UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

## VOLUME 89—PART 1

JANUARY 6, 1943, TO MARCH 1, 1943
(PAGES 1 TO 1458)

Copy 3

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1943

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1943

The 6th day of January having been designated for the annual meeting of Congress by the provisions of Public Law 819 (77th Cong., 2d sess.), approved December 19, 1942, the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

HENRY A. WALLACE, of Iowa, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following

PRAYER

Our Father God, in this hour of solemn convocation as with reverent hands we open a new volume of destiny in our Nation's history, we would, first of all, in contrition of spirit, lift our hearts to Thee, in whom we live and move and have our being. We confess our personal and social sin, our indifference to the want and woe of the world, our racial rancor, and the bigotry which has so often blinded us to the deep meanings of human brotherhood.

O Thou by whom the meek are guided in judgment and light riseth up in darkness for the godly, grant us, in all doubts and uncertainties, the grace to ask what Thou wouldst have us to do, that the spirit of wisdom may save us from all false choices and that, in Thy Light, we may see light, and, in Thy straight path, may not stumble. In all the deliberations begun this day keep our motives clean, our vision clear, our patriotism undefiled, our speech guarded, our appraisals fair, and our consciences unbetrayed. We ask it in the Dear Redeemer's Name. Amen.

SENATOR FROM TEXAS—CREDENTIALS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my colleague the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and ask that they be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1942, W. LEE O'DANIEL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Texas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1943.

Witness: His Excellency our GOV. COKE R. STEVENSON, and our seal hereto affixed at Austin, this the 10th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1942.

COKE R. STEVENSON,
*Governor.*

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WM. J. LAWSON,
*Secretary of State.*

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials of all Senators-elect have been placed on file. The Senators-elect who have not as yet been sworn in will present themselves at the desk in groups of four as their names are called to take the oath of office. The clerk will call the names of the first group of four.

The Chief Clerk (John C. Crockett) called the names of Mr. BAILEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. BANKHEAD, and Mr. BRIDGES.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. HILL, and Mr. TOBEY, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BUSHFIELD, and Mr. CAPPER.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. LUCAS, Mr. TUNNELL, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. REED, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. FERGUSON.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HILL, and Mr. VANDENBERG, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. GLASS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HAWKES, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado.

These Senators (with the exception of Mr. GLASS), escorted by Mr. GERRY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BARBOUR, and Mr. MILLIKIN, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. LODGE, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. MCNARY.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. WALSH, Mr. BARKLEY, Mrs. CARAWAY, and Mr. HOLMAN, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. MOORE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. REVERCOMB.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. KILGORE, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. CLARK of Idaho, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. WHERRY, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. WILSON.

These Senators (with the exception of Mr. WILSON), escorted by Mr. BUTLER and Mr. BREWSTER, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

*Alabama.*—John H. Bankhead and Lister Hill.

*Arizona.*—Carl Hayden and Ernest W. McFarland.

*Arkansas.*—Mrs. Hattie W. Caraway and John L. McClellan.

*California.*—Hiram W. Johnson and Sheridan Downey.

*Colorado.*—Edwin C. Johnson and Eugene D. Millikin.

*Connecticut.*—Francis Maloney and John A. Danaher.

*Delaware.*—James M. Tunnell and C. Douglass Buck.

*Florida.*—Charles O. Andrews and Claude Pepper.

*Georgia.*—Walter F. George and Richard B. Russell.

*Idaho.*—D. Worth Clark and John Thomas.

*Illinois.*—Scott W. Lucas and C. Wayland Brooks.

*Indiana.*—Frederick Van Nuys and Raymond E. Willis.

*Iowa.*—Guy M. Gillette and George A. Wilson.*

*Kansas.*—Arthur Capper and Clyde M. Reed.

*Kentucky.*—Alben W. Barkley and Albert B. Chandler.

*Not sworn.

*Louisiana.*—John H. Overton and Allen J. Ellender.

*Maine.*—Wallace H. White, Jr., and Ralph O. Brewster.

*Maryland.*—Millard E. Tydings and George L. Radcliffe.

*Massachusetts.*—David I. Walsh and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

*Michigan.*—Arthur H. Vandenberg and Homer Ferguson.

*Minnesota.*—Henrik Shipstead and Joseph H. Ball.

*Mississippi.*—Theodore G. Bilbo and James O. Eastland.

*Missouri.*—Bennett Champ Clark and Harry S. Truman.

*Montana.*—Burton K. Wheeler and James E. Murray.

*Nebraska.*—Hugh A. Butler and Kenneth S. Wherry.

*Nevada.*—Patrick A. McCarran and James G. Scrugham.

*New Hampshire.*—Styles Bridges and Charles W. Tobey.

*New Jersey.*—W. Warren Barbour and Albert W. Hawkes.

*New Mexico.*—Carl A. Hatch and Dennis Chavez.

*New York.*—Robert F. Wagner and James M. Mead.

*North Carolina.*—Josiah William Bailey and Robert R. Reynolds.

*North Dakota.*—Gerald P. Nye and William Langer.

*Ohio.*—Robert A. Taft and Harold H. Burton.

*Oklahoma.*—Elmer Thomas and E. H. Moore.

*Oregon.*—Charles L. McNary and Rufus C. Holman.

*Pennsylvania.*—James J. Davis and Joseph F. Guffey.

*Rhode Island.*—Peter G. Gerry and Theodore Francis Green.

*South Carolina.*—Ellison D. Smith and Burnet R. Maybank.

*South Dakota.*—Chan Gurney and Harlan J. Bushfield.

*Tennessee.*—Kenneth McKellar and Tom Stewart.

*Texas.*—Tom Connally and W. Lee O'Daniel.

*Utah.*—Elbert D. Thomas and Abe Murdock.

*Vermont.*—Warren R. Austin and George D. Aiken.

*Virginia.*—Carter Glass* and Harry Flood Byrd.

*Washington.*—Homer T. Bone and Mon C. Wallgren.

*West Virginia.*—Harley M. Kilgore and Chapman Revercomb.

*Wisconsin.*—Robert M. La Follette, Jr., and Alexander Wiley.

*Wyoming.*—Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Edward V. Robertson.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, all the Senators-elect who are present having been sworn in, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Austin | Ball |
| Andrews | Bailey | Bankhead |
| Barbour | Guffey | Radcliffe |
| Barkley | Gurney | Reed |
| Bilbo | Hatch | Revercomb |
| Bone | Hawkes | Reynolds |
| Brewster | Hayden | Robertson |
| Bridges | Hill | Russell |
| Brooks | Holman | Scrugham |
| Buck | Johnson, Colo. | Shipstead |
| Burton | Kilgore | Stewart |
| Bushfield | La Follette | Taft |
| Butler | Langer | Thomas, Idaho |
| Byrd | Lodge | Thomas, Okla. |
| Capper | Lucas | Thomas, Utah |
| Caraway | McCarran | Tobey |
| Chandler | McClellan | Truman |
| Chavez | McFarland | Tunnell |
| Clark, Idaho | McKellar | Tydings |
| Clark, Mo. | McNary | Vandenberg |
| Connally | Maloney | Van Nuys |
| Danaher | Maybank | Wallgren |
| Davis | Millikin | Walsh |
| Eastland | Moore | Wheeler |
| Ellender | Murdock | Wherry |
| Ferguson | Murray | White |
| George | Nye | Wiley |
| Gerry | O'Daniel | Willis |
| Gillette | O'Mahoney | |
| Green | Overton | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 1), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. MCNARY the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. MCNARY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 2), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 3), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order that the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to act in conjunction with a similar committee on the part of the House to notify the President that the Congress is now in session and ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make may have time to perform its duty, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 7, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

* Not sworn.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1943

This being the day fixed by the provisions of Public Law 819 (77th Cong. 2d sess.), approved December 19, 1942, for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members-elect of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-eighth Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by Hon. South Trimble, Clerk of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain of the Seventy-seventh Congress, offered the following

PRAYER

Our Father in Heaven, the God of all grace and power, in the sanctuary of the soul we wait at the altar of prayer. Here may we find that peace and unity which underlie diversity of intellect, fusing courage, strength, and truth into unbiased cooperation. Let there throb in all breasts an undying gratitude for the incomparable genius exemplified in our growing institutions, about which there shall never arise the mournful lament of failure and loss. Thou Christ, who art man's best Friend and love's divinest Love from whom earth's greatest souls have borrowed their greatest gifts, make us worthy to brighten the beacons of this fateful world.

For the facing of this hour give us a light, a searching light that we may step quietly and courageously into the trackless ways of an unknown future. Dispel the dark wind-swept clouds with their tidings of dismay hovering above this anguished earth. Free struggling humanity from those evildoers whose breath is pestilence and who are blind and false to all honor. Enrich us with fortitude of soul out of which victory is born, pledging ourselves to justice and truth. Grant that we may have knowledge with conviction, ability with vision, and understanding that in the kingdom of the soul obedience is life and disobedience is death. Through all the days of this memorable session be at the side of our President, our Speaker, and all Members and clothe them with great discretion and in accordance with Thy holy will.

"Set our feet on lofty places,
Gird our lives that they may be
Armored with all Christ-like graces
In the fight to set men free.
Grant us wisdom;
Grant us courage
That we fail not man nor Thee."

In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The CLERK. This is the day fixed by law, enacted pursuant to the twentieth amendment of the Constitution, for the meeting of the Seventy-eighth Congress. Certificates of election covering the 435 seats in the Seventy-eighth Congress have been received by the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and the names of those persons whose credentials show that they were regularly elected as Representatives in accordance with the laws of their respective States, or of the United States, will be called. As the roll

is called, following the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the State of Alabama, Representatives-elect will please answer to their names to determine whether a quorum is present.

The Clerk called the roll, by States, and the following Members-elect answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

ALABAMA

Boykin, Hobbs, Manasco
Grant, Starnes, Sparkman
Steagall, Jarman, Newsome

ARIZONA

Harless, Murdock

ARKANSAS

Gathings, Cravens, Harris
Mills, Hays
Fulbright, Norrell

CALIFORNIA

Lea, Anderson, Rogers
Englebright, Gearhart, King
Johnson, J. Leroy, Elliott, Johnson, Ward
Outland, Holifield
Rolph, Voorhis, Hinshaw
Welch, Poulson, Sheppard
Carter, Ford, Phillips
Tolan, Costello, Izac

COLORADO

Hill, Chenoweth, Rockwell

CONNECTICUT

Miller, Compton, Talbot
McWilliams, Luce, Monkiewicz

DELAWARE

Willey

FLORIDA

Peterson, Sikes, Hendricks
Price, Cannon, Green

GEORGIA

Peterson, Ramspeck, Whelchel
Cox, Vinson, Brown
Pace, Tarver
Camp, Gibson

IDAHO

Dworshak

ILLINOIS

Dawson, Reed, Simpson
Rowan, Mason, Howell
Busbey, Allen, Johnson,
Gorski, Johnson, Calvin D.
Sabath, Anton J., Vursell
O'Brien, Chiperfield, Heidinger
Schuetz, Dirksen, Bishop
Gordon, Arends, Day
Dewey, Sumner
Church, Wheat

INDIANA

Madden, Harness, Wilson
Halleck, Johnson, Springer
Grant, Landis, Ludlow
Gillie, LaFollette

IOWA

Martin, LeCompte, Jensen
Talle, Cunningham, Hoeven
Gwynne, Gilchrist

KANSAS

Lambertson, Winter, Hope
Guyer, Rees, Carlson

KENTUCKY

Gregory, Creal, Bates
Vincent, Spence, Robsion
O'Neal, May

LOUISIANA

Hébert, Brooks, Larcade
Maloney, McKenzie, Allen
Domengeaux, Morrison

MAINE

Hale, Smith, Fellows

MARYLAND

Ward, D'Alesandro, Sasscer
Baldwin, Ellison, Beall

MASSACHUSETTS

Treadway, Bates, Curley
Clason, Lane, McCormack
Philbin, Goodwin, Wigglesworth
Holmes, Gifford, Martin
Rogers, Herter

MICHIGAN

Sadowski, Wolcott, O'Brien
Michener, Crawford, Rabaut
Shafer, Engel, Dingell
Hoffman, Woodruff, Lesinski
Jonkman, Bradley, Dondero
Blackney, Bennett

MINNESOTA

Andresen, August H., Judd, Pittenger
O'Hara, Knutson, Hagen
Maas, Andersen, H. Carl

MISSISSIPPI

Rankin, Abernethy, McGehee
Whitten, Winstead
Whittington, Colmer

MISSOURI

Arnold, Slaughter, Zimmerman
Schwabe, Short, Miller
Cole, Elmer, Ploeser
Bell, Cannon

MONTANA

Mansfield, O'Connor

NEBRASKA

Curtis, Stefan, Miller
Buffett

NEVADA

Sullivan

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Merrow, Stearns

NEW JERSEY

Wolverton, McLean, Sundstrom
Wene, Thomas, Kean
Auchincloss, Canfield, Hart
Powers, Towe
Eaton, Hartley

NEW MEXICO

Anderson, Fernandez

NEW YORK

Hall, Leonard W., Fay, Culkin
Barry, Baldwin, Douglas
Pfeifer, Kennedy, Hall, Edwin Arthur
Cullen, Bloom, Marcantonio, Hancock
Heffernan, Gavagan, Taber
Somers, Lynch, Cole
Delaney, Buckley, O'Brien
O'Toole, Fitzpatrick, Wadsworth
Keogh, Gamble, Andrews
Celler, Fish, Mruk
O'Leary, LeFevre, Butler
Dickstein, Byrne, Reed
Capozzoli, Taylor, Merritt
Klein, Kearney, Stanley
Burchill, Kilburn

NORTH CAROLINA

Bonner, Folger, Doughton
Kerr, Durham, Morrison
Barden, Clark, Bulwinkle
Cooley, Burgin, Weaver

NORTH DAKOTA

Burdick, Lemke

OHIO

Elston, Ramey, McGregor
Hess, Jenkins, Lewis
Jeffrey, Brehm, Feighan
Jones, Vorys, Crosser
Clevenger, Welchel, Bolton
McCowen, Rowe, Bender
Brown, Griffiths
Smith, Carson

OKLAHOMA

Disney, Boren, Wickersham
Nichols, Monroney, Rizley
Stewart, Johnson

OREGON

Mott, Angell, Ellsworth
Stockman

PENNSYLVANIA

Gallagher, Miller, Van Zandt
McGranery, Fenton, Snyder
Bradley, Hoch, Furlong
Sheridan, Gillette, Graham
Pracht, Scanlon, Tibbott
Myers, Ditter, Kelley
Scott, Simpson, Rodgers
Wolfenden, Kunkel, Weiss
Gerlach, Gavin, Eberharter
Kinzer, Walter, Wright
Murphy, Gross, Troutman

RHODE ISLAND

Forand, Fogarty

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rivers, Hare, Richards
Fulmer, Bryson, McMillan

SOUTH DAKOTA

Mundt, Case

TENNESSEE

Reece, McCord, Murray
Jennings, Priest, Cooper
Kefauver, Courtney, Davis
Gore

TEXAS

Patman, Thomas, West
Dies, Mansfield, Thomason
Beckworth, Johnson, Russell
Rayburn, Lyndon B., Worley
Sumners, Poage, Mahon
Johnson, Luther A., Lanham, Kilday
Patton, Gossett, Fisher
Kleberg

UTAH

Granger, Robinson

VERMONT

Plumley

VIRGINIA

Bland, Drewry, Robertson
Harris, Burch, Smith
Satterfield, Woodrum, Flannagan

WASHINGTON

Magnuson, Norman, Horan
Jackson, Holmes, Coffee

WEST VIRGINIA

Schiffler, Rohrbough, Kee
Randolph, Ellis, Smith

WISCONSIN

Smith, Wasielewski, Murray
Sauthoff, McMurray, Hull
Stevenson, Keefe, O'Konski

WYOMING

Barrett

The CLERK. The roll call discloses the presence of 426 members. A quorum is present. Credentials, regular in order, have been filed showing the election of ANTHONY J. DIMOND, as Delegate from the Territory of Alaska, and of JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, as Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii.

Since the regular election of Representatives to the Seventy-eighth Congress, one change has occurred as a result of which a vacancy now exists in the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Missouri, occasioned by the death of the late Hon. Phillip A. Bennett.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The CLERK. The next business in order is the election of a Speaker, and nominations will now be received.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Clerk, as chairman of the Democratic caucus, I am directed, by the unanimous vote of that caucus, to present for election to the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-eighth Congress the name of Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Clerk, by authority and direction of the Republican conference, representing a minority in this House, I nominate for Speaker of the House of Representatives the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts to the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The CLERK. Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas, and Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts, have been placed in

nomination. Are there any further nominations? There being no further nominations, the Clerk appoints the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WENE], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], and the gentlewoman from New York [Miss STANLEY], to act as tellers.

The roll will now be called, and those responding will indicate by surname the nominee of their choice. The tellers will please take places at the desk, in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for Speaker. The following is the vote in detail:

[Roll No. 2]

RAYBURN

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Gordon | Norrell |
| Allen, La. | Gore | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Anderson, N. Mex. | Gorski | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Baldwin, Md. | Gossett | O'Connor |
| Barden | Granger | O'Leary |
| Barry | Grant, Ala. | O'Neal |
| Bates, Ky. | Green | O'Toole |
| Beckworth | Gregory | Outland |
| Bell | Hagen | Pace |
| Bland | Hare | Patman |
| Bloom | Harless, Ariz. | Patton |
| Bonner | Harris, Ark. | Peterson, Fla. |
| Boren | Harris, Va. | Peterson, Ga. |
| Boykin | Hart | Pfeifer |
| Bradley, Pa. | Hays | Philbin |
| Brooks | Hébert | Poage |
| Brown, Ga. | Heffernan | Price |
| Bryson | Hendricks | Priest |
| Buckley | Hobbs | Rabaut |
| Bulwinkle | Hoch | Ramspeck |
| Burch, Va. | Holifield | Randolph |
| Burchill, N. Y. | Izac | Rankin |
| Burgin | Jackson | Richards |
| Byrne | Jarman | Rivers |
| Camp | Johnson, Luther A. | Robertson |
| Cannon, Fla. | Johnson, Lyndon B. | Robinson, Utah |
| Cannon, Mo. | Johnson, Okla. | Rogers, Calif. |
| Capozzoli | Kee | Rowan |
| Celler | Kefauver | Russell |
| Clark | Kelley | Sabath |
| Coffee | Kennedy | Sadowski |
| Colmer | Keogh | Sasscer |
| Cooley | Kerr | Satterfield |
| Cooper | Kilday | Scanlon |
| Costello | King | Schuetz |
| Courtney | Kleberg | Sheppard |
| Cox | Klein | Sheridan |
| Cravens | Lane | Sikes |
| Creal | Lanham | Slaughter |
| Crosser | Larcade | Smith, Va. |
| Cullen | Lea | Smith, W. Va. |
| Curley | Lesinski | Snyder |
| D'Alesandro | Ludlow | Somers, N. Y. |
| Davis | Lynch | Sparkman |
| Dawson | McCord | Spence |
| Delaney | McCormack | Starnes, Ala. |
| Dickstein | McGehee | Steagall |
| Dies | McGranery | Stewart |
| Dilweg | McKenzie | Sullivan |
| Dingell | McMillan | Sumners, Tex. |
| Disney | McMurray | Tarver |
| Domengeaux | Madden | Thomas, Tex. |
| Doughton | Magnuson | Thomason |
| Drewry | Mahon | Tolan |
| Durham | Maloney | Vincent, Ky. |
| Eberharter | Manasco | Vinson, Ga. |
| Elliott | Mansfield, Mont. | Voorhis, Calif. |
| Fay | Mansfield, Tex. | Walter |
| Feighan | Marcantonio | Ward |
| Fernandez | May | Wasielewski |
| Fisher | Merritt | Weaver |
| Fitzpatrick | Mills | Weiss |
| Flannagan | Monroney | Wene |
| Fogarty | Morrison, La. | West |
| Folger | Morrison, N. C. | Whelchel, Ga. |
| Forand | Murdock | Whitten |
| Ford | Murphy | Whittington |
| Fulbright | Murray, Tenn. | Wickersham |
| Fulmer | Myers | Winstead |
| Furlong | Newsome | Woodrum, Va. |
| Gathings | Nichols | Worley |
| Gavagan | | Wright |
| Gibson | | Zimmerman |

MARTIN

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Ill. | Andresen, August H. | Arends |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Andrews | Arnold |
| Anderson, Calif. | Angell | Auchincloss |
| Barrett | Hall, Edwin Arthur | Murray, Wis. |
| Bates, Mass. | Hall, Leonard W. | Norman |
| Beall | Halleck | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Bender | Hancock | O'Hara |
| Bennett | Harness, Ind. | O'Konski |
| Bishop | Hartley | Phillips |
| Blackney | Heidinger | Pittenger |
| Bolton | Herter | Ploeser |
| Bradley, Mich. | Hess | Plumley |
| Brehm | Hill | Poulson |
| Brown, Ohio | Hinshaw | Powers |
| Buffett | Hoeven | Pracht |
| Burdick | Hoffman | Ramey |
| Busbey | Holmes, Mass. | Reece, Tenn. |
| Butler | Holmes, Wash. | Reed, Ill. |
| Canfield | Hope | Reed, N. Y. |
| Carlson, Kans. | Horan | Rees, Kans. |
| Carson, Ohio | Howell | Rizley |
| Carter | Jeffrey | Robsion, Ky. |
| Case | Jenkins | Rockwell |
| Chenoweth | Jennings | Rodgers, Pa. |
| Chiperfield | Jensen | Rogers, Mass. |
| Church | Johnson, Anton J. | Rohrbough |
| Clason | Johnson, Calvin D. | Rolph |
| Clevenger | Johnson, Ind. | Rowe |
| Cole, Mo. | Johnson, J. Leroy | Schiffler |
| Cole, N. Y. | Johnson, Ward | Schwabe |
| Compton | Jones | Scott |
| Crawford | Jonkman | Shafer |
| Culkin | Judd | Smith, Maine |
| Cunningham | Kean | Smith, Ohio |
| Curtis | Kearney | Smith, Wis. |
| Day | Keefe | Springer |
| Dewey | Kilburn | Stanley |
| Dirksen | Kinzer | Stearns, N. H. |
| Ditter | Knutson | Stefan |
| Dondero | Kunkel | Stevenson |
| Douglas | LaFollette | Stockman |
| Dworshak | Lambertson | Sumner, Ill. |
| Eaton | Landis | Sundstrom |
| Ellis | LeCompte | Taber |
| Ellison, Md. | LeFevre | Talbot |
| Ellsworth | Lemke | Talle |
| Elmer | Lewis, Ohio | Taylor |
| Elston, Ohio | Luce | Thomas, N. J. |
| Engel | McCowen | Tibbott |
| Englebright | McGregor | Towe |
| Fellows | McLean | Treadway |
| Fenton | McWilliams | Troutman |
| Fish | Maas | Van Zandt |
| Gallagher | Martin, Iowa | Vorys, Ohio |
| Gamble | Mason | Vursell |
| Gavin | Merrow | Wadsworth |
| Gearhart | Michener | Weichel, Ohio |
| Gerlach | Miller, Conn. | Welch |
| Gifford | Miller, Mo. | Wheat |
| Gilchrist | Miller, Nebr. | Wigglesworth |
| Gillette | Miller, Pa. | Willey |
| Gillie | Monkiewicz | Wilson |
| Goodwin | Mott | Winter |
| Graham | Mruk | Wolcott |
| Grant, Ind. | Mundt | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Griffiths | | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Gross | | Woodruff, Mich. |
| Guyer | | |
| Gwynne | | |
| Hale | | |

SAUTHOFF

Hull

HULL

Sauthoff

The CLERK. The tellers agree in their tally. The total number of votes cast is 426, of which Hon. SAM RAYBURN has received 217; Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., 206; Hon. HARRY SAUTHOFF, 1; Hon. MERLIN HULL, 1; and present, 1.

Therefore, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas, having received a majority of all the votes cast, is duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], and the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] will please conduct the Speaker-elect to the chair.

PRESENTATION OF THE SPEAKER-ELECT

The committee appointed by the Clerk conducted Mr. RAYBURN to the Speaker's chair.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. My colleagues of the House, one of the compensations for being a defeated candidate for Speaker is that it gives you one thrilling moment. You come to this exalted position, you breathe this rarefied atmosphere, and, if you are of a speculative nature, you can look down on this great gathering and wonder what might have happened if more than 500,000 majority of people in this country who wanted a Republican House had only wisely distributed their votes.

But I prefer to think of this as something nobler and grander than all that. I like to think of it as the American way of life and the American way of government, functioning at its very best. In this country we divide, we debate, we discuss, and sometimes we compromise. When we reach a decision we are all one united people. That is something that those who live in other countries do not always realize.

So, as we meet here today on this very solemn and serious occasion, this is going to be one of the great Congresses in the history of our country. The last Congress might well be called the War Congress, but this Congress will be the Victory Congress. No matter on which side of the aisle we may sit, no matter what may be our party fealty, there is one fixed determination on the part of every man and woman who occupies a place in this House, and that is to see this war to a successful, decisive, and early end. As leader of the opposition, we pledge our earnest and untiring efforts to that end.

We may differ in some philosophies of government, we may differ in some details of government, but there will be no division; this aisle will have no division as far as the purpose of winning the war is concerned. It is necessary for our security and our way of life. We shall win this war decisively and then write a just peace.

In our American system of government there is one great integral part of this Government in whom the American people have faith. The people may at times scold us; they may at times criticize us; they may occasionally damn us; but, in the final analysis, the American people have faith in their Congress. They know the Congress is the bulwark of popular government.

It has always been one of the proudest boasts of this great institution of which we are privileged to be a part, that we have always had a great Speaker. I have served 18 years as a Member of this body and in all that time I never knew the House to have a Speaker who was not a real American. Our new Speaker measures up to our finest traditions. We have elected a really great American as Speaker. We have elected as Speaker a just man; one who realizes that when he assumes this high office there can be but one purpose, and that is to see that every Member of this body, whatever his party may be, shall have a square, fair deal. Our Speaker in the past has always been fair; he presides with dignity and courage.

It is a happy coincidence that this great honor of being elected Speaker of what I believe is to be the Victory Con-

gress should come to our beloved Speaker on his birthday. Members of the House, it gives me great pleasure to present to you the man you have honored by electing him your Speaker; the beloved friend not only of myself but of every Member of this House, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. MARTIN, I should be less than human if I were not deeply moved by your most gracious words when presenting me to my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

To my colleagues in the House and friends—and they are not divided by the center aisle—from the bottom of a grateful heart I thank you for the signal honor you have done me. When I was the humblest Member of the House of Representatives I was proud of my membership. It is a great honor for any man or woman to be rewarded by a district with a seat in this Chamber. For 30 of my years I have been a Member of this body, and the longer I am a Member the prouder I am of being a part of this great House of Representatives.

As was said by our colleague, the leader of the minority, we have just closed a great Congress. We were criticized; we shall be criticized, but, in my opinion, that Congress in which many of you sat was one that for the work it did and the way it did it deserved the least criticism. We cannot administer the laws we pass or fight the wars we declare; this must be done by others. But the Congress just closed did its important work in a great way. It gave to those charged with the administration of the laws and the fighting of the war every law that was needed and every dollar that was necessary. I trust and I believe that the Congress assembling today will so act that just criticism will not fall upon it.

For the honor you have conferred upon me I again bring you this pledge: It shall be my unwavering determination to protect and defend the rights, the prerogatives, and the power of the House of Representatives.

We must have teamwork between the executive departments and the legislative branch of the Government; this cooperation must be mutual and understood by all of us. It is fortunate at a time like this, the most serious, in my opinion, that civilization has faced, that we have leadership of our causes in the great countries of the world allied with us, and I believe you will not deem me partisan on this occasion when I say to you that if America had been searched I believe a greater war leader could not have been chosen than the one who is our present Commander in Chief. Cooperation between him and the leadership of the House has been had; free and open discussions are had each week with the proposals discussed, and I may take you into my confidence and say that these are not blow-pulling conferences. I have no complaint from that part of the executive branch of the Government.

To other branches of the Government suggestions have been made that before determinations are reached or proposals are announced, those in positions of responsibility upon the hill must be consulted. I trust and believe this will be done.

We today, my colleagues, are in the midst of a chaotic world; civilization itself is being tested as never before; all of our ideals of freedom, of democracy, of freedom of conscience, are today under serious and dangerous attack. It remains to be seen in the months that lie immediately ahead of us whether or not Government set up as ours is can function in a crisis. I believe it can; it has in the past; it will in the future.

In my opinion, when this war is over actions must be taken that will be world-shaking in their consequences. Trade and commerce, peace and civilization themselves must be looked to. This must be not a war without victory, but a war of victory. This time there should be no stopping until the vandalism and paganism of Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo are wiped from the face of the earth.

We must win this war and keep it won. Civilization cannot stand a shock like this every quarter of a century; we must have a peace that will remain. There is in my mind but one way this can be brought about: That when we are victorious we disarm these vandals and keep them disarmed. The great Jefferson said:

> We are today in this world the last hope of human liberty. For so dear a state we should be willing to sacrifice every attachment and every enmity.

Those words sound as if they were spoken yesterday or today; or they might be spoken on the morrow.

I have that faith and confidence in the representatives of the people assembled here to feel that they will measure up to the highest standards of statesmanship and patriotism that have stood forth in this country in every crisis since the beginning of the Republic. Criticism there will be. One great leader said of his country that there would always be a country by that name. So long as liberty survives and freedom lives there will be a House of Representatives of the United States of America.

It is needless for me to say to you on this occasion that it is a happy one for me. Three times you have bestowed upon me this distinguished honor which has been a life's ambition with me. You, my friends, have allowed me to realize that great ambition. In this terrible period I must preside over what I conceive to be probably the most important session of the Congress since Washington's day. I pledge with confidence to the American people that you will live up to their hopes, their aspirations, and their ambitions.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] will administer the oath of office.

Mr. SABATH then administered the oath of office to the Speaker.

SWEARING IN OF THE MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. Some years ago the old custom of having each delegation come to the Well and take the oath of office was subrogated, and there was substituted instead the precedent that all Members should rise in their places and take the oath of office at the same time. The Chair thinks the latter precedent is much more convenient and much more practical. The Chair therefore asks each Member- and each Delegate-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress to rise in his place that the the Speaker may administer to them the oath of office.

The Members- and Delegates-elect rose and the Speaker administered to them the oath of office.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1), and ask for its immediate consideration and adoption.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That South Trimble, of the State of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, chosen the Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Kenneth Romney, of the State of Montana, be, and he is hereby, chosen the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Joseph J. Sinnott, of the State of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Finis E. Scott, of the State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives; and

That Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., of the District of Columbia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolution be divided and that a vote first be taken on the election of Chaplain, after which I shall offer a substitute resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the election of a Chaplain of the House.

The resolution was divided; the question was taken; and the Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., was unanimously elected Chaplain of the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute resolution for the resolution offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The Clerk read the substitute resolution, as follows:

Substitute resolution offered by Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan:

*Resolved*, That John Andrews, of the State of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That W. F. Russell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That James P. Griffin, of the State of New Jersey, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; and

That Frank W. Collier, of the State of Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby, elected Postmaster of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute resolution.

The substitute resolution was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the original resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. South Trimble, Mr. Kenneth Romney, Mr. Joseph J. Sinnott, Mr. Finis Scott, and Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., appeared at the bar of the House and the oath of office was administered to them by the Speaker.

NOTIFICATION OF SENATE OF ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 2), and ask for its immediate consideration and adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, has been elected Speaker and South Trimble, a citizen of the State of Kentucky, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-eighth Congress,

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 3), and ask for its immediate consideration.

*Resolved*, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION OF SPEAKER AND CLERK

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 4), which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, Speaker, and South Trimble, a citizen of the State of Kentucky, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 5), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the rules of the Seventy-seventh Congress be, and they are hereby, adopted as the rules of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. May I say to the chairman of the Committee on Rules that the highest constitutional power of the House of Representatives is to formulate its own rules. May I ask the chairman if he can give some assurance that he will call the Committee on Rules together to permit those who have amendments to the rules to present them to that committee in the very near future, as soon as the committee is organized? I have in mind one particular rule that should be considered, relating to the creation of a committee on civilian and commercial aviation. It is necessary to expedite consideration of this rule so that if it is decided by the House to create such a committee those in authority can make the proper designations to the committee.

Mr. SABATH. I assure the gentleman and the House that I shall call a meeting of the committee as soon as possible. If the gentleman from New York or any other gentleman has a rule he proposes to offer, it will receive consideration as early as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 6), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 7), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during sessions and recesses of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 1):

*Resolved*, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the foregoing resolution, the Vice President appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. MCNARY as members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a committee on the part of the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of the two Houses has assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make has performed its duty. The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 12:30 o'clock p. m., January 7, 1943, to a joint session of the two Houses.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 1), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, the 7th day of January 1943, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 8), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That under authority of the act making appropriations for the legislative establishment for the fiscal year 1943, John Andrews is hereby named a special clerk to the minority of the House as successor to William Tyler Page, deceased; and John McCabe is hereby named as a minority employee of the House as successor to John Andrews.

The resolution was agreed to.

PRINTING AND BINDING

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 9), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the standing committees of the House of Representatives and the floor leaders are hereby authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be actually necessary for the transaction of their official business during the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic caucus, I desire to notify the House officially of the election as majority leader of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference, I have been directed to notify the House officially that the Republican conference has elected the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, as minority leader of the House.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 40, sections 175 and 176,

United States Code, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK], members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] stating that he has been unable to get to the session today, and asking me to express his regrets. He is sick.

THE LATE DR. GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an excellent article from the Washington Post of today.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad privilege to call upon you Representatives of the people to join the people of Alabama in mourning the passing of a great Alabamian—a great American—a man of the people. Eminent and world-famous man of science in the field of chemistry, an artist of note, as well as an honored educator, Dr. George Washington Carver, of Tuskegee Institute, was called yesterday to his long and well-earned rest, his great reward. He was a faithful, humble servant of his Divine Master, the servant of all. His greatness knows no color line. The blessings flowing, and to flow, from his work, will make multiplied millions his debtors.

The mourning that his loss evokes is not "denied or abridged" "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

[From the Washington Post of January 6, 1943]

DR. CARVER, NOTED NEGRO SCIENTIST, DIES

TUSKEGEE, ALA., January 5.—Dr. George Washington Carver, the noted Negro scientist, died at 7:30 p. m. today at his home at Tuskegee Institute.

Dr. Carver had been in failing health for some months and was confined to his bed for the past 10 days.

Born of slave parents at Diamond Grove, Mo., he was never sure of his birth date, but once estimated that it was "about 1864."

He became a member of the Tuskegee Institute faculty in 1894 and has been attached to the Negro institution ever since.

Dr. Carver was recognized as one of the outstanding scientists in the field of agricultural research. He discovered scores of uses for such lowly products as sweetpotatoes, peanuts, and clay. From the South's red clay and sandy loam he developed ink, pigments, cosmetics, paper paint, and many other articles.

He will be buried in Tuskegee Cemetery, where also lies Booker T. Washington, founder and first president of the school. The body is to lie in state for a short time before the burial.

Some characterized him "The Ebony Pasteur"; others, "The most outstanding Negro of his time"; and still more, "An outstanding world character."

WHITES JOINED IN TRIBUTE

Many times whites joined members of his own race in tribute. On his fortieth anniversary as a member of the Tuskegee Institute (Ala.) faculty in 1937 a bronze bust of him was unveiled on the campus, a tribute to "Forty Years of Creative Research."

Carver never knew his father. While a child he and his mother were stolen from the Diamond Grove, Mo., farm, where he was born, and taken to Arkansas.

He was ransomed from his captors with a horse valued at $300. His mother was never heard of again.

A gangling boy, determined to better his lot, he worked his way through public schools and then through Iowa State College, winning a bachelor's degree in 1894 and a master's degree in 1896. From there he went to Tuskegee Institute, founded by the late Booker T. Washington and later to become the world's largest institution of learning for the Negro.

Before he turned in 1936 to experimenting with peanut oils as a massage for after-treatment of infantile paralysis, Carver had developed scores of everyday uses for sweetpotatoes, peanuts, trees, clays, cornstalks, blossoms, and even cow dung.

From the products of the South's red clay and sandy loam he developed milk, ink, plastics, cosmetics, paper, paint, and even imitation marble.

VISITED BY THE GREAT

Presidents, statesmen, leaders of industry and the humble called at Carver's laboratory. Henry Ford paused at an exhibit in Carver Memorial Museum to view the peanut-oil massage display.

While he was best known for his contributions to agriculture, Dr. Carver was also listed among the great artists of his age.

One of his paintings hangs in Luxembourg Gallery. Landscapes were his choice, and his Curtis Browns were pointed out with pride to all who called at Tuskegee while he was there. They were made with paints developed by his young assistant—from the magnolia blossom cone, the Osage orange, banana skins and coffee grounds.

Besides being chief of research and experiment at Tuskegee Institute, Dr. Carver was a director of the Department of Agriculture research; collaborator in the division of plant industry, United States Department of Agriculture; member of the Royal Society of Arts, London; holder of the 1923 Spingarn Medal; and winner in 1939 of the Roosevelt Medal for achievement in science.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Pope Pius XII a week ago. I have talked to the Public Printer, and there will be more than two pages, but, irrespective of that, I ask unanimous consent that the address be inserted notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. SPEAKER RAYBURN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in these trying days, when the greatest external danger that has confronted our country exists, it is necessary that we have in all positions of public trust, particularly in high and key positions, men of vision and courage. There must be only one thought uppermost in the minds of all of us—to win the war and preserve our country, and also a future world, in which decent people of all countries, men and women of good will, can live in peace. Fortunately we have such a leader in the legislative branch, whom we have just elected Speaker of this great body. Without regard to party, we all have a great affection for our beloved Speaker. He will treat every Member fairly; he will truly represent the House in all governmental activities. I am proud to enjoy his friendship and to serve with him as majority leader. Not so many years ago there was born one who has made his imprint upon American life. The child of years ago is our beloved Speaker of today—a great leader—of whom we of the House are all proud, our great war Speaker, and we all hope and pray, our victory Speaker. I know I express the sentiments of the House in congratulating SAM RAYBURN on his birthday anniversary, and when I extend to him our best wishes for many future birthday anniversaries.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Chair for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gold of unwavering loyalty and deep friendship buys privilege, then in addressing you I am within my own right.

This House in having reelected you to the great office of Speaker honors itself when it honors you and continues unbroken a cordial and affectionate relationship which must be made to work for the public good.

The responsibilities that rest upon you, Mr. Speaker, are beyond the power of human imagination to measure. Decisions which must be taken in this Chamber may well influence the course of civilization and certainly influence the fate of millions yet unborn. Washington is today literally the hub of the globe. Our Nation is having to mother the whole world, and you are the second ranking official in the Government. You need the help of Almighty God, and the loyal support of your colleagues. It is my prayer that these you may enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, you are not only the Speaker of this House, you are its symbol. In your keeping is its honor, its reputation, and its place in the confidence of the people. Yours is the duty and the pleasure, I am sure, of defending it against all abuse of person or power.

The Congress, Mr. Speaker, is the special instrument of the people by which they control their Government and those who govern them. It is the special instrument through which those who operate the Government get their mandates and their authority from the people. The Congress, sir, is the heart and conscience, it is the spirit and the soul of government by consent of the governed.

The House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, by reason of its very nature—by reason of the fact that its Members go back to the electorate every 2 years for approval or disapproval of their policies—may be said to represent more intimately the people than perhaps is the case with the other branch of the Congress. In conferences which must from

time to time be held between the legislative, the judicial, and the executive branches of the Government you, Mr. Speaker, will speak for this House, and you will speak with an authority that cannot be questioned.

The great honor that is yours delights me as your friend. The great responsibility that is yours I hope every Member of this House, irrespective of party, may be privileged to help you carry and discharge.

Mr. Speaker, the winning of the war is our chief business, and to that end this House will give its all. But we want to keep America. We want to preserve the liberties of our people. We want to keep our constitutional representative form of government. We want a Congress that is not only coordinate but one that is coequal and independent.

It matters little, Mr. Speaker, whether any individual in this House remains here or goes back to private life because throughout a century and a half of our national existence Members of this and the other body have come and gone, but Congress, as an institution, goes on forever, and must go on forever if liberty is to survive.

We recognize with regret that the terrible business of war renders necessary the temporary surrender of many of our liberties and privileges, but let me ask you, sir, have we not at times gone dangerously far astray? If we expect to keep America as we know and love America, do we not need to stop, take our bearings, and be certain of our course? The people expect the laws governing them to be made by their Congress; to be made by those they choose to represent them, and not by people they have never seen, whose policies they know nothing about, whom they have elected to no office, and with whom they are unacquainted.

Mr. Speaker, a difficult task confronts the Congress, and that task is to reestablish balanced government by the Congress, recapturing powers which never should have been delegated. Powers which it cannot reclaim it must redefine. Congress must use that great and certain power reserved to it in the Constitution—the control of the purse. I say to you, sir, that government by bureaucrats must be broken, and broken now, and to the accomplishment of these measures necessary to the preservation of liberty and constitutional government, you, Mr. Speaker, must lead the way.

This House, speaking with the voice of the people, is determined that the legislative shall be in fact as well as name a coequal branch of the Government. It is determined to stand upon its own feet, to do its own thinking, to write its own laws, and, in its own right, to perform its constitutional functions. It is your great good fortune, as it is your awful responsibility, to render a high public service to the Nation and to the world in your position as the presiding officer of this great parliamentary body. I count it fortunate for the Nation and the world that a man of your breadth of views and kindliness of nature should be the Speaker of this House at a time like this.

Your training from childhood has fitted you to render this historic service in this unique period in human history. You have the confidence of both sides of the House. Your fairness, your Americanism, your ability, are unquestioned.

This war has laid tremendous strains upon our civil procedures. Unless those strains are properly met and adequately handled, they can menace our whole scheme of parliamentary government.

This House must be cemented into a working agency with the sole objective of winning the war and of saving civilization afterward.

As Speaker, we all know you will confer with the leaders of both sides. Your fairness and kindliness alone, your good judgment and your sense of justice, alone can make possible a united body in this House to protect our American freedom and our American ideals.

As Speaker, by grace of the House, you are responsive to the will of the House. As the head of this parliamentary body it is your profoundly important function to deal with the President of the United States. The President as head of the executive department is powerful; indeed, as Commander in Chief, he is wellnigh all powerful. The Vice President, as the head of the Senate, occupies a position of great influence and honor. But you, sir, as Speaker of the House of Representatives, wield more power and exert more influence on events in this country than any other individual except the President.

I think we are all keenly conscious that our system of Government cannot function in this time of stress and danger without the aid and influence of the House of Representatives. By reason of events, which touch the lives and fortunes of every individual in the world, it has become imperative that the checks and balances of our American constitutional form of Government be more carefully adjusted and more fully employed than at any time in the history of this Nation.

The decisions which must be taken and the problems which must be met here and the sacrifices which the people must bear as the result of our decisions are too fundamental; they are too profound; they are too vast to be decided by any one man or any small group of men. The people must be heard through their representatives in the Congress. The Congress must be heard in the supreme councils of the Nation through you, Mr. Speaker.

In the sunshine of the Texas plains, in the free winds that swept across those magnificent distances, in the traditions of your State so rich in heroism and self-reliance, in the hospitality, the friendliness of the Texas heart and the Texas home, you, Mr. Speaker, have imbibed that kindly nature, that great courage, that breadth of view, that balance of judgment which stand your Nation in such good stead in her hour of need now.

Reflecting these qualities in your attitude, Mr. Speaker, representing and speaking for this House of Representatives in the councils of the Nation, and the world, I say to you, sir, that you will have the wholehearted support of the House of Representatives and the country. May God put wisdom in your mind and strength in your heart to discharge to your country and the world these vast responsibilities with honor to yourself and eternal blessing to your fellow men.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a poem entitled "A Plea to the Seventy-eighth Congress," written for us by Mr. Joseph Auslander, of the Library of Congress. I wanted to read the poem, but in view of the pressure of official business connected with the inauguration of the new Congress, I shall insert it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to bring to your attention the following poem, which I have entitled "A Plea to the Seventy-eighth Congress." The beautiful and moving appeal was written especially for this day, January 6, by Mr. Joseph Auslander. As you know, Joseph Auslander is the gift officer at the Library of Congress.

I am certain that every Member will enjoy this work of Mr. Auslander and I am sure that the words of the plea will inspire us in our duties as legislators, aid us in our quest for a solution to the problems of government, and encourage us in efforts to furnish leadership, as did Jeanne d'Arc, to the people of America and to the peoples of the world.

The poem follows:

#### A PLEA TO THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

This day on which you meet will mark
The birthday also of Jeanne d'Arc,
Whose life was ruled by simple faith
That rose triumphant over death;
Who stood secure in her great vision
Against the cynic's grim derision,
Strong against traitor's tongue and rod
In love of country, love of God;
In whose heart burned a fire that shamed
The faggots that about her flamed:
The soul's pure light that set France free,
The burning love of liberty,
The burning love of her sweet land,
The faith no foeman could withstand.
This is the day on which was born
The faith that saved a nation torn
Within, without by double strife—
The faith that saves a nation's life.
Such faith, such valor we must give,
If we would make our freedom live.

—*Joseph Auslander.*

### GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening at Tuskegee Institute, in Alabama, the great Negro institute of learning, made famous by Booker T. Washington, there died one of America's and the world's greatest scientists, Dr. George Washington Carver. Dr. Carver was born of slave parents about 1864 at Diamond, Mo., in Newton County, in my congressional district. He found new uses during his agricultural research for the lowly peanut, the soybean, and the sweetpotato, and from the red clay of the Southland he extracted many valu-

able substances—milk, ink, pigments, paint, and cosmetics. His scientific discoveries and research reflect not only credit to the Negro race, but they have brought fame and honor to this great Nation and have served humanity everywhere. Dr. Carver was a great artist as well as a renowned scientist. One of his paintings hangs in the Luxembourg Gallery.

In the last Congress, on July 15, 1942, I introduced H. R. 7391, a bill to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument. Today I am reintroducing this identical bill, and I trust that the Public Lands Committee and this House will take early and favorable action in order that they may purchase the farm near Diamond, Mo., on which Dr. Carver, one of the greatest benefactors of mankind, was born, to do honor to this great leader of the Negro race. This humble man, with his gentle spirit, his deep and abiding religious faith, his artistic temperament, and scientific achievements, won for himself immortality. Presidents, statesmen, captains of industry, and humble folks made a path to his door. The least a grateful nation can do is to build a monument to this hero of humanity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address by Hon. WARREN R. AUSTIN, United States Senator from Vermont.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SHAFER was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include the inaugural address of Governor Dewey, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address that I made recently.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement by Mr. Paul H. Ditzen, a member of the Wyandotte bar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting an editorial from the Minneapolis Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a speech which I recently made over the radio in Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of all other business on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HON. CAROLINE O'DAY

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I am very reluctant to bring to the attention of the House at this time a very sad occurrence which has happened, in the loss of our colleague the late Mrs. Caroline O'Day.

She died just about the time the new Congress was assembling. She was a very great help to us in our work. Mrs. O'Day was a very charitable woman. Not only was she a Member of the House of Representatives but she was also the secretary of the Democratic Club. I am sure every Member feels, as I do, a sense of deep personal loss in her passing. We trust that her reward may be as great as her service.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my distinguished colleague in lamenting the passing of a fine lady who for 8 years honored us and the great State of New York with her service in this body, and who for many years served the womanhood of America and her country in a splendid, intelligent, capable, and forward-looking way. She was a distinguished Member of this House, and we all mourn her passing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know every Member here mourns the passing of Mrs. O'Day, a true gentlewoman, a lady in the real sense of the word, a woman of the strongest convictions from her childhood, a person who did not espouse a cause for the moment or for any purpose except a sincere and honorable one. She did a great service in the earlier days for the cause of women, the garment workers, and for other women in industry, and for the underprivileged in New York. As one of them said to me: "I know you will like our Mrs. O'Day." We did like her, her honesty, her great modesty, her love of humanity, her intelligence, and her ability. We cannot replace people of this kind, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, learned with genuine regret of the death of our late colleague, Caroline O'Day. She was always quiet, unassuming, but withal a most effective Member of this august body. She was elected in 1934 and served with distinction for 8 years. She was a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs, the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and she was chairman of the Committee on the Election of the President and Vice President. She was always careful, precise, and painstaking in her work. She never played to the gallery, she never sought publicity, she was every inch a statesman. She never used her sex as a glamorous weapon of achievement. She was highly regarded for her intelligence and accomplishments.

Caroline O'Day was an idealist, but her idealism never interfered with her realism.

New York loses a splendid leader, a laborer in welfare organizations, a powerful spearhead. The Halls of Congress were not the only arena wherein she succeeded. She was an eminent artist and achieved fame as a painter, etcher, and costume designer. She was always a member, a loyal member, of the Democratic Party.

We have lost a sincere adherent, the country has lost a genuine patriot, and my State of New York has lost a liberal servant; we have all lost a fine friend.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I too, join my delegation and colleagues in mourning the loss of Caroline O'Day. She was a member of the Committee on Immigration of which I have had the honor of being chairman for many years. In her work in the committee she demonstrated intelligent understanding of the problems dealt with. She was human, charitable, and represented a great picture of a fine lady. My committee joins me in mourning the loss of this lady. I personally will miss her very much, as I at many times consulted her on great human progressive problems and always received the proper answer.

Mr. Speaker, on some future occasion I hope to extend my remarks on the life and character of Caroline O'Day.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE].

Mr. GAMBLE. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked to learn of the death of my friend and neighbor, the Honorable

Caroline O'Day, and I join with my colleagues in expressing not only my own personal sympathy in the loss that has come to her family but the deep sympathy of her many friends and neighbors in my congressional district where she lived in Westchester County, N. Y.

Mrs. O'Day was for many years one of the prominent women in public life, not only in Westchester County, but in the State of New York.

A gentlewoman of culture, of high ideals and purposes, Mrs. O'Day was a leader early in the cause of woman suffrage. She believed that women had a place in the political life of this country—that they should take a part in it and her own political career proved indeed those principles for which she strove.

A great humanitarian, a liberal always, kind, soft-spoken, sympathetic, she worked with and for all groups and classes in all walks of life with a complete understanding of and a desire to better the social and economic condition, particularly among the working people. She did much in advancing a liberal program of social and welfare reform.

In all this she worked quietly and yet with much enthusiasm and with a quality of leadership that made her one of the outstanding citizens of the Empire State. In her death the citizens of Westchester County and New York State have lost a true friend.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Mrs. O'Day is not the end of an epoch, but it is the passing of the beginning of an epoch. Mrs. O'Day represented the womanhood of this country who sought through the original suffragette program equal rights with men in suffrage. The story of her work on the suffrage movement is interesting and is also illustrative of the work of millions of other women in our country who were impelled and inspired by the suffrage movement and the leadership of many other women who had been originally in the movement. Mrs. O'Day, in my opinion, is representative of that period when the suffragette movement came to its greatest peak; to wit, about 1910, 1911, 1912, and 1913. Mrs. O'Day was standing on the curb in New York City observing the passing of a suffragette parade. As the parade passed by, her husband turned to her and said:

My dear, some day I hope to see you in a parade of this kind.

The tears sprung to her eyes, her heart was inspired, her soul was thrilled by the parade and the movement, but she wondered how her husband would react to the problem, and when he spoke to her about her joining the movement she felt indeed deeply moved and deeply grateful.

After that there was never a suffragette parade or a suffragette meeting or movement that was not led somewhat by Mrs. O'Day. She proceeded on from year to year until she became in the State of New York one of the great outstanding leaders of woman suffrage.

I shall never forget personally attending many meetings at which she presided, and at which she was the moving spirit. When I came to Congress in 1937 I discussed with her many times the very marvelous improvement that women had attained down through the years since, say 1920. It was in 1916 that the women obtained the right to vote in a national election first in California, and as we all rather vividly recollect, the women, having the right to vote in California, made possible the election of Woodrow Wilson as President in 1916.

Mrs. O'Day has passed to a great reward. She is one of the outstanding pioneers of that particular movement in womanhood and will unquestionably as history is written take a very high place in the record of achievements in the movement. Today I believe she is laid away in her last resting place. My tribute in a poetic sense is one that I am reminded of because she not only loved it but it was loved by one of the great men of all times, Abraham Lincoln. Many times during those perilous days between 1860 and 1865 President Lincoln recited the 12 stanzas of this poem. No one knows who wrote it. Some believe it was written by Knox, while others attribute it to various authors; however, it has great potency and it possesses great philosophy.

Oh, why should the spirit of mortal be proud?
Like a swift-flitting meteor, a fast flying cloud,
A flash of the lightning, a break of the wave,
He passeth from life to his rest in the grave.

The leaves of the oak and the willow shall fade,
Be scattered around, and together be laid;
As the young and the old, the low and the high,
Shall crumble to dust and together shall lie.

The child that a mother attended and loved,
The mother that infant's affection who proved,
The husband that mother and infant who blessed—
Each, all, are away to their dwellings of rest.

The maid on whose brow, on whose cheek, in whose eye,
Shone beauty and pleasure—her triumphs are by;
And alike from the minds of the living erased
Are the memories of mortals who loved her and praised.

The peasant, whose lot was to sow and to reap;
The herdsman, who climbed with his goats up the steep,
The beggar, who wandered in search of his bread—
Have faded away like the grass that we tread.

The saint who enjoyed the communion of heaven,
The sinner who dared to remain unforgiven,
The wise and the foolish, the guilty and just,
Have quietly mingled their bones in the dust.

So the multitude goes, like the flower or weed,
That withers away to let others succeed;
So the multitude comes, even those we behold,
To repeat every tale that has often been told.

For we are the same things our fathers have been;
We see the same sights our fathers have seen;
We drink the same stream, we feel the same sun,
And run the same course our fathers have run.

The thoughts we are thinking our fathers did think;
From the death we are shrinking our fathers did shrink;
To the life we are clinging our fathers did cling,
But it speeds from us all like the bird on the wing.

They loved—but the story we cannot unfold;
They scorned—but the heart of the haughty is cold;
They grieved—but no wail from their slumbers will come;
They joyed—but the tongue of their gladness is dumb.

They died—ah! they died—we, things that are now,
That walk on the turf that lies over their brow,
And make in their dwellings a transient abode,
Meet the changes they met on their pilgrimage road.

Yea, hope and despondency, pleasure and pain,
Are mingled together in sunshine and rain:
And the smile and the tear, the song and the dirge,
Still follow each other like surge upon surge.

'Tis the wink of an eye; 'tis the draught of a breath
From the blossom of health to the paleness of death,
From the gilded saloon to the bier and the shroud;
Oh, why should the spirit of mortal be proud?

Mr. Speaker, upon this very sad occasion of memorializing the memory of one of our colleagues who did so much for the progress of humanity in her lifetime, I place upon her bier these few thoughts of one long dead. I trust that they may enshrine somewhat not only her memory and her accomplishments, but the love that we all bore her and now bear for her memory.

Mr. Speaker, in bidding her adieu, it is my prayer to God Almighty that on the other side, seated at His right hand, she will receive a deserved eternal reward.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire may have the right to extend their own remarks in memory of Mrs. O'Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address I made before the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association in New Orleans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two respects and to include some brief extracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: First, that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial, also transcript of the radio broadcast, in connection with the arrival of the battle cruiser *San Francisco* in San Francisco, and also to extend my own remarks in connection with the Army-Navy E award to the Union Iron Works plant of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, both of which events occurred on December 11, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make two insertions in the RECORD, one a recent address by Mr. Willkie and the second a recent article by General Smuts.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, on what subject is the address by Mr. Willkie?

Mr. COLE of New York. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan must have heard of it at one time or another.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I never heard of it.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is an address delivered by Mr. Willkie on some date in November in Canada.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is it about?

Mr. COLE of New York. It is on a most interesting subject.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is it?

Mr. COLE of New York. Post-war problems.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why clutter up the RECORD with something like that before we have won the war?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 35 minutes. I want to talk about Mr. Maloney down town, and some articles that were put in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem written by Col. Floyd Evans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a remarkable editorial entitled "Freedom's Textbook."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects and also to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include an article in each one.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein the names of 42 Members of this House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on this, the opening day of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I have introduced a resolution for an amendment to the Constitution which would provide that "men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

This is a very historic proposal, known sometimes as the equal rights amendment but more generally as the Lucretia Mott amendment in honor of the distinguished pioneer who did so much to pave the way for women's rights in America and throughout the world.

This proposed constitutional amendment is offered as a corollary of the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution, which gave women a democratic instrument—the vote—by the effective use of which they may gain their rights, but did not give them their rights.

The equal rights amendment, if adopted, would bring to full fruition the age-old struggle of women to attain the complete stature of position and influence to which they are entitled as creatures of God, under all of the canons of justice. It would do this by repealing in one swoop an almost infinite variety of State enactments and local ordinances that discriminate against women. It would truly place woman on a par with man, and that is where she belongs.

It is unnecessary for the purposes of this occasion to review these discriminations in any detail. They stand out as plainly as a flag on a pikestaff, and he who runs may read and understand them. They comprise a black record of oppression and injustice. Some States deny the right of women to serve as guardians. What is the justice of that? What is the sense of it? Who is better qualified to serve as guardian for a child than a competent woman with a mother's instinct and a mother's heart?

Burnita Shelton Matthews, an able Washington attorney, not long ago made a survey of discriminatory statutes and practices imposed by the States on women and the results were very revealing. It seems incomprehensible, but it is true, that women are excluded from jury service in a majority of the States. Now, as we all know, jury service is an important part of the administration of justice, and to say that women are not qualified for that service is a monstrous libel on women. One State bars women from all high public offices. In another State the husband is allowed by statute to collect his wife's pay envelope. In another State no married woman, however intelligent, may freely carry on a business without a court inquiry into her competency. In two States when the husband and wife own common property he is permitted to will away his one-half, but the wife, if the husband lives, cannot leave a dollar of her half of this common property to anyone, not even to her own children. In many States, divorce laws are unequal and discriminatory in favor of men. And so on, ad infinitum.

If women are good enough to serve as WAACS and WAVES and to render splendid service working in the defense plants of our country, they are good enough to be entitled to enjoy equal rights with men under the laws of the land, and the refusal of that right is a stain on our flag.

This resolution takes its honored place as House Joint Resolution No. 1 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. Let us all, as friends of democracy no less than as friends of women, join together and pass this resolution at this session. To be allowed to participate in this great history-making achievement is not only a duty but an inestimable privilege.

Under the rules of the House only one name can appear as the introducer of a resolution, but I am authorized to say that the following 42 Members, representing 19 States, about equally divided between the two great political parties, approve the resolution and will give it their cordial support:

Guyer, Kansas; Jonkman, Michigan; Murdock, Arizona; Gearhart, California; Voorhis, California; Peterson, Florida; Wilson, Indiana; Cunningham, Iowa; D'Alesandro, Maryland; Shafer, Michigan; Woodruff, Michigan; Bradley, Michigan; Hartley, New Jersey; Hendricks, Florida; Harless, Arizona; Ellison, Maryland; Barrett, Wyoming; Baldwin, Maryland; Bender, Ohio; Price, Florida; Angell, Oregon; O'Toole, New York; Byrne, New York; Weaver, North Carolina; Burdick, North Dakota; Mott, Oregon; Troutman, Pennsylvania; Bryson, South Carolina; Plumley, Vermont; Flannagan, Virginia; Ward Johnson, California; Ploeser, Missouri; Beall, Maryland; Gillie, Indiana; Cannon, Florida; Wright, Pennsylvania; Scanlon, Pennsylvania; Sheridan, Pennsylvania; McGranery, Pennsylvania; Sikes, Florida; Myers, Pennsylvania; Weiss, Pennsylvania.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the people of the country are beset by a number of bureaucratic asininities, but the silliest asininity of all is that which requires the people to sign their license numbers on the backs of their gasoline ration coupons.

I hold in my hand form OPA–R–120, which is a sheet of paper having glue on its face. The gasoline dealer who takes your gasoline ration coupons pastes them face up on this glue-faced form, and the license number you have so sweetly written upon the back of the coupon becomes melded with the glue on the face of this piece of paper and no one ever sees that number again.

Why does not the O. P. A. realize how foolish that requirement is and cancel that regulation right off the books? It is a piece of foolishness that ought to be abolished immediately.

[Here the gavel fell.]

POST-WAR PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of the House was thrilled today by the splendid tributes paid by the minority leader to our beloved Speaker, and by the remarks of our reelected Speaker and his reply in turn to the minority leader. They were thrilled also by the resolute and stirring addresses giving testimony to the world that this House and this country are determined to fight this war through to a complete, early, and permanent victory.

However, in that connection I call attention of the Congress to the fact that up to this time at least this Congress has not provided any forum or body or jury to which can be submitted the numerous proposals which are adrift in the country today as to how we can get this type of permanent peace for which we all pray. Today I introduced in the House a joint resolution known as House Joint Resolution 28. My resolution proposes the creation of a post-war planning commission to study the various problems confronting this Republic, both from the standpoint of international policy and from the standpoint of our domestic economy. I recall as a boy hearing a poem that went something like this:

I shot an arrow into the air;
It fell to earth, I know not where.

It seems to me that today a lot of ideas, some good and some bad, have been shot into the air, and nobody knows where they are going to fall, or whether they will ever contact realism, because no proving ground is provided for the conduct of a careful, realistic, and analytical study with respect to the value of these proposals.

Up until Pearl Harbor we had two groups of opinion in this Nation, which for want of better names were called interventionists and isolationists. Since Pearl Harbor we have happily had only one point of view in this country, and that may be called the indomitables, because we are firmly united and we are indomitable in our crusade for victory. However, we must in some manner fashion our thoughts and measure our views as to what is best to do in our post-war policies, as we assume our rightful position in the world of affairs. We must eliminate the blind spots in the thinking of a lot of people speaking on the subject today who apparently fail to recognize a relationship between our foreign policy and our domestic economy; neither can operate in a vacuum. Somebody said one time that the most dangerous thing in the world is the void created by the loss of a religion. I think there is a lot of truth in that. I also imagine that it is highly dangerous for a nation to operate in a void created by the loss of an accepted and acknowledged foreign policy. Consequently, I would like to help contribute to the elimination of such a hazard—the elimination of such a void—by the creation of a biparty, nonpolitical, nonsensational, realistic commission to study the problems of an acceptable American foreign policy following the war, to help crystallize our peace objectives, and to consider our domestic problems related thereto.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to include in these remarks a reprinting of House Joint Resolution 28, which I introduced today, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

House Joint Resolution 28

Joint resolution creating a Post-War Planning Commission

(Introduced by Mr. MUNDT, of South Dakota, January 6, 1943)

Whereas it is necessary, if there is to be a durable peace concluded at the termination of the present war, that the American people prepare for peace; and

Whereas preparation for solving the problems of peace requires study of what those problems may be and the consequences which their solution entails both upon the future stability and peace of the rest of the world and upon the domestic economy of the United States; and

Whereas it is essential that the policy of the United States in respect of the treaty of peace have the undivided support of both major political parties in the United States; and

Whereas since it cannot be foreseen which party will be in control of the Government of the United States at the termination of the present war, it is desirable that responsibility for and leadership and participation in that study be shared equally by both major political parties: Therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That (a) there is hereby created a Post-War Planning Commission, which shall consist of 32 members chosen as follows: Eight members shall be chosen by the Honorable Cordell Hull and 8 members shall be chosen by Ex-President Herbert Hoover. Four each of the members chosen by the Honorable Cordell Hull and Ex-President Herbert Hoover, respectively, shall be chosen to represent, respectively, agriculture, business, labor, and industry, and the other 4 members chosen by each shall be chosen with due regard to geographical distribution throughout the United States of citizens best fitted for a realistic consideration of the problems to be discussed by the Commission. Eight members shall be chosen from among the Members of the Senate, 4 by the majority leader and 4 by the minority leader of the Senate. Eight members shall be chosen from among the Members of the House of Representatives, 4 by the Speaker and 4 by the minority leader of the House of Representatives. The members of the Commission shall not receive any compensation for their services on the Commission, but shall be reimbursed for all necessary travel and subsistence expenses (or receive a per diem in lieu thereof) while away from their residence on the business of the Commission. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original choice was made, except that if for any reason such vacancy cannot be filled in such manner, it shall be filled by the choice of a person chosen by the affirmative vote of not less than 20 members of the Commission. The Commission shall select a chairman from among its members.

(b) The Commission is authorized to employ and fix the compensation of such professional, technical, clerical, stenographic, and other employees as it deems necessary.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to examine and study proposals and suggestions with respect to the organization of the world after the present war, to assemble and digest pertinent data with respect thereto, and to make recommendations from time to time relating to the post-war position of the United States in world affairs, its peace objectives, and its domestic post-war problems.

(b) The Commission may exercise its powers either within or without the United States.

(c) The Commission shall make a report to Congress not later than 8 months after the date of the enactment of this act, and shall make subsequent reports and recommendations whenever it deems it desirable so to do.

(d) The Commission shall cease to exist on whichever of the following dates is the

earlier: (1) The date 1 year after the President proclaims the termination of the hostilities in the present war, or (2) the date of the ratification by the United States of the treaty of peace after the termination of the present war.

SEC. 3. To carry out the provisions of this act the sum of $100,000 is authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the foregoing is a reprint of the complete text of House Joint Resolution 28 for the purpose of creating a post-war planning commission to study the problems of the post-war world and to make recommendations for the clear-cut enunciation of our peace aims in this war, our position and relationship in the family of nations after the war, and for domestic policies which will help alleviate the impact of the war. My bill specifically stresses the importance of this commission making a careful and realistic study of the relationship of our foreign and domestic policies so that we may not make the mistake of developing myopic programs which jeopardize either the success of our domestic economy and our American way of life here at home or the opportunity of making American influence felt for the betterment and peaceful security of the rest of the world. Too many current speakers and writers discuss either foreign or domestic policy with apparent disregard or disdain of the impact of the first upon the latter, or vice versa. It is this blind spot in our thinking which must be eliminated if America is either to assume its rightful position in the family of nations or rebuild its domestic economy so as to continue as the greatest and most powerful member of that family.

By creating such a post-war planning commission as I propose, we would bring together around one table representatives of the executive and the legislative branches of government together with those selected from the general public. We would make certain that agriculture, labor, business, and the professions all had important representation on this planning commission. We would have a bipartisan group selected equally by members of the two major parties and the results obtained from the commission's activities would be devoid of partisanship. It would afford a real opportunity for the two great parties to unite upon a program of post-war policies, both foreign and domestic, which would bring the greatest good to the greatest number. There would be no conflict between various branches of government or between political parties. There could be a genuine meeting of minds on the facts which the most careful study by the best brains available to survey the facts indicated were meritorious.

Mr. Speaker, it is just as important to prepare for peace in time of war as it is to prepare for war in time of peace. Unfortunately, this country after being in the war for more than a year has failed to set up a commission or authority which gives equitable representation to all groups and phases of popular government and which is charged with working out the steps in a wise preparation for a permanent and prosperous peace. Let us delay no longer. No one can predict just when this war will be won nor which political party will be charged with writing the peace and directing the period of reconstruction. It is true, also, that neither a wise and lasting peace nor a safe and sound reconstruction policy will eventuate if either is to be developed and determined upon narrow partisan lines. Thus I hope Congress will adopt my proposal as incorporated in House Joint Resolution 28.

The Commission which I propose would be equipped to make a realistic, bipartisan, nonpolitical study of post-war foreign and domestic proposals to the end that America and all the world can benefit from recommendations worked out in such an atmosphere of serious-minded, nonsensational, deliberation on the most significant problems ever facing this Republic. We must not make the mistake either of fashioning international programs without regard to our own American destiny or of focusing our attention upon American problems without regard to their relationship, workability, and value in terms of the world in which we live. The Commission I propose would bring together these two realms of planning and thinking in a manner which should help clarify our peace aims and aid in the prevention of post-war policies which might become injurious either to our domestic welfare or to the peace and development of the remainder of the world.

Secretary of State Hull is the outstanding authority of the Democratic Party on foreign policy and his selections will give due emphasis to the executive viewpoint. Ex-President Herbert Hoover is the only living Republican who has been President and due to his experience and background he is the best authority among prominent Republicans on matters of foreign policy. The Democratic and Republican leaders of the House and Senate could be depended upon to select representatives to this Commission from among the Members of the two Houses who would give articulation to the point of view of the legislative branch of Government and who would reflect the various attitudes to be found therein.

Mr. Speaker, the peace of the world and the preservation of our way of life here at home may well depend upon the manner in which we prepare for peace and get ready for the victory which our armed forces are sure to win. The type of careful, impersonal, fact-facing planning which a Post-War Planning Commission such as I propose would achieve can mean much to the world after the war. The time to start planning without partisanship for a victory which will be both secure and significant is now. I sincerely hope that my resolution will be favorably adopted by an overwhelming vote in the early months of the Congress which today begins its deliberations with the prayers of most of the civilized world devoted to the devout wish that it will measure up to the challenges confronting it.

BOOKS FOR OUR FIGHTING MEN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to call the attention of the Members of the House to the current Victory book drive to send interesting and entertaining reading matter to our men in the armed services. Army and Navy officers bear witness that ours is the "readingest" Army and Navy, and the news correspondents from the South Pacific have reported that the chief diversion of our men on Guadalcanal is reading. Here is a Nation-wide project which I am sure you will all want to support, the forwarding of good books to our fighters in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard and the merchant seaman service. The 1943 Victory book campaign which opened officially yesterday, January 5, is a patriotic undertaking, sponsored jointly by the American Library Association, the Red Cross, and the United Service Organizations, to provide the best possible reading fare to our men in camps, naval bases, ports of embarkation, on ships, and behind the battle lines.

On Monday of next week, or rather Tuesday of next week, opportunity will be given for the contribution of whatever books Members desire to make. On next Monday I shall announce where in the Capitol Building the books may be delivered, and arrangements will be so made. I understand it is desired to take moving pictures of Members of Congress contributing the books, as a stimulus to be used throughout the country, but between now and Monday when I make the announcement as to where books may be delivered, I hope Members will look over what books they have at their offices and at their homes, and be prepared to deliver them on Tuesday. This is a most worthy cause and the books will prove a source of interest and consolation to the men of the armed forces.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does the gentleman feel that old copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be appropriate to send?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know of anything that is more interesting than the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, though I cannot vouch for its truth always.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if we want to give the American people a real free press, it would not be a bad idea to increase the circulation of the number of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD published, so that they might get into the hands of the American people, who then will know what their Congress is doing. I will go along with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], and more than double the number of copies of the RECORD now published in order that the American people

may get it into their hands and know just exactly what their Members of Congress are doing for them and what they are trying to do to win this war and save this Republic.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think there is much in the comment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a valuable document. I know that everybody likes to get it, and I would like to have a larger mailing list myself.

Mr. RANKIN. As far as I am concerned, I have said all the time and I say it now, and I say it advisedly, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the one free press left that is not controlled by external influences and that is not under the domination of advertising. Every Member who places a word in that RECORD has 434 other Members to answer him. It is the greatest source of information the American people can have. As far as I am concerned, I would not only double the number now published but I would double it many times, in order that it might go into the homes of the American people all over the country. I do not believe we could do anything that would be of greater value to the American people or to the Members of the American Congress who are doing their patriotic duty to win this war and to save American institutions.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I ask the gentleman to yield just for the purpose of saying something along the line which the gentleman from Mississippi has just said so eloquently that there is nothing left for me to say, except that I hope the majority leader will use his influence to help bring about increased circulation of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it can go into the Army camps, to all the ships at sea, into the colleges and high schools of this country. I introduced a bill in the previous session, urging that that be done, but it fell by the wayside. I am sure if such a proposal would have the fathering of the gentleman from Massachusetts with his potent influence, it would mean a great deal to the country.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know whether my influence is potent or not, but I have always felt sympathetic to the proposal made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and, of course, his eloquence has influenced me and persuades me tremendously on this occasion. As far as I am concerned, I think there should be an increase. Just how far it should be worked out is for the appropriate committee, but I think the gentleman from Mississippi is absolutely right and also my friend from South Dakota. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD wields a powerful influence. There must be some limitation on circulation, but the more we can spread it around the country the better it is for the people of our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 more minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman that there are many worthless publications, in my opinion, published by the various Government bureaus. As a rule, they are nothing in the world but self-advertising. We could take the money that is spent on those publications and confine it to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which is not prepared propaganda. The matter contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is either speeches made on the floor or extensions of remarks for which Members take the responsibility. In my opinion, the money that is being wasted on many of these publications would more than pay for five times the number of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS now issued. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to take my part of the responsibility and see that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] said, goes into the Army camps, into the schools and into the libraries of the country where every American can get his hands on one any time he wants to read it. I am tired of having the Congress misrepresented by a few flannelmouth propagandists who are paid to abuse and malign us.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope that my original observation will not be lost sight of in this very interesting colloquy on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that the Members between now and next Tuesday will look over their books and contribute freely and liberally to this drive.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman advise the House what the program is for tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no program after the President's message and such other incidental matters as may arise. The Democrats will hold a caucus for the purpose of electing members to the Ways and Means Committee. I advise my Republican friends of that so that they will have that in mind.

I was hopeful that we would be able to adjourn from Thursday until Monday. Of course, that requires unanimous consent. On the first day of the session I would prefer not to submit it unless I know that unanimous consent would be granted. I see the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] standing. I would like to have him take me into his confidence, if he will, as to whether or not he would object to such a unanimous-consent request? I assure the gentleman that I will submit the unanimous-consent request that he have his 35 minutes on Monday.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would be happy not only to take the gentleman but the whole world into my confidence. Of course, I do not have anything to conceal at all, if I can only get a larger audience. That is what bothers me all the time. As long as we are going to hear the President's message tomorrow, some Members on this side, I know, want to have something to say on Friday. The question that has been bothering me, and I hope the gentleman will help me out on this, are these Members on the minority side, for example, who hold positions on two or more important committees, going to have those same committee assignments in the next Congress? Could the gentleman tell me about that? That has been worrying me terribly.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can imagine that it would worry the gentleman if the gentleman is of the worrying type, but the gentleman is not of the worrying type.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I appear to worry, anyway.

Mr. McCORMACK. But that is a matter for your own party. Now, will you object to my unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will have to ask for a session on Friday, because there are so many Members who want to talk.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice my friend gulped as if he would like to say he would not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just swallowed there because I was trying to be polite to the gentleman and it was hard to do.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry. Unless the gentleman from Michigan changes his attitude I must say reluctantly there will be a session on Friday.

### ADMISSION TO THE CHAMBER ON JANUARY 7, 1943

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement. After consultation with the majority and the minority leaders of the House, and remembering the terrific jam we had upon this floor on previous occasions when the President of the United States appeared here, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders the Chair announces that on tomorrow the door immediately opposite the Speaker will be open, and the doors on the Speaker's left and right, and none others. No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

### THE FUEL-OIL SITUATION IN NEW ENGLAND

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one moment to make an appeal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows the chaotic condition that exists regarding oil and gasoline in the country. We today in Massachusetts, as a result of the lack of any department with power of control, and because of the indecision in all the departments handling oil and gasoline and by their conflicting statements, are actually suffering. In Tewksbury, in my district, kerosene tanks are empty, bunker oil is almost gone in the State—the bunker oil that is used by our industries—and the amount of fuel oil available for heating purposes is extremely low; there is great shortage.

I appeal to Members from other sections of the country to ask their constituents to give up until we can secure legislation—to give up the nonessential use of gasoline in order to keep our people from further suffering. We are assisting other countries, and I am sure my colleagues will want to assist the sections of our own country that today are suffering.

Our hospitals are closing; some of our schools have closed. Will you help us?

PROTECTING CONGRESS AGAINST ABUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, along the line I was speaking a moment ago in response to the majority leader about the distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the time has come when Congress is constantly abused, maligned, and vilified over the radio. This is one of the problems we are going to have to meet. As far as I am concerned, I am in favor of Congress making arrangements whereby we may either have a national radio system or time divided between the two sides of both House and Senate in order that Members and Senators may go on the radio and speak to the American people on issues that confront the Congress, and thus offset a lot of the propaganda and insinuations that are being spread by a few flannel-mouthed propagandists who are doing more to destroy American institutions than they are to spread public information.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has put his finger on a very important point. May I suggest that the radio is relatively fair from the standpoint of its distribution of time among points of view. The difficulty the gentleman refers to comes primarily because speakers use sponsored time to abuse Members of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. MUNDT. I think some legislation should be directed to the situation that permits the power of the purse to determine who is going to control the air to attack Members of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. Congress should move into the driver's seat so far as its own affairs and its own protection are concerned.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 7, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the national adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, transmitting a report of the activities of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Inc., between the dates of August 16, 1941, and July 15, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 39); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing the amount of moneys credited to the helium-production fund and the amount of disbursements made therefrom during the preceding fiscal year ending June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the records and accounts of disbursing officers of the Army, made during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, by officers of the Inspector General's Department or others detailed for that purpose; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the Annual Report of the Red Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 2, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Barnegat Inlet, N. J., with a view to determining whether it is advisable to modify the existing project in any way, authorized by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 9, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 4, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Alamitos Bay, Los Angeles County, Calif., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

7. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting a printed volume of reports of the national officers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, to its forty-third national encampment, and a copy of the audit of the books of its quartermaster general; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a copy of the detailed statement of expenditures of appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

9. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on lists of papers, recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

10. A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of September 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11. A letter from the president of the Electric Home and Farm Authority, transmitting, pursuant to the requirements of section 2 of the Electric Home and Farm Authority Act, as amended, the seventh annual report, prepared by direction of the board of trustees of Electric Home and Farm Authority, covering operations from July 1, 1941, through October 31, 1942, inclusive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

12. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an order pursuant to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564), canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

13. A letter from the chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

14. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the supplemental list of contracts in excess of $150,000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

15. A letter from the executive director, national legislative committee of the American Legion, transmitting the financial statement of the American Legion up to October 31, 1942, as in accordance with the act of incorporation of the American Legion (Public Law 47, 66th Cong.); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

16. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report to Congress of all cases where special contracts are made with railroad companies for the transportation of the mails, and the terms and reasons therefor; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

17. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended November 30, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

18. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of officers and administrative offices delinquent in rendering or transmitting accounts, and officers delinquent in payment of final balances, for the fiscal year 1942; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

19. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on lists of papers, recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

20. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on lists of papers, recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposal of Executive Papers.

21. A letter from the chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting the eighth annual report to Congress of the National Mediation Board, including the report of National Railroad Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

22. A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., to the Congress of the United States for the year 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

23. A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a report to the Congress of amounts and rates paid to the superintendent and to teachers at Columbia Institution for the Deaf; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

24. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the United States Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

25. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period from July 1, 1941, to June 30, 1942, giving names of statutory and contingent-fund employees of the House, and their respective compensations; to the Committee on Accounts.

26. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct, and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States, a hospital, dispensary, or other memorial, for heroic services to men of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

27. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress (H. Doc. 38);

to the Committee on Accounts, and ordered to be printed.

28. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for rights-of-way over, across, in, and upon naval reservations; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

29. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

30. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as a result of the disaster at the East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941; to the Committee on Claims.

---

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1. A bill providing for the issuance of nonnegotiable United States bonds to Federal Reserve banks and terminating the authority of the Treasury to issue other interest-bearing obligations of the United States to commercial banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 2. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into lease agreements with farmers in order to provide for the management of their forest lands and the marketing of their forest products in accordance with proper forestry and marketing practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3. A bill to provide for use of net weights in interstate commerce transactions in cotton, to provide for the standardization of bale covering for cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4. A bill to repeal the special tax on retail dealers in oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 5. A bill to continue the pay of all persons serving in the armed forces of the United States for 1 year after the termination of the present conflict; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 6. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 7. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 8. A bill to create a Federal Industrial Commission to aid in the stabilization of employment in industry, agriculture, and commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DEWEY:

H. R. 9. A bill creating a War Debts and Defense Aid Payments Commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 10. A bill extending the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to American war correspondents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 11. A bill to authorize the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to prepare estimates and plans for improvement of certain river and harbor projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 12. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Finneys Creek, Accomac County, Va., and the channel connecting with Wachapreague Inlet and the Atlantic Ocean; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 13. A bill for the relief of warrant officers of the Army Mine Planter Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 14. A bill to provide for preliminary examination and survey of Jackson Creek, Westmoreland County, Va., and the channel connecting with the Potomac River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 15. A bill for preliminary examination and survey of Taskmers Creek, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 16. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Dyer Creek, Mathews County, Va., and the channel connecting with the Chesapeake Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 17. A bill for preliminary examination and survey of Deep Creek, Accomack County, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 18. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Bonum Creek, Westmoreland County, Va., and the channel connecting with the Potomac River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 19. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Kings Creek, Northampton County, Va., and the channel connecting with Cherrystone Channel, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 20. A bill to provide for an examination and survey of Farnham Creek, Richmond County, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 21. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Parrotts Creek, Middlesex County, Va., and the channel connecting with Rappahannock River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 22. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Davis Creek, Mathews County, Va., and channel connecting same with Mobjack Bay, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 23. A bill for preliminary examination and survey of Browns Bay, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 24. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Bransons Cove, in the lower Machodoc River, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 25. A bill for a preliminary examination and survey of the southwest side of the Rappahannock River in the vicinity of Bowlers Wharf, Essex County, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 26. A bill to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 27. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Rehoboth-Assateague National Seashore in the States of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 28. A bill to waive the limitation in title II of the act approved July 1, 1941 (Public Law 146, 77th Cong.), with regard to the cost of a courthouse at Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 29. A bill to extend the time within which taxpayers shall be allowed a credit against certain taxes imposed by the Social Security Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act for contributions paid into unemployment funds under State laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 30. A bill to expand the facilities of the General Accounting Office by creating therein a Federal Efficiency Service; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 31. A bill to compensate Prince William County, Va., and York County, Va., for certain of their public roads and highways seized by the United States for the use of a permanent Marine Corps post at Quantico, Va., and a Navy mine depot at or near Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 32. A bill to amend section 601 (c) (8) (A) of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 33. A bill to prohibit experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia and providing a penalty for violation thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 34. A bill authorizing payment to the Devils Lake Band of Sioux Indians of the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Indian Reservation, at the Fort Totten (N. Dak.) Indian Agency, for damages for wood and timber used and destroyed by the armies of the United States while maintaining a military post at Fort Totten, N. Dak., between the years 1867 and 1890, and for which damages the said Indians have not been heretofore compensated; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 35. A bill for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 36. A bill authorizing payment to the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians for certain lands ceded by them to the United States by a treaty of July 23, 1851; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 37. A bill authorizing payment to the Devils Lake Band of Sioux Indians of the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Indian Reservation, at the Fort Totten, N. Dak., Indian Agency, for 64,000 acres of land of which said band of Indians was deprived by the erroneous survey made by the United States Government under the treaty of February 19, 1867, between the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians and the United States (15 Stat. L. 505), ratified April 15, 1867; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 38. A bill referring the claims of the Turtle Mountain Band or Bands of Chippewa Indians of North Dakota to the Court of Claims for adjudication and settlement; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 39. A bill providing for an examination and survey with view to channel improvement and maintenance of the channel leading from the Intracoastal Waterway across Indian River to the Lighthouse Service depot at Taylor Creek, Fla., adjacent to the Fort Pierce Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 40. A bill providing for an examination and survey at Jupiter Inlet, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 41. A bill providing for an examination and survey of channel and harbor at Everglades, Collier County, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 42. A bill providing for an examination and survey at Belle Glade, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 43. A bill providing for an examination and survey at Pahokee on Lake Okeechobee, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 44. A bill to provide for a 25-percent increase in annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 45. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pan-American center at Miami, Fla., for the coordination of commercial and cultural relations between the American re-

publics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 46. A bill providing for an examination and survey of channel from the Intracoastal Waterway to, and a turning basin at, Fort Pierce, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 47. A bill to amend the act of May 25, 1937, entitled "An act for the relief of soldiers who were discharged from the Army during the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer uprising because of minority or misrepresentation of age," so as to include certain individuals who enlisted in the Army prior to the War with Spain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 48. A bill to extend certain benefits under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, to husbands and widowers of insured wives; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 49. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to farm acreage allotments, to provide for an adequate supply of peanuts needed for oil and other uses during the war emergency, to include farm wages in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 50. A bill to provide for improving the functioning of the cooperative features of the Federal Land Bank System; to relieve Federal land bank borrowers of stock liability; to organize the Federal land banks and the national farm-loan associations as membership corporations and to provide for placing Federal land banks on a self-supporting basis and for increasing the functions and responsibilities of national farm-loan associations; to establish a method for determining the interest rates on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans; to provide for refunding and guaranteeing certain bonds of such banks; to establish a method for adjusting certain agricultural indebtedness; to provide for limiting the taking of deficiency judgments by Federal land banks and by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GAVAGAN:

H. R. 51. A bill to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State due process of law and equal protection of the laws, and to prevent the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 52. A bill concerning the qualification of voters or electors within the meaning of section 2, article I, of the Constitution, making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite of voting in a primary or general election for national offices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 53. A bill to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 54. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 55. A bill permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 56. A bill to provide for a defense highway in the United States to serve as a link in connecting the Inter-American Highway with the Alaskan Highway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 57. A bill providing free laundry and dry-cleaning service to members of the military and naval forces while on active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 58. A bill for the relief of dependents of civilians who were engaged by civilian contractors on the islands of Wake and Guam; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 59. A bill to establish, for the duration and prosecution of the war, adequate United States Guards for the protection of lines of communication and supply and installations and positions deemed by the military authorities vital to national security anywhere within the requirements of military necessity of the United States Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 60. A bill to provide for the rank of the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 61. A bill to provide that the Civil Aeronautics Authority shall be an independent establishment of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 62. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes," approved June 22, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 63. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 64. A bill to amend an act approved December 17, 1928, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment thereon in claims which the Winnebago Tribe of Indians in Wisconsin may have against the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 65. A bill to provide relief for victims of the flood of September 17, 1942, in and near the village of Spring Valley, Wis.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 66. A bill to provide that a general assignment for benefit of creditors shall not constitute an act of bankruptcy unless connected with some other act of bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 67. A bill granting leave of absence to postal employees on account of death in family; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 68. A bill to provide study periods for post-office clerks, terminal and transfer clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 69. A bill granting annual and sick leave to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 70. A bill to amend section 3466 of the Revised Statutes to subordinate tax claims of the United States to wage claims in State insolvency proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 71. A bill for postal employees' longevity; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 72. A bill authorizing and adopting the improvement of East River, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 73. A bill to provide for the appointment of a personal bailiff for each district judge in a United States district court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 74. A bill to prohibit the registration of trade-marks containing the words "White House"; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 75. A bill to provide for reemployment of persons enlisting in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 76. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of March 4, 1921, relating to the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater Commission; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 77. A bill to amend section 28 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 78. A bill to create the office of Law Revision Counsel in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

H. R. 79. A bill to amend the act approved June 25, 1938, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 80. A bill to amend section 25 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright", approved March 4, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 81. A bill to amend Revised Statutes, section 876, as amended, relating to issuance of subpenas in civil cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 82. A bill to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 83. A bill to establish an Office of Fiscal Investigations as an agency of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

H. R. 84. A bill to provide a uniform fee for the registration of copyrights; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 85. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 86. A bill to grant pensions to certain unremarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 87. A bill to set aside certain provisions of orders and regulations requiring the registration and inspection of tires and tubes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 88. A bill to amend section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 89. A bill to provide pension benefits for certain Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 90. A bill to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 91. A bill to promote the economic welfare of the countries of North and South America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 92. A bill to establish Divisions of Air Warfare, the Navy, and the Army as coequal divisions under a Department of National Defense; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 93. A bill to provide a pension for persons who served in the United States military or naval service who were injured in line of duty and who are now past 65 years of age; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 94. A bill to prevent and make unlawful the practice of law before Government departments, bureaus, commissions, and their agencies by those other than duly licensed attorneys at law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 95. A bill to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 96. A bill to amend section 272 of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C., par. 394) in relation to forbidding corporations and voluntary

associations from practicing law before courts, quasi-judicial or administrative bodies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 97. A bill authorizing the Supreme Court to prescribe uniform rules for the admission of attorneys to practice in certain courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 98. A bill to create a Division of Water Pollution Control in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 99. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey for improvements at the head of Penobscot Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 100. A bill for the erection of a memorial to the memory of Maj. Gen. Henry Knox at Thomaston, Maine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 101. A bill to include insurance paid by a private agency or organization among the exemptions from the annual income limitations governing payment of death compensation under Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and pension under part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. TREADWAY:

H. R. 102. A bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 103. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide annuities for individuals who are totally and permanently disabled and have completed 20 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 104. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide for payment of benefits with respect to the month in which an annuitant or pensioner dies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 105. A bill to continue the pay of all persons serving in the armed forces of the United States for 6 months after the termination of the present conflict; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 106. A bill to restore the rank of brigadier general to William Mitchell, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 107. A bill to amend section 32 of Public Act No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 108. A bill to prohibit the employment of persons by the United States at a compensation of $1 a year, and to provide that persons employed by the United States shall be compensated on a reasonably adequate basis; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 109. A bill to promote the prosecution of the war by preventing monopolistic practices with regard to patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 110. A bill to amend the act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 111. A bill to provide deferment under the Selective Service Act for men with dependents employed in agriculture; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 112. A bill to provide funds for the prosecution of the war and to relieve the American people of unnecessary interest burden; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 113. A bill to promote the mutual understanding and insure the continental solidarity of the peoples of the American republics by the interchange of students and teachers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 114. A bill to establish under the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior a research laboratory to study the diseases of domestic rabbits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 115. A bill to provide for erection of an appropriate memorial to the men who engaged in the defense of Wake Island against the Japanese; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 116. A bill to provide for the dollar-for-dollar matching by the United States of savings by enlisted men in the armed forces through the sale of Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines Savings bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 117. A bill to extend to all citizens an equal right to employment in the service of the Government of the United States, irrespective of age; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 118. A bill to restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and to regulate its value as provided in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States; to improve the banking system; to aid in restoring and maintaining full employment and production; to reduce the public debt; and to provide a stable currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 119. A bill to amend Public Law No. 190 of the Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 120. A bill authorizing the Postmaster General to provide a simplified method of addressing and mailing certain franked mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 121. A bill to restore benefits for veterans of the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 122. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to exempt agricultural organizations; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 123. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an exemption of certain small newspapers; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 124. A bill to provide uniformity in designations of certain historic areas, sites, and buildings administered by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 125. A bill to authorize the purchase of certain lands for addition to the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 126. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands, and for other purpose; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 127. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to sell the Lincoln County Target Range, Lincoln County, N. Mex., and to acquire other land more suitably located for military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 128. A bill to authorize a per capita payment of $10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 129. A bill to provide additional pension for certain holders of medals of honor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 130. A bill to provide that the fund for the relief of sick and disabled and destitute seamen belonging to the United States merchant marine service shall also be for the relief of sick, disabled, destitute, or needy dependents of deceased seamen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 131. A bill to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 132. A bill to provide for the issuance of a device in recognition of the services of merchant sailors; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 133. A bill to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 134. A bill to provide for the suspension, during the war, of operating-differential subsidy agreements, and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 135. A bill to establish a Civilian Glider Pilot Training Division in the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 136. A bill relating to the naming of naval vessels; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 137. A bill to authorize the appointment of certain Reserve officers to the line of the Regular Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 138. A bill to authorize the construction of the Kern River project in California; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 139. A bill to provide a more equitable program of old-age assistance by amending section 3 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 140. A bill to provide a more equitable program of old-age assistance by amending section 2 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 141. A bill providing for the examination and survey of Chipola River, Ala. and Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 142. A bill to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 143. A bill providing for the examination and survey of the Intracoastal Waterway between Carrabelle and St. Marks, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 144. A bill to provide for the refund of certain amounts paid for Bankhead Act exemption certificates; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 145. A bill providing for an examination and survey of St. Josephs Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 146. A bill to extend liability for training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to persons holding certain offices under the United States or any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 147. A bill prohibiting certain acts interfering with the national defense program or with normal Government activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 148. A bill to prevent manufacturers of products from offering for sale and selling the same at retail in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 149. A bill to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard for nonfat dry milk solids; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 150. A bill authorizing the issuance of certificates of indebtedness to the Federal Reserve banks, for financing the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 151. A bill to provide for redemption of certain cotton certificates issued under the Bankhead Cotton Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 152. A bill providing for Government ownership of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 153. A bill to provide for direct Federal old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 154. A bill to provide for the disposition of unclaimed deposits in national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 155. A bill to increase the compensation of the members of the armed forces; to make intangible property bear its fair share of the cost of national defense; to provide for the proper administration of this act; to provide penalties for the violation of this act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 156. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to include citrus fruit and trees; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 157. A bill providing for an additional United States Naval Academy in the New Port Harbor area in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 313. A bill for the relief of certain widows of Foreign Service officers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 314. A bill to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the British Government, for and on behalf of John Bailey, former stoker of His Majesty's ship *Orion*, in full and final settlement of a claim arising as a consequence of injuries inflicted by John Ittner, United States Navy, at Seattle, Wash., on July 16, 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 315. A bill to provide for the effective inspection, conservation, and distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 316. A bill to restrict the establishment of branch offices by financial institutions chartered or insured under the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. R. 317. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide for the payment of benefits to permanently and totally disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 318. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to extend the time for awarding decorations to participants of the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 319. A bill to grant to home owners the right to extend the period for amortization of loans under section 4 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and to reduce the rate of interest on such loans to 4 percent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 320. A bill to provide for the honorary designation of St. Paul's Church, together with the churchyard and the village green associated therewith, in the town of Eastchester, Westchester County, State of New York, as a national shrine; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 321. A bill to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State due process of law and equal protection of the laws, and to prevent the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 323. A bill to authorize the exploration of proposed dam sites located on Indian lands within the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BURCH of Virginia:

H. R. 324. A bill to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 325. A bill to provide differential in pay for night work to custodial service employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 326. A bill to amend the first section of the act entitled "An act to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 327. A bill providing for waiver of prosecution by indictment in certain criminal proceedings in the courts of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 328. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 329. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to incur obligations for the benefit of natives of Alaska in advance of the enactment of legislation making appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 330. A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 331. A bill to authorize the construction of a military supply highway to Alaska; to the Committee on Roads.

H. R. 332. A bill to revise the Alaska game law; to the Committee on the Territories.

H. R. 333. A bill to place the office of the Secretary of the Territory of Alaska under the classified civil service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 334. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

H. R. 335. A bill to extend the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 336. A bill to make the workmen's compensation laws of Alaska applicable to land and premises of the United States in such Territory; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 337. A bill to extend the provisions of certain laws relating to vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Education.

H. R. 338. A bill to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to purchase and improve the electric light and power system of the Anchorage Light & Power Co., Inc., an Alaska corporation, and for such purpose to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed $1,250,000 in excess of present statutory debt limits; to the Committee on the Territories.

H. R. 339. A bill to stimulate the production of tin; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

H. R. 340. A bill to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to grant and convey certain lands to the city of Sitka, Alaska, for street purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 341. A bill authorizing the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America to purchase certain public land on Spruce Island, Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 342. A bill to provide for procurements without advertising; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 343. A bill to amend the act relating to manifests in Alaskan and insular trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 344. A bill to forbid the appointment of any person but a resident of the Territory of Alaska to the office of Governor of said Territory; to the Committee on the Territories.

H. R. 345. A bill relative to annual labor on mineral claims in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

H. R. 346. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of June 6, 1924, as amended, relative to the fisheries of Alaska; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 347. A bill to increase the pay of postoffice employees in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 348. A bill to extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 349. A bill to amend section 6 of the act approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 323), entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GUYER:

H. R. 350. A bill to prohibit, within the District of Columbia the manufacture, importation, exportation, transportation, sale, gift, purchase, or possession of any spirituous, vinous, malt, fermented, and all alcoholic liquors whatsoever, which may be used as beverages, excepting natural wine for religious services, and ethyl alcohol for compounding or manufacturing medicines for internal use and as a disinfectant by physicians, surgeons, and dentists in their professions; prescribing penalties for the violation thereof; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 351. A bill to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws, and to punish the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 352. A bill to amend the crop loan law relating to the lien imposed thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 353. A bill to prohibit discrimination with respect to employment in the service of the United States or employment resulting from expenditures made by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 354. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works in the basin of the Hocking River, Ohio, for flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 355. A bill for the relief of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 356. A bill to amend the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 357. A bill relating to the removal or reduction in rank of postal employees in the classified service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 358. A bill to be known as the General Welfare Act, to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged

persons, blind persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment compensation laws; to establish a Social Security Board; to raise revenue; and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935 (Public Law No. 271, 74th Cong.), so as to provide for and promote the general welfare of the United States by supplying to the people a more liberal distribution and increase of purchasing power, enable certain aged citizens to retire from gainful employment, improve and stabilize gainful employment for other citizens, stimulate agricultural and industrial production and general business, and alleviate unemployment and the hazards and insecurity of old age; to provide a method whereby citizens shall contribute, directly or indirectly, to the purchase of and receive a retirement annuity; to provide for the raising of the necessary revenue to be placed in a general welfare fund to operate a continuing plan therefor; to provide for the appropriation and expenditure of such revenue; to provide for the proper administration of the act; to provide penalties for violation of the act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 359. A bill providing for an additional Naval Academy in the Puget Sound area in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 360. A bill relating to sales by dealers in malt liquors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 361. A bill to authorize the erection of a Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital and domiciliary facility in western Washington; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 362. A bill for the purpose of regulating the conditions of employment of mechanics and helpers at all navy yards and naval stations under the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 363. A bill to amend United States Code, Supplement III, title 16, sections 851–856; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 364. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act by striking out present section 226 and substituting a new section 226; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 365. A bill to amend part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act to prohibit agreements and understandings between certain common carriers in connection with the furnishing of passenger service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 366. A bill to amend sections 116, 118, 126, 128, and 135 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to divide the ninth judicial circuit of the United States, and to create an eleventh judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 367. A bill amending the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit certain aliens whose childhood was spent in the United States, if eligible to citizenship, to become naturalized without filing declaration of intention; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 368. A bill to amend section 115 (a) and (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Revenue Act of 1938, and the Revenue Act of 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MYERS:

H. R. 369. A bill to prevent discrimination against blind persons and persons with impaired visual acuity in the administration of the civil-service laws and rules; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 370. A bill to extend the Federal old-age benefit provisions of the Social Security Act to certain nurses in respect of their employment outside of religious, charitable, and other nonprofit institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 371. A bill to provide that grants to States for old-age assistance shall be double the amount contributed by the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 372. A bill to provide financial credit for national defense in time of war without incurring public debt; to regulate the volume of such credit; to prevent post-war depression; and to provide for orderly transition from a war economy to a peace economy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 373. A bill to vest in the Government of the United States the absolute, complete, and unconditional ownership of the 12 Federal Reserve banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 374. A bill to provide for national defense without incurring public debt; to reduce the Federal deficit; to lighten the burden of debt; and to improve the domestic economy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 375. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 376. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 377. A bill to vest in the Government of the United States the absolute, complete, and unconditional ownership of the 12 Federal Reserve banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 468. A bill to authorize the deferment of men 35 years of age under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and providing for the release of those who have attained their thirty-eighth birthday; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 469. A bill to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State due process of law and equal protection of the laws, and to prevent the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 470. A bill to amend section 216 of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to give shippers the right to designate the routing of shipments by motor vehicle in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 471. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 so as to protect established and bona fide business practices and methods; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 472. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of a naturalized wife residing abroad with her husband, a native-born national of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 473. A bill to classify certain Federal employees into the United States civil service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 474. A bill to require departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government to reduce the number of names on mailing lists for Government publications; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 486. A bill to provide eligibility for pension, if otherwise entitled thereto, to the widow of any deceased veteran, if married to and living with the veteran for 2 years immediately preceding his death or if she gave birth to a child by the veteran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 487. A bill to authorize the acquisition of forest lands adjacent to and over which highways, roads, or trails are constructed or to be constructed wholly or partially with Federal funds in order to preserve or restore their natural beauty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 488. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide for payment of benefits with respect to the r onth in which an annuitant or pensioner dies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 489. A bill to establish a fish hatchery; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 490. A bill making appropriations for the establishment of a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 491. A bill to establish a Commission on Taxation in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Mear s.

H. R. 492. A bill to extend the benefits of the Social Security Act to include individuals who are physically disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 493. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to locate, establish, construct, equip, and operate a hospital for the insane of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

H. R. 494. A bill to authorize the construction of a National Guard armory at Portland, Creg.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 495. A bill relating to the payment of certain benefits under the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 496. A bill to provide for the education of all types of physically handicapped children, to authorize an appropriation of money therefor, and to regulate its expenditure; to the Committee on Education.

H. R. 497. A bill to provide for the payment of annuities to blind persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 498. A bill to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship construction reserve funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 499. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of telegraph carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 500. A bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 501. A bill to abolish the National Youth Administration and the Farm Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 502. A bill to amend the acts providing for the establishment of a Women's Reserve of the Navy and a Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard, to permit the enlistment of women who have attained the age of 18 years; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 503. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States," approved May 14, 1942, as amended, to provide for the enrollment of women who have attained the age of 18 years; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 504. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of San Rafael Creek, Calif., and its tributaries for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 505 (by request). A bill granting a pension of $50 per month to all widows of Civil War veterans who have attained or

hereafter attain the age of 65 years; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

H. R. 507. A bill to amend section 56 of the Internal Revenue Code, providing for the collection of taxes and income currently; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 507. A bill to allow payments in lieu of taxes on property taken by the United States Government; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 641. A bill providing for the establishment of minimum ratings for disabled World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 642. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 643. A bill to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia, and also to conform with wages paid in many cities; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 644. A bill to liberalize existing laws as to forfeitures of rights as to claims for certain benefits by veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 645. A bill providing for an excise tax on retail stores; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 646. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 647. A bill to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WHELCHEL of Georgia:

H. R. 648. A bill to provide that World War veterans who are as much as 10 percent disabled from nonservice causes shall be entitled to pension without regard to the length of service; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 649. A bill for the organization and functions of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 650. A bill to require that parity prices for agricultural commodities reflect increases in farm wages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAY:

H. R. 651. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national offices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 652. A bill to amend Public Law No. 228 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 653. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 654. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 655. A bill to provide for suitable recognition of the voluntary services of civilian nurses with the Army during the influenza epidemic; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

H. R. 656. A bill relating to legislative and budgetary control of expenditures for publicity activities of the executive branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 657. A bill to define the crime of lynching, to prescribe punishment therefor, and to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate the facts in connection with lynchings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 658. A bill to provide prosthetic appliances to certain veterans suffering from non-service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 659. A bill to amend section 601 (c) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, approved October 8, 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 660. A bill authorizing the Federal Bureau of Investigation to cooperate with State authorities in the investigation of certain crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 661. A bill to amend the act approved August 5, 1937, entitled "An act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to cancer; to establish the National Cancer Institute; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 662. A bill to increase the existing rates of death compensation payable to widows and children of World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 663. A bill to create a United States Civil Service Board of Appeals; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. H. 664. A bill to provide that the United States Maritime Commission be increased from five to seven members; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 665. A bill to provide medical and hospital treatment and domiciliary care for members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps on a parity with members of the Women's Reserve of the Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 666. A bill to provide that written statements required by the Civil Service Commission may be made without the formality of an oath, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 667. A bill to authorize an appropriation to provide additional hospital and outpatient dispensary facilities for persons entitled to hospitalization in Veterans' Administration facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 668. A bill to amend section 2800 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 669. A bill to provide compensation for personnel sustaining disease or injury while performing civilian defense duty, and to provide indemnities to the beneficiaries of such personnel in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARNES of Alabama:

H. R. 670. A bill to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 671. A bill to discharge the liability of certain persons in military service from Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 672. A bill relating to the acquisition of foreign silver by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 673. A bill to prescribe fair standards of duty and procedure of administrative officers and agencies, to establish an administrative code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 674. A bill to provide for the office of public defender for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 675. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941, so as to authorize the President to permit unlicensed use of inventions in time of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 676. A bill to provide for the appointment of public defenders in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 677. A bill to provide that retired personnel of the Regular Army called into active military service under the provisions of the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940, shall be restored to active duty with the rank held by them on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 678. A bill designating the person who shall act as President if a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or when neither a President-elect nor a Vice President-elect shall have qualified; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 679. A bill to provide a larger Federal contribution for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 680. A bill relating to the traveling and subsistence expenses of judges and retired judges of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 681. A bill making an appropriation for building a road and bridge on Chickamauga Dam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 682. A bill to change interest rates on loans secured by liens on United States Government life (converted) insurance to 3½ percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 683. A bill to change the definition of permanent total disability for pension purposes, as to World War veterans, so as to base it upon an individual, rather than an average, basis; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 684. A bill to amend the Shipping Act of 1916; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 685. A bill to amend Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 686. A bill to amend Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 687. A bill making it unlawful for any person, firm, association, or corporation not expressly excepted from the operation of the act by the provisions thereof, to use the mails to solicit or effect insurance or collect or transmit insurance premiums in any State without complying with the insurance laws thereof; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 688. A bill to permit all litigation in the courts of the United States without the requirements of deposits of money, and to make it unlawful to require the printing of the record and other papers on appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 689. A bill to provide for the recording of the proceedings in one of the court rooms of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia by sound-recording equipment; and for the reproduction of the sounds of such proceedings, in whole or in part, in the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals and in the Supreme Court of the United States upon the review of any such case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 690. A bill to amend section 3 of the act approved June 30, 1936, by providing a method of appeal in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 691. A bill for the creation of medical academies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 692. A bill to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act approved June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 262), relating to the establishment of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

BY Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 693. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 694. A bill to provide for the attachment, garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 695. A bill relating to through rates in the case of certain property of the United States manufactured or processed in transit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 696. A bill to amend the United States Arbitration Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 697. A bill relating to the original jurisdiction of district courts of suits or proceedings arising under section 20 (11), 20 (12), 219, or 413 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and to the removal of such suits and proceedings from State Courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 698. A bill to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 699. A bill to provide vocational rehabilitation, education, training, and other services to persons disabled while members of the armed forces, or disabled in war industries or through other causes or congenitally disabled, and to render such persons fit for service in war industries, agriculture, or other useful civilian industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 700. A bill to establish a Division of Aviation Education in the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 701. A bill to provide for the discovery, introduction, breeding, and testing of agricultural crops for utilization in industry and manufacturing and for replacement of surplus agricultural crops through cooperation of the United States Department of Agriculture and the several State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 702. A bill to permit the prepayment of the purchase price of certain housing sold to individuals by the Farm Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 703. A bill to expedite the prosecution of the war by making provisions for an increased supply of rubber manufactured from alcohol produced from agricultural or forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 704. A bill to permit production of additional food for the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 705. A bill making an appropriation for building a road and bridge on Watts Bar Dam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 706. A bill to authorize such procedure as to the adjudication of claims for benefits administered through the Veterans' Administration as is designed to assure an equitable evaluation of all facts and factors pertinent to the claim, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CARLSON of Kansas:

H. R. 707. A bill to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed, up to January 2, 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 708. A bill to establish a Department of Defense, to consolidate therein the Department of War and the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 709. A bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice and gambling in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 710. A bill to amend section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to facilitate farmers in the service of the United States receiving the benefits of the farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 711. A bill to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to include farm wages in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 712 (by request). A bill to deny admittance into the United States to all immigrants while the number of unemployed persons within the United States is 1,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 713. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, for the purposes of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 714. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conservation of national soil resources and to provide an adequate and balanced flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 715. A bill to amend section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 716. A bill to promote farm ownership by amending the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to provide for Government-insured loans to farmers and to enable tenant farmers to become owners of farm homes through long-term low-interest-rate loans on farms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 717. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to standardize the amount to be contributed by the United States for old-age assistance; to the Commitee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 718. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide annuities for individuals who are totally and permanently disabled and have completed 20 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 719. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Wacasassa River and its tributaries, Fla., and of adjacent areas in Gilchrist and Levy Counties, Fla., for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 720. A bill granting increase of pension to certain persons now upon the pension rolls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 721. A bill appropriating funds for the establishment of a cooperative wildlife research unit in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 722. A bill to authorize appropriation of funds for the survey and construction of a Federal highway and tunnel under the St. Johns River at Jacksonville, Fla.; to the Committee on Roads.

H. R. 723. A bill to provide for the construction of a marine hospital in Florida; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 724. A bill to provide for the construction of a marine hospital at Jacksonville, Fla.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 725. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Colin P. Kelly, Jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 726. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain lands from entry and authorizing its sale to a public agency of the State of Florida for recreational or national defense purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 727. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Oklawaha River and its tributaries, Fla., and of adjacent areas in Alachua and Marion Counties, Fla., for flood-control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 728. A bill to provide dental service for certain veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 729. A bill to amend the Revenue Act of 1932 with respect to the gift tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 730. A bill to aid in measures for national defense by the development and testing of new devices and materials and by directing natural resources to that end, and at all times to increase industrial employment and to enhance national prosperity by aiding and promoting research and the training of research workers in the engineering experiment stations connected with colleges and schools of engineering in the several State and Territorial universities and colleges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 731. A bill to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 732. A bill exempting cane sugar produced in the United States from the quota provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 733. A bill for the relief of owners of certain properties, mortgages, bonded obligations, and current obligations rendered inoperative by reason of restrictions arising from

the war effort; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 734. A bill to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 735. A bill to confer to certain persons who served in a civilian capacity under the jurisdiction of the quartermaster general during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition the benefits of hospitalization and the privileges of the soldiers' homes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 736. A bill to provide that employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine shall be restored to their positions upon the termination of such service; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 737. A bill to authorize payment of compensation or pension for partial service-connected disability, plus such percentage of the amount of pension payable for his permanent total disability, nonservice connected, as is equal to the difference between 100 percent and the degree of his service-connected disability; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 738. A bill to provide for a statutory award of $10 per month to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 739. A bill to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the veterans regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans; and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 740 (by request). A bill to provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 10 percent of the basic amounts, payable for each 5 years of age beginning with the fortieth birthday, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 741. A bill to provide for the registration of births in the District of Columbia that were not registered when said births occurred in said District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 742. A bill to reenact the law providing for disability allowances for World War veterans and to restore former service-connected disability status; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 743. A bill to terminate certain monetary powers of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

H. R. 744. A bill to terminate the President's authority to enter into reciprocal trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COMPTON:

H. R. 745. A bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 746. A bill to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H. R. 747. A bill to define loss of use of an eye for the purposes of granting the statutory award of $35 per month under the provisions of subparagraph (k), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 748. A bill to extend to 2 years the time for filing application for review of claims on appeal to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 749. A bill to provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after 1 year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 750. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 751. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as a result of the disaster at the east base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 752. A bill to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 753. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for rights-of-way over, across, in, and upon naval reservations; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 754. A bill to provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 20 percent of the basic amounts, payable for each 5 years of age beginning with the fortieth birthday, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 755. A bill to increase the pension payable to war veterans suffering from permanent total non-service-connected disabilities from $30 to $60 per month; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 756. A bill to extend benefits of unemployment insurance to veterans of the Second World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 757. A bill to provide educational grants to veterans of the Second World War; to the Committee on Education.

H. R. 758. A bill to extend rights under title II of the Social Security Act to veterans of the Second World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 759. A bill to provide that during the present war the coastwise laws of the United States shall not extend to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to take certain steps to speed up the utilization in suitable employment of the abilities and aptitudes of all employable handicapped persons; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to section 1, article III, of the Constitution relating to the tenure of Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to amend section 13 (a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution to provide for the participation of the United States in the Florida Centennial and Pan-American Exposition to be held in the State of Florida during the year 1945; to the Committee on the Library.

H. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution to provide for the training of nonfarm rural youth for farm labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit persons 18 years of age to vote in all elections for Federal officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to amend the act to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution to establish a congressional committee on military and naval affairs and appropriations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to removal of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the birthday of Madame Sklodowska Curie by proclaiming a national "War on Cancer Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution to establish the third week of September as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON of Kansas:

H. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to provide for current payment of income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUYER:

H. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to provide for the utilization of a part of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol to portray the story of aviation; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution providing for aviation training of midshipmen at the

United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of April 20 to 26, 1943, as National Humane Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution establishing and legalizing Farm Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

H. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of civil government in the far West, the blazing of the Old Oregon Trail, and the epochal immigration of 1843; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the Government of the United States in regard to tide and submerged lands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution creating a Post-war Planning Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution to provide for a withholding tax of 10 percent on gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the method of ratification of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILCHRIST:

H. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution eliminating from the basis of representation in Congress persons not citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 19 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit persons 18 years of age to vote in all elections for Federal officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution providing for payments for the purpose of equalizing, as between the different regions or territories of the United States, freight charges for the transportation of defense materials during the existing emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution to establish the National Commission for Post-War Reconstruction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution relating to the provision of butter for the patients of St. Elizabeths Hospital; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Planning and Reconstruction, a Congressional Planning and Reconstruction Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee to study problems involved, or which may be involved, in the formulation of a treaty of peace at the termination of the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GUYER:

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution authorizing reproduction in colors of the Howard Chandler Christy painting, The Signing of the Constitution, and the printing of 300,000 copies thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Res. 10. Resolution to amend rules X and XI of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. Res. 11. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Res. 12. Resolution to investigate second-, third-, and fourth-class postage rates; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 13. Resolution to appoint a committee to protect the integrity of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 14. Resolution to amend clause 24 and clause 40 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. Res. 15. Resolution to amend rules X and XI of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. Res. 16. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Civil Service to investigate various activities in the departments and agencies of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Res. 17. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 18. Resolution creating a select committee on small business of the House of Representatives and defining its powers and duties; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Res. 19. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Congressional Reorganization; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. Res. 20. Resolution to continue the Special Committee to Investigate All Matters Pertaining to the Replacement and Conservation of Wildlife; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COX:

H. Res. 21. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. Res. 22. Resolution to create a Committee on Fiscal Planning; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. Res. 23. Resolution to amend rules X and XI of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Res. 24. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PACE:

H. Res. 25. Resolution authorizing an investigation of commodity prices; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Res. 26. A bill changing the Rules of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. Res. 27. Resolution to provide for continuing review of the work of executive agencies by standing committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. Res. 28. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 29. Resolution to amend clause 40, rule XI, of the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 30. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the war effort; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 31. Resolution providing expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 30; to the Committee on Accounts.

---

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 158. A bill for the relief of Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 159. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Ramirez; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 160. A bill for the relief of Charles Beasley; to the Committe on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 161. A bill for the relief of Gus Spano; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 162. A bill for the relief of Ralph Edgar Beebe; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 163. A bill for the relief of Margaret Redmond; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 164. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Boyd; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 165. A bill for the relief of Otto Goetz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 166. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 167. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary McMenamin, Shepherd; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 168. A bill granting a pension to Edna P. Welsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 169. A bill granting a pension to Neva Dobbins; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 170. A bill for the relief of O. T. Travis; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 171. A bill for the relief of James Fleming; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 172. A bill for the relief of James T. Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 173. A bill for the relief of Mor (Morris) Honig, his wife Franciska (Francesca), and their sons Vilmos (William) and Pal (Paul); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 174. A bill authorizing the appointment of James T. Simpson as major in the Chaplains Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 175. A bill for the relief of Frederic Gruder and family; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 176. A bill for the relief of Morris Burstein and Jennie Burstein; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 177. A bill for the relief of Hans Oppenheimer and his wife Marga; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 178. A bill for the relief of Maria Stern, Arpad Stern, Elizabeth Spitz, Maximilian Spitz, and Claude Marguerite Spitz; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 179. A bill granting a pension to Alice G. Townsend; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 180. A bill for the relief of James F. Mellon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 181. A bill for the relief of Gussie Hart and Louis Hart; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 182. A bill for the relief of Horace W. Goldsmith; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 183. A bill for the relief of John Fleckstein; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 184. A bill to extend emergency officers' retirement benefits to Raymond B. Shoemaker; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 185. A bill for the relief of Merrill M. Marks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 186. A bill for the relief of William Beyer; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 187. A bill for the relief of Antonino Cappello; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 188. A bill for the relief of Mendel Hoffmann and his wife Rosa Hoffmann; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 189. A bill for the relief of Markus Preminger, his wife Josefa, and son Ingwald; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 190. A bill for the relief of Clarence Mulligan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 191. A bill for the relief of Ada Rousina; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 192. A bill for the relief of Jakob Zoller; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 193. A bill for the relief of Manuel Maiz y Humara; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 194. A bill for the relief of John J. Berton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 195. A bill for the relief of Gladys A. Ennis as executrix of the estate of George Pears Ennis, deceased, and Oscar H. Julius; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 196. A bill for the relief of Excelsior Automotive Service, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 197. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Riverside St. Clair Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 198. A bill for the relief of Mary Bannach; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 199. A bill for the relief of the Morgan Decorating Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 200. A bill for the relief of Julian Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 201. A bill for the relief of Patrick H. Clifford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 202. A bill for the relief of Michael Soldo; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 203. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Mike L. Blank; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 204. A bill for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 205. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons who have claims for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 206. A bill granting a pension to Kate F. Alderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 207. A bill granting a pension to Inez Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 208. A bill granting a pension to Louise Eberle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CREAL:

H. R. 209. A bill for the relief of Albert B. Goodin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 210. A bill for the relief of J. L. Horton, James Horton, Fred Bird, John Dowdell, Martin Dowdell, Harrison Trent, Charles Clark, Obed Crutcher, Nannie Horton, Virgil Funk, Lubie Bailey, Della Stone, Cowley Heiss, Arthur Carr, Lonnie Wise, E. B. Meyers, Nellie Meyers, Leo Wise, Clyde A. Meyers, W. C. Masters, Gertie Stone, Caskmears Atcher, Josephine Clark, Alexander Higdon, Mrs. J. T. Eubanks, Mrs. Harrison Basham, Harry Yates, and G. S. Stone; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 211. A bill granting a pension to Julia Lyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 212. A bill granting a pension to Rebecca J. Tilley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 213. A bill for the relief of Edward H. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 214. A bill for the relief of Gus A. Vance; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 215. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 216. A bill for the relief of Richard L. Frymire; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 217. A bill for the relief of C. P. Bradbury, J. W. Croan, W. S. Dawson, S. B. Foster, Virgil Hibbs, T. W. Hoagland, Charles Howlett, H. Q. Newman, Starks L. Nooe, L. N. Patterson, Ottis Porter, Mrs. Ott Saddler, W. N. Simmons, and Tomy Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 218. A bill for the relief of H. F. Mathis; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 219. A bill granting a pension to Alfred Daugherty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 220. A bill granting a pension to Martha Kasinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 221. A bill granting a pension to Nancy Ann Laird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 222. A bill granting a pension to Louise F. Mansfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 223. A bill granting a pension to Simpson Pennington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 224. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Blacketer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 225. A bill granting a pension to George Merideth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 226. A bill granting a pension to Jim Merideth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 227. A bill for the relief of Tours Apartment Hotel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 228. A bill for the relief of Frank Collins, James Everett, Edwin Kampel, Ralph Abrams, James N. Couch, and John Lynch; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 229. A bill granting a pension to Mary A. Mears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 230. A bill granting a pension to Dona Citizen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 231. A bill for the relief of William B. Cott; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 232. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary Sheridan; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 233. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lula H. Powers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 234. A bill granting a pension to Mary Harvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of California:

H. R. 235. A bill for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 236. A bill for the relief of W. L. Toland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 237. A bill granting an increase of pension to Clara Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 238. A bill granting a pension to Fred L. Lindsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 239. A bill granting an increase of pension to Susan McCelland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 240. A bill granting an increase of pension to Matilda Tarno; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 241. A bill for the relief of Blanche E. Broad; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 242. A bill for the relief of Capt. Malcolm K. Beyer; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 243. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Bolinross Chemical Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 244. A bill for the relief of Morris Leff; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 245. A bill for the relief of Robert Bennett; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 246. A bill granting death compensation to Ida L. Becker; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 247. A bill for the relief of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 248. A bill for the relief of Louis Courcil; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 249. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 250. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 251. A bill for the relief of Franklin E. Ludwig, Mary Taylor, and Frank A. Taylor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 252. A bill for the relief of Brooklyn Iron Works, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KERR:

H. R. 253. A bill for the relief of Betthel Christopher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 254. A bill for the relief of C. J. Boyle; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 255. A bill for the relief of Col. E. H. Tarbutton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 256. A bill for the relief of Albert S. Horton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 257. A bill for the relief of William G. Schmid; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 258. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Kearney; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 259. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Augusta McCall; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 260. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to summon William D. Gill before an Army retiring board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 261. A bill for the relief of Aileen Phyllis Flock and Ellen Frances Flock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLEBERG:

H. R. 262. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. C. Romberg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 263. A bill for the relief of Ruth Rudnikoff Stotland; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 264. A bill for the relief of Jean Rudnikoff Bloomstein; to the Committee on Immigation and Naturalization.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 265. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Dorothy Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 266. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emmitt Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 267. A bill granting a pension to Margaret E. Duckworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 268. A bill granting a pension to Sidonia B. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 269. A bill to confer the Medal of Honor for service in the Philippine Insurrection on William O. Trafton, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 270. A bill for the relief of Jesse M. Knowles; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 271. A bill for the relief of O. M. Minatree; to the Commitee on Claims.

H. R. 272. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vola Stroud Pokulda; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 273. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Walter H. Schwartz (Medical Corps), United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 274. A bill for the relief of Chet Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 275. A bill granting a pension to Emma Hellwig; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 276. A bill for the relief of certain former employees and materialmen of Joseph P. Casey and the Foundation Waterproofing Co., contractors with the United States of America, under contract No. W-741-eng.-1911 for the clearing of parcel No. 1 in the pool of lock and dam No. 18, Mississippi River; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 277. A bill to reinstate John B. Day, a captain, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 278. A bill for the relief of John August Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 279. A bill for the relief of George Kennedy; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 280. A bill granting a pension to Mabel McBratney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 281. A bill granting a pension to Clara S. Hopple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 282. A bill granting a pension to Eva Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 283. A bill granting a pension to Anna Milholland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 284. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 285. A bill granting an increase of pension to Charity West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 286. A bill granting an increase of pension to Almira Hemingway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 287. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nora C. Fetterhoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 288. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ellen Jondro; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 289. A bill granting a pension to Nettie E. Teeter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 290. A bill granting a pension to Matilda Roach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 291. A bill for the relief of Thomas Callanan, Jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 292. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lila A. Wemp; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 293. A bill for the relief of Victor Bonnici; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 294. A bill for the relief of Mundo Barchi; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 295. A bill for the relief of Michael Francis Spillane; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 296. A bill to provide for the restoration to active duty of Capt. Walter S. Strange, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 297. A bill for the relief of August Michela, infant; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr PFEIFER:

H. R. 298. A bill for the relief of Joseph Ippolito; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 299. A bill for the relief of Hyman L. Schiffer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 300. A bill for the relief of Frank L. Fink; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 301. A bill for the relief of Virginia Lane; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 302. A bill for the relief of Robert Griffin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 303. A bill for the relief of George Spears Melvin; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 304. A bill for the relief of J. E. Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 305. A bill for the relief of Howard Morgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 306. A bill for the relief of Alfred P. Paquin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 307. A bill for the relief of Marie Valida Antonia Michaud; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 308. A bill granting an increase of pension to Cornelia Hunton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 309. A bill for the relief of Marion O. Cassady; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire:

H. R. 310. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Crain; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 311. A bill granting a pension to Maud Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 312. A bill for the relief of Freda Utley; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CREAL:

H. R. 322. A bill granting a pension to Mattie L. Stults; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 378. A bill for the relief of Caroline Janes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 379. A bill to correct the naval record of former members of the crews of the revenue cutters *Algonquin* and *Onondaga;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 380. A bill granting an increase of pension to Caroline Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 381. A bill granting an increase of pension to Effie Washington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 382. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma Cora White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 383. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Hudson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 384. A bill granting an increase of pension to Amanda Jane Worrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 385. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 386. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ella G. Swisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 387. A bill granting a pension to Melissa McCulla; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 388. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lillie L. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 389. A bill granting an increase of pension to Laura M. Dellinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 390. A bill granting an increase of pension to Maggie Custard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 391. A bill granting an increase of pension to Georgian D. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 392. A bill granting a pension to Frederika Bushong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 393. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elmira E. Ballinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 394. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Pidgeon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 395. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 396. A bill granting a pension to Anna Edgar Pollitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 397. A bill granting a pension to Jessie Bell McElroy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 398. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 399. A bill for the relief of John Sims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 400. A bill for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 401. A bill for the relief of James W. Kelly; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 402. A bill for the relief of Frank T. Been; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 403. A bill for the relief of Albert K. Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 404. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Hopkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 405. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eva Barlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 406. A bill granting an increase of pension to Adabelle Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 407. A bill granting a pension to William Bruce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 408. A bill granting a pension to Ella Carl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 409. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 410. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Daugherty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 411. A bill granting an increase of pension to Alice Dunfee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 412. A bill granting a pension to Leslie D. Hood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 413. A bill granting a pension to Everett Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 414. A bill granting a pension to Jennie Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 415. A bill granting a pension to Minnie B. Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 416. A bill granting a pension to Harriett A. Litten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 417. A bill granting a pension to William Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 418. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 419. A bill granting a pension to Mary Ann Melvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 420. A bill granting a pension to Lucy C. Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 421. A bill granting a pension to Thomas A. O'Leary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 422. A bill granting a pension to Dayton Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 423. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth S. Primm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 424. A bill granting an increase of pension to Caroline Rupe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 425. A bill granting a pension to Florence Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 426. A bill granting a pension to Mary Virginia Salisbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 427. A bill granting a pension to Hattie Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 428. A bill granting an increase of pension to Rachel Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 429. A bill granting an increase of pension to Judah A. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 430. A bill granting a pension to Jennie Jackson Tewksbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 431. A bill granting a pension to Samuel Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 432. A bill granting an increase of pension to Violet S. Woodward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 433. A bill granting a pension to Eva Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 434. A bill for the relief of Marshall Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 435. A bill for the relief of Bertha Ebersbach; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 436. A bill for the relief of Charles Palmer Cornwell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 437. A bill granting a pension to Wilson Branch Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 438. A bill for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 439. A bill for the relief of Jack Scarton or John Skarton, formerly Simon Jan Skarzenski; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 440. A bill for the relief of Herbert James Pike; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 441. A bill for the relief of Charles Molnar; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 442. A bill for the relief of John Damacus; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 443. A bill for the relief of Dave Hougardy; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 444. A bill for the relief of Albeno Moreno; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 445. A bill for the relief of Sarah E. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 446. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Neylon Penry; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 447. A bill for the relief of Frank H. Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 448. A bill for the relief of Pearl Welch; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 449. A bill for the relief of Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 450. A bill for the relief of Benjamin E. McCall; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 451. A bill for the relief of Martha A. Donaldson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 452. A bill for the relief of Presly Holliday, quartermaster sergeant, Quartermaster Corps, on the retired list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 453. A bill for the relief of the Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 454. A bill for the relief of Angelo Merlino; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 455. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to present, in the name of Congress, medals of honor to Bertrand W. Keating and to John O'Kane; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 456. A bill for the relief of Joseph Just; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 457. A bill for the relief of Arthur Loren Fletcher; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 458. A bill to enable Eva Sofia Bildstein and her minor son, Jorg Bildstein, to remain permanently in the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MYERS:

H. R. 459. A bill granting an increase of pension to Joseph Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 460. A bill granting a pension to Clara de Valinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 461. A bill for the relief of Harry Solomon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 462. A bill to correct the naval record of Thomas Burke; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 463. A bill for the relief of Michael McGinn; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 464. A bill for the relief of Morris Lindenblit; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 465. A bill for the relief of Samuel Young; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 466. A bill for the relief of Oliver Ellison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 467. A bill for the relief of Royal E. Schaefer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 475. A bill to correct the service record of Thomas Patrick Heaney; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 476. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary Agnes Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 477. A bill granting a pension to Martha J. Poole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 478. A bill for the relief of Edith M. Powell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 479. A bill for the relief of George Geis and Glaser Zeller, as administrators of the estate of Joseph Glaser, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 480. A bill for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 481. A bill granting a pension to Bessie Baldwin; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 482. A bill granting a pension to Susan McKay Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LE. :

H. R. 483. A bill for the relief of J. V. and Zena Mendoza; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 484. A bill for the relief of Valley Concrete Pipe & Products Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 485. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah VanTuyl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 508. A bill for the relief of the city of Red Wing, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 509. A bill for the relief of Frank W. Farrington; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 510. A bill for the relief of Rev. and Mrs. E. F. Wachholz; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 511. A bill for the relief of Lucille E. Knight; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 512. A bill granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Nesseth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 513. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. S. P. Crandall, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 514. A bill for the relief of Frank L. Sarazin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 515. A bill for the relief of the city of Waseca, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 516. A bill for the relief of Marie Oster; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 517. A bill for the relief of Irene Dial; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 518. A bill for the relief of Irving Goldberg, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 519. A bill for the relief of Irving Goldberg; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 520. A bill for the relief of August Runge; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 521. A bill for the relief of Toby Lena Rosenberg, alias Maria Louisa Nasco, alias Alejandrino Echegaray; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 522. A bill for the relief of Kurt Schene; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 523. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Albert Perez; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 524. A bill for the relief of Silman Realty Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 525. A bill for the relief of Alice Scott and Alice Gertrude Scott; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 526. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Harry Kaplan, Rebecca Kaplan, Hyman Kaplan, and Guelda Kaplan; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 527. A bill for the relief of Mary Hertz; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 528. A bill granting an increase of pension to Hattie V. Holdsworth; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 529. A bill for the relief of John W. Farrell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 530. A bill for the relief of Franc Natko, his wife Margaret Natko, and their infant child Margaret Natko; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. R. 531. A bill for the relief of James Theodore Helm; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 532. A bill for the relief of Beatrice Oliver and Ruth Oliver; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 533. A bill for the relief of John P. Von Rosenberg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 534. A bill granting a pension to Isabelle Walton Prentice; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAY:

H. R. 535. A bill for the relief of Donna Pittel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 536. A bill for the relief of Fred C. J. Peterson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 537. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma Grace Bence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 538. A bill granting a pension to Nellie M. Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. R. 539. A bill to authorize the presentation to Andrew J. McLean of a Distinguished Service Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 540. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cora B. Jones and James C. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 541. A bill for the relief of Evanell Durrance; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 542. A bill for the relief of Henry M. Frazee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 543. A bill granting a pension to Josh S. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 544. A bill for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 545. A bill for the relief of G. F. Odom; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 546. A bill for the relief of H. J. Blexrud estate; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 547. A bill for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 548. A bill granting an increase of pension to Effie C. Greene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 549. A bill granting a pension to Margaret S. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 550. A bill for the relief of the estate of Renzie Graham; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 551. A bill granting an increase of pension to Catharine Ribel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 552. A bill for the relief of Winfred Alexander; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 553. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 554. A bill for the relief of J. S. Kirby; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 555. A bill for the relief of William A. Hammond; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 556. A bill granting an increase of pension to Florence S. McGinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 557. A bill granting a pension to Lottie Denny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 558. A bill for the relief of Margaret Dunn; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 559. A bill granting a pension to Fannie Rowlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 560. A bill for the relief of the Farrell-Argast Electric Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 561. A bill granting a pension to Emma Akers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 562. A bill for the relief of Fred McGarrahan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 563. A bill for the relief of Joe Koor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 564. A bill for the relief of Harold H. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 565. A bill granting a pension to Eva L. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 566. A bill granting a pension to Flora Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 567. A bill granting an increase of pension to Hannah Sims; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 568. A bill granting a pension to Callie H. Feaster; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 569. A bill granting a pension to Gussie Dawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 570. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Washington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 571. A bill to correct the military record of Thomas J. Parrott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 572. A bill for the relief of Henderson Stewart; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 573. A bill for the relief of A. L. Sauls Planograph Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 574. A bill for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 575. A bill for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Jasper and Pauline Cuccio (minors); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 576. A bill for the relief of Mary Lynn Morrow, Mrs. W. A. Jones, and the estates of Maurice Jones and Mrs. Avis McDonald; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 577. A bill for the relief of the Williams Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 578. A bill for the relief of the Williams Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 579. A bill for the relief of Barbara Healy; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 580. A bill to correct the record of Ralph Everett Crawshaw; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 581. A bill for the relief of Leo Joseph Berry; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 582. A bill for the relief of Winston Cann; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 583. A bill for the relief of the Franco-American Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 584. A bill granting a pension to Louvisa Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 585. A bill granting a pension to Francis Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 586. A bill granting a pension to Charles Alcorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 587. A bill granting a pension to Ada Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 588. A bill granting a pension to Mollie Sigmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 589. A bill granting a pension to Rachel Fuson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 590. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth Lively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 591. A bill granting a pension to Nancy Lewis; to the Committe on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 592. A bill for the relief of Fred C. Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 593. A bill granting a pension to Lillie B. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 594. A bill granting a pension to John W. Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 595. A bill granting a pension to Lucy Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 596. A bill granting a pension to Mary Bolton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 597. A bill granting a pension to Allie Burnett; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 598. A bill for the relief of Thelma Cannon McGroary; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 599. A bill for the relief of Eaph Toler; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 600. A bill granting a pension to Bettie Dick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 601. A bill granting a pension to Cora Arlena Ballard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 602. A bill granting a pension to Lou King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 603. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. H. G. Foster; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 604. A bill for the relief of the State compensation insurance fund of California; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 605. A bill for the relief of Shumate Investment Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 606. A bill for the relief of the East Asiatic Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 607. A bill for the relief of the legal representatives of Owen Thorne, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 608. A bill for the relief of Jose M. Arrais, also known as Joseph P. Arrais; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 609. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Stone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 610. A bill for the relief of Pacific Dry Dock & Repair Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 611. A bill granting an increase of pension to Adelia A. Truesdell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 612. A bill granting a pension to Addie J. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 613. A bill granting an increase of pension to Betsey A. Noble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 614. A bill granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 615. A bill granting an increase of pension to Anna Ryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 616. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 617. A bill granting an increase of pension to Edith M. Link; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 618. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 619. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Briggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 620. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ella G. Millspaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 621. A bill granting an increase of pension to Zaida M. Secor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 622. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jenettie E. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 623. A bill granting an increase of pension to Miriam E. Crampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 624. A bill granting an increase of pension to Agnes Hitchcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 625. A bill granting a pension to Kittie Grace Bozard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 626. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lorena M. Haskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 627. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Matthews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 628. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 629. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ella Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 630. A bill granting an increase of pension to Maria Wren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 631. A bill granting an increase of pension to Estella D. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 632. A bill for the relief of William H. Gotschall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 633. A bill for the relief of Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 634. A bill to provide for the advancement of Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Construction Corps, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of vice admiral; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 635. A bill for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 636. A bill for the relief of C. J. Toole; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 637. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 638. A bill to authorize the presentation of a medal of honor to J. Edgar Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHELCHEL of Georgia:

H. R. 639. A bill granting an increase of pension to certain veterans who were placed on the pension roll in 1922, and to provide domiciliary care, medical and hospital treatment, and burial benefits; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 640. A bill for the relief of George Wesley Burns; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 760. A bill granting a pension to Bell D. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 761. A bill for the relief of Charles T. Dulin; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 762. A bill for the relief of Walter R. McKinney; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 763. A bill for the relief of Lindsey Harcrow; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 764. A bill for the relief of William H. Bibb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 765. A bill to authorize the presentation of Medal of Honor to J. Edgar Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 766. A bill granting a pension to Anna L. Sweeney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 767. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Joseph E. Wilhelm and Helen B. Wilhelm, husband and wife, for the losses sustained by them by reason of the death of their son John Lee Wilhelm; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 768. A bill to authorize the cancelation of deportation proceedings in the case of Frank Durante and wife, Maria Durante, and five children, namely, Paul Durante, Alfred Durante, Anthony Durante, Henry Durante, and Patsy Durante; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

---

# SENATE

## THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, whose years have no beginning nor ending, replenish us with Thy sustaining and restraining grace as our feet tread the uncertain ways of a new year. Our judgments must weigh vast issues, our minds must face tangled problems. We are pilgrims of the night; we have not passed this way before. Yet we are heirs of great traditions. We are conscious of the cloud of witnesses out of heroic yesterdays who look down upon us from the sacred spaces of this white shrine of each patriot's devotion. We are conscious, too, of a listening world hoping in its agony, as in these halls of state is being designed the global shape of things to come.

Upon the President of the United States and his counsellors, the Vice President, the Members of the Congress, the leaders of our armed forces, and upon all trusted with authority, upon whom rest the heavy burdens and responsibilities of vital decisions so largely molding the future and, for weal or woe, affecting the lives of untold millions, we implore the wisdom which is from above and the undergirding of Thy everlasting arms. Together, with fixed purpose of heart, in Thy might unafraid, we march to meet the issues of this crucial year as in the name of the Lord our God we set up our banners. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 6, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled; that Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, had been elected Speaker; and that South Trimble, a citizen of the State of Kentucky, had been elected Clerk of the House of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The message announced that a committee of three Members, consisting of Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. DOUGHTON, and Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) providing for a joint session of the two Houses at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon today (January 7, 1943) for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President may be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT—JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. MCNARY advanced in the center aisle, and Mr. BARKLEY said:

Mr. President, the committee appointed by the Vice President under the resolution adopted yesterday to act in conjunction with a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President that the Congress is assembled and ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make has performed its duty, and the President stated that he would address a joint session of the Congress in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 12:30 p. m. today.

The concurrent resolution which has just come over from the House of Representatives provides for the joint session, and I ask that the concurrent resolution be now considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1), which was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, the 7th day of January 1943, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the ordinary morning business be postponed until the reassembling of the Senate following the address by the President. I may say to Members that the Senate will reassemble for a session at which bills and resolutions may be introduced, instead of doing that now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

### ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO SENATOR GLASS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution and have it read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 4) was read as follows:

Whereas CARTER GLASS, a Senator-elect from the State of Virginia, is temporarily unable, by reason of illness at his residence in Lynchburg, Va., to appear in person to take the

oath required by law as a Member of the Senate; and

Whereas there is no contest or question as to his election: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to the said CARTER GLASS, and that the said oath, when administered as herein authorized, shall be accepted and received by the Senate as the oath of office of the said CARTER GLASS.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the House has sent word that it desires the Senate be in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 12:20 p. m. Therefore I think it would be well to have a quorum called, in order to notify all Senators.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | George | O'Mahoney |
| Andrews | Gerry | Overton |
| Austin | Gillette | Radcliffe |
| Bailey | Green | Reed |
| Ball | Guffey | Revercomb |
| Bankhead | Gurney | Reynolds |
| Barbour | Hatch | Robertson |
| Barkley | Hawkes | Russell |
| Bilbo | Hayden | Scrugham |
| Bone | Hill | Shipstead |
| Brewster | Holman | Stewart |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | Taft |
| Brooks | Kilgore | Thomas, Idaho |
| Buck | La Follette | Thomas, Okla. |
| Burton | Langer | Thomas, Utah |
| Bushfield | Lodge | Tobey |
| Butler | Lucas | Truman |
| Byrd | McCarran | Tunnell |
| Capper | McClellan | Tydings |
| Caraway | McFarland | Vandenberg |
| Chandler | McKellar | Van Nuys |
| Chavez | McNary | Wallgren |
| Clark, Idaho | Maloney | Walsh |
| Clark, Mo. | Maybank | Wheeler |
| Connally | Millikin | Wherry |
| Danaher | Moore | White |
| Davis | Murdock | Wiley |
| Eastland | Murray | Willis |
| Ellender | Nye | |
| Ferguson | O'Daniel | |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Special Committee to Investigate Agricultural Labor Shortages.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to announce that, in order to comply with the request of the House to be in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 20 minutes after 12 o'clock, the Senate will assemble and leave its Chamber at 15 minutes after 12. In the meantime, I suggest that the Senate recess for 3 minutes so that it may be at ease.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess for 3 minutes.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess for 3 minutes.

At the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the terms of House Concurrent Resolution 1, adopted by the two Houses, the Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for a joint session with the House to receive a message from the President of the United States.

Thereupon the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Edwin A. Halsey), its Sergeant at Arms (Chesley W. Jurney), and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of receiving a message from the President of the United States.

ANNUAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The annual message of the President of the United States was this day delivered by him to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress.

(The full text of the message will be found in the proceedings of the House, p. 45.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate, having returned to its Chamber, reassembled at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m., and the Vice President resumed the chair.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LOAN FROM NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Library.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 1)

A letter from the Secretary of War, President, National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of War, stating that, pursuant to law, a supplemental list of contracts in excess of $150,000 undertaken during the fiscal year 1942 by the War Department, omitted from his report dated August 29, 1942, had been submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the period of July 1, 1942, to January 1, 1943, showing the special assistants employed under the appropriation "Compensation of special attorneys," contained in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1943, together with the rates of compensation or fees paid, and a description of their duties (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SPECIAL RAILWAY MAIL TRANSPORTATION CONTRACTS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement relative to special contracts made with the following railroad companies for the transportation of the mails: Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co., between Thistle and Marysvale, Utah; Rio Grande Southern Railroad Co., between Ridgway and Durango, Colo.; the Alaska Railroad, between Seward and Fairbanks, Matanuska, and Jonesville, and between Junction and Premier, Alaska; Pacific & Arctic Railway & Navigation Co., between Skagway and White Pass, Alaska; and Hudson & Manhattan Railroad Co., between Hudson Terminal Station, New York, N. Y., and Journal Square, Jersey City, N. J.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

CANCELATION OF CERTAIN INDIAN DEBTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of his order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SPECIAL HELIUM-PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Secretary showing credits, disbursements, and the balance on hand in the special helium-production fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS OF FEDERAL OFFICERS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing officers and administrative officers of the Government delinquent in rendering or transmitting their accounts to the proper offices in Washington during th fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, and during prior years whose delinquencies were not manifested until during the fiscal year 1942, and whether the delinquency was waived, together with a list of officers who, upon final settlement of their accounts, were found to be indebted to the Government and had failed to make payment into the Treasury of the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT OF TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Commission for the year ended October 31, 1942, except as otherwise noted (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF ELECTRIC HOME AND FARM AUTHORITY

A letter from the President of the Electric Home and Farm Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the

Authority, covering operations from July 1, 1941, through October 31, 1942, inclusive (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, together with the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

EMPLOYEES OF OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION

A letter from the Director of Defense Transportation, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 322 (77th Cong., 2d sess.), information regarding employees of the agency who draw salaries of $3,000 per annum or over, together with their age, education, and business or professional affiliations during the 5-year period preceding their employment by the agency (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXPENDITURES OF UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the expenditure of the appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE GORGAS MEMORIAL LABORATORY

A letter from the president of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

SEPTEMBER (1942) REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Corporation's activities for the month of September 1942, together with a statement of loan and other authorizations made during the month, showing the name, amount, and rate of interest or dividend in each case, statement of cash receipts and expenditures during the month, and statement of conditions as of the close of business September 30, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, covering the activities of the Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXPENDITURES OF FUNDS DERIVED FROM THE SALE OF BONDS OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the expenditures for the year ended November 30, 1942, of funds derived from the sale of bonds under section 15c of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COMPENSATION OF SUPERINTENDENT AND TEACHERS OF COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of amounts and rates paid to the superintendent and for teachers at Columbia Institution for the Deaf (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of the company for the calendar year 1942, with the accounts for the month of December estimated (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

JUDGMENTS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 2)

A letter from the Assistant Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended November 30, 1942, the amount thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Three letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, War (5), Post Office (2), Navy (3), Agriculture (3), and Labor; War Production Board, Federal Works Agency (2), Civil Service Commission (3), and Office of War Information, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Fort Scott, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1. A bill to provide for a 20-percent increase in the compensation of postmasters and other employees of the Postal Service;

S. 2. A bill to make permanent the rate of postage on mailable matter of the first class;

S. 3. A bill to provide automobile liability for postal employees;

S. 4. A bill to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual salary basis, and fix their rate of pay;

S. 5. A bill to provide increases in clerical allowances at certain offices of the third class, and for other purposes;

S. 6. A bill granting to post offices of the third class an allowance for additional clerk hire during the period of annual and sick leave of the postmaster;

S. 7. A bill to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees;

S. 8. A bill to reclassify the salaries of watchmen, messengers, and laborers in the Postal Service, and to prescribe the time credits for service as substitute watchmen, messengers, and laborers, and for other purposes; and

S. 9. A bill relating to the classification of substitute post-office clerks and substitute city letter carriers in first- and second-class post offices, and substitute laborers in the Postal Service and Railway Mail Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 10. A bill providing for the issuance of certificates of statutory compliance with certain national standards to certain corporations, trade associations, and labor organizations engaged in or affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 11. A bill to provide for the use of 10 percent of the receipts from national forests for the making of range improvements within such forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 12. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 13. A bill to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators;

S. 14. A bill to enact the Aviation Salvage at Sea Convention into statute law in the United States;

S. 15. A bill authorizing the advanced training in aeronautics of technical personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; and

S. 16. A bill to promote safety in the development of air commerce by regulating the lighting of airports and other landing areas; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 17. A bill to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia;

S. 18. A bill to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries for teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter; and

S. 19. A bill to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 20. A bill providing for the transfer to the reclamation fund and waiving of interest upon Government-owned bonds, notes, and other obligations of drainage, irrigation, and reclamation districts; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. 21. A bill to provide for Senate ratification of foreign trade agreements; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 22. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 23. A bill authorizing the Western Bands of the Shoshone Nation of Indians to sue in the Court of Claims; and

S. 24. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 25. A bill to establish a Division of Aviation Education in the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and for other purposes; and

S. 26. A bill to provide for the bonding of Federal officials and employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 27. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war; and

S. 28. A bill to permit defendants to waive prosecution by indictment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 29. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fortified military post at or near the naval depot at Hawthorne, Nev.; and

S. 30. A bill to establish a Department of Aviation, to consolidate therein the activities of the Government relating to military aviation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 31. A bill to amend the Taylor Grazing Act for the purpose of providing for greater participation by district advisory boards in administration of the act;

S. 32. A bill to provide a method for making payments to the several States with respect to certain lands and certain projects of the United States; and

S. 33. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of sampling plants and custom mills, as an aid in the development and acquisition of strategic and critical materials which are essential to the national defense; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 34. A bill for the relief of the Lauderdale County Highway Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 35. A bill to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 36. A bill to suspend the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission under section 14 (a) and section 14 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act to issue rules relating to the solicitation of proxies, consents, and authorizations during the period of war emergency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to establish a monument to George Washington Carver, of Tuskegee, Ala., who recently passed away, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from Missouri.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 37. A bill to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 38. A bill to provide for the economic defense of the United States, and for the protection of American price and wage levels and American standards of living against destructive foreign competition, and for the protection and promotion of American foreign trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 39. A bill placing the position of postmaster in first-, second-, and third-class offices in the competitive classified service and for other purposes essential to the establishment of the Post Office Department on a nonpolitical career basis; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(Mr. VANDENBERG also introduced Senate bill 40, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 41. A bill to provide for universal service and total mobilization during any war in which the United States is now engaged; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 42. A bill to amend section 4 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936;

S. 43. A bill to amend section 17 of the Federal Highway Act;

S. 44. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources;

S. 45. A bill to further amend section 3 of Public Law No. 270, approved June 7, 1924, providing for forest perpetuation and extension, by increasing the annual authorization therefor and extending aid in combating tree insects and diseases;

S. 46. A bill to amend section 8c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, for the purpose of making its provisions applicable to prunes for canning produced in the States of Oregon and Washington west of the Cascade Mountains;

S. 47. A bill to provide for a Forest Credit Commissioner and for a Forest Credit Bank, within the Farm Credit Administration, to extend credit for furthering the conservation and operation of forest lands, and for other purposes;

S. 48. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain lands for and the addition thereof to the Deschutes National Forest, in the State of Oregon; and

S. 49. A bill to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to provide for a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in maintenance of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 50. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Brizendine;

S. 51. A bill for the relief of Lincoln County, Oreg.;

S. 52. A bill for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis;

S. 53. A bill for the relief of William Joseph Caisse;

S. 54. A bill for the relief of Benson Allen;

S. 55. A bill for the relief of R. Thomas Carter and Alice E. Carter; and

S. 56. A bill for the relief of Minnie B. LaBarre and Harrie A. LaBarre; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 57. A bill to authorize completion of alterations to a bridge over the Columbia River, made necessary by Bonneville Dam;

S. 58. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg.; and

S. 59. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish-cultural station at or near Clatskanie on the Clatskanie River in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 60. A bill granting a pension to Carl D. Ziska;

S. 61. A bill for the relief of Dave W. Stearns;

S. 62. A bill for the relief of Julia A. S. O'Brien;

S. 63. A bill for the relief of Marion C. Hunter;

S. 64. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles Martin Corbett;

S. 65. A bill to provide for the payment of annuities to blind persons;

S. 66. A bill to amend paragraph 757 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase duty on filberts; and

S. 67. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 68. A bill to amend section 17 of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 69. A bill for the relief of Jacob S. Silverman; and

S. 70. A bill for the relief of George R. Sharp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 71. A bill to provide pension benefits for certain Spanish-American War veterans equivalent to those granted to Civil War veterans; and

S. 72. A bill for the relief of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and Chinese Boxer Rebellion; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 73. A bill to provide for a uniform method of payments to the several States on account of certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

S. 74. A bill to assure conservation of and to permit the fullest utilization of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific, and for other purposes; to the Special Committee on Wildlife Resources.

By Mrs. CARAWAY:

S. 75. A bill to provide for better rural homes and farm structures through further endowment of cooperative agricultural extension work, agricultural research, and resident instruction in the land-grant colleges; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 76. A bill for the relief of James H. Croxdale, of Arkansas; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 77. A bill to authorize the refund of certain amounts collected from physicians for the privilege of prescribing the waters from Hot Springs National Park;

S. 78. A bill for the relief of James F. Dubberly;

S. 79. A bill for the relief of R. K. Garfield;

S. 80. A bill for the relief of W. H. Dunblazier;

S. 81. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Herbert M. Gregory;

S. 82. A bill for the relief of Emma Fein;

S. 83. A bill for the relief of Nannie Kyle;

S. 84. A bill for the relief of Samuel H. McAlexander;

S. 85. A bill providing for reimbursement of the St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company for expenditure in revetment work on the Arkansas River during the flood of 1927;

S. 86. A bill for the relief of Lark Simms, Elliott Burnett, and G. W. Simms;

S. 87. A bill for the relief of Abner E. McGuire;

S. 88. A bill for the relief of Jack Chestnutt;

S. 89. A bill for the relief of Mrs. W. Spear Harris;

S. 90. A bill for the relief of Jeptha John Arbaugh;

S. 91. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Bennie Cochran;

S. 92. A bill for the relief of Leo Janes;

S. 93. A bill for the relief of Guss Berry and Ernest Dewberry;

S. 94. A bill for the relief of Warren J. Fox;

S. 95. A bill for the relief of A. K. Shaw;

S. 96. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. J. Hudson;

S. 97. A bill for the relief of Malcolm S. Brown;

S. 98. A bill for the relief of Sadie McElroy;

S. 99. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emmett Turner;

S. 100. A bill for the relief of Frank R. Garner, formerly second lieutenant, United States Army;

S. 101. A bill for the relief of Sue F. Melton;

S. 102. A bill for the relief of Jordan Roberts; and

S. 103. A bill for the relief of Clara A. Spratlin; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 104. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to provide additional safety for passengers in aircraft; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 105. A bill for the relief of William Edward Boileau;

S. 106. A bill for the relief of Eula S. Damm;

S. 107. A bill for the relief of Charles N. J. Miller; and

S. 108. A bill to amend the Social Security Act with respect to grants to States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 109. A bill for the relief of Henry Brown;

S. 110. A bill making eligible for retirement under the same conditions as now provided for officers of the Regular Army Capt. Oliver A. Barber, an officer of the United States Army during the World War, who incurred physical disability in line of duty;

S. 111. A bill for the relief of Charles Boothe Amis;

S. 112. A bill for the relief of Benjamin H. Southern; and

S. 113. A bill for the relief of Sarah Harriett Hawkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 114. A bill for the relief of the dependents of the late Chief Radio Electrician Thomas C. Thrasher, United States Navy;

S. 115. A bill authorizing the appointment of Carl Ferdinan Janson as a boatswain in the United States Navy; and

S. 116. A bill for the relief of Harry Roland Burgess; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 117. A bill granting a pension to Eliza Wheeler;

S. 118. A bill granting a pension to Edward H. Wolff;

S. 119. A bill granting a pension to Roy A. Ault;

S. 120. A bill granting a pension to Lillie R. Willmore;

S. 121. A bill granting a pension to Ernest J. Hollis;

S. 122. A bill granting a pension to Norfleet Hughes;

S. 123. A bill granting a pension to Robert Johnson;

S. 124. A bill granting a pension to Ernest McCord;

S. 125. A bill granting a pension to Anna J. Darby;

S. 126. A bill granting a pension to Theta B. Spring;

S. 127. A bill granting a pension to Jennie Railey;

S. 128. A bill granting a pension to Florence L. Bailey;

S. 129. A bill granting a pension to Florence Cooper;

S. 130. A bill granting a pension to William E. Green;

S. 131. A bill granting a pension to Rebecca E. Skaggs;

S. 132. A bill granting a pension to Bill McCarty; and

S. 133. A bill granting a pension to J. H. McGhehey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 134. A bill for the relief of the heirs of John J. Shields;

S. 135. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

S. 136. A bill for the relief of Jacob Oblock; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 137. A bill to prevent discrimination against blind persons and persons with impaired visual acuity in the administration of the civil-service laws and rules; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 138. A bill relating to the accounts of certain governmental agencies; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S 139. A bill to extend to members of the armed forces of allies of the United States the exemption from the tax on admissions in cases where admission is free; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 140. A bill to amend section 3 (g) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 141. A bill for the relief of John A. Auge;

S. 142. A bill relating to the payment of compensation of officers and employees of the United States Government for time spent on duty as members of the military forces (other than the National Guard) of a State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia;

S. 143. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the eastern section of Pennsylvania; and

S. 144. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to correct certain military records; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 145. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of preparatory schools for the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 146. A bill to grant a pension, with arrearages, to Bettie Scott Watkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUFFEY:

S. 147. A bill to amend the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 148. A bill relating to the appointment and retirement in the Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States of persons with physical disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 149. A bill to prohibit certain contracts, agreements, conspiracies, and combinations which prevent the making of recordations for use by radio broadcasting stations and coin-operated phonographs; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 150. A bill making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 151. A bill for the relief of Sam Wooten;

S. 152. A bill for the relief of F. M. Maloy;

S. 153. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alethea Arthur; to the Committee on Claims;

S. 154. A bill to facilitate the prosecution of the war by providing for Federal regulation of sizes and weights of motor vehicles operating on certain highways; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 155. A bill to restore to the active list of the Army and to active duty certain retired officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 156. A bill relating to the status of retired judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 157. A bill to provide for the acquisition of the property known as Temple Heights to be used for the duration of the war as a recreation center for Government employees, or for offices, and thereafter as a site for a memorial building in commemoration of the sacrifices of the defenders of the Union during the Civil War; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. WHITE):

S. 158. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON:

S. 159. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 160. A bill for the relief of Yeichi Nimura (Tomizo Miki); to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 161. A bill for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage, or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N. C., on March 7, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 162. A bill to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; and

S. 163. A bill to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship construction reserve funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 164. A bill providing for establishment of a synthetic-rubber plant at Bismarck or Mandan, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 165. A bill to prevent nepotism in appointments to governmental offices and positions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 166. A bill to provide for the cancelation of certain notes acquired by the Farm Credit Administration as a result of the activities of the Federal Farm Board; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 167. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Kegel; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 168. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 169. A bill designating the fourth Saturday in September of each year as American Indian Day; and

S. 170. A bill for the relief of W. Cooke; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 171. A bill for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke;

S. 172. A bill for the relief of John W. Barbrick; and

S. 173. A bill for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 174. A bill for the relief of Cecilia Pitt; and

S. 175. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Nasli M. Heeramaneck; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 176. A bill for the relief of Austin L. Tierney; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 177. A bill granting an increase of pension to George B. Sheldon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 178. A bill to provide relief for victims of the flood of July 16, 1942, in and near the

city of Bayfield, Wis.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 179. A bill to create the Prairie du Chien Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Prairie du Chien, Wis., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 180. A bill to provide vocational rehabilitation education, training, and other services to persons disabled while members of the armed forces, or disabled in war industries or otherwise and to render such persons fit for service in war industries, agriculture, or other useful civilian industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 181. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, to make eligible to an annuity individuals who, on March 1, 1937, were 70 years of age and were excluded because of not being employed on said date; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 182. A bill to amend the act of April 18, 1940, relating to the furnishing of markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

S. 183. A bill for the erection of a memorial of Maj. Gen. Henry Knox at Thomaston, Maine; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 184. A bill to provide for the presentation of silver medals to certain members of the Peary polar expedition of 1908–1909; and

S. 185. A bill for the relief of Alfred Paquin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 186. A bill to create a Division of Water Pollution Control in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 187. A bill to provide for vocational rehabilitation and the return to civil employment of certain persons disabled under circumstances entitling them after discharge or separation from the military or naval forces of the United States to a pension or retirement pay; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 188. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, to prohibit the use of any pipe line constructed under such act for the transportation or distribution of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce;

S. 189. A bill making unlawful the use of force or violence, or threats thereof, to prevent or attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

S. 190. A bill to amend certain provisions of law relating to overtime pay, and for other purposes; and

S. 191. A bill relating to the hours of employment, compensation, and conditions of employment of employees engaged in interstate commerce or the production of goods for such commerce or employed in the performance of any Government contract; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

S. 192. A bill to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States and the exclusive use for the manufacture of nonessential articles of other silver; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 193. A bill to provide for insurance by the Farm Credit Administration of loans made by financial institutions for the purpose of enabling borrowers to purchase livestock for restocking or herd-foundation purposes;

S. 194. A bill to transfer from the Farm Credit Administration and certain agencies thereof to the Secretary of Agriculture certain notes and other evidences of indebtedness, and for other purposes;

S. 195. A bill relating to the making of certain payments in connection with the 1937 soil-conservation program;

S. 196. A bill relating to the purchase of certain land for inclusion within the Beltrami Island project, Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 197. A bill to amend section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 198. A bill to amend further section 2 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 199. A bill for the relief of Robert Norheim; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 200. A bill to further extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 201. A bill relating to the effective date of awards of compensation to surviving dependents of veterans of the World War who die or have died from a service-connected disease or disability;

S. 202. A bill to require quarterly returns of retailer's excise taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 203. A bill to require the publication of certain information and the preservation of certain records in connection with polls of public opinion; to the Comimttee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 204. A bill relating to the appointment of Members of or Delegates to Congress or of Resident Commissioners to any office in the judicial branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 205. A bill to amend the act of April 27, 1916, establishing the Army and Navy Medal of Honor Roll; and

S. 206. A bill granting a pension to Ole M. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 207. A bill to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class mailing fees upon resumption of publication;

S. 208. A bill authorizing the Postmaster General to grant leaves of absence without pay to fourth-class postmasters who desire to engage in war work; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

S. 209. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property to the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 210. A bill relating to the payment of certain benefits under the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 211. A bill to exclude certain aliens from admission to the United States; and

S. 212. A bill to provide for punishment of persons who escape or attempt to escape from the custody of officers or employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 213. A bill relating to the garnishment of salaries or other compensation of civil officers and employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia; and

S. 214. A bill to consolidate the function of furnishing legal advice to Government agencies in the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 215. A bill to authorize the filing of certain notices to serve as constructive notice of the interest of the United States in realty or personalty under facilities contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 216. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the Medical Department of the Regular Army;

S. 217. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect;

S. 218. A bill to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge;

S. 219. A bill to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers;

S. 220. A bill to provide for payment of certain travel costs of dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Army and the War Department on a mileage basis in order to promote efficiency and economy in such payments;

S. 221. A bill to amend sections 1 and 2 of chapter XIX of the Army Appropriation Act, approved July 9, 1918, relating to protection of life and property in waters endangered by activities of the Army;

S. 222. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 223. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior; and

S. 224. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 225. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Evan A. Edwards; to the Committee on Claims;

S. 226. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a procedure for cost accounting and cost reporting for Federal agencies; to the Committee on Commerce;

S. 227. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct;

S. 228. A bill to exempt from income tax cost of military and naval uniforms and equipment borne by members of the armed forces;

S. 229. A bill to amend subparagraph (c), paragraph I, of part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, so as to grant pensions at wartime rates for disabilities received on or after October 8, 1940;

S. 230. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits to certain World War No. 2 cases; and

S. 231. A bill to provide insurance benefits for total disability under contracts of National Service Life Insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 232. A bill granting the Distinguished Service Cross to Basil R. Otey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 233. A bill to unify the land, the naval, and the air forces of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 234. A bill to establish a Department of National Defense, to consolidate therein the Department of War and the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. CAPPER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 1, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to voting qualifications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 9 as Leif Erikson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to freedom to work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting child labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

S. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; and

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NYE:

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Erikson in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution requiring the registration of labor organizations, prohibiting the employment of certain persons as officers or agents of such organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution providing for an investigation and survey of certain crustacean food resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to amend the act entitled "An act to protect the public health by the prevention of certain practices leading to dental disorders; and to prevent the circumvention of certain State or Territorial laws regulating the practice of dentistry"; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

## TENURE OF OFFICE OF GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to fix the tenure of the office of the Governor of Puerto Rico. I may say that a companion measure is being introduced today in the House of Representatives by the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and I also ask that a statement of my reason for the presentation of the measure in this form be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and referred as requested, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The bill (S. 40) to provide that the term of office of the Governor of Puerto Rico shall expire upon the enactment of this act and at the end of each two-year period thereafter, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. VANDENBERG in connection with the bill is as follows:

It is universally recognized that a serious situation exists in Puerto Rico. There is a substantially supported opinion, both in Puerto Rico and here at home, that these difficulties stem from the administration of Governor Tugwell. In any event, they exist within his jurisdiction. Without further delay the Congress should determine whether a change in the governorship of Puerto Rico is the essential starting point looking toward a solution of these serious conditions.

Under existing law, the Governor of Puerto Rico serves indefinitely at the pleasure of the President. If his removal is deemed advisable by Congress, the only available process is impeachment; but impeachment is presumably confined to high crimes and misdemeanors of which an otherwise undesirable or discredited Governor might not be guilty. Under existing circumstances, the only other possible alternative would be a congressional resolution recommending his dismissal by the President; but when that congressional recourse was invoked in 1924 against certain Cabinet officers, President Coolidge immediately rejected the advice, declaring it to be outside the constitutional jurisdiction of the Congress to deal in any fashion with Presidential appointees after their original confirmation.

Under these circumstances, it appears that the answer to this dilemma—if Congress desires to assert some degree of continuous responsibility—is for the Governor of Puerto Rico to have a fixed tenure of office which forces him to pass periodically in congressional review. Therefore, I am introducing this bill, which terminates the tenure of the present Governor of Puerto Rico forthwith and fixes a definite 2-year term hereafter for his successors. If Governor Tugwell's tenure is thus terminated by statute—which is clearly within congressional jurisdiction—the President can renominate Governor Tugwell if he sees fit to do so. Then the Senate can explore and clarify the whole situation before it reconfirms him if such shall be its desire. Thus the whole controversy can be brought to an effective conclusion.

Certainly there is need to liquidate this controversy for the sake of all concerned. Obviously, there is serious doubt whether Governor Tugwell should longer be left in control of Puerto Rico's destinies. The House of Representatives feels this fact so keenly that its unanimous Agricultural Committee recently made a $15,000,000 relief appropriation for hungry Puerto Ricans wholly contingent upon Governor Tugwell's retirement. But this method of dealing with the problem is an inhumane recourse—namely, to withhold relief from the victims of famine until there is a change in a governorship over which the victims of famine have no control. The responsibility for the governorship is here in Washington and it should be met here in Washington in direct action by the President and the Congress pursuant to an authentic disclosure of the facts.

Governor Tugwell's removal has been prayerfully sought by petitions from numerous Puerto Rican groups, and by other students of Puerto Rican affairs who believe that his swiftly expanding bureaucracy and his superlatively expensive administration—with all its implicit national socialization—is a fateful threat to our Island wards and is related to the Island's present serious predicament. I am frank to say that in my own view his pattern of things—which often failed dismally at home—is being revived in prostrate Puerto Rico. But this is a question of fact which ought to be authentically established in connection with the other numerous protests which have challenged both the propriety and the efficiency of the Tugwell administration. There is no present assurance of any such effective review unless Congress acts in the fashion proposed by the bill which I am introducing today—a counterpart of which is also being introduced in the House of Representatives by Hon. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN, who was elected by the people of Puerto Rico to speak for them in Washington in his capacity as Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

Among others who have asked for Governor Tugwell's removal are not only the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico to the United States but also the Union Republican, the Socialist and Unification Parties of Puerto Rico, the Chamber of Commerce, the Farmers' Association, and the Free Federation of Labor of Puerto Rico. But the only "removal" thus far has been the summary Presidential order last November "removing" Attorney General George A. Malcolm—one of the most distinguished career servants in the American Foreign Service—because he opposed what he officially branded as Governor Tugwell's unconstitutional and illegal acts.

A special Senate committee is investigating the critical Puerto Rican famine. But it has only limited jurisdiction and limited resources although its findings are calculated to have an important bearing upon the Tugwell regime. But I respectfully submit that the whole Tugwell regime should promptly pass in congressional review. Congress cannot escape its share of Puerto Rican responsibility. But it cannot implement this responsibility under existing circumstances—except by some such dubious device as the House committee recently invoked. I respectfully submit that we should immediately meet the issue head-on.

Governor Tugwell was confirmed originally by a margin of one vote with only 21 out of 96 Senators present. He should either be reconfirmed by a clear majority of the Senate upon reappointment under the terms of the bill which I am introducing today or he should be rejected in favor of a successor in the event that the President sees fit to renominate him. We owe this clarification to Puerto Rico and to our congressional responsibility and to Governor Tugwell himself.

I respectfully suggest that the situation in Puerto Rico requires immediate, constructive attention with a view to quick, effective, ameliorating results. In the first place, we cannot allow this population to starve; and while, as the New York Herald Tribune has recently editorially said, these conditions are not "entirely or even perhaps largely Governor Tugwell's fault," yet "he has fallen down on the job of coping with them even in reasonable degree" and "should give place at once to some one with the vigor and common sense which the problem requires." In the second place, Puerto Rico is known as the "Gibraltar of the Caribbean." It is vital to our defenses in the middle Atlantic, and it cannot be left in a status of disorganization and unrest. In the third place, Puerto Rico is well calculated to be a significent symbol of American efficiency and American ideals—for good or ill—in our Latin-American relationships. It should constantly have the best government of which we are capable. The President cannot excuse Congress from its share of these responsibilities—and Congress cannot excuse itself—by falling back on the terms of the existing statute which leaves to his "pleasure" the tenure of the Governor of Puerto Rico. The tenure of the Governor should be immediately terminated by act of Congress. Then if the President still believes

that Mr. Tugwell is the best available man for this key assignment, he can reappoint him; and, in the regular and normal course of events, the Senate, exercising its constitutional power of confirmation or rejection, can survey the field and act upon its constitutional responsibility. The issue thus will be settled conclusively.

Mr. McNARY. In connection with the bill introduced by the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and immediately following the introduction of the bill and his remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the subject of change of command, appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on January 5, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALLING FOR A CHANGE OF COMMAND

The desperate plight of Puerto Rico, normally unable to feed itself and now deprived of adequate imports to maintain even its low living standard, is familiar to most of us. In a series of eyewitness articles by Mr. Homer Bigart this newspaper has publicized the dismal story. More recently, the World-Telegram, in a similar series, has confirmed it. Meanwhile, Mr. Rexford Guy Tugwell remains Governor of the island, though the conditions complained of have arisen under his stewardship.

It would be unfair to say that they were entirely or even perhaps largely his fault. But this can be said: that he has fallen down on the job on coping with them even in reasonable degree. From all accounts he has used his post to promote the visionary reforms with which his name is associated instead of adopting realistic measures, and the general result has been starvation and dissension.

Puerto Rico is known as the Gibraltar of the Caribbean. Its possession is of great strategical importance to the defense of the Panama Canal and of our own shores, and its well-being, therefore, should be a prime consideration. But beyond the purely material argument comes the one of self-respect and prestige. How can this country afford to permit any territory under its flag to suffer privations comparable with those of Nazi-held Europe? It can't, of course, and hold its head up.

So we agree entirely with Senator VANDENBERG that Tugwell should go, and as promptly as possible. Granted that any Governor of the island has a tough job ahead of him. This is a tough war, and no man in command, military or civilian, who fails to make progress against the odds facing him should be retained. The time for excuses is over. Tugwell has shown no ability to deal with the Puerto Rican situation, which is still deteriorating. He should give place at once to someone with the vigor and common sense which the problem requires.

Obviously, other remedies will have to be applied. A mere change of governors will not suffice. But even an executive unafraid, who talks in terms of immediate necessities as distinct from social dreams, what more must be done will become apparent.

CURRENT PAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution to provide for the current payment of personal income taxes in monthly installments.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) to provide for the current payment of income tax was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAPPER. I ask that a short statement of my reasons for introducing the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The pay-as-you-go tax plan proposed in the joint resolution I offer in the Senate is the same as introduced by Representative FRANK CARLSON of Kansas in the other House.

If enacted into law, it would put personal income tax payments on a current basis, and would also provide that they may be paid in monthly installments. For the first year of operation, at least, personal income taxes would be payable in nine monthly installments, beginning with March 15, when the return is filed.

I believe nearly everyone who studies the tax problem reaches the conclusion that the greatly increased personal income tax burden should be paid on a current basis; that is, paid from income received in the year the tax is collected.

To accomplish this purpose the bill provides that personal income tax returns shall be filed March 15 this year as usual. The income tax levied would be levied on the basis of 1942 income, but would be the tentative personal income tax on 1943 income. Adjustment of the tentative income tax to 1943 actual taxable income would be made when the next year's income tax return is filed.

Provision is made for an earlier adjustment where it is shown that by reason of service in the military forces, or other circumstances, current year's income will be greatly decreased from the previous year's income.

The joint resolution introduced by Representative CARLSON and myself would write into legal tax language the main features of the so-called Ruml plan proposed to the Senate Finance Committee last year.

Back in the days when personal income taxes were relatively low, it did not matter particularly that payment of a certain year's income taxes was made the following year.

But now, since personal income taxes are running up toward one-fourth of income in the lower brackets, it is highly necessary that personal income taxes be paid currently. The joint resolution provides for such current payments.

Another desirable feature of the measure, as I see it, is that personal income taxes would be paid in monthly installments. For those on wages and salaries now in income paying class, I believe this to be very desirable.

Farmers also would be particularly affected by the current payment feature of the bill. Their income tax payments being made in the current tax years, they would not be called upon in drought or other crop-failure years to pay income taxes upon income received in good crop years. This is highly important.

I expect to push for early enactment of this proposed legislation, so it can go into effect by next March 15.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON WAR PROBLEMS

Mr. MALONEY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on War Problems (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee"), and to be composed of six Members of the Senate to be selected by the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives to be selected by the House of Representatives. Not more than three of the members of the joint committee selected by the Senate, and not more than three of the members of the joint committee selected by the House of Representatives, shall be from the same political party. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a special study and investigation of the problems arising out of the war under existing and future acts of Congress; to confer with the President, and with the various departments and agencies of the Government, from time to time, with respect to such problems; to consult with other committees of both branches of the Congress, and to report to the Congress from time to time, together with such recommendations with respect to legislation as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $_____, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES OF SENATORIAL CANDIDATES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I submit a Senate resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 5) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Resolution No. 235, agreed to April 16, 1942, authorizing a Special Committee to Investigate the Campaign Expenditures of Senatorial Candidates in 1942, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the committee shall submit its final report, which shall not be later than March 6, 1943.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, why has there been delay in making a report on elections which were held last November?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we do not anticipate that there will be a long delay, but we are compiling some figures which we should like to submit. There is usually some delay in submitting a final report of this nature.

Mr. McNARY. There is no question about that, but I do not recall that extra time has ever heretofore been requested

on the part of a similar committee to submit a report. I shall oppose the resolution in its present form unless the committee is able to make its report on the 1st or the 15th of February at the latest. If there is any uncertainty regarding the title to any seat in the Senate, it should be settled at the earliest possible moment. That is the reason I object to a long, drawn-out continuation of the hearings or consideration by the committee. I am sure that the limit of time which I have indicated will give the able Senator and his committee ample time to compile the figures to which he has referred. I believe that February 1 should give them the necessary time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Would the able Senator from Oregon object to the 15th of February?

Mr. McNARY. No; the 15th of February would be satisfactory.

Mr. McFARLAND. I imagine the 1st of February would be satisfactory to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Let us split the difference and make it the 10th of February.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution as modified?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 5), as modified, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Resolution No. 235, agreed to April 16, 1942, authorizing a special committee to investigate the campaign expenditures of senatorial candidates in 1942, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the committee shall submit its final report, which shall not be later than February 10, 1943.

## CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution to continue the special committee of which I am chairman, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from Missouri.

The resolution (S. Res. 6) was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to March 1, 1941, Senate Resolution 146, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to August 11, 1941, and Senate Resolution 288, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 17, 1942 (relating to the investigation of the war program), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement made before the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program by Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson; also a letter from Under Secretary of the Navy James V. Forrestal, and a letter by Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, all dealing with the work of the special committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement and letters are as follows:

Under Secretary ROBERT PATTERSON. Before I give my prepared statement, Senators, I would like to express the appreciation of the War Department for the very constructive assistance that this committee has rendered. I have personally not been before the committee in quite some months, although I have kept in close contact with the work of the committee, but the work done by the committee has been of the utmost aid in the prosecution of the war program. A great many of the measures that the committee has recommended have been put into operation. You know how it is when you first are told that something you have been doing has some defects in it; at first your feeling is one of, well, perhaps, slight irritation, but on consideration your feeling changes and you are appreciative of the criticism, outside criticism of a constructive character, and that is the point of view of the War Department on the efforts made by this committee. We are quite appreciative of the work done by the committee. It has been a very substantial contribution to the work done by the War Department. The suggestions have been helpful. I believe most of them have been adopted. Some of the very best features of our war program have their origin from the investigations made by this committee.

---

JANUARY 6, 1943.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR TRUMAN: I am informed that the Senate will consider the question of the continuation of the Truman committee shortly after its organization.

I think I have expressed my views to you orally a number of times. They are:

The Truman committee has served a useful purpose in providing a medium for the exploration of criticisms of the war effort. Its work has been as objective as I think it possible for such investigations to be, and both committee and counsel have endeavored to conserve the time of witnesses. The tempo at which this war is being waged and the resulting need of speed of accomplishment mean there should be constant review and survey, particularly of the procurement side of the war effort. The Navy has this constantly in mind and is, therefore, conducting a continuous scrutiny of its business operations. In the vast area being covered by its operations, however, and the greatly increased scope of its business it welcomes the kind of additional outside scrutiny which your committee has given.

I think such inquiries now can substantially lessen the number and burden of postwar investigations.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

---

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
*Washington, D. C., January 4, 1943.*

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR TRUMAN: As our Nation enters upon a year in which war production must expand to greater and entirely unprecedented volume, involving, as it inevitably will, problems of great complexity and difficulty, I wish to express the hope that your Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program may continue to serve the same high purpose that it has comprehended so well since its creation. That purpose, as I see it, has been to obtain the best possible results in our march toward total economic mobilization for war.

Both from personal experience with your committee and from regular study of its extensive activities, I should like briefly to express my deep appreciation and approval of its work. My appreciation becomes the deeper when I consider that your task, which is so often thankless, has been pursued by you and your associates with courage and perseverance.

First, your work has been broad in scope and has provided a needed incentive for the fullest coordination of our war effort. Such coordination has been most helpful, because of the fact that all war agencies are inescapably affected by the plans and operations of any one agency. By making available to these agencies, through formal reports, public or private hearings and in other ways, a variety of approaches to war production problems, your committee has brought vigor and freshness of viewpoint to their solution.

Second, the quality of your analysis has been kept at a high level, noticeably avoiding personalities, minor issues, and biased or incomplete collection of evidence.

Third, the clear and unequivocal character of your conclusions has stimulated plans for improvements and has been especially helpful because of the care and thoroughness with which your supporting reasons and data have been marshaled.

Finally, perhaps the most conspicuous single characteristic of your work from the viewpoint of an administrative agency has been the constant emphasis you have placed upon the need for foresight—upon anticipating coming events and upon making adequate plans and taking appropriate action to meet them.

In short, I believe the committee has made a substantial contribution to the war effort and with it to the work of the War Production Board.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON.

## INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION OF LEND-LEASE ACT

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 7), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

*Resolved*, That a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, to consist of not more than five, or less than three members who shall be appointed by the chairman of such committee, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the administration and operation of "An act to promote the defense of the United States," approved March 11, 1941 (commonly referred to as the Lease-Lend Act). The subcommittee shall report its findings and recommendations to the Committee on Appropriations at the earliest possible date.

For the purposes of this resolution, the subcommittee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the subcommittee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, following the submission of the resolution, a brief statement which was given to the press with reference to the resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This resolution will, with the approval of the Senate, provide for a complete and thorough investigation of the administration of the Lend-Lease Act.

It seems to me that this inquiry should be carried forward as promptly as possible so that the Senate can have in hand the necessary information it will need to pass upon any request from the President for extension of the Lend-Lease Act with additional appropriations. Out of such a thorough inquiry as is proposed in the resolution, the Committee on Appropriations could fully advise itself and know that past expenditures have been wisely and appropriately used for the purposes defined by Congress.

I am in sympathy with a lend-lease program, for there is an inherent obligation upon allies to aid each other and our allies have said repeatedly that they need the output of our farms and factories more than our manpower.

I have proposed that the investigating committee be left with no handicaps in its work and no instructions in advance except to obtain the information upon which we can base a sound judgment in considering new appropriations for carrying the war to a victorious ending.

I assume the subcommittee will decide itself which of its hearings shall be in private to prevent the leakage of war information that should be kept secret and what parts of its inquiry can be held in public to the end that the people can be as adequately informed as possible upon the conduct of their war.

### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 8), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 9), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 10), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. HATCH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 11), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

### INVESTIGATION OF PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND MARKETING OF WOOL

Mr. HATCH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 12), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That Senate Resolution 160, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, agreed to July 10, 1935, authorizing a special committee to investigate the production, transportation, and marketing of wool, as extended, is hereby further extended and continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-eighth Congress; and the said committee may report to the Senate at any time prior to the expiration of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

### INVESTIGATION OF THE VARIOUS BRANCHES OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

Mr. TAFT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 13), which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

Whereas the United States Government is now the owner of numerous projects to provide residence quarters for war workers and lower income groups which were constructed by the United States Housing Authority, the Federal Works Administrator, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Farm Security Administration, the Defense Homes Corporation, and other agencies; and

Whereas the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal Home Loan Banks, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Loan Administrator, the Federal Works Administrator, and other agencies have financed or assisted the financing of various other housing activities; and

Whereas on February 24, 1942, the President of the United States, acting under the authority vested in him by title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, provided for the consolidation of functions of Federal agencies relating to housing in a National Housing Agency, and said National Housing Agency has continued to exercise the functions consolidated in it; and

Whereas the effect of said Executive order expires with the expiration of the First War Powers Act, 1941, and great confusion will result from the expiration of said Executive order if permanent legislative provision is not made to deal with the subject of housing; and

Whereas numerous projects have been constructed under emergency legislation to provide housing for war workers, the disposition of which housing after the war has been left for future legislative determination; and

Whereas the figures now obtainable appear to show that there is now a serious shortage of housing, and the construction of housing in the period which follows the war should be an effective means of preventing industrial depression; and there is need for a constructive and over-all plan for the provision of such housing through private and public agencies, and for the permanent coordination of all Government activities related to such housing: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Education and Labor, through a subcommittee to be appointed by the chairman, is hereby authorized—

(1) To study the work of all branches of the National Housing Agency, including the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Federal Public Housing Authority, the Defense Homes Corporation, the Alley Dwelling Authority of the District of Columbia, and all other Federal agencies exercising functions in connection with housing activities, and prepare a report showing the work of such agencies and the present status of all projects undertaken, financed, or managed by them;

(2) To recommend a plan for the disposition of emergency housing at the termination of the war emergency;

(3) To prepare a comprehensive plan for the construction of housing after the war, including that to be provided or financed by private capital or private agencies, and that to be provided or financed by Government funds or Government agencies, and all other housing, with special reference to the possibility of encouraging home ownership and of eliminating slums and other deteriorated areas, and with special reference to the extent of the necessity of the Federal Government's subsidizing housing for lower-income groups.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

### INVESTIGATION OF CLOSING DOWN OF CERTAIN MINES

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

*Resolved*, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investi-

gation with respect to the reasons for and the effect of the closing down of domestic mines producing gold and war-essential, critical, and strategic minerals and metals, and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

### COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AVIATION AND AERONAUTICS—AMENDMENT OF RULE

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 15), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

*Resolved*, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is hereby amended by inserting after the seventeenth line of paragraph 1 the following:

"Committee on Civil Aviation and Aeronautics, to consist of 13 Senators."

### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 16), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

### CONTINUATION OF SURVEY OF CONDITION OF INDIANS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 17), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

*Resolved*, That Senate Resolution 79, agreed to February 2, 1928, and continued by subsequent resolutions, authorizing the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, to make a general survey of the condition of the Indians in the United States, hereby is continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses.

### COMPENSATION FOR LANDS SOLD TO THE UNITED STATES BY THE CHEROKEE INDIANS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 18), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

*Resolved*, That the report of the Comptroller General on "Compensation for Lands Sold to the United States by the Cherokee Indians," printed as Senate Document 288, November 25, 1942, be referred to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate for examination and report.

The Judiciary Committee is hereby authorized to report to the Senate whether any readjustment of the accounts is necessary in order to fulfill the pledges made in compensation of the lands sold to the United States by the Cherokee treaty, and whether or not a fair and just settlement has been made in accordance with the treaty through which the sale was made. The committee is authorized to obtain further evidence, if found advisable, and report any facts and precedents pertinent thereto to the Senate for its full information. If the committee find necessary, as a matter of justice, it shall submit a suitable resolution for the readjustment of the accounts and the ultimate liquidation of any balances found due.

### PRINTING OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 19), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved*, That the manuscript of the laws, agreements, Executive orders, proclamations, etc., relating to the Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, passed and proclaimed from 1890 to 1938, inclusive, to be known as Laws Relating to the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, 1890 to 1938, prepared under Senate Resolution 60, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, be printed as a Senate document, and that there be printed 30 additional copies for the use of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs and 30 additional copies for the use of the House Committee on Indian Affairs.

### PRODUCTION OF GOLD AND SILVER—CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20), which was referred to the Senate Special Silver Committee:

*Resolved*, That Senate Resolution 187, agreed to August 16, 1935, as amended by motion on January 17, 1939, increasing the membership of the committee to nine Senators instead of five, and as further amended by Senate Resolution 261, agreed to June 29, 1942, authorizing a special committee of nine Senators to confer with the Secretary of the Treasury relative to the administration, and the economic and commercial effect in the United States and abroad, of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1178), and to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the production, or the lack of production, of gold and silver in the United States and its Territories, etc., hereby is continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses.

### COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AVIATION

Mr. WILEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

*Resolved*, That paragraph 1 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting, between the paragraph relating to the Committee on Military Affairs and the paragraph relating to the Committee on Mines and Mining, the following new paragraph:

"Committee on Military Aviation, to consist of 17 Senators."

### FOREIGN RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR FORMULATION OF TREATIES

Mr. WILEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*Resolved*, That the Chief Executive be invited to join with the Senate in the creation of a Foreign Relations Advisory Council to be constituted of the following: The Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, other technicians, whom the Secretary of State might designate, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the chairman and the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and such other Senators as the President might from time to time designate.

### INVESTIGATION OF COMMODITY PRICES IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. NYE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of commodity prices prevailing in the District of Columbia, with a particular view toward determining how prices paid by consumers for agricultural commodities, or for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from agricultural commodities, compare with the prices received by farmers for such agricultural commodities. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $3,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

### INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS CONCERNING THE SUFFICIENCY OF FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. NYE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 24), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

*Resolved*, That the Committee of Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make an investigation of the ability of American agriculture to afford such production as is being required and will be required to meet American civilian and military needs and the commitments of food aid to our allies, with particular reference to the availability of manpower on the farms, the availability of farm machinery and repairs, the relationship of present farm legislation to the production challenge, and the degree to which prevailing farm prices are helping or hindering farm production.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth and

Seventy-ninth Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

### INVESTIGATION OF POLLS OF PUBLIC OPINION

Mr. NYE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 25), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of polls purporting to measure or indicate the state of public opinion upon matters of national importance, the results of which are published in newspapers, magazines, periodicals, or other publications. Such study and investigation shall include, but shall not be limited to, determination of the procedure and methods used in conducting such polls and tabulating the results thereof. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

### INVESTIGATION OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 26), which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

*Resolved,* That a subcommittee of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to be composed of five members of such committee appointed by the chairman thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to economic and social conditions in Puerto Rico resulting from the interruption of the normal flow of trade between Puerto Rico and the United States which has been brought about by the war. The subcommittee shall report to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, at the earliest practicable date.

For the purposes of this resolution the subcommittee, or any member thereof duly authorized by the chairman of the subcommittee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned period of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ and to call upon the executive departments for such experts and such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it or he deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the subcommittee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the subcommittee.

### AMENDMENT OF THE RULES—RIVER AND HARBOR PROJECTS

Mr. VANDENBERG submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 27), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

*Resolved,* That the standing rules of the Senate be, and they are hereby, amended by adding after rule XX a new rule, relating to river and harbor projects, as follows:

"Rule XXI. When a rivers and harbors authorization bill is pending, a point of order may be made against the authorization of any project in any form not formally recommended to the Congress in an official report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors."

### CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF GASOLINE AND FUEL SHORTAGES

Mr. MALONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 28), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

*Resolved,* That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 156, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to August 28, 1941, Senate Resolution 189, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 9, 1941, and Senate Resolution 264, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942, providing for an investigation with respect to shortages of gasoline, fuel oil, and other petroleum products and solid fuels, is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

### COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. DAVIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 29), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Whereas present conditions effectively demonstrate the need for closer supervision by the Congress over fiscal practices of the Government; and

Whereas the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which was established on April 18, 1921, is a standing committee of the Senate; and

Whereas such committee, as its name implies, was created for the purpose of examining the accounts and expenditures of the several departments of the Government; and

Whereas the membership of such committee is not sufficiently large to enable it properly to exercise such functions: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments shall hereafter be composed of 21 Senators.

### INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. DAVIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 30), which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Whereas present conditions effectively demonstrate the need for closer supervision by the Congress over fiscal practices of the Government; and

Whereas the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which was established on April 18, 1921, is a standing committee of the Senate; and

Whereas such committee, as its name implies, was created for the purpose of examining the accounts and expenditures of the several departments of the Government: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is authorized and directed to conduct a continuing investigation of the accounts and expenditures of the several departments, independent establishments, offices, and agencies of the Government, including the necessity for, economy, and correctness of such expenditures; their conformity with appropriation laws; the proper application of public funds; the security of the Government against unjust and extravagant demands; the economy and accountability of public officers; and the elimination of unnecessary activities and expenses, and, from time to time, to report to the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations the results of its studies and investigations.

For the purpose of carrying out its functions, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $——, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

### ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT ON AMERICA'S PART IN WORLD RECONSTRUCTION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "America's Part in World Reconstruction," delivered by the Vice President on the occasion of the eighty-sixth anniversary of the birthday of Woodrow Wilson, December 28, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

### ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARBOUR ON LABOR'S SHARE IN WINNING THE WAR

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Labor's Share in Winning of the War," delivered by him at the convention of the American Federation of Labor organization in New Jersey, which appears in the Appendix.]

### WE NEED A COURAGEOUS AND INDEPENDENT CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "We Need a Courageous and Independent Congress," delivered by him at Aberdeen, S. Dak., on October 12, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

### ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY ON THE FIFTH FREEDOM

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Fifth Freedom," delivered by him before a Republican group at the Hotel Pfister, Milwaukee, Wis., December 17, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOUNDERS OF PROTECTED HOME CIRCLE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address on the founders of Protected Home Circle, delivered by him at the third annual graduation of junior members of Sharon Circle No. 1 to the Senior Circle on December 14, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY FORMER PRESIDENT HERBERT HOOVER ON AMERICA FEEDING THE WORLD

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by former President Herbert Hoover, entitled "We'll Have to Feed the World Again," which appears in the Appendix.]

RESOLUTIONS OF AND ADDRESSES DELIVERED AT MEETING OF MISSISSIPPI VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL ASSOCIATION

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, held at New Orleans, La., December 19, 1942, and also addresses delivered at the same meeting by Senator TRUMAN and Brig. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president, Mississippi River Commission, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE PAY-AS-YOU-GO INCOME-TAX PLAN—ADDRESS BY BEARDSLEY RUML

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Pay-as-You-Go Income-Tax Plan," delivered by Beardsley Ruml, chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, before the Advertising Club of New York on January 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SAMOAN AND OTHER ISLANDS OF THE PACIFIC

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an extract from Foreign Relations of the United States, 1919, the Paris Peace Conference, volume II, page 512, et seq., relating to formerly German-owned islands in the Pacific Ocean, as well as an editorial entitled "Islands Lost in 1919," published in the Washington Evening Star of December 29, 1942, which appear in the Appendix.]

WORLD TRADE, ETC.—FINAL DECLARATION OF THE TWENTY-NINTH NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE CONVENTION

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the final declaration of the Twenty-ninth National Foreign Trade Convention, held at Boston, Mass., on October 7, 8, and 9, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

EIGHTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF WOODROW WILSON—ARTICLE BY HON. JOSEPHUS DANIELS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on Woodrow Wilson, written by Hon. Josephus Daniels on the occasion of the eighty-sixth anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, which appears in the Appendix.]

MILEAGE RATIONING—REPORT BY AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report on mileage rationing by the American Automobile Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDUCTION OF GEORGE W. MAXEY AS CHIEF JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, in view of the vital and important position which an independent judiciary occupies in the American system of government, both as concerns the Federal Government and the governments of the several States, I believe it is well to call to mind the validity of the principles which established that independent judiciary and also some of the very high functions which the judiciary performs in the protection of our fundamental rights and in the perpetuation of freedom and justice.

It is one of the innate features of our Government that the judiciary shall be a dignified and deliberative body, far removed from public clamor, whose efforts shall be devoted to the scrutiny and interpretation of the laws and to the protection of the people who live under them. For more than 150 years the judiciary has continued to function in that high calling, and for more than 150 years, despite all periods of menacing crisis and erring clamor, the courts have sustained the majesty of the law and have cast down all those doctrines which would establish the supremacy of any one man or group of men. We need only look abroad into those miserable lands beyond the seas which have succumbed to the will of a supreme dictator to appreciate the noble thing which the courts have done for us and for all mankind.

Last Monday, January 4, I attended the Pennsylvania Supreme Court induction ceremonies, when Hon. George W. Maxey was installed as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania—the oldest State supreme court in the Union, in point of years of continuous service. Chief Justice Maxey is typical of the many outstanding jurists who have served so tirelessly and fearlessly in the preservation of freedom and the protection of the fundamental right. His career of public service in the law dates back to 1913. Through the years he has become recognized as an ardent and able jurist, both by his colleagues and by the people of Pennsylvania. His philosophy is one of sound and continued progress, based upon the fundamental rights of man.

It is not my purpose here to review the career of Chief Justice Maxey; that was done in a most admirable manner by John C. Arnold, Esq., president of the Pennsylvania Bar Association, in his address of salutation. Mr. Arnold, in referring to the career of Chief Justice Maxey, said in part:

> In the positions of trust and confidence which you have held, much has been required—and the requisition has always been fulfilled.

As an indication of the deep sense of responsibility and purpose which Chief Justice Maxey holds for his high calling, I can do no better than to quote briefly from his inaugural address, in which he said:

> A State or a nation should be ruled by reason, and not by tumult. The passion and prejudice of the passing hour should never be the supreme law of the land, for when they are, no man's life, liberty, or property is safe.

Mr. President, because I feel that the responsible and necessary position of an independent judiciary in our Government cannot be overemphasized, and because I feel that the remarks of Mr. Arnold and Chief Justice Maxey will serve to give the American people a valuable insight into this position of the judiciary, as well as an insight into the deep sense of dignity, learning, and responsibility with which the members of that body approach their high calling, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the addresses delivered by these distinguished gentlemen at the Pennsylvania Supreme Court induction ceremonies held in Philadelphia on January 4, 1943.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN C. ARNOLD, ESQ.

For me, there could be no more congenial privilege than to convey on behalf of the members of the bar of this court their respects and their greetings to Mr. Chief Justice Maxey and to Mr. Associate Justice Allen M. Stearne on this notable occasion.

Mr. Chief Justice, to me, practicing law far away from Lackawanna County, George W. Maxey was first merely a name of a young man of force and ability who was elected district attorney of Lackawanna County in 1913 and reelected to a second term in 1917, his second term being contemporaneous with my first term as district attorney of my county. During my term of office you, sir, presented to the Superior Court of Pennsylvania the brief for the Commonwealth in the case of *Commonwealth* v. *Rogo*,[1] involving the law of evidence, and we, having a similar question, procured the paper books from your office. We said then, and repeat now, that the district attorney's brief in that case was the best presentation of an evidential question which we have ever seen. It seemed to me that that district attorney was giving clear evidence of distinction. Therefore we followed the subsequent years. In the middle of your second term you were elected judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Lackawanna County, and in 1929 both political parties of your county gave you their nomination for reelection. In 1930 your name was presented as a candidate for judge of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. In the ensuing primary you carried every county of this State save one. At the general election your majority was over 850,000. I have mentioned the figures because they demonstrate the increasing public favor of each candidacy of yours.

In your first year on this bench you filed a notable document: Your dissenting opinion in the so-called Yellow-dog contract case of *Kraemer Hosiery Co.* v. *American Federation of Full-Fashioned Hosiery Workers*.[2] It seemed to us to be unanswerable and to reflect your views not only as a sound lawyer, but as one who understood the problems of the present, and the difficulties of those less able to protect themselves. You are the sole remaining member of this Court who participated in that decision. The views of that dissent were forcibly and clearly expressed, and by statute, State and Federal, are now the law of the land.

As foreshadowed by your brief in *Commonwealth* v. *Rogo* you wrote the opinion for this Court in the case of *Watkins* v. *Prudential Insurance Co.*[3] clarifying and restating the law concerning presumptions of fact. This valuable monograph on evidence received much just recognition from judges, from lawyers, and from leading law schools.

We have made mention of only two of more than 500 opinions which you have written

[1] 71 Pa. Superior Court 109 (1918).
[2] 305 Pa. 206 (1931).
[3] 315 Pa. 497 (1934).

for this Court because they illustrate the kind of man and judge who wrote them.

The bar also recognizes the contributions which you have made other than your work on this Court. You were selected by the Philadelphia bar to deliver the commemoration address on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption by the Constitutional Convention of the Constitution of the United States. Under the title "The Problem of 1787 and How It Was Met," it was widely published and widely acclaimed. We think your most notable address, and the one most commended, was delivered at the Union League Club in Chicago in 1938: "The Descent to a Dictatorship," in which you summed up four basic principles upon which the Federal Constitution rested: "(1) The Federal Government shall keep to its sphere and the States to their proper spheres of government. (2) No official shall be entrusted with autocratic power. (3) Unrestrained power shall never be lodged anywhere, not in the President, not in the Congress, not even in a majority of the American people. (4) There shall be maintained an absolutely independent judiciary." You declared: "As long as these basic principles of the Constitution are unviolated, there can be no dictatorship. A certain sign of a dictator complex in any public official is his scorn of these principles."

The bar recognizes that your qualities and accomplishments inevitably led to repeated suggestions that you be a candidate for certain high offices in other branches of the Government, with offers of powerful support. The bar was gratified by your expressed preference to continue in your judicial work which began exactly 23 years ago this morning.

Your elevation to this court met the full approbation of the bar. It is a great thing, Mr. Chief Justice, to merit the approbation of one's fellows, and I suppose no more critical body exists than the bar. It is a great thing to live and to act so that your approving friends need only say, "He has done as I expected." It is a great thing, sir, to discharge large responsibilities with credit to yourself, to your court, and to the public. These things have you done, and these things were not always easily done. On one occasion, the great Teacher said: "Unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required." In the positions of trust and confidence which you have held, much has been required, and the requisition has always been fulfilled. The lawyers have noted your insistence on fair play, your strong sense of justice, your consideration of others, and your courtesy to the bar.

You are commissioned this morning for a 9-year term as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. Not since Chief Justice John Bannister Gibson ended his great career on this bench in the early 1850's has there been so long a term. His term as Chief Justice was not made remarkable because of the length in years. It is the character of service alone which with him, or with you, secures worthy remembrance.

I feel quite inadequate to convey to you and to this court the sentiments of a strong bar, which, as this court best knows, possesses large talents and true fidelity. Only permit me to say that no bar of any court has loftier aims or better minds, and that no bar of any court is truer or more loyal to the bench.

How excellent it is when the bar knows, as we in Pennsylvania know, that this bench possesses not merely great power but great integrity. It is the character of the justices that procures the respect of the bar, and not the position which the incumbents have. We lawyers in Pennsylvania honor this court because this court has honor.

With a sense of happiness, the bar of Pennsylvania welcomes you, Mr. Justice Allen M. Stearne, to membership in this tribunal. You, Justice Stearne, bring to this court a wide experience of 22 years of active practice in the bar, followed by 15 years of judicial service in the orphans' court of Philadelphia. You are, of course, the youngest justice in point of commission and you are also the youngest justice in point of age. You come to this bench with a firmly established reputation as a most able jurist, and, almost as important, with a firmly established reputation for a never-failing kindness and patience toward the lawyers who practiced before you. It would not become me to measure your responsibilities or your opportunity, but your whole life and career guarantee that you will fully measure up to both. We, therefore, know that you will continue in the opportunities of the future as you have wrought in the responsibilities of the past.

To Chief Justice Maxey, to Associate Justice Allen M. Stearne, and to each member of this court we bring the assurance of the continued confidence, good will, and respect of your bar.

---

ADDRESS OF GEORGE W. MAXEY, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

President Arnold, and members of the bar, we appreciate these generous greetings so graciously expressed by the president of the Pennsylvania Bar Association, an outstanding and distinguished lawyer and a highly respected and esteemed member of the bar of this court. There is no more satisfying reward of public service and no more potent stimulus to earnest endeavor than public confidence and goodwill.

One by one the judges leave this bench and others take their places, but there is no pause—the court goes on. This court is now in the third decade of the third century of its existence. It is invested with "judicial power" by the State's organic law. What this judicial power is has been exemplified in Anglo-Saxon and American jurisprudence for hundreds of years. Its chief function has been the protection of the individual, not only against the lawless depredations of other individuals but also against the oppression and spoliations of the government itself. In no nation has liberty ever survived the destruction of an honest, independent, and fearless judiciary. This court interprets and applies the principles and commandments of the State constitution, and in some cases those of the Federal Constitution. We had occasion recently to emphasize the fact that under our American system the State and not the Federal Government is the traditional protector of the lives, the liberty, and the property of its own people.[1]

Nearly a century ago Daniel Webster said: "Wherever the temple of justice stands and so long as it is duly honored, there is a foundation for social security, general happiness, and the improvement and progress of our race."

It must be avowed of the State supreme tribunal as it has been avowed of the Nation's supreme tribunal that "it possesses neither sword nor purse; its strength is found in the reverence of the people for the sanctity of the law."

The maintenance of this sanctity depends upon the people, themselves, upon the courts, and upon the bar. To have a government of law, instead of tyranny or anarchy, that is, a government ruled neither by a man nor by a mob, there must be in human hearts an innate respect for law and order, and in the public mind an instinctive recognition of the postulate that the first duty of government is to govern. Undisciplined liberty means social disintegration. Dictatorships are products of democracies that fail. The courts as arbiters of conflicting interests must consist of judges whose quest is always for the path of right, and when they conscientiously believe they have found that path they should travel it without fear or flinching. Their constant prayer should be that God give them as He gave Solomon: "Wisdom and understanding and largeness of heart, even as the sand that is on the seashore."[2] They should not count voices of approval; they should weigh them, and they should give the greatest weight to the voice of intelligence and conscience. A state or nation should be ruled by reason and not by tumult. The passion and prejudice of the passing hour should never be the supreme law of the land, for when they are, no man's life, liberty, or property is secure. The organic law embodies a people's sober judgment and it demands sober judgment. When the social stream is lashed into fury it will burst its barriers and spread devastation far and wide unless the constitution is strong, and no constitution is stronger than the highest court which stands behind it. It is a judge's duty not only to interpret the respective constitutions of state and nation but also to "support, obey, and defend" them. The illustrious Chief Justice, John Bannister Gibson, who presided over this court 100 years ago, and whose marble image looks down upon us in this chamber, judicially declared in 1844 that: "A constitution is not to receive a technical construction, like a common law instrument or a statute. It is to be interpreted so as to carry out the great principles of the government, not to defeat them."[3] Just judgments depend primarily on the passionate zeal of judges to do justice—a zeal directed by intelligence, clothed with energy and manifesting itself in the craftsmanship of painstaking care.

The functions of the bar are no less important than those of the court. It is the constitutional right of every accused "to be heard by himself and his counsel." In civil cases also this right is an integral part of that "due process of law" which every American when in need of it can freely invoke. Advocates of fidelity and ability are essential to the administration of justice. Each of us may well vow as did one of England's greatest lawyers and judges, Lord Chancelor Erskine: "I will at all hazards forever maintain the dignity, the independence and the integrity of the bar, without which justice can have no existence." It is the duty of lawyers to present the cause of their clients with candor, courage, and clarity and it is the duty of the judges to listen to that presentation with attentiveness and patience, with decorum and with civility. Those who appear before courts of justice are suitors, not suppliants.

It is an ancient Latin proverb that amid the clash of arms the law is silent. This is true where courts are closed by the vicissitudes of war or by dictatorial decrees. In one half of the world today courts of justice are closed, but the war which 5,000,000 embattled Americans, with their allies of the United Nations, are now waging on all continents and on all seas and on the islands of the sea, is a war which will not end until in the arbitrament of arms it is conclusively determined that lawless force must bow in submission and surrender to the force of law.

With every judge and every lawyer taking delight not in distinction but in duty well performed, proud not of his power but of his service, gratified not by what he gets but by what he gives, we will all help to actualize that lofty ideal of the law as something so majestic that there are "none so high as to be beyond its power and none so humble as to be beneath its care; its seat is the bosom of God and its voice is the harmony of the world."

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

---

[1] 344 Pa. 41, 58; 24 A. (2d) 1, 9.

[2] 1 Kings 4: 29.

[3] 7 W. & S. 133.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 11, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, holy, holy, holy is Thy name and righteousness is the habitation of Thy throne. We pray that brotherhood may take to itself an enlarging clasp and gather up all wandering tones into unjarring harmonies, enlarging our charity and keeping us free from all prejudice. Inspire us to carry with us the wisest thoughts and aspirations and whisper Thy presence to us each passing day. God be merciful unto us and bless us, and cause His face to shine upon us; that Thy way may be known upon each, Thy saving health among all nations. Let people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise Thee. Oh, let the nations be glad and sing for joy; for Thou shalt judge the people righteously and govern the nations upon earth. Let the people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise; then shall the earth yield her increase and God, even our own God, shall bless us; God shall bless us, and all the ends of the earth shall fear Him. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker may declare a recess at any time during the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair now declares a recess of the House, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, to meet at the call of the Speaker.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) resumed its session.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session on Thursday, January 7, 1943, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make.

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

At 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. J. J. Sinnott, announced the Vice President of the United States and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Members of the House rose.

The Senate, preceded by the Vice President and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Chamber.

The Vice President took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On behalf of the House the Chair appoints the following committee to conduct the President into the Chamber: The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints on behalf of the Senate the following Members to escort the President into the Chamber: The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

At 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. J. J. Sinnott, announced the members of the diplomatic corps.

The members of the diplomatic corps entered the Chamber and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. J. J. Sinnott, announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Chamber and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m., the President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House and stood at the Clerk's desk, amid prolonged applause.

The SPEAKER. Senators and Representatives of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I have the great pleasure, the high privilege, and distinguished honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 1)

Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, the Seventy-eighth Congress assembles in one of the great moments in the history of this Nation. The past year was perhaps the most crucial for modern civilization; the coming year will be filled with violent conflict—yet with high promise of better things.

We must appraise the events of 1942 according to their relative importance; we must exercise a sense of proportion.

First in importance in the American scene has been the inspiring proof of the great qualities of our fighting men. They have demonstrated these qualities in adversity as well as in victory. As long as our flag flies over this Capitol, Americans will honor the soldiers, sailors, and marines who fought our first battles of this war against overwhelming odds—the heroes, living and dead, of Wake and Bataan and Guadalcanal, of the Java Sea and Midway and the North Atlantic convoys. Their unconquerable spirit will live forever.

By far the largest and most important developments in the whole strategic picture of 1942 were the events on the long fronts in Russia: First, the implacable defense of Stalingrad; and, second, the offensives by the Russian armies at various points which started in the latter part of November and which still roll on with great force and effectiveness.

The other major events of the year were: The series of Japanese advances in the Philippines, the East Indies, Malaya and Burma; the stopping of the Japanese in the mid-Pacific, the South Pacific, and the Indian Oceans; the successful defense of the Near East by the British counterattack through Egypt and Libya; the American-British occupation of North Africa. Of continuing importance in the year 1942 were the unending, bitterly-contested battles of the convoy routes, and the gradual passing of air superiority from the Axis to the United Nations.

The Axis Powers knew that they must win the war in 1942—or eventually lose everything. I do not need to tell you that our enemies did not win this war in 1942.

In the Pacific area, our most important victory in 1942 was the air and naval battle off Midway Island. That action is historically important because it secured for our use communication lines stretching thousands of miles in every direction. In placing this emphasis on the battle of Midway, I am not unmindful of other successful actions in the Pacific, in the air and on land and afloat—especially those on the Coral Sea and New Guinea and in the Solomon Islands. But these actions were essentially defensive. They were part of the delaying strategy that characterized this phase of the war.

During this period we inflicted steady losses upon the enemy—great losses of Japanese planes, naval vessels, transports, and cargo ships. As early as 1 year ago, we set as a primary task in the war of the Pacific day-by-day and week-by-week destruction of more Japanese war matériel than Japanese industry could replace. Most certainly, that task has been and is being performed by our fighting ships and planes. A large part of this task has been accomplished by the gallant crews of our American submarines who strike on the other side of the Pacific at Japanese ships—right at the very mouth of the harbor of Yokohama.

We know that as each day goes by, Japanese strength in ships and planes is going down and down, and American strength in ships and planes is going up and up. The eventual outcome can be put on a mathematical basis. That will become evident to the Japanese people themselves when we strike at their own home islands, and bomb them constantly from the air.

In the attacks against Japan, we shall be joined with the heroic people of China, whose ideals of peace are so closely akin to our own. Even today we are flying as much lend-lease material into China

as ever traversed the Burma Road, flying it over mountains 17,000 feet high, flying blind through sleet and snow. We shall overcome all the formidable obstacles, and get the battle equipment into China to shatter the power of our common enemy. From this war China will realize the security, the prosperity, and the dignity which Japan has sought so ruthlessly to destroy.

The period of our defensive attrition in the Pacific is passing. Now our aim is to force the Japanese to fight. Last year, we stopped them. This year, we intend to advance.

In the European theater of war during this past year it was clear that our first task was to lessen the concentrated pressure on the Russian front by compelling Germany to divert part of her manpower and equipment to another theater of war.

After months of secret planning and preparation in the utmost detail, an enormous amphibious expedition was embarked for French North Africa from the United States and the United Kingdom in hundreds of ships. It reached its objectives with very small losses, and has already produced an important effect upon the whole situation of the war. It has opened to attack what Mr. Churchill well described as "the under-belly of the Axis," and it has removed the always dangerous threat of an Axis attack through West Africa against the South Atlantic Ocean and the continent of South America itself.

The well-timed and splendidly executed offensive from Egypt by the British Eighth Army was a part of the same major strategy of the United Nations.

Great rains and appalling mud and very limited communications have delayed the final battles of Tunisia. The Axis is reinforcing its strong positions. But I am confident that though the fighting will be tough, when the final Allied assault is made, the last vestige of Axis power will be driven from the south shores of the Mediterranean.

Any review of the year 1942 must emphasize the magnitude and diversity of the military activities in which this Nation has become engaged. As I speak to you, approximately one and a half million of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and fliers are in service outside our continental limits, all through the world. Our merchant seamen are carrying supplies to them and to our allies over every sea lane.

Few Americans realize the amazing growth of our air strength, though I am sure our enemy does. Day in and day out our forces are bombing the enemy and meeting him in combat on many different fronts over the world. And for those who question the quality of our aircraft and ability of our fliers, I point to the fact that in Africa we are shooting down two enemy planes to every one we lose, and in the Pacific and in the southwest Pacific we are shooting them down 4 to 1.

We pay the tribute of the United States of America to the fighting men of Russia and China and Britain and the various members of the British Commonwealth—the millions of men who through the years of this war have fought our common enemies and have denied to them the world conquest which they sought.

We pay tribute to the soldiers and fliers and seamen of others of the United Nations whose countries have been overrun by Axis hordes.

As a result of the Allied occupation of North Africa, powerful units of the French Army and Navy are going into action with the United Nations forces. We welcome them as allies and as friends. They join with those Frenchmen who since the dark days of June 1940 have been fighting valiantly for the liberation of their stricken country.

We pay tribute to the fighting leaders of our allies, to Winston Churchill, to Joseph Stalin, and to the Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. There is a very real unanimity between the leaders of the United Nations. This unity is effective in planning and carrying out the major strategy of this war and in building up and maintaining the lines of supplies.

I cannot prophesy. I cannot tell you when or where the United Nations are going to strike next in Europe. But we are going to strike—and strike hard. I cannot tell you whether we are going to hit them in Norway, or through the Low Countries, or in France, or through Sardinia or Sicily, or through the Balkans, or through Poland—or at several points simultaneously. But I can tell you that no matter where and when we strike by land, we and the British and the Russians will hit them from the air heavily and relentlessly. Day in and day out we shall heap tons upon tons of explosives on their war factories and utilities and seaports.

Hitler and Mussolini will understand the enormity of their miscalculations—that the Nazis would always have the advantage of superior air power as they did when they bombed Warsaw, Rotterdam, London, and Coventry. That superiority has gone—forever.

Yes—the Nazis and the Fascists have asked for it—and they are going to get it.

Our forward progress in this war has depended upon our progress on the production front.

There has been criticism of the management and conduct of our war production. Much of this self-criticism has had a healthy effect. It has spurred us on. It has reflected a normal American impatience to get on with the job. We are the kind of people who are never quite satisfied with anything short of miracles.

But there has been some criticism based on guesswork and even on malicious falsification of fact. Such criticism creates doubts and fears, and weakens our total effort.

I do not wish to suggest that we should be completely satisfied with our production progress—today, or next month, or ever. But I can report to you with genuine pride on what has been accomplished during 1942.

A year ago we set certain production goals for 1942 and 1943. Some people, including some experts, thought that we had pulled some big figures out of a hat just to frighten the Axis. But we had confidence in the ability of our people to establish new records. That confidence has been justified.

Of course, we realized that some production objectives would have to be changed—some adjusted upward and others downward; some items would be taken out of the program completely, and others added. This was inevitable as we gained battle experience and as technological improvements were made.

Our 1942 airplane production and tank production fell short, numerically, of the goals set a year ago. Nevertheless, we have plenty of reason to be proud of our record for 1942. We produced about 48,000 military planes—more than the airplane production of Germany, Italy, and Japan put together. Last month, December, we produced 5,500 military planes, and the rate is rapidly rising. Furthermore, as each month passes by, the averages of our types weigh more, take more man-hours to make, and have more striking power.

In tank production, we revised our schedule—and for good and sufficient reasons. As a result of hard experience in battle, we have diverted a portion of our tank-producing capacity to a stepped-up production of new, deadly field weapons, especially self-propelled artillery.

Here are some other production figures:

In 1942 we produced 56,000 combat vehicles, such as tanks and self-propelled artillery.

In 1942, we produced 670,000 machine guns, 6 times greater than our production in 1941 and 3 times greater than our total production during the year and a half of our participation in the First World War.

We produced 21,000 antitank guns, 6 times greater than our 1941 production.

We produced ten and a quarter billion rounds of small arms ammunition, five times greater than our 1941 production and three times greater than our total production in the First World War.

We produced 181,000,000 rounds of artillery ammunition, 12 times greater than our 1941 production, and 10 times greater than our total production in the First World War.

The arsenal of democracy is making good.

These facts and figures will give no aid and comfort to the enemy. On the contrary, I can imagine they will give him considerable discomfort. I suspect Hitler and Tojo will find it difficult to explain to the German and Japanese people just why it is that "decadent, inefficient democracy" can produce such phenomenal quantities of weapons and munitions—and fighting men.

We have given the lie to certain misconceptions—especially the one which holds that the various blocs or groups within a free country cannot forego their political and economic differences in time of crisis and work together toward a common goal.

While we have been achieving this miracle of production, during the past year our armed forces have grown from a little over 2,000,000 to 7,000,000. In other words, we have withdrawn from the labor force and the farms some 5,000,000 of our younger workers. And in spite of this, our farmers have con-

tributed their share to the common effort by producing the greatest quantity of food ever made available during a single year in all our history.

Is there any person among us so simple as to believe that all this could have been done without creating some dislocations in our normal national life, some inconveniences, and even some hardships?

Who could have hoped to have done this without burdensome Government regulations which are a nuisance to everyone—including those who have the thankless task of administering them?

We all know that there have been mistakes—mistakes due to the inevitable process of trial and error inherent in doing big things for the first time. We all know that there have been too many complicated forms and questionnaires. I know about that. I have had to fill some of them out myself.

But we are determined to see to it that our supplies of food and other essential civilian goods are distributed on a fair and just basis—to rich and poor, management and labor, farmer and city dweller alike. And we are determined to keep the cost of living at a stable level. All this has required much information. The forms and questionnaires represent an honest and sincere attempt by honest and sincere officials to obtain this information.

We have learned by the mistakes that have been made.

Our experience will enable us during the coming year to improve the necessary mechanisms of wartime economic controls and to simplify administrative procedures. But we do not intend to leave things so lax that loopholes will be left for cheaters, for chiselers, or for the manipulators of the black market.

Of course, there have been inconveniences and disturbances—and even hardships. And there will be many, many more before we finally win. Yes; 1943 will not be an easy year for us on the home front. We shall feel in many ways in our daily lives the sharp pinch of total war.

Fortunately, there are only a few Americans who place appetite above patriotism. The overwhelming majority realize that the food we send abroad is for essential military purposes, for our own and Allied fighting forces, and for necessary help in areas that we occupy.

We Americans intend to do this great job together. In our common labors we must build and fortify the very foundation of national unity—confidence in one another.

It is often amusing, and it is sometimes politically profitable, to picture the city of Washington as a madhouse, with the Congress and the administration disrupted with confusion and indecision and general incompetence.

However, what matters most in war is results. And the one pertinent fact is that after only a few years of preparation and only 1 year of warfare, we are able to engage, spiritually as well as physically, in the total waging of total war.

Washington may be a madhouse—but only in the sense that it is the Capital City of a nation which is fighting mad. And I think that Berlin and Rome and Tokyo, which had such contempt for the obsolete methods of democracy, would now gladly use all they could get of that same brand of madness.

We must not forget that our achievements in production have been relatively no greater than those of the Russians and British and Chinese who have developed their war industries under the incredible difficulties of battle conditions. They have had to continue work through bombings and black-outs. They have never quit.

We Americans are in good, brave company in this war, and we are playing our own, honorable part in the vast common effort.

As spokesmen for the United States Government, you and I take off our hats to those responsible for our American production—to the owners, managers, and supervisors, to the draftsmen and engineers, to the workers—men and women—in factories and arsenals and shipyards and mines and mills and forests and railroads and highways.

We take off our hats to the farmers who have faced an unprecedented task of feeding not only a great Nation but a great part of the world.

We take off our hats to all the loyal, anonymous, untiring men and women who have worked in private employment and in Government and who have endured rationing and other stringencies with good humor and good will.

We take off our hats to all Americans who have contributed magnificently to our common cause.

I have sought to emphasize a sense of proportion in this review of the events of the war and the needs of the war.

We should never forget the things we are fighting for. But, at this critical period of the war, we should confine ourselves to the larger objectives and not get bogged down in argument over methods and details.

We, and all the United Nations, want a decent peace and a durable peace. In the years between the end of the first World War and the beginning of the second World War, we were not living under a decent or a durable peace.

I have reason to know that our boys at the front are concerned with two broad aims beyond the winning of the war; and their thinking and their opinion coincide with what most Americans here back home are mulling over. They know, and we know, that it would be inconceivable—it would, indeed, be sacrilegious—if this Nation and the world did not attain some real, lasting good out of all these efforts and sufferings and bloodshed and death.

The men in our armed forces want a lasting peace, and, equally, they want permanent employment for themselves, their families and their neighbors when they are mustered out at the end of the war.

Two years ago I spoke in my annual message of four freedoms. The blessings of two of them, freedom of speech and freedom of religion, are an essential part of the very life of this Nation; and we hope that these blessings will be granted to all men everywhere.

The people at home, and the people at the front—men and women—are wondering about the third freedom—freedom from want. To them it means that when they are mustered out, when war production is converted to the economy of peace, they will have the right to expect full employment—for themselves and for all able-bodied men and women in America who want to work.

They expect the opportunity to work, to run their farms, their stores, to earn decent wages. They are eager to face the risks inherent in our system of free enterprise.

They do not want a post-war America which suffers from undernourishment or slums—or the dole. They want no get-rich-quick era of bogus "prosperity," which will end for them in selling apples on a street corner, as happened after the bursting of the boom in 1929.

When you talk with our young men and women you will find they want to work for themselves and their families; they consider they have the right to work; and they know that after the last war their fathers did not gain that right.

When you talk with our young men and women you will find that with the opportunity for employment they want assurance against the evils of all major economic hazards—assurance that will extend from the cradle to the grave. This great Government can and must provide this assurance.

I have been told that this is no time to speak of a better America after the war. I am told it is a grave error on my part.

I dissent.

If the security of the individual citizen, or the family, should become a subject of national debate, the country knows where I stand.

I say this now to this Seventy-eighth Congress, because it is wholly possible that freedom from want, the right of employment, and the right of assurance against life's hazards, will loom very large as a task of America during the coming 2 years.

I trust it will not be regarded as an issue—but rather as a task for all of us to study sympathetically, to work out with a constant regard for the attainment of the objective, with fairness to all and with injustice to none.

In this war of survival we must keep before our minds not only the evil things we fight against but the good things we are fighting for. We fight to retain a great past—and we fight to gain a greater future.

Let us remember that economic safety for the America of the future is threatened unless a greater economic stability comes to the rest of the world. We cannot make America an island in either a military or an economic sense. Hitlerism, like any other form of crime or disease, can grow from the evil seeds of economic as well as military feudalism.

Victory in this war is the first and greatest goal before us. Victory in the peace is the next. That means striving

toward the enlargement of the security of man here and throughout the world—and, finally, striving for the "fourth freedom"—freedom from fear.

It is of little account for any of us to talk of essential human needs, of attaining security, if we run the risk of another world war in 10 or 20 or 50 years. That is just plain common sense. Wars grow in size, in death and destruction, and in the inevitability of engulfing all nations, in inverse ratio to the shrinking size of the world as a result of the conquest of the air. I shudder to think of what will happen to humanity, including curselves, if this war ends in an inconclusive peace, and another war breaks out when the babies of today have grown to fighting age.

Every normal American prays that neither he nor his sons nor his grandsons will be compelled to go through this horror again.

Undoubtedly a few Americans, even now, think that this Nation can end this war comfortably and then climb back into an American hole and pull the hole in after them.

But we have learned that we can never dig a hole so deep that it would be safe against predatory animals. We have also learned that if we do not pull the fangs of the predatory animals of this world, they will multiply and grow in strength—and they will be at our throats once more in a short generation.

Most Americans realize more clearly than ever before that modern war equipment in the hands of aggressor nations can bring danger overnight to our own national existence or to that of any other nation or island or continent.

It is clear to us that if Germany and Italy and Japan—or any one of them—remain armed at the end of this war, or are permitted to rearm, they will again, and inevitably, embark upon an ambitious career of world conquest. They must be disarmed and kept disarmed, and they must abandon the philosophy, and the teaching of that philosophy, which has brought so much suffering to the world.

After the First World War we tried to achieve a formula for permanent peace, based on a magnificent idealism. We failed. But by our failure we have learned that we cannot maintain peace at this stage of human development by good intentions alone.

Today the United Nations are the mightiest military coalition in history. They represent an overwhelming majority of the population of the world. Bound together in solemn agreement that they themselves will not commit acts of aggression or conquest against any of their neighbors, the United Nations can and must remain united for the maintenance of peace by preventing any attempt to rearm in Germany, in Japan, in Italy, or in any other nation which seeks to violate the tenth commandment—"Thou shalt not covet."

There are cynics and skeptics who say it cannot be done. The American people and all the freedom-loving peoples of this earth are now demanding that it must be done. And the will of these people shall prevail.

The philosophy of the Axis Powers is based on profound contempt for the human race. If, in the formation of our future policy, we were guided by the same cynical contempt, then we should be surrendering to the philosophy of our enemies, and our victory would turn to defeat.

The issue of this war is the basic issue between those who believe in mankind and those who do not—the ancient issue between those who put their faith in the people and those who put their faith in dictators and tyrants. There have always been those who did not believe in the people, who attempted to block their forward movement across history, to force them back to servility and suffering and silence.

The people have now gathered their strength. They are moving forward in their might and power—and no force, no combination of forces, no trickery, deceit, or violence can stop them now. They see before them the hope of the world—a decent, secure, peaceful life for all men everywhere.

I do not prophesy when this war will end.

But I do believe that this year of 1943 will give to the United Nations a very substantial advance along the roads that lead to Berlin and Rome and Tokyo.

I tell you it is within the realm of possibility that this Seventy-eighth Congress may have the historic privilege of helping greatly to save the world from future fear.

Therefore, let us—all of us—have confidence; let us redouble our efforts.

A tremendous, costly, long-enduring task in peace as well as in war is still ahead of us.

But, as we face that continuing task, we may know that the state of this Nation is good—the heart of this Nation is sound—the spirit of this Nation is strong—the faith of this Nation is eternal.

At 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m., the President retired from the Hall of the House.

At 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m., the Members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States retired from the Hall of the House.

At 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m., the Members of the Diplomatic Corps retired from the Hall of the House.

At 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m., the Speaker announced that the joint session was dissolved.

Thereupon, the Vice President and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

### REPRESENTATIVE JOHN J. COCHRAN

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 32), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas JOHN J. COCHRAN, a Representative from the State of Missouri, from the Thirteenth District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said JOHN J. COCHRAN at Bethesda, Md., and that the said oath, when administered as herein authorized, shall be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said JOHN J. COCHRAN.

The resolution was agreed to.

### REFERENCE OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President of the United States be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

### ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the Democratic Members that at 2 o'clock there will be a caucus of the Democratic Members in the Chamber for the purpose of electing Members to fill Democratic vacancies on the Committee on Ways and Means.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MICHENER, Mr. PLUMLEY, and Mr. PLOESER asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief biographical sketch of the late Dr. A. Lawrence Lowell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written by me and a reply from General Hershey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered over KWTO in Springfield, Mo., last month.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include

therein a statement made by the minority leader to the Republican caucus this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on a pay-as-you-go tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and include therein certain excerpts and statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a column by Walter Lippmann.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement from the National Campaign Board, 1943 Victory Book Campaign.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington Post relative to the late Mrs. O'Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask uanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

31. A letter from the Postmaster General, chairman, board of trustees, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 16); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and ordered to be printed.

32. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

33. A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

34. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the board of trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

35. A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the Fifty-sixth Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

36. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

37. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Master Gunnery Sergt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

38. A letter from the chairman of the board for the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a report of expenditures for the 12 months ended November 30, 1942, of funds derived from the sale of bonds under section 15c of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

39. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the advancement of Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Construction Corps, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of vice admiral; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

40. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report of the Comptroller General of the United States of the work of the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1942; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 773. A bill to provide temporary increase of salaries for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 774. A bill to amend section 215 of the Judicial Code, relating to the quorum of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 775. A bill providing direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of $40 per month to needy citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 776. A bill to improve the facilities for transcontinental motor transportation; to provide additional facilities for the national defense; to aid in the relief of unemployment; to promote the public safety; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

H. R. 777. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia," approved February 24, 1914; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 778. A bill to prevent the mutilation, desecration, or use of the flag for advertising purposes, and providing penalties therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 779. A bill to authorize uniform recognition of service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard in the computation of retirement and longevity pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 780. A bill to provide liberalized definitions of permanent total disability; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 781. A bill to define "unemployability" under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 782. A bill to establish more equitable procedure governing the determination of service connection of diseases or injuries alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service in a war, campaign, or expedition; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 783. A bill to grant permanent and total disability ratings to veterans suffering from severe industrial inadaptability as a result of war service; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 784. A bill to provide that the term of office of the Governor of Puerto Rico shall expire upon the enactment of this act and at the end of each 2-year period thereafter; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 785. A bill to provide that credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall be allowed for certain service in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 786. A bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 787. A bill providing for an additional naval academy in the San Francisco Bay area in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 788. A bill to provide for grants to the States for needy disabled adults; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 789. A bill to provide for grants to the States for assistance in the rehabilitation of disabled persons incapacitated for normal employment; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 790. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, so as to extend compensation, pension, and hospital privileges to veterans of World War No. 2, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 791. A bill to extend eligibility for compensation to widows and children of World War veterans who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 792. A bill to include persons who stood in loco parentis within the definition of a parent; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 793 (by request). A bill to provide for adjudication of any claim for compensation, pension, or retirement pay upon evidence in file at time of death of the veteran; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 794. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 795. A bill to provide that government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after 2 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 796. A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to correct erroneous adjudications; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 797. A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 798. A bill to amend section 603, title VI, Public Law 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 8, 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 799. A bill to make temporary disability ratings of World War veterans permanent after 10 years; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 800. A bill to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 801. A bill to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the veterans regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 802. A bill to provide for the creation of conservation authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H. R. 803. A bill to provide for judicial determination governing the discontinuance of insurance granted on account of permanent total disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan:

H. R. 804. A bill to prohibit aliens from voting in labor organizations or acting as their officers or agents; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 805. A bill to increase the maximum monthly payment made by States to individuals for old-age assistance which will be matched by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 806. A bill to provide for the economic defense of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 807. A bill to regulate rents of commercial property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 808. A bill removing the $3,000 limitation on the amount of naturalization fees permitted to be retained by clerks of courts exercising naturalization jurisdiction; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 809. A bill to regulate private employment agencies engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 810. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims arising out of the establishment, expansion, or operation of arsenals, navy yards, and other Government-operated plants; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 811. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Ludlow, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 812. A bill providing for the issuance of documentary evidence of United States citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 813. A bill providing for the payment of direct Federal old-age assistance to citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 814. A bill to provide for the restoration to active duty and/or advancement in rank of certain World War veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 815. A bill to provide adequate compensation for dependents of agents and inspectors of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 816. A bill to revise the administrative procedure of Federal agencies; to establish the Office of Federal Administrative Procedure; to provide for hearing commissioners; to authorize declaratory rulings by administrative agencies; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 817. A bill to provide for the adjustment of certain claims against the United States and to confer jurisdiction in respect thereto on the Court of Claims and the district courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 818. A bill to amend the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 819. A bill to permit officers of the Army and Navy, commissioned since December 7, 1941, to continue to hold their civil offices while on active duty during the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 820. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 821. A bill to repeal the act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

H. R. 822. A bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 823. A bill to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 824. A bill to amend the act of September 22, 1941 (Public Law 252, 77th Cong.), with relation to the temporary appointments of officers in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 825. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of certain aliens who have lawfully entered the United States upon visitors' permits and are refugees from or unable to return to their country of origin by reason of the emergency created by the existing war in Europe; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 826. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees killed or injured while performing work of a hazardous nature incident to law-enforcement activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 827. A bill to provide for the appointment of public defenders in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 828. A bill to provide for the construction of a marine hospital in or near Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 829. A bill providing for an additional military academy in the southern district of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 830. A bill to provide that vessels under the control of the War Shipping Administration shall be named for soldiers, sailors, and marines who are killed or die of wounds received in action during the present war; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 831. A bill to provide for the training of civil glider pilots, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 832. A bill to establish as a part of the Reserve component of the Regular Army a Home Defense Organized Reserve for local home defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 833. A bill to give wartime rank to retired officers of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 834. A bill to provide for paying to individuals ordered into active service in, or inducted into, the land or naval forces of the United States during the present emergency the sum of $60 upon honorable discharge or transfer to inactive duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 835. A bill to amend section 16 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 836. A bill to be known as the "General Welfare Act" or "General Welfare Act amendments to the Social Security Act," to amend the Social Security Act so as to extend coverage thereunder to all groups and all classes, to amend the Revenue Act of 1942 and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide the revenue for an all-inclusive system of matured annuities for America's senior citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 837. A bill to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 838. A bill declaring certain lands to be a part of the public domain and providing for the administration thereof; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 839. A bill to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and

additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 840. A bill to establish a uniform definition of "child" for the purposes of laws granting pension or compensation, or accrued amounts thereof, administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 841. A bill to increase to $60 per month the amount of compensation otherwise payable to widows of deceased World War veterans whose deaths were caused by their service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 842. A bill to extend eligibility for compensation to the widows and children of deceased World War veterans who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 843. A bill to provide for the filling of vacancies in the Postal Service by promotion of eligible substitutes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 844. A bill granting free postage to members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps (WAAC's), and to members of the Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service (WAVES), and to the members of Women's Auxiliary of the Coast Guard Service (SPARS); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. J. Res. 38 (by request). Joint resolution to give effect to article 11 of the convention between the United States of America and other powers for the protection of industrial property signed at The Hague, November 6, 1925 (treaty series No. 834); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence Division of the Navy Department in the conduct of certain investigations in the interest of prosecution of the war, to make use of intercepted communications without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to invite foreign governments to participate in an international constitutional convention to draft a constitution providing for an international government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. Res. 33. Resolution to continue the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Res. 34. Resolution authorizing the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to make a study of the alien situation in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 35. Resolution providing for the salary of an assistant clerk to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. Res. 36. Resolution for the continuation of the Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration; to the Committee on Rules.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURCHILL of New York:

H. R. 769. A bill for the relief of John Cardillo and Philip Cardillo; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 770. A bill for the relief of Albert Barrett; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 771. A bill for the relief of Fisil Rosenberg, and his wife, Sofie, his daughter, Jenny, and his son, Jacques; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 772. A bill for the relief of M. L. Leopold Rosemberg and his wife, Lisa; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 845. A bill granting jurisdiction to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit to reopen and readjudicate the case of Robert L. Demuth; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 846. A bill for the relief of Dr. H. R. Allmon; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 847. A bill granting a pension to Mary Quirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 848. A bill granting a pension to Emma Sears Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 849. A bill authorizing the President to reappoint and honorably discharge David J. Sawyer, second lieutenant, National Army, as of May 11, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 850. A bill for the relief of George M. Louie; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 851. A bill for the relief of George J. Cataldo; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 852. A bill for the relief of John T. Shirley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 853. A bill for the relief of John Taylor; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 854. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Person; to the Committee on Claims.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of the pastor and members of Bethany Methodist Church, urging the manufacture, sale, and distribution of all alcoholic liquors be stopped for the duration of the war and the period of demobilization thereafter, except for scientific and industrial purposes, and that existing stock be redistilled for industrial and munition purposes and all distilleries and breweries be used for the production of war necessities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2. Also, petition of 64 members of the congregation of the First Methodist Church of Adams, N. Y., urging the abolishment of alcoholic beverages from all training camps and vicinity; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Oswego, N. Y., opposing further postponement or withdrawing of the proposed plan to extend gasoline rationing throughout the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Rev. John O. Scott, pastor, and 26 members of the First Baptist Church of Teague, Tex., opposing the Victory tax law as it pertains to the religious organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Long Island Chapter of the Knights of Columbus, New York, representing 67 councils and 20,000 members and their families in the counties of Kings, Queens, Nassau, and Suffolk in the State of New York, does hereby record its unanimous opposition to the registration of womanhood of our country; and to the draft, involuntary or voluntary, for industry or the armed forces or for any other purpose; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Rev. C. C. Lanham, pastor, Methodist Church, Triadelphia, W. Va., and other citizens of Ohio County, W. Va., urging the passage of legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in and around the camps and concentrations of said forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 8, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, the loving Father of mankind, hold us to the realization that there is a destiny that makes all men brothers. In pensive and in quiet mood we would understand that enduring happiness and contentment must be born of pity, of tenderness for the poor and distressed, and that the whole round world is bound by golden chains to the feet of the Divine; by service, hallow our joy and gratitude. Show us how the lowliest becomes lofty if inspired by the glorifying motive of love for our fellow men. In the spirit of our great Exemplar, who deeply lived and suffered, lead us clear and safe into new light and a new life.

Give us consciences so fine that they shall be sensitive to all untruth that make falsehood easy. We pray that our earliest passion and our latest ambition shall be to follow the summons of the countless crosses around which the winds moan and sigh while Rachel weeps for her children. Forgive our selfishness, rebuke us when we are untrue, recall us when we go astray, and cleanse us from all secret faults. Not by things seen but by faith is life deepened, sweetened, and dignified and is the power of God unto salvation. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by inserting the results of the Washington Naval Treaty of February 6, 1922.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SILVER

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 or 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, I introduced a bill (H. R. 743) to authorize the use, for war purposes, of silver held or owned by the United States.

Under the New Deal's subsidy program for the benefit of the silver-producing States, the Government is hoarding huge quantities of silver vitally needed for the war effort as a substitute for copper and tin, and other critical metals of which there is a shortage.

This silver program was inaugurated in 1934, in the early days of the New Deal. The bill was jammed through the House without anyone knowing what it was all about, or what its effect would be. It provided that the Government should buy all domestically produced silver at a price approximately double the then market price. Hence the legislation was definitely inflationary in character. Silver certificates were issued against the silver held by the Treasury, and to the extent of approximately half their face value they represent fiat money. The only beneficiaries of the program are the silver producers who are paid twice what their silver is worth on the market. Everyone else suffers.

At the present time, the chief sufferer is the war production program, because under the Silver Purchase Act the silver which the Government acquires must be used as backing for the silver certificates and cannot be used by war industries. Silver has been aptly called the slacker metal. The purpose of my bill, which is similar to others dealing with the same subject, is to permit the sale of this Government-owned silver, now buried in vaults at West Point, for use in war production. Most such bills, however, require the Treasury to maintain at all times the ownership and possession of an amount of silver equal in monetary value to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued. I have omitted this provision from my bill because I believe the Government should retire these silver certificates as the silver is sold.

The silver purchase program is inflationary; it is an unwarranted subsidy to silver producers; and above all it constitutes a definite impediment to the success of the war effort. In my opinion, it should be speedily repealed.

In a separate measure, which I am today introducing, I have provided for the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, as well as section 4 of the act of July 6, 1939, relating to the coinage of domestically produced silver.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE DEMOCRATIC WHIP

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to announce to the House, and I am sure the announcement will be received on both sides with a high degree of pleasure, the appointment, or perhaps I should say the reappointment, of our distinguished and beloved friend from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] as Democratic whip of this Congress.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of other special orders heretofore made the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders today I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the insertion of an editorial entitled "Railroads in the War."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Also, Mr. Speaker, another extension reciting some of the trouble that the farmer is having under this unnecessary gas rationing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the insertion of two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting some editorials on the death of Mr. E. J. Lynett, owner and editor of the Scranton Times, a leading Democratic newspaper in the State of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STUDY OF PEACE PROBLEMS

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and also to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I solicit your support of a House resolution I have introduced today providing for a special investigating committee consisting of 15 Members of the House. The idea is to have the committee make a thorough and orderly study of peace problems, offers, and settlements. Such a committee should be able to help expedite the successful conclusion of the present war and help to prevent future wars. I shall discuss the subject further in a day or so. Meanwhile, Members may find time to scan an informal statement concerning the resolution which I permitted to be published yesterday and which I shall insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SALES OF DAIRY HERDS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, 50 percent of the farm population in my district have either been drafted into the Army or have entered the defense plants of America. I present to you now a sign of an auction sale, and many others of the same sort will be seen on the farms all over my district before this trouble is over unless an immediate remedy for it is brought about.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. Simply to say to the gentleman—and I think everyone agrees with me who comes from the dairy districts—that those signs are on every pole and tree throughout the dairy districts of this country. Yet they are crying out for milk and putting regulations on the farmers so that they cannot produce the milk, butter, and cheese that are needed. I am glad the gentleman has called attention to this, and it ought to be called to the attention of the House every day.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I agree with everything the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has said, and we have now had notice of the release by the Army of 96,000,000 cases of powdered milk that they bought and they do not now need. As to farm sales, in Minnesota we have for many years averaged about 300 annually. This year the estimate runs as high as 10,000 sales.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. And this situation has become so serious that these auction sales are no longer regarded as special occasions. The ladies of the particular community I refer to, where the auction is being held, are serving luncheon during the sale. Are these economic disasters soon to be heralded in every corner of the country as a signal for social gatherings to accentuate the fallen grandeur of individual ownership and private enterprise? These auctions

signify the death knell of that American era.

AUCTION

My son having gone in the Army and being unable to secure help, I am compelled to sell this purebred dairy, which is second to none in Chenango County, on what is known as the Hayden farm, situated 2 miles north of McDonough village on the improved road leading from McDonough to Pharsalia Hook, Tuesday, October 27, commencing at 12:30 sharp, the following:

Forty-four purebred Holsteins, consisting of 12 close-up springers, 4 first-calf heifers due soon, 7 recently fresh, balance due between now and spring; 7 yearlings, 3 spring calves.

The majority of this bunch of cows was raised by me on the farm and carry a butterfat test of 3.6. For the past 4 years the test has averaged from 3.6 to 3.7.

Two herd sires—Senior sire: Man-o-War Premier 27th; son of Man-o-War Premier; junior sire: Thendara Onyx Pledge Tarus, from Frank Decker's good herd.

We would be pleased to have any interested party call at this farm and see this dairy at any time, night or morning, before the sale. Why buy grades when you can buy purebreds at the same price. Papers and signed transfers will be furnished with each animal. Remember the date, and remember the place, and be there.

This farm of 380 acres, well watered, and under good cultivation, is offered at private sale.

The ladies of McDonough will serve lunches beginning at 11:30.

Sale under cover.

Terms: Cash.

ARCHIE W. CALDWELL.
WILL EVANS, *Auctioneer.*

WAR PRODUCTION IN 1942

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most gratifying statements in the President's message of yesterday was that comparing the stupendous war production of 1942 with that of 1941.

It must not be overlooked that a vital, if not a controlling, factor in this revolution was the abandonment of the New Deal concept of production as personified in O. P. M. and the delegation of war production to private enterprise and the W. P. B. under Donald Nelson immediately at the beginning of 1942.

It must not be forgotten that it was the hammering of Congress all through 1941, culminating in the Truman report of January 1942, that smashed the bureaucratic inertia and reinstated the traditional American way of getting things done through private initiative.

It was American industry, that great institution of labor and management, each working reciprocally in its orbit, freed largely from bureaucratic control, that enabled us to build in 1942 6 times the number of machine guns and antitank guns, 5 times the amount of small arms and ammunition, and 10 times the amount of artillery ammunition that we did in 1941.

It is this great American institution of free enterprise, its defects pruned by Government regulation, which must and will solve not only our all-out war production but form the firm fundamentals of a peace economy when the victory shall have been won.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONGRESS RESUMES ITS PROPER FUNCTIONS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-eighth Congress has opened under conditions which have never before confronted this Nation.

We are engaged in a deadly struggle for our liberty and our lives. Free constitutional government is threatened with extinction. The United States, with the aid of its allies, must win this war. The United States, with the aid of its allies, will win this war.

While the war is being fought we are having to exercise great care that our American representative system of government, our American system of free enterprise, and our American system of free society are not displaced by some form of totalitarianism arising through the necessary strictures upon liberties due to the war. We must exercise great care that these strictures are not perpetuated after the war, as the regular order of our American way of life. The auspices under which the Seventy-eighth Congress opens are such as to encourage the American people, because statements by both the Republican and Democratic leaders in the Congress make it certain the Congress means to recover its prerogatives, to resume its functions, and to become again an active, efficient, and assertive branch of the Government.

The Seventy-seventh Congress passed through a period in which a tremendous planned assault was made upon the legislative branch of the Government as an institution. That assault has just about subsided, because the November elections demonstrated that the American people are determined to continue our American system, and that they mean to support the Congress as their special instrument of control over their Government. Those who apparently believed they could persuade the people to discredit and render impotent their instrument of control over their Government and their governors have had an awakening. They now realize their propaganda did not succeed. They have, therefore, gone underground in their efforts to sap the foundations of our free American governmental economic and social system, but they will be no more successful in the future than they have been in the past.

It is clear from the statements of both the Republican and Democratic leaders that the new Congress will be a body wholly united in an effort to win this war as quickly as possible. It is safe to say that there is not a Member of the Congress in either House who does not fully realize that every day the war can be shortened will mean the saving of thousands of men from death or wounds.

It is equally clear from the declarations of the leaders that the Congress will move to take back its prerogatives and to put an end to the defiance by bureaucrats of the expressed will and obvious intention of the legislative body. Government by decrees is coming to a close insofar as it has been attempted by the bureaucrats, and the Congress is going to have much more to say in the future about how the Government is run, how the country is governed, how the war is operated, than it has had in the past. There is no question but that the morale of the American people will be greatly strengthened when they realize that the new Congress is going to insist that all other considerations be set aside and all energies devoted to the winning of the war and the successful transition back to a peace basis, while at the same time avoiding economic chaos.

There is no question but that Congress will lead the way for the people and that a marked improvement in the whole situation will result from the forthright declaration of the congressional leaders that the legislative department is still an integral and effective branch of our Government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a sermon by Rev Clifford E. Barber.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the new Alaskan highway and to include some short verses descriptive of the same.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have an opportunity to speak a word for the dairy industry of the country. I know from experience that a dairy herd cannot be built up in a day, indeed, it takes about 5 years to build a productive herd. Due to the exodus of labor from the farms, valuable herds representing many years of careful, patient work are being sold under the hammer. The releasing of a quantity of dried milk will help the immediate shortage but will not replace broken dairy herds. If we are to continue to have milk, butter, and cheese in sufficient quantities to supply the needs of our troops and of our children and fill the requirements of other countries we must find ways to keep such labor as still remains on the farms right there on the

job and must work out a clear-cut program for the whole basic industry of food production.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a resolution by an American Legion post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WICKERSHAM, Mr. FULMER, and Mr. HOPE were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE MIGRATION

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Defense Migration may have permission to file its final report and that the same be printed on or before next Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article with reference to the Blue Star Mothers, appearing in the Flint News-Advertiser of January 1, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DRAFTEES OVER 38 YEARS OF AGE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under the present Army program it is clear that men over the age of 38 are, generally speaking, less adaptable to modern military conditions than our younger soldiers. To release these men from military service, the Army now requires advance information that a position is open to them in a war plant. Many men are in no position to obtain such assurance, even though there may be many openings available in their home communities. I propose that these men, whom the Army is seeking to release, be honorably discharged and directed to the United States Employment Service offices nearest to their homes where work shortages exist.

By this method we should simultaneously eliminate many men from the Army who are not essential to its improvement and aid in the relief of labor difficulties in many areas of the Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in extending the remarks I just made I may include therein the auction-sale notice to which I referred.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the special orders previously entered today I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in line with the sentiments expressed by my colleagues concerning the dairy industry, I wish to say that I received a letter yesterday from a widow in my district who owns a 100-acre farm with 20 cows. Her son, who attended those cattle, was taken into the Army. She has only a 16-year-old boy at home, who is in high school. It is an impossible situation.

On the 30th of last month I was compelled to sell my own herd, which I was 20 years in building, in order that I might discharge my responsibilities here. Somebody will say, "They brought enough money to pay you to sell them." That is true, but these herds cannot be replaced when once disposed of. That is another dangerous thing. Butchers are offering such high prices for these cows that it is going to be unprofitable to keep them, and patriotic farmers are paying such high prices that they can never make them pay. Then, too, about the time a farmer has put on a few more cows his help leaves him. All this is wrong.

This House should impress upon the men down the Avenue that this system must be changed in order that agriculture may render its proper effort in the winning of the war.

This drafting of experienced farm labor is going to have its effect more ways than one. For instance, the Department of Agriculture reports less wheat sown this fall. Next July will tell the story about that. That may mean a wheat shortage. Many farmers are now making plans for next summer, and those plans are not being made on the basis of what they want to produce or on what their farm can produce but on what they can handle.

There is no use for a farmer to sow or plant what he knows he cannot harvest. Then many of them have been working 15 hours a day, 7 days a week, without any extra or double pay. He has not asked for more. But when he knows that the coal miners are striking and working only 35 hours per week, and he is not able to buy the fuel he needs, then the farmer asks the question, and rightly so, Why?

[Here the gavel fell.]

LET US GIVE THE FARMER A SQUARE DEAL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen who have just spoken have no monopoly on the troubles of the dairy farmers. I represent probably the outstanding dairy district in the South, and we are having the same trouble there; they are stripping our farms of their young men to where many farmers are being compelled to sell their herds of fine Jersey cows—herds that in many instances it has taken a generation to build up.

I will put my district up against any other district in the whole country. We have furnished as large a proportion of our white men to the service in this war as any other district in America, and they are suffering as many casualties. As a rule they are the men who came off these farms. I am tired of seeing four or five men on one job in a shipbuilding plant, a defense industry, or any other kind of industry, while these farms are being stripped of their young men and these herds destroyed. If we cannot get relief otherwise, then Congress should act to put a stop to these injustices.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, everyone of us recognizes the seriousness of the dairy farmers' problem and the tragedy it will be if we permit anything to prevent maximum production of their all-important products. I should like in 1 minute to give what seems to me to be a practical guide which I think should govern the policy of everybody that has to do with this problem; and that is that no policy ought to be adopted by any governmental agency which has the effect of restricting the production of dairy products or any other needed product for that matter.

One matter immediately under consideration is the question of a higher price for manufactured milk products. The question as to whether or not a higher price will be allowed depends upon whether a higher goal of milk production is to be striven for. It seems to me this question ought not to be debated for a single moment; that if a higher price is necessary to get increased milk production and to enable the dairy farmer to do it, then a higher price ought to be one of the answers. It is, of course, not the whole answer, but it is one of them, in my opinion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including a letter from the national commander of the American Legion; also to extend my remarks by including an editorial on the National Youth Administration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FARM LABOR

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, in one of the largest cities of Kansas recently 16 grocery stores closed. I mention this just to get away from the farm problem for a moment. These stores closed because they could not pay the wages that Madam Perkins saddled on this country in defense areas. That is what is happening to help in grocery stores in a lot of sections. The employers cannot pay that standard.

The reason farmers are short of help is partly because the boys have gone to service and because the boys have gone to defense plants, which pay four or five times what farm hands normally get. The defense plants have drawn the boys away from the farms. It is a wicked waste brought about by the wage scale Madam Perkins has fixed in defense areas, added to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act for time and a half for over 40 hours. The asininity of this situation is not equaled any place, yet we heard not a word said yesterday of the wicked waste—not a note of sympathy sounded for the man at home who is losing his shirt, or for the taxpayer, who is not only losing his occupation because of priorities but a chance to pay future taxes. Not a word against the wicked, unnecessary waste.

THE FARMERS' DIFFICULTIES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is next on the list for recognition under his special order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take that time now, but ask instead that after Members who desire to speak today have spoken I may proceed for 35 minutes. I will not waste my time now; I may learn something. In the meantime I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] thinks the remedy for the shortage of dairy products lies in raising the price of milk, butter, cheese, and dairy products generally. Now, if he knows any way to get butter and milk out of a dry cow, or out of a cow that has been killed for beef by raising the price of milk or butter, I should like to have him tell us about it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The trouble about dairying is just this: You have taken all the boys off the farm, the boys who cared for the dairy herds, and, as stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS], the dairy herds are being butchered. One thing is certain, you are not going to get butter and milk out of a cow that has been processed and put in a tin can.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Your wife cannot go to the grocery store here in Washington and buy a pound of butter, you cannot get any butter any place at present. I received a letter from one of my constituents yesterday saying the S. C. C. was distributing butter to the farmers out there. One man who has 24 cows was given 2 cans of condensed milk, and butter was distributed to the children in a country school.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman mentioned me by name.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Think of it! Taking milk and butter to the few farmers who still have dairy herds. What are you going to do about it? That is what I want to know. What is the majority party going to do about it? Will you make it possible for the farmers to farm? Or will you continue to permit the New Dealers to carry on their wrecking program? What are you going to do about it?

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE FARM SITUATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I concede that the farmers have contributed tremendously to our armed forces, but this also applies to labor. As to dairying, I venture to say that 10 times as many dairies and dairy herds were sold under the hammer in 1930, 1931, 1932, and in early 1933, when many foreclosure sales were stopped by force and in some instances sheriffs and judges were driven with guns from farm premises, as are being sold now. Why are they selling their herds at this time? Because they are getting twice and three times as much for the cows as they did in past years and they are taking the profit that they may live in comfort in the future.

Personally, I am willing for the farmer or the dairyman to get a fair price, but let us also take into consideration the consumer who is now paying twice as much for milk, cream, cheese, and butter as heretofore.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in listening to that great dirt farmer from Chicago, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], talk about his dairy herds, I suppose grazing in the City Hall of Chicago and being milked by the city hall gang.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. Do they not milk the public every day in the city of Chicago?

Mr. KNUTSON. And wreck them.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman should speak for himself.

Mr. FISH. I am surprised at the remarks of the gentleman from Chicago, who has always pretended to be such a friend of the farmers and the forgotten dairymen.

Mr. SABATH. And I am.

Mr. FISH. Everybody knows, Democrats and Republicans alike, that our dairy farmers are eking out a very precarious living. They are working 12 and 14 hours a day and overburdened with taxes. They have large investments and they are striving to maintain those investments and continue on their farms in order to produce milk and food for the American people and our armed forces throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is up to the Congress, regardless of party, to help the farmers instead of attacking them here on the floor of the House. Our farmers are doing their utmost to help win the war but they cannot hire farm help unless they receive a fair and adequate price on what they produce.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, all of this discussion about the dairy farmers and the dairy industry is tremendously interesting to one who operates a dairy. I have just checked the list which I made up while I was at home prior to Christmas and I find that I have 175 dairy cows, 90 heifers, and 52 young calves. I am not sending any of them to the butcher. I find that these calves which were worth a few dollars a year or two ago are now worth double the former amount. My producing dairy cows that were worth $60 a year ago are now worth $125 apiece. I was getting 48, 52, and 56 cents per pound of butterfat for fluid milk then, while today I am getting 85 cents per pound of butterfat. Under those circumstances, I cannot complain.

I realize there is a labor shortage all over this country. It is inconvenient at my farm, but I hope that throughout the

country we may approach the dairy situation from the standpoint of urging the dairy farmers to save their herds. The dairy inventories are larger today than they have been in all the history of the country. Milk prices to the producer are better. Dairy cattle are worth more. I believe it would be helpful if that sort of information were given to the House.

Mr. GROSS. What kind of labor does the gentleman have on his farm?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman asks me what kind of labor I have on my farm. I have lost practically all of my former dairy labor, but the people in this country must have ingenuity. We take a truck now and drive each morning 6 miles to an Indian reservation and pick up some of the finest farm labor I ever saw in my life—labor that I did not employ heretofore, but I am getting along with it now.

Mr. GROSS. Are the cattle going to be worth as much 6 months from now if you have nobody to attend them?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I cannot tell you what the cows will be worth, but the dairy herds of Denmark and Norway are being wiped out. There is going to be a demand for dairy cattle from this country for export to Europe, and I am saving every heifer calf I can. I have not sold a heifer calf for 2 years. I may be foolish, but I believe there is going to be a demand for dairy cattle from over on the other side of the Atlantic and I am going to help supply that demand at good prices when the time comes. We should not be talking about selling dairy herds. We should be building them up and we should encourage our farmers to hold onto their dairy stock.

[Here the gavel fell.]

RATIONING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in last Sunday's Boston Herald there appeared an interview with Maj. Donald L. Dickson, United States Marine Corps, who had returned to Boston after serving 109 days in Guadalcanal. During his interview he said:

> Tell your readers to stop squawking about rationing, he said casually. They should live on Jap fish and rice awhile if they think they aren't well treated.

A young man whose name is James LeGrice, motor machinist mate, first-class, called at my house. He had formerly worked in the General Accounting Office. He enlisted in the Navy. He had been wounded twice at Casablanca and he was home because of wounds. After he was wounded he was placed in a hospital ship, which was torpedoed. He landed on a raft and he was there about 3 hours. He did not know how long he would be on that raft.

Later he was on another hospital ship which was torpedoed, and he was in the water for an hour and a half. I said, "How did you do it?" He said, "I was a good swimmer, and I was able to paddle around." I said, "What were some of your thoughts? Would you mind telling me?" He said, "Well, Congressman, I will never forget one thought that was in my mind. When I was on that raft for 3 hours I did not know whether I would ever be rescued or not, or how long I would be on that raft, and the question of food was very important to me." He said, "I looked to see what I had, and I had three little crackers; and, Congressman, those three crackers looked like a million dollars to me."

[Here the gavel fell.]

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 35 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 35 minutes at the conclusion of the other special orders of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have so many new Members, it is suggested that some addresses ought to be made this afternoon. May I say to these new Members, "You could not expect, could you, that the speakers would come from the other side of the Chamber? They would necessarily, of course, at this time, have to be alibi speeches, which are not pleasant for them to make."

On yesterday we listened to a reassuring message. I find little in it to find fault with, but I find much fault with the omissions. We were very happy to listen to its optimistic statements, and we are proud that we have accomplished so much in our war effort. No recommendations for legislation were made, as is customary in a President's message.

Recently I read some of the Harrison and Cleveland messages. Always many matters were brought to the attention of the Congress.

When the President addressed us yesterday, the entire Nation could listen in and be informed. Now messages recommending action by the Congress will be brought to us in driblets, and they will get little notice or attention from the Nation. I marked one passage in the message which was of tremendous interest to me, when he said that "the country knows where I stand." Therefore, if you are in doubt next year as to a candidate for still another term, "you know where I stand." I regret that premature announcement.

A sincere welcome to you new Members. I have been here a long time. I have usually objected to the passage of 2 or 3 days at the beginning of a session, when no business was ready to be taken up, without opportunity to express ourselves on the state of the Nation. I have usually contributed, but I earnestly wish you to believe that I am not seeking publicity. I feel deeply my responsibilities, as you do, and I try to think for myself, although I often see a shortage of necessary equipment in arriving at definite conclusions. I know that you are anxious to do real service for your country. For a time you will be extremely impatient at the snail-pace procedure of the House. You will need to be patient and tolerant. The present procedure is the result of many years of experience in handling legislative matters.

You may find fault with us older ones who have been here so long and have learned caution. The young men of the New Deal seem to think that old men are fools. Old men know that young men are fools. That is an old adage. The New Deal is now generally discredited. I shall do nothing that will hinder the winning of the war. However, it has often been said lately that "we must win the war from the New Deal." On yesterday our President dared make mention but slightly of his heralded social-security program. We know something of what he has in his mind. We want to win the war, but our "heads are full of quarrels" on domestic issues. You are bound to hear expressions of them, but nothing will be done by the minority that will interfere with the winning of the war. I am not and have not been an isolationist. For a long time I have been quite the contrary. I was one of the first to vote for the repeal of the embargo.

We have recently been given a shock by our State Department. I can hardly express my amazement when I refer to the so-called White Paper. Have you read it and digested it? It was given to you with great éclat as if it were something to the credit of this administration. This administration has long pointed a finger of scorn at you isolationists but at the same time were doing the most they could in the way of appeasement and never daring to say "Put up or shut up." Now they claim to have known all along the purposes of the Axis Powers, but they sold them the scrap iron in huge quantities and bought their gold and furnished the sinews of war to those who they now declare were known to be our real potential and expected enemies. It would seem that our State Department were the worst isolationists of us all. What a policy to pursue while claiming full knowledge of the intent of those who are now our mortal enemies. Preaching preparedness to us, but actually preparing our enemies to destroy us. What vision.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to say a moment ago that yesterday the President said "You know where I stand"?

Mr. GIFFORD. He did say that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, as I recall, not long ago he issued a statement in which he said that no man would be forced to join a union in order to work in the

defense of his country. Recently the boards created by him have ordered Montgomery Ward and other companies to employ union men only and have them pay dues. Will the gentleman tell me where the gentleman stands on the right of an American to work in defense of his country without paying tribute to some organization, which in turn contributes hundreds of thousands of dollars to his campaign?

Mr. GIFFORD. I can only assume where he stands. I have a right to assume, because of what he has stood for in the past, and I can only perhaps properly judge by what he has done in the past. However, he was first elected on an economy program. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has just now told us about the public debt. The President was elected on a platform promising not to increase, but to decrease, the public debt. Why such a turn-about-face? Only 2 years ago he promised the mothers of the country that no boy would be sent to foreign lands to fight. Yesterday he told us that a million and a half had already gone abroad to fight. Of course, he must have been sincere and earnest in those promises. Circumstances have forced him to change his mind on this last matter. Of course, a "foolish consistency" is the product of little minds. He has a great mind and consistency is not a fault of our great President. So we do not know but what he may change his attitude in the matter of paying tribute to an organization to work on defense projects. But when he changes, hear the roar of anger up from Lewis and all the others. The roar has already gone up from John Lewis, but it will be greatly augmented if any correction at all is suggested. Even the farmers the other evening said openly, "He is no longer the friend of the farmers." Heaven forbid that labor should say the same thing. There ought to have been some alibi speeches here today explaining the recent elections. Even now the roar of discontent is being heard.

Mr. WOORUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] a moment ago charged that the W. L. B. was the agency which forced Montgomery Ward & Co. to accept the demands of union leaders. I wish to remind him and the House that action was taken by the President of the United States himself and not by any board which he had appointed.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have expressed myself many times on that phase of it. I recall the sit-down strikes. I recall the attitude of the administration, but we will not go into that now. At the present moment, where are we and what are we going to do about it?

I want to refer again to that social-security item in the President's message yesterday. How guardedly he spoke of it, but it is there. C. W. A., P. W. A., F. E. R. A., and all the others come to my mind. All I can say is that it had "a very ancient, fish-like smell, to me." But if needed, the same procedure would be followed again, no matter what it would cost. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] implies that now, because of our great debt, we must not do that any more. But, the President has told you so many times, "What of our national debt? It is an internal debt. We owe it only to ourselves. What of it?" He rejoiced that "the silly dollar sign has been removed from the lend-lease legislation."

I admire him as a war President, of course. The Speaker of the House lauded him yesterday: "If you searched the country over, you could not have found such as he as a war leader." Let us accept that, but his economics are terrible.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Did not the President yesterday leave the inference or impression that social security was in the next campaign to take the place of W. P. A.?

Mr. GIFFORD. He left that impression perhaps among many, but, as I say, the thing smells, as I expressed it. He will continue to want blank checks. He wants no restraint in the checks to be handed out to the people. How the people loved those checks. How he fed even our wealthy towns checks as Christmas presents. No regard as to whether or not those communities needed assistance. Any community which asked for it got it. That is why he was reelected and reelected. There was not so much of that type of money in evidence lately. Votes were lacking They have not been so liberal lately. Good old Senator GLASS and many other Democrats have said, "Oh, yes; these have been bought elections; it is all perfectly plain."

But this is getting to be a little political, is it not?

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. What I have to say is not political. The gentleman well knows the subterfuge that has been resorted to of taking these pay-roll taxes and spending the money, and some day the people will have to pay it over again. The spenders feel that on the theory that they are making the public feel that they are performing a humanitarian service, they propose to open up social security, widen it, get those taxes in and spend them. Some day the people will have to pay them all over again.

Mr. GIFFORD. How often have I drawn that sorry picture. The Congress has lost its power and its dignity. It has handed over to the President of the United States so many blank checks that the public now seems aroused about it. We must act differently. Now, how differently will you act? I have often taken the floor, for the reason that my colleagues have seen to it that I was given the chairmanship of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I am still ranking Member on that committee. They point their finger at me and say, "Why do you not do something?" I say to you new Members that I offered, day in and day out, orders of investigation in 1933, 1934, and 1935, and those orders would be referred to the committee. Then the chairman would write to the department and they would send a brief whitewash explanation, and then before the 10 days expired it moved to lay the whole matter on the table. The majority would not let the committee make one single investigation. They refused to investigate their own doings.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to touch on a phrase in the President's speech of yesterday which I do not think is political. I am reluctant to bring my friend into a discussion of this delicate issue. The President said there are but few in our midst who place appetite above patriotism.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I was going to refer to that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to ask this question: What was the primary cause of revolutions throughout the history of the world? Was it not want of food, want of warmth? What were the primary causes?

Mr. GIFFORD. Those were the primary causes, but not all the causes. Another cause of revolution was the effort to gain power. To turn a government out they would stir up a revolution, as they used to in countries in South America, and in perhaps 3 days, with little bloodshed, the existing government would be overturned and a new one established. I refer back to Theodore Roosevelt's time. When any nation got power by revolution he paid little attention, because he said that was the only way in some countries that the bad could be turned out and the good get in.

But he was watchful as to how they carried on after they got into power. Mr. Wilson came in and changed that version: He would not recognize any Government that gained power by revolution and refused so consistently that we had a war with Mexico and got in bad with Haiti and several other nations all because of his doctrine that he would not recognize any government that came into power by that route.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I proceed?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What are the greatest enemies of physical man? Are not hunger and cold the two greatest enemies of physical man?

Mr. GIFFORD. When a people are hungry and cold they will resort to any measures; yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And they forget patriotism almost invariably.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to develop that point a little.

Mr. GIFFORD. I fear they would be forced to put their appetities above their patriotism. Already deaths and intense suffering from freezing weather are recorded in Boston.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Always. Let us take the young man who is on the raft, the situation referred to by our distinguished majority leader: What did he

think about? He thought about two or three crackers, whatever it was; he did not think in terms of sacrificing his life for his country; he thought in terms of food to put into an empty stomach, an empty intestine. That is what we are going back to, the law of self-preservation, the law of the preservation of the species. We cannot get away from it. Now, let me ask the gentleman this question: On page 7 of this copy of the President's message I now have, referring to economic opportunities after the war ends, it states:

When the boys come back after winning the war they expect the opportunity to work, to run their farms, their stores, earn decent wages. They are eager to face the risks inherent in our system of free enterprise.

What is there in the present program that is destroying the small industries of this country? What is there in the present program that is making it more impossible for the little farmer to operate? I do not refer to the irrigation farmer who operates in terms of hundreds of acres or thousands of acres with Mexican labor and Indian labor where it can be resorted to; I refer to the fellows in the so-called bread basket and in the diversified farming areas. What are we now doing to preserve the capital structures of those agricultural operators and those small enterprise operators? Does the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. GIFFORD. The message carefully avoided all that. The gentleman knows perfectly well from past experience that the New Deal cares little about capital structures. Has not that been demonstrated constantly? Capital has constantly been attacked the last 8 years. They wanted T. V. A.'s; they want now to put them on the Danube and on rivers all over the world. They did everything they could to kill private capital invested in power and then boasted to us "how fortunate we are to have a T. V. A." They have done everything to ruin the capital structures of business enterprises. The businessman has been harassed to the point of nonendurance.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to enlarge on that?

Mr. GIFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us take the Puerto Rican situation. They go down in Puerto Rico and take over the private industries. The Boston court, I believe, rendered a decision forcing them to let go of the industries because they had acquired them illegally. What do they do now? They turn right around and recapture those private industries away from the owners without due process of law and contrary to the opinion of the court. That is what is happening to private business now.

Mr. GIFFORD. Exactly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what has happened even in Puerto Rico, let alone the United States itself.

Mr. GIFFORD. What has happened to the Congress? What has happened to the courts? What happened to the Supreme Court under the New Deal? Because a man was elected, reelected, and again reelected: We must now harken to the voice of the people. It is said that "the voice of the people is the voice of God." What should Congress do? Has the time now arrived when we should assert ourselves? Will those brave words of our Speaker come true and will Congress reassert itself? I doubt it.

For many years I have seen the leaders over here who are supposed to lead go to the White House, take orders, come back and actually drive you. To you new Members let me say that we have witnessed many times when there was a bill before this Congress which many of them did not want to vote for according to their conscience. At the end of the day's debate the last two speakers, the majority leader and the Speaker, would be recognized and say to them: "These Republicans want to destroy our President." They have not only pleaded with you, they have driven you, these leaders whom you have elected. We must demand that our leaders lead, not drive. I have spoken of this before.

I trust the new Members will help us. We cordially welcome you new Members. I also see new ladies here. I welcome the ladies, although I realize that it presents a difficulty to us. The ladies have a tremendous advantage over us. When they think, they must speak. "When a lady's in the case—all other things must give place."

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The corollary of that is that when the gentleman speaks, they must think.

Mr. GIFFORD. Every bird loves to hear himself sing. Do not I?

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. It seems to me the gentleman from Massachusetts has framed a very severe indictment against the New Deal. I am wondering whether the gentleman has been impressed as I have that the disciples of the New Deal should attempt to interrogate the gentleman from Massachusetts or defend their past misadministrations and maladministrations. It seems to me that some of the bold defenders, the erstwhile disciples if not the present disciples, would take this occasion to interrogate the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. The silence which prevails is very significant to me.

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield now, if there is any gentleman who wishes to challenge any statement.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to say that I have 15 minutes following the gentleman for whatever it may be worth.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman tell us whether he is a New Dealer or not?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will in my 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will it take you 15 minutes to explain it?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal has been simply a process of swapping old troubles for new, and most of the time the new troubles are worse than the old. Now, a word of warning from the Bigelow papers: "A genuine statesman must be on his guard. If you must have beliefs, don't have them too hard." Do not be disappointed if you do not seem to attain great influence in this body, but speak your mind plainly, then you will at least have a conscience that will comfort you.

If you come here to protect tomatoes, your conscience can be educated rather easily against anything that would militate against tomatoes. You may feel forced sometime to vote with somebody else for something he wants so he will be sure to vote for your tomatoes. Avoid this all you can, but it will be a great temptation.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not want to take up any of the gentleman's time——

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is very welcome to interrupt.

Mr. RANKIN. But I will take some time in a few days to answer the gentleman's argument and the arguments of anyone else in the House relative to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The T. V. A. is worth more to this country today than any other development that has yet been accomplished by any administration in your day and mine.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman has so often stated that he is dead against socialism, yet that is the most outstanding socialistic experiment that has ever been attempted.

Mr. RANKIN. The trouble with the gentleman from Massachusetts is that he does not seem to discriminate between what is socialism itself and what is real democracy, and what is real, sound public business. The power business is a public business—especially when it handles water power that already belongs to the public, as is the case of the T. V. A.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am glad one man will stand up here and show up my weaknesses while I am still talking and not wait until I take my seat.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wonder if the gentleman from Mississippi thinks it takes the T. V. A. and the expenditure of millions of dollars, $50,000,000, $100,000,000, or $115,000,000 to throw any light on the New Deal and what it has been doing to us?

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that I am not sure that all the electricity generated by the T. V. A. would throw sufficient light on his mind to make him confess his errors.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am in quite a bit of difficulty. It would take a surgical operation to change the gentleman's mind.

Mr. HOFFMAN. While the gentleman from Mississippi is trying to convert me, will he explain why it is, with all the T. V. A. and all the money of the northern taxpayers that has been sent into Mississippi, you still have the highest

percentage of people who cannot read and write down there? Turn some of that light on down there where it belongs so that they may have an opportunity to read.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman that he is wrong about that. They may not be able to write so he can read it and understand it, but they can read and write. Let me say again that the T. V. A. program, or the Rural Electrification program, which grew out of the T. V. A., has done more for the farmers of the district of the gentleman from Michigan than he would do, at the present rate, if he stayed here 50 years.

Mr. GIFFORD. And it has bled people in Massachusetts in inverse ratio. Let us have no more of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to inject a note into this T. V. A. discussion, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi this serious question. Can the gentleman tell us now the approximate tonnage, the annual production, or give us any tonnage figures of fertilizer or superphosphates now being turned out down there?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] that I have not kept up as carefully with that phase of the T. V. A. development as I have with power production. When I entered this Congress all of the American people were using 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. Today the T. V. A. is producing 10,000,000,000 a year, and if it were not for that 10,000,000,000 kilowatts we would be suffering terribly for want of electricity in connection with the manufacture of aluminum and the carrying on of our war program. The T. V. A. has justified itself every day of its existence.

Mr. GIFFORD. Let us hurrah for the T. V. A. and have no more of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like to ask the gentleman why it is that the seven Congressmen from Mississippi received so few votes; why apparently the voters of Mississippi did not vote for Congressmen. Is it because of the great ability of your candidates or because you do not let the folks vote down there, or because they have no interest in their elections?

Mr. RANKIN. I am glad to answer that. It is because the people had so much confidence in their Representatives that they did not get out and run all over the district to get somebody to run against them, or to try to defeat them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will yield further, can the gentleman from Mississippi in his remarks on the T. V. A. on the next occasion give the House information with respect to the production of commercial fertilizer or superphosphate that is now flowing, and can he obtain the figures with regard to the prospective production as well? I have been unofficially informed that England has requisitioned from us under lease-lend a greater quantity of fertilizer for the coming year than our total production in the United States. I have been officially informed by the T. V. A. literature as late as this week, from Mr. Hall, that the total 6-year production is approximately 275,000 tons, and that about 100,000 tons of this has been distributed to approximately 30,000 farmers over a great number of States, probably 24 of them.

It seems to me that if there is any way we can possibly materially increase the production of superphosphate in the T. V. A. at the present time we should do so to help alleviate the foodstuffs situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. I seem to have opened up a real discussion, as I hoped I would. I know that some will take the floor after me and claim that I have not made many constructive suggestions. We must only hope that the majority members are equipped to do that.

When I came here—perhaps you would not believe it—I was a radical; but I found so many dangerous radicals here that I seized the conservative end of the rope and have since pulled with all my might to save my country from the blessings of the New Deal.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I personally feel that rural electrification is one of the most essential programs in our Nation today for this reason: The farmers of my community find it necessary to work both day and night in order to make a living, and we feel they are entitled to electric light in order to do that. Realizing that they cannot do this indefinitely, what relief has the administration to offer them?

Mr. GIFFORD. I listened to the many 1-minute speeches made today on the dire straits of the dairy farmers and would now like to extend my heartfelt sympathy to the Vice President. How will he be able to live up to his implied promise to furnish a quart of milk a day to the needy ones of the entire world? This is not facetious. It is illustrative only.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

## THE DUTIES OF THIS CONGRESS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-eighth Congress has the opportunity of being one of the very greatest if not the greatest Congress in the history of this Nation. In my judgment, we must do better if we are to live up to that standard than we have done so far today. I believe this place from which I speak now must continue to be the well of the House and not a wailing wall. Criticism there will have to be, but in times like the present it should in every case be accompanied by constructive proposals for the correction of what is wrong.

I also believe, and I say this with all earnestness to both Republicans and Democrats, that this is not an hour in which debate should be carried on by attempts at labeling one another, but rather by each of us standing up and telling where we stand as exactly as we know how.

Transcending the things that have been said here in the House today, there stands out one great paramount fact. Throughout this world young men and old men, women and children, are struggling in the most colossal war in all the history of humanity. The people have never so struggled in any war in all history but what they struggled with ideals welling in their hearts and with the conception in their minds of a better world tomorrow. Anybody who neglects those considerations fails in his duty. If this Congress would be truly great it must not only stand for its own powers and prerogatives but it must also be continually at work on constructive programs of its own for the winning of the war first and for the meeting of the very great problems of the peace second.

It does not seem to me now that we can carry through the work of this Congress as we ought to do it unless we do two things.

I am perfectly ready to join with anybody in criticism of the maladministration of parts of this Government program. I happen to be the Member, answering partially what was said a little while ago, who introduced the bill in the last session to provide for the deferment from the draft of all agricultural workers who had even one dependent. I think I have been as active as everyone else in insisting that in the administration of the rationing program, authority and discretion should be placed in the hands of the local boards, instead of depending upon decisions from Washington or Detroit, as to how much gasoline a farmer or a truck operator should have, for example. I am not afraid to speak my piece and say what I think, and I am going to say exactly what I think wherever the chips may fall, and I appeal to anybody on either side of the aisle to do likewise. But the second thing that I recognize as my responsibility is to bring forth a constructive proposal every time I make a criticism, and to do my part in explaining to the people the reason for certain measures and programs, if, indeed, they are really necessary to the winning of the war.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, because I believe I know what he is going to say, and after that I request not to be interrupted.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. The gentleman says that he always likes to let the chips fall where they might.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Even though they may fall upside down, although that is beside the point. That

gave me an excuse to refer to a speech that the gentleman made the other day, and I think it is an opportune time to refer to it now. The gentleman made the statement that the final report of the Dies commitee was presented to the members of the Dies committee on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is correct, substantially. There was no opportunity for discussion of it.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. But the gentleman from California knows that we had the same length of time to amend or correct that report that we have had on any report.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Oh, no.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey rose.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Oh, the gentleman has asked his question and I have only 15 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I am coming to the question now. I think that the gentleman was very unfair to the chairman of the Dies committee when he made that statement, because every other member of the committee that I have spoken to knows that we had plenty of time to amend that report, and that it was not given to us on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Furthermore, the gentleman also knows that on the Axis report, which was fully made up, and to which the gentleman from California wrote the introduction, the only reason that report was not submitted to the House was because the majority members of the Dies committee could not agree to the introduction which the gentleman from California wrote.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I refuse to yield further. I will answer that by saying that in the first place my complaint about that annual report was that in previous annual reports, the committee has met and considered the reports, and had an opportunity to express our views on the matter. This time there was no such opportunity. I have signed every previous annual report since I have been a member of the committee. In every case the committee met together for their consideration.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. It was not——

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Oh, I refuse to yield further. The only opportunity a member of the committee had was to say "Yes" or "No" to the report as submitted, and there was no chance to meet and discuss the matter. I am not blaming anybody. I hope I have not been unfair to anybody. I have only stated a fact.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey rose.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Oh, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. The gentleman is afraid to yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not afraid to yield. With regard to the other report I worked hard upon it. The fact is the report has not been issued. I did my work at the request of the chairman of the committee. It is probably true that some members did not agree with some of the things in that report. I should like to have had a meeting on that report, so that it might have been possible to discuss and issue it.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield to me? Let me ask one question.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. All right.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Does not the gentleman also agree that the introduction that the gentleman wrote for the Axis report was nothing more than a whitewash of the New Deal?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not so agree by any manner of means, nor did it have anything whatsoever to do with that question. Furthermore, I am altogether ready as the gentleman must know to discuss changes in that report which other members may believe should be made in it.

Now I want to proceed with my speech.

I offer no excuses when I say that in so colossal an undertaking as the defeat of the Axis Powers will be, inevitably mistakes will be made. Mistakes have been made. Inevitably there will be privations and difficulties through which the people will have to pass. Any man who will do only a part of his job, namely, point out the difficulties, point out the failures, point out the maladjustments, without at the same time taking responsibility for suggesting where those things can be corrected, and being constructive in the approach that he takes toward those problems, it seems to me is not doing all that he should. In connection with the keynote that was sounded at the opening of this session of Congress, I want to place myself squarely on record in support of things that have been said by the Speaker of the House and others about the importance of the Congress having the right to initiate legislation and assuming its full and proper place in the scheme of American government. I would go further than that. I would suggest, as a case in point, that I believe that most Members of Congress have been conscious of the fact for a long time that in addition to the taxes which we have to levy, a compulsory savings program will be necessary in this country before we have finished with the war. I wish most earnestly that regardless of recommendations that may have come from elsewhere, the Congress might have legislated on that matter and put into effect such a program. I give that only as an illustration.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am very anxious to proceed.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman said he was going to follow me. I expected him to tear my speech to pieces. Are you going to ignore me entirely?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Surely I do not intend to ignore the gentleman. If he will be patient for a moment, perhaps what I will have to say will answer some of the things he has in mind.

Mr. GIFFORD. I wish you would refute them. If I did not speak out and let the chips fall where they may, I will ask for forgiveness.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Massachusetts. And no one certainly would ever accuse him of not speaking out or that he was not ready to let the chips fall where they might.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am glad of that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. My appeal was a general appeal in which I hoped that Members on the Democratic side might be free to criticize the things which the administration did wrong, and at the same time that the gentlemen on the Republican side might take as constructive an attitude toward the matter as we do on this side. We have very real problems here, the greatest America has ever faced—the task of girding a free democratic nation to fight a total war. In connection with the war itself, I think it is important for the Congress to take a more active and continuous hand in straightening out matters that are wrong. I have introduced a resolution that provides that standing committees of the House should be constituted as agents of the House to conduct a continuing review of special agencies set up as a result of the action of those committees, to see whether in the committees' judgment their work is being carried on in accordance with the intent of Congress and to recommend such further legislation as in their judgment may be necessary.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to proceed for a moment, if I may. I believe with all my heart and soul that we face in the future the absolute necessity of the restoration of powers that have been granted specially to the Executive in connection with this war. I know that as long as the war lasts it is necessary for Congress to lodge in the Executive extraordinary powers. I know there is no escape from that. The proposal which I have made in this resolution is an attempt to enable Congress to discharge both its duties, not only the duty of granting extraordinary power but also the duty of seeing to it continuously that that power is exercised, not arbitrarily, but in accordance with the intent of Congress and in accordance with the needs of the American people, who are as earnestly and deeply desirous of carrying forward this war as they have ever been of anything in all history.

A little while ago I said that the one great outstanding fact that confronts us is the fact that men, women, and children of this world are engaged in this great war. Those people have hopes regarding the future. One of those hopes is that freedom and liberty shall live. Inevitably, if freedom and liberty are to live, the vigor of the legislative branch of this great Nation has to be preserved and builded.

I have made a couple of constructive suggestions here as to how that can be done. Inevitably also, however, the people of the world have the right—indeed, they have the need—to look forward after the winning of the war to the preservation of a just and lasting peace; yes, and to a better world in which there will be greater security for everyone of them than there has ever been before.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. I sensed in the opening part of the gentleman's statement that which might be characterized as an admonition. I am wondering whether the gentleman is presently, assuming the role of a pedagogue. If there was the admonition in pedagogic suggestion, the opening statement, I want to remind the gentleman that if they were intended for the benefit primarily of the new Members, the largest part of the new Members are on the Republican side and they probably will have their own pedagogues available who will admonish them if need be.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if what I had to say seemed to be pedagogical, I did not intend it so. I will say also that not one word was directed at any new Member of this House. As I sit here in these opening days, however, I do think about the new Members of the House, and one of the reasons I am making this speech now is because of the fact I think it tremendously important that the new Members of the House should hear the same type of constructive program as we heard from the Speaker and from the minority leader on the opening day of the session. I should like to see things carried on continuously on the plane they set. I should like to see that high idealism carried on throughout the session.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may have 5 additional minutes. He has yielded beyond the bounds of courtesy, and I would like to hear a connected presentation of his constructive statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does the gentleman mean by saying that he yielded beyond the bounds of courtesy?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman has a constructive speech. He has not been able to reach it yet. I should like to hear that speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Arizona that the gentleman's time has already been extended 5 minutes. The gentleman from California may proceed.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. There is one thing I hope for with all the earnestness in my heart and that is that this Congress on both sides of the aisle will recognize the intimate connection between a lasting peace on the one hand and the establishment of the right to work upon the other. One thing is certain. There must be and there will be good places in the economic life of this Nation for every man who returns from the winning of this war.

I put in the RECORD yesterday a column by Mr. Walter Lippmann which I hope everybody will read. In that column Mr. Lippmann makes the point that the one thing the people—above all, men in the fighting forces—will be thinking of when the war is finally won will be opportunity to take up again their own pursuits of business, to work at a real job, not an emergency work program, but a real job. This is a fundamental problem that has got to be solved in some manner which will not imply or include an extension of the powers of Government bureaus or agencies over the everyday lives of the people. There are other ways in which that can be done, and it can be done if we found our policy on one fundamental principle and that is this: That whenever the supply of needed goods exceeds the demand we will always increase that demand on the part of the people and never reduce the supply. So long as the war lasts there is one cardinal principle to be followed by our Nation and that cardinal principle is the principle that we will do all those things which will increase production for war and nothing that will reduce it; and when peace shall have at last been won again the cardinal principle that we have got to follow is the principle of full employment of all our resources and above all full employment of all our people on a basis of justice and equality to agriculture and small business as well as to other groups, and within the framework of a free economy. The achievement of these things is not easy, I know, but it is toward their achievement that I would beg us to work, and I would beg us to recognize this fact, too: That we must guard not only the prerogatives of the Congress but the name of the Congress as it goes before the people of this Nation. We must make clear to them that it is to their Congress as well as to their officials that they can look for constructive leadership.

There exists the danger that progress for the common men will become strangely associated in the minds of many people with increased Executive power and the creation of new agencies of government. That danger the Congress can remove if it is both wise and courageous. But only by advancing a program which will assure continuously a full flow of consumer buying power and the assurance at all times that that buying power will never fall below the point where it constitutes a full market for the products of agriculture and industry. That goal can, in my judgment, be reached by a wise and far-sighted monetary and fiscal policy by a program of national insurance against poverty in old age and similar contingencies by the removal of monopoly controls and bottlenecks. It can be accomplished without the imposition of governmental direction of the economic life of the people. But that hope that a better day after the suffering of this war be given to the people, that is my great concern, and the agency of government that offers that hope will be the one which will command the future. It is this thought, Mr. Speaker, that, above all, I want to leave with the House today.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand from the gentleman's last statement that he is abandoning the advocacy of a planned economy based upon economic scarcity and is now advocating that in the postwar period there must be an economy based upon a program of increased production?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. If the gentleman will examine my statements in the House or elsewhere over a period of years he will find I have emphasized over and over again that very principle.

Mr. KEEFE. In other words, the gentleman may have overemphasized that principle, but from some of the votes he has cast on bills which brought about this very managed economy of scarcity it would not seem so.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman is mistaken. Such influence as I have had has been exerted through the years against scarcity, artificial or otherwise. I have striven as hard as I knew how for a program that might end needless poverty and want in the future for our people.

Mr. KEEFE. And I am wondering if the gentleman supported these various control programs. If he did vote for them he is not now advocating them, is he?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; quite the contrary.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 35 minutes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative business in order for the day and after other special orders, I may be permitted to proceed for 35 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AIR ACCIDENTS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate Air Accidents for the Seventy-seventh Congress, I ask unanimous consent to file two reports and that they may be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of all business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, there are two or three issues I wish to cover in my brief remarks today. Certain documents have been executed and certain statements have been made and all within the recent past. I shall refer to them in this order:

On January 6, 1941, the "four freedoms" speech of the President, and then the calling for the enactment into law of the lend-lease and the facilitating or implementing of that law by an original $7,000,000,000 appropriation, which has since been expanded up to about $60,000,000,000.

The execution of the declaration of nations by some 28 countries.

The execution of the British master agreement.

The execution and announcement of the Atlantic Charter.

Those have since been followed by the release of the so-called White Paper by the State Department.

It seems to me that during the coming 2 years this Congress and our people will have to deal with the principles involved in those five basic steps. There is a gentleman up in Minnesota, Governor of that State, Mr. Stassen, who spoke in Minneapolis on the evening of the 7th of this month, and he expounded his views with reference to a post-war international program. I think his views are highly significant because of the high position he holds in national politics. At the moment I am in no position to go along with Mr. Stassen as he outlined his program. Perhaps someone can educate me into following what he had to say.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did the gentleman notice this morning's paper, first page, and the picture of the Governor of Minnesota together with his statement about the after-war situation?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I am referring to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And a parliament of all the nations of the world?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I am referring to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wish the gentleman would go into that a little further and tell us where we are going to come out.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Those are the things we will have to deal with during the coming 2 years. While I was home during the 2 weeks' vacation period I made it a point to discuss at every opportunity these five propositions I have just referred to. I find they are just as hot issues as is butter, bread, and milk, and other foodstuffs. These subjects will increase in interest in the months to come.

Our people are going to have something to say about these arrangements that are to be made in the post-war period, make no mistake about that. They involve politics, they involve economics, and there is no way we can escape the issue.

Mr. DEWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. I heard the gentleman's reference to a parliament. It might behoove some of the Members to read Mr. Streit's Union Now With Great Britain. There is nothing new in Mr. Stassen's suggestion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. DEWEY. It is all contained in that book.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it is all in there.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend from Michigan is not a knock-down artist, I know that, and I respect him when he disagrees with me. When he disagrees with Governor Stassen I know it is an honest disagreement. Without regard to party affiliations, I am sure the gentleman from Michigan will agree that Governor Stassen has made a contribution that men and women who want to try to take a step forward may well give consideration to, and in disagreement impersonally discuss it with profound respect to the man who is trying to make a great contribution.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it is tremendously important that Governor Stassen made that statement at the present time. I am glad he did make it. Remember what I said a moment ago—at this time I am not in agreement. I am subject to being educated, however, and the older Members of the House know my approach to many of these matters. I do not know what the people of this country are going to demand out of all this turmoil, and I make this statement today so that the people of my district will have an idea as to my general approach to the question. They may proceed to educate me, if they want to do so. I want these discussions on the coming post-war period to take place.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, there are two other things I would like to touch on at this time. I heard the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] today, and I shall not repeat it. I also heard one or two remarks of the gentleman from California. I wish to say that if we are to avoid inflation in this country we must meet our deficit, after paying taxes, through the citizens and their corporations—not including commercial banks—buying the bonds to make up the difference, if I make myself clear.

I am informed by the Treasury Department that during the past month the Treasury placed in the banks alone over $4,000,000,000 of that $11,000,000,000 issue. To me this $4,000,000,000 is the highest type of inflationary fuel that has been added to the fire. The December financing, plus the tax payments that are to be made within the next 60 days, along with the sale of savings bonds and purchase of tax-anticipation certificates, may run the Treasury to about the 1st of March next. I notice that during the first 6 days of January we have disbursed for war activities alone over $1,130,000,000, and for the month of December over $5,824,000,000. Members of the House, that is money on a large scale. Now, let me repeat in order to emphasize my thought: If we are to avoid inflation, the deficit remaining after such increases in taxation as Congress sees fit to provide must be financed out of the savings of individuals and the savings and uninvested accumulations of corporations. The exact form which these savings take is unimportant as long as they result in a reduction of consumer expenditure.

So we face a vast increase in taxation, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has indicated, and I am of the opinion that this Congress shall be forced to enact legislation calling for the purchase of Government securities to an extent far beyond the present imagination of our people. The rope is now beginning to tighten about our economic necks and from here on the flow will be outward if inflation of the most disastrous type is to be avoided.

Why should we expect the O. P. A. to stabilize living costs as referred to in the President's message yesterday? I do not expect Mr. Brown, if he is made Administrator, to do any better job there than has Mr. Henderson, because I do not expect the men in the O. P. A. to do the impossible. But I think when you ask them to maintain stabilization of the cost of living when we, the people, operate our fiscal policy so as to put three or four billion dollars per month into the commercial banks in the form of inflationary money, it just does not make sense. I suggest that you call up the Treasury and ask them what in their opinion is necessary for us to do if we are to avoid inflation, and see if they do not give you exactly the formula I have just given you.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman was speaking about Mr. Stassen. I, too, am glad that he made that statement. If he wants to take his position alongside Mr. Willkie, who became a stalking horse for the Democratic Party or the New Dealers, and aid in trying to put over another Democrat as the Republican nominee, that is all right. However, the gentleman spoke about being back home. Did he find anyone in his district, anyone at all, who wants to surrender our independence and enter an international combination?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not one man or woman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems rather strange that a Democrat should rise to the defense of a Republican, but I am doing this for the man whom I have had the pleasure of meeting, the man himself, whom I respect. Does the gentleman from Michigan, who has the floor, entertain the opinion that Governor Stassen would be a stalking horse for anybody?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have never met the gentleman. I do not believe he would. I certainly would not charge him with that.

THE FARM MANPOWER SITUATION

Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said today about manpower on the farms. We are in the middle of a very bad situation. The act of November 13, 1942, amending the Selective Service Act provides that every registrant found by a selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained. Theoretically, may I say that language was intended to arrest the rapid induction into the military and naval forces of the young trained agriculturists of this country. But the young boys and girls of the towns and cities and the men and women over 38 years of age of the towns and cities are not offering themselves for sacrifice on the altars of the farms of this country. These town and city people prefer to remain inside the towns and cities where wages are high, hours are short, and comforts are available. But the farm boys, patriotic as anyone, preferring to not be stigmatized as slackers, ask for no deferment. The draft boards under pressure to meet their quotas proceed to draft the farm boys. Farm labor becomes scarcer from day to day; the demand for foodstuffs increases, and we move straight toward a "food Dunkerque." This is a vital question that should be settled by this Congress before the next 45 days roll around and before the time for spring planting has arrived. Unless we do settle this issue, the people of this country and other countries will go hungry on many an occasion. It is as important to fly E pennants over the homes of farmers and decorate farm workers as it is to follow such a course with respect to industrial plants and workers.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we are rapidly gaining a lot of national unity now, when we have prominent Democratic Members lauding prominent Republicans, and I think that augurs well for the future. I hope the list can be made more inclusive.

However, I did not take this time today to enter into that type of colloquy but to report back to the House on the developments which have taken place during the interim between the adjournment of the last Congress and the resumption of our activities, from the standpoint of the farm machinery situation in America.

On the last day the Seventy-seventh Congress was in session, December 16, I addressed the House on the subject of L–170, which was the limitation order of the War Production Board reducing the production of new farm machinery to 20 percent of the quotas available in 1940 and also establishing new quotas for farm machinery repairs. I pointed out at that time as best I could the positive inability of the farmers of America to meet the food demands of the United Nations and of this country unless they were to be given the machinery essential to farm operations.

At that time I read at some length from a document prepared by the Department of Agriculture and by the Farm Machinery and Equipment Branch of the War Production Board, which they submitted to the Division of Civilian Supply, insisting that limitation order L–170 was too drastic and that it would jeopardize our entire food-for-victory program.

I pointed out how these governmental departments and agencies closely related to the agricultural problem were in direct conflict with the Division of Civilian Supply, which had as its Director a lawyer from New York City who is not familiar with the problems confronting the farmer.

Two days after that I wrote a letter to Mr. Donald Nelson, the Chairman of the War Production Board, calling attention to my remarks on the floor and offering additional reasons why, in my opinion, it was imperative that action be taken at once to relax Limitation Order 170 and to make available new farm machinery and additional repair parts.

I am happy to report back to the House now that under date of December 28 I received a letter in reply over the personal signature of Mr. Nelson, acknowledging receipt of my communication of the 18th and acknowledging recognition of the position I had presented on the floor of the House. I will quote one or two sentences of Mr. Nelson's letter, because it seems to me it gives those of us representing agricultural States and gives the American people a new hope, because food is tremendously important in the conduct of this war. I quote now from Mr. Nelson's letter in response to the one I have mentioned:

> You will be glad to know further that the production of farm machinery in the quantities established by our Order L–170 has been accelerated through the efforts of our Division, which has been able to find more material for the manufacturers than at first appeared available. * * * The machinery-equipment manufacturing program originally expected to be complete by October 31, 1943, is now headed for completion June 30. * * * This is really equivalent to increasing the amount of machinery by at least one-third.

Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity to check Mr. Nelson's arithmetic on this but I sincerely hope the promised one-third increase in new farm machinery is made available without delay as it will mean much to the food-for-victory program which American farmers are now promoting so vigorously.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point the complete text of my letter to Mr. Nelson and his reply, and of a letter I wrote in reply to that one, stressing the importance of the farm-machinery repair situation and urging additional action along these lines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., December 18, 1942.*

Mr. DONALD M. NELSON,
*Chairman, War Production Board,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. NELSON: As you recall, I have conferred with you in the past primarily on matters pertaining to the impact of war activities upon our small businessmen in the Middle West and you have shown a very considerate attitude toward the problems I have presented. This letter is to call to your attention a very serious situation which has arisen in the farming regions of America and to request you to take action which will provide a remedy for conditions which seem likely to imperil the Nation's entire food-for-victory program. I have discussed this situation with many of the men under you. I now call it to your personal attention because I believe that only by securing your personal attention to the problems involved can the necessary correctives be secured.

On the closing day of the present Congress I discussed America's growing food problems on the floor of the House, and my remarks will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 16, starting on page 9977. You may or may not have had them called to your attention or have seen press statements reporting them. To be sure that this problem comes to your personal attention and to make the direct request that you take action to relieve the serious shortage of farm machinery which now threatens to jeopardize America's farming operations, I am writing you this letter and making a brief summary of some of the pertinent factors involved. I am positive that you appreciate the vital part that food supplies play in the winning of this war and the highly important role they will play as "American aces in the hole" when the opportunity comes to bring peace to the world. There may well come a time when ample reserves of food will speak more effectively than bullets in convincing some of our adversaries that unconditional surrender followed by nourishing food for starving families is preferable to continued resistance followed by eventual defeat, additional casualties, sustained hunger, and pestilence. Thus food may come to play a part in this war fully as important as munitions and implements of war. America must not—dare not—run the risk that unwise or unduly stringent curtailment of the farm machinery needed to produce this food prevents our having our larder full if such a time should come.

It happens that there has come into my hands a copy of the official memorandum submitted on June 23, 1942, by your own officials in the Farm Machinery and Equipment Industry Branch of the War Production Board working in conjunction with the Department

of Agriculture. This memorandum proposes what these experts in the problem of food production consider to be a bare and irreducible minimum amount of new farm machinery which our farmers must have in 1943 if they are to meet the food quotas established for them. These recommendations were prepared after careful surveys of all the factors involved—existing inventories of new machinery, existing machinery now in use on the farms, replacement needs, food quotas established by the Government, availability of manual labor, and the possibility of substituting horse-drawn machines for present power machinery. This study was made by the men best qualified in our Government to make it and with a full realization of the necessity of utilizing our supply of raw material in such a manner that it can make the greatest possible contribution to the war effort.

Unfortunately—and it seems to me very unwisely—the Division of Civilian Supply of War Production Board, however, over-ruled the findings of these experts in farm production. Instead of alloting the irreducible minimum of 50 percent of 1940 farm machinery production for 1943 as the agricultural experts recommended, the Division of Civilian Supply reduced this quota down to 20 percent of the 1940 levels. The official memorandum to which I have previously referred bluntly states that this 20 percent will not do the job. Since producing the food needed to win this war and to promote an earlier victorious peace is a vital necessity, the job must be done.

I do not know where the fundamental difficulty arises. It may be from the fact that farm machinery is apparently classified as a "civilian supply" whereas it is actually an "implement of war" since men must eat to shoot and food equals ammunition in importance when it comes to long-time planning in wartime. If this is the primary difficulty, I respectfully recommend that farm machinery be given a military rating and a corresponding priority so that adequate supplies of new farm machinery can be made available.

Perhaps the difficulty has its genesis in other sources. During my remarks on the floor of the House on Wednesday, Congressman CARLSON, of the great farming State of Kansas, stated that export quotas of farm machinery were being increased while domestic allotments were being decreased. It is possible that further investigation will throw some doubt on the wisdom of such a policy as it is certainly more important to increase the supplies of food which we can control and have easy access to than to curtail those supplies of food while placing over much reliance on foreign sources of food which we cannot control and which comprise a serious transportation hazard. It would be gratifying if we could increase both our exports and domestic quotas of farm machinery; however, if both objectives are impossible, I believe the policy of suppressing our own production while speculating on foreign assistance is open to serious question. I doubt that it is fundamentally any more sound than would be reducing our own production of bombers in order to ship plane-building machinery to other countries with the hope they would make our bombers for us.

Whatever the origin of the problem facing us in the matter of a very possible and probable food shortage, we must find an answer to it or provide some authority higher than the Department of Agriculture to assure American citizens that the Department's findings are wrong and that the Division of Civilian Supply is solely right.

My own observations in actual contact with the farmers who live on the land and who must produce our food leads me to believe most sincerely that the experts who have advised the War Production Board that the 20-percent limitation is too severe and will jeopardize our very war effort by imperiling our food supply have presented a true and valid report. I have seen old, used farm machinery selling at auction sales at prices far higher than corresponding new machinery would bring if it were available at normal or even ceiling prices. That means, Mr. Nelson, nothing else than that farmers are desperate in their need for farm machinery. I have seen good, responsible, experienced farmers leaving their farms and productive land lying idle because of the dual difficulty of securing either adequate farm help or necessary farm machinery. The problem of farm labor is beyond your jurisdiction but the problem of farm machinery will be solved by you and your advisers or it will plague us all and portend possible disaster for our cause. Therefore, I plead with you to give this matter your immediate personal attention and to relax the restrictions on farm machinery sufficiently to assure the fighting forces of America of a full mess kit and our workers of a full dinner pail.

I realize that you are a very busy man administering a complex organization which might well demand your full attention if you could divide yourself into quintuplets. I know that you cannot give personal attention to all the decisions and regulations of the officials working with you. However, I know, too, you have a well-earned reputation for not hesitating to act when emergency requires it. I respectfully submit, Mr. Nelson, that this is such a time and that the foregoing briefly summarizes such a case. America must not commit the unforgivable travesty on good management of failing to utilize the vast productive sources of its rich agricultural expanses at a time in our national history when ample reserves of food may well mean more to us than at any previous time. Therefore, I respectfully urge that you take early and effective action to correct the present situation and to make the necessary farm machinery available to our American farmers in order that both those who fight abroad and those who serve at home may be assured of adequate and proper food.

I assure you of my continued cooperation toward this objective and I feel confident that this call for action will not fall on barren ground.

With kindest personal regards and a keen appreciation of the great service you are rendering America in your monumental responsibilities, I am,

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
*Member of Congress, South Dakota.*

---

DECEMBER 28, 1942.

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of December 18 has been read with care and deep interest. The views which you express are generally in agreement with my own.

You will be interested to know that at my direction our Farm Machinery Equipment Division is following the matter of adequate supply of such items in closest cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and that I am in contact with Mr. Wickard, Food Administrator, on matters pertinent to this subject quite frequently, often several times a day. You will be glad to know further that the production of farm machinery in the quantities established by our Order L–170 has been accelerated through the efforts of our Division, which has been able to find more material for the manufacturers than at first appeared available. What this means is that the machinery-equipment manufacturing program originally expected to be complete by October 31, 1943, is now headed for completion June 30. Besides matching farming season better, this is really equivalent to increasing the amount of machinery by at least one-third, which will give a result even better than that originally requested by the Department. One of our joint problems with the Department has been the distribution of these products and repair parts, but that is having the attention of the two groups and is well on the way to solution. Furthermore, the over-all problem is being treated comprehensively and arrangements are now under study to provide that there shall be no interruption of the production of this class of equipment, but, rather, that the program for 1944 shall be started immediately on the completion of that for 1943.

I believe you can feel safely assured yourself and can communicate to your constituents that the food sector of our national effort is recognized to be equally important with the military sector, is being subjected to only such limitations as our supplies of materials imposed on all parts of the program, and that the plans for producing repair parts and food-producing equipment will be prepared and executed with the highest degree of skill which can be brought to bear upon them.

Thanking you for your interest and your helpful observations, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. NELSON,
*Chairman.*

---

JANUARY 8, 1943.

DONALD M. NELSON,
*Chairman, War Production Board,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. NELSON: Thank you sincerely for your good letter of December 28, written in response to my communication of December 16. I sincerely appreciate the careful and personal attention which you devoted to my correspondence and to the remarks which I made on the floor of the House on December 16.

Your assurance, under date of December 28, that you were taking steps to accelerate the production of farm machinery so that it would be "equivalent to increasing the amount of machinery by at least one-third" is indeed gratifying. Your office has frequently given very helpful and considerate cooperation in matters which I have brought to your personal attention, and I am sure that an increase of 33⅓ percent in the amount of machinery available to America's farmers for this season's farming activities is a wise and prudent move. Certainly none of us want to leave any stones unturned in making positive the fact that those fighting with us in the United Nations, our own armed forces, and the people of America have an adequate food supply to maintain a healthful and strength-producing diet. Manpower and machinery are basic considerations if farmers are to be able to keep our breadbasket full.

It is also gratifying to learn from your letter of December 28 that the highly important problem of providing for the distribution of both new farm machinery and repair parts is receiving your special study I would like to emphasize at this time the direct relationship between the dealers in farm equipment and the availability and adequacy of repair parts. By far the greater percentage of America's crops will be handled by used machinery at any given period of our history; consequently, the job of keeping these machines properly repaired is both a colossal and an inoperative one.

This has been recognized by the officials with whom the War Production Board has consulted on the matter of farm production. The Department of Agriculture experts, and the experts of the farm machinery and equipment industry branch of the War Production Board itself have emphasized the importance of maintaining an adequate dealer organization for keeping them supplied with repair parts. The Selective Service Administration

has now arranged to provide deferments for essential repairmen in the farm-machinery field; however, for this deferment to be effective it is essential that dealer organizations be maintained.

I trust that you will keep this problem of maintaining farm-equipment dealers in business by giving them an adequate supply of repair parts before you until it is solved. It is absolutely impossible for farmers in many parts of the argicultural section of the country to keep their farm machinery in repair unless the retail-dealer outlets for farm machinery and farm machinery repair parts are kept open. I am sure that the manufacturers of farm machinery throughout the country would be able to suggest methods of achieving this in the event that your own organization runs into obstacles which it considers impossible to solve.

Please be assured of my continued cooperation in every way to help develop a program for handling farm machinery and repairs which will prevent America's food-for-victory program from being jeopardized at the very source of its supply. With continued best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
*Member of Congress.*

Mr. MUNDT. I quote now just briefly from the same document from which I quoted on the 16th day of December, the day the old Congress adjourned, this interdepartmental communication prepared by authorities of the Department of Agriculture and by those Members of the War Production Board who are most directly connected with agriculture and who understand best the problems of the farmer. I read from this interoffice communication:

From the foregoing arguments it will be seen why the Farm Machinery and Equipment Branch cannot concur in the small amounts of farm machinery and equipment recommended by the Division of Civilian Supply for production in 1943.

In my remarks on the 16th of December I pointed out the paucity of information from the standpoint of the farmer and the food needs of the country which are reposed in the Division of Civilian Supply, and pointed out how it is in the hands of men from the big cities who do not understand the problems of food production. So I am very happy that this letter I have read indicates, according to Mr. Nelson's own statement, that we are to get one-third more farm machinery available on the farms than was contemplated originally. That will help correct one big error of the Division of Civilian Supply in insisting upon its original order, L–170.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it the man in charge of the civilian supplies is a man named Weiner.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; Joseph Weiner, of New York City.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He is from Brooklyn, is he not?

Mr. MUNDT. From New York City proper, I believe, but either city is a long way from the farming sections of America.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think one of the big troubles that we are experiencing in agriculture and the failure to solve the farm machinery and manpower problem is due to the fact that there are a great many from the larger cities who formulate these policies, who do not understand anything about farm production.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, I agree.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It occurs to me, and I have had repeated conferences with those gentlemen in both the Department of Agriculture and the W. P. B., that they should put men in those positions who appreciate that it takes manpower and machinery to produce food, and that if they do not supply that, there will come a chaotic condition in this country, and famine or starvation for the people.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman has made a pertinent point and he is representing a great farming district. He knows that mine is also one of the great farming districts. We have great respect for the ability of farmers, but neither he nor I would like to see a situation where farmers were taken from the farms in South Dakota and Minnesota and brought here to Washington and put in charge of war plants to manufacture bombers or tanks. It is equally wrong when they bring people from Brooklyn or New York City and put them in charge of a food-production program. They are not familiar with the problems involved. They cannot develop programs which are based on the realistic situations confronting our farmers.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think some of our farmers would do just as well, or probably better, if they were in charge of some of these other programs. At least they would use some horse sense in regard to the matter.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; if they would put farmers in charge of food-production programs and farm-machinery quotas, the results would be better.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I compliment the gentleman for bringing to us the additional information in respect to farm machinery. Did not our recent amendment to the Selective Service Act provide that the farm boys were not to be inducted into the service until substitutes were available to take their place, or words to that effect?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; I think that is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Men and women over 38 years of age who live in the towns and cities are not offering themselves to the farm, are they, and the young men and young women who live in the towns and cities who have not gone into the military service are not yet offering themselves to the farms?

Mr. MUNDT. Obviously not, because they can earn very much more money in the city.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then where are the substitutes to come from in order to permit men to be deferred, so that we may maintain our food production? That is a practical problem that we face at this moment on this question of farm manpower. It seems to me that this country faces a food Dunkerque before we will meet the manpower problem with reference to food production, and I think this Congress can well afford within the next 45 days, before the planting season occurs, to recast the Selective Service Act and get down to brass tacks and leave the boys on the farm who are there now and who are being classified and reclassified as 1–A in almost every draft area in the United States, because the draft board says that they have to make such a report.

Mr. MUNDT. It should be as clear as night follows day that if you give the farmer neither manpower nor machinery he will be unable to produce the food that is needed in this country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The notion of the administration in this proposal seems to be that they are going to take experienced men off the farms and replace them with Mexicans and old men and old women from the villages and cities of the country.

Mr. MUNDT. Who are not offering themselves voluntarily.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right; and in the face of involuntary servitude, how are you going to put them on the farm?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Has the gentleman heard anything to the effect that in the process of rationing the farm machinery, discrimination is being practiced against farmers who have not signed up with the triple A?

Mr. MUNDT. No such complaint has been brought to my attention.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman would certainly be opposed to any such discrimination?

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly would be opposed to any practice of discrimination as between farmers who are trying to fill the bread basket of America.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Has the gentleman given any consideration to the idea of moving about a million Federal employees out on the farms to aid in the production of food?

Mr. MUNDT. I think there are perhaps nearly a million Federal employees that could well be moved out of Federal employment and put somewhere where they might produce, but I doubt very much their efficacy on the average American farm.

Now, continuing the matter of farm repairs, which comes closely to the question of farm machinery, and farm labor and quoting further from this interoffice communication, I read this:

Considering the machines and equipment that must be replaced yearly due to fire losses

or completely wearing out, the greatly increased shortage of labor, the continual decrease in horse and mule population, the increased acreage in normal crops, and the greatly increased acreages in new crops, we believe that such a small amount of equipment will not suffice—

Remember, this word "we" refers to the authorities in the Government agencies who are directly charged with the administration of farm problems and who know farming conditions best—

we believe that such a small amount of equipment will not suffice to keep the farmer's productive ability anywhere near a normal level; yet a food production level more than 10 percent above 1941 is required.

I submit to you it is a serious problem confronting every Member of this Congress when officials of the Government, charged with the food production of this country, state in a Government publication that they believe we cannot even keep the food production normal under these conditions this year, and you know and I know that the Administration is asking for a 10-percent increase in food production.

I quote further:

Furthermore, aside from the difficulties of actual production, we cannot overlook the key role played by the dealer. During the past several years, when ample stocks of new machinery and equipment could be bought to meet every requirement, it is reliably estimated that from 92½ to 95 percent of the crop production was accomplished by used machines and equipment. New equipment, though high in relative value, thus accounted for only 5 to 7½ percent of the total. This serves to emphasize the tremendous importance of maintaining a somewhat adequate dealer organization, both to control the proper distribution of repair parts and to provide the skilled labor service which has become so vitally necessary lately to the farmer owing to the increased amounts of power machinery. It is not unlikely that a program so low as to disrupt this dealer organization would be extremely detrimental to the farm production program.

The producing of repair parts by farm machinery and equipment manufacturers is quite complicated because they are continuing to service machines in the field that are from 30 to 40 years old. Repairs for such old machines, naturally, are not maintained in stock in nearly the proportions as for those of more recent manufacture. This means a large storage of patterns, tools, jigs, dies, gages, flasks, core boxes, drawings, etc. For one large implement plant the space required for such core boxes and flasks alone occupies a full city block piled 6 to 8 feet high. At this one plant over 200,000 different parts are made, and 1,500 men are required full time the year round on repair parts alone.

Such storage of equipment to produce parts for old machines must be maintained in a very orderly and fully cataloged manner to permit locating instantly any pattern, jig, etc., required. Proper maintenance of such equipment is a major task at any plant which has produced in large quantities over a period of years and the most economical and practical way of producing such parts is at the plants equipped to handle the work.

I wish to emphasize this situation, because the agricultural implement dealer renders a genuine service to the farmer who lives away from a large city. Unless dealers are located in these smaller communities there is no opportunity for farmers to get a repair part necessary to put his machine back in operation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman is aware of the fact that if the farmer breaks a part of his machinery, no matter how small it is, he may have to drive as far as 100 miles to get a priority to buy a 50- or 75-cent article. He cannot get it any other way. Am I correct?

Mr. MUNDT. The farmer is not only confronted with a priority order, but unless some recognition is given to the situation of the dealer, he will be unable even to find a dealer within 100 miles, in order to get the part.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Not only that, but he may have to make several trips sometimes in order to get one part.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. He has to squander and waste other critical materials such as gasoline and rubber in order to secure a part essential to his farm operations.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is often necessary for this farmer to get a repairman from the local machinery man to come out and install the new parts?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that point. It gives me an opportunity to say that the Selective Service Administration has done a commendable piece of work in that connection, because they have recently issued directives permitting local draft boards to defer mechanics who are skilled in repairing farm machinery. But the value of that concession will be entirely wiped off the boards unless some action is taken to keep the dealer in business, to enable him to have something to make those repairs with, so he can employ this repairman whom the Selective Service Administration is now willing to have deferred.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. You say the selective-service officials have issued directives permitting the draft boards to defer these mechanics?

Mr. MUNDT. I think it is more than permissive. I think it is recommending that they be deferred.

Mr. CRAWFORD. All right. It is my contention that when a draft board is placed under a squeeze to make up the quota, they will make up the quota, irrespective of permissive directives. We have to stop the drafting of experienced farm workers if you are going to have your food supplies. Starve to death if you want to. Take your choice.

Mr. MUNDT. I would like to go further than that. It seems to me that this Congress should take steps to keep the Selective Service Administration in Washington from passing the buck, in making difficult decisions, to the local draft boards, who serve without pay, who live in the local communities, and who patriotically give their services to the Government, and consequently should be given specific instructions from the proper agency in Washington on which they can make their decisions. Too many of the so-called directives issued by the Selective Service Administration here in Washington should be called suggestives instead. They simply comprise suggestions for meeting difficult problems and these Washington instructions to local draft boards frequently create more confusion than they cure. It is my conviction that it is the responsibility of the Selective Service Administration here in Washington to make its policies clear-cut and definite enough so that local draft boards will know that they are expected to defer essential farm labor and that other regulations as well should be so constructed that local boards will find it easier to administer their tasks. It should be made clear that an essential farm worker doing his best to help produce the food needed for victory by working 10, 12, and 15 hours on a farm is in no sense a draft dodger but is fully as important a factor in our war program as the man in the mine or working on the production line.

However, Mr. Speaker, let us not lose sight of the main object of this discussion. We are at the moment engaged in urging that the War Production Board make available as much new farm machinery as is needed to do the job and as many farm-machinery repairs as are necessary to keep existing farm machinery in usable form. We are also urging that steps be taken to retail this material and these services through established farm-implement dealers so that these dealers can afford to keep repairmen in their employment and to maintain their establishments so as to provide farmers with the service necessary to the maintenance of their farm machinery. I appreciate the interest in this problem displayed here today and also the many Members who have conferred with me about my talk of December 16 and the steps thus far recommended for solving the farm-machinery situation. I sincerely hope that all of you who represent farm States will give this problem your serious and personal attention and that you will join me in further appeals to the War Production Board for the development of a program which will assure the Nation that its farmers will have the tools with which to work.

At no time, in no place, and with no other group could the words "give us the tools and we will do the job" be used more truthfully and effectively than they can in connection with the pleas of the American farmer to be supplied with the machinery needed to fill the breadbaskets of the United Nations. Bureaucrats will have only themselves to blame if food shortages develop and if people go hungry in America because of an unwise and unwarranted curtailment of farm-machinery units and repair parts at a time when we are actually exporting to other countries these same types of farm-machinery equipment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution I am introducing in the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the conclusion of other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, referring to the remarks of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I want to say that in the far Southwest we find, too, that the farmers are hampere in the production of food by some of the very difficulties which he has enumerated. I, too, would like to see that phase of our war effort helped by making possible the furnishing of more farm equipment and repairs for farm machinery, so that the farmers may produce the food which we need to win the war.

I did not ask for this time, however, to say that.

A few moments ago the gentleman from California was occupying the Well of the House and had reserved some 15 minutes. I felt that he was about to make a constructive suggestion which he did not have time to reach because of yielding two-thirds of his time. I anticipated that the gentleman from California would probably have something to say in his prepared remarks concerning one means by which Congress in the role of a national legislative policy-determining body might shape a program following the war.

Much is said these days as to whether we ought now to think about or plan post-war matters. I belong to that school which believes that first things ought to come first and second things second, rather than that second things should not come at all. It is not too early to do the right kind of planning now. I am reminded of a husband and wife who had some children. The wife said, "Now, John, we must give the children music lessons." The Scotch husband said, "No, wife; wait until they are 21 years of age and they can decide for themselves whether they want music lessons or not."

I should like to ask the gentleman from California—I see he is here—if it is not true that in the last Congress he had some rather definite plans? I am anxious to know whether he contemplates a similar measure in this Congress.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much because I had with me when I made my speech, and hoped to discuss, this resolution in addition to the other one I mentioned. It is my profound belief that with so many agencies now working on the matter of post-war problems, the Congress of the United States, to which body primarily belongs the task of determining the policy that America should pursue in meeting the problems of demobilization and reconversion of industry, and the insurance of a condition of economic health, should itself take the initiative in this regard. This resolution would provide for a commission of congressional members first with associate members representing the broad economic and population groups of the Nation, to be a national commission on post-war reconstruction. It is my earnest belief that the initiative with regard to these matters and the central focus of them should be in the Congress rather than elsewhere.

Mr. MURDOCK. Such a move is in keeping with the suggestion we have heard from our leaders, that this Congress must function as a Congress and not wait for legislation to be placed on the Speaker's table from the departments. I am in perfect agreement with the gentleman both as to the need for such action now and that the Congress should initiate it. I wish to ask the gentleman from California one more question: This, I take it, is not a new thought with him; has not the gentleman been working on this for several months?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I may say to the gentleman from Arizona that this bill was before the last Congress from the first day of the Seventy-seventh Congress. I have reintroduced it in somewhat changed language but in practically the same form as it was before. The main difference between this measure and the other is that in this measure the commission itself is entirely congressional and the other members are associate members of the commission. Outside of that it is the same measure I introduced before.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have not had an opportunity yet to study this plan of organization and purpose fully, but from such study as I have made of it, I am convinced that any plan for post-war reconstruction to be taken up ought to be studied and sketched by Congress, both Houses, and by Members on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber and in the other Chamber, as well as the usual process of enacting legislation. I think it is high time that we started some such study now that Congress may legislate wisely when the time comes for legislation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 11, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NICHOLS: Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents. House Resolution 125. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents, and House Resolution 403, amending section 2 of House Resolution 125, Seventy-seventh Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NICHOLS: Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents. House Resolution 125. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents, and House Resolution 403, amending section 2 of House Resolution 125, Seventy-seventh Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TOLAN: Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration. House Resolution 113, Seventy-seventh Congress. Resolution for the continuation of the select committee conducting the investigation and study of the interstate migration of destitute citizens; without amendment (Rept. No. 3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

---

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 855. A bill to extend to veterans the right to appeal their claims within 2 years after denial; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 856. A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to correct erroneous adjudications; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 857. A bill to increase from $15 to $30 the amount of wages an individual may receive for work in any month before any deductions are made from such individual's Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits for such month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 858. A bill to provide for the free passage through the mails of newspapers, magazines, and other periodical publications furnished free of charge to members of the military and naval forces of the United States by publishers and/or their authorized representatives; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 859. A bill to increase the monthly rates of World War death compensation payable to widows and children of deceased veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 860. A bill to extend eligibility for benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to individuals who are ineligible only by reason of the time of separation from service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 861. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H. R. 862. A bill to provide that insurance judgments shall be binding upon the Veterans' Administration until modified by court order; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

H. R. 863. A bill to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 864. A bill to amend section 1601 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits against the Federal unemployment tax); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 865. A bill to increase the tariff on turnips and rutabagas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 866. A bill to repeal section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and to

terminate all foreign-trade agreements entered into thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 867. A bill to amend section 209 (b) (10) (C), title II, of the Social Security Act, as amended, and sections 1426 (b) (10) (C) and 1607 (c) (10) (C) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 868. A bill to amend the Social Security Act by providing for grants to States for furnishing aid to needy individuals who are physically handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 869. A bill for the relief of owners of certain properties rendered inoperative by reason of restrictions arising from the war effort; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 870. A bill to regulate the level of water in certain reservoirs at the headwaters of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 871. A bill relating to the importation, manufacture, sale, or possession in the Indian country within the State of Minnesota of certain nonintoxicating beverages; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 872. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 873. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Mississippi River and its tributaries in the county of Aitkin, State of Minnesota, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 874. A bill providing for compensation at the rate of $5 per day for members of local boards under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 875. A bill to restore standard time during the months of January, February, November, and December; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 876. A bill to amend section 5h (a) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, so as to direct the purchase of, and the making of loans upon the security of, rationed motor vehicles and motor-vehicle tires and accessories, and to modify the basis for determining the amount of any such purchase or loan; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 877. A bill to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 878. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, by providing for loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in aggregate amount not to exceed $100,000,000 in each fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year 1942; by prescribing the rate of interest and maturity of loans made under said act; and by authorizing the extension of the maturities of and the reduction of interest rates on loans heretofore made; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 879. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 880. A bill to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHUETZ:

H. R. 881. A bill to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act in order to conserve materials, labor, and transportation in connection with the packaging and marketing of whisky, protect the revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARNES of Alabama:

H. R. 882. A bill to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 883. A bill to provide payment of national service life-insurance benefits based upon permanent total disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 884. A bill to provide for presumption of soundness at enlistment after 6 months' service in the active military or naval service; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 885. A bill to grant burial allowances in cases of certain deceased veterans of the Regular Establishment who served in a recognized campaign, expedition, insurrection, or occupation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 886. A bill granting a preference to war veterans, their wives and widows in defense industries working on war contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 887. A bill to provide the same privileges for hospitalization and domiciliary care for campaign and expedition veterans as are now applicable to World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H R. 888. A bill to provide that the widows and orphans and dependent parents of deceased World War veterans who were suffering with permanent total combat-incurred disabilities shall, regardless of the cause of death, be entitled to the rates of pension which would be payable to them if the veteran had been killed in action in such service; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 889. A bill to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to amend the rating schedules so as to provide total ratings for the most severe functional nervous diseases or psychoneurotic states; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 890. A bill to grant veterans judicial review against the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 891. A bill to grant permanent and total disability ratings to veterans suffering from severe industrial inadaptability as a result of war service; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 892. A bill to provide for the construction and operation by the Federal Government of a system of new military superhighways and airports for national defense in time of war or insurrection, and for Government and commercial use by automobiles and airplanes in time of peace; to provide for the financing of same; to provide for the relief of unemployment after the present World War ends; to promote public safety; to stimulate general business throughout the Nation; to earn revenue for the Federal Government, and for the general welfare of all the people; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 893. A bill to provide for the placing of a copy of the Constitution of the United States and of the Declaration of Independence in each United States post office; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 894. A bill making it a Federal offense to steal or embezzle certain articles, products, or materials subject to rationing or allocation under Federal law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 895. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for additional clerk hire in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes," approved July 25, 1939; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 896. A bill to repeal section 541 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1941 and to restore certain exemptions from admissions taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 897. A bill to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 898. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 899. A bill to provide compensation for injuries or death sustained by volunteer civilian defense workers in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRANERY:

H. R. 900. A bill to establish a Division of Fine Arts in the Office of Education, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Education.

H. R. 901. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider certain claims arising after January 1, 1926, out of the Tariff Act of 1922; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 902. A bill to provide that a veteran's compensation, pension, or retirement pay shall not be reduced during his hospitalization or domiciliary care; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 903. A bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHUETZ:

H. R. 904. To amend section 2800 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 905. A bill to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in certain land constituting a portion of the tract of land conditionally granted to the county of Los Angeles, State of California, under the act of March 24, 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 911. A bill to provide that veterans needing prosthetic appliances will not thereby be deprived of opportunity to take civil-service examinations; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 912 (by request). A bill to provide liberalized benefits for disabled American veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 913. A bill to extend the privilege of hospitalization to veterans of World War II, for the treatment of non-service-connected disabilities, and to provide for preference of hospitalization to those veterans who were discharged by reason of disability and to those entitled to benefits for service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 914. A bill to provide for uniform definitions of parents of veterans under all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 915. A bill to provide death compensation for dependent parents of deceased World War Veterans under the act of June 28, 1934, Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 916. A bill to so amend Veterans Regulation 1 (a), part I, as to make its provisions applicable as to veterans of World War No. 1

and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 906. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish headstones or markers for graves of honorably discharged war veterans, notwithstanding discharge other than honorable from any prior or subsequent service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 907. A bill to provide that automatic National Service Life Insurance as to deceased veterans of World War No. 2 shall be payable, in turn, to their widow, children, and parents, if any, without any requirement, as at present, as to their dependency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 908. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a retirement system for employees of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 29, 1935," approved June 24, 1937, known as the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 909. A bill to establish a more adequate rate of compensation for certain World War veterans hospitalized for service-connected disability; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 910. A bill to provide for cancellation of citizenship in the case of certain naturalized citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 917. A bill authorizing the construction of one or more pipe lines for the transport of petroleum and its products from States in the Middle West and Southwest to the vicinity of New York City; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 918 (by request). A bill to authorize payment of the compensation or pension for a veteran's partial service-connected disability, plus such percentage of the pension payable for his permanent total disability, nonservice connected, as is equal to the difference between 100 percent and the degree of his service-connected disability; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 919 (by request). A bill to provide pensions to members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who become disabled by reason of their service therein, during other than a period of war, equivalent to 90 percent of the compensation payable to war veterans for similar service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 920 (by request). A bill to provide a scale for payments of compensation, pension, or retirement pay to veterans during hospitalization or domiciliary care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 921. A bill conferring citizenship upon alien veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 922. A bill to permit reopening of civil-service examinations upon request of any war veteran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 923. A bill to continue the pay of all persons serving in the armed forces of the United States for 6 months after the termination of the present conflict; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and regulate the value thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRANERY:

H. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to fix the number of Justices of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

H. Res. 37. Resolution providing for the investigation of persons of Japanese ancestry now interned in relocation centers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. Res. 38. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to study and investigate the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products from rural areas through the various marketing agencies to the ultimate consumer; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. Res. 39. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Poems of Faith and Freedom," compiled in the office of the Consultant in English Poetry from manuscript displayed in the Library of Congress, as a document; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. Res. 40. Resolution ordering the printing as a document of the manuscript entitled "A Digest of State Legislation of 1941"; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. Res. 41. Resolution granting a gratuity to the husband of Berniece C. Lambert; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Miss SUMNER of Illinois:

H. Res. 42. Resolution creating a special committee to investigate peace problems, officers, and settlements; to the Committee on Rules.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 924. A bill for the relief of James E. Taylor; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CREAL:

H. R. 925. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 926. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Ford; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 927. A bill for the relief of Karl F. Rindelhardt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 928. A bill granting a pension to Mary A. Beemer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 929. A bill for the relief of Irving L. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 930. A bill for the relief of Kam J. Kathju; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 931. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Malpas; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 932. A bill for the relief of Sven Oltedale; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 933. A bill for the relief of Conrad H. Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 934. A bill granting a pension to Mary A. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 935. A bill granting a pension to Charles W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLEBERG:

H. R. 936. A bill for the relief of Earl Carlton Buck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 937. A bill for the relief of Luther C. Nanny; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 938. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 939. A bill for the relief of Agnes Brodahl; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 940. A bill for the relief of Howard E. Dickison; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 941. A bill granting a pension to Maude Fielding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 942. A bill for the relief of Henry Fischer; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 943. A bill granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. Goundry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 944. A bill for the relief of Douglas R. Muther; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 945. A bill for the relief of the Pokegama Sanatorium; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 946. A bill for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 947. A bill granting a pension to Lillie Southard; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 948. A bill for the relief of Anton Waytashek; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 949. A bill granting a pension to Rose Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 950. A bill granting a pension to Eugenie Gilsoul; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 951. A bill for the relief of W. Harold Shackleford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 952. A bill for the relief of Michael Kanchier, alias Kancir, alias Kuluk; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McGRANERY:

H. R. 953. A bill granting an increase of pension to Maggie Webster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 954. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. R. E. Patterson, United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 955. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Jennings; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 956. A bill granting a pension to Capt. Victor Gondos, Jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 957. A bill to authorize the payment of adjusted compensation benefits to Sarah Ann Grugan; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 958. A bill for the relief of Rocky Brook Mills Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 959. A bill for the relief of Joseph Nathaniel Gwonder; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 960. A bill to provide for the award of a gold medal to Father Peter B. Duffee; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 961. A bill for the relief of Salvatore and Joseph Falcone; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHUETZ:

H. R. 962. A bill for the relief of Frances Wetterer; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 963. A bill for the relief of Arthur M. Conroy; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 964. A bill for the relief of Salman Bermann; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 965. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Plozy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 966. A bill for the relief of Wallace Taylor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 967. A bill for the relief of Anastazja Nowik; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 968. A bill for the relief of Robert Richard White; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 969. A bill for the relief of the firm of the American Wrecking Co. of Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 970. A bill granting a pension to Ida M. Tillotson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 971. A bill for the relief of Alex Krause; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 972. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Kowalczyk; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 973. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha Gorsuch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 974. A bill granting a pension to Harry A. Croft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 975. A bill granting a pension to Josephine Rutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 976. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Sebastian; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 977. A bill for the relief of Clare A. Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

---

# SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, with all the deep and dire needs of our inner lives unmet by material bread alone, we turn unfilled to Thee. As jaded pilgrims journeying across burning sands gratefully pause under protecting shade and at refreshing springs, so we would come to Thee who art as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land, and where alone are fountains of living waters which can quench the thirst of our yearning souls.

Here at this noontide altar of devotion which our fathers builded and on which they cut deep with their founding faith the devout confession "In God we trust," we humbly bow with the deathless assurance that turns tragedy to triumph: "The eternal God is our refuge and underneath are the everlasting arms." Facing the duties of demanding days, we would grow quiet enough for the still small voice to tell us what our besetting sins are and in what ways our selfish attitudes are hurting others, lest we bar our fellows from more abundant life and thus betray our own souls and fall short of our high calling. We would be the true servants of Thy will in this troubled time. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory. Amen.

### ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

SHERIDAN DOWNEY, a Senator from the State of California; JAMES M. MEAD, a Senator from the State of New York; CLAUDE PEPPER, a Senator from the State of Florida; and ROBERT F. WAGNER, a Senator from the State of New York, appeared in their seats today.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 7, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO SENATOR GLASS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary of the Senate has a report to submit which he will read in person.

The SECRETARY (Edwin A. Halsey). Mr. President, having been authorized by the Senate, in accordance with the provisions of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to on January 7, 1943, to administer the oath to the Honorable CARTER GLASS, Senator-elect from the State of Virginia, I wish to report that I have performed that service, and now hand to the President of the Senate a signed copy of the oath, which is in addition to the oral affirmation made by the Senator as required by law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The signed oath submitted by the Secretary of the Senate will be placed on file.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Ferguson | O'Daniel |
| Andrews | George | O'Mahoney |
| Austin | Gerry | Overton |
| Bailey | Gillette | Pepper |
| Bankhead | Green | Radcliffe |
| Barbour | Guffey | Reed |
| Barkley | Gurney | Revercomb |
| Bilbo | Hatch | Reynolds |
| Bone | Hawkes | Robertson |
| Brewster | Hayden | Russell |
| Bridges | Hill | Scrugham |
| Brooks | Holman | Shipstead |
| Buck | Johnson, Colo. | Stewart |
| Burton | Langer | Taft |
| Bushfield | Lodge | Thomas, Idaho |
| Butler | Lucas | Thomas, Okla. |
| Byrd | McCarran | Thomas, Utah |
| Capper | McClellan | Tunnell |
| Caraway | McFarland | Tydings |
| Chandler | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Chavez | McNary | Van Nuys |
| Clark, Idaho | Maloney | Wagner |
| Clark, Mo. | Maybank | Wallgren |
| Connally | Mead | Walsh |
| Danaher | Millikin | Wheeler |
| Davis | Moore | Wherry |
| Downey | Murdock | White |
| Eastland | Murray | Wiley |
| Ellender | Nye | Willis |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### THE BUDGET (H. DOC. NO. 27)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, which was read, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

(For Budget message of the President, see p. 98, House proceedings in the RECORD.)

### REPORT ON EMERGENCY RELIEF APPROPRIATION ACTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington.*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriations Act, fiscal year 1942, I present herewith a report of the operations under this act to the end of the fiscal year 1942.

This report contains summary and detailed statements of the Treasury Department reflecting expenditures made, obligations incurred, and the status of funds under the above-mentioned act. In addition thereto, the information is presented covering the Relief Acts of 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, and for fiscal year 1941. These statements compiled as of June 30, 1942, constitute the eighth annual accounting to the Congress for relief and work-relief expenditures. Such reports have been submitted at the beginning of regular sessions of Congress as provided for in the above-cited Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts.

Reports of operations of the Work Projects Administration and the Employees' Compensation Commission in connection with funds appropriated under these Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts are also included.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

JANUARY 11, 1943.

### REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE—FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, in accordance with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 26 (a) of an act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America,

and providing compensation therefor, approved February 23, 1931, as amended.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1943.*

[Enclosure: Report Concerning Retirement and Disability Fund, Foreign Service.]

REPORT OF ALLEY DWELLING AUTHORITY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Alley Dwelling Authority for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1943.*

[NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ON STATE OF THE FINANCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Finance.

PERSHING HALL MEMORIAL FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, an itemized report of transactions for account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LANDS OF THE COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Department of the Navy which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with an accompanying paper); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter from Alfred M. Kunze, of New Rochelle, N. Y., relative to his plan for securing the peace of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the New Castle County Industrial Union Council, Wilmington, Del., favoring the prompt enactment of legislation to provide periodic payments and medical care—in the event of injury or death in the performance of duty—to civilian defense workers, such payments and benefits to apply with respect to any death and injury sustained by such workers subsequent to December 6, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the enactment of anti-poll-tax legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by a mass meeting of citizens of Knoxville, Tenn., as a tribute to the public services performed by former Senator Norris, of Nebraska; ordered to lie on the table.

WARTIME PROHIBITION—PETITION

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, without all the signatures attached thereto, a petition signed by a number of citizens, members of the Hopewell U. P. Missionary Society, of Laurel, Pa.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

DECEMBER 17, 1942.

Senator JAMES J. DAVIS,
*Washington, D. C.*

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS: Mothers have worked and prayed that their boys might be kept from evil since we are in the war, and our boys are called to serve their country. We think they should be protected from evil influences while in the service of our country.

Realizing the great harm alcoholic drinks are doing the people of our country and especially to the boys in the Army camps, we beg of you to urge President Franklin D. Roosevelt to give us wartime prohibition as Woodrow Wilson did in World War No. 1.

MEMBERS OF HOPEWELL
U. P. MISSIONARY SOCIETY,
CHURCH OF LAUREL, PA.,
MABEL E. KINARD,
FLORENCE E. HYSON,
CARRIE A. LOFFLER
(And sundry other citizens).

REPORT OF SENATE SPECIAL SILVER COMMITTEE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Senate Special Silver Committee, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 20) continuing Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-fourth Congress, agreed to August 16, 1935, as amended by Senate Resolution 261, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to June 29, 1942, relating to the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1) thereon.

ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION OF WATER SYSTEM OF THE DISTRICT

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 31), and, under the rule, it was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 169, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to March 2, 1942, and Senate Resolution 337, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 16, 1942 (relating to the administration and operation of the water system of the District of Columbia), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE ON PUBLIC LAW NO. 528, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 37), which was referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

*Resolved,* That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 3 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Finance be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, on Public Law No. 528, section 403, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, an act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REED:

S. 235. A bill to prohibit discrimination with respect to employment in the service of the United States or employment resulting from expenditures made by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 236. A bill to amend section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to the pooling and division of certain revenues of carriers subject to such act; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 237. A bill to provide that the workweek established by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 shall temporarily be extended from 40 hours to 48 hours; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. GILLETTE):

S. 238. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to procedure and appeals thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 239. A bill to hold for deportation aliens who refuse to bear arms in defense of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 240. A bill to deny admittance into the United States to all immigrants while the number of unemployed persons within the United States is 1,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 241. A bill for the relief of Rachel Acerra; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 242. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice osteopathy in the District of Columbia to Maria G. Waksmundzka; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 243. A bill granting a pension to Charles G. Hostutler;

S. 244. A bill granting a pension to Roy Joyce; and

S. 245. A bill granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Branch; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 246. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 247. A bill to enlarge the Willamette National Forest;

S. 248. A bill authorizing appropriations for payments to counties supplemental to those authorized by the act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; U. S. C., title 16, sec. 500);

S. 249. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; and

S. 250. A bill to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 251. A bill for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson;

S. 252. A bill for the relief of Philip Kleinman;

S. 253. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Russell L. Patton;

S. 254. A bill for the relief of Edward Gillam;

S. 255. A bill for the relief of Josephine M. Melchior;

S. 256. A bill for the relief of M. Senders & Co.;

S. 257. A bill for the relief of Christine Lund;

S. 258. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Lew O. Calhoun;

S. 259. A bill for the relief of Lee D. Hoseley; and

S. 260. A bill for the relief of Marguerite Polanski; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 261. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., a tract of land heretofore conveyed to the United States by such city for the use of the Veterans' Administration facility located in such city;

S. 262. A bill for the relief of the surviving dependents of John L. Stafford, a World War veteran; and

S. 263. A bill to provide for the issuance of insurance policies under section 300 of the World War Veterans Act, as amended; to prohibit the issuance of insurance policies under the National Service Life Insurance Act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 264. A bill for the relief of Luther Edwin West; and

S. 265. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and operation of an additional military academy and an additional naval academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 266. A bill authorizing the Snake or Piute Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon to sue in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes;

S. 267. A bill relating to marriage and divorce among members of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians; and

S. 268. A bill to provide for the conservation of fish and wildlife on Indian lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 269. A bill to provide for the acquisition and toll-free operation by the United States of the interstate bridge between Rainier, Oreg. and Longview, Wash.;

S. 270. A bill relating to the computation of retirement pay of personnel of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes;

S. 271. A bill to assure conservation of and to permit the fullest utilization of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific, and for other purposes;

S. 272. A bill to provide for the acquisition and toll-free operation by the United States of the interstate bridges at Cascade Locks and Hood River, Oreg.: and

S. 273. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 274. A bill providing for the observance as National Flag Raising Day of the day on which the public schools open each year for the beginning of a new school year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 275. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

S. 276. A bill for the relief of owners of certain properties rendered inoperative by reason of restrictions arising from the war effort; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 277. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 278. A bill for the relief of Robert Paul Horst; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 279. A bill granting a pension to Barbara Hubach; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 280. A bill to provide for the current payment of individual income taxes and the withholding of tax at source; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 281. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Social Security Act; to extend the coverage of Federal old-age and survivors' insurance; to provide insurance benefits for workers permanently and totally disabled; to provide hospitalization benefits; to provide special Federal aid to States for public assistance; to provide Federal grants to States for general public assistance; to amend the provision for Federal grants to States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind; to amend the Internal Revenue Code; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 282. A bill for the relief of Walter C. Blake;

S. 283. A bill for the relief of Charles Dancause and Virginia P. Rogers;

S. 284. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth B. Dayton;

S. 285. A bill for the relief of Antoinette De Couto and Manuel De Couto;

S. 286. A bill for the relief of Barbara Healy;

S. 287. A bill to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Union Iron Works;

S. 288. A bill for the relief of Lottie A. Abbott, the legal representative and administratrix of the estate of James D. Felley, deceased; and

S. 289. A bill for the allowance of certain claims, not heretofore paid, for indemnity for spoliations by the French prior to July 31, 1801, as reported by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 290. A bill granting compensation to Philip R. Roby; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 291. A bill relating to the legality of the entry into the United States of certain persons born in a country contiguous to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 292. A bill for the relief of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 293. A bill for the relief of William D. Ellison;

S. 294. A bill granting the Distinguished Service Cross to Raymond F. Finnegan;

S. 295. A bill for the relief of Frank P. Hoyt;

S. 296. A bill for the relief of Hector H. Perry;

S. 297. A bill for the relief of William H. Rouncevill;

S. 298. A bill to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Service Cross to Barney F. Salner; and

S. 299. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to reinstate Wallace F. Safford to the position and rank of captain in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 300. A bill to establish a Chief of Chaplains of the United States Navy;

S. 301. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for rights-of-way over, across, in, and upon naval reservations;

S. 302. A bill to provide for the advancement of Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Construction Corps, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of vice admiral;

S. 303. A bill to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States;

S. 304. A bill for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps;

S. 305. A bill for the relief of Master Gunnery Sergeant Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps; and

S. 306. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as a result of the disaster at the East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 307. A bill granting a pension to Velma G. Rose;

S. 308. A bill granting a pension to Katherine R. Salmon;

S. 309. A bill granting a pension to Julia Agnes Silva; and

S. 310. A bill granting a pension to Alice L. Tourtellotte; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 311. A bill for the relief of James F. Desmond; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(Mr. DAVIS introduced Senate bill 312, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALLGREN (for Mr. KILGORE):

S. 313. A bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 314. A bill to authorize the purchase of certain interests in lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 315. A bill to amend section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, by striking out subsection (g) thereof relating to exemption from combatant service of conscientious objectors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 316. A bill authorizing the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to reduce the personnel of executive departments and agencies; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 317. A bill for the relief of Guy R. Charlesworth; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 318. A bill for the relief of Thelma Cannon McGroary; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 319. A bill to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I introduce several bills which I ask to have referred to the appropriate committees. Among the bills are three which the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN

NUYS] and I introduced at the last session, relating to administrative law procedure. In connection with the bills which I now introduce I merely desire to say that they are presented in order that the Committee on the Judiciary may continue the jurisdiction it heretofore has had over bills of this nature.

In justice to the members of the subcommittee I desire to say that during the last session of the Congress we held long hearings on the entire subject of administrative law. Those hearings have been published. They comprise some five volumes, and comprise probably the best textbook on administrative law which has been published in this country. I have introduced the bills in the hope that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary will continue its study and may report some appropriate bills on this most perplexing subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills referred to by the Senator from New Mexico will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 320. A bill for the relief of Bradbury & Marchant; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 321. A bill to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior; to the Committtee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 322. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Anne Galbraith Macy a patent to certain lands in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. VAN NUYS):

S. 323. A bill to provide for the more economical, expeditious, and just settlement of disputes with the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 324. A bill to revise the administrative procedure of Federal agencies; to establish the Office of Federal Administrative Procedure; to provide for hearing commissioners; to authorize declaratory rulings by administrative agencies; and for other purposes; and

S. 325. A bill to prescribe fair standards of duty and procedure of administrative officers and agencies, to establish an administrative code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 326. A bill for the relief of the North Dakota-Montana Wheat Growers Association;

S. 327. A bill for the relief of E. B. Murphy;

S. 328. A bill for the relief of Francis Lee Harbough;

S. 329. A bill for the relief of Oscar G. Norgaard;

S. 330. A bill for the relief of Richard Barton;

S. 331. A bill for the relief of the Barlow Crain & Stock Exchange, and the Farmers Union Oil Co.;

S. 332. A bill for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen;

S. 333. A bill for the relief of the widow and child of Walfred Pearson;

S. 334. A bill for the relief of Neil Nicolson;

S. 335. A bill for the relief of Edward N. Berg;

S. 336. A bill for the relief of Edla H. Fyten; and

S. 337. A bill for the relief of Ida Frank; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 338. A bill for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 339. A bill to provide pensions for the widows of certain troops who served in action involving Indian uprisings;

S. 340. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. John W. Carroll;

S. 341. A bill granting a pension to Julia E. Hart; and

S. 342. A bill granting a pension to George P. Mennie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a gate and monument to commemorate the winning of the Oregon country for the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution providing for an investigation and survey of certain crustacean food resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States a hospital, dispensary, or other memorial, for heroic services to men of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. RADCLIFFE (for himself and Mr. TYDINGS) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 17, which was referred to the Committee on the Library, and appears under a separate heading.)

## GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the past week marked the passing of a great American. George Washington Carver—born in slavery, schooled in adversity, and honored in eminence—has gone to his final rest. This patient scholar, this creative scientist, this kindly teacher was one whose humbleness toward knowledge, whose reverence toward God, and whose tolerance toward man molded him into one of America's most beloved characters. His ceaseless quest for learning led him always into the paths of service; his unyielding faith in God built up in him a kind of loving tolerance; his material discoveries brought untold wealth and solace into the world. Yet this honored man lived out his years in a simple, unpretentious dignity.

It is only too seldom that such a mellowed character as this emerges from the passing pages of time. In the death of George Washington Carver, America has lost a noble son, the world a great benefactor, mankind a faithful servant.

His genius will be missed by the Nation and especially the South, where his work for humanity, and particularly his race, had such splendid results.

He took the insignificant peanut, which, up to his discoveries, had been used mostly for fattening hogs, and elevated it to be head of its class. He succeeded in making over 300 discoveries of useful products from the peanut, many of them most important for their medicinal value. He had remarkable initiative in developing something from nothing, as it was mostly the waste products from the southern farms with which he worked. He refused a fortune many times for his discoveries and experiments, explaining that they were for God and humanity and not for worldly gain. He did not want gold but he did want to help his fellow man. He was spiritual in his undertakings and never failed to thank God for his ability to make a new discovery. He was as humble as the lowly peanut which he made serve humanity, and he followed the commandment of Jesus Christ "Love thy neighbor."

I introduce a bill to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 312) to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

## FRANCIS SCOTT KEY

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, today is the one hundredth anniversary of the death of Francis Scott Key, author of the Star-Spangled Banner. I introduce a joint resolution in which my colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], joins, and ask that it be printed in full in the body of the RECORD, and that it be given appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 17) memorializing the name of Francis Scott Key was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas this date marks the centennial anniversary of that day when the God of Peace called Francis Scott Key to a well earned rest and to that everlasting reward for which he had so well prepared himself; and

Whereas by his life, exemplary, distinguished, and devoted to the service of his community, his State and his Nation, he made a lasting impression upon all whose privilege it was to know him and left a rich and enduring heritage for succeeding generations; and,

Whereas it is fitting that there be recorded brief reference to his life and work:

Francis Scott Key, son of John Ross Key and Anne Phoebe Penn Dagworthy Charlton Key, was born August 1, 1779, at Terra Rubra, located on Pipes Creek in the county of Frederick, now a part of Carroll County, in the State of Maryland. At the age of 10, he entered St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., and as a member of the first graduating class of that institution received the degree of bachelor of arts in 1796 at the age of 17. He delivered the valedictory address, using Eloquence as his topic. And 4 years later he received the degree of master of arts.

In 1827 when St. John's College faced a critical period because of the withdrawal by the State legislature of its financial support, Mr. Key was one of the foremost leaders of the movement to organize the alumni. He made the principal address at their first meeting on the subject of public responsibility to institutions of learning, so forceful that it resulted in a renewal by the State legislature of financial aid to the college in an even larger measure. Earlier he had become a member of the Georgetown-Lancaster Society, an organization having for its principal objective the furtherance of free public

schools. He served for a number of years as member of and chairman of a committee charged with this particular phase of its program.

Shortly after Francis Scott Key graduated from St. John's College, he entered the law office of his uncle, Phillip Barton Key, in Annapolis, Md., where he served the usual apprenticeship of 4 years. His regular attendance at sessions of the Maryland Court of Appeals, the Legislature, and of the nisi prius courts served him in good stead in later years. He soon became a worthy opponent of the best lawyers of his day and an adversary to be reckoned with before the bar. He was admitted to the bar in the town of Frederick, Md., in the year 1800, where he practiced for the next 5 years, moving to Georgetown, District of Columbia, in 1805. In 1806, when but 27 years of age, Mr. Key made his first appearance before the United States Supreme Court, John Marshall being its then Chief Justice. His appearances before this high tribunal became more and more frequent in the first half of the nineteenth century. In 1833, President Andrew Jackson appointed Mr. Key as United States attorney for the District of Columbia, the only public office which he ever held. While serving in this capacity, the President sent him as a special mediator to Alabama for the purpose of settling a dispute which had arisen there between the local authorities, the Federal Government, and the Creek Indians over a question of jurisdiction. Although this controversy had been pending for some months when Mr. Key arrived and had reached such a fever pitch that armed conflict between the Indians and the United States Army seemed inevitable, he was able to make a favorable report to his superiors within 6 days and returned home after 6 weeks, completely successful in having settled the dispute.

Francis Scott Key was a devout Christian, using as his daily creed the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount. He served for a number of years as lay delegate to the diocesan conventions of the Episcopal Church in Maryland, and also as lay delegate to the general conventions of that church. His letters to his mother, to members of his family, and to his friends frequently show the depth of his religious convictions. Two of his religious poems are published in the Common Service Book and Hymnal of the Lutheran Church, namely, Lord With Growing Heart I Praise Thee, and Before the Lord We Bow. At one time, Key gave deep thought to the subject of entering the ministry. In 1813, the Reverend Dr. James Kemp, then rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Baltimore, offered him a position at that church, an offer which he declined only after "prayerful consideration." Five days before his death, while traveling from Georgetown to Baltimore by stagecoach, he composed his final poem, a work which bespeaks his belief in the life to come, and some lines of which were almost prophetic of his end.

On February 19, 1802, Francis Scott Key was married to Miss Mary Tayloe Lloyd, of Talbot County and Annapolis, a member of one of Maryland's outstanding and best-known families. Of this union there were born 11 children, 6 boys and 5 girls. Most of Mr. Key's leisure time was spent in the bosom of his family. He was a true and devoted husband and an inspiration to and companion of his children.

While yet attending St. John's College, Francis Scott Key met Roger Brooke Taney, later Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. There immediately sprang up between them a deep friendship, a bond subsequently strengthened by the marriage of Mr. Taney to Mr. Key's only sister, Annie. It was to his brother-in-law that he told the story of experiences incident to the writing of the Star-Spangled Banner, which story is related by Chief Justice Taney in a book of Key poems, published in 1857.

The masterpiece of his many poems, sonnets, and couplets, is, of course, our National Anthem. He reached the zenith of his career as a lawyer and orator when, by his compelling arguments, he succeeded in securing the release of Dr. William Beanes from the commanders of the British Army and Navy, then planning and ready to execute their attack upon the city of Baltimore. No less did his prowess as a poet soar to new heights as, from the deck of an American truce ship, "one of Ferguson's Norfolk packets," anchored some 3 miles off Fort McHenry, he watched the destiny of his country hang in a balance. When the 26-hour bombardment ended abruptly just before dawn on the morning of September 14, 1814, his heart must have sunk within him. Certainly, he thought the fort had been forced to surrender and that, when the morning's sun cast its first glow over the eastern horizon, he would see the flag of the enemy floating over the little battlement at the entrance of Baltimore's harbor. It was during this period of doubt and anxiety that Francis Scott Key wrote the first verse of his immortal poem. Then, as dawn began to break, he was able to get faint and fleeting glimpses of our ensign of democracy. As he writes in his second verse: "On the shore dimly seen;" another line, "Now it catches the gleam of the morning's first beam." With what relief, pride, and triumph, he must have written the last two lines, "'Tis the Star-Spangled Banner! O, long may it wave, o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave." Only in the third verse does Key speak disparagingly of the enemy, but even in this his verse of sarcasm, he does not mention it by name. This is well, for the defense of Baltimore was the last official engagement between the armed forces of Great Britain and the United States. There has since followed an era of peace and amity between these two nations and, having been allies in the World War No. 1, they are now fighting shoulder to shoulder in a second world conflict.

In the fourth and last verse of his immortal poem, Francis Scott Key pours forth his true Christian spirit, giving praise to the Heavenly Powers for the victory and invoking the blessing of God that our cause may ever be just:

O! thus be it ever, when freemen shall stand
Between their lov'd homes and the war's desolation;
Blest with victory and peace, may the Heav'n-rescued land
Praise the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation.
Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just,
And this be our motto: "In God is our trust."
And the Star-Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

On March 3, 1931, President Hoover approved H. R. 14 (Public, No. 823, 71st Cong.), designating this immortal poem as the National Anthem of the United States, thereby making official that which the public had already done for the citizenry had years before taken the song into their hearts, paying it the same homage as if it had been the adopted Anthem.

Francis Scott Key breathed his last at about 8 p. m. on Wednesday, January 11, 1843, at the home of his daughter, Elizabeth Phoebe Key Howard, located on Mount Vernon Place and Charles Street, Baltimore, within the shadow of the first monument erected in honor of George Washington. Flags were flown at half-mast until his burial in John Eager Howard's vault in St. Paul's Cemetery, Baltimore, Maryland, on Saturday, January 14. The United States Supreme Court adjourned in tribute to him. In 1865, his remains were removed to Mount Olivet Cemetery, Frederick, Maryland, in order to fulfill one of his lifetime wishes: "May my remains rest within the shadow of the everlasting hills of Frederick County which I love so well." In 1893, an imposing shaft was erected at the entrance to the cemetery, and the remains of Francis Scott Key and his beloved wife were placed in a tomb at its base. Near the monument there flies a United States flag, night and day a symbol of those fateful hours on the night of September 13 and 14, 1814.

Fort McHenry, over which Francis Scott Key saw the "stars and stripes" so proudly and defiantly waving on that morning after the bombardment, is now reserved by the Federal Government as a national monument and historic shrine. The Star-Spangled Banner Flag House, 844 East Pratt Street, Baltimore, wherein Mary Young Pickersgill made the mammoth flag (30 to 52 feet) which Mr. Key named the "Star-Spangled Banner" in his poem, is now maintained by the patriotic people of Baltimore as a historic shrine. Both of these institutions of inspiration and education are visited annually by thousands of persons.

Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That—

1. The name of Francis Scott Key, poet-lawyer, Christian gentleman, devout citizen, and noble character be, and it is hereby, memorialized and just tribute paid to him and his deeds of service to humanity and to the young Republic which he served so well.

2. His gentle kindness to those less fortunate than he, his tolerance of the views of others, his fortitude in the hour of stress, his love of his country and, above all, his humility before his Divine Creator should serve as an example today and give us strength to face the trying months ahead until we shall be victorious for "Conquer we must, when our cause it is just, and this be our motto: 'In God is our trust'."

3. If we, as a people, profit by Francis Scott Key's inspiring words, his life, and his example, then the Star-Spangled Banner shall continue to wave, "O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

## HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 32), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents a hundred words to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

## CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. REYNOLDS (for Mr. KILGORE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 33), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

*Resolved*, That the provisions of Senate Resolution 303 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to on October 20, 1942, authorizing an investigation of the technological resources of the United States, be, and the same are hereby, continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-eighth Congress.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 34), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Immigration, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. VAN NUYS submitted the followlowing resolution (S. Res. 35), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. GEORGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 36), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Finance, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized to sit during the sessions or recesses of the Seventy-eighth Congress at such times and places as it may deem advisable; to make investigations into internal revenue, customs, and other matters within its jurisdiction, and to compile and prepare statistics and documents relating thereto as directed from time to time by the Senate and as may be necessary; and to report from time to time to the Senate the result thereof; to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ such expert, stenographic, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary; and all the expenses of such committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 38), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

FILMING OF MOTION PICTURES ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 39), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 241, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to May 24, 1940, and Senate Resolution 147, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 8, 1941 (relating to the investigation of the use of public lands and the filming of motion pictures thereon), is hereby continued and may be exercised during the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses; and the limit of expenditures under such resolutions is hereby increased by $10,000.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WALSH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CONNALLY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 41), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WAGNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 42), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized to sit during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress at such times and places as it may deem advisable, to make investigations into all matters within its jurisdiction, and to compile and prepare statistics and documents relating thereto as directed from time to time by the Senate and as may be necessary, and to report in due course to the Senate the result thereof; to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ such expert stenographic, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary; and all the expenses incurred in pursuance hereof shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 43), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. BONE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 44), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Patents, or any subcommittee thereof be, and is hereby, authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee therof, may sit during sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Mr. GREEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 45), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 46), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words; to report such hearings

as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

LABOR POLICIES AND THE LABOR SITUATION—ARTICLE BY ERNEST LINDLEY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in the Washington Post for December 23, 1942, appeared the calmest and most impartial statement of labor policies and the labor situation that I have seen anywhere. It was written by Ernest Lindley, one of the fairest and most able of the newspaper columnists. I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks Mr. Lindley's statement entitled "Unequal Sacrifice."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNEQUAL SACRIFICE—ORGANIZED LABOR FACES ROUGH WEATHER

(By Ernest Lindley)

Captain Rickenbacker says that if the men on the fighting front and the workers in factories changed places war production would be doubled. Statistically, the statement may be wide of the mark but it represents a feeling which is not peculiar to Rickenbacker, and which cannot be overcome by the impressive figures on the volume of American production.

There is no way of equalizing burdens and risks in a war, especially one fought at a distance from the home base. Even if the people at home work as hard as the men at the front, which not many do, they are not subjected to the same risks and in most cases they receive higher pay.

A sense of inequality of sacrifice leads men who are reasonably patriotic to fight for position and gain within the civilian economy at home. The labor unions point to corporate profits and high salaries for executives. The farmers point to the short hours and high wages of the workingmen. And in this they are joined by the industrialists and middle classes generally.

Such sentiments have intensified the political struggles in Washington, often leaving the impression that nobody is interested in anything except his pocketbook. They have helped to write many black pages in the history of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and in decisions on policy by administrative agencies and departments.

Of all the economic groups, that which is now most widely and bitterly criticized is organized labor. The feeling that the labor unions have been favored by the Roosevelt Administration before all other groups seems to be almost universal except perhaps among some of the union leaders and members. Of course, that feeling had taken hold before the war. And, in a large way, it was true. The election of Roosevelt in 1933 was a transfer of political power from the financiers and managers of industry to labor and the farming groups. Agriculture gained much, but in time began to drift away, or to be forced away by certain of the labor policies of the Administration.

The growth of labor unionism, encouraged by the Administration, brought sharp changes in industrial practice. Unfortunately the transition had not been completed when the rearmament program began. Many managers and union leaders and members had not found their proper places in the new type of industrial relation.

Both industrial managers and labor leaders have been frightened by extreme demands. Nothing has done more to keep the conflict alive than the recurrent threats of legislation which would strike at the roots of unionism. But, whatever the balance of blame or credit over a longer period, the unions have come near to isolating themselves from the sympathies of other groups, while the prestige of the leaders of industry has revived, and industry and agriculture seem well on the way toward restoring their old alliance under the banner of the Republican Party.

Little has been said, at least in public, by labor leaders to indicate that they realize their isolation. Some of them have their own internal political problems in handling the extremists. Some of them have made constructive suggestions concerning war production and the war effort generally. But such considerations do not carry much weight with the people who feel that labor has won special benefits out of the war, or who know about the strikes and slow-downs which still occur.

The production still lost from strikes may be only a trifling percentage. But the fact that any strikes at all occur, especially when agencies favorable to labor exist to compose disputes, is abhorrent to the public generally. The full use of manpower is held back by the 40-hour week and by various union restrictions of the "feather-bed" variety. And even if the higher wages now earned by many workers are not much if any above what our national economic machine, working at capacity, can afford, they represent a marked change in relationship to other groups. During the war, labor, especially in the war industries, has gained economic advantage while, by and large, after taxes, other groups have lost ground.

Organized labor now faces very much the same political perils that beset American financiers and industrialists in the early thirties. The question is whether it will make the same mistake made by so many of the leaders of finance and industry; of refusing to acknowledge their mistakes and of resisting changes required in the general public interest. More enlightened leadership in American finance and industry would have saved years of painful and, sometimes, destructive fighting to prevent the inevitable.

Organized labor cannot work out of its present political hole by declaiming against the mistakes of management or by threats to resort to strikes or other forms of direct action. (There have been hints from labor circles that the unions will abandon their no-strike pledges if this or that which they want is not done, although it is difficult to believe that they were inspired by responsible union leaders.) It can regain the sympathy of nonunion members only by cleaning its own house—disciplining the leaders and men who strike, abolishing union rules which prevent the most efficient use of manpower, and working out some modification of the 40-hour week where employers cannot afford to pay the higher rates for overtime. In addition, union leaders could show their grasp of the problem of inflation by urging a combination of higher taxes and enforced savings on smaller incomes. Many unions have made excellent records in selling war bonds by the pay-roll deduction plan, but this is only a sample of what is needed.

Organized labor faces some rough weather. It can profit by studying the political mistakes of American industrial and financial leaders, and avoiding them.

THE UNITED STATES AS A BASIS FOR A NEW WORLD ORDER—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The United States as a Basis for a New World Order," delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah at the Institute of World Affairs, Riverside, Calif., December 14, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

FUNCTIONS OF THE NEW CONGRESS—ADDRESS TO LATIN AMERICA BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the functions of the new Congress, delivered by him in the Spanish language to Latin America on January 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ARMY REPORTS TO INDUSTRY—ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT P. PATTERSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR, AND REMARKS BY THOMAS H. BECK

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Army Reports to Industry," delivered by Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, at a dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, November 12, 1942, together with remarks made on the same occasion by Thomas H. Beck, which appear in the Appendix.]

OUTPUT OF VESSELS DURING THE PAST YEAR—STATEMENT BY REAR ADMIRAL EMORY S. LAND

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administrator, on the subject of the output of vessels during the past year, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT THE ARMY DRINKS—ARTICLE BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES W. WADSWORTH, OF NEW YORK

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What the Army Drinks" written by Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of New York, and published in Collier's magazine of December 19, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

LAW ON DEPLETION ALLOWANCES FOR CERTAIN MINERALS

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the law, as amended, with respect to depletion allowances for oil, gas, coal, fluorspar, ball and sagger clay, rock asphalt, metal mines and sulfur, which appears in the Appendix.]

BEVERIDGE SOCIAL SECURITY PROPOSALS — ARTICLE BY HOWARD M. NORTON

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Sir William Beveridge's Social Security Proposals Had Roots in System Established in New Zealand," written by Howard M. Norton and published in the Baltimore Sun for January 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

GASOLINE AND TIRE RATIONING—ADDRESS BY FULTON LEWIS, JR.

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of rationing, delivered by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on December 15, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRINCE OF PEACE AND A WORLD AT WAR—EDITORIAL FROM THE MONTANA STANDARD

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Prince of Peace and a World at War," published in the Montana Standard for December 25, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

"I KNEW BEVERIDGE"—ARTICLE BY JOHN McLAREN

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "I Knew Beveridge," written by John McLaren and published in the Boston Sunday Globe for December 13, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

SALARY AND INCOME LIMITATIONS—STATEMENT BY JAMES G. PATTON

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of salary and income limitations, delivered by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, before the American Forum of the Air on January 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

REFERENCE TO COMMITTEES OF NOMINATIONS AND TREATIES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which I submit and send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That on calendar days of the present session of Congress when no executive session is held, nominations or treaties received from the President of the United States may, where no objection is interposed, be referred, as in executive session, to the appropriate committees by the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

DEATH OF HON. AUGUSTIN P. JUSTO, FORMER PRESIDENT OF ARGENTINA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish for just a moment to call the attention of the Senate to the death of the Honorable Augustin P. Justo, former President of the Republic of Argentina. Mr. Justo while he was President of the Argentine Republic and before and since he was President of that great Republic was an outspoken friend of the United States and of the people of the United States. He was likewise in sympathy with the program of American solidarity, by which I mean the solidarity of the entire Western Hemisphere in its attitude toward international problems and toward problems affecting the Western Hemipshere.

In view of his outspoken and practically lifelong attitude, I feel that it is not inappropriate now in the Senate of the United States to make reference to his recent death and to express our sympathy at his demise and our appreciation of his broad-minded statesmanship while he was in public office as well as when he was in private life.

While I regret the death of former President Justo and express, insofar as I can, my sympathy and the sympathy of my colleagues to the people of the Argentine, I felt that it was a matter of pride to call attention to his attitude and to his good will and friendliness toward the people of the United States and toward the western world in general.

NOMINATION OF EDWARD J. FLYNN TO BE MINISTER TO AUSTRALIA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the headlines of the morning newspapers of Saturday, January 9, unfolded a very unusual happening in the history of this country. The headline in one newspaper read, "Diplomatic surprise. Flynn says he's been named Ambassador—Australia bound."

In my judgment, the naming of Mr. Flynn as Ambassador or Minister to Australia or any other country on the face of the globe is an insult to the people of America and to the people of the country to which he is named. He is the notorious Edward J. Flynn, formerly known as "Boss" Flynn, and more currently known as "Belgian Paving Block" Flynn.

When "Paving Block" Flynn announced to the world his appointment as Ambassador and personal representative of the President of the United States, he said:

I have more or less a roving commission in the South Pacific as the President's personal representative and ambassador.

It is a very disgraceful state of affairs when it becomes necessary to subpena the chairman of a major political party before a grand jury of any State to answer to a criminal charge. I do not blame the Democratic Party of this country for wanting to get rid of Flynn; I do not blame the President of the United States for wanting to get rid of Flynn as chairman of his party. He has been a weight around the President's neck for some time; but I do not believe in promoting him in order to get rid of him.

It is an interesting coincidence that at the particular moment when "Paving Block" Flynn is seeking diplomatic immunity, Tom Dewey has just been inaugurated governor of New York. Tom Dewey is a noted prosecutor of criminals, and the Citizens' Union of New York has just petitioned Governor Dewey to reopen the Flynn case.

I wonder if in this instance we cannot put two and two together? The Citizens' Union of New York suggests that it is now a year since city employees using city-owned paving blocks paved the courtyard of Boss Flynn's palatial country estate, and, so far as I know, "Paving Block" Flynn still has the blocks that gave him his name.

"Boss" Flynn apparently thinks that the 8,000 paving blocks on his palatial New York estate are getting a little too hot to rove upon. I have no objection to sending him five or six or seven or eight thousand miles away if he wants to be a rover, but in that section of the world New Hampshire boys and other American boys are giving their lives for the cause of freedom in the world; they are giving their lives for something different than what Boss Flynn has stood for in this country. His appointment is a slap at every American boy in the service.

Tom Dewey has already accommodated some of Mr. Flynn's friends, among whom is Jimmy Hines. Another friend of "Paving Block" Flynn's was Dutch Schultz. No doubt he will be remembered. When Flynn was high sheriff in New York he appointed Dutch Schultz, noted for his criminal activities, as his deputy. That is the type of selection Mr. Flynn has made in the past when he was high sheriff in the Bronx. What is there to lead us to believe he would now associate himself with a different type of individual?

I believe the President of the United States should be able to appoint as minister to any nation a man of his own choosing, but I think that anyone the President appoints to a high diplomatic post to represent this country should have the basic American qualities of honesty and integrity and should be free of criminal entanglements, because the people in other lands are apt to judge America and Americans by the caliber of men who represent us.

Just who wants Flynn to go to Australia, anyway? Do the boys in our armed forces want Mr. Flynn over there? Does our gallant General MacArthur want him to help out over there? Does Cordell Hull, our esteemed Secretary of State, want Mr. Flynn as an ambassador or minister over there? Does Sumner Welles want Mr. Flynn there? Does Premier Curtin, of Australia, want Mr. Flynn?

My own State of New Hampshire has given the country many of its distinguished sons to serve in the diplomatic field. John Winant, my predecessor as Governor of New Hampshire, who is now Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, is one of them. I cannot imagine John Winant, knowing him as I do, swelling with pride at having "Paving Block" Flynn become one of his associates in the diplomatic field. I cannot imagine Joseph Grew, our great ex-Ambassador to Japan, swelling with pride at having "Boss" Flynn associated with him. I cannot believe that Mr. Moffat, our Minister to Canada, thinks a great deal of having Mr. Flynn become an associate of his as Minister to a country in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

I do not think we need to wonder what is behind this appointment. We in the Senate have got to answer to the boys who are giving their lives so that we can win this war and bring about a lasting peace, and, in my judgment, the winning of this war and laying the foundations for peace cannot be accomplished by sending to Australia or to any other country in vital battleground areas of the war a man of the caliber and type of "Paving Block" Flynn.

This is no time for the diplomatic service to harbor a man whose past clearly shows him to be wholly unfit for any high position. This is no time for the Senate of the United States to close its eyes. To win this war, the armed forces of the United States need the ablest officers and soldiers we can produce, and in the diplomatic field our Government needs the ablest and most experienced and intelligent representatives it is possible to obtain. "Paving Block" Flynn does not meet any of these specifications; he does not fall in this category.

Mr. President, I cannot imagine that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can be very proud of this nomination. I sympathize with them. I think it is a disgrace. I join with them

in the desire to rid the country and rid any political party of that type of leadership, but I hate to see a man such as "Paving Block" Flynn promoted in order to attain that end.

Along this line, I should like to introduce into the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial from the New York Times, of today, entitled "Mr. Flynn as Minister," and an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of June 18 last entitled "Head of Jury in Flynn Case Gets United States Job."

The head of the jury which whitewashed Flynn was shortly afterward rewarded by appointment to a Federal position.

I also ask to have printed an article from the New York Times entitled "Citizens Union Sees Flynn 'Whitewash'; Asks New Inquiry."

I also ask to have printed an article from the New York Herald Tribune under the headline "Kern Says City's Men, Material Were Used on Flynn's Estate."

Kern was at the head of the Civil Service Commission in New York City.

I present also an article of the New York World-Telegram entitled "Civic Groups Press Flynn Investigation."

I also submit an editorial from the Chicago Tribune entitled "The Whitewash Is Getting Thin."

I present also an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune under the headline "A Second Pail of Whitewash."

I submit also an article written by James M. Minifie entitled "Flynn Says He's Been Named Ambassador—Australia-Bound."

I ask that all these articles and editorials be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 11, 1943]

MR. FLYNN AS MINISTER

Our prestige abroad, and our morale at home, would both be harmed by an action so cynical as getting rid of the political embarrassment of Edward J. Flynn's presence as national chairman of the Democratic Party through the device of making him Minister to Australia. This is so evident that we shall prefer not to believe that this appointment has been offered definitely and irrevocably to Mr. Flynn until the President himself confirms the fact.

In that case there will be no proper course of action for the Senate except to reject the appointment.

---

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 18, 1942]

HEAD OF JURY IN FLYNN CASE GETS UNITED STATES JOB

NEW YORK, June 17.—A letter was sent to the United States Civil Service Commission today advising that Daniel A. Daly, foreman of the Bronx grand jury which exonerated Democratic National Chairman Edward J. Flynn in the Belgian paving-block case, soon would take a job in Washington. The Citizens Committee to Reopen the Flynn Case questioned whether "Mr. Daly is being rewarded for services rendered to Mr. Flynn" and said people were "beginning to wonder if the road to Washington is paved with Belgian blocks."

[From the New York Times of May 7, 1942]

CITIZENS UNION SEES FLYNN "WHITEWASH"; ASKS NEW INQUIRY—APPEALS TO LEHMAN TO NAME SPECIAL PROSECUTOR TO LOOK INTO "SERIOUS CRIME"—KERN IS "NOT SURPRISED"—CALLS PRESENTMENT "SHOCKING"—SAYS HE WILL CONTINUE TO TRY TO EXPOSE LEADER

Following the failure of the Bronx County grand jury last Tuesday to return indictments against any of the persons involved in the paving charges against Edward J. Flynn, the Citizens Union joined yesterday with Paul J. Kern, author of the charges, in labeling the action a "whitewash."

The executive committee of the Citizens Union decided at a meeting yesterday afternoon to ask Governor Lehman to supersede District Attorney Samuel J. Foley of the Bronx in a new investigation. In a telegram to the Governor the Citizens Union said:

"The Flynn grand jury presentment is an obvious whitewash. Its findings prove that a serious public crime was committed, but it fails to fix responsibility and indicts no one. Some one accepted the stolen paving blocks for the Flynn estate and someone in the city government ordered them delivered. Both should be punished to make clear that such practices will not be tolerated and that important political figures do not enjoy special immunity. When we asked you earlier to supersede District Attorney Foley in this case because of his close associations with Mr. Flynn you replied:

" 'I have personally talked with the district attorney and he has given me his assurance that he will proceed without fear or favor. There can be no failure to discharge his constitutional obligations before he has even been given a chance to act. As Governor I would not be justified at this time in superseding the district attorney.'

"The district attorney has now had his chance. He has failed to secure a proper fixing of responsibility for the crime. We renew our urgent request that you instruct the attorney general to appoint a special prosecutor, not affiliated with Mr. Flynn, to do so."

NOT SURPRISED, KERN SAYS

Mr. Kern, deposed president of the municipal civil service commission, said he would not abate his efforts to expose the "Flynn-flamming" he attributed to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee. In a statement on the Bronx grand jury's action Mr. Kern said:

"The presentment is shocking, but not surprising. It could hardly be expected that a district attorney elected by the Flynn machine would find anything wrong with Edward J. Flynn. Certain irrevocable facts stand as follows:

"1. City employees using city-owned paving blocks and equipment, including trucks, paved the courtyard of the Edward J. Flynn estate at Lake Mahopac on November 14, 15, 17, and 18, 1941.

"2. Edward J. Flynn was present in person during this operation and was identified by six city employees and said it was a nice job.

"3. No payment to the city or restitution of any sort took place until after I disclosed this matter under oath on January 16, more than 2 months after the job was completed. If restitution after disclosure is now a defense to grand larceny in the Bronx, every thief is saved from prosecution merely by returning what he took if he is caught.

"4. Although investigators assigned by the mayor had done nothing on the case after December 18, I was three times ordered by the mayor to cease my own investigation of this matter on January 20, 21, and 26, 1942.

INSISTS CRIME WAS COMMITTED

"These 8,000 paving blocks did not fly to Lake Mahopac on their own initiative to enjoy the country air. They were sent there. The presentment is silent on who sent this city property to the Flynn estate. Such action was a crime under any circumstances, for no borough official of the Bronx has power even to loan, rent, or sell city property.

"A finding by Bronx politicians that politics is pure in the Bronx is not convincing. The brazen use of city property for the private benefit of Overlord Flynn would make the 'great McGinty' blush.

"Fortunately we are still living in a democracy, and the people of the State will shortly have an opportunity to appraise the public character of Edward J. Flynn and his political machine. I shall continue my personal efforts to expose this 'Flynn-flamming' further."

Mr. Flynn's office reported yesterday that he had no comment to make on the grand jury's disposition of the case. Mayor La Guardia was similarly silent. Early in the investigation the mayor asked District Attorney Frank Hogan of Manhattan to proceed against him if it could be proved that he had blocked the inquiry, or to proceed against an afternoon newspaper that printed that charge if it were found untrue. In view of the Bronx inquiry Mr. Hogan took no action on the mayor's request.

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 8, 1942]

KERN SAYS CITY'S MEN, MATERIAL WERE USED ON FLYNN'S ESTATE—CHARGES 27 MUNICIPAL WORKERS BUILT COURTYARD IN DEMOCRATIC LEADER'S LAKE MAHOPAC HOME; SAYS MAYOR WAS TOLD "NEARLY 4 MONTHS AGO"

Paul J. Kern, ousted president of the municipal civil service commission, charged yesterday that 27 city employees built an antique Belgian courtyard last November on the Putnam County estate at Lake Mahopac of Edward J. Flynn, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, with property which Mr. Kern asserted was "stolen" from the city.

Mr. Kern said that the civil service commission had examined upward of 30 city employees, including the 27 who built the antique Belgian courtyard, and had a subpena made out and ready to serve on Mr. Flynn when Mayor F. H. LaGuardia suspended Kern and the other two members of the commission on February 6.

Mr. Kern said: "This favor to Mr. Flynn cost the city in excess of $2,000," and he asserted that Mayor LaGuardia had the information contained in his accusing statement "for nearly 4 months."

Mr. Flynn was registered at the Roney Plaza Hotel, Miami Beach, Fla., last night. There was no response to telephone calls to his room and other efforts to reach him for comment on the Kern charges also were unavailing. Mr. Flynn is in the South on business for the Democratic National Committee.

At the home of Mayor LaGuardia, 1274 Fifth Avenue, a New York Herald Tribune reporter sent a note to the mayor asking him whether he cared to comment. The mayor replied that there would be no comment last night.

Mr. Kern further charged that Mr. Flynn was present during the building of the antique Belgian courtyard and was quoted as saying in the presence of at least one city employee: "It is a nice job."

The civil service commission's examination of the city employees began on January 16, and Mr. Kern said that some time thereafter some of the city employees who had been paid by the city "also received checks from Flynn's gardener."

"This belated confession of guilt," said Mr. Kern, "coming only after fear of exposure was imminent, and 2 months after the job was completed, may have been to fabricate an alibi that these city workers were off duty on the days in question and being paid by the city for accumulated overtime."

After he started his examination of witnesses, and "when this story was completely" in his possession, Mr. Kern alleged he had been "assailed by many threats and entreaties to suppress it, on the grounds, among others, that it might embarrass the national administration in the midst of its war effort to have the chairman of the Democratic National Committee so involved."

Mr. Kern had been on close terms with the Mayor for 12 years, serving as his secretary when Mr. LaGuardia was a Member of Congress.

The break in their friendship came when the commission tried to force out four employees in the city register's office, replacing them with persons selected by civil-service examination. Mr. Kern held the employees had been handpicked by politicians. The mayor said they were entitled to their jobs.

DENOUNCED CHANLER

The case went into court where Corporation Counsel William C. Chanler deserted Mr. Kern, who thereupon argued his own case and lost. The commission voted to appeal the decision and issued a statement denouncing Mr. Chanler.

Mayor LaGuardia suspended the commission on charges of insubordination and after a stormy hearing announced February 16 that Mr. Kern and a fellow commissioner, Dr. Wallace S. Sayre, had been removed from office. The third member of the commission, Ferdinand Q. Morton, Negro, was reinstated because he was ill at home and had no part in preparing the statement denouncing Mr. Chanler. Mr. Kern and Dr. Sayre have taken their removal to the courts, asking reinstatement.

Mr. Kern said he was moved to make his charges, because "the public is absolutely entitled to know these facts, casting light as they do upon the character of one of their national leaders in this crisis, and that a great President, absorbed with the tribulations of a terrible World War is entitled to political leadership superior to that emanating from Lake Mahopac."

The antique Belgian courtyard was paved with about 9,000 old granite paving blocks from three municipal storage yards in the Bronx, and were laid in a quadrangle about five-eighths of an inch apart so that the grass would grow between them Mr. Kern charged. The work was supervised by a landscape architect hired by Mr. Flynn, according to the charges. Mr. Kern said that Work Projects Administration wagons and employees were also used, but that he could not investigate this phase of the work.

He said the plans for the antique Belgian courtyard were agreed upon last September when Robert L. Moran, Bronx Commissioner of Borough Works, took a municipal foreman to Mr. Flynn's county estate in Putnam County.

When the statement was read to him last night Mr. Moran said: "We in the borough president's office are investigating those charges, and until we finish the investigation, I don't think it would be proper to make a statement. We are not looking to get into a controversy with Mr. Kern."

TEXT OF KERN'S STATEMENT

The text of Mr. Kern's statement follows:

"About the middle of last September, Robert L. Moran, Bronx Commissioner of Borough Works, took Fred Dennerlein, a general foreman of the city service to Lake Mahopac, N. Y., to look over and lay out an extensive construction and paving job proposed to be done by the city at the country mansion of Edward J. Flynn, chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

"Moran is second in command in the Borough of the Bronx to James J. Lyons, borough president and product of the Flynn political machine.

"On about November 13, a typewritten message was left in Dennerlein's official pigeonhole at the main office of Bronx Borough Works, directing him to go ahead with the Flynn job.

"On the morning of November 14, 1941, two city trucks of 1½ tons, Nos. 62 and 63, from the city garage at 181st Street and Webster Avenue, were assigned to the private job on the Flynn estate and left for Lake Mahopac. The assignment continued for some days thereafter. The trucks were supplied with large quantities of city gasoline to make several round trips to the Flynn mansion, a round trip distance of 108 miles.

"On the same morning, November 14, a considerable quantity of city equipment, including wheelbarrows, shovels, rakes, rammers, brooms, etc., were taken to the Flynn estate for the job. This continued daily for some days thereafter.

"On the same day, November 14, 11 civil-service employees were assigned to work full time on the Flynn job upstate as follows: Otto Haselman, foreman; Joseph Theiss, paver; Paul Quinn, paver; Thomas Walsh, paver; Ralph Fioralli, rammer; Frederick Ueberacher, paver; John Motto, laborer; John Drigel, laborer; William Hickey, laborer; William Kramer, laborer; and James Finn, laborer.

SENT BY SUPERIORS, HE SAYS

"This assignment continued for some days thereafter, and general foreman Dennerlein oversaw the job daily. These men were paid by the city for the days worked on the Flynn job at a cost to the taxpayers of several hundred dollars.

"After this case was broken by the civil service commission on January 16, 1942, some of these men also received checks from Flynn's gardener. This belated confession of guilt, coming only after fear of exposure was imminent and more than 2 months after the job was completed, may have been to fabricate an alibi that these city workers were off duty on the days in question and being paid by the city for accumulated overtime. Suffice it to answer this phony hypothesis by saying that these city workers were sent to the private job by their city superiors, not by private employers; that they were paid in full by the city for the days worked; that they received 'not so much as a drink of water' on the job; that the official pay-roll sheets filed with the comptroller late in November saw no notation of any charge for overtime; that it is admitted that no written record of such overtime exists in the office of the Bronx borough president.

"On the same day (November 14) two other gangs of city employees, Nos. 33 and 34, were assigned to loading city-owned paving blocks onto trucks for transportation to the Flynn job. About 9,000 such city-owned blocks were loaded at the Gulden Avenue storage yard at Gulden Avenue and Two Hundredth Street during that and succeeding days. These were reclaimed blocks with a market value to the city of about $100.

"The 2 gangs of civil-service workers assigned to this loading job were concrete gangs 33 and 34, whose foremen were Eugene Farrell and Joseph Verdecanna. In addition to the foremen, 2 truck drivers were assigned to take these gangs to the Gulden yard for loading the blocks on trucks for the Flynn job (not the same trucks used for transportation of the blocks). These were Aubrey J. Cross, who drove gang 33 in truck 47 to the loading point for the Flynn job; Michael McConnville, who drove the combined gangs in truck 22 for the same purpose.

GIVES LIST OF MEN ASSIGNED

"The 10 civil-service employees assigned to the loading itself were Daniel Corsillo, Giuseppi Capeluppi, Leonardo Marinaccio, John Greco, Vincenzo Pasqualo, Anthony Capolino, Vincent Pizzano, Dominick Cozenzo, James Tracy, and Calogero Rizzo.

"These men were all paid by the city for the work of loading city-owned blocks onto the trucks for the Flynn estate, and in one case where certain of them worked on the Flynn loading job on a day normally off, they were given another day off at city expense a week later to compensate them.

"It should be carefully noted that as far as the record shows of these men and the other workers involved were merely honest civil-service employees doing the job assigned to them by their superiors. No participation in the fraud on the city can possibly be imputed to them. All of these employees were truthful, though some were reluctant witnesses when called.

"Altogether the record shows 27 city employees were assigned in one way or another at either end of the Flynn job over a main period of 4 days.

"Mr. Edward J. Flynn and Mrs. Flynn were present at the job while it was progressing; were identified by some of the men, and Mr. Flynn is quoted as saying that 'it was a nice job.'

"Mr. Flynn, incidentally, furnished a few loads of sand for the job at his own expense while it was in progress, and by this public-spirited gesture no doubt reduced somewhat the cost of the whole project to the city taxpayers.

"No precise estimate of the cost of this private job at public expense has yet been made, but, on the basis of the number of employees involved, the trucking costs, the amount of city equipment used and the supplies furnished, plus overhead, it seems certain that this favor to Mr. Flynn cost the city in excess of $2,000. A small part of this was charged against the private plumbers of the Bronx, since the borough president charged some of the labor to a fund provided by plumbers to repay the city for the cost of paving cuts made by plumbers.

"The record of investigation shows, incidentally, incredibly sloppy methods of record keeping in the office of the Bronx borough president. It shows, for instance, about 20 laborers charged to the labor gangs, but actually assigned to driving cars, many of them passenger cars for officials. It shows false entries regarding certain of the transactions here recorded, and a complete failure of record keeping regarding other matters.

"The record indicates, furthermore, in addition to the assignment of large amounts of city equipment, the probability that the Work Projects Administration was charged for at least part of the trucking costs of carrying the 9,000 stolen city paving blocks from the Gulden Avenue storage yard to Lake Mahopac, 54 miles away. About 8 trips were apparently made by heavy trucks on this part of the project, and the records of the Work Projects Administration for November indicate the possibility that this trucking was charged to them. No jurisdiction existed in the civil service commission to examine this phase of the case, however, and specific information in my possession in this regard is withheld for fear of aiding the establishment of an alibi.

"TELLS OF THREATS

"Since January 16, when this story was first completely in my possession, I have been assailed by many threats and entreaties to suppress it, on the ground, among others, that it might embarrass the national administration in the midst of its war effort to have the chairman of the Democratic National Committee so involved.

"I have carefully considered these threats and entreaties at length, and have rejected them. Full public information is, to my mind, the bulwark of democracy. It is therefore my view that the public is absolutely entitled to know these facts, casting light as they do upon the character of one of their national leaders in this crisis, and that a great President, absorbed with the tribulations of a terrible world war, is entitled to

political leadership superior to that emanating from Lake Mahopac.

"If this story assists to either end, I shall feel amply rewarded for the personal cost at which I made it public.

"The mayor has had this information for nearly 4 months."

---

[From the New York World-Telegram of May 20, 1942]

CIVIC GROUPS PRESS FLYNN INVESTIGATION

Although the March Bronx grand jury has handed up a second presentment clearing Democratic National Chairman Edward J. Flynn in the use of city paving blocks and laborers on his Lake Mahopac estate, the critical reaction of civic groups showed today that they have no intention of dropping the matter.

Prof. Herman A. Gray and Sydney S. Baron, of the citizens committee to reopen the Flynn case, called the new presentment "blundering and brazen."

THREATS ALLEGED

They said that there were "threats of contempt or criminal proceedings" against the juror who in an affidavit to the committee last week stated that District Attorney Samuel J. Foley's advice to the grand jury had "prevented it from seriously considering an indictment," and that it took the grand jury 10 hours yesterday to convince the "recalcitrant" juror he acted under "misapprehension."

Revelation of the juror's name to the grand jury was forced by the grand jury through its subpena power, the committee spokesmen said. They added they would give Governor Lehman reasonable time to answer their request, based on the juror's statement, to order a new investigation of the Flynn case, and if they met with a refusal or received no answer they would consider what steps to take to force a reopening of the investigation.

George H. Hallett, Jr., secretary of the Citizens Union, which twice asked Governor Lehman to supersede Mr. Foley, announced that the executive committee would meet later in the day to discuss the Flynn case, in particular, the application of Robert L. Moran, Bronx Borough works commissioner, for retirement.

He said the union probably would urge the board of estimate at its meeting tomorrow to investigate Mr. Moran's part in the case before it grants him a pension.

LEOPARD'S SPOTS UNCHANGED

Speaking of the grand jury's new presentment, Mr. Hallett said:

"Apparently the leopard hasn't changed his spots. It is more of the same thing."

Paul J. Kern, ousted head of the municipal civil service commission, who was the first to expose the Flynn case, commented:

"Two coats of whitewash on Mr. Flynn will not conceal what one coat failed to hide: that is, city-owned paving blocks were laid by city employees with city equipment at Mr. Flynn's Lake Mahopac estate November 14, 15, 17, and 18, 1941, and that no restitution of any kind had been made until I exposed this case more than 2 months later."

The statement issued by Professor Gray and Mr. Baron follows:

"We expected that the dirty old whitewash would get a new coat, but nothing quite as blundering and brazen as this. On Friday morning we made public a sworn statement, voluntarily made by a grand juror, that Foley advice to the grand jury had prevented it from seriously considering an indictment. If that statement were untrue, Foley could and should have denied it promptly. He hasn't done so yet. The jury itself, at Foley's call, met Monday morning in extraordinary session for more than 3 hours. But it couldn't produce so simple a thing as a denial. Instead it forced the revelation of the juror's name through its subpena power.

"Meanwhile there were threats of contempt or criminal proceedings against the juror. Then followed a continuous session of 10 hours on Tuesday before the juror could be convinced that he had acted under 'misapprehension.' Apparently it was a hard nut to crack. What happened behind that closed door? What arguments were used to persuade the juror of his 'error'?

"Foley can tell us. He isn't a grand juror and may speak freely. Let him tell.

"When the juror's statement was made public we offered to present him to the Governor so that he could tell his story. Wouldn't that have been the better way?

"We look to the Governor for action. It must now be clear who it is who is undermining our judicial administration—whether it is the termites working in the dark or the 'well-meaning citizens' who seek to let in light and air."

CONDUCT IS DEFENDED

In its second presentment, the Bronx grand jury defended its conduct during the investigation, excoriating the press and the citizens' committee.

JUROR MADE RESEARCH

The juror's affidavit pointed out that Mr. Foley told the jury that he and his "capable" staff would go through the evidence in the Kern and Herlands investigations and "would bring to the attention of the grand jury any discrepancies which might be found."

"From some personal research I made in the Herlands testimony," the juror stated, "I do not think that that promise was carried out, especially with regard to one very important instance." This brought this reply, in last night's presentment:

"Upon consideration of paragraph 4 of the affidavit, we find that all of the discrepancies which were known to us were brought to the attention of the respective witnesses by the district attorney or by individual members of the grand jury and each point cleared up to our satisfaction and there can be no criticism concerning this point."

"This grand jury refuses to be coerced by any politically minded group of politically motivated individuals," the presentment concluded. "The grand jury clearly and concisely set forth its findings in its prior presentment; it represented their views then and does so now."

---

[From the Chicago Tribune of May 25, 1942]

THE WHITEWASH IS GETTING THIN

Ed "Paving Blocks" Flynn's golfing partner and political man Friday, District Attorney Samuel J. Foley, of the Bronx, reached the conclusion that his coat of whitewash which his grand jury applied to the Democratic national chairman wasn't sticking any too well. The grand jury had been forced by publicity to investigate the theft of city-owned paving blocks, which later were laid by city labor in a courtyard in Flynn's country estate. Flynn made restitution after the graft was exposed and the grand jury brought in the strange report that although the crime had been committed, no one was indictable for it.

Much light was thrown on the incident when one of the grand jurors made an affidavit that Flynn's district attorney, Foley, had instructed the jurors that an indictment could not be voted if allegedly stolen property had been returned before the grand jury indicted. That is the old pickpocket's defense of offering to return the victim's wallet if he will refrain from testifying in court and has no standing whatever in the law.

When the affidavit was made public Mr. Foley called his grand jury back into session. There was no further attempt to investigate Flynn. Instead, the grand juror who spilled the beans was, according to members of the New York Citizens' committee, threatened with citation for contempt or criminal prosecution in an effort to force him to withdraw his statement.

Foley's first coat of whitewash couldn't conceal Flynn's venality and the second only served to wash off the first. In the words of Paul J. Kern, who was fired from his New York City job by Flynn's ally, Mayor LaGuardia, for exposing the scandal, the net result of the whole proceeding is to establish in Flynn's borough of the Bronx that stealing from the city is not a serious offense but exposure of the theft is.

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 21, 1942]

A SECOND PAIL OF WHITEWASH

The Bronx grand jury has met again and once more has whitewashed the Honorable Edward J. Flynn, sage of the Bronx, grand panjandrum of the Democratic National Committee and present owner of the 8,000 Belgian paving blocks that mysteriously disappeared from the city's store yards last November. More in sorrow than in anger the grand jury has pointed out that whoever questions its verdict is a nasty man, and that its member who (counter to rules and regulations) made a statement which implied that the jury had been instructed how it should act in the matter of the Belgian paving blocks was nothing but an ignoramus who didn't know the law when he met it face to face in the jury room, and who, besides speaking out of turn, said things which he had no business to say and which, therefore, were not true. With heroic tenacity the grand jury reaffirmed its previous findings in all and every particular. By implication, the Honorable Eddy Flynn is now so white and pure that even the cherubim and seraphim will be envious of him.

This is all very well as an example of table-thumping self-exculpation in the face of criticism which has been as bitter as it has been devastating. Many a child has used the same tactics when told he has made a mistake. Lewis Carroll, in the Hunting of the Snark, quotes "this man that they used to call dunce" as saying:

" 'Tis the note of the jubjub; keep count, I entreat;
You will find I have told it you twice.
'Tis the song of the jubjub. The proof is complete
If only I've stated it thrice."

All that now remains is for the grand jury to convene a third time and a third time to say that all is rosy in the otherwise festered Bronx, and the proof will be complete.

What the gentlemen of the jury, like the Governor and the Bronx district attorney, overlook is that the presentment which has been reaffirmed is in itself a severe indictment. The presentment finds that approximately 8,000 second-hand granite paving blocks, the property of the city of New York, were transported from the city to Mr. Flynn's Lake Mahopac estate and were laid by city workmen who had been transported in city cars. This confirms the charge made before the grand jury met. The presentment then proceeds to recite that "after the issuance of subpenas by the civil service commission indicated that an investigation was forward, all of the city employees who worked at Mahopac received checks covering their full time at the city rate of pay, and approximately 8,000 blocks were returned to the city yards." In other words, when it became apparent that this utterly irregular transaction might become a public scandal, restitution was made to the city. Yet we are expected to believe that this work, which was done by city employees on the estate of Mr. Edward J. Flynn, was not done by them at his request. Apparently Commissioner Moran and his foreman, from the office of the Bronx borough president, supervised the

work for purely altruistic reasons, because they loved their friend and protector, Mr. Flynn, so dearly, and suspected that he would be surprised and pleased to find his courtyard paved with city blocks by city employees when he returned from sunning himself in Florida.

The grand jury can reaffirm its presentment a hundred times without convincing the people that mere repetition makes the proof complete. It is a little too much to expect New Yorkers to ignore the fact that the district attorney who had charge of the case, as well as the judge before whom the presentment was handed down, together with one of the principal individuals who took part in the laying of the blocks—Mr. Robert J. Moran—were close political and personal associates of the chairman of the Democratic National Committee on whose property the blocks were laid—as is Governor Lehman, who has done his share to shield Mr. Flynn from a fair and impartial investigation.

---

[From the Washington Post of January 7, 1943.]

DIPLOMATIC SURPRISE—FLYNN SAYS HE'S BEEN NAMED AMBASSADOR—AUSTRALIA-BOUND

(By James M. Minifie)

Announcement by Edward J. Flynn, retiring chairman of the Democratic National Committee, that he had been chosen as President Roosevelt's ambassador and personal representative and as Minister to Australia was received with surprise in American and British circles here yesterday.

Flynn at a press conference in New York, had issued a statement saying:

"The President has today appointed me his ambassador and personal representative, and will send to the Senate on Monday my nomination as Minister Plenipotentiary to Australia.

"I have called a meeting of the Democratic National Committee for Monday, January 18, 1943, at 10:30 a. m. at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.

"At that meeting I will resign as chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

"I have also called a meeting of the executive committee of the democratic county committee of Bronx County for tomorrow, Saturday, at 11 a. m., at which time I will resign as chairman of the executive committee of the democratic county committee of Bronx County."

Flynn said he understood President Roosevelt would give out the text of the letter in Washington yesterday, in which he said it would be explained that "I have more or less a roving commission in the South Pacific as the President's personal representative and ambassador."

The White House was obviously a little put out at being beaten to the gun on the announcement. No confirmation of the nomination was available there, although it was not denied. William D. Hassett, White House secretary, said: "There will be nothing from the White House tonight on it."

Asked whether it was not somewhat unusual for the announcement of an appointment of this nature to come from the recipient rather than the White House, Hassett said: "I shall let you be the judge of that."

It was treated with outright skepticism at the Canadian Legation, where a representative of the senior Dominion pointed out that "surely the word 'Ambassador' must be wrong. There is no law, of course, but the invariable custom of the junior members of the Commonwealth has been to send and receive ministers, not ambassadors."

At the Australian Legation, officials at first turned down inquirers with the formal "No comment," but when asked if they knew Flynn, replied: "Well, he is a public figure to some extent. His name is known."

State Department officials declined to be drawn into any discussion of the nomination, pointing out that this was a purely White House matter. No comment could be obtained on reports that earlier proposals to appoint Flynn to one of the smaller South or Central American republics had been sidetracked by the State Department.

President Roosevelt previously has given the rank of ambassador to personal representatives sent abroad, as in the recent case of William Phillips, veteran diplomat, who on last December 11 was sent to troubled India as the President's personal envoy.

Earlier, Myron C. Taylor had been given a similar title, with unofficial rank as ambassador for social purposes, when he was sent to the Vatican.

But the Flynn appointment, as announced by Flynn, would be in a different category, since in neither of the earlier cases was there an American Minister already on the ground.

The present Minister to Australia is Nelson T. Johnson, who is a career diplomatist, with long experience in China before he was appointed to his present post. It is believed that he will retain that post.

Flynn said he expected to leave for Australia the first week in February.

"I am very happy," he declared. "I think it is a splendid opportunity to do a great deal of work connected with the war."

However, there have been strong reports in the Capital that Postmaster General Frank C. Walker would become chairman if Flynn resigned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate at this moment to discuss the nomination of Mr. Flynn to be Minister to Australia. I realize, as we all do, I suppose, that the fact that Mr. Flynn was involved in some way in the use of some paving blocks in the State of New York constitutes a convenient political peg upon which to hang criticism. I have no knowledge of that transaction except as I have received, from one who knows, information which I regard as reliable. The matter involved was investigated by two grand juries in the State of New York. I suppose at least on the surface, and prima facie, we have to assume that those grand juries were honest. Whether it is necessary to investigate again before a grand jury of New York I do not know, and it is not any concern of mine whether the processes of justice in New York City or New York State require further grand jury investigation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. The nomination of Mr. Flynn has been sent to the Senate by the President, and it has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think the Senator from New Hampshire at least might await the investigation and report of that committee before he comes forth with a tirade against Mr. Flynn. I realize that the Senator from New Hampshire will get the first headlines in the papers tomorrow by his attack upon Mr. Flynn, and that is always a position of advantage; but in all sincerity it seems to me that the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senate itself might well await the action of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I can state to the Senator, not only on my own behalf, as I happen to be a member of the committee, but I can assure him also, I think, on behalf of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], that whatever may be involved touching the propriety of this appointment, or the efficiency or the qualifications of Mr. Flynn to be Minister to Australia, will be inquired into by the committee to which the nomination has been referred. It seems to me we might very well await the findings of that committee with respect to the matter.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield now?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator says the Senator from New Hampshire might well have waited until the Foreign Relations Committee had acted. Let me say that it might have been proper for Mr. Flynn to have waited until Mr. Roosevelt sent in his nomination, rather than make the announcement himself, which is the customary procedure.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the Senator from New Hampshire is taking Mr. Flynn, whom he criticizes, as an example for what he does here now in advance of the action of the committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. I hope that if the majority leader looks into this case throughly, and finds the facts of it, he will be leading the opposition against Mr. Flynn.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make no prediction about that. I shall be governed by the facts, and I shall be governed by them, I hope, in fairness and in a judicial manner, and not by reason of political prejudice.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am sure the Senator will not have any political prejudice against Mr. Flynn. I am very sure of that.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from New Hampshire is more certain of that than he is of many other things which have happened in the Senate which have been sponsored and discussed by the Senator from New Hampshire. I wish to say that I have appreciated the attitude of the Senator from New Hampshire on many things which have been before the Senate of the United States. He has in many instances and in many situations exhibited a broad-minded statesmanship which I have admired, and it is for that reason that I adjure him, if I may use such a word, to be equally judicious and fair in his attitude in this matter.

Mr. BRIDGES. I certainly shall be, and I hope the Senator will adopt the same fair attitude.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall do that.

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall be interested in the attitude of the Senator from Kentucky and of some of his associates, one of whom—and I hope he is on the floor now—gave an endorsement of Mr. Flynn, which I read in the newspapers. I was certainly amazed that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] should be endorsing "Boss" Flynn. I was not surprised at some of the others who endorsed him, but I was surprised at the endorsement by the Senator from New

Mexico, whom I hold in high esteem and who is known to be the author of acts to clean up politics. How he could come out for "Boss" Flynn is more than I can understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have said all I care to say about the matter.

### EPIC OF A BATTLESHIP—TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN OFFICERS AND MEN

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, out of the vast movements, skirmishes, and battles which are war there emerges from time to time a decisive action—an epic of courage, bravery, and precision which marks a guide post, a turning point in a great struggle. Such an epic action has recently been brought to the notice of the American people by the publication of the daring exploits of Captain Gatch and his crew aboard a United States battleship somewhere in the southwest Pacific.

Mr. President, these are the exploits of a battleship—that much-maligned weapon which our armchair strategists have loudly proclaimed to be an obsolete and utterly useless weapon, untenable in the face of combined sea and air attack. Senators, when the complete history of this war shall have been written we shall find that the battleship has more than justified itself as an essential component of that important concept of "balanced military strength" which Admiral Woodward has so recently and so ably described.

Some time before this story was released for public consumption I received a graphic account of all its glowing details from the lips of a young, alert junior officer who had participated in these actions. This young man had traveled the world over on his own initiative—working his way from port to port during his summer vacations away from college. He is only one of the many thousands of this type of sturdy, young Americans who have so bravely responded to the needs of their country—the type of young American in whom we may all take unbounded pride. What he and others like him are doing all across this embattled world has been very vividly portrayed by this newspaper account of the bravery and daring exhibited by Captain Gatch and his indomitable crew.

That young junior officer is my son.

When this epic battle had ended in the complete and frenzied rout of the enemy, my son's ship put into an American port. After taking leave of his officers and friends, my son proceeded homeward by the first possible means, arriving there in the bleak, gray hours of the early morning. Anxious to see his family, and knowing how much his homecoming meant to me, he roused me from a sound slumber. It was 3:15 a. m. After the great joy of our renewed meeting had somewhat subsided, he unfolded to me the details of this great engagement. He told me of the heroism, courage, and resolution of American officers and men; of their gallant exploits in a violent, seething storm of hell and fire; of the wounds which man and officer bore without flinching from the fight; of the deep respect and abiding faith which all the ship's crew held for their fighting skipper.

What a sterling leader this Captain Gatch. What a gallant captain he, who built up within his brave crew such a profound respect, such an abiding confidence, that they would sail willingly with him into the jaws of lurking death. Such leadership as this must not go uncited and unsung. It is such wise and confidence-born leadership as this that will lead America into that better and more productive era which lies ahead. My son also told me of the heavy destruction wrought upon the enemy, or his ultimate flight, and of our relentless pursuit of his fleeing remnants. This stirring account was not completed until the dawn had fully ripened.

Senators, that was a thrilling story, such a story as can be told by every American father and mother who has listened to the experiences of gallant sons who have been in action on the fighting fronts. It is proof positive that in spite of the many dour rumblings we have heard about the weakness and frivolity of the young American, we may now take great heart in the knowledge that when the chips are down, when the battle lines are drawn, the young American has got it in him. He is a fighting man. He will engage and defeat the enemy.

These are the young men—men from the farm, the factory, and the countinghouse—whose chorus of "Aye, aye!" rang out across the churning ocean when their gallant skipper, Gatch, asked them if they were willing to sail into the menacing mouth of an enemy-laid trap. These are the same young Americans whom our boastful and misguided enemies held up to the world as being so soft, so fragile, so afraid to fight. The answer to those hollow epithets is now being heard round the world. To all those who may still doubt the ability of young America to fight, I say let them read the record—that glorious record written in the rock cliffs of Bataan, the steaming jungles of New Guinea, the endless sands of North Africa, the vast expanses of the seven seas, and the trackless air fronts all across the world.

Yes, the exploits of this generation of Americans are being written in every outpost of the globe. Their deeds are no less worthy, no less honorable than were the deeds of the great American heroes who have gone before.

Let us honor, let us pay tribute to these gallant men. They bear well the standard of courage and freedom which was passed on to them by their unfaltering forefathers. These young men shall not falter in the great cause. With continued victories such as this daring triumph scored in the waters off the Solomons, they shall forever preserve the name of glorious America.

Mr. President, because I believe that this notable victory represents an outstanding epic in the history of sea warfare, an epic which sounds the clarion call of an inevitable United Nations victory in this titanic struggle against tyranny, and because I believe that the inspiring deeds of gallantry and courage performed by these young Americans under the hell of heavy fire will be indelibly written into the history of our times, I feel that the account of this far-reaching victory should become a recognized part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

When I speak of victory, I do not speak merely of that complete and total military destruction which must come to Tojo and Hitler, and to the evil and oppressive forces which they have loosed upon the world. I mean that full and productive victory above and beyond this military struggle. I mean that social victory of growth, progress, and security, wherein we shall conquer the forces of poverty, unemployment, and their attendant chaos. That is the final victory—the only victory worthy of the price. Wise policy, progressive outlook, and determined application will gain that victory for us. The young men who fight and die on the fields of battle are doing their part. Let us here not fail to do ours.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article portraying this great event, which was written by Hugh Morrow, and which appeared in the January 4 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### UNITED STATES BATTLESHIP'S SAGA—DOWNED 32 JAP PLANES AND SANK 4 WARCRAFT

(By Hugh Morrow)

WASHINGTON, January 3.—The Navy today proudly revealed the thrilling story of a United States battleship in the southwest Pacific which shot down 32 Jap planes and thwarted the heaviest air attack ever made on a battleship, and less than 3 weeks later sank 3 enemy cruisers and a destroyer or light cruiser.

It was a story of superb equipment—of 16-inch guns which wiped out the 3 Jap cruisers before the foe knew what was hitting them, of antiaircraft guns which destroyed all 20 dive bombers in the first wave of raiders, and allowed only 2 of the 64 planes which came over in the next 2 waves to get within striking distance. Even then, 1 of those 2 planes was destroyed, and its torpedo churned away harmlessly through the sea. In all, the battleship sank or damaged 8 Jap warships.

But it was even more a tale of intelligent and courageous men—of nearly 2,000 voices chorusing "Aye, aye!" when the captain asked if the men were ready for battle; of green enlisted men and newly commissioned junior officers who fought like veterans; of Negro and Filipino mess boys who manned antiaircraft guns and kept them blazing while a Jap dive bomber cut loose a 500-pounder only 100 feet above their heads.

It also was the story of a square-jawed, 51-year-old fighting lawyer, who was stationed at the Philadelphia Navy Yard in 1922 and left his desk in the Judge Advocate General's office in Washington only last February to take over his wartime command at sea.

He is Capt. Thomas Leigh Gatch, of Annapolis, Md., who had an artery in his neck torn open and an arm left dangling uselessly when bomb fragments struck him during the air assault, yet was back on the job in the surface action which came 3 weeks later and turned what the Japs thought would be a trap for American ships into a blazing graveyard for the arrogant warriors of Nippon.

The story of Captain Gatch's ship is a spine-tingling chapter of the engagements

leading up to and including the now famous battle of Guadalcanal, fought chiefly off Savo Island at the northern tip of Guadalcanal.

The outline of that battle—in which the Japs lost 28 ships, including a battleship and another battleship or heavy cruiser and we lost 9 ships—has been sketched in previous Navy communiqués.

But the story of the battleship, based largely on Captain Gatch's reports to the Navy Department, served to show even better than the statistical record the kind of men and ships that are going through hell for us—and perhaps, too, to settle the question of whether the battleship is obsolete.

First came the air attack, on October 26. American aircraft carriers, with protective forces, were moving out to meet three Japanese carriers coming from the north of the Solomons. Captain Gatch's battleship was escorting one of the big flat-tops.

"Ask the men if they are ready," Captain Gatch said quietly.

Over the public-address system, the communications officer read the captain's message.

From stem to stern, from engine room to conning tower, welled up the response to the bridge.

"Aye, aye!" chorused nearly 2,000 voices. The men were ready.

Then came the Japs. Downward screamed the planes bearing the insignia of the Rising Sun. The carrier was the first objective. Then the enemy flyers spotted the battleship. Visions of a second *Repulse* or *Prince of Wales* (British battleships sunk in the Java Sea) must have passed through their minds. Twenty dive bombers tore for the battlewagon.

But the Japs reckoned without the rows of antiaircraft guns bristling along the battleship's length. They weren't ready for the curtain of steel flung thousands of yards by the secondary battery of larger guns.

Captain Gatch gave his orders to the helmsman.

"Our ship was cutting circles and figure 8's and other maneuvers without names," he reported later. "I was more afraid of ramming the carrier we were protecting than of the attacking planes."

And from that wildly maneuvering warship, flaming steel poured into the heavens. One after another, every one of those 20 dive bombers was sent down flaming or disintegrating into the sea. The first wave was completely wiped out. Eight terrible minutes had elapsed—from 11:12 to 11:20 a. m.

Meanwhile, fighter planes were up from the carrier. They added to the terrific toll of Jap planes. Before the engagement was over, the Japs had lost more than 100 planes.

Half an hour later the second attack came. This time there were 40 torpedo planes and dive bombers. They maneuvered into position to strike together, dive bombers in the lead.

Once again glowing steel curved into the skies. Only one plane—a torpedo craft—got through. All the others fell into the sea or turned back.

But that torpedo plane caused an anxious moment on the battleship.

"It came at the stern of the ship," Captain Gatch reported. "It appeared that millions of tracer shells went right past that plane without hitting it, but some did strike it, and at the right time. They struck just before the pilot released his torpedo.

"The plane was jarred out of its line of flight and its torpedo was released well up in the air. It seemed that the torpedo would drop on the ship, but it passed over the fantail and fell in the sea on the other side aft. The plane's wings were shot off. It struck the water and sank."

About 20 minutes later came the third attack—at 12:19 p. m. It lasted 11 minutes—longer than either of the other two. Twenty-four dive bombers and torpedo planes staged the assault.

Apparently so he could look over his entire ship during the attack, since planes directly above cannot be seen from the bridge, Captain Gatch had left his armored battle station.

"I was out on the catwalk in front of the bridge, where I had no business to be," he said.

One dive bomber got through the antiaircraft fire.

"I saw its bomb released from not more than 100 feet above the forward part of the ship. I hoped it would strike a turret and not the deck, for it was a good-sized bomb, probably a 500-pounder, and it might blow a hole in the deck and kill people underneath; and certainly it would kill many in gun crews on the deck itself," Captain Gatch reported.

"The automatic guns forward were manned by mess attendants, some Filipinos, some Negroes. They never stopped firing for a second. Those men are good.

"The bomb did land on top of a turret. That was the only hit we took, and it was the one that got me."

Damage to the ship since has been repaired, the Navy said.

The bomb fragments and concussion, beside tearing open the captain's neck and ripping the muscles of his shoulder so his left arm hung injured, hurled the captain against the conning tower and knocked him unconscious. The executive officer took over command—and the attack passed. The Japs had had enough for 1 day.

In less than 3 weeks, although his left arm still dangled—and does today—Captain Gatch was spoiling for another fight.

"I don't expect you to strangle Japs," his admiral told him, so Captain Gatch took his battleship into its second action.

This was the night battle of November 14. It was the same battle in which the cruiser *Boise*, now under repairs at Philadelphia, and the cruiser *San Francisco* distinguished themselves, although these ships were not in the same task force as Captain Gatch's group of battleships and destroyers.

"We headed into Windy Gulch," Captain Gatch reported. (Windy Gulch is the Americans' name for the strait between Guadalcanal and Savo Islands.) "We got into a far corner and slowed down. We found no Japs, although we knew they were somewhere about waiting for us.

"They had set a trap, and we were trying to find it, so we could go into it and get caught. We wanted to get caught. They weren't expecting us [battleships]. They had set this trap for foxes and we didn't think it would hold bears."

Above the northern tip of Savo, the American ships turned west. The battleship's lookouts spotted enemy ships, faintly visible several miles away.

The big 16-inch guns of the battleship trained on their target. With an ear-splitting bellow, they hurled their deadly missiles over the sea. The shells landed on a large enemy cruiser, and set her afire. The flames lighted two smaller cruisers, following in a straight line.

The Jap cruisers never even got within range of the battleship. The Japs sent up a salvo of star shells, illuminating the sea as they searched for their invisible foe. The shells fell thousands of yards short of the battleship. All three enemy cruisers went down under the battleship's pounding fire.

"They never knew just what sank them," Captain Gatch reported.

"The enemy now sprang the trap he had set. Dead astern of us a destroyer or light cruiser was picked up. Our after turret fired three salvos. We could see the Jap burst into flame. His bow rose to 45°, and he went down stern first."

The American force then passed north of Savo and turned south into a passage west of the island. At full speed, destroyers leading, the force tore through the narrow, shoal-filled and dangerous waters. Near the southern end of the island, Jap cruisers and destroyers, waiting in ambush along the cliffs, launched a torpedo attack on the American destroyers.

Four searchlights from a Jap cruiser lighted Captain Gatch's battleship. Cruisers and a Jap battleship which steamed into the action opened fire.

"Within a second after the searchlights were on us," Captain Gatch said, "our secondary batteries opened up and their searchlights went out. Then 30 seconds later, our main batteries fired. We were fighting the cruisers.

"One of our own battleships ahead of us was pouring shells into the Jap battleship, but now and again the big enemy ship would turn one our way, until the United States battleship ahead silenced it."

One of the cruisers hit the conning tower of Captain Gatch's ship, starting a fire.

"I was on the catwalk," the captain said. "I'd been dying for a cigarette, and now I thought I could have one, so I drew my lighter.

"One of the men shouted, 'Captain, sir! You'll give away our position!' I just looked up at the flames near the top of our mast and finished the cigarette."

Then the battle was over. The fire on Captain Gatch's ship was extinguished. The battleship-destroyer force had sunk one Jap battleship (or heavy cruiser), three cruisers and one destroyer, and had damaged another battleship, a cruiser, and a destroyer.

Later, Captain Gatch sat down to write his report to the Navy Department—a report which he concluded with these words:

"Not one of the ship's company flinched from his post or showed the least disaffection."

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no business for the Senate to transact at this time. I understand the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] desires to address the Senate at some length. I therefore ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of his address the Senate stand in adjournment until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kentucky that at the conclusion of the address to be made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] the Senate stand adjourned until Thursday next? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the resolution adopted earlier today, the Presiding Officer is authorized, on calendar days when there is no executive session, to refer nominations to the appropriate committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations have been appropriately referred.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not recall the provisions of the resolution. I suppose in essence it is the same as the resolution usually adopted at the beginning of a new Congress. I hope there

will be no change in the practice which has heretofore prevailed with respect to nominations. At this particular time I have in mind four nominations which will be made. One of those nominations will be to fill the vacancy now existing in the Supreme Court. Another nomination is that of a former Member of the Senate to be Price Administrator, Office of Price Administration. Still another nomination is that of a former Senator to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the fourth is that of Mr. Flynn to occupy a position in the Foreign Service. I want all those nominations to be referred to the appropriate committees.

Mr. BARKLEY. I can say to the minority leader that that action will be taken without request being made by any Member of the Senate. The resolution which I presented earlier today, and which was agreed to, is similar to the resolution which is always adopted at the beginning of each Congress, authorizing the Presiding Officer to refer Executive nominations to committees on days when there is no executive session. That is all it amounts to.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. My attention was distracted for a moment, but I thought that was the purpose the Senator had in mind. However, in order to avoid any hiatus occurring in the general arrangement, I want it understood that these four nominations particularly shall be referred to the appropriate committees for hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations in question have been appropriately referred.

ACTIVITIES OF THE BUREAU OF MINES

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, opinions have been voiced that this, the Seventy-eighth Congress, will be in session when the present mighty struggle against wrongdoing and oppression is ended. It is my sincere hope that such prediction will come to pass. But all of us are aware that before peace comes the United States and the United Nations must fight their way uphill against great odds and must free this terror-ridden world of the treachery, dishonesty, and back-stabbing policies of the Axis Nations. We must outfight the enemy wherever we find him, we must outproduce him, we must have weapons to return ten blows for every one received.

Many agencies of the Federal Government have been created to keep the war wheels of our Nation turning at a faster rate—the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Economic Stabilization Board, and the Metals Reserve Company, to mention a few. There is another Government agency—a long-established one—the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior, which is right up there at the front in the job of keeping our fighting men supplied with weapons and materials.

As a member of the Committee on Mines and Mining, I wish to present for the benefit of the new Members of Congress and for my other colleagues a brief résumé of the aims and work of the Bureau of Mines, an agency which was created in 1910 and which I have watched with more than casual interest because I come from the important mining and industrial State of Pennsylvania and because my first job, when I was 11 years old, was that of an iron and steel worker at Sharon, Pa., and later in Pittsburgh, Pa.

BUREAU OF MINES ORGANIZED FOR WAR

The Bureau of Mines, as organized for war, conducts research in the fields of gaseous, liquid, and solid fuels and industrial explosives, develops and tests metallurgical processes, conducts far-reaching explorations of our mineral-bearing areas, aids producers of minerals and metals in overcoming production problems, and provides the mineral industries and such Government agencies as the War Production Board and the Army and the Navy with an up-to-the-minute economic and statistical picture of the flow of materials from the ground to the production line. The Bureau of Mines also produces helium for our fighting forces; it promotes health, safety, and efficiency in the mineral industries; makes plant-security studies; and controls all nonmilitary explosives and their ingredients to prevent sabotage and interruptions to the output of needed war minerals.

FIELD WORK

Only a small fraction of the Bureau's personnel is at the headquarters in Washington in order to administer the affairs of the organization, guide its policies, and maintain necessary contact with other war agencies. Its principal work is carried out in the field—the 48 States of the Union and the Territory of Alaska, where its engineers, chemists, metallurgists, and other experts work in close contact with the hundreds of thousands of men in the mineral industries who go underground every day to tap our mineral reserves, who work in the intense heat of blast furnaces and smelters, drill for oil, explore for nickel, chromium, or manganese or tear off the earth's crust with mighty power shovels in order to obtain millions of tons of rich coal, bauxite, copper, and other minerals.

Many months ago the Department of the Interior gave the Bureau of Mines the "go ahead" signal on a planned program to put every usable deposit of ore to work. In order to speed the cycle of mine to metal to war weapon, the Bureau established three regional offices to conduct the exploration work, and to operate its network of pilot mills and laboratories. These offices, each in charge of a regional engineer, are at Salt Lake City, Utah; Rolla, Mo.; and College Park, Md. At this moment crews of men, directed by the Bureau of Mines, are drilling, trenching, tunneling, and obtaining samples by other methods in mineral-producing areas in order to ascertain the nature and extent of each bed of ore and to uncover new beds which may contain quantities of metals useful in the war. They are building trails and roads on which to haul heavy equipment to exploration sites and are conferring with prospectors, operators, engineers, and others so as to get a clear-cut picture of the territory in which they are working. Meanwhile metallurgists in the laboratories and pilot plants are examining ore samples and testing ways of treating the ores to separate metals. When the facts are assembled, the Bureau lays its development plans before other Government agencies whose business it is to initiate and control the production and distribution of the strategic, critical, and essential materials. In many instances these proposals are complete. The cost figure for developing a deposit of ore is there in black and white. The suggested metallurgical process is submitted, together with the estimated tonnage to be expected from a certain ore bed, and with these data there is a recommendation for action.

PILOT PLANTS AND LABORATORIES

At this point I should like to mention a few of the Bureau's laboratories and pilot plants, so as to give a typical cross-section of some of the field work being performed in connection with the war-minerals-exploration program.

At Boulder City, Nev., modern pilot plants are operating day and night, utilizing electrical energy from Boulder Dam to make tests of western ores from which manganese, aluminum, magnesium, chromium, and cobalt can be obtained. As rapidly as these metallurgical processes are tested or developed, the results are made available to the mineral industries concerned and to the war agencies of the Government. Processes already in use likewise are studied so that kinks may be eliminated. The Bureau stands ready at all times to advise producers on methods of adapting new worth-while processes.

At Norris, Tenn., where hydroelectric power is available from the Norris Dam, the Bureau operates an electrotechnical laboratory for studying the preparation and leaching of soluble aluminates, alumina reduction, aluminum alloys, and the use of domestic minerals as refractories and insulators, electric furnace design, and the preparation of magnesium oxide and magnesium from domestic olivine.

At the Central Experiment Station at Pittsburgh, Pa., there are special projects, including work on carbon testers, methods of identifying scrap metals, methods of determining temperature of molten metal, and the measurement of the viscosity of molten metal. At Tuscaloosa, Ala., Berkeley, Calif., Minneapolis, Minn., Rolla, Mo., Reno, Nev., Pullman and Seattle, Wash., and at other places, the Bureau likewise is engaged in this broad, coordinated program of investigation, testing, and research to bring into use as quickly and economically as possible the domestic ores and other minerals which are most urgently needed to fight this war. Every month, as a result of the exploration work of the Bureau, tons of ore are added to the known reserves of the United States. Many of these deposits, which were overlooked in past years, are being worked and are producing metals which are

helping to make tanks, planes, field telephones, guns, ships, and ammunition for us and our allies.

Some of the Bureau's laboratories and pilot plants are relatively new, but most of them have been operating for years. Thus it was that when Hitler invaded Poland in 1939, the Bureau of Mines already had initiated its work of exploring the vast reserves of ores in the United States, studying new beneficiation methods, improving older techniques, and preparing for the contingency when this Nation may be required to depend almost entirely on its domestic resources for war materials.

Much credit can be given the Bureau for its foresight and long-range planning, which already have paid the United Nations large dividends during the present war years. The Bureau is making a substantial contribution to America's war-time production. More war metals than this country ever had dreamed of producing poured out of our blast furnaces, our smelters, and our processing plants last year. There must be no letdown this year, next year, or so long as this war lasts. That is why Bureau of Mines experts and the hundreds of thousands of men in the industrial field must keep on working on an around-the-clock schedule to explore, develop, and utilize our mineral resources.

STRATEGIC MINERALS

Noting the war clouds hovering over Europe and Asia, the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey in February of 1939 issued a document termed "Report Upon Certain Deficient Strategic Minerals." In it the following statement appeared:

> This report discusses the situation of the United States with respect to seven of the minor metals that are so essential in modern industrial activity, that to do without them would require a drastic reorganization in present practices.

The metals listed were manganese, chromium, mercury, tungsten, nickel, tin, and antimony. Pointing out that these metals are essential in peace and vital in war, the Bureau then stated:

> In none of them is the United States self-sufficient. These facts indicate a situation that requires the earnest attention of those upon whom falls the responsibility for the national safety in any emergency that would cut us off from foreign sources of supply.

EXPLORATORY WORK

In the same year Congress passed the Strategic Materials Act, and the Bureau of Mines sent its engineers into the field with orders to map reserves of ores bearing those metals, instructed its metallurgists and chemists to find practical methods of beneficiating them, if possible, and to find possible substitutes. The list of minerals upon which the Bureau has concentrated its work has been increased since 1939, and noted gains have been made in virtually every field.

In the fiscal year 1942 alone several million tons of chromium ore were mapped in Montana, California, Oregon, and Alaska, and three of these deposits now are in production, furnishing chromium for valves, armor-piercing projectiles, armor plate, rifles, and other weapons.

The Bureau of Mines has informed me that in that 12-month period a good find of mercury ore was made in Idaho. Earlier several hundred thousand tons of lower-grade ore, capable of producing some 2.7 pounds of mercury per ton, had been indicated. Bureau engineers continued their quest and uncovered additional mercury ores of good commercial grade, and a bed of high-grade ore which contains several thousand tons, assaying about 8 pounds of mercury per ton. In Oregon a second discovery of commercial-grade ore was made by drilling in an old mine which had closed because of lack of ore.

In the fiscal year 1941 the largest and most important discovery of tungsten ore in the Nation's history was made by the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey. This rich deposit now is being developed for the war. In other explorations, the Bureau's engineers, I am advised, charted deposits which indicated probable tungsten ore reserves of 150,000 tons, with reasonable expectations of developing several hundred thousand tons more. Through this work of disclosing new reserves of tungsten ore, some mines, previously closed because it was thought the reserves were depleted, have reopened.

Basing its recommendations on exploratory work and metallurgical research, the Bureau has proposed building plants which would provide enough manganese from low-grade domestic ores to produce 87,000,000 tons of steel annually. Another recommendation was made for an alumina-production program to provide a gradual change from the use of high-grade bauxite to clays, thus making the United States independent of imported bauxite for aluminum. This plan, like the manganese program, was submitted to the War Production Board. By drilling, trenching, and other exploratory work in Arkansas, Georgia, Oklahoma, and other States, Bureau engineers have made known new deposits of bauxite estimated to contain about 5,000,000 tons of ore.

An iron ore deposit of moderate size was indicated after Bureau engineers explored an iron-bearing formation in California. Small deposits were explored in two other areas in Arizona and Oregon, respectively.

The magnitude of the exploratory work being conducted by the Bureau of Mines is revealed in the following figures given me by the Bureau: In a 1-year period alone 740 deposits containing strategic minerals were given preliminary examination and were indexed and rated as to their relative importance.

In slightly more than 2 years the Bureau's exploratory work has increased the estimated reserves of strategic, critical, and essential ores by more than 65,000,000 tons. Last year the reserves of chromite, manganese, mercury, iron ore, tungsten, nickel, bauxite, and high-alumina clay were increased by more than 41,000,000 tons. About 2,000 deposits of war minerals have been studied by mining and metallurgical staffs. During the past 6 months alone active exploration has been in progress on more than 100 of these in 25 States and Alaska for more than 30 metals and nonmetallic minerals. Since 1939 about 180 exploratory projects have been undertaken by the Bureau.

ORE RESERVES CHARTED

Listed among the reserves of commercial or near-commercial grade ores charted by the Bureau are tungsten, 1,000,000 tons; chromite, 4,000,000 tons; manganese, 10,000,000 tons; antimony, 2,000,000 tons; mercury, 1,000,000 tons, and iron ore, 37,000,000 tons. The Bureau estimates that more than 18,000,000 tons of various metals can be extracted from the ore reserves mapped out thus far in its exploratory program.

In fulfilling their assignment, Bureau engineers have overcome many difficulties. Operations were carried on in the sub-zero winter temperatures of Alaska and in the intense summer heat of the desert. To give an idea of the magnitude of the program, the Bureau since mid-1939 has drilled more than 1,000 holes for a total of more than 200,000 feet, and obtained more than 60,000 samples of ore. The records also show that 62 camps have been built and 70 miles of road and some 50 miles of trails have been built; more than 175,000 linear feet and 140,000 cubic yards of trenching was done; and shafts totaling nearly 18,000 feet were sunk.

Meanwhile, the Bureau has been lending a helping hand to prospectors and others who carry on their own exploratory work. In 12 months, more than 7,000 samples of ore were submitted to the Bureau for analysis.

METALLURGICAL ADVANCEMENT

Since many of the ores which have been charted in the United States are complex or low grade, or both, they would lie idle unless methods were developed for treating them. Thus, the Bureau simultaneously is conducting far-reaching studies so that these ores will give up their wealth of metal. Methods already have been developed for the concentration of various manganese ores to ferrograde manganese; for the recovery of chromium and ferrograde chromite from low-grade chromite ores; for the production of magnesia and magnesium; for the extraction of alumina from some clays and alunite; for increased production of lead; and for the beneficiation of ores containing antimony, copper, iron, mercury, tungsten, nickel, zinc, and fluorspar.

Throughout 1942 the Bureau reported regularly to other war agencies the progress of its metallurgical research. For example, further improvements were made in the Bureau's electrolytic manganese process to provide additional impetus to the production of this vital metal from low-grade and complex domestic ores. A company in Tennessee turned out high-purity manganese with this process, and the Bureau continued the production of the metal in one of its own pilot plants. Manganese produced by the Bureau is being utilized by the

Federal Government for lend-lease and to replace nickel in the 5-cent coin, thus freeing more nickel for use in war matériel.

In order to study the recovery and processing of minerals from the Pacific Northwest on a broader scale the Bureau has been authorized to establish an electrodevelopment laboratory in that region, where hydroelectric power is available from Bonneville and Grand Coulee dams. Plans call for a staff of metallurgists to seek improved methods of recovering magnesium and aluminum from the ores of the Pacific Northwest and to conduct research in the processing of tungsten, chromium, manganese, vanadium, and other strategic and critical minerals found in that area.

A commercial-size pilot plant for investigating the best methods of producing sponge iron on a commercial scale will be operated by the Bureau of Mines at Laramie, Wyo. On the basis of its studies to date, the Bureau concludes that sponge iron can be utilized as a suitable substitute for scrap iron to mix with ordinary pig iron in manufacturing steel. Sponge iron is the product of a process whereby metallic iron is obtained directly from ore without going through the liquid state. This method, Bureau metallurgists believe, is adaptable to smaller and less expensive plants than the standard blast-furnace operation.

NONMETALLICS RESEARCH

The problem of removing impurities from low-grade bauxite has been tackled, and improved methods of washing the ore have resulted. Under a special appropriation from Congress, studies have been completed on processes for extracting alumina from siliceous bauxite. The lime-soda sintering process was one of the methods thought most practical, and processes were worked out to give high recoveries of alumina of satisfactory grade. As a result, this process is to be tested in a pilot plant. Federal war agencies constantly call upon the Bureau for assistance in the field of nonmetallics, and the Bureau's experts respond promptly.

Anticipating that the metallurgical demands for bauxite will make it necessary to substitute clay for bauxite in making aluminum sulfate for treating water and manufacturing paper, the Bureau has studied methods of treating clays to provide suitable substitutes. Properly calcined kaolin can now be recommended as a substitute for bauxite.

Other problems in the field of nonmetallics have been solved with equal speed and efficiency. Substitutes have been found for Indian kyanite, used for special refractories and formerly imported from Calcutta. The most attractive one is topaz, which can be produced commercially in South Carolina.

Before this Nation entered the war a shortage of flake graphite was foreseen. This material, normally imported from Madagascar, is used to make crucibles and stoppers for steel ladles. Bureau engineers attacked this problem and found that Alabama graphite is capable of supplying domestic needs. The war cut off the importation of Belgian glass sand which supplied Pacific coast glass plants. Again the Bureau sent its experts into the field to solve the problem. Some west-coast sands, when treated by scrubbing off iron stains and removing other undesirable materials, were found to be suitable substitutes, and one of the larger glass companies is constructing a plant in California which will use methods developed by the Bureau and will produce high-grade glass sand in large quantities.

The known reserve of ceramic talc suitable for radio insulators was found inadequate for expanded needs. The Geological Survey searched for proper grades of talc, and the Bureau of Mines tested the samples to remove impurities. As a result, increased production of radio ceramic talc along the lines recommended by the Bureau of Mines is expected.

Substitutes were needed for magnesite brick, a refractory made of material formerly imported from Austria and Greece. Deposits of volcanic rock, found in the Eastern States and in the far West, were studied, and methods were developed for producing forsterite from these. Tests show that forsterite is a workable substitute for magnesite brick.

ANTHRACITE LABORATORY

Mr. President, early in January 1941, Representative FENTON, of Fennsivania, introduced in the House, and I introduced in the Senate, a bill providing for a comprehensive study of the anthracite region to aid in the solution of its economic problems; for the establishment and operation of a research laboratory in the Pennsylvania anthracite region; for the development of new uses and markets; for improvement in health and safety in mining; and for the maximum usefulness in the war effort of human resources.

In 1941, by joint resolution, the Seventy-seventh Congress created the Federal Anthracite Coal Commission to study the problems of the hard-pressed anthracite industry. President Roosevelt appointed me as one of the two Members of the Senate on that Commission. The Commission found that the vast anthracite industry is fighting great odds, but that it can be helped to its feet with the aid of research and economic and technologic investigations. The Commission recommended that such work be undertaken. The Congress, in the last few days it was in session, passed an act which authorizes the Bureau of Mines to establish a research laboratory in the anthracite field. It was proposed that the Bureau approach the industry's problems from four angles:

First, technologic research seeking new outlets for anthracite in the iron, chemical, and gas industries; second, a study of flood, health, and safety conditions; third, engineering studies pointing toward increased production per man-day; and fourth, studies emphasizing the development of equipment and dealer organizations to make the use of anthracite in homes more convenient and thus to conserve petroleum.

The anthracite industry produced about 59,000,000 tons last year, compared with a peak output of about 100,000,000 tons in 1917. Few persons realize the many problems encountered in the anthracite region. To mention one, an average of 33 tons of water must be pumped from the mines for each ton of anthracite produced. We need more and more anthracite for the war, and the Bureau of Mines should be enabled to do its part in efforts to help the industry fill the gap created by the shortage of fuel oil on the east coast and to lessen the burden of the byproduct coke ovens using bituminous coal and facing peak demands from blast furnaces. The President has advised me that because of the critical need of materials which go into construction he does not favor building the anthracite research laboratory during the war. Nevertheless, if the Bureau were given the $175,000 in operating funds authorized in the act, it could initiate research of value in the prosecution of the war with the use of existing facilities pending the construction of the anthracite research station.

CONSULTING SERVICE

Throughout 1942 the Bureau of Mines accelerated its work in the field of solid fuels. Because of the increased number of requests resulting directly from the war, it expanded its consulting service for all Federal Government agencies regarding the purchase and operation of steam generating and heating equipment, the purchase and analysis of coal, and the conditioning of water used in boilers.

For many months, the Bureau of Mines has been analyzing water samples from scores of Army posts and stations to determine ways of lengthening the life of the equipment and solving operating problems. Virtually all these posts and stations are equipped with the Bureau's test kit, which permits the operating engineer to conduct his own tests and thus control the chemicals fed to the boilers to minimize the accumulation of sludge or other undesirable materials. Because of this service, the efficiency of boilers has been increased and the life of the equipment has been extended many months.

In a 12-month period alone, several thousand coal analyses were made. Approximately one-half of these were for the War and Navy Departments in their purchases of large quantities of coal. The task of making these analyses for the awarding of Government coal contracts is immense. Bureau of Mines coal-sampling trucks in 1 year visited nearly 500 mines in a dozen States and collected more than 1,500 samples. The result has been that many thousands of dollars have been saved because the Government has been able to get the right kind of coal for the particular purpose that was sought. In one instance alone, a saving of about $300,000 was effected.

In the West the building of new blast furnaces for the production of pig iron has created a demand for western coals which have satisfactory coking properties. Field exploratory crews and the Bureau's coal carbonization laboratory in Pittsburgh, Pa., were given this job. Experiments revealed that certain coals of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Utah, New Mexico, Colorado, and Wyoming will meet the needs.

While this work was going on the Bureau began expanding its studies of the coking properties of coals of the United

States, a project begun in 1927 and which has proved extremely valuable in the selection of coals for blast furnace coke.

Consumers of coal and its byproducts constantly seek and obtain assistance from the Bureau in solving operating and procurement problems. Cooperating with the Office of Solid Fuels Coordinator of the Interior Department, the Bureau of Mines has inaugurated a survey of coke ovens and blast furnace operations to improve both the quality and quantity of metallurgical coke so that the production of pig iron can be increased.

Only recently the Bureau created the Division of Solid Fuel Utilization for War. This is providing technical information and other data for storing coal and preventing spontaneous combustion and degradation of the product. A staff of consultants is employed to inform industries which coals can be adopted as substitutes for regularly used types, and how operating cycles should be altered so as to permit utilization of the alternate product.

PETROLEUM RESEARCH

From the War and Navy Departments, the Office of Petroleum Administrator for War, and other Government agencies, the Bureau of Mines constantly receives requests for technical advice and information on supplying petroleum products for war. In addition to the information available at a moment's notice—due to the Bureau's many years of research in petroleum and natural gas—petroleum engineers are making special studies and surveys to provide additional data when the need arises. Only recently, they surveyed more than 200 crude oils and the products from 25 condensate plants to determine the content of high-octane aviation gasoline stock. They also inaugurated a series of tests to determine the most effective blending of various components of 100-octane aviation gasoline, and initiated a study to ascertain the components of the reservoir fluids and the available reserves in certain fields which contain material needed in aviation gasoline.

Another vital job of these engineers is that of evaluating the sources and means of extracting war materials from petroleum, including butadiene, a source of synthetic rubber.

To stimulate crude-oil production in Appalachian oil fields for the war and to further the conservation of petroleum, the Bureau of Mines opened a petroleum field office at Franklin, Pa., in April 1942. Staffed with Bureau engineers, this office is supplying technical information to determine the best and most practical methods of repairing wells and repressuring the sands to permit maximum recovery of crude oil for our war planes and other battle equipment. In the petroleum experiment stations at Bartlesville, Okla., and Laramie, Wyo., the entire chemistry and refining program is being devoted to a search for answers to questions regarding the essential nature of crude oils, natural gas, condensates, and their components. One contribution is the Bureau's tests to determine the changes that may be expected in aviation gasoline and evaporation losses of blend components in storage.

LIQUID FUELS FROM COAL

The scarcity of fuel oil and gasoline on the Atlantic coast and in the Pacific Northwest—brought about by transportation difficulties—has called increasing attention to an important phase of research which the Bureau has been conducting for several years, namely, the studies on extracting liquid fuels from coal. Although the immediate application in the United States of the known processes of converting coal to liquid fuels is not contemplated and may not even be feasible in existing circumstances, despite sensational newspaper stories that would lead one to believe to the contrary, this work is nonetheless of highest importance. Even though the total number of exploratory wells in the petroleum fields has increased in the past 5 years, there has been a net decrease in new reserves of oil discovered since 1938.

The proved oil reserves of the United States are variously estimated at from 15,000,000,000 to 20,000,000,000 barrels—enough, at the 1942 rate of consumption, to last no more than 14 years. Of course, since it is impossible to withdraw this oil at a rate of one and one-half billion barrels annually over the entire 14-year period—the rate of production decreases sharply in the early years following discovery—the oil will be in the ground for many years. But unless reserves are constantly added, shortage of oil will begin to occur much earlier.

Foreign countries—without petroleum reserves such as our own—have resorted to synthetic production for some time. Germany for example, has been producing much of its motor fuels by conversion from coal, and at last reports was getting about 95,000 barrels of gasoline daily by one method alone. England has constructed and is operating a large-scale hydrogenation plant.

The United States cannot rely on the hope that our natural petroleum reserves will continue to supply the Nation's needs forever. We must be prepared to resort to other means when the time comes. It is therefore urgent that all the processes and methods of obtaining liquid fuels—whether from our oil shale reserves or by conversion of coal, or both—be worked on, and that the most efficient, productive, and economical methods be determined and be ready to be put into operation at the proper time.

The Bureau of Mines has conducted experiments on some of our oil shales, and now is working on two different methods of liquefying coal. One of these is the Bergius method, or so-called direct hydrogenation method. In a small experimental plant in its Pittsburgh laboratories, the Bureau has already tested various American coals. It has been found that virtually all high-volatile and subbituminous coals and lignites can be liquefied by this process, and that the yield will vary from about 30 gallons of gasoline from a ton of lignite to about 60 gallons from a ton of high-volatile bituminous coal. The Bureau also has conducted some experiments with the synthetic process, sometimes called the indirect hydrogenation method, or Fischer-Tropsch process.

These studies are not limited to determining yields of fuel oil and gasoline, but also Diesel oil and valuable byproducts important in chemicals, explosives, drugs, and for making plastics. When one considers that there are more than 3,000,000,000,000 tons of coal in reserve in the United States, the potentialities appear enormous. A practical, economical method could provide the American people with gasoline, fuel oil, and certain valuable byproducts for well over a thousand years at our normal rate of consumption.

The amount of money allocated to the Bureau of Mines for this important experimental work is amazingly small, and in no way compares with the importance of the field being developed by the staff of skilled chemists and engineers. For the future security of the Nation and for sound economic reasons, the Bureau should be enabled to construct and operate commercial-size units utilizing both basic processes of liquefaction so that it can adequately determine the best designs for commercial plants and the cost of operating them. If the Bureau had adequate funds, it is my conviction that the United States could develop not only the cheapest but the best coal-liquefaction plants in the world. During the current fiscal year only $55,330 has been allotted for work on the Bergius process, and $43,000 for research work in the Fischer-Tropsch method. Compare this with the $6,000,000 one petroleum company spent in investigating cracking processes, or with the $10,000,000 the iron and steel industries spend annually for research in their fields.

IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH

We simply have not been giving Federal Government agencies, particularly the Bureau of Mines, enough support in the realm of research. Private industry has recognized the returns paid on research. Private industry for many years has spent an average of more than $300,000,000 annually for research. It employs more than 70,000 research workers in 2,200 laboratories.

At random I will choose a few industries to show just how important they consider research. The food industry before the war spent more than $6,000,000 annually; the chemical industries, more than $42,000,000; the petroleum industry, $22,000,000; manufacturers of electrical machinery allocated more than $18,000,000 yearly for research alone; and the nonferrous metal industries, more than $5,000,000.

Recently the National Resources Committee reported:

> The research activities of the Bureau of Mines are similarly national in scope, and too extensive for any nongovernmental agency to engage in. The mining industry is contributing data of much value, but each segment of the industry is concerned only with the technology of its own particular ores or minerals, while the Bureau of Mines from its detached position may investigate the problems of the industry as a whole.

In 1940 the National Resources Planning Board stated:

> It is essential to the national economy that the stream of technological progress flows freely. Engineering advances cannot go far without simultaneous or preceding

advances in creating new metallurgical materials. Metallurgical research is an essential national resource, because technological advances do not just happen automatically; they have to be produced deliberately.

We who determine the course of work which Government agencies such as the Bureau of Mines undertake, must be as foresighted and as much dedicated to a belief in the future as are our technicians and scientists.

HELIUM PRODUCTION

One of the important functions of the Bureau of Mines—and one for which the Bureau has not always received well-earned credit—is that of operating helium plants. Our Government has a world monopoly of helium, and today it is producing the gas in record-breaking quantities. It is this light-weight, noninflammable gas which goes into our blimps that are on the alert for submarines. Helium also is used by the Weather Bureau to carry sensitive recording instruments into the higher altitudes. It is being used in surgery to lessen the chances of accidents involving the use of anesthetics, by the Navy for rescue diving, and for many other purposes.

Needs of the Army, the Navy, and other agencies for large amounts of helium were forecast by the Bureau many months ago. The Seventy-seventh Congress approved the expenditure of more than $15,000,000 for the construction of additional helium plants so that the future supply of this gas will be ample. Because of research, helium no longer is a costly product; but the Bureau constantly is conducting studies to lower the costs still further. Ever since the United States entered the First World War the Bureau has continued comprehensive surveys of the natural gases and gas-producing areas of the United States for helium for Government purposes. It has been determined that natural gases containing helium are widely distributed over the United States, but so far only a few localities have been discovered in which the volume of the gases themselves and their helium content are sufficiently large for economical production of helium.

The Bureau of Mines believes that only the surface has been scratched with respect to the commercial uses of helium. Research for additional utilization of the gas is continuing, but right now the emphasis is on military uses. Only recently a new welding process utilizing helium was developed for uses in connection with airplane parts and assemblies.

MOTION PICTURES

Motion pictures prepared under the supervision of the Bureau to promote safety, conservation, and efficiency are gaining international prominence. Since 1916 the Bureau has been cooperating with the mineral industries in the production of motion pictures which now are being shown, not only to miners and petroleum field workers, but to members of the armed forces of the United States and Great Britain. These motion pictures are helping win the war. They cover a wide range of subjects pertaining to the mineral industries—the machining, riveting, and welding of metals, the operation of gasoline and Diesel engines, the development of oil wells, proper methods of lubrication, and dozens of other topics.

Only a few months ago a United States Naval Air Station Trade School used 36 films furnished by the Bureau of Mines in instructing 4,000 young men in various occupations and familiarizing them with industrial processes and industrial areas.

Bureau of Mines motion pictures contain no advertising, brand names, trademarks, or other material that might be interpreted as advertising, although the entire production cost of the films has been borne by cooperating industrial concerns. The name of the industrial firm appears only at the beginning and end of each film. In the past 26 years the Bureau has obtained without cost to the Government 110 motion pictures which were financed by private industry at a cost to various industrial concerns or agencies of approximately $1,400,000. The only expense to the Bureau for all these films has been the employment of a safety engineer as a consultant during production of the pictures and the maintenance of a small staff at Pittsburgh to operate the circulating film library. This library, the largest educational motion-picture library of its type in the world, has more than 6,000 reels of film in constant circulation.

At the present time, Bureau motion pictures are being flown across the Atlantic to be shown to members of the Royal Air Force and to students at British flying training schools. They are being sent to South American republics under arrangement with the Division of Cultural Relations of the State Department. They are being shown in Canada to war workers so those men and women will be able to perform their jobs more efficiently. Day by day the demand for Bureau films is increasing, and so popular are the films that bookings sometimes are made many months in advance.

During 1942 more than 100,000 showings of the Bureau of Mines motion pictures were given. In addition to the armed forces and grade and high school pupils, the audiences included students of aeronautical schools, industrial training classes in colleges and universities, civilian defense classes, participants in first-aid classes, C. C. C. workers and, of course, thousands of miners.

COAL-MINE INSPECTION

While the war necessarily has emphasized the Bureau's work in mineral explorations, metallurgy, petroleum, and natural gas, its activities in the conservation of health and the promotion of safety have increased amazingly in recent months. Realizing that every man-hour of work in the coal mine means that much more fuel for the Nation's war plants, Bureau of Mines safety engineers and mining engineers have speeded up their work under the Coal Mine Inspection Act, a measure passed by Congress in May 1941, which gave the Bureau of Mines—for the first time—authority to enter any coal mine to investigate operating conditions and practices from a safety standpoint and to make recommendations to safeguard the lives of miners and protect property.

The Bureau of Mines was created in 1910, when the public demanded that action be taken to prevent the heavy toll of deaths and injuries in our coal mines. During the 5-year period, 1907 to 1911, there were 13,806 fatal injuries, or an average of 2,761 annually. In 1911 alone there were 2,656 fatalities in the production of 496,371,126 tons of coal—or only 186,462 tons produced per fatal injury.

In 1941, when mine operators and miners alike responded again to the plea for more and more coal, the output reached an estimated 556,474,900 tons—the highest since 1929—and fatalities were estimated at 1,264—or an average of one fatal injury per 440,645 tons of coal produced. Thus, since 1911, the tonnage per fatal injury has increased 136 percent, and fatalities have been cut 52 percent.

Under the Federal Coal Mine Inspection Act, the Bureau of Mines sent its first inspectors into the field December 1, 1941. All veteran mining men, and all civil service appointees, they underwent a "refresher" course at Pittsburgh before starting to work. They were trained anew in first aid and in mine-rescue work, and attended lectures by Bureau of Mines men who are recognized authorities in coal mining.

Thoroughness characterizes the work of the Federal coal-mine inspectors. They are trained to get facts and to aid both operators and miners in pursuing safe practices. They are part of a cooperative, safety-educational movement, and the degree of safety in the mines they inspect is measured by the yardstick of some 600 tentative standards drawn up by the Bureau of Mines as the result of more than three decades of experience in the field and in the laboratory.

During their first 12 months of duty Federal coal-mine inspectors examined in 20 States coal mines employing more than a fourth of all coal-mine employees and producing about half of all the coal. Preliminary and detailed reports regarding their findings and recommendations were prepared. The preliminary reports are posted at the mine portal shortly after the inspection is completed, and contain recommendations for correcting hazardous conditions which need immediate attention. Later a detailed report is prepared for each mine. This report, containing analyses of air and mine-dust samples, gives a complete picture of the mine. Every phase of operation is described in the reports. Safe practices as well as unsafe practices are pointed out.

When the new inspectors entered the mines they were faced with the fact that, despite the progress made in cutting down the toll of deaths and injuries, accidents still cost this Nation a potential loss of approximately 11,000,000 tons of coal annually. They realized, too, that in 1 year alone injured coal miners were away from their jobs 2,200,000 working days.

Because in the administration of this act under the direction of Dr. R. R. Sayers, Director of the Bureau, the Federal inspectors have made it plain that their objective is to be helpful and cooperative, industry has responded favorably. Likewise mine workers and State inspec-

tion services have demonstrated their desire to cooperate. The Federal act was not intended to replace State laws and regulations, but rather to permit the inspection of mines under uniform standards relating to health and safety. The coal-mining industry today is governed by different codes in 29 States.

COAL-MINE ACCIDENT TOLL

The Federal coal-mine inspection program is gaining impetus daily, and ultimately it is expected that nearly 2,000 mines a year will be reached. In conjunction with the many other safety activities of the Bureau, the inspection program is exerting a definite influence toward the reduction of accidents, despite the handicaps resulting from the war. The coal-mining industry battled against great odds last year. Young, active men skilled in the operation of high-speed mechanical equipment were called to the armed forces; thousands of others trained to operate and repair equipment went to war plants. Yet, despite the fact that new workers had to be trained and shortages of manpower existed from time to time, the industry came through with flying colors. The coal-mining industry, both anthracite and bituminous, came through 1942 with greatly increased production and with virtually no increase in its accident rate. Under the pressure of increased output, accidents in other major industries jumped about 20 percent since their wartime production programs got under way.

Before the Bureau of Mines was created no accurate records were kept regarding the death toll of coal mines, but we know that an average of about 2,500 to 3,000 men lost their lives each year. We know, for example, that back in 1907, 361 men lost their lives in a mine explosion, and that 13 days later 239 men were killed in another explosion in another State. Since 1910, when the Bureau launched its safety program in the coal-mining industry, the death toll has been cut more than one-half. This has been accomplished in the face of the mechanization of mines—the introduction of high-speed equipment which has brought its own hazards. Back in 1907, in the bituminous mines alone more than 2,500 lives were lost. Compare this with 1941—the year production was surging toward new heights. In 1941, 1,000 men lost their lives. Today, thanks to continued progress in the Bureau's safety work, thousands upon thousands of men who otherwise might have been sacrificed are in our mines producing coal.

Coal mining, it is said, is hazardous. Yet a Pennsylvania mine operated 8 years without a fatality while producing more than 3,000,000 tons of coal. In Colorado, a mine operated from 1932 until 1941 without a fatal accident, while producing well over a million tons of coal, most of which came from pillar-recovery work, the most hazardous operation in coal mining. Bureau of Mines files show equally impressive records for other mines.

Explosions in coal mines, which are headlined in the press because they take the greatest toll of life at a single time, fortunately are becoming less frequent, and stand well down the list as a cause of fatalities. Explosions result from the ignition of methane, a gas liberated by coal beds, or from the ignition of coal dust. In many gas explosions the blast is propagated by coal dust, and thus becomes more devastating. At Bruceton, Pa., the Bureau of Mines maintains an experimental mine where explosions are manufactured. As a result of experiments extending over many years, the Bureau has determined ways of preventing explosions. Effective ventilation, Bureau engineers found, will dilute methane and carry it from mines. Rock dust, or powdered limestone, when spread in coal mines in sufficient amounts renders coal dust incombustible and prevents it from entering into or propagating an explosion. Therefore, the Bureau recommends that all bituminous and lignite mines be rock-dusted.

A tiny spark is capable of igniting an explosive mixture of methane and air. Thus, the Bureau recommends that only permissible electrical equipment be used in coal mines and that only permissible explosives be used for breaking down coal. The word "permissible" is applied to a piece of mining equipment or material only after the Bureau has subjected it to exhaustive tests to determine its characteristics under extreme conditions.

A piece of permissible electrical equipment, when maintained in permissible condition and properly operated, will not cause an explosion. Permissible explosives, when fired in a permissible manner, are less likely to ignite explosive atmospheres because they do not emit as long and as lasting a flame as does black blasting power, which, in the past, was the most common explosive. The safest coal mines of today are those which use permissible equipment and which adhere to timbering, ventilating, haulage, and rock-dusting standards such as those suggested by the Bureau of Mines and those written into the laws of the most progressive mining States.

FALLS OF ROOF AND COAL

Falls of roof and coal, which cause nearly half of all fatal injuries and a heavy percentage of all nonfatal accidents in coal mines of the United States, can be prevented by systematic timbering and roof testing. The Bureau has devoted extensive research to timbering problems and has prepared many pamphlets describing proper timbering methods. Haulage accidents, which usually rank next to falls of roof and coal, likewise have been studied extensively by the Bureau, and many safe operating standards have been formulated to overcome the dangers encountered in hauling coal in the mines and at the surface plants.

LETTERS OF COMMENDATION

Federal coal-mine inspectors are working night and day in their job of promoting health and safety in the coal mines, and many letters of commendation have been received from mine operators and representatives of the workmen attesting to the value of the inspection program. The operators and workmen are proud of the progress they have made toward making coal mines better and safer places in which to work. In many instances, recommendations made by the Federal inspectors are adopted immediately. Many letters have been received by the Bureau from mine operators commending the inspectors and calling attention to the changes and improvements which have been made as a result of the inspectors' visits:

Our company was very much opposed to the Federal inspection bill and did not see what it could accomplish and thought there was a lot of duplication of inspection work. We were under the impression that it might bring about a lot of confliction between the State department of mines, the Federal department, and the companies, but since the law has gone into effect we have had two of our mines inspected by one of the Federal inspectors, and we have begun to feel differently since these inspections. Personally, I feel that the Federal bill is going to be a great help to the coal companies.

It is our desire to cooperate with your department in making our mines as safe as possible, and I wish to express my appreciation at this time for the cooperation we received from your men when they made the inspection of our mine.

We believe the inspector's report gives a clear picture of conditions at our mine during the time of his visit, and we welcome his recommendations for the improvement of any faults which he encountered. Every effort is being made to remedy any unsatisfactory condition that may exist at our mine.

We feel you should know that we were glad of the opportunity to have an inspection and appreciated the fine manner in which your inspector conducted his inspection of conditions and practices at our mine. We are all learning the real meaning of cooperation, and through the fine working together of your departments and the coal operators we feel we can accomplish a great deal of good for our industry.

Here are excerpts from letters from the representatives of labor:

I am sure that both the management and the men who are employed at this mine feel safer because they now know from an impartial body that it really is a safe mine to work in, and that the company, along with the men, are cooperating on a safety program of accident prevention.

I want to compliment the department on its splendid report and recommendations, and assure you that district __, United Mine Workers of America, stands ready at all times to cooperate with your department in establishing safety in the mines of the Southwest.

SAFETY TRAINING WORK

In its safety-education program for the mineral industries the Bureau of Mines has fostered interest in first aid as a necessary step toward curbing accidents. Since the establishment of the Bureau in 1910, more than 1,500,000 persons have taken the Bureau of Mines first-aid course, and most of those were men connected with the mineral industries.

In the past fiscal year, nearly 100,000 employees of the mining and affiliated industries received first-aid and mine-rescue instruction. In addition, with the training of nearly 1,500 as first-aid instructors, more than 16,000 persons throughout the Nation became qualified to teach the Bureau of Mines first-aid course in the civilian defense program of the Office of Civilian Defense. Last year the Bureau of Mines awarded 117

certificates to industrial plants for having all employees trained in first aid.

Safety instructors, coal mine inspectors, and other Bureau personnel are ready at all times to assist in mine-rescue and recovery operations after disasters. All are skilled in the use of oxygen breathing apparatus and gas masks and in procedures connected with fires, explosions, or floods. This training is passed along to mining men, and the Nation thus has a reserve of men who can be called into action to assist in civilian defense and rescue work arising from the war.

OTHER IMPORTANT ROLES

The Bureau of Mines is playing other important roles in the promotion of health and safety in the mineral industries. A new unit composed of doctors, chemists, and engineers is making investigations and studies of occupational diseases in the coal mining industry, in conjunction with the work of the Coal Mine Inspection Division. In order to maintain the highest levels of available manpower, the gas and dust laboratory at the Central Experiment Station at Pittsburgh has been enlarged to handle the increased number of air and dust samples submitted by coal mine inspectors; respiratory devices for protection against gases, fumes, and dusts are being investigated; and studies are being made for the Army and the Navy regarding health factors in some military equipment.

The Bureau's explosives-testing program, conducted for many years with a view to maintaining safe characteristics in explosives and blasting devices, has been broadened because of the war. Research by Bureau chemists has proved of great value to military officials. High-speed explosion diaphragms were developed to protect equipment and employees in special war industries against gas explosions; studies were made of the explosion and inflammability characteristics of chemicals used by the synthetic-rubber and plastics industries; further studies were conducted regarding the use of helium in preventing explosions of anesthetic mixtures.

For safeguarding industries using Diesel engines in explosive or combustible atmospheres, a testing gallery was completed and experiments are being conducted. At the request of the Ordnance Department of the Army, plant-security studies are made of ordnance facilities. Several demolition studies also have been made in cooperation with the Army. The Bureau has assigned an engineer to cooperate with the Chemical Warfare Service of the War Department in connection with civilian protection activities. One recent discovery by the Bureau is that hard coal-tar pitch, in granulated form, is excellent for extinguishing magnesium fires in industrial plants.

FEDERAL EXPLOSIVES ACT

Shortly after the United States entered the war the Bureau of Mines was designated by the Congress to administer the Federal Explosives Act, an anti-sabotage measure which provides for the control of the manufacture, purchase, sale, use, and possession of nonmilitary explosives and ingredients of explosives by means of a licensing system. The Bureau also conducts investigations of the manufacture, storage, thefts, or losses of explosives, and of fires and explosions in which explosives are believed or known to be a contributing factor.

To carry on the licensing work the Bureau has appointed nearly 4,500 public officials as licensing agents. These agents, who serve without pay except for a 25-cent fee for each license, have issued some 225,000 licenses. Forty-eight explosives investigators are at work in the various States and Alaska, supervising and guiding the licensing agents and investigating the manufacture, handling, storage, and use of explosives. In carrying out its duties, the Explosives Control Division of the Bureau works closely with the Army and Navy Intelligence Services, the Office of Civilian Defense, and the Office of the Chief of Ordnance, and the Provost Marshal General.

MINERAL PRODUCTION SECURITY PROGRAM

In the summer of 1942, the Bureau of Mines launched its mineral production security program to prevent sabotage and to investigate possible subversive activities in the Nation's metal mines, coal mines, quarries, mills, smelters, and allied mineral facilities. A staff of engineer-investigators was trained at the Central Experiment Station at Pittsburgh and was sent into the field to work in close coordination with the mine inspectors, explosives investigators, safety engineers, and other field personnel of the Bureau, as well as in cooperation with other Federal agencies concerned with the facility security program of the Government.

ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS

Accurate information on the production, trade, distribution, supply, and consumption of minerals and mineral commodities is essential to the war, to industry, and to the Bureau of Mines and other Federal war agencies. The Bureau's economics and statistical service, which supplies these up-to-date facts, has accelerated and intensified its work of showing where materials come from, where they go, who uses them, and other pertinent details as requested by the War Production Board, the Army and Navy Munitions Board, the Office of Price Administration, the Metals Reserve Company, and the Board of Economic Warfare. This war job involves more than 100 minerals. The complete picture is assembled by experts from material furnished by the thousands of American establishments in the mineral field. As a result of the wartime demand for information regarding the supply, consumption, and distribution of minerals, the economics and statistical service of the Bureau now requires the handling of more than 1,400 regular canvasses and the analysis, tabulation, and dissemination of the results. In addition, many special surveys are conducted from time to time in response to specific requests from war agencies.

The Bureau provides war agencies with detailed facts regarding 30 metals on a monthly basis. These studies cover both producers and consumers. In the calendar year 1942, 672 of the 754 canvasses on metals made by the Bureau were conducted specifically for war agencies. The quarterly iron and steel scrap survey has been changed to a monthly basis as an additional service for war industries and agencies.

In the field of nonmetallics, the studies also have been speeded and broadened. The Bureau makes monthly canvasses of mica, graphite, asbestos, barium oxide, and natural sodium compounds; a semimonthly canvass of cement; and special canvasses of quartz crystals, mineral pigments, and industrial diamonds. Special reports likewise are issued regarding the sources of high-grade dolomite needed for magnesium metal, sources of magnesia, processes for recovering magnesia from dolomite, magnesia refractories, resources and uses of monazite, uses and supplies of strontium, sources of high-grade clays for aluminum salts, and nonmetallic mineral industries in the South.

The work of the Bureau in collecting facts and figures regarding the petroleum and natural gas industries is aiding Government agencies in rationing problems, control of production, and readjustment in refinery operations. The monthly reviews regarding aviation gasoline, which were begun in 1939, and which have been supplemented by capacity surveys, are proving of special value to the program of expanding output to meet war needs.

The need of war agencies for cross-sectional views of the coal and coke industries also is being filled by the Bureau of Mines, which has expanded current studies and has inaugurated new studies so that a glance will reveal just how these industries are progressing and where shortages threaten. Another service of the Bureau is that which supplies essential information relating to production, stocks, and exports of strategic and critical minerals by foreign countries. These figures are obtained on a confidential basis from official sources in nonenemy countries.

Mr. President, with the limited time available it has been possible to present only a brief review of the splendid work the Bureau of Mines is doing to help this Nation and her allies win the war. In my opinion, this agency has provided the United States with an outstanding example of the foresighted and efficient conversion of an old-line bureau to a vibrant and progressive wartime organization—a conversion made possible by long and careful preparation and by an early realization of the possibilities of America's vast natural resources.

There is no question that virtually all the Bureau's work is directly concerned with the war program and the most effective aid to the war effort of this country's seven and one-half billion dollar mineral production industry. Without this industry—coal, metals, nonmetals, petroleum, coke, and dozens of other vital mineral fields—the United States could not rank as the "arsenal of democracy," nor would we be able to produce, as we did in 1942, as much war material as all of the Axis Nations put together.

Enormous wealth is drawn from our mines, and millions of people depend upon the industry for a living. When these minerals are processed or fabricated into war materials as well as articles which every man, woman, and child in the country must have in order to sustain our high standard of living, the value of the industry is multiplied many times. The influence of the mineral industries extends into transportation, agriculture, explosives, electrical manufacturing, steel making, yes, into every activity of the Nation.

Throughout the years of its early history, during the so-called defense era beginning with 1939, and in the actual war period dating from Pearl Harbor, the Bureau of Mines has forged steadily ahead in all branches of its work and has not relaxed its vigilance one iota. For that reason it has been able during this emergency to show the Nation how and where it may best utilize the land's God-given resources in making planes and guns and ships and other weapons for restoring order to a gangster-ridden world. It has demonstrated in the pilot plant, in the laboratory, and in the far-flung mineral deposits of the country how the United States can and should make itself independent of many of the foreign sources of raw materials.

All of this has been accomplished in the face of obstacles and handicaps which would have discouraged a less hardy group of workers or an organization that did not keep before it the shining goal of conserving wisely and utilizing efficiently the valuable minerals beneath the earth's crust. The Congress deserves credit for encouraging and supporting the Bureau of Mines in its difficult task of aiding our mineral industries in the orderly development and exploitation of domestic resources.

Mr. President, with the United States fighting for its very existence and with irrefutable proof that its existence depends upon many of the things for which the Bureau of Mines has long struggled, I feel that every Member of this body should understand what is being done by agencies such as the Bureau.

To the Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress—both the veterans and the new Members—as a member of the Committee on Mines and Mining, I can strongly recommend the work and accomplishments of the Bureau of Mines as well worth serious consideration and study, for to understand what this agency is accomplishing brings a grateful appreciation of the men in government and industry who are constantly working for a better America.

### ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). Under the order of the Senate previously entered, the Senate will now stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, to Thursday, January 14, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 11, 1943:

### SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Wiley Blount Rutledge, of Iowa, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Hon. James F. Byrnes, resigned.

### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Edward J. Flynn, of New York, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

The following-named persons now Foreign Service officers of class seven and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Paul J. Reveley, of Connecticut.
John Peabody Palmer, of Washington.
Henry E. Stebbins, of Massachusetts.
Waldo E. Bailey, of Mississippi.
Jacob D. Beam, of New Jersey.
Mulford A. Colebrook, of New York.

### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Josh Lee, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Department of Commerce for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1943, vice George P. Baker.

### OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Prentiss M. Brown, of Michigan, to be Price Administrator, Office of Price Administration, vice Leon Henderson.

### WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Chester W. Hepler, from the State of Illinois, to be area director at $5,600 per annum in the Chicago area office of the War Manpower Commission.

John Bradley Haight, from the State of Indiana, to be area director at $5,600 per annum in the Indianapolis area office of the War Manpower Commission.

George D. Penniman, Jr., from the State of Maryland, to the position of labor utilization analyst at $6,500 per annum in the Washington regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

William P. Edmunds, from the State of Ohio, to the position of area director at $6,500 per annum in the Cleveland area office of the War Manpower Commission.

T. Hilliard Cox, from the State of Nebraska, to the position of program control technician at $5,600 per annum in the Kansas City, Mo., regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Louis C. M. Abolin, from the State of New York, to the position of assistant labor utilization analyst (trainee) at $4,600 per annum in the Washington regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Edward L. Stevens, from the State of Virginia, to the position of field supervisor at $5,600 per annum in the Washington regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Ernest James Jaqua, from the State of California, to be head employment specialist at $6,500 per annum in the Bureau of Training in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission.

Merriam H. Trytten, from the State of Pennsylvania, to be principal employment specialist (physics) at $5,600 per annum in the Bureau of Training of the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission.

Harold L. Rothschild, from the State of Minnesota, to be head labor utilization analyst at $6,500 per annum in the Minneapolis regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

James Vernon Doucet, from the State of Colorado, to be program-control technician at $4,600 per annum in the Denver regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Louis Bloch, from the State of California, to be program-control technician at $5,600 per annum in the San Francisco regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

John D. Kingsley, from the State of Ohio, to be program control technician at $5,600 per annum in the Cleveland regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

David G. Nagle from the State of Massachusetts, to be field supervisor at $5,600 per annum in the Boston regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Reuben B. Resnik, from the State of Texas, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Carlos Stageberg, from the State of Minnesota, to be senior labor utilization analyst, at $4,600 per annum, in the Minneapolis regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Charles W. Patrick, from the State of California, to be senior training specialist, at $4,600 per annum in the San Francisco area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Donald Theodore Larin, from the State of North Dakota, to be senior agricultural employment specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Minneapolis regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

George P. Williams, from the State of Georgia, to be senior housing and transportation specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Marion A. Gregg, from the State of Ohio, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Youngstown, Ohio, area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Harry H. Hansborough, Jr., from the State of Kentucky, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Louisville, Ky., area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Leroy Allison West, from the State of Colorado, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Denver area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Thomas J. Corcoran, from the State of New York, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Syracuse area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Aloysius J. McGinty, from the State of New York, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Albany area office of the War Manpower Commission.

William Parkinson, from the State of Nebraska, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Omaha area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Daniel J. Boyle, from the State of Massachusetts, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Boston regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Frederick J. Graham, from the State of Massachusetts, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Boston regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Julius Cohen, from the State of West Virginia, to be principal attorney, at $5,600 per annum, in the office of the general counsel of the War Manpower Commission.

Dr. Paul C. Barton, from the State of Illinois, to be assistant director at $5,600 per annum for the Procurement and Assignment Service of the Bureau of Placement in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission.

Hervey Allen, from the State of Florida, to be information specialist at $4,600 per annum in the Atlanta regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

### TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

#### TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. Albert Whitney Waldron (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Henry Barlow Cheadle, Infantry.

Col. Joseph Hampton Atkinson (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States—Air Corps.

Col. LaVerne George Saunders (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States—Air Corps.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou blessed Founder of our most holy faith, who came to us in the form of a little Child, teach us that simplicity is the pioneer virtue that makes secure the foundation of Christian character. There is no power that builds up men in unselfishness and goodness as that which radiates from Him whose life on earth began in a manger. Let us cast aside our costly treasures, giving us minds and hearts to share with all who fear and weep. Dear Saviour, the Friend of changeless love, bless little children and those of ebbing strength who are seeking the rugged way alone and who never bow to defeat.

We pray that we may ever use our position and privileges to succor the homeless, the wanderer, and for all who seek companionship for the day and rest for the night. These are they of whom Thou didst say: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done unto Me." Almighty God, make us strong to forbear and unafraid; help us to spread Thy gracious reign until greed and hate shall cease, making us noble in feelings and in destiny. No fever of unrest can disturb the soul that breathes the lofty air and learns the way of the Christ.

"The holy Supper is kept indeed,
In what 'so we share with another's need;
Not what we give, but what we share,
For the gift without the giver is bare.
Who gives himself with his alms, feeds three.
Himself, his hungering neighbor, and Me."

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 8, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Labor.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Post Office Department.
5. Department of the Treasury.
6. Department of War.
7. Federal Works Agency.
8. War Production Board.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following agencies:

1. Civil Service Commission.
2. Federal Works Agency.
3. Office of War Information.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments:

1. Department of the Navy.
2. Department of War.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS]?

There was no objection.

REPLYING TO ATTACK ON GOV. HAROLD E. STASSEN'S REPUBLICANISM

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I arise to challenge the statement questioning Minnesota's Gov. Harold Stassen's Republicanism and his right to make suggestions relative to the post-war world, particularly looking toward maintaining the peace when the victory shall have been won.

From my long and close personal acquaintanceship, I can assure you that he is not a stalking horse for anyone. Harold Stassen has a mind of his own, and he has always spoken it frankly and fearlessly. I disagree with Mr. Stassen on many issues; but his right to express his views is as sacred as any cause we are fighting for in this war.

Far from his Republicanism being questionable, he is one of the outstanding Republican leaders in the Nation, and I know of no one who has any better right to speak as a Republican on any issue. Harold Stassen was one of the pioneers in the movement of organizing the youth of the Nation under the Republican banner; he led them to victory in Minnesota; and has contributed tremendously to their influence in the party and the Nation today.

I doubt very much whether I would agree with the specific proposal for the organization of the world government, but I also doubt very much whether he is particularly wedded to the plan that he put forth for discussion. He did not announce his plan dogmatically, but stated at the time that he was merely suggesting a possible solution and for purposes of opening discussion on the matter. Far from being criticized for this he should be applauded, and his great foresight and vision should be gratefully recognized. One of the great tragedies of modern history was the failure of the Allied Nations after the last war to carefully provide the mechanics to maintain world peace. I am one of those who do not believe that the League of Nations was the answer. I was opposed to it, and I would oppose reviving it after this war; but because no one had brought before the people that or any other plan for discussion from which a really workable solution could have been evolved, the League of Nations had no alternative; and when it was rejected by the people of the United States, there was nothing to offer in its place. Full and proper discussion during the last World War might very well have produced a real plan to which we and all of our allies could have subscribed and that would have been workable.

Furthermore, who better has a right to speak on post-war plans, and especially plans that will prevent the ever-recurring world wars to which we now seem to be subjected than the man who shall have taken part in those wars? Governor Stassen is a Reserve officer and in a few months is resigning his high office as Governor of the State of Minnesota to enter active service for the duration of the war. I want to assure you that the men who are fighting this war are going to have a great deal to say about post-war conditions in this country and throughout the world when this war is over. They are not going to lose the victory in a few years through pacifism in this country and through international bungling. This Nation has had to support all of the United Nations in this war, and it will have to do a great deal of the fighting everywhere in the world. It will certainly have both the right and the obligation to lead the way in the peace and reconstruction that is to follow the termination of the war. I think when the time comes you will find Harold Stassen one of those who will be among the leaders at that time.

Harold Stassen is not only an outstanding Republican, but he represents the finest type of young American.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print Governor Stassen's remarks to which I referred in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS]?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only to ask the gentleman what was the source of the criticism of Governor

Stassen and the questioning of his integrity?

Mr. MAAS. Well, his Republicanism and his right to make this kind of a proposal was questioned on the floor of the House by a Member.

Mr. COLE of New York. Has it been quesitoned from any other source than that one of which the gentleman spoke?

Mr. MAAS. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will be more specific. Under date of January 8, I had some remarks to make about Mr. Stassen, and I suggest that the gentleman point out to me where I was critical of him. I may say that the RECORD shows that I congratulated Mr. Stassen for making those remarks.

Mr. MAAS. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan, it was not his remarks to which I alluded. There was an interruption in his remarks by another Member of the House, and it is the assertions made in that interruption that I am challenging.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders for the day I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes to answer some criticisms of the administration's power program, and I hope every one will stay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF FRANCIS SCOTT KEY

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the centennial anniversary of that day when the God of Peace called Francis Scott Key to a well-earned rest and to that everlasting reward for which he had so well prepared himself; and

By his life, exemplary, distinguished, and devoted to the service of his community, his State and his Nation, he made a lasting impression upon all whose privilege it was to know him and left a rich and enduring heritage for succeeding generations; and

It is fitting that there be recorded brief reference to his life and work.

Francis Scott Key, son of John Ross Key and Anne Phoebe Penn Dagworthy Charlton Key, was born August 1, 1779, at Terra Rubra, located on Pipes Creek in the county of Frederick, now a part of Carroll County, in the State of Maryland. At the age of 10 he entered St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., and as a member of the first graduating class of that institution received the degree of bachelor of arts in 1796 at the age of 17. He delivered the valedictory address, using "Eloquence" as his topic. And 4 years later he received the degree of master of arts.

In 1827, when St. John's College faced a critical period because of the withdrawal by the State legislature of its financial support, Mr. Key was one of the foremost leaders of the movement to organize the alumni. He made the principal address at their first meeting on the subject of public responsibility to institutions of learning, so forceful that it resulted in a renewal by the State legislature of financial aid to the college in an even larger measure. Earlier he had become a member of the Georgetown-Lancaster Society, an organization having for its principal objective the furtherance of free public schools. He served for a number of years as member of and chairman of a committee charged with this particular phase of its program.

Shortly after Francis Scott Key graduated from St. John's College he entered the law office of his uncle, Phillip Barton Key, in Annapolis, Md., where he served the usual apprenticeship of 4 years. His regular attendance at sessions of the Maryland Court of Appeals, the legislature, and of the nisi prius courts served him in good stead in later years. He soon became a worthy opponent of the best lawyers of his day and an adversary to be reckoned with before the bar. He was admitted to the bar in the town of Frederick, Md., in the year 1800, where he practiced for the next 5 years, moving to Georgetown, D. C., in 1805. In 1806, when but 27 years of age, Mr. Key made his first appearance before the United States Supreme Court, John Marshall being its then Chief Justice. His appearances before this high tribunal became more and more frequent in the first half of the nineteenth century. In 1833 President Andrew Jackson appointed Mr. Key as United States attorney for the District of Columbia, the only public office which he ever held. While serving in this capacity the President sent him as a special mediator to Alabama for the purpose of settling a dispute which had arisen there between the local authorities, the Federal Government, and the Creek Indians over a question of jurisdiction. Although this controversy had been pending for some months when Mr. Key arrived and had reached such a fever pitch that armed conflict between the Indians and the United States Army seemed inevitable, he was able to make a favorable report to his superiors within 6 days and returned home after 6 weeks, completely successful in having settled the dispute.

Francis Scott Key was a devout Christian, using as his daily creed the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount. He served for a number of years as lay delegate to the diocesan conventions of the Episcopal Church in Maryland, and also as lay delegate to the general conventions of that church. His letters to his mother, to members of his family, and to his friends frequently show the depth of his religious convictions. Two of his religious poems are published in the Common Service Book and Hymnal of the Lutheran Church, namely, Lord, With Glowing Heart I Praise Thee, and Before the Lord We Bow. At one time, Key gave deep thought to the subject of entering the ministry. In 1813, the Reverend Dr. James Kemp, then rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Baltimore, offered him a position at that church, an offer which he declined only after prayerful consideration. Five days before his death, while traveling from Georgetown to Baltimore by stage coach, he composed his final poem, a work which bespeaks his belief in the life to come, and some lines of which were almost prophetic of his end.

On February 19, 1802, Francis Scott Key was married to Miss Mary Tayloe Lloyd, of Talbot County and Annapolis, a member of one of Maryland's outstanding and best-known families. Of this union, there were born 11 children, 6 boys and 5 girls. Most of Mr. Key's leisure time was spent in the bosom of his family. He was a true and devoted husband and an inspiration to and companion of his children.

While yet attending St. John's College, Francis Scott Key met Roger Brooke Taney—later Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. There immediately sprang up between them a deep friendship, a bond subsequently strengthened by the marriage of Mr. Taney to Mr. Key's only sister, Annie. It was to his brother-in-law that he told the story of his experiences incident to the writing of the Star-Spangled Banner, which story is related by Chief Justice Taney in a book of Key poems, published in 1857.

The masterpiece of his many poems, sonnets, and couplets is, of course, our national anthem. He reached the zenith of his career as a lawyer and orator when, by his compelling arguments, he succeeded in securing the release of Dr. William Beanes from the commanders of the British Army and Navy, then planning and ready to execute their attack upon the city of Baltimore. No less did his prowess as a poet soar to new heights as, from the deck of an American truce ship, "one of Ferguson's Norfolk packets," anchored some 3 miles off Fort McHenry, he watched the destiny of his country hang in the balance. When the 26-hour bombardment ended abruptly just before dawn on the morning of September 14, 1814, his heart must have sunk within him. Certainly, he thought the fort has been forced to surrender and that when the morning's sun cast its first glow over the eastern horizon he would see the flag of the enemy floating over the little battlement at the entrance to Baltimore's harbor. It was during this period of doubt and anxiety that Francis Scott Key wrote the first verse of his immortal poem. Then, as dawn began to break, he was able to get faint and fleeting glimpses of our ensign of democracy. As he writes in his second verse:

On the shore dimly seen.

Another line:

Now it catches the gleam of the morning's first beam.

With what relief, pride, and triumph he must have written the last two lines:

'Tis the Star-Spangled Banner! O, long may it wave, o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Only in the third verse does Key speak disparagingly of the enemy but, even in this, his verse of sarcasm, he does not mention it by name. This is well, for the defense of Baltimore was the last official engagement between the armed forces of Great Britain and the United States. There has since followed an era of peace and amity between these two nations and, having been allied in the first World War, they are now fighting shoulder to shoulder in a second world conflict.

In the fourth and last verse of his immortal poem, Francis Scott Key pours forth his true Christian spirit, giving praise to the heavenly powers for the victory and invoking the blessing of God that our cause may ever be just:

O! thus be it ever, when freemen shall stand
Between their lov'd homes and war's desolation;
Blessed with victory and peace, may the
Heav'n-rescued land
Praise the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation.
Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just,
And this be our motto: "In God is our trust."
And the Star-Spangled Banner, in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

On March 3, 1931, President Herbert Hoover approved H. R. 14, Public, No. 823, of the Seventy-first Congress, designating this immortal poem as the national anthem of the United States, thereby making official that which the public had already done, for the citizenry had years before taken the song into their hearts, paying it the same homage as if it had been the adopted anthem.

Francis Scott Key breathed his last at about 8 p. m. on Wednesday, January 11, 1843, at the home of his daughter, Elizabeth Phoebe Key Howard, located on Mount Vernon Place and Charles Street, Baltimore, within the shadow of the first monument erected in honor of George Washington. Flags were flown at half mast until his burial in John Eager Howard's vault in St. Paul's Cemetery, Baltimore, Md., on Saturday, January 14. The United States Supreme Court adjourned in tribute to him. In 1865 his remains were removed to Mount Olivet Cemetery, Frederick, Md., in order to fulfill one of his lifetime wishes:

May my remains rest within the shadow of the everlasting hills of Frederick County which I love so well.

In 1898 an imposing shaft was erected at the entrance to the cemetery, and the remains of Francis Scott Key and of his beloved wife were placed in a tomb at its base. Near the monument there flies a United States flag, night and day, a symbol of those fateful hours on the night of September 13 and 14, 1814.

Fort McHenry, over which Francis Scott Key saw the "stars and stripes" so proudly and defiantly waving on that morning after the bombardment, is now reserved by the Federal Government as a national monument and historic shrine. The Star-Spangled Banner Flag House, 844 East Pratt Street, Baltimore, wherein Mary Young Pickersgill made the mammoth flag—30 by 42 feet—which Mr. Key named the Star-Spangled Banner in his poem, is now maintained by the patriotic people of Baltimore as an historic shrine. Both of these institutions of inspiration and education are visited annually by thousands of persons.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered on December 18, 1942, by the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, at the dedication of a plaque for the 168 men of Temple Israel in Boston, who are in the armed services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, Tuesday, after the regular business on the Speaker's desk has been disposed of and at the conclusion of any previous orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to speak for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and other orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO TRADE TREATIES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the present session I introduced a bill (H. R. 744) providing for the repeal of the President's authority to enter into foreign trade treaties.

The Trade Treaty Act was enacted in 1934, in the days when the New Deal Congress was abjectly and supinely delegating its legislative powers to the Executive. It is high time that these legislative powers were recovered by the Congress, as the Constitution intends.

On January 9, 1943, there appeared an item headed "Hull promises attack on trade treaty foes," which indicates that the New Deal intends to pursue the same arrogant, dictatorial program as heretofore, which I assume it will continue to do until the Congress has sufficient courage and independence to regain its delegated legislative powers from the executive branch of the Government.

I may say in this connection that a distinguished member of the Convention which framed our Federal Constitution reminded those who were suffering from tryanny that they possessed the remedy by which to rescue themselves from such oppression. Here are his words:

How often and how long has degrading despotism reigned triumphant because the enfeebled and desponding sufferers under it have not known, or, having once known, have at last forgotten that they retain, during every moment of their slavery, the right of rescuing themselves from the proud and bloated authors and instruments of their oppression.

Under the Trade Treaty Act, the President is empowered to enter into binding trade treaties with foreign governments, without the formality of Senate ratification, as required by the Constitution. Moreover, he is permitted to reduce tariff duties, as fixed by Congress under its constitutional powers, without specific congressional approval, and without even any legislative standard for rate making. In other words, the President, under the act, now exercises discretionary legislative authority, on a scale comparable to that which he previously exercised under the invalidated N. R. A. Act, which the Supreme Court said was "delegation running riot."

There has been no constitutional test of the validity of the Trade Treaty Act because the New Deal's clever draftsmen suspended the appeal provision of section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act, which was the only remedy American producers had to test its legality.

The President has used his authority under the act to reduce American tariffs on over a thousand articles by as much as 50 percent, and he has gratuitously extended the benefit of our concessions not only to the treaty countries but to the whole world, without requiring equivalent concessions in favor of our own goods in foreign markets. Duties have been reduced without regard to differences in foreign and domestic production costs, and for the most part the American farmer has been the chief victim of these indiscriminate reductions.

Trade treaties have now been entered into with some 24 countries, and negotiations are pending with others. Under my bill, I have not only provided for the repeal of the President's authority to enter into new treaties, but also for the termination of those now outstanding, at the earliest date consistent with the terms thereof. In this way, no violation of good faith is involved. All agreements are terminable after a certain period upon proper notice, or for one cause or another.

The trade treaty program failed to accomplish either its primary objective or expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States, or its secondary objective of preserving world peace. It is wholly unsuited for dealing with the probelm of post-war readjustment. What this country needs is a foreign trade program which protects our vital interests, which is truly reciprocal,

and which is geared to deal with foreign trade upon a realistic basis along constitutional lines.

WE WANT NO GESTAPO

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I want to voice my criticism against the new enforcement regulations of the O. P. A. regarding gasoline rationing. I do not hesitate in saying that the Fuel Coordinator's Office and the O. P. A. have done the worst job of bungling in the Capital. Ickes' office issues one order, the office of O. P. A. issues another order diametrically opposite, and the motorists of the country, who are really making every sacrifice—with the exception of a few isolated chiselers—are holding the bag.

The American public welcomes rationing to conserve supplies and price ceilings to prevent inflation. The people realize there is a war to be won, and the public's full cooperation can be had I am sure, but it will not be won by "take it or leave it" pronouncements that leave a multitude of proper and legitimate questions unanswered.

The pleasure-driving ban may be necessary, but the manner of its enforcement is against all American principles. I firmly believe that the office of O. P. A. could have made no greater error than to turn loose a bunch of "drug store cowboys," namely O. P. A. clerks, to stop and question motorists. This is not the American way. It smacks of the Gestapo and is creating bitterness and resistance. Our heritage of sacrifice is a proud one, and in the voluntary system no one will dare use his car for pleasure driving lest his neighbors quickly put him on the spot. We do not need peeping toms, snoopers, or stooges to force us to be patriotic. There is bound to be a little chiseling; we find it in all walks of life. But we want no Gestapo.

Rationing will fail if the American people get any notion that there is something smart or challenging about evading restrictions. We do not look for that to happen, but the best way to guard against it is to treat the average fellow as a partner and tell him all you can—not push him around and have a Government clerk flash a badge at him. The present policy is a Hitler one—the very thing our boys are fighting to prevent. Let us all calmly get our feet on the ground and play the game in the good old American way. It bore fruit before—it will again.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders entered for the day have been disposed of I may address the House for 7 minutes on Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Johnstown Tribune, paying a deserved tribute to Lt. Col. Buzz Wagner. This is a fitting tribute to a great hero.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I received permission to include in my remarks an address of Dr. Paul J. Raver, the Bonneville Administrator, before the Inland Empire Waterways Association. The Public Printer estimates that this will require two and a half pages of the RECORD and will cost $112.50. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE AND TIRE RATIONING

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, much has been said of the need for overhauling the gasoline and tire rationing program. The American people are seeking almost desperately for a simplification of the present unwieldy program. But I see no evidence of any determined effort on the part of O. P. A. to slash red tape and get down to earth. Let me point out that O. P. A. can safely shove its cumbersome form sheets down the throats of an unhappy public. O. P. A. does not have to answer to the public. But it does have to answer to Congress, and Congress is the voice of the people. It is our responsibility to protect our people.

I do not question the necessity for rationing. It is part of the price of war, and we are all ready to get on with it. But I deplore the endless confusion, the unequal treatment of different areas, and the complicated forms which must be filled out at every step. In the effort to achieve the real aims of the rationing program, I earnestly request on the part of those whom I am elected to represent—I demand that O. P. A. simplify its forms and streamline rationing procedures by eliminating many of the present nonessential steps; that tire registration and inspections be dropped; and that all parts of the Nation be placed under one rationing program. We are all Americans together in this struggle.

It is my further request that the continued expansion of coastal waterway, pipe line, and other transportation facilities be authorized and directed in order to relieve gasoline and fuel-oil shortages at the earliest possible minute. The real shortage is in transportation, not in gasoline and oil.

I think it is evident that there are many bureau heads now seeking to regulate businessmen and farmers who are lacking in practical experience, and who are unfamiliar with the problems of those activities and their methods of operation. As a result, confusion and righteous indignation are widespread.

Immediate correction of the unnecessary evils of the rationing program will give a great stimulus to our war effort.

LIMITING SALARIES TO $25,000

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of comment lately about the Executive order limiting salaries to $25,000.

I was a member of the conference committee which adjusted the differences between the Senate and House versions of the price control bill. Those of us comprising the conference committee discussed the question of wage limitation at length and agreed upon certain language which we considered plain enough to prohibit the President from adjusting salaries unless he found it necessary "in any case to correct gross inequities and also aid in the effective prosecution of the war." You will note that the President in order to limit salaries to $25,000 must find that two conditions exist: First, that it is to correct a gross inequity; and second, that the limitation must be an aid in the effective prosecution of the war. We deliberated upon the use of the word "and" instead of "or." The conference recommended the elimination of the word "or" and the substitution of the word "and" to prevent just such action as the President has now taken.

You will note, therefore, that the President must find that a gross inequity appears in any case before he adjusts the salary. His determination that any salary over $25,000 constitutes a gross inequity must be predicated upon a comparison of the salary reduced with all other salaries and wages, without regard to the nature of the employment or the capacity in which the recipient of the salary functions. This is socialistic in that it is an endeavor to equalize income without regard to the services rendered and is also socialistic in that it is in clear defiance of expressed legislative intent. Without regard to the merits of the Executive order in this respect, a fundamental question as to the perpetuation of American representative government is involved.

It is my intention to review this situation, and I shall probably introduce within the next 2 or 3 days legislation to

amend section 4, Public, 729, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, in which the authority under which the President issued his Executive order is allegedly found.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from a letter from a constituent on rationing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Ernest K. Lindley on a pay-as-you-go tax plan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

A PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAX PLAN

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members of the House have called me asking me for an explanatory statement on House Joint Resolution 17, which I introduced on the opening day of this Congress. It concerns a pay-as-you-go tax plan. I have a special order for tomorrow, and, if anyone is interested, at that time I shall be glad to answer any questions I can on that subject.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very enlightening newspaper article by Richard L. Stokes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Miss Jeannette Marks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein, by request, a petition to the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short article, an inspirational message by one of the religious leaders of my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE MANPOWER PROGRAM AND THE SMALLER COLLEGES

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the manpower and brainpower mobilization changes, I want to make a plea for the smaller privately controlled liberal arts colleges. I am afraid that these smaller colleges, practically all of them without sufficient endowments to carry on during the war emergency, are being sidetracked in favor of our great universities and State institutions.

I do not believe Mr. McNutt could render Americanism a greater service than to see, as far as possible, that these smaller liberal arts colleges are used in connection with the brainpower mobilization.

Let me mention a few reasons why these small colleges should be used in connection with our brainpower training program:

In 99 cases out of 100 these smaller colleges are manned from president to janitor by real American patriots who are deeply concerned, not only in winning the war, but in coming out of the conflict with our American way of life and our American institutions intact. Hence, the atmosphere found at these smaller colleges is the American atmosphere of freedom and liberty and equality of treatment. If any of our young men are uncertain as to what we are fighting for it will not take but a few months' training in one of the smaller colleges for them to find out that we are fighting to preserve that which is dearer than life to the true American—freedom and liberty and equality.

Then, too, you will find a spiritual and moral atmosphere permeating these smaller colleges that nowhere else in our educational system is found to such a marked degree. Brain power, without spiritual power and moral stamina, will never develop a man for true leadership.

While I am not decrying our large institutions of learning, I am trying to say that the main source of real American leadership is found in our smaller liberal arts colleges. For example, the publisher of Who's Who in America only recently called attention to the fact that of the last 13 Presidents of the United States 8 were educated in our smaller colleges.

If some way is not worked out to preserve these smaller liberal arts colleges, many of them will fall by the wayside before the war is over due to the fact that they do not have sufficient endowments to tide them over. This would be tragic. I do not know of a greater blow Americanism could suffer.

Mr. McNutt, it may be easier to use the facilities of the large universities and State-supported institutions, but, let me remind you, the easy way now is going to be the costly way later on. I am not thinking about the easy way. What I am thinking about is the safe way. Follow the safe way, Mr. McNutt, and save our smaller liberal arts colleges.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, when the appropriation providing for the administration of the Office of Price Administration was before the House, I called attention to the failures in the set-up that would make that Agency a complete failure. I called attention to their incompetent economists, to their set-up of incompetents without any business experience, and to the terrible situation

with reference to rent control. These things have caused a break-down in public esteem for that organization, and these things, together with the fact that the Congress gave this Agency too much money to spend, have been a menace to our war program. I hope before we get through we will have some kind of a house cleaning. The substitution of one man for another as head will do no good unless the incompetent W. P. A. economists are thrown out and the Rent Control Administrator is thrown out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

HON. JOHN J. FITZGERALD

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed gratified, and I know that some of the old Members are also, that we have a visitor here today who was for many years the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Not only was he recognized as one of the ablest chairmen of that great committee, but regarded during his service as the outstanding parliamentarian of the House. I refer to the Honorable John J. Fitzgerald, of New York, who has retired from the bench, and who has come to Washington to say hello to his many old friends. I welcome him, and hope that he will continue to serve his country as he has for so many years with such great distinction.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to endorse the words of my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] in paying a tribute to former Congressman John Fitzgerald, of New York. I happened to have been secretary to my father, who was in Congress in 1909 when Mr. Fitzgerald was one of the outstanding Members. I am glad of the opportunity to welcome him on his visit to the House to which he was elected in 1898. He was the foremost parliamentarian of his time and one of the ablest and wisest leaders of the House of Representatives, until he resigned in 1917 to take a high judicial position. As a member of the minority party I join in the welcome to such a distinguished American.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have stood on this floor many times and discussed with you the flood conditions in the Ohio Valley and in various other sections of the country. The question of flood control has been with us for many years. The great flood which inundated the whole Mississippi Valley back in 1927 or 1928 awakened the people of our country to the fact that something must be done to control the floods that were disastrous to the property of people living within the reach of the waters and were also so disastrous in their depletion of the fertility of the soil over such wide areas of our country.

Immediately following the great Mississippi flood that I have just referred to, this Congress took action which resulted in the Flood Control Committee of the House becoming one of the very important committees of this body.

The Ohio Valley has just come through another rather serious flood, which was very devastating in many respects, but which, we are glad to say, was not as devastating as several other floods that have visited the Ohio Valley, which is beyond any question one of the most productive valleys of the world, not only from the standpoint of crops and farm products but also from the standpoint of industrial products. The Ohio River, with its locks and dams, has a carrying capacity greater than that of any other river in the world.

The flood of 1937 was the most disastrous flood that history records, as far as the Ohio Valley was concerned.

Immediately following that flood—in fact, before that flood had subsided—the chairman of the Flood Control Committee, at my request, began to prepare legislation which would bring relief to the thousands of people who had been rendered homeless and whose businesses had been destroyed. While the water was still 10 feet in many of the buildings in my home section I had helped to arrange for the passage of the bill which set up the Disaster Loan Corporation. And before the water had receded from the cities along the Ohio River a committee representing the Disaster Loan Corporation was functioning in southern Ohio and providing those in need with immediate financial aid to rehabilitate themselves. In this connection I should not fail to convey to this House the gratitude of the people that I have the honor to represent for the very ready manner in which the Government responded to cope with that great calamity.

Just as soon after the flood of 1937 had receded as we could get the Flood Control Committee together we prepared legislation that we hoped would prevent future floods such as the one which had scourged the Ohio Valley in January 1937. The chairman of the Flood Control Committee and myself made plans, as the result of which President Roosevelt set aside $24,000,000 to be used for flood-control purposes in the Ohio Valley. Naturally, it took considerable time for legislation to pass both Houses of Congress and to receive the approval of the President. Early in the proceedings it became evident that it would be necessary for municipalities to contribute a portion of the expense of any flood defenses that such municipalities might wish to construct. It also became evident as to the manner and method by which the municipalities would be required to come forward with their part. A canvass of the situation by the Army engineers indicated clearly that there was only one municipality in my district that could meet the requirements which the proposed law would provide. That municipality, which is Ironton, Ohio, happens to be the city in which I live. It is by far the largest city on the Ohio River in my district.

There were many people in my home city who at first felt afraid to live behind flood defenses. After long experience with the Army engineers in connection with the construction of dams and other improvements on the Ohio River I had the utmost faith in our great Corps of Engineers. They are beyond question the greatest engineers in the world. With that conviction I pressed forward probably too vigorously, but I was given the most complete assistance and encouragement by the city council and the city officials at Ironton, with the result that every detail required by the law and the Army engineers was met by proper action of the city officials and the city council with the result that my home city of Ironton was the first city in the United States to prepare itself and to claim the benefits of the new flood-control legislation. On the thirteenth day of April 1938 the first work was done on the Ironton, Ohio, flood wall. Naturally I was proud to be present on that occasion.

Now, to make a long story short, I am glad to say to you that several months ago our people, in collaboration with the Federal authorities, completed flood defenses all around the city of Ironton, Ohio. These were the first defenses commenced and the first completed in the whole country. These defenses consist of earthen levees and concrete flood walls. The Federal Government contributed approximately three and a half millions and the city of Ironton contributed approximately $700,000.

The great flood which passed down the Ohio River last week was successfully kept out of the city of Ironton. The flood defenses proved their efficiency 100 percent. The Army engineers, cooperating with the city authorities, watched the man-made defenses turn Old Man River back. Our people were saved many thousands of dollars and much anguish.

As a Representative of a grateful people, I bring you this report in the hope that we may continue this great flood-protection program so that other cities along the Ohio that have partially built flood-defense works may complete them and so that smaller communities that have not been able to meet the financial requirements of the law may be able also to get some relief.

Many people wonder why people afflicted by these periodical floods do not move from the Ohio Valley. The answer is that the most valuable asset in the Ohio Valley is the Ohio River. Water is one of nature's necessities. As water is necessary to maintain physical life, it is also necessary to maintain industrial life. The big industries of the world are built along the waterways. Nature has

given us the Ohio River and it is really the life of all our activities. We who live along the river love the old Ohio, but we also want to keep her harnessed so that she may serve us and not destroy us.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a splendid and informative article or sketch of a man that I have always greatly admired, the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, former Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. It is an article by Mr. Justice D. Lawrence Groner, Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals, appearing in the July–September issue, 1941, of Federal Probation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

VICTORY BOOK DRIVE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one day last week I called the attention of the Members of the House to the victory book drive, the purpose of which is to send interesting and entertaining reading to the men in the armed forces. At that time I stated that on Tuesday of this week Members would be given an opportunity to contribute whatever books they desire to this drive, and I also stated at that time that today I would inform the Members, when and where they could make this contribution. Tomorrow, somewhere between 12:30 o'clock and 1 o'clock p. m., in Statuary Hall, Members may contribute any books they desire. This is a very worthy cause, as we all know. At the time of the contribution, moving pictures will be taken of the Members delivering the books, and these pictures will be distributed throughout the country as a part of the campaign to inspire the general public to contribute as many books as possible. I hope all Members today will look at their homes and in their offices and come over tomorrow with as many books as possible.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN J. COCHRAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him by House Resolution 32, he did, on January 9, 1943, administer the oath of office to the Honorable JOHN J. COCHRAN, at Bethesda, Md.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask its immediate consideration.

And may I add, Mr. Speaker, I am certain the Members of the House will be glad to know, that Representative COCHRAN is making excellent progress, and is on the way to early recovery.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution (H. Res. 43).

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas JOHN J. COCHRAN, a Representative from the State of Missouri, from the Thirteenth District thereof, has been unable, from sickness, to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed to the oath of office before the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said JOHN J. COCHRAN as a Member of this House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING THE BUDGET FOR 1944 (H. DOC. NO. 27)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am transmitting herewith a war Budget exceeding 100 billion dollars for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943. Last year I called the Budget an instrument for transforming a peace economy into a war economy. This Budget presents the maximum program for waging war.

We wage total war because our very existence is threatened. Without that supreme effort we cannot hope to retain the freedom and self-respect which give life its value.

Total war is grim reality. It means the dedication of our lives and resources to a single objective—victory.

Total war in a democracy is a violent conflict in which everyone must anticipate that both lives and possessions will be assigned to their most effective use in the common effort—the effort for community survival—Nation survival.

In total war we are all soldiers, whether in uniform, overalls, or shirt sleeves.

BUDGETING FOR TOTAL WAR

WAR EXPENDITURES

The huge and expanding rate of war expenditures shows our determination to equip our fighting forces and those of our allies with the instruments of war needed for victory. Monthly expenditures for war purposes amounted to 2 billion dollars just after Pearl Harbor; they now exceed 6 billion dollars, and they will average more than 8 billion dollars a month during the fiscal year 1944. For the whole of the current fiscal year total war expenditures are now estimated at 77 billion dollars; for the next fiscal year, at 100 billion dollars. These estimates include the net outlays of Government corporations for war purposes and assume only a small rise in prices.

Victory cannot be bought with any amount of money, however large; victory is achieved by the blood of soldiers, the sweat of working men and women, and the sacrifice of all people. But a 100-billion-dollar expenditure program does reflect a national effort of gigantic magnitude. It calls for vision on the part of those in charge of war production, ingenuity of management, and the skill, devotion, and tenacity of the men on the farms and in the factories. It makes possible the expansion of our armed forces necessary to offensive operations, the production of planes and munitions to provide unquestioned superiority, and the construction of ships which will make it possible for us to strike at the enemy wherever he may be. It reflects the determination of the civilians to "pass the ammunition." Moreover, consumers' goods and services will have to be produced in an amount adequate to maintain the health and productivity of the civilian population. And all of this will have to be done while we are withdrawing millions of men from production for service in the armed forces.

Some persons may believe that such a program is fantastic. My reply is that this program is feasible. If the Nation's manpower and resources are fully harnessed, I am confident that the objective of this program can be reached, but it requires a complete recognition of the necessities of total war by all—management, labor, farmers, consumers, and public servants—regardless of party. Production short of these military requirements would be a betrayal of our fighting men.

This Budget does not include the detailed estimates of war expenditures which would reveal information to our enemies. An additional reason for such action at this time is that rapid developments on far-flung battle fronts make it impossible to submit a detailed war Budget for a year ending 18 months hence. I shall continue, however, to report on the broad categories of war expenditures. The following table summarizes our present estimates of war expenditures from general and special accounts and by Government corporations.

*Estimates of total expenditures for war, fiscal years 1943 and 1944*

[Billions]

| Object of expenditure | Fiscal 1943 | Fiscal 1944 |
|---|---|---|
| Munitions | $43 | $66 |
| Military and civilian pay, subsistence, and travel | 15 | 21 |
| Industrial construction | 6 | 2 |
| Other construction | 8 | 5 |
| Other, including agricultural lend-lease | 5 | 6 |
| Total | 77 | 100 |

This spring I shall submit the necessary information upon which the Congress can base war appropriations for the fiscal year 1944. In the meantime there are available about 170 billion dollars of unspent war appropriations and authorizations; about two-thirds of this

amount is already obligated or committed. Further appropriations will soon be needed to permit letting of contracts with industry for the next year.

THE PROCUREMENT OF MUNITIONS

Total mobilization of all our men and women, all our equipment, and all our materials in a balanced production program will enable us to accomplish the production goals underlying this war budget.

*Manpower.*—Marked progress has been made in mobilizing manpower. In spite of the increase in the armed services, industrial production rose by 46 percent, and agricultural production by 15 percent between calendar years 1940 and 1942. Industrial production has not been delayed and crops have not been lost because of lack of manpower except in a few isolated cases. More than 10 million people have been added to the employed or the armed forces since the summer of 1940, 7 million of whom were unemployed and more than 3 million of whom are additions to the Nation's labor and armed forces.

Manpower mobilization is now entering a much more difficult phase. During the calendar year 1943 approximately 6 million people will be needed above present requirements for the armed services and war production. This number can be obtained by transferring from less essential work, and by drawing into the working force people who have not recently sought employment. Vigorous action is required to mobilize and train our reserve of women and young people, to accelerate the transfer of workers to essential industries, and to reduce harmful turn-over and migration of workers in essential industries. It also requires prevention of labor hoarding and elimination of hiring restrictions based on sex, creed, or race. I reiterate my previous recommendation for a unified and adequate rehabilitation service to make available a million persons for war industry and to restore to civil employment persons who are being disabled in the armed forces.

Manpower needs of the armed forces and of war production during the calendar year 1943 can be met without impairment of essential civilian requirements. I stress the important distinction between "essential requirements" and the thousand and one things that are nonessentials or luxuries. The production of these nonessentials wastes manpower at a time when careful economy and greater efficiency in the use of our manpower resources is imperative. Private thought and public discussion of this subject are very necessary.

*Equipment.*—Were it not for an unprecedented program of conversion and the building up of a new war industry during the past two and one-half years, we could not expect to fulfill the war-production program outlined in this message.

Some progress, but not enough, has been made in spreading war contracts more widely among medium-sized and smaller plants. Further efforts are necessary. In certain cases, of course, saving of manpower and materials requires concentration in those plants best equipped to produce a given commodity.

*Materials.*—Furthermore, war production is limited by our supply of raw materials. The available materials must be transformed into the maximum of striking power. The production of less urgent or the wrong quantity of items, or poor scheduling of production in any single plant or in the munitions program as a whole, results in waste of precious materials. The Nation's war production must be so scheduled that the right items are produced in the right amounts at the right time.

*War contracts.*—The procurement program must achieve maximum production with minimum waste and with the speed essential in time of war. This is the controlling objective not only for the original negotiation of contracts but also for the renegotiation required by law. The law provides for the prevention or recapture of excessive profits, thus supplementing and reinforcing the objectives of the excess-profits tax. I believe that control of the costs of production is of equal importance.

The proper negotiation and renegotiation of contracts must strive to reconcile the avoidance of excessive profits with the maintenance of incentives to economical management.

FARM AND FOOD PROGRAM

Food is a primary weapon of war. An adequate food supply is, therefore, a basic aspect of a total war program. I have placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture full responsibility for determining and fulfilling the food requirements in this war. Our agricultural production is larger than ever in our history but the needs of our armed services and our allies are so great that a shortage of certain foods is inevitable. The production of the less-needed commodities must be reduced, while the production of commodities for war and essential civilian use must be increased. It is imperative also that this increased demand for food be adjusted to available supplies. There will be sufficient volume in our bill of fare but less variety. That may hurt our taste but not our health.

To facilitate this program, I am recommending appropriations for aids to agriculture totaling 837 million dollars for the fiscal year 1944. Among the major items included in the 837-million-dollar total are 400 million for conservation and use of agricultural land resources; 194 million for parity payments on the 1942 crops; and 96 million for exportation and domestic consumption of surplus commodities. Other large items included are 64 million dollars for payments under the Sugar Act; 38 million for the Farm Security Administration; and 31 million for reductions in interest rates on farm mortgages.

Prior to the 1943 appropriation acts, annual appropriations for parity payments were made a year in advance of actual need, and acreage allotments for the year ahead were used as a factor in determining payments on the crops of the current year. In the 1943 Budget and appropriation acts, provisions were made to insure that all factors used in determining the amount of parity payments on the crops of a given year would pertain to the program of that year. Also, to bring this item into conformity with our general budgetary practice, the annual cash appropriation for parity payments was omitted, but the Secretary was authorized to incur contractual obligations assuring the cooperating producers of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco that such payments would be made, if and as necessary, on their 1942 crops.

The appropriation now requested, therefore, is simply the amount estimated to be necessary to compensate the producers of corn, wheat, and certain minor types of tobacco for the disparity between the market returns from the normal yield of their 1942 allotted acreage and the parity price return from that production. It is expected that no parity payments will be necessary on the 1942 crops of cotton, rice, and most types of tobacco.

Since the established national policy is to assure the cooperating producers of these basic crops parity prices on the normal yields of their allotted acreages, I am again recommending that the authority to incur contractual obligations for such payments on future crops be renewed.

On the other hand, I am recommending a reduction of 50 million dollars in the appropriation for conservation and use of agricultural land resources. I am also directing the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the 400 million dollars still provided under this heading as fully and effectively as the basic law will permit to encourage greater production of the crops essential to the war effort. This fund will not be used for restoration of production except of less-needed crops. Payments will be made only to those producers who comply fully in their plantings with the stated war-production goals.

For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities the Budget includes only the permanent annual appropriation of 30 percent of customs revenues provided by law, plus reappropriation of unobligated balances. The food-stamp plan, which is a major item of the current program, will be discontinued shortly. Although other items such as school lunch and school milk projects and the direct distribution of surplus commodities are somewhat expanded, there will be an over-all reduction of about 30 million dollars.

Provision for operations under the Farm Tenant Act and for loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation are continued on about the same level as for the current year. Small farms, like other small war plants, must be encouraged to make a maximum contribution to the war. I hope the Congress will give as much sympathetic consideration to these smaller and poorer farmers as it has given to the smaller and poorer industrial concerns.

Because no one can immediately foresee all the needs we may encounter in fulfilling our essential war requirements for agriculture, various loan and purchase operations, involving contingent liabilities which cannot be exactly predetermined, may be necessary.

CIVILIAN CONSUMPTION

In spite of a hundred-billion-dollar war program, civilians can be supplied with an average of about $500 worth of goods and services during the next year. This implies an average reduction of almost 25 percent in civilian consumption below the record level of the calendar year 1941. Even then most of us will be better fed, better clothed, and better housed than other peoples in the world. Do not let us assume from that statement, however, that there is no need for great improvement in the living conditions of a large segment of our population.

It is the responsibility of the Government to plan for more production of essential civilian goods and less of nonessential goods. Production and distribution of goods should be simplified and standardized; unnecessary costs and frills should be eliminated. Total war demands simplification of American life. By giving up what we do not need, all of us will be better able to get what we do need.

In order to distribute the scarce necessities of life equitably we are rationing some commodities. By rationing we restrict consumption, but only to assure to each civilian his share of basic commodities.

The essentials for civilian life also include a good standard of health and medical service, education, and care for children in wartime as well as in peace.

THE STABILIZATION PROGRAM

We must assure each citizen the necessities of life at prices which he can pay. Otherwise, rising prices will lift many goods beyond his reach just as surely as if those goods did not exist. By a concerted effort to stabilize prices, rents, and wages we have succeeded in keeping the rise in the cost of living within narrow bounds. We shall continue those efforts, and we shall succeed. By making effective use of all measures of control, we shall be able to stabilize prices with only a limited use of subsidies to stimulate needed production.

Some would like to see the controls relaxed for this or that special group. They forget that to relax controls for one group is an argument to relax for other groups, thereby starting the cost-of-living spiral which would undermine the war effort and cause grave post-war difficulties. Economic stabilization for all groups—not for just the other fellow—is the only policy consistent with the requirements of total war. I have read of this bloc, and that bloc, and the other bloc, which existed in past Congresses. May this new Congress confine itself to one bloc—a national bloc.

Stabilization goes beyond effective price control. Under war conditions a rise in profits, wages, and farm incomes unfortunately does not increase the supply of goods for civilians; it merely invites the bidding up of prices of scarce commodities. The stabilization of incomes and the absorption of excess purchasing power by fiscal measures are essential for the success of the stabilization program. I am confident that the Congress will implement that program by adequate legislation increasing taxation, savings, or both. Thus, we will help to "pay as we go" and make the coming peace easier for ourselves and our children.

CIVILIAN CONTROLS IN TOTAL WAR

Total war requires nothing less than organizing all the human and material resources of the Nation. To accomplish this all-out mobilization speedily, effectively, and fairly we have had to adopt extensive controls over civilian life. We use the Selective Service System to man the armed forces. We are systematizing the movement of labor to assure needed manpower to war industries and agriculture. We regulate prices, wages, salaries, and rents; we limit consumer credit; we allocate scarce raw materials; and we ration scarce consumer goods—all to the end of providing the materials of war and distributing the sacrifices equitably.

Such regulations and restrictions have complicated our daily lives. We save rubber, metal, fats—everything. We fill out forms, carry coupons, answer questionnaires. This is all new. We have overdone it in many cases. By trial and error we are learning simpler and better methods. But remember always that reaching the objective is what counts most. There is no easy, pleasant way to restrict the living habits—the eating, clothing, heating, travel, and working habits—of 130,000,000 people. There is no easy, pleasant way to wage total war.

About 400,000 civilian employees of the Federal Government are engaged in the task of civilian administration for total war. They direct and schedule war production; handle the procurement of food, munitions, and equipment for our armed forces and our allies; supervise wartime transportation; administer price, wage, rent, labor, and material controls and commodity rationing; conduct economic and propaganda offensives against our enemies; and do necessary paper work for the armed forces.

Besides these Government employees, millions of men and women volunteers—who draw no pay—are carrying out tasks of war administration, many of them after long hours at their regular occupation. These patriotic citizens are serving on draft boards, on war price and ration boards, in the civilian defense organization, the War bond campaign, and many other activities. They deserve the gratitude of their countrymen.

More than 1,600,000—or approximately three-fifths—of all Federal civilian employees are engaged directly in war production. They build and load ships, make guns and shells, repair machines and equipment, build arsenals and camps, sew uniforms, operate airports and signal systems. These are the workers in navy yards, arsenals, storage depots, military airfields, and other operating centers. It is scarcely ethical to try to make people believe that these workers are holding down armchair or unnecessary Government jobs.

This huge organization, created overnight to meet our war needs, could not be expected to function smoothly from the very start. Congressional committees and many individuals have made helpful suggestions. Criticism is welcome if it is based on truth. We will continue our efforts to make the organization more fully effective.

*Compensation of Federal employees.*—Last month the Congress took temporary and emergency action, which will expire April 30, 1943, relative to compensation for Federal employees. The legislation removed inequities, lengthened the workweek to conserve manpower, increased payment for longer hours, and provided bonus payments for certain employees. The pay increases should be met largely by reducing the total number of employees proportionate to the increase in the workweek.

In the present appropriation requests and expenditure estimates for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944, no allowance has been made for any cost increase resulting from the adjustment in Federal salaries.

The problems of Federal salary administration need further study in the early days of the new Congress for enactment of more permanent legislation for the duration of the war.

"NONWAR" EXPENDITURES

I am making recommendations in the usual detail for so-called "nonwar" appropriations for the fiscal year 1944. This classification includes the same items as in former years.

Actually, the "nonwar" classification now has little, if any, meaning. Most of these expenditures are related to the war effort and many are directly occasioned by it. This "nonwar" category includes, for instance, expenditures for war-tax collections, for budgeting, disbursing, and auditing war expenditures, and for statistical and scientific services to war agencies. It includes also such items as the control of white pine blister rust, which I recently discussed. Expenditures for controlling this threat to our timber resources are necessary to avoid possible loss of millions of dollars in lumber from trees which require more than 50 years to reach maturity.

All counted, there are less than 850,000 civilian employees of the Federal Government, including the Postal Service, who are engaged in these so-called "nonwar" activities.

A few weeks ago I transmitted to the Congress a comprehensive report on "nonwar" expenditures during the past decade. This document demonstrated the important reductions which had been made in these expenditures, especially since the start of the defense program.

The following table summarizes reductions analyzed in the report, to which it is now possible to add revised estimates for the fiscal year 1943 and estimates for 1944 as developed in this Budget.

*"Nonwar" expenditures, fiscal years 1939–44 (excluding interest and statutory debt retirement)*

[Millions]

| Fiscal year | Total nonwar expenditures | Reduction below 1939 |
|---|---|---|
| 1939 | $6,516 | |
| 1940 | 6,246 | $270 |
| 1941 | 5,298 | 1,218 |
| 1942 | 5,125 | 1,391 |
| 1943 (estimated) | 4,582 | 1,934 |
| 1944 (estimated) | 4,124 | 2,392 |

The table shows a reduction of 36.7 percent in nonwar expenditures in the next fiscal year compared with 1939. In appraising these reductions, it should be borne in mind that large items, such as veterans' pensions and social-security grants, are controlled by legal or other commitments. In fact the outstanding increase for the fiscal year 1944 is for the Veterans' Administration, for which expenditures are estimated at 879 million dollars, or 265 million dollars higher than in the current year. Most of the increase is for insurance for our fighting forces in the present war.

The most important reductions recommended for the coming year relate to work relief and general public works. Because of present high levels of employment, I am able to recommend elimination of the Work Projects Administration. This action under present conditions does not cast upon the State and local governments more than the proper burden of financing the relief of those who are unable to work. Expenditures for general public works will be greatly curtailed. Continuing projects are directly related to war needs. Others have been discontinued as rapidly as this could be done without risking the loss of the investment already made.

I shall be glad to cooperate with the Congress in effecting further reductions in nonwar expenditures through the necessary revision of underlying legislation and in every other way. It should be pointed out to the Congress and to the Nation, however, that we are fast approaching the subsistence level of government—the minimum for sustaining orderly social and economic processes—and that further reductions will necessarily be of much smaller magnitude than those already achieved.

My recommendations contemplate that in the fiscal year 1944, 96 cents of every dollar expended by the Federal Government will be used to pay war costs and interest on the public debt, and only 4 cents for all the so-called nonwar purposes.

INTEREST

War financing has raised the requirement for interest on the public debt from 1,041 million dollars in 1940, the fiscal year before the defense program started, to an estimated 1,850 million dollars for the current year and 3,000 million dollars for the fiscal year 1944 under existing legislation.

FINANCING TOTAL WAR

THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS

Financing expenditures which will exceed 100 billion dollars is a task of tremendous magnitude. By meeting this task squarely we will contribute substantially to the war effort and clear the ground for successful reconstruction after the war. An adequate financial program is essential both for winning the war and for winning the peace.

Financing total war involves two main fiscal problems. One problem is to supply the funds currently required to pay for the war and to keep the increase in Federal debt within bounds. The second problem is caused by the disbursement of 100 billion dollars a year to contractors, war workers, farmers, soldiers, and their families, thus adding many billions to the people's buying power, at a time when the amount of goods to be bought is declining steadily. A large portion of this excess buying power must be recovered into the Treasury to prevent the excess from being used to bid up the price of scarce goods and thus undermine the stabilization program by breaking price ceilings, creating black markets, and increasing the cost of living.

We cannot hope to increase tax collections as fast as we step up war expenditures or to absorb by fiscal measures alone all excess purchasing power created by these expenditures. We must, therefore, provide a substantial portion of the needed funds by additional borrowing, and we must also use direct controls, such as price ceilings and rationing, for the protection of the consumer. Nevertheless, the more nearly increases in tax receipts follow increases in expenditures, the better we safeguard our financial integrity and the easier the administration of price control and rationing. All of these measures are interrelated. Each increase in taxes and each increase in savings will lessen the upward pressure on prices and reduce the amount of rationing and other direct controls we shall need.

The revenue acts of the past 3 years, particularly the Revenue Act of 1942, have contributed greatly toward meeting our fiscal needs. In the fiscal year 1944 total general and special receipts under present law are estimated at $35,000,000,000, or almost six times those of the fiscal year 1940. But the increase in expenditures has been even more rapid.

I believe that we should strive to collect not less than $16,000,000,000 of additional funds by taxation, savings, or both, during the fiscal year 1944.

On the basis of present legislation, we expect to meet 34 percent of total estimated Federal expenditures by current receipts during the fiscal year 1944. If the objective proposed in this message is adopted, we shall meet approximately 50 percent of expenditures during the fiscal year 1944.

THE NEED FOR A BALANCED AND FLEXIBLE REVENUE SYSTEM

I hope that the Congress in working out the revenue program will consider that the fiscal measures must be designed not only to provide revenue, but also to support the stabilization program as well by deterring luxury or nonessential spending. The cost of the war should be distributed in an equitable and fair manner. Furthermore, care should be taken that the fiscal measures do not impair but actually promote maximum war production. Finally, it is more important than ever before to simplify taxation both for taxpayers and for those collecting the tax, and to put our taxes, as far as feasible, on a pay-as-you-go basis.

I cannot ask the Congress to impose the necessarily heavy financial burdens on the lower and middle incomes unless the taxes on higher and very large incomes are made fully effective. At a time when wages and salaries are stabilized, the receipt of very large net incomes from any source constitutes a gross inequity undermining national unity.

Fairness requires the closing of loopholes and the removal of inequities which still exist in our tax laws. I have spoken on these subjects on several previous occasions.

The Congress can do much to solve our problem of war finance and to support the stabilization program. In the past, wars have usually been paid for mainly by means of inflation, thereby shifting the greatest burden to the weakest shoulders and inviting post-war collapse. We seek to avoid both. Of necessity, the program must be harsh. We should remember, however, that it is a war for existence, and not taxation, which compels us to devote more than one-half of all our resources to war use. An effective program of war finance does not add to the total sacrifices necessitated by war, but it does assure that those sacrifices are distributed equitably and with a minimum of friction.

We should remember, furthermore, that helping to finance the war is the privilege mainly of those who still enjoy the receipt of incomes as civilians during the war. It is a modest contribution toward victory when we compare it with the contribution of those in the fighting forces.

By the end of the current fiscal year, the public debt will total 135 billion dollars. By June 30, 1944, it will be about 210 billion dollars under existing revenue legislation. Before the present debt limit of 125 billion dollars is reached, the Congress will be requested to extend that limit. To do this is sound, for such a debt can and will be repaid. The Nation is soundly solvent.

PREPARING FOR TOTAL VICTORY

Preparing for total victory includes preparing the base on which a happier world can be built. The tremendous productive capacity of our country, of all countries, has been demonstrated. Freedom from want for everybody, everywhere, is no longer a utopian dream. It can be translated into action when the fear of aggression has been removed by victory. The soldiers of the fighting forces and the workmen engaged in military production want to be assured that they will return to a life of opportunity and security in a society of freemen.

The economic stabilization program, although born of war necessity, will greatly facilitate post-war reconstruction. A determined policy of war taxation and savings will aid in making post-war problems manageable by reducing the volume of additional borrowing and supporting the stabilization program. Because of the unavoidable magnitude of interest-bearing debt, taxes probably will never revert to their pre-war level. But substantial reduction from the war level will, nevertheless, be possible and will go hand in hand with a greater human security if the underlying fiscal structure is kept sound.

I shall be happy to meet with the appropriate committees of the Congress at any and all times in regard to the methods by which they propose to attain the

objectives outlined in this message. We are at one in our desire quickly to win this war and to avoid passing on to future generations more than their just share of its sacrifices and burdens.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

JANUARY 6, 1943.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING REPORT CONCERNING RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND, FOREIGN SERVICE (H. DOC. NO. 40)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 26 (a) of an act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor, approved February 23, 1931, as amended.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1943.*

[Enclosure: Report concerning Retirement and Disability Fund, Foreign Service.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ALLEY DWELLING AUTHORITY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Alley Dwelling Authority for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1943.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—WORK AND WORK RELIEF

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington.*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1942, I present herewith a report of the operations under this act to the end of the fiscal year 1942.

This report contains summary and detailed statements of the Treasury Department reflecting expenditures made, obligations incurred, and the status of funds under the above-mentioned act. In addition thereto, information is presented covering the Relief Acts of 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, and for fiscal year 1941. These statements compiled as of June 30, 1942, constitute the eighth annual accounting to the Congress for relief and work-relief expenditures. Such reports have been submitted at the beginning of regular sessions of Congress as provided for in the above cited Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts.

Reports of operations of the Work Projects Administration and the Employees' Compensation Commission in connection with funds appropriated under these Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts, are also included.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

JANUARY 11, 1943.

EXECUTIVES OF THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein a quotation from a broadcast by Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening, January 5, 1943, Fulton Lewis, Jr., explained in some detail the background and experience of the gentlemen in the executive department now controlling, directing, and writing the details of the Office of Price Administration. In order that Members of Congress may know the background of the gentlemen who have under their control the life and death of all American business activities, I enclose quotations from this address:

Leon Henderson didn't devise and work out the gasoline or the fuel oil rationing program; he didn't write the tens of thousands of pages of regulations; and the point I'm making it's not curing anything to merely replace Mr. Leon Henderson with someone else, and leave in place the same machinery that failed to do a successful job for Mr. Henderson.

And so I've spent a great deal of time, trying to find out for you just who did conceive and plan these programs; who devised them, to be submitted to Leon. I want to say in advance that there are absolutely no personalities involved, in this, they are all very earnest, hardworking, sincere people, and very nice people too—that's not the question—this rationing business is a vitally important part of the war effort, and the sole consideration is whether the people whom Mr. Henderson had working for him and advising him are qualified, by their experience and knowledge to do the job of price fixing and rationing that has to be done. In the case of price fixing, they almost have life and death power over the whole distribution system of the Nation—because they have the life and death of every retail merchant in the Nation in their hands, and that is the distribution system.

Now, here are the facts.

You know, of course, the background of Mr. Henderson himself. He was a professor of economics, at Carnegie Tech University; then a consulting economist for the Works Progress Administration—the WPA; then a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Under Mr. Henderson, as a sort of super deputy administrator, of the whole Office of Price Administration program, is Mr. John E. Hamm (who happens to be Mr. Henderson's wife's cousin) and then, under Mr. Hamm are four deputy administrators, each in charge of a particular branch of activity, and they in turn have various divisions under them, each one headed by a director.

By way of generality, as for Mr. Hamm—I might mention that he is a young man who graduated from Princeton University, in 1930, with a degree of bachelor of science in economics. He was connected for some years with the Russell Sage Foundation, which is an institute of economics which Mr. Henderson himself was associated for many years, and Mr. Hamm came directly to the Office of Price Administration from that organization.

Now, we get down to the four deputy administrators.

First of all, there is Mr. J. K. Galbraith, who is in charge of price control. That's the business of price ceilings, etc. He is a professor of economics at Princeton University, now on leave of absence to serve in this job with the Office of Price Administration. Before becoming a professor at Princeton, he was a professor at the University of California, and at Harvard.

Number two, is Mr. Paul Porter. He's in charge of rent control. He's a young attorney and a very nice one, who used to work with the Washington office of the Columbia Broadcasting System. For a considerable period that was only a part-time job, however, and he held part-time legal jobs in the Government. He has never had any particular real estate or rental experience, but I will say he tells a very excellent story, and is a most delightful luncheon companion. If that helps any.

No. 3 is Mr. Dexter Keezer. He's a professor of economics, formerly at Cornell University, and he now is president of Reed College, at Portland, Oreg. He was in the old National Recovery Administration at the beginning of the New Deal, and was a member of the national advisory committee of the National Youth Administration. His job in the Office of Price Administration is to take charge of all research.

No. 4 is Mr. Paul M. O'Leary, who is in charge of rationing. He's a professor of economics at Cornell University, on leave of absence to serve in his present position. He used to be connected with the old National Recovery Administration, too. And, I might add, he also was on the Temporary National Economic Committee, which you may remember several years back. That was the so-called monopoly investigating committee. I've been unable to find any past background on Mr. O'Leary to indicate that he has ever had any practical experience in any line of private endeavor. His biography indicates that he has been nothing but an economist from the beginning.

And maybe I'd better interject there a little reminder to you. Remember, in all this talk about economists, it's very difficult to know, really, what an economist is. Economics is spoken of as a science. It's professed as a science. As a matter of fact, it's nothing of the sort. Medicine and engineering and all of the real sciences of the world are based on tangible facts and provable realities. Economics is purely a structure of guesses built on more guesses. Theories about what individuals think would happen if things were done this way or that way. It has only one law that has stood up through time—the law of supply and demand—and that's not

a law at all; it's an action of human psychology and behavior, and the economists merely borrowed it from there.

But let's go on.

Under these deputy administrators are some very important divisions, so let's look and see who are the directors of those divisions. The gentleman in charge of price control on industrial materials? Mr. Donald H. Wallace, who is an assistant professor of economics at Williams College, in New England. He used to be an assistant professor of economics at Harvard.

And the gentleman in charge of price control in the vast world of retail trade? He is a Mr. Merle Fainsod, who is an assistant professor of government at Harvard and a member of the faculty of the Littauer School of Public Administration. He also was on the monopoly investigating committee, and he has written a book entitled "Government and the American Economy."

And the gentleman in charge of the fuel and gasoline rationing program? He is Mr. Joel Dean, assistant professor in the school of business at the University of Chicago, on leave of absence while he is handling the job here in Washington.

Those are the people who are directing the rationing program of the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 35 minutes.

### FORCES BEHIND THE SMEAR-PURGE CAMPAIGN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein correspondence between a Member of the other body and Attorney General Biddle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### CONSPIRACY TO DESTROY CONGRESS BY FALSE PROPAGANDA AND BY THE MISUSE OF JUDICIAL PROCESS BY SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL WILLIAM PI MALONEY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is doubtful if there is a Member of this House who is not aware that, during the last campaign, a determined effort was made to defeat, by the use of false propaganda charging disloyalty, Members of Congress who were opposed to the New Deal; who had supported the Dies committee and fought the Communists in their effort to overthrow by force and by subterfuge this Government of ours.

That campaign was so widespread, so bitter, so unfair, so vicious, wicked, unscrupulous, and false that the voters of the Nation put their stamp of disapproval upon it by reelecting those who were its intended victims.

On the 8th of December 1942 on the floor of this House it was charged by me—RECORD, pages 9396–9405—that certain individuals, organizations, and publications were engaged in a conspiracy, not only to defeat Members of Congress, who had opposed the subversive efforts of the Communists and the new dealers, but to destroy the confidence of the people in the Congress as a whole.

Had that campaign been successful, the usefulness of the Congress as a coordinate branch of the Government would have been ended. Similar efforts to discredit the Congress still are being made. Among the individuals, organizations, and publications named as engaged in the smear-purge campaign were the following: Eugene Meyer, publisher of the Washington Post; the Washington Post; Dillard Stokes, alias Jefferson Breem, alias Quigley Adams, a reporter for the Washington Post; William P. Maloney, a special assistant to United States Attorney General Biddle, who acted in conjunction with Stokes; Walter Winchell, who acted as a prophet for Maloney; the twice-convicted head of the Communist Party, Earl Browder; Nathan Cowan, legislative representative of the C. I. O.; the C. I. O. as an organization; Marshall Field III, the inheritor of several millions of dollars; his two publications, one the PM of New York, expressing views similar to those of the Communist official publications, and the Chicago Sun, each brought into existence and wet-nursed by Field's inherited money; Frank Kingdon and L. M. Birkhead, both writers and distributors of literature tending to create disunity and destroy the morale of men in the armed forces; Editorial Publications, Inc., which prints the New Republic; the Daily Worker, official publication of the Communist Party; the New Masses, another communistic rag; the Union for Democratic Action, an organization engaged in subversive activities, and many others. The efforts of the individuals and organizations just named were so coordinated, the propaganda put out by them so similar, that all who knew the facts were aware that they were acting together. That they, in truth and in fact, were engaged in the common purpose of attempting to destroy one of the three branches of the national Government, the Congress of the United States. They knew, as did every intelligent person, that if the confidence of the people, of the men in the armed forces of our Nation, in their chosen representatives could be destroyed, the morale of the armed forces would be impaired. They knew, or they should have known, that, under section 9 of title 18 of the United States Code, any attempt to interfere with or to impair the morale of the military or naval forces of the United States was a subversive activity. At least two of those named above, William P. Maloney, the special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, and Dillard Stokes, reporter for the Washington Post, knew as a matter of fact that such action on their part was a violation of that section of the Federal law, for they, at the time they were engaged in such an effort, were also engaged in an effort to cause the indictment of other citizens of the United States for a violation of that section.

The statement made by me on the floor of the House on the 8th of December 1942 was in support of a resolution which I had introduced on the 3d of December, asking for the appointment of a committee of the House—

(a) To ascertain and to name the individuals, organizations, and associations circulating false charges of disloyalty against those who were candidates for either the House or the Senate in the primaries and general election held during the year 1942;

(b) To ascertain and report the amount of money expended by those making, disseminating, and circulating such charges;

(c) To ascertain and report upon the methods used, the source from which the funds were derived, and if possible, the ultimate purpose of those engaged in such activities;

(d) To ascertain and to report whether a conspiracy was carried on to injure persons in the exercise of their civil rights and, if such conspiracy existed, to report what, if any, legislation is needed and what action should be taken by Government officials to prevent a recurrence of such action and to bring to justice those taking part in such conspiracy;

(e) To ascertain and report in what respect, if any, the laws of either the States or the Nation have been violated in carrying on such activities;

(f) To recommend what legislation, if any, should be passed to end pernicious political activities;

(g) To recommend what, if any, prosecutions should be instituted to punish those guilty of any violations which may have occurred;

(h) To recommend to this Congress what steps should be taken to protect the Congress of the United States and the Members of that Congress from false charges of disloyalty made while a war is in progress;

(i) To report what, if any, further action should be taken to prevent disunity, and to aid in the prosecution of the war, insofar as the same can be accomplished by putting an end to the making and the dissemination of false charges of disloyalty.

Because of the adjournment of Congress, no action was taken upon the resolution introduced on the 3d of December. That resolution was reintroduced on the 6th day of January 1943, and is now known as House Resolution 13.

Some may have doubted the existence of such a conspiracy but the fact that such a conspiracy did exist has now been admitted by the editor of one of the publications charged with being a party thereto, that is, PM, the adopted child of the multimillionaire Marshall Field III. From the December 1942 issue of that publication I quote the following:

He—

Meaning the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan—

says we conspired to beat him and other splendid Americans of his stripe for reelection to Congress last month. He is right. We did so conspire.

The effects of the acts so far performed by the conspirators are violations of sections 51 and 61, title 18, of the United States Code. Those sections make it unlawful for two or more persons to conspire, to injure, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or the laws of

the United States, or to, in the same manner, interfere with the right of any person to vote, or to vote as he may choose, or to cause any person to vote for or not to vote for any candidate for the office of Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives. The foregoing statements of fact and the confession of Kenneth Crawford, one of the conspirators, make it imperative that this Congress, not to protect the individual Members of Congress, but to protect Congress as an integral part of our National Government, ascertain and expose those who carried on that conspiracy and gain whatever information may be necessary to prevent a repetition of that offense. It is necessary that Congress do this rather than the Department of Justice, for one of those engaged in that conspiracy, William P. Maloney, is an official of the Department of Justice, and the experience of the Dies committee has demonstrated that it is futile to ask Attorney General Biddle to investigate Communists in Federal positions.

The facts brought out by me on the 8th of December disclosed to the House that William P. Maloney, while acting as an assistant attorney for the United States, in conjunction with a reporter for the Washington Post, one Dillard Stokes, and others, used his official position to aid the effort to defeat Members of Congress—both Congressmen and Senators; Maloney, according to his own interpretation of section 9, conspired with others to induce individuals to commit an act of sedition within the District of Columbia, and by his acts gave aid to the widespread effort to destroy the confidence of the people in their elected representatives.

The facts narrated on that occasion show conclusively that Maloney and Stokes were seeking to accomplish the same purpose that Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party, and the exconvict, and others who have been named, were seeking to accomplish, that is, the defeat of those who had opposed the Communists.

The natural and inevitable result of the efforts of those who sought to destroy the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives by falsely charging them with disloyalty and lack of patriotism was to interfere with and to impair the loyalty, the morale of the men in the military and naval forces of the United States.

The false charges of a lack of patriotism, published and circulated by those seeking to defeat Members of Congress, beyond question came to the knowledge of men in the armed forces of the United States and of men about to be called into those forces, and might well, under Assistant Attorney General William P. Maloney's interpretation of section 9 of title 18 of the United States Code, be considered a violation of that section.

The facts called to the attention of the House on the 8th of December disclosed an abuse by Maloney of his official position which was so damaging that on the 10th of December the gentleman from Pennsylvania—Mr. JAMES P. MCGRANERY, RECORD, 9457—and the gentleman from Pennsylvania—Mr. Elmer J. Holland, RECORD, 9462—without in any way disputing the statements of fact made by me on the eighth, rushed to the defense of Mr. Maloney.

Apparently their efforts were unsatisfactory, for, on the 14th of December, the gentleman from Kansas—Mr. John M. Houston, RECORD, 9533–9535—took up the task of defending Mr. Maloney.

Two of these gentlemen, Mr. Holland, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Houston, of Kansas, are no longer Members of Congress, and no reply would be made to them, had not each asked me to answer certain questions.

Neither they nor the other gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCGRANERY] gave me notice that they intended to interrogate me, or that they intended to refer to me in any way when they spoke. Nor was I on the floor at the time either made his remarks. Nor did I have knowledge that either intended to speak.

Notice was given the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCGRANERY] that I intended to reply to his remarks today.

Each one of the gentlemen just named ignored the real issue raised by the resolution introduced by me, calling for an investigation of this now-admitted conspiracy.

The purpose of that resolution was not to stifle investigation or prosecution by any agency of the Government. The purpose was not to aid in any way any of the defendants charged with subversive activities. The purpose was, and is, as stated in the resolution, to expose those who were engaged in an effort to destroy a coordinate branch of the Government and to take such proceedings as might be necessary to end that effort.

Another purpose of that resolution is to bring to the knowledge of the public the manner and the extent of the misuse of the processes of the court by William P. Maloney while acting as attorney for the United States of America, in the hope that hereafter citizens of the United States may, here in the District of Columbia, be given a fair, speedy, and impartial trial, in accordance with the law of the land.

The three gentlemen who took the floor to defend William P. Maloney neither answered nor denied the charges made against him. Following the course usually pursued by an attorney for a guilty man, instead of defending Mr. Maloney by challenging the truth of the statements made, they set up a man of straw, raised a false issue, and directed their attack against me.

The charge they made against me was that I had misused the franking privilege, and through carelessness, or inadvertence, had permitted copies of speeches which I made on the 27th and the 30th of January 1942 to fall into the hands of and to be circulated by two Nazi agents. One, it was alleged, was Viereck, who has been convicted of being a Nazi agent; the other named was a Mr. Griffin, who was indicted for subversive activities on the 4th day of January last.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCGRANERY] began his remarks by saying—RECORD, 9457—that I made a statement "dealing with a grand jury investigation now being conducted by one William Power Maloney, a distinguished, able, and courageous lawyer here in the District of Columbia."

If the Members of the House will refer to my remarks of December 8, they can read on page 9399 what some of the United States district courts have said about Mr. Maloney and some will conclude that those courts, before whom Mr. Maloney has practiced, may be more familiar with his record than is the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

One of those courts said:

> The prosecutor was not averse to indulging his talent for spectacle; chorus girls and movie stars were paraded to the stand to prove only minor portions of the Government's case.

The court then continued:

> Theatrical demonstrations, however diverting to the spectators and jury, have no place in a United States courtroom. Nor was the intemperance of several attacks made upon defendants and their counsel in keeping with the Supreme Court's reminder that the prosecutor is to regard himself as "the servant of the law."

The gentleman was in error when he said that the Member from Michigan made a statement "dealing with a grand jury investigation now being conducted." The grand jury investigation to which I referred, as is shown by the RECORD, was the grand jury which was in session last year, and the life of which had been ended prior to the time when my remarks were made.

At no time, on no occasion, have I complained of the fact that William P. Maloney or a grand jury was engaged in investigating the subversive activities of anyone. That is not only a necessary activity, but is one which is highly desirable. On all occasions have I supported all such lawful efforts. Proof of this is found in my consistent support of the Dies committee.

In exposing seditious and subversive activities in the United States, the Dies committee has been outstanding. It has been the one agency which has had the courage to expose those activities in the Federal Government itself—even when carried on by officials of the Federal Government.

Comparisons are odious but inasmuch as those who are engaged in a conspiracy challenging the patriotism of Members of Congress did it by associating their names with the names of German agents, let us take a look at the RECORD. Recognized throughout the country as a committee which has done more than any other agency to counteract subversive actions of the agents of foreign governments is the Dies committee.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Holland, was not elected until May 1942, and the RECORD, so far as I have examined, does not show his support or opposition by vote to the Dies committee.

The gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Houston, on two occasions in the Seventy-sixth Congress voted in favor of the Dies committee. When the question came up in the Seventy-seventh Congress and the roll was called the gentleman did not vote either way—CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, 899. When again in the Seventy-seventh Congress the roll was called—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2297—the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Houston, voted against continuing the Dies committee.

In the Seventy-sixth Congress the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] when the question of continuing the Dies committee came up was 1 of 35 who voted against that committee. Again in the Seventy-sixth Congress, when the roll was called, the gentleman voted against the Dies committee. When the roll was called in the Seventy-seventh Congress at its first session the gentleman failed to vote. Twice in the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] voted against the continuation of the Dies committee—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 2297 and 3758.

Now it is matter of common knowledge that practically every Communist in the country, every Nazi agent in the country, every agent of Japan, every organization which is opposed to constitutional government was an enemy of the Dies committee.

The RECORD shows that one of these gentlemen who defended Maloney voted twice for the committee, once failed to vote, and on the last occasion voted against it; that the other gentleman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY], on four occasions when there was a record vote, voted against that committee.

Would I be justified in using the methods employed by the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Houston, when he asked, on the 14th day of December last—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 9534—referring to me, "But, Mr. Speaker, does he really mean to make common cause with these conspirators?" Would I be justified in adopting the methods followed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] on December 10—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 9457—who, referring to me, said:

> The kindest thing that I, as a Member of this House, could say to the gentleman is that they—

Meaning Viereck and Griffin—

> fooled him.

The fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] has continuously opposed on the floor of this House and is recorded as an opponent of the Dies committee, which is engaged in exposing subversive activities, does not justify the inference that he supports subversive activities.

The fact that the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Houston, on one occasion failed to vote for the Dies committee, and on another occasion voted to discontinue the Dies committee does not justify the conclusion that he opposes an investigation of subversive propaganda.

It was further charged, by innuendo and insinuation, that I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles, one entitled "Are You an American?", the other captioned "We Burned Our Fingers Once—Will History Repeat?" for the convenience of Nazi agents.

Those two articles were inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD by me. The one entitled "We Burned Our Fingers Once—Will History Repeat?" was inserted on May 19, 1941—see Appendix of the RECORD, A2354. It was not written by a Nazi agent. It was not inserted for the benefit of a Nazi agent nor at the request of such an agent. It was an article written by me, containing a quotation from a well-known British writer, Hilaire Belloc. It was put into the RECORD by unanimous consent, and from that day to this no Member of Congress has asked that it be expunged. It was not at Viereck's request, and the copies which were franked out, except those which went to voters in my district, were sent to members of the patriotic organization known as the Purple Heart.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] and the other two Members who rushed to the defense of Maloney might recall the old saying that even the devil can quote Scripture to serve his purpose. Maloney took part in a smear campaign while using the mask of prosecuting those engaged in subversive activities.

Those statements which I put in the RECORD were, at the time they were made, statements of good, sound, patriotic American doctrine.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] finds fault because, on December 26, 1940, I inserted an editorial written by one William Griffin, and published in the New York Inquirer. Griffin has since been indicted. He may or he may not be guilty.

But I have no apologies for inserting that editorial. The first paragraphs of my remarks on that occasion are as follows—and bear in mind that they were made on the 26th day of December 1940—almost a year before Pearl Harbor:

> Mr. Speaker, it is time that Americans face the truth and, meeting the facts, determine whether they owe allegiance to their own country, America, or to some foreign nation.
>
> It is time that loyalty to our own country determine our actions. No longer should animosity toward one nation or one people, friendship toward another, so influence us that we forget ourselves.

The heading of the editorial of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] complains is this. I quote:

> ARE YOU AN AMERICAN?
>
> Let Christmas spur us to fight for peace for the United States of America.

The next to the last paragraph of that editorial reads:

> Why quit our own to stand upon foreign soil? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

Has that a familiar ring? It is a part of Washington's Farewell Address, in which he admonished us to avoid foreign entanglements.

Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] opposed to letting the American people read again a part of the Farewell Address of the first President of our country?

Would the circulation of that address of Washington by Viereck or Goebbels or Hitler himself be termed a seditious act or an improper act?

If those who were for the first time elected to Congress last November are in any doubt about the Americanism of that editorial, my suggestion is that they read it. It will be found on pages 6975 to 6976 of volume 86, part 18, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I was doing my utmost to keep this country out of the war, and the American people had been assured by the President himself that never again would our soldiers be sent to fight a war on foreign soil.

Was it wrong to make an effort to avoid war? The White Paper claims our State Department was making a like effort. It was no more successful than I. Nor did I vote to send scrap, oil, and gas to Japan to be used against China.

Was it criminal, was it improper, for me or for anyone else, for the State Department itself, to use every legitimate means within our power to keep this country out of the war? Eighty percent of our people wanted to stay out.

The argument of all those who conspired to smear—to purge—Senators and Congressmen, to destroy the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives, is that because the agents of Hitler used statements made by Senators or Congressmen, or others, all those making such statements are disloyal, unpatriotic. As well might it be said that the manufacturer of a knife, of a gun was guilty of murder because someone used the weapon to kill. With equal justice might it be said that the discoverer of anesthetics used to relieve the pain of the sick and the suffering was guilty of murder because some criminal had used one of those anesthetics to destroy life. As well might it be said that an isolated page from the Scriptures quoted by Hitler or one of his agents to serve his purpose should never have been written, or that the Bible containing it should never have fallen into the hands of a Nazi or a Jap. Similar reasoning would convict the workman in a factory who makes the gun, which, taken by armed forces to the battle front, falls into the hands of a German or a Jap and is then used to deal out death to our own soldiers. The end of a rope cast to the drowning man thrown overboard from a destroyer may save him; falling into the hands of the enemy, it may be used to hang him.

The patriotism of the individual is to be judged, not by the use which some criminal, which some foreign agent, makes of what he says or does or creates, but by the yardstick of the purpose for which it was made or created.

Another gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Holland, speaking on the 10th of December last—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 9462—when he had been a Member of this House but for 6 months, sought, by cleverly linking the names of Viereck and Hill to statements printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to show that I had made improper use of the franking privilege. It is quite evident that the gentleman was woefully ignorant of the proper use of the franking privilege. That others may not be misled as was

he, I quote correspondence from the legal staff of the Post Office Department, heretofore printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 28, 1942, page 4727:

On November 19, 1937, a letter was written to the then Solicitor of the Post Office Department, Karl A. Crowley, by the then minority leader of the House, Bert Snell. That letter is as follows:

"DEAR MR. CROWLEY: Will you please give me a ruling on the following: Is it legal for a Member of Congress to frank communications, either typewritten or mimeographed, dealing solely with the public business?"

In reply the following was written under date of November 23, 1937:

"The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of November 19, requesting to be advised whether it is legal for a Member of Congress to frank communications, either typewritten or mimeographed, dealing solely with the public business.

"It is provided by 39 United States Code 327 that: 'The Vice President, Members and Members-elect of, Delegates and Delegates-elect to Congress, and the Resident Commissioners from Puerto Rico and the Philippines, shall have the privilege of sending free through the mails, and under their frank, any mail matter to any Government official or to any person, correspondence, not exceeding 4 ounces in weight, upon official or departmental business (until the 1st day of December following the expiration of their respective terms of office).'

"Your inquiry is accordingly answered in the affirmative."

I wrote the Office of the Solicitor of the Post Office Department the following letter:

"On page 18519 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, 1940, I extended my remarks by including an article on the March of Democracy.

"If I have copies of these remarks printed by other than the Government Printer and in different type, may I still send them out under my franking privilege?"

On the 25th following, my letter was answered in these words:

"In answer to your letter of September 21, which the Solicitor has referred to this office, you are advised that the act of Congress of March 3, 1875, embodied in section 609, Postal Laws and Regulations, provides as follows:

" 'The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or any part thereof, or speeches or reports therein contained, shall, under the frank of a Member of Congress or Delegate, * * * be carried in the mail free of postage.'

"The place of printing of extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or the style of type used does not affect their frankability. In this connection, I may say that when it is desired to send under frank extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the extracts should, in order that their character may be apparent on the face, bear such identifying indicia as will clearly show that they are from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

Inasmuch as under the law cited by the Legal Division of the Post Office Department, I was advised that my speeches contained in the RECORD might, under the law, be carried in the mail free of postage, just what was Special Attorney Maloney attempting to do?

On no occasion since coming here more than 8 years ago have I misused the franking privilege.

The gentleman asked:

Will the gentleman from Michigan deny that two mail sacksful of a speech delivered by him on the floor of this House, in which he called the President a Judas, was delivered to Mrs. Bethune in Washington and that the speeches in those mail sacks were enclosed in franked envelopes bearing the frank of the gentleman from Michigan?

That question was answered on the floor of the House on May 28, 1942, RECORD, pages 4728–4729.

I certainly do not deny that copies of two talks made on the 27th and the 30th day of January 1942, later condensed into one, were reprinted.

That talk was entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes." It did not refer to the President as "a Judas." It did refer to those who want to haul down the Stars and Stripes, substitute for the Declaration of Independence a declaration of interdependence; who want to surrender our national independence and make us a part of a super world government, as betrayers of our independence.

We have been told by the President of the United States and others that our national existence is at stake. We have been told that 1,500,000 Americans have already crossed the seas for the purpose of maintaining the American way of life. We have been told that there are 7,500,000 men in the armed forces of the United States.

For what are they fighting? Are they not fighting for the preservation of our Union? Are they not fighting to keep the Stars and Stripes flying? Are our men fighting and are they dying so that politicians, after the war is over, may surrender our independence, submerge our Constitution in a United States of the World or in a United Nations of the World? Are they fighting and are they dying so that, when the war is over, the Stars and Stripes, the symbol of our liberty, of our freedom, of our progress, shall be hauled down and, in its place, the flag of Union Now, the Flag of a United Nations of the World, the flag of a United States of the World, shall be unfurled in its place?

Does any Member of this House know of anything which would more effectively impair or destroy the morale of the fighting men of our country, of the people of our country, than to lead them to believe that, after all the sacrifices have been made, after our men have fought and perhaps a million of them have died in foreign lands, on strange seas—that, after all that, the Stars and Stripes are to be hauled down and the flag of Union Now or of some other organization be run up in its place.

It was in opposition to that drive that my talks of January 27 and 30 were made. It was in opposition to that un-American activity that copies of that talk—more than 130,000 of them—were sent out. Hitler himself, if he read that talk, would realize that here in America there were those who proposed never to surrender our independence and that this Nation, to the last man, would fight on against any nation or any combination of nations which thought to destroy our freedom, to make us a puppet state or subject us to the will of any foreign potentate.

The program which I then cried out against is still being carried on, and there are those who, instead of devoting their energies to the winning of this war, to the preservation of the United States of America, are still seeking to destroy our independence as a Nation.

There are those who not only want us to be the arsenal of democracy, which we are; there are those who not only want us to be the granary of the world, as we are; there are those who, like Vice President Wallace, would have the American farmer furnish a quart of milk a day to every inhabitant of the world; there are those who while our American farmers lack the machinery to grow the crops to produce the food to feed our armed forces; machinery which we are sending to other lands; there are those who not only want us to be after the war is over a glorified W. P. A. for all the world but there are those in high places who have gone so far along the lines of internationalism; who think so little of the liberty and the freedom won by our forefathers through the 8 long terrible years of the Revolutionary War that they would now surrender our existence as a free and independent Nation and make us a part of a super world government.

On the 27th and on the 30th of January 1942—a date which the gentleman neglected to give—on the floor of the House, I made talks which were afterward, by permission of the House, consolidated, and under the title "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," around 165,000 of those speeches were reprinted and all but a few distributed. A reading of that speech will show that the President was not referred to as a Judas. The purpose of that speech will be outlined in my subsequent remarks.

At the request of a Mrs. Goode, president of a patriotic organization which has been in existence 42 years, and which is known as Dames of the Loyal Legion, I did cause to be delivered to Mrs. Bethune, here in Washington, several thousand copies of that speech in franked envelopes to be mailed to members of an organization. Is there anyone in this House who has any objection to that procedure? I was informed by Mrs. Bethune herself that Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, wife of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Mrs. Francis Biddle, wife of Attorney General Biddle, were members of that organization, and that franked copies of my speech were sent to them. Undoubtedly, the two distinguished women received them. Would it be too much to express the hope that they read them, and from the reading derived some small benefit?

Other copies of that speech went to Charles B. Hudson, Gerald B. Winrod, and David Baxter—none in franked envelopes.

Other copies of that speech went to other individuals. Heretofore there has been inserted in the RECORD by me a list of those to whom these speeches were sent in franked envelopes in quantities of 100 or more—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 28, 1942, pages 4728–4729. I have no apology to offer for making those speeches, for sending them out, for the manner in which they were sent out, and my only regret is that I was unable to comply with the requests for hundreds of thousands of other copies of that speech.

Then the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Holland, asks:

What use did the gentleman from Michigan intend that these conspirators should make of his speech?

Those indicted, and some of them twice indicted, and referred to by the gentleman as "conspirators," have not yet been convicted. As to the use which I expected would be made of those speeches, I would state to the gentleman, if he were here, that it was my hope that they would be widely circulated and that those reading them would reach the same conclusion that I had, that in the fighting of this war we would not lose the very things for which the war was being fought, and that we would, when the war is over, still be a nation independent and free. I, too, regret that I was not able, and that I have not been able since, to place a copy of that speech in the hands of every American citizen. Yes; every American citizen, even though some of them be in jail, charged with a criminal offense, even though some of them be convicts, sentenced to serve time in prison.

Apparently not satisfied with the defense of Maloney made by his two colleagues, the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Houston, on the 14th day of December 1942—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 9533—undertook a further defense of Mr. Maloney. He first complained that some of the gentlemen named by me had no method of defending themselves. It is a matter of common knowledge that Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell had for weeks not only been speaking over the radio but that his column had been printed in many newspapers throughout the land. Marshall Field III, according to common report, is able to sink $20,000 a month in his PM publication, he is able to finance the Chicago Sun, and he certainly had the money and the men to carry on the smear campaign against Members of Congress. The Washington Post and Dillard Stokes cannot claim inability to defend themselves.

Then the gentleman, abandoning his defense of Maloney, Stokes, Marshall Field, complains because they were linked with a convicted Communist, Earl Browder, the Daily Worker, New Masses, the Union for Democratic Action, and others. It is unfortunate that those gentlemen and publications traveled along in the smear campaign with those to whose company they now object. But they should be the last to complain, for they have all followed the procedure of linking the names of Senators and of Congressmen with the names of convicted Nazi agents even though they had nothing in common. Getting a dose of their own medicine when they have asked for it, and when it is justified by the facts, they squawk, and by their squawks show their yellow streak.

The gentleman from Kansas and the other gentlemen complain of the procedure which they themselves, Maloney, and others, have used to smear Members of Congress. It is quite true that certain persons have been convicted on indictments returned by a grand jury, but that is no evidence that Members of Congress are disloyal or unpatriotic.

He complains because it is said I did not draw the issue between the Government and its enemies. I never have complained, I never will complain, of any action which the Government may take to prosecute its enemies. I have complained and I shall continue to complain, when the administration which is not the Government, uses the power of the Government to prosecute its critics and political opponents.

Then the gentleman asks the tricky question whether I really mean to make common cause with these conspirators. Just when did the gentleman learn that those indicted were conspirators? He knows very well, for he states, that those who have been indicted have the benefit of the same legal presumption of innocence that clothes any and every citizen until he is proven guilty. They have not been convicted. Each is presumed to be innocent. They should not be called conspirators until a jury has so decided.

If Maloney and Stokes, alias Breem, alias Adams, did not conspire and connive with others to induce some of the defendants to mail what Maloney designates as subversive literature to Stokes here in the District so as to get jurisdiction of the individuals subsequently indicted, why did they induce those individuals to mail that literature? The principal charge which I made, and the gentleman should know it, was that there was a conspiracy—not against the 28 persons indicted, but against Senators and Representatives, against Members of the Congress—a conspiracy to smear and to purge them.

The subterfuge used by Maloney and Stokes to enable them to lay the venue of the offense here in Washington enabled them, through the use of the grand jury, to spread their smear in the Washington papers, to send out news dispatches from Washington and so intimidate Members of Congress who might be inclined to speak out against the procedure of the Communists; the plans and schemes of the New Dealers, which have since brought confusion to the war effort, and a shortage not only of food, but of fuel and essential materials, so that our war activities have in many cases bogged down.

I know nothing at all of the evidence against the persons who have been indicted. I do not know whether they are guilty or innocent. The gentleman himself said:

> I do not know whether they are guilty or not.

Knowing that, why did the gentleman repeatedly, in his remarks, brand them as conspirators. Why did he, at times in his remarks, assume that they were guilty of a conspiracy?

Let me now answer his question as to whether I make common cause with those who have been indicted. I do not, and so far as I can recall, I never met one of them prior to his indictment. I might ask a similar unfair question of the gentleman from Kansas. Did he really mean to make common cause with those who were engaged in the smear and purge campaign against his colleague? Did he intend to assist the convicted Browder? The gossip-monger Winchell? The man Maloney? The tool Stokes? Of course, he did not. He is too honorable a man to engage in such a nasty plot. Or to use the methods they used. He had as much purpose, he was as much a part of that vicious, wicked, reprehensible, smear-purge campaign as I was a part of any conspiracy to further subversive activities—and neither of us had any part in either action.

LET US GET THE ISSUE CLEAR

Let me restate the issue. Let us get the issue clear. At no time have I protested against the indictment of any person; at no time have I made any objection to any investigation; at no time have I defended any man who has been indicted, although each and every person who has been indicted, until convicted, is presumed to be innocent.

The complaint which I made on the 8th of December, the complaint which I now make, the evil which the resolution, which I introduced on the opening day of this session of Congress, seeks to reach is the smear campaign carried on for the purpose of destroying the confidence of the people in their chosen Representatives. Incidentally, I complained, and I now complain, because of the misuse by Maloney, an assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, of his official power, used as it was in furtherance of that conspiracy to destroy the Congress, a coordinate branch of our Government. That is the way—and the only way—that Maloney got into the picture.

According to Attorney General Biddle, the grand jury, over a period of 71 days, heard evidence in connection with this charge against the 28 against whom an indictment was returned on the 24th day of July 1942. That indictment charged that they, on or about the 28th day of June 1940, and continuously thereafter, conspired to commit acts prohibited by section 9 of title 18, United States Code, which section was enacted into law for the first time by act approved June 28, 1940—Public, No. 670, Seventy-sixth Congress.

On August 8, 1942, one of the defendants filed a motion questioning the validity of the indictment. Four days later, the Government asked for an additional 30 days in which to answer that charge. The answer was not filed, and in December, Justice Adkins called upon the Government to answer the charge which called in question the validity of the indictment. The case drifted along, and on January 4, this year, a new indictment, making practically the same charge as the first one, was returned against the original 28 defendants and 6 others. There is something rotten somewhere when a United States attorney, after spending 71 days in taking testimony, refuses, from August 8, 1942, to January 4, 1943—for over 4 months—to meet the challenge to the validity of its action. Gentlemen on this floor have referred to Maloney as a distinguished, able, and courageous attorney. His failure to meet the motion filed by the defendants in this conspiracy case shows that he lacks courage, and the filing of a new indictment shows his lack of legal ability.

Since the filing of the motion on August 8, 1942, Maloney has caused 12 of the defendants named in the first indictment to come to Washington to answer to the charge which he refused to defend. He has forced these defendants

to put up bonds in the sum of $39,000. Some of these defendants have been held in jail; some lack money to employ competent counsel; some were dragged across the continent to meet the charge which Maloney made in July, and on which he would not try them prior to January 4 last, when he caused a new indictment to be filed. One of these defendants, on November 12, 1942, living in the Midwest, received a wire from Maloney's office telling him to be in court to argue a motion on November 16. That defendant appeared and after sitting in court, inquired of Justice Adkins when the motion would be argued. Maloney replied that he was not prepared to argue the motion, and then admitted that the reason for calling the defendant from his home in the Midwest was to ask him the name of his lawyer. The fact that the judge presiding did not approve of such conduct did not help the defendant defray the costs of a round trip from his home to Washington.

Other facts of persecution and oppression have been committed by Maloney. Maloney's procedure smells to high heaven. The Constitution provides, among other things, that no citizen shall be twice put in jeopardy. That means, of course, that no citizen shall be twice tried for the same offense. But the thought behind that provision is that no man shall be twice prosecuted for the same offense. A man indicted has not been put in jeopardy—so the courts have held—but what is the difference in principle between indicting a man, arresting him, compelling him to come a thousand or three thousand miles to the court where he is to be tried, give a bond or be thrown into jail, then filing another indictment against him for the same offense, and again drag him from his home, compel him to give bond or throw him in jail.

Here is a question for some of the lawyers of the House. Some of these defendants in this conspiracy indictment, for lack of bond, were placed in jail. Then came the new indictment charging them a second time for the doing of the acts set forth in the first indictment. Again they are arrested, again required to make bond or be jailed. Failing to make bond on the first indictment the defendant is thrown into jail. He fails to make bond on the second indictment which charges him with the same conspiracy. Again for failure to make bond he is in jail. If able to get bond on the first indictment he is still in jail on the second indictment. Just how many indictments can Maloney return against the same defendant for the same offense? Just how many bonds can he require of the same defendant for the same offense? And just how long can he postpone a trial and keep a defendant, unable to give bond, in jail? Did Maloney have knowledge enough to properly charge the defendants in the first instance with engaging in a conspiracy? When he caused their indictment did he have the evidence to justify a trial? If so why did he not bring them to trial? Why the second indictment? Were the 71 days wasted? Did he not, after taking testimony for a period of 71 days, get enough evidence to give him courage enough to step into court before a jury here in the District of Columbia and try the defendants? The whole procedure of Maloney's is a disgrace to the Department of Justice. How much longer will the Attorney General of the United States permit Maloney and his coactors to continue to return indictments and delay the trial of those incarcerated? How much longer will the Attorney General permit his assistant, Maloney, to smear members of a coordinate branch of the Government?

I have before me a copy of the first indictment; a copy of the second indictment. With the exception of the addition of the six new defendants, there is little difference between the first and the second indictments, except the startling charge, and I quote:

> Heretofore, to wit, on or about the 1st day of January 1933, and continuously thereafter, up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment—
>
> January 4, 1943, the 34 defendants and an individual named as a conspirator, but not a defendant, conspired—
>
> to commit acts prohibited by section 9 of title 18, United States Code.

Will some Member of the House, who is or who is not a lawyer, explain to me how, on the 1st day of January 1933, or on any day prior to the 28th day of June 1940, the defendants named in that indictment, or any other person or persons, could conspire to violate section 9 of title 18 of the Code, when that section was not enacted into law until June 28, 1940?

The indictment charges that for 7 years the defendants conspired and carried on a conspiracy to violate a law which was not in existence.

The three gentlemen to whom I have today referred, and who defended Maloney on the floor of the House, complained because certain speeches or parts of speeches made by me on the floor and articles placed in the RECORD by me had, in some form or another, been used by some of those persons who were indicted.

None of these gentlemen ever complained to me of the contents of any of the speeches or of the articles which were inserted in the RECORD. So far as I know, Mr. Maloney never has complained of the substance of the talk, "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," nor of the contents of the two articles placed in the RECORD. At just what point in this drive to intimidate, to suppress free speech, have we arrived? Are Congressmen to be accused of sedition because something which they said on the floor of the House, or which they inserted in the RECORD, has been circulated by someone who was later convicted of a crime?

If, on the 27th day of January, or on the 30th day of January 1942, when I made those two speeches on the floor of this House, which were afterward consolidated under the title "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," I said anything, or if in the revision or consolidation of those speeches I caused anything to be put into the RECORD which was disloyal or unpatriotic, why were my utterances not challenged? Is it possible that the House would sit here and permit, in wartime, a Member of the House to make unpatriotic and disloyal statements? Of course, it is not. The truth is there was not one disloyal word or thought in either of those talks. At no time has anyone challenged their insertion in the RECORD. Yet Maloney, knowing that those statements were printed in the RECORD, that they have never been expunged from the RECORD, quotes from them in the indictment. Why did he do that? The answer is that while those allegations are unnecessary to sustain his indictment, he hoped, by inserting them, to provide material to defeat Members of Congress. He hoped that by repeating them he would destroy the confidence of the people in Members of Congress.

In drafting an indictment it is not necessary that the evidence expected to be produced at the time of the trial be set forth. Yet, Maloney not only set out in his indictment quotations taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, put into that RECORD by unanimous consent of the Congress, which might be admissible evidence, but he quotes many excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which would not be admissible evidence or, if admissible, of no probative value in establishing a conspiracy to commit subversive acts. His purpose was to show that statements in no wise improper or disloyal were used by third persons in connection with subversive activities of their own, of which Senators and Congressmen could not possibly have any knowledge. Thus he hoped by association of names to create in the minds of the American people the thought that Senators and Congressmen were acting in collusion with German agents.

To show you the absurdity of that kind of reasoning let me quote one statement made by me on the floor of the House, thereafter repeated by one of the defendants named in this indictment and which repetition, it was charged, was an overt act in furtherance of a conspiracy to impair the morale of our fighting men. On January 2, 1942, on the floor of this House, referring to a boy who had lost his brother at Pearl Harbor, I said:

> That boy said to me, in substance, "How come that the fighting planes and the bombers and the ships were not provided to aid my brother in making his fight for his country? How come they were over in the other, the Eastern Hemisphere?" And did I have an answer? No. There was no answer, except the one that we had sent the fighting planes, the bombers, the destroyers to aid Britain.

If the repetition of that statement was a seditious act, why did Maloney not indict me? Why did he not indict every Member of the House who sat on the floor and heard me make that statement and who, by his silence, at least gave tacit approval? Why did he not indict the leadership of the House because thereafter they permitted that statement to remain in the RECORD and permitted thousands of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing it to be printed and circulated throughout the country? Though at the time that statement was made by me I was not aware of the fact, it is nevertheless true that Winston

Churchill had expressed the same thought in a speech made before Congress on December 26, 1941—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 10118. On that occasion he said:

If the United States has been found at a disadvantage at various points in the Pacific Ocean, we know well that it is to no small extent because of the aid which you have been giving to us in munitions for the defense of the British Isles and for the Libyan campaign, and, above all, because of your help in the battle of the Atlantic, upon which all depends, and which has in consequence been successfully and prosperously maintained.

If one of the 34 defendants indicted for conspiracy is indicted because that defendant repeated a thought expressed by a Congressman who but repeated a fact given utterance by Winston Churchill when speaking before Congress, I ask the membership of this House, why not indict the Congressman and Churchill?

We now know that individuals and organizations last year deliberately, persistently, carried on a campaign of abuse, falsehood, and vilification, the purpose of which was to destroy the influence of one of the three branches of the Federal Government—the Congress of the United States. We owe it to the people who sent us here, whose Representatives we are, the people who have faith and confidence in us, to strip from those individuals and groups the false mask of patriotism which they have assumed and to let them stand forth before the people of our country in their true light, their real purpose apparent.

To that end this Congress should either adopt the resolution introduced on the opening day of this session or adopt some similar procedure.

EXHIBIT A

Inserted here are copies of correspondence with the Attorney General, and to which today reference was made:

DECEMBER 3, 1942.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
*Attorney General,*
*Department of Justice,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I wrote to you some weeks ago asking for a copy of the indictment against William Griffin, and others. William Power Maloney answered my inquiry and sent me two copies of the indictment.

I have read the same rather carefully. I think I know something about indictments, the handling of grand juries, and the duties and obligations of prosecuting attorneys as I was United States Attorney for 5 years during President Wilson's administration.

In this indictment an attempt is made to smear the America First Committee which was headed up by a group of the most loyal and patriotic citizens in America, some of whom are now serving in important posts in the armed forces of this country.

In all my experience I have never known of the Department of Justice being used to smear people without foundation, excepting during the reign of Daugherty, Burns, and Gaston Means.

If the information which has come to me is true, the methods used by your Special Assistant before the grand jury here in Washington smack of an inquisition of bygone days.

I scarcely know any of the defendants—and certainly do not approve of the things which they are charged with saying and writing. I believe that they were mostly the mouthings of irresponsible people. But, however misguided they may have been, I cannot believe that some of them were guilty of a conspiracy to obstruct national defense or break down the morale of the armed forces of America.

It is entirely possible that some individuals and organizations may have had that in view, but to draft a catch-all indictment including patriotic organizations and individuals with unpatriotic organizations and individuals for the purpose of smearing them is in itself, to say the least, reprehensible and should not be tolerated in this country.

As you must know, the statute under which the first count was drafted was passed to prevent the circulation of literature among the armed forces by a well-organized group in the United States that you have publicly denounced, and by no stretch of the imagination do the facts alleged fall within that category.

Again, let me say that evidence has come to my attention of the way the grand jury here in Washington has been used, and in all candor I must say to you that I think it has been one of the most disgraceful proceedings that has ever been carried on in this country. If it happened in most jurisdictions in this country, the prosecuting attorneys would be held for contempt of court.

I know how easy it is for a prosecuting attorney to be carried away with the war spirit and to reach the conclusion that everyone who disagrees with his own views is unpatriotic, but I have always had confidence that you, with your background, would never tolerate proceedings of this kind even in time of war.

I believe you owe it to yourself and to the country to review the proceedings of the grand jury and to review the evidence and the law in this matter. I say to you quite frankly that I have discussed this with several Members of the Senate who are able lawyers, and I have yet to find one of them who knew anything about the matter but who felt that it ought to be investigated and carefully reviewed by you, or that a general investigation should be held by some committee of Congress.

May I respectfully urge you to review very carefully both the law and the evidence in this matter?

What some of these people under indictment have written, I repeat, is reprehensible, but that they should be indicted for a conspiracy to undermine the morale of the armed forces of this country, and brought thousands of miles from their homes to be tried in this jurisdiction, unless there is a great deal more than appears upon the face of this indictment, is shocking, indeed, to one who believes in preserving freedom of speech and our civil liberties.

Respectfully yours,

B. K. WHEELER.

---

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
*Washington, D. C., December 12, 1942.*

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I have your letter of December 3, 1942, with reference to the indictment recently obtained in the District of Columbia in the case of *United States* v. *Gerald V. Winrod et al.* You have expressed concern over what you have described to be "an attempt to smear the America First Committee."

You will recall that a grand jury heard evidence in this case over a period of 71 days. The problem of the connection of each individual and each organization with the conspiracy charged in the indictment was thoroughly explored and considered by the grand jury as well as by the officers of the Department of Justice charged with responsibility for the case. As a result of the investigation and consideration, the indictment was limited to those individuals who had a substantial connection with the conspiracy charged, and to those organizations which were the media through which the conspirators acted. Smearing was, and is, not our object.

You state that you have been informed that the methods used by the Special Assistant before the grand jury "smack of an inquisition of bygone days." I do not know to what you refer. I shall, of course, consider any allegations of improper conduct if you will furnish me with specific information.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE, *Attorney General.*

---

DECEMBER 16, 1942.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
*Attorney General, Department of Justice.*

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am in receipt of your letter of December 12, and note you say that a grand jury heard evidence in this case over a period of 71 days. That does not mean very much to me, because of the fact for 5 years I conducted grand-jury proceedings, and know how easy it is for a prosecuting attorney to indict anyone he wants to regardless of the evidence. If you had had as much dealings with grand juries as I have had, you would appreciate what I said was true.

During the last war, all you had to do was to have a man come in and say to a grand jury a man was guilty of sedition or treason and the grand jury would indict him. The same is true with reference to petit juries, because many of them felt if they themselves didn't convict they would be suspicioned of being pro-German, or something of the kind.

I well remember a conversation I had in Washington with John Lord O'Brien, in which he said to me that the greatest trouble he had was not in getting indictments but in preventing some of the district attorneys from indicting for treason, when there was no sedition or treason.

If it were not the intention to use this indictment for the purpose of smearing the America First Committee, it would never have been mentioned in the same. Why was my name, and the names of other Senators, dragged in before the grand jury, and people asked if they knew me? Why was it that a witness would be called before the grand jury, and if he said he could not remember some details with reference to his business, he was told he would be yanked before the court for contempt of court?

I have been one of those who have felt that, with your background, you would not be a party to permitting the grand jury, in time of hysteria, to be used as this grand jury has been used. Not only that, but the indictment on its face shows that in order to establish the jurisdiction here in Washington, that your Department had somebody write letters to various groups and organizations to get them to answer, so as to bring them within the jurisdiction of this court, and try them 3,000 miles away from their home under conditions where the greater part of the population is made up of Government workers, or people who are dependent upon the Government either directly or indirectly. In other words, your Department resorted to entrapment for the purpose of obtaining jurisdiction here in the Capital.

The Department of Justice, under Harry Daugherty, did that very thing. It was condemned in no uncertain terms by my distinguished colleague, the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh, and other Members of the United States Senate.

In this country a man is supposed to be tried by a jury of his peers, by people who know something of him, and about him, and not be yanked two or three thousand miles from his home. If these people are guilty of sedition, they should have been tried in their own communities, and not take a

conglomerate lot of crackpots, and bring them down into the jurisdiction of Washington.

The whole proceeding is a disgrace, and certainly does not reflect to the credit of your Department. I feel this very keenly for the reason, that when I was United States district attorney, every corporation paper in Montana condemned me, because of the fact, that I would not permit United States district attorneys' offices to be used to prosecute everybody who had the courage to speak up and criticize the Government, wrong though they might be, and in this I am glad to say, that I had the backing of Attorney General Gregory and of John Lord O'Brien.

You will recall that Attorney General Palmer started out with his Red raids, because that was the popular clamor at that time, but when the popular clamor died down, men like Judge Anderson, of Boston, and other distinguished jurists and students, condemned the whole proceedings in unmerciful language, and my colleague condemned them on the floor of the United States Senate.

I want to do everything I can to run down saboteurs, and persons guilty of treason, but I do not want to see the Department of Justice again be the object of attack, for their misuse of the criminal laws of this country.

Your assistant, Maloney, was bantering my name, and other Senators' names, around the court without the slightest foundation for so doing, trying to give the impression that some of us who were opposed to getting into the war were guilty of some crime. Your assistant in handling this matter should be someone who has the respect and confidence of Congress and the people.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if opportunity offers tomorrow I will insert in the Appendix answers to the questions asked in yesterday's issue of the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose today to discuss in the time allotted me the agricultural situation, and the serious dislocation which the farmers of my district and the farmers throughout the country are facing. A little while ago we heard a budget message from the President of the United States. Among other things, I think you will find, if you peruse its pages carefully, a statement that food is a primary weapon of war. I do not think there is very much disagreement with that statement, but there is considerable disagreement as to how the best methods of obtaining as much of that food as is possible may be brought about. Today I want to express my dissatisfaction with the way the food situation is being handled by the Government of the United States and by the agencies which are authorized to carry out such a program. I think the only fair way to describe one's reaction to the way things are going, so far as agriculture is concerned, is to go back to the actual experience which he runs across in his own locality. It is my privilege to represent a dairy district, which is one of the most productive in the country. It is also my privilege to represent as patriotic and interested a group of American farmers as there is in America. When I make observations on the floor of the House, I am sure that I do so only as a result of conferences, suggestions, advice, and instructions from those same farmers I represent, and for whom I want to do everything within my power in the Congress of the United States. As a result of those observations I am introducing a bill today, the title of which is the return to the law of supply and demand in production, and to suspend laws, regulations, and orders which restrict the production of agricultural commodities.

I shall read from the resolution so you may know what it contains:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That until the day following the date on which the President proclaims that hostilities of the present war have ceased all provisions of law and all regulations and orders which restrict, authorize the restriction of, or the payments of, benefits having the effect of restricting, the production of any agricultural commodity are hereby suspended.

Throughout the entire Nation, Mr. Speaker, for the past few years there has been a tendency to restrict the American farmer in his production until he has reached the point where he is just about dependent upon the Government for orders and regulations and subsidies of all kinds to run his business. I think, more than any other occupation, the American farmer has been singled out to be made a guinea pig, so to speak, for all the socialistic and bureaucratic experiments that can possibly be imagined. Under ordinary peacetime conditions these experiments are odious enough to those from farm sections. But when the farmer is restricted in production in wartime, when it is absolutely necessary to do everything within his power to produce an essential primary weapon of war, which is what the President calls food, I think it is high time that the Congress of the United States took some action for his benefit.

The dairy farmers in my section are sick and tired of regulations imposed on them which are definitely working against their doing their best in producing food for freedom.

The farmers throughout America are becoming irked and resentful over increasing regulations being placed upon them in many cases by men who never had any kind of experience in working one. I submit to you therefore that it is high time, as we are embarking upon a period of food production on the farm, to put an end to the regulations which are hampering the farmer and which make him unable to do his part in the production of food for freedom.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, tomorrow is M-day for American agriculture.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I believe so.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It seems to me that when such a significant day is placed upon our calendar, in which the farmers are asked to cooperate and produce more food, it would be a good day to remove all of the shackles which have been placed upon agriculture during the last 10 years and give them a chance to demonstrate as they want to that they can fulfill every obligation just as any other good American citizens would want to do during these critical times.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman for that observation, and I want to assure him I am in hearty agreement with his statement.

The task which appears on the horizon of 1943 for the American farmer is threefold, and it has been designated to him by the principal courses of action which the country has seen fit to take. In the first place, he owes it to his country to provide the food for the civilian population, and at this point I want to express the hope that the people of America continue to eat during 1943 and throughout this struggle in very nearly as wholesome a way as they have in the past. I sincerely feel that unless the civilian population is fed, unless the Government makes it a primary objective to feed the people of America, our war effort will be seriously crippled.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I am interested, and I am sure the House is interested, in the comment on the farm program by the gentleman now addressing us, inasmuch as he is one of the influential members of the House Committee on Agriculture. Would the gentleman itemize a few of the limitations about which he complains and which serve as a restraint upon the production of those whom he serves?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I shall be glad to, although I cannot go into it very extensively due to the fact that I have a limited amount of time at my disposal. I think the most effective way would be to describe to the gentleman some of the restrictions which have been placed upon the farmers of my own district, for I am sure they have also been placed at least in part upon the farmers in the gentleman's district.

Mr. PACE. If the gentleman will permit an interruption, he understands, I am sure, that at the present time the only limitation of production relates to wheat, cotton, and tobacco.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That may be true to a certain extent; and I assure the gentleman that so far as his district is concerned I cannot make an assertion, for I am not informed as to the condition of cotton farmers. I do know that the farmers of my own district, at least according to what they tell me all the time, are getting sick and tired of staying up all night long to fill out forms and registration blanks for this, that, and the other agency; and they are also getting sick and tired of restrictions which are being placed upon them by the authorities who, instead of helping them produce, are hindering them in their production of food for freedom.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I will answer the gentleman from Georgia by referring him

to the decision of the Supreme Court recently on wheat in which decision he will find that all the activities on the farm are now completely under the control of the supreme political authority of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from New York that while he is talking about the disadvantages under which the farmer is laboring he also should call attention to the fact that for the first time in the history of this Nation we have electrified farm homes in this Nation and in many States a majority of the farmers now have electricity in their homes. Seventeen thousand miles of rural power lines have been built in the State of Ohio where they had none, you might say, a few years ago. I think the gentleman ought at least give us credit for that because it is the one thing that has been done for the farmer that has benefited him.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. It is a pity that they cannot use some of that electric power to do something to the bureaucrats down here.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. For the information of the House, will the gentleman from Mississippi just tell us if he is so happy over his electricity to see us farmers work about 18 hours a day while the coal miners are out on strike and freezing us?

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman had not worked 18 hours a day he would not have gotten back here.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot yield further, because I have several other points I want to take up.

Mr. Speaker, this bill which I have introduced takes off restrictions which have been placed upon the American farmer and which have become increasingly irksome and burdensome to him. I want to emphasize the fact that the farmer is in a serious plight today in spite of the so-called paternalistic attitude which the Government has had toward him and in spite of the many so-called things that have been done in his behalf.

I think the best evidence of the unfortunate situation he is now in is the display of auction signs that have been shown upon the floor of this House recently. These signs have been tacked up in all parts of the country. They are becoming increasingly burdensome and are threatening to dispossess the farm manager and the farm operator. It was my privilege to hear the Secretary of Agriculture some time ago testify upon the farm labor situation. In answer to a question asked him the Secretary stated that he felt it was necessary to maintain every farm manager and every farm owner on the farms of America in order to continue the food production program that has been going on. These auction signs are not too conducive to private and to individual ownership and to consistent possession of farm property, at least in my district, and I am sure this applies in every other district in the country. For this reason I say that it is high time for the Congress to take action in favor of the American farmer to encourage him and not to hinder him in the great task which has been allotted him.

I suggest that the bill which I have introduced today will if enacted into law go a long way in assisting him to do this properly. There have been many discussions about the rationing program which has been placed upon the people of the country. I am not in any way critical of the general idea of rationing, but I do raise my voice in behalf of objections I have heard about the people being pushed around by unnecessary restrictions and regulations. And the No. 1 man in the country today who is being pushed around is the American farmer.

To show the contrast in the remarks of some people who raised their voices in protest against farm parity a few months ago, I will repeat a statement I heard the other night. When the House passed the inflation bill and tacked on some of the agricultural amendments which were aimed to benefit the American farmer, they said that this was giving too much preference to the farmer. However, I heard a farmer say that the very people who had called him a gouger, one who had taken advantage of the war production effort to get every dollar he could out of this by raising his farm prices, had come to him and offered him any price for a pound of butter. That is a strange contrast to the complaint which they made a few months ago, when they objected to the whole idea of the farmer getting more money for his products. Yet today they are the same people who come to the farmer and say that they will pay any price for a pound of butter or for different dairy products he has. The whole argument there is, as this gentleman pointed out, that rationing knows no price ceiling and in spite of the effort of the Government to place price ceilings on various products, those ceilings will eventually be pushed up.

It is obvious that in spite of the statements which are being made to the contrary there is going to be a serious dearth of production in the next year unless the farmer is allowed to proceed unchecked and is given a free hand and receives all the encouragement in the world to go ahead with his production. In spite of the attempt of those in authority to distribute food properly, we have seen evidences that various sections of the country are undergoing serious food shortages. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this problem must be corrected, and will be corrected by the bill which I have introduced today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD what I consider a pertinent editorial appearing in the Birmingham News. It is rather enlightening and something of much interest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on December 18 pertaining to the scandalous use of pleasure cars by Government officials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next at the conclusion of the regular business and disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 50 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two respects, in one to include a poem and in the other to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I made a short statement awhile ago on the subject I desire to discuss and I secured permission to revise and extend my remarks on that subject; so I yield back the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 7 minutes.

ANNULMENT OF CERTAIN ACTS PASSED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am presenting a joint resolution calling for the annulment of certain acts passed by

the Legislature of Puerto Rico. These acts are the backbone of the amazing scheme of government control which Gov. Rexford G. Tugwell has set up over the people of that island. These acts, which give the Governor absolute control over all forms of transportation, communications, and water resources, and set him up as a dictator over agriculture and the sugar industry are unprecedented in the democratic way of life. Moreover, the acts to be annulled call for the spending of huge sums of insular money and for the issuance of nearly $30,000,000 of bonds at a time when the people of Puerto Rico are starving and begging this Congress for large subsidies.

I am convinced that this legislation, the repeal of which I am proposing, is both unwise and unconstitutional. A Puerto Rican court already has ruled against one of the acts, that which created the Water Resources Authority. Rather than permit Governor Tugwell to get the island involved in a great mess of unconstitutional action, the best solution I can see is to annul the acts in question. The power of annulment was retained by Congress in 1917 when it approved the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

Recently some of the politicians who have benefited from Governor Tugwell's favors came to Washington and tried to tell the House Committee on Insular Affairs that most of this insular legislation was passed before Governor Tugwell came to Puerto Rico. Of the seven acts with which this resolution is concerned, I am informed five were passed at the regular 1942 session, when Mr. Tugwell had been Governor for 6 months or more. I am also informed the bills were introduced at the Governor's request and were openly supported by him. The other two were passed a year earlier—in 1941. It is true that Governor Tugwell had not yet become Governor at that time, but he himself, in an official printed report submitted to Interior Secretary Ickes, admits that he counseled and advised with members of the legislature regarding one of the two acts—namely, the land law. The law establishing the water resources authority also was approved after Governor Tugwell had gone to Puerto Rico and after he had discussed it with members of the legislature.

Puerto Rican politicians who claim that Governor Tugwell had nothing to do with this legislation are deliberately attempting to mislead this Congress. They are trying to prove that it was the Puerto Rican people, not Governor Tugwell, who wanted this legislation, but I am informed that Governor Tugwell maneuvered every step in the program.

I am hopeful that the House will see fit to go into this matter thoroughly. When that time comes there are certain questions which must be answered.

For example, why does Governor Tugwell insist on spending many millions of dollars of insular funds on this government-control program when the island is at the same time seeking huge Federal subsidies to support the many thousands of unemployed workers?

Why did Governor Tugwell insist on creating all of these expensive new boards and authorities when every single one of the functions could have been performed by the existing and authorized branches of the insular government?

Why has Governor Tugwell selected $25-a-week drugstore clerks and $1,500-a-year geography teachers to fill $6,000- and $8,000-a-year positions as head of these new authorities?

Why did Governor Tugwell approve certain of these acts after the attorney general of Puerto Rico had advised him that they were clearly unconstitutional?

Why did Governor Tugwell wait 4 months after the date originally designated before calling a special session of the Puerto Rican Legislature last fall?

How does organized labor feel about Governor Tugwell's program in Puerto Rico?

How do the small farmers of Puerto Rico regard Governor Tugwell's program?

When these and related questions have been answered, Congress will know a lot more about Puerto Rico than it does now.

Governor Tugwell and his whole program are in thorough disrepute in Puerto Rico.

Inasmuch as the administration, for some strange reason, seems reluctant to remove him in spite of the flood of violent criticism and the disruption of economic life in Puerto Rico, the least we can do at this time is to undo some of the evil he has perpetrated in our territory.

These laws of the Puerto Rican Legislature which should be annuled are the land law of Puerto Rico, the Water Resources Authority Act, the Puerto Rican Transportation Authority Act, the Puerto Rico Development Co. Act, the Puerto Rico Communications Authority Act, the act regulating the sugar industry of Puerto Rico, and the act establishing the Development Bank of Puerto Rico.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. So much smoke has come out of the Island of Puerto Rico in the last 6 months regarding Dr. Tugwell and certain phases of political and economic life down there that I wonder if the gentleman will not agree that the Congress will be very much derelict in its duty if it does not direct a full and complete and uncompromising investigation of conditions as they are in that island?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman in that observation. I was informed today that the other body expects to send a group down there some time during the current month. To me, it is almost unthinkable that this body, the House of Representatives, would sit here in view of what is going on in Puerto Rico, and not join with the other body in that investigation. Certainly that should be done.

Mr. COLE of New York. Am I correct in my understanding that the mission of the Senate committee is limited solely to the economic problems in Puerto Rico and does not include an investigation of political conditions?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is my understanding.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does not the gentleman believe that the political conditions should also be studied?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the entire political and economic life of those people should be given serious consideration by an investigating joint committee from the Congress of the United States. There are about 200,000 people unemployed down there, and you will be asked to send anywhere from $20,000,000 to $30,000,000 there this year to help feed them, and that on top of almost a quarter of a billion dollars which has been poured into Puerto Rico during the last 10 years, for which we have too little to show.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman will recall that shortly after Dr. Tugwell was appointed Governor a rumor was circulated through Washington that he was to set up a sugar cartel for sugar produced outside the United States. Does the gentleman think the continuance of Dr. Tugwell in office has anything to do with fulfilling that program?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think so. In the last several weeks representatives have been in this country and in this city from Cuba and Puerto Rico working on the matter of disposing of the 1943 sugar crop from those two areas. I understand informally that the Cuban people are asking in excess of $2.65 per hundred pounds for sugar f. o. b. the shipping points, with the understanding that the Commodity Credit Corporation is to pay certain inland rail shipment burdens toward moving their sugar to the ports, the Cuban industry to carry certain rail transportation costs, and the Commodity Credit Corporation to assume the balance, whatever that may be.

There is a situation that touches upon the guaranteed income of farmers in that area. In Puerto Rico, where the people are citizens of the United States, the crop is to be dealt with on a dissimilar basis, but negotiations are being carried on looking to the Commodity Credit Corporation's lending money to the Puerto Ricans in the handling of their sugar, with the understanding that no interest charges are to be made on those loans where the credit is so granted.

The farmers of this country are interested in programs of that kind. It seems to me that too many of our administrators are extremely anxious to graze in far-away green fields and to carry their treatment of certain people to a much more favorable extent than the treatment given to those who grow foodstuffs in our own country and operate our own farms. So I think we can very well afford to look into that phase of the problem if this body should decide to send anyone down to Puerto Rico.

[Here the gavel fell.]

CONSTRUCTION OF ONE OR MORE PIPE LINES FROM OIL STATES TO NEW YORK FOR THE TRANSPORT OF PETROLEUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, there is a serious fuel situation in New York and New England, which is getting worse daily. It is beginning to look as if the people in my section of New York State will suffer chilblains and unnecessary hardships and have their health endangered because of the inefficiency and lack of foresight of the administration in not constructing one or more pipe lines a year ago from the oil States to New York and New England.

Official Washington ordered the people in my district to change their heating systems from fuel oil to coal, but on account of a coal strike in Pennsylvania the local coal dealers have only empty bins. The health of the public in midwinter is being jeopardized by the acute coal and fuel-oil shortage, for which the topsy-turvy national leadership is responsible.

It is a case of the blind leading the blind. If it were not so tragic it would be laughable. We are ordered to dispense with oil heating because of a drastic shortage of fuel oil, to learn that there is just as serious a shortage of coal.

I have introduced a bill (H. R. 917) authorizing the construction of one or more pipe lines for the transport of petroleum and its products from States in the Middle West and Southwest to the vicinity of New York City, and urge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as soon as it is organized, to consider it on its merits and expedite favorable action.

Let us be sure of enough fuel oil to keep warm next fall and enough gasoline to run our cars on the synthetic rubber promised by then.

Mr. R. L. Minckler, representing the Petroleum Administration for War, stated yesterday that more persons would suffer from lack of heating fuel in the United States in the winter of 1943–44 than at the present time.

The handling of the fuel-oil situation is one of the major blunders of the administration. There is plenty of oil and gasoline in the Middle Western and Southwestern States to supply the needs of our armed forces, our war factories, New York, and New England, and the rest of the Nation. It is largely a question of transportation, and particularly of pipe lines to the East.

The responsibility for the shivering millions in the East and for the slowing up of our war industries rests squarely on the administration.

I have supported every war measure since Pearl Harbor, but it seems to me the health of the American people comes before sending entire rubber tire factories and pipe lines to Russia and Asia, and giving priority on oil to South America and Canada. We should proceed immediately to build one or more pipe lines to the northeastern section of the country. These pipe lines should have been built months ago. It is too late now to remedy the fuel-oil shortage this winter, but let us make sure that it will not happen again.

The following Associated Press dispatch was published in the newspapers on Wednesday, January 6, 1943:

PRIORITY ORDER FOR TANKERS DELIVERING OIL

WASHINGTON, January 5.—Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, appearing before a senatorial investigating committee, yesterday listed the order in which tankers are used for the delivery of oil as follows:

1. The armed services.
2. Great Britain.
3. South American republics.
4. Central American republics.
5. Canada.
6. Essential domestic needs.

If this is the policy of the administration, then it is shocking proof of the indifference of the New Deal administration to the needs of our own people. Why should priorities be given the whole world before the requirements of our population are supplied?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

GOVERNOR STASSEN

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to inject my remarks into a discussion that took place here on Friday last. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] had the floor and commented on certain statements made by Governor Stassen of Minnesota. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] intimated in certain remarks which he injected into the discussion that Governor Stassen is a stalking horse for Wendell Willkie or the Democratic Party. I know Governor Stassen very well. I can assure all of you, particularly the Republicans, that Governor Stassen is not a stalking horse for Mr. Willkie. He is not a stalking horse for anybody. He may have Presidential ambitions himself. If he has, they are very laudable, because every true American has a right to aspire to the high office of President.

We think a great deal of Governor Stassen in Minnesota and of the fine job he has done as chief executive of our State. He may have certain ideas on the international situation and post-war problems. We may not all agree with his philosophies or his suggestions on that subject; nevertheless, as a real American he has a right to propose his ideas, and we have the privilege to consider them.

I have not had the opportunity to study Governor Stassen's post-war suggestions, but I am going to do so just as soon as I get the details of them. I think all Republicans, and Democrats as well, should welcome the suggestions made by our Governor as they would the suggestions made by any other American who is interested in the welfare of our country. Speaking frankly, I feel that our Governor from Minnesota has made a real contribution by presenting his proposal for the post-war period to the people of this country. His plan deserves study and consideration by Members of Congress.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Like my colleague, I have not had an opportunity to study Governor Stassen's proposal for an international parliament, but I will say this, that the proposal made by the Governor of the great State of Minnesota, is worthy of every study and consideration by this and the other body.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am very glad to have that contribution from my distinguished and able colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. While this matter is up for consideration I think we should go a little further in this way. Yesterday afternoon I listened with a great deal of attention to a Chicago University Round Table discussion over the radio. It was along this general line: Who is the head of the Republican Party; what are its aims; what have been its accomplishments? and then finally they got off into a discussion of what its war relationships are, and so on. Unfortunately in the handling of that broadcast each person participating did not call the other by name, and listening with all of the attention in my power the voices of certain men were so similar that it was impossible to determine who was saying what, and about what. I know that many people were misled yesterday in that they feel that Governor Stassen made certain remarks which I am positive he did not make, because of the similarity of voice. I have written for a copy of the transcript so as to make it clear, because I think Members of the House will be requested to explain why they were so condemned by a person whom the people think was Governor Stassen, and who was one of the other speakers, having such a direct bearing upon the speech made in Minneapolis to the Foreign Policy Association, and a discussion on the floor on the 8th along with what has been said today. I think this should be pointed out.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. JENNINGS. Does not the gentleman feel that events are moving so fast, are so kaleidoscopic, that they are stated in such emphatic terms, so as to leave a so much more lasting impression on the minds of the people, that it does not make very much difference what anybody says at any particular time on any particular subject.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is a lot in what the gentleman says.

After all, our first job is to win the war, and that may take some time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 15 mintues.

BLUEPRINTS OF THE FUTURE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I had planned to make these remarks perhaps at a later time, but somehow in these first 2 or 3 days we have an attentive audience, and they will fit with other addresses already made today. We think we understand what Governor Stassen wants in a general way. I do not think he has many blueprints to offer as to details. I hope he has not. We have the Atlantic Charter, which is only a declaration of broad principles that can readily be accepted, namely, no more aggressor nations; freedom of the seas and freedom from fear and want. We can subscribe to those ideals. But now there are highly dangerous suggestions made by some very high in authority. They are excusing themselves by declaring that our boys should now know what they are fighting for. I think they already know. After Pearl Harbor we need little explanation of why we are at war. They do not need any blueprint of the future to complicate the situation. I want to strike a note of warning, lest our Vice President and others high in authority promise too much until they may be sure that the Congress, which speaks for the people, will support them in their commitments. I think it is important that we as a body should make it clear now that they should be very careful in their implied promises of what this Nation will do after the war. Mr. Willkie strongly urged us to make serious commitments. He was an emissary at the moment. He was regarded as an authoritative voice by many peoples. I am greatly worried. Again it is said that the boys ought to know what they are fighting for. This is an excuse for bringing forward favorite notions of building a new world.

Blueprints of almost any sort, wherein you commit the Nation to anything definite, might bring a cessation of fighting on certain fronts, if such blueprints were not acceptable, and contained meddlesome plans regarding other nations' domestic affairs. But our visionaries are very busy at the moment. I want to join in a workable plan for peace. I am not one of those old timers who desire to sit on the fence and watch the procession go by. I do wish to know where the procession is heading for. Governor Stassen says he wants a supergovernment and a supercouncil. That is something like Vice President Wallace's suggestion. He wants a supergovernment, and a sort of supercouncil. But Mr. WALLACE says that such council should act only regionally. He has probably learned that South America would have to be treated as a separate region and not be greatly subjected to the whims and fancies and ideologies of other nations. I referred to the Tower of Babel in a recent speech. That is what might occur when all nations are called together to formulate a general plan. You probably would be suspicious of your own neighbor if he talked in a language which you could not understand, because you would not feel quite sure that he was always saying things that were in full agreement with you. The matter of language, as Mr. WALLACE has suggested, is highly important; the interpreters would have a tremendous responsibility in translating too many viewpoints in various languages at one time to express identical agreements. Mr. WALLACE thinks this so important that he has long advised us to learn Spanish, and in his recent speech he declared that when this war is over we should take such a forcible part that we should even supervise the school systems of the aggressor nations; that the doctrines of Hitler and Tojo should not be allowed in the schools of the future. How they would love to have us supervise their school systems! I want you to read an article by Michael Straight, appearing in the New Republic recently. The New Republic seems to be regarded as a very literary journal, although somewhat communistic to some of us. But I am told it has a real literary value and its columns contain much from our so-called advance thinkers.

Mr. Straight declares—

> That it will be the duty of the United States to accomplish the demolition of the tensions existing between democratic and capitalistic countries—

Is not that literary?

> that it will be the duty of Great Britain to accomplish the demolition of the tension between imperialistic and the anti-imperialistic countries.

Is not that literary? In one of Churchill's statements recently he said:

> I have not been placed at the head of the British Empire to preside over its dissolution.

That was a reprimand. That seemed to mean that we should make no world plans now.

Great Britain is not to give up her advantage of empire. Freedom, of course; freedom from want, and fear, and to stop aggressor nations. That objective is harmless at the present, at least. I want to call this to the attention of my leader: Michael Straight says "The hard core of anti-Soviet and anti-British is the Catholic Church."

He is already blaming your Catholic Church, sir, as possibly the toughest nut to crack in the forming of this world dream of peace and release from fear and want. Now, be careful how you argue with me lest you be mistaken about those Mr. Straight feels will be the greatest of the opposition. The New Republic is so enlightening. The new dealers are its apparent principal contributors.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I too got that copy of the New Republic and read it. I could not see that there was anything literary about it; it was mostly fiction.

Mr. GIFFORD. Lovely. That is as well said as if I had said it myself.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If the gentleman were Oscar Wilde I might say: "You will, Oscar, you will."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMACK. In view of that statement who does the gentleman think is improving, the lady or the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, the lady outranks me, certainly. We are under that tremendous disadvantage of having to agree with them. We would not have them suffer here from the usual and expected right to precede us in any direction.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the gentleman seen the beautiful flag they have worked out for the glorified union of nations?

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman reads my mind because reference to that was the next I had in mind. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] spoke about this flag. Yes; there is to be a flag over all other flags—the flag of the United Nations with a supreme parliamentary government. Ours seemingly could be only a "regional flag."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Under this plan, as I understand it, this man Davis, who is president of the Federal Union, Inc., lives up i.. the gentleman's district. Has the gentleman been able to get him to——

Mr. GIFFORD. He does live in my district.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will withdraw that. He lives up around Massachusetts; well, that is getting a little too close to home, too. I will just say he lives somewhere up to the east. Has the gentleman learned from him whether or not if this thing goes through we are to be permitted to have the Stars and Stripes to represent us even as an inferior part of that group? Can we hope for that?

Mr. GIFFORD. It should appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that this gentleman is a constituent of mine; really, he is a constituent of the United States of America. He is quite a person. He is a man most of you know; he has done much to bring about good roads all over the Nation. He feels that he knows how to spend public money for the public good. I imagine he is one of the most patriotic of men, but that sometimes is a trouble. The very sincerity of these men, especially those in high places, makes them possibly dangerous people because of their very idealism. Idealism is much talked about these days, but little understood. As Mr. Phillips wrote about Secretary Wallace a day or two ago:

> Come down out of the upper berth
> And put your feet on solid earth.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Vice President WALLACE made a statement recently to the effect that we would have to assure the proper education of the conquered countries. Has the gentleman given any considera-

tion to the possibility of a philosophy like that that would also require steps being taken by this Government to ensure the desired education of all of the citizens of this country?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, yes; we have not wholly cured ourselves yet either of want or fear and even lack the proper educational facilities for all our own people.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it is the Atlantic Charter that is set out in some eight basic divisions, and I believe it is item 4, or article 4, if you want to call it that, which provides in substance this: That the two Governments, the United States and the United Kingdom, shall, subject to existing obligations and to the best of their ability, provide that victor and vanquished shall in the post-war period participate in the sharing of the raw materials of the earth and the markets upon equal terms. Some day I hope the gentleman with an understanding of these matters will take at least 30 minutes to discuss item 4 of the Atlantic Charter with respect to the proposition of sharing equally markets and raw materials.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to express my humility in this matter. I have a scrapbook that is very large, already filled with material I have been gathering on this subject during the last several weeks. I spent a long day perusing it yesterday.

Violent differences of opinion and insistence on meddling with the affairs of other nations give me grave forebodings for the future. The free flow of raw materials meets with apparent general favor, but the free flow of manufactured goods would mean a revolution, I fear, even in our own country. To exchange goods that we have for those we do not have seems possible, but between countries having only similar goods it would be most difficult. I am taking these few minutes because I think it is necessary for the Congress to call a halt. Winston Churchill certainly has called a halt. Great Britain is unwilling to give up colonial domination—what some term colonial exploitation. Russia and China and India may not join the world of nations unless we pledge ourselves to see that England does give up her so-called imperialism. Are we ready to demand that? We are treading on very dangerous ground. I will subscribe and you will subscribe to the general aims of that Atlantic Charter. We desire to see to it that there be no more aggressor nations. But to meddle with their ideologies and their educational methods, and all that sort of thing we may well at present make few commitments. It is treading on dangerous ground while a world war is in progress.

I have talked with a number of college professors, and other splendid men of high ideals and intellectual capacities living at the famous Cosmos Club. I have that opportunity. How anxious they are to build a better world! We all are. Many say we should now provide a real peace plan because after the war is over there will be hatred in the hearts of many nations toward each other and they will be in no temper to frame a reasonable peace. Yet they are setting up an international court already, and I approve it, where they are providing that all Japanese, German, and Italian leaders who are found to have committed atrocities will be dealt with and adequately punished. Have those leaders no faithful followers? When we say that we will punish their leaders, are their people to be more submissive, or will their hatred increase? Our job now is to win the war. At the moment it is paramount but must not be jeopardized by blueprints that might be unacceptable to our allies. Controversy asserts itself when we see the actual blueprints. We can form a sort of Atlantic Charter in our own community for its betterment and the people gladly agree to it. But when we are presented with the blueprints, the Methodists and the Congregationalists will begin fighting. Any too definite plans which meet with the disapproval of the United Nations are fraught with danger. That is why I am taking the floor at this time. Let also your voice be heard. We hear from high places, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, and others. We must warn them to proceed slowly. They are terribly sincere in their desire to make the world over. But the great responsibility is ultimately ours. Any President can get us into war or other trouble by his diplomatic action at almost any time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman from Michigan a moment ago called the gentleman's attention, as well as the attention of the House, to the phraseology of the Atlantic Charter and to the words "with due regard to existing obligations." Has the gentleman heard from any source whatsoever what the existing obligations were at that time?

Mr. GIFFORD. I have not, but the gentleman well knows that after the last war our President, Mr. Wilson, found when he arrived in Europe that there had been secret treaties made, of which he had had no knowledge. What do we know about the commitments, or rather implied promises, which have already been made by our emissaries who were sent over to Russia and to China?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Or what agreement was reached by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt before they arrived at that agreement?

Mr. GIFFORD. We do not know much of these matters. Take the illustration of today. The administration sends us a budget, but they do not wish to give us a blueprint in detail relating to vast sums recited in that Budget. Any details might be of value to our enemies. Blueprints of what we may ask of our allies after the war is over would indeed be of value to our enemies.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has referred to the necessity of our being careful in making commitments. We have one course. We have the "four freedoms" speech, we have lend-lease, and some $60,000,000,000 provided to implement the Lend-Lease Act. We have the Atlantic Charter, then we have the British master agreement, and I think it is the eighth article in the British master agreement, if my memory serves me right, which provides that the lend-lease and the Atlantic Charter become a portion of and a part of the British master agreement. These commitments have been made and they will have to be dealt with by public opinion of this country. That is what I have reference to.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am sorry, but the gentleman is so exactly right about that lease-lend business. It is boastfully said by these people who want to make the world over that under extension of the lend-lease plan we can preserve the peace and it will cost us as much as the waging of the war. A long continuance of our lending, leasing, and giving is contemplated. The lend-lease idea is evidently to go on and on until demolition of the tension between the democracies and the capitalistic countries is accomplished. I feel very strongly about this matter, but my protest will not amount to much. Will some of you of real influence and persuasion sound a further and clarion call of caution?

There are two opinons and the proponents of each are very insistent. One is that we need to formulate the peace now or the Allied Nations might not continue to fight. But some of the nations might not fight because the peace plans may not please them. Therefore, I say, let us first win the war and be content with general aims of the Atlantic Charter. It will take many years to formulate a plan for a United Nations of the world. Let us give this attention. Even if you be misunderstood and accused of lack of idealism, urge caution on our leaders, and better control of their enthusiasms to involve our country in the maelstrom of world politics.

We earnestly plead that we are all in entire accord to make this world safe against aggressor nations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly distressed over the turn that the debate has taken this afternoon. We cannot discuss, neither should we discuss, lease-lend, because that is a permanent investment, therefore beyond our poor power to change. Some of the speakers who have preceded me would deprive the dreamers down at the other

end of the Avenue of the privilege to dream. What was it the poet said about dreamers and dreaming? If you deprive them of their dreams and the right to dream, why you may just as well immobilize them in a tomb, because that is as far as they usually get.

I like to think as one with HENRY WALLACE, coming as I do from one of the great dairying sections of the country. It thrills me to think that after this war is over Uncle Sam, with millions of cases of milk, will visit the underprivileged families in all the earth and set a bottle of Minnesota milk down in front of each member of the family each morning. It certainly would create a market for milk, and that is good news out in Minnesota. Little has as yet been said about cake and butter, but they will probably get around to that oversight soon.

Of course, if we are going to do all these things for all these people, what will be left for us Americans? As I understand the program—and my distinguished friend from Massachusetts can correct me if I have not grasped the full purport—the plan is to set up a glorified W. P. A. with a glorified Harry Hopkins to administer it. I presume we will set great, big tables loaded down with what we Scandinavians call smörgåsbord, where they may go round the table with plates and help yourselves—not you but they.

I hope we will not spend all that we have in this war. Let us save something to spend in making this a better world for those who have not and do not miss what they do not have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GRAHAM (at the request of Mr. KINZER), indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I just want to repeat what I said earlier in the day and I know repetition on my part will not be misunderstood. I refer to the importance of looking over this afternoon and tomorrow the books we have in our offices in Washington and to bring them tomorrow afternoon so that we can make our contribution in Statuary Hall. To me this is very important because of the psychological effect throughout the country. I hope all Members will make it their personal and special business between now and tomorrow at noon to get as many books as they can to make this contribution.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include three brief editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]?

There was no objection.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 12, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

41. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 5); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

42. A letter from the President of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the Fifteenth Annual Report of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering the fiscal year 1942 (H. Doc. No. 31); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

43. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the annual report of the activities of the Veterans' Administration as of June 30, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 11); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and ordered to be printed.

44. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

45. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an itemized report of transactions for account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

46. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office dated January 5 transmitting the report of the withdrawals and restoration contemplated by the statute; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

47. A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting a classified report showing the permits and licenses issued by the Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

48. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1, 1942, to January 1, 1943; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

49. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of the fiscal affairs of all Indian tribes for whose benefit expenditures from public or tribal funds were made during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

---

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 978. A bill to repeal the income limitation as to payment of death compensation to dependents of deceased service-connected disabled World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 979. A bill to provide that while hospitalized for service-connected disabilities war veterans shall be rated as totally disabled; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 980. A bill to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall not, in the absence of fraud or clear and unmistakable error, reduce any permanent-disability rating; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 981. A bill to provide for the construction of Veterans' Administration facilities in accordance with veteran population needs; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 982. A bill to amend title III of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, so as to reduce the number of reexaminations of persons receiving insurance benefits on account of permanent and total disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 983. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 984. A bill to amend the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1934, as amended, with respect to the authority of the Attorney General to compromise suits on certain contracts of insurance; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 985. A bill to restore World War service connection granted by special review boards under Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, June 16, 1933; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 986. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 987. A bill to amend an act to prevent pernicious political activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 988. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 989. A bill to revise the method of determining the payments to be made by the United States to the several States with respect to conservation lands subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 990. A bill relating to the disposition of mineral rights to any land acquired by any Federal land bank or by the Land Bank Commissioner through the foreclosure of any mortgage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 991. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, with respect to grants to States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 992. A bill to provide for the reclassification under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 of employees engaged in war production participating in strikes; to make it unlawful for persons to conspire to stop or slow down production in war contracts; to suspend the 40-hour week and provisions for overtime compensation; to limit the profits on war contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 993. A bill to aid in preventing inflation, to stabilize the rents of real property, to treat equitably several million families who are wholly or partly dependent upon the income from homes or other small residential property, to freeze rents at the same level at

which wages and farm prices are stabilized and not at earlier date with no practical means of adjustment, to prohibit general questionnaires, forms, and statements designed to stir up litigation, disputes, and to harass the property owner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 994. A bill to amend title III, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 995. A bill to amend the Banking Act of 1876, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 996. A bill for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to July 1, 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H R. 997. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the Medical Department of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 998. A bill permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 999. A bill for the relief of the State compensation insurance fund, State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 1000. A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1001. A bill to provide for adjudication of any claim for compensation, pension, or retirement pay upon evidence in file at time of death of the veteran; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 1002. A bill relating to deferment of registrants regularly engaged in fishing essential to the war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 1003. A bill to suspend laws, regulations, and orders which restrict the production of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1004. A bill to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class mailing fees upon resumption of publication; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 1005. A bill to increase and equalize the pensions of those persons disabled as the result of service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 1006. A bill authorizing negotiations and providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of an interoceanic canal over Nicaraguan territory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 1007. A bill to authorize the acceptance by Federal agencies of a certification from the records of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard as to place and date of birth of a veteran; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1008. A bill to insure appropriate noncommissioned rank and retirement privileges to certain enlisted persons of the Regular Establishment who serve during the present war in a temporary commissioned status and who return to enlisted status; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1009. A bill to provide pensions for disabled unemployable veterans who served in a war, campaign, expedition, or insurrection beyond the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1010. A bill to provide that World War veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1011. A bill to amend section 201 (a), paragraph 1 (1), of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 1012. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1013 (by request). A bill to grant permanent and total disability ratings to disabled men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard suffering from severe industrial inadaptability as a result of active service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1014 (by request). A bill to provide pensions to members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who become disabled by reason of their service therein, equivalent to 90 percent of the compensation payable to war veterans for similar service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1015. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1016. A bill to provide for the Federal employment of qualified persons whose physical condition is considered to constitute a bad risk for a civil-service retirement fund by exempting such persons from the provisions thereof, by making them subject to the provisions of title II of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 1017. A bill to amend an act to prevent pernicious political activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 1018. A bill to protect democracy in Puerto Rico; and to amend, to that effect, section 37 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1019. A bill to amend section 31, as amended, of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1020. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to extend titles I, IV, and X to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1021. A bill to make the workmen's compensation laws of Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii applicable to land and premises of the United States in such Territories; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 1022. A bill to provide that vessels under the control of the War Shipping Administration under construction one shall be named the William Tyler Page, author of The American's Creed; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 1023. A bill to establish a Chief of Chaplains of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1024. A bill for the relief of families of Reserve officers of the Army who die while on active duty with the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 1025. A bill to amend section 1753 of the Revised Statutes to create a board of legal examiners in the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1026. A bill to promote interstate and foreign commerce, to improve the navigability of the Lakes-to-the-Gulf Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1027. A bill to incorporate the Mothers of Military Servicemen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1028. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, paragraph VII, to define the term "parent"; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1029. A bill to provide permanent and total disability rating in active pulmonary tuberculosis cases; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1030. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10 (a), section 1, paragraph VI, defining the term "child"; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1031. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 1032. A bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALBOT:

H. R. 1033. A bill to suspend the effectiveness during the existing national emergency of tariff duty on coconuts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 1034. A bill to extend the time in which application for servicemen's monthly family allowance may be filed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 1035. A bill to provide that a veteran's compensation, pension, or retirement pay shall not be reduced during first 90 days of his hospitalization or domiciliary care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 1036. A bill to liberalize the bases of eligibility for receipt of disability retirement benefits as to emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers of the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 1037. A bill preserving the nationality of a person born in Puerto Rico who resides for 5 years in a foreign state; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHORT:
H. R. 1038. A bill for the relief of the city of Carthage, Mo.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORDON:
H. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:
H. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to provide for the annulment of certain acts passed by the Legislature of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:
H. Res. 44. Resolution to amend rule III of the House, with respect to the duties of the Clerk of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

---

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLMER:
H. R. 1039. A bill for the relief of William P. Kennedy, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1040. A bill for the relief of Frank Henderson and Frances Nell Henderson, his wife; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1041. A bill for the relief of E. F. Hathorn and E. D. Hathorn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr HÉBERT:
H. R. 1042. A bill for the relief of Mary T. Recely; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEIDINGER:
H. R. 1043. A bill for the relief of Charley Leap; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:
H. R. 1044. A bill for the relief of D. S. Kerr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:
H. R. 1045. A bill for the relief of Mrs. R. D. Robinson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEA:
H. R. 1046. A bill for the relief of David B. Turpel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT:
H. R. 1047. A bill for the relief of the State of Oregon, Department of Forestry of the State of Oregon, and certain organized protection agencies in the State of Oregon for protection of unappropriated public-forest lands intermingled with Oregon and California lands from July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1048. A bill for the relief of Christine Lund; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:
H. R. 1049. A bill for the relief of the estate of Hyman Weiner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OUTLAND:
H. R. 1050. A bill for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:
H. R. 1051. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Eitel, Max Eitel, and E. J. Coyle, of Chicago, Ill., a copartnership doing business under the name of "The C. & E. Co."; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:
H. R. 1052. A bill for the relief of Granite Mutual Insurance; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1053. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harris A. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1054. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Blake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1055. A bill granting a pension to Clara L. Garvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1056. A bill authorizing the appointment and retirement of John Tomlingson as a second lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
H. R. 1057. A bill for the relief of widows of certain Reserve officers of the Army who died while serving the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1058. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Crosett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:
H. R. 1059. A bill for the relief of Mae and Margaret Macdonald, heirs of James Doyle, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDS:
H. R. 1060. A bill for the relief of Curtis Pope; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
H. R. 1061. A bill for the relief of Waldrop Heating & Plumbing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1062. A bill for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:
H. R. 1063. A bill for the relief of Jordan B. Gross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:
H. R. 1064. A bill granting a pension to Katie A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1065. A bill granting a pension to Mary Jane Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1066. A bill granting a pension to Cathrine Orender; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1067. A bill granting a pension to Alice L. Stemmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1068. A bill granting a pension to Mary B. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1069. A bill granting a pension to Rachel Nash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1070. A bill granting a pension to Jesse Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1071. A bill granting a pension to Agnes P. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1072. A bill granting a pension to Sarah E. Hermanstorfor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1073. A bill granting a pension to Henry William Means; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1074. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Hattie M. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1075. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1076. A bill granting a pension to Frank A. Boster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1077. A bill granting a pension to Angeline Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1078. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Seymour Consolidated School District No. 6, of Webster County, Mo.; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1079. A bill for the relief of Oda Herbert Plowman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
H. R. 1080. A bill for the relief of Walter Weston Pierce; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:
H. R. 1081. A bill for the relief of Frank Borah; to the Committee on Claims.

By Miss SUMNER of Illinois:
H. R. 1082. A bill for the relief of the estate of Richard McClure and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHUETZ:
H. R. 1083. A bill for the relief of Morris Skolnik; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1084. A bill for the relief of Paul G. Lorenz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
H. R. 1085. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Noce; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.
H. R. 1086. A bill for the relief of Fred F. Osgood; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1087. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Flaherty; to the Committee on War Claims.
H. R. 1088. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Kruk; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
H. R. 1089. A bill for the relief of Walter C. Paplow; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
H. R. 1090. A bill for the relief of Keith William Kinney; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
H. R. 1091. A bill for the relief of John Klasek; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1092. A bill for the relief of Daniel S. Snyder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
H. R. 1093. A bill for the relief of Eugene J. Ruhnke; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:
H. R. 1094. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. Herfurth, Jr., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPRINGER:
H. R. 1095. A bill granting a pension to Peter Henry Eickenberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1096. A bill granting a pension to Sarah J. Wilder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1097. A bill granting a pension to Clara B. Mathews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMASON:
H. R. 1098. A bill for the relief of El Paso Electric Co.; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1099. A bill for the relief of Jose J. Perez; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TARVER:
H. R. 1100. A bill for the relief of the estate of James A. Henderson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEISS:
H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of George J. Hiner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:
H. R. 1102. A bill granting a pension to Julius Hansen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:
H. R. 1103. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Amberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

---

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of C. L. Brown, manager of the Mexia Torpedo Co., of Mexia, Tex., favoring retail sales tax collected through the Internal Revenue Bureau; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Carrie M. Newton and 51 members of Anna A. Gordon Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of the Liberty Township Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Knox County, Ohio, urging the reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917, and set out in Senate bill 860 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, forbidding the exploitation of the men in the Army and

the Navy by liquor and commercialized vice; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

10. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the California Wool Growers Association, San Francisco, relative to the necessity for predatory animal control, and urging an appropriation of $1,500,000 annually by the Federal Government for such control; to the Committee on Appropriations.

11. By the SPEAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of Lexington, Fayette County, Ky., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 7; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Unto Thee our Father in heaven, we would offer our tributes of praise and thanksgiving and pray Thee to cause us to use our talents in promoting peace and good will. Let us see these like a mantle spread over our country, the lowly cottage and the spacious home, Thy blessing falling in truth and patience. May we greet this day with newness of joy in Thy Fatherhood and with ascending ideals of service that shall light the candle of a larger hope and deeper sympathy.

Dear Lord, if adversity lends gloom to some room of memory, we pray that hope may enter to lighten the shadow and reveal the angel spirit with songs in the air and stars in the sky. Grant us the spirit to minister with the saving influence of counsel and friendship, to grow in grace and in favor with God and man. Give us thoughts so beautiful and aspirations so divine that in the arching blue above we shall realize something of the heights and depths of love which shines above the horizon of every life. Almighty God, help us to keep inviolate the vows which we have taken and endow us with noble powers of choosing that which is good and wise, and spurning that which is weak and small. Oh, consider and hear our humble prayer as we beseech Thee to keep the heart of our country sound, her power compelling, and her spirit eternal. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following Department:

1. Department of the Navy.

### REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title XX, section 43 of the United States Code, the Chair appoints as Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members of the House: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. Cox, and Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire.

### REPRESENTATIVE MARY T. NORTON

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 45), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas MARY T. NORTON, a Representative from the State of New Jersey, from the Thirteenth District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to her election: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said MARY T. NORTON at Jersey City, N. J., and that the said oath, when administered as herein authorized, shall be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said MARY T. NORTON.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution No. 45, the Chair designates as his deputy to administer the oath of office to the Honorable MARY T. NORTON, of Jersey City, N. J., the Honorable EDWARD J. HART.

### ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 46), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives, as follows:

Ways and Means: Robert L. Doughton (chairman), North Carolina; Thomas H. Cullen, New York; Jere Cooper, Tennessee; Wesley E. Disney, Oklahoma; John D. Dingell, Michigan; A. Willis Robertson, Virginia; Milton H. West, Texas; James P. McGranery, Pennsylvania; Wilbur D. Mills, Arkansas; Noble J. Gregory, Kentucky; Albert Sidney Camp, Georgia; Walter A. Lynch, New York; Aime J. Forand, Rhode Island; Thad F. Wasielewski, Wisconsin; Paul H. Maloney, Louisiana.

Accounts: John J. Cochran (chairman), Missouri; Nat Patton, Texas; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina.

Appropriations: Clarence Cannon (chairman), Missouri; Clifton A. Woodrum, Virginia; Louis Ludlow, Indiana; Malcolm C. Tarver, Georgia; Jed Johnson, Oklahoma; J. Buell Snyder, Pennsylvania; Emmet O'Neal, Kentucky; James M. Fitzpatrick, New York; Louis C. Rabaut, Michigan; Joe Starnes, Alabama; John H. Kerr, North Carolina; George H. Mahon, Texas; Harry R. Sheppard, California; Butler B. Hare, South Carolina; Albert Thomas, Texas; Joe Hendricks, Florida.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Schuyler Otis Bland (chairman), Virginia; Robert Ramspeck, Georgia; Joseph J. Mansfield, Texas; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; James A. O'Leary, New York; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; James Domengeaux, Louisiana; Henry M. Jackson, Washington; Winder R. Harris, Virginia.

Military Affairs: Andrew J. May (chairman), Kentucky; R. Ewing Thomason, Texas; Matthew J. Merritt, New York; John M. Costello, California; Overton Brooks, Louisiana; John J. Sparkman, Alabama; Paul J. Kilday, Texas; Carl T. Durham, North Carolina; Clifford Davis, Tennessee; E. C. Gathings, Arkansas.

Naval Affairs: Carl Vinson (chairman), Georgia; Patrick H. Drewry, Virginia; Leonard W. Schuetz, Illinois; Warren G. Magnuson, Washington; Lyndon B. Johnson, Texas; Michael J. Bradley, Pennsylvania; Beverly M. Vincent, Kentucky; Ed. V. Izac, California; Lansdale G. Sasscer, Maryland; James J. Heffernan, New York; L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina.

Rules: Adolph J. Sabath (chairman), Illinois; E. E. Cox, Georgia; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; J. Bayard Clark, North Carolina; Martin Dies, Texas; Lawrence Lewis, Colorado; John J. Delaney, New York; William M. Colmar, Mississippi; Jack Nichols, Oklahoma.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 47), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, to wit:

Allen T. Treadway, of Massachusetts; Harold Knutson, of Minnesota; Daniel A. Reed, of New York; Roy O. Woodruff, of Michigan; Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio; Donald H. McLean, of New Jersey; Bertrand W. Gearhart, of California; Frank Carlson, of Kansas; Richard M. Simpson, of Pennsylvania; and Charles S. Dewey, of Illinois.

To the Committee on Appropriations:

John Taber, of New York; Richard B. Wigglesworth, of Massachusetts; William P. Lambertson, of Kansas; D. Lane Powers, of New Jersey; J. William Ditter, of Pennsylvania; Albert E. Carter, of California; Charles A. Plumley, of Vermont; Everett M. Dirksen, of Illinois; Albert J. Engel, of Michigan; Karl Stefan, of Nebraska; Francis Case, of South Dakota; Frank B. Keefe, of Wisconsin; Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana; Robert F. Jones, of Ohio; Ben F. Jensen, of Iowa; H. Carl Andersen, of Minnesota; Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; and Walter C. Ploeser, of Missouri.

To the Committee on Rules:

Hamilton Fish, of New York; Leo E. Allen, of Illinois; Earl C. Michener, of Michigan; Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana; and Clarence J. Brown, of Ohio.

To the Committee on Accounts:

James Wolfenden, of Pennsylvania, and Leo E. Allen, of Illinois.

The resolution was agreed to.

### VICTORY BOOK DRIVE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the announcements previously made about the Victory book drive and the contribution of books by the Members of the House to the boys in the service, to take place today between 12:30 and 12:45. I hope all Members who can contribute will between now and that time get together as many books as possible, so that the action of the Members will be an example and an inspiration to the people of the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Cornell Alumni News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Miss Mary Jane Gallagher.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem that was recently read over the radio, written by Miss Elkins, daughter of former Senator Davis Elkins.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Samuel E. Robison, of London, Ohio, on a pay-as-you-go tax program, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem entitled "Hitler," by Webster P. Huntington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make and include therein a statement and analysis of House Joint Resolution 17.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. ENGEL and Mr. KEFAUVER asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

### THE ASSESSED VALUATION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the reading of the President's Budget message yesterday, the largest Budget ever presented to a legislative body in the history of the world, my interest was aroused as to how much the assessed valuation of the United States might be and whether or not the Nation is soundly solvent. I referred the matter to the legislative reference service of the Congressional Library and received from the Library this morning the following figures which were taken from the Census Bureau report as to the assessed valuation of this country for 1940. These are the latest figures available. The assessed valuation is given as $144,636,000,000.

Some States assess on a basis of 40 percent, some of 60 percent, and others of 70 percent. The average of all is about 56 percent. Therefore, using the figures just given as to the assessed valuation of this country, the true valuation is approximately $208,000,000,000.

Some States tax personal property, while others do not. The National Industrial Conference Board, a research organization, compiled figures on the national wealth for 1938, the latest available on national wealth, showing a total of $309,430,000,000. A break-down of that figure reveals the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| Land | $166,027,000,000 |
| Public utilities | 46,745,000,000 |
| Other productive estimates | 23,425,000,000 |
| Stocks of goods on hand | 73,234,000,000 |

America is at total war. America will not stop, regardless of the cost, when our very existence is threatened. With what we have authorized and appropriated for war purposes, together with the requirements of the President's Budget message of yesterday, totals $320,000,000,000. I give these figures for the benefit of the House so we may know the colossal expenditures for war exceed the assessed valuation of the country, as well as the national wealth.

When we compare the colossal expenditures for war with our national wealth, we lapse into sobering thought, for it is the deep concern of all of us.

[Here the gavel fell.]

### ANDREW JACKSON HIGGINS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was not surprising to me to see in Monday's paper, to be exact, the Washington Times-Herald, that big Irish Andrew Jackson Higgins has been given a contract to build ships for the Brazilian Government, and at the present time negotiations are under way between that Government and Higgins to start construction in the very near future.

Andrew J. Higgins is considered not only a great boatbuilder in this country, but his ability is recognized throughout the world. He is a man not of just local reputation, nor is he one of common national importance, but my personal and intimate friend, Andrew Jackson Higgins, is a man of international repute.

His contribution to the war effort can never be based on a cold, hard proposition of dollars and cents, but we do know that when things are necessary to be done in a hurry, those needing the boats never fail to call on the one, the only, the original, the inimitable, boat builder of New Orleans, Andrew J. Higgins.

You all remember the cancelation of the Higgins contract in July of 1942. Since then he has been awarded a contract and the yard opened to build 1,200 cargo planes. He will build these planes with the same speed as he builds boats. The press stated that he could build boats faster than greased lightning. Of course, that is some speed; but, in my estimation, he can build boats faster than our beloved SAM RAYBURN can comb his hair, and, ladies and gentlemen, that is speed.

The Brazilian Government is to be congratulated in securing Mr. Higgins' services, as I am positive that he will build boats exactly and precisely as needed in the Amazon traffic and in the coastal waters to convey goods up and down that huge country.

Andrew J. Higgins, I congratulate you, and I am positive that you have the best wishes of all those who know you and also the best wishes and prayers of the people of the country at this time. Your patriotism and your ability to produce is thoroughly appreciated by everyone, young and old, rich and poor. Your contribution, similar to the contributions of many others, will rapidly bring this war to a successful termination and lasting peace.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article appearing in the Boston Sunday Post of December 27 by Robert L. Norton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a press report, showing the war powers of the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a news item from the Daily News of Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel, on the late George Washington Carver.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of all other business and special or-

ders I be permitted to address the House today for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE FOR RURAL SCHOOL TEACHERS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a petition from school teachers in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, much of the Second Congressional District of Michigan has been designated as a national defense area. Here are located the mammoth Ford Willow Run bomber plant and many other national defense industries.

It naturally follows that as a result of this unprecedented, and almost unbelievable, industrial expansion there is an acute shortage of housing, of labor, skilled and unskilled, and of farm help, skilled and unskilled. In fact, there is a crying demand for labor and help in almost every line of work. The undreamed-of wages being paid in defense industries are taking the farm help, the clerk from the store, the stenographer from the typewriter, the accountant from the desk, the maid from the household, and, last but not least, the teacher from the schoolroom.

Possibly the farm and the schoolroom are the hardest hit by this new change in the local economy. It is difficult, if not impossible, for the country school to compete with defense industries in the matter of wages. This condition has resulted in a dangerous scarcity of country school teachers. Most of these teachers are women. Some of them are married and managing their own households. They are willing, however, to do their part in the war effort and are answering the demand for teachers, but are so circumstanced in many cases that it is impossible for them to abandon their homes and their families and take up their abode in the vicinity of the country schoolhouse. In short, they are willing to assume the teaching responsibility, provided they are able to arrange transportation in some form from their homes to their schools.

Mr. Speaker, under present gasoline rationing regulations it is impossible for many of these teachers to continue with their work. Some way must be worked out to give them more gasoline. It is to this problem that I address these few remarks.

I am in receipt of a petition presented to me by Mrs. E. T. Armstrong, County Commissioner of Schools, Lenawee County, Michigan, which petition is also signed by other village and rural school teachers in the county, urging that the Washington regulations be changed so that the local rationing boards will have authority to meet the necessary transportation requirements of this group. The petition states the case clearly and is as follows:

We, the undersigned, in behalf of the teachers, do earnestly petition you and others in authority to make adjustment whereby teachers may be granted a C gasoline ration book when needed to cover the mileage required to transport them to and from their schools. It is necessary for many teachers to drive a distance requiring such a book if schools are to continue operating. Many of these teachers are married women who have taken the teaching position to relieve the teacher shortage and are maintaining a home. Others have an established home and for various reasons cannot stay in the community where they are teaching. There is neither bus nor train service. Cars are being shared wherever possible, and unnecessary driving is entirely eliminated.

It is not always possible to transport four or more riders since schools in rural communities and villages are more widely separated.

We are defense workers since we have organized and conducted paper, scrap iron, and rubber collections. We have issued rationing books and thousands of dollars worth of Defense stamps have been and are being sold through the schools. Also, we are doing Junior Red Cross work. Teachers must have the required gasoline to carry on this work.

We are contributing to the war effort and to the public welfare. Many Government officials have repeatedly stated that "education will shorten the distance to victory," that "education is the backbone of our military effort," and that "it would be criminal to make it impossible for our school teachers to carry on."

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this matter up with the Office of Price Administration and I am told that under existing regulations in order to receive additional gasoline these teachers must procure preferred-mileage cards, and these cards are only obtainable in their case:

(c) By a person for regularly transporting four or more pupils, students, teachers, or school employees to or from regular places of study, provided that alternative means of transportation are not adequate.

Now, this regulation is all right if it can be complied with on the part of the teacher. On the other hand, it is practically impossible so far as application in many cases is concerned. Ofttimes the country teacher, to whom I have referred, resides in a city or village and is obliged to drive 10 or 20 miles into the country to the schoolhouse where she teaches. Obviously pupils are not going from the home of the teacher in the city to the country school where she is employed, where she is the sole teacher and, in many cases, the sole employee in carrying on the work of the school. It is not possible for the teacher, with her small car, to go about the community in the capacity of a school bus and gather up her students. It is just not practical and, unless this regulation can be changed to permit necessary gasoline for essential transportation of these teachers, then it is difficult to see how the schools are to continue to operate.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Office of Price Administration to comply with the petition of these school teachers and I am expressing the hope that, with former Senator Prentiss M. Brown at the head of the Office of Price Administration, these problems will be handled in a commonsense, practical way. Less red tape and more ordinary everyday horse sense in administration of rationing gasoline and other commodities will get results and do much to advance the war effort.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing an address delivered by Mr. Roberts, a member of the Industrial Commission of Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard a great deal about the shortage of fuel. For 14 days the newspapers have been telling us about the 24,000 miners in the hard-coal mines in Pennsylvania, who are on strike, and the mines which are shut down. That strike was brought about because the union slipped over another 50 cents a month dues on the miners. These men are striking against the imposition of additional dues. The result is we are not getting coal, and the people need the fuel. I ask the gentlemen on the majority side who are proposing to settle the problems of the world, what they are going to do about getting our people in America a little coal. I might say that they can do something about it if the administration will quit backing the union racketeers and politicians who bring about these strikes in return for their political support. What, may I ask the majority, are you going to do about it? When the House meets day after tomorrow I will drop in a bill which I think will do something about it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SHORTAGE OF FARM LABOR

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks, and also to include a letter addressed to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, the induction of essential farm workers into the military service is causing a shortage of farm labor in my district which threatens to affect seriously the production of food in our State. It seems to me that it should be possible to provide sufficient men for the armed forces without stripping the farms of workers who are just as essential to the war effort as those engaged in war plants. If present policies are continued we will soon be unable to supply either the armed forces or our allies with sufficient food products.

If the farmer is to increase food production in 1943, as the President has asked, we must do everything possible to aid and encourage him. Agriculture is the mainstay of this great Nation and I intend to devote my best efforts to promote the interests of the farmer.

I have received a communication from a farmer in my district who has tried

unsuccessfully to have two of his farm workers deferred from the draft. I submit it to the Congress because I believe the problem is one affecting all farmers everywhere, and that Congress may want to concern itself with a solution.

Louisiana's 28,000,000 acres of land consist of nearly every type of soil in the Western Hemisphere. Our State produces 95 percent of the sugarcane grown in the United States, and imports for refining many millions of tons of raw sugar. It leads the Nation in the production of rice. Our strawberries, oranges, and vegetables are nationally distributed and demanded and are valued at millions of dollars annually.

Louisiana is the fifth ranking State in the production of oil, having the largest oil refinery in the world. It ranks twenty-fifth in the production of cattle, and is one of the most important agricultural States in the Union, producing soybeans, oats, hay and the finest quality long staple cotton.

Louisiana is the sweetpotato capital of the United States.

This State possesses an inexhaustible supply of salt that is mined 99-percent pure. Its pine and cypress forests are the Nation's largest, giving her the rank of the second largest lumber-producing State.

From these figures it can be seen how important it is to retain on the farm sufficient persons to maintain food production. I hope that the letter I have received from Mr. M. J. Goudeau, Sr., of Melville, La., which I am going to quote in full, may receive the attention of the Agriculture Department, the Selective Service System, and the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. Goudeau writes as follows:

MELVILLE, LA., *January 8, 1943.*

Re Draft classification; essential farm labor.
Hon. Congressman HENRY D. LARCADE,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing action taken by our appeal boards on essential farm labor needed on my plantation. Please permit me to give you the status of the individuals on whose classification I filed an appeal giving them, the appeal board, all necessary information which they needed:

Anthony Ropplo is the son of one of my largest cane tenants. He is the only son that his father has who is physically able to help his father cultivate 24 acres of cane, 9 acres of cotton, and 24 acres of corn. This unit of land which is dependent solely upon this young man and his father takes care of this boy, his father, mother, a crippled brother who is paralyzed in one arm and leg, a grandmother of the boy who is in her eighties and 6 other sisters and brothers. He is the only one of the brothers who is physically able to aid his father in harvesting and cultivation of the above crops. I don't blame the predicament of the farms insofar as labor is concerned on the draft boards or appeal boards, but I do insist that something should be done immediately if the President's wishes pertaining to an increase in food production for the year 1943 are going to be reached.

Clinton Boyd works for me the following acreage of crops: 7 acres of cane, 7 acres of cotton and 7 acres of corn. He lives with his widowed mother and two little sisters and two little brothers, all of which are too young to aid him in the cultivation and harvesting of these crops and acreages. In addition, he works for me by the day working corn. He is the type of farm labor that is used the year around. He is what is known as an essential farm hand.

I would appreciate your taking up this type of problem with the Secretary of Agriculture. If something isn't done, the calling of our farm labor is going to hinder the agriculture and farming setup to the point where it will be impossible to produce what we produced in 1942, much less increase our production. To give you an example what may farm produced in 1942: I raised over 5,000 tons of cane, which converted into sugar is 800,000 pounds, and 400 bales of cotton, which converted into its by-products, cottonseed, means 400,000 pounds of cottonseed from which cooking oils, dairy feeds, and so forth are made. With the drafting of our farm labor I can assure you that the above yields will be less by at least 20 to 25 percent for the year 1943.

Thanking you in advance for your efforts which have always been an interest in your country's welfare and future, I beg to remain,

Yours very truly,

M. J. GOUDEAU, Sr.
(Farmer of 1,500 acres of land).

## ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address delivered by me last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## THE LATE WILLIAM R. EATON

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and great sorrow that I announce to the House the death of William R. Eaton of Denver, Colo., who departed this life in Denver on December 16, 1942. Mr. Eaton served two terms in this House, representing the First Congressional District of Colorado, having been elected to the Seventy-first Congress in 1928, and reelected to the Seventy-second Congress in 1930. He passed away on his sixty-fifth birthday.

Mr. Eaton was the nephew of our beloved and distinguished colleague from New Jersey, CHARLES A. EATON. He was born in Canada on December 17, 1877. He had lived in Colorado 61 years, having been educated in the public schools of Denver and graduated from Denver University in 1909 with a law degree. In his early youth he was employed in a Denver bank and also in the mercantile business.

He had a long and brilliant record in public life. In 1909 he was named deputy district attorney for the city and county of Denver. He served two terms in the Colorado State Senate from 1915 to 1926. In 1915 he was one of the sponsors of the Colorado State Workmen's Compensation law which is still in effect.

As a Member of this House, Mr. Eaton was a tireless and energetic worker. He served on the Public Lands Committee and was always interested in problems of the West. He advocated the enlargement of Fitzsimons General Hospital in Denver and was largely responsible for its establishment as a permanent military institution. He advocated an increased coinage of silver and the substitution of silver dollars for $1 currency. He was opposed to the repeal of prohibition, which was largely responsible for his defeat as a candidate for reelection in 1932.

On his retirement to private life, Mr. Eaton resumed the practice of law in Denver, but continued his interest in local, State, and National politics. He was a member of the American, Denver, and Colorado Bar Associations, the International Law Association, the National Association for Constitutional Government, the Colorado State Historical Society, and the Sons and Daughters of the Pilgrims. He was a thirty-second degree Mason. He served in the Spanish-American War and was a first lieutenant in the First Cavalry Squadron of the Colorado National Guard.

Mr. Eaton lead an active and useful life. The esteem in which he was held in Denver is best attested by the representative group attending his funeral. The Rose Croix service was held in the Colorado Consistory Cathedral, and the leading business and professional men of Denver, as well as the Governor of Colorado and other State and city officials, were present to pay their last tribute to our former colleague.

Mr. Speaker, on the passing of Mr. Eaton Colorado has lost one of her most illustrious citizens and I have lost a true friend.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad duty for me to appear before you for the purpose of paying tribute to a very near and dear relative of mine who was a Member of this House for two sessions, our distinguished friend and colleague, William Robb Eaton, of Denver. He spent 61 of the 65 years of his life in Denver. He grew up with the city. He had a natural gift for business, was associated in an important industry with his father, and in a bank when he was a lad, and when the Eaton industry was disposed of he went into business for himself.

When I was living in Cleveland he came to visit me. I had not seen him from the time he was born, and I was so impressed with his ability, with his knowledge, and with his grasp of the conditions of American life that I urged him to give up the business he was founding, go into the University of Denver and study law. He took my advice. Later on he took my advice again and went into politics. He was a prodigious worker, a great master of detail, an honorable, high-class, Christian gentleman with whom it is a privilege to claim relationship, and I want to express on behalf of myself and my family, which is pretty large and widely scattered, our deep sense of loss in his going.

I happen to be the youngest of 11 children. I had three nephews all near my

own age. One of them is a brilliant lawyer in Boston, another is a distinguished financier—the only one in the family—in Cleveland; Billy was our lawyer representative in the West. It was my humble function to complete the quartet.

William Robb Eaton served nobly in this body as he did in every undertaking with which he was associated. Now that he has gone to his eternal reward he has joined that beloved company of my family who are nearly all over there. I hope that I may live during the rest of my days as worthily as he did. To his devoted and accomplished wife I join my colleagues in extending our heartfelt sympathy in her irreparable loss.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. We Members on the Democratic side who served with Mr. Eaton certainly wish to join in expressing our profound sorrow at his untimely passing away. He was a Christian gentleman, a patriotic American, and a most worthy man.

Every Member on this side of the House who knew him as your humble servant knew him, feel his death as a personal loss.

Mr. EATON. I appreciate that coming from my distinguished friend and thank him on behalf of the family.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I learn of the death of William R. Eaton, of Denver. I shall never forget the assistance and help he gave to me as a new member in the Colorado Legislature in 1925, my first term. He was willing to help young men, always willing to do his best to help on any problem that faced the legislature. Later, when I needed more information, no friend of mine, political or otherwise, gave me better advice than William R. Eaton. Certainly, Colorado has lost one of its finest citizens, and this Nation of ours has suffered a real loss in the death of our beloved friend, William R. Eaton.

To his wife and friends in Denver, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay my humble respects to the memory of my late friend the former Congressman William Robb Eaton. Our friendship began 25 years ago, when Billy Eaton was serving in the Colorado Senate, and I was first elected to the Colorado House of Representatives. Following this, we served two terms together in the senate, and a few years later, in 1929, he came to the National House of Representatives and served two terms in this body.

No one could serve with Billy Eaton without becoming imbued with his breezy, energetic, and friendly personality. He had many of the qualities that have made his uncle, Dr. CHARLES A. EATON, of New Jersey, so greatly beloved by his colleagues in and out of Congress. Billy began his career as a banker, then spent 10 years as a merchant, in addition to serving in the Spanish-American War, before taking up the study and practice of law. This gave him a background that assured a successful career as a practicing attorney in the city of Denver, Colo.

His untimely death at the age of 65 was a great shock to his friends as well as his family. Only last summer he was in Washington on business and called upon many of his friends in and out of Congress. We spent several hours reminiscing over the quarter century that had passed since we first met and the many changes that had occurred both in the world and in our own ideas during that period. We need men like Billy Eaton these days, and we who knew him best will miss him most.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] may address the House for 10 minutes, and that I too may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for tomorrow. In view of the fact the House will not be in session tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WE CAN HAVE ALL THE GASOLINE AND RUBBER WE WANT TO EQUIP OUR FIGHTING FORCES NO MATTER WHAT THE SIZE OF THE ARMY AND NAVY AND AIR FORCE—WE CAN HAVE ALL THE GASOLINE AND RUBBER WE WANT TO KEEP UP PRODUCTION, IF THIS GOVERNMENT WILL WAKE UP AND USE THE LIGNITE DEPOSITS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there is some compelling reason why I asked for 15 minutes of the time of this House on this occasion. This session is just starting, and the Seventy-eighth Congress finds the situation about as follows:

First. We are engaged in a world conflict not of our own choosing.

Second. We are drafting and equipping seven and one-half million men to fight on the front lines, and it takes 40,000,000 to service these seven and one-half million. The last-named seven and one-half million will be engaged in nothing but actual fighting, while the 40,000,000 will be engaged in nothing but making the machines of destruction, transporting and servicing them. We cannot change our figures if we are to equip a fighting force of this size.

Third. These forty-seven and one-half million people cannot take part in the production of the most important item in sustaining a fighting force—namely, production of food. Fifty million people should be engaged in that enterprise if we are to supply this huge fighting force with food, and if we are to supply, as well, those who are producing the food and transporting it, those who are making the machines and transporting them. The Selective Service Act has exacted such a heavy toll from the food-producing areas that in 1943 we will not have labor enough for necessary food production.

Fourth. No fighting force of seven and one-half or 10,000,000 men can be sustained in machines and food unless we are able to produce at home. Too much attention has been paid to the mere numbers drafted instead of a fully balanced program of gearing our production to our war and civilian needs. It is idle to say that we cannot build a fighting force of seven and one-half million men. We can double that if we have to; but in order to do that—or maintain what we have now started out to do—we must recognize, first of all, that all these forces—fighting, building, and food production—must be kept coordinated. Neither of these three elements can be built up at the expense of the other two.

Going into the situation more in detail, we are advised that we are running into a shortage of oil. We had supposed that gasoline was being rationed because it would save rubber, but now the facts are coming to light. The gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman DISNEY, who was raised in the oil fields and is the best authority in the House on oil, makes these statements in a speech before the Congress on December 16. He said:

> Now that we have completed the first year of our participation in the war, we can measure the extent of our further participation. Mr. Speaker, from the facts I have been able to ascertain, unless the present trend is reversed, we will within a year face a serious and certain shortage of petroleum supply to meet the necessary demands upon us to maintain the war for a long period of time. The statistics prove this statement.
>
> What figures I furnish you will be the most conservative estimates I have been able to get. Many opinions are expressed that the estimates I am giving are too liberal. It is estimated that our present demand for crude petroleum is 4,218,000 barrels per day and that our present production of oil is 3,824,000 barrels, according to the American Petroleum Institute report of December 9, 1942.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is conservatively estimated that our demands will be increasing during the coming year to 4,670,000 barrels per day. It is hoped that the supply from all sources can be increased to 4,452,000 barrels per day. This optimistic statement is taken from a report to the Petroleum Industry War Council. I have found no one who will seriously even contend that we can reach and maintain that rate of production of oil produced and delivered. Even if it were reached and maintained, we would still be drawing on our above-ground stocks at the rate of 213,000 barrels per day.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The Congress must not follow the disastrous error in the war program that has already appeared with relation to other essential materials. The story of rubber is not the only one that marks bureaucratic bungling in its worst aspects. The executive department has been given complete authority to carry on this war by the Congress. Personally, I do not intend, as a Member of this House, to take the responsibility, nor do I want to have any colleague share it, for

the petroleum situation to be a byword and a hissing as the rubber situation now is in America.

* * * * *

Our production program for building a great army, for expanding our Navy, for insuring supremacy in the air, has reached stupendous proportions. It continues to grow. As time progresses we are becoming more proficent in the production of every element necessary to our war effort. Every element save one—nothing has been done by our Government to encourage the increasing of our petroleum production and delivery.

* * * * *

Estimates from reliable sources—Congressman COLE'S report to the President—indicate that before this year is over we will have a demand for 5,000,000 barrels of petroleum per day. This is beyond any possible estimate of production from our present ability to produce and deliver petroleum.

Mr. Speaker, this is the situation now at a time when we have nowhere neared our goal in air or land power. The machines necessary to achieve this goal have to have oil to operate in actual war, and about four times that amount in training the men to operate them. No man can step into a bomber and effectively operate it unless he is trained to do so. This takes oil. Instead of looking forward to using less oil we must face the fact that we need 40 to 50 percent more oil per month than we have ever used before. This statement cannot be refuted.

The question then arises, Where are we going to get this oil increase? There are only three places where the oil can be forthcoming. First, we can drive the Japs out of the East Indies, but it will take some time to do it. Second, we can subsidize wildcat oil wells and make new discoveries; this will take time. Third, we can take no chances at all and get all the oil we want if we will develop the lignite coal fields of North Dakota, Wyoming, and Texas.

In North Dakota alone there are surveyed deposits of lignite coal amounting to the stupendous figures of 600,000,000,000 tons, which far exceeds the brown coal deposits of Europe and Asia combined.

What can be made from this great reservoir of the sun?

Electricity, coal, coal tar derivatives for conversion into synthetic oil, rubber, and high explosives—everything known to service a war machine.

How much oil can be manufactured from a ton of lignite?

The United States Bureau of Mines' chemists, in 1941 took around 30 samples of coal from the Beulah and Velva mines in North Dakota and found that lignite as mined—undried—would produce from 35 to 40 tons of oil from 100 tons of coal; and from 100 tons of moisture-free coal would produce 55 to 60 tons of oil.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Because of the interest in the subject and the gentleman having referred to a document of the United States Bureau of Mines, I should like to add at this point that a subcommittee of the Committee on Mines and Mining held hearings at which officials not only of the United States Bureau of Mines but noted scientists and others appeared in support of the contention the gentleman is making. Those hearings have been printed, and I would advise those individuals of Congress who are especially interested to read that document also.

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

As mined, therefore, North Dakota has a potential oil capacity of 2,250,000,000 tons of oil. In each ton of oil there are approximately 7 barrels. It is estimated by the best authorities that our present needs require 4,218,000 barrels per day. Suppose that we have to increase this need to 5,905,000 barrels per day—which would be a 40-percent increase to keep more tanks and more bombers going. We would have oil enough in North Dakota to serve the war machine geared to full capacity as well as the civilian population, including every line of business operating at full capacity, for a period of over 76 years. And remember that North Dakota is not the only State with lignite deposits. We should finish the war by that time with no oil shortage.

How fast can we produce this oil?

For the past 3 years the coal production in North Dakota has been about 3,000,000 tons annually. Of North Dakota's 100 mines only 52 are mass-production mines—that is they are mined by the use of power shovels and excavator draglines. In other words, strip mining. At present only daily shifts have been used, and by increasing working hours to take care of 3 shifts, production could easily be raised to 10,000,000 tons. This estimate is based on what can be done in the mines of North Dakota without any additional machinery. In other words, North Dakota is ready to produce at once—right now—28,000,000 barrels of oil annually. We can do that without any help from the Government outside of processing plants. When we add to that mass production from Government-operated plants more strippers, more men, more process plants, a blind man can see that we have the answer to the oil question.

How cheaply can this coal be produced?

Under our small system now in use in North Dakota, the strip mines sell coal at the mine for $1.35 per ton. Mass production on a large scale would greatly reduce even this price.

Under our present system in North Dakota, the average output per man is 33 tons per day. With increased and improved machinery, this too could be increased.

There is not any guesswork about these estimates. For example, the Truax-Traer Coal Co., Minot, N. Dak., operating 3 open strip mines with 200 men and a dozen shovels at 1 shift per day, produced in 1940, 757,250 tons of coal, with an average output per man of 33 tons.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have visited some of the North Dakota coal mines, and as I recall they have veins of coal 18 feet thick. The ash content of that coal is very low. It burns up about as clean as oak wood.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman is correct. Instead of digging in the earth as they do in Wales for this coal, they strip off the earth and expose the coal.

This was 10 times the production speed of Pennsylvania anthracite and 15 times the production speed of the deep mines of Wales. Comparing this production speed to that of France, which was 2 tons per day per man, we can very clearly see what France was up against in facing Germany. Just visualize what could be done by this 1 company for the defense of the United States if it were to employ 3,000 men in 3 daily shifts with shovels enough to keep them busy.

Another element of speed in turning these great mines into actual defense weapons is that four great railroad lines already run into and through this huge deposit of coal. They are the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific, the Soo Line, and the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Cos., with all their branches. They are all set waiting the command to go ahead.

If 10 percent of the men now employed in the alphabetical bureaus in the United States and in the rationing program were released, we could not only man these mines but have a big quota for enlistment purposes. With the development of this potential source of oil the need for rationing would soon disappear. If 10 percent of our huge taxes—and they will be much higher—was shifted to mining the necessities of war, where there is absolutely no gamble, we would not be worried about keeping our armies equipped.

It is estimated that we are using about 100,000 persons at an expense of $200,000,000 annually to carry out our rationing program. Suppose we did not have to ration gasoline, engine oil, fuel oil, and explosive ingredients. You can see what a horde of workers could be turned loose to mine in abundance the very things we now must ration.

Hitler is no superman, but there must be some secret to the power he demonstrates. When an army can invade a thousand miles of Russian territory in a few weeks there is more than a Hitler to the story. The story is told in coal. The brown coal of Europe is very similar to our own lignite, though inferior in quality and in quantity. In 1922 Germany was producing 100,000,000 tons of brown coal and processing it into oil, rubber, and explosives. In 1933, when Hitler came to power, this production was increased to 180,000,000 tons. By 1937 even this production was doubled, and while there are now no definite figures on present production, we do know that Germany grabbed 5,000,000 tons of annual output from Austria, 18,000,000 tons from Czechoslovakia, 30,000,000 tons from Poland, 35,000,000 tons from Holland, 40,000,000 tons from Belgium and France, 50,000,000 tons from Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Besides this, Hitler has control of most of the coal of the Ukraine, and has converted two-thirds of the grand total of the coal of Europe to his war machine.

Germany is operating these mines by the gas-shovel process and has gone into mass production, and is able to produce 20 tons per man per day, while France was producing only 2 tons per man per day. These great European coal deposits furnish coal, oil, rubber, and explosives that have given the German war machine its tremendous power. Germany has been unconcerned about gasoline and rubber because she produces all her needs from the rich coal beds of Europe, which, taken altogether, does not equal 10 percent of the coal deposits in North Dakota alone. And remember that South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and Texas also have vast fields of lignite. If the Allies generate power enough to drive Hitler out of his conquered territory, the war is as good as won. Germany, by herself, does not have enough coal to feed Hitler's war machine.

Let us see where Japan gets her power to operate her war machine. It is the common impression that after having overrun the East Indies, Japan came into great oil power. There is no question but what she did, but outside of that Japan has planned to supply herself in fuel, oil, rubber, and explosives. If the people of the United States were familiar with the monthly bulletins of the Bureau of Mines for the years 1935 to 1940, inclusive, we would have known what Japan was doing and was intending to do. For 7 successive years, as shown by these scientific bulletins, Japan has been installing, first small-scale laboratory plants, and then larger ones; then industrial plants for the conversion of the lignite reserves of Japan, Manchuria—Manchukuo—and Korea. German scientific processes were installed and the result was that oil, rubber, and explosives were produced in abundance. Japan would have had no dream of mastering the Pacific had it not been for this discovery of unlimited coal resources that would feed a war machine.

President Wilson saw the possibility of the value of our coal deposits from our experience in the last war. The United States Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines went to work to determine definitely the extent of our coal and peat deposits, and then analyzed them. We have that information before us and yet, thus far, we have shut our eyes to the situation.

There is no other way in which I can bring this matter to the attention of the Government and the people than to explain it fully here on the floor of the Congress. While I have very little to do about the administration's war policy, or any other policy, yet I do represent a great State—in part—loyal to the core, ready and willing to do its part under any plan. It seems to the citizens of my State, however, a most strange thing that those in authority do not immediately see the great stores of vital materials resting almost undisturbed in North Dakota's soil. The people of North Dakota do not understand a forced scarcity, when they know there is plenty. It took time—about 500,000,000 years—to produce this lignite, but we hope its strategic value will be recognized in a lesser period of time. Dire necessity, bringing suffering, losses in property and lives, will eventually drive us to the use of this powerful weapon, but why wait until this condition arises? There is some excuse for a blind man who says he cannot see, but there is no excuse for those who are blessed with the sense of sight and will not see. Right here—right now—we are in possession of the greatest fighting power on the face of the earth. Shall we pass it by? If we do, the people of this country will want to know why. Do we want to continue this war short-handed and be responsible for the killing of millions of young men, when we can, by the use of supreme power, end the war quickly? Seven and one-half million men under arms sounds big, but it means nothing unless they are equipped with the best fighting material on earth—material that will match their patriotism and sacrifice.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I have under unanimous-consent request permission to speak tomorrow. Due to the fact that the House is to recess over tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 20 minutes to address the House at the conclusion of other special orders on the calendar for today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

## PAY-AS-YOU-GO INCOME-TAX PLAN

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the kindness of the House in granting me this time to discuss what I believe to be a very urgent tax problem. No one can study our tax structure without reaching the conclusion that the personal income-tax debt of our citizens has become a danger. Our income-tax law is the basis of a sound and stable government. It is based on the sound philosophy of "ability to pay." That is, it was based on that sound philosophy in 1913 when it was first approved by our Nation. Theoretically that principle holds true today, but from a practical standpoint I am not so certain that it will stand analysis.

In 1913 when the Federal income-tax law was approved by this Nation it had one defect which seemed of no practical consequence, but since that time has become of great importance. This defect was that a citizen was required to pay in the year 1914 a tax on his 1913 income. In this way we got started on a vicious practice of paying out of 1 year's income a tax on the income of a year that had already gone. It is true that for many years this made very little difference. In 1913 the rates began at 1 percent and the top rate, including the normal and surtax, was 7 percent. Exemption for a single person was $3,000. A study of the Revenue Act of 1942 reveals the startling growth of the income-tax rates and great reduction in exemptions.

Under the present law a single person is entitled to an exemption of $500 with rates beginning at 19 percent and from that point moving up sharply to 88 percent. In addition to this the 1942 Revenue Act carries a victory tax of 5 percent with an exemption of $624. I believe everyone agrees that this rapid increase in the personal income-tax burden is a national problem. This problem was recognized by the Treasury in the last session of Congress. They submitted various relief proposals to the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee during consideration of the 1942 Revenue Act.

Many economists and tax authorities have offered various proposals to get our taxes on a current basis. One of the original sponsors of a pay-as-you-go tax plan and an outstanding tax authority in the United States, Mr. Beardsley Ruml, of New York City, has proposed a plan that has received Nation-wide attention. It is commonly referred to as the Ruml plan. His proposal was used as a basis for the legislation I have introduced in this session of Congress as House Joint Resolution 17.

During the past few weeks I have spent considerable time studying a number of pay-as-you-go tax proposals. I can definitely state that in my opinion just criticism can be leveled at any or all of them. It was after this study and research that I have reached the conclusion that the Ruml plan offers the best solution to our current tax problem. It was with this thought in mind that I introduced House Joint Resolution 17. It is my intention to discuss this legislation fairly and frankly. It involves no legerdemain. Before proceeding I want to say that I am deeply indebted to Mr. Ruml for the study and material he has prepared on this pay-as-you-go tax proposal. It is being largely used as a basis for my statement today.

My studies convince me there are only two methods of getting the taxpayer on a current basis; first, we can advance the tax payments 1 year, or, in other words, move the tax clock ahead. Secondly, we can collect 2 years' taxes in 1 year or over a period of years. There are legitimate objections to either of these plans. I contend, however, that the problem is so great that Congress should immediately study the various proposals and secure enactment of a pay-as-you-go tax program before March 15, 1943, when the next quarterly installment of income tax is due.

Unfortunately, many citizens have been led to believe that if the Ruml tax plan is approved, they will be relieved of their immediate tax liability. That is not correct. This bill does but one thing, and that is move the tax clock of the Nation ahead 1 year. It makes your taxes current by providing that the taxes you pay this year shall be in discharge of this year's income to liability.

First, I am going to discuss the definite need for this tax legislation. Few people realize how much money they owe the Government for income taxes for 1942. There seems to be a prevailing impression that when you pay your quarterly income-tax payments everything is paid until the taxes for the next quarter are

due, or at least they assume they are not in debt to the Federal Government. This is an erroneous impression. The facts are that every citizen is indebted to the Federal Government for last year's taxes until they are fully paid and more than that, he is indebted to the Federal Government for the accrued taxes due in the year in which he is paying income taxes. This tax indebtedness is a threat to the solvency of our Federal Budget and a millstone around the neck of the taxpayer.

The income tax debt is the meanest kind of debt there is because it hurts people when they are in trouble. We can keep on paying our income taxes as long as we have an income which is not decreased during the next year. In fact, with higher income taxes from year to year, salary and income must be on a substantial increase. The income tax debt hurts most when sickness strikes, when a shift of employment reduces your salary, or when you have lost your regular income.

This past year has resulted in a changed income status for millions of our citizens. I shudder to think what will occur when we must shift from wartime production to peacetime economy. Certainly no one believes we can make this shift without financial shock to a large portion of our population.

In 1940 there were 3,896,435 income-tax-payers; in 1941 there were 7,437,307; in 1942 there were 16,760,865. On the first day of January 1943, under the Revenue Act of 1942, there were 27,200,000 taxpayers in debt to the Federal Government for taxes on their 1942 income, an increase of 23,300,000 since 1940. In other words, our Government is a creditor to some 27,000,000 taxpayers who are in debt for the taxes on their 1942 income. It is my thought that we cannot afford to continue this shaky system of income-tax collections when we can adopt a pay-as-you-go tax plan without substantial loss of revenue.

If the pay-as-you-go tax plan is approved all these income-tax payers will be income-tax debt free. They will be on a current basis. As our taxpayers receive their income they will pay their current income taxes.

As our war production expands and our Nation increases its Federal expenditures for the prosecution of this war, it becomes even more necessary to make immediate plans to take care of this income-tax debt It is estimated that our national income for the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, may reach $125,000,000,000. The Federal Government during that period plans on spending about $90,000,000,000.

When the war ends, this Federal spending will most certainly drop to at least $20,000,000,000 annually. It is estimated that during the present fiscal year 30,000,000 of our citizens will be directly connected with our war effort. Twenty million of them will be employed in war industry, and 10,000,000 will be in the armed forces. No doubt at least 15,000,000 of those so engaged will have to find other work. During this transition period it is reasonable to assume that these millions of employable people will be forced to live on their unemployment insurance. This means that their taxes incurred on a high wage level will have to be paid largely from social-security benefits. This year the farmers of our Nation are going to be the recipient of an abnormal income. Present indications are that it will reach $15,000,000,000. This is the largest percent of the national income the farmers have ever received. Bountiful harvests and fair prices have brought this about. One must assume that this abnormally high income will not continue. The agricultural sections of our Nation have in the past and will, no doubt, in the future suffer from droughts and greatly reduced production. This, together with low prices, will very materially affect the farmers' income. Anyone familiar with agriculture knows these conditions will reoccur. Every fair-minded person knows also that the farmers will be unable to pay high income taxes during periods of drought and low prices unless tax payments are current. Provision must be made to take care of the income-tax liability of the citizen who will be affected by this post-war transition. It is imperative that Congress take immediate action.

I now propose to discuss House Joint Resolution 17 which, if approved, would place into effect the Ruml pay-as-you-go income-tax plan. As I have said, I expect to discuss it frankly and fairly. There are some provisions in it I do not like but am convinced it is the best plan offered so far.

This plan is to be applied to individuals and not corporations. It is my intention to discuss the proposed plan under headings and with permission from the Chair I shall insert at the conclusion of my remarks a detailed analysis of the bill.

The plan provides:

First. Skipping a year to begin 1943 on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Second. Provides for monthly income tax payments.

Third. Making our income tax returns on a tentative basis with a year-end adjustment.

Fourth. Giving relief provisions for those whose income varies from year to year.

Fifth. Giving fair treatment to all taxpayers under the plan, starting the new year on a current basis for everyone.

The first question is now to get our personal income taxes on a current basis without paying 2 years' taxes in 1 year. Mr. Ruml says the answer is as simple as daylight saving. This bill proposes to turn our tax clock ahead 1 year. In other words, the taxpayer's personal income tax liability for 1942 becomes his tax liability for the year 1943.

The question naturally arises in everyone's mind as to how we can drop an income tax year out of the calendar in this way without having the Treasury lose a lot of money badly needed for the war effort. The answer is that we shall all go along paying our income taxes as we have before, except they will be on a current basis. The Treasury will also go along getting its revenues.

Unfortunately, many of our people have been led to believe that by setting the tax clock ahead 1 year they would not be obligated for payment of current taxes. Everyone must realize that our Federal Treasury must have more tax revenue, not less tax revenues. I would be the last person to suggest that any plan be proposed which would threaten the solvency of our Federal Government. This bill protects our Federal Treasury. The big difference between proposed and existing tax collections is that when a taxpayer dies he does not owe the tax as he does under the present system. The only reduction that is possible under the proposed bill is when the taxpayer's income ceases or declines. The reduction is therefore spread over the whole lifetime of the present income-tax-paying generation, and occurs beneficially for each taxpayer at the time when his income fails. The Treasury has at no time ever considered taxes receivable as an asset, and accordingly they can be written off the balance sheet of the Government without the change of a single penny.

The tax experts estimate that the rate of loss to the Government by such means would be so slow that 35 years would pass before a total sum equal to 1 year's income-tax revenue from the whole country would be dropped out of the Treasury's anticipated revenue.

The second point is that the loss of revenue in any case would be partially offset by better tax collections and collection methods.

This bill, if approved, would provide for monthly income-tax collections. I contend this would be to the advantage of the Treasury as well as a large portion of our income-tax payers. The tax collections would also receive the benefit through estate taxes of part of what otherwise would have been payable as income taxes.

At the present time tax collections are important as a part of the anti-inflation control, and the point has been raised that this method of advancing tax collections might have an inflationary effect by releasing funds set aside for last year's tax liability. I doubt this very much, as there are comparatively few people who make provision in advance to take care of their income-tax payments. These people who do are not spendthrifts and are not the type who would go out into the open market and spend their money promiscuously.

The current tax collections might have a wholesome effect on inflationary tendency because our people would be required to pay their taxes from current income. The Revenue Act of 1942 carries a provision for a Victory tax which was enacted by Congress to siphon off excess purchasing power in addition to furnishing needed revenue.

The third point in the pay-as-you-go income-tax plan is designed to solve the problem of how we can pay our income taxes on a current basis, when we do not know at the beginning of a year what our income is going to be in that year. The way of solving this problem is not too difficult. We will go ahead as we do today, filing an income-tax schedule

about the 15th of March, declaring our previous year's income. But this will be a tentative return for the year then beginning and we will pay our current taxes on the basis of this tentative return. After the year had ended there would have to be an adjustment up or down, depending on whether our actual income for the year was greater or less than that on our tentative return. But this adjustment would be made on the same blank and at the same time as our return for the following year. This return would be at one time the final return for the old year and the tentative return for the new. There would be no doubling of returns involved and only a few extra lines for the adjustment computations.

The fourth feature of the plan is the provision for relief in case a taxpayer knows his income in the current year is going to be less or greater than that of the year of his tentative declaration. The plan provides that he may declare his true knowledge of lower or higher income, as a result of salary changes, and so forth, which have actually occurred, and make his current payments accordingly. This provision eliminates the awkwardness of year-end adjustments and keeps the plan closer to a true pay-as-you-go basis than it would otherwise be.

The fifth point about the pay-as-you-go income tax plan is that it proposes to give fair treatment to all taxpayers under the plan. This means to skip a tax year for all alike in every bracket and start the whole country debt free as far as the personal income tax is concerned.

The Treasury has proposed a modified plan which would apply to the full tax debt of some taxpayers and to only a part of the tax debt of the rest. Concretely, the Treasury proposed that the tax year be skipped for only the normal tax and the lowest bracket rate of surtax—that is, a total of 10 percent—and that the balance of the tax debt remaining should be paid over the next 2 years—this, in addition to current income taxes that will be payable in those years. The Treasury concedes that this would leave between 10 and 20 percent of our taxpayers still owing the Government for taxes on their last year's income. This group of 10 to 20 percent includes practically all the administrative, technical, and professional men and women who need freedom from income-tax debt danger as much as anyone else.

Quite apart from the question as to who is included or excluded, or for how much, I personally favor as a matter of principle the over-all application of the pay-as-you-go plan for eliminating tax debt, giving all taxpayers the same treatment under the plan.

These are my reasons: For those in the lower brackets, the plan will obviously have far-reaching beneficial results since unfortunate circumstances of loss of income will not be doubly unfortunate because of last year's debt.

For those in the middle brackets, the plan will eliminate countless personal and family tragedies, free many able citizens for public service, and step up the efficiency of American industry by making possible the retirement and pensioning of executives who are holding on, largely to pay their income tax, and never catching up.

For those in the upper brackets, it will make much less practical difference than might appear. First, because like anybody else, as long as they have their income, they continue to pay their taxes; and, second, because when they die, what would otherwise have been paid as income tax on the taxpayer's previous year's income is subject to estate taxes in his highest brackets.

But apart from the practical considerations, the reason I favor over-all application of the principle is because it gives fair treatment to all tax-payers under the plan. In adopting pay-as-you-go, by skipping a year, I believe we should treat all citizens alike. As we turn the tax clock ahead for some, we should turn it ahead for all, and get the whole Nation out of income-tax debt by the beginning of 1943.

The true significance of the pay-as-you-go plan is that it denies the applicability of last year's income as a criterion either of current wealth or of income presently to be received; and therefore rejects the use of last year's income as a basis of taxation according to ability to pay. The plan involves not only the elimination of income-tax debt; basically it involves a change in the criterion of ability to pay.

I stated at the beginning of this discussion that I would discuss this bill frankly and fairly. Some objections have been offered to it and I want to mention them briefly, as I believe every legislative proposal must stand on its own merits. So far as I know, no bill has ever been introduced that was perfect. It is only by constructive criticism that we adjust varying viewpoints on legislative proposals.

One objection that has been offered to this bill is its administrative difficulty. I challenge that point. The return you file at the beginning of the taxable year is your tentative tax liability for that year. Any adjustment of either underpayment or overpayment of taxes is made in the return at the beginning of the next taxable year.

The second objection is the windfall problem. There is some merit to this criticism, but I am convinced a thorough study of the entire tax structure will convince anyone that fair treatment for all taxpayers is more important in a democracy than trying to penalize a few individuals who were fortunate enough to receive increased incomes during the previous year. This is a problem that I hope will receive the serious consideration of the Ways and Means Committee, and I am certain that my views will prevail.

A third criticism is that it is wrong to cancel a debt. I do not generally approve of the cancelation of debts. In fact, I grew up in a school where once an obligation was contracted it should be paid in full.

I do not admit that this proposal provides for a cancelation of debt in a true sense. The fact is that we started off on the wrong foot when we measured current tax liabilities by last year's income and thereby placed the taxpayer in debt to his Government. We now propose to get on the right foot by measuring this year's tax by this year's income.

It is true that a taxpayer under this plan is not in debt to his Government for last year's taxes. However, he does not escape paying income taxes, but pays on the current year's income—not last year's. That is all it does.

Broadly speaking, what will the plan accomplish?

The pay-as-you-go income-tax plan is a three-way plan:

First of all, it is a plan that will relieve thousands of citizens from hardship and distress arising from income-tax debt, and that will bring peace of mind to millions more who are in income-tax-debt danger.

Second, it is a method for clearing the decks for an all-out war financing program. If we can all be free of income-tax debt on the first of 1943 we can start on a pay-as-you-go basis and stay there. If we need high, withholding taxes we can have them; if we need to supplement voluntary savings with compulsory savings, we can do that, too. But whatever is called for, it would be paid out of the current year's income as an assessment on the same year's income. We would not be paying for dead horses while we are fighting a war.

In the third place, the pay-as-you-go income tax plan is the best kind of financial planning for the post-war period. Our policies can then be forward looking not backward looking. We will not be trying to collect income taxes from people who are unemployed; we will not be debating whether we should collect taxes on 1941 or 1942 income from men demobilized from the armed forces. We will not have a spending spree in the first little boomlet, financed on unpaid taxes, and then a tax-debt headache if incomes should drop off for a year or so.

As a Nation of individuals we will be better able to meet the present and to attack whatever the future has in store for us if we are paid up in our income tax, and, being out of income-tax debt, can pay as we go out of what we earn.

I believe that the problem of tax debt must be solved in some manner. As I have pointed out, the problem is an intensely personal one affecting every taxpayer. The suggested solution offered in the pay-as-you-go plan gives relief to the taxpayer and yet does not embarrass the revenues. The pay-as-you-go plan may not be, in all its details, the very best solution, but it is the best that I and those with whom I have consulted have been able to devise. Whether the solution of the problem of income-tax debt takes the exact form suggested in the pay-as-you-go plan is not important; what is important is that the problem should be solved.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. There is one very tragic consequence that I think the gentleman's plan will correct. I have seen several instances recently where the

husband has died toward the end of the year. The result is now the widow faces the proposition of paying this heavy tax which practically bankrupts her or uses up the little that he has saved.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Does this plan apply to corporations or does it apply to individuals only?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. This bill applies only to personal-income-tax payers.

Mr. MICHENER. There has been quite a bit of discussion on the floor about this, and some Members are apparently opposed to the plan, because certain corporations making large war profits have set aside certain amounts of money to pay the 1942 tax. As I understand the gentleman's plan, the corporation tax would in no way be affected?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is absolutely correct. This, according to the Treasury, will affect about $7,600,000,000 of personal-income-tax payments. I think we might just as well discuss that a minute.

The statement is frequently made, and it is natural that it should be made, that by skipping a year's taxes the Federal Government is going to lose $7,000,000,000 immediately. That is not true. This spreads out over a generation of time; and, if we count as a generation 35 years and estimate $7,000,000,000 of personal-income-tax liability this year, it means $200,000,000 a year over 35 years. Is it not reasonable to assume that we can increase the tax collections much more than that by this proposed method of collection?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am very much in favor of the gentleman's proposal but I would like to find something out from him. At the beginning of his remarks he mentioned something about paying the last year's tax this year. Possibly I misunderstood the gentleman, but did the gentleman mean that the current income would be used as the basis for income-tax payment for 1943?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is correct. Your actual income tax liability for 1942 is the yardstick measuring your tentative tax liability for 1943, subject to adjustments that may occur during the year, which, of course, would be taken care of when you file your next return on or before the following March 15.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If that is the case, then there will not be a forgiveness of the 1942 tax because it in fact will be collected in 1943.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The word "forgiveness" is a very unfortunate word. We move the tax clock ahead 1 year. That is just exactly what we do. Taxpayers will continue making their payments as before, the only difference being that the payments would be treated as being in discharge of the 1943 tax liability, rather than the 1942 liability as at present.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I really think that the main objection has been the understanding that has gone out over the country that they are canceling the tax liability for 1 year.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I think that is correct. There is no cessation of tax payments into the Treasury.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it should be made plain, and I think the gentleman has done so, that the Treasury does not actually suffer any current dollar loss. Most people confuse the method by which the Treasury keeps books with the method by which an individual keeps books.

The Treasury does not carry an accounts receivable item on an amount owed it until the first tax payment is made in March. It is all income and outgo with the Treasury, and it is a matter of receipts. The receipts will not be diminished by this plan. On the contrary, they might well be accelerated.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I hesitate to take the gentleman's time because he has made this so clear that it ought to be apparent, but, as I understand, under the gentleman's plan, we will simply call the payment on the 1942 income a discharge of the liability on 1943 income?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM Will exemptions and deductions be computed in line with what the taxpayer would be entitled to in 1942, and apply just the same in 1943?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Then a man who died near the end of the year or who has no income in 1943 would naturally profit by it, and he would be about the only one who would profit by it?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. His tax liability would not hang over him or his estate after he had ceased to earn income. It would be discharged currently.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. First, may I ask the gentleman specifically, is this plan which has been referred to here in the colloquy the Ruml plan, or is it a plan of the gentleman's own as set forth in his bill?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. This is the Ruml plan put into bill form. It is not my own plan, except as I have made it so by introducing the bill. I have written into this plan a monthly tax collection which is not in the original Ruml plan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to definitely identify your bill as embracing the Ruml plan, because there will be much correspondence on this question, undoubtedly.

Second, does this plan, the Ruml plan as the gentleman has interpreted it, remove from me, an individual, my income-tax liability on income which I received in the year 1942?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Yes; in order that we may make 1943 payments apply to 1943 income, without any doubling up of 2 years' taxes in one. This will be done by moving the tax clock ahead 1 year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The reason I submit the question that way is that I know positively there are thousands of people in my district who assume that the Ruml plan—and this has been defined as the Ruml plan—will forgive them and remove from them the tax liability on their income for the year 1942.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. This plan does forgive last year's tax liability, but it uses your 1942 tax liability as the yardstick for your tentative 1943 income-tax payments and thereby makes your tax payments current, instead of always being 1 year in arrears.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me resubmit my question, if the gentleman will be patient with me. My question is this: Will this plan relieve me, an individual taxpayer, of my liability to the Government based upon the income I received in 1942?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. It will not relieve you of your current payments. It does relieve you of the 1942 tax debt, so that we can make tax payments current. Otherwise you would be collecting 2 years' taxes in 1 year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then, if the income tax which I pay in the calendar year 1943 under this Ruml plan is the tax liability against my income for 1942, at what point do I begin paying the income-tax liability to the Federal Treasury on the income I received in the calendar year 1943?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Under my bill, the tax you pay in 1943 will be on 1943 income. The year 1942 is dropped out of the picture except as it is used as a yardstick for measuring your tentative tax for the current year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am paying the 1943 income tax to the Treasury, assessed against my 1942 income in accordance with law, which says that I may pay it in 1943, but the liability runs against the 1942 income and not against 1943. Now, if under the plan I am permitted to pay 1942 tax liability, based on 1942 income, in the calendar year 1943, at what time do I pay my 1943 liability, assessed whenever it may be, against the 1943 income?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Your 1942 income-tax liability is your tentative 1943 income-tax liability. Adjustments may be made up or down for a substantial decrease or increase in your income.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 10 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the gentleman from New York that there are other special orders following this.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to impose myself upon the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas be given 10 additional minutes, with the consent of those having special orders following him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas be granted 10 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. PLOESER. I want to make this observation, that the 1942 income is not a liability, but is just a yardstick.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. PLOESER. By which to gage the basis on which you make payments until the 1943 liability can be established.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But if the taxpayer should become deceased, then his estate will find out that it is a liability.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Under my plan, there would be no tax debt hanging over a man's estate when he dies. His tax payments would be kept current with his income.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. If under the gentleman's plan the 1942 tax liability is payable monthly in 1943, would you also be paying in addition to the 1942 liability on the income monthly during 1943?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. No; you would not pay on the 1942 liability in addition to the 1943 liability.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. When would you pay on your 1943 income?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. In 1943. Adjustments can be made for any change in the taxpayer's status.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Assuming your taxes in 1942 under existing law amount to $1,000, can you pay this by monthly payments during 1943?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Under the present law your 1942 tax liability is due in 1943 on a quarterly basis. My bill provides for monthly payments.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is, if the 1942 income tax is $1,000, if a man owes the Government that amount for 1942 tax, when do you pay the 1943 tax?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The 1942 tax liability is dropped. You pay the 1943 tax out of 1943 income, in nine installments.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Let us take the case of a Member of Congress, where the income is a specific amount. Your liability for 1942 is so many dollars. In 1943 you have the same income; do you pay an increased amount for the 1943 income?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. You use your 1942 tax liability as a tentative yardstick for measuring your 1943 tax and pay according to whatever rates are currently applicable.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And the 1943 tax is paid in 1944?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. No; in 1943. The 1944 tax is paid in 1944. In other words, we make tax payments current.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. After the taxpayer has paid whatever tax may be assessed against him for 1943, plus such adjustment as may be made on account of a change in his income or circumstances over 1942, that will discharge his tax liability for both 1942 and 1943?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. REED of New York. If the gentleman will permit, let me make this comment. I think one of the great contributions which the gentleman has made here today is to let the country know that the people are not going to have their taxes due on March 15 forgiven under this plan, because already the letters are beginning to come in, in which people are very strong for the Ruml plan, but they ought to be made to understand right now that they are not going to be forgiven this tax.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for making that statement, because certainly everyone should know, particularly a Congressman, that we will have to have more revenue instead of less. The personal income-tax revenue will continue to flow into the Treasury as usual under my bill.

Mr. ARENDS. The point the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is trying to get at, assuming that the income of a Congressman is $10,000 and that the tax on the 1943 income is $1,200, is that then, instead of paying $1,200 on March 15, he will be able to make monthly payments of $100 a month during 1943.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Under my bill, provision is made for payment in nine equal installments, beginning with March 15.

Mr. TREADWAY. I suggest that some of these complicated questions that our colleagues are asking the gentleman from Kansas now will have to be eventually worked out in committee before any bill can be reported in regard to the Ruml idea.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is an excellent statement. I threw this into the hopper in order that we might get a discussion of the pay-as-you-go tax plan. I simply offer the plan as a basis for discussion, in order to get something tangible to work with.

Mr. TREADWAY. As I understand, the gentleman is not advocating any particular device; he is simply taking up a discussion of this question.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I merely brought this up for discussion.

Mr. TREADWAY. With the thought that the method under which it will be administered will be worked out later on.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I know that committee will have to work out whatever provisions are reported to the House, and I know they will be thoroughly considered. We have an excellent chairman and an excellent committee.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The only thing that is confused in my mind about the gentleman's statement was his reference to the change in the status of a taxpayer, that if for instance he were married in June some adjustment would be made. This, it seems to me, would lead to confusion because what would be done with regard to deductions for taxes paid on real estate or other things. It seems to me the status that should be maintained is the status the taxpayer had in 1942.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. My bill has a specific provision covering that point, covering change in marital status. There is no difficulty in making allowance therefor.

Mr. CASE. But suppose the individual has State taxes on real estate, or a State income tax; these are logical deductions, and they should be allowed on the basis of his 1942 status.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. They will be allowed in computing the 1943 liability, since the 1942 tax is used as a yardstick for measuring the tentative tax, and it, of course, makes allowance for such deductions.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Assuming there were no income-tax law on the statute books; if the Congress should pass the Ruml plan we should then be paying taxes in 1943 under the Ruml plan. Does the gentleman under his plan do substantially anything except that which is done under the Ruml plan?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. No; and I am sure that had Congress back in 1913 believed that there would ever have been any such condition as prevails at the present time they would have included that provision in the original income-tax law.

Mr. MICHENER. Their failure to do so is the cause of a lot of this confusion and this talk about allowances here and there; but if we start with that premise we are writing a new tax law for 1943 and are going to pay according to that law. Now, if this be true, the other conclusive point is, What becomes of the tax that is due under existing law?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That, of course, is the problem. I believe there are two ways of handling it: One, by moving the tax clock ahead; the second, by collecting 2 years' taxes in 1 year, or collecting the back liability over a number of years. My bill adopts the first method and drops out the 1942 liability.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Along the line of interrogation just pursued by the gentleman from Michigan, does it not clear up the confusion somewhat if one simply says

that the only purpose in using 1942 figures is to get a basis for making payments which can be adjusted later?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. HOPE. It is not paying the 1942 taxes, but simply taking 1942 income as a basis on which to make adjustment at a later date.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. As a matter of fact you have got to have something as a tentative tax base on January 1, 1943, and when you pay under this bill on 1943 income you pay at the 1943 tax rate.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Under the gentleman's bill would losses occuring in 1942 be deductible, for example, fire loss?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I do not believe I understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Suppose the gentleman's bill were passed and became law, would losses occurring during the calendar year 1942 be deductible? For instance, I suffered a fire loss. Would I be able to deduct that in computing my tax?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The usual deductions would be allowed.

Under leave granted by the House, I am including the following detailed explanation of provisions of House Joint Resolution 17.

DETAILED EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS

The first section of the bill states that the bill may be cited as the "Current Payment of Individual Income Tax Act 1943." It also contains two technical provisions, one of which is merely a drafting device to avoid repetition of the words Internal Revenue Code throughout the bill, and the other of which provides that terms used in the bill are to have the same meaning as when used in the Internal Revenue Code.

RELIEF FROM 1942 TAX

To enable individual taxpayers to get their tax payments in 1943 on a current basis, it is necessary to consider the payments made in 1943 as payments on account of the 1943 tax. Thus section 2 of the bill provides that payment of the amount which without regard to the bill would constitute payment of the 1942 tax due in March of 1943—in the case of calendar year taxpayers—is to be considered, not a payment of the 1942 tax, but an advance payment of the 1943 tax—a payment of a tentative tax for 1943. Through this device taxpayers will be making payments on their 1943 tax out of 1943 income. If the tentative tax for 1943 is less than the 1942 tax liability, the 1942 tax is, to the extent of the difference, to be abated, or be credited as refunded in the same manner as an overpayment. Under the terms of the bill this situation will exist only in cases where the taxpayer establishes that by reason of changed circumstances his net income for 1943 will be less, or his credits against net income greater, than they were in 1942. The manner in which the relief on account of changed circumstances operates is explained in connection with the amendment made by section 3 of the bill adding a new subsection (j) to section 56 of the Internal Revenue Code. Hence in the absence of changed circumstances, the amount which would otherwise constitute the tax for 1942—minus the foreign tax credit and the Victory tax—is considered as the tentative tax for 1943. As explained in connection with the amendments made by section 3 of the bill, if in 1944 when the taxpayer makes his final return for 1943 it is determined that the tentative tax paid is in excess of his actual tax liability for 1943—excluding the Victory tax—the excess is to be credited or refunded as an overpayment made on the due date of the tax for 1943—which would be March 15, 1944, in the case of a calendar year taxpayer. Section 2 of the bill does not affect a taxable year beginning in 1942 if the next succeeding taxable year also begins in 1942.

AMENDMENT TO CODE TO PROVIDE FOR PAYMENT OF A TENTATIVE TAX

Section 2 of the bill does not by its terms require the payment of a tentative tax in 1943, but merely provides for relief from the 1942 tax. Section 3, by amendment to sections 56 and 51 of the Internal Revenue Code, makes provision for a tentative tax for 1943 and subsequent taxable years by (1) stating how much the tentative tax is, (2) prescribing the time and manner of its payment, (3) providing penalties for willful failure to make payment, and (4) making special provision for payment of a tentative tax by new taxpayers. The provisions with respect to a tentative tax apply only to individuals.

Subsection (a) of section 3 adds three new subsections to section 56 of the code—relating to the payment of tax. The first so added—subsection (i)—defines, in paragraph (1) thereof, the tentative tax for any taxable year as an advance payment of the actual tax for that taxable year, and provides that the amount of the tentative tax is either—

(1) the tax shown on the return for the preceding taxable year, minus the foreign tax credit and the Victory tax, or

(2) if the taxpayer establishes—as provided in the new subsection (j) added to section 56 of the code—that circumstances have changed so as to make his net income less, or his credits against net income greater, than for the preceding taxable year, the tax which would have been shown on his return for the preceding taxable year if the changed circumstances had been reflected in his net income or credits—minus the foreign tax credit and Victory tax that would have been applicable;

(3) in the case of a taxpayer not required to make a return for the preceding taxable year, but who exercises his election to make a tentative return for the current taxable year—as provided in the new subsection (e) inserted in section 51 of the code by section 3 (d) of the bill—the amount that would have been his tax for the preceding taxable year if his net income and credits against net income had been as included in the tentative return made for the current taxable year—minus the foreign tax credit and Victory tax that would have been applicable.

Three examples will illustrate how each of the above paragraphs will operate:

Example 1: On March 15, 1944, John Doe, single, with a net income for 1943 of $3,000, makes his return for 1943, and finds that his tax liability for 1943—excluding the Victory tax—is $472. During 1943 he has paid $472 as a tentative tax for 1943. Thus he has already paid his 1943 tax—excluding the Victory tax—in full. His tentative tax for 1944 will be the same as his tax for 1943, or $472, and during 1944 he will be required to pay $472 as his tentative tax for 1944.

Example 2: On March 15, 1944, John Doe, who had a net income for 1943 of $3,000 and who was married on July 1, 1943, finds that his tax liability for 1943—excluding the Victory tax—is $395. On March 15, 1943, before his marriage, he computed, on the basis of his 1942 income and credits, his tentative tax for 1943 at $472 and began paying installments of the tentative tax on that basis. After his marriage he notified the Commissioner of his marriage and showed him that the tentative tax he had been paying had been computed on the basis of his single status and was thus too high. Having made this showing, his tentative tax for 1943 was recomputed, on the basis of his 1942 income, but on the assumption that he was married on July 1, 1942, in order to reflect, for the purpose of the tentative tax for 1943, a married status during half of the year. His tentative tax thus recomputed amounted to $395, and the remaining installments of his tentative tax in 1943 were adjusted accordingly. So on March 15, 1944, he has already paid in full his tax liability of $395 for 1943. He now is required to compute a tentative tax for 1944, which on the basis of his 1943 tax would be $395. But his 1943 tax reflects his married status only for one-half of the year, and he will have a married status during the whole of 1944. So he makes this showing to the Commissioner, and for the purpose of computing his tentative tax for 1944 he recomputes his 1943 tax in order to reflect therein a married status for a full year, and by so doing finds his tentative tax for 1944 to be $324. Thus during 1944 he will be required to pay $324 as a tentative tax for 1944.

Example 3: John Doe, single, with no income other than his wages, becomes a wage earner for the first time on January 1, 1943, and receives wages at the rate of $3,000 per annum. Not having any income in 1942, he was not liable for any 1942 tax. On March 15, 1943, pursuant to the amendment made by section 3 (d) inserting a new subsection (e) in section 51 of the code, he makes a tentative return of his 1943 tax, estimating that his net income for 1943 will be $3,000, and computes his tentative tax for 1943 to be $472. He is not required to make a tentative return, but he knows that unless he does and pays during 1943 a tentative tax for 1943, he will be required in 1944 to pay all of his 1943 taxes and in addition his tentative tax for 1944.

Paragraph (2) of the new subsection (i) of section 56 of the code provides

that the tentative tax for any taxable year is payable in nine equal installments, the first of which is to be paid on March 15 of the taxable year—in the case of a calendar-year taxpayer. The taxpayer is given the election of prepaying any one or more installments. Thus he could, if he so desired, pay the whole of the tentative tax on March 15.

Under paragraph (3) of the new subsection (i) a tentative tax is not payable for any taxable year the taxable year next succeeding which does not begin in the following calendar year.

The operation of the new subsection (j) inserted in section 56 of the code by section 3 of the bill has already been explained in example No. 2, above. Subsection (j) (1) permits a taxpayer to show to the Commissioner that by reason of his having gone into the armed forces during the preceding taxable year, or his status with respect to the personal exemption or credit for dependents having changed during the preceding taxable year, or by reason of other changes in circumstances during the preceding taxable year, his tentative tax—which is computed on the basis of his status during the preceding taxable year—is higher than it would be if his tax for the preceding year had reflected such change in circumstances for the whole of the year. If he makes this showing his tentative tax is the amount that it would have been if the change in circumstance had taken place at the beginning of the preceding taxable year, and thus been reflected for a full 12 months.

Subsection (j) (2) contains the rule for changes in circumstances during the current taxable year, that is, the taxable year for which the tentative tax is being computed. In that case the tentative tax is the amount it would be if the change had taken place 12 months before it did, and hence been reflected in the previous year for the same length of time that it will be effective during the current year.

The new subsection (k) of section 56 of the code added by section 3 (a) of the bill provides that where the tentative tax paid for any taxable year exceeds the tax imposed for such taxable year—excluding the Victory tax—the excess is to be credited or refunded in the same manner as an overpayment made on the due date for the payment of the tax for the taxable year.

Section 3 (b) of the bill adds a new section 36 to the code to provide that the amount of the tentative tax paid for any taxable year shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed for the taxable year—excluding the Victory tax.

Section 3 (c) of the bill amends section 145 (a) of the code to extend the criminal penalties for willful failure to pay the tax to include willful failure to pay a tentative tax.

Section 3 (d) of the bill permits an individual not required to make a return for a taxable year, to make—at the time he would have had to make a return if his income had been sufficient—a tentative return for the succeeding taxable year, that is, the taxable year in progress on March 15, in the case of calendar year taxpayers. In the tentative return the individual is to estimate his income and credits for the taxable year in progress and pay a tentative tax on that basis. Thus individuals who by the other provisions of the bill are not required to pay a tentative tax—there being no return for the previous year on which to compute a tentative tax—are nevertheless permitted to do so and get themselves on a current basis with respect to income-tax payments. The tentative return is to be a return only for the purposes of section 145 (c), prescribing penalties for making false return, and section 55 (f) (1), prohibiting Government employees from disclosing information contained in a return, of the Internal Revenue Code.

Section 2 (e) of the bill makes section 3 applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning in 1943 and subsequent taxable years.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to permit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some time after the election the able commentator, John B. Hughes, over the Mutual network gave in his observations an analysis of the political scene. These observations are as pertinent today as they were then. I ask unanimous consent to insert them in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, last March I spoke in the Well of the House on the subject The Dies Committee, Its Friends and Its Foes. I used as the theme for that speech the well-known quotation: "A man is known by the company he keeps." And I advanced as a corollary of that quotation the statement, "A legislative committee may be known by the character of the friends that it makes and by the character of the foes that it makes."

In order to bear out that theme I gave you a list of the friends that had gone on record in favor of the committee and also a list of the foes who had gone on record as opposed to the committee. I want to repeat that list at this time because I think it is as applicable today as it was a year ago.

Its friends—The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled War Veterans of America, Daughters of the American Revolution, Sons of the American Revolution, Knights of Columbus, The Catholic Churches of America, Federation of Women's Clubs of America, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Junior Order of American Mechanics, and the American Federation of Labor.

I listed as the foes of the committee the following:

Fritz Kuhn and the German-American Bund, a Nazi organization, the Silver Legion of America, the Pelley outfit, The Kyffhauserbund, another Nazi organization, National Workers League, a Nazi anti-Jewish group, Knights of the White Camellia, George Detheridge's old outfit, a Fascist group, the Communist Party and its many front organizations, National Lawyers Guild, controlled by Communists, International Labor Defense, also controlled by Communists, International Workers Order, controlled by Communists, and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, another Communist outfit.

That was the end of the list last year, but I am adding one more this year because it has already gone on record as opposed to continuation of the Dies committee and that is the C. I. O., a new addition to the list since last year.

Mr. Speaker, today I propose to analyze our annual report, to pick out its high points and to touch rather lightly upon the minority report, which is included in our report, but which was prepared by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. I want you today to keep in mind the Biblical injunction, "By their fruits shall ye know them," when I am making this analysis and discussing our present report because that is another measuring stick by which you can judge the work of the committee.

Every Member of the House has been furnished with this annual report of the committee. I want to pick out some of its high points and analyze them a little bit for you. For instance, on page 2 it states:

> After the entrance of the United States into the war the committee proposed to refrain from holding public hearings which might involve the activities of Nazi saboteurs so as not to run any risk of premature disclosures which might embarrass those whose responsibility it is to prosecute those guilty of espionage and sabotage.

I think you will agree with me that this program of refraining from public hearings was a good program to adopt at the beginning of this year. The committee has lived up to that program.

Back in 1938 when this committee was organized, it set up as a part of its job, and I think the most important part of its job, a compilation and tabulation of subversive activities uncovered by this committee and we compiled them in such shape that they would be available for use hereafter by Government departments. At that time our files consisted of just two filing cabinets. Today we have 135 filing cabinets filled with facts and documentary evidence, tabulated and indexed, with over 1,000,000 index cards, so that this material is available to any Government agent who desires to find out what are in those files.

With that as a basis, I want to again read from the report on page 3, but before I do so I want to state that the Dies committee has compiled and tabulated the most valuable stock pile, if you want to call it that, or reservoir, if you want to call it that, of the activities of subversive agents that is in existence today anywhere in the world and this stock pile or

reservoir is being used every single day by agents from the F. B. I., from Naval Intelligence, Military Intelligence, and the Secret Service of the United States. That is what is going on today behind the scenes, but very little, if any, publicity has been given to it. Here are the facts as pointed out in the report:

The committee reports to the House that during the past 14 months some 1,600 agents from various intelligence units of the Army, Navy, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Secret Service have called at the committee's office in Washington for information and hundreds of agents from the same agencies have called at the committee's branch offices in New York, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and Chicago for similar information.

That is the service the committee has been rendering during this past critical year. I could go on, but I do not want to take the time because I want you gentlemen to read this report and see what is in it.

On page 4 there is a tabulation of the number of requests for information from Government agents and others which totals 138,807 requests that have been honored by the committee during this past year. Those are the fruits of the committee during this year. Going on from there, may I say that the committee report is signed by four of the five present members of the committee, and only four. We have 5 members now. Four of the 5 signed this report. The fifth member refused to sign the report, but did compile, and we included in the report, his minority views; the fifth member, of course, being the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

In his minority report—and I urge you to read it along with the majority report—he gives two main reasons, there being many others, for his refusal to sign the report. What are the facts in connection with these reasons? His first reason is that this majority report was not discussed in committee, it was not worked over by the committee, but was presented to each member on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. That is his statement, but it is only a half truth.

Here are the facts: There were only two members of our committee in Washington during the past 6 weeks or 2 months, these 2 members being the gentleman from California and myself. The committee was required to present this printed report to the Congress on January 3. There was no possibility of getting the other members of the committee here to work it over, as should have been done. So the only thing that could be done was to do the best that we possibly could under the circumstances that we found ourselves in and the committee in preparing the report did submit it for criticism and for changes to myself because I was here, and also, I am told, that the committee secretary talked it over with the gentleman from California, the other member of the committee who was here in Washington.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman's recounting of the facts is, of course, correct, and I believe that the gentleman will agree with me that under the circumstances there was, as the gentleman himself states, no chance for our committee to meet to exchange views and to work over our report, as we had done in every previous case, and in every previous case I signed the report.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It is true that the report was submitted to the Members on the 28th of December and from the practical standpoint the only thing that could be done was to agree with it in toto or to file what I did, a minority report, in which I gave my reasons why I could not give unqualified approval to the majority report.

Mr. MASON. That is true. I have also stated that one of the reasons that the gentleman would not sign the majority report was a half truth, because we could not get together to discuss it and it was impossible to get together to discuss it. We had to do the best we could under the conditions we found ourselves in. The report was submitted to myself and to the gentleman for our suggestions, but it could not be submitted to those who were out of town.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I did the best I could.

Mr. MASON. I did, too, and the committee did also, under the circumstances.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 7 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I correct the gentleman on this point? The report was submitted to all the members of the committee, even though they were not in Washington. Perhaps I did not quite understand the gentleman on that.

Mr. MASON. I certainly did not deny that, because it was.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Further, we had plenty of time either to amend the report or make recommendations, subtractions, or additions. We had the same amount of time that we have had on many other reports. This was not the only time a report was issued even though all the members were not here in Washington.

Mr. MASON. That does not change the issue, or the reasons the gentleman from California advanced—and he was perfectly sincere in advancing them—as to why he could not sign the minority report.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois. I just wanted to make it clear to the House that many other times we have approved a report in the manner in which we approved this particular report.

Mr. MASON. Because we had to.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. That is right.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, may I make the record clear insofar as I am concerned? I received a copy of the report in sufficient time to read it. I was asked to make any objections or corrections or notations I cared to. I read the report and notified the clerk of the committee that I approved it. That was before it was ever published and issued.

Mr. MASON. We all did that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I assume I have given the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois the same careful attention that many other Members of the House have given them. It seems to me that the important thing in connection with the matter the gentleman is discussing is whether or not the members of the committee, with the exception of the gentleman from California, have approved the report as it was submitted to the House.

Mr. MASON. They would not have signed it if they had not approved it.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. That is to be assumed.

Mr. MASON. Now I want to go on with the second reason why the gentleman from California did not feel that he could sign this report. In his minority report he points it out very carefully and clearly. In substance it is this:

In his opinion the annual report of our committee this year should have emphasized and borne down on the Nazi and Fascist influences and dangers in connection with our present enemies. I agree fully with him that that is true, but here are the facts.

Our committee has prepared a full report, consisting of about 500 pages, on the very things about which the gentleman complains, and that he says should be included in this annual report. Because committee members differ as to what should be included in that report of 500 pages, which was due to be issued last December, the report has not been issued as yet. The gentleman from California objected to issuing it and said we ought to postpone the issuance of that report until the committee could get together and iron out its differences of opinion on that report. In conformity with the gentleman's request, that report has been delayed and is still in the committee. It contains 500 pages on the very thing the gentleman thought should go in our annual report.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In the first place, an annual report is a very different thing from the large and voluminous reports the committee has issued from time to time on special subjects. The report to which the gentleman refers will be, when issued, one of those large, voluminous compendiums of material in a certain field. The annual report, however, receives a great deal of public attention as a rule, and should, it seems to me, emphasize the things that most need emphasis.

At the chairman's request, I have worked on the very report the gentleman

mentioned. I hoped it could be issued before this, but some members did not agree with it, and for that reason I said of it as of the annual report, that it would have to be talked over in a meeting. But surely the gentleman does not want to give the House the impression that the report constitutes the only work this committee has done in that field. Quite the contrary. In the past, as emphasized over and over by the gentleman and other members of the committee, the committee has done a lot of work in the field of investigation of Nazi and Fascist activities. My point is that this annual report issued in the middle of the war should have emphasized the main thing this committee has on its doorstep and which this Nation faces—namely, activities calculated to weaken our war effort.

Mr. MASON. And following that, I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] that he has the right to have his opinion, that this annual report should have emphasized that, but the other members of the committee, believing that that was so comprehensive, including some 500 pages, felt it should not and could not be boiled down and placed in this annual report, and the fact that we differed upon it and could not agree to issue it, prevented our agreement on placing a boil-down or digest of that in this annual report, and, therefore, the four of us have agreed to this annual report, leaving that out, but hoping that very soon the committee can issue that report.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I assume the annual report is very largely a digest of the activities of the Dies committee?

Mr. MASON. It is a factual digest.

Mr. FISH. And on that factual digest will depend whether the Members of the House want to continue the Dies committee?

Mr. MASON. That is true.

Mr. FISH. I ask the gentleman this question. Are there any members of the Dies committee who are opposed to the continuation of the Dies committee or does the gentleman know that?

Mr. MASON. I, of course, cannot speak for the others, but I am quite sure that no member of the committee as it is composed at present is opposed to the continuation of the committee. I feel quite sure that that is true.

Mr. FISH. I have read in newspaper reports that there were about 60 Members who opposed the Dies committee and that about two-thirds of that 60 were defeated in the last election.

Mr. MASON. I would not know how many, but my understanding is that some 20 or 30 of the 40 who voted against the committee were defeated.

Mr. FISH. I understood that the number is 38.

Mr. MASON. I would not know.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Regardless of the emphasis or lack of emphasis placed in this report on the apparent difference between the Communist and Fascist theories, I think it is significant at this time that Mr. Earl Browder, who is one of the leaders of the Communist Party in the United States, has characterized within the last 24 hours the Congress of the United States as a saboteur of our war efforts.

Mr. MASON. That the Congress is a saboteur of our war efforts? I am very glad to have that information.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the position of the Council of Churches in respect to the Dies committee?

Mr. MASON. I do not know.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman leaves the subject of the defeat of Members, I think the gentleman ought to emphasize the fact that while about two-thirds of the Members who opposed the continuance of the Dies committee were defeated, yet they were not all defeated in the general election. Many of them were defeated in the primaries.

Mr. MASON. Be that as it may, I want to get back to the Biblical injunction, that "By their fruits shall ye know them," and if Members of the House will summarize the fruits of this committee during the past year, I am sure that they will give a vote of confidence to the committee and vote to continue it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

### THE PROBLEM OF THE FARMER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, one of my friends has a sign over his desk which reads something like this:

> It takes us some time to do the hard things; the impossible takes a little longer.

I am motivated today in making this talk by the fact that the farmers are asked to do a big job in fulfilling the request of increased food production for 1943. That, Mr. Speaker, is not only a hard job, but I am wondering if it is not also an almost impossible job to accomplish under the conditions which I will talk about.

On today, January 12, farmers all over the country are observing M-day, the day on which they will begin to sign up in a program calling for increased production and complete mobilization of all resources to meet food goals for 1943. On this date local meetings will be held throughout every community or in county-wide rallies, where the farmer will be acquainted with all details of the production objectives set for the year.

From the experience of last year, there is or can be no doubt but that farmers as a group will willingly and patriotically cooperate and pledge their best efforts to make possible the production of the necessary foods to win this war. 1942 was the best crop year ever experienced, our production being 14 percent greater than in 1941 and 12 percent greater than the previous best crop year of 1937. The good Lord gave us the growing weather and the farmer did the balance.

This coming year, however, presents for production purposes various obstacles with which the farmer did not have to contend in 1942. First, through divine help, we must have the most perfect climatic conditions. Secondly, there is the manpower or farm help problem. Department of Agriculture figures disclose that the American farmer lost, through selective service and movement to war industry up to January 1, 1943, about 2,000,000 men and the only thing that can possibly replace the man labor shortage is power equipment. Such a drain of farm labor cannot help but vitally affect the whole picture and attention must be given this angle. Next, and the subject I want to discuss with you, is the machinery problem which is growing acute since the issuance of the W. P. B. Limitation Order L–170. All of us must realize that if less manpower is at hand, then more machine power must be made available. This applies particularly to tractors, combines, corn pickers, and so forth. Order L–170 limits the production of farm machinery for 1943 to 20 percent of 1940–41 production, and this 20 percent includes repair parts, so the actual production of new machines is approximately 14 percent.

This 14 percent is not enough for replacement of obsolete machines and gives no consideration to those machines required for the additional production of food to feed our armed forces and those of our allies.

The Farm Machinery Section of the War Production Board started work on this order in June of 1942 in connection with the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture. Their recommendations were that the very minimum of farm machinery required for 1943 would be 50 percent of 1940–41 production, and after months of debate on the subject with the Civilian Supplies Section of the War Production Board—this section controls the raw materials for civilian needs—it was decided by the Civilian Supplies Section that all raw materials they could provide would be 20 percent for 1943 for the production of new farm machinery and repair parts, or in other words, the Civilian Supplies Section of the War Production Board, a group of people that knew nothing of the farmers' needs, took it upon themselves to cut the recommendations of two other departmental organizations who did know the farmers' needs, by more than half.

I will not attempt to explain what the effect of this order will be on the farmer on each of the many machines required by him to produce a crop, but I will deal now with only one machine, the tractor, which is his power plant and the most vital machine he uses. Without it, he can do nothing.

The L–170 order permits the manufacture of 14 percent for 1943 of the 1940–41 production on tractors. This means that the whole farm tractor industry can only produce 37,000 tractors.

The minimum required for replacements alone is approximately 200,000, or in other words, the farmer is expected to increase his production with only 18 percent of his actual replacement needs.

Would our Government ask any other war industry to increase their production

for the war efforts and at the same time tell them that they could only have for replacement 18 percent of the actual power needs. It is obvious that they would not.

The question has been raised, What did the farmer use for power before the advent of the tractor?

He used horses and a plentiful supply of man labor.

The next question is, Why cannot he go back to this method? The answer is that neither is available at this time. I quote from an address by Frank J. Zink, research department, Farm Equipment Institute, at the annual meeting of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers, Hotel Schroeder, Milwaukee, Wis., on July 1, 1942. Mr. Zink had this to say about the power required for farmers:

It is estimated that on our farms there are 1,800,000 tractors, 1,047,000 trucks, and 4,140,000 automobiles and that the power plant is in the aggregate, the largest on record. For primary production of food and food crops, however, tractors and animal power units are the only units of substantial value. Trucks and automobiles are indispensable in conjunction with farming, but contribute little, if anything, to crop production. Tractors in this country include everything on wheels, including improvised, home-built units of limited value in food and feed crop production, garden tractors, and old tractors used as stationary power units principally. While many tractors are new, the average age, according to the 1940 census, is 7 years; therefore, many very old tractors must have been included in the counts.

During the past decade of census figures there was a decrease of 4,085,000 animal power units and an increase of 637,000 tractors on farms. This is a ratio of change of 1 tractor replacing 7.5 horses. Animal power population does not maintain itself by a net annual unit replacement of 434,716 necessary to maintain itself static, according to the 1940 census.

Based on the record of the past 10 years, there are annually required 57,962 tractors to replace the declining trend of animal power unit population. It is probable that this ratio is currently more nearly 1 tractor to approximately 4 animal power units. In this case there would be needed about 109,000 tractors to replace estimated birth rate under death rate of animal power units. Further, because of withdrawals of animal units from farms to city usage, a new trend, this number of tractors may be considerably too low for animal replacements. It is estimated that approximately 85,000 tractors are needed annually to replace worn-out units. Thus it is indicated through past experience that approximately 195,000 tractors are required for replacements only. It has been a contention that 4 steel-wheeled tractors are needed to equal the work capacity of 3 rubber-tired tractors, and now that rubber tires are not available for new tractors, there exists an additional circumstance of tractor replacement requirements to maintain the substance of our farm power plant.

Thus tractor production rate for which materials were available in 1942 falls short of a maintenance level. While it is advocated that life of tractors may be prolonged by repair, many of these 85,000 required units are obsolete to the degree that repair in the face of farm-labor shortage is not good engineering, and is also questionable in conjunction with increasing food goals for the war effort.

To farm a 160-acre farm in my district, using animals for power, it requires the farmer and one hired man, but with a tractor for power, the farmer can do most of the work himself with a little help at harvest season, by working 16 hours per day. The farmers in my district and every other district in these United States are willing to work those 16 hours and more per day to meet the demand of producing food to win the war, but they cannot do the impossible if they are deprived of their machine tools. There is only one answer—they cannot produce.

On December 2, 1942, Mr. Donald Nelson made the statement that he ranked agricultural production along with the production of munitions, and that agriculture is a war industry. If this statement is correct, why does he permit agencies under his direction to cut so drastically the output of farm machine tools? Sometimes I wonder why a man from New York City, Mr. Joseph Weiner, happened to be appointed to the job in charge of farm machinery supplies. I do not know Mr. Weiner, but if he lives in New York City, I wonder what he actually knows of true farm conditions. I believe Mr. Nelson might have benefited his office by going out into districts like mine and getting advice and suggestions and even personnel from amongst some of our experienced, common-sense, practical, and able farmers who do know what it takes to run a farm and meet production goals.

Secretary Wickard, speaking from Chicago on December 3, 1942, said that he realizes that there is not enough fertilizer or farm machinery, or other supplies, and that he is doing his level best to improve the situation to make the present supply go as far as possible and be effective as possible in the food-production program. I quote:

With farm manpower being depleted, we need new machines to increase output if we are to increase maximum production. We need more new machinery than we are going to get. I have tried, and tried hard, to get more; I am going to keep on trying, but we may as well face the facts that we cannot get enough new machinery for maximum production; maybe not enough for replacement.

He went on to point out the increasing needs not only in our own country but abroad, saying:

Millions of enslaved people are living in conquered lands and long for the day when American food will follow the American flag in the march of liberation.

He indicated that this year military and lend-lease took about 13 percent of our total food production. Today the estimate is up at least to 25 percent, and he urged farmers to convert completely to war basis.

You have undoubtedly all noticed through the recent press releases and from information disclosed on this floor that the effect of this program is causing farmers to sell out at an alarming rate. Representative HULL, of Wisconsin, recently stated that 10,000 auction sales had been held in Wisconsin alone. Kansas reports about the same number and Minnesota likewise. These are only typical of what is taking place throughout the country.

Yes; our farmers will sign up in the program for all-out food production for 1943. As patriotic citizens they will do their best, will gladly work hard through long hours. But if they are to milk a few extra cows, feed additional pork or beef, raise more chickens to get more eggs, then they must have the time to attend to such duties. More farm manpower with adequate machine equipment is the solution.

Most of you know how important a crop the soybean has grown to be. Last fall, in my district, and this holds true throughout a great part of Illinois, and that State produces by far the greatest bushelage of beans in the United States, from 25 to 30 percent of these beans are still in the field where they are fast deteriorating and becoming of less value each day. Had more combines been available, most of these beans would have been harvested. We should not permit a recurrence of such loss of an essential crop.

Again, indications for 1943 point to the possibility of great insect damage to crops. The European corn borer, running as high as 294 for 100 stalks of corn, has already been noted in the corn belt area of Illinois. Chinch bugs in winter quarters are found in goodly numbers. Other sections of the country have similar insect troubles peculiar to crops grown in their localities. Sufficient up-to-date machinery in the hands of farm operators will minimize the danger from insect damage, for with good tools, used at proper times, better farming methods will help control such pests as the corn borer.

Frankly, I am worried about the food situation for this coming year. Oh, yes; the farmer will do his best, but will he have enough to do it with? I hope those in control of priorities at the War Production Board will give this problem more consideration and make possible a sizable percentage increase in production of machinery for the farmers. To win this war we need food and lots of it, food sufficient to feed our boys in service and ourselves, and at the same time supply our allies with as much as possible. President Roosevelt recognized the importance of the matter when he stated:

Food is no less a weapon than tanks, guns, and planes.

Unless a definite change is made in our food program at once, there is only one answer—the American farmer cannot produce the food required for our war efforts without the proper tools and manpower to produce that food.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. What percent of the 1940 production of tractors are they allowed to have?

Mr. ARENDS. It amounts to about 14 percent for 1943.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Fourteen percent. At the present time no tractors are going out on rubber. When the old rubber tires wear out the farmer has got to put steel lugs on his wheels, and every farmer knows that efficiency then drops another 10 to 20 percent.

Mr. ARENDS. In other words, it takes four steel-tired tractors to do the work of three rubber-tired tractors.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. That is right. He does not therefore add any power.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. We have a peculiar situation in Colorado with regard to sugar beets. This is the first year we have been able to get a beet puller and piler that would work successfully. Up to now it has all been a hand-labor proposition, but now we are not going to be given any priorities on beet pullers and we are thrown back to a reliance on manpower. We are asked to increase our production, but we are given neither manpower nor the priorities to get these machines that cut the tops off beets, pull them, and pile them. Then another machine comes along and picks them up. We must have both machines to work beets expeditiously.

Mr. ARENDS. It must be a combination of supplying both men and machines.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you think it would help any, instead of having this M Day where they get all the farmers into town and have some county agent or some half county agent and half politician tell them how to run their business, if we just gave the farmers the tools and let them go ahead they would produce the stuff we need?

Mr. ARENDS. Given both manpower and machines, the farmer will do a splendid job.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on June 4 of last year I addressed the House at some length on the subject of this balooning bureaucracy. At the time I spoke on that subject Mr. Henderson, head of the Office of Price Administration, was asking the Congress for an appropriation to put on the pay roll a hundred thousand Federal policemen and Gestapo agents. I want to quote one paragraph from that speech of last June, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> We have all heard Mr. Henderson's estimate that it will require another army of 100,000 Federal employees to maintain the system of price controls which he is putting into effect. Here is another matter, which this Congress should take the time to look into very carefully. Just why we need 100,000 Federal snoopers and Gestapo agents riding hard on American shopkeepers and merchants is a little hard for me to understand. Does Mr. Henderson follow the habitual administration attitude that every American enterpriser, per se, is a fellow to be watched, suspected, and hounded at every turn? Does he believe that every American businessman is a cheater and chiseler at heart, who must have a Federal checker at his elbow every time he makes a sale?
>
> Instead of this system of Federal price policemen, why does not Mr. Henderson recognize the shrewd shopping instincts of the housewives of America? Why does not he organize select committees of these shoppers in each community and give to them the job of policing prices. Capable purchasing agents that they are, I am confident that they would have no trouble in spotting the occasional chiseler and reporting him to Mr. Henderson if he failed to make immediate adjustments of any prices on which he was out of line.

While Mr. Henderson did nothing about my suggestion, I am glad to report that the Department of Agriculture has, or is about to inaugurate a very similar plan in connection with food rationing. Notwithstanding our protests, however, the O. P. A. has put on the pay roll a staggering number of new employees to further harass and annoy the people. In my congressional district O. P. A. has just established two regional rent-control offices with a large group of snoopers and Gestapo policemen to chart every rental residential property in the district, requiring every person who rents a property for residence purposes to file in triplicate a questionnaire with the Rent Control Director. There is no need of this army of civilian employees. There are no large cities in my district; in fact all but two are small towns. Control of rents in this district could very easily and simply be handled by local patriotic groups who would gladly serve without compensation and keep a close check on any violation of the Rent Control Act. I shall insist that the Congress abolish this needless waste of public funds and discharge from the pay roll these snoopers who are accomplishing no good purpose, but are driving honest patriotic citizens almost to distraction.

So far as the grim determination to win the war just as quickly and at as little cost in lives and treasure as possible is concerned, the people's decision which created this Congress has changed nothing. That was our one important purpose and it will be until the job is done.

As to administrative policies and methods on the home front, however, the American people issued a clear mandate that drastic changes be made immediately. The voters made it perfectly clear that they have become sick and tired of social planners, teaming with political opportunists and bureaucrats to endanger free government in America.

If this Congress is to obey the desires of the people who created it, it will immediately attack this overgrown Federal bureaucracy which is rapidly strangling American enterprise, destroying all rights of States and individuals, and adding alarmingly to the costs of government. Worst examples are the emergency agencies, such as the Office of Price Administration which is now enjoying a field day in imposing all manner of restrictions upon the people, but there is hardly a Federal agency, emergency or regular, where the pruning knife cannot be used to great advantage. This goes even for the War and Navy Departments which have expanded so completely without coordinated plan that we have one civilian employee for every three men in fighting uniform.

If we will simplify and streamline the essential services, and will cut out the dozens of purely nonessential activities in which this administration still persists, I am sure we can weed out upward of 1,000,000 Federal employees who can go into the essential private fields now crying for help.

By a thorough house cleaning in Federal activities we can make a good start on the problem of manpower, but nothing more than a start. The shortage of manpower has already become so critical, in fact, that we are threatened with the necessity of a total draft of the American people. If this is to be avoided, and at this late stage no one can say for sure that it can be avoided, this Congress must drive the administration into steps which for political expediency it has so far refused to take. Whether we like it or not, everybody who is able to work simply must work harder and longer. Whether we like it or not, we are simply forced to recognize the farmer's labor problems and help him meet them, or face the prospect of actual hunger in America. The time for kid-glove treatment and mollycoddling of any special group or class is over. It is up to this Congress to force the formulation of a manpower policy in which every last person contributes his best efforts for the common good.

As for rationing of goods and services, a great deal of it is simply unavoidable. Many severe shortages might easily have been avoided had we followed a more far-sighted program from the beginning of this emergency, but that is water over the dam. We are faced now with the job of avoiding any unnecessary sacrifices, and of making the unavoidable sacrifices just as light as possible. This means a forced general revision in the bureaucratic conception of seeking results by compulsion, rather than by cooperation.

It isn't necessary to use compulsion on the American people. In fact, the bureaucrats will some day learn that you simply can't put the yoke on people who cherish liberty as we do in this country. The American people, however, will cooperate, no matter what the sacrifice, if they merely are given the facts to prove the sacrifice necessary. It is the job of this Congress, therefore, to see that the whole rationing program is simplified and to see that it is based primarily upon popular cooperation.

Certainly, also, at the very outset we ought to strip the rationing program of its sillier aspects which make it so much harder for the American people to accept cheerfully. All of us could cite a dozen different ways in which rationing regulations simply don't make sense, but consider, as an example, this recent order that your baker may no longer slice bread. In the absence of any official explanation, I have tried to figure out why the baker, who for years has had the slicing machinery, and who would be glad to go on using it, since it adds nothing to his production costs, must now deliver your bread whole loaf. But I am forced to conclude that the order is as pointless as that one prohibiting the cuffs on men's trousers.

When this Congress has forced the people's will upon the administration, it will then be our further duty in the 2 years ahead to keep a constant check upon the Executive. There must be no more blank checks, no more blanket grants of authority offering new loopholes for the bureaucrats.

Above everything else, of course, it will be made and kept plain that this Congress will back the President and Commander in Chief to the limit in the prosecution of the war; and will vigorously promote sound, long-range plans for lasting peace, once total victory is won. Nothing else will so quickly convince the skeptical, both at home and abroad, that the American people were everlastingly right on November 3; and that their unmistakable decision ordering drastic changes in domestic policies and philosophies is a real and important contribution to the effectiveness of the American war effort.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to incorporate therein a speech delivered in Washington last night by the commander of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] for 5 minutes.

TAXATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, if you lived in the city of New York, every time you went to the store you would pay a sales tax in the amount of 1 percent to help finance the city government. As a resident of New York State you would be subject to the State income tax. Added to these taxes would be the Federal income tax. If you owned a house that was worth $10,000, you would find it assessed for its full value and at times in excess of its market value, on which you probably would pay $250 a year for real-estate tax, plus the water tax and a few other special taxes.

My purpose in rising today is to join with other Members of this House who are putting forth plans to bring about a revision of the Federal income tax law, making it easier for the average citizen to pay his taxes. There is no use fooling ourselves; the average citizen pays the taxes due on last year's income out of this year's earnings.

If we are going to treat these figures in an arbitrary manner, we will not get very far because a man who has to support a family and who receives one, two, or three thousand dollars a year will be hard pressed. In many cases some of his children are away to the war. Although that man cannot pay 2 years' taxes in 1, he is just as loyal, patriotic, and devoted citizen as you will find in the land. You cannot get water out of a stone.

It behooves us to act promptly and to do something about a workable plan. I do not care whether you want to call it the Ruml plan or the Carlson plan; you might even call it the Kennedy plan. Whatever it is, let us have it and let us have it quickly. We have over 7,000,000 people in the city of New York, and they are pleading and begging for some favorable action on the part of the Congress in the tax situation. They are not irritable; they are not being quarrelsome; they are being logical; they want to cooperate in the war effort; they want to respond; they want to pay their fair share of taxes, but we must point the way.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman says he want something put into effect quickly.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, Mr. TREADWAY.

Mr. TREADWAY. Of course, knowing the gentleman's ability and standing, both as a Congressman and as a citizen of New York, he does not want it done so quickly that it is not thoroughly done?

Mr. KENNEDY. No; I want it done thoroughly, equitably, and fairly.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is a very big contract, particularly to have it ready to put into effect by the 15th of March.

Mr. KENNEDY. I know the average Member of the House has complete confidence in the membership of the Ways and Means Committee and, while other committees might take a long time, I am sure that the Ways and Means Committee has the ability and the facilities to do an excellent job.

Mr. TREADWAY. We have not any superlative knowledge of the subject before us at the present time, especially when the President asked us yesterday for $16,000,000,000 in new taxation.

Mr. KENNEDY. I realize it is going to be a difficult task, but I also know that the Committee on Ways and Means will find a way. The members of that committee have the right disposition, they have the needed knowledge, and they are assured of the cooperation of the entire membership of the House in their unpleasant assignment.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman would not be surprised if it extended beyond the 15th of March to discover the manner in which it could be done?

Mr. KENNEDY. I would not be surprised at such a delay. I do not expect the committee to act in a hasty manner. I am not trying to stampede the committee because I know that cannot be done. All of the members of that committee are good, sensible citizens. Let us all get to work on this problem. It is a serious proposition, affects every person in the country. The people want to pay, but do not ask them to do the impossible.

I ask for your assistance and best thought on the subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FOOD WILL WIN THE WAR AND WRITE THE PEACE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the most critical problem on the domestic production front consists in our ability to produce and supply an abundance of food for the armed forces, and for civilian needs and our allies. At long last, the administration recognizes that the winning of the war and the writing of a lasting peace depends upon food, and the ability of American farmers to produce and supply it to the peoples of the world. The United States is now the "food basket" for the world.

The stupidity of the administration's past policies of plowing under surpluses and destroying food has brought our country face to face with a possible famine and scarcity in essential foods. It is now apparent that within the next 6 months all essential foods will be strictly rationed. The food problem as it appears today may eventually result in such a scarcity that certain foods cannot be procured at any price.

For the past year many of us have tried to convince New Deal executives that it takes manpower and machinery to produce beef, pork, dairy products, poultry, and other foods. But it is only within the past 60 days that these officials were finally forced to admit the validity of our contention. Of course, one cannot expect eastern bred and born graduates of the Frankfurter school of philosophy, from New York and Brooklyn, to understand much about the need for manpower or machinery as being essential in food production. Scores of these intellectual bureaucrats are key men in the New Deal to make the decisions on food production and farm life.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Who appointed these incompetent bureaucrats who are administering all of this rationing program?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not know who was responsible for the appointment of many of them, but apparently they came in with the "new order" which had for its objective the remaking of the life and government of the American people.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why beat around the bush? As a matter of fact, the President appointed them, or he is primarily responsible for their appointment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about his responsibility, because he was given the authority and if he delegated it to some incompetent who did not understand anything about the practical life of the farmer and the middle classes of this country, he must bear that responsibility.

One-third of America's skilled farm manpower has gone into the armed forces and defense industries. Lack of understanding on the part of selective-service officials in Washington forced the induction of tens of thousands of essential farm workers into the military service, when they should have been retained on the farm to produce food. Several hundred thousand skilled farm workers have also been attracted by the high wages and short hours prevailing in defense industries. American farmers cannot compete with a 40-hour workweek, and a high wage scale with time and one-half for overtime now prevailing in defense industries. This war cannot be won on a 40-hour workweek.

We in Congress from the agricultural districts, have repeatedly urged, for more than a year, that essential farm workers should be retained in the production of food, but we have met with little success in dealing with bureaucrats, who feel that they know it all. Policy changes are now taking place to safeguard agricultural manpower and food production, but many believe that such action is coming too late.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I have one or two questions. In reference to the deferment of farm workers, is it not true that after the regulations went on down pursuant to the mandate of this Congress for the deferment of agricultural workers, they did not reduce the quotas, and I refer to the draft quotas, in those counties that are purely agricultural? The instructions were quite complicated that came to the local boards and it ended up by the boards raising quotas. Is that not true?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think that is substantially correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true also that along with the deferment there must be a lowering of quotas for the agricultural areas?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As a matter of fact, I understand that for the past year they have been taking larger quotas from the Midwest farming sections than they have from the more thickly populated and congested sections of the country.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has been in Congress for many years and has a very distinguished career here. Would he inform me, how did it happen that they passed the 40-hour-week act? Under Secretary of War Patterson said if we would raise the workweek to 48 hours it would release 1,500,000 workers for other jobs. How did that thing happen to be jammed through Congress?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. During the past 10 years, as the gentleman knows, and up to Pearl Harbor, a good deal of so-called New Deal legislation was sent up here by the Chief Executive as "must" legislation and jammed through the Congress by the large majority on the Democratic side, who put it through at the request of the Chief Executive.

Mr. CURTIS. Its purpose was to relieve unemployment?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That was the idea but, of course, it was never successful in that respect.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I have heard a lot of comment about the plowing under of crops and the slaughtering of pigs as if that were a policy or something that happened in the past and there had been reform since. It seems to me the same situation exists today. For instance, in my district farmers who have corn are not going to be able to harvest the corn. It is not going to be harvested. The snow is on it. The farmers cannot get the corn pickers or help. They have soy beans that are not going to be harvested. They are going to rot in the snow because they cannot get combines. I know several farmers who sold their steers when they were small because they could not get barbed wire to fence the cattle in to keep them away from the crops. That is the same thing as plowing under. That stuff will be plowed under next spring.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is less painful.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But it will be plowed under next year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentlewoman for that contribution.

Mr. KNUTSON. When it rots on the ground it becomes an act of Providence and thus relieves the administration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is better to have 1 experienced man on a farm than 10 individuals who are not familiar with agricultural life. The employment of transient labor is not desirable or satisfactory in diversified farm areas, where full-time employment is needed.

Secretary Wickard is proposing the employment of Mexican labor. He, and Manpower Chief McNutt, are working on a proposal to move thousands of unemployed, colored and white individuals, from larger cities, to American farms. This type of transient and untried labor will never be satisfied to put in the long hours and do the hard work required on every farm, and I am satisfied that these programs will not bring results in securing an increase in food production.

Mrs. Roosevelt is toying with the idea of recruiting battalions of women workers for American farms. She got the idea on her recent and well-publicized trip to England.

THE GOODHUE FARM MANPOWER PLAN

The best plan thus far proposed to secure additional manpower for farmers in the harvest season was originated in Goodhue, Minn. Two years ago, the loyal and resourceful businessmen of this community recognized the growing scarcity of farm workers. They got together in a meeting and agreed to close up their places of business during the stress of the harvest season, in order to help harvest the crops. The Goodhue plan worked. Storekeepers, clerks, mechanics, laborers, and other willing workers in the community, stopped their usual activity and went to work on neighboring farms in the harvest. They did a splendid job. The Goodhue plan demonstrates what can be done without the aid of bureaucrats from Washington. It looks to me as though the Goodhue plan is too simple for New Dealers to understand, as it does not involve the usual red tape with scores of high-paid employees to put it into operation.

I suggest that the Goodhue plan be tried in every community in the country. Washington will never solve the farm manpower problem. Lack of coordination between various Federal agencies, red tape, waste, and inefficiency have effectively stopped constructive action for securing real results in settling or distributing essential manpower in our production and war effort.

FARM MACHINERY

The falling off in farm manpower makes it imperative that farmers be provided with an adequate supply of essential farm machinery and equipment in order to meet the increasing demand for essential foods. The latest decision of the War Production Board will only permit the manufacture of 20 percent of 1940–41 production in farm machinery in 1943. Such a small amount of essential farm machinery will be of little or no value in the production of food. If the administration is sincere in its latest slogan that "Food will win the war and write the peace," and therefore desires a tremendous increase in 1943 food production, the War Production Board should promptly authorize the manufacture of a hundred-percent supply of both essential machinery, parts, and equipment. The machinery most needed to secure production, in addition to manpower, is generally known to be the following: Corn planters, cultivators, and pickers; mowers and hay loaders; farm tractors, plows, drags, and elevator equipment; dairy supplies, such as milking machines and other essential equipment; additional material for the construction of silos, as well as poultry equipment and other supplies so essential in the production of dairy, beef, pork, poultry, and vegetable products.

It is not surprising that farmers have experienced so much difficulty in securing farm machinery. Directing the W. P. B. farm machinery program is Mr. Joseph L. Weiner, New York lawyer, who cannot be said to be too familiar with farm life or the production of food. It is quite apparent from his actions to date that he believes that milk, butter, beef, and other food will be forthcoming by simply pressing an electric button or turning on a faucet.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KNUTSON. I did not catch the name of that New York lawyer.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Joseph L. Weiner.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is he the gentleman who made the profound discovery that there are both male and female steers?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am not familiar with his observations in that respect.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the distinguished agriculturalist from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. The gentleman from Minnesota a few moments ago made mention of bringing into agriculture some new types of labor. What is the gentleman's opinion about bringing this labor from submarginal land into the better agricultural districts?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I did not touch on that, but that is a very

important part of the manpower problem.

Mr. GILLIE. What is the gentleman's opinion of it?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. For the past 7 or 8 years, under the farm-tenancy and farm-security program, officials have taken these submarginal farmers throughout the country and purchased farms for them and equipped them with buildings, fences, livestock, and everything they needed to get a start in life. About 2,000,000 of them have had the benefits of this beneficent program. Now they propose to take these people away from the farms the Government has acquired for them and move them into areas where it is claimed they are needed because, it is said, they do not now engage in the production of food essential to help win the war. So it is proposed to move them. I do not know what is going to happen under the program, and I am sorry I cannot answer the question.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. We of the West would like to know why the O. P. A. would select a lawyer from the center of New York to tell us out there in this great irrigated section of the West how many pieces of farm machinery we can buy in 1943. What we want to know is, where is his background of experience? Has the gentleman an answer to that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand, those who believe in or who have followed the Frankfurter philosophy are holding nearly all of the key positions, and make the decisions as to how you and I and the rest of the people shall live our lives.

Mr. HILL. It does not help our farmers to know that Frankfurter is to blame, because who is Frankfurter?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I shall not give the gentleman any biography of him today, but he has quite a following and has educated a large number of men in one of the great eastern colleges, and they are holding key positions in the Government.

Mr. HILL. Yesterday I placed in the RECORD the life history, given by Fulton Lewis, Jr., over the radio, of five or six of the very important men in O. P. A. giving their background of experience. It is ridiculous to place men with no more background and experience and understanding of the practicality of the American economy in positions like these, men whose best recommendation for their jobs is that they have held teaching positions in some college.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman fails to recognize the fact that most of the men to whom he refers are believers in the theory that our American system has outlived its usefulness and that they have been ordained by some high power to give us a new type of economy and a new government in the United States.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I was just going to call attention to the fact just mentioned by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] in connection with his speech of yesterday. I hope the Members will read it. It contains a factual statement by Fulton Lewis, Jr., the Mutual broadcaster. It is worth reading. Our people will understand better the administration of some of the rationing rules and regulations when they appreciate the experience and the background of the men who are making the orders.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman. I have said before on this floor, and I say it again, that Fulton Lewis, Jr., is making a real contribution to the welfare of our country. His research and study covering the economic problems of agriculture and of the common man, and his broadcasts that result therefrom, are bringing to the American people an insight into some of the things that are going on. I think we all owe a debt of gratitude to him.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Considerable stress is placed upon the removal of the head man in these various agencies. When the seat gets hot, the Administrator of the O. P. A. resigns and they change one man. Does that do any good as far as removing this reform group and changing the administration of these laws to make them more reasonable is concerned?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not think it does any good, because the man who does remove himself from the scene still directs it, because his remaining associates are of a similar philosophy and they continue to run the show.

Mr. CURTIS. There is a superorganization within?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

To take care of our obligations to the men in the armed forces and our allies, and to avoid famine in this country, we must have a decided change in the food policies of the administration. Experienced men must be placed in charge of manpower and equipment problems for maximum food production.

Due to lack of coordination and friction between Federal agencies over the manpower problem, President Roosevelt is the only official who can straighten out the mess in food production. I call upon him to do so at once before it is too late. The farmers will cooperate in every possible way, but they must have the tools and equipment, as well as manpower, with which to secure results. They want to win the war and will work around the clock to do so without strikes or squabbling. I agree with the farmers that a 40-hour workweek will never win this war in any type of production.

In conclusion, let me again urge that it is time for the President to provide a coordinated and effective system of manpower and equipment necessary for food production. All bottlenecks must be removed before it is too late. Remember what Napoleon said: "An army travels on its stomach." It is up to us to provide the food to "Win the war and write the peace."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include several letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "An Open Letter to the Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress" printed in the Farm Journal of January 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order heretofore adopted, adjourned until Thursday, January 14, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

50. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $181,000 (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

51. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to $15,000, for the judiciary (H. Doc. No. 42); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

52. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $165,000 (H. Doc. No. 43); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

53. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the national defense activities of the Federal Communications Commission, amounting to $140,500, for the fiscal year 1943, as well as a proposed provision relating thereto, said proposed provision involving an appropriation for the Navy Department (H. Doc. No. 44); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

54. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $7,433,405 (H. Doc. No. 45); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

55. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the

fiscal year 1943, in the amount of $40,000,000, for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 46); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

56. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $8,320, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation (H. Doc. No. 47); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

57. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1941, amounting to $652.91 (H. Doc. No. 48); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

58. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1943 for the United States Maritime Commission in the amount of $4,000,000,000 cash and $5,250,000,000 contract authorization, toward which authorization $3,076,280,455 cash is provided in the estimate (H. Doc. No. 49); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 1104. A bill providing for the removal of local superintendents; and providing for the manner of calling elections; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 1105. A bill to establish a Board of Appeals and Reviews in the Army for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1106 (By request). A bill to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special assistants to the Attorney General in the case of United States against Doheny executors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 1107. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. R. 1108. A bill providing for the issuance of a certificate of citizenship to any person claiming to be a citizen of the United States at birth in whose case no official record of birth is available; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1109. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery in every State; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 1110. A bill to establish boards of appeals and reviews in the Navy and Marine Corps for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1111. A bill to provide for increasing or decreasing the compensation or pension payments, payable to veterans of all wars, campaigns, and expeditions, or of peacetime service, and to their dependents, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, by 10 percent for every 10 percent increase or decrease in the cost of living above the basic cost of living during the first 6 months of 1940, as computed each 6 months, provided that such compensation and pension payments shall not be reduced below the basic amounts provided for under such laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 1112. A bill to transfer the functions of the board of directors of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to the Administrator of the Federal Housing Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 1113. A bill to provide that interests in real property, acquired on behalf of the United States for war purposes, shall be acquired by lease except when the use of such method would impede the war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 1114. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. R. 1115. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to further regulate the operation and navigation of aircraft using the navigable air space overlying the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1116. A bill authorizing the printing, with illustrations, of the proceedings of the national encampments of various veterans' organizations in the United States as separate House documents; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1117. A bill to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1118. A bill to provide that inability of the individual veteran to follow any substantially gainful occupation resulting from service-connected disability shall be deemed to be permanent total disability; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H R. 1119. A bill to amend Public Law No. 257, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 4, 1939, so as to provide pensions to peacetime veterans of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard suffering from arrested tuberculosis contracted while in the service; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1120. A bill to so amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, as to eliminate all statutes of limitations on automatic, yearly renewable term, or United States Government life (converted) insurance policies; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1121 (by request). A bill to provide that the rates of compensation or pension to veterans and dependents of deceased veterans under laws and veterans regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration shall be increased by 15 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1122. A bill to extend pension benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to certain employees for services rendered outside the United States and to increase the amount of pension payable to pensioners under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1123. A bill to provide that the Railroad Retirement Board may award disability annuities to totally and permanently disabled individuals who have completed a period of service within a reasonable time of 30 years' service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 1124. A bill to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 1125. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act with reference to transfer of property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to relieve motorists of unnecessary governmental interference by abolishing compulsory tire registration and inspection as a condition of the use of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable, to provide a penalty for mailing same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to repeal section 3716 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution recommending that any parties or organizations advocating overthrow of the United States Government be prohibited from entering candidates in any State or National election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Res. 48. Resolution to investigate the meat industry; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1126. A bill for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation, of Winona, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1127. A bill for the relief of Shirley K. Bennett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 1128. A bill for the relief of Bernice James; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 1129. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Camp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEIDINGER:

H. R. 1130. A bill granting a pension to Bertie E. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1131. A bill for the relief of the estate of Ola Fowler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 1132. A bill for the relief of Norman W. Leard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 1133. A bill for the relief of Sam Swan and Ally Swan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEFEVRE:

H. R. 1134. A bill granting an increase of pension to Julietta Waltermire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1135. A bill granting a pension to Mary Beale Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1136. A bill granting a pension to Lottie Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1137. A bill granting an increase of pension to Catherine A. Burdick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1138. A bill granting an increase of pension to Phinia E. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1139. A bill for the relief of Benjamin F. Short; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1140. A bill granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Hinkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 1141. A bill authorizing the President to present a Distinguished Flying Cross posthumously to the late Chief Marine Gunner Elmo Reagan, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1142. A bill for the relief of Nannie May Blythe and Claudia Blythe; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1143. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie M. Elben; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1144. A bill for the relief of Fred A. Flanders; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 1145. A bill for the relief of Mark D. Dukes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1146. A bill for the relief of Annie E. Griffeth; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1147. A bill granting a pension to J. L. Parish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1148. A bill for the relief of John N. Crotty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1149. A bill for the relief of Richard Macleod Hull; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1150. A bill for the relief of Hosea Aldred; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1151. A bill for the relief of Wallace L. Edenfield; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1152. A bill for the relief of Gus Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1153. A bill for the relief of Cordie Underwood and Wilbur Kea; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1154. A bill for the relief of Ludvig Vingerhagen; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1155. A bill for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt. Percy K. Morrison; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1156. A bill for the relief of F. J. Rozier; to the Committee in Claims.

H. R. 1157. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Daniel A. Brinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1158. A bill for the relief of Homer H. Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1159. A bill for the relief of Frank Burgess Bruce; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of California:

H. R. 1160. A bill for the relief of Alva Burton Rickey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1161. A bill granting a pension to Lena P. Riddick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 1162. A bill for the relief of R. E. Cotton Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

---

# SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and glory, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. In a confused day, keep our minds clear and clean and uncluttered by prejudice. In a darkened day, give us the sight and insight of the pure in heart, that we may see God and the godlike everywhere. In a clamorous day, filled with angry accents of hate, give us ears to hear the voices that speak of justice and freedom and world brotherhood. In a mad and sad day, grant us sanity of mind and spirit and a glad hope which sees a shining ray far down the future's broadening way.

"Lord, in this hour of tumult,
Lord, in this night of fears,
Keep open, O keep open
Our eyes, our hearts, our ears.

Not blindly nor in hatred,
Lord, let us do our part.
Keep open, O keep open, dear Lord
Our eyes, our mind, our heart."

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 11, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF W. B. RUTLEDGE TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of that committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of January 22 at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in the office of the committee, upon the nomination of Wiley Blount Rutledge, of Iowa, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Any persons who may be interested in the matter may make representations to the committee at that time.

## THE SULLIVAN BOYS OF THE U. S. S. "JUNEAU"

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the loss of any American serviceman in this war is a heavy loss to the Nation and particularly a bitter sorrow to his family, and, of course, is worthy of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by reference, but such a procedure would be impracticable. Within the last few days the Navy Department has made public a report which for poignancy and stark tragedy has seldom been equaled. Five brothers of a family living in Waterloo, Iowa, were serving together on the light cruiser *Juneau* which was sunk. These brothers had entered the Navy in a spirit of resentment over the loss of a boyhood pal who was killed in the attack on Pearl Harbor. They all enlisted and asked to serve together, and were serving on the *Juneau* when she was sunk. They are all listed as missing in action. The Navy Department has stated that in all the history of the Navy there is no record of such a tragedy happening to any family. In view of the unusual circumstances, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks a letter received by me from the Chief of Naval Personnel.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 12, 1943.

Hon. G. M. GILLETTE,
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Pursuant to my conversation with you this morning with reference to the Sullivan boys who are reported missing following the loss of the U. S. S. *Juneau* as result of enemy action on 13 November 1942, I am furnishing you a few of the details.

These boys, Francis Henry, coxswain; Jcseph Eugene, seaman second class; George Thomas, gunner's mate second class, Madison Abel, seaman second class; and Albert Leo, seaman second class, are the sons of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas F. Sullivan, of 98 Adams Street, Waterloo, Iowa. Only one, Albert Leo Sullivan, is recorded as having been married, and his wife, Katherine Mary Sullivan, resides at 2228 Hawthorne Street, Waterloo, Iowa. All five sons enlisted in the Navy on 3 January 1942 at Des Moines, Iowa.

When the loss of the U. S. S. *Juneau* was reported the Bureau contacted Lt. Comdr. Truman Jones, the officer in charge, Naval Recruiting Station, Des Moines, Iowa. He was instructed to proceed to Waterloo, Iowa, to convey to the parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sullivan, and to Mrs. Albert Leo Sullivan, the news as to the fate of the Sullivan boys, which mission has been accomplished. A confirming telegram has been sent to the parents and the wife by this Bureau.

* * * * *

Sincerely yours,

RANDALL JACOBS,
*Rear Admiral, United States Navy,*
*The Chief of Naval Personnel.*

A. C. JACOBS,
*Lieut. Commander, U. S. N. R.,*
*The Head of the Casualties and*
*Allotments Section, by direction.*

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to personnel of the land forces on November 30, 1942, under the Selective Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

### ORDINANCES ENACTED BY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of several ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

### WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATIONS OF PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, enclosing a report of withdrawals and restorations of public lands as of December 31, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

### REPORT AND STATEMENT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a classified report showing the permits and licenses issued by the Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, the parties thereto, the terms prescribed, the moneys received, if any, and an account thereof, and also a statement showing as of

June 30, 1942, the names and compensation of persons employed by the Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT

A letter from the Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the year ended December 31, 1941, with other information relating to the regulation and operation of the public utilities in the District of Columbia coming under the jurisdiction of the Commission, with related data (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A letter from the president and assistant secretary of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., reporting, pursuant to law, on the operations of the company for the calendar year 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EMPLOYEES WHO RECEIVE SALARIES OF $3,000 PER ANNUM OR OVER

A letter from the Rubber Director, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 322, Seventy-seventh Congress, a list of persons employed in the office of the Rubber Director whose salaries are $3,000 per annum or over, etc.; a letter from the Assistant Deputy Petroleum Administrator, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 322, Seventy-seventh Congress, a report covering employees of the Petroleum Administration for War whose salaries are $3,000 per annum or over, etc.; and a letter from the Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 322, Seventy-seventh Congress, a statement showing the persons in that office who draw salaries of $3,000 per annum or over, etc. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, Navy, and Agriculture (15); Federal Security Agency, and The National Archives which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WALSH:

A petition of sundry citizens, instructors, and employees of Wentworth Institute, of Boston, Mass., praying for the prompt enactment of the Ruml pay-as-you-go income-tax plan; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STEWART:

A joint resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

"Whereas the President of the United States, his Cabinet, military aides, and the Congress have worked untiringly and unselfishly in giving their leadership for the prosecution of the war; and

"Whereas considering the magnitude of their task, we feel that they have led us in making most excellent progress toward saving our Nation and the world from tyranny and slavery: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee (the Senate concurring)*, That we hereby express our sincere appreciation and gratitude to the President, his Cabinet, and other aides, and the Congress for their invaluable and sacrificial services which they have rendered to the Nation since our country has been at war; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That this body most heartily endorse the general idea of a 'world congress' to keep the peace, when, through God's help, we shall have attained it, so that our posterity may be saved from the constant recurrence of war, and the dire threat of the annihilation of our civilization; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That this general assembly assure said leaders of the Nation that it is most anxious to cooperate in any way possible toward hastening the day of victory; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Roosevelt, Secretary of State Hull, and to each Member of Congress from Tennessee, and that it be spread upon the journal of the house and senate."

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 343. A bill providing for transportation home during furlough for noncommissioned officers and other enlisted men on active military service in the land forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 344. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of lode or placer mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war; for the relief of owners of gold mines required to suspend operations by reason of restrictions arising from the war effort; and for the suspension of assessment work on lode and placer claims for the duration of the war because of the shortage of manpower and materials; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. MURDOCK (for himself and Mr. GILLETTE):

S. 345. A bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 346. A bill for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards; and

S. 347. A bill for the relief of the Forest Lumber Co., the Lamm Lumber Co. and the Algoma Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 348. A bill to authorize the construction of the Umatilla Dam in the Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash.; and

S. 349. A bill authorizing construction of an entrance channel connecting the facilities of the proposed port development at Arlington, Oreg., with the navigation channel of the Columbia River, in the interest of national defense; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 350. A bill to amend section 75 (s) (2) of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, to provide a further stay of judicial proceedings in the case of certain farm debtors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUFFEY:

S. 351. A bill for the relief of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 352. A bill establishing a Board of Appeals in the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 353. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christoffer Hannevig through his trustee in bankruptcy;

S. 354. A bill for the relief of The Wilson Co., a New Mexico corporation; and

S. 355. A bill for the relief of R. S. Howard Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 356. A bill to aid small independent business of the country by the collection and dissemination of knowledge of business management and its application to specific problems and opportunities, that the American system of free enterprise may be strengthened, and that individual small business may be continued at a profit both to the businessman and the community; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 357. A bill to authorize the presentation of a medal of honor to J. Edgar Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 358. A bill for the relief of Garnet Charles Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 359. A bill for the relief of Thomas P. Hogan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 360. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 361. A bill for the relief of John F. Thomas; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 362. A bill granting an increase of pension to Frances Coffman; and

S. 363. A bill granting a pension to Minnie O. Draper; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 364. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 365. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 366. A bill for the relief of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 367. A bill for the relief of dependents of Frank Edward Dace; and

S. 368. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 369. A bill to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 370. A bill to modify section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, with reference to certain funds collected in connection with the operation of Indian Service irrigation projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 371. A bill for the relief of settlers on the International Strip at Nogales, Ariz.;

S. 372. A bill for the relief of Ward S. Powers;

S. 373. A bill for the relief of Charles Favors;

S. 374. A bill for the relief of Samuel J. Poteete and Julia Poteete;

S. 375. A bill for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co.; and

S. 376. A bill for the relief of C. Y. Webb; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 377. A bill authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896, and reopening such lands to mineral entry; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 378. A bill to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument;

S. 379. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Saguaro National Monument; and

S. 380. A bill to authorize the participation of States in certain revenues from national parks, national monuments, and other areas under the administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. MCFARLAND, and Mr. SCRUGHAM):

S. 381. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 382. A bill to permit the marketing without penalty of excess wheat produced by persons who have subsequently entered upon active duty in the land or naval forces; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 383. A bill for the relief of Irving Kilburn Bills;

S. 384. A bill to correct the record of Ralph Everett Crawshaw;

S. 385. A bill for the relief of Lewis Alfred Dearborn;

S. 386. A bill for the relief of Vincent Andrew Donovan;

S. 387. A bill for the relief of Ray Funcannon;

S. 388. A bill for the relief of Louis Gershon;

S. 389. A bill for the relief of George Anthony Goldsborough;

S. 390. A bill for the relief of Angus Winslow Gray;

S. 391. A bill for the relief of Jack Lecel Haas;

S. 392. A bill for the relief of William Forest Jackson;

S. 393. A bill for the relief of William Kovatis;

S. 394. A bill for the relief of Frederick Elmer Lewis;

S. 395. A bill for the relief of Dominick Edward Maggio;

S. 396. A bill for the relief of Thomas Joseph Malloy;

S. 397. A bill for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Svend J. Skou;

S. 398. A bill for the relief of Albert L. Sliney; and

S. 399. A bill for the relief of Joseph S. Walden; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 400. A bill for the organization and functions of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMAS of Idaho:

S. 401. A bill for the relief of Julian Uriat; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 402. A bill granting a pension to Mabel E. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 403. A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida;

S. 404. A bill for the relief of Richard Barker;

S. 405. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ernestine Fuselier Sigler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 406. A bill to revise the method of determining the payments to be made by the United States to the several States with respect to conservation lands administered by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 407. A bill to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to permit eviction proceedings brought thereunder to be instituted in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLGREN (for himself and Mr. BONE):

S. 408. A bill to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project and substitute any additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 409. A bill authorizing the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians or any band thereof to submit their claims against the United States to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 410. A bill for the relief of James B. Lewis, Jarvis T. Mills, and Richard D. Peters; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 411. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911; to expand the public educational facilities of the several States and provide each with a State nautical academy; to create a new public-school system for education of masses of American youths in nautical, aviation, and technical fields relating thereto; to increase the national defense in the realm of radio; to improve navigation; to provide marine conservation and development; to establish and extend full legal rights to the United States Maritime Service as a supplement to the Naval Reserve; to provide an abundant supply of native Americans, trained personnel to operate the new United States ships afloat and in the air; to provide the technical machinery for further maritime improvement; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 412. A bill for the relief of Herbert A. Magley; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 413. A bill to authorize the President to purchase certain lands in Arlington County, Va.; and

S. 414. A bill for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 415. A bill granting an increase of pension to Gus Hughes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of civil government in the far West, the blazing of the Old Oregon Trail, and the epochal immigration of 1843; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 3, 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes" (44 Stat. L. 807); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR (for Mr. GLASS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 53), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Appropriations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

## HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. MALONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 54), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

## HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 55), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Claims, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

## INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS WITHIN JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 58), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized to sit during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress at such times and places as it may deem advisable, to make investigations into all matters within its jurisdiction, and to compile and prepare statistics and documents relating thereto as directed from time to time by the Senate and as may be necessary, and to report in due course to the Senate the result thereof; to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ such expert stenographic, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary; and all the

expenses incurred in pursuance hereof shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF CIVIL AIRCRAFT AND ITS USE IN WORLD AIR COMMERCE

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 59), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Whereas it is imperative that the United States maintain its proper sphere in world air commerce during the immediate post-war period of development; and

Whereas immediately following the end of World War No. 1 it became necessary to readjust aircraft production to civil needs of the United States; and

Whereas immediately following the end of the present war it will be necessary to establish a civil aviation program for the United States for both domestic and foreign air commerce; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 specifically provides for the encouragement and development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense; and

Whereas the time to determine international air rights for civil air transport to establish a charter for freedom of the air is during peace treaty negotiations; and

Whereas it is desirable and necessary to accumulate and compile adequate data prior to such peace treaty negotiations; and

Whereas such data have been heretofore accumulated by various and sundry interdepartmental committees: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the chairman of such committee, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to (1) the feasibility of adapting current types of aircraft used in the war effort to use in civil-air transport; (2) the feasibility of incorporating in the construction of civil aircraft such features as will make them readily adaptable for immediate conversion and use for war purposes; (3) the feasibility of using world air transport as an international air police force to enforce peace terms; (4) the program of training and providing a reserve of skilled aircraft personnel, including ground crews and operations personnel for the immediate mobilization of civil air forces to adequately meet war emergencies, as well as preliminary training of personnel to be directly available to the War and Navy Departments in a war emergency; (5) the provision for world-wide weather observation facilities for forecasting weather over all civil airways, both domestic and foreign; (6) the provision for adequate landing and refueling facilities for world air commerce; (7) the planning, development and construction of aircraft which will assure to the United States at all times its proper sphere in world air commerce; (8) the coordination of civil air transport with other means of transportation; and (9) any other matters which such committee or subcommittee may deem it necessary to investigate for the purpose of obtaining adequate information to enable it to make recommendations for the supremacy of the United States in world air commerce. The committee shall report to the Senate, from time to time, the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, documents, and other records, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

ECONOMIC JUSTICE—INTERVIEW BETWEEN THE VICE PRESIDENT AND RAYMOND CLAPPER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an interview between the Vice President and Mr. Raymond Clapper, broadcast over the Mutual Network on December 31, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION OF JEWISH MILITARY FORCES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Stop Mass Murder," delivered by him at a meeting held under the auspices of the committee on a Jewish army, at New York City, on December 16, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

PEACE AND WAR—STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued on January 3, 1943, by Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, with reference to the issuance of the publication entitled "Peace and War," which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERVIEW BETWEEN EARL GODWIN AND LT. (JR. GR.) STEPHEN FULLER

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an interview between Earl Godwin and Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Stephen Fuller, of Chevy Chase, Md., relative to the latter's experiences on the aircraft carrier *Hornet*, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR AND ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION AFTER THE WAR—ADDRESS BY RT. REV. JOHN A. RYAN, D. D.

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Labor and Economic Reconstruction After the War," delivered by Rt. Rev. John A. Ryan, D. D., at the annual convention of the American Catholic Sociological Society at Cleveland, Ohio, on December 29, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERIM REPORT OF NEW ENGLAND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO INVESTIGATE THE FUEL OIL SITUATION

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an interim report of the New England Members of the Congress of the United States to investigate the fuel-oil situation, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES BY REV. DR. JOHN P. BOLAND AND PAUL M. HERZOG

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Rev. Dr. John P. Boland, chairman of the New York State Labor Relations Board, and an address delivered by Paul M. Herzog on the occasion of a testimonial dinner to Dr. Boland, which appear in the Appendix.]

ABERDEEN'S SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR EFFORT

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Aberdeen's Scientific Contribution to the War Effort," which appears in the Appendix.]

BERNARD BARUCH—EDITORIAL FROM SPARTANBURG HERALD

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bernard Baruch," published in the Spartanburg Herald of December 25, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

REVIEW OF PROSECUTION OF THE WAR IN 1942 BY RAYMOND GRAM SWING

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech broadcast over the Blue Radio Network by Raymond Gram Swing on December 31, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAXES — ARTICLE BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Pay-As-You-Go Taxes," by Ernest K. Lindley, which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from O. B. H. Miller, of Winchester, Ind., referring to agricultural conditions, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Green | Overton |
| Andrews | Guffey | Pepper |
| Austin | Hatch | Reed |
| Barbour | Hawkes | Revercomb |
| Barkley | Hayden | Robertson |
| Bilbo | Hill | Russell |
| Bone | Holman | Scrugham |
| Brewster | Johnson, Colo. | Shipstead |
| Bridges | Lodge | Stewart |
| Burton | Lucas | Taft |
| Butler | McCarran | Thomas, Idaho |
| Capper | McClellan | Tobey |
| Chandler | McFarland | Truman |
| Chavez | McKellar | Tunnell |
| Clark, Idaho | McNary | Vandenberg |
| Connally | Maloney | Van Nuys |
| Danaher | Maybank | Wagner |
| Davis | Mead | Wallgren |
| Downey | Millikin | Walsh |
| Eastland | Moore | Wherry |
| Ellender | Murdock | White |
| Ferguson | Murray | Wiley |
| George | Nye | Willis |
| Gerry | O'Daniel | |
| Gillette | O'Mahoney | |

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the morning business is concluded, I wish to offer a privileged resolution with reference to the organization of the Senate. I send it forward, and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 47), as follows:

*Resolved*, That Hon. CARTER GLASS, a Senator from the State of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected President of the Senate pro tempore, to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the resolution of the Senate adopted on the 12th day of March 1890 on the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous action of the Republican conference held a few days ago, I am pleased and privileged to suggest the name and to nominate the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] for the position of President pro tempore. I therefore move to strike out the name of CARTER GLASS and to insert the name of ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VANDENBERG (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this important but not entirely doubtful vote I am paired with the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. Not knowing how either of us ought to vote, I withhold my vote. [Laughter.]

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would, if present, vote "yea," and allow my vote to stand. I understand that, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] are absent because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, these two Senators would vote "nay."

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, these Senators would vote "nay."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who, if present, would vote "nay," is detained in one of the Government departments. He is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who, I am advised, if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who, if present, would vote "nay," is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], who, I am advised, if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], who, if present, would vote "nay," is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], who, I am advised, if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who would vote "nay," is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who, I am advised, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who would vote "nay," is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who, I am advised, if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained in Government departments. I am advised that if present and voting they would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. I announce the following pairs on this question:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who would vote "nay"; and

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—29

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Ferguson | Robertson |
| Austin | Hawkes | Shipstead |
| Barbour | Holman | Taft |
| Brewster | Lodge | Thomas, Idaho |
| Bridges | McNary | Tobey |
| Burton | Millikin | Wherry |
| Butler | Moore | White |
| Capper | Nye | Wiley |
| Danaher | Reed | Willis |
| Davis | Revercomb | |

NAYS—43

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Chavez | Ellender |
| Barkley | Clark, Idaho | George |
| Bilbo | Connally | Gerry |
| Bone | Downey | Gillette |
| Chandler | Eastland | Green |
| Guffey | Maloney | Scrugham |
| Hatch | Maybank | Stewart |
| Hayden | Mead | Truman |
| Hill | Murdock | Tunnell |
| Johnson, Colo. | Murray | Van Nuys |
| Lucas | O'Daniel | Wagner |
| McCarran | O'Mahoney | Wallgren |
| McClellan | Overton | Walsh |
| McFarland | Pepper | |
| McKellar | Russell | |

NOT VOTING—23

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bailey | Clark, Mo. | Reynolds |
| Ball | Glass | Smith |
| Bankhead | Gurney | Thomas, Okla. |
| Brooks | Johnson, Calif. | Thomas, Utah |
| Buck | Kilgore | Tydings |
| Bushfield | La Follette | Vandenberg |
| Byrd | Langer | Wheeler |
| Caraway | Radcliffe | |

So Mr. McNARY's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Republican Members of the Senate I second the nomination of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] to be President pro tempore of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to express not only my own appreciation and the appreciation of the Democratic side of the Senate, but, I am sure, the appreciation of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], of the very generous action by the Senator from Oregon.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 48), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Edwin A. Halsey, of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected Secretary of the Senate.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY FOR THE MAJORITY

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 49), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, be, and he is hereby, elected secretary for the majority of the Senate.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY

Mr. McNARY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 50), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Carl A. Loeffler, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected secretary for the minority of the Senate.

ELECTION OF CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 51), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, of Washington, D. C., be, and he is hereby, elected Chaplain of the Senate.

SENATOR FROM IOWA—ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the junior Senator-elect from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is present, and I ask that he be permitted to take the oath at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-elect will present himself at the desk, the oath of office will be administered.

Mr. WILSON, escorted by Mr. GILLETTE, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY. I send to the desk a Senate resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 52), as follows:

*Resolved*, That paragraph 1 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and it is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, with leave to report by bill or otherwise:

"Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to consist of 20 Senators.

"Committee on Appropriations, to consist of 25 Senators.

"Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to consist of eight Senators, to which shall be referred all resolutions directing the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same: *Provided*, That any such resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

"Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of 20 Senators.

"Committee on Civil Service, to consist of 10 Senators.

"Committee on Claims, to consist of 13 Senators.

"Committee on Commerce, to consist of 20 Senators.

"Committee on the District of Columbia, to consist of 15 Senators.

"Committee on Education and Labor, to consist of 18 Senators.

"Committee on Enrolled Bills, to consist of three Senators, who shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions before they go out of the possession of the Senate, and which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives, and which, or some one of which, shall examine all bills or joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled, and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States in person, and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate.

"Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to consist of eight Senators.

"Committee on Finance, to consist of 21 Senators.

"Committee on Foreign Relations, to consist of 23 Senators.

"Committee on Immigration, to consist of 14 Senators.

"Committee on Indian Affairs, to consist of 14 Senators.

"Committee on Interoceanic Canals, to consist of eight Senators.

"Committee on Interstate Commerce, to consist of 21 Senators.

"Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to consist of 17 Senators.

"Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 18 Senators.

"Committee on the Library, to consist of 10 Senators, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives.

"Committee on Manufactures, to consist of 13 Senators.

"Committee on Military Affairs, to consist of 18 Senators.

"Committee on Mines and Mining, to consist of 13 Senators.

"Committee on Naval Affairs, to consist of 18 Senators.

"Committee on Patents, to consist of eight Senators.

"Committee on Pensions, to consist of 11 Senators.

"Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to consist of 19 Senators.

"Committee on Printing, to consist of eight Senators, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives.

"Committee on Privileges and Elections, to consist of 17 Senators.

"Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to consist of 14 Senators, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives.

"Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to consist of 15 Senators.

"Committee on Rules, to consist of 13 Senators.

"Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to consist of 17 Senators."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in accordance with the resolution which has just been adopted, I move that the Members whose names I send to the desk representing the majority be assigned to the committees set out in the list of committees contained in the resolution. I make the motion by order of the Democratic steering committee. I understand the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], wishes to present a list of the minority Members to be represented on the committees.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Republican conference, I submit a report containing the list of minority Members to be placed on the Senate committees, and ask that like consideration be given these Senators as members of the committees as is given to the Senators contained in the list submitted on behalf of the majority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the lists of committee assignments on behalf of the majority and the minority, and, without objection, they will be considered together.

The Chief Clerk read the majority and minority assignments, which, in the form of an order, were agreed to, as follows:

*Ordered*, That the following shall constitute the standing committees of the Senate of the Seventy-eighth Congress:

On Agriculture and Forestry: Messrs. Smith (chairman), Wheeler, Thomas of Oklahoma, Bankhead, (Mrs.) Caraway, Hatch, Bilbo, Gillette, Ellender, Lucas, Stewart, Russell, McNary, Capper, Shipstead, Willis, Aiken, Nye, Millikin, and Bushfield.

On Appropriations: Messrs. Glass (chairman), McKellar, Hayden, Thomas of Oklahoma, Tydings, Russell, McCarran, Overton, Bankhead, O'Mahoney, Truman, Green, Maloney, Chavez, Mead, Maybank, Nye, Bridges, Lodge, Holman, White, Gurney, Brooks, Reed, and Burton.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate: Messrs. Lucas (chairman), Tydings, Hayden, Wallgren, Scrugham, Tobey, Brooks, and Nye.

On Banking and Currency: Messrs. Wagner (chairman), Glass, Barkley, Bankhead, Maloney, Radcliffe, Clark of Idaho, Downey, Murdock, Maybank, Scrugham, McClellan, Tobey, Danaher, Taft, Thomas of Idaho, Butler, Capper, Ball, and Buck.

On Civil Service: Messrs. Downey (chairman), McKellar, George, Byrd, Mead, Scrugham, Langer, Burton, Aiken, and Brooks.

On Claims: Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Bailey, Stewart, Tunnell, O'Daniel, Clark of Idaho, Kilgore, Eastland, Capper, Wiley, Robertson, Wherry, and Wilson.

On Commerce: Messrs. Bailey (chairman), (Mrs.) Caraway, Clark of Missouri, Overton, Bilbo, Maloney, Radcliffe, Pepper, Mead, Wallgren, O'Daniel, McCarran, McNary, Johnson of California, Vandenberg, Barbour, Brewster, Burton, Wiley, and Robertson.

On the District of Columbia: Messrs. McCarran (chairman), Glass, Tydings, Bankhead, Reynolds, Bilbo, Overton, Clark of Idaho, O'Daniel, Capper, Bridges, Holman, Burton, Buck, and Bushfield.

On Education and Labor: Messrs. Thomas of Utah (chairman), Walsh, Murray, Pepper, Ellender, Hill, Chavez, Tunnell, Eastland, ———, ———, La Follette, Taft, Bridges, Aiken, Ball, Hawkes, and Wherry.

On Enrolled Bills: Mrs. Caraway (chairman), Messrs. Truman and Reed.

On Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Messrs. Hill (chairman), Van Nuys, Barkley, Green, McClellan, Davis, Aiken, and Ferguson.

On Finance: Messrs. George (chairman), Walsh, Barkley, Connally, Bailey, Clark of Missouri, Byrd, Gerry, Guffey, Johnson of Colorado, Radcliffe, Lucas, La Follette, Vandenberg, Davis, Lodge, Danaher, Taft, Thomas of Idaho, Butler, and Millikin.

On Foreign Relations: Messrs. Connally (chairman), George, Wagner, Thomas of Utah, Van Nuys, Murray, Pepper, Green, Barkley, Reynolds, Guffey, Gillette, Clark of Missouri, Glass, Tunnell, Johnson of California, Capper, La Follette, Vandenberg, White, Shipstead, Nye, and Davis.

On Immigration: Messrs. Russell (chairman), Maloney, Andrews, Stewart, Radcliffe, Maybank, Eastland, ———, Johnson of California, Holman, Burton, Ball, Buck, and Ferguson.

On Indian Affairs: Messrs. Thomas of Oklahoma (chairman), Wheeler, Hatch, O'Mahoney, Chavez, Wallgren, McFarland, Van Nuys, La Follette, Shipstead, McNary, Langer, Bushfield, and Moore.

On Interoceanic Canals: Messrs. Clark of Missouri (chairman), Pepper, Downey, Stewart, Chandler, Lodge, Bushfield, and Hawkes.

On Interstate Commerce: Messrs. Wheeler (chairman), Smith, Wagner, Barkley, Bone, Truman, Johnson of Colorado, Hill, Stewart, Clark of Idaho, Tunnell, McFarland, White, Austin, Shipstead, Tobey, Reed, Gurney, Brooks, Hawkes, and Moore.

On Irrigation and Reclamation: Messrs. Bankhead (chairman), McCarran, Overton, Hatch, O'Mahoney, Chavez, Clark of Idaho, Downey, McFarland, O'Daniel, McNary, Johnson of California, Gurney, Thomas of Idaho, Butler, Millikin, and Langer.

On the Judiciary: Messrs. Van Nuys (chairman), McCarran, Hatch, Connally, O'Mahoney, Chandler, Kilgore, Murdock, McFarland, Wheeler, Andrews, Austin, Danaher, Wiley, Langer, Ferguson, Revercomb, and Wherry.

On the Library: Messrs. Barkley (chairman), McKellar, Thomas of Oklahoma, (Mrs.)

Caraway, Bilbo, Radcliffe, McNary, Brewster, Willis, and Hawkes.

On Manufactures: Messrs. Overton (chairman), Smith, Russell, Gerry, Guffey, Mead, Bilbo, McClellan, La Follette, Barbour, Millikin, Ball, and Buck.

On Military Affairs: Messrs. Reynolds (chairman), Thomas of Utah, Johnson of Colorado, Hill, Downey, Chandler, Truman, Wallgren, Kilgore, Murray, O'Mahoney, Austin, Bridges, Gurney, Holman, Lodge, Revercomb, and Wilson.

On Mines and Mining: Messrs. Guffey (chairman), Thomas of Utah, Johnson of Colorado, Chandler, Wallgren, Kilgore, Maybank, Scrugham, Davis, Reed, Millikin, Revercomb, and Robertson.

On Naval Affairs: Messrs. Walsh (chairman), Tydings, Smith, Russell, Bone, Byrd, Gerry, Andrews, Gillette, Ellender, Lucas, Davis, Johnson of California, Barbour, Wiley, Brewster, Tobey, and Willis.

On Patents: Messrs. Bone (chairman), Smith, Pepper, Clark of Idaho, Lucas, White, Danaher, and Hawkes.

On Pensions: Messrs. Bilbo (chairman), Wheeler, Walsh, Thomas of Utah, Tunnell, McFarland, ———, Shipstead, Brooks, Aiken, and Moore.

On Post Offices and Post Roads: Messrs. McKellar (chairman), Hayden, Bailey, Chavez, Ellender, Mead, Downey, O'Daniel, Scrugham, Eastland, McClellan, Reed, Langer, Buck, Bushfield, Ferguson, Moore, Robertson, and Wilson.

On Printing: Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Walsh, Truman, Pepper, Maybank, Willis, Ball, and Wherry.

On Privileges and Elections: Messrs. Green (chairman), Smith, Connally, Hatch, Mead, Stewart, Chandler, Tunnell, Kilgore, Murdock, Austin, Bridges, Butler, Ferguson, Moore, Revercomb, and Wilson.

On Public Buildings and Grounds: Messrs. Maloney (chairman), Tydings, Walsh, Connally, Truman, Andrews, Gillette, Green, Barbour, Taft, Brewster, Revercomb, Wherry, and Wilson.

On Public Lands and Surveys: Messrs. Hatch (chairman), Wagner, O'Mahoney, Murray, McCarran, Andrews, Wallgren, Murdock, Johnson of Colorado, Nye, Gurney, Holman, Thomas of Idaho, Willis, and Robertson.

On Rules: Messrs. Byrd (chairman), McKellar, Gillette, Andrews, Lucas, Bankhead, Maybank, Gerry, Vandenberg, Barbour, White, Wiley, and Thomas of Idaho.

On Territories and Insular Affairs: Messrs. Tydings (chairman), Hayden, Clark of Missouri, Reynolds, Bone, Wheeler, Gerry, Chavez, Murdock, Ellender, Vandenberg, Lodge, Danaher, Austin, Taft, Brewster, and Butler.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 217. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect; without amendment (Rept. No. 2);

S. 218. A bill to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge; without amendment (Rept. No. 3);

S. 219. A bill to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers; without amendment (Rept. No. 4);

S. 220. A bill to provide for payment of certain travel costs of dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Army and the War Department on a mileage basis in order to promote efficiency and economy in such payments; with an amendment (Rept. No. 9);

S. 221. A bill to amend sections 1 and 2 of chapter XIX of the Army Appropriation Act approved July 9, 1918, relating to the protection of life and property in waters endangered by activities of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 5);

S. 222. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 6);

S. 224. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 8); and

S. Res. 33. Resolution extending the authority for an investigation of the technological resources of the United States; without amendment, and, under the rule, it was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 223. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 7).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. Res. 17. Resolution further continuing the authority for a general survey of the condition of Indians in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 11), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

As in executive session,

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported favorably the nominations of several officers for temporary appointment as general officers in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

## HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate Resolution 54, submitted today by Mr. MALONEY, reported it without amendment and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

## HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate Resolution 55, submitted today by Mr. ELLENDER, reported it without amendment and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Claims or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

## HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 8, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 7, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; in line 8, after the word "committee", to insert a comma; and in the same line, before the word "to", to strike out "expenses thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000)"; so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

## HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 9, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof", and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000)"; so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 10, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, after the word "subject", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 11, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 7, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in the same line, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-eigth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 16, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, before the word "said", to strike out "before", and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof", and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 32, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents a hundred words to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 34, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Immigration, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 35, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof", and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 38, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Commitee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that

the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 40, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, after the word "subject", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expense pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 41, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 7, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 8, before the word "to", to strike out "expenses thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 43, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 7, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and, in the same line, after the word "the", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 44 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to know if all the resolutions provide for the revival of old hearings, or whether any new hearings are contemplated by the resolutions.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the able leader of the minority that all the resolutions deal with the standing committees of the Senate, and the amendments offered to each are the same. The amendments deal primarily with the limitation of $5,000 on money which can be expended by each committee. Heretofore the resolutions which have been presented have provided no limitation of funds, but under the rules it is very plain and certain that limitations should be placed, and that is what the amendments provide. No resolutions as to any special committees of any kind are being taken up today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 7, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in the same line, after the word "the"; to strike out "expenses thereof", and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Patents, or any subcommittee thereof be, and is hereby, authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during sessions or recesses of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 45, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, after the word "subject", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably Senate Resolution 46, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 46) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

PRODUCTION OF GOLD AND SILVER—REFERENCE OF SENATE RESOLUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded. Under Rule VIII, the call of the calendar is in order, and the clerk will state the measure on the calendar.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 20) to authorize the continuation of the Special Committee on the Production of Gold and Silver.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think the resolution should go to the Committee on Banking and Currency, because under the rule all resolutions for investigations that involve expenditures must go to a standing committee, and, in addition to that, a special committee cannot, I think, under the rule, bring in a resolution continuing itself and authorizing further expenditures by it. Under the rule all such resolutions must go to the standing committee concerned, and I am sure that this one was referred to the special committee by oversight.

Therefore, I hope that the resolution may be sent to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I have no doubt that it will promptly report. However, if one special committee could act on a resolution continuing itself, others could do likewise, and that would be in violation of the rule which has been established. I hope that the course I have suggested will be taken.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say that I am interested in the resolution, as the majority leader knows.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think I may safely state that when the original resolution was adopted in the last days of the last session it was understood that it would be readopted and put in force again.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. The majority leader, the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and I had that understanding.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the resolution goes to the Committee on Banking and Currency—and I think the majority leader is entirely correct in his attitude on that point—I hope that the resolution may be reported promptly to the Senate so that certain work which has been started may proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that, and the Senator is correct about the understanding. The same understanding was had about other committees in order that we might clear the slate of any deadwood and reestablish committees which needed to be continued and were really active. I appreciate the Senator's attitude on the point I have made, and I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## JOINT COMMITTEE ON WAR PROBLEMS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD a letter, written by T. Harry Williams, appearing in the New York Times of January 10. The letter refers to a proposal to establish a joint committee of Congress, and I am offering it for the RECORD because on October 22, 1942, and again on January 7, 1943, I submitted a concurrent resolution which would establish such a committee.

I also ask unanimous consent that immediately following the letter there be printed a copy of the aforementioned resolution which I offered, and thereafter a copy of an editorial appearing in the New York Times of January 10, and an editorial, referring to the same resolution, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the letter, resolution, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 10, 1943]

PRECEDENT EXISTS FOR CONGRESSIONAL WAR COMMITTEE—BUT OUR EXPERIENCE WITH RADICAL REPUBLICAN GROUP IN WAR BETWEEN THE STATES WAS NOT A HAPPY ONE AND MAY SERVE AS A WARNING AT THIS TIME

(The writer of the following letter is assistant professor of history at Louisiana State University. He is the author of "Lincoln and the Radicals," published by the University of Wisconsin Press in 1941.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Congressional leaders who have recently advocated the establishment of a joint committee of Congress to sit down with the Executive and the military to formulate war policies and war legislation can find a precedent for their proposed organization in the Civil War. It is a precedent, however, that they might not care to advertise. The congressional agency of the Civil War was the Committee on the Conduct of the War—the most powerful body ever created by Congress in our wartime history. In general, its influence upon the conduct of the war was bad and its interference with the military machine had highly unfortunate results.

The committee was the brain child of the radical Republicans, that faction of the dominant party which determined to make the abolition of slavery and the destruction of the southern social system the great objective of the war. The radicals were sneeringly contemptuous of Abraham Lincoln's announced intention to conduct the war for the sole purpose of restoring the Union, and fiercely determined to sabotage his program. They wanted a remorseless and revolutionary war. They demanded that the important military commands be given to generals who believed in the radical war aims. They shouted for an all-out offensive that would crush the Confederacy.

### OPPOSED TO LINCOLN

In 1861, at the beginning of the war, the radicals raged because the Lincoln administration was following a policy diametrically opposed to their own. The President, striving to unite the people in support of the war and to hold the border slave States in line, had proclaimed the restoration of the Union as the only war aim of the Government. He refused to touch the issue of emancipation.

In the Army the major and brigadier generalships were overwhelmingly held by men known as Democrats or conservative Republicans. The general in chief, George B. McClellan, was a Democrat, and so were his two most important subordinates, Buell and Halleck. The radicals believed that McClellan and other Democratic officers secretly sympathized with the southern cause and hoped that a resort to arms would be unnecessary.

Visions of McClellan in the role of Cromwell, purging Congress of Republican members and restoring the Union, and slavery, with the aid of southern bayonets, haunted the Radical mind. The Radicals ascribed the inactivity of the Federal armies in 1861 to the southern sympathies of the Democratic generals. Why didn't McClellan advance and sweep the Confederates into the Potomac? they cried. Why was he wasting all this time in drill and training and other West Point foolishness? Because he didn't want to hurt his friends?

### STRONG FACTION

Before December 1861, the Radicals had manifested dissatisfaction with the administration and conduct of the war by sniping at Lincoln from the stump and the press. In that month they decided that some more adequate weapon of protest than mere "growling and showing of teeth" would be necessary to force Lincoln to adopt the Radical war aims.

The Radical faction in Congress was strong and aggressive; it did not have an absolute numerical control, but it was powerful enough to dominate Congress on most issues. The Radical leaders resolved to channel or institutionalize their opposition to the administration's war program in the creation of some congressional agency to represent the legislative branch in the formulation of war policies. Such an agency could delve into the secrets of military administration, supply the faction with needed information for the enactment of military legislation, and act as a liaison body between Congress and the Executive and the military.

The obvious device was a joint investigative committee, "to probe the sore spots to the bottom," as one Radical Senator grimly exclaimed. So in the first part of December the Radical bosses piloted through Congress a measure establishing such a committee, composed of three members from the Senate and four from the House. This was the agency that came to be known as the Committee on the Conduct of the War. It was granted spacious powers to investigate "the general conduct of the war," past, present, and future, and to summon before its bar "persons and papers."

### ASSERTED AUTHORITY

The speeches of the Radical sponsors of the committee showed that they intended it to exercise more important functions than the mere digging up of facts. Thus one Senator proclaimed that the committee's big job would be "to keep an anxious, watchful eye over all the executive agents who are carrying on the war at the direction of the people. * * * We are not under the command of the military of this country. They are under ours as a Congress."

The Committee on the Conduct of the War was an important experiment in the relations between the legislature and the executive, the civil and military authorities of a democracy at war. The guiding spirits of the committee were resolved that it should be more than an investigative agency. The chairman, Senator "Bluff Ben" Wade of Ohio, envisioned it as a representative of Congress whose function was to insure the legislative branch a voice in the conduct of the war and the determination of war policies. Congress, he asserted, expected the committee to obtain such facts as would be useful in determining the causes of military failure, "in order to apply any remedy that may be necessary."

### STORMY SCENES

Whenever the inquisitors in the course of their inquiries decided that something was wrong with the conduct of the war, they asked for an interview with Lincoln and sometimes with the Cabinet. At these sometimes stormy meetings the committee would demand that the President remove some general suspected of treason or incompetency or that he order the armies to advance. If Lincoln demurred, the members threatened to stir up Congress and the people against him. When Lincoln felt strong enough, he defied the committee. At other times he yielded to its dictates.

Although not a single member possessed either military experience or education, the committee did not consider that this should preclude it from investigating Army affairs or rendering judgments on the capabilities of military men. The inquisitors, like most civilians of the sixties, felt a profound contempt for any claims that military science was a specialized, technical subject, mysterious to anyone not educated at West Point or Annapolis. Convinced that their opinions

on questions of strategy and tactics deserved as much respect as those of any general, the members never hesitated to overrule the military men.

This was especially true when the committee attempted to impose its concepts of strategy upon commanding generals. The members possessed very positive ideas about how the war should be fought, and they continually urged their plans upon the generals and Lincoln. They believed that wars were won by fighting; their notion of strategy was perpetual attack. "In military movements delay is generally bad—indecision is almost always fatal," was the committee's maxim. The committee always censured officers who, before a battle, took precautionary measures to insure a safe retreat. Such measures, the members thought, indicated a lack of resolve and the will to win.

ARMY MEN ANNOYED

Most of the witnesses who testified before the committee were officers of the Army. Many of these men, products of West Point and the Regular Army, viewed the committee as a meddlesome civilian agency and objected to supplying it with information of a military nature. This was most marked when the committee, eager to find out the plans of generals like McClellan, tried to persuade witnesses to disclose what operations were proposed for the future. When the investigators failed to get this information from the commanding generals, they endeavored to secure it from subordinate officers. The Army, insisted Wade, had no right to withhold secrets from Congress. Most military men recoiled from such questions. Not only did the soldier deem it dangerous to reveal military secrets to a number of civilians but his training inhibited him from discussing the plans of his superior with other people, especially civilians.

The committee met much the same reaction when it asked officers to discuss and criticize the actions and decisions of other officers. It encouraged subordinates to speak freely about their superiors, to give opinions about battles they had not seen, and to say what they would have done had they been present on a certain field. To the members, seeking to ascertain the causes of Union defeats, it seemed perfectly natural to collect the opinions of all Army witnesses, regardless of rank. For a subordinate to criticize his superior was heresy to the military creed, and many officers refused to answer. There were always some officers, however, ambitious for place and angling for the committee's support, who were willing to give the inquisitors what they wanted. The net result was to sow seeds of dissension and faction among the officers which sprouted into sordid intrigues and seriously impaired the morale of the whole Army.

SECRET HEARINGS

Certain rules of procedure adopted by the committee and its incessant attempts to secure the removal or subordination of generals opposed to the radical war policies caused hostile critics to label it a court of star chamber or an inquisition conducting military trials. At its first meeting the committee decided that all hearings would be secret, and the members swore not to reveal any of the testimony. This was obviously a wise regulation for an agency that received vital military information. The committee, however, sometimes violated its own rule. The members surreptitiously furnished material drawn from witnesses to the radical press or announced the results of their findings in speeches in Congress.

The secret hearings gave the committee a sinister and unfair advantage when it was seeking the downfall of some general and summoned him before it to testify. He appeared alone, unrepresented by counsel. He was not permitted to examine the previous testimony, and hence could not know what charges against him the committee was framing. In fact, he might not even dream that the committee was after his military scalp, and innocently he would supply testimony that helped to bring about his own destruction.

The committee exercised a tremendous influence during the war. On several occasions it was largely instrumental in forcing Lincoln to order premature offensive movements. It took the lead in pushing radical legislation through Congress. It poisoned Lincoln's mind against McClellan and helped to bring about that general's eventual removal. On the eve of McClellan's most important campaign the committee persuaded Lincoln to withdraw 40,000 men from the Army on the false plea that the general had left Washington undefended. With his Army thus sabotaged, McClellan failed. The committee secured the removal of several other Democratic officers and the arrest of one, General Stone; it smeared in its reports the records of the generals whose disgrace it could not accomplish.

IN TUNE WITH TIMES

The committee was an experiment in civilian, Congressional control of the executive and the military in a democracy at war. In no other of our wars has Congress made such a successful attempt to dictate military operations and the personnel of the Army. The committee was a powerful agency because it was a product of the times, and the American public of the times expressed a contempt for scientific military education and a preference for amateurism in war.

Again, the committee reflected the popular spirit in its concepts of strategy and tactics—constant offensive movements and ceaseless fighting. The members were scornful of generals who spoke about the necessity of adequate training of troops, careful preparation, siege machinery, and proper precautionary measures in case of defeat. The guess might be hazarded that any similar congressional agency in this war would be animated by the same impatience for a quick, smashing victory.

The history of the committee provides some valuable lessons concerning the functions that an investigative body of Congress should exercise in wartime. The committee's influence was bad, because, in the first place, it assumed to impose its inexpert knowledge of military affairs upon trained experts in the art of war. The members were civilians. They vaguely grasped the broad concepts of strategy as related to the whole theater of war, but the important details of battlefield tactics and the problems of logistics they rarely understood.

SOME GOOD WORK

On the other hand, when the investigators turned their attention to such subjects as the production of war materials, where they could act with a degree of competence, they did worth-while and needed work.

The second fault of the committee was the violent partisan bias which characterized its every thought and action. Whether any congressional committee, composed of politicians, can divorce itself from politics is open to serious doubt. If it can and if it restricts its duties to matters where it can speak with authority, it will perform a valuable service. If it cannot meet these conditions, it had better not be born.

T. HARRY WILLIAMS.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *January 6, 1943.*

---

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on War Problems (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee"), and to be composed of six Members of the Senate to be selected by the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives to be selected by the House of Representatives. Not more than three of the members of the joint committee selected by the Senate, and not more than three of the members of the joint committee selected by the House of Representatives, shall be from the same political party. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a special study and investigation of the problems arising out of the war under existing and future acts of Congress; to confer with the President, and with the various departments and agencies of the Government, from time to time, with respect to such problems; to consult with other committees of both branches of the Congress, and to report to the Congress from time to time, together with such recommendations with respect to legislation as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $ , shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

---

[From the New York Times of January 10, 1943]

CONGRESS IN WARTIME

We publish on this page today a letter from Prof. T. Harry Williams, on the Congressional Committee on the Conduct of the War which was formed in December 1861, shortly after the outbreak of the War between the States, and continued until June 1865. In view of the proposals in Congress for another joint committee on the conduct of the present war, Professor Williams' account should serve as a warning. Because the 1861 committee did so many things that it should not have done, and did them often in so partisan a spirit, it does not follow that no congressional committee with a similar purpose should be formed now. But if it is, it has much to learn from the errors of its predecessor.

Writing on the same subject in 1917, Prof. W. W. Pierson expressed the belief that in spite of its shortcomings the 1861 committee had "brought speed and energy into the conduct of the war; that they ferreted out abuses and put their fingers down heavily upon governmental inefficiency; and that they labored, for a time at least, to preserve a balance and effect a cooperation between the legislative and executive departments." Prof. Lindsay Rogers, similarly, has expressed the opinion that "the most valid objections to the committee were to its members and to their behavior, rather than to the device as such."

It is academic to ask at this point whether there ought to be congressional committees or the conduct of the present war. We

already have several such committees—the Truman committee in the Senate, the Tolan committee in the House, the various standing committees on military and naval affairs, and so on. The present question is whether some of the committees should not be consolidated into a single joint committee. As Professor Williams concedes, in spite of the particular faults of the committee of 1861–65, if a congressional committee today can keep within its proper sphere and act without partisanship it can perform a valuable service.

It is not the function of Congress, or of any committees representing it, to conduct the war. But it is the function of Congress to see that the war is well conducted. For this function a properly organized single joint committee, dominated by a cooperative and genuinely patriotic spirit, could prove of the first importance.

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

THE WHITE HOUSE AND CAPITOL HILL

Senator MALONEY, of Connecticut, has announced that in the new Congress he will seek to revive a bill lost in the shuffle of the old, to provide for a bi-partisan congressional super committee which would consult with administration officials in advance of requests for legislation. Senator MALONEY'S plan calls for a 12-man committee composed of Members of both Houses, with Republicans and Democrats represented equally. He hopes that these men, by expressing the congressional view beforehand, will eliminate or diminish friction and controversy between the White House and Capitol Hill on war legislation.

The success of such a device depends, of course, upon the spirit in which it is operated. It might easily become a focus for increated resentment between the executive and legislative branches. But if both Congress and the administration accept it frankly as a method of promoting cooperation for the solution of the vital problems facing the Nation, it can have immense advantages in the conduct of the war and in preparations for the peace.

Many Congressmen have expressed fear lest wartime measures be converted into permanent peacetime instruments without congressional approval. Others have been displeased by the proliferation of administrative government under blanket grants of power—to say nothing of such open attempts by the Executive to circumvent the expressed will of Congress as the $25,000-a-year salary limit. A public temper which is critical of the administration, reflected in the election returns last November, adds to these specific grounds for suspicion, and with the close party balance in the new Congress could easily lead to a stalemate, blocking essential legislation and hampering the progress of the war.

Congressional investigations after the fact may help to correct errors or to inform public and congressional opinion as to the course of the administration. But they also lead to irritation, use up valuable time, and do not provide for constructive congressional participation in policy making. Only frequent and candid consultation between the President and congressional leaders can do that. Nor can the President select only leaders representing his own party for this purpose without running the danger of such revolt as cost Wilson his leadership and left the Nation without a fixed policy at a critical time. That tragedy must not be repeated, and it is certainly not too early to organize relations between the President and Congress in such a manner as to avoid it. Senator MALONEY'S plan merits careful consideration.

## CONSTRUCTION OF FUEL-OIL PIPE LINES

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, because of the deep interest of our citizens and State and municipal officials along the Atlantic seaboard in the shortage of the supply of oil, renewed interest has been developed in the progress that is being made in the construction of oil pipe lines to meet future needs.

I request that there be inserted in the RECORD a memorandum from the Navy which indicates the progress in the construction of these pipe lines.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. That the first section of the pipe line from Longview, Tex., to southern Illinois is practically completed—all the pipe is laid—but materials for some of the pumping units have not yet been received. He expects the line to be in operation by February 1. This will increase the eastern oil supply, as tank cars will have a shorter run, as many of them will run only as far west as Illinois instead of going to Texas.

2. The pipe is now being processed for the second section of the line; that is, from southern Illinois to the Philadelphia-New York area.

This project is going along satisfactorily, and this section should be in operation by next fall. The priorities on the materials for this section of the line are now satisfactory, and they hope to retain these priorities. This pipe line will be capable of delivering 300,000 barrels daily.

## INTERIM REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—BARGES (PT. 1 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, at the request of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, and at the instance of the chairman of that committee the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], I submit a report on the barge program. It is referred to as an interim report on barges.

Mr. President, the shortage of petroleum products in the east coast region of the United States is primarily a shortage of transportation rather than a shortage of the products themselves. When this shortage became apparent it was immediately necessary to explore every means of increasing the facilities for transporting petroleum and petroleum products.

In the spring of 1942 this committee made an investigation to ascertain what progress had been made in converting existing dry cargo barges and building new wooden barges for the purpose of transporting petroleum and petroleum products. The committee found that there had been a great deal of discussion about barges but that no important action had been taken.

Shortly thereafter a committee appointed by the President—consisting of Secretary Harold Ickes, Department of Interior; Secretary Jesse Jones, Department of Commerce; Mr. Leon Henderson, Administrator, Office of Price Administration; Major General Reybold, Chief of Engineers, United States Army; Mr. Joseph B. Eastman, Office of Defense Transportation—recommended to the President that a specific program be adopted to obtain increased use of the intercoastal and intracoastal waterways for the movement of petroleum. The President's committee also recommended that existing bulk cargo steel barges be converted to make them suitable for transporting petroleum and urged that 500 wooden barges with a capacity of 6,000 barrels each, 100 wooden-hull tugboats of 600 horsepower each, and 20 steel-hull river towboats of 2,000 horsepower each should be constructed.

These facilities together with additional terminal facilities and a trans-Florida pipe line were expected to provide for the movement of 50,000 barrels of fuel oil per day from Texas to Illinois for transshipment to the east-coast region, 50,000 barrels of fuel oil per day from Texas to Florida for transshipment by rail to Norfolk and intermediate points, and 35,000 to 50,000 barrels per day of gasoline and other petroleum products from Texas to Florida for use in the south Atlantic seaboard area.

By the end of July the President approved the recommendations of his committee and the Corps of Engineers of the Army reported to the Office of Defense Plant Corporation that with the necessary priorities the program might be expected to be completed on or before April 1, 1943.

In August the program for the conversion of existing bulk cargo steel barges was reduced by one-half from 259 to 130 barges by the requirements committee of the War Production Board. The War Production Board also decided that the balance of the program for the construction of new wooden barges, towboats, and tugboats was to be held in abeyance.

So the report of the President's committee—an adequate report, a report which, in my judgment, should be followed to the letter—was not only reduced by one-half but was eventually entirely eliminated.

This action was taken because of the shortage of steel and on the report of the Bureau of Ships of the Navy Department that the most likely source of Diesel engines was the General Motors Corporation, all of the facilities of which would be required until the middle of April 1943 for essential Navy programs. The Diesel Engine Section of the War Production Board was not even consulted concerning availability of smaller Diesels.

In September the Office of Defense Transportation reported to the Defense Plant Corporation that steam engines and 250 horsepower Diesel engines could be made available for use in towboats and tugboats, and the Defense Plant Corporation and the Office of Defense Transportation joined in urging that the War Production Board reconsider the towboat program. In October the War Production Board concluded that the program should be resubmitted in the spring of 1943 on the theory that so much time had been lost that towboats could not be

completed until February or March of 1943, when it would be too late to have any effect on the oil shortage during the winter of 1942 and 1943.

In November 1942 Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, authorized a reexamination of the matter, when his attention was called to the suggestion that a gasoline engine built by the Chrysler Corporation known as the sea mule might be used as a possible substitute for Diesel power. A test of the sea mule has been ordered, but will not be completed for some weeks. The Diesel Engine Section of the War Production Board finally was consulted and reported that Diesels in the 1,000- to 2,000-horsepower class would not be available for the proposed program, but that there was no question of the availability of steam engines and boilers and small Diesel engines and power units for tugs and towboats. This report resulted in the resubmission of the barge program by the Defense Plant Corporation to the Requirements Committee of the War Production Board. At the time of resubmission the Office of Defense Transportation asserted that every available tank barge was in service and that the conversion program was not being held up by a lack of motive power but rather by the failure to convert the existing steel bulk cargo barges. The Office of Defense Transportation asserted that sufficient tugboats and towboats could be made available by transfers from existing nonessential uses and by the transfer of tugboats and towboats which could not be used in their normal operations during the winter months because of freezing conditions.

Up to December 31, 1942, contracts had been let by the Inland Waterways Corporation on behalf of the Defense Plant Corporation for the conversion of only 84 of the 259 steel bulk cargo barges. These contracts represent a total capacity of 1,005,000 barrels. Little progress had been made on the conversion program. Only 4 barges with a capacity of 15,000 barrels each had been converted as of December 31, 1942. The explanation for the lack of progress assigned by the Office of Defense Transportation was that the conversion program was being held up by financial and other restrictions imposed by the Defense Plant Corporation, which made it difficult to use available shipyard capacity.

Late in November, Mr. Donald Nelson asked Mr. Jesse Jones either to modify the contract restrictions or to proceed by letters of intent, and he asked Mr. Joseph B. Eastman to take drastic steps to increase the petroleum deliveries by barge. Mr. Nelson also asked Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt, chairman of the requirements committee of the War Production Board, to take the barge-construction program personally in hand.

Mr. President, if this had been accomplished as it should have been, as required by the President's committee, it would not be found necessary to close schoolhouses and in some instances, perhaps, churches, as well as factories and industries in the northeastern section of the country.

Thereupon, after the matter had been referred to Mr. Eberstadt by Mr. Donald Nelson, the Program Adjustment Committee of the War Production Board considered a revised barge program substituting motive power which had been found to be available, but the Navy and Maritime Commission representatives suggested that even the revised program might interfere with Navy and Maritime Commission programs, and it was again held up. At a later meeting it developed that the Navy's opposition was on the theory that the barge program might conflict with its requirements for lumber and that the Maritime Commission's opposition was based on the theory that steel was more urgently needed for tankers and ore carriers. An examination of the lumber situation developed that sufficient quantities of yellow pine could be made available and an examination of the steel situation developed that although it was tight, it was not sufficiently critical to require the abandonment of a program as essential as the barge program. Mr. Eberstadt as chairman of the Requirements Committee approved the barge program and assigned it an AA-3 priority rating without dissent. The Requirements Committee further decided that where the necessary materials could not be obtained on such a priority rating, application could be made for a higher rating, and where the program was found to conflict with the Navy program the Navy could appeal for reconsideration.

On December 18, 1942, it was agreed by the departments concerned that the construction of the towboats should be pushed with all speed by the Inland Waterways Corporation so as to be ready upon completion of the barges. It was also agreed that contracts for the construction of tugs, wooden barges, and terminal facilities would be let by the Engineer Corps of the Army and financed by the Defense Plant Corporation. The Corps of Engineers estimated that it would require from 4 to 6 weeks of preliminary work such as negotiation, placing of orders, and delivery of material before the shipyards could get into actual production and that the entire program could be completed by the summer of 1943.

Mr. President, from the time the President called this committee together, and from the time the committee submitted what they assumed to be an adequate program, there were certain activities in the various bureaus, to an account of which we have listened, which had to do with the setting up of this program and providing it with material. The postponement reached until the first of the year, and I wish to read to the Senate at this time the conclusions arrived at by our committee:

CONCLUSIONS

The committee believes that there has been unnecessary delay and confusion in carrying out a program essential to the national welfare. The delay which occurred prior to the recommendations of the committee appointed by the President is most regrettable, but the delay which occurred after the matter had been studied by that committee and after its recommendations had been approved by the President is inexcusable.

The lengthy and frequent conferences which took place between the numerous agencies involved produced many arguments but few decisions.

The program recommended by the President's committee and approved by the President ought not to have been discarded on the Navy's suggestion that high-powered Diesels necessary for motive power could not be obtained without exploring whether existing tugboat and towboat power could be made available by a transfer from other uses and without exploring whether steam engines, gas engines, or smaller Diesel engines could be made available.

The following committees and agencies all had a hand in making decisions with respect to barges: The President's Committee to Investigate the Problem of Supplying Additional Means of Transportation to Satisfy Petroleum Requirements of the Eastern Seaboard, and a technical subcommittee thereof; the Defense Plant Corporation; the Army Engineer Corps; the Requirements Committee, War Production Board; Program Adjustment Committee, War Production Board; Diesel Engine Section, War Production Board; Office of Procurement and Matériel, Navy Department; Bureau of Ships, Navy Department; the Maritime Commission; and the Inland Waterways Corporation, Department of Commerce. The confusion resulting from this overlapping of authority and duplication of effort is revealed in the following discussion of facts—

Which I shall submit with the report—

There was simply too much talk and not enough action.

Valuable time has been lost. If the barge program had been carried out expeditiously, the shortages of both fuel oil and gasoline in district 1 (the east coast region), particularly the southern and western portions thereof, would have been much less severe. The committee recommends that no further delays be permitted to occur in this vital program.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does not the Senator feel that the administrative ineptitude and confusion which have been so glaringly illustrated in the report which the Senator has submitted are calculated to undermine the confidence of the country generally in the efficiency with which the war effort is being carried on?

Mr. MEAD. With that statement, Mr. President, I cannot quite agree, for the reason that in the main the over-all production directly connected with the war effort has been little less than miraculous. But as it applies to carrying on essential programs, and the production of items directly connected with and yet perhaps removed from the actual scene of conflict, as well as essential civilian programs, it has not met with the same prompt response as has been the case with the direct program, such as the production of tanks, ships, planes, guns, and so forth.

The reason for that can be found in analyzing this report. The President recognized the situation and set up a committee. That committee realized the situation and adopted a program, and, insofar as that is concerned, there was no delay. But when the matter was referred to the War Production Board and to the very necessary subcommittees, one having to do with Diesel power, another having to do with materials, another having to do with priorities, there were

of necessity conferences with the military and with the Maritime Commission, and it was the postponements in most cases ordered in connection with those military activities that caused a great deal of the delay. I presume the delay ensued because it was felt that the program would interfere first of all with the direct war effort, namely, the production of guns, tanks, and ships. But if the matter had been analyzed a little more deeply, if it had been investigated a little more thoroughly, ways and means could have been found for the completion of the greater portion of the program assigned by the President's committee to the various agencies for their consideration.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator agree that all our observations in the past 2 years have argued strongly toward the fixing of individual responsibility in these programs, as distinguished from that of committees?

Mr. MEAD. Perhaps in a number of instances that suggestion would apply appropriately, but, unfortunately, in setting up any over-all agency such as the War Production Board, we must of necessity break it down into sections, as the Senate breaks down its membership into committees, and the committees are broken down, again, into subcommittees. Each section must be consulted with reference to the authority delegated to it, just as we delegate authority to full committees and to subcommittees.

While there are at times suitable reasons why power should be given to an individual rather than to a committee, there is in the study of the program as it has been set up ample justification for the apparent need for conference, whereby several agencies handling one program must of necessity come together. I know of no method whereby we might take away from Mr. Eastman, the Director of Defense Transportation, all the transportation facilities that have anything to do with the transportation of petroleum, and yet it might be considered proper, if we were going to have a system whereby individual responsibility, and individual responsibility alone, should rule, that the Oil Coordinator have all that authority. So there must be a division.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very much interested in the suggestions which have been made. I heard the distinguished mayor of New York, who, I think we all recognize, is a very good administrator, urge very strongly before the Maloney committee, that Mr. Ickes be given that very responsibility, and he said he saw no reason why Mr. Ickes should not control the tank cars which can be used for no other purpose, in view of orders which the Office of Defense Transportation has only very recently put into effect which are vital to the supply of oil to New York and to New England.

Mr. MEAD. I have no argument, because I am not making an argument for either the committee method or the administrator method, but the Senator can see that if the program which he now suggests were put into effect, then Mr. Eastman would have charge of the box cars on the railroads and Mr. Ickes would have charge of the tank cars on the railroads, and the Senator would by the method he suggests divide the responsibility with respect to the railroads. It is difficult to draw a line so there will be no overlapping of authority. Wherever it must be drawn, however, I agree thoroughly with the Senator's suggested principle that authority be lodged in the individual rather than in a committee or in a section of a given agency.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it was not my intention in my first question to do anything other than raise the point of individual responsibility as distinguished from committee responsibility. I agree that we must have certain overlapping, but let us take the case of Mr. Eastman and Mr. Ickes. The Senator will agree that it is much wiser to place all the power we can in Mr. Ickes, and all the power we can in Mr. Eastman, rather than in a tribunal composed of half a dozen men who never can get together on their actions. With that general conclusion, I think the Senator from New York will agree?

Mr. MEAD. I agree with that; and then these two gentlemen in turn should report, as they do, and as they did in this case, to the President of the United States.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. As I understood the Senator's statement of the report of the committee, the report places emphasis on the fact that the President's committee had reached a conclusion on the policy that a certain number of barges should be constructed?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Through the nine agencies the Senator named there has been inevitable delay, perhaps by reason of the number of agencies and the number of people involved. As a result the Senator is pointing out that at this time the greatest need in this country is the saving of time in the production of barges and war material. The investigating committee is devoting itself to speeding up these operations and eliminating confusion.

I notice that the Senator from New York stated at one point that the agencies had overlooked the fact that there was a committee on Diesel engines in the War Production Board, and that there was an absence of a report from that committee on Diesel engines. It is a question of eliminating the extra committees and agencies and individuals, and the need is for greater speed in the production of barges.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I assume we can find an answer to some of the delays, principally the ones encountered in the War Production Board, in the fact that for the first time in all our history we were called upon to enter into a global conflict, and to build for that conflict an overwhelming volume of new equipment; that in every field of war production we were pioneering, and we were without knowledge as to how we could attain quotas. The Army, agreeing that we have the first line of defense well bolstered, would object when it came to the carrying on of programs which were not directly associated with the battle front; the Navy might step in and say, "The carrying on of such programs may interfere with our program"; and the Maritime Commission might do likewise. But today, after pioneering in this war effort for a year, we have established quotas, and we are able to make more accurate estimates, and now by a scientific division of material we may be able to allocate a certain quota of material for one activity, and realize that we will have a certain amount of the material left for another activity. In other words, as was proper, we were emphasizing the war effort, as it applied to the battlefields of the world, and at the same time we were groping for a new concept of the volume of goods necessary to conduct this all-out mechanized war with materials and equipment we never before heard of. So there probably has been some reason for the delay, but that reason will not be valid from now on.

Mr. BURTON. We say we have developed a way by which we can determine our quotas and our policies, and what we need now is action to put them into effect.

Mr. MEAD. That is quite right.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the very able Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] for the excellent manner in which he has made his report to the Senate. It is the unanimous report of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, before the discussion is concluded, I wish to say that in our investigation, the magnificent contribution of the railroads to the transportation of petroleum products was brought to the committee's attention. Let me say a word of high commendation of the employees and the management of our railroads for the splendid response they have made in this emergency. I think the railroads throughout the United States are doing an excellent job in the handling of every commodity, they are doing a magnificent job. The emergency which confronts us at this time has made us realize how indispensable the railroads are.

Mr. TRUMAN. I thank the Senator from New York, and I agree with him entirely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] will be received and printed.

### OIL FOR THE FIGHTERS OF AMERICA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an able radio address dealing with the oil situation, delivered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I wish to call attention to the fact that the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, of which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] was the chairman, went into the oil situation as it affects production, and made a recommendation that Mr. Ickes be placed in complete charge.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL FOR THE FIGHTERS OF AMERICA

The Washington Star has asked me to discuss the petroleum problem because a bill which I sponsored to stimulate the discovery of new sources of supply on lands belonging to the United States in the Far West was put through Congress in the closing hours of the Seventy-seventh session and is now on the President's desk for signature. This measure had the unanimous support of the Public Lands Committees of both the House and Senate and was actively urged in committee and on the floor by Congressman J. WILL ROBINSON of Utah, chairman of the House committee, Senator CARL A. HATCH, of New Mexico, chairman of the Senate committee, and by Senator ABE MURDOCK, of Utah, who had charge of the measure, in the closing day in the Senate.

The bill was needed because new supplies of oil are needed and because in the public land States, there still are possibilities of new discoveries, provided only that men are encouraged and permitted to search for new deposits. In his letter of November 10 to former Congressman William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, who for 9 years was head of the petroleum study of the House Committee on Interstate Commerce, President Roosevelt stated the simple truth when he said:

"The immediate discovery of additional sources of oil is imperative."

It is so imperative that unless new supplies are made available, we stand in grave danger of not having enough petroleum with which to fight the war. The present supplies are definitely not sufficient and we have not as yet taken adequate precautions to be prepared for the crisis that is now upon us. The fact that as a war measure, gasoline was last week denied to all except the most essential civilian uses in 17 Eastern States and the District of Columbia is proof enough of the desperate nature of the crisis. We have been trying to meet war needs by rationing civilian uses. We have been trying to meet the demands of the military forces by diverting supplies from the civilian economy and, until the passage of this bill, no substantial effort was made to bring in new reserves, but new reserves are what are most needed because we are confronted by military demands which are almost beyond imagination.

Let me say here, that no discussion of any problem associated with the war economy should omit acknowledgment of the perfectly remarkable job of mobilizing our resources which has been accomplished. The President and his aides have taken a country which was geared only to peace and in a short year have transformed it into a powerful military unit. They have accomplished wonders and to analyze some of the things that must yet be accomplished is not to be interpreted at all as withholding credit for what has been done.

The magnitude of the task we must perform grows as we contemplate it. Military estimates of materials needed expand steadily as the weeks pass. The Army and the Navy know now that they will need more oil than they dreamed of 6 months ago, because they have new instruments that burn it up.

UNITED NATIONS DEPEND ON OUR OIL

We now have more and larger airplanes in actual combat service than was deemed possible a year ago. Flying Fortresses which, early this year were almost unknown in the South Pacific theater of war, are now turning back every Jap attempt to retake Guadalcanal and are helping MacArthur to avenge Bataan. More than that, only last Monday we learned that American tanks have reached our forces now hammering at Buna Mission. The delivery of these planes and tanks to our men on that far distant front is in itself a most remarkable accomplishment for which our military and production command are deserving the highest praise. But these planes and tanks are burning up oil in an area which was scarcely within contemplation 6 or 8 months ago. And we are delivering this oil to the South Pacific. It comes from our supplies and it is being sent to a portion of the globe which is itself rich in petroleum, the supplies of which, however, have unfortunately fallen into the hands of the Japanese.

On February 2, 1942, more than 10 months ago, when I introduced the bill to stimulate the discovery of new sources of petroleum on the public domain I pointed out that even then the Japanese armies in the Dutch East Indies were being followed by drilling crews to sink new wells in the oil fields the Dutch had tried to destroy, and that it was incumbent upon us to begin immediately to develop new oil deposits.

Not only have our East Indian supplies of oil been cut off, but the German drive in the Caucasus has seriously endangered the Russian supply, and at the same time the Nazi U-boats have cut us off from Venezuela, from which in the days before the war we received on the east coast approximately 200,000 barrels of petroleum every day.

Two years ago exports and imports of oil, so far as the United States was concerned, were approximately balanced. Now imports have been cut off, but exports have been tremendously increased—exports for our allies as well as for our own forces. Thus United States deposits of petroleum have become practically the only sure and certain source from which the United Nations may draw their essential supplies of oil.

MILITARY DEMANDS GROWING

Meanwhile, the demand is so great and is growing so rapidly that failure on the part of the Government, the oil industry, and the people to prepare immediately can only result in disaster. American production of crude petroleum is now running at the rate of something more than 4,000,000 barrels every day. This was sufficient in the days before the war to take care of all industrial and civilian needs, but it is totally inadequate to fuel the tanks and planes that must carry the war to Tokyo and Berlin. It is not too much to say that it will require considerably more than that amount to fuel the air raids upon which the American Air Forces and the Royal Air Force have already been launched. Every bomber which leaves a United Nations airfield must carry its own supply in sufficient quantity to carry it to its objective and back again. When we talk of a flying radius of say 1,500 miles, it becomes at once apparent that we are talking in terms of gasoline consumption far exceeding anything to which we have ever been accustomed. When we talk of building bigger and bigger air fleets capable of longer and longer flight we are talking in terms of oil consumption that no one, either in the oil industry or in the Army or Navy, dreamed of 2 years ago.

The complexity of the problem is further enhanced by the fact that these air armadas need for their efficient operation a type of high-octane gasoline which is only now coming into manufacture in quantity and which is extraordinarily expensive in terms of crude petroleum, for scarcely 10 percent of a barrel of oil as it comes out of the ground can finally be manufactured into the sort of gasoline that is needed to supply power to our air armadas.

In addition to high-octane gasoline for airplanes, great quantities of ordinary gasoline are needed for tanks and trucks, great quantities of fuel oil for the Navy, large amounts of toluene, a byproduct of petroleum for the manufacture of explosives, and, finally, large amounts of butadiene, another byproduct, for the manufacture of synthetic rubber. It may be that grain alcohol will become an increasing source of the gasoline needed to make rubber, but to date petroleum rather than any agricultural product is the principal source of this material.

It thus becomes perfectly clear how necessary crude oil is to the winning of the war. I am told by those who are in a position to know that two-thirds of the tonnage shipped to our military forces consist of petroleum. It is the realization of this fact which has prompted Congress to pass the bill, the objective of which is to stimulate the discovery of new sources of oil upon the public domain. The measure undertakes to do that by providing a lower royalty to the Government for a period of 10 years for new discoveries. Under the present law, lessees of Government oil lands pay the United States a royalty which ranges from 12½ to 32 percent, according to the amount and the value of production. Under the new law any lessee who brings in a new oil field or who, on an old lease, brings in a new deposit of oil will be rewarded by being required to pay not more than 12½ percent for a period of 10 years after the discovery.

I would be the last person to predict that the passage of this bill will solve the petroleum problem. It will not; first, because even though there may be a large supply of undiscovered petroleum in the public-land States, the process of exploration and discovery is a long and arduous one and it may be doubted whether very many discoveries can be made under this bill in less than a year. Meanwhile, we shall be drawing upon our known reserves of petroleum at a rate which will hasten their depletion.

NEW DISCOVERIES ARE ESSENTIAL

The gravity of the situation will be understood when I point out that the amount of petroleum which has already been drawn from the ground and is in storage ready to be shipped, amounts to only about 250,000,000 barrels, or less than one-fifth of the annual production. The oil which is under the ground can only be estimated and may not in fact be as much as petroleum engineers believe. Whatever it amounts to, however, it cannot be withdrawn too rapidly without extreme danger to the deposits, for the amount of oil which may be taken from any field depends upon the maintenance of gas pressure at the bottom of the well. When a great many wells are drilled in a small area the producing life of the area is proportionately reduced. This is the reason why so-called conservation practices have been followed in most of the oil-producing States.

The rate of discovery of new fields has been falling off and, as a consequence, we have not been bringing in new supplies to make up for the withdrawals which are being made.

In 1942, according to the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator, the United States produced 6 percent more crude petroleum than it did in 1941, but if there are no new discoveries the production in 1943 will be 10 percent less than in 1941 and in 1944 there will be almost 20 percent less, indicating again how necessary it is to promote the search for new sources of oil. If we are to maintain the balance during 1943, disregarding completely the new demand, it will be necessary to discover, either in new fields or by extensions of old fields, enough new oil to amount to 400,000 barrels every day.

To promote the discovery of this oil, no other step has been taken than the passage of this bill, which affects only the public domain. The Senate Committee on Public Lands, which has given months to the study of the problem, has recommended not only the enactment of this measure, but it has also recommended that the Petroleum Coordinator, the War Production Board, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation un-

dertake immediately to finance exploratory drilling wherever oil may be found. Government loans to the so-called wildcatters are necessary because under present conditions the independent operator is unable to secure the necessary loans through ordinary banking channels. A short-term loan is not sufficient. The independent operator, who does not have the backing of large financial reserves, must have the support of long-term Government loans because in the present economic situation banks and other private sources of capital are unable to meet the emergency.

POSITION OF INDEPENDENT OPERATOR

How important this is to the maintenance of what we are pleased to call the free enterprise system will be recognized when I point out that the position of the small independent operator has been steadily growing weaker. In 1939 an examination of authoritative statistics showed that the major oil companies at that time controlled 52.7 percent of all the proven crude oil reserves in the United States. In 1942 they controlled almost 70 percent.

This is because the wildcat operator, when he discovers oil, usually seeks a purchaser for his discovery and usually it is a major oil company which buys the newly discovered oil lands.

The history of the oil industry is the history of the search for new fields by pioneers. It is the pioneer who takes the chance. It is the pioneer who plays the long shot and at a time like this when every petroleum expert and every congressional or executive investigator agrees that new reserves are imperative, it is essential that an inducement should be held out to the independent. The reduction of royalties upon the public domain and long-term loans upon good security through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are two methods by which the Government may support the independent operator in the essential search for new sources of oil supply.

But even both of these inducements are not enough. The most serious obstacles to the search for new oil supplies are shortages of material and shortages of manpower. Unless there is a relaxation of present priority rules with respect to materials that are needed for the drilling of wells it is inevitable that even with lower royalties and long-term loans, fewer and fewer wells will be drilled to completion. It is the testimony of all who know the industry that the amount of critical materials needed for drilling wildcat wells is much les than that which is needed to complete a producing well, but when a well is drilled to production the resulting supply of new oil is of such great importance that priority rulings should be unhesitatingly relaxed to make certain that the new supply is brought in.

Much can be done also to relieve the situation by improvement in the means of transportation, Congressman Cole, who made his final report to the President on October 22 as he was resigning from the House of Representatives to take a seat upon the United States Customs Court, more than a year ago sponsored the Cole Pipe Line Act, but the construction of the pipe lines authorized by this law was delayed for months. Even now, largely by lack of steel and other materials, we are not doing enough to make existing oil reserves available. In west Texas, in New Mexico, and in Wyoming, there are not sufficient transportation facilities to bring into immediate use existing supplies of oil.

The areas in which oil is produced and in which it is refined and used are separated by such great distances that the problem of transportation is one of the most difficult of all factors. For example, in the eastern area, which refines normally about 15 percent of the total amount of crude oil produced, there is less than 2 percent of the total reserve, whereas in the Southwest 68 percent of the petroleum reserves are found while the local requirements for refining amount to only 37 percent.

Lacking in sufficient pipe lines and with the accustomed tanker service cut off by reason of the war, the petroleum industry was forced to turn to the railroads for relief, but although the railroads are now transporting approximately 850,000 barrels of oil a day as compared with less than 5,000 barrels 2 years ago, the facilities are not adequate. The tankers used to carry more than a million barrels a day and the cost was $750,000 less daily than railroad transportation.

PROBLEM OF PRICE

This raises the last and probably the most important factor, namely, the factor of price. The House Committee on Interstate Commerce, through Congressman Cole, on October 22 recommended to the President not only that there should be a centralization of Government authority over the production and distribution of petroleum, but that there should be an over-all increase of price.

The Senate committee, on the other hand, while recommending the reduction of Government royalties, Reconstruction Finance Corporation long-term loans and concentrated authority, did not make any recommendation with respect to price because the Public Lands Committee was of the opinion that that was a matter which was beyond its jurisdiction. It did, however, receive testimony upon this question. The industry, including the independents, urges a price increase and justifies it upon the ground that the war has utterly changed all of the conditions of production and distribution and, second, upon the ground that only an increase of price will enable the producer both of crude and of the refined products to meet the increased costs.

For the refiner it is pointed out that in normal times ordinary gasoline was the principal product and that the price which was received for the gasoline consumed by the civilian economy enabled the production and distribution of other byproducts, including fuel oil, at low prices. Rationing of gasoline, however, and the increased demand for fuel oil, as well as for other byproducts, made it necessary for refiners to produce larger quantities of the product which was sold for the smallest price. The Petroleum Coordinator, in his testimony before the Senate Public Lands Committee, referred "to the changes we have had to order in refinery yields so as to produce from crude oil more heating and industrial oils and less gasoline." He went on to say that "when a refiner is asked to make less and less of his high-value product and more and more of the low-value product, his net returns diminish toward the vanishing point," and that, in these circumstances, small refiners "are faced with the alternative of going out of business altogether or of being consolidated into their larger competitors."

Independent operators, too, urged an increased price of oil. Said one of these, Mr. Bert Aston, of Roswell, N. Mex., at our Artesia hearing:

"The oil man doesn't want a subsidy. He isn't that kind of an animal. He doesn't want the Government or anyone else to subsidize him. All we need is an adequate price for our oil. * * * I say to the Government quite frankly: If you help us get a reasonable price for our oil we will go out and get the wildcats. I represent dozens of fellows like me that drill them and pay for them. We miss them and hit them. We hit a few and miss a lot, but if you will help us get an adequate price you don't need to worry about the oil reserves. The independents will take care of that."

Congressman Cole, in his report to the President, also pointed out the readjustment of refinery production and the increased costs of wildcatting, leading to the following conclusion:

"An adjustment in the price of oil and a collateral adjustment in the price of products is a necessary war measure to insure the drilling of wildcats, to continue production of stripper wells, to rehabilitate wells long shut down and make possible secondary recovery operations in many fields where the oil is needed."

Opposed to this is the policy of the Office of Price Administration. Mr. Henderson, in his testimony to the committee was definitely of the opinion that a price increase would result in unnecessarily large profits for the companies which dominate the petroleum industry. His position was that it would be preferable for the Government to pay subsidies in necessary cases to stimulate production rather than to grant an over-all increase of price which would be paid by all civilians and by the Government in the purchase of petroleum products. It would be better, according to his testimony, for the Government to expend $250,000,000 in direct subsidies to the discoverers of new oil than by an increase of 50 cents per barrel on a daily production of 4,000,000 barrels to incur an additional cost of $730,000,000 for a year's oil supply.

Then, too, I remember the testimony of the late Mr. W. S. Farish, president of the Standard Oil of New Jersey, who told the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1939 that the Nation's oil reserves had been increased during the previous 14 years from 5½ billion barrels to 17 billion while the average price of crude oil was usually under $1.20 per barrel. The average price last year was $1.12. Of course, when Mr. Farish was testifying he was the head of the world's largest oil refinery. He was not the spokesman of the producer.

MAJOR COMPANY HOLDINGS

Whether price increase or Government subsidy is the device for stimulating the discovery of more oil, one thing is certain, namely, that more oil must be found. The royalty bill is an effort to open the public domain to renewed exploration. It must be supplemented by more complete exploitation of the undeveloped land now held by the twenty major oil companies. Though they control almost 50,000,000 acres, they are producing from only 3,750,000 acres. This tremendous undeveloped area must be explored. I am glad to be able to report that the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator is now working on this problem and that as a result of the suggestions of Secretary Ickes, the big companies at this moment have far more seismograph crews at work searching for new oil possibilities than at any previous time in history.

Seismograph search, however, is not enough. We must have drilling. It is not difficult to predict that if the independents and the majors fail to drill, the demand will grow for a drilling campaign under the direction of the United States Army engineers. The Army and the Navy must have the oil.

The testimony to the Senate Public Lands Committee raised the central question which lies at the heart of the whole current debate over price control. The Price Control Act authorized the payment of subsidies, but fixed no standards to guide the administrator, and Congress has not yet appropriated any money specifically for the payment of subsidies either for petroleum products or for agricultural products. This fundamental issue of whether the price system should be used in the traditional manner to bring needed commodities into the market or whether when a price ceiling prevents a producer from getting his costs out of his operation a subsidy should be paid is one which will have to be settled in the new Congress. It is not a question to be discussed here.

I am content to point out that the Office of Price Administration has recognized in some cases that price increases should be granted for the purpose of stimulating production and that this can be done without an over-all order. It has already been done in Pennsylvania with respect to lubricating oil which indicates the need for a price increase. There is another instance in the case of fuel oil. In Wyoming, there are 21 known fields capable of producing what is called black oil, that is to say, a heavy oil which is used for fuel purposes. Before the war there was comparatively little demand for this oil and at one time when the Government, through the Interior Department, sought to fix a price of about 90 cents a barrel on this oil it failed because there was no market for the oil at that price. Lack of market meant lack of development, but that was before the war. When the Office of Price Administration fixed the prices on crude oil of this character, it fixed them as of October 1, 1941, before the need for new production had developed.

The result is that the price of this oil, which is now very much needed, is fixed at the 50-cent level which was in effect October 1, 1941, at a time of little demand. Our committee was told that if the price of that oil were increased it would be possible to multiply the amount of production perhaps threefold; that is to say, to increase the daily output from 30,000 to 90,000 barrels.

California producers of fuel oil likewise assert that an increase of price would result in an increase of production. These questions are now under consideration in negotiations between the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator and the Office of Price Administration.

Whatever may be the merits of the controversy between price and subsidy, this is clear, that to win the war we need more oil. The military needs are the primary needs; and if we do not have sufficient petroleum to fuel our airplanes, our tanks, our battleships, airplane carriers, and destroyers, all questions of price and profit and of civilian use will be idle.

OIL IS THE MOST ESSENTIAL WAR MATERIAL

Whoever uses petroleum today must know that he is using the most essential of all war materials. It is true that the modern army moves only on rubber. It is true that no army can fight without weapons and equipment of steel, but the Armies and Navies of the United Nations could have unlimited supplies of both rubber and steel, but without petroleum they could not move.

To me, when I think of what the men on the front are doing, when I read the dispatches from the South Pacific and from north Africa, when on the radio I hear of the flying fortresses going out over enemy territory and sometimes suffering the loss of gallant men who will never return, I know that all theories of price, profit, and economic control are unimportant. The all-important thing now is the production and distribution of the materials that the men on the fighting front must have if they are to win the war for us.

The following is the full text of the new law which was signed by the President on Christmas Eve, December 24:

"An act to encourage the discovery of oil and gas on the public domain during the continuance of the present war

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That during the period of the national emergency proclaimed by the President May 27, 1941 (Proclamation No. 2487), upon a determination by the Secretary of the Interior that a new oil or gas field or deposit has been discovered by virtue of a well or wells drilled within the boundaries of any lease issued pursuant to the provisions of the act, approved February 25, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., title 30, secs. 181–263), the royalty obligation of the lessee who drills such well or wells to the United States as to such new deposit shall be limited for a period of 10 years following the date of such discovery to a flat rate of 12½ percent in amount or value of all oil or gas produced from the lease.

"Approved, December 24, 1942 (Public Law 832, 77th Cong.)."

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it is agreeable at this time, the Chair will administer the oath of office to Mr. Halsey, elected Secretary of the Senate.

Thereupon Mr. Edwin A. Halsey advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office was administered to him.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 56), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of Edwin A. Halsey, of Virginia, as Secretary of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 57), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Edwin A. Halsey, of Virginia, as Secretary of the Senate.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM ON ANTHRACITE COAL STRIKE

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I wish to make a short report from the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, on the anthracite coal strike, which is now going on in Pennsylvania.

Early in January a number of the members of the United Mine Workers engaged in mining anthracite coal in Pennsylvania went on strike. By Wednesday, January 6, the strike had reached serious proportions and by Saturday, January 9, almost half of the 40,000 miners in the anthracite field were on strike.

The strike was not authorized by the United Mine Workers, which had a contract with the anthracite mine operators which does not expire until April 30, 1943. The reason assigned by the strikers for leaving work was the action of the operators in deducting from wages dues at the rate of $1.50 per month per man. The operators were compelled to make the deduction by their contract with the United Mine Workers.

The dues which have been charged by districts 1, 7, and 9, the three anthracite districts, had been $1 per month per man, from which the international received 50 cents and the district and local union 25 cents each. The constitutional convention of the United Mine Workers, held October 6 to 14, 1942, amended the constitution so as to provide:

SEC. 12. The local dues to be paid by each member shall not be less than $1.50 per month, together with such assessments as may be levied by the different branches of the organization.

This required the three anthracite districts and about one-half of the bituminous districts to raise their dues by 50 cents each. It was not necessary for some of the other bituminous districts, which were charging $1.50 or more per month per man, to change their dues.

The reason for changing the constitution was to enable the international to receive 90 cents per month in dues from each man, instead of 50 cents as originally provided. The constitutional convention adopted the following provision:

SEC. 13. Every local union shall pay direct or cause to be paid to the international secretary-treasurer a per capita tax of 90 cents per month per member and such additional assessments as may be levied by an international convention or referendum vote of the members, payment of per capita tax to be based upon the amount of dues collected each month by the local union.

This change from 50 cents to 90 cents per month per man dues to be paid to the international did not cause an increase in its revenues because during the period from February to November of 1942 the international had been collecting in addition to the 50 cents dues per month per man an assessment of 50 cents per month per man or a total of $1 per month per man. The assessment was collected pursuant to section 26 of the constitution, which provided that the board shall have power to levy and collect assessments when necessary, and the collection of the assessments was ratified by the constitutional convention.

The board referred to is the International Executive Board of the United Mine Workers of America, which consists of 1 representative for each of the 25 bituminous districts and the 3 anthracite districts. The power of that board to levy assessments was stricken by the constitutional convention.

The net result of these changes was that the international would receive 90 cents per month per man instead of $1 per month per man, but would not be able to levy any further assessments unless the assessment was made by a constitutional convention or by a referendum of the membership.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to ask the able Senator from Missouri whether he has received any information concerning the amount of money now reserved in the treasury of the United Mine Workers of America.

Mr. TRUMAN. I have been informed that it is $7,000,000.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has the Senator been informed why, with a reserve fund on hand of approximately $7,000,000, the dues of approximately 100,000 miners were increased during the past year, beginning with last February, to the extent that the yearly increase amounts to more than a half million dollars?

Mr. TRUMAN. I have no information on the subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has there been any showing, so far as the inquiries of the able Senator from Missouri are concerned, which would indicate why such an enormous increase in revenues is essential during the war period?

Mr. TRUMAN. No such showing has been made, to my knowledge. I know of no such information available.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has there been any indication that the miners are contemplating a more serious strike?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes; there is a more serious strike in contemplation, with regard to which I shall speak a little later.

Mr. BREWSTER. Indicating that the anthracite workers may contemplate going on strike to demand an increase in wages in defiance of their existing contracts?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is possible.

Mr. BREWSTER. This action has been characterized by the majority leader in the other House, who is a gentleman who uses his words very carefully, as approaching treason. Without saying that such a characterization is justified, it is certainly to be remembered—and I have discussed this subject with the Senators from Pennsylvania, who are most vitally concerned—that as a result of the strike by the anthracite miners some years ago the users of anthracite in New England and other places began to learn how to get along without anthracite. Anthracite substitutes were found, and the consumption of anthracite declined. As we face the most critical winter in the history of New England we are now being told that there are substitutes for anthracite and we are being urged to use them. If there is no other recourse we shall be forced to use Yankee ingenuity and invention to discover ways in which we may use means other than anthracite to solve our problems.

I hope that the gentlemen concerned with the promotion of the agitation referred to will realize the terrific injury they may be doing to their industry by precipitating this issue at the present time.

Mr. TRUMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the situation with respect to anthracite has been tight throughout the year because of the difficulty in obtaining labor in the anthracite mines and because of the inability of the operators in the mines to do the necessary exploitation work to open up new faces for additional mining.

Anthracite is principally used for domestic heating at home, particularly in New England, and for space heating of offices, apartment houses, theaters, school houses, and the like.

Many anthracite dealers were not successful in obtaining the quantities of anthracite they would like to have had, because of the great demand for anthracite and the relative scarcity, and some of them now have no anthracite in their yards at all. Consequently, the loss to date of several hundred thousand tons of anthracite production has had a serious effect, and the continuation of the strike would have a most serious effect, especially in northern New York and in New England. This is true even though Mr. J. Elmer Thomas and Mr. Howard Gray, Deputy Administrators of Solid Fuels, have informed the committee that there is a relatively free supply of bituminous coal. Some of the grates used for home heating, and some of the stoker equipment used for space heating, are so designed that it would be difficult or impossible to use bituminous coal as a substitute for anthracite. Also, many of the dealers, particularly in New England, are not dealers in bituminous coal and cannot easily obtain supplies of bituminous coal. However, the committee is informed that the Deputy Administrators of Solid Fuels are using every effort to see to it that supplies of bituminous coal are rushed to the areas where the need is great.

The committee has kept closely advised of the facts with respect to the anthracite strike almost since its inception, and has discussed the facts with respect to it with Mr. Harold Ickes, the Administrator of Solid Fuels; Mr. J. Elmer Thomas and Mr. Howard Gray, Deputy Administrators; Mr. John R. Steelman, Mr. H. Ross Colwell, and Mr. Frank J. Sheehan, of the Labor Department; Mr. Thomas Kennedy, secretary-treasurer of the United Mine Workers; and Mr. John L. Lewis.

Representatives of the Labor Department and the War Department attended a meeting at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on Saturday, January 9, at which representatives of the locals on strike were informed that if the strike continued there would be widespread suffering due to the inability to obtain anthracite with which to supply heat to homes, Army camps, and other essential installations dependent thereon. At that meeting demands were made by some of the representatives of the locals there present that Mr. John L. Lewis personally come to the anthracite field and promise, first, to take action to decrease the dues; and, second, to start active negotiations for an increase of $2 a day in the wage rate, despite the fact that the contract with the operators does not expire until April 30, 1943. Threats were expressed at the meeting that unless these demands could be met production would be stopped in all anthracite mines by January 15. That threat still exists.

On Monday, January 11, the committee sent the following telegram to Mr. John L. Lewis as president of the United Mine Workers and to the presidents of the various locals in the three anthracite districts which are on strike:

> The Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program is informed by United States Government officials that suspension of anthracite-mine operations has created a critical situation for homes and Army camps dependent on anthracite for heat. The committee urges all mine workers to return to work at once and arrange for conferences to settle differences within the union at the earliest possible date, at the same time patriotically supporting the war effort by seeing that the flow of anthracite coal is not stopped by internal differences within the union. Anthracite production must be maintained and increased. The Nation expects and demands that this coal be produced.

That telegram was signed by me as chairman of the Special Committee of the United States Senate Investigating the National Defense Program.

Mr. Lewis and Mr. Kennedy proceeded to New York on Monday, January 11, and attended a meeting of the so-called Committee of Twelve, which consists of six representatives of the anthracite operators and six representatives of the United Mine Workers. This committee's telegram was read by Mr. Lewis to the Committee of Twelve, which thereafter sent telegrams to the locals which were on strike, directing that work be resumed. On Monday, January 11, the Labor Department notified the War Labor Board of the seriousness of the situation, and the War Labor Board also sent telegrams to the locals urging the men to return to work.

On Tuesday, January 12, this committee was informed by representatives of the United Mine Workers that the number of men on strike had been reduced to 10,350, and that there were signs which indicated that the strike might end. Representatives of the Labor Department stated that they thought that the telegram sent by this committee had a salutary effect.

After reviewing these facts the committee met in executive session on Tuesday, January 12, reviewed the above facts, and adjourned 1 day in order to wait for action by the miners in view of the telegrams.

On Wednesday, January 13, this committee was further informed by representatives of the United Mine Workers that the number of men on strike had been further reduced to 9,350, that meetings of the locals would be held later that day to vote on a return to work, and that it was believed by these representatives that most of the locals whose men were on strike would vote to return to work.

However, at the special meetings of the locals 10 of the 16 locals involved voted to continue the strike, 2 voted to return to work, 2 had not held meetings, and reports of action were not received from the remaining 2. According to the latest report received by this committee this morning from representatives of the United Mine Workers, approximately 9,000 men still remain on strike.

I am now informed by 2 authorities that 40,000 men are engaged in mining anthracite coal, and I am informed by the United Mine Workers that 100,000 men are engaged in anthracite coal mining, and that 85,000 of the men are at work. I do not know which figures are correct. We are going to find out before we get through.

The amount of the dues to be collected is so slight that it is doubtful whether that was in fact the cause of the strike. That it was not is indicated by the demands that have been made for an increase of $2 a day in the wages to be paid. If the true cause of the strike should be the desire to obtain an increase in wages, it would involve an attempt to force by unauthorized strikes an amendment in the agreement between the anthracite operators and the United Mine Workers of America prior to its expiration on April 30, 1943. To grant such a request would destroy not only the validity of the agreement entered into voluntarily by the United Mine Workers but also would create a differential between the miners of anthracite and the miners of bituminous which might result in unauthorized but widespread strikes among miners of bituminous coal. Such

a strike would be most serious, as the production of bituminous is roughly ten times that of anthracite, and both are required for heat during this unusually severe winter, in which we have had to restrict the use of fuel oil for heating.

The committee has called a special executive session for 4 o'clock this afternoon, at which are to be present representatives of the United Mine Workers, the War Labor Board, and the Fuel Administrator, and I hope that we can arrive at some conclusion that will obtain a result—which is coal. We are trying to get coal.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The suggestion which the Senator made, that the 50-cent assessment could not be solely responsible for the strike, seems to be indicated by the fact that every one of the men on strike during the past 10 days has already sacrificed approximately $75 to prevent what would appear to be an imposition by an assessment of 50 cents a month. Unless some profound issue of taxation without representation is involved, that would not seem to reconcile itself with common sense; but I gather that there is confusion of authority within the union, exactly as we have found confusion of authority within the agencies in Washington concerned with the Government as to the methods which should be pursued to end this difficulty.

Mr. TRUMAN. I thank the Senator; what he says is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a remark?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to point out to the Senator, if the matter has not already been called to his attention, that 2 days ago the mayor of Boston, Mr. Tobin, was in Washington testifying before the Oil Shortage Committee, and he pointed out the relationship of the strike to the oil shortage situation, by saying that he already had under way the conversion of a number of public buildings to the use of anthracite coal, but because of the strike he had ordered those conversions to stop, and therefore he was left in the position of being unable to meet a situation which otherwise would have been met. Of course, that condition will spread rapidly from the city of Boston to other places if the strike continues longer.

Mr. TRUMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion which has just taken place, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Work or Fight," appearing today in the Philadelphia Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORK OR FIGHT

The strike of 20,000 anthracite miners is going into its sixteenth day.

It is a strike in violation of the non-strike pledge given to President Roosevelt by John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, and 11 other national representatives of labor in December 1941.

It is a strike in violation of a contract between the union and the mine operators.

It is a strike against the war, over the comparatively trivial issue of an increase of 50 cents a month union dues and a sudden demand for a $2-a-day pay increase while the contract has more than 3 months to run.

Yesterday, by a tremendous majority, 10 of the largest locals in the anthracite field rejected the ultimatum of the War Labor Board to return to work.

Unless the miners are back in the pits within 24 hours the United States Government should crack down and crack down hard. The War Labor Board must make good.

The Board has declared that stock piles of anthracite are "at a critically low level and endangering the health of our people and the prosecution of the war."

That statement alone should be enough to make any miner forget his hatred of John L. Lewis and his grudge against the operators and go back to work.

If they fail to return to work, they are hindering the war just as much as a draft dodger, or a mutineer in the Army.

They are stopping production just as completely as if the mines had been dynamited by saboteurs put ashore from a German submarine.

The United States dare not countenance sabotage either by German agents or irresponsible strikers.

The Federal Government should tell the able-bodied men who have been given occupational deferments from the draft:

"Dig coal or fight."

As for the others, the Government has several alternatives. It could, as the Record has suggested previously, form special labor battalions at Army pay for outlaw strikers, such as these, who obey neither their own union nor their own Government.

Or it could take the mines over with full protection for the owners (who have not broken contracts or defied the War Labor Board) and put the Army in charge.

Maybe, as Lewis said in 1941, at the time of the captive coal strike, "you can't dig coal with bayonets," but they can make the miners wish they were digging coal.

There is no doubt the miners have grievances. They are sore at Lewis, who, so far, has done nothing to end the strike except to write a letter to the strikers. Federal Conciliator Thomas Lambert has been trying to arrange a meeting with Lewis but hasn't even received a reply.

And they want more money because the owners have been given an increase by the Office of Price Administration.

But any grievances they have can be taken up with the War Labor Board, after they go back to digging coal.

Uncle Sam must get tough. Continuance of this strike will mean cheers in Berlin and Tokyo, and groans in North Africa.

Mr. MAYBANK. I concur in what the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] has said. Not only are the miners doing themselves a great deal of harm; but in South Carolina and other sections of the South strikes in wartime are not the least bit appreciated but are bitterly resented.

## NOMINATION OF EDWARD J. FLYNN TO BE MINISTER TO AUSTRALIA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it is my observation in looking about the Chamber today that the stench of the Flynn appointment has become so nauseating to the majority Members of the Senate that when it was known quite generally that the Senator from New Hampshire would make further remarks regarding Mr. Flynn a great majority of them "beat it" to the cloak rooms. Mr. President, I have on my desk a paving block, one of the stolen paving blocks from which "Paving Block" Flynn secured his name. It was brought to me by a group of civic-minded citizens of New York City. I hope it will represent Flynn's political tombstone, because in my judgment it will be a fitting tombstone, politically, for him. I am glad that at least some open-minded gentlemen on the majority side are present in the Chamber at this time. My compliments to them.

The purpose of my remarks is to focus the attention of the people of America and the Members of the Senate upon the most despicable appointment yet made by the President of the United States. In every city and town and at every crossroads in the country people are alarmed and concerned over the appointment and what it typifies. I know this because from practically every State of the Union I have received letters or communications opposing the Flynn appointment. The people are concerned because in every city and town and at ever crossroads in America are people who have sons, daughters, brothers, and husbands in the armed services, and tens of thousands of them are in Australia today.

I am glad that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is now entering the Chamber. I hope he will come over to my desk and examine the paving block which I have before me, one of the stolen paving blocks from New York City, so that he can look it over and perhaps study it and give it some thought before his committee meets.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations is prepared, whenever the committee meets, to perform his duty, whatever he may feel that is.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. CONNALLY. But at the moment I regret that I cannot follow the Senator from New Hampshire around through the newspapers. I cannot be with him constantly in advance of the committee hearings and in advance of the testimony.

Mr. BRIDGES. All I ask is that the Senator do his duty as chairman of the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the chairman of the committee certainly will wait until he hears some of the testimony, instead of reading speeches in the newspapers. A committee cannot very well be guided by newspaper enthusiasm or by oratorical breast-beating.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator will first provide public hearings and then will be guided by the testimony offered, he will have no other course than to come before the Senate and advocate the rejection of the nomination of Edward Flynn.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. I had not wanted to interrupt the Senator. I merely came in to listen, not to take part in the controversy. I am glad to inform the Senator now that the Committee on Foreign

Relations expects to meet tomorrow at 10:30 a. m. The Senator will be welcome, and I am sure the committee will receive whatever charges he cares to file. After we receive them we shall try to give them proper attention.

For 2 or 3 days I have been looking for the new front; we have heard much said about opening a new front. It is here; it is the Flynn front. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, following my remarks in the Senate in opposition to "Paving Block" Flynn, representative New York citizens came to my office with certain evidence regarding "Paving Block" Flynn's unfitness for any diplomatic post. After reviewing that evidence, I announced yesterday afternoon that today in the Senate I would present certain charges. These charges are sufficientiy serious and sufficiently supported by the testimony of representative citizens, documentary evidence, and affidavits to warrant a thorough investigation by the Foreign Relations Committee at a public hearing.

First. I charge that Edward J. Flynn, through the law firm of Goldwater & Flynn, represented a Mr. Serge Rubinstein, who at the time of his retainer with Flynn had large Japanese interests, and that this Mr. Rubinstein was closely associated with one Guiji Kassai, who was a registered agent of the Japanese Government and was in this country until 2 weeks before Pearl Harbor. Mr. Rubinstein also presented a gift of money to the Japanese Government at a time when our relations with Japan were clearly strained. The story of the Flynn-Rubinstein combination is one of international import that has a direct bearing on anyone who represents us in this international crisis in which we are involved in war with Japan.

Second. I charge that Edward J. Flynn, as chamberlain of the city of New York, invested public funds in the State Title & Mortgage Co., causing the city to lose over a million dollars. Flynn's law firm subsequently became general counsel to this company; and his law partner, Mr. Monroe Goldwater, served as a director. Adolph Berle, now Assistant Secretary of State, who succeeded Flynn as chamberlain, pointed out that the State Title & Mortgage Co. had received more business from the city than any other similar company during Flynn's incumbency, and denounced Flynn's administration as chamberlain. This is the same Berle who is potentially Mr. Flynn's superior officer in the Department of State, and who will be if his nomination is confirmed.

Third. I charge that Edward J. Flynn appointed Dutch Schultz, noted criminal and murderer, a deputy sheriff when Flynn was sheriff of Bronx County. Schultz was appointed by Flynn just a few months after Flynn took office, and Schultz served the full tenure of Flynn's incumbency as sheriff, even though he was a known criminal and a fugitive from justice from many States. It is evident to me that a person who selects as his deputy a man of Dutch Schultz's character is certainly unfit to hold a diplomatic post in our foreign service.

Fourth. I charge that the grand jury investigation of the paving-block scandal was conducted by a political stooge of Flynn's and was improperly handled, to the disgust of at least one member of the grand jury, who will appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, if given an opportunity, to tell why Flynn was exonerated; and I further charge that the foreman of the jury, Mr. Daniel Daly, received a Federal appointment about 2 months after the Flynn whitewash, and is now employed by a Federal department in New York City.

Reputable citizens are prepared to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee to present evidence and proof of each of these charges. It is neither my duty nor my intention to explore in detail these charges here today. That is the duty of the Foreign Relations Committee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. That committee can and should subpena witnesses; it can and should publicly and thoroughly explore for the Senate and the American people the fitness of "Paving Block" Flynn for the high diplomatic post to which he has been appointed. I cannot conceive of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate dodging that responsibility. Having seen much of the evidence American citizens have to offer, I fail to understand how any Member of the United States Senate can conscientiously vote for the confirmation of the nomination of "Paving Block" Flynn. I hope that in the Chamber today the Senator from Texas may not only assure us that the matter will be taken care of, as he has said, but that he will have full public hearings to which the public will be invited to come and at which those in opposition to the Flynn appointment may suggest to the committee the subpenaing of various citizens. I may say that among those who I hope will be summoned will be Sidney Baron, secretary of the committee to reopen the Flynn case; Mr. Paul Kern, former chairman of the civil service commission of New York City, who was thrown out of his position as the result of Flynn's activities; the chairman of the grand jury, who now has a lucrative Federal position in New York City; a member of the grand jury who made a statement after it was all over as to unethical practices; Mayor LaGuardia, who in times past has expressed himself relative to Mr. Flynn; Cordell Hull, the able Secretary of State; Sumner Welles, his able assistant; Adolf Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, who, in the past, has condemned Mr. Flynn. Then I want to see J. Edgar Hoover, or a representative of the F. B. I., invited to tell the committee what they know of Mr. Rubinstein. I think it will be found they know something of Mr. Rubinstein and some of his associates. I should like to have summoned a representative of the Naturalization Bureau, which, I understand, is investigating this man's entry into this country.

Now, I desire to speak of one other angle to this case and that is the obligation of the Senate and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to protect Australia in this matter.

Australia is in a difficult situation today. Australia as a nation is a partner of the United States in a great war; Australia is today receiving hundreds of millions of dollars of lend-lease military equipment, supplies, and food; there are tens of thousands of American boys over there offering up their lives for the protection of Australia. The people of Australia and the Government of Australia know that their future life depends upon the action of this Government and of this administration. So they are a little restrained perhaps about making a protest against Mr. Flynn's appointment. Therefore, we have the double duty of protecting from such a man a government and a people with whom we are associated in a great war.

I think Mr. Flynn's appointment is one of the most glaring examples of the necessity of confirmation by the Senate of Presidential appointments for diplomatic posts. I have already been told by members of the majority party on the other side of the aisle that if they vote for Mr. Flynn they will have "to hold their noses" to do it; that the stench has become so great that they are almost nauseated by it. I also realize that "Paving Block" Flynn is chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and that fact causes them some embarrassment; but I assure you, Mr. President, they will be doing a great service to the country and to their own party if they rid the country and their party of the incubus of Mr. Flynn.

Mr. President, I have before me various interesting articles and editorials which I desire to have printed in the RECORD. For instance, I have an editorial from the Chicago Sun. As is well known, the idea of that newspaper was hatched in the White House. It is published by Marshall Field and his associates, and is solidly behind the President and his general program. Yet the Chicago Sun, in an editorial entitled "Rebuild the Foreign Service," opposes the appointment of Mr. Flynn.

I have an editorial from the Chicago Daily News opposing the selection of Mr. Flynn. I have also an editorial from the Boston Herald entitled "A Smelly Choice." I also have an editorial from the Daily Mirror of New York.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall not presume to prejudge this situation or to give counsel to the Committee on Foreign Relations as to their duty in the premises; but I assume that the Senator from New Hampshire, in his emphasis upon the disqualifications of Mr. Flynn for the post, does not mean to preclude the far broader field than the question of whether he has been guilty of any or all the charges which the Senator from New Hampshire and others have leveled against him. I refer to the far more serious question, even if he should be found not guilty of these charges beyond a reasonable doubt, of in what particular way he is affirmatively qualified for the enormously responsible and delicate position of Minister to Australia and roving ambassador in the

southwest Pacific at this time when thousands of American boys are offering up their lives, when General MacArthur is carrying one of the greatest responsibilities that have rested upon a military authority in the history of our country, and when even the great Dominion of Australia is faced with an extremely delicate situation internally to which our Minister must necessarily address himself in serving the welfare of our country and our armed forces and serving also the great cause of humanity to which America has dedicated its resources. I hope that no emphasis upon Mr. Flynn's past difficulties will blind us to that far greater question which it seems to me the Senate must necessarily determine.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may answer the Senator by saying that it is most important to send a man of outstanding ability, with untarnished reputation, to represent us in Australia at this time.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not mean to minimize in any way or disagree with the importance of what the Senator from New Hampshire is saying as to the necessity certainly of removing doubts along those lines, but I think that, having passed through that zone, if the Committee on Foreign Relations should simply determine that it has not been demonstrated beyond a reasonable doubt that Flynn was guilty of any or all the crimes or misdemeanors with which he has been charged that still would be a very long way from determining that he was, therefore, qualified for the tremendously responsible post for which he has been nominated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say, in answer to the Senator, that when I mention the Japanese connection I am not questioning Mr. Flynn's patriotism. I am saying that any man who has had the connections that Flynn has had with Rubinstein, who, in turn, was associated with an agent of the Japanese Government, certainly will not have my confidence nor do I believe he will have the confidence of the American people in representing us in Australia and in the southwest Pacific; nor do I believe he will have the confidence of the Australian people or the Australian Government, no matter what they may say through expediency.

Mr. President, before the interruption, I was asking that certain editorials be printed in the RECORD. In addition to those already mentioned, I now ask to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Mirror of New York entitled "The Aussies Know All About Flynn"; an editorial from the Washington News entitled "Something Good For Ed"; an editorial from the New York Sun entitled "What a Price to Pay"; an article from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "Chicago Daily News Hits Flynn"; an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "Totally Unqualified"; from the Baltimore Sun an editorial under the title "Mr. Paving-Blocks Flynn as Diplomatic Material"; from the New York Times an editorial entitled "Mr. Flynn in the Wrong Place"; another editorial from the New York Herald Tribune under the headline "An Unmitigated Insult"; an editorial from the New York Sun under the title "Put an End to This Stench"; an editorial from the New York Daily Mirror under the head "More Than Just Paving Blocks"; an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Dear Eddie." I present next an article by Frank Kent, one by David Lawrence, one by Mark Sullivan, one by Gould Lincoln, and one by Raymond Clapper.

All these go to the heart and root of the Flynn appointment, and are of interest and vital concern to every American. I ask that these be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun of January 13, 1943]

REBUILD THE FOREIGN SERVICE

For reasons previously set forth, we hope the Senate will reject the President's nomination of Edward J. Flynn as minister to Australia. Today we submit a more fundamental proposal: The controversy over the nomination of this party boss should inspire a general overhauling and strengthening of our top diplomatic representation.

The principle behind the Flynn appointment is hoary. All too often, over the generations, our ambassadors and ministers have been appointed in payment of political debt. Since salaries fall far short of meeting expenses in many embassies and legations, it is a convenient old custom to appoint rich campaign contributors.

That, of course, is not the only system. The Presidents repeatedly have picked from private life men without riches or special political claims, on the basis of talents deemed especially useful. And career diplomats have become ministers and ambassadors. Some of these have been very able. Yet, unless endowed with exceptional backbones or private fortunes, the careerists are handicapped. When duty bids them to tell the State Department that its policies are wrong, duty is all too likely to run counter to self-interest in protecting a future career. Nor is service under the State Department the best of training in what most of us mean by American democracy.

The fact is that, with exceptions, our ministers and ambassadors are not up to their jobs. We cite, for example, the careerist, Clarence E. Gauss, Ambassador to China. It is an open secret that he is the man of whom Mr. Willkie spoke when he said that despite 20 years in the country of his assignment, a certain diplomat had not troubled to learn the language of the people to whom he was accredited. Mr. Gauss has ability. If China were a colony he doubtless would be a satisfactory high commissioner. As Ambassador to our most valued ally in Asia he should be replaced forthwith.

In Russia our Ambassador is Admiral Standley. His talents have been a great boon to the Navy. He has tackled his job in Moscow with characteristic devotion. But for that diplomatic mission of incalculable import for teamwork to produce victory and a lasting peace, a younger, more vigorous American, whom the Russians would recognize as one of our outstanding and independent leaders, ought to be selected.

How can we secure ambassadors and ministers able to do justice to their jobs? Two steps are needed; Congress should provide remuneration sufficient to permit men, irrespective of private fortune, to represent America in dignity. And the President should bury at once the time-honored practice of making diplomatic appointments political plums or rewards for careerists who fall short of the mark.

Time was when our foreign affairs demanded little more from top diplomats than protocol. Today the needs of teamwork in a coalition war, and peace through unprecedented cooperation after the war, make it imperative to rebuild the foreign service.

---

[From the Boston Herald of January 12, 1943]

A SMELLY CHOICE

A man who has been closely identified with Tammany politics all his life and whose acts while holding political office were investigated by a grand jury is hardly the proper man to serve as our Minister to Australia. That will be a key post from now on. It calls for the selection of somebody who is eminently fitted for it by experience and otherwise, about whose qualifications there cannot be the slightest doubt.

Edward J. Flynn, who himself announced the appointment in advance of the formal nomination by the President yesterday, was unknown to most persons outside of New York until his appointment as Chairman of the Democratic National Committee first brought him to general attention. People heard little else about him until a grand jury investigated the alleged misuse by him of city-owned material. No true bill was returned, but the incident left a bad odor which still persists and will cling to him if the Senate should so insult the public as to confirm the nomination.

It doesn't make much difference whether the President named Mr. Flynn in order to make room for another, more acceptable chairman of the Democratic National Committee or to reward him for political services rendered to the party, or for both purposes. He is simply not the sort of man in whom the American people take pride. Surely this is no time for the playing or even the appearance of the playing of politics in the old, old way, for the discharging political debts at the expense of the Nation.

Wendell Willkie's comment yesterday that the selection is, "so crassly cynical that it must be revolting to all decent citizens" probably expressed the view of most persons. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations owes it to the people to investigate Mr. Flynn's carreer thoroughly before voting on the subject. Acts which did not justify an indictment might very well be ample ground for rejecting a man who is to speak abroad for his country.

---

[From the New York Daily Mirror of January 11, 1943]

THE AUSSIES KNOW ALL ABOUT PAVING

It won't work, Mr. Flynn. You say the President says he's going to appoint you, and you expect the Senate to confirm the appointment, and you may indeed get the job. But it won't work. We'll tell you why.

Next door to the office in which this column is written, there is the small, neat office of the Sydney Daily Mirror and the Australasian Truth, over which presides a pert and pretty Australian, Miss Betty Riddell, who is that rare thing among women: she is a "newspaperman."

That is, she is a good reporter who knows a story when she smells one.

She knew it was a story "down her alley" Friday, when you announced that the President was making you his "Ambassador" (capital A) and personal representative to Australia, and would send your nomination to the Senate Monday as Minister Plenipotentiary.

IN SEARCH OF BIOGRAPHY

So she came into our office and asked us if we could help her get some background material on this Edward J. Flynn, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, chair-

man of the Executive Committee of the Bronx County (Democratic) Committee.

We are always anxious to cement inter-Allied solidarity, so we loaned her our copy of "Current Biography" for the year 1940, in which the story of your life appears.

"But," said Miss Riddell, "this is only up to 1940, and it will not include the story about the paving blocks."

So we gave this Australian correspondent access to our "morgue," the casual term for a newspaper's library and files, in which, as in St. Peter's book, the record of big and little people, the great, near-great, and merely notorious is kept.

Now, it is a long way from Lake Mahopac to Sydney, Australia, Mr. Flynn, but soon the story of your life was speeding there by cable—at 14 cents per word. The story was complete, accurate, and fair, for it included the fact that a Bronx grand jury cleared you of any wrongdoing in the use of city-owned paving blocks to cobble the Belgian courtyard of your country estate.

But, you see, the story of the paving blocks was read way down under, and people in Sydney, Canberra, Port Darwin, Brisbane, etc., are wondering about it.

You can't stop people from wondering, either there or here.

We can imagine that people in Australia are wondering why a Minister Plenipotentiary to that great, friendly, and strategically vital country should not be, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion.

Of course, when and if you step off a plane or destroyer in Australia, the people there will treat you with full hospitality, but you will know they are thinking:

"That's the paving-block chap. He was a big politician in the States. Had a lot of diplomatic experience in helping Roosevelt get elected to the third term."

And a lot of people will wonder in this country, too, particularly in view of the President's plea to Congress the other day for a moratorium on politics for the duration.

Your appointment, if it is an appointment, will seem to have a political color.

It will seem of the same stamp as the appointment of other repudiated or defeated New Deal Democrats to high official posts.

---

[From the Washington News of January 12, 1943]

SOMETHING GOOD FOR ED

President Roosevelt serenely ignored the storm of public protest aroused by his shameless abuse of wartime diplomacy to provide a pay-off for his political henchman, Democratic National Chairman Edward J. Flynn. The President has not only sent the nomination to the Senate but also, in a personal letter to "Dear Eddie," he expatiated on the high honors in store for him, not alone as Minister to Australia but as Mr. Roosevelt's "personal representative with the rank of Ambassador" in a "very large area of the Southwest Pacific."

All this for a man whose diplomatic experience has never been broader than that of a party ward heeler and vote getter, who has earned his party's promotion only by his political activities as a party boss, and whose political reputation has been clouded by scandal.

We are reminded of the easygoing attitude of Bronx County Judge Lester Patterson, who presided at the proceedings of the grand jury that whitewashed Flynn in the affair of the city-owned paving blocks. After the whitewash Judge Patterson, informally discussing what he called the "Flynn gesture" of Robert L. Moran, then Bronx Works Commissioner, said:

"That's all Bob Moran was doing when he sent Flynn those paving blocks. He wanted Ed to have something good."

Now it's the President of the United States who wants Ed to have something good. And to see that Ed gets it the President is ready to flout diplomatic standards, affront Australia in a critical wartime situation, and send Ed roving over the Southwest Pacific on a high-titled difficult job that he has never done one thing to merit.

Playing politics with war diplomacy and war needs is both disgraceful and dangerous. The Senate should block the Flynn appointment. Our wartime diplomatic relations with Australia should not be degraded merely to produce something good for Ed.

---

[From the New York Sun of January 12, 1943]

WHAT A PRICE TO PAY!

A diplomatic envoy ought to enjoy the confidence of the people whom he represents and the respect of the government to which he is assigned. In peacetime he should know the history of the place to which he is sent. In wartime he ought to know the part which that place is taking in the conflict. It is plain that Edward J. Flynn, nominated by President Roosevelt to be American Minister to Australia and "my personal representative, with the rank of Ambassador," does not qualify on any of the points named.

This is not the first time that a President has paid a political debt with a diplomatic appointment. Usually, however, no actual harm has come of it, the appointee having capable subordinates to carry on for him. But we do not recall a political appointee who went abroad with such a load of discredit as the paving block scandal has attached to Mr. Flynn. It is useless for him to plead that the scandal was instigated by "a discredited public servant," meaning Mr. Kern. Commissioner Herlands, who is still in office, went over the same ground and with almost the same results.

No Democratic Senator can vote to ratify this nomination unless he accepts the idea that Mr. Flynn must be richly compensated for relinquishing the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee. But what a price it is to pay!

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 14, 1943]

CHICAGO DAILY NEWS HITS FLYNN

CHICAGO, January 13.—The Chicago Daily News, of which Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, is the owner, urged editorially today that the Senate refuse to ratify the appointment of Edward J. Flynn as special envoy to Australia.

The editorial, headed "A step backward," noted that it is vital to appoint as representatives abroad in wartime "the very best qualified men that can be found," and added: "In the career of Edward J. Flynn we can find nothing, absolutely nothing, to warrant the appointment."

"He is not a diplomat. He has had no foreign experience. He has had no military experience. He has no particular familiarity with Australia or with the problems of the Pacific," the editorial continued.

"For years our Consular and Diplomatic Service suffered under the practice of using it as a dumping ground for political "lame ducks" and job seekers. This practice is supposed to have been officially ended some 20 years ago. To revert to it at any time would be a step backward. To revert to it now is inexcusable."

Reviewing Mr. Flynn's activities as a "Tammany politician" in New York, the News said: "He has been involved in the usual number of public scandals that seem to go with Democratic pay-roll careers in the life of our great sister State in the East."

When he was appointed Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox placed control of the newspaper in the hands of a committee of editors.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 12, 1943]

TOTALLY UNQUALIFIED

It is true. In the silence that fell upon the White House on the heels of Edward J. Flynn's announcement of his own appointment as diplomatic Lord High Everything Else to the southwest Pacific, it was still possible to hold to some faint hope that Mr. Flynn had made an inexplicable error; that he was trying to force the President's hand or that the President would belatedly recognize the impossibility of giving Mr. Flynn a diplomatic post. It was particularly difficult to believe in the reality of the Flynn appointment in the atmosphere of high purpose created by the President's stirring report on the state of the Nation. But now the appointment is official; Mr. Roosevelt really has appointed the Democratic national chairman as Minister to Australia, naming him, in addition, "my personal representative with the rank of ambassador."

The United States has sent some odd figures to represent the Nation in foreign capitals. The use of diplomatic office to pay political debts has often placed square pegs in round holes—sent men of ability in their own lines to flounder helplessly in the intricacies of international affairs or to write their personal prejudices into the record of American diplomacy. The American foreign service, in the noncareer positions, at any rate, has been a sort of grab bag with numerous shining successes, many miserable failures, along with a fair proportion of comfortable mediocrities. But certain standards of achievement were required of candidates for diplomatic office. Mr. Flynn does not meet them. He represents nothing but politics in the narrowest sense—quite apart from the affair of the paving blocks, in which, as everyone knows, he was declared free from stain by grand-jury action.

It is now up to the Senate to reject Mr. Flynn. This is not a party matter, although some Democrats appear to view it in that light. It is a question of the dignity of the United States, at a time when that dignity must be upheld with especial care. It involves a diplomatic task of exceptional delicacy, intimately concerned with the winning of the war. Mr. Flynn is totally unqualified. The Senate must say so in unmistakable terms.

---

[From the Baltimore Sun of January 12, 1943]

MR. PAVING-BLOCKS FLYNN AS DIPLOMATIC MATERIAL

Good performance in office is a normal qualification for advancement to higher office. It is difficult to recall, in recent history, a case in which a President has, instead, named to high diplomatic office anyone who has been so notorious a misfit even in low office as to require his relinquishment of that low office.

This unhappy precedent President Roovevelt has now established in nominating Eddie Flynn, boss of the Bronx and, briefly, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, as United States Minister to Australia and "personal representative with the rank of Ambassador." Of all the personal favors at Government expense which the President has bestowed, this is probably the most completely cynical. Flynn is to succeed Mr. Nelson Johnson, one of the best of our career diplomats, who had 34 years of Foreign Service experience before going to Australia. It is difficult to recall in Mr. Flynn's experience any foreign relationship save that with Belgian paving blocks.

Such skillful and intelligent professionals as Mr. Johnson and Mr. Joseph C. Grew, admirably qualified by character, training, and experience in Far East affairs, have been of

incalculable aid to Secretary Hull during this past critical year. To have such men succeeded by a politician whose presence as national committee chairman had embarrassed even the Democratic Party, and in a year which is more rather than less critical, is to unload on an overworked State Department an appalling burden.

The United States Senate's custom is to gag on inept appointments, but finally to swallow them, on the comfortable theory that it is better to embarrass the Nation than to irritate the President. In this instance it would be a silly custom. The Senate would help itself and the country—and, in final analysis, the President himself—by rejecting this clownish appointment and reminding the President that the needs of a nation are more important than personal friendships.

---

[From the New York Times of January 12, 1943]

MR. FLYNN IN THE WRONG PLACE

The relationships between a President and his Ambassadors and Ministers are necessarily and properly so personal and so confidential that the Senate is seldom justified in withholding its approval of any candidate for diplomatic office. We believe that the case is different when a candidate is as poorly fitted for a post as is Mr. Edward J. Flynn to be Minister to Australia, and when the results of confirmation of his appointment, both at home and abroad, would be uniformly bad.

Mr. Flynn is a county boss, elevated to the post of Democratic national chairman, who has become a political liability to his party because the public is angry about the celebrated case of the Belgian paving blocks. Mr. Flynn's field is the Bronx. There is no reason to believe that he has more than the most perfunctory knowledge of Australia. He has certainly not had the slightest experience as an international diplomat. The extent of his natural talent for "diplomacy" is accurately measured by his haste in beating the White House to the gun in announcing the news of his own appointment.

To send Mr. Flynn to Australia at this critical stage of the war, when we cannot send the supplies for which our friends are begging, would be equivalent to confirming the suspicions of the Chinese, as well as the Australians, that we do indeed regard the Pacific front as of second-rate importance. On our own home front the concurrence of the Senate in this action would strengthen the cynical belief that Mr. Flynn has been promoted to the high councils of the United Nations and the planning of the better postwar world in order to relieve the Democratic Party of the political embarrassment of having him continue as national chairman.

Any dispute between the President and the Senate is deeply unfortunate in wartime. But the President has made the issue here, and it would be better to risk a dispute than to suggest to our Pacific allies that there has been no public protest in this country against Mr. Flynn's appointment.

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 9, 1943]

AN UNMITIGATED INSULT

The appointment of Mr. Edward J. Flynn as Minister Plenipotentiary to Australia (with some sort of unorthodox roving commission) is an insult to the people of the United States—whom he is supposed to represent—and to the people of Australia. There is a real need now for an American of high standing, able and sympathetic, to serve his country in Canberra. The Australians are alarmed about the military and naval effort which the United States is putting forth in the southwest Pacific; they are sensitive concerning what they feel is an insufficient appreciation of their plight. It has been suggested that Prime Minister Curtin make a personal trip to Washington to present the point of view of the commonwealth. All of this suggests poor liaison between this country and its Pacific partner.

To restore the situation the President proposes to send a very ordinary politician with extraordinary hard luck, to say the least, in the matter of certain paving stones. One can only assume, with charity, that the President postponed the nomination of Mr. Flynn until a new Congress took office, which, he has reason to expect, will be less amenable to Presidential suggestion. But, even if the Senate rejects Mr. Flynn, as it is that body's obvious duty to do, the President must still bear the onus of having made one of the worst appointments in a career which includes many bad appointments.

---

[From the New York Sun of January 11, 1943]

PUT AN END TO THIS STENCH

Most Americans acquainted with the paving-block scandal comforted themselves over the week end with the suspicion that Edward J. Flynn was suffering from a delusion when he announced that President Roosevelt would nominate him for Ambassador or Minister to Australia. Theirs, not Flynn's, was the delusion, for the President has done exactly what Mr. Flynn said he would do.

So the unbelievable thing becomes the fact. If the Senate gives its consent to this shocking appointment the great South Sea dominion of the British Empire will be asked to accept the New Deal boss of the Bronx as the representative of the United States.

The situation would be unpleasant enough in time of peace. It is created at a time when Australia looms as the center of our Pacific operations in the war on Japan. It is a shameless and shameful situation. The Senate should end it before the stench rises further.

---

[From the New York Daily Mirror of January 13, 1943]

MORE THAN JUST PAVING BLOCKS

The Flynn appointment goes deeper than the paving blocks. It goes deeper than the obvious inadequacy of Edward J. Flynn, the Bronx politico, to hold a diplomatic post that is currently one of the most important within the giving of this country.

The appointment, yet subject to Senate confirmation, seems to us to high light two grave weaknesses—the one a personal weakness of the President's, the other a weakness of his war administration.

The first, the President's personal shortcoming, is his proclivity for appointing weak persons to high posts for no other apparent reason than that they are his personal satraps.

This weakness has given us a Secretary of Labor who is not and never was a Secretary of Labor, but who has been maintained in Cabinet rank despite the fact that her duties and responsibilities have had to be taken from her and placed in the hands of a succession of boards and other agencies.

This weakness has supported a Secretary of the Treasury whose administration has been marked by the employment of taxation as a weapon of class warfare; a Secretary so distrusted at the Capitol that the Seventy-seventh Congress, by statute, gave itself the power to go over his head in the search for fiscal information.

This weakness has nurtured the Rex Tugwells and the Harry Hopkinses, the latter so well that the byword in Washington today is, "If you want to see Roosevelt, you've got to see Hopkins first."

This weakness has resulted in the rule that worshipful new dealers, though they may be defeated and repudiated at the polls, can't be swept out of the Government; they are appointed to something better than the offices for which the voters rejected them.

This weakness, finally, has given us the nomination of Flynn, not only as Minister to Australia but as the President's "personal representative with the rank of Ambassador."

It is not lese majeste for us to ask the question that is being asked in Australia and in the United States:

What reason, other than political, could have motivated the appointment of such a man to such a post?

The overtone of irony, of course, is that only last Thursday, in his masterful and conciliatory speech on the state of the Union, the President impressed Congress with a determination to forego politics for the duration.

OUR NO. 2 WAR

The second grave weakness silhouetted by the Flynn appointment is the apparent failure of the war administration to realize that we are fighting two great wars, not one big war and one little war.

Our relations with our allies, in what the administration seems to regard as the little war, are being strained.

Only a week ago, the Chinese Military Mission, headed by brilliant Gen. Hsiung Shih-fei, ignored and slighted for 9 months, never once invited to sit in the councils of the Allied high command, was recalled from Washington to Chungking by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

Only 2 weeks ago, Prime Minister Curtin of Australia warned that Japan is consolidating her gains and voiced his fear that the policy of dealing first with Hitler and the European war was being overdone. He said:

"The United Nations in the Pacific are being denied resources for their total war effort which are invaluable to them, and resources are being reserved by Japan for building up her capacity not only to wage war, but to resist an offensive."

Now, into the clouded Pacific atmosphere, is injected the personable but preposterous Flynn. He is named to replace a distinguished career diplomat, Nelson T. Johnson.

It will be for the Senate to decide what effect upon our delicate Pacific relations the confirmation of the Flynn appointment would have.

We are realistic enough to know that, in a Senate where Democrats outnumber Republications 57 to 38, such confirmation is not only possible, but probable.

We are idealistic enough to hope, almost to trust, that straight partisan voting will not be the rule in this issue that is so much deeper than the small, smelly scandal of the paving blocks, although that is the incident which gives it its drama and symbol.

In any event, the Senate decision should be by roll call, and for the record.

The constituents of every Senator are entitled to know his decision in the "affaire Flynn."

---

[From the Washington Post of January 12, 1943]

"DEAR EDDIE"

The President's nomination of Edward J. Flynn, retiring chairman of the Democratic National Committee, as Minister to Australia is bound to come in for sharp challenge on the floor of the Senate. We hope it will be rejected. In this way two services will have been gained: The President will have discharged his political debt and the country's dignity will have been sustained. There is little to add about the Bronx boss to what we have already said. It was in keeping with Mr. Flynn's irregular conduct that he himself should have been the first to announce the nomination.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 13, 1943]

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—IN WAR AS WELL AS PEACE, PUBLIC CAN REFUSE TO TOLERATE QUESTIONABLE POLITICAL APPOINTMENTS

(By Frank R. Kent)

It is the White House thesis, concurred in and supported by all the administration spokesmen, that it is extremely reprehensible to point out that so far from rising above partisanship and politics in the conduct of the war, the President is consistently mindful of politics and his New Deal aides are using the war as a screen behind which to play their New Deal political game.

It is a shocking thing that this should be so but the proof is overwhelming. Nor is the performance rendered more palatable by the effort to make it appear that all protests are partisan and unpatriotic. Apparently this administration wants support of its war policies to include freedom to do, without comment or criticism, exactly what it pleases in domestic affairs.

The effrontery of this attitude is supreme. It assumes that the people as a whole are boobs, who, because we are engaged in a great war, must abandon their own sense of right and wrong and accept the idea that Mr. Roosevelt's every act is commendable.

SILENCE OFFERS NO CURE

A more nationally stultifying notion could hardly be advanced; nor one better calculated to weaken our fiber as a people in this great struggle.

Instead of silent acquiescence to the acts of this administration—instead of accepting them as something that should not be mentioned because we are in a war and Mr. Roosevelt is Commander in Chief—instead of that, these things should be exposed and expounded, denounced, and condemned, until those responsible for them cease doing them and an end is made to this sordid political maneuvering in, perhaps, the most serious period of our history.

No other course can be justified. To permit these things to pass without protest is unintelligent, unwholesome, and against the national interests. Take, for example, the occurrences of the last few days. The country had hardly ceased applauding the President's really good speech an the progress of the war when he stepped down from the lofty plane upon which that was delivered to a level low enough to permit him to name Edward J. Flynn, the New York politician, Minister to Australia.

Mr. Flynn, whose paving-block experiences made unfeasible his retention as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, is thus—if the Senate confirms him—to succeed an outstanding career diplomat as the President's personal representative to a sensitive nation whose friendship is of very great importance to us.

OTHER POLITICAL DOINGS

The inexcusable nature of this appointment of a man without any known qualification for such a post, is further aggravated by the news that, through presidential influence, an important post in the War Department is to be conferred upon Charles Poletti, former lieutenant governor of New York and for some 20 days acting Governor in the gap between Gov. Herbert Lehman's resignation and Thomas E. Dewey's inaugural.

Mr. Poletti is another New York politician who distinguished himself in those 20 days by releasing from jail an unprecedented number of criminals, among them a labor thug, whom he pardoned without consultation with either presiding judge or prosecuting attorney.

In addition, Mr. Roosevelt, as other Presidents have done, recently has provided jobs for various "lame duck" Representatives and Senators defeated in the last election. These are not particularly creditable, though not bad enough to cause concern or call for criticism. But the Flynn appointment is without excuse or defense.

Here, this politician, replacing a man with a fine record and conceded ability, is given an important post in an Allied country where our interests are vital and our relationships delicate—a post for which he is totally unfitted and to which he has no claim. The Senate cannot do anything about the Poletti appointment, but it can about that of Mr. Flynn.

Support of the war and loyalty to the President's foreign policies ought not to include tolerance of such a selection as this. Rejection by the Senate would be beneficial to this country, an act of friendship for Australia and helpful to the President, in that it might convince him that he cannot, with impunity, follow the noble words of a fine speech with such ignoble acts.

---

[From the New York Sun of January 12, 1943]

TODAY IN WASHINGTON

(By David Lawrence)

FLYNN APPOINTMENT HELD CONTRARY TO WAR INTERESTS

WASHINGTON, January 12.—President Roosevelt has made one of those unfortunate mistakes in judgment which he probably didn't realize would not only do a distinct disservice to the war effort but would complicate the fulfillment of the lofty aims for a better world when peace comes.

Mr. Roosevelt has undertaken to pay off political obligations in the midst of the most critical period of history, when international relations are delicate and the Nation is asked to furnish to the war effort its best energies. The President has given away the post of Minister to Australia—a country in the active theater of war—to a politician.

If the appointment of Edward J. Flynn was approved by the Department of State, then the prestige of Secretary Hull and everybody connected with the Department must necessarily suffer. If it wasn't approved by the Department of State, then the President is disregarding the many years of painstaking work that has been done by men in the diplomatic service to keep politics out of our foreign embassies.

RELATIONS ARE DELICATE

It has happened in peacetime, of course, that Republican Presidents have paid off big campaign contributors with diplomatic appointments, but the new dealers have never been anxious to use precedents of the "wicked Republicans" to chart their own course here. And in the middle of war, it is to be presumed that political obligations are subordinated to the Nation's broader interests, such as, for instance, winning the war.

The matters at issue at this time between the Australian Government and the United States Government are of a delicate nature. There are many people here who feel that there should be a closer understanding between the two countries and that the task of bringing Australia and America into better relationship is of such delicacy that only the ablest diplomat in America should be chosen.

There are many diplomatic representatives who are on the Government pay roll already and are back here because the countries to which they were accredited, have been conquered by the enemy in this war. There is Ambassador Grew, for instance, who knows the Pacific situation intimately. It is puzzling that the President shouldn't have selected a man of Mr. Grew's intellectual stature and diplomatic experience to go to Australia.

The problems as between America and Australia have for reasons of forbearance been touched upon lightly by the press in the hope that behind the scenes such things might be worked out, but when Mr. Flynn is asked to go to Australia, the appointment is no compliment to the great nation in the South Pacific.

OBSTACLE TO NATIONAL UNITY

It is not so much the man chosen but the attitude of the President toward an important diplomatic appointment in the midst of war which shakes confidence. There are altogether too many people in America who belonged to the isolationist school of thought before Pearl Harbor and who think Mr. Roosevelt is more interested in third terms and fourth terms and in personal ambition than in keeping the war effort free from all political taint. These isolationists found their ranks swelled in the last congressional election by many who felt that the President was not administering the war restrictions on a fair basis and that there was too much special privilege and too much politics in his New Deal set-up.

These charges now will be given added weight as the antiadministration elements which do not believe in Mr. Roosevelt's postwar program point to his misuse of public power during the war as proof of what might be expected afterward.

The biggest obstacle to national unity has been the charge that the present administration will seek to use the war powers for political purposes. Appointment of the Democratic national chairman to be Ambassador to Australia with undefined jurisdiction, probably including other areas, is good news for the opponents of American participation in post-war arrangements and bad news for those who believe in an international organization to maintain peace. It is not the kind of news that the troops and sailors fighting for America will understand. "Politics as usual" is not a good slogan for wartime and Mr. Flynn would spare the President much embarrassment if he declined the appointment.

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 13, 1943]

POLITICAL DEBT SEEN CATCHING UP WITH ROOSEVELT IN CASE OF FLYNN—MARK SULLIVAN SUSPECTS PRESIDENT MAY HAVE MADE APPOINTMENT WITH "SOUR FACE" AND ONLY BECAUSE "CREDITOR" PRESSED HIM HARD

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, January 12.—About the appointment of Mr. Edward J. Flynn to be Minister-Ambassador to Australia, the momentary question is, Will the Senate confirm him? The practically universal judgment of thoughtful persons is that refusal of the Senate to confirm would be a tonic to the national spirit, a relief to the State Department and the Diplomatic Service, and a help to the morale of Government servants generally. It is a fair guess that it might also be a relief to President Roosevelt. In making the appointment, Mr. Roosevelt is paying a political obligation—and there are signs that he pays with a sour face and only because the creditor pressed him hard. Last July there was a story that Mr. Flynn was to be made Ambassador to Mexico. Early publication of the story led to such protest, including from inside Mexico, that Mr. Roosevelt got a 6-month extension on his debt. Whether the Senate will confirm Mr. Flynn is the question that momentarily rages. But the more permanent aspect of the Flynn appointment is the light it throws on the political situation in which Mr. Roosevelt now finds himself in a long swing tide of American politics. This is important as respects the Presidential politics of 1944 and for some years after.

THE HAGUES AND THE NORRISES

Mr. Flynn is a type, a politician of the big cities, his practically lifelong career that of officeholder in New York. And Mr. Roosevelt is so involved with him and the background he reflects that it is necessary to give him a diplomatic post for which he is inappropriate. The appointment is made not only because Mr. Flynn wants it as reward. It is made also for the effect on leaders of other big-city machines—upon whom Mr. Roosevelt feels it necessary to make an impression of living up to his political obligations. The Flynn appointment is made in the same spirit in which last July Mr. Roosevelt appointed a Federal judge to please the leader of the Jersey City political machine, Mr. Frank Hague. About that appointment, New Deal Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, said the appointee "is a pawn of the greatest political machine in the United States. He is a Hague nominee."

Mr. Roosevelt's principal political support is now composed mainly of two groups not only diverse but fundamentally opposed—the hard-boiled Hagues and the star-eyed Norrises. Utterly opposed to each other, they unite in supporting Mr. Roosevelt. He holds the Hagues and Flynns by patronage, the Norrises by idealistic policies.

In the beginning and until recently Mr. Roosevelt had a third group, the Midwest farmers. But in the congressional elections last November he lost them disastrously. In 12 Midwestern States, out of a total of 128 Members of the House the Democrats elected only 25, the Republicans 103. In those Midwest States, in the country, and in Congress, Mr. Roosevelt has lost the farm and small-town rural vote. If a survey of last November's vote were made by counties it would probably be found the Republicans carried 80 to 90 percent of the counties (outside the solid South). The counties carried by the Democrats were mainly those containing big cities, such as the counties composing New York.

LABOR FOLLOWING MAY SHIFT

The groups remaining with Mr. Roosevelt—the big-city machines and the ardent New Dealers—overlap the labor vote. As long as Mr. Roosevelt had these and the farmers, too, he was triumphant and he was master. With the farmers gone it is doubtful—if, indeed, there is any doubt at all—whether he can continue triumphant in 1944. And when he is no longer triumphant it is doubtful if he is master of the groups who still give him support. Today it is a question whether he leads them or follows them, commands them or obeys them. He feels obliged to give to a city political leader a diplomatic appointment going counter to his sense of fitness.

The relation between Mr. Roosevelt and the labor leaders has become much the same. The labor leaders are supposed to be his following, and because of what he has done for them they ought to be. But as of today the labor leaders do not do what Mr. Roosevelt wishes. On the contrary, they embarrass him, go counter to his policies, resist the agencies he has set up to handle labor relations. As respects the labor leaders, Mr. Roosevelt is now in a position in which to hold them, he is called upon to yield more and more.

---

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 12, 1943]

THE POLITICAL MILL—FLYNN'S APPOINTMENT TO AUSTRALIAN POST ATTACKED ALONG A WIDE FRONT

(By Gould Lincoln)

The appointment of Democratic National Chairman Edward J. Flynn to be United States Minister to Australia was the political sensation over the last weekend and it promises to remain in the limelight for another week or two. The Republicans began shooting at Mr. Flynn the moment he made known the coming appointment at his office in New York. They are demanding a thorough hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—which probably means delving again into the now cause célèbre of the Belgian blocks, formerly owned by the city of New York but which were used to improve Mr. Flynn's country home.

As a matter of fact, 2 grand juries in New York have gone into that matter and have exonerated Mr. Flynn, who was away from home at the time the blocks—some 8,000 of them—were placed in his garden by city labor. According to Mr. Flynn, when he got back and found out about the improvement he insisted upon paying for work which had been done.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, its chairman, Senator CONNALLY of Texas, says, will meet Friday. It may decide what shall be done about the case of Mr. Flynn at that time. In view of the fact that Mr. Flynn has to be in Chicago the following Monday to attend a meeting of the Democratic National Committee, it is not likely, Senator CONNALLY said, that Mr. Flynn will be heard by the committee until some time next week, if the committee determines to hear him.

Under date of January 7, Mr. Flynn wrote Senator CONNALLY a letter in which he said he knew of the appointment which was to be made and declared himself in favor of a thorough investigation if anyone brought any charges against him. Mr. CONNALLY made the letter public late yesterday. Obviously, Mr. Flynn had some idea that Senators would go gunning for him as soon as the appointment became known. It was not until January 8, last Friday, that Mr. Flynn told the press that the President was sending his nomination to the Senate to be Minister to Australia.

WELCOMES INVESTIGATION

Mr. Flynn said in his letter to Senator CONNALLY that there was nothing in his past life to fear and that he would welcome a full hearing, if any charges or criticism were leveled at him.

Senator BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, lashed out at the Flynn appointment in the Senate yesterday, dubbing the newly appointed Minister "Paving Block Flynn." He suggested, during the course of his remarks, that Mr. Flynn was seeking to put a long distance between himself and the new Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey, with the idea of keeping out of range of any investigation Governor Dewey might undertake.

Mr. Dewey, during his campaign for election as Governor last fall, speaking in the Bronx, where Mr. Flynn has been Democratic leader since 1922, said there had been a time when any Republican visiting the Bronx was naturally expected to attack the Democratic boss. He added, "But it is no longer necessary. Everybody knows about him now."

At that time it was rumored that Mr. Flynn was to be sent as Ambassador to Mexico, and Mr. Dewey's comment was: "The people of Mexico have more to worry about him than have the people of New York. What a strain on the good-neighbor policy." Mr. Dewey, when questioned about the Flynn appointment to Australia, said he would stand on what he had said in his Bronx speech last October.

Mr. Flynn has been Democratic national chairman since "Jim" Farley stepped out of that office in the summer of 1940, after the latter had split with the President over the third term candidacy. Mr. Roosevelt was elected in the campaign of 1940, over which Mr. Flynn presided, although the margin of Mr. Roosevelt's victory was much less than it had been in 1932 and 1936.

The National Capital is agog over the President's reasons for sending Mr. Flynn to Australia. Australia is in the Pacific war theater in a big way. It is in Australia that Gen. Douglas MacArthur has been placed in command of the United Nations forces. And Gen. Douglas MacArthur—without any effort on his part—whose name has been repeatedly used as a possible, or even probable, Presidential nominee in 1944. To the politician it might occur that Mr. Flynn's trip to Australia was for the purpose of keeping an eye on General MacArthur. This may be unfair to the President, General MacArthur and Mr. Flynn—but is being said in some quarters.

CONFIRMATION SEEN

Despite the roars from the Republicans, it is likely that the Democratic majority in the Senate will finally confirm the nomination of Mr. Flynn—that is, unless a hearing should reveal anything damaging, which Mr. Flynn insists it will not.

It's a poor system which places men in high posts in the American diplomatic system who have had little or no experience in foreign affairs. Mr. Flynn, however, is just another of those cases. Diplomatic posts have been the reward of political service—or contributions of one kind or another—for years and years in this country. The number of career men among the United States ambassadors and ministers is on the increase, fortunately.

Mr. Flynn's successor as Democratic national chairman will be Postmaster General Frank C. Walker, who has a host of friends on Capitol Hill as well as throughout the country. Mr. Walker will be elected at the meeting of the national committee which has been called for Monday. He was at one time treasurer of the national committee.

There has been talk of employing an executive director of the national committee—but it does not seem likely now. The job of the new chairman will be to raise money to keep the national headquarters in operation during the next year and a half, and to help pay off any debts of the committee. If he has an efficient finance committee, the chairman can leave the job largely to it. Presumably, however, the chairman will seek a publicity director for the committee to take the place which was occupied so long by Charles Michelson, who resigned not long ago. It will be a tough job duplicating Mr. Michelson.

---

[From the Washington Daily News of January 13, 1943]

CASE OF ED FLYNN

(By Raymond Clapper)

In this Ed Flynn case, I find myself sputtering not so much at Flynn as at Roosevelt. He's the one who ought to know better, and who does know better.

I don't believe the gossip that the President wanted a trusted politician in Australia to keep an eye on General MacArthur and watch for anything that looked like 1944 Presidential politics. Ed Flynn wanted to be an ambassador and Mr. Roosevelt undertook to make him one.

It was not surprising that Ed Flynn wanted a diplomatic post. He was eager to take almost anyone that the President would offer. Mr. Flynn has been beaten around in the paving-block affair. His stretch as chairman of the Democratic National Committee was marred by the constant reiteration of the charges despite the fact that two grand juries considered them and returned no indictments.

Quite understandably, Mr. Flynn wanted the kind of vindication and prestige that come from a diplomatic appointment. It would mean a lot to his family. Diplomatic life carries a glamor of distinction, or so the movies would lead one to think. The New York politician wears a morning coat and a high hat on special occasions, and he looks with awe on a craft in which, the movies

suggest, such are the working clothes. It was the most natural thing in the world that Ed Flynn should ask the President to fix him up with a diplomatic job.

But it is difficult to understand why Mr. Roosevelt should send Mr. Flynn to Australia. True, our Minister there is an old career man, Nelson Johnson, who has been in the foreign service 35 years and is ready to retire.

But Australia is a ticklish spot right now. The Government there hangs on by a majority of one. It is anti-Churchill. Australian politicians play a game of complaining frequently about inadequate aid from the United States. There have been strikes and other instances where the cooperation was not all that was wished.

General MacArthur has conducted himself with discretion in a most delicate situation, when it would have been so easy for such a spectacular figure to stick his neck out to the disadvantage of our mutual interests. Mr. Flynn himself broke the proprieties to announce his own prospective nomination. That is in itself a sufficient indication that he is likely to have trouble finding his way around in such a delicate and complicated situation as exists in Australia.

And it is unwise anyhow to be using the diplomatic field as a place for burying politicians, especially now when our relations with other governments are becoming more complex than they ever have been. We are entering a new period in our foreign relations and we shall need the very best technicians at all contact points.

I don't subscribe to the idea that no laymen should be appointed to our diplomatic posts and that everything should be left in the hands of career men. The professionals are needed in all missions to handle the technical work. But sometimes they are too restricted in their interests, and lacking in that political sense or feeling for the forces that may be surging around them.

Almost invariably they are tied in with the reactionary groups wherever they may be, because they play with rich people, and they are apt to be toadies. Yet a man like Joseph E. Davies, a filthy-rich capitalist, can go into Communist Russia as Ambassador and get on better than anyone else we ever had there. He had a shrewd judgment of what was going on. He sensed the things that career men sometimes muff.

So the argument against Mr. Flynn isn't that nobody but career Foreign Service men should be appointed to be head of missions. The point is that when you shove a layman into one of those spots he ought to be very, very good indeed, a man of distinct achievement and one commanding respect in his own field—a man like Governor Lehman, for instance, who is better equipped to do the relief and rehabilitation work better than any career Foreign Service officer.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire, in this calm and temperate exposition of his views, has made a very distinct contribution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee will meet tomorrow, and we hope to perform our duty. We have been told by several Senators—notably the Senator from New Hampshire—what our duty is. The Senator from Maine is also willing to make his contribution.

I feel that I speak for the whole committee when I say that the Committee on Foreign Relations will try to do its duty as the facts will justify. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are members of the committee, and the Senator from Maine is likewise a member. There are very distinguished and very useful minority members on the committee, and if any member of the committee should show any willful disposition to err, I am sure that some of those Senators would hold up the green light and warn us, and not let us commit grievous errors and legislative crimes. We shall try to handle this case in the best way we know of. We did not appoint Mr. Flynn, nor have we expressed the view that we would not let him be confirmed in advance of a hearing.

In the days when I was practicing law I was always suspicious of a juror who would send word that if we would get him on the jury, he already had his mind made up. I would never trust that kind of a juror, because I was afraid he had sent word to the other side to the same effect. I do not like to decide cases on the sidewalk, or in the cloakroom, or even in the newspapers. When great newspaper columns are glaring at you there is a temptation to try to swell up and fill out. I do not like to try cases in that way.

I may have the wrong idea. I used to be just an ordinary country lawyer, and I always felt that I had better luck when I tried cases in the courthouse. We had a record there, and could take an appeal if necessary. But I never did like to try cases at the blacksmith shop, or in the livery stable. The livery stable was a favorite place in the old days for trying a lawsuit. There one could "cuss" all he pleased, and spit tobacco juice on everything, and give everybody hell, without any proof except his own prejudice, his own predilections, or what Bill Jones said that Henry Johnson said that old man Jenkins said, to the effect that so and so was something.

I hope we can try this case in the regular way. I welcome the Senator from Maine. I have very great respect for the Senator from Maine, and a fondness for him. I assure him now that the members of the committee are going to try to do our duty, whatever it may be.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly; I never can resist the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the very generous comment of the Senator from Texas, and I am very sorry that, as I conceive, he misconstrued my very well-meant remarks, because I thought I made it very clear in the beginning that I was not presuming to either prejudge the case or to instruct the Committee on Foreign Relations as to its duty.

Mr. CONNALLY. We all appreciate instruction.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should never presume to instruct the Senator from Texas as to his duty in anything, because of his very much longer experience and his very acute intellect.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. My remarks were rather addressed to my good friend from our neighboring State, the Senator from New Hampshire. I was seeking to call attention to the fact that in his emphasis on Mr. Flynn's rather negative virtues it should not be presumed that affirmative qualifications are not required. I was not at all meaning to prejudge the case.

Mr. CONNALLY. I accept the statement of the Senator from Maine. I realize the close kinship between New Hampshire and Maine. Maine has sent many emigrants into New Hampshire, having controversies with them in past years over boundary lines, and questions of that kind. I can appreciate the warm sympathy that exists, and his anxiety not to see the Senator from New Hampshire get off on the wrong tack.

Mr. President, I am just as anxious as are these Senators that the Senate should perform its duty and that the committees should perform theirs; but under the Constitution the Senate consists of 96 Members, not merely one Senator, and no one Senator has ever yet been given the responsibility of taking care of the consciences and the responsibilities and the duties of the other 95. Occasionally a Senator tries to do that, but in my short and uneventful career as a Senator I have never seen it work.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should be very glad to turn over to the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, this stolen paving block if he would like to have it as an exhibit in the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am surprised that the Senator from New Hampshire would allow himself to be put into the position of being in possession of stolen property. [Laughter.] He should see the district attorney, not the Senator from Texas. I am not in criminal practice.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator may be in criminal practice before he gets through with the hearing.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say a word further to the Senate. The Senator from New Hampshire is welcome to come before the Committee on Foreign Relations when it meets. I would rather he would not approach me in the corridor or in the hall and insist on my taking his stolen paving block; but if he desires to come before the Committee on Foreign Relations tomorrow, we will hear him, and we will look over anything he may bring with him.

## THE CIVILIAN CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, in the stress and strain of an all-out struggle, of total war, we are constantly looking, and properly so, with great concern toward the fighting fronts, and to heap our rightful praise and recognition upon those who have distinguished themselves in the actual fire of combat. It is indeed fitting and necessary that we should do this, for the sacrifices which those gallant fighting men are making in this great struggle are far above our poor power to repay or to emulate.

But oftentimes in our great concern over the ebb and flow of the battle line, we are prone to forget our tireless and patriotic soldiers on the home front, the thousands of men and women who comprise the civilian effort behind the war, and who devote untold hours of conscientious effort to their jobs—jobs which are the backbone of our civilian

and military machinery, jobs which are the fundamental essentials of a full and unimpeded national war effort. I speak of that vast army of civilian soldiers who comprise our selective service boards, our civilian defense organizations, and our war rationing committees.

There has been no greater example of unselfish service in our war effort than that which has been exhibited by our many draft boards, their appeal agencies, legal advisers, and employees. Overcoming almost insurmountable difficulties, they have performed well that Herculean task of registering and classifying millions of their fellow citizens, and they have effectively carried out all the numberless details which have resulted in the final induction of the millions of registrants who now comprise our powerful and ever-growing Army. That the functions of these boards are being carried out with but a minimum of public complaint is in itself evidence of the fine work being done by these very important agencies of the war effort.

The civilian defense organizations throughout the country are also performing an important and vital function in the war program, for it is this group of loyal, well-trained civilian soldiers which is standing by 24 hours out of every day, prepared for any emergency, alert and ready should the enemy strike, and guarding the Nation against the attempts of saboteurs who would spread demoralization either by rumor or by action.

The inspiring work which this organization very recently performed in combating the raging floodwaters of the Ohio River will never be forgotten by that vast multitude of citizens who were rendered homeless and shaken by that great tragedy. The work which these organizations performed under the most adverse conditions was truly magnificent and worthy of every praise.

Another important adjunct to the prosecution of the war lies in the war-rationing committees which can be found in every neighborhood of our vast country. These committees are charged with the very difficult and at times thankless task of seeing to it that the wartime commodities are fairly and efficiently rationed, and that the maximum constructive use is made of all commodities. The importance of their function becomes increasingly apparent with the steady inclusion of more and more articles on the list of rationed goods.

The cooperative and coordinated activities of these groups represent the very heart and fiber of America's civilian war program, and the importance of these activities must never be lost sight of. We must remember that the thousands of people who comprise these organizations serve largely without compensation, that they devote great portions of their time and talent to the common cause, and that they, like all true Americans, are performing their patriotic services in an efficient, if unappreciated and uncompensated manner.

Mr. President, these are no easy tasks, no honorary nor pleasurable callings. These are vital and sometimes disheartening chores. There is no great joy, no unbounded enthusiasm, in deciding whose mother's son or whose child's father shall be sent into this raging maelstrom of military combat. There is no great pleasure in trying to explain to the American people the need for wartime rationing, and the profound necessity for using all commodities sparingly and wisely. Neither is it a pleasant thing to have heaped upon one's head all the wrath and criticism of a disgruntled and caustic public whose nerves are frayed and whose tempers are inflamed because of the mass of bureaucratic red tape and hopeless inefficiency which emanate from Washington. Neither is it a particularly enticing prospect to undergo months of detailed and careful training in any number of vital subjects, and then to go out and try to encourage the active cooperation of an all too lethargic public where such matters as air-raid precautions, fire drills, mock invasions, and like activities are concerned.

Mr. President, these are vital activities, and they are being performed effectively and efficiently by the many thousands of our workers who comprise these organizations. We must bear in mind also that the vast majority of these people receive no compensation whatsoever. They give willingly and freely of their time; they devote untold effort to their labor; yet rarely do they receive even so much as a kind word. More often than not they are subjected to all manner of criticism and censure. But, despite all these things, despite the fact that they remain unrecognized, uncompensated, and uncited, they continue in their vital work.

We have made reasonable provision for the compensation and recognition of our soldiers on the fighting fronts; we have made similar provision for recognition and compensation for our soldiers on the production line; but the appalling fact remains that we have provided nothing even by way of recognition, much less compensation, for these civilian-soldiers who are contributing so much to the preservation of America.

Mr. President, it is my contention and firm belief that we should devise some means—some appropriate medal or certificate of honor—for the recognition of these people. This is the least—the very least—that we can do to convey our appreciation to them, and to make them aware that we do recognize and appreciate the outstanding and commendable efforts which they, as soldiers on the home front, have made and will continue to make in behalf of American security and final victory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief résumé of certain correspondence and communications which have come to my office, and which deal with the important matter about which I have just spoken—the real democracy of this glorious Republic on the home front at work during war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE

In Pennsylvania alone there is a total of 582,000 certified members in the defense corps, quietly performing their varied tasks day in and day out, with no thought of reward or compensation other than the satisfaction of knowing that they have kept the faith at home while their sons and brothers are laying down their lives on foreign soil.

France was without any protective service of this kind, and when the unprecedented type of warfare was visited upon her, we all know the quick result. England, organized 2 years before the start of actual hostilities, presented a far different picture. And so, here in the United States with the broad and firm foundation of civilian defense already established and serving us so well, we should encourage continued vigilance and the expansion of these services. Even though we know that victory is certain to be achieved, we cannot relax; we must redouble our efforts. Our enemies, too, will know that ruin and death are fast and inevitably closing in. Typical of snakes and rats when cornered, who can say in what ways they will attempt to strike us at home in their maniacal desperation and all-consuming hatred?

RATIONING

Three weeks after Pearl Harbor businessmen throughout the country were summoned to the offices of the mayors and burgesses of their home communities and asked to volunteer to serve on ration boards in the localities in which they lived. The ration board set-up roughly approximated that of the draft boards that were already functioning.

The work, they were told, would entail only a few hours a week. No appropriation had been made, so that office space, stenographic help telephones, stationery, etc., would have t be paid for by the members of the prospective rationing boards. Almost without exception these men consented to undertake the task set before them.

Since that time, you all know how the work of these boards, now designated as the War Price and Ration Board, has multiplied. The few hours per week has now increased to a minimum of 24 hours service at the board headquarters, with many additional hours of homework and study devoted to studying the multifarious regulations, changes of procedure, and instructions that emanate several times a week from Washington.

Members of the rationing boards are now required to check upon commodities that intimately affect the lives of their families and neighbors. If they do their jobs well, the best they can hope for is an absence of censure. They are harassed night and day, threatened, cajoled, and abused.

But I very strongly feel that our Federal Government, which has so much talent and time to devote to preparing complicated questionnaires and regulations for the rationing boards to administer, might take a little time off to give the members of these boards some concrete recognition of the patriotic service they are rendering. Some kind of commission should be conferred upon these men and women that they could treasure in later years as evidence that their Government recognizes and appreciates the sacrifice they have been making to insure our ultimate victory.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

The members of the draft board are citizens taken from every walk of life who have the rather unpleasant duty to perform of deciding which of their fellow citizens and neighbors shall be called to serve the country.

The employees of the board have been faithful from the time the Selective Service System was instituted. They do not know the meaning of holidays and very few Sundays are their own. In most localities, inductions are held early in the morning with the result that the employees arrive at their offices often at the hour of 6:30 and they then stay for meetings of the board which are held at least twice a week and often last until midnight.

Without this unselfish service which has been exhibited by the draft boards, Government appeal agents, legal advisers, and employees, it would have been impossible to carry out the functions of the Selective Service System and we would not now have in our armed forces the millions of our fellow citizens who are at present fighting for America on all parts of the globe.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, recent years have witnessed an abundance of charges leveled against men in public life. This is true concerning those who have entertained one view on international and domestic problems as well as those entertaining opposite views. One in public life learns to "take it" and to endure endless criticism; but there perhaps come times to all of us when we reach the saturation point. Through the years I have ignored many false accusations, being able to sense that to pause and give answer to obvious falsehoods would be only to waste much time and energy. In some instances I have been later made to wish that I had answered at the time the charges were made, finding here and there someone who has accepted the charge as fact simply because the charge was not answered.

Since that fateful day in December, in 1941, I have read endless charges, most unfair in their conception, most bitter and prejudiced in their presentation, starting with certain published accounts of an address I was delivering at the very hour when the Japanese were attacking Pearl Harbor. I have tolerated endless criticism and charges rather than in any degree to contribute to the disruption of the highest degree of unity attainable in this land in meeting the challenge which is ours by reason of the war. But I now come face to face with charges which reflect not only upon me but upon the people I am here to represent, upon my State—North Dakota—and I rise in my place here in the Senate to give answer to those who seemingly are not content with unity, those who will not have unity, if you please, unless unity carries with it the privilege, for them, to deride, berate, and falsely charge those who have not been in agreement with them respecting the conduct of foreign policy and the ways of accomplishing victory.

Before me is a news clipping from the front page of a Sioux Falls, S. Dak., newspaper, under the heading of "Finds Pro-Nazi Sentiment Is Heaviest in Dakotas; Seger, Former Member of Reichstag, Here for Talks." Under this heading I read a most amazing tale, the sponsorship of which could be attributed to no one less than a writer of fiction or a downright liar. The article is a report of an address delivered before a meeting of members of the B'nai B'rith Society at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., an address by one Dr. Gerhart Seger, represented to be a former member of the German Reichstag and a German World War pilot, who allegedly had escaped from a German concentration camp and is seemingly now here lecturing to the American people, and allegedly making a personal survey of all communities in the United States to determine what percentage of German-Americans are pro-Nazi, what percentage are anti-Nazi, and what percentage are "on the fence."

This report of Dr. Seger's address finds him declaring that only in New Jersey is the percentage of Nazi sympathizers greater than in North and South Dakota. He complained that in one South Dakota town the German proprietor of a flower shop refused to wait on him when he recognized the lecturer as an anti-Nazi. Then he went on to say—and I quote what he was quoted as saying in the newspaper report—

> There are 7,000,000 German-Americans in the United States today, and of that number 5 percent are Nazis and another 5 percent are anti-Nazis. That means that there are 350,000 Nazis in the United States and an equal number who are fighting the Nazis. The other 90 percent of the German-Americans are on the fence.

Mr. President, I insist that these charges by Dr. Seger, whoever he may be, respecting the people of the Dakotas, is as baseless, as foundationless, as any charge could possibly be. It sickens me to know that a foreigner, perhaps a refugee, should be left free to make such baseless charges which are not made, and could not be made, by responsible agencies of our own Government and country who have been ferreting out whatever Nazi sentiment there may be in our country.

I resent these charges to whatever degree they might reflect upon that part of the population of North Dakota which is in any degree of German descent. I know these people; I knew them before this Nazi war got under way; I have known them since our involvement in this war; and I know that those North Dakotans of German descent are just as largely loyal to the cause of the United States today, just as helpful in the winning of this war, as any other group of people within my State or any of the other 48 States of the Union. Nazi sympathy of which Dr. Seger speaks simply does not exist. I take great pride at this moment in calling attention to the fact that in the last 2 months my State of North Dakota has oversubscribed its Government bond obligations in greater percentage than is true of any other State of the Union. I am extremely proud of the people of my State, including those of German descent, who threw themselves into this year's agricultural effort in a way and to a degree which brought agricultural production in North Dakota this year to a total far in excess of production in the past, and this in spite of the handicaps and hardships which present-day policies were affording.

Senators are being given at frequent intervals reports by the War Department covering Army casualties by States. I hope I shall not appear out of place if I call attention to the release of January 2 by the War Department revealing casualties by areas and by States. I point out, Senators, that only one State in the Union suffered larger casualty lists than were suffered by my State of North Dakota as of that period. Thirty-six North Dakotans are listed. There were many times that number of heartaches and heartbreaks in my State of North Dakota. As I run through that casualty list I find that at least a third of the names are plainly of German origin—Geiger, Holzworth, Huffstutler, Kohnke, Pflugrath, Stimmel, Vettel, Weigel, and others which I might recite.

Mr. President, I find it in my heart to say, "Damned be any man who dares to rise and say that Americans of German origin in the State of North Dakota are not working, sacrificing, bleeding, and dying in the interests of American victory in this war, on a par with the sacrificing, laboring, bleeding, and dying of any other section of the people." There are moments when I would like to wring the very necks of the agitators and prejudice-builders, who would, if they only could, destroy the unity and the centralness of purpose which have so long possessed Americans and made them contributors to the creation of the greatest, most resourceful, and most enlightened Nation upon the face of the earth. I for one am quite done with standing idly by while some few go forth in the guise of "patriotism" with programs that are insulting and most destructive in their very nature, particularly when this kind reflect upon my State or its people, all of whom are doing just as great a job of helping to win this war as is being done by the people of any other State in the Union.

With that, and while I am on my feet, I shall devote myself to a more personal matter, yet a matter which is to some degree in keeping with the wanton effort I have just demonstrated as intended to destroy confidence in entire communities of people. I have written what I wish to say now, and I follow closely my manuscript, lest I let my feelings carry me away into words and charges that might not be in keeping with the dignity which ought to prevail in this Chamber.

I presume that Senators have all read yesterday's Merry-Go-Round column by Drew Pearson, appearing in the Washington Post. Some Senators may have missed it, since the Post is obviously relegating this Merry-Go-Round feature ever backward and backward in its pages until now it comes within one or two pages of the want-ad pages. But I should hardly be deserving of the respect of my colleagues if I did not rise here and now and give answer to Mr. Drew Pearson's allegation under the heading "Hitler's stooges." In particular, Pearson writes that Senator NYE—

> Has also been active behind the scenes in aiding the appeal of George Sylvester Viereck, convicted for failure to register as a foreign agent and now indicted for sedition.

Mr. President, I label this with a term the meaning of which need not be misunderstood in any mind. It is a deceitful falsehood, frequently referred to as a lie. It was obviously intended to deceive those who would read it. If it was not deliberately a lie on the part of its author, then it is based upon deceitful information, and I wish there might be a way to ascertain the identity of the informant.

Perhaps this is what should be expected of one who deals in lying for profit.

A fortune, I understand, has been accumulated through ability to produce sensation; and when lies are necessary to produce sensation, there seems to be no hesitancy in lying. As a newspaperman it was my training that a lying reporter was the worst challenge to the continued existence of a free and objective press. Honest reporters and honest newspapers must suffer by reflection the opprobrium which Pearson has created for himself, because, after all, he does call himself a newspaperman, which some will insist is the biggest lie he has yet told.

It is to the credit of most newspapers that they want nothing to do with Pearson's Merry-Go-Round. An editor of some importance, who had considered taking on the Pearson column but decided not to do so, once remarked to his staff:

> It is all right to read Pearson for entertainment, but keep in mind that every time he has written about anything we know about personally, he has always been wrong. If he is wrong on the things we have knowledge of, how the hell can we trust him on things we do not know about?

Pearson is a master of the half-truth. When a direct lie does not suit his purpose because it might be too dangerous, he can lie by inference by merely leaving out qualifying remarks and explanations. He is one who could quote from Mein Kampf and make Hitler seem a hero, or quote isolated verses from the Bible and make devils out of the Apostles.

With respect to his charge that I have aided in the appeal of Viereck, I say to my colleagues that there is not the faintest or slightest cause or ground. To one who hates the truth as much as Pearson seems to hate it, what I say here will be without force or effect, of course; but I want to have no seeming will on my part to let his quite direct falsehoods go unchallenged.

With all the force at my command, Mr. President, I insist that there is not the slightest basis for any such charge as Pearson has made and the Post has published. I have talked with Mr. Viereck only once or twice in my life. I have not seen or had any contact with Mr. Viereck in many, many months. On his last visit to my office he was abruptly rebuffed and made to understand that his calls were definitely not welcomed. This happened more than a year before Pearl Harbor. I have had no contact with Mr. Viereck or with anyone else who has even suggested my doing any act that would aid Mr. Viereck in his appeal. I do not know what more I could say to assert emphatically that I have not had the slightest interest in whatever might be the appeal of Mr. Viereck. I cannot conceive what purpose Drew Pearson or any publisher would have in drawing so completely upon falsehood as to warrant such a charge as Mr. Pearson has made.

There are other features about Mr. Pearson's comment in yesterday's newspapers to which I must devote myself for just a moment. Mr. Pearson said that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and myself are "working so feverishly for an investigation of the Justice Department and its prosecution of Hitler's stooges in the United States of America." Mr. Pearson goes on to say that the reason for our interest is allegedly that of preventing disclosures involving ourselves, disclosures that are rather certain, allegedly, to develop if ever these conspiracy cases are brought to trial.

Mr. President, I have not the slightest fear of any facts which the approaching trials might produce. Fortunately, even columnists and commentators must be direct and explicit when they are reporting as witnesses in our courts. Innuendo and deception are rather easily met in a court of justice, and facts are a burden only to those who find facts unprofitable.

Speaking of deceptive charges, let me point to the charge now repeated by Mr. Pearson, to the effect that I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Nazi propaganda which was printed and sent out under my frank, loaned to the Steuben Society of America. I should like to make the record clear on this matter, now that I am dealing with it.

The Winchells and the Pearsons have often thrown this charge, which is intended to convey the thought that I had inserted in the RECORD something of Nazi origin which had been sneaked into public circulation by alleged "agents" and "sympathizers" with the Nazi cause. Now, what are the facts? Let me state them so that the record may be clear.

One of the finest American citizens it has been my pleasure to know is Mr. Theodore Hoffman, president of the Steuben Society of America, which is made up of a group of Americans, so far as I have been privileged to know them—and my privilege has been large—whose spirit is completely American, and who, I have found, thoroughly detest nazi-ism. I find that it is a matter of record that early in the days of the American Bund, the American Steuben Society put its foot down on this undertaking without mercy, condemned it, and wrote itself off from any possible affiliation with this un-American group. I have great admiration for the Steuben Society of America because I know its purpose has been so emphatically American all the way. The society has been a distinct credit to that great German whom the society honors by naming itself after him, a German who contributed much to the creation of our country.

On April 30, 1941, Theodore Hoffman, the president of this society, delivered an address at Madison, Wis., which I inserted, under unanimous consent, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on May 20, 1941. The address was on the subject of Americans of Germanic extraction. I challenge any Senator to read that speech in its entirety and to come to any other conclusion than that which is mine, namely, that this address was worthy of a place in the RECORD, was a credit to the American who delivered it, and that it was anything but an address in sympathy with the cause of nazi-ism. I find Mr. Hoffman saying in that address, among other things, this:

> Ours is a Nation composed of citizens of all countries and no one has a place in our ranks whose allegiance is not wholly to the United States of America.
>
> We deprecate and disapprove of any exhibition of foreign politics on our shores which can have no other result than to create a feeling of hostility against those who exhibit it and the country which they claim to represent. We resent it as in conflict with the principles upon which our country is founded.

Again, as I scan that address by Mr. Hoffman, which I inserted in the RECORD, I find him saying:

> Americans of Germanic extraction do not want communism, fascism, or nazi-ism, and they do not want British imperialism. They want Americanism.

I suppose this is sordid Nazi propaganda, possibly written by Goebbels or even by Hitler himself.

Mr. Hoffman went on ir his address to recite the aims and purposes of the Steuben Society as being "loyally to support the Constitution of the United States of America by advocating the proper application of its provisions and inculcating the principles underlying true democratic government; to quicken the spirit of sound Americanism; fostering a basic American spirit among all citizens; to aid in maintaining the independence and sovereignty of the United States of America and its freedom from all foreign influence; to establish cooperation among its members in the exercise of their civic duties, and to encourage among them an active participation in every phase of our national life; to promote the welfare and enhance the happiness of its members and their fellow men; to perpetuate itself as a patriotic and fraternal voluntary membership organization and to provide for its government; to guard our political liberty by maintaining an honest equality of citizenship regardless of the birth, origin, or religion of any citizen; to maintain the traditions of our country."

Senators, I submit that this address by Theodore Hoffman of the Steuben Society of America was deserving of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and not only do I have nothing to apologize for in having inserted it in the RECORD, but I say now that I am happy to have been privileged to offer it.

This is the speech which Mr. Pearson and Mr. Winchell would have their audiences believe was Nazi inspired, this speech which was so completely anti-Nazi even to the point of saying so.

Then come Pearson and Winchell with a broader insinuation concerning the manner in which this speech was circulated.

After its printing in the RECORD Mr. Hoffman desired copies of it printed. He paid the very nominal sum that was necessary for printing three or five thousand copies of his speech. These copies were given to him in my frank for the purpose of mailing to such as he chose. Instead of mailing them separately to individual addressees, he distributed some of this print to the officers of local Steuben societies in the country for distribution among their membership. This practice I dare say is one which has prevailed in Congress for many, many more years than I have been a Member of it. But someone—I think I know who—ran with complaint to the Post Office Department, and the Post Office Department made demand upon Mr. Hoffman and the Steuben Society for the

payment of postage on whatever part of these three or five thousand copies of his speech had been sent out under my frank. Mr. Hoffman advised me that he did not know exactly how many had been thus mailed, but that in order to be perfectly fair he paid to the Government a postage fee on more items than he knew had been mailed.

Mr. President, I shall not argue here the merit of the demand by the Post Office Department upon Mr. Hoffman for the payment of this postage. It certainly would be subject to debate, but I confine myself at this moment to the assertion that these facts hardly warrant the assertion by Mr. Pearson of yesterday that "Senator NYE has lent his frank to the Steuben Society for which the Steuben Society was fined by the Post Office Department."

Mr. Pearson knows how eagerly some forces tried to "get something" on Mr. Hoffman and the Steuben Society during those days when "smearing" was rampant to a degree that made the program hysterical. He knows that Hoffman and members of his staff were summoned before a grand jury here in Washington and that they submitted themselves and their books and records to closest study, yet no indictment resulted. Mr. Pearson's will to keep up the smear has led him, apparently, to anger not unlike that entertained when Hoffman went to West Point last summer and made the annual award by the Steuben Society. Some folks will not tolerate such a course of action by anyone who has been the subject of their smearing. Once smeared by them one is naturally expected to stay smeared.

I would not deny for one moment that I entertain grave doubts concerning the merit of the charges which have resulted in the indictment of some 30 Americans by a District of Columbia grand jury. To me, as to others in the Senate, there has been representation of alleged practices before the grand jury which left one wondering concerning the issue of personal liberty. I would hold no brief in any quarter for anyone guilty of contributing to the undermining of our defense, or undermining the morale of our armed forces, but I submit that with respect to the indictments returned against most of those involved in this alleged conspiracy they are no more guilty of conspiracy than I am, and have seemingly done nothing more than I and others of us here have done time and time again. Thus I am brought to the conclusion that possibly many of those who are facing trial under these indictments are no more guilty than are millions of other Americans who, prior to Pearl Harbor, were giving voice to their feelings respecting possible involvement in this war. I am driven at moments to feel that the indictment about which we have been reading through these many months is not an indictment of 20 or 30 individuals but is an indictment of 75, 80, or 90 percent of the people of the United States.

I would not want my remarks here to prejudice in any degree the trials which allegedly are about to ensue; but since the question has been raised, as it has been raised by Mr. Pearson, I would not want to seem to be denying that I have considered, and that I have heard others considering, the possible justification for an investigation of the whole proceeding which has brought about the indictments. I would deny, however, that I or anyone of my acquaintance has been "working feverishly for an investigation of the Justice Department and its prosecution of Hitler stooges in the U. S. A."

I have nothing more to say, Mr. President. I appreciate the privilege which has permitted me to rise in my place and defend myself against the outrageous innuendoes and lies which have been so prominent during many months of seeming effort to smear, smear, smear one and all who dared, prior to Pearl Harbor, to differ with policies which some of us felt were policies which could not lead anywhere other than into war.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from North Dakota needs no defense from me or from anyone else. I do not subscribe to the Washington Post. My attention was called to the article written by Drew Pearson only yesterday. My attention also was called to an article in the Washington Post by Dillard Stokes.

First of all, let me say that when I first came to the Senate a newspaper in my State wrote an editorial derogatory to me. I thought about rising in the Senate and answering it. At that time, I was just a young man. I went to the office of the then Senator La Follette, and I showed him the editorial. He said to me, "I would not pay any attention to it. Remember that this man can afford to attack you every day, but you cannot afford to rise in the Senate and attack him every day." Then he said to me, "Remember that, as a Member of the Senate, you cannot afford to get into a contest with the little black animal which has a white stripe up its back." [Laughter.]

I have always remembered that. I have no desire to get into a contest with that kind of an animal today; and that is the kind of an animal, in my judgment, Drew Pearson is. He has not only lied about the Senator from North Dakota, but he has lied about the Secretary of State; he has lied about Jesse Jones; he has lied about the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and other Senators. If my understanding is correct, the Senator from Maryland wrote a letter to the newspapers of the country in which he called Pearson a liar, and even the Washington Post finally published a retraction of the Pearson story about the Senator from Maryland. Yet this man Pearson goes on the radio once a week, not representing some legitimate business enterprise, but representing some patent medicine—I think it is a cathartic. It is perfectly proper that he should represent that kind of a patent medicine. That is the only kind of an enterprise that would pay him to speak.

But he goes on week after week and week after week spewing forth his venom and lies about anyone and everyone who happens to disagree with him; and we have to permit it in the name of free speech. I am in favor of free speech, and the only reason I ever wrote the letter to the Attorney General was because of the fact that I believed in free speech in America, and I did not want to see it prevented even during the war.

During the last war, when I happened to be a United States district attorney, and hysteria was sweeping over the country and there were demands for the prosecution of everybody who had a German name and everybody who had a Jewish name, and for the prosecution of some Irish societies, I refused to prosecute unless I was furnished with the evidence. Because of that fact I was attacked by the press. Yet, as I look back upon my career in public and private life, there is nothing that I cherish so much as the fact that I was not carried away by the hysteria of those times to use the force of my position to prosecute everybody who did not agree with the views I held.

I read the other day an article in a magazine stating that trials should be conducted in the United States such as were held in Russia when they purged many leaders. That was printed in a magazine called The Jewish Survey. I thought that of all the people in the United States who should be advocating anything of that kind this magazine was the last.

When I wrote a letter to the Attorney General of the United States, I said that, in my judgment, he owed it to himself to investigate the situation that had existed and the rumors which were going around in reference to the handling of the grand jury. When I did that, the Washington Post devoted to me two pages and a half, as I recall, in a Sunday edition. I felt highly honored that they would give me so much space. They intimated that they thought I was honest but I had been misled by a lot of Nazi stooges.

Now this fellow Pearson says that the reason I was interested was because of the fact that I was afraid something might come out about me. Let me say that there is nothing more that can be said about me than has been said. As a matter of fact, there is hardly any name that I could be called that was not applied to me before I came to the Senate of the United States. I came up the ladder of politics the hard way. Anyone who does not know about politics in Montana in the early days does not know what politics is. So it does not bother me, except that I dislike to have it intimated that I entertain any religious or racial prejudice. It so happens that my father was a Quaker, and he taught me never to let racial and religious prejudices enter my mind. I have prided myself that I have never done it, and yet I find some newspapers that know better charging me with having such prejudices. They ought not to make these charges for their own sake, for they are not doing me any harm; the only ones to whom they are doing harm are their own class and their own race.

Yesterday morning a newspaper was handed to me by a young man who formerly worked in my office who called my attention to an article which stated:

Hudson ran an isolationist, anti-British, anti-war propaganda bulletin in Omaha,

Nebr., plying his mailing list with vast flocks of propaganda under the franks of Senator BURTON K. WHEELER (Democrat) and others.

That is just a plain unadulterated lie; there is no other way to express it. Let me show why it is a lie. I have never met Hudson and did not recall any correspondence with him. However, when this statement was called to my attention, I had my files checked and I found therein a letter which I had written to Hudson on July 31, 1941, some 5 months before this Nation was in the war. When I wrote the letter a bulletin which Hudson apparently publishes at frequent intervals was called to my attention. In that bulletin Hudson had informed his readers that apparently I was not his kind of an isolationist, and he suggested in his bulletin that I might have been responsible for making known to the military authorities that speeches of various Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were reaching members of the armed forces.

Apart from that allegation, which concerned me but little, I was disgusted with Hudson's bulletin, which seemed to me to be a vile, un-American propaganda sheet, apparently designed to incite racial and religious hatred. Thereupon I wrote Hudson a letter. I do not expect the Washington Post or Stokes or Drew Pearson will have the honesty of purpose and decency to quote this letter, but I am sure the Members of the Senate will be interested in hearing what I wrote to Hudson on July 31, 1941:

JULY 31, 1941.

Mr. CHARLES B. HUDSON,
*Omaha, Nebr.*

DEAR SIR: There has just come to my attention your bulletin No. 274, dated July 21, 1941.

I note your reference in the third paragraph on the first page of that bulletin to "spy activities of the two Jews on Senator WHEELER'S staff." Your reference is completely and unequivocally false. If you had followed the facts in connection with the letters from selectees to Senators, you would have known that the facts were not as you portrayed them. Both the Army and the public learned of the origin of some of the telegrams and letters from selectees because copies of the messages sent me and other Senators were also sent to newspapers by the selectees themselves.

I tried to locate a copy of the bulletin to which I have called attention, but I could not find it. Then in my letter I said:

It is true that I have in my employ two Jewish people. I do not employ people because of their race, religion, or creed; I employ people who are capable, honest, and loyal. I do not approve of your attitude, because I deplore anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism, or any ism which has as its basis the persecution of minorities, whether they be religious, racial, social, or economic minorities. I regard such activities as dangerous to democracies because they strike at the very heart of free democratic government.

Very truly yours,

B. K. WHEELER.

Does anyone think that, after that letter to Mr. Hudson, I sent to him any speeches or other matter to be circulated by him or any mailing list to whom they might be sent?

A newspaper in New York, one of the largest newspapers in that city, called me up and said that the Fight for Freedom Committee had said that I was sending out speeches or circulars and giving them to anti-Semitic organizations. I inquired if the words "anti-Semitic organizations" were used, and was told "Yes." I said, "I can hardly believe that, because it so happens that the young man in my office who distributes and handles all that mail happens to be Jewish himself, and I do not think he is anti-Semitic." The one who called me up said that ought to answer it. Notwithstanding that fact, there is a little group in Washington that seeks to smear every Senator and every Member of the House who does not agree 100 percent with the administration. If they could not smear a man on one charge, they would try to smear him on some other.

If there is any member of the Senate who desires to debate with me my attitude before we entered this war, I am perfectly willing to debate it. I have not any apologies to make for anything I said or anything I did before we entered the war. I want that to go down in the RECORD, and I want it known that that is my position. I was opposed to our getting into this war. I thought we could keep out of it, and I was honest in my conviction. Not only did I myself believe that, but one of the men closest to the President spent some hours with me as late as October 1941, before Pearl Harbor, and said that the President was going to keep out of the war.

Mr. President, we hear much said about unity. Who is it that wants unity? So far as the Senate is concerned, there has not been a man here, Republican or Democrat, who has not said that we want unity and that we want to do everything we possibly can to win the war. I think that every Member of the Senate, Republican or Democrat, regardless of what his views were before the war, has done everything he possibly could to bring about unity in this country. But on the outside, in some of the executive departments, there have been many people, such as Archibald MacLeish, who have gone out and attempted to stir up disunity.

There was a time when the Communists in this country were all for keeping out of war. There was a time when the President denounced Stalin and there was a time when many people were denouncing Communists and saying that the Communists were sabotaging and destroying our industries, and wanted to take over the Government. During that period of excitement, when people were afraid that the Communists were going to ruin the Army of the United States, we passed the 1940 Sedition Act. I did not think it was a good law. I thought it would be misused; but it was enacted. And who opposed it in the House of Representatives? Who do Senators suppose filed the minority report? It was Maury Maverick, and Kvale, of Minnesota.

Maury Maverick is now one of the executives in the departments and he filed a report, which I have here. But since Russia was attacked by Germany, of course, these people have said, "We have to have unity with the Communists." Stalin was not then a dictator, but was a great democrat, and Russia became overnight a democracy, and was no longer a Communist state. I believe we should help Russia—she has done a great job of fighting Hitler.

I always said that, so far as I was concerned, I was in favor of permitting Russia to have the kind of government she wanted, that it was not any of our business if they wanted the sort of government they had set up.

Some distinguished persons talk about isolationists, and denounce them. The first time I ever heard the word "isolationists" was when I read a speech by the President of the United States in which he said, "I am an isolationist." He said, "I am an isolationist to the extent that I want to keep out of war." That is the kind of an isolationist I have been. I wanted to keep out of war.

Let me serve notice on some persons in Washington that if they want to get into a controversy and debate some of these issues I am perfectly willing to debate them; but I am becoming sick and tired of trying to go along and to do everything I possibly can to win the war and then have a lot of snipers peddling out information to some of these columnists. Where do Stokes and the Washington Post get the information which they have been spreading about the evidence in the case, and about what is going to be said about Senators and Representatives? Where did they get the information on which was based the statement published in the Washington Post as to what was taking place in the grand-jury room? How did they get it? If it had been before almost any other district court in the United States they would have been haled before the court and charged with contempt for publishing what was going on and what was said before the grand jury. But here in Washington, nothing was said about it and no action was taken.

As I have said, I do not know any of these defendants. If they are guilty, I hope they will be convicted. I do not agree with one single thing they are charged in the indictment with having said. But whether I agree with them or whether I do not, they are entitled to have a fair trial, by a fair judge, before a fair jury, and by a decent and respectable prosecuting attorney in whom the people of the United States have some confidence, and in whom the Congress of the United States has some confidence.

I did not rise with the intention of speaking so long as I have spoken. I rose merely to brand the statement which appeared in the Post, written by Mr. Stokes, as a deliberate falsehood, and as libelous. I likewise brand what Mr. Pearson said as a deliberate falsehood, when he stated that the reason why I am trying to prevent an investigation or do something else—I do not remember the exact language—is that I am afraid of what is going to come out about me. If the Department of Justice, or if Mr. Meyer, or Mr. Pearson, or anyone else, has anything to bring out about me, I challenge him to produce it, for it cannot be produced.

When a former Governor of New York was told that some politician was against him, he said, "I cannot understand why that man is against me, because I never

did anything for him that I can recall." I can understand why Mr. Meyer is against me. Probably it is because of the fact that every time his name came up in the Senate for confirmation, I voted against him.

I could not understand why Drew Pearson was against me, because I did not remember anything I had done for Drew Pearson. Then I happened to recall that when there was an attempt to put him off the air at one time, when I was in the Orient with a group of Senators and Representatives, I was cabled and asked if I would not intercede for him; and I did, and helped to have him kept on the radio at that time.

On another occasion, when he and his partner were about to be thrown off one of the newspaper chains, he and his partner talked to me and I again tried to do something for them. When Pearson's father was appointed to office and was being attacked, again he came to see me, and I went to the support of his father. So I presume that is the reason why this man seeks to do everything he can to try to intimate to the people of the country that I am disloyal, and to try to smear those of us who were opposed to our country getting into the war.

I know some of my colleagues will say, "Why pay any attention to it? Nobody believes him, nobody trusts him, nobody has any confidence in him." I agree that no one in the Senate of whom I know has the slightest confidence in him, no one in the Senate of whom I know has the slightest respect for him, for his truthfulness, his honesty, or his integrity. But one gets weary of a man of that kind, who has access to the radio, speaking over the radio and attacking members of the Government. As I said, he has lied about Jesse Jones, he has lied about the Secretary of State, he has lied about Members of the House of Representatives, and he has lied about Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, the question may well be asked, "Does not such conduct tend to break down the morale of the people of the country? What effect will the dissemination of lies about members of the Cabinet have upon the armed forces?"

Mr. President, while the voice is the voice of Pearson, or the voice is the voice of Stokes, I sometimes wonder whether the hand is not the hand of Esau.

I apologize to the Senate for having taken up so much of its time in saying anything about these two disreputable persons.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. TYDINGS introduced a bill (S. 416) for the relief of the city of Baltimore, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 60), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 307, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 9, 1940, and Senate Resolution 119, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to June 28, 1941 (providing for an investigation of airplane crashes), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE INVESTIGATION WITH RESPECT TO FUEL IN CERTAIN AREAS WEST OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 61), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942 (providing for an investigation with respect to fuel in certain areas west of the Mississippi River), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think there is nothing else to come before the Senate at this time, so I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, judge of all men, unto whom all hearts are open and all desires known, be pleased to make Thy presence known throughout the hours of this day. We thank Thee that ours may be the hope which is wrought by the Comforter, the joy of the forgiveness of sin and the grace of faith, full of cheer and gladness. Enable us to throw off all doubt that we may perceive truths of Thy word and all that it signifies. Grant that all goodness may abound, all graciousness, all trust, all zeal, and knowledge.

Blessed Lord, God, do Thou safeguard those influences which are striving in the union of nations for the advancement of civilization, for the enslaved and dying peoples who are begging to exist. May the crimes and the cruelties, the oppression and the suffering of this tragically inhuman war be remembered as the darkest sin of the night. Oh, quicken the pulse of a new day that the world may know that the rise and progress of our Republic is the grandest educational and religious epic that ever came out of the arteries of the historic past. We pray Thee to make us worthy; free us from all vanity, all corroding materialism; all divisive forces, and from every ambition to live unto ourselves; then shall we walk in the light, sharing its radiance with man everywhere. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 12, was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE WILDCAT COAL STRIKE

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the unauthorized wildcat strike of the hard coal miners in Pennsylvania is an unspeakable affront to the people of this country. While the East is suffering from an acute shortage of anthracite the miners in that State, in defiance of their own leaders' agreement for a week's truce, go on strike primarily because Mr. John L. Lewis' united mine workers convention last October boosted their monthly dues from $1 to $1.50. There is no justification for such walk-out. In the lands of the Axis powers there are no strikes, but here at home, while Uncle Sam is fighting a war for the freedom of Americans, including the coal miners, they let the country down.

The President came before the Congress last week, not as the head of the Democratic Party, but as our Commander in Chief. In that role he warmed the hearts of Americans everywhere. His message was excellent, informative, and helpful. It stressed the importance of continuing the United Nations' wartime cooperation to maintain the peace.

We are now faced with a great fuel shortage and the situation in Pennsylvania is a grave one. It does not affect only that State, it has within it the seeds of our destruction. As a result of this sort of thing we can very well miss altogether the attainment of peace. Down this road lies the distinct possibility of our losing this war. The Commander in Chief has ready at hand a solution employed in World War No. 1 for such an unauthorized strike. In June of 1941, I wrote a letter to the President, calling attention to the manner in which President Wilson successfully dealt with a like situation. Answering a letter which I received from the President with reference to this problem, I wrote again on February 27, 1942, as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On June 3 last year I wrote a letter to you in which I called your attention to the method in which President Wilson dealt with the labor problems which beset him in 1917.

In reply to that letter you wrote me that the decision as to whether the drastic powers exercised by President Wilson should be used depended on the particular circumstances of each case and the choice of an appropriate time.

I do not believe that anything has given me greater concern in all my life than the labor situation with which you as the Chief Executive and the Congress have been wrestling for many months. On yesterday the debate in the House was very bitter on the Smith amendment to the war-powers bill. I do not

believe I have even seen the membership of the House so worked up. It is my judgment that their reactions truly reflect the intense feelings on the subject by their respective constituencies. All seem to agree that production must not be interrupted and yet, my dear Mr. President, there are interruptions.

Only three agencies can correct this situation, the Chief Executive, the Congress, and the unions themselves. Bossism is firmly entrenched in some of the unions in certain parts of the country, and there is little hope that a remedy will be forthcoming from this group. Those of us who serve in the House and who sincerely desire to correct this situation have time and again been beaten by the majority of our colleagues who are not only adamant against any antistrike legislation for the duration of the war, but strenuously object to any move which would have the effect of disturbing the present status of laws relating to labor.

History will record that upon your shoulders circumstance has placed the heaviest burden ever to be borne by any leader since the beginning of time.

I count myself as one of that number in the House who sincerely desire to assist you and to help you in any way possible. In view of the impasse in the House; and the inability of labor unions to cope with the situation, may I respectfully suggest in reply to your letter of June 11, 1941, that now is the appropriate time to apply the work-or-fight doctrine of Woodrow Wilson.

* * * * *

As I see it, we cannot afford to lose a moment or a single pair of hands. The blood of our boys now slowly dripping soon will be a crimson cascade. Certain it is that those who have reached high upon the shelves of their hearts and cheerfully given their sons will wholeheartedly subscribe to the course—work or fight.

Very respectfully,

DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, Jr.

There are emergencies on the home front which require speedy action. A problem of fuel shortage in the middle of the winter for a people already rationed is one that cannot be solved by legislative enactment. Time is of the essence. The Chief Executive has issued many helpful directives lately. Now is the time, it seems to me, for our Commander in Chief to say to these people:

"So long as you regarded yourselves as indispensable to our war effort and so long as your services in the coal mines of this country were consistent with such an appraisal, well and good; but your conduct in selfishly leaving your countrymen to face the winter without adequate fuel puts you beyond the pale. Unless you continue in the mines pending the settlement of your complaints, your names will be certified to the selection boards in your respective localities and you will be inducted immediately into the armed service of your country."

I have an idea that such action on the part of the President will discourage strikes of this type for the duration.

In a recent issue of one of the newspapers in my home city—Richmond—a leading article announced the growing shortage of fuel oil and urged upon the citizens of Richmond cooperation with local officials of the O. P. A. It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that failure on the part of the Government to deal immediately and sternly with the situation in Pennsylvania will beget an understandable indifference on the part of Americans everywhere, for if 20,000 miners are permitted to leave the coal mines on caprice, what earthly hope has the average citizen of securing coal even if his oil burner is converted?

There is a critical shortage in fuel oil. Are we to endure a deliberate creation of a shortage in coal as well? The President, in his letter to me of June 1941, stated that the work or fight order of President Wilson should be used only when careful reference had been made to the particular circumstances of each case and the choice of an appropriate time. I cannot conceive of a situation which provides a more appropriate time, in view of the gravity of our present position and circumstances.

### SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. RICHARD P. GALE appeared before the bar of the House and took the prescribed oath of office.

### HELP FOR THE O. P. A.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there has been a great deal of criticism of some of our bureaus, especially of the O. P. A. All of us have at times joined in that criticism. I should like to suggest however that in addition to criticism we also offer constructive suggestions.

The Director of the O. P. A. in our county, Santa Barbara, in my district has sent me a very constructive list of suggestions. He suggests in the first place a greater amount of funds so that better personnel and more adequate space can be provided. In the second place he asks for a greater degree of decentralization and local authority.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this report in an extension of my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### CONGRESS SHOULD USE THE PROCESS OF IMPEACHMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for this House to protect itself and the country against the scorn and the abuse of bureaucratic dictatorship by resorting to the process of impeachment.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests to submit: First, to extend my own remarks and include a couple of letters; second, to extend my own remarks and include an editorial from Collier's. This document, Mr. Speaker, is a speech, or an article, written by a Member of this House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and I want to place it in the RECORD. It will slightly exceed the limit, but inasmuch as the House does not meet again until Monday, I ask permission to extend my own remarks and include the article notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SATTERFIELD] a few moments ago outlined very clearly the situation of the country as a result of the coal strike. I live in western New York and want to point out how serious this situation is to the defense industries in the general Buffalo area. Within the past few days I have received protests from war industries, from war workers, from citizens at large, and from members of draft boards. It is my understanding that the mayor of the city of Buffalo has forcibly brought the matter to the attention of the Senators from New York State, and, of course, we all know what the situation of today is.

Draft boards say that they do not feel free to draw men and send them into the service to fight the Huns and the Japs. They want to know whether these miners are Americans. They want us to do something. The demand is made everywhere to do something. If this were a streamlined Congress—and I am sorry it is not—we would do something to pass a simple resolution, and it should be passed nearly unanimously, directing that immediate action be taken.

The President has the power, and the Labor Board has the power. We have an Army of three or four million men. We have plenty of troops in the vicinity of Pennsylvania. The time has come when the President or his Labor Board should take action and, if necessary, send the troops in there the way Grover Cleveland did in 1893.

[Here the gavel fell.]

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an excellent article on the Speaker of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Reno Evening Gazette of January 8, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN]?

There was no objection.

### JAMES AND FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT, JR.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and also to revise and extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest the announcement this morning of the citation of James Roosevelt, but I have information which came to my attention that he was jerked, without his consent, from Guadalcanal by the Commander in Chief immediately after the marines entered that place, and flown to Los Angeles.

Early in December another son, Franklin, left the battle front of north Africa and, according to an AP story, spent 4 days in a Philadelphia hospital with a slight cold before returning home. Both of these boys were apparently jerked, one from each front.

I challenge anybody to answer me to the contrary—this voice that from back of me here accused us isolationists prior to Pearl Harbor of being ostriches, burying our heads in the sand, afraid to fight—I am asking, Is it true that two sons of the President have been jerked from the battle fronts by the Commander in Chief? Somebody answer me to the contrary, if they know better than I do. There are a million homes in America interested.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], may I say that he makes no charges, but he tries to throw out to the country a suspicion. Any such thought is without foundation, and if the gentleman had the courage to make the direct accusation within the rules, I would say that he is making a complete misstatement of the facts. Outside of the House anyone making any such statement I would say tells a deliberate lie.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests; first, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter addressed to Senator MURRAY by the California Retail Grocers & Merchants Association, Ltd., and the other request is that when the business of the House and the other special orders have been concluded, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH]?

There was no objection.

THE ELECTION OF MR. MARION BENNETT, OF MISSOURI

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that both sides of the aisle will take a significant glance at the special election results in the Sixth District of the State of Missouri. This district is normally Democratic by from six to ten thousand votes. The Honorable Phil Bennett was elected during the last term and was reelected for another term shortly before he died. However, his son, formerly his secretary, 28 years of age, was elected by over a 14,000 majority in a total vote of some 54,000 votes last Tuesday, a very definite indication that the people of America are on the march for the return of free government.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch said editorially on Tuesday of this week:

A MISSOURI DISTRICT IN THE SPOTLIGHT

Has the Roosevelt administration improved itself with public opinion over the low point struck November 3 when a majority of the voters in the country voted for Republican candidates for the House of Representatives? Would an earlier beginning of the African expedition and earlier appointpointment of Food and Manpower Administrators have materially altered the results at the polls?

A partial answer will be provided today in the special election in the Sixth Missouri Congressional District for the seat of the late Republican Congressman, Philip A. Bennett. The candidates are Sam Wear, of Springfield, unsuccessful Democratic nominee last fall, and MARION T. BENNETT, also of Springfield, 28-year-old son of the last occupant of the seat, who was with his father in Washington during the recent session.

Since the total vote will be lower than in November, the main point to watch is whether the Democratic or Republican vote suffers the greatest relative decline. Obviously, the results will report the preferences of only those who go to the polls, but, after all, it is the votes of only those citizens who do go to the polls that count in American elections.

Mr. Speaker, the vote I have just reported to the House is the answer.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] has just told the House that in a by-election held in his State a few days ago the Republican candidate, Mr. MARION BENNETT, won by 14,000 votes in a district which until 1940 had been consistently Democratic. However, that news and that information was not carried in the interventionist and international press of the East, except for a few lines in the Washington Evening Star. If there had been a by-election in England, where the districts have one quarter the population, the election results would have been carried in every British and most American newspapers. However, when a noninterventionist, following the footsteps of his father, wins by 14,000 in a former Democratic stronghold, it is not mentioned in the papers of the East. If a New Dealer had been elected, Mr. Elmer Davis, or one of the White House secretaries, would have had it announced on the radio here and abroad as a great New Deal victory for Roosevelt's foreign policies prior to Pearl Harbor, and carried in the eastern press. The time has come for the internationalist newspapers to stop trying to fool 100,000,000 Americans who were not interventionists before Pearl Harbor, but who are now doing their part to win the war.

The election of Mr. BENNETT in Missouri last Tuesday, by 15,000 votes, to replace his father in Congress, is an indication of the temper of the American people and that they are not being deceived by New Deal and foreign propaganda of any kind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial on post-war planning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. One, that on Thursday next I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of War Guilt Punishment, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered. And at this time I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

THE ARREST OF EDWARD PAGE GASTON

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I read from an article appearing in the Times-Herald of this morning as follows:

Edward Page Gaston, self-styled founder and American director of the World Prohibition Federation, has been arrested on charges of illegally wearing the uniform of a captain of the United States Army, the Department of Justice announced last night.

Advocating the return of prohibition, he has appeared in public in an Army uniform in connection with publicity for his various dry activities.

He has button-holed Members of Congress constantly. He installed himself in the House Office Building, maintained by the taxpayers of the United States, where he set up prohibition propaganda machinery and where he mimeographed and sent forth for several months his prohibition articles, letters, and pamphlets.

It is pertinent to ask who gave this man authority to install himself in the House Office Building and to use Government machines to pound out his prohibition propaganda. It is also pertinent to state that water will always find its own level and the law has finally caught up with this self-styled prohibitionist, Edward Page Gaston.

Perhaps the Anti-Saloon League, the National Prohibition Party, and the International Reform Federation may

come forward with some statement concerning Gaston. He was their baby.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests; first, to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial; and, second, that I may proceed at this time for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

THE RATIONING PROGRAM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe sufficient experience has now been derived from the operation of the various rationing programs so that the experience of the local rationing boards should be taken advantage of by the officials in Washington and elsewhere. I should like to suggest two things: First, that in the consideration by Congress of the problems of this whole great and difficult program, new to Americans, particular attention should be paid to strengthening the work of the rationing boards, giving them sufficient staff, equipment, and necessary forms, and insisting that they be given sufficient discretionary authority to deal with their local problems; second, that the officials of the O. P. A. should from time to time, and beginning soon, call to Washington experienced people who have been executive secretaries or chairmen of the local rationing boards, to consult with them about the problems that only members of and workers on the local boards know at first hand.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by James Morgan appearing in the Boston Globe, Sunday, January 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by our colleague of the Seventy-seventh Congress, William G. Stratton, on the occasion of his inauguration as treasurer of the State of Illinois. I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the seventh annual voice of business edition of the New York Sun, by Fred I. Kent, director of the Foreign Exchange Division of the Federal Reserve Board during the last war, entitled "The Alternative to a Post-War W. P. A."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HERTER, Mr. GWYNNE, and Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written me by the New Jersey Taxpayers Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Gen. C. W. Wickersham last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

[Mr. WICKERSHAM addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Helena (Mont.) Independent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by me in cooperation with the Office of War Information, broadcast short wave to the people of Italy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from the Comptroller General and some tables from the General Accounting Office.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LUDLOW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a bill which was endorsed by the Order of the Purple Heart of the regular Association of Disabled American Veterans. Also I would like very much to have included in my remarks a bill which I introduced, which is for the rehabilitation of veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONFUSION FROM WASHINGTON

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of this House at this time a paradox in headlines. I quote from two newspaper articles which appeared in the leading newspapers throughout the country on the same day. One article was captioned "Coffee supply grows, according to Office of Price Administration." The other article was captioned "Not enough coffee for United States, even on cup-a-day basis."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we do something about ending the clouds of confusion that are blowing out of Washington to the Nation through such conflicting statements that I have just referred to. I think it is high time that the Congress took some action about the maze of unsteady, unreliable, and confusing ideas being projected upon the national scene in such a critical period. In this connection I shall take the liberty of reading a few sentences of a letter which I received from one of the leading manufacturers of my district:

MY DEAR ED: No doubt you will wonder why the people of the United States don't have confidence in any of the orders issued from Washington. First, one fellow comes out with the information that the reason for the rationing of gasoline is not to save gasoline but to save rubber, then they turn around and make the 17 Eastern States save all the rubber for the entire country. Then another fellow comes out and says the rubber situation isn't as bad as it sounds, especially since they are making such a success of synthetic rubber, and then all of a sudden you don't hear anything about it any more.

Now we come to the coffee situation. Out of the Binghamton Press on January 9 I extracted a clipping where it is noted that there isn't enough coffee in the United States even for a cup-a-day basis. Then on Sunday out of the Philadelphia Inquirer I extracted a clipping issued January 9 from Washington to the effect that the Office of Price Administration advised that the coffee supply grows.

How in the devil is anyone in this country going to have any confidence in anything that is said about these restrictions? This would be a good item for you to bring up on the floor sometime when you have your fighting gloves on.

Yours,

C. A. MURRAY,
*Endicott Forging & Mfg. Co.,*
*Endicott, N. Y.*

It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that some sort of reaction grew up in the House to

take proper steps so that such confusion will not go forth in the future from this great Capital.

THE 49-CENT WHEAT PENALTY

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am directing your special attention to a bill I have introduced to repeal the law that imposes a 49-cents-per-bushel penalty against farmers on wheat grown in excess of quotas allotted under the triple A program. This 49-cent penalty is in addition to forfeiture of rights to soil conservation and parity payments, as well as the right to have 85 percent of parity loans.

I am also reintroducing my bill to knock out the restriction that requires a farmer to pay 49 cents per bushel on his excess wheat before he can feed it to his own livestock and poultry. Of course, if we pass the first-named bill the latter will not be needed. I tried to get the Committee on Agriculture last year to at least lift the ban on penalties on feed wheat, but the triple A in Washington was against it. So the committee did not recommend it.

Mr. Speaker, there is no justification for making a farmer pay penalty on wheat he feeds to his own livestock and poultry. That just cannot be right.

Let me give you some rather interesting figures. In my State of Kansas in 1941 producers were penalized for raising excess wheat in the sum of $5,194,822. About $2,000,000 has been refunded to farmers who were still in the business, who put up bonds, and cut their production the next year to make up for the excess over the allotment. Last year, 1942, the Government collected and placed in escrow penalties on Kansas wheat the sum of $763,000. About $38,000 of this amount has since been refunded. I do not have the figures for the entire country, but it is estimated it amounts to about five times the above figures.

Mr. Speaker, there is no justification or excuse for continuing this sort of thing now.

Here is a rather odd situation. A farmer who feeds excess wheat he has on hand right now is required to pay 49 cents per bushel for every bushel he feeds to his own livestock and poultry. His neighbor, who does not raise wheat of his own, can buy a carload of wheat from the Commodity Credit Corporation, not at the market price of about $1.24 per bushel in my part of the country, but for 86 cents per bushel, provided he feeds it to his livestock. Both are the same kind of wheat and grown on the same kind of land. One farmer pays a penalty to one agency and another buys from another agency of the Government for 35 or 40 cents under the market price and the wheat is used for the same purpose and fed to the same kind of livestock. That just does not make sense and we ought to know it.

Now, the situation is still more complicated when we find that still another agency of the Government is fixing the price ceiling on flour in order to keep the price of wheat and wheat products from going too high.

Mr. Speaker, here we are facing the greatest food shortage experienced in this country in 80 years. People in other lands are starving and crying for food. The demand for increased production of food of all kinds is tremendous. The shortage of meat and many other foods is already becoming acute. It is going to become worse. To continue the practice and policy of imposing penalties and restricting the production of grain or any other food products is all wrong. It ought to be corrected right now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have two or three requests. First, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mary Carter Roberts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Next, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders today, I be permitted to address the House for 8 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MUCH BITTER FACTIONALISM

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, those who would permanently take this country into the ever-recurring wars and revolutions of the nations of Europe should read the article by Ernest K. Lindley entitled "Much Bitter Factionalism" in the Washington Post of December 20. The writer deals with conditions in Yugoslavia. When racial hatreds in one nation can assume the proportions now displayed in that war-stricken country, when two factions of their unfortunate people, both fighting the Axis Powers, can carry on another war between themselves, it is not difficult to fully understand what conditions will be when the Axis Powers are defeated and the two factions are able to turn upon each other the full fury of their hatreds.

Mr. Speaker, there are few nations in Europe where internal hatreds do not exist. In a number of these countries, including Spain, France, and others, this feeling is suppressed at the moment, but in Yugoslavia and in the others the ending of the present war will mark the opening of outbreaks of civil war that for viciousness will parallel anything the world has heretofore known.

Those who close their eyes to the teachings of history are willfully blind. Those who believe human nature has changed during the thousands of years of recorded history are stupidly blind. Wars since the beginning of the human race have stemmed from human selfishness. Desire for food, lust for power, lust for wealth in one form or another has provided the urge. This will continue until human selfishness is washed from the human heart. All the wars, all the negotiations, all the treaties between nations will not change this fact.

We are now engaged in the greatest war, the most horrible war, in all history. Every American desires to win this war in the shortest possible time and with the least loss of human life. That is one thing upon which the American people are agreed. On this there is no division of opinion. There is, however, Mr. Speaker, a very definite and widespread division of opinion as to what the national policy shall be when this war is finished.

In evaluating the proposals already set forth in the Atlantic Charter and elsewhere, having as the objective the sudden transformation of this wicked and selfish world into Utopia, it is well to bear in mind that when peace has come, and as time softens the memory of the horrors of the present conflict, the world still will be governed by selfish and powerful individuals such as have been responsible for all previous wars. The great war of a quarter century ago, with its millions of dead, injured, and maimed, with all its agony of human hearts, taught the world nothing. The war in which we are now engaged will teach the world nothing. I have no doubt that strong men, greedy men now in high places, and others of like character seeking high places are already intriguing, scheming to secure for themselves and the nations to which they belong those things which will give them an unfair advantage over others. This has been human experience since time began, and to me it seems both wishful thinking and folly to believe there can overnight be a complete transformation of individuals, singly and collectively, growing out of our present struggle.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believe that when this war is over and we have gained our security, we should look to that security in the future, and look long and well before we allow ourselves to be again projected into the quarrels and wars of other nations.

I present for the RECORD the article by Mr. Lindley entitled "Much Bitter Factionalism":

MUCH BITTER FACTIONALISM

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

Secretary Hull's appeal to all factions opposing the Axis to get together was not intended for French ears alone. Yugoslavia is another case in which bitter factionalism is hindering the most effective opposition to the Axis. Since the quarrels among the Yugoslavs were discussed in this column 5 weeks ago, they have gone from bad to worse.

The trouble is rooted partly in the old conflicts between the Serbs, on one side, and partly in political ideology; and partly in the Croats and Slovenes, on the other; opposing concepts of military strategy. The Serb Patriots, led by General Mihailovitch, favor straight guerilla warfare—maximum damage to German supplies and communications, with minimum losses. Mihailovitch opposes risking masses of troops in pitched battle with a better armed foe. He maintains perhaps 20,000 men in the field.

The Communist-led Partisans, operating mostly in Croatia and Slovenia, are now more numerous. They profess to have between 200,000 and 300,000 men in the field. They have recently wrested considerable areas from the Germans but in so doing have courted grave danger. It is always possible for the Reichswehr to throw in sufficient reinforcements to wipe them out.

The Partisan diversions serve Soviet strategy. Each German division tied down in Yugoslavia subtracts one division from the Russian front. Moscow has provided the Partisans with some supplies as well as leadership. And the Comintern has waged propaganda warfare against Mihailovitch, describing him variously as an Axis stooge and a tool of the ultranationalist Greater Serbia movement.

There seems to be little doubt that Mihailovitch has given the Italian overlords of Croatia at least temporary respite from attack in return for munitions and gasoline. And the communiqués indicate that his operations against the Germans have been crimped by clashes between his forces and the Partisans.

Responsibility for these clashes is difficult to fix. The Partisans apparently have pillaged Serbian farmers who supported Mihailovitch with taxes; he may have attacked the Partisans in reprisal. On the other hand, the virulent Communist propaganda against him may have inspired the Partisans to initiate the attacks.

As Office of War Information Director Elmer Davis has stated, our Government trusts Mihailovitch and considers his strategy sound. Diplomats who know him intimately say he had said and done nothing to indicate he favors the Greater Serb movement which, in the minds of the Croats and Slovenes, may mean post-war vassalage to the Serbs. Our experts justify this traffic with the Italians as a sound guerillist expedient which may also be useful in making friction between them and the Germans.

Various proposals have been advanced to close the breach. Mihailovitch, himself, suggested a Moscow directive requiring the partisan commanders to accept his leadership. The Yugoslav exiled government in London made representations to that end, but without result.

The Yugoslav government in exile is shot through with feuds. Our Government's decision to raise Yugoslav Minister Fotitch to ambassador's rank is an example. The idea was first broached during the Washington visit of King Peter. Croat leaders, who accuse Fotitch of secretly favoring the Greater Serbia movement, were incensed at this "endorsement."

The higher rank was nevertheless given Fotitch, in fulfillment of a promise to the King, and with the explanation to the Croats that the purpose was to honor Yugoslavia, not any faction or individual. The explanation did not suffice. Ivan Subacic, Governor of Croatia before the German occupation and deputy prime minister in the exiled government, resigned that post in a huff and went on an American speaking tour.

Last week, in a radio talk, Subacic's secretary, Ante Pavelich, said Mihailovitch was "in eclipse." Ambassador Fotitch, in a press release, repudiated him as a renegade, who had abandoned his post in the Yugoslav diplomatic service a few days after the German attack and was formally dismissed from the Government service by royal decree last May.

Fotitch is understood to have expressed indignation at the failure of our censors to suppress the broadcast. Croats in the embassy have also incurred his disfavor. His military attaché, Col. Mirko Burya, a Croat, regarded by our officials as a capable officer and loyal Yugoslav, has been dismissed for a Serb. Burya has volunteered his services to our Army but has thus far been unable to obtain the formal Yugoslav release our policy requires.

Although the Yugoslav cabinet has proportionate representation for Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, the Serb group seemingly is dominant. The exiled government's propaganda exaggerated Mihailovitch's exploits and did little or nothing to correct the impression that the Croats were supine. Battles fought by the partisans were credited to Mihailovitch, leading the outside world to expect new exploits which neither his strategy nor his resources allowed.

Young King Peter has promised the restoration of the Yugoslav state as a whole, with full rights for the Croat and Slovene minorities. Mere pronouncements do not heal old sores or allay the present civil strife. But observance of the principles stated by the King by the members of the exiled government would moderate the hatreds now consuming the Yugoslavs. Beyond that lies a test of the ability of Moscow, London, and Washington to reach an agreement on questions of high military and naval strategy.

### LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in these days of pyramiding propaganda units in practically all executive departments of government, America might well turn to the advice of Alfred E. Smith and adopt "Let's look at the record" as its guide book for determining where the praise or blame for governmental action should be placed. For that reason, I have today introduced a bill to substantially increase the number of copies of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be distributed without charge by our Government, specifically designating in part that all reading rooms of military establishments be provided with regular copies of the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, such action as I propose would be a valuable contribution to America's current victory book campaign. The country has recently been treated to a misguided tirade against Congress by radio commentators, newspaper columnists, magazine sophisticators, organized purge committees, and others. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tells the true story of Congress and reports the processes of freedom in action. Let us let the RECORD speak for itself. Surely the soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen of the country have a right to know what is going on in Congress from an unexpurgated source. The same is true of the students who are training to become the citizens of tomorrow. The cost of supplying these RECORDS will be but a tiny fraction of the money now being spent by the almost endless number of publicity bureaus and propaganda units maintained by the executive departments, some of which, themselves, have contributed to the program of misrepresentation directed against the legislative branch of government.

The Seventy-eighth Congress is destined to recapture for the legislative branch its rightful position as a coordinate unit in this Government. In the long run it will prove wise economy and prudent Americanism to make copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD available to as many as possible of the citizens to whom this Government actually belongs.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, January 13, 1943, on the passing of Gen. Agustin P. Justo. General Justo, who had served as President of Argentina, was a great soldier as well as a great statesman. He was a leader of foresight and vision, who had registered consistent dissent against the isolationist foreign policy of the present Argentine administration. Especially since the entry of the United States into the war, General Justo had been an ardent supporter of pan-American solidarity and the cause of the United Nations. His passing, particularly at this time, is a great loss to the cause of hemisphere solidarity and it is to be hoped that his farsighted and patriotic aims will be carried on to the successful conclusion for which he had labored.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Edwin A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### THE FAMILY-SIZED FARM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I think we should learn something from the miners' strike now going on in Pennsylvania while the whole country is shivering from the cold. We might well visualize what would be going on all over the country now if the farmers of this country had taken the advice of the Administration and John L. Lewis for the last 6 years and organized with the C. I. O. The country then would not only have been suffering from the cold weather and the coal shortage, but it would be starving also if the advice of John L. Lewis had been followed.

After we have inaugurated our Governor in Pennsylvania next week, I propose to ask for 1 hour's time in which to discuss the matter of the farmer with the family-sized farm and his problems. The problems that we of the family-sized farm have to deal with are not understood in Washington.

UNAUTHORIZED STRIKES

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I feel I should be derelict in my duty to my constituents, and to my country, if I did not now before this House take a stand with regard not only to the coal strike, but to all work stoppages that interfere with war production. In my campaign I openly stated my opposition to all those stoppages and I want to say now that in my opinion the first duty of this Congress is to promptly take definite steps to put an end to all stoppages that curtail or interfere with war production.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. COX. It certainly ought to be possible to find enough people with membership in this body who love their country well enough to support such an effort.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I believe so.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, like all Members here I am receiving innumerable letters wanting to know what legislative program the majority intends to submit. We have been in session 2 weeks now and nothing has been said with regard to an agricultural program or any other kind of program, and we do not know how to proceed.

I yield to the distinguished majority leader to answer this question.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows, of course, that it takes some days to organize the House, to make committee assignments, and that this is now being done by the committee on committees of both parties. As the gentleman knows, there is no program for the rest of this week, for we have already agreed to adjourn until Monday when we adjourn today, and I see nothing so far as next week is concerned.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I do hope the majority leader will bring in some kind of program soon in order that we may be in position to tell our own people at least what to expect.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know of nobody whose experience and knowledge of legislative procedure is greater than that of my distinguished and dear friend from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have three consent requests to submit: First, that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today at the conclusion of other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would say to the majority leader that while it may take him some time to get a program together that it does not take very long for the people in Michigan and other Northern States to get very cold these days when there is no coal.

Now, some of us here would be pleased to have the gentleman to ask his leader, the President, on one of his visits to the White House why he does not get after, not the miners in the coal mines but these union fellows who are assessing this additional 50 cents a month to the dollar a month the miners are now forced to pay the union. The miners are striking because the Administration is back of the union which now seeks to compel them to pay additional dues to the organizations, the unions, which contributed money for the New Deal political campaigns. Now, if that is not a rotten situation, you tell me one. Instead of continuously kicking the miner—the workingman—around, why not get after the union racketeer. "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's," apply the boot where it is needed, not, in this instance, to the miners, working in the hard-coal mines, who protest this additional levy, but to those who are exacting it, the union. I have today introduced a bill to correct the evil.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania I want to go on record as saying that I feel very sorry and regret very much that the good name of the great State of Pennsylvania should be splashed in all the headlines of the country as a result of this very disgraceful strike in the anthracite mines. I have no sympathy whatsoever with this strike, yet everybody knows that my position has always been in favor of organized labor. It is just such actions as this that do a great deal of harm to organized labor, local unions, and the great body of organized labor.

I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe there are today on the statute books sufficient laws to deal adequately with this situation in the anthracite mines. I hope in all sincerity that those who have the power under these laws will act immediately so that the morale of the country will not be broken down. These men should be compelled to go to work immediately or be compelled to get into the armed services.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, first, permit me to extend my sympathy to the gentlemen whose constituents are now shivering up and down the Atlantic seaboard, in western New York, in Pennsylvania, in New England, and along the Great Lakes to Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and to say to them that they are largely to blame.

The people of Ontario, Canada, are not freezing, because they took time by the forelock and developed their water power, chased the Power Trust out of Ontario, and for years have been heating their homes with electricity.

To the people of New York, I say again that it is time you woke up to the fact that you are paying more than $200,000,000 a year overcharges for your electricity, compared with the rates they are paying in Ontario just across the line. Your rates are so high you cannot afford to heat your houses with it; while the people of Ontario have been heating their homes with electricity for more than 30 years. Many houses have no chimneys or flues, but depend exclusively on electric heat—the finest, purest, and cheapest heat in the world, when supplied at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

In Pennsylvania they are paying more than $75,000,000 a year in overcharges. They could heat the entire State of Pennsylvania and the surrounding country with electricity generated with their own coal, gas, oil, or water power. But you are dominated by the Power Trust, which will not let you do that.

Michigan can look across into the promised land and get a glimpse of the electric age in Windsor, Canada. If the people of Michigan got their electricity at the same rate the people of Windsor are getting theirs, they would save more than $45,000,000 a year on their light and power bills alone.

We can take the fuel that is now imbedded in our soil, such as coal, gas, and oil, and the waterpower that is going to waste in this country, develop it, as Ontario has done and heat every home in America more satisfactorily, if not more cheaply, than they are being heated

today. Then we could let this oil and gasoline go to our boys who are fighting the battles of the world, and to our allies across the sea.

This is the program for which I have pleaded for years. If it had been carried out, as it was in the T. V. A. area, and as it was in Ontario, your people would not be suffering for want of fuel today; and the oil you are now using could be sent to our fighting forces on the various fronts.

For your information, I am inserting five typical bills from my home town of Tupelo, Miss., for the year from and including July 1940 to and including June 1941.

These homes never have a fire in them, but are electrified throughout. I will have some more recent statistics to submit later.

*Space heating study—Monthly electric billing*

Customer's name: Miss Cassie Williams. Address: 112 North Madison St.

| | Kilowatt-hours | Bill under old rate | Bill under new Tennessee Valley Authority rate |
|---|---|---|---|
| July 1940 | 276 | $12.54 | $4.51 |
| August 1940 | 224 | 10.46 | 3.99 |
| September 1940 | 220 | 10.30 | 3.95 |
| October 1940 | 282 | 12.78 | 4.57 |
| November 1940 | 350 | 15.50 | 5.25 |
| December 1940 | 776 | 32.54 | 7.25 |
| January 1941 | 898 | 37.42 | 7.74 |
| February 1941 | 852 | 35.58 | 7.56 |
| March 1941 | 710 | 29.90 | 6.99 |
| April 1941 | 552 | 23.58 | 6.36 |
| May 1941 | 278 | 12.62 | 4.53 |
| June 1941 | 232 | 10.78 | 6.36 |
| Total for 12 months | 5,650 | 244.00 | 69.06 |
| Saving per year under new rate | | $174.94 | |

Customer's name: George Thompson. Address: 426 North Green St., Tupelo, Miss.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| July 1940 | 440 | $19.10 | $5.91 |
| August 1940 | 538 | 23.02 | 6.30 |
| September 1940 | 450 | 19.50 | 5.95 |
| October 1940 | 698 | 29.42 | 7.69 |
| November 1940 | 1,336 | 54.94 | 9.49 |
| December 1940 | 2,010 | 81.90 | 12.94 |
| January 1941 | 2,198 | 89.42 | 13.69 |
| February 1941 | 2,408 | 97.82 | 14.53 |
| March 1941 | 2,046 | 83.24 | 13.08 |
| April 1941 | 1,626 | 66.54 | 11.40 |
| May 1941 | 660 | 27.90 | 7.54 |
| June 1941 | 576 | 24.54 | 7.20 |
| Total for 12 months | 14,986 | 617.44 | 115.72 |
| Saving per year under new rate | | $501.72 | |

Customer's name: A. J. Eubank. Address: 420 Goodlett St., Tupelo, Miss.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| July 1940 | 462 | $19.98 | $6.00 |
| August 1940 | 466 | 20.14 | 6.01 |
| September 1940 | 500 | 21.50 | 6.15 |
| October 1940 | 832 | 34.78 | 8.23 |
| November 1940 | 1,482 | 60.78 | 10.32 |
| December 1940 | 1,910 | 77.90 | 12.54 |
| January 1941 | 2,198 | 89.42 | 13.69 |
| February 1941 | 2,602 | 105.58 | 15.31 |
| March 1941 | 2,642 | 107.18 | 15.47 |
| April 1941 | 1,310 | 53.90 | 10.14 |
| May 1941 | 606 | 25.74 | 7.32 |
| June 1941 | 424 | 18.46 | 6.60 |
| Total for 12 months | 15,434 | 635.36 | 117.58 |
| Saving per year under new rate | | $517.38 | |

*Space heating study—Monthly electric billing*—Continued

Customer's name: J. P. Nanney. Address: 346 North Green St., Tupelo, Miss.

| | Kilowatt-hours | Bill under old rate | Bill under new Tennessee Valley Authority rate |
|---|---|---|---|
| July 1940 | 650 | $27.50 | $6.75 |
| August 1940 | 654 | 27.66 | 6.77 |
| September 1940 | 652 | 27.58 | 6.76 |
| October 1940 | 1,270 | 52.30 | 9.23 |
| November 1940 | 3,018 | 122.22 | 21.08 |
| December 1940 | 2,956 | 119.74 | 16.72 |
| January 1941 | 4,052 | 163.58 | 21.11 |
| February 1941 | 4,376 | 176.54 | 22.40 |
| March 1941 | 3,874 | 156.46 | 20.40 |
| April 1941 | 2,672 | 108.38 | 15.59 |
| May 1941 | 866 | 36.14 | 8.36 |
| June 1941 | 684 | 28.86 | 7.64 |
| Total for 12 months | 25,724 | 1,046.96 | 162.81 |
| Saving per year under new rate | | $884.15 | |

Customer's name: Shelby Reed. Address: 359 North Green St., Tupelo, Miss.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| July 1940 | 1,096 | $45.34 | $8.53 |
| August 1940 | 900 | 37.50 | 7.75 |
| September 1940 | 1,100 | 45.50 | 8.55 |
| October 1940 | 1,094 | 45.26 | 8.53 |
| November 1940 | 3,184 | 128.86 | 22.67 |
| December 1940 | 4,036 | 162.94 | 25.94 |
| January 1941 | 4,254 | 171.66 | 26.82 |
| February 1941 | 6,808 | 273.82 | 37.03 |
| March 1941 | 5,224 | 210.46 | 30.70 |
| April 1941 | 3,098 | 126.42 | 22.19 |
| May 1941 | 1,328 | 54.62 | 10.21 |
| June 1941 | 1,076 | 44.54 | 9.20 |
| Total for 12 months | 33,198 | 1,345.92 | 218.12 |
| Saving per year under new rate | | $1,127.80 | |

Mr. Speaker, what is being done here can be done anywhere in America—and it will be done when the representatives of the people demand it. If you do not demand it, your successors will. It is just as sure to come as the night follows the day. We are moving into the electric age.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special order of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] today, I may be allowed 10 minutes to discuss the fighting Roosevelts and the "lie" of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]?

The was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 50 minutes.

THE WISCONSIN CHEESE SITUATION

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, aside from the subject that I want to discuss this afternoon, I cannot refrain from commenting on something that has just occurred. When the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi was talking about the utilization of coal for the manufacture of power and for the heating of the homes of New York and Pennsylvania, as well as the other States where coal is available, I wondered under present conditions how he is going to get that coal out of the mines so long as the miners refuse to work and refuse to bring that coal to the surface so that it can be used to manufacture power?

But I do not want to go into a discussion of that subject today. I want to call your attention to some things that I believe are of interest, not only to the people of my State, but, in view of the situation that is confronting the people of the Nation who may go hungry, to the people of the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Tuesday last leaders of the Allied Nations in a Nation-wide broadcast called for an unprecedented production of farm products for 1943 from the farm families of America. Throughout the entire country farmers were urged to assemble in observance of Farm Mobilization Day. A message from the President to the farm families of America was part of this program. Every speaker stressed the importance of food and the vital place that American farmers occupy in the war program. Among other things, the President said, and I quote:

> Food is a weapon in total war—fully as important in its way as guns or planes or tanks. So are other products of the farm.

Thus the high place of farm production in the war program was graphically portrayed by every speaker on this great radio broadcast. The President paid a long delayed tribute to the farm families of America when he said:

> In spite of the handicaps under which the American farmers worked last year, the production victory they won was among the major victories of the United Nations in 1942.

The President closed his address with these words:

> Our fighting men and allies and our families here at home can rely on farmers for the food and other farm products that will help to bring victory.

I believe that I am speaking the attitude of the farm families of America when I say that these people welcome the opportunity to meet any kind of a challenge for the production of farm products if such production will assure the preservation of our institutions of government and hasten the day of ultimate peace, provided they have some tangible assurance from their Government that they will be afforded equality in the distribution of the Nation's income. The farm people of this country are fully aware as to the legislative and governmental security that has been given to labor and industry in the war effort and in good conscience and justice they have a right to demand the same assurances of family security. They well know that when labor participates in a war-production program it knows in advance that it will be well paid.

The law protects the hours of labor and provides for overtime payments on the basis of a 40-hour week with time and a half for overtime and double time for certain days. Labor knows that it is protected in the enjoyment of its right to strike for better wages or on account of jurisdiction or other disputes. When industry was asked to convert its operations from normal business to war business, they were assured that the Government would absorb any loss sustained. They are given contracts for the production of war materials on a unit-cost basis and are protected in the enjoyment of assured profit. If they exceed the production requirements under the terms of their contract they have no worry about the disposition of the surplus. The Government encourages increased production and purchases any surplus and pays cash for it at unit-cost prices. The Government recognizes such efforts by special awards of E flags and through a system of priorities and allocations of materials assures to both labor and management continuous factory operation. This type of security the Government has extended to labor and to management and in speaking in behalf of the farm families of America, I am not critical of the security which has been attained either by labor or management. Common justice, however, demands that the attitude of the administration and many reflecting that attitude in editorial and radio comment, should now revise their critical attitude toward the farmers of America and once and for all begin to realize that if we and our allies are to eat, some form of adequate security must be given to the farm population of this country. They do not want any right to strike and they do not ask for time-and-a-half or double-time pay. They will continue to work the hours from sunup to long after sunset in order to help carry on this fight, and they not only will devote their own time but will utilize the services of their wives and children.

They only ask in exchange for this effort that they be permitted to enjoy the right to live in free America as decent human beings, and they have a right to know that when this war is over and the excessive demands of lease-lend and other governmental activities have ceased, that they will not again be thrown into the calloused hands of the bankruptcy court. If the farm people of this country are given the incentive of a decent wage during this period of increased production and assurance that greatly increased production will not ultimately destroy them when the war is over, they will produce the food and the fiber necessary to win this war.

At this time, however, they do not intend to be guided in their thinking by mere soft words of praise. They recall that sometime over a year ago the Federal Government pleaded for an increase in the production of milk. They accepted the Government's promise that the milk thus produced would find a market at a reasonable and fair price. In the months of October, November, and December of 1941, the farmers began to increase the production of milk, and they were paid during the 3 months indicated at the rate of about $2.25 per hundred for milk testing 3.5 percent butterfat, less hauling costs. This period was the low production period of the year. In January 1942, in response to the Government's constant urging for more and more milk production, the farmers met the challenge and production began to climb. Instead, however, of meeting the Government's obligation under its promise, the price of milk began to decline. I might say in fairness that this price decline at that season of the year is of normal conditions. The farmers were assured, however, that conditions were not normal. They had prepared for abnormal conditions. They were stepping up their production to meet abnormal conditions, and in the face of this response by the farmers of America the price of milk began to drop, and after long hours of labor they received compensation at $1.95 per hundred with a continued drop in price until milk reached $1.80 in July. Thus, all of the high-sounding praise of the farmers was not reflected in the wage which the farmers received for his greatly increased labor.

The farmers felt, and had a right to feel, that they were being misled by their Government, and thus began a breakdown in the morale of the farm population of this country.

I know of no more patriotic loyal American group than are to be found in the farm families of America. This letdown, however, was not only unexpected by them, but constituted what they rightfully conceived to be a breach of faith.

Today, in line with the appeal of the President on Farm Mobilization Day, soft words are again being poured into the ears of the American farmer. While he appreciated the expressions uttered on that day, he has a right to demand now an assurance that it will be no repetition of the situation that confronted him in the first half of 1942. The farmers of this country want to know the facts. He wants these facts stated by somebody in authority to speak for the Government. He wants to know and is entitled to know that if he steps up his production that he will be afforded a market for his products that will guarantee him a decent place in our economic system. He needs to know these facts so he can plan for the future.

The farmer of America cannot plan his work from day to day. He not only must plan for the planting and rotation of crops, but he must plan his other production programs. All of these plans are dependent upon anticipated income, and even then his over-all planning may be destroyed overnight by insects or the elements. He must be able to plan his help and plan for farm machinery, for feed, and a multitude of things incident to the conduct of the farm.

In the over-all picture the price of farm products is all important. In this connection the recent attitude of the Government in the matter of fixing price ceilings on dairy products clearly demonstrates to me another evidence of breach of faith.

May I say to you men and women of this country and to my colleagues in this Congress, those of you who saw that cartoon in yesterday's Star must be impressed with the fact that the people of America are facing today a deadly threatening food shortage and those of you who can only get a quarter of a pound of butter and who in a short time will not be able to buy a pound of natural American cheese better sit here and listen for a moment and not kid yourselves that we are just talking shop because the dairy industry happens to be a dominant industry in the State from which I come.

Let me be specific.

The State of Wisconsin, one of whose congressional districts I have the honor to represent, today produces between 50 and 60 percent of all the cheese produced in the United States. That cheese production consists of many types of cheese that have been developed over long years of effort. We produce a large volume of so-called foreign types of cheese. The Swiss, Brick, Limburger, and other foreign types of cheese have for many years absorbed a large volume of the fluid milk produced in Wisconsin.

Millions of dollars are invested in this enterprise and the products of these Wisconsin factories find a ready sale in the markets throughout the country.

In addition to these foreign types of cheese, Wisconsin produces today approximately 60 percent of all the American cheese that is produced in this country.

Overnight and almost without warning, a price subsidy was announced by the Department of Agriculture and the O. P. A. providing for the payment out of the Treasury of the United States of a subsidy of 3¾ cents per pound to be paid to the farmer whose milk went into the production of American cheese. No subsidy was provided for the manufacturers and producers of foreign types of cheese. What will be the result of this subsidy order in its effect on the manufacturers and producers of foreign types of cheese? It is perfectly obvious that this industry, which has taken many years to develop, will be forced out of business. The manufacturers and producers of these foreign types of cheese will not be able to pay to the farmers who produce the milk a sufficient amount to permit the continued flow of milk into the factories producing foreign types of cheese. The explanation given is that our lease-lend requirements do not include foreign types of cheese and that therefore the subsidy must be paid to encourage the production of American cheese. It is the latter type of cheese which is wanted for shipment to our allies. Unless this subsidy program is abandoned or unless it is applied equally to the producers of foreign types of cheese, the latter group will be completely put out of business. Perhaps such a result may be thought to be necessary as one of the incidents of war. I want

to assure you, however, that it is difficult for those who have devoted their lives to the upbuilding of this business to see it wiped out overnight by Government regulation and bureaucratic order.

Let us look one step further into this picture. The Secretary of Agriculture, who is now Food Administrator, has demanded a tremendously stepped up and increased production of American cheese to meet our lease-lend commitments. As previously indicated, Wisconsin today is producing over 60 percent of all the American cheese produced in this country. We have the facilities to produce American cheese, which is the type wanted by the Government. We have the experienced cheese makers, who have spent years in making and upgrading their cheese. It would seem only common sense, therefore, to believe that the increased production of American cheese should be stimulated in the area that has the milk and is equipped to produce the cheese.

Let us see what the bureaucrats have done. There has been created what is known as a dairy industry advisory committee. These are the men who offer suggestions and advice to the W. P. B. and the O. P. A. in connection with the dairy industry. The cheese section of the advisory committee is composed of four men as I am advised: First, Mr. Charles Eckburg, president of the Borden Cheese Co., of New York; second, Mr. Fred Kraft, of the National Dairy & Kraft Cheese Co., of New York; third, Mr. Roy D. Smith, of Jerome, Idaho, and fourth, Mr. Ernest Henegar, Lewisburg, Tenn. The gentleman from Idaho I understand is a small cheesemaker and the gentleman from Tennessee falls in the same category. Thus it will be seen that this committee is dominated by the representatives of the two great cheese processing organizations of this country; namely, Borden and National Dairy with the Kraft Cheese Co. as a subsidiary. It will be noted that the State which produces 60 to 70 percent of the American cheese of the Nation is not represented on this advisory committee. It is to be assumed that the orders of the O. P. A. and the W. P. B. must to some degree at least reflect the attitude of this advisory committee which is clearly dominated by the big cheese processors of this country. I make no charge that they have dominated either the W. P. B. or the O. P. A. in the matter of orders affecting the cheese industry. The Nation may judge from the facts. The proof of the pudding is in the eating.

It is well known that the production of American cheese in Wisconsin is largely in the hands of small factories scattered throughout the State, which operate as farmer-controlled plants or farm cooperatives. The big interests are located in areas principally outside the State of Wisconsin in their direct manufacture of American cheese. In order to understand this picture thoroughly it must be borne in mind that American cheese for years has been made in certain styles. Generally speaking, these styles may be designated as large and small. The large styles are known as Cheddar and twins. The twins and Cheddars weigh approximately 70 pounds each. The small styles are known as flats, double daisies, triple daisies, single daisies, longhorns, young Americas, square prints, natural loaf, and picnics and midgets, ranging in weights from the smallest style, natural loaf, 5 pounds, to triple daisies, weighing a total of 66 pounds.

In an order made by the O. P. A. on December 24, 1942, the Administrator set the maximum price for American cheese. These maximum prices ranged from 23¼ cents per pound for the large styles, Cheddars and twins, up to 24¼ cents a pound for square prints, natural loaf, picnics, and midgets. The price for double daisies and triple daisies was fixed for 23¾ cents per pound, and for single daisies, longhorns, and young Americas 24 cents per pound. It will be observed at the outset that under this maximum price order the differential between the price of the small styles of cheese and the large styles is not sufficient to take care of the necessary increased costs necessary to manufacture and package the small styles of cheese.

The price of these two large styles of cheese is fixed at 23¼ cents. They have fixed a little higher price for the small type of cheese. I am told by the cheese makers' organizations of my State that the differential between the two is not sufficient to absorb the extra labor necessary to make the small types weighing from 5 to 33 pounds and to pay the extra cost necessary for the additional packaging of that cheese. I want you to bear that in mind because it is very important in what I am going to say to you in just a moment in tracing these orders through for you.

I am advised by those in the cheese industry who should know that the effect of this order will be to stop the production of the small styles of cheese and force the producers of American cheese to manufacture only the large styles—namely, cheddars and twins. I want you to bear this fact in mind at this point as it will assume a commanding importance later on in this discussion.

The prices which I have hereinbefore enumerated are the maximum prices for American cheese, delivered at all places in the State of Wisconsin regardless of the point of origin. What about the manufacturers of American cheese outside of Wisconsin? Here is where the inequity and discrimination begins to manifest itself clearly. The order provides that the maximum prices for American cheese delivered at all places outside the State of Wisconsin shall be the Wisconsin prices which I have heretofore listed, plus transportation charges. The order provides that the transportation charges shall be the lowest published railroad carlot, freight rate per pound, gross weight from Plymouth, Wis., to that place, times 1.15. It further provides that the calculation on the per pound basis shall be carried to the second decimal point.

Now let us see how this order works and how it encourages the Wisconsin farmers to produce more American cheese. In simple terms the order means this: A factory producing cheddar or twin styles of American cheese at any point in Wisconsin is under a maximum price ceiling of 23¼ cents. The same type of cheese manufactured any place outside of Wisconsin can be sold for 23¼ cents per pound plus 115 percent of the lowest published railroad carlot freight rate per pound, gross weight, from Plymouth, Wis., to the place of manufacture. For example, cheese manufactured within the areas of the following points will receive the following price advantages:

| City and State | 115 percent of freight rate from Plymouth, Wis. | Maximum price freight plus 23¼ cents |
|---|---|---|
| Freeport, Ill. | $0.22×1.15=$0.25 | $23.50 |
| Dixon, Ill. | .25×1.15= .28 | 23.53 |
| Escanaba, Mich. | .51×1.15= .58 | 23.83 |
| Kansas City, Mo. | .58×1.15= .66 | 23.91 |
| Pine Island, Minn. | .68×1.15= .78 | 24.03 |
| Memphis, Tenn. | .84×1.15= .96 | 24.21 |
| Springfield, Mo. | 1.07×1.15= 1.23 | 24.48 |
| Birmingham, Ala. | 1.11×1.15= 1.27 | 24.52 |
| Dallas, Tex. | 1.17×1.15= 1.34 | 24.59 |
| Any place in Wisconsin | | 23.25 |

What will this mean to Wisconsin that now produces from 60 to 70 percent of the American cheese requirements of the Nation? It means that a factory located at Escanaba, Mich., will receive 23.83 cents per pound as against 23¼ cents per pound paid the Wisconsin factory just across the State line. The factory at Freeport, Ill., will receive 23½ cents a pound; the factory at Dixon, Ill., 23.53 cents per pound; a factory in Dallas, Tex., will receive 24.59 cents per pound. Is it not clear, therefore, that the farmer who produces the milk and upon whom the factory is dependent for its successful operation will deliver his milk to the factory that will afford him the best price advantage? We are, therefore, threatened with this situation: The milk which now goes into Wisconsin factories that are equipped and set up to make American cheese will flow across State lines into the factories in other States that enjoy the price advantage heretofore indicated. Is it not clear also that the milk which used to flow into the factories making foreign types of cheese will be attracted from southwestern Wisconsin into Illinois, Iowa, and Minnesota where advantage can be taken of the increased price afforded the producers in those States under this Plymouth-plus order?

I have talked with many men connected with the cheese industry, and no one has been able to indicate any reason for this destructive blow to the American cheese industry of Wisconsin. I point out these facts as evidence of what is transpiring in government that is causing the revolt among the farm people of this country. Why should a government that seeks increased production of American cheese break up an industry in the State that produces 60 to 70 percent of that cheese and destroy the incentive to the trained cheesemakers and operators to produce more American cheese? I am wondering if you can see in this picture the skillful hand of the big operators who have plants located outside the State of Wisconsin who will

reap a rich harvest by reason of this price differential. I am advised that these same big operators are constructing milk-drying plants in the State of Wisconsin to produce powdered milk at a price ceiling fixed by O. P. A. which will enable them to drive more cheese factories to the wall. The whole picture should be the subject of a congressional investigation, and I propose at the proper time to introduce a resolution to that effect. As a Representative from a great dairy State, I cannot sit idly by and see a whole industry ruined by reason of the orders of a small bureaucratic group who have failed to even ask the advice and opinion of those who today are making 60 to 70 percent of the production which the Government so badly needs.

A moment ago I indicated to you that the manufacture of small styles of cheese would no doubt cease due to the inadequate price differentials between the large and small styles. Let us examine this order further. It provides that whenever twin and Cheddar styles of cheese are sold for processing to the United States Government or any agency thereof and the moisture content of such cheese is 37½ percent or less, the maximum price shall be as set forth in table B contained in said order. An examination of this table indicates that the maximum price for twins and Cheddars when sold to the United States Government or to a processor shall be a price ranging of from 23.82 cents per pound for cheese with a moisture content not over 37½ percent to 25.54 cents per pound for cheese where the moisture content is 33 percent or less. Thus it will be seen that when sold to the United States Government or to a processor, the price ceilings on twins or Cheddars is very much above the general price ceilings on the same styles of cheese. The result of this price advantage again is that the producer of twins and Cheddar styles of American cheese in order to obtain the maximum price must sell the same either to the United States Government or to a processor. Thus we find that in accordance with the price ceiling fixed for all styles of American cheese the cheese maker will be forced to discontinue the make of small types of cheese because he can make more money by making the large styles; namely, twins and Cheddars. Having converted to the manufacture of twins and Cheddars, he must either sell to the Government or to a processor in order to get the maximum price provided for in this order. This means, in simple language, then that so far as the American public are concerned, they will be required to eat processed cheese. They will not be able to buy that which is purchased by the Government because that will be shipped under lease-lend to our allies abroad. They will not be able to buy the small styles of American natural cheese because the cheese makers will discontinue the making of those styles as hereinbefore indicated. I do not know whether the processors had this in mind or not, but I am stating the facts as they are, and I am reliably informed that natural cheese will soon be entirely off the domestic market as a result of these orders.

Another indication is to be found in the general order providing for maximum mark-up for retailers who sell all types of cheese. I am advised that the mark-up that a retailer doing an annual business of $250,000 or more dollars per year on natural cheese is 22 percent. I am further advised that this mark-up is all out of proportion to the mark-up permitted on packaged processed cheese, thus forcing the large retailer to sell only processed cheese. One of the large retail distributors in my district recently wired me in part as follows:

> Office of Price Administration is restricting the mark-up to 22 percent on Wisconsin cheese, an item that we have promoted and developed for years in every State in the Union. This mark-up might be satisfactory for a store handling a few varieties of prepackaged processed cheese. We handle every conceivable kind of cheese and must absorb the cutting, shrinking, and packaging cost. This order puts us out of the natural cheese business and takes away all incentive of future promoting Wisconsin cheese.

Again this order appears on its face to discriminate against natural cheese in favor of the processed variety. Wisconsin has spent millions of dollars in this country to cultivate a taste for natural cheese. These successive orders with one sweep of the Henderson pen threaten to destroy these efforts.

They have worded this order so that it even has the effect that a retailer who used to take a twin and cut it up and sell a pound or a pound and a half or two pounds, and wrap it up, cannot do so at a price high enough so that he is able to pay for the cutting and the shrinkage and packaging. They have imposed on him a mark-up that will not permit him to absorb those items any longer in the retail store. By a further differential in favor of processed cheese, he will be confined in his sales of cheese to the cheese made by the processor. The processor is the one we will have to sell twins and cheddars to, in order to get the price advantage to the farmer stipulated in this order.

Is not the picture suddenly beginning to clear up a little?

My friends who are on this Dairy Advisory Committee, in charge of cheese, will very vigorously deny that they had anything to do with the writing of these orders. Then who did write these orders? I should like to have somebody who is always apologetic for the actions of the bureaucrats in this administration make some study and be prepared to answer that question.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it any wonder, therefore, that the farmer, who will ultimately be most affected by these orders, views the situation with alarm? He may be getting a fair price for his milk today, but when he sees this natural cheese industry destroyed, which he himself has spent millions of dollars to build up throughout this Nation, cultivating a taste in the people of American for natural cheese, he is ultimately going to be the sufferer.

Is it any wonder therefore that the farmer who will ultimately be most affected by these orders views the stranglehold that great dairy monopolies are acquiring on his business with alarm? I say to you, my colleagues in this Congress, that honeyed words and soft praise is not what the American farmer wants today. He demands security. He demands protection. He demands his right to be heard before these far-reaching orders that so vitally affect him are entered. He has no desire to accept charity at the hands of his Government. He wants no dole. He wants no subsidy. He wants to be assured of a fair wage for himself and his wife and his children.

In short, he wants and demands the same security that is afforded to other segments of our society, and this Congress owes him the responsibility and the duty of investigating this bureaucratic action to the end that he may receive simple justice.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What the gentleman has stated about the cheese industry of Wisconsin is similar to the experience we have had in Minnesota with reference to butter. Wisconsin is conceded to be the largest cheese-producing State in the Union, and Minnesota is conceded to be the largest butter-producing State. They started out with a program in Minnesota where they diverted the milk from butter into evaporated milk and paid a higher price for evaporated milk, but scores of small creameries closed down all over the State, dislocating the butter-production program. Then they went into powdered milk from evaporated milk. The result has been that we are having a famine in butter. The creameries producing butter have gone out of business just the same as the cheese factories in Wisconsin will go out of business under the program.

Mr. KEEFE. May I thank the gentleman and say that due to the limitation of time I have attempted to confine myself to the over-all picture today and the situation as it affects cheese. I hope I shall be able to discuss the general situation as it affects butter and powdered skim milk and powdered whole milk and the evaporated-milk problem that is facing the farmers of the gentleman's State and mine. It will not be possible to do it within the limitations of one address in one afternoon.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman pointed out in the beginning that labor knows what it is going to get for its hire.

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The industrialist knows what he is going to get, whether his contract is on the cost-plus basis or any other basis. The President has asked $100,000,000,000 for the coming fiscal year to meet war and other expenses. Nowhere along the line, however, does the farmer know what he is actually going to receive as his price for his products. It seems to me the solution to give him security for the things he is going to produce which are a vital war element, namely, foods, and to encourage him to increase production, would be to fix a floor under those prices as well as fixing a maximum beyond which the prices cannot go. Nowhere is the farmer guaranteed even the cost of production for his products.

Industrial plants costing millions of dollars have been built with the taxpayers' money for the purpose of producing war materials. No adequate attempt has been made to financially assist agriculture, one of the largest industries to meet the requirements of war needs. Our small farmers are going out of business every day and selling their few remaining units of livestock and so forth because of the drain on their help and because of lack of financial ability to keep upon their farms their dairy and livestock herds. Some provision should be made to assist the remaining small farmers in purchasing some of the dairy herds and so forth that are being sold because of the draft law and the way it has been administered. That is one of the reasons for our shortage and it is going to increase in intensity as we go along. We are going to have to face and meet the issue.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman that I think he is quite familiar with the attitude on this general question of the gentleman from Wisconsin who is speaking. The responsibility of legislating on this subject, however, rests with the gentleman's party. You still have control. You still have not met this issue. You prattle about the increased prices the farmers have received from the time they received nothing until today, but you have not fundamentally solved this problem. I congratulate the gentleman upon the diligent fight he has made, as I well know, to encourage his party in this Congress to deal adequately with this problem. After all, we of the minority can make suggestions, but we cannot legislate until the majority is willing that legislation come before this House. I hope the gentleman will have some influence upon the leadership to begin to legislate to stop the sort of thing I have described this afternoon.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I appreciate what the gentleman has said regarding myself. I have done my best to make my party see this very situation, but I may say the responsibility rests upon the shoulders of every Member of this Congress, whether he be Republican, Democratic, or Progressive. The responsibility rests upon the gentleman just the same as it does upon me, to introduce legislation which will bring about security for the American farmer as well as insure an adequate supply of food to meet war needs. Maybe our shortage is due to some extent to our commitments under lend-lease.

Mr. KEEFE. If it does rest upon me and upon the minority, I would like to know why some of the measures that we have advocated are not enacted into law. You cannot get them out of the committee, you cannot get them on the floor of the House until the administration permits it. Your party is charged with the primary duty in matters of legislation and it is because you have failed to properly meet the issue that the whole country is aroused——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] for 10 minutes.

## MANPOWER

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I quote now a phrase from the President's Budget message delivered on Monday last:

> Private thought and public discussion of this subject are very necessary.

The President said that when he delivered his Budget message to Congress here the other day. He was referring to the procurement of munitions and used this particular language:

> Total mobilization of all our men and women, of all equipment, and all our materials in a balanced proportion program will enable us to accomplish the production goals underlying this war Budget.

Following that general statement was his subhead of manpower, and I wish to touch on that for a few moments, for the purpose of public discussion. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we are making rather poor progress in the mobilization and use of the man and woman power in this country, and if you will permit me to read a few lines from a book just published by the Brookings Institution, prepared by Harold W. Metz, I call the following excerpt to your attention:

> Much public confusion has resulted from conflicting statements issued by Government officials, both with respect to the ultimate size of the armed forces and the possibility of a labor shortage. Brigadier General Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, stated in September 1942, that we can look forward ultimately to a total of 13,000,000 men in the armed forces, and that he contemplated 10,000,000 men at the end of 1943. Secretary of War Stimson testified before the Senate Military Affairs Committee on October 15 that the number in the Army at the end of 1943 would be 7.5 million; and according to Navy officials, the naval force will be approaching 2,000,000 by the end of 1943.
>
> With reference to the available manpower, Secretary of Labor Perkins stated in September that she did not believe there would be any real labor shortage making it necessary for Congress to enact legislation regulating the use of manpower. At practically the same time, Chairman McNutt of the War Manpower Commission asserted that a manpower shortage is imminent, and that legislation to control the allocation of the labor supply is imperative.

Some of those statements you will notice go back to last fall, and yet in the President's Budget message he in my mind still raises the question, to the effect that these munitions can be obtained only provided we properly balance the manpower and the womanpower forces of this country. The Industrial Conference Board, together with other studies which have been submitted, indicate that we have a total labor force in this country of approximately sixty-two to sixty-five million people, but in order to obtain that high figure, you have to take in many of the able-bodied youngsters between the ages of 14 and 19, who are now in school, and you have to take in a great army of the women in this country under 45 years of age, who have reached maturity, married or single, and with children over 16 years of age. Studies have been made in connection with maintaining a 9,500,000-man army, and a 12,000,000-man army. If you will permit a personal reference, based upon these studies, I wrote my own family this very week and told my wife to prepare herself mentally to be brought into this question of securing munitions, and by munitions I mean total war supplies, on a basis of a ten to twelve million man army. With the food supplies that we have, and which have been so very well referred to by our friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] this afternoon, I think we will have to scrape the bottom of the meal barrel in order to get out this production of war material and I think these men and women, boys and girls, will have to move into the production lines at just as rapid a rate as possible, and with all the work of these people, unless we get ships far beyond anything in sight at the present time, I do not think you will have the bottoms in which to move the men and goods, after you prepare for a ten to twelve million man army.

Mr. Metz in his study gives us these interesting figures. On the basis of a nine and one-half million man army, in 1944, you will need a total labor force of 65,000,000 people, consisting of an agricultural force of nine and one-half million, an unemployed force of 1,000,000, agricultural workers nine and six-tenths million, and nonagricultural, 45,000,000, and he points out that—

> The magnitude of the draft upon the youth and the aged is indicated by the fact that we would be recruiing for full-time employment over 15 percent of the 11,000,000 persons in the over 65 and between 14- and 19-year groups, both boys and girls who are not now employed, and that in the case of homemakers we should have to take at least 60 percent of the nonfarm women who are under 45 and who have no young dependent children. It is obvious that such a program would involve enormous social as well as economic consequences.

I think these are some of the things that the President was referring to when he said that this subject needs to be discussed and thought out by our people.

Going on in connection with this study, and dealing with an army of 12,000,000 men, if the armed force could be increased to 12,000,000 by the end of 1944, with no increase thereafter, then in 1945 you will need 69,000,000 people in the labor forces. This would require an increase in the labor force of ten and four-tenths million people from 1942 to 1945. This means the using of 250,000 Mexican workers and two and four-tenths million retired workers, five and six-tenths million homemakers, and 2,000,000 as a result of the natural increase in the population. At least 20 percent of those between 14 and 19 years of age normally in school and of the workers who would normally retire would have to be brought into the labor force, and at the same time all nonfarm homemakers under 45 without small children would also be required.

I think it is well for the country, for the women of this country, particularly the homemakers, our wives, to consider these studies which are now before those who are dealing with this manpower problem. Now, going on to one or two other points.

FINANCING THE EXPENDITURES

In his Budget message the President pointed out that before Pearl Harbor our monthly expenditures for war were running around two billions, that now they have reached six billions, and that during this current fiscal year we shall top seventy-seven billions, and in the following fiscal year we are to disburse $100,000,000,000 for war purposes. He gives some figures which I have projected along with the chart made by the Industrial Conference Board. Taking the appropriations as of July 31, 1942, at two hundred and fourteen billions and adding to that the one hundred billions called for by the message the other day, makes a total of three hundred and fourteen and two-tenths billions; and when you take the amount spent against this before Pearl Harbor of thirteen and one-tenth billions, the amount spent up to June 30, 1942, of thirty-two and four-tenths billions, and the amount to be spent during the current fiscal year, we have a total of one hundred and nine billions, and deduct that from the three-hundred and fourteen and two-tenths billions it leaves two hundred and four and eight-tenths billions of dollars to be spent on war subsequent to July 1, 1943, having in mind only the appropriations and authorizations heretofore made plus those called for in this Budget. We can well raise this question: To whom are the securities to finance these activities to be sold? Let us look at that for just a moment. Taking into consideration the $12,000,000,000 of securities placed by the Treasury last month, the month of December, we find that nonbanking sources purchased $7,230,000,000, and the banking sources purchased $5,070,000,000; in other words, about 41 percent of this last issue was placed in the commercial banks of this country and thereby became highly inflationary material. Now, let us consider this thought for a moment: I believe it is reasonable to assume that the business institutions and insurance companies and corporations other than commercial banks skimmed the cream from their cash positions this last month in their purchase of the large volume of securities which they purchased. They undoubtedly exerted themselves in their response to the Treasury to make the selling campaign a success. But let me ask this question: Will those corporations, estates, and trusts repeat with such a liberal response say in the month of April 1943, when another great issue must be sold? And again every 3 months or more often, will they so respond? It is reasonable, I submit, they will not be able to do so. In that event the Treasury will then have to resort more specifically to two other sources: First, the savings and income of individual citizens; and, second, the commercial banks. Let us examine into this question further: During the 13 months December 1, 1941, to December 31, 1942, Savings bonds amounting to about $10,000,000,000 were sold to our people; just a fraction of their income during that period and only a small percent of the total disbursements for war purposes during those months. Monthly redemptions of Savings bonds have jumped from about $16,000,000 in December 1941, to around $50,000,000 in December 1942. That is a rather small item at present as related to the total amount of Savings bonds outstanding. Taking the amount of disbursements given by the President for the remainder of the current fiscal year plus the more than $100,000,000,000 to be spent during the coming fiscal year makes it very clear to everyone who listens that the individual citizen must probably double or treble his purchases unless we are to resort to the wildest inflationary process and place these Treasury issues in the commercial banks, taking whatever economic consequences that may follow.

It should be clear to all that if we are to avoid inflation the deficit after such increase in taxation as Congress sees fit to provide must be financed out of the savings of individuals and the savings and uninvested accumulations of corporations. And I submit this question: If the Congress adopts the Carlson-Ruml plan as advocated by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] this week, will that assist in preventing inflation or in promoting inflation? More about this later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted for this time to the gentleman from Michigan who preceded me. He told me that he was to talk about the Budget message and wished I would add a little to his remarks. I have usually studied recent budgets, listened to the reading of the present one, then taken the floor at once, commented and made comparisons. This message you heard on Monday was so general in character that there was little to comment on, since there was no chance to compare, there being not many detailed figures or statements in it. Message that the nonmilitary appropriations amounted to little because they more or less tied into the war effort, and might be generally included as military expenses. Like the first message, we were given a generalization and patriotic talk. The President paid tribute to all of our citizens who were doing most yeoman service in the war effort. The real trouble that I have had for years, or had years ago, was a fear that the Budget would raise the debt to the point of real danger. I have had to change my mind however. When asked if our debt would be paid, I have always said that that depended upon the willingness of Congress to tax our people sufficiently to pay it. We were then talking about some four to ten billions! Now, of course, we are talking about a debt of $210,000,000,000. I have had to change my views and fix my eyes upon the stars and infinity.

The President has asked us for some $35,000,000,000 to be taken out of the people's pockets in 1 year. We never dreamed that the time would, or could ever come when our people would pay willingly, even in war time, $35,000,000,000 almost all of which would be in direct taxes; and now it is suggested that we ought to have a $16,000,000,000 tax in addition to the $35,000,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The $35,000,000,000 the gentleman mentions does not take into consideration the twenty or more billions that the people of this country pay to the States and the subdivisions of the States.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, no.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Our States and State subdivisions have been very careful about paying their debts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is correct. I have found, as I have observed, read, and listened to discussions on taxation by those in power within the Administration, that they have not too carefully refrained from giving the probable reason for desiring that our people become used to paying very heavy taxes to the Federal Government each year. If we are to be taxed 50 percent of our war effort each year, we can pay our debt in a few short years.

What is their real object? It apparently is that they want about the same amount of money each year after the war. Some now in authority are telling you that it is probably going to cost as much or more to keep the peace after the war is over. They apparently hope to extract from our people forty to fifty billions of dollars in taxes each year for some time to come, so that they can proceed to make the world over by acting as Santa Claus for all backward nations.

Little did I dream, a few short years ago, that a Congress would ever dare to impose such huge amounts of taxes on our citizens. What marvelous things we will do when patriotism is the issue. However, when the war is over, will our patriotism extend to such enormous exactions to keep the nations at peace through largesses? The idea to continue lend-lease methods is the vehicle for continuance of the huge spendings contemplated.

Do you not think that I have reason for these assumptions?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Jesse Jones tells us that we can expect on the basis of today's price level a national income of $135,000,000,000 for the calendar year 1943. I think this is the problem that the Congress faces and I feel it very deeply. We have had a 35-percent increase in the price level since the outbreak of the war. Assuming that is correct, I want to ask the gentleman, what in your opinion would have been the increase in the price level had our people not tended to practically hoard many of their liquid savings after income instead of letting them flow into the competitive retail market bidding against each other? Where does the gentleman think the price level would have gone to?

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not know. I know what the gentleman thinks. He probably thinks that the price level in 2 years from now will be 75 percent higher than it is at the present time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. GIFFORD. I will let the gentleman answer his own question. I cannot challenge that statement. I have said I did not think it was possible that our people would give up $40,000,000,000 for any purpose during one particular year. Are we not afraid of what our credit may be after the war? Certainly, such a huge amount of taxes each year ought to preserve our credit if applied to the debt. But will it?

The new scheme is to take the money from any source they can get it. They desire to seize your savings, or much of your salary, that it may be returned to you after the war. They suggest that you buy listed articles on installments, but such articles could only be delivered after the war is over. That argument must be challenged at once. The Secretary of the Treasury is right. He says that this can better be accomplished by buying savings bonds. What about this great demand debt of ours? We are selling bonds and stamps in great quantities, making a highly dangerous debt on demand. This must now amount to some thirty billions.

But this administration has been shrewdly planning after all. It has learned a lot about currency. I will place an interesting reassurance in the RECORD. Do not worry about not getting back dollars that you paid for your bonds. But you may still worry about what those dollars will buy. I will read this into the RECORD:

> Dollars are not a problem. Cash for bonds turned in can come from other bonds sold to other investors or to banks. After the war all the holders will not sell their War bonds at once. Furthermore, the Government can create more deposits as fast as bonds are offered for sale, and, if buyers for new bonds can't possibly be found, the Federal Reserve System can step in and buy. The Government has guaranteed to supply dollars in exchange for its bonds, and there is nothing that can interfere with that guarantee.

You will get your dollars. The new Members have not yet heard me bewail our financial conditions. I must confess that the public have proven themselves apparently willing to be taxed some $40,000,000,000, therefore I must withdraw some former lamentations. I will close with a quotation I have often used, but now repeat for the possible enjoyment of the new Members:

> Hush, little deficit;
> Don't you cry,
> You'll be a crisis
> By and by.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter addressed by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JOE MANSFIELD, to Mr. Roy Miller with reference to a matter involving considerable foresight on the part of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, which, had it been acted upon would have largely reduced the present shortage of fuel in the Eastern States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not object, the gentleman refers to that barge canal across the Florida Peninsula?

Mr. KLEBERG. I do refer to that. It is a rather full set-up for any reference of the House to the facts in connection with that matter.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, if that had been developed, the people on the Atlantic seaboard would have plenty of oil today. They would not be freezing and shivering?

Mr. KLEBERG. That is right.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what has been done regarding the Florida ship canal thus far?

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Donald Nelson recently made some recommendations which are set out in this letter. It will take less time if the gentleman will read this than for me to explain it.

Mr. RANKIN. This is the barge canal, not the ship canal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of all special orders on the calendar for today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]?

There was no objection.

PROBLEMS OF THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the small businessman today is suffering very much, especially in the city of New York, and probably in all other communities, because of the red tape in the regulations heaped upon him by the various Government agencies. The act which Congress passed to relieve the burdens of the small businessman has not done very much for him.

We talk about the little fellow who is the backbone of the country, the small retailer, the butcher, the grocer, and the others who are the backbone of our way of life, yet although I have heard much said on the floor of this House and of the other body and seen much in the newspapers about it, I have not as yet seen one constructive measure that would in some form or another bail out the small businessman who is in trouble because of the sudden changes in our economic life.

I refer as an illustration to my own city, a city of close to 7,000,000 people, the greatest center in the world for industry, science, culture, and almost everything you can name. As the war progresses and as the problems of our industrial development become more acute, it is of tremendous importance that Congress lend its effort to find a solution to these problems in the best interest of industry and labor. In New York City, for instance, the garment industry, which used to employ say half a million people and indirectly affected the welfare of an additional three-quarters of a million of the population, has been hit very hard by war conditions, and the complicated and arbitrary orders and regulations heaped upon it by the O. P. A. and the Labor Department do not help industry in its desperate struggle to adjust itself to a war economy.

I am not blaming the administration; I am not blaming the leadership of this present Government, but something is radically wrong. Either Congress pays no attention when it is passing laws, or it throws the whole burden of issuing rules and regulations and orders on the departments or commissions or other agencies, and as a result a lot of dollar-a-year men who, in my opinion, ought to be removed from all Government agencies, get a great deal of power they should not have. If we need experienced men in certain industries, we ought to employ experts, pay them a regular wage, and make sure they work for the interest of the whole country and not for the exclusive interest of their respective companies.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman believe those businessmen are experts?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They are experts when it comes to their own business, but I believe some of them are more interested in their former business associations than in the job they hold. I say some of them. I believe the dollar-a-year men are all right in their own factories, but not working for the Government. I think we ought to employ capable men at a definite wage and know that they are administering for the benefit of all the people the laws that Congress passes, and not administering them for a special group or a special individual.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is making a very constructive statement.

Would he go further and suggest the class from which these experts should be drawn? Will the gentleman make a constructive suggestion as to where they could be gotten?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think they can get plenty of capable men if they pay them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Where?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There are plenty of them in this country today, big men.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know the gentleman is trying to help, but will he name some of them or tell us the societies or the class from which they can be drawn?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I could go into that very thoroughly and most likely completely, and I am going to make every effort I can to see what I can do to satisfy the gentleman.

It is true that Congress has approved the laws under which the Labor Department and the O. P. A. are functioning, but I feel sure that we never intended to set up agencies which would complicate matters by bureaucratic methods and a lot of red tape. It is true that consumers must be protected against speculative prices. It is true that it is necessary to ration certain materials to insure equal distribution. It is true that steps must be taken to guard against inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I am not attacking the basic law enacted by Congress to take care of certain emergencies, but I certainly disagree with the way these laws are being administered. Judging by the various orders and regulations with which the country has been swamped in the last few months, it would seem that a lot of people who know nothing about the various industries are allowed to draw the orders in which the prices are fixed. The harassed small businessman cannot possibly understand the complicated legal terms. He has to employ attorneys and additional clerks to comply with all the new rules and regulations. He has to fill out so many forms that his own business almost becomes a side line.

Take for example M. P. R. 287, which is supposed to regulate the manufacturing of women's, girls', and children's outerwear garments.

This, by the way, is only 1 part of several other circulars dealing with other branches of the garment industry. In order to establish a maximum price, the order goes along for 20 columns, closely printed regulations, and winds up with a table which divides the articles in question into 31 different groups, each of which is subdivided into 16 more groups. There are, therefore, 496 distinct items which must be borne in mind by the manufacturer of such garments in that industry; otherwise he simply could not manufacture. Now, Mr. Speaker, 496 items are a large number to consider if a person wishes to engage in this type of business. Out of the 496 types, there must be at least 75 percent which necessarily affect the wages to be paid by the employer in such establishments. We, therefore, come to the question as to how it would be possible for a businessman to continue his activity and pay a reasonable wage to employees, with such a tremendous amount of detailed regulations which he must follow; otherwise the regulations provide for detailed penalties and all kind of unpleasant reprisals. When I say 496 I am really somewhat inaccurate. We have to multiply this by 496 more, since in addition to the regulations established in 1 part of the order there are different figures established in another portion of the same regulations covering 496 other items. So that the total number is really twice 496, or almost a thousand detailed figures which have to be borne in mind if the manufacturer is not to become enmeshed in these regulations to the extent which will mean his complete extinction or bankruptcy. I did not say a word as yet about the 20 columns of the text which tell the manufacturer what to do and what not to do, and which prescribe for him and all kind of methods of determining the wages and determining the styles, and all of the other manifold regulations, with which he is pressed under this circular known as M. P. R. 287. I am afraid that most of the regulators, who so plentifully supply the Government Printing Office with printing matter for the regulation of industry, do not in most cases know the first thing about the problems of the industry, or the necessities of either the manufacturer or the worker. The administration in my opinion is opposed to all this, but we have some people in these various branches of Government, who apparently sit up night and day thinking up new orders to keep busy without realizing what these complicated orders will do to business.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. As a new Member seeking information, it is quite surprising to me the number of men making these regulations. Can the gentleman tell me who voted these agencies into being?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, Congress does not adopt the regulations.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Did you vote for the bill originally?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certainly.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Then, may I ask this: Do you feel that we should make some changes?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I shall come to that in a moment. I want to answer the gentleman's question. The gentleman is a new Member. We pass a law, and then we say that the administrator, or the person who is to carry out the intent of the law, shall make such rules and regulations. Congress cannot do that. All we can do is to tell the administrator to make regulations and put them into effect.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman agree with me that if we have the remotest hope of preserving government by the people that the time has arrived for us to cease talking and begin acting?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman. I think that is a fair statement. We should act.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman agree with me that we are living under a government of dictatorship by bureaucrats?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I would not put it that way. That is a rather strong statement to make. We are just living under a government, a pretty good government, that is trying its best to protect the interests of all the people. There are some people in some of the Government agencies, however, that are misfits. We ought to study these problems carefully, remove the incompetents, and put better men in office.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman will agree with me in the further statement that the way to stop these bureaucrats is to starve them out by not giving them money to carry on that practice.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, that is rather a large order.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I understand the gentleman to say that the administration is opposed to this, and that the gentleman is condemning these unnecessary regulations?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think so. I do not think, for example, that the administration is in favor of all the time-consuming orders and regulations which are practically ruining a whole industry in my city. It is simply a matter of having too many people trying to show their authority in drawing up orders on subjects they know very little about.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman point out just one instance where the administration has indicated that it is against this regimentation and this bureaucratic interference?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have not gone into that particular phase except that I have talked to a few people. Some of them did not themselves know what the regulations were, because some of their understudies drafted them. If the situation is the same in other industries, as it seems to be in the shoe industry and the clothing industry, the gentleman will find that before long nobody will know where we are or where we are going. We ought to turn around and clean house.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman, then, cannot point out any single instance where the administration has indicated that it is against this regimentation and this bureaucracy. The statement which the gentleman made that the administration is opposed to these things is not therefore backed up by any proof.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think it is the great responsibility of the Congress in passing laws fixing prices, or laws for the general welfare and the benefit of the people, to make doubly sure who is going to administer the law and what kind of regulations are going to be made to take care of the administration of the law rather than to pass a law so general

in term that it in effect says: "Mr. Administrator, you can issue any regulations you want," and then pay no more attention to it until our constituents commence to squawk.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield, but my time is going fast, and I have many more things to call to the attention of the House.

Mr. BROOKS. I have been furnished figures to the effect that during the year 1942 some 33,000 small food stores in the United States had to close their doors, and I have been told that to a general extent this was due to the multitudinous regulations that are smothering them out of business. Has the gentleman got those figures too?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the gentleman made a fair statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me? I will give the gentleman 2 minutes of my time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not want to take the gentleman's time; I want to use my own.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Two minutes of mine for half a minute of the gentleman's?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield.

At the present time we have over 400,000 people unemployed in the needle industry of New York. We have no defense work, we have no other method of taking care of these families, and this means 100,000 families.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. COX. The gentleman should call that to the attention of the people who are saddling inefficients on the Government, because today we find washerwomen and bricklayers holding jobs as stenographers in every department of the Government here in Washington.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is another serious problem the manufacturers in the garment industry have to face and that is the interpretation of certain phases of the Walsh-Healey Act. The Secretary of Labor, as well as her inspectors, have shown very bad judgment in the intepretation and enforcement of this act and have created a great deal of unnecessary confusion and uncalled for hardships. In order to remedy this situation, I saw fit to introduce the other day a bill—H. R. 690—which deals with a certain phase of the so-called Walsh-Healey Act, affecting public contracts. It provides that the determination of the Secretary of Labor shall be subject to review by the circuit court of the United States and confers jurisdiction on the circuit court to hear an appeal taken from the decision of the Secretary of Labor.

Due to the administration of prices and the various regulations dealing with the production of New York City's needle industry as well as the curtailment of civilian needs, a good many business concerns could keep their heads above water only by securing Government contracts from the Army and the Navy Departments. The Walsh-Healey Act gives the Secretary of Labor certain rights in approving or disapproving concerns bidding for Government contracts and the Secretary of Labor has not been very wise in using this authority. The rules and regulations set up by her Department are very complicated and as has been proven in a number of cases were even too complicated for her own investigators to interpret. How, then, can one expect the average businessman to be able to obey all these rules and regulations? It is almost impossible to escape technical infractions of these regulations, and the average small businessman harassed by regulations coming from the various Government agencies, must, whether he wants to or not technically violate some of them at some time or another. When that happens, there is another section of the Public Contracts Act which says that when a businessman violates any of the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary can bar him from bidding on any public contract for 3 years. Invariably where such an event has happened, the Secretary of Labor, in spite of the fact that the power to bar a businessman from future contracts is discretionary, has exercised her right to the *n*th degree, and has always barred a business manufacturer from future contracts, so that in addition to paying a fine and being beset with all these rules and regulations the slightest infraction of any of them means being put out of business. In this way, more thousands of employees lose their jobs and again the roll of unemployed increases.

To bring partial relief in this situation, the bill I introduced, H. R. 690, will vest in the circuit court of appeals the right to overrule the Secretary of Labor whenever the facts in a case may warrant such action. At least some way will be provided for, by which the courts will be able to determine whether or not the infraction of some minor rule by a manufacturer shall bar him from future contracts and throw his employees out of work.

This becomes so much more necessary, since the Supreme Court, on January 11, 1943, sustained the scope of the Walsh-Healey Act, and strengthened the powers of the Secretary of Labor, making her a virtual czar in the enforcement of this act. There should be some check on the powers of this executive official and the place for such a check should lie in the courts.

I hope and expect that Congress will enact this proposed legislation without delay so as to give much needed relief to a great number of people who through no fault of their own are losing the means to make a livelihood for themselves and their families.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair calls attention to the fact there are several other special orders pending.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I withdraw the request.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress will receive within the next few days a personal message from the Apartment House Association of San Francisco. I have a copy of it here. It is a letter dated December 31, 1942, signed by Douglas Dorn as president. I urge my colleagues to read not only Mr. Dorn's letter, but also the interesting data and information contained in the brochure attached. The title of the brochure is "Rent Control—as Congress Intended it—as O. P. A. Runs it."

Many citizens of San Francisco feel they have been unfairly treated. On October 14, 1942, Justice James F. Byrnes appeared before the House Committee on Banking and Currency seeking an amendment to the Price Control Act to cover Nation-wide rent control. I quote a portion of the colloquy between Justice Byrnes and myself appearing on page 18 of the committee hearings:

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Justice, I come from San Francisco and I was out there recently and a number of these people who have modern apartment houses have asked me if some machinery could not be set up whereby they could make applications to have their rents increased. For instance, during the depression they reduced their rents very drastically and now they are unable to get any increases because of the Rent Control Act and a good many tenants have had their incomes very greatly increased through the war situation. I was wondering if you could not arrange to have some simple machinery set up so these people could be heard without great delay.

Justice BYRNES. There is no reason why it should not be done. I will be glad if you will get in touch with me to ask those in charge to provide machinery to give them a hearing on it. I will be delighted to assist you in that.

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that I did not have any opportunity of going over these remarks before they were printed. The words "modern apartment" as printed in the hearings is a mistake, for I am sure I said "moderate apartment."

About 10 days after the October meeting of the committee I went home to San Francisco for the November election, returning to Washington some time about the middle of December. While home, many people broached their rent troubles to me. On January 2, 1943, I wrote Justice Brynes a letter under the caption "Rent Control":

WASHINGTON, *January 2, 1943.*

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
*National Economic Stabilizer,*
*Board of Economic Stabilization,*
*Washington, D. C.*

RENT CONTROL

DEAR JUSTICE BYRNES: You remember when you appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee in connection with rent control I asked if it were not possible for some simple machinery to be set up in order that cases in which the landlords felt they were being unjustly treated, could be heard.

You were very kind and expressed your sympathy in connection with this problem.

I am enclosing herewith letter addressed to me as well as to Senator HIRAM JOHNSON, Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, and Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH, written by Joseph A. Brown, attorney for Apartment House Industry of San Francisco, under date of December 28.

I would greatly appreciate your earnest consideration to this matter.

With every good wish for the new year, I am,

Cordially,

THOMAS ROLPH.

Mr. Speaker, I received the following reply, dated January 4:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 4, 1943.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of January 2 with reference to the rent-control program.

Of course, you know I have nothing to do with determining the manner in which this office should be administered, but I am forwarding your letter to Mr. Paul Porter with the request that he give consideration to the letter from Mr. Joseph A. Brown.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

To date I have had no word from Mr. Paul Porter.

Mr. Speaker, I also submit a letter dated San Francisco, January 6, 1943, from Mr. and Mrs. Pessarra, of 811 Forty-second Avenue, reading as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, *January 6, 1943.*

To Congressman T. ROLPH,
*Fourth District.*

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN: We never did ask any favors. But now we feel we are, with many others, being treated very unjust. We have been decent citizens. Could we please get some kind of closer information about that Office of Price Administration renting business—as it is, it is a most unfair-one-sided proposition only for the tenants. Our case is miserable, not only unjust. In 1941 we rented to one particular tenant very reasonable as he kept chewing down on Mr. Pessara until he finally gave in to said tenant's terms; said tenant faithfully promised they both where never home thereby using very little or barely any gas and elect. Same tenant is using both by far too much, thereby breaking his word. Agreements have just been mutual, not in writing, as no one would ever come, thought then that such laws could ever come, where the property owner had absolutely nothing to say any more except take all mischief whatever a tenant might do. The Office of Price Administration tells us there is nothing we can do, no matter how much said tenants are using or wasting it is up to the landlord to write to his Congressman so the present laws may be changed. In our other apart. is the same thing improved conditions under 1940 unimproved conditions (rentals). The tenant can do as he pleases, waste hot water and break all his other agreement to any extent even using terrible language if you ask them in a nice way to be a little more careful. Why does that Office of Price Administration renting law just condemn the landlords and step all over them? While wages and food prices have gone sky high are we not even to exist any more? This is one of the most unfair and class discriminating laws ever been put in effect yet. Please try your utmost to do something for us and help better just a little on that law as now it's very unfair. We both have been loyal voters with friends in your both terms and want to be in the future. Sorry to bother you with our trouble in this times as you must be a very busy man but the Office of Price Administration says to write your Congressman to change the laws; as it is now they can't do nothing. I will not go into details about my other problems in my aparts, as it would be too much for you to read.

Thanking you sincerely.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. PESSARRA.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. What is the date fixed for the fixing of rents?

Mr. ROLPH. San Francisco was one of the first areas declared a defense area. I cannot remember the date. It was away back in the early part of 1942.

Mr. ROWE. April 1, 1941.

Mr. ROLPH. Whatever date it was. I cannot remember the exact date, but I know that San Francisco was among the first areas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the gentleman agree with me that 90 percent of the difficulties that are emanating out of the rent-control situation is due to the regulatory concept of the law instead of the law itself?

Mr. ROLPH. Exactly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I have filed a bill today to correct the situation, and I hope the gentleman will support it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is a most encouraging thing to note that our friend from California is trying to correct some of these errors. Is it not a fact that the minority side protested against this broad grant of power when those bills were put through, but in spite of that they were jammed down our throats?

Mr. ROLPH. I voted for the price-control bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And now what have you got?

Mr. ROLPH. Well, I am trying to correct certain objectionable inequities.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The trouble with that bill, as well as others, is that it delegated the power down at the other end. They could not do a thing except through what we have given them the power to do. The minority side objected to those broad grants of power to those individuals, and I am glad the gentleman is trying to correct them.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the gentleman doing penance today?

Mr. ROLPH. No. I am trying to correct a wrong.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman can agree with me in the statement that the practice of the Congress in the adoption of legislation carrying broad grants of power permitting an almost unfettered use of discretion is the thing that has made the Congress ridiculous throughout the country and put it in a bad situation?

Mr. ROLPH. I agree with the gentleman; we should correct it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman agree with me that one of the greatest errors that has been made by O. P. A., the Rent Control Division thereof in particular, is that they have set up rules and regulations which take them into the most intimate activities of the homes of our people and the owners of those homes and apartment buildings and business institutions, to a point where there is such great interference that the people themselves resent the activity by reason of the fact that they personalize these interferences. In other words, our people are not objecting to rationing as such, they are not objecting to the scarcity of materials due to the war needs, they are not objecting to the personal sacrifices they make on that basis, but they are objecting to the type of administration by which the O. P. A. sticks its nose into everything that we try to do in order to promote our welfare and carry on the war.

Mr. ROLPH. May I say that it has been my experience in my trips home that it is perfectly amazing and perfectly wonderful the way the people have accepted every request and every regulation that has come out of Washington? This method of trying to have these things changed is an orderly and proper way for them to do it. I think the people should have credit for doing it the way they do. I think it is a wonderful demonstration of the loyalty and patriotism of the American people the way they have cooperated with this Government 100 percent. I thank the gentleman very much for his observation.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Does the gentleman know that in Summit County, Ohio, the rent control board is now employing snoopers to go out and inquire of renters whether or not they are satisfied with their agreements with the rentees, and where there are perfectly amicable arrangements in existence they foment trouble in order that they may have control?

Mr. ROLPH. I think that is very unfortunate.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will yield further, may I call his attention to the enormous form, tabulation after tabulation, that has just come out. I have a copy on my desk. The owner of a house or an apartment must fill out this form. Then, as I understand, the O. P. A. takes that form and hands it to the tenant, thus stimulating a dog fight between the tenant and the owner of the place.

Mr. ROLPH. I am not familiar with that condition, but it should be corrected at once.

Mr. Speaker, if municipalities and other political subdivisions are to be saved from long lists of delinquent taxpayers, it is necessary that relief be granted at once to those who are suffering gross inequities. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution

setting forth that to successfully further the war effort the House Committee on Banking and Currency should make a complete national survey of rent control.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman find in the administration of the price-control regulations strong evidence of a violent and hostile attitude toward private ownership?

Mr. ROLPH. That is what my people at home tell me

Mr. COX. In other words, an intent to outlaw the institution of private property in this country?

Mr. ROLPH. I would not say that, but I think they are overzealous, and I believe the conditions should be corrected.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I say not only to the gentleman who has the floor but to the other Members of the House that the present speaker has in his hands a letter addressed to him from the brother of a boy who is on Guadalcanal doing that job for $55 a month. He has a 6-room modern home in the city of Akron, Ohio, in which seven people are living. Their total income from work in war industries exceeds $700 a month. The Rent Control Board compels that man to rent that property for $22 a month.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 7 minutes.

BUREAUCRACY RUNS WILD

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, again a committee controlled by the party of the administration has had to conclude from the evidence before it that faulty management of the armament procurement program, the manpower program, and a general condition of confusion in the bureaucracy at Washington are interfering with the highest efficiency in our war effort.

This report is not made by "obstructionists," "isolationists," or "partisan Republicans." It is made by a special committee of the House of Representatives headed by a Congressman noted for his astuteness and fairness, and who last November was highly praised by the Democratic floor leader of the House as a man who had always supported the administration as far as possible. Under these circumstances, the report of the Tolan committee is very disquieting and merits the grave consideration of the American people. The people must not be discouraged by such reports as these. On the contrary, they should be encouraged that faults can be discovered and corrected. The most dangerous situation which could arise would be one in which a congressional committee could not find out and make public such facts as those secured by the Tolan committee.

There will be those, it is to be presumed, who will assert that the report of the Tolan committee may give aid and comfort to the enemy. Such a view is foolish and unwarranted. The very fact that the Tolan committee has uncovered the practices and derelictions which it describes in its report is the guaranty that the Congress will see to it that these weaknesses in the war effort are remedied. That will give no aid and comfort to the enemy.

The committee, in its report, is sharply critical of the way the armed services are handling armament procurement. The report expresses general concern over the manner in which Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt is shaping up that program. The committee declares that we cannot win the war merely with our surplus energies, and makes a recommendation for the establishment of an over-all civilian war mobilization agency. This proposal should be scrutinized very carefully, because piling agency on agency has not heretofore achieved efficiency. On the contrary, the practice has resulted in conflicting authority, contradictions of policy, seething internal jealousies and general confusion. It is not too much to say that our greatest danger in this war comes from an enemy led by General Confusion.

The criticisms of the larger business corporations voiced by the committee arise largely because those larger corporations have been pulled and hauled, have operated under conflicting instructions, and cross lines of jurisdiction which have made it very difficult for business to operate efficiently at all. In spite of these obstacles, American free enterprise has already accomplished a marvelous job and will continue to do so. The committee took special pains to deplore the custom among Washington bureaucrats of substituting words for deeds. The committee said, in part:

> There has been a widespread attempt to persuade the American public that many of the steps previously urged by this and other congressional committees have been carried out when even a brief investigation by well-informed persons will reveal the contrary.

This is a very disquieting condition of affairs—this empty pretention of following congressional directions and advice—especially when considered in connection with a most recent defiance of a direct congressional expression of will. There was an open and flagrant breaking of a specific promise made by administration spokesmen in both Houses of the Congress.

The essential point is that these dangers and derelictions pointed out in the Tolan Committee report must be remedied. Since it is apparent the executive department seems not intent to remedy its own mistake, the Congress, on behalf of the American people, will have to take a firm stand. These criticisms must be given serious attention, because they are of grave import and merit serious consideration.

We must immediately move to eliminate as far as possible all the objectionable features which now characterize the war effort, both in the civilian and military divisions as pointed out in the Tolan report. This special committee has done the Nation a great service and there is no question but that the Congress will give careful attention to the committee's report.

The SPEAKER. Under a special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 10 minutes.

BUREAUCRACY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not see our friend from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] around. He is the gentleman who spoke to us earlier today and complained so bitterly about the bureaucrats, who are raising hob with his people up in New York. It was certainly refreshing, but it was at the same time somewhat ridiculous, if one can experience all three in so short a period, to hear the gentleman complain about those bureaucrats, because I recall very distinctly, that when those acts which gave those bureaucrats authority were under consideration here in the House, every time a Republican got up and called attention, as we did many, many times, to what would happen, to the misuse that would be made of the power granted—every single time someone on the majority side, usually the majority leader—and I am sorry that he is not present at the moment—would get up and, figuratively speaking, just damn the Republicans from hell to breakfast for playing politics, when they pointed out the absurdity of making those grants of arbitrary power and the abuse of power which would be made if we gave it to them. Now, when they cannot deny the misuse and abuse of that power, they come in as has my friend, who has now, I see, come into the Chamber, and themselves complain about these very bureaucrats. I say to my friend from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] that he was one of the principal advocates of that legislation. I am glad that he has repented. I hope his repentance is deep-seated, and sincere. I hope it will stick. I hope he will not backslide.

The gentleman said that we have not offered one constructive suggestion. If he will go through the list of bills he will find that Republicans every time they criticized have offered a bill which, if adopted and adequately enforced, would have remedied the situation. Let the gentleman offer a constructive suggestion, and he will find every Republican here doing all he can to get the thing through.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The trouble is that some of the Republicans, instead of trying to honestly criticize and suggest a remedy, have criticised to such a degree that they have made it appear that there is somebody in the administration who is trying to bring about this complicated O. P. A. complication. I was not talking about the bureaucrats. I was talking about the bureaucracy in the regulation that was made in the particular needle industry, which requires almost 1,000 forms to fill out for that business. I was addressing myself to a specific question and the gentleman is trying to get me on another phase.

Mr, HOFFMAN. Oh, no; I am not. I am sticking to what the gentleman said. The gentleman was complaining because of regulations which the bureaucrats had

made. They made those regulations under legislation which the gentleman advocated and supported.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And for some of which the gentleman voted also.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, wait a minute. I did not vote for your general grant of power. Because I did not vote for every blanket arbitrary grant of power; because I would not become a rubber stamp, I was accused during the campaign of obstructing the war effort. Now we know, and many a Member on the majority side admits, the absurdity of the regulations the bureaucrats are putting out under the power we gave them.

I knew that the doggone thing would not work, and so did almost everybody else in the country. It was only the professors and those New Dealers who thought that they could make it go. Now the argument is that the boss, the big boss, the administration, is not responsible for what his hired men do. Why does not he fire them? Was the gentleman in favor of Mr. Henderson resigning? He was one of those bureaucrats, or does the gentleman think he was one of the good ones?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not know whether he was good or bad. I know what is happening today with certain regulations and I do not believe the administration would sanction it if the matter was called to the attention of the public.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, the gentleman means that the administration will not stand for it if the people make it too hot for the administration.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, I did not say that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The President is responsible. He has the power. He delegates it to somebody, to some bureaucrat, and then that bureaucrat comes along and squeezes the people so that they cannot support the men that we have sent abroad, and yet the gentleman says that the administration is not responsible. You tell me, in God's name, if the administration, which has the power and the money, is not responsible, who is?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does the Republican platform and the Republican minority approve of everything that the gentleman from Michigan says on this floor?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, heavens, no. We do our own thinking over on the Republican side. Each individual man over here thinks for himself, and if you would do a little thinking on some of these bills that I have introduced here, we would get a little further toward solving some of our problems. Although there are symptoms over here of following the leader, yet as a rule, if I understand it correctly, the Republicans have always done their own thinking and voting as their conscience and judgment have indicated they should vote.

Over there—and this is a secret, too—for the last 6 or 8 years those gentlemen on the majority side, patriotic as they are, have always played this little game of follow the leader. You all remember back when you were boys you played that game, and the leader would run around on top of this picket fence, over that ridge pole, and then the first thing you knew everyone was off in the ditch somewhere. Now, that is the situation we are in at the present time. And I am glad, I am happy, to know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], who has been an ardent, an all-out, shut-eyes-and-swallow-everything supporter of the New Deal—now at last has discovered when his people in New York are being pinched that that medicine which he has been ramming down the necks of the people out in the country is not good medicine. It has proved to be castor oil instead of paregoric.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was going on to talk about something—

Mr. DICKSTEIN. When the gentleman remembers, as he must, that time after time the Republican minority voted in a solid block, why does he criticize the Democratic Party? Why should we not vote in a solid block when we knew the proposed legislation was wrong?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I never criticized the Democrats; no, no, just the New Dealers.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Just a moment ago the gentleman condemned the whole Democratic Party.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, my, no; there it is! That is the way it goes! The gentleman gets excited. I did not criticize the Democrats at all, because the Democrats are honest, conscientious, zealous Americans, though sometimes mistaken. It is just the New Dealers here who want to sell us out, who want to do away with our system of government, and are ruining our country; that is the only group I am criticizing. But wait a second—there is that other group, the Communists—I forgot them, but they work so close together that they come under one head.

But what I wanted to talk about is this: We have heard a lot today about the gentleman's people being cold. I rather fancy some of the constituents of the gentleman from New York are getting cold up there because they are not getting coal. I cannot sympathize too much with him about that. I cannot sympathize with him about the lack of beef, either, because I remember that he backed a policy under which, when our farmers wanted to take milk or meat into the city of New York before they could get into the city, our teamsters, our farmers, had to dig down in their socks and pay $8.41 if they were driving a small truck and $9.42 if it were a big truck, just to take farm produce into the city for the gentleman's constituents to eat to keep them from being hungry. You charged us—you robbed us, let me put it—while we were taking in food for them to eat—do not talk about selling it, even if we gave it to them, if we took a truckload of beef to feed the hungry people the gentleman says there are in New York and drove up to the city limits, we could not get into New York City until we dug up $8.41 tribute money to permit us to drive on the streets. Paid to the city? Oh, no; paid to the union racketeers. Now, what do you think of that? Do you think that was right? I wish they would get hungry and stay hungry just a little while, say, 5 minutes, until they changed their minds and decided to help themselves by being fair and breaking the grip of the racketeers. We can bring food and fuel to your city limits, but you will not let us bring it into the city markets and stores until we have paid for the privilege of bringing it in. It does not strike me that that is a situation that calls for sympathy for the people of the gentleman's district.

END THE COAL STRIKE

Now, as to this coal strike. Why was this strike brought on? It was caused by John L. Lewis and the racketeers in his organization sticking another 50 cents on the miners every month before they could work. The miners say: "We are patriotic; we will dig the coal if you let us." And John says: "No; you cannot dig any more coal until you pay that 50 cents." And the administration backs the policy of giving a closed shop and check-off, so that if the miner works that $1.50 will come out of his pay check. He never gets the money in his hand until that $1.50 is taken out. This coal strike is the fault of the administration.

Why does not the administration and the press turn their guns on the politicians in control of the labor union who are insisting upon the payment of this extra 50 cents? These miners never agreed to this additional 50-cent assessment. That was just put over on them by the organization to which they are compelled, by this administration, to belong. Let the administration quit playing a crooked political game with labor politicians and the miners will work.

The administration pretends to be a friend of labor. But what is it trying to do to the employees of Montgomery Ward & Co.? President Roosevelt in effect orders Montgomery Ward & Co. to refuse to continue giving jobs to the men and women employed by it unless those men and women pay the sums demanded by union officials.

In Germany, men and women work where Hitler's agents tell them to work. Here in America, men and women cannot work, even in defense of their country, unless they join and pay tribute to unions backed by the President.

Not long ago, in Jackson, Mich., 175 employees, who did not want to submit to the demands of 30 fellow employees who were members of a C. I. O. union, were told by the administration to get back to work. Why did not the administration tell the 30 C. I. O. employees to stop trying to force the 175 into the C. I. O. union?

Does this administration think it is creating confidence in our Government by demanding that everyone who wants to work in the highly paid jobs must open his pocket to the hand of the union racketeer, organizer, or politician?

It is all very well to talk about carrying the "four freedoms" to the uttermost parts of the world. What about having

a little of the freedom to work right here at home?

Today I have introduced a bill which, if enacted, will help to end the un-American practice of sabotaging our war effort by insisting that everyone who wants to contribute to that effort kick in to the funds of an organization which contributed to the President's campaign fund.

Let us have a little more Americanism, a little more constitutional government, a little more regard for the freedom and liberty of our citizens; not quite so much solicitude toward building up organizations which may be able to exert political power in the 1944 campaign.

Two statements from Montgomery Ward shed light on the situation. I quote:

MONTGOMERY WARD'S SECOND STATEMENT TO NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

The following statement was submitted to the National War Labor Board at its meeting in Washington on December 8, 1942:

The War Labor Board, on November 5, 1942, issued an order that Wards "incorporate" in a contract with a Congress of Industrial Organizations union at Chicago:

1. A clause establishing a form of the closed shop, called maintenance of membership, together with a check-off of union dues from wages.

2. A clause providing for compulsory arbitration on any questions the union wishes to raise.

3. A clause guaranteeing in these uncertain times present wage and working conditions for a year.

Wards rejected this order of the Board for these reasons:

1. The Board was without authority. Congress, the only lawmaking authority under the Constitution, has not empowered the Board to order any employer to do any of the things which the Board demanded of Wards.

2. The order violated the fundamental principles of liberty. Liberty requires that an employee be free to join or to resign from a union without jeopardizing his livelihood. Liberty requires that an employer be free to employ the person best suited for the work.

3. The order was in itself illegal. The order required Wards, first, to interfere with the free choice of its employees to resign from the union; second, to give support to the union by a check-off of union dues; and third, to discriminate against employees if they resigned their membership in the union, all in direct violation of the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Wards operates in a highly competitive field composed of 1,750,000 retail establishments. It is unfair to impose burdens upon Wards and not upon those with whom it is in competition.

The imposition of the closed shop against Wards cannot be justified by reference to the so-called no-strike agreement. Wards was not a party to this agreement. Wards had no voice in the selection of those who, as representatives of industry, attended the conference in December 1941, which formulated this agreement. Wards has never ratified the results of that conference.

Furthermore, the conference itself did not agree that the War Labor Board might impose the closed-shop principle. Those acting as representatives of industry expressly recommended to the President that this issue not be considered by the Board. The Board, in ordering a form of closed shop at Wards, has acted contrary to these expressed recommendations of the industry representatives.

If Wards had had the right to test the legality of the Board's demands in a court, Wards would have done so, but Wards was deprived of a remedy in the courts by the Board's complete lack of legal authority to compel obedience of its order. The court will only act when legal rights have been violated. The courts have declared that the mere making of demands which do not have to be obeyed does not, in the eyes of the law, violate any legal right. The Board's very lack of authority thus resulted in a denial to Wards, as it has to other employers, of a right to relief in the courts.

The President of the United States, as well as the Board, is wholly without constitutional authority to order any employer to do the things demanded of Wards. Nevertheless, in deep respect for the President and his great responsibility in time of war, Wards said, in rejecting the Board's order:

"If Congress imposes closed shops, compulsory arbitration, or contracts for a year's duration on employers, or if the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief in time of war, directs that Wards accept the Board's ruling, which we earnestly believe are illegal and uneconomic, we will respectfully obey."

The President, on November 18, wrote the company, saying:

"As Commander in Chief in time of war, * * * I * * * direct Montgomery Ward & Co. to comply, without further delay, with the National War Labor Board's directive order of November 5, 1942."

Wards immediately answered:

"Your order of November 18 has been received and will be promptly obeyed."

Wards thereupon altered the general form of its contracts with unions and incorporated, word for word, the clauses ordered by the War Labor Board. This document was offered to the union. The company has fully complied with the President's direction and will continue to do so.

The document which the President has directed Wards to sign is not a contract. The requisite of a contract is that there be a meeting of the minds or agreement between the parties. There has been no agreement between Wards and the union. The document which the President has ordered Wards to sign affects the rights and liberties of Wards and of its employees. Therefore, in order that the document itself may be clear and state the facts, Wards informatively included these three sentences:

"The following provisions are not voluntarily agreed to by the company. In the company's opinion they are illegal and unsound. These provisions are copied verbatim from the War Labor Board's order of November 5, 1942 and are incorporated herein, on the company's part, under duress and only because the President of the United States as Commander in Chief in time of war has expressly ordered that they be included."

These three sentences are in all respects true. They do not alter the effect of the provisions ordered by the Board—provisions which Wards will carry out. Nevertheless, the union has refused to sign the offered document.

Wards will be happy to accept any improvement in the wording of this statement, but Wards will resist any attempt to hide the truth by a change in its substance.

On January 9, 1941, the President said:

"In the future days which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world."

Wards feels that it is bound by the rules of good citizenship to make sure that the simple truth about these provisions and Wards' acceptance of them be not hidden from or misrepresented to its hundred thousand employees, its 60,000 shareholders, and its many millions of customers. The elimination of this statement would serve no purpose but to conceal the truth from readers of the document.

Wards has cheerfully met with the union and with this Board whenever requested. Wards has promptly obeyed the direction of the President. Wards insists that its right to tell the truth not be destroyed.

MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.,
SEWELL AVERY, *President.*

---

JANUARY 11, 1943.

*To All Montgomery Ward People:*

1. You are free to join or not to join a union, as you wish. The company fully respects this privilege. Your opportunity with the company will be the same whether you are a union member or not.

2. You do not have to join a union to work at Ward's.

3. Ward's is opposed to all forms of the closed shop. Liberty requires that an employee be free to join, to refuse to join, or to resign from a union without losing his job. Liberty requires that an employer be free to employ the person best suited for the work.

4. The President of the United States has commanded Ward's to accept for its Chicago plant a form of closed shop called "maintenance of membership." Under this form of closed shop, employees are not free to resign from the union without losing their jobs. Ward's is compelled to discharge every union member who fails to maintain his union membership in good standing (nonpayment of dues, etc.). This making of membership in a union a condition of holding a job is the closed shop.

5. Ward's did not voluntarily agree to this requirement. Ward's believes it to be illegal and uneconomic. Ward's has accepted it under duress and only because the President of the United States expressly so ordered.

6. Ward's is the only retailer in the United States upon whom the President has imposed any form of the closed shop. It is unfair to impose burdens upon Ward's and not upon those with whom it is in competition. If the retail industry is to be subjected to the closed shop requirement, it should be legislated by Congress and applied uniformly against all retail establishments.

7. The National War Labor Board has now called a hearing to determine whether the employees at Ward's six large stores in Denver, Detroit, and New York City must belong to the union in order to hold their jobs. Ward's will continue to oppose this illegal and uneconomic requirement. Ward's will reject any demand of the Board that employees be discharged because they fail to maintain their union membership.

8. The President of the United States has no authority to order Ward's employees to remain union members in order to hold their jobs. Congress is the only lawmaking authority. Congress has passed no law requiring the closed shop.

MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.,
SEWELL AVERY, *President.*

SMEAR-PURGE ARTISTS STILL WORKING

Mr. Speaker, there is something else that I wish to speak about today.

One of the most vindictive and most unreliable of those engaged in the campaign to smear-purge Members of Congress and destroy the confidence of the people in Congress, notwithstanding the rebuke administered the group by the people at the November election, still continues his dirty work. As an illustration, in the Sunday, January 10, edition of the Washington Post, that paper and Dillard Stokes, alias Jefferson Breem, alias Quigley Adams, continued their campaign of misrepresentation and falsehood by falsely writing that I charged that the prosecution of certain individuals alleged to be seditionists was "just an effort to smear" isolationists.

I certainly did tell the House, and I propose to repeat that charge as often as may be necessary, that Maloney, an assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, and Stokes and the Washington Post have been using the grand-jury investigation to smear Congressmen, but I never have claimed—I do not claim now—that the investigation by the grand jury and the subsequent prosecution of the persons indicted was solely for the purpose of smearing Congressmen. Those instrumentalities were diverted from their legitimate purpose by Maloney and Stokes and were improperly used to smear Congress.

Either Dillard Stokes willfully, in reporting proceedings of the grand jury, lied, or he violated the rules governing grand-jury proceedings, when on the 22d of January 1942, in the Washington Post, he wrote, "the prosecutors declared Hill told the grand jury he recently received $12,000, but would not reveal the source." Did the prosecutors, including Maloney, reveal to Stokes the secrets of the grand-jury room? Either they did, or the truth is not in Stokes. If they did tell him what Hill said in the grand-jury room, they as officers of the court should be haled before the court to answer a contempt charge.

Now note, please, that charge does not rest upon any statement made by me; I merely quote what Dillard Stokes said.

On December 8 I called the attention of this House to another instance where a columnist writing for the Washington Post quoted the testimony of a grand-jury witness, Mrs. Goode, and a statement made in the jury room, according to the columnist, by a grand juror. It would seem that Washington is the only place in the United States where the rule as to the secrecy of the grand-jury proceedings is violated.

Certainly I do not complain because a grand jury is investigating alleged criminal acts. I do complain when that body and an assistant to the Attorney General of the United States proceeds in violation of all fairness, decency, and legality to carry on a subversive activity.

Stokes then sought to create the impression by his Sunday article that I had either failed or refused to answer three Members of the House who spoke in defense of Maloney—two on the 10th and the other on the 14th day of December last, and that I was upon the floor.

Each of those gentlemen spoke when I was not upon the floor, without notifying me that they intended to refer to me and I answered them earlier this week.

Stokes further stated and I quote:

The Speaker flung these questions at the dour Michigan isolationist.

He capitalized the word "Speaker," evidently intending the readers to believe that the Speaker of the House had asked me certain questions. The Speaker did not ask me any questions. The questions repeated in the Post were asked by the Member from Pennsylvania, Mr. Holland. Stokes but asked them again and why did he repeat them? Why did Holland ask them—because they wanted the information? Oh, no; they just wanted to again—once more—link my name with the names of those who have been indicted. That was their sole purpose.

During the grand jury investigation Stokes tried to make it appear that I was concealing something. He knows better. As long ago as November 17, 1941—more than 13 months ago—on the floor of this House when one of the assistants to the Attorney General was sitting in the gallery, referring to him I said, "If he is hard up for witnesses, he can call me. I will be glad to go down and talk to him. Thirty thousand copies of my speeches went out under my frank that were antiwar speeches." Those were the speeches entitled "We Burned Our Fingers Once—Will History Repeat Itself?" Now Stokes, more than a year later, squawks and asks whether I sent out those speeches.

Why, on January 2, 1942, under his own signature in the Washington Post was the same fact published?

On April 13, 1942, I nailed the lie that in the speech, Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, I called the President a Judas and pointed out those to whom I referred as betraying our Nation. On that same occasion I disclosed the fact that I had furnished thousands of copies of that speech to others.

What a silly donkey Dillard Stokes, alias Jefferson Breem, alias Quigley Adams, shows himself to be when in writing about what I had to say on the floor yesterday he captioned his report, "HOFFMAN admits circulating speech." Members of the press gallery, Members of the House, and those of the public who paid any attention at all to the matter know that I never denied circulating the speech, Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes. Stokes knows it but he is so crooked, his mind is so twisted, he is so lacking in political morality that he just cannot tell the truth. He must in writing an article, disseminate falsehood.

Those familiar with the circumstances know that time and again on the floor of this House I have stated that I circulated that speech, that anyone who wanted a copy could have it for the asking.

The first question asked by the smear-purger, Dillard Stokes, in his Sunday article was this:

1. Will the gentleman from Michigan deny that two mail sackfuls of a speech delivered by him on the floor of this House, in which he called the President a Judas, were delivered to Mrs. Bethune in Washington and that the speeches in those mail sacks were enclosed in franked envelopes bearing the frank of the gentleman from Michigan?

Answer to question 1: I have pointed out the falsity of Stokes' statement that in that speech I called the President a Judas. For further answer to that question let me here quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 28, 1942, page 4728. Those speeches went out in franked envelopes. What of it?

March 30: Copies went to Mrs. N. N. Bethune, the LaSalle Apartments, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington D. C., upon the understanding had with her and with Mrs. Goode, who was in the office with her asking for reprints, that they were to be addressed and mailed to the members of the organization known as the Dames of the Loyal Legion and others mentioned by Mrs. Goode when she first came to my office asking for reprints.

I will answer the other seven questions categorically.

2. Will the gentleman from Michigan deny that he sent, or caused to be sent, 2,000 copies of this same speech to Charles B. Hudson of Omaha, Nebr., who is now under indictment, charged with conspiring to break down the morale of the armed forces?

Answer to question 2: He received 2,000 copies of Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes in the flat—not in franked envelopes. What of it?

3. Will the gentleman from Michigan deny that he sent 1,000 copies of this same speech to Gerald B. Winrod of Wichita, Kans., another of the defendants in the same indictment?

The same answer as made to the second question will serve as an answer to questions 3 and 4, except that Winrod received 1,000 and Baxter 500 copies of Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes. Again I ask, What of it?

Let me add all three were indicted on the 28th day of July 1942 for a violation of section 9 of title 18 of the United States Code. All three were arrested and with other defendants indicted at the same time for the same offense and were brought before the court in the District of Columbia. The validity of the indictment was challenged on the 8th day of August 1942. Though Maloney had used 71 days, according to Attorney General Biddle, in taking testimony against these gentlemen, on August 12 he asked for an additional 30 days to answer the challenge to the validity of the indictment. If my understanding is correct, from that day to this Maloney has never accepted that challenge nor has he brought the defendants to trial.

Maloney evidently has forgotten that provision of our Constitution which guarantees to every person accused, a speedy and impartial trial. We all recall the Scottsboro case where the conviction of the Negroes from the South of the most heinous crimes known to our law, was reversed by the United States Supreme Court because they had been denied a fair trial; that is, men of their race on the jury.

A speedy trial was not Maloney's objective. When it seemed no longer possible to delay the challenge to the validity of the indictment, Maloney, on January 4, handed in a new indictment charging a violation of the same section by practically the same acts and charging, absurdity of absurdities, that the defendants conspired to violate that section 7 years before the act became a law.

Where is Maloney's pal, Walter Winchell, who was suddenly assigned to active service? For months Winchell, a lieutenant commander in the Navy, violated the articles of war by falsely charging Members of Congress with disloyalty. He was much in evidence, but when it appeared that those charged with sedition were about to be brought for trial and that Winchell, the courageous Winchell, who peddled salacious

gossip or, as Pegler described him, "the gent of the men's room," might be called as a witness, forced upon the stand, and compelled to submit to a cross-examination which would disclose some of his falsehoods, his back-door connections with brothels and gambling joints, his pipe lines into Maloney's office, he was suddenly sent on active duty. If he was detailed to the job for which he is best suited, he will be found. It may be, too, that he has been sent to Australia to prepare a garden for "Paving-Block" Flynn, former chairman of the National Democratic Committee.

Questions 5, 6, and 7:

5. What use did the gentleman from Michigan intend that these conspirators should make of his speech?

6. Was it to be used in furtherance of their conspiracy to break down the morale of the armed forces of the United States at a time when we are at war and our boys are giving up their lives for the defense of our country?

7. Let him explain to this body what his interest was in sending his speech to these people.

The answer to all three questions is the same. The use which I expected to be made of my speeches, the purpose of the speech, and the circulation of it was set forth by me when I spoke in this House on the 28th day of May 1942. It was explained again on the 11th day of January 1943 and on many, many occasions in between those dates.

To, once for all, enlighten Dillard Stokes, if that can be accomplished, let me say to him that that speech was made and it was distributed in the hope that some of those who lack confidence in the United States of America and in her institutions, in the determination of her people to preserve this, a Nation, would finally be convinced that the people of America believe in America, believe in the Constitution, and believe that, under God and with his help, we will be able, in spite of the enemies from without and the traitors from within, to carry on as have our forefathers since the day of Washington.

To convince Stokes and Maloney and some of the others who were engaged in the now admitted conspiracy, to slander and vilify the Congress and to destroy it as a coordinate branch of the Government, that there was no secrecy about the distribution of that talk, I here refer to remarks made by me on the 28th day of May from the Well of the House and which will be found on pages 4728 and 4729 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I do not quote from those remarks at length but I here repeat that many, many individuals received copies of that talk; that copies went to residents of 34 of the 48 States of the Union who asked for them.

Question 8:

Let him explain to this body his unusual interest in the prosecution of an indictment which does not name him either as a defendant or a conspirator.

Answer to 8: I have no interest whatever in the prosecution of either of the indictments returned against the defendants therein named. I have no knowledge as to whether those defendants or any of them are guilty or not guilty. As a lawyer practicing for something like 40 years, I have been deeply interested in the misuse and the abuse made of judicial processes by the man Maloney.

I have been astounded by his unfair methods, by his complete disregard of professional ethics, by the rank injustice of his procedure. Over and above all that, I have been interested in the proceedings of the grand jury and of Maloney prior to the rendition of the indictment, and by his effrontery in violating all constitutional guaranties thrown around the people's Representatives. Though I did not choose to avail myself of any protection afforded by the Constitution, but volunteered to give the prosecuting representative of the Department of Justice any information at my command.

I was interested in the proceedings of the grand jury because the Washington Post and its reporter, Dillard Stokes, alias Jefferson Breem, alias Quigley Adams, used those proceedings in their effort to smear and purge Members of Congress. I had never realized that an official connected with the Department of Justice would so prostitute his office, that he would engage in such a foul conspiracy, and I determined that I would do all in my power to give to the public a true and accurate picture of the disreputable, morale-destroying methods of Maloney and Stokes.

Just to prove that Stokes cannot tell the truth about even immaterial matters, permit me to call attention to the fact that he wrote, and I quote, referring to the talk made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCGRANERY] and the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Houston:

Congress did not adjourn for several days and HOFFMAN was often on the floor, free with carping and with questions, but not with answers.

That statement is absolutely false. I was not on the floor when any of the gentlemen made the remarks to which Stokes refers; had no knowledge that they intended to speak and at 5:10 on that day I left for my home to bid my son, who was going into the Navy, good-bye. I did not return until after Congress adjourned. Again Stokes wrote a plain lie—a lie which he knew to be a lie.

I have had no acquaintance with Hudson, Baxter, or Kullgren. I have no knowledge of what they did with the copies of the speech, "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes." If any of the men named, or all of them, sent out the talk "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," with seditious material, he or they made a mistake for if you will pardon my egotism, I am quite sure that the patriotic sentiments contained in that speech of mine would tend to overcome any seditious sentiments expressed in the other literature.

Having now answered several questions, permit me to ask one—the people having answered at the November election, the vilifying propaganda of Stokes, the convict Browder, Birkhead, Maloney, Winchell, and others of that ilk and of the Union for Democratic Action, the New Republic, the Masses, PM, the Chicago Sun, and the Communists, just how much further does Stokes, Browder, Winchell and company intend to go to create disunity? Just when will they end their conspiracy to destroy the morale of the American people?

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to use my time this afternoon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to use my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MCCORD, for Tuesday and Wednesday of next week, on account of an important engagement at West Point, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to include a statement in my remarks, and to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[Mr. MCCORMACK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock) the House adjourned to meet, pursuant to its special order, on Monday, January 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

59. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to permit eviction proceedings brought thereunder to be instituted in the Federal courts; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

60. A letter from the Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the

year ended December 31, 1941; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

61. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

62. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of various ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

63. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of various laws passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

64. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of various laws passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

65. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a detailed report of the receipts and expenditures made during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, from the working capital fund established for the operation of the industrial activities at the United States Public Health Service hospitals, Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

66. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

67. A letter from the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

---

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 4. Report on the disposition of records in departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 5. Report on the disposition of certain records by departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 6. Report on the disposition of records by departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

---

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 1163. A bill authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1164. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1165. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 1166. A bill to permit civil officers whose compensation amounts to $2,500 or more per annum who were commissioned in the armed forces of the United States since September 16, 1940, serving on active duty during the war, to resume the duties of their civil offices after honorable discharge or relief from active duty; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1167 (by request). A bill to amend section 1 of the act of July 30, 1942, Public Law 690, Seventy-seventh Congress, to provide increase of pension payable to dependents of veterans of the Regular Establishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 1168. A bill making Members of Congress ineligible to hold appointive office in the executive or judicial branch of the Government within 2 years after the termination of their service in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPOZZOLI:

H. R. 1169. A bill to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 1170. A bill to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R 1171. A bill to liberalize existing laws as to forfeiture of rights as to claims for certain benefits by veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr HÉBERT:

H. R. 1172. A bill to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 1173. A bill to aid in the preservation of constitutional government in the United States of America; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JEFFREY:

H. R. 1174. A bill to repeal all limitations as to the amounts of compensation or pension otherwise payable to the dependents of a deceased veteran; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1175. A bill creating the Office of Photographic Imports and providing for the admission into the United States duty-free of certain historical, educational, documentary, or religious photographic dry plates and films; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 1176. A bill to make available copies of the daily editions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to certain libraries and schools; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 1177. A bill authorizing the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians or any band thereof to submit their claims against the United States to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1178. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Assiniboine Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1179. A bill providing for the payment of mileage for certain employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue when traveling on official business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1180. A bill to increase up to $50 per month the amount of pensions otherwise payable to the widows of those deceased World War veterans whose deaths were caused by their service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 1181. A bill granting equipment allowance to postmasters of the third class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1182. A bill to provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1183. A bill to provide for deportation of certain aliens who do not make declaration of intention to become citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1184. A bill to provide for the creation of the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, in the States of West Virginia, Maryland, and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1185. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1186. A bill to provide that the feeding of wheat to poultry or livestock shall not constitute marketing of such wheat for the purpose of marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1187. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which provide for national marketing quotas with respect to wheat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1188. A bill to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1189. A bill to authorize and to direct the Veterans' Administration to provide vocational rehabilitation, and assistance in securing suitable employment, for service-connected disabled veterans in need thereof, and feasible therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. R. 1190. A bill to amend the Judicial Code by adding a new section thereto, designated as section 266a, to provide for intervention by States in certain cases involving the validity of the exercise of any power by the United States, or any agency thereof, or any officer or employee thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1191. A bill to provide for the hearing of certain criminal cases by United States commissioners, to fix compensation of United States commissioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1192. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, with respect to regulations and orders establishing maximum rents; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 1193. A bill making applicable to all lands or premises subject to the partial, concurrent, or exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, the law of the State within

the exterior boundaries of which such land or premises is situated, pertaining to the recovery of damages for injury or death by wrongful act or omission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1194. A bill to provide for the orderly payment of conflicting claims and demands against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1195. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1896, as amended, relating to the appointment of assistant United States attorneys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1196. A bill to repeal certain acts of Congress (pocket vetoed); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1197. A bill to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1198. A bill to change the time of the appointment of Presidential electors and the election of Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

H. R. 1199. A bill to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting and certain other laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1200. A bill to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1201. A bill to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1202. A bill to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1203. A bill to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of fraud against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1204. A bill to amend the Criminal Code so as to punish anyone injuring a party, witness, or juror on account of his having acted as such; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1205. A bill to provide for the punishment of certain hostile acts against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1206. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1207. A bill providing for waiver of prosecution by indictment in certain criminal proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1208. A bill authorizing the judicial council of a circuit to direct that a term of court be not held where the public convenience does not require the holding of such term and there is insufficient business to warrant the holding of such term, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1209. A bill prohibiting the soliciting or accepting of fees for referring persons for employment by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1210. A bill to exempt persons in the military and naval forces of the United States from Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 1211. A bill providing for a survey of South Basin, San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 1212. A bill to provide for the installation of pipe lines sufficient to provide oil requirements for the eastern seaboard; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1213. A bill to regulate in the United States Court of Claims and in the United States district courts suits for payment for the infringement of patents infringed by or for the Government and for the use of inventions used by or for the Government, and for the better protection of the rights of inventors and owners of patents, and to stimulate the making of inventions useful to the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1214. A bill to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1935 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 2, sec. 251); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution protesting against the attempts of the Nazis to exterminate racial and religious minorities in occupied territory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of "The American's Creed"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee of the Senate and House to formulate social-security legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 3, 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to aid and expedite the prosecution of the war effort by raising revenue through the sale of war participation tickets, to be conducted under the supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. Res. 49. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the enforcement of regulations and orders issued by the Price Administrator; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 50. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Rules to employ a clerk-stenographer; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. Res. 51. Resolution to expedite the war effort by authorizing an investigation of the activities and practices of the Office of Price Administration with respect to the stabilization of rents; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER:

Memorial of the Legislature of the Dominican Republic, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the teaching of Portuguese language; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 1215. A bill granting an increase of pension to Bertha M. Knapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1216. A bill for the relief of Walter Ervin and Cora Ervin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 1217. A bill granting a pension to Elsie Israel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1218. A bill for the relief of F. L. Riddle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 1219. A bill for the relief of Fred Taylor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1220. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Campbell, father of Paul M. Campbell, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1221. A bill for the relief of Capt. Edward J. L. Russell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1222. A bill for the relief of Jacob Wolozin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 1223. A bill granting a pension to Ed Armel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1224. A bill to restore John Gilbert DeMuth, formerly a captain of Motor Supply Train No. 428, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, who rendered military service as a commissioned officer during the World War, to the emergency officers' retired list with pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 1225. A bill for the relief of Joseph Nathaniel Gownder; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TIBBOTT:

H. R. 1226. A bill granting a pension to Ella Howearth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1227. A bill granting a pension to Mary Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1228. A bill for the relief of Marshall A. Dequeant; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1229. A bill for the relief of Elmer T. Johns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1230. A bill for the relief of Ivan Rightnour; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1231. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kochinich; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. R. 1232. A bill for the relief of Roscoe McKinley Meadows; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1233. A bill for the relief of Frank Kelley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1234. A bill for the relief of the General Exchange Insurance Corporation, Richmond, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1235. A bill for the relief of Walter Ormes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 1236. A bill granting a pension to Zack Pool; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1237. A bill granting a pension to Roy Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 1238. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charles J. Bair; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1239. A bill for the relief of John V. Saul; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1240. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, adjudicate, and enter judgment on the claim of Carl G. Allgrunn against the United States for the use of his invention in rifling guns during the war and thereafter by the Symington-Anderson Co. at Rochester, N. Y., said invention being shown and described in his Letters Patent No. 1,311,107, issued by the Patent Office of the United States on or about July 22, 1919, and conferring jurisdiction upon said Court of

Claims to reopen and further adjudicate the claim of said Carl G. Allgrunn for the use of his invention by companies or in shops other than the Symington-Anderson Co. in 1918 and 1919, which claim has heretofore been settled on the basis of the judgment of the Court of Claims of February 8, 1937; to the Committee on War Claims.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

12. By Mr. ANDREWS: Statement from the Buffalo Master Bakers Association having to do with raise in the ceiling price of flour, and protesting against no action having been taken to permit bakers to raise the price of bread; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

13. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Long Island Association, New York City, urging support of the Ruml pay-as-you-go income-tax plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

14. Also, petition of the Triangle Ink & Color Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging support of the Ruml pay-as-you-go income-tax plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

15. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Edward F. McKee, president; Hal T. Kain and Thomas F. Gavin, members of the board of commissioners of the county of Ohio, Wheeling, W. Va., urging that the county of Ohio and other counties similarly situated may be freed from the discriminatory restriction heretofore imposed upon them as the result of gasoline rationing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

16. Also, petition of W. P. Liller, president, Kiwanis Club of Wheeling, W. Va., urging that the dividing line of gasoline rationing be placed where it was before Nation-wide rationing went into effect, and that the Wheeling area be excluded from the 17 Eastern States, for the reason that the Kiwanis Club of Wheeling feels that there is not a shortage of gasoline in their section of the State and that an injustice has been done by drawing a rationing line directly through the center of an intensely populated, industrial section; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

17. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Third National Congress of the Confederation of Workers of Cuba, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Governor of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

---

# SENATE

## MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, whose kingdom is forever and against which the gates of hell cannot prevail, we would rest our weary and needy souls in Thee. At the wicket gate of another day with all its waiting tasks, we bow our heads and our hearts in reverence and devotion.

Into Thy hands we commit the mystery and the mastery of the godlike power of choice—the royal right to say "I will. Our wills are ours, we know not how; our wills are ours to make them Thine."

May the altar lights of faith, undimmed, burn brightly in spite of the winds of adversity and unbelief. In the confusions of these troubled days, help us to keep inviolate in our souls a little shrine of quietness; a chapel of peace within, an altar of contrition, a sanctuary of sure and swift retreat, where the world's angry voices die, where Thou alone art real. So, in turmoils without and within, may we find day by day,

"A little place of mystic grace,
Of self and sin swept bare,
Where we may look upon Thy face
And talk to Thee in prayer."

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 14, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

OATH OF THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the oath of office of the Honorable CARTER GLASS, Senator from the State of Virginia, as the President pro tempore of the Senate, duly subscribed and sworn to by him on the 14th instant, which will be read.

The oath was read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

I, CARTER GLASS, President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States of America, do solemnly swear that I will truly and faithfully discharge the duties of my said office, to the best of my knowledge and abilities.

CARTER GLASS.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 14th day of January A. D. 1943.

A. D. BARKSDALE,
*United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia.*

LYNCHBURG, VA.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in this connection I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 62) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of Hon. CARTER GLASS, a Senator from the State of Virginia, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BARKLEY. I send forward another resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 63) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. CARTER GLASS, a Senator from the State of Virginia, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that at the earliest opportunity following the convening of the Senate on Thursday next I shall address the Senate on the subject of how our manpower should be divided for the conduct of the war, with reference to the Army, the Navy, shipping, production for war purposes, agriculture, and the civilian economy.

CONFIRMATION OF PRENTISS M. BROWN TO BE PRICE ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Banking and Currency I report favorably the nomination of Hon. Prentiss M. Brown to be Price Administrator, and I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be at once confirmed.

Mr. McNARY. Was the committee unanimous in its approval of the nomination?

Mr. WAGNER. The committee was unanimous.

Mr. McNARY. I am advised, and I think authentically, that the present Administrator desires to leave his position at once. I conferred this morning with former Senator Byrnes, the Director of Economic Stabilization, and he is anxious that Mr. Brown be inducted into office at once. I have high regard for both these gentlemen, having served with them in the Senate.

Of course, it is contrary to the rule to permit confirmation of a nomination without its going to the Executive Calendar, and it is not done unless unanimous consent is given; and request is made for unanimous consent on this occasion.

I have discussed the matter with the able junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and I can say that he has no desire to oppose the confirmation.

In view of the circumstances, and always keeping in mind my desire to conform with the rules of the Senate, I am willing in this instance to waive the rule, and, so far as I am personally concerned, consent to action at this time upon the nomination of former Senator Brown.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination as in executive session? The Chair hears none, and the nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Prentiss M. Brown to be Price Administrator, Office of Price Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WAGNER. I ask that the President be at once notified of the confirmation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

QUORUM RULE ADOPTED BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, at the first regular meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary, held in executive session today, the 18th instant, the following proposed rule of committee procedure respecting a quorum of the committee was submitted by the chairman:

PROPOSED COMMITTEE RULE NO. 4

*Resolved*, That a quorum of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall consist of six members present in person at any regular or special meeting of the committee.

The rule proposed was unanimously adopted by the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE NAVY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to division of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, the prices therefor and the reason for the award in each case (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

LEGISLATION OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman and Secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the Corporation for the period from its organization on February 2, 1932, to September 30, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Commitee on Banking and Currency.

EMPLOYEES RECEIVING $3,000 AND OVER, OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 322, Seventy-seventh Congress, information on national and field office employees receiving salaries of $3,000 and over, with the exception of region II including the States of New York, Maryland, New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War and Labor; the National Archives, and National Housing Agency, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO TAKE IMMEDIATE STEPS TO RELIEVE DISTRESS AND SUFFERING CAUSED BY THE SHORTAGE OF FUEL OIL IN MASSACHUSETTS

"Whereas the prosecution of the existing war has limited the facilities for the transportation of fuel oil into the New England States, thereby drastically reducing the supply thereof; and

"Whereas the people of this Commonwealth are undergoing great suffering by reason of their inability to properly heat their homes due to said reduced supply of fuel oil, thereby creating a deplorable condition and a serious menace to the lives and health of the people of this Commonwealth; and

"Whereas the people of this Commonwealth look to Congress for the providing of immediate relief from this dangerous situation; and

"Whereas tragedy has already occurred in this Commonwealth in the death of residents thereof due to exposure to cold in their homes; and

"Whereas many stricken families without heat in their homes will soon be forced to seek shelter elsewhere unless immediate relief is provided: Therefore be it

*"Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts respectfully urges upon the Congress of the United States the dire necessity of immediate action by it, through legislation or otherwise, so that relief may be provided without delay for the people of this Commonwealth who are so vitally affected by this extraordinary emergency which deprives many of them of the only means of heating their homes and who are threatened with increased suffering if such action is not taken forthwith; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth forthwith forward copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of both branches of Congress, and to the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth.

"In the house of representatives, adopted January 7, 1943.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
*"Clerk.*

"A true copy.
"Attest:
"[SEAL] F. W. COOK,
*"Secretary of the Commonwealth."*

A letter from the President of the Senate and the President of the Chamber of Deputies of the Dominican Republic, urging the teaching of the Portuguese language in the higher institutions of learning in this country; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Harry A. Gordon, Esq., of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against any action by the War Labor Board to require the incorporation into an agreement with a labor union of a provision that the right to a continuance of employment of workers shall be dependent upon their membership in the union and payment of dues (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A letter from Lic. Javier Rojo Gomez, of Mexico, relative to a memorandum reporting on the activities of the Federal Department of Justice under his charge; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Earl L. and Anna E. Miller, of Rochester, N. Y., remonstrating against confirmation of the nomination of Edward J. Flynn, of New York, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Australia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Leonard H. Holder, trading as April Showers Co., Washington, D. C. (by Zach Lamar Cobb, attorney for petitioner, Los Angeles, Calif.), praying for a redress of grievances caused by the alleged repudiation in the War Production Board of its written authorization, duly issued and fairly obtained, in connection with the procurement of prefabricated copper tubing intended to be used in the erection of the Dorchester House Apartments (with an appendix); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram from Lawrence C. Spivack, chairman of the book and magazine publishers' committee of the 1943 victory book campaign, New York City, N. Y., inviting Senators to contribute copies of their own books to be sent to persons in all branches of the armed service; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. 158. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 13).

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. Res. 6. Resolution continuing the authority of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS (REPT. NO. 12)

Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MEAD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. TAFT), from the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of American Small Business, created by Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, submitted an additional report.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE TO AUDIT AND CONTROL THE CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 64), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

INSPECTIONS OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 65), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof duly appointed by the chairman of the committee, accompanied by one expert, hereby is authorized to visit, for the purpose of inspection, during the present session of Congress, any part of the Military Establishment in the Western Hemisphere, the expenses incurred in pursuance thereof, not to exceed $3,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate

by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the nominations of several persons now Foreign Service officers of class 7 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, also to be consuls.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 417. A bill making certain regulations with reference to seeds, nursery stock, or fertilizers that may be distributed by agencies of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 418. A bill for the relief of Howard M. Sandus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 419. A bill for the relief of Thomas S. Brading; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 420. A bill granting a pension to Lottie Flint;

S. 421. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Faught; and

S. 422. A bill granting a pension to Mary E. Farrar; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 423. A bill for the relief of Gladys Mary White; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 424. A bill for the relief of Fred Wiseman;

S. 425. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn; and

S. 426. A bill for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 427. A bill to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 428. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, and for other purposes," approved May 24, 1938; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 429. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a medal of honor to William Mitchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 430. A bill relating to the appointment of postmasters; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 431. A bill for the relief of the Morgan Decorating Co.;

S. 432. A bill for the relief of Julian Johnson; and

S. 433. A bill for the relief of Patrick H. Clifford; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 434. A bill to prohibit experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia and providing a penalty for violation thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 435. A bill to increase the monthly rates providing a penalty for violation thereof; to widows and children of deceased veterans; and

S. 436. A bill consenting to taxation of lands held by the United States within the various States; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 437. A bill for the relief of Mary Bannach; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 438. A bill providing for a minister plenipotentiary and ambassador at large from each State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 440. A bill to prohibit the deferment of persons between the ages of 18 and 38 from service in the armed forces because of their employment by the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 441. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Robert A. Watson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 442. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 443. A bill for the relief of John W. Howard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALLGREN (for himself and Mr. HOLMAN):

S. 444. A bill providing for the transfer of certain functions of the War Relocation Authority to the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 445. A bill authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 446. A bill for the relief of the Florida Citrus Exchange, the Growers Loan & Guaranty Co., and the Guaranty Operating Co.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 447. A bill authorizing and directing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to create a subsidiary corporation to be known as the War Distress Finance Corporation, to deal with cases of business distress and financial hardship attributable to the war and causes related thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 448. A bill for the relief of F. B. Sweat; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 449. A bill to further amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; and

S. 450. A bill to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of civilians, and for the prevention and relief of civilian distress arising out of the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 451. A bill to provide for the retirement of any officer of the National Guard who has served an aggregate of 25 years in the National Guard and who has served as Chief of the Militia Bureau or Chief of the National Guard Bureau; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 452. A bill to provide for a method of voting, in time of war, by seamen absent from the place of their residence; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

S. 453. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to include citrus fruit and trees; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 454. A bill dividing the State of Florida into two judicial districts, defining the territory embraced in each, and fixing the time of holding terms of court therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide relief from income and estate taxes for individuals killed while serving with the armed forces; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution appointing a joint committee of the Congress to make a study of war and post-war problems; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON BUDGETARY CONTROL

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, which I ask be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The resolution goes to the establishment of a joint committee on budgetary control, and is offered by the minority members of the Senate Appropriations Committee. The members of that committee may later in the day wish to address themselves to the subject of the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) submitted by Mr. NYE (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. LODGE, Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. WHITE, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. REED) was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee known as the Joint Committee on Budgetary Control (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee).

SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee shall be composed of 10 members, as follows: (1) Five members who are members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 3 from the majority and 2 from the minority party, who shall be chosen by the majority and minority members of such committee, respectively; and (2) 5 members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, 3 from the majority and 2 from the minority party, who shall be chosen by the majority and minority members of such committee, respectively.

(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations by which he was chosen, except that the members chosen by the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriation who have been reelected to the House of Representatives shall continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress.

(c) The members shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the joint committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the joint committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of a clerk and such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this resolution, the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States,

whether or not the Congress is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary, to authorize such expenditures as may be necessary for printing, binding, and other purposes as may be authorized by the joint committee. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the joint committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or such member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said joint committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any questions pertinent to the matter herein authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 2, sec. 192). The cost of stenographic services in reporting such hearings as the joint committee may hold shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 7. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to investigate the operation and effects of the present budgetary system, to ascertain the necessity for, the economy, and the correctness of amounts of appropriations made to or requested by the various governmental departments, independent agencies and establishments, and to make such other investigations with reference to the expenditure of public funds as it may deem necessary, and in particular to investigate such questions as may be submitted to it by the Appropriations Committees of the Senate or House of Representatives, or by any member of the joint committee, and to report, from time to time, to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 8. The joint committee shall make available to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the subcommittees thereof at the request of the chairman or ranking minority member of committees or subcommittees thereof all available data, together with the services of experts and assistants on the staff of the joint committee.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MEAD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. TAFT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 66), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, as agreed to October 8, 1940 (providing for a study and survey of the problems of American small business enterprises), is hereby extended and its membership increased from 7 to 12, and the Vice President is authorized to appoint 5 more members to said committee.

SEC. 2. That the limit of expenditure under the said resolution is hereby increased by $50,000.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 67), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION OF CIVIL SERVICE LAWS AND CLASSIFICATION ACT

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 68), which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

*Resolved*, That Senate Resolution 198, Seventy-fifth Congress, agreed to on April 1, 1938 (providing for an investigation of the administration and operation of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

Mr. BILBO submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 69), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Pensions, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES

Mr. OVERTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 70), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Manufactures, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 71), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Education and Labor, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 72), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES, INCLUDING OIL AND GAS, OF THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 73), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 53, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to May 1, 1941, and Senate Resolution 310, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to November 27, 1942 (relating to the investigation with respect to the development of the mineral resources, including oil and gas, of the public lands of the United States), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses.

INVESTIGATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 74), which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Education and Labor, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation in cooperation with the Manpower Commission and any other agency, or agencies, public or private, it might see fit to consult, of the manpower resources of the United States with particular reference to housing, health, education, technical training, and civilian mobilization and morale, and how such manpower resources should be employed to the best advantage in agriculture, industry, the armed services, and other activities so as consistently with the spirit of our institutions, and the national emergency best to promote the war and victory for our cause. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistance, to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to make such investigations, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to incur such expenditures as it deems advisable.

That the heads of the executive department and other executive agencies detail and/or engage personnel temporarily to assist the committee upon the request of the chairman. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it may deem necessary. The committee may utilize the services or facilities of the various departments and agencies of the Government.

The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the subcommittee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the subcommittee.

### SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UNEMPLOYMENT AND RELIEF

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 75), which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

Whereas it is apparent that the World War and the tremendous dislocations in the domestic and world economy and trade will present serious unemployment, industrial, trade, and fiscal problems; and

Whereas it is important that the Congress, the Government, and the country may be aware of such problems, so that most appropriate and proper measures to meet them may be prepared: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That a special committee consisting of nine Senators, to be appointed by the Vice President, is hereby authorized and directed to study, survey, and investigate unemployment and relief problems, and cases of dislocation, and problems appearing in our economy, trade, and fiscal affairs in the United States arising, or likely to arise, out of disturbed world conditions, the defense program, and the conditions attending the post-war period. Such committee shall be authorized to act in concert or cooperation with any other committee of the Congress having similar objectives, or with any committee appointed by the President, or with any administrative agencies of the Government. It shall be the duty of the committee to collect such data as will be in the public interest and of benefit to the Congress. The committee shall begin its study, survey, and investigation as soon as practicable, and shall continue such study, survey, and investigation expeditiously and with all possible dispatch, and shall at such times as it may see fit, or the Senate may require, report to the Senate any recommendations it may have for legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON REOCCUPATION AND RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 76), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*Resolved*, That there shall be established within the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations a subcommittee, to consist of not more than seven members, to be appointed by the chairman of the said committee. This subcommittee, which shall be known as the Committee on Reoccupation and Reconstruction, is authorized and directed to study all problems relating to the economic reconstruction and political reorganization of areas reoccupied by the United States or any of its Allies among the United Nations in the more complete and effective organization of the United Nations. The subcommittee shall examine the effectiveness of reconstruction and reoccupation measures currently being undertaken or proposed as to their effectiveness in winning the war and achieving reconstruction of the reoccupied areas in harmony with the interests of the United States, friendly nations, and minimizing the possibility of future conflict. The subcommittee shall report to the Committee on Foreign Relations, which shall report to the Senate such findings as it may make, from time to time, relating to the problems of reoccupation and reconstruction together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation. For the purpose of this resolution the subcommittee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to borrow from Government agencies and departments such special assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the limits of such funds as shall be set aside for its use by the Committee on Foreign Relations or shall be appropriated to it directly by resolution of the Senate. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $2,500, in addition to the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

### AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 77), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

*Resolved*, That that part of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to cloture (as shown on p. 28 of the Senate Manual) is amended to read as follows:

"If there is presented to the Senate at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate (1) upon a motion to take up a measure, together with any and all points of order against such measure, or (2) upon any pending measure, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"If such question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting in the case of any such motion to take up a measure, together with any and all points of order against such measure, then such measure shall be deemed to be the unfinished business.

"If such question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting in the case of any such motion to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure, then such measure shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of. Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the pending measure, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 72, submitted today by Mr. MCKELLAR, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 72) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 71, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 71) submitted today by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Education and Labor, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which

shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask that we have order in the Senate. I had difficulty in hearing what the resolutions submitted by the Senator from Illinois referred to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McNARY. I wish to ask the able Senator from Illinois whether the resolutions reported by him are the formal resolutions which are presented at the beginning of each session of the Congress?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, they are. I will say to the distinguished minority leader that all the resolutions which the committee has reported favorably have placed a limitation of $5,000 on the amount of money each committee can expend, with the exception of three resolutions dealing with three committees, which I am now about to submit, which would place the limitation of $10,000 each upon those three committees. Those committees are the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Banking and Currency. The work of those three committees is of such a voluminous nature that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate deemed it advisable to increase the appropriations for those committees from $5,000 to $10,000.

Mr. McNARY. I think the explanation made by the Senator from Illinois is very wholesome. Did the full Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate pass upon the policy referred to by the Senator?

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Oregon repeat the question?

Mr. McNARY. The matter, as I understand, was presented to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and it is, as I understand, the policy of that committee for this year to grant three of the committees of the Senate $10,000 and other committees of the Senate $5,000?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. The majority of the committee agrees to that policy.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his statement.

### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. LUCAS. With the explanation I have just made, Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 36, dealing with the expenses of the Committee on Finance, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 36), which had been submitted by Mr. GEORGE on the 11th instant.

The amendments were, in line 8, after the word "Senate," to insert "and", and, in line 13, after the word "committee", to insert "(which shall not exceed $10,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Finance, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized to sit during the sessions or recesses of the Seventy-eighth Congress at such times and places as it may deem advisable; to make investigations into internal revenue, customs, and other matters within its jurisdiction, and to compile and prepare statistics and documents relating thereto as directed from time to time by the Senate and as may be necessary; and to report from time to time to the Senate the result thereof; to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ such expert, stenographic, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary; and all the expenses of such committee (which shall not exceed $10,000) shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 42 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been submitted by Mr. WAGNER on the 11th instant.

The amendments were, in line 11, after the word "expert", to insert a comma; and in line 12, after the word "hereof", to insert "(which shall not exceed $10,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized to sit during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress at such times and places as it may deem advisable, to make investigation into all matters within its jurisdiction, and to compile and prepare statistics and documents relating thereto as directed from time to time by the Senate and as may be necessary, and to report in due course to the Senate the result thereof; to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ such expert, stenographic, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary; and all the expenses incurred in pursuance hereof (which shall not exceed $10,000) shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 53, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been submitted by Mr. McKELLAR (for Mr. GLASS) on the 14th instant.

The amendments were, in line 6, to strike out the word "before" and to insert "referred to", and in line 7, after the word "thereof", to insert a comma and "which shall not exceed $10,000", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Appropriations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the expense thereof, which shall not exceed $10,000, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

### HOW WE CAN MEET WAR DEBTS—AND LIVE BETTER—ARTICLE BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by the Vice President entitled "How We Can Meet War Debts—And Live Better," from PM's Daily Picture Magazine of January 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

### TENNESSEE SENATORS, BY SENATOR McKELLAR—REVIEW BY WILL P. KENNEDY

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a review by Will P. Kennedy in the Washington Star of January 10, 1943, of the work Tennessee Senators, by Senator McKELLAR, which appears in the Appendix.]

### ACTING GOVERNOR GOODLAND'S FIRST MESSAGE TO THE 1943 WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the first message to the 1943 Wisconsin Legislature delivered by Acting Gov. Walter S. Goodland, on January 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

### MARYLAND'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR EFFORT—ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. MILTON A. RECKORD

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord in Baltimore, Md., January 11, 1943, on the subject Maryland's Contribution to the War Effort, which appears in the Appendix.]

### THE VICTORY TAX

[Mr. BILBO, on behalf of Mr. HILL, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Alabama Baptist of January 7, 1943, dealing with the Victory tax, which appears in the Appendix.]

### NOMINATION OF EDWARD J. FLYNN TO BE MINISTER TO AUSTRALIA—EXCERPTS FROM BROADCAST BY EARL GODWIN

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a radio broadcast by Earl Godwin on January 15, 1943, dealing with the nomination of Edward Flynn to be Minister to Australia, which appears in the Appendix.]

### POST-WAR PLANNING FOR THE WEST—ARTICLE BY REX NICHOLSON

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on post-war planning for the West written by Rex Nicholson, regional director of the Federal Works Agency for 11 Western States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOBODY'S BUSINESS—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Nobody's Business" written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

FORWARD AMERICA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BROOKS

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by him to the Traffic Club of Chicago at the Forward America dinner at the Palmer House, Chicago, on January 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

EMPLOYMENT OF WAR PRODUCTION BOARD DOLLAR-A-YEAR PERSONNEL

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum from the Food Distribution Administration, Department of Agriculture, entitled "Director's Memorandum No. 39, Policy on the Employment of War Production Board Dollar-a-Year Personnel Transferred to the Food Distribution Administration," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SANCTITY OF THE LAW—SERMON BY REV. IGNATIUS SMITH

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon by Rev. Ignatius Smith, O. P., dean, school of philosophy, Catholic University of America, at the Red Mass, at the Immaculate Conception Shrine, January 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTION OF THE AVERAGE CITIZEN TO WINNING THE WAR

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from James W. Shoemaker, secretary of the Charleston (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce, regarding little business, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAX PLAN—EDITORIAL IN THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Anybody Lose by Ruml Plan?", dealing with the proposed pay-as-you-go method of Federal income-tax collection, published in the Washington, D. C., Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIRST THINGS FIRST—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "First Things First" written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of January 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXPANSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several editorials in support of an expanded social-security program, which appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF WORKWEEK

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the heading of "Subjects on the table" on the calendar I find Senate bill 237, a bill to provide that the workweek established by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 shall temporarily be extended from 40 hours to 48 hours, introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I do not understand why the bill, which should be referred to a legislative committee, was placed on the calendar under the heading of "Subjects on the table." The bill should have been referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. The Senator from Kansas is not in the Chamber at the moment. I understand that he asked that the bill be placed on the table; but that is not the course which the bill should take.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not recall the reasons assigned by the able Senator from Kansas, who introduced the bill, for suggesting that it be placed on the table. Of course, it should be referred to the committee having general jurisdiction over a bill of that nature. Is the subject matter in the form of a bill or a resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is Senate bill 237. It is not a resolution. I have been informed privately that the reason why the able Senator from Kansas asked that the bill be placed on the table was that he desired to make some remarks with reference to it. He may do so anyway. I am willing to withhold any motion until the able Senator from Kansas is present. Obviously, the bill should be referred to the proper committee.

Mr. McNARY. There is no doubt that the bill must finally be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor which has jurisdiction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The fact that the bill has been ordered to lie on the table does not preclude its reference to the appropriate committee.

Mr. McNARY. In view of the absence of the able Senator from Kansas, I ask that the bill remain in statu quo until he returns.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to that course. I called the matter to the attention of the Senate in order that the bill might not be regarded as having a status under which it could properly be taken up at the present time merely because it lies on the table.

Mr. McNARY. No, Mr. President; it would not have that status at all.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business having been concluded, the calendar under rule VIII is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with. The bills appearing on the calendar were reported only last Thursday, and some Senators may wish to examine them more thoroughly. I do not know of any good reason for calling the calendar today.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I join in the request. Until a few minutes ago I did not know that any bills were on the calendar and I should like to have an opportunity to inspect them. I hope that consideration of the bills on the calendar will go over until Thursday.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, there is no objection to that. If I correctly recall, all the bills on the calendar were passed by the Senate at the last session of Congress, but they failed of passage by the House. There is no particular reason for considering them today. However, I should like to have them considered on Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 5, 1943.

This particular editorial refers to a resolution which I first introduced in the Senate on October 22, 1942, and which I reintroduced on January 7, 1943. The author of the Plain Dealer editorial is so grievously in error in connection with this proposal that I desire to refer to the editorial very briefly.

In the first place, my proposal was not defeated in the last Congress, and in the second place, it is not a measure "to assist in the prosecution of the war." I have previously, on the Senate floor and elsewhere, insisted that this measure—and those who read the proposal would quickly understand—is not intended to "assist in the prosecution of the war," nor is it a proposal to investigate the "conduct of the war." Military strategy rests—and must rest—with the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and the officers of those services.

At some later time I shall discuss the aforementioned resolution at some length, but I believe that I should, for the sake of the Plain Dealer—and the record—correct this misunderstanding at this time.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROLE OF CONGRESS

The intention of Senator FRANCIS MALONEY, of Connecticut, to reintroduce a bill, defeated in the last Congress, which would set up a bipartisan congressional committee "to assist in the prosecution of the war" is in line with the post-election opinion that the Seventy-eighth Congress should have a good deal more to say about the conduct of the war than the Seventy-seventh had.

There is danger inherent both in the bill and the point of view. Certainly it was never intended that the Congress should be responsible for strategy or have more than an intelligent insight into the military aspects of war.

The actual conduct of the war should and must remain in the hands of the President, who is Commander in Chief. It is to be hoped that he will choose his counselors and advisers wisely and in matters of strategy will be guided by the judgments of those who by training and experience are best qualified to formulate them.

Congress should have no voice, for example, in deciding where or when any military operation should be undertaken. In the first instance it is impossible for Congress to act with the secrecy required by successful military operations; in the second, congressional decisions cannot be reached with the expedition which so often is the essence of such operations.

In matter of supply, on the other hand, Congress has very definite obligations and responsibilities. Whether in the present set-up at Washington, with so much of the activity on the home front in the hands of such agencies as the War Production Board, the Manpower Commission, and the Office of Price Administration, Congress should initiate policies or should wait for guidance from the heads of these war agencies is a moot question.

Certainly Congress should function as a watchdog, and when it becomes apparent that the executive departments and administrative agencies created by the President for prosecuting the war on the home front are not functioning effectively and in the broad public interest, should intervene.

There are two situations which, in our opinion, call for early action at the hands of Congress because of the failure of the executive department to adopt and pursue policies on the home front commensurate with the gravity of the war emergency.

The first of these has to do with the financing of the war. No one familiar with war financial measures and policies would contend for a second that the Secretary of the Treasury and his advisers have given the Nation sound leadership in fiscal matters in the last year or have lent their support to fiscal policies of the kind and character required by the present and prospective rate of expenditures.

In the face of this admitted fact the appropriate committees of the two Houses should act on their own. There is nothing in the record of Secretary Morgenthau to suggest that his counsel will be useful in the future. He has obviously preconceived notions both of raising most tax revenues by imposing heavy burdens on business and on persons of large means, and of the adequacy of a purely voluntary borrowing program from which apparently he will not recede. Still obviously unconvinced of the dangers inherent in heavy dependence on the commercial banks for funds with which to finance the war, the Secretary of the Treasury has impeded and will probably continue to impede the progress of sound financial policies. The sooner the Congress takes cognizance of this probability the better.

There is much to indicate also that the executive department of the Government has no intention of dealing firmly with the labor problem. It held out consistently against any legislation restricting the rights of organized labor in the first year of war and despite the lip service it has paid to over-all wage ceilings its agencies find excuses almost daily for authorizing wage increases, thus adding to the dangers of inflation and, still worse, supporting the impression which is widely entertained that it is the policy of the administration to protect labor against any war sacrifices or any reduction in real wages.

Here, then, is another place for congressional policy determination, and probably for legislative enactment. There are doubtless others. Certainly others will present themselves as the year advances.

The effectiveness of the new Congress, then, will be determined largely by the wisdom it displays in stepping into situations in which the executive departments and the administrative agencies have bogged down and in steering clear of the problems and situations which obviously can be dealt with only by the Commander in Chief, with the aid of his military and staff advisers.

## GEN. ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, tomorrow, January 19, will be the one hundred and thirty-sixth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Robert E. Lee, the beloved hero of the Southland, and, as the Senate will probably not be in session tomorrow, I should like to take a moment to pay him respect and honor and reflect the esteem in which he is held by North, South, East, and West.

General Lee, if he were living today, would in this terrible conflict impress upon us all that we should do our duty without thought of self. Duty was to him his very lifeblood, and his Christian character, tolerance, temperance, integrity, and fidelity to the truth should be an inspiration to all of us.

As a part of my remarks I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a brief sketch of the life of General Lee written by my secretary, Hal P. Phillips.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF ROBERT E. LEE

(By Hal P. Phillips)

Robert E. Lee, fourth son of Gen. Henry Lee (known in history as Light Horse Harry Lee) and the third son of Anne Carter, his second wife, was born January 19, 1807, at Stratford, Westmoreland County, Va., about a mile from the south bank of the Potomac River.

As a youth, as a young man, and all through life he was an ardent admirer of Gen. George Washington, and it is said one could not fail to note the strong resemblance of his character in its strength, its poise, and its rounded completeness to that of Washington.

In 1825, at the age of 18, he entered West Point as one of Virginia's representatives. It is said that Andrew Jackson, then United States Senator from Tennessee, to whom he applied in person, was responsible for his appointment to the academy.

In a class of 46 Lee graduated second with the extraordinary distinction of not having received a demerit. He and Joseph E. Johnston entered the academy as classmates and here a friendship was formed that was never impaired.

June 30, 1831, he married Miss Mary Parke Custis, granddaughter of General Washington's stepson. Seven children were born to them, all of whom grew up—two adopted the profession of arms and rose to the rank of major general in the Confederate Army.

After graduating from the Military Academy he was assigned to the engineers. His first service was in Virginia, where he was engaged on seacoast defense, an experience greatly helpful later on when he was called to construct coast defenses of the Carolinas.

When the bloody Negro uprising known as the Nat Turner rebellion occurred, he was stationed nearby at Fortress Monroe. The important mission of quelling this rebellion—in which he succeeded—was entrusted to him.

In 1834 he was assigned to Washington as assistant to the Chief Engineer of the Army; in 1836 he was promoted to the rank of first lieutenant and in 1838 to the rank of captain.

When the Mississippi River, owing to a gradual change in its banks, threatened the city of St. Louis, he was sent by General Scott to take charge, and although the city withdrew its appropriation because of his methodical way, the young engineer succeeded.

In 1842 he was assigned to Fort Hamilton, where for several years he was engaged in improving defenses of New York Harbor. Two years later he was appointed on the Board of Visitors of the United States Military Academy. His efficient service thereon prepared him for the position of superintendent of the academy later on—1852.

During the Mexican War Lee, starting in as an engineer officer on the staff of General Wool, achieved more renown than any other soldier of his rank, and possibly more than any other officer in the army of invasion except the Commander in Chief. He became General Scott's chief of staff, and between the two was cemented a friendship which even the Civil War could not destroy. His scouts and reconnaissances at Cerro Gordo, Contreras, Churubusco, and Chapultepec brought him the brevets of major at Cerro Gordo and of colonel at Chapultepec September 13. General Scott declared that he was the "very best soldier he ever saw in the field."

Such, in brief, was Col. Robert E. Lee when at the age of 54 he found the storm of civil war on the verge of bursting upon the country.

April 17, 1861, Virginia seceded from the Union; and 3 days later, April 20, Colonel Lee resigned his commission in the United States Army. To his sister, whose husband and son espoused the Union cause, he wrote: "With all my devotion to the Union and the feeling of loyalty and duty of an American citizen, I have not been able to make up my mind to raise my hand against my relatives, my children, my home. I have, therefore, resigned my commission in the Army; and save in defense of my native State, with the sincere hope that my poor services may never be needed, I hope I may never be called on to draw my sword."

As he wrote his son April 5, 1852: "Do your duty in all things like the old Puritan. You cannot do more; you should never wish to do less. Duty is, then, the sublimest word in our language." So for 4 years he followed duty with the constancy of the northern star:

"Of whose true, fixed, and lasting quality,
There is no fellow in the firmament."

After the war, although tendered positions carrying with them large salaries, General Lee accepted the presidency of Washington College at a salary of $1,500 a year—October 2, 1865.

At the age of 63, October 12, 1870, General Lee passed away and was buried in the little mountain town of Lexington, in the valley of Virginia, where he lived and where he died.

"A prince once said of a monarch slain,
'Taller he seems in death.'"

## PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, it is my intention to speak briefly on a bill which I intend to introduce soon in the Seventy-eighth Congress. It is an exact copy of Senate bill 860, which was introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress by my predecessor, the late Senator Morris Sheppard, except that my bill omits that part of Senate bill 860 which deals with vice in and around Army reservations, because that part of Senate bill 860 has already been enacted into law. My proposed bill seeks to enact into law only the remainder of Senate bill 860, which has not yet been enacted. It reads as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the interest of the common defense no person, corporation, partnership, or association shall sell, supply, give, or have in his or its possession any alcoholic liquors, including beer, ale, or wine at or within any military camp, station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training or mobilization place which is being used at the time for military purposes, but the Secretary of War may make regulations permitting the sale and use of alcoholic liquors for medicinal purposes. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating the provisions of this section or any orders, rules, or regulations made by proper authority thereunder shall unless otherwise punishable under the Articles of War be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000 and/or imprisonment for not less than 30 days nor more than 12 months.

SEC. 2. That in the interest of the common defense it shall be unlawful within such reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training, or mobilization place as the Secretary of War shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy and shall designate in

general orders or bulletins for any person, corporation, partnership, or association to sell, supply, give, or have in his or its possession any alcoholic liquors, including beer, ale, or wine. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating the provisions of this section or any orders, rules, or regulations made by proper authority thereunder shall, unless otherwise punishable under the Articles of War, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000 and/or imprisonment for not less than 30 days nor more than 12 months.

SEC. 3. In construing the foregoing sections of this act, the word "Army" shall extend to and include "Navy"; the word "military" shall include "naval"; "Articles of War" shall include "articles for the government of the Navy"; the words "military camp, station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training, or mobilization place" shall include such places under naval jurisdiction as may correspond to the aforenamed places under military jurisdiction. The powers conferred under this act upon the Secretary of War are hereby conferred upon the Secretary of the Navy with regard to the naval service. The words "Navy" and "naval" shall include the Marine Corps. The aviation units of both the military and naval service shall be subject to the provisions of this act.

Mr. President, I wish to explain the urgent need of this legislation. We are now engaged in the most horrible war the world has ever witnessed. All our selfish interests and personal likes and dislikes should be abandoned for the duration, and we should concentrate all our might and main on one thing, and one thing only, and that one thing is the winning of this war. This bill is strictly a war measure. It has absolutely no relationship whatever with the highly controversial subject of national prohibition. Let us then discuss it and consider it solely from the standpoint of a war measure.

I believe almost everybody agrees on three things: First, a man is less efficient when he is intoxicated; second, he cannot become intoxicated except by drinking liquor; third, he cannot drink liquor if it is not obtainable.

My bill is, therefore, positive assurance that our armed forces will not be intoxicated in any degree while on duty, because it prohibits the possession of liquor on Army reservations. Certainly, with our Nation and everything we hold dear hanging in the balance, this is no time to theorize or to trifle. We must eliminate all possible hazards. My bill completely eliminates one hazard—liquor.

My bill is based on at least three sound fundamental principles:

First. It will place Government workshops and training schools on Army reservations in exactly the same category with all successful civilian factories and schools. Practically every successful civilian factory or training school in America prohibits liquor to be sold on the premises or consumed by employees or students on duty. Upon that sound fundamental principle America has been built into the greatest commercial nation on earth. This bill will impose on the personal liberties of soldiers no restrictions that are not now imposed by rules upon civilian employees while on duty. While off duty, soldiers and civilians alike may buy liquor from legally established stores, and may drink it if they desire.

Second. My bill includes the sound fundamental principle so strongly advocated by most businessmen—that of keeping the Government out of active business competition with private enterprise. By prohibiting the sale of liquor on Government reservations, the legally established private liquor stores outside the Government reservations will enjoy the business. The privately owned establishments have their money invested in property, pay their licenses and taxes, and are, therefore, entitled to some protection from the competition of the Government which they help support by paying license fees and taxes.

Third. The third sound fundamental principle contained in my bill is to simplify management on the Army reservations and to reduce the cost of operation. Every business manager knows that eliminating unnecessary activities reduces operation costs and gives more time to devote to the major purposes. My bill lifts the liquor business, its supervision, and enforcement out of the Army camps, thereby eliminating that expense and leaving more time for all men to devote to the major purpose of the Army—the winning of the war.

My bill goes further than that. It recognizes that in some instances it is just or necessary that such helpful regulations be established in certain areas adjacent to Army reservations. So the bill provides that in such cases the Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy will have legal authority to establish such areas. Certainly they are the public officials to whom such authority should be delegated. Upon their shoulders rests the responsibility of maintaining the efficiency, health, and welfare of our armed forces. Therefore, along with those duties and responsibilities should also go the legal authority to do the things necessary to carry out their duties. It is not certain that they now possess that authority. My bill will give them that authority, beyond any doubt.

Mr. President, it is well known that our present Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy have opposed the enactment of this legislation. I can easily understand why any public official might prefer that no additional responsibilities be placed upon him, especially responsibilities as grave as these. But some public officials should have this grave responsibility placed squarely upon their shoulders, and I know of no more appropriate persons upon whom to impose it than the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War.

Suppose, before this bill is enacted, that some terrible catastrophe should occur due directly to conditions which this bill would have prevented. Who would share the blame? The Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy certainly could not be blamed. In my opinion, nobody except the Members of Congress could be blamed for having failed to center the responsibility upon some specific person or persons.

Under these conditions it is only natural that opposition to this legislation should come from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. But, according to our form of government, Mr. President, I believe Congress should be guided by the voice of the people who elected us to office, not by the voice of public officials who hold office only by appointment and are not the elected representatives of the people. I am a strong advocate of the theory upon which this Government was founded—namely, that the people are the masters and the public officials are the servants. I fear that too many Washington bureaucrats of the present day who show signs of wanting to dictate to Congress have the opposite view, and that they believe public officials are the masters and that the people are the servants.

We also find opposition to this legislation now showing up in the form of propaganda issued by the Office of War Information. This agency recently detoured from its duty of passing out war information to the public, and issued a 16-page epistle. The Office of War Information failed to title the article, but it has been titled by the journal of the liquor industry, Tap and Tavern, in their editorial of January 4, 1943, as follows: "An Answer to the Liquor Industry's Prayer." Mr. President, is it not characteristic that the liquor interests would embellish their ally's concoction with sacrilege? I shall not take time here to discuss all the false statements or inconsistencies contained in the article titled by the liquor industry's journal, "An Answer to the Liquor Industry's Prayer."

On page 1 the report states:

> There is not excessive drinking among troops and drinking does not constitute a serious problem.

On page 9 it states:

> General Marshall, in July 1942, ordered that military police be stationed on all trains and at all depots habitually used by military personnel. Because of the shortage of military police, this order is not yet completely in effect, but 1,935 men will soon be detailed exclusively to these duties.

So, Mr. President, during this period of serious manpower shortage we have 1,935 able-bodied men assigned exclusively to the policing of troops on trains, at a cost of approximately $6,000,000 a year of our heavily burdened taxpayers' money, although the report says, "Drinking does not constitute a serious problem."

Only fragmentary parts of the voluminous report were quoted by most newspapers, but intertwined in the report are statements that near 1 camp 16 soldiers were arrested in 1 night for drunkenness; 5 in another. In another camp in 1 month there were 18 courts martial for soldiers charged with intoxication; 14 in another; 16 in another; 23 in another. In another town 900 men a month were being sent back to camp in custody of military police, and in the past the number has run as high as 900 a week. The report says that in 1 camp there were 404 arrests for minor offenses in 1 month, and 508 the next month; and the report further states "minor offenses, for our purposes, can be considered drunkenness." I call attention

to the fact that with all this drunkenness going on and hundreds of arrests being made, as stated in the same report, we are told that "drinking does not constitute a serious problem."

The anonymous gum-soled sleuths of O. W. I. who reportedly strode over 12,000 miles of territory during this tire shortage emergency and strict gasoline rationing period to write the Answer to the Liquor Industry's Prayer, evidently missed Sheppard Field at Wichita Falls, Tex.—the field named in honor of the author of S. 860. A humble citizen from that district wrote me under date of December 29, 1942, as follows:

I attended a funeral in Wichita Falls back when Sheppard Field first opened and the police told my husband that the night before they put 50 drunken soldiers in jail.

Since that time conditions became so bad under the management of those who oppose S. 860 that a public election was held, and an indignant and outraged public citizenship, who had high respect and sincere consideration for the welfare of our brave and noble boys in uniform, outlawed liquor in that entire county for the benefit of our boys in armed service.

Mr. President, I read the following, from page 4 of this sheet known as the Answer to the Liquor Industry's Prayer:

It is legal for a civilian to take a drink in this country; it would be discriminatory to deny the same right to the soldier who has already relinquished many privileges the civilian considers his rights.

Take notice of that logic, if you will, and then listen to the paragraph which immediately follows that statement, reading as follows:

Enlisted men and noncommissioned officers may not possess hard liquor on a Government reservation and this regulation is stringently enforced.

Inconsistency, thou art a jewel. In one breath the statement is made that it would be discriminatory to permit civilians to drink liquor and deny the right to soldiers, and in the next breath the statement that enlisted men and noncommissioned men may not possess hard liquor on a Government reservation. What do they have, Mr. President? An Army club where only a favored few officers may indulge? My bill would straighten out that inconsistency and remove all discrimination.

I will not take time here to point out various other inconsistencies in the 15-page document titled "An Answer to the Liquor Industry's Prayer," published by our Government at Government expense, but I will say that about the only way it could have been made more ridiculous than it is would have been for it to have been prepared by the editors of the defunct old Literary Digest. The report, in my opinion, falls into the category of pure propaganda, issued for the sole purpose of trying to influence public opinion. It so happens, however, that there are a great many people living around our Army camps, some of whom have relatives in those camps, who know that conditions are not as outlined in this report.

As an example, I refer Senators to the front page of the Hugo Daily News, of Hugo, Okla., dated December 30, 1942. In the second column is a news item date-lined Washington, D. C., reading in part as follows:

The American Army drinks beer and whisky conservatively and is the best-behaved Army in the world, Office of War Information said today in a comprehensive report on drinking conditions in and around training camps and posts. * * * Soda pop, said the report, is the favorite drink in Army camps.

On the same front page in the fourth column is this news:

A total of 288 arrests of soldiers for drunkenness in Hugo last week end was reported by Lieutenant Smith, Camp Maxey provost marshal. Unless sales of liquor in Hugo and elsewhere in the country are curbed sufficiently to bring about a marked improvement of this situation next week end, which will be immediately after pay day at Camp Maxey, the Army's answer will be "Hugo off limits" on that score.

It would seem to me that the people in and around Hugo could have very little confidence in any reports put out by O. W. I., in view of this report to their own knowledge being so far from a correct statement of the actual conditions existing there. The same may apply to people around Army camps all over this Nation who are familiar with true conditions. I am of the opinion that this war is too serious a problem to be used as an excuse for a Government agency to publish "an answer to the liquor industry's prayer."

This deadly war is indeed a serious war. The brave soldiers in the ranks realize it is serious. The families who have dear ones at the battle front realize it is serious, and the heartbroken Gold Star Mothers and others who have lost their dear ones in battle realize it is serious. Yet, I ask you, Do the liquor interests view this war from a different standpoint—from a profit-motive viewpoint? They have said an official Government document is "an answer to the liquor industry's prayer." They have also stated that they consider the regimentation and concentration of teen-age boys as an opportunity to increase the volume and profits of the liquor traffic. To substantiate that I quote from another liquor editorial in the Brewers Digest, published at Beloit, Wis., as follows:

One of the finest things that could have happened to the brewing industry was the insistence by high-ranking Army officers to make beer available at Army camps. * * * The opportunity presented to the brewing industry by this measure is obvious.

Commenting on the attitude of the Army authorities, the editorial proceeds:

Here is a chance for brewers to cultivate a taste for beer in millions of young men who will eventually constitute the largest beer-consuming section of our population.

That article proves the true character of the men engaged in this hellish liquor traffic, and establishes their brand of patriotism—the brand that looks upon this bloody war as a means of increasing their volume of liquor business and greedy profits. Mr. President, brushing aside all the alibis and manufactured statistics and getting down to bedrock, everyone knows that this business of selling booze either to military or civilian customers is only a game to make money. Reason tells us that if we were to take the profit out of the booze racket, nobody would continue in that business very long. I ask, Why should our Government back such a nefarious and degenerating business just for the purpose of enabling a few conscienceless money-grasping individual booze manufacturers and dealers to make profits?

Let us look a little further into this nefarious liquor traffic, fostered, condoned, encouraged, and engaged in by our Federal Government. We boast of our democracy, our freedom, and our liberty. Then, to counteract our song of freedom and liberty, we drown it out by our actions. Good Christian people who oppose liquor and all the evil akin to it, have by law established dry counties or States. There these freedom-loving and liberty-loving fathers and mothers have reared their families, bringing up their boys and girls in a clean, Christian environment. Then comes the war. Their teen-age boys, before becoming old enough to vote, are drafted into the armed service and taken from their clean, wholesome surroundings and forced to live where liquor is sold and drunk freely. At that impressionable age, when the habits of those teen-age boys are so susceptible to character-deteriorating influences, they are deprived of the tender care and protective guidance of their fathers and mothers, and entrusted to the care of their Uncle Sam. And, I ask, What does their Uncle Sam do? He sets up a saloon right in the reservation where these teen-age boys are forced to live. This thing of getting our teen-age boys away from their good, clean Christian homes and Christian parents, and placing them in liquor-infested Army camps and Army reservations, is recognized and acknowledged as a big boon to the booze business by the liquor manufacturers, and they are advertising that fact through their publications and other means of publicity. They gloat over the fact that high officials in this Government have given them what they refer to as "the answer to the liquor industry's prayer."

To show further how unfair these liquor interests are in using the war effort as a means of profit, let me point out that they are not even fair with each other. Listen to this quotation from a letter I received from the president of a large brewing company:

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: May we bring to your attention the fact that practically all the beer for the armed forces in foreign service, for lend-lease shipments, and for the various service cantonments in this country, is purchased from 5 or 6 favored breweries. Considering that there are 488 breweries in the United States, do you not think that this distribution of Government business is a little out of proportion?

We are not being honored with any of this business and are thus petitioning you solely in the interests of fair play and just representation.

That, Mr. President, is a letter from a large brewing company accusing our Government of showing partiality to the extent of virtually giving to 5 or 6 breweries a complete monopoly on the

beer business in Army camps, in all our foreign service, and in lend-lease shipments, and shutting out 482 or 483 of the 488 breweries in this Nation. If such conditions as are stated by the president of this brewing company exist, it indicates that this booze racket in Army camps is almost a closed shop. It looks like the little fellows in the brewing industry are locked out.

The brewers recognize that the business is valuable and worth fighting for, and it looks like they are staging a successful battle and a profitable one. In this time of emergency, when people are being called upon to curb their appetites and desires, let us bring out the records and show that the liquor interests are actually increasing their sales. During the fiscal year July 1, 1940, to July 1, 1941, the consumption of domestic distilled spirits, indicated by tax-paid withdrawals, and not including withdrawals of spirits produced at industrial alcohol plants, was 102,685,625 gallons. For the fiscal year July 1, 1941, to July 1, 1942, including about 7 months of war, the consumption was 119,277,575 gallons. That shows an increase of 16,591,950 gallons, according to Internal Revenue Bureau figures.

Let us now examine the beer record. In the fiscal year July 1, 1940, to July 1, 1942, the tax-paid withdrawals for conliquors for consumption amounted to 1,636,774,611 gallons, and in the following fiscal year, July 1, 1941, to July 1, 1942, the tax-paid withdrawals for consumption were 1,884,243,457 gallons, or an increase for the year of 247,468,846 gallons.

While this wild orgy of increased liquor consumption continues during our serious war crisis, encouraged by the selfish liquor gang and by our Federal Government, the Government of our sister nation to the north of us recognizes that we are in an all-out war, and recognizes that liquor will not help win the war, so on December 16, 1942, the Canadian Government reduced the amounts of liquor for sale 10 percent on beer, 20 percent on wine, and 30 percent on spirituous liquors. They also reduced the alcoholic content of spirituous liquors to a maximum of 30 percent under proof. They also prohibited the fortification of wine with distilled spirits. The Canadian Government also appealed to the Provinces to reduce the hours of sale to a maximum of 8 hours per day, which meant a cut of 8 hours a day in operation of Ontario beverage rooms.

The Canadian Government also appealed to the public for full cooperation in the Government's wartime temperance program. Contrast, if you will, this action by the Canadian Government with the action of our Government through Office of War Information issuing the statement of December 30, 1942, which the liquor interests titled "An Answer to the Liquor Industry's Prayer."

The Canadian Government has made and will make appeals to the public for full cooperation, and appeals for leadership to set an example.

In America there has been no official Government appeal for temperance in 10 years.

As far-reaching as the Canadian policy is, the reasons given for it are even more inclusive.

Premier King contended to the Canadian people that the plan would do much to make possible a total war effort, impossible under the old plan. He said the increased consumption of all liquor necessitated the action. Absenteeism and inefficiency in war work and many industrial accidents—in one Province alone equal to an entire army division—were the result of the old system of unrestricted drinking, which is the continuing American system.

Apparently the only political connotation to the new move was the Premier's warning that aside from all the evils the Government charged against unrestricted sale was the obvious resentment people were showing at the taverns continuing as usual when everywhere else, in their homes, in industries, and so forth, the people were making tremendous sacrifices in the war effort.

But the most startling ban established by the Canadian Government in its effort to help win the war is that on liquor advertising. While the brewers and distillers in the United States will spend upward of $28,000,000 in advertising in 1943, in Canada not one penny will be permitted to be expended in advertising liquor after February 1.

Contrast the Canadian ban on liquor advertising during wartime, Mr. President, with the radio programs which clutter up the air waves of this Nation urging people to be patriotic and help win the war by drinking one large bottle containing three times as much liquor as one small bottle in order to save metal caps for Uncle Sam to use in the winning of the war. This and other utterly disgusting practices by the money-crazed liquor interests is fast turning a war-worried and heartbroken American citizenship away from tolerating this foolish, demoralizing liquor traffic. This type of advertising rides the air waves and forces its unwelcome propaganda into pure Christian homes in dry territory, where the radios happen to be tuned to these radio stations. There it sows the seeds of corruption and crime in the minds of the youth of our Nation.

Federal Judge Patrick T. Stone, of Wisconsin's western district, says:

> From my experience on the bench, I have concluded that more boys and girls go bad because of drink than for any other reason. Drink quickly leads to all forms of dishonor.

Arthur James Todd, professor of sociology at Northwestern University, said in an interview:

> Just why the liquor traffic should be allowed to pyramid its tremendous waste onto the tax burdens of the country in a time of such emergency as the present program demands is an enigma to those American people who are concerned for human welfare and for the conservation of national resources.
>
> And as to the hue and cry that taxes would be even higher if the liquor revenue were withdrawn, that is complete folly. The estimated billion dollars that the liquor traffic pays annually to the Federal, State, and local government out of its customers' pocket is but a drop in a hogshead as compared with what, because of liquor, is being doled out in relief for funds, unemployment insurance, accident and sick benefits, hospitalization, care of mental and physical wrecks—women as well as men—and liquor-caused crime.
>
> What are beer-caused mistakes in the Army costing the people in defense taxes?
>
> Who will ever know?

Many people are so thoroughly disgusted with the lack of consideration given S. 860 during the Seventy-seventh Congress that unless some reasonable legislation such as this bill calls for is enacted very soon, in my opinion, there may be such a strong revolt that national prohibition legislation may be reenacted. The fact of the matter is that national prohibition exists right now. Prohibition is now in effect on dozens of articles. Our Government has a police force attempting to prevent bootlegging in gasoline, rubber tires, sugar, meat, and dozens of other articles. We do not now need to enact a national prohibition law exclusively against liquor. All that is necessary is to add liquor to the list of articles already prohibited or rationed.

Public indignation over the liquor interests' activity during this terrible war is all that is needed to add liquor to the list.

Further to substantiate my remarks concerning this growing resentment against this liquor traffic, I wish to read the following letter which was recently written and distributed by the liquor industry of Washington, D. C., in the Beverage Bulletin.

> NOVEMBER 9, 1942.
>
> *To All Those Who Want To Keep the Alcoholic Beverage Business Alive:*
>
> We have just seen the United States Senate defeat the Lee amendment to the draft bill which would have made possible the imposition of prohibition upon a large part of the country.
>
> With the rest of the industry and with the President and high commanders of the Army and Navy who led the fight against the amendment we rejoice in its defeat because if it had been adopted this amendment would have led the country back to intolerable conditions.
>
> Since the amendment has been defeated it behooves all those interested in preserving legal liquor to give thought to the amendment, to the strength that its proponents showed, to the reasons for its advancement, and to the reasons for its defeat.
>
> Many of those in the industry who were scared almost to death while the amendment was pending have become tremendously brave since its defeat.
>
> Many who quaked before the vote now are going around saying "I told you so" and, incidentally, adding that the defeat of the Lee amendment, shows that this country can't go dry.
>
> Many more are claiming that they and they alone are responsible for beating the proposal. Organizations within the trade, both big and little, are each, severally and collectively, asserting that it was their work that beat the amendment.
>
> Press agents and public relations counsels are pointing to their fine work and are using the defeat of the dry program to bolster themselves and their organizations.
>
> The defeat of the Lee amendment carries with it a great danger to the alcoholic beverage industry.

That is the plain and important fact that all of those in the industry who are commenting on the event seem to be overlooking.

The danger lies in the fact that defeat of the amendment may perpetuate the blindness with which the industry seems to be afflicted. And as long as the industry remains blind to conditions as they exist the business is liable to destruction.

The Lee amendment was defeated because common sense still prevails and because the United States Senate had the courage to withstand the demands of a heavy pressure minority.

It was not defeated because the American public or the Senate esteems the alcoholic beverage industry or the method of that industry's conduct. And further, it was not defeated by the adoption by certain industry organizations of semipressure tactics of their own.

This industry cannot afford to sit back and contemplate the defeat of the Lee amendment through rose-colored glasses while telling itself, "Everybody loves me. I'll go along my merry way and nothing will happen to me."

The fact is that despite the beating the Lee amendment took, something, or rather, some things, are going to happen to this industry. Furthermore, they are going to happen within a very short time. And unless the industry does something about it those things will be much more effective in accomplishing its destruction than would be the adoption of a half dozen Lee amendments.

In thinking about the beverage industry these days, it should be borne in mind that it is no longer a manufacturing business. It is purely a selling and buying business.

All of that part of the industry which could be of any possible use in the manufacture of war supplies is at work on that manufacture. We cannot justify the industry on the ground that part of it can be converted to making alcohol for munition purposes. That conversion is an accomplished fact.

The question now arises as to whether in the war program this business can justify the buying and selling of liquors for the manufacture of alcohol would go on even if that buying and selling were prohibited.

We believe that that buying and selling can be and is justified, even under war conditions as they exist at the present time.

But we also believe that certain modifications and changes in the methods of buying and selling alcoholic beverages are essential if the justification of their existence is to be made clear to the general public and to the legislators who will make the final decision on whether we continue to operate or not.

A great many people are in doubt as to the wisdom or desirability of continuing the sale of liquors during the wartime entirely aside from their beliefs about prohibition and temperance.

They are skeptical about the wisdom or desirability of leaving thousands of men and women employed in the liquor business when their services might be put to more useful purpose in other fields of activity.

They are skeptical about the wisdom or desirability of leaving thousands of motor vehicles with rubber tires at the disposal of the liquor business when those tires and those vehicles might be put to serving other purposes.

They are skeptical about the wisdom or desirability of permitting the liquor business to consume thousands of gallons of gasoline and oil when that gasoline and oil might be put to serving more useful purposes.

They are skeptical about the wisdom or desirability of permitting the liquor business to occupy space in stores and warehouses when that space might be used in a direct war effort.

They are skeptical about the wisdom or desirability of permitting the liquor business to use great quantities of materials, such as glass, paper, and caps when such materials consume time of workers in manufacturing.

They are skeptical about the wisdom or desirability of devoting to the liquor business railroad cars and shipping space which might be used for transporting men and freight more necessary to the war effort.

With this skepticism existing not only among the enemies of the business, but among many of its friends, it is obvious that the business exists only on sufferance.

The tendency to permit it to operate will decrease as the war pressure increases and you may rest assured that the war pressure will continue to increase.

Consequently anyone who thinks that the defeat of the Lee amendment ends the peril to the industry is living in a fool's paradise.

The Lee amendment was only the beginning. Furthermore it was probably the weakest pawn that could have been played in the game and it was played at an inappropriate time from the standpoint of the trade's enemies.

The real danger still exists. The real danger still grows.

What is the business doing about this real danger?

The answer is nothing.

That is probably not the complete answer. The business is doing nothing to abate the real danger. It is doing many things to increase that danger.

We are beating the drums for the sale of more liquor. We are waving the banners for greater and greater consumption. We are increasing the waste of manpower and material power in the business along many lines.

We are consuming materials that we don't have to consume We are using more gasoline and oil thar we need to use. We are using more space than we need to use.

And more than that we are shouting to the public that we are using these things while the public knows that we are a nonessential and purely luxury business.

If this business wants to cut down the danger that it finds itself in, if it wants to weather the storm which its own actions are brewing, its course is simple.

It must find a seat in the back of the hall and sit in it and keep quiet.

To carry out that prescription would bring drastic changes.

It would mean the end of all advertising, retail, wholesale, and distiller.

It would mean the end of the display of liquor, in windows, on bars, and everywhere else.

It would mean that we would have liquor for sale and that is all.

The public that wants liquor would find it in its legal place.

The public that doesn't want liquor and, in fact, doesn't want anything that isn't directly helpful to the war effort, wouldn't have liquor flaunted in its face every time it listened to the radio, read a newspaper, or walked down the street.

That is the only way for the industry to meet the real danger to its existence.

Has the industry the courage to meet that challenge and conduct itself on that basis?

Mr. President, that is a letter written by the liquor interests themselves. It is, without doubt, one of the most remarkable self-indictments ever published by the liquor interests. Furthermore, the truth is now known about who started the propaganda to bring about the break-down of enforcement of the prohibition law and later the repeal of national prohibition, and who paid for the campaign, and why. Much of the story is published in the official files of the congressional investigating committee and elsewhere.

According to reliable information, the repeal movement was started by a group of prominent millionaires in this Nation for the purpose of setting up a tax on liquor to replace the income tax. The plan was so appealing to some wealthy people who wanted to dodge the paying of income taxes, and the plan looked so plausible, that large contributions were made to the committee in charge for the purpose of conducting the largest and most comprehensive propaganda program ever conducted up to that time. It worked, and repeal came. But the reward hoped for by those wealthy proponents of the plan failed to materialize. Instead of income taxes decreasing, they have rapidly increased ever since. So have liquor taxes increased. The ever-increasing flood of tax money only sharpened the spending appetite of our Government bureaucrats, and now we have reached a point where taxes are about to devour the wealthy perpetrators of the "repeal plot." Perhaps in due time, and in their respective turn, taxes will also devour the liquor industry and almost all other industries, and will serve to help drag our Nation into a communistic or socialistic state. The liquor business is a wicked business. Because it is such, it will fall of its own wickedness, as did the ancient cities of Sodom and Gomorrah.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let us review the past to gain knowledge that will help guide us during the present serious war crisis.

In the enlightened world of today it is not necessary to guess the answer as to what we should do about liquor. The correct answer to the question is inscribed on all the pages of history since time began. The answer is definitely known. We have over 2,000 years of recorded history to teach us the dire results of the use of liquor. In the Holy Bible we read such admonitions as these:

Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging: and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise.

They shall not drink wine with a song; strong drink shall be bitter to them that drink it.

But they also have erred through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way; the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine, they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble in judgment.

Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright.

At the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder.

Beverage alcohol has played an amazing part in undermining and ultimately bringing about the defeat and collapse of practically every nation that has lost the crucial decision on the field of battle. Liquor has defeated more men, more armies, more nations than any other cause.

Alexander the Great bewailed the fact that there were "no more worlds to conquer." His end came in a carousal at the invitation of Medius. "There," said Plutarch, "he drank all the night and the next day, till at the last he found a fever coming upon him." Alexander conquered the world, but alcohol con-

quered him. He died drunk at the age of 33.

The Romans, in their early years strictly abstemious, undermined and destroyed their great civilization through a period of years of dissipation.

The Normans won the Battle of Hastings, September 28, 1066, during which, as the historian William of Malmsbury tells it, "they passed the night in fasting and prayer," while the Anglo-Saxons devoted the same period to drunkenness and debauch.

On Christmas Eve, 1776, the American troops crossed the Delaware and won the Battle of Trenton when they surprised the Hessian soldiers celebrating the season with drinking and feasting.

The Battle of Waterloo, fought near Brussels in June 1815, proved to be the decisive defeat of Napoleon because Marshal Ney, retiring to his headquarters on the eve of the battle, "fell into a deep and prolonged sleep" after imbibing his favorite Burgundy too freely, and "when he awoke he found himself apparently unable to give orders or to reach any decision."

In March 1918, when the German forces were advancing on Paris, the spearhead of the advance suddenly broke. No one could tell why. What transpired, as afterward officially reported by Prof. Hans Schmidt, of Helle, a commanding officer on the west front, was that—

The French had left a great supply of alcoholic drink as the surest means of retarding the German advance. Two whole divisions were found drunk, ready to be cut down by the Allied troops * * *. The wine-drenched Germans were simply mowed down by the enemy machine guns.

The Crown Prince, acknowledging the receipt of Schmidt's report, said:

If we had not found alcohol, we should have advanced farther than the March offensive. You are right in laying your finger on this painful wound.

George Washington, father of our country, realized the damaging effect of liquor, and had this to say with reference to its use:

The crime of drunkenness is one of hideous aspects and appalling consequences. There is, however, less occasion to discuss this vice, because many pens and tongues have been, of late, actively engaged in displaying its enormity, and holding up its evils to the public view. In all that is said of its guilt, its malignity, and awful effects we entirely concur. It has, indeed, been the unrelenting scourge of our earth, and is now one of the most dreadful curses by which the race is afflicted. It is at this hour one of the most prolific sources of disease, disgrace, poverty, and death, that is known in our world and more than anything else, demands the zeal of the patriot, philanthropist, and Christian, in order to its correction and final extinction. Wise and good men have ever been the uncompromising enemies of the evil practice and habits here detailed. Regarding them as offensive to God and destructive to men, they have held it their duty to condemn their indulgence, and endeavor to arrest their growth and prevalence.

With specific reference to the use of liquor in the Army and the dangers and serious consequences resulting from its use by the soldiers, George Washington, in 1756, issued an order reading in part as follows:

Any soldier found drunk shall receive 100 lashes, without benefit of court martial.

Abraham Lincoln, who led us to victory in the Civil War, said:

The liquor traffic is a cancer in society, eating out its vitals and threatening its destruction. It cannot be regulated, it must be eradicated, for all attempts to regulate it will prove futile.

Stonewall Jackson said:

I never use liquor. I am more afraid of it than of Yankee bullets.

Robert E. Lee said:

My experience through life has convinced me that abstinence from spirituous liquors is the best safeguard to morals and health.

Theodore Roosevelt, who took such a leading role in the Spanish-American War, and offered to volunteer his services in World War No. 1, said:

Neither the men in the Army nor the men engaged in doing vital work for the Army in connection with railroads, factories, mines, and shipyards should be allowed to waste strength and health in drink at this time. The same reasons that render it necessary to prohibit the sale of liquor to soldiers in uniform, or within a given number of miles from a military camp, and to stop its use on battleships, apply to extending similar protection for all citizens engaged in the work of railroads, factories, mines, and shipyards.

I may mention that my sons who are now in the Army in France write me most strongly (just as General Pershing has expressed his public opinion unstintingly) as to the harm done to the men of the Army by permitting the sale of liquor to them, stating that they believe in absolute prohibition for the Army in wartimes—and one of them adding that his experience has made a permanent prohibitionist out of him.

In 1917 Secretary of War Newton D. Baker said:

Our responsibility in this matter is not open to question. We cannot allow these young men, most of whom will have been drafted to service, to be surrounded by a vicious and demoralizing environment, nor can we leave anything undone which will protect them from unhealthy influences and crude forms of temptation.

Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels said during the First World War:

There lies upon us morally, to a degree far outreaching any technical responsibility, the duty of leaving nothing undone to protect these young men from that contamination of their bodies which will not only impair their military efficiency but will blast their lives for the future and return them to their homes a source of danger to their families and to the community at large.

And he said more recently, on November 2, 1942:

The same laws and regulations should be put into effect in this greater war. My experience in 1917–18 justifies me in urging that the Congress act favorably upon a like measure which worked well in that war.

Our great General Pershing, who led the Allied Nations to victory in the First World War, said:

Banish the entire liquor industry from the United States; close every saloon and brewery; suppress drinking by severe punishment to the drinker * * * and the Nation will find itself amazed at its efficiency. * * * I shall not go slow on prohibition for I know what is the greatest foe to my men, greater even than the bullets of the enemy.

On August 24, 1941, a dispatch from Vichy, France, by the United Press, stated:

A Government spokesman said today that alcoholism was the chief cause of the moral collapse of the French Army under the German attack. He said drunkenness was rampant in the Army during the 8 months of inactivity at the start of the war; that a single hospital in the Fourth Army Area had 814 cases of delirium tremens during January, and that the "disastrous area of intoxication" by young French soldiers had caused most of the cases of nervous break-down and shell shock when they had to face the German dive bombers and tanks.

Field Marshal Henry Petain, of France, after the fall of France, said:

Our soldiers were drunk and could not fight.

Dr. Charles E. Maddry, of Richmond, executive secretary of the Southern Baptist Foreign Missionary Board, witnessed the December 7 attack on Pearl Harbor. He is quoted as saying:

On December 6 Honolulu had 4,000 saloons, more than half of them operated by Japanese. Free liquor was served American soldiers and sailors the night before the treacherous Japanese assault. An immediate shut-down of all saloons was ordered, but a licensing system was put into effect in February.

This record, Mr. President, hands down the opinions of some of the world's greatest men, men upon whom we look with the greatest respect and admiration for the great deeds performed during their lives for the good of this country and all mankind, in the service of their country. There are many others whose opinions I should like to quote, but time does not permit. Also, there are others to whom we look for guidance in this country today whom I should like to be able to say had expressed themselves as being in favor of discouraging the evils of liquor, but I regret to say that I am unable to locate any such statements by them.

Mr. President, this is a serious situation, and one which the Christian people of this country are begging and pleading with our Congress to correct. We have that power but we have turned a deaf ear to the urgent appeals of those helpless citizens who are paying such a costly price. The very existence of our Nation is at stake. Thousands of men in the armed forces are disgusted with the unpleasant environment forced upon them. They want it abolished. Thousands and thousands of our citizens are demanding that liquor be abolished from our Army camps and Army reservations during this crisis. Unless this reasonable and sensible request of the people is respected, and respected by the Seventy-eighth Congress promptly, the liquor interests may well expect the wrath and vengeance of an enraged public to descend upon them by imposing measures which will not only abolish liquor from Army camps but also throughout the entire Nation.

Our great American democracy does not intend to be shackled by foreign

tyrants, nor to have its heart eaten out by a gutter-sniping booze gang, even if reenforced by some dictatorially minded Washington bureaucrats. A great psychological change is taking place in the people of this Nation. They are determined to exercise their rights and not sit back and lose their country and all that they hold dear. They are ready to fight the enemy abroad as well as the enemy at home. They are getting tough. They are off soft rubber tires and are running on hard iron rims. Women are moving from comfortable homes into busy war factories. They are discontinuing their club and social activities, and picking up the riveting machines and electric welders.

Mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, and sweethearts are giving up their loved ones to fight and perhaps die in this war. They are making tremendous sacrifices, and are ready and willing to make further sacrifices if need be to back up their boys in the armed forces. But these same women are carefully observing the protection and care which their loved ones are receiving at the hands of this Government, and many of them resent bitterly the presence of liquor on the Army reservations.

Mr. President, we are building in this Nation one of the finest armies that ever existed. It is the cream of our American manhood. It is composed of those who are nearest and dearest to our hearts. There is scarcely a home in America from which has not gone some father, son, husband, brother, or other loved one. This army tugs at our heartstrings, especially so because of the thousands of teen-age boys in the service. It is for those men and boys that we seek this protective legislation. Many of them who despise liquor have requested this action. Others who advocate freedom to use it during peacetime express the desire to have it dispensed with during the period while we are engaged in the serious business of fighting this war. Are those men who abhor liquor to be, like slaves, chained to it? Are we, who have loved ones in the service who detest liquor, expected to sit idly by and not fight for their rights and freedom, while they fight for the rights and freedom of all of us?

Mr. President, this is a just cause, and, with the help of God, we will be delivered from the destructive and demoralizing effects of liquor while we are fighting this terrible war. We know there is a God in Heaven, and God is not mocked. Prayer is a holy thing, and thousands of good Christian people are praying daily for enactment of this legislation to protect our boys in the service, and to help win this war and save our Nation. May the Seventy-eighth Congress have the honor of furthering this great cause at this critical time, when the whole world is trembling in the balance, and all of our people are bowed in brief because of this deadly war.

God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue,
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking.
God give us men.

THE PEACE AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER FOLLOWING THE WAR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there is a great deal of talk nowadays about the kind of a treaty and the kind of a world we shall have when the war is won. I wonder if we are not just a little bit "previous" when we spend so much time on that subject.

The other night I heard the national commander of the American Legion tell an audience in Washington that first we had better win the war before we talk so much about winning the peace.

The eminent commentator, Upton Close, yesterday over the radio said some words which all America should hear. He spoke on this very subject. He said we should not confuse the issue.

In other words, he indicated clearly that we had a big job ahead of us. He said we were not winning through at present. He spoke of the Budget of $109,000,000,000 presented by the President, to be spent in 1 year, and said that the Germans and the Japanese were planning to extend the war over a long period of time, so that the struggle would result in a stalemate, meaning that we could not continue indefinitely to spend at the rate of $109,000,000,000 a year.

Here in the Senate, and in the country generally, our attention has been diverted from the tremendous Budget demand of $109,000,000,000 by such matters as the Flynn nomination.

At first, when the President suggested $109,000,000,000, America seemed a little appalled at the suggestion that we were going to spend that amount in 1 year's war effort. The total cost to America of the last World War has been estimated at $42,000,000,000. The size of the Budget is not the important thing. The important question is, Are we using every dollar most efficiently toward the objective of winning the war?

We know that it is just as dangerous to spend too much carelessly as it is to spend too little too late.

Mr. President, I did not rise, however, to speak on that subject. I rose to make one point, and a simple one. It is fine for us to talk of a unity of objectives among the United Nations. It is fine for us to talk of some concert of action among the United Nations, looking toward an ultimate peace. It is fine for us to talk of correlating all these objectives through a council composed of representatives from each of the United Nations. It is well for us to talk over all these things, but, Mr. President, I submit that long before these things can even be considered, we must establish some kind of a simple mechanism—some kind of assurance—that, whatever happens, the people's representatives will be consulted.

In other words, Mr. President, in the establishment of whatever kind of peace or whatever kind of new world we are looking toward, the fundamental issue involved is the preservation of our system, and that means that the representatives of the people must be consulted.

This is a time for us to avoid all the mistakes of past history. This is a time for us to give assurance to the United States and to the world that whatever kind of peace is written, that whatever objectives are considered, the elected representatives of the people will have a voice in the determination of those objectives or of that peace.

Mr. President, the treaty which will be written when the war ends will determine the course of history for decades and perhaps centuries to come. Because we as a nation have grown so big and so powerful, the new situation has created new responsibilities and new duties. Therefore, we must make sure that we as a people are adequate to meet those responsibilities, especially now that modern inventions have contracted the globe.

What constitutes adequacy? The Good Samaritan, of whom Christ spoke, was adequate for the occasion. He had the proper concept as to his responsibilities—which the priest and the Levite did not have—but he also had the wine and the oil and the cash, making him the good neighbor. He made the wounded man whole so he could take care of himself. In other words, the greatest act of charity is that which enables the recipient to become competent and to stand on his own feet.

In the international field, as President Hoover has shown, we will have to feed the world when the war is over, becoming the Samaritan among the nations in order that once more humanity may march toward a better tomorrow. It is our job to make other nations competent to attend to their own business, but not to be a Santa Claus for the whole world.

Let us in our work, as the Samaritan of the nations, not forget—and this is very important—that a battle is constantly being waged between the forces of good and the powers of darkness. Let us never again be apathetic, careless, unalert. The fight between right and wrong, liberty and slavery, greed and selflessness, tolerance and intolerance, justice and injustice goes on within and without the Nation, and the ending of the war will not bring that fight to a close.

The good yeast is working and we look forward to the time when wars between nations shall be no more, when nations shall beat their swords into plowshares and make war no more, and the people of earth shall have one objective and that is to improve themselves and God's footstool—living in peace, fraternity, and brotherhood. But let us not confuse hope with reality.

The new world order toward which we are groping our way calls for men of action, possessing the qualities of the realist and the idealist. Yes; America has a tremendous job ahead of her.

Recently there have been introduced in the House and the Senate various resolutions which would establish a postwar planning commission. House Joint

Resolution No. 28 was introduced by Mr. MUNDT of South Dakota, and House Joint Resolution No. 36 was introduced by Mr. VOORHIS of California. In the Senate a similar measure was introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY].

In substance, each of these measures would create a joint body of Congressmen and representatives of agriculture, labor, and business. The main purpose suggested by these measures is to create a group that would become aware of world conditions and study all plans and ideas relating to a post-war peace, and bring the information to the Congress and the President.

Mr. President, I would welcome the creation of such a body or commission. It undoubtedly would and could perform a valuable function, depending of course upon the way it handled the problem.

But, Mr. President, the treaty America will enter into after this holocaust is over will have to be confirmed by the Senate and signed by the President. Section 2 of article II of the Constitution provides that—

> The President * * * shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Mr. President, last September I submitted a resolution in the Senate which reads as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Chief Executive be invited to join with the Senate in the creation of a Foreign Relations Advisory Council to be constituted of the following: The Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, other technicians whom the Secretary of State might designate, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the chairman and the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and such other Senators as the President might from time to time designate.

A few days ago I resubmitted that resolution in the Senate. The leading newspapers of the country, as well as some of the leading magazines, have written editorials approving the resolution; yet the committee to which it was referred would not report it to the Senate. Is this because the resolution itself is so simple, so understandable, so workable? I trust that it will have more favorable action in the near future.

I do not want history to repeat itself in respect to what happened after the last World War. I am not saying what pattern the world peace treaty should follow. I do not think any man is competent at present to lay down an adequate plan. Why? Because we must cut the cloth to fit the pattern, and no one can foresee what that pattern will be. I am happy to know that everywhere in America the people are thinking about this matter. The executive branch of the Government is giving thought and study to the subject. Great institutions devoted to public service, whose objectives are to develop sound national policies and to aid in building a better world, are also giving study and thought to the subject. Church groups and public forums, but most of all the common man and woman, are thinking about the kind of world we hope to bring about when this war ceases.

We have had the expression of former President Hoover suggesting that when the war ceases there must be a breathing spell before agreeing to a final plan. That idea is debatable. Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, has suggested a plan the nucleus of which would be a "single house parliament" to be composed of representatives of the United Nations of the world.

Mr. President, I have said that in this matter of international affairs we must cut the cloth to fit the pattern. I also said that as yet we have not the world pattern. What do I mean? Recently I received a letter from a friend in the State of Wisconsin on the subject of world peace, from which I quote the following:

> That the peace to come ought to be planned, most of us agree. That it must be planned and the support of the citizenry obtained before victory, many of us insist. What is dimming our hopes is the question of how. What is a plan through which the nations can contrive a lasting peace? Never has it been so apparent that means effect ends. In the last war the means we took (trusting it to a few harassed men working under the pressures of time, and of an impatient public, and of self-seeking groups) in the end brought the world to its present catastrophe.

Let me say parenthetically that that statement is also debatable.

> What method do we propose to use this time? Can an ordinary citizen like me have any part in it?
>
> I write representing no political or religious group, purely in my capacity as a citizen who is, as you are, interested in doing the right thing now, that our children and grandchildren may not, because of our indifference, have to face problems even more difficult than those we face today.
>
> Out of the din of voices there seems to be rising a concurrent sound opinion, which I can only mention and commend to you for your mature consideration and action. It has been given form best by Mr. Herbert Hoover, whose primary position is this:
>
> "That the United Nations shall agree now on the bases for a conditional peace, which shall be open to democratic discussion in the democratic nations, approved by popular will, and ready to be offered to the peoples of the Axis nations to be put into effect the moment they lay down their arms."
>
> Mr. Hoover suggests that this temporary peace should provide at least five things:
>
> 1. The total disarmament of the enemy.
> 2. The designation of provisional boundaries to nations.
> 3. The machinery for repatriation of prisoners and civilians driven from their homes.
> 4. The removal of economic blockades the instant that the enemy has handed over his arms.
> 5. The immediate organization to relieve famine and combat pestilence and aid in reconstruction. Otherwise there will be anarchy and no peace.
> 6. The provisional restoration of all commercial treaties that trade may begin again.

In answer to this letter I said that I am happy to see that people everywhere are thinking about the kind of world we are going to try to shape when the war ceases. I called attention to the following plans which are under consideration:

American leadership and mastery in the post-war world.

A new balance of power with America as the balancing power.

A British-American alliance.

A British-American union.

A federation of the democracies.

An association of the United Nations.

Regional arrangements.

The League of Nations.

Which plan the world will follow will be determined not only by the United States, but by the other nations of the world.

But plans alone are not sufficient. A great deal must take place in the rebirth of the human race before wars will cease.

As we get a broad perspective of the world we realize that many nations are just coming into "their own." Their peoples are stepping up the rung of the ladder of time to where they will feel the great impetus of national existence. Russia, with her hundred speaking tongues, is being amalgamated—a great people stepping out of their past into a world dynamic with all kinds of action. China, with her 400,000,000, is being united into a modern nation. South America, with her "dictator republics," is feeling the fever of a new world. And what about the black race and India? Are they not also feeling the impact of a great push?

We are living in a great, changing world. Even coral life is building new continents. We know that, because many heretofore uncharted reefs are being discovered.

Bearing all these things in mind, America must be realistic. She must constantly be on guard. We must, of course, attempt—and I hope bring about in the world—some form of association of governments which will be able to build peace and order. But until the race is reborn in the things of the spirit, we shall find volcanic eruptions—wars.

A great desire—which is prayer—among the common people of the earth may operate to channel the efforts of statesmen so that at least peoples of similar mind (like our Colonies were, back in 1786), will get together in some form of international association or union.

What is now going on in Africa—the trouble which our generals there are now facing, the trouble between the various groups of Frenchmen: Royalists, De Gaullists, Vichy French—is just a little sample of the problems that we must approach with realism as well as idealism when we talk of shaping a post-war peace and framing a treaty or an arrangement that will operate successfully in the post-war period. We all—especially we Senators—have a great responsibility, a great constitutional responsibility, and that is to see to it that this people is not put into a position such as we were when Hitler struck in Europe. If we are ever in that position again there may be no England and her air force to stop a yellow or a white horde, or a combination of the two, from striking at America.

Before Pearl Harbor a great many people in England and in this country had

come to feel that no price was too high to pay for peace. On the other hand, we had a group of unrealistic interventionists who had no realization of what war meant, who said, "We are going to lick 'em in 3 weeks."

I say frankly that, looking out upon the world today, I am of the sincere conclusion that until the race has learned to be Christian in fact instead of in theory the problem is primarily one of power—the way of applying power for the purpose of maintaining world order. Mere generalities or phrases or fine-sounding clauses will not do the job.

Recently, Mr. President, there came into my hands, apparently forwarded to me from England, a document called Points for Post-War European and World Organization, by A. Hutton Ashkenny, Member of Parliament. I ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks because it is rather full of specific ideas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. WILEY. The document is not simply a collection of generalities. This, gentlemen, also suggests certain corollaries.

My purpose in inserting into the RECORD these points with the corollaries is simply to provide food for thought and to bring to the students of the great problem of the proper kind of post-war peace plan some phases of the problem about which perhaps they may not have thought. It has been said so often, Mr. President, that we won the last war, but lost the peace. We are resolved now that if it is humanly possible we will win the war and win the peace. We should know by this time that merely passing laws or engaging in international pacts will not do the job.

The Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war demonstrates that fact clearly. By the Kellogg-Briand Pact we outlawed war, but war came upon us. We know that you cannot by legislation or international convention change human nature and make wars cease, any more than you can make a good man out of a bad man by passing a law. In the post-war period we do not want to be caught napping at the peace conference or at any time thereafter. If we do we may not find it so easy to escape. Pearl Harbor should be a constant reminder that eternal vigilance—eternal vigilance in all matters, in peace and in war—is the price of liberty.

Will the peace treaty create a new balance of power, a federation of democracies, a league of nations, regional arrangements, an American-British alliance, or will America attempt to "go it" alone? No man at present is big enough to answer that question. There are too many imponderables in the future. But one thing is sure: If we are realists we shall see to it that America, either singly or jointly, is in control of the pivotal air bases and the sea bases of the world. We shall also see to it that the threat of foreign nations in the Caribbean is removed.

I believe that at the outset it must be apparent to most thinking people that, considering the psychological, religious, intellectual, social, and political conditions of the various races of the earth, it would be impossible at this time to amalgamate them into a world state. I think that consideration is primal.

All the enthusiasm and all the things that make men whose feet are not on the ground dream dreams and see visions amount to nothing. I say that unless we are realistic enough to see the picture of this globe as it is, it is impossible at this time to amalgamate all the races and all the peoples, with their various backgrounds such as I have enumerated, into a world state.

I believe after we have won through to victory and have paid the price of this war, in lives and material values, this people will never forget—at least, I hope so—that we are living in a changing world, and that the maintenance of a world order and peace depends to a large extent upon the power lodged and the way that power is exercised by the associated nations.

We know that when this war is over the world will not be cleansed of the evils which make for war. There will be no opportunity to put into effect a great many of the Utopian and visionary schemes which have been advanced. Our problem is to create a plan. We must ever bear in mind that the plan must fit a complex world which is ever changing, and will have to deal with nations and groups and their capacity—I reemphasize the point—and their will—I also reemphasize the necessity for their will—to fit into the plan. Consequently, our eyes must be open. They must be on the past; and we must be aware of the experiences of history, as well as consider the dynamic present and the imponderables of the future. America must go forward searching out and seeking a way for the world's good, but constantly on the alert and on guard, aware of the dangers within and without which might threaten her very existence. No matter what kind of a post-war world we find ourselves in, America must see to it that she is adequately awake and prepared against any emergency that may arise.

Mr. President, I have gotten a long way off from my resolution. I return to it.

If President Wilson had advised with the Senate, as he knew other Presidents before him had, if he had appointed plenipotentiaries some of whom were Senators, might not the whole course of history have been changed? I believe so.

When Woodrow Wilson was president of a great university he taught the meaning of the constitutional phrase "advice and consent"; but when, as President of the United States, he went to Europe, he forgot his own teachings, and subsequently he submitted to the Senate of the United States what has been called a "fait accompli," a treaty ready to be ratified, and the Senate was told to ratify it. I say to you that the very course of history might have been changed and the present war might never have occurred if President Wilson had remembered his own teachings.

So I ask every Senator to give consideration to my resolution, because I think it is the answer to the way out.

I believe, Mr. President, that the recent election in the United States is a mandate to the President and the Senate to get together, to cooperate now, on the subject of planning the treaty and the peace for a post-war world. The advisory council provided for in my resolution, a council made up of the Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, and their experts, together with certain Members of the Senate, whose function it is to advise and consent, would be a liaison committee between the Senate and the Executive in this period, a group that would rub out the rough spots.

While this council would be concerned with the definition and formulation of the foreign policy of the United States, the council itself would have no constitutional authority. It would not detract from the power of the Senate to advise and consent or refuse to consent, nor would it limit the power of the President. It would be a committee built up for a specific purpose, to get over the bumps which exist. It would be simply a mechanism that would coordinate these two separate and distinct branches of government. This liaison committee would iron out some of the rough spots between the Senate and the Executive.

I have already said that the executive branch of the Government is studying this matter. Does the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate know what the Executive is thinking Not at all. Are we to go into another repetition of a situation in which the Executive is to attempt to dominate the picture, or are we to follow the mandate of the last election, a mandate by our masters to the Executive, a servant, and to the Senate, a servant, that we had better get together and play ball? If not, we will constitute the committee I am proposing.

I say again, it would not detract from the power of the Senate to advise and consent, nor would it limit the power of the President. It would merely be a mechanism which would coordinate these two separate and distinct branches of the Government. This liaison committee would iron out the differences.

It is equally apparent that the Senators on this council would be leaders in the debate when the treaty came before the Senate for its consent. Moreover, the members of the council would be in an intimate position to discuss matters with the Committee on Foreign Relations and get the benefit of the advice of that committee.

What is more, if this liaison committee were built up and created it could get the benefit of the best minds of the country. It could get the benefit of the joint commission which is contemplated under the various plans I have heretofore mentioned. It could be the reservoir of all the constructive ideas on earth. The members could call before them the leaders of Britain, if you please, and the ambassadors of the Allied countries.

They could get the benefit of the great independent brains and the great associations. Why should this be? Because, whether some folks believe it or not, the Constitution still lives, and it is the function of this body and the Executive to build the treaty to follow the war, not have it built and put in our laps, but to build it, and then, if it is satisfactory, ratify it and make it a living international organism.

If this proposed body were created the Senate would be on the inside in the formulation of the treaty. Oh, how important is that. We are the representatives of the people; we are the constitutionally elected officers, told to advise with the President. In the past other Presidents have said that meant aiding in the formulation of a treaty, and other Presidents have taken Members of the Senate and made them plenipotentiaries who have created treaties.

Are we looking forward to a period of cooperation, or to a period when again the two separate arms of government which are supposed to cooperate and coordinate their efforts will be distinct, as if a barrier were between them?

The suggestion I have made would require no legislation. The adoption of this resolution by the Senate would mean that the Senate, at least, would be on its toes, demonstrating a splendid example of democratic government in action. After the resolution was adopted, it would be up to the President to reject or to cooperate, and I believe the President would cooperate, in spite of the letter of the Secretary of State, which is already in the RECORD, which I inserted about a month ago, in which he said, in substance, that he knew his friends, the Senators, and could consult with them. It is not sufficient that the Secretary of State consult with a few buddies in the Senate of the United States. This is a Senate obligation; the Senate will insist, and if once again, months or years from now, the present Executive, if he is in office, should be handling the international subject of peace, and should appear before the Senate with another treaty in the formulation of which we had had nothing to say, we might see a repetition of history.

Mr. President, I do not want that to happen. I want this body and the President to assume their responsibility to the world, working together, cooperating. It is a big job, and it merits grave attention by big brains, tolerant, cooperative, willing to work together.

I am sure that if any Member of this body were the Executive of this Nation in this critical hour, he would welcome this gesture on behalf of the Senate. If the Senate should adopt the resolution there is no question that, if this suggestion were carried out, it would result in a more intelligent formulation of our foreign policy, and would certainly create a better working relationship between the Executive and the Senate.

Mr. President, I began my remarks with the thought that we have to attend to this idea of winning the war. I think the general tendency, because there is so much talk about peace planning, is to assume that the war is won. There is not a military man of any consequence in the United States today who says that. We did hear Halsey, out in the Pacific, say what would be done; but great naval men have disagreed with his statement. So it is our problem to win the war; and the only effect of my resolution would be the creation of a general liaison committee between the Executive and the Senate, the treaty-making powers of the Government, so that we could think the thing through together, and work in harmony, to the end that, if and when peace comes, we will be ready to give to the world the result of our study, and we will be working as teammates, with the thought that we could do the job, whatever it is.

EXHIBIT A

100 GREYHOUND LANE,
STREATHAM, S. W. 16,
*London, England, July 12, 1942.*

Mr. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Senator for Wisconsin,*
*United States of America.*

P. T. O. for Corollaries September 3, 1942

DEAR SIR: The following proposals for a post-war European and world organization was submitted by me to all members of Parliament, Ministers of the Crown, and Cabinet Ministers. The replies suggest my praying your indulgence also. Hypocritical democratic leaders of peoples on the European Continent, and elsewhere, will oppose a watertight organization, hence the urgency for its insistence, to prevent future religious and economic wars.

POINTS FOR A POST-WAR EUROPEAN AND WORLD ORGANIZATION

1. No anticipatory wartime promise by the Allies of sovereignty to any European or world state whatever.

2. Six to 9 months' interval before a general election in Britain, dominions, and other world states, permitting the national populations to form a wise public opinion on a just comprehensive peace plan.

3. After the order for cessation of hostilities, the Allies to march into Paris, Brussels, Berlin, Munich, Rome, Vienna, and Warsaw, disarming all European states, only thereafter distributing food and clothing, rebuilding houses, organizing, and redistributing populations, establishing free institutions, democratic education, and just courts within the newly constituted states. The Allies to remain in occupation from 5 to 10 years.

4. The pooling of all personal and national offensive and defensive equipment (except personal sporting equipment) within the European states, into one federal army and navy. Air forces to be at the disposal of the supreme federal world power.

5. Establish undefended boundaries, not defended frontiers. Only the international union police to carry arms. All civilians over 16 years, to carry identification cards containing officially taken portraits and fingerprints.

6. Try, by Allied open courts, all Nazis accused by German or occupied territory nationals of criminal acts, violating pre-Nazi national and international law, and vouched for by witnesses.

7. The British Empire federal representatives, together with the United States of America and Russian representatives, shall alone be responsible for the democratic education of all European and mandated territories.

8. The creation of several large federal powers throughout the world, based on geographical position, either by an immediate post-war world conference or by the post-war allied overwhelming power.

9. Each federal power to possess a democratic constitution, an army, navy, and a federal police force, courts of justice, judges, prisons, and staff in each state. The federal high court shall hear appeals from states (or from minorities within states), and give decisions, it will promote appeals from states or minorities to the supreme federal power, who in turn will submit legal or constitutional matters to their independent supreme high court.

10. The British Commonwealth of Nations to be formed into six constitutional federations, owing allegiance to one constitutional king.

11. Constitutional guaranties to all peoples in all world states, freedom of association, expression, and thought. Appropriate legal, military, or air force action shall immediately follow any threat or contravention of the laws and constitution, by any person, minority, or state. Failing this, the supreme world federation shall immediately take control and armed action.

12. States — constitution, legislation, and administration: A federation constituting a state shall provide a code of federal laws and by-laws, devolving power to pass future regulations having the power of laws. The federation shall pay, own, and control the administration of justice for carrying out these regulations, by appointing state courts of justice, judges, staff, police, and prisons. When any state or minority therein is threatened from within or without, the federation shall immediately provide armed assistance.

13. Rising above these separate federations, covering the entire world, there shall be established a supreme world federal power, representative of the world federations. This grand federal power will appoint offices and officers to assist and coordinate work in all federal administrative departments, and shall conjointly control all armies and navies and shall alone control all aviation, civil and military. The decisions of its supreme court shall be final.

14. Any state or power not joining, or having joined, seceding, not complying with lawful decisions, or refusing to meet its proportional financial obligation toward the cost of the world organization, from taxation, shall be considered an enemy of mankind and be treated as such.

Yours faithfully,

A. HUTTON ASHKENNY,
*M. B., Ch. B., B. Sc.*

---

Corollaries, September 3, 1942, amplifying my points of July 12, 1942, for a post-war European and world organization.

A. Training personnel: The United States and British Dominion Governments are training officers at Virginia and Oxford Universities respectively for post-war European and world reconstruction and organization, and to act as liaison officers between the organizers of international union army of occupation, rescue workers, executors of justice for war crimes, and the civilian native populations. But many thousands more trainees are required. Students in universities and colleges, boys in public and secondary schools in United States of America and Britain should immediately be advised and guided to select a country, study its approved political, social and economic history, and language. It is vital for United States of America, Britain, and Russia to fill all such posts, instead of relying on native antidemocratically influenced personnel.

B. Armistice priorities: First, international union army of occupation to occupy all towns

and strategic points all over Europe, including unoccupied supine states. Second, immediate collection and control everywhere of all military equipment. Third, only after collecting all arms, including those from unoccupied states, feed, clothe, and suitably house that section of the population, first in occupied then in Axis and unoccupied states. Fourth, organize execution of justice, concentration camps, prisons, etc. Fifth, organize employment, agriculture, transport, etc., with the help of judicially forced labor of Axis offenders. Sixth, establish absolute equality of religious freedom of worship for all denominations, forbidding abuse of freedom by political and religious secret propaganda. Seventh, establish undefended boundaries, not defended frontiers. Only the international union police to carry arms. All civilians over 16 years to carry identification cards, containing officially taken portraits and fingerprints. Eighth, establish free approved compulsory nonsectarian universal education, including for adults, compulsory biweekly civics, international organization and duties, social policy debates, and secret uninfluenced voting. Ninth, constitutional elections of local and state representatives, after 6 months' compulsory politico-social education, using identification cards.

C. Executing justice: Allies must now prepare classified directories of Axis populations, leaders, gestapos, military, and civilians, whether disguised, in hiding or protected in unoccupied countries, of those imprisoned, robbed, tortured, murdered, and of informants, etc. All military-aged men to be presumed guilty of cooperating in crimes, unless pr ed otherwise. No vindictive or life-taking punishment, only judicial, humane, even merciful.

PUNISHMENT CLASSIFICATION—CLASSIFIED PER SEVERITY OF OFFENSE AND JUDGED IN GROUPS

1. Hard labor for life. (a) Individual isolation on isolated world islands. (b) In isolated concentration camps for mining, reclamation, forestry, or agriculture, without the aid of labor-saving machinery, library, or radio.

2. Hard labor for a long term (20-30 years) as 1 (a) above.

3. Hard labor for a short term (10-20 years) with or without aid of machinery, library, or radio.

4. Good conduct men of classes 2 and 3. Service in labor corps in isolated or semi-isolated mines or farms with aid of machinery, library, and radio.

5. Labor corps long term (5-10 years), classified in trades and grades for mining, forestry, agriculture, building, engineering in various parts of the world, to recondition and reconstruct, land, farms, factories, houses, towns, roads, and railways, etc.

6. Same. Short term (1-5 years).

7. Educational labor (1-10 years), for students, teachers, in approved educational studies in isolated school camps or rural institutions, suitable, when freed for service as such, in state of origin.

8. Good conduct men in classes 4 to 7 may have wages, increased freedom of movement, amusement, less restricted civilian association or complete freedom in state of origin. Bad conduct men, duration and severity of labor increased.

Classes 4 to 7 to be provided with suitable feeding, clothing, housing, recreation, library, and radio.

Population remaining in Axis states, after redistribution and adjudication, will consist of men over 60 years, women, children under 16 years, released good conduct men, international union army of occupation, including federal staff for executing justice, prisons, and approved teachers, etc.

## JOINT COMMITTEE ON BUDGETARY CONTROL

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there has been submitted in the House of Representatives and in the Senate today a concurrent resolution which, I understand, is Concurrent Resolution No. 2 in the Senate, providing for the setting up of a joint committee on budgetary control. As I have been one of the many who have interested themselves in that subject, I should like to say just a few words about the measure.

The proposal is, broadly speaking, patterned on the system which has obtained for a number of years under the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate. There is a Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which, in its turn, employs a staff of experts, who are responsible to Congress and to Congress only, and who maintain a constant, 12-months-a-year contact with and study of the subject of taxation.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 proposes to set up a Joint Committee on Budgetary Control consisting of members of the Appropriations Committees of the two branches of Congress. That committee in turn would employ a staff of experts, who would give the same kind of close attention to governmental expenditures that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation gives to taxes.

Certainly the matter of appropriations has become extremely complicated. Whether or not it is as complicated as the subject of taxation is something which I will not discuss, but I think anyone who has had any contact with appropriations will agree that the matter has become extremely complex. This year in particular, when we have a Budget of $109,000,000,000, it is certainly no less difficult. In my judgment, if Congress is properly to discharge its function, it needs this type of expert help.

I see in the Chamber the able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] who has many times been acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and who is chairman of some of its most important subcommittees, and whose diligence and industry are an inspiration to the younger Members who serve with him. I do not believe that men of his standing should be swamped with the detail which now comes to their lot. We have two extremely able secretaries of the Appropriations Committee today, but, of course, they are in no sense of the word a substitute for the kind of system which is contemplated by the measure under discussion.

Mr. President, I hasten to add that this is in no sense of the word a partisan undertaking. The joint committee contemplated in the concurrent resolution would give a majority representation to the majority party. It is above all a sincere attempt to enable Congress to function as Congress is intended to function. It is an attempt to follow through the policies which Congress establishes. It is an attempt to find out where the money goes and what happens to it. It is an attempt to have an authoritative voice at the disposal of Congress which can check on inaccuracies and on any misrepresentations which may be made to us by other branches of the Government.

For this reason I commend the measure to the attention of the Senate, and hope that the purpose and the spirit which underlies the concurrent resolution will find a friendly reception at its hands.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I should like to speak very briefly concerning the subject to which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has so well devoted himself. I see that the Acting Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], is in the Chamber, and I wish to repeat what the Senator from Massachusetts had to say respecting the complete divorcement from any partisan purpose of this effort on the part of the minority members of the Appropriations Committee.

No one knows better than do the minority members of the Appropriations Committee the zeal and the energy with which the Senator from Tennessee presents and discusses appropriation measures in the Senate, and the measure under discussion is presented only with a view to building that sort of understanding which will bring about complete cooperation, to the end that we of the minority can more efficiently perform our duty as members of the committee in cooperation with the members of the majority.

Senators who are not members of the Appropriations Committee can have no conception of the task which the Appropriations Committee has to perform. The responsibility which falls particularly upon the chairman or the acting chairman is, I am sure, a responsibility greater than that carried by any other Member of the Senate. With appropriations assuming frightful figures, being now in excess of $100,000,000,000 a year, and the organization for handling appropriations being what it is, there ought to be better understanding of the task that falls on the Committee on Appropriations.

In the Senate, its Appropriations Committee, as, I am sure, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] will agree, is given only 3 or 4 months to deal with these total appropriations. The Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, starting at this time through its subcommittees, is beginning the study of appropriation bills, supply bills, and getting them on their way.

If the usual practice is followed, we will not see any of those supply bills before late March or perhaps in April. Then the obligation will be upon the Senate Committee on Appropriations to function, and function fast, to the end that we can complete action on the bills before the beginning of the new fiscal year. That is an almost impossible task to place upon the Senate committee. When appropriation bills are received from the House the Senate committee

cannot undertake in any material degree to go back of what the House has already done. Of necessity our time is devoted in largest part to a consideration of added requests, or requests which the House has denied, or new estimates which had not been presented in time to be dealt with by the House of Representatives. So we as members of the Senate committee are pressed in an impossible way, and we cannot do the job; and I do not believe any member of the committee would claim that it was possible for the committee to do the job in the manner expected by the Senate of its other committees.

So, Mr. President, this concurrent resolution is offered. It has now been appropriately referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, where I know the majority leadership will be cooperating to the end that there can be a thorough consideration of the proposal. It may well be that that consideration will afford a more expeditious approach to our problem.

Mr. President, I should like to make the point that those who are offering the proposed legislation are not in any degree seeking to shirk a responsibility which is theirs, and solely theirs, and that of every member of the committee. But it is not humanly possible for members of the committee to do the full job that ought to be done.

Mr. President, I see coming in our approaching work for the ensuing fiscal year a terrific challenge respecting the issue of personnel in some of the Federal departments. The journal of the Federation of Federal Employees—I do not remember the exact title of the journal—carries an editorial in its current issue attacking the existing overwhelming personnel, and argues that it would be possible to weed out endless numbers of employees, and thus reduce the budgetary requirements. Since that charge comes from the employees themselves, it seems to me the obligation rests upon our Appropriations Committee to make most careful investigation concerning personnel needs. We could be aided in an immeasurable way if we had at the service of the Appropriations Committee such a joint staff of experts as is made available to the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the Senate and House, respectively—a staff of experts who would be devoting not a week, not a month, not 3 or 4 months in the year, to a study of budgetary needs and the uses to which our appropriations were being devoted, but would spend 12 months in the year studying those matters.

Mr. President, if that sort of joint operation were to cost $60,000 a year or $70,000 a year, I venture to say that for every dollar expended for that kind of service we would be able to save many, many times the cost of the effort.

Mr. President, I wish to say only one thing more, and it is rather a repetition of what has already been said.

This concurrent resolution is not offered to discount in any way the splendid leadership on the Senate Appropriations Committee. I repeat that we wish only to cooperate, and be of the greatest possible aid and service in assisting that leadership in doing more fully the job which I know the acting chairman of the committee as zealously desires to accomplish as does any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed in its entirety Senate concurrent resolution 2.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) establishing a Joint Committee on Budgetary Control was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee known as the Joint Committee on Budgetary Control (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee).

SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee shall be composed of 10 members, as follows: (1) 5 members who are members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 3 from the majority and two from the minority party, who shall be chosen by the majority and minority members of such committee, respectively; and (2) 5 members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, 3 from the majority and 2 from the minority party, who shall be chosen by the majority and minority members of such committee, respectively.

(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations by which he was chosen, except that the members chosen by the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations who have been reelected to the House of Representatives shall continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress.

(c) The members shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the joint committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the joint committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of a clerk and such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this resolution, the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the Congress is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary, to authorize such expenditures as may be necessary for printing, binding, and other purposes as may be authorized by the joint committee. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the joint committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or such member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said joint committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any questions pertinent to the matter herein authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 2, sec. 192). The cost of stenographic services in reporting such hearings as the joint committee may hold shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 7. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to investigate the operation and effects of the present budgetary system, to ascertain the necessity for, the economy, and the correctness of amounts of appropriations made to or requested by the various governmental departments, independent agencies and establishments, and to make such other investigations with reference to the expenditure of public funds as it may deem necessary, and in particular to investigate such questions as may be submitted to it by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, or by any member of the joint committee, and to report, from time to time, to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 8. The joint committee shall make available to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the subcommittees thereof at the request of the chairman or ranking minority member of committees or subcommittees thereof all available data together with the services of experts and assistants on the staff of the joint committee.

## CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Executive Calendar be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none.

The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

### THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith. That completes the Executive Calendar.

## CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, earlier in the day several routine nominations in the Diplomatic Service were favorably reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the nominations of the following persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 7 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Paul J Reveley, of Connecticut.
John Peabody Palmer, of Washington.
Henry E. Stebbins, of Massachusetts.
Waldo E. Bailey, of Mississippi.
Jacob D. Beam, of New Jersey.
Mulford A. Colebrook, of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, may I inquire what is the order of business?

Mr. BARKLEY. We are now about to consider certain routine nominations in the Diplomatic Service.

Mr. AUSTIN. Are they new appointments?

Mr. BARKLEY. They are merely routine promotions of members of the Diplomatic Service.

Mr. AUSTIN. Have they been referred to a committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. They were referred to a committee and were reported today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They were reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations today.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none.

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 21, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 18, 1943:

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Paul J. Reveley
John Peabody Palmer
Henry E. Stebbins
Waldo E. Bailey
Jacob D. Beam
Mulford A. Colebrook

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Prentiss M. Brown to be Price Administrator, Office of Price Administration.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

*To be major general*

Albert Whitney Waldron

*To be brigadier generals*

Henry Barlow Cheadle
Joseph Hampton Atkinson
LaVerne George Saunders

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of righteousness and of grace, Thou who art the Shepherd of our souls, we are pleased to come into Thy presence and look up to Thee as the fountain of wisdom, goodness, and power. Give us the peace of those who put their trust in Thee, who can suffer and be strong, who can bear burdens though the way be hard, who can live and serve in the midst of difficult tasks. We pray Thee to merge our courage and our motives into Thine own will so that our uprightness and honesty shall command respect; remind us, dear Lord, that there is no sculpturing like that of molding character. Oh, link us to a great crusade that shall be administered by the spirit of honor, truth, and unselfishness; thus the world shall be aroused from its nightmare and humanity shall be made free from the shambles of threatened death.

Give our citizens everywhere minds of discernment, willing minds, that they may heed the stern dictates of patriotic duty, of sacrifice, and frown upon ease and self-imposed idleness. We pray Thee to sanctify our joys, our hardships, our temptations, and our circumstances, and all who have distress of heart and are secretly bleeding. Spare us from any expression of complacency or self-aggrandizement and grant that the accents of our words and actions may be in the spirit of cooperation. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 14, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 57):

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Edwin A. Halsey, of Virginia, as Secretary of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the Act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Federal Security Agency.
5. The National Archives.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The Members who have not taken the oath of office, if there be any, will present themselves at the bar of the House and take the oath of office.

Mr. KIRWAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. TARVER, addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution relating to the farm situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article and extracts from letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE BERNIECE C. LAMBERT

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 41), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to the husband of Berniece C. Lambert, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary compensation, and an additional amount not to exceed $250, to defray funeral expenses of the said Berniece C. Lambert.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a declaration made by the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives entitled "The Place of Farmer-Owned and Farmer-Controlled Cooperatives in the National Economy."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address I delivered in Statuary Hall on Saturday last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF FISCAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have asked this time to call attention to a bill—H. R. 83—which I introduced almost a year ago, and which I have reintroduced in this Congress, to establish an office of fiscal investigations as an agency of the House of Representatives. I think by implementing the purpose of this bill either by adopting it or making it the basis for the consideration of a proper correction of this matter, we can save untold millions of dollars to the taxpayers of this country. We ought to know what is done with the money that we appropriate, and we ought to have an agency of our own to keep tab on it in order that we may not have to accept 100 percent every statement that is made to the committees of the House of Representatives by the bureaucrats who appear before us.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, Tuesday, after the conclusion of matters on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ILLEGAL STRIKES

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the outlaw anthracite coal mine strike in Pennsylvania borders on treason against the Government and people of the United States, and I urge the Department of Justice to take prompt action to prosecute the labor leaders responsible for it.

Men and women working in war production industries, as well as management, are generally doing a splendid job to help win the war. However, when we consider that the lives of millions of American men, on the battle front, are wholly dependent upon production of essentials at home, strikes in every necessary industry should be prohibited for the duration. Lawful methods have been provided for the adjustment of labor and wage disputes. These facilities should be used without resorting to illegal strikes.

The labor leaders responsible for strikes and racketeering in essential industries are doing more than giving aid and comfort to our enemies. They are the advance invasion army of Hitler and the Japs, primarily engaged in sabotaging war production and in destroying public morale and confidence. They are also jeopardizing the lives of our fighting men and retarding victory over the enemy. The strike leaders and their followers should be given a taste of front-line fighting if they are not willing to work at home under legal and patriotic methods.

If our public officials in charge of law enforcement refuse to prosecute individuals and leaders responsible for illegal strikes and racketeering in essential industries, it is about time for Congress to begin a few necessary impeachment proceedings.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] be permitted to extend his remarks and include therein certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the conclusion of other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial from the Daily Argus Leader of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and some other newspaper comment in connection with my resolution for a post-war planning commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include a report of the College of Agriculture of the University of Missouri relative to farm labor and machinery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a resolution regarding the milk industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the day's business and other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include some newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by the majority leader appearing in yesterday's Washington Post, and also the text of a short bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

QUESTIONNAIRES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I received a communication from the National Federation of Federal Employees. I believe other members also received it. It contains one suggestion with regard to the problem of so-called paper work, forms and questionnaires, sent out by governmental agencies, which I think is worth commenting upon. The N. F. F. E. suggests that in every case where a form or questionnaire is to be sent out, before it goes out, it be submitted to two or three minor employees of the agency in question, that if these employees can understand and appreciate its import, it is all right, but if they cannot, it be corrected, simplified, and improved. I think that is a simple suggestion and a constructive one, and that it ought to be followed up.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix by including an address made by Maj. Gen. J. D. Patch to his soldiers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STRIKES IN INDUSTRY

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the American people are outraged, as they have a right to be, at the continuance of strikes on the home front when our boys are fighting and dying on the battle fronts. The promise of the labor leaders that strikes would not take place has not worked. As I tried to get the Congress to do at the last session, we should pass legislation which makes it a crime to strike or to foment strikes in defense industries when our country is at war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address I recently made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BLACKNEY was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, a day or so ago I received a telegram from William Brushaber, president of the Genesee County Funeral Directors Association, in which he stated that gasoline was refused immediate relatives of deceased people in Genesee County who desired to attend the funeral of the deceased. The association asked if this strict rule could not be modified. We immediately submitted the proposition to the O. P. A., who informed us in no uncertain language that the rule would stick, that relatives of deceased were in no better status than anyone else. This certainly is a peculiar travesty on humanity and justice.

I have long felt that bureaucracy in Washington was reaching a nauseating stage, but when a rule of this character is applied to conditions involving death, then it seems to me that it is beyond all rhyme and reason. Our bureaucratic friends apparently desire the American people to be Hitlerized. Anyone who is familiar with Washington knows that a constant succession of official cars are being driven, many of them needlessly. You can see them parked and double parked in front of hotels and places of amusement, and yet that seems to be all right.

The growth of bureaucracy in this Government has reached a nauseating stage. These bureaucrats seems to be imbued with the idea of subjecting the American people to every inconvenience and every indignity. They pose as supermen of erudition that makes me think of Goldsmith's description of the village school teacher, where he says:

> And still they gazed and still the wonder grew, that one small head could carry all he knew.

I think it is high time that the Congress of the United States, representing 131,000,000 of people, should place its stamp of disapproval upon such tactics. The people of the Sixth District of Michigan, of which I have the honor to be Congressman, are law abiding, thoroughly patriotic and loyal, and my district is producing, in the large industrial institutions located therein, great quantities of defense matériel and compares favorably with any other district in the Nation. Any reasonable regulation, based upon common sense and necessity, will be gladly obeyed, but I fail to see the necessity of inflicting multitudes of nauseating rules upon the American people, apparently based upon the fact that the bureaucrat seemingly desires to show his authority.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday of this week I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, at the conclusion of any other special orders and the business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OVER-EMPLOYMENT IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include therein an article by Jerry Kluttz.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for many months we have known of the stupid, senseless, outrageous overemployment existing in the various bureaus and departments of this Government. Not long since the Civil Service Commission itself, finding these conditions to exist to an extent far beyond the bounds of reason, called upon the bureaucrats to reduce this employment and to then keep it within the realm of necessity.

One of the fine newspapermen of this community, Jerry Kluttz, conducts the Federal Diary for the Washington Post—a daily column devoted to news about the Government's civilian employees. Mr. Kluttz—than whom no man is better informed on the subject—is an able writer and entirely reliable.

In an article appearing in the December's Reader's Digest, entitled "To Washington, An E for Inefficiency," Mr. Kluttz discusses these conditions in the various departments in a most comprehensive way. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks this article by Mr. Kluttz in order that every Member of the House and Senate may see for himself exactly what the situation is and the necessity for a radical change in the policy of putting thousands of employees on the pay rolls when there is not the slightest justification for doing so. It seems to me the conditions as disclosed by Mr. Kluttz can be characterized in one way and one way only—bureaucracy gone mad.

[From the Reader's Digest of December 1942]

TO WASHINGTON: AN E FOR INEFFICIENCY

(By Jerry Kluttz)

In wasted manpower and low morale, no war plant anywhere surpasses bureaucratic Washington—the biggest war plant of them all. This unfortunate fact is revealed in hundreds of letters and telephone calls which I receive from Government employees, has been confirmed by data submitted to the Congress by the Civil Service Commission, and is underlined by President Roosevelt's recent comment that the Nation's war spirit is everywhere excellent—save in the capital.

In the first 16 weeks after Pearl Harbor, 40,000 young people, hired from every State in the Union, were added as stenographers and typists to Washington's war-swollen agencies. By June 1 more than half of them—disillusioned and disgruntled—had quit their jobs. By August 1 the Civil Service Commission, in making 189,000 Washington job-placements, required 118,000 of that total to fill places of employees who had quit. That turn-over rate would be disastrous in any private enterprise.

When President Roosevelt suggested that wealthy and idle "parasites" move out of the capital to make room for war workers, a Government clerk wrote to me as follows:

"I am one of the parasites. If I didn't exist, $1,620 a year could be directed into vital war channels instead of into my salary. I am one of the huge number of Government employees who spend their days killing time. Yet I am a capable person; my qualifications include college and successful jobs in private industry where I was glad to work like a Trojan. I should be useful here, but actually I'm an utter waste. My hardest task is waiting in line to cash my pay check.

"Clerks who are criticized because they spend too much time at the water cooler or talking to their neighbors will confide to anyone that they might as well waste time. There is nothing else for us to do.

"We are a great army—we parasites. And, almost unanimously, we don't like it. We came to Washington to be part of a united war effort. We are grossly disappointed. Our fervent plea is for someone to put us all to work."

I published that letter in my column. A woman called me. She had made a trip to Washington because her Government-employed daughter, distraught at weeks of enforced idleness in her job, wanted to resign. I promised to make some inquiries. I found that not only this girl but 130 other employees in that unit had no work whatever to do When I presented this story of enforced loafing to the bureau chief he confirmed the facts.

Further inquiry convinced me that mass idleness within the Government is a disease of epidemic proportions. More than any other fact, it accounts for the abysmal level of Washington morale.

Last July I invited Federal workers to write my column for a week while I took a vacation. I asked for newsy and humorous anecdotes. What I got, instead, was several hundred letters, most of which told the same story of idleness, inefficiency, and frustration, all strongly criticizing the way the Government is conducting the war on the Washington front.

"It used to amuse me to read about the 'shortage' of stenographers in your column," one girl wrote. 'Now I get a sick feeling in the pit of my stomach. I know, because I have investigated. I'm a stenographer and a good one. I work, eat, sleep, and play with others doing the same work.

"I happen to be at the War Production Board, but I have talked with at least 100 stenographers who represent a dozen different Government departments. Seventeen of these girls are overworked. Some of them work 12 hours a day regularly, even on Sundays. Five of the seventeen have had physical break-downs of one degree or another.

"The rest of us are complaining, too; we're underworked."

The most moving letter was from a young woman whose husband came to Washington to do vital war work, at a considerable financial sacrifice. To help meet their responsibilities, she—like thousands of others in the Capital, where the cost of living is sky high—took a job in the War Department. She wrote:

"In the biggest war plant of them all—the War Department—many of us sit around waiting for work that never, or hardly ever, comes. Other war agencies are understaffed, need people badly, and appeal to the Civil Service Commission daily for more personnel. But if an idle War Department employee applies for a transfer he or she is flatly refused. Office regulations say that no transfers will be granted for any reason whatsoever.

"You beg your superiors for work; they agree with you—and continue to let you sit. The situation is tragic and dangerous. You want to help fight this war by working with all your energy for the Government, but all you do is sit day after day, wasting time that should'nt be wasted. Who in the world is responsible for this crazy system?"

A recent college graduate wrote me on behalf of a group of 50 young women—all trained specialists—who had been lured to war jobs in Washington during the past year. At the end of 8 months, after long spells of idleness and part-time work, all but 1 of them had resigned.

"I worry because, with the world in turmoil, I sit all day with ample time to read newspapers, magazines, and books," said a $3,000-a-year Government expert. "I know there is work to be done. But how to get it? My superiors assure me that my services are 'highly satisfactory.' But that doesn't satisfy me. I am working only one-tenth as hard as I could. My duties are such that a person with half my training and salary could handle them."

An $8,000-a-year War Production Board official—a production executive who had been drafted from private industry—reported that he was on his way back to private industry "where I can again do some real war work." In 4 months in Washington he had been given nothing to do. An economist at the Board of Economic Warfare told me he wasn't given a single assignment to do in his 5 months with that agency. When the draft caught up with him he welcomed it—although his Government superior urged that he ask deferment on the ground that his "work" at the Board of Economic Warfare was "essential."

Some of this waiting around for work was probably an inevitable result of the rapidity with which Federal bureaus were expanded after Pearl Harbor. The fact that now, a year later, these conditions still prevail can be ascribed only to bad planning and to the instinctive urge to expand which is the curse of every bureaucracy.

I have known Government agencies to hire as many as 100 new employees with nothing whatever in sight for them to do. It was merely thought that some day they might be needed. I recently had a letter from a high-priced Government specialist who said that he was one of a group of specialists who had all been idle, on the Government pay roll, for months. The entire group tried to resign, but the chief of the section rejected their resignations. "Eventually," he said, "you may be needed."

Workers who are hired to wait for work are often assigned to "pools." If they are stenographers, and typewriters are available, some of them practice. Many work crossword puzzles. Most of them just sit. I have visited pools so crowded that there weren't enough chairs for them all to do even that.

Some offices, of course, have a different story to tell. One high officer at the War Department, who declared that "between half and a third of the employees now in Washington could be at once eliminated and the work done better," put through a reorganization. He reduced the number of his employees 50 percent and raised the pay of the remaining ones 40 percent, in this case saving 25 percent in overhead and 50 percent in office space. As a result, the work of his unit is now much better done.

But such salutary purging is likely to run afoul of the bureaucrats. An executive of the Board of Economic Warfare who had previously presided over a Department of Agriculture office "where 'made' work was necessary to keep my employees busy," determined that his set-up at the Board of Economy Warfare would be "compact, efficient, where every employee would have a clear understanding of his job."

The bureaucrats heard of it. "I was immediately besieged," he wrote me, "by $2,600-a-year personnel experts who said bluntly, 'You can't do that. It wouldn't conform to the organization charts of similar Government offices.' After weeks of conferences I found myself saddled with 40 percent more employees and a 35 percent greater budget than I had planned.

"For nearly every employee around the $2,000 level whom I proposed to hire, I had to take on two at $1,440 each. I had chosen two persons for work which I knew they could do and agreed to pay them $2,600 each, but the personnel experts overruled me and I ended up with five persons whose salaries are $1,620 each."

Hence this executive concludes that what an office needs in order to conform to the general pattern of Government offices is to be overstaffed.

"I'll never forget those days after Pearl Harbor," a veteran at the Labor Department told me. "Thousands of Government employees got to work ahead of time; willingly reported to their offices on Christmas and New Year's. They asked for more and more work. Production skrocketed. Morale was never better. Now the Pearl Harbor stimulus has worn off. Employee morale has gone a-tumbling; production is off. We asked for action; we got merely words."

The general public has looked upon Uncle Sam as an ideal employer whose labor policy is a model for industry, yet the Government's own labor policy is shot full of inequalities and injustices that no well-operated concern would tolerate. More than half of a group of employees questioned attributed bad morale to poor supervision. Work was ordered and no explanation given. Comments were made only on mistakes. No appreciation was shown for good work. Office politics and inept handling of personnel by supervisors and administrators, in addition to the uncertainty and confusion over the policies and functions of the many different bureaus, are held responsible by the workers themselves for their sense of frustration. Employees are not given a feeling that their work is important or that they actually are contributing to winning the war.

Consequences of this drop-off in morale are apparent in Washington's poor showing in civilian war efforts. For this city's below-average civilian defense organization—particularly in Government buildings—it has been severely rebuked by James M. Landis, National Director of the Office of Civilian Defense. In the recent Red Cross war relief drive Washington raised but $550,000 of its $750,000 quota—the worst record of any large city in the country. For that it was rebuked by the President. Among Government agencies bond buying by employees of the War Department up to September 1 was near the bottom—along with that of the employees of the White House.

In its recent report to the Congress, the Civil Service Commission declared that "thousands of Federal employees are working below their highest skills; thousands of others are using their highest skills during a very small percentage of the working day."

But even with the active prodding of this Commission, something more is needed to force Washington bureaucracy to put the Government machine into streamlined war-winning condition.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of all legislative matters and other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a scholarly letter on post-war financing and employment by Ralph W. Manuel, of Minneapolis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STRIKES IN INDUSTRY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, apropos of what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] has just said with reference to strikes, recently I reintroduced a bill that would stop strikes. It is now before the Military Affairs Committee. I do not know whether it will meet the proposition or not, but some action should be taken by this Congress to stop strikes. You do not have to have a strike in the aircraft industry or any particular industry. Just strike in the coal industry and you stop everything, because it takes coal to make coke and it takes coke to make steel and it takes steel to make munitions for the boys who are dying on the battle fronts. I would like to see some action on this proposition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday morning there was sent to the desk of each Member the final report by the Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate Airplane Accidents. Accompanying that report was a letter which pointed out to you that there was much information which the committee felt should not be put into a written report, even to the Congress. We advised you at that time that on one day of this week we would ask you to meet in this chamber in executive session so that we could, off the record, give you information gleaned in our investigation which we thought you were entitled to have. So, in agreement with those in charge of the House, on Wednesday afternoon, immediately after the business on the Speaker's desk has been concluded, there will be a meeting in this chamber in executive session, to which all Members are invited, in order that this Committee can give you information which we think you should have.

In that connection, I hope you will forego requests for special orders on Wednesday, so that we can get to that business as soon as possible, because it will require an hour or so to do it in any form.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think there has been a misunderstanding as to any agreement that I entered into. I perfectly agree that this meeting should be held on Wednesday but I did not want it to be interpreted that I am in any agreement to extend for any time the life of this committee that is now investigating airplane accidents.

Mr. NICHOLS. This has nothing to do with that. I will say to the gentleman, however, that this morning there was passed in the Committee on Rules a resolution which does extend the life of this committee until March 1, not for the purpose of making any further investigation, but for the purpose of winding up our final reports and getting the business of the committee to close by March 1.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The reason I probably will oppose that is because we have a request, as the gentleman knows, for the creation of a standing committee to take into consideration this question of aviation after the war. It is one of the great questions of the country at the present time. There is a tremendous demand for it. I do not want to be put in the position by extending the gentleman's committee until March 1 of sidetracking this request that the country has demanded.

Mr. NICHOLS. I think if the gentleman from Massachusetts will talk to me before he makes objection I can convince him that the very ground work we shall lay from now until March 1 will be of material advantage to a standing committee if and when it is created.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith a letter addressed to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], chairman of the Select Committee on Air Accidents, in which are set forth my advocacy for many years of a standing committee on aviation in this House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on three subjects and to include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. FISH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of the business of the day and other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today after the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks, to include a letter from Gen. C. P. Summerall, former Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

JAMES AND FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT, JR.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to amplify on the 1-minute speech I made Thursday, on the lifting of James and Franklin Roosevelt from two battle fronts to the American shore.

Before going into that, however, I want to say a little about my good friend from Massachusetts, the majority floor leader, and his short and ugly word. I have been twitted by some of my western colleagues that I was not living up to the traditions, especially of the West, by passing that over so lightly. There were four reasons why I did not do anything about it.

First. I am a timid soul;

Second. I know it is undignified to engage in any brawl about the House;

Third. One always runs a chance of being whipped when he participates and that is embarrassing; and

Fourth. I do not think any exhibition that the gentleman of Massachusetts and myself would put on would be worth the money.

I am going to give him a little larger order today. He will have the chance to repeat his lie or produce some a-li(e)-bies.

There are two reasons why I asked unanimous consent to postpone this 10 minutes I had allotted to me on a special order for Thursday, until today.

First, it was the desire of some of the leaders on the minority side. In fact, they wanted me to postpone any further remarks indefinitely, and my second reason was, I might give anybody more time to answer my question of Thursday.

I am impelled to make a further statement on this subject now because I feel I am distinctly on the spot. I am only a humble Member of the minority and I carry no prestige of leadership, and the man with the most powerful prestige, the leader of the majority, and all others following his lead, have chosen to dismiss me with the insinuation that I am just a common liar. I say I am on the spot before a hundred new colleagues here who never knew me before and in the country because everybody knows that a majority floor leader outranks a humble minority man and his words carry more weight than mine generally.

First of all, I want to clear up a misconception which has been coming to me in letters since Thursday that I am attacking the military record of the Roosevelt boys, that I am shooting at them. I want to say and to be perfectly honest with you, I am not. They had nothing to do with their sudden departure from the battlefields, and I am not intimating that it was their desire. On the contrary, I think they were humiliated with the orders that brought them out.

Let us review the major events of the subject matter before us. I will not be specific in my dates, but let us review them in a general free way. In the late summer the marines entered Guadalcanal. There were pictures of James Roosevelt on the screen everywhere leading his marines to action. Suddenly, one day, I noticed a little news item in a western newspaper, only about an inch long, announcing that he had arrived by plane on the western coast of America. It appeared to me that it was the same week that the marines entered Guadalcanal. I pondered this thing a good deal. Along in November Drew Pearson had a story about how James would have been decorated had he not been a President's son and how unfortunate it was for him. Then, the last week of November, there was an occasion in which the subject matter was cleared up. I will pass over it for the time being and refer to it last.

Following all of this, and with my hunch more confirmed than ever, on December 5, in the Times-Herald of Washington was a United Press story of how Franklin had the day before come back from the African front and was entering the Navy hospital of Philadelphia for 3 or 4 days, with some kind of a mild attack. The words "mild attack" were distinctly emphasized. Three or four days later there was another item indicating that he was out, and later we know he spent Christmas at the White House. The technique of the second son to leave the battle front was just like the first one. I did have a paragraph in the RECORD of December 10 making reference to the two battle fronts having diversions from them, but I still resolved not to make a speech about it. However, on last Thursday morning here came the announcement in the morning papers, in spite of what Drew Pearson had said weeks before, that James had been cited last October. Then, as you know, I just could not stand it any longer.

This is what happened the last week in November. I came upon a group of seven or eight men talking. There was one distinguished American who was being talked to principally and who was

doing most of the talking. I said to him, "Do you have any idea that it was the Commander in Chief of the Army that lifted James from Guadalcanal?" His reply was, "There isn't any question about it. The Commander in Chief told me he ordered him out. He said, 'When I heard that the marines and James were in Guadalcanal, I ordered him out.'" I said to my distinguished friend, "Are you really sure of that?" He said, "I heard the President say it, and he made no bones of it." I have had the temerity to use this today, because it was not given to us in confidence. It was given to a group of seven or eight and the statement that the President made no bones of it seemed to take away any thought that it was confidential. Now, I know I am facing the big black bear. I know the powerful influences that can take a distinguished citizen with courage and sometimes make him testify absolutely to the contrary. I can even comprehend how they could take seven men that heard him and make them all splendid forgetters, but I am asserting to my colleagues here, if I ever told the truth in my life, I am telling it now. There was not any mistake about what was said. There was not any mistake about what I heard. When they ferret out this distinguished citizen I do not believe they are going to make him testify anything to the contrary. I do not think they are going to seek out the seven other men in order to be able to repudiate me. They might be able to do it, but if they do I know what I heard and I believed the man who said it.

In closing let me say there has been a lot said in this country about chiseling in the little things of life, using too much sugar, pleasure driving, using the gas, owning a sixth tire, and then I have heard time and again the emphasis on that word as applied to the man in small business trying to save himself from the Fair Labor Standards Act. The American people, if I know them rightly, will not stand for chiseling off of the battle front by the higher-ups.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

JAMES AND FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT, JR.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of regret and shame for the gentleman from Kansas and for the dignity and integrity of this Chamber that I have witnessed his performance just now and on last Thursday. It is not characteristic of the gentleman. I would not say that he has put himself and this Chamber to shame did I not fear the consequences of such stabbing at the heart of American unity and America's will to win.

With all respect for the gentleman from Kansas but in due regard for the truth and in proper respect for the integrity of the Commander in Chief of this great Nation and in the honor of his four sons who today are wearing the uniform of the Stars and Stripes, and in deep concern for the unity not only of the people of the home front but for the morale of the men in uniform, I must brand his insinuations and statements as the cheapest, the nastiest below-the-belt disservice yet uttered in the Chamber of this House.

The gentleman says he is on the spot. Mr. Speaker, he is on a worse thing than that. He is on the altar of shame before his country and before this Congress.

Let us look at the record. He challenged on Thursday last that some one answer his statement with the record.

James Roosevelt was first appointed a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps in November 1936. He performed active training duty with the fleet of the marine force on maneuvers in 1938, but in 1939 he submitted his resignation for this reason:

> I am impelled to take this step for reason that I do not feel my age or experience justify my holding such rank in case of actual call to service, and, therefore, it is not proper for me to hold such commission.

His resignation was accepted, but in December of 1939 he was recommissioned at the lower rank of captain.

In August 1940 he was assigned to the Twenty-second Battalion, Marine Corps Reserve, in Los Angeles. In November 1940 this battalion was mobilized—and he with that battalion—for active service at the Marine Corps base, San Diego, Calif.

He was absent on temporary special duty abroad as an observer attached to the British Army headquarters in Egypt for a brief spell.

In July 1941 he was assigned to the office of the Coordinator of Information, Washington, D. C.

In December 1941 he was detached from that duty at his own request, for duty with troops at the Marine Corps base, San Diego.

In February 1942 he joined combat organization of Marine Corps, which went to duty in the Pacific.

In the summer of 1942 he participated in the raid at Makin Island, one of the Marshall group, and was second in command of the raider battalion which participated in this raid. He returned to the United States in October 1942 and is now in San Diego in command of the Fourth Raider Battalion training men for the kind of duty in which he has had personal experience.

Here is testimony from a young man who was wounded in this raid, which I would like to read, and I quote from an Associated Press dispatch from Seattle:

> A wounded marine sergeant related yesterday how the landing for the successful raid on Jap-held Makin Island last August 17 was accomplished from submarines after months of training with inflated rubber boats.
>
> It was the raid in which Lt. Col. James Roosevelt, eldest son of the President, participated actively.
>
> The sergeant, Lawrence A. Lang, 36, a carpenter at Wheeling, W. Va., before he joined the marines 13 years ago, was brought to the Navy hospital last week with a bullet-shattered right elbow.
>
> SERIOUS BUSINESS
>
> "We didn't know where we were going when we started in training," Sergeant Lang explained in an interview, "but we knew it was going to be serious business. We were reasonably sure we were going after Japs if we had to sneak up on 'em in submarines.
>
> "That was the only way we could get in because we were right in the heart of Jap territory.
>
> "We landed under cover of darkness just before daybreak. They didn't spot us when we landed, but the fighting started about half an hour later and it was pretty hot and heavy after that. It was all close-range stuff. The range averaged from 30 to 100 yards.
>
> RIFLES, MACHINE GUNS COUNT
>
> "There wasn't much hand-to-hand fighting. You usually shoot the other fellow or he shoots you before you get that close. Tanks and planes are all right out in the open, but it's just rifles and machine guns that count in the jungle."
>
> Sergeant Lang said he was taken off the island, one of the Gilbert group, about 10 at night, after the Japanese detachment had been wiped out.
>
> He described Colonel Roosevelt as "a swell fellow."
>
> "A lot of people have said he got his rank because he's the President's son," Sergeant Lang said, "but he's way above the average. He's right up in the front line in action."

Mr. Speaker, the commanding officers in charge decorated this distinguished colonel of the American marines for outstanding service and bravery in action; yet today and on Thursday we hear his integrity, his honor, and his record of service challenged. We hear further the very integrity of the armed forces challenged. Any man who states that a commander at the orders of his Commander in Chief, or the commander himself, withdrew one as a special favor from points of danger undermines the integrity and the morale of the armed forces of the United States. I brand it as a disservice and call upon the gentleman to apologize to these boys, to the Commander in Chief, and to his fellow men, as well as to the honor and integrity of the House of Representatives.

Further mention was made that Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., had been pulled from North Africa. Here is what happened, and I contacted the Bureau of Personnel of the Navy Department today for this information. The young man has been attached to a destroyer for 21 months, plowing the North Atlantic on patrol duty and convoy duty, one of the most dangerous assignments that may be given to a naval vessel. Yes; he was at home in December. Why? Because he and his vessel participated in the battles incident to the landing in North Africa. His ship returned to port and he, like other boys aboard, had a few days' leave. Instead of being dishonored, he is back on the high seas today fighting German submarines, upholding the Stars and Stripes, and it comes as poor patriotism for any Member of this House, no matter how humble he may be or claim to be, to try to destroy and take from that boy the glory with which he and his comrades are clothing themselves in this terrific struggle in which the very freedom of mankind is at stake.

There is the record of the other two Roosevelt boys. Let me say here that it is rather striking that out of the millions of men in the armed services, three sons of the President of the United States have already engaged in some of the most difficult operations on land, at

sea, and in the air in which our forces have participated.

Elliott Roosevelt has not been transferred from north Africa. He is there performing a most dangerous class of service in the Air Corps. I am told by his superiors that he has a superior record of bravery going beyond what is ordinarily expected of a man wearing the uniform, risking his life to make photographs of enemy territory. Not only is he making such photographs now, but he went into the territory before it became an area of war operations and made photographs upon which our plans, which worked out so beautifully, were based.

The younger son has been treated as any other American boy, just as the other three have been treated as other American boys have been treated. He has not been abroad. He is assigned to a station, and, although he has made repeated applications for active combat duty, I am told, he has not yet had the privilege of being assigned to such duty.

I call on the gentleman from Kansas to recant. I do not say he is unpatriotic; I know he is not. I do not say he would do a disservice to his country in order to strike at the President; I know he would not. I do not say that the gentleman from Kansas has possession of his full equilibrium in making this statement. The only explanation to which I can subscribe is that he has on this occasion allowed his stark, rank prejudice to so overbalance his equilibrium and intellect as to perform this great disservice to himself, to this House, and to the armed forces of the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 20 minutes.

### HOW THE RUML PLAN OF INCOME TAX COLLECTION WOULD AFFECT YOU AND YOUR GOVERNMENT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I do not need to tell you that there is great interest in this country in the enactment of some method of paying taxes which will not leave the people in debt in case they lose their positions. You have each noticed the editorials, magazine articles, and special pamphlets and resolutions of chambers of commerce pouring into your office with reference to a plan known as the Ruml plan. I have done my best for several days to try to see if I can clarify some of the confusion which seems to persist in the public mind about this new tax proposal.

Mr. Speaker, this widespread interest in the adoption of the so-called Ruml plan for placing individual income-tax payments on a current basis probably will result in early consideration of the proposal, and other pay-as-you-go plans, by the Ways and Means Committee.

#### NO GENERAL MORATORIUM ON TAXES INVOLVED

Pressure for early enactment of the Ruml plan is coming in a large measure from those who mistakenly believe that they will thereby escape the payment of income tax this year. This, of course, would not be true in the case of the great majority of the 27,000,000 persons now subject to income tax. It is principally to prove that this is not so, and thus not to hold out any false hope to anyone, that I am making these remarks. Also, it should be made clear that the proposal would apply only to individuals, and not to corporations.

#### A PAY-AS-YOU-GO SYSTEM HAS MERIT

I am strongly in favor of making our income-tax payments current, for a pay-as-you-go system would be of benefit both to the Treasury and to the taxpayer. So far as the Government is concerned, current collections would bring revenue into the Treasury as income is earned, instead of in the year following. Moreover, there would be less delinquencies, since the Government would cease being a creditor to 27,000,000 taxpayers for last year's taxes. This will be an even more serious problem when the war boom ends, and the Treasury tries to collect the last year's income taxes from millions of persons who will then be without jobs and be unable to discharge their tax liability to the Government.

From the standpoint of the taxpayer, pay-as-you-go collection of the income tax would remove the tax debt which constantly hangs over him under the present system. His current tax liability would be based on, and be paid out of, his current income. Hence there would be no crushing burden of taxation to be paid after he dies, or loses his job, or ceases to have an income as large as he had in the previous year. The present system of deferred collection works a particular hardship on men who go into the armed forces and have to pay a substantial tax on their past year's civilian income out of their present meager pay. In many cases the service pay will be far from adequate to meet the past year's tax liability.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I have been reading about the suggestions with regard to a pay-as-you-go plan and deferring the 1942 income tax to another time. May I inquire of the gentleman if he has made any study of the position in which we may find ourselves as taxpayers if we should defer the payment of our taxes on a fat year like 1942 and then strike an extremely lean year when we may be called upon to pay that tax?

Mr. REED of New York. Later on in my speech I shall make mention of the necessity of guarding against that very thing. I am only trying to present the plan and show some of the things that are in the public mind, which they think this plan proposes to do, but which it does not do. If the gentleman will be patient, I think I shall arrive at the point in which he is interested.

#### TWO ASPECTS TO PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAXATION

It should perhaps be pointed out that there are two separate aspects to pay-as-you-go taxation. To some people, pay-as-you-go means pay-as-you-earn instead of in quarterly installments. This can be brought about simply by providing for weekly or monthly income-tax payments, or through withholding of the tax out of pay envelopes, as is done in connection with social-security taxes and the Victory tax. This phase of pay-as-you-go taxation is not an inherent feature of the so-called Ruml plan, although it has been included in the bill introduced by our colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

The second aspect of pay-as-you-go taxation concerns the question of whether we will continue to collect the Federal income tax on last year's income and out of this year's income, or will "turn the tax clock ahead," as proposed by Mr. Ruml, and collect the tax on this year's income out of this year's income, whether the payments are made quarterly, monthly, or weekly.

#### THE PROBLEM OF LAST YEAR'S LIABILITY

If we are to collect the tax on this year's income out of this year's income, we must somehow postpone or cancel our present liability for paying the tax on last year's income out of this year's income, else as a result of the transition we will be paying 2 years' taxes in the first year during which the new method of collection is in operation.

#### RUML PLAN WOULD CANCEL TAX DEBT ON 1942 INCOME

Various suggestions have been made for dealing with this problem. It has been proposed by some that our income-tax debt on our 1942 income be spread over a number of years, thereby avoiding any doubling up in any 1 year. Others have proposed that the 1942 liability be collected from the estate of the taxpayer when he dies. Mr. Ruml has proposed that this 1942 tax debt now hanging over us be absolutely canceled, so that we may start with a clean slate in putting our tax payments on a current basis. His argument for completely wiping out the 1942 liability is that the object of making income-tax payments current is to get rid of the present tax debt resulting from the fact that we now collect the income tax on a particular year's income the year after it is earned. He contends that mere postponement of the debt will defeat the whole purpose of trying to set up the collection of the income tax on a pay-as-you-earn basis.

#### INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS WOULD CONTINUE TO FLOW INTO TREASURY UNDER RUML PLAN

The question naturally arises: "Does not the cancelation of our liability for income tax on our 1942 income result in a terrific loss of revenue to the Government at a time when we need every cent we can raise to help pay for the staggering cost of the war?"

Though it may be difficult to see at first blush, the answer, however, is "No," because while the Ruml plan would cancel the liability for paying the income tax on 1942 incomes out of 1943 income, it would at the same time move up the time for paying the income tax on our current incomes to the current year. Thus the great majority of the 27,000,000 income-tax payers would go on paying their taxes as if nothing had happened, and the revenue would continue to flow into the Treasury.

#### THOSE WHO WOULD BENEFIT THIS YEAR

The only ones who would immediately benefit from the cancelation of the 1942 liability would be those who died during 1942, or who are receiving less income in

1943 than in 1942, or who have this year lost their jobs or ceased to have sufficient income to make them subject to tax.

In the case of the man who died during 1942, or who no longer has any taxable income, no tax would be payable in 1943 on the 1942 income.

In the case of the man who is receiving less income in 1943 than in 1942, his current tax burden would be reduced in keeping with his current income.

SOME WOULD PAY MORE THIS YEAR

On the other hand, in the case of the man who is receiving a higher income in 1943 than in 1942, there is no cessation or diminution of tax payments in 1943. Instead, he would pay a higher tax than under the present system, because instead of his current liability being measured by his last year's income it would be measured by the increased income anticipated during the current year. In other words, where the income is increased, the Government benefits by collecting the increased tax on the increased income a year sooner than under the present system.

Any current loss of revenue resulting from the outright cancelation of the 1942 liability in the case of certain taxpayers would be offset by the speeding up of collections from those who have increased incomes during 1943. Moreover, as I have previously indicated, the Government probably would have fewer tax delinquents under a system of current collection.

THOSE WHO HAVE SAME INCOME IN 1943 AS IN 1942

In the case of those who have the same income in 1943 as in 1942, there would be no immediate benefit to them, or loss to the Treasury, as a result of the cancelation of the 1942 income-tax liability under the Ruml plan. They would go on paying income tax just as if nothing had happened. Their 1942 income would be used as a basis for measuring their tentative income tax for the current year. In other words, they would be taxed in 1943 on their anticipated 1943 income, instead of on their last year's income. Any minor adjustments which might be necessary on the basis of the final determination of the income and deductions at the end of the year would be made when the tentative return is filed for the subsequent year.

TO SUMMARIZE

Thus I repeat that the adoption of the Ruml plan will not result in a general moratorium on income-tax payments during 1943 or any subsequent year. In the case of those with the same income in 1943 as in 1942, the Government would collect the same tax during 1943 under the Ruml plan as under the present system. In the case of those with more income in 1943 than in 1942, the Government will collect a higher tax during 1943 than under the present system. Only in the case of those who have died during 1942 or have suffered a reduction in income or ceased to have sufficient income to make them currently subject to tax, would there be any current loss of revenue to the Government or gain to the taxpayer.

WHEN BENEFIT OF CANCELING 1942 LIABILITY ACCRUES TO AVERAGE TAXPAYER

The question may be asked: "If this is so, then when do other taxpayers benefit from the cancelation of the 1942 liability and when does the Treasury suffer any loss of revenue in their case?"

The answer to this question is very simple, but it varies in each individual case, depending upon when the person, as a result of death or loss of his job or otherwise, ceases to have income in the then current tax year.

Under the present system of deferred collection the individual, although he had no income in the then current year, say 1960, would still owe for the taxes on the previous year's income. Under the Ruml plan his taxes would have been paid currently, and he would have no tax debt hanging over him or his estate when his income ceased. Up to that time, however, he would have had no benefit from the cancelation of the 1942 liability in the year 1943, since he still had to pay his 1943 taxes in 1943 and his subsequent taxes in the year in which the money was earned. Thus, in his case, the benefit of the cancelation is deferred until the year following his death or loss of income. In that year, as I have indicated, there is no tax debt for the prior year's income hanging over him or his estate. It is then that the benefit in his case is felt and, conversely, that any loss to the Government results.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. As I understood the gentleman, he said that only two classes of people would be benefited by this plan that he is advocating, but which I have not had time to look into.

Mr. REED of New York. I am advocating only the merits of the pay-as-you-go system, with such modifications of the Ruml plan as will be workable and will not permit tax avoidance by those making large incomes in 1942, who, under this plan, might see fit to retire early in 1943.

Mr. DOUGHTON. This is no criticism of the gentleman from New York, but, as this plan is so new, so revolutionary, and doubtless will be so controversial, I have been hoping that discussion of it could have been left until the committee has had hearings and both sides of the controversy be explained. However, as I say, I understood the gentleman from New York to say that only two classes would be benefited, those who died during 1942, and those who would have a less income in 1943 than in 1942. Take those who are not included in those two classes, with their 1942 taxes payable in 1943. When would they pay them? If they never pay them, would they not be benefited?

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman has asked a very pertinent question, and he may ask it again after I conclude, if I have not answered it in the meantime. I do not want the gentleman to get the idea that the members of his committee would not try to cooperate with the gentleman 100 percent in this matter of the current collection of individual income taxes. However, we are all going to be flooded with mail, and a great many people think at the present time, because the word "forgiveness" has been used, that they will not have to pay any income tax on March 15 if this plan be adopted.

Mr. DOUGHTON. There are two classes who will be entirely excused from present liability in 1942, and that is what I am trying to get light on, whether or not they will ever pay the 1942 tax, or whether this Ruml scheme means to let them out of paying the 1942 tax entirely.

Mr. REED of New York. That is exactly what I am trying to clear up.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. There has been, as the gentleman knows, and as the chairman of the committee is aware, the plan of carrying the 1942 taxes on as a debt, and then, when a man dies, if the estate exceeds the $60,000 exemption, the tax would be paid.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. That 1942 tax would be collected from the man's estate.

Mr. DOUGHTON. But suppose he did not die for a while?

Mr. KNUTSON. Very well; then we would not get it for a while.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I think it should be collected before he dies.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this may be a very interesting colloquy between my two friends, but I cannot yield further.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I think the gentleman should proceed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman proceeds, will he yield to me?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. I compliment the gentleman from New York for bringing out these questions and answers, questions that are somewhat confusing. I think every Member of the House, and I think every man in the country, wants to understand this and every other suggestion, because we all know that when the committee and Congress details its program, the committee will have to go into every one of these matters.

Mr. REED of New York. And may I say to the gentleman from Kansas that I wish I could flatter myself that I have approached this problem as intelligently as he did when he took the floor on this same question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the gentleman that there are other special orders following him.

Mr. REED of New York. Then, with the consent of those having the special orders, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman has mentioned those who had large incomes in 1942 who would be benefited by this Ruml plan. Could not that be provided for by stating that in no event could the tax paid in 1943 be less than the man would have paid in 1942?

Mr. REED of New York. I think there are at least a half dozen different ways that we could provide for that danger. I merely call attention to the fact that I know such a danger exists, and it can be corrected by the Committee on Ways and Means, whose business it is to see that there is no tax evasion under any plan.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. McLEAN. And I suggest to the gentleman from New York that if he will examine the bill which I have introduced, H. R. 506, he will see that it is an effort to accomplish the purpose which he has in mind.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes. I am using a Member of Congress as an example, because I know that will challenge the same attention of Members that a picture of an individual does when he finds his own photograph in a group.

Mr. DOUGHTON. On what assumption would he necessarily pay the 1942 tax out of the 1943 income? Have not many people looked ahead knowing that they would owe a 1942 tax, and out of the 1942 income have they not provided for the payment of that tax? I think a great many people have done that. Then, why pay out of the 1943 income if they have paid for it out of the 1942, as they should?

Mr. REED of New York. That is what they are trying to avoid. When this war is over, and millions of people find themselves without income, they will still have hanging over them this tremendous debt from the last year, under the present system.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Could we not deal with that matter then?

Mr. REED of New York. Oh, it is a good idea to deal with it now, because this is the time to do so; not when there is a $300,000,000,000 debt. No man knows how high the taxes will be when the war boom is over. It would be a fine thing if the taxes were current rather than in arrears.

EFFECT OF RUML PLAN SPREAD OVER THE YEARS

It must be evident, therefore, that the effect of the transition from the present "year-behind" system of collection to current collection, as proposed under the Ruml plan, would be spread over a period of a great many years.

Let me illustrate this point by taking the case of a Member of Congress, who has an income of $10,000. At the present moment, he is in debt to the Treasury for the tax on his last year's income, which in the case of a single man would amount to about $2,000. Under the existing method of tax collection, he would normally pay that debt in four equal quarterly installments during 1943, out of his 1943 income. If the Ruml plan should be adopted, that debt for last year's income tax liability would be wiped out. However, he would still pay $2,000 income tax during 1943, but the payment would be in discharge of the anticipated 1943 liability instead of the 1942 liability.

If the Member in question stays in Congress, he will go on paying his tax year after year under the Ruml plan without interruption. As long as he receives his congressional salary and pays his tax, the Treasury will not be out 1 cent so far as he is concerned, nor will his payments have been reduced.

If at some future time the Member dies or resigns from Congress or is not reelected and does not take up any other occupation, he or his estate will then receive the benefit resulting from the elimination of the taxable year 1942. Under the present system, one more year's tax liability would be due. Under the Ruml plan, there would be no tax debt for the past year.

Thus it is apparent that whatever gain to the taxpayer, or loss to the Treasury, which would occur by reason of dropping the year 1942 in order to get tax payments on a current basis, would, as I have said heretofore, be spread over a great many years, which in the individual case will be the productive lifetime of the taxpayer.

It would work out very much the same as insurance policies are paid off over a period of years. People do not all die at the same time.

What I have tried to picture in words is graphically illustrated by the following table:

| Income year | Income | Assumed tax payments[1] | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Present law | Ruml plan |
| 1942 | $10,000 | $1,200 on 1941 income, paid in 1942 | $1,200 on 1941 income, paid in 1942 (plan not in effect). |
| 1943 | 10,000 | $2,000 on 1942 income, paid in 1943 | $2,000 on 1943 income, paid in 1943. |
| 1944 | 10,000 | $2,000 on 1943 income, paid in 1944 | $2,000 on 1944 income, paid in 1944. |
| 1945 | 10,000 | $2,000 on 1944 income, paid in 1945 | $2,000 on 1945 income, paid in 1945. |
| 1946 (dies at end of year) | 10,000 | $2,000 on 1945 income, paid in 1946 | $2,000 on 1946 income, paid in 1946. |
| 1947 | None | $2,000 on 1946 income, paid in 1947 | None. |

[1] Exclusive of Victory tax, and assuming rates are unchanged in future.

Under the present plan, the taxpayer, or his estate, would make six tax payments in the above example from 1942 through 1947. Under the Ruml plan, only five tax payments would be made in this period, the omission occurring in the last year. At the present time, the tax liability continues after the income has ceased. Under the Ruml plan, there is no tax debt. The above table shows how the full effect of dropping the year 1942 is not felt, either by the taxpayer or the Government until the taxpayer ceases to have an income which is currently taxable. It also illustrates how the effect of dropping the year 1942 would be spread out over the years, the time differing in each individual case.

Suppose we take the case of a single man who earned $3,000 per annum in a civilian job, and went into the Army January 1, 1943, at $50 per month. Here is how his tax payments would work out under existing law and under the Ruml plan:

| Income year | Income | Assumed tax payments[1] | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Present law | Ruml plan |
| 1942 | $3,000 | $200 on 1941 income, paid in 1942 | $200 on 1941 income, paid in 1942 (plan not in effect). |
| 1943 | 600 | $400 on 1942 income, paid in 1943 | $5 on 1943 income paid in 1943.[2] |
| 1944 | 600 | $5 on 1943 income, paid in 1944. | $5 on 1944 income, paid in 1944. |
| 1945 (back at old job) | 3,000 | $5 on 1944 income, paid in 1945 | $400 on 1945 income, paid in 1945. |
| 1946 (dies at end of year) | 3,000 | $400 on 1945 income, paid in 1946 | $400 on 1946 income, paid in 1946. |
| 1947 | None | $400 on 1946 income, paid in 1947 | None. |

[1] Exclusive of Victory tax, and assuming rates are unchanged in future.

[2] Since the taxpayer knows that his income for 1943 will be less than for 1942, he is not required to use the 1942 liability as a tentative basis for computing his 1943 liability, but can determine his tentative tax on the basis of his reduced income for 1943. The converse is true as regards the year 1945. (See H. J. Res. 17, p. 5, line 13.)

Under the above example, the taxpayer and the Treasury both feel the effect of dropping the year 1942 out of the picture, as provided under the Ruml plan, as soon as the diminution of income occurs. However, it is made up again as soon as he returns to his old job—from 1942 through 1945 he would pay a total of $610 under both methods of tax payment. As long as he continues in his job his tax status would continue to be the same under either method. When he dies or ceases to have a taxable income he still has a tax liability for the past year under the existing method of collection. Under the Ruml plan this tax debt would not exist. Thus the foregoing example also makes clear that the ultimate effect of dropping the 1942 liability under the Ruml plan is postponed until the taxpayer dies or ceases to have income. It also demonstrates how, where the income is increased over the previous year, the Ruml plan would speed up collection of the increase in tax by a full year. See reference to year 1945, where soldier returns to his old job after service in the Army.

Mr. JENKINS. I want to say that I have read this article, and I presume I

am reading from your speech. This is a mimeographed copy I have here. I want to say to the Members of the House that this is absolutely the most complete document yet published on taxes. The gentleman from New York has just read some figures that you could not possibly follow. Nobody could follow them in a speech, but they are the most conclusive story of the Ruml plan that has yet been printed by anybody. I wish to compliment the gentleman for his preparation of this wonderful article.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his kind remarks.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield briefly.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We have a right to assume that the income taxes will continue through the years; that is, it will be a policy of this Government.

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There are about 27,000,000 people who come within the law. I have seen the statement somewhere that about 15 percent of those will likely not be able to pay any income taxes from their salaries, and so forth. That would be three or four million. The chances are that the income of the people this year will be greater than it was in 1942. Can we not assume that?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Then, perhaps, we will catch three or four millions. So can we not assume that the Treasury will collect more money in 1943 under this pay-as-you-go program than it would under the 1942 plan?

Mr. REED of New York. That is the conclusion I have come to. Perhaps later events may change my mind, but that is my conclusion now.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is not a question of whether the Treasury will get more money. The question is whether a large taxpayer will have to pay the tax which the law says he should pay. We need a great deal more money. The question is whether the taxpayer is excused from paying the tax which the law says he should pay. We expect to get more money. We will have to impose additional taxes and get more money. The question is whether or not somebody is going to be relieved of taxes that the law says he should pay. That is the issue.

Mr. REED of New York. In my opinion, you will get more money by this shift, with such modifications as the committee may make.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Under the same rates?

Mr. REED of New York. Under the same rates, because these rates are retroactive to 1942 anyway.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield briefly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not hear the gentleman's discussion about a million of taxpayers who are in the professional class, about whom there is no way to estimate the amount of their taxes.

Mr. REED of New York. Of course, provision must be made with reference to them and with reference to farmers and other groups. I am not dealing with that question. What I am trying to do is to clarify the public mind, and show that they are not going to be relieved of taxes in the final analysis. They are going to pay them on March 15. They are going to pay them at the same rates. As a result of the speeding up of collections currently we will gain considerable revenue, to make up for any alleged loss that we may suffer otherwise.

Now, in conclusion, I hope, as a result of this discussion, I have helped to clarify some of the confusion regarding the Ruml plan. Let it be understood that if the plan is adopted, there will be no immediate cessation of tax payments for the average taxpayer; also, that any loss to the Treasury will be spread over a long period of years.

Of course it should be pointed out that if Congress gives favorable consideration to the Ruml plan, there is no assurance that it will be enacted exactly in the form proposed by Mr. Ruml. The details would have to be worked out after careful study and deliberation. Congress certainly would want to make provision against any possibility of tax avoidance, and it probably would also want to give consideration to the question of whether the 1942 liability should be forgiven in all cases, or only where the income did not exceed a certain amount. In the case of larger incomes, it might want to provide that the 1942 liability should be deferred for a certain number of years, or possibly collected from the man's estate when he dies. All these questions and many others would have to be carefully considered.

[Here the gavel fell.]

### INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report (Rept. No. 8) on House Resolution 21 for printing in the RECORD:

*Resolved*, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission with a view to determining whether or not such Commission in its organization, in the selection of personnel, and in the conduct of its activities, has been, and is, acting in accordance with law and the public interest.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at the earliest practicable date during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NICHOLS). There is no question of objecting. The gentleman is simply filing a report.

Mr. FISH. I would like to ask when the gentleman expects to bring this up?

Mr. COX. The first thing tomorrow morning.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the question of social security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech made in New York before the National Association of Retail Secretaries, on the future role of water transportation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, now that the Seventy-eighth Congress has been organized and is beginning to function, it is altogether appropriate that it take some legislative soundings as it pursues its course. In performing our responsibility as public servants, we should attempt to determine the will of the people as much as possible, as indicated in the recent elections. To ignore the expressed will of the electorate is to fail in our duty and cause the legislative processes of free government to fall.

Few will deny that the election last November established very definitely that the American people are in revolt against the unbridled bureaucracy which has run rampant throughout the Nation and invaded every home. The American people are ready to make any manner of sacrifice and to submit to all sorts of restrictions necessary for winning the war and bringing their sons home to them at an earlier date but they are indignant with the confusion of thought, confliction of policies, the lethargy of action, protection of special and private interests and the intimidation threatened them by the pontifical pronouncements of the war lords of bureaucracy.

The determination of the people to win the war quickly and effectively seems to be in conflict with the equal determination of the bureaucrats to continue their practices of paternalistic and dictatorial administration. The people are tired of being pushed around like so many pieces of game—they will fight this war after the American way and not after the pattern of foreign dogmas.

This is the responsibility of Congress, the chosen spokesman for the people. We cannot shirk it. It is not enough that the Congress appropriate funds to equip and maintain a vast military establishment. It is not enough that it enact legislation authorizing the administration to regulate our domestic economy in time of war. We must, in addition, make sure that the funds are as wisely and effectively spent as wartime conditions permit. We must make sure that the administration of the laws and the exercise of the authorities conferred are positive and productive and not excessive. It is the duty of the Congress to see that this is done. The people have selected us to protect them against the deadening influence of interbureau jealousies and against the high-handed and officious practices of arrogant administrators.

One of the most bitter complaints against bureaucracy arises in connection with the price and rationing program. For over a year, criticisms have come from all parts of the country relative to all phases of the program and in ever increasing number and volume. Yet the Congress has done nothing about it. The complaints have fallen on barren ground. As Members of the Congress, we individually hear the complaints and individually communicate them by phone or letter to the proper administrative official, usually without success or satisfaction and invariably with the inescapable feeling that the official at the other end is habitually registering his disdain for us by that typical American gesture of the nasal-digit drama. Even informal combinations of the House Members interested in a common problem have met with no success.

This utter disregard of the public interests and practice of the ruthless and high-handed methods typical of European governments must stop. The Congress is not entirely innocent in this regard. There has been no legislative instrumentality or agency before which these complaints could be placed by the people, no agency which had the authority to investigate the need for rationing, to settle the differences between conflicting policies, statements, and charges between various bureaus, to inquire into the progress of plans to correct the conditions which make rationing imperative or, finally, to expose the ruthless, arrogant, and un-American methods of enforcement.

In some instances our neglect to inquire into the progress of action necessary to remedy conditions has resulted in months of delay with an inevitable adverse effect upon our domestic economy. It was not until the bureaucrats had been permitted to flounder and vacillate in the rubber situation that any congressional action was taken, and even now we cannot be sure but that inside personalities and behind-the-scene private interests are causing the synthetic rubber program to bog down.

There has never been any complete uncontradicted explanation of the necessity for sugar rationing, with our refineries and warehouses with excess stocks and with the sugar production in continental United States, if properly developed and directed, sufficient to meet all our domestic needs. Surely the people are entitled to learn from their Government the truth in this regard without equivocation or confusion.

For months the American people have been rationed in coffee, and yet we hear that ships return from South American ports with nothing in their holds but sand and water for ballast. Failure to relieve the gasoline and oil transportation situation last summer and fall might have been corrected had there been a legislative forum where the individual responsibility for the failure could have been brought to light. There are scores of instances such as these where our Government has fallen down, in which the public has been given an abundance of half truths by way of explanation and yet the Congress is silent.

Even now there is widespread clamor throughout the Nation over the unreasonableness of the methods of enforcement of the ban on pleasure driving. People quite properly refuse to be victimized by a system of secret ogpu or gestapo. They will observe reasonable rules and regulations but will never submit to a system of civilian sneaks, snoopers, and snipers, nor should they.

How then can these conditions be best corrected by the Congress? At one time last summer I endeavored, without success, to require all rationing orders of consumer commodities to be approved by the Congress, solely for the purpose of bringing facts into the open and convincing the people of the necessity for the rationing and of making sure that the rule of enforcement would be fair and reasonable. There are many sound objections against seeking to correct these conditions by such a proposal. However, the alternative is not for the Congress to take the attitude that once having delegated the authority to the executive branch of the Government, we are powerless to act and that the responsibility of proper functioning and exercise of the authority rests upon someone else.

The alternative, to my mind, is to create an official legislative forum, a place where these complaints of the people can be voiced, where their protests can be heard, and where their solutions and recommendations can be considered. Such an agency of the Congress can go a long way toward re-creating public confidence in Government by bringing to light the factual conditions which make rationing necessary. Such an agency can give to the people honest and uncolored assurance that steps are being taken to correct those conditions. Such an agency can give persuasive impetus to the relaxation or modification of unreasonable rules, regulations, and edicts.

Accordingly, I have today introduced a resolution authorizing the creation of a special select committee of the House, to be composed of nine Members, and whose duties will be to inquire into the fairness of price limitations, the necessity for various types of rationing of consumer commodities and services, the reasonableness of the policies affecting rent control, the progress of Government-sponsored programs to alleviate the scarcity of rationed articles and the reasonableness of methods of enforcements. Of course, the operation of such a committee must be conducted in such a way as to help rather than to interfere with the war program. Important, secret, and vital information which, if permitted to reach the ears of our enemies would do us serious harm, cannot be disclosed to the public, but this does not mean that representatives of the people who value their oath of office no less than even the Commander in Chief, should not be kept informed. I firmly believe that if such an agency were created and the public given to realize that its representatives in Government, chosen by them, are an active, constructive, and dynamic part of the domestic war program, much of the criticisms would be mollified and greater confidence generated. I strongly urge that this or some similar proposal receive serious consideration and positive action by the House.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman gets favorable action on his resolution. Had the Congress or representatives of the people been informed as to things going on in Japan prior to Pearl Harbor, the situation might have been entirely different and we could have anticipated the attack which was made on us December 7, 1941.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman is delving into a realm of international politics which my resolution does not contemplate. I do firmly believe, however, that the people should be told the truth on any subject matter affecting their interest.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We learn now there were certain things that Ambassador Grew had informed the State Department were taking place a whole year prior to December 7, 1941, which information was not conveyed to any Member of Congress, irrespective of a committee of Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some observations of mine on the subject Successful Small Plants Pooling, together with two articles and a portion of a letter from our distinguished friend the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN].

I am informed this will take two and a half pages and will cost $112.50, but because of the importance of the small businessman's problems at this time I feel there may be some contribution to a solution in part of the plight they are in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute to ask the majority leader a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, can the majority leader tell us what the program will be for tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. On tomorrow the resolution reported out of the Rules Committee to investigate the Federal Communications Commission will come up for consideration in the House.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast I made over radio station KWTO in Springfield, Mo., last Monday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this Congress the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] introduced House Resolution 21, calling for an "investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission with the view of determining whether or not such commission in its organization, in the selection of personnel, and in the conduct of its activities, has been, and is, acting in accordance with law and the public interest."

The resolution was reported out today by the House Rules Committee and is scheduled to come before the House for consideration, according to the announcement of the majority leader a minute ago, on tomorrow.

I think that this resolution, in its present form, is too narrow. It should either be amended or superseded by a broader resolution. I have therefore today introduced another resolution which includes the substance of the Cox resolution and other issues as well.

Radio broadcasting vitally affects the public. If there is to be an investigation, we want one which will get into the basic issues in this most important field. I have no objection to the Cox resolution except that it is too limited. We want to know what the Commission is doing. But more important even than that we want to know about the industry, an industry in which a few networks dominating the field make inordinate profits and in which the small independent stations in our rural sections are being forced to the wall. In 1941, for example, the return on net investment, after taxes, was about 60 percent for the National Broadcasting Co. and for the Columbia Broadcasting System. While this was going on, two or three hundred of our smaller stations lost money; and they are still losing money. During this year, the small radio station, along with other small businesses, is threatened with extinction. We cannot afford to let that happen. With gasoline rationing, they are more important than ever. They are the backbone of independent broadcasting service in the interest of our own local communities, and in the interest of the Nation at war. We must not have the building up of monopoly, control, and inordinate profits at one end of the line and economic disaster at the other end.

We want to know the extent of the monopoly and control exercised by a very few of our 130,000,000 people over this, the world's most effective medium for molding public opinion. We want to know how that control is tied up with control over the sources of program material—over records and transcriptions, for example. Can small record and transcription companies survive? Our small independent stations cannot get network service. Those on the networks get little or nothing from it. Stations, especially the independent ones, rely to a great extent upon transcriptions. We want to know whether there is any undue concentration of control here and whether it is being exercised to the detriment of the independent stations.

We also want to know how the control of radio broadcasting is being exercised in terms of what the public is permitted to hear. We want to know how it is that organizations like the Cooperative League are denied time to use the frequencies which belong to the public. Regardless of our own views regarding the merits or demerits of this movement, we should know how it is that a movement of such public significance is denied time on the ground that its program concerned a controversial matter or that it may be disturbing to present vested interests. We want to know the answer to that. We must know how much discrimination there is by radio stations in selling the use of their facilities, who the favored persons or groups are and the reason for their advantage.

And the use of radio in political campaigns is another matter we have reason to be concerned with. Some Congressmen who remained in Washington during the recent campaign have particular reason to be concerned over the action of radio stations in denying time to their supporters back home.

There are other matters any investigation should include. All of us no doubt have received complaints in recent weeks about the great wave of vulgarity, obscenity, and suggestiveness that has been coming in over various radio programs. We know that the average station is powerless to control this flood of vulgarity because it has no control over the program and no advance notice as to what may be in it. We cannot afford to let programs which come into our homes and which cannot well be kept from the ears of our children replace the Police Gazette.

Commentators, too, merit our attention. Whose interests are they serving? The recent attacks upon this body over the radio are serious business. We want to know what is back of all this. We want to know what efforts have been made to present the other side, and if none have been, why not.

We have only one agency, the Federal Communications Commission, which is entrusted with authority to do something about these vital subjects unless we can dispose of some of them by definitive legislation. It may well be that the Commission can be expected to do a better job in protecting the public interest if more explicit duties are placed upon it. At any rate here is a grave problem and I submit we cannot continue to overlook it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish to thank the gentleman for his excellent statement but I also wish to state that it seems to me if there is to be an investigation of this kind it should cover the whole field of this very vital industry and all of its effects upon the people of America. I also want to commend the gentleman for what he had to say about this matter connected with the Cooperative League which I understand has now been straightened out, but the fact that there was ever any question about it is rather disturbing to me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand it has been straightened out since the subject has been raised in the Congress of the United States. In this connection, I may say that it seems interesting that the companies first turned down the program offered. I certainly have no interest in the Cooperative League; I have no connection with it and know very little about it; but I understand that it was largely turned down on the ground that it presented controversial matters and that the second cause of the rejection was that it might perhaps be objectionable to other advertisers who were already on the program, which indicates that the advertisers are very largely controlling what goes out over these wave lengths which belong to the people of the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein editorials and clippings on the subject which I have discussed, and also to include the language of the resolution I have today introduced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[From Variety of December 23, 1942]

RADIO HITTING BLUE NOTES—SOUND WARNING ON DIRT, SLANG—COMPLAINTS FROM STATION OPERATORS PERTAIN TO "GIRL GAGS" OF COMICS BROADCASTING FROM ARMY CAMPS—CUSS WORDS AND DOUBLE ENTENDRE FREELY USED IN NIGHTTIME SCRIPTS—PREY FOR BLUENOSES

As indicated by letters received by Variety during recent weeks, local broadcasters are becoming increasingly distressed over the latitude of language allowed some of the network comics and dramatic shows. The complaints, as expressed by these station operators, range from the tendency of comics

while playing before service camp audiences to give a bluish tint to "girl gags" to the free use of questionable expletives and double entendre in nighttime script programs. Most of the letters have sounded a note of warning, urging that the networks bear down on the culprits before the bluenoses start up with their customary exaggerated alarum.

One of the more articulate and provocative notes on this theme comes from Barron Howard, business manager of WRVA, Richmond. His letter follows:

"Damn! hell! guts! lousy! These and other odd bits of profanity and vulgarity are commonplace on the air now, particularly on programs with a metropolitan origin. The explanations range from 'freedom of the art' to 'this is war,' and a plea for 'realism.'"

EASY ATTENTION-GETTER

"As usual, those who make these explanations have an ax to grind, and merely make use of surrounding circumstances and conditions to get these axes ground. Of course, it is easy to hop up a program with shock technique and blue gags when other writers fail to do so. Violation of a tabu always compels attention, regardless of the nature of the tabu. It is also axiomatic that such violations are effective only in inverse ratio to the extent of use.

"'Freedom of the art' sounds swell, but any art is addressed to its audience. The artist who fails to define the audience to which he is working, is that much less an artist. A spicy cartoon would go to Esquire—decidedly not to the Southern Churchman.

"The plea of 'realism' falls down completely. What has happened to all the good solid four-letter Anglo-Saxon words? Why eliminate them from a realistic picture? A line is drawn, and it can just as well be drawn before anyone becomes offended. What does the paternity gag have to do with 'realism' in art?

"It is true that 'this is war,' but it is also true, as a matter of record, that the most stirring appeals in American, or any other history, have been phrased without benefit of profanity or vulgarity.

THEN CAME THE COMICS

"Time was when radio was family entertainment. Then came the stage comedians with a background of blue gag technique and a nostalgic odor of the burlesque wheel. The blue pencils wore out one by one until now a cloud of ozone surrounds the average comedy program. Paternity jokes are standard. Illegitimate children and human triangles frolic during the daytime.

"Radio is the only truly national medium and it is fundamentally a family affair. By its very nature it cannot become all things to all men. Its function is distribution of education, culture, and entertainment. Youths Companion, Ladies' Home Journal, Atlantic Monthly, and the Saturday Evening Post, yes—but no dice on Captain Billy's Wizbang. Many people object to profanity and vulgarity, whereas none object to the absence of these items and all can be entertained, educated, and informed without them.

"Admittedly it is tough going to entertain a gang at an Army camp with an hour of burlesque routines and then follow in the next-to-closing spot with a radio script that is so dull by comparison that not even a titter comes from the highly publicized military background. This goes right back to the time-honored radio custom of playing to the immediate audience—the studio audience or the group with which the writer is familiar. All too often this is the smart metropolitan theater-going public which is not even representative of the cities in which it resides. In our own area, for instance, church groups are all-important. These groups are highly vocal, truly representative, and play a large part in community affairs. It may be recalled that an evangelical bishop swung the State of Virginia into the Republican column for the first and only time in history when Al Smith was a Presidential candidate. The motion picture managed to see the light when the church became militant.

MUST CLEAN SHOP

"Aside from any sense of stewardship or of proprieties, it is to our own self-interest to clean up the shop before somebody comes in with a new broom and does it for us.

"It is purely a matter of good writing and fairness to our fellow craftsmen. If, for instance, 'guts' were strewn over every progress, the word would become ineffective and another shocker would have to be found—presumably some word connected with bodily excreta or sexual functions—until it, too, went the eventual way of all shockers.

"The lazy writer must be made to recognize the limitations of his craft—lest someone else define his audience for him. Or shall we at WRVA go ahead with the idea of presenting a good narrator of Pullman smoker stories each evening at 10:30 p. m.?

"BARRON HOWARD."

---

[From the Washington Times-Herald of January 12, 1943]

RADIO, PRESS FLAYED FOR NAUGHTY WORDS

NEW YORK, January 11.—A protest against the use of "hells and damns and other rough and vulgar expressions" was lodged today by the Ensley Highland Methodist Church of Birmingham, Ala., with broadcasting companies and newspaper press services. The letter of protest was also sent to President Roosevelt and Wendell L. Willkie.

---

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of December 15, 1942]

RADIO SHOULD GUARD

The right of radio to be free of over-regulation imposes upon broadcasters a duty of self-restraint which is necessary if programs are to be kept clean enough to be welcome visitors in the American home. The majority recognize that duty, and heretofore few broadcasts have contained the vulgarities which would make them objectionable.

Listeners are aware of a creeping now in that direction. Maybe it's the war. Perhaps some script writers, or the comics employing them, believe that national robustness requires a saltier diet; maybe commentators, interviewers, or those interviewed on the air, believe that profanity seasons and adds virility to their words; or perchance they reason that in an era of stark realism anything goes. Whatever the explanation the trend is noticeably on. In the vast majority of cases, the objectionable features occur on the chains, far from the point of outlet.

The industry does not need to be reminded, surely, that among its listeners are millions of children and young people, who do not yet regard uninhibited language and smut in the guise of humor as smart. But they might come to so regard it if they hear it often enough.

Broadcasters are in a position to regulate these offenders. They owe it to the public to preserve—and compel their entire retinue, big names and small, to respect—standards consistent with a sense of decency which hasn't changed, war or no war.

---

[From the Advertiser of December 1942]

THE PROBLEMS OF THE SMALL RADIO STATION DURING WARTIME

(By C. L. "Chet" Thomas, general manager, KFRU, Columbia, Mo.)

Have you noticed the worried look of the small station manager? Notice particularly the deep crease between his eyes and the horizontal worry lines on his forehead. These outward signs of agitation are slight indeed when compared to the inner mental turmoil. The reason? That's easy to answer. The solution? That's a difficult assignment, and no one man is brilliant enough to know all the answers. There is a solution, of that you can be sure, but it is going to take unity of action and an unselfish approach to the problem. To review a few of the problems:

First is the sharp decline in business. Many 250-watt stations are located in towns and areas devoid of war industries or Army, Navy, and Marine encampments. Population in these areas has decreased appreciably due to a mass migration of workers to industrial centers. Loss of population means loss of buying power which is accompanied by curtailed advertising budgets. Tough indeed is the lot of a small station dependent for revenue on the advertising appropriations of retailers. The problem becomes more acute when you consider that small stations derive up to 85 percent of their revenue from merchants in their home town. The volume of national advertising placed on the 250-watt station in a minor market is too small to pay the overhead. This is a source of income that must be exploited if many of the "smallies" are to survive for the duration.

Personnel has always been a problem and is becoming a major source of worry now. Enlistments and the draft have taken their just toll, and I doubt if you will hear many complaints from the management. Winning the war is our greatest problem, and the small stations are making an all-out effort. Loss of men to the fighting forces affects the large, medium, and small stations, and therein lies the problem. The larger station needs replacements and has been reviewing applications received with a less critical eye. No one blames anyone else for trying to advance his or her position in life, and, contrary to popular belief, the manager of a small station is a human sort of fellow under his callous exterior. This makes it all the harder for him to sell the staff member on the advantages of small-town life in order to keep a good announcer, writer, salesman, etc. Financially, the harried small-station manager cannot compete, so most of the time he loses the argument. Were this to happen infrequently, it could be coped with, but when it becomes a weekly occurrence, it makes old men out of young men quickly.

Equipment—a nine-letter word meaning grief. Spare stock is at the required minimum, but rarely above. When a tube burns out the entire staff becomes depressed. The small station is no hoarder of tubes, condensers, transformers, etc., for patriotic as well as financial reasons. Engineers are becoming inventive geniuses in order to keep the station on the air. Not many station managers are technically minded, so when the transmitter starts "acting up" in these times a sense of humor is the only thing that saves the day.

Recordings and transcriptions are the very lifeblood of the nonnetwork small station. Take them away and there's not much left. The need for the maintenance of public morale and communication is just as important in the small community as it is in the large. Broadcasting of Navy, Army, Marine, Air Corps, Red Cross, nurse recruiting, salvage, fuel consumption, and so forth, announcements is a must on the daily schedule. War bond and stamp programs and announcements are on the air from sign-on to sign-off. The small station is doing a real job, and it must not be sacrificed or even endangered by the machinations of a union czar.

In Chicago, recently, James C. Petrillo won round one of a lawsuit prosecuted by able Thurman Arnold. The judge's decision cannot be questioned, nor should it be as it was predicated on a sound legal basis. The majority of the remaining rounds must be won or broadcasting will have been dealt a blow so stunning that many of the small stations of the Nation will throw in the sponge.

This must not, and cannot, happen if we will but apply the muscle and brain power to whipping this problem as we have applied in building our properties against seemingly unsurmountable odds.

These are not all of the problems, as any 250-watt station manager will tell you. There are others of a local, regional, and even national nature. What is the solution? The salvation of the small station lies with themselves, primarily. The Government and the industry will lend a helping hand, but action and forthright thinking must come from the men operating these small radio stations. Here are two ideas that will mean much work and may even cost money, but with unified action and intelligent cooperation should form the nucleus for widespread recognition of the importance of the small station in the radio industry as well as in the American way of life.

The small stations need representation in Washington. The clear channels, the regionals, and the networks are constantly promoting their interests through well managed, well financed organizations. Congress, the administration, the Federal Communications Commission, and the public at large must be made to realize the importance of the small station to the Nation. There's a real story to be told and it must be told convincingly. There are far more low-power stations than there are 5-, 10-, or 50-kilowatt outlets, and in a democracy it is the will of the majority that decides any issue. Small stations are a real power and if properly organized and represented, they can do much to improve their status and increase their ability to "operate in the public's interest, convenience, and necessity."

Sales representation for small stations is a crying need. National representatives are doing an excellent job for the larger stations, but in many cases spend too little time in selling the small station. This is natural, because the rewards in the form of commission are not in proportion. This does not imply that the representative should be allowed a larger commission for selling the "smallies" but it is a problem that is worrying more than one small-station manager. Perhaps one answer is to form State or regional organizations of small stations. Selling these stations individually, or as a unit, can be made attractive to national advertisers. The selling agent must be well acquainted with the operation and problems of small stations and he must understand the local prestige of these stations. In order to get a man of recognized caliber, it may be necessary to work out a salary, expense, bonus arrangement. If so, it is advisable and will pay dividends over a period of time. The cost to the individual station would not be considerable on a group basis. There's the germ of an idea here, and it can be incubated if approached objectively.

This same State or regional organization can work together in solving other problems, such as equipment, music, labor, legislation, increasing the sale of bonds and stamps, etc., etc. The small-station operator has been accused of being "small town" and unable to see beyond the horizon. This cannot be true if these stations are to survive. In unity there is strength, and it's going to take all the strength available to solve the problems facing the radio industry as a whole and the "smallies" in particular.

---

[From Harpers Magazine of June 1942]

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE BROADCASTERS?—THE CURIOUS CASE OF THE "MONOPOLISTS" WHO DO NOT CONTROL THEIR OWN PROGRAMS

(By Bernard B. Smith)

For the better part of a year the radio industry has been in turmoil. One of the great networks has brought suit against another; the Federal Communications Commission has charged that the entire existing system of network broadcasting is monopolistic in character and has taken steps to curb it; two of the broadcasting companies in their turn are carrying to the Supreme Court a suit to enjoin the application of the Commission's network rules; the United States Department of Justice has brought suit against those same companies under the terms of the Sherman antitrust law; a number of congressional committees have conducted independent hearings on various aspects of the controversy, and a member of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives has proposed that Congress investigate the Federal Communications Commission, charging that its chairman "is guilty of a monstrous use of power and is rapidly becoming the most dangerous man in the Government."

Amid all the bitterness, the charges and countercharges in this bewildering series of events, there is only one factor which should concern the radio-listening public, and that is the preservation and improvement of network broadcasting in the public interest. Let this, therefore, be stated at once: the public interest will be served not by breaking up the networks, but by increasing their responsibilities and their control over their own radio programs; by compelling them to extend network facilities where the existing ones are insufficient; and, finally, by accomplishing this through sound regulatory legislation rather than through lawsuits which threaten the very existence of the networks.

Taking a glance backward, it is clear to almost everyone that it is to the networks we owe a large share of the improvements in the technical aspects of broadcasting. It is quite true, as the Federal Communications Commission points out, that there are remote areas of the country which are still entirely without network broadcasting services, and that in certain other areas available services are insufficient. What is not equally clear to everyone, however, is that as long as network broadcasting derives its principal financial support from the sponsorship of radio programs by national advertisers, network facilities will be extended only if advertisers require such extension.

It seems pretty clear that the networks have been operated primarily in the service of the advertisers rather than in the interest of the public, and it is in this fact, rather than in the allegedly monopolistic character of the industry, that the basic deficiencies of American network broadcasting have their origins.

The networks, in order to induce the large national advertisers to purchase their facilities for the sponsorship of national radio programs, have worked out a system of discounts which sharply reduces the time costs for those advertisers who employ the greatest amount of broadcast time in a given year. In addition, the national advertiser who purchases the facilities on a network for a continuous hour of broadcasting pays in proportion substantially less for this hour than an advertiser who purchases only a 15-minute period. And during the daytime 15 minutes constitute the standard period.

Thus, for example, Procter & Gamble will purchase a full hour's time on a network; it will then break this up into four 15-minute segments each of which advertises a different Procter & Gamble product with a distinct radio program. Procter & Gamble, however, pays for this time upon the basis of a full hour program. When, therefore, a small competitive company having only one product to sell desires to advertise its product on the air it will find that its cost for a 15-minute period of network time over the same stations and at approximately the same time will, after all discounts have been allowed, be as much as 50 percent more than the allocated cost of such a 15-minute segment to Procter & Gamble or General Mills. If, nevertheless, this smaller manufacturer should persist and decide to spend a premium of 50 percent more than his competitors, he would be likely to find that the best broadcast hours of the afternoon on the principal networks had already been contracted to such dominant companies as Lever Brothers, General Mills, General Foods, and Procter & Gamble. In fine, he could not—even at a premium—purchase equally desirable time in which to deliver his commercial message to the American public.

It is, therefore, not surprising that the crowding out of the smaller advertiser as a commercial sponsor of national network programs has become a pronounced phenomenon of network expansion. Thus in the 5 years from 1937 through 1941, while the network revenue of the largest broadcasting company increased over 50 percent, the number of its commercial advertising sponsors decreased almost 25 percent; and by 1941 11 advertisers accounted for over 50 percent of the network revenue of all the national networks in the United States.

The networks are not to be condemned for such situations, for it is only by encouraging large firms to use radio as an advertising medium that network broadcasting has received the financial support which made possible its phenomenal growth and advancement. Nor, for that matter, can we criticize the conduct of the national advertisers; for in the keenly competitive climate in which they operate, uncontrolled by adequate Government regulations, these advertisers must seize upon every available advantage in order to keep their trade names and shibboleths ubiquitously and incessantly before the public. In fact, despite the purely commercial character of their enterprise, they have provided the Nation with some of its finest radio fare.

But there are further difficulties. For example, if a small independent manufacturer, using only a single 15-minute period for network broadcasting, should develop an excellent radio program, and through this means achieve notable success in spite of being confined to a less desirable time spot, it rests within the power of the network upon the expiration of a 13-week period to terminate its contract with that company in obeisance to some powerful competitor. It is true that networks have not been known to employ such tactics. Nevertheless, under existing unregulated network broadcasting, the network may at its own pleasure refuse to renew the time contract of a legitimate small advertiser. Today, when drugs, soaps, and grocery products depend in vital measure upon radio advertising as a means of keeping their trade names before the public, the power of the networks to take away the broadcast time of a given advertiser and to grant such time to others is almost a power of life and death.

Furthermore, under existing network practices, the cost of advertising depends to the very largest degree upon the skill of an advertising agency in obtaining for an advertiser a radio program of great popular appeal at the lowest possible cost. If, through a stroke of good fortune, an advertiser should acquire at low cost a radio program which achieves great popularity, its cost of advertising will become substantially lower than that of its competitors in the same field. For advertising costs are measured by the ratio between the aggregate cost of the program (the charge for broadcasting time plus the fees for the performers and other talent) and the total number of persons who are listening to the radio program in the course of which the commercial message is broadcast. The number of listeners is approximated by test samplings and surveys made by such companies as Crosley, Inc., and C. E. Hooper, Inc.

Thus General Foods, several years ago, at relatively low cost introduced a radio program known as the Aldrich Family which now attracts one of the three or four largest radio audiences that listen to any program broadcast in the United States. Any competitor who

wishes to reach an audience of similar size must build a program around radio entertainers of such national attraction as to make the cost of the program almost prohibitive; and even then it could not be certain that it would reach an audience comparable to that of the Aldrich Family. Accordingly the value of radio advertising depends not only upon the amount of money appropriated, but largely on the advertiser's good fortune in finding a program that will attract a Nation-wide audience.

Between the hours of 7:30 and 8 o'clock every Sunday evening the F. W. Fitch Co. advertises its shampoo over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co. This half hour is sandwiched between two of the most popular half-hour radio programs; for at 7 o'clock on Sunday evening the Jack Benny program is on the air, and at 8 over the same network the Charlie McCarthy program is broadcast. The F. W. Fitch Co., taking very natural advantage of the tremendous popularity of each of these costly program, devotes this half hour to a simple, low-cost musical program, relying upon the recognized habit of that segment of the listening audience which—desiring to hear both the Benny and the McCarthy programs—refrains from dialing off the red network during the half-hour period between them.

As a result the Fitch program draws a radio audience altogether out of proportion to its cost and entertainment value, and the F. W. Fitch Co. enjoys a tremendous economic advantage over its competitors because of its stroke of fortune in having acquired the right to broadcast during this half-hour period. Its competitors must spend tremendously more in order to present a commercial advertising message to an audience of comparable size.

There is scarcely an advertiser of any significance in the country who would not offer the National Broadcasting Co. a substantial premium over its standard rates to acquire this particular half hour. Yet because of those same self-imposed limitations which restrain the networks from terminating a contract with a small advertiser who has evolved a successful 15-minute program, the National Broadcasting Co. will continue to renew its contract with the F. W. Fitch Co. as long as the company desires.

Working under such a system, the broadcasting companies cannot exercise real control over the programs broadcast on their networks. Their contention that they provide balanced programmatic fare is refuted by even a cursory examination of their actual program schedules. The truth is that the decision as to whether or not a radio program shall be presented over network broadcasting depends not on the network's opinion of the program's worth but on the advertiser's opinion about its effectiveness in promoting the sale of the laxative, dentifrice, or breakfast food he produces.

Such radio programs are developed and produced either by independent producers retained by advertising agencies in behalf of the advertisers or by the radio staffs of the advertising agencies. Many of the agencies would welcome a change in network practices which would relieve them of the production of radio programs as a prerequisite to the efficient conduct of their business. But until such time as the broadcasting companies are required to be solely responsible for the programs presented over their networks, a successful advertising agency has no choice but to continue to maintain—or employ the services of—a skilled and resourceful radio production staff.

When the broadcasting companies assume such programmatic responsibilities these experienced production staffs can create and produce programs in behalf of the networks. The agencies cannot in any sense be held accountable for a lack of balanced radio fare, for no one agency or combination of agencies controls all of the programs on any of the networks. On the other hand, the only control that the networks assume over commercially sponsored programs is to assure themselves that their content is neither politically partisan nor offensive to the general public.

The broadcasting companies speak tenderly of the educational sustaining programs which they provide without profit to the stations comprising their network. Yet during the period of greatest radio attendance, from 7 p. m. to 10:30 p. m. each evening, we find few such programs. These most valuable broadcast hours are now owned almost exclusively by advertisers of drugs, foods, soft drinks, cigarettes, soaps, and beauty preparations. We have yet to hear of a network terminating the time-contract of a national advertiser in order that it may supply the Nation with a half-hour sustaining program of intellectual significance.

The degree to which control has been relinquished by the networks is indicated also by the right granted to an advertiser to specify, subject to certain minimum requirements, how few or how many of the network stations are to be used for the broadcast of a program. The advertiser will, quite understandably, purchase time only on those stations which serve the area in which he has existing or potential markets for his product.

Thus the Sun Oil Co. sponsors the broadcasts of Lowell Thomas over only 25 stations because these are the maximum stations serving the area in which the company's products are sold. It may be presumed that the Sun Oil Co. proscribes Mr. Thomas from appearing on the air in behalf of any other sponsor. So, because of advertiser control, three-fourths of the country is deprived of the opportunity to listen to Lowell Thomas' comments on current events. On the other hand, the radio program How'm I Doin'? is heard over 4 times as many stations as is Lowell Thomas—virtually throughout the United States—simply because the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., its sponsors, have existing markets for their cigarettes throughout the country.

The Jack Benny and Charlie McCarthy programs are heard over Nation-wide networks only because there is no broadcast area in the United States which is not either an actual or potential market for Jello and Chase & Sanborn coffee, the products, respectively, advertised on these programs. If these programs had originally been acquired by advertisers enjoying only limited markets for their products, vast areas of the country would have been deprived of the right to hear them.

Thus the advertiser determines not only what the people of the country shall listen to but also—in accordance with his own market problems and at variance, frequently, with the public interest—precisely what sections of the country are going to be permitted to hear a specific broadcast.

II

To insure that the networks control radio broadcasting basically in the interest of the public, rather than in the service of the national advertiser, it is essential that we promptly provide for the sound regulation and licensing of network broadcasting—not indirectly through the control that the Federal Communications Commission now exercises over the individual stations but by a specific, unambiguous statute which, as the basic premise, will recognize network broadcasting in its present high state of development and will seek to continue it and improve it.

When, by statute, network broadcasting is recognized as a public facility, it will definitely become the responsibility of the networks to create balanced radio programs available to the entire Nation in much the same fashion as the great national magazines provide reading matter. If a program is sufficiently popular to interest the entire Nation the entire Nation should be afforded the opportunity of hearing it. One section should not be deprived of such opportunity solely because it displays insufficient interest in the beverage or household remedy advertised by the sponsor.

To continue the analogy, in our national magazines advertisers with large budgets purchase the right to display their advertisement in preferred space. Advertisers with smaller budgets purchase less desirable space but pay proportionately less therefor. The magazine and not the advertiser determines what the magazine shall contain, and its editors assume the obligation of creating a balanced, interesting magazine for sale to the public. No advertiser receives a reduction in rates if his product enjoys no market in certain sections where the magazine is sold.

With definitive legislative licensing of network broadcasting, each network would be required to build and create radio programs independent of the national advertisers. These programs would be broadcast simultaneously over the entire Nation-wide system of the specific network. An advertiser would then no longer sponsor a radio program; he would simply purchase the right to have a commercial message delivered for several minutes during the course of the broadcast of a radio program. The amount he would pay would be determined by a formula based upon the following correlative factors:

1. The size of the audience that customarily listens to the radio program during which the commercial message is delivered. (This is, as has been pointed out, now satisfactorily tested by a sampling process. Just as magazines and newspapers now guarantee their circulation in fixing their advertising rates, so would the networks guarantee the size of the audience listening to a radio program in the course of which a commercial message is to be delivered.)

2. The number of stations whose facilities the advertiser employs, their power, and the number of radio-equipped homes in their broadcast area.

Thus, while many advertisers would purchase the right to have their "commercial" broadcast over an entire network of stations, others (because of the limitation of their markets) might prefer to employ station facilities only in the specific broadcast areas in which their products are sold. A program could be sponsored by a number of different companies in a number of different areas. In the course of the program, when the moment for the "commercial" arrived, the national network could be broken down into the required groups of stations, each of which would carry the message of a different advertiser; then the national hook-up could be restored and the program continued. Thus, Lowell Thomas could be heard everywhere even if no single advertiser could be found to sponsor him on a national basis.

Under this plan the advertiser, whether large or small, will receive precisely what he pays for; he will no longer have to fear that the program during which his "commercial" is delivered will not attract a sufficiently large audience, since the basis of advertising rates will be scientifically predetermined, and will no longer be based upon the accident of an advertiser developing a program of phenomenal audience appeal. Small companies will have an opportunity to employ radio advertising without the present disadvantage of competing with large advertisers who have virtually monopolistic control over network broadcasting.

Today it is difficult to find a sponsor for a series of Toscanini concerts because, although its listening audience is smaller than that of the program Truth or Consequences, its cost is substantially greater. Under the plan proposed, programs like the Toscanini concerts would be eagerly employed for commercial broadcasting, for then the advertiser's cost

would be predicated not as heretofore solely upon the charge for broadcast time plus program costs, but principally upon the actual size of the listening audience.

All network programs would be heard over the facilities of radio stations in every broadcast area of the United States. Only part of the day and evening, however, would be employed by the affiliated radio stations for the broadcast of network programs. The balance of broadcast time would be used by the individual stations for programs of local importance. Thus the individual stations would furnish a balanced service in much the same manner as a local newspaper which—in addition to syndicated columns, Associated Press, and United Press dispatches, and a national Sunday supplement—publishes articles and news of purely sectional interest.

The networks can be depended upon to create through this system of balanced programming a profitable enterprise, yet one which will better serve the public interest than does the existing system of broadcasting. As magazines strive to increase their circulations as a means of charging increased advertising rates, so each of the national networks would strive to improve the character of its programs in the hope of increasing its listening audiences and thus being able to charge higher rates for the broadcast of commercial announcements.

Independent radio program owners and producers and advertising agencies as well as the networks themselves would supply the radio programs; and the networks would reasonably be expected to pay for such programs a sum commensurate with the size of the listening audience that the program would attract.

If proper technical control were employed there would be no physical handicap to the creation of additional networks. Instead of concerning itself with the economic relationship between the network and the individual station, the Federal Communications Commission should now be overhauling its methods of power allocation; instead of freely granting increased power for transmitters (as it has done in the city of New York) it should, by reduction of power and other signal limiting devices, insure that stations will be clearly heard only in the broadcast area which they are intended to serve and will not prevent stations in other areas from broadcasting over the same wavelength.

In existing broadcast practice we are not infrequently confronted with the paradox of having too many rather than too few networks in operation. When Fibber McGee, Bob Hope, or Jack Benny is on the air even two national networks are one too many, for no national advertiser will, in the exercise of sound judgment, attempt to sponsor a costly radio program under the present system in competition with one which virtually monopolizes the Nation's listening audience. The price of the half hour of the Jello broadcast time over the red network is substantially the same as that asked for the same half hour over the Columbia Broadcasting network. The latter dare not reduce the price for this half hour, and certainly no sponsor can reasonably be expected to pay that price. But under the proposed system the rates asked for advertising on a rival program would be determined by the number of people listening to that program. The smaller the listening audience the lower the rates would be; if the program proved good enough to win over listeners from the Benny program, the rates would rise.

Thus virtually all programs could be commercially sponsored: the smaller advertiser would once again find it possible to support network broadcasting serving not alone his own interests but equally those of the network and the public. And if the power and scope of stations were properly controlled, any needed number of networks could compete in creating attractive rival programs.

Fundamentally, all that the courts by their decision in the current radio litigation will determine is whether to recast the existing competitive balance between rival networks and stations in their bids for national advertiser patronage. The problems which have been posed will not be solved until, by an Act of Congress, network broadcasting is recognized as an independent facility, and the rules and standards governing its conduct are clearly and unequivocally defined. Only then will the networks be provided with enduring yardsticks and blueprints to guide them in serving the public interest.

---

[78th Cong., 1st sess. H. Res. —. In the House of Representatives, January 18, 1943. Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules]

Whereas the public owns all radio frecies and the granting by the Government of quencies and the granting by the Government of quasi-monopolistic licenses to private persons is of vital interest to the public and it is essential for freedom of speech and public discussion, the free and untrammeled flow of information and opinion, the encouragement of education and social progress, and the maintenance of public morality and democratic institutions—

That radio broadcasting and the sources of program material and talent be free of any monopoly, monopolistic practice, or undue concentration of control;

That small, independent radio stations be able to continue in operation in order to serve their communities;

That the control of any station or network of stations should not be exercised to advance the special interests of any persons, group, or business or in any other manner than in the public interest and in the interest of its listeners;

That the facilities of any station or network should be made available to all persons upon a fair basis and without improper discrimination; and that programs should be free from vulgarity, scurrility, vilification, or other debasing content: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That there is created a select committee to be composed of five members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to make a thorough and full study and investigation of the Federal Communications Commission, the broadcasting industry and of any business related thereto or connected therewith, including, but not limited to, the following matters:

(1) The organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission with a view to determining whether or not such Commission in its organization, in the selection of personnel, and in the conduct of its activities, has been, and is, acting in accordance with law and the public interest.

(2) The existence, extent, formation, legality, and effect upon the public of any monopoly, monopolistic practice, or undue concentration of ownership, control, or management in the hands of a person or group of persons in radio broadcasting or any phase thereof, or in the recording and transcription industry, the management of artists, or any other source of program material and talent;

(3) The existence and extent of conditions endangering the continued operation of small, independent broadcasting stations, especially in outlying areas of the country, and the effect upon the public of the cessation of operation of such stations;

(4) The extent to which radio stations or networks censor or decline to accept programs offered to them, the reasons therefor and effect upon the public thereof, including programs concerning public or controversial issues and programs offered by or in behalf of any legally qualified candidate for election to any public office or for nomination in any political primary; and

(5) The quality of program service of radio stations, especially the extent to which programs contain vulgar, scurrilous, vilifying, or other debasing material.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at the earliest practicable date during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such time and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York, who has the next special order, yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman if it is of the utmost necessity.

## SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AIR ACCIDENTS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 33, Rept. No. 9), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents authorized by House Resolution 125 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, and House Resolution 403, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, be continued for a period from January 1, 1943, to March 1, 1943, for the purpose of allowing said select committee to complete its unfinished work and investigations and file its report and make recommendations to the House covering the hearings held and the studies made by said committee since March 12, 1941.

That said select committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to act during the present Congress for a period from January 1, 1943, to March 1, 1943, with all powers-granted to it under House Resolution 125 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, and House Resolution 403 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session.

That the funds appropriated to said select committee by House Resolutions 525 and 570 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, or any part thereof not already expended by said select committee, are hereby made available to said select committee to take care of the further expenses of conducting said investigation and study, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, and shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting the investigation and study or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the resolution just introduced by the chairman of the Rules Committee extending the time of the committee, of which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] is chairman, to March 1 was reported unanimously. I supported it but if it is the purpose by extending the life of that committee to March 1 to delay consideration in creating a permanent standing Committee on Aviation in the House, I shall oppose the extension when it is brought up.

Mr. SABATH. It is not the intention of the committee of which the gentleman from New York is a member to delay giving hearing to those seven or eight Members who have introduced other resolutions for purposes that the gentleman has mentioned. I am hopeful that as soon as we get through with the hearings on the important resolution introduced by the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, in conjunction with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] that hearings will be held on twelve other resolutions that are pending and that must be acted upon without delay.

Mr. FISH. May I say to the gentleman that we want to expedite action because there are many Members on both sides who would like to serve on a House Committee on Aviation. The standing committees of the House are now being chosen and if we expedite the creation of a Committee on Aviation I think it would be in the interest of the Members of the House and of aviation.

Mr. SABATH. Nothing would please me better than to get action on it, but I cannot in the next few days.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution—House Resolution 10—providing for the creation of a standing Committee on Aviation in the House, composed of 21 members, and dealing with all phases of civilian and commercial aviation.

Such a committee should be set up immediately, and begin the consideration of the problems of post-war aviation, in order to properly develop and expand American airways and to maintain the dominance we have achieved. I am fearful that unless we have a constructive program to put into effect as soon as victory has been achieved, we will lose our dominance of the airways of the Pacific, of South and Central America, and also to Africa. World War No. 2 will bring about tremendous changes all over the world, and particularly in the greater use of airplanes for transportation and travel.

Aviation is still in its infancy. There are a million Americans employed in the aircraft industry, and another million in the Army and Navy air forces. It will emerge from this war as one of our greatest industries. Last year 48,000 war planes were produced, and in 1943 that figure will be doubled. The conversion of such a huge industry to peacetime requirements is a serious task in itself.

The need for a permanent aviation committee should be apparent, if we are to have a definite policy of commercial air-line expansion and perfect plans for world-wide air routes and transportation. The Congress should ascertain our rights to freedom of the air in Africa, where we are spending huge sums under the lend-lease and war appropriations. Will we be permitted to use these airfields, after the war, for commercial aviation?

It is not too soon to make plans to take care of the excess planes and excess pilots after the war, instead of virtually abandoning the aircraft industry as we did in 1919. There is no reason why thousands of planes and pilots could not be used, if plans are made in advance, to carry first-class mail in the United States and abroad. Huge bombers could be easily converted into transport or cargo planes. The carrying of light freight by big planes is not only feasible but highly probable. It is not difficult to visualize transport planes seating 200 passengers, cargo planes that will carry 30 tons of freight, and fast commercial planes that will do over 300 miles an hour. Aviation is only in the morning of its destiny.

Unless Congress creates a permanent committee on civilian and commercial aviation, the end of the war, with its shutting off of war orders, may cause an aviation tailspin and collapse that will far exceed the panic of 1932 and its resultant unemployment.

It is the duty of Congress, as the sole Federal legislative body, to try by all possible means to avert a collapse in our aviation industry after the war. It should start now to plan the expansion of our air transport on such a large scale that it will keep our aircraft industries going and provide employment for 100,000 pilots.

An aviation committee in Congress, composed of experts, could, through foresight and planning, help save our aviation industry and make it, as Eddie Rickenbacker says, the kingpin in American economy. The railroads were after the Civil War, the automobile after the World War; why not aviation after this war?

Mr. Speaker, if Congress acts and acts immediately and wisely, aviation may well be assured a glorious destiny after the war. If, however, the Congress fails to act, then we can anticipate what happened after the first World War—there will be a collapse in the aviation industry and it will have a dismal future instead of a glorious one, providing employment and extending our civilian and commercial airways throughout the world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

DOLLAR-A-YEAR MEN IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend two actions which have come to my attention recently. I have stated on the floor of the House on numerous occasions that I did not believe in the method of hiring dollar-a-year men for the Government service. I believe that people in positions of control of governmental policy should be on the governmental pay roll.

I am encouraged to read in the Sunday paper where the Secretary of Agriculture, who is also Food Administrator, states that as far as the work of his agencies is concerned, all people connected therewith shall be on the Government pay roll and not on any other. I want to commend that action.

I want to also point out that a man by the name of Mr. Ralph J. Cordiner has recently given up a salary from a private corporation running into six figures to accept $8,000-a-year salary from the Government in the War Production Board. I think mention should be made of that because his patriotic example could well be emulated by others.

Any person in a position to make governmental decisions should derive his income from the Government and not elsewhere.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio (at the request of Mr. JONES), indefinitely, on account of an accident.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include resolutions adopted by the Legislature of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]?

There was no objection.

DOLLAR-A-YEAR MEN IN THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], I desire to say that today the trouble is not so much the salaries these men are drawing as it is whom they represent. Regardless of what salaries they may draw, some of them still represent the very interests they represented before they got on the Federal pay roll. That is the trouble we have been having with our power development and with rural electrification. That is one trouble we are now having with the railroads blocking the building of pipe lines and the Florida barge canal, which would supply the eastern seaboard with all the oil and gasoline necessary and get rid of this field in which the German submarines are preying upon our transoceanic and coastwise shipping.

Therefore, it is not a question of their resigning from one job if they are going to come down here and represent the same old corporation. What we want are men of independence, men who will will represent all the American people, and carry out the will of the Congress, and not go in there and "pinch hit" for special interests at public expense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, January 19, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

68. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

69. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation pursuant to Public Law No. 644, Seventy-seventh Congress, an analysis and recapitulation of investigations conducted under Public Law No. 644, Seventy-seventh Congress, during the second quarter of the fiscal year, 1943 (October 1 through December 31, 1942) (H. Doc. No. 51); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

70. A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report covering the operation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to December 30, 1942, inclusive (H. Doc. No. 52); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

71. A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; 28 U. S. C. 534); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

72. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of designs, aircraft, aircraft parts, and aeronautical accessories purchased by the Navy Department pursuant to section 10 of said act during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, the prices therefor and the reason for the award in each case; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

73. A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., sec. 548–555); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 41. Resolution granting a gratuity to the husband of Berniece C. Lambert; without amendment (Rept. No. 7). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 21. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 8). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 33. Resolution continuing for 90 days the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents; with amendment (Rept. No. 9). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 292) for the relief of Mrs. Lila A. Wemp, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 1241. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey of St. Marys River, at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 1242. A bill providing for delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. STARNES of Alabama:

H. R. 1243. A bill to provide for the preferred employment of American citizens by the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 1244. A bill to protect war industries and the United States merchant marine from the threat of sabotage and espionage by aliens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. H. 1245. A bill to establish a National War Memorial Auditorium Commission, to provide for construction and maintenance of a National War Memorial Auditorium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1246. A bill to establish a Department of Air Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 1247. A bill to provide for the readjustment and rehabilitation of veterans of the present war in the post-war period by limited continuation of base pay after separation from the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 1248. A bill to provide a greater degree of self-government for the Territory of Puerto Rico; to provide for the election of the Governor by the people of Puerto Rico and, to that effect, to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 1249. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1250. A bill to provide pensions for disabled veterans of the World War under similar conditions and in the same amounts, as now provided for disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1251. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1252. A bill to establish the calendar year as the Government fiscal year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1253 (by request). A bill to extend provisions of the act of March 20, 1933, and veterans regulations applicable to World War veterans and dependents to veterans and dependents of the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 1254. A bill to provide for the presentation of a north Russia and Siberia expeditionary force medal to each person who served in north Russia or Siberia as a member of the American contingents of the allied expeditionary force; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 1255. A bill to provide for a 20-percent increase in the compensation of postmasters and other employees of the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 1256. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 1257. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near St. Ignace, Mich.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1258. A bill instructing the Secretary of War to henceforth designate the new lock in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the General Douglas MacArthur lock and designating the lock at that point now known as the fourth lock as the Colonel L. C. Sabin lock; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 1259. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital in or near the city of Gladstone, Mich.; to the Committee on World Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1260. A bill providing for an examination and survey of Au Train River Harbor, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 1261. A bill to establish rearing ponds and fish hatchery; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1262. A bill to amend the National Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1263. A bill to provide additional personnel for civilian defense activities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution to create a Commission on Tax Integration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution to provide additional research personnel for the committees of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee known as the Joint Committee on Budgetary Control; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 52. Resolution to continue the investigation by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries begun under House Resolution 281, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. Res. 53. Resolution authorizing an investigation of national defense program in its relation to price and rationing regulations of rents, consumer commodities, and service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 54. Resolution making the chairman and ranking members of the Naval Affair: Committee ex officio members of the Military Affairs Committee and making the chairman and ranking members of the Military Affairs Committee ex officio members of the Naval Affairs Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. Res. 55. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission, and of the radio broadcasting industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Res. 56. Resolution establishing a select committee to investigate rationing procedures; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 57. Resolution providing for amendment to Articles of War to provide trial before military commission of Americans who are serving Italy and Germany as radio propagandists; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. Res. 58. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to continue the investigation with respect to petroleum begun under House Resolution 290, Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 1264. A bill for the relief of Thomas P. Hogan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 1265. A bill granting a pension to Sarah Foxton Judson; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1266. A bill granting a pension to Isiah J. Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 1267. A bill granting the Distinguished Service Medal to Albert W. J. Johnsen, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1268. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Ida Londinsky; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 1269. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Wimot; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 1270. A bill for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret; Mrs. Margaret J. Meals; Donald Meals (a minor); and Betty Wrighstone (a minor); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 1271. A bill for the relief of Ernest L. Barlow; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1272. A bill for the relief of Mary J. Blattner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1273. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 1274. A bill granting a pension to Julia Bush; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 1275. A bill for the relief of Clement B. Baldwin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1276. A bill for the relief of Raymond W. Baldwin and Mattie Baldwin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1277. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Mary E. Robison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1278. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Richard Stever; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1279. A bill for the relief of Lee Watts; to the Committee on Claims.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee for Thy impartial benevolence, for Thy fatherhood, and for man's brotherhood. Grant us the strength and the assurance of that fountain from whose course the Apostles gathered their inspiration and gave to the world the promise of a new morning. In our meditation and wonder, fill us with gratitude for Thy long-suffering and unvarying providence. Rebuke us, dear Lord, when we fail to remember the message of the historic past with its injunction: "Walk humbly with Thy God and forget not all His benefits."

Our hearts often grow faint as clouds creep over us and faith and hope become confused. We pray Thee to crown us with fortitude of soul and with loyalty to our Master Teacher that we shall be led to cheer and nourish this mortal world with His eternal and undying promises. With stout hearts and with wills to serve, help us to lighten life's burden, ease life's load, and brighten life's ways. Blessed Lord, we would reflect the prayer of a great patriot: "Grant that not only the love of liberty but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man may pervade all the nations of the earth." Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 63):

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. CARTER GLASS, a Senator from the State of Virginia, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Labor.
2. Department of War.
3. National Housing Agency.
4. The National Archives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Big Timber Pioneer, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written by Mr. Holloway, of Pompeys Pillar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] before the Texas State Society last Saturday evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MERRITT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief article appearing in the Indianapolis Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that Dr. George Washington Carver, the noted scientist and author, graduated from the Minneapolis (Kans.) High School. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, the monster, Frankenstein, and his cohorts are still parading over this land of ours

with their clutches on the throats of every American citizen, whether that citizen be on the home front, engaged in the mighty effort of saving this country from slavery or the civilization of the world, or dressed in the olive drab and today spilling their blood on the far-flung battlefields of Africa, of the Far East, in fact, in every part of the world.

John L. Lewis, the Frankenstein, Phil Murray, and every other labor racketeer throughout this country, the cohorts through their continued pressure for a few more shekels, as Judas Iscariot accepted to betray our Saviour, so are they betraying not only those men whom they profess to control but the entire 130,000,000 people of this country. This is being sanctioned and condoned for the reason that nothing but puny efforts have been made in the past 5 or 6 years to stop their nefarious actions.

Is it because John L. Lewis threw a mess of pottage from his ill-gotten gains on the political feasting table prior to the election of the party in power, or is it because other elections are coming on and it is thought that an organized minority may control them?

When, oh when, is the leadership and the elected representatives of this great American people going to take action, and such action that will sound the death knell forever of those of their ilk and clan?

Members of Congress, in the northern section of this country of ours, mothers and babes are cold, when there is plenty of fuel. Industries will soon shut down, if this strike continues, at a time when they should be running 24 hours a day, when the workers should be warm and comfortable, to produce that which it is going to take to destroy Hitlerism. This House acted a year or so ago, but the unseen and magic hand of some power blocked its action. John L. Lewis tried to pull a strike like this during the last World War. He was then given his choice of ending the strike or going to jail. He decided not to go to jail.

Any man in any capacity who, by his action, stops the progress of the program to win this war should be tried for treason and immediately executed.

Members of Congress, let us act again and save our country from the Frankensteins.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the program of the National University School of Law for a taxation clinic.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 21, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission with a view to determining whether or not such Commission in its organization, in the selection of personnel, and in the conduct of its activities, has been, and is, acting in accordance with law and the public interest.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at the earliest practicable date during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will this resolution be read under the 5-minute rule and then be subject to amendment?

The SPEAKER. It will not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do I understand from the statement of the Chair that the rule is not subject to amendment?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Georgia makes a motion for the previous question and that is voted down, the resolution is then open to amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the situation, it is this: The time under the resolution is entirely within the control of the gentleman from Georgia. If the gentleman from Georgia yields for an amendment, he loses the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. So that if a Member desires to amend this resolution, it may be done only by unanimous consent, unless the gentleman from Georgia yields the floor, when the control of the time goes to the gentleman offering the amendment.

The SPEAKER. That is correct, or unless the motion for the previous question, which will probably be submitted by the gentleman from Georgia, is voted down.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Under the rules of the House, any Member has a right to offer one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Is not that correct?

The SPEAKER. Not on a matter that is reported by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the Chair hold that, under the rules of the House, no Member can move to strike out and substitute?

The SPEAKER. No motion or amendment is in order after the previous question is ordered. If the gentleman from Georgia does not yield for an amendment, an amendment cannot be offered.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and suggest that he use some of that time now.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes. This resolution is reported to the House by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Rules. In the last session of the Congress hearings were held by the Rules Committee on a similar resolution and representatives of the Federal Communications Commission were present and testified. The Rules Committee is composed of practically the same membership in this Congress with one single exception, so, with the information and the facts already presented, when this resolution came up before us the other day, the members were unanimous in reporting it out after we had heard a statement by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. I think if every Member of the House, whether Republican or Democrat, had heard that statement, he would have favored reporting the resolution, and will probably support it on final passage.

The House of Representatives has not created very many investigating committees. The Senate, on the other hand, has some six investigating committees out, and as far as I know every one of them is doing an exceedingly valuable work. This is the first select committee of investigation that the House has created for some time and I hope there will be as many as are needed. This resolution involves a fundamental principle of American government, that of freedom of speech, freedom of inquiry, and freedom of discussion. That is the home-born fireside privilege of every American and must be preserved. The resolution provides:

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission, with a view to determining whether or not such commission in its organization, in the selection of personnel, and in the conduct of its activities, has been, and is, acting in accordance with law and the public interest.

I want now to refer briefly to one individual who holds an important post under that Commission, Prof. Goodwin Watson, Chief, Analysis Division, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, who comes from Warwick in my district. In 1936 he was a member of the advisory committee, Reconciliation Trips to U. S. S. R., sponsoring sending American youths to Soviet Russia for training and instruction in communism; 1937, member, advisory board, American Students Union—communistic; 1938, director, Consumers Union—radical, left-wingers, and Communists; 1938, leader of Open Road, sponsorship for trips to U. S. S. R.; 1939, signer of petition to discontinue

Dies committee, sponsored by the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom; 1939, endorser for American League for Peace and Democracy, formerly the League Against War and Fascism, denounced by Dies committee as a Communist organization; 1938, asked teachers of the Nation—in a speech sponsored by Teachers College, Columbia University—to indoctrinate children to overthrow "conservative reactionaries" directing American Government and industry—New York Herald Tribune, June 29, 1938.

I assume Dr Watson refers to constitutional Democrats and Republicans whose liquidation he urges. I hope this committee, as the resolution provides for an investigation of the personnel, will likewise investigate Professor Watson and his communistic activities. On November 28, 1941, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], in a speech before the House, stated he had informed the Chairman, Mr. Fly, of the F. C. C., that Dr. Watson—

> Had probably associated himself with a large number of front organizations of the Communist Party; and, second, that Goodwin Watson had for years been a propagandist for communism and the Soviet Union.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The matter that I had in mind awhile ago is this: The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has a resolution to also investigate the entire broadcasting system, the broadcasting monopolies, and also the very things the gentleman from New York talks about, who are using the radio for selfish purposes or for propaganda purposes.

Mr. FISH. And for smear purposes.

Mr. RANKIN. For smear purposes, and I am wondering why the Rules Committee did not accept at least some of the provisions of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Alabama, to make this complete investigation, if it is the desire to make any investigation at all.

Mr. FISH. That was not suggested in the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I shall take 3 minutes more. That amendment was not proposed, as far as I know, in the Committee on Rules. Of course it would mean an entirely different investigation, a very much broader investigation. This is a specific authorization to investigate only the matters set forth in the resolution but it includes the activities of F. F. C. which are extensive. I am in sympathy with what the gentleman from Mississippi says, but I would suggest an additional resolution, to investigate a much broader field, and by an entirely different committee. There is ample work for two committees to perform if freedom of speech and our free institutions are to be preserved.

Mr. RANKIN. It seems to me that the same committee could make the entire investigation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. I would suggest that insofar as the alleged monopolistic practices in radio are concerned, very extensive hearings were had of that whole matter by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the last Congress. While no bill was reported, the hearings are very complete. I would not undertake to speak for the committee, but I have no doubt that in due time that particular thing to which the gentleman from Mississippi has referred will be under consideration by the proper legislative committee.

Mr. RANKIN. And let me say to the gentleman from Indiana that there are certain propagandists now broadcasting that have for their object the destruction of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. FISH. And I am in accord with that statement. There has been a continuous and communistic or radically inspired program to attack and discredit Congress for the purpose of destroying representative and constitutional government.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think we ought to wait on this snail-progressing committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I do not think the resolution should be gummed up by matters not under consideration.

Mr. FISH. I am in accord with that. I think the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Alabama ought to stand on the merits of their own resolution. From my point of view there is a great deal of merit to their proposed resolution, and it should have been presented to the Rules Committee—and I hope it will be in the near future—in order to protect the Members of this House, as well as the House itself, against constant abuse and vilification over the radio seeking to undermine the confidence of the American people in their elected Representatives and republican form of government.

Let me say in conclusion, as we are fighting for the "four freedoms" all over the world, we in the Congress should do everything in our power to preserve those same "four freedoms" in America. By far the most important and paramount one is the freedom of speech, which is involved in this resolution. Certainly if our sons are sacrificing their lives to maintain the "four freedoms" throughout the world, it is our duty as Members of Congress to preserve these freedoms in America, particularly freedom of speech.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am this morning bringing to you a matter in which I have the deepest possible personal interest. If the resolution I am offering is adopted, it will operate as a depressant upon the bureaucrats seeking to swallow up all legislative power which belongs alone to Congress and should be of like concern to you.

In 1939 the Albany Herald, a newspaper, the editor of which is Mr. Henry T. McIntosh, the model man of my State, its first citizen, brought to my attention that it was interested in the development of a small broadcasting station in Albany, Ga. Ours is something of a desert land insofar as radio is concerned. In Albany there is a small station, but it did not render entirely satisfactory service to the people within that territory, though it rendered a service that was valuable and appreciated.

Following this first communication from Mr. McIntosh, the Albany Herald filed its application for leave to establish a station. The Albany Herald is a daily newspaper, the largest newspaper published in the southwest quarter of my State, and is the paper of widest circulation.

The people who own and operate the Albany Herald are my lifelong friends. They are people with whom I was reared. They are my confidants. They are people whom I love and who love me. In the spring of 1940 permission to build and operate a station was granted by the Federal Communications Commission.

While the application was pending in the Commission I made many visits to the Commission. I visited with Mr. Fly, with Mr. Ring, its engineer, with Mr. Walker, another member of the Commission, with the counsel of the Commission. I consulted freely and frequently with Mr. Dempsey, its general counsel. After the license had been granted and the station had been built and had been operating for about a year, a new corporation was set up to take over the property and its operation. That new corporation was created because of advice given to me, to the counsel of the Albany Herald and to its manager, by Mr. Dempsey, the general counsel of the Commission, in which Mr. Dempsey said that because of the hostile attitude of the Commission toward newspaper ownership and operation of radio, a new corporation to take over and to operate the station should be created. Tremendous correspondence passed between McIntosh, the Albany Herald, counsel, and others interested in the station and myself. When the new corporation was set up, and without any knowledge on my part, they issued to me, upon the suggestion of Mr. McIntosh, according to the minutes, a check for $2,500, which was in turn endorsed by me and returned as payment for stock in a like amount in the new corporation. Later on the stock was issued for $2,500 in the new corporation. It may be worth $2,500 or it may not be worth a dime. It will not be worth a dime unless the new corporation is permitted to function. Friends in the new corporation insisted they wanted me connected with the station; that they wanted me to serve in an advisory capacity. They had been told that I could not represent them before the Commission or anyone connected with the Commission or any other agency of the Government. They said they did not want this; that they had their regular counsel.

When the new corporation was set up, an application for transfer of ownership of property and license to operate was

made to the Commission. In March 1942, after the station had been operating for more than a year, and after the Albany Herald had filed its application for leave to transfer, about which I had nothing to do and no information, I introduced a resolution to investigate the Commission.

Neither the Albany Herald nor McIntosh nor any other person interested in the Albany property had any knowledge, much less anything to do with my introducing the resolution to investigate. The resolution which I offered was the result of representations made to me by the small broadcasters throughout the country, by newspapers having an interest in broadcasting, and by people in the Government—people connected with the Army and with the Navy, and many others, and because of the bad reputation of the Commission ever since it was first created; all these people insisted that Mr. Fly, the Chairman of the Commission, was undertaking to set up a despotic dictatorship over all media of communication. That he has been endeavoring to do that I attest to be a fact. To those of you who doubt the truthfulness of this statement, if you know anybody connected with the Commission in whom you have confidence, and will telephone them now, they will tell you. Or if you still have doubt and you know anybody in the newspaper field who in anywise is interested in broadcasting, ask them and they will tell you so.

Now, after the resolution was introduced, Mr. Fly sent his agents into my district. He did for me just what he has done for other Members of Congress. He did for me just what he has done for everybody else who has made any criticism of the Commission and of its communistic operations. He set his gestapo like a pack of hungry wolves on my trail, and they have trailed me since the day I offered the first resolution, and they are trailing me now.

As stated he sent these agents into my district. They went to the office of the broadcasters and they rifled their files. They went to the office of the Albany Herald and they rifled its files. They went to the office of the counsel of the Herald and the broadcasting company and they rifled his files. They came back and brought a bale of material here to Washington over the protest of the people whose property it was. They brought it to Washington and they have it now, and they refused to return it over repeated appeals on the part of the people whose property it is.

That was not all. They went in the banks of my district in an effort to find something on me; they went to the post offices in my district and made investigation as to registered mail that had been sent to me, and they sought to make an investigation of that. And that is not all. This man Fly, when his agents got back to Washington, went down to the Department of Justice and appealed to the Department to prosecute me or to initiate some sort of investigation. He and his snoopers and spies have in a sense sat upon the steps of the Department of Justice for a year almost making appeal after appeal that the Department initiate an investigation of me. They cited the Herald radio station to show cause as to why the license granted to it should not be revoked and as to why other applications that it had on file should not be denied. Those hearings were continued from time to time for the purpose of giving Fly further opportunity to influence the Department of Justice to investigate me, continued not once, not twice, but more than that; and following every continuance another visit by the gestapo of this man Fly, who is the worst of a bad lot, was made to the Department of Justice.

And that is not all, my friends; that is not all. This same Fly—and if I were disposed to go into his record I could bury him with filth—he sent his agents into the Internal Revenue, his gestapo into the Bureau of Internal Revenue to examine my returns from 1931 up to last year; they made photostatic copies of them. That was not all: They made a like investigation in Internal Revenue of a clerk in my office. Think of it, my friends. A clerk in my office. They went into the Internal Revenue department in my State and made a similar investigation there.

As to the stock that was issued to me, that was in the new corporation; it was issued on the basis of an opinion, furnished by their attorney, that it was perfectly ethical and legitimate for a Member of Congress to represent anybody insofar as he did not appear before any agency or agent of the Government in their behalf. From the time that stock was issued I have never communicated directly or indirectly with the Commission with reference to any interest of the broadcasting company or of anybody else; there was no irregularity in the transaction, no effort to cover up at all; and I might say to you as to what disposition was made of the stock, not made in the endeavor to cover up anything, it was transferred to a little private charity.

This resolution that is pending here now is a reintroduction of the first resolution. I am endeavoring to have a special committee set up to investigate the Commission and its operations and I say to you that of all the bureaucrats who have sought to smear Congress this man Fly is the worst. His pursuit of me has been nothing but blackmail. When he was down here in the Tennessee Valley Authority a cell of the Communist Party which was referred to as the best unit of the entire organization was set up in the Authority; and there are other things I might tell you. His whole outfit now is a nest of "reds." This man Dodd, who opposed HOWARD SMITH 4 years ago, is there; so is the man who wrote the statement that Congress was the joke of the century; he is still there, this man Dodd, who said to his draft board over in Virginia about 5 weeks ago that he was going to South Africa, but applied to the State Department for a passport to England and was denied a passport because of his communistic affiliations, he is down there now. This Commission as run by Fly is the nastiest nest of rats to be found in this entire country.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 21, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Organization, Personnel, and Activities of the Federal Communications Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. COX (chairman), Mr. HART, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, and Mr. MILLER of Missouri.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on a subject and to include a letter and newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Dean Ackerman, of the Columbia School of Journalism.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to speak for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make the announcement that, immediately after the adjournment of the House today, there will be a Democratic caucus.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN] is recognized for 25 minutes.

PAY-AS-YOU-EARN INCOME-TAX PLAN

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, for several days there has been a running debate

on the subject of the improvement of our income-tax procedure. What brings this discussion about is that more than a year ago when the tax act of 1942 was under consideration it became apparent that, to protect the revenue, income taxes should be paid at the source out of current income. Nothing was done in the House. I introduced a bill in June which I presented to the Committee on Ways and Means, but at that time it received scant consideration. In the Senate a new tax was devised, designated as the Victory tax, payable out of current income and at the source. We now have two income taxes—one under the act of 1913, the other under the act of 1942. Both are payable out of 1943 income. One is measured by the actual income of the previous year, and the other by the current year. The principle of making payment out of current income has been recognized in the Victory tax and, therefore, needs no argument to support it. Our only difficulty is in getting our income tax under the act of 1913 over to a current basis.

The methods of assessment and collection under the act of 1913 are obsolete, resulting in loss of revenue. The fundamental principle providing for payment according to ability to pay is lacking. The income tax has been in operation for 29 years, and experience has developed its defects. Some have been corrected. It is possible to strengthen the system to avoid loss through delinquencies and avoidances by making the date of payment conform to the taxpayer's ability to pay. The necessary change requires that payment be made out of current income. This can only be done by changing our present system to provide that the tax be based on anticipated income for the current year rather than on the actual income of the previous year.

Mr. Mayne S. Howard is a distinguished authority. He was for a time director of research of the Department of Taxes and Taxation of New York. He is general editor of Tax Systems of the World. I quote from his recent book, Principles of Public Finance:

> Personal income tax is based upon ability to pay. It is intended to be personal to an extreme degree. The flow of commodities or benefits during the years, stated in terms of market value, is the precise ability upon which the personal income tax is imposed.
>
> The personal income tax is the tax which most closely conforms to the principle of ability. It best allows for those fluctuations in the taxpayer's means which result from the vicissitudes of life and business.
>
> It reaches many who do not accumulate property and who thus escape the property tax.
>
> It never falls upon those without resources. (Its date of payment, however, may be deferred so long that the taxpayer has no funds left with which to pay it.)
>
> The taxpayer may lose all his assets between the end of the taxable year and the date of payment.

In these observations Mr. Howard shows the defect in our present system—that the date of payment is too long deferred, and when the time for payment comes the taxpayer may have lost or dissipated his assets and be without the ability to pay. Such losses now occur and will become larger as the number of taxpayers increases. The date of payment should be changed so that payments will be made out of current income. As it is now, more than a year elapses before payment is demanded. Payments should be made when the taxpayer has the ability to pay, that is, out of his income on a pay-as-you-earn basis. We now designate the tax as a "tax on income." It should be a "tax out of income."

The greatly expanded power and authority of the Federal Government, to which must be added the cost of the war, create new problems in Federal taxation. We have attempted to meet the demands by a piecemeal expansion of our tax program. We have now reached a point where we must build an entirely new tax structure based on present-day needs. To modernize the administration of the income-tax law is as important as finding new sources of revenue and increasing rates.

The adoption of the income-tax amendment made available to the Federal Government tremendous resources. The personal income tax has become its principal source of revenue. In the effort to realize additional revenue personal exemptions have been reduced to increase the number of taxpayers, and the rates have been increased, until now the number of taxpayers is upward of 27,000,000, and the ability to pay is largely dependent upon current income.

The first income tax was adopted in 1913. The needs of the Government then were quite different from what they are today. Taxpayers were few, the rates were low, and the tax applied to a class of people who were well able to meet the payments any time demand was made.

These facts are probably responsible for the error that was made at the time of the adoption of the first act in basing the tax on the actual income of the previous year. Had it been based on the income of the current year we would not now be facing the problem of the change necessary to protect present-day income.

The adoption of the income tax is the principal factor in the expansion of the Federal Government and the centralization of power and authority in Washington. The inadequate revenue systems of many States made it difficult for them to finance public improvements, and resort was had to the Federal Government for money with which to provide public buildings, highways, irrigation systems, public-power developments, and other public improvements. The Federal Government became the instrument whereby moneys raised through taxation in the prosperous States could be diverted to areas less fortunate. The suggestion that we could spend our way back to prosperity in a depression period by the expenditure of large funds for public works, the idea that prices could be fixed by regulating supply and demand through subsidies to farmers, and the political advantage of these policies to those in control of the Government with unlimited means at their command, resulted in the expansion of the functions and expenses of the Federal Government. The consequences were disregarded. They are now being realized. They increased the national debt upward of $40,000,000,000 over a period of 8 years.

Wars, too, have played their part. Many of the powers conveyed to the Federal Government as necessary to national defense create Government agencies which continue beyond the emergency for which they were intended. We have had two such epochs since the advent of the income tax, and both have contributed to our expanding bureaucratic government.

The total revenue from the income tax in 1914, the first year of its operation, from both individuals and corporations, was $71,000,000. In the fiscal year of 1941 it had increased to $6,331,000,000. This tremendous increase was provided by increasing rates and the number of taxpayers. The Revenue Act of 1942 further increased the number of taxpayers and the rates, and still further increases are contemplated during the current year. Our collections are made under an administrative system entirely outmoded. The resulting loss must be considerable. These losses will be converted into savings if the taxpayers are required to meet their obligations out of current income.

Every consideration of our present-day tax problems suggests the need of economy and efficiency—a reduction in expenditures by abolishing unnecessary or duplicating agencies, and greater efficiency in the operation of those agencies which are essential. Improved efficiency is the purpose of the proposal to modernize our income-tax system. The Government will benefit by better collections, less delinquencies, and fewer tax-avoidance practices. Hence, the suggestion that personal income taxes be collected out of current earnings. This will require that the taxes for 1943 be paid out of 1943 income. But, as matters now stand, 1942 taxes are payable out of 1943 income. It follows that, with such a change, the taxpayer would face the payment of 2 years' taxes in 1. Such a burden would challenge the ability of the taxpayer to make such payments. This and the fact that there are advantages to the Government in changing to the pay-as-you-earn plan make it appropriate that some concession should be made in connection with the 1942 income-tax debt. What that concession should be is the only obstacle standing in the way of this much-needed improvement. The change must be made without too much disturbance to our present procedure and loss or inconvenience to the Treasury.

The most logical plan of the many that have been offered is that of Mr. Beardsley Ruml. It is based on the principle of ability to pay and sound principles of finance practiced in the world of business and banking. This plan would abate the taxes for 1942, and instead of using the actual income of 1942 as a basis for the tax, it would substitute the current income of 1943 and make the tax payable out of income of the current year. I am in entire accord with Mr. Ruml except as to administrative details. It is my idea, as suggested by the bills I have introduced, that, having in mind the large number of taxpayers in the lower brackets, monthly rather than

quarterly payments would be in better conformity with the principle of ability to pay, and that tentative returns should be filed with the first monthly payment in February with the privilege of annual or ad interim adjustments.

What will actually happen under the basic idea of the Ruml plan is that the taxes based on the 1942 income, payable in 1943, will be abated. In their place will be substituted a tax for 1943 using as a basis the current income, and the 1943 tax will be collected in lieu of the 1942 tax.

The abatement of a tax suggests a loss to the Government and our difficulty is that such a loss is here apparent. But there are different kinds of losses, and this loss is the type that will suffer the Government no inconvenience. The flow of income to the Treasury will continue because in place of the abated 1942 tax there will be substituted the tax for 1943. The abated tax will not amount to an actual loss to the Government for much of it will be returned in course of time by the operation of the estate tax. The difference will be compensated for by various items such as improved collections, less delinquencies, and an increased income in 1943 and subsequent years from anticipated increases in incomes and the number of taxpayers.

The delinquency factor is illustrated by those who will die owing the Government for their 1942 income taxes, and whose estates will be insolvent. So the Government loses. The tax is abated and the Government will never get its money. This is an enforced abatement. These situations can be multiplied by the number of persons who will die, as well as by those who have lost their earning power through illness, accident, old age, or other causes, and who will be unable to produce the money for their income taxes. That situation will continue for years to come under existing law. By the voluntary abatement of 1 year's taxes for the purpose of putting everybody on a basis where income taxes will be paid out of current income such losses will cease.

Now, I know there are those of you who, in spite of what I have pointed out, will be unable to dismiss from your minds the thought that by the adoption of the program a whole year's personal income tax will be lost to the Treasury. Well, you must take a broader view than that. What is proposed is not for a year. Its purpose is to protect the revenue year after year for years to come, and the loss of 1 year's revenue—if it be a loss—may not be too much of a price to pay for the benefits that will result from the application of the principle. The important consideration is that collections out of current income will be money in hand in the Treasury, and will be an assurance against actual and substantial losses should the country be confronted with the vicissitudes of economic depression and the taxpayer be without the money to pay the taxes that accrued in a previous year.

Mr. Ruml points out that one criticism of his plan stems from a feeling that somehow Congress would be forgiving a debt to all taxpayers who are now subject to the 1942 tax, and as to that he says:

> It is a common practice, as evidenced by the experience of banks and other commercial institutions, to recognize debtor-creditor relations, upon the initiative of either party, whenever it becomes necessary in furthering the best continued interests of both, and certainly the canceling of debt, in order to further the welfare of all concerned, has had the high approval of age-old moral authorities.

But it can be argued that we are not forgiving a debt at all. The Treasury has never set up on its books as an asset anticipated tax collections, and tax assessments amount to nothing more than a contingent liability which Congress can increase or decrease at will. The practice of adopting retroactive tax measures, although questionable and somewhat unfair, is established and should work both ways. The Treasury is only concerned with the flow of operating revenue. The means by which it is provided is the concern of Congress, and, if an improvement in our machinery of tax collection can be made without disturbing the supply of operating revenue to the Treasury, good business practice dictates that it should be done.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand from the gentleman that he favors the Ruml plan virtually in its entirety.

Mr. McLEAN. Yes; with the modifications I have stated.

Mr. MURDOCK. Including the provision to abate or cancel the 1942 taxes?

Mr. McLEAN. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I cannot agree with the gentleman fully in that one respect, although I do want to agree with him in others and I want to compliment the gentleman on the fine presentation of this matter which he has made. Now is the proper time, I think, to change from the year-behind scheme to the pay-as-you-go system. Will not the gentleman agree that a provision for collecting the 1942 taxes by spreading their payment over a certain definite period might be more satisfactory? I cannot favor canceling them entirely.

Mr. McLEAN. The gentleman will find that my first bill gave the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the power to make such adjustments as might be convenient for the taxpayer. My second bill has provision making the tax a lien upon the taxpayer's estate at death, but that period is a considerable time from the due date and it is in conflict with the principle of ability to pay as I see it now. The advantage being uniform to all taxpayers, we should meet this difficulty with the philosophy of the farmer who finding his barn on fire tears down another barn between the fire and his house in order to save his house.

We have reached the point where we might just as well abate these taxes for 1942, clean the slate, start all over again and get our income tax on the basis where authorities say it ought to be, so that it will be a tax out of income payable currently when the taxpayer has the ability to pay and not a tax on income to be paid or demand for which will be made at some future time when the taxpayer is without the means to pay.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I see it, an individual's debt to the Government is as sacred as the Government's debt to the individual. Both should be paid fully if at all possible.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This may sound like a facetious inquiry at first, but I mean it very seriously. If the Treasury is not concerned with matters except that it have a constant flow of money, why not let the 1943 income-tax payment which we make apply for the year 1944 and be a year in advance all the time?

Mr. McLEAN. The gentleman would not say that is a current payment; would he?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not talking about current payments.

Mr. McLEAN. I am. I say that current payments are absolutely essential.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, the Treasury receives the money or the Treasury has a constant flow of money with which to meet its outgoing disbursements and the taxpayer is put in the position where he has paid in advance, and this certainly gives him an advantage; there is no question about that. If a fellow dies before the thing materializes, let the Treasury refund it to him. I submit that question seriously, and at the same time I would like to submit another one.

Mr. McLEAN. Could I answer the gentleman's first question?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes. I was not going to insist on an answer.

Mr. McLEAN. The logical thing to do would be to provide for the filing in the month of January of a tentative return of the taxpayer's estimated income for the year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. For the year?

Mr. McLEAN. For the year; and out of the money that is earned in January one-twelfth of the tax would then be paid and one-twelfth would be paid in each successive month. The taxpayer would be given the privilege of making adjustments according to his fortune, good or ill, during the year, and at the end of the year would make adjustments to his exact income.

Death and misfortune come quickly and unexpectedly. The idea of the income tax, being so personal, is to keep it up to date and concurrent with a man's ability to pay.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with that principle so fundamentally that I have followed that custom for years in my own affairs, either by depositing the money away from my normal use or through the purchase of tax-anticipation certificates. I can prove that by actual demonstration.

My other question is this: If the Treasury is not to receive the $10,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 from the taxpayers on 1942 income by reason of this remitting or canceling out——

Mr. McLEAN. Abatement, I call it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will not the Treasury be put in a position currently where it must borrow that additional amount of money, whatever it may be?

Mr. McLEAN. No. Under the present system money will begin to flow into the Treasury on 1942 taxes on March 15 next. Under my system, the flow would begin on the 1st of February on 1943 taxes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

### WE HAVE TOO MANY PEOPLE ON THE FEDERAL PAY ROLL

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the country a vast majority of the people are clamoring for the drastic reduction of every item of nonessential spending of the people's money for unnecessary things. Much comment has been made regarding the huge number of employees now on the Federal pay roll. It may be of interest for the people and the country to know that quite recently it was definitely determined that there were 4,073 civilians on the Federal pay roll in the city of Indianapolis, Ind. That check was made only a few days ago, but in order to ascertain just what the present number of civilians on that pay roll may be it would be necessary to make another and a complete check again to secure the exact information on this subject. The changes in personnel and in the number of the employees is rapid. As one of the agency heads stated, upon being asked the number of employees in his department, his answer was:

> Do you mean how many were working here this morning, or do you mean how many are working here this afternoon?

Even the department heads are unable to keep pace with the numerical strength of the civilian personnel under their control. New faces appear each day in this astounding build-up of those Federal agencies.

The people are protesting vigorously against this waste and confusion. Of course, that vast number of civilians on the Federal pay roll in the city of Indianapolis covers only a small part of those employees in the State of Indiana. Every city and every county has its large group of civilians who are on the Federal pay roll; and, while I am unable to give to the Congress the exact number of those employees in the State of Indiana—I wish I had the exact number so I could impart that information to the public—but it will suffice to say that those 4,073 civilian employees in the city of Indianapolis alone are drawing an annual salary of approximately $7,800,000. This amount increases as additional civilians are added to the pay roll. Here I wish to add that of that total number of civilian employees in that city, in all agencies, only 538 are directly involved and engaged in the emergency war effort, and that number includes all the paid workers on all the local draft boards, rationing boards, and kindred agencies. All of the remainder of the 4,073 are working in departments which are presumed to constitute the cogs in the normal machinery of government.

The city of Indianapolis is a sizable city of almost 400,000 people. But the city government of that city is operated, in its entirety, by approximately 2,000 employees. These city employees, of just about one-half the number of the civilian Federal employees, operate all departments of that great city. There is no scarcity of help, but every person on the pay roll has a job, and they are responsible for that particular task and its completion.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that our State government in Indiana, with all of its governmental functions, with its hospitals, its institutions, its schools, its prisons, and with every essential department of State government, has only approximately 12,000 State employees on the pay roll. These State employees each have a job, and they are each responsible for the completion of that job. They have complete organization in every department of State government. No employee is given a job unless his or her services are necessary. While I do not know the number of civilian Federal employees in the State of Indiana, as I have hereinbefore stated, yet I am constrained to believe that the civilian Federal employees in the State of Indiana, now on the pay roll, exceed in number all of the State employees in that State.

What does the payment of the staggering sum of approximately $7,800,000 in wages and salaries to that 4,073 people who are now on the Federal pay roll in the city of Indianapolis mean to our war effort? And what does the payment of many times that amount in wages and salaries to the civilian Federal employees in Indiana mean to the war effort? Take, for instance, the sum of $7,800,000 paid annually to those Federal employees in the city of Indianapolis alone, and that sum would pay for 80,000 Garand rifles, or 1 modern submarine, or 100 pursuit planes; that sum would equip our boys on the battle front with machine guns and antiaircraft guns; it would give them food and shelter; it would give them tanks and ammunition. And we must remember these employees are only a part of the approximately 3,000,000 civilians who are now on the Federal pay roll in time of war and national emergency. With this vast number of civilian employees, all now drawing huge sums in wages and salaries from our Government, the very vital part of the lifeblood is being sucked out of our all-out war effort. These nonwar and nonessential civilian employees must be reduced to the very minimum. Those whose services are not required to carry on the necessary functions essential to our war effort must go. Business must be injected into every department of Government, and business policies must be inaugurated by all those in charge.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman has no doubt made a careful study of this subject, judging from the way he is presenting it. I wonder if the gentleman would venture to give us an opinion as to what proportion of the nearly 3,000,000 civilian employees of the Government are unnecessary to the carrying on of the functions of the Government.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to my distinguished friend from Kentucky, that in making a comparison between the situation existing in the present war and in World War No. 1, that the peak of employment of civilian personnel during World War No. 1 was less than 900,000, although we had an Army of more than 5,000,000 men in the field. We would have ample civilian employees if one-third to one-half of those now on the pay roll were discharged.

Mr. Speaker, unless this civilian personnel is reduced to a minimum, we may soon find it hard to secure the means with which to prosecute this war properly. We must win this war. The people of this country are willing to make every necessary sacrifice to win this war but they do not want to make untold sacrifices and find their hard-earned dollars being squandered and frittered away in the payment of high wages and salaries to useless and valueless employees on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. May I ask my colleague if he can give us the amount paid the Federal employees as compared with the amount paid the 12,000 State employees of Indiana?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not have the exact amount of the pay roll. However, the number on the pay roll in the State of Indiana in all departments of government is 12,000. In the city of Indianapolis alone, there are 4,073 Federal employees drawing the huge sum of more than $7,800,000 per year in wages. Mark you, that number is increasing daily. The civilian Federal employees in the State of Indiana, at this moment, will equal, or exceed, the number of the State employees in that State. I am confident this same situation exists in practically every State in the Union.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Is it not true that we are being called upon to furnish houses for these surplus employees and to supplement the transportation facilities taking them to and from work as well as the hospital facilities and all the other conveniences that go along with an increased population? If we should do without a thousand of these employees, it would also help us to save critical materials needed in the war effort that are now being used to build houses for these people.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct, and I wish to thank him for that observation. The larger the employed civilian personnel, the greater the cost for transportation, housing, and all incidental matters. The total cost is

appalling. It is absorbing the funds intended for our war effort.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has the gentleman made any particular inquiry with reference to the number of persons who have been taken off the farms in Indiana to fill these surplus jobs, in the light of the statement just made by the Secretary of Agriculture that in the 12 months ended last September, 1,500,000 persons had left the farms to go into other occupations, and in the further light of the proposal now being considered for the drafting of women and children to be placed on the farms as replacements for those who have left the farms to fill these unnecessary positions?

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to my colleague that the migration of farm help into other occupations has been extremely high. The farmers have been left without sufficient help with which to operate their farms. The Government now asks our farmers to produce to the limit—but the help is not available; farm machinery and parts are under priorities—gasoline rationing has further impeded the farmer's progress, and our farmers are in a sad plight at this very moment. Many of those who were engaged in farming are now filling these unnecessary Government positions, we are advised.

As long as the loadstone of useless civilian employees, in various agencies of Government, is forced upon the people of this country—those employees drawing the very funds which should go into our war effort—we are laboring under a very serious handicap. This waste, extravagance, and confusion might mean disaster. This great governmental blunder might make it hard to win the victory which every American contemplates and desires.

Many of those civilian employees mentioned herein are engaged in rationing of every kind, in housing activities, in rent control, and other kindred projects, many of which could be better controlled and more advantageously handled by the local authorities, all of whom would willingly give their time and effort for the welfare of their country. You have observed the comparatively few of the total number of such employees that are engaged in the emergency war effort. The 538 civilians who are engaged on the war effort are, perhaps, essential. If they are engaged in some essential task connected with our war effort, they should be retained. However, there are 3,535 of such civilian employees who have no direct or indirect connection with any essential war work. That vast number of employees—all civilians—on the Federal pay roll in the one city is astounding. Many of them could well be dispensed with, which would result in a tremendous saving for the war effort, because their services are unnecessary and wasteful. Many of those civilian employees are young men, of military age, who are sound and well, capable of performing military duty. Many of them should be discharged from the Federal pay roll in order to aid our country in our all-out effort for victory in this war.

Mr. Speaker, the people in Indiana, and those in all of the States in our Union, want to win this war as quickly as possible. They do not want our war effort to become bogged down because of the heavy inroads made upon our finances by nonessential spending of the money which has been provided for victory in this war. They want the waste and extravagance stopped. They are sick and tired of bureaucratic government. They detest the useless and unnecessary regulations imposed upon them, and they are tired and worn from making reports of many and various kinds, many of which could not be of any worth-while benefit to any department in Washington. The tremendous overloading of the Federal agencies with civilians who are now on the pay roll may be attributed to the bureaucrats. They appear to enjoy heading an agency that is top-heavy with personnel; they want to spend the taxpayers' money. In the city of Indianapolis, where this unprecedented overloading with personnel has been developed, there are many people who are volunteering their services, gratuitously, for the war work, yet the overloading of those agencies continue without abatement.

Because of the waste and extravagance of the bureaucrats—and I might suggest the uninterrupted use of Government automobiles by them, with the running of motors while the cars are standing in order to keep the driver warm, although the public are conserving in their driving, and they are conserving gasoline—the people condemn such wasteful methods. The people are thinking of serious things—they are thinking of their boys, and their neighbors' boys, who are in this war for the very existence of this Republic.

Mr. Speaker, let us resurrect the records of World War No. 1 and compare some of those records with those of today. During the peak of the employment of civilians in that war we had much less than 1,000,000 of such employees in all departments of Government. We had a vast Army then, and those civilians performed every task and rendered every essential service. But today, in this war, we find that we have approximately 3,000,000 civilian employees, all of whom are on the Federal pay roll. The people shudder when they contemplate the result of such a policy of wastefulness and extravagance.

Mr. Speaker, this is a frightful and appalling situation. Our people throughout the land are bending their backs to earn money with which to buy bonds and stamps; they are trying to meet the terrific tax load which has been, and which will be, placed upon them; and they want to do everything within their power to aid in the prosecution of this war. Yet they want every person in high Government places to likewise bend their backs in curtailing and reducing every item of nonessential and nondefense spending of their money. They demand that their Government, and every officer and agent thereof, exert the same conscientious effort to win this war that they, the people, are doing. They want their money used to aid in the war effort and in winning the war. They protest against the spending of their money, which has been contributed for the war effort, for other nonessential uses and unwarranted purposes. They protest against the spending of their money for the purpose of paying the wages and salaries of useless and needless employees.

The people want to go forward after this war is over, Mr. Speaker, without having unnecessary burdens placed upon them which are caused by waste, extravagance, and bungling. They want to live again in the American way of life in our country, where peace shall reign and where liberty and freedom shall ever obtain. They want to go forward uninterrupted by internal obstructions against the war effort, with a clear vision, with a keen and correct understanding, and with an indomitable will and an unselfish determination to save the United States of America.

[Here the gavel fell.]

### ADJUSTMENT OF EGG PRICES

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a petition from 38 citizens of Boswell, Choctaw County, Okla., protesting against a ceiling price of 32 cents a dozen on eggs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, if the citizens of Boswell, Okla., knew what price we paid in Washington for eggs they would really have a grievance. We started housekeeping here last Saturday. Our first dozen eggs cost us 69 cents. Something should be done to take up the slack between the price of Boswell eggs, 32 cents a dozen, and Washington eggs, 69 cents a dozen. If this is efficiency, if this is justice, I have the wrong conception of the meaning of those words. This is one of the difficulties confronting us today in satisfying the public that Congress is in dead earnest. If we do not give them an explanation they may want someone who will explain it to them eventually.

Mr. Speaker, the petition to which I referred at the beginning of my remarks is as follows:

BOSWELL, OKLA., *January 15, 1943.*

Hon PAUL STEWART,
*Washington City.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been selected by the local Office of Price Administration to call your attention to the ceiling price on eggs, as compared to the prices we pay for feed consumed by hens. We have a ceiling price of 32 cents per dozen on eggs, which will be reduced shortly due to volume of eggs thrown on the market.

However, when the ceiling price was fixed, laying mash sold for $2.50 per 100 pounds, small grain for $1.35 per 100; oystershells at $1 per 100. The prices have now advanced until we are paying $3.10 per 100 pounds for mash, $2.50 for small grain, and $1 for 80 pounds of oystershells.

We are told by the dealers to expect higher prices to increase, as there is no ceiling price on feed. To those of us who have increased our poultry flocks due to helping the war effort, this is a handicap, as our eggs will scarcely pay for the feed at present price levels.

Can we hope for any adjustment? With best wishes for your success in Congress, we remain,

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. O. J. Majors, W. L. Pitts, R. H. Duncan, B. E. Pitts, Mrs. B. E. Pitts, W. W. Moran, W. G. Ruth, Mrs. W. G. Ruth, Mrs. V. H. Bryant, Mrs. O. E. Pattison, Mrs. S. D. Dobson, A. L. Middleton, Mrs. John Armstrong, Mrs. C. D. Ryburn, Mrs. J. D. Ingram, Mrs. H. L. Dewoody, Mrs. J. K. Porter, Mrs. W. Y. Morrijo, W. E. Bryant, Mrs. W. E. Bryant, Mrs. Carl Schuessler, Carl Schuessler, Maggie Wallace, Mrs. M. D. Harper, Mrs. Frank Yoe, Mrs. Paul Leader, Mrs. Charles Yoe, Mrs. A. T. Tillery, Mrs. W. C. Stephens, Eric Smith, Dixie Smith, W. C. Stephens, D. Wickwire, S. M. Danoer, J. L. Adair, O. J. Majors, Walter Webb.

## AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of reminding gentlemen that tomorrow, immediately after the business on the Speaker's desk is disposed of, the committee appointed by the Congress under H. R. 125 will meet during an informal recess with the membership of the House, in executive session, to give you some facts which perforce, because of wartime emergencies, could not be put into our final report. There are many vital matters that the committee does not desire to withhold from the membership of the House, and we are taking the House not only into our full confidence, but we assure Members that we have some things to tell them which we feel they must know, and we hope there will be a good attendance.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FULMER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## RENT CONTROL

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that letters to which I refer be printed at this place in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday—January 14, 1943—I addressed the House on rent control. I made reference to a letter from Joseph A. Brown, attorney for the apartment-house industry of San Francisco, which I forwarded to Hon. Joseph F. Byrnes.

Today I received a reply signed by Price Administrator Leon Henderson. To complete the record, I submit the following correspondence: Letter from Mr. Henderson, dated January 16, 1943, together with the Joseph A. Brown letter of December 28, 1942, and a letter from Price Administrator Henderson to Senator HIRAM W. JOHNSON:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D. C., January 16, 1943.*

The Honorable THOMAS ROLPH,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. ROLPH: Your letter of January 5 to the Honorable James F. Byrnes enclosing a communication from Mr. Joseph A. Brown, of San Francisco, Calif., has been referred to this office for reply.

An identical letter from Mr. Brown has been directed to this office by Senator HIRAM W. JOHNSON. We are enclosing herewith a copy of our reply to Senator JOHNSON for your information.

Sincerely yours,

LEON HENDERSON, *Administrator.*

[Enclosure.]

---

SAN FRANCISCO, *December 28, 1942.*

Hon. HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
*United States Senate,*

Hon. SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
*United States Senate,*

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
*Member of Congress,*

Hon. THOMAS ROLPH,
*Member of Congress,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIRS: As the attorney for the Apartment House Industry of San Francisco, and as the representative of many apartment-house owners in the bay area, it is my belief that the suggestion herein made will be of general benefit to the owners of rental property in the United States and not in anywise interfere with the practical and effective operation of the Office of Price Administration—with reference to rent control—mainly intended to prevent inflation.

I might preliminarily observe that, with any sound proposal, law, rule, regulation, suggestion, plan, or order reasonably calculated to prevent inflation, we are heartily and unqualifiedly in accord and will support it whether compulsory or not. The grim specter of inflation hovers over the Nation in time of war and during periods of necessary enormous bond issues and governmental borrowing. It can only be curbed—if even that is effective—by universal regulation. Merely freezing rents will not suffice. The rising tide of wages, restaurant prices, meats, railroad fares, materials for building and most essential commodities for apartment-house operation, leaves rents remaining as the sole and single and absolute one thing in a grossly inequitable state.

Let us examine the subject in closer detail:

When, effective retroactively to March 1, 1942, rents were frozen on July 1, 1942, about one-half of the apartment-house operators in San Francisco were renting apartments from figures ranging from a low basis to one fairly ratable as being below cost. Since that time, city taxes have increased (although definitely we concede this should not rightly be true) and likewise every branch of repair, service, and maintenance costs has increased; furthermore, general living costs are conceded to have materially increased since March 1, 1942. There are thousands of instances requiring adjustment of real estate rentals to render a fair return to honest, conscientious, and 100 percent loyal, patriotic, and law-abiding landlords.

Under Office of Price Administration rules, no provision for curing, correcting, or alleviating in any form such inequalities, exists or has been made. These rules are inelastic and rigid. When this subject is discussed with those associated officially with the Office of Price Administration, the reply is made that neither the necessary manpower or funds to defray the cost of administering the law and giving individual attention, investigation, and hearing to each complaining owner, are available, and that the cost would be prohibitive and is, therefore, as a practical and feasible matter, out of the question.

When the reply is made that a patriotic committee of responsible businessmen, experienced in the field, volunteering for the work, sworn in under the Office of Price Administration Act as Federal officials, could be appointed to do this work—without one dollar of expense or cost to the Government—it is declared they could not be trusted or that the plan will not work—for some unexplained and inexplicable reason. To this we reply most vigorously that it cannot be true that there are not sufficient numbers of outstanding honorable American citizens throughout the United States who could, without a dollar of expense to the Government, administer efficiently and honestly this suggested feature of the law in harmony with the letter and spirit of the law designed primarily to prevent inflation. It is a most specious avoidance of the issue to contend against this plan. The United States Selective Service Act is administered by uncompensated civilian boards most successfully and competently, from local to appeal boards—and under that act the boards have a wide discretion and a vitally important duty to perform. They are not paid, and often times induct their friends and neighbors and their children, and perform their duties courageously and fearlessly. It is an unjustifiable impugning of the integrity of American citizenship to contend for such reasons against the plan herein proposed.

The plan does not contemplate encroaching o the functions or prerogatives of paid employees nor to displace them. The proposed boards would be an adjunct of the established Office of Price Administration offices in different cities and all should work in complete harmony.

It is our thought that these boards should be composed of sufficiently large numbers comparable to the population of each city concerned, for efficient and prompt investigation of injustices and inequalities. Simplified application forms could be employed by the applicants and must be prepared and formulated by themselves to obviate costs. These could be numbered and indexed and then referred to subcommittees of members residing or having their places of business in the locality concerned and a proper investigation made by such subcommittees. They would be required to report their findings in writing, whereupon they should be considered by the entire committee at a regularly scheduled meeting, with a calendar of all prepared cases, at which time the applicant and any tenant desiring to be heard could appear and present their respective cases. This would result in the fair and impartial consideration of cases and give to the American landlord and tenant the security of a fair hearing before a duly established tribunal. We feel this course will do much to create faith in the Office of Price

Administration and in the public support which is important to such a law, and will materially foster the Government's purpose.

The writer is firmly for the enforcement of all Office of Price Administration rules while they are in force, and always will be so disposed. It is the duty of an American citizen to abide by and support all law and order. Laws must be obeyed regardless of agreement or disagreement with them. American citizenship calls for and demands such obedience, and the writer has pledged his devotion and full adherence to the requirements of the Office of Price Administration rules and orders.

However, with equal determination, it is the considered opinion of the writer that the suggested relief plan is the only workable one for equity and justice in the premises. Won't you be good enough to strive for the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress to accomplish the purpose herein advocated? If the Congress can be positive the alleged and claimed obstacle to a full and just administration of the law can be effectively eradicated by entrusting the herein discussed proposed law to sworn uncompensated citizens, loyally desirous of administering justice under the Office of Price Administration without any cost or expense of any kind to our Government, then we earnestly and sincerely ask that the Congress enact the required legislation to effect the suggested plan.

That endless individual cases of injustice exist is beyond doubt. Even the most ardent Office of Price Administration administrative officers will concede the existence of such instances calling for remedial legislation—even though they are equally unwilling to concede the practicability of the proposal herein considered.

I feel certain the Nation's renters of multiple dwellings will deeply appreciate relief as herein suggested.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. BROWN,
*Attorney for Apartment House Industry of San Francisco.*

---

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D. C.*

The Honorable HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: We acknowledge receipt of your communication enclosing a letter from Mr. Joseph A. Brown, of San Francisco, setting forth certain suggestions concerning rent control.

This letter suggests that there has been an increase in wages, meats, railroad fares, materials for building, and other essential commodities, leaving rent as the one thing in an inequitable state. This argument is based on an essentially unsound comparison. It derives from the assumption that an increase in rent normally represents the same proportionate increase in a landlord's net income. This assumption is contrary to fact. A landlord's net income in the operation of rental housing is only a relatively small part of his gross rent income and a small percentage increase in gross rent income, whether from increased rates or increased occupancy, combined with relatively stable expenditures, results in a far larger percentage increase in net income. The contention with respect to the position of landlords neglects these factors.

In keeping with what we believe to be the intent of Congress, the effect of rent control upon the operation of real estate is under constant study. It is clear from these studies that the operating position of landlords will be considerably better under rent control than it was during 1939 and 1940, the 2 years immediately prior to the sharp impact of defense activities. It was not the intent of Congress, nor is it the purpose of the Administrator, to guarantee the landlords or any other class of persons a better financial position than they would have enjoyed in the absence of the peculiar economic conditions created by the war.

The proposal is made that the rents initially established by the regulation should be subject to adjustment upon application of the landlord through submission to voluntary panels. The letter does not attempt to set forth the standards which such panels would use in guiding their determination. In substance, this idea is not new. It was originally considered by Congress and rejected during the course of the House debates on the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. The following amendment to the bill was proposed:

"When rents have been established as is herein provided, the same shall be adjusted upward or downward upon the application of the owner or the tenant so as to produce a gross rental which after payment of taxes and other costs of ownership, management, and operation, including depreciation and an allowance for vacancy, will provide a net return which is reasonable upon the value of the property."

This amendment was rejected because it was recognized that there is no satisfactory standard for measuring "reasonable return" and because of the tremendous administrative burden which it would entail. The impossibility of arriving at a determination of a satisfactory value of rental property which constitutes a "reasonable return" even as a follow-up measure may be briefly pointed out.

Valuations by tax authorities are useless. In some localities, as a matter of custom and practice, assessed values are fixed absurdly low. It would be grossly unfair to property owners to make their rents dependent upon such valuations. In other localities, assessed values are by custom and practice even higher than the prices at which properties are commonly bought and sold. To base rentals on such values would permit inflationary rises inconsistent with the purposes of the act.

It has been suggested that the value of a rental property for purposes of fixing a "reasonable return" might be determined by establishing a theoretical sales value or by applying the principle of prudent investment. However, both of these are largely dependent upon how much rent the property will produce. Thus, either of these devices requires the assumption of a point in controversy.

Other suggested devices by which value might be determined are cost of reproduction and actual cost less depreciation. Use of the reproduction cost device would reflect recent increases in building and material costs and would result in unduly high rents as to owners who built their properties when lower prices prevailed. In the case of owners whose properties are not favorably located in relation to transportation facilities or otherwise, reproduction cost as a basis for determining value is wholly irrelevant. Many owners of rental property keep no books so that the necessary figures as to actual cost less depreciation are not available. In this case, also, due to factors such as the shifting desirability of neighborhoods and location with reference to transportation facilities, the test of actual cost less depreciation will in many cases bear no relation to actual rental value.

The proposal that all rents be adjusted to the generally prevailing level for comparable housing accommodations has a plausibility which is only superficial. This suggestion presupposes that there are a substantially large number of every type of dwelling units which are alike for purposes of rental value, are rented at substantially the same rental, and are comparable to the dwelling unit in question. Actually a comparable dwelling unit is a very rare thing. Intangible factors such as subtle differences in appearance and surroundings, the lay-out of the rooms, the direction in which they face, the scenery, and other factors will, in a normal market, result in a higher rental for one dwelling unit than for another which is in many respects comparable. It has been observed that the rent for the dwelling unit which is most comparable to the one in question is the rent charged for the one in question. The maximum rent regulation issued by the Administrator, it is true, uses this device for determining a maximum rent in those cases in which there was clearly no rental value arrived at by the processes of ordinary economic forces on the freeze date. This is only because in this limited class of cases some artificial basis must be resorted to, and no better device is available. This standard is one which at best results in a crude approximation of fair rental value and should be used in only a relatively small number of cases.

All of the alternative devices above discussed, even if used only as follow-up devices for establishing fair or reasonable maximum rents, would require detailed and complex investigation and study of data regarding every one of the millions of properties for which it is necessary to establish maximum rents. Protracted litigation would result in many cases. It would take years for such determinations to be made. The judicial or administrative processes by which they were made would break down or lag far behind. In the meantime, some owners would have rents giving them a so-called fair or reasonable return while many would remain on the date basis. The Administrator and his staff would be so absorbed in the task of determining reasonable return that they would have neither the time nor the facilities to make those adjustments which are really necessary nor would they be able to devote themselves to the proper and effective administration of the act.

A further and important objection to both the reasonable return and the comparability standards, whether used initially or as follow-ups, is that they require a departure from the fundamental concepts of the American competitive system. In a normal rental market, differences exist in the rents and the rates of return which different landlords receive for comparable dwelling units. As has been pointed out above, this is due to a great variety of factors, including differences in the terms on which the owners obtained their properties or capital, differences in efficiency of management, vagaries of fortune, and differences in rental policies of the individual landlords. To equalize all rents or income from rental properties without regard to these varying factors, would raise some owners to a rent or income level which, for one reason or another, they did not attain under ordinary competitive conditions and would reduce others from a higher level which they had attained under the same competitive conditions. Such a process would be inflationary insofar as it would result in tenants paying higher rents than the landlord would have obtained in the absence of the abnormal pressure created by war activities. For the more fortunate or competent operators, it would be regimentation in its worst aspect. It would amount to equalizing by Government action incomes of landlords and incomes from rental properties which had been unequal under normal market conditions. No authority is granted in the act, and it is inconceivable that the national peril should be utilized, for equalizing differences which have always existed in American economy resulting from differences of policy, differences of fortune, and differences of ability.

Sincerely yours,

LEON HENDERSON, *Administrator.*

THE PRICE OF EGGS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes, to explain the matter of the price of eggs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] about those egg prices. It was with a little amusement that I listened to him and his complaint about the high price paid for eggs, because he is an old, experienced legislator. He has been for years in the legislative body of Oklahoma. I am sure if he had thought a moment he would have caught on to this. No one feels sorry for a Congressman; no one should. There is no law which compels one to be a Congressman and pay 69 cents a dozen for eggs. I will tell you how it works out in Michigan. The Hamilton co-op markets two or three carloads of eggs a week that they ship by truck. What kind of eggs were those that you had? Were they pullet eggs?

Mr. STEWART. No. 1 eggs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, those would be good, big eggs. Now, up in Michigan we get three or four carloads of eggs at Hamilton every week to ship to Chicago. Those eggs pass inspection both by Federal and State inspectors in Hamilton, in Allegan County, Mich. But when we start to send them to Chicago, then we have to pay to the union $50 for every truck driver. But he only gets halfway to Chicago. He gets down to the Indiana State line and then the co-op has to pay $50 more. We must have two drivers. Then when the eggs come to Chicago the union wants $1.10 to inspect those eggs over there, after they have already been inspected up in our country.

Now, a lot of that money goes to these union truck drivers or to the union. The farmers do not get it. So do you not see you are not paying the farmers when you pay 69 cents a dozen, when your farmer down there only gets 32 cents. Some of the money paid for the eggs goes to these fellows who are riding the trucks, more of it goes to the union. The result, the country over, is less for the farmer, less for the consumer. Remember this, the administration protects those unions and compels a man to join a union whether he wants to or not, and then along comes election time and the union kicks in to the New Deal campaign fund. So it all comes back to the majority for a remedy.

That is the fact, and that is one reason why you have to pay that 69 cents for the eggs the farmer sold for 32 cents. You should not kick about it because, indirectly, even though you do not like it, you are contributing to the New Deal campaign fund when you buy a dozen eggs.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I wonder if the gentleman knows of any instance in which somebody jumped onto a wagon and drove in and collected this $50, and the Supreme Court of the United States upheld them?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes; I know that the stand-by practice was upheld in the case of *U. S.* v. *Local 807, I. B. C. T. & H.*, March 2, 1942. While one Justice characterized the practice as highway robbery, the others held that Congress did not mean that kind of racketeering—just intended to stop the Dillinger type of robbery. Those fellows up there who do not have any meat have charged the farmers $25 to get into Detroit with a truckload of meat. So I do not feel too bad about them not getting any meat.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I think you might be right at that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; by accident—perhaps by accident.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix by printing an editorial from the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. GEARHART), for 2 days, to attend a funeral in Vermont.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 20, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

74. A letter from the Administrator of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions of the United States Department of Labor, transmitting the report of the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor for the year ended June 30, 1942, together with a report for the same period of the public contracts, with which it has been consolidated; to the Committee on Labor.

75. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

76. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report covering the fiscal year 1942 of the National Park Trust Fund Board; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

77. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey of the Wolf Creek watershed in Texas and Oklahoma, made by the Department of Agriculture pursuant to the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

78. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture transmitting a report of the survey of the Pajaro River watershed, California, based on an investigation authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

---

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 854) for the relief of Mary G. Person, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

---

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 1280. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, blind persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment compensation laws; to establish a Social Security Board; to raise revenues and for other purposes", approved August 14, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1281. A bill to establish a self-sustaining national pension system that will benefit retired citizens 60 years of age and over; to stabilize the economic structure of the Nation; and to induce a more equitable distribution of wealth through monetary circulation to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:

H. R. 1282. A bill for the relief of certain members of local or district boards, or legal advisory boards, and of medical advisory boards appointed under the provisions of the Selective Service Act of May 18, 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 1283. A bill to facilitate the liquidation of Home Owners' Loan Corporation through the transfer and sale of its assets to individuals and local banks, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, trust companies, insurance companies, and other mortgage institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 1284. A bill relating to the naturalization of persons not citizens who serve honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 1285. A bill to fix the compensation of substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 1286. A bill to amend section 1001, title X, of the Social Security Act (Public Law No. 271, 74th Cong.), to include needy individuals who are permanently crippled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:
H. R. 1287. A bill to establish a national land policy and to provide homesteads free of debt for actual farm families; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOTT:
H. R. 1288. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:
H. R. 1289. A bill to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:
H. R. 1290. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.
H. R. 1291. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WARD JOHNSON:
H. R. 1292. A bill authorizing payment of a clothing allowance to members of the Fleet Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARE:
H. R. 1293. A bill to provide that grants-in-aid by the United States to any State shall be computed on the basis of the ratio of the per capita income of the United States to the per capita income of such State in lieu of being computed on the basis of equal matching of funds by the United States and such State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANHAM:
H. R. 1294 (by request). A bill to authorize the sale or transfer of property belonging to the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MASON:
H. R. 1295. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the residence for naturalization purposes of certain aliens who serve in the military or naval forces of one of the Allied countries during the Second World War, or otherwise assist in the Allied war effort, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.
H. R. 1296. A bill to amend sections 347 (b) and 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940 by extending the periods within which petitions for naturalization filed prior to the effective date of that act may be heard, and to extend for a period of 4 years the time within which certain citizens must return to the United States as evidence of the fact that they have elected to become American citizens, respectively; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOTT:
H. R. 1297. A bill to authorize the Director of the Census to issue certifications of birth records; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. NORRELL:
H. R. 1298. A bill to provide identification buttons for persons deferred or discharged from or rejected for military or naval service on account of physical defects not due to personal misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARE:
H. R. 1299. A bill relating to transportation of the mails by common carriers by motor vehicle subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:
H. R. 1300. A bill to establish a national land policy, and to provide homesteads for actual farm families; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:
H. R. 1301. A bill to authorize the construction of the Umatilla Dam in the Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.
H. R. 1302. A bill to provide for the acquisition and toll-free operation by the United States of the interstate bridges at Cascade Locks and Hood River, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.
H. R. 1303. A bill to provide for the conservation of fish and wildlife on Indian lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
H. R. 1304. A bill authorizing the Snake or Piute Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon to sue in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
H. R. 1305. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.
H. R. 1306. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain lands for and the addition thereof to the Deschutes National Forest, in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture.
H. R. 1307. A bill to authorize completion of alterations to a bridge over the Columbia River, made necessary by Bonneville Dam; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LEMKE:
H. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution making provisions for the refund of the processing tax on hogs marketed for slaughter by the raisers and producers who in fact bore all or part of the burden of such tax; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILCHRIST:
H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution making provisions for refunding to producers the unlawful processing tax which they paid or bore on hogs marketed for slaughter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:
H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Economy and Efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:
H. Res. 59. Resolution to amend rules X and XI of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:
H. Res. 60. Resolution to provide for continuing review of the work of executive agencies by standing committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:
H. Res. 61. Resolution providing expenses for continuing the investigation authorized by House Resolution No. 20; to the Committee on Accounts.

---

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:
H. R. 1308. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma E. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAVENS:
H. R. 1309. A bill for the relief of L. A. Holcombe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
H. R. 1310. A bill for the relief of Thula B. Wellborn; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1311. A bill for the relief of Dan Crotts; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1312. A bill reinstating Clyde H. Phillips to the position and rank of first lieutenant in the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLISON of Maryland:
H. R. 1313. A bill for the relief of Delores Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARE:
H. R. 1314. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Lott; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:
H. R. 1315. A bill for the relief of George Henry Bartole; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1316. A bill for the relief of Vernon Wayne Tennyson; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1317. A bill for the relief of Premier Insurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1318. A bill for the relief of Jack V. Dyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:
H. R. 1319. A bill for the relief of Mrs. W. V. Justice; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT:
H. R. 1320. A bill to restore George H. Gardiner, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTON:
H. R. 1321. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:
H. R. 1322. A bill granting a pension to Leona McCrary; to the Committee on Pensions.
H. R. 1323. A bill granting a pension to Anna M. Fladger; to the Committee on Pensions.
H. R. 1324. A bill granting a pension to William McKinley Green; to the Committee on Pensions.
H. R. 1325. A bill granting a pension to Jackson McCoury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1326. A bill to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to Robert Judson McGarry; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1327. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Wilson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
H. R. 1328. A bill for the relief of Frank P. Luttrell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
H. R. 1329. A bill for the relief of Martha Smith Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.
H. R. 1330. A bill for the relief of Leonard P. Shoun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
H. R. 1331. A bill for the relief of Robert Helton; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1332. A bill for the relief of William McKinley Laws; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
H. R. 1333. A bill for the relief of Roland W. Davison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:
H. R. 1334. A bill for the relief of J. Frank Meador; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1335. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decisions of the Court of Claims in two suits instituted by H. B. Nelson (doing business as the H. B. Nelson Construction Co.); to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1336. A bill for the relief of Commercial Investment Discount, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:
H. R. 1337. A bill for the relief of Ben H. Owens; to the Committee on War Claims.
H. R. 1338. A bill for the relief of Bonnie R. Howard; to the Committee on War Claims.
H. R. 1339. A bill for the relief of Jeter P. Owenby; to the Committee on War Claims.
H. R. 1340. A bill for the relief of Ira Ellis Veal; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:
H. R. 1341. A bill to permit naturalization of Mrs. Susie Demeter; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:
H. R. 1342. A bill granting an increase of pension to Oscar Sheffield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1343. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Painter Menoher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHIFFLER:

H. R. 1344. A bill for the relief of Paul W. Busbey, Mrs. Paul W. Busbey, Paula Busbey, and Mrs. Louisa Busbey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:

H. R. 1345. A bill for the relief of W. H. Rabold, Sr., administrator of the estate of Raphael Fred Rabold; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1346. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Hancock, administratrix of the estate of Arch F. Hancock; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1347. A bill granting a pension to Jamaica Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1348. A bill granting a pension to Laura C. Clarke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1349. A bill granting an increase of pension to Burley L. Van Fleet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1350. A bill granting a renewal of pension to William H. Shanklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1351. A bill for the relief of the State compensation fund of California; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to reinter the bodies of Mary McDonough Johnson Doughtery and Sarah Phillips McCardle Whitesides near the body of former President Andrew Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

18. By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of Frank W. Baukus, of Saginaw, Mich., praying assistance for inventors; to the Committee on Patents.

19. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition presented by Mrs. N. T. House, clerk of Hillerman Baptist Church, of Massac County, Ill., signed by A. M. Troutman, pastor, and 48 members of said church, protesting against the sale of intoxicating liquors in and around the Army camps, and petitioning the Congress to pass legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in the vicinity of said camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

20. By Mr. HERTER: Petition adopted by the House of Representatives of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to take immediate steps to relieve distress and suffering caused by the shortage of fuel oil in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

21. Also, petition of the Massachusetts Fruit Growers Association, Inc., favoring increase in basic workweek from 40 hours to 48 hours; to the Committee on Labor.

22. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of E. H. Hines and 53 other farmers and farm owners of Limestone County, Tex., favoring repeal of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

23. By Mr. LANE: Memorial prepared by Frederic W. Cook, secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, requesting in behalf of the people of the Commonwealth that Congress take immediate steps to relieve distress and suffering caused by the shortage of fuel oil in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

24. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging immediate steps to relieve distress and suffering caused by shortage of fuel oil in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

25. By Mr. REES of Kansas: Resolution of the Boston Grange, No. 1838, of Lyon County, Kans.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

26. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution No. 17 of the California Cattlemen's Association, 55 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, for removal of overlapping and unnecessary bureaus; to the Committee on Appropriations.

27. Also, resolution of the board of supervisors, city and county of San Francisco, Calif., petitioning the Office of Price Administration to increase gasoline ration for San Francisco motorists; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

28. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of J. O. Wagoner, secretary pro tempore, Wheeling Automotive Merchants' Association, Wheeling, W. Va., protesting against the subrationing for the First District of West Virginia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

29. Also, petition of the West Virginia State Restaurant Association, Charleston, W. Va., urging the West Virginia Senators and Representatives to exert and exercise their influence with the Office of Price Administration for the relaxation of existing rules and regulations affecting gas rationing and that every effort be made to have West Virginia taken out of the classification of the Atlantic seaboard States and placed under the same regulations as the other States of the Union; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

30. Also, petition of the Lions Club of Wheeling, W. Va., protesting against the recent regulations concerning gas rationing in the First District of West Virginia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

31. Also, petition of the executive committee of the Live Wire Group of Wheeling, W. Va., protesting against the discrimination to the citizens of West Virginia by being placed in zone 1, and urging that the Northern Panhandle territory be excluded from the eastern seaboard or zone 1 classification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious Father, who in all ages hast been revealing Thyself to man as the Child of God, we approach Thy throne of grace. We would humble ourselves before Thee because of our unworthiness, confessing our sins and asking Thy forgiveness. We rejoice in Thy care and patience which lasts from day to day and never grows weary. We pray that we may always seek the higher ideals—a quiet home, a number of friends worthy of being loved, wholesome pleasure which brings no pain, devotion to the right which will never swerve, and a simple faith full of trust, hope, and love.

O Divine Spirit, as watchers of the night so ominous, we wait for the morning and rejoice at the radiance of the sun which is destined to gild the sky. The future will surely strip the fragile might of human power and the angels' song, with its consoling message, will roll across the wide spaces of this dark earth; hasten the hour in which the tyrant's ambition to reign shall be supplanted by the passion to serve. In the name and for the sake of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article on the Tolan committee report written by Felix Morley.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, according to today's press, Lou Holland, Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, has been replaced by Col. Robert Johnson. I sincerely trust that the replacement of Mr. Holland will also be followed by the replacement of several of the directors of the Corporation. When that Corporation was first formed and its directors were appointed, I sent the following telegram to Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board:

Today's New York newspapers carry announcement of appointment of directors of Smaller War Plants Corporation. Regret failure to appoint New York man on board who would be familiar with industrial and labor problems of New York City. With all due respect to your ability to appoint competent executives, and without reflection on ability of gentlemen appointed directors, can frankly see little hope of workable plan being devised by directors from Kansas City, Louisville, York, Murphysboro, and Chelsea to utilize in war effort New York's industries and unemployed skilled and unskilled labor. Urgently suggest appointment as director New York man familiar with New York's industrial and labor problems who will be able to submit first-hand information to board of directors on situation in New York.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a letter from Mr. Donald Nelson.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
*Washington, D. C., July 13, 1942.*

Hon. WALTER A. LYNCH,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. LYNCH: This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram of July 11 in which you expressed regret that a New York man had not been appointed to the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and urged that a man familiar with New York labor and industrial problems be appointed as New York director.

The members of the board of directors of the Corporation were selected with considerable care and are, I believe, not only sympathetic with the objectives of the legislation, but are familiar with the problems of the smaller businessmen in the various parts of the United States.

The various regional and local offices of the War Production Board, through which the Smaller War Plants Corporation will function, are being staffed with the same concern for maximum utilization of the productive capacity of small plants, and you may be sure that every effort will be made to get the most competent employees possible.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. NELSON.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, my fears in connection with the Smaller War Plants Corporation have been confirmed. In all the months of its existence not a single prime contract has been let by the Smaller War Plants Corporation to any industry in New York City; as a matter of fact, it has apparently been the policy that because New York City is a large city it therefore does not need aid in connection with its smaller industries. I sincerely trust that when the new directors are appointed a New York man will be placed on the board, so that the people of my city will feel that the Smaller War Plants Corporation has been organized for the benefit of all small industries, not to the exclusion of New York.

I do not desire to be overcritical of Mr. Holland and his associates on the board of directors of Smaller War Plants Corporation, but when this Corporation has been in existence for more than 6 months, and with an available fund of $150,000,000, it has failed to let a single contract in New York City, the most distressed area in the country, it is about time that a change of directors and a change of policy are made.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Today an employee of the House, George Taylor, leaves to join the armed forces. He is a capable son of a very distinguished citizen of Brooklyn, a father who during his public career served his district in the State legislature, served his city as comptroller of the city of New York, and as welfare commissioner. He also served as sheriff of his county and is presently a commissioner of the Port of New York Authority. George does credit to an already distinguished name, and he goes, I am sure, with the good wishes of all the membership of this House and with the hope and prayer that he will have a speedy return with the victory to which we all look forward.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain letters published in an Italian daily paper under date of January 18.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two separate insertions—in one to include an editorial and in the other resolutions recently adopted by the Kansas State Board of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Governor Earl Snell to the Oregon Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two requests: One, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article; and, secondly, that I may address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COTTONSEED CAKE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the president of the State board of agriculture of my State called my attention to a recent order of the War Production Board limiting, not to exceed 2 weeks, the supply of cottonseed cake to any one individual operator.

To anyone who pretends to know anything about the cattle industry, especially in the range country where thousands of head of cattle winter on nothing except grass and oil cake, such an order is of course impractical and nonsensical, and additional evidence of the absurdity of giving authority to someone to formulate policies and prepare orders promulgating such policies or making regulations under such policies, who has no practical knowledge of the subject matter being considered or the regulation being promulgated with respect to the same.

A few months ago someone who knew nothing about the milk and cream business made effective an order fixing and limiting the number of days in the week and designating the particular days that farmers could sell and deliver their cream to the dealers in the various towns throughout the country. Naturally, the order created such a furore among both buyers and sellers, that it had to be repealed.

It is unfortunate that during these critical times it seems necessary to be constantly criticizing these agencies which have been set up to administer the legislation made necessary by the exigencies of the war. But until those in authority make practical knowledge and experience a major qualification for competency in selecting those who formulate policies and make the rules and regulations governing the same, we may expect these inconsistent and farcical orders to keep recurring.

WHY NOT RATION USE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in these days of rationing tires, gas, farm machinery, household goods, clothing, food, and manpower, all in interest of the war effort, the Government has given little consideration to rationing one of the things that does not contribute to the winning of the war, but consumes food and manpower so essential to the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, why does not the Government ration alcoholic beverages of all kinds? Why not cut down the time during which it may be sold? Why has the Federal Government not acted in this regard? It will be said that most distilleries of hard liquor are now making industrial alcohol. The fact is, it is estimated there is 3 or 4 years' supply of hard liquor on hand. The manufacture and sale of beer and similar products continues practically as usual.

Let me quote some figures. The total consumption of alcoholic beverages in this country during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, was more than 2,000,000,000 gallons. It cost approximately $4,000,000,000. The labor and transportation costs are estimated at $2,000,000,000. It took 15,000,000 tons of grain, more than a million tons of fruit, and 70,000 tons of sugar and sirups, to produce it. Even a share of that food would go a long way to help feed people who are hungry.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated there are more than 400,000 liquor sellers in the United States. While we are asking people to cut down the use of fuel and lighting in their homes and in the schools and churches, drinking places in Washington and in cities throughout the country are well heated and well lighted until early hours in the morning.

Mr. Speaker, before the Manpower Commission gives too serious consideration to requiring women to leave their homes for employment in industry, it may well consider utilizing the services of a good share of a half million persons engaged in the liquor business.

Mr. Speaker, here is a place for some real rationing. It will do good in more ways than one, if the officials have the courage to do it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a sermon delivered by Rev. Paul Little, D. D., at the American Legion memorial services conducted in All Saints Episcopal Church, San Francisco, on Sunday, November 8, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]?

There was no objection.

OATH OF OFFICE ADMINISTERED TO HON. MARY T. NORTON

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with your designation of me, pursuant to House Resolution 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, adopted by the House of Representatives, to administer the oath of office to Representative-elect MARY T. NORTON, of the Thirteenth District of New Jersey, I have the honor to report that

on the 16th day of January 1943, at Jersey City, N. J., I administered the oath of office to Mrs. NORTON, form prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, being the form of oath administered to Members of the House of Representatives, to which Mrs. NORTON subscribed.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 62), as follows:

Whereas MARY T. NORTON, a Representative from the State of New Jersey, from the Thirteenth District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed to the oath of office before the Honorable EDWARD J. HART, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in her behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to her election: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said MARY T. NORTON as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

REGULATION OF UNIONS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it is unfair and in the long run it never pays to give one group of citizens privileges that are denied to others simply because the favored group seems to be in a position to blackmail the public. A little more than a year ago this Government, under threat of a shut-down of all in heavy industry, extended unfair privileges to Mr. John L. Lewis and his fellow hijackers. All coal miners were forced into his union regardless of their wishes and were required to pay tribute in the form of dues fixed not by the men themselves but by Mr. Lewis and his fellow officials. The dues were deducted from the workers' pay and turned over to the Lewis organization by the mine operators. In return for the closed shop and the check-off Mr. Lewis agreed that there would be no more strikes. That agreement which the Government so ruthlessly imposed on the miners and the mine operators was binding on everyone except the group of blackmailers who got the cash. Has Mr. Lewis made good? Has he stopped strikes in the coal mines? Not only is the war being unnecessarily prolonged today by the strike of thousands of miners whose labor and personal freedom Mr. Lewis assumes to offer for sale in the market place, but we are now threatened with a much more far-reaching strike in April, and Mr. Lewis indicates that he will aid and abet this contemplated treason.

In the meantime, why has not Mr. Lewis and his United Coal Miners been held accountable for their breach of their contract? Simply because years ago the Congress exempted labor unions from the responsibility for their acts that is enforced on any other group of citizens engaging in business, and under recent decisions of the Supreme Court this exemption in the irresponsible hands of Mr. Lewis has been for practical purposes converted into a license to steal.

I hold no brief for the striking miners. They probably would not personally shoot American soldiers in the back, as those soldiers crept through the jungles of Guadalcanal or over the hills of North Africa, but the action of these Pennsylvania miners is surely allowing the Japs and the Germans to shoot a needless number of our boys. The most charitable thing that can be said about these strikers is that they are more interested in their own welfare than they are in the welfare of the Nation. At the same time it is unfair to place all the blame on the miners. The blood of American boys is not only on the hands of these selfish strikers, but it is also on those who created the un-American peonage in which Mr. Lewis holds these men. This strike originated as a protest on the part of the men against the action of Mr. Lewis' union itself. Under the undemocratic check-off system whereby a worker could not draw the wage that had been promised him even though the employers paid it, there was no recourse left to the men. With the apparent sanction of Government, Mr. Lewis exercised the right to take wage money already earned by the worker and divert it to himself. In the State of Texas our solicitude for the laborer goes so far that no writ can touch the current wages of the worker even though the courts have already found the worker indebted in the amount sought to be withheld, nor can even the State itself take tax money in this manner. Why, then, should an irresponsible group like the officials of the United Mine Workers be licensed to levy tribute on all those who toil in the coal mines of America without so much as the right on the part of the worker to vote on the question of increased dues or to have an accounting at the end of the year?

After all, the grievances of the miners against Mr. Lewis and his coconspirators are serious. They do not justify the miners in jeopardizing the safety of our fighting men by striking, but they do demand prompt and honest action at the hands of the Congress and the President. The least we can do is to pass legislation to make labor unions responsible for their acts just as all other business institutions are responsible for their acts, and liable for damages when they break their contracts. Today Mr. Lewis can make any kind of contract. The employee will be bound, but the union cannot be compelled to either carry out its promises or respond in damages for its failure to do so. This condition cannot continue.

In addition, we should make the unions responsible to their own members. We can require free secret-ballot elections of union officers, and on questions like dues and strikes. We can require union officials who handle money to make bond and to account for the funds they handle.

If we do not do these things, the people of America are going to put Congressmen in this Chamber who will destroy labor unions entirely. In years past labor unions were looked upon as purely voluntary organizations which a worker could join or not join as he saw fit, and it was felt that their internal affairs were of no public interest. Somewhat the same feeling existed as to privately owned utilities and even political parties. Today it is recognized that public utilities should make full disclosure of their operations in order that the public may not be overcharged and yet surely no one would contend that the Northern Pennsylvania Power Co. exercised as direct control over the welfare of as many citizens as the United Mine Workers of America. It is admitted by all that the States have the right to set up regulations covering the manner in which political parties conduct their primaries and spend their funds. Membership in political parties is purely voluntary, and they do not charge dues. Why does not government have as much right and duty to see that the rights of union members are protected as it does to see that small and minority stockholders of private corporations are protected?

In the last session of Congress we had the opportunity to do these things. Our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, offered legislation covering these points. Certain members of the labor committee did their best to prevent consideration of the legislation by this House and to a large degree succeeded. We were, however, able to send some helpful legislation to the other body where it suffered an untimely demise. I supported these reforms last session. I still support them. I believe in justice for our workers, and in justice for the people of America. I have no desire to persecute anyone, but I cannot sit idly by and see this war needlessly prolonged and American lives needlessly lost simply because some hijacker who lives off of the organization of distrust and prejudice among workers may be offended or even for fear that some honest members of honest unions will be misled and brand me as a "labor-baiter." I am more interested in America than I am in any group of Americans, and I call on this House to rally to the prompt passage of a fair and honest program of union responsibility as being the only method of preventing an increasing wave of treasonable strikes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I

may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]?

There was no objection.

FLORIDA CANAL

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, last July this Congress passed a bill providing for the construction of a canal across Florida which would connect the intracoastal waterways of the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic seaboard. Procrastination is the thief of time. Someone has been stealing time. This work has not been started after 7 months, and as a result not only our Military Establishment but millions of our civilian population have been suffering.

I am today introducing a bill providing for an appropriation of $44,000,000 to complete this waterway. I expect to have more to say about this matter later in the week. I believe I can convince you that if we start now, our people who are having to do without fuel and without the things they need and also our Military Establishment can be provided with the fuel and other materials which are necessary, and this in a very short time. I hope that I will be able to explain this to you tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on next Monday, at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

REGULATION OF UNIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] was bemoaning the fact that the last Congress failed to pass legislation which would curb strikes. The administration and all the agencies of the administration are asking us, all of the people, over the radio, and through the press, day and night, to do more to aid in the war effort. As the gentleman said, the administration is also forcing every workingman into the unions.

This is the situation: The administration insists that those engaged in war production join a union, preferably the C. I. O.—workers in shipyards, in the aircraft industry—yes, in the employ of Montgomery-Ward, which is not engaged in war production. It forced Americans to come under the jurisdiction of the C. I. O.

Then what does the C. I. O. do? I hold in my hand a card issued by Local 793, U. A. W., affiliated C. I. O., address, 601 Ship Street, St. Joseph, Mich. On that card is printed this:

Join now for (1) union shop contract; (2) wage increase; (3) better vacations; (4) real safety—

Then it reads—

stop speed-up.

Being interpreted, that means join the union and sabotage any effort to increase war production.

The administration is backing that union and insisting that everybody go into it. Then the union, into which war workers have been forced, has as its objective the defeat of any effort to speed up war production.

Is that good news to our fighting men in Africa and the southwest Pacific? Talk about destroying the morale of our fighting men. Could Hitler himself issue a statement more disheartening to them as they sit in their foxholes or seek shelter from the enemy in the desert sands?

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Mr. Paul, of the Treasury Department, on taxation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial on pay-as-you-go taxes by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include in each a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I find from various letters I have been receiving from my district that the Office of Price Administration is assuming the three prerogatives of government and is taking over the three branches of the Government that were defined in our Constitution, namely, the legislative, judicial, and executive. Today I am introducing a bill which will prohibit the O. P. A. from proceeding with sanctions, taking away licenses and ration coupons, as penalties which they have prescribed under rules and regulations. Unless the Congress passes some sort of legislation authorizing it, such action is illegal. An agency of government has no authority under the Constitution to proceed as policeman and judge of its own law. I think the time has come when the House should take some step to safeguard the rights of the folks back home. Now is not a time to put a damper on patriotism by pushing the people around and denying them their rights.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement from the National Association for the Deaf, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, in order to ask the majority leader if he can tell us the program for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed by the chairman of the Committee on Rules that four resolutions were reported out of the Committee on Rules this morning. I do not believe there will be any controversy over any of them. My intention is to call them up tomorrow, if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

One of the resolutions involves continuing into this Congress the authority of the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to carry on the very fine work they have been doing in connection with war contracts and in investigating improper activities in connection with such contracts.

There is also a resolution giving the Committee on the Civil Service power to investigate certain conditions, a matter with which we are acquainted.

Then there is a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], giving the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries certain powers of investigation. There is also a resolution continuing the life of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wild Life Resources, of which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is chairman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They are all continuing resolutions?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I know of no opposition to them. It is my intention to call them up and dispose of them tomorrow. I doubt whether there will be any roll calls, but if there are it will be with the understanding that they will take place at some later date.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the four resolutions which the majority leader has stated he desires to have considered tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The resolutions referred to are as follows:

House Resolution 16

(Rept. No. 10)

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed (a) to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in the departments and agencies of the Government, including Government-owned corporations; (b) to study and investigate the effect of such policies and practices upon the conduct of the war, with the view of determining whether such policies and practices are efficient and economical; (c) to determine the number of employees in each department or agency (including Government-owned corporations), whether such number of employees is necessary, and whether their skills are used to the best advantage; (d) all other matters relating to the recruiting and the efficient and economical use of the civilian employees; and (e) to make such inquiry as said Committee on the Civil Service may consider important or pertinent to any matter coming within the jurisdiction of said committee.

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

House Resolution 20

(Rept. No. 11)

*Resolved*, That the Special Committee to Investigate All Matters Pertaining to the Replacement and Conservation of Wildlife is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 237, of the Seventy-third Congress, continued under authority of House Resolution 44, of the Seventy-fourth Congress, House Resolution 11, of the Seventy-fifth Congress, House Resolution 65, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and House Resolution 49, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 237, of the Seventy-third Congress, and shall report to the House as soon as practicable, but not later than January 3, 1945, the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations, for necessary legislation.

House Resolution 30

(Rept. No. 12)

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs, respectively, each acting as a whole or by subcommittee, are authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of the progress of the war effort insofar as it relates to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committees, respectively, with a view to determining whether such effort is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously, and economically.

The Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation as they deem desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the respective committees, or any subcommittees thereof, are authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairmen of the respective committees and shall be served by any person designated by such chairmen. The chairman of each committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 2. The heads of the various executive departments and agencies are hereby requested to detail to such committees such number of legal and expert assistants and investigators as such committees may from time to time deem necessary, or, in case such detail is not authorized by law, to grant leave of absence without pay to personnel who may request such leave to serve with such committees, without prejudice to any rights or privileges to which such personnel would be entitled if such leave had not been granted.

House Resolution 52

(Rept. No. 13)

*Resolved*, That effective from January 3, 1943, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed to continue the study, inquiry, and investigation begun under the authority of House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purpose shall have the same powers and duties as those conferred upon it by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. The committee shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of its studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] for 15 minutes.

## EARLY HISTORY AND IMPORTANCE OF THE SOO LOCKS IN TIME OF WAR

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, from what was described as the folly of the white man and a project "beyond the remotest settlement of the United States, if not the moon" to the greatest artificial waterway in the world, carrying 123,000,000 tons of commerce in a single year, is the unique and romantic history of the locks in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.

In 1840 when a bill was introduced in Congress in accordance with a memorial from the first Legislature of the State of Michigan asking for an appropriation of a hundred thousand acres of land to aid in the building of the locks, the famous orator and statesman from Kentucky, Henry Clay, addressed the Senate against the bill, characterizing the proposal in the words above indicated, and the bill was defeated.

The building of canals and locks at the Soo, Mich., as the city and locks are commonly known and called, unlocked the largest and greatest freshwater sea on the globe—Lake Superior. It also provided an unbroken and continuous water highway 1,000 miles in extent with the lowest cost for waterborne commerce known to the world.

Contrary to common opinion, generally accepted and believed, the State of Michigan and not the Federal Government recognized the importance of building a ship canal and locks around the rapids in the St. Mary's River at the Soo. Gov. Stephen T. Mason, known as the Boy Governor of Michigan, as well as the first Governor of the State, in his message to the first legislature of the State on January 2, 1837—24 days before Michigan became a State—called attention to its great importance and urged the construction of the locks and canals. That legislature appropriated $25,000 to make the first survey and maps of the location.

It should be noted that the first canal and lock at the Soo were not built either by the State of Michigan or the Government of the United States. The first canal lock was built on the Canadian side of the falls—the St. Mary's River forms the international boundary line between the United States and Canada—in 1797 by the Northwest Fur Co. This company was later merged with the Hudson Bay Co. That canal lock was less than 9 feet wide, 38 feet long, and probably was the first canal lock built on the continent of

North America. It was constructed to accommodate and to make possible the passage of the birch-bark canoes of the Indians and the bateaux of the French voyageurs, with their cargoes of furs destined for the markets of the Atlantic seaboard and to adorn the ladies of the courts of Europe. This canal was destroyed during the War of 1812 by United States troops. With the passage of time, it was covered with debris and hidden from human view. Eighty-three years later, in 1895, it was discovered, and is now restored and preserved as a truly historical landmark.

From 1855 to 1881 the locks were operated and maintained by the State of Michigan. Strange as it may now seem, the records of the State show that reports were made annually to the State government on the amount of tonnage, cost, and other details in connection with the locks. From the very beginning of the locks, its importance is reflected in the amount of commerce that passed through that narrow water channel or commercial highway. From 100,000 tons of commerce that passed through the lock in 1855, being the first year that the lock was opened and operated by the State of Michigan, to 123,000,000 tons in 1942, a span of 87 years, is the amazing and unparalleled record of the world's greatest and most important water highway.

I have with me today photographs of the first State locks, given to me by Nellie M. Donnelly, residing at Mackinac Island, Mich., whose father helped, with pick and shovel, to build those locks. I shall be glad to pass them around among the Members of the House for their inspection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Those locks were made of wood, were they not?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; and I will touch on that.

The earliest photographs, taken about 1855, of the first State lock and canal at the Soo, show that it was operated by hand, of wooden construction, and only the towering spires of the great white fleet of sailing vessels are in evidence together with a straggling village of the Indians who still inhabited the land made famous in Longfellow's Hiawatha.

A very large proportion of the tonnage passing through the locks consists of iron ore from the mines of the great Northwest. Out of the 123,000,000 tons of commerce passing through the locks during the navigation season of 1942—about 8 months—92,000,000 tons consisted of iron ore. This colossal tonnage represents approximately 85 percent of the steel industry of the United States.

It should be said that the locks at the Soo have been greatly enlarged and expanded in order to meet the growing needs of navigation and commerce, and at the present time the old Weitzel lock built on the site of the first lock constructed by the State of Michigan, is in the process of being widened and deepened to meet the new needs of commerce. And may I say in this connection that the Nation owes a debt of gratitude to our friend and colleague from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] for his insistent demands and determined efforts to bring legislation to the floor more than a year ago to make that possible.

From the time that these famous locks were taken over by the Federal Government in 1881 to the present, our Government has expended on them approximately $60,000,000. If a toll charge of 50 cents a ton had been made on the commerce passing through those locks during the navigation season of 1942, the entire cost of that famous project would have been paid in full. These figures indicate the enormous importance of water-borne commerce on the inland waterways of the Nation and particularly the low-cost transportation on the Great Lakes. It also brings to the attention of the people of this country the economic importance of our inland waterways and of this particular project with its strategic importance to the welfare, security, and defense of the Nation in time of war.

It is known that the enemies of our country know the great value of those narrow channels of water, to the war effort of the Nation, and adequate and proper steps have been taken to safeguard them against damage and destruction.

It is not too much to say nor is it idle to predict that some day, in the not far distant future, the locks at the Soo, Mich., will form a link in an unbroken chain of connected waterways more than 2,500 miles long which will lead through the Great Lakes and the mighty St. Lawrence River to the seven seas and the ports of the world. When this is accomplished, an inland empire inhabited by 40,000,000 of our people will be given low-cost water transportation to the markets of the earth.

In order that we may have comparative figures on the importance of the locks and canals at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., I include a table of other noted and famous canals of the world in concluding this brief presentation, I call attention to the fact that the tonnage through the Soo Canal totals more than the other six famous canals of the world:

*Total freight passing through canals at Sault Ste. Marie in net tons*

| | 1940 | 1941 |
|---|---|---|
| Bulk freight: | | |
| Iron ore | 66, 226, 030 | 83, 151, 024 |
| Coal | 10, 269, 860 | 12, 309, 058 |
| Grain | 8, 184, 688 | 10, 448, 241 |
| Petroleum products | 1, 042, 930 | 1, 014, 215 |
| Stone | 693, 838 | 871, 921 |
| Scrap iron | 411, 714 | 283, 092 |
| Salt | 48, 845 | 50, 406 |
| Total | [1] 86, 877, 905 | [2] 108, 127, 957 |
| Package freight or nonbulk: | | |
| Wood products | 781, 235 | 796, 786 |
| Flour | 690, 592 | 662, 898 |
| Structural steel | 213, 776 | 248, 830 |
| Copper and zinc | 107, 662 | 39, 168 |
| Automobiles | 51, 532 | 49, 259 |
| General merchandise | 1, 135, 616 | 1, 196, 786 |
| Total package | [3] 2, 980, 413 | [4] 2, 993, 727 |
| Grand total | 89, 858, 318 | 111, 121, 684 |

[1] Equal to 96.7 percent.
[2] Equal to 97.3 percent.
[3] Equal to 3.9 percent.
[4] Equal to 2.7 percent.

*Statement of canal traffic from latest figures available*

| Canal: | Net tons |
|---|---|
| Welland | 13, 232, 263 |
| St. Lawrence | 6, 929, 569 |
| Panama | 24, 950, 791 |
| Suez | 29, 573, 394 |
| New York State Barge | 4, 503, 059 |
| Manchester | 6, 409, 873 |
| Total, 6 canals | 85, 598, 949 |
| Sault Ste. Marie | 111, 121, 684 |

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AIR ACCIDENTS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Virginia). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time at the suggestion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] to remind the Members of the House that following the adjournment of the House today the members of the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents would like to present to them some facts we feel it is unwise to present publicly. Therefore, if Members will do us the honor of remaining quite a little while after the session, we will be pleased, and I think they will hear some things in which they will be greatly interested themselves.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Indianapolis News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two respects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, Mr. BLAND was granted leave of absence, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 21, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABBATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 16. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Civil Service

to investigate various activities in the departments and agencies of the Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 10). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 20. Resolution to continue the Special Committee to Investigate All Matters Pertaining to the Replacement and Conservation of Wildlife; without amendment (Rept. No. 11). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 30. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 12). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 52. Resolution to continue the investigation by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries begun under House Resolution 281, Seventy-seventh Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 13). Referred to the House Calendar.

---

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 1352. A bill making it a Federal offense to alter the inner surface of the hand for the purpose of preventing identification by the use of fingerprints; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 1353. A bill to provide an appropriation for the construction of the barge canal from the St. Johns River across Florida to the Gulf of Mexico authorized in Public Law 675, Seventy-seventh Congress, for the purpose of connecting the intracoastal waterways of the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic seaboard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 1354. A bill to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act to certain persons, and to the widows, children, and dependents of certain persons injured while performing duty as fireman on property under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1355. A bill relating to the appointment and retirement in the Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States of persons with physical disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1356. A bill to provide for the adjustment of certain tort claims against the United States, and to confer jurisdiction in respect thereto on the district courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 1357. A bill authorizing preliminary examination and survey of Loosahatchie River, Tenn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1358. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Pulajane and Moro campaigns and other uprisings in the Philippine Islands, from July 16, 1903, to December 31, 1913, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 1359. A bill to prohibit the use of sanctions not provided by law for violations or alleged violations of regulations and orders issued by the Price Administrator; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1360. A bill to promote the defense of the United States by prohibiting the conducting of certain foreign-language schools; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1361. A bill to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the merchant marine who serve after September 26, 1941, and during the present war as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who serve during the present war; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 1362. A bill to abolish and correct unfair practices and substandard working conditions and to raise living standards among the employees of the United States Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 1363. A bill relating to the appointment and retirement in the Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States of persons with physical disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1364. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1365. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1366. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1367. A bill for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 1368. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in Alachua County, Fla.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1369. A bill recognizing the American's Creed as the national creed of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1370. A bill to increase the pension payable to war veterans suffering from permanent total non-service-connected disabilities from $40 to $60 per month; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1371. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1372. A bill to amend section 4915, title 35, section 63, of the United States Code, as amended by section 72a of the Code, and for the protection of inventors and owners of patents and applications for patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHELCHEL of Georgia:

H. R. 1373. A bill to fix the compensation of substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 63. Resolution providing for the payment of the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 52; to the Committee on Accounts.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 1374. A bill for the relief of Abilio Pataca; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1375. A bill for the relief of Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 1376. A bill for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 1377. A bill for the relief of W. T. Martin Luckett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 1378. A bill for the relief of Jeremiah Aldersley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 1379. A bill for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1380. A bill granting a Distinguished Service Cross to William A. Sullivan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 1381. A bill granting a pension to Callie Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 1382. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jabez Fention Jackson and Mrs. Narcissa Wilmans Jackson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 1383. A bill for the relief of John L. Bosley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 1384. A bill granting a pension to Louise Stockwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1385. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ella S. T. Witbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1386. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lucy W. Gately; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1387. A bill granting an increase of pension to Minnie L. Fitcham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

32. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the Retail Drug Store Employees Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations, urging acceptance of the wage stabilization provisions of the President's order of October 3, 1942; to the Committee on Labor.

33. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution No. 19 of the California Cattlemen's Association, San Francisco, opposing legislation that will cancel or modify existing sanitary restrictions in importation of livestock or livestock products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

34. By Mr SMITH of Wisconsin: Copy of letter from Grover C. Weyland, executive chairman, Racine War Savings Staff, Racine, Wis., to members of the staff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

---

# SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, Thou has taught us that in quietness and in confidence shall be our strength.

We turn to Thee for refuge from the noise and hurry of the world without and from the tyranny of selfish moods and

motives within. May we fear only to be disloyal to the best we know, to betray those who love and trust us, and to disappoint Thy expectations concerning us. In a world where we see the fearful penalties of our selfish human separations, dedicate us in this anguished generation as builders of bridges across all the dividing gulfs which mar and rend this embattled earth.

Help us this new day to meet its joys with gratitude, its difficulties with fortitude, its duties with fidelity. Grant us to accomplish whatever tasks lie before us with cheerfulness and sincerity of heart. Deliver us from petty irritations which dim the far look. Bring us to the ending of the day unashamed and with a quiet mind. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 18, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the period October 1, 1942, through December 31, 1942, of an investigation of Federal employees who are members of subversive organizations or advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government by force (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL PARK TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Park Trust Fund Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

REPORT OF WAGE AND HOUR AND PUBLIC CONTRACTS DIVISION

A letter from the Administrator of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division (a consolidated division), United States Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Division for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SURVEY ON THE WATERSHED OF WOLF CREEK, TEX. AND OKLA.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a survey on the watershed of Wolf Creek, Tex. and Okla. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

SURVEY ON THE WATERSHED OF PAJARO RIVER, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a survey on the watershed of the Pajaro River, Calif. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth annual report of the Board for 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION—NEED FOR LEGISLATION RELATING TO SAFETY

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, stating that the annual report of the Commission on the need for legislation relating to safety of life and property, required by the Communications Act of 1934, will be submitted later; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Popular Democratic Party of the Municipal Committee of Toa Alta, P. R., endorsing the administration of Rexford G. Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GERRY:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Commerce:

"STATE OF RHODE ISLAND, ETC.,
"IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
*"January Session A. D. 1943.*

"House Resolution 552

"Resolution requesting the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to take all necessary steps to provide for proper, substantial recognition of the status of the men of the American Merchant Marine Service.

"Whereas one of the most dangerous of all the fighting services is the work of the merchant marine in keeping vital supplies moving through submarine infested waters; and

"Whereas we know that time and time again after torpedoing by the enemy and escape from seas of blazing oil, men of the merchant marine immediately reenlist for similar tasks upon other merchant ships; and

"Whereas these indomitable, courageous hearted mariners are the unsung heroes of these turbulent times in this surely most dangerous of all services: Now therefore be it

"*Resolved* That this general assembly does hereby respectfully request the President of the United States of America, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to take all necessary steps to provide that official, governmental status be given the officers and men of the American merchant marine in order that during and after World War No. 2 their standing shall have all proper recognition in the ranks of those who have not hesitated to give their lives to safeguard the life of this Nation; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of State to the President of the United States of America, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to have it noted in the RECORD that I have received petitions signed by several hundred members of the Ladies' Aids of the Aberdeen Circuit of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America protesting the sale of intoxicating liquors in and around military and naval centers, and urging the passage of the bill for the control of the sale of intoxicating liquors in and around such places. I ask to have the petitions appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions presented by the Senator from South Dakota will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF GEORGIA—PRICES OF PEANUTS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I present a memorial from the Legislature of Georgia protesting against double prices on the same farm products, under the quota and nonquota provisions, and also asking for legislation to correct that situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorial will be printed in the RECORD under the rule and appropriately referred.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas there now exists in this State, as well as in the entire Peanut Belt of the Nation, a system of dual prices for peanuts and products obtained therefrom; and

Whereas there has been set up by the Department of Agriculture of the United States, under Federal legislation, a system designating certain acreage of peanuts as "quota peanuts" and all above said designated acreage as "excess peanuts"; and

Whereas at this particular time it is utterly impossible to have such a thing as excess peanuts when practically all of the foreign vegetable oil supply has been cut off by the war and peanut oil is being used to replace said foreign oil; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture of the United States has called for the planting of 5,500,000 acres to supplant the deficiency in foreign oil; and

Whereas the planting, harvesting, and marketing of said peanuts is absolutely necessary as a contribution to the war effort; and

Whereas the farmers of Georgia and the entire Peanut Belt are patriotic citizens, eager to do their part to help win this war; and

Whereas the cost of production, in past experience, has exceeded the price which is paid for so-called excess peanuts and it is impossible to produce peanuts for oil at the prices paid for the same in 1942; and

Whereas there can be no possible excuse for the differential in price of $82 per ton for so-called excess peanuts and $190 to $200 per ton for quota peanuts when said peanuts were actually grown in the same field, fertilized with the same fertilizer, picked with the same picker, and sold in the same market; and

Whereas the prices being paid for so-called excess peanuts in Georgia are not reflected in the prices paid by consumers for peanut oil made from said so-called excess peanuts; and

Whereas there can be no possible excuse for the differential between the present prices being paid for so-called excess peanuts and the oil products therefrom, which is utterly out of proportion, unreasonable, and unwarranted, since there can be no possible justification for $1.75 per gallon cooking oil made from $82 per ton peanuts: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That it is the sense of this House that the Congress of the United States and particularly the Congress delegation from Georgia be memorialized that the situation relative to the planting, production, gathering, and marketing of peanuts in Georgia and in the entire Peanut Belt is urgent; that the peanut farmers cannot possibly continue to produce peanuts for oil at the prevailing prices and that unless action is speedily taken farmers cannot and will not continue producing so-called excess peanuts for the reason that although farmers are patriotic and willing to do anything that they can to contribute to the winning of this war it is unreasonable, unwarranted, and unjust to expect them to produce such peanuts for prices below the cost of production and marketing; be it further

*Resolved*, That the Congress be memorialized to speedily enact such necessary legislation as will abolish the dual-price system and place a floor under the price of all peanuts in order that the farmers may be insured a reasonable and just compensation for their labor and that they might expect to earn a livelihood from their business and that they be not expected to indulge in a losing proposition when labor, industry, and everything else connected with the war effort is booming; be it further

*Resolved*, That the Clerk of this House shall immediately transmit a copy of this resolution to each Member of Congress from the State of Georgia and to the Senators from Georgia.

CARE OF RETURNED DISABLED SOLDIERS — LETTER FROM NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to call to the particular attention of the Committee on Military Affairs a letter I have received from Oscar E. Erickson, commissioner of insurance of the State of North Dakota. I shall read the letter, omitting the names:

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: Just for your information and to satisfy my own curiosity I am wondering why the Government gives honorable discharge to soldiers brought home from the South Pacific and unloads them onto their parents to take care of, when these same soldiers have become shell-shocked and must immediately be sent to the asylum at Jamestown. It seems to me it should be the Government's duty to take care of these boys.

I have in mind one of the ——— boys here in Bismarck, one of the ——— boys, also from Bismarck, and a ——— ———, of Fargo. These were all given honorable discharge and sent home, only to be sent to Jamestown—

That is, to the insane asylum—

with the exception of the last one mentioned. The folks at Fargo are trying to care for him, but the mother herself says she would rather have had word that he had fallen in battle than to have had him return home in his present condition.

Isn't there anything that can be done for these boys?

Yours truly,

OSCAR E. ERICKSON,
*Insurance Commissioner.*

I suggest to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, who I see is now in the Chamber, that thousands of soldiers from the Northwest were sent to the Solomon Islands and to Guadalcanal, and, as I understand from the military authorities, up to the present time that has been one of the very worst places for soldiers in this war. I ask that the letter be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The letter will be so referred.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 12. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war; with an amendment (Rept. No. 14).

By Mr. SCRUGHAM, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 381. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war; without amendment (Rept. No. 17).

By Mr. MURDOCK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. Res. 20. Resolution continuing Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-fourth Congress, agreed to August 16, 1935, as amended by Senate Resolution 261, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to June 29, 1942; with an amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to amend the act entitled "An act to protect the public health by the prevention of certain practices leading to dental disorders; and to prevent the circumvention of certain State or Territorial laws regulating the practice of dentistry"; without amendment (Rept. No. 18).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 17. A bill to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 19); and

S. 18. A bill to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries for teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter; with an amendment (Rept. No. 20).

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk two reports from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, one dealing with the bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] (S. 40) which has to do with the tenure of office of the Governor of Puerto Rico, and the other dealing with a resolution submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] (S. Res. 26) for the continuance of his investigation into the administration of affairs in Puerto Rico.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

S. 40. A bill to provide that the term of office of the Governor of Puerto Rico shall expire upon the enactment of this act and at the end of each 2-year period thereafter; with amendments (Rept. No. 15); and

S. Res. 26. Resolution to investigate economic and social conditions in Puerto Rico; with amendments (Rept. No. 16), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM — FARM MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I wish to present a report on farm machinery, a unanimous report of the special committee of which I am chairman, and I should like to read just a few paragraphs from the introduction to the report, with the permission of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. What is the nature of the request? There is some confusion, and I was not able to hear what the Senator said.

Mr. TRUMAN. I am filing a report on farm machinery from the special committee of which I am chairman, and relative to the situation with regard to that very necessary product at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator desire to make some comment on the report?

Mr. TRUMAN. I wish to make a few comments on the report, if I may.

I read from the report:

America faces the grave danger of not reaching its food production goals for 1943 and 1944, instead of obtaining the increases required by wartime demands. The effect of the farm labor shortage has been intensified by the drastic limitation on production of farm machinery in 1943. Responsibility for this limitation rests squarely on the Office of Civilian Supply of the War Production Board. This Office erroneously regarded farm machinery as semiessential. In fact, farm machines are the machine tools of agriculture. An adequate supply is vital to maintain an increased food production. Before weapons can be produced or used, we must first have food.

I should like to read the conclusions which the committee came to on that subject:

The committee recommends that (a) Food Administrator Wickard's determinations of nonfood materials required for the food production program be given maximum consideration in allotting materials; (b) the proposal to manufacture present quotas of farm machinery by June 30, 1943, instead of by October 31, be adopted; and (c) a new and more adequate program for farm machinery production for the year beginning July 1, 1943, be developed and issued as soon as requirements are ascertained and that concentration provisions be eliminated.

The extended wrangling over the 1943 program between the various governmental agencies establishes the need for a single control over the food goals to be set and the methods of achieving them. Despite the apparent general power of the Foods Requirements Committee of the War Production Board, this group did not have sufficient power to resolve the controversy, or if it had the power, it did not exercise it.

The committee believes that the views of those responsible for food production must be given a position of importance in drafting the new program and that sufficient material should be made available to produce the amount of equipment which they deem essential to obtain the food goals.

Secretary of Agriculture Wickard's appointment as Food Administrator is a step in the right direction. In addition, there has been transferred to his control all agencies concerned in determining requirements to meet the food goals, including farm machinery. While he will represent agricultural needs directly as a claimant for critical materials on the Requirements Committee of the War Production Board, his order of appointment provides, however, only for his recommendations to the Chairman of the War Production Board on the nonfood materials needed to carry out the food program.

He might as well not have any power unless he can order the carrying out of his recommendations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Has not the Secretary of Agriculture used that same power heretofore in making recommendations, and is he not practically in the same position in which he has been heretofore?

Mr. TRUMAN. So far as the tools and equipment necessary to make farm machinery are concerned, that is true.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to ask the Senator another question with respect to the general quota about which he is speaking. Am I to understand the quota has been set now by the War Production Board, and if so, what is the quota?

Mr. TRUMAN. It has not been set. The only quota which has been set is under L–170, which gives the farmers 23 percent of the new machinery, based on 1940 purchases, and then the allotments for repairs have been increased from 137 percent of the 1940 repairs to 167 percent.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, I wish to say that I agree with him in what he has said in the report with respect to farm machinery, and I believe that from my own personal experience, not only with those who manufacture farm supplies and equipment, but the farmers as well, that the Secretary of Agriculture is absolutely correct in his constant attempt to obtain more of the vital materials which are necessary for the making of farm machinery.

I am constrained to say that in my humble judgment the War Production Board has utterly failed to see the great necessity for the production of the machinery and the tools and the equipment to raise the basic commodities of this country, which is the first thing necessary to carry on the great war effort throughout this country. I myself have been to the War Production Board, and I have talked to various members of the Board about this very critical problem, and my only regret is that the Secretary of Agriculture himself does not have the full power and authority to make the allotments of the necessary machinery for the purpose of carrying on the greatest industry in America, which is agriculture for all—for civilians, for the war effort, and for everything else.

Mr. TRUMAN. I thank the Senator from Illinois, and I wish to say to him that farm machinery allotment for the crop year of 1942 was 83 percent of the 1940 purchases of new farm machinery, and that when the quotas for the 1943 farm machinery were being made up, the Secretary of Agriculture used the reports from 3,000 counties in the United States, on which he based an estimate that the very smallest amount that could possibly be gotten along with in 1943 anywhere nearly to meet the calls that are necessary, was 50 percent of the 1940 purchases. The Office of Civilian Supply in the War Production Board first decided that 27 percent would be enough, and then when the final allotment was made it was made on a 23-percent basis. I do not see how we are going to increase the production of food in 1943 by 18 percent over the food production in 1941 unless we can obtain the machinery or the manpower to do it, and we must have one or the other.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Senator realizes another thing—that the allotment which is now fixed by the War Production Board, insofar as the quota of machinery is concerned, comes too late to do anything, insofar as the spring crops are concerned throughout this country. In other words, if the farmer was going to get any relief, this quota should have been increased along last November or December, in order for the manufacturers to deliver the machines and other necessary equipment.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true. Too much time has been spent in wrangling as to who was right and who was wrong, and how much the farmer ought to have, and the farmer did not have anyone to look after his interests in the War Production Board.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri if his very useful committee has any jurisdiction to inquire into the deferment of necessary mechanics to keep farm machinery or equipment going and in use.

Mr TRUMAN. That goes along with the inquiry into the manpower problem which we are making now.

Mr. GEORGE. If we are to have production of a sufficient amount of food, it is absolutely essential that such deferments be made. If those charged with the responsibility for this situation do not have common sense enough to understand it, unless we have allocation of materials out of which to make the machines, and mechanics to keep the machines and equipment in going condition, and a deferment of enough manpower to operate the American farms, the people throughout the country will suffer.

Mr. TRUMAN. I hope the able and distinguished Senator from Georgia will read the report in toto because it goes into that question.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be very happy to read it, and I compliment the Senator from Missouri on his usual clear conception of these problems.

Mr. TRUMAN. The report goes into that question.

Mr. GEORGE. When the full effect of the committee's report is properly evaluated, it will be found that there is no more vital problem today in the United States, and in the world also, than the production of ample supplies of food. If there are any restrictions in the Department of Agriculture on the production of food, those restrictions should be lifted, so far as our present production of food is concerned. Such a policy of restriction is a short-sighted one. Those of us in the Senate who are charged with the responsibility—and all of us are—ought to make it perfectly clear that if common sense methods cannot be adopted in allocating raw materials for the production of farm machinery, the deferment of absolutely necessary labor, and the deferment of mechanics who are able to keep farm machines in operation, we cannot produce the food we are called on to produce, and which is an absolute and irreducible minimum in the great war effort we are making.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator from Georgia is absolutely correct. As a result of what has been done in connection with farm machinery, the farmer has come to have an inferiority complex. Blanket deferments are made of mechanics in war plants, but when the farmer comes along to ask for deferment so he can raise a little food he is treated like a slacker. The farmer is just as necessary in the meeting of the war effort as the man who makes guns and bullets, for if the man who makes guns and bullets cannot eat, he cannot very well make those guns and bullets.

I have one or two additional paragraphs of the report to read. I hope the Members of the Senate will read the report carefully. We shall have a report on the manpower situation in a very short time, which will cover the subject to some extent.

I continue reading from the report:

> After the committee had begun its investigations and had made inquiries concerning the possibility of increasing production of farm machinery and repair parts for 1943 to relieve the crying need therefor, the Farm Machinery and Equipment Branch urged an increase in the production of repair parts under Limitation Order L–170 from 137 to 167 percent of 1940 production. The Office of Civilian Supply concurred and cooperated to get action on the matter. After the appointment of Secretary Wickard as Food Administrator, he repeated the request and obtained the increase. The branch also developed a plan to accelerate production under Limitation Order L–170 so that all the new machinery authorized by such order might be manufactured by June 30, 1943, instead of by October 31, 1943—i. e., in 8 months instead of 12.
>
> Such acceleration in the program—

It will not solve the problem, but it will help—

> should prove of material assistance. A new order to take effect on July 1, 1943, must, however, be formulated for issuance as soon as possible.

That is because the manufacturer of the machinery has to start from "taw," and the manufacturers must have plenty of time to get it ready if we are to have a crop for 1944.

> The committee recommends that the concentration provisions be omitted from the new order and that allowable production of new machinery be greatly increased. The amounts of iron and steel for the machinery needed to do the job of food production required by the war program must be made available to the manufacturers.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the report issued today states as its main conclusion that increased allotments of critical materials should be made to the farm-equipment industry for the prompt production of increased amounts of farm machinery. With this conclusion, I concur. Since we have decided to use food as an instrument of war, we must make sure that we obtain enough of it. I join with the chairman in calling on the Chairman of the War Production Board to take the necessary action forthwith.

However, the concentration of the farm-equipment industry carried out by order L–170 of the War Production Board is designed to accomplish two purposes. First, to release labor from areas where

there is a critical labor shortage. Second, to preserve the existence of the small manufacturers by giving them a larger proportion of the necessarily reduced total volume of farm-equipment business. Because of the accidental location of the various plants it happens that the fulfillment of one purpose automatically accomplishes the fulfillment of the other. The large manufacturers on the whole have much war work and are able to continue in business with usefulness to the Nation and profit to themselves. In addition to their war work they are the sole manufacturers of large farm machines such as tractors and combines, which are not subject to the concentration program. Their future is assured. On the other hand, if there were no concentration of production, more than 1,500 small manufacturers would inevitably be forced to drop out of business or to raise the price of their farm equipment to levels that the farmer could not afford to pay.

To overcome this difficulty, the War Production Board has assigned to the small manufacturers a large amount of the total machinery business. This decision seems to be sound in theory and in accord with the mandate of Congress in the smaller war plants bill. It was urged by the Under Secretary of War, the Commanding General of the Services of Supply, the War Manpower Commission, the Labor Production Division, the labor committee of the industry, and the deputy for smaller war plants, acting with the Office of Civilian Supply under the mandate of section 1 of the Smaller War Plants Act.

Mr. President, while I heartily concur in the conclusions which have been expressed in the report just read by the able chairman of the special committee investigating the national defense program, I desire to say that in carrying out the program the Office of Civilian Supply is experiencing some difficulty with respect to the laws enacted by the Congress, as well as the proclamations and directions issued by the authorities.

For example, the Congress enacted Public Law No. 603, Seventy-seventh Congress, which contains, among other provisions, the following:

> It shall also be the duty of the Chairman of the War Production Board, and he is hereby empowered, through the deputy so appointed by him, to cooperate to the fullest practical extent with the Director of Civilian Supply and other appropriate governmental agencies in the issuance of all orders limiting production by business enterprises, with a view to insuring that small business concerns will be most efficiently and effectively utilized in the production of articles, equipment, supplies, and materials for both war and essential civilian purposes.

The Office of Civilian Supply was forced to carry out that mandate of the Congress. I realize, as does the chairman, that in concentrating civilian activities in small industries by taking them away from the larger manufacturers, who can be more readily transferred to war activities, at times adequate supplies are not forthcoming for the particular trade in which the supplies are needed. It follows, therefore, that there sometimes exists the necessity of balancing the production between larger manufacturers and smaller manufacturers.

However, I believe the able chairman will admit that in trying to carry out the mandate of the law, the Office of Civilian Supply attempted to divert to small enterprises as much manufacturing of farm machinery as possible.

Mr. TRUMAN. I believe that is true.

Mr. MEAD. In doing so it encountered difficulties.

Mr. TRUMAN. It encountered difficulties, and tied up the program to such an extent that it could hardly be carried out even on a 23-percent basis. That is what I am quarreling about.

Mr. MEAD. In our report we stated that—

> An impractical plan for concentration of farm-machinery production in smaller concerns not only delayed action on the 1943 farm machinery program but threatens to destroy Nation-wide dealer and repair service organizations essential to the farmer in maintaining food production.
>
> * * * * *
>
> There was injected into the picture the issue of concentration of production. This plan, laudable in purpose, sought to require large manufacturers of farm machinery to convert to the production of war materials so as to permit small manufacturers to produce the bulk of the curtailed amounts of farm machinery to be allowed.

I believe that in the main our chairman, and the remaining members of the committee, are very anxious to concentrate as much as possible on small industry.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MEAD. However, we expect an adequate job to be done, and we expect that the smaller industries will be given materials which they need to produce machinery. It is easily seen that the larger corporations can more readily convert to war manufacture, and it is easily agreed that if we keep small business alive we must see to it that there is made available to small industries the greatest possible amount of civilian supplies which can be allotted to them.

Therefore, there is a delicate situation, which requires a constant study in order to maintain a proper balance between large and small enterprises. I believe that we sympathize with the Office of Civilian Supply in its efforts to carry out the mandate of Congress as expressed in one of the laws enacted by it at the last session, and the recommendations contained in our report as submitted today.

I wish to say, however, that the labor committee having to do with this problem has recommended that where plants are located in a "tight" labor area, the work might well be transferred to areas where surplus labor is available. It has also suggested that there be a continuous and progressive shift from larger to smaller plants in order that the larger plants may do war work and the smaller plants may manufacture farm machinery.

It also suggests that there be a progressive concentration in the smaller plants so that the smaller plants may have a larger volume of work, which in turn will permit them to meet the competitive prices in any given activity.

I know that our chairman and the members of his committee agree with the program so far as it can be carried out, and so far as the attitude of our committee and the legislation enacted by the smaller business committee can be harmonized.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true; but I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from New York that what this committee is particularly interested in now is getting farm machinery on the farms. Unless we get it on the farms we shall go hungry in 1944.

Mr. MEAD. We cannot get too much machinery on the farms if we are to be the granary as well as the arsenal of the world.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MEAD. However, in aiming for an adequate supply we can also continue the process of shifting from larger to smaller enterprises so there will be no destruction of our small-business economy.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true; and I will say further——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, may I answer the able Senator from New York?

Mr. McNARY. I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is demanded. The report will be printed.

Reports of committees are still in order.

### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 67, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 67), submitted by Mr. BANKHEAD on January 18, 1943, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

### HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 69, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 69), submitted by Mr. BILBO on January 18, 1943, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Committee on Pensions, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers;

to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 70, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 70), submitted by Mr. OVERTON on January 18, 1943, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Manufactures, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 455. A bill granting a pension to Eliza Lightle;

S. 456. A bill granting a pension to Ella Kahler;

S. 457. A bill granting a pension to William Edward Fugatt;

S. 458. A bill granting a pension to Josephine Morton; and

S. 459. A bill granting a pension to Addie M. Mandeville; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 460. A bill to provide for uniform regulation of marriage and divorce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 461. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 462. A bill for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 463. A bill to confer to certain persons who served in a civilian capacity under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition the benefits of hospitalization and the privileges of the soldiers' homes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 464. A bill to fix the compensation of substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 465. A bill to prohibit the mailing of certain classes of unsolicited merchandise; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 466. A bill for the relief of C. T. MacNeille, Andrew L. Yerger, Edna M. Yerger, William Yerger, Edward M. Yerger, Maxwell Plantations, Inc., and Moberly & Son; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 467. A bill relating to the citizenship of Belle Soltz; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 468. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Tensas Swamp National Park, La., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 469. A bill to implement article 28 of the convention signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, relating to the use of the emblem and name of the Red Cross;

S. 470. A bill to implement article 28 of the convention signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, relating to the use of the coat of arms of the Swiss Confederation for commercial or other purposes;

S. 471. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; 28 U. S. C. 543); and

S. 472. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., sec. 548–555); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 473. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims for compensation for damage done to farmers' crops by migratory water fowl from the Lower Souris Migratory Waterfowl Refuge in North Dakota; to the Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 474. A bill for the relief of Clarence Atkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BONE:

S. 475. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, so as to make insurance under such act available to merchant seamen; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 476. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 477. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Christine Hansen; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 478. A bill to provide for the further improvement of the Snake River between its mouth and Lewiston, Idaho; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 479. A bill relating to the sale of public lands granted to or vested in the State of Idaho by the act of July 3, 1890; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 480, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 481. A bill authorizing payment to the Devils Lake Band of Sioux Indians of the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Indian Reservation, at the Fort Totten (N. Dak.) Indian Agency, for damages for wood and timber used and destroyed by the armies of the United States while maintaining a military post at Fort Totten, N. Dak., between the years 1867 and 1890, and for which damages the said Indians have not been heretofore compensated;

S. 482. A bill authorizing payment to the Devils Lake Band of Sioux Indians of the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Indian Reservation, at the Fort Totten (N. Dak.) Indian Agency, for 64,000 acres of land of which said band of Indians was deprived by the erroneous survey made by the United States Government under the treaty of February 19, 1867, between the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians and the United States (15 Stat. L. 505), ratified April 15, 1867;

S. 483. A bill referring the claims of the Turtle Mountain Band or Bands of Chippewa Indians of North Dakota to the Court of Claims for adjustment and settlement; and

S. 484. A bill authorizing payment to the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians for certain lands ceded by them to the United States by a treaty of July 23, 1851; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 485. A bill to adjust the basis of compensation for overtime service of certain employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 486. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee; and

S. 487. A bill for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR (for himself, Mr. STEWART, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. RUSSELL):

S. 488. A bill to provide for flood-protection works at Chattanooga, Tenn., and Rossville, Ga.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 489. A bill authorizing the payment of half-rate Army pensions in certain cases; and

S. 490. A bill to equalize the pay of retired enlisted men of the armed services in accordance with grade and length of service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 491. A bill to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 492. A bill for the relief of Frank L. Amistead; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 493. A bill for the relief of Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 494. A bill to provide for retired pay for retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 495. A bill to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 496. A bill to prohibit the employment of persons by the United States at a compensation of $1 a year, and to provide that persons employed by the United States shall be compensated on a reasonably adequate basis; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 497. A bill for the appointment of a police commissioner for the District of Columbia, to authorize said commissioner to reorganize the Metropolitan Police force to increase its efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 498. A bill to extend the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, to the Cumberland River and its basin;

S. 499. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, with respect to the manner of the exercise of the power of condemnation by the Tennessee Valley Authority and to require the receipts of the Authority to be covered into the Treasury; and

S. 500. A bill for the relief of W. T. Martin Luckett; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 501. A bill for the relief of Claudia F. Banks and Edna B. Towner;

S. 502. A bill for the relief of Joe D. Dailey;

S. 503. A bill for the relief of the city of Memphis, Tenn.;

S. 504. A bill for the relief of Drs. W. S. Davis, P. A. Palmer, H. S. Oakes, and J. M. Ousley;

S. 505. A bill for the relief of Fred C. Lindsay;

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Rent-a-Car Co.;

S. 507. A bill for the relief of John B. Dow;

S. 508. A bill for the relief of N. F. Clower and Elijah Williams;

S. 509. A bill for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.;

S. 510. A bill for the relief of Inez Smith;

S. 511. A bill for the relief of Davis-Mize & Co., Inc.;

S. 512. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Dr. R. N. Harwood," approved June 10, 1935;

S. 513. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Howard Burkette;

S. 514. A bill for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton;

S. 515. A bill for the relief of Janie McCord Watson, James Scott Howell, Alice Ruth Howell, and Houston Thomas Howell;

S. 516. A bill for the relief of the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway;

S. 517. A bill for the relief of Vodie Jackson;

S. 518. A bill for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom;

S. 519. A bill for the relief of Thompson and McKinney; and

S. 520. A bill for the relief of Freddie Sanders; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 521. A bill requiring that persons holding certain positions under the United States be citizens of the United States; and

S. 522. A bill providing for separation from the classified civil service of persons absent from their official duties for certain periods; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 523. To authorize the submission to Congress of a comprehensive plan to provide local flood protection for the city of Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 524. A bill to avoid unnecessary appropriations, to eliminate wasteful expenditures, to prevent duplication of functions, and to provide for efficiency in the making and execution of plans, by consolidating and coordinating various activities of the United States relating to housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 525. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Sergt. Alvin C. York as a colonel in the United States Army and then place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 526. A bill authorizing negotiations and providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of an interoceanic canal over Nicaraguan territory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

S. 527. To amend section 1 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 528. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Constantine Cotrotsos (Cotros); to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 529. A bill to establish a new judicial circuit of the United States, with a circuit court of appeals, hereafter to be called the eleventh circuit; and

S. 530. A bill to amend section 107 of the Judical Code, to change the statutory terms for the District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee;

S. 531. A bill to provide that no person shall be barred from serving in the military or naval forces of the United States because of conviction of a felony for which he has been pardoned;

S. 532. A bill to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to crimes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 533. A bill to change the times for holding terms of the District Court for the Eastern Division of the Western District of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 534. A bill authorizing the erection of a memorial statue of Andrew Jackson; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 535. A bill authorizing the appointment and retirement of Mark Conley as a captain, United States Army; and

S. 536. A bill authorizing the appointment of Alexander McNair Willing as captain in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 537. A bill granting a pension to Lettie N. Cooper;

S. 538. A bill granting a pension to Rufus Harvey Grant;

S. 539. A bill granting a pension to Steven E. McLaughlin;

S. 540. A bill granting an increase of pension to Claude Hathorn;

S. 541. A bill granting a pension to Chanley Freeman;

S. 542. A bill granting a pension to Leona McCrary; and

S. 543. A bill for the relief of Virgie M. Hinchey; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 544. A bill to amend section 194 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. L. 1088);

S. 545. A bill to prohibit the use of the mails for the solicitation of the procurement of divorces in foreign countries;

S. 546. A bill amending acts extending the franking privileges to widows of ex-Presidents of the United States;

S. 547. A bill to require that periodicals sent through the mails or introduced into interstate commerce contain the name of the publisher, the place of publication, and for other purposes;

S. 548. A bill to extend the time within which the States may cause toll bridges to be made free in order to qualify for aid under the act of August 14, 1937;

S. 549. A bill relating to the compensation of William J. Muse for services rendered as a clerk in the post office at Mountain City, Tenn.;

S. 550. A bill to authorize mailing of small firearms to officers and employees of enforcement agencies of the United States;

S. 551. A bill to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes; and

S. 552. A bill to amend section 226 of the act of March 4, 1909 to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

S. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution to abolish regional offices of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. CAPPER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 24, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. GILLETTE (for himself, Mr. BARBOUR, Mr. CAPPER, Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. NYE, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. STEWART, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. TUNNELL, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. WHEELER) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 25, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

## PAYMENT OF OVERTIME RATES OF COMPENSATION TO POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill which I believe justice and equity demand should be given thorough and immediate consideration by the Congress. It is not by any means a new bill or an innovation in established policy in dealing with labor in general. In private industry the Government has insisted for some time that employees should be paid time and one-half for all services performed in excess of 40 hours per week, or on the basis of the actual number of days worked per year.

Recently we have enacted legislation which purports to extend the same fair treatment to all Government employees, but which, in fact, falls far short of that objective. In my opinion, all those who labor, either for the Government or in private industry, should be accorded the same fair treatment in this respect.

The bill I am introducing provides for payment for overtime to all postal employees at the time-and-a-half rate based upon the actual number of days worked per year. It is my understanding that separate legislation will be introduced carrying this same provision for all Government employees, which I shall also wholeheartedly support.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 480) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution extending until April 30, 1943, the period fo which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), and for other purposes," approved December —, 1942, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

## UNIFORM MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE LAWS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I am introducing a proposal in the form of a joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide for a uniform Federal marriage and divorce law. The amendment I propose is a simple one, but highly important. It would add this amendment to the Constitution:

> The Congress shall have power to make laws, which shall be uniform throughout the United States, on marriage and divorce, the legitimization of children, and the care and custody of children affected by annulment of marriage or by divorce.

I have been urging for 20 years the adoption of such an amendment as highly desirable. Since a decision by the United States Supreme Court last month, the adoption of such an amendment and the enactment of appropriate legislation has become highly necessary.

The effect of the decision, in the language of Justice Jackson, is that it "repeals the divorce laws of all the States and substitutes the law of Nevada" in cases where the husband and/or wife can afford a trip to and a 3 weeks' stay in Nevada.

To allow one State to write a national divorce law, even if it applied uniformly to everyone—which it does not, because not all our people desiring divorce can go to Nevada to get one—I say is not sound practice or good public policy.

Personally, I should prefer that the 48 States should enact laws governing marriage and divorce, and the care and cus-

tody of children affected by annulment or divorce, which would be uniform. But I do not see any possibility of that happening, so I must come to the conclusion that national uniform laws on the subject are required. To allow Congress to enact such uniform laws it seems that an amendment to the Constitution is required.

There are many statements made and views held as to what constitute the bases of our present day civilization, particularly in the United States. But I believe that most will agree that 2 of the cornerstones are the family and the right to hold property. Both of these are threatened by the 49 different and conflicting sets of laws on the subject of marriage and divorce.

A man and woman may be law abiding citizens, and their children legitimate and entitled to all rights, including property rights, in the community where they live. But if they move across the state line, even a few miles or a few rods, perhaps, they may be held guilty of bigamy or adultery, their children held illegitimate, and not legally entitled either to the father's name or to inherit their parents' property. I doubt if the decision in the Nevada case can cure this situation, even if it were desirable to cure it in such fashion.

I shall not take the time of the Senate today to discuss the confusion caused by these varying statutes; I shall do so later in the session. For the present, I merely urge that committee hearings be held promptly on the proposed amendment, and that we have an early vote on submitting the amendment. The problem will be more acute during and immediately following the war, on the return of millions of American youth, and the only remedy is a uniform marriage and divorce law for the entire Nation. I ask that the resolution be printed as part of my remarks at this time.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to marriage and divorce laws was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"The Congress shall have power to make laws, which shall be uniform throughout the United States, on marriage and divorce, the legitimation of children, and the care and custody of children affected by annulment of marriage or by divorce."

## EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in just a moment I propose to send to the desk a joint resolution relative to what is popularly known as the equal-rights amendment to the Constitution. The resolution is under joint sponsorship, and I am submitting it for introduction and reference to the Committee on the Judiciary. I understand that several Members of the Senate wish to refer to the matter in addressing the Senate later, after the routine business has been concluded. I merely wish to say at this time that the amendment is the same as, or similar to, the proposal which has been before the Congress at various times, and was on the Senate Calendar at the time when the Seventy-seventh Congress went out of existence. It is a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States by the following amendment to be submitted to the States for ratification of three-fourths of the legislatures:

ARTICLE —

Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.

Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say that this seems to me to be a particularly appropriate time for expecting and anticipating prompt favorable action on this matter. We are witnessing the mobilization of women in all enterprises, military and civilian, in the ranks, at the lathes, at the drills, at the assembly lines; and this final step in the upward course of women from the status of chattels to the dignity of human beings is one which should very appropriately be taken, in the opinion of the speaker.

So, Mr. President, on behalf of the following Members of the Senate, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and myself, I introduce the measure and ask to have it appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be properly referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting equal rights to men and women was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the remarks of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], a telegram I have received from Cecil Norton Broy—Mrs. Charles Broy—political chairman, National Woman's Party, of Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 11, 1943.

Senator ROBERT RICE REYNOLDS,
*Chairman, Military Affairs Committee,*
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

As chairman of our Military Affairs Committee of the Senate I know, of course, how very, very busy you are. However, it is necessary for me to communicate with you at this time on a matter that is considered by many of best citizens to be of great importance to our country. On Thursday, January 21, there will be a Woman's Day in the Senate. Senator GILLETTE will reintroduce the equal-rights resolution; the following Senators will be cosponsors with him. They are as follows: Senator BARBOUR, of New Jersey; Senator CAPPER, of Kansas; Senator CHAVEZ, of New Mexico; Senator GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania; Senator KILGORE, of West Virginia; Senator LUCAS, of Illinois; Senator NYE, of North Dakota; Senator PEPPER, of Florida; Senator RADCLIFFE, of Maryland; Senator ROBERTSON, of Wyoming; Senator THOMAS, of Oklahoma; Senator THOMAS, of Idaho; Senator TUNNELL, of Delaware; Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland; and Senator WHEELER, of Montana. Senator GILLETTE and the National Woman's Party are asking you to be a cosponsor for the resolution when it comes up on Friday. We have arranged a program of 5 set speeches by Senators for Thursday. Other Senators have stated that they will make impromptu remarks in favor of the resolution on January 21. Women have the vote, but there are still 1,000 discriminations against the women of our country in the various States. I am hoping that you will feel like saying something on this important subject on Friday so that your word may go out to the people of this great land along with the words of these other fine gentlemen of the Senate. The press has promised its cooperation, and, of course, the 30,000 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies reach the people of our land daily. News of this Woman's Day in the Senate will strengthen those loyal women who are now carrying heavy burdens on the farm and in the factories, as well as in the home. As you will remember, in some States of the Union women do not have equal control of property, nor equal control of their earnings, nor equal rights to make contracts, nor equal opportunities in the profession and industry nor in government service, nor equal pay for equal work, nor equal control of National, State, or local government. Any fair-minded, just man knows in his heart that God created 2 sexes both equal in his sight and that women should, therefore, have equality of rights before the law in our great Republic. Surely no man will say that the mothers of men are inferior to the men themselves. If the principle of equality between men and women is right—and it is—then no one fear the consequences of establishing it in the law of the land.

Yours for the women of America,
CECIL NORTON BROY,
(Mrs. Charles Broy),
*Political Chairman, National Woman's Party, Washington, D. C.*

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. REYNOLDS, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration

of the bill (S. 413) to authorize the President to purchase certain lands in Arlington County, Va., and it was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. WILEY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee") to be composed of —— members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and —— members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and —— members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and —— members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and analysis of the Budget of the United States, and to make such other studies and investigations concerning governmental revenues and expenditures as it may deem necessary, with a view to assisting the Congres in formulating a comprehensive fiscal program. The joint committee shall report, from time to time, to the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives from which the membership of the joint committee was appointed, and, in its discretion, to the Senate or House of Representatives, or both, the results of its studies and investigations together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The joint committee is authorized to request the use of the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $——, shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives, one-half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. WILEY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Social Security (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee") to be composed of —— members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and —— members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the need for and advisability of modification or enlargement of the present social security program, and to consider any proposals submitted to the Congress in connection therewith. The joint committee shall report, from time to time, to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, or, in its discretion to the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, the results of its studies and investigations together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The joint committee is authorized to request the use of the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $——, shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives, one-half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

JAMES D. REILLY

Mr. McNARY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 78), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint James D. Reilly a messenger (acting as an additional assistant doorkeeper), who shall be paid at the rate of $2,400 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

SHOWING TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS THE MOTION PICTURE, PRELUDE TO WAR

Mr. HOLMAN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 79), which was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of War is hereby requested to make the necessary arrangements for showing to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives the motion picture entitled "Prelude to War," which is the first of a series of motion pictures to be prepared and released by or under the authority of the War Department under the general heading "Why we fight."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is further requested to fix a time and place for the showing of such picture, and to notify the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives at least 5 days in advance of the time and place so fixed.

PRODUCTION OF INDUSTRIAL ALCOHOL, SYNTHETIC ALCOHOL, AND SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 80), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

*Resolved*, That the authority of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 224, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to March 5, 1942, and Senate Resolution 318, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to November 30, 1942 (providing for an investigation with respect to industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, and synthetic rubber), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

DENIAL TO CERTAIN MUSICIANS OF RIGHTS IN CONNECTION WITH MECHANICAL REPRODUCTION OF MUSIC

Mr. CLARK of Idaho submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 81), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 286, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 24, 1942 (authorizing an investigation of the action of the American Federation of Musicians in denying its members the right to play or contract for recordings or other forms of mechanical reproduction of music), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 82), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Civil Service, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BYRD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 83), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Rules, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a

cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make the request at this time. There are several of us who wish to speak briefly, and we have been waiting until after the routine morning business shall have been concluded.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am perfectly willing to wait, but I did desire to discuss the proposal submitted by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] gave notice Monday that as soon as he could get the floor today he wished to speak on the utilization of manpower, and we have all been deferring taking up the time until the morning business could be concluded. I have no disposition to cut the Senator off, but I thought that perhaps he was not aware of the fact that the Senator from Alabama had been waiting to get the floor.

Mr. BARBOUR. I did wish to say a word following the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I made a point of order a few moments ago against the Senator from New York and the Senator from Missouri proceeding. I think we should complete the morning business before any speeches are made or any permission is given for the making of speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The submission of concurrent and other resolutions is in order.

TRANSFERS AND REDUCTIONS OF PERSONNEL IN THE CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. BYRD. I send to the desk a Senate resolution asking for certain information from the Civil Service Commission, and ask that it lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 84) was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the Civil Service Commission is requested to prepare and submit to the Secretary of the Senate detailed monthly reports for the month of January 1943 and each month thereafter up to and including April 1943 with respect to (1) the number of employees of the various executive departments and agencies released or transferred to other departments and agencies pursuant to section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "A joint resolution extending until April 30, 1943, the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), and for other purposes," approved December 24, 1942; (2) the number of vacancies which have been allowed to remain unfilled subsequent to the date of enactment of such joint resolution; (3) the savings in salaries resulting from such reductions in personnel; and (4) the instances in which such reductions were made possible by the adoption of a 48-hour workweek.

ELECTION OF HON. FRANK C. WALKER AS CHAIRMAN OF DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE — TELEGRAM FROM THE PRESIDENT AND STATEMENTS BY SENATORS BARKLEY AND MURRAY

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from the President and statements by Senators BARKLEY and MURRAY on the election of Hon. Frank C. Walker as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, which appear in the Appendix.]

SOCIAL SECURITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Social Security, delivered by Senator GREEN in the National Radio Forum January 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA AT WAR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator HILL before the Legislature of Alabama on January 19, 1943, together with a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Alabama inviting Senator HILL to address it, which appear in the Appendix.]

ACCEPTANCE ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK C. WALKER ON ELECTION TO CHAIRMANSHIP OF DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Frank C. Walker, newly elected chairman of the Democratic National Committee, on January 18, 1943, broadcast over the Blue Network, which appears in the Appendix.]

HITLER AND THE WAR—ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN I. COX

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. John I. Cox, former Governor of Tennessee, to the Kiwanis Club of Bristol, Tenn., on the subject Hitler and the War, which appears in the Appendix.]

INAUGURATION OF HON. EDWARD MARTIN AS GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Edward Martin, at Harrisburg, Pa., on January 19, 1943, on the occasion of his inauguration as Governor of Pennsylvania, which appears in the Appendix.]

A POSITIVE CONSTRUCTIVE LIBERALISM FOR TEACHERS IN THE LABOR MOVEMENT—ADDRESS BY RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN A RYAN, D. D.

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, D. D., director of the department of social action, National Catholic Welfare Conference, at a luncheon for the New York Teachers' Guild, Local No. 2, American Federation of Teachers, and Teachers' Guild Associates, which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND FARM LABOR—STATEMENT BY C. A. GARNIER

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by C. A. Garnier, president of the Los Angeles County Farm Bureau, on December 3, 1942, to the Special Committee to Investigate Agricultural Labor Shortages in the West, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF EDWARD J. FLYNN TO BE MINISTER TO AUSTRALIA—ADDRESS BY ROBERT ST. JOHN

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast by Robert St. John on January 14, 1943, from station WRC in Washington, regarding the nomination of Edward J. Flynn to be Minister to Australia, which appears in the Appendix.]

MOUNTAIN AIR FOR THE NAVY—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

[Mr. CLARK of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Richard L. Neuberger, from Collier's magazine of December 19, 1942, under the title "Mountain Air for the Navy," which appears in the Appendix.]

NATURE OF THE POST-WAR WORLD—LETTER BY FRANK ALTSCHUL

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of the nature of the post-war world, written by Frank Altschul, of New York, to the New York Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

CAMPAIGN FOR THE SALE OF BONDS

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several articles from the Delaware Coast News and the Sussex News relative to the campaign for the sale of bonds, which appear in the Appendix.]

AN ENDURING SYSTEM OF JUSTICE, PROGRESS, AND PEACE—EDITORIAL FROM THE BIRMINGHAM AGE-HERALD

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Birmingham Age-Herald of Tuesday, January 12, 1943, under the heading, "The only basis," written by Mr. McClellan Van Der Veer, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNFULFILLED PREDICTIONS—ARTICLE BY CARL GOERCH

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the State magazine of January 16, 1943, by Carl Goerch, editor, entitled "Unfulfilled Predictions," which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

ROBERT E. LEE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BAILEY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, many very eloquent speeches have been made about Robert E. Lee, but few, if any, excel the speech made by the brilliant senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] before the Kiwanis Club in Raleigh, N. C., on January 15.

As long as there is a South, the memory of Robert E. Lee will live in the hearts and spirits of the southern people as the noblest and most beloved man the South ever produced.

This speech which was delivered by my colleague the Senator from North Carolina is so outstanding in expression and in the concise review of the career of this great American that I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The speech is as follows:

It is fortunate that the highest tribute to Robert E. Lee has come from Stephen Vincent Benét, the son of a colonel in the United

States Army, of Spanish descent, born in Pennsylvania, educated at Yale, and a resident of New York City—and not in the highly emotional period of the war period but under date of 1927. He cannot be suspected of sectional prejudice or partisan enthusiasm. I quote from his memorable epic poem, John Brown's Body:

"Broad-foreheaded, deep-eyed,
Straight-nosed, sweet-mouthed, firm-lipped, head cleanly set,
He and his horse are matches for the strong
Grace of proportion that inhabits both.
They carry nothing that is in excess
And nothing that is less than symmetry,
The strength of Jackson is a hammered strength,
Bearing the tool marks still. This strength was shaped
By as hard arts but does not show the toil
Except as justness, though the toil was there.
And so we get the marble man again,
The head on the Greek coin, the idol-image,
The shape who stands at Washington's left hand,
Worshipped, uncomprehended and aloof,
A figure lost to flesh and blood and bones,
Frozen into a legend out of life,
A blank-verse statue—
How to humanize
That solitary gentleness and strength
Hidden behind the deadly oratory
Of twenty thousand Lee Memorial days,
How show, in spite of all the rhetoric,
All the sick honey of the speechifiers,
Proportion, not as something calm congealed
From lack of fire, but ruling such a fire
As only such proportion could contain?
The man was loved, the man was idolized,
The man had every just and noble gift.
He took great burdens and he bore them well,
Believed in God but did not preach too much,
Believed and followed duty first and last
With marvelous consistency and force,
Was a great victor, in defeat as great,
No more, no less, always himself in both,
Could make men die for him but saved his men
Whenever he could save them—was most kind
But was not disobeyed—was a good father,
A loving husband, a considerate friend;
Had little humor, but enough to play
Mild jokes that never wounded, but had charm,
Did not seek intimates, yet drew men to him,
Did not seek fame, did not protest against it,
Knew his own value without pomp or jealousy
And died as he preferred to live—sans phrase,
With common sense, tenacity and courage,
A Greek proportion—and a riddle unread.
And everything that we have said is true
And nothing helps us yet to read the man,
Nor will he help us while he has the strength
To keep his heart his own.
For he will smile
And give you, with unflinching courtesy,
Prayers, trappings, letters, uniforms, and orders,
Photographs, kindness, valor, and advice,
And do it with such grace and gentleness
That you will know you have the whole of him
Pinned down, mapped out, easy to understand—
And so you have.
All things except the heart.
The heart he kept himself, that answers all."

Fully agreeing with Mr. Benét, I here undertake not to add to his portrait of Lee but only to utter certain impressions of a lifetime concerning him intended to be of timely import.

Robert E. Lee was a Virginian, a Christian, a gentleman, and a soldier; a Virginian rather than an American or a southerner, a Christian rather than a pagan, in that the God he worshipped he also served, seeking nothing for himself save that he should know and do his duty; a gentleman to the manner born, equally at home in camp or parlor, kind, patient, and considerate of others not only in bearing but in his heart, he could respond as graciously to the salute of a slave as to a king, and none could feel ill at ease in his presence; a soldier by inheritance, by instinct, by choice, skillful and courageous, a captain by reason of gifts of the heart and mind, resourceful in attack and unequalled in all the annals of the defeated, in retreat, and at last overwhelmed by an ever-increasing tide, in capacity to endure, to lead and to triumph. In the final phase the man himself was more than Virginian, more than Christian, more than gentleman, more than soldier—the shadow of a great rock in a weary land, the leader of his generation and the generations to come—an epic figure of infinite inspiration to all men everywhere, destined, I think, to live in the company of Achilles and Agamemnon. In that final phase it may justly be said that he added to his earlier titles that of rebuilder, educator, statesman, southerner, and American.

One looks from a western window of the United States Capitol upon a vista of unparalleled significance. Before him stretch the great plaza, Constitution Avenue, and Pennsylvania Avenue, in the foreground the historical Peace Monument, the Grant Memorial, the National Art Gallery, then the series of immense Government buildings, the monuments to Washington and Lincoln, and beyond the Potomac, fully 2 miles distant, the National Cemetery, the Flag lifted high, and Arlington—a colonial mansion—overlooking the Memorial to the Unknown Soldier, and surrounded by the graves of thousands of American heroes who served our country in battle. That mansion presiding with timeless grace over the moving scene was the home of Robert E. Lee, and it speaks a message all its own. The home of the chieftain of the Confederacy is the resting place of our Federal warrior dead: Itself a living monument to a civilization passed away, the shrine of duty and its sword—all the glory of Old Virginia serenely looking down upon the great Capital of the Nation that sprang from Old Virginia's loins.

It was here that Lee made his great decision; here he offered himself a living sacrifice to duty and his State. He was a Federal soldier, with the rank of colonel. He had won distinction in the war with Mexico. A great career in the United States Army lay before him. But he was not governed by ambition. Neither fame nor fortune tempted him. As between the call of the Federal Government and the call of Virginia to defend her against invasion by that Government, he could not do other than respond to his native State—be the consequences whatsoever they might be.

Lee's decision was not as between the United States, on the one hand, and the Confederate States, on the other. It was a choice as between the command of the Army of the United States and his duty to the State of Virginia, as one of its citizens. He was a soldier of the United States, and trained at West Point for that service. He was opposed to secession and to the war. He was happy in his career and in his home and his prospects. He could not be neutral under the circumstances. He chose to dwell in the tents of his people rather than in the high places of the Nation, and thereby without intention won the highest place in the hearts of men. None understood better than he the meaning of his choice—none realized more fully than he the desperate weakness of the Confederacy as a fighting power—without industries, without organization, and without army or navy.

But he lived in a day when loyalty to one's State was the first loyalty of a citizen, and in a State that demanded precedence over the Union as one of the thirteen creator States. It was said of North Carolina's foremost statesman, Nat Macon, that he pursued his studies at Princeton with little thought of duty in the Revolution until Cornwallis reached Cowpens, S. C., whereupon he said—"I do believe the British are about to invade North Carolina"—and at once volunteered. That was the old concept, doomed from the beginning to play out at length. But in Lee's day it had not played out anywhere in the United States; the Nation that you and I know had not been born—it was only entering, in 1861, the travail of its birth.

Until 1861 our country was a Republic of States under a Constitution, but within the terms of the powers granted in that great instrument the States were first and were each a sovereign. Lee would have obeyed Virginia even though she had stood alone. He would have resisted a Federal invasion of Virginia with his life. He was loyal to the Constitution, and he believed as did many another, that it provided for a superior loyalty to his State. His choice required no impairment of his oath to support that Constitution, and, therefore, no dishonor, no disloyalty to the Government under whose flag he had fought and whose uniform he had honored in war and in peace. He considered only that his clear duty was to defend Virginia against invasion, and he hoped to avoid secession. We have too long neglected to weigh the import of his solemn statement to the Governor of Virginia as he accepted command of his State's armed forces—"I hope this ends secession." Emphatically he was not against the Federal Union, but only against armed invasion of his State by that Federal Union. It was this statement that caused President Davis to dislike him and to delay his elevation to supreme command until the last days of the struggle.

Nor was his decision odd, abnormal, or sentimental. It was such a decision as he was sure Washington, his ideal, whose life and standards were quite real to him, would have made—a decision in accord with the principle asserted by Woodrow Wilson in 1919 in his declaration of the right of self-determination for small states and nations and his proposal to organize a league of nations to maintain that right of self-determination against the whole world. It did not seem odd to Lee—or in any degree traitorous—to maintain the inviolability of Virginia against invasion from any source. He even thought that that could be done without secession.

We yet have a domain of duty and self-determination for the States of the United States. God forbid that that domain shall ever be questioned by armed force from any quarter, but should any State or group of States find themselves invaded, or threatened with invasion from any quarter, to impose policies calculated to break down their social and political structures against the will of the people, there would arise again this principle of self-determination under the Constitution, and any State would be fortunate to have a Lee to assert and defend it. The more our Republic respects this principle, the greater its unity and power will be.

I have taken time to make clear the consistency of Lee's choice with honor and duty not by way of defense, but because there has been and there continues to be misunderstanding, and because hundreds of thousands of southern men and women were actuated by the same motives as Lee.

We do have now a mighty Nation, and loyalty to it is supreme. There are none more loyal than the people of the South. I have no question as to where Lee would stand

today. I have no doubt that he would defend our flag with his life against all who would lift a hand against it—at home or abroad. And I am equally clear that in casting aside the command of the Federal Army and taking his stand with the State of Virginia he did his duty—even that to have done less was to do less than his duty. I question whether, as he meditated his decision there in Arlington and in sight of the Nation's Capitol, he considered the consequences of his choice or weighed the value at stake. He knew that he must yield up his proud station won by valor in battle and constant application in peace. He knew that he must give up Arlington, his home, his comrades in arms, and all his cherished prospects. But he knew also what his duty was, and that was enough; for as he himself declared, "Duty is the greatest word in the English language." It was the sole word in his vocabulary—the touchstone that resolved any problem, that shaped every decision. There was for him only the inner voice—the heavenly voice—and no earthly power could be heard to the contrary.

Elevated to the command of the armed forces of Virginia, General Lee had at once to create an army to command and to provide defenses on her coasts. And what an army he did create. In dash, in striking power, in tenacity, in fortitude, in gallantry, not since the days of Caesar's imperial legions has this earth beheld its equal. Within 18 months that army was in sight of victory; within 2 years it had driven McClellan from the peninsula and out of Virginia; and in less than 3 years it was in Pennsylvania and had victory in its grasp in the decisive battle of Gettysburg. Lee had all but succeeded in his task of repelling invasion.

He might have won that battle. The outcome hung 3 days by a thread so slender and events so fell that there are many who attribute it to that Providence which from the outset had determined that this country of ours was to be a mighty union, a great nation of one people, blest far above all others and charged with a peculiar destiny—which even now it is fulfilling. In all probability that outcome was determined by the accidental death of Stonewall Jackson at Chancellorsville.

In the hour that Gettysburg was lost, Vicksburg, far down the Mississippi, fell. The Confederacy was done for July 3, 1863. Either event alone might have been sustained, but the two at once meant the end.

The great captain of attack was now to prove himself the master of retreat. The Southern States were surrounded on all sides; aid from abroad was out of the question. Lee's generals were quarreling—one laying the blame for the Gettysburg failure upon another; one even blaming Lee. He settled the question, saying, "It is all my fault—I expected the impossible of my men." He had expected too much when he sent Pettigrew's and Pickett's men across the open plain in full view of the Federal guns. But it was not that order which lost the battle—the famous charge was rather the last and only available recourse to retrieve the battle that had been lost by the failure of Ewell to strike as Jackson would have struck and of Longstreet to come up as expected. It was impossible only because there were no reinforcements for the immortal soldiers who swept across that open plain and fought hand to hand on Cemetery Ridge. It was ordered by Lee because he had never retreated when attack was apparently possible.

Notwithstanding the fatal blows of Gettysburg and Vicksburg, Lee did not consider capitulation, nor did his associates. It was proposed to exhaust the last resource. Perhaps it was argued that Frederick the Great had been overwhelmed in defeat but had held on without a hope until circumstances far beyond him wrought alterations that brought victory and enabled him to win his war and found an empire, and there were those who believed that a cause so glorious could not be lost.

From Gettysburg to Appomattox stretched 21 months. The world will always wonder not that Lee would not admit defeat but that he could maintain his army in the field so long. He was never again to have the initiative. Grant and his ever-increasing Army came upon the scene, the Federal power always increasing, the Confederate power always waning—and Lee's army fighting great battles but always falling back. Lee's great distinction is that he held this army and the Confederate States together not only by skill in arms that kept hope alive but by faith of his soldiers and his people in himself that nothing—not even the surrender at last—could quench, a faith that was as spontaneous as the light of day.

The war was over at length. Lee was in private life without funds and without occupation, and without a country, political disability having been imposed. If he took note of the great parade of triumph at Washington and the national acclaim accorded Grant and Sherman, there is no evidence that he regretted his decision at Arlington or that he envied them. Grant became President, and well may Lee have reckoned that had he taken the position of Chief of the United States Army when President Lincoln tendered it to him he himself would have been in Grant's high station. But there were no regrets, there was no repentance, no explanations. He had done his duty and he accepted the lot fate had assigned with serenity and dignity. It was enough, perhaps, to be at home again in the bosom of his family to which he was devoted as husband and father. His problem was to earn a livelihood.

He was offered a business connection in New York with ample compensation. But his fame and the confidence of all the South were not assets which he would capitalize. At length Virginians offered him the presidency of Washington College. He saw therein his opportunity to serve and to achieve. It is now an institution of national fame and bears his name with that of Washington; and there he rests. He not only laid the foundations of the rebuilding of this institution but he gave to it and to all his countrymen new ideals of peace—of reconciliation, of rebuilding the South, of culture and of serenely facing the new day and the new conditions, with heads unbowed, with hearts unbroken, in triumph over defeat in war by daily living in an unconquerable faith and a changeless self-respect. He led an innumerable host and continues to lead them from disaster through suffering to triumph and reunion. Events had set him free to serve the United States once more.

There are those who hold that in this last phase Lee won his highest title and did his greatest work. He was the hero of the South, its leader and ideal, and never was his power in the field of warfare greater than his influence as a private citizen. The purity of his life, his devotion to duty, and that greater loyalty to his God and country which moved him not only to accept the national decision of arms but to lead the southern people in rebuilding for themselves in the new nation, won for him an ever-widening acclaim, until now, at length he has no critic or detractor in all the land. If the South worshipped him as the knightliest of a knightly race, the North honored him for his great character, his military genius, and his leadership in the rebuilding of the once-divided nation. All men everywhere recognized his greatness as a captain and his goodness as a man. Whether he realized this can never be known; it is not unlikely that his native modesty made the realization impossible, that an inherent humility of spirit forbade that he should gather to himself the harvest which he had earned and deserved. Perhaps he considered that it was enough for him to recall that as he rode down the lines his men could not forbear to cheer; enough to reflect with quiet satisfaction that he had kept the faith and had done his duty day by day and hour by hour, and that now in the fading hours of life he had work to do suited to his character, worthy of his spirit, and of highest import to the people who had loved him and trusted him. It was said of Moses that he knew not that his face shone when he returned from converse with the Most High. The truly good man does not know that he is good. The truly great man does not suspect that he is great.

History's halos in literature and art have never been and never will be for those who walked the earth in proud assurance of their superior gifts or station, but only for those who did not suspect themselves to be worthy to be honored above others and walked the lowly path. The most unrighteous are not the publicans and sinners, but the self-righteous; the most exalted are the humble in spirit. Theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.

Time, with healing in his wings, has brought throughout our land understanding and appreciation. Everywhere the goodness and the greatness of Lincoln is cherished as the common heritage of us all. Grant has taken his place as a great military leader. Andrew Johnson is remembered as the brave statesman and Democrat who offended the South by standing out for the Federal Union and thereafter offended the North by demanding just policies toward the South after the war. Sherman is no longer regarded in the South as the monster he was painted during his memorable march from Tennessee to Atlanta, from Atlanta to Savannah, and Savannah to Raleigh, where he framed terms of surrender so sound and considerate that all the North accused him of throwing away the Federal victory in the hour of triumph. We know now that he was a masterful general who had proceeded upon a theory of war intended to avoid the slaughter of battles and based upon the destruction of supplies and communications. On the other hand, Jackson has taken his place in the hearts of all Americans as one of the greatest captains of all time—and as good as he was great. And Lee is honored as a master of strategy, a genius in tactics, great in attack, greater yet in retreat, and greater yet in his capacity to endure and to fight against overwhelming odds—greater still in the serene dignity with which he accepted the verdict of war and led a devoted people by example and precept to rebuild the South as a part of the great Union of States that the whole world knows as America, the mightiest of nations, devoted to peace but capable of war in the highest degree.

And now in the hour of our greatest test these and many more are the cherished possessions of a united people. We carry with us against our enemies Lincoln and Lee, Grant, Sherman, and Jackson. In his memoirs after the first World War, the greatest of German generals, Von Hindenburg, wrote it down that "the American people understand war." They do, and it is because of their inheritance of the spirits of men, from Washington and Andrew Jackson until now. There are nations to the west and to the east of us who are soon to realize that the present generation of American people understand war—even modern, mechanized, total war—even as its predecessors understood the wars of their time. We are now again to bring forth new Washingtons, new Lincolns, new Grants, new Shermans, new Jacksons, and new Lees, new armies of the South and of the North worthy of the heritage which is theirs.

It is said that on the night of the burial of Stonewall Jackson a Confederate captain stood at the foot of his grave and addressed him:

"General Jackson, if you see Caesar tonight, tell him we still make war."

Today all Americans can invoke the departed spirits of Washington and Andrew Jackson, Lincoln and Grant and Sherman, of Lee and Stonewall Jackson and Joseph E. Johnston and call upon them to bear witness to the heroes of the past and the future that the new Army of our sons and brothers, our daughters and sisters, ourselves, we mothers and fathers—North, South, East, and West—still make war after the manner of a people inspired by warrior heroes unsurpassed in all the annals of men.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, last Monday I gave notice that I intended to address the Senate today on the subject of the utilization of manpower, and I desire to proceed at this time.

For 3 years we have moved from a normal peacetime economy to a position of enormous production for war purposes. During 1940 and 1941 we moved reluctantly and without positive and definite objective. The hope that we would not be obliged to go to war still influenced countless thoroughly patriotic men and women, there was lacking a cohesive unanimity of understanding and belief that horrible war was just ahead of us. We progressed toward a war status as fast as it was feasible for a representative government of a divided people to take the drastic steps required to prepare us for active participation in a global total war. When the unspeakably cruel, cowardly, murderous, and villainous assault was made on us by Japan while her representatives were treacherously in conference with our Secretary of State, presenting pleas and protestations that Japan desired to find a formula that would preserve peace, all citizens of the United States instantly said in their hearts, "War, war to the hilt with Japan and her hateful Axis associates," and in spirit answered the first reveille call to arms.

Since December 7, 1941, the people of our country have without division, without reluctance, and without fear been anxious to do everything within their power to conduct a successful war against our enemies.

When war develops it is natural that primary attention be given to the organization and training of combat forces—Army, Navy, Marines, Air Corps, and submarines. The very word "war" promptly suggests armies, training, marching, shooting. Since December 7, 1941, young men, prompted by valorous courage, patriotism, and love of home and the American way of life, have volunteered for services in our combat forces by the hundreds of thousands. Millions of our young men, actuated by the same noble and inspiring motives, have gladly joined the colors for war duties anywhere on earth that they may be sent by their superior officers in the management of our war effort. The response to every call for more soldiers has been wonderful and comforting. When called to leave their homes and loved ones to go to some unknown assignment in the United States or Europe or Asia or Africa or Australia or the islands of the seas, the young men from cities, towns, and farms have marched away with intrepid courage and fortitude and without objection or protest—to win or to nobly die if that end should come to them.

We now have about 7,000,000 physically fit men, withdrawn from the occupational pursuits of our national economy, many of them scattered over the face of the earth and many more in training camps throughout our country. The number of our warrior soldiers, sailors, and marines who are now on foreign soil and in immediate or prospective contact with our enemies has not been publicly disclosed. All of them, with very few exceptions, had at least 1 year's training before they were sent abroad. They were sent in American troop transports, convoyed by suitable American warships. Supplies, equipment, arms, and other instruments of warfare have been sent across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans many thousands of miles away, and must continue to be sent so long as our soldiers remain on foreign soil. Many companies and divisions of our armies are destined yet to sail the dangerous seas.

While our combat forces were being mobilized, a multitude of industrial workers from all urban and rural areas have been assembled to work in war production plants throughout the country—producing airplanes, guns, ammunition, chemicals, ships of every description, uniforms, equipment, and instruments of war of every character and description. Production in some spheres of our war activities has not equaled the desired volume. More workers are needed, and with the abnormally high wages being paid it is inevitable that very large numbers will be drawn from town and cities and from the farms.

As the size of our armies sent to foreign countries is increased, additional production workers will be required to provide them with the combat equipment required to conduct a successful campaign. Additional food for export will be required; additional shipping facilities for transportation and protection of troops, and for furnishing food and arms and everything necessary to equip and maintain large armies thousands of miles across the oceans in foreign countries.

What about food? The imperative need for adequate food for our armed forces wherever located, for the millions of war production workers, and for our civilian population is universally recognized. It is not clear, however, that there is a realization and full understanding of the farm production problem. While the demand for food has been steadily increasing, due to lend-lease requirements and shipments to our armed forces abroad, there has been a terrific drain of farm labor for Army duty and industrial employment. The crops produced in 1942 were quite sufficient for normal purposes. The bread crops supplied the surpluses, but the meats and oils and fats developed deficiencies which resulted in food shortages and widespread rationing. It is now evident that during 1943, even with weather conditions above normal, rationing of foods will be extended to the point that the average standard of living may be substantially reduced; and still the reduction in the number of farm workers continues, thereby increasing the number in our armed forces and among our war production workers.

I submit a table from the Bureau of the Census showing the farm population, the total population, and the percentage of the total population on farms in the United States, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

*Population of the United States*

| Year | Farm population | Total population | Percentage of total population on farms |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1920 | 31,614,269 | 105,710,620 | 29.9 |
| 1930 | 30,445,350 | 122,775,046 | 24.7 |
| 1940 | 30,546,911 | 131,669,275 | 23.3 |

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, this table shows that from 1920 to 1940 the farm population had decreased 1,067,358, while the total population of the United States during the same period had increased 25,958,655. In 1920 the percentage of population on farms was 29.9 and in 1940 it had decreased to 23.3 percent. Thus it appears that in spite of the reduction of 6.6 percent in the percentage of farmers, they produced in 1940 ample food for the civilian population. How much further can that reduction go in view of the increased demands for foods, especially if we are going to supply any food to our allies?

The Secretary of Agriculture has recently stated that during 1942, 2,000,000 farm workers left the farms. The President in his recent address to Congress stated:

> While we have been achieving this miracle of production, during the past year our armed forces have grown from a little over 2,000,000 to 7,000,000. In other words, we have withdrawn from the labor forces and the farms some 5,000,000 of our younger workers.

In the President's message transmitting the Budget for 1943, he said:

> During the calendar year 1943 approximately 6,000,000 people will be needed above present requirements for the armed services and war production.

The President did not break down these figures but I believe it may be stated with accuracy that the present plan for enlarging the Army calls for a monthly addition of 400,000 selectees. If this plan is continued throughout the year, 4,800,000 young men will be drawn from civilian life for armed service. If the same percentage of the farm population is selected that the farm population bears to the total population, there will be approximately a million more farm workers removed from the farms as a part of the increased armed service. These figures are sufficient to cause thoughtful citizens, and especially public officials who are entrusted with responsibility, to stop, look, and listen, and probably to reappraise the entire program if there is such a program at this time for the division of our manpower.

There are at least four major groups to be considered: The armed forces, the

war production workers, the industrial production workers, and the agricultural workers. The fact that the last named group must produce food and clothing for all the other groups as well as for themselves, and are expected to provide large quantities of food and fiber for shipment to our allies, makes it necessary in the development of any sound distribution of manpower to give primary consideration to the subject of agricultural production.

It seems to me that the time has been reached when Congress should, consistent with its constitutional responsibility, make a complete survey of all the important factors which properly enter into a division of our manpower resources for the most effective conduct of the war and the maintenance of the health, morale, and national economy of our civilian population. If the present rate of increasing our armed forces continues, we shall have at the end of this year approximately 12,000,000 men working under the national colors. That raises directly the question of how many civilians are required to support each person in the armed forces. It is a subject upon which intelligent opinion differs, but estimates of from 10 to 17 and more civilians for each man in the service have been made. If the minimum of 10 only is required, then we could not support an armed force in excess of 13,000,000. If 15 are required, then we could not support an armed force in excess of 8,600,000.

The first draft law, approved September 16, 1940, authorized the President to induct into the land and naval forces of the United States for training and service such number of men as in his judgment is required for such forces in the national interest. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, states that the appropriations contained shall not be subject to any limitations as to the strength of the Army, as to the number of flying cadets in the Army Air Corps, as to the number of assistant superintendents in the Army Nurse Corps, or as to the number and grade of Reserve officers who may be ordered to extended active duty with the Air Corps. An act approved August 18, 1941, provided that limitations on the number of men who may be in training and service at any one time are suspended.

From the acts quoted it will be noted that the President has been granted the power, without limitation, to determine the number of men in the land and naval forces required in the national defense.

I made no complaint against that unlimited grant of power when conditions were so chaotic and the probable requirements were so nebulous. I do not intimate that there has been any abuse by the President of power granted to him. It seems to me, however, that the time has now arrived for the Congress to aid the President by advising with him as another year of unlimited control of eligible manpower between 18 and 38 years of age is now with us.

I shall make bold to venture an expression of some of my views on some phases of our manpower problems. Every cog in the entire war machinery would promptly weaken if the food supply were too greatly reduced. We must watch food production with anxiety and deep concern. Ordinary judgment prompts action that will avoid jeopardizing adequate food production. If the draft of farmers is allowed to continue, and if war contractors continue to lure labor from the farms with wages so high that farm workers are unable to resist them, the American people may sometime, when it is too late, realize that a food shortage of dangerout proportions confronts them. The current farm-labor supply should not be reduced.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has prepared tables from which it appears, using the average of 1935 to 1939 as a basis and counting the farm labor and industrial labor supply during that average period at 100, that for 1942 farm labor supply has gone down to 63 percent, while the industrial labor supply has gone up during the same period from 100 to 150 percent.

After accounting for all the men who do not have the physical and mental requirements, it is estimated by capable persons that only about 14,000,000 men between 18 and 38 years of age are available for military service. Of this figure, 7,000,000 men are now in the service, and the remaining reservoir would be 7,000,000, out of which the additional 5,000,000 are to be inducted. That development would leave a thin line of only about 2,000,000 for other services and eventualities. These are not official figures, but I believe they are fairly accurate. From what labor pool are the 5,000,000, yet to be inducted, to be drawn? Where are the men coming from to increase war production? How many of the 5,000,000 new inductees will be withdrawn from war production plants? From what reservoir will they be replaced?

At this time there are about 44,000,000 men engaged in war, civilian, and agricultural production, and in the armed services. They are divided substantially as follows: War production thirteen and one-half million, civilian production fifteen and one-half million, agricultural production eight and one-half million, and armed service 7,000,000. There are no known figures to show the number of men engaged in civilian production who by reason of age, physical infirmity, or other reasons do not possess the necessary requirements for military service.

It is essential that the economy of this country be sustained as far as possible. It is necessary to continue the required standard of living in order that our civilian population may be fed and clothed and supplied with other necessities of life and in order that we may maintain our local and State governments and preserve our domestic organization, and at the same time contribute to the support of the Military Establishment through taxation.

In view of the absolute necessity of at least continuing, and if possible increasing, the production of war materials and instruments and implements, it is apparent that it will be too dangerous to withdraw from war production many more men for service in the armed forces. When we recall that we have pledged our faith and credit to become the arsenal for the democracies of the world who are allied with us in this life-and-death struggle, we should shrink from the adoption of any program which endangers in the slightest way the production of all of the things that our armed forces and our allies need in conducting this terrible war to a speedy and successful conclusion.

The soldiers who are supplied by Russia and China are in immediate contact with our enemies. The soldiers supplied by Great Britain and her Dominions are in large measure in the same situation. Soldiers to be furnished by the United States, if sent across the Atlantic Ocean, must travel a distance of more than 3,000 miles and be confronted with the hazards of the German and Italian flotilla of submarines and airplanes. Our soldiers who are sent across the Pacific must travel six or seven thousand miles and encounter the dangers of destruction from the fleet, submarines, and airplanes of the Japanese.

In addition to the transportation of our soldiers such long distances, we must also send with them guns of every kind being used in the war, including rifles, machine guns, antiaircraft guns, cannon, and tanks. We must also send food and clothing to supply their requirements. A large number of ships will be needed for conveying and convoying the soldiers as well as the supplies; and if the size of our armed forces sent abroad increases from time to time, an equivalent increase in shipping facilities and convoys will also be needed.

It seems to me that the practical solution of this, the most important problem confronting us, is to continue in position to serve ourselves and our allies as an arsenal for the production and supply of food and instruments of war, and call upon our allies to furnish the additional manpower necessary to constitute any sized army that may be used to our advantage. Russia is supposed to have a population of around 130,000,000 outside of the German-occupied areas. Russia has from the beginning stated that it was not necessary for her allies to send her any manpower. She has frequently asserted that if we would furnish the war tools she would furnish the men to use them. I submit that it would be infinitely better and safer from every standpoint to equip 5,000,000 Russians with exactly the same equipment that our soldiers would use if sent to fight with the Russian Army on foreign soil or anywhere else in Europe. The Russians are adjusted to the ways of life in the climate of their country. They know its topography. They have proven themselves to be valiant and courageous soldiers. They are already there, and do not need long ocean transportation. All they want is the proper amount of the needed supplies and equipment—food, ammunition, weapons of all sorts, and all necessary instruments of war.

China has millions of men ready to give their lives in conducting the heroic struggle to defeat Japan's aggression. A statement was widely published that on November 1, 1941, China had an army of 2,900,000 well-seasoned troops who

had been fighting 6 or 8 years. There is little doubt about China's ability to raise an army of 25,000,000 men. Their great need is arms, including tanks, cannon, antiaircraft guns, and airplanes in sufficient quantities.

Dr. Soong, brother-in-law of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, very recently stated while in this country that China did not ask for troops; that it had almost unlimited manpower; and that all China asked for was the up-to-date weapons of war. He gave assurance that if furnished such weapons, China would do the rest and would not quit until she had annihilated the Japanese. After the patient and heroic struggle of the Chinese for 6 or 8 years to preserve their liberty and to overcome the barbarous Japanese invaders, with the odds against them because of lack of suitable instruments of war, no one can doubt the courage of the Chinese or their devotion to democratic principles and the protection of their homeland.

Great Britain and her dominions are reported to have a total population of 504,000,000. The Japanese Army is in China and in close proximity to India. It is understood that India has now at least a million organized and trained soldiers. I do not know why these troops, who, I understand, are under the control of Great Britain, have not been pitted against the Japanese invading army. The Axis countries, including the population of the Japanese Empire, have a total population of 229,934,823. Counting only the United Kingdom's population, which is 46,213,169, and China, with 458,000,000, and India, with 353,000,000, and Russia, with 193,000,000, and the United States, with 132,000,000, the Allies have a combined population of 1,182,213,169. Thus it appears that manpower is not a deciding factor in favor of the Axis. The combined population of the Axis Powers is only about one-fifth of that of the Allies.

Of all the countries in the world, China and Russia are in the best position to furnish men, while America is in the best position to furnish equipment. Why should we not accept these undisputed, fundamental facts, and apply to them the rule of sound reason and unanswerable logic?

The War Department has not kept figures on the cost of paying and maintaining each soldier. The best obtainable figures, however, show that based upon the pay of the lowest-paid private, together with food, clothing, and equipage, it costs about $1,000 a year per man. If the Army is increased by 5,000,000, that will add $5,000,000,000 to the expense of maintaining the Army for those items alone. There are many other items, of course, that must be considered. Of course, our Government would not refuse to incur that additional expense if it appeared to be reasonably necessary in the successful conduct of the war. If it is not reasonably necessary, however, it should not be considered in reaching a decision as between using 5,000,000 more of our young men and using the same number of young men of our Allied countries.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the Chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has frequently stated that 5,000,000 men will be needed this year. I understand that that figure does not include any replacements for casualties. If the number of casualties is in accordance with the normal expectation, virtually every able-bodied man between the ages of 18 and 38 must expect to be called within the next 12 or 13 months.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, that will depend upon the number of fatalities, but whatever that may be, I think the Senator is right.

Mr. AIKEN. The natural assumption would be a million men.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have been using the most conservative estimates, and have stated that if there is any such number of replacements because of casualties as has been suggested by the Senator there will not be sufficient men in this country between the ages of 18 and 38 years to do any work on the farms or in plants producing materials and equipment for war use; because, as the Senator has suggested, all of them would be required in order to attain the objective of 5,000,000 new troops this year.

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly. I think the Senator from Alabama is performing a service in calling the attention of the Senate and of the people of the country to that fact.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Constitution vests in Congress the power to raise and support armies, and for an additional safeguard it provides that no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer time than 2 years. Congress has delegated the power to the President to prescribe the number that we should have in our armed forces for this year. The President has exercised that power from time to time by authorizing the drafting of additional men for the armed forces. He has not, so far as I know, exercised the power to the extent of fixing the maximum number to be inducted into the armed forces. It seems to me that Congress, in view of the specific authorization in the Constitution to raise and support armies, should now reappraise our entire manpower program with special reference to fixing the maximum number to be inducted into the Army and the number to be left on the farm. I do not deem it necessary at this time to undertake to withdraw any of the powers heretofore granted to the President on this subject, but it seems to me that the President would welcome a study of this subject in all its phases, provided such study is undertaken in a spirit of national unity and of helpful cooperation in the conduct of the war.

I am therefore offering a resolution which authorizes the Senate Committee on Appropriations to enter without delay upon hearings, to be followed by recommendations by the committee. I have named the Appropriations Committee because it is the only Senate committee which deals in a direct way with the money to be expended for each of the war purposes. That committee is composed of more than one-fourth of the entire membership of the Senate. Its membership has a very wide geographical distribution, and most of its members have had the opportunity to examine and pass on all the appropriations heretofore made for the conduct of the war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, which I send to the desk, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 85) is as follows:

Whereas the subject of a proper division of the manpower of the United States for the best interest of the conduct of the war is of great importance and deserves the attention and consideration of the Congress; and

Whereas an improper division of manpower may endanger our food supply, or may endanger our production of implements and instruments for the conduct of the war, or may bring about an army of undue and excessive size, or may imperil our national civilian economy: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Appropriations is hereby authorized and requested to consider the subject of the best division and distribution of our Nation's manpower in order to secure the speediest and most successful conduct and conclusion of the war;

*Resolved further*, That the said committee is hereby authorized and requested to hold hearings and to make a study of the subjects mentioned in this resolution, and thereafter to submit its findings and recommendations to the Senate, and, if it decides that legislation is necessary, that it present appropriate bills to the Senate in line with the committee's recommendations.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I congratulate the Senator from Alabama upon bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. I concur in his thought that there should be a thorough investigation by the Committee on Appropriations.

When the Senator called attention to the number of men it took to support a man in the Army, he said it ranged from about 10 to 17. We have had testimony before some of our committees, as a matter of fact there was testimony given before a committee this morning, and I have had the information from authoritative sources, that what is needed in Russia today, more even than ammunition, is food; that the Russian people, who have made such a tremendous contribution to the United Nations' war effort, are actually in dire need of food, and that unless they get food this winter, and get it immediately, millions of Russian people are likely to starve to death.

It so happened that I was in Russia on two occasions. I was there once right after a tremendous drought in the Ukraine. When the grain of the Ukraine was lost because of that drought, millions of people starved to death. Now they have lost that territory, and lost part of the Caucasus region, so far as the production of anything is concerned, and millions of people will be starving to death. We here in the United States will have to furnish them with food.

Not only that, but we will have to furnish England with food; we will have to

furnish South America with food; and it has been represented to me that at the present time, unless some of the South American countries can get food, they will be faced by a very serious situation.

Our problem is not merely to feed our own Army. If that were the only problem, that would be one thing, but when we take into consideration the fact that there are 130,000,000 people in Russia who have to be fed, not according to our standards, but who have to be given enough food to keep their bodies and souls together, and that, on top of that, we have to furnish the Russians who are fighting with munitions in order to keep them fighting, we see what faces us. We also have to furnish munitions of war to the Chinese, and to furnish munitions of war to England. We also have to furnish them to India, and we have to furnish the people in India with tires. I was amazed at the number of tires and the amount of rubber we have to furnish to India and to various other countries in order to enable them to carry on the war.

Notwithstanding these things, we hear it said in the United States that we can build up an army of 12,000,000 men, and unless I am badly mistaken, furnishing them the necessary food and ammunition would wreck the economy of the United States, I do not care who says we can support an army of that size. To be sure, we can support them; we can even support a bigger army, provided they are fighting on our own soil. We could probably support a bigger army if we did not have to furnish the food to other nation.

I want to see the Russians given the necessary food to keep them from starving; I want to see them given the materials, the machinery, the guns, the powder, and everything else, to enable them to keep fighting. I also want to see the Chinese furnished the necessary supplies. A representative of the Chinese Government said to me not long ago, "If you people will just give us the equipment, we will lick the Japs. We do not need anything except the equipment." We cannot furnish them with the equipment, and we cannot give the Russians the food and the materials they need if we are going to strip our American factories of workmen and take all our married men and men with families and with children and put them into the armed forces.

It seems to me it is time that the Congress of the United States spoke up, and used the power provided by the Constitution, as pointed out by the Senator from Alabama, and made an inquiry into the facts. If we come to the conclusion that what we are asked to do cannot be done, let us exercise our power and put a stop to taking the number of men it is claimed will be taken, namely, 400,000 every month. As I said, that would take not only the boys off the farms, but it would take fathers away from their children, it would take men away from their homes. If we do that, we will break down the morale of the country, and break tant problem confronting Congress and the President and the American people.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In order that the RECORD may be more complete, I think it should contain at this point a statement of the division of power. Is it not a fact that, under the Constitution, the responsibility falls upon the Congress, first, "To declare war"; second, "To raise and support armies"; and, third, "To provide and maintain a Navy"? These are constitutional provisions. Therefore the responsibility rests upon Congress alone for the raising and equipping and supporting of an army. After the army is provided for; that is, after the army is raised, uniformed, and furnished with fighting equipment, then the President, as the Commander in Chief, is in charge of the strategy or of the operations of the Army.

I should like to ask the Senator this specific question: Is it not a fact that the larger we build our Army the more difficult it will be for the remainder of our people to provide equipment in the way of ordnance and food?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, there can be only one answer to that question. The answer is that, of course, it will be more difficult.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is it not also true that if the Army of the United States should be developed to a 12,000,000-man Army about the only persons left in the United States to provide and furnish equipment and to furnish food will be elderly men and women, and younger women and children, and boys under 18 years of age?

Mr. BANKHEAD. There will be a percentage of boys or men between 18 and 38 who are physically or otherwise unfit for Army service who will be rejected, and will not be sent to the Army. They may be able to do some work. Of course, they cannot have the vitality and strength possessed by those who are sent to the Army.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Alabama for taking the present occasion to call this issue to the attention of the Congress and the country. I wish to say that his resolution is most timely, and I feel certain it will be given the consideration which the importance of the subject matter entitles it to receive.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I submit the resolution which I stated in my speech would be presented, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I did not understand the request made by the Senator from Alabama. To what committee did the Senator ask that the resolution be referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator requested that it be referred to

sometimes think we do not take into consideration the various factors involved in a global war, such as transportation, production, and distribution. Of course, I should like to see an investigation made of the questions raised by the Senator. Such an investigation is needed. I was wondering if the Committee on Appropriations is the proper committee to make such an investigation, however, because it appropriates public funds, whereas other committees are known as legislative committees, and all matters appertaining to legislation should be referred to them for action.

Mr. President, again expressing my very deep sympathy with the attitude of the Senator from Alabama and with the remarks he has made, and again complimenting him on the careful attention he has given to this very important matter, I question the appropriateness of the reference requested by the Senator. I should like the privilege of asking the Senator if he thinks the resolution should go to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind reference to my remarks made by the Senator from Oregon. I may say that I am not particular as to which committee the resolution is referred. My thought was that if the resolution were sent to the Committee on Military Affairs it would be sent to a committee which deals directly with the Army, and the committee may have some predilections on that subject. If the resolution were sent to the Committee on Naval Affairs we would have the same situation. Of course, it might be sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not conversant with the early provisions of the resolution, as my attention was distracted when it was being read at the desk. I ask that the resolution again be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk again read the resolution.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think another resolution of the same tenor was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and a subcommittee was appointed to consider it, and that subcommittee has been giving its attention to the subject of manpower. I know that the Secretary of Agriculture, Manpower Commissioner McNutt, and General Hershey appeared before the subcommittee. Inasmuch as the subject dealt with in the resolution is legislative in character, I think it should not go to the Committee on Appropriations, and I make that suggestion in the most kindly manner.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Oregon, I should suggest that the resolution lie on the table until we have had time to think further about the matter of reference.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, the resolution should go to some committee which

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, there is one other reason for my request that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, a reason which I did not have time to state, and that is that the Appropriations Committee, of course, must pass on every dollar of money paid out of the Treasury for all war purposes. The Appropriations Committee has had before it from time to time appropriation bills for war agencies. Generals and officials in charge of various agencies have appeared before the committee from time to time. So in a general way that committee has been passing on this subject by virtue of the amount of money it has appropriated. I have no objection to the resolution going to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is not a sufficient answer to my objection. Of course, the Appropriations Committee passes eventually upon the question of supplying of funds in connection with all legislative bills. But the Appropriations Committee does not act on proposed legislation. It has enough to do in looking after the fiscal policies of the Government. That is the reason for my objection. The committee is perfectly competent to deal with the subject, of course. It has a strong personnel. But I am trying to keep the jurisdiction of other committees well defined. I have no objection to the resolution lying on the table for the present, but, I repeat, I do oppose reference of it to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I do not insist on the resolution being referred to the Appropriations Committee. I am willing to have it lie on the table for the time being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will lie on the table.

## ATTACKS ON RELIGION BY NAZI LEADERS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the religious-minded people of the world were shocked to learn of the attacks made upon all religions by the Nazi leaders of Germany. When we realize the philosophy of nazi-ism as propounded by the Hitler puppets we realize what the people of that stricken country are up against. As this philosophy unfolds, as we become acquainted with its many sides, we come to the conclusion that the world cannot live with Hitler or with his philosophy. We also realize that it took years of preparation for Hitler to subdue his own unfortunate people. We realize, likewise, that the Nazi philosophy was given to the infants of Germany as they fed at their mothers' breasts; that it was inculcated in the minds of the youths in those impressionable years; and that it became the motivating principle of all those who embraced nazi-ism within the German Reich.

Occasionally there came out of Germany a word of rebellion, a word of denunciation, a heroic utterance, which led us to believe that no matter what Hitler and his spokesmen may accomplish, religion, democracy, and eventually justice, would survive, and surmount all the obstacles of the Nazi leadership.

To explain in a brief word the religious philosophy of the Nazi, let me read a statement made by the Nazi Commissar of Thann to a gathering of civil servants, which sums up their position concisely, although blasphemously. He said:

A good Catholic—

He might just as well have said a good Protestant or a good Jew—

cannot be a good national socialist, but the officials of the Third Reich must, before all things, be good Nazis.

They must choose either one thing or the other: Either Jesus Christ or the Fuehrer.

Mr. President, from time to time outstanding religious leaders in Germany, men who tower like giants in the Christian world, have taken issue with this philosophy. They have struck out against its progress, only to find themselves in the concentration camps of their own country. We all recall the utterances of the Reverend Niemöller, of Archbishop Innitzer, and of Cardinal Faulhaber.

I have quoted on this floor a sermon delivered by Bishop Clemens, august count of Galen. However, of all the religious utterances coming out of Germany the most startling, perhaps the most heroic—the most defiant—is the pastoral letter delivered recently by an outstanding German cleric, the Bishop of Berlin. This pastoral letter was written and distributed during the Christmas season. What has happened to that cleric is a mystery to me, and perhaps to many of his friends.

Mr. President, because of the startling information which this statement contains, because of the revelation it will be to those who have opportunity to hear it and read it, I have asked the O. W. I. to give this speech all the publicity its national defense importance warrants. I trust that it will be publicized throughout the Americas, because it points out the effects of a Nazi victory, no matter where that victory may be.

Mr. President, there is a force in Germany today that is fighting the Nazis as determinedly as are our own soldiers in North Africa, the defenders of Russia, and all the other men of the United Nations who on land and sea and in the air are battling Hitler's henchmen. This force is not any underground movement. It is not composed of those brave but suppressed people who meet in dark cellars and secret hiding places to discuss Hitler's downfall—and all honor to the heroes who chose physical darkness rather than spiritual darkness. No; this force is in the open. It has refused to take cover. It is the one head which rises to challenge Hitler in his own domain; it is the one head in his own country which has refused even a semblance of an obeisance, the one head he has not been able to bow to his will. Hitler fears this force, perhaps more than any other.

This force, Mr. President, is religion—the force of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish religion.

Mr. President, I have here one of the most remarkable documents of this war. I am going to read part of it to you. It is, as I have explained, a pastoral letter—a Christmas pastoral letter—written by the Roman Catholic bishop of Berlin, Conrad Count Von Preysing, written to his flock and circulated throughout Nazi Germany. It has just been received in this country. It was relayed through neutral channels. I cannot, of course, make public the exact way it got here. I have asked the Office of War Information to make copies of the complete letter available to the press, to the radio, and to individual Americans. This force, Mr. President, is on the side of right and justice; it is on our side. We should fight better—all of us should fight better—for knowing that it is with us.

The letter begins:

My dear diocesans; the Christmas season for us has always been, and is particularly so this year, a time for self-examination. We see before us the great figure of St. John the Baptist, the proclaimer of truth and the champion of external rights, and we hear his appeal: "Metanoeite—change your mode of thinking." It seems to me appropriate therefore that the present Christmas season gives us an opportunity to ask ourselves in what respect should the world change its mode of thinking, particularly in view of the fact that its present principles have resulted in misery and woe.

Mr. President, who should know more about misery and woe than the people of Germany under Hitler?

The letter goes on:

"Justice and right are the foundations of your throne," proclaims the psalmist. As little as the rebellion of the renegade angels could shake the throne of God, just as little will mankind be able to upset the foundations of the dominion of God; the worth of each individual and of the nations will be determined by the foundations of this dominion, and every departure from right and justice will sooner or later be broken against these foundations of God's domain.

You, Hitler—

Bishop Preysing is saying—

You, Hitler, will also be broken against the foundations of God—and you and all Godless Nazis.

Mr. President, Bishop Preysing said that to Hitler right in the capital city of Germany—Berlin.

Then the letter says:

Justice is essentially a quality based on eternal foundations. It does not depend upon the arbitrary actions of mankind. One of its principles is: "Do as you would be done by."

Let me read that again:

It does not depend upon the arbitrary actions of mankind. One of its principles is: "Do as you would be done by.

Arbitrary actions of mankind—arbitrary actions of Hitler, Bishop Preysing means. Hitler, who put Pastor Martin Niemöller in a concentration camp for telling the truth, Hitler, whose followers parade through the streets as priests and carrying aloft the Nazi symbol on a false altar to make a mockery of religion. Hitler, who has persecuted Protestant, Catholic, and Jew—Hitler, who for all his evil power cannot still the voice of religion, even in Germany.

What has Hitler to do with the motto, "Do as you would be done by"?

Now I want you to note this next part of the pastoral letter. You know that

the Nazi principle is that the state is supreme, that everything must be subordinate to the state—even if this means killing by abortion an unborn child of Jewish parents, or the murder of old, helpless German persons who are of no more use to the state.

Another such principle—

Thunders Bishop Preysing—

is that the life of an innocent individual, be it an unborn child or an old person, is holy, and that the innocent may not be punished with or in place of the guilty. To take the life of a man is only permitted to the authorities as punishment for a crime or in defense of the home country or in justified self-defense.

Those thousands of innocents slain by Hitler's orders have a voice in Bishop Preysing and in those others who speak without fear of torture or death. Hitler cannot stop those tongues. Their words reach him through his strongest ring of guards.

Bishop Preysing cries:

Right cannot be determined by the criterion whether it is useful or otherwise. The rights of the individual, as those of the community, are limited by eternal justice. The individual cannot impose his rule against this eternal right—and neither can the community do so; even the community is obligated to observe the rights whose principles are graven in every man's heart.

Those words are addressed to Hitler. Bishop Preysing says:

Right is something which must be enforced even against the interest of the individual and the Nation.

How does that sound to Hitler, who has announced that right is anything which furthers the Nazi cause? And how dare Bishop Preysing fling those words into Hitler's teeth, from the pulpit of a church in Berlin? Perhaps, after all, there are some Germans who are not afraid of Hitler. Perhaps, after all, Hitler is not supreme in Germany—perhaps he is beginning to feel the strength of those who owe allegiance to someone higher than Hitler.

Bishop Preysing proceeds:

The resistance against God's sovereign rule occurred to a large extent in the eighteenth century—the century which proclaimed the primacy of human intelligence, the individual as an autonomous being and as his sole judge, and that all right was to be derived from this intelligence independently of God's law. The church has met this opposition as it has met all other temporary errors. In its syllabus it has condemned the temporary errors of liberalism. Its deepest error does not consist in the overemphasis of the right of the individual at the expense of the community; it exists in the denial of God's sovereign rule and the separation of humanity from the eternal law. This is the root of the teaching of the licentious liberty and the self-determination of man.

That, Senators, is not the voice of one who has been conquered. It is not the voice of pacifism. It is a fighting voice—the defiant voice of the church militant.

In the course of evolution—

Bishop Preysing declares—

philosophy has developed individualism to a kind of collectivism. It no longer attributes to the individual but to the community, whether that be considered as all mankind or as individual nations the privilege of complete sovereignty in right and custom. The state was conceived as the manifestation—more than that—as the very incarnation of this God. It was a deity which had nothing but the name in common with the true God.

This denial of God's sovereign rule is directly responsible for the uncertainty and bewilderment surrounding the idea of right. Power rules in place of justice and profit in place of right. The moment this standpoint is adopted the word "justice" loses its connotation. The moment mankind—whether as individuals, as larger communities or as nations—no longer feel bound by an immutable eternal law the result can only be strife and discord, hatred and disunion, disorder and chaos.

Imagine the courage of a man saying or writing publicly those things in Nazi Germany. But listen to this:

If power creates and represents right there can be no peaceful communion between individuals or smaller communities or nations and a fight of all against all will result.

How could Bishop Preysing say any plainer: "You started this war, Hitler, by a lust for power. I, the representative of religion, dare tell you this. We are your enemies, and there are a great number of us, and we are strong, for we have God on our side—we have right, and justice on our side. Even in your own Capitol I dare tell you this."

Mr. President, that is the force which Hitler must reckon with. Have we, in this country, realized that there is such a force? I do not believe we have. I do not believe we have recognized the potentialities of such a force. Bishop Preysing's letter—there are other parts of it I want my colleagues to hear also—is not an isolated case of the revolt of religion in Germany, and in the countries occupied by the Nazi armies of Germany. Religion and Hitler are deadly enemies. There is not room in the world for both. And members of all religions—Catholic, Protestant, Jew—wherever they live, whatever their country, know that to survive Hitler must be defeated.

I say that there are some religious persons in this country—not many, but some—who do not believe this war must be fought through to a finish—and when I say "finish" I mean the finish of Hitler. There are some who do not understand what it would mean to their religion if Hitler were left with power—who prefer pacifism and isolationism to taking part in a conflict, even when that conflict will decide whether freedom, religion, and civilization will live or die.

To these I say: Read the letter from the bishop of Berlin to his people. If that man, standing in a pulpit in the capital of Nazi Germany, will risk his life for his God, can you do less than join him, with all the strength of which you are capable, in the battle against the enemy of God?

Hear Bishop Preysing further:

The most powerful will win until a still greater power arises and crushes him; the result is an existence devoid of all human dignity—a fight for existence on the level of creatures deprived of human intelligence.

Listen, Mr. Hitler, to the bishop's further word:

The individual cannot and must not be permitted to be completely absorbed by the state or by the nation or by the race. Whoever the individual may be, he has an immortal soul and an eternal destiny. He is and will remain responsible for each of his deeds. God has endowed him with freedom and he must remain free.

I want to repeat that last sentence:

God has endowed him with freedom and he must remain free.

The man who said that may join, or he may have already joined, Niemöller in a concentration camp. But he said it—and if he is taken away others will come who will say it after him. I am sure other German clergymen will come to leadership and will say it again and again.

One thing is certain—

Bishop Preysing asserts—

no power on earth may venture to force an individual to make declarations or to commit acts which would be against his conscience or against the truth. It is certain that in such case the words of St. Peter would apply which became the foundation of the freedom of the Christianized western world. When called before the high council and cautioned never again to speak to anyone in the name of Christ, St. Peter and St. John replied, "Judge for yourselves whether it is right before God to obey you more than God."

That is what Bishop Preysing tells Hitler. That is what all the Protestants and Jews and Catholics—all members of all religions—tell Hitler:

Judge for yourself whether it is right before God to obey you more than God.

That is why Hitler has not been able to conquer religion, why all the concentration camps and penitentiaries, all the whips, and all the headsmen in Germany cannot conquer religion.

The rights of the family are age-old.

Says Bishop Preysing—

No hierarchic worldly community can deprive it of these rights, because they were not conferred on the family by a worldly power, but by God Himself. Parents have privileges and duties toward their children, and these cannot be assumed by a hierarchic worldly power. These privileges and duties include—and this is an idea which the Holy Father has proclaimed over and over—the religious instruction and training of children. It is a holy task which no other power may usurp. Parents have the right and the duty to raise their children as Christians, and every endeavor either inside or outside the family to aggravate or nullify this right is an injustice.

Mr. President, it is an injustice that cannot be tolerated.

Even the ears of the Hitler youth will hear that—and so will their parents, who have been forced to give up their children to state control, who have watched them march off with a hand raised to heil Hitler, to their deaths in Russia or in other lands which Hitler has futilely marked for conquest.

Now, Senators, listen to Bishop Preysing on Hitler's most cherished ideal—the idea of race superiority, the idea that

Germans are destined to be the rulers of the world. Bishop Preysing writes—

Since the least principles of rights are not of merely temporary duration and cannot be the quintessence of racial peculiarities, the rights and the application of such rights and the use thereof cannot be the privilege of a single nation. Every human being enjoys privileges of which no worldly power can deprive it. It is an honorable page in the history of mankind that the rights of aliens have been more and more developed and that the laws of nations define and establish these rights. All primeval rights enjoyed by mankind—namely, the right to live, to exist unharmed, to be free, to have preferences, to contract marriage—the existence of which does not depend upon the arbitrary dictum of governments, may not be taken from anyone who is not of our blood or who does not speak our language.

Mr. President, those are strong words directed against that pet idea of nazi-ism. The bishop continues:

A certain German philosopher who has been the guiding spirit of a great many people has exerted a harmful influence over the German Nation by proclaiming that as far as specially endowed individuals and highly gifted nations are concerned, there can be no good or evil, no right or wrong, and that they are dispensed from respecting any questions of right or morality and that it is one of their privileges to deprive weaker nations or peoples on a lower cultural level than themselves or races which really or seemingly do not enjoy as many advantages of every right.

That is the Nazi philosophy as it is stated in the bishop's pastoral letter. The bishop continues:

And it is intimately connected with this terrible creed that this philosopher, unlike any other, denies God's existence and incidentally that of universally acknowledged rights.

My dear diocesans—

Continues the bishop—

I must seriously warn you against such theories.

The bishop is warning the people against Hitler's pet theories—

Especially in wartime, when might confronts might and when power seems to be supreme, we are in danger of despising justice. As yet only by acknowledging and respecting right can we hope for a better future for everyone and a just peace for all. Let us examine ourselves and see how far the idea of an eternal, immutable right lives in us and how strongly we are convinced that certain primeval rights may not be denied any man, regardless of his origin. We must be perfectly clear that the absence of such rights or even a violation of the rights of our fellow man is an injustice toward the alien nation as well as against our own nation. "It is the curse of an evil deed that it must continue to conceive more evil" was never more true than it is in this case.

My dear diocesans, metanoeite! Change your mode of thinking. This is my appeal to you. No single erroneous theory which the world adopts ever fails to influence even the faithful children of the church and those who would be true disciples of Christ. Let us cling to the faith that everyone is entitled to his rights, and let us also cling to the faith that these rights protect everyone who is innocent of personal wrongdoing. And let us furthermore cling to the faith that these rights are universal and applicable to us all. We do not want to claim for ourselves things to which we are not entitled; neither do we wish to refuse anything to which others may be entitled. We wish to cultivate the spirit of justice and fairness. Let us always remember that by respecting alien rights we acknowledge and profess God's sovereign rule.

Our Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost be with you. Amen.

So proclaimed in Berlin on December 12, 1942.

(Signed) Conrad Bishop, of Berlin.

Responsible for the publication and production: Dr. Conrad Graf von Preysing, Berlin, W 8.

That, Members of the Senate, is the Christmas pastoral letter of the bishop of Berlin, Conrad Count von Preysing, a brave man. May we, who live in a land of freedom, be no less brave in preserving it.

Mr. President, this great churchman takes his place among the heroic churchmen who are fighting the battle for religious freedom in our age. He stands proudly along with the heroic men who have been able and willing and unafraid to strike out for religion, and for justice, even in Nazi Germany.

Mr. President, when the bishop spoke to his people, the mature people of Germany heard him, the religious population of Germany listened to him. They have no sympathy for this new paganism, this revolting despotism which has been forced upon them by these idolatrous followers of Hitler. The bishop struck a popular chord in their hearts. They thirst for the freedom of their fathers.

Mr. President, I believe that these utterances will continue to come out of Nazi Germany. I believe they will increase, both in number and in effectiveness, until the day comes when the people will break off the shackles which hold them to this false and pagan philosophy, when they will assume again that dignity and that democracy for which they were noted in the past.

## JOINT COMMITTEES ON BUDGETARY CONTROL AND SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier today I submitted two Senate concurrent resolutions which I should like to discuss very briefly at this point.

On Tuesday of last week, January 12, as a newly appointed member of the Senate Rules Committee, I wrote to the distinguished chairman of that committee, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] with respect to a modernization of congressional machinery so that we can more adequately meet the challenges of the present.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to the Senator from Virginia be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAYDEN in the chair). Without objection, the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my proposals were for an adequately staffed single Joint Budget Committee, a Joint Committee on Social Security, and a Committee on Aviation.

The measure relating to the Committee on Aviation was introduced on January 7, 1943, and I propose to speak on this subject at a later date.

The measures relating to the single Joint Budget Committee and the Joint Social Security Committee were introduced today pursuant to the outline which I submitted to the chairman of the Senate Rules Committee on Tuesday, January 12, 1943.

On Monday of this week, January 18, I listened with extreme interest to the able presentation made by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] with reference to a proposal for a joint committee on budgetary control which was submitted by the minority members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, those Senators very effectively outlined the reasons behind the creation of a joint committee on budgetary control. The resolution they submitted provides for a joint membership drawn from the committees on appropriations of the respective Houses.

My only reason for today presenting my proposal for a Joint Budget Committee, as outlined in my letter of January 12 to the Chairman of the Rules Committee, is because I feel that the proposal which was made on Monday of this week is not adequate because it provides only for an integration between the Appropriations Committees of both Houses. However, I agree wholeheartedly that such an integration is not only desirable, but absolutely vital in these days of staggering and astronomical budgets.

There is no excuse and no reason for the lack of integration between the Appropriations Committees of both Houses at the present time. That is in no sense a criticism, but is merely an observation of a glaring inadequacy.

I submit, Mr. President, that the integration of the two Appropriations Committees is, however, not enough to remedy the situation.

It is almost inconceivable that there should be no correlation and no integration between revenue-raising and the spending committees of Congress. There is not a business in the land which could function on that kind of a basis and survive; and in normal times, at least, it is doubtful whether any government could long survive on that kind of a basis.

I realize, Mr. President, that in wartime some of the reasons for correlating the revenue-raising committees with the spending committees have vanished. Wartime calls for big-scale spending, whether we can raise the money or not.

Nevertheless, that does not lessen the necessity for an intelligent, workable approach, not only for wartime, but for the post-war period.

In other words, there is still a necessity for integrating the work of the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee with the Appropriations Committee. That is just plain ordinary common sense, and it is good business, which government needs.

Therefore, I feel that such proposals as have been discussed relating to joint budget committees are essentially inadequate if they do not attempt to correlate along with the Appropriations Committees of both Houses, representatives

from the Senate Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

I believe that such a joint committee should make a full and complete study and analysis of the Budget of the United States and should make such other studies and investigations concerning governmental revenues and expenditures as it may deem necessary with a view to assisting the Congress in formulating a comprehensive fiscal program.

I believe that the joint committee should report from time to time to committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives from which the membership of the joint committee was appointed. I believe that this joint committee at its discretion should submit its recommendations and studies to the Senate or to the House itself.

I believe that this joint committee should be authorized to subpena witnesses, to print reports, and to have an adequate technical staff.

Mr. President, if this war has demonstrated one thing it is the need for a unified governmental control. We tried all sorts of makeshift expediencies in our production front earlier in the war, but we found that we could not get production out of that kind of governmental crazy quilt.

We also found out, as this war progressed, that it was not exclusively a military war; it was also an economic war.

That brings me to the very obvious conclusion that we need some kind of an economic high command—not merely an economic high command in the executive or administrative branch of Government. This is not an executive or administrative war—it is a people's war and that is why the people's representatives should set up a coordinated, integrated group to deal with the Budget and our revenue-raising activities, so that they can correlate our spending and our revenue raising in some kind of a comprehensive over-all fiscal program which would be good economic warfare during the war and good business after the war.

Earlier in this war we saw the muddle on the production front which resulted from overlapping authority, duplicated work, and a general lack of centralization. In order to get adequate production we needed a unified control, and we are still working toward that objective.

I submit, Mr. President, that in order to get an intelligent fiscal program which will enable us to win this war and to win this peace, it will be necessary for us to have some kind of an integrated fiscal planning.

I submit, Mr. President, that it must not be merely an economic high command centered in the executive branch. It must have its roots deep in the legitimate constitutional authority of the Congress; and that, Mr. President, is the reason why any joint committee on the Budget should embrace, not only representation from the appropriations committees, but also representation from the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee.

Among the functions of the Bureau of the Budget we find that it is supposed "to aid the President to bring about more efficient and economical conduct of Government service as well as to assist the President in the preparation of the Budget and the formulation of the fiscal program of the Government."

Those words set forth commendable objectives. Does anyone think that if the Bureau of the Budget had been completely adequate to realize these objectives pursuant to the language I have quoted, we should have had all this inefficient and uneconomical conduct of Government service?

We are talking now about a Budget of $109,000,000,000 for a 12-month period. Judging from the experience of the past, we know that billions of dollars can be saved out of that Budget. The single item of $97,000,000,000 for war requires that we of the legislative branch of government set up more adequate machinery to insure efficiency and economy. That is why I am suggesting this budget committee.

Let me re-emphasize, Mr. President, that my suggestion is in no sense to be considered as a reflection on the work of the Appropriations Committee of either House. The fact of the matter is that these committees, as the junior Senator from Massachusetts and the senior Senator from North Dakota pointed out last Monday, are today confronted with a problem for which their committee set-up is no longer adequate. The present Appropriations Committees can function ever so diligently, but with their present machinery can still be inadequate to the tremendous task which confronts them.

We can sit here and can talk day after day and can spend our time in discussing matters which probably occupy the public interest. However, no one seems to be interested in trying to ascertain a way or a means by which to reduce the tremendous cost of this war. Today we heard a discussion by a distinguished Member of the Senate implying that we on the home front are not meeting the challenges as are the men on the battle front; and to me that is absolutely a true statement. Men are loafing on the job in the production lines. I desire to ask the question whether we in the Congress of the United States are loafing on the job, whether we have allowed ourselves to fall into a rut and follow along the same line and dissipate billions. When we make a suggestion, is it acted upon? Well, we shall see.

The Appropriations Committee of the Senate probably does not get more than 3 or 4 months to deal with total appropriations. This year we shall deal with appropriations of $109,000,000,000. The House Committee is, of course, working at the present time on appropriation measures, but these measures will not reach the Senate before March or April. That requires an almost incredible speed of the Senate committee, and it sets up a very difficult task for them. It means also that the Senate Committee spends most of its time considering new requests or requests which have already been denied by the House, and it means in effect that frequently the Senate committee cannot go back to a consideration of some of the matters already disposed of by the House.

It is obvious that concurrent action by the Appropriations Committee would be desirable, particularly if such a concurrent committee functioned in cooperation with representatives from the Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committee with an independent staff of experts who would be able to effect many worth-while economies in government.

Mr. President, I am very much concerned about the Budget of $109,000,000,000. As I have stated on previous occasions, the total cost of the last World War to the United States has been estimated to be $42,000,000,000. Now, in 1 year—between July of 1943 and July of 1944—the Executive requests us to spend $109,000,000,000.

Why am I concerned? Well, Mr. President, let me ask the question, How long can this Government go on spending as it has and as it will spend if it spends at the rate of $109,000,000,000 a year? With less and less civilian goods being manufactured, with more and more small businesses going out of existence, with criminal wastage of the Nation's resources, and in many places men idling on their jobs, as was intimated today by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], is there not a tremendous need for seeing that efficiency and economy are brought into the picture?

Has not the time arrived for the leaders in government to call a spade a spade? Every one of our boys in uniform in Africa, in the islands of the south seas, on the seven seas, in the air, and in the submarines is asking that we stop fiddling while the world burns. The letter which was read to the Senate today is typical of letters which every Senator has received from folks overseas. They are asking us to get down to brass tacks. Think of it, Mr. President. Hundreds of those boys are giving their lives every day—by the hundreds, and perhaps before long by the thousands—and we at home—those of us who are supposed to preserve this America for those who come back—are voting billions, working short hours, and living life as usual, and think we have done our part.

It should be the function of Congress to see that every dollar spent results in a dollar in value in return. If we do not do so, what will happen if Japan and Hitler succeed in dragging this war out for 3 or 4 years? I ask that question most seriously. What kind of a world will our boys come back to, if they do come back? Yes, Mr. President, I think such a budget committee had better be brought into existence quickly so it can begin its job.

I believe it is imperative that Congress create such machinery as will enable it to consider the recommendations of the Executive with the assistance of an adequate expert staff, so that Congress will not be compelled to rely so largely upon Executive recommendations or recommendations from the Bureau of the Budget.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask that the resolution on this subject which I submitted today be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee") to be composed of —— members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and —— members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and —— members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and —— members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the Hoouse of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same mananer as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and analysis of the Budget of the United States, and to make such other studies and investigations concerning governmental revenues and expenditures as it may deem necessary, with a view to assisting the Congress in formulating a comprehensive fiscal program. The joint committee shall report, from time to time, to the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives from which the membership of the joint committee was appointed, and, in its discretion, to the Senate or House of Representatives, or both, the results of its studies and investigations, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The joint committee is authorized to request the use of the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $——, shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives, one-half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I come now to a discussion of the second concurrent resolution which I presented today. The resolution relates to social security.

In this period of world upheaval we know that at the conclusion of this war we shall face the greatest mass security problems the world has ever known. We have already had statements from the Executive indicating that revisions in our present social-security set-up are inevitable. Members of this body are familiar with the procedure by which the executive branch has formulated our social-security policy. I submit, Mr. President, that here again the initiative for a comprehensive, intelligent, long-range social-security program must originate with the representatives of the people.

I submit, Mr. President, that one of the ways in which this body can recapture public esteem and respect is to initiate such a program. There is only one way to initiate it, and that is, not by waiting for Executive initiative, not by waiting for the superplan of some alabaster-browed intellectual in any bureau, not by considering social-security plans piecemeal in a number of different committees, but by considering one overall plan by a joint committee on social-security which would embrace members from both the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House. To provide for such a joint committee is just common horse sense, also.

The committee should make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the need for and the advisability of any modification and enlargement of the present social-security program. The joint committee should consider any proposals submitted to the Congress in connection therewith, and should report from time to time to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, or in its discretion to either the Senate or the House itself, as to the results of its investigations and as to its recommendations.

Mr. President, I believe consideration of these measures is imperative, not merely in the interest of placing the legislative emphasis back where it belongs—and we all know that it belongs back here in the Congress—not merely in the interest of modernizing our mechanical set-up so that we shall be able to meet the challenges of the present, but, Mr. President, in the interest of a more effective prosecution of the war and in the interest of a more effective and a lasting peace in the period which will follow.

Mr. President, I ask that the second of the concurrent resolutions which I submitted be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Social Security (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee") to be composed of —— members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and —— members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the need for and advisability of modification or enlargement of the present social security program, and to consider any proposals submitted to the Congress in connection therewith. The joint committee shall report, from time to time, to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, or, in its discretion to the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, the results of its studies and investigations together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The joint committee is authorized to request the use of the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $——, shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives, one-half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

---

EXHIBIT A

JANUARY 12, 1943.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
*Chairman, Committee on Rules,*
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: As a newly appointed member of the Senate Rules Committee, I am writing you to say that at the outset I am gratified to be associated in this new assignment with such an outstanding legislator as yourself and with a committee of such recognized caliber as the Rules Committee.

Perhaps, as a newly appointed member of the committee, it might serve some constructive purpose for me to outline what I regard as a great challenge confronting this committee.

Some weeks ago you wrote an article which was widely circulated throughout the United States in which you discussed, with your customary ability, the pressure groups which affected the legislative branch.

This was an able article and it did a comprehensive job of reviewing the desirability of eliminating selfish and sandbag pressure on the legislative branch by any segment of our economy.

I can wholeheartedly concur, Senator, in your implied conclusion that the only yardstick by which any legislation can be measured is its effect on the general public welfare which, of course, at the present time means its general effect on winning the war and the peace.

I felt, however, frankly, Senator, that your article had one serious omission. That omission was a neglect to comment on the pressure which is exerted on Congress by the executive branch.

Please understand that the purpose of this letter is not to indict the executive branch for the influence which it has exerted on Congress, although I am not certain that this influence has always been a healthy influence. Nevertheless, if there is an indictment for the gradual erosion of legislative powers and legislative initiative, the indictment rests with the Congress for its failure to modernize its structure so that it could be competent to handle present-day problems of a magnitude never before encountered.

In other words, in recent years there has been an unfortunate tendency in Congress to rely more and more on the expert counsel, research, and recommendations of the executive branch, and as a consequence, the stature of Congress has perhaps dwindled in public estimation.

In restoring Congress to its legitimate stature in the public mind, this committee, Senator, can perform a vital and badly needed service and can make an outstanding contribution.

A few days ago we were given a $109,000,000,000 Budget which represents more than one-half of all the expenditures of the Nation from 1789 to the outbreak of the war.

Senator, our machinery for considering such a tremendous Budget is obviously inadequate. Any business whose budget had increased on such a fabulous scale would long since have changed the mechanics of its budget consideration to more nearly approximate the magnitude of the present-day job.

At the outset then, it is apparent that Congress today needs an adequately staffed single joint budget committee, empowered to call before it experts not only from within Government but from within the ranks of industry and business throughout the country. The budget problem is one which should be considered at one table around which are seated representatives from both Houses of Congress acting in concert on the best advice obtainable.

Moreover, there is at the present time no correlation between the spending and revenue-raising committees. That just doesn't make sense and it's high time that a joint budget committee of both Houses was set up to embrace the Appropriations Committees and also representatives from the Finance and Ways and Means Committees—all acting in unison on one logical coordinated plan.

I. Accordingly, I propose to introduce a measure calling for the creation of an adequate single joint budget committee of both Houses, which I believe can supply competent machinery to enable Congress to regain its legitimate stature in the consideration of this momentous budget and I believe, incidentally, Senator, that such a move will do a great deal to restore the confidence of the people in their representatives and their ability to adequately handle the budget problem.

We already have a Joint Committee on Internal Revenue, so there is perhaps no necessity for further machinery along this line, but I believe very fervently that we must place an increased emphasis on this joint committee and its function in the consideration of a revenue problem unprecedented in the history of our Nation.

II. We have already been advised that far-reaching changes in social-security legislation will be considered at this session of Congress. Here again there is a definite need for a joint social-security committee of both Houses to consider this problem which will assume incredible proportions at the close of this war, and accordingly I propose to introduce a measure providing for the creation of such a joint committee.

III. There is one other committee which perhaps need not be a joint committee but which certainly must be created under the sponsorship of the Rules Committee in the very near future. I refer, of course, to the committee on military aviation which I sought to have created during the last session of Congress and for which I shall continue to fight.

If there is one single fact which has emerged crystal clear from the war thus far, it is the emphasis which is now placed on aviation and we now know that if we are to win this war we must dominate the air.

Now the point I make, Senator, is a simple one. I don't know how any Member of Congress can go back to face his constituents and tell them that their lives, the lives of their children, who are fighting in the armed forces, their securities, a large share of their income, and all of their hopes for the future which are embodied in the aviation problem, haven't even been considered by a single separate standing committee of Congress.

We have already made provisions for the appropriation of some thirty-four billions of dollars for aviation, Senator, and yet there isn't a single separate Senate committee on aviation and the new Budget, of course, will bring this total up to an even more astronomical figure. The most charitable conclusion that we can make is that it isn't good business to spend that large a proportion of the American people's funds without subjecting it to the scrutiny of a separate committee of Congress. But it is far worse than bad business. It means that Congress is evading a responsibility which it owes to the people of this country to call in the Nation's outstanding experts and to consult with them on problems of aviation to the end that Congress may use its powers to further the development of the most effective fighting air force in the world. Congress has a responsibility in connection with aviation which it cannot dodge in war or in peace.

I might point out that such a committee on aviation could integrate its work with that of the Budget Committee so that we would have a more intelligent, well-rounded approach to our broad, general problems.

IV In general, Senator, what I am proposing is a modernization of congressional machinery, not a jerry-built modernization, but an intelligent program designed to insure that Congress can meet the challenges of these days and meet its responsibilities to the people to the end that it may again assume the kind of legislative leadership and legislative stature which warrants public confidence, about which you wrote so ably. This is not merely my idea. Others share these beliefs and I am merely endeavoring to suggest a workable approach to the problem.

In general, Senator, I should like to add that I feel that now as never before there is a great need for an integration of the committees of both Houses. I believe it is an obligation of the Rules Committee to formulate the mechanics by which committees of both Houses may more frequently be integrated with a view to a more concerted and united action and with a view to efficiency and with a view to eliminate unwarranted duplication not only in consideration, but in expensive and time-consuming hearings.

Senator, I respectfully ask that the Rules Committee give the earliest possible consideration to these matters.

Yours for victory,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

## EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I am anxious to make a brief statement endorsing the so-called equal rights amendment, proposed this morning in a joint resolution submitted by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE].

Mr. President, it is fitting that we Members of Congress recognize the splendid example of patriotism, leadership, and service being set by our American women in this present great struggle to preserve our democratic principles of liberty, freedom, equality, and justice for all—principles that have been handed down to us by the sweat and blood of our forefathers—so that they may enjoy the inalienable right of equal rights with men.

Twenty years have passed since the equal-rights amendment was first introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable Daniel R. Anthony, nephew of that great emancipator of women, Susan B. Anthony. Many hearings have been held since, and I believe I am correct in stating that the last one was in February 1938. The causes of the defeat of the resolution at that time were apprehension and fear that the amendment would remove from the statute books in many of the States protective legislation for women in industry that had been passed after many years of strenuous effort.

The responsibilities placed upon women today make it imperative, however, that we take cognizance of their rightful place in our scheme of life. Whatever may have sufficed for the past, today both men and women have equally qualified to work cooperatively, and their joint earnings are needed more and more to lessen the strain of the economic burden imposed by our present social situation. There should be equal opportunity for obtaining knowledge, equality of opportunity for work and service, and equality of remuneration for service rendered. I know that in many of the States of the Union legislation has been placed upon the statute books which makes this possible.

In other States, however our legislators have not as yet adopted this progressive viewpoint.

Those who have been and are now working for the economic as well as social improvement of women should realize that the whole industrial scene has changed rapidly in the past few years. Today, more and more women are entering all fields of useful work, and are thus making a most valuable and necessary contribution to our manpower problem, which is so acute in this emergency.

Therefore, a new approach is justified by rapidly changing social conditions, but the demands today should be as always for decent working conditions and adequate remuneration applying to industry in general and not for one sex alone. As far as I can see and understand the context of this amendment, there is no conflict between the amendment which prescribes equal rights to all and a demand for better conditions in industry for both men and women. If for one moment I thought that this amendment would in any way destroy the advanced social and economic legislation that has been adopted in many States of our Union for the protection of our women, I would most vigorously oppose its passage. But, as I have said, I do not believe that if this amendment becomes law it will in any way affect such legislation.

The great contribution of our women today—especially in our defense plants and in our armed forces in these hours of

baptism by fire—necessitates our giving to the women of this country truly equal opportunities. It will not only be a source of great satisfaction at a job well done, but it will serve as a beacon light of justice to all women—in all parts of the world.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, 20 years ago a distinguished Kansan, Hon. Charles Curtis, then representing his State in the Senate and destined to be Vice President of the United States, introduced the equal rights amendment, which today was offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and others. When Senator Curtis introduced his joint resolution in 1923 he summed up the argument in these words:

> The introduction in Congress of the equal rights amendment to the Constitution of the United States marks another milestone on the road to human equality. When that amendment becomes an integral part of the fundamental law of the land, the consummation of the demands made by the Seneca Falls Conference of 1848 will have been reached, so far as law can effect this end and so far as the United States is concerned * * *. The suffrage amendment was first introduced in Congress in 1878 and was finally adopted in 1920. Forty-two years were spent by women in working to induce Congress to establish the principle that there should be no discrimination against women in the suffrage. Had the Congress of 1878 passed the amendment when it was first proposed 42 years of effort on the part of American women would have been saved. The time, the labor, the money, which women gave to winning the vote, could have gone into other fields where time, labor, and money were sorely needed. Let not the same delay occur with the equal rights amendment.

Mr. President, let us heed the warning of the late Vice President Curtis. Forty-two years were spent by women in securing for themselves what should be the birthright of every American citizen, the vote. Twenty years have been spent by American women in attempting to secure the corollary to that suffrage amendment, the equal rights amendment, which will give women an equal legal status with men.

Let us without delay state clearly in the Constitution of our land that men and women stand on an equal footing before the law, with justice to each and favors to none.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] today proposed the so-called equal-rights amendment to the Constitution, and I wish to take a very brief moment of the Senate's time to make some remarks on that subject matter.

The proposed equal-rights amendment represents one more step which we must take in establishing justice for all American citizens. Its great significance lies in the fact that it touches intimately the life of every American woman, and indeed of every American man.

Beginning in 1848, with the convention on women's rights called at Seneca Falls, N. Y., by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott, women became conscious of the gross inequalities of the law which affected them in every field. Their property rights, their political rights, the right to work and to enjoy the fruits of their labors; the right to be joint guardians of their children, and to contract were all denied them in 1848. In no respect did a woman enjoy the same rights enjoyed by men in 1848.

Realizing that the vote was an instrument by which other discriminations could be righted, women first bent their efforts toward securing an amendment to the Constitution which would give them the suffrage. In 1920, by the nineteenth amendment, they gained the right to vote—but none other.

Meanwhile, various States have corrected some of the most flagrant abuses. Property rights were conceded slowly, but still imperfectly. Joint guardianship rights were allowed in some States. The right to contract, to sue and be sued, was also granted in some States, although lawyers today still refer to the "danger of a married woman's papers." But still, there is today no State in the Union where the law applies equally to men and women. Wherever the common law, unmodified by statute, exists, there injustice to women exists.

The equal-rights amendment would end this injustice for the whole country. I am happy to be a cosponsor with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] in the proposal of this amendment.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, earlier today the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] introduced a measure providing for a constitutional amendment. I am one of the Senators who joined with him in introducing that measure. The amendment is commonly referred to as the equal rights amendment. In this connection I wish to say that no citizen of the United States has any just grounds for denying equal justice before the law to the women of this country. Democracy, to be real, can no longer refuse equal legal rights to any citizen.

All my life I have opposed special privilege and therefore gladly support this amendment, which will do away with special legal privileges for men in the various States and thus grant all citizens—men and women alike—equal legal rights throughout the country.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I am happy to be one of those who have been contributing to the advance of the so-called equal rights cause.

It is hardly my purpose to ignore the representation which comes in opposition to the equal rights amendment. I can quite understand and appreciate the sound ground upon which some of this opposition is based, and I expect to witness compromises in legislative consideration which will greatly forward the course of equality.

Mr. President, I feel strongly that equality of rights before the law should not be denied the women of our country. Thousands of discriminations are practiced against women, and it is our task as legislators to eliminate those discriminations.

Very often so-called protective legislation proves to be an obstacle to women. Hours of employment of women are often discriminatory and stand as a preventive against equal pay for equal service. More and more are women coming into active participation in our economy, taking the places of men in essential fields of operation. A greater equality of rights ought to prevail. I hope Congress will afford the proposed amendment larger discussion and opportunity for consideration than it has heretofore had.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I have noticed that a number of short speeches have been made on the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment designated as the equal-rights amendment. The term "equal rights" is a very enticing one, but I wonder if those who have made speeches in favor of the amendment have gone to the trouble to discover what the adoption of such an amendment would mean to the constitutions and the laws of their States.

When the Constitution of the United States was formed, the whole field of domestic relations was reserved to the States. That field includes domestic relations and personal rights. That field was clearly reserved to the States. If this amendment is ratified it is quite certain that married women and widows may lose many more rights than they will gain. Insofar as the constitution and statutes of my own State on that subject are concerned—and I am sure this applies to the constitutions and statutes of other States—I am sure the adoption of such an indefinite provision as the one now proposed would result in disrupting many State statutes developed over the past two centuries for the protection of women.

For example, in the constitution of my State we have a provision which may have been inserted in it as the result of the treaty made with Spain when the United States bought Florida from Spain. Florida's constitution provides—

> That all property, real and personal, owned by a wife before her marriage, or lawfully acquired afterward by gift, devise, bequest, descent, or purchase, shall be her separate property.

Of course, Senators know that when a man marries, all that he has when he marries and all he thereafter acquires by gift, devise, or otherwise belongs to both husband and wife.

I realize that the term "equal rights" is very catchy and a pleasing slogan, but I think we had better look into the subject very carefully, because I fear the adoption of the amendment would result in unending litigation in the various States. Divorce laws, for example, might be thrown out of kilter. I was on the bench a number of years, and handled many hundreds of divorce cases, many involving the question of payment of alimony. Under this amendment a man might rightfully claim alimony from his wife. The whole question is so involved that we had better look carefully into it before we take action.

Mr. President, I feel that before submitting this proposal to the States for ratification we should first be sure we understand what its far-reaching effects might be. I shall undertake to prepare a statement on the subject and I hope it will be of some service to us in arriving at a solution of the question.

That is all I have to say about the matter at present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I regret very much that the very few remarks I shall make should appear so proximate to contrary sentiments expressed by my distinguished colleague, for whom I have not only the greatest affection and deepest friendship, but to whose opinion I always very much defer. However, I cannot escape the conclusion that those of us who have advocated by our signatures the equal-rights amendment, which is now upon the desk and properly referred, as well as those who are favorably inclined toward it, advocate an ideal too long delayed, the complete emancipation of women.

The whole question of the evolution of human rights is a matter of interesting historical trend. There was a time when men were not regarded as entitled to many privileges or prerogatives, and protected by few immunities, if they happened to be men of poverty or without estate. I have read that at the time of the French Revolution in France it was permissible for one of the grand gentlemen of France, a member of the nobility, on a cold morning's hunt to have the privilege of warming his feet in the bowels of not to exceed two peasants.

We all know what great progress was made in the protection of human rights when the Magna Carta was promulgated.

There was a long time in this country when able, earnest, and honest men and women opposed the extension of the suffrage to women because they really thought that association with politics would contaminate women and to subject women to such taint was unworthy of men.

I remember very distinctly a clever gentleman who was later in the Senate, making a remark in my high school, when I was a high school student, when he spoke against woman's suffrage, to the effect that John was a suffragist and Mary was a suffragette, and they were both suffering it. Those were just a few of the sentiments of ridicule and scorn which were hurled at those who advocated what we all now take as a matter of fact and right, and the right of women to vote.

I feel, therefore, that the trend toward women enjoying equal rights has progressed until today they are entitled to enjoy all rights equally with all human beings, and that sex is not a sufficient line of demarcation for different rights. There may be instances where there would be a difference in duties, but that will depend upon the ability of the person or persons affected to perform the obligation required, not to their rights equally to share and to enjoy the benefits which are derived from citizenship and equality due to all.

When the Declaration of Independence was written, and those moving words that "all men are created equal" were incorporated therein, to lift the hopes and the hearts of the oppressed everywhere in the world, I do not believe that Thomas Jefferson was thinking only of mankind which happened to be masculine in sex. I think he spoke about human beings, and therefore that it is in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Independence to say that women are born equal with men in the rights of citizenship and civil prerogatives.

I hope, therefore, that this may be the last hurdle which it will be necessary to surmount; that the race to bring equality, complete freedom, independence, and liberty for women shall at long last be won.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, does the distinguished minority leader have anything further to bring before the Senate?

Mr. McNARY. I have nothing further to present.

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 25, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Spirit of the living God, when our faith wavers and drifts, when our watch ceases and we falter, in every emergency we need Thy source of sympathy and deliverance. Thou who dost minister help and grace according to Thy fullness, lift us into the true and beautiful spirit of life with our Master the chief among ten thousand and altogether lovely. Thus without fear we shall come into the circuit of Thy merciful being, enriched by the conscious power which Thou dost bestow.

We pray Thee Father, not to allow our light to grow dim in the midst of common toil, reminding us that real joy comes not from ease, riches, or from the praise of men, but being and doing the things which are worth while in Thy sight; not the sustenance of dismal restraint, but from an exalted inspiration. O Thou who dost hang destiny upon the hinges of the human will, we beseech Thee that our achievements may be wrought by noble purposes and served by unselfish devotion. Remove all despondency, clothe us with patience, thoughtful persistence, and make our lives a blending of confidence and eager decision. For the sake of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

HON. MARION T. BENNETT, REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

JANUARY 21, 1943.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. MARION T. BENNETT as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress, from the Sixth Congressional District of Missouri, to fill the vacancy in that district, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 36, to establish the National Commission for Post-War Reconstruction, and that the same be re-referred to the Committee on Labor.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMPOSITION OF STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 64), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That during the Seventy-eighth Congress the Committee on Appropriations shall be composed of 43 members.

The Committee on the Judiciary shall be composed of 27 members.

The Committee on Banking and Currency shall be composed of 26 members.

The Committee on Military Affairs shall be composed of 27 members.

The Committee on Naval Affairs shall be composed of 27 members.

The Committee on Rules shall be composed of 14 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS AND COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS TO STUDY THE PROGRESS OF THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 30, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs, respectively, each acting as a whole or by subcommittee, are authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of the progress of the war effort insofar as it relates to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committees, respectively, with a view to determining whether such effort is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously, and economically.

The Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation as they deem desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the respective committees, or any subcommittees thereof, are authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairmen of the respective

committees and shall be served by any person designated by such chairmen. The chairman of each committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 2. The heads of the various executive departments and agencies are hereby requested to detail to such committees such number of legal and expert assistants and investigators as such committees may from time to time deem necessary, or, in case such detail is not authorized by law, to grant leave of absence without pay to personnel who may request such leave to serve with such committees, without prejudice to any rights or privileges to which such personnel would be entitled if such leave had not been granted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], and I reserve 30 minutes for myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, this resolution proposes a continuance of the power vested in the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs during the last session of the Congress, to investigate the expenditure of war funds by the Army and the Navy.

The Rules Committee had before it a report from those committees, which is, of course, available to the whole House, somewhat detailing their activities during the last session of Congress. It appeared from those reports that the respective committees claimed to have saved the Government something like $2,000,000,000 by their investigations of the manner in which these great war contracts had been let and executed.

The Rules Committee felt that that was an enormous amount of money to have been saved by the activities of those committees in so short a time, and that perhaps thereby the War and Navy Departments may have been put in a little disadvantageous light. With an appropriation of something like $100,000,000,000 and a large tax bill in the offing, and with those committees requesting a continuation of their power to investigate, we felt that the War Department and the Navy Department should have the opportunity of appearing and having something to say about the saving of these large amounts of money.

So the Rules Committee had before it the Assistant Secretary of the Navy and the Assistant Secretary of War upon this subject.

I shall not dwell upon what they had to say, further than to say that after hearings extending over two mornings, the Rules Committee was well satisfied that those two committees of the House have done a splendid piece of work, and that it should be continued. We are also pretty well satisfied that, all things taken into consideration, those two great departments of government are expending the taxpayers' money in a manner in which the taxpayers of the country can afford to have a great deal of confidence.

I am not going to take the time to dwell further upon this subject, which will be referred to by the able chairmen of these committees, no doubt.

I reserve the balance of my time, and I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is an agreeable duty and a very pleasant one, to appear before the House and advocate the continuation of these two committees to investigate the war progress and the conduct of the war. I do not believe there has ever been a time in the House of Representatives when any such claim has been made by a committee of the House as has been made by the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs that each one of them had saved by their efforts, by their diligence, and by their labors, $1,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money.

The people of America are burdened with taxes. They are bewildered and apprehensive over paying their income taxes on March 15 for 1942, and are appalled at the request of the President for $16,000,000,000 of new taxes. Any large savings in Government expenditures should be welcome news to the American taxpayers who are staggering under the existing taxes. If a reason for the existence of the Congress of the United States were necessary it seems to me that fact alone, that the House Military Affairs Committee and the House Naval Affairs Committee have in a short time saved $2,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money should be sufficient. The Military Affairs Committee claims they have saved the taxpayers a billion and a quarter. Some of us in Congress get confused at times between a million and a billion; I am, however, referring to a billion dollars, as much money as was expended by the entire Federal Government prior to the First World War. I think, therefore, this is an occasion to call the attention of Congress to the facts and give credit where credit is due, to all the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs and to all the members of the Committee on Military Affairs for carrying out the mandate of the Congress to investigate the War Department and the Navy Department, the progress and conduct of the war, and particularly in exposing the huge profits made by the contractors in armaments of all kinds, and obtaining refunds.

I am in accord with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] and I join with him in believing that it is not advisable at this time to undermine the confidence of the people in either the War Department or the Navy Department; nevertheless, the facts speak for themselves. The responsibility and the accountability in the first instance rests squarely with the War Department and the Navy Department. Why did not they save this money? It was not the responsibility of Congress; it was our duty to do whatever we could but we did not make those contracts; they were entered into by the Navy Department and by the War Department. It is all right for Members to present alibis and excuses and state that of course we recognize that the War Department and the Navy Department had to rush hastily into contracts to get them under way, that they did not know the costs at the beginning, but that does not excuse the War Department or the Navy Department for not undertaking this work for themselves and finding out that these contracts had been excessive and that there had been huge profiteering, or for not stopping it themselves instead of on the request of committees of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there not some measure of excuse for the War Department and the Navy Department when we know, as we do, that the politicians in the administration forced those departments into contracts where the men slow down on the jobs and where excessive wages are paid and the costs are thrown back? For example, if there is a demand for higher wages some administrative department agrees with the demand that the wages be increased, and the Navy and the War Departments have nothing to do with it. If they want the goods they must pay the wages. It is the politicians in the administration who are to blame in the first place.

Mr. FISH. I would prefer to yield the gentleman time to speak for himself; I would rather confine my remarks to the question that is before the House, and that is the action of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs in instigating the refund of several billion dollars from profiteering contractors.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, too little credit has been given to these committees, both in the House and outside of the House, in the press and to the public. I do not believe that at this very moment the public has the slightest idea that any committee of the Congress has saved as much as a billion dollars. It has been popular in the past, and particularly popular during the recent campaign, to attack the Congress of the United States for its sins of omission and its sins of commission; very seldom is the Congress given any credit whatsoever. I want the RECORD to show that $2,000,000,000 was saved by the initiative and the industrious efforts of these committees of the House of Representatives. I want to emphasize this statement because I desire to follow it by suggesting that we have only just begun this type of work, that we have only just started to carry out our investigating duties and that there should be investigations of a half dozen other departments of the Government, not only the War and the Navy Departments but also the United States Maritime Commission by the Committee on the Merchant Marine, which will be considered today under another rule; but why should we stop there? Why should we not reach out and investigate all the departments of the Government by appropriate committees? Why should we not investigate the lend-lease either by the Foreign Affairs Committee or the Appropriations Committee where billions of dollars are involved? Why should we not investigate the expenditures of the other departments and bureaus of the Govern-

ment, including the W. P. A., the War Production Board, and the Office of Price Administration?

When Mr. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, was before the Rules Committee—and he is in charge of the procurement of the War Department, and it is his responsibility and accountability—a number of questions were asked. One of the questions asked of Mr. Patterson was: Supposing the Committee on Military Affairs had not initiated this investigation; supposing it had not considered the question of excessive and exorbitant profits on the Army munition and armament contracts, would there have been any refunds? Would these contracts have been renegotiated? And he replied that he did not know. I take it that the Congress alone—with the cooperation, of course, of the War Department and the Navy Department—initiated it and that no money would have been returned if it had not been because of the fact these two committees of the House made a careful investigation into the war contracts and exposed the huge profits.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Just in order to keep the record straight and to be fair to the War Department, is it not fair to say that what the Under Secretary said was that these two committees of Congress were helpful?

He never did say at any time that this money would not have been recaptured. He insisted all the way through that these congressional committees were helpful in saving the money, and in answer to the gentleman's categorical question as to whether or not it would have been, of course he said he could not speculate upon that.

Mr. FISH. I asked him that specific question and he said he did not know whether the War Department would have recovered anything without the action of the House committee.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, I am not here to hold any brief for the War Department.

Mr. FISH. I have already said that the War Department had a great many difficulties to overcome. It had to go hurriedly into these contracts. It did not know what the cost would be. But after it had entered into the contracts, after it found out, and everybody else knew that some contractors were making exorbitant profits, it was the duty and the responsibility of the War Department to find out about these profits and to obtain a fair refund.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Here is what I am trying to get at. The War Department, or the agencies of the War Department were in the process of recapturing some of these enormous profits.

Mr. FISH. No, I do not think so.

Mr. COLMER. That was the testimony.

Mr. FISH. I do not think so; not until the House committees had exposed the deplorable situation. I want to be fair, just as much as the gentleman. The War Department certainly cooperated with the committee. Both the War Department and the Navy Department cooperated all the way through in the investigations by the two House committees, but they themselves had done nothing about it, and I submit that if the committees had not existed we would not have recovered a billion dollars on behalf of the War Department and the Navy Department.

Mr. COLMER. In response, may I say that was not the impression that I got from the testimony of the War Department officials, or from the various Members of Congress who constituted these committees? I think they all cooperated and they have done a good job.

Mr. FISH. They have all cooperated; yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Perhaps the gentleman should advise the House of the amount of money spent by these two committees in their proceedings which resulted in these great savings.

Mr. FISH. I cannot speak for the Committee on Military Affairs, because I have not the figures, but I can say that the Committee on Naval Affairs only spent the sum of $64,000 to investigate 45,000 war contracts. The committee analyzed these contracts in detail and found out the facts in connection with each contract, whether there had been exorbitant profits or not and, as I stated, with the small sum of $64,000 the Committee on Naval Affairs saved in excess of $1,000,000,000. I do not know the amount spent by the Committee on Military Affairs, but I doubt if it was any more than that.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there was a certain amount of carelessness and negligence on the part of both the War Department and the Navy Department in not doing this work themselves. That is as far as I want to go in time of war. When the war ends I would like to see a thorough investigation that will go much further into these expenditures, into war contracts, and into the accountability for them; but for the present and to serve the purposes which we are now interested in of continuing these committees, all I want to say is that both the War Department and the Navy Department were careless and negligent in not recovering this money by their own action without prodding by the House committees.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Is it not a fact that in addition to the more than a billion dollars that have been returned because of renegotiation of contracts, a great many millions of dollars were turned back voluntarily by the contractors?

Mr. FISH. Yes. The money was refunded voluntarily by the contractors and that was forced by public opinion. It was all really forced by the action of these two committees. The House can take credit only because it created these committees, but the committees did the work, and because of this work the contractors, when they found out that the facts were known, refunded the money. It is still coming. I hope the House will appreciate the magnificent work of these two committees and when other committees come before the House, special or standing committees asking to be authorized to do investigatory work, that the House will give them the money that is required and the power to do it with.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. How is it that a year ago the Committee on Immigration sought to obtain the passage of a similar resolution in order to go into the question of alien enemies and other aliens in this country and the House by a 2 to 1 majority voted it down where it would not cost but a few dollars and probably save a lot of heartaches for this country and some people who are in this country? This House voted that down and I believe the gentleman from New York voted against it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman remembers, we already had the Dies committee, which the gentleman fought, that was doing that other work.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield to answer the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The power sought by the committee had absolutely nothing to do with the Dies committee. It dealt with another question entirely.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would it be an answer to say that perhaps the House had some doubt as to what service might be rendered by the committee of which the gentleman is chairman?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman has minority members on there for whom I have a high regard and men in the leadership of his party. There is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], one gentleman who would be responsible, as well as myself.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. MASON is also on the Dies committee.

Mr. FISH. I cannot yield further.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the House would like to know about some of the information given to the Rules Committee yesterday by Under Secretary Patterson.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. I understand the gentleman just made a statement to the effect that the War Department in the investigation of the House Military Affairs Committee would not have corrected a lot of things they were doing and that they were derelict in the performance of their duty.

Mr. FISH. I said the War Department cooperated with the committee fully but it was the committee that initiated the investigation and if it had not done it the money would not have been collected or refunded from profiteering contractors.

Mr. MAY. That is the one question I wanted to ask the gentleman. They did agree to cooperate and did cooperate.

Mr. FISH. The information presented by the Under Secretary of War in regard to the policy of the War Department in purchasing hotels was this. He said that the War Department had acquired 500 hotels by lease and 14 by purchase, 12 of which were to be used as permanent military hospitals.

One of the hotels purchased was the Stevens Hotel in Chicago at a cost of *$6,000,000.* He made out a reasonably good case that by purchasing that hotel the War Department might save money. What we were interested in was finding out whether it is the policy of the War Department to purchase hotels throughout the country and go into the real estate business. We were assured that that is not the policy of the War Department.

One other question was raised that might interest the House. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] asked if the former Lieutenant Governor of New York, Charles Poletti, is holding any position under the War Department at the present time, what the position is, what the salary is, and what the duties are. The Under Secretary said that he is holding a position as civilian assistant to the Secretary of War, that he did not know what his duties and qualifications are, whether he has had any prior military service, or what his salary is.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that he did not know because Mr. Poletti was appointed as assistant to the Secretary of War himself, and naturally he did not know, but that he believed Mr. Poletti to be an able gentleman who would render valuable service?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Is it not true that the Secretary said that this former Governor was a specialist, and then, after the Secretary said that he did not know what his job was, a member of the committee suggested that they had not yet determined what his special qualities were so that they could assign him to duty?

Mr. FISH. I think the gentleman is correct. The fact is that the Under Secretary did not appear to know much about the position.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, everyone who is familiar with the record of these two committees is convinced that their powers should be continued and that they should be given whatever money is necessary to carry on their activities.

Apparently there is some question as to whether or not the War and the Navy Departments have performed as efficiently as they might in saving us some money. The suggestion that they are to blame in some degree may or may not have merit. I recall at least two incidents which show that the War and Navy Departments have been unable to correct a situation which impaired their efforts.

Just week before last a gentleman from Pennsylvania came into the office. He is a carpenter on this new field they are building down here. I said, "If you are a carpenter working on that job how come you are in the office this morning?" He said, "I go down there at 8 o'clock, and at half past 9 the foreman tells me to go home." I said, "How many of you fellows are down there working that way?" He said, "There are 10 in my crew."

"How did that come about," I asked. He said, "Well, it is this way. There is no work for us there now, but the contractor says he is compelled to hold us on the pay roll if we wants help, so we go down there at 8 and come back at half past 9."

That is just one illustration, but it can be multiplied a thousand times.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Of course, that is due to an order that is made by the Secretary of Labor that fixes the wage and labor conditions.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is not the fault of the War and Navy Departments at all. They are helpless when that situation arises. As I tried to say a moment ago, it is the fault of the politicians in the Administration who are putting this excessive load on the War and Navy Departments all the time. Those politicians are adding enormously to the cost of the war. There is no question about it. We know how it is. They are the fellows who insist that this act which states that 40 hours continue to be a normal week's work be continued.

The men themselves want to work, there is no doubt of that; but along come the union politicians and, joining hands with the politicians in the administration, they say "No, we are going to keep these social gains, we are going to keep these short hours, we are going to keep this pay and a half for Saturday, we are going to keep this double pay for every bit of work we do on holidays and Sundays on munitions for the boys who are doing the fighting. We are going to keep that come hell or high water, win the war or lose the war." They are going to have it anyway. That is the situation, and we know it. We have known it ever since December 7, 1941, more than a year ago, and we have failed to legislate to correct it.

Now go back more than a year. Up here in Detroit the Navy was having airplane motors for the Philadelphia Navy Yard built in the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Co. plant. For 41 days in one plant and for 24 days in another the C. I. O. held up the plans and specifications of the Navy, which wanted to get them out of there. I put in the RECORD before a letter from Assistant Secretary of the Navy Edison showing that the Navy of the United States was unable to get its own plans and blueprints because of the actions of those strikers.

The incident was so outrageous, so unbelievable, that I read into the RECORD the letter from the then Acting Secretary of War Edison. I quote:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
*Washington, October 20, 1939.*

The CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The resolution (H. Res. 314) requesting information from the Secretary of the Navy on certain matters in connection with a strike of employees in the plants of the Bohn Aluminum Co. at Detroit, Mich., was referred to the Navy Department by your committee with request for report.

The questions in the resolution are set forth below, the answer to each appearing immediately thereafter.

(a) Whether the Navy Department did have a contract with said corporation.

At the time the said strike was called, the Navy Department did have a contract with the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, of Detroit, Mich., for the manufacture of special bearings for aircraft engines. In addition, the corporation was also engaged in the manufacture of special bearings and castings for manufacturers with whom the Navy Department had contracts.

(b) Whether a strike which interfered, or would interfere, with the activities of the Navy Department occurred.

A strike actually occurred in the plants of the said corporation which did interfere with the activities of the Navy Department.

(c) How long such strike continued.

A strike was called at the corporation's plant No. 1, Detroit, Mich., on August 29, 1939. At the time the strike was called, plant No. 1 was engaged in the manufacture of special bearings for aircraft engines for manufacturers with whom the Navy has contracts. On September 15, 1939, a second strike was called at all of the seven plants of the corporation in the Detroit district in sympathy with the strike at plant No. 1 (bearings). At the time of calling the second strike, plant No. 2 was engaged in the manufacture of castings for airplane engines in process of manufacture at the Naval Aircraft Factory, Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa.; also castings for a manufacturer with whom the Navy has a contract for a special type of marine engine.

The duration of the strike in plant No. 1 (bearings) was from the 29th of August to October 8, inclusive, 41 calendar days. The duration of the strike in plant No. 2 (castings) was from September 15 to October 8, 1939, inclusive, 24 calendar days.

(d) Whether the delivery of bearings or parts which had been manufactured for the Navy, or of plans, specifications, or equipment, or any of them was delayed.

The delivery of completed castings, bearings, and parts, also those in the process

of manufacture, was delayed for the duration of the strike.

The Navy Department was unable to obtain the return of the Government-owned patterns, plans, and equipment for the duration of the strike.

(e) What, if any, representations were made by the Navy Department to the corporation looking toward the ending of said strike.

No representations were made by the Navy Department to the corporation looking toward the ending of the strike.

(f) What, if any, representations were made by the Navy Department to the union or its representatives looking toward the settlement of the strike.

On September 28, 1939, the United States Navy resident inspector of naval material at Detroit, Mich., informed the regional director of the United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Detroit, Mich., of the seriousness of the delay in the delivery of the material due on contracts, also the urgent need of the shipment of patterns and requested that he instruct his representative in charge of the picket line at the corporation's plant No. 2 to allow a representative of the inspector of naval material and a truck to pass through the picket line to pick up Government-owned patterns and ship them on a Government bill of lading.

The regional director of the United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, sent three representatives of union local No. 208 to discuss the removal of the patterns with the inspector of naval material. The representatives of union local No. 208 were given full access to the files on the Navy contracts and they were informed that the delay in releasing patterns for delivery were seriously jeopardizing the manufacture of airplane engines at the Naval Aircraft Factory. At the end of the discussion, the union representatives stated that as the strike situation stood at the present time, their answer was emphatically "No" and that they would not let patterns or inspected castings be removed. No further action was taken by the Navy Department to remove the patterns and castings. The Navy Department kept in touch with the strike situation at the Bohn plants through its field representatives, and through the United States Department of Labor, but took no steps looking toward the settlement of the strike.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES EDISON,
*The Acting Secretary of the Navy.*

I hope that every Member of this House will not only read this letter but that he will listen to and then read again the remarks which will later today be made by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]. Those remarks will show that today, in the midst of war, this administration has failed, and we in Congress have failed, to adopt and enforce a policy which would end these subversive acts.

Now, why did they get away with these un-American acts back in 1939, and how did they get away with it? They got away with it because the administration, the Secretary of Labor was back of them. The New Deal administration, if you please, took a position with the strikers, with the union politicians, with the racketeers against the Navy, which could not get the material it wanted. That is shown by the letter just read. Read it again, and then you will know where the fault lies. And again I say to the majority side, What are you going to do about it? Anything?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, of course I am always pleased to hear from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] knowing full well that he will have a good word for the cause of labor. As to extending the time of the committees that have investigated so splendidly the Army and the Navy activities, I congratulate the committees upon the splendid work they have done and I hope that the resolution before us will receive the unanimous support of the House, as it deserves.

At the same time, however, not wishing to detract from the activities and work of the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs, I am going to give some little credit where credit is due, because I do feel that both the Under Secretaries of the Army and the Navy have made it clear that they have been instrumental in bringing about renegotiation of the contracts that have been let. I myself do not believe that the Army or the Navy has perhaps acted as economically or wisely, or as efficiently as under the direction of a Democratic Secretary of War or Democratic Secretary of the Navy. I think if that had been the case, they would have had more interest and more in common with the administration and that in all likelihood they would have been more careful as to the contracts which were awarded.

Unfortunately, I recognize that due to the delay originally to follow the recommendations of our President, which he pointed out in his Chicago speech, and even before, there would have been greater efficiency and economy in proceeding in due time. We were warned and requested to prepare for the threatening danger confronting our country—and if that delay had not taken place, and we had acted on his recommendation, there would not have been the haste necessary that both the Under Secretaries testified to, and it would not have been necessary for them to have rushed the production of needed war materials without regard to costs, but they were compelled to do so because it was felt that we were in danger and that the ammunition, the guns, and the airplanes were necessary to safeguard the interest of this country. I appreciated the testimony of Under Secretary Forrestal of the Navy and that of the Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson, that due to the tremendous requirements of war supplies at the beginning of the war they could not haggle over prices when the fate of our country was at stake.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; pardon me—in a moment. In view of that fact, I feel that the criticism which has been made by my colleague from New York [Mr. FISH] is not justified, though I do not wish to defend them in any way. I do say they were confronted with a condition, a very serious condition, and I believe any real American, any patriotic American, whether on this side or that side of the aisle, would have done perhaps the same thing, would have gone on and said, "Let us get the ammunition that we need, so as to preserve and protect our country"; and that is what they actually did, regardless of the cost, and I am informed that both of them also put a proviso in those contracts, not knowing what the actual cost would be, that the Departments would have the right to renegotiate the prices originally fixed by the manufacturers, and that if they found later on that the prices were excessive, they would have the right to readjust them.

This, as both the Under Secretary of War and the Under Secretary of the Navy explained, was due to the fact that many manufacturers were not in position to estimate what the actual cost would be. It was further testified, and I believe it to be true, that many manufacturers reduced their costs because, as they proceeded with production on tanks, airplanes, trucks, and other items they found that from one-half to two-thirds less man-hours were required than in the beginning. Personally, I am of opinion that our committees have aided and expedited the adjustment, and that there has been nearly two and one-quarter billion dollars already recovered, and I am of opinion, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to recoup much more, more millions, perhaps billions, from these industrial gentlemen or corporations who have placed altogether too excessive prices on their products. In view of that fact, I believe the extension of these committees will be helpful, and that they should continue to cooperate with the Army and the Navy, and, as the gentleman from New York said, perhaps investigate some other contracting bureaus of the Departments, to ascertain whether excessive prices have not been fixed on contracts entered into.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield now. When that time comes I know that the Rules Committee, and I as the chairman, will not hesitate to report a resolution giving other committees the right to investigate and examine into the situation, because I know that there are other departments, due to certain gentlemen who have been imported and designated and commissioned, many of whom do not seem to display an interest to safeguard and practice economy and bring about efficiency as they would if they were interested and believed in the proper achievements of the administration, who might not have again the same interest in the administration and the affairs of our Government as if they had been real, loyal, economically inclined Democrats.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I am not going to say that all of the Republicans that are there, and the most of them are in major positions, are incompetent or inefficient, but they seem to be indifferent as to whether their recklessness would subject them to criticism. Yes, I do believe that they do not have the proper interest in the administration and that many of

them think it is a good thing for the administration to be criticized for our failure to act wisely and economically and in the best interest of the country.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Consequently I feel that our action has been wise and prudent and in order, and that from now on we will watch all of these gentlemen, not only in the Army and the Navy, but that the Congress will assume the jurisdiction that it is its duty to assume, and will maintain a watchful eye upon all of the expenditures of all of the other departments that have expended billions and billions of money, that we are pledged to provide and vote for.

Therefore, in view of what I have said, I feel that the life of these committees should be extended and the resolution passed to give them additional time to continue their investigations, especially in view of the fact that the Under Secretaries of the War and Navy Departments and the chairmen of the two House committees have been working harmoniously.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs should also be congratulated for bringing to light the ascertainment of the tremendous commissions received by many of the procurement agents, several of whom, I am informed, and the record will show, were formerly connected with the departments. I am inserting a partial report submitted by the Committee on Naval Affairs bearing on the commissions received by 30 manufacturers' agents or so-called engineering sales companies, together with a statement of amounts due or to become due of 5 others:

*Amounts of retainer fees, reimbursements of expenses, salaries, and commissions paid to and due manufacturers' agents, 1939–42* [1]

| Name of agent | 1939 | 1940 | 1941 | 1942 [2] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Received | Due [3] |
| Associated Manufacturers, Inc. | | | $17,529.89 | $47,797.19 | $75,073.21 |
| Associated Sales Engineers | $704.55 | $5,332.23 | 23,521.98 | 6,176.43 | 554.84 |
| W. Lester Baker | 27,957.71 | 81,015.39 | 184,471.76 | [4] 261,947.00 | |
| The Bradley Co. | 49,221.83 | 69,881.94 | 100,688.36 | 72,765.33 | 18,575.00 |
| John B. Brady | 17,035.59 | 16,616.18 | 67,308.66 | 104,808.59 | 10,944.24 |
| Brew, Altiery & Wesely, Inc. | | | 5,671.57 | 34,502.18 | 94,133.35 |
| Luther Matthew Bolton | 1,900.00 | 12,372.15 | 63,419.31 | 74,161.52 | 16,000.00 |
| Commercial Engineering Co. | 15,924.13 | 18,511.45 | 32,998.06 | 59,714.00 | 141,200.00 |
| Dunn & Jones | | | 84,718.32 | 98,016.01 | |
| S. Douglas Gibson | 5,038.37 | 18,167.36 | 65,438.25 | 130,456.96 | 34,744.22 |
| E. S. Goodloe | 3,072.66 | 9,072.73 | 20,542.52 | 49,764.43 | 40,863.89 |
| Harry L. Grant | 16,900.00 | 32,412.98 | 60,358.37 | 51,037.31 | |
| George A. Gray | 6,570.48 | 19,191.42 | 36,946.52 | 60,656.30 | 44,440.96 |
| L. D. Joralemon | 42,573.53 | 63,496.01 | 103,312.72 | 64,088.06 | |
| Gustaf and Raymond Lindquist | 60,861.55 | 39,114.32 | 24,104.92 | 21,208.88 | |
| Luther and Wood | 4,330.71 | 6,257.76 | 38,440.26 | 40,937.99 | 44,425.39 |
| Macintosh and Sheridan | 38,935.04 | 39,532.77 | 124,186.38 | 123,352.92 | 47,933.27 |
| Sidney F. Mashbir, Inc. | 12,499.69 | 19,316.85 | 40,737.98 | 19,401.48 | 15,440.47 |
| S. J. Meeks | 13,469.00 | 14,608.00 | 28,452.00 | 39,755.00 | 56,799.00 |
| George L. Meleney | 13,721.23 | 15,627.53 | 23,509.03 | 34,877.63 | 80,650.90 |
| Milburn & Brady, Inc. | | 34,550.00 | 52,176.00 | 48,000.00 | 4,400.00 |
| Leo F. Mullin | 15,062.42 | 33,427.63 | 33,773.32 | 36,311.01 | 9,375.00 |
| M. R. Pack | | | 34,986.70 | 40,010.00 | 9,400.00 |
| Charles Rubel & Co. | 69,543.82 | 104,375.88 | 204,092.55 | 191,828.84 | |
| Sweeney & Bishop | 10,833.56 | 31,559.38 | 48,372.61 | 49,660.65 | |
| R. E. Taylor | | 750.00 | 5,425.91 | 25,325.83 | 141,591.68 |
| C. A. Thumm | 53,039.33 | 46,888.36 | 212,754.11 | 112,154.76 | 195,906.48 |
| Washington Engineering Co. | 60,644.61 | 74,944.24 | 310,177.05 | 124,527.70 | |
| Edward W. Weller | 1,361.54 | 2,711.42 | 15,268.86 | 38,753.42 | 66,219.23 |
| Edward Whitehead | 2,929.39 | 5,555.15 | 22,128.40 | 58,438.95 | |
| Total | 544,130.74 | 815,289.13 | 2,085,512.37 | 2,120,436.37 | 1,148,671.13 |
| Shirley, Olcott & Nichols [5] | 67,072.78 | 165,944.96 | 609,899.43 | [4] 972,568.84 | |
| Wm. Scrimgeour & Sons [5] | | | | [4] 430,171.09 | |
| Horace Ward [5] | | | 133,116.32 | 298,346.99 | 284,499.73 |
| John J. Orr [5] | | | | 16,571.39 | 35,627.32 |
| Alexander H. Stone [5] | | | | 46,038.64 | 429,259.76 |
| Grand total | 611,203.52 | 981,234.09 | 2,828,528.12 | 3,884,133.32 | 1,898,057.94 |

[1] In some cases, amounts include payments on commercial business.
[2] As of approximately August 1942. (See footnote 4.)
[3] Represents amounts due and to become due.
[4] As of Dec. 31, 1942.
[5] As of Sept. 30, 1942, including amounts previously mentioned during hearings.
[6] Agents who previously appeared before committee.

Mr. Speaker, some of my Republican colleagues do love to assail and attack and to hold the administration responsible for these expenditures and these excessive contracts. I know that it was the desire, wish, and earnest plea of the President not only to have efficiency and to have expeditious and speedy production of war material, but that it would be produced economically. He had reason to believe that these men to whom he entrusted this tremendous task would carry out his instructions. Therefore, to charge the Democratic administration with extravagance is unjustified because nearly all of these men who have been entrusted with the work are Republicans and the great majority of the industrialists and manufacturers who have been awarded contracts are also Republicans. To substantiate my assertion, I insert a statement of the profits of 10 of these corporations, showing their profits in 1941, after deduction of taxes, and the percentage and increase in the profits of that year over 1940. I am satisfied that the profits for 1942 will be much greater which is another and sufficient reason why the committees should be empowered to continue their investigations:

*Corporation profits after deduction of taxes*

| | Average 1936–1939 | 1941 | Increase |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *Percent* |
| General Motors | $184,261,000 | $220,339,000 | 20 |
| Curtiss Wright | 3,038,000 | 33,238,000 | 994 |
| Bethlehem Steel | 19,269,000 | 42,929,000 | 123 |
| Douglas Aircraft | 1,765,000 | 18,177,000 | 930 |
| Consolidated Aircraft | 824,000 | 8,754,000 | 962 |
| Glenn Martin | 2,084,000 | 5,773,000 | 177 |
| Boeing Airplane (loss) | −840,000 | 6,113,000 | (1) |
| United Aircraft | 5,161,000 | 21,721,000 | 321 |
| New York Shipbuilding | 122,000 | 3,075,000 | 2,420 |
| Lockheed Aircraft | 953,000 | 10,109,000 | 961 |

[1] Not computed because of loss in base period.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. It is regrettable that the debate today should wander far afield from the thing which we are considering. Let us forget the verbiage, let us forget the talk, and get back to what is before the House—a resolution to continue the work of two investigating committees. Every Member on this floor is sincerely in favor of their continuance. The Army appeared and the Navy appeared before the Rules Committee. Each stated that its branch of the service was in hearty sympathy with the continuation of these investigating committees.

I do not like to hear politics, Democrats and Republicans, brought up in discussions concerning essential war measures with which we are in sympathy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I would rather not, my time is so limited.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like to ask you if you believe in free speech and if you want to have a monopoly on it?

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman who just interrupted me certainly believes in free speech and indulges in it to a great extent.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are right, I do; and you believe in the school-teacher attitude.

Mr. MICHENER. Well, possibly I do not always follow the course of my good-natured friend from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee has been here a long time. He is steeped in the political tradition and the Chicago way of doing things. I am sure that he would not intentionally inject partisan politics in this debate, but I fear that remark may be misconstrued.

It is conceded by all that these investigations have saved at least $2,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. I am not going to argue as to just where the credit should go, but I am going to say that none of these savings was made until these two committees came before the Congress and asked permission to set up an investigating committee in each case. Just as soon as those committees were set up, the march of the profiteers to

the mourners' bench started, and throughout the length and breadth of this land these large contractors who had contracts which gave them unconscionable, unreasonable profits, approached the Government, and in many cases voluntarily laid millions of dollars upon the table—millions of dollars; dollars that were not earned, as conceded by them. So that the psychological effect of the committees has been wholesome, commendable, laudable, and beneficial to the war effort.

Those two committees recommended early that legislation be enacted directing the renegotiation of those unconscionable contracts by the two departments making the contracts. The Congress responded unanimously. Authority was given and some of those contracts have been renegotiated, and many of them are being renegotiated at this time. The work is not completed. The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee told the Rules Committee that the renegotiation of over $670,000,000 of additional contracts is in progress.

Now let us get down to brass tacks. Let us be generous. Let us congratulate these committees. Let us congratulate the Congress. Let us congratulate the two departments making the contracts for their willingness to concede that some exorbitant contracts have been made and upon their desire to cooperate with the Congress in saving the taxpayers' money and furthering the war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 20, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Special Committee to Investigate All Matters Pertaining to the Replacement and Conservation of Wildlife is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 237, of the Seventy-third Congress, continued under authority of House Resolution 44, of the Seventy-fourth Congress, House Resolution 11, of the Seventy-fifth Congress, House Resolution 65, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and House Resolution 49, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 237, of the Seventy-third Congress, and shall report to the House as soon as practicable, but not later than January 3, 1945, the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations, for necessary legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to provision of House Resolution 20, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SCHUETZ] to fill the existing vacancies on the Special Committee on Wildlife Conservation.

### INVESTIGATION BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 16, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed (a) to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in the departments and agencies of the Government, including Government-owned corporations; (b) to study and investigate the effect of such policies and practices upon the conduct of the war, with the view of determining whether such policies and practices are efficient and economical; (c) to determine the number of employees in each department or agency (including Government-owned corporations), whether such number of employees is necessary and whether their skills are used to the best advantage; (d) all other matters relating to the recruiting and the efficient and economical use of the civilian employees; and (e) to make such inquiry as said Committee on the Civil Service may consider important or pertinent to any matter coming within the jurisdiction of said committee.

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] with the hope that he will not use it all.

Mr. Speaker, I will not be guilty at this time of saying anything that perhaps might be considered, unfortunately, by my good friend from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] as political. But sometimes we cannot help ourselves from coming out with the truth, and I know that the truth will hurt.

I assure you it is not my desire to hurt the feelings of anyone present at any time. This resolution before us is similar to one that was voted out in the last session of Congress giving the Committee on the Civil Service of the House the power and jurisdiction to investigate the employees and overcrowded conditions of various departments not only the War and the Navy Departments but all the departments. The Rules Committee granted such a rule last year because representations were made that in many of the departments they had altogether too many employees, and the Rules Committee was under the impression that if such were the case we ought to know about it and eliminate everyone that was not needed.

I do not have to say anything about the chairman of this committee, for I believe there is not a Member of this House who enjoys greater confidence or who is more beloved than the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. Every man in this House no matter on which side of the aisle he sits has the utmost confidence in him. Because of this and because we are satisfied that he will conduct a fair investigation of existing conditions, I feel the power should be given him to proceed with the work that was started in the last session.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Can the gentleman state whether or not the committee made a report last session?

Mr. SABATH. The committee hardly got started last session, for the resolution was passed only in the last few weeks of the session. I doubt if the committee was able to get sufficient information on which they could base a report. I see the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] here. I will yield to him if he cares to answer the gentleman further.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The committee did make a report; it is Union Calendar No. 1001, Report No. 2747.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman very much for the information.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose at this time to burden you with any lengthy discussion. I should like to suggest, however, that it is the primary duty and responsibility in our scheme of government for the Congress of the United States to enact laws and appropriate the money to carry on the functions of government. After that is done the responsibility and obligation for the administration of those laws and the expenditure of the money passes to the administrative and executive agencies.

The Congress, however, does have a continuing responsibility to see to it that the laws are administered according to the way we would want them administered, according to the intent of the Congress expressed in the legislation, and certainly we have a continuing responsibility to see to it that the departments

charged with the expenditure of the taxpayers' money given to them by the action of the Congress do not waste that money. I believe it is entirely fair to say that the country, as to those matters, is looking to the Congress for action. To me it is a heartening sign that on this day we here in the House of Representatives are implementing various of our committees to the end that they may fulfill that obligation to the country.

It has been suggested that this resolution was adopted in the last Congress and a question was asked such as might raise a doubt as to whether the committee had functioned properly. The resolution, of course, was not adopted until very late in the last session, I think a month or 6 weeks before the session ended, and under those circumstances there was not a lot the committee could have done, although they did definitely accomplish some things that have been helpful. That, however, does not have anything to do with the sort of job they are going to do when this resolution is adopted. In the last Congress there was no assurance this committee would be continued, but with the adoption of this resolution this early in this Congress there is no doubt but what the committee will have plenty of time to go to work.

As the able and distinguished chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has pointed out, the purpose of this resolution is to give the Committee on the Civil Service of the House of Representatives the power to inquire into the practices and policies of civilian employment in the Government, whether they are being carried on efficiently and economically and whether the number of employees so engaged are necessary.

I might suggest that in my humble opinion there is plenty of room for some first-class investigation along this line. We are all familiar with the tremendous growth of civilian employment; we know that employees of the Government have been brought into Washington by the hundreds of thousands as they have been brought into the employment of the Government all over the country. We constantly hear reports of employees here in Washington and other places sitting around doing nothing. Every once in a while some newspaper initiates an investigation on its own responsibility, contacts a lot of employees and finds out first hand that there are many here on the Government pay roll who, for the life of them, cannot seem to find out what they are supposed to be doing.

Today we hear the cry of manpower shortage raised on every hand. We hear it stated over and over again that the production of food and fiber for the maintenance of our armed services and of our population and of the armed services of our allies is being threatened by lack of manpower on the farm. Small business and big business alike are being closed all over the land because the necessary employees cannot be found to carry on the business. Would it not then be a good idea to find out just how conservative the Government has been in the matter of its use of manpower?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to my friend from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sure the gentleman is not offering any criticism of that extraordinary announcement in the newspaper this morning that the War Production Board, after great research, has discovered the best way to cut a slice of bread?

Mr. HALLECK. What was that? I am not familiar with it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thought the gentleman was familiar with that. I find that the War Production Board has issued a statement advising the housewives of America, after great research, as to what is the best way of cutting a loaf of bread and they have made the amazing discovery that any sharp knife will cut a slice of bread.

Mr. HALLECK. I am sure that will be a great contribution to the convenience of the housewives of America.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Will the gentleman state whether or not it will be within the province of this committee to inquire into the question of whether or not a great many of these civilian employees are more essential or might be more essential to the Army than to the departments in which they work?

Mr. HALLECK. The committee is charged with the responsibility of inquiring into the proposition of whether or not the practices and policies in the Government are efficient and economical. It would certainly seem to me, and I think I know what the gentleman is talking about, that some of these employees, and we see them on every hand as we go about our business in Washington, might be doing a lot better job for their country in the armed service or working on some farm out in Indiana than they are doing in the job in which they are located.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would the activities of this committee cover cases similar to that which we had in the last Congress, when voting appropriations certain men were named and it was provided that none of the funds appropriated should be paid to them either by way of compensation, expenses, or salaries, yet those men are back drawing money in some other department now? I refer, for instance, to Dr. Saposs.

Mr. HALLECK. It would seem to me that would be a matter worthy of investigation as it might be questioned whether or not the employment of that individual is economical, efficient, and in the public interest. I know something about the situation to which the gentleman refers. Dr. Saposs, who was employed by the National Labor Relations Board, was criticized quite severely by a committee of the House and was subsequently named in an appropriation bill where it was provided that no money should be used for his employment. Thereupon, of necessity severing his employment with that agency, we now read in the papers that Dr. Saposs turns up as an economic adviser for the War Labor Board, or a part thereof.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is an expert on legislation. Could he advise us as to what form the legislation should take to keep him off the pay roll?

Mr. HALLECK. Well, of course, the gentleman knows that after all, as I stated, the first responsibility of the Congress is to enact the laws that set up the agencies and to provide the money for their operation. The selection of the personnel passes to other hands. Sometimes I think it is a little unfortunate that maybe there is not a more direct way for the Congress to express its will in respect to some of these matters.

Mr. Speaker, there is a manpower shortage in this country. Every one of us certainly wants to see every individual in that job in which he can be the most effective and where he can contribute the most to the national good. Certainly the Government of the United States should set the example for everyone else in its conservation of manpower. They should not be wasting manpower. As I have observed on many, many occasions, I think in many ways our own Government and many of our agencies are the most lavish squanderers of available manpower of any organization or industry or business to be found in the whole country.

I have confidence in the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], who is chairman of this committee. I am sure he will have an able committee working with him. May I express the hope that in approaching this whole problem he will go about it sincerely, effectively, and aggressively, and come back to the House with a fine report of what has been accomplished.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the prior resolution for the continuation of the Wildlife Committee was rushed through the House without any debate whatsoever. I had expected the majority to discuss the resolution. There were some members of the committee on the minority side who wanted to be heard. I do not believe that is the right way to pass resolutions creating special committees in the House, without giving the facts and information to the Members. There are a great many new Members in this House, particularly on the minority side, who know nothing about the Wildlife Committee. They do not know what its work is or who is on the select committee or where the money comes from or anything about it. I think it is an unfortunate state of affairs to rush through a resolution of that kind without any consideration whatsoever. In a few minutes I propose to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who is chairman of that committee, be given 5 minutes of the time that we have left on this rule to speak on that resolution, and I shall so move.

The Committee on Rules reported out this resolution empowering the Civil Service Committee to investigate the status of our civilian personnel. I be-

lieve that both sides of the House are in favor of retrenchment, saving, and economy. At the end of the last World War we had 900,000 employees in the civil service. Within a short time after that this number was reduced to 500,000. Today we have almost 3,000,000, somewhere far in excess of 2,500,000. The exact figures are not given in the report, but it is between 2,500,000 and 3,000,000.

There are many Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who feel that we should economize by reducing the number of these civilian employees. For example, the War Production Board has somewhere around 25,000 employees. Members who have made a study of the work of the War Production Board have publicly stated that they think that work could be just as efficiently and possibly more efficiently handled if that Board cut its personnel in half.

The Office of Price Administration has 40,000 employees. There are those who state that they could make a very large cut and have increased efficiency. So I believe this committee has a great work cut out for it, to bring about not only efficiency in the Government service, but to reduce the number of personnel, save money, and retrench. This resolution should have the unanimous support of the Members on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], may have 5 minutes to speak out of order on the work of the Wildlife Committee, of which he is chairman and has so ably headed for a number of years past.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, of course I do not object to my colleague speaking on any subject at any time, but such request as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has just made is not proper in the consideration of this rule, as the time is in the hands of the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois will with great pleasure yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia. I do not believe anybody will object to his speaking out of order.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to use the 5 minutes?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, this puts me in a very embarrassing position, that of bringing up a subject alien to the resolution under consideration. If I may have permission to revise and extend my remarks, I can place in the RECORD a summary of the very important work the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources has been doing, for the information of all Members of the House, without delaying the orderly procedure of the adoption of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman ask that his remarks be placed in the RECORD immediately following the presentation of the resolution?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed out of order for 5 minutes. We would like to hear him.

Mr. FISH. I made that same request. I do not know whether it was objected to or not.

Mr. SABATH. If I am not mistaken, that request to speak out of order was objected to.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] desires to make a speech for 5 minutes, the Chair will let him talk about anything he desires, unless a point of order is made.

The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am reluctant to speak under the circumstances that now exist, when I know there are some who would like to finish the business in hand. Naturally, I am flattered to have the suggestion come from my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Kentucky, that he would like to hear me on the subject of wildlife conservation.

We have sent to each Member of the House copies of our report and of the hearings. We are dealing with a subject in which 10,000,000 licensed hunters and 7,000,000 fishermen are interested. But it is broader than that. There are thousands of persons who hunt with cameras, other thousands love the out of doors as created by God and unspoiled by man.

All of us are vitally interested in the contribution being made to the war effort by our natural resources. Our fish and fishery products are third in volume of food production, following beef and pork, with a total of 5,000,000,000 pounds. Formerly we imported about one-half of the furs we use in this country but now we are stepping up fur production to try to meet the demands of those who are on the northern sea patrols, those who have gone into the frozen wastes of Greenland's icy mountains.

We are trying to conserve our timber resources, as we realize the demand being made upon our timber for the war effort. Do you know that we are really facing a timber shortage this year, with an estimated 20,000,000,000 feet of timber less than the estimated demand? All too late have we taken steps to stop forest fires and to urge private owners to engage in scientific and selective cutting of merchantable timber.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I did intend to say a few words in regard to the resolution to continue the life of the Wildlife Conservation Committee when it was under consideration a few moments ago. I concur in everything the gentleman has said. May I add that all our natural resources are rapidly disappearing. For instance, up in northern Minnesota nearly 90,000,000 tons of iron ore were taken out of the iron mines last year. One of the functions in which our committee can assist is formulating plans to use some of the low-grade ore and get that ore into productive use throughout the country. I am very glad the House has unanimously passed this resolution to continue the life of the Wildlife Conservation Committee, because I feel that we can serve a constructive purpose for the future of the country.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As the gentleman from Minnesota, an active and helpful member of our committee, has said, there is much war work for us to do.

Our committee has jurisdiction in an advisory and investigatory capacity over all of the wildlife conservation of the Federal agencies directly engaged in that work, which are the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, and United States Forest Service. We likewise have jurisdiction over those incidentally engaged in wildlife conservation, such as the Soil Conservation Service; the Army and Navy, now big land owners; the Reclamation and Grazing Services, and so forth. The agencies dealing directly in conservation matters consult us with respect to all major policies. The other agencies cooperate. We worked out a plan for full and helpful cooperation not only between agencies dealing directly in wildlife conservation but between all the agencies of the Government touching that field.

We sponsored the Duck Stamp Act, which produces about $1,000,000 a year for migratory waterfowl, and the tax on sporting guns and ammunition that produces about $3,000,000 per year, to be used as grants-in-aid to the States. There is now to the credit of that trust fund about $10,000,000. We exercise constant supervision over the way that fund is handled.

When the C. C. C. camps were organized, they first operated with little regard to wildlife conservation. Under our direction they were turned into one of the best conservation agencies we have ever had, building thousands of fine fishing ponds, improving and restocking thousands of miles of fishing streams, and handling its silvicultural operations both with regard to leaving a habitat and food for wildlife as well as the production of a commercial timber crop. The C. C. C. camps also had an active part in building and developing breeding and feeding refuges for migratory birds in an area of some 12,000,000 acres, which was a major contribution to the fact that we now have about four times as many ducks and geese as we had before our committee started its operations.

The fact that these conservation agencies of the Government must report each year in detail to us on their operations, and those reports will be printed and distributed to the four corners of the country, keeps them on their toes and encourages them to tackle new jobs to which they can in such reports point with pride. Our reports go not only to all State game departments and organized conservation associations but to many public libraries and the technical schools of many colleges. It is the only full and complete report of the conservation work of the Government, and

in some schools our hearings are used as textbooks.

Another service, and of no mean proportions, rendered by our committee in the past 2 years was in inducing the United States Forest Service to recognize the superior jurisdiction of the States where title to and the right to take wildlife was involved. Our committee is the forum to which State game departments, conservation organizations, and individual sportsmen come for the presentation of their views and the protection of their rights. We were successful in working out a cooperative agreement between the Government and the States in the administration of national forest areas that has apparently been satisfactory to all concerned. And, from the standpoint of the average sportsman, the most popular thing we have done was in urging the Fish and Wildlife Service to liberalize shooting regulations in recognition of an increased supply of game.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I add my word of commendation of the splendid work of the gentleman's committee. I know it has met the unanimous support and favor of sportsmen throughout the country, both in the Isaak Walton League and the other service organizations.

May I make this suggestion: I hope that in the report the committee will work out during the present session of Congress some plans and proposals can be incorporated by which, when and if we enter into another public-works program after this war, due attention can be given to the needs of the service, such as the development of recreational areas, the correction of pollution problems, and the development of other ways of improving the natural resources of America.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank my distinguished friend for that suggestion. The post-war recreational program he suggests is one that is close to my heart.

In all of recorded history I never heard of a dictator who loved to hunt and fish. Some of the Roman Emperors provided bread and circuses to allay popular unrest, but it was not until this country of ours was settled that there was any hunting and fishing except for those who wore the royal purple. When our ancestors came here seeking a new type of freedom, a part of that freedom was to be the freedom of fields and streams—the freedom of hunting and fishing, without an overlord stringing us up by the thumbs for poaching in his private preserve. With us, the privilege for the masses of hunting and fishing has become a hallmark of our democracy.

Our first President, George Washington, the greatest man this country has ever produced, and a model all should strive to emulate, loved to hunt and fish. And almost every succeeding President has enjoyed either one sport or the other. Teddy Roosevelt was a hunter of international fame and his establishment of the Forest Service, under the direction of Gifford Pinchot, laid the foundation for what is now our greatest national playground—175,000,000 acres of national forests, to which must be added, of course, the 25,000,000 acres of national parks, in which fishing is permitted but not hunting. Those facilities for outdoor recreation are not duplicated in any nation in the world. In fact we were the first nation in the world to establish a national park, although most nations have since followed our example.

Here is what one of our soldiers wrote to his friend at home:

When I come back this time I hope I shall find America to be still the America of my boyhood dreams, a nation where a man of reasonable intelligence, energy, and integrity can achieve a happy life. Loving the outdoors, I should hate to find that our conservation program had been junked—not only because we should conserve the resources which have made America great, but also because I want again to fish clear streams and tramp through unspoiled fields and forests with a dog and a gun. I want—

Said the soldier—

to come back to the America I have always known—an America of freedom, of opportunity, and of happy living. It seems to me that these are perilous times, not only because we must prepare to defend ourselves against external aggressors, but also because we may forget to keep America whole. Clean waters, green fields and forests, fertile soils, an abundance of wild things, and freedom to use and enjoy these resources properly—these I hope Americans will always have.

Our best hope of contributing to the establishment of democracy abroad is to make sure of preserving it at home. As I have already indicated, we can draw on our resources—our fisheries, our furs, our game animals, as a contribution to the war effort, although from now until the end of the war hunting will be greatly curtailed because our supply of shells is almost exhausted, and there will be no more for civilian use until the war is over. Ten million or more fine boys are coming home when the war is over. It is not enough to have a parade down Fifth Avenue for them, or a band concert in their home town, and then forget them for the duration of the peace. We must think about jobs for them when they get back and have clean and wholesome recreation for them. Based upon my own experience as well as observations in the last war, there is going to be some discontent among those veterans of World War No. 2 when they get home. We must make it possible for them to realize the meaning of the New England poet, who, speaking of those who commune with Nature, said:

And she glides into your darker musings,
With a mild and healing sympathy,
That steals away their sharpness ere you are aware.

For those who, like myself, love the mountains best, I want them to come back to green mountains and well-stocked streams, and not to burned-over, barren wastes. For those who love the wide open spaces, I want them to be able to say with the cowboy:

Oh, Lord, I've never lived where churches grow.
I love creation better as it stood
That day You finished it so long ago
And looked upon Your work and called it good.
I know that others find You in the light
That's sifted down through tinted window panes,
And yet I seem to feel You near tonight
In this dim, quiet starlight on the plains.

I thank You, Lord, that I am placed so well,
That You have made my freedom so complete;
That I'm no slave of whistle, clock, or bell,
Nor weak-eyed prisoner of wall and street.
Just let me live my life as I've begun
And give me work that's open to the sky;
Make me a pardner of the wind and sun,
And I won't ask a life that's soft or high.

Let me be easy on the man that's down;
Let me be square and generous with all.
I'm careless sometimes, Lord, when I'm in town,
But never let 'em say I'm mean or small!
Make me as big and open as the plains,
As honest as the hawse between my knees,
Clean as the wind that blows behind the rains,
Free as the hawk that circles down the breeze!

Forgive me, Lord, if sometimes I forget.
You know about the reasons that are hid.
You understand the things that gall and fret:
You know me better than my mother did.

Just keep an eye on all that's done and said,
And right me, sometimes, when I turn aside,
And guide me on the long, dim trail ahead
That stretches upward toward the Great Divide.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the resolution before us extends the life of the committee, headed by Mr. RAMSPECK, to investigate the personnel requirements of the various departments and agencies of the Government to ascertain if there are more persons on the civil pay rolls of the Government than are necessary. This is an important resolution and it extends the life of a very important committee.

The charge has been made time and again on the floor of the House and Senate, by investigating committees of the House and Senate, and by the press, that the departments and agencies of the Federal Government are greatly overmanned.

There was a general complaint at the close of the last war we had too many persons on the civil pay roll of the Government. There were about 900,000. Today we have close to 3,000,000, and the civil pay roll of the Government is growing by leaps and bounds.

Senator BYRD, of Virginia has, from time to time, stated our civil pay roll was overmanned by at least one third. Hon. Paul V. McNutt, head of the Manpower Commission of the Nation, according to press reports, charged the Federal Government was the worst manpower hoarder of the Nation.

We see this excess of manpower on the civil pay roll of the Government everywhere. I was recently talking to a farmer and dairyman of Kentucky who informed me that some time ago 16 Government employees came to his place in automobiles merely to take the serial numbers of his tires. While he

had several trucks that were used on his farm and in the operation of his dairy, he stated that one person could have done the work in the same time the 16 were engaged. Their sole and only job was to take the serial numbers on these tires, and he was surprised when 6 of the men returned the following day in an automobile and stated they had made a mistake.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And where were the 10?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Our Saviour asked where were the 9, and the gentleman from Michigan wants to know where were the 10. Perhaps the 10 were waiting until the 6 returned from the second trip.

This citizen being a taxpayer, farmer, and businessman, was astonished that these automobiles, this gasoline, and this excess of manpower should be employed to do this little simple job, at the same time this farmer and dairyman was greatly in need of workers for his farm and dairy.

Not long ago I had occasion to observe something about a unit or division of one of the Government departments. I was informed by more than one of the persons in that division or unit they had no work on many days and it was greatly overmanned.

I am sure you, like myself, have visited many of the departments and agencies of the Government and have observed this excess of persons on the civil pay roll of the Government. This condition must be corrected. The shortage of manpower is one of the very serious problems confronting the Nation. Small and large business and the farms of the Nation find the production in their business and on their farms greatly handicapped by reason of the shortage of men. Young men and married men, even with wives and children, have been taken from mines, factories, shops, mills, and from off the farms for our armed forces, and at the same time we have at least a million unnecessary persons on the civil pay roll of the Government. Tens of thousands of these are ablebodied single young men who have been favored and kept out of the armed forces under the pretext they are needed to carry on the civil activities of the Government.

This is a gross imposition on the taxpayers of the Nation. This excess of manpower on the civil pay roll should be required to enter the armed service or aid in carrying on our war-production effort in industry or on the farms.

So our friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], who has shown a great interest in the civil employees of the Government, and his committee, have a real job to do. I am hopeful he and the other members of this committee will take off their gloves and do a real job and give some relief to the taxpayers and release these unnecessary persons from the Government pay roll, so that they may go out and perform essential services in business, on the farms and in the factories, where their services are so greatly needed at this time, and that this Government will cease to be the chief manpower hoarder of the Nation.

This is, I wish to repeat, an important resolution, and this committee can, and I am sure will, render a great service to our country by thoroughly investigating every branch and agency of this Government.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I raised the question before when the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] was yielded time, because it was my desire that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] follow the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] desired to speak in order. Otherwise I would not have raised that question. However, I am pleased now to yield all the time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] that he desires on the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] saw fit to criticize the method by which the resolution was put through to continue the wildlife investigation. As I put the resolution through, I desire to make the following statement with respect to the matter: This committee has been in existence for about 8 years. It has become a matter of course to continue that committee. There was no objection to it in the Rules Committee, and no objection in the House. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] knows that under the rules of the House, if he had desired to make a speech upon the subject, he was entitled to 30 minutes, which would have been yielded to him, and had he been present on the floor listening when the resolution was called up he would have had the opportunity to make that speech. He has made several speeches this morning, and I did not know that he had any other subjects that had not been explored. I take the floor only because the discussion might have left the impression that my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and I were at variance as to the method that I have used, and that I had kept my colleague from making a speech. I consulted my colleague from Virginia before I called up the resolution, and he agreed with me—and I think the House will probably agree with me—that it is sometimes a good idea to expedite the business of the House, when there is no objection. Neither my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] nor myself is accustomed to taking the time of the House for the mere purpose of hearing our own voices resound in the Chamber.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I had no desire to cast any reflections upon the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I was present and heard the motion, but almost immediately the gavel fell and the resolution was agreed to. There were two members of the minority, members of that committee, who would like to have been heard. One of them was the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], and the other the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]. Both are members of the select committee. I still maintain it is advisable when resolutions come before the House to have them discussed, and the facts presented, particularly on a subject of that kind, which is entirely new to the new Members of the House, and there are some 69 of them. I certainly did not mean any reflection on the gentleman from Virginia. If there was any mistake it was mine. I was here on the floor and could have protested, but as soon as the gentleman had made the motion the Speaker banged the gavel and the resolution was through. I assume if anybody was at fault it was myself in not getting up and protesting at the time. However, it is the practice of the House for the Member in charge of a rule on the majority side to yield half of the time to the Member handling the rule for the minority which was not done. Personally I am opposed to any resolution creating a special committee going through the House without any discussion and explanation. I hope the gentleman from Virginia will not think that I was trying to criticize him personally because, as I have said, if anyone is to blame, it is myself. I want, however, to protect the right of the House and particularly of the two members on the special committee who desired to be heard. I hope in the future that the minority will be informed whenever the majority decides to give up its right or time to present legislation.

I tried my best to get the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] an opportunity to speak. He is the chairman of the committee and he wanted to be heard. We finally succeeded and he made a very fine speech and presented the facts to the House in an interesting and able manner and I am glad that he did.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. While I had some remarks on that resolution, in favor of it, I can assure the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Virginia that since the sentiment was so overwhelmingly for the continuation of the committee, I will let my remarks go until some other time.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Minnesota is very considerate.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is there remaining on this resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The gentleman from New York has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. FISH. I yield that time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, many of the Members of the House will recall that about a year ago at this time the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was studying the problem of defense housing for the employees in the city of Washington. I was a member of that committee and I realized that if we continued to bring these employees in by the thousands, no appropriation or appropriations would be sufficient to provide the housing needed for them. Therefore, and at that time, I offered a 10-point program to alleviate the necessity of never-ending appropriations of money and allocations of critical materials; also a resolution to investigate

the personnel situation in the departments of government in Washington.

One of those 10 points was to increase the efficiency of the personnel already in Washington. At that time I offered evidence of inefficiency. I had signed letters from Government employees who said that there were 60 in their department and that 6 could do all the work. I had signed letters from employees who said that their supervisors felt that the more people they could get to work under them the more important they were, and, therefore, the greater salary they could demand, and that they were instructed to read magazines and to write letters to friends on Government time; in other words, just appear busy.

I presented a great deal of evidence of that kind, but I did not get the committee established. I do hope that the present Civil Service Committee will make a thorough investigation and give us a good, thorough, honest, and sincere report.

Mr. FISH. No Member of Congress has done more to expose the deplorable conditions that have existed in Washington or tried harder to restore efficiency in the departments and bureaus of the Government that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON]. He deserves a great deal of credit and his efforts in behalf of Government efficiency and retrenchment are highly commendable.

Mr. WILSON. Since I made my charges, a United States Senator, Dorothy Thompson, and another columnist, Mr. Kent, have substantiated charges that I made. I would like for the Government, in addition to the rationing program it is subjecting everybody to all over the country, to ration a little red tape in Washington. They might ration personnel. They might ration the wasting of time. They might ration a few of the cocktail parties which would make toward greater efficiency in the employed personnel in Washington, and thereby alleviate the necessity of using much-needed materials to build houses, sewers, and other utilities that will have to be used to take care of the ever-increasing stream of Government employees coming to Washington.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] does not need any defense, because if there is one man in this House who does not take the time of the House unnecessarily, it is the gentleman from Virginia. I know he would be the last one to deprive the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] or any other Member from being heard on any pending resolution. Unfortunately, as the gentleman from New York stated later on, the gentleman from New York did not hear the gentleman from Virginia originally, and therefore did not rise to ask for the time. Had he risen, I know the gentleman from Virginia would gladly have yielded to him the usual 30 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FISH. I would like to make it very clear to the gentleman from Illinois that I have no complaint except this: I think if you are going to put through a resolution without debate you should notify the ranking Member on this side, so he will be prepared, instead of just presenting it and having it passed, because then it is too late. There are those who want to be heard. In future if you are going to do that, I hope you will notify us on this side. It is difficult to protect your rights once the gavel goes down.

Mr. SABATH. I did not present the resolution. I think instead of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] being criticized for not giving ample time, perhaps the gentleman from New York and I might be criticized for taking up too much time. But my aim has been to give the House as much information as I am capable of at all times, and surely I never desire to deprive any man of having an opportunity to speak on any question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a list of questions and answers concerning the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces, prepared by Mr. Helvering, officially.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee of Rules, I call up House Joint Resolution 52.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective from January 3, 1943, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed to continue the study, inquiry, and investigation begun under the authority of House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purpose shall have the same powers and duties as those conferred upon it by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. The committee shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of its studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. I should like to inquire whether the gentleman has any requests for time.

Mr. FISH. Yes; I have.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman use his time?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, delighted to see the House belatedly regaining some of its functions. The country is fed up on expensive bureaucratic government. We pass laws generic in character and turn the administration of them over to the departments and then begins the debacle. Without the passage of such resolutions as have been put through here today and this pending resolution it is impossible to lift the curtain and see what is behind.

When the Maritime Act of 1936, under which we are now operating, was before the House, we tried to write into that statute provisions that would prevent the Treasury from being looted as it was in the old Shipping Board days. We tried to write a law that would give an effective auxiliary to the Navy in time of war and would carry our commerce under our flag to all parts of the world. It was our definite purpose, our vigorous purpose, to prevent the shipbuilding "racket"—it cannot be characterized by any other term—from making a new killing and to provide a decent environment with proper food for the men who go down to the sea in ships, and incidentally to compel the operating companies, who are the most highly subsidized in the world, to operate their ships on a scale of efficiency and integrity. The war and our need for added tonnage has of course dislocated our plans to a considerable degree; but war is no excuse for waste or for raids on the Treasury. We do not abandon common honesty or take larceny out of the penal code when we go into war. That, strange to say, seems to be the impression of some of the bureaucrats who are running the Government.

I have always been a vigorous advocate and defender of the Maritime Commission. As at present constituted I felt they were doing a good job and should have the support of the country and the Congress. Several matters have intervened however to make me believe there is something "rotten in Denmark" and that the interests of the country and the Treasury are not being conserved at the present time by the Maritime Commission.

My suspicions were first aroused by the ruthless and unwarranted cancelation of the Higgins contract. This made me believe—I may be of a suspicious nature—but it made me believe that the old ruthless parasites had come to life again and were going to have a dominant influence in the affairs of the Commission. I do not believe the cancelation of that contract was proper; I think it was ruthless, that the procedure was unsound; and in saying this may I say also that I disagree with some of the members of my own committee.

Fast on the heels of that came the report of the Comptroller in the Waterman case, reported in Document 840, House of Representatives, Seventy-seventh Congress. The Waterman Company purchased five vessels from the

Commission's laid-up fleet for the sum of $596,000 with an option to the Commission to repurchase these boats at the same price plus what the company in the meantime had disbursed for betterments. Instead of doing this and repossessing these vessels when the Commission apparently needed vessels, repossessing them at approximately $800,000 which included the repairs and betterments, the Commission paid to the Waterman Co. $3,374,000 for five other and older vessels. This report of the Comptroller is devastating in character and is to my mind not susceptible of justification. The Maritime Commission obviously in this case wasted and made the Waterman Co. a Christmas gift of $2,500,000. I want to say here and now that these facts did not come out until a report came from the Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren, formerly a Member of this House. I do not believe there was an abler Member of Congress who served during my 14 years here than Lindsay Warren. He is full of integrity, justice, and fair dealing; and his exposure of this case is contained in a document which every Member of Congress should read.

My attention has also been called to the fact that this same company, operating a number of ships through the Red Sea on voyages between October 1941 and June 1942, made profits amounting to some $3,342,000. These were single trips, and the net book value of these boats whose earnings on single trips was in excess of $3,000,000 was $800,000. This procedure, to my mind, smells to heaven, and every phase of it should be ruthlessly investigated and exposed.

I append hereto a list of voyages:

*Waterman's Red Sea earnings*

| Vessel | Built | Net book value (Dec. 31, 1941) | Deadweight tons | Profits per trip |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Antinous | 1920 | $52,272.66 | 9,648 | $512,384.44 |
| Bienville | 1920 | 16,581.95 | 8,760 | 313,765.69 |
| Iberville | 1919 | 58,028.10 | 8,940 | 268,908.81 |
| Pan Kraft | 1919 | (1) | 8,614 | 326,736.86 |
| Ipswich | 1919 | 30,847.88 | 8,890 | 222,442.04 |
| Lafayette | 1919 | 76,346.06 | 10,405 | 261,521.95 |
| Beauregard | 1920 | 170,108.87 | 8,804 | 184,983.27 |
| Gateway City | 1920 | 24,952.03 | 8,804 | 162,987.08 |
| LaSalle | 1920 | 147,586.96 | 8,837 | 140,289.80 |
| Andrew Jackson | 1920 | 158,493.01 | 8,804 | 274,815.37 |
| West Kyska | 1918 | 8,139.00 | 8,480 | 325,165.80 |
| Jean Lafitte | 1919 | 43,039.22 | 8,750 | 348,667.89 |
| | | 786,422.74 | 107,736 | 3,342,669.00 |

[1] Under charter from Pan-Atlantic Corporation.

Voyages began May to October 1941.
Voyages ended December to June 1942.
$3,342,669 divided by 107736=$31.02 deadweight ton earnings.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other reports of the Comptroller General of like tenor, exclusive of the disgraceful administration of the South Portland yard, which has already been condemned by this committee.

It might be well to say just a word about that. This yard has been conducted with actual larceny and is a clear violation of decent administration. The total investment of the company in this yard was $250,000. The cost and expenses of every character, including the salaries of the officers, are reimbursed to it by the Maritime Commission. To date this outfit has had a net income of 200 percent and it has contracts to build 84 ships. It now stands to earn 2,000 percent on its investment while it incurs no risk.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I would like to ask the gentleman why his committee has not proceeded along the same lines as the Military and the Naval Affairs Committees and compelled the Maritime Commission to renegotiate these contracts where the profits have been exorbitant, and return the money to the Treasury?

Mr. CULKIN. I do not think we are so expert a collection agency as the Naval and Military Committees of the House. What we did on that, I may say to the gentleman, was to recommend immediate cancelation of the contracts. There was recovered and given back approximately $50,000, but the end is not yet.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes. I would like to follow that up, because these two committees have saved over a billion dollars apiece. The gentleman has stated to the House that in this one contract they had a profit of 2,000 percent. I presume your committee proposes to do this, but why should not the committee do exactly the same thing with all these contracts of the Maritime Commission—have them renegotiated and the money refunded to the Treasury and of course to the Government?

Mr. CULKIN. I think we have unanimity of opinion on that matter, including the views of the chairman of the committee, the very able and diligent gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] who unfortunately is ill. Mr. BLAND is the soul of honor and believes that the contract should be canceled. Part of the vice of the thing is that although that was recommended some time ago there has been no cancelation.

Mr. FISH. I understand that.

Mr. CULKIN. There is just one item to which I wish to refer, and I do not intend to be partisan. I understand former Governor Brann and Mrs. Herrick, formerly of the C. I. O. in New York, are their labor relations counsel and they both pull down about $10,000 a year apiece. I cannot charge that to the Republican side, and I do not make any charges against the Democratic side, but certainly it is considerable to give those two people $20,000 out of this contract. I do not think it is justified.

Mr. FISH. In extending powers to the Merchant Marine Committee to make this investigation, I am merely suggesting that I hope it will follow the footsteps of these other committees and get back these exorbitant profits in order to save the people's money.

Mr. CULKIN. I was a prosecutor for 10 years and my belief in those matters is that the best way to cure this public thievery is to put somebody in jail. That is the way to do it. Invoke the criminal law and put these criminals and wrongdoers behind the bars for a long time. That is my theory. Then we can recover back, if you please, in a civil action these felonious misappropriations.

Mr. FISH. Your committee does propose to renegotiate these contracts?

Mr. CULKIN. You can rely on full diligence being exercised in all these matters.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. May I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries on November 24 last unanimously recommended cancelation of the South Portland shipyard contract, but to date the Maritime Commission has not acted.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. In the absence of the chairman of that committee, who asked me to watch this resolution, may I ask: Is it true that a committee of another body took a little different view about the contract of the South Portland Shipbuilding Co. and that may have something to do with the reluctance of the Maritime Commission to follow our recommendations?

Mr. CULKIN. That is something new to me, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Well, they did.

Mr. CULKIN. I did not know they had. I do not see how they could possibly do that.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I agree with the gentleman that the contract should be canceled and that the Maritime Commission is derelict in this instance in not canceling the contract.

Mr. CULKIN. It would seem after the action of the committee, which was taken some weeks ago, that the Maritime Commission should exercise due diligence on that, but nothing has been done. It would seem that some angel is holding her protecting wings over this felonious contract.

Another phase of the work of this committee has been the efforts of Mr. BOYKIN's subcommittee on the investigation of the steel shortage situation. That matter has far reaching ramifications and may well result in the development of steel furnaces in more than 20 States of the country where ample iron ore deposits are present.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to first congratulate the gentleman for making this statement. I have very carefully read all those reports to which the gentleman has referred and I have studied this question as best I could, not being a member of the committee. Is it not true that your committee is forced to go along under an entirely dissimilar law to the machinery which governs the letting of Army and Navy contracts?

Mr. CULKIN. Yes. These are all cost-plus contracts.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Under the Maritime Act of 1936 you are not in position to proceed as the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee can proceed at this time? I think the gentleman is 100 percent correct when he says that this is the time and the proper procedure to take is the institution of a criminal action against those people who were guilty, then follow along as quickly as possible with such corrective measures as you can put through.

Mr. CULKIN. This is slightly in the vernacular, but I think the time has come when the Congress should see that everybody stops wet nursing these crooks. That is my view.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, and this is more or less generic, I am going to emphasize that the time has passed when the people of the country will be content with the Congress turning its business in toto over to the bureaucrats. The people of the country are now holding the Congress responsible for maladministration. The investigation offered by this resolution will give this committee authority to delve more fully into these outrageous performances and apply correctives to the situation. I think the result will be that many millions of dollars will be turned back into the Treasury and the bureaucrats will be brought vigorously to book. I urge the passage of the resolution.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the resolution provide for this committee to have about the same powers that have already been conferred upon the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. CULKIN. Yes; just about the same general powers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the gentleman at liberty to say whether or not in his opinion, based upon the progress that has been made by the committee, these errors, as we will call them, which have been made have been sufficient to interfere with the building of the ships we need so badly today? In other words, can the Commission function efficiently toward getting out these ships when machinations of this nature are going on?

Mr. CULKIN. I think the progress has been slowed down somewhat but I do not think it has been slowed down seriously. Personally, I do not agree with the type of ship we are building. I think we ought to have a faster ship. Instead of these 10-knot ships, I think we ought to have had 16-knot ships from the beginning. The 10-knot ships are not going to be any good after the war. Any submarine can overtake them now. However, the yards are generally doing a good job, with Kaiser and Higgins more or less pioneering.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has made a very fine presentation to the House, but I wonder why the Maritime Commission, which has the responsibility and accountability, does not renegotiate these contracts. Why should the Army and Navy be forced to renegotiate contracts for airplane plants and armament plants and the Maritime Commission not renegotiate contracts for building ships, where profits range from 1,000 to 2,000 percent? In the first instance, the accountability and responsibility rests with the Maritime Commission and not with the Congress of the United States, which should not have to force the Commission to do it, as was done in the case of the Army and the Navy. If the Maritime Commission refuses to do it, then the Congress should do it, and the Committee on Merchant Marine should force the Maritime Commission to proceed at once to recover on contracts where the profits have been excessive. War profiteering smells just as bad under the Maritime Commission as it does by the War or Navy Departments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this has been called a war of production, and such it is. I have never doubted the ultimate outcome, because I know that the productivity of men enslaved to a state can never equal the productivity of freemen. Given the tools, our courageous men in the armed forces will do the job.

Many illustrations of our tremendous accomplishments on the home front under our time-honored system of free enterprise can be cited. They should be cited because, considered together, they put to shame those who say that our system is inefficient and cannot compete with foreign totalitarian systems. I want to talk about one great accomplishment.

We have in the Great Lakes the greatest natural inland watercourse in the world. Over their broad surfaces move tremendous quantities of freight, mostly in the holds of bulk carriers. I first became fully aware of the magnitude of this operation as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when, in 1940, we were amending the Interstate Commerce Act. At that time, it was determined that this movement of freight in bulk on the Great Lakes was not competitive with other types of transportation and that regulation thereof was not in the public interest. I shared that view. Final action on the bill left unregulated those lake carriers whose exclusive business is the movement in bulk of raw materials so highly indispensable in the war effort, namely, iron ore, limestone, coal, and grain, to mention only the more important.

As a Representative from a Great Lakes State, I want to say for the record that the accomplishment of the Great Lakes fleet, first, in its contribution to the defense program, and, latterly, to the war effort, fully justifies the confidence and vindicates the judgment of the Congress. I will shortly relate the tonnages for 1940, 1941, and 1942, but I wish to preface those figures with a brief description of the extent to which war industries are dependent on this fleet.

These Great Lakes ships are the link connecting the great iron ore deposits of the Lake Superior region with about 95 percent of the Nation's iron- and steel-making capacity. Huge quantities of limestone and coal are also transported by the fleet for the steel industry. Producers of chemicals, utilities, railroads, and others are benefited by the efficiency with which the ships handle vast quantities of raw materials. The farm lands of the Northwest are also linked to the eastern mills and Atlantic seaports by the fleet. All industry in the Great Lakes Basin, the heart of industrial America, is directly served by this tremendously efficient mode of transportation. Its importance is illuminated by the fact that it is not an alternative to other routes or forms of transport. On the contrary, Great Lakes ships are the only means by which iron ore in sufficient quantity may be supplied to the steel mills in the Chicago, Cleveland, Youngstown, Pittsburgh, and other areas.

The tonnage of these last three seasons of navigation on the Great Lakes are successively records of performance. Prior to 1940 the record for iron ore transported in one season was 65,204,600 gross tons, and for all bulk commodities 138,574,441 net tons. Interestingly, this former iron-ore record was established in 1917. In 1940, 63,712,982 gross tons of iron ore and a total of 142,878,985 net tons for all bulk commodities were transported; in 1941, 80,116,360 gross tons of iron ore and a total of 169,020,975 net tons for all bulk commodities; in 1942, 92,076,781 gross tons of iron ore and a total of 178,577,828 net tons for all bulk commodities.

Iron ore, limestone, and coal are transported on the Great Lakes in some 345 United States and 57 Canadian ships specially designed and constructed for the handling of those commodities in bulk. While the average ship has a carrying capacity of about 9,000 tons, there are many cargoes of as much as 15,000 tons moved between the upper and lower lake ports. In a large measure, the efficiency of the fleet is explained by the rapidity with which those huge cargoes are loaded and unloaded. A cargo of iron ore is loaded at an upper lake port in about 3 hours and unloaded about 3 days later in a lower lake port in about 4 hours. The time of ships in port is constantly being reduced with accompanying increase in dispatch and operation. During the 1942 season of navigation great quantities of war materials literally flowed in these ships from the natural deposits to the consuming industries. The splendid achievement of the Great Lakes fleet in 1942 has been appropriately recognized by Chairman Nelson of the War Production Board and Director Eastman of the Office of Defense Transportation. This achievement is only one manifestation of the many accomplishments of free enterprise which is making it possible for the people of this Nation to prosecute total war.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. I congratulate the gentleman on his very able tribute to water transportation.

May I have the gentleman's reactions to this question: There is some suggestion now that the diversion at Chicago will be increased, which will lower the waters in the channel and make less the carrying capacity of these ships the gentleman has so ably described. The ships will then carry less tonnage. Does the gentleman think it is timely to do that now when these materials are needed in the war effort?

Mr. HALLECK. As the gentleman knows, the question of diversion has raged for quite some time, and I certainly do not claim to be an expert on that. When this season was opening the lake carriers were asked what they could bring down in the way of iron ore, and were asked to step up tonnage to almost unbelievable figures, because, except as the iron ore is brought down in these lake ships in ever-increasing amount the steel that is so badly needed in the war effort cannot be produced. I would say without hesitation that the maximum transportation of iron ore to the consuming steel mills must be maintained. And at least until the crisis is over and the war is won, anything that would be calculated to interfere with the efficiency and the absolute maximum of transportation by the Great Lakes vessels should be scrutinized with extreme care.

Mr. CULKIN. I thank the gentleman. May I ask him this further question. These vessels carry that ore on the lakes at a cost of about a mill per ton-mile, probably the lowest cost transportation in the history of the world. Does the gentleman believe that that could be benefited by regulation?

Mr. HALLECK. When the gentleman reads my speech in the RECORD tomorrow, he will find that I have something to say about the fact that the bulk movements on the Great Lakes are not competitive with any other system of transportation. They are not competitive because the charge per ton is so low, as the gentleman has pointed out.

Mr. CULKIN. There was a provision in the 1940 Transportation Act that would have made them subject to regulation, but that provision did not go through.

Mr. HALLECK. As the act was originally introduced, that is true. But the committee and the Congress properly eliminated that provision.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Is it not the opinion of the gentleman, insofar as the diversion at Chicago is concerned, that Congress will never grant a diversion that would injure the traffic on the Great Lakes? Does not the gentleman have confidence that the Congress will never do that?

Mr. HALLECK. I am not an expert on diversion, I may say to my very able friend from Texas. But I certainly do have confidence in the Congress and in its fairness in dealing with any problem of that nature.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot resist the temptation to compliment the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] who just preceded me. He is an able and painstaking and studious member of the Committee on Rules. I think he has not in any way overestimated the need for water transportation, and although he has paid great tribute to the lake carriers, and the advantages that accrue to our country due to the Great Lakes and their uses in transportation, and the advantages that flow therefrom to that section of the country, yet he has omitted to state anything about the water transportation in which I know that he, as well as myself and many others in the Middle West, are greatly interested. We people in the frequently criticized city of Chicago, unfairly and unjustly criticized, without warrant, having a splendid administration and a mighty fine city, have expended over $200,000,000, which now seems a small sum when we think of the billions that we have been spending but an amount that years ago was a considerable sum, and that was expended to provide a deep waterway from the Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. Every sane and sensible gentleman who is interested in cheap transportation, water transportation, must recognize that that was a great expenditure for one city to make, to bring about a closer cooperation and a shorter and better and cheaper haul between the Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico. Unfortunately, due to objections of our neighbors to the north and the west we have been deprived of the proper flow of water that would make that deep waterway as efficient as it should be.

I have endeavored to obtain an additional flow of water from the Great Lakes so as to make the Illinois River and its tributaries navigable for even larger boats than now ply those waters. Unfortunately the question has been raised, and it is entertained by some, that because of the additional amount of water that might be taken from the Great Lakes, it would lower the lake levels and may interfere with lake navigation, but the facts are that, notwithstanding that a certain amount of water has been taken from the Great Lakes, the lake levels are higher today than they have been in the history of the country, or at least for over 60 years, as the record will show. So that the objections raised by the neighbors of Illinois, namely, those of Michigan and Wisconsin and some other gentlemen, will not hold, and they should be reconsidered and our efforts consummated to make Chicago's $200,000,000 contribution for this waterway a fact, because it will be of vast benefit to commerce not only in Chicago, but to the entire Middle West. I hope that instead of objecting in the future, these gentlemen will cooperate with us and help us secure an additional flow of water, making that great waterway for the future and for the country's needs.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, while I am in accord with many of the things that my friend from Illinois does and advocates, yet I have to differ with him on this matter. The matter to which he referred has been really settled by a decision of the Supreme Court, and the Court has refused on at least four different occasions to reopen the case.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, I know that the Supreme Court——

Mr. CULKIN. Of course, I mean the old Supreme Court.

Mr. SABATH. I know that if the Supreme Court had the information that we have, and if it had used judgment that should have been used, I know it would reverse that decision, and that the original opinion of the former Secretary of War, and later President of the United States, Mr. Taft, would be followed, because in the first instance he allowed 10,000 cubic feet per second of water to be withdrawn. However, I am not asking that. We will be satisfied with 5,000 cubic feet and that will solve the situation without any injury to New York or any other State, because I assure the gentleman that I have had surveys made showing positively that the lake levels are higher today than they have been, as I say, in the past 60 years.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, while the previous resolution was under consideration, some of my colleagues were kind enough to express confidence in my ability to carry on that investigation in the committee of which I have the privilege of being chairman. I wish to thank them for that and I assure them that we will make every effort to do a constructive job.

I appear now on this resolution in behalf of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], who unfortunately is ill and who has designated me as acting chairman in his absence.

I think the committee has done a good job so far. I know that the chairman of the committee has plans for the continued investigation of the South Portland situation and the Waterman case and the Tampa shipbuilding case, as well as all other matters connected with our shipbuilding program.

In order to keep the record straight, since the name of former Governor Brann and Mrs. Herrick have been brought into this discussion in connection with the South Portland case, we might well realize that a member of another body, of a different political faith from mine, serving on an investigating committee in that body, has taken a somewhat different view of the South Portland case. I mentioned that fact a while ago because I did not think it ought to be a political matter, but I do think that the Maritime Commission ought to cancel that contract.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice the gentleman stated that the name of former Governor Brann had been brought into the discussion. I was not present when that occurred. Would the gentleman enlighten me as to the manner in which that distinguished gentleman's name was brought into the discussion?

Mr. RAMSPECK. In a colloquy between the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] and some other Member on that side, the gentleman from New York made the statement that former Governor Brann had been employed by the South Portland Shipbuilding Co., and also Mrs. Herrick. He did not know whether that had anything to do with the failure of the Maritime Commission to cancel the contract or not, but the inference was that it might have had.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. I also said they were each getting the same amount as a Congressman's salary; that is, $10,000 a year.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from New York does not intend to say anything derogatory of Governor Brann, does he?

Mr. CULKIN. I think he is a most delightful gentleman. I do not know what his necessities are.

Mr. McCORMACK. And a very honorable gentleman.

Mr. CULKIN. Very charming.

Mr. McCORMACK. And very honorable, too.

Mr. CULKIN. Well, I would not indict him. I have seen him. I think he is a sincere and able gentleman. I will put it that way.

Mr. McCORMACK. A sincere and able gentleman covers everything. He is very nice and honorable.

Mr. CULKIN. And I know nothing about his necessities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Georgia 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thought that matter ought to be cleared up for the information of the House. I do say that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] is one of the most conscientious and able chairmen that we have in the Congress. I think it can be said in all fairness that in part, at least, the reason he is in the hospital today is because of overwork in undertaking to investigate this situation. But it must be remembered that the Maritime Commission is the one agency of the Government that met its quota last year. We have built more tonnage and shipping under that agency than any other country ever constructed in the same time in the history of the world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, 4 minutes, to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Civil Service Committee can render valuable service to the Government and to the country if it will really get down to business and make an investigation and study of the problem of Government employment. This matter of Government employment has become not only important but a gigantic problem.

At the close of World War No. 1 civil employment in Government reached a high of 917,000 employees. In the following years it dropped to 500,000. Then in the 1930's, bureaus and agencies multiplied and expanded so that by 1940, and before war preparations were under way, that number had increased to almost a million and a quarter Federal employees. Thousands were appointed without qualifying examinations, but were politically appointed. Thousands of these people were engaged in all kinds of new activities.

Mr. Speaker, the number of Federal employees now is about 3,000,000 and there are about 300,000 in and near the District of Columbia. Of course, we realize that it has been necessary to have great increases because of the tremendous job of prosecuting the war effort. There is also, however, the immediate responsibility of reducing and cutting to the core all agencies and activities that may have value in peacetime but not necessary now in the war effort.

As I have pointed out, we must have necessary men and women to carry on the war effort, but just because they can be secured, is no reason why we should employ more than are required to do the work. Our employees should be paid reasonable compensation for their services, and they likewise should be glad to serve accordingly, even if they are required to work a little more than during peacetime.

Mr. Speaker, let me say I believe the great majority of Government workers are conscientious and want to do a good job. They are willing to do their part. But, Mr. Speaker, the Government service is no place for loafers, idlers, and incompetents.

No one should be kept on the pay roll unless there is an important job for him. All duplication of effort should be cut out. Activities should be consolidated wherever possible even if it means transfers, or temporary demotions. There should be no favoritism. Let efficiency and industry be the reason for advancement.

Mr. Speaker, I believe government could be reduced as much as 25 percent or 30 percent right here in Washington if the matter is properly handled and government activity were put on a business basis. At the same time we could do even a better job than we are doing right now. There is a lot of discussion about manpower these days. The administration could do well by streamlining its own activities, and use its extra manpower and womanpower for more essential work.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished and able Member from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman feel that the Civil Service Committee can conduct an impartial investigation in this matter? I of course have the highest regard for every individual on that committee, but there is a tendency in all of us to become advocates of the subject matter coming within the jurisdiction of our committees. The impression is given that when your Committee on the Civil Service brings a measure in for consideration that you are acting for some group of Government employees. Is there not a tendency for your committee to become an employee's committee or agent?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I see no reason why the Committee on the Civil Service should not conduct a fair and impartial investigation; it certainly should be able to do it. It is not going to be a snooping committee or anything of that kind. I am sure it is going to go into this fairly and honestly and try if possible to see that we have more efficient service and less expense to the country. It is a tremendous problem. I believe the very fact that the committee is in existence will do a great deal.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of a merit system, but I am not inclined to agree that everything that has been promulgated either by the Civil Service Committee of this House or by the Civil Service Commission has anything to do with the merit system. Too often it is to take care of the boys that are "in" who neither obtained or hold their jobs upon merit.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from Nebraska well knows my position on this matter. I have always been for a competitive merit system in Government. I have opposed the principle of blanketing in of employees without competitive examination, although a lot of it was done in the last few years.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is in line with the previous resolution passed here for investigation today, one by the Military Affairs and Naval Affairs Committees and this one by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I hope the wrong impression has not gone out to the country about this matter. It is true that these committees have done splendid work, and I would not detract for one moment from the accomplishments of the Naval and Military Affairs Committees. I think this committee we are now considering should be continued without one dissenting vote. On the other hand, however, these investigations do not mean that these departments are not trying to look after this matter themselves. As Under Secretary of War Patterson said yesterday, the War Department is glad to have the cooperation of the committees, but they are trying to do everything they can at the same time along the same line. These committees are to be congratulated, but I do not think the impression should go out to the country that the War Department and the other departments connected with it are merely sitting up there and letting everybody get away with anything they desire. These committees are doing a fine thing. The people look to Congress to see that this waste and extravagance does not

continue; but at the same time let us give credit where credit is due.

Something has been said about the Maritime Commission and about Admiral Land. I know of no man in public life today whose record can more successfully bear the scrutiny of public investigation than Admiral Jerry Land. He has done a splendid job as head of the Maritime Commission.

In closing, I repeat that it is a splendid thing to have these committees, and, as I say, I hope there will not be a dissenting vote on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AIR ACCIDENTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman does that will he yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Is the gentleman bringing in a resolution from the Rules Committee to extend the life of the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents headed by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS]?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I ask the gentleman if he will not kindly defer that, because many Members are absent. I discussed the matter with the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]; he asked me to stay here and make this request, that it not be called up at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had no knowledge that this was coming up today. On yesterday I announced that four resolutions would come up for consideration today. On yesterday I tried to get unanimous consent to adjourn from today until Monday, but this was objected to. It was my understanding that this resolution would come up tomorrow, Friday. I have not conferred with my distinguished friend from Illinois. May I ask if there is not another rule about to be reported dealing with small business, a bill from the Patman committee?

Mr. SABATH. The Committee on Rules reported that out this morning, but it will not be called up today.

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman from Illinois insists on calling up this resolution to extend the Select Committee on Air Accidents today, I shall have to object.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will not have to object; I will assume that responsibility myself.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. Does the gentleman from New York intend to oppose this resolution?

Mr. FISH. No; the gentleman from New York is in favor of the resolution, but most of the Members have left thinking no other resolution was to be called up today. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, has left, under the impression that it would not come up. Under these circumstances, I prefer that the gentleman's request go over.

Mr. NICHOLS. Of course, the gentleman understands what this is. It is simply a continuation of this committee until March 1 so that we can wind up and quit. We are trying to quit.

Mr. FISH. Some Members on this side, like myself, are in favor of it, but want it understood that extending this committee's life will not interfere with the creation of a permanent committee.

Mr. NICHOLS. We can give that assurance.

Mr. FISH. I am sure the gentleman will give that assurance. Nevertheless, Members have left the House and I do not want to be put in the position of objecting.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will not be put in that position.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the majority leader and the statement of the gentleman from New York that he is speaking for the minority leader, I would be the last man in the world to urge consideration of the resolution today, notwithstanding that I feel there should not be any opposition to it. Consequently, I withdraw the resolution for the present.

THE LATE CHARLES KRAMER

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a strange coincidence, in fact a regrettable one, that the occasion of my first speech in the Halls of this Congress should be to make the sad announcement of the death of my predecessor, Mr. Charles Kramer. However, it is an exemplification of the true spirit of this body that as a former political opponent I am given the honor of being able to be the first man on this floor to pay homage to Mr. Kramer.

Mr. Kramer passed away yesterday in the city of Los Angeles. While I did not have the privilege of personally knowing Mr. Kramer, after we have passed to the Great Beyond we are remembered by that which we have contributed for the welfare of our fellow man and our Nation. Mr. Kramer has served his district and the Nation in the Halls of Congress for the past 10 years. The fact he has heretofore been nominated on both minority and majority tickets in the primaries is tribute of the fact he has well served.

The true fighting spirit of Mr. Kramer was shown to me today when I was in the office of our esteemed Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN] and I heard another gentleman state to his secretary that he had just received a letter from Mr. Kramer. I interjected and stated that I had just received notice of his death. This gentleman was astounded because in Mr. Kramer's letter he had left the impression that everything was well. Surely this was a true American.

I join with the other Members of the California delegation in paying tribute to a former Member, your friend and my friend, Mr. Kramer.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep feeling of regret that I learned last night of the sad news of the passing of our former colleague, Mr. Kramer. He had the privilege of serving in this body for the past 10 years, and it was my good fortune to have known and served with him here during 8 of those 10 years.

Mr. Kramer was always interested, and aggressively interested, in the welfare of the people of his district and in their problems. He served them faithfully, assiduously, and vigorously. He had an assignment upon the Committee on Immigration while he was here, and at all times he was very anxious to do what he could to show his sympathy for the problems of the newcomers to our shores, but he was also ever watchful that the security of our Constitution was always maintained and was ever vigilant to preserve the Nation he loved so well from the infiltration of any undesirable elements.

As chairman of the Committee on Patents, Mr. Kramer brought into play his vast legal experience and was instrumental in having enacted much legislation providing for the betterment of our patent laws. Through his efforts, many changes were accomplished in patent legislation which have very materially aided our war activities and brought about a simplification in the utilization of patents in our war industries.

Before coming to California, Congressman Kramer, a native of the State of Kentucky, was educated in the schools of Chicago and attended De Paul University and the Illinois College of Law. He engaged in the practice of law in the city of Chicago from 1904 until the time of his removal to California in 1917. During this period he acquired the esteem and respect of the members of the Illinois bar, where he served with ability and distinction. Thereafter he continued to enjoy in California the same honored recognition during the years it was our privilege to know him there. In addition to his legal activities, he was also engaged in various financial and manufacturing enterprises.

Upon his election to Congress in November of 1932, Congressman Kramer brought to Washington a wide field of experience and knowledge which proved of inestimable value in his work here. Particularly of value was his wide legal experience, which proved most helpful to him in the investigatory work of the special committee assignment which was accorded to him during his first term of office as a Member of Congress. His spirit of patriotism and his love of country was exemplified when he became a member of the Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities some years ago, headed by our distinguished majority leader, Hon. JOHN McCORMACK. Mr. Kramer was very active on this committee. He worked hard and long because he felt that it was most important that we preserve this Government and

preserve the Constitution under which this Government functions. Mr. Kramer likewise carried that message out to the people of his district. In his own unassuming way he did his utmost to see to it that the young school children of his district were instilled with a genuine love of country and a true spirit of patriotism. In his quiet way he encouraged that. On many occasions he presented flags to the schools and to the school children of his district in order that they might constantly have that symbol of this Nation before them, and learn to love and respect both flag and country.

I know his passing is a real loss to this body. He spent 10 years here and he was always vigorous and aggressive. Nothing pained him more than to realize during his last months that he was not able to give of his time and of himself to carry out the duties to which he had been assigned. We mourn with his wife and children his passing, and we pray God that he may have the reward of eternal rest and peace to which he is so justly entitled.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I know that every Member who served with our late friend, Charlie Kramer, felt grieved on hearing of his death yesterday.

The gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] referred to his service on a special committee to investigate un-American activities of several years ago, a committee of which I happened to be the chairman. I can give testimony to the strength of what the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] has said.

We were given $30,000 to make the investigation we did make. It was only as a result of sacrifice on the part of every member of that committee that the special committee was able to accomplish within the limited amount appropriated the great results that flowed from our investigation. Out of that investigation came the law compelling persons directly or indirectly engaged by any foreign government or agency of any kind for propaganda purposes in the United States to register. Under that law many indictments and convictions have been obtained of persons who have engaged in activities subversive to our country.

Out of that committee came the bill, later enacted into law, making it a crime for anyone to "knowingly or wilfully advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence." Prior to the passage of that provision of law the only legislation upon the books to meet subversive activities was the conspiracy statute, applying where two or more persons conspired to overthrow the Government. That meant that it was necessary to prove, first, conspiracy and, second, an overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy, and it was practically impossible to do that. For all practical purposes the Conspiracy Act was a dead-letter law.

Other legislation, extending the power of the War Department and the Navy Department to meet the distribution of subversive literature, and of subversive activities in camps and on board ships, was enacted into law, all recommendations of the committee.

Our late friend from California played a very important part in the success of that committee, which I think has made a marked contribution by way of legislation to combatting the subversive elements that exist in our country.

As we all know, he was a very lovable character, a man with whom it was easy to get along, always with a smile on his face, but a man who was devoted to his duty. The death of our late friend is a personal loss to me. I know that all of those who served with him and the new Members who did not know him join with me in expressing and extending to Mrs. Kramer our profound feeling of sympathy in her great loss and sorrow.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our former colleague, Mr. Kramer, is a shock to the Membership of this House. Charles Kramer was a distinguished member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. I had opportunity to observe his activities on that committee. He was diligent and industrious and ever watchful that the rights of American citizens were protected and preserved. Charles Kramer was a real American. The members of his family have our sincere sympathy.

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mixed in his that Nature might stand up
And say, This was a man.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of personal loss of a good friend that I learned of the passing of our recent colleague Charles Kramer. He came to this House 10 years ago. He liked men; he loved his friends. He soon made many of them here. It was a pleasure to him to be helpful to others. That was a part of the happiness of his life so commonly reflected in a smile that seldom failed him.

Mr. Kramer's health began declining more than a year ago. All the years while he was here, up to that time he served his district to the satisfaction of its people to a remarkable degree.

He was in some instances influential in securing legislation highly creditable to him and useful to the Nation. I join with thousands of his friends in California in expressing an appreciation of him and an affectionate tribute to his memory.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, my acquaintance with Charles Kramer dates back some 10 years to the time when he was first elected as a Member of Congress.

Charles was one of the most loyal friends I was privileged to make in this House. He served with me on the Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, and it was our good fortune to assign to him the investigation of subversive activities on the Pacific Coast, which task he performed with integrity and a great deal of ability. He was able by his intelligent and conscientious method of cross-examining hostile witnesses to gain important facts which helped our Department of Justice to convict many spies and saboteurs.

He was also a member of my committee, the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and his warm sympathy for the case of the downtrodden and underprivileged left its mark on the committee's legislative program as he was assigned many important tasks in connection with the legislation pending before our committee. Charles Kramer will long be remembered and his death at the expiration of his term of office was a serious blow to the Members of this House as well as to his family.

His personality will long be missed in the Halls of Congress, and those of us who were privileged to serve with him will forever cherish his memory.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of sadness that I learn of the death of our late lamented colleague, Charles Kramer, of California. I served with him for 10 years, and came to know him intimately well. He was an ardent and conscientious Member of this body. As chairman of the Committee on Patents, he contributed much to the arts and industries having to do with patents and appliances. He rightfully earned the respect and esteem of members of the patent bar.

As a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, he was fair and just in his attitude and ever kept in mind the paramount interests of the United States in the admission of refugees. On the other hand, neither did he lose sight of the fact that this country was built up out of the "blood, sweat, and tears" of refugees. He was ever mindful that his own forbears came from foreign shores. He ever struggled to make this land of ours a better place to live in, not only for these immigrants, but for all of us.

He was ever kindly, well disposed, and with a sweet disposition. I never heard him utter a harsh word of anyone. In his recent illness, he showed an unflinching courage and an indomitable spirit. He struggled valiantly against the physical disturbance that finally brought about his end, but all through that turmoil of body and mind, he never failed in his devotion to his duties as a Congressman.

My heartfelt sympathy goes to Mrs. Kramer and Charlie's loved ones. The Nation loses a loyal son, this body loses a staunch advocate, and I a true friend.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include some correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by the Vice President of All-American Aviation before the Junior Traffic Club of Chicago, on January 14, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table, and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 30 minutes on Monday next at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table and after any special orders that have been heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include notices from two Government agencies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Grinnell Herald-Register.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

THE HIGHWAY TO ALASKA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, in 1935, after many years of discussion by the Governments of Canada and the United States, this Congress created the Alaskan International Highway Commission. Its purpose was to work under and with the State Department toward the completion of hemispherical agreements looking toward the completion of a highway to Alaska. Canada appointed a like commission. These two commissions, with various representatives of both Governments and with engineers, made a complete study of the entire terrain and the project's feasibility. Their efforts were met in some official quarters with enthusiasm, but in many others with complete apathy as to the importance of a means of access to the vital frontier that is Alaska.

Not only were recommendations made as to the feasibility of the project, but suggestions were also made to both Governments as to the route to be followed. The difficult task of coordinating all the various agencies—diplomatic, administrative and otherwise—of the two countries toward definite action during these years seemed almost insurmountable, and yet the crying need and justification for such roadway seemed to the Commissions to be apparent.

Even up to the outbreak of the war some military officials considered the highway to be of secondary importance; others were enthusiastic in their support. Interest, however, did not reach a peacetime pitch sufficient to sign the final treaty agreement, although step by step these two great countries were coming to the realization and to a practical working agreement to build this roadway. Hostilities with Japan clarified the whole matter, and the military necessity for such a highway superseded the peacetime commercial justification. The Army finally took the matter in hand and directed its engineering corps to proceed with this vital network to our northern front. Japanese activities hastened the conclusion.

Canada had built throughout certain portions of its northern provinces a series of airways leading to the Bering Sea and Asia. The military deemed it wise to connect up these airways with a so-called pilot road to Alaska. This reason was given as the basis for their decision of the route. Although the commissions and other Government officials had little or no knowledge regarding events leading up to this selection—nor were they asked for any suggestions regarding the possibility of routes—the military need as evidenced seemed an apparent justification for the so-called pilot road connecting the airports. Your commission questioned the feasibility of the route chosen as against the route determined by the joint highway commissions; however, it must be remembered that our selection was made under peacetime needs. In any event, the Army engineers got busy and did a marvelous job of completing the highway connecting the airports and on into Alaska within a short period of a few months. The two countries must not only admire but be proud of the great engineering task tackled and completed.

Trucks are now rolling over the so-called Alcan Highway, not only supplying vital needs to the air route and its fields, but also to our men in the northern armed forces. There has been some misunderstanding of the commission's attitude regarding the Alcan route. It was merely our contention—and I must admit it was based on peacetime observations—that the best possible route lies farther west, in the natural trough between the Rockies and the Coast Range. We merely offer the suggestion that this was the shortest possible way to Alaska and that this might be tackled first or even jointly with the so-called pilot road farther east, connecting the airports. Your commission, of course, has no objection or no valid criticism of the Alcan road for the purpose it was intended. We merely contend, however, that a further supply line to Alaska is needed up the before-mentioned natural trough.

All of the Alaskan highway has not yet been built, but it will be, we are sure, in due time. The complete highway to Alaska will be a continuation of a Pacific highway through Seattle, Vancouver and Prince George, thence northerly along the most direct and feasible route toward Whitehorse in the Yukon Territory, connecting up with the so-called Alcan route coming from the southeast. This would, of course, give us two approaches to our great territory and possession. This routing has been approved by both the United States and Canadian commissions.

The Alcan route is somewhat at present a different proposition. It is a well-constructed and, we must assume, a well-considered military road, primarily not only to connect the military airfields but to allow as much overland transport of military supplies as possible as an emergency war measure. It can be made suitable for all-time purposes and can fit into the plans envisioned for a permanent Alaskan highway, with connections to the east and to the Pacific coast, and in particular, a connection which parallels as closely as possible the commercial sea and air routes.

Your Commission can understand why, as a possible war project, the Province of Alberta prefers the development of an interior route as a main highway. We are confident that Canadians generally, and especially the residents of British Columbia, have the same adequate reason to press toward the completion of a so-called coastal route in order that both great sections of our country and Canada may project their commerce, trade, and military activities into Alaska and on to Asia.

Your Commission is going to continue its work toward the ultimate completion of these permanent highways to Alaska, and will give every cooperation to the military toward making the Alcan Highway an efficient proposition.

We have even expressed the prophecy that not many years hence will find both routes with broad, adequate roadways joining at some suitable, well-considered point in northern Canada and proceeding on, not only to the interior of Alaska, but on across the Bering Sea into Asia. It is then and then only that the dreams of those who have for many years fought for and advocated this great project will be concluded.

I know the House will be interested in a description of the opening of the marvelous Army achievement, the Alcan

Highway, not only because of its appeal to their great American sense of pioneering, but because this House, as a matter of far-sightedness, has for many years given me and my Commission every aid and encouragement in overcoming the difficulties incidental toward pushing this great project. Unfortunately, many of us interested could not be present at the ceremonies formally dedicating the Alcan Highway. Both Governments, however, were adequately represented. Present also was Lt. Richard L. Neuberger, aide-de-camp to Gen. J. A. O'Connor, who now commands the Alcan Highway. General O'Connor is one of the able brigadiers in the Army. This Congress can be assured that under his command things will run as smoothly as possible on this important network. Mr. Neuberger, prior to his entry into service, was one of the outstanding writers on economic and political questions on the Pacific coast. He writes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. ANTHONY DIMOND] and myself as follows:

As Delegate in Congress from Alaska and as Chairman of the American Commission, you will be interested, I am sure, in some of the background of the opening ceremony. The most interesting features of any public event always occur in that twilight zone between its evident phases and the part which is wholly preparatory.

It was a ceremony international in character. Your friend, Bob Bartlett, led a representative delegation from Juneau. The Honorable Ian Mackenzie, of the Canadian Cabinet, headed an outstanding delegation from Ottawa. Gen. George R. Pearkes represented Canada's armed forces. In 1914 Pearkes was a constable in the Royal Mounted at Whitehorse. He told me that some of the territory he drove over en route to the ceremony he once patrolled on horseback in a scarlet tunic. When the first World War broke out Constable Pearkes resigned from the Mounted and enlisted in the Canadian Army. He won the Victoria Cross for valor and now commands the Pacific Command of his country.

Just as the construction of the highway demonstrated the ingenuity of our soldiers and workers on a large scale, the ceremony opening the highway demonstrated that ingenuity on a much smaller scale.

We had no printing press, yet programs seemed indispensable. What to do? Mimeographing was too colorless and drab. The blueprinting machine of the Public Roads Administration finally was pressed into service. Jean Ewen, Public Roads Administration design engineer, made some excellent Arctic drawings. Gay Pinkstaff, Public Roads Administration photographer, ran off the copies. The result was a program which many people thought was not only printed but actually engraved.

It was quite a task to find distinctive food because supply difficulties in the wilderness are enormous, as you know. We finally relied on nature's larder. Maj. Dick Luckow, whom you may remember as one of the men who helped build the Alaskan Railroad, sent out hunting parties. The result was moose meat, mountain-sheep steaks, and a thinned-out black bear. We gave all the groceries local names—viz, Dawson Creek crackers, Fairbanks cheese, and Slims River salad. The Slims River salad turned out to be lettuce and hot-house tomatoes, and we never succeeded in convincing any of the guests that the lettuce and tomatoes were picked right outside at 40 degrees below.

Where to hold the ceremony? This problem was a stickler for a month. Finally Col. T. W. Essig made a trip over the road. He selected Soldiers' Summit. This is a stretch of highway 1,500 feet above the wide swath of Kluane Lake. Above the road dark crags tower. Below, the lake is spread out like a vast inland sea. The setting symbolizes the fastnesses which the highway penetrates. Kluane Lake is approximately 100 miles east of the Alaska-Yukon international boundary.

The participants in the dedication ceremony, accompanied by newspaper correspondents and photographers, drove from Whitehorse to Kluane Lake on a day that the temperature crowded 15 below. Many feet, tender from the luxuries of civilization, were chilled by the time the new spruce barracks at Kluane were reached. Everyone slept that night dormitory style. The blueprinted programs were given out, and privates traded autographs with colonels. A Negro soldier asked General O'Connor for his autograph, and the general climbed out of his sleeping bag, put on his spectacles, and signed the soldier's program. "That's the epitome of democracy, isn't it?" Bob Bartlett asked Ian Mackenzie, as they watched.

When we went to bed, all of us were slightly apprehensive over the fact that neither General Pearkes nor General Ganong of Canada's Eighth Division had arrived. They had been delayed by bad flying weather but were expected later. I think I went to sleep about 10 o'clock. Sometime later I was awakened by a gentle padding on the lumber floor. I cautiously peeked out of a corner of the bag. General O'Connor, in his long underwear, with his fur cap on his head and his parka thrown around his shoulders, was tiptoeing to the door. He threw it open, and a lusty "Halloo there!" came through.

The red hat bands and lapels of British general officers appeared in the darkened portal and in walked Generals Pearkes and Ganong. I lay there in my sleeping bag and struggled between comfort and duty. The bag was warm and comfortable. Yet I was General O'Connor's aide. Could I stay in bed while he welcomed our latecomers? Soon from nearby another shape in long underwear emerged. It was Col. K. B. Bush, our chief of staff. He and General O'Connor, looking like union-suit advertisements, were convoying the Canadian generals to their bunks. My conscience overcame my drowsy laziness, and I got up and added my size 42 underwear to the scene. "You chaps look quite nifty in those," said Lt. Bob Sails, the aide to General Pearkes. This was British politeness at its kindest.

In the morning the ceremony was held. It was an event full of color, drama, and significance. Colonel Bush's hands became blue as he took off his gloves to read the statements received from yourself and many other distinguished men in public life. A long file of Royal Mounties stood at attention in their scarlet coats and leather boots. Their feet must have been as cold as anvils, but they stood as straight and rigid as signal poles. "Discipline and tradition account for that," said Colonel Bush and Inspector William Grennan, commanding the mounties in the Yukon Territory, nodded his assent.

All the speakers stressed the historic importance of what was taking place. Bob Bartlett presented an Alaskan flag sent by the Fairbanks chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, whose head is Mrs. Donald MacDonald. Colonel Bush described Donald MacDonald as a pioneer advocate of a land route to Alaska, and Bartlett said that the people of Alaska wanted their flag to grace the headquarters of the Northwest Service Command. Ian Mackenzie spoke most eloquently for Canada and brought an inspiring message from Prime Minister King.

The ceremony moved toward a natural climax. At its end Mackenzie and Bartlett were given a pair of scissors. These scissors had been especially engraved in Alaskan gold by William Osborne, pioneer resident of Juneau. Fittingly, Mr. Osborne's daughter is Mrs. Joe Crosson, the wife of the Arctic aviator who has saved so many lives. Mackenzie took one blade of the scissors, Bartlett the other. The crowd became tense. Then the blades closed and the red, white, and blue ribbon across the road was severed. In the cold and gloom of the Arctic morning an American Army band played God Save the King. Then the strains of The Star-Spangled Banner filled the snowy air.

As the basalt cliffs flung back the last strains of the music, a great cheer went up from the crowd. I hurried from General O'Connor's side and struggled to save the ribbon for posterity. The first truck bound for Fairbanks rolled forward as the band played The Maple Leaf Forever and Washington Post. At the wheel of this truck were two American Army enlisted men selected personally by General O'Connor—Corp. Otto Gronke, of Chicago, and Pvt. Bob Bowe, of Minneapolis.

The general had declared that rank-and-file soldiers, who did so much to construct the road, were to be given genuine representation at the ceremony. The ribbon was held by four enlisted men: Corp. Refines Sims, Jr., of Philadelphia, and Pvt. Alfred Jalufka, of Kennedy, Tex., representing the Whitehorse sector, and Master Sgt. Andrew E. Doyle, of Philadelphia, and Corp. John T. Reilly, of Detroit, representing the Fort St. John sector. Sims and Reilly are Negroes, symbols of the colored troops whose toil has played a material part in the 1,630-mile undertaking.

After the ceremony, lunch was served in the barracks. The smell of spruce pitch and wood grain was still in the air. Boughs hung from the ceiling. The crimson tunics of the Mounties mingled with the somber khaki of their American allies. We ate moose meat and mountain sheep. Cigar and cigarette smoke hung beneath the beams. The band played Johann Strauss' Tales From the Vienna Woods and the Blue Danube, lilting memories of a land which may soon be free. It was like some scene from a Graustarkian operetta. Inspector Grennan swayed his head to the gay waltzes, and so did the American mess sergeant who hurried along the tables seeing to it that no one's plate was empty.

It was an episode which will not soon be forgotten by those who participated in it. My own most vivid memory of it is the playing of our national anthem by the band at Soldiers Summit. As the music faded away and I looked around me at the stern faces of the American soldiers and at the grim countenances of the Mounties, I felt sure that in such a scene as this lay the future of the United Nations—that in the ability of us all, Canadians, Americans, and Alaskans, white and black, civilian and soldier, to fuse together our efforts in such a project as the Alcan Highway rests the hope of free peoples throughout the earth.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Delegate from Alaska has again reintroduced H. R. 331, a bill to authorize the construction of a military highway to Alaska. This bill, in effect, provides for an additional route and highway up the natural trough between Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, and Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, Canada, along or in the general vicinity of the route which is called the A Route selected and designated as such by the Alaskan International Highway Commission pursuant to the authority of the act of Congress of May 31, 1938.

This bill, if enacted into law, would provide the connection mentioned above and would complete the necessary system of roadways not only needed in time of war to our greatest territorial possession, but would adequately meet the needs of

a post-war development that is sure to come to the people of British Columbia, Northern Canada, Alaska, and our friends in Asia.

REPEAL OF THAT PORTION OF THE VICTORY TAX LAW WHICH REQUIRES CHURCHES TO BECOME FISCAL AGENTS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein two letters, two newspaper articles, and two resolutions from a Baptist Church and a group of Protestant ministers protesting that portion of the Victory-tax law which requires churches to become fiscal agents of the Federal Government in collecting the Victory tax from their pastors and other employees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, on October 21, 1942, the Seventy-seventh Congress passed what is known as the Revenue Act of 1942. One portion of that act is, I think, grevious and wrong. Under the provision for imposing a 5-percent Victory tax, churches and religious bodies are made revenue-collecting agents of the Federal Government by being compelled to withhold, report, and pay to the Government 5 percent of the wages of their pastors and other employees with heavy penalties provided under this law for any church or religious organization that conscientiously declines to act as a fiscal agent of the Federal Government. This portion of the 1942 Revenue Act forces church people to violate the dictates of their conscience, by merging the institutions of church and state thereby violating the sacred principle of absolute separation of these two institutions and violates the spirit of the Bill of Rights and the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Ministers and churches do not protest the paying of the Victory tax, they are glad to pay it, but they do protest this infringement upon the sovereignty of church organizations and the making of churches revenue-collecting agents of the Federal Government. This grievance imposed upon the churches of America should be removed and removed at once.

WILBURTON MINISTERIAL ALLIANCE,
*Wilburton, Okla., January 14, 1943.*

Representative PAUL STEWART,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STEWART: Herewith, a set of resolutions passed by the Ministerial Alliance of Wilburton, Okla., relative to the Federal Victory tax law in its relation to church organizations.

We do not seek an exemption from this tax We only ask that the employees of the church be allowed to pay it rather than using the church as a tax-collecting agency.

Yours sincerely,
GUY C. HALL, *President,*
HERBERT M. PIERCE, *Secretary.*

---

PETITION TO CONGRESS FROM THE MINISTERIAL ALLIANCE OF WILBURTON, OKLA.

Whereas under the Federal tax law known as the Victory tax law churches and religious bodies are made revenue-collecting agents of the Federal Government and are required to withhold, report, and pay to the Government 5 percent of the wages of their pastors and other employees, with heavy penalties provided under this law for any organization which conscientiously declines to act as a fiscal agent; and

Whereas the Protestant position has consistently been that there should be complete and absolute separation of church and state and said law violates this fundamental religious principle by requiring churches to act as tax collecting agents of the Government, violating the spirit of the Bill of Rights: Therefore be it

*Resolved*—

1. That we, the members of the Ministerial Alliance of Wilburton, Okla., as individuals cheerfully pledge support to the Government in its efforts to collect the Victory tax.

2. However, we deplore the act insofar as it calls upon church people to violate the dictates of their conscience by merging the institutions of church and state and obviously violating the spirit of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

3. While we even now are engaged in a war for our very survival, we respecfully petition Congress not to legislate laws that will infringe upon the freedom of religion and thus tend to divide the Nation.

4. We therefore earnestly petition Congress that immediate action be taken to repeal that portion of the Victory tax law which requires churches to become fiscal agents of the Federal Government.

Respectfully submitted.

GUY C. HALL.

---

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
*Atoka, Okla., December 29, 1942.*

Hon. PAUL STEWART,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I have not had the privilege of meeting you, but I was pastor in Norman when you were in the Senate and took that house cleaning at the university and got rid of that bunch of Communists. Since that time it has given me a great deal of pleasure to follow your political successes. It is with pleasure to us all that you have taken our Brother Davis as your secretary. I know that you will have the confidence of our people with him in that capacity.

The purpose of this letter is to ask you to investigate and if it is consistent with your views, oppose the making of churches collectors of taxes in the matter of the Victory tax. Let me assure you that we do not oppose the tax as such, neither do we try to avoid it nor oppose its purpose, but rather we are afraid of the imposition of this requirement on churches will violate our American principle and cardinal Baptist doctrine of the "separation of church and state." Once the camel's nose is in the tent the whole beast will be in.

Let me refer you again to your secretary. He will tell you exactly how we feel about it.

We want to win the war; soon, now. Our church has 70 men and boys now fighting on the far-flung battlefields of the world and we want to preserve these liberties for them. I am not a letter writer to Congressmen, but I could not fail here. Will you kindly investigate it for us and give us representation in this matter?

Sincerely,
ANSON JUSTICE, *Pastor.*

---

[From the Washington Daily News of January 11, 1943]

MINISTER FIGHTS VICTORY LEVY—"IT'S NOT THE TAX, IT'S THE PRINCIPLE"

Holding his Bible in one hand, gesturing with the other, the Reverend Thomas Boorde, of Anacostia Baptist Church, today lambasted collection of Victory tax from church salaries and disclosed that a movement against the levy had developed among ministers.

Thumbing to Mark 12:17, the minister read: "And Jesus answering, said unto them, render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's."

The Reverend Boorde opposed the method of collection of the tax, not the tax itself, he explained. He broached the subject yesterday from his pulpit. Expanding today, he said:

"Clergymen and all other employees of the church should pay taxes because they are citizens, but the church should never become a tax collector. That is a violation of the separation of church and state."

His first weekly salary this year was minus the levy. His plans against deduction at source pends decision of "a group of ministers and others," he asserted.

---

PETITION TO CONGRESS FROM THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF WILBURTON, OKLA.

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
*Wilburton, Okla., January 6, 1943.*

Whereas under the Federal tax law, known as the Victory tax law, churches and religious bodies are made revenue-collecting agents of the Federal Government and are required to withhold, report, and pay to the Government 5 percent of the wages of its pastor and other employees, with heavy penalties provided under this law for any church organization that conscientiously declines to act as a fiscal agent; and

Whereas the Baptist position has consistently been that there should be complete and absolute separation of church and state, and said law violates this fundamental religious principle by requiring churches to act as tax-collecting agents of the Government, violating the spirit of the Bill of Rights: Therefore be it

*Resolved*—

1. That we, the members of the First Baptist Church of Wilburton, as individuals, cheerfully pledge our support to the Government in its effort to collect the Victory tax.

2. However, we deplore this act insofar as it calls upon church people to violate the dictates of their conscience by merging the institutions of church and state and obviously violating the spirit of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

3. While we even now engage in a war for our very survival we respectfully petition Congress not to legislate laws that will tend to infringe upon the sovereignty of church organizations, which course would doubtless tend to divide the Nation, or to remove any safeguards to the preservation of the priceless heritage of religious freedom.

4. We, therefore, earnestly petition Congress that immediate measures be taken toward the repeal of the Victory tax insofar as it requires church organizations to become fiscal agents of the Federal Government.

HERBERT M. PIERCE,
*Moderator.*
Mrs. ALMA COX, *Clerk.*

---

[From the Orthodox Baptist, Ardmore, Okla., of December 10, 1942]

SHALL BAPTIST CHURCHES COME UNDER BUREAUCRATIC CONTROL?—THE VICTORY TAX MAKES NO EXEMPTIONS FOR THE LORD'S HOUSES

One of our Baptist editors recently wrote, "We believe that our churches and other denominational organizations can consistently assist the Government in collecting or withholding the taxes of individual employees, without violating any of our cherished principles. As a matter of fact, churches and denominational organizations are already paying taxes to the Government in one form or another, largely as emergency war measures.

Churches and various denominational institutions and organizations pay State or Federal tax, or both, on every long distance telephone call and telegram above a certain amount; on every gallon of gasoline used by such bodies; on railroad and bus tickets charged up to such organizations as legitimate traveling expenses, etc."

Now, let's look at this committal.

As a matter of fact, pastors who charge up to their churches the taxes they pay to the Federal Government on transportation tickets should be fired for compromising their churches by such deeds. Any pastor who would involve his church in any such a way loves himself too much to safeguard our faith.

As a matter of fact, our churches in Oklahoma do not pay State tax on long-distance telephones. The attorney general of this State stopped the practice of the State collecting toll taxes from churches by a special ruling and churches have already been reimbursed for the taxes paid out before this ruling came. Churches today do pay taxes on long-distance calls to the Federal Government. The First Orthodox Baptist Church of Ardmore pays this tax under protest, and expects to be reimbursed by the United States Government for the same. All churches should petition Congress to remove this grievance.

As a matter of fact, the Victory tax does not differ in principle from the social-security tax. Both are money-getting measures. Both would bring our churches under bureaucratic control, and it is the bureaucratic control that we must resist. The amount of money our churches would have to put up under the social-security tax might not be burdensome, but the bringing of our churches under bureaucratic control in its application would be grievous. The amount of time required of our churches to withhold said Victory tax, and then to send the money to Federal bureaus, with sworn statements concerning the honesty of the transactions, might not be great, but the bringing of our churches under bureaucratic control, making it legally possible for bureaucrats to come into our church offices and demand our church books and subject the Lord's workers to insults would be grievous—so grievous that no pastor and no church will willingly submit to such a thing.

James Otis once shouted, "Taxation without representation is tyranny," and he was right. Today we can shout from the housetops, "Bureaucratic control of our churches without church representation is tyranny." Since churches have no representation in Congress, and since they are barred both by the Bible and by the Constitution from such representation, then to impose bureaucratic control upon churches is tyranny.

The very moment our churches are made subject to bureaucratic control then our rights are flouted and our historic and cherished principles are outraged. Our Baptist forebears, during the dark ages, died by the millions before they would yield our cherished rights and doctrines to State control. If today we refuse to protest the invasion of the State into our church affairs, then we have already consented to the devil's program of socialization. Yea; even more than that, we have already confessed thereby that we are willing to play the role of spiritual blockheads for the sake of conformity. God forbid!

As touching the editor's statement above, we are mantling it with charity, assuming that the editor had not had an opportunity to read the tax bill before he made his committal. He is a good man, even though he is grievously wrong in what he says.

Our churches can neither scriptually nor constitutionally accept bureaucratic control. While the Master paid His personal tax to the Roman Government, He proclaimed the principle of complete separation of church and State when He said to His critics, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's," Matthew 22:21. Our Constitution likewise provides for complete separation of church and state in the first amendment to our Constitution. The amendment says, "Congress shall make no law respecting establishment of religion or of prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The builders of our historic Democracy laid the framework for complete separation of church and State in this provision, and our Government should honor the same.

We have been amazed over and over at the thoughtless attitudes assumed by Christian leaders during the past 10 years. During this time we have witnessed movement after movement initiated by Washington left-wingers, all calculated to invade the rights of churches, and that without much protest from worshippers. 'Tis the business of the devil to put churches in chains. He has largely succeeded all over the world. He will not be satisfied until he brings the free churches of America under complete bureaucratic control. Surely there is much wisdom in the old adage, A stitch in time saves nine, and surely the application of this wisdom would cause every church in America to protest any act of Congress which would crimp the freedom of our churches. Brethren, our churches must continue free.

Personally, we shall be happy to pay the Victory tax, or any other tax needful to win this war. We believe that church employees all over the country will also be glad to so do. Accordingly, we are not protesting against the tax—we want to pay it, but we are protesting against our churches being made collecting agencies, without their will or consent, and contrary to the Scriptures and the Constitution of the United States.

Writing under the caption, "Shall Baptist churches go to jail?" Editor John D. Freeman, of the Western Recorder, says of the Victory tax:

"At first glance it might not seem to be a matter of any great moment when a church is asked to act as a collecting agency of the State. But is it? The power that can say to a church, 'You deduct 5 percent of the salary paid each and every one whom you employ or else,' can readily usurp the power to say to the same church, 'You will be bound by our rules both as to whom you employ and under what conditions * * *.' It will be a sad day indeed for all citizens of this land when the sacred rights guaranteed us under the Constitution as amended during its early days, have been taken away from us. 'Boring from within' is a process of gaining control which is both subtile and subversive. It may be that the authors of the Victory tax bill never once thought of all that is implied in it and how vitally it will affect the free church groups of our Nation. It is not too late, however, for them to undo the damage already done to the morale of the Nation and to make such alterations in the enforcement provisions of the bill as to free the churches both from the necessity of becoming agents of the Federal Government and of having held over their heads the threat of heavy fine and jail sentences if they fail to collect the tax.

"As we have already notified one influential Congressman, the bill must be altered or else we face almost certainly the spectacle of seeing Baptists go to jail in America for their religious beliefs."

Thus this good editor speaks out of his heart. He truly sees the import of the failure of Congress to exempt evangelical churches from bureaucratic control.

Dr. R. G. Baucom, vice president of the Baptist General Convention of Texas, writing in the same issue of the Western Recorder, in which Editor Freeman speaks, says:

"This provision of the bill is a clear violation of the separation of church and state and of the Bill of Rights, and the committee so states in the resolution. Furthermore it opens our churches to bureaucratic control. Nearly everything else except churches has been under bureaucratic control during the past 10 years, and now the churches are to be told what to do. This gives the Federal Government the right to check our churches' finances."

Dr. Baucom quotes a prominent southern Baptist pastor as saying:

"This (the Victory tax) is the entering of the camel's nose into the tent to put our churches under a dictatorship."

And he quotes another as saying:

"I wish I could feel that there was nothing back of this other than an oversight."

Dr. Baucom protests making our churches become collecting agencies of the Government. In that protest he is eminently right. We are happy to note we do not stand alone on this important matter. Baptists everywhere will so react, once they understand.

Then one inquires, "What can we do about it?" Answer: We can send memorials to our Congressmen and to our Senators affirming our desire to help finance the war, and petition them to get our churches exempted from bureaucratic control, and request them to secure a way for church employees to pay the Victory tax without involving our churches. We believe that such procedure would get results. Remember: Let our churches and denominational bodies act, and act at once. Let them petition our Congressmen and our Senators for relief, and we believe the job will be done.

Some action has already been taken. We trust that action will become widespread. Let our churches get busy now. Today is the day to work to prevent our churches from coming under the control of the state.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. Walter Dooley, of Anaconda, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Sprague Holden in the Detroit Free Press under date of January 16 commenting on the Grand Old Party's New Stand by Harrison Spangler.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD two brief poems as they appeared in the Zion Herald of the issue of November 11, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the reading of the Journal and all other special orders, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the Old Telegraph Trail.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I received consent 2 or 3 days ago to extend my remarks and include certain material. The printer informs me that the cost will be $157.50. Notwithstanding that, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes after other special orders are concluded today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday next, after the legislative business has been disposed of and any other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include three editorials on the work of the Tolan committee of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the floor leader a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the majority leader inform the House as to the program for the rest of the week, if we are to have one?

Mr. McCORMACK. I submitted a request yesterday that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next, and that was objected to. Tomorrow there will be two resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules extending the life of the small business committee and also a resolution in connection with the closing up of the special committee of which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] is chairman. I know of no business on Saturday.

Mr. MICHENER. I take it then that the gentleman expects to adjourn over tomorrow until Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not like to punish and I do not like to react. I think my friend from Michigan gets my point of view.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, the gentleman is averse to making such a request?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall make it now, just to see what interesting results we get. Mr. Speaker, I ask now that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and I shall object, but I want to reserve the right now, in view of the panning the gentleman from Massachusetts is trying to give me.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman is going to object, I think he should object.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And I would like to ask if these gentlemen on either side, the assistant leader of the minority and the leader of the majority, advocate the 40-hour week in congressional service, or whether they have any aversion to serving the people 6 days a week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, in answer to that question the gentleman from Michigan may kid some people outside, but he cannot kid me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think that would be impossible.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not yet.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object. The people on November 3 last—and I am sure that the majority leader and the assistant minority leader both are aware of it—registered their disapproval of a rubber-stamp Congress, of a Congress which failed to enact legislation which would have prevented the present labor troubles. If there is any valid reason why we should not now continue in session from day to day and work on legislation which will prevent further inflation, additional delay in our war production, I am not aware of it.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 18, Rept. No. 14) for printing, under the rule, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved* That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise because of the war, with particular reference to (1) whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and utilized, and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering such development and utilization; (2) whether adequate consideration is being given to the needs of small business engaged in nonwar activities, or engages in the transition from nonwar activities to war activities; (3) whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sales, or purchase of said materials; and (4) the need for a sound program for the solution of the post-war problems of small business.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order which was granted me for today be changed to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

NAZI ATROCITIES AND PUNISHMENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we need not wait for history to do our judging. We have stood and stand witness to crimes so enormous that we find not its scope in the story of mankind. In viewing the history of horror that are the Nazi and Fascist regimes, we face, however, a serious danger. Because story follows story of mass executions, of forced labor, of deportations, and internments, of the deliberate and systematic murder of millions of minority peoples in occupied and conquered territories, our minds and hearts must fiercely fight against becoming inured to these unspeakable atrocities. Repetition must not dull our senses into helpless acceptance. Each tale of outrage is just not another story. Each one must stand alone in violent condemnation of the perpetrators, for example, the number of Jewish victims deported or perished since 1939 in Axis-controlled Europe now reaches the appalling figure of 2,000,000 while 5,000,000 are in danger of extermination. Hitler and his jackals seek complete destruction of the Jews of Europe. Not since the days of Genghis Khan or Attila have we witnessed such horrors of mass torture and murder.

In the sight of God and men let the guilty be named and brought to punishment.

I am in wholehearted accord with what President Roosevelt has stated concerning the post-war world, namely, that the United Nations must set up the machinery to disarm and keep disarmed Germany and those parts of the world which would break the peace. "We must pull the fangs of the predatory nations of the world."

I am in wholehearted accord with what Vice President WALLACE has stated, namely, that the United Nations must devise means for preventing economic warfare and enhancing economic peace between nations.

To these ends there must be set up an over-all international council to determine policies of peace and an over-all international court to interpret and determine policies of this peace, and before which court shall be hailed offenders against the spirit and word of treaties. An international police force composed of services of land, air, and sea will have to be set up to enforce the pronouncements of this court and the decrees of this over-all world council. There may have to be some sort of psychological disarmament of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy and the development of the modus operandi whereby the moral regeneration of these offending nations can be assured.

This might involve supervision and rigid control of the teaching and curricula of the so-called volkschule gymnasium, Hochschule or universities. This might require teaching the new generation of German and Italian youth to shun the totalitarian and embrace the democratic way of life.

But in keeping with these plans for world reorientation, what of the personal punishment of those who are the war guilty—the Nazi culprits who have violated the laws of nations and offended against the cannons of humanity?

I give you a quotation from a newspaper: "The establishment of a grand court of Allied representatives, civil and military, for the purpose of trying those guilty for crimes during the war is advocated." What paper was it and what was the date? It sounds like the New York Herald Tribune of yesterday. Actually, it was the London Daily Express of November 4, 1918.

Here is a headline: "Atonement for Atrocities"; subhead: "To pass this over would be to ignore a vital issue in the war." That has a familiar ring. But it appeared at the beginning of a letter in the New York Times of January 21, 1918. The writer drew attention to the lists that were prepared by the French of acts of wantonness, but the writer added, "We hear nothing of a definite nature respecting reparation along these lines." He asked that the thieves make reparations and the murderers be called to justice.

In 1918 John Hayes Hammond proposed an atrocities court to be made up of distinguished jurists of neutral countries to try perpetrators of atrocities. He added that if this were not done and the responsible directors of these inhuman acts are—

to be given asylum in any civilized country, the great task before the peace conference of setting up a new and better dispensation for mankind will be intrigued by the sense of bitterness which unpunished barbarity cannot fail to engender in the most humane spirit.

Theodore Roosevelt, the same year, said:

Put them behind the bars; put them in a padded cell.

When we have struck the sword from the hands of the Prussian Junkers, as we are bound to do in self-defense, shall we parley with them as defeated equals, or proceed to punish them as offenders against the laws of God and man?

Was that a question propounded in the House of Representatives last week? No. It was culled from an article called Peace Without Amnesties, from the October 1918 issue of the Nineteenth Century.

When the time arrives His Majesty's Government is determined to bring to justice the criminals, whoever they may be and whatever station they may occupy. To such cases as these, the authors of the system under which such crimes are committed may well be the most guilty of all.

Were these words spoken in the British Parliament yesterday? No. They were the words of Mr. Asquith in 1918.

I have delved into the files of the Library of Congress and have found literally hundreds of articles and editorials, all urging the setting up of courts of some sort to try the Huns, as they were then called, for their barbarities, from the Emperor Wilhelm down. All these pronouncements are practically word for word with the proposals we read in our papers, periodicals, and books of today. The will was there then as it is now. We failed then; we dare not fail now. The question remains now whether to belie our conscience or to flay the conscience of the Nazis.

Far more horrendous than in the last war have been the scientific atrocities inflicted by the Nazis and Fascists upon the people of the conquered provinces. If the cry for vengeance in 1918 was strong, how much more piercing should that cry be today? But that cry today should not be in vain.

The Versailles Treaty demanded that Wilhelm 2d, of Hohenzollern, the former German Emperor, be publicly arraigned and tried for his supreme offenses against international morality and the sanctity of treaties. The Government of the Netherlands was requested to surrender him to the end that he might be brought to trial. Through miserable intrigue by the royal families of Europe, the Government of the Netherlands refused the request. The Kaiser continued his woodchopping in comfortable exile as the squire of Doorn. Thus we embarked on our journey of appeasement.

A list of 900 culprits to be tried had been prepared by the associated powers, among whom were the Kaiser, the Crown Prince, Field Marshals Hindenburg and Ludendorff, Count Bismarck, and Admiral von Tirpitz. They were accused by the so-called Commission of Fifteen of the peace conference of the following:

Murders and massacres, tortures, shields formed of human beings, execution of hostages * * * the massacre of prisoners, attacks on hospital ships, the poisoning of springs and of wells, etc.

This Commission of Fifteen recommended the setting up of an international judicial tribunal composed of three members appointed by each of the five chief Allied governments, and one by each of the governments of the lesser powers. This court was to try these 900. It was to determine its own procedure. The recommendations of the commission, however, were not followed. Significantly, the American representatives were the first to make reservations. They refused consent to the unprecedented, as they put it, proposals of creating an international criminal tribunal. The Japanese also had reservations. Debate, connivance, and intrigue then resulted in the conclusion that the German Government was to hand over the accused for trial before military tribunals of the powers against whose nationals the alleged crimes were committed.

In other words, the trial courts were to be national instead of international. France demanded then the surrender by the Reich of 334 persons accused. Britain demanded 100. Belgium demanded 265, and so on. Germany then had the effrontery to state that a political and economic revolution would rend Germany and topple the entire peace structure if these requests for extradition were granted. By way of compromise it suggested that all persons accused of war crimes be tried by the Supreme Court of the Reich at Leipzig. It consisted of seven Hun judges. The allies cowardly consented. Imagine these criminals being tried by their own countrymen. It would be like the Hitler jackals of today being tried by members of their own Gestapo. In the meanwhile the 900 names had dwindled to 45. It is a sad commentary that to this last list Britain contributed only seven names and we contributed none. The Germans continued to offer all manner of subterfuge and excuses. The Oberreichsanwalt—public prosecutor—in Leipzig complicated matters by legalistic pettifogging. Two and one-half years of bickering, scheming, and claptrap ensued. Meanwhile the British reduced the number of named guilty from 7 to 4. As a typical illustration of this gigantic farce, the Germans nonchalantly said they could not bring U-boat commander Patzig to trial because he had to deliver an address in Danzig.

Suffice to say, that of the whole number, 12 were actually tried and of these, 6 were acquitted. Two naval lieutenants received 4-year sentences and the other four received sentences of 6 months in jail. The two naval lieutenants, who were supposed to spend 4 years in jail, contrived to escape. The sum and substance of this attempt at international justice was 6 months in jail for four culprits. That indeed is the quintessence of absurdity—a mere international wink of the eye. It is a pathetic picture indeed.

We dare not repeat this mockery. But the same isolationist and parochial forces that balked Wilson and caused us to shirk our responsibilities are again afoot. They would again hold their skirts around them as if Europe were a carrion. They are again, as the President said, seeking to climb into an American hole and pull the hole in after them. They fail to realize that there are no longer any Maginot lines, be they in the form of chains of fortresses or oceans. Neither time nor space protects us from the furies of war. Only in mutual arrangements with other nations, who see eye to eye with us, can we accord future generations any protection. And in that unity, we may have to swallow, somewhat, our pride and to give up something of our sovereignty in order to get in return international peace and comfort for the years to come.

But that accord or comity with other nations must be implemented by punishment of the war guilty. In that regard, we dare not fail a second time. We beat the Nazis once; we will beat the Nazis again, but we may not be able to beat them a third time. Their punishment must be thoroughgoing and complete. Otherwise, they shall rise again to smite us.

Russia has no qualms on that subject. She is proceeding vigorously in her preparations to punish the guilty. She has appointed an Extraordinary State Commission whose purpose is to investigate now, not after victory is won, the loss of life and the damage to property caused by the Nazis, and to sentence now these Herrenvolk murderers. To indicate her seriousness of purpose, a Soviet trade-union leader is chairman. Among its members are a brain surgeon, a historian, a distinguished writer, and a woman pilot. They have already started their work and garnered and sifted much evidence and are soon to call some of the raging fiends to the bar of justice. It is interesting to note that no so-called diplomats are on the roster of these judges.

Why should we not immediately follow suit and set up now a commission to try these accursed scoundrels and to mark down their brutalities, to sentence them, even in absentia? If the Bill of Rights requires trial by jury and confrontation of witnesses and thus precludes civil trial, then let us set up military tribunals under the Articles of War where the Bill of Rights is not applicable. We should immediately try and mark out for retribution every known gauleiter, wehrmacht junker, every member of the S. S. regiments, the Gestapo, the Waffen S. S. Schutzstaffel, the Black Shirts, Hlinka Guards, all members of the Brown Shirts, the Uschla—Nazi punitive courts—and all who directly or indirectly are connected with the Nazi and Fascist Parties.

Our great President has stated:

> When victory has been achieved, it is the purpose of the Government of the United States to make appropriate use of the information and evidence in respect to these barbaric crimes of the invaders, in Europe and in Asia. It seems only fair that they should have this warning that the time will come when they shall have to stand in courts of law in the very countries which they are now oppressing and answer for their acts.

Bravo, Mr. President, but with one correction. Why should we have to wait until victory has been achieved? It is imperative to act now. We can prepare indictments now. We must try these brutes now. Hitler, Goering, Ribbentrop, and Goebbels have made of Europe a charnel house. Himmler has converted most of Czechoslovakia into a caravan of death. Horthy in Hungary, Antonescu in Rumania, Anton Adrian Mussert in Holland, Quisling in Norway, the stooges of Hitler, have inflicted indescribable atrocities upon the innocent.

Karl Rudolf Werner Best, chief jurist of the Gestapo, writes:

> History teaches that annihilation of an alien people is not contrary to the laws of life provided the annihilation is complete.

Poland is the proving ground of that plan of annihilation. Jews by the thousands are herded into cattle cars only to die of suffocation. Electricity, machine guns, starvation, lethal gases are the weapons of Nazi scientific barbarism. Each Jewish corpse, for example, has a utility value of 50 reichsmarks. The bodies are used to supply fat and the bones are used for fertilizer. Why should not these Nazi hyenas be brought to the bar of justice now? What reason is there to prevent their being given their own brand of punishment?

The New York Times recently commented editorially as to the Nazi war of extermination:

> The accomplished facts which the Nazis seek to create are forcefully indicated by the fears of refugee governments in London that the nations they represent face extermination or permanent crippling unless they can obtain aid this year. Hundreds of thousands of many nationalities have already been deliberately slaughtered by the Gestapo, millions have died of famine and privations, and the remnants of some smaller nations are now being deported, transplanted, brutalized by slavery or terrorism or—as a particularly cunning measure—pitted against one another in internecine strife.

A dispatch from Sweden, under date of January 18, is as follows:

> How Norwegians are being forced to accept the services of Quisling clergy, who do not shy at taking bodies from undertakers with police aid to perform "new order" funerals, and how the Quisling police forcibly drag children from their parents for the so-called youth front are revealed in the new year message of the Interim Church Council.

What about the Benedict Arnold broadcasters?

There emanate nightly from Germany and Italy short wave broadcasts by Nazi and Fascist radio broadcasters who unfortunately are Americans. These traitors are Constance Drexel, Fred Kaltenbach, Douglas Chandler, Jane Anderson, Ezra Pound and Robert H. Best. Douglas Chandler bradcasts under the pseudonym of Paul Revere. Fred Kaltenbach broadcasts under the salutation of Dear Harry. Constance Drexel entitles her traitorous utterances "News from Germany." Robert H. Best uses the alias Guess Who. He also urges Americans to write to their Congressmen to impeach Roosevelt. Jane Anderson apparently broadcasts from Italy and is introduced usually as a famous orator. Ezra Pound opens his damnable talk with a sort of verbal Fascist salute.

The Constitution, by article III, section 3, says that treason, among other things, consists in adhering to our enemies and giving them aid and comfort. Beyond doubt, these modern radio Benedict Arnolds are daily giving aid and comfort to our enemies by attempting to lessen our confidence in our Government and in the cause for which we fight. They bolster our enemies and try to convert their listeners to revere Hitler and his Gestapo, Il Duce and his Black Shirts.

It may be that they can not be brought to book, especially in absentia, by jury trial because the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution provides that in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy trial by an impartial jury and shall be confronted with witnesses. Such confrontation includes the right to cross examine. Thus, trial by jury may be impossible and, therefore, civil prosecution may be barred.

Shall we stand idly by and do nothing? Assuredly these people must be punished summarily. Their trial now, even in their absence, might have the effect of deterring them or moderating their treasonable utterances. The gibbet is their due.

I, therefore, have offered a resolution to provide for amending Article 38 of the Articles of War whereby the President will be empowered to set up military tribunals, or commissions, to try these culprits, even in absentia. The Bill of Rights, which requires trial by jury, is not applicable to the Articles of War. If Congress so provides, persons tried before a military tribunal cannot demand trial by jury or confrontation of witnesses. The Articles of War, by article 38, may even now give the right to the President to set up these military commissions, but I believe it is proper for Congress to give them the specific power so as to remove any doubt.

Thus far in this war, these six knaves are the only known cases of American traitors on foreign soil. While trials in absentia are a bit strange to us, they are of every day occurrence in continental Europe. I am bold enough to suggest such a procedure only because without it, we would be helpless. It would be ridiculous to let these curs go unwhipped of justice—now.

The resolution is as follows:

*Resolved*, Article 38 of the Articles of War (sec. 1509 of the U. S. Code Title 10—Army), be hereby amended to read, as follows:

"The President may, by regulations, which he may modify from time to time, prescribe the procedure, including modes of proof, in cases before courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, and other military tribunals, which regulations shall, insofar as he shall deem practicable, apply the rules of evidence generally recognized in the trial of criminal cases in the district courts of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing contrary to or inconsistent with

these articles shall be so prescribed: *Provided further*, That all rules made in pursuance to this article shall be laid before the Congress annually." (June 4, 1920, ch. 227, subchap. II, sec. 1, 41 Stat. 794.)

The next section is new:

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized to create military commissions for the trial and punishment of citizens of the United States, who, on foreign soil, are serving our enemies, Germany, Italy, and Japan, or other enemies of the United States, as radio propagandists. The President may by regulations prescribe the procedure for the conduct of such trials before such military commissions. Such trial before such military commissions need not require the actual presence of the accused.

Let us beware lest the delays and impedimenta that obtained in the last peace conference again come to the fore. Let us not repeat the "comedy of errors" of the last conference. Otherwise the mountain labors to bring forth a mouse.

In the thirst for retribution well might we quote from the Psalms of David, Psalm 58:

The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance: He shall wash his feet in the blood of the wicked.

And well might we chant with the Revelation, chapter 13:

He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword.

As a German himself had said—Bismarck, in 1871:

I have a lovely idea in connection with the conclusion of peace. It is to appoint an international court for the trial of all those who have instigated the war—newspaper writers, deputies, senators, and ministers.

I urge that President Roosevelt, in addition to his condemnation and protest against the carnage of Jews, address short-wave messages to the German people telling them of the crimes of their leaders and asking them to express and demonstrate their revulsion. If they refuse to express opposition and thereby acquiesce, then they shall be deemed guilty of complicity. Then hell fire shall be let loose by our flying fortresses. In reprisals the German countryside shall then be systematically razed. German cities, one by one, shall be block bombed and pulverized. As St. Paul stated in Romans, chapter 13:

For he—

The ruler or magistrate—

is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.

Sadist Hitler knows no law but the law of force. Only fire and sword will subdue him and his henchmen. Only triple reprisals now will prevent his carrying out the plans sponsored by Dr. Alfred Rosenberg and other brutes—to make the world Judenrein. Only triple retribution now will prevent Poland from becoming a Gargantuan Jewish grave. Why wait till the war is over before visiting revenge upon a culprit nation? We must act now. Wait, and then all Europe will be Judenloss. Why wait until Nazi Vernictungscolomen—extermination columns and destruction squads—commanded by the highest Nazi authorities in Berlin shall have finished their ruthless work. It shall then be too late.

This Jewish problem is really a Christian problem for it is only in the lands of Europe that are called Christian that this anti-Semitism comes to such full flood. Archbishop of York recently characterized the bestial cruelty practiced on the Jews as—

the greatest crime in history. * * * These people have committed no crime. Their only offense is that they belong to the race of which our Lord and his Apostles were members.

Dr. Atkinson, general secretary of the Church Peace Union, states:

It is imperative that the Christian churches, Protestant and Catholic alike, help to make the winning of this battle against Jewish persecution and the other manifestations of anti-Semitism the spearhead of a new effort to rehabilitate the world and guarantee liberty for all people everywhere.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and insert in the RECORD an article appearing in the Chelsea (Mass.) Record of Wednesday, January 13.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing three statements constituting a discussion over the radio on the occasion of the Civil Service Week anniversary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

## LABOR CONDITIONS IN THE SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY ON THE PACIFIC COAST

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of unsavory publicity is being circulated as a result of the strike of the coal miners, all of it deserved, but we should not overlook a situation that exists on the Pacific coast, to which I want to call particular attention this afternoon.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and I spent 3 weeks on the coast not long ago, investigating the naval shipbuilding program from Seattle to Los Angeles. In San Francisco we found a rather serious situation existing because two local union organizations were failing to comply with the master agreement which covers all shipbuilding contracts on the Pacific coast. In the San Francisco Bay area there are approximately 165,000 shipyard workers now engaged in building ships. In 1942 their efforts produced approximately 1,500,000 tons of shipping. They have been asked to produce in 1943 3,000,000 tons of shipping.

Back in April of 1941, after much negotiation, a Pacific coast shipbuilding stabilization agreement was entered into by the unions and by management up and down the Pacific coast. This was followed later by a master labor agreement, which consisted of a closed-shop agreement between management and the American Federation of Labor. The bargaining agents for the American Federation of Labor were the Metal Trades Councils of the various areas.

In San Francisco one local American Federation of Labor Machinists' Union, Local No. 68, headed by Business Agents Harry Hook and E. F. Dillon; and, across the bay in Oakland, a C. I. O. local of the steel workers' organizing committee, Local 1304, headed by James Smith, failed to comply with the master agreement. Remember those names, because you will hear a great deal more about those gentlemen. They claimed that they had separate contracts with the shipyards' management which did not bring them under the master agreement. Mr. Hillman, when he was joint administrator of the O. P. M., sent a letter out there stating that their contracts were not valid and that they had no right to bargain independently, and that they should abide by the terms of the master agreement. Many attempts have been made to reach a local agreement in the San Francisco Bay area. They were unsuccessful. Following my return to Washington, I wrote to the Department of the Navy to try to ascertain as fully as possible just what was occurring in that area. I have here a letter from Assistant Secretary Bard, of the Navy Department, which reads, in part, as follows:

One such local agreement, established for the purpose of providing continuous operations on a basis of three shifts per day, 7 days per week, in order to provide for the maximum possible production in the shipyard industry, set up a shift arrangement which provides for the payment of premium wages for the sixth and the seventh shifts worked in a regular workweek but not for any calendar days as such. This shift arrangement was consistent with the publicly stated policies of the national labor organizations to eliminate the payment of premium penalties for work on specific calendar days, which practice had formerly been in effect and required the payment of such premiums on Saturdays and Sundays regardless of whether or not any individual might have worked on any other days of the same workweek. The policy relative to the elimination of premium calendar days as such was further effectuated by appropriate provisions in amendments to the zone standards agreements established through voluntary negotiations in May 1942 between management in the shipbuilding industry throughout the United States and representatives of their employees in the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and as a national policy, by the issue of Executive Order 9240 effective as of October 1, 1942.

Now permit me to read the Executive order sent out by the President in October 1942. It is in part as follows:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, it is hereby ordered:

I. That the following principles and regulations shall apply for the duration of the war to the payment of premium and overtime wage compensation on all work relating to the prosecution of the war:

A. No premium wage or extra compensation shall be paid to any employee in the United States, its territories, or possessions for work on Saturday or Sunday except where such work is performed by the employee on the sixth or seventh day worked in his regularly scheduled workweek and as hereinafter provided.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in my remarks Executive Order No. 9240.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER 9240 (AS AMENDED BY EXECUTIVE ORDER 9248)

REGULATIONS RELATING TO OVERTIME WAGE COMPENSATION

Whereas many labor organizations have already adopted the patriotic policy of waiving double-time wage compensation or other premium pay for work on Saturday, Sunday, and holidays, as such, for the duration of the war; and

Whereas it is desirable and necessary in the prosecution of the war, and to insure uniformity and fair treatment for those labor organizations, employers, and employees who are conforming to such wage policies that this principle be universally adopted:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, it is hereby ordered:

I. That the following principles and regulations shall apply for the duration of the war to the payment of premiums and overtime wage compensation on all work relating to the prosecution of the war:

A. No premium wage or extra compensation shall be paid to any employee in the United States, its Territories, or possessions, for work on Saturday or Sunday, except where such work is performed by the employee on the sixth or seventh day worked in his regularly scheduled workweek and as hereinafter provided.

(1) Where because of emergency conditions an employee is required to work for 7 consecutive days in any regularly scheduled workweek a premium wage of double-time compensation shall be paid for work on the seventh day.

(2) Where required by the provisions of law or employment contracts, not more than time and one-half wage compensation shall be paid for work in excess of 8 hours in any day or 40 hours in any workweek or for work performed on the sixth day worked in any regularly scheduled workweek.

B. No premium wage or extra compensation shall be paid for work on customary holidays, except that time and one-half wage compensation shall be paid for work performed on any of the following holidays only:

New Year's Day, Fourth of July, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, and either Memorial Day or one other such holiday of greater local importance.

II. All Federal departments and agencies shall conform the provisions in all existing and future contracts negotiated, executed, or supervised by them to the policies of this order. All such departments and agencies shall immediately open negotiations to alter provisions in existing contracts to conform them to the requirements of this order.

III. Nothing in this order shall be construed as requiring a modification of the principle that every employee should have at least 1 day of rest in every 7 days. The continuous operation of plants and machines in prosecuting the war does not require that employees should work 7 consecutive days.

IV. Nothing herein shall be construed as superseding or in conflict with the provisions of the statutes prescribing the compensation, hours of work, and other conditions of employment of employees of the United States.

V. All Federal departments and agencies affected by this order shall refer to the Secretary of Labor for determination questions of interpretation and application arising hereunder. In any industry or occupation in which the Secretary finds that a wage stabilization agreement approved by a Government department or agency is operating satisfactorily, or in any industry or occupation in which the Secretary finds that the nature and exigencies of operations make such action necessary or advisable for the successful prosecution of the war, the Secretary may determine that any or all of the provisions of this order shall not apply to such industry or occupation or to any classes of employees therein. (As amended by Executive Order 9248 dated September 17, 1942.)

VI. The provisions of this order shall become effective October 1, 1942.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*September 9, 1942.*

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, another agreement was also entered into trying to control the migration of workers between yards and to eliminate absenteeism. Again these two labor unions objected. Now we get down to another point in Secretary Bard's letter to which I hope you will all listen carefully:

Particularly in respect to the action of the East Bay Local 1304, Congress of Industrial Organizations, the insistence of this union upon the terms of its own individual labor contract has resulted in its refusal to permit its members to work on Saturdays or Sundays without the payment of premium wages. In the case of union members who have disregarded this requirement of the union, Local 1304 has assessed fines of $10 per day against such individuals. Specifically, on the week ends of December 19 and 20, 1942, and of December 26 and 27, 1942, contrary to the demands of East Bay Shipyards for the work of machinists on vital and urgent war work, East Bay Local 1304 refused to permit its members to work on those week ends under conditions applicable to all other local labor. This refusal had the specific effect of disrupting work schedules on new vessels under construction and involving delays in several ship projects of extreme urgency.

Now, please get the next sentence:

A further consequence was failure to effect repairs on Navy and Army vessels so preventing these vessels from meeting schedules controlling convoys required for shipment of men and supplies with the result that convoys were delayed and schedules of troop movements to ports of embarkation were seriously disorganized.

I charge that the individuals who prevented that work are just as guilty of treason as though they had put a time bomb under these ships and delayed their sailing for 3 days, and I hope that in the future the military authorities will take the necessary steps to see that such delays are not further encountered.

Paying particular attention now to the other local union, Local No. 68, A. F. of L., there has been a refusal to furnish urgently needed machinists to shipyards within the jurisdiction of that union because of refusal in conformity with their mutual agreements of such shipyards to accept employees from other shipyards without clearances.

These are not jurisdictional disputes; I hope I make that clear.

All of this came to a head just before the Christmas holidays. It is covered in the letter from Secretary Bard. As a result of serious disruption of this war work, the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission found it necessary to call on the President and request that he take action in order to put these two unions back to work. On January 1 the President sent the following wire to the unions involved. I quote as follows:

I am informed by Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission that actions of your union are seriously interfering with vital war production and have delayed shipments of men and supplies to fighting fronts because, contrary to the action of practically all other labor, you have refused to abide by agreements for work on Saturdays and Sundays and to comply with measures established to prevent unnecessary migration of labor.

You are directed to conform with the amended Pacific coast shipbuilding and ship-repair stabilization agreements and to anti-migration measures adopted and generally operating in San Francisco Bay area.

When that wire reached the coast, the gentlemen involved, Messrs. Hook, Dillon, and Smith, were invited by Vice Admiral Greenslade and General DeWitt to confer with them the afternoon the wire arrived. These two prominent officers were left cooling their heels, however, because the local representatives would not call around to discuss the matter with them.

When we come to this point we get headlines in the San Francisco papers:

Bay union leaders defy Roosevelt on order for war work.

We are getting into a pretty pickle along about now. I should like to read briefly from an article which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner calling attention to the flat disobedience of these machinists' representatives and their refusal to permit their men to work in the yards on that particular week end:

From an indisputably reliable source, it was learned that a union spokesman had dismissed the matter by explaining offhandedly that "Secretary Perkins told us, in a phone call from Washington, not to do anything until her representatives got here, so we just didn't go to the conference with the admiral and the general."

Next:

Growing rebellion seethed within the ranks of the machinists' unions themselves, particularly the East Bay Congress of Industrial Organizations union. Four of this union's men have been suspended, and $25 fines imposed by the union on 30 others, because they disobeyed union orders and worked through the Christmas week end, in order to fulfill their patriotic pledges to Navy officials that they would complete vitally needed Navy construction work at that time.

Think of it! Twenty-five dollars assessed against patriotic machinists because they went to work that week end.

Why the hell should we be fined for doing our patriotic duty?—

A spokesman for these union men demanded.

I think we might all ask the same question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place this newspaper article in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

BAY UNION LEADERS DEFY ROOSEVELT ON ORDER FOR WAR WORK—FINES KEEP 34 MACHINISTS FROM AIDING PRODUCTION AT ALAMEDA YARDS

The Bay region shipyards machinists' "beef" which last week drew a rebuking wire to Congress of Industrial Organizations and American Federation of Labor union bosses from President Roosevelt himself after Army and Navy schedules had been disrupted by the machinists' refusal to work on week ends, yesterday appeared moving to a climactic show-down with a new series of rapid-fire developments:

1. In flat disobedience of the President's directive, ordering the unions to cease interfering with war production, the East Bay Congress of Industrial Organizations union local's tactics yesterday prevented 34 machinists from working at the General Engineering and Drydock yards in Alameda, "crippling" production of new Navy warships.

2. By plane from Washington, representatives of the Department of Labor, dispatched by Madam Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, arrived here and went into a huddle with the machinists' union officials. At twelfth district naval headquarters, spokesmen for the Navy, most vitally interested in the effects of the machinists' work stoppage, had no official word of the Labor Department's agents' arrival, said "they apparently did not see fit to take us into their confidence."

3. It was learned that the union bosses on New Year's Day had deliberately let Vice Admiral John W. Greenslade, commandant of this Navy district; Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt, commander of the Army's Western Defense Area, and Maj. Gen. Frederick Gilbreath, commandant of the San Francisco Port of Embarkation, cool their heels waiting vainly to hold a scheduled conference with the union leaders, in an attempt to effect a mutually satisfactory ending of the machinists' labor bottleneck which had already delayed Navy warship trials, and sailing of ships with war supplies needed by General MacArthur's men.

From an indisputably reliable source, it was learned that a union spokesman had dismissed the matter by explaining offhandedly that "Secretary Perkins told us, in a phone call from Washington, not to do anything until her representatives got here, so we just didn't go to the conference with the admiral and the generals."

4. Growing rebellion seethed within the ranks of the machinists' unions themselves, particularly the East Bay Congress of Industrial Organizations union. Four of this union's men have been suspended, and $25 fines imposed by the union on 30 others, because they disobeyed union orders and worked through the Christmas week-end, in order to fulfill their patriotic pledges to Navy officials that they would complete vitally needed Navy construction work at that time.

"Why the hell should we be fined for doing our patriotic duty?" a spokesman for these union men demanded.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker please understand that all this refers only to two local unions. All other labor on the Pacific coast is working under the master agreement and we have found some splendid relationships between management and labor, particularly in the Northwest area.

Now let me read you the statement of Mr. Al Wynn, who is the official spokesman for the San Francisco Metal Trades Council. This is what Mr. Wynn had to say:

This council and its affiliated unions have made an agreement with the shipyards and with the Government, and we intend to carry out that agreement. That agreement provides there shall be no stoppage of work; when a grievance arises, the Government has set up a committee to take it up, and our unions will abide by that, while our men stay on the job. I believe all other groups should do likewise.

Undoubtedly that represents the attitude of the vast majority of loyal workers throughout the country.

Here we have two local labor organizations in San Francisco, one of them a local of the C. I. O. and one a local of the A. F. of L., which have formed an unholy alliance in defiance of all orders from the President and from the Army and the Navy. It seems to me that the responsible heads of these organizations ought to be yanked out of their jobs to cool their heels as they made Admiral Greenslade and General DeWitt cool theirs when they were asked to confer with them. Their own national organizations have no control over their activities.

I have just this criticism to make of the Secretary of Labor: This situation has been fomenting out there for something like a year and a half. I cannot understand why Madam Perkins had to wait until this good moment before sending her representatives out to attempt to settle it. She should have had her representatives there long ago trying to prevent these disturbances and not wait until they have actually occurred before taking action.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There are two points I would like to have cleared up in my own mind. The gentleman dropped the remark that the Army and Navy should do something about that. May I ask if it is the gentleman's opinion that the Army and Navy is authorized to take action in such matters?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. My attitude is that persons responsible for strikes which delay convoys going to the Southwest Pacific with materials for our fighting men should be treated exactly the same as traitors to their country. Have not the military authorities some rights where traitors are concerned?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not so sure about that. It is a legal question.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Then the Congress should give them such authority immediately.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I want to bring out. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the instructions from Madam Perkins, Secretary of Labor, cut across the directive issued by the President and that the three or four union leaders kept away from the conference directed by the President because they had received an order from the Secretary of Labor?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am simply telling the gentleman what was stated in this newspaper article which I read. I cannot make the accusation that Madam Perkins' activities cut across the directive issued by the President. The union agents said they were not going to take any action until her representatives appeared and until they received instructions from her.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The observation which the gentleman has just made in answer to an inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] indicates that there is a difference of opinion as to what agency of the Government can aid us in doing away with strikes in war industries. The Labor Committee of the House of Representatives on November 26 and 27, 1941, prior to the passage of the so-called Anti-Strike legislation in this House on December 3 of that year, listened to the representative of the American Federation of Labor, President William Green, and to the C. I. O. through its secretary, Mr. James B. Carey. They were specifically asked the question if it were not proper for the Congress of the United States to write into the statutory law of this country provisions whereby we could meet the strike situation. I think the testimony will show that those men said in effect that the heads of the unions could control the problem, which was at that time and since, seriously curtailing defense and war material output. In other words, what they proposed to do in 1941 has not been accomplished, even though some leaders have tried, and the Congress of the United States without shifting the responsibility to the Army or Navy or the President should act as the House did on December 3, 1941. The Senate failed to act. The Seventy-eighth Congress not only in the House but in the other body, should affirm its courage to meet this unhealthy condition.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I heartily agree with the gentleman from West Virginia. I feel that the Secretary of Labor has been remiss in her duties and, as the gentleman knows, I feel that the Labor Committee has been a little remiss in some of its duties also. I agree with the gentleman that where the national heads of these organizations cannot control the situation we should take steps to see that it is properly controlled. We cannot have these strikes delaying the shipment of vital materials going to our men overseas who are doing the fighting.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. With some trepidation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It does not make any difference to me just so long as you yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Go ahead.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman said that the Labor Committee has been remiss.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That was putting it rather charitably.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not disagree with the gentleman. As one member of the Labor Committee I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that

bills to remedy that situation have been introduced, four or five of them, as long as 2 years ago, by the Member from the Fourth District of Michigan and the adoption of those bills has been urged on the floor of this House time and time again.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In fact, the patience of the House has been tried by remarks which I have made along the line of ending these subversive activities. And yet we have failed to get action.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I quite agree with the gentleman, but attention should be called to the fact that on several occasions the House has done its duty well. We have passed the type of legislation needed, it has gone somewhere else, and then disappeared.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman know of any reason why we should not continue in session 5 days a week, in an endeavor to put through legislation which would end this evil?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am sure that the gentleman knows I have no objection to working as many days on the floor of the House as is necessary, but I hope he will leave me a few minutes for my committee work and other work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is correct. We need time for committee and other work but we have no excuse for dodging corrective legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the entire letter from Secretary Bard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
*Washington, January 9, 1943.*

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of January 4, 1943, in which you request details relative to recent labor difficulties affecting shipyards in the San Francisco Bay area. The essence of these difficulties is contained in a telegraphic directive, dated January 1, 1943, addressed to the responsible unions by the President, and published in the press on January 4 and January 5.

The present difficulties have been an acute action definitely connected with a chronic situation of which a brief summary may serve a useful purpose.

Beginning with the effective date of the Pacific Coast Shipbuilding Stabilization Agreement, made effective on April 1, 1941, the International Association of Machinists Local Union 68, American Federation of Labor, under the leadership of its business agents, Mr. Harry Hook and Mr. E. F. Dillon, objected to the agreement concurred in by all other American Federation of Labor organizations concerned, for the establishment of the standard wage rate of $1.12 per hour for skilled mechanics. They demanded a wage rate for their own membership at a rate of $1.15 per hour. This demand had subsequent repercussions in negotiation of contracts by the same labor organizations with the so-called up-town shops. The union demands developed into a strike which tied up some 50 or 60 San Francisco shops engaged in production of war material. The dispute was settled by reference to the National Labor Mediation Board, which made an award on the basis of union demands.

So far as the shipyards themselves were concerned, the Shipbuilding Stabilization Agreement was followed by the negotiation of a master labor agreement between the American Federation of Labor and practically all west coast shipyards then in operation. This agreement was established on a closed-shop basis and was applicable to all shipyards then parties to the stabilization agreement. However, subsequent to April 1, 1941, certain shipyards on the east side of San Francisco Bay renewed, as of that date, labor contracts which had existed previously and which had been made with a local union known as the East Bay Machinists Union, No. 1304, affiliated with the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, Congress of Industrial Organizations, James Smith, business agent. This contract operated for the benefit of machinists only, in the east bay shipyards only, but it immediately raised a contention on the part of American Federation of Labor that it was in conflict with the master agreement which actually covered all other trades in the east bay yards and presumably would control the supply of machinists also.

The contention of American Federation of Labor developed a jurisdictional dispute with the Congress of Industrial Organizations, local 1304, relative to which Mr. Sidney Hillman, his his then official capacity as Associate Director of the Office of Production Management, in a telegram to the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council, American Federation of Labor, replying to letter dated July 24, 1941, from the council, and stating their contentions, Mr. Hillman stated as follows: "There was absolutely nothing stated that could, even by the remotest stretch of the imagination, be construed as authorizing in any way the entry into additional agreements by the employers and local unions in addition to said master agreement. Any attempt, therefore, to negotiate such individual agreements would necessarily constitute an unwarranted departure, both from the letter and the spirit of the understanding reflected by my letter of July 24. Any such individual agreements with individual local unions that may have been entered into consequently constitute such a departure and cannot be recognized by us as binding." Subsequently local 1304 attempted to prevent the supply of machinists to yards with which the union considered its contract valid and the supply of machinists was maintained by direct action of the metal trades department, American Federation of Labor. This action did not, however, result in a complete settlement of the jurisdictional dispute.

Since the foregoing incidents, local No. 68 has withdrawn from the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council, American Federation of Labor, in order to maintain its independent autonomous action, and has evidently maintained close collaboration with East Bay local 1304, Congress of Industrial Organizations, to the extent of refusal to consider either union bound by the Shipbuilding Zone Standards Agreements or other local agreements participated in between the American Federation of Labor Metal Trades Department and local shipyards.

One such local agreement, established for the purpose of providing continuous operations on a basis of 3 shifts per day, 7 days per week, in order to provide for the maximum possible production in the shipyard industry, set up a shift arrangement which provides for the payment of premium wages for the sixth and the seventh shifts worked in a regular workweek but not for any calendar days as such. This shift arrangement was consistent with the publicly stated policies of the national labor organizations to eliminate the payment of premium penalties for work on specific calendar days, which practice had formerly been in effect and required the payment of such premiums on Saturdays and Sundays regardless of whether or not any individual might have worked on any other days of the same workweek. The policy relative to the elimination of premium calendar days as such was further effectuated by appropriate provisions in amendments to the Zone Standards Agreements established through voluntary negotiations in May 1942 between management in the shipbuilding industry throughout the United States and representatives of their employees in the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and as a national policy, by the issue of Executive Order 9240 effective as of October 1, 1942. By appropriate action of the Secretary of Labor, the shipbuilding and ship repair industry operating under the Zone Standards Agreements has temporarily been exempted from the application of Executive Order 9240 because the Zone Standards Agreements themselves nearly universally are so drawn as to comply with the intent of Executive Order 9240.

Another local agreement between the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council and Shipbuilders in the San Francisco Bay area who are signatory to the Pacific coast master agreement, was adopted pursuant to expressed national policies as exemplified by War Manpower Commission rules to control unnecessary migration of labor among war industries. This agreement provides, among other things, that no shipbuilder in the Bay area shall employ any person previously employed by any other shipyard in the area, unless such person presents a clearance card from the previous employer.

The present difficulty has arisen through failure of the cited unions to conform to the policies for elimination of premium calendar days on the grounds that they were not specifically represented in the Chicago conference and are therefore not bound by the amendments to the zone standards established by that conference, and that they are not subject to the control of the national policy expressed in Executive Order 9240 because of the exemption granted by the Secretary of Labor. These unions have further failed to comply with the local agreement relating to migration on the ground, so far as the Navy Department understands, that the unions are in disagreement with the policy expressed.

Particularly in respect to the action of the East Bay local 1304, Congress of Industrial Organizations, the insistence of this union upon the terms of its own individual labor contract has resulted in its refusal to permit its members to work on Saturdays or Sundays without the payment of premium wages. In the case of union members who have disregarded this requirement of the union, local 1304 has assessed fines of $10 per day against such individuals. Specifically, on the week ends of December 19 and 20, 1942, and of December 26 and 27, 1942, contrary to the demands of East Bay shipyards for the work of machinists on vital and urgent war work, East Bay local 1304 refused to permit its members to work on those week ends under conditions applicable to all other local labor. This refusal had the specific effect of disrupting work schedules on new vessels under construction and involving delays in several ship projects of extreme urgency. A further consequence was failure to effect repairs on Navy and Army vessels so preventing these vessels from meeting schedules controlling convoys required for shipment of men and supplies with the result that convoys were delayed and schedules of troop movements to ports of embarkation were seriously disorganized.

Particularly on the part of local union No. 68, American Federation of Labor, there has

been a refusal to furnish urgently needed machinists to shipyards within the jurisdiction of that union because of the refusal in conformity with their mutual agreements of such shipyards to accept employees from other shipyards without clearances.

Accordingly, after consultation between the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, these agencies, in order to accomplish their deep responsibilities in the efficient and expeditious prosecution of the war, and upon the definite assurance on the part of local 1304 that a Presidential directive would be necessary to establish the willingness of that union to conform with the provisions of the amended shipbuilding zone standards agreements which are accepted by and complied with on the part of all other local labor, were constrained to request the directive issued by the President on January 1, 1943.

Coincident with the issue of the directive as referred to in the preceding paragraph, the Secretary of Labor, after consultation with the Navy Department, sent representatives of the Department of Labor to San Francisco for the purpose of exploring the basic questions involved, with a view to establishing local understandings which may insure satisfactory cooperation among the conflicting interests, and avoiding further obstruction of war production because of these conflicts. In connection with this action of the Secretary of Labor, all local representatives of the Navy Department have been directed to cooperate and to assist in every practicable way.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH A. BARD.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have an additional minute. I would like to make a further observation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me a second time. I desire to make myself perfectly clear. I believe that the majority of the working men and women of America, especially in time of war, are of a type which we may designate as loyal labor and responsible unionism. I am only saying that in any legislation of a restrictive nature, we must of necessity direct it at a small minority group rather than the large group. I do not think that labor itself should take the attitude that Members of Congress like myself and others who attempt to solve this problem by legislation mean an affront to them. Just the opposite is true in my own case, because I would not knowingly tear down a single proper gain labor has been given.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I agree with the gentleman that the vast majority of the working men and women of this country are loyal and patriotic, but they have to be protected from their own misguided leaders.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

## FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill providing an appropriation of $44,000,000 for the completion of the Intracoastal Waterway across Florida. The purpose of this was to provide the eastern seaboard with the necessary fuels. I said I would have something more to say about that this week.

Mr. Speaker, the most serious blow which the Axis has struck at us is the dangerous impairment of our transportation system. By driving our coastwise and intracoastal travel from the seas, the enemy submarines have created a threat to the success of our arms which can only be exceeded by successful invasion of our territory. This was and is the principal mission of the German undersea warfare, and so far it has been successful, even beyond their expectations. In addition to this it has recently been announced over the air that the Axis Powers will probably put in service 700 submarines in the spring. The devastation wrought by these submarines is not even at its peak if this is true.

The destruction of our coastwise transport has had the effect the enemy calculated it would have, and has set in train a series of internal difficulties which strike at the very root of our war effort and our capacity for carrying the war overseas. That we were unprepared and unable to meet this thrust is one of the tragic results of our failure to recognize the strategic necessity for developing a balanced system of transport. It should have been evident to all, but was clearly understood by too few, that the extent and nature of the physical geography of the United States automatically preclude sole reliance on rail transport.

We have failed to build up and connect our inland waterway systems; we have lost our coastwise ocean transport; and now our overburdened railways are breaking down.

The crisis is upon us. We are already too late with too little. By our failure we have fixed the limits of our war effort. The creeping paralysis of a failing transport has definitely set in, and unless we can arrest it, we must abandon our hopes for an early victory.

First. Among the already existing results of this failure of our transport system are acute and crippling gasoline shortages, especially in the East. This has multiplied and complicated our transport difficulty by reducing motor carriage of individuals to a dangerously uneconomic minimum, and overburdening the public urban and interurban facilities, and vastly diminishing truck transport via the highways. This is too well known to require elaboration but many of us do not yet clearly perceive the further results of this gasoline shortage. The manpower losses in hours due to the situation have been conservatively estimated to be more than 7 percent. No one who is cognizant of the general picture in industry fails to recognize this fact, and to regard it as equal to the loss of many divisions of our fighting men. Something must be done about it.

Second. The second disastrous result of the failing of our transport has been the famine in fuel oil. All are aware of the cold homes, cold schools, and churches, the lowered efficiency of workers, and the tremendous dislocation in employment brought about by the industrial rationing of fuel oil. But relatively few are watching the death graphs for pneumonia and influenza, the increase in accidents and the very serious loss of man hours resulting.

Third. A third result of our deteriorating transport system is seen in certain food shortages already existing. Sugar is an outstanding example. Milk and butter production are similarly affected. New dairy development has been precluded and existing production diminished by lack of distribution and collection facilities.

This is a brief outline of the situation as it exists. The Petroleum Coordinator, the Director of Defense Transportation, and the Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization have told us that not only have they been unable to prevent these conditions, but that they are wholly unable to prevent the present situation developing into an even worse debacle next winter. It is easy to see why this is so, in the absence of any determined attempt to throw into the breach our potential inland water transportation facilities. Not only will the deterioration of our rail equipment proceed at an accelerated pace, reducing the number of ton-miles of freight which it will be possible to move, but the African campaign has indicated clearly that the military policy of the United States will be to make shipments of petroleum and other supplies to the European theater direct from the east coast when possible. Only a little foresight makes plain that when a second front is opened in Europe, as we expect it will be, the need for movement of petroleum and all supplies to the eastern seaboard will be vastly greater than it is now.

Congress appears to have substantially recognized and ratified the truth of these statements when it enacted last July Public Law 675, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing for the connection of the Gulf and Mississippi waterway systems with the Atlantic intracoastal system by the construction of a barge channel across northern Florida. The act clearly stated that the authorization was made "in order to promote the national defense, and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of supplies needful to the Military Establishment."

The urgency was so clearly recognized that the Chief of Engineers was authorized to employ temporary structures where necessary. The act was expressly an emergency war measure.

Nearly 7 months have elapsed and nothing further whatever has been done about it, either by Congress or the administration, and we have driven headlong into a situation which continues to grow worse. The people will want to know why.

There is not one single physical obstacle to bringing this relief to the people and our military forces within 10

months time. The equipment to build the project is available and idle. The manpower offers no problem. The amount of material is inconsequential, and for the most part can be furnished locally.

I have seen definite proposals from some of the largest and most responsible construction concerns in the country, offering to complete this job and to open it to travel next October, if it is begun immediately. Plans have long since been developed by the Army engineers and only an appropriation is required to begin the work forthwith.

I am aware that views have been expressed to the effect that the construction of this project would require 3½ years. I can understand how, under normal conditions, it would be possible to spread the construction over that length of time, but with all due respect to those holding these views, I submit that they are untenable in the light of these concrete proposals from construction people who are actually engaged in this kind of work and with a long record of achievement behind them. In fact, some of the engineers have confidentially stated that it could be built in 15 months if necessary. I just want to give you one example of what can be accomplished when we are faced with an emergency. When my committee was asked for an appropriation for the Douglas Dam in the necessity for a step-up they came to estimated it would take 18 months to build that dam, but when they were faced with a shortage of power and saw the necessity for a step-up they came to the conclusion that it can be done in 11 months, and I think they will do it in even less time than that.

I concur with General Summerall, former Chief of Staff of the United States Army, in his statement made in a letter to the Governors of all Eastern States under date of January 17. He says:

> Any statements to the contrary notwithstanding, it is possible to construct this connecting channel and to initiate barge traffic on a scale adequate to supply the entire petroleum needs of the Eastern States without rationing within 10 months after the work is begun. * * * The responsibility for the delay and the resulting situation rests squarely in the lap of the Government. * * * It is admitted by all that if this completed waterway were now in existence there would be no petroleum shortage in the East; no looming shadow of food and other vital supply shortages beginning to materialize; and no break-down of our rail transport. * * * Our transport must be maintained regardless of priorities, materials, or manpower. It is time for Congress and the Government to take a realistic view of the position; to cease to consider the Nation's arterial water transport in political and sectional terms; to look upon this work as the stark military necessity it is, and to think of construction in months instead of in years.

Bear in mind that this canal not only links up the oil fields of Texas with the East, but connects almost every point in the Mississippi Valley with the Atlantic seaboard. Cargoes can move to Philadelphia direct from points in Missouri, Iowa, Illinois, Arkansas, and other Valley States.

I do not think it is necessary at this time to argue the currently expressed judgment of Congress embodied in this act. It takes only a glance at the map to satisfy the average man of the common sense of this legislation enacted last summer.

In authorizing this project, and in the wording of the act, Congress has declared in effect:

First. The project is practicable.

Second. It is urgently necessary.

Third. It can be built in time to serve the situation.

I desire to make clear that while the act provides particularly for transportation relief to the eastern seaboard and for the facilitation of trans-Atlantic movement from eastern ports, it provides to an important degree, for the relief of the general transportation system in other portions of the country. The chief reason why there is a fuel-oil shortage in many of the Mississippi Valley States is the use of an enormous number of tank cars and railway facilities pressed into service for the haul to the seaboard. The opening of this continuous waterway would take out of this service practically all of these cars and make them available for their proper function of distributing petroleum products throughout the inland areas of the country.

The chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers have both stated that through the construction of this short connecting channel across northern Florida the entire petroleum needs of the eastern seaboard can be supplied by through barge transport. I quote from House Report No. 2153, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, in which the chairman of the committee states:

> The barge channel across Florida authorized by this bill is the only proposal that can be made capable of supplying all the oil needs of the Atlantic seaboard, in the absence of ocean-tanker service.

Aside from the absolute necessity of providing for this through barge transport, the Congress can practice no more wise economy than by immediately providing the funds for construction. When the tremendous difference between the cost of barge transport and rail transport to the eastern seaboard is considered, and it is remembered that the Federal Treasury is now expending more than $1,000,000 a day to subsidize this transportation by rail, it will be seen that the project would pay for itself in less than 40 days' time and would permanently relieve the taxpayers throughout the country of a burden now amounting to more than $300,000,000 a year and which bids fair to continue as long as this war lasts.

For those who may not have a clear picture of the physical situation in mind, I want to again point out that there exists today a completed waterway over which barges may now travel from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Trenton, N. J., except for a small connecting channel across northern Florida, the length of which is only 3½ percent of the total length of the waterway, and the absence of which interposes an absolute barrier to the use of this system upon which we have spent tens of millions of dollars.

On yesterday I introduced a bill appropriating $44,000,000 for the completion of this Intracoastal Waterway. I sincerely feel that it is not only for the best interest of the Military Establishment but also for the civilian population of the Atlantic seaboard and every citizen of this Nation that this appropriation be approved and the construction of this project be begun at the earliest possible date.

I hope the committee to which this bill is referred will give it its present consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I wanted to call to the gentleman's attention the very statement of General Summerall that he just read, to the effect that this barge canal could be completed in 10 months.

I also want to call attention to a more serious aspect of this proposition. The gravest danger with which we are confronted today is the submarine warfare. On yesterday, I believe, Viscount Cranborne, the Government leader, reported to the British House of Lords as follows:

> As German land and air prospects decrease, they are concentrating more and more on attacks on our sea communications. They realize this is the only chance of escaping total defeat.

Every day we are being told now that this is the gravest danger with which we are confronted, yet because of the failure to build this short strip of this great inland waterway our vessels are compelled to go around through the Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean Sea, or the Florida Straits, the Windward Passage, and they are being destroyed by German submarines. This is not only preventing the eastern seaboard from securing the fuel it needs but is also destroying the fuel oil that is intended for our armed forces abroad and for our allies. It is also destroying the vessels necessary to carry this oil. Besides the oil ships we have lost large numbers of bauxite ships and other vessels carrying war materials.

Therefore, I submit that it is absolute folly to speed up the building of these oil-carrying vessels and then refuse to build this short strip of this great Intracoastal Waterway across the Florida Peninsula that would, if completed, relieve the oil shortage on the Atlantic seaboard and at the same time entirely eliminate one of the most dangerous preying grounds used by the German submarines in their attempt to destroy our intracoastal and transoceanic shipping.

For that reason, I say that the Congress ought not to wait another week. This provision ought to be brought to the floor of the House and passed now,

because, if this submarine menace continues to increase as today's press indicates it is increasing, we may find ourselves unable to supply our armies and our allies overseas. Therefore, I sincerely trust that the Committee on Appropriations will bring this measure out and that the House and Senate will pass it without delay.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his contribution. His knowledge of intracoastal waterways is exceeded only by his knowledge of the Tennessee Valley Authority. He is a ranking member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I pointed out just a few moments ago that we had many reports that this spring 700 submarines would be turned loose on our transport system. I could quote a newspaper release by Elmer Davis of OWI, which points out that danger, but I don't think it is necessary as I think everybody realizes the danger, and I believe that unless this canal is constructed so that we can get fuel to the Atlantic seaboard for the coming winter, that the wrath of the people of that section of the country will fall upon the members of Congress in that section and not only fall from there, but from all over this Nation. We should not hesitate to spend $44,000,000 if necessary to provide those people with the fuel they need, and the fighting forces with the oil that they need. I now quote a short paragraph from the report of the Rivers and Harbors Committee on the bill that passed in July and I think it is apropos today:

> There is no shortage of oil or gasoline in this country. All storage facilities of the Southwest are filled to capacity, while the wells and refineries are being closed down. People there are suffering great financial loss because the surplus stocks cannot be moved to market. In the East, gasoline is being rationed because of the inability to secure transportation under existing conditions. As winter approaches the need for fuel oil to relieve actual suffering may become very acute.

That was predicted last summer, and I predict that if this canal is not completed, if provisions are not made to transport this oil from the West, conditions in the East will become more acute next winter than they have been this winter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that the gentleman knows that in Massachusetts, in New England, people are suffering today, and people have died as the result of the lack of fuel. We do not need legislation if we could only get people to act.

Mr. HENDRICKS. We do not need legislation. All we need is an appropriation, and I have introduced this bill to bring it before the people of this country and point out to them that they have something here if they could get Congress to act, and consider it, and I have pointed out that I have the names of four contractors who say that they will complete it in 10 months and have it in operation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the war production could go ahead even without that appropriation.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for her contribution. I do not care how it is done as long as we get that fuel to the East.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And for the protection of our ships.

Mr. RANKIN. The proposal to put a 24-inch pipe line to the Atlantic seaboard will take some time, but even if we complete that it will have to pass through the Allegheny mountain region, where the freezing is very great, and when completed it can carry only about 240,000 barrels a day.

Mr. HENDRICKS. And it will take more steel to build a 10-inch pipe line, by three than it would to complete the canal across Florida. The oil pipe line would be able to carry about 30,000 barrels a day, and the canal could carry over a million barrels a day. It is mere stupidity to build these lines when we could get this canal.

### PRICE OF CORN

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I hold here in my hand a copy of the Government magazine Victory which was issued yesterday by the Office of War Information.

On page 75 you will find this headline "Corn prices frozen at highest levels, 100 percent in excess of parity."

This headline, which is a dastardly slap at the already harassed farmers of the Nation, cannot be passed off under the classification of sloppy journalism.

Would it be by mere coincidence that this lying headline in an official Government document, with wide newspaper circulation, appeared on the same date as cartoons and articles in the metropolitan press portraying the so-called congressional farm bloc as the road hog for the farmers, and branding the efforts of the farmers to have farm-labor costs included on computation of parity as a threat of inflation?

This should be a warning to the people against a Government controlled or subsidized press which could counterfeit the truth with its own fraudulent headlines.

In this particular article it is necessary to read dozens of lines of print to learn that the headline is a contemptible lie. American people are headline readers and in glancing through this magazine one would readily assume that everything had been fixed for the farmer to receive double the amount of parity since the headline words "100 percent in excess of parity" certainly imply that.

And how strange that Victory's editor inserts an editor's note demanding that whenever anything is reprinted from the document that "the original meaning be preserved."

Mr. Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, which issued the magazine, should put into practice in his own backyard what he is trying to sell the American public.

In a recent chain broadcast on handling wartime news, Mr. Davis, who is at least Director of Government information, if not minister of Government propaganda, told his listeners, "We want our news to be accurate."

Read the purposes of Mr. Davis' Office of War Information, found on page 83 of the United States Government Manual, and you will find it is to "formulate and carry out, through the use of the press, radio, motion picture, and other facilities, information programs designed to facilitate the development of an informed and intelligent understanding at home and abroad of the status and progress of the war effort and of the war policies, activities, and aims of the Government."

If Mr. Davis wants the public to have an intelligent understanding, why does his publication imply that American farmers are going to get a fat plum in the form of 100 percent in excess of parity? Anyone who can tell a horse from a cow knows there has never been anything of the kind ever proposed, and if the headline writers of the Government's mouthpiece cannot keep abreast of the farm program enough to know what is going on, they had better take a leave of absence and substitute a straw hat for their eyeshades and a hoe for their blue pencils and get out and learn the difficult battle the American farmer is fighting for us and the rest of the world on our own home front.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 22, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

79. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a list of suits arising under the act of March 9, 1920 (41 Stat. 525); to the Committee on Claims.

80. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a list of suits arising under the Public Vessel Act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1112); to the Committee on Claims.

81. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the Annual Report of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

82. A letter from the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, transmitting the third report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended October 31, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 54); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

83. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey of the Billings area, Montana, made by this Department pursuant to the Flood

Control Act of June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

84. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of lands acquired for naval uses covering the period from July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

85. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting statements, by projects, of the obligations incurred under the appropriation for temporary and emergency construction under the heading "Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

85a. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the final report of the Secretary of the Treasury with regards to the liquidation of the War Finance Corporation (H. Doc. No. 55); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 18. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and defining its powers and duties; with amendment (Rept. No. 14). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 1388. A bill to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAMBERTSON:

H. R. 1389. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Prairie Band or Tribe of Pottawatomie Indians of Kansas and Wisconsin against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1390. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 with respect to the apportionment of fees collected by clerks of certain courts in naturalization proceedings; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1391. A bill to recognize the high public service rendered by soldiers who volunteered and served in trench-fever experiments in the American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 1392. A bill to authorize payments in lieu of taxes to counties and other political subdivisions in which national forests are situated; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 1393. A bill providing for the temporary exclusion, in computing the public debt of any subdivision or municipality of Puerto Rico under the organic act, of certain refunding bonds issued by such subdivision or municipality; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1394. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Bayomón River and Hondo River, and their tributaries, municipality of Bayamón, P. R., for flood control, for run-off and waterflow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 1395. A bill authorizing the naturalization, without filing of a declaration of intention, of persons who have resided in the United States for 15 years or more; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1396. A bill making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT:

H. R. 1397. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 1398. A bill to amend the act of June 13, 1933 (48 Stat. 139); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas:

H. R. 1399. A bill to provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after 2 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1400. A bill relating to the classification of substitute driver-mechanics in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 1401. A bill to incorporate the Regular Veterans' Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1402. A bill to authorize and direct the Veterans' Administration to provide vocational rehabilitation and assistance in securing suitable employment, for service-connected disabled veterans in need thereof, and feasible therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1403. A bill to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1404. A bill to extend veterans' preference under the civil-service laws and rules; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1405 (by request). A bill to extend the insurance benefits granted by section 602 (d) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to parents of certain deceased members of the armed forces even though such parents are not dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHELCHEL of Georgia:

H. R. 1406. A bill to provide increases in clerical allowances at certain offices of the third class and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 1407. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 1408. A bill to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to include the cost of all farm labor in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 1409. A bill to confer upon members of the merchant marine serving after November 17, 1941, the same rights, privileges, and benefits as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States serving in the present war; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHIFFLER:

H. J. Res. 62. A joint resolution designating the Sunday immediately preceding Decoration Day, May 30, of each year as Memorial Sunday for deceased firemen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1943, as Edison Day, in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the method of ratification of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to provide for the construction of suitable living accommodations for rental to Members of Congress, legislative employees, and their families; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COX:

H. Res. 65. Resolution for the continuation of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. Res. 66. Resolution to provide for investigation by the Committee on the Judiciary into civil action brought against the Associated Press; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. Res. 67. Resolution providing for the payment of the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 16; to the Committee on Accounts.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1410. A bill for the relief of Dale McNeal; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1411. A bill for the relief of Eddie T. Stewart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 1412. A bill for the relief of Mildred M. Hempton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 1413. A bill for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1414. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Knickerbocker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1415. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma S. Dolaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1416. A bill granting a pension to Clarinda E. Kenyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1417. A bill granting a pension to Jesse Morse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1418. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha K. Holcomb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1419. A bill granting an increase of pension to Agnes Tannery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLEN:

H. R. 1420. A bill to grant an honorable discharge from the military service of the United States to William Rosenberg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 1421. A bill for the relief of Paul B. Lingle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 1422. A bill for the relief of the estate of R. L. Blaylock; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT:

H. R. 1423. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Freeman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1424. A bill for the relief of Ernest P. Leavitt; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1425. A bill for the relief of C. W. Robbins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas:

H. R. 1426. A bill for the relief of Mrs. F. A. N. Yeager; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 1427. A bill for the relief of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1428. A bill for the relief of Paul W. Mankin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1429. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John S. Burns; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1430. A bill for the relief of Abraham Gaber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1431. A bill for the relief of Francesco Sapienza; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1432. A bill for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 1433. A bill granting a Distinguished Service Cross to Raymond P. Finnegan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1434. A bill for the relief of Anna M. Kohler; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1435. A bill for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 1436. A bill granting an increase of pension to Celia A. Chappelle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 1437. A bill for the relief of Mrs. María Pastrana Alemán; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 1438. A bill for the relief of Pedro Sagazeta; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1439. A bill for the relief of Luis Ortiz; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 1440. A bill for the relief of William Andrew Johnson; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 1441. A bill for the relief of Joe H. Ross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VORYS of Ohio:

H. R. 1442. A bill for the relief of Lafayette Gibson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 1443. A bill for the relief of Nels Bernard Long; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1444. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth J. Patterson, Joy Patterson, and Roberta Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and paper were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

35. Mr. HOCH: Resolution of the Sixteenth Ward Democratic Club, of Reading, Pa., urging the favorable consideration of the Ruml pay-as-you-go income-tax plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

36. Also, resolution of the Twelfth Ward Democratic Association, of Reading, Pa., urging the favorable consideration of the Ruml pay-as-you-go income-tax plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

37. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the New Jersey State Council, protesting against the flood of questionnaires issued by Federal agencies and appealing for such agencies to confer with State authorities before initiating any additional projects which may result in further confusion, duplication, and unnecessary new burdens on the people of New Jersey; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

38. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Rev. C. Werner, of Randolph, Kans., and 32 other citizens of that community, joining the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kansas in petitioning the Senate and House of Representatives to enact into law war-emergency measures regarding liquor traffic; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

39. Also, petition of Rev. J. P. Langsjoen, of Everest, Kans., and 97 other citizens of that community, joining the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kansas in petitioning the Senate and House of Representatives to enact into law war-emergency measures regarding liquor traffic; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

40. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Resolutions from the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to take immediate steps to relieve distress and suffering caused by the shortage of fuel oil in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

41. By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to take immediate steps to relieve distress and suffering caused by the shortage of fuel oil in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

42. By Mr. FOGARTY: Petition of the State of Rhode Island in general assembly, requesting the Congress of the United States of America to take all necessary steps to provide proper recognition of the men of the American merchant marine service; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## FRIDAY, JANUARY 22, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and everlasting Father, Thou hast abundantly succored us to this day upon the bosom of Thy innumerable mercies. Grant that these blessings may lead us to deep gratitude and unselfishness, building something of fidelity to Thee in our souls and helpfulness in the lives of others; thus securing our immortality on earth; the workman dies but the work goes on forever.

Do thou breathe upon all our land the spirit of knowledge and understanding; take away those things which separate our people and unite them in confidence, in cooperation, and labor; may men of every station learn to love as they have learned to hate. Dear Lord of our souls, we thank Thee for Thy surpassing love and wonder and we pray that the simplicity of Thy teaching may turn us to its sky-born beauty; the cup of water, the bread given to hunger-bitten lips, the clothing for the wind-chilled body, the visit to the cot of pain; Oh, thus is woven the robe of righteousness that will radiate forever in the light of the throne eternal. Hear our humble prayer as we thus go forth in Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 68), and move its adoption.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives, as follows:

Accounts: Alfred J. Elliott, California; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi.

Agriculture: Hampton P. Fulmer, chairman, South Carolina; John W. Flannagan, Jr., Virginia; Richard M. Kleberg, Texas; Harold D. Cooley, North Carolina; Orville Zimmerman, Missouri; Stephen Pace, Georgia; Edward W. Creal, Kentucky; W. R. Poage, Texas; George M. Grant, Alabama; Pat Cannon, Florida; Victor Wickersham, Oklahoma; Jerry Voorhis, California; Walter K. Granger, Utah; Jim McCord, Tennessee; Bolivar Pagán, Puerto Rico.

Appropriations: Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio; John M. Coffee, Washington; W. F. Norrell, Arkansas; Albert Gore, Tennessee; Elmer H. Wene, New Jersey; Clinton P. Anderson, New Mexico; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; Thomas J. O'Brien, Illinois; James M. Curley, Massachusetts.

Banking and Currency: Henry B. Steagall, chairman, Alabama; Brent Spence, Kentucky; Thomas F. Ford, California; Paul Brown, Georgia; Wright Patman, Texas; William B. Barry, New York; A. S. Mike Monroney, Oklahoma; James A. Wright, Pennsylvania; John H. Folger, North Carolina; H. Streett Baldwin, Maryland; Brooks Hays, Arkansas; La Vern R. Dilweg, Wisconsin; Roger C. Slaughter, Missouri; Merlin Hull, Wisconsin.

Census: A. Leonard Allen, chairman, Louisiana; John E. Rankin, Mississippi; Ed Gossett, Texas; John R. Murdock, Arizona; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; Graham A. Barden, North Carolina; Andrew L. Somers, New York; James F. O'Connor, Montana; Grant Furlong, Pennsylvania; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio; Thomas F. Burchill, New York.

Civil Service: Robert Ramspeck, chairman, Georgia; Jennings Randolph, West Virginia; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Henry M. Jackson, Washington; Carter Manasco, Alabama; Joseph A. Gavagan, New York; Nat Patton, Texas; Graham A. Barden, North Carolina; Thomas E. Scanlon, Pennsylvania; Arthur G. Klein, New York; Cecil R. King, California; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi.

Claims: Dan R. McGehee, chairman, Mississippi; Robert Ramspeck, Georgia; Samuel Dickstein, New York; Eugene J. Keogh, New York; Nat Patton, Texas; Carter Manasco, Alabama; William A. Rowan, Illinois; John W. Murphy, Pennsylvania; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; Harry Sauthoff, Wisconsin.

Coinage, Weights, and Measures: Andrew L. Somers, chairman, New York; John J. Cochran, Missouri; Compton I. White, Idaho; Dan R. McGehee, Mississippi; Eugene Worley, Texas; John Lesinski, Michigan; Louis J. Capozzoli, New York; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; John P. Newsome, Alabama; William L. Dawson, Illinois; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; Harry Sauthoff, Wisconsin.

Disposition of Executive Papers: Alfred J. Elliott, chairman, California.

District of Columbia: Jennings Randolph, chairman, West Virginia; Dan R. McGehee, Mississippi; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; John Lesinski, Michigan; Ed Gossett, Texas; William A. Rowan, Illinois; John W. Murphy, Pennsylvania; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio.

Education: Graham A. Barden, chairman, North Carolina; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; Eugene J. Keogh, New York; John Lesinski, Michigan; Charles A. Buckley, New York; Fritz G. Lanham, Texas; Mary T. Norton,

New Jersey; C. Jasper Bell, Missouri; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; William A. Rowan, Illinois; John W. Murphy, Pennsylvania; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio.

Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress: Eugene Worley, chairman, Texas; John E. Rankin, Mississippi; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; Carter Manasco, Alabama; John S. Gibson, Georgia; Arthur G. Klein, New York; Daniel K. Hoch, Pennsylvania.

Elections No. 1: James Domengeaux, chairman, Louisiana; C. Jasper Bell, Missouri; Charles A. Buckley, New York; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio.

Elections No. 2: Ed Gossett, chairman, Texas; Dan R. McGehee, Mississippi; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; Louis J. Capozzoli, New York; John P. Newsome, Alabama.

Elections No. 3: Hugh Peterson, chairman, Georgia; Eugene J. Keogh, New York; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; O. C. Fisher, Texas; John W. Murphy, Pennsylvania.

Enrolled Bills: Arthur G. Klein, chairman, New York; Mary T. Norton, New Jersey; John J. Cochran, Missouri; John W. Murphy, Pennsylvania.

Expenditures in the Executive Departments: James A. O'Leary, chairman, New York; John J. Cochran, Missouri; William M. Whittington, Mississippi; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; Joe B. Bates, Kentucky; Carter Manasco, Alabama; Joseph J. Mansfield, Texas; Joseph A. Gavagan, New York; Cecil R. King, California; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio; Daniel K. Hoch, Pennsylvania; William L. Dawson, Illinois.

Flood Control: William M. Whittington, chairman, Mississippi; Lex Green, Florida; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; Alfred J. Elliott, California; Henry M. Jackson; Washington; J. W. Robinson, Utah; James F. O'Connor, Montana; Thomas E. Scanlon, Pennsylvania; Carter Manasco, Alabama; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana; Thomas F. Burchill, New York.

Foreign Affairs: Sol Bloom, chairman, New York; Luther A. Johnson, Texas; John Kee, West Virginia; James P. Richards, South Carolina; Joseph L. Pfeifer, New York; Pete Jarman, Alabama; W. O. Burgin, North Carolina; Wirt Courtney, Tennessee; Herman P. Eberharter, Pennsylvania; Thomas S. Gordon, Illinois; Howard J. McMurray, Wisconsin; Will Rogers, Jr., California; J. W. Fulbright, Arkansas; Mike Mansfield, Montana.

Immigration and Naturalization: Samuel Dickstein, chairman, New York; John Lesinski, Michigan; Lex Green, Florida; Dan R. McGehee, Mississippi; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Robert Ramspeck, Georgia; Ed Gossett, Texas; Thomas E. Scanlon, Pennsylvania; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi; O. C. Fisher, Texas; John P. Newsome, Alabama.

Indian Affairs: James F. O'Connor, chairman, Montana; Joe L. Smith, West Virginia; Samuel Dickstein, New York; John R. Murdock, Arizona; Compton I. White, Idaho; Lex Green, Florida; Nat Patton, Texas; Henry M. Jackson, Washington; George E. Outland, California; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi; Harry Sauthoff, Wisconsin; Anthony J. Dimond, Alaska.

Insular Affairs: C. Casper Bell, chairman, Missouri; Joe L. Smith, West Virginia; Dan R. McGehee, Mississippi; J. W. Robinson, Utah; Ed Gossett, Texas; James Domengeaux, Louisiana; John S. Gibson, Georgia; Eugene Worley, Texas; Cecil R. King, California; William L. Dawson, Illinois; John W. Murphy, Pennsylvania; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; Harry Sauthoff, Wisconsin; Bolívar Pagán, Puerto Rico.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Clarence F. Lea, chairman, California; Robert Crosser, Ohio; Alfred L. Bulwinkle, North Carolina; Virgil Chapman, Kentucky; Lyle H. Boren, Oklahoma; Martin J. Kennedy, New York; Donald L. O'Toole, New York; Lindley Beckworth, Texas; Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., Maryland; Francis J. Myers, Pennsylvania; J. Percy Priest, Tennessee; Oren Harris, Arkansas; George G. Sadowski, Michigan; Richard F. Harless, Arizona.

Invalid Pensions: John Lesinski, chairman, Michigan; Joe L. Smith, West Virginia; Lex Green, Florida; James A. O'Leary, New York; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; William L. Dawson, Illinois; Thomas F. Burchill, New York; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; Daniel K. Hoch, Pennsylvania.

Irrigation and Reclamation: Compton I. White, chairman, Idaho; J. W. Robinson, Utah; John R. Murdock, Arizona; James F. O'Connor, Montana; Thomas E. Scanlon, Pennsylvania; James Domengeaux, Louisiana; Eugene Worley, Texas; Andrew L. Somers, New York; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; George E. Outland, California; William L. Dawson, Illinois.

Judiciary: Hatton W. Sumners, chairman, Texas; Emanuel Celler, New York; Zebulon Weaver, North Carolina; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Sam Hobbs, Alabama; John H. Tolan, California; William T. Byrne, New York; Dave E. Satterfield, Jr., Virginia; Estes Kefauver, Tennessee; Joseph R. Bryson, South Carolina; Fadjo Cravens, Arkansas; Sam M. Russell, Texas; Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts; Martin Gorski, Illinois.

Labor: Mary T. Norton, chairman, New Jersey; Robert Ramspeck, Georgia; Jennings Randolph, West Virginia; John Lesinski, Michigan; Graham A. Barden, North Carolina; Eugene Worley, Texas; Thomas E. Scanlon, Pennsylvania; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; George E. Outland, California; Thomas F. Burchill, New York; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Bolívar Pagán, Puerto Rico.

Memorials: John R. Murdock, chairman, Arizona; Mary T. Norton, New Jersey.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Louis J. Capozzoli, New York; Cecil R. King, California; Anthony J. Dimond, Alaska.

Military Affairs: John Edward Sheridan, Pennsylvania; Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Philip J. Philbin, Massachusetts; Paul Stewart, Oklahoma; Anthony J. Dimond, Alaska; Bolívar Pagán, Puerto Rico.

Mines and Mining: Joe L. Smith, chairman, West Virginia; Andrew L. Somers, New York; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; John R. Murdock, Arizona; Jennings Randolph, West Virginia; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; James Domengeaux, Louisiana; Compton I. White, Idaho; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; Grant Furlong, Pennsylvania; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; Anthony J. Dimond, Alaska.

Naval Affairs: F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island; Winder R. Harris, Virginia; Cameron Morrison, North Carolina; Anthony J. Dimond, Alaska; Bolívar Pagán, Puerto Rico.

Patents: Frank W. Boykin, chairman, Alabama; Fritz G. Lanham, Texas; Charles A. Buckley, New York; Joe B. Bates, Kentucky; Arthur G. Klein, New York; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; John S. Gibson, Georgia; Cecil R. King, California; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi; Grant Furlong, Pennsylvania; William A. Rowan, Illinois.

Pensions: Charles A. Buckley, chairman, New York; Nat Patton, Texas; James A. O'Leary, New York; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; John S. Gibson, Georgia; C. Jasper Bell, Missouri; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; Carter Manasco, Alabama; Grant Furlong, Pennsylvania; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana.

Post Office and Post Roads: Thomas G. Burch, chairman, Virginia; B. Frank Whelchel, Georgia; David J. Ward, Maryland; George D. O'Brien, Michigan; Samuel A. Weiss, Pennsylvania; James H. Fay, New York; Charles E. McKenzie, Louisiana; Chet Holifield, California; Maurice J. Sullivan, Nevada; Tom Murray, Tennessee; Emory H. Price, Florida; Ray J. Madden, Indiana; Harold C. Hagen, Minnesota.

Printing: Pete Jarman, chairman, Alabama; Alfred L. Bulwinkle, North Carolina.

Public Buildings and Grounds: Fritz G. Lanham, chairman, Texas; C. Jasper Bell, Missouri; Charles A. Buckley, New York; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; John S. Gibson, Georgia; Alfred J. Elliott, California; Carter Manasco, Alabama; Joe L. Smith, West Virginia; Louis J. Capozzoli, New York; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; William A. Rowan, Illinois; George E. Outland, California.

Public Lands: J. Hardin Peterson, chairman, Florida; J. W. Robinson, Utah; Compton I. White, Idaho; Hugh Peterson, Georgia; John R. Murdock, Arizona; James F. O'Connor, Montana; Alfred J. Elliott, California; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; Daniel K. Hoch, Pennsylvania; George E. Outland, California; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; Anthony J. Dimond, Alaska.

Revision of the Laws: Eugene J. Keogh, chairman, New York; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; Ed Gossett, Texas; Arthur G. Klein, New York; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; John W. Murphy, Pennsylvania; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio.

Rivers and Harbors: Joseph J. Mansfield, chairman, Texas; Joseph A. Gavagan, New York; Lex Green, Florida; Hugh Peterson, Georgia; C. Jasper Bell, Missouri; Graham A. Barden, North Carolina; John E. Rankin, Mississippi; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Henry M. Jackson, Washington; Cecil R. King, California; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana; William A. Rowan, Illinois; Thomas F. Burchill, New York; Anthony J. Dimond, Alaska.

Roads: J. W. Robinson, chairman, Utah; William M. Whittington, Mississippi; Jennings Randolph, West Virginia; Hugh Peterson, Georgia; Nat Patton, Texas; Alfred J. Elliott, California; Joe B. Bates, Kentucky; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Daniel K. Hoch, Pennsylvania; George E. Outland, California; Anthony J. Dimond, Alaska.

Territories: Lex Green, chairman, Florida; Hugh Peterson, Georgia; Nat Patton, Texas; J. W. Robinson, Utah; Ed Gossett, Texas; James F. O'Connor, Montana; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; John S. Gibson, Georgia; Louis J. Capozzoli, New York; Henry D. Larcade Jr., Louisiana; George E. Outland, California; Anthony J. Dimond, Alaska; Bolívar Pagán, Puerto Rico.

War Claims: Joseph A. Gavagan, chairman, New York; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; Eugene Worley, Texas; Thomas E. Scanlon, Pennsylvania; Lex Green, Florida; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; Arthur G. Klein, New York; Daniel K. Hoch, Pennsylvania; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; John P. Newsome, Alabama; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi.

World War Veterans' Legislation: John E. Rankin, chairman, Mississippi; Joe B. Bates, Kentucky; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; John S. Gibson, Georgia; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; James Domengeaux, Louisiana; William A. Rowan, Illinois; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; John P. Newsome, Alabama; Thomas F. Burchill, New York; Grant Furlong, Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, here is some food for thought and action for the special committee investigating civil-service employment. To those of us who see Washington thronged with Federal employees, hearing the complaints of some of them that they are not busy half the time, it is discouraging and disconcerting to see the Civil Service Commission putting out such propaganda as this:

TELEGRAM FOR MR. AND MRS. AMERICA

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Federal agencies must find stenographers and typists to fill thousands of vacancies. Situation critical. War program suffers delay. Will you inform girls 17½ years old and up that they will receive immediate appointment upon passing civil-service test? Salaries hiked to $146 and $164 a month. Apply any first- or second-class post office.

TENTH CIVIL SERVICE REGION,
*New Orleans, La.*

I assume that a similar statement has gone forth from every other region in the United States, and we hear such appeals over the radio. Certainly this special committee should look into this and stop this kind of practice.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes today after the other special orders have been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by ex-President Hoover on increased farm production, delivered last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short news article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HÉBERT and Mr. HOLIFIELD were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

SOUTHERN VOLUNTEERS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include therein one paragraph appearing in an article in yesterday's Post, entitled "America at War," by Selden Menefee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Post there appeared an article under the title "America at War," in which this paragraph appears:

The South, with its high birth rate and large number of youths eligible for the draft, has a disproportionately high number of men in the armed forces. More than that, poverty is so widespread that to southern youth Army life seems attractive by comparison to life back home. Southerners are volunteering by the thousands, before their numbers come up.

Mr. Speaker, you know any writer who would say such a thing about the young men in the armed forces in this critical time and can still obtain space thereafter is something of a miracle. We need men who write in our papers today with patriotic pens, not with pens which are motivated apparently by their bellies. If this calumnist knew the young men that I know from my home district who are at present in Guadalcanal and in Buna and in Africa, and could he know the vital suffering, the terrific pestilence, and the constant danger which confronts them, he would bow his head in shame.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, one of the many troubles, in the case of applications from small business, is the long delay consumed in processing applications after they have been filed. For instance, I have personal knowledge of a small engraving company which filed an application for the use of a small amount of critical material months ago. In spite of its every effort to push the application to approval, month after month has passed and no decision has been reached on the application. The delays and red tape seem to be insurmountable in spite of the fact that this company needs the small amount of metal for the purpose of working upon Army publications. The company is producing company and regimental books for the Army containing histories and information about these units; and high Army authorities have certified without results as to the vital importance of such publications in maintaining the high morale of the men in service. I have in my possession photostatic copies of letters from War Department officials expressing the desire for them.

This is only one instance of the many thousands of applications which when filed are lost in the shuffle. By useless regulation requiring the filing of new application after the applicant has been working upon his original application for many months, by requiring an appeal to be taken in certain cases when a decision is what is wanted, by sending the application to other departments for so-called special study when a decision could be made promptly by the office which originally received the application, and by many other devious forms of red tape, applications are allowed to languish and die as the small businessman vitally needed by the Nation fights for his very existence.

I am confident the Patman committee will dig deeply into the many complaints which have come to me from Louisiana and elsewhere and will give to the small businessmen of the Nation promptness in the handling of these matters and by doing so will aid the the war effort and hasten the day of victory.

[Here the gavel fell.]

NEWSPAPER COLUMNISTS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are all agreed with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] in what he said about this writer who reflects on our white boys of the South who are fighting the Nation's battles in this war.

He need not be surprised that the writer of such slander continues to get his column into a paper that persists in carrying what is called the Merry-Go-Round, written by those scavengers who perpetrated that loathsome volume known as The Nine Old Men, in which they attempted to besmirch, beslime, belittle, and destroy confidence in the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is about time the press of this country drove such scavengers from the columns of their publications if they wish to retain the respect of the American people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks

in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Oil City Derrick of Oil City, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a speech recently made by him before the Vermont Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next I may address the House for 20 minutes after the conclusion of the legislative business and the special orders, following the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NEWSPAPER COLUMNISTS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if I understood the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] correctly, the article to which he referred appeared in the Washington Post. The Washington Post, he must remember, is one of the publications in that plot to destroy the confidence of the people in Congress, and so to destroy Congress itself. It is not surprising that it and its publisher, Eugene Meyer, holding the views they do, should make such a charge. I call attention to the fact that I have Resolution 13 on the desk. If the gentleman will help get that resolution through, we will uncover the activities of those who are in that plot. I may also say that if you will refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a few days ago to an article inserted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], you will learn that the percentage of volunteers from Texas in the present war is greater than that from any other State.

It is doubtful if there is any other publication in the country which would open its columns to so false—so dastardly—a charge as that referred to by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]. Certain we may all be that neither the publisher of the Post, Mr. Meyer, or his purge-smear artists, would venture to even hint at such a charge and to intimate that any motive other than that of patriotism inspired those enlistments, if he were within the State of Texas.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to extend and revise my own remarks, and to include an article from the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the membership to an extension of remarks of my own which I want to put in the RECORD today in which I shall include an article from the Baltimore Sun which tells about the reduction of nearly $50,000,000 per year in telephone rates which has been brought about by certain action of the Federal Communications Commission.

I hope earnestly that the committee set up to investigate this body will sift thoroughly any charges that have been made against the Commission. But I also believe the committee should carefully consider the problems with which the Commission is supposed to deal and should take proper account of the benefits that can accrue to the people from proper, constructive, and courageous action by it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

REFLECTION ON SOUTHERN YOUTH

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I address you with further reference to the subject of which my colleague [Mr. KLEBERG] and my colleague, [Mr. RANKIN], have just spoken. First, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for calling your attention to some statistics that were placed in the RECORD last Tuesday by myself.

The newspaper article to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] referred is not the first time that some disreputable commentator has referred to and reflected upon the patriotism of the South. May I say that anyone who intimates that the great number of volunteers from Texas in the armed services of this country is occasioned by anything other than patriotism and good citizenship is either a villain or a fool and we can prove that by facts and figures.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Any reflection by anyone, either directly or indirectly, upon the youth of this generation is vicious and reprehensible. If the youth of any generation has risen, and I refer to the youth of all parts of the country without regard to where located, to the greatest heights when our country has been imperiled, it is the youth of today.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next at the conclusion of the legislative business in order for the day and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an open letter on the subject of the farm manpower situation, the letter being written by the secretary of the South Dakota chapter of the Citizens for Victory Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

CREATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 18 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise because of the war, with particular reference to (1) whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and utilized, and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering such development and utilization; (2) whether adequate consideration is being given to the needs of small business engaged in nonwar activities, or engaged in the transition from nonwar activities to war activities; (3) whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sales, or purchase of said materials; and (4) the need for a sound

program for the solution of the post-war problems of small business.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjouned, to employ such personnel, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall later on yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] jointly 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in the last session of Congress there was created the so-called small businessman's committee, which has done very splendid work in the short space of time that they had to act.

The resolution now under consideration provides for the re-creation of that committee. It provides for the appointment of nine members, who would continue in their effort to aid the small businessmen of the Nation. For many months, yes; for several years, we have heard a great many complaints from the Democratic as well as the Republican side against discriminations involving the small businessman. We have heard complaints that large business has been receiving 75 to 80 percent of all the war contracts, and that the small businessmen, the small plants and factories, have been ignored, thereby creating conditions of an unsatisfactory nature in many sections of our country—conditions which have not been wholesome nor beneficial so far as the production and aid to our war effort is concerned.

May I say that as early as 1931 I introduced a bill which would have created what was then known as the National Relief Corporation to aid the small businessmen. I tried to obtain the passage of that bill in 1931 when the conditions in our country were deplorable, not on account of any Democratic activities but due to mismanagement on the part of those then in power, unfortunately. Though I endeavored to obtain the passage of that measure to afford relief to the small businessmen, nothing was done because those in power at that time thought it would be better to wait until 1932, the Presidential election year, and that it would give them a splendid issue for the reelection of the then President, Mr. Hoover. I stated then that they were making a great mistake; that conditions would get worse, and no one could foretell what would happen. They failed to act. Finally we passed the act creating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was merely an aid to the big insurance companies, the bankers, and the railroads. The little fellow was left out.

I immediately started out again and tried to amend the act to make it possible to relieve the small businessmen. Ever since that time that has been my constant aim. I will tell you why I have been doing this. I recalled the conditions that existed in 1917. I saw the avariciousness of the big business people. In 1917 big business was grabbing all the orders and obtained nearly all the work of the Government at the expense of the Middle West and the small manufacturers.

In 1939, and again in 1940, to avoid making the same mistakes again, I urged that real consideration be given to the small businessman, and that the available plants should be utilized by the Government in promoting production for war needs rather than to construct huge new plants or to expand the present large ones.

Within the last few months charges have been made that the small businessman is still being annoyed and that nothing is being done for him. I wish to inform those who make such charges that they are in error—that within the last year a great deal has been done for the small businessman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean by sending them questionnaires?

Mr. SABATH. No. I may say to the gentleman that 6 months ago I called the attention of the President and of others to the matter of the sending out of unnecessary questionnaires. Shortly thereafter the President urged a simplification of these questionnaires, and that is now being done. Unfortunately, some of the new agencies have not carried out the President's desire to be of aid with as little annoyance as possible to small business or business in general. I hope that now that conditions are improving from day to day the small businessman will not be annoyed by these many questionnaires but instead will be given the benefit of many war orders he has been seeking and pleading for.

When we originally considered the creation of this committee, there were many who objected to taking favorable action. I for one am indeed grateful and pleased that I have been instrumental and helpful in bringing about the creation of this committee, of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is chairman. That committee has rendered the House, the small businessmen, and the country extremely valuable service. It is due to the efforts of the members of that committee that thousands of small businessmen are now being provided with work, and that the Middle West, the North, the South, and the East are receiving a much larger portion of the work and employment. Therefore, I believe it to be our duty in the interest of the small businessman to reestablish this committee, giving them additional power so that they can continue in the future to be of service as they have in the past.

I know that many complaints a year ago came from this side. Charges were being made that people came here to Washington and did not know where to turn, that they were being sent from one agency to the other, and, after having been here for weeks, were sent home empty-handed without any work. I am, indeed, pleased to know that ever since this committee was created, the departments and bureaus have paid some attention to the little fellows who do not keep special agents here by the year—men to whom the large manufacturers can afford to pay $10,000, $15,000, $20,000, or $25,000 a year—nor do they know those agents who have an "in" with some of the departments and who, as has been testified before our committee, have received as high as $100,000 to $150,000 in commissions. The little fellows do not know such men.

Now they have a place to go; they can appeal to our congressional committee for assistance and advice. They obtain that assistance and advice, and I know that many small businessmen in many sections of the country have been benefited to a great extent. I know that you on this side of the aisle do not now hear the complaints you heard up to a few months ago. The small businessman is now being taken care of to the best of our ability, but not to the extent that he should be, because it is generally recognized that big business, the large industries, have up to 75 percent of all the war work there is to be done and only about 25 percent is left for the small plants, of which there are nearly 280,000 in the United States. However, conditions are improving. The small businessman is being taken care of and receiving consideration, mainly due to your efforts and the efforts of your committee. I appreciate and I am gratified and pleased with the services this committee has rendered.

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. NEWSOME. As a little businessman, may I say that this resolution goes much deeper than just the preservation of the little businessman. It goes to the heart of the preservation of our system of distribution and the preservation of opportunity for the young men coming back from the war.

Mr. SABATH. I am grateful to the gentleman for his statement. I know that is true. I am indeed pleased that the activities of this committee will aid in the direction the gentleman has mentioned.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am interested in the cost of the various investigating committees. About how much does a committee like this cost?

Mr. SABATH. I believe this committee spent a little over $15,000, but the chairman of the committee will explain

that. May I say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that we have on that committee perhaps the two hardest-working Republicans in the House, men in whom I and the House have the utmost confidence. I know they will thoroughly and clearly explain the activities of the committee and that my distinguished colleague and every other Member will be satisfied with its activities and accomplishments and will vote unanimously for the resolution to continue its effective work for the small businessmen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman of the opinion that the work of that committee is such that it will require a great deal of the attention of the committee members; that is, is it a hard job, a job that requires for some time, anyway, quite a little attention?

Mr. SABATH. I do not believe that a great deal of time will be required. They already have a splendid foundation. They have made a good start, and I think from now on all they need to do is to follow the program which they began, and it will be much easier to attain speedier and still greater results. I also think that with the aid of the help the committee will obtain from some of the departments, the members of the committee will be able to give the time to legislation that may require their presence on the floor of the House—and you know I would not like to deprive any Republican from being on the floor of the House, especially at this time, because we will need all of them here at all times.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just want to know if the gentleman thinks that it could do something for the farmer. Does the power of the committee go far enough?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, yes; that is included.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If they can restore some of the dairy herds, that would help a lot.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. And I would like to see these investigating committees have meetings here where we can attend them. Has this committee been on any trips?

Mr. SABATH. I do not know. I have not been with them. They have made some trips, but they spent very little money, taking into consideration the amount of work they did. I think that every dollar that was spent, was well spent, and has been of great benefit to the small businessmen of the country.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Has the gentleman not observed and does he not feel that a lot of this attitude which has been in existence in respect to the small businessman has been aggravated unnecessarily by some of the bureaucrats who have wanted to get their names in the newspapers, who have been telling these small businessmen that they might just as well lock their doors in their places of business? That has done a lot of harm. It may not have been intentional but it should never have been said.

Mr. SABATH. I agree with the gentleman that the conditions and the viewpoint of the small businessman have been aggravated by statements that have been made, but I will not say that it is by the bureaucrats. Unfortunately, I think it is being done by people who are unfriendly to the administration. It was done for the purpose of creating prejudice and resentment against the administration, which has actually tried to aid the small businessman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What about the results of the November election?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, well, we have no election today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We had one the other day in Missouri.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman please yield for an observation?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. There is no politics in the matter so far as I am concerned, but I took a small businessman from a little town to a man and I do not know whether he was a Democrat or a new dealer or a Republican, but I do know that the first thing he said to this man was "Well, you might just as well go home and turn the key in your door until the war is over." My friend nearly went through the floor.

Mr. SABATH. Was this man to whom you took this individual in one of the departments?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, in the War Production Board, but my little man is still in business, and is staying in business, I hope.

Mr. SABATH. I will tell the gentleman where the trouble lies. The trouble has been that too many of these one-dollar-a-year men have been brought in by various gentlemen who have been originally designated and appointed by the President, in good faith, believing that they had the interests of the country at heart and that they would supply men or surround themselves with men who also would have the interest of the country at heart and bring about economy in the departments, as well as efficiency and a greater production, but unfortunately, as I have stated, some of these men who have been brought in by these dollar-a-year officials in various agencies and departments were connected with large industries, with large corporations, and they had their friends and favorites to take care of. Consequently when a little fellow came in he would be pushed aside, and he would be discouraged, so that those on the inside could exercise free rein in giving those whom they knew and favored advance information and award them the bulk of the contracts. That is the reason this committee was created, and that is the reason I am urging its reappointment.

I say to the House that here is a file, only a portion of a file, compiled in my work to aid the small businessman. I know that 2 years or 2½ years ago I sought the assistance of Donald M. Nelson, then Director of Purchases of the Office of Production Management, and after explaining the situation to him he finally promised that he would create a separate division to aid in the fair distribution of contracts to small manufacturers. I stated to him that the President urged such a division, and I know that Mr. Nelson talked to him about it and I know that the President did say that he was interested in the small businessman. Well, the division was created in the agency—the Division of Contract Distribution—and a businessman was put at the head of it, but the division failed to effect a distribution of contracts to the small manufacturers; whether through lack of cooperation of dollar-a-year procurement officials or due to inexperienced officials within the Division itself who did not have a knowledge of the problems of small manufacturers seeking contracts, I do not know. Therefore, the efforts of Mr. Nelson at that time to help the small manufacturers did not materialize, as I had hoped they would, and as he had hoped.

Nevertheless, we have created a new organization through the aid and assistance of this committee. A law was enacted in July 1942 establishing the Smaller War Plants Corporation which is in position to see that every small businessman or manufacturer who has a plant that can be utilized will have it utilized in the war effort. We know that the operation of small plants will tend to economy and efficiency and also will expedite production as well as serving to balance employment in various sections of the country.

Mr. NEWSOME. May I suggest to the gentleman that through the necessities of the war, through shortages and restrictions, we are actually eliminating so many little businesses that we are creating a monopoly.

The purpose of this committee is to formulate plans so that individual opportunity will exist in the future. It is very important.

Mr. SABATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. To my colleague, of course, I could not refuse.

Mr. DEWEY. I would like to call to the gentleman's attention, as well as the attention of the members of this committee, which I feel very certain will be continued, the fact that due to the cooperation between members of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on the Judiciary, section 12 was put into the so-called small-business bill, which permits cooperation between small businesses without running foul of the provisions of the Anti-Trust Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act. I think the committee should draw the attention of small businesses to that possibility of cooperation in the war effort. It is not usually given.

Mr. SABATH. Yes. I am familiar with that provision. I know that Senator MURRAY and his committee, in conjunction with our committee, has worked on it, and the men who represent so-called small business have been active to bring that about. I was indeed pleased with

the inclusion of the provision in the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act and that it will materially aid the small manufacturer in negotiating war contracts without running counter to the Anti-trust Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act goes without saying, and I appreciate the cooperation of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Banking and Currency that led to the incorporation of section 12 of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that since the passage of the Smaller War Plants Act there have been some complaints as to its activity—complaints here and there that it was not effectively functioning in aiding the small manufacturer to obtain contracts. Aside from its duty to effect the distribution of contracts to small manufacturers, it has at its disposal an authorization of $150,000,000 for loan purposes and for a slightly higher award price in sections where a manufacturer is compelled to pay high wages and rentals. I regret that I have not had the time to check or investigate the activities of the Corporation to date—as to the number of contracts that it has been instrumental in placing with small manufacturers, the loans made, et cetera. I am told that within the last few days a change has been made in the directorship of the Corporation and that a gentleman has been appointed who is a business executive and a man of ability.

There has just come to my notice a release dated January 18 from the Office of War Information of the War Production Board, carrying an announcement of Hon. Lou E. Holland, Deputy Director of the War Production Board and Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. The release carries a heartening report as to the placement of contracts awarded to concerns employing from 5 to 500 persons, totaling over $1,000,000,000 in the last 2 months. I am inserting it in the RECORD for the information of the Congress and the small businessmen of the country, as follows:

Over a billion dollars' worth of Army contracts have been placed during the last 2 months with concerns employing from 5 to 500 persons, it was announced yesterday by Lou E. Holland, Deputy Director of the War Production Board and Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. This is in support of the personal pledge given by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, Commanding Officer, Services of Supply, War Department, to Mr. Holland that the procurement officers of the War Department would cooperate to the fullest with the Smaller War Plants Division.

Mr. Holland hailed the cooperation of the War Department procurement officers and predicted that this was simply the forerunner of an even greater distribution of war contracts among distressed plants.

"During November and December alone," Mr. Holland pointed out "7 supply services of the War Department awarded 43,056 supply contracts totaling $846,000,000 to plants employing between five and five hundred persons. These contracts account for 24 percent of the total dollar volume of all contracts awarded by these services during these 2 months. Additional subcontracts were distributed by the Army among 3,274 firms with a total spending of $151,500,000."

The Air Forces procurement officers at Wright Field in Dayton, Ohio, have placed during November and December a total $50,300,000 among 733 firms employing less than 500 wage earners. This business, Mr. Holland said, was increasing steadily.

The credit for the distribution of this total of $1,047,800,000 of war contracts to small plants, according to Mr. Holland, is due to the full support being given by the procurement agencies of the Army to the principles established by the Smaller War Plants Division.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether all the complaints registered against the Smaller War Plants Corporation are justified, but I feel that credit should be given when due, and the release indicates aid has been given in the past 2 months. The Corporation was appointed in August 1942, and has been operating approximately 6 months. To those of us who know of the trials and tribulations of the small businessman coming to Washington during the past 2 years, who were given the run-around and forced to return to their homes empty-handed, it can be surmised that the Corporation had many difficulties to overcome. As I stated earlier in my remarks, the infiltration of dollar-a-year men in the early defense agencies and the appointment of business executives connected with firms seeking Government contracts, all led to the awarding of contracts to the firms with which they were associated, to the exclusion of the small manufacturers. The task of the Corporation has been to break down the grabbing of contracts by the large firms and the fair and equitable distribution to the small manufacturer. The release indicates that some departments and agencies are cooperating with the Smaller War Plants Corporation and I feel that it should be the immediate duty of our small business investigating committee to ascertain what departments and agencies have not cooperated with the Corporation since its establishment, or why they have not done so sooner. I know that the membership will encourage the new chairman and it is hoped that the $150,000,000 authorization will be utilized in addition to the other aid that we can give to small business. The small business committee has been created to aid small business and that is what the administration and the President are anxious to have accomplished.

I reserve the balance of my time and I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] 30 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by former President Herbert Hoover last night.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that has already been done, but, without objection, permission will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important resolution. It comes to the House with the unanimous report of the Committee on Rules. It continues the special committee that was set up in the last Congress to study the problems of small business. The only amendment made to the resolution was to increase the membership from seven to nine.

I believe one of the most important problems before the Congress and the American people is that of small business. The plight of the small businessman is appalling and tragic. Some 400,000 small businessmen are faced with the very serious danger of extinction. They are fighting for their very existence against regimentation, against red tape, against the burden of taxes, and if this Congress does not do something immediately hundreds of thousands of small businessmen will be ruined and wiped out with all their investments, goodwill, and employment. Therefore, the expenditure of a mere $25,000 to help solve this problem is little enough.

I wish I could agree with my colleague, the chairman of the Rules Committee [Mr. SABATH], that the condition of the small businessmen is greatly improved and they are facing happier and better times. We have to face conditions as they are. Everybody knows, because there are small businessmen in every congressional district in the United States, including the big cities, that they are being backed to the wall and are being squeezed out of business, and that most of them are afraid they cannot continue much longer in their livelihood.

Every Member of Congress, particularly on this side, knows that one of the main issues in the recent campaign for Congress was the preservation of free American enterprise and opposition to collectivism and totalitarianism. The small businessman for the past 150 years or more has been the backbone of the American system of free enterprise, based upon private initiative and reasonable profit. It is the small businessman that has made for the growth, development, and prosperity of the United States. Today the small businessmen are appealing, Democrats and Republicans alike by the hundreds of thousands, to the Congress for immediate assistance and protection. They are properly giving Congress the Macedonian cry, "Come over and help." It is the duty of Congress to act before it is too late.

I admit that this special committee we are about to re-create, or any other committee of Congress, cannot solve the entire problem, and that hundreds of thousands of small businessmen may be forced out of business within a year due to the regimentation of the New Deal and its collectivist doctrines. They cannot hire labor. They cannot compete in the labor market. They cannot get goods to replace those taken from their shelves. The war is taking their sons and salesmen, and gasoline restrictions and priorities make the plight of the small businessmen desperate. Back of the entire problem is the question of free enterprise as opposed to collectivism. This special committee has rendered great service already, and we believe it will continue to render even greater service to the small businessmen, but none of us must be so foolish as to believe for a moment that this committee will have the power to solve the problem.

The problem is far deeper. It has to do with our times. It has to do with the war and taxes. It has to do with the New Deal and the march to collectivism, regimentation, and bureaucracy, and its failure to distribute war orders to the small shops and factories.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman from New York will agree that every member of the committee, both Democrat and Republican, is wholeheartedly working to try to make the maximum contribution toward solving this very trying and difficult problem.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman's statement is correct; it is a very able committee. I shall yield 10 minutes each to 2 of the minority members, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], under the rule so that the new Members, and the old Members too, may know what has been done and what the committee expects to do for the small businessmen of America. Everybody knows that neither this committee nor even the Congress can solve the whole problem. They know also, however, that without assistance the small businessman cannot continue in existence. We must do everything we can to help him and do it immediately.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of this special committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], 5 minutes.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this body for 14 years, and every year during this time the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has done something toward aiding and assisting small business. Everything he said here this morning I remember. I remember his efforts to aid small business; the small businessman does not have a better friend in either the House or the Senate than the able and distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Obviously, in the short time allotted to me, it will be impossible to give a full account of the activities of this committee, but may I suggest, that the committee is entitled to the major part of the credit for the passage in the House of four important laws in the past year for aid and assistance to small business.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman needs it—and I think he is entitled to it—I shall be pleased to yield him up to 3 minutes of the time on this side.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield me 3 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois yield me 7, that will give me 10 which I will appreciate very much.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I had a request for 2 minutes; I yield that time to the chairman of this special committee.

Mr. FISH. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the chairman of the special committee should be heard in the House, should be given an opportunity to tell the House what their committees are doing on such occasions as this.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I say in the beginning that I denounce—and I hope you listen to this—I denounce as untrue and unjustified any statement by any person or any official of this Government who says it is necessary for 300,000 small businessmen to go out of business during the next year or at any other time during this war. It is absolutely unjustified and unnecessary. This Congress has done everything that a Congress could do to save the small manufacturing and producing companies, and if the law is placed into execution as contemplated by the Congress when it passed it, there is no reason in the world why even 1 percent of the manufacturing and producing concerns of America should be forced out of business. That law states that the Smaller War Plants Corporation with plenty of money shall have the power to do what is necessary to save every manufacturing and producing concern that can make either war supplies or essential civilian goods, and I submit to you that any such concern can make either war supplies or essential civilian goods. This being true, when this Smaller War Plants Corporation is put into effect in the way and manner contemplated by Congress, not even 1 percent of the concerns of America should go into bankruptcy or go out of business; it will be unnecessary, and if they do the fault will be in the administration of the act.

It is true that in the distributing business Congress has not done much to help the distributors. It is necessary that we preserve our distribution system. Without the distribution system we shall be forced into socialism or some other form of paternalistic operation. We do not want that; we want independent business to survive. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] said, it is the backbone of the country and should be protected and preserved by this Congress. On distribution our committee has heard much evidence, and we have made certain reports to the Office of Price Administration and to the War Production Board, and the recommendations we have made are being put into effect. We believe they will be helpful. Just because there will be a scarcity of goods does not mean that the distributors should be put out of business; it means that they can all continue in business if they are not hampered, or harmed, or injured in some way, but are given a fair and square deal. They may receive diminished incomes and diminished profits, but that does not mean that they should absolutely go out of business. It is my belief that the people of this country expect Congress to delegate plenty of power to the Executive. I do not think there is a question but what the people of this country want Congress to check up carefully on the administration of these laws, and do it frequently, to make sure that these laws are being administered as Congress intended they should be administered. It is true that lots of mistakes will be made; the people expect mistakes to be made, many of them, in any huge program, but the people have a right to expect, and this Congress has a right to expect, that these mistakes will be quickly corrected when they are discovered.

One thing that was seriously and vitally wrong with the Office of Price Administration was that they would not quickly or within even a reasonable time correct the obvious, the known, the gross errors that they had committed.

That was the fatal mistake that O. P. A. made. Let us hope that from now on the O. P. A. will delegate some power, and plenty of power, to their district and regional offices to pass upon these minor questions, certainly they will be able to pass upon them, and people will not have to come to Washington, and that they will not be bogged down with red tape in the administration of that law.

May I say a word about the laws that this committee has helped to secure the passage of during the last Congress. First, there was the law to help the automobile dealers and the tire dealers, who were the first victims of this war, the first casualties of this war. The law that this committee sponsored and secured the passage of has been satisfactory and has kept those people in business. They are indeed grateful to this Congress and to our committee for the help that we gave them.

Another law was the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act which has helped tens of thousands of small businesses, although the Smaller War Plants Corporation itself has not been functioning satisfactorily. It has been a failure. But by reason of the intent and the purposes as expressed in that act, the various procurement agencies of the Government have been carrying forward that intent and purpose and have kept materially and substantially tens of thousands of small businesses operating in this country.

The other bill that I have reference to is a bill having to do with red tape, or Federal reports. Our committee went on a trip. We had been persuaded to go to nine cities in this country to hold public hearings. We heard every witness who came before us to be heard. We listened to testimony from 6 to 9 hours a day and we heard hundreds and hundreds of witnesses representing hundreds of associations. We heard the problems first hand. I believe the people appreciated the fact that they had an opportunity, without having to come to Washington, to appear before a legislative or a congressional committee and present their grievances or their complaints and knowing that they would be printed and distributed to every Member of Congress and to every member of the

Executive department and would therefore receive consideration. As I say, I believe they appreciated that, but we found out very soon that the red tape, the useless questionnaires, the unnecessary reports, were causing people to get so mad about them that they were actually forgetting they had sons in the service engaged in an all-out war, total war. They were really irritated to the extent that they were forgetting we were at war. So it was necessary that we do something to try to eliminate these unnecessary reports.

We came back here after holding four hearings and appeared before a legislative committee in support of our bill which we had introduced on Federal reports to try to eliminate some of this red tape. The House passed our bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House passed our bill and by reason of that every report that any agency wants to ask some one to give, or every inquiry, every questionnaire, must first be submitted to the Director of the Budget and the Budget Bureau will determine whether or not it is necessary. In many cases they already have the information.

In conclusion, may I praise the members of this committee, Republicans and Democrats alike. They are all good, sincere, conscientious men, who have the interests of the small businessman at heart. They are doing an excellent job and I am doing my very best to cooperate with them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] a very distinguished member of that committee.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to devote myself briefly and pointedly to a part of a preliminary report made by this committee on December 17 and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at that time. Our distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas, has very ably pointed out some of the problems which the committee met in the field and a part of the analysis made with particular emphasis on our concern over the Smaller War Plants Corporation, a creature of the past Congress.

On December 17, our committee made this preliminary report, and may I explain at this point that the final report is now in printers' proof form and will, in a few days, be ready for final distribution to the Members of this House. Among other things this report stated as follows:

> On June 6 of the present year, the Congress established the Smaller War Plants Corporation. The Smaller War Plants Corporation was created for the purpose of assisting small manufacturers who could produce war supplies to obtain Government contracts and thus to utilize to a maximum degree the full producing power of the country in the war effort.

We found very definite, vital war machines, instruments needed in the war effort, lying idle throughout the country, while other concerns were fighting over priorities for new machines which actually duplicated these idle devices.

> The Corporation was given large powers by Congress to rectify a situation which had been too long neglected. Upon the successful functioning of this Corporation depended, in large measure, the fate of many thousands of small manufacturers in the United States.

I want to pay particular attention to this because it is a very brief and a very much condensed preliminary report, and, if you please, an indictment of a situation which we found deplorable.

> The committee was shocked to find that though the Corporation had been in existence for nearly 6 months, its results in the important south and southwestern parts of the United States have been practically negligible. In none of the cities visited was there an operating organization set up to represent the Corporation and to do the work for which it was created.

We came back to Washington and held hearings in joint session with the Senate Small Business Committee and heard the heads of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. These officials had the temerity to come before the joint sessions of the two Small Business Committees and tell us that they virtually had a Nation-wide functioning, active organization. We know that, and subsequent events have proved this organization was nothing but a paper organization existing only here in Washington, and that they had no instructions of any benefit whatever to men in the field, nor did they have any men in the field.

The Small Business Committee of the House went to work to see that something would be done to rectify this very terrible situation, with the result that changes have recently been made. We found Donald Nelson, head of the War Production Board, willing to cooperate. There has been a shake-up in this Corporation. We are hopeful now that we will get some definite, progressive results. Up until now it has been pathetic, it has been an insult to the intelligence of this Congress.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the gentleman could advise the House as to the number of primary contracts that have been negotiated by the Smaller War Plants Corporation in the 7 months of its existence?

Mr. PLOESER. If the gentleman means by "negotiated" the number of prime contracts which have been accepted by the Smaller War Plants Corporation as a prime contractor, up until the time of these hearings—none.

Mr. MUNDT. That is my understanding. May I say to the House that the Members have confidence in this committee and I am sure it will be instructed to continue the work, although we are bitterly disappointed with the past results of some of these agencies. Can the gentleman advise the House, further, whether the newspaper reports that Colonel Johnson is to be the new chief indicate that Mr. Holland has been removed? Has he resigned or has he been reduced in rank?

Mr. PLOESER. I have not been sufficiently informed in the last few hours to give the gentleman anything definite on it. I will say this for Mr. Holland, there never was a time when this committee questioned his integrity. I do not mind saying that at least one member of the committee—and I am talking about myself—questioned his ability to do the job.

Mr. MUNDT. The results have been bitterly disappointing. Unless he can explain to the country the reason for that failure, it seems to me his removal and resignation are certainly merited. However, I for one believe that Mr. Holland has a right to be heard if he feels something beyond his control has contributed to this dismal record.

Mr. PLOESER. There has been no explanation for the failure. It was 3 months before an Executive order was ready to set this operation into motion. We created the law in June. In July Mr. Holland was appointed. In August he was permitted to start looking for an office and for a staff. Finally, in the middle of September, an Executive order was issued giving him authority to function. and 3 months later nothing had been accomplished.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I am tremendously impressed with the importance of and the need for the work of this committee. As the gentleman has just indicated, one of the things that has impressed me as being needed is speed, promptness, and dispatch in handling matters that must be attended to so that industry may be continued. For instance, an application goes in for materials. If month by month a delay occurs and no action is taken, that is tantamount to smothering that business. There should be promptness.

Mr. PLOESER. May I say at this point that we are getting increasing cooperation from the Army and the Navy. It is not always necessary and it may not even be desirable for the Smaller War Plants Corporation to become a prime contractor. If merely the influence of the law as passed by the Congress and the creation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation were sufficient to keep the Army and Navy reminded that small business must live, we would go a long way toward alleviating many of the problems. But, the Smaller War Plants Corporation has great authority and power, which should be used whenever other agencies fail to perform in the proper distribution of war-production contracts.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does the gentleman think Colonel Johnson, who I understand is the head of Johnson & Johnson, the biggest corporation in the

medical supplies business in the United States, is particularly familiar with or sympathetic with the problems of small business?

Mr. PLOESER. I hesitate to say. I do not know Mr. Johnson. But let it be said that the fact that the man may represent big business as far as his industry is concerned should have no bearing on the question. If he is able and is a good big businessman he will know that if small business is crushed so will be big business. There is no chance for big business to live if small business is crushed behind the screen of this war effort. Let the socialistic planners accomplish the destruction of small business and big business will find its management taken over by Government. If we are to have American free enterprise small business units must live.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. We had Floyd Odlum in there. He was a big businessman, a Wall Street operator, but he was not successful in the field of lining things up for small business.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], another distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any question about whether or not this resolution will prevail here today. I am convinced it will. However, I think it is very much in order that some report be made of the things that have been accomplished and possibly something said about what may be expected in the way of accomplishment in the future.

To go back a little, when the extraordinary defense effort of the country began in June of 1940 we began to see something of the impact of that effort on the small business of the country. Members of Congress, being peculiarly responsible and responsive to the people of their districts, began to get the reverberations of that impact. Demands were made that the Congress try to lessen the force of that impact if at all possible.

The distinguished chairman of our Committee on Rules has gone back into quite ancient history to talk about some things that might border on politics although he himself has for years been an ardent champion of small business. In view of that, possibly it may be in order for me to suggest that in August of 1941 the first official action in the Congress looking to the solving of some of these problems of small business was taken by the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOSEPH MARTIN, in the appointment of a Republican committee to study these problems. I served as chairman of that committee. The day that committee appointment was announced, the resolution for the creation of this official committee was dropped into the hopper.

That Republican committee held hearings during that summer and fall and did much, I am sure, to convince a lot of the folks downtown who are in charge of administering these different programs that practices and policies could be corrected to the end that small business would be benefited, and that without interfering with the defense, either.

Finally, on December 4, we got around to the adoption of the resolution setting up this official committee, and I am sure that all of us on the minority side were glad to terminate the operations of our Republican committee to join in the efforts of the official committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in 1939, 1940, and 1941 I introduced bills and resolutions to aid the small businessman. The gentleman remembers that, because he has always been interested in this problem himself.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly would not question the gentleman's statement. The gentleman has been interested in small business, and he has been working in that direction, although I must say again that as far as any official notice and effort in this direction was concerned on the part of the leadership of the majority generally in the Congress it was not in evidence.

Something has been said about legislation that has been enacted as a result of various committee hearings. But really the legislation enacted, helpful as it is, is not the only good result that comes from public hearings like those of this committee. It is highly important that the small businessman over the country, the fellow who cannot come to Washington and who is not represented by full-time operators here, be given a forum in which his views can be expressed and his voice heard not only by the Congress but by those in charge of administrative agencies who have directly to do with the various practices and policies which so vitally affect him. Let me suggest to you, because I know whereof I speak, that sometimes these people will not listen to anything other than the loud voice of a lot of indignant people who finally get an opportunity to make their views felt and heard.

I might suggest, also, that these hearings have in my opinion done much to establish the confidence of the people in the Congress of the United States. They have exhibited an earnest and sincere desire upon the part of the Congress, through the agency of its select committees, to find out what their problems are and do something about them. For that reason, among others, the work of the committee has been highly valuable, and will continue to be valuable.

As Federal controls of business increase, as the O. P. A. is set up, and rations this article and it rations that article, and all these controls extend over the country, the opportunity for discriminations and inequities against small business become more prevalent, and so the need for doing something for small business becomes greater.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I yield to my colleague.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I take it my colleague from Indiana, who is on this committee, is familiar with certain practices of some of these Federal employment agencies throughout the country, who are imposing their will upon the small operators, and taking away their key men; that is, their mechanics and such as that, and putting them in defense industries or demanding if they do not go there they must go into the draft. I wonder if the committee has looked into that at all or has any views upon it?

Mr. HALLECK. The committee has looked into that, and in respect to various operations has taken considerable evidence, and I am sure the gentleman will find when our report is filed, that much attention has been given to that very subject. And much more attention will be given to it. Just one illustration: Everyone knows that if we do not keep some automobile mechanics in the shops over the country, one of these days the cars cannot carry the workers to their jobs. There has been a terrific drain upon the men in the automobile shops. That has been investigated, and now there is a directive that will in a measure cure that situation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I take this time because I do not want the colloquy that I had with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] to be construed as any indictment made by me against Mr. Holland until he has had ample opportunity to speak for himself. There may be some extenuating circumstances in the matter, and the country is entitled to know them. Mr. Holland told a group of Senators and Representatives at a small businessmen's meeting in the Wardman Park a few months ago he would either get results or tell the country why. The Nation is entitled to the facts. Can the gentleman shed any light as to why 3 months elapsed between the time that Congress authorized the establishment of this Corporation and the time the President issued an order permitting Mr. Holland to begin to function?

Mr. HALLECK. I think there are some things about it that probably should be said, although this committee has not been carried on as a political matter at all and I do not think it should be. It is entirely fair to say that Mr. Holland was not appointed until months after the act was passed by Congress, and the gentleman knows where that responsibility lies as well as I do. In the second place, the directive which made it possible for him to enter upon the discharge of his duties was terribly delayed. And it should be said for Mr. Holland that he undoubtedly accomplished much in bringing about a better cooperation by procurement agencies.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. I hope, before the gentleman concludes, that he will explain how these small businessmen can proceed to take advantage of this legislation. Many of them do not understand

just how to go about it. I know some of them, and I wish the gentleman would give some attention to that.

Mr. HALLECK. That involves the operation of the Small War Plants Act. It was the intention of the committee and of the Congress that there be set up in each W. P. B. office throughout the country a division of the Small War Plants Corporation, which would include in its personnel trained engineers and others who could actually advise and help the little fellow to find his place in the war-production effort. These divisions are now being set up. I would advise any small businessman who thinks he can produce something essential to contact the division in his territory. Those separate and distinct agencies were not created with the speed we thought they should be created. There has been much criticism of the delay, but the failures cannot be charged to our committee, as the report read by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] points out. The committee itself criticizes the delay.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a portion of the report heretofore filed by the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Indiana 1 minute more.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Did the gentleman find that the Small Business Division had to fight for its very existence against the parent organization and all of its connections?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know whether I quite get what the gentleman means, but will attempt to answer his question. It has been suggested that the creation of this committee and its work has created a consciousness in the minds of all procurement agencies of the needs of small business and the rights of small business. That there has been some resistance on the part of procurement agencies to the giving of contracts to the small men cannot be denied. Insofar as that is true, it does represent resistance to the Smaller War Plants Act and small business. On the other hand, I think there is no question but what there is now a more enlightened and sympathetic attitude on the part of the procurement agencies, much of which has resulted from the hearings and reports and the work of these small business committees.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Is that friction being removed, in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. HALLECK. I am confident that it is.

Now, to conclude, everyone must realize that when the Nation changes from a peacetime production of consumer goods to a wartime production of war goods, business as usual is out the window. There can be no such thing. Producers who cannot convert to war production are hard hit. Distributors with little or no consumer goods to sell are hard hit. But it is the job of all of us to lighten the blow as much as possible and equalize opportunities wherever we can. If that is done, much of small business, otherwise doomed to extinction, may be kept alive for the duration to be on hand and functioning when our great need for reconstruction arises.

Our committee has striven in that direction. The gentlemen from Texas and Missouri have already discussed at some length our efforts to bring the manufacturers into the war picture. The gentleman from Missouri has read from our intermediate report regarding the Smaller War Plants Corporation. The report which we filed is no soft-soaping proposition, as its reading will disclose. On the contrary it has called a spade a spade, letting the chips fall where they will.

The problems of distributors were definitely before our committee. We made recommendations in our report of benefit to them. We are glad to report that these recommendations are now being out into operation at least in some measure. To show what I have in mind, I quote from the report:

We have, however, discovered certain conditions which we believe to be so urgently in need of relief that they should be called to the attention of the Congress, the administrative agencies responsible for their existence, and the country, at once. We desire to invite your immediate attention to the following critical situations, which we have found to exist in the war effort of the Nation:

1. On June 6 of the present year, the Congress established the Smaller War Plants Corporation. The Smaller War Plants Corporation was created for the purpose of assisting small manufacturers who could produce war supplies to obtain Government contracts and thus to utilize to a maximum degree the full producing power of the country in the war effort. The Corporation was given large powers by Congress to rectify a situation which had been too long neglected. Upon the successful functioning of this Corporation depended, in large measure, the fate of many thousands of small manufacturers in the United States. The committee was shocked to find that though the Corporation had been in existence for nearly 6 months, its results in the important South and Southwestern parts of the United States have been practically negligible. In none of the cities visited was there an operating organization set up to represent the Corporation and to do the work for which it was created. Yet in all the localities visited, the committee found many unused facilities, and many distressed small manufacturers who have been trying desperately to obtain contracts to produce necessary war materials. On December 15 the House Committee on Small Business attended a joint session with the Senate Committee on Small Business to hear Mr. Lou E. Holland, Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, make a report on the progress of his agency. It is the considered opinion of the House committee that the failure of the program of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, as evidenced in our hearings, can be attributed to the management of the Corporation.

2. Our existing system of distribution of consumer goods has been seriously undermined and weakened as a result of the policies thus far pursued by the Office of Price Administration and a collapse which might gravely imperil the entire war effort appears inevitable unless these policies are speedily corrected. To factors, all of which could and should be adjusted by the Office of Price Administration and the War Production Board under existing law, are primarily responsible for this threatened break-down on the home front:

(a) Price squeezes: In so many instances as, in the aggregate, to constitute an insuperable obstacle to thousands of distributors remaining in business, the operating margins between replacement costs and ceiling prices are too thin to permit of continued operations except at a loss. In some instances, the current replacement costs are actually higher than the current ceiling prices.

In other cases the retail price ceiling has been so low as to induce a decline in the production of commodities vitally necessary to the health of the Nation. The outlook for an adequate supply of dairy products, for instance, is dark indeed, unless the Office of Price Administration will revise its retail price ceilings so as to stop an impending wholesale slaughter of milk cows. Many dairy farmers are finding it more profitable to sell their cows for meat rather than try to make a profit on their milk.

The situations to which we refer are situations of long standing. The committee listened to complaint after complaint of urgent appeals to the Office of Price Administration in Washington for relief from such situations, which were completely ignored, or which were handled with so many complications of red tape and bureaucratic buck passing as to leave the complainants bewildered. The general inflexibility of price ceilings on the retail front is apparently widespread and is causing many retailers either to close their doors or to contemplate going out of business. The failure of the Office of Price Administration in this matter has seriously crippled and indeed threatens to destroy distribution in the United States.

The obvious practical remedy for this is, of course, to pass on cost increases permitted by the Government at any level to all other levels, plus such reasonable operating markup as will protect the retailer or other distributor against actual loss and the consumer from unwarranted gougings. Consumers must be protected and inflation avoided, but those worthy objectives are not properly attained by requiring retailers to do necessary business at a loss. The consumer can be protected and inflation prevented without the destruction of the retailer.

(b) Inequitable distribution of merchandise: In addition to the burden of price squeezes, the distributor is also faced with an acute problem of obtaining his fair share of available consumer goods. From the testimony which the committee heard, the conclusion is inescapable that some method for an equitable distribution of consumer goods is necessary if many distributors are to survive.

3. Unnecessary reports and complexity and multiplicity of regulations: We recognize that it is necessary for administrative agencies to obtain information from time to time through the medium of questionnaires and that certain administrative regulations are a necessary evil, especially in time of war. However, the present situation is one of bureaucracy run riot and, unless corrective measures are speedily taken, this factor alone will close the doors of thousands of businesses which might otherwise remain open. And what is said here about unnecessary governmental red tape in the field of distribution of course applies equally to manufacturing.

As was stated above, these conditions can and should be corrected by the executive directors under existing law. If they are not, however, our committee proposes to offer legislation at the beginning of the Seventy-eighth Congress to compel their correction in order to avert the destruction of independent small business—and with it, the middle class—in this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks there has been a concerted effort to discourage and stop unnecessary driving of automobiles throughout the country. People are saving their tires because of an acute shortage of rubber. Gas is rationed to the minimum. In the Eastern States a ban is put on pleasure driving because of a dire shortage of gas. I am informed gasoline sales in the eastern part of our country have been further reduced as much as 40 or 50 percent during the past few weeks. People are warned to comply with rules and regulations established for saving every bit of rubber and gas possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are advised through a Washington press release that Federal officials in Washington, exclusive of those in the War and Navy Departments, traveled about 673,000 miles during the last month. That is 27 times the mileage around the earth.

According to figures obtained from the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, Government department automobiles in the District of Columbia consumed 44,868 gallons of gasoline last month. And, as I have said, this does not include Army and Navy automobiles. This is 15 percent more than was consumed during the same period last year. It is suggested there are more employees in Washington than during the same period a year ago. The fact, however, is that the 45,000 additional employees who came to Washington during the past year are nearly all clerks and stenographers, and do not rate free official transportation.

Mr. Speaker, while the Government is clamping down on motorists in order to conserve a dwindling supply of gasoline in the East and to save every ounce of rubber possible needed for war purposes, it would be well, I think, to do a little cracking down on some of the useless driving that is being done by certain Government employees and bureaucrats in the Nation's Capital. It would save rubber and gas and would have a wholesome effect. Of course, we want to save gas and rubber; but why not begin at home?

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 2, strike out "seven" and insert "nine."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

JANUARY 20, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully tender herewith my resignation as a member of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, this action being necessitated by the fact that I have been assigned to the Committee on Naval Affairs, an exclusive committee.

Cordially yours,

WINDER R. HARRIS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

CONTINUING THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AIR ACCIDENTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 33, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents authorized by House Resolution 125 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, and House Resolution 403, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, be continued for a period of 90 days from this date for the purpose of allowing said select committee to complete its unfinished work and investigations and file its report and make recommendations to the House covering the hearings held and the studies made by said committee since March 12, 1941.

That said select committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to act during the present Congress for a period of 90 days from this date with all powers granted to it under House Resolution 125 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, and House Resolution 403 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session.

That the funds appropriated to said select committee by House Resolutions 525 and 570 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, or any part thereof not already expended by said select committee, are hereby made available to said select committee to take care of the further expenses of conducting said investigation and study, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, and shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting the investigation and study or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the last two words, and in line 5, strike out "days from this date" and insert "from January 1, 1943, to March 1, 1943."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "period", strike out "of 90 days from this date" and insert "from January 1, 1943, to March 1, 1943."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall later on yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] 30 minutes. I hope he will not take that much time. I am going to be very brief and I will not take up any more time than is absolutely necessary. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that I may have the right to extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution originally contemplated to extend the life of this committee for 90 days, but after the Rules Committee heard the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] and had taken the matter up, we agreed that the time should be limited to March 1, by which time that committee is to make its final report. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, it has been made clear to the Rules Committee that the select committee has done an extra amount of work and they did not have time to complete some extremely important investigations and prepare their report in full. However, the Rules Committee came to the conclusion that the select committee will be able to complete its work and prepare its report by March 1. That was satisfactory and the Rules Committee unanimously agreed to that shortened time.

Mr. Speaker, most of you heard the report of the committee yesterday in executive session. I am satisfied that any Member who listened to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], and the others, is satisfied that the committee has rendered very valuable service. They have called attention to many of the shortcomings and abuses. I, for one, feel that many lives will be saved in the future because of the recommendations made by this committee and the work this committee has done. Originally I was criticized for favoring this resolution, and especially because the committee made one trip outside the country, but having heard the statement of the gentleman from Texas, I am sure you feel the committee has rendered our country a great service. Their studies and their calling attention to conditions existing in other countries resulted in our controlling the air lines that formerly were controlled by the Nazis, Italians, and others. This in itself, I feel, deserves the unanimous approval of all who are interested in the future of our Nation and the welfare of the country.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It is not contemplated that the committee will take any trips between now and the time it winds up its affairs, is it?

Mr. SABATH. No; I do not think it is contemplated that they shall make any trips. The trip they did take cost only a few dollars, yet is has been worth millions for every dollar it cost. I do not know whether the gentlewoman was present when the report was made in executive session, but had she been present, she would be more than pleased that the committee did make that trip, and I feel sure she would say it rendered wonderful service.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I was present. Let us put it this way: There are able men on that committee; there is work to be done in the Congress. I hope they will stay here to help us take care of the affairs of the country.

Mr. SABATH. As I stated before, I am not in favor of having Members away from the House when important legislation is being considered. I know that as a rule these four Members are here. When they did make that trip they were not gone any length of time, and although they are very capable men the House did not lose a great deal from lack of their presence at that time. The service they rendered, I repeat, has been justified. They should be commended instead of being criticized for making the trip.

Mr. Speaker, after hearing the reports of these four gentlemen of the select committee, and in the light of the extraordinarily valuable service they have rendered to the House and to the country, I, myself, would not hesitate to extend the life of this select committee for the next 2 years, and not only up to March 1. However, the gentlemen of the select committee are reluctant to continue this work, due, I presume, to some unjustified criticism directed against them, which I, myself, greatly deplore.

In conclusion, let me say that unfortunately more planes and more lives are being lost, and, consequently, I feel that every effort should be made to reduce these accidents investigated by the select committee and reported in the newspapers. Certainly it is our duty to ourselves and to the country to do all in our power to prevent this tremendous loss of lives and planes. I regret exceedingly there are some committees and some members of committees who have felt and who feel now that this select committee has encroached upon their jurisdiction and prerogatives. My own view is that it is not a question of what committee should retain jurisdiction, but the question uppermost in my mind is how we can best serve the country, in further safeguarding the terrific losses to which I have called attention, while at the same time doubling our air power. I feel that the select committee in calling attention to the control of the air routes in the Central and South Americas has brought about the taking over of this control by American interests and by our Government. It is impossible to overestimate the tremendous value of our control of these air routes to our national interests during this war period, and certainly to the postwar development of our foreign commerce. Though I naturally feel that we must continue to devote our entire energies and efforts now to the winning of the war; nevertheless, we must not neglect our duties for the postwar period.

Mr. Speaker, I promised I would not take up much time, so I conclude my remarks. I reserve to myself the balance of my time and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule comes before the House with a unanimous report of the committee. There is no reason why this committee should not be extended to March 1 in order to permit it to finish and complete its report to the House in every detail. I have been assured by the chairman of the committee [Mr. NICHOLS] that there is no intention on his part or that of anyone else to delay consideration in the Committee on Rules or in the House in case the Committee on Rules acts on a resolution to create a permanent standing committee on aviation; so, adoption of this resolution extending the life of the committee will not in any way delay consideration by the Committee on Rules or the House of a resolution creating a standing committee on civilian aviation.

I was interested in what the chairman of the Committee on Rules had to say. I was not able to be present during the entire discussion in executive session the other afternoon to hear the full report of the committee by its chairman and other members, but the chairman of the Committee on Rules referred a few minutes ago to the taking over of the Nazi and Fascist air lines in South America. I desire to take this occasion to say that I introduced a resolution long before the Special Committee on Aviation was organized, empowering the State Department to acquire the Nazi and Fascist air lines in South and Central America, and spoke on it on a number of occasions in the House, saw the Secretary of State about it, saw Mr. Jesse Jones, and they were all in favor of it. I received finally a note from Mr. Jones or a telephone call that it was not necessary to press that legislation because the administration thought it had the authority to proceed without legislation to buy or acquire the lines.

In order to make the record clear, I asked Mr. Jones to kindly write me a letter so at least I could have something to show that I had initiated this legislation. He wrote a letter to me to this effect, which I have in my files. This was long before the Special Committee on Aviation was created or went to South America.

Mr. Speaker, in the course of human events and in the progress of this country certain things become inevitable, and one of these, in my opinion, is the creation of a standing committee on aviation. I take this opportunity to give a few reasons why such a committee should be created. At the present time we have engaged in our aviation industry about a million and a half people in a civilian capacity and about an equal number in our armed forces, in the Army and the Navy. As a result of the war and the progress and development of the country, aviation has become one of our greatest industries, employing millions of Americans; yet it is only in the infancy of its destiny. It is inevitable that there must be a standing and permanent committee composed of experts who will devote their entire time to trying to solve the tremendous problems with which aviation will be confronted after the war.

Post-war problems involving the continuation of this great industry which employs millions of Americans must be gone into with the utmost care and study for the safety and welfare of the Nation. The whole matter, I presume, will be discussed later on in the Congress. I am particularly interested in the creation of a permanent committee because I want to see the United States continue its dominance in aviation, not only in this country, where we have it for the first time since the start of the war, but for all time in the future throughout the world. Today we are producing more airplanes than any other country, probably twice as many. The President reported that 48,000 war planes were built last year and probably a hundred thousand war planes would be this year. We want to continue our domination in aviation after the war, not only in America, but over the airways of South and Central America. We want to make sure that we will maintain our rights and interests where we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars for airfields in north Africa, in South America, in Australia, and on islands in the far Pacific Ocean.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I assured the gentleman from New York last week that he and all others who have resolutions pending on the subject of creating a standing committee will be heard. I promised some of the Members day before yesterday that we would have a meeting for that purpose on Monday, but, unfortunately, due to conditions over which I have no control, that meeting will be postponed until Tuesday.

Mr. FISH. I am glad the gentleman makes that statement to the House because I have introduced a similar resolution to six or seven others to create a permanent standing committee. I believe other Members during the last session introduced this type of legislation also.

My resolution to create a standing committee on commercial and civilian aviation is the first one numbered in this Congress. It has the support of the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], who intended to present one in his own name, but when he found out I had presented a prior one, he decided not to offer his, and wanted mine considered among the others. Of course, I realize it will come out under the name of either the chairman of the committee or some Democratic member of the Rules Committee. This is in accordance with the regular order, and I am entirely satisfied. All I am asking for is action, and I have been assured that hearings will be begun early next week.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Is it the gentleman's idea that this new committee that he proposes would have jurisdiction over civil aeronautics only?

Mr. FISH. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because apparently there is some confusion in the minds of some Members. As one of the sponsors of this legislation, it is my intention that it shall be confined to civilian and commercial aviation and that alone, not interfering with the Military Affairs Committee or with the Committee on Naval Affairs, although I assume the new committee will cooperate with them on matters affecting the aviation industry which is supplying the needs of the Army and Navy.

It is nothing revolutionary or nothing new to create a standing committee. The State of New York has had a standing committee for a number of years on aviation and I think many other States have likewise permanent committees on aviation. It is absolutely necessary to have a committee of experts to try to solve the post-war aviation problem and to give their entire time to solving it. This is no reflection on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, one of the greatest committees of this House and having among its members some of the ablest Members of the House. But they cannot work 24 hours a day. There is no bigger problem facing post-war America than that of aviation. Are we to maintain our dominance? Are we going to continue to train pilots? Can we employ a hundred thousand pilots? Can we continue our domination over the airways extending throughout the world unless we have such a committee? If Congress does not act and fails to do its duty to preserve our existing air leadership I anticipate an aviation tailspin that will make the panic of 1932 look like a picnic and at the same time endanger our own safety and destiny.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER], a former aviator, who desires to speak on this question.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that there is no opposition to the resolution now before us to continue this select committee of the House. Every Member who has read the reports of this committee or who attended Wednesday's executive session and heard the off-the-record report is certainly satisfied that this committtee has done an outstanding piece of work and has made a very real contribution to the future of aviation in the United States. I want to refer in the few minutes available to me this afternoon not to this particular resolution but to a resolution that I hope will be brought before the House in the very near future to create a standing committee of the House to deal with civil aviation. There is no doubt in my mind but what this special committee could have been continued and would have been continued by the Congress if the members of that committee had so recommended.

I think the fact that the chairman of this select committee, and at least one of the minority members of the committee, have introduced resolutions asking for the creation of a standing committee of the House to deal with civil aviation indicates the way that committee feels about the need of having such a standing committee in the House. It is a very simple question that the members of the Rules Committee and finally the Members of the House must answer, and that is simply this: Is the aviation industry, is the future of aviation, of sufficient importance, and are the legislative matters that will come before the Congress in order to properly develop aviation in this country of such a nature, and will they require such time that we need a standing committee to devote its attention exclusively to legislation of that type?

I think those of us who heard the report of the select committee in this Chamber last Wednesday afternoon are thoroughly convinced that the problems are of such magnitude that we do need at this time and for some time in the future such a standing committee. In my congressional district at the present time more than 50,000 men and women are dependent upon this industry for their livelihood. We could bring down to hearings before the Rules Committee representatives of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, airport managers, State commissioners of aviation, manufacturers in the industry, and others, all of whom could testify to the benefit that will be derived by the industry if we have such standing committee as is now proposed.

In my humble opinion, no truer words are printed in the report of this select committee than the sentence which states in substance that the nation that is best prepared to bring about a sound aviation expansion after the war may well be the first nation to recover economically. I want to see the first nation to recover economically, and the nation to control the tremendous air commerce that will be available, the United States of America. I do not know that there is any serious opposition to the creation of this committee except possibly from some members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I tell the gentleman that I, a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, am opposed to the creation of such a committee and that the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs are also opposed to it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I can speak only of my own knowledge. I am glad to have that information.

May I say to the gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that if that great committee could devote practically their full time, at least for the next few years, to this problem—and we have a tremendous problem relating to our railroads, and there will be a post-war problem there as well as in the fields of other means of communication and transportation—I can think of no committee of the House I would rather see handle the problems of aviation than the present Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There is plenty of precedent for the setting up of such a committee. The Congress itself and the executive branch of the Government have recognized the wisdom of separating aviation from other means of transportation. We have an Interstate Commerce Commission that sets the rates for our railways, waterways, and trucks, but this Congress did not turn over the problem of establishing airplane rates, either passenger or freight, to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Aviation passenger and freight rates are set by the Civil Aeronautics Board. This certainly indicates the desire and the intention of the Congress to deal separately with the problems of aviation.

We have had other cases where some of the heavy work of committees has been taken from them and given to a new committee. Flood control was handled that way, and I think we are all satisfied that it has worked out quite successfully.

In the State of Connecticut in 1927 I had a very small and modest part in writing what we believe to be the first State legislation relating to the control and policing of aviation within the State, dealing, of course, only with flying intrastate. As a result of that legislation and later amendments to that act we were able in that one little State to keep a very fine commission of men busy a good deal of the time filing each 2 years with the General Assembly of Connecticut a report of their activities and their efforts to develop aviation within that State.

That is all we ask that you do with this great national question here in the Congress, that we establish a committee that can devote its full time to the needs of aviation. If the day ever arrives when that industry is on such a firm foundation and the problems we see immediately ahead of us are such that they can be handled by another standing committee of the House along with its other work, I for one will be glad to see this proposed new committee disbanded and the work turned back to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I hope the Members of the House will give some consideration to and try to visualize some of these tremendous problems we are going to face after this war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, the chairman of the committee [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there is no controversy over the pending resolution providing for the extension of the life of this select committee to the 1st of March. This is only for the purpose of winding up the work of the committee, also to permit us to pay the personnel for work they have already done in 1943, work which could not be paid for unless this resolution were passed. So I do not care to talk about the work of the select committee.

However, since two gentlemen have talked to some extent on the creation of a permanent standing committee of the House on aviation, I should like to

say a few words about that. You can go back through the history of this country and you will find that wherever progress has been proposed there has been opposition to it. That is true now. Three great committees of this House, all of whose members are splendid, high-class gentlemen, for reasons known best only to themselves have started to fight the creation of this committee. My distinguished friend the gentleman from North Carolina Major BULWINKLE, just called attention to the fact that the Committe on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs are opposing the creation of this committee; why, I cannot understand.

The resolution which would create this standing committee provides specifically that the committee would deal only with civil, commercial aviation. Probably some member of one of those two great committees can tell me what power that would take away from the Committee on Military Affairs or the Committee on Naval Affairs. In the name of common sense, can the creation of a committee to deal solely with commercial, civil aviation have anything to do with the carrying on of this war? Can it interfere with military or naval aviation? I think not by any stretch of the imagination.

The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs just a minute ago told me that the reason he is opposed to the creation of this committee is that the first thing we have to do is to win this war and that all aviation now is either military or naval. I am inclined to agree with that statement entirely. Commercial aviation today is, of course, lending almost 100 percent of its effort to the naval and the military effort.

However, as was stated the other day here in executive session, after this war is over the United States must return to an era of economics. We must begin to think then, if we refuse to think now, of recouping world markets. We must begin to think about world trade. We must never be so ill-advised as to think that aviation will not play a tremendous part in the world trade of the post-war world.

Why create this committee now? Because now you can pass basic legislation which will permit commercial aviation to grow and expand and compete with the other aviation of the world in the post-war period.

Let no one tell you that the creation of this committee will in any way interfere with the war effort. Men on naval affairs and men on military affairs have no corner on patriotism. Men in those two committees have no corner on wanting to win the war more than any other Member of this House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, certainly no one will say that there is anything that I would do that would retard in the least the war effort. No one will say that there is anything that I would do that would retard in the least the activity of the Army's air force or of the naval air force. No; there has to be some other reason than that. Oh, I do not blame the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That is a splendid committee, it has a splendid chairman, and it is membered by splendid members. I do not blame them for opposing it, because at the moment that committee has under its jurisdiction all commercial aviation, despite the fact that it is a committee that has so much other business before it that it cannot do justice to all of the business before it if ever they were called on to do all at once. A great member of that committee just a few days ago told me that if it was necessary for that committee to appoint a subcommittee for every subject before the committee, that there are not enough men on the committee to provide personnel for those subcommittees. I am not fussing about it. They are a great committee, and it does a great job. At the same time that committee already has jurisdiction over matters pertaining to all railroad, bus, and truck operations, the inland waterways, the radio, the telegraph, the telephone, the Pure Food and Drugs Act, and it is also concerned with many other matters.

Mr. Speaker, commercial aviation has become so potent in this country that a subcommittee of no committee can do justice to the job that has to be done, if we are to meet Great Britain, if you please, or Canada, if you please, and Germany and Italy—the rest of the nations in the world, if you please, in the post-war period, when it will be necessary to go into the markets of the world and compete with them, because they are as anxious to win the war as you are, but they do not stop at winning the war. Plans by them are going ahead every day for the post-war period. When this committee was in South America, we ran into trade commissions from Canada, trade commissions from Great Britain, down there for the purpose of gathering trade and making arrangements to get into trade with South America in the post-war period. Good business, I say it was. What is the United States doing? Win the war; of course we want to win the war, but are we not big enough, do we not possess enough intelligence and ingenuity to look a little bit beyond the war, for the economics of this country after the war is over? All right, now this fight is in the open. I did not have any idea that there would be a concerted fight against the creation of this great committee. It means no more to me than to anybody else, but if the fight is in the open, and if the three great committees are going to oppose it, then there is a country boy from Oklahoma who is ready to take up the cudgel and see where we end up.

I think there can be no question—and any unselfish person must agree—that now is the time to start to give some impetus and support to one of the greatest industries of today—one that will be in the post-war period probably the greatest industry in the world, and certainly the greatest new industry in the world. I said before, and I say it again, that that country which is first ready with huge cargo-carrying fast airplanes is the country that will likely first recover from this war effort; and you do not have on the statute books today a basic law which will permit commercial aviation to grow. You do not have on the books today a law which will permit your American aviation, which leads the aviation of all the world, to grow and expand; and it is your job, Member of Congress, to see that it is put there, irrespective of what committee you are on.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I favor the resolution we have before us at this time, the purpose of which is to extend the life of the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents for another 90 days in order that this committee can wind up its work and file its report and make recommendations to the House. I have read the report of this committee, and I believe the work of the committee has been of great value to the country and also that it has been of great benefit to the aviation industry and also to our war effort. The suggestion that this Congress or this House pass some legislation to set up a permanent aviation committee should be given serious consideration not only because of the great importance of aviation during this war but also because of the great importance aviation will play in the post-war period.

While we are discussing aviation, I feel it is important that I call your attention to the importance of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the wonderful ground work it has laid in aviation prior to the war, its great contribution to successful aviation during the war, and its plans for commercial aviation after the war.

I am a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handles appropriations for the Department of Commerce, and we have worked very carefully on all of the problems facing the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The lengthy records of our hearings on aviation have been available to the membership of this House. These hearings had to do with most of the activities of civilian aviation, and I am certain that these hearings have proved of considerable value to the committee which has been investigating our domestic air accidents. Therefore, in discussing present and future civilian aviation, it is important that the work already done by the C. A. A. and the committees responsible for that agency should not be overlooked. Also, the records of these committees and the valuable records of the entire A. A. A. set-up should not be overlooked.

You are discussing now not only the matter of extending the life of this committee for 90 days, but you are discussing and also laying the ground work for some kind of a permanent committee on aviation to work on aviation in its present and future phases.

In discussing aviation of the present and its contribution to our war effort, I will call your attention to the fact that after many months of work on the part

of the committee having to do with appropriations for C. A. A., this House in its wisdom kept alive the civilian-pilot training program. The result was that when war broke out, the C. A. A. had ready to offer to our Army and Navy a reservoir of thousands of trained pilots, many of whom today can be numbered among the many heroes of this war. At the same time, this House through its support of our committee and its support of the civilian-pilot training program through C. A. A., made possible a turn-over of pilots and students amounting to thousands. The story of the long fight to save the civilian-pilot training program is an interesting one, but I will not take up your time today in long details. I do wish, however, to commend those in this House whose far-sighted support saved this pilot-training program which is so valuable to our fighting forces in the time of our war crisis.

There are many men who first laid the ground work in the C. A. A. which resulted in the organization and completion of the great civilian pilot training program in the early days of aviation. General Connolly, now serving in the War Department, a former Administrator of C. A. A.; Charles Stanton, the present Administrator; Robert Hinckley, former Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air, now an executive with the Sperry Co., known as the father of civilian pilot training; Frank Tischnor, editor of Aero Digest; and many others can be named as the pioneers of this great service. I wish I had the time to give you other names. Scores of aviation pioneers contributed much of their time, energy, and money to keep aviation in the United States alive at a time when the value of their efforts was neither realized nor appreciated.

The airports scattered throughout the States, the new methods in communications, the better styles of planes, the increased speed of our planes now in use in combat and in commercial service, the newer aids to air navigation, the safety controls, and many other valuable aviation assets can be traced to the pioneering work of these men and especially to the activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. In considering a permanent committee on aviation, the basic and valuable work of these individuals, organizations, and the C. A. A. must be made the foundation, and neither the C. A. A. nor the regular committees responsible for aviation should be subordinated. The permanent committee should be a committee auxiliary to the already great foundation laid for present and future aviation. It should be such an auxiliary committee as would aid in the development of work already done.

The various State legislatures certainly should come in for some commendation while we are discussing aviation of the past, present, and future. The Governors and State legislatures of the various States have not neglected aviation. The great State of Nebraska was one of the pioneers in aviation. The Nebraska State Legislatures of the past and present have been and are composed of men who have great vision. Very early our State legislature appropriated large sums of money for aviation expansion. Our Governors have appointed men of flying experience to membership on the State aeronautics commission. Our State aeronautics commission works in the closest kind of cooperation with Civil Aeronautics Administration to the end that State aviation laws, regulations, and policies may be coordinated with the master plans of the C. A. A. Other States have worked along that line, but Nebraska was a leader in that endeavor. The States which followed that rule and the States which, like Nebraska, saw the possibilities of future aviation are many and are to be commended. The result was a Nation-wide interest in aviation among the youth of America long before the outbreak of war, and a great reservoir of young pilots available at a time when pilots were badly needed. So I want to join others in doing whatever I can to give encouragement to the formation of any committee which will help in this great effort to make the United States the leader of the world in aviation not only during this war but in the post-war period when, I predict, aviation will be one of the chief facilities for the relief of the world's economic ills.

If I may be permitted to do so, I would like to digress briefly to call your attention to some aviation matters that affect a number of Members here. In our period of depression and also during the time when war clouds approached us and the world realized the importance of aviation during a war, many of our communities were induced to undertake the construction of airports. Federal agencies came to our communities and urged our community representatives, official and civic, to build airports. Many communities feeling that the Government would need airports badly in wartime, voted bonds and went into debt to buy land for airport sites. The Federal Government, through the W. P. A., aided substantially. Large investments were made in some of these airports. Many of the sites have been graded, drained, and made ready for hard surfacing of the runways. Many communities had contracted for the paving and many were ready to advertise for bids on the work to complete the projects. The W. P. A. had earmarked large sums for the completion of some of these airports with the approval of the C. A. A. Then came liquidation of the W. P. A. Communities ready to complete their airports suddenly found themselves with large unfinished projects on their hands, although much work had been done. Work which in many cases would be destroyed by time and erosion. The amount of money invested in these airports by the Federal and city governments is being ascertained by the C. A. A. A full picture of this situation should now or soon be in the hands of that agency. My plea now is that these airports be completed not only to save the investment the Federal Government has in the projects but for the purpose of putting them to immediate use in our war effort.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss aviation briefly in the light of the resolution before us. I have great faith in our committees now working on aviation, and I have faith that this House will give full consideration to the plan for a permanent aviation committee to help in present and future aviation problems. No one will deny that aviation will win the war and that aviation will help solve many of our problems in the post-war period. No one with vision will deny the prediction that you and I will live to see the day when myriads of airplanes with passengers, freight, and mail will connect all corners of the earth.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to touch upon a phase of this general approach which was missed the other afternoon in the grand presentation made to us by the members of the aviation committee, and which has been overlooked here today in the debate.

Between Christmas and January 1, I attended a meeting of the Rotary Club in Detroit, at which were present about two or three hundred members of greater industrial Detroit. There were three 8-minute speeches made by speakers on that day. The gentleman who closed the round table presented his argument on the basis of the trade that we are going to recapture or take or create in the different countries of the world in the post-war period. At the end of his talk I raised this question, as to what he was going to do about section 4 of the Atlantic Charter, which reads this way—speaking of the United Kingdom and the United States:

SEC. 4. They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

If we overlook that language in connection with the trade that we expect to control and the cargo ships that we expect to send out and the cargoes on those ships in the post-war period, I think we may wake up some day with a headache. If I can understand English, section 4 of the Atlantic Charter will have something to say about what markets we recapture, what markets we create, and about the goods which we move into those markets, the terms which we apply to that trade, and all about it. So I want to call your attention to section 4.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman think that that probably means just what it says, "on equal terms with all other nations," that every nation in the world would be a competitor of every other nation, and those who competed with us would be up against the disadvantage of our being able to take the markets by reason of our own expansion and capacity to produce?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No. I do not read that meaning into the language; and if you will go to article VII of the British Master Agreement, which is a part of this whole approach, you will find that the Atlantic Charter and the Lease-Lend Act of March 1941 are tied into the British Master Agreement. And if you will go one step further and carefully digest the general approach and the philosophy of the concept, you will also find that the "four freedoms" and the declaration by the United Nations are two other facets of this many-sided international trade diamond which has been designed, I must say, behind the curtains of international diplomacy. These documents state "ends", not "means"; and it is up to the Members of this House to explore into the meanings of these vague political and economic and social international terms. They point the way for a new order—good or bad, I am not saying—for the American people. Of course, the people have not spoken on these highly important matters which involve the highest policy of government. But in due course the people will speak with understanding. The phrase "on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity" is made up of beautiful words. But to effectuate the intent is an entirely dissimilar, and I must say very difficult, problem. Any man who has engaged in trade on a large scale knows that "on equal terms" is something that just does not exist in the very practical world of trade and commerce, and more particularly so if many national interests are involved. For instance, how are you going to put little Finland on equal terms with Britain in the Argentine market in the post-war period? Or Norway on an equal footing with the United States in the Chilean market or Italy on equal terms with Japan in the Chinese market?

Now let me read to you article VII of the British Master Agreement:

> In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the United Kingdom in return for aid furnished under the act of Congress of March 11, 1941, the terms and conditions thereof shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries, but to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of world-wide economic relations. To that end, they shall include provision for agreed action by the United States of America and the United Kingdom, open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and, in general, to the attainment of all the economic objectives set forth in the joint declaration made on August 12, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.
>
> At an early convenient date, conversations shall be begun between the two Governments with a view to determining, in the light of governing economic conditions, the best means of attaining the above-stated objectives by their own agreed action and of seeking the agreed action of other like-minded governments.

And, may I ask you just what does the term "countries of like mind" mean? Another question: What meaning shall we now read into the language "by appropriate international and domestic measures?" That will undoubtedly call for many treaties and statutory acts before the plan is properly functioning. and these conversations that are to be held. Just when and where?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this resolution. I think the Nichols committee, officially known as the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents, has done a most commendable job, and certainly this body should permit them to wind up their affairs and complete their final report; and for that reason and for that reason only the life of this committee should be extended the additional 90 days requested by the chairman and other members of that committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time primarily to address myself to the very important question of the several resolutions now pending before the Rules Committee looking toward the creation of a standing committee of the House on Civil Aviation. It is, of course, understood in advance by everyone properly informed that this committee should have to do only with the question of nonmilitary aviation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why the Naval Affairs Committee, the Military Affairs Committee, or even the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—or any other committee—should object to the formulation of this standing committee on civil aviation in this House. Certainly, no question of patriotism is at stake, and there should be no question of politico-personal jealousy permitted to enter the picture. Civil aviation has in the past been dealt with by a subcommittee of the powerful and splendid Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. There has been no criticism of their handling of the problem in the past, but the future problems demand undivided attention by a standing committee.

Up to the last World War, aviation was in the diaper stage. It grew into the romper stage in that war. For many years its growth was stunted and until very recently it had not advanced beyond the short pants stage. But within the past few years, Mr. Speaker, civil aviation had just begun to put on its long pants and civil aviation merits careful and above all undivided attention in the future. No presently standing committee of this House can, in justice to its other work, give it the consideration to which it is properly entitled.

Insofar as commercial civil aviation is concerned, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] has stated its extremely important position very wisely. We might streamline and modernize the historic words of the Confederate General Forrest in this fashion: "In the post-war world that nation will recover 'fustest' which gets there 'fustest' with the 'mostest' and the fastest transport airplanes." But the question of commercial aviation has been adequately covered heretofore. There is an angle to this aviation question, which it seems to me has been overlooked in the present discussion and to which I address myself now.

I refer to the matter of private flying after this war. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been intensely interested in this question of private flying. I have owned and, although never a licensed pilot, flown several different airplanes of my own, and, in fact, against the advice of some of my political advisers, I conducted most of my initial compaign for Congress by air. I found it expedient. I found it very valuable as a time-saver in covering the huge spaces in the 16 counties of northern Michigan which I have the honor to represent, and which—thanks to a farseeing policy of the Michigan Department of Aeronautics—is quite well studded with many strategically located, and adequately equipped, small airports and landing fields. For a number of years I have been a member of the Sportsmen's Pilot Association and the National Aeronautic Association. I have followed private flying rather closely until the war brought an end to all such activity, with the exception of the remarkable work now being done by the Civil Air Patrol, which is a wartime organization of private flyers.

Mr. Speaker, after this war has been ended, aviation is going to continue to be a very large industry in this Nation—make no mistake about it. It will be the salvation of America. Turn back the pages of history. About the turn of the century this country made a great financial and industrial recovery. Why? Due to the advent of the automobile—the creation of a new mode of transportation. Following the last war, there was a brief depression, and yet this country was placed back on its economic feet by the advent of the radio and certain of the new mechanical devices used in the home, such as the vacuum cleaner, electric refrigeration, electric stove, air conditioning—to mention only a few.

The recovery of the entire world after this war is going to be due solely to aviation—a new mode of transportation. I repeat that I agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma when he says that country will recover quickest which is best capable of capturing the markets of the world through the seas of the sky—that country which can get its products to the markets of the world in the quickest time—by means of civil aviation. It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that England is mistress of the seas. That statement may be properly challenged in the future. But in looking into the post-war world, Mr. Speaker, America must retain its title of master of the skyways.

And so I say that civil aviation is the most vital subject which this House should be considering today. It is a most vital subject which this House should be considering through very carefully trained and experienced experts

serving in a standing committee dealing solely with the future of civil aviation.

After this war shall have ended, we will have literally hundreds of thousands of carefully trained pilots in this Nation. That presents a potential market for hundreds of thousands of private aircraft. It takes a war to bring about a change in our domestic economy of such magnitude. Bear in mind that in normal peacetimes, it costs almost $1,000 for the average young man to learn to fly. Where can the average young man get that money? He cannot, and if he did, he could not afford to buy an airplane after he learned how to fly. But even then, he is still not a pilot in the accepted sense of the word. Sure! He can take off, fly around the country and land in fair weather and following contact flight rules—which means keeping in close touch with the ground by means of a map lying on his lap—find his way reasonably well. But that young man is not a real pilot until he has learned to conquer the elements, or in other words until he has learned to fly blind and has obtained an instrument rating, which means that he can fly out of contact of the ground—over the clouds—by means of instruments and radio. This postgraduate training in pre-war days cost the young man another $1,000 more or less, and most fathers, and certainly not the young man, did not have that money to put up.

War changes all of that and when we have won this war, Mr. Speaker, we will have literally a hundred thousand or more of these trained instrument-rated private pilots in the market for airplanes, or their services will be available to you and me and others of us who will be forced to employ their services in order to fly about the country and about the world, in order to compete with our fellow man in the economy of the world.

And so I say to you that the creation of a standing committee on civil aviation in this House is an absolute necessity. The post-war recovery of America will be very definitely linked with civil aviation. A civil aviation committee must be created. It has been overdue for some years past. The post-war protection of America may well be dependent entirely upon military aviation. The two subjects do not clash in any sense of the word and military aviation should—as it has in the past—be handled by, and in the future receive No. 1 priority in, the standing Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs. Unfortunately that has not been true in the past.

These three committees should cooperate closely together, because the skyways of the world will be traveled by all, but very definitely rigid regulations will of necessity be imposed to see to it that each of the several classifications of aircraft remain within their own sphere of the skyways. The sky traffic of the post-war world is going to be a tremendous problem. Reference has been made here today to the fact that we today have 48,000 military aircraft; that next year we will have 100,000 in the skyways. But they will be scattered all over the world. Prior to Pearl Harbor we had, roughly, 300 commercial air liners in the skies over our country. Contrast these puny figures with the roughly 30,000,000 automotive vehicles that we had on our highways prior to Pearl Harbor, then you will get some inkling—just a faint inkling—of the skyway travel of the future. Just this morning I read, as you probably did, the prediction of a noted plastic engineer with the Glenn L. Martin plant in Baltimore to the effect that shortly after this war is over, we shall have plastic helicopters ascending vertically and descending vertically and capable of being stored in an ordinary garage the same as cars are stored today. While it may sound fantastic, still I tell you that within 5 years after this war there will be hundreds of thousands of helicopters and other light aircraft—maybe not today on blueprint but certainly existing in the minds of our own, the world's leading aircraft designers—carrying you and me and other citizens of this country in our daily pursuits, not in our own home town, not in our own State, not in our own Nation, but, conceivably, all over the world. This problem demands intensive, careful study by men who have their minds focused on that particular industry and the problems related thereto.

Now, just to go back a bit into recent past history; let me point out just one or two little angles which have hitherto been befogged and which need clarification. The Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Air Safety Board, prior to Reorganization Plan No. IV, did a mighty fine job in endeavoring to bring order out of chaos in the private flying and the commercial flying picture. They made a good start, but they did not have time to accomplish all they had in mind, and so, as one flies around the country in the private plane of yesterday from State to State, he found different local regulations applying to the operation of airports. He found different taxes on aircraft gasoline. He found some different local regulations with respect to operations near certain airports. These were all handled as local problems; aviation must be handled on a national, a worldwide basis. This has not been a serious thing in the past, because there was not enough traffic in private aircraft to create much of an operational hazard, but that is very definitely going to be a problem in the future and one which must be dealt with nationally. In the post-war world and by cooperative action, House Committees on Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, and Civil Aviation will have to get their heads together to keep America foremost in the world as king of aviation. We may hear that England will choose to remain mistress of the seas, but I say to you in all sincerity, with America paying the bill for this war, paying the bill for this war, as the President recently asked in his Budget—that America is today and in this coming year going to spend more on this war effort than all the world put together—we in this Congress must see to it that Uncle Sam remains the king of the skyways of the world, and a Civil Aviation Committee is the answer. Do not kid yourselves, gentlemen; just today one of our colleagues from California informed me that he knew from first-hand information that right today some of our latest and best civil air transports are being delivered to some of our friends abroad, possibly under lend-lease—he was not sure; I leave it to you to guess. But it is definitely known that those American transports are today being used not only to prosecute the war effort but to build up in the eyes of the post-war markets a serious competition to America's future position as king of the skyways. Wake up, colleagues. Do not let them talk you out of a standing Committee on Civil Aviation.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 72), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That during the Seventy-eighth Congress the Committee on Rivers and Harbors shall be composed of 26 members; the Committee on Insular Affairs shall be composed of 23 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which appeared in the Baltimore Sun of January 22 regarding the election of my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MARION BENNETT].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with some reluctance that I ask the Members of the House to bear with me for a few minutes today, as I am not unaware that I am one of that large body of new Members sent here by the people to represent them and their interests in this most important session of the Seventy-eighth Congress. I am also aware that it has been a rather unwritten rule that the function of new Members is mostly to be seen and not heard.

In former days, when the people of the country and their Government were gliding along in peaceful and normal times, I am inclined to believe that this rule was more applicable than it is today. Some 65 Members representing their districts with a total population of 15,000,000 people or more, with property holdings of billions of dollars, with their sons being called into the armed forces in this cruel war, with their civilian life being restricted and regimented; after giving consideration to the facts and issues in the past campaign made the decision to send to this august body these

new Members to represent them in this Congress. In the stress of these abnormal wartimes, it is fair to assume that the constituents of these Members are expecting them to assume their full share of responsibilities in representing them now in the conduct of the affairs of their Nation.

Speaking for myself, and I think I represent the thought of most of the new Members of this session, I have been deeply impressed with the sincerity of purpose of the Members of this body with whom I have come in contact, on both sides of the House. I have been greatly encouraged by the apparent and expressed intense interest and determination of the Members of this body in carrying forward the business of government, their eager desire to measure up to the great responsibilities that are now before this body and will continue to weight it down throughout the session.

I want at this time to express my appreciation of the splendid fellowship, advice, and helpful counsel of the older Members. I am sure that the other new Members have the same feeling and the same appreciation for the older Members of this body. I am further certain that I vouch their sentiment when I say that it is our earnest desire to follow your leadership and be helpful in the solution of the problems, so far as it lies within our power, that are before the country today. I think it was Dr. Johnson who once very wisely and graciously said:

> God Himself, sir, does not purpose to judge man until the end of his day; why should you and I?

I feel certain that the Members of this most important Congress will not be too quick to judge the new Members, and they will be forbearing with us neophytes who are anxious to take our place in helping in the work of the Nation's business.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is to bring to the attention of this body some thoughts that have been on my mind for many months. In calling them to your attention, I am not unmindful of the old adage that "fools rush in where angels fear to tread." I know it is a question which might be regarded as dangerous to one's prestige and political future; however, I prefer to follow my conscience and let the future take care of itself. I do not deem it of much importance whether a particular Member is returned to this House, only insofar as his services are important to the Nation and the public welfare. How well he serves his country in these trying times while he is here is what is really worth while.

For almost a year now the question of manpower has become increasingly more serious, and has been engaging the attention of the administration and the Congress. In the last few months it has become acute.

High wages from Government war plants have drained millions of men away from industry and the farms. Under our selective-service agency, millions more have been inducted into the military service.

We are faced today with the serious facts that manpower on the farms of our country is so depleted that we are likely to have a serious food shortage here in this country. The farmers are not able to get the additional machinery needed with which to carry on efficiently, and they are not able to procure the necessary labor to plant, till, and harvest their crops. Secretary Wickard is urging greater production to feed our Army, our civilians, and for lend lease, with the slogan that "food will win the war."

Young men have been taken from large farms all over this country, with the result that such farms have quit producing. Public sale bills have gone up all over the farming sections of this Nation announcing the sale of stock and equipment. Dairy cows by the countless thousands have been slaughtered and we are short of butter and milk throughout the country.

There have been some silly proposals that young city women and high-school children be sent to the farms to help in planting and production. Such ideas are too impractical to be given consideration. I understand the Government is now holding schools of instruction on farm machinery repair for high-school students. This, too, is a waste of time and money.

This is the thought that I wanted to bring to the attention of this body. It has had some appeal to me for several months.

Have we not reached the point where less men can be taken from civilian life as the months of 1943 face us?

Have we already drawn sufficient manpower when they are trained and equipped to win this war in the shortest time with the least loss of life? It is estimated that we have possibly 7,000,000 men in the armed forces now. There is talk of inducting some 3,000,000 men during 1943. Such a procedure will work additional hardships on the civilian economy, will cause married men, with children, to be taken from their jobs and their family, and will add tremendously to the financial burdens of the Nation.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Has the gentleman given any consideration to the question of getting our troops over to the fighting lines?

Mr. VURSELL. I will get to that.

Mr. FISH. In connection with this whole question of having a huge army, I think that is the most important issue to discuss.

Mr. VURSELL. I will get to that a little later. Food for our people, our Army, and our allies is most important. The buying of bonds, our contribution in taxes to help finance the war is just as important. The preservation of our financial structure now and for the postwar period is just as important if we are to save our American form of government. take our proper place at the peace table, and do our proper part in helping to feed the stricken and helpless people of the world in the years of reconstruction to follow.

While we are all proud of the marvelous achievement of our Nation in making such rapid strides in preparing and equipping our military forces, and are proud of the heroism and valor displayed and the victories of our American soldiers, the smartest and best in the world, as a Nation we must guard against calling to the colors possibly 2,000,000 more men than are needed to do the job. There has been talk of mobilizing an armed force of ten or twelve million men. Such estimates to me seem entirely too high.

Question: Will we need such a large force? Can we build or get the ships to put even 5,000,000 men on foreign shores and provide them an adequate flow of supplies? These are questions that I know are in the minds of many of the people in my State and are giving Members of this body serious thought.

This is a mechanized war and calls for a mechanized army. One man in the field now can use three times the munition in a day than could be used in World War No. 1. I am told that it takes 10 tons of shipping to supply one man in Africa or in the Pacific. Three million men would require 30,000,000 tons of shipping. Can we get supplies to them—can we get the ships?

Our Nation started in this war as the arsenal for the Allies; later, through lend-lease, we assumed our full share as the granary for the Allies. Now, added to that, we are fast moving into the center of the picture, with the exception of Russia possibly, with the largest army of them all. We are proud of the part we, as a nation, are able to play; but are we not justified in at least exploring the thought and possibilities that we can win the war more quickly, at less loss of life and with less financial strain placed upon our Nation with an armed force smaller than is now contemplated?

More planes and tanks to Russia will hit the German Army more effectively now than a year later in the hands of American boys that are using that equipment now in training. Russia needs equipment now. She has the manpower.

China, lying close to Japan, can hurl an army of 10,000,000 men against her if we can get guns, planes, tanks, and munitions to her.

Many of the Members of this House in a conference I was permitted to attend heard the officers of the Independent Oil Producers of America in this building Monday appeal for help to keep oil-well workers on the job in order that they might drill the Government's program, 16,000 oil wells in 1943. They told how their men were being taken into the Army and some going to work in war plants.

In this meeting a high Government official expressed the seriousness of the labor shortage in the oil fields, making the statement that 70 percent of the tonnage that was going abroad to supply the Army was petroleum products. He was anxious that production and reserves be increased and pointed out the tremendous amount of oil and shipping that was required to supply this mechanized world army.

In conclusion may I say, Washington, the seat of this Government, in its influence in winning this war, writing the

peace, and aiding in reconstruction, is now and will be the focal and most important point in the world. This Congress cooperating with the administration, the War and Navy Departments, may well be the most important Congress that has ever functioned since the beginning of this Republic. There is no question about the interest, earnestness, and great ability of many of the veteran leaders of this body. Because of my high regard for your leadership, my desire to be helpful, my faith in representative government, I have attempted in my humble way to call to your attention these thoughts which I have deemed worthy of your consideration.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. I wish to congratulate the gentleman upon his excellent contribution to a very important subject.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIKES). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the Federal Works Agency has at last taken an important step in the right direction. I was informed yesterday that it would be the policy of the Agency in the future to let all contracts on the open, competitive bidding basis, rather than on the closed, select bidding basis.

Heretofore, by select bidding, they have singled out a few contractors, perhaps in some cases, a favored few with the understanding that they and they alone were eligible to bid on a certain project and, therefore, eliminated many worthy contractors. Reasons given were hardly plausible in view of the facts which I am about to present in regard to a project with which I am very familiar.

It is claimed that select bidding was initiated in order to economize in the preparation and distribution of plans and specifications; that, for open bidding, the cost of preparation and distribution of additional plans and specifications would amount approximately to $500 per project. It is my firm conviction that open bidding will save much more than that and that the quality of the materials used may be substantially improved.

The case I wish to point out to you now is that of the armory at Shelby, N. C. The successful bidder on this project got the contract to furnish precast stone at $6,200. The Ingalls Limestone Co., of Bedford, Ind., placed a bid of $5,075 on furnishing natural Indiana limestone delivered on the scene at the time specified. In this bid submitted on Indiana limestone an allowance of $1,840 was made for freight charges to the project, leaving the cost of the stone fully processed in the mills $3,235. This made the price paid for the precast stone at the processing plant 91.6 percent higher than that of natural limestone at its place of production.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understood the gentleman to say that the man who got this contract received nearly $4,000 more for the stone than the gentleman's concern there in Bedford, Ind.

Mr. WILSON. That is correct in regard to the price that was received for the stone at the place of production. The point I am trying to bring out there is the fact that they paid 91.6 percent more for an entirely inferior product. It happens that the Ingalls Stone Co., of Bedford, Ind., agreed to deliver limestone at a cost of $5,075, which was about $1,100 less than the other stone delivered on the site. Allowing $1,840 for freight, they paid 91.6 percent more for precast stone f. o. b. than they would have had to pay for limestone—at least twice what they should have paid.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Was this an open-bid contract?

Mr. WILSON. No; it was a closed-select-bid contract.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman imagine the man who secured the bid was compelled to make certain contributions to certain charitable and eleemosynary organizations?

Mr. WILSON. Well, in answer to your question, I do know that the whole thing stinks and that there were other contracts in the same State that were let under the same conditions and that they did pay more for this inferior product than the price they would have paid to have had Indiana limestone delivered on the ground. Also, I know that the excuse they gave for doing this is entirely in error.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, we from the Hoosier State are well aware of the fine qualities of Indiana limestone as a building material. Is it not true that it is one of the outstanding and best building materials in the whole country and that it has been used in a great many places with very great success?

Mr. WILSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and I thank him for his contribution. I am told that about 75 or 80 percent of the permanent Government buildings here in Washington were built of Indiana limestone.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is true all over the country.

Mr. WILSON. Yes; it is of stone buildings. Another friend of mine from the Granite State of Massachusetts told me yesterday that the post office in Boston was built of Indiana limestone. We can ship limestone and compete with any building stone anywhere.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Is it not a fact that Indiana limestone is the standard stone for constructing buildings?

Mr. WILSON. That is absolutely true and I thank the gentleman. I am glad the gentleman asked that question, because it brings to my mind some more information in regard to this particular project. I am informed that the man who got this contract to furnish precast stone, John J. Norton, in North Carolina, also processes limestone, that he preferred to have the bids let only on the precast stone because there was too much competition in the limestone field. Therefore, he wanted to eliminate competition in order to get the bid—and on this inferior product at a much higher price.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I inform the gentleman, if he does not know it, that a great deal of the Boston Post Office is built of granite, of which there is such a lot of very fine material in the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. WILSON. Is it true that there is Indiana limestone in the Boston Post Office?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; but there is a great deal more granite also.

Mr. WILSON. Of course, the gentlewoman will agree that the lion's share is limestone, because we can ship it all the way from Indiana and compete with granite in your home State of Massachusetts. The people in Boston, Mass., are not afraid that the Indiana limestone will crack, are they?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, we feel, and I think the gentleman will find the experts in the different departments will verify this, that the granite is the most durable of all stone.

Mr. WILSON. The gentlewoman did not answer my question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think I did answer it. I think it is not inferior, but that the granite is better.

Mr. WILSON. Just more expensive.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I ask the gentlewoman from Massachusetts if that is because it comes from a New England State, just like the beans?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am prejudiced, I suppose, but I am stating now what experts say, not giving my own opinion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have noticed that whenever there is anything of that kind on New England always has the better of the argument. It has better material and gets more money for it, no question about it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think New England has wonderfully fine material, and everybody admits it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We do, and we admit that they get their share, if not a little more.

Mr. WILSON. The people of the Indiana limestone area always welcome open, competitive bidding. They are

glad to submit their product entirely on its merits.

I think you will agree that the price which was paid for this precast stone down in North Carolina was entirely out of line by any stretch of the imagination.

For instance, in the Bedford limestone area, precast stone producers always have to underbid the limestone people in order to get a contract. On this very small job alone, $1,125 was paid for a wholly inferior product delivered at the project. I have reason to believe that this has been going on in many large and small projects all over the land. Another reason given by the officials in charge was that Indiana limestone is an inferior product, that it chips and cracks, which argument is, of course, ridiculous. Most of our Government buildings of the permanent type here in Washington, our Nation's Capital, are built of Indiana limestone. This pragmatic proof should satisfy even the most inexperienced or skeptical hireling of the Federal Works Agency. Indiana limestone is a pure carbonate of lime product, than which there is no better building stone.

Another argument was advanced that the Ingalls Limestone Co. of Bedford was not mailed copies of the plans and specifications and were, therefore, not entitled to bid, which argument was entirely false, for the Ingalls Limestone Co. did receive copies of the plans and specifications.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that while we are making investigations in the interest of economy and fairness that the Federal Works Agency should not be overlooked.

Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out a concrete case and given you facts which indicate gross incompetence and possible graft.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I commend the gentleman for the solicitude he has shown for this great industry in his district, and commend him also for the diligence with which he has sought to protect the interests of that industry.

Mr. WILSON. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

[Here the gavel fell.]

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], is recognized for 10 minutes.

### COMMERCIAL AVIATION'S POST-WAR FUTURE

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months there has been a growing interest in post-war planning in this country. The subject is being widely discussed in the press, over the radio, and in magazines. We have a special board set up to make recommendations and work out a program to be put into effect immediately upon the cessation of hostilities. So far as I can gather from press releases our board is dealing with the post-war program as a social and not an economic problem.

There has been some criticism of those who are making preparations for the day when peace again returns to all nations on the ground that we should devote all our energies and talents to winning the war and allow the post-war problems to be solved when they arise. If we follow this line of reasoning we will probably find ourselves in another war in less than 20 years. If a baby is expected in the family the parents do not await its arrival to provide for it, but make plans for its welfare many days in advance. If we want lasting peace, we must make plans now to play our part in the post-war period.

It is not unwise to have idealists make recommendations for the part we will play. Some of them want to remake the world and feed, clothe, educate, regulate, and control all the peoples on the globe. Some of their suggestions may, by accident, prove of great value. Some people want to set up an international police organization and assure posterity that another Hitler cannot rise again. Some Americans would have us, when the war is won, take no part in international affairs. With all the different views we hope that a sound policy can be worked out that will insure a lasting peace and that our country will justify its existence as a progressive Nation by playing a major role in the days to come.

We Americans have by now, or should have, learned that we cannot build a wall around our territorial limits and have the things that it takes to make our standard of living so much higher than the rest of the world. Our automobile depends on rubber from the East Indies, chromium from Turkey and Russia; our food is better because of the coffee of Brazil, the tin of Malaya and the spices of India; our health is better because of quinine from the East Indies and South America; benzedrine from China and rare herbs from all parts of the globe. We must not allow a wall to be built around us if we are to continue to have the luxuries and necessities to which we have been accustomed.

Others have made suggestions about the part we are to play in the post-war world and I have decided to offer some suggestions that I have not yet seen in print.

It is nice to dream of a Utopian world, but we must be realists if we want to stay in the picture. We must build our post-war position in the world by commerce operated by private enterprise with Government assistance when necessary to put us on an even footing with our competitors. We must not blind ourselves to the fact that the burden on our taxpayers will be too heavy when this war is over to undertake an international W. P. A. We all recall how our Uncle Sam was repeatedly referred to by all European nations after the last World War as Uncle Shylock. If we have not learned already that we cannot buy good will and friendship, it is high time that we learn. The only way to win international good will is by having some commodity or service that other nations need and are willing to pay for in cash or trade and make them live up to their bargains. If we are fair with them in our dealings and give them value for what they buy, they will continue to be our friends instead of becoming ingrates when the cow goes dry and the milk fails to be delivered.

To my humble way of thinking, the nation that controls the most commercial aviation lines throughout the world after the war is over will be the nation that recovers quickest. Today we have many hundreds of thousands of workers in aircraft factories and associated industries. They are making machines of destruction now, but unless we decide to take advantage of our opportunity to become the dominant commercial nation 90 percent of these workers will be thrown out of work when the war is over. Today we are training thousands of crews to fly multiengined bombers who can step into commercial aviation and carry our commerce to the four corners of the globe. Today we are building, with the money of our taxpayers, excellent airports on every continent in the world. I hope we have had foresight enough to secure the rights, in perpetuity, for American air transports to use these fields. If we have not made these arrangements we should do it at once before our commerce goes the way of Phoenicia.

When peace comes we should insist that provisions be made that certain designated air routes and landing sites be made available to the air lines of all nations. A group of experts should be authorized now to prepare data and suggestions as to proposed air routes over every nation. There will be stiff opposition to this suggestion, but it will insure equal commercial opportunities to the air lines of all nations and will enable every nation to keep an eye on military preparations of every other nation. We have always insisted on the freedom of the seas. Now that air transport is a vital part of our economy, we must insist on freedom of the air.

It is highly probable that within the next 2 years huge cargo planes will be in operation with a cargo capacity of 300 tons or more and speed of 400 miles with a cruising range of 10,000 miles. Motor efficiency and structural design will increase the wing load, thereby reducing per pound operating cost, thus enabling the cargo planes of tomorrow to successfully compete with slow water transportation. We must begin preparations now to play our part in the air commerce of the future. Careful study should be given to necessary international regulation of air commerce.

We should start today training young men and women to become representatives of this country in every land. We

should offer courses in every civilized language. These young people will not only serve our commercial adventures but can be trained to be ambassadors of good will. We must train them in ethics and diplomacy for if we let unethical representatives go to other lands to represent our private concerns and they make a reputation of being cheats and frauds, our Nation will be thus branded and we will be sowing the seeds of another terrible war. These trained representatives will be in a position to keep our State Department advised of the internal conditions in all countries. They will enable us to prevent the rise of another Hitler or another sneak attack.

Unless we start preparations now to support private commerce, we will awaken too late and find that the planners have regimented the world and destroyed private enterprise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

THE UNITED STATES MARINES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we are all extremely grateful that the marines are to have a well-earned rest after 5 months of the most intensive fighting. The Navy believes that this is the longest period of day-to-day fighting, 24 hours a day, that has been performed by any American unit. On August 7, when they leaped from their ships and dashed onto the sands of Guadalcanal, they probably did not realize what intensive fighting, under horrible conditions, they would face. But they were there to accomplish a purpose, and nothing could have stopped them. During the First World War the First Division had 223 days of fighting, but a period of training and a few lulls were included in that period.

We owe the marines our undying gratitude. The bravery, endurance, and superhuman skill and strength that those men put into their battles for us thrill you and me to our very souls. We salute the marines.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following the remarks of the gentleman from Washington, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the question of a special committee on aviation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the same subject as the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes in opposition to the creation of a new committee on aviation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Raymond Clapper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Robert L. Norton.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 25, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

86. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of investigation by the office of the Comptroller General of the United States of the contracts and other records of the United States Maritime Commission; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed.

87. A letter from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Seventh Annual Report of the National Labor Relations Board for the year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Labor.

88. A letter from the major general, United States Army, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting a report on work done by the Public Roads Administration under the provisions of the Federal Highway Act in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, and recommendations concerning future work; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

89. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certified volume comprising the acts of the second and third special sessions of the Fifteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, June 15 to 28, 1942, and October 26 to November 8, 1942, respectively; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

90. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

91. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on forest roads and trails for the fiscal year 1942; to the Committee on Roads.

---

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1143) for the relief of Jennie M. Elben, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

---

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON of Kansas:

H. R. 1445. A bill to provide for issuance of a duplicate adjusted-service certificate to any veteran who establishes that the original has been lost or destroyed, or is being withheld or concealed from him, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DREWRY:

H. R. 1446. A bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GWYNNE:

H. R. 1447. A bill to incorporate the United Service Women of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1448. A bill to provide for adjudication of any claim for compensation, pension, or retirement pay upon evidence in file at time of death of the veteran; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1449. A bill to amend the Social Security Act with respect to old-age assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWE:

H. R. 1450. A bill to incorporate the Army Air Corps Mothers' Organization of America, Second World War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1451. A bill to establish uniform procedure relative to the proof of age, place of birth, or of death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 1452. A bill to expedite the prosecution of the war and insure the continuance of private motor transportation by making provision for an increased supply of rubber

manufactured from agricultural or forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 1453. A bill to provide that veterans of the present war suffering with tuberculous or neuropsychiatric ailments shall receive the same domiciliary or hospital care as veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 1454 (by request). A bill to amend the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 1455. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to provide for an adequate supply of peanuts needed for oil and other uses during the years 1943 and 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1456. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1457. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 1458. A bill to authorize and direct the Veterans' Administration to provide vocational rehabilitation and assistance in securing suitable employment, for service-connected disabled veterans in need thereof, and feasible therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. Res. 69. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to conduct studies and examinations of executive agencies to assist it in the determinations of matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 70. Resolution establishing a Select Committee To Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies beyond the scope of their authority; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. Res. 71. Resolution to authorize compensation for services of Hallie Reeves; to the Committee on Accounts.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1459. A bill for the relief of Alvertine Nast and Wayne Nast, a minor son; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 1460. A bill to reinstate E. Lewis Field, a captain, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 1461. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Kligler (Robert E. Arden); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MONKIEWICZ:

H. R. 1462. A bill for the relief of William H. Shultz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 1463. A bill for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 1464. A bill for the relief of J. H. Atkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 1465. A bill granting a pension to Margaret M. Crane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1466. A bill granting a pension to James C. Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1467. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1468. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Azer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1469. A bill for the relief of Robert Beckwith, Julius Buettner, and Emma M. Buettner; to the Committee on Claims.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

43. By Mr. ELLIS: Resolutions adopted by the Parkersburg Chamber of Commerce, relative to gasoline rationing and pay-as-you-go plan of Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

44. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, requesting the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to take all necessary steps to provide for proper substantial recognition of the status of American merchant marine service, passed by the general assembly on the 13th day of January A. D. 1943; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

45. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the California Wool Growers Association, San Francisco, on the control of livestock diseases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

46. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the office of city clerk, city of St. Paul, Minn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

---

# SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of all life and light, by whose love we have the gift of today's fresh beginning, we thank Thee for this reverential moment of quiet as we bow in Thy presence before the pressure of demanding hours lays its hand upon us. Lord of the new day, who spreadest the mantle of light about us when purple morning breaketh, fairer than morning, lovelier than daylight, dawns the sweet consciousness we are with Thee: If we take the wings of the morning and fly to the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall Thy hand lead us and Thy right hand hold us.

Even as the dawn has climbed to the zenith with glamor and golden dart and has grown into the fullness of noontide, so let Thy radiance banish all shadows of unbelief, of fear, and of guilt. May the day star from on high rise in our hearts with healing in His wings. So may we walk the steep and sharp road of duty and service as children of the light. In bitter and baffling days, when the earth is full of thunder and the seas are dark with wrath, give us a courage that never quails, give us a faith that never wavers, give us a hope that never dims. Thus, in the glory of the morning grant us Thy blessing, and in the gloaming of the evening let Thy peace be upon our hearts. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 21, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gillette | Pepper |
| Andrews | Green | Radcliffe |
| Austin | Guffey | Revercomb |
| Bankhead | Gurney | Reynolds |
| Barbour | Hatch | Robertson |
| Barkley | Hawkes | Russell |
| Bilbo | Hayden | Scrugham |
| Bone | Hill | Shipstead |
| Brewster | Holman | Stewart |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | Taft |
| Brooks | La Follette | Thomas, Idaho |
| Buck | Langer | Thomas, Okla. |
| Burton | Lodge | Thomas, Utah |
| Bushfield | Lucas | Truman |
| Butler | McCarran | Tunnell |
| Byrd | McClellan | Tydings |
| Capper | McFarland | Vandenberg |
| Caraway | McKellar | Van Nuys |
| Chandler | McNary | Wagner |
| Chavez | Maloney | Wallgren |
| Clark, Idaho | Maybank | Walsh |
| Clark, Mo. | Mead | Wheeler |
| Connally | Millikin | Wherry |
| Danaher | Moore | White |
| Davis | Murdock | Wiley |
| Ellender | Nye | Willis |
| Ferguson | O'Daniel | Wilson |
| George | O'Mahoney | |
| Gerry | Overton | |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report of the operations of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUITS ARISING UNDER PUBLIC VESSELS ACT

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a list of suits arising under the Public Vessels Act of March 3, 1925, in which final decrees were entered, exclusive of cases on appeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUITS IN ADMIRALTY AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a list of suits aris-

ing under the act of March 9, 1920, authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty involving merchant vessels in which final decrees were entered against the United States, exclusive of cases on appeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LANDS ACQUIRED FOR NAVAL USES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of lands acquired for naval uses, for the period from July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of obligations by projects incurred under the appropriation for temporary and emergency construction (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

ACTS OF LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior transmitting pursuant to law, the acts of the second and third special sessions of the Fifteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriture transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the activities of the Department of Agriculture relating to forest roads and trails for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

SURVEY OF WATERSHED, BILLINGS AREA, MONTANA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a survey of the watershed improvement and flood control of the Billings area, Montan. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF LEND-LEASE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Lend-Lease Administrator, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of operations of the Lend-Lease Administration covering the period from March 11, 1941, to December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Price Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third quarterly report of the Office of Price Administration, for the period ended October 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EMPLOYEES RECEIVING $3,000 AND OVER, OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Chief of the Congressional Information Unit, Office of Price Administration, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 322 (77th Cong.) additional information regarding employees who draw salaries of $3,000 per annum or over, together with their age, education, and business or professional affiliations during the 5-year period preceding their employment by the agency (with accompany papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on work done by the Public Roads Administration under the Federal Highway Act in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, and recommendations concerning future work (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

STEAMSHIP "PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT"

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of an investigation by representatives of his office of contracts and other records of the United States Maritime Commission relating to the sale by the United States Shipping Board of the steamship *President Roosevelt*, and its acquisition subsequently and further sale (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, together with a list containing the names, salaries, and duties of all officers and employees of the Board, and decisions rendered by the Board during the fiscal year (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the council of the city of St. Paul, Minn., favoring continuation of the National Youth Administration, or some other worth-while youth training program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from Fred Whitmore, of Kalamazoo, Mich., relative to his plan to provide security for every person, to simplify the tax structure and place it on a pay-as-you-go basis, and also to stabilize the national income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens, young women of Wesleyan University, Salina, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to members of the land and naval forces of the United States; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. WALSH:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to take immediate steps to relieve distress and suffering caused by the shortage of fuel oil in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on the 18th instant, p. 196, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, requesting the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to take all necessary steps to provide for proper, substantial recognition of the status of the men of the American merchant-marine service; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GERRY on the 21st instant, p. 251, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. TRUMAN:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Whereas Wiley Blount Rutledge has been appointed by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt as judge of the Supreme Court of the United States; and

"Whereas Judge Rutledge has been, for a number of years, a leading teacher and educator connected with various universities and schools of law; and

"Whereas Judge Rutledge was dean of the law department of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., for some years; and

"Whereas during the period of time that he was dean of the Washington University Law Department, he made many friends in the State of Missouri, and the people of the State of Missouri became conscious of the ability and learning of Judge Rutledge: So, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Missouri*, That we commend the President of the United States for his wise choice in selecting Wiley Blount Rutledge for the high position as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and wish for Judge Rutledge a most successful and happy tenure of office; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house be directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a copy to Judge Wiley Blount Rutledge, a copy to Washington University Law Department, St. Louis, Mo., and a copy each to the two United States Senators of Missouri, HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK and Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN."

By Mr. WHEELER:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Whereas there is a genuine need for more farm machinery than has been allotted the State of Montana if the farmers are to produce the foodstuffs desired; and

"Whereas a diminishing supply of available labor makes farm machinery even more necessary than in normal times; and

"Whereas lack of both materials and labor is making it increasingly difficult to make repairs to machinery: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana*, That we petition the War Production Board and the Secretary of Agriculture to reconsider both the national quotas of new farm machinery for 1943 and the present Montana State quotas, to the end that quotas may be increased and more equitably allocated and that farmers may be equipped to handle the huge task of farm production which it is well known is so vital to the successful prosecution of the war and the feeding of our armed forces, our allied soldiers, and our civilian workers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies properly attested by the president and secretary of the senate be transmitted by the secretary of state to the War Production Board, Donald M. Nelson, Chairman, and to Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Montana."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Whereas the War Production Board has seen fit to severely curtail the 1943 production of farm machinery, despite representations of need by county and State war boards and the Secretary of Agriculture, and despite the fact that the steel needed for producing farm machinery is a very small percentage of total annual steel production and further despite the fact that more farm machinery is needed in order to meet 1943 war production goals of food and fiber crops and to replace lost farm labor; and

"Whereas the quotas of both 1943 farm machinery production and other new machinery which it has been necessary to set up to allocate available supplies entails unfortunate discriminations among States, counties and individual farmers needing machinery and replacements; and

"Whereas as an example of the foregoing, Montana now needing hammer mills and feed grinders for grinding winter feed

for livestock and having requests for approximately 500, has been allotted only 49 in comparison with 379 allotted North Dakota whose total livestock units are practically the same as the State of Montana; and

"Whereas a survey conducted among the many members of the house of representatives who are engaged in agricultural pursuits revealed that inability to buy sufficient badly needed farm machinery is one of the major factors which threaten to seriously handicap food production: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the house of representatives in session assembled,* That we petition the War Production Board and the Secretary of Agriculture to reconsider both the national quotas of new farm machinery for 1943 and the present State quotas to the end that quotas may be increased and more equitably allocated and that farmers may be equipped to handle the huge task of farm production which it is well known is so vital to the successful prosecution of the war and the feeding of our armed forces, our allied soldiers and our civilian workers; be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the journal of the house, and that a copy thereof properly attested by the speaker and the clerk of the house, be transmitted by the secretary of state to the War Production Board, Donald M. Nelson, Chairman, and to Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Montana."

PARITY PRICES ON FARM PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I present a copy of engrossed House Resolution 8, adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, and I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be referred as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma, and printed in the RECORD, under the rule:

House Resolution 8

Resolution memorializing Congress to revise a method of arriving at parity on farm products by taking into consideration the increased cost of farm labor, farm machinery, and the increased cost of living

Whereas it has been and is being stated in high public places that food will win the war and win the peace, and to that end our farmers are being urged to make every possible effort to increase production; and

Whereas farm income has not kept pace with the increased cost of labor, the increased cost of farm machinery, and the increased cost of living, and is also being hampered by the scarcity of farm labor: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma:*

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and the same is hereby memorialized and petitioned to revise the method of arriving at the parity price of farm products by taking into consideration the scarcity of and the increased cost of farm labor, the increased cost of farm machinery, and the increased cost of living.

SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each of the Oklahoma Senators and Members of the National House of Representatives, to the floor leaders of both parties in the House and Senate, and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 18th day of January 1943.

HAROLD FREEMAN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

RESOLUTION OF LOYALTY AND SUPPORT IN WAR EFFORT ADOPTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the Legislature of Oklahoma has passed Concurrent Resolution No. 1, which is of interest to the State of Oklahoma, and might be of general interest to the country; so I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD in full as a part of my remarks and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 1

Resolution commending the President of the United States of America and the Congress for the war effort and pledging the support of the State of Oklahoma in the winning of the war

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt became President of the United States of America on the 4th day of March 1933; and

Whereas under section 2 of article III of the Constitution of the United States, he, as President, is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy; and

Whereas the President pointed out to Congress from time to time in his annual messages the necessity for expanding the Army, Navy, and Air Corps, and the fortifying of the Philippine Islands, Pearl Harbor, Wake Island, and Midway, and other outposts of American defense; and

Whereas for some years following there were in Congress obstructionists, isolationists, appeasers who delayed the rearming of America and the fortifying of its defense outposts; and

Whereas the President of the United States had on numerous occasions pointed out that there were criminals at large and nations denominated as aggressors who made their living by taking what others had worked for and earned over generations of peaceful and quiet living, such as the stout-hearted Holland Dutch and the peaceful working Danes; and

Whereas the Congress failed to heed his pleas and warnings until a state of war existed in the four corners of the globe, and finally a poll of the American people convinced Congress that the President was right in the rearming of this Nation and in the preparation to defend ourselves; and

Whereas on December 7, 1941, Pearl Harbor was attacked without warning while the envoys of the Japanese war lords were sitting as invited guests at the peace table in Washington; and

Whereas this act constitutes a declaration of war by the Japanese Empire on the United States; and

Whereas Germany and Italy declared war on the United States the following day, it then became necessary for the President, as Commander in Chief, to call upon Congress to recommend that war be declared upon Japan, Germany, and Italy; and

Whereas from that day until this the Congress of the United States, as a whole and in the main, has supported the President's war program: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives of the Nineteenth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, the Honorable Senate concurring herein, do commend the President of the United States of America, as President and as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, for his leadership and his war effort in winning the war; be it further

*Resolved,* That we commend the Congress of the United States for its support of the President's war program since December 7, 1941; be it further

*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives of the Nineteenth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, the Honorable Senate concurring therein, pledge the unqualified and undivided support of the State of Oklahoma to the President and Congress of the United States of America in whatever is necessary to win the war now being fought by the United Nations against Japan, Germany, and Italy; be it further

*Resolved,* That we pledge our full cooperation to the President and the Congress of the United States of America in securing a just and lasting peace, based upon Christianity, equality, and democratic principles after conclusion of the war; be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the United States, to each of the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Oklahoma.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 6th day of January 1943.

HAROLD FREEMAN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

Adopted by the senate the 13th day of January 1943.

ROBERT BURNS,
*Acting President of the Senate.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TRUMAN, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 414. A bill for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight; without amendment (Rept. No. 21).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. Res. 39. Resolution continuing the authority for an investigation of the use of public lands and the filming of motion pictures thereon, and increasing the limit of expenditures; with an amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. MEAD, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. Res. 68. Resolution continuing the authority for an investigation of the administration and operation of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. Res. 73. Resolution continuing the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 58, Seventy-seventh Congress, and Senate Resolution 310, Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to the investigation with respect to the development of mineral resources, including oil and gas, of the public lands of the United States; with an amendment; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF METROPOLITAN POLICE, UNITED STATES PARK POLICE, WHITE HOUSE POLICE, AND MEMBERS OF FIRE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT—MINORITY VIEWS: AMENDMENT

Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, submitted minority views on the bill (S. 17) to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the

Fire Department of the District of Columbia, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 19.

Mr. BURTON also submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 17, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR TEACHERS AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL EMPLOYEES OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT—MINORITY VIEWS: AMENDMENT

Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, submitted minority views on the bill (S. 18) to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries for teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 20.

Mr. BURTON also submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 18, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 82, submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] on January 21. The resolution in context and import and provision is similar to other resolutions along this line. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 82) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Civil Service, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 83, submitted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on January 21, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 83), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Rules, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the able Senator whether the resolution affecting the Committee on Rules is not different from those affecting other standing committees.

Mr. LUCAS. It is the same.

Mr. McNARY. Has it been customary for the Committee on Rules to hold hearings?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; the Committee on Rules holds hearings from time to time on different matters.

Mr. McNARY. On changes in the rules, I assume?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have here a series of special Senate resolutions which heretofore have been submitted and passed upon by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, of which I am chairman, which I report favorably and desire to have considered. First, I report favorably with an amendment, Senate Resolution 6, submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] on January 7, 1943, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 6).

The amendment was, on page 1, line 7, to strike out the words "and succeeding Congresses" and to insert the word "Congress", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to March 1, 1941, Senate Resolution 146, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to August 11, 1941, and Senate Resolution 288, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 17, 1942 (relating to the investigation of the war program), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND MARKETING OF WOOL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 12, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, do I understand the resolution provides for the continuation of a committee?

Mr. LUCAS. The resolution provides for the continuation of the committee which was appointed heretofore by the Senate for the purpose of making investigation into the production, transportation and marketing of wool. Let me say to the able minority leader that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who is not now on the floor of the Senate, stated to our committee that there was at the present time a sufficient amount of money in the fund heretofore provided for his committee to make a complete and final report, which would be done previous to December 31st of this year.

Mr. McNARY. I thought the committee had completed its work last year. That is the only reason I made the inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is correct in saying that the committee has completed its work, but it is my understanding that no final report has been filed, and that the work extended over a long period of time, and there is quite a bit of work to be done in connection with making the final report. That was the statement made by the senior Senator from New Mexico to our committee.

Mr. McNARY. The resolution contemplates the filing of a final report?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; and the winding up of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 12), which had been submitted by Mr. HATCH on the 7th instant.

The amendments were, in line 5, after the word "effect", to strike out "during the Seventy-eighth Congress" and insert "until December 31, 1943"; and in line 7, after the words "prior to", to strike out "the expiration of the Seventy-eighth Congress" and insert "said date", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That Senate Resolution 160, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, agreed to July 10, 1935, authorizing a special committee to investigate the production, transportation, and marketing of wool, as extended, is hereby further extended and continued in full force and effect until December 31, 1943; and the said committee may report to the Senate at any time prior to said date.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF SURVEY OF CONDITIONS OF INDIANS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 17, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I will say that the resolution was submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] on January 7. The original resolution has been pending for some time, and the Senator from Oklahoma came before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and stated that there was a small amount left in the fund, and he would like to have the committee continued in order to take care of individual and various problems which come up from time to time in connection with Indian

affairs. The Senator from Oklahoma is present; and if any question is raised concerning the resolution, I should like to have him make a full explanation of it.

I should also like to say in connection with the resolution that it was reported to me that the fund remaining was being used primarily for the purpose of keeping a couple of persons on the pay roll The Senator from Oklahoma emphatically denied that allegation. The only purpose for which the money left in the fund is being used is by the Senators themselves in making investigations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 17), which had been submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma on the 7th instant.

The amendment was, in line 6, after "Seventy-eighth", to strike out "and succeeding Congresses" and insert "Congress", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That Senate Resolution 79, agreed to February 2, 1928, and continued by subsequent resolutions, authorizing the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, to make a general survey of the condition of the Indians in the United States, hereby is continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION OF WATER SYSTEM OF THE DISTRICT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 31, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 31), reported by Mr. MCCARRAN from the Committee on the District of Columbia on the 11th instant, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 169, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to March 2, 1942, and Senate Resolution 337, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 16, 1942 (relating to the administration and operation of the water system of the District of Columbia), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

CONTINUATION OF STUDY AND SURVEY OF THE PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate resolution 66, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the question of further appropriation has been postponed, has it?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will say in answer to the question asked by the Senator from Ohio that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate did postpone the question of the amount of the appropriation for this committee, and the resolution was referred back to the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of American Small Business Enterprises, with the request that the committee thoroughly investigate and determine the amount needed, and report on that point later. That action was taken primarily because request was made that five new members be added to the Small Businessmen's Committee, and our committee thought the entire membership of that committee should determine the question of the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. TAFT. I agree entirely with the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 66) which had been submitted by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MEAD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. TAFT), on the 18th instant.

The amendments were, in line 4, after the word "hereby", to strike out "extended" and insert "continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-eighth Congress," and to strike out section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. That the limit of expenditure under the said resolution is hereby increased by $50,000.

So as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, as agreed to October 8, 1940 (providing for a study and survey of the problems of American small-business enterprises), is hereby continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-eighth Congress and its membership increased from 7 to 12, and the Vice President is authorized to appoint 5 more members to said committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. The Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs unanimously reported Senate Resolution 26 last Thursday. May I inquire of the chairman of the committee when he expects to have another meeting of his committee, as our committee would like to have some action taken on the resolution, which was referred to the Audit and Control Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the resolution which the Senator from New Mexico is now discussing was favorably reported by his committee last Thursday, as I recall, and a meeting of our committee was held on Friday morning. We did not have the resolution before us at that time to consider it. We considered only those resolutions which were then before us. Other resolutions have been submitted since that time, and I think perhaps at present there are four or five resolutions pending before our committee. I will say that some time this week the committee will hold another meeting and determine definitely what we will do with all the resolutions which are now pending before us.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The reason I made the inquiry is that the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs unanimously voted to try to continue the investigation of Puerto Rican affairs. The resolution in question is identical to one presented in the last Congress, with one exception. The resolution submitted in the last Congress provided for investigation of social and economic conditions in Puerto Rico due to the shortage of shipping and to the war in general. From the information obtained by the committee during the last session of Congress the committee came to the conclusion that while it was true that conditions have been temporarily ameliorated and to a certain extent have been improved, the over-all picture of conditions as they have existed for some 43 or 44 years is still the same, and it is our belief that a subcommittee of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs should go to Puerto Rico and make an investigation The committee is not in any way whatsoever interested in the political angle of the Puerto Rico situation, but is interested in social conditions in Puerto Rico, and I believe the committee can serve a very useful purpose. We wanted to do the work as soon as possible, because the Senate has now completed various organization steps, and the committee desires to do the work before other important questions are taken up by the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. The report made by the Senator from New Mexico was a very fair and complete report with respect to what had been done. I should say that some time during the week the resolution in which the Senator is interested will be considered by the full committee.

Mr President, while I am on my feet I should like to say another word with respect to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. Senators all know that the membership of the committee was increased to eight. The Senator from Illinois thought it the better part of wisdom to hold meetings in connection with all these resolutions, and as soon as we have enough resolutions before us another meeting will be held, and the chairmen of the various committees who are interested in resolutions will be called before the committee, or anyone who is interested will be called before it for the purpose of giving brief testimony in connection with the various resolutions, insofar as the financial aspects are concerned.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 553. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 554. A bill for the extension of admiralty jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 555. A bill for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 556. A bill for the relief of Pedro Jose Arrecoechea; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 557. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. Herfurth, Jr., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 558. A bill to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof; and

S. 559. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a differential in pay for night work in the Postal Service" so as to include custodial employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 560. A bill for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 561. A bill to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial to the Twenty-ninth Division, American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 562. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. O'Connor; and

S. 563. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims arising out of certain blasting operations on the Merrimack River; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 564. A bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 565. A bill for the relief of R. E. Cotton Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. GEORGE also introduced Senate bill 566, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 567. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public kindergarten or kindergarten and nursery-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 568. A bill to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 569. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 570. A bill granting a pension to Clarence Edward Shipman;

S. 571. A bill granting a pension to Lydia C. Wark;

S. 572. A bill granting a pension to Alice Wright; and

S. 573. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nancy Jane Spence; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 574. A bill providing for cancelation of certain crop production and harvesting loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 575. A bill to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,600 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 576. A bill to validate certain applications for national service life insurance where deductions of premiums from service pay were authorized but the applicant died prior to the effective date of such insurance and prior to February 11, 1942; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 577. A bill to amend an act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 578. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reopen and readjudicate the eminent domain case of John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), and revise its judgment heretofore entered therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the Sunday before Memorial Day as a day for memorial services for deceased firemen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## INCREASE OF NATIONAL DEBT LIMIT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes. The bill would increase the debt limit to $210,000,000,000, which is the Budget figure as estimated and contained in the Budget report on the national debt at the end of the fiscal year 1943–44, that is, on July 1, 1944.

The bill is in the form of similar bills, but there have been added two additional sections to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate and especially of the members of the Finance Committe. The first section would give to the Secretary of the Treasury the power and authority to permit payments in connection with the redemption of savings bonds to be made by incorporated banks and trust companies; and the second section would authorize and permit the Secretary of the Treasury to pay losses resulting from payments made in connection with redemption of savings bonds out of the fund established by the Government Losses in Shipment Act, as amended. It will be, I hope, agreeable to the committee, Mr. President to consider the bill on Thursday or Friday of this week; and public notice will be given to the members of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 566) to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES OF SENATORIAL CANDIDATES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 86) was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That Resolution No. 235, agreed to April 16, 1942, authorizing a Special Committee to Investigate the Campaign Expenditures of Senatorial Candidates in 1942, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the committee shall submit its final report, which shall not be later than March 6, 1943.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I will state my reason for asking for the additional time. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] will recall that several days ago we discussed a resolution dealing with this matter, and the Senator from Oregon and I agreed to making the date the 10th of February. I wish to say that I have had to do a part of the work with my own office force. We are keeping down expenses to a minimum. We expect to turn back more than half the money allotted to us. We really need the additional time to compile figures necessary to be placed in the report.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, when the matter came before the Senate for consideration a week ago, I objected to the length of time requested by the able Senator from Arizona. We agreed on the 10th of February, as I recall. What is the date contained in the resolution the Senator has now submitted?

Mr. McFARLAND. The date is the 6th of March. That date was also contained in the original resolution. In discussing it we finally agreed on February 10.

Mr. MCNARY. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. The reason for requesting that the date be made the 6th of March is that one of those working for me had to leave for a short time. We have seen fit to do much of the work in our own office in order to hold down the expenses of the committee to a minimum. We expect to turn back more than half the money which was allotted to us.

Mr. MCNARY. That is an unusual statement.

Mr. President, in the interest of economy I join the Senator from Arizona in the request that the committee be given until March 6, 1943, to file its report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 86) was considered and agreed to.

## R. BRINSKELLE AND CHARLIE MELCHER; WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS

On motion of Mr. HILL, it was,

*Ordered*, That the papers accompanying the bill (S. 1352) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of R. Brinskelle and Charlie Melcher (77th Cong., 1st sess.) be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

## ELECTION OF SERGEANT AT ARMS—PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday Mr. Bert Andrews wrote an article, which was published in the Washington Post of January 24, which I read:

The poll tax issue. Chesley W. Jurney, Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, resigned and was replaced by former Senator Wall Doxey, of Mississippi. Mr. Jurney had incurred the wrath of Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee, and other southern Senators, when he hunted out absent Members and served warrants of arrest to force their attendance at debate on the anti-poll tax bill.

Mr. President, Mr. Andrews is wholly mistaken in what he says in this article

concerning my part in the Jurney matter. The arrests in the poll tax matter did not have the slightest or the remotest thing in the world to do with my opposition to Mr. Jurney. In that matter Mr. Jurney did what the Senate ordered him to do. He cannot and could not be blamed for doing what the Senate ordered him to do.

It is very good of my critic, and I thank him for the compliment, to suggest that my wrath had such a powerful influence on the Senate majority, but I am sure it did not have the slightest thing in the world to do with the case. I think every member of the majority who was at the majority conference will agree with me that that was not remotely the reason why Mr. Jurney was defeated. Mr. Andrews might ask any member of the conference.

### POST-WAR AIMS—STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, there is much discussion throughout the country regarding the post-war aims of the United States. It is a good thing for the people of the country to discuss the aims of our country after the war. I think that such discussions should not be for the purpose of controversy or of spreading disunity, but should be made in good humor and based on common sense.

The Vice President has made a valuable contribution to a consideration of America's part in the post-war era. A reading of the very frank statement which he made several days ago would be advantageous, I think, to the people of the country; and I desire to have it included in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Some men have said we cannot discuss post-war aims without rekindling peacetime controversies and emphasizing peacetime disunities. They talk "in dark whispers of the collectivization of American life, of the destruction of free enterprise." They would have us believe that our only alternatives are to choose between a return to the old system with its chronic depressions, unemployment, and want, or else to assure employment through a full state socialism with everyone working for the Government under tight central bureaucracy. They seek to frighten our great American middle class of independent self-supporting citizens by this bogey. They claim that to discuss now ways of maintaining full employment after the war would split our people wide open. They claim it would create a class warfare that would weaken and undermine our war effort.

Such claims are nonsense. "We can have full employment in this country without destroying private initiative, private capital, or private enterprise. We need the driving force of self-interest to get most of the work of the world done." Despite all the gains of modern machinery, it still takes a lot of hard work to make a house, an automobile, a grapefruit, a beefsteak, or even a movie. Every farmer knows how true it still is that "in the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat bread. Men must work for what they have. By and large their material reward will continue to be based on how skilled they become." Social security and other measures, public and private, can provide protection against the contingencies the individual cannot avoid, such as disease, accident, involuntary unemployment, and old age. Provision of such security and of opportunity to all for health, education, and work, "are not inconsistent with the principle that hard work must be rewarded to encourage workers to do their best."

What I visualize for the America of the future is not a nation of propertyless workers, but rather an America where all can become members of the middle class, where all can share in the benefits which that class has enjoyed in the past. For this representative American of the future, these include a home of his own with all the conveniences modern science has made possible—electric lights, central heating, modern plumbing, electric washing machine, electric refrigeration, radio, comfortable furniture, and rugs. They include a car neither old nor ramshackle, decent clothes, and books. They include his share of recreation—movies or theater, trips, vacations, high school and college for his children, horse racing, football, baseball, golf, or tennis, as his taste is inclined. These, together with ample food, make up the American way of life which only a minor portion of our people has enjoyed in the past. They can be and will be enjoyed by the great mass of our people in the future, if only we can find the means to translate our present great productivity for war to an equally great productivity for peace.

We will produce this year, right here in the United States, at least one hundred and thirty to one hundred and forty billion dollars' worth of goods and services. That is equal to an average of $4,000 worth of products turned out for each family in the country. Of course, our families won't consume that much this year, for over half of what we produce will go to wage war. If we can work out the ways to keep production going on an equally high level after the fighting ends, every family can enjoy a comfortable income, even though there continue to be wide differences between what is earned by skilled professional men or inventors or daring businessmen, and what average workers earn.

But when we come to ask how we will keep business going on such a full level after the wartime demands stop, the prophets of doom say in effect it cannot be done except by abolishing private enterprise, by substituting complete Government ownership and Government control for the freedoms of the competitive system. I take a different view. I believe that the spirit of free competition will and must continue to be one of our main driving forces. We must continue incentives to individual effort and progress. The farmer who is the first to breed up his cows or improve his seed lines, the engineer who invents a labor-saving technique, the merchant who finds ways of meeting his customers' needs more economically and more fully, the businessman, or the inventor who risks his work or his capital in a new productive enterprise, the worker who studies and fits himself for a more productive job, each must be rewarded for his achievement, and encouraged by the reward to push on to still greater effort and production. There is need in American society for the flexibility, imagination, and growth which such individual opportunity and achievements produce. Horatio Alger is not dead in America and never need be.

This does not mean that the future will be the same as the past. Though we can retain many of the elements of business as we have known it in the past, we cannot go back to the past complete lack of economic responsibility and insure full employment at the same time. I hope that some kinds of easy money-making are gone for good—money made by the old-fashioned manipulation of security markets and of speculative commodity markets, or by the unrestricted use of business monopoly powers which strangle trade, kill competition, and cut down production or jobs. In the last few years we have done our best to see that exploitation of all kinds has become permanently unfashionable. Even tremendously large incomes will be less common in the future, not only because they are bad for those that receive them, or at least their children and grandchildren, but also because they build up hoards of idle money instead of putting people to work, and concentrate control of industry in single hands.

No; we are not going back to the past irresponsibilities, to the kind of business where money-making had no relation to service to the community or to the citizens. Instead we shall continue to develop the kind of mixed society where both business and Government have responsibilities. Private property and private enterprise will be used to the fullest extent they can to serve the general welfare. Individuals will be free and must be encouraged to start their own businesses, to increase their own production, to acquire and use capital. At the same time Government can and must restrain abuses of private initiative, which corporations and monopolies under the guise of freedom of enterprise have used to damage the welfare of society as a whole. More than that, government can and will accept the major responsibilities for filling in whatever gaps business leaves. Private enterprise will continue to be our first reliance in providing jobs and providing work. Businessmen will be encouraged to do what competition has always tended to make them do—to reduce prices as costs fall, to increase the levels of sales and employment, to use profits only as an incentive to increase production or lower costs. To the extent that there are areas of unemployment left despite these efforts by business, government must and will step in to see that all people have opportunities for work and to establish such minimum standards of living that no member of the community suffers even though business temporarily and in part fails to provide opportunities at good work for all people. The more private enterprise succeeds in maintaining full employment through the policies I have just indicated, the less Government spending will be required.

Meanwhile, people will continue to own and to acquire property, to start new businesses, to get ahead in the world, to fail or succeed under their own drive. Individual initiative and enterprise, and Government responsibility for the general welfare, will continue to pull in double harness, for a better life for our people.

### DISFRANCHISEMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, on January 5, James R. Kirkland, chairman of the District of Columbia Bar Association, delivered an address to some 90 men and women upon their induction into a naturalization class. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I wish particularly to call attention to the following statement by Mr. Kirkland:

Those of you who remain in the District of Columbia are aware that there is still a limitation upon your rights as an American. While your neighbor may cast his vote on election day, you still are denied the complete privilege of a citizen. You are aware that the residents of the District of Columbia are disfranchised and are not entitled to be represented in the Congress nor to have a voice in the local government. When you take your oath today, it should act as an immediate challenge to you to work for suffrage in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. President, it is high time that Congress take action to correct this situation, and restore to citizens of the United

States living in the District of Columbia the rights their fellow citizens have in the States to elect a President and Vice President and Members of Congress. The District of Columbia should not be the "voteless ghetto" of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

May it please the court and you new American citizens, as chairman of the District of Columbia Bar Association Committee on Americanism, it affords me great pleasure in its behalf to welcome you into the circle of American citizenship. We of the District of Columbia Bar Association are endeavoring by these ceremonies to make more memorable and more impressive this ceremony of your naturalization. When you reflect that two-thirds of the signers of the Declaration of Independence and two-thirds of the signers of the Constitution of the United States were members of the American bar, it is fitting and proper that we should carry on those fine traditions of our profession by extending to you the hand of fellowship upon your entry into American citizenship.

The presence among your class of members of the armed service should serve to impress upon you not only that your newly acquired citizenship enables you to enjoy many privileges but also calls for many obligations on your part. Those uniformed members of your class are prepared to defend their new citizenship with their lives and to do their utmost to preserve the ideals of American democracy.

Against the many causes of the great World War No. 2 we cherish the hope that the genius of our Government, which permits all classes, creeds, and races to live together in peace and harmony to the complete economic and social freedom of the individual, may prove the model of government upon which all the nations of the world may in the future unite in a permanent and lasting peace.

Perhaps some of you may feel that while you have been honored by your American citizenship, apart from discharging your general obligations, there is little that you as a citizen can do to aid and improve your Government. To those of you who will go to live in other States, you will undoubtedly exercise the supreme privilege of an American by voting in your State, county, and municipal elections and in furthering the great principles of representative government. Those of you who remain in the District of Columbia are aware that there is still a limitation upon your rights as an American. While your neighbor may cast his vote on election day, you still are denied the complete privilege of a citizen. You are aware that the residents of the District of Columbia are disfranchised and are not entitled to be represented in the Congress nor to have a voice in their local government. When you take your oath today, it should act as an immediate challenge to you to work for suffrage in the Nation's Capital.

Again may I extend to you in behalf of the Bar Association our sincere congratulations, and we trust that in the years to come, you will look upon this occasion as one of the most inspiring moments of your life.

### INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR GRISWOLD, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, Nebraska has no State income tax, it has no State sales tax, and is entirely free of debt. When weather conditions are favorable we rank among the largest producers of food. We produced a tremendous crop the past season despite the shortage of labor and farm equipment. I hope we can continue our support of the Government, with food and men and money, until the war is won. We are fortunate in having no State tax program that might interfere with Federal taxation, which must necessarily be greatly increased.

I am certain the Members of this body will be interested in reading the message of the Governor of Nebraska when he addressed the opening session of the State senate on January 7, and I request that it be inserted in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, members of the senate, you gentlemen have been chosen by the people of Nebraska to assemble here and work in their behalf. I am here as Governor, chosen by the same people, elected for a second term.

Our task is different from that usually confronting a legislature and a Governor because our Nation is now engaged in a horrible war which, in one way or other, is thrusting its way into the life of every man, woman, and child. It completely dominates our thoughts.

These are days of danger, danger not only from the vicious struggle for survival but from the inevitable post-war period when proper readjustment will be threatened by swarms of crackpot schemes.

What can we, the governing authorities of this State, what can we do during a brief legislative session to repel these dangers?

There are signs to guide us.

Two years ago at my inauguration I stated that very few new laws were needed for Nebraska and that my duty was rather to furnish a better administration of the laws we already had. Since then we in the executive departments have worked on that premise. If there were doubts as to its soundness, I think those doubts were washed way by the voters on November 3.

Now again, I say, but even more emphatically, we can do the people of Nebraska a real service by just leaving them alone. Our people are busy with crops and livestock, they are busy in factory and business, they are busy with thoughts of fighting sons, husbands, and fathers. In the name of common sense, let us rise above this fad of regulation and leave our people free to work and fight for the victory which must be won.

That is my paramount recommendation.

Two years ago we could not know, of course, that within 11 months, war would come to us. Our planning necessarily was based upon what we thought might happen. It was your foresight in creating the defense organization and in establishing an emergency appropriation, which permitted the State to properly function without a special legislative session. I trust the same foresight will continue with the enactment of war emergency measures, effective only for the duration.

So that you would not be delayed in your consideration of this emergency program or in your consideration of such other routine and corrective legislation as I have to offer, these bills have been printed. They are now ready for introduction. My budget recommendations are also ready. This is in keeping with plans of your own legislative council which, I believe, has its own legislative program ready for submission. Consequently you can begin work at once. The avenue is open for a short, businesslike session, free from petty squabbles—a session worthy of Nebraska and one of which you as senators may well be proud.

As the session progresses, many other bills will be placed before you from other sources. In considering them I suggest you bear in mind that our State agencies must contemplate assisting in the war effort by the orderly release of all possible manpower. State and municipal construction work should stop. Travel must be held to a minimum. Like other Americans, we in the State's service, must be willing to work longer hours. We ask such performance and more of our fighting men; we cannot shirk it ourselves.

We will also aid in the war effort by keeping taxes at a minimum. People must have opportunity to pay the tremendously increased Federal taxes, meet higher living costs, and invest in war bonds. In my judgment, there are better ways of avoiding inflation than by levying taxes, merely to reduce consumer purchasing power.

As you work, remember Nebraska is a great State. We have no State debt of any kind, we impose neither a sales nor income tax, and we are the only State in the Union with such a record. In addition, we have about $2,000,000 in our general fund, $9,000,000 in other funds, and about $14,000,000 invested in bonds. As a State, we own 1,700,000 acres of land. We have the most beautiful Capitol in the Nation—all these paid for in full.

You as Senators, and I, as Governor, have a heritage to uphold; the reputation of a State to keep. But we have even more. I say to you that Nebraska is in a position to become a governmental model for the other States and for the Nation itself. To people beset with doubts and uncertainties, we can give sorely needed reassurance by proving that in Nebraska are legislators and executives who are statesmen, voting for what is right even though it be temporarily unpopular; statesmen who trust the people and who can be trusted by the people. In this we must not fail.

When the war is won—and won it shall be—our Nation will have a national debt of more than two hundred, perhaps three hundred billion dollars, blooming in the shadows of an overstuffed bureaucracy. We will have with us tens of thousands of governmental problem children, the offspring of this bureaucracy, all suckled on red tape and accustomed to giving orders to the people. We will all be tempted by recent habit to look to the Government for help with every difficulty that confronts us.

This is not a partisan problem; it is an American problem and it bids fair to become the great American tragedy. We of Nebraska, as Americans, must assist in solving it. The solution will not come easily and it will require foresight and faith, courage and conviction. And the task will be complex because as we cut away the tangled growth of demagoguery, we must be vigilant to preserve the good roots.

We recognize, certainly, that there is important governmental work to be done; that there can be proper planning by public agencies representing the whole people; that society has a responsibility to care for those in real need; that labor is entitled to fair treatment; that capital has a right to prosper; that work and industry deserve rewards, but, above all, that in times of peace the individual citizen shall be master of his own destiny.

Under a system of free enterprise, we built here an industrial order which trained the workmen and built the factories which are today saving us and saving the world. In this land of free decision, we have raised the young men who have gone out with courage and faith in their hearts, and with a smile on their lips, to fight the enemy on land and sea, and in the air.

"The American way of life" is more than a name, and it must be retained.

So again I ask, What can we here this winter do to make sure Nebraska shoulders

her proper share of the current and coming problems?

We must prove that our State, a large unit of government, can be operated in a business-like, efficient manner; that useless positions need not be created; that appropriations can be wisely made; that Nebraska is fully capable of making progress without making debts. As we keep our standard of government high, we will be living up to our responsibility by setting an example others may wish to follow.

Our people have already shown they know how to do much with little. Our farms, with scars of drought fresh upon them, have in 1 year, through hard work and sacrifice, made an amazing production record. Volunteers have risen by the thousands to aid in necessary civilian defense work and scrap drives. Our industries, battling shortages, have plunged into 24-hour operations without a serious misstep. Surely, we need have no fear that our people lack spirit, intelligent enterprise, or competent self-control.

We can best recognize their accomplishments by leaving them unbothered and unhampered by trivial legislation and new schemes. We can take care of present-day emergencies, make necessary corrections, pass an appropriations bill, and permit people to go ahead with their work.

That is our immediate duty. Our swift and efficient execution of it can well serve as a bright beacon in a dark sky.

REPORT OF CHAIRMAN OF WAR PRODUCTION BOARD RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES (S. DOC. NO. 3)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the third report of the operations of the War Production Board, transmitted to the Senate pursuant to law on December 15, 1942, and now in the files of the Senate, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAN THE UNITED STATES WIN THE PEACE WHILE FIGHTING THE WAR?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him at America's Town Meeting of the Air, on January 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD SUPPLIES FOR THE WAR—ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of food supplies for the war, delivered by Hon. Herbert Hoover before the National Industrial Conference Board, New York City, on January 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CAMPAIGN IN NORTH AFRICA AND CONDITIONS IN CHILE AND RUSSIA—EXTRACTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY JAMES W. GERARD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD extracts from an address delivered by Hon. James W. Gerard in New York City January 24, 1943, dealing with the campaign in North Africa and conditions in Chile and Russia, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE WARTIME AGRICULTURAL SITUATION—ADDRESS BY ALBERT S. GOSS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Wartime Agricultural Situation," delivered by Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, before the National Industrial Conference Board, at New York City, on January 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN H. A. MILLIS ON THE SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Dr. Harry Millis, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, in connection with the seventh annual report of the Board, which appears in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION IN LONG DISTANCE TELEPHONE RATES

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times containing an announcement by the Federal Communications Commission regarding a reduction by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. in long distance telephone rates, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER TO CONGRESS—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW REPUBLIC

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Letter to Congress," published in the New Republic for January 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TRUTH ABOUT LEND-LEASE—EDITORIAL BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Truth About Lend-Lease," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of January 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF W. B. RUTLEDGE, JR., TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Free Press, of Chattanooga, Tenn., of January 13, 1943, referring to the nomination of W. B. Rutledge, Jr., to the Supreme Court of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONALIST IMPERIALISM — EDITORIAL FROM THE FORT WAYNE NEWS-SENTINEL

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Must Be on Guard," published in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of January 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "First Things First," on the subject of manpower, published in the Washington Evening Star of January 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WORLD WAITS—EDITORIAL FROM THE BIRMINGHAM AGE-HERALD

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The World Waits," written by McClellan Van der Veer and published in the Birmingham Age-Herald for December 16, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

AIR WAR ON JAPAN

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, without for one moment desiring to detract from the importance of the operations in North Africa, I believe it is fair to say that, so far as the press is concerned, it has to some extent been preoccupied with developments in that theater of the war. However, in the southwest Pacific operations of great importance have been under way, under the most difficult conditions, under which men have ever been called upon to fight, so far as topography, terrain, climate, transport, and supplies are concerned. These operations have been carried forward under the able leadership of General MacArthur.

In this morning's issue of the New York Times there appears a very unusual statement from the pen of General MacArthur. I desire to trespass on the time of the Senate long enough to read it:

MAC ARTHUR VISIONS AIR WAR ON JAPAN—REJECTING ISLAND-TO-ISLAND HOPPING, HE LOOKS TO GREAT BLOWS BY AIR-BORNE ARMY

AT UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS, AUSTRALIA, January 24.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur said tonight that widespread use of air power both offensively and defensively was the "outstanding military lesson" learned in the victorious Allied campaign in Papua and that it pointed the way to the ultimate defeat of Japan.

Air power, effectively combined with ground forces and sea power, opens the way, he said in a written statement, to "swift massive strokes" rather than the dilatory island-to-island advance that some have deemed necessary to defeat Japan.

In one of his infrequent comments on military operations since he left the Philippines to become supreme Allied commander in the southwest Pacific last March, General MacArthur said that in the New Guinea offensive a "new form of campaign" in which planes played the major part was tested and found successful.

The statement contained General MacArthur's first evaluation of the just-completed Papuan campaign in which a Japanese army of 15,000 was annihilated by American and Australian troops. It came at a time when the success in New Guinea had created widely divergent interpretations, ranging from undue jubilation to equally undue pessimism about the smallness of Allied gains and the discouragingly long road ahead.

General MacArthur indicated, however, that the day would come when air and ground forces, with proper naval support, would point the way to victory through new and broadened strategic and tactical conceptions.

His complete statement follows:

"The destruction of the remnants of the enemy forces in the Sanananda area concludes the Papuan campaign. The (Lt. Gen. Tomatore) Horii army has been annihilated. The outstanding military lesson of this campaign was the continuous calculated application of air power, inherent in the potentialities of every component of the air forces, employed in the most intimate tactical and logistical union with ground troops. The effect of this modern instrumentality was sharply accentuated by the geographic limitations of this theater.

"For months on end air transport, with constant fighter coverage, moved complete infantry regiments and artillery battalions across the almost impenetrable mountains and jungles of Papua and the reaches of the sea; transported field hospitals and other base installations of the front; supplied the troops and evacuated casualties. For hundreds of miles bombers provided all-around reconnaissance, protected the coast from hostile naval intervention, and blasted the way for the infantry as it drove forward. A new form of campaign was tested which points the way to the ultimate defeat of the enemy in the Pacific.

"The offensive and defensive power of the air and the adaptability, range, and capacity of its transport in an effective combination with ground forces represent tactical and

strategical elements of a broadened conception of warfare that will permit the application of offensive power in swift, massive strokes rather than the dilatory and costly island-to-island advance that some have assumed to be necessary in a theater where the enemy's far-flung strongholds are dispersed throughout a vast expanse of archipelagoes. Air forces and ground forces were welded together in Papua, and when in sufficient strength with proper naval support, their indissoluble union points the way to victory through new and broadened strategic and tactical conceptions."

Mr. President, I hope that every Senator will have an opportunity to read this statement carefully when it is printed in the RECORD. It is the fervent hope of the Senator now speaking that this important lesson, which appears to have been learned under most difficult and harrowing conditions in this campaign, will be utilized in the further conduct of our operations.

It is likewise the fervent hope of the Senator now speaking, who acknowledges himself to be utterly a layman in matters involving land and naval operations, that nothing will ever be permitted to prevent the delivery of the supplies, the instrumentalities, and the manpower necessary to maintain and continue the glorious achievements which have begun in the Southwest Pacific.

### ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

### UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, last week I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 85) relating to the investigation of manpower, and some discussion arose at that time as to the appropriate committee to which the resolution should be referred. After consulting with other Senators, I have decided to withdraw the resolution which I submitted.

In this connection I wish to state that the Committee on Appropriations held a meeting this morning—a well-attended meeting—and, after full discussion of the subject, it adopted the following motion:

> The chairman of the committee is authorized to appoint a subcommittee to consider the subject of the best division and distribution of our Nation's manpower in order to secure the speediest and most successful conduct and conclusion of the war, as such subject is related to appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution (S. Res. 85) will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No, Mr. President; I desire to have the resolution withdrawn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state, on the advice of the Parliamentarian, that the procedure of withdrawing measures is not followed by the Senate; but indefinite postponement has the same effect.



Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well; either way. Let that be done.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is the resolution to which the Senator refers the one to the consideration of which I objected a few days ago, and asked that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that it is the same resolution.

Mr. McNARY. And what has just occurred is the further disposition of it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. McNARY. I understand that the desire is to have the resolution indefinitely postponed; is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely want to call the attention of the Senate to the last phrase of the motion before the Appropriations Committee to which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] referred:

> As such subject is related to appropriations.

I want it distinctly understood that the Appropriations Committee is not invading the jurisdiction of any other committee at all and is not substituting itself for any other committee, but is investigating the matter solely as it relates to appropriations, and so that it can intelligently act on the appropriations.

### REFERENCE OF MEASURES TO COMMITTEES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it seems to me that this is an appropriate time to call the attention of the Chair and of the Senate to the action unanimously taken a few days ago by the steering committee of the majority with reference to the introduction and reference to committees of bills and resolutions.

While the rules of the Senate are not so definite with regard to the appropriate reference of bills and resolutions as are the rules of the House of Representatives, there has grown up, through long practice, in addition to the rules and the precedents, a fairly clear line of demarcation as to the jurisdiction over proposed legislation.

A few years ago the then Vice President announced from the chair—although he did not make a final ruling on the question—that he would refer any bill or resolution introduced by any Senator to the committee designated on the bill by its author. I do not know whether that was a whimsical ruling or announcement, induced perhaps by a feeling of disgust at the indefiniteness of the Senate rules on many subjects. Nevertheless, that announcement was made from the chair. I protested at the time against even the announcement because I did not think it was in compliance with the rules of the Senate, and under such a ruling I could introduce a bill on the tariff and have it referred to the Committee on the Library, and any other Senator could introduce a bill on any subject, mark on the back of the bill the committee to which he wanted it referred, and, according to that announcement, the Vice President or the Presiding Officer, whoever he might be, would send it to the committee thus designated.

Such a procedure is not and never has been in accordance with the rules and practice of the Senate. Having that in mind, the steering committee of the majority a few days ago unanimously instructed me to call the Chair's attention to the rules of the Senate and the propriety of the reference of bills to committees having jurisdiction of the subject matter. I am doing that now, so that the Vice President may know how the steering committee feels, and, I think, how the Senate feels, as to the propriety of referring bills to committees that have jurisdiction over the subject matter, instead of simply having a Senator write on the bill the committee to which he desires it to go, regardless of the rules and practices of the Senate.

I make that announcement not only for the Vice President's benefit but also for the benefit of any Senator who may be called to the chair by the Vice President to preside at the time when bills are introduced. Any other practice makes for chaos and confusion.

From long experience over the years, the committees of the Senate have a fairly good idea as to what their jurisdiction is, and the rules require the Vice President, with the advice of the Parliamentarian, of course, to pass upon that subject. The matter seems to me to be of sufficient importance, and the steering committee felt it to be of sufficient importance to take action on it. The steering committee took action unanimously, and I am sure that all Senators will agree the practice recommended by the steering committee is the only practice that will preserve order in the consideration of bills, and not take away from committees that have long had jurisdiction over particular subject matter opportunity to consider them simply because a Senator would prefer that his bill go to some other committee.

I hope that the long-standing practice and rules of the Senate on that subject will hereafter be preserved.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have always insisted on a strict reference of bills. The question of jurisdiction is sometimes a difficult one, but its application should always be preserved.

The practice has grown up, as stated by the very distinguished leader of the majority of the Senate, of having the Senator who introduces a bill make his own reference of it. Of course, the rule is that the reference shall be made to the appropriate committee by the Vice President or the occupant of the chair, whoever he may be.

There is a remedy, Mr. President, in the hands of the various Senators. If a Senator in any way demurs to the reference by the Vice President or the occupant of the chair he may instantly appeal from his decision and have the matter come ultimately to the decision of the Senate. That preserves all his

rights and also makes final the action of the Senate.

I hope that the rule will be followed in the future. Let me say, Mr. President, without criticism, that I think when a bill is introduced, the President of the Senate, or the Senator who occupies the chair in the absence of the President of the Senate should state at once the committee to which the bill is to be referred, so that opportunity may be given to the author of the bill to appeal at that time from the decision of the Chair, and let the question be decided by a vote of the Senate. That would be fair to the Senator who introduced the measure; it would be considerate of the occupant of the chair, and would work for fairness all down the line.

With that word, I want to say that I concur in the remarks of the able Senator from Kentucky.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is most happy to have the assistance of the majority and minority leaders in upsetting the temporary precedent to which reference has been made, but in view of the haste with which bills are introduced, the Chair would suggest that the Parliamentarian of the Senate be given opportunity to glance at bills in advance. In fact, he generally is given such opportunity but the Chair would ask that it be done uniformly.

Mr. BARKLEY. That matter is always in the control of the Chair. If the Chair has any doubt about the committee to which a bill should be referred, of course, he has the long experience of the Parliamentarian at his disposal, and if his advice does not satisfy the Chair, I am sure the minority leader and I will be glad to supplement it in any way we can.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Even the Parliamentarian may at times be unable to decide in a split second, when the matter in question is a debatable one.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Chair.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I am gratified at the action of the two leaders of this body in agreeing that hereafter no Senator will have the right to send a bill he introduces to any committee to which he sees fit to have it referred, but that power and discretion will be left to the Presiding Officer, who will make the decision.

In the 8 years I have been a Member of the Senate I have noticed that on many occasions bills have been sent to committees which from a parliamentary or governmental standpoint did not have jurisdiction of the subject matter of the bills, and I wish to ask that in the future the Presiding Officer, in making reference of measures, not be governed by what has been the custom. A thing which is inherently wrong in the beginning cannot be made right by its continuance. I know of some proposals which have been sent to the wrong committees for some time, which should be diverted to the proper committees, even though the custom has been different heretofore.

## CONSOLIDATIONS AND MERGERS OF DOMESTIC TELEGRAPH CARRIERS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 158.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I inquire if the bill the consideration of which has been moved by the able Senator from Arizona was before the Senate during the last days of the last session of Congress?

Mr. McFARLAND. It was. The bill was passed by the Senate during the last session of Congress, but did not come to a vote in the other House.

Mr. McNARY. Has there been any change in the substance of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. There has been only one clarifying change.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I understand the motion is to take up the bill at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is. The motion is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, Senate bill 158 is the outgrowth of a study of the subject made by the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate under Resolution 95 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, which resolution was continued in the Seventy-seventh Congress. The Committee on Interstate Commerce made its report on the 28th of October, 1941.

The Committee on Interstate Commerce, after a most careful consideration of the subject, recommended a merger of domestic American telegraph carriers and of international American telegraph carriers. One of the reasons for the proposed merger, as stated in the report, is as follows:

> These recommendations were based upon the findings of the committee, one of the most urgent of which was the finding that the Postal Telegraph Co.—third largest carrier—was in imminent financial danger. It was found that by September 1, 1941, less than $750,000 remained of a $5,000,000 working-capital loan made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Since that time the Postal Telegraph Co. has borrowed an additional one and a half million from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which sum, we are informed, is largely used up at the present time. While the Western Union Telegraph Co., the largest land-line carrier, is presently operating at a profit, it has experienced great losses in recent years. Like the Postal, it has lost a large portion of its revenue to the Government-subsidized air mail, to the telegraph facilities of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and the radio point-to-point communication facilities. It also has a substantial debt structure, which may prove dangerous to it in the event another major business depression occurs.

I should like to state that since the time that report was submitted the debt to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by the Postal Telegraph Co. has increased to $9,000,000.

Mr. President, after the report of the Interstate Commerce Committee, on the 28th day of October 1942, I was asked to introduce a bill which would embody the recommendations made by the committee. I, in turn, asked the able Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] who is well informed on this subject to join with me in the introduction of the proposed legislation. The Senator from Maine and I called in representatives of the various interested parties, including the communication companies, and representatives of the various labor organizations, and asked their advice as to what they thought should be contained in the proposed legislation.

After we had heard all their recommendations, and after a careful study of the report, we jointly introduced Senate bill 2445. After the introduction of the bill, a subcommittee was appointed, of which I was made chairman. The other members of the subcommittee, appointed to consider the proposed legislation, were the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Most careful consideration was given the proposed legislation, and at that time we heard witnesses from the various departments, Mr. Jones of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Federal Communications Commission, and the representatives of the companies, as well as representatives of labor.

Because of the objection made by the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, the international field was eliminated from the bill, and the committee recommended the enactment of Senate bill 2598. That bill was passed at the last session of the Congress. I understand that the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the House of Representatives favorably reported the bill for passage but amended it by including the international field. However, owing to the absence of a quorum, the proposal never came to a vote in the House of Representatives.

Immediately on the convening of the Seventy-eighth Congress the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and I reintroduced the bill, which is now Senate bill 158, and which is the same as Senate bill 2598 of the last Congress, which passed the Senate except for one clarifying amendment, on page 6, paragraph 4, where the words "and will be in accord-

ance with the existing contractual rights of the carriers" were added. That provision merely makes the section conform to the other sections of the bill.

I wish to state, Mr. President, that the passage of the proposed legislation has become even more important since the entry of the United States into the war. It is important that we maintain all the communications facilities available to us at this time.

I wish to read briefly the recommendation of General Stoner, representing the War Department. He appeared before the committee in its hearing on Senate bill 2445 and gave the following testimony:

> An illustration of the saving in important critical equipment and matériel may be had by referring to a recent report published by the Defense Communications Board prepared for publication by the Federal Communications Commission, in which it was stated that there are approximately 13,431 teletype printers in use in business offices. The Postal has approximately 6,550 of these printers. It is assumed that approximately 50 percent of those installations are caused by reason of competitive conditions. It is, therefore, safe to assume that approximately 5,000 of those printers might be diverted to national defense communication purposes in event of consolidation.
>
> The Postal also has 747 branch offices. Assuming that 500 of those branch offices could be abandoned, it would mean an additional 1,200 printers would be released for such other use as might be made of them.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's presentation, but I should like to ask him a question, if I may.

Mr. McFARLAND. I gladly yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course, I have had no time to read the bill, but I notice in subsection (a) of section 222 the following provision:

> It shall be lawful, upon application and approval by the Commission, as hereinafter provided, for domestic telegraph carriers to consolidate or merge their properties, or any part thereof.

I notice that further on the measure contains a definition of a domestic telegraph carrier. If a domestic telegraph carrier has, as part of its property, a telephone system or a radio system, or some additional system other than a telegraph system, is it not a fact that the bill would authorize the company to merge its properties, or any part of them, with another company, and would not that permit it to bring into the merger its entire communications system?

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say to the Senator from Iowa that it is the intention to allow domestic telegraph carriers, as defined, to merge and they may consolidate their properties, but before they can abandon any part of their system they must obtain permission from the Federal Communications System to do so.

Mr. GILLETTE. Then it is the intention to allow them, if they also control telephone systems and radio systems and other means of communication, to merge their entire communication systems?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; it is not intended to allow telegraph systems to merge with telephone systems.

Mr. GILLETTE. Even though a telegraph carrier has a telephone system as a part of its property, and that the measure provides that all the company's properties may be brought into the merger, yet the Senator thinks the company would not be permitted to bring its telephone ownership or radio ownership into the merger?

Mr. McFARLAND. The intention was to include point-to-point radio communications. That was thought to be necessary in order to put the domestic telegraph carriers upon a sound basis. The proposed legislation is only permissive in character. I will explain the bill a little more in detail later. It also makes it permissible for companies to merge the teletype part of the system.

Mr. GILLETTE. Undoubtedly the Senator will explain the measure more fully as he proceeds.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I merely desire to ask a question for information. We are being told on all sides to go easy with our communications systems these days because they are being overworked. I notice the Senator from Arizona said that if the merger were completed it would enable the company in question to do away with a large amount of the equipment which it now has. I was wondering if doing away with the teletype machines would have any effect at all on the ability of the one remaining company to handle the entire amount of business, if it is true that the companies are already overworked.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that the companies would not be permitted to abandon any part of their equipment which the Federal Communications Commission deemed necessary to the war effort, and necessary efficiently to carry on the war and to maintain our communications system. I had not completed reading the testimony of General Stoner, which pointed out that there are duplications of lines, duplications of offices, and duplications of work, which could be eliminated, and would result in a saving.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps the Senator from Arizona will explain that matter as he goes along.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator referred to the saving of material which would result by a combination. Of course, the most serious problem we have to face today is that of manpower. Does the bill propose to provide some solution of the manpower problem by cutting down the number of employees needed in the communications service?

Mr. McFARLAND. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that it was the hope that some of the persons employed in the communications service would go into other lines of work which might be attractive. In the bill protection is afforded labor, as I will explain later. However, there is a rapid turn-over of labor at present among the domestic communications services, and there is a provision for discharge for those employed after March 1, 1941, and those not needed would be made available for other private industries and for war industries.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Without knowing much about it, it seems to me rather extraordinary that at a time when we need more manpower, and when we are proposing to concentrate many other industries, such as sugar refineries, which it is proposed to concentrate into a few refineries, in order to provide manpower, we should in this proposed combination provide a soft job for persons who are not needed in the work at all. It seems to me the theory of the bill conflicts with everything the War Production Board is doing today, so far as labor is concerned, and everything that is being proposed for other industries. In other industries concentration which is not wanted is being forced for the purpose of releasing manpower and putting the manpower to work in war industries. How can the Senator reconcile the labor provision in this bill with the present program of the War Production Board in other fields?

Mr. McFARLAND. I may answer the Senator from Ohio by quoting from the testimony of Commissioner Durr before the committee. He said:

> Western Union and Postal adult turnover rates show that about 7,250 employees voluntarily quit their jobs and that another 570 were discharged for cause. It will also be observed that the number of military separations is extremely small, amounting only to 179 in the case of Postal and 544 in the case of Western Union land lines.

The total separations from the two companies for the year 1941 was 7,820. There are approximately 30,000 adult employees in the Western Union and some nine or ten thousand in Postal. In 1 year there was a turn-over of 7,820. Before the proposed legislation will become law or become effective, or at least before a merger can be effected, 2 years will elapse, which would make available over the same percentage, 15,640 employees. The committee felt, and I personally feel, that it is very important to protect in his job a man who has spent some 30 years in this particular line of work and who has been trained for that work alone. One man testified that he had been an employee of the Postal Telegraph Co. for 40 years. I consider the

labor provisions of the bill very important to the men who are working in the telegraph industry.

Mr. President, I will admit that the labor provisions of the bill are more favorable than any contained in any past legislation, but they are made possible by the rapid turn-over during this war, and the enactment of the proposed legislation at this time will make it possible to protect men who have spent years in learning a profession. That is something which could not be done in ordinary times.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that the War Production Board shut down gold mines and threw out of work employees who had been engaged in the gold-mining industry for years, in order to force them into some other industry, such as the copper-mining industry, which was essential for war production? Can the Senator reconcile the principle of the bill with the present policy of the administration with respect to the field of telephone and telegraph communications?

Mr. McFARLAND. I can reconcile it in this way, that the labor provisions are made possible by the very rapid turnover in the communications field. There is no protection for the new employees. There will be plenty of need in the merged company for the employment of the old employees.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The able Senator from Arizona has referred to a turn-over of about 7,000 employees in 1 year. That number separated themselves from the company, but that did not represent a reduction in the number of employees because they were replaced by others.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct. There is no protection for the new employees. That is the reason why it is possible at this time to afford protection to the old employees who know nothing else but communications work.

I thank the Senator for his suggestion.

Mr. President, I desire to complete the reading of the statement of General Stoner in this connection:

> I might also refer to the item of secondary copper. The Postal and Western Union Telegraph Cos. at the present time have parallel circuits along railroad rights-of-way and along highways, running side by side, where the full capacity of both services is not needed and where recovery might be made by doing away with one of the companies' leads, and in so doing there also would be recovery of secondary copper, which is a critical material at the present time.
>
> We feel that the bill you have under consideration amply provides for the Secretary of War being a party in licensing proceedings in event of any consolidation, thereby affording him the fullest opportunity to protect the rights and interests of the War Department.

I will give a brief summary of the provisions contained in the bill. I read from the report of the committee:

> Section 1 of the bill provides for the amendment of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by the addition of a new section, section 222. Subsection (a) thereof makes lawful, after application to and approval by the Federal Communications Commission, the consolidation or merger of domestic telegraph carriers.
>
> Subsection (b) requires the parties to a proposed merger or consolidation to submit application and the Commission to hold public hearings thereon, giving notice of hearing and opportunity to be heard to the Governors of each State in which property to be merged is situated, to the Attorney General, the Secretaries of War, Navy, and State Departments, and representatives of employees, and permits the Commission to enter an order approving merger if certain conditions are met.
>
> Subsection (c) permits the merged or consolidated telegraph carrier to take over the domestic telegraph facilities of any carrier. Paragraph (2) provides for the divestment by the merged or consolidated domestic telegraph carrier of any international telegraph business it may carry on.
>
> Subsection (d) prohibits approval of any consolidation or merger which would have more than one-fifth capital-stock ownership by aliens, or representatives of aliens, or by foreign governments, or representatives of such governments.
>
> Subsection (e) provides that the merged or consolidated telegraph carrier shall work out a formula for exchange of traffic with international telegraph carriers under certain equitable standards, and permits the Commission to prescribe such a formula only after the telegraph carriers fail to agree. Paragraph (2) provides an identical formula for the exchange of traffic with telegraph carriers in contiguous foreign countries (Canada, Newfoundland, and Mexico) whose telegraph traffic is regarded as domestic rather than international telegraph traffic. Paragraph (3) provides that for the purpose of this subsection, domestic telegraph operations of an international telegraph carrier shall be considered a domestic carrier, and similarly, international telegraph operations of a domestic carrier shall be considered an international telegraph carrier. Paragraph (4) permits the Commission, upon complaint or on its own motion, to prescribe a telegraphic traffic interchange formula if, at any time, it finds that the formula followed is not equitable or in the public interest.
>
> Subsection (f) provides that all employees of any carrier which becomes a party to consolidation or merger, who were employed on March 1, 1941, shall have full job protection at the compensation and rate of pay they received on the date of the approval of the consolidation or merger, with the added proviso that no employee may be assigned to work inconsistent with his training and experience. Paragraph (2) provides that if any employee who is not covered by paragraph (1) is discharged as a result of consolidation or merger, he shall receive severance pay equal to 4 weeks' pay multiplied by the number of years he was employed by any carrier which was a party to consolidation or merger; and no employee, regardless of the tenure of his employment, is to receive less than 4 weeks' pay as a severance allowance. Paragraph (3) requires that for 5 years following merger or consolidation, employees of any carrier which was a party to merger or consolidation shall have a preferential hiring status with the merged telegraph carrier for such positions as he is qualified to fill. Paragraph (4) provides for payment of traveling expenses, continuance of salary, and a bonus equal to 2 months' pay for any employee transferred from one community to another as a result of consolidation or merger. Paragraph (5) provides against impairment of any pension right or any other health, insurance, or death benefit as a result of merger or consolidation. Paragraph (6) protects the jobs of those employees who have entered or shall enter the military service since August 27, 1940. Paragraph (7) protects employees against discharge, or reduction in earnings, or furlough for 5 years after the consolidation or merger, or for 6 months before in anticipation of consolidation or merger. Paragraph (8) is the usual provision permitting discharge for incompetency or similar cause. Paragraph (9) protects employees' rights now guaranteed by any collective-bargaining agreements until such agreements are terminated, and extends to employees the remedies provided by the National Labor Relations Act. Paragraph (10) exempts employees who are paid more than $5,000 per annum from the provisions of the subsections.
>
> Subsection (g) defines the terms used in the bill.
>
> Section 2 provides for the amendment of section 214 (a) of the Communications Act, making certain technical clarifying changes in the present act to conform with the new bill. Section 3, section 4, and section 5 make similar technical changes in sections 214 (b), 214 (c), and 214 (d), respectively, of the present act.
>
> Section 6 provides for amendment of section 5266 of the Revised Statutes to give priority of transit for Government telegrams and permits the elimination of the present preferential rate granted for carriage of Government messages.
>
> Section 7 is the usual separability clause.
>
> The Committee on Interstate Commerce desire to call specific attention to the labor-protection provisions of the bill S. 2598. The committee believe that they have recommended in this legislation the greatest degree of labor-protection requirements yet proposed in any legislation. The committee believe that if this legislation is enacted promptly, and if the carriers do not delay taking action under its terms, these labor-protection requirements will work no hardship on the consolidated or merged carrier.

Mr. President, as I have stated, the immediate enactment of the pending legislation has become more important because of our participation in the present World War. I repeat that we have provided in the bill all possible protection to labor, made possible by the rapid turnover in the telegraph industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator a question. Why does he feel that it is important and necessary under the terms of the pending bill to grant to labor further extensions in respect to the guaranty of employment than have been provided under the terms of any other bill previously enacted? How can we or how can anyone in industry foresee what industry will be able to do 5 years from today? Let me say to the Senator from Arizona that I recognize the importance of the bill. I agree with him as to the importance of such an authorization as that which the bill provides. I realize that what the bill would accomplish is very important to the war effort; but I cannot see why at this time it is necessary to guarantee to anyone 5 years' employment at compensation not less than that which he received at the time of the merger, when no one can foresee what is in front of us for a 5-year period.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from New Jersey let me state my opinion that the 5-year period is necessary for the reason

that in order to have a merger one of the companies must buy or take over the other, and in my judgment that necessarily means—I believe there can be no question about it—that the Western Union Co. will have to buy the Postal Telegraph & Cable Co. It would be most natural unless protection were afforded by the bill for the Western Union to favor their own employees. At the end of 5 years a Postal Telegraph & Cable Co. employee would by that time have become a part of the merged companies, and would have the same standing as that had by any other employee of the company. For that reason I think the provision referred to is particularly necessary. Even though a man had been employed only 3 months by the Western Union Co., or whatever company might take over the merged companies, it would be the natural thing for the company to favor him. The company would be familiar with the particular employee's efforts; it would be familiar with his work; and it might prefer him rather than a man who had been in the employ of the Postal Telegraph Co. for 15 or 20 years. Under such circumstances, it might discharge a man who had spent years in learning the industry.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would not that purpose be accomplished by providing a period of 2 years, instead of 5?

Mr. McFARLAND. The committee gave most careful consideration to the question of what the specified number of years should be. After careful consideration we thought that a 5-year period would be the fairest to place in the bill. Of course, the determination as to the particular period of years to be provided must necessarily be arbitrary. The Western Union Co. recommended this be reduced to 4 years; some of the labor organizations recommended 7 years, and some of them recommended 8 years. After careful consideration the committee felt that 5 years was a fair period of time to assure adequate protection.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator why the period during which employment is to be guaranteed should be different in this case than in the case of the Railway Merger Act? Why should the pending measure provide a further extension of protection as to compensation? Mind you—and I should like to have my position made of record—I am very definitely in favor of providing every protection we can give to labor.

I believe that private enterprise itself should recognize the long-time service about which the Senator has spoken. I believe it is coming more and more to a recognition of it. However, I do not believe—and I feel very strongly on this point—that the Government itself can foresee what is ahead of it for 5 years; and certainly the Government cannot see what is ahead of private industry for 5 years. The only difference between the position of the Senator from Arizona on the bill and my position is that I would limit the period of years to be provided in the pending bill to the same number provided in the Carrier Merger Act; and I should like to be so recorded.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we have come a long way since the enactment of legislation on the merger of railroads. The protections proposed to be afforded labor under the terms of the pending bill are made possible by the rapid change in personnel, as I have already pointed out. I do not think that the company will have any difficulty at all in carrying out the labor provisions of the bill, in view of the fact that at the present time there is a turn-over of some 7,800 persons a year; and at that rate in 2 years there would be a turn-over of about 15,000 persons, out of a total of about 40,000, adult employees. I do not think there will be any difficulty at all in the matter. However, I feel strongly that a man who has spent years in learning a profession should be protected. I think that the conditions of the times are altogether different from those which existed when the railroad merger legislation was enacted, and I believe that from year to year it has become more difficult for a man to change from one profession to another.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona for further information. I desire to have the information in order to be able to make up my mind how to vote on the bill. Does the Postal Telegraph & Cable Co. serve a considerable area that is not served by the Western Union Co.?

Mr. McFARLAND. It serves some territory that is not served by the Western Union Co. I should not be prepared to state offhand just how much. There is duplication of some 13,000 miles of line along the railroads alone; as to how much of other lines is a duplication is somewhat a technical question.

Can the Senator from Maine more fully answer that question?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I did not hear the question asked of the Senator from Arizona; but if the Senator from Arizona cannot answer it I doubt that I can.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Vermont asked me to what extent the Postal Telegraph & Cable Co. served territory not served by the Western Union Co.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, there is a tremendous overlapping, and that is one of the difficulties of the situation; because in many communities scattered throughout the United States there is no real need for the maintenance of service by two telegraph companies.

Mr. McFARLAND. That was not the question asked by the Senator. He asked to what extent the Postal Telegraph Co. serves territory not served by the Western Unio Co.

Mr. WHITE. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. AIKEN. The area served by the Postal Telegraph Co., not served by the Western Union Co., would not be very large; would it?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; it would not be very large.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator tell us the approximate value of the Postal Telegraph system?

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me say to the Senator from Vermont that his question is a very difficult one for me to answer. I would answer it by saying that Mr. Jones, of the R. F. C., stated that he had loaned to the Postal Telegraph system the limit that he thought he could loan it, namely $9,000,000. How much more it would be worth would be only an estimate; but the Postal Telegraph Co. is incurring deficits at the rate of approximately $300,000 a month; and it is very evident that, unless there is a merger, as a going concern it will not be worth anything at all. Of course, its properties are worth something.

Mr. AIKEN. How can the company be losing $300,000 a month, in view of the fact that we are given to understand that our communications systems are tremendously overworked—so much so that we are asked not to send messages over them except when absolutely necessary. There must be some reason why the Postal Telegraph & Cable Co. is losing $300,000 a month. Was that reason developed before the committee?

Mr. McFARLAND. The majority of the telegraph business is carried on by the Western Union Co.; and the Postal Telegraph & Cable Co. simply does not have enough business, even under present conditions, to make it financially sound. The Western Union Co. is getting along fairly well under present circumstances; but I should say to the Senator from Vermont that, because of the competition of the subsidized air-mail lines and the competition of the telephone companies, both the telegraph companies are finding it difficult to exist. I believe it is very important that the telegraph method of communication be saved. There still will be ample competition after a merger of the telegraph companies.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, the Postal Telegraph Co. has a capital structure. Does the Senator from Arizona know what the amount of the capitalization of the company is?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know offhand, I will give it later.

Mr. AIKEN. That was not brought out before the committee? I think that would have some bearing on the matter. We should know how large a company we were merging.

Mr. McFARLAND. Regardless of what the capital structure is, I can say to the Senator definitely that the Postal Co. now owes to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation $9,000,000. It does not make any difference what they claim their properties are worth, unless they are a going concern, unless they can make money, they are not worth anything at all as a continuing business, but from a merging standpoint, they are worth some money.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know the amount of bonds of the Postal Telegraph Co. outstanding?

Mr. McFARLAND. Their indebtedness is not in the form of bonds, as I understand. It is in the form of a loan

by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. Do they not owe any money besides what they owe to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which I understand is $9,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think that is about the extent of their indebtedness.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator tell us how it is financed? Suppose the company fails; who will lose?

Mr. McFARLAND. The public will lose, and the employees will lose; everyone will lose, if the company fails.

Mr. AIKEN. What would the public lose? It would lose the duplication of services if the company failed, but as I understand, if the company failed, it would go out of business or be purchased in the usual course of events. I wondered what the public would gain by the proposed merger.

Mr. McFARLAND. The public would gain a continuance of the lines which were deemed necessary to handle the present communications business. It is very important that we continue that part of it, which is necessary to our communications system. Those of the public who have money invested in the Postal system would gain, but I do not know how much they would gain by a merger. They would primarily gain by not having a group of people put out of employment in the change over of some properties during the midst of a war. It is very necessary at this time that this be done in a different way, rather than for the Postal to fail. There are facilities which are not made available by the Western Union. There are lines which are necessary. Many of the lines should be continued. In my opinion the public has everything to gain by the proposed merger legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. The Government is very free in maintaining with its cash uneconomical investments, that is, normally uneconomic ones which are considered necessary during wartime. Does the Senator believe that the Federal Government would allow these lines to fall into disuse merely because the company was losing $300,000 a month? I still do not see how they could be losing such an amount, if what we are told about the communications system is true.

Mr. McFARLAND. The fact remains that they are losing the money, and I do not believe we can allow them to go out of existence. I do not believe the Senator from Maine would want to see our Government continue to subsidize any company, if the work could be carried on without subsidization. I admit that we are doing much financing of various companies and industries during the war, which is necessary; but personally I feel that we should do just as little of it as possible. I do not believe in any more subsidizing than we absolutely have to have to enable us to win the war. I personally do not feel that the fact that we are subsidizing other industries is any reason why we should continue to subsidize one which it is very evident will have to be subsidized forever, or go out of existence. We need to save all the money we can, and I do not think there is any question that there will be a merger under the proposed legislation and that the Government would be saved the amount of money I have stated.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish briefly to express my general views about the proposed communications legislation and to express the hope that it may have the approval of the Senate.

We have in our country today various media of communication. We have our air mail, we have our telephones, we have our telegraphs, we have radio, all in competition one with the other. In the face of this competition, over late years the Postal Co. has fallen upon unhappy days. It has undergone financial reorganization, but notwithstanding such financial readjustment of its affairs, the Postal has been compelled again and again, and in constantly increasing degree, to call upon the Federal Government for assistance, until today that company is indebted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in a total of approximately $9,000,000. The subcommittee which gave consideration to this problem were definitely warned that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had reached the end of its liberality to this corporation.

What were the alternatives, then, that we faced as a committee? It seemed to me perfectly clear that one of two things was bound to happen: Either the Postal Telegraph Co. must seek bankruptcy and go out of business, or the Federal Government would have to take the company over.

What would be the result of either of those courses? If the Postal Co. fades from the communications picture through bankruptcy, it leaves alone in the domestic telegraph field the Western Union Co., and through the failure of the Postal Co., through its disappearance as a competitor, there will have been made a direct contribution to monopoly in the telegraph business within this country.

Mr. TAFT. Is not that just the Senator's purpose in urging the pending bill, to create a monopoly?

Mr. WHITE. Yes——

Mr. TAFT. What is the difference?

Mr. WHITE. But by a different rule and under a different control, if it results in the way I have suggested.

The other possibility is that the Government itself will take over the Postal. It has $9,000,000 already invested in the company and its affairs. If it took over Postal, then we would see the Government of the United States in the telegraph business, probably operating through the Federal Communications Commission. Then we would find the Western Union faced by governmental competition in the domestic telegraph field. Then we would find our air mail in competition with the Government in the field of communications here in the United States. Then radio would face competition from a governmentally owned and operated agency of communication. Then it might well be that the telephone system of this country would find itself in competition with a governmental agency.

Mr. President, there are some provisions of the bill which I should like to change, but the alternative of merger under the terms of the pending bill is as nothing, so far as I am concerned, compared with what I think the evils would be which would follow if we did not take the proposed step.

I think that if the Government of the United States were to take over the Postal Telegraph Co. at this time, and if it were to operate that company at this time and in the future, the day would not be far distant when the Government of the United States would be embarked in the field of communications, and I think it would inevitably follow that it would in time operate not only in the telegraph field, but would reach out into the field of radio and would invade the field of the telephone, and that to me would be a greater evil than any evil which inheres by any possibility in the proposed legislation.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. The Postal Telegraph Co. now, as I understand, is showing a deficit and has been showing a deficit for the last 2 years.

Mr. WHITE. The Postal Telegraph Co. has been showing continuing deficits over a period of years.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Failure to support the proposed legislation would force the Government, in order to protect its own loan, to go into the telegraph business, would it not? And should it not be said to those who violently disagree with the idea of the Government being in business that this is one opportunity to keep the Government from going into business?

Mr. WHITE. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky.

Some fear has been expressed with respect to the labor provisions contained in the bill. If I had been in complete control of the situation I think I would not have gone to the extent proposed by the pending bill.

The fact is that we have written into the bill the most liberal provision in behalf of labor found in any law on the statute books of the United States today. But we need not be too fearful about that, for I call to the Senate's mind that the bill proposes no mandatory legislation, but only permissive legislation, and if the Western Union, or a merged company, reached the conclusion that it could survive under the labor provisions contained in the bill, but that under the provisions of the bill it would be uneconomic and inefficient for it to merge, then there simply would not be any merger, and there would be no harm done. It seems to me we are worrying about something which

is wholly within the control of the communications companies involved, and we can safely leave to them the determination of whether under the terms of the bill they can carry on their services with profit to themselves and with benefit to the public of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not undertake to go into the details of the bill. These are the over-all considerations which prompt me to favor the measure and to express the hope that it will have the support of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator object to an amendment reducing the period from 5 years to 2 years, and if so, why?

Mr. WHITE. I should vote against such an amendment. After all, as the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] has said, the question of the precise time of guaranty was a matter of much difference of opinion. Some would have been glad if there had been no guaranty at all. Some wanted to extend the period beyond the time named in the bill. I am in favor of the provision contained in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am still desirous of obtaining information. Perhaps the Senator from Maine can tell us about the capital structure of the Postal Telegraph Co. How much money is involved? What is the capital structure of the company?

Mr. WHITE. I have a very definite recollection that that was covered in the evidence in the hearings before the full committee and before the two subcommittees which were appointed. Of course, the capital structure of the Postal Telegraph Co. has undergone reorganization and readjustment, and I have to admit that I do not have in my mind at this time what the figure is.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senate ought to know that.

Mr. WHITE. So far as I am concerned, the capital structure makes very little difference to me. We know what the operating results have been over the term of years, and we know that a continuation of them spells disaster and the disappearance of the Postal Telegraph Co.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to know to whom the company is indebted besides the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. WHITE. The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has just handed me some figures. This is a consolidated balance sheet of the Postal Telegraph Co. It shows assets as of December 31, 1941, in the grand total of $49,661,000. What there is outstanding in the way of securities I do not know. I have not had a chance to look at this sheet; but if I may, I will turn over the copy of the hearings handed me by the junior Senator from Ohio to the Senator from Vermont. I think the answer to what he has in mind will appear on the open page—page 10 of the committee hearings.

Mr. AIKEN. I thought the Senator from Maine would be more familiar with the figures, and that he could tell the Senate about them. There are other Senators besides myself, I am sure, who would like to know what the figures are. I should like to know if the Postal Telegraph Co. ever did pay dividends.

Mr. WHITE. I think the Postal Telegraph Co. for a while paid dividends on its preferred stock, but never having owned any, I do not know.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sorry if I appeared to be too inquisitive, I had hoped to find out something about the financial structure of the Postal Telegraph Co.

Mr. WHITE. I cannot help the Senator beyond what I have done.

Mr. AIKEN. If I cannot obtain this information I shall naturally vote against the bill. I received very disturbing reports earlier today to the effect that the company owed money in addition to what it owed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I am not criticizing the committee in any way. I simply wanted to have it clear in my own mind, and if it were made clear I presume I would vote for the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in answer to the question asked by the Senator from Vermont I should like to have incorporated in the RECORD exhibit No. 3, which appears on page 10 of the hearings, which sets out the financial structure of the Postal Telegraph Co. As I stated before, I do not think it makes any difference what their financial structure is, or what they claim the company is worth. The question is how much it is actually worth.

Mr. President, I ask that exhibit No. 3, to which I previously referred, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT No. 3.—*Postal Telegraph, Inc., and subsidiary companies—Consolidated balance sheet, condensed, Dec. 31, 1940 and 1941*

| | Dec. 31, 1940 | Dec. 31, 1941 |
|---|---|---|
| Assets: | | |
| Plant and equipment | $69,116,097 | $70,156,957 |
| Less: Depreciation reserves | 27,776,465 | 28,803,340 |
| Total | 41,339,632 | 41,353,617 |
| Current assets: | | |
| Cash (including funds for unpaid money orders) | 2,331,492 | 1,998,884 |
| Special deposits | 228,702 | 125,376 |
| Employees' working fund | 307,946 | 363,260 |
| Accounts and notes receivable (less reserve) | 2,837,031 | 3,301,534 |
| Materials and supplies (less reserve) | 752,415 | 1,060,169 |
| Total current assets | 6,457,586 | 6,849,223 |
| Restricted deposits (see note payable to bank—contra) | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 |
| Prepaid accounts and deferred charges | 243,705 | 258,381 |
| Grand total | 49,240,923 | 49,661,221 |

EXHIBIT No. 3.—*Postal Telegraph, Inc., and subsidiary companies—Consolidated balance sheet, condensed, Dec. 31, 1940 and 1941*—Continued

| | Dec. 31, 1940 | Dec. 31, 1941 |
|---|---|---|
| Liabilities and reserves: | | |
| Notes payable to Reconstruction Finance Corporation [1] | $2,246,243 | $4,857,241 |
| Note payable to bank—due Feb. 5, 1943 | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 |
| Current liabilities: | | |
| Accounts and wages payable | 1,257,419 | 1,459,283 |
| Unpaid money orders | 973,451 | 1,203,645 |
| Accounts payable to other communication carriers | 686,758 | 1,144,922 |
| Accrued taxes | 377,465 | 399,759 |
| Other current liabilities | 73,967 | 75,420 |
| Total current liabilities | 3,369,060 | 4,283,029 |
| Other reserves | 7,462,617 | 7,395,848 |
| Total liabilities and reserves | 14,277,920 | 17,736,118 |
| Net worth—capital stock: | | |
| Common | 1,027,080 | 1,027,080 |
| Preferred | 2,567,699 | 2,567,699 |
| Capital surplus | 33,932,429 | 33,932,429 |
| Earned surplus (deficit) | (2,564,205) | (5,602,105) |
| Total net worth | 34,963,003 | 31,925,103 |
| Grand total | 49,240,923 | 49,661,221 |

[1] The agreements between Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Postal provide for 2 loans aggregating $5,000,000 and $1,500,000, respectively. The 2 loans are to be repaid as to principal concurrently as follows:

$10,000 and $3,000, respectively, on or before the 24th day of each month from Apr. 24, 1943, to and including Mar. 24, 1945.

$20,000 and $6,000, respectively, on or before the 24th day of each month from Apr. 24, 1945, to and including Mar. 24, 1947, and the balance on or before Apr. 24, 1947.

Source: Annual report for the year 1940 and carrier's balance sheet for the year 1941.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish the Senator to understand that I simply wanted to obtain information. I have listened to the argument with an entirely open mind, not knowing whether I should be in favor of the bill or against it. I thank Senators for what little information I have received.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Some very pertinent questions have been asked of the Senators in charge of the bill. I think we should have a full exploration of all matters involved in the final consideration of the measure. I rose only for the purpose of suggesting to the able Senator in charge of the bill that it go over until Thursday. Why could it not go over until Thursday? In the meantime Senators could acquaint themselves with the capital structure of the company, with its indebtedness, and with the duplication of service, if any there is, and whether there are any areas now being served by the Western Union which are also served by the Postal Telegraph. Also the amendment suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] regarding the shortening of the period of 5 years could be considered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Oregon will not ask that the proposed legislation go over. Next Thursday I could not give any better explanation of the financial structure

of the company than is contained on page 10 of the hearings. A similar bill was passed at the last session of the Senate, after careful consideration had been given the matter. As I said before, I feel that so far as the financial structure is concerned it is really immaterial what the company sets up. I agree with the Senator from Maine that the question of the number of years of protection to be given employees received the most careful consideration by the committee. Recommendations were made to us by the companies. The Western Union itself recommended that the period should be reduced to 4 years. I do not think we have gone too far. I should very much like to have the bill disposed of. If the Western Union is to buy the other company, the longer it is delayed the more the debt will increase. So it will only become more difficult as time goes on to effect a merger under the proposed legislation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. What is the attitude of the Postal Telegraph Co., as evidenced by its showing before the committee?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Postal Telegraph Co. is very anxious for a merger because it is going under; it is going out of existence.

Mr. McCARRAN. Has the company made that known, and does it appear in the printed hearings?

Mr. McFARLAND. Oh, yes; it appears in the hearings. There have been two different sets of hearings on this subject. One set of hearings was held on Senate Resolution 95. Everyone was given an opportunity to come before the committee.

In answer to the Senator from Oregon, let me state that the House has made a different report than the report to which I have referred. This matter will all have to go to conference anyway. I believe it is very important to dispose of the proposed legislation.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my suggestion was made in a helpful attitude. The able Senator from Arizona, who is in charge of the bill, has control of it, and it is the unfinished business.

I am mindful, as the Senator must be, that there are 10 or 12 new Members of the Senate who were not present during the last session of the Congress. Those Members have not had an opportunity to examine the record made before the committee, and to become familiar with it, or with the record of the hearings held by the House committee. It is only because of a desire that the new Members may become familiar with the matter that I suggest that final action be deferred until Thursday. In the meantime, Members on both sides of the aisle will have an opportunity to read the record and satisfy themselves on the questions which were propounded earlier in the debate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Two of the new Members are members of our committee, and they were present when the matter was discussed by the committee. I had intended to move for consideration of the bill last Thursday, but at the request of a Senator who asked that consideration be postponed until a future date I agreed that it should go over until today. He told me this morning that it would be satisfactory to him to bring it up today.

I am personally very anxious to have the bill disposed of. I do not wish to deprive any Senator of an opportunity to study it; but, as I have said, it is not a new bill. It is the same as a bill which was passed by the Senate at the last session of Congress after most careful study. Time is a very important element if there is to be a merger. No company will care to take over another company which becomes too much involved. Many times I have seen consideration of legislation postponed, and then someone would bring in something else. Therefore I am inclined to insist that we go ahead and dispose of the bill today.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not attempting to interfere with prompt action and early consideration; but a delay of 3 days, after all the months which have elapsed since this bill or an identical bill has been on the calendar, would not disturb the economic composure of the Western Union or the Postal Telegraph Co. I believe that in the interest of new Members of the Senate, who have propounded questions, the bill should go over until Thursday. If that were done I would not be able to see any reason for any further delay. I have not been prompted by any suggestions on the part of any of the new Members. It is possible that they are all satisfied to go forward; but since questions have been propounded, I thought it would be courteous to the new Members to suspend consideration of the bill at this time and allow it to go over until next Thursday. However, the able Senator from Arizona is in charge of the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I took the matter up with the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and he was satisfied to have it go over until today. He was not satisfied with some of the labor provisions. Senators may well differ in regard to some of those questions. As I have said, all these matters will have to go to conference anyway. The bill originally reported to the House of Representatives contains labor provisions which are different from those in the bill under consideration, and the question will have to go to conference. Inasmuch as we have already passed a bill on this subject, I believe that it would be in the interest of the merger for us to proceed as rapidly as possible, and let the House take up the subject again.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on page 7, line 6, after the words "not less than", I move to amend by striking out the word "five" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "two."

I offer the same amendment on page 8, line 6, after the words "period of"; and also on page 10, line 12, after the words "during the."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the amendments will not be agreed to. They represent much less than the Western Union even asked for.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not understand that the Western Union asks for anything at all. Because the committee insisted, it reluctantly agreed to 4 years, but, as I read the record and understand the situation, it did not ask for anything.

Mr. McFARLAND. The amendments are not in accordance with the recommendation made to the committee by the Western Union. I feel that a man who has worked for 15 or 20 years for a telegraph company and who has spent his life in preparation for an industry, is entitled to some consideration. I admit that these provisions are favorable to labor; but I consider it most important that the Senate protect labor to the fullest extent. I say that protection for 5 years is not too much for a man who has spent years preparing for service to an industry.

We have testimony showing that the turn-over in these two companies in 1 year was 7,800. There can be no hardship under those circumstances. Some of the witnesses asked for a longer protection and for full protection of the employees. Under these circumstances, I submit that there can be no injustice to the companies. I feel that there can and will be a merger under these conditions.

As was pointed out by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], it is not compulsory for these companies to merge. They do not have to merge if the provisions are too strict. If they feel that under the circumstances they cannot merge, they do not have to merge. However, I venture to say that there will be a merger under the bill, because they are desirous of making the new company a stronger company. They desire especially to merge the teletype operations, which are cutting in on their business.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona a question. If there is to be a merger of these companies, which he and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] has told us is absolutely necessary, where are we to stop in the treatment we accord all the wonderful men throughout the United States who have given their lives to industry? What have we done for the boys who have been taken out of industry and put into the armed forces? We have not given them any guaranty.

Mr. McFARLAND. Oh, yes; we have given protection to those boys. They are protected under the bill; and when they come back they will be given the same protection and the same employment they would have been given had they continued in the service of the company during the war.

Mr. HAWKES. I am not referring to the boys who have been taken out of the service of the Postal and Western Union. I am referring to the hundreds of thousands of boys who have been taken out of industries throughout the United States. All we did in the Selective Service Act was to say that the employer should, so far as possible, put those boys

back into his employment. I believe in doing that, and I believe that we should go as far as we can. However, the question I am asking is, Where are we to stop in this matter if we go further and further with guaranties here and no guaranties over there?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I feel that I have answered the Senator, in stating that because of the rapid turnover of telegraph company employment under the present set-up it is possible to have the desired protection; and I believe it is the duty of Congress to give to the employees this protection. I feel that it is the duty of Congress to give the employees as much protection as we can give them. I do not want to do anything that would make it impossible to have a merger; but most certainly I am in favor of providing protection for employees who have served for a number of years. Labor has helped to make these companies, just as financial organizations have helped. Labor has made the Postal System; labor has made the Western Union System. Those companies have reached such a point that, because of the competition of the subsidized air-mail lines and the telephone companies, it has become difficult for them to operate. The telephone companies already have merged, under previous legislation. I think that under the terms of the pending bill we should provide labor with as much protection as possible—all the protection which can be given them. Practically all the testimony was to the effect that we can provide them the desired protection, and I feel that it is the duty of Congress to do so.

THE NORTH AFRICAN SITUATION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not wish to divert the attention of the Senate from the telegraph company merger legislation, but I desire to avail myself of this opportunity to make a few comments with respect to the situation in North Africa as it reiates to the Secretary of State, the State Department, and the military authorities now representing this Government in North Africa.

There has been quite a substantial amount of comment and criticism in the public prints, from commentators and writers, as well as from commentators over the radio, attacking the action of Secretary of State Hull, and charging that he is at some fault with respect to the political and military arrangements in North Africa. I want to say that I regard the action of the Secretary of State and the State Department prior to the landing of our troops in North Africa and the handling of the Vichy authorities as having been guided by wisdom and skill. While foreign relations were maintained with Vichy, there was no recognition of the Vichy Government, or of the Vichy inclination to favor the Axis Powers. To have severed relations with Vichy would have rendered it impossible for the United States Government to secure much valuable information which our continued diplomatic contacts made possible.

I regard it as highly significant that when the United States military expedition successfully landed in North Africa, the State Department and the military authorities had so well concealed and kept out of the public notice the intentions with regard to landing the expeditionary force that the landing was entirely a success.

But, the critics say, once our troops landed in North Africa we should not have had any further contact with certain persons whom they charge with being in sympathy with Vichy. Mr. President, I have no doubt that due to the skill with which alinements were made at that time under the direction of General Eisenhower, our commander in chief in that area, and because of negotiations and contacts with the ruling authorities in Morocco, in Algiers, and in all that territory, the lives of thousands of American troops were saved.

The Senate will recall that our armed forces met some resistance, but that the losses were insignificant compared to the number of men involved and to the magnitude of the military operations. As we all know, Admiral Darlan has been assassinated. The Secretary of State was roundly denounced and criticized for having anything to do with Admiral Darlan. Mr. President, it would have been tragic for General Eisenhower, as commander in chief of our forces, to have done otherwise than treat the situation in a realistic manner, or for the State Department itself to have undertaken to influence General Eisenhower to do otherwise. In this war the military commanders in the field must recognize the realities of their situation. Admiral Darlan was in that area. He seems to have cooperated with the American forces and the British forces in bringing about the capitulation of the French; and, all in all, the result, so far as the United States and the United Nations standpoint were concerned, constituted a valuable contribution to our military efforts.

There is a controversy now as to who should be governing North Africa—whether this French group or the other French group—and the State Department is being roundly denounced and attacked because it does not assert itself and bring about a realinement of the French persons in authority. The United States Government is not concerned in internal French politics as such. It is interested, however, in maintaining control, through the proper French authorities, of the areas now occupied by American forces, and of areas which we hope will be occupied by American forces in the near future. Without detaining the Senate with a long dissertation on the details of the situation, I rise today merely to say that I regard the action of Secretary Hull throughout this whole chapter of our international contacts in North Africa, and preceding the landing of the troops in North Africa, as having been a wise one, one which prevented immense losses of American life and matériel, and one which now gives promise of realizing the actualities of the situation, and of being of great assistance to the American forces. I am willing to trust General Eisenhower, who is on the ground, who is in military command, who will be held responsible for everything that happens to our forces in North Africa. I am willing to have him treat the situation as he finds it, and I am willing for him to adopt such measures as seem to offer the best hope of his realizing all the advantages of the situation.

Mr PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In view of the very able and clear statement the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is now making, I wonder if for the record, at least the able Senator from Texas will state—although it would not be news to the Senate—whether Admiral Darlan was invited to Algeria, or whether he was there on a private mission, to visit his son who was a paralytic, and whose health was almost dispaired of, and that Admiral Darlan happened to arrive there the night the American forces entered Algeria, and was not brought there by any machinations on the part of our military or State Department officials?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I am not prepared to state all the details of how he came to be there at that particular moment; but the important thing was that he was there and, being there, and having influence with the French authorities, and having power with them General Eisenhower had the good sense to use him in the saving of American lives and in advancing the military objectives of the expedition.

What else could he do? Some of the French armed forces are now fighting on the side of the United Nations. They are maintaining a part of the front in North Africa. Do we want to worry about what those particular Frenchmen would do if they were back in France, as to what their particular preference for some particular leader might be? The important thing is that they are out there baring their breasts to the enemy. They are fighting side by side with American troops, and I for one applaud the Secretary of State, and I applaud General Eisenhower for the course they have pursued

If I am in a fight, in a struggle for my life, when death faces me, when I go out upon an adventure that may end either in safety or the sacrifice of my life, and I have standing by me someone who is willing to share my dangers, who is willing to take the hazards of battle, I am not going to stop and say, "By the way, wait a minute. Listen. Instead of fighting, let's talk this thing over. What political party do you belong to?" I would not want to stop the contest and turn to him and argue with him, "What church do you belong to? Do you believe in immersion, or baptism by sprinkling?" [Laughter.]

No, Mr. President; the French authorities in North Africa, those who are there on the ground, are cooperating, so far as my information goes—and I think I have what information there is available—with the armed forces of the United States; and Mr. Hull, as Secretary of State, is doing all he possibly can to strengthen and uphold the hands of General Eisenhower. I think that General Eisenhower's record in North Africa

has already demonstrated that he is pursuing that course which is best for the interests of the expedition, and which offers the greatest hope for the success of our armed forces in North Africa.

Mr. President, I trust that the attacks back home, behind the lines, on the Secretary of State, will not impress the public mind, and will not create more confusion. All of us say we want to win the war. "Yes; we want to do what we can to win the war, but—then, when we get to the "but," someone wants to make all sorts of attacks.

Mr. President, I have not always agreed with the President of the United States on some of his policies, and I have not hesitated to say so, and I have not hesitated to vote my convictions. But we cannot have two or three leaders in a war. When the Nation is engaged in war, we have to have one leader, and President Roosevelt is now our leader. He is our leader by the sanction of the Constitution. He is our leader by the votes of the people of the United States. While we do not like some of the things our people are complaining about, some of the irritating things, some of the irritating regulations, I might say that we did not like them in time of peace, and we did not like them because they interrupted our comfort and our convenience. But let me say to those of us who are here at home, that today other men are out yonder on the distant reaches of the sea dying. Other men are far out yonder in the jungles of the Dutch East Indies dying and suffering, and it behooves us not to engage in too much bickering and quarreling here at home about which particular group is recognized in North Africa, or this or that or the other. We should try to follow the leadership of our Commander in Chief. When I say Commander in Chief, I mean it in a military sense, of course, and in those other senses which contribute to the military effort. I do not mean that because the President is Commander in Chief he can do illegal things, that he can do things which are not warranted by the Constitution. But this war is a world war, it is a war which is going to require every ounce of energy and resource and strength this people are able to produce.

Let us not deceive ourselves; this a real war. We have two powerful, militant adversaries. They are good soldiers, they are good fighters, they are determined; they were trained and skilled by years of practice before we became engaged in the war.

Mr. President, the struggle before us may be long and it may be bitter, as it already is bitter, and I for one hope that we may discourage criticism of this, that, and the other, and unite on doing those things which are necessary to enable us so to marshal our strength and so to centralize our resources that we may be able to give to the men on the front line every instrumentality and every weapon and every kind of supply necessary to make it possible for them to achieve over our enemies a triumph in the shortest possible time, and to bring peace to the people of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to ask the Senator a question which is suggested by a cartoon which appeared in the Washington Star 2 or 3 days ago. Of course, we all realize that General Eisenhower had to deal with the situation in North Africa as he found it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. He did not create the condition; he had to deal with it as he found it, and it seems to me he dealt with it in the way that was the wisest possible under the circumstances, gaining the greatest amount of territory and time at the minimum loss of American lives.

What I rose to suggest to the Senator was the cartoon which appeared in the Washington Star a few days ago, which pictured a long-distance conversation between General Eisenhower and Secretary Hull. In that imaginary conversation General Eisenhower, in North Africa, was talking by long distance telephone to Secretary Hull in Washington, and saying, "If you can handle the situation there, I think I can handle it here in North Africa."

It seemed to me that was a very impressive way of saying what I have just suggested, and what the Senator from Texas has emhasized, that General Eisenhower had to deal with the situation in North Africa as he found it, and he has dealt with it in what seems to me to be a combination of statesmanlike qualities and military precision, in undertaking to handle the matter as he has handled it. The cartoon really expressed in a very potent way the situation as it existed between the Secretary of State and General Eisenhower, and as it still exists, and may continue to exist for some time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. The cartoon described by the Senator certainly presented a graphic picture of the essentials of the situation. We send a commanding general into a territory of which we expect him to take control. Naturally, he has to recognize the realities of the situation, and in recognizing them he has the facts before him, and is on the ground, and it should not be expected that Secretary Hull would undertake to direct in every detail the measures which the general might adopt. The cartoon was very eloquent in suggesting that he would be able to look after North Africa if people would let Secretary Hull alone over here and let him take care of the domestic situation.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I rise to say that I think it is very timely that the Senator should today call this matter to the attention of the Senate and of the country. So far as I am concerned, I am in thorough accord with the views he has expressed with reference to letting General Eisenhower handle the situation. I think the general has done an excellent job, the very best job he could have done under the circumstances.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Montana. I feel that upon reflection, if Senators have not already done so, they will come to the same conclusion. It is well known that following the initial landing in North Africa, with a relatively small casualty list, we subsequently received the surrender of Dakar and West Africa, about which there had been much talk in the Senate in months past, which was sought to be accomplished at one time in an attack by the British and the Free French, with warships, and with military forces, and which culminated in very substantial losses to the attackers. Yet, by reason of the manner in which General Eisenhower handled affairs in North Africa, Dakar and West Africa surrendered without the loss of any lives and without the loss of any matériel. There came under our influence and under our prestige, and within the sphere of our armed forces, this great territory, which renders impossible its use by the Axis as a base from which to attack Brazil by aircraft, or any other operations in that area. It rendered it impossible for them to utilize Dakar as a submarine base from which to prey upon our merchant vessels, our convoys, and our naval vessels.

So, Mr. President, I think the country ought to know that Secretary Hull has rendered an outstanding service, a service that was actuated by his almost unbelievable sense of prophecy and foresight in taking the measures which meant most for the safety of our forces and most for the success of our enterprise.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, apropos of what the able Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has just said, Senators will also recall that an article appeared in the Washington Evening Star some two or three days ago, in which was published information which Senators already had from a responsible source—the circumstances of Admiral Darlan's entry into this picture. As will be recalled, Admiral Darlan had a son, a victim of infantile paralysis, lying ill in Algiers. Prior to the arrival of American troops in Algeria he had paid one visit to his son's bedside. The son appeared to be better in health, and Admiral Darlan returned to Vichy, or back to France. Subsequently his son's condition became acute. Admiral Darlan went back to Algeria thinking his son was about to pass away, and was in the Governor's palace the night the American forces landed in Algiers.

The article in the Star also went on to point out that our consul, Mr. Murphy, went to Admiral Darlan's room to plead with him to use his influence against resistance to the American occupation forces, and, if there were any, to the British occupation forces. Subsequently, while he was in custody—actually at first in the custody of the troops raised by another French leader, and later in the custody of the American forces—Admiral Darlan made the decision which led to the course he subsequently followed.

It will be apparent, therefore, and I think no one can dispute the facts, that Admiral Darlan coming into this picture was not a part of some scheme or sinister arrangement made by our State Department in any clandestine way, but was the result of a straightforward appeal made to him by an American consular

representative to spare bloodshed, and certainly intended to arouse the patriotism he might still have had in him for France and for the cause for which the American troops were going to Africa. So I think it is a fair inference that Secretary Hull had not become an appeaser.

Insofar as I am personally worthy of mention in that connection, I am sure I have not been and am not now an appeaser myself, and I do not favor the adoption of appeasement at any time or at any place by anybody. But that does not mean that military officers and those working in concert with them cannot go to anyone who has the power to resist, and make an appeal to him not to resist, and try to arouse his support for the same cause for which we are fighting.

Mr. President, Secretary Hull has had a long record in public life. The Tennessee mountains do not very often produce appeasers. Secretary Hull is a glorious product of the ruggedness of the Tennessee mountains, and as fine an expression of American character as is to be found anywhere.

INVESTIGATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

Mr. President, turning briefly to another subject, there have been some comments made on the floor during the last few days about an additional manpower investigation. I have neither the right nor the disposition to retard any study of the subject of the best use of the Nation's manpower resources. I think the Senate is entitled to know, as a matter of fact, that the Military Affairs Committee has for some months had before it measures pertaining to the effective use of the Nation's manpower, and it has in the past conducted certain investigations. The able Truman committee has also held numerous hearings upon the subject, and appointed a subcommittee, I believe, headed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. They have made a rather considerable study of this subject. A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, of which I have had the honor to be chairman, has for at least 3 months been investigating the same subject. The jurisdiction of that committee rested upon the fact that legislation was proposed which related to the civilian labor supply of this country. It was the view of that subcommittee, at least of its chairman, and of many others, that legislation pertaining to the civilians of this country and the obligations which might be imposed upon them to work properly came within the scope of those whose jurisdiction related to the subject of labor. Our study did not contemplate coercion upon American labor, certainly not unless every alternative should fail.

A resolution providing for the continuation of the life of that subcommittee is pending now before the whole Committee on Education and Labor, having been submitted by the junior Senator from Florida. If that resolution is approved the Senate Committee on Education and Labor expects to continue its investigation. Of course, if any other committee cares to conduct an investigation, and believes it should do so, that is the thing for it to do. I did, however, want to make it clear that that subject had already received considerable consideration in the Senate, and that the Committee on Education and Labor, which deals with the subject of vocational training, and education, and legislation pertaining to labor, would not naturally expect to desist from its study unless required by the Senate to do so.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell when a report will be made by the committee?

Mr. PEPPER. The subcommittee has already submitted two preliminary reports to the full committee. Legislation has not yet been recommended because the study has not been completed by the subcommittee, and I would not presume to speak for a subcommittee which has not yet been given legal validity. However, if I were again the chairman of a similar subcommittee, I believe some recommendation in the form of legislation, if it were thought legislation were necessary, could be expected within a resonably short time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Florida realizes what is taking place in the Northwest? Our boys are being taken away from the farms. Our dairy cattle are being sold by the thousands. Auction sales are being held, even in the winter time.

A few days ago former Senator Lynn J. Frazier was in Washington. He served in this body for 18 years. He has lived in North Dakota for nearly 50 years. He told me that he never saw such a situation as that which confronts the farmers of North Dakota at the present time. Thousands of acres of land will not be put into crops next year. Unless something is done in the near future, not even the machinery which the farmers use will be repaired. Mr. Frazier came to see me to ascertain whether something could not be done to get these committees to act promptly.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from North Dakota for making the observation which he has made, for he has stated a situation which has been neglected by the administrative agencies of the Government. I do not know what has happened to the power of the War Manpower Commission. I do not know why it apparently has not taken hold of the farm labor problem with some grasp, some policy, and some effectiveness.

This morning's newspapers indicated that the whole question will be turned over by the War Manpower Commission to the Department of Agriculture. If the Department of Agriculture does not perform any better than it has relating to the question of food production, it will not do the job very well. Until the Department of Agriculture tells the farmers of the country that they may be assured of a dependable source of labor to enable them to cultivate and harvest their crops, we have no right to ask them to plant their crops.

Mr. President, how can a farmer be asked to spend his money for the purchase of seed and fertilizer, and the acquisition of equipment necessary to plant and harvest his crop, when the Government of the United States does not give him any assurance that he will have the labor with which to cultivate or harvest the crop? The United States Government should be willing, at least, to indemnify him for the amount of money the crop has cost him if he cannot get the necessary labor to harvest it, or it should assure him that the labor will be available for the purpose of cultivating and harvesting the crop.

The Food Administrator's Office should take hold of the problem and deal with it. If it should become necessary to use the armed forces, to call for volunteers and recruit an itinerant labor army, or hire farm labor upon a monthly, bimonthly, or periodic basis, then let it be done, and let the United States Government make such labor available to the farmer at a fair compensation. Whatever method is determined upon, the United States Government can furnish labor to the farmers if whoever has charge of the problem takes hold of it and actually does something toward its solution.

I am one of those who, with regret and almost despair, have seen this problem rock along week after week and month after month, with no clear-cut governmental policy on the subject.

In nearly every mail—and I am sure other Senators have had the same experience—I receive letters from farmers. I received one this morning which says:

> I am ill. I have a farm (of a certain size). I have certain livestock. I expect to plant certain crops. I cannot do it unless my son is given some sort of deferment. The local draft board says that it does not feel that it can defer my son. What shall I do?

I do not know what to tell him. I do not know whether to tell him that he should refer the matter to the selective-service board and ask them to put his son in a deferred category or refer the matter to the Manpower Commission and ask for consideration. I have not heard of the Commission intervening in such cases. Or should we advise the farmer to appeal to the Department of Agriculture and have the Department write back and say that the solution of the problem is someone else's responsibility?

Mr. President, what we need is a clear-cut manpower policy. I prefer to see it administratively conceived and promulgated, because in that way it would have greater flexibility and could be better adapted to the changing circumstances found in various sections of the country. However, I think we owe it to our Government to give notice that if the administrative agencies do not prepare, promulgate, and put into effect a sensible manpower policy, there will be no alternative but for the Congress to enact such legislation as will be necessary in arriving at a solution of the problem.

## THE MANPOWER SITUATION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion of the manpower situation, I believe it is appropriate at this time for me to make a few remarks which I had intended to submit later.

In the first place, I should like to concur in what has been said by other Senators in connection with the situation relating to agricultural labor. I also entirely agree that the sooner some plan is devised and put into effect the better it will be for everyone concerned.

Mr. President, I invite attention to a news release from the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C., issued on January 20, 1943. This release shows that the active spindle-hours in the State of South Carolina are higher than in any other State in the Union, numbering 2,725,956,051. In fact, the spindle-hours in South Carolina alone exceed the active spindle-hours in all the States outside the Cotton Belt.

Workers in South Carolina have been most patriotic. There have been no strikes or slow-downs, and I desire to take this opportunity, as one of their representatives, to commend them.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that although South Carolina has an abundance of electricity and other resources, including some of the most highly skilled workers in America, since the beginning of the conflict no attempt has been made to utilize these resources by any war production activities or by the establishment of any war plants of any consequence within the State. In fact, Mr. President, last month the War Manpower Commission showed a surplus of labor available in South Carolina despite the fact that more than 100,000 of our boys have volunteered, or have been called to the colors.

If the United States Government wants skilled workers far removed from the coast line, there is no better place to be found in America than in the foothills of the mountains of South Carolina. South Carolina is leading the Nation in the production of textiles which are extremely important in the war effort. However, it also has available labor which could be utilized in many small or large industries.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement from the Bureau of the Census showing the activity in the cotton-spinning industry for December 1942.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Bureau of the Census announces that according to preliminary figures, 23,845,746 cotton-spinning spindles were in place in the United States on December 31, 1942, of which 22,887,072 were operated at some time during the month, compared with 22,948,248 for November, 23,012,046 for October, 22,956,224 for September, 22,973,572 for August, 23,109,576 for July, and 23,062,264 for December 1941.

The aggregate number of active spindle-hours reported for the month was 10,733,658,128. Based on an activity of 80 hours per week, the cotton spindles in the United States were operated during December 1942 at 127.9 percent capacity. This percentage compares, on the same basis, with 133.4 for November, 136.9 for October, 134.9 for September, 136.4 for August, 130.2 for July, and 125.4 for December 1941. The average number of active spindle-hours per spindle in place for the month was 450.

The total number of cotton-spinning spindles in place, the number active, the number of active spindle-hours, and the average hours per spindle in place by States are shown in the following statement:

| State | Spinning spindles | | Active spindle-hours for December | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | In place Dec. 31 | Active during December | Total | Average per spindle in place |
| United States | 23,845,746 | 22,887,072 | 10,733,658,128 | 450 |
| Cotton-growing States | 17,890,520 | 17,401,962 | 8,737,442,708 | 488 |
| New England States | 5,256,998 | 4,889,550 | 1,795,454,294 | 342 |
| All other States | 698,228 | 595,560 | 200,761,126 | 288 |
| Alabama | 1,815,544 | 1,785,858 | 909,408,891 | 501 |
| Connecticut | 518,192 | 453,806 | 147,456,209 | 285 |
| Georgia | 3,130,934 | 2,979,926 | 1,557,019,160 | 497 |
| Maine | 618,296 | 577,452 | 216,317,990 | 350 |
| Massachusetts | 2,928,908 | 2,725,374 | 1,004,116,918 | 343 |
| Mississippi | 133,840 | 133,840 | 71,706,771 | 536 |
| New Hampshire | 280,272 | 261,248 | 119,742,813 | 427 |
| New York | 319,416 | 267,534 | 89,994,946 | 282 |
| North Carolina | 5,794,640 | 5,687,102 | 2,712,348,546 | 468 |
| Rhode Island | 876,680 | 837,398 | 291,811,020 | 333 |
| South Carolina | 5,421,332 | 5,276,208 | 2,725,956,051 | 503 |
| Tennessee | 543,904 | 532,982 | 316,283,838 | 582 |
| Texas | 237,420 | 235,112 | 104,251,512 | 439 |
| Virginia | 645,124 | 606,170 | 272,827,288 | 423 |
| All other States | 581,154 | 527,062 | 194,416,175 | 335 |

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have made reference to my State because I know the conditions there. I know that similar conditions exist in other States. In one section of the country there is a surplus of manpower. In another section additional workers are needed. Along the coast, where shipyards are constructing vessels, there is a shortage of manpower. In other regions there is a great surplus. However, nearly all the farmers throughout America are in the same position with regard to a shortage of help. I hope some solution of the manpower problem will soon be found.

## CONSOLIDATIONS AND MERGERS OF DOMESTIC TELEGRAPH CARRIERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Chandler | Hill |
| Andrews | Chavez | Holman |
| Austin | Clark, Idaho | Johnson, Colo. |
| Bankhead | Clark, Mo. | La Follette |
| Barbour | Connally | Langer |
| Barkley | Danaher | Lodge |
| Bilbo | Davis | Lucas |
| Bone | Ellender | McCarran |
| Brewster | Ferguson | McClellan |
| Bridges | George | McFarland |
| Brooks | Gerry | McKellar |
| Buck | Gillette | McNary |
| Burton | Green | Maloney |
| Bushfield | Guffey | Maybank |
| Butler | Gurney | Mead |
| Byrd | Hatch | Millikin |
| Capper | Hawkes | Moore |
| Caraway | Hayden | Murdock |
| Nye | Shipstead | Wagner |
| O'Daniel | Stewart | Wallgren |
| O'Mahoney | Taft | Walsh |
| Overton | Thomas, Idaho | Wheeler |
| Pepper | Thomas, Okla. | Wherry |
| Radcliffe | Thomas, Utah | White |
| Revercomb | Truman | Wiley |
| Reynolds | Tunnell | Willis |
| Robertson | Tydings | Wilson |
| Russell | Vandenberg | |
| Scrugham | Van Nuys | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has offered an amendment reducing to a 2-year period the 5-year period, wherever it may be provided in the bill, dealing with an employee of any company consolidated or merged under the bill who was in the employment of the company prior to March 1, 1941. I might say, Mr. President, that in undertaking to frame the legislation the Committee on Interstate Commerce had in mind particularly the situation existing among the stockholders of the Postal Telegraph and Western Union Cos., one of which is, and has been for some time, losing money, and both of which could not merge so as to form a single company under the law without enactment of the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. President, it was not an easy matter to frame the legislation in a way which seemed to deal justly with all the interests concerned. Among the interests concerned, and among those which the committee has sought to deal with in a just manner, were the employees of the telegraph companies involved in the contemplated merger. So we had to consider not only the question of how the stockholders of the merged companies should be treated, but also to consider what would be fair treatment for the employees of the merged companies, many of whom have been in the employ of one or the

other of the companies longer than many of the stockholders have held stock in either of the companies.

Many of the employees have never since their maturity engaged in any occupation except that of telegrapher or other employee of one of the two telegraph companies. The situation with employees of a telegraph company is the same as it is with employees of a railroad company. Men who spend their lives in the railroad business—as conductors, engineers, flagmen, or otherwise—find it difficult to integrate themselves with other industries and in other activities after they have been employed by a railroad company practically all their lives, and lose their positions or are discharged for one reason or another.

So in dealing with the companies that are to be merged we felt that it was also fair to deal with the employees.

In subsection 2, on page 7, the bill provides that all persons who became employees after the 1st of March 1941 may be discharged.

We have undertaken to provide in a simple way for those who became employed later, who have not spent their entire lives in the telegraph business, by providing that—

(2) If any employee of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger, who was employed by such carrier immediately preceding the approval of such consolidation or merger, and whose period of employment began after March 1, 1941, is discharged at any time as a consequence of such consolidation or merger by the carrier resulting therefrom, such carrier shall pay such employee at the time he is discharged severance pay in cash equal to the amount of salary or compensation he would have received during the full 4-week period immediately preceding such discharge at the rate of compensation or salary payable to him during such period, multiplied by the number of years he has been continuously employed immediately preceding such discharge by one or another of such carriers who were parties to such consolidation or merger, but in no case shall any such employee receive less severance pay than the amount of salary or compensation he would have received at such rate if he were employed during such full 4-week period.

In other words, he cannot be discharged if he became an employee after the 1st of March 1941 without being paid at least 4 weeks' compensation at the rate he would have drawn.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I desire information. The Senator referred to men who have spent all their lives in that business. As a matter of fact, the protection would be extended to a man who was employed on February 1, 1941, would it not, even though that was the first time he ever had seen a telegraph line?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; subsection 2 on page 7 refers to that.

Mr. TAFT. But would it not protect any person who was an employee on March 1, 1941, regardless of how long he had been employed as of March 1, 1941, by a telegraph company?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have read that paragraph because it is taken out of subsection 7, which the Senator seeks to amend. I have said all I care to say about that. I explained the matter so that the Senator would understand that paragraph 7, on page 10, which he seeks to amend, lifts out of this provision those who come under paragraph 2, to whom I have just referred.

Subsection 7 reads as follows:

No employee of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger shall, without his consent, have his rate of compensation reduced, or (except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection)—

Which is the one I have just read—

be discharged or furloughed, as a direct result of such consolidation or merger, during the 5-year period after the date of the approval of such consolidation or merger, and no such employee shall, without his consent, have his compensation reduced, or be discharged or furloughed, in contemplation of such consolidation and merger, during the 6-month period immediately preceding such approval.

What the Senator from Ohio seeks to do is to reduce the 5-year period to a 2-year period. We might as well be frank about this proposed merger legislation. It is based upon the theory that two competing telegraph companies in this country cannot succeed, and we all know that one of them is now losing money and has been losing money. The stockholders of that company have received no dividends on their stock, and in order to bail them out, as it were, we are providing for this merger of the two companies. While no company is mentioned, we all know we have in mind the Western Union and the Postal Telegraph Cos. By the proposed legislation we would make it possible for them to merge and consolidate, which might result in what is commonly known as the bailing out of the stockholders of one of the companies by reason of the merger. They would be put upon a more solid foundation with respect to their stock. The merger would have to be approved.

Mr. TAFT. Is there any evidence to support what the Senator has stated? The Postal Telegraph Co. is certainly not by any chance worth the amount of money it owes. The chance of a stockholder of the Postal getting any money is simply completely negligible, as I understand the situation. I do not think the stockholders of the Postal Telegraph Co. will ever get a cent as a result of what is proposed. I know the Postal owes the Government $9,000,000. How much more it owes I do not know, but it certainly is not worth anything like that amount to anyone.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be——

Mr. TAFT. As stated by the Senator from Maine, the real purpose is not what the Senator from Kentucky has stated. The reason of the Senator from Maine for supporting the proposed legislation is that the Government should not take over the Postal Telegraph Co. and put the Government into the telegraph business, which he thinks is the alternative to the proposed consolidation.

Mr. BARKLEY. At any rate, those who are interested in the Postal Telegraph Co., whether they are stockholders or the Government of the United States, stand a chance to be better off as a result of the consolidation than they would be if the Postal had to go out of business completely, or go into bankruptcy.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will change his statement from "stockholders" to "creditors or bondholders," I will withdraw my suggestion.

Mr. BARKLEY. At any rate, those who are interested in the Postal Telegraph Co., whether stockholders or bondholders, or Uncle Sam, would presumably be better off after the merger than they are now.

The point is whether we are to make an effort, by the proposed merger, to improve the financial situation with respect to the stockholders or the bondholders or the Government, and at the same time not take employees who have spent their lives with the company and throw them out the window to the dogs. I am not willing to do that, and I think the 5-year period is a fair one. It was arrived at in the committee after long deliberation, and I think unanimously. I am not certain, but I do not believe there was any serious opposition to the 5-year period.

It seems to me that while we are undertaking to provide for all the exigencies which may arise as the result of the merger and consolidation, we should not overlook the welfare of the employees, many of whom know nothing else but telegraphy, many of whom have been with one or the other of the companies all their adult lives.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I think it was understood in the committee, of which I am a member, that we all favor an effort to merge the two companies into one, but it has seemed since that there are conditions imposed which will preclude a merger.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not catch what the Senator said.

Mr. MOORE. Since a study has been made, it seems that conditions are imposed which would preclude the desirability of a merger, if we have to impose upon the merged company a labor provision which would be uneconomical and unbearable, and preclude any profit being made out of the merger. Both companies are weak. Certainly the Postal Telegraph Co. is now insolvent, and what objection would there be to making the labor provision effective over a 2-year period rather than imposing a 5-year period?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have just stated my objection to it. The 5-year provision is not new. It was considered in the committee in the last Congress, during almost the entire existence of the last Congress, for 2 years. The 5-year period was agreed to in the last Congress, and the bill as passed by the Senate contained that provision. The only reason why we have this bill before us now is that the legislative situation made it impossible for the House of Representatives to act upon the bill, so that the 5-year period is not new. It was considered and agreed to by the committee and by the Senate without serious opposition.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am yielding to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to see a merger brought about; I think it would probably be a wise step from the standpoint of economy. I should like to see it for the reason that the Postal Co. would probably fail anyway, and then its employees would be out of work, unless the company were taken over by the creditors or the Government. In the latter case the employees of the Postal would be working for the Government.

The hope which some of us have is that private enterprise will be encouraged, and situations brought about which will result in men being employed in private enterprise, rather than have the Postal Co. continue in competition with Western Union, so that they will both lose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know of anyone, in the Senate or elsewhere, who seriously desires to have the Government of the United States take over either the Postal Co. or the Western Union, and it seems that inasmuch as the Government has a considerable amount of money invested in the Postal, if it had to take either one of them, in the absence of a merger, it would be the Postal. Whether the Government had better lose the $9,000,000 it has loaned, or whatever the amount is, instead of having to take the Postal Co. over and operate it in competition, is a matter about which any man may have his own opinion. Of course, the companies might never merge. They would not be required to merge. They would merely be permitted to merge.

If they never merged, of course the 5-year period or 2-year period would not have anything to do with the enactment of the law or its operation. But if they are to be merged on the theory that it would be to the interest of the public service, to the telegraph business generally, and if it were to the interest of all concerned in both companies that they should merge, the committee felt, and now feels, and I myself feel strongly, that 5 years is not too long to allow the merged companies to adjust their relationship to the old employees who have spent their lives in the telegraph business and who may find it difficult to integrate themselves into other vocations, so as to enable them to survive and support themselves and their families.

Mr. MOORE. It is not a question whether it is just or not to the employees. It is a question whether the measure would impose a burden so heavy as to make it prohibitive for the Western Union to assume the burden. The proposed legislation is permissive in nature, as I understand, but if it were to result in placing a prohibitive burden on one company, then the point I make is that it would be a futile thing.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Western Union was given every opportunity to present its contentions to the committee, as was the Postal Telegraph Co. Everyone connected with the whole situation was given opportunity to appear before the committee. The committee fixed the 5-year period as being fair and just to the employees.

Mr. President, I think the period is a reasonable one. I have nothing further to offer, and I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Kentucky may have the information I desire. One of the main purposes of the bill is to take care of the employees of the company which is to be absorbed. Does that include all the employees, or only a certain number of the employees?

Mr. BARKLEY. The two sections of the bill which I discussed draw a distinction between the employees who have been on the company's pay roll since the 1st of March 1941 and those who have been employed for a longer period of time. Those who come in the former category of more recent employees may be discharged, but they must receive what would be equal to 4 weeks' full pay at the time they are discharged.

Mr. BUTLER. The point on which I should like to have some light is this: No doubt there are certain employees who are organized, and undoubtedly a company which has been so long in existence, and which has had so much experience as the Postal has had, has a good many employees who are unorganized I should like to know if the application of the bill is to be the same in either case.

Mr. BARKLEY. Absolutely. I see no distinction between those who are unorganized and those who are organized. Subsection (7) on page 10 provides that no employee who has been employed or was employed at a period prior to the 1st of March 1941 shall be discharged without his consent, or have his compensation reduced without his consent during the 5-year period. It makes no reference whatever to whether such employee belongs to an organization or not.

Mr. BUTLER. If I may ask a further question, are the provisions of the bill applicable to the president, the vice president, the general manager, the chief counsel, and all other employees of the company? There appears to be no exception.

Mr. BARKLEY. While in a sense the president of a corporation is employed by it, he is not referred to among the employees. I have not read whether there is a definition of the word "employees" in the bill itself.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I might say that anyone who receives a salary of more than $5,000 is specifically excepted. It applies only to those who receive under $5,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I find on page 11 of the bill the provision that those who draw more than $5,000 are excepted from the provision of the bill.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say on the subject.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is true that a bill similar to this passed in the last session of the Senate, with the 5-year provision in it. Since that time, however, the whole situation regarding manpower has substantially changed, and this bill is absolutely contrary to and at variance with the present policy of the Government regarding manpower. Whereas in every other field we are trying to force people into essential employment, here we are, by definition, providing excessive employees in the telegraph industry, and encouraging them to remain in that industry, although they do not have anything to do, or will not have enough work to do for a period of 5 years, during and perhaps long after the war.

The manpower situation has become sufficiently serious to call for a reconsideration of what the Senate did when it previously passed a similar bill. We do not treat any other industry in this way. Mr. Donald Nelson appeared before a Senate committee the other day and discussed with us the question of so-called concentration of industry. He said that he had had a committee working for months considering the question and that the weight of opinion was that we must in the case of many industries say to an industry, "You must shut down half your plants and throw out of work the people in those plants, and concentrate all the work in the other plants, in order to save material and in order to relieve manpower."

Mr. President, we saw the actual operation of the War Production Board in the case of gold mines. The Board shut down every gold mine in the country, largely because, as it said, "We do not have enough men in the country, so we are going to shut down the gold mines, thus forcing those men into unemployment in the mines, and using them in other fields where labor is needed."

Mr. President, it is very well to say that the men involved in the proposed merger are a special group, but the manpower pool is a single pool. Older men often can go into some other work and relieve younger men, until we finally reach the point where we have men available for the most violent and pressing kind of physical labor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Ohio said we have treated no other industry like this. Some years ago we passed legislation authorizing the merger of railroad companies, and we made provision for at least attempting to take care of employees who would be affected by mergers. We did not provide exactly as we do here, but we did undertake to protect employees who had spent their lives in the railroad business and who were thrown out by reason of mergers. We sought to protect them so that they could be gradually integrated into the merged companies, so they would not be left on the streets wanting any protection. The method by which we did it was a little different from this, but the principle is the same.

Mr. TAFT. That was in times past, when no manpower problem existed. The point I make is that the situation has changed since the passage of the original bill. Anyone who will read the report

of the Truman committee made to the Senate last week will see that in the farm machinery industry a concentration was carried out; that plant after plant manufacturing farm machinery was cut down. Nothing was done for the employees of the farm-machinery plants which were closed. They were told to enlist in the Army or to find some other position in which their work could be more useful to the war effort.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, those were inevitable results of the war. This is not a war measure. A similar measure has been under consideration for a long time. It was considered by Congress long before we got into the war, so it does not present a situation parallel to that which the Senator is discussing.

Mr. TAFT. I think the situation is parallel today. Why should we deliberately force thousands of other persons out of work in order to get enough men, and then provide a feather bed in the telegraph industry for twice as many men as are actually needed to carry on that business in time of war?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that from December 31, 1940, to December 31, 1941, there was a total turnover of employees of the Western Union and the Postal Telegraph of 7,820. It will be at least 2 years after March 1, 1941, before the merger can occur, which will make a total turn-over of 15,000 men who could be let out.

Mr. TAFT. I am interested in knowing why the Senator says it will take 2 years. My understanding is that the bill must be passed now because the merger has to be carried out immediately.

Mr. McFARLAND. I might say to the Senator that the employee must have been in the service of the company on March 1, 1941. The bill must be passed in the House. Notice must be given to the Federal Communications Commission of the proposed merger, all of which will take time. By that time 15,000 persons will be out as a result of the turn-over of employees. There is a total of adult employees in both systems at this time of approximately 40,000. In the Western Union approximately 30,000 are employed. Fifteen thousand subtracted from 40,000 leaves about 25,000 employees. Twenty-five thousand is less than will be needed.

Mr. TAFT. Then apparently the labor provisions are wholly unnecessary, and could be entirely omitted from the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. That would be unnecessary if we had any assurance that the Western Union would keep the Postal employees who have devoted a lifetime to this industry, and whose whole livelihood is at stake. If we had some assurance that they would be kept, such a provision would be unnecessary. Some one will have to take their places.

Mr. TAFT. Today either the Western Union or the Postal may dismiss its employees. If the shortage is as described by the Senator, the Western Union will not be able to get any but Postal employees to carry on the telegraph business, if there is no excess; but there is an excess, and there will be a substantial excess.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Subparagraph 7 on page 10 of the bill limits the effect to one cause only, namely, "as a direct result of such consolidation or merger." The bill merely provides that the rate of compensation of employees of the merged companies shall not be reduced without their consent, and that they shall not be deprived of their employment without their consent, for one cause, namely, "as a direct result of such consolidation or merger."

I merely suggest that the Senator from Ohio consider those words as bearing upon the point he has made, namely, that this provision would be in conflict with the proposed National Service Act. My own opinion is that it does not conflict with any other law. If the Congress should enact a National Service Act, and thus give authority to the Government to control and dispose of labor, which authority the Government does not now have—and I am sure the Senator from Ohio will agree with that statement—then the provision to which I have referred would not affect the operation of the National Service Act at all.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Vermont to this extent: I do not think the proposed act—although it is not entirely clear—would interfere in any way with the Draft Act. I thing that act supersedes any provision in the pending bill. If an employee is drafted under the Draft Act he is entitled to go back after the war to his former place of employment and finish out the remainder of his 5 years. Whether the 5 years would run from that time, or from the present, I do not know. I have not been able to ascertain. However, I assume that if there were a National Service Act—there is not, and may never be—it would probably supersede any provisions in the pending bill, although I suppose it would still contain the 5-year provision.

I believe there is only one good argument for inserting the labor provisions in the bill. In the case of a merger of two companies, if there is an excess of employees, and there is need for only the employees of one company, the company which takes over the other is likely to allow the employees of the other company to go. It therefore seems reasonable to provide for a short period—2 years, perhaps—so that the new company may have an incentive to take those employees in, try them out, and let them compete with its own employees for the jobs.

I believe there is something to be said in favor of forcing the Western Union into that positior. However, that object could be accomplished by a 2-year provision just as easily as by a 5-year provision. A 2-year period would be sufficiently short so that the men who were likely to lose out would begin to look around for work immediately. Many of them would go into war work. That is what it is desired to induce them to do if it can be done. That is the object of the present voluntary method of obtaining manpower. If the men are protected for a period of 5 years they will have no incentive at all. They will look forward to a period after the war when there may be a great deal of unemployment, and will say to themselves, "We had better take this rather than go out and look for other work," because the moment they go out and find war work to do, as we want them to do, they immediately lose the benefits of this provision unless they are actually drafted under the selective service law.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not familiar with the proposed legislation. I am wondering whether or not there is anything in the bill which would compel the Western Union to keep its employees also for a period of time.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. The bill would require it to keep both sets of employees for 5 years. Naturally the result would be too many employees.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The pending bill comes from a committee of which I am not a member. I understood the Senator from Arizona to say to the Senator from Ohio that the design of the provision under consideration is to protect men who have given a lifetime of service to one or the other of the merging companies. However, as I read the bill, it apparently applies only to those whose period of employment began on or before March 1, 1941. If that is correct, it then follows that a person who has been in the employ of one of the companies for a period of somewhat less than 2 years would come within the provision to which reference has been made, and, therefore, no lifetime of service is necessarily involved. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. TAFT. My understanding is that if anyone—a messenger boy or girl, or anyone else—who was employed before March 1, 1941, is discharged as a result of the proposed merger, he or she may immediately claim pay or employment for 5 years. I cannot find anything in the bill to the contrary.

Incidentally, the legislation applying to railroads provides that no man can have a period of protected employment longer than the period he has already served.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I appreciate the view and the courtesy of the Senator from Ohio; but I wonder if he will be kind enough to ask whether or not the interpretation which he has just given is concurred in by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. TAFT. I will ask the Senator from Arizona to answer the question.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will state very frankly that the provision referred to is intended to give protection to all who were employed on March 1, 1941, and continued in employment from that date.

In Senate bill 2445 we divided it up, and said that those who had been in the employment of the company for more than 5 years should be protected in their jobs, and so forth. In making the change we protected them as to salary, but eliminated the provision that they be employed in the same class of employment, and provided they must be assigned to work which is consistent with his past training and experience.

The matter was gone into very carefully and considered by the committee. It was decided that this protection could be given the employees without any injury to the company. Of course, it would protect some employees who have not been in the service of the company for such a long period of time; but, as I have pointed out, the turn-over is very rapid. I have reference to adult employees. I am not speaking of messengers, because the turn-over of messengers is 320 percent a year. There is no question about the situation pertaining to messengers. Everyone concedes that that is not a problem. Our problem deals only with the adult employee.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator from Arizona for answering the question of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, I wish to say only one thing more. I believe that so far as the men and women in these companies are concerned, they would be better off with the 2-year provision, because they will never find another time when they can get another job as easily as they can get one today. I believe they ought to go out and look for other jobs. I think they should look for war jobs. They ought to be persuaded not to stay for a period of 5 years where they are not needed.

There has never been a time when there was so great a call for men with telegraphic or electrical knowledge as there is now. I do not believe we can give to the employees any benefit by insisting that they have 5 years of employment in an industry which, by definition or hypothesis, does not actually need that many employees.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Chandler | Holman |
| Andrews | Chavez | Johnson, Colo. |
| Austin | Clark, Mo. | La Follette |
| Bankhead | Danaher | Langer |
| Barbour | Davis | Lodge |
| Barkley | Ellender | Lucas |
| Bilbo | Ferguson | McCarran |
| Bone | George | McClellan |
| Brewster | Gerry | McFarland |
| Bridges | Gillette | McKellar |
| Brooks | Green | McNary |
| Buck | Guffey | Maloney |
| Burton | Gurney | Maybank |
| Butler | Hatch | Mead |
| Byrd | Hawkes | Millikin |
| Capper | Hayden | Moore |
| Caraway | Hill | Murdock |
| Nye | Russell | Wagner |
| O'Daniel | Shipstead | Wallgren |
| O'Mahoney | Stewart | Walsh |
| Overton | Taft | Wheeler |
| Pepper | Thomas, Utah | Wherry |
| Radcliffe | Tunnell | White |
| Revercomb | Tydings | Wiley |
| Reynolds | Vandenberg | Willis |
| Robertson | Van Nuys | Wilson |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the ditsinguished Senator from Arizona whether one Joseph P. Selly, president of the American Communications Association, testified before the committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. He did testify.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am not a member of the committe. I also should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I might say first that I listened to the statement by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], in which he said in substance that the question was one of getting the two organizations together. Does the Senator recall the testimony of Mr. Williams, the president of the Western Union Co., in which he said:

> This brings me down to the labor provisions. My view is that, as written, it is very doubtful that any merger and consolidation would result, certainly not the acquisition of Postal by Western Union. I believe that the consolidated telegraph company should do everything within reason to find employment for the largest possible number of Postal employees, at their present rates of pay, but this can be done only if the consolidated company is given wide latitude as to where and how they can be employed.

My question is this: How did the Senator arrive at the 5-year period, if the president of the only company which could effectuate the consolidation said that it could not be consolidated on that basis.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall answer the Senator; but first, in answer to the question of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] in regard to Mr. Selly's appearance and testimony, let me say that he appeared and testified in the hearing on Senate bill 2445, which was virtually identical to the pending bill. The pending bill was only recently introduced. We did not have open hearings on it, because in the last session we had complete hearings on the corresponding measure, and we felt that the record was sufficient.

In answer to the question by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], let me state that in the testimony to which the Senator has referred, Mr. Williams was not referring at all to the 5-year period. What Mr. Williams was referring to was a provision providing each employee shall continue in the same class of work. Mr. Williams wanted more latitude in respect to changing them around.

We gave Mr. Williams the latitude for which he asked. We made the change in the bill which was reported to the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am sorry to say that I think the Senator is mistaken. If I may follow up the observation of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I should like to read from the bottom of the page from which he read and continuing on the next page. At that point Mr. Williams said:

> I believe also that the consolidated company might be expected to provide employment for certain Postal employees not actually needed in any capacity, particularly those of long service, but generally it should not be required to employ thousands of people for 5 years for whom it has no work or for whom it would be required to create unnecessary work.

So his observation would seem to apply to the pending question.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, Mr. Williams wanted a 4-year period to be provided. Without referring to the testimony, which I remember very well, let me say that the quotation read by the Senator from Wisconsin referred to the other provision. Mr. Williams said, in effect:

> You cannot have two men doing identical work in the same town. You cannot require the employment of two managers for the same office. You must let us have some leeway, and let us move one of those men to some other job.

We gave him the leeway for which he asked. We did not give Mr. Williams everything for which he asked—no—but we gave him everything to which we thought he was entitled; and we did think he was entitled to have a little leeway in the matter of moving his employees around.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a further question of the Senator from Arizona. I understood from what the Senator said a short time ago that the Postal Telegraph Co. is insolvent. However, I notice that its financial statement as of December 31, 1941, which I have before me, says it has a capital surplus of over $33,000,000. Not being a member of the committee, I should like to have the Senator explain that if he will.

Mr. McFARLAND. My statement was made in response to the question asked by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who asked for the financial statement. The figure which the Senator from North Dakota has stated is contained in the financial statement; but, as was explained by Chairman Fly, the financial assets of a company are measured by its earning power. The company is earning less than nothing; it is losing $300,000 a month. So we cannot take its financial statement as to its assets and say that it is worth that much, because it is going in the hole all the time.

As was pointed out in the recommendations of Mr. Jones, head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, that company is now at the end of its rope. The R. F. C. did not feel that it could lend it any more money.

In other words, that is the situation which is confronting us, and something must be done.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator think it is strange that this company is broke, but that its stock has been going up until it has doubled in the last year?

Mr. McFARLAND. Regardless of what the stock is worth on the market at present, we must take into consideration the earning power of the company; and the Postal company is going under. When a company cannot hold its own under circumstances such as those found in the middle of a war, what will it do in peacetime? That is the whole consideration. We have an opportunity here to save the employees and to save the communications system, and I say that it is important to save a telegraph communication system for the people of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Postal Telegraph Co. stock was quoted at 6⅛ just a short time ago. At the end of the year it had risen to 10, and now it is in the neighborhood of 12.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me ask the Senator if that is not the preferred stock.

Mr. LANGER. The preferred stock, yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, they are anticipating the enactment of the pending bill. Perhaps they will get something out of it. I hope they will, but I do not want them to get it at the expense of the man who is employed, the laborer.

Mr. LANGER. At the same time, is it not true that Western Union stock has gone up from 20 to 30? Therefore it looks to me as though these companies were not in very bad shape.

Mr. McFARLAND. There is no question as to the financial condition of the Postal Telegraph Co. They are going in the hole at the rate of $300,000 a month. The Western Union are now in a little better condition. They do have some bonded indebtedness. We do not know what the condition of that company will be after the war. Everything has gone up a little. We have had a little inflation. Some may say we have had a good deal of inflation, but at least we have had enough to make the price of nearly everything rise somewhat.

Mr. LANGER. To go back to the Postal Telegraph Co., looking again at the financial statement, we find that as of December 31 last all they owed was about $14,000,000, and that included what they owed the Federal Government, and everyone else, and they have assets of $49,000,000. Is not that a fact?

Mr. McFARLAND. What company?

Mr. LANGER. The Postal Telegraph Co.

Mr. McFARLAND. They owe $9,000,000 to the R. F. C. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. LANGER. This is the financial statement of the company, placed before the committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. LANGER. From page 10 of the hearings on consolidations and mergers of telegraph operations.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not a part of the hearing; that is a statement someone issued, is it not?

Mr. LANGER. It is the very statement the Senator from Arizona himself inserted today.

Mr. McFARLAND. What is that?

Mr. LANGER. It is found on page 10.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have it here before me. It was generally conceded that the Postal company is worth nothing now. No one appeared before our committee, no representative of any labor organization or anyone else, who did not admit that something had to be done with regard to the Postal Telegraph Co. Some would like to have us continue to subsidize them. But I hope we may avoid that by this legislation.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona admits that the Postal Telegraph Co. is bankrupt?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. That it is losing money at the rate of $300,000 a month?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; approximately that.

Mr. MOORE. And that it owes the Government a sum of money which it will be unable to pay?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. MOORE. Then it would be desirable for the Western Union to take the Postal over and consolidate it into its facilities, and extend the employment of the men employed both in the Western Union and in the Postal, if it could do so. The Senator admits that?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. That is what the Senator wants?

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. The legislation proposed would be permissive, and if the Postal is going to fail anyway, what would be the difference if the Senator yielded on the 2-year provision, in place of imposing a 5-year period, which would probably be prohibitive on the Western Union?

Mr. McFARLAND. I could not agree that it would be prohibitive at all. I do not think it would be. As I pointed out several times, the protection would not all be in favor of the employers. The employees would be getting some protection. I would point to the figures just given by the Senator from North Dakota. The proposal before us is a 5-year proposal. A 5-year provision was adopted by the Senate at the last session, and in view of the adoption of that provision, and with the prospect of it becoming law and the prospects of the merger, the preferred stock went up.

Mr. LUCAS. What would these employees do if the Postal became bankrupt, and there were no merger?

Mr. McFARLAND. If it became bankrupt, they would be out, of course, and to prevent that condition arising is one of the objects of this legislation. We should not give all the protection to the company. Let us give part of it to the employees. Let us be fair to the employees.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Arizona a question. I should like to know if the bill contains a definition of the word "carrier," such as found in the Communications Act of 1934. The reason I ask the question is that in my section of the country there are many small mutual telephone companies which carry Postal telegrams continually by phone. Is the definition of those carriers, as contained in the Communications Act of 1934, contained in the pending bill, if the Senator knows, and if he knows, I should like to inquire whether there is any possibility of such mutual telephone companies being included in the provisions of the measure, because the bill provides that any domestic telegraph carriers might merge their properties.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will answer the question by reading from subsection (2), page 12, as follows:

> (2) The term "domestic telegraph carrier" means any common carrier by wire or radio, the major portion of whose traffic and revenues from record communications is derived from the acceptance, transmission, reception, and delivery of such communications both originating and terminating within the continental United States, including a corporation owning or controlling any such common carrier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments on page 7, line 6, page 8, line 6, and page 10, line 12, offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Without objection, the three amendments will be voted upon en bloc. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I do not know how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in his State on matters pertaining to agricultural problems.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent on official business. His general pair has been announced.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—29

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Ferguson | O'Daniel |
| Barbour | Gerry | Revercomb |
| Brewster | Gurney | Robertson |
| Bridges | Hawkes | Taft |
| Brooks | Holman | Vandenberg |
| Buck | Lodge | Wherry |
| Burton | McNary | Wiley |
| Butler | Millikin | Willis |
| Byrd | Moore | Wilson |
| Danaher | Nye | |

NAYS—49

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Hatch | Pepper |
| Austin | Hayden | Radcliffe |
| Bankhead | Hill | Reynolds |
| Barkley | Johnson, Colo. | Russell |
| Bilbo | La Follette | Shipstead |
| Bone | Langer | Stewart |
| Capper | Lucas | Thomas, Utah |
| Caraway | McCarran | Tunnell |
| Chandler | McClellan | Tydings |
| Chavez | McFarland | Van Nuys |
| Clark, Mo. | McKellar | Wagner |
| Davis | Maloney | Wallgren |
| Ellender | Maybank | Walsh |
| George | Mead | Wheeler |
| Gillette | Murdock | White |
| Green | O'Mahoney | |
| Guffey | Overton | |

NOT VOTING—18

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bailey | Eastland | Scrugham |
| Ball | Glass | Smith |
| Bushfield | Johnson, Calif. | Thomas, Idaho |
| Clark, Idaho | Kilgore | Thomas, Okla. |
| Connally | Murray | Tobey |
| Downey | Reed | Truman |

So Mr. TAFT's amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LANGER and Mr. AIKEN asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in his State on matters pertaining to agricultural problems.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent on official business. His general pair has been announced.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent on account of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—70

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Gerry | O'Mahoney |
| Austin | Green | Overton |
| Bankhead | Guffey | Pepper |
| Barbour | Gurney | Radcliffe |
| Barkley | Hatch | Reynolds |
| Bilbo | Hayden | Russell |
| Bone | Hill | Shipstead |
| Brewster | Holman | Stewart |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | Thomas, Utah |
| Brooks | La Follette | Truman |
| Buck | Lodge | Tunnell |
| Burton | Lucas | Tydings |
| Butler | McCarran | Vandenberg |
| Capper | McClellan | Van Nuys |
| Caraway | McFarland | Wagner |
| Chandler | McKellar | Wallgren |
| Chavez | McNary | Walsh |
| Clark, Idaho | Maloney | Wheeler |
| Connally | Maybank | Wherry |
| Danaher | Mead | White |
| Davis | Millikin | Wiley |
| Ellender | Moore | Willis |
| Ferguson | Murdock | |
| George | Nye | |

NAYS—10

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Langer | Taft |
| Byrd | O'Daniel | Wilson |
| Gillette | Revercomb | |
| Hawkes | Robertson | |

NOT VOTING—16

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bailey | Glass | Smith |
| Ball | Johnson, Calif. | Thomas, Idaho |
| Bushfield | Kilgore | Thomas, Okla. |
| Clark, Mo. | Murray | Tobey |
| Downey | Reed | |
| Eastland | Scrugham | |

So the bill S. 158 was passed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is my purpose, as soon as the business of the Senate for the day is concluded, to move to adjourn until Thursday. In order that Senators may know what the program will be, let me state that the Committee on Foreign Relations will meet on Wednesday to take action on the nomination of Mr. Edward J. Flynn to be Minister to Australia, and on Thursday will report to the Senate the result of its action in that matter. It is contemplated that the Flynn nomination will be taken up next Monday for consideration by the Senate.

I understand that the hearings are being printed. If they are not already available, they will be available before the Senate meets on Thursday, so that all Senators may have an opportunity to read them.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am advised that the printed hearings will be available tomorrow morning.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have made this statement in order that Senators may govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 28, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We praise Thee, our Father, that the truth of Thy Word includes the security of the present "Emmanuel, God with us." We rejoice that Thy Son is full of righteousness and grace and all the hopes of the human race are met in Him: Mountains rise and oceans roll, to sever us is vain. We pray that we may be shown how to walk the broad, spacious ways of life which lead from the heart of our Saviour into the soul of humanity. Oh, chart our course these days, leading us through the ever-widening spaces of cooperation until the gods of evil shall shiver and topple from their stained pedestals.

We pray that the riches of Thy spirit may keep us in the natural mood of our Lord, that all differences which spring from separations and self-aggrandizement may be done away. Grant that our people may be delivered from these perils, with clear judgment gathering strength and fighting doubts, appraising men as to whether they are right or wrong. Oh, let us all recognize clearly the claims of character, noble duty, and the service we owe to our generation. Through our only Mediator and Redeemer, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 22, 1943, was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 22, 1943.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Accounts.

Very sincerely yours,
JAMES WOLFENDEN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. COMPTON I. WHITE, a Representative-elect from the State of Idaho, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ELECTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 73), which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members and Delegate be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives, as follows:

Accounts: Frank L. Sundstrom, New Jersey; C. Frederick Pracht, Pennsylvania; John D. McWilliams, Connecticut.

Agriculture: Clifford R. Hope, Kansas; J. Roland Kinzer, Pennsylvania; Fred C. Gilchrist, Iowa; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Anton J. Johnson, Illinois; Reid F. Murray, Wisconsin; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio; George W. Gillie, Indiana; Edwin Arthur Hall, New York; Ross Rizley, Oklahoma; William S. Hill, Colorado; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Banking and Currency: Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan; Charles L. Gifford, Massachusetts; Fred L. Crawford, Michigan; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Robert W. Kean, New Jersey; Jessie Sumner, Illinois; Frederick C. Smith, Ohio; John C. Kunkel, Pennsylvania; Thomas Rolph, California; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; B. J. Monkiewicz, Connecticut.

Census: J. Roland Kinzer, Pennsylvania; Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska; C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois; William H. Stevenson, Wisconsin; Charles M. LaFollette, Indiana; Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa; James Gallagher, Sr., Pennsylvania; Fred Norman, Washington; Marion T. Bennett, Missouri.

Civil Service: Edward H. Rees, Kansas; Clarence E. Kilburn, New York; Richard P. Gale, Minnesota; Henderson H. Carson, Ohio; Winifred C. Stanley, New York; Charles M. LaFollette, Indiana; Christian A. Herter, Massachusetts; C. Frederick Pracht, Pennsylvania; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois.

Claims: J. Parnell Thomas, New Jersey; William A. Pittenger, Minnesota; John Jennings, Jr., Tennessee; Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Pennsylvania; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; Wilson D. Gillette, Pennsylvania; Henderson H. Carson, Ohio; Louis E. Miller, Missouri; Angier L. Goodwin, Massachusetts.

Coinage, Weights, and Measures: Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Pennsylvania; Richard P. Gale, Minnesota; William H. Stevenson, Wisconsin; Joseph Clark Baldwin, New York; Ranulf Compton, Connecticut; Frank L. Sundstrom, New Jersey, Homer A. Ramey, Ohio.

Disposition of Executive Papers: Bertrand W. Gearhart, California.

District of Columbia: Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois; George J. Bates, Massachusetts; Joseph Clark Baldwin, New York; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; Jay LeFevre, New York; Sid Simpson, Illinois; Ed Rowe, Ohio; Edward G. Rohrbough, West Virginia; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland.

Education: George A. Dondero, Michigan; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; Edward O. McCowen, Ohio; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; William I. Troutman, Pennsylvania; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Max Schwabe, Missouri; Edward G. Rohrbough, West Virginia.

Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress: Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; Harris Ellsworth, Oregon; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania.

Elections No. 1: Clarence E. Hancock, New York; James V. Heidinger, Illinois; John Jennings, Jr., Tennessee; Robert W. Kean, New Jersey.

Elections No. 2: Francis D. Culkin, New York; Stephen A. Day, Illinois; Thomas Byron Miller, Pennsylvania; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana.

Elections No. 3: Charles A. Plumley, Vermont; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Angier L. Goodwin, Massachusetts; Homer A. Ramey, Ohio.

Enrolled Bills: B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee; Earle D. Willey, Delaware.

Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Charles L. Gifford, Massachusetts; Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; D. Lane Powers, New Jersey; George H. Bender, Ohio; Wilson D. Gillette, Pennsylvania; Ralph E. Church, Illinois; Norris Poulson, California; John Phillips, California; Robert Hale, Maine.

Flood Control: Harry L. Englebright, California; Charles R. Clason, Massachusetts; Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Max Schwabe, Missouri; P. W. Griffiths, Ohio; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; William I. Troutman, Pennsylvania; Norris Poulson, California.

Foreign Affairs: Charles A. Eaton, New Jersey; Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Robert B. Chiperfield, Illinois; John M. Vorys, Ohio; Foster Stearns, New Hampshire; Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota; Bartel J. Jonkman, Michigan; Frances P. Bolton, Ohio; James W. Wadsworth, New York; Charles L. Gerlach, Pennsylvania; Andrew C. Schiffler, West Virginia.

Immigration and Naturalization: Noah M. Mason, Illinois; Edward H. Rees, Kansas; Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska; Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia; Bernard W. Kearney, New York; William P. Elmer, Missouri; John B. Bennett, Michigan; Lowell Stockman, Oregon; Edward O. McCowen, Ohio; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Indian Affairs: Fred C. Gilchrist, Iowa; Usher L. Burdick, North Dakota; Fred J. Douglas, New York; Richard P. Gale, Minnesota; Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota; Wilson D. Gillette, Pennsylvania; Robert F. Rockwell, Colorado; Hal Holmes, Washington; Wat Arnold, Missouri.

Insular Affairs: Richard J. Welch, California; W. Sterling Cole, New York; Fred L. Crawford, Michigan; Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; Ralph E. Church, Illinois; Chester H. Gross, Pennsylvania; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; Jay LeFevre, New York; Christian A. Herter, Massachusetts; Ranulf Compton, Connecticut; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Pehr G. Holmes, Massachusetts; B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee; Charles A. Halleck, Indiana; Carl Hinshaw, California; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Evan Howell, Illinois; Harve Tibbott, Pennsylvania; Leonard W. Hall, New York; Thomas D. Winter, Kansas; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota.

Invalid Pensions: J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; Gordon Canfield, New Jersey; John C. Butler, New York; Calvin D. Johnson, Illinois; William C. Cole, Missouri; Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming; Charles N. LaFollette, Indiana; Robert Hale, Maine; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania.

Irrigation and Reclamation: Dewey Short, Missouri; Robert F. Rockwell, Colorado; William Lemke, North Dakota; Chester H. Gross, Pennsylvania; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; Lowell Stockman, Oregon; John Phillips, California; Chester E. Merrow, New Hampshire; Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming; Walt Horan, Washington.

Judiciary: U. S. Guyer, Kansas; Clarence E. Hancock, New York; Earl C. Michener, Michigan; John M. Robsion, Kentucky; Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; John W. Gwynne, Iowa; Louis E. Graham, Pennsylvania; Raymond S. Springer, Indiana; Joseph E. Talbot, Connecticut; Frank Fellows, Maine; Earl R. Lewis, Ohio; Harry L. Towe, New Jersey.

Labor: Richard J. Welch, California; Fred A. Hartley, Jr., New Jersey; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana; Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Stephen A. Day, Illinois; Joseph Clark Baldwin, New York; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; A. L. Miller, Nebraska.

Library: Allen T. Treadway, Massachusetts; C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois.

Memorials: James V. Heidinger, Illinois.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Richard J. Welch, California; Francis D. Culkin, New York; Joseph J. O'Brien, New York; Fred Bradley, Michigan; James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; Gordon Canfield, New Jersey; Lawrence H. Smith, Wisconsin; Daniel Ellison, Maryland; Alvin F. Weichel, Ohio; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Military Affairs: Walter G. Andrews, New York; Dewey Short, Missouri; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; Charles R. Clason, Massachusetts; J. Parnell Thomas, New Jersey; Paul W. Shafer, Michigan; Thomas E. Martin, Iowa; Charles H. Elston, Ohio; Forest A. Harness, Indiana; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; J. Leroy Johnson, California; Clare Boothe Luce, Connecticut; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Mines and Mining: Harry L. Englebright, California; John M. Robsion, Kentucky; Fred Bradley, Michigan; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana; C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois; Robert F. Rockwell, Colorado; Calvin D. Johnson, Illinois; William P. Elmer, Missouri; Walter E. Brehm, Ohio.

Naval Affairs: Melvin J. Maas, Minnesota; James W. Mott, Oregon; W. Sterling Cole, New York; George J. Bates, Massachusetts; William E. Hess, Ohio; John Z. Anderson, California; James Wolfenden, Pennsylvania; William W. Blackney, Michigan; William H. Wheat, Illinois; Ward Johnson, California; Robert A. Grant, Indiana; Margaret Chase Smith, Maine; Joseph Rider Farrington, Hawaii.

Patents: Fred A. Hartley, Jr., New Jersey; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Pennsylvania; William H. Stevenson, Wisconsin; Fred E. Busbey, Illinois; Winifred C. Stanley, New York; Robert Hale, Maine; Louis E. Miller, Missouri.

Pensions: William H. Stevenson, Wisconsin; P. W. Griffiths, Ohio; Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia; Howard Buffett, Nebraska; Hal Holmes, Washington; William I. Troutman, Pennsylvania; James Gallagher, Sr., Pennsylvania; Joseph Mruk, New York; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin.

Post Office and Post Roads: Fred A. Hartley, Jr., New Jersey; Noah M. Mason, Illinois; John Jennings, Jr., Tennessee; Fred J. Douglas, New York; John C. Butler, New York; Thomas Byron Miller, Pennsylvania; William J Miller, Connecticut; Chester E. Merrow, New Hampshire; William C. Cole, Missouri; Ed Rowe, Ohio; Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa.

Printing: James Wolfenden, Pennsylvania.

Public Buildings and Grounds: Pehr G. Holmes, Massachusetts; J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; Clarence E. Kilburn, New York; Robert L. Rodgers, Pennsylvania; Earl Wilson, Indiana; James Gallagher, Sr., Pennsylvania; Wat Arnold, Missouri; Calvin D. Johnson, Illinois; John D. McWilliams, Connecticut.

Public Lands: Harry L. Englebright, California; James W. Mott, Oregon; Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; William Lemke, North Dakota; Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming; Hal Holmes, Washington; Walter E. Brehm, Ohio; Harris Ellsworth, Oregon.

Revision of the Laws: John M. Robsion, Kentucky; Stephen A. Day, Illinois; John C. Kunkel, Pennsylvania; William Lemke, North Dakota; Harry P. Jeffrey, Ohio; Homer A. Ramey, Ohio.

Rivers and Harbors: Albert E. Carter, California; Francis D. Culkin, New York; George A. Dondero, Michigan; William A. Pittenger, Minnesota; Robert L. Rodgers, Pennsylvania; Homer D. Angell, Oregon; George H. Bender, Ohio; Fred Norman, Washington; Joseph Mruk, New York; Howard H. Buffett, Nebraska; Sid Simpson, Illinois; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Roads: Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan; James W. Mott, Oregon; Usher L. Burdick, North Dakota; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; James V. Heidinger, Illinois; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Angier L. Goodwin, Massachusetts; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; Dean P. Taylor, New York.

Territories: Usher L. Burdick, North Dakota; Clarence E. Kilburn, New York; Homer D. Angell, Oregon; James V. Heidinger, Illinois; Paul H. Cunningham, Iowa; Earle D. Willey, Delaware; John B. Bennett, Michigan; Walt Horan, Washington; Dean P. Taylor, New York; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

War Claims: Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Joseph J. O'Brien, New York; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Thomas Byron Miller, Pennsylvania; Chester H. Gross, Pennsylvania; Wat Arnold, Missouri; Walt Horan, Washington; Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia.

World War Veterans' Legislation: Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Albert J. Engel, Michigan; James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; Paul H. Cunningham, Iowa; Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; Earle D. Willey, Delaware; Harry P. Jeffrey, Ohio; Fred E. Busbey, Illinois; Marion T. Bennett, Missouri.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 23, 1943.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*United States Congress,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of each of the following five committees:

Coinage, Weights, and Measures; Invalid Pensions; Public Lands; War Claims, Mines and Mining.

I want to make it plain that in taking this action I am not attempting to shirk my share of work. It is a fact, however, that the work of these committees is of no interest to people in my part of the country. Nor does the work of these committees have to do with the war, or national policy. Hence, if I tied myself down to committees of this type I would be serving interests which are of no concern to my people.

My district is predominantly agricultural. My whole personal background is agricultural. I have been intimately associated with farmers and farm organizations. I know little, if anything, of (1) mines and mining, (2) coinage, weights, and measures, (3) pensions, (4) war claims, and (5) there are no public lands worth mentioning in all my territory.

I requested an assignment to the Committee on Appropriations, where I hoped that I might serve in connection with agricultural appropriations, or to the Committee on Agriculture. I know that they are important committees, and that it is not ordinarily considered that a new Congressman has a right to demand them. I did not ask for them because of any personal interest or virtue of my own. I asked them in the name of my people, who form one of the largest and most important agricultural communities in the country. I felt that if I did not get some such assignment, then I could be more useful by leaving myself free to devote whatever talents and energy I possess to the war, to national affairs, and to things in which my people are directly concerned. I certainly should feel that I was not representing my people if I permitted myself to be tied down with the details of five such committees as these.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that in taking this action I hold no resentment against anybody. I have been told that it is an unusual action for a new Congressman to take. If so, my answer is (1) that these are unusual times; and (2) that it ought not to be unusual for any Congressman to insist on devoting his time and energy to the purposes for which he is elected.

I assure you that in all matters which appear to me to be in the interest of the war effort, the welfare of my people, and the national good, you shall have my support.

Yours very truly,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, section 1081, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following Members of the House:

Mr. DELANEY, of New York; Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas; Mr. SASSCER, of Maryland; Mr. LECOMPTE, of Iowa; Mr. CANFIELD, of New Jersey.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on January 26, on the completion of all legislative matters and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RULES AND REGULATIONS IMPOSED BY GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to commend my distinguished friend and colleague the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, for the proposed resolution which I am informed he will bring before the Rules Committee within the next few days authorizing a special committee to investigate the action of various departments and bureaus of the Government in issuing countless rules and regulations carrying with them severe penalties in many instances, which rules and regulations are without congressional authorization and tend to harass the people of this country.

At the opening of Congress our distinguished Speaker made very timely remarks along this line. And it is of urgent necessity that Congress act now to stop this usurpation of power on the part of these various department heads and bureaucrats—power which they have been gradually delegating unto themselves through recent years.

The President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy should, during this war period, exercise every power necessary to the early and successful termination of the war. I am convinced, however, that in various bureaus and offices and agencies there are those with many foolish and crackpot ideas which they are attempting to force upon the American people. Many of these fellows are taking advantage of the war and of the patriotism of our people in attempting to fasten upon this country a system of bureaucracy and paternalism which is destructive of our free institutions, and which is most repulsive to our people.

Now is the time for Congress to do something about this. We should not lose 1 minute in taking drastic action and I hope the resolution setting up this investigation will be speedily adopted by the Rules Committee and by this House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE JAY PIERREPONT MOFFAT

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has suffered a grievous loss by the untimely death, at his post of duty, of Jay Pierrepont Moffat, of New Hampshire, its Minister Plenipotentiary to the Dominion of Canada. Of distinguished lineage—an ancestor was John Jay, our first Secretory of State—he had felt this as a call, not to privilege, but to service; and his life was one of untiring energy in his chosen career of diplomacy. Although his great abilities early brought him the confidence of those in high places, he never lost touch with the fountains of our national life; and he always won the enthusiastic regard of the American colonies in the foreign capitals where he was stationed, for his ardent Americanism and his constant attention to their interests.

Only recently there has appeared again in the press the perennial complaint that we have a Department of War, but no department of peace. Certainly Pierrepont Moffat considered that beyond the routine duties of the office, he had, as a Foreign Service officer, a real vocation as an agent of international understanding and good will. Had he lived, he would undoubtedly have played an important part in the difficult task of negotiating a peace that shall be lasting. It is in the nature of things that a career like his should not be much in the public eye; and the people at large may not recognize the reality of their loss. For himself, his life was singularly complete, each day's duty met as it came due; and had he lived out his span of life to the full, he could not have merited more completely than he does today the reward that is accorded to faithful service.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I join in the tribute paid to Mr. Moffat by the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire. It was my privilege to know Mr. Moffat personally. I know the high esteem in which he was held by the State Department and all who knew him. The country has lost the services of a great and useful man in his passing and our Government can ill afford to lose one of his type at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Adam Lapin, appearing in the Daily Worker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the article to which I just referred from the Daily Worker in my remarks upon the theory that forewarned means forearmed.

The article states that a battle is on once more against the continuation of the Dies committee; that the battle is to be led by Philip Murray of the C. I. O.; and that the strategy is to be furnished by some so-called liberals in the House.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for today following the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD following the gentleman from California, and I yield back the time allotted to me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE JAY PIERREPONT MOFFAT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to pay my tribute to the late Jay Pierrepont Moffat, who died yesterday at his important foreign post of duty as Minister to Canada; for his wonderful life of service to our country. He was a descendant of the famous John Jay, Secretary of State during the Continental Congress and negotiator of the Jay Treaty with England in 1794. As a young lad he had a dream of following his ancestor in serving his country in our foreign service and in the State Department. He entered young and went, step by step, up the ladder in the foreign service, serving both as a consular officer and diplomatic officer. He demonstrated his love for America and his loyalty to the welfare and protection of America during his very fine service in the different nations of the world. It was always what is best for the United States. He was a true American.

Mr. Speaker, he was, although young, one of our ablest career officers and one of our greatest diplomats. His service proved the importance of appointing foreign service career officers instead of political appointees to represent the United States at foreign posts. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may insert as a part of my remarks a tribute paid Mr. Moffat by Secretary of State Hull.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The tribute paid by Secretary Hull follows:

Mr. Moffat's untimely death is a tragic loss to our country. He was the highest type of officer developed in a trained foreign service, and he died at the peak of his usefulness. He entered the foreign service in 1919 and served at many posts throughout the world. At every post he served with distinction. Everything he did, he did well. He was promoted through the various grades of the service as his experience broadened and his usefulness to his country increased.

Mr. Moffat served two tours of duty in the Department of State as an associate of mine and worked in daily contact with me for several years. He was one of my ablest advisers and closest personal friends. In May 1940 he was appointed Minister to Canada, one of our most important posts, where he had, since that time, represented our country with conspicuous ability and success.

Mr. Moffat's career will be an inspiration to the youth of the country. In his death our country has lost one of its ablest public servants from whom the highest accomplishments had come to be expected as a matter of course.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Nation has lost in his untimely passing a great patriot, a great statesman, and a great diplomat. I, with countless others, mourn his passing as a warm personal friend.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include the text of a radio program in which I participated.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on two subjects and to include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE RUML PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAX PLAN

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks there has been much criticism of the proposed Ruml pay-as-you-go tax plan on the theory that the Federal Treasury would lose substantial revenue if our Nation's tax clock were moved ahead 1 year. I am today placing in the RECORD a letter written by Mr. Beardsley Ruml, of New York, which goes into this matter thoroughly. He makes the direct statement that—

The gross loss will be more than offset by better tax collections and collection methods without increased burden on this account to any taxpayer.

In other words, the Federal Treasury would lose no revenue and the taxpayers of our Nation would be on a current basis, which would eliminate income-tax debt and do it without loss of revenue and with no additional burden on any taxpayer.

Mr. Ruml presented this letter and statement to a group of members of the American Institute of Accountants for their opinion as to whether or not his statement was correct. A large number of accountants have analyzed and studied the proposal and submitted letters stating his analysis is correct. The signatures of these accountants and the firms they represent are made a part of the letter I have submitted for the RECORD. I want to urge the membership of this House to study the letter closely.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a letter from Mr. Ruml of New York, which is also signed by a large number of other members of the American Institute of Accountants.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to me to address the House today be transferred to tomorrow, to follow any other special orders that may have been previously granted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a resolution of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON RULES—AUTHORIZATION TO EMPLOY CLERK-STENOGRAPHER

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I send a privileged resolution (H. Res. 50, Rept.

No. 15) to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise authorized by law compensation at the rate of $1,800 per annum for the employment of a clerk-stenographer to the Committee on Rules, effective from January 3, 1943.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE—FUNDS TO CONDUCT STUDY AND INVESTIGATION

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I send a privileged resolution (H. Res. 74, Rept. No. 16) to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, effective from January 3, 1943 the expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by House Resolution 550 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and House Resolution 16 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Civil Service, not to exceed $31,500 in addition to the unexpended balances of sums made available during the Seventy-seventh Congress for conducting the studies and investigation authorized by said House Resolution 550 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND INVESTIGATE RELATIONSHIP OF NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 75, Rept. No. 17), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 294 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and continued by House Resolution 18 of the Seventy-eighth Congress incurred by the select committee appointed to study and investigate the national-defense program in its relation to small business in the United States, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $22,500, effective from January 3, 1943, in addition to the unexpended balances of sums made available during the Seventy-seventh Congress for conducting the study and investigations authorized by said House Resolution 294 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts, investigators, attorneys, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or any subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation, signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS—FUNDS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I send a privileged resolution (H. Res. 76, Rept. No. 18) to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective from January 3, 1943, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 30 of the present Congress, incurred by the Committee on Naval Affairs, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee conducting such studies and investigations or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS—FUNDS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 77, Rept. No. 19), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That, effective from January 3, 1943, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 30 of the present Congress, incurred by the Committee on Military Affairs not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee conducting such studies and investigations or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today after the disposition of other special orders, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FLOODS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, information comes to me that there has been another disastrous flood in southern California. On last week, on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, a terrific rainfall and windstorm hit the coast. In my home town of Pasadena, Calif., some 12 inches of rain fell; immediately behind it, on Mount Wilson, nearly 30 inches of rain fell.

It is unfortunate that the flood-control program of our Government which is being conducted there had to be curtailed because of the war, but certainly it is a most worthy project and I hope that it and other flood-control measures throughout the country will be resumed again immediately after the conclusion of the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

REVISION OF PRICE-CONTROL ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to announce that I have today introduced a bill which amends, or repeals, the Price Control Act in four particulars: First, is the clarification of the authority which the President arrogated to himself to limit wages and salaries; the second has to do with the regulation of O. P. A. in respect to compelling one-third of the purchase price of real property to be paid in cash; the third has to do with what we know as the snooping provision of the act, and it denies to O. P. A. the authority it now has to send out questionnaires by the thousands to merchants; the fourth provision of the bill has to do with the practice of accepting voluntary contributions to the Treasury in settlement for violations which it is alleged in some instances amount almost to a compounding of felonies.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, upon the conclusion of the legislative business and other special orders today, I may be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the Office of Price Administration is putting on a tremendous number of employees in the States, increasing the operation of the "Gestapo." The Hitler way of enforcement of that act has brought universal condemnation. The longer it is continued, the worse the spirit of the people is going to be. I hope that the new Administrator will find that he is going to be blamed for that kind of performance and will put his foot down on it before the Congress is required to operate on it.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I think the gentleman is mistaken. The people will not blame him. They will blame the Congress, like they did in the last election.

Mr. TABER. It is about time that the Congress began to act, so far as the Office of Price Administration is concerned, and to do away with some of its nonsense.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that there is likely to be great suffering if people are refused oil because they have not converted to coal? In many instances they cannot get the coal and they cannot convert.

Mr. TABER. I expect that that condition does exist.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Tuesday next at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address by the Honorable ROBERT HALE, my colleague from Maine, on the occasion of the dedication of a marble bust of Thomas Brackett Reed, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, in the House Gallery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Memorial Resolution No. 1 and House Memorial Resolution No. 1 of the State of Montana may be included in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose today to discuss the national debt of the United States. Mr. Speaker, in the year 1800 the national debt of the United States amounted to $82,000,000. By 1835 that debt had been completely wiped out in the administration of President Andrew Jackson. At that time the United States was entirely free from debt.

AMERICA ONCE WAS FREE OF DEBT

First, may I say that that was due primarily to the conditions of that time and basically to the fact that the Federal Government had huge resources in the form of western lands which it was selling and which gave it a source of revenue never before known in the history of humanity and which probably never can be matched again.

By 1865, the close of the War between the States, the national debt was $2,677,000,000, but it would have been almost a half billion dollars more than that had President Lincoln not secured the issue of some $450,000,000 of so-called greenbacks as a partial means of paying for the war. By 1915 the debt had been gradually reduced until it stood at $1,191,000,000. At the close of World War No. 1, the national debt stood at $25,482,000,000, so that the increase during the World War No. 1 amounted to about $24,000,000,000 in round figures.

TOTAL WORLD WAR INCREASE LESS THAN AMOUNT OF SEVERAL SINGLE APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR THIS WAR

The point here is that the total increase in the public debt during World War No. 1 was considerably less than the amount of a number of single appropriation bills which this Congress has enacted for the purpose of fighting the present total war. In case anybody needs to have it said, which I hope they do not, may I say that this is only illustrative of the fact that the problem which America faces today in this total war is a problem of such tremendously greater magnitude than what it faced between the years 1914 and 1919 as to challenge our imagination in every respect.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has just said that the Government was free from debt in 1835 which was due to the fact that we had at that time a great natural resource which the gentleman says we may never have again. "Never" is a long, long time. Cannot the gentleman think of any great natural resources which the Government has or may have comparable in potential value to the great amount of public land which we at that time had?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes, I can. I can think of resources in the field of power, resources in the field of other natural resources, which may be used for the benefit of all the people if some of us here are devoted to that cause. But I am not sure that any of them are quite comparable to the great area of unused public land which belonged to the Federal Government in the early nineteenth century, the sale of which brought great revenue to the Treasury. That never again can happen.

INCREASE IN DEBT UNDER HOOVER

In 1930 the public debt of America was $16,185,000,000. Remember, Mr. Hoover was President at that time. By the close of Mr. Hoover's Administration the national debt had gone to $22,538,000,000, an increase of $6,350,000,000 in those 3 years.

And the point here is that in spite of the fact that we had an administration in power at that time which was committed to a policy of "Government hands-off" in every respect, which attempted to reduce governmental expenditures as much as it could, nevertheless, in spite of or possibly because of those very policies the revenues of the Government went down so much faster than receipts that although there was no philosophy in the administration at that time of trying to support purchasing power in the Nation, nevertheless the public debt increased by over $6,000,000,000 in the 3 years, at the end of the Hoover administration. What were the forces that caused this? Basically, a need of the whole Nation for an additional supply of a medium of exchange and the fact that under our present practices the only way it could get that was by an increase in the debt burden.

NEW DEAL INCREASES

Between 1933 and 1940, which was what may be generally termed the period of the New Deal before we got into a pre-war economy, the public debt was increased from $22,538,000,000 to $42,445,000,000, a rough increase of $20,000,000,000.

Why did that take place? The philosophy that lay behind it was very briefly this: We had a great volume of unemployment. Business was at a low level. Obviously, we had a great power to produce that was not being used. If a draft of consumer demand could be brought to bear upon that unused productive capacity, it should bring about a recovery of employment. The facts of the matter are that it did, to a certain extent,

accomplish that purpose, but that if this method and this method alone is used, even those colossal sums of money were insufficient.

The further fact is—and this is one of the main points of my speech—that that $20,000,000,000 increase in public debt should never have been interest-bearing public debt at all. For if a nation faces a situation where an increase in consumer demand is required in order to induce increased production and employment, there is no sense in a sovereign government's going into debt to private institutions to get them to create a medium of exchange in order to improve the economic circumstances of the entire nation. That is a job for the Government itself to do. And primarily, it is a responsibility of the Congress.

WORLD WAR NO. 2

Between 1940 and 1942 the public debt increased by $30,000,000,000 under the impact of the war preparation program. In the last fiscal year, between June 1942 and June 1943, it will probably happen that the debt will increase by $63,000,000,000, so that by June 30, 1943, it will amount to $135,000,000,000 in all. By the time the war has finally been won no one knows what the size of the debt will be, but at a conservative estimate we may assume, that it will be $200,000,000,000—and it may be $50,000,000,000 or *$100,000,000,000* more than that.

INTEREST CHARGES

In the Budget presented to Congress by the President on January 8 he called for a $3,000,000,000 item for interest on that public debt. If the public debt does go to $200,000,000,000 before the end of the war, then interest on that sum at 2½ percent will amount to $4,500,000,000 per year. Taking, however, the interest burden even at present on that public debt, we find that it is in excess of 50 percent of the largest amount the Federal Government ever raised in revenue in any year prior to 1941, which was $5,600,000,000 in round figures in 1920. Even in 1941, when we had a national income vastly increased by the war preparations program, we raised something over $7,000,000,000 in total tax revenues.

NO DEFLATION MUST BE PERMITTED AFTER THIS WAR

The next major point I want to make is that if after this war shall have been won those responsible for public policy permit a deflation to take place such as took place in 1920, the net result of that deflation will be principally twofold; first, an immediate collapse of farm prices such as happened between 1920 and 1921, from which collapse farm prices have never recovered relative to industrial prices to this good day; and, second, it will multiply the real burden of that public debt by twice or 50 percent or 75 percent or whatever the amount of that deflation is. For with less money in circulation each dollar will be more valuable and hence each dollar of the debt will require that much more labor or goods to discharge it.

In other words, if we permit deflationary policies to be followed after the war, whatever the history during the war period, we will heap one injustice upon another.

Therefore, I believe it incumbent upon every Member of Congress to vow in his heart that after this war shall have been won we will not permit deflation of currency or credit. For if we do we will thereby increase the economic power of everybody who possesses money or the power to create it, but we will correspondingly injure every producer in the land. We must therefore bend every possible effort toward stabilizing the value of our dollar at whatever point it may have reached at that time.

SIGNIFICANCE OF INCREASES IN DEBT LIMIT

Now I want to contrast two debates which took place in the House and which most Members will remember. The first one had to do with a bill brought before the House by the Committee on Ways and Means for an increase of the statutory limit on the public debt from, as I recall, $50,000,000,000 to $65,000,000,000. When that bill came before the House there were still many who hoped that America might escape this war. The bill was debated at great length. Members got up and predicted bankruptcy for the Nation. There were many speeches. Finally the bill, after sharp debate, was passed, though there was a substantial vote against it.

A little bit later, when matters had proceeded further and it became more and more evident that America would be committed to the war completely, we passed another bill by a unanimous vote which raised the debt limit to $125,000,000,000. Every man who voted for that bill knew when he voted for it that he probably would be voting again to increase the debt limit even further before he was through.

PART OF THE JOB OF WINNING THE WAR IS TO MATCH TOTALITARIAN PRODUCTION

Why was there this difference? I think I can explain it. We knew that we were confronted with a great international danger and we knew that that international danger came from a very definite source.

It centered in two nations, Germany and Japan, and I shall refer now only to Germany. What was it that Germany had done? A lot of people have mistakenly said that Hitler had found out how to get along without gold. But Hitler seized every dollar of gold that he could get his hands on in every capital that he captured. Other people have said that Hitler had reformed the monetary system of Germany and had freed Germany from debt. I find no substantial evidence of that whatever—quite the contrary. Indeed, all I can find he has done is that by means of imposing dictatorial power on the financial system of Germany, he compelled a debt-money system to bring about full production for war. The German banking system profited but it became the slave of the state.

The point that I make is that the Nazis did accomplish one thing. They accomplished by means of their dictatorial power this one result, namely, that they were able to use the entire productive capacity of Germany to the full, for the purpose of preparing for and prosecuting their war. So we were up against a nation where there was no financial limit to the amount it would produce, no financial limit to the commitment of every bit of energy and industry in that country to the war. We knew that we had to compete against that sort of thing, and so we said whatever the cost may be, however high our debt must go, we would be committed to an economy in the United States which will take account not of financial limitations but only of physical limitations upon production for this war, and the needs of the people. To use the words of a prominent newspaper columnist, Germany had adopted an economy of things, and men, instead of an economy of money and finance. We knew we had to do the same thing, if we were to meet that challenge. So we did.

THE 1944 BUDGET

Now we find ourselves confronted with a national budget for the next year which calls for $4,124,000,000 for nonwar expenditures; for $3,000,000,000 for interest on the public debt, and for $97,000,000,000 for the cost of the war. I only hope that Members will cease attempting to get the American people to believe that the colossal burden of this public debt can be taken from their shoulders by economies in nonwar expenditures. When I say that I do not mean to say that I do not think Congress should scrutinize every dime of expenditure with the greatest care. But obviously, when the relation is 97 to 4, you cannot relieve the burden of the people very much—certainly you cannot remove the problem of this debt—by reduction of nonwar expenditures alone.

THE PROBLEM OF THE DEBT, LIKE ALL OTHER HUMAN PROBLEMS, CAN BE SOLVED

More important than anything else which I want to say is this. This situation is not hopeless because it cannot be hopeless. Never in all of the history of humanity has God confronted mankind with a problem that he could not solve and solve reasonably and well if he has the courage and the vision to attack it. This problem is not an insoluble problem, and it cannot be, and it is not beyond the capacity of this Congress to deal with it.

There has to be a means whereby the American people can see how they can earn their way out from under this debt. I think that is all we need—an assurance that that can be done. I want to tell you how it can be done. I will say some things that somebody may not agree with but I challenge them to think of this as I give the rest of my speech. I challenge them to ask themselves this question:

> Gentlemen, do you believe that a national debt of of two hundred, two hundred and fifty, or three hundred billion dollars, with interest charges per year on those three amounts of between four and a half and seven billion dollars can be either carried or liquidated out of taxation if we employ only the traditional nineteenth century financial methods as we are now doing?

If you believe that can be done, then there is no use listening to me. If you do not believe so, then I want to offer

you a means which, in my judgment, is economically as sound as can be whereby you can guarantee your country against those two evils which may raise their heads—first, the evil of a deliberate inflation such as European nations suffered after the last war for the purpose of reducing the real burden of the debt; second, the danger of proposals for various types of repudiation of the debt. Those two devices, as far as I am aware, have rarely been used by nations without serious consequences to their political stability.

There is another way, as I said in a speech which I delivered a few days ago, which ought to guide the economic policy of this Congress, and that is this: That whenever the supply of needed goods exceeds the demand, always increase the demand of the people, and never reduce the over-all supply. I am not speaking of individual commodities. I am talking about over-all production. If we are to follow that rule, and if we see that the potential supply of commodities throughout the Nation is in excess of the effective demand of the people to support a full market for them, what should you do? We have but one answer at present, and that is to print Government bonds and sell those bonds to commercial banks for new deposits, which they write upon their books without cost to them, with which they buy the bonds. Thus the public debt is increased for one purpose. That purpose is not to borrow money from somebody who has that money in order that they may give up that money temporarily and let the Government use it. No. The purpose is to increase the total over-all amount of the medium of exchange in circulation, to stimulate the business activity of the entire Nation.

THE CENTRAL QUESTION OF THE FUTURE AND THE KEY TO THE DEBT PROBLEM

The great question is whenever we are confronted with the necessity of bringing the total over-all demand to an equality with supply, Is it necessary for a sovereign nation to contract interest-bearing debt? My answer to that is "no." I say that a nation must be free to draw upon its own credit in such a case. It must exercise its constitutional right to credit itself upon the books of its own treasury with an amount of new income to that treasury which corresponds to the percentage increase in its production or in its capacity to produce, and to do this, of course, without incurring additional debt.

For example, the average growth of the United States, the growth of its business, the growth of its commerce, the growth of its production has been 4 percent a year as an average throughout our history. If that 4-percent increase in production takes place, it is my contention that the Nation as a whole has a right to a 4-percent expansion of money in circulation, without the incurring of additional debt. That 4-percent increase should be accounted for as net income to our Treasury for the benefit of the American people, without tax burden, in order to maintain a balance between the volume of the circulating medium on the one hand and the volume of real goods and services upon the other. Thus were we to apply this one rule over a period of time the American people could earn their way out of debt simply by increasing their production of real wealth. And that, after all, is a sound way to do it, is it not?

To bring the matter into more familiar fields, perhaps, the Federal Reserve Board is now charged with the responsibility to accommodate business and industry, and at times when it is believed that additional money is needed in circulation, the Federal Reserve Board conducts open-market operations, and purchases bonds from the banks, transferring those bonds from the portfolios of the commercial banks to the portfolios of the 12 central banks, and putting more ready cash into the hands of the commercial banks in place of the interest-bearing securities.

That is supposedly a means of increasing money in circulation, giving the banks a greater incentive to lend money. Sometimes it works and sometimes it does not, but since the 12 Federal Reserve banks are private institutions, when that transfer of the bonds purchased with the credit of the American Nation by the Federal Reserve banks takes place, the size of the public debt is just as great as it was before. Nothing has happened except that we owe the money to the private 12 central banks instead of to the private commercial banks.

But when our national business has expanded so that we need any greater money circulation, our public debt ought to be reduced and those bonds should be canceled and retired out of the net result of the energy, the inventive genius and the labor of the American businessmen, industrialists, and farmers, and all the rest of us. If the 12 central Federal Reserve banks belonged to the whole American people as they should this very result would be achieved. That is the main reason I have advocated that step.

DEBT THAT OUGHT NOT TO BE DEBT

One-third of the public debt of the United States as of August 1941, which was substantially before the great war boom came upon us, or $22,000,000,000, was debt which had been contracted not by the sale of Government securities to people who gave up money to buy them, but which had been contracted by the process of selling bonds to banks which created deposits with which to buy them. In other words, bonds sold by a sovereign government to private financial institutions for new money which they created.

In 1942 alone approximately $9,750,000,000 was added to this total. Roughly one-third of the public debt then is of this character, which, as I said, in my humble opinion, never should have been interest-bearing public debt at all.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The effectiveness of the gentleman's argument, if it is effective, is found in the increase in the circulating media, incident to the pyramiding of profits by the Federal Reserve banks in consequence of the practice to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No, I do not care about the profits of the banks. I am concerned solely with their power to control the economic life of the Nation by controlling the volume of our money based on our debt to them.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If it is not profitable to the Federal Reserve banks to do it, then there is no incentive. I am not criticizing the gentleman's position; I am commenting upon it.

What has been the increase in the circulating media of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks since the abnormal increase in the national debt started 10 years ago? Can we get figures as to that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not sure I can answer the gentleman off-hand. He has asked me, of course, a very difficult question, one that would have to be looked up and I want to be sure that I understand it. Does the gentleman want to know what the increase in money in circulation in the last 10 years has been?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think we can sum it up this way: Can the gentleman tell the House in substance on his contention that banks pyramid their cash for the purpose of purchasing Government bonds, how much cash has been put in circulation in addition to our normal needs for the purpose of pyramiding Government bond holdings by the banks?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not think that up until the time of the war enough additional money had been put in circulation to overcome the depression.

Let me say in the first place that I am not attacking banks and bankers. They are operating under a system that was set up by act of Congress, and they are doing a perfectly normal thing; in the last few years they have been given the choice either of making venture loans or engaging in the very safe business of creating money and buying Government bonds. Which would you choose? I think I know which I would choose if I were a conservative-minded banker.

When the gentleman refers to pyramiding I take it he refers to the fractional reserve system, which means that if required reserves are 20 percent and a bank has reserves of shall we say $1,000,000, it may then have deposits on its books of $5,000,000. Therefore, if at any given date it has deposits amounting to only $3,000,000, it would be in a position to purchase $2,000,000 additional of Government bonds on the basis of its reserves and thus to create new bank deposit money which could be put into circulation by the Government and used in the transaction of business. But this would not necessarily bring about any increase of cash in circulation. Other factors govern that. The gentleman would, of course, agree to that.

The thing I am contending for is not to make banking unprofitable, not to take away from banks an opportunity to

make money, but on the contrary, to see that we pay banks for the services they render instead of enabling them to make money out of creating money which the Government itself ought to create. I think we should pay banks for the services they render. We pay the dentist when he pulls our teeth, although sometimes we may not like to very much. We pay the grocer for the groceries he delivers to us; we pay the teacher for teaching our children; but when it comes to a bank, many of us expect to get the services of banking without paying any charge for its clerical services. We should pay for those services and we should relieve the American people of the necessity of contracting a huge interest-bearing debt to private banks when they need as a whole nation an additional volume of money in circulation.

During a war our whole policy must of course be completely reversed. I am talking here today about a long-range policy of meeting this national debt. During war we need precisely the opposite policy, for during war we have a surplus of purchasing power coupled with an artificial and drastic reduction of the volume of consumer goods available. What is needed in wartime is heavy taxation, a compulsory savings program, and things like that in order to do precisely the same fundamental thing; namely, to maintain the value of the medium of exchange, a stable relationship between the volume of money on the one hand and the flow of real goods, wealth, and labor upon the other. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman and I are in accord that as the Federal debt increases there is a tendency on the part of the circulating media, cash, we will say, to depreciate in value.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That all depends.

Mr. WOLCOTT. All right; as a general rule.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It depends on the increase of the production of goods.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It depends upon how close a valuation there is between cash, credit, and the national debt.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; I would not agree to that. I think it depends upon the relationship between the increased money on the one hand and real goods on the other.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; all right. Now, in order that the national debt may not be used to freeze up the investment capital and the purchasing power which should be available to purchase those goods according to this suggestion of the gentleman, which is very worthy, that we increase production to narrow the differential between goods and prices, does not the gentleman believe that we could do that first by displacing the public debt from the circulating media and provide for the security of the Federal Reserve by the issuance of Federal bonds?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman wants to know if we could not divorce the public debt from the circulating medium.

OUR NATIONAL MEDIUM OF EXCHANGE MUST NOT BE TIED TO DEBT

My contention is that we ought not only to divorce the circulating medium, whether cash or credit, completely from the national debt but we ought also to divorce it from the lending of money. The matter of lending money, the volume of loans of banks to private individuals or to the Federal Government ought to bear no intimate relationship or cause-and-effect relationship to the volume of money that we have in circulation; and yet today the volume of money in circulation depends directly on the volume of debt of the American people, either as a government or as individuals, and the extent of the increase of the Government debt is usually a reflection of the fact that private debt has not increased as fast as it needs to to keep up with the increase in our potential production.

The problem of even this huge national debt can be solved, but only if we apply a constitutional mandate to our action. That mandate is this:

> The Congress shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are the words of the Constitution of the United States. They are really the text of my speech.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE COMPLAINT AGAINST ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the House to a resolution I offer today for the preservation of a free press in America, as it was guaranteed in the first amendment to the Constitution. Specifically, I ask your support of my proposal to create a select committee of the House to investigate the circumstances which led the Department of Justice to bring a complaint against the Associated Press for alleged violation of the antitrust laws.

Let me say at the outset that a resolution likewise authorizing an investigation of this matter was offered to the House on Thursday last, January 21, by my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER. I want to say that my colleague's resolution and my own are in no wise conflicting. In fact, his purpose and mine are identical. Whereas the original resolution would direct that the investigation be undertaken by the Judiciary Committee, my proposal would create a special committee to conduct the investigation.

While the matter in question may be considered to be properly within the province of the Judiciary Committee, there appear to be factors indicating that this is more than a routine court procedure, or than an ordinary civil action brought by the Department of Justice in the regular administration of Federal law. I believe that this action directly and vitally touches basic private rights specifically guaranteed in the Bill of Rights in a way which should make it of paramount interest to the whole House.

I foresee a further reason why this subject may more fittingly be placed in the hands of a select committee than with the Committee on the Judiciary. This important standing committee deals regularly and continuously with matters pertaining to our Federal court system in such a close relationship that its members might feel constrained to avoid such action as is proposed while the matter is pending before the courts, lest there be undue influence upon the courts implicit in their action. That implication can be entirely avoided if an inquiry is conducted by a select committee.

The House is undoubtedly familiar with the much-publicized suit against the Associated Press filed in the United States District Court, Southern District of New York, on August 28, last. Burden of the complaint is that the Associated Press illegally restricts the use of its news-gathering and news-dispatching facilities; that Associated Press has no legal right to choose and restrict its membership, or to require its participating member newspapers to furnish locally gathered news to the membership of the association.

The House is also undoubtedly familiar with the counter charges and complaints which have arisen against the Department of Justice as a result of this action against the Associated Press, for publishers without regard to their immediate relation to the case, have boldly and vigorously denounced the action as a direct attack upon the American free press, or as an effort to control and direct wire services for the special benefit of publishers who are administration supporters. The unadorned facts in the case convince me that either or both counter charges may be justified.

In the first place, the type of service which an association of newspapers accomplishes in an organization such as the Associated Press is by no means new in principle, or so exclusive in operation as to destroy competitor publishers. In all the years that news has been transmitted in associations or syndicates, only a few publishers have sought to test the validity of such services as the Associated Press. In the few instances where disappointed publishers have sought relief through antitrust action, the Department of Justice has refused to find the association method of collecting and distributing news a violation of the Antitrust Act. Why, then, should the Department of Justice now press this action, unless it is motivated by a hidden desire to bring the American press under the control and direction of the central government or to favor, for political reasons, certain newspapers?

In the second place, the character of this news service, while distinctly unlike other business enterprises in some respects, no more violates the spirit of our antitrust laws than many other common and accepted American business practices. The Associated Press is by no means the only source of telegraphic news service. There are two other similar services regularly collecting and distributing news in a very similar way, and

in addition, there are numerous syndicated feature services available to any publisher who desires them. Finally, no publisher is denied the right to maintain his own special correspondents and news bureaus. How, then, can the Department of Justice support the charge that the Associated Press rules impose unreasonable restraints upon any publisher who is denied its services? I contend that it is just as logical to say that a motorcar company, or any other manufacturer or service organization distributing its goods or services on an exclusive basis, is fully as guilty of antitrust violation as the Associated Press. Would it, in your opinion, make sense for the Department of Justice to attack General Motors because that organization refuses to give a person half of a sales territory developed by an already established dealer? Of course not. Even the men who designed this action against Associated Press would laugh such a person out of their offices and tell him that if he could not sell Chevrolets to try Fords or Plymouths, or even another line of business.

If there is actually nothing in the activities of the Associated Press which denies to nonmembers the right to gather, distribute, and publish news; if there is nothing in its operating policies actually inconsistent with long-established American principles of business, just what is it that the Department of Justice attempts to prove or to accomplish in this action? Has it really found a point at issue here which has long been overlooked or rejected in other administrations? Has it a just complaint, or is there, on the other hand, real basis for the fears that this is a designed and deliberate attack upon the guaranties of the first amendment to the Constitution? Or, finally, is there any merit in the charges commonly heard that this action is founded on the desire of this administration to promote the selfish interests of certain publishers who promise to be blind followers and supporters of a political administration in payment of special privileges secured?

However you look at this picture, you must be impressed with the thought that there are factors here which do not meet the eye. This is not an ordinary suit, based upon the accepted meaning of the antitrust laws. Neither is there anything new or different in the practices of the defendants which would seem to warrant this attempt to impose an entirely new interpretation of our antitrust laws. Under the circumstances, there appears to be sufficient basis for the charges arising against the Department of Justice to warrant a full and careful review of all the factors involved in this action. Under any circumstances, we must jealously guard the freedoms guaranteed in the first amendment to the Constitution and restated by the President in his words of promise to the entire world. But now, more than ever, as we work under the blackout of censorship which necessarily limits the right of free speech and free press, we certainly must be zealous to allow no unwarranted infringement of these rights.

The American press has demonstrated over and over again its thorough loyalty. Both before and since the outbreak of war, it has cooperated magnificently in its meticulously careful handling of strategic news, and in its furtherance of our defense and war efforts. It has in every way fully justified the confidence and trust placed in it. It certainly deserves better from the American people than this reward which the administration has prepared for it unless there are circumstances supporting this complaint which have entirely escaped us. I hope the House will see fit, therefore, to undertake a searching review of the whole matter.

### ITALY'S SAD PLIGHT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes, if there is no objection from any of those who have special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the capture of Tripoli is a bad blow to the Axis, and is a stunning blow to the Italians. It is apparent from news items that the Italian people did not know of the danger of its capture. Its capture means the fall of the last bastion of the Italian Empire in Africa.

But more, the defeat of Rommel's army and its hasty retreat ought to convey to the people of Italy a greater story—that the Nazis, in a pinch, think only of themselves. Rommel's only interest was to save as many Germans as he could. He left his Italian allies to their fate. His disregard of the welfare of the Italian soldiers engaged in the battle of Africa ought to open the eyes of the people of Italy to the fact that the Nazis have a cold, inhuman regard, not only of those they conquer, but, also, in a pinch, of their own allies.

A Fascist spokesman in Rome Saturday said over the radio:

> The eyes of all Italians are turned on Libya as each one asks himself anxiously, "What is happening there?" Well, there is only one answer. We are fighting, fighting harder than ever, and desperately, against overwhelming strong enemy forces. More than this we cannot, at this moment, say.

Yes; something more could be said. The people of Italy could be told, and we should tell them from outside of Italy that the Nazi forces in Africa deserted the Italian soldiers. Rommel thought only of the Germans, and to save as many as he could.

Yes; on the Russian front, the same thing is happening to the Hungarians, the Rumanians, and other non-Germans, most of whom are fighting for Nazi Germany against their will.

The people of Italy and these other countries should awaken to what has happened and is happening to their own people. In Italy, the Fascist regime is dominated by Nazi Germany. For all practical purposes Italy is another conquered country. It has been bled and it will continue to be bled, as long as the people of Italy remain passive to Nazi control, and as long as Nazi Germany can use Italy and its people.

If the people of Italy did not know it before they must know it now—that Nazi Germany thinks only of itself.

Mussolini's boastful dreams are over. Hundreds of thousands of Italians have been killed, wounded, and captured. Italy has been bled in every other respect. Its soldiers have been left to their fate—deserted by the Germans whenever the going is bad. Italy and its people face a dreadful future.

When the going is rough, the Nazis will desert the Italians in Italy proper just as quickly as they deserted the Italian soldiers in Africa.

The question that interests many persons is, "How long will the people of Italy stand this situation? How long will they continue to permit themselves to be deserted?"

One thing is certain: If Italy capitulated to the United Nations the fate and future of Italy and its people would be much better than continuing under the domination of the Nazi war machine.

The desertion in Africa of the Italian soldiers by Rommel should be stressed in Italy by the propaganda agencies of the United Nations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

### PAY-AS-YOU-EARN PERSONAL INCOME TAX

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the President has presented to the Congress a Budget exceeding $100,000,000,000. On January 19 the national debt was $109,509,275,786.72. The American people will be called upon to pay taxes to the full limit of their ability in order that as large a portion of this huge war bill as possible may be met from current income. It is important, therefore, to do everything within our power, Mr. Speaker, to perfect our tax structure so that this immense burden resting upon the taxpayers may be borne with a minimum of suffering and hardship.

To this end the Congress and the American people are deeply interested in the proposal to abandon our archaic method of collecting personal income taxes a year and a quarter after the taxes have been imposed upon the taxpayer, and substituting therefor a pay-as-you-go, or a pay-as-you-earn, program collecting the taxes currently; that is, the 1943 taxes, for instance, would be collected in 1943 and not in 1944. This plan is known as the Ruml plan, due to the fact that Mr. Beardsley Ruml, chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, advanced the proposal to the United States Treasury and to the Senate Finance Committee last year. Under it the 1942 taxes would be abated. This plan is applied to individuals only and not to corporations. As originally proposed it did not include the collection-at-source provision. Its objective is to put personal income taxes on a current basis

without paying 2 years' taxes in one. Mr. Ruml himself said in discussing it on the C. B. S. network January 16 last:

> The answer is as simple as daylight saving. Let us turn our tax clocks ahead 1 year. The taxes we have paid last year out of our 1942 income are taxes on our incomes received in 1941. We can best solve the problem now by recognizing these 1942 payments to be taxes on 1941 as they really are; and by beginning 1943 by paying on 1943, thereby dropping out the year 1942 from the tax calendar forever.

This plan has been defined as follows:

> Individuals will pay income taxes during a given year on that year's income, determined tentatively by the preceding year's income and subject to year-end adjustment. Taxes for 1942 are waived.

It will be recalled that our first endeavor to levy an income tax ran afoul of the Federal Constitution and it became necessary to amend the Constitution in order to avail ourselves of the income-tax principle. Fundamentally it is based on the ability of the taxpayer to pay, and at the same time giving the taxpayer the opportunity to share in the responsibilities of government by helping to pay for its operation by contributing a fair share of his income with as little hardship as possible.

When the income tax law was passed in October 1913, unfortunately it was provided that the first tax should be collected in 1914 but should be considered as a 1913 tax and should be based on income for the previous year 1913. Since that time we have always been a year behind in paying income taxes. It was an erroneous plan to call this tax the 1913 tax rather than a tax for the year 1914, which in fact it was. It results in great hardship to taxpayers and heavy financial loss to the Government.

In theory a citizen pays taxes to his Government each year measured by his ability to do so for the purpose of securing the advantages of living under the protection of his Government. It is erroneous to assume that any individual citizen having paid income taxes during his entire lifetime while receiving taxable income has not discharged the full duty resting upon him as a citizen in helping to defray the expenses of his Government. Under our present law he not only pays during his entire lifetime on taxable income but his Government stands at his open grave seeking an additional year's taxes from his estate. This extra post-mortem income tax, it should be remembered, is in addition to an estate tax or inheritance tax levied against his estate upon his death.

The main objection which has been urged against the proposal for pay as you earn or current payment of personal income taxes is that the 1942 taxes must be waived or an onerous burden placed upon taxpayers of paying 2 years' taxes in 1. The United States Treasury has opposed the proposal for this reason, and it continues to oppose it. It does, however, recognize the value of changing over to the current-payment plan and has even suggested the postponement of the 1942 liability or the rebating of a portion thereof and the collection of the balance in installments spread over a period of years. It would seem, however, that the taxpayers as a group having to meet the large exactions for taxes under our present war conditions should not be called upon to pay an additional tax during the same period, or should not be required to meet such an obligation in the distant future.

A savings clause could be included in the proposed law providing that in any event the 1943 tax of any individual should not be less than it would have been under our present law. This proviso would take care of windfall cases where taxpayers made large incomes in 1942 and had no income during 1943, or smaller incomes than in 1942. In any event the law should be framed to give adequate protection to the men in our armed forces. This would meet the objection urged by the Treasury Department, as set forth by Mr. Randolph Paul, General Counsel, in his statement of December 8, which appeared in the Washington Post December 17 last, when he said:

> The Treasury has opposed the original Ruml plan for several reasons. This plan does not, in fact, put the taxpayer on a current basis; it merely changes labels on the income-tax payments he is now making. By canceling a year's tax liability it gives a windfall to persons whose incomes were abnormally high in that year.

Mr. Speaker, the consideration that should control us in adopting a tax program should be to provide the maximum of tax revenues with the least burden upon the taxpayers. The present plan of collecting a year or more after the tax is imposed is indefensible. As a class, income taxpayers pay their taxes from current income, and such taxes should be collected currently. There are some 35,000,000 taxpayers under the present personal-income-tax program; 9,000,000 new taxpayers. Even though there would be individual cases where windfalls would result to the taxpayer by shifting to the pay-as-you-earn method of collection, the great advantage accruing to the other taxpayers would completely offset such advantage in a few individual cases.

The waiver of the 1942 taxes by adopting this proposal coupled with a withholding at source provision, it is believed, will not result in any financial loss to the Federal Government. The Treasury program would not be disrupted, because Treasury financing is based on tax income received and not on tax debts. As pointed out under this proposal, taxes would be paid in 1943 and in larger amounts under the proposed plan than under the existing tax program, and the Government would continue to collect from every taxpayer as long as he lives and continues to receive a taxable income. The only apparent loss would be at his death or upon failure to receive taxable income. That loss, however, would be spread over a generation or more of taxpayers and would cover a period of 25 to 50 years. Furthermore, the additional taxes collected and savings made by the Treasury under the pay-as-you-earn provision would more than offset this apparent loss. Those taxpayers who hereafter die while this plan is in operation, leaving estates subject to an estate or inheritance tax, will still be contributing through their estates to the Federal Government on any enrichment such a taxpayer might have received by reason of the abating of the 1942 tax.

The present personal income-tax plan of always being a year or more behind in the payment of taxes is outmoded and indefensible. It keeps our taxpayers in hot water, always in debt, and subject to continuous worry as to how they will pay this year's taxes next year when the tax collector calls. They are always paying for a dead horse. A pay-as-you-earn plan with collection at source will relieve these millions of taxpayers of the unnecessary worry and hardship. It will bring to them peace of mind and remove the ever present specter of a tax debt staring them in the face. It will also be of equal advantage to the Government. It will provide a continuous stream of tax dollars coming into the Treasury currently as the taxes are imposed and as income is earned. Collecting at the source will relieve the Treasury of trouble and expense in following up and collecting delinquencies and prevent more taxpayers from escaping their tax liabilities. Uncle Sam, by necessity, is going to exact as heavy tax payments as the traffic will bear anyway to meet the war demands. Shifting 1942 taxes and adopting a current payment system will simplify the procedure and will aid materially in financing the war. It will not only be a welcome relief to overburdened taxpayers, but will help their morale in the big task of providing the sinews of war.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that this House will enact at an early date a law providing for the current payment of personal income taxes, with a withholding-at-the-source provision, and that it may be put into effect at the earliest practical time, not only to bring relief to the great body of overburdened taxpayers of our country, but also to help fill our Treasury with tax dollars for the successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the gentleman that we ought to transfer from the year behind to the current-year method of collecting income taxes, and I want to commend him for a strong statement to that effect. I cannot agree with the gentleman in regard to some other things. The gentleman implies that there is no other alternative in order to make this change but that we must collect 2 years in one, the 1942 and 1943 taxes this year. I think there is another alternative.

Mr. ANGELL. May I say to the gentleman that was not my complete statement. I said the Government could try to collect them all in 1 year, or else apportion the 1942 taxes over a number of years, or remit in part and apportion the rest.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad to get straight on that. I think that is another alternative which I would favor, if the gentleman will elaborate upon it.

I want to ask the gentleman, Do we not have, at least in some of the States, the sale of tax anticipation bonds? For instance, I know of a State which in

time of depression sold a special bond issue known as tax-anticipation bonds and these were a lien upon the taxes of a given year. If those taxes had not been collected, there would have been nothing to pay the bonds for tax-anticipation bonds constitute no lien upon the State's other resources. If the taxes for that year had been abated or forgiven, the bondholders would have been out of luck. They would not have been paid. As I see it, all United States bonds are in a sense tax-anticipation bonds. I feel that if we forgive the taxes for any given year we are jeopardizing the credit of the Nation just to that extent.

Mr. ANGELL. I may say to the gentleman, unfortunately that is not the position of the Federal Government. It bases its operations upon tax receipts and not upon tax debts or taxes to be collected. There is only available to it the taxes that are received and for that reason the principle to which the gentleman refers would not apply, in my judgment. In view of the fact that from 70 to 75 percent or more of the people pay their taxes from current income, and that in this year and the next several years we are going to have to pay everything that we can stand to take care of current taxes, it is my view that it is an idle attempt to put an additional year on the already heavily burdened taxpayers of this year or to spread it over a period of years. That is the very thing we are trying to avoid. We are trying to relieve the people of this unnecessary worry. As long as we collect from an American citizen a personal income tax for every year of his life, why should we say to his relatives at his death, and to his heirs or to his estate, "Pay another year of taxes in addition to the heavy inheritance or Federal estate taxes"?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; this survival tax must be heavy but not too heavy. Without increasing any individual's yearly income-tax burden above what it would be with 1942 forgiven, I would not forgive 1942 but amortize that tax over a number of years so that a fractional part of this 1942 tax would be included in each yearly payment for a period.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I want to compliment the gentleman from Oregon on his fine statement. It shows that he has made a thorough study of this problem, and he has demonstrated by his statement that there are only two ways to get the taxes, either move the tax clock ahead or collect the taxes 2 years in 1, or spread it over a period of years.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman is absolutely correct in his concluding statement.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes, and at that time to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a report of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries concerning the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation which will exceed the 2-page limitation, at a cost estimated by the Public Printer to be $247.50.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMAS of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter received from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am going to address the House on a very important subject matter, the establishment of a separate committee to deal with civil aeronautics. I am glad that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], both members of the Committee on Rules, as well as the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], one of the authors of this proposal and also a member of the Committee on Rules, are present to hear what observations I have to make on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, there have been introduced at this session thus far eight resolutions designed to create a permanent standing committee on civil aviation.

According to the phraseology of some of these resolutions, whether or not there would be encroachment upon the prerogatives of the Military and Naval Affairs Committees is open to question.

As to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I should say that committee would be stripped of all of its civil aviation jurisdiction.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has general jurisdiction of bills affecting domestic and foreign commerce—except such as may affect the revenue—and the two standing defense committees—Military and Naval—have jurisdiction of all legislation relating to the military and naval establishments.

Very frankly, I am willing to admit that when we again shall be at peace, it may be that we shall need to sit down and canvass the whole aviation picture and redraft our mode of legislative approach, but today, in the midst of war, any disturbance of presently prescribed procedure would not prove to be a step forward, but rather a move that would tend to create confusion, occasion delay, and thereby interfere with the war's vigorous prosecution.

There is no civil aviation in the United States today. The military is in complete control, as it should be, and as it will be again, should we become involved in another war after this one.

Production is in control of the military and operations are in control of the military. Every airplane, despite its designed use, is a potential military asset or weapon. Our peacetime air liners have become troop, cargo, and essential defense and nondefense personnel conveyors.

Privately owned planes are employed upon auxiliary scouting and observation missions. Flight by any, except in certain exempt areas, is prohibited by the military or is controlled by the military. There practically exists today no civil aviation in a peacetime sense in this country.

The Congress has established in recent years a Civil Aeronautics Administration and a Civil Aeronautics Board.

That legislation originated in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—not a special committee on civil aviation, and for it the country should be profoundly grateful to that committee's great chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], and to his committee colleagues, for their wisdom and foresight. Its value in this war situation has proved to be immeasurable.

The civilian pilot training program, the development of landing areas, the installation of air navigation facilities and the development thereof, including communications and directional guidance, and the accomplishments of the Civil Aeronautics Board, have all been of the greatest value to the country in the prosecution of the war, and every phase of the work of these agencies today is performed under the closest kind of cooperation with our military and naval air arms. In time of war, in fact, they may be said to be adjuncts of our defense arms, like the Coast Guard, for example, is of the Navy. They are part and parcel of the defense establishments.

There must be this close relationship and military dominance in time of war, and, in time of peace, that which we do must have relation to possible war conditions and demands.

Our progress in aviation has been phenominal. It is not all due to legislation. Much of it has been due to the force, and drive, and vision of our enterprising industrialists.

Civil and military development is closely interwoven.

Development of all types of planes has a direct relationship, and particularly is this true when we get into the heavy types.

We have a National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Army and Navy each engages in research, and industry, I dare say, has done as much

or more than these three both in fundamental and applied research and in development of the art generally.

What would be the jurisdictional subjects, then, of a standing committee on civil aviation? The commerce side of the picture is now in most capable hands. I see nothing, therefore, but the private flier, and he is out of the picture until the war is over.

Aviation, we all know, has advanced by leaps and bounds. It will continue to grow. After the war it may become the chief common carrier within and to points without our borders.

All signs point to its wide use by individuals, either for pleasure or transportation in place of or as an additional means over the automobile. It is conceivable that there may then arise a need for legislation which goes beyond the jurisdiction of existing committees. I maintain that that need is not now present.

In the midst of war, why should we be changing our rules to give jurisdiction to a committee "on aviation," over aviation subjects, "including all commercial and civil aviation and including their relationship with or between Army and naval air services"? That is the phraseology of the Fish resolution, the Hinshaw resolution, the Nichols resolution, the Randolph resolution, and that, substantially, is the tenor of the several other resolutions.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is not the phraseology of the resolution I asked the Committee on Rules to consider.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is the one the gentleman introduced on January 6.

Mr. NICHOLS. I introduced two resolutions.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. NICHOLS. One of them had nothing to do with the relationship of commercial and civil aviation to the Army and naval air services.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The resolution the gentleman introduced on January 6 is exactly as I have stated.

Mr. NICHOLS. But it is not the resolution I asked the Committee on Rules to consider.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In addition, the gentleman introduced a resolution for the establishment of a committee on civil aeronautics and did not define its jurisdiction.

What does civil aviation comprise? Does it embrace manufacture? Does it embrace commercial aviation in time of war, when it virtually is under control of the military? Does it embrace air navigation? Does it include the Federal Airways System, particularly to Alaska, Hawaii, and other Pacific islands, and the Caribbean area, solely of use and value to the military in time of war?

And what is embraced by "relationship with or between Army and naval air services" We are at war. Do we want to have another legislative agency established that will have a voice in legislating directly or indirectly for the defense establishments?

I do not want to see Congress do a foolish thing. The war is not over in any sense. God only knows when it will be over. Our chief concern just now should be in doing those things which will hasten its conclusion; not to delay it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Just as a matter of information, may I ask the gentleman what committee of the House has jurisdiction over the matters to which the gentleman has just referred, civil airways, airports, and so forth?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. One of the most outstanding committees of the Congress, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a group of as brilliant men as sit on the floor of this House. What they have accomplished has been of the greatest value in the prosecution of this war.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Does the Committee on Naval Affairs or the Committee on Military Affairs have anything to do now with the subjects to which the gentleman has referred, or are they entirely under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Civil aeronautics and military aeronautics are so interwoven that, particularly in wartime, a new committee should not be established to deal with that question.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Why?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. For the reasons I have just stated.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman has not given a good reason.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It may not sound good to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, but it sounds good to me.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I do not want to offend the gentleman. The gentleman cannot praise the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for their 1938 act in more vigorous language than I.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then why does the gentleman propose to take it away and set up to deal with that subject matter a new group that has no knowledge of it?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I can answer that question in a simple sentence.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman has received permission to address the House later today. He can answer it then.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman does not want an answer.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; we want this question debated fully and it will be debated fully.

Instead of a greater division of control in the Congress, we should be striving for greater unity of control. That is the way to hasten the day of victory. We are prone to criticize lack of unity downtown and on the battle fronts. We are continually hearing complaint of the superimposement of activities upon established executive agencies and of the decentralization of existing agencies. Let us begin at home and have more unity in the control of our legislation bearing upon the prosecution of the war.

I have pending before the Committee on Rules myself a resolution seeking to have greater unity of action and legislative direction of defense programs by our Military and Naval Affairs Committees. We need more teamwork, more pulling together, more seeing eye to eye here in this House, to bring this war to a speedy close. That should be our main concern, and I submit that these pending proposals to create another jurisdiction over aviation matters, inseparable in their civil and military phases in time of war, would be a delaying action which this House should not for a single moment countenance.

When the peace has come, and that will be time enough, the leadership on both sides can get together and determine whether or not there is ample warrant further to divide present jurisdiction or create new jurisdiction. It would not be in the interest of national defense to do so at this time.

For all those who will hear there is gaining throughout the land in rising volume a pulse beat and an undertone which unmistakably demand that we representatives of the people must stop government as usual and concentrate on streamlining our efforts toward winning the war.

This resolution to create an additional committee to regulate aviation should not be approved because it is inconsistent with that undertone and that pulse beat.

Here we are in the midst of a war to the death. Millions of our men are in it. Hundreds of thousands of them are on foreign soil. Thousands have already made the supreme sacrifice. In these circumstances business as usual has stopped. Now it is the deadly serious business of kill or be killed.

These men in the armed services, and the loved ones they left behind them, and all the other patriotic Americans helping in the defense program, have every reason to expect and every right to insist that government shall not continue as usual, that Congress shall stop creating new committees in the House, new units, new divisions, new bureaus, and agencies, with all the confusing regulations, questionnaires, and paraphernalia they entail, and shall instead concentrate a maximum effort on winning the war.

If we do not do this, I do not want to be here to face the disillusionment, dissatisfaction, and bitterness which will be in the hearts of those boys who are fortunate enough to come back from the hell of Guadalcanal and the other fronts where men are fighting and dying.

In Georgia, no less than in every other State in the Union, every passing day brings fresh signs of growing and vociferous dissatisfaction caused by the multiplication of Government agencies. It is high time that we stopped creating new supervisors to supervise the supervisors.

The House, instead of condoning the addition of new committees, giving birth

to new bureaus, agencies, and divisions should be endeavoring to curtail all governmental activities not absolutely essential to winning this war.

The crying need of the hour is the consolidation and coordination of existing Government agencies and committees in Congress and not the creation of new ones.

The boy from your district now on the front lines and his parents back home would rather hear that Congress had abolished half of the Government agencies in existence and consolidated and coordinated House committees and streamlined the Government in the prosecution of the war than to hear that we had created new committees which will only bring on confusion worse confounded.

Most of our people now think that we have too many bureaus, too many agencies, and too many committees in Congress and they are looking to this new Congress to correct this situation and not to start off by creating new committees.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, there is a pending proposal to take from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce its jurisdiction over civil aviation and give that authority to a special committee. This is not a proposal simply to change the membership of the committee to deal with the question but an attempt to break down a policy of unification of transportation that has been carefully built up by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and approved by this House in the last 8 years.

It is, in my opinion, a move to do an injustice to the aviation industry.

The history of legislation in this country amply supports the proposition that a minor transportation agency that is unregulated or regulated by a separate agency is in effect a stepchild in the transportation system of this country. If we want to contribute to the future of aviation and its proper development, then we should let it keep its legitimate place in the transportation system of this county. Let it remain under the same legislative committee that has jurisdiction over the other great transportation agencies of the country. The proposal here is just as improvident as a proposal to create a separate committee on trucks or busses. It would be like a proposal to remove the dairy industry from the jurisdiction of the Agricultural Committee and to create a separate committee to deal with the dairy industry as distinguished from agriculture generally. It would be like creating a special committee for artillery and deprive the regular Military Affairs Committee of that jurisdiction; or like a special committee to take shore stations from the Naval Affairs Committee.

In recent years Congress has taken jurisdiction of pipe lines, highways, interstate water transportation, air, and freight forwarders, and placed them all in the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House. The last of these carriers to be placed under unified legislative control was the freight forwarders, last year. This completed the policy of embodying every type of public service interstate commerce transportation in the United States, within the jurisdiction of that committee. That means a unified, legislative control of the subject of transportation.

Prior to that time the transportation of this country suffered enough to amply justify this policy. In 1887, when the transportation act was passed, Judge Cooley, a great judge and a great statesman, became the first Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission. He then proposed that all interstate transportation agencies be placed under unified regulation. Unfortunately that was not done. I believe a careful study of the decades that followed will prove that the greatest sufferer from that mistake was the Mississippi Valley. It made the Interstate Commerce Commission a rail commission instead of a transportation commission. It owed no duty to the water carriers. They had no standing to plead their rights. They were outside of regulatory protection. The result was that the Interstate Commerce Commission was in effect a rail commission instead of a transportation commission. In the last 10 years we have tried to build up the regulation of transportation to make it apply to all interstate transportation and not merely to one particular branch of transportation. Unified legislative control has been approved by this House.

I call attention to the fact that members of the minority party as recently as the enactment of the Civil Aeronautics Act gave their support to the unified legislative control of all transportation agencies. The first name on a minority report on that bill was that of Carl Mapes, of revered respect in this House. The list also included Mr. Wolverton, Mr. Wolfenden, Mr. Holmes, Mr. Reece, Mr. Wadsworth, Mr. Halleck and Mr. Withrow. After my close association with those men, they have my very high respect. In that report they urged that the Interstate Commerce Commission be given jurisdiction of civil aviation and in addition to that they make this declaration:

> There should be unified control of all phases of transportation.

That was just good sense, good statesmanship, and these men of the highest quality in the minority party gave it their approval.

Now we have, of course, civil and military control. Let us look at that feature for a moment. Transportation as an economic phase of our country is one of the greatest problems the Government of the United States must deal with. The people of this country pay over $20,000,000,000 a year in normal times for transportation. This is a land of great distances, widespread productive areas, and great consuming capacity. Transportation is the connecting link between the producers and consumers of the country. Everything that the American people buy has added to it the cost of transportation. No persons in this country can escape the fact that transportation concerns them. I am one of those who believe there are a good many inequalities in the rate structure of this country that should and can be corrected if the policy of this committee as pursued, be carried to its logical conclusion. We have looked forward, not from the standpoint of committee jurisdiction, but rather for the better regulation of transportation, to the benefit of the people of this country.

Of the $20,000,000,000 and more which the country pays for transportation, something like eight billions is paid for public service transportation, and the balance is for the construction of roads and harbors; and for private transportation, which is not subject to regulation. The amount paid to the air carriers last year amounted to about $105,000,000, which, of course, is a small proportion of the total the American people pay for transportation.

What is the object of regulatory civilian control of transportation? We have the implements of war. They are not subject to civilian regulation. We give them to the Army and the Navy, including airplanes, and we say to them, use these implements of destruction to defend America and win our wars. Their military use is not a matter for civilian regulation. We exercise general regulation over only that transportation that is engaged in serving the public for hire, the public service of the United States. That regulation is for the purpose of protecting the public in its dealing with these transportation agencies, and to protect the carriers in their relation to the public and their competitors. Those are among the purposes of regulation.

When the act of 1887 was passed it took in rails alone. There had been great abuse in the railroad industry to the injury and injustice of the people of the United States. Therefore, much of the movement that led to that legislation was punitive in purpose. In recent years that has been changed. The legitimate motive of regulation is instructive. It has in mind both the welfare of the public and the carriers. Aviation came to this Congress and asked to be regulated. We did not regulate it because of abuses in the industry. The motive was the constructive purpose of aiding aviation, of building it up and developing its use for the benefit of the Nation.

Aviation is transportation. Nobody can deny that. There is a common relation between the regulation of all of these transportation agencies. For instance, here are some of the common purposes of regulation. In the first place, we require inspection of the carrier. Whether it be a locomotive, a motor vehicle, a steamboat, or an airplane, its qualifications for the uses for which it is designed must be established before it can get a certificate to operate.

There are requirements as to the ability of the operators to perform their services. There is a certificate of convenience required by which the carrier establishes his right to perform the particular service and the routes that he

is to serve. There are provisions against discriminations, rebates, as to the anti-trust laws, against interlocking directorates, liability to passengers and shippers, the duty to authorize service, and, finally, the regulation of rates.

The healthiness of any carrier depends upon the condition of its balance sheet. If it cannot make money it is on the way out finally, and if it does make money it should be able to give efficient service to the public. So that from an economic standpoint, looking to the welfare of the public carrier, the thing we must look to is his balance sheet. What is going to be the effect upon that balance sheet? Now, what is coming for aviation?

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I will ask the gentleman to wait until I have finished.

Aviation is today in the heyday of its existence in this country. The war has taken it over; the question of cost is not a consideration, in order to get transportation for our military purposes. Nearly every civil air carrier in the world up to this date has operated under a direct subsidy or subsidized rates. Very few carriers are today on a self-supporting basis from an economic standpoint. Up to this time civil aviation has been possible on account of the subsidization of the industry. After the war is over we are going to have a great supply of engines and airplanes; we are going to have factories turned to production; and we are going to have uses to which the the airplane can be applied—things that may mean a great deal to the future of our country if we can successfully deal with this question.

But when the gray dawn appears after the war is over, a very practical problem is going to confront the industry. The industry is largely going to have its future determined by how it can meet competitive rates. It has limited cargo-carrying capacity and limited classes of service to which it can appeal for support. As it expands beyond its present limits it is going to meet the competitive transportation industries of this country.

If I were running an air line, having in mind what we are going to face after the war is over, I would not come here and say, "Release me from the general committee of Congress that deals with transportation." I would say, "Put me in that general scheme of regulation." I would say, "Take me under your protection as a full-fledged member of the transportation system of this country. Consider the value of the service I can give to this country and give me a just place within the scheme of transportation. Don't treat me as a stepchild or cripple."

If you go under a separate committee, that separate committee can legislate for you, but it cannot legislate to control your competitor or assure you legal protection against him.

A general transportation committee owes a protective care to all the agencies under its jurisdiction. It is the legislative authority and umpire to assure justice between competing carriers. It has both a protecting and restraining power as to each against the other. That is not true where separate committees are given jurisdiction of competing transportation agencies.

The destructively low rate has been the weapon used by the strong carriers against the weak. With $8,000,000,000 a year being paid to public-service carriers, and aviation receiving only $105,000,000 of that amount the safest place for aviation is within the protecting care of that general committee which has the power of restraint as well as protection against all of our public-service carriers.

Aviation has the distinct advantage of the time element in competitive transportation, but it has a comparatively limited class of traffic so far as cargo is concerned to which it can look for its best support. Its legitimate source of income should not be impaired by the destructively low rates its competitors might impose.

The shipping public has little objection to destructive rates if it can get the profit out of them temporarily.

If the limited types of carriage, on which aviation must mainly depend for its future, can be cut from under the aviation industry, it will be restricted in its progress. That is a possibility that should not be invited by the establishment of a limited legislative control for its protection.

Rather than discard the main transportation committee of the House so far as aviation is concerned, we should say to it, "We expect you to be the guardian and protector of this industry and do justice between all these agencies of transportation." If we do not have the wisdom and fairness to do that thing we are not fit to be the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I prefer to finish, if the gentleman will permit. I have a great deal more than my time will allow me to say.

Now, our committee is not a stranger to the question of aviation. I have probably given more time since I have been in Congress to aviation than any other single subject, notwithstanding the Transportation Act. I was on the war investigating committee. My section was aviation. That investigation lasted a year. We made exhaustive reports. I was on the select committee of 1924. I wrote the body of the report by that committee, by consent of both sides. I was on the subcommittee that wrote the Air Commerce Act of 1926, which looked primarily to safety. Then when the Civil Aeronautics Act came before the Congress I happened to be chairman of this committee, and we had a lot of work to get that bill through. One of the principal difficulties we had was to shake loose the departments of this Government from the control that they wanted to exercise. A short-sighted, destructive control prevailed. We had to fight a year with those departments to shake them loose. What do we have at the present time?

We have a unified legislative control of all the transportation agencies of this country. We have a separate regulatory body for aviation. Why did we do that? Because aviation was a new industry still in the course of rapid development. Administration involved details which required much attention. Aviation has a promotion factor in addition to all the ordinary elements of regulation. There are so many details of the administrative functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board and of the Administrator that we wanted a body that could give its complete time to those duties

Now in that body we have experts to advise us on every problem of aviation. We do not need those experts on the committee; we cannot make an airplane or take part in its construction; we cannot plan it, we cannot operate it, and we cannot administer it. Every man in this Congress knows the difference between the legislative function of the Congress and the administrative function of the executive departments. Congress cannot attempt successfully to perform the administrative function.

In 1937 and 1938 this committee took up the question of legislation for aviation. What was then the situation of aviation? One hundred and twenty million dollars had been invested in aviation for transportation. Of that capital $60,000,000 of the $120,000,000 had been washed out. We were urged to hasten legislation because there were at least two American lines that were facing bankruptcy. Their immediate hope of survival was in the passage of that act. So we have in mind the financial condition of the industry. Credit with the banks and with investors was about to disappear.

After this act was passed there was little difficulty about financing; the investors were ready with their money; the investors had confidence, and the investments had multiplied between three and four hundred percent before this war as a result of that legislation.

FOREIGN SERVICE

We hear a great deal about the foreign service in aviation. This foreign relationship of aviation was not discovered just yesterday, it is a long-standing situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend for just a moment?

ELECTION CONTEST—SULLIVAN AGAINST MILLER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Elections No. 3 and ordered printed:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., January 25, 1943.*

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: This office has unofficial knowledge of the bringing of a contest growing out of the election held on November 3, 1942, for a seat in the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Eleventh Congressional District of the State of Missouri.

On December 9, 1942, John B. Sullivan served notice on LOUIS E. MILLER, returned Member from the Eleventh Congressional

District of the State of Missouri, of his intention to contest the election of the said MILLER. Reply to this notice was made by LOUIS E. MILLER on December 28, 1942. From this latter date, the 90 days provided by law in which to take testimony in support of the allegations began to run. Now comes the parties to the contest in communication addressed to me dated January 20, 1943, making joint application for order or recount and setting forth the reasons therefor.

The joint letter signed by the parties to the contest together with the four enclosures noted therein are submitted herewith for the consideration of the appropriate committee.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. LEA. An American air carrier acquires its right to operate in foreign countries by two different methods: One is through rights acquired by treaty between this country and the foreign country; the other is by negotiating their own agreements with such country. We had this matter up with the State Department when this bill was written in 1938. At that time, Germany in particular, and Italy to a degree, were engaged in trying to control airlines in South America. They were engaged in a movement not only directed against the economic interests of the United States, but against the very safety of this country as a Nation. The State Department was fully aware of that. Mr. Moore, beloved in this House, then in the State Department, took an active interest in that problem. Without any fanfare or headline effort we tried to work out a plan to meet that situation.

There were two difficulties: In the first place if our Government negotiates a treaty with another country it usually results in granting reciprocal rights. In order to get a right by treaty with another country that country will commonly demand reciprocal rights. We might get the worst end of the bargain because we are the assertive Nation, we actively seek a privilege by going there and trying to acquire our rights. They may not be in aviation, but they will say, "We will give you those rights but in return we will require that our country be accorded similar rights in the United States." Those rights can be transferred to unfriendly nations; so we may sacrifice by making treaty agreements.

It was considered better on the whole to let these aviation companies so far as possible work out their own treaties with these different countries. This we did with the requirement that the agreement with a foreign country shall be subject to the approval of the Civilian Aeronautics Board. A license is granted subject to the approval or disapproval of the President. In this way we avoid making the sacrifice that the system of reciprocal agreements would involve.

A provision of the act requires that the Board in fixing air-mail compensation shall take into consideration whether or not the revenue of the carrier taken with the other revenue of the air carrier would enable the carrier under efficient management to maintain and continue the development of the air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, the Postal Service, and the national defense. The Attorney General interpreted this language to mean that the Board had to take into consideration for instance cost and expense to our air lines in carrying out a contract for air lines in Latin America where those contracts are approved by the C. A. B. under section 412 of the act. That is the way we accomplished the purpose, and the German and Italian planes have been practically driven out of South America today because of that power given to the Civil Aeronautics Board. In other words we subsidized our foreign carriers sufficiently to enable them to cut out our destructive competitors in those countries. Today the American air lines are flying and giving service in over 50 nations of this earth. At the same time the good-neighbor policy and the activities of the State Department also greatly contributed in executing the general plans.

As to whether or not our committee has done a useful service in these matters I want to make three quotations. The first is by Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association of America, a society that included all the air lines of the United States. He has a comprehensive knowledge of all phases of aviation, probably not surpassed by any American. He made this statement in his personal capacity in 1939.

He said:

> With the air-transport industry forging ahead in its mission of public service, we are extremely fortunate in having as our Federal charter of regulation a new Civil Aeronautics Act, in the drafting of which the statesmanship of foresight was employed in liberal degree, and in the support of which the President and the Congress, after a patient, long-continued and conscientious study, made an immeasurable contribution to the needs and aspirations and the future welfare of our commerce, our Postal Service, and our national defense. Already America has recognized their action as just and wise. The brake has been taken from the wheel.

Then Eddie Rickenbacker, well known to our country, said recently after the Collier Trophy was given to the air lines and to the Army for the greatest accomplishment in aviation for last year:

> This award takes on special significance at this time because it brings to light the vision and foresight of the Congress of the United States and the Government in adopting, years ago, a long range program to foster, develop, and encourage civil aviation.
>
> Such a program, under which the air lines of the United States were developed to a degree of usefulness and efficiency unsurpassed anywhere else in the world, enabled them to be ready to help the Army solve one of the most difficult problems of the whole war.

The President, in 1939, said:

> Civil aviation is clearly recognized as the backlog of national defense in the Civil Aeronautics Act which set up the effective machinery for a comprehensive national policy with respect to the air.
>
> Underlying the statute is the principle that the country's welfare in time of peace, and its safety in time of war, rests upon the existence of a stabilized aircraft production—an economically and technically sound air transportation system, both domestic and overseas—an adequate supply of well-trained civilian pilots and ground personnel.

The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 was written by this committee after the hearings were completed. We made an exhaustive study, and the committee took time to do this. We were not on a headline hunting expedition. We accepted the responsibility that rested upon us as a committee of this House. We accepted the job as a plodding, working job, which it was.

We followed that with the Civilian Pilot Training Act, under which more than 50,000 boys were trained in primary flying before the war started. Many of them are now in the service. That training plan was later expanded.

An airport program was put into effect under this act and over 500 airfields have been established in the United States. The matter of airport regulations is important to the future of this country, it should be continued and no doubt will be, if we have proper supervision.

Now, a word about the future of aviation. Aviation, as I told you, received last year $105,000,000 for its services. Aviation should within a few years have an income of three or four hundred million dollars. The more it advances, the more efficient it becomes, the greater it can reduce the cost and increase the mechanical skill of the plane, the more important it will be in the transportation system of this country and the world.

In some respects the airplane made easy progress. It has a good appeal for patronage where time is essential. It has a good appeal to the passenger traffic. It can appeal to high-class freight—expensive but not very heavy. It can do a good service in carrying more of the mail of this country, I have no doubt. But it has had some hard troubles, too. The necessity of greater mechanical improvement, the cheaper production of planes, more endurance, and reduced fuel cost are of tremendous importance. Then it must produce a balance sheet on which its very life depends.

I was much interested when my attention was called a few days ago to an address by President Patterson, of the United American Lines, in which he compared the cost of transportation by airplane with the cost by freight train. He based his calculation on the assumption that under present costs it would cost 35 times more to transport a trainload of freight from Chicago to San Francisco and back by air than it would if it were done by freight train. Then he made a computation of the relative cost of transporting by airplane and ship cargo from San Francisco to Australia and back. He estimated that the final comparison was that airplane transportation would cost 250 times that of the ship.

Mr. NICHOLS. What kind of stuff was that? What commodity was involved?

Mr. LEA. That was based on weight—general cargo.

Mr. NICHOLS. What type of cargo?

Mr. LEA. General cargo of a ship. Understand this is heavy cargo.

Mr. MOTT. Is this in peacetime or wartime?

Mr. LEA. I was going to say that is based upon the present estimate of cost. My judgment is that the airplane as we have it today and as we can reasonably expect to have it in the next 2 years can make a much better showing than was thus estimated. I mention this simply to show the other side of the picture. We have had too much reckless, unthinking appraisement of what is going to occur in the future.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BULWINKLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Patterson estimates that to carry that shipload to Australia and back by air would take 18,000,000 gallons of gasoline. It would take three cargo ships of 15,000 tons each to haul the gasoline that would be necessary to supply the airplanes to carry out that transportation problem overseas. The ship would carry the same cargo from San Francisco to Australia and return on 500,000 gallons of oil, which, of course, makes a tremendous difference.

But when all is said and done we can say that so far as heavy freight is concerned, and low-grade freight, there is still a vast spread in the practical competition between the airplane and surface carriers.

The Civil Aeronautics Board is authorized to recommend legislation to the Congress. Our committee has a subcommittee on aviation. Some months ago we determined to hold hearings on these questions. I may say right here that my constant attitude with the Government officials and with the industry itself since the Civil Aeronautics Act has been passed has been that our committee passed that legislation. We want it to be successful and whenever we get any suggestion that shows substantial need of improvement, we will be glad to consider it and report legislation if we think it will be beneficial. We have a bill now pending, H. R. 1012, and we expect to begin hearings in February upon this bill. It deals with quite a number of problems, some of them not of great critical importance, yet all of them involving matters that appear to be worthy of consideration as a benefit to the industry and the country.

It is said that our committee is too burdened with work. We were not so burdened but what we wrote that act which everybody familiar with the industry admits was a great constructive piece of legislation. We are not so busy but that we are willing to give attention to aviation.

I recognize the promotional characteristics of aviation and its relation to national defense as well as transportation. Twenty years ago when I wrote a report that was concurred in by some of my colleagues I recommended that we encourage not only commercial aviation and military aviation and the necessary ground force to keep them in good repair but we also encourage the use of sporting planes and private planes so that we could make the American people more air-minded. In 1925 our committee recommended to the Congress that it be given complete jurisdiction over the air spaces of the Nation in aid of the solution of these problems.

I hope I am not boastful or not unwarranted in what I say, but our committee feel that we have done a useful service to aviation and to this country. We have been given a job and we have been faithful to it. We are ready to go ahead with that job. If I am right as to the attitude of our committee, is not our experience in these years with the transportation problem worth something to this country and to the Congress of the United States? Is it wisdom, is it common sense under these conditions to say to this committee, with all of its experience in transportation, with its success in this particular legislation, "We cannot count on you next time." We have never failed you and we are not going to fail you now.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. The gentleman said a minute ago that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had sometime in the past recommended that commercial aviation be placed under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. LEA. No. We had a controversy on that question and the prevailing vote of the committee was in favor of this present group, the Civil Aeronautics Board. However, I read from the minority report on that question.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is it now the gentleman's opinion that civil aviation should be placed under the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. LEA. No; it is not. I advocated what was done, and I think it was the right way to handle it.

Mr. NICHOLS. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BULWINKLE]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. If the gentleman will yield further, may I ask him whether or not his committee now has any authority to fix rates?

Mr. LEA. No committee of Congress has that authority.

Mr. NICHOLS. I thought I understood the gentleman to say a minute ago that another reason the legislation should be left with the gentleman's committee is that you would have control of the rate structure.

Mr. LEA. No. We were pointing out the similarities of regulation as applied to all of these agencies, and the control of rates in the legislation is one of them. If for each transportation agency we created a separate group in the legislative body, we would be destroying unity of legislative control.

Mr. NICHOLS. All I wanted to do was to clear it up. The committee has no rate-fixing power.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman, who is chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has done an unusual service to aviation. I have followed the gentleman's reports on this subject for many years, and I wish to say that the gentleman is responsible for many of the aviation laws we have today. I am especially cheered by the gentleman's approval of the work of the Civilian Pilot Training Division. The gentleman mentioned a reservoir of 50,000 pilots who were available for the armed forces at a time of need. I think that figure should be raised to 70,000 pilots.

Mr. LEA. It should now.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the gentleman's wonderful speech on aviation would be incomplete unless he added to it something about an independent commission on aviation, the secretary of which, I believe, is Mr. John Victory, and the members of which are from the Army, the Navy, the C. A. A., and others, who made it possible for aviation to be advanced to the point it has reached today, and who are every day experimenting with their air tunnels and other equipment to make our aviation more effective in the war effort. Would the gentleman, when he revises his remarks, include in his statement something about that independent commission, with which I know the gentleman is very well acquainted?

Mr. LEA. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is indeed worthy of commendation in any discussion of the progress of aviation in this country. It has done a painstaking, a devoted, and a very productive work for development of American aviation. Through research and experiment it has done a full part toward the progress of aviation. Its laboratories are worthy of a visit from any person. Mr. John Victory has long been its able secretary, and Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker is now its chairman.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I think the gentleman from California misunderstood the question of the gentleman from Oklahoma. Congress has the power to fix rates but does not exercise that power. It delegates it to other bodies.

Mr. LEA. I thank the gentleman for that contribution. My statement was in-

accurate in that respect. We have the legal authority to fix rates but we do not exercise that power in practice. Rate making is a power too complicated and involving too many details to be exercised by Congress. We give to the regulatory body the administrative duty of fixing rates.

Mr. NICHOLS. If the gentleman will yield, it just occurred to me that if the committee does have the authority to fix rates, why is it there is the great inequality in freight rates throughout the country that the gentleman mentioned a minute ago?

Mr. LEA. That is a problem in itself of long standing. It grew up, largely, not entirely, out of the inequalities of control and regulation. Then, unfortunately, too many artificial influences have been at work that took advantage of situations. The plan of unified control is, I believe, only a first step toward giving this country a more just rate structure.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Since the question under discussion here is the propriety or impropriety of establishing an additional legislative committee to have charge of commercial aviation alone, I wonder if the gentleman would express himself on the question of the experience of the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce over a period of some 20 years in dealing with transportation and aerial questions, and as to whether or not it would be unwise to stack another committee on top of this committee, in view of the years of experience this committee has had.

Mr. LEA. I have tried to explain that in what I have said already. I think it would be very unfortunate. The chief sufferer would be civil aviation if jurisdiction over its affairs were given to a separate committee and it were made a stepchild in our transportation system.

If I owned an air line and one group had a right to legislate to control my activities but had no right to control my competitors I would think I was in a bad fix.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed now under the special order originally designated to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, inasmuch as I had that order he spoke on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington for 15 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said here regarding the creation of a separate legislative committee on aviation. I want it definitely understood that I rise, not in opposition to the creation of a special legislative committee on aviation, but to point out and discuss the different elements with respect to it, and very briefly to inquire into the necessity for doing so at this time, and the advisability of it. I wonder whether it will not create even more confusion than the proponents of such a committee are trying to eliminate.

In the first place, the term "commercial aviation" today does not mean what it meant a year and a half ago. I think the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] will concede that I have had some experience in this matter. Practically, there is very little commercial aviation in the United States today, due to war conditions. The Army and the Navy have taken over the bulk of the planes. The Army and the Navy practically run commercial air lines. They tell them what passengers they can put on, what mail they can take on, and what express they can haul. The tendency is to take even more under control. Commercial aviation's personnel, its experience, its planes, and many of its functions have been transferred to the far-flung areas of the world under the command of the Army transport group. There is very little left. As a matter of fact, no operator today of a commercial air line does anything without first having the approval of the Army or the Navy, in the way of expansion of schedules, expansion of lines, new planes, or what they carry; and I am just wondering, as I stand here, whether or not the creation of a special committee to handle the commercial air-line problems of today would not create more confusion in view of this situation.

If it can be proven that it will not, then possibly many of us would change our minds. Second, I do not know—and I have no doubt of the sincerity of the enthusiasm of this special committee—but by the same token, I have no doubt of the sincerity of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and its distinguished chairman, regarding aviation. If there was a legislative bottleneck in that committee, insofar as commercial aviation is concerned, then I say by all means appoint a separate committee, but I do not know of any legislative bottleneck except one bill that the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Texas have talked to me about. That bill provides for the creation of Federal control of air space.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. I may point out that the able chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in a current issue of American Aviation lists 17 changes in aviation laws, and lists the bills which he proposes to introduce to bring about those changes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is there any intimation that this committee is not studying that matter and will not report out those bills?

Mr. NICHOLS. I do not know. I am only pointing out that the chairman of that committee points out 17 changes which he thinks should be made in the aviation laws.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the one important bill that this select committee has recommended to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is the so-called freedom of the air. I do not know that this committee will not report that out and do a good job with it, but let me point out to the gentlemen of this committee what the Civil Aeronautics Board has to say about this proposition. I have their annual report before me for 1942 and this is what bothers me. And I may say in prefacing this that the Civil Aeronautics Committee recommends legislation here, but there is no intimation that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will not hear them on that subject, or that it does not have these matters under active consideration. Here is what the Board says:

> In view of the existing demands upon the efforts of all concerned arising from the national emergency, the Board does not urge in presenting these amendments that they be considered at the present time by Congress.

Mr. NICHOLS. Of course, the gentleman has no amendment to talk about.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They suggest basic amendments and they are in the report. I could read them but they are very lengthy. In other words, there exists in their minds the idea that bringing this matter out now would cause more confusion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the gentleman think that the very thing which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] suggested a few moments ago, the article in American Aviation contributed by the chairman of the committee listing 17 proposed changes in the law, itself indicates that he, as the chairman of the committee, is alert to the necessity of making needed changes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would think so.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think it should be stated that all responsibility should not be placed on the so-called Nichols committee; that this is not a new agitation, nor that is something that came out of the Nichols committee. These resolutions have been before the Congress for the last 6 years, 5 years before the creation of the Nichols committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, I agree with the gentleman. There is no question about that. The gentleman from Oklahoma and myself have spent many hours talking about aviation. He knows the situation. Of course, it is not new with him. But the gentleman from Oklahoma is an aviation enthusiast, one of the most sincere in the House. There is not any question about it. So is the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. There are many of us. That brings me to another practical point that I want answered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the gentleman's statement about me, but I wanted to say that regardless of the disposition of this matter finally by the House of Representatives, I am sure it will be made with honesty and conviction, as the House should act upon important phases of our legislative program for the future. I simply wanted to observe at this moment that I believe it is wholesome and the country will react in that manner, in knowing that the Congress of the United States these days is discussing and thinking very carefully of the place that our country must take now and in the future in this great development in the air.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is no question about that.

Now, here is another practical point that I cannot answer in my own mind. If this committee should be created, there are 10, 15, or 20 or more men in this House who not only as sincere advocates of aviation, as the men I have mentioned, but there are many of us on important places in other committees. I might say, in all humbleness, some of us believe that our places on those committees entail a great deal of war work. We do not think we should leave those committees to go to another committee that we feel we probably know as much or more about; at least our usefulness would be divided. It would disrupt the standing membership of 3 of the most important committees of this House, the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on Military Affairs, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. NICHOLS. Would the gentleman be interested in my attempting to answer briefly his inquiry?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. I think the gentleman has a very fine thought there. My idea about that matter is this: The House majority and minority side can do anything it wants to. If a permanent committee were to be created on civil aviation in the House, I think the rules of the majority and the minority should be changed as to exclusive committee assignments, in order that the membership of the committee could be made up of representatives who have a special interest in aviation, from the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any other committee in the House that could supply specialists to this committee. It is my opinion that the rules should and will be changed as to exclusive committee assignments, so that the membership of the committee can be representative of aviation throughout the House Military and Naval Affairs Committees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, that would clear up the point. The suggestion has been made that this be a select committee, composed of members of these other committees.

Mr. NICHOLS. Of course, a select committee does not have legislative authority.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the gentleman wants my honest opinion, I would rather see a continuation of his fine committee.

Mr. NICHOLS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is, to handle this problem, if there are problems that the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce cannot handle.

Now, let us go to another phase that has been mentioned, namely, our place in the post-war world. There is not a person in this House who will not agree that this is going to be the key to the whole post-war world communications system. There is not a person in this House who does not know that after this war this aviation picture is going to burst all over the map. You are going to have thousands of planes, thousands of pilots, and many new planes. I was down in California the other day, in the district represented by the gentleman from California, [Mr. HINSHAW], and I saw the mock-up of an airplane that is so big that the only way I can describe it is that it has an elevator. We in this House must be on the alert either through the committee of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], or some other committee of the House. We ought to be up in arms and watching this proposition. Do you know that today we have built with our money, with our aviation experience, with our personnel and with the Army Transport Command the greatest world airways yet established? You can leave Washington today if you are on a military mission and I think on a regularly scheduled flight you can go any place in the world. Is that not true?

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is correct. I am interested in the gentleman's remarks about the desirability of having the membership of this committee from other committees, because that was the same recommendation which I originally privately made in letter form to certain leading Members of the House, believing that not only Military and Naval Affairs Committee members are interested in such questions, but also such committees as the Post Office and Post Roads, Foreign Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and perhaps some other notable committees of the House.

The rules of the two sides of this House are such, of course, that unless you made it a select committee which has no legislative authority——

Mr. NICHOLS. Oh, that can be changed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That can be changed.

Mr. HINSHAW. Such a committee should be given legislative authority over certain matters connected with aviation, and it should have the best advice that the House has to offer on account of the importance of the subject.

Mr. NICHOLS. There is no question about that.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I have been very much interested in this discussion. I should like to know if two or three members are taken from this committee, that committee, and the other committee, where there are going to be these new places we have been hearing about.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right; it is a practical matter.

Mr. BECKWORTH. If members are going to be taken from other committees I do not see where there will be any new places on the Aviation Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This is for information, if I may be so presumptuous; then I want to ask a question.

There are plenty of Members on this side serving on two committees and some on three; so you can get Members from some of those committees and divide things up a little. The question I wanted to ask is this:

Is there any substance to these newspaper stories and rumors we hear that other nations are now preparing to take over the aviation traffic after the war is over?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that of course there is no question about it; but the gentleman from Michigan wants to remember, as I said before, that the key to the whole post-war communications system is going to be the world-wide airways, the "toll houses" that are the fields of today, we are now building with our money, with our personnel, and our boys. They are being built, of course, on foreign soil and mostly British soil. So far as I know we have no agreement in writing as to the use of these airways after the war. We should be alert to this.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If memory serves correctly, the other day our Vice President made the assertion that while we were going to have airports, or air fields, whatever they are, all over the world, I gathered from reading the article attributed to him that these are to be under the control of other nations, and not under the control of the United States. Has the gentleman from Washington any information on that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. My information is that the Vice President is sincerely and honestly trying to effect in the post-war world a sane equitable basis which would include the freedom of the air; and this we are all working for.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But are we to pay for it and then not have the management of it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact, we have paid for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman believe we should have some control over it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have paid for it; all we want is value received for what we paid for.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I realize we paid, but does the gentleman not believe we should have control of it if we paid for it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe the nations of the world can sit around the table and do this thing properly; I hope they can. If there is any intimation that we cannot have our rightful picture in this post-war world I will be the first one to rise in this House and denounce any part of the administration responsible.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. We have heard a great deal of discussion about the creation of a new committee. So far I have heard only one point of view; that is, to create new committee positions. Is there any major legislation concerning aeronautics pending in this House now or that may be expected which has not had expedition and urgency? I want to know if this new committee will turn out legislation any faster than the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Is there any reason to believe that the new committee will turn it out any faster?

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me? I think the gentleman is entitled to be properly advised.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. There is a bill pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the gentleman will permit an interruption—except the one I have mentioned concerning the freeedom of the air.

Mr. NICHOLS. That, of course, is a basic bill, and until that bill is passed there are 12 or 15 other subjects that cannot be handled by legislation. That bill has not yet been considered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But the gentleman from California states they are going to start hearings on that matter. Perhaps this agitation did a little good; maybe it will spur somebody to action.

Mr. NICHOLS. But the committee has not held any hearings yet.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think what the gentleman from Oklahoma is driving at, the thing that is uppermost in my mind, is the question of this post-war world aviation. If a new committee can work any faster or better than this committee, there would be some justification for it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. As a matter of fact, were there not four or five vacancies on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee? If the gentleman from Oklahoma, or any other gentleman, had been so interested in transportation and aviation, and they had some seniority here, could they not have applied and given up the committees they were on and asked for membership on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and served there?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. As a new Member of the House, and I think the other Members of the House would like to know this, may I ask: Does this resolve itself down to the mere fact that you are trying to create some new positions or is it an attempt to get expedition? Has this particular bill that has been mentioned been in the mill, in process, for many months or is it a new matter? Can this new committee handle it any faster?

Mr. MAGNUSON. What motivates this is the very thing I am worried about. We have got to be on the alert in this House and in the Senate that when this thing is all over, so that the so-called British Imperial Airways will not control flights around the whole world and we become isolated within our own borders.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I want to ask the gentleman a question. I am sure he read the report rendered by the Military Affairs Committee in November on the general matter of aviation, especially Army aviation. If the gentleman has read that, and I am sure he has, he will have reached the conclusion that American aviation today stands without a peer in the whole wide world. If that is the case would the gentleman think there is anything fundamentally unsound about the legislative set-up here in the House of Representatives or that it had impeded the progress of American aviation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would not.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am not familiar with the proposition of securing the position of the United States insofar as aviation facilities in other nations are concerned. Is it contemplated that anything may be done here or that something can be done anywhere that will at all reduce the power of these several nations to control what happens on their own soil? I ask that for information. Is it contemplated that any sovereignty will be surrendered?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And in the so-called conquered nations.

Mr. NICHOLS. I would like to answer that question.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute so that I may ask him a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I conclude from the gentleman's remarks that the gentleman is of the opinion that commercial aviation at the present time is a thing of the past and that the military has taken over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. I did not say that.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman said that they had practically taken over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I said that much of the control of commercial aviation today is in the hands of the military, and that is as it should be.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to ask the gentleman's opinion. Does he think that in the post-war period the military may take over all forms of aviation, commercial, and otherwise, eventually?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. GAVIN. Then possibly there is some ground for the creation of a committee here to give intensive study to this particular problem, so that they will not take over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not opposing the selection of the committee as such, but I oppose any more confusion than is necessary in the smooth functioning of this House as it pertains to the winning of the war and the part aviation plays in it. That comes first.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if there are no other special orders, in order that we might develop the matter, I would like to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 or 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are two other special orders, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to yield 5 minutes of my 10 to the gentleman from Texas, if he cares to pursue that question any further.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman may have my 5 minutes, if it will help him any.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, with the consent of the gentlemen who have special orders, that I may have 5 minutes at this time in order to develop one of these questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of affording opportunity for development of the question that I just propounded and of getting information. I read in the papers and in the magazines and all around where people are using up a lot of time deciding what is going to be done after the war is over. They call it post-war economy, post-war this, and post-war the other thing. It is all right to give this post-war business some consideration now, but perhaps the time could be better utilized in winning this war, then when it is won, and the condition then existing is known we will be able to see clearer and understand better what should be done and what can be done. I refer especially to these aviation fields which we are constructing abroad to facilitate our war activities and those of our allies. Is it contemplated that anything be done now which would establish our sovereignty over these fields and over air lanes, and so

forth, that could bind any other government or control the policy of political parties as they come to responsibility in the various countries where we now have established these aviation fields? My purpose is to get some information in view of statements which have been made.

Mr. NICHOLS. I would like to attempt to answer that for the gentleman from Texas. I had with me a clipping under a London date line which appeared a few days ago, but at the moment it is in the hands of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], who, in a couple of days, will read the whole text of the statement. The gist of it was about as follows, and this was a debate had on the floor of Parliament. The speaker was pointing out that in the post-war period Britain should attempt to do in the air what she has done at sea. That is, become mistress of the air.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. We are not going to let them do that.

Mr. NICHOLS. I am going to try to give the gentleman an answer. We are not going to let them do it, but they will do it through us unless we become alert to this thing. Here is what the gentleman said on the floor of Parliament. He pointed out that the United States had built airports and aids to navigation across the continent of Africa. He also pointed out that an American-owned air line was now operating commercially across all those airports. He said that—

We, in England, have got to get commercial operations going in Africa because under international law—

And I do not know whether this is right or not—

the right to the occupation of such things as airports is based upon usage.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. A temporary use in wartime cannot control the peacetime economy or Government policy except, of course, as priorities may be recognized among joint conquerors.

Mr. NICHOLS. I say to the gentleman, I do not know.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. But I know.

Mr. NICHOLS. I am trying to tell the gentleman what England is thinking about. Since that time the military has taken over our operation in Africa, and perfectly properly so. I am not complaining about that. However, if in the post-war period the basis of usage is going to determine who has the right to use the commercial facilities the United States has put in Africa, then we shall have to be alert to protect our own interests.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not want to take the time of the House further on that question now because other gentlemen have been good enough to yield to me, but I think we can proceed on the theory that these things are going to be settled after the war, controlled by the conditions which then obtain, and we cannot do it by legislation here enacted.

Mr. NICHOLS. No; except as the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has so ably pointed out, by the passage of some basic legislation now which will permit commercial aviation to expand and grow in the post-war period.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman believe that the gentleman from Oklahoma had better be careful about that kind of a statement, which indicates that he is thinking of his own country, or he will be classed as belonging to that America First organization which was mentioned in the indictment recently returned here in Washington? He had better be careful or Maloney will indict him.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, two or three questions came to my mind during the remarks of the chairmen of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I think when I spoke on this subject the other day I tried to make clear that I had a most wholesome respect and regard for the opinion, the ability, and the work done by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I had studied many of his reports long before I came to Congress.

I thought I understood the gentleman to say this afternoon that to set up this new committee to deal with civil aviation would do an injustice to the aviation industry. I wondered when he said that just whom that committee recognized as having the right to speak for the industry.

Further in his remarks he said that the aviation industry came to Congress and asked for regulation. This leads me to believe there is some organization the gentleman recognizes as speaking for the industry. May I ask the gentleman if the authority he recognized, the authority that asked to be regulated, will now come and ask for the setting up of this special committee and will testify before the Committee on Rules that it wants it, will the gentleman withdraw his opposition?

Mr. LEA. The observation I made referred to the situation of the industry in 1938, when the Civil Aeronautics Act was passed, and not at present.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is not the same body still in existence? Was it the aeronautical chamber of commerce?

Mr. LEA. There is an aeronautical chamber of commerce, but I think it is not the duty of these industries to come here and determine how Congress should set up its affairs. That is a question for Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman stated that he regulated the industry at the request of this organization, which I suppose is the aeronautical chamber of commerce. Now I ask him if he will accept the same authority as to the desirability of this special committee.

Mr. LEA. No; I did not even have in mind the aeronautical chamber of commerce. I had in mind the people engaged in the industry, the air-line people.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is what I want to get at. Whom would the gentleman recognize as an authority that should come here and ask for this committee in order to express the opinion of the industry?

Mr. LEA. My position about that would be what I announced when I gave notice of the hearings on the bill we have before us. We will be glad to hear from anybody in the industry or who has a legitimate interest in the subject any recommendations they wish to make, but I do not believe the recommendations or the requests of the industry should be controlling on the committee or on Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No.

Mr. LEA. So I do not want to attach any undue importance to what they may have to say about this matter.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman said the industry came here and asked to be regulated, which was apparently the reason for regulating it. I want to bring those same people here and get their opinion on this proposition. I am just trying to determine who they were.

Mr. LEA. The problem of how the House wants to take up these problems is for the House itself to determine.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Surely.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. I should like to straighten out the gentlemen on the matter of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce. The Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce is a trade organization which represents only the manufacturers.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Right.

Mr. NICHOLS. The trade organization which represents the air lines is called the Air Transport Association. One might believe the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce has something to do with transportation, but it does not.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That brings to mind that I think the question of transportation and the fixing of rates is being much overemphasized in this whole discussion. I cannot help but think it simmers down to a question of whether this whole problem of what we are going to do with the future of the aviation industry is of sufficient magnitude to take up the time of 25 men in this House. I contend that it is.

At the end of the World War thousands of young men came home after serving in the Army and Navy Air Corps, with a desire to go into the aviation industry to help expand it. We got very little help from the Federal Government at that time.

Still today, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs comes in and says that we are at war, and that we have to win the war and therefore cannot do anything about this problem, but we were at peace for 25 years after this industry was born, and it could not get a standing committee in this House. This is not a new thing. It is something that has been desirable for 25 years.

Mr. NICHOLS. I thought the gentleman, in his question to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was going to propound this inquiry. The chairman of that committee said that this standing committee on aviation should not be set up, because it would retard the industry. I thought the gentleman was going to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not he would be willing to let the aviation industry answer that question itself, and be bound by their answer.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It would be a perfectly fair question and we know that the industry, manufacturers and air-line operators, want this new committee set up. I yield back the remainder of my time.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the regular business is disposed of and other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House heretofore made the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask unanimous consent that my time may be lengthened by 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly sorry that the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs has left the floor, because the chairmen of the three committees who have spoken to us today are familiar with the work which their committees have been doing and their advice is always well received. I agree as a general proposition with the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee in the thought that we should not create new committees and commissions, but I know of no reason why the bureaucrats should be given so much power and the people's representatives deprived of needed information. If I get the sentiment of the people, correctly, it is that it is up to Congress now to do something to correct some of these abuses which have been so prevalent during the last 8 years, and which today we can all see will ruin us if not corrected. I can understand why the chairmen of these committees oppose the creation of a new committee which might deprive their committees of jurisdiction over the air commerce. Inevitably there is that feeling, you may call it jealousy or something else but it is a natural desire to protect their own jurisdiction. A committee always wants to retain its jurisdiction and power, but if I get the situation correctly, and I think I do, the Committee on Naval Affairs has a big job on its hands. The submarine menace has not been met. The safe transportation of men and munitions demands the best from that committee. There are other matters all the time coming up, which require attention of every single member of that committee. Just this week we learned of the difficulty connected with the making of repairs on convoy ships. There is something for the committee to set its teeth into. I can go back for 3 years and call attention to where the Naval Affairs Committee was asked what it was that was holding up, not our preparation for war, but our preparation for national defense. There was no adequate answer then. There has been none since.

That committee, and I have no criticism to make of it, has done a faithful, wonderful job. Any criticism that may be charged against it for failure to accomplish things that should have been done is due to the fact that it has too big a job. It has too much to do. That committee has never in the last 3 years been able to get through the Congress legislation which would end interference with the national defense, and later with the preparations for the fighting of the war. Am I correct in that? Every Member of this House who knows the facts knows that that statement is true. I see before me the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], and the same thing applies to that committee. I am not finding fault with that committee. It has never shirked. It has always been diligent. I say the job is too big for the committee, the job it has on hand. It is too big for any one committee. That committee has not put through legislation to correct the evils that interfere with the carrying on of the war.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I take it that the gentleman refers to the obstruction by certain groups of laborers that interfere with the production of war equipment?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; not by groups of laborers, but by the labor politicians and labor racketeers, backed by the administration. I do not charge any of this to the workers themselves.

Mr. MAY. Then the gentleman remembers very well that last year the House Military Affairs Committee brought in an amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act, a provision which authorized the President of the United States to police the plants where strikes were threatened or under way for the purpose of continuing production and that we were defeated by 3 to 1 on the floor of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is correct. And I supported the bill the gentleman's committee brought in. The administration opposed it.

Mr. MAY. So the committee is not to blame.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, and the Committee on Naval Affairs did the same, several times, but did you get the legislation? You did not. Why did you not? You did not because the administration opposed you.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Would any special or extra committee get it any quicker than we would?

Mr. HOFFMAN. You gentlemen had and have your hands full. You understand that I am not criticizing your committee.

Mr. MAY. I understand that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You just have too big a job, and there should be a committee that could and would devote all of its time to questions like that. There should be committees that could and would keep everlastingly at it. I am on the Labor Committee. We should have legislation of that kind, but every time the legislation has been introduced it has been bypassed over the Labor Committee to the Committee on the Judiciary. Take the effort of the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH. That is what happened to that bill, and perhaps it was well for it was put through the House. No matter how often the House acted, the sad fact remains that we did not get the needed legislation. The same may be said of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That committee has too large a job. Under the recent decision of the Supreme Court it will be recalled that the growing and marketing of wheat is interstate and foreign commerce. It follows that there is not a thing that anyone can do any more in this country that does not affect interstate and foreign commerce. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has jurisdiction, as the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] has said; and I would like the attention of the gentleman from California. I have no fault to find with the gentleman's committee. The chairman of that committee is one of the hardest working Members in the House, but I say, sir, your committee has never been able to get out of the committee and put through Congress legislation which would permit the War Department or the Navy Department to take materials of war through the city of New York without paying tribute to the unions. Have you?

Mr. LEA. We have no jurisdiction over that question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, bless your heart——

Mr. LEA. We sometimes thought that if we had jurisdiction, we would take a try at it, but we do not have jurisdiction. I think certainly it is a condition which should be remedied.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not have any doubt about that. So here we are. The gentleman said from the Well of the House that his committee had jurisdiction over the trucking of the country, over transportation by trucks, and his committee certainly has jurisdiction over motor traffic.

Mr. LEA. But we do not have jurisdiction over the labor questions.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But over the transportation of goods by truck.

Mr. LEA. We do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; surely you have. And how can you have motor transportation unless you load and unload them? The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has jurisdiction over the movement of freight by truck, and yet that committee and the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs—all three of those committees have not had enough influence and

enough power to get through this Congress and enacted into law a statute which will permit even the War Department itself, to say nothing about civilians who furnish war materials, to drive trucks through the city of New York until the drivers or owners pay that $8.41 for a small truck and $9.42 for a big one.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, have those three committees things to do? I will say they have. They are doing a good job but they cannot do the impossible and so part of the work should be given to another committee—that part which has to do with labor.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman of course is a member of the House Committee on Labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. MAY. That committee has jurisdiction of labor questions, and as far as I know they have never been able to bring a bill out of the committee. Can the gentleman explain that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes; I surely can explain it. The majority party has control of that committee, and it has the chairman, and it has the next ranking member, and it has the next ranking member, and it has a majority of the committee and it refuses to vote to bring out a bill, and we cannot even get a meeting of that committee. I go over there and I sit there, and "this is out of order"; "that is out of order." That is why I do not have any work to do as a member of the Labor Committee when it is in session. I do draft bills and introduce them but the committee does not even hold a hearing on them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five more minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have brought bills over here and every time I introduced one it was buried in committee. If we here in the House could ever get a shot at them we might do something, but the Speaker usually bypasses the Committee on Labor. I do not know whether you are ashamed of that committee or what is the trouble, but you send it to the Judiciary Committee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is the distinguished head. We have had great promises about what the Committee on the Judiciary was going to do, but they have fallen down, too. You see, when they meet this irresistible force from the White House they all fade away and nothing is done.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not certain that my memory serves me right exactly, but as I recall there was a bill of some nature seeking to regulate this nefarious practice, before the Labor Committee, and it was not reported out by a single vote. The report was rumored around here that had the gentleman from Michigan been present and voted as he has so often spoken here on the floor of the House, the bill would have been reported to the floor of the House, but instead his proxy had voted the other way.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I guess I will have to plead guilty to the fact that I did trust a member of the committee. I did not realize that every single Democrat was going to vote wrong. I had believed there would be one of them on the majority side that would vote right. But, being of a trusting nature, being innocent and inexperienced in the ways of politicians who are seasoned, I did not realize what might happen, and I did give my proxy, but, brother, I have never done it since. And I might say that a few days later I voted to bring out that same bill, but still we did not have a majority. You know how they treat legislation which comes from the Labor Committee. The House just waves it aside. The House does not pay any attention to it. You on the Democratic side have had a majority for 8 years, and yet these things have gone on.

Mr. MAY. Ten years.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. The gentleman says 10 years. That makes just 2 years worse than I thought.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEWART. How about your side on the same issue?

Mr. HOFFMAN. One time when I had an amendment that I thought would cure some of that trouble we had 20 votes on the Republican side and 30 on your side, which was a fair proportion, and which showed that at that time the sentiment was about equally divided on percentages. But do not lay that to me, because I am not a leader on our side; I cannot even get these new Members membership on a major committee; they are just shoved aside and put on the committee on the disposition of useless executive papers, or wastebasket collections, or something of that kind; that is not my fault.

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. ELMER. Can the gentleman imagine any greater contribution to enforced isolation than to build and pay for all these airfields all over the world, yet have no contract for the use of them and be shut out of them by other nations?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I hope the Members on the majority side heard that question. Isolationists have been condemned and damned for a long time and in a good many different ways. The gentleman from Missouri wants to know if I can imagine any way in which this country could be more isolated than, after having built this great world system of airports, to be excluded from either the use or control of them. That makes friend WALLACE an isolationist. I am sure I do not know whether the gentleman from Missouri wants to so classify him or not.

You gentlemen are all familiar with what is happening with reference to the labor situation.

WHY NOT DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT?

The un-American practice, which has prevailed throughout the New Deal, of requiring American citizens to pay tribute, not to the Barbary pirates, but to labor politicians and labor racketeers, is not only a violation of the principles enunciated in the Bill of Rights and the Constitution, but is unjust and offensive to every right-thinking citizen.

It has continued overlong. A great deal of talk has been directed toward ending it, but effective action to accomplish that purpose has always been lacking. Decent citizens throughout the land, Members of Congress, rage and storm about it, condemn it in vigorous language, but to date Congress has failed to take the necessary steps to end the vicious practices which not only added to the cost of national defense, which are adding to the cost of the war, but delayed preparation for national defense and today delay more effective prosecution of the war.

More than 3 years ago, on the floor of this House, I relayed to the membership the statement of the then Acting Secretary of the Navy, Charles Edison, that a strike in Detroit, conducted by members of the C. I. O., delayed for a period of 41 calendar days the delivery to the Navy of completed castings, bearings, and parts which were needed for airplane engines in process of manufacture at the Naval Aircraft Factory, Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa.

At the same time, from the same source, the Congress was informed that the Navy Department was unable, during the duration of the strike, to obtain the return of Government-owned patterns, plans, and equipment.

Just a few days ago, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], informed this House that the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Ralph A. Bard, over his signature stated that one of the consequences of the recent strike on the west coast was the—

> failure to effect repairs on Navy and Army vessels so preventing these vessels from meeting schedules controlling convoys required for shipment of men and supplies with the result that convoys were delayed and schedules of troop movements to ports of embarkation were seriously disorganized.

Still later, we learn from news sources that, for one reason or another, seamen belonging to the N. M. U., a C. I. O. affiliate dominated by Communists, refused, upon arrival of the ships carrying supplies for our fighting men at Guadalcanal in the southern Pacific, to unload those supplies.

Now we know—and there is no disputing the fact—that as long as 3 years ago the C. I. O. deliberately and willfully interfered with production for national defense. Now we know that C. I. O. and A. F .of L. organizations refused to make repairs and by that refusal, hindered and delayed convoys carrying supplies to the men who are fighting our battle down in the southwest Pacific. Now we read that an affiliate of that same union has refused to unload food and supplies needed by men who have been battling for weeks in what are practically desert islands more than 7,000 miles from home.

The cold facts, the bare truth, give us a story of treasonable activities unsurpassed in the history of the world. This Congress to date has failed to end those treasonable activities.

No one with any judgment contends for one moment that the workers of America are disloyal or that they approve of the practices to which reference has been made. They are as indignant, they are as desirous of ending those practices, as any other class or group of citizens. They have on several occasions, as witness the recent strike at Jackson, Mich.; the still more recent one in Pennsylvania against the 50-cent addition to their dues, taken action against their officials, their bosses.

To date, this administration, by its labor policy, has stood back of and supported those who are responsible for the situation which now exists. By that statement I do not mean that all labor leaders approve of or sanction those things which have been here narrated. But I do mean that, because of the labor policy of the New Deal administration and because of the policies pursued by the officials of the major labor organizations, we have now gotten into a situation where they do not effectively control the membership of their organizations, but permit some, who would overthrow this Government by sabotaging its war efforts, to carry on their program aimed at the destruction of our national existence.

I am today introducing a resolution directing the Commander in Chief, the officers of the Army and the Navy, and the Department of Justice to take action forthwith to end these subversive actions.

There has also been introduced by me an amendment to the Selective Service Act which would cause those who strike, bring about slow-downs, who in any way interfere with the production or transportation of war materials, to be inducted into the Army, there to have the status of privates in the armed forces.

The appointment of committees, the carrying on of investigations on this subject, is a waste of time and money. What the people of this country are demanding is action, and they do not mean some time in the dim and distant future. They want action now.

Let me paraphrase a statement written long, long ago:

> For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God? (I Timothy 3: 5).

If an administration cannot rule its own people; if it cannot preserve the freedom and the liberty of its own citizens, how shall it carry the four freedoms to the uttermost parts of the world?

To the majority party, which is responsible for legislation, I put this query: Regardless of what you say about it, what do you intend to do about the situation which confronts us? And when, if ever, do you intend to do it?

## RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication, which was read.

JANUARY 25, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully tender herewith my resignation as a member of the Committee on Claims.

Cordially yours,

HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 26, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Thursday, January 28, 1943, for consideration of House Resolution 1294.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

92. A letter from the Lend Lease Administrator, transmitting a report on operations under the Lend-Lease Act, from the passage of the act, March 11, 1941, to December 31, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 57); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

93. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing refunds of internal revenue during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, in excess of $500 as approved by the Bureau of Internal Revenue; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

94. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing the status of credit operations as of June 30, 1942, of the Indian Affairs Office of Chicago; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

95. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting reports of contracts entered into or modified under authority of Public Law 46 beginning April 1, and ending December 31, 1942; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

96. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the official operations of the District of Columbia government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

97. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers for disposition by him from certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

98. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a resolution adopted unanimously by the National Assembly of Panama on January 6, 1943, expressing solidarity and best wishes to the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

99. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

100. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska at Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

101. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a letter and certain other information relative to a recount in the Eleventh Congressional District of the State of Missouri (H. Doc. No. 58); to the Committee on Elections No. 3 and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House resolution 50. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Rules to employ a clerk-stenographer; without amendment (Rept. No. 15). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 74. Resolution providing for payment of the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 16; without amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 75. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 18; without amendment (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 76. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 30; without amendment (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 77. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 30; without amendment (Rept. No. 19). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NICHOLS: Select Committee to investigate Air Accidents. Resolution 125 and Resolution 403 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. Resolutions to investigate air accidents; without amendment (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 1470. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 1471. A bill providing for the continuance of payment of compensation or pension to a child of a deceased World War veteran during education or training; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 1472. A bill to aid in national defense and to protect union employees; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 1473. A bill to preserve employment for, and seniority rights of, persons enlisting or inducted into the military services of the United States of America; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 1474. A bill to amend section 420 (a) of title 18, United States Code (48 Stat. 479), and section 420 (d) of title 18, United States

Code (48 Stat. 980); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 1475. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 1476. A bill to remove the statutory limitations governing the filing of suits on automatic insurance, yearly renewable term insurance, or United States Government life (converted) insurance; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1477. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits under certain conditions to persons permanently and totally disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 1478. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation as a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt of the Maltese Cross Ranch, Billings County, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 1479. A bill to provide that the heads of the executive departments may occupy seats on the floor of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 1480. A bill to establish and promote the use of standard methods of grading cottonseed, to provide for the collection and dissemination of information on prices and grades of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1481. A bill to prohibit the issuance of alcoholic beverage licenses in certain localities in the District of Columbia, to prohibit advertising the price of such beverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1482. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for crediting service in the armed forces for certain purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 1483. A bill to require the furnishing of certain information by labor organizations and to prohibit political contributions by labor organizations; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 1484. A bill to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 1485. A bill relating to the status of certain custodial employees in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 1486. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing a method whereby the services of those interfering with war production may be made available; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1487. A bill to lessen the number of strikes and to prevent violence in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 1488. A bill to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 1489. A bill to regulate the selling price of candy, cigarettes, and other commodities to the members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1490. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 1491. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 1492. A bill to amend the Social Security Act by providing special Federal aid to certain States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 1493. A bill to suspend the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission under section 14 (a) and section 14 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act to issue rules relating to the solicitation of proxies, consents, and authorizations during the period of the war emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to establish the Joint Committee on Administrative Review; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the first day of each new year as Good Neighbor Day for the purpose of setting an example in neighborliness on the first day of the year, to serve as an inspiration and as standard for all the days to follow—leading to better relations at home, in all the Americas, and throughout the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution to prevent pollution of streams by pulp and paper manufacturers; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 69 Joint resolution to establish the first week in October of each year as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution advising that the President immediately or without undue delay enter into agreement with the several United Nations and other members of the community of sovereign nations to secure and maintain law, order, and peace among the covenanted nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 78. Resolution to end practices which are interfering with success of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. Res. 79. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the circumstances surrounding the bringing, under the antitrust laws, of the action by the United States against the Associated Press; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 80. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the activities of the Farm Security Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 81. Resolution to provide for the expenses of investigation authorized by House Resolution 80, a resolution creating a select committee to investigate the activities of the Farm Security Administration; to the Committee on Accounts.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 1494. A bill for the relief of H. L. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 1495. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Fred Joseph Tobias; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1496. A bill granting an increase of pension to Maryette Vannatta; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 1497. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. T. Taulbee; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 1498. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Ruckman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 1499. A bill granting a pension to H. Emma Streepy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 1500. A bill for the relief of B. B. Stevans; to the Committee on Claims.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

47. By Mr. HOCH: Resolution of the League of Cities of the Third Class in Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa., advocating the Rumi income-tax plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

48. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Kurt Mertig, petitioning consideration of his petition with reference to countermand Presidential Executive Order No. 9066, dated February 19, 1942, regarding exercise by military authorities of the power of removal of individual United States citizens from the eastern military area without civilian review; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

49. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Pile Drivers, Bridge, Wharf and Dock Builders Union, Local No. 34, San Francisco, Calif., dated January 8, 1943, requesting increases in old-age benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Reverend Dr. Robert J. Slavin, of the Order of Preachers, professor of philosophy, Catholic University, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

O Lord Jesus Christ, who in Thy mercy heareth the prayers of sinners, pour forth, we beseech Thee, all grace and blessings upon our country and its citizens We pray in particular for the President, for our Congress, for all who are suffering the hardships of war. Give grace and strength to everyone in his own place to fight Thy battle. Give the light of wisdom to those in high station that they may neither yield to fear nor be seduced by daring. Make them prudent as serpents and simple as doves. Be with all courageous servants of Thine whether in low station or in high; instruct them from Thy divine heart how to act every hour of the day so as to preserve their own souls from evil and to protect the welfare of this country.

To our rulers and leaders upon the earth Thou, O Lord, has given a share of Thy power in order that we, recognizing the glory and honor given them by

Thee may be subject unto them according to Thy divine will. Give to them, we pray, health, peace, harmony, wisdom in order that they may exercise the authority given them by Thee. Order their counsels, O Lord of Hosts, according to that which is pleasing and good in Thy sight, so that they devotedly exercising their power may find Thee guiding and directing them. Teach us one and all to live in Thy presence and to see Thee as our leader, and Thy cross as the foundation for the new battle cry which Your victory made possible: "Peace be to you." May this peace and the blessing of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost descend upon you and remain forever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 158. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk on next Thursday and after any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address delivered by the Reverend Paul E. Martin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include the inaugural address of Gov. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein an editorial, and that the remarks may appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ROWE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include copy of resolutions, letters, and newspaper clippings in regard to the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in the days of the Revolutionary War, George Washington is said to have spoken these words:

Give me a banner to plant upon the hills of West Augusta, and I will gather around me men who will set this bleeding Nation free.

He, of course, referred to the Allegheny Highlands, now the State of West Virginia.

We have a man, Quartermaster Clerk Hugh F. Deakins, from Rowlesburg, W. Va., from this mountain country, who now after 35 years as a marine has taken his accumulated pay, more than $21,000 coming to him, and has purchased $20,000 worth of War bonds. I have a letter from his wife who explains that they have forgone the purchase of a home and other certain needs because not only does he fight to win the war but he uses his dollars to preserve America and civilization.

Mr. Speaker, I include a newspaper report and correspondence which is further explanatory:

MARINE VETERAN DRAWS HIS PAY—$21,269.29

Quartermaster Clerk Hugh F. Deakins, United States Marines, Quantico, Va., hit the jackpot yesterday when he received $21,269.29 in settlement of his accounts as an enlisted man and promptly invested $20,000 in War bonds.

When a man is promoted to warrant officer grade his enlisted accounts are settled. Recently Mr. Deakins traded his Quartermaster sergeant's chevrons for the insignia of a clerk. The sum he received represented savings he permitted to accumulate on the books during his 35 years' service.

And he isn't through yet. He's going to finish out this war before he thinks of retirement.

"Buying War bonds," he said, "is the greatest opportunity ever offered to the people. "You are not speculating when you buy them," he said, "You are investing in a sure thing."

His pay check was one of the highest ever issued to a marine. Mr. Deakins, native of Rowlesburg, W. Va., has a 9-year-old son, Howard.

---

QUANTICO, VA., *January 18, 1943.*

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I am taking this liberty and a minute of your time to enclose a clipping of one of your native sons of West Virginia.

No doubt you have heard of the family, for I think you were invited to speak at one of the reunions a couple of years ago.

We are so proud of him to think we have passed up everything—buying a home and many other things that we could have done—but we think this is the wisest thing he could have done.

I am sure you will be as proud of them being West Virginians as we all are.

We are like all others; we want this war over as soon as possible, and I hope, with this small help, it will do some good in place.

Thanking you in advance to read same, I am,

Sincerely,

Mrs. LOIS DEAKINS.

---

JANUARY 21, 1943.

Mrs. LOIS DEAKINS,
*Quantico, Va.*

DEAR MRS. DEAKINS: I deeply appreciate your letter of January 18, with newspaper clipping about your good husband. I am so happy that he is making good. In the days of the Revolution, George Washington paid tribute to the fighting qualities of the men from that section of the country now known as West Virginia. In this terrible war worthy successors like Hugh Deakins are in uniform ready to protect America and all for which our country stands.

Extend to Mr. Deakins my best wishes and congratulations for the splendid spirit which he has shown in not only fighting for our country in the armed service but also by buying bonds.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on a proposal for the liquidation of the 1942 tax liability in order that the putting of the payment of taxes on a current basis may be more speedily effected.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial on No Substitute for Freedom.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of

business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CARSON] may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

AMERICA FIRST

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, one living in Washington can begin to see already indications of the fact that a certain group here is endeavoring to, as a part of the peace program, establish a supergovernment, or world government, in which the United States would be simply one integral part thereof and our flag would be subservient to a world flag. This is the dream of those proponents of such a scheme. There are certain American citizens who, in their zeal and idealism, would support a world government even to the detriment of our own. But, let me call your attention to the fact that Russia, after the World War is ended, and peace is restored, will be thinking in terms of Russia first; the British in terms of the British Empire first; and the Chinese in terms of China first. It is definite that the Russians, for example, will take no advice from us about their form of government and little, if any, about their post-war boundaries. Mr. Churchill has said frankly that he would not liquidate the British Empire—a rebuff in advance for any American idealist who may come to the peace conference with advice to Britain to cut India adrift. It is my judgment that after the war is over and peace comes, our peace treaty will be able to alleviate many, if not all, of the causes of war without turning our American Government over to a supergovernment above us. It is fine to be idealistic, but it is finer to be thoroughly patriotic based upon good clear common sense. We can still show our brotherly relations toward the liberty-loving nations of the world without sacrificing American institutions or making America subservient to some foreign influence.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the Boston Daily Record of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. FOAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Dr. A. B. Cox, of the University of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CRITICISM OF THE CONDUCT OF THE WAR

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, when there is a lull on the battle fronts, some of the news columnists and a few of the radio news commentators begin to speculate on what is happening in that area, and since there is a dearth of news which they can give to the public, they fill their columns with criticism and unwarranted attacks on their own Government and its conduct of the war. It gives them something to talk and write about, and they can thereby impress their readers and listeners with their superior knowledge, and they likewise know that things controversial always attract the attention of the public.

They do not stop to weigh the effect of such utterances upon our own people, our allies, or our enemies.

Criticism of things happening at home is in a different category to the happenings on the battle fronts abroad. What happens here is within our knowledge, and criticism of it affects our own people only.

When our armed forces are far from home on another continent fighting side by side with those of our allies, to publicly condemn our Government for what is happening is calculated to instill a lack of confidence in our own armed forces, to create disunity among our allies, and to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

I am referring specifically to the snipers in our own country who have been pointing out alleged mistakes with reference to our occupation in North Africa and our collaboration with the French.

Some of these busybodies, all of whom are thousands of miles from the theater of conflict, and are entirely unacquainted with conditions existing there talk glibly and write voluminously about the mistakes of our military leaders and our State Department, in the recognition of certain Frenchmen who are temporarily holding positions there.

Secretary Hull recently administered a justly deserved rebuke to these critics when he said that he had complete confidence in those of our Government who are in charge there, and he thought it best for us to keep our minds on the prosecution of the war rather than the political, social, factional, and other situations behind the battle lines.

I thoroughly agree with Secretary Hull's position, and in my judgment, these critics, however eminent or smart they may be, are rendering a disservice to their country in time of war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution to repeal Public Law No. 403, Seventy-seventh Congress, chapter 7, second session, and to reinstate the standard time provided by the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States, approved March 19, 1918, as amended."

Since July 20, 1942, our Nation has been on what is referred to as wartime, disregarding God's time. This arrangement has been tried for a full year, resulting in untold inconveniences and hardships to the people of our great country, and with no material contribution to our war effort, except to bring home to each and every individual that we are at war—a fact that they all well know.

I have had complaints from all over my district—from mothers of school children, farmers, business and professional men, and individuals in all walks of life. Most of the complaints, however, are from mothers in the rural sections of my district, to the effect that at 7:30 a. m. wartime, they are required to carry a lantern and walk from one-half mile to 1 mile, in order to protect their children while going to and waiting for a school bus.

It is my opinion that my concurrent resolution should be speedily adopted, in order that God's time be restored to the citizens of our great Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address on social security and the Beveridge plan, delivered by the Honorable W. Arthur Simpson, old age assistance commission chairman, of Vermont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement on O. P. A. price policy issued by Mr. Edward C. Welsh, regional price executive of the O. P. A., which I believe explains the purposes of that Bureau of Government in regimentation of the people.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a proclamation by Governor Bricker of Ohio on the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of William McKinley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of last Sunday's Gallup poll.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL CURRENCY

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I acquired what appears to be a $20 bill. Printed across the top are the words "National Currency Secured by United States Bonds Deposited with the Treasurer of the United States of America or by Like Deposit of Other Securities." May I ask some member of the Committee on Banking and Currency or the Committee on Ways and Means just what kind of currency that is? It was issued by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.

Mr. DEWEY rose.

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DEWEY. That is a Federal Reserve bank note. I believe its issue at the present time is unauthorized.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman mean to say that we would have money in circulation called national currency the issue of which would be unauthorized?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. May I state to the gentleman that it is no more misleading than the paper money we have out that is supposed to be payable in gold, although we are off the gold standard and it is not payable in gold.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would not argue with the gentleman on that question, but this is a piece of national currency that is secured by the deposit of United States bonds or other securities. Can we go on indefinitely depositing bonds by the billions and issuing national currency?

Mr. DEWEY. I understand that the issue of $660,000,000 of this currency was authorized, but its further issue has been stopped.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, it is worth 100 cents on the dollar. The gentleman would not sell his bill for any less than that?

Mr. HINSHAW. I took it for a $20 bill myself. I am not worried about that.

Mr. RANKIN. I will give the gentleman $19 for it.

In fact I would give him full value for it. It is the same kind of money that Abraham Lincoln issued to fight the Civil War on. He issued $346,000,000 of United States notes that are still outstanding, and during that time we have saved $11,000,000,000 in interest on it.

The editorial follows:

[From the San Marino (Calif.) Tribune of January 14, 1943]

THINKING ALLOWED

(By Stanley Arndt)

WHERE I AM ALLOWED TO THINK ALOUD—IT COULDN'T HAPPEN HERE

We've heard a lot about blue Monday and black Friday, but Monday, December 21, 1942, may turn out to be the blackest day in American history. Something happened that day that may wipe out the savings of the entire American people; something that may destroy the value of every note and bond and mortgage and deed of trust in this country; something that may make the American dollar worth but a dime or a nickel or even a penny.

And yet not a newspaper that I've seen carried the story; not a news commentator told about the event; not a financial journal chronicled the happening or raised a word of warning. Ralph Robey in Newsweek for January 4, alone caught the affair and its significance.

You've heard of printing-press money, fiat money, phoney money, printed and issued by a poverty-stricken government without any gold or silver or bonds or collateral behind it. You've no doubt heard what happened in Germany with its printing press money after the last war. Look at your son's stamp collection and see the German stamps he has—10 marks, 100 marks, 500 marks, 1,000 marks, 5,000 marks, 100,000 marks. That 100,000-mark stamp cost 100,000 marks and 100,000 marks in pre-First World War days was worth $25,000 in United States gold coin—but when it was issued, that 100,000-mark stamp wasn't worth a single United States silver dollar.

Why?

Inflation—not inflation of rising prices, but inflation caused by printing-press money unbacked by coin or collateral.

But that couldn't happen here.

"True," you say, "we can have simple inflation caused by the law of supply and demand acting upon increased purchasing power (from higher wages) trying to buy the decreased production of consumer's goods (due to curtailment and rationing) but we'll never have print-press money like Germany did. It couldn't happer here—the people wouldn't stand for it."

That's what you think; it couldn't happen here.

But it has!

On December 21, 1942, the Federal Reserve bank commenced putting into circulation $660,000,000 of Federal Reserve notes not secured by anything, pure 100-percent fiat printing-press money; not the Federal Reserve Bank of the Third Reich; not the Federal Reserve of the Nip-huns; but the Federal Reserve bank of these United States.

You may have some in your pocket now, they look just like the Federal Reserve notes we've been used to for 25 years, the ones that were secured by Government bonds or other collateral 100 percent, only these are secured by nothing.

"But," you ask, "how could it be done? Congress didn't pass a law allowing such printing-press money and the Federal Reserve bank couldn't act without congressional sanction."

Let's think back a few years. On March 9, 1933, just after Mr. Roosevelt was inaugurated, this country was faced with a panic—the banks were all closed by Presidential decree—a real emergency was facing us. On that day Congress amended the Federal Reserve Act (sec. 18, par 6) and authorized the issuance of fiat printing-press money. Nearly $660,000,000 of this emergency printing-press money was printed—but was never issued—then. But the 1933 amendment provided "no such circulating notes shall be issued * * * after the President has declared by proclamation that the emergency recognized by the President by proclamation of March 6, 1933, has terminated."

True, the emergency has, as a matter of fact, terminated; true the closed banks have all reopened. But the President has never declared such termination by proclamation—and so the administration says the emergency powers of 1933 to issue fiat printing-press money still exists, and on December 21, 1942, started to issue the money.

It couldn't happen here. Well, it has.

It was only $660,000,000, says the Treasurer. But fiat money is fiat money, and phoney money is phoney money. If the Government can and does issue that amount under that 1933 act, it can and might issue a second and a third and a fourth six hundred and sixty millions.

If the people don't complain about the first six hundred and sixty million, then perhaps they'll try another batch and another batch and another.

Inflation is here—and unless the people of this Nation raise a mighty shout of protest, they can look forward to buying $10,000 stamps to send an air-mail letter across the country. It's no use writing JERRY VOORHIS—he's always advocated this very type of money—but you can protest to JOHNSON and DOWNEY and the rest of the California delegation, and you can write Morgenthau and Roosevelt.

It couldn't happen here, but it has.

December 21, 1942, may become the blackest day in American history—unless you act.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 183, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members of the House: The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short address by Sarah Ruth Frazier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert a short item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POSTPONEMENT OF LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for this afternoon. I ask unanimous consent that I may have that same time on Tuesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a letter from a soldier and an additional letter from an Army officer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STANDARD TIME

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks by the insertion of a joint resolution which I have filed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I have also introduced a resolution this morning in the matter of time, and I cooperate 100 percent with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE] who addressed the House a few moments ago.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas it is provided in the act entitled "An act to promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight saving time," approved January 20, 1942, that the Congress may by concurrent resolution designate the date when such act shall cease to be in effect; and

Whereas it is provided in such act that at 2 a. m. of the last Sunday in the calendar month following the calendar month during which such act ceases to be in effect the standard time of each zone shall be returned to the mean astronomical time of the degree of longitude governing the standard time for such zone as provided in the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the act entitled "An act to promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight saving time," approved January 20, 1942, shall cease to be in effect as of January 31, 1943.

NATIONAL CURRENCY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], who spoke a moment ago about the money that has been issued by the Treasury Department, I call attention to the fact that the only difference between it and the money issued regularly by the Federal Reserve is that the Federal Government is not now paying interest on its own money. We have all the gold necessary behind every dollar, as well as the resources of this Nation. They are behind every dollar issued by the Federal Government, but we do not have to pay interest on it.

I presume if it had been issued through the Federal Reserve banks, and the Government had paid interest on it, then it would have been all right.

But let me remind the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] that we gave the President of the United States the right to issue $3,000,000,000 of United States notes, and he still has that right. If that had been done 10 years ago, instead of the borrowing spree that we have been on, the chances are the Government would have been better off. I remind the gentleman also that during the Civil War this same question arose, and Abraham Lincoln issued United States notes and put them into circulation in order to raise money to fight the Civil War. Three hundred and forty-six million dollars of that money is still in circulation, and it is estimated that we have saved $11,000,000,000 in interest upon it in that time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after other special orders and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michgan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back that time.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE MEAT SHORTAGE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is engaged in a war effort of stupendous proportions. One that dwarfs and overshadows any similar undertaking of our own Nation or of other nations in the history of man. The American people are not unconscious of the magnitude of this effort, and, like other people in nations similarly engaged, are girding themselves for sacrifices never before contemplated.

Those who are making the fight for us on the world's battle fronts—our own boys, our brave allies, and the people of the nations alined with our cause—must have food. An ever-increasing stream of life's necessities must be kept flowing to them. Nobody in the Nation can take issue with the necessity of such an obligation. And nobody would countenance a measure that would have the effect of lessening or diminishing food supplies for the armed forces and lend-lease. The people of the United States can take it. They are conscious of the gravity and immensity of the war in which we are engaged, and know full well the consequences of defeat. And they are willing to make any sacrifice that is necessary to make final victory certain. And if going without food items will hasten victory, by keeping the boys in the battle areas adequately supplied with life's necessities, you can depend on the people of America.

But, when a condition exists, as now, when the American people are told by responsible Government officials that an ample meat supply is available for the Armed Forces and lend-lease and that an ample meat supply is available for their tables, and find that their retail and wholesale shops have no meat; when they find that meat is available for the rich and not for the poor; when they observe that meat is piled high in the windows of some of the better restaurants; when they hear of retailers compelled to drive their automobiles from suburban districts, form lines 3 to 4 blocks long outside packing plants, and go away with 1 or 2 pieces of meat, when they hear of wholesale houses closing down all over the Nation because packers, placed in a monopolistic status by O. P. A. regulations, refuse to sell them meat, and get away with it; when housewives are compelled to walk 20 or more city blocks in search of a piece of meat for the dinner table and return home with Canadian bacon for which they have paid 95 cents per pound; when racketeering, brought on by O. P. A. regulations has skyrocketed meat prices beyond the pocketbook of the poor and even the middle class; when conditions like that are prevalent—and they are today—there is something very, very rotten in the bureaucratic woodpile, something that must be smoked out forthwith, if the national morale is to be maintained. But whatever the cause, and wherever the responsibility reposes, matters have reached the stage where the American people are asking "Why?" And as far as my own constituency is concerned, I can tell you they are asking in no uncertain terms.

Of course, there are some of us who have had the temerity to form our own opinions. Opinions that have crystallized into convictions, as ill-conceived regulations, born in the fertile minds of theorists and experimentalists with lit-

tle or no practical experience in business or industry, have forced constituents to close down establishments that have flourished through the years.

Perhaps a few excerpts from a report of the National Association of Retail Meat Dealers, dated January 1942, may indicate the uncompromising O. P. A. approach to the formulation of regulations. I quote:

Unfortunately, every meeting attended by our representatives the past year is presided over by a new chairman and different groups, again emphasizing the trial and error method; in other words, if this doesn't work, we will try something else, with another set of Office of Price Administration officers.

Ten months ago officials of Office of Price Administration were conferred with and some practical recommendations discussed, but those in charge who wanted to try out their theories ignored the sound recommendations of businessmen, and, failing, were obliged to try something else. Hypocritical meetings were called to confer with meat experts, but their advice or recommendation is ignored unless in harmony with the blueprint—theoretical plans prepared for the conference.

Those are the reactions of meat retailers—reactions of the men who come in contact with the consumer every day in the year. They know the meat problem, not from theory, not from what textbooks have told them, not from experimenting in college classroom or laboratory, but from actual, practical, day in and day out experience with it, and they came to Washington to assist, to cooperate, to give O. P. A. the benefit of suggestions gleaned the hard way through the years. Their industry was affected by proposed regulations and they assumed that their suggestions would be accorded serious consideration. But apparently those who formulate regulations at O. P. A. feel they need no advice or suggestions from the practical phase of the various industries they tinker with, and that brings to mind an expression one frequently hears with reference to the O. P. A. attitude concerning its regulations, which is summed up like this: "If you do not like our regulations, get out of business."

But regardless of the beautiful phraseology of O. P. A. meat regulations, the civilian population still is not getting its equitable share of available meat. And it seems to me that the worth of these regulatory measures is summed up realistically and accurately by application of the before-and-after formula—before the regulations everybody had meat after the regulations nobody has meat. That is the reason the American people want to know why.

One answer is furnished by E. W. Williams, a food authority, in an editorial that appeared in Butcher's Advocate under date of January 13 last:

"Despite the Army and lend-lease," writes Mr. Williams, "there should be enough beef to go around in this country. Yet stores are closing for lack of beef, housewives and defense workers find it increasingly difficult to get meat.

"There are today more cows coming on the market than ever before. This is due to the labor shortage on dairy farms and will result in decreased breeding. Steers coming on the market are not fully mature, lacking in many cases about 300 pounds of potential meat and fat. This is because they come directly from the range and have not had the benefit of the feed lot.

"It would seem clear that the duty of the planners is to see that meat is grown which will produce every possible pound of beef and fat. But let us see what really happened. First, no effort has been made to stop the marketing of she cattle. Secondly, the Office of Price Administration repeatedly refuses to place a ceiling on livestock, thus setting prices on finished beef which are not sufficiently above the prices of range cattle to encourage raising cattle to maturity and getting the maximum amount of weight."

As early as August 14, last, Mr. Joseph Cohn, counsel and executive director or the New York Meat Trade Institute, addressed communications to both Leon Henderson of O. P. A. and Secretary Wickard of Agriculture, emphasizing the fact that current meat shortages, among other things, are due to the lack of a ceiling on livestock, and urging the establishement of such ceilings in price regulations then under consideration. Others, equally informed and experienced in the meat industry, advanced similar recommendations.

Several regulations fixing ceilings on various meats have emanated from O. P. A. since these suggestions were advanced. All are without the ceilings on livestock so urged. Apparently the boys who dream up the regulations at O. P. A. either want no advice from practical sources in industries or make a pretense of accepting it, and then toss it into the wastebasket. "If that doesn't work, we'll try something else," the head of an O. P. A. division once remarked to a friend of mine whose business future was at the brink of disaster as the result of O. P. A. theorizing. The let's-try-something-else impulse undoubtedly is an exhilarating one to the boys at O. P. A.; but it is not exhilarating to the housewife who walks 20 city blocks for a pound of hamburger, or to the poor who pay 68 cents for a pound of soup meat in New York City. And it should not be exhilarating to those of us here in the Congress whose constituents are in that category.

According to Secretary Wickard, the packers actually are buying livestock at a loss. In a radio address, delivered August 19 last, he said:

They are bidding more for livestock than the meat dressed out of the livestock will bring under existing price ceilings. They are doing this because they are willing to give up profits temporarily in order to keep their line-up of customers.

The Secretary's statement is absolutely accurate. But whenever the packers turn their backs on profits, it is time to look for the Ethiopian in the proverbial woodpile. And here it is: the packers are casting expectant eyes to the future. They control the meat industry now—thanks to the boys at O. P. A.—and by refusing to sell meat to competitive nonslaughtering processors and wholesalers, they put the latter out of business and eventually, take over their customers.

Several months ago O. P. A. issued price regulations on beef and lamb. During the same period it also issued what is known as meat restriction order No. 1, which limits slaughterers—packers—to 70 percent of their 1941 kill. The purposes of these measures were twofold; first, as announced in the price regulations, statement of considerations, to insure an equitable distribution of meat; and secondly, to keep prices at a level that would prevent inflation.

HAVE EITHER OF THESE OBJECTIVES BEEN ACHIEVED?

Ask wholesalers, processors, and retailers, who are going out of business because they cannot get meat from the packer. Ask the housewife who is paying abnormal prices for unpalatable meat. And ask the poor who are going without meat because they cannot afford to pay the "black market" prices.

If all of that spells equitable distribution and reasonable price levels, then Hitler and his murdering rabble are just a bunch of big-hearted, good-natured play boys.

The price regulations compel the packer to pay a discount of 50 cents per hundred pounds for meat sold to wholesalers or processors in less-than-carload lots; but they do not make the same discount applicable when the packer sells meat to hotel supply houses and retailers. In other words, it costs the packer money to sell to wholesalers and processors, but costs him nothing to sell to hotel supply houses or retailers. The packer has been accused of a lot of things through the years, but never, to my recollection, of being remiss in business acumen. And need I tell you who is getting his meat since the price regulations went into effect?

That is just another nail driven into the coffin of a branch of the meat industry that represents investments and facilities aggregating millions of dollars and employing thousands of skilled workers that know no other trade; a long-established, economically sound, and, despite the O. P. A.'s contention to the contrary, an essential and necessary branch of the industry.

But the final nail in the coffin—the act they call the coup de grâce in the parlance of the firing squad—takes the form of O. P. A. Meat Restriction Order No. 1. If any doubt existed as to whether rigor mortis had set in after the price regulations, the meat-restriction order removed all doubt. It left the nonslaughtering processor and wholesaler facing a future that spelled ruin with a capital R.

The phraseology of this order is innocent-appearing enough. It provides chiefly that slaughterers—packers—for 1943, must not kill more than 70 percent of the cattle slaughtered in the year 1941 for civilian consumption. Nobody can quarrel with the kill-limitation theory, but the order fails to specify what the slaughterer—packer—shall do with the 70 percent. And remember the packer is in competition with nonslaughtering processors and wholesalers. He maintains his own branch houses, his own processing plants, and one of his most burning desires, through the years, has been to eliminate competition from the independents. Well, O. P. A. has done the job for him. And what a job! The meat industry today is his—lock, stock, and barrel. For the packer—and who can blame him—is using the 70 percent for his own wholesale and processing

plants, and for the retail trade—chiefly the chain stores—he wants to take from his competitors. And as for competition—it is no longer any contest.

I do not suppose it is a matter of any importance to those who formulate the policies and regulations at O. P. A. that the packers currently are under indictment for monopolistic practices. The Government, it seems, has been trying to keep them from gobbling up the little fellows of the industry. That is why they are in court. And it has been consistently a policy of the Department of Justice through the years to keep a watchful eye on their avaricious tendencies. But apparently a little matter like antitrust laws does not bother the boys at O. P. A. They have handed the packers a complete sky-is-the-limit monopoly on a silver platter. And one of the officials at O. P. A. who played a major role in framing the restriction order was loaned to O. P. A. by Armour & Co., with a 20-year background in the packing industry.

Quite recently the Office of Price Administration has been making a spectacular show of going after the so-called "black market." But it might be interesting to inquire, Who is responsible for the 'black market?" Is not it O. P. A.? If their meat regulations had permitted the normal distribution of meat what need would exist for a "black market?" There would be meat for everybody—packer, processor, wholesaler, and retailer. But under present conditions the packer calls the turn. The meat of the Nation has been placed entirely in his hands, to distribute as and how he sees fit. And we know that he is not delivering meat to wholesale and processing plants in competition with his own wholesale branch houses and processing plants. And we know also that, not possessing adequate distributive facilities, he cannot deliver meat to all of the retailers that wholesalers could deliver to, because wholesalers possess adequate facilities in the larger cities—facilities that permitted in most cases, Statewide, daily deliveries. That is why my people and your people cannot buy meat—and that is the genesis of your "black market."

Roy M. Cohen, an authority on meat, who writes for the Butcher's Advocate, has the following to say about the situation:

> We must show that the Office of Price Administration's theorizing is the direct cause of bootlegging "black markets," and that their threats will not remedy our situation at the present moment, calling spades spades, and the present methods of supplying meats to the consumer is so bad that it is just like an apple that is rotten to the core. The whole meat plan of the Office of Price Administration must be scrapped. We will have to start all over from scratch on a sound economic basis.

Only last Saturday one of our big retailers in Brooklyn said to me:

> For many years there has been a wholesale house and packing branch house in my district and I have been doing business with both, and never once has the price of the wholesaler been higher than that of the packing branch house. But I know that if the wholesale house goes, I will be at the mercy of the packer, and the Lord himself only knows what prices may be in that event.

Now, I would like to read for the record a letter which was received from a man who has been engaged in the meat-processing business for more than half a century. This is typical of the letters Members of both Houses have been receiving since the issuance of O. P. A. meat regulations and the restriction order:

> We have been engaged in the manufacture and the processing of sausage and meat products over 60 years. We have an organization of 25 employees and have recently completed an addition to our sausage plant due to the increased demand for our processed food products. After years of struggle and effort to establish our business, we find ourselves faced with a disastrous situation, being eliminated from business.
>
> Since the history of our business we have been purchasing beef and pork products necessary for the manufacture of sausage principally from the large packing houses, such as Swift, Armour, Morrell, Cudahy, Hammond, Dold, Kingan, and others. However, under present Office of Price Administration Meat Restriction Order No. 1, supplies lie entirely in the hands of the slaughterers. We have helped them to establish their quotas. At the present time they have usurped the entire quota for themselves and are not granting us any share of the quota which we helped to establish. Since they are not compelled to do so under Office of Price Administration regulations they are consequently taking advantage of the situation. We believe this to be monopolistic and greedy, an unfair practice, contrary to our Nation's principles of fair trade—the very principles for which this war is being fought.
>
> At this point we wish to make ourselves clear. We are in no way complaining about what the Government is taking, for we realize that our boys who are fighting for us must be fed, and fed well. We are only asking for a fair share of the quota. It looks to us as if the packers are making the world safe for the packers.

The plight of the man who wrote that letter is not an extraordinary, isolated case. It is rather, the plight of meat processors, wholesalers, and retailers all over the country. These men—most of them—are the little business men President Roosevelt declared the backbone of the Nation's economic structure. They have grown up with, and rendered honest, useful, and essential service to the communities of the Nation. For years in many instances more than half a century, they have constituted the medium that made meat available daily, to the butcher shop around the corner. Their service, their distributive facilities, and their dependability have brought meat to the Nation's dinner tables without interruption through the years. And any success, any prosperity that may have come to any of them, came because, in the beginning, they had faith in the promise that our system of government offers to all humans, the right to work out one's destiny without unwarranted interference from any source. And now that O. P. A. has decreed their liquidation not their utter ruin, the corner butcher shops of the Nation cannot get meat; black markets with prices beyond the means of the poor have come into being overnight and are flourishing; and the channels of distribution for meat are clogged, hopelessly. O. P. A. has decreed, by one or two strokes of some bureaucrat's pen, that the works these little business men have created by dint of honest toil must go. O. P. A. says they are necessary war casualties. I say they are not—they are not necessary war casualties. And here and now, I challenge anybody in O. P. A., in Agriculture, or any place else in the Government or out, to prove that their destruction is necessary to the winning of the war. And I say further, that unless and until O. P. A. can prove, by conclusive evidence, in a public hearing before a committee of this body, that these little business men of the Nation are not an integral and essential factor to the smooth flow of meat to the civilian population, they must immediately be placed in a position where the present packer monopoly, established by O. P. A. regulations, will not, and cannot deprive them of their just and equitable share of meat.

O. P. A. and Agriculture both know how this can be accomplished. Both have had before them for several weeks now, a plan—submitted by the processors and wholesalers—which sets up simple procedure and machinery for just and equitable allocation of the existing meat percentage allocated for civilian use; the percentage which, under existing conditions, the packer is devoting to his own use. This plan contemplates a situation where all factors of the industry will be able to secure meat.

It will free distributive channels now badly clogged and with meat available to all branches of the industry there will be no reason for the existence of the "black market."

One official at Agriculture pronounced the plan the clearest and most workable solution of the problem presented to date. But that seems to be the extent of any action on it, so far as that Department is concerned. Mr. Madigan of O. P. A. however—he is the former official of Armour & Co. who played a major role in preparation of the meat-restriction order that has put the finishing touches on the processors and wholesalers and has created a state of chaos with respect to current meat distribution—Mr. Madigan appears to feel it will take too long to work out the plan. I wonder if Mr. Madigan has observed the sign that seems to be plastered all over the walls at O. P. A. "the difficult can be done right away. The impossible takes a little while longer."

I have reached the conclusion that the present meat situation should be aired for the edification of the American public. The present mess is so muddled, so confused, and apparently so hopeless that nothing short of a thorough investigation by this body will clear the atmosphere and shed light on all persons and all interests responsible for it. If the responsibility reposes at O. P. A.—and I personally am convinced that is where it lies—or if it reposes elsewhere, let us make that determination—and let us make it quickly. For that reason I have introduced House Resolution 48 which, you will observe, aims to lay the entire meat problem open from beginning to end, by a complete and comprehensive investigation. We are faced

with a situation where a certain percentage of meat has been made available to the civilian population and the civilian population is not getting it; where the Government is spending large sums of money and adding to the Government pay roll to make investigations, and prosecute persons allegedly operating on the "black market." And the "black market" is the direct result of lack of meat; lack of the percentage of meat allotted by the Government to the civilian population. Where is that percentage of meat? Why cannot our housewives get it? Why do they have to pay sky-high prices on the "black market," when meat should be available in their regular retail stores? Who is responsible for all of these things? The people of the Nation are asking these questions. They feel they should know. House Resolution 48 will accomplish that end.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I subscribe completely to all my colleague [Mr. O'TOOLE] has said concerning the meat situation. I happen to represent a constituency on the East Side of New York City; one that comprises fine, hard-working patriotic Americans. But most of my people are poor. They are the people of the Nation that find it difficult, frequently, to make both ends meet. But they are trying to do their share in the war effort. Their sons are fighting—and dying—on the battlefields of the world, as are the sons of other people, in other parts of the country. And they are prepared to make any sacrifice, cheerfully and willingly, to make the lot of the little people of the world a better and a happier one.

My people, too, most of them, are in the category mentioned by my distinguished colleague from New York. So long as there exists a "black market" for meat, with its prohibitive prices; so long as this present intolerable condition remain with us, where meat is available only to those who can afford to pay bootleg prices—the majority of my people will be unable to have meat on their dinner tables.

It is not easy for people who have steeled themselves to great sacrifices—for people who are willing to go without most of the small luxuries that helped dispel the shadows of a difficult existence—for people who have been told that this is everybody's war—to learn that an essential commodity like meat actually is available; but is not available to everybody, except at exorbitant prices. And when the housewives of my district are compelled to tramp the city streets and go from butcher shop to butcher shop, without finding meat for the dinner table that is within the range of their slender income, they are human, and they begin to wonder and ask questions. That is what is going on among the families of the East Side. They are asking one another—and asking me—by mail, by telephone, and by direct contact "Has not the Government told us there is sufficient meat for the armed forces, for lend-lease and a substantial amount for the civilian population? Where is it? Why cannot our butchers get it? The people up on Park Avenue get it; the big hotels have it; and there is a lot of it in the windows of the big Broadway restaurants."

I suppose that the little people all over the Nation—the middle class and the poor—are asking the same question. The Government said there was meat for all of us. Where is it? And I submit that when the people of the Nation begin asking questions of that character a definite, logical, and accurate explanation should be forthcoming forthwith. If there has been bureaucratic bungling, if the meat situation has become enmeshed in a jungle of red tape, if some of our governmental theorists have applied the wrong formula, it is high time the people were apprised of the error.

In the past few days the press has carried stories describing steps taken by the O. P. A. to curb the so-called "black market." One reads of arrests being made and of impending prosecutions by the score, and one observes statements by O. P. A. officials and by other Government, State, and municipal officials condemning "black market" practices and urging prosecutions and other measures. But it does not seem to have occurred to anyone that the best and most effective manner in which to curb and eliminate it is to attack it at its roots. Arrests, prosecutions, and statements do not mean anything unless the source of the evil definitely is erased. We did not stop prohibition violations until we repealed the prohibition law, and it does not seem necessary to recall the millions of dollars of taxpayers' money expended, as well as the hopelessly clogged Federal and State court dockets that continued until prohibition actually became a dead letter; and so it is important, I submit, that before we enter upon another law-enforcement era like that of prohibition we search out the causes of this black-market problem.

Current meat regulations were planned, sponsored, and issued by the O. P. A. They were sprung upon the industry several months ago, and immediately more civic worries, headaches, and difficulties came into being than ever flew out of the famed Pandora's box. Their purpose was, first, to insure an equitable distribution of meat, and, second, to keep prices at a level that would prevent inflation; neither of those objectives have been accomplished. In fact, instead of an equitable distribution of meat, a gross and notorious inequitable distribution is apparent; and instead of maintenance of prices at a level to prevent inflation, sky-high, exorbitant prices currently prevail, and whereas there was no "black market" before those regulations came into being, a healthy and flourishing black market has sprung into existence since their issuance.

It does not seem to me that it takes a meat economist, a mathematician, or a "superdooper" administrative genius to figure out the answer. As my colleague has said, "Apply the old before-and-after formula." Before O. P. A. theorists went into a huddle and came up with the meat regulations, everybody had meat, prices were not too high, and there was not a black market. After the huddle and the play, there is no meat, prices have skyrocketed, and we have a nice, big juicy black market.

The surest method for creating a scarcity of any commodity is to clog channels of distribution. O. P. A. meat regulations and orders do that very thing. How? Because they are putting the meat processor and wholesaler out of business and because the meat processor and wholesaler possess most of the distributive facilities of the industry. The packer now has the field practically to himself. He is sitting back, enjoying a more complete monopoly than ever was envisioned in his wildest and most ambitious dreams. Who "dun" it? O. P. A. with its little regulations and orders. The processor and the wholesaler had the distributive facilities; the packer had his branch houses, but not facilities for distribution comparable to those of his competitors. That is why our housewives cannot find meat at the corner butcher shop. It is not there because the packer, who now rules the meat roost, does not have sufficient means for reaching the thousands of retail shops that wholesalers and processors serviced daily. And regardless of the statements and explanations that are emanating from O. P. A., from Agriculture, and from other sources, meat will not be available in those little retail shops until the processor and the wholesaler are accorded the right to continue in business, which is being taken away by O. P. A. regulatory action.

All of this adds up to the word "investigation." If packer influences in O. P. A. have handed the meat industry to the packing interests, if O. P. A. bungling is responsible for the present meat mess, and if, as I am informed, O. P. A. and Agriculture both view the existing situation with complacency, the people of the Nation should have the opportunity to learn what brings things of that character about. For these reasons I favor the investigation envisioned by my colleague's resolution. But I favor more. I favor immediate remedial action by O. P. A. and Agriculture not only to save the millions of dollars invested in processing and wholesaling establishments, which have been in existence for years and have rendered efficient and honest service to their respective communities but to keep them in business by making meat available to them; meat that they can get to your corner butcher shop and those of my people on the East Side. Neither O. P. A. nor Agriculture can afford in these times to procrastinate or to temporize. Either they prove to us beyond a reasonable doubt that a sufficient supply of meat is not available or, failing in that, see to it that meat flows to the civilian population through its long-accustomed channels.

### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other special orders today I may have 10 minutes in which to answer the city farmer on the beef shortage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] may extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a letter and statistics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

COMMITTEE ON CIVILIAN AVIATION

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of discussing with the membership of the House the pending proposal to establish a regular legislative committee on the subject of commercial aviation. What I shall say here this afternoon is wholly impersonal, and anything that I say to which objection might be taken is not intended as offensive to anybody concerned. I recognize the right of every Member of this House to have his own views and freely express them, and that is the reason I am expressing my views here today. I am opposed to the proposal on a good many grounds, only one or two of which I think it is necessary to state, to convince an impartial thinker that it ought not to be done. In the first place, as the gentleman who preceded me here this morning has just stated, we are now engaged, we do not know whether in the middle or in the front or in the last part of the most difficult war in the history of the whole world. We are fighting on every battle front where a fight can be staged, and are participating in this war on every continent in the world in one way or another. At this time, all ships of commerce in the air are under the supervision and control of the Army and Navy of the United States, and that is as it should be. I call attention now to a phrase in a statement that was made by your House Military Affairs Committee as a result of its investigation of these subjects and other subjects, which it was authorized to investigate, and I say that statement, when it came to the floor of the House in the form of a report, met with universal approval.

The House Military Affairs Committee for the past year and a half has been making many investigations, careful investigations, into the operation of the air power of this country. That, of course, was confined to military activities, as it should have been, and as any committee with authority and jurisdiction should do.

I was referring to a statement which we made in that report after these long months of study and investigation, and this is it:

> Whenever a new or varied problem is presented a new commission, board, committee, or agency is usually created. Let us concentrate and not duplicate.

That was a criticism of what was going on in the executive agencies and departments of the Government. What I am tremendously concerned about here today is not the question of whether my committee shall have jurisdiction of this, that, or the other, but it is a question of whether the House of Representatives is going to put itself in the attitude, through one of its special committees, of making a statement and then following up the practice that it has condemned in the executive departments of the Government.

Hardly a day passes but what somebody on the floor denounces bureaucracy. Hardly a day passes that somebody does not talk about duplication of effort. If I am not mistaken, the Congress has already passed four different measures seeking to consolidate and coordinate the executive agencies of the Government for the purpose of utilizing them more effectively and for the purpose of economizing in the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. That principle applied to Federal executive agencies is sound, and it is even more sound when it is applied to the legislative branch of the Government.

We have three regular standing committees, one of them more than 100 years old, another one close to a century old, and another one perhaps 50 years old. Those committees are regularly engaged in the investigation not only of interstate and foreign commerce, military affairs, and naval affairs, but the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, constituted as it is today, the personnel of which are able and capable statesmen, headed by the distinguished leader, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] enjoys, and ought to enjoy, the entire confidence of the membership of the House of Representatives. So long as we have that kind of a committee set-up, which has jurisdiction not only of the legislation to create but legislation to regulate, what reason is there to establish an additional legislative committee to deal alone with one of the many problems that are properly within the jurisdiction of that committee? In other words, the meaning of the thing is this, that we establish a regular legislative committee to be composed of 21 members to deal with peacetime civilian air commerce. If you do that, the next move may be to establish a committee to deal alone with rail carriers. The next move may be to establish a regular committee to deal with water carriers. The next move, a committee to deal with highway carriers, such as busses, trucks, and motor vehicles.

The reason I say that is this: I have proof of it in the Congressional Directory, because we have five committees now dealing with veterans' affairs and pensions, when, as a matter of fact, one committee could deal with the whole subject in a more concise and better way, without duplication, extra effort, and expense.

I find no fault with any of the excellent gentlemen who are on this special committee that has been investigating airplane accidents, but let me point out that one of the first resolutions they introduced—and there are two or three pending yet—provided that they were going to set up this committee for the purpose of dealing with civilian air commerce in its relation to the Army and the Navy. Now, if that is not authority to go out and deal with military and naval questions, I am somewhat uninformed and do not know how to think straight.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. NICHOLS I am sure the gentleman wants to properly inform the House. Of course, the resolution which is now being considered by the Committee on Rules has no reference, either by statement or inference, to military or naval aviation.

Mr. MAY. That is true, but I was not discussing the resolution nor any of them in that light. What I was pointing out was that a committee designated for a specific particular proposition might go out of its jurisdiction and invade the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or the House Military Affairs Committee. As evidence of that, and without any criticism whatever, of the distinguished and very capable gentleman from Oklahoma as chairman of the special committee that has made the investigations, and very ably made them with regard to air accidents, in the course of their investigation as to why an airplane fell here, there, or yonder, they found it necessary to look into a colony of Japanese in a foreign country to find out how many guns they had. They not only found that necessary, but they had meetings and assemblies with parliaments of foreign governments, none of which related to the sole question which they were authorized to investigate, that was to find out whether it was water in the gas, or whether it was bad equipment, or whether it was a foul in the mechanism of the airplane, or whether it was the failure of the pilot to read his orders, or whether it was bad weather conditions that brought about the airplane accident. I merely point that out, without any criticism or any feeling whatsoever, to show that when you set up a committee to deal with a particular subject, it is always difficult to keep from going out into the field of speculation and on the outside.

But now let us get ourselves in the right attitude. Why create a committee to deal with a subject that has been the matter of study by a regular House committee with long experience in all of the subjects relating to air transport and air traffic? Why bother the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee when they are going to deal from now on with problems in the realm of air commerce relating to air transport which we would have to authorize the other committee to deal with? Who set up the Civil Aeronautics Authority? Who created under that Authority the Air Commerce Board? So when you come to deal with the question of an additional legislative committee and the economy involved it may not be in dollars and cents but I find I have difficulty in holding down the cost of hearings in the House Military Affairs Committee perhaps due to the fact that we are almost constantly in session; but I be-

lieve that when you want to save money for the Government the man who knows how to save a penny will finally reach the economy of a dollar; the man who knows how to save $1 will finally know how to save $100; and the man who knows how to save $100 ultimately will save thousands. So it is not a question of necessity that exists here. The committee that has been appointed to make the investigation of air accidents has already performed its duty well; they have not only performed their duty, but they have asked permission for a 3-months' period of time to close their hearings, close their operations as a committee and go out of business. If they have finished the whole study of air accidents and you have your regular committees already established for the purpose of dealing with legislation and authority to deal with Air Corps personnel, then I say it is eminently improper at this time in the midst of a great war to make a change of this character.

What is the actual situation? The Army actually has in operation subject to its own control today a little more than one-half of all of the commercial air lines of this country. It not only operates those commercial air lines to points within the United States, but to points without the United States. Upon every battle front where our country is engaged in war they are coordinated and synchronized into the American Army Air Corps and Naval Air Corps. If they are welded together and mixed together in such way that they are under military supervision, nobody knowing how long this war is going to last, nobody willing to predict as to when it will end, nobody able to say whether it will be 2 years longer, 5 years longer, or 10 years longer, why take this step until we see where we are and get our feet on the ground and then move forward with the question of the appointment of a special or regular legislative committee dealing with this question?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Can the gentleman give us any information as to whether the commercial planes in foreign countries, such as Great Britain, are operated by the military at the present time, or whether they are under some independent set-up?

Mr. MAY. They are under the supervision of the American armed forces, or the War Department; in other words, under the jurisdiction of General Arnold, the Chief of the Air Corps of the United States, so far as their operation is concerned.

Mr. REED of New York. I believe the gentleman did not understand my question. I asked the gentleman if foreign governments, such as Great Britain, for instance, had their planes operated by the military or whether they were operated under an independent set-up.

Mr. MAY. The Royal Air Force, of course, operates the Army planes for the British Government.

Mr. REED of New York. All right; now, I am talking about the commercial planes; what is being done about them over there?

Mr. MAY. It is my understanding there are no commercial planes in England right now, in the sense that commercial lines must have permits from the military authorities similar to our own situation.

Mr. REED of New York. I think the gentleman must be mistaken.

Mr. MAY. If there are any operating I believe they are controlled by the Army exactly as they are here; that is my understanding. The commercial aviation of Britain, of course, is operated by private companies, subject to control by the military.

Mr. NICHOLS. And, if the gentleman will yield, lend their efforts to the military and are under military control.

Mr. MAY. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. NICHOLS. In Germany only 2 weeks ago the German military took over all the commercial air lines in Germany; but that is not true in Britain; neither is it true in Canada. It is the same system we have here.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The gentleman from Oklahoma knows that the commercial air lines in foreign countries are under quasi-military control.

Mr. MAY. That is it exactly.

Mr. NICHOLS. Oh, no.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Just the same as our commercial air lines are.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman also knows that commercial aviation is operating in Great Britain to a very negligible extent.

Mr. NICHOLS. No.

Mr. MAY. They are flying to the armed fronts almost exclusively and are under military control; that is about the only place they go.

Mr. NICHOLS. They fly for military uses just the same as our lines do here, but they are owned privately.

Mr. MAY. The Royal Air Force has the final say as to what passengers, express, and mail shall be carried.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was about to say they cannot leave an airfield to fly out of Great Britain without first having the O. K. of the Royal Air Force.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman has stated the matter as I understand it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman has discussed this question intelligently, of course, from his standpoint and I followed the argument carefully. I believe, however, that the gentleman said to the House that we could keep the status quo of the subject of commercial and civil aviation, or words to that effect.

Mr. MAY. No.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe the gentleman would be the last person to say that we have kept the status quo from the standpoint of the prosecution of this war by the armed forces of the United States. The gentleman knows that constantly we are making changes and are using aircraft to a greater degree and that within the organizations of the War Department and the Navy Department there is a constant change going on giving greater emphasis to air power.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman misunderstood me if he thought I said that the status quo was being maintained. I do not think I used those words at all.

Mr. RANDOLPH. No. I used them.

Mr. MAY. What I meant to say was that more than half of the commercial air lines of this country are now subject to the control and direction of the War Department. The other half is rapidly becoming so, because as the needs of the country develop and as the war problems become more difficult, the Army must take over. To that we all agree.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, who has just retired from the floor, objects to the proposed committee because it will cause interference with jurisdiction in the House. Under existing law and rules the Military Affairs Committee has jurisdiction over military aviation. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over commercial aviation. If this other committee were set up to deal with commercial aviation alone, there could be no more conflict in jurisdiction under that set-up than there is today?

Mr. HINSHAW. None whatever.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with intense interest to the addresses that have been made to this House by various chairmen of important committees. One of the gentlemen, of course, is my own chairman, the deeply revered and honored chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As a member of that committee I perhaps should not be here in the Well of the House advocating a procedure which is inconsonant with his ideas or the ideas of others on that committee, including the ranking members on my side of the committee.

I have also heard the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] just now, and on yesterday the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], discuss this very same subject. They are highly respected in their own fields. I do not intend to launch into a general support of any contention that we should have a standing committee on aviation for the mere purpose of creating a new committee when we already have some committees whose work might well be consolidated, or for the purpose of robbing either the Military or the Naval Affairs Committees of their jurisdictions.

I am concerned, however, over the fact that both the Military Affairs and the Naval Affairs Committees would themselves be concerned over the creation of a standing committee on aviation. They doubtless have reasons of their own, but as this proposed committee

would not take jurisdiction from them in any way I cannot see the cause for concern on their part unless it be the fear of both of those committees that there ultimately will be set up a standing committee which will take jurisdiction of aviation matters for both the Army and Navy which would, of course, mean first a separate air force. I know no Member of the House will stand on the floor and advocate that there be set up in this time of war a separate air force. That certainly could be a mistake.

However, I do believe that after this war is over and after the men return from the front, and this question is given sober consideration by all men who know well the problems of the Army and the Navy, at that time, probably, the armed forces of the United States will be divided into a land force, a sea force, and an air force, and there will be provided for those forces an over-all general staff in order that they may be coordinated in their various theaters of action to a far better degree than they have been in the past. I have heard men from both services, high in position, express themselves in that way. But that is not the point, that is not the thing that we are considering here at the present time.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, distinguished member of my Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman introduced a resolution for a separate committee, did he not?

Mr. HINSHAW. Oh, yes; it is House Resolution No. 11.

Mr. BULWINKLE. And the gentleman provided in his resolution that jurisdiction would be taken from the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House, the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee also, did he not?

Mr. HINSHAW. No; I do not believe so.

Mr. BULWINKLE. State what your resolution provided.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I state what I have in mind?

Mr. BULWINKLE. State what your resolution was.

Mr. HINSHAW. It reads as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Rules of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, amended as follows:

To rule X add the following:

"40B. On Air Services, to consist of 25 Members."

To rule XI add the following:

"40B. To Air Services, other than appropriations therefor, including all commercial and civil aviation and including their relationship with or between Army and Naval Air Services, and including meteorological services."

Let me explain that resolution. There was no intention in that language whatever of including the affairs of the Military and Naval Affairs Committees. May I say further that any commercial aviation set-up in the United States is per se related to the military and the naval, because in itself it is a part of the national defense under the Civil Aeronautics Act which the gentleman ably joined in presenting to the House as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce before I came here. The civil aviation of this country, including civil pilots and commercial pilots, and all of the airplanes that go along with it, are a part of the national defense. It is certainly a part of the duty of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, as well as it would be of any standing committee on aviation, to have due regard for the relationship between civil aviation and the military and naval aviation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. It is my understanding then that the gentleman did not intend to take any jurisdiction at all from any other committee aside from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I not remind the gentleman of how he introduced that bill?

Mr. HINSHAW. I took the language from another bill and added some language of my own because I did not feel myself entirely competent to draw a proper technical amendment to the rules of the House. But that is a common practice. I may mention that I added additional language to it because I was concerned that another service be added to the jurisdiction of the civil aviation committee, and I refer to the subject of meteorology. If there is anything more vital to aviation than meteorology I do not know what it is, and certainly any standing committee on aviation in the House should also have jurisdiction over the subject of meteorology in this government, because it has been partly the development of meteorology that has enabled the airplane pilots to do the things that they are now doing in flying weather and in avoiding weather all over the world. It is a fact that the exacting requirements of commercial aviation in respect to weather observation and forecasting has spurred meteorology to new and remarkable accomplishments of enormous benefit not only to aviation but to almost every civil pursuit, not to mention the military.

Now let me proceed.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has jurisdiction over many important subjects. When it comes to considering the separation of some of its duties and placing them in another committee, it may be said that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is the mother of committees, for certainly the committees I shall name and perhaps others have sprung from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As was so ably stated, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was the second committee formed in the House of Representatives 147 years ago. I do not know how many committees have sprung from that committee, but I understand that the following have, although I have not checked the facts:

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries; the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; the Committee on Flood Control, which split off in its turn from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; and the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and all of the general committees having to do with veterans' affairs and pensions that one gentleman has mentioned heretofore.

There are certainly four if not nine or more committees of the House that have sprung from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and no one here will say that if that committee still had jurisdiction over the matters now handled by those other committees it would be able to accomplish the work of all of them and do its own work as well.

Another statement has been made that I should like to discuss very briefly, namely, that all air commerce today in the United States is under the jurisdiction or under the control of the Army or the Navy. Practically speaking, that is correct, because, as everyone knows, one can hardly get on an airplane without a priority. Also, the number of airplanes that have been retained in the service of the domestic air lines is a little more than half the total number employed at the beginning of this war. The balance of the planes and a good many in addition are operated by what is known as the Air Service Command, which operates the air freight and transport system of the United States Army. Who operates the Air Service Command? Do you know? The United States air lines as a group operate the Air Service Command through the supply of its various functions in dispatch, in traffic, and in other features of the commercial air lines used by the Air Service Command, and a good many of the pilots and copilots of the air lines of the United States have gone on those lines.

If the air lines of the United States had not been available to take over that very important function for the United States air force, great confusion would have resulted, for they would not have had personnel trained and organized in the handling of that particular type of business—I mean freight and passenger transport. This is one of the great contributions the air lines of the United States have made to this war. They have made many other important contributions as well.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I think the gentleman might also add to his statement a word about the masterful work being done by the air-line pilots, that on several occasions they have pinch-hit for the Army and transported Army equipment over long distances on uncharted air lanes when the Army did not have the trained personnel available to take over the planes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion. But because this is

not an executive session of the House, I do not propose to discuss that matter here, although what the gentleman has said is exactly correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. It is also true, is it not, that veteran air-line pilots who are today operating these services for the Army are at the same time performing a very valuable service in training copilots who are young Army officers?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is quite correct, I believe, although some difficulty was experienced in persuading the Army Air Force that its pilots could learn something from old experienced air-line pilots.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. May I read to the House a portion of a letter from General Marshall on the very subject of whether or not there is a commercial air-line system in the country and what it is doing. The following paragraphs are from a letter dated November 6 from Gen. G. C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, United States Army, addressed to the air-line industry:

> My business of the past 6 months has involved me in flights into active theaters. On each occasion I was in the hands of commercial pilots, so from that point of view it seems to me they are participating in active operations.
>
> However, my principal concern would be that they do not forget that in their personal desire to get into the active fighting they must not let us down in the tremendously important service of the transportation operations in which they are now engaged. Although in a civilian status, your personnel engaged in these operations have been performing not only a very great service for the Army and Naxy and, therefore, for the Nation, but to my mind an equally patriotic service with that of Army and Navy pilots.
>
> I very much hope that your personnel will keep on with this job which is essential to our business of getting on with the war.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I should like to remind the other gentlemen again that commercial aviation is not dead in the United States, for the time being or permanently or anything else. One of the reasons it is not dead today is that, perhaps exceeding their jurisdiction but still being Members of the House of Representatives, certain Members insisted that if there was going to be a taking over of the air-lines personnel by the United States Army those air lines and the functions they performed should be conducted as a unit, and that the personnel itself should not be dispersed all over the world, because then the air lines truly would be destroyed. It is a mighty good thing for us and our allies in this war that we had a strong and going air-transport industry in this country that could take over and expand into a world-wide network of military transport by air. And the end is not yet here. As the new great air-transport fleet comes off the assembly lines we will really have something, but we should have had it long ago. That, however, is another story.

I yield now to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, by the action of this Congress we created the so-called air-mail pick-up system, whereby the plane in flight drops and picks up the mail without the use of any landing facilities. There are approximately today in 6 States 115 communities being so served. The Civil Aeronautics Board at this time has applications to serve an additional 1850 communities in the United States, in more than 34 States. That program certainly is valuable, not only now but in the future, and will deserve the attention of a standing committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is quite correct. Let me go on now and mention a few more of the lesser things that should concern a standing committee on aviation. For example, one clever little device is of special importance to our aviation. It has been paid relatively little attention heretofore, even by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, although they have supplied the funds and built and operate this particular device. I do not know why, and they do not seem to know why, when you ask them—why the use of this device has not been expanded long since. I refer to the blind-landing system that is experimentally installed in one location in the central portion of the United States, a most vital thing. It is a device that will enable our aircraft to come into an airport practically at a zero ceiling and in low visibility. It would be exceedingly valuable to military aircraft as well as civil. It is amazing that its use has not been expanded, although every pilot who has flown it is sure that he can come into an airport safely under that system. That is something that will enable us to do remarkable things.

The Germans also have a device for almost blind landing, known as the Telefunken set. That is operated similarly to but at the same time very differently from our radio beam. Some Members of the House certainly should be out making studies not only of the great problems of world commerce in all its various aspects, but all these other things so that they might be able to come to their fellow Members and translate to them and tell them the great truths that have been discovered. Only in that way can the busy membership as a whole become cognizant of the full importance of, the needs of, and the progress of commercial aviation.

Under authority to extend my remarks, may I add that, as everyone knows, a million or two young men will come back from the war as experienced men in aviation. Another million or so will have become experienced in aircraft production. Other countries will have large numbers of aviation people to consider. Let us be in on the ground floor. Let us not wait until too late to prepare for the employment of our people after the war. The subject of aviation alone is big enough to absorb the full available time of a committee of the Congress. Let us take the progressive step and set up a standing committee on aviation—now. Let us not again be too late with too little.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] for 15 minutes.

### CIVIL AVIATION COMMITTEE

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, we have heard during the last few days a great deal of discussion regarding the proposal to create a new committee in the House to handle civilian aviation. The question has been raised as to why the Military and the Naval Affairs Committees of the House should become interested in this question. I am quite sure that those of you who have been in attendance at this discussion, who were present at the executive meeting of the House, the first one that I have ever witnessed, will agree with me that the great basis of the argument made by the proponents of this proposal to create this new standing committee is largely a criticism of the War and Navy Departments. Gentlemen discussed almost entirely the War and Navy activities. They discussed their trip down into South America, and told us the great military things that they had uncovered down there. Of course, I think most of you will agree with me that much of the information that was given to the Congress was information that could have been read in the newspapers at any time during the past 2 years. In fact one of the gentlemen commented on the possibility of standing in the Pacific Ocean and being able to toss rocks at oil derricks on the coast of South America. I invite the gentleman and his committee to come to California and there they may duplicate that function. As a matter of fact, if the gentleman is a good swimmer, he might be able to swim out to several derricks placed in the water and if he had a good hatchet with him, he could hack on through the casing under the water. We were even told of Japanese bean fields down there that might be used as landing fields. Why, you have had the same kind of stories coming out of California day after day and month after month for the past 10 years, and it did not require a special committee to investigate the safety of our air lines to uncover those facts.

A great deal of criticism was directed at the War Department itself. One of the things brought up was the construction of commercial aircraft, and the air force was criticized because they attempted to stop production of commercial airplanes. It is all right to stand here and say that today we need a vast number of cargo planes, and yet 6 or 8 or 10 months ago the War Department through the air force attempted to stop that production. Why? Let us have the explanation. This country is engaged in a great war, a war whose complexion changes from week to week and month to month. When the lend-lease bill was passed in this Congress England was crying for aid, and what did she want? They wanted fighter planes to ward off German attack across the English Channel. They needed lots of them and they need them right now. When they had protected the channel, the picture changed. They wanted then to go on and bomb France, and they wanted light and short range bombers, and so the demand in this country was not for many fighter planes, but for light bombers. Then they

wanted to bomb farther inland, and wanted long range bombers, and later this program of going into Africa developed, and they wanted some real long range ships.

The program of transporting cargo by air came into being subsequently. Then the necessity for cargo planes developed. But you only have so many airplane factories. You are only producing so many engines and you only have so much aluminum. At any given time you must allocate available supplies for those things that you need most. So it does not come with good grace to stand here and criticize the War Department because, appreciating the immediate necessity of the war which called for fighter planes and bombers, and did not call at that moment for cargo ships, that they therefore should curtail the production of cargo ships.

Many members of the Military and Naval Affairs Committees took this matter up with the War Department, just as did the members of that special investigating committee. We urged a continuance of our commercial airplanes. We urged that the air lines be given additional ships, but we were willing to see to it that our military needs came first, even at the sacrifice of the needs of our commercial aircraft.

Yes; our commercial airplanes are functioning. They are not only functioning all over the United States but they are functioning all over the world under the direction of the air force, and the Chief of the Army Air Forces has directed the establishment of air lines to every known spot upon this globe. The Army has developed the largest system of global air lines ever conceived. You say that they have brought in the commercial air lines to handle that job. Yes; that is true. The War Department is making use of every trained available man it can get to perform the function for which that man was trained. In the years that have gone by, your Army Air Force, through its pilot-training program, has trained the great majority of the pilots who serve the commercial air lines of this country. A great majority of them are Reserve officers of the Army Air Force. What is more natural, then, than that the air force should call upon those men whom the air force has trained to come and give service to the Army in its time of need? They have not been trained in recent years in combat flying. Those pilots know only the normal routine flying that is called for in the Ferry Command, in cargo dispatching. Therefore we called in the air lines to handle that noncombatant branch of the air force duty. As a result, we are able to employ this vast group of pilots to their greatest ability.

One point I would like to call to your attention is this question of post-war aviation, of which we have heard a great deal. I ask you who is going to direct the post-war aviation program? The Committee on Aviation in the House of Representatives? It seems to me that that program is going to rest almost exclusively in the hands of the State Department. It is the Secretary of State, in negotiating the peace treaty and in handling trade treaties following the war, who is going to be able to dictate whether we maintain our air lines as we have them today or whether we sacrifice them to other countries. Our Army Air Forces have gone out and established those lines. Our Army Air Forces are anxious to see America maintain those lines, but it will rest in the hands of the Department of State whether we do or not. The committee of this House that will have most influence there would be the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but more particularly that matter is going to rest on the other side of the Capitol. It is going to rest in the hands of the Senate, because the Senate will have to ratify whatever treaties may be entered into.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I wonder if the gentleman has read a recent book, of which Roland Young is the author, on the subject of Congress, What Is It? The New York Times of Sunday had a very extensive and commendatory review of the book. The New York Times said that every Member of Congress should read it. The paramount recommendation suggested in this book was that Congress should reduce the number of its committees; that it had too many committees.

Mr. COSTELLO. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. I have not read the book, but I think I can agree with the conclusion, and particularly emphasize, as the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] pointed out yesterday, that his committee is now handling all branches of transportation. There is no more logical thing than to concentrate in the hands of a single committee that one field of transportation, and the minute you start to segregate and scatter it in a dozen different committees you will have duplication and much of the confusion that we have in many of our bureaus because of the fact that there is overlapping authority and too many departments trying to handle similar or identical things.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. In yesterday's issue of the Washington News there is an article by someone writing on the subject of congressional committees in Congress in which they say it is laughable as to the number we have.

Mr. COSTELLO. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his contribution.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Regardless of what committee or committees handle the problems of aviation, I hope that in this current discussion somebody will take a pencil and paper and with the proper basic information do a little figuring on supply stations and repair bases to maintain cargo air transport. The Subcommittee on Military Appropriations has discussed the problem of airplane transportation with representatives of the War Department at various times. I think it is the opinion of the members of that committee that there is a place for air transportation of critical items, but that many of the general statements about large-scale air transportation will bear considerable scrutiny. For instance, maintaining a supply line to fuel and maintain the cargo planes themselves would be a problem not much smaller than the problem of carrying the original cargo, especially in certain theaters of operation. I like and everybody likes the idea of speed but supplying a modern army calls for moving a lot of old-fashioned heavy freight.

Mr. COSTELLO. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and he is quite correct. When you fly cargo by plane you are only carrying pounds, but when you send it by boat you are carrying tons. There is the answer to your air transportation problem. When you start to maintain two or three million men overseas, equip them with their munitions, food, and implements of war, you are going to have to transport hundreds of thousands of tons of material; if you do not do that you are not going to have an efficient Army.

There is one other point I want to make and I want to impress it upon you very deeply: We would not have in this country today an aviation industry; we would not even have commercial airplanes in this country if it were not for the support, the aid, and the encouragement that the War and the Navy Departments have given to this industry. The small number of commercial and civilian airplanes that were purchased in a year was so insignificant that undoubtedly we should not have had any development of that character in the country except for the tremendous purchases on the part of the Army and the Navy. The experimentation they have encouraged, the pressure they have brought upon our manufacturers to produce bigger, better, and larger planes is one of the greatest factors furthering the development of commercial aviation in this country. I may say to you that at least 6 years ago I went into the office of General Arnold. At that time he showed me on his desk a little slip of paper in which he had marked out the size of the current airplanes. Next came 40,000 pound ships; and he turned to me and said: "We are going to make them 80, and we will get them up to 120,000 pounds, and when we get there we will just be starting." Then he showed me a little ship, a model which he had; he pulled back the cloth and there was a wooden model of an airplane with four engines; it was the Boeing bomber, the Flying Fortress of which we hear so much today. It is the plane that today is doing more in this war perhaps than any other single type of plane.

It is the support of the War and the Navy Departments that has built this industry. I say to you that for these reasons the Military and the Naval Affairs Committees of the House are naturally very much concerned when they see these two Departments being criticized as though they were trying to hold back

aviation, as though they were trying to thwart its development when the truth is that these two Departments of the Government have done more to promote aviation in this country than any other force we have in the Nation.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. I agree with the gentleman that both the Army and the Navy have made great contributions to the development of aviation in recent years; but I presume that the gentleman will agree with me that we led the world in commercial aviation before the military or the Navy gave any impetus to the development of commercial aviation in this country.

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman says we led the world in the development of commercial aviation before the military or the Navy added anything. I question his statement very definitely, because it is the force of the War and Navy Departments that has been constantly pushing the development of aircraft, that has brought about the fine type of transport plane that we now have; it is that force that has brought about the development of our own airplanes so that American ships are known all over the world and are appreciated because of their quality and workmanship—almost exclusively because of the interest of the War and Navy Departments in developing and building newer, bigger, and better ships. Because of that we developed these huge transport ships.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am interested to know at what period it was that the Army and the Navy did not have an interest in aviation.

Mr. COSTELLO. I do not know that there ever was any period in which the Army and Navy did not have an interest in aviation.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Or in its advancement.

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman is correct. As a matter of fact, the men who are at the top of our Army Air Forces are men who started in aviation either before or at the time of the World War, and they have had their hands in it ever since. General Arnold could tell you some stories out of his personal experience of flying boxes and crates when they were held together by wires—flying them through the worst kind of storms—tell you any number of hair-raising experiances that he personally has had. We have at the head of our Army Air Forces a general who is willing to take any airplane anywhere he would ask any one of his men to take them. He has been in aviation from its very beginning and is a man who perhaps has done more for aviation in this country than any other single individual in the Nation. I say this without qualification.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is entitled to recognition for 15 minutes, but will the gentleman from Nebraska yield to permit several Members to submit unanimous-consent requests?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield, Mr. Speaker, for that purpose.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. SHAFER asked and was given unanimous consent to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I received from a former colleague of ours, one of the ablest men who ever served in the House, the Honorable Ross A. Collins, of Mississippi, together with an enclosure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Judge Wyman that he made to some men who were convicted of evading the draft.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

### CREATION OF A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AVIATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I request that I be not interrupted until I have completed my prepared statement.

Mr. Speaker, for several days we have been listening to some very fine addresses concerning the creation of a new committee on aviation. It may be true that the last speaker does not have a chance; perhaps you have already heard too many speeches; if so I am informed that the exits are still open and the retirement of any of the Members from this Chamber will not embarrass me in the least.

### AVIATION IN THE POST-WAR WORLD

Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as favoring the creation of a new standing committee in the House of Representatives to give attention to civil aeronautics, this committee to have jurisdiction over the legislative program for peacetime commercial aviation. We cannot stop the wheels of progress. Whichever nation dominates the airways of the world in the post-war days will be the greatest force for shaping the events of the world. If that nation is the United States, air domination will be a force for good. Therefore the expansion of aviation by the United States is both an opportunity and a responsibility. The time to act is now.

The Congress of the United States should have a committee on aviation, preparing for that day when the world will again be at peace. No good American wants to advocate anything, regardless of its merits, which would detract in the least from the winning of this war in the shortest possible time. That does not mean that we should not plan and lay the foundation for our economy that will follow this war. Much of the world trade of tomorrow is going to be carried on through the skies.

The peoples of the earth, whether they be in far-off Asia or our good neighbors to the south, are going to buy the products that are brought to them quickly and efficiently. That nation which dominates the air lanes, which has the bases, the fields, and the facilities, will be the nation that can supply that trade. It is true that much of the bulky and heavy shipments will never be made by air. But the air lines will supply the contacts and lines of communications from which trade will follow.

There are many reasons why we should expand aviation within our own country. Aviation will be expanded. If not by the United States, it will be expanded by others. In order that we, as a nation, keep abreast of the times, it is essential that we recognize the great aviation industry, which is so typical of American genius, by creating a standing committee in the House of Representatives to have jurisdiction over aviation and to assume responsibility on the part of our Government for its future development.

For this Congress to stand in the way of this progress, certainly is to get off the beam. It has always been the practice of the House of Representatives to adjust its committees to the needs of the times. Not many years ago, the Congress created a standing Committee on Flood Control, because of the tremendous flood problem that was developing in our Nation. Today, everyone recognizes the necessity and importance of that committee. With that same objective in mind, other committees, such as the ones on Mines and Mining, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Agriculture, Rivers and Harbors, and other like committees, have been created. It is said by some that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should assume this job and that a new committee should not be created for aeronautics.

I have the utmost respect for the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House. I am convinced that some of the ablest Members of the House compose that committee, but they have a tremendous job on their hands. Their attention is not only directed to the railroads and truck and bus lines of the country, but they have jurisdiction over legislation relating to other forms of communication, such as telephone, telegraph, and radio. We have on that committee some outstanding individuals, who have become experts, but I submit that most of them are experts in other forms of transportation

and not in aviation. The future for aviation is so big that we need a committee assigned to that task alone. It should also be borne in mind that, while the title of the committee that I have mentioned—the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—indicates that it has jurisdiction over foreign commerce, the facts are that its time and attention are absorbed with the pressing problems of our domestic or interstate commerce.

As we approach the post-war days, we have to think of world commerce. Either the United States must have a network of peacetime commercial air lines, meeting the needs and demands of Central and South America, or some other country, whose economic interests are adverse to ours, will gird South America with air lines, and with these great air lines of tomorrow and the radio they will dominate the culture, the ideas, and the trends of our South American neighbors as they have in the past. If the United States girds the entire globe with commercial air lines, it will mean that we will have "eyes that see 'round the world." What is more, it will mean the police force that we must have in the many parts of the world will be materially lessened, because an air base that can accommodate a passenger plane can also accommodate our military flying units.

This time we must see to it that our enemies stay licked. The war dogs and the totalitarian cliques of Germany and Japan must be brought to their knees and receive a good taste of what they have been inflicting upon the other peoples of the world. But that is not all—we must see to it that they are forever placed behind the well-known "eight ball." We must be in a position to overwhelm them from a military standpoint for a long, long time, and be able to do it on short notice.

Today the dollars provided by the American taxpayers are being spent in every corner of the earth. The blood of American boys is being spilled on every continent and countless islands of the seas. We cannot let that sacrifice be in vain. We must be so strong that a Hitler or a Tojo will never dare rise up again. By a world-wide expansion of commercial aviation we can at the same time make that task easier and do it with fewer troops on foreign soil.

In addition to that, the commerce of the United States will be greatly improved. No one can excel the Americans in making things and in marketing them if we set ourselves to the task. That nation which leads in the air will lead in the sale of its products; but that is not all, it will sell to the world the American idea of freedom, liberty, peacetime commerce, and representative government. It will cause the entire world to look to the United States and to realize that a free people get along better and are stronger than anybody else.

I would mention one other reason why we need to give time and attention now to post-war aviation within the United States—the taxpayers of this country have huge investments in almost every State in the Union in air bases, air schools, airfields, airplane factories, and other facilities. These great resources should not be abandoned and wasted. Every one of them should be made use of, not only to advance the transportation of tomorrow, but in line with economy and good business practice it will benefit taxpayers of this country.

Today, we are training thousands of American boys in aviation. They are becoming pilots, observers, mechanics, photographers, and skilled technicians of every sort. I favor this training program. It is going to be a vital factor in winning the war. In fact, some months ago I stressed on the floor of the House the necessity of extending aviation training to our high schools. I still favor that. But, when this war is over, are we going to send all of these boys back to loaf in front of the corner drug store in idleness? The expansion of peacetime world-wide commercial aviation will provide the answer to our employment problem. It will increase our world trade and commerce and thereby make for employment in our factories and on our farms. This is the American way, and from the employment angle alone, it will offer much more than a glorified leaf-raking program.

There are those who say, "Let's put off consideration of this until the war is over." That should not be done. This is a big job. This is the time to do it. The men chosen for this committee will have to give a great deal of thought and study to the problem that is placed in their hands. By taking this forward step now we will not detract from the war-time aviation effort carried on by the Committee on Military and Naval Affairs. Neither will we take one ounce of steel or any other critical material to expand commercial aviation, if the same is needed for military purposes, but we should get ready for the job that lies ahead. If the United States does not do it, some other nation will and the United States will become a second-rate nation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Nebraska speaks with what I believe to be sound judgment on this subject. I do not want to commend the gentleman for the purpose of flattery, but I recall months and months ago the extended arguments when he spoke about the need for aviation courses in the high schools of this country. Certainly that must be done, not by haphazard, slipshod methods which are now employed, but by an over-all picture in every high school in the country at least in September 1943.

The second point, if the gentleman will indulge me, is this: He spoke about the desirability of going ahead now, not waiting, and he is correct, because these problems, even though we cannot attack them as of today, are here and careful consideration should be given to them now.

I call your attention to the Pennsylvania turnpike operating between Pittsburgh and Harrisburg. That is not only for high-speed traffic in the days of peace when those days come again, but we are going to have development of the so-called photocell whereby we will be able to stop highway traffic moving on that great road and dozens of other roads like it which will be built throughout the country, and we will know that great planes are going to come in and use that surface for landings and take-offs. The traffic will be blocked off for a moment. This is one of the tiny, although important developments, that we see in the future and it should be studied now.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman, and may I ask him a question?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman feel, if some other nation whose economic interests are adverse to ours dominates the airways, owns the fields and all the facilities on any continent, that we can break in there for any kind of trade whether we ship by water, by land or by air?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct. There was a day when we were laggards from the standpoint of filling out the white sails of the commerce of this country. Let us not become laggard again. Let us move forward and bring not only commerce and trade to the United States from all nations, but let us bring a preservation of the peace. It will come about only by this method.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I subscribe to the splendid theories and sentiments expressed by the gentleman. In reference to expanding our trade by air, and also expanding our world commerce, I wonder if the gentleman has considered the Atlantic Charter, the master agreement with Great Britain and the four freedoms, wherein it has been agreed already by this country that the commerce is to be shared with other countries of the world and we will not have the opportunity to go ahead? The gentleman knows that we are having a fight now in South America with Great Britain to see who is going to get the commerce of South America. While I agree with the gentleman generally, I hope he will give us a further dissertation at some time in the future with reference to the effect of those things on our future expansion of commerce.

Mr. CURTIS. I am sorry I haven't time to answer the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

WILLIAM J. JEFFERS

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Mr. William J. Jeffers, Director of Rubber in the War Production Board, for his frank and fearless statement to the country in regard to our rubber situation. I want

to assure Mr. Jeffers that in my opinion the people of the United States are back of him. I believe Congress is back of him, and it is my sincere hope that he will continue to expose the dangers that our country is approaching. Our Nation is geared to an economy that must have rubber if we are to furnish materials for war and food necessary for our own people and our allies. This administration has bungled the rubber program from its very inception, and it is time that someone in administrative authority informed our people of the seriousness of the situation. We are now advised by Mr. Donald Nelson of the W. P. B. that in 1943 our Nation will be able to produce only 55 percent of the rubber recommended by the Baruch report, and Mr. Nelson makes the further statement that none of it will be available for civilian use. The picture is not much more encouraging for the year 1944. It is late, but not too late to make plans to produce a large amount of grain alcohol which can be converted into materials for making rubber. Mr. Jeffers, you are rendering the Nation a valuable service, and I am sure the American people will support you to a man.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to thank the gentleman for coming to the defense of this gentleman, although he needs no defense, because the American people are with him. Mr. William Jeffers, my fellow Nebraskan, is doing a splendid job and he is rendering a great service to the country in informing the people that some people in high places are willfully retarding our synthetic rubber program.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I do not think Mr. Jeffers needs any defense. He needs encouragement from the people and the Congress.

Mr. BUFFETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Jeffers is one of my constituents, I am proud to say, and I am sure he needs no defense before this House.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think Mr. Jeffers and others are overlooking the fact that there is a strong undercurrent among certain keymen in the administration who are determined to stop the establishment of a permanent synthetic-rubber program in the United States. They do not want our country to become self-sustaining in rubber production, and they are therefore retarding the progress of factories and processing plants which we need now and which we could have for the future use of our country.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I thank the gentleman and heartily agree with his statement. It was only last year that Vice President WALLACE was concerned about a tariff to protect our synthetic-rubber production. It was his thought that it would be unfortunate for our good neighbor policy if we became self-sustaining in rubber production. It is about time that some of the officials in key positions became concerned about the welfare of our own citizens.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I make this comment in support of the good thought the gentleman has expressed in connection with the courageous attitude Mr. Jeffers is demonstrating from the standpoint of the synthetic rubber program: I believe that within the next few days or few weeks at the outside a bill wil be brought before the Congress by Members of the Senate which will put some teeth into legislative support behind Mr. Jeffers, so that the synthetic-rubber program—that rural America is able and ready to implement—can be put into action. I think it is unwise to attempt to win this war without the use of synthetic rubber when synthetic rubber can be produced from the agricultural products raised in abundance on American farms.

[Here the gavel fell.]

## THE SHORTAGE OF BEEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with all the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] had to say about Mr. Jeffers, and I agree with the other commendatory remarks that have just been made about him, but someone should caution Mr. Jeffers to be a little more careful, because if he continues to question the infallibility of the "powers that be" down at the other end of the Avenue or contrary to the views expressed by the lady who travels so much, and who each day presumes to advise the world on any and all topics, he is very apt to be called in before a grand jury and Maloney may get after him. Mr. Jeffers had better watch his step, there is no question about it. The lightning from the throne may strike him as it has others who ventured to have opinions of their own. Some of us have been criticizing the so-called planning of the dreamers, and we have learned to our sorrow that that is an act which brings down the wrath of the smear-purge artists like Maloney, Browder, and keyhole peeper Winchell and should not be done, not here in the United States where freedom of speech and the right to work are opposed by the administration.

I was moved today by the very, very eloquent talk made by the farmer from Brooklyn, N. Y. [Mr. O'TOOLE]. He finds now that his people are short of beef. They are just not getting it. He gets up here and criticizes the O. P. A. because dealers in meat in his district and throughout the country are being put out of business. People are hungry for meat.

If memory serves me correctly, and I think it does, I recall when that same gentleman, if a Member on the minority side even ventured to suggest in a most delicate way that there might be something wrong with one of the administrative bodies downtown, condemned us as being pro-Nazi and aiding Hitler.

When we called to the attention of the Members of the House that if we took all the help off the farm either by putting the men in the Army or in the war plants there was going to be a shortage of milk and dairy products, and there was going to be a shortage of beef, we were criticized as being obstructionists, as hindering the war effort, as opposing the administration.

I am not a farmer but we have farmers on our side of the aisle. I talked with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] two or three evenings, and I talked to a gentleman from the other side, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE], whose people raise and fatten cattle. I talked to some of the Members from Iowa, Kansas, and Illinois, more principally from Illinois, the great corn, hog, and cattle State, some of those men who feed cattle. They told me, and the Congress was warned, in all seriousness, that if this administration went on the way it was going there would be a shortage of beef and a lack of food.

Then one evening when I did not have anything else to do I read a Supreme Court decision and learned that those Justices, those wise men—not the nine wise old men but the new members of the Court—decided that when in 1935 Congress passed a law against racketeering it meant only that no one should engage in racketeering of the Dillinger type. The Supreme Court said it was all right for members of unions in New York, the constitutents of the gentleman who spoke this morning, to make our farmers going into New York City with a load of beef stand and deliver $8.41 or $9.42, depending upon the size of the truck, before driving on to take the meat to the gentleman's constituents or to his family—and I note that he has a wife and three children. Now, Mr. Justice Stone, dissenting, said that the rule laid down in that case "would render common-law robbery an innocent pastime," but the majority opinion written by Mr. Justice Byrnes, the same gentleman who now is the big boss over all bosses, laid down the doctrine that if members of unions conspired together to compel farmers driving their own trucks, loaded with produce or meat into the city of New York, to pay a fee to the conspirators, those conspirators were not guilty of racketeering, even though the union drivers did not intend to render any service at all.

The opinion held and I quote, that—

> And where, as here, the offense charged is conspiracy to violate the section, the defendants are entitled to immunity if their objective is to become bona fide employees and to obtain wages in that capacity, even though they may fail of their purpose.

The Court further said:

> For example, the members of a labor union may decide that they are entitled to the jobs in their trade in a particular area. They

may agree to attempt to obtain contracts to do the work at the union wage scale. They may obtain the contracts, do the work, and receive the money. Certainly Congress intended that these activities should be excepted from the prohibitions of this particular act, even though the agreement may have contemplated the use of violence. But it is always an open question whether the employers' capitulation to the demands of the union is prompted by a desire to obtain services or to avoid further injury, or both.

The Court further said:

The doubtful case arises where the defendants agree to tender their services in good faith to an employer and to work if he accepts their offer, but agree further that the protection of their trade-union interests requires that he should pay an amount equivalent to the prevailing union wage, even if he rejects their proffered services.

We think that such an agreement is covered by the exception. The terms "wages," "bona fide employee," nad "bona fide employer" are susceptible of more than one meaning, and the background and legislative history of this act require that they be broadly defined. We have expressed our belief that Congress intended to leave unaffected the ordinary activities of labor unions.

And the Court then continues and holds that even though the union men who conspired to hold up the trucks, and who did hold up the trucks and who compelled the payment of tribute money as a condition precedent to driving into the city and who did not perform any service, were not guilty of racketeering because, forsooth, Congress did not intend to legislate against unions practicing that type of racketeering.

Note this language from the opinion:

The proviso in section 6 safeguarding "the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof," although obscure indeed, strengthens us somewhat in that opinion. The test must therefore be whether the particular activity was among or is akin to labor union activities with which Congress must be taken to have been familiar when this measure was enacted. Accepting payments even where services are refused is such an activity. The circuit court has referred to the stand-by orchestra device, by which a union local requires that its members be substituted for visiting musicians, or, if the producer or conductor insists upon using his own musicians that the members of the local be paid the sums which they would have earned had they performed. That similar devices are employed in other trades is well known. It is admitted here that the stand-by musician has a job even though he renders no actual service. There can be no question that he demands the payment of money regardless of the management's willingness to accept his labor. If, as it is agreed, the musician would escape punishment under this act even though he obtained his stand-by job by force or threats, it is certainly difficult to see how a teamster could be punished for engaging in the same practice. It is not our province either to approve or disapprove such tactics. But we do believe that they are not the activities of predatory criminal gangs of the Kelly and Dillinger types at which the act was aimed, and that on the contrary they are among those practices of labor unions which were intended to remain beyond its ban.

To kill that decision of the United States Supreme Court, which put the stamp of legality upon extortion, I yesterday introduced an amendment to the Anti-Racketeering Act of June 18, 1934. I ask your support.

I feel sorry for the consituents of the gentleman who spoke this morning. We all regret that they are hungry. That they must pay an outrageous price for meat. But it all goes back to the legislation the gentleman in the majority supported. You wanted it and now you have it. You do not like it. I cannot say you do not like the taste of it because you do not even get a taste of the meat. You just see it in the windows here and there where the Wall Street men, where the multi-millionaires can buy a steak. But the poor man and the woman and their children are hungry for meat, and they are hungry for meat because you have developed a situation where our farmers have had to kill their dairy herds—and the individual members of a dairy herd are the mothers of steers, you know; and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] told us here one day how an official in a department had inquired if there are both kinds, male and female steers. This administration has jumped upon the farmer—it has taken his sons and sent them to Africa, to Australia, to the islands of the southern Pacific in such numbers that the farms are idle and before another year rolls around there will be hunger in the land unless the dreamers and planners mend their ways. Now the scarcity has spread so far it has gone clear over to the eastern coast and you lack beef over there because you have tied the hands of the farmers in the Middle West and the great West so that they cannot raise these cattle. Now you feel sorry about it. So do we. And we suggest that before your constituents get too hungry, too angry, you take Wallace, Wickard, Hopkins, Tugwell, Perkins, and a few more out of the places where they are bringing chaos and ruin. If you want meat and food try a little, just a little, of the philosophy of the "horse and buggy" days.

What I am asking is what are you going to do about it, and when are you going to do it? How hungry will the constituents of the gentleman from New York have to get before he will come in here with some legislation or before he will support legislation I have heretofore introduced, or which other Members on the Republican side have introduced? How long will it be? If the people of the East do not get anything but a soup bone, maybe we will get something started on that side. But no one wants to see that condition. Talk about these regulations! I wish the gentleman was here. I know what he referred to. They are going to give you 2 pounds to an individual, and I ask the city farmer this question. When he goes down to the market and he wants to get his 2 pounds on that little ticket from some bureaucrat in the O. P. A. who does not know the conditions, or who wants to know how many kinds of steers there are, male and female, and asks for 2 pounds of meat, is he going to take a soup bone or a pig knuckle, or ribs, or a pound of hamburger and just plain meat? Just who will take 2 pounds of bones and who gets the 2 pounds of meat? Those are some questions that the gentlemen from the cities ought to make talks on and advise their constituents about, so that they do not get trimmed in still another way.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What the gentleman has said in regard to the inability to get meats and other foods, is entirely due to the administration policies, although they are inconsistent with each other, and I point out this, inasmuch as the gentleman has referred to a certain court, and some decisions on some cases. Does the gentleman recall that the same court also approved a decision assessing a fine on farmers for feeding wheat that they raised on their own land to their own livestock on the farm so that they could produce more meat?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I recall that. It is 49 cents, is it not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Fifty-nine cents.

Mr. HOFFMAN. At the time of the court decision I think it was 47 cents. The fine, as I recall, is one-half the loan value and that varies. Now I say to you city folks, let us take a farmer in the country who grows some wheat or some corn, and if he feeds that wheat or corn to the cattle, in order that he may make more beef, increase the quantity and quality, or to poultry, to get more eggs, we find that he is fined 47 cents a bushel. What do you think of that? That is so even if the farmers feed the grain to the chickens, so as to give you some fresh eggs once in a while. It is all wrong. We know it is wrong. It is off the same piece of regimentation that you gentlemen are complaining about. Under this new regulation which provides that the independent distributors shall not kill more than 70 percent of the number or weight of cattle that they killed the year before. That sounds all right, but here is the trouble. Some of the distributors and packers did not kill any cattle last year. They bought their supply from larger packers, and so now they have nothing to sell, because 70 percent of nothing killed is still nothing, and that is one thing the gentleman is complaining about. It is these independent distributors, these independent processors, who used to buy of the packers, and the result of this last regulation by the O. P. A. is that it throws all the business of dealing in cattle and processed meat into the hands of a few large packers, and these independents are being put out of business. The result is that these gentlemen's constituents are going hungry for meat because, first, the administration policy cut off the supply at the source on the farm, and second, what little is left is all thrown into the hands of the big packers, and the men who have heretofore served the gentleman's constituents in New York and Brooklyn and other cities, no longer have any beef to sell.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. GAVIN. I would like to ask the gentleman what they are going to do when they run out of pork? Pretty soon they will not have much pork to sell in New York or throughout the East. How about the little pigs? I have reference to the hogs that were slaughtered several years ago, to be converted into fertilizer, to distribute the fertilizer to the farmer to increase his yield and production and then to plow it under.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, well, some gentlemen back on the floor said that they do not eat pork. The gentleman from Michigan said that they do not eat pork out there, but it calls to mind, however, the old statement that the Chicago packers even utilize the squeal of the pig. And if the new dealers are not stopped, we will all be glad to get pork; yes, perhaps horse meat similar to that which is now being sold in Boston. But, as the gentleman said, if present policies are continued, our people will not have beef or pork or butter; they will not have milk or eggs; and if they keep on with their wheat program, they will not have even bread, and then will come hunger and trouble.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And they will not have bread at any price.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are right; they will not have it at any price, so it is up to this Congress to do something about it, and I appeal once more to the majority side. Come on, let us do something about it, and let us do it before it is too late.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 158. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 27, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Thursday, January 28, 1943, for consideration of House Resolution 1294.

---

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

102. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, a draft of a proposed bill to extend the terms of judges of the district courts in Alaska, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands to 8 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

103. A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

104. A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, a comparative general balance sheet of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

105. A letter from the national headquarters, Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting, report of proceedings and activities and statement of receipts and expenditures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 311) granting a pension to Maud Patterson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 266) granting an increase of pension to Emmitt Mitchell; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

---

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr BLOOM:

H. R. 1501. A bill to provide for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr BOREN:

H. R. 1502. A bill to clarify the application of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempted securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANCOCK:

H. R. 1503. A bill to authorize the appointment of official reporters in the courts of the United States and to fix their duties and compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 1504. A bill providing for transportation home during furlough for noncommissioned officers and other enlisted men on active military service in the land forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1505. A bill to eliminate the income limitations as to eligibility for pensions to the widows of certain World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 1506. A bill to further amend the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H R. 1507. A bill to provide funds for the national defense; to make intangible personal property bear its fair share of taxes; to halt tax evasion by citizens of the several States who secrete wealth in other States in the form of intangible property; to provide for the proper administration of this act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1508. A bill to restore to the active list of the Army and to active duty certain retired officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 1509. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act of June 7, 1924, section 202, paragraph 7, and all the amendments subsequent thereto; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. R. 1510. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide that the aid by States to dependent children who are mentally incompetent, irrespective of age, be included in computing grants by the United States to such States for aid to dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1511. A bill to provide for free laundry and dry-cleaning service for members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1512. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Pulajane and Moro campaigns, and other uprisings in the Philippine Islands from July 16, 1903, to December 31, 1913, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1513. A bill to transfer all property, real or personal, of the Frederic. Douglas Memorial and Historical Association to the National Association of Colored Women; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 1514. A bill to provide adequate aeronautical training for the youth of the United States, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 1515. A bill to authorize prospecting, locating, developing, mining, leasing, and patenting the mineral resources of property acquired under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 1516. A bill to prohibit interstate common-carrier pipe lines from transporting commodities in which such carriers have any interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 1517. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the right of citizens of the United States, 18 years of age or older, to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution to provide that the act of January 20, 1942, establishing daylight saving time, shall cease to be in effect; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution to repeal Public Law 403, Seventy-seventh Congress, chapter 7, second session, and reinstate the standard time provided in the act entitled, "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to protest against Nazi atrocities committed by the German Reich against Jewish communities in German-occupied territories; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Res. 82. Resolution authorizing the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to make a study of the alien situation in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 1518. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 1519. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COMPTON:

H. R. 1520. A bill for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 1521. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Herbert R. W. Lauterbach and others for overtime labor performed at the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va.; in excess of the legal day of 8 hours; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 1522. A bill for the relief of Morton Fiedler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1523. A bill granting a pension to Charles Hovermale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1524. A bill granting a pension to Elmer G. Runyan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1525. A bill for the relief of Raymond Nelson Hickman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1526. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Davenport; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1527 A bill granting an increase of pension to John W. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1528. A bill granting an increase of pension to Virgil O. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1529. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Sevaljevick, now known as Nicholas Hornacky; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1530. A bill granting a pension to Amelia Branson; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1531. A bill granting a pension to Martha A. Lumley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1532. A bill granting a pension to Edward Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1533. A bill granting a pension to John Hannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1534. A bill granting an increase of pension to Harry G. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1535. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Jordan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1536. A bill granting an increase of pension to John M. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1537. A bill granting an increase of pension to Harley Hesler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1538. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as a result of the disaster at the East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1539. A bill for the relief of Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1540. A bill for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 1541. A bill for the relief of David E. Goodwin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1542. A bill for the relief of Herbert M. Garland; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1543. A bill for the relief of Stanley McMahan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1544. A bill granting a pension to Laura Alice Donnelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1545. A bill granting a pension to David C. Norris; to the Committee on Pensions.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

50. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the City Council of the City of Lynn, Mass., dated January 12, 1943, expressing disapproval of the intention of the United States Government to make a bird and game sanctuary out of that part of Newburyport called Plum Island, and their expenditure therefor of a large sum of money; to the Committee on Appropriations.

51. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Resolution adopted by the Nevada Range Sheep Owners Association on January 16, 1943, requesting the Congress of the United States of America to take the necessary steps to relieve the manpower situation in the sheep industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Saviour of the world, in whom the power of Almighty God is raised to the highest, in Thy name we pray that we may learn the lesson of self-revelation. Touch the deeps of our natures from which come the blessed issues of life and the measureless claims of a saving faith. Dear Lord, down in the human heart are wells which only Thy hand can open, here with a consciousness deeper than the sea, let Thy spirit speak calmly. "I am the way, the truth, and the life."

In our thoughts and in our secret impulses conform us to the divine law and in every heart open any sealed avenues of gratitude. Amid the friction of nations and the collisions of classes, we praise Thee for America and her mission. Being thus thankful, make us witnesses for the freedom of personal rights, for the defenseless, for justice cast down in the streets, pleading in this longing and waiting world. In the very soul of our Republic may there be a shrine where is breathed a noble spirit of sacrifice and of unselfish devotion to those ideals which shall make us worthy to stand among the peoples of earth and break those chains which shall never again stain the calendar of history. Oh, blessed Life eternal, in safety and in unyielding strength be at the side of our President day and night and bring to a glorious fruition the "Conference of Unconditional Surrender" and Thine shall be the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Hon. VIRGIL CHAPMAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, many of the Members of Congress are seriously interested in and much concerned over the growing power of the Executive at the expense of the Congress. Many persons outside the Halls of Congress recognize the seriousness of this problem. The American Political Science Association some 2 years ago appointed a committee to study the whole question. Friday night there is to be a conference to consider the results of the work of that committee.

Not only will there be representatives of the committee, but our colleague, the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, will participate in the discussions. Members of Congress are invited to attend the conference, which, let me repeat, will be held next Friday night at 8 p. m. in the auditorium of the Department of Commerce Building.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some newspaper clippings.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by a sitting Member of this body.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article by Clifford Prevost.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a letter from Mr. Kernkamp, secretary, Minnesota State Veterinarian Medical Society, and also a

copy of resolutions adopted by that society having reference to the foot-and-mouth disease.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE FUEL OIL SITUATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today there exists in this country a perfectly inexcusable and unjustifiable situation so far as heating of family homes is concerned and also so far as the distribution of oil for the running of essential industries. If the situation does not improve within 1 or 2 days, if some sort of order is not brought out of chaos, I am going to demand that the Army and the Navy take over the entire fuel problem.

Mr. Speaker, the Army and the Navy are not interested in sectionalism and are more interested in the entire country and in winning the war than any other groups. The Army and the Navy are the two departments most concerned in operating and winning the war. Today the whole petroleum situation amounts to a scandal. Persons in Massachusetts and other States are getting ready to be evacuated from their homes because of the cold. Already there have been numerous deaths. I ask that the Members of the House assist; otherwise, they may be considered a part of the same scandal.

Because of lack of coordination among the various Government departments confusion exists among different groups in the same Government departments. Even the fuel oil that is available is not being properly distributed. Some one person or some one Government department should have a single plan and should see to it that the plan is carried out. I ask that the Members of the House assist, otherwise they may regret it. Those whose districts are not affected today may well be tomorrow. If they refuse cooperation they may be considered a part of the same scandalous neglect of the fuel problem.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the business today and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE VICTORY TAX WITH REFERENCE TO MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, section 465 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code—title 26 of the United States Code—does not include remuneration paid for services performed as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, other than pensions or retired pay, in computing wages for the purpose of collecting the Victory tax at the source—but section 451 (a) of the Code imposes the Victory tax upon the members of our armed forces.

This is an anomalous and, in my opinion an indefensible situation, which I hope the Congress has but inadvertently created.

The wages paid our soldiers and sailors should not be charged with the Victory tax, and I have today introduced a bill which will have the effect of removing this injustice. The victory which will be ours will result in graver and greater contributions by our armed forces who should not be taxed, too—it will be their victory to which we at home are glad to contribute in the form of the Victory tax.

The wages of the soldier and the sailor are low enough. They should be free of any Victory tax, and I respectfully urge immediate action on my bill so as to correct the present situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an article that appeared in the American Bar Association Journal of January.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FARM MACHINERY AND PARTS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

"HORSESHOES IS STILL HORSESHOES"

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to you this evening for a few minutes about our farm machinery and parts program. If I took a text it would be horseshoes. Not that horseshoes are the most important things needed in connection with farming, but because the attitude of the Industrial Program Branch, Office of Civilian Supply, of the War Production Board, toward the humble horseshoe is indicative of the way farm machinery and parts are being handled, and gives a fairly good insight into the practical knowledge of those administering the program.

For many months I have not only been vexed and irritated, but at times alarmed, at some of the blunders that have been made in connection with our food-for-victory program. It is evident that many of those who seemingly are directing the farm program which, in my opinion, is the biggest, the toughest program confronting the American people today, never had their lily-white hands soiled by mother earth, nor needed a good scrubbing Saturday night to get rid of the malodor of the barnyard so they would not only look but smell presentable Sunday morning.

Some of these long haired star-gazers who are administering the program, I am afraid, know more about astronomy than they do about agronomy. If they would stop dreaming, take their eyes off of the stars, and get their feet back on good earth we would get along better.

In peacetime it is tragic for the directing head to be ignorant of what he is directing. In war it is not only tragic—it is fatal. When it comes to wrecking our war effort, the saboteur who has to work under cover and await his opportunity to wreck is a piker compared with the incompetent directing head who, by reason of his position, does not have to await his opportunity to wreck, but with a boldness engendered by ignorance, wrecks in the broad daylight.

But let me get back to my text. In my home town we have two very large hardware companies, manned by two country boys who moved to town and made good. E. H. Powers is the directing head of Mitchell-Powers Hardware Co., and J. T. Cecil is the directing head of the Interstate Hardware Co. Neither could get any horseshoes, so they took the matter up with the Industrial Program Branch, Office of Civilian Supply, War Production Board, and in due course received a reply which, while it clearly demonstrated that the writer knows his syntax and rhetoric, on its face furnishes indisputable proof that he does not know his horseshoes. Or does he? While Ez and Jim and I were all raised on the farm, it has been a good many years since we left the dear old sod, and during the intervening years probably horseshoes, like many other things, have been revolutionized, and our failure to appreciate the learned treatise on horseshoes is due to the fact that we have not kept abreast of the times. However, I have a sneaking idea that back on the farm today "pigs is still pigs" and "horseshoes is still horseshoes."

My colleagues, the fourth paragraph of the reply is such an illuminating, learned treatise on horseshoes, and especially on the use of horseshoes and the modern custom of farmers with respect thereto, that I believe it should be preserved among the sacred archives of this great Republic, so I quote it verbatim:

> The 75-percent quota for horseshoes when applied to the 1940–41 average as a base will yield 92 percent as many new shoes as were produced in 1942. This available production can be much further extended in supplying urgent 1943 needs for food production and other activities essential to the war effort by: (1) more "resets" to get more wear out of available shoes; (2) elimination of uses which are obviously nonproductive and nonessential in the war effort; (3) elimination of unessential styles and improved distribution methods to reduce the quantity tied up in inventories; and (4) horse owners can, in many cases, save shoes by removing the shoes immediately after a period of necessary road work or other work where shoes are necessary only during certain periods.

I do not think I should hide the identity of the author of the above masterpiece. He is no other than Mr. Edward R. Gay, chief of the Industrial Branch, Office of Civilian Supply, War Production Board. Mr. Gay, I am informed, is a resident of the city of New York,

educated at Harvard, and prior to becoming attached to the Government on June 15, 1942, was vice president of St. Regis Paper Co. of New York City. A splendid background for one selected to administer the machinery and parts program for the farmers of America.

Now, when I was a boy, it was more or less a treat to take one of the horses to the country blacksmith to be shod. In the first place, it meant that I would get a good rest for a few hours; and then, too, I got a kick out of watching Uncle Ned take the old shoe off and put a new shoe on. As I remember, he had to first unclinch the nails that had been embedded into the hoof and then pull the nails in order to get the old shoe off. You know at that time we followed the crude method of nailing the things on. Having gotten the old shoe off, which was no easy undertaking, he then proceeded to trim the hoof down to get rid of the growth that had taken place since the old shoe was nailed on and to shape the hoof up for the new shoe. The hoof having been prepared, he then placed the new shoe over the hoof to determine what changes, if any, would have to be made in the new shoe before being nailed on. He then placed the new shoe in the forge, started pumping the bellows to fan the fire up, and after heating the shoe to a white heat took it out of the forge with a pair of tongs and commenced whipping it into shape on the anvil.

After two or three fittings the new shoe was ready to be nailed on. The nails were inserted in the holes the manufacturers had provided in the shoe, which had been opened up by Uncle Ned with the proper tool, and the nails were driven at the right angle for them to come through the hoof about 1 inch above the shoe. The nails having been driven in, a groove was filed just under the nails, the nails cut off to the proper length, and then embedded in the groove to hold them secure. Then, all that remained for Uncle Ned to do was to dress the hoof up with a file so it would be even and smooth around the shoe. Horseshoes in those days were put on to stay. It was supposed to be a permanent operation that would hold the shoe until it wore out. The shoes were not put on with the idea in mind that sooner or later they would be taken off or reset.

Well, it seems that Ez and Jim and I have grown a little rusty on our horseshoes and horseshoeing. The rules of the game have entirely changed. And for fear that the good farmers in my district are as ignorant on the subject as Ez and Jim and I, I want to make a few observations to set them right. These observations, of course, are all based upon the learned dissertation I have just quoted.

First, in order to lengthen the life of the shoe, you must have more "resets." I am glad that the word "resets" was enclosed in quotations, because I am frank to admit that at first the word as applied to horseshoes bothered me, and it was comforting to know that the learned author had evidently borrowed the expression. After much study, however, I believe I have the thing all figured out. If your horse is knock-kneed in his front legs, for instance, and this physical deformity causes the inner parts of the front shoes to wear out faster than the outer parts, why, all you have to do is to take old Dobbin back to Uncle Ned for a "reset," and he will correct the whole matter by simply changing shoes. Oh, it may be a little costly having the left shoe taken off and put on the right foot and the right shoe taken off and put on the left foot, but this little extra cost is all absorbed in the satisfaction that comes to you from knowing that you are living abreast of the times and playing the game according to the latest W. P. B. rules. Then, you know, another thing that frequently calls for "resets" is the slue-footed horse. This deformity usually appears in the front legs and causes the toe of the front foot to strike the surface first, which, in turn, has a tendency to wear the front of the shoes out faster. Well, this is all corrected by "resets." In this case all you have to do is to put the front shoes on the hind feet and the hind shoes on the front feet. Oh, it is all quite simple after you catch on to the rules of the game.

Now, the second rule to follow in prolonging the life of the horseshoe is, and I quote, the "elimination of uses which are obviously nonproductive and nonessential in the war effort." Well, what does this mean? Why, Mr. Farmer, among other things, it means this: You may feel the urge to go to church Sunday morning, and having worked from 14 to 15 hours per day all through the week you may feel "kinder" tired and entertain the old-fashioned idea that the thing to do is to "hitch old Dobbin to the shay" and drive your wife and children over. Well, if you entertain such thoughts, then banish them before you are considered unpatriotic in permitting old Dobbin to engage in work nonproductive and nonessential to the war effort. In such a case, under the new rules, the thing for you to do is to run down to the barn and put a fresh batch of straw in old Dobbin's stall to cushion her dear tootsie wootsies against the hardness of mother earth, and then go back home and get your wife and children and hoof it, brother, hoof it, on to church. Oh, this may entail the wear and tear of your own shoes, and the shoes of your wife and children, but when you think the thing through and consider the worthlessness of your own shoe leather, and the shoe leather of your wife and children, compared to the preservation of old Dobbin's shoes, the patriotic sacrifice you have made makes you feel as important to the war effort as a MacArthur or Eisenhower.

And then to prolong the life of the horseshoe you must not be too finicky about the style of shoe your horse wears, because the third rule calls for, and I quote, the "elimination of nonessential style." Now, when Ez and Jim and I were boys a horseshoe was simply a horseshoe. Of course, there were large shoes and small shoes and middle size shoes, but they were all made on the same type last. Styles were unknown. The rich man's horse could not lord it over the poor man's horse by wearing pointed toes, or box toes, or low quarters, or patent leather, or tan shoes. I am glad to know that we are going to get rid of the styles that came in vogue after Ez and Jim and I left the farm, because I know they created a lot of confusion and ill will and envy and jealousy among the female horses. I am afraid the female horses simply worried the farmers to death trying to keep up with the latest styles in high heels and open toes. Well, thank the Lord, this rule takes us back to the good old days of my boyhood when a horseshoe was a horseshoe which, to say the least, is comforting. Then, you know, equality of treatment is one of the things we are fighting for in this war, and I know it brings our boys who are doing the fighting a lot of comfort to know that this equality of treatment is going to apply to horses. Yes, when it comes to horses, we have abolished styles and placed all horses upon an equal shoe footing.

And now I come to the last rule. It reads:

> Horse owners can, in many cases, save shoes by removing the shoes immediately after a period of necessary road work or other work where shoes are necessary only during certain periods.

Well, this rule stumped me for a long time. Being kind of old fashioned I foolishly wondered how you would keep on taking the shoes off and putting the shoes back on. I construed the rule to mean, of course, that it was no longer polite or in accordance with established custom for old Dobbin to go to bed with her shoes on, and trying to figure out how to take her shoes off when she went to bed at night and put them back on when she got up in the morning, I confess stumped me for quite a while. And then it all came to me, as clear as the noonday sun. Why I was still living back in the horse-and-buggy days, and had forgotten all about—if I ever knew—the styles changing. Of course the improvement in styles brought about the zipper style, and I presume we now have zipper horseshoes. So, Mr. Farmer, all you have to do now in order to comply with the new rules is to buy the zipper style, and zip them off at night and zip them back on in the morning. This is mighty easy on you, Mr. Farmer, but I am afraid it has put old Uncle Ned out of the horseshoeing business. And, alas, it has taken the stuffin's right out of that dear old poem we all used to recite about the grand old village blacksmith. Poor old fellow, he has fallen by the way, the victim of the zipper.

Since I took a text, it is up to me, I suppose, to point to the lesson to be found in the text. The preachers do, and, you know, it is always safe to follow the preachers. Let me point to the lesson by telling a story.

Years ago in one of the counties of my district lived a school teacher by the name of Jonothan Phipps. In that day and time the people of that section, although there coursed through their veins the purest Anglo-Saxon blood to be found in America, paid very little attention to education. Clearing new ground called for brawn and muscle and a strong back, and these early pioneers had these

qualities, plus indomitable will power and courage, to the *n*th degree. They did, however, respect education and looked up to those who were versed in the rudiments of the three R's. Naturally, Jonothan stood out as a real personage in the county, and, quite naturally, his wife assumed that what he did not know had not been written in the books, and that he was capable of engaging in any undertaking or directing any project or program. When it came to Jonothan she was no respecter of limitations, and Jonothan, because of the popular acclaim that surrounded him, augmented by his wife's admiration, was looking for new worlds to conquer. Well, in the course of time Jonothan's faithful old mare, Maude by name, reached the age that made it advisable to swap her off for a younger mare, and so he took her over to the Hardshell Baptist Association to make the swap. In that day every meeting place of the association had a jockey ground hard by, where the slickest horse jockeys that ever cocained an old mare into acting like a young filly operated without let or hindrance. Meeting a jockey that had a likely looking prancing mare, Jonothan asked:

"How will you trade?"

"How old is your mare?" inquired the jockey.

"I neither ask nor answer questions," responded Jonothan.

"Well," said the jockey, "if that is the way you feel about it, what do you say?"

Jonothan looked the mare over and then mounted the saddle and rode across the jockey lot for about 50 yards and back. When he dismounted, the jockey again asked, "Well, what do you say?"

"Give you my mare and $25," replied Jonothan.

"It is a trade," snapped the jockey.

Returning home, Jonothan, thinking that he had made a wonderful trade, in high spirits related to his wife the old story about "I came, I saw, I conquered."

The next morning when Jonothan went to feed he found the mare lying down. His efforts to get her up proved of no avail, and it at least dawned upon him that the mare's spirits and spryness had been caused by cocaine, which had died, and that he had let the jockey beat him out of a faithful old mare and $25.

Returning to the house, his wife at once knew from his dejected look that all was not well; and when he had finished telling the sad, pathetic story, she cried out:

"Jonothan, it passes strange to me that a man of your education could be made a sucker out of by an ignorant horse jockey."

And Jonothan replied—and there is wisdom in his words—"Martha, Martha, education has darn little to do with horse swapping."

And so say I; rhetoric and syntax and B. A.'s and M. A.'s and Ph. D.'s and a Harvard accent have darn little to do with horseshoes.

Moral: As long as we have to have bureaus, divided into divisions and sections, let us man them with men of practical knowledge and experience, even at the expense of getting rid of some of our wonder boys, because, after all is said and done, back on the farm "pigs is still pigs" and "horseshoes is still horseshoes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DOMESTIC FUEL OIL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Member from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] just stated on the floor of the House that if the shortage of fuel oil in the East continued the Army should be given authority and should take over. In addition she made the statement that the Army was more interested in winning the war than any other group. Now I challenge as arrant nonsense that last statement. If it comes to a question of making comparisons that is a poor one to make. No one questions the desire or the ability of the armed forces to win the war. Comparison of degrees of patriotism are odious. There is no degree of loyalty or willingness to serve among our people. All will give their utmost. Did the Member mean to tell me that the mothers and fathers and all those who are willing to give everything they have to the winning of the war are less interested than the officers of the Army? Or are the men of the Army? I say it is just nonsense; everyone is interested in this war and there is no reason why any comparisons should be made. We are all in the same boat and every one is interested in stopping the leaks.

The Member from Massachusetts should have remembered when she was advocating the giving of everything to foreign governments, when she was crying for lend-lease, she should have remembered that the supply of fuel oil, gasoline, food, manpower, and everything else was limited, and that if we gave it all away, sent it across the seas, somebody here at home would suffer. She asks for sympathy because now there is a shortage of many things necessary not only to the comfort but to the existence of our own people. We have made our bed and if we find in it corn cobs and corn stalks we should not cry for a beauty rest mattress. We of the Middle West will take it and grin but we intend to kick out of the way all who block the road to victory. That far I can go with the Member from Massachusetts, but when she stands on the floor and says the Army is more interested in winning than are the people at home we part company. She should appeal at the other end of the Avenue. If anyone is welcome to go down there it is the Member from Massachusetts. She should go down there and make her complaint against the incompetents who take shelter under the Commander in Chief's shadow.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include an editorial concerning the lend-lease policy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from today's Washington Post on the significance of the mode of travel the President used to North Africa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE RATIONING PROGRAM AND ITS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared today to discuss a subject which I am sure every Member of the House will be vitally interested in because it affects each and every district throughout this country. I am going to talk about the situation back home as regards rationing, pleasure driving, and various other measures which have been undertaken to aid the prosecution of the great struggle we are in. At this time I want to make it perfectly clear that I am in no way criticizing or challenging the patriotism of any group of people in the Government or in any way casting aspersions upon their interest in the war effort. I do propose, however, to elaborate upon the conditions as I find them in my district in connection with the Government's attitude toward patriotic men and women whom it is my honor and privilege to represent in this House.

In the first place I want to pay tribute to the people I represent for the wonderful way they have responded to the war effort, for the way they have sacrificed their personal fortunes, placed their sons in the service and given up the hundred and one things they previously enjoyed before this great crisis came upon us; I want to take time out to pay my tribute to the loyal men and women back home who have given so much of their time in a volunteer capacity serving on rationing boards and

draft boards, in the interests of the war effort in general. Their effort and their patriotism have contributed in very large degree to the great success which the American public is enjoying on the home front.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman represents a district that borders on mine. I want to take this occasion to join with him in saying that the people he represents are the finest type of American citizens, loyal, patriotic, and self-sacrificing, and doing everything within their power to help win this war.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman for his observation. In return I want also to say that I believe my district is only typical of every other district throughout the country in the patriotic and generous way in which they have responded to this war effort.

I also want to make clear today in my discussion that along with just about every other Member of the House I voted for the system of rationing which has been introduced to the country because I recognized that some definite action along this line would have to be taken if the population were to receive an equitable distribution of the food, gasoline, tires, and of the other various commodities which we have known in civilian life. I also recognized the fact that if the Nation were to proceed with an all-out war effort and to supply the armed forces of our country with tanks, planes, and guns with which and only with which we could be victorious, drastic steps should be taken at home in order to provide our men with the necessary weapons. So today I do not propose to challenge the wisdom of rationing, because I feel that it is necessary for the prosecution of the war; but I do expect to criticize the way rationing has been handled as far as the administrative end of it goes. I feel it my sovereign duty as a Representative of a fine patriotic district to stand here in the House today and protest about some of the high-handed ways which various agencies have taken in superseding the power of the Congress in a legislative sense by making their own rules, in superseding and encroaching upon the powers of the various local law-enforcement agencies by executive officers to enforce the rules and regulations which they have made. I also rise today to protest the deliberate invasion of the privileges of the Congress of the United States by the various agencies of government who, after having been given more or less blanket authority on the part of Congress, have assumed powers above and beyond anything that either the Congress or the people ever intended to have them assume.

At this point I think it only fair to state that a great deal has been said on the subject of bureaucracy in this House. Ever since the last election, which was taken by most of the people as an indication of the dissatisfaction of the people back home with increased regulations, I have recognized a vigilance on the part of the men and women of this House. I have observed a definite interest on their part to see that the Congress took drastic action to curb the ever-increasing power of the bureaucrats throughout the country.

Today I am prepared to discuss in detail H. R. 1359, which I introduced about a week ago, because, as I have said, I feel it the solemn duty of every Member of the House of Representatives and Senate to speak for their people back home and to maintain American privileges and rights which they so anxiously desire to be preserved. I took the last election, which was definitely a protest of the Gestapo methods used by the Government, as an indication of the approval of the people to hear their representatives speak in this manner. I am only waiting to see steps taken and to see legislation presented which will enable me to cast my vote for the preservation of the individual rights of the people back home whom I represent.

I wish to discuss the subject of pleasure driving and some of the other steps that have been taken by the Office of Price Administration and other agencies to regulate and to regiment, if you please, the people of the United States of America. I am sure I share the same feeling as most of the other Members here today when I say that I gladly gave authority to the Office of Price Administration to regulate the amount of gasoline we should use, or the amount of coffee that we should drink, or the types and number of tires which we could buy or purchase, or the distance that we should be able to drive our cars. I think those are reasonable regulations which every right-thinking American is willing to consider as his honest and just sacrifice in the great crisis we are now facing. However, I raise my voice in protest against any official of the O. P. A., or any other agency of the administrative branch of our Government, who swoops down upon the people of my district and tells them how they are to use their ration coupons and who tells them that they cannot do this, that, or the other thing. I raise my voice in protest against the agencies of the Government that have been created by the Congress and the people challenging the authority—the sovereign constitutional rights—of the people. I protest against those individuals entering into the personal affairs of our people and telling them what they should do or how they should live or what steps they should take.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman represents a great farming district. Does he know whether the farmers of his district are permitted to attend grange meetings under their gasoline supply or whether they are permitted to go to town to buy supplies on Saturday night?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will say to the gentleman, in answer to his appropriate question, that after a great deal of protest had been brought to bear upon the agencies in charge by the rural population of my district, they were finally allowed to drive to grange meetings. But, since we are on that subject, may I point out some of the petty regulations which were placed upon the citizens of my district. I know that every Member here will join with me in protesting such petty regulations.

For example, there is a defense worker in my district who was recently given enough gasoline to drive to and from his work. He happens to be employed in a defense factory making vital weapons for the war. It happened that this gentleman stopped on the way home at a barber shop to get a shave and a haircut. On his way out he was accosted by a snooper of the O. P. A. who had been delegated to cover his activities. This defense worker found that he had disobeyed one of the regulations he never dreamed existed, in that he was not supposed to stop and get a haircut on the way home from his work in the factory. He found that he was to take his car home, according to this official, to drive his car all the way home from his place of employment, and he must take the bus back to the barber shop. Even though this barber shop was on his way home, he could not stop and get a haircut. He would be forced to return home with his automobile, then return to the barber shop and get a haircut. I say today that such regulations are absolutely ridiculous, not only ridiculous but they are undemocratic, and they are an encroachment upon the rights of every American citizen back home.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe that there is one great cardinal principle the O. P. A. is violating today. In their treatment of the American people, does not the gentleman feel that perhaps first of all they take it for granted that the average American citizen is a crook?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe that the O. P. A. would do much better, and this is offered in the same constructive strain that the gentleman from New York is speaking today, if that agency would get down to the township method of government and give as far as possible as much of their authority as they could to our township boards who know every person, having as little bureaucratic control as is necessary.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. To elaborate upon the gentleman's statement, may I say that I have in mind a further regulation which was brought to my attention in the district I have the honor to represent. A couple wanted to get married. They were allowed by the O. P. A. officials to ride to their wedding in their own car. However, this was a rather large church wedding. They had invited several guests and several relatives. Imagine their surprise to find out that the guests at the wedding had to walk or take public conveyances, even though they had cars of their own and plenty of gasoline, according to their ration books. That to me is another example of the deliberate encroachment and invasion of the personal rights and privileges which Americans hold so dear.

If the Office of Price Administration continues with these obnoxious activities, these deliberate intimidations against the rights of every American citizen, every citizen back home will raise his voice in righteous indignation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Walking to the wedding was not so serious as letting people freeze in their homes?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentlewoman. She has hit upon a very important point which should have every consideration by the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RAMEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. The gentleman alluded to the term "defense worker." Is not the farmer or the farm hand just as much a defense worker as the man on a factory pay roll, or perhaps more so?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is right. May I also call attention to an instance which came to my attention in my district. It happens that I am a very good friend of a small merchant in one of the villages of my district. He has a considerable number of rubber boots on the shelves of his shoe store, but he is actually unable to dispose of them because it has been decreed by the Office of Price Administration that boots of that type shall be sold only to coal miners. The mine nearest to my district is about 100 miles down into Pennsylvania.

I happen to represent largely an agricultural district in this one particular county in which the man who owns the store resides. He is unable to dispose of those rubber boots because the O. P. A. has forbidden him to do so. In the meantime, I have received letters from farmers in that and adjacent counties to the effect that they are unable to proceed with their own work of raising food for freedom because they have no footwear suitable to withstand the elements.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am rather surprised to hear the story about the rubber boots. Possibly the O. P. A. down here thinks that all the barnyards in New York are paved with paving blocks.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That may be the case with penthouse farmers, but it is not so with the farmers of my district. One farmer wrote me recently:

> It is impossible for me to get any rubber footwear whatsoever, but I want to know what the Office of Price Administration expects me to do. Do they expect that I am going to shovel manure in my bare feet?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Any kind of fuel is important to the people of my district today. I do not know whether or not any of the farmers in the gentleman's district sell cordwood, but I have been surprised to learn that by regulation the O. P. A., without reducing the price of a cord of wood, has taken 32 cubic feet out of every cord of wood that is sold. That is important in New England today. I wish the gentleman could get an answer to that for me.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I think the gentleman is correct, and I feel he should have a definite answer from the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to the gentleman's question about the O. P. A. expecting the farmers to go into the barnyard in their bare feet, may I say that some of us have done that, but you cannot do that until after the April rains come along. In February and March, when the work should be done in our country, some of it, at least, it is a little different, and it just cannot be done.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It is pretty hard for anybody to do that in this freezing weather.

I have had these questions presented to me in the form of letters of protest. I am sure every other Member in the House has received some such protest from his district.

I cannot help but feel that these agencies of government are deliberately encroaching upon the authority of Congress and upon the jurisdiction of the courts. They are doing worse than that, they are assuming authority that was never given to them and which the Congress never intended they should have. They are going along with about 10-percent authority and 90-percent bluff. They are intimidating the people back home in such a way that they are definitely hindering the war effort. I submit that you cannot get away with pushing people around. You cannot insult the patriotism which is so manifest back home and not expect a lot of hard feeling. I for one raise my voice today to protest against such procedure.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has indicated that these bureaucrats are intimidating the people. Has the gentleman given any thought to the fact that in order to intimidate the people they are snooping around among the people? The thought occurs to me that it might be well to consider the enforcement of all these Federal regulations by local and State officers, who know what the conditions are in every community.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman for the contribution he has made. Frankly, I think there has been intimidation of the local authorities; at least, there has been intimidation in certain instances in my district on the part of those agencies who have swooped down from Washington and come into each small locality and assumed powers they were never given. They have been loud in their demands for cooperation on the part of the local population. They have made insinuations against certain people in my district and everywhere else. They have questioned their patriotism, if they have not received immediate cooperation from them. I for one believe that the administrative agencies of the Government should have cooperation from the people, but I believe they can get it without snooping and prying into their business.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. The gentleman comes from a dairy district. Are the gentleman's people having any trouble getting feed concentrates up there to mix dairy feeds?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am pleased to have the gentleman mention that, because we are.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I have a letter from my own district which, like the gentleman's, is a dairy and farming district, stating that the feed mills are suffering from a lack of oil cake, linseed cake, peanut meal, soybean meal, or what have you, which by ration has been withheld, so that they are on the point of closing down. I am sure the gentleman, like myself, has received dozens of letters from dairy producers telling of their inability to obtain these concentrated feeds to produce foods for victory. It may not make so much difference to the gentleman whether or not his people have rubber boots, but if they do not have some cow feed they will not have any manure to haul.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is correct. I appreciate his remarks.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman spoke of the difficulty of a merchant in his district disposing of certain boots in that district, and asked for a suggestion as to how he might dispose of them. I suggest we might dispose of some of the heels in Washington that have caused all this trouble.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman. My purpose in rising today is to do just that, and I think by a combined interest on the part of every Member of the House along these lines Congress can take definite action, and that is one of the reasons I have just introduced H. R. 1359, which has for its title "A bill to prohibit the use of sanctions not provided by law for violations or alleged violations of orders and regulations issued by the Price Administrator," and I have provided in this bill that no agency shall have the power—it does not have the power now, but a lot of people think it has—no administrator shall have the power to go into anybody's

locality and say to the population there, "We have the right to take away your gasoline coupons; we have the right to take away your drivers' licenses; we have the right to intimidate you along this and that line and to deprive you of the rights you have under the law." Mr. Speaker, they have no right at all because Congress has never given them that right.

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. ELMER. Does the gentleman not think that the things he is griping about now are the very reason that there are 48 new Members like myself on this side of the House?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I agree with the gentleman. I believe more than anything else it was not so much the prosecution of the war effort, because everybody had one objective in mind and that was to win the war, and that is true of Members on both sides of the House. The reason for the New Deal disaster was because the people resented their patriotism being questioned by agents of the Government snooping around back home and trying to put everybody on the spot, trying to scare everybody out of his personal liberties and rights.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Is it not a fact that these snoopers and spies are just a part of the vicious circle of a growing democracy here in Washington, and did they not simply go there as a part of the bureaucratic system, having actually little power, but in order to make good in their jobs and seize all of the power they can on the part of that system?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes. In connection with that, not long ago I disclosed the fact that I was going to do some considerable agitating myself against the encroachment of power on the part of these agencies. I said that to a friend of mine back home, and he said, "You are wasting your breath in raising your voice in protest against it, because nothing will ever be done about it, and, furthermore, you are bucking a bureaucracy which is going to swallow you up and is going to swallow up the whole Congress and take away the last vestige of the rights and privileges that the Constitution has guaranteed to everybody throughout the country." I said in answer to that that no matter what happens to me, or to anybody else, I feel it is my duty to do everything I can to fight this Frankenstein which the New Deal has created and which is rapidly gobbling up every vestige of right which the people have and enjoy today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman has had an opportunity to read the extension of remarks I put into the RECORD this morning, which contains an order or price policy just issued, in more or less secrecy, by the Office of Price Administration, and in which two very significant sentences appear. First, there is this statement:

> The Office of Price Administration is not concerned with whether individual businesses flourish or fail, just so long as necessities are produced in as large a volume as war conditions will permit and that these necessities are available at controlled prices to all persons essential to our war effort.

If the gentleman will bear with me for a moment, I think he will interpret that to mean that they do not care whether a business fails or goes to the wall, just so long as a certain group of citizens receive goods at prices that they fix.

Second. I want to read this. They set forth four new orders, No. 4. This is the new policy:

> 4. Making price adjustments only in cases which involve war materials or commodities and services absolutely necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. All other things must be considered of secondary importance. Hence the manpower of the Office of Price Administration cannot be dissipated in considering price adjustments for nonessential goods.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Incidentally, they go further and say they do not care particularly what happens to any particular community.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes to conclude my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I have brought this discussion to the floor because I feel it is necessary that the Congress take some steps against this bureaucratic invasion not only of the people's rights, but of the right of Congress and of every other legislative and judicial branch of our Government.

If I may make one more observation, there will be no sense of Congress continuing or the courts or any other branch of our Government continuing except the dictatorial branch if we allow this situation to continue, if we allow these bureaucrats to make rules and regulations, to issue executive decrees and other directives, and if we continue to allow them to browbeat and intimidate and scare the local agencies of law enforcement and people generally throughout the United States. I raise my voice in the House today in defense of the rights that the people back home are losing now in an unnecessary and ridiculous way, because their patriotism does not need any tampering by being pushed around or by threatening their rights if they do not follow direct orders from these bureaucrats.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Further along the line of the question raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and quoting from his extension of remarks, I call your attention to this statement:

> The policy of considering price adjustment for individual concerns or for cream puffs and hair nets is a thing of the past.

In other words, this man, clothed with arbitrary power, says he has just as much respect for a man's property rights, for his liberty, for the goodwill that he has built into his business through a lifetime of effort, as something which rises to the dignity of a cream puff or a hair net.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Before very long the strictest kind of rationing of food will be on the books, and it will be carried out with a mighty army of supersnoopers emanating from Washington. Although I am not criticizing rationing itself, and I think it is necessary, I think that when they threaten to search your homes for any articles you have hoarded you are opening the door for the final invasion of the American home and you violate the age-old adage "a man's home is his castle." You are reducing him to the status of a serf.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the other special orders today I may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes, and I waive my time at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein certain editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

### GOVERNMENT-OWNED SHIPYARDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of this country have a right to know, and they should know, of the incompetence and extravagance of the Maritime Commission.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House, of which I am a member, has been investigating its activities, and, among others, that of conditions existing at the South Portland

Shipbuilding Corporation yard. This shipyard is owned outright by the Maritime Commission as an agency of Government, just as much as the Government owns our navy yards. It financed the construction and operation of this yard. The Maritime Commission has had representatives personally at the South Portland yard from its very inception. The incompetence and extravagance of the Maritime Commission are amply shown by the deplorable conditions existing at that yard, as indicated in the report of the committee submitted on November 24 last.

Emory S. Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, and Commissioner Howard L. Vickery attempted to justify these conditions as set forth in the report by stating that conditions equally as bad exist at other yards under the Maritime Commission's control.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries unanimously recommended that the Maritime Commission cancel this contract on November 24 last, but up to this time, so far as is known, the Maritime Commission has failed to act upon this recommendation.

In accordance with the unanimous consent previously granted, there is appended hereto the report of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, No. 2653, of the Seventy-seventh Congress. I suggest and recommend that every Member of the House, in the interest of economy and good government, read it. It will be noted that the report contains my minority views. I voted to terminate the contract of the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation with the Maritime Commission, but not to relieve the Maritime Commission of responsibilities which wholly belong to the Maritime Commission.

INVESTIGATION OF SOUTH PORTLAND SHIPBUILDING CORPORATION

INTERIM REPORT

FOREWORD

By the terms of House Resolution 281 your committee was authorized and directed to conduct an investigation into the merchant marine shipbuilding program. House Resolution 281 is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed (a) to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the progress of the national defense program, insofar as it relates to matters coming within the jurisdiction of said committee, or administered by the United States Maritime Commission, or any other agency under the jurisdiction of said committee, with a view to determining whether such program is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously, and economically; (b) to make such inquiry as said Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries may consider important or pertinent to the merchant marine or fisheries of the United States or any of the Territories thereof, or to any matter coming within the jurisdiction of said committee.

"For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

"That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable."

At the very beginning it appeared obvious that the best procedure was for your committee to devote its attention to the most pressing matters and that policy has been consistently followed.

In the early stages of its work the committee employed various investigators. In July 1942 it employed a general counsel and other counsel within the limits of the committee's appropriation. Your committee decided upon an immediate detailed investigation of the affairs of South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation, hereinafter referred to as South Portland Ship. This decision was prompted by various considerations, including the fact that South Portland Ship had the poorest performance record of any company engaged in the construction of Liberty ships.

Members of the investigating staff were in Portland from shortly after August 1 until November 1. During that time they made a thorough examination of all phases of the activities of South Portland Ship in the performance of its facilities and ship-construction contracts. They investigated certain vendors who dealt with the shipyard. They investigated the files of the Maritime Commission at the yard, at the regional offices in Philadelphia and in Washington. Extensive hearings have been held and the testimony of many witnesses taken both in Portland and in Washington.

Your committee sought among other things to discover the underlying reasons for the poor performance of South Portland Ship. The sole purpose of the accelerated merchant shipbuilding program is to produce ships at an ever-increasing pace. The demands of a global war cannot be met except by superlative performance. Your committee had no preconceived ideas as to the cause of the delays at South Portland Ship. Its findings have been dictated by undisputed evidence.

THE CONTRACTS BETWEEN THE MARITIME COMMISSION AND SOUTH PORTLAND SHIP

There are two shipyards located at South Portland, Maine, with a total building capacity of 13 ships. The older of the yards was built early in 1941, pursuant to a contract between the British Government and the Todd-Bath Iron Shipbuilding Corporation, hereinafter referred to as Todd-Bath. This contract provided for the construction of the necessary facilities and of 30 merchant ships. The yard has 3 basins, with a capacity of 7 ships. The British contract has been virtually completed and the Maritime Commission has acquired the yard for consolidation with the adjoining South Portland Ship yard. Construction of the South Portland Ship yard was commenced in the spring of 1941, pursuant to a contract between the Maritime Commission and South Portland Ship dated April 28, 1941. Both South Portland Ship and Todd-Bath are controlled by the same interests, to wit, 50 percent by Bath Iron Works and 50 percent by Todd Shipyards Corporation.

At the time of the making of the facilities contract the Maritime Commission and South Portland Ship entered into a separate contract for the construction of 16 Liberty ships. Since the original contracts were made the Maritime Commission has entered into further contracts with South Portland Ship for additional facilities and for 68 more Liberty ships. Thirty-three of these Liberty ships are to be built in the Todd-Bath yard, and construction has begun there. The contracts with South Portland Ship for facilities were straight-cost contracts with no provision for any fee. The contracts for ship construction are cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. The fixed fee is $110,000 per ship, plus bonuses for good performance, minus penalties for poor performance. Fee plus bonuses are limited to $140,000 per ship. The imposition of penalties cannot reduce the fee below $60,000 per ship.

The original plan was that South Portland Ship would be a four-way yard with very limited facilities for fabrication. The intention was that most of the fabrication would be handled at the Todd-Bath yard adjoining or at the Harding plant of the Bath Iron Works, which is located some 35 miles from South Portland. Subsequently, it was decided to add two additional ways. Since fabricating facilities were not available for the additional ways, it was necessary to make provision for such facilities.

An examination of the contracts, both for facilities and for ships, indicates an attitude of extreme generosity on the part of the Maritime Commission. In the facilities contracts there is no obligation on the part of the contractor to complete construction of the facilities by any given date and there is virtually no limitation upon their cost. The contracts provide "that the contractor shall not be deemed to have guaranteed that this contract can be performed" for the amount stated and "shall in no event be obligated to continue its performance of this contract beyond a point to which its obligations * * * equal the unexpended portion of the amount payable by the owner hereunder." The ship contracts are equally generous and, among other provisions state that "the contractor shall be reimbursed for all costs of remedying defective work * * * whether the * * * work shall have been furnished or supplied by the Commission or the contractor."

INADEQUATE MANAGEMENT

The fundamental trouble with South Portland Ship is that it lacked sufficient managerial personnel and skill to accomplish the vast task of organizing and operating a yard capable of performing its contracts. That lack still exists. While Bath Iron Works and Todd Shipyards Corporation are equal owners, Todd Shipyards Corporation has contributed virtually nothing in the way of personnel or management. The management load was carried originally by Bath Iron Works.

The vast majority of the managerial personnel at both Todd-Bath and South Portland Ship came from Bath Iron Works. While Bath Iron Works enjoyed an excellent reputation for shipbuilding for many years, it was a small concern. When the Todd-Bath yard was organized, its staffing necessitated a big drain on this small, though well-trained, personnel. The Todd-Bath yard was bigger than Bath Iron Works had ever been. The available managerial material was, therefore, already spread thin, possibly too thin, even before the South Portland Ship contracts were awarded. The result was inevitable. Men, likely good mechanics—on that score we venture no opinion—who had always been

subordinates, were suddenly vaulted into executive and subexecutive posts.

This can readily be illustrated. On the pay roll there are approximately 100 superintendents, foremen, and assistant foremen. Of these, 75 had no prior experience in the direction of men. These 75 were originally employed by the yard in various capacities ranging from common laborers to skilled mechanics of one kind or another. Their average beginning salary at time of employment was $1.15 per hour, and their average salary at the present time is approximately $5,500 per year. The average length of time it took these men to reach their present salary levels from the date when they were first employed is 5 months.

The failure of the management at South Portland Ship could be evidenced by innumerable instances. A few examples must suffice.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE FACILITIES

Shortly after the execution of the facilities contract in April 1941, South Portland Ship, with the approval of the Maritime Commission, entered into contracts with Alonzo N. Harriman for all architectural, engineering, and supervisory service required for the construction of the yard, and with Ellis C. Snodgrass as general contractor for the entire construction thereof. Pursuant to these contracts, plans were drawn and construction got under way. Until after October 1, 1941, South Portland Ship had virtually no organization on the site and the entire construction program was left in the hands of the Harriman and Snodgrass organizations. Thus, by reason of the fact that South Portland Ship had no purchasing department, all of the purchases of materials for facilities construction were made by the Harriman organization, although this is wholly outside the sphere of the usual activities of an architect and engineer. At the same time, supervision of the work by South Poland Ship was virtually nonexistent.

During the early period of construction of facilities the only supervision exercised by South Portland Ship over the performance of their contracts by the architect and the general contractor, was by two representatives of the company, Mr. T. R. Allen and Mr. Robert Crean. Mr. Allen was an experienced shipbuilder and had for many years been connected with Bath Iron Works. He had, however, no experience in building construction. When asked for an explanation as to what construction experience Mr. Allen had which would fit him for the task of supervising the construction of the yard, Mr. William S. Newell, president of South Portland Ship, testified before the committee:

"Mr. HAYES. Was Mr. Allen ever in the building construction business?

"Mr. NEWELL. I do not know, Mr. Hayes. I believe h's father was a contractor, but I am not sure of that. I do think, however, that I recall hearing Mr. Allen say that Mr. Allen was with his father, who was a contractor in Philadelphia.

* * * * *

"Mr. HAYES. So far as you know, Mr. Allen had never engaged in building construction before? He was a shipbuilder, as I understand your testimony.

"Mr. NEWELL. Yes; but as I told you his father was a contractor, and I believe as a young man he had done some work with his father."

Mr. Crean likewise had no building construction experience and had even less shipbuilding experience than did Mr. Allen. Mr. Crean was only 27 years old and had previously been employed as a ship fitter at Bath Iron Works. It was not until the construction of the original facilities had been largely completed in the early part of October 1941 that a competent representative was appointed by South Portland Ship to oversee the conduct of the balance of the work.

About the only contribution made by the top management of South Portland Ship or either of its stockholders, the Bath Iron Works and Todd Shipyards Corporation, to the construction of the facilities, was the lay-out of the yard itself. The yard was laid out by the architect, Mr. Harriman, with the advice of Mr. Newell and Mr. Allen. The lay-out is bad for a yard which was intended to exploit to the full the use of prefabrication and preassembly in the construction of ships. The assembly building is much too close to the head of the ways, and a portion of the distance between is taken up with a roadway for the passage of trucks and with a railroad track. The remaining space is too small to take care of the preassembled units in sufficient number.

The placing of the assembly building in a position so close to the head of the ways was described by a witness before the committee, an experienced engineer, as a $5,000,000 blunder. The explanation for the blunder lies likely in the fact that Bath Iron Works and its president, Mr. Newell, have engaged principally in custom-tailor ship construction and were not acquainted with the methods of mass construction used and intended to be used in the building of Liberty ships. Thus, the only participation by South Portland Ship in the performance of the facilities contract was the furnishing of a bad lay-out and the appointment of two inexperienced men to supervise construction.

FAULTY RECORD KEEPING

The failure to establish proper and accurate checking systems on material deliveries and to keep adequate records has caused much confusion, with a consequent loss of precious time that should have been devoted to construction. We instance the handling of timber, equipment, and appropriations as examples of this failure.

*Timber*

In connection with the construction of the facilities, it became apparent that large quantities of timber would be required and delays in deliveries had previously been experienced. To meet this situation the architect prepared tentative estimates of the sizes and quantities of timber that he expected to use. The amount required was calculated at about 2,500,000 board feet and, after bids were obtained, the contract for its delivery was awarded. As detailed plans were prepared, the actual timber requirements were calculated and sent to the vendor who, in turn, delivered the required amount to the yard. Several months after the execution of the contract the vendor sought payment, South Portland Ship at that time owing him some $145,000. Thereupon an attempt was made by the Harriman organization to check the records of South Portland Ship to determine the amounts actually delivered. It was found that it was impossible to do so as the necessary records had not been kept and recourse had to be had to the vendor's own records. Thus, it was discovered that approximately 1,200,000 feet, or some 75 carloads, over and above the amount originally ordered, had been delivered, and that no record of this overage had been kept.

*Equipment*

In the course of the construction, a considerable quantity of equipment, cranes, compressors, pumps, etc., had to be rented for the use of the general contractor. The facilities contracts provide that rentals upon such equipment shall not exceed the cost of such equipment and that whenever the rental paid equals the replacement value at the beginning of the rental period, such equipment shall become the property of the Maritime Commission. In order to effectuate this provision of the contract it would be necessary to determine the value of the equipment at the time it was first used in the yard. At the present time this is done by a clause in the rental agreement between the equipment vendor and South Portland Ship. In the beginning, however, and until about February 1942, equipment was brought into the yard without any effort to fix either its value or the amount of rental to be paid and, at times, it was worked for several months before any purchase order was prepared.

The customary basis of renting equipment is to rent for use during a period of 8 hours per day In the event that it is used for any part of an additional 8 hours per day, one-half of the rental for the first period is paid and a similar amount is paid for use during the third 8-hour period. In view of the fact that the rental on various pieces of equipment ran to as much as $1,500 per month for 8 hours' use per day, it was important to determine the number of actual hours use. No record of the time was kept by South Portland Ship until about February 1942, and payments were made upon the basis of bills submitted by the vendors without any check thereof being possible through the records of South Portland Ship. Disputes going back to this early period are still in process of settlement.

*Appropriations*

The appropriations made by the Maritime Commission for the construction of the facilities were divided into separate amounts for the construction of particular items; i. e., crane ways, assembly building, etc. The plan was that as each commitment was made by South Portland Ship for services or materials upon a particular structure, such commitment would be charged against the appropriation and thus a record would be available to determine the degree of exhaustion of the particular appropriation. There was, however, a progressive failure to record commitments when made, with the result that by March 1942 actual commitments exceeded recorded commitments by approximately $600,000. In order to bring the records up to date, it became necessary at that time to cease purchases and to instruct vendors to make no further deliveries for a period of about 2 weeks.

The important point in connection with the failure to keep adequate records is the time loss that resulted. It is impossible now to determine how many man-hours, not merely of subordinates but of men in executive posts, were wasted in their endeavors to settle the controversies that resulted from this failure.

THOMPSON'S POINT

When the yard was expanded from a four-way to a six-way yard South Portland Ship decided to use as a fabrication and storage site a property known as Thompson's Point. This property consists of abandoned railroad engine and car repair shops located some 7 miles from the yard across the city of Portland. For the past several years the property has been used for the storage of sulfur, automobiles, and wood pulp. The Maritime Commission quite properly vetoed the use of Thompson's Point for prefabrication and has since acquired a site adjacent to the yard for the erection of a fabrication plant which is now virtually complete. However, in January 1942, South Portland Ship leased the Thompson's Point property and has since used it for storage of materials. The lessor of the property is the Portland Terminal Co., a subsidiary of the Maine Central Railroad, of which William S. Newell is a director. Mr. Wadleigh Drummond, counsel to South Portland Ship, is a director of one of the underlying railroad corporations involved. The maximum revenue of Thompson's Point for any year during the 5-year period immediately preceding the making of the lease was less than $15,000. The assessed valuation of the property was under $120,000 and the book value of the buildings thereon was $103,000.

The lease provided for $36,000 per year rent for a minimum term of 2 years and for a

maximum term, including renewals, of 6 years. In addition, the lessee agreed to pay all taxes in excess of $5,541.12 per year and was permitted to make improvements which would become the property of the lessor upon the termination of the lease. The Maritime Commission's estimate of the cost of these improvements is $520,000. The lessee was given an option to purchase the property at any time during the term of the lease for $555,000.

The property consists of a point of land extending into a body of water known as Fore River, which is a part of Portland Harbor. The main line of the Boston & Maine Railroad, which operates the Maine Central Railroad, crosses Fore River on a trestle located between Thompsons Point and Portland Harbor at a distance of approximately three-quarters of a mile from the former. The lease contains a covenant to the effect that the lessee will in no way, directly or indirectly, attempt to promote the use of Fore River as a navigable waterway, and that if, at any time within 20 years, the railroad is compelled to build a bridge to permit navigation there, South Portland Ship will defray the entire cost of such structure and its maintenance until January 1, 1962.

It is difficult to understand why South Portland Ship should ever have entered into such a lease. It is impossible to justify it. Testifying before your committee, Mr. Newell explained the rent by stating that an officer of the Portland Terminal Co. had informed him that the property was worth $600,000, 6-percent return on which would amount to $36,000, but that he had made no investigation of his own to verify the value. He could offer no explanation for the inclusion in the lease of the strange and unusual provisions relating to the construction of the bridge. In response to questions concerning that provision, his testimony was that he didn't remember the lease contained such provision. He finally admitted that either the railroad company of which he is a director had driven a "sharp bargain" or "somebody was asleep" in his organization.

No prudent businessman, dealing with his own money, would ever have entered into such a lease. Its improvidence and imprudence can be explained only by keeping in mind that all costs incurred are reimbursable by the Maritime Commission.

Quite properly, the Maritime Commission refused to approve the lease, primarily on the ground that the rent was excessive. Its action in doing so is to be commended. Instead, on March 12, 1942, the Martime Commission authorized the condemnation of the property. No petition in condemnation was filed in the United States District Court for the District of Maine until June 23, 1942, and up to the present no declaration of taking has been filed. In the meantime, South Portland Ship has been using the Thompsons Point property as a storage yard, and the Maritime Commission has been expending money for the erection of facilities there. No rent has yet been paid to the lessor for the use of the property.

In a hearing before your committee in October of this year, representatives of the Maritime Commission testified that the Commission had taken title to the property. This testimony was erroneous. It is our understanding that the Commission, acting through the Lands Division of the Department of Justice, is presently arranging for the filing of a declaration of taking so that title will vest in the Commission. Because of the improvident nature of the lease, your committee called the whole transaction to the attention of the War Frauds Unit of the Department of Justice.

TRUCKING

The intrayard transportation problem is chiefly one of transporting steel from the storage racks to the ways. Originally, this was handled by the use of 3 tractor and trailer combinations, for which South Portland Ship paid Materials Handling Corporation, hereinafter referred to as Materials Handling, $4.75 per hour each for 24 hours per day. In addition, a flatcar rented from the Maine Central Railroad at 50 cents per day performed the same service. In the course of time, 2 other flatcars were added and a small gasoline locomotive was obtained. These 4 pieces of equipment require the services of 11 men over the 24-hour period. The distance traveled is about 200 yards, and the locomotive makes approximately 5 trips over that distance in a 24-hour period. The functions performed by the tractor-trailers and the railroad equipment are essentially the same, and either means of transportation alone is sufficient to perform the work. By the use of additional flatcars and the installation of a small amount of trackage the entire work could be performed by rail, without any increase in expense other than rental of flatcars at 50 cents per day each. There appears to be no reason for the continuance of both means of transportation, and the elimination of the truck transportation would decrease the expense of this phase of the operation approximately 75 percent.

Up to the present the yard has spent about $325,000 on trucking, almost all of which went to Materials Handling. At the present time the bills of Materials Handling average in excess of $1,000 a day.

The majority ownership of Materials Handling is in Mr. Kenneth T. Burr, general manager of Bancroft & Martin, a local steel concern, his wife, and his daughter. Small minority interests are held by various employees of Bancroft & Martin. Prior to 1941, neither Bancroft & Martin nor any of the individuals connected with Materials Handling had ever been in the trucking business. Materials Handling was incorporated in January 1941 to perform trucking services for the Todd-Bath yard. The total investment was $3,000, of which $2,000 was paid by Kenneth T. Burr, and $1,000 by Mortier D. Harris, a director both of the Todd-Bath yard and of the South Portland shipyard, and an old friend of Mr. Burr. Mr. Harris withdrew from the company shortly after its organization and, according to both Mr. Burr and Mr. Harris, was repaid his investment, although no record of the repayment could be found on the books of the parties involved. The company purchased its original equipment by borrowing the money therefor from a local bank, giving to the bank as security mortgages on the equipment acquired.

Materials Handling has never had sufficient equipment to supply all the needs of the yard. Accordingly, it has rented equipment from others, and in turn rerented it to the yard at a higher rental than that which it paid. An example of the operation of this method is the following. A firm known as Truck Leasing Corporation rented a truck, supplying gasoline and oil, but without a driver, at $6.50 per day to Hunnewell Trucking Co., hereinafter referred to as Hunnewell. Hunnewell placed a driver on the truck and rented it to Materials Handling at $2.75 per hour. Materials Handling in turn rented the same truck with the Hunnewell driver to the yard at $3.50 per hour.

Most of the equipment supplied by others to Materials Handling for rental by it to the yard was obtained from either Hunnewell or William H. Gilbert Partnership, hereinafter referred to as the Gilbert Partnership. Hunnewell is an old, established concern. The Gilbert Partnership, on the other hand, is, like Materials Handling, a by-product of the shipbuilding boom in Portland. The members of the partnership are Bernard, Elery, and Omah Harris, all brothers of the aforementioned Mortier D. Harris. Originally one William H. Gilbert had a one-third interest in the partnership but his interest was retired in April of this year.

The rental of trucks to the yard is a most profitable business. During the period from its incorporation in January 1941 to September 30, 1942, Materials Handling Corporation showed a profit of $87,394.30, after deducting officers' salaries totaling $38,000, and after writing off depreciation based on an 18-month life for equipment, a rate of depreciation wholly unjustified by any standard. If a 3-year life for the equipment were taken as a base—the equipment was all purchased new—the profit would be over $107,000, after deducting the afore-mentioned salaries. Of the total of $38,000 salaries $10,000 was paid to Kenneth T. Burr and $9,875 was paid to Miss Barbara Burr, a daughter of Kenneth T. Burr. Miss Burr is 22 years of age, and is employed as a stenographer by Bancroft & Martin at a salary of $25 per week.

While these salaries were being paid the individuals so recompensed were all receiving very substantial salaries from Bancroft & Martin, for which firm they were chiefly working. The total profits received by Materials Handling, plus the total salaries paid, amount to $145,000. To repeat, the total investment was $3,000.

The experience of Hunnewell is equally interesting. It was not until the last part of 1941 that Materials Handling began to rent trucks from Hunnewell in any appreciable number. During the years 1936 to 1940, inclusive, Hunnewell's average profit was approximately $2,000 per year, after deduction of officers' salaries, which never exceeded $12,000 in any one year. It first began to receive business from Materials Handling in 1941 and in that year showed a profit of over $5,000, after deduction of officers' salaries totaling $24,000. For the 9-month period ended September 30, 1942, the profit of Hunnewell was $71,000, after deduction of officers' salaries at the rate of $36,000 per year.

The Gilbert partnership has had an equally profitable existence. This partnership, like Materials Handling, has never rented a truck to anyone other than the two shipyards or contractors engaged in work at either of the two shipyards. However, all of the trucks of the Gilbert partnership used at the South Portland shipyard are rented to the yard through Materials Handling and not directly. The Gilbert partnership had no investment, acquiring its equipment, mostly second-hand, on the installment plan, and paying the installment notes out of the proceeds of its trucking rentals. During the period from its creation in January 1941 to October 31, 1942, the Gilbert partnership showed a profit of $74,000.

The profits and salaries mentioned above exceed $300,000. While the business which produced such profits was in part supplied by the Todd-Bath yard, the bulk of the business came from the South Portland shipyard.

In addition to its enjoyment of a virtual monopoly on trucking at the South Portland shipyard, Materials Handling has been accorded some unusually favorable treatment. The best example of this has to do with the failure to apply the usual recapture provisions to the equipment rented by it to the yard. There is no recapture of any equipment rented by or through Materials Handling. This is not the case, however, with other trucks rented to the yard. There is a local truckman who owns two trucks. Both are used at the yard. He supplies the fuel, maintenance, and the driver in both instances. In the one case he rents the truck directly to the yard and in the other case he rents the truck through Materials Handling. In the case of the truck which he rents directly the recapture provisions are being applied, but in the case of the truck which he rents through Materials Handling recapture is not applied. Further,

he receives more rental on the truck he rents through Materials Handling than on the truck he rents directly to the yard.

One would suppose that the owners of Materials Handling would be quite satisfied with the profits they were making, but such appears not to be the case. Examination has disclosed that they have been engaged in a systematic course of double billing the yard on certain hauling on which they are supposed to be paid on a pure tonnage basis. They have been billing for such hauling on both a tonnage and a time basis, and because of the method of record keeping at the yard, a method which was installed by the Materials Handling representatives themselves with the knowledge and approval of Mr. John W. Osborn, then general manager of Thompson's Point for South Portland Ship, this practice was not discovered until we made our examination. We have advised the War Frauds Unit of the Department of Justice of the condition which we discovered. Since our investigation brought the double billing to light, Materials Handling has issued a credit to South Portland Ship of $6,079.50. We are convinced that the double billing amounted to a much larger sum.

Our endeavors to get some explanation from the executives of South Portland Ship as to why the yard did not do its own trucking or why it did not seek competitive bids—no such bids were ever asked—or why favored treatment was accorded Materials Handling were totally fruitless. The invariable answer was (a) that the particular executive was not very well acquainted with the arrangement, and (b) that anyhow he was interested in getting ships built and couldn't be bothered with such details. This answer might carry some conviction if, in fact, ships were being built.

The lack of experienced supervision during the original construction of facilities, the bad yard lay-out, the time lost in wrangling and fruitless search for verification of vendors' bills due to the lack of adequate records, the profligate Thompson's Point lease, the use of expensive tractor-trailer combinations instead of cheap flatcars within the yard, the granting of a trucking monopoly to Materials Handling and the delegation to Materials Handling of the task of instituting a record-keeping system to check its own transactions, all spell, to be charitable, the laxest kind of management. Yet, if possible, a worse story is told by the performance of South Portland Ship in ship construction itself.

SHIP CONSTRUCTION

From the beginning it was apparent that the progress made by South Portland Ship in the construction of ships was unsatisfactory. Numerous reports of conditions in the yard were made to the Maritime Commission and the urgent necessity for changes was pointed out. These reports came not only from Maritime Commission representatives within the yard but also from its traveling inspectors. So ineffective was the management that at the time of the delivery of the first ship it was necessary for representatives of the Maritime Commission, Mr. Bonner, chief inspector of machinery, and Mr. Blakeman, chief, ship construction section, to take control of the trial trip.

The lack of managerial skill is further illustrated by the failure of South Portland Ship to use prefabrication to the extent to which it could and should be used in this type of shipbuilding. As has been stated, the management of the yard was secured chiefly from Bath Iron Works. That organization, while possibly efficient in the construction of single ships, was wholly inexperienced in the use of mass-production methods, and very shortly after the contract was awarded, at the Maritime Commission's suggestion, the president, Mr. William S. Newell, and the vice president in charge of production, Mr. T. R. Allen, visited shipyards on the west coast to learn modern shipbuilding technique. This, of course, involves the use of prefabrication by which large units of the hull are preassembled and then fitted into place on the ways. The use of this method permits the employment of a far greater number of men per hull and vastly increases the speed of construction. But whatever they may have learned with respect to the far speedier methods of ship construction in use there, they applied none of it to the South Portland yard, and continued to build ships piece by piece.

In March of this year one of the members of the Maritime Commission and a representative of the War Production Board visited the yard. At that time, and after that, the Commission took the position that a new manager would have to be placed in the yard, and as a result Mr. Carl Klitgaard was appointed deputy to the president. Mr. Klitgaard's specific task was to build a shipbuilding organization, and one of his first acts was to send the general manager, Mr. Thatcher B. Pinkham, on a visit to other shipyards. That as late as May of this year, just 1 year after the original facilities and ship-construction contracts had been made, a new manager should have to be brought into the yard, is the most eloquent testimony obtainable of the failure of South Portland Ship to supply what was expected of it, to wit, an organization capable of building ships.

Mr. Klitgaard's first task in this direction was the elimination of incompetents, all of whom had come from Bath Iron Works, who had been placed in important posts in the yard by the South Portland management. For example, he removed Mr. Thomas R. Allen, who had been vice president in charge of production, the gentleman who, with Mr. Newell, made a tour of the west-coast yards so that he could learn mass-construction methods and then objected to the use of automatic-welding machines. In the original master plans prepared for the construction of Liberty ships, the use of automatic welding was contemplated. By reason of the opposition of the corporation, voiced by Mr. Allen particularly, the substitution of hand welding was permitted and was utilized until it became evident that such outmoded methods could not produce the desired results. Nevertheless, it was only through the continued insistence of the Commission that the more modern and speedy automatic welding procedure was instituted in the spring of this year.

Mr. Klitgaard also removed Mr. John W. Osborn, who had been the general manager at Thompsons Point and who had formerly held other key posts in the yard. It was Mr. Osborn who failed to establish a proper method of checking on trucking which made it possible for the double billing by Materials Handling. Mr. Klitgaard also removed Mr. Crean, the 27-year-old ship fitter, who had been placed in the important position of hull superintendent, after serving as general manager during the early construction of facilities. Most of the people removed were relatives or favorites of officers or stockholders of Bath Iron Works. Thanks to Mr. Klitgaard's efforts nepotism has largely been removed from the yard.

LABOR

Perhaps the worst example of the management's bungling has been its handling of labor relations. The result is that there is a complete lack of morale in the yard. The chief reason for this lack of morale is the failure of South Portland Ship to act on an agreement it made on July 2, 1942, with the metal-trades department of the American Federation of Labor covering wages and working conditions in the yard. In general, the wages agreed to by the parties were higher than the prevailing rates in the yard. Although the agreement was executed on July 2, 1942, and was stated to be retroactive to May 4, 1942, the management did not pay any part of the agreed increases until the latter part of October, when a few of the men were increased "as evidence of good faith."

Within the past 2 weeks a tentative agreement was arrived at in the course of a meeting in Washington of a subcommittee of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee of the War Production Board, which meeting was attended by the chairman of your committee. It appears that now, at long last, the wage disputes at the yard will be settled by paying the men the moneys owing to them.

Although the labor conditions at the yard have been notoriously bad for many months, and although there has been a complete lack of morale, it was not until about 1 month ago that South Portland Ship took any positive step toward meeting the situation by appointment of a labor-relations counselor. There is a crying need to establish a spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding between labor and management at the yard.

IMPROVEMENT DUE TO MARITIME COMMISSION

While Mr. Klitgaard is technically an employee of South Portland Ship, his presence in the yard is due entirely to the intervention of the Maritime Commission. The members of the Maritime Commission secured his release from a retainer to another company so that he could accept employment at the yard. Under the terms of his employment he is free to act independently of the officers and directors of South Portland Ship, to whom he is in no way beholden. He has, in fact, acted independently of the officers and directors of South Portland Ship, which, as a corporation, today has nothing to do with the management of the employees insofar as ship construction is concerned.

As a result, any improvement which has taken place in the production of the yard since Mr. Klitgaard's arrival, and there has been an improvement, is due not to South Portland Ship, but to the Maritime Commission. Were it not for the insistence of the Commission the yard would still be under the control of Mr. Newell's appointees, such as Messrs. Allen and Osborn, who have now been eliminated.

Since Mr. Klitgaard's arrival he has devoted most of his time and attention to affairs at South Portland Ship. He has left the existing set-up at the Todd-Bath yard quite alone. The result is that since March of 1942 the Todd-Bath yard has been conducted almost entirely by the superintendents with almost no supervision of any kind by management. There are at Todd-Bath some very capable men in the superintendents' posts and there exists virtually no contact between them and the management.

FORBEARANCE OF MARITIME COMMISSION

These conditions have been well known to the Maritime Commission during the whole period of the yard's history. The members of the Maritime Commission have seen fit to devote very little of their personal attention to it. The Maritime Commission did insist upon and obtain a change of management in the appointment of Mr. Klitgaard. Aside from that single contribution, however, it has done nothing to improve conditions at the yard other than to plead with South Portland Ship for better performance.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER YARDS

As the test of the pudding is in the eating, the test of a shipyard's efficiency is in the results obtained. During the months of March, April, and May 1941, contracts for construction of Liberty ships were made with 9 different shipyards in different parts of the United States including South Portland Ship. As of November 1, 1942, South Portland had delivered 8 ships. Next lowest is a yard which delivered 13 ships, and the next lowest yard delivered 17 ships. The 2 best yards delivered 80 and 86 ships. One yard received a contract for construction of ships in March of this year and has already, less than 8 months later, delivered 1. South

Portland Ship did not deliver its first ship until more than a year after it received its contract. A more significant comparison exists between the Todd-Bath yard, which is now being devoted exclusively to the construction of Liberty ships, and the Richmond No. 1 yard, located in California. Both these yards on the same day received contracts for the construction of facilities and of 30 identical merchant ships from the British. That was in December 1940. In addition, both yards, in January 1942, received contracts for the construction of 33 Liberty ships. At November 1, 1942, the Richmond No. 1 yard had delivered all of the 30 British ships and 15 Liberty ships. At the same date the Todd-Bath yard had not yet completed its British contract, 3 ships remaining to be delivered, and had delivered no Liberty ships.

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL FACILITIES

Recently South Portland Ship requested the Maritime Commission to appropriate $9,769,000 for the construction of additional facilities. Upon examination of the request, the regional office of the Commission approved additional facilities in the sum of approximately $5,000,000 and communicated its approval to the Commission. Some time ago the Commission decided as a matter of policy, that, under certain circumstances, if any additional facilities beyond those originally provided for a shipyard were to be furnished, it would not appropriate the necessary funds unless the yard would agree to reduce the fees payable to it for all ships remaining to be built. The reason for this policy is that the additional facilities would make it easier for the yard to complete its contract and thus earn large bonuses, and its fee on each ship should therefore be reduced. We commend this policy.

When the Maritime Commission received from its regional office approval of $5,000,000 additional facilities, it wrote to South Portland Ship, suggesting that the fees be reduced from $60,000, $110,000, and $140,000, to $35,000, $75,000, and $100,000, respectively. Several weeks later South Portland Ship wrote to the Commission over the signature of Mr. Newell, stating, that it could not agree to a reduction of its fees. When he appeared as a witness before your committee Mr. Newell stated that he considered a reduction of fees "not fair" and that, so far as he knew, none of his associates in South Portland Ship "feel that it is fair." As a result of this attitude on the part of South Portland Ship, the construction of the additional facilities is being held up.

SOUTH PORTLAND SHIP'S POSSIBLE PROFIT

The fees paid to South Portland Ship as of October 31, 1942, amounted to $450,000. These fees are, for all practical purposes, net earnings of South Portland Ship. Its total investment is $250,000. All costs and expenses incurred by it, including salaries of officers, even $6,575 of the $10,000 salary paid to Mr. Newell, are being reimbursed to it by the Maritime Commission. It has already received a return on its investment of almost 200 percent. Under its contracts with the Commission it is to build 84 ships. Judging by its performance to date, its fees will not exceed $60,000 per ship, as on the ships built so far the penalties imposed for bad performance keep the fees at the minimum figure. Even at the minimum figure, however, its total fees will amount to $5,040,000, or a return of 2,000 percent on investment. This high return on investment must be considered in the light of the fact that South Portland Ship incurs no risk. Up to the present time it has financed its operations by short-term bank loans, a simple matter when one is enabled to borrow on the security of a Government contract. Incidentally, even the interest expense incurred on such loans is reimbursable.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The question presented is whether or not the performance by South Portland Ship has been such as to warrant the payment of fees of not less than $5,040,000. To summarize the relevant facts in the light of which an answer to this question must be framed, South Portland Ship contributed substantially nothing to the performance of the facilities contracts other than the lay-out of the yard and the lay-out is bad. It delegated the performance of the facilities contracts to the architect and the general contractors. Until the original facilities were nearly complete, it supplied no experienced or able supervision over the work of either the architect or the general contractors. The original management was removed at the insistence of the Maritime Commission. Were it not for the Maritime Commission's insistence at that time, to wit, the spring of this year, there is no indication but that the then existing management would have been continued and the yard would be in even worse shape than it is today. Since the appointment of Mr. Klitgaard in May 1942, and the granting to him of complete authority without any control by either the officers or directors of South Portland Ship, it has delegated to him the performance of the ship construction contracts. For long periods of time and until very recently it followed a policy of not paying any bills rendered to it until those bills were first approved by the Maritime Commission auditors in the yard, thus assuring it that the items paid would be reimbursed. Its investment of $250,000 is insignificant when compared with the moneys necessary even to meet the pay rolls in a yard employing some 13,000 men, and now with the addition of the Todd-Bath facilities, some 25,000 men. It has delegated to banks the task of supplying the necessary funds for the financing of its work without cost to it since the interest expense incurred is paid by the Maritime Commission.

The inevitable conclusion is that South Portland Ship is receiving a fee for the trouble of incorporating a company, choosing a name for that company, holding an occasional directors meeting and delegating the performance of its contract duties.

Your committee conceives that it would not be doing its full duty if it merely reported the above facts and did not suggest a remedy. It is clear to your committee that to continue in force the existing contract with South Portland Ship would be to throw away millions of dollars needlessly. As indicated above, South Portland Ship has already received fees representing almost 200 percent of its invested capital. The contracts may be summarily canceled upon payment of fees earned to the date of cancelation. In the alternative the contracts may be terminated at any time without payment of fees when the contractor has failed to exercise due diligence. South Portland Ship has already received more than enough. There is ample cause, as recited above, for the termination of its contracts.

In a hearing held about a month ago, your committee suggested to the representatives of the Maritime Commission, including two of the members of the Commission, that the contracts be terminated immediately because of the failure of South Portland Ship to exercise due diligence in their performance. While the Commission members conceded freely that they were not satisfied with conditions at the yard, they demurred to the suggestion that the contracts be terminated giving as an excuse that there is bad management in other yards also.

The record of South Portland Ship is the worst of any company engaged in the construction of Liberty ships. Your committee is unable to subscribe to the principle that South Portland Ship should be paid $5,000,000 for its incompetence, inefficiency, and obvious inability to perform its contract duties solely because other yards furnish examples of bad management. There is no room for incompetence, inefficiency, and incapacity, the only effect of which is a hampering of our war effort. In the opinion of your committee, the proposition that the contracts enjoyed by South Portland Ship should be terminated immediately is so clear that it admits of no debate. The other yards which, it is said, furnish examples of bad management will be very carefully examined, if your committee is authorized to continue its investigation.

One other reason was suggested by the members of the Maritime Commission for their reluctance to terminate the contract of South Portland Ship, to wit, that there is a dearth of available managerial skill. Your committee believes to the contrary. In this connection it must be stressed that the job at South Portland is not a technical shipbuilding job but a construction job. Experience in other yards has demonstrated that the chief executive need not possess shipbuilding experience.

The specific suggestion of your committee is that the contracts with South Portland Ship should be terminated immediately and that the existing top management should be replaced by a single qualified executive who, with the existing staff of superintendents and foremen, can carry out the task of constructing the remaining ships. Under such an arrangement millions of dollars would be saved and there is every reason to believe that ships would be coming off the ways and out of the basins with ever-increasing speed.

MINORITY VIEWS

I concur in the recommendation contained in the report to terminate the contract of the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation with the Maritime Commission, but believe it should go further for the following reasons:

1. The report indicates that the Maritime Commission has been fully aware of the condition existing at the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation yard from its inception and it has been the responsibility of the Maritime Commission to eliminate the conditions existing without congressional investigation or action. The Maritime Commission has been derelict in its duty in not terminating this contract many months ago.

2. Members of the Maritime Commission have testified to the Commission's incompetency as set forth in the following language on page 38 of the typewritten report:

"In a hearing held about a month ago, your committee suggested to the representatives of the Maritime Commission, including two of the members of the Commission, that the contracts be terminated immediately because of the failure of South Portland Ship to exercise due diligence in their performance. While the Commission members conceded freely that they were not satisfied with conditions at the yard, they demurred to the suggestion that the contracts be terminated, giving as an excuse that there is bad management in other yards also."

RICHARD J. WELCH,
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CORE). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

## PRICE CEILINGS ON AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Administration is threatening at this time to impose ceilings on wheat at less than parity. This is in direct violation of the Emergency Price Control

Act of 1942 as amended, in that that act prohibits the imposition of ceilings on any agricultural commodity at less than parity. Even if it were not expressly prohibited by law there is no justification for the imposition of price ceilings on wheat at this time. I understand the excuse given by the O. P. A. for imposing a ceiling at less than parity is that unless ceilings are imposed it may be necessary to slightly increase the price ceiling on bread. I do not profess to know whether parity prices on wheat will increase the price of bread or not. If they do increase it, it will be very little. Hard winter wheat prices today are from 15 to 17 cents per bushel below parity at country marketing points in Kansas. Sixty-two 1-pound loaves of bread can be made from a bushel of wheat. If wheat prices are permitted to move to parity it will mean at the most an increase of from one-quarter to one-third of a cent per loaf, assuming that all of the increase had to be assumed by the baker.

Let us assume for the sake of argument that it might be necessary to increase the retail price of bread one-half cent per loaf. It would still be by far the cheapest food we have. The price of bread would still be slightly less than it was in 1926 when both wages and employment were far below what they are now. The price of bread today is the same as it was a year ago. Of what other commodities can that be said? The wheat producers of this country have been subsidizing the bread consumers for many years by supplying wheat at less than parity prices, which means at less than fair prices. There might have been some excuse for this when we had millions of unemployed. Certainly there is no excuse for it now when everyone who wants work can secure it and when wages are the highest ever known.

It may be said that it is the Federal Government rather than the wheat farmer that is subsidizing the consumer of bread. This is because wheat producers who comply with the farm program are being paid a subsidy which covers a part of the difference between farm prices and parity prices. Assuming that the Federal Government is paying a part of this subsidy, what logical reason can be advanced for compelling the taxpayers of the country to subsidize the consumers of bread? Why should either the farmer or the taxpayers of this country be compelled to subsidize consumers in a time of full employment and high wages? It doesn't make sense.

While this move is being initiated by the O. P. A., it should not be forgotten that if ceilings are imposed the Secretary of Agriculture must be held equally responsible because under the Price Control Act no ceilings can be imposed on agricultural commodities without the prior approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture believes that either the farmers or the Federal Government should subsidize consumers of bread in times like these. The record of the O. P. A. to date indicates that we cannot expect any sensible consideration of this question from that organization. The farmers of this country, however, have a right to demand that the Secretary of Agriculture use the authority which the law gives him to prevent the imposition of price ceilings at less than parity. There have been complaints in the past that the Secretary of Agriculture, instead of asserting his authority, had gone along with whatever was suggested by the Office of Price Administration. I have no way of knowing whether or not this is true. This attempt to impose wheat ceilings, however, will furnish the acid test. If the Secretary of Agriculture, a man in whom I believe the farmers of this country have confidence, expects to retain that confidence, he is going to have to decide whether he is on the side of the O. P. A. price fixers or the farmers of this country. He is going to have to approve or disapprove of the O. P. A. attempt to ignore and defy the laws of Congress. He is going to have to take a position on the question of whether in times of full employment and high wages either the farmer or the Federal Government shall subsidize the consumers of the cheapest food which we have. If the Secretary goes along with the O. P. A. on this clear-cut issue we might as well repeal the provision of the Price Control Act which requires that he give his approval of price ceilings imposed on agricultural commodities, and farmers might as well conclude that as far as this Administration is concerned even the Department of Agriculture has gone back on them.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The gentleman has made a study of the cost of flour in a loaf of bread. I wonder if he has any figures on how much it would cost the average family annually if the price of bread were increased one-half cent per loaf.

Mr. HOPE. I may say to the gentleman from Kansas that the average annual per capita consumption of bread is 75 pounds. Thus an increase of one-half cent a loaf would mean 37½ cents increase per year per capita, or less than $2 per year per family of five.

Mr. JENKINS. I should like to ask the gentleman a question about a matter not exactly in line with what he is talking about; but this morning I received a letter from a very prominent citizen of my district which cites the case of a farmer taking wheat to the mill and turning it over to the Government and receiving $1.20 a bushel for it, then buying back his wagon loaded with wheat from the miller at 90 cents a bushel and taking it home to feed. What kind of situation is that? And who is responsible for it?

Mr. HOPE. I do not think the farmer actually bought the same wheat that he took to the mill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But wheat that was just as good.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; perhaps just as good. Undoubtedly this farmer bought some of the wheat which the Commodity Credit Corporation is selling as feed for livestock. This is being sold at less than the market price in order to make it profitable to feed it to livestock. I think out in Kansas it averages about 85 cents a bushel, whereas the market price of wheat in Kansas is $1.20 or $1.21 a bushel.

Mr. JENKINS. I presume if this man got $1.20 for the wheat, that was the loan value. Am I right in supposing that this is the loan value?

Mr. HOPE. It might have been sold on the market, because the market value at present is about $1.20; or it might be even higher at the present time. That sounds a little high for loan value, although the rates vary in different parts of the country, and it may well be that high in the gentleman's district.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. PACE. In connection with the wheat situation to which the gentleman has referred, it might be well also to bring to the attention of the Congress the fact that the wage earner today is receiving his food at a considerably less percentage of his income than at any time in the history of the Nation. The figures issued by the Department the other day showed that food is now costing about one-half of the percentage of his income that it did in the past.

Mr. HOPE. That is true, and I appreciate the gentleman's bringing that fact to the attention of the House; it is something that ought to be brought out.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I was interested in what the gentleman had to say concerning wheat and the putting of a ceiling on the price of wheat. As the gentleman knows a ceiling was placed on corn recently. I wonder if the gentleman would express any opinion on that or tell us what he thinks of that.

Mr. HOPE. As far as placing a ceiling on corn is concerned, it stands on the same basis of illegality as the placing of a ceiling price on wheat, because under the Price Control Act the O. P. A. is prohibited from placing a ceiling on the price of any farm commodity at less than parity.

Mr. ARENDS. And corn is a long way from parity.

Mr. HOPE. The price fixed is considerably less than parity; yes.

Mr. ROWE. The gentleman having been referred to as an expert in this particular field, I, as a beginner, would ask what his opinion is as to why the Government will buy a farmer's wheat at $1.20 and then sell it back to the same farmer at 90 cents, 85 cents, or whatever the price may be.

Mr. HOPE. I do not know that I have time, within the few minutes left, to go into a full discussion of it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman that what is being done, of course, is perfectly legal and pursuant to legislation passed by Congress author-

izing the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell wheat for feeding purposes at less than the market price. The sales that are being made are made by the Commodity Credit Corporation for feeding purposes, are considerably below the market price, and considerably below the loan price.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. If, as has been stated here, the wheat is equal, the kind that is sold back as is bought, may I ask the question, what is the purpose of the differential between 85 cents and $1.35?

Mr. HOPE. I have no way of knowing the facts of this particular case except as stated by the gentleman from Ohio. It is evident that there were two different transactions. First the farmer disposed of his own wheat either by an outright sale to a private purchaser or by getting a loan from the Commodity Credit Corporation. Then he must have purchased from the local dealer acting as agent for the Commodity Credit Corporation some of the wheat which that organization is selling for feed.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Does not the cost of penalty wheat come into the picture. Will the gentleman explain that a little bit?

Mr. HOPE. That cannot be fed to livestock. I have introduced a bill which I hope the Committee on Agriculture will very soon report favorably to permit the feeding of penalty wheat to livestock.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman mind clearing up for us, those who have read and those who have not read the Supreme Court decision, which I understand to be to the effect that any fellow who grew wheat contrary to the provisions of law must put up that penalty if he uses that wheat for any purpose. Is that the effect of the Supreme Court decision?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is true.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask another question on that point? This bill which the gentleman proposes to introduce would correct the law so that the user of wheat under those conditions would not be subject to the penalty?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. The bill which I have introduced provides that penalty wheat may be fed to livestock by the farmer who produces it without payment of the penalty.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Illinois raised the question awhile ago about the price of corn. Victory, the Government publication by the O. W. I., came out the other day with headlines to the effect that the price of corn had been set 100 percent in excess of parity price. That is not so, is it?

Mr. HOPE No; it is not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The price of corn was not so set?

Mr. HOPE. No; the gentleman called the attention of the House to that the other day, and very properly so. I appreciate the fact he did so, because it was certainly a very misleading and untruthful statement on the part of the O. W. I.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I was interested in noticing that the Secretary of Agriculture now contemplates getting $100,000,000 in addition to appropriations from the Congress in order to do some intensive growing on the farms. Incorporated in one of these groups of commodities is the soy bean. Assuming we are getting payments for not growing something, and you increase the acreage of soy beans by 10 acres, for which it is proposed to give the farmer an additional amount, are you going to get a check both for increased production and also for not producing?

Mr. HOPE. I assume that would be possible if you used the same acreage.

Mr. KERR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. Can the gentleman tell us how much the price of a loaf of bread has risen in the last 30, 60, or 90 days?

Mr. HOPE. It has not risen one fraction of a cent. The price today is the same as it was a year ago, and, as far as I understand, it is substantially the same as it was 2 years ago.

Mr. KERR. If that is true, how can there be any justification for putting a ceiling on wheat prices?

Mr. HOPE. I cannot see any justification for it, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. In connection with the sale of wheat for feeding, the gentleman would probably want to mention that it is limited to 125,000,000 bushels and that that supply is rapidly diminishing now?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. I appreciate the gentleman bringing that to my attention. The legislation which we passed last year provided for the sale of wheat and limited the amount to 125,000,000 bushels.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas just one question. When I was home last fall I received information to the effect that wheat was being imported into this country from Canada and that it was being sold for feeding purposes at 83 cents a bushel.

I should like the gentleman to elaborate on that a little and tell us why that was done.

Mr. HOPE. I do not have any information on that point. If it is being imported, I do not know of it. I am unable to say whether or not it is. Of course, I cannot see much reason for importing wheat into this country for any purpose as long as we have on hand today a supply sufficient to last us for 2 years at present rates of consumption if we do not grow another bushel.

Mr. GILLIE. The information I got was that they went to a farmer to sell him some wheat, to take some of the wheat off their hands. He said, "I have no room, but I will tell you what I will do. I will take 100 bushels of this wheat to the mill and sell it and take 100 bushels of your wheat and put it into my bin." He sold his wheat at $1.36 a bushel and bought this wheat at 83 cents a bushel. This was imported wheat, A–No. 1 wheat.

Mr. HOPE. I am sorry I have no information on the subject. I am unable to enlighten the gentleman on it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The main point the gentleman from Kansas is trying to make is that the law is not being followed. Is that right?

Mr. HOPE. That is the first point; yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The second point is that the gentleman cannot see any rhyme or reason in keeping one product, regardless of what it is, below parity and then fixing prices from 125 to 130 percent above parity for other farm products?

Mr. HOPE. I am not complaining about that. I am simply complaining of the fact that through this policy we are subsidizing the consumer of bread at the expense of the farmer, who is getting less than a fair price for his wheat.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman would be satisfied if they would follow the law?

Mr. HOPE. Certainly.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think every fair-minded man will agree with the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman indicated that the people were being subsidized in their purchase of bread. The only thing that is happening as a result of a recent price increase in flour is that a lot of small bakeries throughout the country are being put out of business, because they cannot manufacture and sell bread at the present price of flour. The gentleman no doubt has received complaints about that. The O. P. A. refuses to increase the price of bread, so they are putting these little fellows out of business all over the country.

Mr. HOPE. I have had complaints along the same line, I may say to the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, back of the ridiculous situation where the farmer takes 1 bushel of wheat to the market and gets $1.29 for it and buys another bushel of wheat from the same miller for 82 or 85 cents, is the position taken by the administration some years ago when it sought to bring every farmer under its control and tell the farmers how to operate their farms.

You will recall that at that time, I think it was back in 1935, all farmers who wanted to grow wheat and comply with the A. A. A. program had to sign a contract. Under the terms of that contract the farmer was told how many acres he could plant and how many bushels of wheat he could grow, the purpose being to establish what they called an ever-normal granary. Then if you grew more wheat than they told you to, they fined you some sort of a penalty which was one-half of the loan value of the wheat. They thought they were going to keep the supply constant all the time, at a certain level, and they thought they were going to have absolute control of the amount of wheat produced. Unfortunately for the successful working of their plan they were not able to control the laws of nature or the law of supply and demand, so we found ourselves with an enormous quantity of wheat on hand and they did not know what to do with it. They wanted to keep the price for the farmer up to a certain level but they wanted to get rid of this surplus wheat, so they provided that the farmer should get a certain price for his wheat but that the Government should charge another price for the wheat sold by it to the farmer to feed stock. Am I right, may I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], the expert on butter, milk, cheese, all dairy products, the fattening of cattle, and all farm problems?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If any of you gentlemen ever want to know anything about matters affecting dairy farming, ask him.

That is the way this now apparent absurdity came about.

As I understand the gentleman from Kansas, he is complaining now that the O. P. A. is violating the law, disregarding the law as enacted by Congress. Yesterday the farmer from Brooklyn [Mr. O'TOOLE], who has three small children who are not, I judge from his remarks, able to get, up there in Brooklyn, without excessive cost the meat they should have. I sympathize with him because he and his people are not able to get meat. He was complaining yesterday about the same organization with which the gentleman from Kansas found fault; so it may be assumed the trouble extends at least from Brooklyn to Kansas. The gentleman from Kansas made a very, very clear statement to the effect that the O. P. A. is violating the law. Am I correct? Is that what the gentleman said?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I say the O. P. A. is violating the law we passed here last October when we said that they should not fix the price of any agricultural commodity at less than parity or less than the market price between January 1 and September 15, whichever was the higher. In the case of wheat the parity price was higher than the market price during that period.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That statement that the law is being violated is not new, except in this particular case, to the older Members of Congress. It must be rather shocking to the new Members, some 69 of you, to discover that the departments down here in Washington are violating the law.

They are violating the law, and yet this Congress sits here and does nothing about it. When you charge a department with violating a Federal statute, you should have in mind the fact that the administration sets a bad example, that recently the President of the United States ordered Montgomery Ward & Co. to employ only those people who maintained membership in a certain union. Is there any authority for the President of the United States to tell an employer not in war production that he shall compel his employees to join a union? You know there is not.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. RAMEY. If they are violating the law, is there not an Attorney General? Congress is not the prosecuting attorney of this Government. If a department is violating a law, why not call the attention of the Attorney General of the United States to it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman, but after he has been here a few weeks or months, he will learn that we have called violations of law to the attention of the Attorney General time and time again. The Attorney General knew of the sit-down strikes in 1937; he knew that men and women were driven from their jobs; he knew there was civil war. He let it ride. The Dies committee has called instances to the attention of the Attorney General where there are in the service of the Government Communists who are violating the law, and the Attorney General does not act. The only procedure that can be taken is impeachment by this Congress, or the enactment of laws stopping these things and then prosecution, and if the officers who are charged with the prosecution will not prosecute, then we should impeach those men.

However, going back to the Montgomery Ward matter, there are two statutes on the books already that prohibit the thing that the President did. The Railway Act, for example, is one. The railway employees wanted a closed shop, but they are not getting it. The Board had denied their plea. The law which governs their case does not apply to Montgomery Ward. But we have the so-called Wagner Act, the labor law administered by the National Labor Relations Board, and that law expressly provides that it is an unfair labor practice for any employer to even suggest that his employees join a particular union, and time and time again the Board has held, and the courts have held—the circuit courts of appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States have held that employers who did that thing, who suggested that their employees join or remain members of a certain union, were guilty of an unfair labor practice, and they have punished them, inflicted penalties on them. Yet here you have the President of the United States backing up his board and telling Montgomery Ward & Co. that they must do something which is a violation of law. Read the law. Read the order of the President. Judge for yourself.

There is no hope for the people of this country if we are to be judged in this Congress by what has happened in the past, by what has gone before. The older Members know all of these things. They have been pointed out time and time again from the floor and the Seventy-seventh Congress did not act. I appeal to you 69 new Members who have come here with a mandate from the people to reestablish in this country constitutional government. I appeal to you, I beg of you, I ask you in the name of God, if you love your country, insist that some action be taken. Members talked yesterday, and every day since you have been here on this floor, and have pointed out the things the bureaucrats are doing, that the administrative departments are doing, which are contrary to law, things which are a denial of constitutional government. There has been talk—words—but no action. What are you going to do? Sit here and take it? I know you have been told to sit tight and keep your mouth shut. I know it is early in the session, but do not let it go along too long. Get down here in the well of the House and call on the older Members to do something. I do not care anything about this advice to new Members to keep still. You come from the people. They sent you here because they wanted you here. You represent them. You are not representing the old Democrats, or the New Deal or the old Republican organization. When you are up for reelection in 1944 the old Members of Congress will not be voting for or against you. The home folks will weigh you in the balance and they will determine your fate. The people sent you here to represent them and I ask you to do it, and not to let it go on too long. Let us in the early weeks of this session force out and pass the needed legislation—force the administration to do its duty or kick those who will not out of office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY], after other special orders, may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.)

the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 28, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Thursday, January 28, 1943, for consideration of House Resolution 1294.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 158. A bill for the relief of Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez; with amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 170. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. T. Travis; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 203. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Mike L Blank; without amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 204. A bill for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 205. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons who have claims for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 227. A bill for the relief of the Tours Apartment Hotel; without amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 241. A bill for the relief of Blanche E. Broad; without amendment (Rept. No. 27). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 249. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts; without amendment (Rept. No. 28). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 250. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Daugherty, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 29.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 251. A bill for the relief of Franklin E. Ludwig, Mary Taylor, and Frank A. Taylor; without amendment (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 279. A bill for the relief of George Kennedy; with amendment (Rept. No. 31). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 402. A bill for the relief of Frank T. Been; without amendment (Rept. No. 32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 478. A bill for the relief of Edith M. Powell; with amendment (Rept. No. 33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 517. A bill for the relief of Irene Dial; with amendment (Rept. No. 34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 533. A bill for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 546. A bill for the relief of H. J. Blexrud estate; with amendments (Rept. No. 36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 605. A bill for the relief of Shumate Investment Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 37). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Committee on Claims. H. R. 769. A bill for the relief of John Cardillo and Phillip Cardillo, with amendment (Rept. No. 38). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Committee on Claims. H. R. 845. A bill granting jurisdiction to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit to reopen and readjudicate the case of Robert L. Demuth; without amendment (Rept. No. 39). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Committee on Claims. H. R. 940. A bill for the relief of Howard E. Dickison; without amendment (Rept. No. 40). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Committee on Claims. H. R. 946. A bill for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh; without amendment (Rept. No. 41). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Committee on Claims. H. R. 976. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Sebastian Eger; without amendment (Rept. No. 42). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Committee on Claims. H. R. 1047. A bill for the relief of the State of Oregon, department of forestry of the State of Oregon, and certain organized protection agencies in the State of Oregon for protection of unappropriated public-forest lands intermingled with Oregon and California lands from July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939; without amendment (Rept. No. 43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Committee on Claims. H. R. 1048. A bill for the relief of Christine Lund; without amendment (Rept. No. 44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Committee on Claims. H. R. 1094. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. Herfurth, Jr., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Committee on Claims. H. R. 1099. A bill for the relief of Jose J. Perez; with amendment (Rept. No. 46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1100. A bill for the relief of the estate of James A. Henderson, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1128. A bill for the relief of Bernice James; without amendment (Rept. No. 48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1131. A bill for the relief of the estate of Ola Fowler; without amendment (Rept. No. 49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1142. A bill for the relief of Nannie May Blythe and Claudia Blythe; without amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1162. A bill for the relief of R. E. Cotton Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 51). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1270. A bill for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor); with amendment (Rept. No. 52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1273. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre; without amendment (Rept. No. 53). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1279. A bill for the relief of Lee Watts; with amendment (Rept. No. 54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1319. A bill for the relief of Mrs. W. V. Justice; without amendment (Rept. No. 55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1423. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Freeman; with amendment (Rept. No. 56). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1424. A bill for the relief of Ernest P. Leavitt; with amendment (Rept. No. 57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1426. A bill for the relief of Mrs. F. A. N. Yeager; with amendment (Rept. No. 58). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1428. A bill for the relief of Paul W. Mankin; without amendment (Rept. No. 59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1464. A bill for the relief of J. H. Atkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 60). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1468. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Azer; with amendment (Rept. No. 61). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 546. A bill to provide for the construction of two vessels for the Coast Guard designed for ice breaking and assistance work; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CARLSON of Kansas:

H. R. 1547. A bill to provide eligibility for adjusted compensation to provisional, temporary, and probationary officers of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 1548. A bill to provide for the common defense and for the protection of the health and morals of persons in the military or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1549. A bill to amend section 451 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1550. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a differential in pay for night work in the Postal Service" so as to include custodial employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1551 (by request). A bill to amend veterans' regulations; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1552. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1558 (by request). A bill to provide the same reduction of pension in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, and Philippine Insurrection, without dependents, while hospitalized or domiciled in a Veterans' Administration Facility, as is applicable to Civil War veterans, under similar circumstances; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution authorizing th President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWE:

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution creating a commission to determine the order of importance to the prosecution of the war of rubber, escort vessels, and aviation gasoline; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. Res. 86. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate old-age assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1553. A bill for the relief of Francesco Sapienza; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 1554. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reopen and readjudicate the eminent-domain case of John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Baxten, substituted), and review its judgment heretofore entered therein; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 1555. A bill for the relief of Arkansas Power & Light Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 1556. A bill for the relief of Archie Barwick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 1557. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam; to the Committee on Claims.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

52. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Leon Hayes, principal, Travis Elementary School, Bryan, Tex., and 12 other persons of Bryan, favoring general Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education.

53. By Mr. ROLPH: Senate Joint Resolution No. 7 of the California Legislature, Sacramento, Calif., for the suspension of exemption from tolls in favor of United States Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge during the war emergency and for 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

54. By Mr. WELCH: Senate Joint Resolution No. 7 of the Senate of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing and petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass the bill generally referred to as the Lea-Welch bill suspending the exemption from tolls in favor of United States Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge during the war emergency and for 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

55. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William Marvin Woodall and Kelvie Appelbaum, petitioning consideration of their application with reference to reimbursement of attorney's fees incurred by them in contested-election case of W. A. Denson, contestant, versus Luther Patrick, contestee; to the Committee on Elections No. 3.

---

# SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose fear is the beginning of wisdom and from whom proceeds all holy desires, all good counsels and all just works, our greatness is that we can lose ourselves in Thee and become the healing channels for what Thou dost desire and will for our common humanity. Recognition of our oneness in Thee makes vivid our realization of the oneness of humanity across all separating barriers of race or birth. May our human loyalties be as wide as Thy divine fatherhood. Make us wise enough to give ourselves to the greatest. Make us good enough to surrender ourselves to the best.

In what we have to give to a hate-torn world may our own inner lives be part of the solution—not part of the problem—of our ailing social order. In honest moods may our hearts not utter the fatal judgment upon ourselves: They have made me a keeper of the vineyards and my own vineyard have I not kept. Save us from an easy belief in statutory substitutes for character. Give us this day light to guide us, courage to support us, love to unite us. We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 25, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ELECTION OF SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, by direction of the conference of the majority, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 87), as follows:

*Resolved*, That Wall Doxey, of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, elected Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is understood that Mr. Doxey will take the oath of office and begin his term on next Monday.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Courier-Journal, of Louisville, Ky., published January 21, 1943, under the title "The Poll Tax Bloc Is on the March."

I desire to read a few lines from the editorial:

In the Senate the poll taxers won a victory about which more regret may be expressed. They succeeded in retiring the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, Chesley W. Jurney, who has served Congress 46 years, the last 10 of them in the post from which he is now ousted. Mr. Jurney is a victim of the venom of Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, because one of the Sergeant at Arms' deputies carried out the order of Majority Leader BARKLEY for the arrest of the Tennessean during the late poll-tax filibuster.

Omitting a portion of the editorial, I continue the reading:

Simultaneously in the Senate their colleagues were engineering a political deal whereby Mr. MCKELLAR'S grudge was satisfied and a job found for a southern "lame duck," former Senator Wall Doxey, of Mississippi, who now becomes Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. President, I wish to read a letter which I have written a colleague in the newspaper business of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], at whom I happen to be looking at the moment. On yesterday I wrote this letter:

JANUARY 27, 1943.

LOUISVILLE COURIER-JOURNAL,
*Louisville, Ky.*

DEAR SIRS: Someone has sent me a copy of your editorial entitled "The Poll Tax Bloc Is on the March." In part, you say:

"Mr. Jurney is a victim of the venom of Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, because one of the Sergeant at Arms' deputies carried out the order of Majority Leader BARKLEY for the arrest of the Tennessean during the late poll-tax filibuster.

* * * * *

"Simultaneously in the Senate their colleagues were engineering a political deal whereby Mr. MCKELLAR'S grudge was satisfied and a job found for a southern 'lame duck,' former Senator Wall Doxey, of Mississippi, who now becomes Sergeant at Arms."

My letter to the Courier-Journal continues:

Your statements are willful, deliberate, and vicious falsehoods. Another newspaper published a similar statement, and I corrected it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a copy of which I am sending you. I shall denounce your statements in the Senate as false.

Why do you newspapermen not find out the truth about the cause of Jurney's dismissal before you publish such falsehoods against Members of the Senate? There is not a man, woman, or child at the Capitol—

Of course, I refer to the Capitol Building here on the Hill—

who cannot give you the reasons for his dismissal. There were a number of reasons, and any newspaperman desiring fact and not falsehood could obtain information as to these reasons simply by asking. An honest press is one of the finest of American insti-

tutions, and it would, indeed, be refreshing to have facts reported correctly once in a while.

Yours truly,

KENNETH MCKELLAR.

I regret that the chairman of the committee who had charge of the Jurney matter is not present at the moment. I shall ask him to make a statement verifying what I have written the Courier-Journal and have just expressed to the Senate.

I have no grudge of any kind against Jurney. As I said the other day in the Senate, in executing the writs of arrest he was carrying out his duty; that was one time he was certainly carrying out his duty, and no one could entertain any grudge on that account. I had nothing but kindly feelings toward Jurney until I found the facts which have recently developed about him. But somebody is engineering an effort to defame me because I happened to recommend the nomination of Mr. Wall Doxey, a neighbor and friend of mine, who lives about 40 miles from my home, for the place of Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. Jurney was not even a candidate for Sergeant at Arms before the matter closed; he was not proposed by anybody at the last, and could not be proposed by any Member of the Senate as I looked at it.

The idea of trying to make it appear that he was defeated because of any grudge that I had against him is willfully and insolently false and untrue, and if any man will make such a suggestion to me face to face I will tell him exactly where to "head off."

I now ask that the entire editorial from Courier-Journal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of January 21, 1943]

THE POLL-TAX BLOC IS ON THE MARCH

There can be no cause for satisfaction in seeing the kind of people triumph who have triumphed in the House Democratic caucus and prevented the assignment of Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, of New York, to the Judiciary Committee. The victors were the old southern poll-tax bloc, led in this instance by two of its most small-minded members, the Texans, SUMNERS and DIES. But there could have been no special satisfaction either in seeing the New Yorker win. He has lately assumed sponsorship of anti-poll-tax legislation and wanted the place on the Judiciary Committee for that reason. As the Courier-Journal has said before, Mr. MARCANTONIO's sponsorship of that legislation can do it no good.

He has been revealed as a doggedly consistent follower of the Communist Party line. He voted against lend-lease and against selective service. He was, he said, against any bill which would "catapult the American people * * * into a war between two gangs of imperialistic bandits." That was the Communist Party line at the time, and on both the political and labor fronts. There was a definite attempt to impede our preparedness both in policy and in production.

After the German invasion of Russia, Mr. MARCANTONIO about-faced with the others. It turned out, of course, that these efforts and a vote like Mr. MARCANTONIO's against selective service and lend-lease had been not only against the interests of this country but against the interests of Russia, too. That is an ironic instance of the folly of an American taking his politics from a foreign capital. And it is simply impossible to have confidence in such Americans.

This is said in full awareness of and deep gratitude for the incomparable courage and invincible devotion which have just wrought the miracle of Leningrad. None of the United Nations has yet contributed as much as Russia to the cause in the way of killing Germans, and we believe that she, in cooperation with the democracies, can and will contribute indispensably to the stability of the peace. That cooperation will be hindered rather than helped by the Marcantonios, and we doubt if realistic Joe Stalin shed any tears over the New York Congressman's reverse.

In the Senate the poll taxers won a victory about which more regret may be expressed. They succeeded in retiring as Sergeant at Arms of the Senate Chesley W. Jurney, who has served Congress 46 years, the last 10 of them in the post from which he is now ousted. Mr. Jurney is a victim of the venom of Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, because one of the Sergeant at Arms' deputies carried out the order of Majority Leader BARKLEY for the arrest of the Tennessean during the late poll-tax filibuster. Over in the House the poll taxers piously protested that assignment of Mr. MARCANTONIO to the Judiciary Committee would only carry out a "political deal" made in New York, and that this was no time for political deals. Simultaneously in the Senate their colleagues were engineering a political deal whereby Mr. MCKELLAR's grudge was satisfied and a job found for a southern "lame duck," former Senator Wall Doxey, of Mississippi, who now becomes Sergeant at Arms.

The MARCANTONIO and Jurney incidents are worth mentioning, not for their importance in themselves but for the demonstration they gave of the cohesiveness of the southern reactionaries. This cohesiveness, plus the power the poll taxers can wield when they combine, as they can whenever they want to, with their northern Bourbon friends is going to make for plenty of trouble in the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have not seen the editorial from the Courier-Journal which has been quoted by the Senator from Tennessee, but I think that in all fairness, without indulging in the revelation of any confidential information, I should say that soon after the defeat of Senator Doxey in the primary in Mississippi, and some time before the poll-tax bill was taken up in the Senate, friends of his here began to urge his election as Sergeant at Arms.

When the majority conference first met, Mr. Jurney was presented as a candidate, and Mr. Doxey was presented as a candidate. Some discussion ensued, following which a motion was made that I, as chairman of the conference, appoint a committee of five to bring in a nomination for Sergeant at Arms. I appointed the committee, and it met and went into the question of a choice for Sergeant at Arms. During the sessions of the committee Mr. Jurney voluntarily retired from the race for reelection as Sergeant at Arms. The committee reported that fact, and made no nomination and no recommendation.

When the committee made its report there was before the conference for consideration no candidate for Sergeant at Arms. Mr. Doxey's name was again presented, no other name was presented, and he was recommended to the Senate by the conference for the position.

In fairness to Mr. Jurney, and to the Senator from Tennessee as well, and to all others, I think it is not inappropriate to say that in all probability someone else would have been elected Sergeant at Arms if Mr. Doxey had not been. Mr. Jurney had retired from consideration. I do not know what motives actuated anyone in any vote he cast, but it is true that Mr. Doxey's name was seriously under consideration weeks before the poll-tax bill came before the Senate, and he was being suggested and considered immediately after his defeat in the primary in Mississippi.

I make this statement in fairness to everyone concerned, and I hope there will be no further agitation of the matter.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator can certainly say that no grudge or suggestion of a grudge on my part had anything in the world to do with the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. There was no evidence of such a thing in the conference, so far as I know, and I do not now recall whether the Senator from Tennessee was one of those who, back in September, or whenever it was that the primary was held in Mississippi, suggested the propriety of electing Mr. Doxey as Sergeant at Arms.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] as members of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, to fill existing vacancies.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND MARKETING OF WOOL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] as a member of the Special Committee to investigate Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool, vice the former Senator from Wyoming, Mr. Schwartz.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provision of law regarding the appointment of Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy, the Chair appoints the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] as a member of the Board of Visitors to that academy.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provision of law regarding the appointment of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, the Chair appoints as members of the Board the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CREDIT OPERATIONS RELATING TO INDIANS AND INDIAN TRIBES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report as of June 30, 1942, of credit operations relating to Indians and Indian tribes under authority of the acts of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), and June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

OBJECTIVES AND OPERATIONS OF DIRECTOR OF CENSORSHIP

A letter from the Director of Censorship, outlining the objectives and present operations of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NAVY CLUB

A letter from the national commandant and national shipswriter, national headquarters, Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the proceedings of its fifth annual reunion, minutes of its October national staff meeting, and a statement of receipts and expenditures for the calendar year 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO OR MODIFIED BY THE MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of contracts entered into or modified by that Commission under authority of the act of May 2, 1941, for the period beginning April 1, 1942, and ended December 31, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

EMPLOYEES RECEIVING $3,000 AND OVER, WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 322 (77th Cong.), information regarding employees who draw salaries of $3,000 per annum or over, together with their age, education, and business or professional affiliations during the 5-year period preceding their employment by the Board (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the official operations of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a corrected report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COMPARATIVE GENERAL BALANCE SHEET OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a comparative general balance sheet of that company for the year 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, Post Office (7), Navy, and Agriculture (11); The National Archives, Executive Office of the President (Office for Emergency Management), and the Civil Service Commission which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from officers and members of the medical and chirurgical faculty (the State medical society), Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 345) to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Quinter, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of liquor in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

USE OF ELECTRIC POWER—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, LEGISLATURE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I present and ask to have appropriately referred and printed, under the rule, a resolution of the House of Representatives of Tennessee concerning the use of electric power.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the southeastern section of the United States has in the recent past suffered a severe shortage of electric power; and

Whereas the power demand in the State of Tennessee has increased over seven times during the past 10 years; and

Whereas the shortage of such power at this time in this section would seriously, if not disastrously, handicap the Nation in its production of the necessary sinews of modern war; and

Whereas such shortages, having occurred in the past, may well under the pressure of ever-mounting demands reoccur; and

Whereas this section and, more particularly, the lands and cities drained and visited by the Cumberland River in its course through Tennessee and Kentucky have many times been laid waste by floods, and may well be again, causing great loss of topsoil and the destruction of valuable properties, as such, at this critical time, the Nation could less than ever afford to endure; and

Whereas the completion of the dams now under construction by the Government in the Cumberland Valley area would go far toward providing against occurrence of the aforestated dangers, and would entirely prevent reoccurrence of floods in this area, as well as supply ample electric power for the rapidly increasing needs of the vastly enlarged industry and war-plant consumption in this territory, and, furthermore, increase the facilities of freight transportation on this river upon which this section largely depends for supply of gasoline: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee,* That War Production Board Chairman Donald M. Nelson is hereby memorialized by this body to complete the above-mentioned dams at the earliest possible date in order that another power shortage may be averted, thereby hastening the day when peace and liberty will again be restored to the world; be it further

*Resolved,* That the clerk of the house transmit immediately by wire a copy of this resolution to War Production Board Chairman Donald M. Nelson, and that copies be mailed to all of the Senators and Congressmen from the States of Kentucky and Tennessee.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I also present and ask to have appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, representing 1,000,000 farmers in convention assembled at St. Louis, Mo., on the 20th of January 1943, urging that action be taken immediately to clean up the Power Branch of the War Production Board. I call the attention of Senators to the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, representing 1,000,000 farmers, in convention assembled in St. Louis, Mo., on the 20th day of January 1943,* That action be taken immediately to clean up the Power Branch of the War Production Board.

In July 1942 the War Production Board after due consideration limited the extension of construction of new projects by rural electric cooperatives. The Power Branch of the War Production Board misinterpreted this order to prohibit extensions to serve farm families from existing distribution lines. Rural electric cooperatives during the past 6 months have attempted to show the Power Branch that this order had no bearing whatsoever on extensions from existing lines. The Power Branch consistently pursued a policy of, in effect, prohibiting any connections of additional farmers engaged in the production of food for war.

In the early part of this month, January 1943, representatives of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association discussed with Chairman Donald Nelson this misinterpretation by the Power Branch of the War Production Board order. Chairman Nelson agreed that the Power Branch had misinterpreted the order and that the materials designed for rural extensions, and immediately available, should be put to productive use. In the conference with Chairman Nelson it was again urgently insisted that these materials now frozen in the hands of the cooperatives should be put to use for increased food production or should be used for the making of ammunition and other implements of war. Chairman Nelson emphatically stated that increasing food production was imperative for the conduct of the war and these materials, without limitation, should be used for his purpose.

A new directive was issued to use these materials for the production of food for war. The Power Branch again distorted the clear intent of this program. They have again misinterpreted the order, without even attempting to confer with the Rural Electric Cooperatives engaged in the production of food. Their interpretation benefits the Power Trust.

We are today confronted, through the press, with the astounding announcement that Curtis Ernest Calder, of Bronxville, N. Y., who lists his office address as No. 2 Rector Street, which is the office of the Electric Bond

& Share Co., as Director General of Operations in the War Production Board, is now to determine the destiny of our country in the application of power to the production of food and to the relief of the shortage of manpower. Mr. Caider is a former secretary, vice president, and president of the Texas Power & Light Co., a subsidiary of Electric Bond & Share. He is now president of the American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., and the Southwestern Sewer Co., and he is a director in one of Mussolini's power companies—the Italian Super Power, Inc.

We respectfully urge, in the interest of the war program, that intelligent, patriotic use be made of the materials now available and the country place its destiny in the hands and hearts and minds of individuals who have only one allegiance—the United States of America.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

S. 408. A bill to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 22).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 176. A bill for the relief of Austin L. Tierney; without amendment (Rept. No. 23);

S. 184. A bill to provide for the presentation of silver medals to certain members of the Peary Polar Expedition of 1908–09; without amendment (Rept. No. 24);

S. 301. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for rights-of-way over, across, in, and upon naval reservations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 25);

S. 303. A bill to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 26);

S. 304. A bill for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 27);

S. 305. A bill for the relief of Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 28);

S. 306. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as a result of the disaster at east base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 29); and

S. 393. A bill for the relief of William Kovatis; without amendment (Rept. No. 30).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. Res. 60. Resolution continuing the authority for an investigation of airplane crashes; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. Res. 61. Resolution continuing the authority for an investigation with respect to fuel in certain areas west of the Mississippi River; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. Res. 81. Resolution continuing the authority for an investigation of the denial to certain musicians of rights in connection with the mechanical reproduction of music; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

## PRODUCTION OF GOLD AND SILVER—CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I report favorably, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Senate Resolution 20, with an additional amendment, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendments.

The amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency was, on page 2, line 3, to strike out "and succeeding Congresses" and to insert "Congress", and the amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was, on page 1, line 2, after the word "January", to strike out "17" and insert "16", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That Senate Resolution 187, agreed to August 16, 1935, as amended by motion on January 16, 1939, increasing the membership of the committee to nine Senators instead of five, and as further amended by Senate Resolution 261, agreed to June 29, 1942, authorizing a special committee of nine Senators, to confer with the Secretary of the Treasury relative to the administration, and the economic and commercial effect in the United States and abroad, of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1178), and to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the production, or the lack of production, of gold and silver in the United States and its Territories, and so forth, hereby is continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

## INVESTIGATION OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an additional amendment, Senate Resolution 26, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the amendments will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs were, on page 1, line 6, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "resulting from the interruption of the normal flow of trade between Puerto Rico and the United States which has been brought about by the war", and on page 2, line 6, after the word "employ", to insert "clerical and other assistance."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question about the second amendment. That is the usual form, is it not?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot say to the Senator that it is the usual form.

Mr. McNARY. It is customary, is it not? In making inquiries for information from departments, is it necessary to have assistance?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico to reply to the inquiry.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to inform the Senator from Oregon that that amendment was inserted at the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], who felt it would clarify the situation, and that it would be better for the Senate to be under no obligations to the departments.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments, which have been stated.

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate will now be stated.

The amendment was, on page 2, line 15, to strike out "$25,000" and to insert "$15,000"

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That a subcommittee of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to be composed of five members of such committee appointed by the chairman thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to economic and social conditions in Puerto Rico. The subcommittee shall report to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, at the earliest practicable date.

For the purposes of this resolution the subcommittee, or any member thereof duly authorized by the chairman of the subcommittee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ clerical and other assistance and to call upon the executive departments for such experts and such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it or he deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the subcommittee, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the subcommittee.

## FILMING OF MOTION PICTURES ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with additional amendments, Senate Resolution 39, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and the amendments will be stated.

The amendment of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys was, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "and succeeding Congresses" and insert "Congress"; and the amendments of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate were, in line 5, to strike out "and the filming of motion pictures thereon", and in line 8 to strike

out "$10,000" and to insert "$5,000", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved,* That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 241, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to May 24, 1940, and Senate Resolution 147, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 8, 1941 (relating to the investigation of the use of public lands), is hereby continued and may be exercised during the Seventy-eighth Congress; and the limit of expenditures under such resolutions is hereby increased by $5,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution continuing the authority for an investigation of the use of public lands and increasing the limit of expenditures."

INSPECTIONS OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 65, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported by Mr. REYNOLDS from the Committee on Military Affairs on the 18th instant.

The amendment was, on page 1, line 3, after the word "one", to strike out "expert" and insert "investigator", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof duly appointed by the chairman of the committee, accompanied by one investigator, hereby is authorized to visit, for the purpose of inspection, during the present session of Congress, any part of the Military Establishment in the Western Hemisphere, the expenses incurred in pursuance thereof, not to exceed $3,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION OF CIVIL-SERVICE LAWS AND CLASSIFICATION ACT

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 68, submitted by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on the 18th instant, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 68) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved,* That Senate Resolution 198, Seventy-fifth Congress, agreed to on April 1, 1938 (providing for an investigation of the administration and operation of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES, INCLUDING OIL AND GAS, OF THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without additional amendment, Senate Resolution 73, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 73), which had been submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY on the 18th instant, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys was, on page 1, line 8, after "Seventy-eighth", to strike out "and succeeding Congresses," and insert "Congress", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved,* That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 53, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to May 1, 1941, and Senate Resolution 310, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to November 27, 1942 (relating to the investigation with respect to the development of the mineral resources, including oil and gas, of the public lands of the United States), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS—NOMINATION OF EDWARD J. FLYNN TO BE MINISTER TO AUSTRALIA

As in executive session,

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we shall probably not have an executive session today, and I ask, out of order, to make a favorable report from the Committee on Foreign Relations on the nomination of Mr. Edward J. Flynn, of New York, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Australia, and I submit a report (Ex. Rept. No. 1) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Commerce:

Josh Lee, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Department of Commerce for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1943, vice George P. Baker.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BONE:

S. 579. A bill to authorize the construction of a military supply highway to Alaska; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 580. A bill recognizing "The American's Creed" as the national creed of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 581. A bill granting a pension to Alma Blanche Shipman;

S. 582. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha Myers; and

S. 583. A bill granting an increase of pension to Tina Newlon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 584. A bill relating to the district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 585, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr McKELLAR:

S. 586. A bill for the relief of William Andrew Johnson; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITE:

S. 587. A bill granting a pension to Charles Knowlton; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 588. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 589. A bill with reference to certain loans made under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 and to grant certain relief to Florida Citrus Exchange, the Growers Loan & Guaranty Co., and the Guaranty Operating Co.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 590. A bill providing for the improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville to Key West, Fla.; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 591. A bill for the relief of Ross Jung; to the Committee on Immigration.

(Mr. HAWKES introduced Senate Joint Resolution 27, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of The American's Creed Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution relating to the use of existing establishments for defense production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill in the nature of a substitute for one I introduced last Monday. It merely adds provision for supervisory employees, special clerks, clerks, and laborers in first- and second-class post offices, employees of the motor-vehicles and pneumatic-tube services, and carriers in the City Delivery Service and in the Village Delivery Service, employees of the Railway Mail Service, clerks at division headquarters of post-office inspectors, employees of the stamped envelope agency, and employees of the mail equipment shops; cleaners, janitors, telephone operators, elevator conductors, paid from appropriations of the First Assistant Postmaster General.

The bill (S. 585) to adjust the basis of compensation for overtime service of certain employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

THOMAS ALVA EDISON DAY

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution which would request the President of the United States to proclaim February 11, 1943,

as Edison Day in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison. The joint resolution is as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating February 11, 1943, as Thomas Alva Edison Day and calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on said date and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies.

Mr. President, I may say that the people of New Jersey have a great sense of pride in the fact that Thomas A. Edison was for a great many years a citizen of our State. I believe the people throughout the entire Nation recognize the great contributions made by Thomas Edison during his life to the benefit, welfare, and comfort of humanity throughout the United States and indeed generally throughout much of the world.

I request that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred as requested.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it does not make any difference to me to what committee the resolution goes, but is the Committee on the Judiciary the appropriate committee to which to refer the joint resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has already announced the reference of the joint resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to that being done. I merely want to have the precedents preserved. Joint resolutions of such nature formerly were referred to the Committee on the Library. I do not know when the rule was changed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that measures dealing with the designation of special days are customarily referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. He also informs the Chair that bills dealing with monuments and memorials go to the Committee on the Library.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1943, as Edison Day, in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF PANAMA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, some days ago, on the 6th of January of this year, the National Assembly of the Republic of Panama adopted a resolution in which it conveyed its sentiments toward the Government of the United States and set forth the solidarity of the two nations. On the 22d of January the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, sent a copy of this resolution to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal and the resolution itself may be read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter of transmittal and the resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 22, 1943.

The Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE,
*President of the Senate.*

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Ambassador of the United States at Panama City, Panama, has forwarded to the Department of State copies of Resolution No. 5 adopted unanimously by the National Assembly of Panama on January 6, 1943, expressing solidarity and best wishes to the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States on the occasion of the opening of the present session.

Accordingly, I have pleasure in transmitting to the Senate, in compliance with the request from Panama, a copy of the resolution in Spanish and in English translation. A similar communication has been addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

[Enclosure: Copy in Spanish and English translation of resolution of National Assembly of Panama.]

---

PANAMA, *January 6, 1943.*

ENCLOSURE NO. 3 TO DESPATCH NO. 3476, DATED JANUARY 8, 1943, FROM THE EMBASSY AT PANAMA

[Translation]

The National Assembly of Panama, considering:

First. That the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States of America inaugurates its sessions today;

Second. That the legislative power of that great Nation to the north has rendered an incalculable service to the noble cause of the United Nations by the issuance of laws of transcendental importance which have mightily contributed to the strengthening of the defense of the freedom-loving nations which are resisting attacks of the totalitarian conquest; and

Third. That beyond any doubt it will be incumbent upon the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States to continue that admirable work and to issue new laws which will tend to strengthen even more the defense of the United Nations and to chart for them the course of definitive victory;

*Resolves:*

First. To send a message of solidarity and sympathy to the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States and to express to it the fervent wishes of the Assembly and people of Panama for the success of the important work begun today.

Second. To designate a commisison from the Assembly to deliver personally, with a formal note, a true copy of this resolution to the most worthy Ambassador of the United States of America in Panama, His Excellency Edwin C. Wilson.

ARCADIO AGUILERA O,
*The President.*
G. SIERRA GUTIÉRREZ,
*The Secretary.*

This is a true copy:

G. SIERRA GUTIÉRREZ,
*Secretary.*

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. I should have consulted the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I consulted the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is not necessary that I be consulted. I heard the resolution read at the desk.

Mr. CONNALLY. The concurrent resolution expresses the thanks and appreciation of the Congress of the United States. I ask that the concurrent resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5), as follows:

Whereas there have always existed close ties of friendship between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama; and

Whereas these friendly relations, based on the mutual respect and admiration of two free and independent nations, happily grow stronger day by day; and

Whereas the Government and the people of the Republic of Panama have cooperated wholeheartedly with the United States of America in the present world conflict; and

Whereas on January 6, 1943, the National Assembly of Panama graciously adopted a resolution expressing solidarity and extending felicitations to the Congress of the United States: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States express its deep appreciation to the National Assembly of the Republic of Panama, and to the people which it represents, for this message of friendship and solidarity, which had as its inspiration the determination of achieving complete victory over our common enemies and restoring the principles of liberty and democracy throughout the world;

*Resolved further*, That a copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the National Assembly of the Republic of Panama.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not know that I shall interpose an objection. Of course, it is customary for measures of that character to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I can conceive of no opposition on the part of any members of that committee. However, I ask the Senator from Texas if there is any reason for immediate consideration of the measure?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there is no immediate, urgent reason for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution except that prompt action would carry with it a more spontaneous response and convey a little more friendly feeling.

Mr. McNARY. I think those are worthy considerations. Personally, I have no objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I simply wish the RECORD to show that the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] consulted with Republican members of the Foreign Relations Committee, and his request with respect to immediate action by the Senate has the entire approval of the members of the minority of that committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator very much.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

## ALL-OUT AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have read with interest the announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture in bringing before the public an incentive program suggested to increase all-out agricultural production on the farms. I have some very definite views on this subject, which I have discussed in many speeches, and which I embodied in a letter I wrote to the Secretary on January 26. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It has to do with my views on all-out, total agricultural production.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 26, 1943.

Mr. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
*Secretary of Agriculture,*
*Department of Agriculture,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: This morning's press carried your announcement that the Agricultural Adjustment Agency is to do an about-face, a "reverse English" and adopt an incentive program to pay the farmer to produce rather than not to produce.

The abolishment of a contradictory policy that you have maintained in the first year of this war of an economy of scarcity is a step in the right direction. It should have been done before the commencement of the war.

One week after Pearl Harbor, I addressed a communication to you, requesting the suspension and removal of all agricultural production restrictions and penalties for the duration of the war. In that communication I suggested that you adopt an all-out program of agricultural production in order to win the war, rather than to continue a philosophy of an economy of scarcity.

The new program is a continuation of subsidizing the farmer as a bait for increased agricultural production. Why not terminate the Agricultural Adjustment Agency for the duration of the war and get a maximum agricultural production by paying the farmers a parity price or a legitimate profit on the farm? Why not take off all restrictions and limitations; give the farmers their "head" and encourage them to produce by guaranteeing parity prices where they grow the agricultural product? This is the only way to get the maximum production of foodstuffs for our Army and civilian population.

As this war progresses, it is becoming increasingly evident that the agricultural production policy which I called to your attention last December must now be adopted. In that connection, I call to your attention the statement made by Deputy Chief of Staff Lt. Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, last Sunday night, in which he said: "Food is just as important as the production of ammunition. We should pray God for the rain to produce the maximum crops; we should see that everyone raises all the food that can be raised, and then we should save that food by rationing, that we might be the better prepared to sustain not only the Army at the front but the civilian population at home."

My files are replete with communications from Nebraska farmers criticizing the Agricultural Adjustment Agency policy of restriction and complaining against failure of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, the Department of Agriculture, the War Production Board, and the Manpower Commission because these agencies do not correlate their activities to the end that agriculture can have all-out agricultural production and the machinery and labor to meet such demand.

Nebraska farmers, as well as those of other States in the agricultural sections, are unable to obtain new farming machinery. They cannot obtain repairs for that machinery, and the planting season will soon be upon us.

Our farmers complain against the enticing of farm labor to other fields of higher pay—especially war industry—and no effort has been made on the part of the administration, until too late, to stop or discourage such migration. The administration has failed to timely anticipate this need of agricultural manpower and only recently has there been any recognition of this acute problem by Selective Service.

Our farmers also complain that they are unable to obtain lumber with which to make repairs of farm buildings necessary to agricultural production. Our farmers are rationed in the use of gasoline so that they are kept off the highways and from delivering their products to market. They are rationed in the use of tractor oil to the point where they will be forced out of the fields unless the condition is alleviated.

With these things before you; namely, a demand on the one hand for all-out agricultural production, and, on the other, a continuation of a policy of restrictions and penalties, and added to that contradictory position, the failure of the administration to develop a policy whereby manpower, farming implements, repairs of farming implements, lumber, gasoline, and tractor oil have been available as priorities to the farmer, you can easily understand why the farmers are depressed, worried, impatient, and irritable. If our farmers are to produce, let's give them the necessary priorities of manpower, materials, and remove all restrictions and penalties as to an all-out production of agriculture, and induce that maximum production by providing parities at the farm.

The wisdom of adopting such a policy and taking such a position is common sense and is borne out by the many communications which I am receiving. It is also very definitely established by the report of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program—Farm Machinery and Equipment (pt. 2 of Rept. No. 10), CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 252, January 21, 1943, which report was made to the Senate on January 21, 1943, and was very generally agreed to by Senators who that date evinced an interest in the said report.

I therefore recommend the immediate removal of any and all currently existing restrictions and penalties on agriculture; that our farmers be provided with necessary and needed farming implements, supplies, and manpower to effect all-out production; that priorities be granted industry in the manufacture of such equipment and supplies; that the farmer have parity prices at the farm; and that this matter be immediately brought to the attention of all bureaus, boards, commissions, or agencies which are at the present time establishing policies, especially acreages and farm prices, either directly or indirectly, that have to do with an all-out agricultural program in this country.

Yours truly,

KENNETH S. WHERRY.

## FARM LOAN PROGRAM—LETTER FROM GEORGE F. PETERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dated January 19, 1943, from George F. Peters, of Harvey, N. Dak., secretary of the Harvey Farmers' Union Elevator Association.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARVEY, N. DAK., *January 19, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. LANGER: At a meeting of our Harvey Farmers Union Elevator Association, comprising a membership of 600 farmers, I, as secretary of this association, was asked by this group of farmers to write to you, asking that you do all in your power to continue our Agricultural Adjustment Agency farm program and our loan program.

It has been brought to our attention that our eastern Congressmen are trying to scrap our farm and loan program.

We do not wish to see that happen, as we feel that the farmers are entitled to a guaranteed price for their products as well as labor and industry.

The farmers have shown their loyalty to our Government last year by producing a record crop of farm commodities and without question will again in 1943 repeat that precedent in spite of a shortage of manpower and machinery.

North Dakota, as one of the Northwestern States, has contributed enormously to the war effort in line of men, food, scrap iron, and War bonds, and commands consideration by Congress in upholding our farm and loan program.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE F. PETERS,
*Secretary of the Harvey Farmers Union Elevator Association.*

## LOANS TO FARMERS FOR INCREASED FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the RECORD a communication from John I. Taylor, president of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, which deals with some vital problems of farmers.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,
*January 27, 1943.*

Hon. E. H. MOORE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

It has been called to our attention that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for an additional appropriation of $100,000,000 to be used as a loan to farmers for the purpose of increased food production. We further understand that county war boards have been authorized to employ the necessary personnel and proceed in the carrying out of this program. We are strictly opposed to the setting up of an additional loan agency of any kind. Obtaining needed credit is no problem for Oklahoma farmers. We are short on manpower and needed farm machinery. Nothing will increase the production of foods as rapidly as parity prices including production costs at the market places. We most sincerely urge you as our Senator to oppose to the last the setting up of any such additional loan agencies and urge that you continue the good fight for full parity prices for our farmers.

JOHN I. TAYLOR,
*President, Oklahoma Farm Bureau.*

FARM CONDITIONS IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from T. T. Varner, of Poteau, Okla., regarding conditions on the farms in Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POTEAU, OKLA., *January 22, 1943.*

Hon. E. W. MOORE,
*United States Senator,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have not had the pleasure of meeting you personally, but by way of introduction I am a member of the Republican State Central Committee and was a candidate for district judge in the sixteenth judicial district of Oklahoma composed of Haskell, Latimer, and Leflore Counties. However, you seemed to have been the only one on our ticket that won and I am proud that I had the honor of being on the ticket with a winner even though I lost. Am not writing you as a member of any political party but as a citizen and taxpayer of Oklahoma.

I am not a pessimist nor an alarmist but am very much disturbed at this time because of the way in which the affairs of government are being administered and the way in which the ordinary citizens are gradually losing their individual rights and liberties and being deprived of their property without due process of law under the guise of the war power of the President.

The executive branch of the Government seems to be gradually taking over and usurping the powers conferred upon Congress by our Constitution, and strange to say, Congress seems unwilling or afraid to go to battle with the President in order to retain its powers which have not heretofore been taken over or to regain those which have been taken over by usurpation or voluntarily surrendered by Congress.

The President and the bureaucrats do not seem to have given a thought to the ability to pay, of the persons who really support the Government by paying taxes and furnishing the necessary revenue with which to operate the Government and prosecute the war.

By the trial-and-error methods which have been employed by the New Deal converts of the administration the small business concerns and many of the larger ones have been and are now being forced out of business. Every time a business fails or is destroyed the owner of such business ceases to be a taxpayer and, therefore, the taxes which would have been paid but for such failure, are lost to the Government.

I am especially concerned about the food situation and the present condition of the American farmers because of the attitude of the administration toward agriculture and the effort which has been and now is being made to regiment and place the farmers in a strait jacket to such an extent as to weaken the morale and destroy the independence of the farmers and thereby impair the progress which has heretofore been made by the farmers.

The administration and its bureaucrats who are telling the farmers what is to be done and how it must be done seem to take as an admitted fact, that the majority of the farmers are not only ignorant, unpatriotic, but dishonest as well. This is evidenced by the fact that in every capital and county seat in the United States there are hordes of white-collared office executives and clerks, who have never worked a day on a farm, but who are assuming to tell the farmers what crops to plant and how to cultivate them, the kind of labor to be used and the price which should be paid, and of course the higher-ups fix the prices which the farmers shall receive for whatever crops they may have been so fortunate as to grow and harvest.

I am engaged in farming and raising pure bred Hereford cattle for breeding purposes and operate some 300 acres in connection with this business. I have never grown cotton, but do grow corn, wheat, and other small grains and grasses for feeding my livestock. I have never signed on the dotted line to take orders from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and am therefore in bad standing with those in charge in this county. I have tried to do everything I could to follow the rules of the Department as to the best farming methods by way of soil conservation, etc., and I do believe I have done as much to improve my farm as any farmer in this part of the State. Last year I sold 42 head of registered cattle for breeding purposes which were raised on my farm, and the man in charge of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration who reports farming activities reported my farm as an idle farm. Recently I tried to procure phosphate for use on my land by joining with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in the purchase of a car, offering to pay the regular price and my share of the freight; but I was told that because I had not seen fit to sign the contract form used by the Government that I could not participate in this purchase and have phosphate shipped with the quantity purchased by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. The phosphates are controlled by priority rating and of course I will be unable to secure any because I have not identified myself with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration by signing the contract. My reason for not signing with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration when it located in our county was that the contract contained certain provisions which obligated me to do things which I did not believe that any self-respecting farmer should do, taking into consideration the fact that those in charge of the enforcement of the contracts were not always competent to say what should be and should not be done under certain circumstances, I have not seen the contract used at this time and do not know whether the same has been modified or not. I explained to those in charge that I was willing to cooperate in every way and would not accept any premium or payment for failing to grow or for growing any crops on my land nor did I accept any payment for any terraces which were built by me under Government instructions. I have built terraces but did so at my own expense and I have never accepted a single check from the Government for anything that I have done in keeping with its rules.

I believe I am familiar with the general opinion of the farmers, and that if a poll should be taken of all the farmers in the State that there would be very few that would voluntarily indorse the methods pursued by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency.

I do not believe there is a more patriotic class of persons than the American farmers; and if they were organized as are the industrial workers and miners, they would not be in the condition they now are, and the President and his bureaucrats would hesitate to undertake to do some things they are now doing and would not make some of the statements which they have made concerning the American farmers.

What the American farmers need are leaders and not drivers. Furthermore, unless something is done toward supplying the farmers with tools and machinery at once there is going to be the greatest shortage of food in the fall and winter of 1943 that has ever been experienced since the Pilgrim Fathers landed at Plymouth.

Last summer I was unable to buy, hire, or borrow a binder or a combine, and as a consequence I lost my entire crop of oats. Many others had the same experience. It will be much worse this year than last. I consider the need of tools and machinery for farmers of as much, if not more, importance than the need of ammunition for the soldiers.

The New Dealers shot the pigs, hogs, and cattle to make good times. They now seem to think crops will grow without being cultivated and that they may be harvested without labor or machinery of any kind.

Due to the drafting of farmers and to the high wages paid at the large industrial plants, hired labor on the farm cannot be had at the price the farmers are able to pay. With the shortage of labor, there is an added necessity for a plentiful supply of tools and machinery, and instead of decreasing the supply it should be increased. I feel sure that any farmer who is in good faith trying to assist in growing food with which to win the war will confirm my statements, and I do hope that Congress will take an active interest in assisting the farmers to procure tools and machinery without delay and in freeing them from the red-tape regulations and restrictions which now handicap their honest efforts to remain independent and useful citizens.

I think that now is the opportune time for Congress to assert its independence and powers, assume and discharge its duties as the agency of the people to make their laws, and to protect them from the attempt on the part of the executive branch of Government to make them on a parity with the people of Germany.

Pardon his lengthy epistle, but as a public official you no doubt are getting accustomed to being imposed upon by your constituents. Here's hoping that you do all you can to help a law-ridden people.

I am, with kindest regards,
Yours very respectfully,
T. T. VARNER.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I have another letter along the same line from Claude Smith, of Stroud, Okla., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STROUD, OKLA., *January 24, 1943.*

Senator ED H. MOORE,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: I just stay mad all the time, the dab blame crazy outfit. Yesterday I went to Prague to get some cake (peanut) and they only had 5 sacks. They are shut down, the Government won't let them crush any more, they are going to ship the peanuts to Canada and make peanut butter out of them in Canada. They can't ship all of the peanuts to Canada. In the Prague Cotton Oil Mill they have 500 tons of peanuts on storage belonging to the Government.

What is going to happen is that grass will be here in April and the Government is going to piddle around and do nothing with the peanuts and soy beans until April, then it will be too late to do us any good and the Government will have a great pile of feed on their hands that they won't know what to do with, it will be just another one of their utter wastes that they like to make.

I have to drive 28 miles to the mill, my pick-up is a 1940 model, it is wore out. In 1941 I had made a trade for a new one but everything was froze and the dealer could not make delivery. My old pick-up is just about passed out and I need a new one real bad. In the surrounding towns there are 36 pick-ups froze, doing no one any good. I am trying to get a new one—to do this the county board passes on it, then it goes to Stillwater, then to Tulsa, then to Washington. I doubt very much if my requests get

through all of these boards, and if it does the war will be over before I receive an answer to it.

Senator, what do you think a man ought to do, sell out and quit or keep trying to operate in spite of the bureaucrats?

Don't take time out to answer this letter, save all of your energy to fight the bureaucrats.

Respectfully yours,

CLAUDE SMITH.

THE HOME FRONT AND THE POST-WAR PERIOD—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the Home Front and the Post-War Period, delivered recently by Senator LODGE at the fiftieth anniversary of the New England Iron and Hardware Association, Parker House, Boston, Mass., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RAILROADS' PLACE IN WAR—ADDRESS BY F. G. GURLEY

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the Railroads' Place in War, delivered by F. G. Gurley, vice president of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., in Wichita, Kans., on January 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

HUMAN NATURE AND THE RUML PLAN—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Human Nature and the Ruml Plan," published in the Washington Times-Herald and the New York Daily News, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRADE-UNION ORGANIZATION AND THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT—ADDRESS BY JOHN P. FREY

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address by John P. Frey, president, metal trades department, American Federation of Labor, before the Town Hall, Los Angeles, Calif., January 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FIRST FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY STERLING F. MUTZ

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The First Freedom," delivered by Sterling F. Mutz in New York City on January 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CASABLANCA CONFERENCE—ARTICLE BY CAPT. LOWELL LIMPUS

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the Casablanca conference by Capt. Lowell Limpus, published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLICY OF THE NAVY WITH RESPECT TO DISCLOSING INFORMATION ABOUT ITS WAR ACTIVITIES

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, Vice Admiral Horne appeared before the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate this morning and gave the committee some very valuable and important information with reference to activities of the Navy since the commencement of war with Japan. In the course of his confidential statement to the committee he gave reasons why it was not possible or advisable to disclose to the public all the information from day to day that became available to the Navy Department. He stated, among other things, that the Navy has been accused of wanting to withhold information from the American people. "This charge," he stated, "is based on a misunderstanding, as it is not from the American people but from the Japanese that the Navy is seeking to withhold information. There are three reasons why it is important that our enemy should be prevented from learning facts about our naval forces and plans." Vice Admiral Horne set forth those reasons, and I think the Members of the Senate and the public should know the position of the Navy in this important matter. I ask that the statement given to the press at the meeting be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

The Navy has been accused of wanting to withhold information from the American people. This charge is based on a misunderstanding, as it is not from the American people, but from the Japanese, that the Navy is seeking to withhold information. There are three reasons why it is important that our enemies should be prevented from learning facts about our naval forces and plans.

In the first place, he wants to know where our ships are. If he can have exact knowledge of the whereabouts and movements of our vessels, it makes it easier for him to plan for naval action. Such information in the hands of the enemy can be effectively used against us.

In the second place, he wants to know the condition of our ships. This is particularly true when one of our ships has been damaged or put out of commission temporarily or for a long period. Precise knowledge of the extent and nature of the damage can be of great help to the enemy in shaping his plans for future actions. Vessels have been damaged in night action and all that the enemy knows is that he has scored hits, but if the vessels get away from the scene of action the enemy can not know the nature and the extent of the damage he has inflicted.

In the third place, the element of surprise is of great importance in any naval action. The less the enemy knows or can guess about our next moves, the greater the advantage to us. One of our guiding principles is never to make public information which might give the enemy a clue as to our future activities.

Premature publication of damage or losses may result in the loss of other American vessels and the death of more American boys. If there is any doubt as to whether or not information should be withheld, we make it a practice to err on the side of excess caution.

METHOD OF HANDLING NAVY NEWS

The Office of Public Relations of the Navy Department handles the preparation and release to the press of all items of news concerning the Navy and its activities. These news releases fall into the following categories:

(a) Navy Department communiques which deal principally with action reports from battle areas. No Navy Department communiqué is released by the Office of Public Relations without prior check and approval by an appropriate official of the Office of War Information.

(b) Press releases which cover items of general interest concerning naval activities and naval affairs. These are released by the Navy Department without checking with the Office of War Information.

The Directors of Public Relations of the Army and Navy meet daily with the Director of the Office of War Information (Mr. Elmer Davis). At this time, the Director of Public Relations of the Navy gives the Director of the Office of War Information a secret report of all developments in the combat zones under the control of the Navy which have taken place during the preceding 24 hours. The Office of War Information is informed as to how much of this information the Navy Department considers can be published without endangering the success of future operations.

SUPPLY OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TO THE ATLANTIC SEABOARD

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two letters and a memorandum which I have received in reference to the oil situation along the Atlantic seaboard.

One letter is from Hon. James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy. The other letter is from the Director of Petroleum Supply, Mr. R. L. Minckler. The memorandum is from the Navy and deals with the unwisdom and inadvisability of the proposed construction of a concrete-pipe oil line rather than a steel-pipe oil line.

There being no objection, the letters and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
*Washington, January 17, 1943.*

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: I was glad of the opportunity to discuss with you the critical fuel situation existing in the Northeastern States. The Navy Department has foreseen such a condition, and, in fact, has endeavored to cooperate with the Petroleum Administrator for War for the past several months in the hope that the anticipated conditions would not develop into reality.

To the extent that it is possible, without jeopardizing the flow of petroleum products to our forces at sea and overseas, the Navy Department is sharing, and intends to continue sharing, its stocks of petroleum with the civil authorities. In fact, in the month of January there has been made available to the Petroleum Administrator for War a substantial volume which we are advised has been most helpful in meeting certain localized conditions.

You may be sure that, consistent with actual war needs, the Navy Department will continue this practical cooperation with the Petroleum Administrator for War in the hope that it may be of some service in alleviating the conditions brought about by the petroleum shortage in the East.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

---

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
*Washington, January 20, 1943.*

Hon. DAVID WALSH,
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: Pursuant to your telephone request Thursday, we have studied the possibility of present storage facilities for petroleum products being inadequate in New England.

My opinion, however, is that existing facilities are sufficient to store any and all petroleum products which present and expected transportation may be able to bring into New England during those months when the supply is expected to exceed the demand. We intend, of course, to do everything possible to build up New England inventories this summer, but have no information which would lead us to believe that present facilities cannot handle any stocks which we can reasonably expect to accumulate this summer.

Very truly yours,

R. L. MINCKLER,
*Director of Petroleum Supply.*

JANUARY 13, 1943.

MEMORANDUM FROM THE NAVY RE CONCRETE PIPE OIL LINES

To SENATOR WALSH:

I talked with an officer in the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy Department, regarding concrete pipe lines, and was informed that the use of concrete for large fuel-oil pipe lines was not practicable, and would not solve the fuel-oil problem.

First, the trouble is not in getting steel piping but in obtaining the necessary pumping equipment. The use of steel pipe for other purposes is decreasing, and no great trouble is anticipated in obtaining the required amount of steel pipe.

Second, with steel piping, pressures of 900 to 1,100 pounds per square inch are employed, while, with concrete, pressures of only about 200 pounds could be employed. This would require about double the number of pumping stations and double the amount of pumping equipment, and it is the pumping equipment which is the bottleneck at the present time.

Third, if concrete reinforced with steel were used, almost as much steel would be required, and this would not solve the problem, as the bottleneck re pumping equipment would still exist.

This officer informed me that the Navy had been studying this problem for some time; that they actually have some concrete fuel-oil lines in operation and are convinced that the use of concrete instead of steel piping is not practicable; and that any attempt to use concrete instead of steel piping would delay the pipe-line program, as it would throw a still heavier burden on the manufacturers of pump and pumping equipment.

JAMES A. SAUNDERS,
*Captain, United States Navy (retired).*

---

JANUARY 13, 1943.

Capt. A. F. Carter in the Navy says:

1. That the first section of the pipe line from Longview, Tex., to southern Illinois is practically completed—all the pipe is laid—but materials for some of the pumping units have not yet been received. He expects the line to be in operation by February 1. This will increase the eastern oil supply as tank cars will have shorter runs, as many of them will run only as far west as Illinois instead of going to Texas.

2. The pipe is now being processed for the second section of the line—that is, from southern Illinois to the Philadelphia-New York area.

This project is going along satisfactorily, and this section should be in operation by next fall. The priorities on the materials for this section of the line are now satisfactory and they hope to retain these priorities.

The pipe line is capable of delivering 300,000 barrels daily.

J. S. SAUNDERS.

DISCONTINUANCE OF MANPOWER INVESTIGATION BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, at the request of and on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, I desire to make an announcement.

For approximately a month the committee has been conducting an investigation on the question of manpower, and has filed a preliminary report. However, desiring not to duplicate the work of other committees, and learning that five other committees are also conducting investigations of a similar nature, the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program has directed me to report to the Senate that it will discontinue its investigation, and will make available all the information it has for the use of any of the other committees which may request it.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY—CONSIDERATION OF FLYNN NOMINATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no Executive Calendar and, so far as I know, the Senate has finished its transaction of business for today. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

Before the motion is disposed of, I desire to repeat what I have already said, that immediately following the morning business on Monday, I shall move that the Senate go into executive session, and proceed to consider the nomination of Edward J. Flynn to be Minister to Australia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 1, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In Thy holy name, O Christ of God, do we lift up our hearts in prayer, and when Thou hearest, forgive. Thou hast said that it is faith that overcometh the world and we pray that it may possess our souls in peace and in holy confidence, never casting us down by disappointments and unduly elating us by our success. Amid clouds, skepticism, and sorrows we even dare to put on the garment of faith in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Uplifted by this power we pray Thee that murmurings, reproaches, cynicisms may be hushed and that we may be patient and trustful, then we shall soon glimpse the Star of Victory and the Prince of Peace shall be vindicated.

Heavenly Father, may we know the joy of sharing our blessings and the help of sympathy in common sorrow. Many voices offer us a rest in our quiet hours, but Thou alone hast offered us a covert in the storm; in conflict Thou hast a palm for peace, and a garland for grace when cast down. We pause in tribute to our departed friend and comrade. Oh, grant him peace and joy in the heavenly paradise. Deal lovingly with those whose love for him has ever been the earnest of the arms divine. In our pilgrimage keep us all on the toilsome march and bring us at last to the "Master's Well Done." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE JOSEPH J. SINNOTT

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last evening the Honorable Joseph J. Sinnott, Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives for 22 years, passed on to his reward. Mr. Sinnott was a native of my home city, Richmond, Va. His passing will be sincerely mourned by his many friends in Virginia. We shall miss him here on the floor of the House.

He has had a long and splendid career on Capitol Hill. He first came to Washington in 1885. For 58 years he has labored on assignments here at the Capitol. He first assumed the responsibilities of Doorkeeper under the administration of Woodrow Wilson, and he was again elected to fill this position in 1930.

In the last few years his health was poor, and those of us who saw him from day to day have marveled at his determination to carry on despite the frailty which the ripening of age brought him. His has been a life of service to his country, intense loyalty to his friends, and fidelity to his duty.

I voice, I am sure, the keen regret of every Member of this body at the passing of one who has served so long and so faithfully here.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I have only to say that no more genial or efficient gentleman ever officiated as Doorkeeper of this House than our departed friend Joseph J. Sinnott. Peace to his ashes.

I suffer and I profit by reason of the fact that, unofficially and officially, I have been in and about these corridors for a very long time.

I knew our friend back in 1910, and from that day to this he and I have been friends.

Jealous of his prerogatives, efficient in the discharge of his duty, always a gentleman, he has endeared himself to all those who have come in contact with him over the years.

If ever a man won the accolade of the Lord, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord," it was Joseph J. Sinnott.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, when I came to this body 20 years ago it was my good fortune to be taken into the home of Joseph J. Sinnott, where, for 8 years, I lived practically as a member of his family. I regarded that as the high point of initiation into the mysteries of official life in Washington. His great fund of knowledge, his wide acquaintance with men of importance, his long service to his own party and to the Nation enabled him to give wise counsel and advice. I do not know of any man in my public service whose loyalty to his official duty was more pronounced than that of Joe Sinnott. That carried with him right up until the last, because even on yesterday when, as all of us have recognized lately, he was becoming an ill man, he insisted on coming out and being at his post of duty.

He fell in line of action. I believe that the great service rendered by this distinguished public servant will be of inspiration to all of us.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Virginia has contributed much to this Nation. Probably no State in the Union has contributed more. Especially is that true when it comes to the names of her illustrious men: Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Marshall, Patrick Henry, Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, Walter Reed, and hundreds of others I could name. But I can safely say, after more than 20 years of intimate association with him, that Virginia never furnished a more faithful servant to this Nation than our distinguished friend, Joseph J. Sinnott.

He will be missed more than any other man I could mention at this time, and especially on our side of the House. He set an example for faithfulness that I wish to God were followed by everyone throughout the Nation at this time. If everyone in America were imbued with the spirit of Joe Sinnott we would have no strikes, no sit-downs, no slow-downs, no racketeering, or other interference with our war program, to embarrass our men on the fighting fronts who are clamoring for materials. He was not only a faithful servant, but he was a patriotic American citizen. His example in public life might well be emulated by every person under the American flag. For, as I said, the country never had a more faithful public servant.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of our late beloved friend is a great blow to the organization of the House of Representatives, and is a personal blow to every Member, particularly those who were associated with him for years. It is a personal loss to me.

There are many things that I could say on this sad occasion about our late friend, Joseph J. Sinnott, or as we endearingly called him, Joe Sinnott, but I think the point brought out by our distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is the one that I would want to stress on this occasion and to emphasize in the RECORD at this time because it constitutes an example and an inspiration to all, not only to those of us who serve in this great body, but to all persons, an example of devotion to duty up to the very moment of impending death. The example set by our late friend is one that is particularly inspirational at this time, in this trying period of the history of our Nation and of the world; the example of a man carrying on his duty up to the very time of his death. Those of us who have known him for years have seen him withering away during the past months, but in his office carrying on his work, on the floor of the House, carrying out his duties.

We know that Joe Sinnott went to his Maker with a complete performance of his duty under the most trying circumstances, when he was seriously ill to the point that he should have stayed home. You and I wished he had, but on the other hand we respect the state of mind that permitted him to carry on the performance of his duties under great physical difficulties, performing his duties to the point of death.

I am deeply grieved personally and I join with our colleagues from Virginia—and I know my other colleagues of the House join with the delegation from Virginia—in expressing our sympathy to the State of Virginia, and particularly to the members of Joe Sinnott's immediate family, our profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, those who served here with Joe Sinnott loved him, those who served here with him will miss him. Joe Sinnott was a Christian gentleman; Joe Sinnott was a Virginia gentleman. In his unfailing courtesy to all, and in his fidelity to his trust, he set an example of public service worthy of emulation.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let this moment pass without adding my word of tribute to a friend of many, many years' standing. It was in April 1911 I first became acquainted with Mr. Sinnott when as a very young man I was clerk here on Capitol Hill. He was kind and courteous to me as a young boy. When I came back here as a Member of Congress he was helpful and always friendly. He was ever faithful in his duties. I join with his other friends in expressing sincerest sorrow in the loss of this faithful official and this long-time friend. The loved ones he leaves behind have my deepest sympathy. Our Nation has lost a great citizen.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply grieved, as were the other Members of the House, by the sad news of the death of our elderly official, Doorkeeper Mr. Sinnott. Another familiar figure is gone from these Halls. Only a few months ago we were saddened by the passing of William Tyler Page, who had spent more than threescore years of service in connection with this Chamber, beginning as a page boy in his duty, and continuing his service until he became Clerk of the House of Representatives in the day of his party control. While Mr. Sinnott has not served quite threescore years, his services here have been varied and perhaps of even greater responsibility. I personally have lost a friend in the death of each of these outstanding officials and servants of the House of Representatives.

What history this venerable man has seen enacted through the years as he has announced Presidents and Kings and other notables of the earth in the course of his duty. Although he could mingle with the great men of the Nation, he did not overlook common people. Although he was severe in exterior he had a great heart and never failed to try to do the impossible by way of favoring Members, as when there was a clamor for balcony seats at special joint sessions of Congress. I have often been the recipient of his consideration in this regard and of many other acts of kindness which have endeared him to me personally.

As in the case of William Tyler Page, so now, with Joseph J. Sinnott, I can no longer say to my visitors in the Capitol, "There is a great man who has grown up with this Capitol and is an inseparable part of it." They are gone but their dignity is as much a composite part of the dignity of this great parliamentary body as the brilliant careers of our Speakers and legislative leaders.

I ask unanimous consent that I may express my sentiments more properly and fully in the RECORD at the conclusion of the eulogies that have already been given.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Joseph J. Sinnott, Doorkeeper of the House, and an employee for nearly 55 years.

*Resolved*, That as a mark of respect to his memory the Speaker appoint a committee of four Members to attend the funeral services.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appoints the following Members to attend the funeral of Hon. Joseph J. Sinnott: Messrs. SATTERFIELD, WOODRUM of Virginia, DOUGHTON, and TREADWAY.

### ADDITIONAL CLERK FOR THE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 35, Rept. No. 62), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That until otherwise authorized by law there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives the sum of $2,400 per annum, payable monthly, as compensation to an assistant clerk to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to be appointed by the chairman thereof.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us the need for this additional clerk?

Mr. PATTON. I yield to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], to explain the need.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. This is for an additional clerk for the Committee on Immigration. Up to this time we have had only one clerk, yet in the last Congress over 400 bills were referred to our committee and we held over 200 hearings. The work is getting very heavy.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman ever bring any of these resolutions to the House?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Did I ever bring in any resolutions?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman did not bring them in, I do not see that he needs an extra clerk.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not quite understand my colleague.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Six hundred resolutions might be referred to the gentleman's committee; but if they are not actually reported out, I do not see that the work would be such as to call for an extra clerk.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We actually reported out about 200 resolutions after days of hearings in the committee room. We have had public hearings and passed on many resolutions. Reports have to be compiled on each bill on which hearings are held or which are considered. In the last Congress we made 150 voluminous reports. We worked on one thing alone, the codification of the nationality law, for 5 years.

The work of the committee has increased to the extent that it is impossible to carry on without an extra clerk. Some of the committees of the House have two or three clerks, yet they have no legislation before them. We are an active committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has it occurred to the gentleman that he might take a clerk from one of those inactive committees to help him out on his committee?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We do not want to take anything from anybody. What I am asking the House to do is to furnish a little extra assistance to a committee of 22 members. This work is referred to our committee by the Members of Congress. I am sure the majority of the committee feel as I do, for I have talked to them about it and they are in favor of it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This action is taken, then, after consultation with the committee?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; we talked about it several times last year.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And this resolution is the desire of the whole committee?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have personally examined this matter and went into it very carefully. This committee has a tremendous number of bills before it. It is a very hard working committee and it has only one clerk, with no assistant clerk. It is my judgment that the facts warrant an assistant clerk in this particular case. What the gentleman says about other committees is correct, but that is a matter that should be looked into later and will be. I can assure the gentleman from Massachusetts that I have personally looked into the matter and my sense of judgment, my desire to be fair, prompts me to arrive at the conclusion that here is a justifiable case.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. With the assurance of the gentleman, I shall personally withdraw my objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The Accounts Committee heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] for about an hour today and the members of the Accounts Committee were unanimously of the opinion that he is entitled to this additional clerk. The committee only has one clerk. There have been over 600 bills and resolutions brought in to that committee and it is obvious that one clerk cannot take care of the 600 bills, which have to do with the naturalization of aliens serving in our armed forces and other things. I reiterate what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has just stated, and I hope this resolution will pass without any objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yesterday the names of six refugees who have positions in the office of the O. P. A. in New York, or six alleged refugees, I will put it that way, were submitted to me and the inquiry made whether or not they are working there. I would like to know whether a refugee is going to be given this job as clerk, and I am asking this question in all seriousness.

Mr. McCORMACK. In answer to the gentleman's question, and it is a very proper one, I can assure the gentleman that I will take the responsibility of assuring him there will be nothing like that.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 84, Rept. No. 63), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 237 of the Seventy-third Congress, continued under authority of House Resolution 44 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, House Resolution 11 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, House Resolution 65 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, House Resolution 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, and House Resolution 20, Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the special committee appointed to investigate the conservation of the wildlife resources of the United States and related questions, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $7,500, effective from January 3, 1943, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. That the official committee reporters shall serve said committee at its meetings in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in explanation of this, the Committee on Wildlife, under the chairmanship of our able friend from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], had appropriated for that committee the sum of $7,500. He returned $2,600 to the Sergeant at Arms. I may say that this was also unanimously reported by the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 85, Rept. No. 64), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the study, inquiry, and investigation authorized by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and House Resolution 52 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, not to exceed $50,000, effective from January 9, 1943, in addition to the unexpended balances of sums made available during the Seventy-seventh Congress for conducting the study, inquiry, and investigation authorized by said House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] at this time.

EX-PRESIDENT WILLIAM McKINLEY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, no doubt you and the Members of the House have already noticed the red carnations that are being worn by the Ohio Members in the Chamber this morning. It is our purpose to present each Member with a red carnation.

This was Mr. McKinley's favorite flower and it has become the favorite flower of Ohio.

It is reported that when President McKinley occupied the White House it was his custom to pin a red carnation on the lapel of his visitors, especially those whose request he was not able to grant. He wanted to send them away as graciously as he could, even if he could not grant their request.

In view of the fact that we have just been paying our respects to our beloved

Doorkeeper, Mr. Joe Sinnott, who passed away yesterday, we who are taking the leading part in this observation of McKinley's birthday want to approve what has been so appropriately said about Mr. Sinnott. No doubt Mr. Sinnott was here in the Capitol during the time McKinley was President, and no doubt he had many pleasant recollections of his acquaintance with Mr. McKinley. There are not many now living that knew McKinley. There are a few Members of the House and some of the clerical staff of the House who met him. If we had the time we would be glad to have them relate the incidents connected with their meeting this distinguished man.

I crave your further indulgence while I say a few words before the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CARSON] delivers what I know will be an enlightening address on the life and achievements of Mr. McKinley.

For several years the Ohio Members have called the attention of the House to McKinley's birthday. Tomorrow will mark the one hundredth anniversary of his birth. Each year we try to have some appropriate program. We do this not because McKinley was a President of the United States. Ohio has, as you know, produced many Presidents. We put on these programs because we think that Mr. McKinley was one of the ablest and most effective Congressmen that ever sat and served in this great body. We appreciate that it is not possible to measure greatness with mathematical accuracy, yet we feel that the impartial historians will so record that William McKinley was one of the greatest of all Congressmen. He was a great Congressman because he left a great impression on the economic growth and stability of our country. I have repeatedly stated on the floor of this House and other places that McKinley made his greatest contribution to his country right on the floor of this House. That is why I have been so persistent in asking for fitting observation of his birthday on this floor. He had a magnificent record as a soldier in the Civil War. He was considered as an able Governor of Ohio. He ranked high as a President. But he would never have been Governor or President were it not for the magnificent record he had made as a Congressman.

Mr. McKinley had a great capacity to make friends. He did this because he was fair in all his dealings. I have been so much impressed with the warmth that the Democratic Membership has always shown to these programs that we Ohio Members have been putting on each year. Last year when we had an observance similar to this one I remember a distinguished Member from Texas rose and expressed his wish to speak. We were glad to hear him. He respected William McKinley because McKinley had shown great kindness to the South after the war. This Texas Member had great respect for Roger Q. Mills, who was one of America's great statesmen. Roger Q. Mills was a Member of Congress from Texas and he served contemporaneously with McKinley. Both were great champions of their respective sides of the tariff issue. There was a friendship between McKinley and Mills which was very warm and enduring. McKinley had been an officer in the Union Army and Mills had been an officer in the Confederate Army, and both were great men. This friendship was very similar to the friendship between Nick Longworth and Jack Garner, both great Congressmen; and it was somewhat similar to the friendship that we from Ohio have for our own very distinguished Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

There is no question but that in the heat of battle on this floor many warm friendships are created. Students of the life of McKinley generally maintain that the great dignity and the great honors that came to McKinley came to him because of his work on this floor. We do not respect him because he was a President any more than we do the other distinguished Presidents that Ohio has produced, but we respect him as the most outstanding Congressman Ohio has ever sent to this distinguished body.

Mr. Speaker, the Ohio delegation has selected the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CARSON], a new Member from Ohio who has the honor to represent the district formerly represented by Mr. McKinley, to make the formal anniversary address today. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CARSON].

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the Sixteenth District of Ohio, a native Ohioan, and a resident of the city of Canton, the home of the late President William McKinley, I am proud to have the honor of addressing the House on the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of our beloved martyred war President, and of paying tribute to one of our country's great men. Tomorrow the whole Nation will observe the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of William McKinley in Niles, Ohio, on January 29, 1843.

At the age of 17 he enlisted in the Union Army and served through the Civil War under Rutherford B. Hayes. He served his country with distinction and was mustered out with the rank of major.

In 1867 he opened his law office in Canton, county seat of Stark County, Ohio, where he maintained residence for the remainder of his life. William McKinley was elected as Representative to the Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, Forty-seventh, and part of the Forty-eighth Congresses. He was again elected to the Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, and Fifty-first Congresses.

The Republican Party became more closely identified with the protective tariff in each successive year of McKinley's congressional experience. The tariff was to him a national policy and not a cloak for special privilege to favored interests. In 1889 he contested the Republican caucus for speakership, and Reed, who defeated him, made him chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

In 1891 McKinley became the fortieth Governor of the State of Ohio and served for two terms. In 1896 he was elected President of the United States, becoming the twenty-fifth President.

The administration that he set up was orthodox in its Republicanism. Except for the restoration of the high tariff and the establishment of the gold standard, the theory implicit in Republican ideology was that all that was needed was to let business alone and to harmonize the clashing claims of interest with as little loss as possible. For this task McKinley was ideally suited. His long professional career had given him an intuitive knowledge of the psychology of the Members of Congress. His natural kindliness and consideration had been developed by the need to conciliate everyone in order to attain his own ends. With a smile he met angrily insistent men at his office door and sent them away beaming, often wearing a red carnation, his favorite flower, from the Presidential desk. He did not pretend to know more than Congress or his party; to him, as to so many in his generation, the Nation and the Republican Party seemed merged as one. He did not surrender his mind to any of his advisers, but he rarely allowed himself to stand far in advance of the opinion of his constituents.

It was during his first term of office that the Cuban question and the War with Spain arose. Up to that time our relations with foreign nations filled but a slight space in American history and excited generally only a languid interest.

The Cuban question was a chronic nuisance. The persistence of slavery in Cuba and the military and absolute government of the Spanish captain-general there, excluding the natives from all participation and from all enjoyment of the fruits of administration, was responsible for the first revolutionary outbreak in the island. These revolutions continued from President Grant's time and almost reached a climax in the last year of President Cleveland's administration. In Congress there was a mounting tide of sentiment for the Cubans. This same situation confronted McKinley at the beginning of his first term as President. President Cleveland had endeavored to be a leader of public opinion and McKinley was a follower. The momentum of Cleveland's sanity and courage had its effect on the country and on the new President McKinley for several months, until dramatic untoward incidents inflamed to the bursting point a public that was already saturated with a genuine sentiment of sympathy for Cuban revolution.

McKinley soon faced the alternatives of leading the United States into a war which he abhorred, or of fighting the politicians who were yielding to the popular clamor and egging on war. He settled the matter when he referred it to Congress, which directed him on April 20, 1898, to intervene in Cuba in order to establish Cuban independence, disclaiming an intent to aggrandize the power of the United States in so doing.

Almost before the minds of the Government had been adjusted to the fact of war, it was turned to the policy of peace. There arose the Philippine situation. Again McKinley, not desiring annexations and sincere in his philan-

thropic gesture toward Cuba, was the slave of his technique. When he instructed his Commissioners to negotiate peace in Paris, he was not ready to say whether the Philippines should be returned, released, or kept. At this crisis he turned as always to his conscience, for he was devout and earnest. He left, as an explanation of how the decision came to him, a statement made to a delegation of clergymen who visited him in Washington a year or so afterward. He said:

I walked the floor of the White House night after night until midnight; and I am not ashamed to tell you gentlemen that I went down on my knees and prayed Almighty God for light and guidance more than one night. And one night late it came to me this way—I don't know how it was, but it came. 1. That we could not give them back to Spain—that would be cowardly and dishonorable. 2. That we could not turn them over to France or Germany—our commercial rivals in the Orient—that would be bad business and discreditable. 3. That we could not leave them to themselves—they were unfit for self-government, and they would soon have anarchy and misrule over there worse than under Spain. 4. That there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all and to educate the Filipinos and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace do the very best we could by them, as our fellow men for whom Christ had also died. And then I went to bed and to sleep and slept soundly.

President McKinley then directed the Peace Commission to demand the cession of the entire Archipelago. Strangely, Spain resisted and they were finally offered the sum of twenty million as compensation. Spain had already offered to Germany the islands, so she quickly accepted the offer of settlement.

It was during McKinley's administration that Hawaii was annexed. Japan protested, claiming violation of her treaty of 1886 with Hawaii. There were some 25,000 Japanese on the island and it was claimed the annexation might jeopardize their rights. Japan withdrew her protests when she was assured that the United States would protect her treaty rights, and the islands were finally annexed on August 12, 1898. Wake Island was annexed January 17, 1899, and Guam by the treaty with Spain ratified by the Senate on February 6, 1899. I mention these islands since they have made history in our present war.

McKinley was reelected in 1900. On September 6, 1901, during a public reception at Buffalo, he was shot by an anarchist, Leon F. Czolgosz, and died in Buffalo 8 days later. On his lips at the end was the phrase:

It is God's way. His will, not ours, be done.

McKinley believed in the divinity of Christ and a recognition of Christianity as the mightiest factor in the world's civilization. From his youth he had been by conviction a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was buried in Canton, Ohio, where later a beautiful memorial was erected, the fund being raised by millions of pennies collected by school children. His personal associates maintained for the rest of their lives an affectionate loyalty to his memory such as few American statesmen have inspired. We of Ohio are proud to acclaim President McKinley as a native son and to honor and cherish his memory.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is only fitting and proper that today, the anniversary of the birth of a great American, we of the House should pause to honor the contributions made by this great American, and to pay respect to his memory.

During its constitutional history our country has been very fortunate in having a great line of Presidents. It is particularly appropriate that today, when our country is engaged in war, we should pause to honor the memory of another wartime President.

Without regard to party, the President of the United States is the President of all the American people. That is my viewpoint of the Presidency, as it should be the viewpoint of all Americans. During the lifetime of a man human emotions come into play, sometimes producing misunderstanding, but history records the true facts concerning the events that occur during one's span of life, particularly in the case of Presidents of the United States, all of whom are sufficiently prominent to occupy outstanding pages in history.

William McKinley was one of the outstanding Presidents of the history of our country. He led our people during the trying period of the Spanish-American War, a turning point in the history of our country. He steered the ship of state to safety. While the Spanish-American War was not a terrible war as far as casualties are concerned, it was an important conflict. We had to have in the White House in those days, just as today or in any other trying period of our country's history, a man of vision, a man of courage. Fortunately, during the Spanish-American War we had in the White House in the person of the man whose memory we honor today, and rightfully so, a man of vision and courage, a man who can take his place among the great Presidents of our beloved country.

When our beloved country is in danger we need a man in the White House who has not only vision and courage but the judgment to lead our people to safety, no matter what may be his name, his religion, or his political party; they are immaterial.

President McKinley is recorded in history as a President who met the crisis of his day and steered the ship of state to safety. It is well that we pause today as Americans to honor this great man and his contribution to our country and to pay tribute to his memory.

I hope and pray that, when Americans of this generation are gone, and if a future generation of Americans is faced with a dangerous crisis there will be in the White House on that occasion, regardless of what party elects him, what his name may be, or what his religion may be, a man of vision, a man of courage, a man of judgment, the type of man we honor today, the type of man we have in the White House now and whom we have had in the White House in every crisis that has confronted our country in its constitutional history. In times of danger, we need a leader in the White House.

I join with the Ohio delegation in everything that has been said today about this great man in honoring his outstanding contributions to the progress of our country.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the kind words of our distinguished majority leader, and, with the Speaker's further permission, I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the few men in this House who had the great privilege of meeting President McKinley. It was during the Spanish-American War. My regiment was camped at Camp Alger, a little way over in Virginia. I was a corporal in my company, and one day secured leave of absence for myself and my "set of fours." We wished to see Washington. We had no idea that we would be privileged that day to meet the President of the United States. We came to Washington; but in those days you must remember that there were no taxicabs or any other means of moving quickly about the city. However, we four youngsters, I think, saw more of Washington in one day than anybody had ever seen prior to that time. We were, all of us, in fine physical condition, full of energy and enthusiasm, and we wanted to see everything there was to be seen. Someone told us there was a public reception at the White House on that day and that we would be permitted to attend. We hurried there and joined a long line that was passing slowly before the President. As we approached him we saw that on the other side of him in a wheel chair was his invalid wife. As each one of us boys came to the President he stopped us and talked with us. He held up the whole line to talk to each of us, and no man not having had contact with McKinley can ever appreciate how kind and generous and how in every way delightful his personality was.

As I passed by the President and came to Mrs. McKinley I then thought I had never before, and I now know I have never since, been more impressed with the beauty and the graciousness of a woman than I was with that of the then mistress of the White House. Her hair was snow white and her eyes to me appeared to be as black as night. While I have known in my lifetime many lovely women, many gracious women, certainly I have never met anyone more gracious and delightful to me than was she. I think every one of the boys felt exactly as I felt. We were the only ones in that great crowd who were in uniform. It was this, I think, which caused them both to pay such attention to us.

That experience has enshrined in my heart a love, a veneration, for McKinley and his dear wife that will remain there so long as I shall live.

It was later when I was attending the Detroit College of Medicine that I learned of the President's assassination. I do not think that in all my life I have ever received such a shock or one that affected me more deeply than that. Of the privileges I have had in this life, I count the greatest of them all that of meeting President McKinley and his dear wife on that occasion, and under those circumstances. I join in everything that has been said by the other Members in regard to this beloved man. I count him among the greatest Presidents we have had.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud indeed to wear this red carnation in honor of the memory of so great and so good a man as William McKinley. It may be that because the campaign of 1896 was the first campaign that I can remember I have always taken such a personal interest in the life and accomplishments of President McKinley. In that campaign, like most others in Virginia, I was strong for free silver. I have since learned that McKinley was right. It was when I was a boy during the stirring events of the Spanish-American War that I recall, of everything else that happened then, that President McKinley prayed all night long before he agreed to dispatch a note to Spain protesting the treatment of our friends in Cuba, which he knew would in all probability lead us into war.

Mr. McKinley was a Christian and did not hesitate to appeal to the Father of Light to illuminate his understanding. It was on a warm summer day when I was still a boy that I drove to the little station of Brandy, in Culpeper County, to meet some guests coming from Washington and the news came over the wire that President McKinley had been shot. I stood in front of that little station platform while three old Confederate veterans were discussing the assassination of the President. I remember well one of them said that he was shot in the stomach. The second said that that must have been very painful, and the third one said, "Well, I was shot in the stomach in the Battle of Bull Run. It did not hurt so much but the bullet was mighty hot."

After I grew to manhood and became interested in public problems, I studied the work of McKinley as a legislator, and I am proud to be on the committee that once was headed by that great man. I give Mr. McKinley credit for the fact that in deciding that we should have possessions in the Orient he committed us to the policy of being a world power. In his last speech at Buffalo, in support of his policy, he said that we must not assume that we can forever sell abroad and never buy abroad, and added:

> The period of exclusiveness is past. Commercial wars are unprofitable; reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not.

That message still rings down to me from that great public leader who envisioned the destiny of a world power, and expected succeeding generations to carry on in the light that he held for us.

It is very fitting, as our distinguished majority leader has just said, for us to pause from time to time to honor the memory of great leaders in this country.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to thank the Speaker very sincerely for his courtesy, and I now yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues from Ohio and the rest of the country in the tributes to one of the great Americans of all time. William McKinley was a kind and gentle man. He loved peace and yet by a curious trick of fate this man of peace was forced to fight as a soldier in one war, to be at the head of the Government in another war, and fall the victim of an assassin's bullet.

William McKinley was devoted to the people of this country. He wanted to serve his day and generation, and he served ably and well not only in war but in peace as well. He left his lasting impress upon our Nation because under his leadership America emerged from a colonial country and became an important world power.

McKinley loved people. He loved his country.

He devoted every hour of his long public career to the interests of the common man. His ambition was to make our country a better land to live in. His devotion to his wife, an invalid, appealed strongly to the American people. His love for children, as evidenced every time he came in contact with them, evoked admiration and respect. The little thoughtful things left their impress upon our people, and he became a most beloved President. We are glad to join in perpetuating the memory of a man whose service helped to make this a greater and a better country. Today as we honor this great and gentle son of Ohio, we hope he may continue to radiate inspiration and the urge for a better life to the American people to the end that here on this Western Hemisphere we can build a finer and better civilization and that through the better civilization we build here we, as a Nation, may be a beacon light for the rest of the world.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will mark the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of President William McKinley. As a lifelong admirer of that great American, whose usefulness was cut short by an assassin's bullet, I am truly grateful to the distinguished speakers who have preceded me for what they have said in appraising his life as citizen, Civil War veteran, Representative in Congress, Governor of the great State of Ohio, and President of the United States.

William McKinley was a great humanitarian, a great American, a great statesman.

As member and chairman of the great Ways and Means Committee and author of the Tariff Act of 1890, William McKinley did much to promote industry in America and to make us self-sufficient, so far as is humanly possible. He believed in protection for the American workingman and the American farmer, and so long as we followed the principles of sound economics laid down by him America grew and the American people prospered.

He was one of the first, and easily the ablest, advocate of truly reciprocal trade relations with foreign countries, but he wanted such trade relations based on sound economics and so carried out as to redound to the welfare of our country and our people.

At this point let me quote from one of President McKinley's statements on the subject of reciprocity. Said he:

> The end in view is always to be the opening up of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and cannot produce ourselves and which do not involve any loss of labor to our own people but tend rather to increase their employment.

This quotation is from his inaugural address.

Unlike the present alleged reciprocity program, the McKinley philosophy does not include the granting of concessions on foreign products which we do not need and which directly compete with and displace our own—at least where the domestic product is available in commercial quantities at a cost not economically prohibitive and where the existing duty thereon does not exceed the minimum of protection necessary to give the American producer an equal opportunity with low-cost foreign producers in competing for the home market.

The fundamental purpose for which this or any other nation carries on foreign trade is to sell abroad what it is able, and to buy from abroad the things which it must import to supply domestic needs. A reciprocity program, to be of any net benefit to this country, must be consistent with the fundamental purposes of foreign trade—in other words, it must be employed to further the exchange abroad of our own surpluses for the commodities we need but do not ourselves produce.

That, my friends, is the principle for which the Republican Party has stood since its inception. The operation of that principle enabled this country to become the greatest industrial and agricultural country in all the world, and it also enabled us to raise our standard of living to a level never before dreamed of in any land.

The reciprocity program that was put into effect by President Roosevelt and his free trade advisers some 10 years ago does violence to all the principles of foreign commerce laid down by the late McKinley, and it is for that reason I have introduced a bill to repeal the trade treaties that have been entered into between our State Department and foreign governments without congressional approval as required by the Constitution.

Each trade treaty should stand on its own bottom and should apply only to the country with which the agreement is entered into. As it now is, when we give concessions to one country, all other countries, save one, receive the same benefits without necessarily giving us anything in return. Foreign countries thus receive most of the ad-

vantage. I call that one-sided bargaining, not true reciprocity.

Under the great McKinley, the broad general principle of mutually advantageous exchange was laid down. Commerce was to be a two-way affair, with each side gaining some benefit. We bought from other nations such commodities as we could not produce at home, and in return we expected the countries with which we did business to buy from us the things that they needed and of which we have a surplus. That was sound, Yankee horse trading. Now, however, it seems that a new philosophy has grown up in this country, fostered by crystal-gazers, visionaries, and dreamers. They would buy commodities and products from other countries that we produce here at home, in order to foster the so-called good-neighbor policy. As it now operates, the countries we buy from are not obliged to buy from us and frequently do not.

When this war is over, and God grant that it may be soon, America must reembark on the McKinley system of protection and genuine reciprocity if we would retain the American market for the American producer and maintain the American standard of living. There is no immediate hurry that I can see, as the war serves as an embargo on all peacetime commerce. It is after the war is over and the mad scramble for the great American market begins that we must take steps to protect the American producer on farm and in factory from the devastating competition of pauperized lands. The administration's present foreign trade policy, if in effect at that time, will only result in unemployment and in lowering our own high standard of living to the lower levels obtaining in Europe and the Orient.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to refer in detail to the public service of William McKinley. Others here are competent to do this and are doing it. I think perhaps the House may be interested, however, in just a word of personal reminiscence of an event that occurred in my younger life that left a marked impression on me that has lasted from that day to this.

During Mr. McKinley's campaign for the Presidency, when I was a young farm boy in Allen County, Ind., he made a speaking trip through a portion of my district. It was a great and gala occasion climaxed by a parade and I made a special trip to town on horseback, with some of the neighborhood boys, to view the celebration.

Two things stand out in my memory of that important day in my young life. The first is the kindliness of that great American, who was to become a wartime President of the United States. The second is an incident which occurred during my ride back to the farm. The events of the day so impressed me, and I was so wrapped up in my contemplation of them, that I became careless and was thrown from my horse.

Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of our martyred President, the beloved William McKinley. It is fitting that we should pause a moment in our deliberations to pay tribute to his memory. In the words of the inscription on his memorial at Canton, Ohio, he was a "good citizen—brave soldier—wise executive—helper and leader of men—exemplar to his people of the virtues that build and conserve the state, society, and the home."

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, Kansas has always taken pride in the fact that her date of admission into the sisterhood of States coincided with the date of President McKinley's birth. We join with the Ohio delegation in commemorating January 29, our Kansas Day, and the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of President McKinley.

I recall a dramatic incident which occurred on the battlefield of Antietam. It was there that President McKinley delivered his last Memorial Day address. It was on May 30, 1901, at the Antietam National Cemetery, a part of the historic battlefield. With President McKinley was Senator John M. Daniel, of Virginia, who spoke from the same platform. Senator Daniel, in his most dramatic manner, told how the President, who was a soldier at this battle and commissary sergeant of the One Hundred and Forty-first Ohio Regiment, worked all night of September 16 to make coffee and sandwiches for the Ohio boys and, before daybreak on the morning of the 17th, drove over the peaceful hills where the hell of battle was so soon to plunge and gave many a poor soldier his last breakfast. A bronze plaque now marks the spot. Only 3 months after the memorial address at the Antietam Cemetery on May 30, 1901, McKinley fell victim to an assassin's bullet.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I very well remember when I was a boy in my teen age, my father and a neighbor had spent a few days at the Buffalo Exposition. They had come home late in the afternoon and we were all on the lawn in front of the house listening to my father's story as to the wonderful things he had seen at the exposition. He was telling us this when a neighbor came driving by who had gone to town to get his mail. He stopped and told us that McKinley had been shot and he was dead. I will never forget the shock I got at that and how I walked away from the group and cried. A little while later I went to bed and I knelt down by the side of the bed and prayed for Mrs. McKinley, perhaps more earnestly than I had ever prayed before. I have been wondering just what it was that excited me so and directed my actions in that way, and the only conclusion I can come to is that it was the tremendous influence in my young life that was brought about by a great American and a lovely lady in the White House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of the deep South, I join in expressing the reverence of the people of that great section of our country for our distinguished former President, the one hundredth anniversary of whose birth we are now commemorating—President William McKinley, of Ohio.

I first learned of William McKinley in the campaign of 1896 when he and William Jennings Bryan ran for the Presidency on opposing tickets. In those days there were "giants upon the earth"; and that contest was a battle between two mental giants.

Never have two more consecrated Christian gentlemen opposed each other for the Presidency of this Republic in any contest in all the Nation's history. Indeed, they lifted American politics into a purified moral atmosphere that challenged the admiration of the civilized world.

Every friend and follower of William Jennings Bryan bows in reverence for the memory of William McKinley. He was a statesman, a patriot, and a Christian gentleman. Thomas Jefferson once said there were three questions to be asked of any man who applied for political office: Is he honest? Is he qualified? Is he faithful?

The life and character of William McKinley answers all those questions in the affirmative. However much we may have differed from him on policies and procedure, no honest man could challenge his integrity or question his devotion to those high Christian principles upon which this country must continue to rest if the Republic is to endure.

When I think of that contest between him and William Jennings Bryan, two of the cleanest, finest, and purest men who ever lived, it is my earnest prayer that their example may be repeated throughout all the national contests this Nation is to experience, and that their "lofty scene may be acted over in states unborn and accents yet unknown."

SUBSIDY PAYMENTS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has announced unexpectedly a new subsidy policy under which a bonus is to be paid to farmers from the United States Treasury in the form of incentive payments. The Department states that the payments would be subsidies to the consumer rather than to the producer. In other words it proposes to pay a part of the grocery bill of certain classes of people and charge it to the taxpayers.

The amount mentioned by the Department to start the program is $100,000,000, but estimates indicate that the amount required would be from $150,000,000 to $200,000,000, and departmental spokesmen who discussed the subject when it was before the Committee on Appropriations last year said that carried to its ultimate conclusion it would require billions.

On the testimony submitted by the Department when the subject was before the committee during consideration of the price-control bill in the last session the committee not only disapproved such a policy but incorporated in the O. P. A. bill a provision that no part of the funds therein appropriated should be used for subsidies in any form. That provision was approved by the House and is now a part of the law.

It is therefore a matter of surprise that the Department should, without notice and without consultation with any congressional committee, suddenly announce that these payments will be made. The only method by which funds can be secured for the purpose is through appropriation by Congress, and the announcement by the Department carried in every metropolitan newspaper and over every radio channel is tantamount to announcement that Congress will reverse its decision and repeal the policy incorporated in the law and provide the money at the direction of a Government bureau.

The release by the Department of Agriculture does not say that the plan is under consideration or that Congress will be asked to take action, but is a categorical statement that the policy will be followed and that the money will be forthcoming.

It is not only an encroachment on the constitutional prerogatives of the Congress but it is a proposal to take a vast sum from the Treasury to pay a part of the cost of living of certain consumers at a time when the consumer's income is the highest in the history of the Nation and when every available dollar is needed for the prosecution of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD; and also to extend my remarks and include a joint statement by all of the national farm bureaus opposing this proposition.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Wickard has announced a program of payments of subsidies to farmers to plant the things that he tells them to, and conform in every way to his regulations. This is another subsidy designed to create inflation by robbing the public of the normal curb on higher prices resulting from the fact that people will not buy when the prices are higher.

It means appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars and adding that amount to our national debt, and that increase in debt is highly inflationary.

The farmers do not want this. They want a fair price for their product. They are entitled to it, and the Office of Price Administration should obey the law which Congress has passed so that they can get it.

I know that the Congress does not want to provide this subsidy money.

The Secretary has tried to deceive the farmer into believing that he will get this subsidy. I do not believe that the money will be appropriated. The farmer must have a decent price for his goods, but subsidies must end.

## EDUCATION OF CHINESE STUDENTS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, during the deserved tributes paid to the memory of President McKinley mention has been made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] of the expression of far vision in connection with the Orient by that former great leader of our land. I should like to call attention just now to the fact that we have on Capitol Hill and present in the gallery members of the Chinese race. I have been privileged during the morning to explain legislative procedure to these Chinese students who are here in this country and have been studying for many, many years.

It so happens that when war broke out there were approximately 1,000 Chinese students in the institutions of learning in this country. Through the Division of Cultural Relations, Department of State, there was given through the emergency fund of the President an amount sufficient to carry forward and complete the education of 175 of those youths. I pay tribute to those young men and also to the solidarity between America and China, which is being brought ever closer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

## THE AIR TRANSPORT COMMAND

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the other day on the floor of the House a friend of mine repeated a rumor to the effect that 50 percent of the personnel in Army planes taken to our flying fronts were killed in transit. I have heard this rumor repeated since in the city of Washington. In fairness to the brave men who are doing a superb job in flying these planes to the fighting fronts of the world, I desire to read a letter just received from Hon. Robert A. Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air. The letter reads as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT
SECRETARY FOR AIR,
*Washington, D. C., January 27, 1943.*

The Honorable OVERTON BROOKS,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. BROOKS: Thank you for bringing to my attention a rumor, apparently reported to certain Members of Congress, to the effect that "50 percent of personnel in Army planes en route to our fronts are killed in transit."

This vicious and reckless rumor is completely untrue. The Army Air Forces, ferrying, flight delivery, and transport operations comprise one of the outstanding accomplishments of the war. The truth of the matter is that in such operations the percentage of fatal accidents to deliveries is two-tenths of 1 percent for the 6 months' period ending December 31, 1942. Furthermore, for the full calendar year 1942, 99.7 percent of all aircraft accepted for domestic ferrying and foreign flight delivery by our Air Transport Command were delivered to their destinations.

Such a record would be gratifying even under peacetime conditions. Remembering that flight delivery of our modern high performance aircraft is made to ten active overseas air fronts completely encircling the globe (from the subzero temperature of the Arctic to the subtropical climates of Africa and the southwest Pacific) the accomplishment is a superb one and an extraordinary tribute to the pilots, the machines, and the operating and supervisory personnel.

The Army Air Forces are justly proud of this record and are doing their utmost to maintain it. Such malicious rumors naturally have a serious effect on morale and we would appreciate very much any assistance you may be able to give us to enable us to trace such stories to their source.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT,
*Assistant Secretary of War for Air.*

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the business of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 10 minutes at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an article by Kingsbury Smith.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 1

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Wednesday the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill will come up. This will probably take 3 days, though I hope only 2.

I have no information now as to whether there will be any legislation called up except possibly some small matters that may be disposed of by unanimous consent.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is my understanding correct that the leaders will be liberal in general debate on the Treasury-Post Office bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Whatever the committee agrees upon, I assume they will be liberal. The only thought I had in mind, and this is just a personal observation, is that in these busy days if the House can go over from Thursday until Monday it would enable Members to catch up with their mail and their office work and departmental matters. The Members have so much of this kind of work to do.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We will cross that bridge when we come to it; we shall see what happens in the meantime.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true, but that was just a personal observation.

The following week, the week of February 8, the independent offices bill will come up.

I am hopeful that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will meet next week and report out a resolution extending the lend-lease policy. If this is done it is my intention to bring it up as soon as possible. I have no definite knowledge beyond what I have stated.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Next week there will be just this one appropriation bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I am not quite clear as to when the Treasury-Post Office bill is to be called up. I understood the majority leader to say it would be reported out on Wednesday; that he wanted the balance of the week free for Members to clean up other work.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill will be called up Wednesday; that is the information I have received.

Mr. CASE. Presented to the House on Wednesday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a report received by me from the Commerce and Industry Association of New York concerning the proposed revision of the Securities and Exchange Commission proxy rules. This is a very important report on a very important subject, and I should like each Member of the House to read this report in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by S. G. Webb published in the Newport County Sentinel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered on Monday next I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]?

There was no objection.

THE WAR IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, the drama and the glamour of the Casablanca conference has no equal in all the pages of history. The full import of this conference on the conduct of the war may not be appreciated until after the passage of many months and the happening of many great military achievements. However, it is most unfortunate that two of the great leaders of the United Nations were not present to participate in the deliberations. While the absence of Stalin and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek has been explained, nevertheless the absence of representatives of the Governments of Russia and China cannot be explained.

In determining the strategy on which this global war is to be fought, it is only proper that all the members of the United Nations should participate in the deliberations. In order that this may be accomplished, dual boards of strategy should be established. The Atlantic conference on strategy should consist of Russia, Britain, and the United States. The Pacific board of strategy should consist of China, Britain, and the United States. The members representing Britain and the United States should be the same on both boards in order that they might serve as a means of coordination, the method of cohesion, and as a force for liaison between the dual hemispheric wars. In this way not only will Russia be given her part in the determination of European war strategy, but also China would be likewise recognized and would be given the position to which she is so justly entitled in carrying out the plans for the complete conquest of Japan.

Too long have we delayed in taking China into our full confidence. For 5 years China has been conducting a single-handed fight against Japan. Unfortunately we have not been in a position to give to China all the aid which we would like or which China should have. The longer we continue to delay in providing China with the essential munitions of war and delay in establishing an effective offensive force of our own in the Pacific, the stronger becomes Japan's position on the continent of Asia. Japan is today building railroads and highways, army bases and supply depots, as well as establishing munition plants and factories. All of which will make Japan a continental power as difficult to destroy as is Germany today as a result of her complete conquest of Europe. The cost in men and materials of defeating Japan already gives promise of being extremely high, and every month we delay in taking the offensive is going to make our task more costly, more difficult, and almost insurmountable.

We must attack Japan now. We must stop Japan's development of the Asiatic Continent now. We must join with China in taking the offensive now.

Germany has been stopped in her forward advance and is now encircled by the United Nations. Our problem is to reduce the size of that circle and reconquer the vast territory of the defeated nations in Europe. Too many people, imbued with a spirit of overconfidence, are of the opinion that the complete downfall and destruction of Germany is at hand. In fact, the war against Germany may yet prove to be long and difficult. The road to Berlin will be arduous and tedious, for it can be truthfully said that in Europe we have not yet begun to fight.

Because of the attention focused on the European war by reason of the Casablanca conference we are in danger of forgetting the Pacific theater of war. Here, too, a tremendous task lies ahead. The defeat of Japan at this time would require years even were we not divided in our efforts by reason of the Atlantic theater of war. If we do not take steps now to encircle Japan as Germany is encircled and to prevent Japan's development of the continent of Asia, we will find that Japan has so developed her resources as to make her destruction three times as difficult and thrice more costly. We cannot afford to pay that price. We must give more attention to the Pacific theater of war. We must find a means of sending planes and munitions to China. The war in the Pacific must not be ignored.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak today for 10 minutes at the conclusion of any special orders that have been entered for today and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Carlos J. Benitez.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a concurrent resolution passed by the Michigan State Legislature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution from the

Brotherhood of Railroad Shop Crafts of America, Altoona Works, Local No. 42.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 10 minutes after the other special orders that have been heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

CHINA AND RUSSIA

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] has just called attention to an issue which requires our immediate consideration. A Chinese mission has been here in Washington knocking at our door since last April asking for admittance. They have been knocking at that door ever since and have not been favored with our attention. I think it is highly necessary and essential for our own welfare, for the welfare of the Chinese people, and out of consideration for the situation existing in the Orient and our relation to it that we take the Chinese into our confidence and make real partners of them as we have of the British and others.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on William McKinley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

LET'S MAKE THE FARMER A PARTNER IN THE NATION'S WAR EFFORT

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have studied the Federal-subsidy program announced by the Department of Agriculture to encourage increased production of war foods and fibers in 1943. To my regret I must express extreme disappointment at the adoption of this plan, and I shall work for its withdrawal or modification. The fault in the use of subsidies is easily noted, for this approach avoids the question of simple justice to the Nation's farmers. The farmer does not want to be a public beneficiary. He wants no left-handed subsidy based on a system which refuses to admit that he is entitled to fair compensation for his labor.

There is a direct and a simple way to achieve needed food production, and in final analysis it comes to this: Needed food production can be assured if the farmer is placed on a basis of national partnership rather than that of Government beneficiary. It is time that the administration use its authority for fixing farm prices at levels which make production profitable. When that is done, a great part of our farm problems will automatically disappear, along with the complicated regulations and bookkeeping of the present patchwork program.

Obviously, agriculture, the oldest and the largest and perhaps the most essential of the industries, has not received a just share of the national income for many years. Workers in other industries enjoy wage-hour legislation, unemployment compensation, and now the highest wages of all time. But, better returns for his crops, improved living conditions on the farm, and a measure of the security which has blessed the lives of so many Americans have been denied to the farmer. Through the years he has accepted near-starvation prices for his products. He has been forced to look to Government benefits payments for a part of his inadequate income. And now comes this crowning blow. Alone, among all the workers in America's war effort, the farmer is refused adequate compensation for his contribution. Alone, among all the workers in America's war effort, he is to be required to depend for livelihood upon a subsidy rather than fair prices. This kind of thing must not be.

Mr. Speaker, there is no lack of patriotism among farmers. Their creed is Americanism in its simplest form—love of God and love of country. They have responded patriotically to every demand, whether for great production or for great sacrifice. They are anxious to feed the millions who look to them. They will fight a good fight, but they need help. They need Nation-wide understanding and sympathetic appreciation of agriculture's problems and they need leaders who are unafraid to place in the hands of the farmer the tools he needs for the job of feeding the world.

America's decade of deliberate scarcity was ushered out with the thirties. Now the picture is altogether changed. Scarcely more than a year ago there were great surplus stocks. Food was plentiful and cheap. Now, with the exception of wheat and the shorter staples of cotton, the surpluses are gone. Already every housewife knows something of the panic that goes with real or threatened food shortage. This has taken place almost overnight, and agriculture's big job has become production—all-out, tremendous production.

To secure production there must be adequate compensation to make it possible. Returns to the producers always have had and always will have a direct bearing on production. In their efforts to control inflation, our Government overlooked the danger of establishing crop prices at or below the mounting costs of crop production. Unwittingly it contributed to a possible critical shortage of the food and fiber necessary for our armed forces, our civilian population, and our allies. There is but one satisfactory solution. Farm crop prices must be increased. Subsidies will not do the job in the American way.

I see but two roads ahead for American agriculture. The administration can use its authority for fixing farm crop prices at reasonable levels which permit fair returns, or the American public must prepare to embrace forever a system of farm benefit or subsidy payments. I fear that administration spokesmen are bound to the latter policy. Officials of the Department of Agriculture declare that subsidies to keep food prices where they are and to encourage farmers to produce those crops most needed in the war effort may well save the taxpayers money in the end. In other words, their position is that subsidies may be necessary as a war measure to prevent inflation and to secure production. Their case places undue emphasis as usual on the contribution of farm crop prices to the threat of an inflation spiral. Actually, inflation is a securely chained bugaboo if those in authority have the courage to use legislation which has been provided for its control. It is a poor excuse for keeping farm prices at present levels.

We must look beyond today's farm picture, Mr. Speaker. Even the requirements of war, however great we know them to be, must not blind us to the tasks of the future. Whatever the remedy, America's farm ills must be cured. They are not now being cured. Agriculture is too important to our way of life to permit its collapse from gradual starvation. Its problems present a challenge which will not forever accept postponement. In this great world struggle for the preservation of American ideals the American farmer must also have his chance to build his resources and strengthen his faith, and in the triumph of peace to enjoy his share in the victory.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from a Boston newspaper. I further ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address I delivered before a meet-

ing of the Rural Electric Cooperatives at St. Louis, Mo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

LET'S GET RID OF THE JAPS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in what the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] had to say. While we are all excited about the Casablanca incident, we must not overlook the fact that our permanent enemy in this world is Japan.

The Japs have been most treacherous in times of peace and are most beastly cruel in times of war. They have betrayed every confidence we have ever reposed in them. Their inhuman treatment of war prisoners is shocking to every instinct of civilization.

Whatever else may happen, remember that if our civilization is to continue to exist and if we are to drive them back and free ourselves of the humiliation they have attempted to impose upon us, we must forever drive the power of those savage apes from the face of the earth.

The American people are not going to be satisfied until Japan is destroyed.

I wish our allies in this war would give us air bases now close enough to Japan that we can blow hell out of Tokio and destroy the Japanese Empire for all time to come.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

CREATION OF A COMMITTEE ON AVIATION

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to bore you with an account of the place which aviation will play in the future economy of the United States—that, I think, is perfectly obvious. Any schoolboy will tell you that air transport will be a commonplace occurrence. Apparently, it has taken the urgency of a war to really push aviation. If I recall correctly, prior to 1914 men were flying planes sitting out in front of a contraption which looked like an egg crate. Four years of war and terrific competition saw a most outstanding development. So much of a development that in the spring of 1919, Alcock and Brown flew the Atlantic. All this progress, mind you, in 4 years.

It is quite reasonable to expect that aircraft development will follow a similar pattern due to the bitter competition for air supremacy in this war.

It is quite conceivable that a new type of motor may appear, a new type of landing gear and an entirely new conception of flying. The stories and rumors which emanate from the test grounds at Wright field would lead one to believe that there literally is no ceiling on aircraft development.

Certainly if the United States steps out into the world after the war, and I think all of us agree that such a move is part of our destiny, aircraft will be the link between the hundred and one frontiers and the homeland. Other forms of transportation will not be displaced, they will be supplemented. Obviously, ships will carry heavy cargoes, obviously freight trains will carry heavy and bulky freight, obviously automobiles will travel the highways, but over and above will fly the transport planes of the future. This is not a prophecy—this is not a guess—but an absolute certainty.

If Congress is to resume its former important place in the Government, it must take full advantage of these changes which are certain to occur. We must openly recognize the importance of air transports as an integral part of the lifeblood of the American economy. It is not too soon now to begin thinking about such changes. Time is shorter than we think. To authorize now a new standing committee on aviation is the only logical procedure for Congress to follow. It is the intelligent thing to do and we must do it not next year or the year after next, when it is too late, but now.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is a very important body and has fulfilled efficiently and well its functions. However, that group is already overworked in many categories and has its hands completely full with surface transportation. Believe me, this is no criticism of the efficiency and the capabilities of that committee, but in all fairness we cannot expect one committee to do everything, to handle legislation dealing with railroads, motor transportation, and barges is a tremendous order in itself in addition to the thousand and one other things that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee now handles. Without any question, to heap further duties, which might assume considerable proportions in a post-war period, would be riding a free horse to death and taking advantage of an exceedingly hard-working group. The supervision of aeronautics will be a field completely separate by itself, just as different from surface transportation as the dead past is from the future, and aviation should very definitely have a committee specializing in this one particular field. I sincerely hope that the House will follow the only logical, intelligent, and farsighted policy, namely, to authorize the creation of a Committee on Aviation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] for 20 minutes.

PAYMENT OF 1942 TAXES

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I presume that in common with my fellow Members a fair percentage of mail coming in from not only our own districts, but from all sections of the country, contains expressions of opinion in regard to the so-called pay-as-you-go plan of taxation. We have already heard several most scholarly explanations of the Ruml plan, and all those who have taken the opportunity of studying our colleagues' clear dissertations are familiar with the subject.

Mr. Speaker, in taking the time of the House this afternoon I propose speaking only in regard to the transition from our present form of tax payment to a current basis, which I think is puzzling to everyone and I know is puzzling to me to find a practical solution.

Section 11 of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the act of 1942, reads in pertinent part as follows:

> There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each tax year upon the net income of every individual a normal tax of 6 percent.

Section 12 contains a like provision with respect to surtaxes. I judge from this that the law definitely states that a tax is now due, although not collectible until March 15, 1943. I also know from my correspondence that it is the desire of the individual taxpayer to commence as soon as possible paying future taxes on a current basis. The query at once arises, How is such a thing possible and at the same time take care of the 1942 tax, particularly when one considers the very high rates imposed under the existing law?

In fact, the tax rates are so high that after a certain point in the rate structure is reached, 1 year's income would fall far short of paying the taxes for 2 years. I mention this to show the difficulty of collecting 2 years' taxes in 1.

There are very few individuals who are sufficiently farsighted to have set aside out of their monthly or weekly earnings a reserve for taxation, even if they had known what reserve was necessary. It must be remembered that no tax bill was given to the public until 9 months of 1942 had passed. In fact, not until October.

A further difficulty must be taken into account. The lowering of the exemptions in the 1942 law will bring in as new taxpayers a group estimated at over 7,000,000 persons. I assume that a great number of these new taxpayers are workmen and mechanics who only commenced receiving full-time jobs at good pay as a result of the war effort, and I further think that it is fair to assume that many of these people have only recently paid off private debts on account of mortgage indebtedness or living expenses. Hence, I doubt very much that even if they had had the knowledge and experience as a taxpayer, they would have had the resources with which to set up a reserve for their 1942 tax liability.

The proposed law, commonly known as pay-as-you-go out of current earnings, will probably contemplate the withholding at the source of a certain percentage of weekly or monthly wages or revenue. Where income is not so withheld, it will be incumbent on the taxpayer to make a periodic remittance to the Treasury on the taxpayer's estimated annual income for the year 1943.

The President in his recent report to the Congress stated that he would ask for additional revenue in the amount of $16,000,000,000. Hence, the people of the country may expect the tax rates to be increased, and that a further percentage of income from salary, or whatever source it may be, will go to the support of our war effort. This being the

case, it would seem utterly impossible to add to these increasing taxes, the total tax now due for the year 1942.

The answer to this problem to me is self-evident. If we cannot pay all of the taxes due for the taxpaying year of 1942 at one time on top of the 1943 current taxes, we might solve the problem by modifying the 1942 taxes and paying them in installments over a number of years.

The Treasury Department, while not having as yet offered any definite proposal, suggested that the 1942 tax burden might be eased by eliminating the low surtax brackets in estimating the 1942 individual tax liability. While I have made a number of estimates as to the percentage tax liability resultant of such procedure, I am not at present ready to offer any suggestions as to what uniform reduction in rates should be made. I am, however, ready to state that a reasonable uniform reduction of the surtax rates and the elimination of the 1942 normal tax would eliminate millions of small taxpayers, many of whom are in the armed forces, from whom it would be difficult to collect any appreciable revenue without an expense almost equivalent to the revenue collected. Naturally, in fairness and justice, any reduction of rates at the bottom should be uniformly carried through the entire rate schedule for individual incomes.

I cannot help but believe the relief afforded by this means to the new taxpayers would have a most beneficial psychological effect and would prepare the way for a prompt and willing response to any policy of withholding tax that may be inaugurated for 1943 income.

Now, let us consider what would become of the tax liability of the larger individual taxpayers with, for example, a net income of $4,000 or more, who although the 1942 tax rates have been reduced, yet will still have a tax liability for 1942. These individual income taxes will run from small amounts to the very large sums due, even under reduced rates, from the recipients of large salaries or revenue. The small taxes can undoubtedly be paid off in a rather short period, but the larger taxes, unless reserves have been set aside for the payment, will have to be paid in installments over a period of years.

I should like to digress at this moment from the consideration of taxes and tax payments to that of the national revenue. As I have stated, the President has estimated that in the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1943, it will be necessary to raise revenue by taxation and savings in the amount of about $50,000,000,000. This money will be used not only for the ordinary expenses of the Government, but principally to pay the cost price of the materials of war. I can assure my colleagues that neither the Navy Department nor the War Department nor the other expending agencies are interested whether the dollar they are spending is a 1942 tax dollar or a 1943 tax dollar. In fact, it might be a 1933 or 1934 tax dollar obtained from Federal estates taxes of estates that have elected to pay their death duties over a period of 10 years at 4 percent interest on the deferred payments as is permitted by existing law. This being the case, any arrangements we may make to permit the 1942 tax money to enter into our cash revenue system will have three effects: First, of increasing the revenue; second, the increase of revenue would offset an increase of tax rate that would be necessary to produce the amount of the 1942 tax installment cash; and third, the taxpayers' liability to the Government for the 1942 tax would be gradually liquidated.

To return again to the proposed pay-as-you-go plan and the 1942 liability. For the sake of argument let us assume that the 1942 taxpayer is permitted to pay his modified tax liability in installments over 10 years or 120 months. The question immediately arises, What if the taxpayer dies before his liability to the Government is liquidated and there is nothing in his estate upon which to levy? For example, the taxpayer may have been entirely dependent upon a salary and such estate as he may have may be in tax-exempt insurance. This contingency can be covered by insurance protection. You are all familiar with the purchase of an automobile upon the installment plan. It is quite customary for the automobile agent to add a sufficient sum to the installment payment to pay the premium on a fire and theft insurance policy in case the automobile should be stolen or destroyed prior to the completion of its purchase.

I offer a simple insurance plan as a possible solution of the perplexing problem of paying the 1942 tax. During the study I have been making of this whole subject I called upon the Veterans' Administration. I believe no officers of our Government have had a more specialized experience in insurance than they. I propounded my problem to the Assistant Administrator in charge of finance and insurance. He is confident that he can work out a simple scale of actuarial factors which can be applied for every age from the cradle to the grave. If the factor applicable to the age of the taxpayer be applied by the taxpayer to his tax liability for 1942 as modified, the annual constant installment will be determined requisite to liquidate the said taxpayer's 1942 tax in 10 years, and also to provide an insurance fund to insure the Government against any loss of revenue due to the death of an individual taxpayer prior to complete liquidation of the modified 1942 tax claim. There will also be included a low interest charge as an incentive to the taxpayer to make prepayment of his tax claim should he be in a position to do so.

To express the idea less technically, the plan proposes to permit the individual 1942 taxpayer to pay off his modified tax claim in either 10 annual or 120 monthly installments. The installment payments will be so computed that besides liquidating his tax liability they will provide a fund to insure the Treasury against any loss due to death of a taxpayer prior to complete liquidation of his indebtedness, and also pay the Treasury interest at a low rate on deferred payments. Commuted value of future installments will be provided in case of prepayment, and there is little doubt but what many of the larger individual taxpayers will take advantage of this, for the reason that they have probably been in the habit of accruing taxes to meet their tax liability, but for those of more moderate means and revenue, the burden will be greatly lightened.

It may be contended that such a plan does not put the individual taxpayer on a current basis and that he is actually paying his current taxes plus an additional sum to liquidate his 1942 modified tax liability. Such a criticism might be properly sustained if our tax rates were static. They are not; it can be almost accepted that taxes are on the increase—that what the Government needs is more actual cash revenue, and if it does not get it by picking up cash from the 1942 tax liability, it will get it by raising the tax rates to obtain the same amount of money from current taxes.

I recognize that I have drawn a picture of this proposal with very broad strokes and that there are many technical details that I have not covered. I have forborne to do so for the sake of simplicity of presentation. I do believe, however, the insured installment tax plan of liquidating the individual 1942 tax liability will permit a speedy transition to a current collection of taxes. Further, it will relieve the Treasury of a perplexing problem of collecting millions of small tax items from embarrassed taxpayers. While some relief will be granted to larger taxpayers, no "windfalls" will be possible. Last, but most important, insurance is provided against loss of revenue by death.

I hope the idea is worthy of consideration by my colleagues of the House and my experienced associates of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes.

Mr. GALE. I agree perfectly in the necessity for a pay-as-you-go plan, but does not the gentleman think that as a part of that plan, and a necessary part of it, there should be adequate provision for collecting these taxes at the source? After all, about 70 percent of income-tax payers will be people on salaries or wages, and in order to get money into the Treasury, which, after all, is pretty important to the Government, we will have to have a broad pay-roll deduction policy.

Mr. DEWEY. I thank my colleague for his question, and I thoroughly agree with him. The whole purpose is to simplify our tax system by getting on a pay-as-you-go basis so that tax revenue may be collected at the source, and immediately turned over to the Treasury. We have had experience in social security, and it would be a matter of employing virtually the same system with respect to wages and other income such as from bonds and shares of stock. As I have stated, the taxpayer could estimate his income and make monthly payments directly on account of his estimate.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he is dealing primarily with the problem of the 1942 income tax liability?

Mr. DEWEY. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And that, to go along with such pay-as-you-go plan as Congress may adopt?

Mr. DEWEY. Correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me ask the gentleman this question, if he cares to consider it at this time, and if not I shall not press the question. First, is the gentleman in favor of it, and, second, does he recommend that the income-tax liability now standing against the taxpayer on his 1942 income be remitted or canceled out or done away with entirely in any way?

Mr. DEWEY. I do not think that it is possible to cancel all of 1942 taxes. However, as I stated, I do believe, and I make no suggestion as to amount, that if we omit the normal tax for 1942 and drop down by one or two brackets the percentage on through the entire rate schedule we would thereby wipe out the tax liability of a lot of small taxpayers from whom it would be difficult to collect taxes—and that includes many men in the armed services—that would accomplish a desirable end.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And the gentleman makes that a part of his plan to handle these 1942 taxes?

Mr. DEWEY. I offer the insured installment tax plan as a suggestion to be considered by the Ways and Means Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair informs the gentleman from New Jersey that there are other special orders.

Mr. McLEAN. Notwithstanding that, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am very much interested in the approach the gentleman has taken on this subject, and I have, I believe, more faith in his particular judgment on this particular subject than perhaps that of anyone else in the House. I make this suggestion: Rather than dropping the tax liability, as far as the 1942 tax is concerned, down by percentage points, thereby giving the big taxpayer a windfall, why not make a flat exemption of possibly $200, thus wiping out all small accounts?

Mr. DEWEY. I think that is a matter that I would not want to argue here on the floor at present, because there are too many elements that go into a matter like that. I think, however, that if you are going to make any modification, it should be a flat percentage, reaching all the way through the 1942 rate schedule and not be on a dollar basis, because $200 at the bottom has an entirely different effect than $200 at the top. I believe, however, the thought deserves study.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague on the committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Carrying the "soak the rich" proposal just a step further, it might be well to have the RECORD show at this point that the so-called very rich are now paying 88 percent of their income to the Federal Government, leaving them 12 percent to pay all other costs, including State income taxes.

Mr. GALE. As I understand it, you agree with the advisability of a pay-as-you-go plan, but not quite to the extent of Mr. Ruml's plan? In other words, not of completely crossing off the 1942 obligation. Is that correct?

Mr. DEWEY. That is quite correct. I might say to my colleague that Mr. Ruml sets the tax clock ahead, completely eliminating 1942 taxes. The plan that I propose only modifies the 1942 taxes and makes them more easily collectible. When one considers that the 1942 tax bill will bring in over 7,000,000 new taxpayers who have never thought of Federal income taxes before, the cost of collection and the burden on these taxpayers will be something terrific. I would like to have the 1942 tax modification made. I do not believe in favoritism, and if you are going to modify the rate structure the modification must go to all taxpayers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman bear with me further?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have been very anxious to get into the RECORD for the benefit of my constituents advance opinions and observations of the members of the Ways and Means Committee. In view of the fact that the gentleman is a member of that committee, I want to submit this question: In that capacity and based upon your past experience in handling Government fiscal affairs as an official of the Treasury Department, do you believe that the people of this country can sanely go along with that portion of the Ruml plan which cancels out the 1942 tax liability, with the obligations we have assumed and with the commitments we have made and with the disbursements we have to meet? Do you believe that we can sanely go along with Mr. Ruml on that part of his program?

Mr. DEWEY. I would like to say to my colleague from Michigan that I have mentioned here the fact that it is revenue that the Government needs. It is cash revenue to pay the various obligations. I do not think it makes much difference what the date on the dollar is, but I hold with the gentleman that it would be bad for the morals of this country to forgive 1 year's taxes. However, I do think there should be a modification made so that they would be as little burdensome as possible.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the gentleman wants to make it possible for us to meet these obligations?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes.

Mr. McLEAN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. McLEAN. Let up assume that the 1942 taxes are evaded and that the taxpayer must pay his 1943 taxes, based upon his income for 1943, the flow of revenue to the Treasury would not be affected in any way?

Mr. DEWEY. In no way whatsoever.

Mr. McLEAN. Now, assuming that there would be a loss to the Treasury, when would that loss be felt? Is it not a fact that it would not be felt until some time long in the future, and then only gradually over several years, as the various obligors die? Therefore, would it not be so much of an advantage to the Treasury to increase the flow of revenue annually by getting on a more business-like basis and take our taxes out of current income and apply to our present situation that principle of the income tax, that the date of payment should not be so far deferred as to hazard the collection of taxes?

Mr. DEWEY. My colleague has asked me two questions. I would like to answer the first one first. The flow to the Treasury would not be interrupted. In fact, I think it would be increased and better collected when we get on a pay-as-you-go basis and withholding at the source; but I would like to say that I have suggested here an insured installment tax plan that will not lose any portion of the modified 1942 taxes. One can apply an insurance factor that will pay the taxes in case of the death of any taxpayer before the completion of his 10 annual payments, or 120 monthly payments.

Mr. McLEAN. I want to emphasize my thought, that in the consideration of this whole matter we have had in mind not losing a sou. We would like to have the Treasury have its cake and eat it too; but there are advantages to the Treasury in this change that ought not be lost sight of. There would be very great advantages to our fiscal system if we would forget about the small contingencies that might arise in the future, in comparison with the present advantages to the Treasury.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The phase of this question that concerns me is that if we do not adopt something along the line of the Ruml plan, perhaps with some modifications, you are going to drive thousands and thousands of the smaller taxpayers into the grasp of the loan sharks.

Mr. DEWEY. I agree.

Mr. KNUTSON. The loan sharks charge 2 and 3 percent per month interest under the State laws. In Minnesota they charge 3 percent. If some individual in the lower brackets were called upon to pay two taxes in 1943, that is, 1942 and 1943, during the calendar year 1943, he would have to go to some loan shark and place himself in his power.

We virtually would sell them into perpetual slavery to the loan sharks.

Mr. DEWEY. I agree with the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois be permitted to continue for 5 additional minutes, because we have taken up so much of his time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota thoroughly, that it would be quite impossible to pay 2 years' taxes in 1 year. I feel, therefore, that the modification of the rates at the bottom to relieve these new taxpayers would be very beneficial. I also want to have it fair and based on ability to pay, and on justice, to carry it straight through the rate schedule. Then if the liability of the larger taxpayers is spread over a 10-year period, supported by this insurance proposal the Treasury will be protected against loss of money through death of the taxpayer.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The gentleman from Illinois is such a student of finance that I hate to get into a discussion with him, but he has presented a matter that constitutes a problem for all of us; that is, what to do with the 1942 tax liability. This is going to be the issue that will have to be decided in the Ways and Means Committee; there is no question about it.

We can use the 1942 tax liability as a basis for 1943 taxes and the Treasury will not lose substantial revenue if it loses any revenue whatever.

The gentleman's proposal, as I understand it, is to reduce the income-tax collection for 1942, 19 percentage points, 6 percent normal and 13-percent surtaxes.

Mr. DEWEY. I do not recommend any particular percentage, but that in general was what I had in mind.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is the thought the gentleman had in mind. We all know that a number of taxpayers will be current; there is no question about that, if we increase the 1943 rates about 5 percent; but a reduction of 6 percent normal and 13-percent surtaxes on the 19-percent bracket income taxpayers makes a windfall for the 88-percent-bracket taxpayer just as much as the Ruml plan so far as windfalls are concerned; so I think we shall have to watch that at the same time.

Mr. DEWEY. It has never entered my mind that it should apply unfairly to the poor or to the so-called rich. I should like to see a full consideration of the question of method of payment.

What the Government needs now is cash revenue. I believe an insured installment plan will liquidate the 1942 situation. The 1942 tax situation must be so disposed of that it will not be a subject for discussion in the future.

I do not consider that which we are required to pay as being taxation. We are all willing to pay to support our country in time of war, but I do not call it taxation. Rather it is the obligation of the citizens to their country to give all they possibly can; and they do it willingly, but one would scarcely call it a tax system.

In order that we can supply the revenue our country needs, let us move in the direction of bringing ourselves to a current system of pay-as-you-go and collect-at-the-source. At the same time let us modify and pay in some way that will be fair and equitable the 1942 liability. If we do not pay this liability it means we shall have to increase the rates in 1943 to pick up the money we did not get which should have come out of 1942 taxes.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Providing there is a loss in collections for 1943 taxes over 1942; that is the only difference. Many of us seem to forget that these taxpayers have been paying taxes in 1942 out of 1942 income but on a 1941 tax liability. The tax on last year's salary is not paid out of last year's earnings but out of this year's earnings. We must find some way to establish this new system whereby the 1942 tax liability will not be wiped out or that revenue lost to the Government. It could be spread over the years 1943, 1944, and 1945. That would take care of the larger taxpayers and the estates.

As to the insurance suggestion I do not believe I could go along with it, for it places an additional liability on the taxpayer, not only the liability of paying 1943 tax liability in 1943 but added to that is an insurance premium.

Mr. DEWEY. He pays a very small additional charge as an insurance premium and his family is protected against claims of the Treasury for his unpaid balance.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I realize that, but it is an additional burden.

[Here the gavel fell.]

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which impressed me as being one of the most concise analyses of the lend-lease situation that has been published, an article by Walter Lippmann.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Mr. Keller, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, relative to the pay-as-you-go tax plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I may be allowed to proceed for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include Senator Vest's tribute to a dog.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, almost everybody loves a dog. Anytime I find a man, woman, or child who does not love a dog, I become suspicious of them, and anytime I find the average dog that takes an immediate dislike to somebody—of course, after due smell to satisfy his curiosity—then I am immediately suspicious of that person.

What the late Senator George Vest said in his immortal address about dogs is all too true. In my extension of remarks, I ask to include his speech at this point.

#### DEFENSE OF THE DOG

Gentlemen of the jury: The best friend a man has in the world may turn against him and become his enemy. His son or daughter that he has reared with loving care may prove ungrateful. Those who are nearest and dearest to us, those whom we trust with our happiness and our good name may become traitors to their faith. The money that a man has he may lose. It flies away from him, perhaps, when he needs it most. A man's reputation may be sacrificed in a moment of ill-considered action. The people who are prone to fall on their knees and do us honor when success is with us may be the first to throw the stone of malice when failure settles its cloud upon our heads. The one absolutely unselfish friend that man can have in this selfish world, the one that never deserts him, the one that never proves ungrateful or treacherous, is his dog. A man's dog stands by him in prosperity and poverty, in health and sickness. He will sleep on the cold ground where the wintry winds blow and the snow drives fiercely, if only he may be near his master's side. He will kiss the hand that has no food to offer; he will lick the wounds and sores that come in encounter with the roughness of the world. He guards the sleep of his pauper master as if he were a prince. When all other friends desert, he remains. When riches take wings and reputation falls to pieces, he is as constant in his love as the sun in its journey through the heavens.

If fortune drives the master forth an outcast in the world, friendless and homeless, the faithful dog asks no higher privilege than that of accompanying him, to guard against danger, to fight against his enemies, and when the last scene of all comes, and death takes the master in its embrace, and his body is laid away in the cold ground, no matter if all other friends pursue their way, there by the graveside will the noble dog be found, his head between his paws, his eyes sad, but open in alert watchfulness, faithful and true even in death.

Mr. Speaker, I have a dog—a little white and liver Springer Spaniel—that I have had for almost the entire 10 years of his life. He is a splendid hunting dog and has been a great companion of mine through all these years. He has flown with me for hundreds of hours through the air; has hunted with me each fall and I can honestly confess that at one

time he actually helped save my life. I think a lot of that dog and, therefore, I was much upset several weeks ago when that dog disappeared on New Year's Day on his customary morning run. I advertised constantly for 2 weeks, not only in the four daily papers in the District, but likewise in two of the colored weekly papers. His disappearance was broadcast over the radio on several occasions and I am sincerely appreciative of the cooperation I received from all of these several avenues of information.

I am very glad to say that 2 weeks to a day after my dog disappeared, I received a telephone call late at night from a doctor and his wife who had located the dog 12 miles from the Capital down along the shores of the Potomac and who identified him by a name tag attached to his leather harness. When I recovered the dog, he was a pitiful sight to behold and indeed it took almost a week in a veterinary hospital to pull him through and restore him to health.

During the time my dog was gone, I made inquiry into the laws of the District, into the laws of the several States, and into our Federal laws, which might afford some protection to these poor animals in the future.

After all, Mr. Speaker, we in the District, we in my home State of Michigan, and in practically every State of the Union, are required to pay a license fee or a dog tax in order to keep a dog. I have been told on good authority that in the District of Columbia, for instance, the taxpayers last year paid approximately $70,000 in dog taxes. Just what does the taxpayer get in return for that expenditure? I was amazed to find that there are very few modern statutes on the books which give these tax-paid dogs or their owners in the District any protection. Consequently, I am introducing legislation today seeking to afford some measure of protection.

It is perfectly true that in the District of Columbia, as elsewhere, an unlicensed dog is subject to being picked up and being deposited in the pound, and by statute that dog is, after a reasonable length of time, subject to disposal. We have such a pound in the District of Columbia; and may I say at this time that I think the District of Columbia should congratulate itself on the splendid manner in which that pound is being conducted, and the people of the District should pride themselves on the sincerity, the industry, and the ability of its poundmaster and his assistants. I just previously stated that the District collected approximately $70,000 in dog taxes last year. Of this sum, the District fathers generously appropriated approximately $16,000 for the operation of the pound and its designated duty of picking up stray dogs. Almost one-quarter of this generous appropriation is returned to the District treasury by the poundmaster through the sale or return of dogs which have been thus acquired, after he has been fully satisfied that the proper owners have redeemed their dogs and paid their proper license charges and other fees, or after he has been satisfied that the dogs will not be thus reclaimed and that a proper new home has been found for the animal.

But, Mr. Speaker, while my dog Curley was gone I was amazed to find that there are very few laws on the books giving the properly constituted police authorities in the District an even break to cope with the problem of lost dogs. I was amazed, and very much disturbed, to learn that there is a widespread racket prevalent in the District of Columbia, and prevalent in many States of this country, and especially is it virulent along the eastern seaboard. I learned from indisputable evidence that, unfortunately, there are at large in the District of Columbia and elsewhere those who will deliberately steal a dog and hold him for ransom, if you please; those who will pick up a dog and watch for advertisements with the word "reward" appended thereto, and who then mysteriously find the dog that has been missing. There are those who make a practice of stealing dogs for transportation to other cities for disposal through so-called dealers in pets, and, perhaps worst of all, there are those all over the Nation who make a habit of stealing hunting dogs, transporting them hundreds of miles across State lines, and then disposing of them as trained hunting dogs through surreptitious advertisements in the smaller sporting publications. These—perhaps the worst of the lot—advertise trained hunting dogs at nominal prices and dispose of these stolen valuable hunting dogs at absurdly low figures.

There is a second class of devastators of dogs that I think we ought to deal with and that is the hit-run driver. In most States outside the District of Columbia it is a crime for a person to injure a dog by means of an automobile or otherwise and then inhumanly fail to give that dog proper assistance or at least report the facts to the proper authorities. A person who will hit and injure a dog and then drive away is the type of person who would just as soon hit-run an individual. There is one third type that we must cope with and that is the dastardly inhuman individual who will set out poison for a dog. That inconsequential inhuman being, in his own ignorance, apparently does not realize that there are such treasures as little children in the world, and in his stupidity fails to realize that a young child is curious and will put most things into its mouth.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills which I hope will be speedily reported by the proper committes and which I think will adequately cope with the above-named situations.

The first bill I have introduced, I hope and expect will be assigned to the District of Columbia Committee, because it deals specifically with the problem within the District. It is a very simple bill which I can briefly describe, as follows: It provides for a penalty in the form of a maximum fine of $100 or a jail sentence of 90 days, or both, for anyone who harbors a dog without the owner's consent and who does not report that dog with its complete description, together with his own name and address and telephone number, if any, to the District poundmaster within a period of 48 hours. It provides a similar penalty for anyone who injures a dog by means of an automobile or anything else and who does not stop or administer such help as possible, and who fails to report the circumstance together with the description of the animal, and his name and address, to a regular police officer of the District. It provides further that a maximum fine of $300 or imprisonment for 90 days be levied against anyone convicted of setting out poison.

I have introduced a second bill today which I assume will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which would make it a Federal offense for anyone to transport across State lines any licensed dog that has knowingly been stolen and provides a penalty for anyone who shall knowingly buy such a dog. Mr. Speaker, I think that every person in this country, and everyone in the District of Columbia, who has any regard for a dog should certainly join me in working for the speedy enactment of these two pieces of legislation. Dog owners have a right to expect a proper sense of protection for their dogs, otherwise we have no right to tax them for the privilege of owning a dog; and those who would traffic in stolen dogs merit just condemnation and just penalties.

In conclusion, may I say two things. I think one of the surest ways of providing perfectly humane and adequate identification, as a means of protecting dogs, is through the process of tattooing them on the inside of the ear. This is absolutely painless and can be done at a very low cost. Most valuable dogs are proudly registered by their owners with the American Kennel Club, which serves as the clearinghouse for registered dogs in this country, and which keeps a record of the pedigrees of such registered dogs. My dogs are having their American Kennel Club register number tattooed on the inside of their ears. I recommend it to others. It is a very prevalent practice in Canada. And lastly, may I commend to all of you your support for, and your approval of, the admirable work being carried on in the District of Columbia and all over the country by the various civic-minded, humanely minded private or semipublic organizations, who seek the proper and humane protection of the dumb animals, such as the Animal Rescue League, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, The Tail-waggers, and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate that this Nation is at war. Our primary thoughts must be directed toward the successful prosecution of this war. This legislation should require no debate, should not command any appreciable amount of time on the part of any Member of this House, nor of any committee of this House. The dog is playing his full part in this war, and as to verification of that I respectfully refer you to the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. The dog played a valuable part in the last war. The dog and the dog owners who willingly give up those dogs

to the service, whenever acceptable, are doing their part in the winning of this war. Those valuable animals deserve the protection offered by these bills and likewise those dogs, just as human beings, who are physically incapable of filling their niche in the war program still have the right to the protection offered by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that in behalf of both of these bills I may have the unanimous support of this House in behalf of our true friends—our best friends—who cannot speak for themselves, who cannot vote for themselves—your dog and my dog.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a speech I made and an address made by Paul A. Strachan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include a letter and in the other to include a short statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] earlier in the afternoon mentioned a new subsidy proposal which was recently announced by the Secretary of Agriculture. I desire at this time to further discuss that proposal as well as our entire subsidy policy as far as it pertains to subsidies which are designed to keep down the prices of farm products.

I feel that this is of the greatest immediate importance in connection with our efforts to produce an adequate food supply and is fully as important from the standpoint of our future agricultural economy.

I refer particularly to those subsidies designed to keep down the prices of agricultural commodities which are being put into effect without any discussion or consideration of the matter by the Congress.

For the purpose of this discussion I want to refer to two kinds of subsidies—one, the subsidies which have been paid in the past under legislation authorized by Congress for the purpose of making up a part of the difference between farm prices in the market place and what Congress has determined to be fair or parity prices. Tied up with these subsidies have been programs of production control and soil conservation.

The second type of subsidy has come into the picture only recently. It has been made necessary in the main by reason of price ceilings placed upon agricultural products by the O. P. A. and its ostensible purpose is to encourage production. This type of subsidy has not to my knowledge been authorized by Congress either directly or indirectly, with the exception that the Secretary of Agriculture has been given authority to give assurances to farmers that in the cases of some commodities a certain minimum price will be maintained for the commodity during the war and for a certain period thereafter.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman knows that when the new Administrator of the Price Administration took office he was quoted in the press as stating that it was the intent of Congress in passing the Price Control Act that an administration should be set up for the protection of the consumer. He made that very clear. I am wondering by what authority the Secretary of Agriculture is given this authority which the gentleman has just mentioned and if the Secretary of Agriculture abandons the protection of the producer and his prices, who is going to speak for them?

Mr. HOPE. I think the gentleman's observations are very much in point and I am in entire accord with what he has just stated.

The authority to which I was referring when I yielded to the gentleman from South Dakota has been exercised in the case of some commodities through Government purchases at the minimum price, a good illustration being the purchase and resale of oil-bearing crops by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This operation, of course, would not have been necessary except for the low ceilings placed upon fats and oils by the O. P. A. If the prices of fats and oils had been permitted to rise naturally, the price of all oil-bearing agricultural products would have gone above the minimum price and no government purchases would have been needed. In the operation just mentioned the procedure followed was for the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase the product at the minimum price and then immediately resell it to processors at a lower price based upon the O. P. A. ceiling on fats and oils. The ultimate effect, of course, was the payment of a subsidy to the producer by the Federal Government.

In other instances subsidies have been paid outright. Such a subsidy is now in effect on Cheddar cheese. For a time subsidies of this type were being paid to milk producers in the New York City and one or two other milksheds. This subsidy, however, has now been abandoned.

Earlier this week the Secretary of Agriculture announced a program involving the payment of $100,000,000 in Federal subsidies to the producers of certain crops which are badly needed in connection with the war effort, the crops involved being sweetpotatoes, soybeans, grain sorghums, peanuts, flax, and dried peas.

This subsidy will be paid directly to farmers, not on all of his acreage of the crop in question but upon that part of his acreage above 90 percent and less than 110 percent of the goal assigned to the farm in question.

At the present time the House Committee on Agriculture has before it for consideration a bill setting up the machinery by which all of the peanut crop of the United States is to be handled through a Government agency to the exclusion of private dealers and handlers in order that producers of the crop may be subsidized. This is essentially the same operation which was used by the Commodity Credit Corporation during the past crop year in connection with the soybean and flaxseed crops. In each case the Government becomes the sole handler of the commodity, and marketing through any other agency is prohibited.

With the exception previously mentioned by which the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to fix minimum prices on certain products, there has been no consideration by Congress of these various types of subsidies, nor does it appear that there is any authority for putting the same into effect unless it is contained in some of the sweeping powers given the President under the national defense program. Assuming that those powers do exist, I think it is safe to say that they are being exercised in a manner not contemplated by the Congress at the time they were granted.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress now because I believe it is high time that congressional consideration be given the matter of whether agricultural prices are going to be permitted to rise in accordance with wages and other prices or whether a permanently lower price level is to be established for agricultural products, supplemented in times like these by subsidies paid out of the Federal Treasury. The subject is of vital importance to everyone and particularly so to those who are dependent, directly or indirectly, upon agriculture for their livelihood. There can be little doubt but what we are going to have a higher price level after the war. This will be necessary in order to discharge the war indebtedness.

It is almost as certain that the level of wages will remain practically as high as it is at present in the post-war period. That was our experience after the last war at a time when labor had nothing like the organization it has now. If, through the use of subsidies, the level of farm prices is kept below the cost of production and below a fair price ratio with other commodities and wages, the disparity between farm prices and other prices which has existed ever since World War No. 1 will be further increased. On the other hand, if subsidies are eliminated and the price of agricultural products permitted to rise in harmony with the wages of labor in industry and the price of other commodities, we can hope for the maintenance of a fair balance between agricultural prices and other prices after the war. We know from experience what happens when we destroy the fair relationship between farm prices and other prices. Loss of buying power on the part of our farm population is bound to result in industrial unemployment and bread lines.

There are other important issues involved. One I have already mentioned. That is whether in the case of some commodities, like oil-bearing products, the Federal Government should become the sole handler of the commodity.

Another vital question is whether in a time of prosperity the taxpayers, either now or in the future, should be called upon to pay subsidies to consumers. All of the subsidies under consideration are subsidies to consumers, although not considered as such by consumers, and in the public mind they are bound to be charged up to agriculture. Is it sound fiscal policy to pay these subsidies out of borrowed money for the benefit of consumers at a time when the greatest threat to inflation is a so-called inflationary gap of unused purchasing power? Why shouldn't consumers devote some of this purchasing power to paying a fair price for farm products now rather than having this amount added to the public debt and loaded on the shoulders of future taxpayers? Looking at it from the standpoint of inflation, isn't it much less inflationary to pay as we go rather than to pile up the public debt through these subsidies? There is a particular reason why these questions should be considered by Congress now. That is because farmers must know now and not next summer what they can depend upon. This subsidy program has been worked out without any authority by Congress and without congressional consideration. However, in the case of the direct subsidies, Congress is going to have to provide the money. The chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. CANNON] is quoted in the daily press as stating that Congress will not appropriate the $100,000,000 required for the subsidy program announced by the Secretary of Agriculture earlier in the week.

This afternoon he has again expressed his opposition to the proposal and in this he has been joined by the ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I believe that the sentiment of Congress is in accord with the views expressed by these gentlemen. Whether it is or not, the matter should be submitted to Congress now for its consideration. Farmers are not going to go into the subsidy program, and should not be asked to go into it, until there is assurance that the money will be provided. Congress has never passed upon the question of paying subsidies for the purpose of keeping prices down. This question should not be decided by officials in the executive branch of the Government. It involves matters of fundamental governmental policy which should be passed upon by Congress. I am not suggesting at this time the procedure to be followed except to suggest to the executive branch of the Government that it take no further steps in this matter until there is an opportunity for Congress to act.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I would like to make just one observation. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, of which the gentleman speaking is also a member, I feel that the majority of that committee agrees exactly with what the gentleman has said.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. First, I want to congratulate the gentleman for what I think is an outstanding and appropriate statement at this particular moment. To bring this thing right up to the snubbing post, can the gentleman inform the House whether or not the Department of Agriculture, responsible for this new program, now has within its hands the money with which to proceed to pay these subsidies, or must it come to the House for appropriations?

Mr. HOPE. It is my understanding that the Department expects to ask the Congress to appropriate the money. I think the Secretary of Agriculture has made a statement to that effect.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was not informed of that. If they have to come here for the appropriations, we can, we should, and we must do something about it; but if they have the funds in their hands by reason of an appropriation previously made, perhaps they can bull this thing through for the time being.

Mr. HOPE. It is my understanding that they will have to ask for the funds. Some of the subsidies I have discussed can, of course, be provided by existing appropriations to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation, but the particular one announced by the Secretary recently requires a direct appropriation from the Treasury, as I understand.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The President's Budget message and the Budget showed that $1,018,000,000 is to be provided for Government subsidies to agriculture. Certainly, that must be appropriated by the House of Representatives or the money cannot be had.

May I also make the observation that in my judgment the asking of these large subsidies for the agricultural interests of the country is a confession of guilt on the part of this Government that the farmers have not been treated fairly.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is the ranking minority member on the Committee on Agriculture and has given the benefit of his experience to the Members of the House for many months on this very subject. May I ask the gentleman if the Committee on Agriculture, knowing that the farmers of the country are not so much in favor of subsidies but want what their crops are worth, has given any consideration to studying measures to do by direct legislation what you are trying to do indirectly through subsidies; that is, to give the farmer the average cost of production with a fair profit, eliminating this vicious subsidy program which is hanging over the head of the farmer all the time? All the farmer wants is cost of production plus a fair profit.

Mr. HOPE. I may say to the gentleman that bills along that line will probably be introduced in this session of Congress. They have been introduced in previous Congresses. I do not think it is necessary at this time to enact legislation to enable the farmers to receive parity prices if the O. P. A. will simply adjust its ceilings in accordance with the legislation passed by Congress.

The trouble is that the O. P. A., disregarding the laws of Congress, is now putting price ceilings on certain farm products at levels which are below the cost of production and by reason of which it is impossible to get the needed production of those products.

Mr. STEFAN. There is no trouble involved in figuring parity?

Mr. HOPE. No; we have a formula for figuring parity.

Mr. STEFAN. Can the average cost of production be figured out?

Mr. HOPE. I think that can be arrived at; yes.

Mr. STEFAN. If that is true, why does not the O. P. A. in putting a ceiling on farm prices put those prices at cost of production plus a fair profit, instead of going into the intricate matter of subsidies, which are obnoxious to most farmers?

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is addressing that question to me, but I cannot tell him why the O. P. A. does not do it.

Mr. STEFAN. In the gentleman's address on yesterday he indicated his belief that the O. P. A. is doing something illegal in fixing farm prices below parity.

Mr. HOPE. That is true.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the gentleman's solution of the problem? Would the gentleman suggest that the O. P. A. set a fair price for the farmer, with a bottom on those prices, and that subsidies be eliminated?

Mr. HOPE. I say that if Congress refuses to appropriate money for subsidies the O. P. A. and the Food Administration will be forced to permit farm prices to rise to a point where farmers can afford to produce the needed quantities. That is all we need for the present.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Does the gentleman feel, then, that it would be a misappropriation for the Department of Agriculture to use money that has been appropriated for the A. A. A. benefit payments to pay for incentive payments or subsidy payments along the lines of the recent announcement?

Mr. STEFAN. But this is in addition to the A. A. A. payments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

GOVERNMENT REPORTS AND QUESTIONNAIRES

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-seventh Congress, after considerable study of the problems created by the wave of Government reports and questionnaires now swamping American free enterprise, late in the last session enacted Public Law No. 813, known as the Federal Reports Act of 1942. This act directed the Bureau of the Budget to investigate Government methods of collecting statistics and information, and to coordinate and simplify these collection methods.

Certainly this action was a move in the right direction, resulting from a real desire to relieve American enterprise from the deplorable burdens with which it is now saddled. My only criticism of that law is that Congress failed to go far enough, and to act positively enough in the matter. The executive agencies are, in my opinion, still allowed too great discretionary authority to harass and burden the American people.

The existing act suggests that information and statistics be gathered by simplified methods through a single coordinating agency. I agree with that suggestion fully, but I believe we have an agency much better fitted for the job. I believe, also, that Congress should make the simplification and coordination specific and mandatory. Therefore, I urge your support of the proposal I am offering today requiring the Department of Commerce to be the sole agency for the collection and coordination of Government reports and questionnaires.

Self-important little bureaucrats in a dozen different Washington agencies have been running riot in red tape and so overburdening business with paper work that thousands of enterprises simply will not be able to keep up with the demands. A certain percentage of business may be prosperous enough to afford the added costs, but they cannot possibly find the additional personnel to handle all this unnecessary work. The greater portion of American business certainly cannot afford this extra work, even if additional help could be found to handle it. The larger firms may devise ways to struggle along under the burden; but thousands of smaller concerns, already hard-pressed to survive the serious trouble confronting them in the emergency, are simply being driven out of business.

And all this has been happening by the most flagrant abuses of administrative law. The worst offenders among the guilty Federal agencies are interpreting laws in devious ways never remotely intended by the Congress which passed them; and issuing orders and directives to which they are actually attempting to give the force and effect of criminal law. The poor, harassed businessman who finds it impossible to comply with executive demands may actually find himself threatened with criminal prosecution.

All of this has led to almost criminal wastes of time, money, and, worst of all, manpower; and a shameful invasion of private rights. It is high time that Congress issue positive orders, not mere suggestions to the Executive.

We already have in the Bureau of the Census the largest statistical agency in the world, completely staffed and equipped to handle all the fact-finding work necessary to any problem of administration. The job of Government reporting can be turned over to this agency with many real benefits.

In the first place, this agency, realistically administered, will find that at least half of the information now being regularly demanded by little bureaucrats is unnecessary, and that it is uncoordinated and unused after it has been gathered at great expense to business and the Government. In the second place, if the mountains of information already on hand were coordinated, I believe it can be shown that much of the really necessary information is already available right here in Washington, where it is collecting cobwebs and dust in file batteries and storage lofts, forgotten by the bureaucrats who sweated it out of the American people. Finally, by clearing all fact-finding through this single agency, all the duplication of reporting which now haunts American business could be eliminated.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Well of this House a fervent appeal was made to the new Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress. It was stated in that appeal that we new Members just came from the touch and thought of the people and that we were expected to revitalize the strength and fortitude of the Members who because of their small number were impotent in their efforts to continue with constitutional government and keep America American.

I cannot speak for all of the new Members, but I can speak, and speak frankly, for myself, even though I may violate the traditions of decorum in my sincere efforts to convey my observations and opinions of what the good people of the Fourteenth District of Ohio were thinking when they unseated a man of professional power and long membership in this House by sending me here.

My people are crying for relief from the weight of a strong centralized governmental yoke. They are asking, yea, even praying, that this Government stop policing their patriotism with thousands of snoopers and tycoons of totalitarianism who harass them and eat out their substance.

I have been here but 1 month and I notice that many Members take this floor every day and recite at length the injustices that are heaped upon the people whom they represent. One day it is the dairy industry, another day it is the wheat farmer, another day it is the small businessman, and then the landlord, and so on through every strata of American life. Nothing is being done to encourage them that relief is anywhere in sight.

It is not my purpose to point a finger of criticism at our President. He appears to be assuming all of the responsibility that was intended that he have under the Constitution and much in addition thereto. If he has any powers above and beyond what this House believes he should have, then the Congress of the United States is alone to blame.

I appreciate that many in this House may feel inclined to rise and defend themselves as opposing acts by this House that have generously given up of the powers that belong here. Gentlemen, you have not given up your powers and the people at home are fully aware of it. They know that past Congresses have abdicated both their power and responsibility. That is why that each time many of the Members of this House come up for reelection without the support of a very popular President, from 60 to 80 are retired to private life.

This House and its Members are under the scrutiny of a hostile electorate. We must stand on our own feet. Under article I, sections 3 and 7 of the Constitution of the United States, the Congress has the power to limit the number of employees and impeach those who do not follow the law as prescribed by this Congress.

Past Congresses have tried the blank-check process and the people are sorely distressed from its effect. Congress has tried the appeasement process to avoid pressure and adverse propaganda from the predatory power seekers, and 107 Members were hung higher than a kite last November. No, sir, gentlemen; we are all on our own and the people are not wasting patience. We had better streamline this Congress and recapture, and exert, the powers that are rightfully ours in behalf of our people. They will make every sacrifice necessary in the war effort, including the blood of their boys, but they are demanding immediate relief from control by a lot of bureaucratic buncombe over their personal lives.

I sit in the office to which my people elected me, and am overwhelmed by our slowness to remedy admitted wrongs. I receive at my office each day a Federal Register with 100 pages of orders and directives that either result from powers granted by the Congress, or a usurpation of the powers that belong to us.

If this Congress does not restrict or prescribe the definite use of the money we appropriate for the next fiscal year, we may as well give the bureaucrats a blank check for $117,000,000,000 and all go home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE LEND-LEASE PROGRAM

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I have been forced to make the discussion on lend-lease this afternoon because of the impending hearing tomorrow on the extension of the lend-lease bill. It came a little sooner than I had anticipated. However, I want to give the preliminary report, some of which I have verified, and some of the original report which I will continue to verify in coming days. Because of the importance of getting some of this information before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the subcommittee on appropriations that will consider the $7,000,000,000 of additional lease-lend appropriations, I make this preliminary report this afternoon.

Several days ago by chance it came to my attention that lease-lend had been forced upon some countries that did not want lease-lend in the first place. In other words, the dollars of our taxpayers, earned by their sweat and toil, are being forced upon countries which want to remain financially independent.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that nations which have not asked for money are being told that they should come and get it?

Mr. JONES. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is in his right mind, is he not? Is that possible?

Mr. JONES. I say to the gentleman from Michigan that I was as shocked with the report that was made to me as he is now. I was so shocked that I disregarded the rest of the statement and the rest of the story.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. JONES. I attempted to verify, by the best means possible, whether the charges made are absolutely true. I contacted the Lease-Lend Administration and did not get any satisfaction. Then I contacted the Congressional Library, thinking that perhaps their Legislative Reference Service would not have in it the rancor of partisanship, and that they might have that information. They too were denied the information and said no such arrangement existed. Then today, just before coming on the floor of the House, I learned through the Legislative Reference that they had found a publication entitled "The Bermuda Gazette and Colonist," for the issue of October 22, where the charges are substantially verified. I yield now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman was on the floor the other day when the Member from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] told about how impossible it is for his constituents to get meat up in the city of Brooklyn. The gentleman has been on the floor, and has listened to these other Members of the House when they have told how their people are short on fodder, on milk, on meat, on bacon, on canned goods. Does the gentleman mean that these other foreign countries are asking for and getting those things when we cannot get them?

Mr. JONES. Let me read to you from the issue of October 22 of the Bermuda Colonist, which was established in 1856, and I presume is a reliable newspaper, or the Congressional Library would not take it.

Mr. RANKIN. Where is it published?

Mr. JONES. In Bermuda.

Mr. RANKIN. The Bermuda Islands?

Mr. JONES. Yes. I hold in my hand a photostat of the issue of October 22, and the issue of October 20; in the October 20 issue, which has the same cap head, and apparently is the same paper as the October 22 issue from which I will quote. It says—

Hamilton, Bermuda, Tuesday, October 20, 1942.—

A Bermuda purchasing commission came to the United States some time before October 20 last year. They went back, and the matter in this publication is a report of that Bermuda purchasing commission. Mr. Tucker, apparently a member of the commission and probably a member of the general assembly, made the following report:

"I hope," he said, "to give the house some more detailed information in regard to shipping at a later stage of this discussion, when I shall move that the house go into secret session."

He referred to lend-lease, and stressed that the house had not been committed.

I quote further:

"I should like to assure the public," he declared, "that there is nothing mysterious about lend-lease, and that no secret commitments of any sort exist."

How different from the method of procedure of our Foreign Affairs: Months after commitments have been made by our executive departments we learn what has happened, sometimes many months afterward. Continuing the quotation:

"No one country," he added, "at the moment was bearing its contribution to the war effort in the form of dollars or sterling." It was simply a matter at the present time of gathering together all essential supplies and allocating them where they would do the most good. "I feel," he said, "that the committee did everything in its power to present Bermuda's case vigorously and accurately. We stressed the fact that Bermuda liked to be financially independent. We stated that for that reason the house of assembly had been adverse to the principle of lend-lease. We met with a courteous reception of our problem. We received attention and every consideration possible, but in the final analysis it resolved itself into the situation where, in my opinion, if we wish certain supplies we must get them through the lend-lease procedure."

I think this is enough to lay the foundation for the Foreign Affairs Committee to investigate, before any new bill extending the present lease-lend law is reported to the House. Why should we not know exactly what is intended by lease-lend? I think every Member of the House had the impression that lease-lend was for the purpose of helping to win the war. If you will look at the fifth report of the President under lease-lend, you will find agreements between the United States and foreign countries as a result of the lease-lend law, which project themselves far into the future, long after the war is over, committing our country to a policy long after arms are laid down. I suggest that you look at the fifth lease-lend report and the succeeding reports, and find how far from our general impressions that law is being administered. We have little idea of what is being done under the basic law that was passed in 1941, and have little conception of what is intended or being done every day without our knowledge.

In October 1941 I called the attention of the House to the fact that there was no prohibition in the lease-lend law or in the rules and regulations of the lease-lend administration that airplanes that we have built with our genius would not be used after this war is ended to bend our people down by competition with our own products, so that we cannot compete in world trade, because we have given of our toil and sweat.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] a moment ago referred to the fact that while these arrangements were being made the people in New York were hungry. On yesterday, I believe it was, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] pointed out the fact that the trouble in New York has been that certain labor racketeers have stood guard at the gates of the city and demanded tribute on every truckload of produce that the farmers of the West and South shipped into New York. That is a tariff. That is where the word "tariff" came from; the port of Tarifa. That is where this tariff racketeering began years ago, probably 100 or 150 years ago. So they demanded a tariff or tribute on every truckload of material that the farmers send in there. Now, since we can only get a small amount of rubber to supply our trucks, the farmers of the country do not feel it incumbent upon them to ship this material to New York City and take the risk and then be robbed at the city gates on every truckload.

Mr. JONES. Now, continuing the discussion on lease-lend——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Along the line the gentleman was speaking, I know there was a great deal in the press several months ago to indicate that our Government was asking these other nations to make known their wants; that we had an ample supply of everything; but I had thought that since a scarcity developed in this country and since our own people were put on rations, that practice had ended and that now we were only giving to those who conceived themselves to be in need, without any prompting from the doers of good.

Mr. JONES. I would say that the Congressional Library Legislative Reference Service reported to me yesterday afternoon that it was absolutely denied that there was any such arrangement as I have reported on Bermuda in any shape or form.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I call attention also to the fact that Bermuda is an ally of ours in this war.

Mr. JONES. I am glad to have the gentleman's contribution, but why should we object if Bermuda, by action of its general assembly, wishes to remain financially independent; wishes to take its place in the stature of the United Nations in helping to win this war? Why should we force upon her the sweat and toil and tears of our American people, if Bermuda wants to continue themselves, as the report indicates?

Mr. RANKIN. Do you mean to say they were able to buy this material and pay for it?

Mr. JONES. I mean to say that they were averse to receiving lease-lend.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that as far as I am individually concerned, where any of our allies is able to buy material and pay for it, and is willing to do so, I am certainly anxious to see them do it.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It seems to me that that is common sense. It seems to me that that makes them better partners in bearing their share of the burden.

Mr. RANKIN. But at the same time we are fighting a war in both oceans, and if we are able to send material to our allies who are doing the fighting, and thereby probably save the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys, I want it distinctly understood that I am in favor of carrying out that policy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We can go along with that, all right, but when the gentleman says they have the money with which to buy it and want to buy it and do not want to be classed as charity patients, that is a different proposition. When we are all getting letters, as we are—and I am sure the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is getting letters of that kind, too, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]—where mothers are writing in wanting to know if we cannot change this regulation so that they may send packages to the boys, and are told that they cannot do it because of transportation space, and then we hear that cargoes of beer and other things are being shipped out, it does not just seem right. I have difficulty in explaining to my constituents that that is the right sort of practice. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio can tell us of things of that class that have been sent across in some of these transport vessels, where our mothers were denied the privilege of sending packages to their boys. I wish the gentleman would tell us about some of those things, if he has knowledge of them—things like silk garments and powder puffs, and things like that.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Do we understand that the position of Bermuda is that this is as much their war as it is our war, and they have the notion that it is as much their business to take care of their people as it is our business to take care of our people, and that they do not want to be in the attitude before the world of panhandling this country?

Mr. JONES. I think the gentleman's observation is entirely correct.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Are we not fighting this war as much as the people in Bermuda and are they not as much interested in winning the war as we are?

Mr. JONES. I should think so. I think there is a good deal of dignity in their position.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not get the slant myself that in this World War we are the only people who have any interest in having it won.

Mr. JONES. In connection with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan in regard to the shipment of nondefense items, that question came up a few days ago and I learned that there were several thousand cases of beer, and rayon hose, and powder puffs shipped and transportation paid for with lease-lend funds. I understand, from talking with the Lease-Lend Administration that they claim to have been reimbursed for these transportation charges.

Further than that, I am told on reliable authority that the shipments of these nondefense articles, the rayon hose, the beer, the powder puffs, were to private individuals and shipped with lease-lend shipments—the entire cargo otherwise lend-lease. The Lease-Lend Administration states that they were reimbursed for every bit of the charges paid, but all these private shipments entail an enormous amount of detail work; many thousands of people come into the Government in the city of Washington, making the housing shortage critical so we can figure the accounts. We pay for the accounting system, we pay for the personnel, we pay all the expense of segregating these items. In addition to that our boys are denied the little box of cookies their mothers may want to send them because the space is taken up, or was at least at that time, with these nondefense articles shipped to private individuals. Private individuals made a profit reselling them in the several countries to which they were shipped. If this continues, certainly the order against shipping packages of little knicknacks and things from home should be lifted and our boys not denied these little things that mean so much to the morale of our soldiers, sailors, and marines fighting in the far corners of the world.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Has it come to your attention that a cargo of heavy underwear was sent somewhere down in the Far East where they had absolutely no use for it?

Mr. JONES. I had not heard of that.

Mr. GROSS. I think if the gentleman checks the records he will find that a cargo of heavy underwear was shipped where they could have no possible use for it.

Mr. JONES. A question I should like to have answered is: What machinery have we provided in the basic lease-lend law for the clearance of orders that come to us for lease-lend aid? What basis of clearance have we in the lease-lend administration to say to the shipping authorities on the dock: "We will not take these nondefense items like powder puffs, beer, and rayon hose; we will not pay for freight of those shipments." What safeguard have we provided for ourselves and for our boys at the front? At one time there was in the lease-lend administration a control committee that went over every request with a fine-tooth comb. At one time a request was received for several thousand snappers. Nobody in lease-lend knew what snappers were. They found out later they were false teeth. It is time we found out whether there is any type of material control in lease-lend by military and naval experts who know what is necessary for our allies, the United Nations, to have to help them win the war. Or is control in the control of Harry Hopkins?

If we extend the lease-lend law, we should be interested in some such type of control, some sifting of orders so that our receding cargo space may be used to the utmost to ship necessary guns, planes, and tanks to our boys or the United Nations wherever they are needed. At the present time I can report to you on reliable authority that Harry Hopkins, particularly in the case of the British Government orders, has full charge of what shall be sent and what shall not be sent. I should say: "What shall be sent, period," and there is no military or naval authority going through those orders to see that necessary amounts are sent.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. It seems to me a third necessary thing is a restriction that lend-lease shipments must be necessary for use in the war effort only. When a decision is made whether a Diesel engine shall be sent that will last 5 years or one that will last 15 the decision should be in favor of the one with the lesser life in order to conserve our

critical materials and send the machine that will use less critical materials if it will last long enough to win the war.

I point these things out, and any member of the Foreign Affairs Committee may have my photostatic copy of the paper to which I have referred and the other reports upon which I based my original inquiry. Any other information I have as it is verified is available. Later on, next week, I hope to have the rest of the information verified and will report further to you.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders, I may address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE CIVIL AIR PATROL

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when enemy submarines some time ago were working havoc in our coastal waters there was formed, in fact it had been formed before that time, among civilian owners and operators of airplanes, an organization which tendered their services and the services of their planes to the Federal Government. My interest was aroused in this organization because of its demonstrated unselfish, self-reliant, willingness-to-do-something - about - it, fit - to - live-and-govern-in-a-free-democracy sort of spirit, the sort of spirit which must be nurtured and encouraged and must spread in this country if we are to have that fitness which makes free government possible. One of the leading spirits in this organization is a citizen of my own city, Maj. D. Harold Byrd. I have had compiled certain facts with regard to this fine organization which for its inspirational value to the American people I ask the privilege, which has been granted, to give them to the House and to the country.

The Civil Air Patrol was brought into being, according to its first general order, by "the universal demand of the civil airmen of the United States to be utilized, with their equipment and facilities, in the war effort." In this spirit, the private pilots at the municipal airports and hayfield landing fields mobilized throughout the country.

Long before the declaration of war, groups were formed along military lines in many States by alert volunteers who wanted to get ready. For years, these flying civilians, many of them pilots in the last war, were the backbone of air progress in America. Believing in aviation, they fought for air power, for the development of air transport, and for a national system of airports. They kept alive the spark of aviation interest in thousands of communities. When air power became the deciding force in warfare as they had predicted, it was not in their temperament to play a passive role.

At once applications from every one of the 48 States poured in by the thousands. These individualists threw all their assets and skills into the common cause.

The first job was to train the local squadrons in military drill and discipline so that each member would know his duties and serve under orders; then to undertake a rigorous program of practice missions to get each unit ready to meet emergency situations. The volunteers went to work with a will. At their national headquarters a comprehensive roster was set up on punch cards to index the specialized experience of every member so they could be placed on assignments for which they were best fitted.

This work was barely launched when the men of C. A. P. were given their first opportunity to show their mettle on an active military assignment. Enemy submarines were operating along the Atlantic seaboard within sight of shore. Sinkings of tankers and cargo vessels were a daily occurrence. Available blimps and subchasers were few. Army and Navy planes were urgently needed on the battle fronts.

The Flying minutemen Flew their little ships to hastily improvised bases. They brought their own radios, repair parts, tools, and equipment, starting from scratch to fly their single-motored landplanes over the winter ocean unarmed and with no more protection than their kapok life jackets.

This coastal patrol has been maintained ever since, from dawn to dusk, regardless of weather, on constant watch. Men from 45 States have entered this service. Subs spotted by Civil Air Patrol observers have been sunk. Vessels in distress have been reported; hundreds of survivors of torpedoed ships have been rescued. Many of the Civil Air Patrol planes are armed with bombs now. By their own labor and money they have converted their fields in farmyards, on sand spits, and in swamps into well-organized airdromes with the highest standards of maintenance and discipline.

Men from all walks of life work together on these patrols. The private marching on guard with a shotgun may be a millionaire, and the lieutenant about to fly may be a garage mechanic who spent his last dollar to patch up his plane and bring it to the base. They are working merely for expense money with no salary or allowance. They have sought no personal credit and want only to do a job for their country.

The discipline of this volunteer organization in keeping the military secrets with which it is entrusted is shown by the fact that although the little planes on C. A. P. coastal patrol have been carrying a heavy load of bombs for many months, the first time the public knew it was when an official announcement was made a few days ago. The best-informed newspapers reported it as something that had just been added.

In much the same way the Patrol has been manning inland missions on an increasing scale now approaching that of the coastal patrol and potentially much larger. While planes upward of 90 horsepower must be used in flying over the ocean, because of the bomb load and the dangers of off-shore winds against which smaller ships could not return to land, the inland work is performed by "grasshopper" planes under 90 horsepower.

Thousands of miles are being flown each day for the Army on regular schedule to carry dispatches, urgent shipments, and key officers between widely separated military posts; to fly tests of the air-raid warning system; inspect camouflage installations; give sighting practice to antiaircraft gunners; tow aerial targets over the fire of guns; and for many other purposes. This work helps release military planes and airmen for service on the advancing fronts around the world.

The men and women of the Civil Air Patrol are keeping the faith.

Organized with a Wing Command in each State, the patrol has active units at more than 1,000 local airports. In their home-town squadrons, the members serve without compensation, buying their own uniforms, paying for the operation of their own or rented planes, and maintaining all the overhead expense of the organization. In their capacity as aerial home guards, they are making themselves ready for any local emergency. Frequently the squadrons turn out to fly on flood or tornado rescue missions, search for lost Army aircraft or stand on guard in local disasters without a cent of compensation.

Although many are devoting their working hours to duties in war-production plants, they turn out for evening classes and drills and report to the air fields regularly each Sunday for flying practice. An important by-product of this training is the preparation it gives to men who enter the armed forces. Membership or active duty in the patrol do not exempt anyone from the draft, and the men who are called or who volunteer are much better able to enter military duties, whether they are assigned to flying or ground service.

C. A. P. has opened a number of airports of its own, developed through volunteer labor and donated material.

These fields are available as emergency landing areas to military planes as well as for recruitment and training centers. The fact that civilian planes are being kept airworthy and that repair and fueling facilities are maintained give the United States a vast reserve of auxiliary air facilities which can be drawn upon in many ways toward the winning of the war. The States in which the recruitment of flying cadets has been the highest are the States in which civilian aviation activities have been most intensively organized.

A new undertaking has recently been launched by the patrol in the formation of a C. A. P. cadet corps for students in the last 2 years of high school. It is a father-and-son organization. Each C. A. P. squadron can set up a counterpart squadron of cadets and each member of C. A. P. can sponsor one cadet. On this simple plan, the total cost to the Government to date has been only that of printing a one-page directive, and application form, and a membership card and mailing them to the 48 wings. As a result, tens of thousands of young Americans are receiving the same military and aviation training that the senior organization gets, under the guidance of seasoned flyers.

May I give you some more details as to this fine organization?

Sixty-seven thousand civilian volunteers have been enrolled. A wing of C. A. P., as a State organization, has been formed in each of the 48 States, which reports directly to C. A. P. national headquarters which is staffed by several officers of the Army Air Forces. Under the wing commands, local squadrons and flights are active at more than 1,000 airports. The larger State wings are divided into group commands with several squadrons in each group. Maj. Earle L. Johnson is the national commander.

Each wing, group, and squadron has its own commander and staff officers assigned to special duties such as operations, intelligence, communications, transportation, and medical. About a third of the members are pilots; a third are student pilots; and the rest have special skills as mechanics, radio operators, photographers, nurses, typists, and ground crew. Each unit is self-contained with personnel, equipment, and training to perform any mission that light planes can fly.

C. A. P. is not a flight training corps but rather an organization of citizens with prior experience applicable to aviation. Its training program, however, not only has advanced the skill of airmen in C. A. P. but has encouraged many with little or no previous experience to take lessons and become good pilots.

Each member is required to cover the ground studies necessary for a private pilot's license. The basic C. A. P. course of 81 hours stresses military and defense subjects such as infantry drill, discipline, first aid, gas protection, military secrecy, and signaling. The advanced course of 150 hours includes air navigation meteorology, crash procedure, and a number of flying missions simulating the actual wartime assignments of the patrol.

Thousands have left the patrol for flying duties in the armed forces, the Air Transport Command, the pilot schools, and the airlines, better prepared by their C. A. P. experience which is good background for any wartime service. From its detailed roster, C. A. P. frequently recommends men and women for special war posts. Members while in their local units continue their regular occupations and devote their spare time to the patrol. But, thousands who have been able to volunteer 30 days or more of continuous service have been detached from their squadrons for assignment to active-duty missions which C. A. P. performs for the Army. In addition to the sea operations and services mentioned, extensive inland missions also are being flown for the Army to help release military planes and pilots for air duty.

Courier service totaling thousands of miles a day on regular routes and schedules is being flown to carry officers, dispatches, and rush shipments between Army posts. Other work included towing aerial gunnery targets, tracking flights for guns and searchlights, aerial reconnaissance and inspection, simulated air support for ground troops in training, and searches for lost aircraft. In addition, active missions are performed for Federal and State agencies. For the United States Forest Service, area patrol, and observation flights over fires have been conducted to conserve timber resources in a number of States. Federal officials have been carried on rush trips. For war-production plants, courier services have been organized in many areas to carry key executives and urgent shipments such as machine parts. In some cases, the stoppage of assembly lines has been prevented by this aerial pony express.

Members on active duty receive a moderate per diem to cover personal expenses including cost of their uniforms and a good deal of their equipment. A moderate rental, varying with horsepower, is paid for planes per hour of flight. It would be interesting, I believe, to know something of the strength of the several State organizations and to have the names of their respective commanding officers. They are as follows:

| | Groups | Squadrons | Oct. 31 enrollment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama: Maj. Harold F. Wood, C. A. P., 228 South 19th St., Birmingham, Ala | ------ | 7 | 665 |
| Arizona: Maj. Carl C. Knier, C. A. P., Sky Harbor Air Service, box 649, Phoenix, Ariz | ------ | 1 | 378 |
| Arkansas: Maj. Rex P. Hayes, C. A. P., box 2461, Little Rock, Ark | 4 | 16 | 948 |
| California: Maj. Bertrand Rhine, C. A. P., Citizens National Bank Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif | 6 | 19 | 4,136 |
| Colorado: Maj. Harold R. Smethills, C. A. P., 300 Logan St., Denver, Colo | 2 | 6 | 460 |
| Connecticut: Maj. Thomas H. Lockhart, C. A. P., box 537, Hartford, Conn | ------ | 8 | 972 |
| Delaware: Maj. Herman S. Miller, C. A. P., 2 East 9th St., Wilmington, Del | ------ | 1 | 349 |
| Florida: Maj. Wright Vermilya, Jr., C. A. P., box 1411, Lantana, Fla | 4 | 11 | 1,842 |
| Georgia: Maj. Winship Nunnally, C. A. P., box 1516, Atlanta, Ga | 2 | 4 | 1,064 |
| Idaho: Maj. A. A. Bennett, C. A. P., 402 State House, Boise, Idaho | 1 | 7 | 556 |
| Illinois: Maj. Robert K. Belt, C. A. P., room 1416, 222 West Adams St., Chicago, Ill | 6 | 27 | 3,236 |
| Indiana: Maj. Walker W. Winslow, C. A. P., 612 Board of Trade Bldg., Indianapolis, Ind | 6 | 26 | 2,463 |
| Iowa: Maj. Daniel F. Hunter, C. A. P., State House, Des Moines, Iowa | 4 | 20 | 1,804 |
| Kansas: Maj. J. Howard Wilcox, C. A. P., box 109, Anthony, Kans | 6 | 29 | 1861 |
| Kentucky: Maj. Charles H. Gartrell, C. A. P., Bowman Field, Louisville, Ky | ------ | 9 | 591 |
| Louisiana: Maj. Richard G. Jones, C. A. P., 619 Decatur St., New Orleans, La | 7 | 12 | 1,132 |
| Maine: Maj. Guy P. Gannett, C. A. P., 604 Press Herald Bldg., Portland, Maine | ------ | 5 | 598 |
| Maryland: Maj. Arthur C. Hyde, C. A. P., 7942 Wisconsin Ave., Bethesda, Md | ------ | 4 | 1,087 |
| Massachusetts: Maj. John Shennett, C. A. P., room 716, 18 Tremont St., Boston, Mass | 5 | 11 | 1,120 |
| Michigan: Maj. Ray H. Baker, C. A. P., 2310 Booktower Bldg., Detroit, Mich | 7 | 28 | 3,621 |
| Minnesota: Maj. Horace Read, C. A. P., 310 Minneapolis Armory, Minneapolis, Minn | 3 | 18 | 1,455 |
| Mississippi: Maj. L. D. Pepper, Jr., C. A. P., Fourth floor, New Capitol Bldg., Jackson, Miss | ------ | 6 | 268 |
| Missouri: Maj. William B. Robertson, C. A. P., Lambert Field, Robertson, Mo | ------ | 13 | 1,803 |
| Montana: Maj. Herman H. Henrickson, C. A. P., 210 City Hall, Billings, Mont | ------ | 1 | 439 |
| Nebraska: Maj. Harry B. Sidles, C. A. P., 502 South 19th St., Omaha, Nebr | ------ | 11 | 730 |
| Nevada: Maj. Carl F. Johnson, C. A. P., 150 North Virginia St., Reno, Nev | ------ | 3 | 296 |
| New Hampshire: Maj. John F. Brown, C. A. P., 318 State House, Concord, N. H | ------ | 3 | 349 |
| New Jersey: Maj. George A. Viehmann, C. A. P., 605 Broad St., Newark, N. J | 3 | 14 | 1,632 |
| New Mexico: Maj. Harllee Townsend, Jr., C. A. P., Franciscan Hotel, Albuquerque, N. Mex | 1 | 8 | 326 |
| New York: Maj. Stuart C. Welch, C. A. P., 1211 Liberty Bank Bldg., Buffalo, N. Y | 6 | 28 | 4,593 |
| North Carolina: Maj. Frank E. Dawson, C. A. P., 118 Court Arcade Bldg., East Trade St., Charlotte, N. C | 3 | 12 | 1,083 |
| North Dakota: Maj. W. E. Van Walker, C. A. P., Jamestown College, Jamestown, N. Dak | ------ | 4 | 209 |
| Ohio: Maj. George A. Stone, C. A. P., 501 Wyandotte Bldg., Columbus, Ohio | 9 | 39 | 4,212 |
| Oklahoma: Maj. Moss Patterson, C. A. P., 613 Hales Bldg., Oklahoma City, Okla | 8 | 32 | 1,738 |
| Oregon: Maj. Leo G. Devaney, C. A. P., Lumbermen's Bldg., Portland, Oreg | 10 | 12 | 913 |
| Pennsylvania: Maj. William L. Anderson, C. A. P., Harrisburg Airport, New Cumberland, Pa | 8 | 33 | 3,686 |
| Rhode Island: Maj. Norris W. Rakestraw, C. A. P., 1051 Main St., Providence, R. I | ------ | 1 | 268 |
| South Carolina: Maj. Dexter C. Martin, C. A. P., South Carolina Aeronautics Commission, Columbia, S. C | 1 | 6 | 775 |
| South Dakota: Maj. T. B. Roberts, Jr., C. A. P., South Dakota Aeronautics Commission, Pierre, S. Dak | 2 | 6 | 363 |
| Tennessee: Maj. Herbert F. Fox, C. A. P., 517 Stahlman Bldg., Nashville, Tenn | 3 | 12 | 980 |
| Texas: Maj. D. Harold Byrd, C. A. P., White Plaza Hotel, Dallas, Tex | 14 | 45 | 3,060 |
| Utah: Maj. Joseph D. Bergin, C. A. P., 439 State Capitol Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah | ------ | 5 | 602 |
| Vermont: Maj. William V. Mason, C. A. P., State House, Montpelier, Vt | ------ | 1 | 148 |
| Virginia: Maj. Allan C. Perkinson, C. A. P., 204 Sauer Bldg., Meadow and Broad Sts., Richmond, Va | ------ | 7 | 763 |
| Washington: Maj. Philip H. Hinkley, C. A. P., State Armory, Spokane, Wash | 4 | 11 | 1,012 |
| West Virginia: Maj. David M. Giltinan, C. A. P., 257 Capitol Bldg., Charleston, W. Va | ------ | 14 | 712 |
| Wisconsin: Maj. John F. Stratton, C. A. P., room 300, 110 East Wisconsin Ave., Milwaukee, Wis | 5 | 19 | 1,556 |
| Wyoming: Maj. W. Dillard Walker, C. A. P., Plains Airways, Inc., Cheyenne, Wyo | ------ | 1 | 125 |
| Total, United States | 139 | 616 | 62,979 |

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] has just given us a very fine summary of the activities of the Civil Air Patrol. I am particularly interested, as I am a mem-

ber. I was on active duty for a month last summer, during the informal congressional recess, as a pilot on an anti-submarine patrol and I have, therefore, had a chance to see the C. A. P. in action, and to witness first-hand the initiative and resourcefulness they exercise in getting the job done. You find all shapes, sizes, and conditions of men on a C. A. P. base, for they are not exempt from the draft and, therefore, the C. A. P. depends upon men who are not subject to military service. You find fat, bald-headed pilots; others wear glasses when flying; there are also women members of the C. A. P. and women pilots, although they do not go on the coastal patrol. All are alike in one respect, however; they have a wonderful spirit of getting the job at hand attended to. I know of members, who have spent thousands of dollars of their own money securing equipment for bases. These same men, who would never think of asking for anything for themselves, are willing to beg or borrow planes, engines, or other equipment from their friends, when it is needed to keep them going. Their spirit seems to inspire a kindred spirit in the communities where they operate, and businessmen and public officials have dug up for C. A. P. bases everything from screw drivers to radio generators and buildings without charge.

At a time when there is a great tendency for people to lean on the central government for support and guidance, the Civil Air Patrol is keeping alive in war work the old pioneer spirit of self-reliance and resourcefulness, although in performing their flying missions their discipline and obedience meet military standards. They are the home guard, the continental militiamen of the air, and they are not only performing important services in the war effort, but are keeping alive a kind of American spirit that is not too prevalent these days.

I want to congratulate my distinguished friend from Texas on telling the House about their work. With his usual keen insight, he has discerned in this outfit an example of the type of American spirit which he is continually preaching in the House. My own contribution in time, or otherwise, to the C. A. P. has been very small, but I am proud to have had a small part in it, and I am grateful for the chance it gave me to see them in action.

PUTTING FIRST THINGS FIRST

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] addressed this House for a period of 10 minutes. The subject of his discussion was concerning some bills that I understand he has or will introduce, and which he no doubt feels are of national, or, perhaps, international importance. The fervor and deep earnestness with which the gentleman approached the matter would indicate to the casual listener that the legislation he is espousing is a real emergency and that Congress should drop everything else, and possibly meet in extra sessions, to consider this question of such far-reaching importance to the present generation of dogs, legislation that no doubt will vitally affect canine generations yet unborn.

In these dark and perilous times, with our country engaged in a life or death struggle, I was frankly amazed that the gentleman from Michigan would consume 10 minutes of the valuable time of this House discussing proposed legislation affecting the welfare and security of dogs, pedigreed or otherwise. I yield to no one in my affection for a good dog. It has been said that dog is man's best friend. My little 3-year-old son, Jed, Jr., has one which he loves devotedly. It occurs to me, however, that this is not the time nor the place for the consideration of the welfare of dogs, especially when so many human beings are enduring slavery and worse. The matter about which the gentleman complains might be presented to the pound master for the District of Columbia, otherwise known as the dog catcher, rather than to consume 10 minutes' time of this House.

Someone facetiously suggested, while the gentleman was talking so fervently about his proposed legislation for the uplift of dogdom, that a special committee on canine activities be created for the consideration of the legislation to which the gentleman refers. Another Member suggested the matter might be presented to a subcommittee of the city council.

In all seriousness, however, it is just such speeches as the one made today by the gentleman from Michigan that brings down the wrath of righteous criticism on the membership of this House and creates a fertile field for those who hold up this Congress to ridicule.

Let me make it plain that I am not trying to lecture anyone or scold. But these are serious times. Events of 1943 will undoubtedly shape the destiny of the world for generations to come

If I know the sentiments of Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress, irrespective of political affiliation, or whether they represent the North, East, South, or West, it is the one impelling thought and determination to concentrate first on the winning of this war, to leave no stone unturned to see that the planes, guns, tanks and materials and supplies be furnished our gallant men in action on the many far-flung fronts of the world. All other matters not connected with the war effort, important though they may appear to be in ordinary times, must be relegated to the rear, including the gentleman's proposed dog-security legislation. Until there is a complete routing of the enemy on all fronts and an unconditional surrender, I beg of you that we shall put first things first, and support to the utmost our gallant men who are offering their lives, if need be, in order we may continue to live as free people and preserve our American way of life.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 6 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include three letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was not present to hear the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] talk about dogs, but evidently it made some impression upon the gentleman from Oklahoma, [Mr. JOHNSON], who just left the floor, and who took it upon himself to scold the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] for talking about dogs. I realize that we on the minority side should not talk about anything to which you of the majority object. We realize, too, that we should talk in a manner you would have us talk. In brief, we realize full well that you have played follow the leader so long that it is now a habit and you sometimes attempt to pass it along to us. We can only reply, No, thank you. We have had enough of the "rubber stamp" procedure.

It ill becomes those who have but echoed the New Deal words to tell us what to say and when to say it. If the Members of the minority had wasted as much time in advocating and passing and trying to enforce silly, liberty destroying legislation of which you now complain as has the majority we might be subject to criticism.

You of the majority have spent 10 years in putting on the books laws and in creating boards which now plague you and of which every day and sometimes many times a day you complain.

About all we now hear from you is condemnation of your own brain children. What unruly little brats they are.

It is very nice for you to act as schoolmasters or instructors to our side, and to tell us what we ought to talk about; but it will be more profitable, perhaps, if I may venture to suggest it, if you look after your own speeches and we will do the same on our side and let the constituents in our respective districts judge as to the value of what we may say.

Speaking of dogs, I did not hear what the gentleman from Michigan said about dogs, so I cannot make answer directly to what the gentleman from Oklahoma said about the proposed legislation; but may I say that anyone who has been yelped against and howled about as have so many Members of this House by some one or two of these radio commentators is justified in bringing to the House some sort of suggestion to limit the malicious slandering of Congress. There are many kinds of dogs; many breeds of dogs; dogs are of many colors and sizes. There are short-haired dogs, long-haired dogs, curly dogs, and dogs

that are not curly. There are four-legged dogs and there are two-legged curs. There were, and there are, the dogs of the Alps which rescued many a traveler. More than once a child has been dragged from a watery grave by the faithful dog. More than once a farmer has been saved from an enraged bull by the faithful dog.

Today, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] must know it, the armies of the world, at not a little expense, are training dogs to take part in the war. Dogs carry messages of great importance. They carry first-aid kits and medicine to the wounded soldiers.

The gentleman from Oklahoma, I am constrained to believe, spoke in a thoughtless moment and does not want to be classed as unfriendly to even a dog. Throughout the history of the world the dog has been characterized as man's greatest friend. He should not begrudge to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] the 10 minutes used in an effort to conserve the dogs of the country, many of which may before this war is over, do their heroic part on the battle front. Surely, the gentleman for a moment forgot that dogs have already, in this war, been decorated for bravery and courage exhibited in battle.

To show the opinion held by some of the yelping human beings who stand on two legs and who are not dogs, permit me to read from two letters received this morning. One from Jacksonville, Fla. May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi if that is what he would call the deep South?

Mr. RANKIN. There is a map out there in the hall. If the gentleman will look at it he will see where Jacksonville, Fla., is situated.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When I have a walking-talking encyclopedia right in front of me, why waste my energy to go out there and look at a map.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say "Yes" to the gentleman. Jacksonville, Fla., is in the deep South.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. This comes from the Florida Beacon, Jacksonville, Fla. It reads as follows:

JANUARY 25, 1943.

The ANDREW JERGENS Co.,
*Cincinnati, Ohio:*

I see that you have turned loose on the public again that disturber, Walter Winchell, with his egotism and unreliable statements.

In his broadcast last evening he repeated what he claimed was a quotation from a speech he had said Congressman Houston, of Kansas, had made, in which Congressman HOFFMAN, of Michigan, had been given a drubbing.

The only thing wrong with this is that nowhere in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD do such words appear; also there is no one by the name of Houston in Congress, either from Kansas or any other State. There was a party by that name in a previous Congress, but he was repudiated at the polls by his constituents; and his present address is Wichita, Kans., and not Washington, D. C. Winchell in his broadcast was careful to conceal the fact.

Here is another one that came in from New York and it reads as follows:

Is it not about time that this loud-mouth Walter Winchell who shouts forth his feuds over the radio every Sunday evening was muzzled?

How is it he can get away with the kind of stuff he puts over the air when other people are frozen out, the public are getting tired of this fellow. He was off the air for a few weeks which I can truthfully say added refinement to Jergens lotion broadcast.

If he is wearing a Navy uniform why in hell don't they put him on a ship and keep him off the air, he seems to air all his fights over the radio.

This would be a good time for Congressman Cox to ask Mr. Fly why he is permitted to go on the air with his insulting remarks to advertise some cheap skin lotion.

I think the gentleman is in error about that latter statement. I do not think it is cheap. It may smell that way, but it is not cheap in price. If it is no more reliable than its mouthpiece it is of little value.

So may I say to the gentleman who protests the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan, that the gentleman from Michigan does love dogs, and I never knew that to be a crime.

Now that we are in this war, of course, our first business is to take care of the people, but I suppose that before the war is over some of these doers of good, like Harry Hopkins and some others of those people down there, will be taking care of the dogs, the Chinese dogs, and the Hottentot and the Bushmen dogs, and the dogs of all those people down in South Africa, and in India, Europe, and Asia. If they are going to take care of those dogs all over the world, why should my colleague from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] be criticized for advocating a measure, which he thinks will conserve dogs, when many of them are being sought by the Army for war service, and for thinking that maybe the dogs here in America should be protected? Congress has been treated like dogs. During the last campaign we were treated worse than our dogs. I have been wondering if we would have courage enough to insist finally that some of those who have been abusing, and misusing and kicking us around as though we were dogs, without even giving us the privilege that is given to a dog when kicked—I am wondering whether those on the majority side will not kindly join with us and get Resolution 13 out from the Committee on Rules and bring up this man Maloney and Winchell and the convict Browder—there are three good ones, Maloney, Browder—put Browder in the middle and Walter Winchell at the end—bring up those three fellows and let us see what they are up to, and what they are doing, and who is paying them, and what their purpose is. We know it, but let us spread it on the record. Their purpose is to destroy the confidence of the people in the Congress, not in the individual Members but the Congress as a whole.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Will the gentleman extend his mercies to the Frankfurter "hot dogs" also?

Mr. HOFFMAN. From what I can see and learn, and from what I learn from the Supreme Court reports, the Frankfurters are very well able to take care of themselves. They need no help from Congress. Congress should watch its step that it does not fall under the Frankfurter ban.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not believe that is the resolution the gentleman from Oklahoma had in mind when he was speaking, though.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. As I understand, he was talking about the talk made today by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]. Perhaps it was a waste of time, and maybe I waste more time than anyone else, but I have some close seconds over on the other side.

[Here the gavel fell.]

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARE, for 2 days, on account of important business.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 1, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

#### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be an organization meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, February 3, 1943.

---

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

106. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a report from several governmental agencies stating that money received by them which was not paid into the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

107. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Selective and Training Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

108. A letter from the Chairman, District Unemployment Compensation Board, transmitting the Seventh Annual Report of the District Unemployment Compensation Board for the calendar year ending December 31, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

---

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 35. Resolution providing for the salary of an assistant clerk to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization; without amendment (Rept. No. 62). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 84. Resolution providing expenses for continuing the investigation authorized by House Resolution 20; without amendment (Rept. No. 63). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 85. Resolution providing for the payment of the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 52; without amendment (Rept. No. 64). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DREWRY: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1446. A bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 65). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 653. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation", approved June 18, 1934; with amendment (Rept. No. 66). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1559. A bill to provide night differential for certain employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 1560. A bill for improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville to Key West, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 1561. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to farm acreage allotments, the farm marketing excess of wheat, the use of excess corn as silage for feed to livestock on the farm, to provide for the adequate supply of peanuts for oil and other uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 1562. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to prohibit abandonment of communications facilities, increase the security of communications systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 1563. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1564. A bill to exempt persons in the military and naval forces of the United States from Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1565. A bill relating to the appointment of postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 1566. A bill to provide for the punishment of persons transporting and receiving certain stolen dogs in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1567. A bill prescribing certain offenses relating to the keeping, injuring, and destroying dogs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 1568. A bill providing that members of the merchant marine and the Army Transport Service shall be deferred from training under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and be credited against selective-service quotas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 1569. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit courts of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; 28 U. S. C. 543); to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 1570 (by request). A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 1571 (by request). A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. R. 1572. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Comptroller General to prepare and transmit to Congress a statement of the account of the United States with the Miami Tribe of Indians and the Miami Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 1573. A bill relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 1574. A bill to repeal the last sentence of section 42 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. R. 1575. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies from requiring persons to furnish burdensome and nonessential information, to require the Department of Commerce to act as the Government information collection agent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1576. A bill increasing the amount which the United States may contribute to any State for old-age assistance in respect of any individual from $20 to $30 per month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 1577. A bill to provide for the assignment for the benefit of dependents of payments due or to become due from the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 1578. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1579. A bill to continue for 6 months after honorable discharge, separation, or release from active service the pay of veterans of World War No. 2 who have served actively in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 1580. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 1581. A bill providing that commissions on postal money orders be paid to postmasters of the first, second, and third classes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MRUK:

H. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution to provide for the training of nonfarm youth for farm labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DREWRY:

H. Res. 87. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1446, a bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 1582. A bill for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 1583. A bill for the relief of Reuben T. Little; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 1584. A bill for the relief of Howard M. Sandus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 1585. A bill for the relief of George Edward Gudewill; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 1586. A bill for the relief of Father Peter B. Duffee; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1587. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1588. A bill for the relief of Raymond Crosby; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1589. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary St. Clair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1590. A bill granting an increase of pension to Prudence Dickinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1591. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 1592 (by request). A bill for the relief of Garry Kelly; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1593. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Sallop and Mrs. Dora Projansky; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEAN:

H. R. 1594. A bill for the relief of Peter A. Gawalis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORD:

H. R. 1595. A bill for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 1596. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. Smith and others; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1597. A bill for the relief of Joseph Spear; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MYERS:

H. R. 1598. A bill for the relief of George S. Wolbert, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 1599. A bill for the relief of Irwin A. Borncamp; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1600. A bill granting an increase of pension to Anna Houghtlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1601. A bill granting an increase of pension to Anna Belle Le Fay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 1602. A bill for the relief of Robert N. Bickert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 1603. A bill for the relief of Clarence Haney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

56. Mr. CANFIELD presented a resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, respectfully urging and petitioning the Congress of the United States that it proceed promptly to place the collection of Federal income taxes from individuals on a current or pay-as-you-go basis, and in connection therewith that it provide such method for making the transition from the present system of tax collection as, in its judgment, will be fair, feasible, and nondiscriminatory and will minimize the hardships of such transition, without undue loss of revenue to the Government of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

---

# SENATE

## MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of grace and glory, we would yield our flickering torch to the flame of Thy redeeming love. Strengthened with might in the inner man, send us forth to quest and conquest on the wings of this new morning, sustained by a faith that will not shrink though pressed by every foe.

Into Thy keeping we confide and commit our loved ones, our fighting men, our country, and our cause. In all danger and distress, in all anxiety and perplexity, keep them and us, that, upheld by Thy might even in these turbulent days we may live quietly, confidently, and victoriously. Strengthen us to carry our share of the burden of mankind's advance toward Thy will, in the Nation and in all the earth. Solemnize us with the responsibility of ability. With the vision splendid may we be found among the pathfinders of humanity—leading another day's march toward the bright and beckoning land of promise.

"God of justice, save the people
From the clash of race and creed;
From the strife of class and faction,
Make her nation free indeed.
Keep our faith in simple manhood
Strong as when her life began,
Till it find its full fruition
In the brotherhood of man."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 28, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

OATH OF OFFICE TO SERGEANT AT ARMS

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Sergeant-at-Arms-elect will present himself at the desk the oath of office will be administered to him.

Wall Doxey, of Mississippi, advanced to the Vice President's desk and the oath of office as Sergeant at Arms of the Senate was administered to him by the Vice President.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR CARAWAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to the fact that today is the anniversary of the birth of one of the eminent Members of this body. I recall with great pleasure that I entered the House of Representatives on the same day on which her husband became a Member of that body from the State of Arkansas. I served with him in the House for many years. Later I also served with him in the Senate. I have served in the Senate with his widow, the present distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] for many years. She is an outstanding American woman. She has two boys, both of whom are at this hour in the service, wearing the uniform of their country.

Mr. President, I call attention to this birthday anniversary because I wish to congratulate the senior Senator from Arkansas upon the distinguished service which she and her family have rendered and are rendering to the United States of America. I am sure that not only in Arkansas, but in the country at large, that service will be cherished as a tradition by all the people of our country.

If Mrs. CARAWAY were no older than she looks she would not be eligible for membership in the Senate of the United States. [Laughter.] I congratulate her. I am sure we all congratulate her and wish for her many, many returns of this happy day which we are celebrating for her and which she celebrates today, and I personally wish for her and her two boys the greatest of success and happiness and honor in the service of their country.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to offer my felicitations and congratulations to the distinguished young lady from Arkansas on her birthday anniversary.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SPECIAL STATISTICAL STUDIES BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing special statistical studies made by the Department upon payment of the cost thereof, together with the names of those for whom work has been performed, the nature of the service rendered, the price therefor, and the manner in which the moneys received were deposited or used (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

A letter from the Director of Selective Service, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act to persons assigned to work of national importance under civilian direction (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EMPLOYEES RECEIVING $3,000 AND OVER, OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION—CORRECTION OF ERROR

A letter from the administrative officer, Office of Defense Transportation, stating that on January 5, 1942, that agency submitted, pursuant to Senate Resolution 322, Seventy-seventh Congress, a list of employees drawing salaries of $3,000 per annum or over, and that through a clerical error Mr. Heston H. Walker, of the Washington office, was shown as earning a salary of $5,600 per annum whereas actually his yearly compensation is $3,800; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

A letter from the president of the Capital Transit Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of that company for the calendar year 1942, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, Interior, and Agriculture (4); National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, National Housing Agency, Federal Works Agency, and Executive Office of the President (2) (National Resources Planning Board and Office of War Information) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Winchester, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor sales and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, which was ordered to lie on the table.

COMPENSATION OF POSTAL WORKERS—PETITION

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the postal workers of this country have not received an increase in their wages for the past 18 years. In the matter of compensation these valuable and indispensable workers stand today where they have stood during all that long period. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred, a letter in the nature of a petition which I have received from the Central Labor Union of Pittsburgh, Pa., signed by M. J. Dorsey, president, and John A. Stackhouse, secretary. The letter embodies a resolution adopted by the Pittsburgh Central Labor Union urging favorable action on legislation designed to improve the condition of this very worthy body of governmental workers.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Post

Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PITTSBURGH CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
*Pittsburgh, Pa., January 21, 1943.*

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: At a meeting of the Pittsburgh Central Labor Union held at Pittsburgh, Pa., on January 21, 1943, the following resolution was adopted by unanimous vote:

"Postal workers have not received a salary increase since the passage of the Kelly bill, made effective January 1, 1925. In 1932 each postal employee was furloughed 1 month without pay. In 1933, by the passage of the Economy Act, their salaries were reduced 15 percent, or $315 per year. In succeeding years this act was repealed; 10 percent retrieved in one session of Congress and 5 percent in a later one; and

"Whereas postal salaries stand today exactly where they stood more than 18 years ago. The War Labor Board, after finding that the cost of living had risen 15 percent by January 1, 1941, allowed a 15-percent wage increase in all cases adjudicated by their Board. However, since all decisions rendered were those of strikes, walk-outs, or other threatened work stoppages, postal employees were bypassed; and

"Whereas we as citizens of this Republic have an abiding interest in postal workers; our own employees. Their loyalty, patriotism, and efficiency are beyond question. They are not permitted to strike nor engage actively in politics. The increased and increasing cost of living is ample justification for a wage increase at this time, in common with workers in private industry; and

"Whereas Senator JAMES M. MEAD, of New York, has introduced in the Senate S. 360 and Congressman GEORGE D. O'BRIEN of Michigan, an identical bill (H. R. 1366) in the House of Representatives, which provide a bonus of $300 per year to each postal employee for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter. The measure of increase allowed by the Mead-O'Brien bill is less than 15 percent above the salary now in effect fixed more than 18 years ago; and

"Whereas we, recognizing the soundness and justice of this modest proposal, realizing that their appeal must be made to Congress through the people as a whole; that in order to meet the mounting living expenses prevalent in wartimes, added income is required; that this measure is fair alike to the Government and the worker, and will help to maintain the present high standard of efficiency in the Postal System: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we earnestly request your vote and active support for S. 360 and H. R. 1366, otherwise known as the Mead-O'Brien bill, to the end that justice may be done to this large body of steady, industrious, and capable governmental workers."

Sincerely,

M. J. DORSEY, *President.*
JOHN A. STACKHOUSE,
*Secretary.*

## REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MALONEY, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 28) continuing the Special Committee to Investigate Gasoline Shortages, reported it without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 592. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to the circulation of matter concerning candidates for election to Federal offices;

S. 593. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to the limitations on political contributions and expenditures; and

S. 594. A bill to protect the integrity of the democratic process by requiring disclosure of persons writing, publishing, and circulating scurrilous literature in connection with political campaigns; to deny the use of the mails to such literature and to prohibit its importation into the United States, in default of such disclosure; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 595. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hal S. Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 596. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 597. A bill to amend the act of September 22, 1941 (Public Law 252, 77th Cong.), with relation to the temporary appointments of officers in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 598. A bill for the relief of John E. Creighton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 599. A bill amending the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, as amended, and providing for payment of compensation for permanent and total disability ratings of tubercular World War veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 600. A bill for the relief of Eldredge L. Brown; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 601. A bill granting a pension to Chief Red Bird; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 602. A bill for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 603. A bill for the relief of Henry Angell; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 604. A bill granting a pension to Earl E. Bayles;

S. 605. A bill granting an increase of pension to Earl W. Newlon; and

S. 606. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha L. E. Bromberg; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. KILGORE also (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. BALL, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. THOMAS of Utah) introduced Senate bill 607, which was ordered to lie on the table, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 608. A bill for the relief of the Meadows School district (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 609. A bill for the relief of Sloper, Patton, & Gooch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 610. A bill to establish a Division of Cooperatives in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 611. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. O'Brien;

S. 612. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Perry;

S. 613. A bill granting an increase of pension to Anna Perkins; and

S. 614. A bill granting an increase of pension to Susanne Katharina Reinhardt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 615. A bill to provide for the issuance of furlough travel certificates to persons serving in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 616. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Vullo; to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, which is a duplicate of a bill which was acted upon at the last session by the Committee on Military Affairs, was favorably reported by that committee, and then favorably acted upon by the Senate. I ask that with that history the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be so referred.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 617. A bill for the relief of Homer C. Chapman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 618. A bill to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska at Anchorage, Alaska;

S. 619. A bill to extend the terms of judges of the district courts in Alaska, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands to 8 years; and

S. 620. A bill to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States; to fix their duties; to provide for their compensation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 621. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. CLARK of Missouri):

S. 622. A bill to authorize and to direct the Veterans' Administration to provide vocational rehabilitation and assistance in securing suitable employment for service-connected disabled veterans in need thereof and feasible therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. WALSH also introduced Senate bill 623, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 624. A bill for the relief of substitutes in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

## OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION—REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and myself, I introduce a bill and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, because a similar bill in the last session was before that committee and hearings have been held thereon by the committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia why the bill should be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor? Why should it not go to the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, which is one of the defense committees of the Senate and which should have an opportunity to consider

the great question which is involved in the bill?

Mr. KILGORE. The reason for the request is that the Committee on Education and Labor at the previous session had under consideration a similar bill, on which hearings were conducted for about 6 weeks, and the committee probably can submit a report on the bill in a very short time because it was ready to report the previous bill, but not in time to have it acted on before the close of the session. The only reason I make the request is in order that the bill may go to the committee which has already heard testimony on the subject and be ready for report at an early date, with the minimum amount of hearings.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I inquire if the Senator would object to a reference of the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. KILGORE. I think it would involve the repetition of about 2 months' work. That is the reason why I should object. This bill should be brought on the floor with the minimum of delay.

Mr. BRIDGES. Can the Senator give any logical explanation, outside the fact that the Committee on Education and Labor has had a similar bill before it, why it should go to that committee rather than to the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; because it deals largely with the civilian effort in the war, with labor, production, and things of that nature, which the Committee on Education and Labor, rather than the Military Affairs Committee or the Naval Affairs Committee, considered during the last session when the previous bill was introduced, and the Senate decided that the Committee on Education and Labor could cover the subject just as well as any other committee. Furthermore, as I have said, that committee has taken a great amount of testimony on the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I did not rise to discuss the question where the particular bill introduced by the Senator from West Virginia should go, but I think it is important at the very earliest date possible to determine the jurisdiction as between the Military Affairs Committee and the Committee on Education and Labor in regard to bills of this character. There is, undoubtedly, a twilight zone, due largely to the fact that bills affecting the same thing have been referred to both committees in the past, but it is very confusing to have legislation go to two committees or to have any doubt as to which committee it ought to go. Inasmuch as we are probably going to adjourn over until Thursday, and no action will be taken in the meantime, I would suggest that the matter of reference be left open until that time, so that the Vice President, in his capacity as Presiding Officer, who must determine these matters, may look into the question where the bill should be sent.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I hope that arrangement will be made. There are four or five committees now studying the problem involved. In order to have the matter settled and to have the Vice President afforded an opportunity to determine what should be the proper reference of the bill, I, too, should like to have the matter go over until Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Obviously, many Senators in their capacity as members of different committees are more familiar with the contents of the bill than is the Vice President. The Vice President, perhaps setting another precedent in regard to committee reference, is going to ask that the Senate take on itself the obligation to determine the reference when there is a question of sharp difference of opinion.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that event, Mr. President, I think the matter should go over until Thursday, if the Senate is to be asked to pass on the reference, so that Senators can familiarize themselves with the bill, and somewhat with the precedents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reference will be passed over until Thursday. The bill will lie on the table until Thursday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no choice as to which committee this bill shall go, but certainly we should reach some conclusion as to the reference of bills which deal with a subject jurisdiction of which is being claimed by two or more committees, particularly when it might be said that any one of two or three committees might have a right properly to claim jurisdiction. The question should be settled, so that the Vice President would have something to guide him in determining where a bill should go, and so that the Senate itself would know where bills should go.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I am in accord with the able majority leader. I think a rule should be established, and I am perfectly willing that the reference of the bill I am presenting should go over until Thursday. I am not a member of the Committee on Education and Labor; I am a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, but I am in accord with the majority leader in this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will entertain a motion Thursday as to the committee to which the Senate desires to have this particular bill referred.

The bill (S. 607) to establish an Office of War Mobilization, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and ordered to lie on the table.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—EXTENSION OF INSURANCE BENEFITS TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Social Security Act, and ask unanimous consent that a memorandum explanatory of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts will be referred to the Committee on Finance, and the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 623) to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits of the Social Security Act to certain employees of religious and charitable organizations, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The memorandum presented by Mr. WALSH in connection with the bill is as follows:

This bill will extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits of the Social Security Act to certain employees of religious and charitable organizations. If enacted into law, it will add over a million persons to those already embraced within the provisions of the existing law.

In 1935–36 representatives of the churches, colleges, and hospitals asked for and received exemption of their employees from the Social Security Act. Many of these same organizations for the past few years have been considering ways and means of having their employees included within the Social Security Act without interfering with the general provisions of law which exempt religious, educational, and charitable institutions from taxation.

The bill now being introduced is the result of these deliberations and, in effect, will provide for the inclusion under old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act and the corresponding taxing or contribution section of the Internal Revenue Code of all employees of religious, educational, and charitable institutions except ministers of religion and members of religious orders.

In view of the fact that legislation to include these groups has been recommended by the Social Security Board in its report to the President dated December 30, 1938, and by the Advisory Council of Social Security in its report dated December 10, 1938, the action of representatives of the churches, colleges, and hospitals makes the change certain.

The bill would safeguard the tax-exempt status of the religious and charitable agency paying the tax by requiring that all revenues collected from such tax-exempt agencies "shall be paid directly into the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance trust fund" and in this way the proposed amendment would in reality convert what otherwise would be a general tax into a true contribution to a trust fund available only for the payment of old-age benefits and not subject to appropriation by Congress for any other purpose.

The bill would result in extending the coverage of old-age and survivors insurance benefits to all lay employees of the tax-exempt charitable, religious, and educational agencies heretofore excluded. It would continue to exclude from old-age and survivors benefits all clergy, sisters, and brothers of religious orders attached to schools, colleges, hospitals, homes for the aged, and all other charitable institutions.

The proposed amendment would subject these lay employees and their employers to the payment of the taxes levied for the support of the old-age and survivors insurance benefits system which at the present time are levied at the rate of 1 percent of wages received by the employee and of wages paid by the employer and which under the Social Security Act may be increased gradually but never without new legislation exceed 3 percent of wages received and wages paid.

The religious, charitable, and educational institutions that have agreed to this proposal, approve of the legislation and request favorable action are the following: National Council Protestant Episcopal Church (speaking for itself and not the whole church); National Catholic Welfare Conference; Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds; American Hospital Association; American Association of Social Workers; Community Chests and Councils, Inc., and National Recreation Association.

The principle of the amendment is favored by the Social Security Board and it will be

included in the general revision of the Social Security Act which has been contemplated for some time.

REESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF AGRICULTURAL LENDING AGENCIES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, to be referred to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures, in connection with the concurrent resolution, a letter which I sent to the Secretary of Agriculture on January 28, which briefly, in three paragraphs, sets forth the purpose of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and the letter will be printed in the RECORD, and also referred to the same joint committee.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) is as follows:

Whereas on January 23, 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture in a formal release stated that through the Food Production Administration 5 percent 1-year agricultural loans would be made available to farmers to provide funds to aid war-food growing, that $225,000,000 was available for that purpose; that this program was not a substitute for other sources of credit or intended to compete with other lenders, but that its purpose was to supplement such other sources of credit where needed and that producers were to be urged to obtain their financial requirements, if possible, from other sources; and

Whereas there is already in operation the Production Credit Corporation, a governmental lending agency which provides, on a commercial basis, agricultural loans in direct competition with private enterprise, and also in operation the Farm Security Administration, a governmental agency which provides credit to eligible farmers who desire to rehabilitate themselves on the land, both of which were created to provide funds for farmers, that they might produce agricultural products; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture has stated that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation (formerly known as the Barnyard Loan Agency) is to be revived as another Government-subsidized lending agency, to be financed out of public funds, where there is already in operation the Production Credit Corporation and the Farm Security Administration which have similar functions; and

Whereas it is believed the functions and activities of such Government-subsidized lending agencies could be appropriately handled, through available facilities of private lending agencies, without detriment to agriculture or impairment of all-out agricultural production, inasmuch as private lending agencies now have available money to make agricultural loans without reviving any governmental lending agency, without unnecessary governmental expenditures, and without competition with private enterprise or prejudice to private lending agencies; and

Whereas a consolidation of the agricultural lending agencies of the Government, or a proper correlation of their functions, activities, and services with those of private lending agencies, should provide the same equivalent service to agriculture as is now being provided by such Government-subsidized lending agencies, and would not result in loss to the agricultural producer but would benefit him, would eliminate unnecessary agencies, would conserve public funds, would eliminate duplicity, would release and provide needed manpower and materials for other lines of endeavor, and would be feasible: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures created by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 is hereby requested, in connection with the investigations provided for by such section 601, to investigate the need for the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation and its reestablishment, to determine whether the making available of $225,000,000 of public moneys for lending purposes is an essential or nonessential expenditure and to determine whether the consolidation of all agricultural lending agencies of the Government, or the correlation of the functions of such agencies with the services of private lending agencies, would result in the conservation of public moneys and release manpower and materials to other essential activities.

The letter presented by Mr. WHERRY is as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1943.

MR. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
*Secretary of Agriculture,*
*Department of Agriculture,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SECRETARY: On January 23, you made a formal release stating that through the agency of the Food Production Administration, 5-percent 1-year agricultural loans would be made available to farmers to provide funds to aid them in war food growing, and that $225,000,000 was available for that purpose.

Your release further stated that the proposed program "is not a substitute for other sources of credit, nor is it intended to compete with other lenders. Each producer is urged to obtain his financial requirements, if possible, from other sources." I would appreciate enlightment on the exact meaning you attached to the phrase "from other sources." Do you mean other governmental lending agencies, or do you mean private lending agencies, or both?

I have received many protests from private lending agencies who have become aroused at the further extension of your lending program, and especially at your proposals to revamp the old R. A. C. C. and set up the machinery when there are already two governmental agencies—the Production Credit Corporation and the Farm Security Administration—that are making loans to farmers for this purpose.

The private lending agencies, which include country banks, have funds in abundance for this purpose, but find themselves confronted and competing with Government-subsidized credit.

I suggest that some regulation be promulgated by proper authority which would require that before borrowers obtain loans from any of these agencies that they be required to certify that they have applied for and were unable to secure funds from their local lending agencies, or in the alternative if such funds are not so available, then the Farm Credit Administration should and could arrange to handle such loans through private lending agencies.

This would encourage the continuation of private lending agencies and would forego the reviving of the R. A. C. C., which in reality is setting up another bureau at an enormous and unnecessary expense to the taxpayers of this country.

Yours truly,

KENNETH S. WHERRY.

INVESTIGATION OF LABOR SHORTAGE IN PACIFIC COAST AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN STATES

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 88), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the existing shortage of labor in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States and its effect upon the efficient and successful prosecution of the war effort, and (2) methods of relieving such shortage. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

ARMY AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS — CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR FOR AIR

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD correspondence relating to Army airplane accidents between Hon. Robert A. Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air, and myself.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT A. LOVETT,
*Assistant Secretary of War for Air,*
*War Department, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You will recall that last fall I talked with you in reference to the number of accidents in South Carolina. Recently there have been quite a few and naturally many of the people have written me regarding the same.

I do wish if you have any information on the situation that is consistent with the War Department's policy to release that you might inform me.

I do hope that it has been decreased and if it has been I would appreciate your advising me in order that I may give publicity to this information. I believe it will be of great benefit to the many who are interested if you could write me exactly the record that is being made, and, of course, if it is consistent with the policy of the War Department to publicize the same.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

BURNET R. MAYBANK.

---

WAR DEPARTMENT,
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR AIR,
*Washington, D. C., January 28, 1943.*

The Honorable BURNET R. MAYBANK,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: In reply to your letter of January 21 requesting information

about accidents in Army airplanes, we welcome the opportunity to set forth the facts in the case.

All activities of the Army Air Forces in the United States have been expanded in the past year far beyond the realization of even the best informed public. In the first 8 months of 1942 (the latest completely tabulated figures available) 74.3 percent more hours were flown than in the whole 10-year period from 1930 to 1940. Ninety-eight and five-tenths percent more miles were flown from January through August 1942 than in the entire 10 years, 1930 to 1940. This 8 months' mileage was equivalent to over 48,000 trips around the world.

In spite of this extraordinary expansion the rate of accidents per 1,000 hours flown was lower in the 1942 period than the 10-year peacetime average.

Accident rates fluctuate from month to month and from year to year. Hence an average is used to obtain a reliable comparison. The figures for the first 8 months of 1942 show that the accident rate per 1,000 hours during that period was actually eleven one-hundredths lower than the rate for the 10-year peacetime period from 1930 to 1940. The rate of fatal accidents is up only fourteen one-thousandths compared with the 10-year average.

The increase in fatalities results primarily from two factors: (a) the great increase in speed and weight of modern combat planes as compared with the peacetime planes; and, (b) the very great increase in the size of the planes and the number of persons carried as crew. Since a larger number of men are frequently involved in a single accident today, the rate of fatalities per 1,000 hours has increased five one-hundredths compared with the 10-year peacetime average.

These figures are striking, and especially so when it is realized that our training schools and operational training units are operating under pressure of war. Furthermore, before sending combat crews into combat theaters in varying climatic conditions completely around the world, it is necessary to train them in a variety of weather conditions so that, when they meet the enemy in life and death combat, they will not have the added hazard of running into flying conditions and weather with which they are not experienced.

The military airplane is a weapon—perhaps the most powerful one in existence. Such planes are very fast, heavily armed, and carry explosives. Nevertheless, in the face of these facts it is notable that the frequency rate of accidents is still actually lower per hours flown than the average of the peacetime years mentioned above.

The Army Air Forces are understandably determined to maintain the fine record which has resulted from unceasing attention to safety measures and control. The Directorate of Flying Safety is continually improving safety techniques in order to keep accidents at the lowest rate consistent with the hazards necessarily involved in the primary task of the Army Air Forces, which is to make our pilots the best combat pilots in the world.

We feel sure that the public is prepared for unavoidable accidents, but they are entitled to know all the facts which can be given short of disclosing information which would be useful to the enemy. Accordingly, as a matter of policy the Army Air Forces do not withhold from the press news of accidents. In consequence, the publicity such occurrences receive has created in the minds of some people the wrong impression that accidents are increasing at an alarming rate and that proper measures are not being taken to reduce them. The facts given at the outset of this letter prove that the opposite is the truth.

It is well to point out at this time that the number of accidents has increased and will increase in some proportion to the tremendous increase in the number of planes flying and the number of hours flown. This is so for the same reason that there are more accidents in a State with 1,000,000 automobiles than in another one with 100,000 cars. The important criterion is whether the rate of accidents in relation to the number of hours flown has increased disproportionately.

A knowledge of the true facts and of the determined efforts which are constantly made to protect the lives of our men in training and to give them a better fighting chance against an enemy seasoned by years of combat experience should result in continued confidence by the public in the carefully planned and supervised program of the Army Air Forces.

You may use this letter in any way you wish. If you decide to use it, I trust that you will agree with me that it is best to have it published in full rather than in part.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT,
*Assistant Secretary of War for Air.*

---

JANUARY 30, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT A. LOVETT,
*Assistant Secretary of War for Air,*
*War Department, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please permit me to thank you for your letter of January 28 and commend and congratulate those who have made such a splendid record.

I am indeed happy to have this information in order that I may have it placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the people of the United States will fully appreciate what the Army Air Force is doing in these perilous times.

With my kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

BURNET R. MAYBANK.

## QUORUM FOR TRANSACTION OF BUSINESS BY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Finance Committee, by unanimous agreement at its first meeting of the Seventy-eighth Congress, on Friday, January 29, 1943, adopted an order which I desire to have entered in the RECORD after it has been read by the clerk.

I may say that the order is the reestablishment of a policy of the committee which prevailed throughout the Seventy-seventh and previous Congresses.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The Finance Committee, by unanimous agreement at its first meeting of the Seventy-eighth Congress, on Friday, January 29, 1943, adopted the following order:

"That seven members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of such business as may be considered by the committee during the Seventy-eighth Congress."

## FRAUD IN WAR INDUSTRIES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I was shocked a few days ago when I read a front-page editorial in the Kansas City Kansan, published in Kansas City, Kans., disclosing that a Federal grand jury, district of Kansas, had found practices in war-production plants in the Kansas City area which had resulted in the assembly and in the manufacture of faulty and defective war materials and utilities.

The grand jury found that there was callous indifference with regard to the character and quality of personnel in certain inspection departments and an apparent lack of cooperation between production and inspection.

The grand jury also found that these things, which affect the safety and lives of our men in the armed services, and some of which apparently might have serious repercussions on the entire war effort, had been condoned, overlooked, or encouraged by supervisors or officials.

Mr. President, if careless selection of personnel, careless supervision of work, careless work, and careless or perfunctory inspections are resulting in turning out inferior equipment in our war plants, then those in charge should take immediate and forceful steps to remedy this condition.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial referred to and a copy of the grand jury findings forwarded to the Kansas delegation in Congress be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and findings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Kansan of January 22, 1943]

### A SCATHING CRITICISM

The Federal grand jury's caustic criticism of loose production procedure in war industries in this area is a matter of utmost importance to the entire Nation, in fact it is vital to the entire United Nation's war effort. The conditions reviewed by the grand jury may exist in war industries in other communities where pressure production methods are being used to speed production.

Our fighting men must be given plenty of fighting equipment. But every precaution against defective fighting equipment must be taken.

The grand jury asserted bluntly that it had received evidences of certain practices in war plants here, arising from the pressure of production, which resulted in the assembly and in the manufacture of faulty and defective war materials and utilities.

It claimed that it had discovered callous indifference with regard to the character and quality of personnel in certain inspection departments, that it had found an apparent lack of cooperation between production and inspection. And to top it off, the jury claimed that these things apparently had been condoned, overlooked, or encouraged by supervisors or officials.

The whole productive procedure, in the estimation of the grand jury, is such as to create "additional and unnecessary hazards to our men and women in the military forces and such as to constitute either sabotage, fraud against the Government, or other possible violations of the laws of the United States."

This is criticism so scathing and serious that it cannot be overlooked. It points to something far deeper than ordinary human carelessness. It charges indifference both to the lives of our fighting forces and to the very life of the Nation in the greatest crisis of war it has ever encountered.

Not since Washington issued a wave of criticism of public complacency toward the war effort a year ago has such a serious criticism been heard. In all fairness, it is a matter that should be gone into thoroughly

even to the point, as the grand jury suggests, of immediate and thorough consideration by our courts and the National Congress.

---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
DISTRICT OF KANSAS,
*Topeka, Kans., January 26, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
*United States Senators,*
*Washington, D. C.*

Hon. U. S. GUYER,
Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Hon. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON,
Hon. EDWARD H. REES,
Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
Hon. THOMAS D. WINTER,
*Washington, D. C.*

GENTLEMEN: A Federal grand jury was charged by Judge Hopkins in Kansas City on December 7, 1942. The grand jury adjourned from December 18 until January 4, but other than that was in continuous session from December 7, 1942, to January 21, 1943.

For the most part, the grand jury engaged in an investigation of certain monopoly practices of the chain grocery stores, but near the end of the session the grand jury considered a complaint against an employee of North American Aviation, Kansas City, Kans., and a stenographic report was made of the testimony before the grand jury by a large number of North American employees and officials.

It was in connection with that investigation that the grand jury made a special report in writing to Judge Hopkins, and you will notice the last paragraph of the report directs that copies be furnished to the United States Senators and Members of Congress from the State of Kansas. I have the honor to here transmit copies of that report.

Most sincerely,

HOWARD F. MCCUE, *Clerk.*

---

KANSAS CITY, KANS., *January 21, 1943.*

Hon. RICHARD J. HOPKINS,
*United States District Judge,*
*Kansas City, Kans.:*

In the court's charge to the grand jury at the beginning of this term of court it was indicated that the jury could and should inquire into and investigate any act by any individual which might constitute a violation of the laws of the United States. In accordance with such admonition, the jury directed the United States attorney to present whatever evidence there was obtainable concerning acts of individuals engaged either as workmen or officials in certain war and defense industries in this district in the manufacture or assembly of war or national defense products or material in such a defective manner as to create additional and unnecessary hazards to our men and women in the military forces, and such as to constitute either sabotage, fraud against the Government, or other possible violations of the laws of the United States.

A considerable amount of testimony was heard, and while no indictments have been returned by this grand jury charging violation of the United States statutes with respect to these matters, your jury feels tha certain practices have been engaged in by both employees and supervising personnel a plants engaged in the assembling and manufacture of war materials and products in this district with respect to pressure of production of such materials and products which has resulted in the assembly and in the manufac ture of faulty and defective war materials and utilities.

In the light of testimony presented, this grand jury feels that there has been exhibited a callous indifference respecting the character and quality of personnel in certain inspection departments. There also exists an apparent lack of cooperation between production and inspection.

In the opinion of this jury, such practices, apparently condoned, overlooked, or encouraged by supervisors or officials, are certainly not only to be condemned, but should be the subject of thought and earnest consideration by the law-making power of the Government, looking to the enactment of additional legislation covering such practices, as well as the subject of exploration and investigation by future grand juries convened in this district. This investigation should be made, in the opinion of this jury, in an attempt to fix the proper responsibility on those who may be guilty of causing such war materials and utilities to be manufactured or assembled in a defective manner.

The necessity for rapid production of war materials at this time is vital to this Nation. But, in the opinion of this grand jury, a system which under the guise of pressure of production tolerates, encourages, or overlooks the defective manufacture or assembly of war materials or parts is reprehensible. It is further the opinion of this grand jury that if the responsibility for such a system, if existing, can be fixed, that such system should be indictable under the laws of this Government, and manifestly be a subject of future investigation by other grand juries, and by other law enforcement agencies, as well as given the attention of legislative bodies.

It is, therefore, respectfully suggested that this honorable court call matters of this nature to the attention of a grand jury which may be convened in the future in order that further investigative attention be given such practices, if existing, with a view of presenting indictments, if there is, in the opinion of such jury, probable cause to believe that any individual, firm, or corporation has violated laws of the United States.

It is also respectfully suggested that copies of this report be forwarded to the Representatives in Congress from this State in order that the attention of the law-making power of the Government be directed to this matter, and that it be given the consideration which it deserves.

Ed. L. Mason, Kansas City, Kans., foreman; Ralph E. Adams, Norton; Darrell Garman, Republic; I. D. Conrad, Eskridge; Wm. Bierman, Kensington; R. B. Hooker, Winona; A. F. Dill, Goodland; F. W. Roepke, Manhattan; O. F. Smith, Kansas City, Kans.; Victor G. Lohse, Bremen; John S. Lewis, Willard; Joe Schletzbaum, Atchison; Fred H. Friedrichs, Herkimer; George R. Schroeder, Beverly; J. G. Bachelor, Belleville; O. E. Fones, Erie; Fred Moore, Goodland; Henry M. Hansen, Morland.

[Endorsed:] In the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

Grand jury report: Filed January 21, 1943. Howard F. McCue, clerk.

A true copy: So certified this 26th day of January 1943.

HOWARD F. MCCUE,
*Clerk.*

## EFFECT OF GASOLINE RATIONING IN NORTH DAKOTA ON FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, ever-increasing demands are being made continuously upon the farmer to step up food production, while at the same time farm equipment, machinery repairs, and transportation programs are being curtailed and a critical shortage of skilled farm labor is rapidly developing. In times such as these we need to know exactly how the various rationing programs are affecting the food-production efforts of our farmers.

With that thought in mind, I submit a résumé of a few typical reports from North Dakota showing first-hand how gasoline rationing actually works out in an agricultural State and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. Albert B. Prestbo, president, Northwood Commercial Club, Northwood, N. Dak.:

"Many farmers must avail themselves of the B or C coupons or look for greater elasticity in the rationing system; as an illustration, in the rigors of the northwestern climate, which includes North Dakota, a farmer might easily consume his entire quota of gasoline in trying to get a stalled car out of a snowdrift, and frequent emergencies arise which compel him to make from some distance out several trips to town the same day or to a neighbor's or a relative to help care for livestock or milk cows or to borrow or return articles and the like, when his ordinary quota of gas would be entirely inadequate.

"It is true, however, that many large farm operators here who had their quotas cut from the actual and necessary representation of their needs, will find themselves really crippled for their spring's work unless changes are made in the quotas allowed them. These farmers intend to lay their cards on the table when the time comes for their greatest need of gas and hope to be accommodated; if they are not taken care of the war effort itself must suffer. They trust, hope, and believe that their efforts to carry on with livestock, especially, will not be handicapped.

"The tire situation, of course, is infinitely worse than the gas-rationing program, and will tax to the utmost the ingenuity and resourcefulness of the farming community, the truckers and haulers, etc.

"The community, we are sure, will do all within its power to comply with any reasonable and necessary regulations to aid in bringing victory to the Allied forces, and there is daily evidence of this fact and of the patriotic cooperation of the citizens of the Northwood community."

Wesley E. Keller, vice president, Truax-Traer Coal Co., lignite division, Minot, N. Dak.:

"In our case, it is our understanding that under Office of Price Administration ruling, salesmen of essential commodities such as coal are entitled to either 8,600 miles of driving per year or 65 percent of their normal driving, whichever is less. With us 65 percent of normal driving would be less and we secured B ration coupons from the local rationing board for our five salesmen which range from 43 to 62 percent of their driving for last year which we do not feel is 'too liberal.'

"As to tire rationing and inspection, everybody that I have talked to thinks it is absolutely ridiculous to have to make these periodical inspections of tires and pay the amounts required by Office of Price Administration for such inspections as I am quite sure that a lot of these inspectors will make a racket of the program.

"Most of the garages, filling stations, and tire dealers are extremely short-handed trying to keep the cars running without foisting this job of tire inspection on them. Perhaps Office of Price Administration or McNutt will furnish the necessary labor to perform these periodical tire inspections."

Ray Thompson, Walcott, N. Dak.:

"The gas rationing regarding farm passenger cars is working reasonably well, so far. Most boards have been generous to farmers, and have given C mileage lavishly. Tires are in a different situation, although perhaps as well as can be expected.

"But the farm-truck program is the sore-spot of the whole gas situation. We have insufficient mileage, not enough gasoline, and the Office of Defense Transportation local requirements cripple the 'around the farm' operations of the smaller trucks. Example: I am putting in wheat a mile from home. I need gas, oil for tractor, seed for the drill, etc. Do I use my pick-up truck or shall I take 5 times as long and go with the tractor? The Office of Defense Transportation says I can't haul less than 1 ton per round trip, 20 gallons of gas and a pail of grease are a long way from a ton. Maybe I better farm a quarter less and quit raising so many hogs.

"That is farmer psychology. The Government does not want him to drop that extra quarter and quit raising hogs. But the farmer, by his very nature, is not one to go along with red tape and restrictions. How could he farm and comply with them all? Why can't Washington see that if they want to have large production in the face of farm labor shortage, that they should cease and desist from pestering to hampering him?"

"Why should tractor gas be rationed? Do they think we'll go joyriding on tractors? I know that many, many farmers are going to cut down seriously. 'Let 'er lay' and 'Let 'em farm it themselves.' That's the wrong attitude, and we don't want that, but the Federal Government is asking for it. None of the farmers want soldiers to go hungry but we've heard about wheat and corn surpluses for so long, we don't believe there is an actual shortage. I don't believe it myself if they wouldn't try to feed half the rest of the world.

"As a farmer I suggest taking off restrictions of every kind from the farm truck and tractor. Let his car be controlled with everybody else, but don't bother the tools of production.

"P. S.: I personally know of farmers who have been allotted 10 gallons of gas for this 3-month period for a pick-up truck, and of others who have been making 8 to 10 thousand miles per year and have been cut to 3,100. Also I know of one man who doesn't use his truck in the winter outside of a load of coal or two who has to drive 25 miles every 60 days to get his tires inspected. He told me that he would make more miles for tire inspections than he would use the truck from December 15 to February 15. Another farmer had trouble getting his hogs to market at West Fargo because he doesn't own a truck, and his neighbors didn't want to use up their own precious allotments to haul his hogs. You can imagine how baffled he was."

Howard Boyd, Wheatland, N. Dak.:

"I have considerable to say. As a beginning, the mileage allowance as sent out by the Detroit Office of Defense Transportation office were so ridiculously out of line they were not even funny. E. g.: I have a one-half ton pick-up as an only means of transportation and was allowed 3,100 miles per year. This mileage is figured on 15 miles per gallon of gas. That would be possible without a load on a good road but when trucking snow and mud, with or without a load, it is hopelessly out of line. Then there are some instances of applicants getting plenty of gas, a few even more than asked for. It has also been noticed that large truckers are getting unlimited gas which adds up to an effort to force the farmer to hire his hauling done (this would build up great truck lines and would mean monopolistic commercial transportation under Government control).

"Another thing: I have made two trips to Fargo regarding this ration business and I have no idea how many more times I will need to go (75 miles per trip) before I am through. It sure saves tires and gas.

"The feeling is growing that while gas rationing may be desirable and necessary, why—oh, why—can't we have some sane and sensible administration? If the powers that be don't see the light before they ration tractor gas it will be a national calamity and I don't mean maybe. No farmer can farm without plenty of fuel (and has no time to unwind miles of red tape to get it), and isn't going to try very long. I feel safe in saying that the idiotic rationing administration is driving more farmers to quit in disgust and by next year food rationing will be a national necessity."

Carl Siverts, proprietor, Grain and Live Stock, Ash Coulee Ranch, Dodge, N. Dak.:

"I operate a combination cattle ranch and grain farm, consisting of 3,360 acres, of which I cultivate about 500 acres. Due to good competent help being hard to get of late years, I was obliged to sell off most of my horses and purchase power farm equipment in order to get the work done with less help. Now that so many of our boys are being drafted for armed service, it has been almost impossible to get any help this past year. In fact, during the year 1942 I have been alone on the place about two-thirds of the time, and in spite of this, by working night and day I managed to market over 100,000 pounds of beef, 5,000 pounds of hogs, and about $1,000 in cream, eggs, and poultry, so you can readily see that I haven't found much time for joy riding. I am 55 years old and getting to the age where I am not as able to put in long days like I used to, but as long as we are expected to produce food to feed the world, I am more than willing to continue to do my bit.

"I have a car that we use for what little family driving we find time to do and use a half-ton pick-up truck for hauling produce, and general farm trucking.

"When I applied for my Office of Defense Transportation certificate for my farm truck I gave all the information I could on my driving requirements in connection with the operation of my ranch and when the certificate was issued to me it allowed me a maximum mileage for the year of 717 miles for the farm truck. As my business takes me to a half dozen towns ranging from 15 miles the nearest to 50 miles the largest, you can see that 717 miles per year is inadequate. In fact, I use the truck hauling feed, seed, and general driving around the ranch and this alone will exceed the maximum allowance granted by the Office of Defense Transportation Board and makes no provisions for hauling grain and produce to market.

"I am wintering 175 head of cattle with the intention to continue raising beef, pork, grain, and produce, but if the Government is going to tie me down so that I cannot get enough gas to attend to the necessary driving in connection with my farm and ranching operations, I have only one alternative, and that is to sell out and retire. I can sell out, pay all my debts, and still have enough left to retire on, and that is just what I will do unless some measures are taken by you gentlemen in Washington to remedy this situation. I think that you will agree with me in that one man operating a large farm and ranch like mine with one man to help about 4 months out of the year, that it doesn't give me much time to go joyriding and still attend to my work.

"I notice a lot of State and Federal employees driving around with C cards on their car and sometimes have my doubt about their driving being very essential to the war effort. Also beer and liquor trucks as well as tobacco trucks, so if these industries are essential to the successful prosecution of the war, I would think that raising food should be that more important.

"There are hundreds of thousands of farmers and stockmen in the same position as I am in, all willing to continue to work a few more years in order to provide food for our people, but if we are going to be hamstrung by curtailment of items vitally necessary in order to produce this food, we have no other choice but to fold up and call it quits.

"I hope the injustices imposed on the people out here in the farming area in connection with the gasoline rationing can be remedied. We are not asking for one single gallon of gas for pleasure riding, nor do we feel that there is any time for anyone doing any joy riding for the duration, but we do ask that we are given the necessary supplies to produce all the food we can.

"P. S.: If anyone should doubt the statements as to labor available, acres farmed, number of cattle fed and sold, I will gladly substantiate this under oath."

Carl A. Braun, M. & B. Petroleum Co., Mayville, N. Dak.:

"It is my opinion the complete rationing set-up appears to be very inefficient. Citing my own experience, it was necessary for me to make five trips to the county seat, 20 miles away, to obtain a few coupons and blanks that could have been handled locally, thus saving approximately one-half day of my time each trip, say nothing of the waste of tires and gasoline. This being only my experience, others the same. Furthermore, the great amount of additional book work and extra clerical work needed to comply with the rationing set-up is unnecessary, and the large business as well as the small are holding this type of help from defense jobs where they, too, could be of a benefit to the war effort. The small as well as the large business would have more money for which to pay additional taxes and buy bonds.

"It is disgusting to think a certain Washington official continues to insist that a special group are paying to avert gasoline rationing in the Midwest.

"I have yet to hear the first objection to gasoline rationing by any major company, as today they are blessed with more Government contracts than they can fill. Naturally, when they can sell all the gasoline they can manufacture at prices from 12 to 15 cents per gallon to the Government, why should they want to take care of the small farmers and small users in our State, when they can only get 6 cents f. o. b. refinery? Yet their attitude is that of selfishness; if they cannot have all, they will see no one else gets it. I have reference to the many Montana refineries who are not fortunate enough either financially or have the necessary equipment and are too far away to bid on Government contracts. Yet they are able to supply our State and neighboring States with all the gasoline that is needed to take care of our requirements."

Ulrich Buchli, Hebron, N. Dak.:

"Bill, what do you think of our rationing situation, especially with the gas rationing that came into effect now? It makes it plenty tough for us that live out in the country, driving 13 miles one way; and then another thing, when a person has to go before the rationing board and then to beg for more gas and, another thing, for every application we make we have to go to Mandan where, on the other hand, we are supposed to save gas and tires; it just doesn't work out. It came in the paper that Congress was extending the rationing for 90 days, and then over the radio came that Roosevelt ordered Jeffers to go ahead with the rationing. I don't see that our Congress has anything to say what the people want and need. I only hope, when the new Congress meets after January 1, to put the brakes on a lot of red tape that we have to go through."

C. W. Graves, secretary-treasurer and general manager, Northern Packing Co., Grand Forks, N. Dak.:

"With reference to gas and tire rationing as it is working out in North Dakota. Of course such a radical readjustment as was required could not help but cause rather grave inconvenience, and the writer has heard of a number of instances that were

manifestly unfair. But on the whole there is no rebellion. The main trouble seems to have been the method used and the extremely complicated conditions. Possibly Mr. Henderson leaving the administration may tend to help adjustment; and I note in recent news dispatches that Jeffery has recommended that the farmer be cared for up to their full needs until April the first when new regulations can be worked out. What North Dakota must have is sufficient gas (and only sufficient) to do its farm work and to move its products into the centers.

"Personally, the writer is inclined to believe that this country is so large and its interests so diverse that it would be almost impossible to direct in detail what is to be done, by Washington bureaus. What the country needs is to be told what is necessary to do and I am quite sure, as doubtless you are, that North Dakota will cooperate fully. This will come about because North Dakota is contributing fully to the armed forces, and our people want to do what will help their boys the most.

"NOTE.—This is an important letter on N. D.'s incomes and taxes to be paid; on army."

George Crites, Crites Oil Co., Lisbon, N. Dak.:

"There is entirely too much red tape on tractor gas rationing. I would like to have a chance to exchange ideas with someone who has charge of the program. I have some ideas that would make it easier for the Government, the farmer, and the oil men. As far as cars go everyone around here seems to be pretty well taken care of. The questionnaires were too tough for the average fellow to make out and it put a lot of extra work on us."

A. J. Brandt, Fargo, N. Dak.:

"Regarding conditions existing up here with the gas rationing in effect, most people have used up their allotment for this period and just cannot go on. If one gets seriously ill in one of these small towns (you know doctors are few and far between in this country) and has to go from 25 to 100 miles to reach a doctor he probably will not have enough gasoline to serve his needs and by the time he finds a neighbor with a sufficient amount of gasoline it probably would be too late.

"The farmer being cut short it hurts business. And, after all, if our Government depends upon our farmers to raise a great share of the food needed to feed our soldiers and European countries, they should make allowances for extra gas so that they, the farmers, can get to town. In turn, this keeps our merchants, machine shops, and blacksmiths alive through these slack months, so that when spring comes they will be on the job when an emergency arises—a break-down. People in this North country cannot go out in their back yards and pick vegetables, yeast, or other necessary items more than 3 months of the year. It is just too cold (it is 10° below zero this a. m., with a foot of snow on the level). You realize that every farmer is trying to use all of his old machinery so as not to buy any new machinery as a war measure (we are all patriotic out here). You know as well as I do that this old machinery is going to have more break-downs and need more replacements than a new machine. The farmer just has to go to town to get his machinery repaired.

"I just learned of a blacksmith that burned out at Sabin, Minn. He was going to leave for defense work, but the merchants and farmers got together, bought him a new outfit, and started him in business—they needed that blacksmith. In reality, he is a defense worker. We have to have this farm machinery in working order to raise the food the Government is asking for, and we need gasoline to get these parts to the repairman and back to the farm. You cannot wait until the ration board allows gas for this, as the planting season will soon be here. I called the office of the Share-Your-Car Club and asked them to write you. I am enclosing a certified copy of statements issued by various firms as to their gas requirements and the amount allotted them. There is quite a difference. Too much to be healthy. You know, BILL, there is no pleasure driving in this country at this time of the year—it is too damn cold."

Aug. H. Seidel, Jr., Cathay, N. Dak.:

"We in this community are not at all satisfied; we must make too many trips to town to get something done. I have made 4 trips to town for my A card, or 108 miles (always something wrong); 2 trips for tractor fuel, or 42 miles; 2 trips for truck; and I do not know how many more for tractor gas and truck gas. If you want or must have a tire, you have to make from 4 to 7 trips to town. Then they at the board tell you you overlooked your truck tires and cannot get a new tire; you must meet them personally and state your case. Now, I think this is the board's fault. They, the board, tell you they do not know how to fill out the blanks; to go to some lawyer, which costs us extra; and if we fill out the blanks ourselves, they send them back, stating that we filled them out wrong. They are either ignorant or stubborn. We do not want to make any more miles than is necessary; we want to save gas and rubber. But how can we with such inefficiency? Some people live 20 to 25 miles from town; look at Milloy and Gus. We go once a week to town regular, or 34 miles round trip. Some people live farther, some closer, but all get 4 gallons per week; for farmer living 1 or 2 or 3 miles is O. K., but not 15 to 25 miles. I do not know how this can be regulated, except by local community * * * just a farmer."

Albert Kuball, manager, Farmers' Union Oil Co., Fessenden, N. Dak.:

"My personal opinion of gas rationing is that it is the most cussed thing that ever happened to us all in North Dakota, especially to us dealers. We have so much red tape to contend with that we must have extra help to do the red-tape job and do not get anything for it to pay our help. Last month my income was $50 less than I had to pay my help and then I did not get a dime out of it for myself as manager, to feed my family. This cannot go on for very long, or it will hamper the farm production as well as the war. There absolutely is no sense in having all the red tape connected with this rationing here in North Dakota; the farmers must have so much gasoline to do their jobs and why in hell penalize the dealer by making him work day and night for foolishness. The farmers are sick about it, and we as dealers are more than sick about it all—to spend our valuable time trying to explain and cannot do just justice to our regular business. I have talked to many of the oil dealers and they too are all sick about it as I am, and I hope something can be done about it as soon as possible.

"Many farmers have already quit farming and many, many more will, if this red tape keeps on. The draft boards take their boys that are needed here to help, and many have to sell their farm, machinery, cattle, and sheep, and go. I have a sale bill right in front of me here in my office of such a case. (Something screwy somewhere). We all want to do our very best to win this war but it seems to me, it is done backward. People are getting disgusted and that is not good for our future. Please try and correct some of this if possible."

Wes Keller, vice president, Truax-Traer Coal Co., Minot, N. Dak.:

"As to tire rationing and inspection, everybody that I have talked to thinks it is absolutely ridiculous to have to make these periodical inspections of tires and pay the amounts required by Office of Price Administration for such inspections as I am quite sure that a lot of these inspectors will make a racket of the program.

"Most of the garages, filling stations, and tire dealers are extremely short-handed trying to keep the cars running without foisting this job of tire inspection on them. Perhaps Office of Price Administration or McNutt will furnish the necessary labor to perform these periodical tire inspections."

Berlin Boyd, manager, Bismarck Association of Commerce, Bismarck, N. Dak.:

"From all the information I have been able to get locally the majority of gasoline users in this area seem to be pretty well satisfied with the way the tire and gasoline rationing programs are being handled here.

"There was some confusion at the outset, particularly among the farmers who used their passenger cars with trailers to haul livestock and produce into town and supplies back home. However, this matter was called to the attention of the State Office of Price Administration board and rectified immediately and from all reports our local board is using good judgment and making a sincere effort to approve sufficient gasoline for essential needs of farmers and business organizations."

Ray Thompson, Richland County Republican chairman, Walcott, N. Dak.:

"I am writing you regarding the gasoline and rubber situation from a farmer's viewpoint. The gas rationing regarding farm passenger cars is working reasonably well so far. Most boards have been generous to farmers and have given C mileage lavishly. Tires are in a different situation, although perhaps as well as can be expected.

"But the farm truck program is the sore spot of the whole gas situation. We have insufficient mileage, not enough gasoline, and the Office of Defense Transportation load requirements cripple the 'around the farm' operations of the smaller trucks. Example: I am putting in wheat a mile from home. I need gas, oil for tractor, seed for the drill, etc. Do I use my pick-up truck or shall I take five times as long and go with the tractor? The Office of Defense Transportation says I can't haul less than 1 ton per round trip. Twenty gallons of gas and a pail of grease are a long way from a ton. Maybe I better farm a quarter less and quit raising so many hogs.

"That is farmer psychology. The Government does not want him to drop that extra quarter and quit raising hogs. But the farmer by his very nature is not one to go along with red tape and restrictions. How could he farm and comply with them all? Why can't Washington see that if they want to have large production in the face of farm-labor shortage that they should cease and desist from pestering and hampering him?

"Why should tractor gas be rationed? Do they think we'll go joy riding on tractors? I know that many, many farmers are going to cut down seriously. 'Let 'er lay' and 'let 'em farm it themselves.' That's the wrong attitude, and we don't want that, but the Federal Government is asking for it. None of the farmers want soldiers to go hungry, but we've heard about wheat and corn surpluses for so long we don't believe there is an actual shortage. I don't believe it myself if they would not try to feed half the rest of the world.

"As a farmer, I suggest taking off restrictions of every kind from the farm truck and tractor. Let his car be controlled with everybody else, but don't bother the tools of production."

"P. S.: I personally know of farmers who have been allotted 10 gallons of gas for their 3-month period for a pick-up truck, and of others who have been making eight to ten thousand miles per year and have been cut to 3,100. Also, I know of one man who

doesn't use his truck in the winter, outside of a load of coal or two, who has to drive 25 miles every 60 days to get his tires inspected. He told me that he would make more miles for tire inspections than he would use the truck from December 15 to February 15. Another farmer had trouble getting his hogs to market at West Fargo because he doesn't own a truck, and his neighbors didn't want to use up their own precious allotments to haul his hogs. You can imagine how baffled he was."

Robert Gooden, Drayton, N. Dak.:

"I think if we all do our part it is going to work out good. There was a notice came out in the mail today that was being held a meeting for the purpose of enlarging our allowance. I am afraid I have this wrong, since I have looked at the notice again the meeting is to get an estimate of how much fuel of all kinds we think we will need this season. But I think anyone can get more if he can show that his demands are essential. Everybody seems satisfied and cooperating."

## SUGGESTIONS FOR SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a memorandum which I have prepared, which contains three suggestions for the Committee on Rules. It was recently my privilege to be appointed a member of that committee, but so far the committee has had no meetings. I ask that the proposed suggestions be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The memorandum of suggestions is as follows:

1. The Senate presiding officer should be required to state the motion whenever a vote—whether it is a voice vote or a roll-call vote—is taken. In other words, the presiding officer should not merely say the motion is on the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia. He should identify the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

Moreover, the principal motions and, in fact, all motions should be completely identified with a statement of exactly what their intent may be. This will, of course, appear in the RECORD and will greatly facilitate the use of the RECORD.

As it is at the present time, a Senator who has been absent is required to, in some cases, read through a number of pages of the RECORD before he can find out what a particular motion was. The effectiveness of the RECORD as a reference source would be immeasurably increased by the adoption of this rule.

Moreover, this procedure would be of tremendous value to Senators on the floor, particularly those Senators who may happen to come in just prior to a vote without having had the benefit of the previous discussion, in which case they are compelled to question other Senators as to precisely what the motion implies.

2. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should list all of the committee hearings and committee meetings scheduled for the following day. This would be an invaluable ready reference for all Members of the Senate. Frequently, hearings are conducted which may be of particular interest to some Senator who may not happen to be a Member of that particular committee and hence may not receive a notice of the meeting. The listing of these hearings and meetings in the RECORD would make it possible for each Senator to be advised as to all meetings which are scheduled.

3. Official United States Treasury Department balance sheets are sent to every Member of Congress. I think it would serve a very constructive purpose, particularly in these days of astronomical spending, if the totals involved in our balance sheet were inserted daily in the RECORD, so that each legislator would continually have before him the exact financial condition of our country.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to read the third suggestion into the RECORD, and comment very briefly upon it. It is as follows:

3. Official United States Treasury Department balance sheets are sent to every Member of Congress. I think it would serve a very constructive purpose, particularly in these days of astronomical spending, if the totals involved in our balance sheet were inserted daily in the RECORD—

Simply the totals—

so that each legislator would continually have before him the exact financial condition of our country.

As every Senator knows, the Budget provides for $109,000,000,000, $9,000,000,000 of which is the estimated overhead cost of government, and $3,000,000,000 the cost of interest. That leaves $97,000,000,000. That amount is broken down into various items as follows: Munitions, $66,000,000,000; government overhead, $9,000,000,000; military and civilian overhead, $21,000,000,000; interest, $3,000,000,000; industrial construction, $2,000,000,000; other construction, $5,000,000,000; lend-lease, $3,000,000,000, until we get a $66,000,000,000 balance, which is supposed to be used for munitions. Yet, Mr. President, it has been stated by the best authority in this country that the maximum amount which the country can produce in munitions through its industries is some $30,000,000,000. That leaves $36,000,000,000 which has not been accounted for in that respect.

Mr. President, the country has been thrilled, of course, by the recent action of the President. It has undoubtedly performed a great function in strengthening the morale of the peoples of the earth and the people of this country. But the American people have their eyes on that $109,000,000,000, as the letters which come to our desks indicate, and they are expecting that the Congress shall keep its eye on the ball. They do not want any more reckless, almost criminal, spending.

Mr. President, I have in mind a letter which came to my desk last Saturday. One of the commentators had mentioned an incident of someone selling a gold brick to the Government. The writer of the letter asked, "Are we expected to buy bonds when deals like this go on?"

I agree that it was a small item, but the morale of the people is tied up with the economics of the country, and the future of the country is tied up as well with its economics.

Mr. President, I believe that it would be well if, at the end of that part of the RECORD which shows the Senate proceedings, there were to be shown for each day the Senate is in session the balance as indicated, by the Treasury.

## AID TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, toward the end of the last session of the Congress I introduced a bill to aid small independent businesses of the country by the collection and dissemination of knowledge of business management and its application to specific problems and opportunities, in order that the American system of free enterprise may be strengthened, and that individual small businesses may be continued at a profit both to the businessman and to the community. The bill would give aid to small business through the extension of the field service of the Department of Commerce. The bill declared it—

to be the policy of the United States to maintain small independent businesses of the country, to improve their efficiency through improved management methods, to aid them in contributing their utmost to the national welfare, to expand the opportunities for such classes of enterprises, and assure the economic stability of the Nation.

Mr. President, on January 14 of this year I reintroduced the bill S. 356, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and I shall shortly ask the committee for hearings. The bill, in my judgment, is very necessary, particularly at this time.

The economic ailments from which small businessmen in the United States are suffering cannot be cured by absent treatment. Too many small business firms are far too ill to go to the doctor. The doctor must go to them. It is for this reason that I have reintroduced the bill which I presented at the close of the last session of Congress to give aid to small business through the extension of the field service of the Department of Commerce. I trust the bill will receive the approval of the Senate early in the present session.

The Government has for many years been rendering to the farmers of the United States the same sort of service proposed in the bill, and we all know that this similar type of service has been of tremendous benefit to agriculture. We should have provided this service for small businessmen many years ago. It would be criminal for us not to do so at this time when many experts tell us that the mortality rate in the field of small business will be very high unless some means are found of preventing this economic epidemic.

Mr. President, it is certainly vital to the war effort that the existing channels of distribution be kept in operation. We must keep wholesalers, retailers, and other small businessmen going, or our distributing system will be greatly injured. We must, however, give the small businessman practical advice. As matters now stand it is very difficult for him to obtain this sort of information. He can write to his Representatives in Congress and to Government agencies, but the specific individual problems which are confronting him, and which seem to him to be insurmountable, are hard to put into a letter, and equally hard for the recipient of such a letter to understand.

The proposed arrangements with educational institutions, as developed in the provisions of my bill, would permit the Department of Commerce to subcontract special research questions, thus utilizing existing facilities and talents without in-

creasing the permanent research staff of the Department.

The Department of Commerce already has a field service, known as the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, so that, as an organization in the field, it can carry forward the policy enunciated in the bill.

The Department of Commerce also has trained men and a very large amount of information collected by the Bureau of the Census and other agencies, all of which would be invaluable if it could be placed at the disposal of small businessmen.

Mr. President, my bill is designed to grant the Department of Commerce sufficient authority and personnel to decentralize this big problem, using the established field services of the Department as a nucleus for the work. It may not be possible under this program for representatives of the Department of Commerce to contact every businessman in need of information, in need of advice, in need of engineering services, in need of counsel on business practices, but it will be possible to make these services readily accessible. Almost any small businessman can reach his State capital, or one of the leading cities of his State, while very few of them have time or money to come to Washington.

So, Mr. President, my bill would increase the activity of the Department of Commerce and grant it additional authority in the field of small enterprise. The Department has the system in the field already set up. It has the information collected by the Census Bureau and by other agencies of the Government, and it can bring to little business that service which big business is able to purchase for itself. In my judgment, it would aid small business very materially. It would inform the Congress of the difficulties of small business. It would result in housing in the Department of Commerce an appropriate agency to handle a situation which that Department of Government was originally created to deal with.

The one big question and problem in the field of business is the survival of small business. It is fundamentally connected with the survival of our own way of life. So, Mr. President, during the present session I shall bring to the attention of the Senate the progress of this bill, and I hope that all Senators interested in the well-being and the progress of small business, as I am sure they are all interested, will lend me their support and their cooperation to the end that we may do something of very material substance insofar as small business is concerned. The proposed legislation will be before the Committee on Commerce. Hearings will be held, I am sure, in the very near future, and the interest of my colleagues in the Chamber will be deeply appreciated.

### FOOD PRODUCTION FOR THE WAR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there came to my desk today, from the United States Department of Agriculture, a very significant piece of information. We have heard a great deal lately about the threat to our food supply. The information to which I refer, Mr. President, shows that for the week ending Thursday, January 21, 1943, cheese production in this country is down 24 percent as compared with the corresponding week last year. For the preceding week, cheese production was down 20 percent.

Mr. President, we all know what that means. If cheese production is down, what is the situation with respect to other items? We know that in many places, particularly in Washington, we cannot procure a great many items of ordinary food, such as beef. If a week ago cheese production was down 20 percent, and for the week ending January 21 it was down 24 percent, where are we heading? Are we not in the position which was prophesied some time ago of the Government talking about aiding the farmer, but doing nothing to aid him?

Already we notice in the newspapers another campaign more or less to blame the farmer. There are three causes for the present situation. The first cause is that the farmer has not been able to obtain the necessary labor. It has been taken from him by competing industrial plants and by the Army.

In the second place, until recently, the farmer was not able to obtain adequate machinery, and he will not be able to obtain it until the manufacture of farm machinery is increased.

In the third place—and I say this because of the misrepresentation which is abroad in the land—the farmer has not been receiving adequate prices. Irrespective, Mr. President, of what you and I pay, the farmer has not been receiving adequate prices for his products.

I am not speaking merely for the farmer. I am speaking for 131,000,000 Americans who are asked to curtail their consumption of food in order that our armed forces and our allies may receive necessary food to keep the battle going.

Last year I called attention to the fact that it was imperative that an effort should be made to see that sufficient proper manpower was made available to the farmer for the spring work. I stated then that we should probably have to organize the boys and girls in the high schools, as well as professional men in the villages, and that many businessmen would have to close their places of business in order to assist in and go to the farms to provide adequate labor. Just the other day Mr. Landis, in Washington, suggested the same idea.

What has the Government done in order to effectuate that purpose? Has it expected the people to carry out the program on their own initiative? The answer is—as was suggested by a distinguished Senator only recently—that the Government is transferring a group of submarginal farmers from West Virginia and Kentucky and expecting them to go into the dairy business in my State and elsewhere to do the work required to be done.

I believe that such action will be of some assistance; but, Mr. President, this is our job. The situation is so serious that 6 or 8 months from now, when we really start to ration America, we shall feel the repercussion of it in the Senate.

I suggest that we get busy now and take action to see to it that the farmer is supplied with the labor necessary to produce the required quantity of food for our people at home, as well as for our allies and our armed forces.

### THE JOB OF THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Job of the Seventy-eighth Congress delivered by him before the Akron Junior Chamber of Commerce on January 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

### THE SPIRIT OF LIBERATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Spirit of Liberation" delivered by him at the proclamation dinner at the Knickerbocker Hotel at Chicago, Ill., on December 16, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

### A WARTIME CONGRESS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him on January 18, 1943, at the Young Men's Christian Association Forum, Portsmouth, Ohio, on the subject A Wartime Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

### WILLIAM McKINLEY THE MAN—EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a statement by him on January 29, 1943, at Niles, Ohio, at the McKinley centennial celebration, on the subject William McKinley—the Man, which appear in the Appendix.]

### BUILDING FOR A BETTER RURAL LIFE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR AIKEN

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Building for a Better Rural Life" delivered by Senator AIKEN before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, St. Louis, Mo., on January 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

### THE BAR IN A WORLD AT WAR—ADDRESS BY PAUL BOSLAUGH

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Bar in a World at War," delivered by Paul Boslaugh at the annual meeting of the Nebraska Bar Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

### TRAINING OF SOLDIER MECHANICS—ARTICLE BY WALTER McCALLUM

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the Aberdeen, Md., Proving Ground, written by Walter McCallum, and published in the Washington, D. C., Star of December 26, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

### PAY-AS-YOU-GO PLANS FOR PAYMENT OF FEDERAL INCOME TAX—LETTER FROM H. GRADY GORE

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter in relation to pay-as-you-go Federal income-tax plans, addressed to him under date of February 1, 1943, by H. Grady Gore, which appears in the Appendix.]

### THE FARMER AND THE WAR—EDITORIAL FROM THE FARMINGTON (CONN.) VALLEY HERALD

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Farmer and the War," published in the Farmington (Conn.) Valley Herald of January 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR MAIL—ARTICLE FROM UNITED STATES NEWS

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Tie-Up in War Mail—Why Letters From Home Are Slow in Reaching the Boys Overseas," published in the United States News of January 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded, and the calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and a treaty, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOMINATION OF WILEY BLOUNT RUTLEDGE TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. From the Committee on the Judiciary I submit a favorable report on the nomination of Justice Wiley Blount Rutledge, of Iowa, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Hon. James F. Byrnes, resigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

George D. Penniman, Jr., from the State of Maryland, to the position of labor utilization analyst, at $6,500 per annum, in the Washington regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Louis C. M. Abolin, from the State of New York, to the position of assistant labor utilization analyst (trainee), at $4,600 per annum in the Washington regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Edward L. Stevens, from the State of Virginia, to the position of field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Washington regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Ernest James Jaqua, from the State of California, to be head employment specialist, at $6,500 per annum, in the Bureau of Training in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission;

Harold L. Rothschild, from the State of Minnesota, to be head labor utilization analyst, at $6,500 per annum, in the Minneapolis regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Louis Bloch, from the State of California, to be program control technician, at $5,600 per annum, in the San Francisco regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

David G. Nagle, from the State of Massachusetts, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Boston regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Carlos Stageberg, from the State of Minnesota, to be senior labor utilization analyst, at $4,600 per annum, in the Minneapolis regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Charles W. Patrick, from the State of California, to be senior training specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco area office of the War Manpower Commission;

Donald Theodore Larin, from the State of North Dakota, to be senior agricultural employment specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Minneapolis regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Thomas J. Corcoran, from the State of New York, to be area director at $4,600 per annum, in the Syracuse area office of the War Manpower Commission;

Aloysius J. McGinty, from the State of New York, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Albany area office of the War Manpower Commission;

Daniel J. Boyle, from the State of Massachusetts, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Boston regional office of the War Manpower Commission; and

Frederick J. Graham, from the State of Massachusetts, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Boston regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA — RELINQUISHMENT OF EXTRATERRITORIAL RIGHTS IN CHINA

Mr. CONNALLY. The President of the United States has this day transmitted to the Senate a treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China providing for the relinquishment of extraterritorial rights in China and the regulation of related matters, signed at Washington, January 11, 1943. I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the treaty, so that it may be published.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The treaty, with the accompanying supplementary notes, is as follows:

EXECUTIVE A, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA FOR THE RELINQUISHMENT OF EXTRATERRITORIAL RIGHTS IN CHINA AND THE REGULATION OF RELATED MATTERS

The United States of America and the Republic of China, desirous of emphasizing the friendly relations which have long prevailed between their two peoples and of manifesting their common desire as equal and sovereign States that the high principles in the regulation of human affairs to which they are committed shall be made broadly effective, have resolved to conclude a treaty for the purpose of adjusting certain matters in the relations of the two countries, and have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America,

Mr. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

The President of the National Government of the Republic of China,

Dr. Wei Tao-ming, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of China to the United States of America;

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers found to be in due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

*Article I*

All those provisions of treaties or agreements in force between the United States of America and the Republic of China which authorize the Government of the United States of America or its representatives to exercise jurisdiction over nationals of the United States of America in the territory of the Republic of China are hereby abrogated. Nationals of the United States of America in such territory shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of the Republic of China in accordance with the principles of international law and practice.

*Article II*

The Government of the United States of America considers that the Final Protocol concluded at Peking on September 7, 1901, between the Chinese Government and other governments, including the Government of the United States of America, should be terminated and agrees that the rights accorded to the Government of the United States of America under that Protocol and under agreements supplementary thereto shall cease.

The Government of the United States of America will cooperate with the Government of the Republic of China for the reaching of any necessary agreements with other governments concerned for the transfer to the Government of the Republic of China of the administration and control of the Diplomatic Quarter at Peiping, including the official assets and the official obligations of the Diplomatic Quarter, it being mutually understood that the Government of the Republic of China in taking over administration and control of the Diplomatic Quarter will make provision for the assumption and discharge of the official obligations and liabilities of the Diplomatic Quarter and for the recognition and protection of all legitimate rights therein.

The Government of the Republic of China hereby accords to the Government of the United States of America a continued right to use for official purposes the land which has been allocated to the Government of the United States of America in the Diplomatic Quarter in Peiping, on parts of which are located buildings belonging to the Government of the United States of America.

*Article III*

The Government of the United States of America considers that the International Settlements at Shanghai and Amoy should revert to the administration and control of the Government of the Republic of China and agrees that the rights accorded to the Government of the United States of America in relation to those Settlements shall cease.

The Government of the United States of America will cooperate with the Government of the Republic of China for the reaching of any necessary agreements with other governments concerned for the transfer to the Government of the Republic of China of the administration and control of the International Settlements at Shanghai and Amoy, including the official assets and the official obligations of those settlements, it being mutually understood that the Government of the Republic of China in taking over administration and control of those Settlements will make provision for the assumption and discharge of the official obligations and liabilities of those Settlements and for the recognition and protection of all legitimate rights therein.

*Article IV*

In order to obviate any questions as to existing rights in respect of or as to existing titles to real property in territory of the Republic of China possessed by nationals (including corporations or associations), or by the Government, of the United States of America, particularly questions which might arise from the abrogation of the provisions of

treaties or agreements as stipulated in Article I, it is agreed that such existing rights or titles shall be indefeasible and shall not be questioned upon any ground except upon proof, established through due process of law, of fraud or of fraudulent or other dishonest practices in the acquisition of such rights or titles, it being understood that no right or title shall be rendered invalid by virtue of any subsequent change in the official procedure through which it was acquired. It is also agreed that these rights or titles shall be subject to the laws and regulations of the Republic of China concerning taxation, national defense, and the right of eminent domain, and that no such rights or titles may be alienated to the government or nationals (including corporations or associations) of any third country without the express consent of the Government of the Republic of China.

It is also agreed that if it should be the desire of the Government of the Republic of China to replace, by new deeds of ownership, existing leases in perpetuity or other documentary evidence relating to real property held by nationals, or by the Government, of the United States of America, the replacement shall be made by the Chinese authorities without charges of any sort and the new deeds of ownership shall fully protect the holders of such leases or other documentary evidence and their legal heirs and assigns without diminution of their prior rights and interests, including the right of alienation.

It is further agreed that nationals or the Government of the United States of America shall not be required or asked by the Chinese authorities to make any payments of fees in connection with land transfers for or with relation to any period prior to the effective date of this treaty.

*Article V*

The Government of the United States of America having long accorded rights to nationals of the Republic of China within the territory of the United States of America to travel, reside and carry on trade throughout the whole extent of that territory, the Government of the Republic of China agrees to accord similar rights to nationals of the United States of America within the territory of the Republic of China. Each of the two Governments will endeavor to have accorded in territory under its jurisdiction to nationals of the other country, in regard to all legal proceedings, and to matters relating to the administration of justice, and to the levying of taxes or requirements in connection therewith, treatment not less favorable than that accorded to its own nationals.

*Article VI*

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China mutually agree that the consular officers of each country, duly provided with exequaturs, shall be permitted to reside in such ports, places and cities as may be agreed upon. The consular officers of each country shall have the right to interview, to communicate with, and to advise nationals of their country within their consular districts; they shall be informed immediately whenever nationals of their country are under detention or arrest or in prison or are awaiting trial in their consular districts and they shall, upon notification to the appropriate authorities, be permitted to visit any such nationals; and, in general, the consular officers of each country shall be accorded the rights, privileges, and immunities enjoyed by consular officers under modern international usage.

It is likewise agreed that the nationals of each country, in the territory of the other country, shall have the right at all times to communicate with the consular officers of their country. Communications to their consular officers from nationals of each country who are under detention or arrest or in prison or are awaiting trial in the territory of the other country shall be forwarded to such consular officers by the local authorities.

*Article VII*

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China mutually agree that they will enter into negotiations for the conclusion of a comprehensive modern treaty of friendship, commerce, navigation and consular rights, upon the request of either Government or in any case within six months after the cessation of the hostilities in the war against the common enemies in which they are now engaged. The treaty to be thus negotiated will be based upon the principles of international law and practice as reflected in modern international procedures and in the modern treaties which the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China respectively have in recent years concluded with other governments.

Pending the conclusion of a comprehensive treaty of the character referred to in the preceding paragraph, if any questions affecting the rights in territory of the Republic of China of nationals (including corporations or associations), or of the Government, of the United States of America should arise in future and if these questions are not covered by the present treaty, or by the provisions of existing treaties, conventions, or agreements between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China not abrogated by or inconsistent with this treaty, such questions shall be discussed by representatives of the two Governments and shall be decided in accordance with generally accepted principles of international law and with modern international practice.

*Article VIII*

The present treaty shall come into force on the day of the exchange of ratifications.

The present treaty shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

Signed and sealed in the English and Chinese languages, both equally authentic, in duplicate, at Washington, this eleventh day of January, one thousand nine hundred forty-three, corresponding to the eleventh day of the first month of the thirty-second year of the Republic of China.

[SEAL] CORDELL HULL.
[SEAL] WEI TAO-MING.

---

SUPPLEMENTARY EXCHANGE OF NOTES

CHINESE EMBASSY,
*Washington, January 11, 1943.*

Hon. CORDELL HULL,
*Secretary of State.*

EXCELLENCY: Under instruction of my Government, I have the honor to state that in connection with the treaty signed today by the Government of the Republic of China and the Government of the United States of America, in which the Government of the United States of America relinquishes its extraterritorial and related special rights in China, it is the understanding of the Government of the Republic of China that the rights of the Government of the United States of America and of its nationals in regard to the systems of treaty ports and of special courts in the International Settlements at Shanghai and Amoy and in regard to the employment of foreign pilots in the ports of the territory of China are also relinquished. In the light of the abolition of treaty ports as such, it is understood that all coastal ports in the territory of the Republic of China which are normally open to American overseas merchant shipping will remain open to such shipping after the coming into effect of the present treaty and the accompanying exchange of notes.

It is mutually agreed that the merchant vessels of each country shall be permitted freely to come to the ports, places, and waters of the other country which are or may be open to overseas merchant shipping, and that the treatment accorded to such vessels in such ports, places, and waters shall be no less favorable than that accorded to national vessels and shall be as favorable as that accorded to the vessels of any third country.

It is mutually understood that the Government of the United States of America relinquishes the special rights which vessels of the United States of America have been accorded with regard to the coasting trade and inland navigation in the waters of the Republic of China and that the Government of the Republic of China is prepared to take over any American properties that may have been engaged for those purposes and to pay adequate compensation therefor. Should either country accord the rights of inland navigation or coasting trade to vessels of any third country such rights would similarly be accorded to the vessels of the other country. The coasting trade and inland navigation of each country are excepted from the requirement of national treatment and are to be regulated according to the laws of each country in relation thereto. It is agreed, however, that vessels of either country shall enjoy within the territory of the other country with respect to the coasting trade and inland navigation treatment as favorable as that accorded to the vessels of any third country.

It is mutually understood that the Government of the United States of America relinquishes the special rights which naval vessels of the United States of America have been accorded in the waters of the Republic of China and that the Government of the Republic of China and the Government of the United States of America shall extend to each other the mutual courtesy of visits by their warships in accordance with international usage and comity.

It is mutually understood that questions which are not covered by the present treaty and exchange of notes and which may affect the sovereignty of the Republic of China shall be discussed by representatives of the two Governments and shall be decided in accordance with generally accepted principles of international law and with modern international practice.

With reference to article IV of the treaty, the Government of the Republic of China hereby declares that the restriction on the right of alienation of existing rights or titles to real property referred to in that article will be applied by the Chinese authorities in an equitable manner and that if and when the Chinese Government declines to give assent to a proposed transfer the Chinese Government will, in a spirit of justice and with a view to precluding loss on the part of American nationals whose interests are affected, undertake, if the American party in interest so desires, to take over the right or title in question and to pay adequate compensation therefor.

It is mutually understood that the orders, decrees, judgments, decisions, and other acts of the United States Court for China and of the consular courts of the United States of America in China shall be considered as res judicata and shall, when necessary, be enforced by the Chinese authorities. It is further understood that any cases pending before the United States Court for China and the consular courts of the United States of America in China at the time of the coming

into effect of this treaty shall, if the plaintiff or petitioner so desires, be remitted to the appropriate courts of the Government of the Republic of China which shall proceed as expeditiously as possible with their disposition and in so doing shall insofar as practicable apply the laws of the United States of America.

It is understood that these agreements and understandings if confirmed by your Excellency's Government shall be considered as forming an integral part of the treaty signed today and shall be considered as effective upon the date of the entrance into force of that treaty.

I shall be much obliged if your Excellency will confirm the foregoing.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

WEI TAO-MING.

---

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, January 11, 1943.*

His Excellency DR. WEI TAO-MING,
*Ambassador of China.*

EXCELLENCY: In connection with the treaty signed today between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China in which the Government of the United States of America relinquishes its extraterritorial and related special rights in China, I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of today's date, reading as follows:

"EXCELLENCY: Under instruction of my Government, I have the honor to state that in connection with the treaty signed today by the Government of the Republic of China and the Government of the United States of America, in which the Government of the United States of America relinquishes its extraterritorial and related special rights in China, it is the understanding of the Government of the Republic of China that the rights of the Government of the United States of America and of its nationals in regard to the systems of treaty ports and of special courts in the international settlements at Shanghai and Amoy and in regard to the employment of foreign pilots in the ports of the territory of China are also relinquished. In the light of the abolition of treaty ports as such, it is understood that all coastal ports in the territory of the Republic of China which are normally open to American overseas merchant shipping will remain open to such shipping after the coming into effect of the present treaty and the accompanying exchange of notes.

"It is mutually agreed that the merchant vessels of each country shall be permitted freely to come to the ports, places, and waters of the other country which are or may be open to overseas merchant shipping, and that the treatment accorded to such vessels in such ports, places, and waters shall be no less favorable than that accorded to national vessels and shall be as favorable as that accorded to the vessels of any third country.

"It is mutually understood that the Government of the United States of America relinquishes the special rights which vessels of the United States of America have been accorded with regard to the coasting trade and inland navigation in the waters of the Republic of China and that the Government of the Republic of China is prepared to take over any American properties that may have been engaged for those purposes and to pay adequate compensation therefor. Should either country accord the rights of inland navigation or coasting trade to vessels of any third country, such rights would similarly be accorded to the vessels of the other country. The coasting trade and inland navigation of each country are excepted from the requirement of national treatment and are to be regulated according to the laws of each country in relation thereto. It is agreed, however, that vessels of either country shall enjoy within the territory of the other country with respect to the coasting trade and inland navigation treatment as favorable as that accorded to the vessels of any third country.

"It is mutually understood that the Government of the United States of America relinquishes the special rights which naval vessels of the United States of America have been accorded in the waters of the Republic of China and that the Government of the Republic of China and the Government of the United States of America shall extend to each other the mutual courtesy of visits by their warships in accordance with international usage and comity.

"It is mutually understood that questions which are not covered by the present treaty and exchange of notes and which may affect the sovereignty of the Republic of China shall be discussed by representatives of the two Governments and shall be decided in accordance with generally accepted principles of international law and with modern international practice.

"With reference to article IV of the treaty, the Government of the Republic of China hereby declares that the restriction on the right of alienation of existing rights or titles to real property referred to in that article will be applied by the Chinese authorities in an equitable manner and that if and when the Chinese Government declines to give assent to a proposed transfer the Chinese Government will, in a spirit of justice and with a view to precluding loss on the part of American nationals whose interests are affected, undertake, if the American party in interest so desires, to take over the right or title in question and to pay adequate compensation therefor.

"It is mutually understood that the orders, decrees, judgments, decisions, and other acts of the United States Court for China and of the consular courts of the United States of America in China shall be considered as res judicata and shall, when necessary, be enforced by the Chinese authorities. It is further understood that any cases pending before the United States Court for China and the consular courts of the United States of America in China at the time of the coming into effect of this treaty shall, if the plaintiff or petitioner so desires, be remitted to the appropriate courts of the Government of the Republic of China which shall proceed as expeditiously as possible with their disposition and in so doing shall insofar as practicable apply the laws of the United States of America.

"It is understood that these agreements and understandings if confirmed by Your Excellency's government shall be considered as forming an integral part of the treaty signed today and shall be considered as effective upon the date of the entrance into force of that treaty.

"I shall be much obliged if Your Excellency will confirm the foregoing.

"I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration."

I have the honor to confirm that the agreements and understandings which have been reached in connection with the treaty signed today by the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China are as set forth in the above note from Your Excellency.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

CORDELL HULL.

## NOMINATION OF EDWARD J. FLYNN TO BE MINISTER TO AUSTRALIA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*February 1, 1943.*

*To the Senate of the United States:*

At his request, I withdraw the nomination of Edward J. Flynn, of New York, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia, which was sent to the Senate January 11, 1943.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement issued yesterday by Mr. Flynn in regard to his request that the nomination be withdrawn.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything in connection with this situation, but if the statement of Mr. Flynn is to be printed in the RECORD, I desire to comment upon it briefly, because I think the RECORD should be clear for the sake of history. I am referring particularly to some of the contents of the Flynn statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no desire to get into a controversy over what Mr. Flynn said in his statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There will be no controversy, but I wish to make a comment if the Flynn statement is to go into the RECORD. I shall make it for the sake of historical accuracy.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it is going to lead to any debate, I withdraw the request.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is immaterial to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is immaterial to me, too.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Some of Mr. Flynn's comments require a parallel statement if the RECORD is to be accurate.

Mr. BARKLEY. For the moment, I withdraw the request.

## CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD—NOMINATION OF JOSH LEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Josh Lee to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I anticipated the withdrawal of the Flynn nomination this morning, and immediately conferred with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], who will oppose the confirmation of the nomination just read. He has advised me he is ready to proceed to the consideration of the nomination. Therefore I want the presence of the Senator noted before we take up the Lee nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that this nomination will probably lead to some discussion, we should have a quorum present. I suggest the absence of a quroum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Ball | Bilbo |
| Andrews | Bankhead | Bone |
| Austin | Barkley | Brewster |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bridges | Hatch | Revercomb |
| Brooks | Hawkes | Robertson |
| Buck | Hayden | Russell |
| Burton | Hill | Shipstead |
| Bushfield | Holman | Stewart |
| Butler | Johnson, Colo. | Taft |
| Byrd | Kilgore | Thomas, Idaho |
| Capper | Langer | Thomas, Okla. |
| Caraway | Lodge | Thomas, Utah |
| Chandler | Lucas | Tobey |
| Chavez | McClellan | Tunnell |
| Clark, Mo. | McFarland | Tydings |
| Connally | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Danaher | McNary | Van Nuys |
| Davis | Maloney | Wagner |
| Downey | Maybank | Walsh |
| Ellender | Mead | Wheeler |
| Ferguson | Millikin | Wherry |
| George | Moore | White |
| Gerry | Murdock | Wiley |
| Gillette | Nye | Willis |
| Green | O'Mahoney | Wilson |
| Guffey | Overton | |
| Gurney | Radcliffe | |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is detained in the West on official business for the Senate.

I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is detained because of a slight cold.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, in connection with my remarks in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Josh Lee to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, I submit a copy of a letter which I wrote to the able chairman of the Committee on Commerce [Mr. BAILEY] under date of January 13, 1943. The letter states some of the reasons why I oppose the nomination. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
*Washington, D. C., January 13, 1943.*

Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
*Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Referring to the nomination of Josh Lee, of Oklahoma, as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Department of Commerce, that is pending before your committee for consideration, I beg to advise that I am opposed to his nomination and, therefore, would oppose confirmation by the Senate.

I am opposed to him for the reason that he is totally lacking in qualifications to fit him to be of service on that Board. His lack of qualifications for this position is a matter of common knowledge. His lack of qualifications is well known, in my opinion, by the Senators who have served with him. His lack of qualifications is well known in Oklahoma among the people who know him, and that is a very great many people. The people of Oklahoma, in my opinion, passed emphatic judgment on Josh Lee in the recent election regarding his suitability for public service.

I am very sure that the aviation industry, if it were free to express an opinion, would regard Senator Lee as totally unqualified for this important Board. The Board is important because it has to do with a broad field of aviation. It has to do with air routes, air fields, technical progress, and all sorts of features that require a technical knowledge. Whatever training Senator Lee may have had for public service, it certainly is not in the field of aviation. He is not a flyer, nor has he shown any particular confidence in aviation as a method of transportation. This is well known to the aviation industry. Since this is a regulatory board in the main, the aviation industry would be reluctant to testify before your committee concerning Senator Lee's fitness to serve efficiently upon the Board.

I am told that it has become a common practice on the part of both political parties to give preferential consideration for executive appointments to Senators who have been defeated by a vote of the people. Their fitness for the positions for which they are nominated is not very carefully scrutinized. What has grown to be known as senatorial courtesy has been persuasive in the minds of Senators of both parties in determining their votes. This so-called senatorial courtesy has, of course, some merit. It might be assumed, and very properly so, that a man who had served his country in the Senate should be given consideration for a further opportunity to be of service in public life, even though he had been defeated by the people of his own State. In the case of Senator Lee, I am of the opinion that the people of Oklahoma and many millions of people outside of the State of Oklahoma think that he has done a distinct disservice to his country. He has contributed substantially, while in the Congress, to the building up of a bureaucracy that is antagonistic to democratic institutions under the Constitution. He has been a willing advocate in the divesting of Congress of its constitutional powers and in the vesting of those powers in the executive department, which policy has done a great injury to the country and the country's government.

On principle, I am opposed to the appointment of a defeated Member of Congress to an office or a board created during his term in Congress. I would favor legislation prohibiting Members of Congress from being appointed to positions created during their terms for at least 2 years after they had retired from Congress, either voluntarily or involuntarily. I am reminded of the country-wide protest against pensions that were voted for Congress. That protest was so uniform and aggressive that Senator Lee himself advocated the repeal of this pension, or provision for civil-service-retirement benefits to the Members of the Congress of which he was a Member. Yet, as the law stands now, if Senator Lee were appointed to this position, he would be entitled to count all the years that he has been in Congress toward civil-service retirement, the same as he would have been if the so-called pension provision of the law had not been repealed.

I know of no reason why Senator Lee should not take his chances in a highly competitive situation in private industry, which has become distressingly infiltrated with bureaucracy and bureaucrats to the extent that to make a living in private enterprise today offers the most difficult problems in our American history.

I am making this protest against the confirmation of Senator Lee at the possible hazard of being construed as lacking in sympathy with the traditions, practices, and customs of the Senate, but I am doing it willingly, without any personal animosity toward Senator Lee and without fear of the consequences to me. I hope I may be considered to be making these objections in the interests of the general welfare.

With kindest regards, I beg to remain,

Yours very truly,

E. H. MOORE.

Mr. MOORE. I also submit a copy of an article concerning the appointment published in the January issue of United States Air Services magazine. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, since it bears upon the lack of suitability of former Senator Lee for the position for which he has been nominated.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Illinois for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to know whether or not the article which the Senator from Oklahoma has asked to have printed in the RECORD is to be adopted by him as a part of his remarks.

Mr. MOORE. I adopt it as a part of my remarks.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I believe that, in order that Senators may know what the Senator from Oklahoma is referring to, the article should be read rather than merely adopted as a part of the Senator's remarks. Otherwise Senators will not know what the Senator is referring to unless they have read the article.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Let me suggest to the able Senator from Oklahoma that the clerk be requested to read the article to which he has referred.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I adopt the suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read the article.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

WE HAD SUPPOSED THEY WERE MERELY JOSHING—WE BEG THE SENATE NOT TO CONFIRM THE APPOINTMENT

It has happened. Ex-Senator Josh Lee has been nominated as member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Back in the middle thirties the agitation for legislation to establish a Federal regulatory body for the aviation activities of the country persistently stressed the desirability of a nonpolitical board in contradistinction to the Bureau of Air Commerce of the Department of Commerce then under the political aegis of "Rowboat" Johnson. "Rowboat" got his name because he wouldn't fly and his fame was more for smoking unusually strong pipes than for any particular abilities in aeronautical ways.

All of which brings to mind a well-remembered remark by Bill Stout, made when what later became the old Air Commerce Act of

1926 was first suggested. After Bill MacCracken and Clarence Young and others had strongly advocated the necessity for Federal regulation, Bill Stout said it would be all right with him so long as those gentlemen were the ones who handled it, for after all they were from within the group involved.

"Sooner or later," Bill went on, "the champion tobacco spitter of Kansas will be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air and then what will you have?"

Wichita at that time was the air center of the country, so Bill's choice of a State was not very politic. The Wichita boys resented the remark most strongly as a slur on the State, completely overlooking the meaning.

As it happens, Stout was only one State off on two occasions. First, it was the pipe-smoking champion of Missouri and now it's the God-knows-what champion of Oklahoma.

None of us in aviation knows the new member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. We do know that his record shows him to have been a rubber-stamp Senator, recently defeated for reelection, and now rewarded with an appointive job for which he has no known qualifications beyond a publicly expressed sympathy for aviation.

This industry is not in need of any sympathy. The present dollar value of aeronautical manufacture in the United States is well beyond that of the automobile industry at its greatest. It does, however, need competency in that part of the Government which has been sadly lacking.

This magazine has never been too happy about the membership of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Safety Board as they were originally constituted nor as they were revamped in the President's reorganization of 1940 into the present Civil Aeronautics Board. We have felt that there was in the Board's attitude and viewpoint too much of the amateur's ineptness and corresponding lack of objective and planning. There was, however, even though some decisions seemed more for political expediency than for sound business, no actual taint of politics.

We have heard the last few years a great deal about democracy. We are afraid that in all this talk we are losing sight of an equally important point — representation. Representative government is part and parcel of the American way and, if we are to have commission government, let's have it representative, representative of the industry concerned and of the interested public.

The Civil Aeronautics Board differs from other regulatory commissions in two important ways. Section 2 of the act definitely charges the Authority (now Board) with the responsibility of fostering the industry, which is quite different in concept to that of the thinking back of other regulatory acts whose prime consideration was to harness or break the power of an industry or activity that had become too powerful for the country's welfare.

The other difference is the broad scope of the Authority. A short-line railway can operate without coming under the Interstate Commerce Commission, but all phases of Aeronautics must meet the Authority or the Board save only construction for the military. Even military operations must conform in many respects to dictates of the Administrator. These things make it most important for the Board to be truly representative.

Who should be represented? Certainly the interested public, and on such Board it might be argued that ex-Senator Josh Lee, the successful job seeker, and ex-Representative Andrew Edmiston, the other seeker after the appointment, were qualified. However, as the constituents of these gentlemen soundly repudiated them, they can't be said to be representative of those constituents, at least. In any case it's the interested public that is supposed to be represented and such representation has been more evident in previous appointments than professional representation has been.

It is our opinion that public servants of the caliber of Harllee Branch adequately and most effectively represent the public. In addition, the board must include sound, broad-minded men with experience, chosen from the several parts of the industry—the air carriers, manufacturers, private flyers, and the educational field, including the so-called small operators. Furthermore, to be truly representative in selecting the membership, notice should be taken of the opinion within these groups. All of them include men of adequate caliber, sufficiently public spirited to take the chore and not expect it to become a sinecure. Their associates know just who these people are.

There is another strong reason for a board having long experience within the industry. History shows that the best transportation can best lead the world. We have in air transportation the potential key for that world leadership right here in the United States. What we do with it after this war is over depends upon the type and quality of leadership the industry gets. A board that has the confidence of the industry, together with adequate vision and the imagination, can supply a good part of that leadership.

Let us hope that the new Senate will refuse to endorse the appointment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MOORE. I yield for a question only.

Mr. OVERTON. Am I to understand that the opposition of the Senator from Oklahoma to the nomination is based on the ground that the nominee has not had sufficient practical experience in aeronautics to fit him for the duties required of a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the answer to that question will be revealed by the presentation of my opposition.

Mr. OVERTON. Is that the position of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MOORE. I shall discuss that question during the presentation of my remarks.

Mr. OVERTON. Judging from the article which has just been read, I assume that to be the ground of the opposition of the Senator from Oklahoma to the nomination. If that be true, I should like to propound a question to the Senator which I hope will not be embarrassing. If the Senator intends to apply that yardstick in considering the nomination of former Senator Lee to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, may I ask the Senator what legislative experience he has had which justified him in seeking a seat in the Senate?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I shall reach that question in due time.

Mr. President, I think this character of appointment is most important. I do not think the appointment should be confirmed. I might say that I have little expectation that it will not be confirmed. It has been intimated to me by Senators that I should not have made objection. One distinguished Senator has predicted that the appointment will be confirmed by the votes of at least 90 percent of the Members of the Senate. I have also been told, in substance, that these appointments are not based upon qualifications. I regret that practice, and I hope the people of the country regret it and may continue to do something about it.

What criticism has come to me because of my opposition to this appointment comes, of course, from ardent new dealers and from those who actually consider the New Deal inevitable and invincible. I do not share that belief. No party ever existed in American politics that did the injury to our Government that the New Deal has done, and many believe that the injury is almost irreparable. I know the injury has been great, and yet I think it can and will be repaired.

The New Deal party is the party that substituted government by bureaus for government under the Constitution. It has all but destroyed the two-party system of government. It is made up of former Democrats and former Republicans. If the two-party system of government continues to exist, the parties must be constituted from those who subscribe to the New Deal philosophy and those who oppose it.

The clear line of demarcation must be between those who submit to bureaucratic form of government and those who insist upon government under the Constitution. The cleavage must be between those who believe in government of men and those who believe in government of laws. I take my position with those who believe in a government of laws, and against those who believe in a government of men.

I do not admit the indispensability of any man. The New Deal party is the party that maneuvered the third term in memorable convention in Chicago in 1940. I remember very well that Josh Lee was an active participant in that farce. The people of Oklahoma remembered it, too. That New Deal convention reached an all-time low in political chicanery and skulduggery. I hope this country will never witness another such. I expect it to be tried, but I hope it will not prevail.

The New Deal party is the party that, through its inefficient bungling, has produced confusion almost to the point of discouragement of the economic activities among the people in their efforts at production so needed in the all-out war effort.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I do not yield.

Millions of people throughout the country were disappointed and disillusioned at the appointment of ex-Senator Brown to the important position of Price Administrator. That appointment, they fear, is of such a character as to be antagonistic to the needed harmonious administration of a vital war measure.

Former Senator Brown, like former Senator Lee, was a top-flight new dealer. Former Senator Brown was an outstanding advocate and partisan of legislation in the Seventy-seventh Congress generally known as the anti-inflation measure. That legislation was prepared by the bureau heads of this administration,

and it stirred opposition that was bitter, both in the Congress and among the farmers of the country. The opposition to Senator Brown on account of that law, and the arguments that he employed in its behalf, no doubt made a large contribution to his defeat at the polls in Michigan.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MOORE. I yield only for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Are we to vote on the nomination of former Senator Brown, as well as that of former Senator Lee?

Mr. MOORE. Former Senator Lee's appointment was made as a reward for his services to this New Deal administration.

Former Senator Lee's appointment is made for his services as a messenger boy for the executive department.

Former Senator Brown's appointment has been confirmed, and the people know that it was confirmed as a matter of political expediency. Senators may regret that they did not voice their opposition, as in their hearts they felt an opposition; and if they confirm the nomination we are now discussing, Senators may also regret that.

The President of the United States told the Congress that if the anti-inflation legislation were not passed he would issue an executive decree proclaiming it to be the law of the land and let another branch of the Government pass upon its validity. The Congress must have thought that other branch of the Government would hold the edict valid. That threatened edict stands out in brazen effrontery above anything I know of that has happened in this country.

Former Senator Brown made a powerful argument that Congress must acquiesce in the measure in order to avoid a head-on collision with the President.

Then he made his own interpretation of the law, one which was at variance with the intent of Congress. That interpretation was adopted by the Price Administrator by virtue of an Executive Order of the President.

The pending appointment may fail to inspire confidence on the home front; and such confidence, which is needed in the Government by the people, is so woefully lacking as to make an all-out war effort uncertain.

The appointment of former Senator Lee is so political and partisan that it probably will further the belief of the people that Congress has lost its independence and is constantly becoming so subservient to the will of the President that representative government will fade from the country. The last election should indicate a mandate from the voters that Congress should reassert its constitutional powers, and cease to take into the Government men appointed purely for political reasons, especially men who have been repudiated by the voters at any recent election.

The paramount thing to do is to win this war, not to be concerned about jobs for Senators who have been repudiated by voters at the polls.

There will be more appointments of this kind from time to time. The practice and tradition of senatorial courtesy may have its points, but it is no substitute for fitness for public service in important positions. There are available qualified men who would willingly serve at this critical time—men who are actuated by duty and patriotism, men who want to preserve this country for free enterprise and opportunity, not men actuated merely by political ambition.

The President, in connection with a meeting of the Democratic Party in Chicago, which accepted the resignation of Mr. Flynn as chairman of the committee, said:

> Americans of all parties are, of course, subordinating all considerations of partisan politics to the single task of these days—defeating the enemy and establishing a better future for ourselves and later generations.
>
> Where the safety and welfare of our country are concerned, there will be no division on political lines. But even in times of war, democracy as we know it, continues to rely upon sound, honest, strong, political parties—all bound together in a unified purpose to achieve overwhelming victory.

How magnanimous that statement is, and how willingly we would endorse it if it were true. Politics has had entirely too much to do with the prosecution of this war. Political expediency has had entirely too much to do with controlling the action of Congress. Under the cloak of war, Congress has adopted the blank-check practice that has enabled the building up of unneeded bureaus and bureaucrats throughout the length and breadth of the land. It has produced the infiltration of bureaucrats into every human activity. It has retarded industry; it has discouraged it, and it seeks to discourage it. The continuation of this bureaucratic form of government will totally destroy private enterprise. It may be designed to destroy private enterprise, and to institute in its stead governmental tyranny.

The New Deal party is the party which has arrayed class against class. It is the party of labor racketeers and big-city political machines. It is the party that seeks to perpetuate itself in power by whatsoever means it is necessary to employ. It is the party that not only violates the tradition of no third term, but it will stop at no term. It is now engaged in playing fourth-term politics; and it is the party that cries to high heaven against those who dare to challenge its partisan activities, and charges with treason those who dare to oppose it. The new dealers who were defeated in the last election went about the country charging that those who were opposed to the Roosevelt party were playing into the hands of Hitler.

Apparently the voters did not believe that those who dared to oppose the trend to socialism were traitors. Now it is the same men who made those spurious arguments, arguments that were disbelieved by the voters, who come back in great swarms for appointment to important places after they have been repudiated at the polls. They have gone out the front door, and yet come in through the back door by Executive appointment.

In Chicago, a few days ago, at the meeting of the Democratic National Committee, were heard warnings from the "nonpartisan" representatives of this administration; and in particular, Eugene Casey, who is one of the assistant secretaries to the President, referred to those directing the Senate investigation of Mr. Flynn as "embryo Presidential candidates in both parties", and said that "the fight being made on Flynn by the opposition and the anti-Roosevelt press is not so much against him personally as against your party and the President." He urged the committee to "be alert" and arouse the people against this "insidious and bypass method aimed at destroying the President" and said that his anger knew no bounds as he witnessed Democrats, who "owe their postions to the Democratic Party and the President," combining to block the progress of this administration. He referred to the case of Judge Meaney, who was elevated to the bench in New Jersey, and declared that attacks on him were engineered by "scheming Republicans" and "the hostile press." Resolutions were passed, "whereases" were indulged in, and "whereases" and resolutions were submitted—by whom? E. D. Rivers, a recent Governor of the State of Georgia. Is not his reputation for political trickery pretty well known to the country, and should his preachments be taken very seriously? He submitted, among other things, that the American people should be advised of the duplicity of a group that hopes to "repeat with Franklin D. Roosevelt what they did by similar methods to another great President, Woodrow Wilson." That is the same attitude that ran through all the demagogic speeches made in the last political campaign. This man Rivers further said that this attack upon Flynn is a treasonable plot to hamper the Commander in Chief by seeking to destroy the people's confidence in the President.

It is characteristic of the New Deal to charge treason against anyone who dares to oppose it. It is nothing new. It has been practiced year in and year out. It has been resorted to by every New Deal demagogue in his campaign speeches for reelection.

It is heartening to know today that the people have turned against the New Deal party as being inimical to the best interests of the American Government. They have turned against it because it is destructive of constitutional government. They are turning against it because it is leading to state socialism.

Mr. President, everybody in America today will support the Commander in Chief in his earnest efforts to prosecute this war to a complete and unconditional surrender; everybody will make any sacrifice that needs to be made to win this war, but many of us resent the using of the war as a smoke screen behind which these new dealers hide their schemes for socializing the country.

This appointment is political and partisan and it is based on nothing else. Lack of qualifications for the position is wholly ignored. It is universally conceded that this appointment was not made because of special fitness but because Josh Lee is a "lame duck" favorite of the White House and must be taken care of, war or no war. I have not seen a single newspaper, or heard of one in the State of Oklahoma, that is supporting Josh Lee for this appointment. The Oklahoma City Times suggests that Senator Lee write a letter to the President saying:

> Thanks, Mr. President, but I don't know a blooming thing about aviation and its problems. You had better give the job to someone who has had a little experience in the commercial or technical end of flying. My line is teaching and ranching. I thought I was a pretty good Senator, but the people of my home State fired me from that job rather decisively, and I'm going to stay home and try to beat back into the people's good graces, sticking to the jobs I am trained and fitted for.

Mr. President, it may appear to the Senate that I am taking this matter too seriously. If detached from the whole plan, it might seem that it was not of very great concern, but considered in connection with the whole plan that has been put into effect by this administration, it is working out to further regiment the people in their every activity. Today, in Oklahoma, there is being built up a huge political oligarchy. That probably applies to every portion of the country. Senator Lee is one of those who have been defeated at the polls on fundamental issues.

Any time a representative of the New Deal administration is appointed to some executive position, it enables him to build up, from his own kind, additional smaller-ilk bureaucrats. I am satisfied that today in Oklahoma there is a great deal of scurrying around by men and women who are looking for sinecures and jobs with the Federal Government. They are of the same stripe that were repudiated at the recent election. They have not surrendered. They will strike again in force. They are interested in jobs and patronage. They are not so much interested in winning this war, or in the preservation of this Government, as they are in having some easy job for themselves.

At a later time I shall prepare a list of "lame duck" appointees during this administration. I shall attempt to characterize, to some extent, what appears to be their concept of public service, and I shall give it circulation in the hope that it will be a helpful revelation to the public.

Why should we be reticent about opposition to appointments that we know to be purely partisan and political, and designed to further strengthen the power of the New Deal philosophy? It is said that in this administration an activity exists for the very purpose of finding places for obedient statesmen who have been defeated at the polls. Jobs have been created in advance in order that they may be filled by casualties in elections. A vacancy in a Federal judgeship exists in Oklahoma and has existed for more than 2 years, and yet no appointment has been made to this day. These jobs are created to be dangled before the eyes of ambitious political leaders in order that their support may be had in elections. I witnessed that in Oklahoma.

The full storm against practices of our Government has not as yet broken, but we can see the gathering clouds that, I hope, bode a storm of no small proportions.

Mr. President, probably no purpose would be served by my attempting to persuade the Senators that Josh Lee has no qualifications for the position to which he has been appointed. I have submitted a statement to each Member of the Senate, and I have submitted also an article from a reputable aviation magazine on the subject of the Lee appointment. If Senators have not read them, or are not interested in them, it is not my fault; I cannot help it. If they are not persuaded by them, that is their business.

There has been introduced in the House a bill prohibiting, for 2 years after he retires from Congress, the appointment of a Member of Congress to a position that was created during his term in Congress. I would favor that legislation, and I would probably make it a longer period than 2 years.

Men are defeated in elections usually because the people disagree with their concept of public service. A great Democratic President once said that a public office is a public trust. Many of us think that to be a sound concept.

In this appointment the safety of the public is concerned, and, for the public, that is more important than the safety of Senator Lee in a cushioned seat at the expense of the public and at the expense of the safety of the public.

I will regret to see this appointment confirmed, but if it is confirmed, it will probably be based upon so-called senatorial courtesy. If it is approved, and more like it, I shall hope that as a result of a continuance of the defiance of the judgment of the voters, new faces will appear here from time to time. Senatorial courtesy seems to impel Senators to confirm such partisan and political appointments. This nominee is no longer a Senator. He has been repudiated by the voters of his State. I happen to have been elected by the voters of the State, on a fundamental issue, to succeed him. So far, I have heard of very little senatorial courtesy being extended to me in my opposition to him. I am opposed to him for the reasons heretofore stated. I am a Member of the Senate, sent here by the voters of the sovereign State of Oklahoma.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, if I understand correctly, the Senate, in confirming an appointment sent by the Executive, not only confirms but, by its act of confirmation, assumes a share in the responsibility of the appointment.

To share that responsibility, it is right and proper and it is necessary that we know something of the qualifications of the appointee for the particular position. In the appointment under consideration, I have yet to hear that the appointee has any qualifications which would justify this body in assuming a share in the responsibility which would be theirs following confirmation.

Is there a yardstick to guide us in our confirmation of this and any other appointment of like character? Very definitely there is. First, and most important, does this appointment contribute to the war effort, and, secondly, has the appointee the necessary qualifications which would enable him to function efficiently as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board?

Last week there was distributed the Annual Report of the Civil Aeronautics Board for 1942. As a new member of the Commerce Committee, I have read the report most carefully; in fact, I am giving it considerable study and have found that the most important functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board at this time are the coordination of the civil transport aircraft service with military activities; of war contracts entered into by the Army and Navy with the civil carriers; and study of wartime safety measures. A study of these matters shows that the civil air carriers are doing a great wartime job, and that, as the go-between, the arranging authority coordinating this effort with the military and naval war effort, the Civil Aeronautics Board functions, and the men comprising that Board should be men who have had experience in this particular phase of business or who have at least occupied some responsible executive position. I cannot find that this appointee has any such qualifications.

In the recent election nine Senators of the party in power were defeated, and nine new Senators of the opposition were elected to take their places. The new Senators come from such States as New Jersey, Delaware, West Virginia, Oklahoma, Michigan, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

The opinions expressed at the polls by the voters in these States form a good cross-section of the opinions of the people of the entire Nation. The Senate is considering the confirmation of the appointment of one of the defeated Senators to an important Federal position. The repudiation of the defeated Senators in nine States is very definitely a repudiation by the entire country. These candidates defeated for reelection to the United States Senate should not now be placed in high executive positions in our Government.

A principle is involved, and I believe my actions should be directed toward the state of mind of the people of my State, and of the people of the United States. I do not feel, and I do not think the people of the country feel that, because certain ex-Senators may have rendered valuable service to a political party, their appointments should be ratified. When the people of their own States decided to terminate their careers as United States Senators, it is surely logical to conclude that they considered they were not qualified to represent them in highly lucrative Government positions.

I have no personal feelings regarding the ex-Senators. I do not know them. They are probably fine gentlemen, but appointments under the Government, which affect the lives of millions of people, should not, and must not, be determined by pleasant personal relationship.

The new Members of the Senate have a sense of duty to the people of the country. We have been sent here for a definite purpose. If we are to maintain our republican form of government, if we are to get away from the present bureaucratic form of government, we must heed the voice of the people, and we must oppose the ratification of the appointment of ex-Senators, who, during their term in the United States Senate, contributed to the building up of a form of government which the people of this country have definitely decided to eliminate.

A firm stand in these matters by the new Senators will give the country a badly needed renewal of confidence in the United States Senate.

These appointments have been referred to as "lame duck" appointments. Mr. President, this duck is not lame; he is dead. It is a case of a politically dead duck being resurrected to become a cornerstone of a crumbling bureaucracy, and I object, and I am taking this opportunity to express my objection in the constitutional manner, so that it may be a matter of record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Josh Lee, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Department of Commerce, for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1943?

Mr. OVERTON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | George | Nye |
| Andrews | Gerry | O'Mahoney |
| Austin | Gillette | Overton |
| Ball | Green | Radcliffe |
| Bankhead | Guffey | Revercomb |
| Barkley | Gurney | Robertson |
| Bilbo | Hatch | Russell |
| Bone | Hawkes | Shipstead |
| Brewster | Hayden | Stewart |
| Brooks | Hill | Taft |
| Buck | Holman | Thomas, Idaho |
| Burton | Johnson, Colo. | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bushfield | Kilgore | Thomas, Utah |
| Butler | Langer | Tobey |
| Byrd | Lodge | Tunnell |
| Capper | Lucas | Tydings |
| Caraway | McClellan | Vandenberg |
| Chandler | McFarland | Van Nuys |
| Chavez | McKellar | Wagner |
| Clark, Mo. | McNary | Walsh |
| Connally | Maloney | Wheeler |
| Danaher | Maybank | Wherry |
| Davis | Mead | White |
| Downey | Millikin | Wiley |
| Ellender | Moore | Willis |
| Ferguson | Murdock | Wilson |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

On the question of the nomination of Josh Lee, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is detained in the West on official business for the Senate.

I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] would vote "yea."

I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] is detained because of a slight cold. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained. If present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—46

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Gerry | Mead |
| Bankhead | Gillette | Murdock |
| Barkley | Green | O'Mahoney |
| Bilbo | Guffey | Overton |
| Bone | Hatch | Radcliffe |
| Byrd | Hayden | Russell |
| Capper | Hill | Stewart |
| Caraway | Johnson, Colo. | Thomas, Okla. |
| Chandler | Kilgore | Thomas, Utah |
| Chavez | Lucas | Tunnell |
| Clark, Mo. | McClellan | Van Nuys |
| Connally | McFarland | Wagner |
| Davis | McKellar | Walsh |
| Downey | McNary | Wheeler |
| Ellender | Maloney | |
| George | Maybank | |

NAYS—31

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Brewster | Burton |
| Austin | Brooks | Bushfield |
| Ball | Buck | Butler |
| Danaher | Moore | Tydings |
| Ferguson | Nye | Vandenberg |
| Gurney | Revercomb | Wherry |
| Hawkes | Robertson | Wiley |
| Holman | Shipstead | Willis |
| Langer | Taft | Wilson |
| Lodge | Thomas, Idaho | |
| Millikin | Tobey | |

NOT VOTING—19

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bailey | La Follette | Scrugham |
| Barbour | McCarran | Smith |
| Bridges | Murray | Truman |
| Clark, Idaho | O'Daniel | Wallgren |
| Eastland | Pepper | White |
| Glass | Reed | |
| Johnson, Calif. | Reynolds | |

So the nomination of Josh Lee to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board was confirmed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement as to why I voted "nay" on the question of the confirmation of former Senator Josh Lee, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Such a vote is not a pleasant one to cast. My relations with former Senator Lee have always been friendly and pleasant in every way. In my humble estimation, however, this particular office calls for very far-reaching experience, understanding, and judgment. We have had a good many airplane accidents in the country. I do not say that any of them are attributable to the Board, but certainly the lessening of such accidents in the future will require of those who administer the Civil Aeronautics Authority the highest quality of good judgment and understanding of the particular operations undertaken in the aviation field. For another position which, in my judgment, would not require highly technical skill and knowledge, I should have been glad to support Senator Lee. I do not believe he is eminently qualified for the particular post, and I therefore voted "nay."

## ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 4, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 1, 1943:

### THE JUDICIARY

Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., of Oklahoma, to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma (additional position).

Hon. J. Frank McLaughlin, of Hawaii, to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii, vice Hon. Ingram M. Stainback.

Hon. Charles D. Lawrence, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Hon. Frederick W. Dallinger, resigned.

J. Saxton Daniel, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Georgia. Mr. Daniel is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 24, 1942.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named assistant dental surgeon to be passed assistant dental surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite his name:

James O. Blythe, Jr., November 20, 1942.

UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Alvin C. Thorson to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 2d day of December 1942.

Joe C. Partington to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 4th day of December 1942.

Glenn W. Moore to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 4th day of January 1943.

Emerson E. Jones to be aide, with rank of ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. John McDonald Thompson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 1, 1936.

Capt. Gunnar Carl Carlson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1941.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. James Vincent Reardon, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 12, 1942.

Second Lt. Wayne Norbury Bolefahr, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Charles Kelly Bortell, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Carey Herbert Brown, Jr., Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. James Edmund Buckley, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Mark John Burke, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. James Isaac Cox, Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt. Joel John Dilworth, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Byron Arthur Evans, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Elkin Leland Franklin, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt. John William Guckeyson, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Charles Edward Mosse, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1941.

Second Lt. John Richard Murphy, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Harold Archer Ogden, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Robert Alroy Olson, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1941.

Second Lt. Frank Clyde Smiley, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Frederic Homer Sargent Tate, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Ernest Johnson White, Jr., Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Lester Strode White, Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt. James Norwood Wood, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. James Stanley Woolfolk, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

MEDICAL CORPS

*To be colonels*

Lt. Col. Gouverneur Vincent Emerson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 2, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Archer Hagins, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Oscar Hampton Prosser, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. George Corwin Beach, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 7, 1943.

Lt. Col. Jesse Irving Sloat, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. David Norvell Walker Grant, Medical Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from February 9, 1943.

Lt. Col. James Stevens Simmons, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 10, 1943.

Lt. Col. Alvin Jay Bayley, Medical Corps, with rank from February 14, 1943.

Lt. Col. John Francis Corby, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 15, 1943.

Lt. Col. Roy Edward Fox, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 18, 1943.

Lt. Col. Dean Flewellyn Winn, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 20, 1943.

Lt. Col. Alva Burton McKie, Medical Corps (temparory colonel), with rank from February 21, 1943.

Lt. Col. Albert Walton Kenner, Medical Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from February 22, 1943.

Lt. Col. Arturo Carbonell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 28, 1943.

*To be captains*

First Lt. Robert Glenn Thompson, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 1, 1943.

First Lt. Hayden Waldo Withers, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 1, 1943.

First Lt. Manah Robert Halbouty, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 1, 1943.

First Lt. William Winfield Hurteau, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 1, 1943.

First Lt. William Meier Moody, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 1, 1943.

First Lt. Robert Edward Lyons, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 11, 1943.

First Lt. Oscar Peyton Moffitt, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 14, 1943.

First Lt. Hugh Warren Jones, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 14, 1943.

First Lt. Benjamin Hardy Sullivan, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 14, 1943.

First Lt. Philip Alexander Bergman, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 14, 1943.

First Lt. Sterling James Ritchey, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 14, 1943.

First Lt. Joseph Brown Gordon, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 14, 1943.

First Lt. James Edward Sams, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 14, 1943.

First Lt. John Ward Regan, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 14, 1943.

First Lt. Robert Bresette Gorman, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 14, 1943.

First Lt. Harry James Grossman, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 14, 1943.

First Lt. Don S. Wenger, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 14, 1943.

First Lt. John Joseph Chizik, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 14, 1943.

First Lt. Harold Buffington Graves, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 14, 1943.

First Lt. James Edward Hix, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 14, 1943.

First Lt. Robert Haney Brooks, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 15, 1943.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

*To be first lieutenants*

Second Lt. George Henry Wilson, Medical Administrative Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 18, 1943.

Second Lt. Ernest William Bye, Medical Administrative Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 18, 1943.

Second Lt. John Valdo Painter, Medical Administrative Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 18, 1943.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Second Lt. Arnold Beverly Addlestone, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1941.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Second Lt. James Joseph Gibbons, Jr., Chemical Warfare Service (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from October 5, 1942.

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. Charles Andrew Beaucond, Jr., Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Robert Arnold Berman, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Donald Frank Blaha, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Howard Lay Burris, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Austin Patrick Byrne, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Richard Robert Clark, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Lucius DuBignon Clay, Jr., Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Gerhardt Christopher Clementson, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. John Ott Sanders Damron, Infantry, with rank frcm May 29 1942.

Second Lt. Donald Eugene Deffke, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Claire Alfred Pelton Duffie, Coast Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Kenneth Earl Dyson, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Wallace Biddle Frank, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. William Carroll Garland, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Charles Howard Garvin, Coast Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Richard Eddy Gaspard, Coast Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Walter Franklin Griffin, Signal Corps, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Selmer Gustaves, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Ben Franklin Hardaway, Jr., Signal Corps, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. John William Harrell, Jr., Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. John Arnot Hewitt, Corps of Engineers, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Robert Henry Hinckley, Jr., Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Richard Malcolm Horridge, Coast Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Richard Arthur House, Cavalry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Henry Premyslaus Kozlowski, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Horace Allan Lawler, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. John Royal Linehan, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1940.

Second Lt. Richard Wood Maffry, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. John Raymond Moran, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. John Clarence Peck, Signal Corps, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Timothy Asbury Pedley 3d, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. John Raymond Penington, Ordnance (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1942.

Second Lt. Jack Willard Pryor, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. John Douglas Reid, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Karl Nelson Retzer, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Galen Person Robbins, Coast Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. John Boursiquot Rose, Jr., Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. David Rowland, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lieutenant John Aloysius Ryan, Jr., Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Harvey Wirt Courtland Shelton, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Lynn DeWitt Sifford, Jr., Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Raymond Elmer Smart, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain), with rank from February 20, 1942.

Second Lt. Gene Clifford Smith, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Roy Orval Smith, Jr., Cavalry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Carl William Stapleton, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Altus Grant Steadman, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Frank Dwight Waddell, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Albert McConnell Ward, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Andrew Hudson Weigel, Cavalry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. George Williams, Jr., Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Hugh Pat Williams, Signal Corps, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Carter Williamson, Jr., Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Philip Shaw Wood, Jr., Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Edwin Herbert Garrison, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1941.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

*To be colonels with rank from January 1, 1943*

Lt. Col. Benjamin Fiery Hoge, Cavalry.

Lt. Col. Frederick Herr, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Clifford James Mathews, Infantry (temporary colonel).

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM JANUARY 19, 1943

*Corps of Engineers*

Edward Rice Ardery
Alvin Mann Bachrach
Richard Traber Batson
Edward Elmer Bennett
Edward Joseph Bielecki
Douglas King Blue
Robert Belleau Burlin
Frank Ambler Camm
Paul Roscoe Ellis
Richard Lewis Evans
Edmond Lawrence Faust, Jr.
Arthur Leslie Freer
Mitchel Goldenthal
Arthur Beardsley Grace, Jr.
Thomas Everett Griess
Leslie Buckingham Harding
Robert Guthrie Hillman
Walter William Hogrefe
Samuel Nairn Karrick, Jr.
Dimitri Alexander Kellogg
Ernest Crews Lacy, Jr.
John McClure, Jr.
Charles Stuart MacVeigh
Robert Creel Marshall
Thomas Hutson Martin, Jr.
Maxwell Adolph Neumann
Woodrow Wilson Pratt
John Carpenter Raaen, Jr.
George Anthony Rebh
Darrie Hewitt Richards
James Randolph Richardson
Albert Emmanuel Saari
Vernon Keith Sanders
Frederick Mark Smith
William Love Starnes, Jr.
Milton Ernst Stevens
William Johnson Talbott
John Jones Upchurch 3d
Fred Brenning Waters, Jr.
John Franklin White
Robert Morse Wood

*Signal Corps*

Charles Francis Alfano
Ben Lee Baber
Joseph William Benson
Donald Hepburn Bruner
Charles Herbert Burr, Jr.
Ralph Lincoln Cadwallader
Walter Hugh Cook, Jr.
Myron Haines Dakin
Edward Allen Doran
Hubert James Fiander, Jr.
William Hayes Fritz
John Gregory Hoyt
James Creelman Huntley
John Erwin Huffner
William Eugene Lewis
Rex David Minckler
John George Moses, Jr.
Douglas Blakeshaw Netherwood, Jr.
Joseph Edward Nett
John Robert Nickel
Walter Edwin Nygard
Cecil Wray Page, Jr.
Ernest Charles Raulin, Jr.
Emmett Robinson Reynolds
James Hamlin Schofield, Jr.
Arthur Joseph Sebesta
Daugherty Mason Smith
Donald Henry Vicek
Lowell Lyndon Wilkes, Jr.

*Cavalry*

Henry John Ebrey, Jr.
Vasco John Fenili
William Reed Hahn
William Allen Knowlton
William Edmund Larned, Jr.
Howard Anthony Linn
Adrian St. John, Jr.
John Gray Wheelock 3d
Sidney Zecher

*Field Artillery*

James Roland Anderson
Lawrence Harold Bixby, Jr.
Leo Mose Blanchett, Jr.
Merle Landry Carey
James Justus Cobb
Gerard Vincent Cosgrove
Robert LeVerne Davis
Howard Deane Elliott
John Henry Featherston, Jr.
Robert Emil Fiss
Edward Michael Flanagan, Jr.
Thomas Walsh Flatley
Norman David Greenberg
Charles Lester Heltzel
Jesse Benjamin Hollis, Jr.
Algin James Hughes
Richard Baldwin Jones
James Edward Kelleher
Jacob Whitman Klerk
Conrad Epping Koerper, Jr.
Herbert Suddath Lewis
John Daniel McGowan
John Gilmore McNamara
Marion Hopkins May
Stewart Canfield Meyer
William Douaire Neale
John Jacob Norris
Robert James Rader
John Thomas Russell, Jr.
Ernest Darius Scott, Jr.
Frederick Clayton Spann
John Foster Stephens
Dana Lee Stewart
Arthur Pearson Wade
George Harvey Watson
Donald Eugene Wilbourn
Edwin James Willcox
John Shirley Wood, Jr.

*Coast Artillery Corps*

James Anthony Aleveras
Paul Edward Andrepont
Roger Alexander Bertram
Lawrence Philip Bischoff, Jr.
Clifton Lewis Butler, Jr.
Belmonte Pasquale Cucolo
Clarence Maude Davenport, Jr.
John Leopold Dworak
Kirby Alexander Gean
Henry Frederick Grimm, Jr.
Clarke Duncan Hain
John Dennis Healy, Jr.
Gregg Henry
Lee Boyer James
Stanley Livingston James, Jr.
John Frank Johnson
Francis Casimir Kajencki
Herbert Eugene Kemp
Robert Leonard Lawrence
Barton James Mallory
Benjamin Willis Mills, Jr.
Howard Everett Moore
William Robert Myers
Pete Daniel Pavick
Robert McNeely Peden
Thomas Edward Ramsey
Joseph Anthony Riccio
Michel Andre George Robinson
Roy Alexander Sanders
John Laurence Shortall, Jr.
John Jacob Shultz, Jr.
Joseph Peeler Stabler
Vernon Edward Trinter
Ralph Joseph Truex
Patrick Gerald Wardell
John Miller Wilson
Cecil George Young, Jr.

*Infantry*

Jonathan Waverly Anderson, Jr.
Virginio Lorenzo Antonioli
DeWitt Clinton Armstrong 3d
John Winthrop Armstrong
Robert Eugene Baden
Henry Anson Barber 3d
John William Barnes
Robert Sprague Beightler, Jr.
Marvin Jay Berenzweig
Lucian Dalton Bogan, Jr.
William Boyce Brice
Thomas Wilson Brown
Kenneth Ecklund Buell
Robert Lee Bullard 3d
Edmund James Carberry
Turner Mason Chambliss, Jr.
James Changaris
Wendell Lapsley Clemenson, Jr.

Richard Maddox Combs
Joseph Bartholomew Conmy, Jr.
Robert Morehead Cook
Hal Fitzgerald Crain
Arvid Paul Croonquist, Jr.
Wesley James Curtis
William Harold Dannacher
Norvin Leslie Davis
Thomas Quinton Donaldson 4th
Jack Fontaine Dulaney
George Mayer Eberle
Elbert Pritchett Epperson
Thomas Henderson Farnsworth
Charles Robert Finley, Jr.
Victor Arnold Franklin
James Wentworth Freeman, Jr.
Robert Wood Dailey Guthrie
Dick Elmo Hall
Robert Edward Harrington
William Ernest Hensel
John Alden Hine, Jr.
Ralph Mills Hofmann
Burton Francis Hood, Jr.
James McClain Huddleston
Darwin Jack Kitch
Frederick Seaton Kremer
Lyle Marvin Lappin
John Rossignol Lovett
Everett Edward Lowry, Jr.
George Bradley Lundberg
John Jacob Luther, Jr.
George Kameil Maertens
Everard Kidder Mead, Jr.
Hugh Mease, Jr.
Thomas Arthur Mesereau
James Robert Michael
John Riley Mitchell
James Daniel Moore
Edward Henry Murray
John Joseph Nazzaro
Sidney Conrad Peterman
William Hiram Pietsch, Jr.
Donald Franklin Powell
Altus Emory Prince
Harry Hall Pritchett, Jr.
Harold Kilburn Roach
Elvy Benton Roberts
John Roy Ross, Jr.
James Edwin Hickey Rumbough
Raymond Francis Ruyffelaere
Harry Alfred Saunders
William Harrell Scott, Jr.
Boone Seegers
Franklin Prague Shaw, Jr.
Victor Vaughan Taylor, Jr.
Alfred Lukacs Toth
Harold Staats Walker, Jr.
Daniel Dawson Waters
William Edwin Waters
Thomas Robert Watson
Howard Franklin Wehrle 3d
John Parsons Wheeler, Jr.
Patrick Wester Wheeler
Roy Robertson Wilson
Willard Bruce Wilson, Jr.
Thomas Bates Windsor
Charles Alvin Wirt
James Dumont Wright

*Air Corps*

John Willard Baer
David Harvey Barger
Thomas Henry Beeson
Milton Albert Behn
Charles Calvert Benedict
Stephen Otto Benner
Kearie Lee Berry, Jr.
Harold James Bestervelt
Wendell Lowell Bevan, Jr.
Cleo Merton Bishop
Francis Hamilton Bonham
Roy Lindsay Bowlin, Jr.
Frank Edward Boyd
William Diebold Brady
Raymond Cecil Brittingham, Jr.
Richard Howell Broach
Edward Hale Brooks, Jr.
John Hugh Buckner
James Emerson Bush, Jr.
Chester John Butcher
Keith Edward Canella
Morton Campbell Cormack
Thomas Isaac Cary
John Crocker Catlin
Victor Anthony Cherbak, Jr.
Jack Francis Clark
James Bernhardt Cobb
William Joseph Cook
Edward Michael Costello
Norman Daniel Cota, Jr.
John Joseph Courtney, Jr.
George William Criss, Jr.
John Milton Cutler, Jr.
George Luck Danforth, Jr.
John Frederick Daye, Jr.
Oliver Williams DeGruchy, Jr.
James Raymon Dempsey
Rexford Herbert Dettre, Jr.
George Warner Dixon
William Frederick Dolby
Joseph Harrison Dover
James Leslie Doyle
John Keeler Eckert
Edmund Barber Edwards
Robert Logan Edwards
Frank Terry Ellis
Robert Hugh Fautt, Jr.
Robert Ralph Fishel
Lowell Boyd Fisher
Roger Louis Fisher
Edward Potter Foote
James Fisher Frakes
James Oliver Frankosky
Moses Joseph Gatewood, Jr.
Clough Farrar Gee 3d
Charles Glenn Glasgow
John Jay Gorman
Quentin James Goss
Donald Ernest Griffin
James Franklin Hackler, Jr.
Joseph Louie Hamilton
Edward James Hardebeck
Charles Edward Hardy
William Lamar Hardy
Russel Price Harris
Thomas Daniel Harrison
John Everard Hatch, Jr.
McGlachlin Hatch
Earl LeRoy Hehn, Jr.
Russel McKee Herrington, Jr.
John Kenneth Hocker
Charles Asbury Holt 3d
William Johnston Hovde
William Haywood Hume
Arthur Pershing Hurr
Richard Joseph Hynes
Arthur Vincent Jackson
Herschel Ashby Jarrell
Jack Jean Jones
Hugh Fagan Jordan
Francis Xavier Kane
John Arthur Kerig, Jr.
William Albert Kerr, Jr.
Frederick Martin King
George Romanta Kinney
Henry Hodgen Kirby, Jr.
Herbert Gordon Kolb
Robert Guy Kurtz
William Donald Kyle, Jr.
Robert Ernest Lacy
Howard Louis Lambert, Jr.
Albert Lossen Lane, Jr.
Warren Joseph Lane
James Willis Ledbetter
Charles William Lenfest
Keith Gordon Lindell
John Harvey Linton
James Marshall Little
Jessup David Lowe
Theodore Thomas Lutrey
Robert Francis McDermott
Edward Alexander McGough 3d
James Alfred McKinney
Robert Seton Maloney, Jr.
Arthur Anson Marston
Britt Stanaland May
Henry Joseph Mazur
Lester Meltzer
Clifford James Moore, Jr.
Robert Muldrow
Benjamin Norris, Jr.
John Remington Northrop
Dan Morey Parker
John Francis Phelan
Charles Clifford Pinkerton, Jr.
William Frederick Pitts
Younger Arnold Pitts, Jr.
Frederick Sherwood Porter, Jr.
George William Porter
George Thomas Prior
James Foster Reynolds
James Alfred Rippin
John Edward Roberts
Henry Benton Sayler, Jr.
Richard Turner Schlosberg, Jr.
Louis Theodore Seith
Clyde Kelsey Sellers
John Hixon Shaffer
Edward Lee Sheley, Jr.
B. B. Skaggs
Malcolm Alexander Smith
Robert Nelson Smith
Russell Jackson Smith
William Bernard Smith, Jr.
Donald Maurice Stangle
William Robert Stewart, Jr.
Albert Earl Stoll, Jr.
Harry Richard Stroh
Joseph Alexander Stuart, Jr.
Edmund Cornish Suor
George Kunkel Sykes
Carlos Maurice Talbott
Walter Richard Taliaferro
William Hall Tallant
Lester George Taylor, Jr.
Melvin Sidney Thaler
Francis Anthony Thomas
Donald Warren Thompson
William Martin Thompson
Floyd Oralee Tobey, Jr.
Robert Bernard Tresville, Jr.
William Henry Tucker 3d
Hiram Glenn Turner, Jr.
John Edgar VanDuyn
Robert John Walling
Malcolm Seth Wardrop, Jr.
George Spoor Weart
John Leroy Weber, Jr.
Robert Victor Whitlow
Louis Locke Wilson, Jr.
Eugene August Wink, Jr.
Roderic Thomas Wriston
Barton Kyle Yount, Jr.
Raymond C. Zettel

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT OF FIELD ARTILLERY WITH RANK FROM JANUARY 21, 1943

Robert Tomkins Blake

IN THE NAVY

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Howard F. Kingman, May 10, 1942.
Claude S. Gillette, May 13, 1942.
Sherman S. Kennedy, May 13, 1942.
Frank A. Braisted, August 7, 1942.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Cornelius W. Flynn, January 1, 1942.
Armit C. Thomas, January 1, 1942.
Edmund E. Brady, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Frank G. Fahrion, June 30, 1942.
Simon P. Fullinwider, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Robert G. Tobin, June 30, 1942.
Theodore M. Waldschmidt, June 30, 1942.
Joseph W. Gregory, June 30, 1942.
Francis C. Denebrink, June 30, 1942.
Lester J. Hudson, June 30, 1942.
Samuel B. Brewer, June 30, 1942.
Merrill Comstock, June 30, 1942.
John B. Heffernan, June 30, 1942.
Edward J. Moran, June 30, 1942.
Elliott M. Senn, June 30, 1942.
Robert L. Porter, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Ward P. Davis, June 30, 1942.
Earl W. Morris, June 30, 1942.
Robert W. Fleming, June 30, 1942.
Allan R. McCann, June 30, 1942.
Forrest P. Sherman, June 30, 1942.
Ralph S. McDowell, June 30, 1942.

William R. Nichols, June 30, 1942.
James Fife, Jr., June 30, 1942.
William W. Warlick, June 30, 1942.
Charles W. Styer, June 30, 1943.
Thomas L. Sprague, June 30, 1942.
Einar R. Johnson, June 30, 1942.
John J. Ballentine, June 30, 1942.
Stanley D. Jupp, June 30, 1942.
Albert F. France, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Julian D. Wilson, June 30, 1942.
Henry Y. McCown, June 30, 1942.
Henry E. Thornhill, June 30, 1942.
Jacob H. Jacobson, June 30, 1942.
Gordon Rowe, June 30, 1942.
Jerauld Wright, June 30, 1942.
Harry W. Need, June 30, 1942.
Earle W. Mills, June 30, 1942.
John D. H. Kane, June 30, 1942.
James W. Whitfield, June 30, 1942.
Peter K. Fischler, June 30, 1942.
Herbert B. Knowles, June 30, 1942.
Kenneth M. Hoeffel, June 30, 1942.
Henry S. Kendall, June 30, 1942.
Olton R. Bennehoff, June 30, 1942.
Arthur T. Moen, June 30, 1942.
Ralph H. Henkle, June 30, 1942.
Ellis H. Geiselman, June 30, 1942.
Watson O. Bailey, June 30, 1942.
Wallace M. Dillon, June 30, 1942.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Edwin M. Crouch, December 8, 1941.
Carl H. Sanders, January 1, 1942.
Ralston B. Vanzant, January 1, 1942.
George M. Brooke, January 1, 1942.
Wakeman B. Thorp, January 1, 1942.
Louis G. McGlone, January 1, 1942.
Elmer P. Abernethy, January 1, 1942.
Willard R. Gaines, January 1, 1942.
Joseph R. Barbaro, January 1, 1942.
Francis J. Bridget, January 1, 1942.
Leland D. Whitgrove, January 1, 1942.
Frank R. Walker, March 1, 1942.
John A. Hollowell, Jr., March 1, 1942.
Robert W. Bedilion, April 1, 1942.
Edgar A. Cruise, April 21, 1942.
Isaiah Olch, June 30, 1942.
William B. Ault, June 30, 1942.
Robert H. Smith, June 30, 1942.
Howard D. McIntosh, June 30, 1942.
Emory P. Hylant, June 30, 1942.
Thomas T. Beattie, June 30, 1942.
Augustus D. Clark, June 30, 1942.
Howard B. Hutchinson, June 30, 1942.
Robert A. Knapp, June 30, 1942.
William W. Cone, June 30, 1942.
Albert L. Toney, June 30, 1942.
John Connor, June 30, 1942.
Robert McC. Peacher, June 30, 1942.
Worthington S. Bitler, June 30, 1942.
Alexander F. Junker, June 30, 1942.
Delbert S. Cornwell, June 30, 1942.
Robert A. J. English, June 30, 1942.
Charles W. Crawford, June 30, 1942.
John P. W. Vest, June 30, 1942.
John Y. Dannenberg, June 30, 1942.
Joseph B. Dunn, June 30, 1942.
Kenmore M. McManes, June 30, 1942.
Francis B. Johnson, June 30, 1942.
Daniel W. Harrigan, June 30, 1942.
Francis J. Mee, June 30, 1942.
John B. Pearson, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Frank T. Ward, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Harry Sanders, June 30, 1942.
John W. King, June 30, 1942.
Frederic S. Withington, June 30, 1942.
Selden B. Spangler, June 30, 1942.
Albert C. Murdaugh, June 30, 1942.
William V. O'Regan, June 30, 1942.
John G. Crommelin, Jr., June 30, 1942.
William B. Ammon, June 30, 1942.
William H. von Dreele, June 30, 1942.
Alfred C. Olney, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Harry H. Keith, June 30, 1942.
William A. Riley, June 30, 1942.
Elliott B. Strauss, June 30, 1942.
John M. Ocker, June 30, 1942.
Harold D. Krick, June 30, 1942.
Arleigh A. Burke, June 30, 1942.
Le Merton E. Crist, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Harold N. Williams, June 30, 1942.
Elbert L. Fryberger, June 30, 1942.
Gordon J. Crosby, June 30, 1942.
Robert L. Dennison, June 30, 1942.
Roland M. Huebl, June 30, 1942.
Richard W. Ruble, June 30, 1942.
Stanhope C. Ring, June 30, 1942.
Charles F. Coe, June 30, 1942.
Thomas B. Williamson, June 30, 1942.
Paul F. Dugan, June 30, 1942.
Aaron P. Storrs 3d, June 30, 1942.
William L. Hoffheins, Jr., June 30, 1942.
William K. Mendenhall, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Richard M. Scruggs, June 30, 1942.
Frederick A. Edwards, June 30, 1942.
William E. Hennigar, June 30, 1942.
Joseph L. Kane, June 30, 1942.
John D. Kelsey, June 30, 1942.
John S. Keating, June 30, 1942.
Leon N. Blair, June 30, 1942.
Harry D. Felt, June 30, 1942.
Percival E. McDowell, June 30, 1942.
John M. Will, June 30, 1942.
Karl G. Hensel, June 30, 1942.
Robert H. Rodgers, June 30, 1942.
Frank E. Shoup, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Frederick Moosbrugger, June 30, 1942.
Francis M. Hughes, June 30, 1942.
Edwin R. Peck, June 30, 1942.
Murvale T. Farrar, June 30, 1942.
Howard L. Young, June 30, 1942.
Marvin M. Stephens, June 30, 1942.
Josephus A. Briggs, June 30, 1942.
Robert P. Wadell, June 30, 1942.
William M. Haynsworth, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Arthur L. Maher, June 30, 1942.
Henry M. Cooper, June 30, 1942.
Louis N. Miller, June 30, 1942.
Frank Monroe, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Thomas J. Casey, June 30, 1942.
John V. Peterson, June 30, 1942.
Frederick J. Nelson, June 30, 1942.
Joyce A. Ralph, June 30, 1942.
William D. Anderson, June 30, 1942.
Murr E. Arnold, June 30, 1942.
William M. Hobby, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Philip R. Coffin, June 30, 1942.
Wells L. Field, June 30, 1942.
Homer B. Hudson, June 30, 1942.
Horace C. Robison, June 30, 1942.
Thomas H. Hederman, June 30, 1942.
Valentine L. Pottle, June 30, 1942.
Philip D. Lohmann, June 30, 1942.

Lt. Clarence M. Bowley to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Eugene B. Fluckey, December 16, 1941.
William C. Hembury, January 1, 1942.
Marshall H. Austin, January 1, 1942.
William H. Hazzard, January 1, 1942.
Wilson R. Bartlett, January 1, 1942.
Benjamin E. Adams, Jr., January 1, 1942.
James S. Clark, January 1, 1942.
Leonard J. Baird, January 1, 1942.
John S. C. Gabbert, January 1, 1942.
Sam C. Loomis, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Fred Borries, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Cecil E. Blount, January 1, 1942.
John N. Ferguson, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Francis R. Drake, January 1, 1942.
Russell Kefauver, January 1, 1942.
Gould Hunter, January 1, 1942.
Chester W. Nimitz, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Walter V. Combs, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Charles R. Eisenbach, January 1, 1942.
John M. Oseth, January 1, 1942.
Floyd T. Thompson, January 1, 1942.
Robert J. Williams, January 1, 1942.
Francis A. Greenup, January 1, 1942.
Philip E. Shetenhelm, January 1, 1942.
Albert B. Furer, February 11, 1942.
Dallas M. Laizure, February 19, 1942.
William B. Parham, March 1, 1942.
Ellis B. Orr, March 1, 1942.
Parker L. Folsom, April 9, 1942.
Joseph A. Coppola, April 13, 1942.
Ralph W. Arndt, May 15, 1942.
Frank G. Law, June 9, 1942.
Charles E. Houston, June 30, 1942.
James W. O'Grady, June 30, 1942.
Richard L. Fowler, June 30, 1942.
Ray S. Thompson, Jr., June 30, 1942.

Ensign Earl E. Carlsten to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942.

Assistant Dental Surgeon Estes W. Murphy to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

Ensign John F. Chimienti, H–V (P), U. S. Naval Reserve, to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 28th day of October 1942.

Pay Inspector William A. Best to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of captain, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942.

Passed Assistant Paymaster John K. Chisholm to be a paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

John P. Kilroy, January 1, 1942.
Charles R. Beaman, January 1, 1942.
Richard L. Myers, June 30, 1942.
Randolph Meade, Jr., June 30, 1942.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 7th day of November 1940:

Alfred I. Pollack.
William F. Mims.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 19th day of November 1941:

| | |
|---|---|
| Robert L. Clark, Jr. | Robert J. Everett |
| Jacob H. Kettler | Julian S. Macaulay |
| James F. Ellison | James H. Hennessy |
| John D. Sullivan | John McCormack |
| Howard L. Van Orden, Jr. | Stanley R. Juch |
| | Frederick H. Vogt |
| Oliver W. Fraser, Jr. | Donald E. Williams |
| James D. Browder, Jr. | Carroll H. Stephens |
| Thomas J. James | Charles W. O'Toole |
| Rodman P. Kypke | Douglas H. Lyness |
| William A. Mann | Ralph E. Williams, Jr. |
| Joseph D. Kennedy, Jr. | Martin J. B. Kahao |
| Richard R. Fowell | John K. Walker |
| Charles E. Lee | Harry L. Miller |
| Joseph P. Quinn | Joseph D. Miller |
| Stuart A. MacCaffray | David J. Watson |
| William J. Carter 3d | John D. Custer |
| Richard D. McIntosh, Jr. | John R. Arnzen |
| | Henry S. Nisbet, Jr. |
| Herbert A. Ingley, Jr. | Robert F. Lautze |
| James W. Cartee | Rex A. Bradley |
| Robert McDonald | John F. Culp 3d |
| Francis E. Jepson | Richard S. Balch |
| Ernest M. Clark, Jr. | Peter M. Lindsay |
| Robert W. Van Evera | Roger W. Hatch |
| Robert E. Tidrow, Jr. | John M. Law |
| Ira C. Dockrey | Edward F. Hines |
| Walter R. Finn | William M. Wilson, Jr. |
| John R. Griffith | Robert H. Tobias |
| Ralph L. Meilandt | James L. F. Hennessy |
| Richard M. Hoag | Tyler R. Matthew |
| Frederick M. Rosseland, Jr. | Houston A. Brice, Jr. |
| | Allen M. Paget |
| Willis W. Alexander, Jr. | Ronald E. Kinney, Jr. |
| Alfred P. Boileau | Lloyd S. Bjorlo |
| William H. Miller | Roy B. Bursch |
| William W. Chisholm | Robert E. Holt |
| Benjamin J. Kerr 2d | James W. Bridges |
| Theodore B. Purvis, Jr. | Louis H. Litchfield, Jr. |
| Morgan C. Marshall | Howard G. Luyendyk |
| John H. Haig | William F. Tobin |
| Harold L. Henkel | Richard T. Power |
| Charles D. Tandy | Benjamin S. Gantz, Jr. |

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 23d day of March 1942:

| | |
|---|---|
| Gerard F. Dunican | Oscar W. Leidel, Jr. |
| Robert R. Baines | James E. Raynes |

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 15th day of July 1942:

Thomas A. Morris, Jr.

Mark Dodge

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) J. Kenneth Hall, DC-V (G), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 26th day of October 1942.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. Littleton W. T. Waller, Jr., to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps Reserve, for temporary service, from the 25th day of September 1942.

Col. Lewie G. Merritt to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 5th day of October 1942.

Lt. Col. (temporary) Gregon A. Williams to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of June 1942.

John D. Hayes, a citizen of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of May 1942.

John J. Kalen, a citizen of Virginia, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of July 1942.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of October 1942:

Cyrus N. Morgan, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Roger F. Seasholtz, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Warren F. Lloyd, a citizen of Virginia.

Dudley R. Carr, a citizen of Mississippi.

Sgt. William E. Lunn, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of October 1942.

The below-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 14th day of November 1942:

Platoon Sgt. Benjamin F. Royal, Jr.

Platoon Sgt. Rufus B. Thompson, Jr.

---

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 1, 1943:

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Edward J. Flynn to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

---

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 1, 1943:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Josh Lee, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Department of Commerce.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Father, we pray in the name of Him who carried eternity in His heart. We thank Thee that Thou art sufficient for every problem and disillusionment of life. Thine arm is not shortened and Thou art the shelter for every storm and the light which no darkness can dim. Thy ministries are very precious and our souls hang upon Thy fellowship; thus our love and life are strengthened and multiplied.

Reminded, dear Lord, of our inefficiency and dependence, we would indulge in no personal exaltation but humbly pray Thee to clothe us with a conscience that leaps beyond creed and liturgy, seeking the Christ alone whose infinite nature is interpreted in the borrowed center of the heavens: "I am the light of the world." In every county and State throughout our Union, may every man scorn disloyalty, sham, and fraud, inspired from a throne on which reigns the royalty of an unsullied conscience. Our Father, the day is weary, burdened with perplexity and unrest and need is crying from the four corners of this scarred and beaten globe. Oh, we pray for counsel that is wise, true, and just; direct all men with a searching eye to look within and in sacred calmness and quiet hear the small voice of the monitor within their own breasts. Oh, help us to be true to ourselves. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 28, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution expressing to the National Assembly and people of the Republic of Panama appreciation of their friendship for the United States.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government" for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Post Office Department.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. Civil Service Commission.
6. Executive Office of the President (Office for Emergency Management).
7. The National Archives.

THE SIXTY-FIRST BIRTHDAY OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Saturday last, while the House was not in session, was the sixty-first birthday of our beloved and courageous Commander in Chief, President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is fitting that we should pause today to congratulate and extend to our President our best wishes and felicitations on his birthday anniversary of a few days ago.

As the Washington Post well said in an editorial of last Saturday—

No man has had so much responsibility to the people in this Nation's history. No man has had as much responsibility to humanity. Indeed, we are all in the same boat, sailing to a new destiny, and he is our chief helmsman.

President Roosevelt is a precedent breaker. The first President to break the heretofore fixed third-term policy. If it was for no other reason than this, he would occupy a foremost page in American history.

President Roosevelt is the first President while in office to fly in an airplane.

He is the first wartime President to leave the continental United States in time of war.

Like the vision, courage, and adventurous spirit of Christopher Columbus brought about the discovery of a new world, out of which came our beloved country, so will the vision, the courage, and the sound, forward looking adventurous spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt lead the way to victory, and thereafter toward a permanent peace and a better world in which men of good will can live.

President Roosevelt has always been found fighting for the preservation of our institutions of government; for sound, practical, social justice, for the progress of our people. To me, he is the real conservative, who tries to preserve our fundamentals and ideals by regulating and controlling abuses that exist, the continuance of which existence would or might prove harmful to our Nation.

We find him in 1933, when banking and business was prostrated, when fear was in the minds of all, particularly in the minds of our bankers and businessmen, stepping into the breach and saving our banking system, the economic lifeblood of our Nation. By his courageous leadership, in addition to saving our banking system, and the deposits of well over 20,000,000 of our people, he also saved business, industry, finance from complete prostration. Simply because some have forgotten does not minimize that fact.

He then thought of the weak, of the millions of unemployed and their families and dependents, of the farmers and their families, of the youth of the land, who were facing disillusionment.

Then came the march of totalitarianism, nazi-ism, fascism, and the Jap war-crazed imperialism and hatred of America, and he led in seeing the danger that confronted us—criticized, scorned, scoffed at by some, facing division from within, he carried on with faith, vision, courage, preparing our country for the impending danger. Everyone knows of the history of the past several years, and of the unusual foresight and courageous leadership of our Commander in Chief.

He has been characterized in many ways, the great humanitarian, the great leader, the man of courage, the man without fear, the precedent breaker, the hope of the oppressed and the conquered. I do not mention what he has been termed by his enemies, as they are not worthy of being dignified by notice.

You will note I say enemies, not honest critics, or persons who honestly misunderstood and who acted as their consciences dictated, and who found out later they were wrong in their outlook of the future, and that President Roosevelt was right.

But there is one title, in my opinion, future historians will give him—and with victory he will deserve—and that is "The Preserver of Democracy."

Washington: "The Father of Our Country."

Lincoln: "The Savior of Our Country."

Roosevelt: "The Preserver of Democracy."

It is interesting to note that Washington was first inaugurated in 1789. Lincoln, in 1861, was first inaugurated 72 years after Washington. Franklin D. Roosevelt, in 1933, was first inaugurated 72 years after Lincoln.

We of the House appreciate his responsibilities in this critical period of our Nation's history. Without regard to party, we of the House, as the Washington Post well said, recognize "he is our chief helmsman."

While all of our Members could not see eye to eye with the President on all occasions, practically all of our Members respect him personally; respect him as our President and, in this crisis, as our wartime Commander in Chief.

A few days ago we honored the memory of another great wartime President and Commander in Chief who has gone to meet His Maker, William McKinley, who, while on the stage of life, played an important part in the history and progress of our country.

Today we pause to extend our congratulations and to express our sentiments of respect, confidence, and support, not as Democrats or Republicans, or Independents, or otherwise, but as Americans, to our living wartime President and Commander in Chief, to this man of destiny, and to express the hope—yes, prayers—that God will continue to give him good health, and direct and guide him in the performance of his grave duties, in the early winning of the war, and in the establishment of a just, lasting, and permanent peace.

### FORMER REPRESENTATIVE JOHN F. DOCKWEILER

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this House who served with former Congressman John F. Dockweiler, of California, will be grieved to learn of his death, which occurred at his home in Los Angeles yesterday morning, January 31.

Mr. Dockweiler was born on September 19, 1895, in Los Angeles. He was a son of Isadore Bernard and Gertrude Dockweiler. His family has been prominent in the history of California since the early days. For more than 40 years his father has been an outstanding character in our State. Still living, he is regarded as the Old Roman of them all in the Democratic Party of California. He is the outstanding, living example of the type of men who led our progress from the earliest beginnings. Always abreast of the times, for many decades he has taken an active part in practically all questions associated with the progress and advancement of our State.

John was a worthy son of his father. His career was closely associated with many fraternal, civic, political, and economic activities of our State. His versatile work was reflected in his career in this House.

John Dockweiler was a graduate of Loyola College in Los Angeles in 1918 with a degree of bachelor of arts. In 1921 he graduated from the Southern California law school and subsequently took postgraduate work and special courses at Harvard Law School.

He was elected to Congress in 1932 and served here for 6 years in the Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, and Seventy-fifth Congresses. He voluntarily retired in 1938 when he became a candidate for the Democratic nomination for Governor. Among a number of candidates, he received next to the highest vote.

While a Member of the House, Mr. Dockweiler served as assistant whip of his party. He was a member of the Appropriations Committee at the time of his voluntary retirement.

In 1940 he was elected district attorney of Los Angeles County. That county contains one of the greatest constituencies served by any county district attorney in the United States. He filled the office with diligence and great credit to himself and to our State.

While a Member of this body he won the respect and affection of its membership. He was a lovable character and an honor to California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I do this in order to add a few words to what the gentleman from Californi [Mr. LEA] has had to say about the sad passing of a former colleague in the House, Hon. John F. Dockweiler. I have been acquainted with our late colleague and members of his family, notably, his splendid father, for many years. The Dockweiler family has been one of the outstanding families in California from almost the beginning of its growth. Their service in various phases of public life has been one of the things that California is proud of. Brothers of our late colleague have served on the bench and in other capacities and always with outstanding record. Our late colleague is going to be missed by many people. He has given an administration as district attorney of our county which has won the approbation and approval of all constructive citizens, and I join with the dean of our delegation the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] in professing my own profound sorrow over his death.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, Los Angeles has sad news today for many men in this House. John Dockweiler, who worked among you for 6 years, is dead. For those 6 years John represented the district which I now represent.

In California we have many legends—woven from the mission days, the Spanish land grants, the sudden impact of a bright, new civilization. The name Dockweiler is a signpost of this legend.

Isadore Dockweiler, John's father, rode horseback over southern California when the present site of Los Angeles was rolling hills, covered with cattle, herded by Mexican paisanos.

Isadore Dockweiler, pioneer, had 13 children. When they became grown, a new city, a white-walled, red-roofed city of 2,000,000 people, lay at their feet. And they were the literal symbol of this city's growth. They were Dockweiler doctors, Dockweiler lawyers, Dockweiler engineers, Dockweiler statesmen.

John, the statesman, is dead today, but in his father, Isadore the pioneer, lives on. And to him today I send my sorrow at the loss of his and California's son.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I have learned of the passing of one of the former Members of the California delegation in Congress. John F. Dockweiler served in this body for three successive terms, from 1933 to 1939, as a Member of the Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, and Seventy-fifth Congresses. During his first term he was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs and subsequently served on the Appropriations Committee on the subcommittee handling the appropriations for the War Department.

During his service here, John Dockweiler proved untiring in his efforts to promote and develop a sound program of national defense for the Nation, realizing as he did the great conflict of American and Japanese interests in the Pacific. With almost prophetic vision he daily championed the cause of greatly augmented coastal defenses for the entire Pacific coast, and it was due to his efforts almost exclusively that the harbor defenses of San Francisco Bay were greatly improved and strengthened. Who shall say that it was not due to these very installations that the perfidious attack of the Japanese on that eventful December 7 was not extended to include the bay region in the onslaught against the United States? Without hesitation John Dockweiler, as Congressman, urged upon both the War and Navy Departments a greater vigilance of the activities of the Japanese throughout his native State of California, but more particularly in and around the harbor and industrial areas of Los Angeles. With a keen discerning mind he anticipated the real treachery with which the Japanese would initiate an attack upon this Nation.

With a splendid legal education and the experience of several years of active practice, John Dockweiler was elected district attorney of Los Angeles County just 2 years ago, having previously been a candidate for the Democratic nomination as Governor of the State of California. He administered the duties of the office of district attorney efficiently and well, always having a high regard for the rights of individuals, the while he

demanded the enforcement and prosecution of the law in the interests of good, sound government. It is indeed unfortunate for the people of Los Angeles County that the career of this able and industrious young attorney should be cut short in the very beginning of his service in government. That his absence will be keenly felt by all needs no comment on my part.

A kindly individual, John Dockweiler made a host of friends for himself while serving here in the Congress, and there are none who met him but admired him for his high principles and fine ideals. Quiet and unostentatious, he nevertheless displayed great vigor and force whenever the occasion demanded. He demonstrated in his daily life his fine character and deep religious convictions, splendid attributes, which merit for him the fond memory we shall always have of him. As he lays down the burdens of this life we pray that he may enjoy eternal rest and happiness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the Military Order of the Liberty Bell, national headquarters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CAMP HALE, COLO.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman CLASON, read to me a letter from one of his constituents, wherein it was stated that he had heard that there had been deaths and much illness among the boys stationed at Camp Hale in Colorado. I had not heard any such rumor but since the camp is located in my congressional district, it seemed to me that an inquiry should be made at once.

Accordingly, I asked the Surgeon General's Office to make an investigation. I am glad to report that the Surgeon General has made a careful investigation and states that there has not been a single death among the soldiers since the camp was created; that the general health of the men is good; and that there were only minor ailments, such as measles, mumps, and common colds, usual to a group of enlisted men suddenly brought together from various parts of the United States. The only losses reported were two Army mules, and they were probably caused by a fall from some cliff.

Camp Hale is a comparatively new camp where men are taught skiing and mountain climbing and generally trained for mountain warfare. It is located at Pando, Colo., which lies at an elevation of 10,000 feet. Considering the high altitude and the vigorous exercise necessary to train mountain troops, I think that the health record of no deaths and only minor ailments among the thousands of troops stationed there, is remarkable.

I thought that you would be interested in this health report from a mountain training center high in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, Tuesday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ERRONEOUS CHARGES AGAINST LEND-LEASE

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. At the last session of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], made certain charges against the administration of lend-lease. The day after this speech was delivered, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House heard Mr. Stettinius, the Administrator of Lend-Lease, and he completely answered and denied all of these charges made by the gentleman from Ohio. Since the membership of the House did not have the privilege of hearing the reply by Mr. Stettinius, and since readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD did not have that privilege, I wish to answer these four charges based upon Mr. Stettinius' reply thereto. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] stated that thousands of cases of beer, rayon hose, and power puffs have been shipped abroad and paid for with lend-lease funds.

The gentleman from Ohio is misinformed. No beer and no powder puffs have been bought with lend-lease funds. In procuring cotton hose for lend-lease shipment to north Africa, a small amount of cheap 25-cent-a-pair heavy-duty rayon hose was included along with the cotton hose. In addition, some rayon hose was included in various barter goods previously purchased by the War Department for our forces in north Africa to use in payment for local labor on airfields, barracks, and other installations.

Lend-lease shipments of clothing—and of food—for distribution to the civilian population of north Africa are a pressing matter of military policy. At General Eisenhower's urgent request, supplies are being sent to the people of North Africa who have been stripped to the point of destitution.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] also said that lend-lease is being forced on some countries that did not want it, and mentioned Bermuda specifically.

He has been misinformed. Acceptance of lend-lease aid has not been forced on Bermuda or on any country. As a matter of fact, no lend-lease aid has been given to Bermuda. Lend-lease aid is made available only at the specific request of the country to which such aid is to be rendered.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] also said that Harry Hopkins, as "lend-lease expediter," has absolute authority in assigning lend-lease shipments.

This charge is erroneous. E. R. Stettinius, Jr., has been Lend-Lease Administrator since October 28, 1941, when he was authorized by the President "to exercise any power or authority conferred upon the President" by the Lend-Lease Act, in accordance with the policies prescribed by the President.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] also said that the United States has no assurance that airplanes furnished our allies will not be used in the post-war period to take commercial airways away from this country.

Again the gentleman is in error. Under the terms of the master lend-lease agreements, the United States may require the return of any articles furnished under lend-lease, including all types of planes, that have not been "destroyed, lost, or consumed," and shall have been determined by the President to be "of use to the United States of America."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the subject of sponge iron, and to include a statement from Gov. J. Melville Broughton, of North Carolina, and also a brief statement from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, under the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN]; also a statement from Science News in Review?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WALTER WINCHELL

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I have always supposed that the rules and regulations of the Communications Commission prohibited the use of profanity and the utterance of sentiments calculated to stir up hatreds and disunity on the radio.

Last evening I listened to Walter Winchell. Apparently he feels that he is above the rules and regulations that apply to citizens generally, because in his broadcast last evening, in my judgment, he reached a new low as a purveyor of hate and discord when he contemptuously referred to the reelection of Members of Congress whose pre-Pearl Harbor voting record he had so vigorously condemned. He spoke as one who had been thwarted and rebuked by the people of the country who went to the polls and cast their votes last November. While impliedly admitting the failure of his campaign of hate directed at many Members of Congress, last night he directed his vituperation and venom toward the millions of American citizens who voted their honest convictions and returned to the Congress of the United States men and women in whom they had confidence. I was astounded to hear him in-

dict the patriotism and intelligence of millions of American people when he stated in substance that what worried him most today was the "damn fools who voted for them."

It is true that he apologetically stated that there were hundreds of good and able representatives in the Congress, and he singled out our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY], as a wonderful man. I hope that this orchid tossed to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] will not be the kiss of political death such as he administered to our erstwhile colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK]. Winchell has taken on a big order this time when as an officer in the United States Navy he referred to millions of decent Americans as damn fools and desecrated a decent Sabbath evening and every law of radio to give vent to his undisguised venom. It seems to me, Mr. Winchell, that you owe an apology to the people of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial on the farm problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Farm Journal on concentrated feeds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the Cleveland City Council.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD and to address the House for 1 minute to make an explanation of the correction, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, I followed Judge SUMNERS in referring to the Civil Air Patrol. The RECORD on page 443 contains an error which changed the context very much. I said that the men of the Civil Air Patrol are not exempt from the draft and that therefore the Civil Air Patrol depends on men who are not subject to military service. In the RECORD the word "not" was omitted and it appears that those men "are exempt from the draft," which is a great injustice and an erroneous statement.

Among these men of the Civil Air Patrol are fat ones, bald-headed ones, old ones and underage ones, because they are subject to the draft and are not exempt because of that service. Thus we are getting splendid service in the air from men who would not otherwise be in the military service.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by Nicholas Picchione on the negative side of the Ruml plan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio speech which I have made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Thomas Lyons, Secretary of the Foreign Trade Zone Board. I have cleared through the Government Printing Office and the cost of this will be $90.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MERCHANT MARINE SEAMEN AT GUADALCANAL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a statement recently appeared in some of the public prints, which statement was reechoed on the floor of this House, that seamen in the merchant marine have refused to unload supplies and discharge cargoes from ships at Guadalcanal. There is a welcome disclaimer of that statement. Admiral Halsey states that "in no instance have merchant marine seamen refused to discharge cargo from their vessels at Guadalcanal or in any other way failed to cooperate with United States forces ashore in that area."

That statement, originally made, was an aspersion upon the brave merchant marine men who daily risk their lives on the Atlantic and the Pacific, who risk being bombed and torpedoed by U-boats every hour. Those who made and repeated that lie and aspersion now have a glorious opportunity to apoligize to those brave men.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the regular business of the day and any other special orders today I may proceed for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TIRES ON JAPANESE-OWNED AUTOMOBILES AND TRUCKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in these days when Rubber Czar Jeffers professes his inability to get the synthetic-rubber program under way and our supply from natural sources continues to dwindle, one cannot help but wonder whether or not there is any cooperation among the various agencies of the Government in an effort to relieve the situation.

From isolated press dispatches which have been called to my attention, verified by independent investigation, I am convinced that there are in excess of 25,000 Japanese-owned automobiles and trucks in storage in our Pacific coastal States, upon which there are some 125,000 serviceable tires which, if put into use, would contribute much to the solving of the problem with which we are now vexed.

Furthermore I am informed that Japanese-owned tractors, threshing machines, pumping equipment, motors, and other agricultural implements of a value running well into millions, are also impounded in storage and, therefore, out of use in our food and fiber production program at a time when agricultural implements and equipment are sorely needed upon our western farms.

If there were ever an occasion when different departments and agencies of Government could cooperate to the advantage of our war effort, this situation presents a striking example. Is it not time for the War Relocation Authority to get together with Mr. Jeffers' rubber agency and the Department of Agriculture with a view of recovering this rubber for use and these agricultural implements for service upon our farms?

It is not reasonable to ask the American people to continue their personal sacrifices in order to supply service deficiencies when our war-making officials constantly overlook opportunities such as the ones to which I have today called the attention of the Congress.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago charges were made, on the floor of the House, that merchant seamen refused to unload a cargo at Guadalcanal on a Sunday, in conformity with the rules of the maritime union, thus compelling convalescent marines to do the job. It was a serious charge.

It has now been proven that the charge was baseless, in that the incident never occurred.

It is both proper and fitting that a denial of this unfounded charge be made from the same forum from which the original charge was made because, as it

happens, it was an unwarranted attack upon heroic seamen who are performing brave, noble, and essential service.

In this connection, I should like to read a brief editorial which appeared in the Baltimore Evening Sun of January 29, entitled "End of an Evil Rumor." It should be recognized that the Baltimore Sun papers are considered among the best in this part of the country:

END OF AN EVIL RUMOR

That story about the merchant seamen who refused to unload ships at Guadalcanal on Sunday because it was against their union rules, has been officially denied. Admiral Halsey, commander of the United States forces in the South Pacific states:

"None of the crews has ever refused to discharge its ship's cargo, and the merchant seamen's cooperation, efficiency, and courage—on some occasions in the face of enemy attack—have won high praise."

It is a salutary thing to have this report squelched by the highest naval authority in the area in which the incident was supposed to have occurred. For this story was exactly the kind that Herr Doktor Goebbels would be happy to have going the rounds. Far too many tales do go the rounds, and baseless though most of them are, they are repeated by irresponsible persons until they gain such wide currency that even sensible people begin to wonder if there might not be some truth in them. Whenever that point is reached, Herr Doktor Goebbels' aim—which is to spread distrust and dismay—has in some measure been achieved. The unfounded-rumors machine is working for him.

The Guadalcanal story was especially harmful in that it appeared to have some basis in fact and could be traced, as the others so seldom can be, to a respectable and apparently reliable source. It was especially hateful, in that it tended to discredit the men of the merchant navy—men who have been exposed time and again to attack by planes, subs, and surface warships, and whose work is at all times arduous and risky.

The merchant marine is performing its indispensable task with efficiency and courage, as Admiral Halsey has said. The story that some merchant crews refused to work in an emergency has been denied by him. That should be the end of such rumors.

I, and I am sure all of you, must agree with the sentiments expressed in this editorial.

## THREAT TO LIVESTOCK DISEASE CONTROL

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, on January 27 my esteemed colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] sounded a timely warning on the dangers from the foreign livestock malady, foot-and-mouth disease. His remarks were clear, concise, and convincing, but they dealt only with what might be termed predictable avenues through which this disease, and other foreign diseases of comparable seriousness, may menace our livestock industry.

With a world at war we must not only envision the usual or predictable means by which our livestock may fall victim to this disease but in addition what may be termed the unpredictable means such as the willful and malicious activities of saboteurs.

Our enemy countries as well as other European and Asiatic countries are now suffering the most severe scourge of this disease in history. Obviously our best precautions may, during wartime, be circumvented. Therefore, our vigilance against its introduction is not enough. There must be no weakness in our preparedness plan to cope with the disease should it make its appearance within our borders.

There were 5 separate invasions of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States during the first 29 years of the present century. Each outbreak was of foreign origin and was vigorously combatted and promptly eradicated. The two most destructive outbreaks occurred in 1914–16, involving the livestock to a greater or less degree of 22 States, and in 1924–25, when 2 States—1 very seriously—were involved.

Throughout the five campaigns against this costly plague the responsibility for its control and eradication was vested in the Bureau of Animal Industry for the Federal Government, and the comparable veterinary organizations of the affected States. No State has ever shirked its responsibility during such times, but in most cases State veterinary forces have been limited, and it became necessary for the Federal Government to provide the major veterinary personnel.

Foot-and-mouth disease is an acute, rapidly spreading, infectious disease and its successful extermination calls for a large, well-trained, and mobile veterinary force. The United States Bureau of Animal Industry has kept constantly in readiness a program and personnel roster for immediate action whenever necessary.

The Bureau is the largest single employer of veterinarians in the world. In normal times they are employed in regular assignments, in various divisions o. the Bureau, but in case of emergency they are quickly mobilized for such essential special duty.

The Bureau has each time been successful in quickly placing into the field to combat foot-and-mouth disease a large force of veterinarians experienced in the diagnosis, control, and disposition of infected animals.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent large sums of money from private and public sources to eradicate and control animal disease in this country and now have the cleanest livestock in the world. We are literally holding in trust for the rest of the world the best blood lines now existent for the reestablishment of herds and flocks in other countries when the war is over.

With this in mind, I have been very seriously concerned over reports that the Bureau of Animal Industry is to be broken up under plans for a reorganization of the Department of Agriculture. Acting under authority of an Executive order issued on December 5, 1942, the Secretary of Agriculture is now entertaining a proposal to detach permanently the Meat Inspection Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry and place it in the Food Distribution Administration.

Such a move would reduce by about 900 the number of trained veterinarians now available to the Bureau to combat such diseases as foot-and-mouth disease.

My remarks should not be construed as minimizing the importance of the food distribution program, but I am greatly concerned when from any source or through any pretext, action is contemplated which tends to deplete the only organization that is competent to furnish the protection required by our livestock industry against the threat of such a devastating malady as foot-and-mouth disease.

Any benefit that might be furnished to the Food Distribution Administration by such a move would sink into insignificance when compared to the loss that would unavoidably be sustained should we suffer an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD at this point a letter directed to the Secretary of Agriculture by the American Veterinary Medical Association, urging that the Bureau of Animal Industry be maintained as an intact working organization, with all its forces under the unified direction of a veterinarian as chief:

AMERICAN VETERINARY
MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
*Chicago, Ill., January 21, 1943.*

Hon. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
*Secretary of Agriculture,*
*Department of Agriculture,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The board of governors of the American Veterinary Medical Association are much concerned about the future of the Federal Meat Inspection Service and the disease control and prevention agencies which have been directed so long and so efficiently by a veterinarian as Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

The fact that the United States is today the safest place in the world in which to grow livestock is not the result of mere accident but of planned and practical methods, based on scientific knowledge such as:

1. The control of infectious diseases within the country itself.

2. The development and enforcement of regulations which have served, with rare exceptions, as effective barriers against the introduction of livestock disease plagues prevalent in other countries.

For over 50 years the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry has had the benefit of competent veterinary direction and has functioned faithfully and efficiently in protecting our livestock industry.

In cooperation with the entire veterinary profession, it has completely rooted out or brought under control several devastating livestock diseases and has eradicated foreign plagues on the few occasions that they have been introduced into this country.

The system of animal disease control developed in the United States has been the marvel of its kind and the envy of other countries.

It spells the difference between a prosperous agricultural nation and one burdened by enormous losses.

Moreover, the effective control of infectious and contagious diseases of animals under competent veterinary direction has been an important public-health factor through the suppression of those animal diseases which are transmissible to man.

On the basis of the record, there would seem to be no justification for a change in the administration or the make-up of the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry, both of which have enabled it to function as a well-rounded unit to meet all requirements and emergencies. Of all times in the Nation's history, it would seem particularly ill-advised now to make changes which might create

confusion and impair the proven efficiency of an organization when it is most essential to the successful prosecution of the war program.

It is therefore our firm conviction that, for the best interests of the entire country, the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry should remain as an intact working organization and with all its forces under the unified direction of a veterinarian as Chief.

Sincerely yours,

O. V. BRUMLEY,
*Dean, School of Veterinary Medicine, Ohio State University, and Chairman, Board of Governors, American Veterinary Medical Association.*

W. W. DIMOCK,
*Head, Department of Animal Pathology, University of Kentucky, and President, American Veterinary Medical Association.*

C. W. BOWER,
*Practitioner, Topeka, Kans., and President-elect, American Veterinary Medical Association.*

J. C. HARDENBERGH,
*Executive Secretary, American Veterinary Medical Association, Chicago, Ill.*

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a letter from the Veterinary Medical Association to Hon. Claude Wickard.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I commend the splendid remarks made by our distinguished majority leader in recognition of the birthday of our Commander in Chief on last Saturday.

We Georgians look upon President Roosevelt as a part-time citizen of our State. We recognize not only his splendid leadership as President throughout the years and his magnificent work as Commander in Chief of this great Nation and of the United Nations, but particularly do we appreciate the humanitarianism of this great man and the fine work he has done at Warm Springs, Ga., in the establishment of that institution for the treatment of sufferers of infantile paralysis.

Last Friday night it was my privilege to attend a dinner given for the stars who were here to celebrate his birthday. Among those stars was a splendid young woman, a singer, who herself has suffered from infantile paralysis, but who has had the courage to carry on and continue to use her beautiful voice notwithstanding her inability to walk.

I think the most amazing thing about our Commander in Chief is the courage he has displayed in the face of his handicap, and especially the courage he has shown in the last few weeks in making that dangerous trip to north Africa in the interest of carrying on our war against the enemy.

I know we all join in felicitating him on his sixty-first birthday and wish him continued happiness and good health.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief article by Frank Kent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

"LAME DUCKS"

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to call attention to a bill which I have this day introduced in the House.

When the citizens of the Eleventh Ohio District inform me at the polls that my services are no longer desired as their Congressman, I trust that I will retire gracefully and not attempt to force my attention of my "lame duck" services on them, whether it be done by Executive order or as permitted in the present law which I am attempting to repeal.

I realize that there may be certain business which requires time to complete before retiring, but it seems to me that the time elapsing between the defeat of a candidate in early November and the time of seating the new Congress in early January is sufficient time for any "lame duck" to still keep his bill in.

Since coming here in January I have run into several examples where I am actually stymied in rendering proper service to my constituents because of the present law, which extends the "lame duck's" authority for full 6 months, or until June 30, following his retirement in January.

This is particularly manifest in regard to the Agricultural Yearbook. As I understand it, these books are placed to the credit of the individual Members of Congress in November, and even though the Member be defeated in November, these publications still remain to his credit and cannot be released to the newly elected Member unless the defeated candidate so orders. This very definitely works a hardship upon the newly elected Members, as well as upon his constituents back home who are desirous of obtaining these publications.

It seems to me that the authority of any defeated candidate should cease at the same time the newly elected Congressman's authority begins, and I trust that you will see your way clear to support my bill.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignations from committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., February 1, 1943.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as a Member of the Committee on Claims of the House of Representatives.

Very sincerely yours,

WILSON D. GILLETTE.

---

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., January 28, 1943.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES WOLFENDEN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 88), which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That WILSON D. GILLETTE, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Printing of the House of Representatives.

PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inquire of the majority leader about the program for tomorrow, Tuesday. I understand there has been a change in the program.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. The Committee on Rules reported out a rule making in order a bill reported out of the Naval Affairs Committee. This will come up on tomorrow. I understand there is nothing controversial about it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much general debate will there be on the resolution?

Mr. SABATH. One hour. There is no opposition to it from any source.

Mr. McCORMACK. And while I am on this subject, if I may encroach upon the minute's time given my friend from Massachusetts, I wish to make an announcement to the Democratic Members.

On Thursday after the legislative day is over there will be a caucus of the Democratic Members for the purpose of selecting a nominee for the position of Doorkeeper.

This is an announcement for my own side. Notices will not go out much before

tomorrow or Wednesday morning, and so the Democratic Members may know as soon as possible I make this announcement. The second matter before the caucus will be the question of permitting Democratic Members on select committees to also serve on the District of Columbia Committee. In other words, the District of Columbia Committee will be an exception to the rule against Members of select committees serving on other committees.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I ask the gentleman about his program for the week? I am filing a report on the telegraph merger bill and I hope to appear before the Rules Committee as early as possible. I know the chairman of that committee will grant a hearing as early as possible.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot make any promises now. I cannot see how it can come up this week, but I will see that it is brought up as soon as possible.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by one of America's foremost authors, Stuart Edward White.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL SHIP REPAIR FACILITIES FOR THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 87, Rept. No. 68), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 1446, a bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief editorial that appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION]?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

On January 31, 1943, there was disseminated a pamphlet by the National Lawyers Guild, and I read from it the following excerpt:

*To the Members of the House of Representatives:*

MARTIN DIES and his committee is the secret weapon with which Adolf Hitler hopes to soften up our Nation for military conquest.

I have many excerpts, not only from this but from other pamphlets, all of which raise clearly a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentleman is entitled to an hour. He asks unanimous consent that his time be extended 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in a great struggle to preserve our constitutional government and our American way of life. The most important phase of that struggle is the supreme effort to win the war. To that end all of us, of every political party, are devoting all of our energies, our resources, and our ability. The House of Representatives has from the beginning of this emergency cooperated in every respect with the executive department in order to prepare this Nation for the struggle. There is no Congress in the history of America that appropriated more money for our military preparedness than the last Congress. The executive department has received the fullest degree of cooperation in its effort to defeat the Axis Powers.

But while this is the most important phase of the present conflict, there is another phase of almost equal importance. This is not only a clash between the armies of the Allied Nations and the armies of the Axis Powers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman tell us who made that statement?

Mr. DIES. The National Lawyers Guild. I will get to that and other statements as I go along.

Mr. Speaker, of almost equal importance with the conflict between rival armies, the armed forces of democracy and the armed forces of the Axis Powers, is the struggle between conflicting ideologies of government. The nineteenth century liberalism which advocated the protection of individual rights, which culminated in those great and eternal beliefs and philosophies which surround the individual with every possible protection in the enjoyment of his rights, has been challenged for a long time by a new philosophy which in one country is communism, in another country fascism, in another country nazi-ism, and in another country bureaucracy. But the underlying principle of all of these philosophies is essentially the same. Stripped of their verbiage and viewed in the naked truth, we find similar phrases, and similar expressions, as well as similar policies and programs advocated in each instance.

We hear the voice of Adolf Hitler when he contended in Mein Kampf that the highest duty of the individual is to subordinate himself to the state. We read in the doctrines of Marx the pronouncement that the state must be supreme. In the fascism of Mussolini there is a corporate state administered and controlled by a self-perpetuating bureaucracy. The very essence of fascism is and has been a centralized state, a state that expands, extends, and broadens until ultimately the individual becomes a mere cog in a collectivistic system of government.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has overlooked, in my opinion, one of the most important, one of the most dangerous ideologies that threatens America now and for generations to come. That is the ideology known as Shintoism that Japan is spreading throughout the world and especially in the United States.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The point I am trying to make is simply that when liberalism first came into existence it represented a struggle of the people against centralized government and, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] stated in a speech a few days ago, and he expressed it so appropriately, the history of democratic progress has been the history of decentralization. Liberalism was derived from the word liberty. It meant those who were in favor of the liberty of the individual and of the entire body of society. It meant those who were struggling against a great bureaucratic or autocratic or oligarchic government, whichever you may term it, in which the citizen became nothing and the state was everything.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The House is not in order. Some Members on that side are holding a conversation.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. DIES. We sometimes overlook the fact that in our own country there has been a trend toward centralized government, not of the same nature and perhaps not as marked as in foreign countries, but, nevertheless, over a period of several or more decades there has been a constant, steady trend toward bureaucratic and centralized government and away from the original concept of our fathers.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Just a moment ago a gentleman stood up and pointed his hand in a certain direction. Three or four gentlemen were standing here. I wonder whether the gentleman would care to identify the person to whom he was calling attention.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will do it if the gentleman wants me to.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I identify him by the group who finds this bad medicine.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, it is essential, of course, to this country that every Member of the House or of the other body strive in every possible way, by example, by speech, by conduct, to contribute to the successful prosecution of this war. All Members of this House are vitally and deeply interested in it. Most of us have boys who are now in the service of their country, many of us have nephews and friends and boys of our friends who are fighting on foreign soil. But it is equally important that we as a legislative branch of this Government guard jealously and zealously the rights and the prerogatives of this body.

The very heart and core of democracy is the parliamentary system. The history of every country that has lost its liberty is the history of the gradual centralization of power in the Executive and the stripping, so to speak, of the legislative branch of government of its powers and prerogatives.

When the time comes in this country that the legislative branch of government lacks that independence and that courage to speak honestly and truthfully and to vote convictions that are sincerely and profoundly felt, that moment will mark the decay and the disintegration of this Republic. Nations are sometimes destroyed by a sudden revolution, but more often republics are destroyed by the gradual process of subversion, the step-by-step method under which under one pretext or another one power is taken away from the legislative branch and then another power is taken away from it, until finally we have the totalitarian scheme of bureaucracy which means government by bureaucratic edict, which is the first step toward dictatorship, which creates conditions under which dictatorship is inevitable.

The Roman republic preserved the externalism and the forms of a democracy or of a republic long after Caesar had usurped the real functions of the legislative branch of government. He permitted the Roman senate to exist as window dressing during a period of transition, because he well knew that the people of Rome were not quite prepared for the destruction of their republican system.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, a wise and alert Congress working in the interest of a free electorate will always be jealous of its rights and will resist every attempt that may be made to curtail those rights and responsibilities.

There is no more insidious way of destroying democracy than the method of discrediting the Congress of the United States. I do not mean by that that people should not criticize Congressmen or the Congress. I recognize that Congress, like the executive branch and the judicial branch, should always welcome constructive criticism from the Nation. There is no one so perfect that he cannot improve himself with the aid of constructive criticism. Therefore I do not want to be understood as branding as subversive those who exercise their God-given right to criticize Members of Congress or to criticize Congress.

THE CAMPAIGN TO DISCREDIT CONGRESS

I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to what I conceive to be a well-organized and highly financed conspiracy on the part of devotees and followers of totalitarianism to discredit individual Members of Congress, to discredit committees of Congress, and to discredit Congress as a whole. It is a very clever piece of strategy, one with which I have been familiar for some time, a strategy that I knew 4 years ago would inevitably be used in this country when the occasion made it appropriate, the strategy of attempting to pin the Nazi or Fascist label upon all those who do not agree to certain principles or certain policies of the present administration.

But, Mr. Speaker, in their attempt to discredit Congress through this smearing campaign, it is only right that Congress should know who is engineering the campaign, who is financing the campaign, and why they are attempting to do it. I have here a number of excerpts from different magazines and publications. From the New Republic, for instance, as follows:

> MARTIN DIES, a Democrat of Orange, Tex., who came to Congress in 1931, had been so clearly acting in the best interest of the Axis Governments that he is now the most frequently quoted American on Axis broadcasts sent to this hemisphere.

That was used not only in the New Republic but in other magazines of the same character as a part of a well-organized conspiracy to create the impression, through the Hitler tactics of propaganda, that the committee that I have the honor to serve as chairman has been pro-Axis or pro-Hitler. This first appeared in the form of a release of a statement purporting to come from the Federal Communications Commission, to the effect that the listening post of the Commission had discovered that my name was more frequently used by the Axis Powers than any other living American. The truth was that our committee had just exposed some of the officials in that Commission, and in their attempt to fight back or to discredit the committee this so-called report was first given to the Birmingham Age-Herald, a newspaper published in Alabama, and then to Newsweek and PM. I immediately took the matter up with Mr. Fly, and, of course, there was not any such report, and, of course, there was no action taken by the Communications Commission to ascertain who was the most frequently quoted American. It came from those in the Commission who wanted to smear me and to create the impression that I had favored the Axis Powers. It would be unimportant that it should be mentioned to the House were I the only Member of Congress who has been repeatedly attacked by this group, but let us remember that, preceding the last campaign, there were attacks made on a majority of the Members of this House. The attacks were not confined to temperate language. There was no attempt to constructively criticize Congress. Wholesale and sweeping indictments were made that Members of this Congress were the tools and agents of Adolf Hitler.

Let us take, for instance, the New Republic. Here is a magazine, Mr. Speaker, that parades under the name of liberalism. It pretends to speak for the liberals of America. This magazine carried a number of statements accusing many Members of this House of being Fascists and sympathizers with the Axis Powers. I want to discuss, if I may, this magazine. I want to point out the part which the magazine, the New Republic, has played in this coalition of antiparliamentarism.

It will be recalled that the vicious document known as A Congress To Win the War was published as a supplement to the New Republic on May 18, 1942. The Union for Democratic Action and the New Republic claimed joint responsibility for the document.

Before I divulge to this House a startling fact about the New Republic, I wish to refresh your memories concerning a few of the magazine's editors. For many years Malcolm Cowley has been one of the editors of this journal. On January 15, 1942, I addressed this body at some length on the record of Malcolm Cowley. I also presented to every Member of the House 24 pages of documentary evidence which established conclusively that Malcolm Cowley had for years collaborated closely with the Communist Party; that he had, in fact, served publicly as a member of the Communist Party's campaign committees. A few days after I exposed Cowley's record, he published a volume of poems in one of which he described enthusiastically the march of a mob of armed revolutionists upon the Capitol and their successful armed seizure of the very Chamber in which we sit today. At the time I addressed the House on Cowley's record and at the very time he published his poems, he was employed in the Office of Facts and Figures as chief information analyst at $8,000 a year. As a result of my exposure, Cowley was forced back into private life, where he resumed his editorial duties on the New Republic.

For many years one of the New Republic's contributing editors has been Rexford Guy Tugwell, original "brain truster," whose current administration of the affairs of Puerto Rico reflects no credit upon himself or those who appointed him to the position of Governor of the island. The outstanding feature of Tugwell's administration has been a complete and undisguised contempt for the legislative branch of the Puerto Rican government. While holding his important post in our overseas island possesion, Tugwell has maintained his official connection with the New Republic, and his name appears on the masthead of the very issue in which the vicious assault upon Members of this House was made last May.

Bruce Bliven is the guiding genius and principal editor of the New Republic. The kind of pseudo-liberalism which Bruce Bliven represents is revealed in his

link with one of the enterprises of Joseph P. Lash, that perennial youth leader of America. Bliven wrote the introduction for one of Lash's books, a copy of which I hold in my hand. The book bears the imprint of the Communist Party's publishing establishment, which is known as International Publishers, but the chief fact with which I am now concerned is Bruce Bliven's glowing recommendation of Lash's views as set forth in this volume.

Naturally, I cannot quote at any great length from Lash's book, but I must point out that its entire substance is propaganda for the idea that American youth should, in the book's own words, "refuse to support any war which the United States Government may undertake." Appearing exactly 60 months before Pearl Harbor, the book contains Lash's own announcement that he was "waging a vigorous battle against American war preparations." Among other things, Lash demanded—and I quote his exact words—"drastic reduction in the present armaments budget, especially the Navy." Lash further proclaimed himself the leader of "mass resistance" against the United States Government in the event of this country's involvement in any war in Europe or the Pacific. I could go on quoting indefinitely the un-American sentiments of this self-styled leader of our American youth, but I must satisfy myself with the repeated observation that Bruce Bliven, principal editor of the New Republic, placed his unqualified endorsement upon this subversive propaganda which was written by Lash and published by the Communist Party.

Bruce Bliven has long proclaimed himself "a sincere liberal." That was his defense in the columns of his magazine last July shortly after our committee exposed the un-American and subversive attack upon Congress, made jointly by the New Republic and the Union for Democratic Action. I declare, and the record which I am revealing proves, that Bruce Bliven more fittingly represents the utter intellectual bankruptcy of pseudo-liberalism. What possible element of true liberalism can be found in a man who at one moment comes out for "waging a vigorous battle against American war preparations" and then does a complete right-about-face and attacks Congress for having made too meager preparations for war?

As a sample of the downright falsehoods which the New Republic distributed far and wide in its attack upon the Congress, I cite a single example together with Bruce Bliven's own acknowledgment of the falsity of his magazine's charges. One of the Members of this House in the Seventy-seventh Congress—let us call him Congressman X—was accused of certain things in the New Republic's supplement of May 18, 1942. He was accused of being interested in a company where the employees were paid 10 cents an hour. He was further said to have been found guilty of unfair labor practices by the National Labor Relations Board. It was further alleged by the New Republic that the efforts of the American Federation of Labor to organize Congressman X's plant were met with stubborn resistance by the management. All of these charges were absolutely without any foundation in fact, yet the New Republic which contained these falsehoods was distributed throughout the district of Congressman X. In the recent election Congressman X was defeated. Almost 7 weeks after election day Bruce Bliven wrote the following to Congressman X:

> I find that in some instances we did you an injustice, and we are planning to print a correction and expression of regret on these points in the New Republic in the immediate future.

Now let us suppose for the moment that Congressman X wanted to sue the New Republic for the irreparable damage which he suffered in consequence of the magazine's admitted falsehoods. Would he be able to do so? Absolutely not. One hundred percent of the New Republic's capital stock is owned by a foreign corporation. That is the startling fact which I promised to disclose about this pseudo-liberal publication.

On the masthead of the New Republic, the publisher's name is given as Editorial Publications, 40 East Forty-ninth Street, New York. An investigation into the ownership of Editorial Publications revealed that all of the capital stock of the organization is owned by a foreign corporation. Consider, therefore, the effrontery of Bruce Bliven and his magazine in issuing any kind of advice on the composition of the Congress of the United States, to say nothing of their attack upon the institution of Congress. The capital stock of Editorial Publications is listed with the secretary of state of New York as $1,750,000, but not 1 cent of that stock is held in the United States.

The case of the New Republic is reminiscent of the Bermuda corporations which the Treasury Department exposed not many years ago. I hardly need to point out that the Treasury Department kept hands off the New Republic even though its situation was exactly parallel to those Bermuda corporations which served the interests of various American concerns by avoiding corporation taxes in the United States, by concealing the source and location of funds, and by enabling those concerns to evade process within the jurisdiction of the United States. Sue the Republic? Not a Chinaman's chance, for its capital stock is safely lodged in a foreign corporation. And this, my colleagues, is the foreign corporation which lies back of the vicious attack upon the Congress which was distributed in an issue of a million copies last May. And this is the foreign corporation whose employee, Malcolm Cowley, enthusiastically rendered into poetry his imaginary seizure of this Chamber by an armed mob of insurrectionists. And this, furthermore, is the same foreign corporation whose magazine, in its current issue, sees in Winston Churchill only "a Tory Prime Minister" and sees in our American State Department only a vicious collaborator with Hitler's "nearest spiritual relatives."

"CITIZENS FOR VICTORY" ATTACKS CONGRESS

Next, I shall take up the purge organization known as the Citizens for Victory, of 8 West Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. This organization is responsible for many full-page attacks on Congress which appeared in the metropolitan press. For example, I hold here a photostatic copy of a page from the New York Herald Tribune of May 18, 1942, sponsored by the Citizens for Victory. The headline is "Will you help stop votes for Hitler?" The entire page is devoted to an attack upon Congress. They ran a number of such spreads, copies of which I have here. The Citizens for Victory, like the other purge groups, also issued a supplement on the voting records of the Members of the last Congress. I want to read you some excerpts from a letter, dated June 17, 1942, written on the letterhead of the Citizens for Victory, and signed by Frederick C. McKee, treasurer:

> Thank you very much for your recent contribution to Citizens for Victory. Your donation, along with the hundreds of others we have received, will aid us greatly in our fight against the appeasers, defeatists, and obstructionists who are still trying to block America's efforts to wage a truly total war.
>
> Citizens for Victory is convinced that the American public is tired of politics as usual, time wasting, and weak-kneed appeasement, both in and out of Congress. We know that the American people, when made to realize the crucial importance of this year's elections, will flatly repudiate the cowardly policies of the defeatists and obstructionists at the polls.
>
> I am enclosing the record of the votes of the Congressmen of your State and district upon 10 major issues before the war. From a glance over the records of some of the more unfavorable Congressmen you will see how important it is that they not be allowed to have another chance to be wrong.

If you will examine this letterhead, you will find listed as vice chairman one Clark M. Eichelberger. Besides being the directing genius of several of the purge groups, Mr. Eichelberger is a consultant in the State Department, at $25 per day.

Mr. McKee, who is treasurer of the Citizens for Victory, who writes so freely about the fight against "appeasers, defeatists, and obstructionists," and so enthusiastically about waging a "truly total war," is also secretary and treasurer of the National Casket Co.

It is also significant to point out at this time that one of the highest-paid officials of the Citizens for Victory is one Jay Lovestone, who was formerly general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States.

Most of the officials who make up the Citizens for Victory and the Union for Democratic Action have one main objective: That is to discredit Congress in order that their program of internationalism will not be hampered after the war by a strong and alert Congress.

The next purge organization I should like to take up is the Coordinating Committee for Democratic Action, of 103 Park Avenue, New York City. This organization on December 30, 1942, merged with the Friends of Democracy, Inc., to form one national organization to be known as Friends of Democracy.

The Coordinating Committee for Democratic Action, like its coconspirators, the Union for Democratic Action, the Citizens for Victory, and the New Republic, issued a special supplement to the public on the so-called voting records of

the Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress. It, like the Union for Democratic Action-New Republic supplement, attacked Members as obstructionists and Fascists in an effort to undermine the people's faith in Congress.

This organization, like all the other purge organizations, has been thoroughly investigated by our committee, and while I intend to incorporate the details of this investigation into a special report, I would like to bring to your attention a few of the facts disclosed during the course of our investigation.

I hold here in my hand the supplement on Congress, issued by this organization, entitled "Your Congressman and Pearl Harbor," and call your attention to the language in the second paragraph, wherein they state that certain Members of Congress "felt a kinship for the attackers and obstructed all measures."

From another supplement, which they issued on May 12, I call your attention to the following language:

> The Coordinating Committee took no part whatsoever in the controversy prior to Pearl Harbor over the United States entry into war. However, as part of the organization's regular procedure, it observed all pro-Fascist groups and tendencies and noted carefully the attempts to use high office and even the floor of Congress as a forum for working against democracy.

In the issue of their publication, The City Reporter, dated January 6, 1942, the following statement is made:

> Both Senators and Representatives cooperated intimately with Fascist groups.

I have cited these excerpts from the official publication of this organization in order that you might see the vicious propaganda that has been circulated against Congress, as a body, and which could only raise suspicion and doubt in the minds of the people.

It may, or may not, surprise you to learn that the telephone and telegraph records of this organization reveal that they were in close touch with officials of this Government. For example, I hold here the long-distance telephone record of the calls made from New York to Washington, which shows that officials of the organization were in frequent communication with Gardner Jackson, Principal Economist of the Department of Agriculture. Several of the calls were taken by Mr. Jackson on a Government phone at the Department of Agriculture, and still other telephone records show that Morris Rosenblatt, executive secretary of the organization, received calls at Mr. Jackson's office in the Department of Agriculture, from his secretary in New York in July 1942, which was prior to the election. There are also telephone calls to Mr. R. Keith Kane, at that time Assistant Director of the Office of Facts and Figures, and now with O. W. I. There are also telephone calls to Mr. Morris Rosenthal, Assistant Director in charge of Office of Imports, Board of Economic Warfare.

I hold here in my hand original telegrams from Morris Rosenblatt, executive secretary of the organization, to Gardner Jackson, and William Lewis, Assistant Director of the Office of Facts and Figures, and I ask unanimous consent to include these four telegrams in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, all of these organizations, the Union for Democratic Action, the Citizens for Victory, and the New Republic, and many more whose records I have here this afternoon, sought by hundreds of thousands of pamphlets and magazines to create the impression throughout the country that the majority of the Members of this House were pro-Axis. Why did they do that? What was the reason that Marshall Field would contribute large sums of money to known pro-Communist and purge organizations? Here is a man who parades himself as a liberal. Here is a man who, by his great wealth, is financing publications and organizations that attack not one Member, not five Members, but the majority of the Members of this House as secret sympathizers and agents of our enemies. Why would he do that? Is he sincerely a liberal—this man who is making millions of dollars every year? Last year, when he was contributing money to Communist organizations, he spent $120,000 to maintain his racing stable; $120,000 for a playboy's fad. I wonder if all the farmers in the county in which I live make $120,000 a year. Yet here is this man in company with Arthur Goldsmith, another very rich man, who has contributed to this campaign, and William F. Cochran, a man with an enormous income in this country, who has likewise contributed. Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of the days of my youth when I read those never-to-be-forgotten Lives of Plutarch, including the life of Julius Caesar, who was descended from an aristocratic family and who began his political career under the handicap of being denounced by the rabble as a reactionary, and who felt himself, therefore, compelled to outdemagogue the worst demagogues which Rome produced, and who undertook, by handing out large sums in bounties, free dispensations, and all sorts of free money to achieve a greater degree of popularity than his demagogic rivals who flourished during the decadent days of the Roman Republic. It is sheer hypocrisy for men to pose as defenders of the poor and then to denounce Members of Congress, the overwhelming majority of whom are not wealthy. Nevertheless, these self-chosen defenders of the poor, such as Marshall Field, depict the Members of Congress as great reactionaries and economic royalists, while Marshall Field himself, in turn, pretends a love for the poor so great that he disburses millions in order that his magazines and other publications may defame and smear the honesty and integrity of men who serve in this body because they love America and who, throughout this emergency, have demonstrated the fact that when a crisis does arise in America all men of every party, Democrats and Republicans, rally to the defense of their country.

Mr. Speaker, when I first announced that I was going to make this speech it was my intention to take up the many details, and to show you check by check of, for instance, the Robert Marshall Foundation; how here was Gardner Jackson, sitting in the Department of Agriculture until a few days ago, writing check after check to organizations that the Department of Justice and Mr. Biddle said were clearly Communist organizations; organizations that for a period of 3 or 4 years directed their main attack upon the honesty and patriotism of a majority of the Members of this House. I intended, Mr. Speaker, to show you something about the Twentieth Century Fund. I intended to take up one by one these benefactors of totalitarianism who live in great wealth and luxury and live under circumstances that would appear unbelievable to the people of your district and my district, or to you and to me; nevertheless, they have the effrontery to use their wealth in order to attempt to create the impression in this dark hour that there are Members, or even one Member, of this House who secretly wants the Axis Powers to win; men whose boys like those of my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], two of his boys are in the armed forces of this country; my own boy who volunteered; my nephew who this day is in Africa fighting for his country. I know many Members in this House whose loved ones are now engaged in this stupendous struggle. Yet here are all these so-called proponents of liberalism, who would reverse nineteenth-century liberalism and who would make of it an entirely different philosophy from what it was always understood to be. Instead of fighting against centralized government they would centralize government. Instead of protecting and safeguarding the individual against a growing bureaucracy that threatens our very liberty, they are using their influence to increase it.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, I have not said that we have yet reached bureaucracy in the literal sense, for bureaucracy is government by bureaus. What I do say, Mr. Speaker, is that we are rapidly approaching a period in America when the real power and function of government will not be exercised in this Chamber, but it will be exercised by bureaucracy. As for me, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Congress is the chief bulwark of freedom in America. I denounce all organizations or groups who seek by sweeping statements and denunciations to create the impression that a majority of the Members of this House are not loyal to their country.

Why do they do it? Why was this organized attack against me revived a week ago? We should try to arrive at a correct answer; let us do so by the process of elimination.

Is it because some of the racial minorities fear that the gentleman from Texas, MARTIN DIES, may be prejudiced? I am convinced that could not be the true answer, for they have investigated my record from the time I was a little boy until the present time. I know of no man in this House who has been investigated more frequently and more exhaustively than I. Do you know what they found, Mr. Speaker, when they sent

representatives of the New Republic and of these organizations into my home county? They asked some of the citizens: "Was not MARTIN DIES anti-Jewish?"

And a Jew said to them, a Jew who lives around the corner, whose wife is one of the sweetest women who ever lived, both of whom have been my constant friends for many years—this Jew said to him:

"MARTIN DIES! Why," he said, "friend, do you not know that MARTIN DIES was one of the few men in Texas who during the power of the Ku Klux Klan, when the Klan controlled almost every political office in the State, when few dared stand out and speak against this illiberalism when the Klan became the controlling factor in this State, do you know that MARTIN DIES stood on the stump and throughout this country denounced the Ku Klux Klan, when he was burned in effigy, when his law firm was being boycotted by the Ku Klux Klan?

"Do you know that MARTIN DIES walked into the courthouse at Orange, Tex., and defended Mr. Gloudeman, a Catholic who could not get a lawyer anywhere in the district—defended him against unjust charges when the courthouse was filled with Klansmen and when the Klan hired a special prosecutor to prosecute the case?"

They then asked some of my fellow townsmen: "Well, is he not anti-Negro, living down here?" "Anti-Negro," they said, "why, when Ben Wilkes was indicted by a grand jury as an accessory to crime after his boy had killed three white men and when Ben Wilkes could not get a lawyer in Texas or anywhere else to go into the courtroom and defend him, MARTIN DIES went there and defended him and protected him against any possibility of lynching and cleared him. No, you cannot make a case of intolerance against him, for he and his father before him have been outstanding advocates of the recognition of the fundamental rights of every man, woman, and child in all America."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this vehement and unrestrained attack upon me and upon, as I shall show later, other Members of Congress is not inspired by fear of intolerance. Is it that they fear we are opposed to measures necessary to win this war and establish a lasting peace?

Mr. Speaker, there are two kinds of isolationists in America: There was the isolationist before Pearl Harbor who was a sincere American who honestly believed that the best interests of this country could be served by maintaining strict neutrality, but who after Pearl Harbor abandoned isolationism and became a strong advocate of war measures. That is the type of isolationist who is constantly attacked in all these publications. But there is another type of isolationist, the ones who joined the American Peace Mobilization, which picketed the White House, the ones who opposed all measures to prepare America. They abandoned this isolationism only after Adolf Hitler invaded Russia. Strange to say in all these publications and in all these attacks there is no denunciation of this type of isolationist before Hitler's attack on Russia. There is not a single instance where any of these leaders of isolation before the break between Hitler and Stalin has ever been denounced or criticized in these publications; and, certainly, Mr. Speaker, my own record in that regard stands out above any criticism, for I have a record of 100 percent support of war measures, having supported every appropriation to protect and defend this country, having supported lend-lease under which aid was extended to Russia; so, therefore, there can be no real ground for opposition based upon that.

Then why this concerted attack timed appropriately after the Rules Committee postponed the hearing on our resolution for extension from last Friday until some future date? Why did Drew Pearson say over the radio last night that the National Lawyers' Guild would attack me today as an agent—a secret agent—of Hitler? Why did Walter Winchell last night time his insinuations at this particular moment? Why should the C. I. O. send out a letter to every Member of Congress and charge our committee with being a friend of totalitarianism and of Hitler?

I will tell you what is behind it, Mr. Speaker. There has been for 4 or 5 years a well-organized attempt to build up in this country a united front of radicals—a united front of Communists, crackpots, Socialists, men of different shades of totalitarian beliefs; there has been a well-organized attempt to bring within the sphere of their influence the Negro population of this country by appeals in publications that I could read to you. Constantly the Negroes are told that now is the time for them to achieve that degree of social equality to which they are entitled.

In the People's Voice, not long ago, A. Clayton Powell, a Negro Communist, advocated that I be assassinated—that my death was as desirable as Hitler's. Immediately other publications took it up and throughout the Negro press there was a most vicious denunciation, not only of me but of Congress.

What do they hope to gain by that? We in our country live in peace with the Negro; we respect him, for he has contributed much to the progress of our country. I have made hundreds of speeches in this country, and in many speeches I have said to the American people that the great majority of the Negroes are loyal, patriotic American citizens.

Why, then, Mr. Speaker, is this united front of radicals and crackpots so desirous of creating hatred and bitterness between the white and the colored races? Why are they making this appeal through racial publications?

I wish I had the time to read the translations of some of the foreign language newspapers and magazines published in this country in which we of the South are invariably held up as bigoted and intolerant and as naturally opposed to them because of their birth. I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. The real reason is that there are people in this country who do not believe in America and who have never believed in it. They use the word "democracy" to cloak a brand of totalitarianism that is as vicious as any that ever thrived on European soil. What they believe in, Mr. Speaker, is government by bureaus, government with great centralized power, government in which they say that economic life will be regimented; true, but they are going to stop after having regimented the country economically and after having tried to do with economics what they accused others of trying to do with prohibition, namely, force everybody to be good by a paternalistic government. They say, "After we have done that we will stop and not bother your religion. We are going to give you the Bill of Rights, we will outrage and defile a part of the Constitution, but we will guarantee that we will not interfere with your religious and personal rights."

Mr. Speaker, the history of the world has always shown that free enterprise is the basic foundation of all democracy. When people are regimented economically, then the next step is to regiment them politically and religiously. When any group of supermen or social planners get control of government and impose their fanatical beliefs, they become avaricious for power and they subjugate the whole body politic.

Mr. Speaker, how can there be a free America if we attempt to build a gigantic bureaucracy in which we in Congress become powerless? Tell me bureaucracy does not wield great power in this country? Did I not go through an election and see how the long tentacles of bureaucracy could reach out into every county through Farm Security, W. P. A., and through this vicious practice of blanket authority to the Executive? I say it is wrong.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder if the gentleman has noticed lately that these crackpots led by a man by the name of I. F. Stone, of PM, I think his name is Feinstein, are now attacking and attempting to besmirch Cordell Hull, Secretary of State.

Mr. DIES. We have the telegrams here of these purge groups. We have telegrams from purgers like Frederick C. McKee, who parades as a great patriot. He is identified with six of these purge-Congress organizations. He is for weeding out and purging Congress of everyone who does not share his view.

Here is what he said in a letter. Let me read an excerpt:

> Citizens for Victory is convinced that the American public is tired of politics-as-usual, time wasting, and weak-kneed appeasement, both in and out of Congress. We know that the American people, when made to realize the crucial importance of this year's elections, will flatly repudiate the cowardly policies of the defeatists and obstructionists at the polls.

Mr. McKee is treasurer of this organization, the Citizens for Victory, and director of the biggest casket company in the United States.

The Citizens for Victory organization distributed throughout this country the pamphlet entitled "Will You Help Stop Votes for Hitler?" Think of it, Mr. Speaker. The majority of the Members of this Congress are accused openly in the pamphlet of voting for Hitler. That is not construed as sedition, and they are not prosecuted for it.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to drive a point home, and I speak with all the sincerity in my heart, for I have often been on the unpopular side of many questions. I was on the unpopular side of the Ku Klux Klan. I was on the unpopular side of many questions in this House. But of one thing I am absolutely certain and that is that the greatest responsibility lies on this Congress, not only to maintain our prerogatives, but to restore the rights that have been taken away from the Congress of the United States.

How has this been accomplished? One, by blanket appropriations. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and I, led the first revolt in the Rules Committee against the first blanket appropriation of $4,000,000,000. We refused to vote for a rule on it for we then foresaw that whenever the Executive is given unlimited and blanket authority to use public funds, the Executive, whether Democratic, Republican, or whatnot, will find it impossible to resist political pressure. So that I believe, Mr. Speaker, that through blanket appropriations, through the right of bureaus to issue rules and regulations under which they become legislators for the country, this powerful bureaucracy has become entrenched. Why not be perfectly frank? Let us say to the American people what we all know, with few exceptions. When we call up the bureaucrats, what man in this House receives even ordinary courtesy? Why should they be courteous, when they feel that they are the real power in America, that they are the ones who administer the funds? They believe that we must come crawling on our knees to them in order to get jobs for needy constituents who are constantly pressing us for employment. We must come to them for public works appropriations in our districts in order to save ourselves from the charge that we have no influence in the city of Washington.

Bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker? It is as deadly and poisonous as any form of fascism there is and is as destructive of the freedom and the liberty of the American Nation as anything could possibly be. What does it lead to? Certainly there is no point in speaking in general terms in our denunciation of bureaucracy. Certainly we gain no end when we simply denounce it in general terms.

Let us be specific. Let us find out, Mr. Speaker, what bureaucracy leads to, how it is possible for men to secure positions with fat salaries in a bureaucratic set-up when they could not be elected dog catcher in any Congressman's district in this Capitol.

I speak frankly, Mr. Speaker, for I conceive it to be my duty to my boy and to the boys of my friends and the people of my district during this critical hour to be perfectly frank.

I admire one thing about the British Parliament—that during the whole course of this struggle the Parliament of England has insisted at all times on its right and its freedom to criticize, not destructive criticism, not attempts to thwart the war effort, not sweeping generalities that seek to condemn this branch of the service or that branch or to repeat rumors and lies, but truthful assertions based upon facts that are incontestable. So I shall descend or ascend, as you may wish to term it, from generalities to specific examples.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. All the gentleman says is well and good, I may say to my colleague, but I wish he would explain one thing. If this is a nonpartisan matter, why is it that in the middle of last summer, when we were going to have our State Democratic convention out there and we expected to see in the papers that the Speaker and majority leader would come out to speak to us—and we were all glad of it, because they would make good speeches—why did the gentleman's party send this loud-mouth Holland out there to repeat all the things the gentleman is now saying were said against the Members of Congress?

Mr. DIES. My party did not do it.

Mr. Speaker, I take first the case of Frederick L. Schuman. I intend to read the names and positions and records of many of the bureaucrats who have wormed their way into this bureaucratic set-up, in order to make crystal clear just what we mean by irresponsible, unrepresentative, crackpot, radical bureaucrats.

Schuman is chief political analyst of the Federal Communications Commission, at a salary of $5,600 a year. Think of it. How many men in your district get $5,600 a year? The district judge in my district, who serves five counties and has the responsibility of dealing with life and death, does not receive $5,600 a year. Not 5 percent of the lawyers in my district get $5,600 a year. As for the farmers, why, Mr. Speaker, out of all the farmers in my district there are not half a dozen who get $1,000 a year after they have worked in sleet and wind and rain and in the heat of the midday sun, after they have battled insects and drought and everything else. To come out with $1,000 a year would make them feel like "economic royalists."

Schuman is a man of violent political views. His Communist affiliations are a matter of public record. He belonged to the group which organized itself under the name of the League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford. Foster and Ford were the Communist candidates for President and Vice President, respectively. This League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford issued a pamphlet, which I hold in my hand. Over the name of Frederick L. Shuman and others, the following statement appears:

> We call upon all men and women—especially workers in the professions and the arts—to join in the revolutionary struggle against capitalism under the leadership of the Communist Party.

There are no if's, but's, or and's about this statement. Schuman, the chief political analyst of the Federal Communications Commission, signed it and will undoubtedly step up as a man and admit his participation in a revolutionary movement aimed at the overthrow of our American form of government.

How would you like to go back to your constituents, to that father and that mother who have just received word that their dearly beloved son has given his life in defense of America, how would you like to stand up on the stump, Democrat or Republican, and attempt to defend the appointment by bureaucracy of a man who does not believe in the system these boys fought and died to preserve?

In my own little town, three of the boys who grew up with my boys, who used to play on my front porch and in my yard, have all made the supreme sacrifice. For what? For bureaucracy, for totalitarianism, for socialism, for crackpotism? No, Mr. Speaker; for the American way of life and the American Constitution.

Here is the case of Goodwin B. Watson. Watson is Chief Broadcast Analyst of the Federal Communications Commission, at a salary of $6,500. In a letter which I sent to Chairman Fly on November 18, 1941, I called attention to Goodwin Watson's long record of Communist views and his numerous affiliations with Communist-front organizations. As a result of that exposure this House once refused to allow any portion of the appropriations of the Federal Communications Commission to be used to pay the salary of Goodwin Watson. Since that time Watson's salary has been raised from $5,600 to $6,500 a year.

In an article which he wrote for a magazine known as the World Tomorrow, Watson lumped Coueism, pyorrhea, and Congress together as some of the great jokes of the age.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman has referred to a constituent of mine. I am in entire accord with what the gentleman from Texas has said, but I would like to know who appointed Mr. Watson to this office, and who appointed these other revolutionists?

Mr. DIES. Wait until I get through. In Common Sense magazine, Watson went on record as favoring a sudden, complete, and violent, that is, Communist, change from our present form of society to a Socialist society. In this article, he categorically rejected the idea of a gradual shift from capitalism to socialism. No amount of sophistry can explain away Watson's favorable views on communism as he himself publicly expressed them before he came down to Washington to draw his $6,500 salary as one of our host of radical bureaucrats.

Watson is a fit associate of Frederick L. Schuman of whom I have already spoken, but neither one is qualified on the basis of his publicly declared beliefs to hold a Government position.

Here are four folders of exhibits which contain a fairly complete documentation of Goodwin Watson's Communist views and affiliations. I shall be glad to turn this evidence over to the committee which this House has recently set up for the investigation of the Federal Communications Commission.

William E. Dodd, Jr., is employed by the Federal Communications Commission at a salary of $3,200 a year. Dodd was recently refused a visa by the State Department when he was assigned a commission which would take him to England. This refusal of a visa by the State Department was based upon information furnished the Department by our committee and the F. B. I. Among his many activities on behalf Communist Front organizations. Dodd was a secretary of the American League for Peace and Democracy which the Attorney General branded as subversive.

I shall be glad to turn this evidence over to the committee that this House has recently set up for the investigation of the Federal Communications Commission. And may I digress long enough to answer perhaps the question you are being asked, and that is, Why not let the Communists have a Government job, are they not fighting valiantly in resisting the Axis brutality and atrocities? Why is it we should not hire them? Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this House who from the beginning has not hoped and prayed that Russia would be successful in resisting this brutal unprovoked attack upon her sovereignty, and her soil. As for me, Mr. Speaker, I care not what kind of a government Russia has. I did not care what kind of a government Germany has, if Germany had not sought to impose that kind of government upon the peoples of other lands and upon my own land. I am not a maudlin internationalist who believes that I or my Government can go all over the world and make people democratic, whether they want to be democratic or not. I do not mean by that that I do share the views of extreme nationalism that has been the curse of many countries. I do not believe in extreme internationalism or extreme nationalism, but I do believe that every true American must put his own country and his own country's interests above that of every other country in the world. I have nothing but praise for the heroism and the courage of the Russian people. I would not under any circumstances sanction, indeed, I would resist, any attempt by our own citizens to go into Russia and seek to impose Americanism upon those people. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there is a vast distinction between the Communists in Russia and the Communists in America. The Communists in Russia are loyal to Russia, they are fighting and dying for Russia, but the Communists in America had to wait until Hitler attacked Russia before they would come to the aid of America. So, Mr. Speaker, I conceive that it is the right of the people of this country to demand not that they shall not believe in communism, because that is an inherent right of every citizen, but I believe it is right to say to them, and to say to the Government, "You have no right to take the hard-earned tax money of the loyal, patriotic people in my district, and to give it to people who are on record against the very Government that is supporting them."

Now let us take the case of Paul R. Porter. This man is chief of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Branch of W. P. B. at a salary of $8,000 a year.

Think of that, my fellow Members of the House. Most of you represent ordinary and average districts in this Congress. Most of you know that even the bank cashiers, that even the presidents of banks in your small towns and villages never earned $8,000 a year, and to the workmen, the workers on the farms and in the factories who are laboring constantly to preserve this Government, $8,000 a year would seem almost a dream to them, something never to be realized. Yet here is a bureaucracy that is able to take this man and pay him $8,000 a year.

Throughout most of his adulthood Paul R. Porter has been a Socialist, one of the leading Socialists in the United States. Porter has made no secret about his socialism. To cite only a single passage from his prolific Socialist writings, he has said:

> Nothing less than a Socialist revolution will free labor from insecurity and industrial serfdom.

Furthermore, here is a copy of the New Republic's supplement, issued jointly by that magazine and the Union for Democratic Action, which attacked the Congress of the United States and was used as campaign document No. 1 in the purge organizations' efforts to defeat a large part of this House in the recent elections. You are familiar with this document. It was distributed all over your districts by the so-called purge groups and by the C. I. O. A million copies were scattered over this whole country. Replete with lies and libels, it sought to undermine the confidence of the people of this country in the legislative branch of their Government. I also have here a copy of the letterhead of the Union for Democratic Action, the organization which prepared this scurrilous attack upon Congress. On this letterhead the name of Paul Porter appears as a member of the national executive committee of the Union for Democratic Action. I also hold in my hand two telegrams from the national office of the Union for Democratic Action which show that Mrs. Paul R. Porter was in charge of the Washington Office of the Union for Democratic Action. Now I want to know how long we are going to sit here supinely and vote billions of dollars, much of which is used for the payment of large salaries to Government bureaucrats who are working to smear Congress and the Members of Congress. Where, by the way, is the Hatch Act? If, in the face of this gigantic bureaucracy, we have lifted our voices in vain to the executive departments and war agencies, it is still our constitutional prerogative and responsibility to appropriate the funds with which these departments and agencies operate.

In the case of another member of this gigantic Government bureaucracy, I want you to participate in a guessing game. I want you to try to guess who made the following statement:

> I believe in the abolition of the capitalist system. I believe in the necessity of the destruction of this system of exploitation by the might of workers' organizations.

Now, do you think that statement was made by Earl Browder? Or Karl Marx? Or Lenin, possibly? No; that statement comes from the pen of the principal business consultant in the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs! His name is John Herling. He draws an annual salary of $5,600 as principal business consultant. The circumstances under which Herling wrote his statement expressing his belief in the "destruction" of our American system are most interesting. Early in the life of this administration, John Herling was offered a position in the Government here in Washington. In a letter which he published over his own name and a copy of which I hold in my hand, Herling contemptuously rejected the offer of a Government post, saying, among other things:

> I believe in the abolition of the capitalist system. I believe in the necessity of the destruction of this system of exploitation by the might of workers' organizations. * * * I decline to be even an insignificant member of a government which, after a year of displaying its brand of social engineering, has devised such a positive, direct, and universal scheme for workers' enslavement. * * * Nor can I entertain the elaborate rationalizations with which some radicals have spun their ways into various sections of the Roosevelt administration.

Despite his one-time emphatic and contemptuous rejection of a position in this administration, John Herling relented and accepted a $5,600 salary in a post which he occupies today. Did he finally decide that he could further his belief in the destruction of the capitalist system better by working inside the Government than by working outside?

Let us take up the case of Paul F. Brissenden who is employed as a consultant in the shipbuilding stabilization committee of the War Production Board at a salary of $8,000 a year. In March 1941, when the whole country, including official Washington, was becoming aroused over the Communist-led sabotage strikes on our major defense industries, Paul Brissenden and others issued a defense of the Communist Party which filled almost an entire page of the Daily Worker. Brissenden also signed a public manifesto supporting the appointment of the avowed Communist, Simon Gerson, as assistant to the borough president of Manhattan. Furthermore, Brissenden was a member of the national committee of the International Juridical Association, a Communist front organization whose leaders were mostly well-known Communists and Communist fellow travelers. Brissenden was also a sponsor of the National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance, an organization which was led by the well-known and avowed Communist Party leader, Herbert Benjamin. Associated with Brissenden as sponsors of this organization were Earl Browder, William Z. Foster, Israel

Amter, and many other equally well-known Communists. Despite whatever pretension of liberalism Brissenden may make, the record shows that he has been a long-time defender of the Communist Party and a frequent sponsor of the party's fronts. Now we confer upon him the distinction of an $8,000 position in the War Production Board.

I do not want to tire you by attempting to read all of these examples. I have some 50 here, and 50 more over there, and I can multiply them, but I am giving you some of the leading examples, so that when you and I return to our war-worn and weary overtaxed constituency, when they ask us what we did in the great city of Washington, we can stand proudly before them and say, "Well, I attended to my job, and I stood idly by and let the bureaucrats, like Paul R. Porter, take over."

Take the case of David J. Saposs. Several years ago our committee received testimony in which it was established that Saposs had been a leader in a revolutionary organization whose avowed objective was for the "workers to take control of industry and Government and build a workers' republic." At that time Saposs was Chief Economist of the National Labor Relations Board. As the result of our exposure Saposs was removed from the N. L. R. B. Now we find that Saposs has recently been made assistant to the chief of the labor division of the War Production Board at a salary of $8,000 a year.

In Labor Age, a magazine of the revolutionary group with which Saposs was prominently identified, he gave expression to the following un-American and revolutionary position:

> But bourgeois democracy is a sham. When it is evident that socialism is the only remedy, it is not worth saving a democracy in which Socialist Parties only collaborate with capitalism * * *. If in the attempt to carry out such a program political action fails, then the workers must unhesitatingly resort to organized force. The (Socialist) International must take the position that if another war occurs the workers will destroy capitalism. With that end in view the workers must be prepared to stretch arms across the frontiers in case of war and definitely win power for themselves.

At no time did we charge that Saposs was a Communist or a member of the Communist Party. It will, however, be perfectly clear to any student of the revolutionary ideologies, that the foregoing statement by Saposs was couched in the strictest Marxian terms.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. Is this Dr. Saposs the same man that this House of Representatives provided should not be paid out of the appropriations?

Mr. DIES. That is correct, and that is an illustration of the arrogance which characterizes men who do not need to face a constituency to account for their actions.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. I am sorry to interrupt the gentleman, but I just want to keep the record straight. The gentleman spoke about government by bureaucracy and said that it had not yet arrived. Perhaps strictly speaking that is true, but the lawyers of this country today who wish to advise their clients, do not go to the statutes for the law, but they go to the regulations of the departments. That is almost government by bureaucracy.

Mr. DIES. Now, I have here the very special case of Maurice Parmelee. Almost a year ago, I addressed a letter to the Vice President calling his attention to the record of Parmelee, who was at that time employed in the Board of Economic Warfare at a salary of $5,600. I cited the fact that Parmelee had written numerous volumes—all of them revolutionary in character—and that one of them, entitled "Nudism in Modern Life," advocated the practice of universal nudism in office and factory. I called the Vice President's attention to the fact that Parmelee's book contained 35 photographs, all of which are obscene, and that the volume was an attack upon the moral structure of our society and upon the church and religion. In the nudist society which Parmelee envisaged:

> Convent and monastery, harem and military barracks, clubs and schools exclusively for each sex will disappear, and the sexes will live a more normal and happier life together.

Think of that, Mr. DOUGHTON. In that God-fearing district of yours, in the mountains of North Carolina, where people still go to the church-house and still believe in God and in religion, those God-fearing people that you have the honor to represent and have so ably represented for so many years, what would they think if excerpts of this lewd and filthy book were read from the stump and they were told that their money was being used and their boys were giving their all in order to make it possible for this man to use his talents and his pen in order to undermine the very basis of all democracies, which is the belief of people, not in the materialism of Karl Marx, but in the divine guidance of Almighty God?

Almost immediately after my exposure of Parmelee's activities—which included several years spent in European nudist camps—he was dismissed from the Board of Economic Warfare. The great bureaucratic fraternity was, however, not to leave Parmelee jobless for long. He is now employed as an economist by the Railroad Retirement Board at a salary of $4,600. Time and again, a similar thing has occurred—a bureaucrat exposed in one agency, and fired as a result of that exposure, has been picked up by another agency of the Government. The contempt which these bureaucrats have for the Congress which appropriates their salaries is unbounded.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman would tell the House who it is that is responsible for these appointments that he has mentioned?

Mr. DIES. I will come to that in a moment. I want to give you some typical examples, because I want to hammer this thing home.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Please let me proceed for a moment. I would like to conclude this.

Now take Harold Loeb. On January 15, 1942, I spread the record of Harold Loeb before this House. He was then business specialist in O. P. A. He was let out of O. P. A. but not out of the Government service. Today Harold Loeb is senior economist in building materials for the War Production Board at a salary of $4,600.

I know this is a matter that would be of vital interest to your constituents. I know that during these trying hours when they are all working and sacrificing to produce materials of war, in factories and on the farms, I know that the boys in the foxholes at Guadalcanal, faced by an insidious and brutal enemy, shot at almost constantly, in rags and in filth after the long stay in the foxholes, often with food not cooked, not warm—I wonder if that boy this afternoon as he lies there waiting for the enemy to show his head would get much consolation by knowing that at home, on the home front, in the battle of democracy here in America, a gigantic bureaucracy which he is called upon to fight for has given a job to the author of the following books:

The Professors Like Vodka, Doodab.

Think of a heavyweight, an economic adviser, a social planner, a superman—behold the mountain labored and there came forth Doodab.

Tumbling Mustard, Life in a Technocracy, The Chart of Plenty, Production For Use

The first three of Loeb's books are pornographic novels. I have never read filthier passages in a novel than some of those with which Loeb sprinkled his books. The other three titles of Loeb's books which I have cited are treatises on technocracy. At one time and for a long time, Harold Loeb was No. 1 technocrat in this country. Now, will you please search these 6 books and see if you can find any evidence of Loeb's qualifications for his present position as senior economist in building materials for W. P. B. In one of his technocratic works, Loeb advocated the abolition of money and the substitution therefor of erg certificates to be distributed willy-nilly at the rate of 20,000 a year to every member of society. I know of no man who could better qualify for the title of perfect crackpot, but he is the kind of Washington crackpot for whom we sit here and vote millions of dollars in salaries. I want to know when we are going to cry halt to this business.

I now take up the case of Sam Schmerler. In 1935, Schmerler was dismissed from his position in the Federal Bureau of Investigation on account of his Communist activities. In the space

of a few weeks, Schmerler found employment in the Social Security Board. There he worked for several years, meanwhile carrying on his outside radical activities as usual. Then in 1940, when the Communists launched the American Peace Mobilization, Sam Schmerler became one of the organization's leading promoters here in the Nation's Capital. Schmerler was in charge of arrangements for the Washington delegates to the Chicago convention which launched the American Peace Mobilization. Shortly after that, when the Peace Mobilization was urging and supporting sabotage strikes in our major defense industries, and when the peace mobilizers were picketing the White House, Schmerler was still an outstanding leader in the movement. At that time he was drawing a salary of $2,600. Where is he today? Did the Attorney General's investigation lead to Schmerler's dismissal from Government service? Not at all. Sam Schmerler has been rewarded with a promotion. Today he is a Social Security policy consultant at a salary of $3,800. There is not the slightest doubt that Sam Schmerler is a Communist. There is not the slightest doubt that his Communist activities have been consciously directed against the welfare and safety of the United States Government which employs him. Nevertheless and notwithstanding, Sam Schmerler has been rewarded with a $1,200 increase in salary since the time of his outrageous and disgraceful activities in the American Peace Mobilization. Our committee first exposed Schmerler in 1939 as a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy. Furthermore, we sent his name to the Attorney General in October 1941 as one of the now famous list of 1,124 Government employees having affiliations with subversive organizations.

On September 8, 1941, I addressed a letter to the President in which I cited a small part of the record of Emil Jack Lever. At that time Lever was principal field representative of the Labor Division of O. P. M. at a salary of $5,600. Here again, we are face to face with an old story. Since my exposure of Lever, his salary has been upped to $6,500 a year and his present title is that of head labor adviser in the War Production Board.

I have here a voluminous documented record of Emil Jack Lever's Communist views, affiliations, and activities. I do not need to cite more than one of them. The rest are available for the inspection of the Appropriations Committee or any other committee of this House that might desire to see them. Lever was national executive committee member and treasurer of an organization whose publicly announced purpose was stated on its own letterhead, as follows:

> It aims to inspire the workers to take control of industry and government, abolish the present capitalist system and build a workers' republic.

I want to know if we are going to sit here supinely and allow a gigantic bureaucracy which has been thoroughly infiltrated by such as Lever to take over this country. If these facts shame us, you will realize that I did not make the facts; I am only reporting them.

Here is the case of David Lasser, about whom this House has heard much before. A few years ago, one of the largest and most influential front organization of the Communist Party in this country was the Workers Alliance. At the height of its influence—and I may add, its mischief—the Workers Alliance was headed by David Lasser. In 1940 Lasser broke with the Communists and denounced the Workers Alliance. But in addition to his past affiliation with and leadership of Communist front organizations, Lasser was also mixed up with technocracy. He was, in fact, editor of a technocracy magazine. Furthermore, as illustrative of his marked tendency toward one form of mental aberration or another, Lasser was president of the Interplanetary Travel Association. Today David Lasser is senior labor economist for the War Production Board at a salary of $4,600.

I come now to the case of Tom Tippett, who is assistant chief of the rent section of O. P. A. at a salary of $5,600. Tippett was one of the leaders in an organization known as the Trade Union Conference for United Action. Associated with Tippett in that organization were Earl Browder, William Z. Foster, and more than a score of other Communist leaders. The printed matter issued by the organization was as rabidly Communist as anything which ever appeared with the party's official imprint. Tippett was a national committee member of yet another organization whose revolutionary objectives were carried on its letterhead in the following language:

> It aims to inspire the workers to take control of industry and government, abolish the present capitalist system and build a workers' republic.

I call your attention to the case of Henry G. Alsberg who is now senior feature writer for the Office of War Information at a salary of $4,600. In the early life of our committee, back in 1938, we exposed the extensive infiltration of Communists into the Federal Writers project. We showed how Communists had used the Writers Project to obtain the Government imprint upon their propaganda. We exposed some of the Communist filth which was put into the official publications of the Federal Writers Project. As a result of our exposure, the Congress abolished the Writers Project. Who was the head of the Federal Writers project? None other than Henry G. Alsberg who has crept back into Government employment in the Office of War Information.

Here is the case of David Karr who is assistant chief of the foreign language division of the Office of War Information at a salary of $4,600. For 2 years, Karr was on the staff of the Communist Party's official newspaper, the Daily Worker. There is not the slightest doubt that all members of the Daily Worker staff were required to be members of the Communist Party. Karr was a writer for the Communist front publication, Equality, whose editorial council was composed largely of well-known Communists and Communist fellow travelers.

David Karr was also public relations director of the American League for Peace and Democracy, one of the Communist fronts which Attorney General Biddle branded as subversive. Karr was a frequent writer for the League's magazine Fight.

Take the case of Guiseppi Facci who is senior foreign language information advisor in the Office of War Information at a salary $4,600. For years, Facci has been active and prominent in the front organizations of the Communist Party in California. He was especially active in the American League Against War and Fascism on the west coast, an organization which the Attorney General branded as subversive. I have his complete record of Communist affiliations here, but I shall not take the time necessary to read it.

Take the case of David Wahl who is associate analyst in the Board of Economic Warfare at a salary of $3,800. David Wahl signed the incorporation papers of the Washington Bookshop, a Communist enterprise which the Attornew General himself branded as subversive. Furthermore, the Cooperative League of Washington expelled the Bookshop from membership in the League on account of its notorious Communist control.

Hugh Miller is senior attorney for the Bituminous Coal Commission of the Department of the Interior at a salary of $4,600 a year. Miller was chairman of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, a Communist front organization which the Attorney General last year branded as subversive. Miller was also a leader of the infamous Communist front known as the American Peace Mobilization which the Attorney General also branded as subversive. Miller's wife, Helen, was dismissed from her position in the Department of Labor because she assailed the President as a Fascist.

Walter Gellhorn, assistant general counsel of the O. P. A. in the New York office at a salary of $8,000, was a lecturer this week at the Communist Party's Workers School. Karl Borders, director of O. P. A. in Hawaii at a salary of $8,000, has a long record of radical activities in Chicago.

Now, let us take the case of Jack Fahy. Fahy is principal liaison officer of the Board of Economic Warfare at a salary of $5,600. Jack Fahy worked in closest sympathy with and support of the Communist Party in Spain for 2 years. In the Daily Worker of October 17, 1938, Jack Fahy's resignation from the Socialist Party was published. His resignation from the Socialist Party was not so much a severance from the Socialists as it was an endorsement of the Communist Party. Anyone may refer back to the files of the Daily Worker and see that this was so. Jack Fahy is now being considered for a transfer to the Department of the Interior, where, if transferred, he is to become Chairman of the Territorial Affairs Bureau at a salary of $6,500 a year.

Nathaniel Weyl is senior economic analyst of the Board of Economic Warfare at a salary of $4,600. For several years Weyl was very prominent in Communist activities among students. His

writings in the Student Review, magazine of the National Student League, make it clear beyond the possibility of any slight doubt that Weyl himself was a Communist. His writings in the Communist Party's newspaper, the Daily Worker, also leave no doubt about his being a loyal Communist Party member.

Take the case of Robert Morss Lovett, who is secretary of the Virgin Islands at a salary of $5,800. Only a few men in this country have records of Communist affiliations which are as long as that of Robert Morss Lovett. I shall not take the time to give you his entire record, but here is a part of it:

Lovett was vice chairman of the American League for Peace and Democracy, an organization branded as subversive by the Attorney General. He was a contribulator to New Masses. He was also a member of the advisory board of Champion—magazine of the Young Communist League. He was a member of the advisory board of the American Student Union, a member of the national committee of the Student Congress Against War, a member of the National Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners, a signer of a letter protesting the ban on Communists in the American Civil Liberties Union, a member of the national advisory board of the American Youth Congress, a sponsor of the Mother Bloor birthday celebration, a sponsor of the Emergency Peace Mobilization which launched the American Peace Mobilization, a director of the American Fund for Public Service—better known as the Garland Fund—a sponsor of the National Student League, and a member of the All America Anti-Imperialist League. All of the foregoing organizations and many others with which Lovett was affiliated were Communist controlled.

Here is the case of Merle Vincent, director of the hearings branch in the Department of Labor at a salary of $7,250. Merle Vincent was the first chairman of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, the Communist front organization which the Attorney General branded as subversive. Vincent was also temporary chairman of the National Conference on Constitutional Liberties where the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was organized, the latter also being on the list of the Attorney General's subversive organizations. I have here a sample of the growing boldness of the radical or pro-Communist bureaucrats. According to a recent issue of the Daily Worker which I hold in my hand, Merle Vincent delivered the first of a series of lectures at the Communist Party's own official Workers School in New York. It is time that we learned that there is a world of difference between our military alliance with Russia on the one hand and taking American Communists to our official bosom on the other hand. Pro-Communist bureaucrats such as Merle Vincent are doing their best to obliterate that all-important distinction. When some of our high Government officials rhapsodize at Communist-controlled meetings on the anniversary of the founding of the Communist regime in Russia, it is pertinent for us to remember that Stalin does not hold pro-American celebrations in Moscow on the Fourth of July. Stalin is a thoroughgoing realist, while some of our officials behave like sentimental fools in coddling those who are wholly disloyal to our own country.

Gardner Jackson, who was principal economist for the Department of Agriculture at a salary of $5,600. Jackson's Communist affiliations have been many. I call attention to only a few of them.

Gardner Jackson was a sponsor of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action. He was a signer of the Call for American Youth Congress. He was a speaker for the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights. He was a speaker for the Workers' Alliance. He was a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy. All five of the foregoing organizations with which Gardner Jackson has been affiliated were found to be subversive by the Attorney General.

Gardner Jackson was also a signer of a letter protesting the ban on Communists in the American Civil Liberties Union.

In my remarks to this House on September 24, 1942, I proved by checks that the Robert Marshall Foundation has become one of the chief sources of funds with which the numerous Communist front organizations are kept going in their subversive work. I also pointed out that Gardner Jackson is one of the five trustees who dispense these funds.

Alice Barrows is educationist, specialist in school buildings, for the Office of Education at a salary of $4,800 a year. Alice Barrows was vice chairman of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, a Communist front organization which the Attorney General branded as subversive. She was also a member of the national committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy, another on the list of the Attorney General's subversive organizations.

Now, take the case of William Pickens, who is principal securities promotion specialist for the Treasury Department at a salary of $5,600. Pickens signed a manifest in defense of the notorious Communist Sam Darcy. Pickens was vice chairman of the American League Against War and Fascism, which the Attorney General branded as subversive. He was also a contributor to the Communist Party's New Masses. He was a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, a section of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties which the Attorney General also found to be subversive. Pickens was a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, a speaker for the United States Congress Against War, and a sponsor of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.

Arthur F. Goldschmidt, special assistant to the Secretary of the Interior at a salary of $6,500, and Marcus I. Goldman, employed by the Department of the Interior at a salary of $4,000, were both active members of the American League for Peace and Democracy and of the Washington Bookshop. Both of these organizations were found to be subversive by the Attorney General.

Leonard Emil Mins is employed by the Office of Strategic Services at a salary of $4,000 a year. Mins and his father before him have been big shots in the Communist Party. Leonard Mins worked for the Communist International in Moscow for several years. He has been an active Communist since 1930. He has written for the New Masses and the Daily Worker. He has also been prominent in the League of American Writers, which was branded by the Attorney General as a subversive organization.

Henry T. Hunt, special assistant to the general counsel of the Federal Works Agency at a salary of $5,600 a year, publicly protested against the ban upon Communists which was adopted by the American Civil Liberties Union. Hunt was also officially connected with the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, one of the organizations which the Attorney General found to be subversive. Hunt also has numerous other affiliations with Communist front organizations on his record.

Here is the case of Mary McLeod Bethune who is employed by the National Youth Administration at a salary of $6,250. Mary McLeod Bethune was publicly and prominently affiliated with four of the organizations which the Attorney General branded as subversive. She was national vice chairman of the American League for Peace and Democracy. The other three subversive organizations with which she was affiliated were the American Youth Congress, the National Negro Congress, and the Washington Committee for Democratic Action.

Harry C. Lamberton, head attorney of the Rural Electrification Administration at a salary of $6,500, was chairman of the Washington branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy which the Attorney General branded as subversive. It has been almost 4 years since our committee exposed Lamberton and his 581 fellow Government bureaucrats who were members of the American League for Peace and Democracy. Today we see some of the fruits of the administration's policy of extreme hostility toward and ridicule of our exposure of the American League. As a result of that policy, the radical and crackpot bureaucrats have become more and more bold in their contempt for the Congress of the United States. Furthermore, their number has increased alarmingly. Harry C. Lamberton was also counsel of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, an organization which Attorney General Biddle found to be subversive.

T. A. Bisson, principal economic analyst in the Board of Economic Warfare at a salary of $5,600, was affiliated with the American League for Peace and Democracy. He also contributed numerous articles to the Communist publication, Soviet Russia Today. He was a speaker for the American Student Union, whose former head, Joseph P. Lash, has

assured us was a Communist-controlled front organization.

Katherine Kellock is employed in the Board of Economic Warfare at a salary of $3,800 a year. In 1938, our committee exposed the Communist infiltration of the Federal Writers' project. At that time Katherine Kellock was field supervisor in charge of 4,600 Government employees who were at work on the notorious series of Federal Guide Books. The Congress broke up that project, but, like Henry G. Alsberg, who was head of the Federal Writers' project, Katherine Kellock has slipped back into Government employment.

Here is Jay Deiss, senior editor writer of the Federal Security Agency, at a salary of $4,600. Also Milton V. Freeman, Assistant Solicitor of the Securities and Exchange Commission, at a salary of $6,500. And again, George Slaff, principal attorney for the Federal Power Commission, at a salary of $6,000. Here also is A. C. Shire, Director of the Technical Division of the Federal Public Housing Authority, at a salary of $7,500. And to these add the name of Edward Scheunemann, assistant attorney in O. P. A., at a salary of $3,800. Deiss, Freeman, Slaff, Shire, and Scheunemann were all leaders of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action. I hope no one will rise to say that these men's names simply appeared on a mailing list of the organization. Such was not the case; they were officially and publicly identified as leaders of this organization which Attorney General Biddle has branded as subversive.

Mr. Speaker, to read each and every one of these names would impose too much upon the generosity of this House. I could stand here for day in and day out and read you the records of men who have no place in our Government; men, Mr. Speaker, who have gone on record against the kind of thing that the people in your district and in my district believe in with all their hearts and with all their minds. There are many people in my district this afternoon, plain folk; they are not economic experts; they are not learned in all of the philosophies that grace our great universities. They believe in certain fundamental principles. Those people that I have had the honor to represent for seven terms in this House believe in this Constitution that our fathers purchased with their blood and our mothers by their tears. They believe in the preservation of this country, for they know that it is the only country under which every man can be free. If I stood before those people, and took a poll there would not be one hundredth of one percent in my district who would support and sanction the employment of men like some of these holding positions in our Government.

What, then, is the answer?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We all had on our desk this morning a copy of a statement from the Lawyers' Guild. I wonder if the gentleman is going to discuss that?

Mr. DIES. The National Lawyers' Guild is an organization of radical lawyers, many of whom are employed by this Government. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the figure, for I have not checked it closely enough, but I have been informed by those in my office that fully one-half of the members of this guild are employed by the Federal Government. It was so rotten that Adolf Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, withdrew from it, saying that it was a Communist organization. It was so rotten that Judge Ferdinand Pecora withdrew from it because of its communistic nature. It was so rotten that Robert Jackson, Attorney General, withdrew from it because of its un-American character.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier in this speech, it is a shrewd tactic for those who really do not believe in democracy to wrap the cloak of democracy and liberalism around themselves and to pretend to go forth to battle for democracy when the thing that they believe in is the very thing that has brought curse and destruction to the republics of other countries and other ages.

So they would like to create the impression that those who expose them are pro-Fascist or pro-Nazi. Since the beginning of this committee, Mr. Speaker, every member of this committee knows there has been but one definite aim and that is to fearlessly expose every form of un-American activity. Three and one-half years before the Government moved against the German-American Bund this committee pointed out to the American people that it was an espionage organization, that its leaders were disloyal to the people of the United States; and in a letter which I addressed to the Attorney General 2½ years ago I called upon him not only to prosecute the German-American Bund, but also the Kyfhauser Bund and numerous other Nazi organizations. With few exceptions, there has not been a conviction in the United States obtained by the Department of Justice, which was not obtained by information from our committee's files. Let us read the record, and I do not do so as a special plea for the committee or in the role of one who is asking you as any favor to me to continue this committee. The committee has been under pressure from the beginning by those who would like to brand everybody as Communists simply because of their progressive views. Thousands of names of people have been submitted to me with the earnest and almost peremptory demand that they be branded as Communists simply because of their radical views. There have also been many people who have demanded that our committee brand as pro-Nazi everyone who has expressed conservative views.

Let me make myself clear, Mr. Speaker; I believe in America, and believing in America, I believe that everyone in America, whether Jew or Gentile, Protestant or Catholic, is entitled to his fundamental rights as a man; and because I believed in that I stood on the streets of Orange and defended a handful of Jews and Catholics who had few friends at that time to defend them and to champion their right to be freemen in a free country. But there have come repeated demands that this person or that person be branded as pro-Fascist or pro-Nazi simply because he expressed intolerant views. I do not hold with those who condemn anyone on account of his race or creed but there is no law against a man's being intolerant as much as we deplore intolerance; there is no law against a man's denouncing the South. God knows I have heard southerners denounced as viciously in certain quarters of this country as I have ever heard Jews denounced. Only a few days ago a Member from Texas read an editorial here which stated that southern boys had joined the Army because of the low standards of living and because they could make more money in the Army than they could at home. That is typical of what I have encountered during the past 4½ years. I have seen people boycott meetings at which I was scheduled to speak because I came from the South. Talk about intolerance. What is intolerance? How can any minority invoke the name of tolerance and Americanism when it itself is guilty of the same intolerance it decries in others. Tolerance in America means that Jew or Gentile, Catholic or Protestant, southerner or northerner, all of us must unite unhesitatingly and without qualification in the support of the Bill of Rights, the chief cornerstone upon which this Republic was established.

Mr. Speaker, may I refer to the RECORD so that this House may know the truth? And I read an excerpt from the report of our committee as evidence of this service to Government agencies. This committee reports to the House:

> As evidence of this service to Government agencies, the committee reports to the House that during the past 14 months, some 1,600 agents from the various intelligence units of the Army, the Navy, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Secret Service, and others have called at the committee's office in Washington alone for information. Hundreds of agents from the same agencies have called at the committee's branch offices in New York, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and Chicago for similar information.
>
> In addition to the above, the following agencies have detailed liaison agents to work daily at the committee's offices checking and obtaining information from the committee's files: Civil Service, Intelligence Unit of the Treasury, Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, State Department, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Work Projects Administration, Secret Service, and Office for Emergency Management. The branch offices of the committee have been used in a similar manner.
>
> Numerous requests for information which the committee has received from Government departments have involved the committee's turning over large files of documents. For example, the committee on February 3, 1942, supplied the Office of the Coordinator of Information with 210 documents on Nazi propaganda. Somewhat earlier, the committee turned over to the Department of Justice hundreds of original documents which provided the Department with the basis of its cases against Auhagen, Zapp, and Tonn.
>
> On August 15, 1942, the committee forwarded to the President a list of approximately 17,000 individuals who had been identified or affiliated with the Nazi movements in this country and suggested at the time to the President that some form of surveillance should be kept over these people.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years before there was any vigorous attempt made against un-American elements our committee had seized and exposed practically all their records and we sent to the President of the United States at one time the names of 17,000 people who were pro-Nazi, names this Government could not have obtained from any other source in the United States except this committee. Last year we received over 138,000 requests from Federal agencies for information which we gave. I say this in justification of the committee's work, because there is a well-organized attempt being made for the purpose of creating the impression that this committee has neglected the Nazi angle and that the committee has devoted all of its attention to the Communist angle. When they say "Fascist" what do they mean by "Fascist"? They mean people who believe in simple, fundamental Americanism, people who believe in preserving our Constitution, people who believe that America shall not fall a victim to the maudlin internationalism which characterizes a few people in this country. They mean people who are opposed to opening wide the gates of this country and permitting immigration to flood into our midst; consequently they have chosen from this House Members of Congress who oppose their views, who oppose their objectives, and with the money of Marshall Field, Cochran, Arthur Goldsmith, and others, they are seeking to play the old Hitler trick of propaganda that if you tell a lie often enough some people come to believe it as the truth. They are seeking by that technique to defame and besmear the honest names and reputations of men in this House who have no other purpose on earth except to protect America and preserve it for their children and their children's children.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I shall wind this speech up, because if I attempted to elaborate upon the many phases of it, it would be an imposition upon your time. Let me, however, as I conclude, Mr. Speaker, say to the House that on account of the importance of many of the matters that I hold here I shall recommend to our committee that a special report be filed for the purpose of documenting the evidence which shows the efforts that were made against Members of this House by these same forces, the lies that were disseminated.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in a fair fight, I believe in standing up face to face and fight, but I do not believe in these blows below the belt; I do not believe in insidious organizations spreading propaganda that is false. I want to know why the Robert Marshall Foundation, which I exposed on this floor on September 24, 1942, is not taxed when they use funds for political activity in this country. Thousands of dollars have been contributed by Gardiner Jackson and the other trustees to other organizations that are busily engaged in an attempt to smear Members of Congress. If that is not political activity, what is political activity? If it is such, why should not this great foundation of wealth be subjected to the tax laws of the United States of America?

Mr. Speaker, because I do not have time to read all these names, I ask unanimous consent to place them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I come now to the question of what Congress can do about it. The people of this country, make no mistake about this, are demanding of the Congress a few simple things. One is that we support in every possible way the war effort, that we devote all our energies, all of our abilities, to the one task of winning this war at the earliest possible date. On the other hand, they are equally insistent that we preserve this Government so that when our boys return they will not find that their sacrifices have been in vain. They are demanding that the Congress assert its independent role as a member of the tripartite government under which we live.

They are demanding that while cooperating in the war effort we act in a constructive and helpful way, not as haters of the administration, not as bitter critics of anyone, but as Members upon whose shoulders there devolves a special responsibility and a special function as sacred as that responsibility that is imposed upon the Chief Executive. This Congress can and will meet that challenge in a helpful and constructive way. It will meet this challenge by demanding that bureaucracy shall be curbed, that authority given to the Executive must be safeguarded by every possible provision and clearly defined and that the heads of bureaucratic government must come before the Congress and account strictly for their acts and their conduct.

We have no right to interfere with the conduct of our international affairs or by speech or by action to embarrass those who are charged primarily with that responsibility. We have a right to assume that those who are directing the international affairs on behalf of this country are jealously guarding our future interests. We have a right to assume as Members of Congress that those who are conducting the war effort are keeping constantly in mind that when this war is over the American people must face the gigantic task of reconstruction with the largest debt ever imposed upon people in the annals of time. We and the people have a right to expect that there be no commitments to any kind of internationalism which involves the destruction or the security of our sovereignty as a free people.

We believe that will be done. We have no right as Members of Congress to embarrass the President or State Department in the conduct of international affairs. But as Members of Congress we do have the right to demand that every dollar we vote from the pockets of the American taxpayers shall be wisely and usefully spent, not in order to achieve some social idea of a crackpot, not for the purpose of trying to build up this theory or that theory of government, not for the purpose of entering into alliances to further strip the States of their authority and jurisdiction under the Constitution; but that this money shall be used as the money of a free people to be devoted to winning this war.

We also have a right to expect that when this war is over we shall have the courage and the determination to occupy Germany, Italy, and Japan with our soldiers and to say to them: "There will not be another war. We will not rely upon your treaties, nor upon your written or spoken word."

We will go into Germany and into Japan and there with our soldiers we will stay until such time as we may be certain that there will never be a recurrence of totalitarian aggression. To that end members of both parties can dedicate themselves without stint. To that end let us all work.

There must be national unity, but it must be a national unity cooperated in as much by the executive branch as by the legislative. There can be no national unity when bureaucrats are linked up with the effort to smear Members of Congress. In the report which I hope our committee will print, I shall give the names of men in the Government who behind the scenes have actively engineered this whole campaign to smear Members of this House who are exercising their God-given and constitutional right.

Bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker? I hold here a folder of evidence so outrageous that I wish I had the time and the occasion was appropriate for me to read you the telegrams. This evidence came quite accidentally to our committee in the course of its investigation of the Union for Democratic Action. We came into possession of many telegrams, bank records, and telephone slips relating to a matter not directly under our jurisdiction.

I am going to turn this entire file over to the Committee on Appropriations. Here are the telegrams and records of Government officials showing that some 10 Government officials were involved in a conspiracy by one business concern to smear and destroy another business concern; telegrams showing that officials of the Government seized the files and the records of an American business concern and turned them over to its competitor so that the contents could be used by the Union For Democratic Action in a campaign of smearing that business concern; evidence showing the extent to which irresponsible bureaucracy will go when men become so partisan in their feelings and in their beliefs, so called upon to usher in the new order by their own efforts, so fanatical in their zeal for the cause which they mistakenly confuse with democracy and liberalism, that they use their office in order to do what common decency and ordinary honesty forbid, to

take the files and records of one American taxpaying business concern and deliberately turn them over to its competitor to be used by a filthy agent of lies for the purpose of smearing and blackmailing and besmirching the other business concern and its officers.

While I shall not at this time disclose all these telegrams, for the simple reason that we have no jurisdiction over them and it would immediately be charged that the committee was stepping out of bounds and engaging in something foreign to its authority, I shall turn these telegrams over to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] in the hope and the certainty that he will take the telegrams and bring before him the Government officials concerned and ask them to explain their outrageous conduct. Congress does have a remedy. If we cannot obtain relief from one source, then we as Members can say, "If you do not get rid of these people we will refuse to appropriate money for their salaries."

Mr. Speaker, I tell you that that is what the great majority of the people of this country want. That is what 85 or 90 percent of the Democrats want, and that is what 85 or 90 percent of the Republicans want. If the people want it and it is our duty to do it, then I submit it is now in order that the Committee on Appropriations take immediate and vigorous steps to eliminate these people from public office.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I take this occasion upon the conclusion of last year's work of the committee to express my deep gratitude to the members of that committee for their cooperation? May I express gratitude to the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle for their unswerving loyalty to a committee that has consistently fought the enemies of this country during a period when many people in America were asleep?

Mr. Speaker, if we had been as well informed by our diplomats and our commercial attachés about what our enemies were doing in Germany and Japan as this committee has kept this House and the country informed about what they have been doing in the United States, there would not have been a Pearl Harbor. That is spilt milk, but the future lies ahead, the future in which all of us must break a lance in the defense of constitutional government. We must say to the bureaucrats and the crackpots and the Communists and all of the disciples of totalitarianism, Americanism must live, America shall live.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, we have just had an oration delivered in the more classic vein. I should like it to be known that at least one Member of this House disagrees; that I disagree with the sentiments expressed, the flamboyant manner of expression, and the use of this great public forum as a means of what we in Hollywood would call personal publicity. I disagree.

[Here the gavel fell.]

"HORSESHOES IS HORSESHOES"—PART II

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Saturday, January 23, edition of the Washington Evening Star the information man of the W. P. B. attempts to set me right on my horseshoes. Well, if this information man—his identity is not divulged—does not know anything more about horseshoes than his answer to my remarks would indicate, I do not blame him for using a nom de plume—"information man."

If, however, I knew his identity, I would, in charity, recommend him for membership on the popular radio program, Information Please. Adams and the rest of the Information Please staff would have to strut their stuff to keep up with him. To begin with he states:

> The prose style of the letter led Mr. FLANNAGAN to conclude that its author was E. R. Gay of the War Production Board, vice president of the St. Regis Paper Co., and son of the late Prof. Edward Francis Gay, of Harvard * * * but the spokesman for the Board today said the letter was not written by Mr. Gay, who is chief of the industrial branch, Office of Civilian Supply, but by one of his subordinates, Verne V. Gregg, in charge of farm machinery, a man born on a farm, graduated from Missouri College of Agriculture, one time manager of a 2,700-acre farm and until recently an employee of the Agricultural Department. Yes, said the spokesman, there were horses on the big farm Mr. Gregg managed.

My colleagues, there is nothing prosy about the style of the letter. It was not written in a dull or commonplace manner without regard for its metrical structure. Why, I think it should be set to music. Read it in my remarks that appear in the RECORD on page 397, and I think you will agree with me that the style is distinctly poetic, and clearly shows that the writer is not only endowed with imagination, but possesses the power of rhythmical expression. Far be it from me to accuse a distinguished alumnus of Harvard and the son of the late Prof. Edward Francis Gay of Harvard of having a prose style. Why in my remarks I conceded that he was a master of syntax and rhetoric. And to allay the suspicion of the W. P. B. information man that I was so dense as to consider the style of the letter prosy, I hasten to state that from beginning to end the letter clearly indicates a Harvard accent, rather than the farm flavor one would expect from a renowned graduate of the Missouri College of Agriculture.

But, my colleagues, why speculate on the authorship of the letter? I did not have to resort to either style, or accent, or flavor, to determine its paternity. The author was so proud of his learned treatise on horseshoes that he signed his name in black ink. The letter is signed: "Edward R. Gay, Industrial Program Branch, Office of Civilian Supply."

I am indeed surprised that the information man now informs us that Mr. Verne V. Gregg is attempting to literally steal Mr. Gay's masterpiece. If I were Mr. Gay, I would not permit a subordinate in my office to steal my brain child.

And if I were Mr. Verne V. Gregg and had been born on a farm, graduated from Missouri College of Agriculture, and managed a 2,700-acre farm, I would deny with my dying breath that I ever entertained such thoughts about the lowly horseshoes as are expressed in Mr. Gay's letter. But if, as a matter of fact, Mr. Gregg did compose the horseshoe masterpiece, he played a dirty trick on Mr. Gay in allowing him to daddy it.

Now, just a word as to the management of the 2,700-acre farm. Probably the reason Mr. Gregg lost out as manager and had to seek employment with the Department of Agriculture was because he did not know his horseshoes. "There were horses, you know, on the big farm Mr. Gregg managed," says that information man, and probably Mr. Gregg fell down on the job of keeping them shod.

Continuing, the information man has this to say, and I again quote from the Evening Star:

> What Mr. Gregg meant, it was explained, was that it would be a good thing for farmers to remove the shoes from horses at the end of their annual work period before turning them out to pasture. Otherwise, the horses cast the shoes in the pasture and when they are recovered by little boys they do not go into the scrap drive but are hidden under their pillows or nailed to the barn door.

Well, what Mr. Gay, not Mr. Gregg, said in the letter was this:

> Horse owners can, in many cases, save shoes by removing the shoes immediately after a period of necessary road work or other work where shoes are necessary only during certain periods.

But now, lo and behold, it appears that the necessity for removing the shoes is to keep little boys from picking up the worn-out horseshoes and hiding them under their pillows or nailing them to the barn door, and thus diverting them from the scrap drive. As to nailing them to the barn doors: Horseshoes are supposed to bring good luck, and if, perchance, they do, the good Lord knows that they should be nailed above every barn door in America until we get rid of some of the wonder boys that are trying to run the farm program. As to little boys hiding them under their pillows, let me say that at one time I was a little boy on the farm, and I remained on the farm until I grew into a big boy, but neither as a little boy nor a big boy did I ever put horseshoes under my pillow. When night comes on the farm the little boys, and the big boys, too, are usually tired and worn out and ready for the "hay," and I cannot imagine that any of them would put horseshoes under their pillows to disturb their slumber. While I confess that as a boy on the farm I used to sleep with my dog, when it comes to sleeping with horseshoes I deny the charge, not only for myself but for every farm boy in America. Usually old Morpheus has very little trouble with the

country boy. But, my colleagues, would not old Morpheus have a time trying to nurse a country boy who had horseshoes under his pillow back to sleep?

As the information man does not attempt to answer my observations on the elimination of nonessential styles, I presume that what I said about the pointed toes and open toes and the high heels and low heels and the zipper styles stands good. This is indeed comforting, because the zipper style which permits you to zip them off and zip them on solves the whole problem.

In conclusion the information man reaches a new high in horseshoes. Old Dobbin is really going places according to the information man. Listen, and I quote:

What surprised Mr. Gregg, the board spokesman said by way of a return shot, was that a rural Congressman like Mr. FLANNAGAN did not understand this instruction in the letter: "more resets to get more wear out of available shoes." "Resets" do not mean changing the shoes from one foot to another, it was explained, but mean resetting the same shoes on the same foot. Unless the horse is manicured under his shoe periodically the hoof deteriorates (military term) and the shoe is cast while working.

Well, this return shot was a hot one and came nigh unto paralyzing me. Under the new rules of the game, I now observe, we are not only going to give old Dobbin the choice between pointed toes and open toes, high heels and low heels, black and tan, low quarters and high quarters, but we are going to open up beauty salons and give dear old Dobbin a manicure. And I suppose when the winsome lassie gets through manicuring old Dobbin that she will put on some hoof polish, to be selected to match up color, and then direct him to the next chair where he will get a permanent, mane and tail.

Holy smoke, "where," Mr. Information Man, "do we go from here?"

Let me again tell you a story:

Years ago I represented a 6 foot 2 farmer, who weighed around 250 pounds, in a lawsuit. It took a lot of cornbread, hog jowl and cabbage, and other foods rich in muscle building, to keep him going. In the course of the suit we had to make a trip into the cabbage country around Rural Retreat to take depositions. When we boarded the train to return home we found the car rather crowded, and my farmer friend took a seat by a nice looking old gentleman who, from his appearance, it was evident was a stranger to the countryside. I secured a seat immediately behind them. We had only gotten a short distance from the station when we commenced to run through one cabbage field after another, and so naturally the conversation between my farmer friend and his new acquaintance drifted into cabbage.

Said the stranger to my farmer friend:

"Now, the way to cook cabbage is with cream," and he went ahead and told in an appetizing way how his wife creamed cabbage.

I saw that the new cabbage recipe was not registering with my farmer friend. He sat mum and looked bored. No doubt he was thinking about trying to do a hard evening's work on creamed cabbage.

Finally the stranger said:

"Now, my friend, when you get home get your wife to fix you up some creamed cabbage."

And all my farmer friend said, and I could see by the expression on his face that he was disgusted, was:

"A little hog jowl won't hurt them."

And so say I; "a little hog jowl" complex won't hurt some of the bureaus handling the farm problem.

Moral: Give us a few more men in the farm program set-up who know more about cabbage and hog jowl and less about cabbage and cream.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes on next Monday at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, following the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, during the last several weeks there have been a good many rumors going around in reference to the number of airplane accidents in continental United States. Only last week I took cognizance of one of these rumors when I had placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air. If the Members have read that letter, which appears in the RECORD, they will find that insofar as the Air Transport Command is concerned, a marvelous record of efficiency is being maintained in that service. That letter indicates, Mr. Speaker, that for the preceding 6 months' period, of the planes delivered to the Transport Command for flight to the 10 theaters of war throughout the world, only 1 fatal accident occurs out of every 500 planes received for transport. Over the 12 months' period, the Members will see when they have read the letter, that the record of efficiency of the Air Transport Command is so high that during that period, out of every 333 planes which were placed in the hands of the Transport Command for delivery to the 10 fighting fronts of the world, only 1 sustained a fatal accident.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I will be glad to yield when I have finished my statement.

Mr. HINSHAW. I just want to get one point straightened out.

Mr. BROOKS. I should be very glad to answer the gentleman's question later. Mr. Speaker, that should cover record of the Air Transport Command, but it does not cover all figures as to all Army aviation. I read the Nichols committee report, and there are a great many accidents which are covered by that report. The committee report states clearly the reasons for the accidents, and gives its conclusions and findings as to what action should be taken to prevent a recurrence of accidents of the kind investigated. But this report omits reference to the over-all figures as to the accident rate existing in the Army at the present time, in a comparative sense. Accordingly last week I addressed a communication to the Assistant Secretary of War for Air and asked him if it were possible to give me the figures down to date covering all Army air accidents in Continental United States. As a result of this communication, I am in receipt of a letter from Assistant Secretary Robert A. Lovett, which letter is as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1943.

The Honorable OVERTON BROOKS,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. BROOKS: In reply to your inquiry about accidents involving Army airplanes, I am glad to give you below figures obtained from the Directorate of Flying Safety, Army Air Forces.

The expansion of the Army Air Force activities in the United States in the past year has been enormous and has reached a scale far greater than is realized by even well-informed officials of the Government. In the first 8 months of 1942 (the latest completely tabulated figures available) 74.3 percent more hours were flown than in the whole 10-year period 1930–40; 98.5 percent more miles were flown from January to August 1942 than in the entire 10 years 1930–40.

This 8 months' mileage is equivalent to over 48,000 trips around the world.

In spite of this extraordinary expansion, the rate of accidents per 1,000 hours flown was lower in the 1942 period than the 10-year peacetime average.

Accident rates fluctuate from month to month and from year to year. Hence an average is used to obtain a reliable comparison. For purposes of comparison and to establish a peacetime average against which operations can be fairly measured, the 10 years 1930–40 have been used as a norm. The figures for the first 8 months of 1942 show that the accident rate per 1,000 hours during the period was actually eleven one-hundredths lower than the rate for the 10-year peacetime period from 1930 to 1940. The rate of fatal accidents per 1,000 hours flown is up only fourteen one-thousandths compared with the 10-year average.

The increase in fatalities results primarily from two factors: (a) The great increase in speed and weight of modern combat planes as compared with peacetime planes; and (b) the very great increase in the size of the planes and the number of persons carried as crew. Since a large number of men are frequently involved in a single accident today, the rate of fatality per 1,000 hours has increased five one-hundredths compared with the 10-year peacetime average.

These figures are particularly striking when it is realized that our training schools and operational training units are operating under pressure of war. Furthermore, before sending combat crews into combat theaters located all over the world and in widely varying climates, it is necessary to train them in a variety of weather conditions so that when they meet the enemy in life and death combat they will not have the added hazard of running into flying conditions and weather with which they are not experienced.

The military airplane is a weapon—perhaps the most powerful one in existence. Such planes are very fast, heavily armed, and carry explosives. Nevertheless, in the face of these facts, it is notable that the frequency rate of accidents is still actually lower per hours flown than the average of the peacetime years mentioned above.

It is well to point out at this time that the number of accidents has increased and will increase in some proportion to the tremendous increase in the number of planes flying and the number of hours flown. This is so for the same reason that there are more accidents in a State with 1,000,000 automobiles than in another one with 100,000 automobiles. As time goes on and our air force grows toward its goal of becoming the most powerful one in the world the number of airplane accidents will inevitably grow. However, the important criterion is whether the rate of accidents in relation to the number of hours flown has increased disproportionately.

The Army Air Forces are understandably determined to maintain the fine record which has resulted from unceasing attention to safety measures and control. The directorate of flying safety is continually improving safety techniques in order to keep accidents at the lowest rate consistent with the hazards necessarily involved in the primary task of the Army Air Forces, which is to make our pilots the best combat pilots in the world.

We feel sure that the public is prepared for unavoidable accidents, but they are entitled to know all the facts which can be given short of disclosing information which would be useful to the enemy. Accordingly, as a matter of policy, the Army Air Forces do not withhold from the press news of accidents. In consequence the publicity such occurrences receive has created in the minds of some people the wrong impression that accidents are increasing at an alarming rate and that perhaps proper measures are not being taken to reduce them. The facts given at the outset of this letter prove that the opposite is the truth.

A knowledge of the true facts and of the determined efforts which are constantly made to protect the lives of our men in training and give to them a better fighting chance against an enemy seasoned by years of combat experience should result in continued confidence by the public in the carefully planned and supervised program of the Army Air Forces.

If, as indicated in your inquiry, you intend to make this letter public, I trust that you will agree with me that it is best to have it published in full rather than in part.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT,
*Assistant Secretary of War for Air.*

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BROOKS. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. The important thing to remember from this letter is that the ratio of accidents per 1,000 hours flown is being reduced and the rate of fatal accidents per 1,000 hours flown is up only fourteen one-thousandths as compared with the 10-year average between 1930 and 1940. When we contemplate the fact that 98.5 percent more miles were flown in the 8 months from January 1942 to August 1942 than in the entire 10 years from 1930 to 1940, we can say that this record of efficiency is truly remarkable. Especially is this the case when we find that the mileage flown during this 8 months' period is equivalent to 48,000 trips around the world, or a total of 1,200,000,000 miles.

The Army is training pilots in tremendous numbers and is developing very rapidly the largest and most powerful air force in the entire world. Greater speeds, more powerful engines, larger bombing and transport planes, and the necessity for training under sub-Arctic conditions as well as under typical tropical conditions those who fly the ships—all are conditions which place a greater strain upon the efforts to keep down the rate of accidents and prevent unnecessary crack-ups and casualties. In spite of all of these factors, the letter of the Assistant Secretary for Air presents some facts and figures which should be of intense interest to the families of the men who compose our air force as well as the public at large. It is truly a magnificent wartime record of a great air force.

To those of us who are especially interested in the standing and efficiency of American aviation, I invite your study to the report of the Military Affairs Committee, No. 2515, dated October 2, 1942. This report shows the same trends as early as October 1942 as are shown in the letter of Robert A. Lovett, Assistant Secretary for Air. The report was accompanied by a box score showing the actual number of American planes lost in combat to those lost by the enemies of this country. At that time the ratio of losses in combat with the Japs was from five to seven Jap planes to every American plane lost. The ratio as to the Germans at that time was three Nazi planes lost for every one of our own; and for the entire war on all fronts the ratio at that time was between two and three enemy planes lost to every American plane brought down. It, therefore, appears that we are more than holding our own on every combat front in the world, and that our pilots, mostly trained hastily under wartime conditions, are more than the match in courage, ability, and skill of those of any other nation.

In conclusion, I quote from the last paragraph of the report of the Military Affairs Committee, to which I have already referred:

> There is an old saying, "The proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof." In the final analysis, it is the box score that counts. It is idle to compare the speed, performance, and maneuverability of one plane against another when engaged in war. These in actual combat are academic questions. It is only common sense to say that our planes and our pilots are performing exceptionally well when they are knocking down two or three enemy planes to every one of ours that is lost. Your committee finds that our planes are not inferior to those of Germany and Japan. We also find those in command of our Army Air Forces fully alert to the lessons in combat that are being learned and ready to make such changes as experience dictates. The American people may be justly proud of the record of the Army Air Forces, their achievements, and their will to bring this war to a speedy and successful conclusion.

I yield now to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I was wondering if, in referring to the Air Transport Command, the gentleman was referring to the command which transports troops, or the ferry service, or the Air Service Command, which transports freight, or to the whole thing altogether.

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, the Transport Command is a part of the Air Force.

Mr. HINSHAW. To which part was the gentleman referring?

Mr. BROOKS. I refer to the aviation that the Assistant Secretary of War refers to in his letter of January 27, which the gentleman no doubt read in the RECORD.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is that the Ferry Service that the gentleman is referring to?

Mr. BROOKS. It is more than the Ferry Service. It is also the Transport Command. It transports not only troops, but freight.

Mr. HINSHAW. Then it includes all of these branches?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; and naturally transports combat planes and transport planes to the fronts all over the world.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] is recognized for 1 hour.

## MEAT RATIONING IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak today to explain as nearly as I can a subject about which many of us have perhaps given very little thought.

Beginning in November 1942 we had some rules and regulations set up by the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture with regard to our supply of meat. There was a quota placed on animals slaughtered. There was a ceiling price placed on the dressed meat.

In many areas in the State of California people have not had meat on their table for a period of 3 or 4 weeks at a time. In one community of 9,000 people in my congressional district for 4 consecutive weeks there has been no bacon or ham for sale in any of the stores. I am wondering how long we as American citizens can continue to wait while some bureaucrats down in the departments sharpen their pencils, wear them out on paper, trying to figure out some new scheme or theory while somebody back home who is working in agriculture, a defense plant manufacturing airplanes, or working in the shipyards trying to produce material for our armed services goes without food.

Departmental officials have told me and other Members from the State of California that as of January 1, 1943, meat rationing would be in effect. January 1 has come and gone. The month of January has gone. What do we find this morning? A committee from the Department of Agriculture, a committee from the Office of Price Administration, members of the Lease-Lend, and a member of the Quartermaster Corps spent 2 hours in my office, together with three other Members of the California delegation who were named by the dean of our California group, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], to try to work out this problem. They told us this morning it would be April 1 before we could expect any assistance in the State of California in securing meat.

So I have asked for this time to try to give my viewpoint as I see it. If we are going to have a meat shortage in the United States, if we can foresee additional meat needed other than what we hope to have in the year 1943, certainly we should not sit around here as Members of Congress and let somebody in the Departments set up rules and regulations to continue to slaughter female animals which we hope may produce more meat. That has happened in the dairy industry.

Last year, in January, I spoke in the well of this House and again in the fall of 1941, pointing out what would happen to the dairy industry. Not only I, but other Members spoke on that subject. We were ignored and we awakened to find that dairy cattle are now being slaughtered. Now we are going to have rationing of milk and dairy products. So I think this situation is serious. Our farmers could produce amply if only they were left alone long enough without somebody injecting a lot of red tape to strangle the businessman or the farmer who is doing his utmost to produce in large amounts what the civilian population will use, plus what our armed forces will use.

As I told you, I began studying this problem in November. I had meetings in my home State in the month of December with the officials of the Office of Price Administration. Information was set forth at that time and given to the officials of the Office of Price Administration, but they have undoubtedly ignored the solution set up by their own man in the State of California to assist in this program of providing additional meat for that State. Here is his letter of recommendation to his official.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
*Fresno, Calif., December 5, 1942.*

To Bert M. Green, acting district manager, Fresno district office.

From John J. Gallagher, chief price attorney, Fresno district office.

Subject: Restriction Order No. 1.

On December 4, 1942, at your request, I attended a meeting held in Tulare, Calif., at which meeting were present the secretary of the Retail Grocers' Association of this district; three or four retail meat dealers; Congressman ALFRED ELLIOTT, Congressman for that congressional district; the manager of the Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce; the manager of the Kern County Chamber of Commerce; and representative of the Kern Valley Meat Packing Co.

Kern Valley Meat Packing Co. have their headquarters in Kern County, and have been supplying retail meat dealers throughout the counties of Kern, Kings, and Fresno, approximately 25 percent of their business being in these outside counties.

Kern Valley Meat Packing Co. informed their retail dealers located outside of Kern County that beginning December 7 they would no longer be able to supply them with meat. Most of these retail dealers have depended exclusively on the Kern Valley Meat Packing Co. for their supply, and now would be unable to go to any other meat packing company for their meat since these other meat packing companies have all they can do to supply customers they have been supplying under their quotas.

The reason for Kern Valley Meat Packing Co.'s action is as follows:

Kern County has a population of approximately one hundred and thirty-five to one hundred and forty thousand people. A year ago there were between 8 and 10 meat-packing companies supplying retail meat stores. Among these meat-packing companies were Armour, Cudahy, Swift, Hormel, etc. They shipped their meat in from Los Angeles, and accordingly, when restriction order No. 1 became effective, these outside packing companies stopped supplying meat to Kern County, and, despite the fact that their quotas were determined on people whom they had supplied in Kern County, they no longer make deliveries to Kern County. The result of this is that the Kern Valley Meat Packing Co. is the only slaughterer and supplier of Kern County and vicinity at the present time.

If Kern Valley Meat Packing Co.'s quota is not raised immediately, beginning December 7, 1942, all the retail dealers that have been buying from the Kern Valley Meat Packing Co. outside of Kern County will have no meat at all for their customers.

I believe some method should be set up in which the meat quotas should be determined by territory and population rather than by giving packers quotas when these packers' quotas can move out of a district, take their quotas with them, leaving the people of the district meatless.

This problem is true at the present time in Kern County and vicinity, and we shall have the same problem throughout this whole valley in the immediate future. Unless something is done, the result of the present restriction order will be that packers residing outside of districts and furnishing these districts will take their quotas with them and move to their home districts, with the result that these home districts will have much more than their share of the meat, under the quota system, whereas the territories these packers have left will have practically no meat at all.

Some people ask why should there be a shortage just in the State of California. At the present time that State has had an increase in population estimated all the way from 750,000 to 1,000,000 within the last 9 or 10 months. In addition to that, we have in round figures almost a million armed forces in the State of California, of whom perhaps one-third are released each week end, so that they consume in the restaurants and hotels meat that the Government thought would be used for the civilian population. Certainly we do not want to tell the men in the armed forces when they are away from camp that they cannot purchase a sirloin steak or a juicy hamburger.

I am going to give you some figures to prove my point. The estimate given by the Department of Agriculture in 1943 of the production of meat in the United States was 25,700,000,000 pounds. Lease-lend and the armed forces will receive of that amount 8,500,000,000 pounds, leaving 17,200,000,000 pounds of meat available for the use of our civilian population. On that basis, estimating 125,000,000 people in the civilian population, there would be provided for each and every person, considering the babies who may be eating meat, 2.6 pounds of meat per week. Yet in 1941 the people of the United States consumed 18,900,000,000 pounds of meat. On the quota of our civilian population at that time we had 2.8 pounds of meat per person per week, only two-tenths of a pound difference.

I will agree that a majority of civilians have more money today with which to purchase meat, especially those who are working in the manufacturing plants and who have jobs that they did not have in 1941. But here we are with a rationing program, when we have an estimated amount of meat available for 1943 of 25,700,000,000 pounds of meat against meat actually consumed in the United States in 1941 of 18,900,000,000 pounds.

How does this thing operate? There is a ceiling price placed on slaughtered animals but not on animals on the hoof; so the slaughterhouse man, the packing-house man, in order to operate, has got to get enough to pay his overhead, but the ceiling prevents this. To illustrate how this works out, let us assume that a heifer on the hoof weighs 800 pounds. This heifer will dress out 55 percent of her liveweight, or 440 pounds. The packer pays 13½ cents on hoof for that animal, which is $108; but there is a ceiling on the meat after it is dressed of 23.75 cents a pound, so, after he dresses the animal, he gets only $104.50, immediately losing $3.50 in the operation. Certainly, he has the hide and the tallow, but also he has his operating costs. So

the average packer today for every animal he kills, because of various rules and regulations, is losing from $8 to $10. How long can the packer operate under such a program? The man in the feed yards is not doing his utmost to fatten more animals, because he is wondering how long it will be before the packer will have to go out of business because of losses.

Who is responsible? Certainly nobody should be working for our Federal Government who has facts that in some localities people have been without meat from 3 to 5 weeks, yet wants to wait an additional 60 days in order that he may push a pencil around some more blueprints, set up more strangling rules and regulations and red tape, instead of approaching this thing on a businesslike basis.

As a result of what has been done, a black market has grown up. This is not a healthy situation. We are forcing people to be crooks in order that they may operate. No quota or ceiling has been placed on the restaurant or hotel operators. They can buy a steak for 50 cents and charge $1.50 for it, take it or leave it.

No rules or regulations have been set up regarding the cold storage units all over the United States. In many places in the West, not only the State of California but in many other Western States, we have a supply of meat stored away. If it is not used before warm weather sets in perhaps it will spoil because the plants are not equipped to continue to operate and protect the meat in warm weather.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. As I remember it, the gentleman has stated that the total consumption of meat in the United States in 1941 was 19,000,000,000 pounds; is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Eighteen billion nine hundred million pounds.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is very close to 19,000,000,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman also stated that the civilian consumption in this calendar year has been fixed at 17.2 billions.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. Since 1941, close to 10,000,000 men have been taken out of the civilian population, and these 10,000,000 men are now assigned a quota under military authority. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. In other words, perhaps 10 percent of the 1941 consumption has been removed from the civilian consumption quota. Is it correct therefore to say that in assigning 17,200,000,000 pounds for civilian consumption today there is no actual reduction in the amount of meat over the normal consumption of 1941?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true.

Mr. HINSHAW. In other words, can the gentleman assign any reason whatsoever for the rationing of meat today when the meat already assigned for civilian consumption is practically identical with the amount we normally consume without rationing and without restriction in 1941?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The bureaucrats' answer to that is that they want to force into the channels of lend-lease and our Army quartermaster department more meat. More meat for the armed forces and more meat for lend-lease. We are all agreed that the armed forces must come first regardless of what we have to do for our civilian population, but the armed forces and lend-lease can use only 8,500,000,000 pounds in 1943, according to their own figures, so we still have 17,200,000,000 available for the civilian population, which will give them two-tenths of 1 percent of a pound less meat for 1943 than they actually consumed in 1941.

Mr. HINSHAW. In other words, if we were permitted to go ahead and slaughter and consume meat today on a perfectly normal level there would be no shortage whatsoever and consequently no need of rationing, not only in California but elsewhere in the United States.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think we shall have to go back to practically the old formula, the law of supply and demand and proper distribution. Part of our difficulty and one of the reasons this has bogged down is distribution. They are trying to put these new schemes into effect without making any allowance at all for the problem of proper distribution. No matter how much meat is available for consumption, unless it can be distributed to the point of consumption the program is bound to bog down. For instance, in my valley area we had 10 slaughterhouses serving the territory. When this program went into effect all but 1 of them left.

The quota provides for 70 percent of the slaughter for civilian consumption and 30 percent for the armed forces. That would have been all right had the 10 slaughterhouses continued there, but when 9 moved away they took their quotas with them and the result is we have but 1 slaughterhouse to supply the area that 10 formerly supplied and that 1 slaughterhouse is allowed but 70 percent of its former quota for civilian use.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is perfectly true, but the thing I am getting at here is that if there is no actual shortage of meat allocated to the civilian population what is the purpose in going into a difficult and complicated rationing scheme in order to distribute this meat among the people? In other words, even if there were no rationing of meat at all that in itself would not bring meat to the people if they do not allow the animals to be slaughtered? Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. And under the present schedules that have been set up the animals are not to be slaughtered. Is not that right?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right; the animals are not to be slaughtered, especially not if the packer is to be forced to take a loss on every animal he slaughters at the present time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course not. Therefore, the whole scheme from beginning to end is a farce.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It seems to me that the figures the gentleman has given, and to which the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] referred, are extremely important and should be the basis for our consideration. I do think it is important to remember that the point which was brought out many times in our meetings by representatives of agriculture and O. P. A. was that there was a great deal more buying power throughout the country that has to be taken into consideration. Personally, I would disagree with what seems to be the expression here that rationing would be a mistake. On the contrary, it seems to me that only if we have a program of fair and just rationing will we be able to get meat into those parts of the country that need it the most. Without that I do not know how in the long run we are going to get it. The point the California delegation made, and the committee, as I get it, is that we have not been content to see our State with such short supplies of meat for such a long time while they were getting ready to introduce a program of just rationing. We have taken the position here, and I agree with what the gentleman has said in that respect, that there were some barriers against full production on the one hand and perhaps some false prices that should be removed; and in the second place there should be efforts made so that right now there might be a more equitable distribution into our State of the supplies that are now available. I do believe that we should make our position plain. What we are after is a just distribution of the supplies that are available, so that some sections of the country will not be without meat.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman. When part of your slaughterhouses and packing houses are not killing their full 70 percent quota owing to the program that has been set up, the other houses cannot afford to deliver it to the areas they did in past on account of the distances from market with such a small amount of meat to deliver, and naturally that makes a shortage of meat in that area.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with the gentleman's point that wherever that exists that quota should be taken up by somebody else immediately and not left lying idle.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The committee has asked the Department to increase the quota where a slaughterhouse might be in that area and where other slaughterhouses have moved out of the area. I agree with the gentleman; and, as was stated by the group, until they are ready to put this rationing program into effect they should permit the slaughterhouses to slaughter their full 100 percent at the present time so nobody will go hungry for meat and this to continue until they

are able to put this rationing program into effect.

Mr. HINSHAW. If we have as much meat per capita for the civilian population today as we had in 1941 under free market conditions, what is the purpose of reducing the slaughter to 70 percent? It seems to me there is no excuse for it. It ought to be 100 percent based on the population.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The number of people is the same and the number of pounds of meat is the same, but the people are not eating the same amount that they were eating in the year the gentleman quotes. They are eating a lot less for the moment. The whole population is eating a lot less per capita. It seems to me that the gentleman who is speaking has called attention to the real difficulty in the whole situation and that is that the Department charged with the distribution, if we may call it that, of the meat supply has made these announcements prior to any ability to put rationing into effect and that the same thing has happened here as has happened with sugar, with coffee, and with the other commodities which were rationed. All of the elements involved have not been taken into consideration, and as the gentleman from California said, the difficulty is that we will not get this properly solved until these other elements are taken into consideration and until we get actual rationing and distribution on a proper basis per person. The gentleman who is speaking has recited the fact that certain of these slaughtering houses and packers have ceased delivering in the areas which were entirely dependent upon those packers. I would like to hear the gentleman develop that point a little further.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. I do not know anything about these statistics the gentleman speaks about, but I do know very definitely that my community, San Francisco, is really right up against it for meat. I received this morning copy of a telegram that the Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations of San Francisco sent to the President on January 29, setting forth the conditions in San Francisco. With the gentleman's permission I would like to insert this telegram in the RECORD at this point, because it states in a very clear and concise manner the situation in my State. I also want to take this opportunity of complimenting and congratulating the gentleman on his devotion, not only in looking out for the interests of the people of his own district but also the people of California, and I want to say that we are back of him 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the telegram referred to at this point, with the gentleman's permission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH]?

There was no objection.

The telegram referred to follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, *January 29, 1943.*

To His Excellency the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT,

*Washington, D. C.:*

Fully aware of your many and trying difficulties and appreciative of your great leadership we turn to you for succor and relief in a matter of great moment in effort to win the war. Metropolitan San Francisco defense area suffers direly from meat shortage. Daily hundreds are waiting for hours for frugal supplies that are far too fresh for healthful consumption, and thousands of disappointed people are turned away when meager stocks are exhausted. More astonishing is fact of ample slaughter cattle available. Ceiling prices for slaughtering payable and receivable have hamstrung the industry and created black market and havoc. Hundreds of butchers unwillingly forced to leave jobs account shortage of work. Shipbuilders' restaurants are deprived of supplies that could be available. For weeks our citizens are meat hungry and distressed. High Washington officials on recent visits here recognized this deficiency and newspapers daily record promises of relief which is not forthcoming. Can you not with your great power and wisdom so often successfully employed alleviate this unusual intolerable condition. Representative of progressive and greatly expanded San Francisco we earnestly appeal to you.

CIVIC LEAGUE OF IMPROVEMENT CLUBS AND ASSOCIATIONS,
DR. OTTO G. FREYERMUTH,
*President.*

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, May I go further? If we propose to use more meat in 1944, now is the time for us to accept some kind of a program to produce more meat in 1944. For instance, a gilt that was farrowed in the spring of 1942 will have a litter of pigs in the spring of 1943. A gilt that was farrowed in September 1942 will have a litter in the fall of 1943. That same gilt that farrows the spring litter in 1943 will farrow another litter in the fall of 1943.

We can immediately increase the production in hogs more than anything else. Today in the State of California we are slaughtering practically all female animals in beef. Very few steers are being slaughtered. Why? Because of the rules and regulations set up by someone who does not know what he is doing, thus working hardships on the man who is in business. It resolves itself down to one thing after another. There were seven of these men before the California delegation here the other day. I asked them finally, "How many of you men know anything about the meat business or was ever in it before? Those of you who were, hold up your hands." One out of the seven held up his hand. Yet those same gentlemen have set up the rules and regulations which tell us how many we can kill, where we can send it and what we can do, disregarding people who have millions of dollars invested in their own business. I say that until we erase some of those conditions it will still be hard for the men in the cattle business to keep on producing, not knowing what they are going to face.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. How many of those seven men had been in California and knew first-hand of our problems?

Mr. ELLIOTT. None of them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Has it ever occurred to the gentleman that the quickest way to increase the supply of pork would be to pay premiums for heavier hogs? Today it pays a man better to sell his hog at 180 pounds, although the price could just as well be stepped up to make the 300-pound hog popular. That could apply to beeves, too.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Last Monday on the Lancaster market I sold a load of cattle, well-finished shorthorn steers weighing over 1,200, that brought only $1.50 a hundred more than cows, because of the price ceilings put on meat. The packers chose the common, half-finished stuff. Common steers with just a little bit of flesh brought $14.50, and these well-finished steers of mine brought $14.75.

It is a matter of this thing not being managed right. If there were a premium paid for weight this stuff would quickly go ahead. If all the hogs in the country now coming at 180 were marketed a month or three months later at 250, can the gentleman see what that would mean?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman said he sold a carload of cattle at 14¾ cents a pound. Does the gentleman believe the packer who bought his cattle at 14¾ cents a pound can stand a ceiling of 24¾ cents a pound on his dressed meat?

Mr. GROSS. He said he could not. That is why he was buying the other steers. Bulls brought more than my steers did. Lean bulls brought more last Monday on the Lancaster market than my well-finished shorthorn steers.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OUTLAND. The question has sometimes been raised that perhaps the matter of transportation enters into it; that the problem of transporting both troops and equipment into certain sections like California has helped to cause this situation. According to the testimony the gentleman's own committee has developed, there is a sufficient supply so that if the regulations permitted it there would be not an adequate but certainly a comparable supply for areas like that State.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true.

Mr. OUTLAND. In other words, the problem of transportation is not causing the shortage in California?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I live in the State of Texas, which produces more cattle than any other State in the Union, yet we are faced with exactly the same situation you are of being unable to buy beef right in the heart of the cattle country. A large part of it goes to just the same situation that we have, a system of prices set up that makes it impossible for anybody to carry anything along that will produce more meat next year. We are able to get more for cows than we are for steers. We are able to sell calves for more than we can get for well-fed cattle.

I myself sold some calves just a short time ago which I had no intention in the world of selling, but the boy down on the place wrote me saying, "I was offered so much for those calves and could not afford to turn it down." Of course, he could not, because we got as much for those calves in December as we could get for them by carrying them over until next spring.

We now are faced with the same thing I am sure you are faced with. I know it is the rule in Texas that you cannot buy feed for more than 2 weeks in advance. If you are going to put steers in the feed lot, you cannot contract for your feed for more than 2 weeks at a time. As long as I have known anything about the cow business, I have never known anybody who could afford to go to feeding steers without knowing where he was going to get his feed and knowing whether he was going to be able to have feed enough to finish them up. If we stop a lot of these rules and let the cowmen of America go to raising beef, they will raise beef. If you let the hog people of America go to growing hogs, they will put pork on your table, if you will simply give them an opportunity to do it and pay them a price for doing it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. This is what is happening. In the State of California today hay is at $40 a ton. On the 1st of January it was from $28 to $32 a ton. Now it has reached a point where it is $40 a ton. Cottonseed cake jumped from $25 to about $45 a ton. Yet here is a man feeding cattle, and he does not know what minute someone will come along and slap a ceiling on these animals he is proposing to have fat at a certain date. The present program is keeping a lot of cattle from being in the fat yards that are not there at the present time. The remarks of the gentleman are absolutely correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not hear all of the gentleman's able speech, but the situation in my district is probably similar to that in Los Angeles and San Francisco. When I left my district it was my understanding that one of the main reasons they issued this regulation of which the gentleman speaks was that our quotas on the Pacific coast, particularly in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, and Seattle, were based upon the 1940 census.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, anybody who has been out in that area would know that San Francisco, for instance, probably has half a million more people, Seattle 300,000 or 400,000, and God knows how many there are in the Los Angeles area now.

Yet the people making the quotas here, if you tell them that, look at you with blank amazement as if to say, "We set the quotas, and there you are." That is one of the problems.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I have commented on that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Has anything been done to correct that or are they still looking at us as if we did not know our own districts?

Mr. ELLIOTT. They told me this morning they doubted very much whether we had an increase in population on the west coast, but in the city of Los Angeles itself, there has been an increase of over 300,000, and every week-end there are from 150,000 to 250,000 men in the armed services that visit that city, and they do not eat bread alone while they are there, they eat steaks.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If those officials would go out to the coast cities and try to get a place to sleep some night, they would know how crowded they are.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. Is it not a fact that in the conferences held between the California delegation and the representatives of the O. P. A. and the Department of Agriculture, it was admitted that a greater beef shortage exists in California than in any other State?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. WELCH. And also that the State of California has increased its population faster than any other State in the Union?

Mr. ELLIOTT. They agreed on that also.

Mr. WELCH. The population of San Francisco alone has increased nearly 100,000 since war was declared, and still they do not see fit to increase our meat quota. Workers performing the hardest kind of labor in the shipyards and other defense plants are going as long as a week at a time without sufficient meat to sustain men performing that kind of labor.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I want to give now some figures that prove my contention of wondering whether or not we should be going into the meat rationing program at all until we have a proper formula. In the 10-year period 1931–40 there was a slaughter average in the United States of animals, cattle, 14,200,000; calves, 9,200,000; sheep and lambs, 21,900,000; hogs, 64,400,000. In 1941 we slaughtered 16,400,000 more cattle, a 2,000,000 increase over the average of the 10-year period; calves, 9,300,000; sheep and lambs, 22,300,000; hogs, 71,400,000. Then take the estimate for 1942 as contained in the last month for which they have made an estimate for that year. There is an estimated slaughter for 1942 of 18,300,000 cattle, an increase of approximately 2,000,000 over the previous year; calves, 9,600,000; sheep and lambs, 26,000,000, an increase of 4,000,000 over the previous year; hogs, a jump from 64,400,000 in the period for the 10 years and then from the 71,400,000 in 1941 to 82,000,000 for the year 1942.

Mr. Speaker, that definitely shows that we are producing more meat all the time, and I repeat again that we should have definite information if it is expected that we will use more meat in 1944 than is being used at the present time. Further, I suggest that we should slow up on the slaughter of heifers in the various slaughterhouses, and we should stop the slaughter of a lot of the veal calves being slaughtered. Let them grow into more meat, and let those heifers produce a calf possibly the next year. We have to put this on some sort of a business basis. No one knows how long this war is going to last, and as for after the close of the war, we should give consideration at this time to the many countries that will need meat, and we should protect the female animals we have in the United States so that they will be available for breeding purposes to be sent abroad, so that those people in those countries may be able to start to produce something in the form of food for themselves, instead of having this country continue on the lend-lease basis. I am for the lend-lease program and I think that we will have to do something about it perhaps after the war is over to help some of those countries, but certainly we cannot go on continuing to slaughter our animals at the present time in the way we have, but we should start in and try to get an abundance of meat produced not only for our own people, but for many other countries that will be in the market for meat after the war is over.

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. ELMER. I would like to ask if the gentleman knows who was the fellow appointed to put a restriction on how many little pigs the old sow might have out in the barn lot?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; I could not tell you.

Mr. ELMER. Mordecai Ezekiel.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman spoke about being in favor of lend-lease. I presume we are all in favor of it, because we are in this thing and there is no way to get out of it now. While you California people are complaining, you heard the gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. O'TOOLE] last week make the same complaint that you are making today. That is, virtually the same complaint, the shortage of meat in Brooklyn and in New York. You are complaining on the other coast about a shortage of meat. How far are you going with lend-lease? There is a limit to the number of heifers, as you suggested a moment ago. How much will you send across and how

much will you keep at home? In the olden days we always kept a little seed corn and a little seed wheat. We kept something to start with.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I might say to the gentleman from Michigan that the proposed amount of meat that will be used for the armed forces and lease-lend in 1943 is 8,500,000,000 pounds.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is all right to use it for the armed forces. People are willing to go without any meat at all if it is for the armed forces, but when you are speaking of giving it to the civilian population in other lands, that is a different question.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Meat going under lease-lend today is not going for the civilian population in other countries. I asked the direct question. Practically all of it is being sent to the men in the fighting lines, to the Russians and to the English on the African front.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The fighting men, you mean?

Mr. ELLIOTT. To the fighting men. I asked the same question you asked of the Department on two different occasions. They assured me that as far as meat was concerned, lease-lend meat was going to the men in uniforms. As long as it is going there, I think it is good judgment for you and I to agree that that is the proper place for it to go, for it will save thousands of our own boys being placed on the fighting line.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No one has any objection to that. Now you were speaking about killing so many heifers. In our country at least, and I am sure in some of the other Northern States, like Wisconsin, a great dairy State, they have to have equipment in their barns. They have to have drinking cups. The water must be warmed and all that. They cannot get drinking cups. They cannot get piping to carry the water. They cannot get wire for the electricity. Until we can get those things those heifers are not going to do anything. They cannot. How are you going to help that?

Mr. ELLIOTT. As I said, some of this red tape must be erased in order to take care of many of these various things we are discussing, to correct them to the point where we can produce more, no matter whether it is beef cattle or hogs or other commodities.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not so critical of some of these people who are administering the program as some others, because I realize we are asking for three or four times what they have. There is something to be said along that line. But my point is that unless you keep the foundation here at home so that we can produce this stuff, it would not do any good to talk about sending it over there.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Is it not true, in line with the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] concerning the fact that cows are selling at a better price than steers, that this condition exists in Los Angeles County? Los Angeles County is considered one of the largest dairy counties in the United States. Even the distinguished professor from Wisconsin will admit that. They are discouraging the dairy industry there; in fact, encouraging the sale of dairy cows by having a lower ceiling price on fluid milk than in San Diego and in San Francisco. As a result the latest figures show that they are only milking the cows for 10 months, and then selling them on the butcher block. Of course, this not only discourages the dairy industry, but in the long run it will be very disastrous, because it is recognized that a cow is not at her height of production until she is 4 years old. I think that is another one of the short-sighted things that has been brought out in this O. P. A. program.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman. I might add that in 1942 in Los Angeles County you had 88,000 dairy cows, and you had an average kill of 5,000 head a month. In the county of Los Angeles that is what you killed. Those were top dairy cows that were brought in out of the valley. After they had reached the point of production it would not pay the farmer to feed the high-priced feeds they were compelled to feed, and those animals were slaughtered.

To bring out my point that we are still increasing livestock, the figures show that in 1941 in the United States we had all cattle, 71,461,000 head. Of that amount beef cattle amounted to 45,983,000.

Stock sheep, 54,283,000. We had stock hogs, 54,256,000.

In 1942, of all cattle in the United States, we had 74,607,000. Beef cattle, 48,304,000, or an increase of 3,000,000 over 1941. Hogs jumped from 54,000,000 to 60,000,000.

On January 1, 1943, we had over 76,000,000 head of cattle in the United States. Sheep dropped from 55,000,000 to 53,000,000. Why? The reason that sheep dropped was because the sheep herders were taken away from their herds and in order to comply with that issue, they were forced to sell a part of their flocks. So we have a loss of 2,000,000 sheep in the United States in the fall of 1942, owing to the fact of taking away the men who herd the sheep.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Would the gentleman agree that in all of these programs, price ceilings and everything else, there are two factors that the people in charge of them have to be required to take account of? On the one hand is to prevent the cost of living from spiraling, but on the other hand to make certain that it is possible for the producers to maintain maximum production of those commodities. Upon that almost everything depends. So would not the gentleman agree that every price ceiling regulation, all of the matters that will affect the manpower of agriculture and everything else, should be reviewed by somebody who knows something about that production angle?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. It might be well to recall that when the Executive message was sent to Congress on September 7, with reference to price ceilings on agricultural products, it set forth four objectives, and it placed as the first objective controlled prices, and as a second objective, or secondary thereto, ample agricultural production. It has never been the policy of the Price Control Administration to use their powers and prerogatives to increase the production of food; it has not even been their foremost objective to feed the people.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In view of the fact that O. P. A. has changed hands does the gentleman have any reason to believe that Mr. Brown can do any better than Henderson, whose administration we did not like, unless Brown or we get rid of some of Henderson's understudies?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am not in position to say at this time; but I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that if I were in charge of this program, I would do something different. They have operated this program or proposed to operate it in one form or another for the last 60 days. We have pointed out to them how serious the situation is on the west coast, that in some areas meat is not available for men working in shipbuilding plants and airplane manufacturing plants to the point that there may well be strikes on account of improper food. Notwithstanding that they tell us they can do nothing until after April 1. In other words, we have got to wait 4 months until they can work out a formula. If I were in charge of such an organization and 2 months had gone by without their being able to work out any kind of program but asking still another 2 months, I would begin firing people and employing others who could do something about the situation.

Twenty-three members of the California delegation, entirely unanimous as to the situation, 100 percent in accord on the situation, have told them as a delegation that the condition is very serious and that we expect them to do something about it whereby these workers can have some kind of meat made available for their tables whether it be 2 pounds, 2½ pounds, or some other quantity, but to date nothing has been done. It is a serious proposition.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] has made a very careful study of this situation. I ask him if it is not a fact that there is no shortage of animals in California available for slaughter at the present time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. A representative of the packing industry came here and made the statement that animals were available for slaughter. Then it was

brought to my attention that California did not produce more than the meat it consumed. I have here among my papers a table that shows 1,545,000 head of cattle slaughtered in California in 1941; we imported only 362,000. That is very different from saying that 50 percent of the cattle slaughtered in California were shipped in. The truth of the matter is that the percentage is much smaller.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do they not ship in cattle from Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Texas, and even from as far as Kansas City?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes; but after the animals are slaughtered, the processed meat is then shipped back into those States, Arizona particularly, to provide meat for those people.

Mr. HINSHAW. But there is no reason for the statement that there is a shortage of cattle at the present time, is there?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Many things are involved in answering that question. I personally believe there are plenty of cattle available. I feel that distribution is the main consideration, proper distribution, to see that everybody gets his just share; but what has this program done? It has brought about the black market. They are killing cattle, hogs, everything, any place they want to, practically. The people in the restaurant business and the hotel business can afford to pay twice as much as ordinary civilians can for it. He buys it, puts it on his menu, and charges just what he wants to. No ceiling has been placed upon him. The result is that the little fellow is being robbed right in the very start of the program. I cannot see what this thing is designed for, unless it is to put out of business practically every little slaughterhouse or packing house. I sometimes wonder if that is not what they are trying to do at the present time; drive the little fellow out of every business in the Nation. It is beginning to show up now in the packing industry.

Mr. OUTLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. In accordance with what the gentleman has just said, the evidence seems to be that there is either in California or nearby States a supply which would guarantee to the people there an amount at least comparable to what people in other States have, would the gentleman say that the situation could be partially solved by two steps:

First, increasing the percentage, the quota allowed for slaughter in California by some designated percentage, 10 or 15 percent out of the total amount made available; and, secondly, by limiting the proportion that could go to restaurants and hotels, thereby increasing the proportion to the individual buyer? Would these two steps be of value in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. ELLIOTT. They would be helpful; but remember that of the slaughter 70 percent is allocated for civilians, 30 percent goes to lend-lease and the armed services. All the slaughterhouse gets out of the animal is the ceiling price of 23.75 cents per pound allowed by the O. P. A., and which operation results in a loss. So he is in the position that when the lend-lease and the Army come along and want their 8,500,000,000 pounds of meat, the price is reduced 75 cents per 100 pounds, as those agencies buy in carload lots. Yet he has already lost $10 a head on every animal. Little by little the small packers are going out of business. He is not killing his 70-percent quota. I have a telegram here before me showing that in California 25 percent in some instances of the 70-percent slaughter is not being slaughtered at the present time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the gentleman has commented on this particular point, but I would like to hear him discuss it just a little further. I have in mind some of these small independent packers. There are two in the agricultural district that I represent which, of course, is not primarily a livestock area. Its principal interest in the past has been cotton and other crops, but in the last several years these little independent packers have come in there and have encouraged the people to grow livestock which they in turn bought from them.

In the last couple of years, where plants have come into that area, there has been a considerable increase in population. I have in mind, however, the area of one of them where I dare say the population has increased 25 to 30 percent, yet the amount of slaughter that that independent house can indulge in is cut down to this percentage which is set by the O. P. A. I have had the matter up with them and tried to get them to give an increase which would take care of the increased population, but they say, "No; we will let the slaughterhouses away from there ship in." Now, your independent house cannot buy the animals that have been grown right in that area, so the farmer is required to ship his stuff 150 or 200 miles away, have it killed, then that packing house ships back the meat.

Mr. ELLIOTT. By rail or on tires?

Mr. SPARKMAN. What difference does it make?

Mr. ELLIOTT. We are saving rubber, are we not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Any way they can get it there. The inevitable result will be that that farmer is going to quit growing that stuff because he cannot ship it to market and make anything out of it. In addition to that, this is at a time when transportation facilities, regardless of whether it is by truck or train, are in great demand, and there is a great shortage. The O. P. A. forces that condition upon us, and I think it is wholly unreasonable. Another result is going to be that the big packer is going to be made bigger and the little packer is going to be wiped out of business.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I want to state an instance to the gentleman from Alabama. In my congressional district we at one time had eight or nine bakeries operating in the valley. The O. P. A. set up their rules and regulations on the amount of sugar a bakery could have, and because those bakeries were not in a defense area they could only produce so much in the way of pastry and bread per day. But in Los Angeles the bakeries down there are in a defense area, and they can get all the sugar they want. So up over the mountain and around the hills come bakery wagons every day delivering bread into this valley in which the bakeries are shut down.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Perhaps the gentleman stated this or I perhaps misunderstood him. What was the element of time involved that the gentleman stated to the House relative to the possibility of the readjustment of the present condition that exists in California as it pertains to the meat problem?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will go back to that. The first time I talked to the Department they told me and every other Congressman it would be about January 1. We met again, I think, about the second week in January; that is, the California delegation, and we had before us seven members of the various agencies. They told us that the following Monday they would come back with some kind of a solution. On the following Monday they did come back but no solution. They agreed at that time that in a few days perhaps something would be worked out without fail. I was told last week that on Monday of this week they would be in my office and to have my committee there, that they thought they had something worked out that would be helpful. They told us this morning that it would be April 1 perhaps before they could give us any relief. In the meantime, going back to December, I asked early in December that an invitation be sent out to the packers and slaughterhouse men to come to Washington, sit down around the table and try to work out a solution that would give relief not only in our State but in many other States that are beginning to have trouble.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does not the gentleman feel that he cannot expect any responsive reaction from that specific department under 8 months?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is the way it begins to look.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I represent a district that has some packers in it. Before I came up here, I talked to some of them about the seriousness of the situation and their inability to supply the local demand for meat. I apprehend that that is what is taking place in California and other sections of the country.

Some of these gentlemen told me that a low limit has been placed on the slaughter. In other words, a packer who slaughters from 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 pounds will be restricted to a certain percentage of his previous slaughter. It seems to me if they would list the number of pounds a packer could put up before they put a quota on him that would enable these men to take care of the local situation and supply the meat to the people of many sections where they are not now getting meat.

The truth of the matter is that the large packers are getting Government orders and they are catering to that alone and not giving as much concern to the local communities as they should. If something is not done to help these small packers, as the gentleman says, they are going out of business and the local people are not going to have any source of meat supply.

Mr. ELLIOTT. One of the reasons is that even our armed forces cannot get meat at the present time. The Quartermaster General sat in my office this morning with representatives of various other Government agencies and made the statement that he is way behind in his Government purchases of meat for the armed forces. Why? There is a ceiling placed on meat of 23¾ cents a pound, yet the price of the live animal continues to rise. The packer is losing money. Today the animal hanging on the hook costs the average packer 26 cents a pound. The people in the O. P. A. say, "If it costs him 26 cents a pound, how can he operate?" The reason he can operate is that he has a large investment and he is hoping some formula will be worked out to remedy the situation, so he is taking a loss every day on each animal he kills, because if he stops his operations the men in his plant will get jobs in manufacturing plants some place producing airplanes or tanks or munitions, and when he comes to open up again he will have no men in his slaughterhouse. This situation is daily growing more serious.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does not the gentleman believe that unless something is done to help the small packers we are going to have a really serious shortage of meats?

Mr. ELLIOTT. You have to help both the small ones and the large ones.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The large packers think that they can supply the Army. They have proper inspection and they meet the requirements. The Army will buy from some of the large packers when it will not buy from the small packers.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true, but the Army and lend-lease together use only 8,500,000,000 pounds of meat a year. That is the estimate for 1943.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. There is no doubt what the gentleman says is true about the price they have to pay for the meat and what they can get for the finished product.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I have here a statement from Mr. Claude L. Safstrom, who is in the packing-house business in Los Angeles, which I should like to read:

1. SEVENTY-FIVE CENT REDUCTION ALLOWED ARMY

The meat packers desire that this reduction be eliminated for the reason that cattle costs so much more than the ceiling price on Grade A cattle in California that to allow this 75-cent reduction means an absolute net loss to the packer. In areas where the meat shortage is so acute there is no reason for the packer to be forced to allow any discount at the present time because the buyers are willing to go to the various plants for the purpose of picking up their meat purchases and pay cash for them at the top ceiling prices.

2. FIFTY-CENT DISCOUNT TO WHOLESALERS

The Vernon packers have been supplying these various wholesalers who operate refrigerator trucks through the outlying suburban sections of southern California where the big packer's truck did not previously make deliveries. These hundred or more wholesalers have been supplying approximately 1,500 little individual retail and grocery markets in metropolitan Los Angeles for years. Therefore, the 50-cent reduction which the Office of Price Administration forces the packers to give these wholesalers is working a great injustice at the present time. It has already caused practically all of the small individual markets to be completely out of stocks of meat for the past 6 weeks.

3. MEAT SHORTAGE IN CALIFORNIA

The meat shortage in California has been so acute that it has fostered the development of two kinds of bootleggers in the meat industry: One, the jobber who purchases live cattle in the stockyards at an exorbitant price and has them slaughtered by some local packer through the payment of an advance premium and then the dressed cattle are taken to his jobbing house, or retail markets, where he has to pierce his own ceilings to a great extent in order to obtain a return on his investment. Two, the operator who has a few retail stores and who bribes the cooler salesman in amounts ranging all the way from 5 to 10 cents a pound to secure a carcass of beef. These are concrete and substantiated facts, not mere hearsay.

4. THE LIVESTOCK PROBLEM

Wholesale cattle prices have risen to such a great extent that the present dress ceiling does not approach the cost to the packers of producing dressed animals for the Army or civilian trade. At the present time the packers are suffering considerable losses on their operations and the outlook is for a continuation of these losses unless the bootleg operators are stamped out of business. The most effective way that they can be stamped out, in the view of the packers, would be through the lifting of the quotas on meats throughout the United States for approximately 1 week or even 2 weeks and the subsequent application of general meat rationing. The packers believe this would solve the bootleg problem very quickly.

May I say to the gentleman from Missouri that earlier in my remarks I pointed out that although there was a ceiling of 23¾ cents a pound on dressed meat, 75 cents a hundred is taken off the price of the meat the Army and lend-lease purchase. So the small packer, although he is losing money, in view of the fact that he has to take off this 75 cents is not very happy about furnishing meat for the armed forces during the present meat shortage and limitation of slaughter to 70 percent, when he has a market for his meat and can get the full 23¾ cents a pound for it. That is one of the things that is happening today that should be corrected immediately. You can talk to the Quartermaster Corps and they will say that they are short millions of pounds of meat they should have at the present time, due to the fact that it is not available. The small packer is losing money and does not want to go further into the hole $15 on every ton of meat he actually handles, and that is what he loses selling to the armed services and lend-lease.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It seems to me somebody down at the O. P. A. ought to get busy and do something to relieve the civilian population of our country. If that is not done, we are going to be confronted with a very, very serious situation.

I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a telegram which pertains to meat deliveries to our armed forces:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 31, 1943.*
CLAUDE SAFSTROM,
*Care Mayflower Hotel,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Have delivered 400,000 pounds of meat to Army in January. Have 150,000 pounds to deliver first 10 days February. Losing average $10 head. Cannot assume future contract obligations under present market conditions. Also have cut down civilian quota. Cannot compete with black-market bidders. Last month's results disastrous.

QUALITY MEAT PACKING CO.,
HYMAN ROSEN.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. COSTELLO. I understand that in spite of the conferences that the delegation has had with the Office of Price Administration, and the late conference even this morning, the result is that they have no program and do not now intend to take any particular action.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. COSTELLO. And all that we have to do is to wait until rationing begins sometime later in the year, in April.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. COSTELLO. In other words, between now and April the people of that part of the country must suffer for want of food, and the armed forces of the country will not be able to get enough food, adequate for the Army. It seems to me that is rather a pitiable condition, that after a full month's deliberation we have not made any progress with these officials, and that they are still unwilling to take any course whatever to alleviate the situation. It seems to me rather ridiculous.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will say in closing that I believe that the time has come when Congress should act and not sit around here and do nothing, when we have a serious condition affecting one or two States at the present time, and that we should move in force and correct the situation. We should not go along here and continue to wait for a bunch of boys down there who are pushing pencils around a table, who seem to know all of the answers to everything and who at the same time do not want to do anything to correct the situation. We have suggested many remedies and we certainly should get a release of the quotas at the present time and give the people

plenty of meat until their rationing program goes into effect. When they refuse to do that, they are refusing the American people proper cooperation.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. BUFFETT. The California delegation, as I understand it, spoke of having lower rates on dressed beef. I come from a large stock-producing area, and those people out there try to find ways and means of shipping more meat to California and they find that an unfair situation results from much higher rates on dressed beef, as opposed to beef on the hoof. And, of course, they are interested in the shipping of the most meat with the least cost of transportation.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman is from Nebraska?

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Last week cattle was shipped on the hoof from Nebraska to California.

Mr. BUFFETT. That the gentleman will agree is a poor method of shipping beef to get the maximum amount of meat for the minimum amount of transportation.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes. An Army officer said that they would purchase beef in Kansas City and Chicago and Omaha if available, but at the present time beef there is not available, because the packing-house men do not want to sell at a reduction of 75 cents a hundred they have to take. That is one of the difficulties at the present time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert certain letters and telegrams that I referred to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] for 10 minutes.

### THE MEAT SHORTAGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the people of America have long taken pride in our ability to produce. We have especially emphasized the productive capacity of our mills, our mines, and our factories. We have awarded the Army and Navy E to plants all over this broad land. Industry has spent millions of dollars for newspaper advertisements, patting itself on the back over its productive achievements. Organized labor has crowded the largest hotel lobbies and convention halls of America with meetings to proclaim the outstanding contribution of its members in bringing about this great industrial production. High officers of the Army and Navy, from Cabinet Members down, have given public recognition at ship launchings, plant openings, and on regular holidays to the debt that our country owed to industry and labor. I find no fault with this deserved recognition of a job well done. It is, however, most unfortunate that there has been no corresponding public recognition of the vital contribution that has been made to our war effort by the third of our population who till the soil. On the contrary, the Army, the Navy, big business, and big labor organizations have all assumed that the farmer, himself, like the farmer's mule, could be expected to toil from sun to sun without recognition and with most meager reward.

Mr. Speaker, I was reared far out in the country, 30 miles from the nearest railroad. I have been closely associated with agriculture all my life. I represent one of the great farm districts of the Nation. I think I can fairly say that I know that the farmer will, to the absolute limit of his ability, contribute to the needs of his Nation, but even as the mule must look to the farmer he serves for adequate food and shelter if he is to be able to pull the plow, so must the farmer look to the Nation he serves for adequate economic sustenance if he is to perform the vital task assigned him. This Nation has not given the producers of food, fiber, and feed the economic sustenance that they must have if they are to meet our war needs. We have recognized the importance of giving every other class in this Nation adequate financial return for the work they do, but we still seem to assume that the ordinary laws of economics do not apply to farmers, or else we are dangerously deceiving ourselves as to the farmer's true condition.

Some years ago we decided that the men working in the coal mines of America were not receiving an adequate wage. About the same time it was recognized that those who worked on the railroads must receive a higher wage to enable them to maintain a proper standard of living. Having decided that the wages of those groups should in justice be raised, we followed our decision to its logical conclusion. We recognized that neither the coal-mine operators nor the railroads could pay the higher wages unless we increased the income of the mine operators and the income of the railroads. We therefore established the Bituminous Coal Commission for the avowed purpose of raising the price of coal, to enable the mine operators to pay the miners a higher wage. The Interstate Commerce Commission deliberately raised railroad freight rates all over this Nation to enable the railroads to pay higher wages. Thus the people who buy coal and the things that are made through the use of coal paid the increased wages of the miners. The people who ship goods by rail and the people who buy those goods—and that is everybody, including the farmer—paid and are still paying the increased wages granted to the railroad workers.

After all, that is the only logical way in which those raises of wages could be given. But at the very time that we allowed those raises the agricultural workers of America were working for a wage far lower than any man in any mine or on any railroad received; they were in fact the lowest paid group of workers in all this broad land—then and now. They were neither organized nor skilled. At that time there was no particular demand for their labor anywhere, and the result was that agricultural labor received no consideration whatever. Today this labor on the farms of this country is in demand. There is competition. Our great war industries want this labor. They are beginning to offer a higher wage for the so-called unskilled labor from the farms. These laborers are often highly skilled in the production of food, but they are leaving the farms today, leaving the farms to go into industry, to go into the factories, to go into the mills; doing the same thing that you and I would do if we were in the place of that fellow who is trying to make a living for his wife and six children, struggling along on some farm. You and I would do the same thing, but it is the very thing which the Nation cannot afford to see done.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I have just received a telegram from my district saying that the employment office of the Government was, down in that great agricultural section where farming operations are just getting under way and where we are going to need all of the manpower possible to produce what the rich soil down in that alluvial valley will produce, recruiting men and taking them to San Francisco, Calif., or to Oakland, to work in a shipbuilding plant out there, at a higher wage than our farmers can pay down there. That is the inducement they are offering—higher wages and ideal housing conditions, and they are recruiting hundreds of farm laborers from that section. We are going to be left down there to try to produce an all-out crop to meet this war emergency, and our manpower depleted, taken to another section of the country. I wonder if the gentleman can suggest what can be done to stop a foolish practice like that?

Mr. POAGE. I can only suggest that in the first place it is but another evidence of the stupidity of the bureaus and commissions, that has been so well discussed on this floor during the preceding hour. It is but another evidence of the unwillingness of some of those who hold high positions in this Government to recognize that agriculture is the most vital industry in this Nation today. You cannot stop the submarine menace by making the American crews that man the cargo vessels go hungry. Nor is there going to be much need to stop the submarine menace if you do not have any food to send in the ship that those submarines are trying to sink.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Surely, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I notice in the noon edition of one of the Washington papers the following:

> Expected demands by 450,000 bituminous coal miners for a one dollar-a-day wage increase without regard for the War Labor Board's Little Steel formula.

Would the gentleman explain to me how the administration—and you will probably be branded and so will I as a

labor baiter—but will you explain how the administration is going to continue to raise the wages of coal miners and all of the other workers in industrial plants, and keep the farms operating and still get food?

Mr. POAGE. No. I will not explain it to the gentleman because I know, as the gentleman knows, that it cannot be done. There is no administration that can pull those sleight-of-hand stunts and still feed the Nation. Of course, this country has had enough to eat in recent years because there was not any opportunity for that fellow out on the farm except simply to stay there with his mule and plow from daylight to dark.

But when he has the opportunity to go, as the gentleman from Missouri has so well pointed out, not only the opportunity but has an invitation extended to him by his Government to go, and work under ideal labor conditions in sunny California, of which we have so recently heard, and draw what seems to him to be fabulous wages—more in 1 week's time than he has made sometimes in a full year—of course that man who has been growing the food for this Nation is going to accept the position. Millions of them have already gone and the tragedy of it is that we apparently never awoke to it until the horse was stolen and those whose labor is necessary to make next year's crops have already left the fields and have gone to the shipyards and airplane factories and munition plants.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. POAGE. Surely.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Last week came a letter from a farmer in one of the agricultural counties in my district in which he asked me this question. He said:

> My neighbors are going down to Benton Harbor and St. Joe—

That is less than 20 miles away—

> to work in the factories and the shipyards there. What do you think I should do for my own best interest, stay with my wife on the farm, go out in the snows and tend the cows and the chickens, or go with my neighbors to take a job in the factory? What would you do if you were in my place?

What is the answer to that letter?

Mr. POAGE. The answer is the same as the answer I have to make to my own people.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There are thousands of them doing the same thing.

Mr. POAGE. And doing it all over the land.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then how are you going to feed the Army?

Mr. POAGE. The answer is evident, that we are not going to feed either the Army or the civilian population unless we change our ways. Those who seem to think we can secure increased farm production have ignored the most serious problem this country is facing; nor can it properly be answered by saying as so many would like to say that we will simply "freeze" the labor on the farm. I cannot believe that any Member of this House with elemental justice in his soul would advocate compelling some man to stay on a dairy farm up in the district of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], getting up at 3 o'clock these cold mornings, going out, doing the milking, and staying out till long after dark for a wage amounting to only a small fraction of what he might secure working in some well-heated pleasant factory for 8 hours a day. No, we have no right to say to the farm boys that they must put up with all those inconveniences, that they must accept a lower standard of living than their brothers in the city; this Congress has no right to say it. We owe it to those boys to say to them that we will treat them the same as we treat the others who toil for the Nation in our factories, in our mines, and in our mills.

We should pay the man on the farm a fair wage. I know there are those of you who are going to say: "But, Mr. POAGE, I want him to be paid a fair wage." That is all right, but, after all, the farmer who employs him must pay him his wages, and, of course, as a practical matter every worker on the farm must be paid, directly or indirectly, out of the products of the farm on which he toils. In many cases however the farmer for whom the laborer works is hardly making a living himself and simply cannot pay a higher wage no matter how just the worker's demands may be or how willing the farmer may be to increase his wages. If the farmer does not have the income he can no more increase the wages of that farm laborer than could the railroads of this country raise railroad wages without an increase in their freight rates.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In connection with the subject the gentleman has been discussing, while we received the news that the Federal Employment Agency is down in our section recruiting some of our farm labor and taking it out to California to work in the shipyards, we are advised from a responsible source that the Farm Security Administration, an agency of the Department of Agriculture, is down there now inaugurating a plan to move people from the submarginal sections at the expense of the Government back into that section to supply farm labor. In other words, one agency of the Government is moving the people out while another agency is moving them in from other sections of the country temporarily to do this work. What does the gentleman think about a program like that?

Mr. POAGE. I think it is exactly like the story of the grand old Duke of York, who had 10,000 men. He marched them up a very steep hill and then he marched them down again. I think that is exactly what our Government is trying to do. The quicker we get to marching on level land in a straight direction the quicker we shall reach our destination. I think that at the present time there is altogether too much disposition to overlook the fact that all agricultural wages must come out of the sale price of products of the farm; that regardless of whether the worker is a day laborer, a sharecropper, a tenant, or the landlord, his wage must be paid from the price that the products of that farm bring in the market and that economically there is no other way whereby wages can be paid.

Therefore, we must recognize that all wages, including the wages of the farm operator and his family, must be included in the price of the farm product. That is a thing that so many would like to overlook or pass over lightly without consideration. We should recognize that the wages of the farm operator and his family must, if we are to have an honest calculation of prices, be included in the price of the farm products.

At this time we do not include any wages. We seem to assume that the farmer can do what no other producer has ever been able to do, that is to ignore the cost of production. To correct this situation your Committee on Agriculture has just reported a bill, which I trust will be before the House in the next few days, providing for the inclusion of all wages, the wages of the operator, the wages of all who toil on the farm, in the calculation of parity prices for the product sold from that farm. This bill should be passed without a moment's delay.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, unless we abandon our entire economic philosophy, which I have understood was based upon the theory of private property and actuated by the profit motive, then we must recognize that fundamental justice requires us to include in any fair estimate of a price level for farm products the wages payable to those who toil to produce the goods. If we are unwilling to accept—and for my part I am unwilling to accept—the communistic doctrine that we should not look to private property or profit, then we must grant our farmers this consideration or we must face a most serious food shortage. As a matter of fact, I think that we all recognize that we have already waited too long—that no matter what we do at this late date we are going to be faced with a serious shortage of certain items of food. The hour is late, but it is never too late to do justice, and we can prevent an even more serious shortage during the coming years if we act now.

When the American people recognized that they had to produce ships, that they had to produce guns, bombs, and airplanes, what did they do? Acting through the War Department and other agencies of Government, they took steps to make the production of these items attractive to both industry and to labor. We applied the fundamentals of the profit system. It may well be charged that there was very little democracy in the way this was handled, because, as I understand it, the negotiations were carried on with only the big corporations

and the big labor groups. But there was a sound application of the profit system, and it got results.

Just as an illustration, let me take an illustration from my own district. We have a shell-loading plant. What happened? The Government went to the National Gypsum Co., which was simply a large manufacturer. It had never manufactured shells. The Government said, "Mr. Gypsum Company, how about making shells for us?" The company said, "Why, we have never made shells; we are not in that business and we do not know anything about that." "Oh, that is all right. The Government will teach you how to make shells."

The company said, "We have not any plant in which to make shells. Our plants were established for an entirely different purpose and we do not want to convert or rebuild them."

"That is all right. The Government will build you a plant and the Government will pay for it."

"But we don't want to buy a shell plant. We would not want it after the war is over."

The Government answered, "The Government will never make you pay for it, and if you want it after the war you can have it at salvage prices."

Still the company demurred: "But we do not know what it would cost us to make shells. We do not know how we can make an intelligent bid."

Said the Government, "That does not make any difference. We will give you a contract and guarantee you a profit regardless of what it costs you. Do not let that bother you."

Well, the company might have one more objection. "We do not know about the labor question. Can we get the labor?"

"Oh, you can pay any price that is necessary to get the labor and the Government will let that be included in your cost."

With that kind of proposition, those people could not turn it down. Neither could you nor I or any other businessman. So they took the contract. The same thing has happened all over this country. You could not expect industry to reject that sort of proposition.

When they went to get labor they faced the proposition that the Government had already been competing in the labor market to build camps and other structures around over the country. How was the company to handle the situation? Pay enough to get it. Make a contract with one of the big labor organizations to get their members to pay them wages that will be attractive, no matter how high the going scale is. That was done. Why should industry bother? The Government was going to pay the bill. Why should the labor organizations bother about it? Some of those men did not know a saw from a hydraulic jack, but they all paid their initiation dues into the union, the Government paid the wages, the corporation got its profit, and shells were made.

We are getting industrial production, through a rather expensive method, a rather undemocratic method, but nonetheless an effective method and we are getting results. We are paying the bills, but we are getting industrial production. I do not mean to be critical of what happened in the way of industrial production because we are getting production and that is the big thing.

What happened then? After big business got all the contracts it wanted, after big labor got all the work it needed to supply employment at good wages to all of its members, then big business and big labor got together and said, "Now, then, we want to freeze the situation right where it is. We want to freeze prices."

Whose prices? Not the prices big business gets. Those prices are fixed by Government contracts that take care of all cost factors. Not the prices big labor got. They had contracts taking care of their people. They had Government boards to allow increases. They had exemption in the law. Whose prices were they going to freeze? Why, the farmer's prices, the man who is producing the food and the raiment, and the wages of the man who works for him, and the prices of little businessmen all over the country. That is who they froze. That is who has been affected by your ceiling prices.

If you want to get production on your farms, may I suggest that there is one way in which we can get it, and as far as I know, only one way; that is, to treat the farmer like you treat any other businessman in this country. Farm prices today are little more than half what they were 23 years ago, yet industrial wages are three times what they were during that period. At the same time, they tell us that farm wages must not go up or more accurately they say that while farm wages should go up that farm prices out of which these wages must be paid, if they are paid, must be held down. There is no way of letting farm wages go up without letting farm prices go up, too.

If we are to continue to pursue this short-sighted policy, it is my firm conviction that this Nation is absolutely certain to find itself within the course of another year unable to feed not only our allies but our own people. I do not believe the Members of this House realize the desperate seriousness of the situation or we would be demanding as one man that this legislation to do justice to our farmers and give us an opportunity to produce the feed and food and fiber that we need be brought out on this floor so that we might give it a unanimous vote, to do justice to our farmers and to assure our people of a reasonable supply of food in the months to come.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose we had proceeded on the theory that we should have had a reasonable price for tanks and airplanes and guns first, and adequate production of those implements afterward; would we have produced many of them?

Mr. POAGE. I doubt it. I want the gentleman to understand that I have not criticized the fact that we have purchased the tanks and the airplanes and the guns at a high cost.

Mr. CURTIS. Neither have I. Is it not true that the reverse has been true with food? We have said we must have reasonable prices first and adequate production afterward.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. We have emphasized price rather than production. It is just as important to emphasize production of food as to emphasize production of industrial products.

Mr. CURTIS. Should not the Price Control Act be an instrument to produce food rather than to destroy it?

Mr. POAGE. In my opinion, it fails of its fundamental purpose if it is not so used as to encourage the production of food. It is surely much more important to have plenty of food, even at a higher price if necessary, than it is to keep the legal price of food low but have no food to buy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

RENT CONTROL

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 1943, I addressed this House on rent control. On January 19, 1943, I submitted certain correspondence regarding rent control. Now I want to quote herewith resolution 3128, adopted January 13, 1943, by the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco:

Whereas there exists in San Francisco at the present time an acute housing shortage due to an influx of war workers; and

Whereas we are informed by Federal and industrial authorities that increasingly large numbers of war workers will come to San Francisco during the next few months; and

Whereas, due to exigencies of wartime, new housing accommodations are not being erected; and

Whereas additional housing space to be made available by the National Housing Administration will probably be insufficient; and

Whereas there are thousands of apartment units in San Francisco which are not accommodating the maximum number of occupants; and

Whereas San Franciscans will undoubtedly be called upon to share their housing facilities wherever possible; and

Whereas, under present Office of Price Administration rental regulations, tenants are not permitted to pay nor landlords allowed to charge for extra occupants within a rental unit; and

Whereas a modification of the existing Office of Price Administration regulations with respect to additional occupancy will bring about more cooperation between tenant and landlord, thereby creating additional shelter: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, on behalf of the people of San Francisco, realizing and recognizing the vital importance of this problem, does hereby memorialize the Rent Control Division of the Office of Price Administration to amend this regulation in order to permit a reasonable charge for additional tenant occupancy; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the proper Federal agencies, our congressional and senatorial representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PRODUCTION OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the dairy business is appreciated when we realize that it represents some 20 percent of the national farm income. It is not necessary to call your attention to the fact that the low prices received for manufactured dairy products from 1930 to 1940 were even lower than the 1909–14 prices. This is not the time to try to correct any injustices of the past. Even in 1941 when the program to increase production for lease-lend was launched, cheese was only 16-plus cents per pound and butter only 32-plus cents per pound.

The question today is, what are the facts as to the possibility of producing 122,000,000,000 pounds of milk—the goal for 1943. The goal was 125,000,000,000 in 1942 and 119,000,000,000 pounds were produced—the only agricultural goal that was not attained.

WHAT IS THE STATISTICAL PICTURE?

BUTTER

The production of butter from 1930 to 1942 is listed in the following official table:

TABLE A.—*Creamery butter: Production in factories, United States, 1930–41* [1]

| Year | January | February | March | April | May | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* |
| 1930 | 108,382 | 102,252 | 115,679 | 133,271 | 184,385 | 189,788 | 167,559 | 137,420 | 122,580 | 120,247 | 101,974 | 111,694 | 1,595,231 |
| 1931 [1] | 118,354 | 109,596 | 126,792 | 145,367 | 183,783 | 194,256 | 161,296 | 140,395 | 120,936 | 126,569 | 117,035 | 123,073 | 1,667,452 |
| 1932 | 124,320 | 124,894 | 133,095 | 141,741 | 186,607 | 190,644 | 163,370 | 149,625 | 127,386 | 121,819 | 109,790 | 120,841 | 1,694,132 |
| 1933 | 130,245 | 122,322 | 133,266 | 138,306 | 191,098 | 201,969 | 176,829 | 166,562 | 140,038 | 130,454 | 115,215 | 116,384 | 1,762,688 |
| 1934 | 119,775 | 111,381 | 127,476 | 136,482 | 177,980 | 185,396 | 174,943 | 165,190 | 143,761 | 133,817 | 112,577 | 105,930 | 1,694,708 |
| 1935 | 106,056 | 100,512 | 110,166 | 129,482 | 179,879 | 199,696 | 184,161 | 159,285 | 141,786 | 119,748 | 96,462 | 105,147 | 1,632,380 |
| 1936 | 110,666 | 108,744 | 121,543 | 133,290 | 177,847 | 190,699 | 156,463 | 141,556 | 133,021 | 135,493 | 111,535 | 108,550 | 1,629,407 |
| 1937 | 107,957 | 102,963 | 121,074 | 131,396 | 181,700 | 198,191 | 171,687 | 147,069 | 128,266 | 118,878 | 103,242 | 111,548 | 1,623,971 |
| 1938 | 116,122 | 112,340 | 128,735 | 147,628 | 197,259 | 202,528 | 185,099 | 168,688 | 151,081 | 136,999 | 116,841 | 122,852 | 1,786,172 |
| 1939 | 130,671 | 124,650 | 142,550 | 147,525 | 197,089 | 202,549 | 182,151 | 167,038 | 133,755 | 123,243 | 112,251 | 118,265 | 1,781,737 |
| 1940 | 129,558 | 128,143 | 140,730 | 153,628 | 195,332 | 206,555 | 187,687 | 167,704 | 146,247 | 136,812 | 117,783 | 126,647 | 1,836,826 |
| 1941 | 135,178 | 129,839 | 147,542 | 162,525 | 214,241 | 210,285 | 194,646 | 168,823 | 146,465 | 133,731 | 112,601 | 116,730 | 1,872,606 |
| 1942 [2] | 119,825 | 118,020 | 135,920 | 149,585 | 203,360 | 203,860 | 188,665 | 169,620 | 140,130 | 126,265 | 107,480 | 119,500 | 1,782,230 |

[1] Beginning 1931 includes whey butter.

[2] Estimates, subject to revision.

Source: Dairy and poultry separate from agriculture statistics, 1941.

Please note that the above table indicates the total national production has been rather well maintained in spite of the diversions of milk to cheese, evaporated milk, and for fluid milk consumption. The cold-storage holdings or stock piles, for the years 1931 to 1942, are shown by the following official table:

TABLE B.—*Creamery butter: Cold-storage holdings, United States, 1931–41* [1]

| Year | Jan. 1 | Feb. 1 | Mar. 1 | Apr. 1 | May 1 | June 1 | July 1 | Aug. 1 | Sept. 1 | Oct. 1 | Nov. 1 | Dec. 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* |
| 1931 | 63,401 | 46,792 | 30,672 | 18,010 | 17,195 | 35,155 | 89,172 | 115,121 | 104,678 | 80,152 | 56,229 | 42,242 |
| 1932 | 26,643 | 22,506 | 15,243 | 9,094 | 10,394 | 29,160 | 84,269 | 110,247 | 107,259 | 89,490 | 66,828 | 37,207 |
| 1933 | 22,043 | 17,833 | 11,580 | 9,255 | 9,398 | 35,159 | 106,378 | 150,934 | 175,476 | 174,713 | 160,463 | 138,166 |
| 1934 | 111,249 | 75,995 | 36,853 | 15,351 | 11,838 | 27,161 | 70,148 | 108,748 | 120,467 | 125,047 | 111,073 | 81,034 |
| 1935 | 47,175 | 18,907 | 8,110 | 5,341 | 5,676 | 33,096 | 96,392 | 149,628 | 156,855 | 148,822 | 120,210 | 71,948 |
| 1936 | 40,117 | 21,502 | 8,217 | 5,346 | 4,997 | 21,157 | 73,816 | 103,259 | 112,106 | 108,835 | 105,368 | 88,866 |
| 1937 | 61,234 | 42,734 | 20,678 | 6,700 | 6,406 | 22,904 | 83,119 | 123,863 | 134,885 | 118,697 | 98,624 | 66,191 |
| 1938 | 42,953 | 31,211 | 21,167 | 14,947 | [2] 20,144 | 55,266 | 121,467 | 173,257 | 201,252 | 210,703 | 195,263 | 160,632 |
| 1939 | 128,770 | 111,354 | 92,780 | 78,909 | 70,909 | 84,437 | 131,609 | 165,183 | 172,825 | 154,594 | 128,111 | 89,783 |
| 1940 | 55,462 | 29,189 | 18,366 | 8,875 | 9,504 | 25,463 | 81,005 | 123,628 | 134,266 | 128,087 | 105,106 | 67,598 |
| 1941 | 41,497 | 29,715 | 16,462 | 8,983 | 17,795 | 56,792 | 120,246 | 178,493 | 200,228 | 202,957 | 186,635 | 152,484 |
| 1942 | 114,436 | 83,106 | 63,701 | 45,045 | 37,228 | 64,720 | 117,111 | 148,504 | 152,198 | 123,599 | 86,981 | [2] 45,937 |

[1] Quantities given are net weights.

[2] Preliminary.

Source: Dairy and poultry separate from Agricultural Statistics, 1941.

On January 1, 1943, there were only 25,154,000 pounds in storage, or, as you will note, the least for many years.

CHEESE

American cheese production has come into greater prominence for lease-lend, for domestic consumption, and now for Mr. Lehman's program.

It is estimated that 500,000,000 pounds are needed for lease-lend, and 100,000,000 pounds for Mr. Lehman. This would leave about 300,000,000 pounds for domestic consumption, or considerable reduction in the per capita consumption.

The following official table shows the annual production for the years 1930 to 1942:

TABLE C.—*Cheese, whole-milk American Cheddar: Production in factories, United States, 1930–41*

| Year | January | February | March | April | May | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* |
| 1930 | 23,666 | 23,031 | 28,502 | 34,143 | 48,545 | 53,887 | 45,582 | 33,555 | 26,705 | 23,581 | 18,781 | 18,838 | 378,816 |
| 1931 | 21,941 | 22,018 | 27,571 | 32,940 | 44,439 | 49,513 | 40,595 | 32,956 | 29,139 | 30,470 | 23,016 | 20,050 | 374,648 |
| 1932 | 20,895 | 21,993 | 25,484 | 29,706 | 41,933 | 48,534 | 40,205 | 34,796 | 31,510 | 29,267 | 23,601 | 22,819 | 370,743 |
| 1933 | 24,877 | 23,868 | 28,571 | 32,356 | 43,564 | 54,653 | 48,206 | 42,857 | 35,620 | 29,864 | 21,016 | 23,179 | 408,631 |
| 1934 | 24,573 | 24,867 | 30,915 | 36,546 | 48,858 | 55,610 | 51,126 | 45,211 | 37,983 | 33,987 | 24,824 | 20,991 | 435,491 |
| 1935 | 22,197 | 21,919 | 26,914 | 32,825 | 48,926 | 60,560 | 55,238 | 53,101 | 49,053 | 42,114 | 28,811 | 27,341 | 468,999 |
| 1936 | 28,881 | 26,211 | 30,804 | 35,324 | 53,008 | 64,145 | 51,029 | 45,228 | 44,933 | 45,629 | 33,088 | 29,296 | 487,576 |
| 1937 | 28,515 | 27,765 | 32,262 | 39,061 | 56,268 | 64,454 | 55,706 | 48,824 | 42,701 | 38,875 | 30,209 | 27,401 | 492,041 |
| 1938 | 30,535 | 30,670 | 38,884 | 48,469 | 70,263 | 74,363 | 65,881 | 55,682 | 44,277 | 43,069 | 30,173 | 28,276 | 560,542 |
| 1939 | 29,575 | 28,900 | 36,311 | 43,649 | 62,189 | 70,739 | 61,884 | 54,895 | 46,046 | 40,687 | 31,662 | 30,761 | 537,298 |
| 1940 | 32,280 | 33,945 | 41,704 | 48,996 | 67,702 | 77,343 | 68,321 | 59,776 | 53,460 | 47,923 | 36,073 | 35,267 | 602,790 |
| 1941 | 38,329 | 37,830 | 47,086 | 56,155 | 81,960 | 85,022 | 78,050 | 75,972 | 70,824 | 66,996 | 56,347 | 58,551 | 753,122 |
| 1942 [1] | 62,350 | 62,505 | 77,215 | 88,810 | 117,085 | 110,430 | 97,005 | 87,225 | 70,675 | 58,800 | 43,170 | 45,200 | 918,470 |

[1] Estimates, subject to revision.

Source: Dairy and poultry separate from agricultural statistics, 1941.

Please note that the production of American cheese has shown the remarkable increase of about 50 percent in the last 2 years. In addition, the United States produced about 50,000,000 pounds of Swiss cheese, 25,000,000 pounds of brick cheese, and a large amount of Limburger, Italian, blue, and other foreign types of cheeses. These producers of the foreign-type cheeses have been called upon to fill the demands of the domestic market formerly supplied by imports. The following table shows the cold-storage holdings, or the stock piles, of cheese from 1931 to January 1, 1943:

TABLE D.—*Cheese, American: Cold-storage holdings, United States, 1931–41* [1]

AMERICAN [2]

| Year | Jan. 1 | Feb. 1 | Mar. 1 | Apr. 1 | May 1 | June 1 | July 1 | Aug. 1 | Sept. 1 | Oct. 1 | Nov. 1 | Dec. 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* |
| 1931 | 67,599 | 58,516 | 52,304 | 45,277 | 44,792 | 46,764 | 63,156 | 73,693 | 73,740 | 70,940 | 69,611 | 66,053 |
| 1932 | 60,804 | 54,360 | 47,106 | 42,009 | 38,951 | 40,461 | 53,922 | 63,667 | 66,721 | 68,555 | 66,813 | 62,392 |
| 1933 | 57,749 | 53,532 | 46,992 | 41,625 | 37,321 | 41,336 | 67,456 | 82,771 | 94,394 | 99,326 | 95,831 | 85,146 |
| 1934 | 77,773 | 65,476 | 54,934 | 49,856 | 52,217 | 58,073 | 79,925 | 97,018 | 103,805 | 108,624 | 102,832 | 96,688 |
| 1935 | 89,878 | 71,007 | 60,943 | 54,769 | 46,593 | 48,320 | 64,395 | 82,397 | 92,767 | 102,661 | 100,670 | 92,912 |
| 1936 | 86,537 | 78,197 | 68,363 | 62,261 | 55,756 | 56,946 | 70,282 | 80,735 | 90,471 | 98,206 | 102,847 | 98,975 |
| 1937 | 95,418 | 88,091 | 80,713 | 73,822 | 70,584 | 71,603 | 89,191 | 100,418 | 105,026 | 101,178 | 97,160 | 93,633 |
| 1938 | 89,258 | 80,479 | 73,815 | 66,361 | 65,767 | 79,345 | 99,676 | 114,607 | 127,862 | 121,423 | 115,351 | 109,738 |
| 1939 | 102,563 | 90,401 | 77,270 | 68,812 | 62,866 | 64,750 | 81,805 | 98,659 | 104,524 | 98,419 | 94,694 | 91,035 |
| 1940 | 87,601 | 75,678 | 66,970 | 61,983 | 65,386 | 73,603 | 96,920 | 116,847 | 126,315 | 128,104 | 124,783 | 119,331 |
| 1941 | 113,074 | 109,820 | 105,153 | 97,496 | 94,602 | 102,869 | 121,064 | 139,568 | 151,906 | 156,746 | 157,468 | 158,238 |
| 1942 | 171,869 | 137,276 | 133,140 | 165,704 | 182,613 | 200,460 | 228,478 | 261,535 | 243,596 | 224,861 | 169,913 | [3] 134,332 |

[1] Quantities given are net weight.
[2] The term "American cheese" is intended to cover only those varieties known as twins, flats, daisies, Cheddars, longhorns, and square prints. It does not therefore include all kinds of cheese made in the United States.
[3] Preliminary.
Source: Dairy and poultry separate from Agricultural Statistics, 1941.

There were 112,716,000 pounds in storage on January 1, 1943.

EVAPORATED MILK

The following official table shows the production of evaporated milk from 1931 to 1943:

TABLE E.—*Production: Evaporated milk, case goods, unskimmed*

| Year | Jan. 1 | Feb. 1 | Mar. 1 | Apr. 1 | May 1 | June 1 | July 1 | Aug. 1 | Sept. 1 | Oct. 1 | Nov. 1 | Dec. 1 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* |
| 1931 | 104,038 | 108,929 | 128,276 | 147,243 | 181,982 | 177,078 | 128,842 | 95,205 | 83,254 | 99,355 | 85,949 | 88,842 | 1,428,993 |
| 1932 | 99,843 | 105,308 | 128,058 | 149,255 | 191,116 | 191,592 | 157,894 | 134,797 | 113,025 | 105,594 | 92,513 | 101,617 | 1,570,612 |
| 1933 | 116,947 | 109,622 | 145,706 | 176,195 | 213,174 | 220,253 | 179,204 | 154,595 | 129,399 | 113,258 | 73,592 | 84,755 | 1,716,700 |
| 1934 | 97,752 | 97,669 | 127,279 | 148,674 | 189,096 | 208,978 | 192,643 | 173,260 | 146,883 | 134,189 | 101,183 | 93,964 | 1,711,570 |
| 1935 | 113,393 | 121,134 | 146,500 | 177,264 | 236,512 | 252,831 | 202,274 | 160,522 | 134,809 | 105,710 | 86,337 | 101,604 | 1,838,890 |
| 1936 | 117,253 | 113,951 | 148,174 | 178,657 | 235,361 | 254,858 | 200,279 | 181,269 | 184,136 | 186,141 | 129,736 | 114,004 | 2,043,759 |
| 1937 | 119,152 | 126,509 | 153,290 | 184,829 | 239,136 | 252,535 | 205,752 | 162,506 | 138,376 | 124,126 | 92,322 | 104,012 | 1,902,545 |
| 1938 | 127,302 | 131,765 | 171,440 | 203,249 | 285,673 | 278,601 | 227,443 | 185,808 | 151,122 | 125,000 | 102,056 | 114,739 | 2,104,198 |
| 1939 | 131,320 | 139,717 | 179,848 | 203,867 | 263,215 | 268,840 | 226,600 | 190,902 | 158,271 | 144,568 | 123,694 | 139,759 | 2,170,601 |
| 1940 | 158,212 | 171,125 | 201,286 | 225,606 | 273,824 | 293,173 | 259,114 | 229,696 | 197,991 | 171,881 | 134,192 | 148,568 | 2,464,668 |
| 1941 | 172,262 | 169,493 | 208,296 | 254,215 | 353,803 | 350,073 | 310,791 | 308,855 | 290,634 | 281,683 | 259,758 | 286,684 | 3,246,547 |
| 1942 [1] | 313,517 | 300,003 | 339,552 | 358,443 | 449,330 | 402,584 | 317,007 | 277,969 | 226,695 | 208,445 | 163,648 | [2] 174,000 | [2] 3,531,163 |

[1] Preliminary. [2] Approximation.

Please note the 40-percent increase in production during the past 2 years. The manufacturer's total stocks from 1931 to January 1, 1943, are shown in the following official table:

TABLE F.—*Evaporated milk (case goods): Manufacturers' total stocks, 1931–41*

| Year | Jan. 1 | Feb. 1 | Mar. 1 | Apr. 1 | May 1 | June 1 | July 1 | Aug. 1 | Sept. 1 | Oct. 1 | Nov. 1 | Dec. 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* | *1,000 lb.* |
| 1931 | 202,670 | 157,152 | 136,896 | 150,931 | 177,754 | 230,739 | 275,280 | 275,931 | 181,745 | 136,408 | 129,802 | 139,844 |
| 1932 | 132,011 | 127,883 | 116,859 | 101,388 | 117,687 | 164,421 | 212,431 | 225,897 | 190,912 | 176,197 | 146,204 | 139,957 |
| 1933 | 100,092 | 107,154 | 101,085 | 50,571 | 36,975 | 48,127 | 104,088 | 131,987 | 177,536 | 208,493 | 234,665 | 225,040 |
| 1934 | 210,407 | 168,502 | 112,936 | 99,176 | 117,115 | 151,691 | 153,149 | 205,545 | 167,864 | 175,129 | 215,700 | 203,402 |
| 1935 | 156,793 | 59,791 | 28,914 | 39,993 | 74,145 | 179,684 | 287,204 | 339,978 | 358,780 | 343,132 | 229,065 | 91,250 |
| 1936 | 72,916 | 66,094 | 45,375 | 42,597 | 61,775 | 141,774 | 186,359 | 99,638 | 102,021 | 160,682 | 251,751 | 278,511 |
| 1937 | 258,904 | 208,911 | 176,912 | 152,575 | 161,208 | 242,390 | 302,435 | 227,696 | 263,324 | 227,710 | 244,766 | 218,372 |
| 1938 | 181,686 | 156,894 | 132,663 | 123,801 | 151,669 | 261,703 | 350,790 | 392,641 | 419,142 | 398,287 | 344,316 | 284,375 |
| 1939 | 205,073 | 150,311 | 120,397 | 109,882 | 134,625 | 209,044 | 292,393 | 341,686 | 355,071 | 135,135 | 175,646 | 188,290 |
| 1940 | 186,081 | 156,253 | 150,458 | 173,378 | 207,740 | 287,778 | 288,565 | 321,332 | 349,433 | 380,545 | 358,244 | 226,266 |
| 1941 | 187,652 | 189,246 | 176,624 | 136,073 | 126,160 | 173,838 | 189,711 | 261,559 | 289,904 | 339,716 | 382,605 | 417,643 |
| 1942 | 328,475 | 252,532 | 218,410 | 213,550 | 222,485 | 292,558 | 331,571 | 290,875 | 210,140 | 136,626 | 97,706 | 90,678 |
| 1943 | [1] 82,672 | | | | | | | | | | | |

[1] Approximation.
Source: Dairy and poultry separate from Agricultural statistics, 1941.

There are some 17,000,000 cases owned by the Government, 2,000,000 cases of which are now being released to supply the domestic demands last month, and according to the announcement on the radio 3,000,000 cases are to be released for February consumption.

THE PICTURE

The official tables above show the production of the past and what the stock piles are at the present time. In addition to the above dairy production figures, we also have fluid milk but this is immediately consumed and does not enter into the picture of stock piles. The per capita consumption is being rapidly expanded. We must realize that the production of fluid milk is one manpower problem but to convert this milk into cheese, butter, and other manufactured dairy products involves additional manpower. This work requires efficient men and their production is an art. A comparatively small number of men are capable of making these high quality products.

Under normal times, out of every 100 pounds of milk produced in the United States, 42 pounds went into butter production, 29 pounds into city milk dis-

tribution, 6 pounds into cheese, 5 pounds into ice cream, 5 pounds into evaporated milk and the remainder into other dairy products, fed to calves, wasted, or lost in manufacture or distribution. It is readily seen that, in the past, butter has been the single product that has required the largest volume of milk. However, these percentages have changed. As you can see, the butter production of the United States has remained rather stationary while the evaporated milk and cheese production has been increased 40 and 50 percent, respectively.

There is one fact evident in all the production tables A, C, and E which really merits your attention. Please note that in table A we have a smaller production of butter beginning September 1942 and that there was considerably less butter produced than during the corresponding months in the year previous. You will note that there was an upswing in production in December 1942, no doubt due to the reduction to 19 percent in the butterfat content of cream. This increase in production may also have been due to the regulations as to the butterfat in ice cream and also the curtailment in sales of this product. The first two January 1943 weekly reports show a 4- to 7-percent increase in butter production over the year previous, and last week 1 percent below last year. We could be on the way to ample production of this great food if viewed only from a statistical standpoint.

In table C you will find that, beginning in September 1942, there was a monthly reduction in cheese production in comparison to 1941. This decline in cheese production still exists. The January weekly reports show a decrease of 17 to 24 percent in the national production from the corresponding weeks last year.

The table showing the production of evaporated milk shows that, beginning in August 1942 and continuing up to January 1, 1943, there was a much lower production of evaporated milk than the corresponding months of the previous year. These are not seasonal reductions; they are reductions from the amounts produced for corresponding months of 1941.

WHAT CAUSED THIS REDUCTION?

There are many reasons advanced for this reduction.

First. Many people think that the comment by the metropolitan press, some radio announcers, and some administration officials was largely responsible for this reduced production. As you no doubt remember, the criticism was directed at the farmer in general and at the dairy farmer in particular when the second price-control bill was being considered by Congress.

Second. Others think that the fluid-milk demands due to the increased buying power of the people were a contributing factor. In southern Army camps no doubt the fluid-milk supply comes from plants formerly engaged in the manufacture of butter and cheese.

Third. Others, like the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, an organization whose members produce over a billion pounds of milk a year, appear to believe that the administration has not kept faith with its members and that the results of having the prices drop from $2.25 per hundred to $1.80 per hundred was the contributing cause.

Fourth. Many cheese men believe that the reduction in the price of cheese from 24 cents to 21 cents a pound by the administration, after they had asked for increased production was also a contributing factor in this reduction. Whatever the causes, and whether they were of omission or of commission, the fact remains that 376,000,000 pounds less of evaporated milk, 35,000,000 pounds less of cheese, and 18,000,000 pounds less of butter were produced than the corresponding months a year previous. In terms of fluid milk this would represent a reduction of about one and one-half billion pounds of fluid milk. This reduction occurred during one of the most favorable milk-production seasons that the dairy sections of this country have ever enjoyed. The following table shows the number of dairy cows in the United States for the years 1920 to 1942, inclusive:

*Milk cows 2 years old and over*

| Year: | |
|---|---|
| 1920 | 21,455,000 |
| 1925 | 22,575,000 |
| 1930 | 23,032,000 |
| 1935 | 26,082,000 |
| 1940 | 24,926,000 |
| 1941 | 25,478,000 |
| 1942 | 26,303,000 |
| 1943 (estimated) | 27,000,000 |

This table shows that we still have plenty of dairy cows, if well fed, to furnish the 119,000,000,000 pounds of milk, or the goal for 1943.

The national average production per cow for 1942 would be 119,000,000,000÷26,000,000 or 4,600 pounds per cow per year. This amount can easily be increased by proper feed and care. There is an abundance of young dairy animals—we still have the stock pile. The January 1 estimates of the number of dairy cows in the country show a further increase in numbers regardless of the numbers which may have been sold as a result of public auctions.

We have been talking about past history. We must all agree that Donald Nelson must have had these dairymen in mind when he told our country that the farmers of our country had done a job not excelled by any other group.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IN 1943?

In 1943, the dairymen of this country are confronted with greater problems than they were in the previous years. These are:

First. Additional difficulties as to manpower. This does not only involve the farm work but also the men engaged in the manufacture and processing and distribution of the products.

Second. More difficulties in obtaining concentrated feeds. The demand for high proteins has been so extensive. Millions of cows have been fed grain during the pasture season the last couple years that had never had a mouthful before. We might have had a stock of these high proteins sometime in the past but they have passed out of the picture. Not only the increased production of milk but also the increase in the production of eggs and pork have made the demand for these protein feeds.

Third. Problems of machinery and equipment for the farm as well as for the plants that are manufacturing these dairy products.

Fourth. Transportation. This is becoming more and more of a serious problem. It is not going to be reflected only in the production, procurement, and accumulation of feed but also in the accumulation and transportation of the manufactured product itself.

CONSTRUCTIVE SUGGESTIONS

First. It would be well to follow the suggestion of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative and ask the Secretary of Agriculture to issue a specific statement to the dairy farmers to the effect that all their products will be taken at a reasonable price and for a definite period of time.

Second. Fulfill this promise. The Secretary has given the pork producer a time table with a $13.25-per-hundred floor until September 30, 1944.

Third. With all due respect to lease-lend and its objectives, we must realize that we must have a proper consideration for our own food producers. We cannot constantly be changing the product and the marketing of an industry based upon the change of mind of our lease-lend friends. We must, in fairness, do some forward thinking in order that our own industries are not ruined in order to fulfill the wishes of our lease-lend friends. If we continue to follow the footsteps of the past we will really harm the war effort. Hauling milk halfway across the State with its waste of tires and gas to make one dairy product is an example. The recent O. P. A. order on cheese is most assuredly another.

Fourth. Develop a more cooperative spirit between the Department of Agriculture and the legislative committees of Congress and also a more cooperative spirit between the Secretary's office and the farm organizations of our country. Within the past few days, we have had an example of bureaucrats' announcements of huge expenditures without evident knowledge or consultation with the chairman of our Appropriations Committee.

Fifth. A greater use of the educational forces of our country could be realized. This will include our country and city schools, extension service, Coagts, Smith-Hughes teachers in high school, and boys and girls club work. There is an opportunity to broaden the program with education from sources recognized as reliable.

Sixth. A little clearer understanding of the fact that we cannot have a control that prevents all possible production. For all many of these controls are supposed to be out for the duration, there are still many catches in most legislation that do not make for 100-percent production. We cannot have our cake and eat it and we must control the controls so that they do not prevent the maximum production. There are many many examples but the recent cheese

order is sufficient. Were the men that milk the cows and make the product ever asked as to how the order would affect them? The 17 to 24 percent lower production may be part of the answer.

I have endeavored to discuss this subject fully from a factual standpoint and trust that the facts as presented may give you a picture of the dairy situation at this time, and I am sure you all know the clouds that are in the skies and want to do your part to continue the production of the greatest food known to man.

CONCLUSION

The demands of war may denude our forests and they may drain our mines of much of our precious metals but the land of our country will be the source of restoring happiness and contentment to our people. No country in history has ever achieved greatness that did not have within its borders large areas of rich, productive, and fertile land. It bids well for the future that our country is blessed with large areas of this type of land. Though it may not be worth but $35,000,000,000 as it was on January 1, 1940, it can, if properly handled, increase in productivity and be a source of protection for our future generations. It can improve with time and this is most assuredly a source of comfort. Let us ask these fertile acres for abundance and ask of it the best crop in 1943 that we have ever witnessed. If these acres are to continue to furnish the food for our armed forces, for our allies, and for liberated peoples, all factors of production must have their merited consideration or we will not be helping these acres to fulfill their mission.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by Mr. Pegler.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain excerpts and statements on three subjects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] for 10 minutes.

PROTECTION OF DOGS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday afternoon I had the temerity to take up the time of this House to discuss a couple of pieces of legislation I introduced seeking the humane protection of dogs. A few minutes after that, after I had left the floor, to enjoy my luncheon late in the afternoon with a couple of constitutents from my district, my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] took occasion to criticize me for having taken up that time of the House of Representatives. He made several rather caustic remarks which appear in the RECORD, and to which I take some exception. In the first place, I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Oklahoma, personally. He has been very kind to me during my service in the House. He is a valuable member of the Committee on Appropriations, and as such, as is true of every other member of that committee, his time is very valuable. I have a very warm political friendship for the gentleman because I owe him a debt of gratitude. Back in 1940 when I was campaigning for reelection, it was reported to me that the gentleman from Oklahoma had been detailed to my congressional district, among others, to bring about my defeat. I am glad to see the gentleman here this afternoon, because our paths have not crossed since he came to Cheboygan to help defeat me. Up until that time I had never been able to carry Cheboygan County, but I did that year, and in the last election I carried it by twice the majority I did before.

But I do not want to take up much of the time of this House today. It is late, and we have heard some very interesting things here on the floor this afternoon. I do not want to take up too much time discussing dogs, but I do point out to the gentleman that while he censored me for taking up the time of the House, it was after the distinguished majority leader had asked unanimous consent and had received unanimous consent for this House to take a 3-day vacation. Therefore I think I might be pardoned for taking up 10 minutes of that time in the manner in which I did, and I may say that during the ensuing 3-day vacation, and despite the bad weather, I have not been entirely idle, nor have I been spending my time on dogs. It so happened on Friday afternoon that a newspaper photographer called at my office and asked to be permitted to take a picture of myself and my dog. I hold that picture before you right now. Some time later this same gentleman called back and asked if I would permit him to take another picture, because the Office of War Information would not permit any picture to be published showing snow on the ground in the Capital; that that is a very serious thing, notwithstanding the fact that every daily newspaper throughout the city for days has been broadcasting comment on the weather conditions in the Nation's Capital. They were commenting upon the fact that we were enjoying the worst storm that we had had for years.

Now, during the very time that this picture was being taken, a pilot was approaching one of the surrounding airports of Washington, flying a very hot plane, and one of these pursuit ships is worth about $150,000—though a fighting plane cannot be measured in terms of dollars—he was approaching one of these airports and he sought to learn the weather conditions on the ground. He wanted to find out whether there was any snow on the airport. He was not permitted to have that particular information as to the conditions on the ground, with the result that when he brought in this super hot plane he nosed over and smashed it up. I suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma that the Committee on Appropriations might carefully consider many such similar wastes of the taxpayer's money as that, and among other waste of the taxpayer's money, this morning, just this morning, right before my eyes, and within a block of where I stood, on one of the nearby airports in Washington I saw another crew bring in a bomber that I was told cost about $250,000, and they attempted to land that bomber on one of these particular airways, still covered with snow, on which not a plow has been put since the storm started last Friday. On an airport charged, among other things, with the defense of this Capital. Probably because of the fact that the man could not see the number on the particular runway that he had been told that he must use to come in, he attempted to make a down-wind landing. I saw that airplane completely destroyed right before my eyes, due to a mistaken bit of judgment perhaps on the part of the pilot or a misunderstanding of the signals. Those things are serious. We cannot judge the value of an airplane in terms of dollars and cents, but we can judge the fact that that fighter plan, that bomber, because of some mistaken ideas or instructions is at present permanently out of the war picture.

I might suggest to the gentleman on the Appropriations Committee that he might seek a reduction in the appropriation for some of these various New Deal agencies and bureaus that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] mentioned in his admirable address a few minutes ago.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I was present when the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] made his statement with reference to the gentleman from Michigan. If I understood him correctly, he said it was because of the interest shown in such subjects as dogs that the public esteem for Congressmen and for Congress generally had fallen so low. I hardly think that is true, and I would like to make this observation: That it was the voting away repeatedly of the powers and prerogatives of this Congress to other agencies that caused the American people to look with disfavor upon Congress and not because some of them happened to be lovers of dogs.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for his observation, and I may say that in the several hundred letters I have received since I took up the time of the House last Thursday, I have been rather roundly applauded for the fact that somebody took an interest in dogs even under present circumstances. One man said that in this cockeyed world thank God somebody had time for the most sensible animal that we have in the world today, the dog.

But I wanted to make this further observation to the gentleman from Oklahoma. I suggest that the Appropriations Committee drastically limit the funds which have been assigned to the Farm Security Administration. Let me tell you what they are doing up in my district, which goes right back to Cheboygan County again. Government bureaucrats, to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] referred, have been going around that district drumming up a farmers' cooperative association among the farmers of that district. There are three bureau chiefs in Cheboygan County that have been organizing this farmers' cooperative. They said originally it was to be a cooperative simply to warehouse and dispose of their farm produce in that area. The farmers have been asked to buy shares of stock or bonds in the organization, with a $10 contribution. Then they announced, after they had organized, that they were going into a general merchandising business of all descriptions, competing with practically all the merchants in Cheboygan County. They are getting their working capital for that project from the Farm Security Administration. I have a petition, signed by practically every merchant in Cheboygan, asking why Congress does not wake up and put a stop to such practice on the part of these Federal bureaucrats. Here we have men sweating blood night and day figuring out how they can meet their pay rolls, how they can buy War bonds and War stamps, and so on, yet we have the Federal Government bureaucrats running around deliberately subsidizing farmers' cooperatives in order to put these same individuals out of business.

I would suggest that perhaps the Appropriations Committee, in its wisdom, might find out that they can considerably reduce the appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission. I have always understood it to be against the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission for anybody to swear over the radio. Yet last night if you heard Walter Winchell, he said your constituents and my constituents who voted to return any of the pre-Pearl Harbor isolationists last fall "were plain damn fools." How much longer are you going to permit this man Winchell to get away with that stuff and violate the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission, with impunity?

Those are some of the suggestions I want to make at this time. There are some others. There are some splendid suggestions in this letter which I will include at this point in the RECORD, which I received from the editor of a small weekly paper in my district, a paper published in Gaylord, Mich. It is as follows:

GAYLORD PRINTING CO.,
*Gaylord, Mich., January 23, 1943.*

Hon. FRED BRADLEY,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR FRED: Your letter regarding the outcome of your interview with Major Canning, re the removal of the Ordnance Service Command repair shop here, received, and personally, as well as for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, want to thank you for prompt action.

We did not hold out much hope of retaining the present set-up, or expect another group to come in. Our purpose was to acquaint you with the situation here in the hope that being cognizant with the situation, its central location, advantages of rail and road transportation, and a general understanding of the situation not only Gaylord, but other small towns within your district, are faced with.

Our ability to buy stamps and bonds is necessarily greatly curtailed as well as our general business, which is going to materially reduce our effort to do our civilian job of helping win the war, and Fred, we are consecrated to that big job. Our sons and brothers and fathers, and our sisters too, are in there pitching. In a small community you know everyone. And when one is called, it is a personal loss to the rest of us as individuals.

It is disgusting to hear official Washington talk about our lack of war consciousness. They don't know anything about it. We in these small communities are cutting out, voluntarily, many items that have been regarded as necessities, because we want our boys and girls on the front, to have them or other things to make their jobs easier.

We do not spend for pleasures, consciously remembering that when we have a desire for a soda, a dinner party, a show, and so forth, that if we do not go, or do what we have in mind, we will be able to put that much more money in stamps and bonds.

We have cut down in employment, and are working longer and harder hours, so that it will release more for the armed forces and defense plants, and provide more money for bonds. We are getting along without many essential things in our businesses because by not getting them it will release that much more to the war effort.

Is official Washington doing as much?

We are in this fight with all we have. We kick and complain, not because we must get along without some things, but because all we get from Washington is free advice as to what we should do, then the next day read of where Washington has done this or that which retards, rather than advances our war aims.

Our Government is making us all very socialistic minded, and this will undermine our so-called democracy unless there are some changes. We don't want it, as a people, but it is being forced upon us, and before the threat of losing our individuality, so apparent in all the actions of Washington in the past few years, Mr. John Q. Public is going to use his franchise to defeat bureaucracy, and this spells defeat to democracy.

But enough of that, so referring back to our subject.

It is our hope that with the knowledge you now have of our situation, you will use your good offices in watching developments so that if anything breaks you have the information that may make it possible for you to assist us in making use of the fine buildings that will soon be idle, and which are surely needed for some type of war or peace work.

With every best wish for your success, and again thanking you in the name of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the people of Gaylord and Otsego County, I am

Very truly yours,

PAUL MACDONALD.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would not ask for the indulgence of the House for this brief time at so late an hour had the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY], who has just addressed the House, not taken so serious exceptions to remarks made by me a few days ago, with reference to his proposed dog-security legislation. The gentleman reminds me that I spoke in one of the splendid cities of his district during the campaign of 1940. I am sorry if my appearance in Michigan offended him. The people of Michigan were very kind, courteous, and hospitable to me then. I did not criticize the gentleman in his own district merely because I do not agree with him politically. Incidentally, I spoke in 15 other States of the Union during that memorable campaign and I am glad to say I did not say an unkind word personally against any sitting Member of Congress.

I want to assure the gentleman from Michigan that I certainly hold no ill will toward him. He as a very affable gentleman and I have a high regard for him personally. Nothing that I said on the floor of the House could possible be construed as reflecting on his character, integrity, or reputation as a gentleman.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield, gladly.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. One remark to which I took exception was the suggestion of the gentleman that if I sought the protection of dogs I should go to the city council. Now, what is the city council of Washington if it is not the District of Columbia Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would say to the gentleman that had he gone before the District of Columbia Committee it would in my judgment have been a little more in keeping with the dignity of this House rather than to introduce a couple of bills that seem to me more for the mutual welfare of dogs of the District of Columbia and the United States than for the protection of the public.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I shall be pleased to again yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I may say to the gentleman that I discussed the matter in advance with the chairman of the committee and several other members, and with the corporation counsel, and that they had advised me to introduce a bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Very well. That may be sufficient explanation to the gentleman's constituents for having introduced the dog legislation in question in the Congress of the United States, but frankly, I am afraid the corporation counsel and others have gotten my friend out on the proverbial limb.

Today the esteemed gentleman from Michigan, who spent his entire 10 minutes last week talking about dogs in general and his own dog in particular, side-steps the issue to discuss airports, airplanes, the Dies committee, and the splendid speech of the gentleman from Texas today, with whom few Members of this House could possibly disagree, and the fact that undesirable bureaucrats have infested some of the departments of Government. Permit me to compliment the gentleman on his speech today. I must say in all frankness, it was much more statesmanlike and constructive than his address of last week for the uplift of dogdom.

Can it be possible, however, that the gentleman would like for the Congress and his constituents to forget about his speech on canine activities and the security of dogs by side-stepping the issue? After all this little friendly argument started when the gentleman introduced his two bills for the relief of dogs, rather than for the relief of the public.

In my previous remarks I did not criticize the gentleman's bill at all. I did not read the bill at that time and I would not wish to embarrass the gentleman by reading all of it into the RECORD now, but I have one of the gentleman's bills here, and I am sure he would like for me to call special attention to some of its provisions. I see that there are three provisions in his bill. Provision No. 1 makes it a crime, punishable by 30 days in jail or a fine of $100 or both, to injure a dog. But the gentleman's bill is strangely silent with reference to protection for the man, woman, boy, or girl who might be injured by a vicious dog. As I walked nearly a mile through the snow this morning to catch a bus to come to the Capitol there were three large, vicious dogs that ran for a block after, and almost attacked, a little girl. A very elderly lady came along. The same dogs followed her for a block. Under the provisions of the gentleman's bill, had anyone taken a club and clubbed one of those vicious dogs, unless he immediately reported it to the police, they would be a criminal and be liable to 30 days in jail or $100 fine or both for kicking a dog that might bite a child. After all there are a few bad, vicious dangerous dogs as well as a lot of good faithful ones.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. There are laws on the statute books at the present time that provide for the legal relief of those people. The owners of the dogs are criminally liable if they let such dogs run loose. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. But the point is there are too many such vicious dogs running loose here, but apparently the gentleman is not as deeply concerned about them as he is about protecting the dogs of the District and Nation, judging from his pet bills. Under the provisions of the gentleman's bill, if a stray dog should come to your house, whether or not you have a telephone—and there are thousands of good people who have no telephones in Washington—you would be liable if you did not call up the dog catcher and report it, did not give the number of the dog's tag or whatever identification there was on him, if there were any—you would be made a criminal under the provisions of the gentleman's bill.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Within 48 hours.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Within 48 hours. Even then you would have to have a telephone. A young man came to my office this afternoon and said he had been trying to get a telephone for 6 months, but had been unable to get one. Now, I submit that is going pretty far, and I again respectfully suggest that it is beneath the dignity of this House to discuss, much less seriously consider, such an absurd proposal.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman knows what the practice is today right in the District of Columbia: People will call up the poundmaster and say, "Have you had a call for a brown and white dog about 14 inches high?"

"Who is calling?"

"It is none of your business. Have you had a call for such a dog?"

Many dogs are stolen that way. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, I must confess that I am not familiar with what the public says to the dog catcher over the telephone. But the gentleman also knows that I made it plain in my first brief remarks that I am fond of good, faithful dogs. As I stated heretofore, my own little boy has a dog that he loves very much. But let me again respectfully suggest that there are far greater issues here than the protection of dogs, good, bad, or indifferent. Every day we are reminded that there is a real crime wave in Washington. The police and the F. B. I. are overworked here in our Capital City. Last night a man was murdered with a few blocks of this Capitol Building. With the F. B. I. and the police undermanned and begging for additional help to enforce the law and run down saboteurs, then the gentleman would not seriously contend that Congress should make them dog catchers.

Moreover, there are some fine boys from Michigan and other States who are fighting for this country, for what we like to call the American way of life. The present world situation is entirely too serious for Congress to "fiddle while Rome burns" by going off on little side issues.

This is a war Congress, not a dog Congress nor a canine show. Let's not have it said of us that we got there too late with too little.

So much for the gentleman's proposed dog legislation that the Corporation Council or someone suggested he introduce. Now the gentleman comes along and offers some very appropriate suggestions with reference to some things that he thinks the Appropriations Committee ought to do. As a member of that committee and as chairman of the subcommittee of that committee, I welcome his valuable suggestions and I am willing to discuss them for a moment in order to help the gentlemen get from off that limb with as little damage as possible. Concerning the gentleman's suggestion that all appropriations be cut, I will say that even though the Interior Department is more closely connected with the war effort save and except the War and Navy Departments, that last year I brought that bill to the floor of the House, reduced more than $18,000,000 below the budget estimates after the Secretary of the Interior had voluntarily cut his own department $10,000,000 below the estimates submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. I feel that I can say with all modesty that is a record for which my committee has a just reason to be proud. May I also add in that connection that early in our hearings a year ago, we inquired of the Secretary's office about the alleged subversive activities, or activities of any other crackpots that might be in that department. Our committee was assured by officials in position to speak with authority, that the F. B. I. had combed the Department of the Interior, as it were, with a fine comb and that anyone even suspected of advocating the overthrow of the Government by force, had been weeded out by that department. I can assure the gentleman that no money in any of the appropriation bills will become available if I can prevent it, by any bureaucrat who would bite the hand that is feeding him and who advocates the overthrow, by force, of the Government of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma, [Mr. JOHNSON]?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if he is suggesting that when the gentleman from Michigan showed interest in a local matter or local ordinance in the city of Washington relating to dogs he was neglecting the welfare of the men and women of the armed forces from the State of Michigan?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am giving the facts as I see them. I am casting no insinuations. The record will show whether or not the gentleman from Michigan has expressed the same interest in the human beings of his district as he has in the dogs of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The voters of my district seemed to think that I showed enough interest in them to be reelected, and also in the boys in the armed forces from the State of Michigan, and I yield nothing to the gentleman from Oklahoma in reference to my votes for the war effort.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. Again I suggest that the record speaks for itself.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like an answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman wants to make a speech, he can make it.

Mr. CURTIS. No. I am asking the gentleman a question and I am trying to get an answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will answer it.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to know if the gentleman feels that the gentleman from Michigan has neglected his duties, or did he have some other reason for making answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, the gentleman is attempting to side-step the issue. But again I desire to make it very plain that I have no ill will toward the gentleman from Michigan, and that I have a very high regard for him personally. Let us not befuddle the issue. I did not start this dog business. If it has embarrassed the gentleman, I submit in all candor that is not my fault. I again say that the legislation proposed by the gentleman, important that it evidently appears to him, might wait until after the end of this terrible war which is going to settle the future of this generation and generations yet unborn.

### HAS CONGRESS VOTED AWAY ITS POWERS AND PREROGATIVES?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Nebraska does not leave because I want to make a suggestion about a statement that has often been made about Congress voting away its powers and prerogatives. I wonder if the Congress has been voting away its powers and prerogatives?

Under the Constitution of the United States the Congress has the lawmaking power. We make the laws. We do not execute the laws. Obviously, we must leave the execution of the laws to the Executive. Under the Constitution the executive department of the Government executes the laws.

This being true, it is within our rights and it is our duty to pass the laws and leave the execution of the laws up to the President. I know there have been many mistakes made in the execution of the laws that have been passed by the Congress. I think though the people keep in mind—I am sure we do as we are elected by the people of our respective districts and States to serve in the House and Senate—that the President of the United States is also elected by the people of this Nation for the purpose of executing the laws that we pass.

Obviously the President himself cannot execute all these laws. He must delegate this power to others, and if he delegates the power to someone who is not a good administrator, it is true that the Congress is criticized, and if the Congress should be criticized, well and good. But should the Congress be criticized because some poor administrator is selected? I know that in the case of a war like we are in now, with a huge program involving tens of billions of dollars a year, mistakes will be made, and serious mistakes will be made. I think the people expect mistakes to be made. I am sure that the Congress expects the Executive to make a reasonable number of mistakes. But I feel that the Congress has the right to expect and the people have the right to expect that those mistakes will be quickly corrected when discovered.

Congress has been blamed for the poor administration of the price-control law. Our critics doubtless favor such a law in order to prevent runaway prices and inflation. What they object to is the manner of its enforcement, which is something over which we do not have control.

I think the greatest criticism that has come to the administrators in the executive department recently has been because of their failure to correct their mistakes quickly. I do not think Congress should assume all the responsibility, because we merely pass the laws; we do not execute them. I seriously invite that to the attention of the gentleman and others for consideration, because, as we have our duty and responsibility, so the Executive has a duty and responsibility. It is our duty to work with the executive department as much as we can. If a law is not properly administered, I think Congress should deal with it not by putting somebody out of office—because Congress does not have the power to put him out of office in the absence of grounds for impeachment and did not have the power to appoint him in the first place—but by either repealing the law or changing the law by amendment. To that extent only our power is granted to us under the Constitution.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I cannot quarrel with what the gentleman says. I am very much in accord with his statement that the Congress suffers because of the sins and errors of the administrative branch.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I suggest that the gentleman from Texas read in tomorrow's RECORD the remarks of one of his colleagues from Texas, because I am sure they will show that if anyone in this House is a little bit critical of the things that have happened, that criticism comes from the gentleman's side of the House.

May I further say to my colleague that I agree with what he has said because many of our troubles are our own troubles. We passed the price-control bill but voted against the Wolcott amendment, which would have ironed out a lot of the kinks in the price-control bill.

Mr. PATMAN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that mistakes have been made. The criticism I have of those administrators is that they have not quickly corrected those mistakes when discovered. I know some of the errors of these administrators have remained uncorrected, and I regret that very much. In a huge program such as we have now under way, certainly a number of mistakes will be made; but let us hope they will be reduced to a minimum and quickly corrected when discovered.

The main point I want to make is, Why should we say we are voting away our powers and prerogatives? I do not agree with that statement at all. We are merely passing the laws. It is not within our power to enforce them. The criticism comes from enforcement of the laws, but it is not our power to enforce them, and we cannot enforce them. So, why say we are voting away our powers and prerogatives?

[Here the gavel fell.]

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

### BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES,
*January 27, 1943.*

The SPEAKER,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SAM: Pursuant to the act of April 16, 1937, as amended (Public, No. 38, 75th Cong., 1st sess.), I have appointed the following members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1943: Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, Hon. JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Hon. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN.

As chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex-officio member of the Board.

I notice in the RECORD that you have appointed Mr. FORAND and Mr. STEFAN.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND, *Chairman.*

### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution expressing to the National Assembly and people of the Republic of Panama appreciation of their friendship for the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 2, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

### COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet at 10 a. m. Tuesday, February 2, 1943, in room 356, House Office Building.

### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be an organization meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, February 3, 1943.

### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, February 2, 1943. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 1012, "To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes."

There will be a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Friday, February 5, 1943. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 649, "For the organization and functions of the Public Health Service."

---

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

109. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $13,182,000 (H. Doc. No. 59); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

110. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Executive Office of the President, Office for Emergency Management, War Manpower Commission, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $2,454,000 (H. Doc. No. 60); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

111. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations for the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 61); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

112. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1943 amounting to $9,242,200 (H. Doc. No. 62); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

113. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations of $427,096 for the fiscal year 1940 and 1942, and supplemental estimates of appropriations of $470,000 for the fiscal year 1943, in all $897,096, for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 63); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

114. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Conciliation Service, Department of Labor, for the fiscal year 1943 in the amount of $425,000 (H. Doc. No. 64); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

115. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Selective Service System, War Manpower Commission, for the fiscal year 1943 in the amount of $21,160,000 (H. Doc. No. 65); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

116. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $770,000 (H. Doc. No. 66); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

117. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board, Executive Office of the President, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $200,000 (H. Doc. No. 67); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

118. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Federal Security Agency amounting to $787,400, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for said Agency, all for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 68); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

119. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for traveling expenses for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1943 in the amount of $175,000 (H. Doc. No. 69); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

120. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Office for Emergency Management, War Relocation Authority (H. Doc. No. 70); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

121. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the fiscal year 1943 amounting to $1,437,000 (H. Doc. No. 71); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

122. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1943 amounting to $7,997,000 for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 72); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

123. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the legislative establishment, United States Senate, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $200,000 (H. Doc. No. 73); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

124. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1943 amounting to $250,000 (H. Doc. No. 74); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

125. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting three supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1943 for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, amounting to $5,494,000 (H. Doc. No. 75); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

126. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for 1943 and prior fiscal years, amounting to $682,100 (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

127. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting three supplemental estimates of appropriations, totaling $5,730,300, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

128. A letter from the president of the Capital Transit Co., transmitting report covering the operations of the Capital Transit Co. for the calendar year 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

129. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report of funds received by Bureau of Census to defray cost of special statistical studies, compilations, etc., covering the period from January 1 to December 31, 1942; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

130. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

131. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish official checking accounts with the Treasurer of the United States for clerks of the United States courts and United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

132. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, transmitting a letter that its report for the period ended September 18, 1942, was delayed and the report will be filed not later than April 1, 1943; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

133. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

134. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting the report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ended December 31, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

135. A letter from the president, Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a detailed statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

136. A letter from the president, Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting a report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. for the year ended December 31, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

137. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States; to fix their duties; to provide for their compensation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 839. A bill to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 87. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1446, a bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for

other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 158. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 702. A bill to permit the prepayment of the purchase price of certain housing sold to individuals by the Farm Security Administration, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER. Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 75. Joint resolution to provide for the training of nonfarm youth for farm labor, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 1294. A bill to authorize the sale or transfer of property belonging to the Government for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 535. A bill for the relief of Donna Pittel; with amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 575. A bill for the relief of Peter Cuccio, and Jasper and Pauline Cuccio, minors; with amendment (Rept. No. 71). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 598. A bill for the relief of Thelma Cannon McGroary; without amendment (Rept. No. 72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 637. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward; with amendment (Rept. No. 73). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1098. A bill for the relief of El Paso Electric Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 74). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1153. A bill for the relief of Cordie Underwood and Wilbur Kea; with amendment (Rept. No. 75). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1276. A bill for the relief of Raymond W. Baldwin and Mattie Baldwin; with amendment (Rept. No. 76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1538. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as the result of the disaster at the East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 77). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 265) granting a pension to Mrs. Dorothy Murphy, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1604. A bill to authorize the erection of the United States veterans' hospital in the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 1605. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to farm-acreage allotments, the farm marketing excess of wheat, the use of excess corn as silage for feed to livestock on the farm, to provide for the adequate supply of peanuts for oil and other uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 1606. A bill to provide that service subsequent to July 25, 1918, in respect of the management, operation, and maintenance of the Cape Cod Canal shall be included in computing length of service for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committtee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1607. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of alien Chinese wives of American citizens who are admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those authorizing exclusion on grounds of race or birth in a defined geographical area; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 1608 (by request). A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims with right of Appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in all claims which the Miami Indians of Indiana had and have against the United States under treaty of June 5, 1854, ratified August 4, 1854 (10 Stat. L. 1093), and as to lineal descendants, or issues of said Miami Indians, pursuant to said treaty of June 5, 1854, and so forth ratified and promulgated August 4, 1854; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 1609. A bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to improve and safeguard the financial integrity of the Farm Credit Administration by effecting a better coordination of Federal lending and marketing activities; to provide a permanent formula for arriving at parity prices for farm commodities; to provide for the general welfare of the people of the United States by establishing the means to stabilize the purchasing power of money, to protect them and their property from the recurring evils of inflation and deflation and to promote the greatest normal exchange of goods and services among themselves and with the citizens of other nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 1610. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 1611. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 1612. A bill to extend the terms of judges of the district courts in Alaska, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands to 8 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 1613. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10 as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 1614. A bill to amend sections 72 and 85 of the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, so as to deny Members of Congress, and certain other officers, after their respective terms of office have expired, the right to dispose of public documents and the use of the franking privilege; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 1615. A bill to extend for 3 years the period during which the President may enter into foreign-trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 1616. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1617. A bill to restore certain disabled veterans of the Regular Establishment who were disabled in line of duty to pension roll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 1618. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to widows of recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 1619. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1620 (by request). A bill to grant civil-service preference to wives and widows of certain veterans; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 1621. A bill to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 1622. A bill to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska at Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1623. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., secs. 548-555); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1624. A bill authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 1625. A bill to aid small independent business of the country by the collection and dissemination of knowledge of business management and its application to specific problems and opportunities, that the American system of free enterprise may be strengthened and that individual small business may be continued at a profit both to the businessman and the community; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1647. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937, in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of April 11 to 17, 1943, as National Humane Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Res. 89. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate activities of various departments, bureaus, and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROWE:

H. Res. 90. Resolution authorizing the Banking and Currency Committee to investigate and study rent control in the city of Akron, Ohio; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. Res. 91. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the acquisition by the War Department of certain land in Anderson and Roane Counties, Tenn.; to the Committee on Rules.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1626. A bill for the relief of Robert D. Doherty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 1627. A bill for the relief of Vida B. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 1628. A bill for the relief of John Hirsch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1629. A bill granting a pension to James William Westerfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1630. A bill granting a pension to Albert E. Akins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1631. A bill granting a pension to Jesse L. Fisher; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H.R. 1632. A bill granting an increase of pension to Essie M. Pursel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1633. A bill granting an increase of pension to Estella Walton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1634. A bill granting a pension to Martha E. Lumley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1635. A bill for the relief of William E. Search, and the legal guardian of Marion Search, Pauline Search, and Virginia Search; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 1636. A bill for the relief of B. B. Stringer; to the Committee on War Claims.

H.R. 1637. A bill for the relief of Fred Hunter; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 1638. A bill for the relief of Isobell Shanks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H.R. 1639. A bill for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublein and Mrs. Ethel Bowers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H.R. 1640. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H.R. 1641. A bill for the relief of Joseph Schoenbach; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H.R. 1642. A bill with reference to certain loans made under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 and to grant certain relief to Florida Citrus Exchange, the Growers Loan & Guaranty Co. and the Guaranty Operating Co.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROWE:

H.R. 1643. A bill for the relief of Mary Lovis Elliott; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H.R. 1644. A bill to authorize the presentation of the Medal of Honor to John C. Reynolds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 1645. A bill for the relief of Edward Gillam; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 1646. A bill for the relief of James W. Kiplinger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

57. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution from the Buffalo Fur Merchants' Association, Inc., favoring the adoption of a pay-as-you-go plan for collection of income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

58. Also, petition from employees of the Consolidated Packaging Machinery Corporation of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring enactment of a pay-as-you-go tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

59. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of 44 citizens of Walla Walla, Wash., protesting against recurrence of strikes during war, and urging speedy correction of situation; to the Committee on Labor.

60. Also, resolution of Washington State Cooperative Council, urging that rationing of gasoline and other farm necessities be left to local rationing boards who understand local conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

61. Also, resolution of the Washington State Cooperative Council, urging inclusion of labor cost factor in determining agricultural parity price; to the Committee on Agriculture.

62. Also, resolution of the Washington State Cooperative Council, urging a definite clear-cut program assuring an adequate supply of skilled farm labor to insure adequate food supplies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

63. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the Buffalo Foreign Trade Association, favoring appropriations to support the field service of the United States Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

64. By Mrs. NORTON: Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializ' g the Congress of the United States to place income-tax collections from individuals on a current or pay-as-you-go basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

65. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of B. W. Brown, president, County Court of Marshall County, Moundsville, W. Va., protesting against the inclusion of the western part of West Virginia in the gasoline-rationing program set up by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

66. By Mr. SUNDSTROM: Assembly concurrent resolution of the State of New Jersey, memoralizing the Congress of the United States to place income-tax collections from individuals on a current or pay-as-you-go basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

67. By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of the Michigan State Legislature, asking the creation of a War Labor Board office in Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Labor.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, close as the air that wraps us round, for breath and work, for success and hope, and for the privilege of sharing in human joy, we praise Thee. At all times, in every hour of stress, help us to realize that Thy wisdom never errs and Thy judgment never fails. We ask not for ease, nor for the approval of men, but for Thy blessing upon every task that it may have a place in Thy eternal purpose, steadily driving its roots into the nourishing earth of the will of Him who feels and hears our appeal on the other side of silence.

Thou hast taught us that the highest joy of existence is in the renouncing of self that we may help others. Our debt to this sorrowing world, dear Lord, is not discharged by a trifle of silver or gold, nor by the garment of praise. We give thanks to our Saviour who paused over the call of human need with a lowly spirit of self-renunciation. Oh, let us forget all things in the preciousness of His example.

"Greatly begin; though thou have time
But for a line, be that sublime—
Not failure, but low aim is crime."

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Treasury.
3. Department of the Interior.
4. Executive Office of the President (National Resources Planning Board).
5. Executive Office of the President (Office of War Information).
6. Federal Works Agency.
7. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
8. National Housing Agency.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar on today be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND EXAMINATIONS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolu-

tion (H. Res. 69, Rept. No. 81) for printing in the RECORD:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Appropriations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees thereof appointed by the chairman of such committee for the purposes of this resolution, is authorized to conduct such studies and examination of the organization and operation of any executive department or any other executive agency (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) as the committee may deem necessary to assist it in connection with the determination of matters within its jurisdiction.

For the purposes of this resolution, such committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order today for 5 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that that time be extended to 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMOUNT RECEIVED BY PRODUCERS OF ORANGES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, a typical example of the relation between the price paid by consumers for oranges and the amount of that price which goes to the growers, the pickers, the handlers, and the packers of that fruit is as follows: The consumers in the case of one typical carload in New York paid 42 cents a dozen. Out of that 42 cents the price which the grower received was approximately 6 cents. The pickers, handlers, and packers received 6 cents. Nine cents went to freight. Nine cents went to the wholesale merchants and 12 cents to the retail merchants. Here is one of the major problems in connection with agricultural production and a fair return to farmers for their crops. Here is an example of the very wide spread between the return to the farmer and the price which the consumer pays.

Mr. RANKIN. How much did those racketeers who stand guard at the gates of New York get for permitting them to bring that material in?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say to the gentleman that these oranges came in by railroad.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, California Senate Joint Resolution No. 10, relative to memorializing the President, the Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, and the War Production Board with respect to the urgency of prompt completion of all studies of all units of the Central Valley water project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an article from the Reader's Digest for February.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein the aims and objectives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an open letter to the Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, after the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and disposition of other special orders on tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WALTER WINCHELL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that someone in that organization which manufactures this stuff which people put on their hands and face, a sort of lotion I believe they call it, does not advise their spokesman and salesman, Walter Winchell, that it does not pay to kick anybody's dog around. It does not pay to bite the hand that feeds you. It is doubtful if it is good salesmanship to tell prospective customers that they are dumb. Walter told us last Sunday that there were some 14,000,000 damn fools in America who voted for Members of Congress. I wonder whether he thinks he is going to persuade any of those 14,000,000 to buy that lotion sold by his sponsors? What do you think of trying to sell something and telling the fellow you are trying to sell it to that he is a damn fool?

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders today I may be allowed to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WHILE THE VALIANT DIE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting a front-page editorial which appeared in the Commercial Appeal, at Memphis, Tenn., on last Sunday, entitled "While the Valiant Die." I hope every mother and every father and everyone else who has anybody in the service will read that editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ACQUISITION OF LAND BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, in October of last year the War Department began the acquisition of a tract of farm lands in Anderson and Roane Counties in my district comprising in area 56,000 acres. There were living upon that tract at that time and cultivating the farms which they owned more than 1,000 farm families. At that time in my section of the country they begin to prepare their lands for fall sowing.

The Government followed up the announcement of that project by the institution of condemnation suits against the owners of those lands. They sent into that area of my State land appraisers who had formerly appraised land for land-loan banks to put an appraised land valuation upon the homes of those farmers. I have in my possession more than 100 protests, many of them sworn to, stating that those appraisers have fixed a valuation upon those lands in many instances only one-third their actual value.

Those tillers of the soil, those people who themselves and their ancestors have lived in the area for more than a hundred years and who have spilled their blood in every war waged for this country in all its history, and whose boys are now on fighting fronts in every part of the world, are now being evicted from their homes with less than enough money to anywhere in that area duplicate their homesteads by the purchase of farms of the same value. On yesterday I introduced a resolution providing for the appointment by the Speaker of a committee composed of five Members of this House with full power to investigate the injustice that is being done these farmers and landowners of my district. They are asking no more than simple justice when they insist that their Government pay them the real value of their homes, based on present-day valuations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and

extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in connection with the Central Valley and include therein a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 87), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order.

FLOATING DRYDOCKS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 87.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of House Resolution 1446, a bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of the time on the rule to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and yield myself 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, this rule was unanimously reported by the Rules Committee. The resolution has for its purpose the building of floating drydocks. The reason for this is obvious, because of our naval activities in all parts of the world where there is no provision made for the repairing of our ships which may have been attacked by the enemy or may have met with an accident. The necessity for these docks must appear to all to be a practical necessity. This also applies to the acquisition of land. This may appear strange to some of us—why land should be necessary for floating drydocks. This can be explained by saying that it is apparent that a floating drydock could not possibly carry all the utensils necessary to repair our ships.

I think it is not necessary for me to indulge further, except to say that we of the Rules Committee thought this legislation not only necessary, but imperative. This legislation was unanimously adopted by the Naval Affairs Committee, and you will hear from the chairman of that committee the reasons for it.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. TABER. A thing about this bill I should like to have discussed is whether or not the Committee on Naval Affairs has had hearings on the specific items of real estate it is proposed to purchase? I feel that the war effort would be promoted if the committee would go into these things as they used to and make specific authorizations for specific items.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield with pleasure to the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee to answer the question.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that if he will read the report he will see that it may not be necessary to acquire any particular property in connection with this program. We did, however, make inquiry about it, as we do about all acquisition of land. This subject matter will be debated either under general debate or under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. COLE of New York. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Georgia might also advise the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that a bill is pending before the committee to withdraw from the Department authority to acquire any land unless it is approved by the committee and by Congress.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York again yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], ranking minority member on the Appropriations Committee, that we are endeavoring to ascertain from the Navy what it intends to do with reference to the spending of money that has been given to the Department in blanket form.

Mr. TABER. I think that should be done. We should be specific about our authorizations and our appropriations.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman, and with the cooperation of the Appropriations Committee I am satisfied we shall be very successful.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I would suggest to the membership that they remain on the floor after the rule is adopted and listen to the statement to be made by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee as to the purchase of this land. I raised the same point in the Rules Committee and I was satisfied that the Naval Affairs Committee had ascertained that only such land was to be purchased as was necessary in the construction of the facilities to implement these drydocks that might be placed on foreign soil.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I call the gentleman's attention and the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the report states:

The bill also provides authority for the acquisition of land, but it is not now definitely known that it will be necessary to exercise the authority.

Permit me to say, if the gentleman will yield me time, that if it becomes necessary in the construction of a drydock to acquire land, instead of holding up that program and coming back here and saying that "we want 10 acres or 20 acres at a certain place," the Secretary should have the discretion to acquire this land and notify the Congress just as soon as he has done so.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before the House with the unanimous report of the Rules Committee. It authorizes the expenditure of some $210,000,000 to construct new drydocks and ship-repair facilities to repair ships of various categories. I am very glad of an opportunity to advocate legislation that brings to my district certain governmental work. This bill provides for the building of three drydocks at Newburgh, N. Y., which will cost $600,000 apiece. Although I have been voting for naval appropriation bills for years running into many billions of dollars, I am particularly glad now to vote for a bill that authorizes the expenditure of $1,800,000 at the Newburgh shipyard in my district and thereby provide employment for people living there and in that vicinity. This will be very thankfully received in my district and I hope we will receive some additional contracts later on.

Mr. Speaker, I confess I had some little difficulty in getting the facts from the Navy Department. This morning I called up and was assured that Admiral Robinson would give me the information that I wanted about this bill, but he never did. I had to call the Navy Department three times and finally got another admiral after 12 o'clock to give me the information I desired. We are having considerable difficulty with bureaucrats, but I did not know that that type of disease had spread to the Navy Department. I hope that the delay and buck passing that I experienced this morning is not typical of the Navy, but rather the exception to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I asked to speak out of order because this is, after all, a Navy bill and what I propose to speak on has not only to do with the Navy but the Army and the State Department. In fact, it has to do primarily with our foreign policy. This is the first time I have spoken in Congress, since December 14, when I resigned from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in reference to our foreign policies. I propose to devote 15 minutes this afternoon during the consideration of the rule to giving my ideas

as to what I think should be done to help win the war.

I have no patience with those Americans, members of both parties—I specifically refer to the PM, Daily Worker, and radical press—who have been sniping and criticizing the policy of the State Department, and particularly Secretary Hull, because of his recognition of the Vichy government prior to our invasion of north Africa. It seems to me that the diplomacy of Secretary Hull in connection with the recognition of the Vichy government and our invasion of north Africa was the greatest military, naval, and diplomatic victory of the war. In my opinion, he deserves the highest commendation, not condemnation, for making it possible for the American Army to land troops in Morocco with few losses and take over all of Morocco and Algiers, and at the same time secure the support of the French Army there of some 300,000, who had sworn their allegiance to Marshal Petain. Today that army is on our side instead of fighting and killing American soldiers. It was a great bloodless victory, and it was due in large part to the diplomacy of the State Department. If it were not for that fact, we would not be fighting now in Tunisia. We would, instead, be fighting the French forces in Africa. We would have to be guarding the railroads and highways for over a thousand miles and our supply line from Casablanca to Tunisia. Therefore I want to go on record as protesting this criticism and sniping by members of both parties and the radical press, particularly by one of the foremost leaders of the Republican Party who has constantly been attacking Secretary Hull, who made possible our almost bloodless invasion of north Africa and secured the support of the French forces there afterward.

Mr. Speaker, on November 18, 1942, I sent the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, the following letter, which I have not released until now:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have just read the statement made by Wendell Willkie before the Herald Tribune Forum criticizing the State Department for its policy toward the Vichy government prior to the landing of our troops in Morocco and Algeria.

Mr. Willkie speaks for himself and not the Republican Party. I want you to know that I regard your handling of the difficult and complicated Vichy problem to have shown vision and the highest statesmanship. Your foresight, which permitted our troops to land in north Africa almost unopposed, resulted in the greatest diplomatic, military, and naval victory of the war.

With high regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

That was in November. This criticism has kept on right up to the present time. We are concerned with only one thing, and that is winning the war. On that we are united, Republicans and Democrats, and winning the war at the earliest possible moment.

Why should we drag politics into a difficult and complicated situation? After the war let the French decide what kind of government they want in France, but in the meantime let us get on with the war, and let us take into our Army and on our side the French troops in north Africa which formerly lined up with Marshal Petain. Our successful invasion of Algeria ought to give us a springboard or base of operations against southern Europe and shorten the war.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Does not the gentleman think that criticism such as he is condemning is calculated to render a disservice to the country in time of war and might be misinterpreted by our allies and by our enemies and by our own people? I think the gentleman is exactly right in condemning that character of criticism at this time.

Mr. FISH. I agree with the gentleman. Lieutenant General Eisenhower, who represents us in north Africa, is an able general and administrator who knows what is best for the Army, and we ought to support him in his decisions aimed to help our armed forces and expedite victory. To constantly harp and criticize and impugn the motives of General Eisenhower and the State Department is not rendering a service to our own country, our armed forces, or promoting unity among the Allies.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Some of these critics who are thousands of miles from that area have no information with reference to the existing facts there and are not in position to criticize even if it were proper for them to do so.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from New York that on yesterday I called attention to the attack made by a man named Stone. When Secretary Hull asked him what his real name was I think it developed it was Bernstein or Finestein. He is one of the pen pushers on this communistic publication known as PM. The most disappointing thing and the one thing that most patriotic Americans will resent is the editorial attack on Secretary Hull in last Sunday's issue of the Washington Post. I believe Secretary Hull, President Roosevelt, and those men who are responsible for bringing about the conditions that now exist in north Africa deserve the commendation of every patriotic American and not the abuse and criticism that is being hurled at them by certain elements throughout the country.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to make certain suggestions as to our foreign policy.

I do not claim to be a military expert or strategist, and speak today as a layman interested in winning the war at the earliest possible moment. I urge the following three-point program:

First. The creation of a Supreme Allied War Council, as we had in the last war, composed of representatives from the United States, Great Britain, Soviet Russia, and China, with equal rights for all to plan, coordinate, and carry out the final victory campaign and to prepare for the peace to follow. There should also be military representatives from all the conquered territories.

Second. To increase our efforts to supply China with a larger share of our lease-lend weapons, particularly airplanes.

If there is any nation that has earned the respect and admiration of the American people it is China, which, with 3,000,000 poorly equipped soldiers, has been fighting Japan for 6 years. Why not arm and equip additional millions of available Chinese? Why not build numerous airfields and provide China with 500 fighter planes and 500 bombers to enable her to take the offensive? Where there is a will there is a way. Concentrate on getting airplanes to China and when that has been solved the bombing of Japanese cities, war industries, and shipping will begin.

Why not persuade Soviet Russia, now that she has defeated the German armies, to permit American planes from Alaska to land on Soviet airfields in Siberia and continue on to China? We have furnished over a billion dollars of lease-lend supplies to Russia, and she might be willing to reciprocate to that extent without even asking the use of her airfields to bomb Japan.

Third. Place General MacArthur in supreme command of all the Allied forces in the far Pacific.

Now that "Dear Eddie" Flynn has thrown in the sponge before the battle had even started for confirmation as Minister to Australia and Ambassador to the far reaches of the Pacific Ocean, would it not expedite victory by making General MacArthur the supreme commander of all Allied forces in the Far East? He has the confidence of the American people, who know him as the ablest, the most brilliant, and most experienced fighting general in our Army. If his name should be sent to the Senate, it would be approved unanimously for any office.

Give General MacArthur the armed forces, airplanes, and ships and he will find a way to open up the road to Tokyo. Inadequate forces mean inadequate attacks on small islands and outposts of the Japanese Empire. The island-hopping campaign began 6 months ago and might go on for 6 years without reaching the heart of Japan. We have been merely bruising the fingers or outer edges of the Rising Sun Empire.

The Japs, in a sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, began the war 14 months ago, and in spite of the statements of various public officials prior to Pearl Harbor that we could crush the Japanese Navy in 2 weeks' time and take Tokyo in 3, we are still a long way from it. It is about time we struck at the head and heart of Japan and not at its fingers and toes.

The American people want to bring the war to an end by defeating and crushing the enemies. Japan not only started the war but took the Philippines from us, and the American people are beginning to ask why do we not get on with the war; why do we not bomb Japan.

Why not place General MacArthur in supreme command and furnish him with sufficient troops, airplanes, and ships to open up an all-out campaign on the Japs

before they become entrenched in their new possessions and have exploited the natural resources in oil, rubber, metals, and food to develop and expand their home war industries? Is there any sound reason why General MacArthur, our greatest fighting general to date, is not given supreme command and an army of a million or more men supported by a huge air force and the Navy? I have sufficient faith in General MacArthur to believe he would drive the Japs out of Burma, Borneo, and Sumatra and carry the fight to the heart of Japan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read into the RECORD an article that appeared in the New York Times of this morning, by Madame Koo, wife of the Chinese envoy to Great Britain.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. May I ask the gentleman about his first point, a unified command. I think we can all visualize the desirability of that. A command headed by Russia, China, the United States, and Great Britain would be most desirable if we all had common enemies. However, does not this element enter into the situation? Would not the fact that Russia and Japan have not yet declared war on each other, that they are not belligerents each against the other, complicate the situation as to having a unified command, when all the nations are not fighting the same enemies?

Mr. FISH. If that were true and really material, then it would be very easy to have a unified command in the Pacific and another unified command in the Atlantic, putting, say, Great Britain, the United States, and China on one side in the Pacific, and the United States, Great Britain, and Russia in the Atlantic. I think you can divide it up, if necessary, but the main point is to arrange for a supreme allied war council and if necessary divided into the Atlantic and Pacific sections.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It would not be a unified command, it would be two commands.

Mr. FISH. You could divide the supreme command, in the Pacific and Atlantic sections, although I do not think the difference is so material. There should be a supreme allied war council right now and every day's delay impairs our united war efforts and the winning of the war.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I was very much interested in the gentleman's three points. I wonder if before the gentleman takes his seat he will give us the benefit of his view about a fourth point, a statement of the peace aims of the United Nations.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman has asked a very pertinent question, What are our peace aims? For a long time I have thought it was advisable for the Congress to ask the President to state to the American people and the world exactly what our peace aims are, and to state in concrete language what we are fighting for, and our program for maintaining peace after the war. I believe millions of soldiers in our armed forces ought to be told definitely what our peace aims are, and that it would likewise have favorable reaction in the conquered nations and the few remaining neutral nations.

Mr. LUDLOW. Would it not be beneficial if the terribly oppressed people in the nations abroad knew that we had a really altruistic peace aim, and if that knowledge could percolate through those foreign countries?

Mr. FISH. I think it would be highly advisable to explain our peace aims to the entire world. I am sure our peace aims are altruistic and unselfish and should appeal to all the world and to all the people in conquered territory suffering from aggression and starvation. Certainly nobody on either side of this House has the faintest idea of our engaging in any form of imperialism after victory has been secured. We do not want any additional territory. Of course, it is pretty hard to make people believe that we are fighting for the "four freedoms" because, if that is so, then we would have to make an exception of Soviet Russia. The people want to know exactly what we are fighting for, and they are entitled to know and particularly those in our armed forces.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman think our peace aims are fully and clearly set out in what is commonly known as the Atlantic Charter?

Mr. FISH. No; I do not. I have read the Atlantic Charter many times. I approve of most of it. However, it is very vague and in general terms. It was produced by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill as a joint statement 4 months before we entered the war and has never been considered by the Congress. The Atlantic Charter does not contain anything about freedom of speech, freedom of the press, or freedom of religion. It does say that the people of each country may determine their own form of government. That is the most important statement in the Atlantic Charter, and will appeal to the people in the conquered territories. It means that we are not going to impose any form of government—democracy, monarchy, or any other kind—on any of the foreign nations.

Mr. MAY. Regarding the gentleman's other line of argument, that the Allied Nations ought to strike now at the head and heart of Japan instead of at the fingers and toes, does the gentleman have any doubt that the armed forces—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps—are doing everything on earth they can to do that?

Mr. FISH. I have considerable doubt. I do not believe there are sufficient forces in Australia to carry on a major campaign against the Japanese. I think everybody knows that we cannot conduct a major offensive against the Japanese because we do not have the necessary armed forces and we do not have sufficient airplanes, to carry on a major campaign.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman doubt that the armed forces of this country are doing everything that it is humanly possible to do?

Mr. FISH. Certainly not. Every one of our men is fighting as hard as he can and doing a brilliant and brave job in the jungle fighting on Guadalcanal and New Guinea. We do not have the men, we do not have the equipment, and we do not have the airplanes to start a major offensive against Japan. Our men are doing everything they can in attacking a few islands, which I described as the fingers and toes of Japan, but not the heart and head of Japan.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not assume the gentleman read my remarks of 2 weeks ago wherein I forcibly expressed the point that no blueprint, no definite aims, should be drawn up.

Mr. FISH. I heard that speech. It was an excellent one in some respects.

Mr. GIFFORD. No one here took exception to those remarks, and I waited and waited here, and today the gentleman demands a definiteness of purpose that would remove some of our allies from us. Only generalizations should be indulged in at the moment, but that is not what I rose for.

Mr. FISH. It was the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] who spoke about the proposed peace terms. I was talking about three specific proposals that I believe will help expedite winning the war.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman this morning is defending the State Department. How unusual for him to do that.

Mr. FISH. That is right, but I am glad to do it whenever it is deserving of it.

Mr. GIFFORD. And I am glad to hear it. Perhaps it is high time somebody challenge these constant shafts against Mr. Willkie. I did take him for a long ride here after he returned, but I want to say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] that Mr. Willkie did stop at north Africa, and that he made a tour of the several nations, and he does know as much as some of us, and he did promise these nations sympathy, help, everything, and the gentleman should not worry about those nations losing sight of that.

Mr. FISH. There is one thing about Mr. Willkie. He can always talk for himself, he always has and will probably continue to do so, but he does not necessarily talk for the Republican Party.

Mr. GIFFORD. And so will the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. I shall talk for myself, and the gentleman may talk for himself.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I rose only to reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]. I am not intervening in this Republican fight for or against Mr. Willkie. I was simply making some observations.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield any further.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I congratulate the gentleman on his statement about the Atlantic Charter not being very specific. Do not stop with reading the Atlantic Charter, but go on into the British master agreement, section 7, which ties the Atlantic Charter and the lend-lease and the British master agreement all up in one package, and then try to figure it out.

Mr. FISH. All of which shows that there should be a clear expression of our peace aims. Mr. Speaker, I shall not have time to read this article from today's New York Times, but with the permission of the House I shall insert it as a part of my remarks. The article is headed "Economic collapse held near in China," and it is a plea on the part of Madam Koo, wife of the Chinese envoy to Britain. She pleads for speedy help from America. According to her, only 2 percent of our lend-lease materials were sent to China, and less than 1 percent of that arrived. She goes on and answers in detail the statement made by the President about the amount of lend-lease goods getting into China. I hope that every Member will read this statement of hers. She speaks with knowledge, very definite knowledge, of what has reached China. I believe everyone in this House and all Americans are sympathetic with China and admire the Chinese for their long fight against Japanese aggression, and if what she says is true, that the Chinese are near the end of the road of endurance, that they are near collapse, then something ought to be done about it immediately. Where there is a will there is always a way to find a road into China to assure the delivery of more lend-lease supplies—food, airplanes, and munitions of war—without delay. Time is of the essence; we must deliver the goods now.

ECONOMIC COLLAPSE HELD NEAR IN CHINA—MME. KOO, WIFE OF ENVOY TO BRITAIN, PLEADS FOR SPEEDY HELP FROM AMERICA—FOOD AND GUNS ARE ASKED—ONLY 2 PERCENT OF LEND-LEASE SENT EAST, SHE SAYS, AND ONLY QUARTER OF THAT ARRIVES

PHILADELPHIA, February 1.—With nothing more than pitiful assistance arriving from the United States, China is on the verge of economic collapse, Mme. Wellington Koo, the wife of the Chinese Ambassador to Great Britain said today in an address to workers of the United War Chest.

For want of food for her starving people and supplies for her heroic Army, China's ability to resist the Japanese may soon reach the breaking point, Mme. Koo said, adding that realistic examination showed that President Roosevelt's estimate of the aid reaching China from this country was, at least, incomplete.

"President Roosevelt has said that as much is being flown into China as ever went over the Burma Road," Mme. Koo said. "What he did not say was that of all the lend-lease materials China gets only 2 percent, the rest going to England and Russia. What he did not say was that of this pitiful 2 percent only half ever got to Burma and that, of this, only half again ever got into China.

"The President did not point out that of what materials did go to China 100 percent were made up of equipment of war and medical supplies. Not a pound of food ever went over the Burma Road or is going in now.

"While China needs guns, nevertheless the danger of economic collapse is so serious that America cannot long delay to equip and supply China and the Chinese Army, she said.

America cannot, at the same time, long put off financial aid in stabilizing the Chinese currency, Mme. Koo asserted. While loans have been made for that purpose, she declared, it is painfully clear that the import of American credit could not prevent the devaluation of the Chinese dollar as long as there remained an insufficiency of goods for that dollar to buy.

"If China collapses, America will be in a grave spot," Mme. Koo warned. 'If America is in a grave spot, the United Nations may lose the war. Therefore, aid to China must be sent now, at once, without delay. The old saying is still true: 'Divided we fall; united we stand.'"

More dangerous than the Japanese to the cause of the United Nations, she said, "was the relentless pressure of war which makes itself felt in hunger and cold and worthless money, the grinding burden of increasing scarcity and rising prices."

The Chinese, Mme. Koo said, "do not worry much about rationing because there is little or nothing to ration." In the last year prices have gone up not 5, 10 cents, but "in terms like 5 times, 10 times, and 50 times.

"With what money you have, you cannot afford to buy the things which are available and the things you can afford are not available.

"My stepdaughter is in the interior of China, working for the Red Cross. She gets a salary of $50 a month, which is above that of most salaried workers. However, a meal costs her $3, a yard of cloth $10. A one-room hut, made of mud and straw, costs $3,500. A trip by sedan chair, which formerly cost 60 cents, now costs $6. People cannot afford to buy coal, as it costs $1,000 (Chinese) a ton. In Chungking, hotels are asking $50 (Chinese) for a night," Mme. Koo said.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, to this bill there is no objection. It was reported by the Rules Committee unanimously. I believe the bill, as have other naval bills, will speedily pass the House unanimously. Today I rise to call again the attention of the House to the very dangerous policy, or lack of policy, with respect to labor in this Nation during this war. I warn the House of Representatives just what you are up against in the coal industry. Just 2 weeks ago we had a rather disastrous coal strike in the anthracite fields that tied up production and caused much suffering and much dislocation of war production. Mr. John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, has served notice on the Government and on the country that when his contract expires on the 1st day of April he is going to ask for a $2-per-day increase for all the coal miners. I do not know whether the country realizes just what that means, but we have to deal with the coal situation and with Mr. John L. Lewis.

That is the real difficulty. When his contract expires no more coal will be mined until a new contract is made. So that unless the Government accedes to his demand of a $2-a-day increase there is going to be a coal strike, and there is going to be a disastrous coal strike. If the Government does accede to his demand of $2 a day, then you have blown the lid off of the efforts to prevent inflation.

We have what is known as the Little Steel formula for the control of wages. The Little Steel formula provides that there shall be not greater than a 15-percent increase. The coal industry has already had something like twice that amount increase. So that you either must have a coal strike or you must abandon the only anchor you have against inflation, namely, the Little Steel formula.

I mention these things because I think we ought to pay some attention to them. Somebody will say, "Well, let the administration attend to that." I have been trying to get some legislation to correct some of the present labor laws for a long time. We have had some luck in the House, but we have had none in the Senate. However, I do not think we can excuse ourselves by saying we do not agree with what the administration is doing about it. Let us put the blame right where it belongs. What makes possible these conditions? They are made possible by laws that were passed by this Congress. You are not going to be able to go home to your people, neither Democrats nor Republicans, and say, "We are not responsible for this thing. The President should have done so-and-so. The Labor Board should have done so-and-so."

We made those laws. It is our duty to correct the obvious wrong.

Now, take the situation with respect to the 8-hour law, the 40-hour week.

Mr. SADOWSKI. What are the average earnings of these coal miners at the present time?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think it is about $8 a day. I am not sure. But under the coal-mine contract, and I am coming to that now—the question of the 40-hour week—under the John Lewis coal miners' contract the miners are absolutely prohibited from working more than 35 hours a week, and we have on the books our 40-hour-week law. Nobody thinks we can win this war working 40 hours a week. No official in the Government thinks so. All you are getting out of war industries now is forty-two and a fraction hours per week. Yet who is responsible for it? Congress put the law on the books. Is Congress willing to do anything about it? Why do we not proceed to consider these matters, proceed in a democratic way; bring out a bill to the floor of the House? I do not know what the answer is. I do not undertake to say.

I am willing to go along with any reasonable proposal, but a proposal that

will stop the waste of manpower that is certainly endangering our productive effort in this war. We all know it. Every administrative officer in the Government will tell you that we must have at least a 48-hour week. Yet we sit here with this restraining law that prevents us from doing a real job that we ought to do, and that the country expects us to do. I wonder if we realize just how grave the situation is going to be in another 6 months on account of the lack of farm labor? We have drained them off to go into the Army; we have drained them off by higher wages in defense industries, until we have reached the point where in this growing season, which begins very soon, the farmer will be so handicapped that it will be utterly and physically impossible for him to raise the food that is necessary for this country, much less for the whole world. And what have we done about the manpower situation? Do you realize that if you take away this restraining influence of the 40-hour week, you would release enough manpower to man those farms? Do you realize how much manpower is lost by these silly union rules, known as the feather-bed rules, that require one man to sit around and look while some other man does a job of work? Count those things up. We talk about having a manpower law. We would not need any manpower law if you would just take away the artificial restraint upon the production of the working men of this country. Take them out from under the heel of the labor leader who is preventing them from working to their full capacity and you will not need a manpower law.

I hope the Congress will begin to give serious consideration to these things. You may blame John Lewis, you may blame Philip Murray, you may blame William Green, but you are putting the blame in the wrong place. John Lewis has been very blunt and frank with the country. He says, "Here is the law. You have given me the right under those laws." All he is doing is availing himself of the weapons that Congress has put into his hands. Let us put the blame where it belongs. It does not belong on the President. It does not belong on the War Labor Board. It does not belong on John L. Lewis or William Green or Philip Murray. It belongs on the Congress of the United States who for 3 years has been on a sit-down strike with reference to doing anything about labor laws.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. My understanding of the Congress of the United States is that it is composed of a Senate and a House of Representatives, so I think the gentleman should be a little more specific as to where the blame rests.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad my good friend from Kentucky, who has always supported proper measures of this character, has directed that to my attention. I did say we had luck with those measures in the House. I do not want to make any criticism or animadversions of the other body, but the fact is that this House, on two occasions, by overwhelming votes, has passed corrective labor legislation, only to see it die in another body for lack of action.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I heard with great interest the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] concerning a unified command. We all desire a unified command beyond peradventure of doubt. It is easy to criticize the failure to establish a unified command at this juncture, but we must remember it is difficult to accomplish, for it is complicated by many intricate and diverse factors of which we have no knowledge whatsoever. I query whether we have the right to criticize to the extent that the gentleman from New York did with reference to that failure at this time. I have the highest respect for the knowledge and attainments of the gentleman from New York, but I ask him and other Members to be patient. I am sure this problem is being considered and will be satisfactorily worked out. We have confidence, I am sure, in General MacArthur in the east; we have confidence in General Eisenhower and General Clark in north Africa, and General Marshall, General Arnold, and Admiral Leahy right here. They are in constant touch with the President. We must repose the utmost faith in all these men, because they know what the situation really is and we do not know what the situation really is. They, not we, are going through the baptism of fire. They must be the final arbiters. They will not fail us.

Another matter to which I should like to advert is punishment of the war guilty when peace comes. When one compares the statements and articles appearing in newspapers today with what appeared in the newspapers and periodicals of 1917 and 1918 one finds a distinct parallel. Everybody then asked, everybody now asks, for the setting up of so-called atrocity courts to try the war guilty. What happened then? It is most significant to realize that 900 individuals were scheduled for indictment and punishment, from Kaiser Wilhelm down, following the First World War, but all it resulted in was an international wink of the eye, as it were, a mere mockery. The 900 were whittled down to 70, and then to 60, and finally to 12—and where do you think the 12 were tried? As a result of reservations made by this country and by Japan—think of it!—and England, those 12 culprits were tried before the Supreme Court of Leipsic by Hun judges. It would be equivalent to Hitler, Goering, and Goebbels being tried by a court made up of Gestapo agents. That farce resulted in the trial of 12 men. Six were acquitted, 6 were convicted; 2 naval lieutenants were sentenced to 4 years in jail but contrived to escape; and the others were sentenced to 6 months in jail. Only 4 served any sentences. The Kaiser continued his wood chopping in Holland—in comfortable exile—as the Squire of Doorn. The Dutch Government had refused to recognize the order of extradition. Think of it! We should have no recurrence. The will was there then as the will is here today, but this time we must carry out the good intentions; otherwise we shall make ourselves utterly and woefully ridiculous. We beat the Nazis or Huns once, we will beat them again, but if we fail to punish properly and curb and control these Prussian Junkers this time, they will rise again to smite us. We shall never beat them a third time.

When following the First World War we demanded the setting up of these atrocity courts Theodore Roosevelt said: "Put them behind the bars, put them in padded cells." But nothing came of those high protestations. The time has now arrived when we should blueprint and plot as it were—if I may use that term—the setting up of appropriate tribunals to try these international culprits, these offenders against the laws of God, man, and humanity. If we let it all go until victory shall have been achieved we shall be bogged down with so much bickering as to what type of court, as to what type of material evidence, as to who shall prosecute, as to who shall be the judges, as to the venue of the court, that we shall accomplish nothing. That shall not be. Let us do the spade work now and not wait.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, there being no further requests for time, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1446) to authorize appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1446) to provide for additional ship-repair facilities, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY], who reported the bill by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, I hope I shall not be interrupted during my presentation of this analysis of the bill for I have endeavored to make a complete statement of every section. After I have completed this exposition I shall be pleased to answer questions; and I may add that I shall have plenty of time in which to do that.

This bill is a bill in general to authorize appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities. Specifically, the appropriation

when obtained will be used for the purpose of building floating drydocks sufficiently mobile to use them in places where there are no ship repair facilities at the present time. As the war developed our Navy was called upon to take part in movements far removed from our shores. Then as ships were damaged there were few facilities for repairing same and, in some cases, they had to be brought back from the southern Pacific as far as Pearl Harbor and, of course, even farther to our own docking facilities on the west coast.

This situation was fully studied and considered, and the conclusion was that the need for ship repairing could best be met by building mobile drydocks which could be towed to places nearer the fleet. This study and analysis was made of existing docking facilities throughout the world that would be available to the Allied Nations, and an estimate of the number of ships which could be expected to require docking. Based on this study, it was thought that the best results could be obtained by the use of this appropriation for mobile drydocks alone and in three classes, each one with reference to the types of vessels served by said drydocks. The number of floating drydocks recommended is 48, and the estimated cost is placed at $133,000,000. The equipment and facilities to be used by these drydocks, it is estimated, will cost $77,000,000, making, therefore, a total authorization of $210,000,000.

The bill also provides for the acquisition of land, but there is no intention at this time to acquire any land except within the continental limits of the United States. These drydocks will not be specifically located, for they are movable and will be placed where they are most needed, and their location will depend upon the developments of the war. The committee, however, offered an amendment that the Secretary of the Navy should, within 60 days, transmit to the Congress a full report of all acquisitions of land effected under the authority of this act.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREWRY. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I notice the gentleman stated there was no intention to purchase any land outside continental United States. The gentleman always knows whereof he speaks, but my understanding was that if we had a base, for instance, somewhere in the world and it was necessary to transport a drydock to that base for the purpose of repairing crippled ships in the vicinity, it might become necessary to acquire sufficient land on shore to establish the equipment which must be used and go with a drydock, if the drydock is to be of service. Am I wrong in my understanding?

Mr. DREWRY. No; the gentleman is entirely correct. There is no intention to acquire land at this time. We do not know what may occur in any theater of war that may later necessitate getting some land at some place to use these mobile drydocks for the repairs to which the gentleman just referred.

Mr. MICHENER. The reason I interrupted the gentleman was that I understood him to leave the impression that this land would be purchased only within continental United States. It seems to me it is vastly more important if we have a drydock that we implement the drydock, whether it requires the purchase of a half acre of land at a base in a foreign country or not.

Mr. DREWRY. I said there was no intention at this time to that effect in this bill. I probably should not have said even within the continental limits. The bill itself provides for the acquisition of land, if necessary, which meets the idea that the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREWRY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman give the House assurances that this bill does not authorize the acquisition of land for any other purpose than that expressed in the bill; that is, incident to the construction of drydock facilities?

Mr. DREWRY. Yes. That is the statement that was made to the committee, that no acquisition of land as referred to in this bill would be required except in the event of some contingency which we cannot foresee at this time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman that they cannot buy land under this bill for any other purpose except drydock purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREWRY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it should be pointed out also that if any land is acquired, the amendment in the bill requires that it report to Congress after 60 days when and where they have acquired it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In that connection I may say that the damage could be done by that time. I want to establish the clear intent of Congress that this bill does not carry with it any authority to acquire land by the Government or the Navy Department other than what may be necessary incident to the construction of the drydocks authorized by the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DREWRY. That is true.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREWRY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I confess that I cannot see any place in the bill where there is a limitation to drydocks. The authority granted here, as I see it, is for acquiring essential equipment and facilities, at either public or private plants, for repairing, altering, or converting any vessel operated by the Navy and in connection with the grant of authority for the acquisition of land there is also the authority granted to erect or extend buildings and acquire machinery and equipment. I must confess that it seems to me we have put a fine coat of veneer on this thing if we say this is only for the purpose of getting a drydock, because, under the terms of this bill, the Secretary of the Navy may do anything. True, the representation may have been made before the Rules Committee that the real purpose of this is to acquire the necessary land for the circumstances requiring repairs at certain points during the course of the war, but the language, the latitude that is allowed, in this bill certainly goes far beyond any limitation expressed before the Rules Committee. I would prefer to let my distinguished friend from Virginia continue with the very able presentation that he is making. It was not my intention to interrupt at this point, so I will withdraw my observation presently and address it to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think it is very pertinent at this time. The intention of the bill is to confine the acquisition of property to that which is connected and related to the operations of these floating drydocks. Of course, I do not consider that the Secretary under this authority could go out and buy land for the purpose of building air fields or building anything except that which is related to a floating drydock. If it can be interpreted that the Secretary could do that, of course, we will be most happy to have a limitation that the acquisition must be confined to the drydock proposition.

Mr. DITTER. I am going to withdraw my present objection, and when my distinguished friend from Georgia amplifies further the purposes of the bill, I will direct my attention to him. I am sorry I interrupted the gentleman.

Mr. DREWRY. In the meantime, let me suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he read the first section, as follows:

> That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $210,000,000 for essential equipment and facilities at either private or public plants for repairing, altering, or converting any vessel operated by the Navy or being prepared for naval use.

That does not refer to construction.

Mr. DITTER. I have not said that it did refer to construction.

Mr. DREWRY. That does not apply to construction. It applies to the essential equipment and facilities that are needed for these mobile drydocks and nothing else. There is no way that we can tie the hands of the Navy or this Government, if you choose to say so, in this war by making a limitation so rigid that they cannot meet conditions as they arise. This is not peacetime. This is wartime. This bill contains this language because elasticity is needed for the very reason that the mobile drydocks are being constructed.

Mr. DITTER. I will withdraw presently.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREWRY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. As a matter of fact, the wording of this bill authorizing the construction of facilities for the repair and alteration of vessels follows

two previous authorizations, so that, generally speaking, it is supplemental to authorizations for facilities to repair and alter vessels, but actually it is intended for the construction of drydocks.

Mr. DREWRY. I was coming to that.

With reference to the acquisition of land, the committee has an amendment that the Secretary of the Navy should, within 60 days, transmit to the Congress a full report of all acquisitions of land effected under the authority of this act.

At this point I wish, also, to call to your attention that the bill must necessarily be general and that the location of these drydocks cannot be given out, nor even the names of the places where it is possible they may be located. Such information would be very helpful, of course, to the enemy. All the information, however, concerning every phase of this proposed construction has been given in executive session to the Naval Affairs Committee. The committee unanimously approved the bill and directed me to report it. It has been approved by the Navy Department and has the approval of the Budget and is in keeping with the plan of the military command.

The committee also amended the bill to provide that the title of all construction included in this bill should remain in the United States, and the amendment is in accordance with the act of March 11, 1941.

In order to meet the immediate need, the Navy Department thinks that an authorization for $210,000,000 would be sufficient at this time for the construction of these floating drydocks and the equipment and facilities for repairing, altering, or converting vessels being prepared for naval use.

Three hundred and eighty-five million dollars has already been appropriated for similar purposes, and $347,000,000 has been obligated in contracts made to this time. Further tentative contracts have, however, been made based upon the appropriation asked for in this bill.

The Navy Department recommends enactment of this proposed legislation, and it has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Navy Department advises that the steel requirements for the proposed mobile drydocks has been arranged and correlated with other naval construction in such a way as to keep the total consumption of steel plate in any one month below the present allocations of steel to the Navy Department. The Navy Department thinks that it will be possible to construct these docks without impairing the essential shipbuilding program. If, however, there should be insufficient steel to carry on all these programs, together with the drydock program, the construction of the drydocks will be necessarily suspended for the time being.

The need for the recommended mobile docks is very urgent, and construction should be commenced at the earliest possible date. The construction of these mobile docks will require less time, and will not require the use of vessels needed for other war services. Said docks will be, in the opinion of the Navy Department, the most efficient and satisfactory for all types of vessels which have been damaged. Such mobile drydocks will avoid the difficulties of transportation of men, equipment, and materials from the United States to other locations for permanent docks.

If there are any questions the Committee wish to ask, I shall try to answer them.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREWRY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Reading the newspapers gives the impression that the Navy is following the policy of trying to outbuild the submarine menace. Was there any testimony before the committee regarding what steps are being taken to stop the submarine attacks?

Mr. DREWRY. Not in regard to this bill. The discussion before the committee on this bill was based on the bill and not on other matters.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The committee did not go into the submarine question at all?

Mr. DREWRY. Not on this bill. We entered into a discussion of it at other times.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREWRY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I understand that Admiral Horan, Assistant Chief of Operations, is to come before the committee day after tomorrow to discuss the subject of submarine activities.

Mr. DREWRY. That subject has been taken up in a general way but not in connection with this bill, which refers only to mobile drydocks.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the question propounded by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] is a very important one. I want the Committee to understand that under the interpretation I place on the language of section 4 the Secretary of the Navy will not have the authority to acquire land for any purpose unless it is related to the conversion, repair, or building of these floating drydocks. I want this debate to show that, in my opinion, this language does not convey to the Secretary the authority to acquire land for any purpose that is not directly referred to in this bill.

This bill is primarily for the purpose of constructing floating drydocks. There are two kinds of drydocks. One is called a graving drydock, the other a floating drydock. A graving drydock is one that is built in the earth. The ships come into that graving dock and it is filled with water. This bill has reference to floating drydocks, some of which are self-propelled and some of which are towed by tugs. While the floating drydock is in the water, the ship is put into it, then the water is pumped out and the repairs made on the ship.

It may be necessary in certain parts of the country in the construction and operation of these drydocks for the Secretary of the Navy to acquire a very limited area of land. If we did not convey that authority to him and it became necessary for him to acquire such land, he would have to come back here at another time and ask Congress to give him the authority to acquire that land to operate his drydocks. However, there is no intention in this bill to permit the Navy Department to acquire large acreages of land and use them for any purpose other than specifically referred to in this bill.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has rendered an outstanding service in this debate by calling the attention of the committee to the broad interpretation that might be applied to the language of this bill. To be absolutely sure that it is not the intention of the committee that such an interpretation be applied to the bill and that it cannot be applied, I propose to offer an amendment that, on page 2, in line 1, after "purpose", there be inserted "of the authority herein contained."

I am just as much opposed—and the committee is just as much opposed—to giving a blanket authorization without our knowing exactly what is taking place as is the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am frank to say that I and the other members of the committee have been very much disturbed by the fact that the Navy has acquired large tracts of land during the prosecution of this war. So disturbed have I become that I have requested the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] to introduce in Congress a bill which I have prepared.

I may say in that connection that we in the Committee on Naval Affairs do not know any party lines. The minority will introduce bills and they will be presented to the House by the minority members, just as this bill is being presented by a majority member, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY].

The purpose of that bill is to prohibit the Navy from acquiring any land or spending any money for that purpose until it has been specifically authorized to do so by the Committee on Naval Affairs. In the past we have done a fairly good job of keeping up with what has been going on. In two or three acts we authorized large sums of money to be spent, and when we did so we broke down the items in committee, but, much to our surprise, we later read in the newspapers that the Navy had acquired Mount Vernon Seminary and other properties of whose acquisition we had never dreamed when we made these authorizations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, for instance, here is a bill which was passed on April 13, 1942—fleet facilities, $4,000,000; aviation facilities, $168,780,000, and other items totaling in all up to eight or nine hundred million dollars. When they appeared before the committee we required them to bring in an itemized statement as to how they expected to spend all that money. Of course, sometimes they change their views down there, and they change their minds, and sometimes they do not follow accurately in their acquisition program which was laid out before the com-

mittee, but we are going to do our level best to see that the money that has not been spent, some one hundred fifty million dollars or two hundred million dollars, cannot be spent until they come back to the committee and say, "We propose to spend $25,000,000 to do this or $25,000,000 to do that," and the very purpose of this inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] is a pertinent one, because this Congress must know how this money is being expended, and where it is going to go and for what purpose. Therefore I assure the committee that the intention of our committee was that the acquisition of land here is so clear in connection with the subject matter set forth in this bill, and the Secretary of the Navy would not have the authority to go out and buy land for any purpose, if it had no relation to this bill. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, if the conclusion that I have reached is incorrect, I hope that my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will set me straight. As I read section 4 of the bill, it proposes to authorize the leasing by the Federal Government, the Government of the United States, of any ship, boat, barge, or floating drydock to any other nation.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, that is not entirely correct. It is to permit the leasing of any vessel under the authorization of the Lend-Lease Act.

Mr. DITTER. To that extent.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; to that extent.

Mr. DITTER. So that we start with that premise; that is, section No. 4 does not bear relevancy to the authority that is provided in sections 1 and 2. In other words, we are doing a double-barrel job. In sections 1 and 2, we are authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to acquire facilities and land for a certain purpose in connection with the repair and altering of vessels. Then we go over to section 4 and in section 4 we go along an entirely different line, and we say there that any vessel we have, boat, barge, and so on, may be leased by the Government of the United States. I should like to concur with the conclusion reached by my friend from Georgia, but I fail to see how those two divergent purposes can somehow or other by implication be merged into one.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It happens in this way. There is no distinction as to whether a floating drydock is a ship, under the lease-lend bill. Under this act of March 11, 1941, they have authority to lease ships, but the title does not pass out of the Federal Government. When the matter was brought up in the committee it developed that in all probability a great many of those floating drydocks may be used possibly in the Mediterranean or other places, and the question was raised as to who would use them, and it developed that probably our allies might use them, and, therefore, instead of classifying a floating drydock as a ship, making a classification of a floating drydock, we simply said that these ships, floating drydocks and things of that kind referred to in section 4, can be leased, but that the title must remain in the Government of the United States.

Mr. DITTER. I do not want to be understood as being critical of section 4 or the intent and purpose of section 4. I have no criticism of that whatever. The point I raise is that the gentleman from Georgia used section 4 as the means of tying into sections 1 and 2 the thought of a drydock. In sections 1 and 2 there is nothing whatever said with reference to a drydock.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is true.

Mr. DITTER. And then we go on an entirely different tangent with reference to the leasing of these drydocks, and the gentleman as I understood him attempts to tie up the authority under section 4 with the authority under sections 1 and 2. I do not want to be critical of the committee or the purpose. My only hope was that in some way we might limit what I believe the gentleman has already said today, the extension of authority and the abuses of authority.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. DITTER. That in some instances have been brought to our attention. May I ask this question? Instead of the acquisition of the land, and by the acquisition I believe we contemplate the purchase?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is true.

Mr. DITTER. If extraordinary conditions require the mooring of a drydock at a particular point for repair purposes, have we not certainly reason to expect that it would be at a friendly point, at a point where one of those who are identified with us in this war effort would have ownership or sovereignty, and would it not be reasonable to suppose that in the joint effort we have, that a lease might be made for the temporary purpose of providing that mooring facility rather than this temptation to the abuse of power by granting authority to acquire?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I imagine that in every foreign place where a drydock is used it will be used under lease arrangements, but if it so happens that it cannot be used—I cannot conceive of any foreign country hesitating to lease—but we must have the authority, if it becomes necessary, to step in and buy. But I hope it would not happen, and I do not believe it will happen, and I do not think under the provisions of this bill the Secretary will be justified in acquiring a foot of land, the fee passing to the United States Government. However, I do not want Congress to be in the position of saying, "We are ready to tie up and repair a ship and we have the facilities here, but we have to go back to the House of Representatives and the United States Senate and get a law passed to permit us to acquire a piece of property." It would mean a delay, and to expedite the matter authority to acquire or to lease should be granted. However, I agree with the gentleman and I want the House to understand that your Naval Affairs Committee is most determined to see that this money is used for the purpose for which it is appropriated and that there is no abuse of authority in the latitude we have permitted in the various bills.

I am frank to say that I am apprehensive that they have, in instance after instance, acquired far more land than I would have acquired or probably any other Member of the committee would have acquired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished friend yield further?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Am I to understand, then, and can the House have an understanding as a result of the observations made by the gentleman from Georgia—and those observations were in the nature of an assurance to me, and, of course, I can place every confidence in the assurance that comes from my distinguished friend from Georgia, for I accept them without question whatever—are we to understand that if the Secretary attempts to use this authority and then comes to the Appropriations Committee for the acquisition of land which, in the judgment of the gentleman from Georgia, is beyond the scope of the contemplated authority under this bill, that he will join with me in refusing an appropriation to implement the authority voted in this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, the gentleman from Georgia and the entire Naval Affairs Committee will urge the Appropriations Committee to cut out any appropriation which, in the opinion of the committee, after a hearing, is concluded by the committee to be an abuse of the authority granted here. We are going to cooperate with the gentleman's committee, and by cooperating with the gentleman's committee we will be able to bring about more economies, because, in my opinion at least, from reports that have been submitted to me which have been called for from the Department, there has been entirely too much Navy placed on shore. The Navy is a sea-going organization and not a shore-going organization. I am unalterably opposed to building up a great land and shore Navy. Let it go to the high seas and fight. For that very reason your committee has come here time after time suggesting that these officers who are sitting behind desks in Washington should go to the fleet and their places be taken by some WAVE or by some person beyond the draft age. There has been entirely too much placed on the shore. The place for the Navy is on the high seas.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Does the gentleman from Georgia include in that expression of attitude, leaving to the Army, the operation of land-based planes?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Now, do not get me onto that subject because we are not going to try to sit in the Naval Affairs Committee as strategists. We are not going to tell them how to fight the war. All we are trying to do is to see, if possible, that the American people get

full value for the money that the Congress appropriates.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with the abuse of power noted by my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], who is the outstanding advocate of logic and expression and eloquence that I know, my friend from Georgia has in mind, I am sure, the fact that we have to win the war, and that hind thought is always better than forethought?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, yes; we have to win the war, but at the same time——

Mr. DITTER. Now, will my distinguished friend yield right there?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. The chivalry of the South would certainly not make it possible for him to reject the overture I am about to make to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, when I say that as a blushing bride I almost bow before that very gracious compliment; but the gentleman should always remember that I prefaced my statement, as the gentleman from Georgia will remember, with the declaration that I did not intend to be critical of the committee, nor did I want to obstruct the war effort.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is exactly right.

Mr. DITTER. My friend knows I have cooperated long before the war effort.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has lent valuable aid and assistance in inquiry and by careful investigation of these expenditures, and is not subject to any criticism from my party or anybody else that he is critical. He has only tried to see that the American taxpayer's money is properly spent.

Mr. DITTER. We want the best defense for the money we spend, and the gentleman from Georgia joins me in that attitude.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Now, if there are no further questions, I will yield the floor.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There have been so many eulogies passed around that it is difficult to find out what this bill is about.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And that has the gentleman from Kentucky somewhat confused, has it not?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes, it has. First, I wish to inquire whether the ships, boats, barges, or floating drydocks mentioned in section 4 are the drydocks and ships provided for in sections 1 and 2?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. The drydock is—but the ships, boats, and barges are any that belong to the Navy.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. So that under section 4 the Secretary of the Navy can lease or lend to any other nation any ship or boat of the entire United States Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is the law today, I may say to the distinguished gentleman, under the Lease-Lend Act; and we only add drydocks in there.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If that is the law today why should it be in this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Because we wanted to include in it these drydocks, so that title to them would not pass out of the Navy but would remain in the Navy.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But I thought that under lease-lend these things had to be done by direction of the President; here direction is given to the Secretary of the Navy. I want to know why that is done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This is in accordance with the act of March 11, 1941, the Lend-Lease Act.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, what I want to know is whether excess land or any land owned by the Navy Department could be transferred to the Army without an act of Congress.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Land can be transferred from the Army to the Navy or from the Navy to the Army by Executive order of the President. That has been done in the past.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. And when under lend-lease a transfer is made of anything between the Army and the Navy there must be a full accounting to the appropriate appropriation; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right. Not long ago we took Moffatt Field in California from the Army. To reimburse the Army we had to buy another field for them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Was I correct in my understanding that the gentleman said in answer to the gentleman from Kentucky that as the law stood at this time the Navy could lend-lease any of these vessels to any nation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is the law of March 11, 1941.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it also true that when the Navy does that the crews go with them?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; the crews do not go with them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We just let them have the boats and not the men.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Sometime I trust the gentleman will come around to my office. I will let him read something about the merchant marine in which he may be interested.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will be around.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there can be much controversy about this particular bill; it seems to be meritorious and it should be enacted; but it should not suffice to spend hundreds of millions of dollars for the construction of drydocks and munitions of war without making adequate provision for feeding the armed forces and the civilians who must produce the goods with which to carry on this war.

When the price control bill was before Congress, I offered a compromise which was later adopted in principle, which authorized the President to take into consideration farm labor costs in setting maximum prices for farm products. I did this after Secretary Wickard and Price Administrator Henderson had "eaten their words" wherein they had approved 110 percent of parity. The President had threatened to break through even the parity formula of 85 percent, in total disregard of the parity provisions of the Price Control Act.

You will recall that he assumed to have this authority and threatened to use it on October 1 if the Congress had not acted by that time. The suggestion that all farm labor be included in establishing parity would have increased the ceiling to about 112 percent of parity. Needless to say the President would have vetoed any such bill inasmuch as he had objected to 110 percent of parity and would have then issued his Executive order, the authority for which he claims is contained in the War Powers Acts, breaking through not only 110 percent of parity but in some cases announced that he would go as low as 65 percent of parity, this latter statement being borne out by the fact that administrative spokesmen at the time of our conferences advocated that authority for this action be contained in the price control bill.

To me it was a question of salvaging what we could in the hope that the new Congress would correct the situation. I advocated, therefore, the compromise which guaranteed parity and established a floor in respect to ceiling prices, raising the parity formula under A. A. A. from 85 percent to 90 percent. Therefore, we were assured of a ceiling of 100 percent of parity and a floor of 90 percent of parity, which continues for a period of 2 years following the war.

It was represented that the administration would take into consideration the increase in farm labor costs, and to assure an adequate production of farm products would add labor costs to the parity formula in establishing maximum prices. The administration has not done so. In this respect it has broken faith not only with the Congress but with the farmers and all others both in the armed forces and civilian life who had a right to expect that the President, Secretary Wickard, and the O. P. A. Administrator would adjust farm-price ceilings upward to encourage adequate production. We are now faced with the probability of a serious food shortage which is due primarily to the failure of the administration to understand the labor problem confronting our farmers and the necessity for adequate production of farm products as an essential auxiliary to our

war effort. An adequate production of food in time of war is as necessary to victory as is a plentiful supply of munitions. Because of the disastrous consequences of the failure of the administration to use the powers granted to it by the Price Control Act to assure an adequate supply of food for our armed forces and civilians, there is but one alternative—the Congress must reassume its responsibility and adopt in principle, at least, the provisions of the Pace bill, H. R. 1408.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, last week I directed the attention of the House to an impossible situation which was being created in Battle Creek, Mich., because of governmental red tape and conflicting regulations. The impossible situation has now developed and as a result there is no delivery of coal in that city.

The drivers of the retail coal dealers in Battle Creek went on a strike yesterday, bringing about a complete cessation of deliveries.

I would just like to point out again the basic fact facing the city, facing the drivers, and facing the dealers. The outstanding fact in which I am interested is that my people in a cold community cannot get coal, the drivers cannot get the increase in wages which they seek, an increase from 75 cents to $1 per hour. The drivers are caught in a squeeze from two directions. They could not be given an increase under the regulation which freezes wages. Likewise, they could not be given an increase because of the ceiling price on coal which makes it financially impossible for the dealers to give the increase demanded and still operate without going bankrupt.

The dealers are likewise caught in the squeeze because they cannot sell coal without the drivers, and they cannot continue to operate their business, being forbidden to meet the drivers' demands by Government regulations, and being prohibited likewise from meeting the demands because the price at which they sell their product is frozen.

Consequently, Battle Creek, with very low temperatures, is going to be very cold before it gets warmer.

This same situation can, and will, develop in other communities throughout the country. It is a senseless and inexcusable malfunctioning of government.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to this bill. We should not close this debate without making it clear that the purpose of section 4 is not to allow anything that is not now allowed by law but it was the intention of the Naval Affairs Committee and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], who first brought it up, that we should limit this Government and the Navy Department from transferring anything to any foreign government whereby the title did not remain in the United States. This is the purpose of section 4.

Secondly, this debate should not close without complimenting the Bureau of Ships, and Yards and Docks on the plan they have for floating drydocks. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this is a new floating emphasis on Navy repair facilities.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman does not mean to convey to the House the impression that we have not had floating drydocks before, does he?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no; I say that the emphasis is being placed upon a huge program of floating drydocks rather than going into these foreign countries and acquiring land to build something permanent in the way of graving docks or wharves.

Mr. DITTER. We do not like to call them foreign countries, do we? We mean that we are going to avail ourselves of the friendly relationships presently existing between this Government and those that are identified with us in a common purpose. We are going to avail ourselves of facilities that they may have at hand for mooring our floating drydocks.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the necessity may arise when we would have to put one of these floating drydocks in some country that is not technically our ally. It may be a neutral country.

Mr. DITTER. Friendly?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know. I am somewhat like Churchill who says, "He who is not with us in this fight is against us."

Mr. DITTER. But the gentleman would not imagine for a moment that we would purchase land in a country that presently is under the sovereignty of one of our enemies?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; not necessarily.

Mr. DITTER. All the rest of the world is our friend.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania is right.

Mr. DITTER. That is my impression as I think of the magnitude of our relationship in world affairs today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The purpose of this program is to get away from permanency of drydocks on land beyond the continental limits of the United States. We have restricted the bill so that the title to these drydocks will remain in this country and after the war those drydocks will be ours and can be used by ourselves.

Mr. DITTER. I compliment the gentleman on the caution that he has already exercised, which is due not only to his intelligent approach to the problem but because of his experience with the Navy, and I compliment him.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Referring again to section 4 and the limitation contained therein, there are two rather than one; first, that the title shall not be transferred to any foreign power, either for a short period or a long period, and that if a lease is made that lease shall not extend beyond the present war.

Mr. MAGNUSON. For the duration of the war.

Mr. COLE of New York. There are two limitations rather than one.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The idea was originally brought up by the gentleman from New York and the committee entirely agreed with him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The theory behind the bill, so far as the floating drydocks are concerned, is a very important one from the practical angle in connection with winning the war and involves the proposition of repairs to naval vessels at places other than at land bases or naval stations on land?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right, and to get away from what bothers all of us.

Mr. McCORMACK. And answering the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, to satisfy him and to bring a little consolation to him, this bill is considered very important in connection with winning the war?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. May I say further, when this war broke out we found ourselves in the Pacific, for instance, with no drydock facilities throughout that vast expanse of water with the exception of Pearl Harbor. This type of drydock facility can be used in the Pacific and we hope, of course, we will not have to keep them there long.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAAS. I want to point out this amendment that the committee inserted at its own instance not only applies to this bill but applies to ships of every character, and every ship in which the United States still has title.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, it is the intention of the Naval Affairs Committee of this House that the great Navy we are building will always belong to the United States, that the title of it will be in the United States of America and no other country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the indulgence, and I do not want to detain the Committee unduly, but, for the benefit of the Committee, I think I should make clear what probably is presently not definitely before us. There might be a misconstruction placed on the statement of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, the majority leader.

We have had floating drydocks before. If I am incorrect in that statement, I should like to be corrected. I repeat, we have had floating drydocks before. May I say to my friend from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, that as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I helped provide appropriations for floating drydocks. We were critical in times past of one mammoth floating

drydock. The Navy subsequently withdrew the request for that particular type of floating drydock.

So that, whatever observation was made in connection with my thought on the possible abuse of power, it was in no way critical of the use of floating drydocks or the possibility of them being very necessary during the course of the war. I am thoroughly in accord with that. I feel that mooring facilities should be provided, but I do believe there should be a limitation in some way on the grant of power which is a continuing invitation to possible abuse; and in this position I think I have the support not only of the minority side but of a very substantial part of the majority side, who also recognize the temptation to which I refer.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Under the circumstances we may well afford to let this bill move on and become law, but there is much in what the gentleman has to say. In order to prevent abuse hereafter, I think it would be well to apply the practice of writing the intent of Congress into the legislation that we pass.

Mr. DITTER. I accept the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia.

I have already pointed out during the course of the debate that the authority vested in the Secretary of the Navy under the provisions of this bill is not confined to drydocks. He is authorized to acquire lands, and that means purchase lands, erect or extend buildings, acquire machinery and equipment for repairing, altering, or converting any vessel operated by the Navy or being prepared for naval use.

Repeated efforts have been made here on the floor today to leave the impression that the authority extended only to the possible operation of drydocks. Apparently the representation was made before the Rules Committee that the authority was intended to apply only to those instances in which it would be found necessary to obtain mooring facilities for a floating drydock. I believe such facilities might well be necessary and essential to the prosecution of the war. I need not dwell at this time on the position which I have always taken—that nothing should be done to interfere with the war effort. But let it be understood, definitely understood, understood beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Secretary is not authorized to extend further the generous real-estate operations to which resort has already been had.

Few of us realize the magnitude of the real-estate operations already undertaken by the Army and the Navy. In truth Uncle Sam has become the No. 1 realtor. According to the December issue of the Army Officer, "The Army and Navy before war's end will have acquired land equivalent in size to the entire New England group of States." Mark you, not one State, but equivalent to the entire New England group. The same journal is authority for the statement that "To date some 64,368 tracts have been purchased with 57,000 in process of condemnation, or some 12,000,000 acres, representing a value of $284,000,000. The Office of War Information estimates that the land purchased from private property holders equals in size the combined areas of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Delaware, the District of Columbia, and four-fifths of New Jersey."

Think for a moment what this means to the problem of local taxation. For the most part these tracts prior to the acquisition by the Government carried their share of the real-estate-tax burden of the community. Others must now take over this burden. The surrounding community must make up the loss. Insofar as these acquisitions are necessary, they should be secured. But care and caution should be the watchword.

We should also be mindful of the future—mindful of that day when curtailments in the instruments of war will be inevitable. What use will be made of some of these extensive and, in many instances, exorbitantly expensive real-estate ventures? I say very seriously today that restraint on the practices already indulged in to make Uncle Sam the No. 1 realtor should be exercised, rather than giving encouragement to further excursions in the same field.

I find it difficult to contemplate any possible condition where mooring facilities for floating drydocks could not be secured by short-term lease agreements. The very idea of a floating drydock suggests a temporary stand rather than a permanent location. The sites will be the property of our friends, not our enemies. Mutuality of purpose would prompt the granting of every possible concession to us. By no stretch of the imagination can I conceive of the need of an unconfined and vagrant grant of authority such as I feel is provided for in the measure before us.

Let it be remembered that the Congress, not the Secretary of the Navy, is answerable to the people. The responsibility is ours. If power which we delegate is abused, the people have the right to ask whether we exercised the caution of reasonably prudent men in making possible the complained-of abuse.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $210,000,000 for essential equipment and facilities at either private or public plants for repairing, altering, or converting any vessel operated by the Navy or being prepared for naval use.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think I would be derelict in my duty if I did not bring to this committee some information in regard to the proposal that has been presented to the committee. Every dollar of this money has already been contracted for. The contracts have been let to build these drydocks, without a line of authority for it having been enacted into law, and without any consideration of it by the Committee on Appropriations. You are merely called on here today to ratify something that has already been completed and finished. We have been reduced to a rubber stamp.

I think it is about time for us to call the Navy Department and the War Department on the carpet and for the Congress to have something to do with the money they are spending. I do not want to be placed in the position of being opposed to building drydocks but I am opposed to the manner in which this matter has been transacted. The contracts are being let without a line of authority from the Congress, without any consideration by the Committee on Appropriations, and without a line of publicity about who is to get the contracts or how much money is involved in the matter. The contracts are supposed to be on a cost-plus-a-fee basis, which I have opposed for the 4 years that I have been a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. Such a practice lends itself to all kinds of abuse and to all kinds of favoritism. When the country is bankrupt and we are taxing the shirts off our people back home, it is about time that we looked these matters over very carefully. This Congress has been in continuous session for 2 years. We have had plenty of time to consider any matter the Navy Department has wanted to bring here, but they come up to our committee and say, "This is what we have done. We have let this contract and that contract and we have spent all this money, $210,000,000. Now we want you to honor our cold check." I am opposed to that kind of practice by the Navy Department or any other Department. It is illegal and irregular and breeds waste and extravagance. Now is the time to call a halt.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I invite the attention of the committee to the report that was submitted when the bill was brought to the House. It is true the Navy Department felt the urgent need for these floating drydocks and did obtain from the President of the United States authority to make tentative contracts until the House could get back in session and ratify what had been done.

May I say further that the Committee on Naval Affairs wants the country to know the good news as well as the bad news. There is no hesitancy on the part of this committee at any time to disclose any and all facts.

The report of the committee includes this language:

The need for the recommended mobile docks is very urgent and commencement of construction at the earliest possible date is necessary. In order to expedite such commencement, the Navy Department requested the approval of the President to contract for the entire program, within the estimates herein submitted. This approval was given subject to the condition that the Navy Department could complete the drydock program out of its present assignment of steel without impinging on its essential programs. Arrangements have been made to conform to this condition.

I said, "Put in this report and tell this committee the people with whom you

made your contracts." Here in this report are listed all the contracts that have been made.

We are asked today to ratify that which the President authorized the Navy Department to do. If this House should refuse to pass this bill, what would be the result? The Navy Department would automatically cancel these contracts.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the same situation that confronted the last Congress. We get a bill here, and you can take it or leave it. If you do not take it, you are accused of being disloyal, so you have to vote for it or be referred to as an obstructionist, or worse.

I agree with the gentleman who spoke just before the last speaker left the floor that it is about time that instead of telling what we are going to do next time we have now some real opposition to some of these bills. As the chairman of the committee said, let us know beforehand what they are going to spend the money for. We get nowhere by giving these appropriations for blanket sums under blanket authority, and I will tell you why.

Yesterday I saw a Martin bomber, costing $250,000, wrecked on an airport in the District. There were at least two reasons for the wreck: The pilot came in downwind, and the officer in charge of that field did not have the common sense to get the snow off the runways before using them. That happened on yesterday, and the snow had been on there for 2 or 3 days. Five minutes after that bomber crashed there were three snow plows out there clearing the runways. Why should they not have done it the day before? No one was killed, fortunately. While the men say, "Well, that bomber cost only $250,000," they do say, "There is a bomber we needed across the seas that has gone."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman has probably lost sight of the fact that the reason the snow was not removed is that we cannot get anyone to work over 8 hours.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is one thing the gentleman's committee tried to do last year. Get men to work a full week. If I recall correctly, the gentleman gave me his assurance that he was going to get rid of that condition last year, and I have no doubt that he did all he could.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes, but unfortunately there was nobody behind it except the gentleman and me, and there are 435 Members in the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. For once in his life the gentleman is mistaken. The people of the United States were back of us, no question about it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But the people of the United States are not here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You and I are here and I intend to do all I can to help the gentleman and I know that some of those who opposed the legislation introduced by the gentleman last year are not here. I know that new Members who are here for the first time are anxious to support the kind of legislation we offered last year. But you have the administration here. You have the New Dealers on your back. I realize the load under which you are laboring and I am not criticizing you. You are buried clear out of sight and you cannot help it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. May I point out to the gentleman that while the snow was not being taken off the runways it had all been removed from the aprons and the roadways around the field, so the people could walk around without getting their feet wet but a bomber could not land.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The driveways were clear, the driveways were dry, but the lanes for the planes to land were covered with snow and ice. I am not talking about something that John Jones told me. I saw it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot. Gentlemen over here on the right were talking about the 40-hour week as a reason for lack of hours of work. Well, they got those snowplows out there within 5 minutes after the plane went down. Out there they are engaged in making repairs to planes, fighting planes and bombers. There are 168 varieties of planes. They have got it over the Heinz Co., but I understand that they are going to cut down somewhat. They have out there four-hundred-and-twenty-odd Federal employees, all under civil service. They are there to repair airplanes used or to be used by our fighting forces. In January of this year 871 man-days were lost because of absenteeism. Last Saturday, January 30, we had a snowstorm. Too bad. If there was ever in the world a thoughtless, "let George do it" people, some of them are right here in Washington. I notice here that they have not even initiative enough to sweep off their own doorsteps when it snows, to say nothing about the sidewalks. Seventy of these 427 employed at repair work laid off; they did not work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Some time later this week I will discuss this absenteeism which is holding up work on war planes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I trust I may have the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. The gentleman from Michigan said something about absenteeism and I want to say something about that, too. If the gentleman from Michigan and other Members who talk about the 8-hour law will use some of their influence with their committees and bring in a bill and give the Congress an opportunity to pass upon it——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I am on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and that committee does not meet.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Is not the gentleman a member of the Committee on Labor?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am on that committee, yes; but I do not count there, and few of the others do—just the chairman, the gentlewoman from New Jersey, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]. They have acted that way, and there you are.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does the gentleman from Michigan mean to inform the House that he sits on that committee and that he has no influence on the Committee on Labor? Some of the rest of us were hoping that the gentleman from Michigan would accomplish something and do something, now he admits that he is just a mere figurehead on that committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not even that, but if you gentlemen on the majority side would give us some folks who would go along with some of the views that I have we might get somewhere. The gentleman does not find any fault with my reasoning or the things that I advocate—we might get somewhere. The gentleman merely says that I have no vote. Let me vote more than once, and I will fix it all right.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, if I may now have the floor, I have risen to bring to the attention of the committee this afternoon a few words spoken by Eddie Rickenbacker out in Los Angeles on this matter of absenteeism in war-production before the Los Angeles Advertising Club, he said:

> The perpetual slow-down in war industry caused by absenteeism—particularly in the aircraft industry, where it exceeds an average of 10 percent—probably is the most flagrant abuse of your obligation since Pearl Harbor.
>
> In the Boeing factory alone (where Flying Fortresses are made), the day following Christmas 26 percent of the employees were absentees, and our aviators in those hell holes are crying their eyes out for only a few more.
>
> In the Douglas plants there was an absenteeism of 11,000 employees the day after Christmas. * * *
>
> There is no absenteeism in the fox holes in the jungles of the Pacific or the burning sands of Africa, for if attempted there they would get a bayonet in their bellies from their fellow Americans.

I trust this situation will receive the attention of appropriate committees of the House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 2. The authority herein granted shall include the authority to acquire lands at such locations as the Secretary of the Navy may deem best suited to the purpose, erect or extend buildings, acquire the necessary machinery and equipment, and shall be in addition to all authority heretofore granted for these purposes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 2, line 1, after the word "purpose", insert "of the authority herein contained."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 5, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy from time to time, but not less frequently than every 60 days, shall transmit to the Congress a full report of all acquisitions of land, by lease or otherwise, effected under the authority of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 9, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 4. Hereafter any ship, boat, barge, or floating drydock of the Navy may be leased in accordance with the act approved March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 31), but not otherwise disposed of, for periods not beyond the termination of the present wars, but title thereto shall remain in the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this concludes the reading of the bill. Before the Committee rises under the rule, I announce to the House that this is the first bill passed by the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the chair Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration H. R. 1446, authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities and for other purposes, and pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 87, he reported the same back with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gross.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND STUDY THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 18, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints the following Members of the House as members of the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business: Messrs. PATMAN (chairman), BULWINKLE, ROBINSON of Utah, KEOGH, JACKSON, HALLECK, LEONARD W. HALL, PLOESER, and STEVENSON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter and a circular.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an address delivered by Harrison Spangler of Topeka, Kans., on January 29.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an article from Life magazine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on pay-as-you-go taxation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. FULMER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Wendell Willkie at Duke University on January 14.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address given in regard to the situation in Norway with reference to post-war recovery. I am informed this will cost $120. I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the Appendix notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by the Governor of Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS WITH REFERENCE TO THE DRESS INDUSTRY

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on the 14th of last month I spoke on the question of the Office of Price Administration's dealing with the dress industry in the city of New York. I especially discussed Regulation No. 287, issued by the Office of Price Administration, which had so complicated the needle industry that it was absolutely impossible for the industry to proceed with any action unless they violated the law almost continuously and subjected themselves to penalties and imprisonment.

I stated then, Mr. Speaker, I did not think the persons responsible for order No. 287 knew anything about the industry. I said I did not think they were in the dress business or in the needle business. They were put there because some sponsor had some connections in placing them there. To prove their authority, some of them must have concocted order No. 287, which has at least 1,000 or more features, rules, and regulations which must be complied with before you can actually start sewing a dress. From what I gather it takes longer to comply with some of these rules and regulations than it does to manufacture the dresses.

I have given the matter very careful consideration and from my observation I have every reason to believe that the American people want to comply with the orders of the Office of Price Administration. We are all Americans. We all want to do a job and help our country, whether it is on the farm or in the needle industry or in the milk industry. But the trouble lies with the so-called bureaucratic regulations that are made by someone in the departments.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman think that if we had protected the price-control bill by passing the Wolcott amendment we could have cut a lot of kinks out of the O. P. A. rulings which have caused so much distress in different parts of the country?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That may be so. I have not given the matter any study. But what I wanted to bring to your attention is that the various industries, whether the needle industry, or the dress industry, or the clothing industry, or farming, they are all handicapped by too many unnecessary regulations. Every American wants to obey the law. In fact, after giving the matter some very careful consideration I can see where the trouble lies. Big business was called in when their price regulations were fixed, and their men sat at the council table with the so-called brain trust of the O. P. A. in fixing the code dealing with their industry. So that big business, like the woolen mills and other big mills, are satisfied with the code that was fixed, because they have something to say in the construction and building up of the code of ethics dealing with price control. I do not think the farmers had anybody in there. Other little businessmen had no one in there. The needle industry had no one there. So some cockeyed regulations were concocted by somebody in that industry and it is impossible to conform to those regulations. They have amended the particular order I referred to in my previous speech, since I spoke on the subject last month, but that amendment is more confusing than the original order. In other words, it does not help the people in the industry. I have a little sketch that was prepared for me by someone in the dress business, showing that every little seam in a dress must be reported.

That may be exaggerated but it serves to illustrate his plight. If you put on a sleeve you have got to say what the amount of labor is on it. That is impossible; they all work by piece work or week work, and so by the time they get through with making these reports on 287 and its amendments they might as well turn around and close their shop because it almost eats up all the little profits they make.

What I want to suggest to the Office of Price Administration—and I mean it in all seriousness and for the interest of the country—is that they get to some sound basic understanding. Under the N. R. A., which was held unconstitutional 10 years ago, if you remember, every industry had its own representative present at the time the codes were fixed; every businessman had someone representing him in N. R. A. when a code was agreed to between the manufacturers, or the business people and the administration then in existence. We did not have the present difficulty under N. R. A. with the codes, because everybody had something to say. There is no reason under God's sun why the Price Administrator should not call in the little businessman as well as the big businessman and give him an opportunity to confer with the Bureau representatives and work out some agreeable code by which all this red tape could be avoided and under which they could let them go about their business.

I remember very distinctly how in 1933, when the present administration took office, we sought to reorganize industry by the creation of national recovery codes. We did so in close cooperation with the industries affected. All of us who are old enough to remember the situation 10 years ago know how careful the Government was in not imposing any regulations on industries, but on the contrary the industries were encouraged to send representatives to Washington and after many hearings, discussions, reports in trade organs, and the taking of testimony relating to actual conditions in a given industry, a code was promulgated which was to govern that industry for a given period and which could be revised from time to time in the same manner in which it was created. The revision would be made after hearings and the cooperative activities of all branches of the industry in question. It was always the interests of the industries which were considered, the interests of the men and women who worked in the particular trade or industry. Manufacturers and employees would cooperate in the creation of codes and each code was the product of careful study of the best interests of all the parties concerned.

In the present set-up of the Office of Price Administration nothing of this type is contemplated. True, the Office of Price Administration has singled out certain interests and given them the green light. Some industries are privileged children of the O. P. A. and are permitted to dictate to the O. P. A. and lay down their own rules and regulations and whatever concerns them. On the other hand the dress industry has been at the other end of the line and has not been permitted to utter a word of criticism in regard to its own regulations. Instead of pursuing a uniform plan in having each industry represented in connection with the organization of its production and distribution, it is given to men who have no idea whatsoever about the details of the dress industry to make regulations which this industry must operate under or find itself entirely out of business.

I see no reason why, in view of the experience gained by the Government in connection with the imposition of national recovery codes, the same procedure should not be uniformly applied to all trades and industries, particularly in view of the fact that by doing so it will be much easier to continue where we left off in 1933, instead of starting a new system without any basis or foundation to go on.

I realize the vast task which the O. P. A. has on its hands. I realize that it is not easy to change from a peacetime economy without some mistakes being made along the line. But I do not understand why the O. P. A. should not have utilized previous activities of a similar nature in doing its own work.

I cannot see why after making due allowances for changing conditions, there should not be a constant advisory board attached to the O. P. A. consisting of representatives of the particular industry which should have the duties and responsibilities of cooperating with the O. P. A. in the fixing of prices and rules of production.

The machinery is available if the administrator of the O. P. A. would just take advantage of it. Industry is more than ready and more than willing to work with the administration. No one in industry would object to any reasonable regulation if it were made by someone familiar with the industry and in the best interests of the industry itself.

But industry surely does not wish to be made the football of the O. P. A. by being kicked around by individuals who do not understand the industry, do not know its problems and promulgate regulations which are destructive and do not in any way touch the meat of the situation.

The Office of Price Administration should draw upon the industries for help and assistance, and I am sure that all industries will reply to such a call in the best interests of the country and for the benefit of the public at large.

I am sure the dress industry will not hesitate to send its best talent to the O. P. A. for counsel. Let us not overlook the burden which was placed on many industries by reason of priorities, war contracts, and to the war production which must take preference over peacetime production. But let us not add to the burden of peace industries by having their regulations drawn up by persons unfamiliar with the facts.

This order No. 287 not only affects New York, it affects every great city in the whole country.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Being a new Member, I am interested to know what approach to make in these cases, because many of my people are affected in the same manner as are the gentleman's. What is the gentleman's suggestion? How can we remedy what the gentleman is complaining about?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I would suggest that the Price Administrator immediately withdraw order No. 287 or suspend its operation and give the businessman an opportunity to consult with the personnel of the Administration.

Mr. ROWE. What can we do to formulate the suggestion of which the gentleman speaks, and make it operative in the way he wishes?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I should think that what we are doing now would be judicial notice to the Price Administrator that if he does not correct the abuse of which we complain, we shall have to do something by way of amending the law and take away from the Price Administrator some of the powers we granted him. Others call them bureaucrats; I call them administrators. They have been called all kinds of names, but name calling is no remedy.

Mr. ROWE. If I may make the further suggestion, it does not seem to me to make any difference what we call them. I have learned long since that even though you call a bulldog a rabbit, if he bites you it hurts just the same.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with you. I think it is about time that when we pass laws giving these men power we couple with them some control that would prevent their formulating rules and regulations that result adversely to an industry that affects millions of people—millions of jobs. We ought to be in the position where we could approve or disapprove these so-called regulations that the Administrator makes under the laws we pass and under which we give him power.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it would have been well for the country if the gentleman had talked before November 3 as he is talking today. After the horse has been stolen there is not much reason to shut the barn door. The gentleman stood here and voted for everything before November 3. At that time he did not know there was such a word as bureaucracy—before November 3—and his stuff is not going down with me.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, wait a minute. The gentleman's question and his own answer do not mean to be helpful. In my opinion, it is stupid to be spiteful when other people are earnestly trying to solve a difficult and important problem.

Mr. JENSEN. It is.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. All right. I do not yield any further, if that is what the gentleman is driving at—because I voted for it.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman voted for everything.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Many times I voted with the gentleman's side, but the gentleman gives me no credit for it. I would vote against anything that I thought was wrong, no matter who

sponsored it. Had I known such rules and regulations were going to be promulgated in December or January, I would have voted against the measure myself.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman must be very stupid himself.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I hope the gentleman is not going to drag the whole discussion down to the level of his last few remarks.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman did not know it, everybody else did.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is lots the gentleman himself does not know, and he had better get busy and learn a little.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. Does not the gentleman believe we really need some permanent legislation to regulate the bureau similar to the Walter-Logan bill that was considered a couple of years ago?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Something should be done to stabilize the situation so that the country and particularly the businessmen affected can find out exactly what the administration is trying to do. We would then be in a much better position, in my opinion, to correct the evils we are complaining about.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. We realize the effect it is having on industry throughout our districts and in deference to the Members of Congress who voted for this legislation originally, as I would see it, it was the intent of the Congress that the O. P. A. and its creation should prevent inflation. Was it the intention of Congress that they should arbitrarily cut the profit of a manufacturer?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; I do not think so. I do not think it was the intention of the Congress, when we voted for that law, to hurt the small, little fellow, or the big fellow. The intention was to control inflation.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. And to maintain a price level?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And to maintain a certain price level.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Not above a certain figure?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right, and the regulations fixed by the O. P. A. are not necessary for that purpose.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. This order, as I see it, arbitrarily cuts the profit that is made by the manufacturer without affecting the price?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Absolutely.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. In other words, they have violated the intent of Congress. They have assumed an authority that the Congress never intended?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes. If you want to put it that way, it comes right down to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Asked a moment ago about what remedy the gentleman had to suggest, he said, "Repeal Order 287." Is that the number?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I did not say repeal it. My colleague asked me what can be done, and I said that the Administrator should suspend Order 287.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Suspend 287.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Pending further consideration, and give the business people an opportunity to sit in council with the O. P. A. to determine what the right thing to do is, without tying up small industry, as well as large industry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That might be all right for your needle trade, but here is an order affecting the meat industry and the farm industry telling us how to cut up a steer.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I would be willing to go as far as to do it for any industry, if it does not affect the ceiling price. This simply complicates the matter so much it is impossible to get through it. Order No. 287 does not apply to the meat industry, and I do not know what their problem is. I am in sympathy with any group of people who are burdened with a lot of complicated forms and regulations which are unnecessary to control the price of anything.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has reached the conclusion, then, that instead of making the situation better they have just muddled it and confused it down there and the situation is worse now than it was before?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Talking about 287, I should say "Yes."

Mr. HOFFMAN. What about these other orders that affect the rest of us?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. You may be right. I think the gentleman has been very keen on his feet right along in asking a lot of questions when I get up to speak, and I am only too glad to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am seeking information. I should think the gentleman would consider it a compliment when I seek to get the information from the source I do.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There are so many regulations that it is impossible for me at this moment to answer all of the questions.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon if I am pumping at a dry hole, but I did not realize that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If the gentleman is trying to get a laugh out of the House, that is all right with me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I am looking for information.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROWE. I am sincere in my effort to obtain information.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I appreciate that.

Mr. ROWE. I want to get some information of a constructive nature. Do I understand that the gentleman believes that the Office of Price Administration should apply a limitation to control the upward trend of prices, but that they should not go into regulations and orders beyond that?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They should formulate some regulations, but they ought to call in the people representing certain industries to formulate what is known as a code, as they formulated a code during the N. R. A. days. In other words, let us not be arbitrary and let somebody in the Office of Price Administration fix a code for your industry or my industry or this man's industry without first calling in the industry and determining what is the code of ethics on the question of price control.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am interested in what the gentleman has to say, but I have a situation, and I will give a little illustration which I believe will clear up something. The O. P. A. fixes a wholesale price, we will say, on eggs. While the O. P. A. is doing that, and putting a ceiling on eggs, the Department of Agriculture through lend-lease has broken or pierced that price ceiling and is paying the farmers more for eggs than the wholesalers can get, which results in a disruption of the entire marketing system for eggs. Here we have one governmental agency trying to stop inflation and we have another governmental agency piercing the price of eggs and you have chaos in the whole marketing situation.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the best solution to the whole problem, whether it is eggs, clothing, or shoes, is for the regulators to be called down here by some committee to determine how they arrive at a particular order and how they issue these orders. In my opinion I do not think the Administrator knows anything about most of these orders.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman has hit it on the head there.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Somebody in there is running the show. When it is all prepared they go over to him and he puts his John Hancock on it and that is the law. There is a violation almost every day.

Coming back to my people in New York, there are approximately 500,000 people affected by this order. The manufacturer's hands are tied. He needs 10 lawyers, 80 accountants and I do not know how many bookkeepers to fill out all these forms and then when he complies with the law he is exhausted, he has paid out more money than he will get for a hundred dresses. The same thing applies to shoes and garments and collars. It seems to me that all this is unnecessary. If the Administrator says, "We will fix a ceiling as of March 1, 1941," let him say so.

If he says, "Give us the prices as of a certain month or a certain date," it can all be done on one form, and penalties can be created sufficient to punish anybody who violates that regulation. But when you tell him to take 20 different kinds of main orders and then divide them by four and subdivide them again, and then make out forms along all these lines, it runs to 900 or 1,000 regulations which it is impossible for the ordinary merchant to understand.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Further, they cannot stay in business unless they are at least able to break even on the cost of production.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. On top of that, they are just cutting their price. Congress never intended them to do that when the law was enacted, yet they are doing it and we let them get away with it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House for 25 minutes today. I ask unanimous consent that it be canceled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, in order to assure more efficient prosecution of the war, several standing committees of Congress and other special committees have been investigating and checking various activities of the Government. This is as it should be.

It is an important contribution which Congress can make toward victory. But the speedy victory which we all desire cannot be achieved unless the 12,000,000 men who are to be in the armed services have behind them the united effort of the 120,000,000 Americans who will remain in civilian life.

One of the most important functions for controlling and directing the civilian economy is administered by the Office of Price Administration. Nearly every step in the daily lives of our people is affected by its actions.

A year ago, after extensive hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee, the Seventy-seventh Congress passed the price-control bill. Last autumn, at the request of the President, this legislation was further strengthened.

The administration of this law has been extremely burdensome to the American people. Mistakes have been made; wrong policies have been adopted. Some of this was inevitable, for in the setting up of the necessary control, new fields had to be explored.

Daily we hear criticisms of its administration on the floor of this House. We hear that the O. P. A. is violating the law; that it gives no heed to legislative intent; that it is arbitrary, ruthless, and un-American.

But what are we here in Congress doing about this organization which we have set up? What has our Banking and Currency Committee, which spent months in studying the question and which has jurisdiction over this legislation, done to correct the inevitable mistakes made in pioneering in this new field? What have we done to try to find out where authority has been exceeded; where legislative intent has been deliberately thwarted?

Mr. Speaker, we have done absolutely nothing. After passing this law we have completely washed our hands of the affair, except that when the Executive demanded further legislation it was obediently passed, and then we again washed our hands of it.

Members make speeches of complaint, and we do nothing more than applaud.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman is putting his finger on a very, very important question. It so happens it is one I was going to discuss somewhat myself this afternoon. May I ask the gentleman if he does not feel that it would be a proper function of standing committees of the House which have enacted legislation setting up agencies or affecting the work of agencies to act thereafter as agents of the House in continuously seeing whether or not those agencies perform their jobs in accordance with the intent of Congress and in an efficient and proper manner, and report continuously to the Congress about it?

Mr. KEAN. That is exactly what I am going to say in a minute, as the gentleman from California will hear if he listens further to my remarks.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I shall be glad to. If the gentleman will permit, I may say that I have introduced a bill to bring about that very situation.

Mr. KEAN. Is this the proper course for this legislative body? Should we continue to be merely rubber stamps, passing laws which the Executive wants and then forgetting about them? I do not so conceive my responsibility. I want to do my part toward winning the war. I know that the other members of the House are just as willing and anxious to do their part.

The majority party which controls this Congress should allow us to take some action; and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution providing that the Banking and Currency Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, investigate and study this matter and the other questions connected with the war, which are under its jurisdiction.

There is now no forum by which aggrieved citizens can call attention to mistakes in this legislation and ask for remedial action. They wander around the Halls of Congress telling their troubles to various members of the Banking and Currency Committee, knowing that we wrote the bill, but get nowhere.

We should have hearings, review these complaints and see if we cannot better the legislation. We do not want to hinder the O. P. A. from attaining its objectives. We want to help it. It is our job as Members of Congress to initiate improvements in legislation—not to wait for suggestions from the Executive branch.

Of course I do not feel that we should be continually calling the Price Administrator before our Committee to explain every detail of his actions. He is a busy man. But his subordinates can and should explain their methods and the reasons for them whenever there is general public clamor against certain regulations.

Some of these matters have been looked into by other committees of Congress, but why should this not be done by the Banking and Currency Committee, when it is our job?

Many bills have been introduced to amend portions of this law. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has introduced a bill which might correct some of the mistakes which have been made. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] has called attention to practices which certainly bear investigation.

I do not say that all criticisms which have been made are justified. Much of what has been done, though painful, was inevitable and necessary, but the best way to prove to the country that this is so is to study and analyze the complaints.

The Office of Price Administration is not the only agency important to the war over which the Banking and Currency Committee has jurisdiction.

We have control of the borrowing power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. One of the questions which should be looked into is the relationship between the R. F. C. and the Board of Economic Warfare.

Today, through legislation approved by the Banking and Currency Committee and passed by Congress, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has authority to borrow money.

In the past, through its board of directors, the R. F. C. has had control of the spending of this money, but a few months ago the Board of Economic Warfare started the practice of having one of the many Government corporations—the United States Commercial Company—enter into contracts and then ask the R. F. C. to carry them out.

And the other day—January 20, 1943—there appeared in the Federal Register an order signed by Vice President WALLACE, as Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, effective February 25, 1943, giving to this Board all the authority—I quote:

> For the negotiation, preparation, supervision, and administration of all future imported material contracts financed by either the Defense Supplies Corporation, the Metals Reserve Company, the Defense Plant Corporation, or the United States Commercial Company.

The plan, as I understand it, is for the Board of Economic Warfare to obtain the money for these activities merely by telling the R. F. C. to carry out the contracts which it entered into.

We are thus asked to make money available for one well-established agency, while it is intended that an entirely different agency set up by Presidential decree will direct the spending of this money. What an example of the contempt in which certain new dealers hold our legislative responsibilities. Talk about blank checks, this is potentially one of the biggest we have ever issued.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Was legal authority given for the power to issue the order that was issued by the Vice President, which the gentleman has just quoted?

Mr. KEAN. Yes; it was given under the First War Powers Act, which states that the President is authorized to make such redistribution of functions among executive agencies as he may deem necessary. They interpret that as making possible this action.

Mr. HINSHAW. In other words, by the President's issuing an order authorizing the Vice President to make a redistribution, they can also redistribute the power given by the Congress to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation so as to supply funds in turn to some totally unrelated agencies, or certainly to an agency that does not come under its jurisdiction?

Mr. KEAN. Yes; that is the interpretation that was given me when I called up the Department.

Yesterday a bill was introduced in the House enlarging the borrowing power of the R. F. C. by $5,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, we should under no circumstances grant this increase unless we specifically limit the funds which the R. F. C. might be forced to give to the Board of Economic Warfare upon its demand.

Congress must continue to control the purse strings. Money given to the R. F. C. should be controlled by the R. F. C. If the Board of Economic Warfare needs money, Congress can appropriate it; or, if for any reason, it seems advisable for them to continue to obtain their funds from the R. F. C. the maximum amount which can be used for these purposes should be specified and there should be full disclosure—at least to the members of the Banking and Currency Committee—of its activities.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I think the new Members should be informed that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation itself loaned $2,500,000,000 to Mr. Hopkins, of the C. W. A. and its successors, and the notes of his organization were carried on the books as assets until 1936, although everybody knew the notes were worthless. They used the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and continued to use it as a method of bypassing the appropriations of Congress. Think of instructing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to give Harry Hopkins $2,500,000,000. It took action by Congress to make them lop it off.

Mr. KEAN. I thank the gentleman. I am inclined to believe that the Board of Economic Warfare has been rendering a fine service; that what it is doing is for the best interest of our Nation. But, Mr. Speaker, should anyone be allowed to spend hundreds of millions of the taxpayers' money without giving some sort of an accounting to Congress?

It has been acknowledged that much of what the Board is doing will result in heavy losses. Its officials should tell us exactly what they have done and what they propose to do. If we do not insist upon this, are we not unfaithful to our trust?

Vice President WALLACE, as Chairman of the Board, might feel that owing to his august position it would be undignified for him to appear before a committee of the House for interrogation. However, having accepted a position to which he is not called by his constitutional duties as Vice President, he should assume the obligations of his job. If he does not wish to appear, we should certainly hear from his subordinates.

It has been the practice of the Democratic leadership, when any member of the minority has questioned the great authority we have given to the R. F. C., to state that this is all right because Jesse Jones would be the Administrator, and we all know that the House has confidence in his integrity and ability.

Republicans have repeatedly stated that it is bad practice to pass any legislation on the theory that it would be administered by any one individual. Were we not right?

The Rubber Reserve Company, which holds our stock of rubber, and the Defense Plant Corporation, which is building synthetic rubber manufacturing plants, are also financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and were organized through legislation under the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee.

We have had numerous investigations of the rubber situation by many committees of Congress. Certainly I do not think we should have a duplication of their efforts, but is it not peculiar that the committee under whose auspices the corporations dealing with the rubber situation were set up is one of the few which has not investigated the situation?

Many of these Government corporations are of extreme importance. Owing to the method of financing, there is no control of their spending by the Appropriations Committee. Congress should keep a constant check on all agencies financed in this manner.

They are an essential part of our war effort. It is the duty of the Banking and Currency Committee to investigate and study the way they are functioning. If we do not do so, Mr. Speaker, I believe we are neglecting our duty to our country. We should be good soldiers, too.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I want the gentleman to know and I want to state for the RECORD that I am heartily in accord with the gentleman's resolution for the Committee on Banking and Currency or some other committee to make a searching and complete investigation of the Office of Price Administration.

May I ask this question of the gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency? Did Mr. Henderson, or anybody representing his office, ever come before that committee when this question was under consideration and tell you that they were going to set up agencies throughout the United States to enforce rent ceilings, for instance, and that they were going to put hundreds and perhaps thousands of employees on the pay roll and require every person who owned a piece of rental property to file a questionnaire in triplicate with the regional housing authorities?

Mr. KEAN. He certainly did not, but when we asked him about how many employees he would need he said he thought about 20,000, if I recall correctly.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Did the committee or the gentleman himself ever contemplate any such program as that when the act was approved?

Mr. KEAN. Certainly not.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from California, my colleague on the committee.

Mr. ROLPH. It has been my privilege and pleasure to serve with the gentleman for the last 2 years on the Committee on Banking and Currency. I commend him for the very faithful and conscientious way he has served on that committee. I further commend him on his idea of having a committee investigate the administration of the acts we pass, and I approve of that idea 100 percent. Incidentally, I have myself introduced a bill providing that the Committee on Banking and Currency investigate the rent-control business from top to bottom.

Mr. KEAN. I thank the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an article from the San Francisco Chronicle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

### MYSTIFIED AND IRATE PEOPLE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, people are mystified and irate. They can find neither rhyme nor reason in many of the things that are being done by the President and his administration.

On Thursday last I returned from a week's visit to Minnesota. During the time that I was out there I spoke with many people and listened to their troubles. When I say troubles I mean just that.

There are so many things being done in Washington these days that the people do not understand the need for. There is a general complaint that our manpower, a shortage about which we hear so much, is needlessly wasted in making out Government reports that come to them by the ream and in an endless stream. I saw some of the questionnaires that are being sent to our part of the country and they impressed me as having been prepared by crackpot chair warmers who had nothing else to do but to make nuisances of themselves and to pester the people needlessly. One small businessman told me that fully one-fourth of his time is taken up with filling out Government questionnaires.

At the Minnesota editorial convention, which convened in St. Paul on January 22 and 23, I was told that newspaper offices are being swamped with propaganda matter that has little or no value or interest, but the volume of which is so great that if the editor were to read but a small part it would require his full time. One editor complained to me that it had been necessary for him to place a large unsightly pasteboard carton beside his desk as the old wastebasket simply couldn't hold it all. Yet Washington rations paper.

Farmers complain that they are being urged toward greater and yet greater production but their boys, who are needed on the farms to attain the volume of production asked for, continue to be taken by the draft and by war industries where the going wages average $90 and $100 per week for unskilled labor, with time and one-half for overtime.

To make matters yet worse it is practically impossible for a farmer to purchase machinery or to secure necessary replacement parts. It is almost impossible to get a broken machine part welded.

Then there is bitter criticism of daylight saving in the winter when the small school children have to be awakened, washed, dressed, fed, and sent off to school by lamplight. I was told of one little girl in Minneapolis who was recently run over and killed by a truck while on her way to school before daylight. The people of rural America, especially in the Northern States, fail to see the need or wisdom of daylight saving during the months of January, February, November, and December. To them it is just another New Deal mystery, or should I say innovation, for which there is no discernible need.

The folks back home cannot understand the necessity for the army of taxeaters that continually snoop about the country trying to get something on someone. With taxes as burdensome as they are, and with the alleged shortage in manpower, they figure that these snoopers can be much better utilized in uniform, and at the front where their own sons are.

The folks back home strongly feel that this administration does not trust the American people to do the right thing without compulsion. The letters that I get are as one voice in declaring that the American people are just as patriotic today as they have ever been; that they do not need spying upon. As with one voice they demand to be placed upon their honor in all the war efforts. Such black marketing as may exist should be dealt with in a most severe manner, but the people feel that because there are a few chiseling crooks is no reason why the patriotism and the honesty of the great mass of our people should be questioned and suspected.

In the smaller towns many garage owners, as a result of governmental urging, installed machinery for making parts for planes, guns, and other war equipment. Nearly all of them went into debt to do so upon the assurance that they would be given work that would last for the duration. They naturally thought that they had the inside track on that class of work because they were able to produce cheaper, more efficiently, and make quicker deliveries.

Then, too, in these small towns there is no housing shortage and no labor troubles. They figured that farming this class of work out to the smaller communities would obviate the necessity for much of the tremendous building program in the larger cities, most of which the Government is financing and which will be amortized through reduction in income taxes. Now they find that this work is being taken away from them and centered in the large industrial areas, thereby adding to the confusion, congestion, cost, and uncertainty of production. There is everything to be said in favor of farming out as much as possible of the war production work to the smaller centers. The quality of their output is of the best, as each worker takes a personal pride in his product. The production cost is less in the smaller centers because of the absence of gouging by racketeers. The more war production is spread out the more production is facilitated. If the present policy to centralize production is not reversed, it will prolong the war because of limited production and, at the same time, will bankrupt thousands of small businessmen who, in good faith and through a patriotic desire to help their Government, bought and installed expensive equipment at great cost to themselves. Many believe that the work is taken away from the small communities because they are not unionized and therefore the racketeer does not get any "take" from such activity. I hope that is not true, but I would not be willing to vouch for it, because this is a labor Government.

Then we come to the case of the small-town banker, merchant, and others in that classification. Let me read to you a few letters that have come to my desk. The first will be from the owner of a small business college, and I quote:

Will you do me a personal favor? I know you are a busy man these days, but this is really important. I want you to read a letter that I received from the secretary of our private school war emergency council. It tells the whole story in a nutshell.

From your weekly message in our local newspapers, which I read regularly and agree with 100 percent, I can see that the New Dealers cannot convert you. Nice going, HAROLD, I'm with you 100 percent as I have always been.

May I say just a few words about private schools in my own behalf. I have been in this business since 1915 and still think that we do a darn good job of training office help. We are on the job 365 days of the year, and when business or government wants office help we always have some ready or nearly ready any month of the year.

The only way they will ever get us private schools to quit is through legislation. They will never get us out through honest competition. The private schools started the commercial training program, and now the public and Government schools are trying to take it away from us, just like they are taking many other things away from private business.

I next read you two letters from small-town bankers:

It has just come to our attention that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation will have a local set-up and make loans to farmers under the subterfuge of working to increase production by farmers. We understand that it will be just another set-up in direct competition with our business. This apparently is Claude R. Wickard's baby, as we find a statement where this organization states they plan to loan between two hundred and two hundred and fifty million dollars through the above organization. The Government is so strongly incorporated in a competitive banking business that we are beginning to see red.

We have the local Production Credit Association with main offices here. At the time this set-up was started it was to operate in areas where bank credit was not available to the farming population. I think you will find, however, that these associations are established in county-seat towns where banking facilities are available and credit readily extended. Although they make some outside loans their main loans naturally are in the immediate area of the association headquarters. Production Credit Association receives a Government subsidy of $2,600 for paying overhead which together with their preferred position in being tax exempt permits them to lower the interest rate. On this unfair basis they make loans on the same basis and in direct competition with us.

We also have a Farm Security office whose function it was to loan to individuals unable to get bank loans and place them on a self-sustaining basis. If these principles had been adhered to it would have some merit, but they also overstep and make loans in direct competition with us.

We have a seed-loan office here making loans to farmers, most of whom could get their requirements at local banks.

On top of all this the regional Agricultural Credit Corporation with their new set-up is now stepping in to be in competition with local banks as well as other governmental loaning agencies. We are fully aware that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation served a good turn during the depression as far as banks were concerned. Over a period of years we understood that this concern was liquidated and have helped them in this regard by taking over many of their loans as we were under the impression that this agency would be discontinued and the money returned to the Government. We are sure that none of these governmental agencies are self-supporting and in our opinion have outlived their usefulness if any ever existed outside of political reasons. Would it not be better to have the losses entailed by these organizations stopped and their capital returned to the Government to somewhat alleviate the constant need for money in the war effort?

A short time ago all salaries in private industry were frozen but all of these Federal agencies received an increase of salaries at about the same time, in spite of the fact that their salaries prior to the raise were much higher than ordinary business could afford to pay.

Our local newspapers are getting advertising releases from these governmental agencies constantly requesting free publication to further their loan activities. We are enclosing herein a copy of our recent published statement and we wish to call your attention to our investment in United States bonds of $461,900 and since that time we have added $100,000 to this account. We are mentioning this so that you will see that we are cooperating in every way possible to help the war effort. You will also note that we had cash on hand of $1,100,000 which we

are certainly willing to loan. We are also enclosing herein copies of several "ads" run the past few weeks encouraging loans for production and there are more in this series to follow.

We have been actively engaged in selling War bonds ever since they were available and we are constantly striving to further increase the sales. As you know, we have to buy our own supplies and furnish our own time in so doing without any remuneration, all of which we are glad to do, but at the same time, when you face Government competition, with all of its unfairness, such as we encounter, it does not create good will.

During 1942 we paid over $7,000 in taxes, in which is included $1,700 Federal income taxes. We are unable to understand why the Government wants to set up tax-exempt loaning institutions and at the same time expect larger income from tax returns. If Government loaning agencies were eliminated, local bank earnings would increase proportionately and would mean more revenue for the Government.

We favor competition, but I think that you will readily agree that it should be set up on a comparable basis and pay its own way as private industry has to do. We do not subscribe to the apparent Government policy of having banks just as service station for the Government in selling War bonds, doing ration banking, and giving assistance in filling out Federal income-tax returns.

We are sure that hardly any of these governmental agencies are self-supporting and, inasmuch as there is no need for their existence, this waste of money should be eliminated, and taken throughout the Nation, it certainly must amount to a very sizable sum. If this were done and the capital of these organizations returned to the Government, perhaps our national financial structure would be somewhat improved. It appears to us that it would be only fair for the Government to set some kind of example on curtailing national expenses and be somewhat comparable to the individual who has to cut every corner and watch every step in order to buy a few more bonds and pay income taxes. We still have another governmental competitor, which is the Postal Savings System. They pay a return of 2 percent interest, which again is in direct competition with us. It would seem that if this organization must remain in existence, the least it could do would be to lower the rate of interest return in line with current returns on short Government bonds.

Perhaps we, of the small town in the backwoods, are out of step with the flagrant Government socialist policy which has sprung up around us and now furthered under the guise of the war effort. If this is the case, we do not expect any cooperation. We do hope, however, that there is still a semblance of Americanism left smoldering which might be fanned into a flame and that recognition might again be given to individual efforts and business be allowed to exist the American way we used to know and enjoy.

You will please pardon the length of this letter, but these matters have just been piling up, one on top of the other, until they finally reached the point where they had to be expressed. You may be sure that we will appreciate your effort in trying to correct this situation and if you wish us to supply any details or further information regarding these operations we certainly shall be glad to do so.

Let me read excerpts from the second letter:

Agricultural credit companies view with alarm the return of more Government subsidized loaning agencies to go in competition with privately owned banks and credit companies who are able to stand on their own feet and pay taxes which in part must go to keep our Government competitors in business.

What earthly excuse is there for the return to the loaning field of the R. A. A. C.? What excuse is there for Government subsidized production credit associations in which the Government has millions of dollars invested and without which only about one in eight of the production credit associations could operate, even though they pay no taxes?

In our own case our taxes for 1942 amounted to something over $2,400, or $200 per month, while our competitor engaged in the same line of business paid no taxes. We furnish our own capital with no help from the Government and we do not ask our borrowers to contribute 5 percent of their loan for stock on which they receive no interest return.

We are not only up against a Government-subsidized competitor, but in many cases subjected to unfair competition in that production credit associations have solicited our loans and pressure has been brought to bear on borrowers to change their loans to the Government agency. Practically all Government loaning agencies are instructed to turn loans such as we handle to a production credit association set-up.

Private banks and credit companies throughout this State are fully capable of taking care of every legitimate farm chattel loan. We ourselves had a turn-over in loans of about $1,000,000 in 1942 and have something over a half million in loans on our books at the present time to some 700 farmer borrowers, and we as well as other credit companies and banks could handle every loan now carried by R. A. A. C. and production credit associations, if such loans were considered good, bankable paper. The production credit associations and R. A. A. C., with their Government assistance, take some chances that we as private credit companies could not and would not take; however, there is another Government agency (the Farm Security Administration) that could take care of the shady ones.

As secretary of the Seventh District Association of Agricultural Credit Companies (Minnesota, North Dakota, and Wisconsin) I am fully aware that our membership, composed entirely of privately capitalized companies, is very much worried at the continued encroachment of Government into our line of business.

The foregoing is only my personal opinion. However, I know that I voice the sentiment of every agricultural company and bank and they all feel that something should be done to head off any further invasion of their rights to operate their business on which instead of the Government paying them, they pay thousands of dollars to the Government. Something should be done now to head off these Government subsidies.

Any help or suggestions that you may give that would help to eliminate these gross inequalities will be greatly appreciated.

Think of it. They are being taxed to keep their competitors in business. Who but a "damphool" new dealer would ever conceive such a thing?

This is what a small town merchant writes me:

I cannot make head or tail of the Price Administration. Weeks ahead they announce a pending shortage of a certain commodity and tell us that it is only a question of time until it must be rationed. Then the profiteers and hoarders rush in and buy up the visible stock thereby exhausting the supply and increasing the cost if and when it can be purchased. Where do all of these screwballs come from?

Now I want to read you from another businessman who wrote both Senator Shipstead and myself. This letter has to do with the way the Government is confiscating tires. I use the word "confiscating" because when a man only receives 40 cents for a tire that has gone less than 10,000 miles it is confiscation. In Minnesota it must exceed $100 before it is classified as grand larceny.

Undoubtedly you gentlemen are besieged with hundreds of letters regarding the same matter I am about to mention. Far be it from me to begrudge the Government anything that I do for it or give to it in order to assist in the prosecution of this war; but I do feel that in some matters one is justified in registering complaints. This has to do with automobile tires released to the Defense Supply Corporation for which the owner was to receive a reasonable price for his surplus tires.

This writer turned in his extra tires last November, four in number, two fairly good tires, good for at least 20,000 miles, one not so good, and one new retread never used. The retread cost the writer $7 for retread and the tire was worth $6 before retread; that is what I was offered for it. My tires had a conservative value of $22. Today I received a statement and check from the treasurer in the sum of $10.70 the statement reads as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 6.00 by 16 | $3.50 |
| 1 6.00 by 16 (scrap) | .20 |
| 1 6.00 by 16 | 6.65 |
| (This is no doubt the retread.) | |
| 1 6.00 by 16 | 3.50 |
| | 13.85 |
| Less appraised cost of repair | 3.15 |
| Net total | 10.70 |

What I would like to know is who gets the graft; certainly any of the tires sent in were worth more than the amount paid for them. The retread had never been used and in itself should have been worth, as I understand it, $8.50. And why in the name of common sense should one be charged for repairs to tires sold as used tires and at used-tire prices. What prompts me to write and bother you with this trifling detail is the complaints, not only my own, but so many others heard everywhere about the same treatment. If all the benefits go to the Government I want to be the last person to complain, but there seems to be something in this tire deal that has a bad odor and if there is any way that you can purify the atmosphere for me I will feel better about it as will thousands of others. Personally, I would much rather have given my tires, bad as I needed them, direct to the Government if the Government needed them and would receive full benefit from them, but to be jipped is another thing. What do you know about this, if anything?

Here is another letter on tires from a hatchery owner:

I have long been one of your admirers and am coming to you with a problem that to me seems serious.

In 1940 I owned a car with 5.50 by 16 tires. I had two tires cut with less than 1,000 miles on them. Tires were cheap, so I put them in the basement and got new ones. In 1941 I got a new car with 6.00 by 16 tires. Then came Pearl Harbor and tire rationing. At that time I was driving about 25,000 miles a year and I visioned myself driving on rims, so I got the two tires from the basement and had them repaired just before the tire ceiling, at a cost of $5.50, and was offered $12 per tire on the spot for them, which I refused on account of wanting them myself. Then came gas rationing and I was obliged to turn them in. I got my check today for 40 cents, the tires marked "scrap."

I realize this letter won't bear much weight and that you alone can't accomplish much, but can't this steal be brought into the open,

somehow? I am just like millions of others. I wouldn't mind giving the price of those tires for victory, and I don't care if they tax me for every cent I can make for the duration, but it does get me down to think laws are enacted to force a man to dispose of his property in order to give some individual a chance to resell it at huge profits. Those tires were worth at least $5 or $6 each any place. A citizen here told me he sent in a tire that had never been put on the car and got only 20 cents for it.

I hope this can be stopped because it is reasonable to think that you can never keep the public in a spirit of cooperation by stealing what they have.

I might add that it was necessary for me to recap two of my tires since I turned them in, and it cost me $15.75 for the two and it was an inferior job.

I wonder what those who suffered with Washington at Valley Forge would think, if they could look down upon us. But Congress is not blameless. For 10 years rubber-stamp Congress after rubber-stamp Congress has surrendered power after power to the executive branch.

The following letter is from a woman who writes me that while her letter does not require an answer she does want me to know that she is keeping an eye on Washington. I would suggest to her that she keep the other eye on her pocketbook, if such advice does not come too late:

I just read an article about the point system of rationing and wondered why Franklin Delano Roosevelt has been allowed to bring the country's food supply to such a low ebb.

First, he killed the pigs, then plowed the crops under, then drove farmers from good farm lands and used it to build defense plants when there are thousands of acres of waste land which would have served as well. Two years ago we were asked to not eat cheese because England needed it. Last summer Wisconsin put on a selling campaign to get rid of her surplus cheese and, at least, part of the money came from Washington.

I was in the Brainerd courthouse in December and found Franklin Delano Roosevelt was still giving out thousands of pounds of butter and cheese, cases of milk, pork and beans, etc., to school districts for school lunches. I spoke of this to one of our C. I. teachers and he said, "Yes, C. I. has tubs of butter and hams in the locker." What I saw given to that one school was far more than they could possibly use, and it is too far to a locker. That district didn't need relief, neither does C. I.

Our woman's club in 1936 started serving soup to the grade children at noon and 3 years ago we gave milk during sessions without Government help. The domestic science department in the high school has served meals for years. Why did Franklin Delano Roosevelt step in? Politics. If you multiply this waste and manpower by the number of counties in the United States, what have you?

If we are short of food and are not turning out enough ammunition so China can get some, why draft more men into the Army? Why not leave them where they are and see to it that our boys overseas are well supplied.

This may sound as though I am a sorehead. I'm not. I am as anxious as anyone that we win the war and win it quickly and that is why I have told you things only people in small towns can know. I would like Franklin Delano Roosevelt to practice what he preaches—pay as you go.

The only promise he has kept since he took office is: "You will be taxed and taxed and pay and pay."

Now I want to read you a copy of a letter that is addressed to Hon. J. F. Byrnes, Economic Stabilization Director, by a prominent farm dairy cooperative leader in Minnesota:

In behalf of our 6,500 farmer-members and the war effort, we want to present a problem which we consider one of the most wasteful and unnecessary programs which the Government has fostered.

While dairy products are desperately needed for our Army, Navy, and Allies, one department of the Government is trying to foster a new social experiment whereby all the pupils, teachers, and even janitors in the public schools will have so-called penny milk. This means they will have milk by paying 1 cent per one-half pint bottle while taxpayers of the country will pay the balance of the cost, which in most cases will be about 2 cents per bottle.

Six men came to our office at one time trying to force us to agree that this was a good plan for the Twin Cities when we knew it was not at all necessary. The Twin Cities are on about the same level as other cities in the United States and are using 12 percent more market milk than they were last year. There is work for everybody who can work and the pupils in the St. Paul schools who cannot afford milk have been for years given free milk and this system can continue.

The penny milk plan was designed as a surplus disposal plan and it is no longer needed any more than the distribution of food by the stamp method. With an acute shortage of dairy products, this distribution of milk at the cost of the taxpayers should cease at once. Providing this point: At the present time the relief load in St. Paul is just one-twentieth of what it was at the peak, and authorities report that it has now reached the irreducible minimum. It seems unfair to us that our 6,500 dairymen members, or anyone else, should be asked to take war bonds to help give milk to the children of wealthy people in the schools.

We are writing this not only from the standpoint of the Twin Cities, but here is a national program which is absolutely contrary to the interest of the war effort. It is a new, idealistic, social plan which is not necessary with present employment conditions and with the increased use of milk throughout the United States. The six men who came to our office said that funds had been appropriated for this cause before the war and must be spent.

This plan is opposed by the people in charge of the school milk in St. Paul, by the producers' association and by the head of the Parent-Teacher Association. In spite of all this, it is being forced upon us by every conceivable means and it is difficult to explain the justice of a program of this character under present war conditions.

I do not suppose there could possibly be as much nutriment in milk furnished free by the local authorities as there would be in milk furnished by Washington, but I would like to see the butterfat content of the two kinds of milk analyzed. You know we are learning a lot these times that we never knew before. It was only the other day—and I lived on a farm until I was 23 years old—and it took a New Deal philosopher to disclose to us that there is such a thing as a female steer.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And did you believe it?

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, I read it in the paper.

Members of the House, these are but a few of the many letters along the same line that have come to my desk the past few weeks. You will note that they express grave doubts that all the regimentation to which the people are being subjected is necessary to our war efforts, and until they become convinced to the contrary there will be that lack of full cooperation so necessary to final and complete victory.

If there are any snoopers who want to see the originals of the letters that I have been reading, they are on file in my office; but, before I show them I would remove the signatures.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman does not want to show them the signatures on the letters that he has, he can send them over to my office and I will show them the signatures on the letters that I have.

Mr. KNUTSON. But it would not be fair to the gentleman's correspondents, because the administration then would turn all the agencies of the Government on them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, they have already done that down there where I live, and the people do not care anything about it. They welcome them.

Mr. KNUTSON. Then they probably have kept their shotguns.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not only that, but they have some basswood clubs and some neck yokes.

Mr. KNUTSON. How about rope?

The country is getting sick and tired; yes, Mr. Speaker, the American people are becoming indignant and outraged over some of the things that are being done to them in the name of emergencies and the war. If the President and his advisers are as smart as I think they are they will take to heart the special election that was held in the Sixth Congressional District of Missouri on January 12. Since the Civil War, that section of Missouri has been almost solidly Democratic. Two years ago our late colleague, Phil Bennett, as a candidate on the Republican ticket, carried the district by less than 5,000. Last fall he was reelected by nearly 10,000. Within a month after his reelection Mr. Bennett passed to his reward and his son MARION was given the Republican nomination for the vacancy and on January 12 he was elected by a majority of 15,000. He carried every county in the district. That has been an almost solid Democratic part of Missouri but like so many other sections of America, the Democrats down there differentiate between the Democratic Party and the New Deal Party. The voters in all northern States did likewise last November.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield—what about Mr. WALLACE?

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, what about Mr. WALLACE? I yield. The gentleman always wants to bring up contentious subjects. Go ahead. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. WALLACE is your Vice President. Does not the gentleman know that Mr. WALLACE said that only the wealthy voted at that election?

Mr. KNUTSON. Then that shows a wonderful increase in prosperity, but I

am not a psychiatrist, and therefore cannot analyze the line of Mr. WALLACE'S reasoning.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for all Americans who believe in and revere American institutions, the American form of government and the American way of life, regardless of past affiliations, to join together for the preservation of the America that we love and cherish.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Butte Daily Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIKES). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after the conclusion of the legislative business and other special orders, I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of other business, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PACIFIC WAR COUNCIL

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have two subjects which I wish to discuss in these 15 minutes. The first one has to do with the Pacific war.

I think that all thoughtful people will admire the intrepid courage of the President of the United States in his flight to and from Africa for the Casablanca conference. I would like to point out that it is impossible for us to know at this point the full results that those conferences may bring forth. I am confident that the result of those conferences has been to bind together more closely the British and American forces and, I earnestly hope and believe, to bring forth action in the near future which will bring closer the winning of the war.

I do not believe it is the job of Members of Congress to attempt to influence military decisions, nor to demand impossible action just so as to make the record for themselves. But I do think there are certain broad outlines of policy which are the business of every American and certainly of every Member of Congress. My remarks today are made from the point of view of a Pacific coast Member of this House. It seems to me it was unfortunate that the conference at Casablanca could not have included representatives of all the United Nations. I do not know why it could not. I have no doubt the reasons were good and sufficient, but because it did not I want to second with great earnestness the suggestion made by my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], the other day, in which he set forth a proposal that as soon as it can be done, there be established an Atlantic war council composed of representatives of Britain, the United States, and Russia, and a Pacific war council composed of representatives of Britain, the United States, and China. It is about that relationship existing in the Pacific theater of war that I want to say a few more things.

China is the one nation that has struggled longest against the aggression of the Axis Powers. She has been at war for 6 long years, and she has been at war for very little to go on. No one can fail to realize the tremendous difficulty involved in getting substantial military aid to China at the present time, nor would any sensible or thoughtful Member of Congress ask that the impossible be accomplished.

I think, however, it is not out of place for a Member of Congress to urge that every possible effort be made to arm to the best possible extent the millions of Chinese who have fought so courageously for so long. My reason is this, that if Japan is to be conquered in what people far wiser than myself have indicated is the surest way—namely, by an attack upon Japan herself—obviously the matter of preventing Japan from consolidating herself on the continent of Asia becomes of tremendous importance. The manpower of China is almost unlimited. The extent to which she can be taken into full partnership in this effort, as I am confident we are going to do, and the extent to which material aid can be sent to her, may determine the possibility of preventing Japan from so consolidating her position.

Furthermore, this is not only a military war, but a moral war as well. It is a war between two opposing philosophies of life and government around the world. Japan has made the specious and false claim that she represents by her armies the cause of all the non-Caucasian peoples of the world. She is wrong. She represents the cause of tyrannical government. The way that the United States can answer that false claim on the part of Japan better than in any other way is by the building up of relationships with the Chinese people and their nation.

May I point out that in the long run the friendship of that most populous people on the Asiatic Continent, one with some of the greatest potentialities of any people in the world, will be of priceless value to the people of the United States.

I submit these ideas, these appeals, if you want to call them that, with no thought in the world of attempting to unduly influence the military strategy of our command. But, as I said before, I think there are matters of deep, broad policy which may be quite as important in this connection, even as military aid to China.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 60

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the second place I want to speak about the position of the Congress and the job that the Congress, in my judgment, has to do in this session. There are certain problems with which we are confronted. We hear speech after speech on the floor in which Members appeal that the Congress should assume its full and proper place as a coordinate branch of government. For my part, I am in hearty accord with that statement. But too often those speeches end with simply a cry of that sort. That is not enough; we have got to know how we can accomplish that. Many of us have read of proposals for the strengthening of Congress or how it can build up its own position. It seems to me that if we analyze the situation we shall find that Congress has two duties. I want to read from House Resolution 60, which I introduced on January 19, for those two duties are set forth therein. I read from the resolution, as follows:

Whereas it is a responsibility of the Congress in time of war to provide such emergency and extraordinary powers to executive agencies as may be necessary for an effective prosecution of the war; and

Whereas it therefore becomes a corresponding responsibility of the Congress to see that such powers are exercised in accordance with the intent of Congress, and that they are neither abused nor exercised in an arbitrary fashion; and

Whereas it is at all times desirable that Congress be continually informed concerning the functioning of governmental departments and agencies which execute the laws passed by Congress: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That any standing committee of the House of Representatives, which has reported to the House legislation which has resulted in the creation of an executive agency of the Government for the accomplishment of certain purposes connected with the war effort or for any other purposes, is hereby designated as an agent of the House to carry on a continuing review of the work of such agency to determine whether or not such agency is carrying on its work in accordance with the intent of Congress, whether the powers granted to such agency are being used in an efficient, effective, and proper manner, whether any amendments to the legislation in question are necessary or desirable, and to report its findings periodically to the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. In the case of war agencies set up by Executive order and in the case of any other departments or agencies of the executive department of government not covered by the provisions of section 1 of this resolution, the Speaker of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed to designate such standing committees as may in his judgment be most appropriate to carry on a continuing review of the work of such agencies for the purposes and under the conditions set forth in the preceding section of this resolution.

SEC. 3. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of the House of Representatives in enacting this resolution that the work provided for herein be carried on in such fashion as, (1) to promote cooperation between the legislative and executive branches of government; (2) to avoid unnecessary confusion, friction, or misunderstanding between the people and their Government; and (3) to in no way retard and in every possible way to advance the war effort of the United States.

This resolution, as will be seen, states that in the case of an agency established by Executive order, or agencies which do not fall easily within the category of the work of one committee, that the Speaker shall have the power and the duty to designate standing committees to carry on this type of work.

In other words, the Congress has two duties, not one; one is to enact legislation; the other is to see that that legislation is carried out in accordance with the intent of Congress. How can it do it? By setting up innumerable special committees? By waiting until there is difficulty in connection with the administration of a law and then having a special resolution brought in for a special committee with an ex parte hearing on the floor about all the things that are wrong with an agency and then going into it in that manner? Or would it not be far, far better to strengthen the position of the standing committees of the House by giving them continuously this investigating function and saying that we are not going to wait until there is difficulty but that we are going to have in the standing committees of the House a continuing means and a recognized constant duty to see to it that the laws they pass are carried out as was intended by this House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In just a minute.

Furthermore, the suggestion that has been made that committees of the House equip themselves with additional staffs for the purpose of carrying on their work more effectively would be very largely met by this proposal, because I think it would be inevitable that if the committees were as active as I think they would be under these circumstances they would naturally acquire such staffs as they might need; and I might say further that I have many times felt as I sat on committees of the House that it was too bad that in order to get accurate information about the problems that we had in hand the only way we could do it was to go to an executive agency and ask for the information.

I have wished many times we might have at our command such assistance as to be able to develop our own philosophy, and more especially to have access to facts and information about the problems we face, which we then might compare with the views of the departments carrying on the important and necessary work.

Mr. Speaker, it is not of any use for us simply to complain about things that may be not perfect or may in some cases be very bad in connection with the huge and complex war effort of this Nation. I say again today, as I have said many times in this House, we cannot possibly organize a great democratic people to fight a total war and have everything work out nearly as well as we would like to have it work out. Our job is to be critical when criticism is necessary, but to advance constructive proposals for the solution of these problems at the same time we criticize.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a newspaper column by Mr. Will Blair, from the Pasadena Post, commenting on this measure which I have introduced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, is not the gentleman advocating a procedure similar to that advocated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; and if not, in what does it differ?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. My proposal, so far as I know, contained in this resolution has not been advanced by anybody except in cases like the resolution spoken of here today by the gentleman from New Jersey and introduced by him to have the Committee on Banking and Currency investigate the work of the Office of Price Administration. That is precisely along the lines I am talking about here except my resolution would take care of the matter once and for all and would say that any standing committee at any time and continuously would have not only the right but the duty to perform this investigative function of the Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did not the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] advance that same proposition some time ago, that the Congress employ experts to assist it?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Oh, that is right, but I am not talking primarily about employing experts. That is a different proposal. I am talking about having the standing committees exercise not only the function of passing laws but the corresponding function of seeing that the laws are carried out in connection with the intent of Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman realize that when you are on a standing committee you go to the executive department for information, as the gentleman just stated?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the procedure. Naturally they have their views and the interest of their own department and as we go along and the longer we are here we become acquainted more or less with them and we become reliant upon what they have to say. Does not the gentleman see how we become a sort of an errand boy for them?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman is injecting things here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not injecting anything. I am asking the gentleman something.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. My whole speech is the answer to the gentleman's question. Of course, I cannot conceive of the gentleman from Michigan becoming dependent upon any executive agency or department.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I may not believe anything they say, but I have no other figures except what they give me.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Exactly. And that is one of the situations I am trying to correct. I may say to the gentleman my proposal is intended to cure that situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I say to the gentleman from California that I am an off-sheep in that way, but I do not think all the Members of this House are so lacking in determination or common sense that they do not follow their own conclusions.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think most of them follow their own conclusions, may I say to the gentleman.

The editorial to which I referred follows:

THE LOOKOUT

(A column of comment edited by W. L. Blair, managing editor of the Pasadena Post)

CONGRESS CAN FIND PLACE IN IMPROVING WAR EFFORT

Congressman JERRY VOORHIS, of California, has made what, at this distance, appears to be an excellent proposal as to what Congress may do in regard to the administrative agencies engaged in the war effort on the home front.

Results of the November election generally are interpreted to mean that the public is dissatisfied with what may be termed "the business management of the war." There is little disposition on the part of the public or of Congress to interfere in military policies, but there is a decided feeling that both Congress and the public should hold the administration to more strict accountability in its handling of human and economic problems.

Proposals heretofore discussed among congressional leaders have been for the formation of a general investigating committee to study, to expose abuses, and to make proposals for avoiding clashes of authority, duplication of effort, and unsound interpretations of policy. The hope would be to bring order and legal sanctions into a scene marked by extemporization and personalism.

The aim is commendable and its achievement would be of the utmost value in the prosecution of the war.

But many persons who have followed the work of congressional investigating committees know that such committees, in general, have followed destructive courses. They are all right, perhaps, in matters which can be deal with by wholesale destruction and slow rebuilding. There is no time for such a process in reforming the war agencies. If Congress wants to be helpful, it must offer immediate suggestions and immediate legislation rather than sensational exposures.

Mr. VOORHIS has prepared and submitted to Congress a resolution which seems to meet these and other objections. This resolution, in Mr. VOORHIS' own words, "would empower the standing committees of the House to carry on a continuing review of the work of any agencies of the Government set up by legislation originating with that committee, and, in the case of agencies set up by Executive order of the President, would authorize the Speaker of the House to designate standing committees most nearly connected with the work of the executive agencies to conduct a like continuing review of their work."

"The idea behind this resolution," Mr. VOORHIS continues, "is that it is not only the duty of Congress to provide funds for the prosecution of the war and to grant necessary powers for the organization of our economic effort, but also to see that the powers of governmental agencies are exercised in accordance with the intent of Congress, are not abused or used arbitrarily. Had a measure of this kind been in effect, it is my firm conviction that some of the confusion and mistakes which have accompanied some of the programs in the past year would have been avoided. I feel it is preferable to the use of special committees because the work could be conducted with less fanfare and would furthermore in all cases be in the hands of people who would already be familiar with the problems to be dealt with."

Some such plan as this must eventually become a part of the ordinary process of legislation and administration at Washington. One of the weakest links in the Federal Government is the link between the

President and Congress. It should be strengthened, not necessarily to strengthen Congress or to weaken the President, but to strengthen Government.—W. L. B.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to put into the RECORD some more figures having to do with the work or the slackening up of work at the airport where the fighting planes are repaired for the use of both the Army and the Navy; in fact, all of the work that comes into this section of the country. That will take too long at this time and I will do it later in the week.

Permit me to call attention at this time to a privileged resolution which I introduced today which reads as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the House of Representatives the answers to the following questions:

1. Does section 1534 of title 10 of the United States Code, among other things, provide that—

"An officer who uses contemptuous or disrespectful words against * * * the Congress of the United States shall be dismissed from the service or suffer such other punishment as a court martial may direct?"

2. Are officers of the Navy subject to the provisions of the section quoted in question No. 1?

3. If they are not, is there any Federal statute or rule or regulation of the Navy of similar import?

4. Section 1567 of title 10 of the United States Code reads:

"Any officer or cadet who is convicted of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman shall be dismissed from the service."

Section 1568 of the same title provides, among other things, that:

"Though not mentioned in these articles * * * all conduct of a nature to bring discredit upon the military service * * *, of which persons subject to military law may be guilty, shall be taken cognizance of by a general or special or summary court martial, according to the nature and degree of the offense, and punished at the discretion of the court."

Are there any similar provisions of law, or any rule or rules or regulation of the Navy of like import?

5. Does article 8 of chapter 21 of title 34 of the United States Code provide, among other things, that—

"Such punishment as a court martial may adjudge may be inflicted on any person in the Navy * * * who is guilty of profane swearing, falsehood * * * or any other scandalous conduct tending to the destruction of good morals?"

6. In the August 22, 1942, issue of the magazine published under the name of Liberty, is an article by Walter Winchell, which, among other things, charged (p. 54) that one Smith "now indicted, sabotaged the war effort by spreading disunity."

In the September 12, 1942, issue of the same magazine, on page 32, are the following words:

"A correction—

"On page 54 of the August 22 issue of Liberty it was stated that Gerald L. K. Smith had been indicted. This was an error and an injustice to Mr. Smith, against whom no indictment has been returned. We apologize for the error."

which is an admission that Lieutenant Commander Winchell, of the United States Navy, was guilty of a falsehood.

Have any proceedings been taken to inflict upon him the punishment specified in article 8, of chapter 21, of title 34, for the conduct made an offense by the first subdivision of said article?

7. On July 12, 1942, Walter Winchell, while an officer of the United States Navy, asked a radio audience:

"How about the voters going after those other saboteurs who landed in Congress?"

I do not know how many Members present or Members of this body he referred to, but that is what he said.

A few days later he inserted in his column published in the press the following statement:

"Another reason some Congressmen are demanding the eight saboteurs be shot is that they might talk too much."

Congress is a queer place for saboteurs to land. I do not know of any Congressmen who were making talks about it at that time. The Congressmen were keeping quiet about the matter and letting the Department of Justice follow its own course. He stated that "some Congressmen are demanding that the eight saboteurs be shot because they might talk too much."

That was an officer, a lieutenant commander in the Navy, who was saying that.

On July 26, 1942, Walter Winchell, over the radio, made the statement that—

"Nearly everyone who printed seditious articles has been indicted except those who put the same things in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. * * * But, 'honeychile'—all of them will be confronted by the same charges after November 5."

There is a threat. There is a statement that Congressmen put seditious articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If I put seditious articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, why was it that some of the gentlemen on the majority side and why was it that some Members on the minority side, there must be one or two loyal Members in the Congress, did not ask to have them expunged from the RECORD?

Do you realize what this man is doing? He is telling the people of the United States, and he claims to have millions of listeners and readers, that Congressmen, without protest from other Members of Congress and by unanimous consent, are putting seditious articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Just how long are you going to let him get away with that?

My resolution goes on to say:

If the making of such statements was "scandalous conduct tending to the destruction of good morale," what, if any, action has been taken by the Navy or any officer thereof to either punish the said Walter Winchell for the making of such statements, or to put an end to the making of such statements?

8. (a) During the month of January 1943 was Walter Winchell an officer in the United States Navy? And, if he was, what was his rank?

(b) If Walter Winchell was an officer in the United States Navy during January 1943, did he, on January 31, 1943, in a radio broadcast, or in his column as printed, in substance refer to American citizens who voted for certain Representatives in Congress as "damned fools who voted for them"?

9. What was the official position of Walter Winchell in the United States Navy during each of the months of 1941 and 1942?

10. During each of said months, what was his official designation and what, if any, rank did he hold in the United States Navy?

11. To what duties in the continental United States was Walter Winchell assigned by the Navy, and what portion of his time did he spend in the service of the United States Navy during each of the months of 1941 and 1942?

The point of the whole thing is this: We have a law against sedition. Sedition is the utterance or the publication or the circulation of any statement which tends to influence a soldier or a man in the armed forces to do less than he otherwise would toward the winning of the war.

Can you imagine anything that would discourage our people more than to hear over the radio, as they did last Sunday night, from an officer of the United States Navy, a lieutenant commander, that some 14,000,000 of our citizens were damn fools?

I am asking the Secretary of the Navy and I want to know whether this officer in the Navy is to be permitted to continue on the air not only to slander and vilify individual Congressmen but the Congress as a whole, the Congress as a branch of the Government, and is he to be permitted to go further than that and refer to 14,000,000 citizens who voted the Republican ticket, Democrats and Republicans who believe in this country and its institutions, and who are making every sacrifice asked of them—is he to be permitted to go on and over the air designate those 14,000,000 people as damn fools? If he is, and if the Navy will do nothing about it, will the Congress do anything about it?

I have asked members of the Committee on Naval Affairs what they were going to do about it. One of them told me, "I cannot say anything because the things we were told were told us in executive session and our hands are tied and our lips are sealed."

Since when has it been thought lawful to gag Congress when Congress itself is assailed and its loyalty challenged, and when the people who sent us here are referred to as damn fools? It is bad enough to charge an individual Member of Congress with disloyalty or lack of patriotism; it is bad enough to charge the whole Congress with being incompetent or disloyal to the interests of the country, but what glad news it must be to Hitler to learn from New York, the largest city in our country, over the radio which carries the words to millions of people thoughout our country, that a man, an officer in the Navy, can charge 14,000,000 American citizens with being damn fools.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.)

the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 3, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

### COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet at 10:30 a. m. Wednesday, February 3, 1943, in room 356, House Office Building.

### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, February 3, 1943. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 1012, "To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes."

There will be a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Friday, February 5, 1943. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 649, "For the organization and functions of the Public Health Service."

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 69. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to conduct studies and examinations of executive agencies to assist it in the determination of matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 81). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LUDLOW: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 1648. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept No. 87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1605. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to farm-acreage allotments, the farm marketing excess of wheat, the use of excess corn as silage for feed to livestock on the farm, to provide for the adequate supply of peanuts for oil and other uses, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1539. A bill for the relief of Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 82). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1540. A bill for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1582. A bill for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1587. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1598. A bill for the relief of George S. Wolbert, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship and Engine Building Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 633) for the relief of Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps; Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 635) for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps; Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 1649. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 1650. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing that citizens of former neutral countries shall become eligible for military service when their countries cease to be neutral; making eligible for naturalization aliens who claimed exemption as citizens of neutral countries and who subsequently serve honorably in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 1651. A bill to assure conservation of and to permit the fullest utilization of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1652. A bill to provide for the issuance of insurance policies under section 300 of the World War Veterans' Act, as amended; to prohibit the issuance of insurance policies under the National Service Life Insurance Act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 1653. A bill to regulate the practice of professional engineering and creating a board for licensure of professional engineers in and for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 1654. A bill to authorize the acquisition, rehabilitation, and operation of the facilities for the public in the Olympic National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1655. A bill to provide for the acquisition of Mueller's Airport, Revere, Mass., for the use of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 1656. A bill granting privileges for reenlistments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 1657. A bill to amend Public Law No. 607, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 1658. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1659. A bill transferring the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 1660. A bill to provide pensions for widows and children of deceased officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1661. A bill to protect the second-class mailing privilege of newspapers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. Res. 92. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives so as to create a Committee on Forestry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. Res. 93. Resolution providing for an investigation by the Committee on Agriculture of programs of Government agencies which affect or may affect food production; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. Res. 94. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to study the progress of the war effort and the civilian war economy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 95. Resolution requesting information as to status of Walter Winchell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 96. Resolution establishing a select committee to investigate acts of executive agencies beyond the scope of their authority; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to preserve inviolate the State rights as provided in the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation with reference to farm labor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for passage of legislation with reference to tolls paid over the Golden Gate; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 1662. A bill for the relief of Claude M. Nichols; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1663. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ora F. Houser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLEN:

H. R. 1664. A bill for the relief of James M. Robedee; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 1665. A bill for the relief of Joseph Paste, Anna Paste, Rose Paste, and to the legal guardian of Doris Paste, and to the legal guardian of Evelyn Paste; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 1666. A bill for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1667. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1668. A bill for the relief of Lessie C. Selman; to the Committee on Claims.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

68. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 16 citizens of Ellwood City, Lawrence County, Pa., favoring a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to the War Act of 1917, forbidding the exploitation of the men in the Army and the Navy by liquor and commercialized vice; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

69. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Mrs. H. G. Brown, chairman, Navarro County Society for Crippled Children, Corsicana, Tex., favoring House bill 699; to the Committee on Education.

70. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition under the authority of Ethel Sheckherd, clerk of Bowling Green rural school district, and signed by 48 parents and patrons of Brownsville, Ohio, protesting against order No. 21 of the Office of Defense Transportation, which would require school children to walk as far as 1½ miles to the school bus and 2 miles to the school building; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

71. Also, petition, under the authority of V. B. Moffett, superintendent of Ashland County, Ohio, schools, and signed by parents and patrons of the following school districts: 236 of the Hayesville school district; 281 of the Jeromesville school district; 227 of the Montgomery school district; 22 of the Nankin rural school district; 28 of Perry Township school district; 268 of Perrysville school district; 202 of Polk village school district; 180 of the Ruggles rural school district; 151 of the Savannah-Clear Creek-Butler school district; 297 of Sullivan school district; 258 of Troy rural school district, protesting against Order No. 21 of the Office of Defense Transportation, which would require school children to walk as far as 1½ miles to the school bus and 2 miles to the school building; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

72. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Board of Aldermen of St. Louis, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the home of George Washington Carver as a national shrine; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Freely Thou givest, gracious Lord, and Thy precept teaches us that only he lives who has learned not to withhold. Oh, save us from an unfruitful waiting upon a struggling humanity that still has a long path to tread for redemption from the wild fires of scorn and hate, and before a new morning with its advancing light is irradiating this embattled world. Oh, save it from the rebel works, murmuring in the wilderness with their gilded iniquity, seeking to rock the freedoms of man with their inhumanity and shame.

Heavenly Father, do Thou bless abundantly our own United States; in humble gratitude may it in turn seek to bless Thee; help every citizen of every race to lift up the sunken, appealing ruins of wicked war into a redeemed world. Remind us, blessed Lord, that our splendid might reaches its coronation in being tolerant and brotherly, following Him who taught us all to say, "Our Father." We praise Thee that life hidden in the Divine One requires neither crown nor title to reflect the imperial majesty of its manhood. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 2, 1943.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Claims. This action has been made necessary by the pressure of other duties which makes it impossible to do my share of the work on the Claims Committee.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT RAMSPECK.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, following the legislative business and any other special orders heretofore made, my colleague the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the other special orders and the conclusion of the legislative business, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the conclusion of the other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a communication from the chief of police of the Bethlehem Steel Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### QUIT CODDLING THE JAPS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks, and that they may appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the National Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1648, Rept. No. 87) mak-

ing appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 3]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Ill. | Hendricks | Rabaut |
| Arnold | Holmes, Mass. | Ramey |
| Baldwin, N. Y. | Jones | Reece, Tenn. |
| Bland | Keogh | Reed, Ill. |
| Boykin | Kerr | Richards |
| Buckley | Kirwan | Satterfield |
| Capozzoli | Klein | Schuetz |
| Carson, Ohio | Lea | Sheridan |
| Cochran | Lesinski | Short |
| Crosser | Lewis, Colo. | Smith, Ohio |
| Cullen | Lynch | Starnes, Ala. |
| Domengeaux | McGregor | Stockman |
| Douglas | Marcantonio | Sullivan |
| Elliott | Miller, Pa. | Sumners, Tex. |
| Ellis | Norton | Talbot |
| Engel | O'Leary | Taylor |
| Gamble | O'Toole | Voorhis, Calif. |
| Gibson | Peterson, Fla. | Weichel, Ohio |
| Hall, Edwin Arthur | Pfeifer | Whelchel, Ga. |
| Hays | Phillips | White |
| | Price | Zimmerman |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 372 Members have answered to their names. A quorum.

On motion by Mr. LUDLOW, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 97), and move its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives, as follows:

Library: DONALD L. O'TOOLE (chairman), New York; GRAHAM A. BARDEN, North Carolina.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce: JOHN P. NEWSOME, Alabama.

Judiciary: MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Ohio.

Banking and Currency: MAURICE J. SULLIVAN, Nevada.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

FEBRUARY 3, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully tender my resignation from the following committees: World War Veterans' Legislation; War Claims; Immigration and Naturalization; Coinage, Weights, and Measures; Library; Elections No. 2.

I am taking this action in order to be eligible for another committee assignment.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN NEWSOME.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a short editorial appearing in the Boston Herald of Friday, January 29.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Providence Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by Hon. J. Melville Broughton, Governor of the State of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate shall continue for 8 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1648, with Mr. COURTNEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 50 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I present the first of the appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1944 with a very realistic conception of the intense desire of the American people, amounting to a mandate, that the Congress of the United States shall proceed to chart a course of the most rigid economy in nondefense expenditures and shall place effective curbs on our overgrown and vigorous bureaucracy, which has become such a dominant force in our national life and which is threatening to stifle free enterprise.

The one outstanding lesson of the recent election, a warning, as I conceive it, to Democrats and Republicans alike, and which ought to sink deeply into the consciousness of this House, is that the people know, even if we may not, that this Government of ours is getting too far away from the Constitution and that there needs to be a change of direction and a return to fundamental moorings; that the people are deeply stirred by glaring evidences of waste and extravagance and that they are alarmed by seeing the long outstretched arm of bureaucracy reaching out into every community, every business, and every home and exercising ever-increasing authority over the American way of life. They find that in the period from January 1, 1941, to December 9, 1942, 659 Executive orders were issued—mostly orders originating in the bureaus at Washington—and thus we are witnessing the metamorphosis from the Government of our fathers in the direction of a government by bureaucrats, a lethal process which, unless checked, could easily transform our Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" from its original form and mold to a great Washington superbureaucracy.

During the last 10 years—January 1, 1933, to December 9, 1942—3,556 Executive orders have been issued, many of which, drafted in the bureaus, have had the effect of law and thus have substituted the will of bureau chiefs for the will of our legislative branch of government that was established to make the laws. During the same 10 years only 4,300 public laws have been enacted by Congress. Think of it! As a Member of this body that was established to make the laws of our country, of which you also are Members, I point out to you that the number of Executive orders issued during the last decade almost equals the number of public laws enacted by Congress. Congressional authority, which means the authority of the people, is weakened and paralyzed to the extent that the country is governed by bureau-inspired orders.

I am not going to hold any post mortem on this occasion, to try to fix the responsibility for this great bureaucracy that has been built up in Washington. If the executive establishment is to blame for excessive zeal in bureaucracy building, Congress, by the same token, must be condemned for ignobie complacency in too easily surrendering its powers. I am not going to blame anybody, but I do maintain that a situation is being created that must be corrected, if constitutional government, founded on rule by the people, is to survive.

The people are looking to this Congress as never before to see that these untoward trends are corrected; to see that the operations of government are brought within the four corners of the Constitution and kept there; to see that the rights of the States, localities, and individual citizens are made secure—and this wish of the people is a challenge to all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike. It is not a partisan question, and partisan politics should not be allowed to enter into it. It is a fundamental question of what is best for America now and for our children and children's children down through the ages.

PEOPLE ARE THINKING IN TERMS OF JEFFERSON

The people of America everywhere are turning away from the Tugwell bureaucratic type of thinking, with its ideas of killing little pigs and converting them into soap grease, plowing under every third row of cotton, and paying farmers for what they do not raise. That kind of thinking is not Democratic thinking. It is not Republican thinking. It is an exotic brand of thinking which can never successfully be transplanted to American soil. More and more—and I can sense it everywhere—the people of America, Democrats and Republicans alike, are turning to the sound thinking of Thomas Jefferson, who dwelt upon economy in government as a primal virtue, and who asserted that "the government is best that governs the least."

From out of the background of history comes Thomas Jefferson to aid us in the solution of the paramount problems of this tragic era. We in this House will do well if we will sit at the feet of Jefferson and gain inspiration from his ideas of economy and constitutional government.

In the reconstruction of thought and procedure which must take place if we follow the election returns, this House is destined to have its important part. If ever there was a time when Congress should rise to the heights of its responsibilities as a defender of constitutional government against the encroachments of bureaucracy, that time is now, and I have faith to believe that this Congress is going to make itself both known and felt as the instrumentality of government closest to the people.

In this evolution the Appropriations Committee, presided over by the able and resourceful gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], which has initial control over the purse strings, is in a position to assert a wholesome and effective national leadership, and I am sure that in the manner of its discharge of its heavy duties and responsibilities at this crucial time our committee will justify itself. We will vote to the Commander in Chief every dollar needed to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion, colossal though the amounts will be. There will be no niggardliness about war appropriations, but we will be watchful against waste in war as well as civil expenditures; and, if I correctly sense the situation, nondefense, nonessential estimates will be cut as never before. Blanket-check appropriations are out of the window.

CONSCIENTIOUS EFFORT TO REDUCE APPROPRIATIONS

In the preparation of the bill now before us we members of the subcommittee have made a diligent, earnest, conscientious effort to scrutinize every item and to apply the rule of economy wherever possible. In many days of tedious hearings we heard a large number of witnesses, including the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General, who gave us the over-all picture of their Departments. In the deliberations of our subcommittee members belonging to opposing political parties worked together in common devotion to the country's best interest, thus again justifying the tradition that we park our politics in the anteroom. Our few differences of opinion were settled amicably on the basis of majority rule. I wish to testify to my great esteem for the members of our subcommittee—Messrs. O'NEAL, MAHON, CURLEY, TABER, KEEFE, and DWORSHAK—and to say how highly I value the privilege of serving with these very able men, and I would like also to express publicly my deep appreciation of the helpful services of our efficient clerk, George Harvey.

SERVICE ESTABLISHMENTS

It will aid in a better understanding of the bill now before us—the one making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments—if we will just remember that both of the Departments embraced in this bill are primarily and essentially service establishments. There is not a dollar in this bill for the purchase of land; there is not a dollar in it for the construction of buildings; there is not a dollar in the bill that is not for salaries for services to be performed or for materials, equipment, research, or other facilities essential in the rendering of services.

The picture in both Departments is one of vast, almost amazing, expansion in the various fields of service. An example in the Treasury Department is an enormous increase in the load of checks issued by the Division of Disbursement and paid by the United States Treasurer. The Division of Disbursement estimates that it will handle in 1944 a total of checks, bonds, and collections, 71,314,115 items, as against 61,434,882 items in 1942, an increase in round figures of 10,000,000 items. Even more staggering is the increase in postal business. Through its 43,638 post offices and 6,480 branches and stations, the Postal Establishment during the fiscal year 1942 transported and delivered 30,117,633,460 pieces of mail, weighing 3,244,719 tons, an increase of 881,842,132 pieces of mail and 120,492 tons over the fiscal year 1941. Reports from the 187 largest post offices, which produce approximately 64 percent of our postal revenue, for the first 5 months of the current fiscal year 1943, show a continued increase in special service transactions as follows:

| | *Percent of increase* |
|---|---|
| Pieces of paid registry | 122.61 |
| Pieces of free registry | 61.82 |
| Pieces of insured | 31.67 |
| Pieces of c. o. d | 7.40 |
| Pieces of special delivery | 13.61 |
| Money orders issued | 18.25 |

It is axiomatic that the mails have to be moved and we must provide the funds to handle them, and when we consider, in addition to the enormous expansion in the volume of mail and postal services, the very large but as yet indeterminate item of the Saturday overtime cost, due to recent legislation, a reduction in postal appropriations was difficult of accomplishment. However, by inserting the pruning knife wherever we thought it could be done without impairing vital activities we did make reductions in the estimates of both the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the summation of which is as follows:

*Treasury Department*

| | |
|---|---|
| Total of estimates presented by the Department to the the Bureau of the Budget | $528,985,805 |
| Total allowed by the Budget | 306,328,315 |
| Total carried in this bill | 302,724,416 |

*Post Office Department*

| | |
|---|---|
| Total of estimates presented by the Department to the Bureau of the Budget | $927,077,786 |
| Total allowed by the Budget | 906,527,515 |
| Total carried in this bill | 899,282,855 |

*Both Departments*

| | |
|---|---|
| Total of estimates of both Departments combined presented to the Bureau of the Budget | $1,456,063,591 |
| Total allowed by the Budget | 1,212,855,830 |
| Total carried in this bill | 1,202,007,320 |

COMPARISON OF 1944 APPROPRIATIONS WITH 1943

The bill which we present today carries for 1944 a total of $113,889,392 below the appropriations for the two Departments in the 1943 bill. The total for the Treasury Department is $110,193,684 below the appropriations for 1943, and the total for the Post Office Department is $3,695,708 below the appropriations for 1943.

MORGENTHAU AN INTERESTING WITNESS

One of the most interesting witnesses before our subcommittee was the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau. He occupied the stand for a good half day. To those who enjoy entertaining reading I would commend perusal of his testimony, pages 1 to 49 of the hearings. He gave us a broad view of the banking situation, which he pronounced "As sound, or more sound than at any time since 1933" and of the business of the country, over half of which, he ventured to say, is now devoted directly to the war effort. He told us of his plans to finance the war and to expand the revenue service to provide for the processing of 8,500,000 additional income-tax returns, due to lowered exemption features of the new legislation. He saw no danger of runaway inflation at present, but said that is something that has to be watched "every single minute."

There are lots of ways of meeting inflation—

He said—

but I do not know of any more effective way of meeting it than through taxation. We have not even begun to approach the tax burden in Canada.

CONDEMNS SILVER PURCHASE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman care to yield or does he not wish to be interrupted?

Mr. LUDLOW. I shall be pleased to yield to my friend the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. While the gentleman is discussing Mr. Morgenthau's testimony, will the gentleman give us some enlightenment as to his opinion concerning the Silver Purchase Acts and the vast stock piles—upward of almost 3,000,000,000 ounces of silver—now tarnishing at West Point on the Hudson?

Mr. LUDLOW. I believe I can answer that best by quoting the exact language of the Secretary of the Treasury.

One of the high lights of his testimony was his unqualified condemnation of the silver purchase subsidy.

If it were left to me I would strike the silver legislation right off the books—

He said.

Speaking of the need of the vast accumulation of silver in the production of implements of war, he said:

Left to our own devices we would be in favor of striking all silver legislation off of the books and make it possible for us to make use of the silver, other than that which is back of the outstanding currency, available for war purposes.

It was brought out in Mr. Morgenthau's testimony that the gross public debt at the end of the current fiscal year will be about $136,000,000,000, but he would not venture an opinion as to what would be a safe debt limit. On that point, he said:

We have a war on our hands, and we must win it, and under those conditions the debt limit question will have to take a back seat.

FARMERS' IMPROVED FINANCIAL POSITION

We reduced the estimate for payments to Federal land banks on account of reductions in interest rate on mortgages from $22,800,000 to $21,800,000 and the estimate of payments to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation from $8,200,000 to $7,400,000. These payments cover the difference between the interest rates which the loan contracts bear and the statutory rate of 3½ percent which Congress has provided shall be collected on these loans. The average contract rate, estimated as of June 30 next, is 4.863 percent. The number of outstanding loans in both categories has declined every year for 7 consecutive years, and the rate at which the farmers are now repaying their loans, and repaying them in full, led our subcommittee to believe that both estimates would stand a reduction. If this should turn out to be overoptimism, no harm could be done and no one's interests would be jeopardized, as these payments are a legal obligation and the difference would be covered by a deficiency appropriation. It will be noted on page 68 of the hearings that Dr. C. W. Warburton, Deputy Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, sent me a letter voluntarily proposing that these estimates be reduced in the sums of $500,000 and $400,000, respectively, on account of the improving farm financial picture.

FOREIGN FUNDS CONTROL

For Foreign Funds Control we allowed $4,100,000, which is $250,000 below the Budget estimate and $900,000 below the appropriation for 1943. The funds of 35 countries are now blocked under Executive Order 8389, which set up the Foreign Funds Control, and the total amount of the blocked property is $8,500,000,000. This is an involuntary control, except for China, which asked that its property be taken over under a freeze order. There is no compensation for managing these foreign-owned properties, as it is a measure in the interest of and for the protection of America. In the last fiscal year the Control returned, unused, $478,000 of its appropriation. One of its functions, that of supervising business enterprises, has been taken over by the Alien Property Custodian, and it is believed the Control can get along with the appropriation we have allowed.

NEW ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

In the Treasury appropriations for the fiscal year 1943 we allowed $150,000 to begin the creation of a new streamlined system of Government accounting and reports under the Bureau of Accounts, as provided for in Executive Order No. 8512. A good start has been made toward the establishment of that system, from which much benefit is expected in the way of bringing order and efficiency out of a very disordered, imperfect, and lackadaisical Government accounting service. The subcommittee noted that a very pleasing harmony exists between the Treasury Department and the General Accounting Office in the construction of this new governmental accounting machinery, and we allowed $150,000 to continue the work.

Because of the mounting load on the Bureau of Disbursement, we allowed that bureau an appropriation of $2,900,000, which is $196,587 more than its combined regular and supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1943.

For a similar reason we allowed an appropriation of $3,800,000 for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of the Public Debt, an increase of $1,200,000 over the amount provided for the current fiscal year. In the varied activities and operations connected with financing the war this Bureau is functioning in high gear, and its costs of operation have shot upward. When a loan has been outstanding for two years it automatically is taken over from the expenses of loans roll to the Bureau of the Public Debt for permanent servicing and this is piling up work on the Bureau rapidly as the public debt grows.

MONEY FOR SALE OF BONDS

For the indefinite appropriation, "Expenses of loans," we allowed $57,000,000 as against a Budget estimate of $58,690,000, and $45,000,000 for the current fiscal year. We believe that an appropriation of $12,000,000 above the current year's figure will suffice, but if it should fall short a deficiency will be entertained. This appropriation covers a budget allocation of $9,300,000 for the sale of War Savings bonds and stamps, a decrease of $2,700,000 below this year's allocation for that purpose. The War Savings staff asked the Budget for $12,000,000, and the Budget reduced the estimate to $9,300,000 and directed that the cut be applied to the expenditure for printing and binding. For printing and binding the staff had well over $4,000,000 in the fiscal year 1942, and the amount it has in the present fiscal year is $5,300,000, while the amount involved in the appropriation estimate for 1944 is only $2,288,000. Harold N. Graves, Director of War Savings sales, told us that his organization will stand on the Budget figure and make every effort to reduce its printing and binding costs accordingly. It is interesting to know that about 275,000 persons are now engaged in selling War bonds under Mr. Graves's direction, of whom only 1,250, including 350 in Washington and 850 in the field receive any compensation whatever for their services. It is estimated that 50,000,000 people now own bonds of the E series, which is the bond of $25 maturity value. The goal of the bond-selling campaign is $1,000,000,000 a month. At the present time 160,000 firms have the pay-roll voluntary deduction plan as compared with 10,000 a year ago, and 23,600,000 persons in private firms and Government agencies are now having money deducted from their pay every month to buy bonds.

TREASURY'S BIG LOAD

An idea of the expansion of work in the Office of Treasurer of the United States may be obtained from the fact that he expects to clear the enormous total of 161,700,000 checks in 1944 as against 138,385,000 in 1943, an increase of 23,315,000. We allowed him an increase of $200,000 over his 1943 appropriation to cover the cost of increased operations.

ELIMINATION OF COMPTROLLERS

We have taken an economy step which we hope will have the support of Congress by writing into this bill a provision for the elimination of comptrollers in the Customs Service. There are seven of these officers. The following information in regard to the locations of the offices, dates of expiration of terms of service, and salaries paid was furnished to us by the Bureau of Customs.

| Place | Date of expiration | Salary |
|---|---|---|
| New York | Nov. 30, 1945 | $8,750 |
| Philadelphia | May 31, 1946 | 6,000 |
| Boston | Dec. 16, 1946 | 5,600 |
| Baltimore | Feb. 28, 1938 | 6,000 |
| New Orleans | Aug. 15, 1941 | 6,000 |
| Chicago | Mar. 30, 1942 | 6,000 |
| San Francisco | Nov. 21, 1939 | 5,600 |
| Total | | 43,950 |

Comptrollers of customs, it was brought out in our investigation, are political appointees who perform no duties that cannot be performed by other employees in each office, who, as a rule, are much more familiar with the work. Assistant comptrollers are civil-service employees who in every case have been selected from among qualified customs employees who were appointed into the service through competitive civil-service examination. If the comptrollers were abolished, the present assistant comptrollers with the existing organization, would carry on without the slightest inconvenience, and the taxpayers would be saved $43,950 annually. That these offices can be dispensed with is shown by the fact that the comptrollership of customs at San Francisco, one of the seven places, has been vacant since November 21, 1939, without the least detriment to the public service. Comptrollers are appointed for 4 years, but when their terms expire they continue to serve unmolested, several of the present incumbents being now in that status. In 1940

the House, with Treasury Department backing, passed legislation to abolish the comptrollers, but it was stopped by Senate opposition. At that time E. R. Ballinger, of the Office of Secretary of the Treasury, was questioned by this subcommittee:

Mr. LUDLOW. Do you think this position could be dispensed with without injury to the public service?

Mr. BALLINGER. Yes, sir; in my opinion they can be dispensed with, because in every office we have competent assistants who are well qualified to do that particular job.

On account of war impacts, the customs business has receded since 1940, and, if comptrollers were nonessential at that time, they are doubly nonessential now. Here is an opportunity to show that our service to the cause of economy is not mere lip service. Let us give the taxpayers a break by wiping these useless positions out of existence.

REFUNDS AND DRAW-BACKS

The Bureau of Customs came before us with a request, urgently supported by importers from New York and Boston, that we change the appropriation for customs refunds and draw-backs from an annual specific appropriation to an indefinite appropriation. In justice to our obligations as members of the Appropriations Committee we could not see our way clear to do this because an indefinite appropriation is removed from the watchful eye of the committee and we felt that the proponents should come before us with an annual justification and showing of need. It may be that in some instances importers suffer a hardship by delay in receiving the refunds due them, but this can never be for a long period, as Congress acts promptly on requests for deficiencies to replenish this fund.

On the other hand, we did yield to the request of the Bureau of Internal Revenue that internal revenue tax refunds be changed from a specific to an indefinite appropriation, but the cases are entirely dissimilar due to the enactment by the last Congress of the withholding tax. There was abundant expert testimony by revenue officials that, with the withholding tax entering the picture, the internal revenue refund system cannot be operated except on an indefinite appropriation basis. Estimates of the amount of withholding tax refunds ran as high as half a billion dollars a year, but it was contended that the prospect is so speculative and obscure that any definite appropriation figure would be a mere guess in the dark, with which our subcommittee agreed.

Most of these refunds, I may say, will be refunds to poorer people in small amounts, and we felt it would be very unjust to set up an arrangement that would prevent them from securing their money promptly.

INCREASE FOR INTERNAL REVENUE BUREAU

The broadening of the tax base has placed on the Bureau of Internal Revenue a vast additional burden, and to cope with this burden we allowed the Bureau an increase of $5,532,385 over its 1943 appropriation of $89,561,680. Of this increase, $5,308,452 will pay for personal services. Five thousand five hundred and four permanent field employees who were employed for a fractional part of the fiscal year 1943 will be paid for a full year in 1944 at an added cost of $4,672,217.

FEW ARMY DRUG ADDICTS

For the continued maintenance of the Bureau of Narcotics through 1944 we allowed $1,100,000, which, though a reduction of $100,000 below the Budget estimate, will enable the Bureau, we think, to carry on in its usual effective way. Dr. H. L. Anslinger, the Commissioner of Narcotics, gave us a very hopeful picture of drug addiction in the armed forces. On page 484 of the hearings this testimony appears:

Mr. LUDLOW. What do the Army enlistments show so far as drug addicts are concerned, compared with the other war?

Mr. ANSLINGER. In the last war, out of some 4,500,000 men there were 3,000 rejected for drug addicts as such. Out of the present Army of 4,000,000 men, so far as we know, not more than 100 have been rejected because of drug addiction which is a very heartening thing, because the last war created an army of drug addicts. Now this time they are weeding them out. This we did not do in the last war.

Mr. LUDLOW. What could you say about drug addiction in general; is it on the increase or decrease?

Mr. ANSLINGER. It is down so far that it is a bit startling.

GOOD WORK IN REDUCING COUNTERFEITING

A similar encouraging report in respect to counterfeiting was made to us by Frank J. Wilson, Chief of the Secret Service:

Tell us about counterfeiting. Is it increasing or decreasing?

He was asked. He replied:

I am very glad to report, Mr. Chairman, that counterfeiting is decreasing and that it has shown a decided decrease since we started a new method of fighting counterfeiting.

This new method included the showing of a motion picture on counterfeiting which reached over 8,000,000 people and the Nation-wide circulation of a 32-page booklet on the detection of counterfeit money entitled "Know Your Money."

FINE SCHEME THAT DIDN'T WORK

A new industry, however, is the attempted counterfeiting of War Savings stamps of the 25-cent denomination, but before any could be put in circulation the Secret Service arrested 6 defendants and seized $52,000 worth of War Savings stamps, with the entire plant and equipment. It was a fine imitation and a fine scheme but it didn't work.

POSTAL VOLUME AN ALL HIGH

Postal volume is now an all-time high and the picture in that department is one of vast and unprecedented expansion with very unreliable indices to determine direction and progress with precision. The Department estimates that its audited cash expenditure in the fiscal year 1944 will be $906,527,515, and its audited revenue will be $910,000,000 by which token it will find itself with a comfortable over-all surplus of $3,472,485 at the end of the fiscal year 1944. But it is very doubtful whether that attractive surplus will stand up in the finals. Every time the Postal Service approaches the black something happens to set it back. This time one of the retarding factors is the new Saturday overtime law which gives time and a half on Saturday in lieu of compensatory time on some other day of the week. Shortage of manpower in the Postal Service is making it impossible to grant compensatory time and is throwing large blocks of employees over into the Saturday overtime bracket and that coveted 1944 postal surplus of $3,472,485 probably will be nothing more than a will-o'-the-wisp, after all. At the most, postal estimates of receipts and expenditures are but little more than "best guesses" as the Department at present has no cost ascertainment facilities that are worthy of the name. Postmaster General Walker, a shrewd businessman and fine executive, lamented that while fate has placed him at the head of the largest business organization in the world—the United States Postal Service—it has given him no means to determine his factors of cost, which seemed to him incongruous, as it did also to us, so we provided in this bill funds whereby he may set up what we hope will be adequate cost ascertainment facilities under the Bureau of Accounts.

In all probability this cost ascertainment unit is going to find the promise of a future surplus completely illusory. Saturday overtime is likely to grow like a rolling snowball, for the manpower problem in the Postal Service is one of increasing seriousness. So far, more than 25,000 postal employees have joined the armed forces and in many instances the reserves of substitutes have been sapped to depletion.

Other unprecedented items of cost are further operating to throw the Post Office Department off of its financial balance. Among these is the free mailing privilege to the soldiers. On the basis of 6,000,000 men in the service the postal establishment is now handling 1,453,920,000 pieces of first-class mail per year free, resulting in lost revenue of $43,617,600 per annum at 3 cents per piece.

FREE MAIL 1 PIECE IN EVERY 10

The ordinary citizen of this country, and I think it is true of Members of this House, will be surprised to learn that including free mail to soldiers, penalty mail, franked mail, and so forth, 1 out of every 10 pieces of mail is handled by the Postal Service without the payment of any postage whatever. One-tenth of the vast volume of mail in number of pieces is handled free. Without the free mail to soldiers the ratio of free to paid mailings would be 1 to 20.

PENALTY MAIL THE BÊTE NOIR OF THE DEPARTMENT

Penalty mail—the free mail of Government departments, bureaus, commissions, and so forth—has become one of the Department's biggest and sorest problems. It is growing by leaps and bounds. The Postmaster General told us—see page 7 of the hearings—that he estimates the loss of revenue in the fiscal year 1942 on account of penalty mail was $71,000,000, and the first 6 months of 1943 show that this stride is being accelerated. The

number of pieces of penalty mail in 1942 was 1,516,015,444 as against 1,123,563,721 in 1941 and 999,138,119 in 1940.

CONGRESSIONAL MAIL ON DECLINE

Meanwhile franked mail—the free mail of Members of Congress—has been showing a steady decrease. In 1940 there were 45,136,539 pieces of franked mail on which, if postage had been paid at regular rates, the revenue would have been $1,217,561. In 1941 the franked mailings decreased to 30,920,380 pieces on which the postage at regular rates would have been $926,843. There was a still further decrease in 1942 when the number of pieces of franked mailings was 24,460,040 and the loss of revenue was only $767,028.

What should be done in respect to putting a curb on penalty mail is a matter to be considered by a legislative committee and does not come within the purview of the Appropriations Committee, but there was a very pronounced opinion among our members, as well as among the witnesses from the Department, that something should be done to keep the situation from getting entirely out of bounds. A department, bureau, or other activity may put out all the free mail it chooses to issue, just so it is official. Only the sky is the limit. Some members of our subcommittee were inclined to the view, which seemed to meet with favor among postal witnesses, that the problem of restricting penalty mail to proper bounds could be solved if Congress were to make definite appropriations for postage to the various units in the executive establishments and require those units to justify their postage needs in estimates before the Appropriations Committee.

POST-OFFICE INSPECTORS

We had presented to us a request for 100 additional post-office inspectors, with an annual salary obligation of $260,000, and with a commensurate increase in clerical personnel and the related travel item. The Postmaster General, when he was before us, very impressively stated the need of additional inspector personnel. There are now 750 inspectors, of whom 141 are assigned to postal work in connection with the military forces. A very important part of the inspection service is the examination of post offices in order to recommend improvements in service and to guard against defalcations. The ideal arrangement would be an examination of every one of the 43,638 post offices once a year, but, of course, that is obviously impossible, and in extreme cases examinations have been made only once in 3 or 4 years.

Of the value of the inspection service there can be no doubt. It has been described as the eyes and the ears of the Postmaster General. Its possibilities of usefulness are almost unlimited and unquestionably a thousand or more inspectors would find plenty to do, but it is a costly service and its expansion must be held within reasonable limitations.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield, with pleasure, to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I notice from the hearings that the number of inspectors was increased last year.

Mr. LUDLOW. One hundred new inspectors were allowed last year.

Mr. HARE. The Department also asks an increase this year. I do not mean to criticize the work of the inspectors, but I notice that the backlog of cases has increased from 61,000 to 72,000 as compared with a year ago. In other words, as the number of inspectors has increased, the number of cases left over at the end of the year has increased somewhat correspondingly. The gentleman from Indiana is quite astute and is also a philosopher; I was wondering whether or not he has made any study for the purpose of determining whether or not the backlog of cases should not decrease annually in proportion to the increase of inspectors, by finding out the predominant violations of the law and seeing if it were possible to decrease these violations. I had the impression when all postmasters were placed under the classified civil service and became familiar with the duties of their offices that there would be increased efficiency in the administration of these offices and necessarily a decrease in the number of cases making it necessary for the services of inspectors.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman certainly reasons logically. If we were to consider only normal times, he would be eminently correct, but the war has terrifically dislocated the inspection service as it has everything else, and added vast new obligations and vast new categories of service; and the regular operations have been disturbed and diverted on that account.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has consumed 50 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in recent years we have been most liberal in building up the force, and last year we allowed for the appointment of 100 additional inspectors. In this bill we have granted 25 more inspectors, which, we believe, will materially reduce the load on the inspection service.

POSTMASTERS' SALARIES

We allowed an increase of $1,750,000 for the payment of compensation to postmasters, raising the amount from the appropriation of $51,750,000 in 1943 to $53,500,000 in 1944. Under the law postmasters are paid on the basis of the receipts of their offices. When the receipts warrant they are entitled to an increase of compensation and this appropriation is nothing more than a mathematical adjustment. The same is true in reference to assistant postmasters, for whom we allowed an increase of $847,200 to cover statutory requirements.

BUDGET ESTIMATES ALLOWED FOR CLERKS AND CARRIERS

For the great blocks of postal employees, including clerks, of whom there were 85,162 on November 30 last, and city delivery carriers, of whom there were 58,531 on the same date, we allowed the exact Budget estimates, $239,000,000 in the case of clerks and $165,000,000 in the case of carriers.

In all probability the Budget figures, which we allowed, will prove to be below the actual cost of the clerical and city delivery services by millions of dollars, but no harm can be done by appropriating the amounts estimated for, as the Department has authority to employ all of the clerks and carriers necessary to handle the mails and then to return to Congress for deficiency appropriations to cover the cost when the needs of the service can be better ascertained. That has been the rule for years and it has worked satisfactorily.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Is any increase allowed in this bill for postal employees? I receive a great many letters complaining that they have not had an increase in pay for years.

Mr. LUDLOW. I may say to the gentleman that we have no authority in that matter. It was not before us. It could not come before us without a legislative authorization. It will have to be brought up later and can be brought about only when legislation is passed by Congress.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Will this bill as reported by the gentleman's committee permit of any increase to these low-paid employees of the Postal Service whose salaries have not been increased for many years?

Mr. LUDLOW. It would require legislation to adjust the salaries. We have not, therefore, carried any increase in this bill. We could not do so.

Mr. ANGELL. May I say, if the gentleman will permit, it seems to me these Government employees in the Postal Service should be given increases in pay, while we are increasing the pay of Government employees in various other lines, particularly war activities. I understand we have not given the postal employees increases in 17 years. They are grossly underpaid. If we cannot provide for these long-deserved increases in this bill, I hope legislation will be passed before we end this session. The increased cost of living is a heavy load upon these underpaid Government employees.

Mr. LUDLOW. Personally, I am very sympathetic with the gentleman's suggestion, because the postal employees have not had an increase in salary for 17 years. The cost of living meanwhile has gone up tremendously and I think they have a very good case, but that has to be handled by legislation. I am in favor of such legislation. It cannot be handled by this bill.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I commend the gentleman's fine statement except for his last comment about postmasters receiving an increase, and that increase being a mathematical transaction. As the business increases they get an increase in compensation.

Mr. LUDLOW. By statute.

Mr. BENDER. By statute; yes. The point the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] makes is something that interests all of us. Why is it that these regular employees of the Government, the people who come closest to the families in our communities, are treated so niggardly? Why is not some effort made to compensate them in accordance with the regular increase that has been given other employees?

Mr. LUDLOW. Again I express my sympathy in line with the gentleman's suggestion. I think that is on the way. That legislation is on the way through Congress now. There is existing legislation authorizing automatic receipts to postmasters and assistant postmasters, based on receipts.

Mr. BENDER. It has been on the way for the last 4 years and it has never reached home plate.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman appreciates that we are an appropriation committe. We cannot appropriate money unless authorized to do so by an act of Congress.

Mr. BENDER. I have no complaint about the gentleman or the committee.

Mr. LUDLOW. We cannot do anything about it. No matter what amount is appropriated the Department can pay no salary greater than the schedule fixed in the statute.

Mr. BENDER. I think it desirable to call this condition to the attention of the Congress at this time, when appropriations are being made.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think that is entirely proper, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BENDER. The 10-percent increase granted other Government employees did not apply to the postal men; is that correct?

Mr. LUDLOW. All employees who did not receive an increase under the overtime provisions of the new law were granted a 10-percent flat increase.

Mr. BENDER. When was the last law passed?

Mr. LUDLOW. The temporary overtime law was passed in December 1942.

Mr. BENDER. That temporary overtime device, then, is interpreted as an increase in pay? This did not apply to carriers and clerks.

Mr. LUDLOW. There was in that legislation a straight 10-percent increase in pay for all postal employees who did not receive an increase through the overtime provisions.

Mr. BENDER. There was no 10-percent increase. It provided for giving them more for overtime.

Mr. LUDLOW. I am advised that the postal employees did get an increase.

Mr. BENDER. If they worked 48 hours a week. The additional 8 hours—that is, for the overtime—is computed, and they can get an increase in pay on the basis of 48 hours' work and not on the basis of 40 hours a week, as other Government employees are paid for regular work plus the 10-percent increase. The postal employee must work 48 hours in order to get the increase in pay.

Mr. LUDLOW. It is the same as all other employees. I understand it is tantamount to an increase.

Mr. BENDER. Of course, the appropriation here does not indicate that that increase applies to the postal worker.

Mr. LUDLOW. That law expires on April 30, before this bill becomes effective, and there could not be any money carried in it for that reason.

Mr. BENDER. This is for 1944?

Mr. LUDLOW. That is right. The overtime law expires on April 30.

DONALDSON APPROVES ESTIMATES

The Department prefers to have its big personnel appropriations handled in that way. When the estimate for clerks of first- and second-class post offices was under consideration by our subcommittee and Jesse M. Donaldson, the efficient deputy First Assistant Postmaster General, was on the stand, the following colloquy occurred:

Mr. LUDLOW. Is it your judgment, Mr. Donaldson, that the Department can and does stand on the appropriation estimate as submitted here, with the understanding, of course, that the doors of the deficiency subcommittee are open for the consideration of estimates that may be later deemed necessary for the administration of the clerical service, should that time arrive?

Mr. DONALDSON. Yes, sir; I think that is thoroughly proper, more so now than ever before, for the reason that the people in the Post Office Department that are and should be most familiar with these figures are in the dark as to what it is going to cost.

Mr. LUDLOW. This is a time, perhaps, when you are, on the whole, in a more unsettled condition than you have been for a good many years, and it is pretty difficult, if not impossible, to forecast very far in advance as to your needs; is not that true?

Mr. DONALDSON. That is very true.

Later, when the estimate of the appropriation for carriers was taken up, the interrogatory was repeated, and questions and answers were as follows:

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Donaldson, as I understand it, you are content to stand on the Budget's estimate and do the best you can?

Mr. DONALDSON. Yes, sir. I might say, Mr. Chairman, while there is a deficiency looming up of around $6,000,000 it is based on normal overtime. We now pay time and a half for overtime, and I think the deficiency will be greatly increased. If we could continue on the old basis as to overtime rates, the deficiency might not be $6,000,000. With the longer workweek and higher rate for overtime, we can only guess at total expenditures. I think the best thing for us to do, not knowing just what we will have in the future, is to rely on the amount that the Budget set up, and when we come before you for a deficiency we will have a better idea of what we will require, because nobody now knows what it will cost.

Mr. LUDLOW. You think that you can so manage things that you can get along in that way without any impairment to the service?

Mr. DONALDSON. As a matter of fact, we would prefer to do that, and go along with this amount, and then we can see what our problem will be when we have to ask for a deficiency, anyway, under the new law.

So it seemed to us to be the part of prudence for Congress to stand on the Budget estimates for these great personnel groups until time clarifies the situation and we can make a more definite ascertainment of service requirements.

CLERKS AT THIRD-CLASS OFFICES

For clerks at third-class post offices we allowed an increase of $150,000 over the 1943 appropriation of $8,450,000, based on the growing needs of this service.

VILLAGE DELIVERY

For Village Delivery Service we allowed the Budget estimate of $1,500,000, which we were advised is ample to maintain all existing village delivery. No new village delivery services have been established since 1938.

RURAL DELIVERY

For Rural Delivery Service we allowed the Budget estimate of $92,200,000, which is the same as the appropriation for the current fiscal year, and we wrote into the bill a provision that not less than $200,000 of this amount shall be available for extensions and new service. The average cost of an extension is $87, and the average cost of a new route is $1,822. The money carried in this limitation, therefore, would provide for 2,300 extensions or 110 new routes. The Department has on hand 15 applications for new routes that have been approved and 28 applications for new routes that are being investigated. The mandatory limitation we have established will be ample to cover new service. There are now 32,242 rural routes in operation and the service is distributed equitably throughout the country.

STAR ROUTE SERVICE

The Star Route Service is expanding as railroad trains are being discontinued, and there is an assured increase in the cost of that service due to a reletting of contracts in the Third Contract Section, which will take place on July 1 next. We allowed for that service next year an appropriation of $14,750,000, an increase of $1,250,000 over the combined regular and deficiency appropriations for 1943. A new postal service by bus, known as the highway post-office service, is being tested out with very promising prospects of useful expansion. Because the Army and Navy now are carrying a great deal of the mail formerly paid for under powerboat service, we were able to reduce the appropriation for that service from $1,650,000 in 1943 to $550,000 in 1944. For the railroad transportation of mail and mail messenger service and for the personnel of the Railway Mail Service we allowed the Budget estimates, $118,000,000 and $60,530,175, respectively. If more railroad space is required than the estimate will pay for, it can be, and will be, provided in deficiency appropriations and the handling of the mails will be in no wise adversely affected.

AIR MAIL PICTURE COMPLETELY CHANGED

The war has changed the entire picture of our foreign mail service, both by surface and by air. Vast sections of the earth have been entirely cut off from our foreign air mail facilities, while on the other hand our foreign air mail service in the Western Hemisphere has greatly expanded. For foreign mail service by surface we reduced the appropriation from the 1943 figure of $2,410,000 to $675,000 due to the fact that most of this service has been taken over by boats of the Army, Navy, and the War Shipping Administration without any charge to the postal appropriation. For foreign air mail we propose to appropriate $4,500,000 for 1944, as against an appropri-

ation of $16,055,979 in 1943. This large reduction is possible not only because of curtailment of foreign service but because the Navy is taking over operations to Alaska and Hawaii, which formerly were charges against this appropriation. For the domestic air service we allowed an appropriation of $22,000,000 for 1944, as against $24,588,115 in 1943. We were able to make this reduction because the Civil Aeronautics Board has recently ordered deep cuts in the contract rates of the American Air Lines and the Eastern Air Lines and information came to us which led us to believe that further heavy cuts in rates paid to domestic air mail carriers are in the offing. On the financial side the air mail picture, both foreign and domestic, has become increasingly brighter. In both services there is now a large excess of receipts over direct expenditures and the subsidy is near to being washed out, even when all factors of cost, direct and indirect, are considered. The war has increased the volume of air mail greatly. The military service has taken over 159 of the 324 planes that were in the domestic commercial service when the war began, leaving only 165, which is somewhat of a handicap.

REASONS FOR ELIMINATING COTTON ITEM

There is one more postal item to which I should like to advert before taking my seat. For some years we have carried in the post office appropriation bill under the head of "Post office stationery, equipment, and supplies" the following language:

> Not more than three-fourths of the funds herein appropriated for the purchase of twine shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from materials or commodities produced outside of the United States.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman has shown that there is a tremendous reduction in the cost of foreign mail, and has also shown that the fact that the Army and Navy are now doing considerable mail work is reflected in a reduction in the amount carried in this appropriation bill.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. Notwithstanding that fact, is it not true that the money required for this service is being spent under another appropriation bill?

Mr. LUDLOW. I imagine the additional cost of this service to the military agencies is very light because these other agencies are carrying this mail on the ships and planes that are in regular operation in military service. I cannot imagine any very great increase in cost to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. STEFAN. It costs money to haul that mail, whether the Army or the Navy hauls it or whether the regular mail service hauls it.

Mr. LUDLOW. They do not use planes and ships expressly for this mail service. It has been carried on simply as an incident to the operations that have to go on anyway.

Mr. STEFAN. We assume, however, that after hostilities cease, the cost of this service, concerning which we now show a reduction in expenditures, will again be reflected in this appropriation bill?

Mr. LUDLOW. There is no question but that there will have to be readjustments after the war ends.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Would the gentleman mind referring back to rural deliveries, in which I am very much interested?

Mr. LUDLOW. With pleasure; yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that applications are on hand in the Department for 25 additional new services, or are those extensions?

Mr. LUDLOW. The Department has on hand 15 applications for new routes that have been approved and 28 applications for new routes that are being investigated.

Mr. STEFAN. There is money in the bill for how many extensions?

Mr. LUDLOW. We appropriate money enough to cover 2,300 extensions, or 110 new routes. We have not divided it as between the two. We leave that to the Post Office Department. However, there is ample money to cover all existing applications if they allow every one of them.

Mr. STEFAN. That is what I wanted to bring out—that you have sufficient funds here to take care of all of the applications that have been made.

Mr. LUDLOW. All that are pending, whether or not they have been approved.

Mr. STEFAN. Would the gentleman care to say anything about consolidations? The Department undertook wholesale consolidation of rural routes. Is that practice going on now?

Mr. LUDLOW. I think it is to the extent that it is determined to be feasible and practicable. There were savings on an annual basis of $281,000 in the last year on account of consolidation. It is not a large operation, I may say to the gentleman, because the service has become shaken down until it is pretty nearly stable at the present time.

Mr. STEFAN. Would the gentleman care to answer a question on another subject, in which many of the Members are interested? Are not the Postal Service employees subject to the Selective Service?

Mr. LUDLOW. They are.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the situation in the Service now? Is the Service having trouble in maintaining an efficient and sufficient staff in all branches?

Mr. LUDLOW. The Service is faced with a tremendous problem of manpower. The military services have taken 25,000 men out of the Postal Service up to this time.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman have any information as to the percentage of the rural mail carriers or the clerks or members of all branches of the Postal Service who have gone into the Army or Navy?

Mr. LUDLOW. I do not believe we have testimony showing percentages. It is a big problem and a serious one. It is so serious that consideration has been given to the employment of women in the Postal Service.

Mr. STEFAN. But a large number of employees of the Postal Service have already joined the armed forces?

Mr. LUDLOW. Twenty-five thousand.

Mr. STEFAN. From all branches of the service?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Can women be used as carriers of mail?

Mr. LUDLOW. That has not been found to be especially practicable, but consideration is being given to their employment in clerical and other capacities, more than ever before.

Mr. STEFAN. For inside work?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Referring to the appropriation made for the extension of the rural delivery service, does that appropriation include any amount for the rendition of service on holidays on rural routes?

Mr. LUDLOW. I may say to the gentleman that we appreciate his very able presentation of that matter to the committee. It was considered, but it was thought better to leave the matter to the administrative discretion and judgment of the Department. We did not take action on it. However, we appreciated the gentleman's presentation.

Mr. HARE. So no funds are included in this bill for that purpose?

Mr. LUDLOW. No funds are specifically designated for that purpose. I have no question but that under the latitude of administration it can be done. That is my off-hand opinion. It might be well for the gentleman to talk to the Postmaster General about it, since the gentleman is quite interested in the subject.

Mr. HARE. I hope the gentleman will yield me a little time on that subject before the debate is over.

Mr. LUDLOW. I promise the gentleman all the time he wants.

Mr. HARE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I should like to have the gentleman's reaction as to the influence organized labor is having in the Post Office Department on the shortening of hours of service. With the great influx of people into the large cities today because of war conditions, the situation has become such that you cannot get mail at the general delivery window from 4 o'clock Saturday until 7 o'clock Monday morning. It is shut up tight. There does not seem to be any spirit on the part of the Post Office Department to increase their service in that regard. From my observation, a sack of franked mail put in the post office over here at noon on Saturday lies

in the post office there until Monday morning. They will not touch it.

Mr. LUDLOW. Undoubtedly the mail has lately been in a worse, dislocated condition than ever before. It was terribly dislocated along about the holidays, but that is due to the shortage of manpower in the first place, inevitable in wartime. Certainly the Post Office Department officials are not to blame. War conditions are to blame.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I think it is the influence of organized labor to not do very much. Special deliveries come here on Sundays, and are delivered Monday morning, and I think the post-office service is suffering from the influence of organized labor, due to the shortening of hours, and the doing of less work.

Mr. LUDLOW. We have no evidence to that effect. I repect the gentleman's opinion, but we have no evidence to indicate that.

Three kinds of twine have been experimented with to supply the large needs of the Postal Service—twine made out of jute, twine made out of cotton, and twine made out of paper. Twine made out of paper breaks too easily and therefore it may be eliminated from consideration. Experiments, repeatedly made, have demonstrated that jute and cotton twine are equally serviceable. The department makes no distinction between them as to quality.

The original purpose of our subcommittee in ordering a distribution of the money between the two classes of twine was founded in a sincere desire to assist the cotton industry of the South and we have continued to carry the provision for that reason. However, we have to admit regretfully that the purpose so far has not been achieved. Cotton manufacturers have displayed little, if any, interest in the proposal. Only one bid for the Department's last requirement of 7 carloads of cotton twine has been received and the bidder has shot up the price to 40.9 cents a pound. We feel that our well-meant efforts to help the South have not been of much avail. There is plenty of jute twine on hand and in sight at 19.9 cents a pound and to fill this order with cotton twine, instead of jute, would be the same as throwing away the differential in price, which would be $58,800. We can seen only one right course to pursue in justice to the taxpayers of America, and that is to delete the language from the bill, which we have done, with the assurance, however, that if in the future the cotton manufacturers will show more interest in the proposal and will submit bids on a reasonably competitive basis we will be very glad to consider restoring the language in a future appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes more.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. In reading over the hearings, I observe that for 1944 there is an estimated surplus of approximately three and a half million dollars. In considering postal receipts, does the committee take into consideration the 3-cent postage rate on first-class mail, or 2 cents?

Mr. LUDLOW. This estimated surplus is based on the 3-cent letter postage. We give no consideration to a change in postal rates. These estimates are based on existing rates.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. As I recall, several years ago Congress increased first-class postage from 2 to 3 cents, and this additional 1 cent was earmarked for purposes other than post-office receipts. Is that correct or not?

Mr. LUDLOW. If it is true, I am not aware of the fact. I think, on the contrary, that it was a general increase in the receipts of the Post Office Department. It is estimated that 1-cent increase on letter mail made a differential of $100,000,000. Postmaster General Farley and Postmaster General Walker have resisted any reduction of rates, because they have figured that the general receipts of the Postal Establishment could not stand a reduction that would reduce revenues in such an amount.

I have covered, I believe, most of the main features of the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill which we are bringing to you for your consideration. It has been a long presentation, undoubtedly tedious at times, and I thank you very much for your patience.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I believe I reecho the sentiments of the House on both sides in saying that we are very grateful to the gentleman for the statement that he has made and, over and beyond that, for the painstaking conduct of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having in charge the Post Office appropriation bill.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the very detailed explanation of this appropriation bill which has been given by our beloved chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], I shall not attempt to retrace the steps that he has taken. Let it be said that no more indefatigable worker exists in the Congress of the United States than the gentleman from Indiana. He is very meticulous in handling the details of such an appropriation bill, and perhaps without that meticulous care which he exercises at all times, it would be very difficult to bring all of these items before you in understandable detail. I suggest that each Member of the House read the speech the gentleman from Indiana has made here this afternoon, and, as usual, I know they will find that it is a masterpiece of logic and diction. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has been a tower of strength in bringing his great ability to bear on this bill.

I may say that all of the members have endeavored to bring a bill to the Congress that would be in harmony with the spirit of the times, which is economy in Government. I would call to the attention of the public and of this Congress the fact that this is not a typical appropriation bill, in which real economies can be practiced. If gentlemen will turn to the table that appears in the report and in the hearings of the testimony of the Postmaster General, they will see, for instance, with respect to the Post Office Department just where the postal dollar of 1944 came from and just where it went. You will also find that upon an examination of the break-down of the expenditures of the Post Office Department that the Appropriations Committee in this Congress can only deal with about 5.7 percent of these appropriations. All of the rest of the post-office items of the appropriation bill are prescribed by existing law. We cannot reduce the pay of the post-office clerks or the pay of the rural mail carriers, or the pay of the postmasters throughout the country. Congress has prescribed the compensation of the employees of the Postal Service, and those are the big items of cost—personal services. About the only place where we are able to make any cut at all is occasionally in the matter of personnel. Let me illustrate. The Post Office Department came before the subcommittee and asked for an increase in the number of inspectors. They wanted 100 additional inspectors. After thoroughly going into that picture we decided that 25 new inspectors would be all they ought to have for the next fiscal year. So we reduced the appropriation by the amount that would be expended contemplating their request for 100 and our granting of 25 additional inspectors.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not want to yield right now. If I may go on I shall yield later.

The other item was explained just before the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] left the floor. That is illustrative of the few places where your committee could make reductions in these postal items. This Congress placed in the appropriation bill several years ago a provision which bound the Postal Service to buy at least 25 percent of their requirements for string, cord, and wrapping twine to be made of cotton. It was done to help out the cotton industry which was then in a slump. The cotton industry did not pay very much attention to that provision in the bill, however. Last year there was only one bidder for the requirements of the Postal Service. Do you know what the differential was? The jute manufacturers who had always furnished twine for the Post Office Department entered a bid of 19.9 cents per pound. The cotton manufacturer, only one bidder, boosted the price up to 40.9 cents per pound, a dif-

ferential that on the requirements which the Post Office Department under existing law was compelled to buy made of cotton, made a difference of $58,800. There, by that one cut of striking that provision out of the Post Office Department appropriation bill we have saved the Treasury $58,800. Perhaps it would not even show in either the Budget estimate or in the estimates shown in the committee report.

I want to impress upon you that the committee has tried diligently to reduce every item of appropriation consistent with the necessity for carrying on essential service. No one will say that the Post Office Department, which is rendering a postal service to the people of this country which they pay for, should be reduced to the point where we are not giving adequate postal service, consistent with the war effort.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Is it not true, as a matter of fact, that in all appropriations it is going to be impossible to satisfy the demand for a cut such as the public has been led to believe is possible, due to the fact that Congress had prescribed certain practices and because many of the items of expenditure are fixed?

Mr. KEEFE. Well, that is true in some cases. I do not want to say that generally that is true. I think there are many agencies of Government that can be eliminated entirely and that tremendous savings can be effected all through the Government service.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak for a moment about one of the things that I believe would show a real saving to the Government, and that is this matter of penalty mail. I think it is one of the outstanding tragedies in our country that we sit supinely by and see penalty mail in this country, which is burden upon the Post Office Department, always increasing, reaching this year the outstanding proportion of approximately $71,000,000. At the same time the franked mail privilege has shown a steady decline, so that the privilege enjoyed by the legislative department of Government, the franking privilege, this year amounts to approximately $767,000.

The Congress of the United States has been abused in certain publications and upon the radio by certain commentators, for abusing this franking privilege. I have never heard one of them say a word about the abuses of the penalty-mail provisions of law, which permit these bureaucratic agencies of Government, without restraint, without check, without restriction, to send carloads of printed material throughout this country until every newspaper office, every chamber of commerce, every store, every farmhouse in the country is littered with these brown envelopes coming from the departments under the penalty-mail privilege. I think it is high time that the Congress do something now about limiting and restricting a privilege that has been most grossly abused. When this bill is read I propose to offer an amendment to deal with that problem. I do not have time to read the interrogation which I made of the Postmaster General upon that subject, but I would ask each Member of the Congress to take the hearings and read the testimony of Mr. Walker, the Postmaster General himself, on that subject. He testifies that no one has any control whatsoever over the issuance of penalty mail by these departments.

I have in my office hundreds of publications and pamphlets being sent out by the various departments of Government that ought to be stopped. The mail should not be burdened with the necessity of carrying them all over the country. My amendment will be very simple. It will simply provide that none of the funds provided in the appropriation for the Post Office Department shall be expended for carrying mail of any official of any administrative or executive office of the Government. Now, what will that do? Do I want to stop them from using the mail? No. I want those people to go to the proper committee of Congress and say, "Gentlemen, we need some postage for sending our material through the mail." I want a committee of Congress to pass on the question as to the necessity for sending this material out. It will be a salutary check upon those departments of government that have caused such a tremendous increase in the use of penalty mail. Let us see how that has gone up. In 1939 it was $36,000,000. In 1940, $39,000,000. In 1941, $49,000,000. According to these tentative figures that were given to us, $67,000,000 in 1942. In accordance with the testimony of the Postmaster General it will perhaps be $71,000,000. Let me tell you this, that his testimony discloses that they do not have the slightest idea whether their figures are anywhere nearly correct. The best judgment that I have is that instead of being $71,000,000, if the real facts were disclosed and a real check had upon the number of pieces of penalty mail, it would perhaps approximate $90,000,000 instead of $71,000,000, because they are not now checked at all.

The law used to require them to report to the Post Office Department the number of pieces and the character of the mail they sent out, but that law has been repealed; so there is no check at all upon them; they can send a carload or 10 carloads through the mail and the Post Office Department has got to carry it. Every postmaster in the land will testify to the burden that has been placed upon their carriers attempting to get this mail out, mail that in many cases no one has asked for, no one wants, no one ever reads, and no one ever will read—an absolute loss in printing as well as postage, and yet there is an alleged shortage of print paper to the point that they are trying to cut down the size of daily newspapers. I think we can well make the start in cutting down on the number of these pamphlets that are being sent out by these new agencies of the Government that have sprung into existence lately.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Assuming that the gentleman's amendment will prevail and that it will eliminate at one and the same time essential and nonessential distribution of pamphlets, and that the department head or Cabinet member will have to come before the appropriate committee to obtain authority to expend a certain amount for postage, what authority, in the meantime, will these department heads and agencies have for the distribution of some of the essential pamphlets?

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman should understand that this appropriation bill we are now considering does not become effective until July 1. It applies only to appropriations for the next fiscal year and all they would have to do between now and July 1 would be to come before the appropriate subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and justify he necessity for their post-office expenditures. They have plenty of time to do that between now and July 1, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I am not finding any fault with the gentleman's idea; I am asking for information.

Mr. KEEFE. I have answered the gentleman, have I not?

Mr. DINGELL. All right.

Mr. KEEFE. There is no desire on my part to stop the agencies of the Government from using the mails; all I want them to do is to use them in a reasonable way, and I will go further than that, and I want to call attention to this: The amount of franked mail which was used last year amounted to $767,000-plus; that is what the Post Office Department says. I do not know how they checked that—whether it is any more accurate than the figures on penalty mail. Bear this distinctly in mind: Penalty mail is the mail used by the various agencies and the departments of Government; franked mail is limited to use by the legislative department of the Government and the two clerks of the House, I believe, and the Sergeant at Arms; 535 people have the franking privilege in the United States Government set-up. The $767,000 estimated cost of franked mail would amount to approximately $1,400 a year postage per Member. This amounts to about 160 pieces of mail a day at 3 cents postage on each. I wonder how many Members who are listening to me here today send 160 pieces of mail each day 300 days a year? So far as I am concerned, I would be perfectly willing to have a specific limitation placed upon the amount of postage which I, as a Member of Congress, am permitted to use. I do not want to treat myself any differently than I want the executive and administrative agencies of the Government to be treated. I think that

$1,400 is altogether too much for any Member of Congress to consume in the matter of postage, and I think when you check into it, unless you are one of those who is sending out thousands upon thousands of printed speeches and thousands upon thousands of bulletins of the Department of Agriculture, which are charged against your frank and not against them as part of their penalty, I believe that the real business of the Congress could be carried out with a very severe reduction in the amount of postage that is allowed or that might be allowed to Members of Congress themselves.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I have been allotted $50 worth of air-mail stamps, as has each Member of Congress. In the last year I have not used three of them because I can send mail to my constituents in New York just as fast by ordinary mail as I can by air mail. What shall I do with the balance of those stamps?

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman need not take them, need he?

Mr. CELLER. Why should we be allowed them? They are practically rotting in my safe.

Mr. KEEFE. So far as I am concerned, if you examine the records you will find that the proposition of giving Members of Congress $50 of air-mail and special-delivery stamps has saved thousands upon thousands of dollars in the use of telegrams. Telegrams used to be sent most frequently. Certain Members used to be very prolific in their use of telegraph facilities; they used to write letters and send them by telegraph to the west coast. Members who represent districts in the far West are entitled to have their mail expeditiously handled. In order to save on telegraph bills this privilege was given to Members of Congress, to use $50 of air-mail stamps annually.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I agree wholeheartedly with what the gentleman says about the saving that has accrued to the Government by reason of this $50 allowance for air-mail stamps. I should like to say to the gentleman from New York who states that the stamps are practically rotting in his safe that a Member of Congress should not get the stamps in the first place unless they are needed.

Mr. CELLER. Why should we be given them? I did not ask for them.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has to make written application to get them.

Mr. KEEFE. The law requires that a written application must be made for these stamps by the Members of Congress. I may say to the gentleman from New York that if he has any stamps which he cannot use, he should immediately return them to the disbursing office.

May I call attention to the fact that whenever a department of the Government uses the air mail it must buy air-mail stamps. They have to buy air-mail stamps and affix them to any mail they send out for delivery by air mail. It would seem to me that when they are sending out these thousands upon thousands of brown envelopes they could be put through a metering machine with very little difficulty and thus there would be some check upon what they are sending out and the burden each department is throwing upon the postal facilities. If the Post Office Department had half of the amount they spent for penalty mail next year, the Post Office Department would show a real cash surplus in its operation. We hope to be able to operate without any deficit for the first time next year. I believe it is the duty of Congress to take some action, and I know of no way that it can be expeditiously done except through the adoption of the amendment which I expect to propose. I may say that I do not believe that my amendment will be objected to either by the Post Office Department or the Bureau of the Budget itself.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In view of this ruling which prevents families of soldiers sending them papers and magazines unless the soldier requests it of his commanding officer, how would it be to limit the department to mailing such periodicals or material as they have only upon request? In other words, wait until they are asked before they send it out.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman if he will read the law he will find in the very act that provides for free mailing privilege to the various officials of the departments of Government, a provision which was intended to take care of that very point. There is a provision which was intended to prohibit them from sending out material of the kind that is going out until a request for that material had been made to the agency or department.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I am much interested in the gentleman's remarks about savings. I wonder if he has given any thought to an amendment which would put some curtailment upon long-distance telephone calls by bureau officials? Members of Congress may not frank telephone calls. Telegrams become matters of record as to what they contain. It is my observation that there are department heads and departmental agencies that use the long-distance telephone to great extremes. I hope the gentleman has some suggestion as to how we can cut that out.

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot go into that question, today, although I am thoroughly familiar with it. We all know they are using the long distance until the bills are just beyond comprehension. I believe the Government's communications bill for the past year was over $300,000,000 for the various agencies. I cannot go into all those various opportunities for saving. I just want to say that here is one opportunity that every small newspaper in this country has been clamoring for. I have letter after letter on my desk from people throughout the country who say, "I am sick and tired of having my place of business cluttered up with all this stuff that is being sent out from Washington. For God's sake do something about it."

Here is an opportunity to do something about it when my amendment will be offered.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman's observation with reference to penalty mail I feel has made a very favorable impression. There is just one concern in my mind about that. If the gentleman's amendments were approved, would there not be a material crippling of the New Deal's propaganda machine?

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman that whether or not it would cripple the New Deal propaganda machine it should be done. One of the things that contributed to the loss of confidence on the part of many people in this country in the administrative agencies of government is the very fact that they have been overburdened with material that has been sent to them, material that they never asked for, and they cannot understand how it is that every newspaper will carry an item on the front page telling about the limitation on the use of newsprint when every mail brings to them a wastebasket full of publications from the various agencies of the Government, using the same kind of paper, and in most cases a very much better grade of paper.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I do not know whether my colleague from Wisconsin considered any evidence in the hearings about complaints that come to him and to all Members of Congress concerning the matter of months going by without the soldiers getting their mail.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman that I have not time to go into that now. I have another matter I want to discuss at this time. If the gentleman will read the hearings he will find that we did go into that matter and discussed it at great length. He will find in the hearings, I think, the answer to his questions. Now I want to discuss another subject.

Mr. Chairman, in December 1942 the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, with the approval of the Treasury Department, authorized Federal Reserve banks to pay out to member banks the existing stock of Federal Reserve bank notes on hand, which were printed in 1933 and which approximated

$660,000,000. A release was issued to the press, justifying this action as a contribution toward the Government's effort to conserve both labor and material during the war period. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System indicated in their statement that more than $300,000 would be saved in the cost of printing new currency. This action on the part of the Governors of the Federal Reserve System precipitated much discussion throughout the country. Editors, financial writers, and economists have issued conflicting statements with respect to the objectives, purposes, and results of this action. Members of Congress have placed in the RECORD editorial and other comment with respect to this action, and many have attempted to forcee in this action of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve bank the beginning of a highly dangerous currency inflation program. I believe that the Congress and the people are entitled to an understandable, clear statement of the facts.

Any discussion of the problem involved and the mechanics used in carrying out this program must necessarily be somewhat technical.

I am reminded that one of my colleagues said to me this morning that Will Rogers, not the gentleman in the House but his late father, once said:

> There are two places to find an insane man. One is in the asylum and the other is where men congregate to discuss the subject of money.

I shall not attempt to be profound in my discussion of this subject and I assure you that I will try to refrain from making any insane comment on this subject. I shall attempt to confine my statement to facts which I believe can be readily accepted and understood by any thinking person.

May I say that I have had the advantage in the last 3 weeks of having had conferences with the economists who are opposed to this program as well as those who favor it. As a result of all these conferences and all the study I have been able to make on this very abstract and difficult subject, I have come to a conclusion that I came to years ago as a trial lawyer. Then I found that experts could be found to give testimony on all sides of an agreed state of facts. In discussing this problem with experts I find a lamentable lack of agreement. I am going to give you the facts as I see them, in order that the people in this country who find themselves in possession of a note which is called a Federal Reserve bank note will not be disturbed and will not lose faith in the currency of their country. If the people of this country ever lose faith in their currency, with all the bills that are, no doubt, hoarded and in hiding, and if that currency ever comes out and becomes active and becomes a bidder for this lessening supply of consumer goods, we shall be faced with a real threat of inflation, a threat that is causing severe concern to the Treasury Department of our Nation at the present time.



First of all, let us understand the fundamentals of this thing we call money. At the present time the circulating medium of the country is to be found in coins and four types of paper money. The paper money which we use as a medium of exchange consists of, first, silver certificates; second, Treasury notes; third, Federal Reserve notes; and, fourth, Federal Reserve bank notes. While there are some limitations in existing law on the amount of silver certificates, Treasury notes, and Federal Reserve notes that can be printed and issued, and while some notes are supposed to have either silver or gold or Government bonds or other collateral as security behind them, yet in the last analysis we find that the Congress of the United States, on May 12, 1933, passed an act found in title 31, paragraph 462 of the United States Code, which for practical purposes eliminated all distinctions between the various types of circulating medium. This act provided, and I quote:

> All coins and currencies of the United States (including Federal Reserve notes and circulating notes of Federal Reserve banks and national banking associations) heretofore or hereafter coined or issued, shall be legal tender for all debts, public and private, duties, and dues, etc.

Thus, by this act in 1933, Congress wiped out all distinctions between the various types of circulating medium.

With regard to the notes of national banking associations, the circulation privilege was withdrawn some time ago from the national banks, so such notes are no longer supposed to be in circulation. As they come in to the Treasury they are being retired.

The gentleman from California called attention to the fact that Federal Reserve bank notes are again being issued and made some inquiry as to the facts surrounding their issuance. In this statement I shall try to answer the questions that are being asked concerning these notes. I believe the man on the street corner out in the hinterland who comes into possession of one of these notes must be absolutely sure that it is as good as any other type of currency.

By other legislation the Secretary of the Treasury is compelled to maintain a relationship of parity between the various types of circulating medium. He cannot allow one type of currency to become depreciated in favor of another type of currency, under existing law. He is charged with the responsibility under the law of maintaining all types of currency on a relationship of parity.

Therefore, so far as the citizen is concerned, he may have assurance that whether the bills in his purse are one type or the other, they all have the same rights and purchasing power under the law. Fundamentally, this is the thing that you and I are interested in. Will the Federal Reserve bank note which we tender for groceries buy the same amount as a Federal Reserve note, a Treasury note, or a silver certificate? We want the people of the country to know that there is no distinction under existing law and that every type of circulating medium has exactly the same purchasing power as the other.

Difficulty is encountered in our thinking on this subject, however, when we read the law relating to the issuance of Federal Reserve notes and Federal Reserve bank notes. I specifically call your attention to the fact that the law gives to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, for the purpose of making advances to member banks and for no other purpose, the right to issue Federal Reserve notes. The law prescribes that said notes shall be the obligations of the United States and further provides that the Federal Reserve bank shall accompany its application for specific quantities of this type of currency with a tender to the local Federal Reserve agent of collateral in an amount equal to the sum of the Federal Reserve notes applied for and issued pursuant to such application. The law provides the type of collateral that must be deposited with the Federal Reserve agent. It might be commercial paper or direct obligations of the United States Government. Thus, without becoming technical, it is apparent that the Congress had in mind that when Federal Reserve notes were issued to the member banks for circulating medium, they would be secured by a deposit of collateral.

You have a bank in your town. There is a demand for currency there. Where does the bank get it? It makes application to the Federal Reserve bank in Chicago and says, "Ship us such and such denominations of printed bills." Under the law, either I have to tell them to charge my account in the Federal Reserve bank for those bills or I must put up collateral, which may be either United States Government bonds or bills of exchange and commercial paper. Then they will ship me these Federal Reserve notes.

In addition to this collateral requirement, the law requires that the Federal Reserve banks shall maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 40 percent against their Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation.

They can have a lot of notes in circulation, because they have $22,000,000,000 of Federal gold certificates in their vaults. With that amount of gold certificates, and being required to maintain only a 40-percent gold reserve, if you take pencil and paper, you can readily figure out what a tremendous expansion of the currency is possible under existing law through the issue of Federal Reserve notes that have a 40-percent gold reserve behind them.

The Federal Reserve banks are also required to have on deposit with the Treasury a redemption fund out of which these notes placed in circulation can be redeemed as they become worn own. It will be noted, therefore, that the Federal Reserve banks could receive from the Federal Reserve agent a supply of currency known as Federal Reserve notes

by depositing as collateral United States Government bonds. The bonds themselves are a direct obligation of the Government of the United States and have behind them merely the full faith and credit of the Government. The Federal Reserve notes likewise are a direct obligation of the United States Government. It thus seems rather anomalous to require the deposit of United States Government bonds as collateral to secure the Federal Reserve notes as circulating medium, when both the bonds and the notes have behind them the full faith and credit of the United States Government. I am not urging that this requirement be dispensed with, but I am not unmindful of the fact, however, that if I went into my bank to borrow a thousand dollars and the banker asked for collateral, the chances are he would not permit me to execute another note and deposit that note as collateral. The requirement of the 40 percent reserve in gold certificates means little, because the Federal Reserve banks now hold about $22,000,000,000 worth of gold certificates and can easily maintain the legal gold reserve and still legally provide for a tremendous inflation of the currency through the issuance of Federal Reserve notes. In this connection, may I state with emphasis that we must have faith in those charged with the responsibility of administering our fiscal affairs. We must assume that no Federal Reserve notes will be issued except as the demand from the country for additional circulating medium requires it. In this connection it will be borne in mind that early in the New Deal, a rider was attached to an agricultural bill, giving authority to the President to issue $3,000,000,000 worth of unsecured, fiat currency. Up to date, the grant of authority contained in that act has never been exercised by the President or the administration.

Is not that a peculiar situation? My bank can go to the Federal Reserve bank and get a lot of money issued to it by putting up United States Government bonds as security. The Federal Reserve banks can go to the Treasury and get currency by putting up United States Government bonds. They can also put up commercial paper, and is it not a rather anomalous situation, that if I would go into a bank and ask to borrow $1,000 and the cashier sends over a note and I sign it and he says "Now, we have to have some collateral" and I say "All right. I will give you collateral," and I make up another note for $1,000, and I sign it and hand it over to him. Do you think he would loan the money? I am calling this to your attention for this reason. We must at all times bear in mind that regardless of provisions to be found in the organic law, known as the Federal Reserve Banking Act, the thing that is behind these notes we call Federal Reserve notes, regardless of their character, after all, is the full faith and credit of the United States Government, and if the full faith and credit of the United States Government is not sufficient behind our currency, then, for God's sake, of what value are these bonds that we are printing, that have exactly the same thing behind them? And so I want the people of this country to know and understand that there is at all times, regardless of the requirements of collateral, regardless of the requirements of silver, regardless of the requirements of gold—there is at all times behind our circulating medium, the full faith and credit of the United States Government. I am one of those who still believe that that credit is still unimpaired, and that that credit is still good, and that it is still the best credit that exists on the face of the earth, and if I did not think so, I would not be here making this speech this afternoon.

Those who think they may be protected by the requirements of silver behind a silver certificate must realize that the amount of silver behind that certificate is valued on a monetary basis and not on its market value. So, after all is said and done, should we not as Members of Congress attempt wherever the opportunity presents itself to stifle this propaganda that attempts to picture that through some chicanery of some kind we have depreciated one type of currency as against another? Should we not make sure that fear is eliminated from the minds of the people, so that they may not be induced to take their savings and put them into competition in the market for the purchase of tangible consumer goods? That is the threat as I see it of real inflation in this country, and that is why I am raising my voice this afternoon so that there may be assurance given to the people of this country to have faith in their Government. If you have faith in your Government, you must have faith in its credit as evidenced by bonds and by our circulating medium.

Mr. VOORHIS of California rose.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, if I may be permitted, I shall yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] if I have time, in a moment. I want now to direct your attention to the Federal Reserve bank notes. Authority for the issuance of this type of currency is to be found in title 12, section 445, of the United States Code of Law, and provides:

> Such notes shall be the obligations of the Federal Reserve banks procuring the same.

You will observe that the Federal Reserve notes under the law are the direct obligation of the United States Government. Under the law the Federal Reserve notes when issued are supposed to be the obligation of the Federal Reserve bank, and when they are issued the Federal Reserve banks are required to deposit with the Treasury again either United States bonds or commercial paper, or what they call lawful money, to secure the Federal Reserve bank notes which are issued.

The facts in respect to this $660,000,000 are these. You all remember the situation in 1933, when banks throughout the country were ordered closed by Presidential proclamation. It was anticipated that when those banks were opened there would be a run on the banks, and so the Treasury Department in order to make provision for that situation caused national-bank notes to be printed. They did not have time to make the plates to make Federal Reserve bank notes, and so they printed nearly a billion dollars of national currency, using the plates already in existence. They then imprinted upon those notes the words which the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] found on the bill which he referred to the other day. They printed on there "This note is secured by deposit of United States Government bonds or other collateral in the Treasury of the United States." Those notes were issued out through the country to the various Federal Reserve banks. Every Federal Reserve bank was then in a position to meet the demands of its member banks for currency, so that they would not have to close because of not having money to pay out to their depositors.

I think that was all right, I think that was a good thing and I do not think anybody did or could object to it. They issued only about $360,000,000 of those Federal Reserve bank notes at that time, out of nearly a billon that were printed. There were lying in the vaults of the Federal Reserve banks of this country $660,000,000 of these Federal Reserve bank notes. We are now faced with the critical situation growing out of the tremendous demand of people of this country for currency. Take your book and look at it and see what your currency amounts to today. In round figures all during the twenties and down to and including 1929 when we were alleged to be at the height of business activity, the amount of circulating medium in this country aggregated approximately $4,500,000,000. That circulating medium today is well up around $16,000,000,000. It has more than doubled in the past 12 months.

I am inserting a table showing these facts at this point:

*Stock of money, money in the Treasury, in the Federal Reserve banks, and in circulation June 30, 1913, to Dec. 31, 1942* [1]

[000 omitted, except in per capita figures]

| June 30— | Stock of money | Money held in the Treasury | | | | | Money outside of the Treasury | | | | Population of continental United States (estimated) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Total | Amount held as security against gold and silver certificates (and Treasury notes of 1890) | Reserve against United States notes (and Treasury notes of 1890) | Held for Federal Reserve banks and agents | All other | Total | Held by Federal Reserve banks and agents | In circulation | | |
| | | | | | | | | | Amount [2] | Per capita | |
| 1913 | $3,777,021 | $1,834,112 | $1,475,783 | $150,000 | ---------- | $208,329 | $3,418,692 | ---------- | $3,418,692 | $35.12 | 97,337 |
| 1914 | 3,797,825 | 1,845,570 | 1,507,179 | 150,000 | ---------- | 188,391 | 3,459,434 | ---------- | 3,459,434 | 34.93 | 99,027 |
| 1915 | 4,050,783 | 1,967,665 | 1,619,429 | 152,977 | ---------- | 195,259 | 3,702,547 | $382,965 | 3,319,582 | 32.96 | 100,725 |
| 1916 | 4,541,730 | 2,356,536 | 2,057,409 | 152,979 | ---------- | 146,147 | 4,242,603 | 593,345 | 3,649,258 | 35.63 | 102,431 |
| 1917 | 5,678,774 | 2,859,396 | 2,063,391 | 152,979 | $526,295 | 116,731 | 4,882,769 | 816,365 | 4,066,404 | 39.05 | 104,145 |
| 1918 | 6,906,237 | 2,976,251 | 1,407,694 | 152,979 | 1,205,082 | 210,496 | 5,337,681 | 855,984 | 4,481,697 | 42.33 | 105,869 |
| 1919 | 7,688,413 | 2,907,812 | 906,673 | 152,979 | 1,416,086 | 432,074 | 5,687,275 | 810,636 | 4,876,638 | 45.95 | 106,136 |
| 1920 | 8,158,496 | 2,379,664 | 704,638 | 152,979 | 1,184,276 | 337,771 | 6,483,470 | 1,015,881 | 5,467,589 | 51.38 | 106,422 |
| 1921 | 8,174,528 | 2,921,089 | 919,643 | 152,979 | 1,537,857 | 310,610 | 6,173,082 | 1,262,089 | 4,910,992 | 45.29 | 108,445 |
| 1922 | 8,276,070 | 3,515,583 | 1,000,578 | 152,979 | 2,108,887 | 253,139 | 5,761,065 | 1,297,893 | 4,463,172 | 40.61 | 109,893 |
| 1923 | 8,702,788 | 3,821,846 | 1,150,168 | 152,979 | 2,285,170 | 233,529 | 6,031,111 | 1,207,836 | 4,823,275 | 43.18 | 111,693 |
| 1924 | 8,846,542 | 4,248,438 | 1,628,139 | 152,979 | 2,260,891 | 206,429 | 6,226,243 | 1,376,935 | 4,849,307 | 42.64 | 113,727 |
| 1925 | 8,299,382 | 4,176,381 | 2,059,799 | 153,621 | 1,752,744 | 210,217 | 6,182,799 | 1,367,591 | 4,815,208 | 41.73 | 115,378 |
| 1926 | 8,428,971 | 4,210,358 | 2,139,770 | 154,189 | 1,717,348 | 199,050 | 6,358,384 | 1,473,118 | 4,885,266 | 41.71 | 117,136 |
| 1927 | 8,667,282 | 4,159,056 | 2,096,205 | 155,421 | 1,712,003 | 195,427 | 6,604,431 | 1,753,110 | 4,851,321 | 40.90 | 118,628 |
| 1928 | 8,118,091 | 3,725,650 | 1,986,761 | 156,039 | 1,387,650 | 195,199 | 6,379,202 | 1,582,576 | 4,796,626 | 39.97 | 120,013 |
| 1929 | 8,538,796 | 3,789,886 | 1,854,373 | 156,039 | 1,562,426 | 217,049 | 6,603,283 | 1,856,986 | 4,746,297 | 39.08 | 121,455 |
| 1930 | 8,306,564 | 4,021,937 | 1,978,448 | 156,039 | 1,796,239 | 91,211 | 6,263,075 | 1,741,087 | 4,521,988 | 36.74 | 123,091 |
| 1931 | 9,079,624 | 4,227,735 | 2,196,103 | 156,039 | 1,776,690 | 98,902 | 7,047,992 | 2,226,059 | 4,821,933 | 38.85 | 124,113 |
| 1932 | 9,004,505 | 3,493,122 | 1,979,137 | 156,039 | 1,235,737 | 122,209 | 7,490,520 | 1,795,349 | 5,695,171 | 45.57 | 124,974 |
| 1933 | 10,078,417 | 3,797,692 | 1,711,721 | 156,039 | 1,771,486 | 158,446 | 7,992,446 | 2,271,682 | 5,720,764 | 45.49 | 125,770 |
| 1934 | 13,634,381 | 8,408,392 | 5,453,713 | 156,039 | [3] 3,999,055 | 2,798,640 | 6,679,455 | 1,305,985 | 5,373,470 | 42.44 | 126,626 |
| 1935 | 15,113,035 | 9,997,362 | 7,131,431 | 156,039 | [3] 5,532,590 | 2,709,891 | 6,714,514 | 1,147,422 | 5,567,093 | 43.66 | 127,521 |
| 1936 | 17,402,493 | 11,851,635 | 9,355,224 | 156,039 | [3] 5,304,027 | 2,340,372 | 9,602,055 | 3,360,854 | 6,241,200 | 48.60 | 128,429 |
| 1937 | 19,376,690 | 13,685,480 | 10,240,964 | 156,039 | [3] 6,030,913 | 3,288,477 | 9,901,261 | 3,454,205 | 6,447,056 | 49.88 | 129,257 |
| 1938 | 20,096,865 | 14,535,627 | 12,233,068 | 156,039 | [3] 7,829,838 | 2,146,520 | 9,964,467 | 3,503,576 | 6,460,891 | 49.62 | 130,215 |
| 1939 | 23,754,736 | 17,862,671 | 15,299,262 | 156,039 | [3] 10,708,118 | 2,407,369 | 10,483,210 | 3,436,467 | 7,046,743 | 53.72 | 131,173 |
| 1940 | 28,457,960 | 21,836,936 | 19,651,067 | 156,039 | [3] 14,938,895 | 2,029,829 | 11,333,196 | 3,485,695 | 7,847,501 | 59.47 | 131,950 |
| 1941 | 32,774,611 | 24,575,186 | 22,300,087 | 156,039 | [3] 17,506,167 | 2,119,059 | 12,993,346 | 3,380,914 | 9,612,432 | [4] 72.24 | [4] 133,065 |
| 1942 | 35,840,908 | 24,783,526 | 22,596,352 | 156,039 | [3] 17,750,403 | 2,031,135 | 15,903,331 | 3,520,465 | 12,382,866 | 92.35 | 134,082 |
| Dec. 31, 1942 [5] | 39,046,762 | 24,777,451 | 22,585,919 | 156,039 | [3] 17,738,209 | 2,035,492 | 19,117,022 | 3,705,745 | 15,411,276 | 114.50 | 134,592 |

[1] The figures in this table differ from the monthly circulation statements for the following reasons: (a) Beginning June 30, 1922, the form of circulation statement was revised so as to include in the holdings of the Federal Reserve banks and agents, and hence in the stock of money, gold bullion, and foreign gold coin held by the Federal Reserve banks and agents, and to include in the holdings of the Federal Reserve banks and agents, and hence exclude from money in circulation, all forms of money held by the Federal Reserve banks and agents, whether as reserve against Federal Reserve notes or otherwise. For the sake of comparableness the figures in this table for earlier years have been revised to include these changes. For full explanation of this revision, see annual report for 1922, p. 433. (b) The form of the circulation statement was revised again beginning Dec. 31, 1927, so as to exclude earmarked gold coin from the stock of money, and hence from money in circulation; to include in the holdings of the Federal Reserve banks and agents, and hence in the stock of money, gold held abroad for the account of the Federal Reserve banks; and to include in all categories, minor coin (the bronze 1-cent piece and the nickel 5-cent piece). Beginning on Dec. 31, 1927, the circulation statement is dated for the end of the month instead of the beginning of the succeeding month, as was the practice theretofore, and figures on the revised daily Treasury statement basis for "money held in the Treasury" instead of the unrevised basis are used. For the sake of comparableness the figures in this table for earlier years have been revised to include these changes. For full explanation of this revision, see annual report for 1928, pp. 70-71, and for figures for years prior to 1913, pp. 550-551. Final revisions, minor in amount, are made in some figures of the June 30 circulation statements for use in these annual report tables.

[2] The composition of the money in circulation is shown in the following table.

[3] Gold certificates not included in total money in the Treasury, since the gold held as security against them is included in the second column preceding.

[4] Revised.

[5] Preliminary.

Source: Annual Report of Secretary of Treasury, 1942 (Dec. 31, 1942, figures added).

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, who is responsible for this demand for currency? As far as the banks in my home town are concerned, the people who want the money are responsible for it. I do not know whether they need it for pay rolls or whether it is due to increased business, whether it is due to so many people being paid in cash, whether it is due to the Army paying the privates in cash; I do not know whether it is due to hoarding or what it is due to. I do know that if we have an increase in the currency which has now grown by leaps and bounds, it is because the people of this country are going to the banks in the small towns and asking the bankers to pass out some currency. Those banks, in turn, have to ask the Federal Reserve banks to replenish their supply. So we have a circulating medium today of perhaps in excess of $16,000,000,000, and the printing office is having a hard time to keep up with the demand for currency, in addition to the printing of stamps and the printing of bonds.

So I think when the Federal Reserve Board looked around and found this $660,000,000 worth of Federal Reserve notes locked up in the vaults of the Federal Reserve banks, which was perfectly good money the minute it was issued, they decided they would issue that money and save the printing charges on $660,000,000 worth of Federal Reserve notes. They have started to issue, and I believe have issued, substantially the whole amount. If you will look at your daily Treasury statement, you will find that this $660,000,000, or the portion that has already been issued, is carried on that daily Treasury statement as an obligation, not of the Federal Reserve banks but as the obligation of the United States Government. That is where all the difficulty arose.

The law said they should be the obligations of the Federal Reserve banks, but now it appears by process of legal legerdemain they appear in the Treasury statement as an obligation of the United States Government. How was that accomplished?

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman will let me finish, please.

How was that accomplished? I have before me the opinions of the legal department of the Federal Reserve System, the legal opinions of the legal department of the Treasury, and as a lawyer, having gone through those opinions and having carefully studied the law, I would say that technically the Treasury Department has complied with every law. What did they do? They told the Federal Reserve banks, "All right, you can go out and issue this currency. Now, you have to put up the security that the law requires, which is either gold certificates of United States Government bonds or commercial paper." What they actually did perhaps was this: the Federal Reserve agent in each Federal Reserve bank no doubt went into the office of the chairman of the board of that bank and said, "Now, you want to issue some currency. We have it down here in the vaults. Your member banks want money. You hand over to me—if you want $50,000,000 worth of currency—you hand over $50,000,000 worth of gold certificates. You have got them." All right. Now we have got the gold certificates and that complies with

the law. "You can go on and issue your currency." But the next step, he said, "Now, instead of the Treasury holding those gold certificates, which they are prohibited from holding under the law, I will tell you what you do, Mr. Reserve Bank. You give the Treasury a deposit credit on your books for this $50,000,000. By that action you have created $50,000,000 of lawful money on the books of the Federal Reserve bank to the credit of the Treasury of the United States. Having done that, you have discharged your obligation, because the Government now takes over, and those notes become the obligation of the Treasury of the United States and are no longer the obligation of the Federal Reserve bank."

So that was done. It was one contemporaneous transaction, done perhaps in 15 minutes of time, but done strictly according to law, and because those securities were not deposited and kept there for any great length of time, word has gone out that there was some skulduggery or some shenanigans practiced by which the Treasury Department has inflated the currency to the extent of $660,000,000. Now, it is true that the Treasury has received credit for $660,000,000 on the books of the Federal Reserve banks, and they can write checks on that money and use that money. They have that much additional check-writing capacity with which to pay bills, and the Treasury, on the other side, has increased its obligation, as shown by the Treasury statement, to an equal amount. The Treasury has really lost by the transaction, because they can borrow money at about three-eighths of 1 percent. Had they issued Federal Reserve bank notes and kept them in circulation as the obligation of the Federal Reserve System, the law would have taxed those notes on the basis of one-half of 1 percent. The Federal Reserve banks would have had to pay a tax on those notes of one-half of 1 percent. So you see the Treasury actually lost a small sum in the transaction.

Mr. GIFFORD. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman has quoted the law. We voted for the $3,000,000,000. We feared that notes would be printed by the Government itself. The gentleman now says these are Federal bank notes, recently marked "Federal Reserve bank notes."

Mr. KEEFE. No. They were marked "Federal Reserve bank notes" in 1933, and I so stated.

Mr. HINSHAW. They are marked "national currency."

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. I explained why that was, because they used the old plates. That is why in the emergent character of the situation they just used those old plates; they could not have taken the time to cut new dies and new plates to print this new currency.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman explain the reverse operation?

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman want to ask a question?

Mr. GIFFORD. This is a very important matter. I hope the gentleman will yield; I always yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I will yield for a question.

Mr. GIFFORD. I will make it a question, then; it is easy. Is it not the reverse process? Formerly the Federal Reserve notes were issued for Government bonds; now the notes are purchased by the Government in reverse order; but where is your interest money? Heretofore the Government has used bonds on which the Federal Government through its Federal Reserve notes provided a circulating medium. This is just the reverse method.

Mr. KEEFE. To avoid payment of interest? I am glad the gentleman has raised this question. I am no profound money economist as is the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not want any satire about this.

Mr. KEEFE. I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact—he is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and he was here in the House, I believe, at the time—I believe in 1934 the Government attached a rider known as the Thomas amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Appropriation bill and gave authority by that rider to the President of the United States to issue $3,000,000,000 worth of unsecured fiat money. The President of the United States, however, has not seen fit as yet to use the privilege which was granted to him then, and not a single dollar of that type of money has been issued by the Treasury.

I call attention to the fact further what I indicated a few moments ago, that if the Treasury Department was motivated only by a desire to save interest through the issuance of Federal Reserve bark notes, why should they go to that expediency when, as I just got through explaining, they have power under existing law to issue Federal Reserve notes with a 40-percent gold reserve? And they have billions of excess gold certificate reserves at the present time that they can use as reserves for the issuance of Federal Reserve notes. They did not have to go to the trouble to use Federal Reserve bank notes; they did not have to do that. I am firmly convinced that the only reason they used them was to save some money for this Government and not to burden the Bureau of Engraving with the necessity of printing $660,000,000 additional money. We must assume that men comprising the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are Americans who want to maintain our system.

Mr. GIFFORD. I hope I have time to complete the gentleman's remarks. What the gentleman states is all right, but he should tell the whole story.

Mr. KEEFE. I have not time to tell the whole story. If I had the time I should like to go into the full story and answer all arguments on the question of reserves; and I am quite familiar with it, too, I will tell the gentleman, because I have never studied anything quite so hard as I have this question for the last 3 weeks, and I have done it for one reason and one reason only. I am not talking as a partisan, nor am I speaking as a profound economist—I am speaking as an American citizen who sees danger signals ahead. The threat is to be found in this unholy inflationary threat which was described by Mr. Bell before our committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I want the people of this country to know that the currency which they have is as sound as the credit of the United States. They do not need to get panicky. They do not need to begin to throw that money around and pay prohibitive prices for consumer goods and thus bring upon us a wild currency inflation. I am a Republican, and I am proud of it. However, I appreciate the dangers that confront this Nation and it is because I do appreciate the dangers in our fiscal situation that I am trying to caution those who would cast discredit upon the operations of our Treasury at this time. As a Republican I cannot believe that responsible men in our Treasury are deliberately trying to deceive the people. We must not put into the unthinking mind an idea that their Government is about to collapse because the money it issues is of no value or is of depreciated value. When the time comes that we no longer have faith in our money, when we no longer have faith in our bonds both of which are secured by the full faith and credit of the United States Government, all I can say is that if that time ever comes, God help us all; we shall not be able to save our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

### WE CAN HAVE A BETTER AMERICA NOW IF WE GET BACK HOME GOVERNMENTALLY

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, much has been said and written about a better America after the war. I believe there are many ways in which, even in these times of hostilities among nations, we can have a better America now.

This is very naturally a period of great patriotic fervor. The conflict in which we are engaged intensifies our devotion to America and what America means. Our boys are fighting on many fronts for our chance to keep it true to its high ideals. Is it not a fitting time for us to join forces with these fighting men in preserving for ourselves and for posterity the true and enduring principles upon which our Nation was founded? Surely, by such a determined policy on the home front, even now we can turn our patriotic fervor to the task of promoting and safeguarding the institutions which, with their cherished blessings of liberty, have come to us as an incomparable heritage. Our men in service want to find those institutions unimpaired when they return from the war, and they have a dominant right to expect to find them so.

In my opinion, the suggestions I shall offer for a better America now are distinctly progressive. The Constitution of the United States was framed upon the principles of progress, and we have made progress to the extent that we have remained true to its enduring teachings and adapted them to the times in which we live.

The remarks which I shall make are also an appeal for unity. Unity implies an accord of purpose and endeavor. I think it cannot be successfully disputed that the people of this country now have a great and awakened interest in keeping it true to the fundamental things for which our boys are fighting. They are not fighting for innovations in our governmental system, but for the maintenance and preservation of the rights and institutions of a free people. In that same patriotic spirit it is incumbent upon us as representatives of the people, and through the power they have vested in us in our organic law, by our counsel and necessary aid to serve our Commander in Chief and our country in keeping the old ship of state on an even keel and on the course charted by the fathers.

This is a government of the people, of the American people. They are willing to make any essential and reasonable sacrifice to keep it so, but they want to carry on in the American way of American philosophy. They have been burdened time and again with administrative orders which on their face have seemed to them unreasonable and which have been imposed upon them by bureaucratic, autocratic power without any logical explanation of their necessity. And it is through such administrative agencies that the legislative intent of the Congress is so often diverted, subverted, and perverted by the rules and regulations of those who assume dictatorially functions and powers which are legislative, judicial, and executive. Surely it is high time for the Congress to live up to the transcendent purpose for which it was created.

In his immortal song John Howard Payne expressed a sentiment which is recognized universally as true:

Be it ever so humble, there's no place like home.

That line from this familiar ballad is dear to us all because in our personal experiences we have realized the accuracy of these words. Just as it is gratifying after any detour to find ourselves again on the main highway, so one of the chief delights of a period of vacation is returning to the home from which we started. In other words, it is always a helpful and refreshing experience to get back home.

It is my belief that the best and most inspiring way of fulfilling our ardent desire for a better America is to get back home governmentally. Of course, we all realize that in times of war there are many abnormal conditions and situations which require some temporary modification and adjustment of some of our normal practices, but I believe that even in the midst of such situations there are many ways of assuring a better America by adhering as closely as possible to the true and tried fundamental principles upon which we have relied so confidently throughout our history. Styles and conditions change, but eternal truths remain invariable and are applicable to every condition of our personal and governmental lives. Because of this incontrovertible fact, we do not need a new Bible and we do not need a new Constitution of the United States. We need to get back home to each. The precepts of the sacred writers are still pertinent. The basic system of our organic law is still our surest hope of governmental security.

I believe it behooves us to get back home to those personal and governmental principles and policies which the fathers preached and practiced if we are to speed the day when we shall have a better America. I wish to mention specifically a few of the many ways in which I think it is possible to get back home governmentally.

I want to see the States of the American Union get back home to the retention and the exercise of their constitutional rights. In no proper sense are they the wards of the Federal Government. In a very important sense in the philosophy of our system the Federal Government is their ward. What I shall now say has no reference, of course, to the various elements of preparation for national victory which have led to the necessary establishment in the States of the Union of strategic plants and projects for our defense and offense. I wish to speak of those other and normal processes, even antedating the war, in which the States have been forsaking and surrendering the sovereignty rightfully theirs in our dual system of government. It took centuries for such rights of the people to be wrested from autocratic power, but without that vigilance which liberty demands they can be relinquished very rapidly.

For example, in recent years these States and their political subdivisions have been very active in seeking governmental grants from the United States in furtherance of purely State and local affairs. We must awaken to a realization of the fact that there is no such thing as a governmental grant of this kind. The Federal Government has nothing to give to the people except what it takes from the people. Aside from such very definite things under constitutional authority as provision for the Army and Navy, the coinage of money, the establishment of military and post roads, and the other functions so delegated to the general government, the States by our organic law are intended to be supreme in their spheres. In the matter of these so-called governmental grants other than those under constitutional authority, from each dollar that the Federal Government takes from the States it retains and diverts a part of that sum for the establishment or enlargement of some administrative agency, and then it returns the remaining part to the States themselves provided they will expend it in such a way as Federal agents in Washington direct. The States could keep their dollar in the first place and spend it all in accordance with their own desires and purposes. And under these circumstances there would not be so many of these expensive bureaus of the Federal Government performing the functions of the States. Let us get back home to the fundamental doctrine of having each member of our dual system operating effectively within its proper jurisdiction. We will have a better America when we do.

I want to see us get back home to the matter of economic administration by the abolishment of useless bureaus, some of which were created before our active participation in the war, by the elimination of those which simply duplicate the operations of proper Federal agencies, by investigating and preventing waste and extravagance, by ridding ourselves of the delay and vexation of unnecessary red tape, and by freeing our citizenry from the necessity of spending so much of their time and money in filling out long and complicated questionnaires.

In an effort to be helpful in this regard, I have reintroduced a bill which I introduced originally almost a year ago, and which is now H. R. 83, to establish an office of fiscal investigations as an agency of the House of Representatives. The enactment of such a measure would enable us to follow up the appropriations that are made and to know in detail how these funds are used and expended. In my judgment, its adoption would result in the saving of untold millions of dollars for the taxpayers of this country. The amount of Federal revenue through taxation is now so large that people of very low income are being required to contribute in direct taxes, in addition to the so-called hidden taxes. In many instances such a part of their earnings may involve real persona sacrifice. In their loyal zeal to assure our victory they are willing to make that sacrifice, but they want to know, and they have every right to know, just what is done with their money. Let us see to it that through an agency of our own, and as their representatives, we get that information and effect the economy such knowledge will make possible.

I want to see us get back home to a practice of the sound principle of having the personnel in necessary governmental agencies familiar with the situations and problems with which they are supposed to deal. The livestock industry, the oil industry, the dairy industry, and many other essential industries have been greatly hampered by the lack of appreciation and understanding of their problems by many of those before whom it has been necessary for such industries to appear in carrying on their respective contributions to our national welfare. For example, it is well known that many dairy herds are being forced to the slaughterhouse today through rules and regulations emanating from Washington, and it should not be difficult for all of us to realize that the people of this country and our allies cannot get from dead cows the milk and dairy products they need. The livestock industry and the farmers of our land cannot carry on in their various avenues of production without the labor essential to their tasks and without a proper consideration of what is due them in every regard in these days when we are undertaking to feed and clothe not only the people of America, but many of those joined with us in our efforts for victory. This is no time for favoritism to special classes. Certainly favoritism cannot make for unity. Upon the producers of this country we

all depend for sustenance and supplies. They are peculiarly entitled to fair and equal treatment.

And I cannot be convinced that the many strikes which have retarded our production for this war have had the sympathetic sanction and approval of the truly American workers of our land. Many of their sons are fighting in the mud and muck and dangers of foreign fronts. Like all patriotic citizens, real American workers are anxious that these fighting forces should not lack for the equipment and supplies necessary for our triumph. I think I speak for the great majority of loyal American workers, and I am sure I speak for the boys who are fighting and suffering and bleeding for us on many foreign fields, when I assert that they want every part of our production to carry on steadily and efficiently to our final victory. They will not, if left unmolested by racketeers who either owe allegiance to hostile lands or are in sympathy with their ideologies, stifle the production so vitally necessary for those brave souls who endure the constant hardships of active warfare in our behalf. They realize fully that labor and every other group of patriotic citizens will be reduced to serfdom and slavery if our cause should not prevail. I am convinced that these truly American workers join with us in a fervent desire to present a really militant and united citizenry, and we'll have a much better America when we do.

I think we could get back home governmentally to a very great extent if all the personnel in our governmental agencies had a full understanding and sympathetic appreciation of the obligations of their oaths of office "to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and to bear true faith and allegiance to the same." We stand very much in need of a vital and unanimous loyalty to the principles of our representative government. Only in this way can we prevent the spread of subversive and socialistic encroachment upon our fundamental system.

The American people today are suspicious of some features of a pattern they see in evident operation. They insist, as has often been insisted in this chamber, that they discern the well-organized efforts of a subversive group—and they think they detect some of them in important positions, persons in whose selection they had no voice—who are seeking to destroy our system of free enterprise and foist upon us the ideology of foreign regimes hostile to our basic and traditional purposes. They very properly warn us not to be dupes of such socialistic agents whose dominant plans seem to be to remain as parasites on our body politic and to enlarge and extend their operations by increased appropriations and personnel. In the language of the doctors, they believe that very considerable legislative surgery is indicated. They have the right to demand that we ascertain the accuracy of their well-defined suspicions. And they have the right to demand the removal from service of all who may be found to justify their fears.

It has been said that when the boys in service—who are fighting so valiantly for the preservation of the things that may be regarded too lightly by some on the home front—return to their homes they will be interested primarily in finding employment along the lines of their talent and training and experience. I believe they think they will find it more readily if they come back home to the real America for which they are now fighting. It must be borne in mind that the great majority of these boys, aside from those who were in school when inducted into the service, were employed in the small businesses of this country. I want to see us get back home to the preservation of small business in which these boys may have their jobs awaiting them. Certainly in a democratic system they cannot all be given Government positions.

But small business, which has contributed so materially to our progress, is now being thwarted and in large measure destroyed. All business in this country was small in the beginning. The average citizen has had practically all of his dealings with small business. In our economy we need both small business and big business, but the people are naturally suspicious that, if small business should be destroyed and all our operations restricted to very limited channels, it will not be so difficult after the war for subversive interests to bring about a general and popular hostility to those permitted to carry on and thus promote their nefarious contention that the Government should take over all commercial enterprise. The distance to socialistic governmental control would thus be very materially shortened. Certainly no real American could be convinced that that would make for a better America.

I want to see us get back home to that same spirit of independence and initiative and courage and industry and self-reliance and thrift which characterized the lives and labors of those who gave us this glorious Republic. We hear very little about these virtues in these strenuous times. They are becoming much too strikingly memories of the past, but they gave us this Nation. They have been, they are, and they always will be essential elements in the building of character of strong men and women. They are vital requirements of all individual and collective progress and development. Let us retain those words in our personal and governmental dictionaries and let us keep universally in our practice the sterling virtues they betoken. We will have a better America if we do.

We will have a better America when we are really the Christian country we profess to be. Religious principles inspire unity and brotherhood and not the strife and hatred and dissension that we see so often aroused and manifested. In this land of the free, where men may worship according to the dictates of their own consciences, we have expressed in our national anthem and have stamped upon our coins the ennobling sentiment that "In God we trust." I think it is high time to get that sentiment impressed also upon our hearts.

And by all means, as the dominant hope for the continuance and prosperity of this free Republic, let us make the Congress of the United States, which is so often censured unjustly for the faults and shortcomings of others, a truly representative forum of the people. It is the only forum they have. In these critical times the people of the United States are very much perturbed about the preservation of their liberties. They are not hesitating to express in private and in public their sentiments of deep concern, their mounting fears, with reference to many tendencies and policies which in their judgment threaten the maintenance of those liberties. We who serve in these two bodies of the Congress are their only direct representatives in Government to give voice to their judgment and to avert, insofar as possible by legislation, the dangers that menace the system bought for us all by the toil and blood of the fathers. By toil and blood the sons of the people are now seeking on many foreign shores to preserve that system. If there ever was a time for the Congress to exercise its constitutional functions, that time is now. We must not forget for one moment that this Government of ours belongs to the people and that for the people in essence and in practice it must be forever preserved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I state that I have heard the very splendid, able, clearcut, and courageous address delivered by the gentleman from Texas, which is characteristic of all the addresses he delivers to this House. I hope that all Members will take the opportunity of reading it carefully. May I ask the gentleman a question in reference to the several matters about which he complains? Does he not think that the bureaucrats and crackpots down in many of the departments of Government are largely responsible for the conditions that he has described?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not think there is any doubt in the world about that, and I tried to the best of my ability to give that thought and that impression in the remarks that I made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I always listen with a great deal of profit to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it not true, too, that, in addition to the mistakes which have been made at the other end of the Avenue, we in Congress have been responsible, in part, at least, for giving them that power?

Mr. LANHAM. I think it is time now for us to be not Republicans or Democrats, but all join together as loyal Americans and win this war. We should forget petty differences and cast aside the strife and dissension that so often exists, and in the real spirit of unity here which we find in the people all over the country, manifest by our industry and

by our cooperation with the people that we are in hearty accord with the patriots who gave us this country, and with the followers of those patriots all through this land today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just one more question. In spite of all we may say about bureaucrats and the crackpots, does not the responsibility rest squarely upon the shoulders of the Congress today?

Mr. LANHAM. I think that it does very largely, as indicated in the remarks that I made. To the extent that it is possible for us by legislation to correct the evils that exist, the obligation is certainly upon us to correct them. Unfortunately the situation is that the rules and regulations of the administrative agencies interpreting the laws that we pass here are so foreign, often, to the legislative intent that the people of this country begin to ascribe to the Congress responsibility for many things for which we were in no way responsible. We have 531 Members of the two bodies of the Congress. There are approximately 3,000,000 people on the Federal pay roll today exclusive of the Army and Navy; yet this little group of 531, the only ones in whose selection the people of this country have any voice, get the great majority of the criticism, unfortunately, from the people themselves with reference to the many mistakes that are made by those in whose selection the people have no voice whatever. I think that through the adoption of the bill which I have reintroduced, or one of similar import and certainly with the same purpose, we would be enabled to obviate and to prevent a great many of these administrative errors of which we know and of which the people of this country are learning very rapidly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, today I have introduced the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation for the purpose of determining—

(1) Whether the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, or any other agency or officer in the executive branch of the Government, is formulating plans with a view to putting into effect (a) requirements with respect to Federal grade labeling of articles or commodities, and the discarding of private brand names of articles or commodities, and (b) any other requirements intended to bring about simplification and standardization of production, marketing, and distribution of articles or commodities, as well as concentration of industry or production; and

(2) Whether, and to what extent, the formulation and carrying out of such plans are necessary in connection with the war effort; and

(3) The extent to which any such plans may represent an attempt to change our domestic economy along lines not authorized by Congress.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. For purposes of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, to many Members in the House all this talk of concentration brings back to us the days of the late and unlamented N. R. A. Recently I was reminded of certain testimony given by Donald Richberg, one of the official sponsors for the N. R. A. law when it was before the Congress. Our colleague from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] asked Mr. Richberg if the N. R. A. program of concentration would injure small business, putting his question in the following form:

In a general way it encourages reformers to do the same things that the cartels are doing in Europe?

Mr. Richberg, speaking officially for the bill, answered:

I think, in a general way, that may be true; yes.

I propose that we make sure that the same philosophy is not back of this current drive seeking to take advantage of the war period just as certain reformers took full advantage of a situation when our people were distracted because of the depression in the early thirties.

We hear that Great Britain has gone far along this line. Well, maybe in England such a program could have a bearing on the war effort. But British experience does not necessarily justify it here where we do not have anything like the problem they have had in England with labor and material shortages. And if we are going to have this sort of regulation here, we in the Congress must demand that we know in detail what the program is and that our needs justify it.

Coming to the question of standards, the Bureau of Standards is the best evidence of the continuing interest of the Congress in fair and reasonable standardization and simplification. But we also know there can be great danger of regimentation by standards. A standard may be good or bad. Briefly, good standards, when fully observed, protect the public against shysters, eliminate inferiority, promote fair competition, and permit more efficient business practice. Standards misused can destroy quality, create mediocrity, stifle competition, slow up progress, destroy initiative, help the shyster, eliminate brands as consumer guides, and regiment production.

The Congress has long been in favor of simplified practices in industry. We have passed many laws to encourage it. For more than 20 years we have granted appropriations to the Bureau of Standards to lead and assist industry in these efforts.

But some of us have discovered that our suspicions were well founded in regard to the activities of certain bureaucrats in these temporary war agencies. The Members of Congress have little confidence in the assertions of certain individuals that they are using the vast powers granted to the Executive strictly for war. It is all very well to claim that certain steps are in the interest of controlling prices or guarding public health, but the people told us less than 90 days ago that they want the Government to quit playing "papa." The people of the United States stand unalterably opposed to the ever-increasing paternalistic trend reflected in the theory that "papa knows best." It is bad psychology and even worse statesmanship. And some of our good friends of the last Congress who are not here today will concede that. The American people are no longer to be treated as children. If the bureaucrats downtown do not know this, Congress should help them find out.

Simplification is only one aspect of standardization. It usually has to do with sizes and varieties of commercial goods. One of the first jobs of this sort ever done concerned paving brick. There were hundreds of sizes and varieties. Government experts realized that a better, cheaper paving job could be done if all manufacturers of brick made their product of approximately the same size. So they called together representatives of the industry.

A plan was developed by which the industry itself agreed upon the useful needed sizes. The result was a plan which businessmen themselves made. After its adoption approximately 20 sizes of paving brick took the place of nearly 400 sizes. There was immediate benefit to the industry. Dealers did not have to carry as great stocks. They were not always out of the wanted sizes. They could deliver promptly what the paving contractor needed and he knew it would fit the job and serve the public. The result was a help to all because it was done in a businesslike manner with only the leadership, not the compulsion, of the Government. That is free enterprise at work under intelligent governmental leadership. Several hundreds of such programs of simplification have been guided and aided by the Bureau of Standards. I have only commendation for those efforts. But more recently we have had a misuse of such programs. It is easy to understand why the public is not benefiting by them. In these recent plans a few governmental theorists get together and decide what they want done. They may consult a few people, but essentially the result of their deliberations is an academic, bureaucratic finding. They then impose the results of their thinking on the industry by an arbitrary order.

I should say the paramount necessity is for the people to know what part of this current program of simplification and standardization is actually designed for the immediate purpose of speeding up the winning of the war and what part the bureaucrats plan as a measure of increased, permanent governmental control over business to continue after the war. We may also find some parts of the program which do not deserve even

wartime tolerance because they are against the public interest and of no help at all in winning the war. If so, those parts should be quickly identified and eliminated. The apprehension of the Members of this House, as revealed in speeches made on the floor during the past 2 weeks, can best be transformed into a safety check by having it specifically ordered by legislation that certain wartime measures and regulations will cease when the war ends.

I want it understood that there is no partisanship in urging that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee pull back the curtain and let us see what is behind all this. I think I can truthfully say that members of the majority have contributed most in the denunciation of bureaucrats on the floor of the House since the elections.

I have before me a clipping from the New York Journal-American of January 23. In it the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], is quoted in connection with O. P. A. grade labeling as follows:

> There is absolutely nothing in our economy, because of the war, of such gravity as to justify any action that would destroy trade names. There is no justification for the destruction of trade-marks that signify a certain brand.

Our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], also of the majority side, and chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, on which I have been privileged to serve, was also quoted in the same article, as follows:

> I do not approve of a policy that would obliterate trade names of standard goods whose reputations have been built up over many years and which constitute valuable business assets.

And let me add that in concerning ourselves with this problem we concern ourselves with a public problem rather than merely a problem of business. Brands have a public value. By long experience, the housewife and the ordinary citizen have learned that certain brands are satisfactory and that these brands guarantee a desired quality. It is a disservice to the housewife and to all citizens to deprive them of these guides to intelligent purchasing of goods unless the need therefor is clearly demonstrated. The brands should be protected, therefore, more in the interest of the consumer than in the interest of the owner of a brand who has created public confidence by selling an honest quality of service under that brand.

I urge that special attention be given in this investigation to what efforts, if any, have been made to correlate the activities of the O. P. A. with the operations of the Food and Drug Administration. I would like to make very sure we are not disregarding the long experience of the Food and Drug Administration and turning some of its activities over to the people Leon Henderson brought in to man O. P. A. and Civilian Supply.

I believe if we are going into a wholesale job of grade labeling, the Congress owes it to the people, in view of its long support of the Food and Drug Administration to make certain there is a proper correlation of activities and no overlapping. We might find a way to contribute to the manpower problem by approaching the question from this angle. I feel that I speak for every Member of the Congress when I tell those serving in the executive branch that the people of this country want the war agencies to confine themselves to the winning of the war and not to unnecessarily encroach upon the functions of the permanent branches of this Government.

In case these temporary additions to the executive branch do not know it, the Congress believes that some of the older men in the Department of Agriculture, for instance, have a little more experience in handling an agricultural problem than the impractical, theoretical economists who seem to occupy most of the desks in O. P. A. and Civilian Supply.

Let me illustrate: Last Wednesday, our colleague from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] told the House of the rules promulgated for the conservation of horseshoes. He read a part of the rules into the RECORD, and I just want to remind you of one of these rules. I quote:

> Horse owners can, in many cases, save shoes by removing the shoes immediately after a period of necessary road work or other work where shoes are necessary only during certain periods.

The gentleman from Virginia drew on his boyhood experience to tell us the slight inconvenience it would cause the farmers to take off the horses' shoes each evening and put them on again before starting the days' work the next morning. We are also indebted to him for giving to the House and the people of this country the identity of the author of this masterpiece. As it turned out, he was a Harvard product who came to the Government via experience limited to New York City. With that background he was selected to help administer the machinery and parts program for the farmers of America. He probably never heard of James T. Jardine, M. L. Wilson, or C. W. Warburton, who have long served the farmers of America well and with distinction in the Department of Agriculture. I suggest he telephone them for a little advice on some of his regulations.

It seems very strange, and perhaps reflects the zeal of the reformer rather than the constructive thinking of a seasoned executive, that certain forces can make a major issue of the alleged vital urgency of this program of simplification and standardization.

Just a day after Senator Byrnes became the Director of Economic Stabilization it was annnounced that Ben Cohen, whose name is certainly familiar to all of us, would be his first assistant and legal adviser. Within 48 hours Senator Byrnes wrote a letter to Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, directing him to proceed at once with simplification and standardization. Some of us may have thought otherwise, but this program seemed to be the most important matter before the Nation when the Office of Economic Stabilization came into being.

To keep the record straight, Senator Byrnes' letter to Mr. Nelson was written November 3. One is supposed to believe that all the facts were in possession of Mr. Nelson so that he could proceed intelligently. But two and a half months later, on January 17, 1943, to be exact, the chairman of the Senate's Committee on Small Business, in a report to the Senate, declared:

> Our essential civilian requirements for food, clothing, and other necessary goods and services have not yet been determined. Consequently it has been impossible to determine the amount of labor and materials needed in producing essential goods and services.

If that finding is true, what man could be wise enough to chart a course in concentration, standardization, simplification, or Federal grade labeling? Ben Cohen was back in the driver's seat and working fast.

It also raises a question about the curtailment of printing paper. I understand there are capable and experienced men directing the Printing and Publishing Section of W. P. B. But without adequate and reliable figures on total consumption of paper by industries under their supervision, they are asked to administer a curtailment program that could threaten the press of the Nation. The decision on reduction in use of paper was made somewhere else.

I want to know why that printing-paper curtailment order was issued, on what facts as to necessity it was issued, and upon whose investigation it was issued. I want to know if the files of those responsible contain ample evidence of complete and thorough investigation proving the necessity for the action taken. A spotlight in the hands of a congressional committee is the only weapon we seem to possess to safeguard the freedom of the press and the Nation's economic and business structure.

Very frankly, I think it is the obligation of the House to find out just what is back of all this. Yes, and I might add, find out who is back of all this. I, for one, believe I owe it to the people of my district to examine and carefully weigh the background and experience of the men who are doing this advocating and planning. In the face of the mandate to this Congress on November 3, we have no choice but to stand guard against any attempt to regiment any segment of our economy unless such regimentation is necessary to the prosecution of the war.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I am very much interested in the gentleman's remarks and his resolution. I wonder if his resolution is broad enough in its scope to include inquiry into the condition which exists as far as the canning industry is concerned? It is my understanding that the bureaus in the W. P. B. and the O. P. A. have promulgated some rules and regulations as to limitations in the canning industry as well as certain others. We are facing a shortage of canned products. On March 1 we go into the rationing of canned goods. Is the gentleman's resolution broad enough to cover an investigation of the phase I have just called to his attention?

Mr. HALLECK. It certainly is broad enough. I think the situation to which the gentleman refers is exactly the sort of situation expected to be covered by this resolution.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I had an experience along those lines with reference to private brands. The Agricultural Marketing Administration went into the market around New York to purchase soap, in connection with the $15,000,000 revolving fund we appropriated for the purchase of supplies for the needy in Puerto Rico. Although a certain firm in New York was the lowest bidder, the Agricultural Marketing Administration said, "We will buy that soap provided you take off your brands." I thought that was rather an unjustified attitude on the part of the A. M. A. and protested it with all the power within me, but I could not get the A. M. A. to buy that soap and retain the private brands. I thought that was outrageous.

Mr. HALLECK. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman and thank him for his comment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not orders have already been issued to packers for the simplification and standardization of packages?

Mr. HALLECK. Certain orders already have been issued, and, according to the reports and the news releases, it is indicated that they are to be extended over the whole field of canned goods. Just in what detail they will be extended and in what particular way they will be worked out I do not know. The observation of the gentleman from New York simply bears out a suspicion that many of us have had that this drive has been in the background for quite a long time around here, and probably stems from some ambitions that have not much to do with the winning of the war.

Mr. GAVIN. It looks like an attempt, then, on the part of the bureaucrats to sabotage the packers and regiment them. I quite agree with everything the gentleman has said. I think we should take some definite action immediately to forestall the bureaucrats who have been taking over business, bureaucrats who never built a business, and never attempted to develop an industry, upon which thousands of people are now dependent. It is about time we recognized the seriousness of the situation as far as the packers are concerned and gave some attention to this matter before it is too late.

If these theorists, who are trying to make over our American way of life, had ever raised the necessary money to create a business and slaved 14 to 16 hours a day to secure the money to buy the materials and meet the payroll, they would understand what it means to individualize package goods. Simplification and standardization of packages will eliminate thousands of people from the glass industry and packers of food products. The many thousands of dollars now invested in molds for making glass would all be cast aside. New molds would necessarily have to be made and with the shortages of metals, the necessity of securing priorities on such materials and the fact that the metals are not available nor die makers to make the molds, it is questionable whether or not any simplification or standardization program could be developed until long after the war has ended and then we would have no use for it. This plan would permit anybody to jam anything in a bottle they cared to, and we would have to accept it. Now we know what we are buying from the package and label.

The Congress of the United States, representing the people, certainly ought to have the right to determine whether or not we are going to revolutionize our economic life by permitting the bureaucrats to step in and take over the various food-packing businesses which have taken the lifetime of individuals to build, Trade names that are known throughout the world would be cast out to satisfy the ambitions of the bureaucrats who are anxious to control and regiment business and industry.

At this time it should be an all-out effort to win the war and such proposals as are now being made would do no good, hinder the war effort and only cause additional confliction and confusion to the food industry which now has plenty of headaches to absorb, and millions of dollars now invested by the food-packing industry would be lost.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, some years ago, for reasons which are quite beyond my ken, we passed the so-called silver purchase acts, which require our Government to purchase all the newly mined silver in this country, amounting to approximately 60,000 ounces a year, sometimes going as high as 70,000 ounces. Under these acts payment must be made in the amount of 71 cents per ounce, although the world price of silver may vary from 35 to 40 cents an ounce. Today, for example, the Treasury offers only 35 cents for foreign silver.

The situation with reference to the required purchase of that silver is becoming well-nigh intolerable. As a result of these yearly purchases, there has been built up a stock pile of silver in the enormous amount of 2,800,000,000 ounces, all of which is stored on the banks of the Hudson at West Point, N. Y. About 1,500,000,000 ounces are used to secure silver certificates and the balance, of 1,300,000,000 ounces is so-called free silver. This silver is sorely needed by industry, but by virtue of the silver purchase acts silver is sacrosanct and cannot be purchased and used in industry like copper or nickel or brass.

Science has told us in recent years of the great uses to which silver may be put. It has wondrous chemical and metallurgical uses. Yet silver is a "sacred cow," just as sacred as in the days of William Jennings Bryan. It is an obelisk, as it were, that we have built to false gods. This silver cannot be touched. It is sacrosanct. Let us remove the halo from silver.

Although we need silver badly in war industries we cannot open the vaults at West Point to use it in the war effort. Thus we suffer in the midst of plenty. The Government must continue to pay 71 cents an ounce for the useless silver that is being added to this useless stock pile year after year.

I think it is time to get mad about silver. I have the highest regard personally for the Representatives of the so-called Silver States, but it is only because of the machinations of these gentlemen from Idaho, Montana, Utah, Arizona, Colorado, and Nevada that this intolerable situation has come about. We seem to be helpless.

Frankly, we do not seem able to do a bloomin' thing about it, and that is a rather strong term to use, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] says, "Oh, oh," when I make that remark.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, that was merely approval.

Mr. CELLER. I am very glad that it was approval, but legislation was held up in another distinguished body because gentlemen from those States said they would not allow any business to be conducted if there was the slightest possibility of certain legislation introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island being considered and possibly passed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I gather from the gentleman's remarks that he thinks that the Silver Purchase Act should be repealed.

Mr. CELLER. I think those acts should be completely wiped off the books, dumped overboard, lock, stock, and barrel.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wish the gentleman would have helped me in 1935 and 1936 when I introduced a bill for that purpose.

Mr. CELLER. I do not know why the House was so purblind, and I include myself in that regard, when the bill came forward. We probably did not realize the repercussions and the far-reaching consequences of that silver legislation when we first put it on the statute books, but I think the day of reckoning has come, and we must surely take stock and repeal those asinine acts, because they help only about 60,000 people, or 1½ percent of the silver States' population, and just about one twenty-fifth of 1 percent of our entire population.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is the gentleman not aware that ample quantities of silver have been released, so that there is no freezing in the industry?

Mr. CELLER. No, indeed. "Ample" is not the word. It is a mere trickle that is being allowed for the war effort, and under what conditions? To get around the Silver Purchase Act restrictions, the

Treasury lend-leases it to industry, but then only for limited purposes, namely, as bus bars. Frankly, in my humble opinion, the Treasury Department, in lend-leasing to war industry—lend-leasing, mind you—is violating the statute. They have no more right to take that silver out of the vaults at West Point than I have the right to take it out. At the Treasury they bypass the statute, and they have unlawfully—though I approve the effort—taken that silver and used it as indicated in war industry. So I say to my good friend, why must the Treasury Department use such subterfuge? That seems to me intolerable, and we must give the Treasury Department the right to do this thing honestly and to put it in another way, we must make "honest women" of the Treasury Department and repeal the statutes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Just let me finish my statement. The Secretary of the Treasury, in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee, stated last year and stated again this year:

> As far as I am concerned, I would be glad to see Congress strike the silver legislation off the books.

And our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on the Treasury Department appropriation bill said this:

> If our rubber and aluminum are held in a hole in the ground or piled up in stocks in some great warehouse, it would not do the country any good, and I do not see any difference with respect to silver, for it should now be made available for war purposes.

I reecho his sentiments. Silver should be made available for war purposes. The War Production Board wrote me recently:

> Silver is now replacing tin in solder.

It is also used, so I am informed by the War Production Board, in engine bearings, and to save tin where tin is used in the bearing alloy. Silver also is used as a substitute for copper. The principal substitution of silver for copper is in bus bars, and they say further:

> In the electrical field, silver and silver alloy also replace copper and other metals for such uses as circuit-interruption devices, commutator segments, contact switches, wiring in fractional horsepower motors, etc.

Further, they inform me that silver in a sense replaces copper in brazing alloys, and copper-zinc alloys containing silver are now needed in which the silver content varies from 5 to 80 percent. Further, they speak of silver as a substitute for nickel and as a substitute for antimony and a substitute for aluminum, and that silver could be used in lieu of sheet or foil aluminum because of its malleability, corrosive resistance, and high reflectivity.

Mr. Chairman, silver is thus a war material of great importance in the manufacture of implements for submarines, tanks, planes, torpedoes, bombs, and antiaircraft guns. Yet the silver bloc refuses to relax its hold. Silver is a slacker metal. Let us put it to work and make it fight. It is time to get mad about silver.

The Treasury has agreed to loan to industries through the Defense Plant Corporation 497,000,000 ounces. This is being done by way of so-called lend-lease. Lend-lease was devised for the benefit of our allies for the purpose of sending food, supplies, and matériel to England, Russia, China, Australia, and so forth. It certainly was never intended to cover silver stock.

By another arrangement with the Defense Plant Corporation whatever silver is used in war industries must be returned to the Treasury after the war. How in thunder it can be returned is beyond me. According with the arrangements made with the Defense Plant Corporation, the silver may not be used up. It may not become part of the produce of the war production plant. It may be used only in such form as permits its return to the Treasury after the war. It can, thus, only be used as a substitute for copper in electrical bus bars—bars carrying all the current produced by a powerful electric source. The use is thus very limited, though, as I pointed out, silver has an almost unlimited usage in the arts and sciences and in war industries.

So restricted and limited is the use to which the Treasury can put silver that between April last, when the silver lend-lease program was announced, and September 11 there has been turned over to the Defense Plant Corporation and other users only 162,000,000 ounces, or 12 percent of the amount of free silver—1,300,000,000 ounces. And besides there is the currency silver amounting to 1,500,000,000 ounces.

The silver Representatives remind us of the silver assigned for use in industry. See what a mere drip that amount is and see how absurdly restricted the use is.

Remember also that the Treasury Department is forbidden to sell the silver it has been buying at less than $1.29 an ounce. Where are the buyers at $1.29 per ounce, especially with the Treasury itself offering 35 cents for foreign silver? Does not the whole business seem ridiculous?

The Treasury has more silver than it knows what to do with. Yet, industry is badly in need of the silver and the Treasury cannot sell it to industry. It is a most uncomfortable situation and cries to high Heaven for remedy.

The aforesaid use is practically limited to bus bars. The silver cannot be industrialized and used as in solder or in many other ways in which silver can now be used, such as, a substitute for tin, brass, copper, aluminum, antimony, and so forth.

> Imagine a stack of silver dollars as tall as the Washington Monument—

Says Herbert Bratten, formerly silver expert of the United States Treasury—

> and then imagine about 65,000 such stacks, each 555 feet high * * * that will give you some idea of how much "untouchable" silver this country holds under lock and key.

It is high time that we wiped the silver statutes completely off the books.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], for inspiring the House to adopt the resolution authorizing the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate just what is happening to certain phases of our domestic economy. I am glad he mentioned paper production and I hope the newspapers of the country, and magazines also, will become interested in what any such investigation will develop in connection with their business. This angle is of vital importance to this House if we are to save the American way of life.

We all know, of course, that the administration has started curtailing the use of all kinds of paper and there are persistent reports that the initial curtailment step on printing paper was just a beginning. More drastic reductions are at hand unless we move very quickly along the lines indicated by the purpose of the Halleck resolution. I hope we will be able to expedite its passage for unless something is done, and done quickly, the bureaucrats will have dealt the paper-producing industry of this country a death blow. I doubt if many of the newspapers of the country are aware of this.

The foundation on which paper production is built is, of course, fiber and by all odds wood is the most important source of fiber supply. I have been making a quiet survey of men engaged in the production of wood and paper and I can best illustrate what is happening by telling you the story of one typical operation in northern Michigan. This little operation multiplied many, many times gives the American people the cultural papers used in our newspapers and magazines. This operator was doing selective cutting on land that had been logged over twice since 1900, the present cutting being the third crop on the same land. As I said, it was a small operation producing about 2,000 cords. At the beginning of this season the operator who has other timber interests was not going to cut this year, but then decided that it was a better policy to go ahead and keep busy his foreman and certain other keymen who are used the year round at forestry work on other property. Arrangements were made with a paper mill at a certain price which was an advance over the previous year and that would just about offset increased labor costs.

Then, as this operation was well under way, the O. P. A. came through with ceiling prices on the pulpwood, bringing them down to approximately what was received the year before. When that happened roads had been already cut and a good deal of preliminary work done so that the inevitable loss was just about the same whether operations were continued or abandoned. But the net result is that this operator this year is losing at least half of the value of the timber itself and he tells me that under no circumstances would he plan on operating next year. This illustrates how the effects of this Washington bureau's rulings and regulations are not felt immediately, but they do result in ultimate disintegration of a working organization, dispersal of

equipment and consequent inability to resume operations once the damage has been done.

I ask you to multiply that many, many times and you have a quick picture of what is happening in the production of wood fibers.

I do not believe we can reclaim lost ground, but it is my firm belief that this Congress should demand that certain policies be changed before the publications of the country are ordered to cut back production to a level that will make it unsound for them to continue in business.

I would certainly urge that the House committee, when the Halleck resolution is adopted, go right to the very bottom of this paper situation, for I understand it is O. P. A.'s intention to extend the ceiling prices now in effect in the Lake States to New England. Incidentally, I have some information about the tactics being used by the O. P. A. in the New England area. According to the Commercial Bulletin of Boston some 85 lumbermen from New England met in Boston last December to hear O. P. A. representatives outline price schedules for the producers. One Harry Eckstein, speaking as the O. P. A.'s softwood executive, announced that the press was welcome, but its representatives were forbidden to report the meeting. The reason given for this arbitrary action was the danger of inaccuracy.

This extraordinary pronouncement—

Observed the Commercial Bulletin—

to the press in regard to a public industry meeting which reporters trained in the lumber business were covering, is in our opinion, the last word in dictatorial unreasonable action.

H. A. Lindenberg, lumber editor of the Commercial Bulletin, protested to the O. P. A. in Washington, but Mr. Eckstein remains on the pay roll. I respectfully draw this matter to the attention of Senator Brown who might as well reconcile himself to discharging several thousand Ecksteins if he intends to improve the administration of O. P. A.

Now while I am talking about New England, here is another interesting observation which came to me recently in the form of a quotation from a letter to a Member of the other body, Senator TRUMAN:

New England is overrun with Government supervision employees wholly devoid of any of the requirements now necessary in their respective positions.

New England is also filled with Government forest and timber salvage employees, still drawing breath and pay, years after the hurricane that created their jobs—now sinecures.

You Members of the House will recall that several years ago we appropriated a considerable amount of money to salvage and clean up a large amount of timber that had been knocked down in a severe hurricane which covered a considerable area in New England. Then the letter goes on:

One, with several years' service in the territory, attending a meeting of small sawmill owners, when requested by the chairman for his suggestions, said he had come to learn what were the problems and needs of the sawmill owner.

There is considerable manpower in almost every New England community not gainfully employed. Office of Price Administration is reported to have over 50,000 employees; one-fifth that number gifted with common sense would certainly effect much more efficient administration. A reputable New England lumber producer reports a recent visit to the Office of Price Administration offices in Washington, requesting of the top executive some corrective measures, and receiving this answer: "To h—— with New England lumber manufacturers." The New England lumber producer requires no brief assuring his respect for high office or his loyalty to his Government but the Congress may judge as to how much longer he will endure indifference and incompetence, yoked with coercion, before adopting the slogan, "To h—— and Boston Harbor, with orders of confusion, ceiling, incompetence, and inefficiency."

Now, gentlemen, just how much longer are we in this House going to continue to tolerate on the Government pay rolls men who adopt the attitude of this man Eckstein? Just how much longer are we going to permit these autocratic, dictatorial bureaucrats to continue to insult the American people openly or by means of asinine rulings? Personally, I have the highest regard for the integrity and the ability of our former colleague, Senator Prentiss Brown, and I fondly hope that Senator Brown will put an end to such actions in the O. P. A. and will immediately clean house of this man Eckstein and all of his type and will see to it that, in the future, men are assigned to responsible policy-making jobs in his organization who at least have some working knowledge of the particular problem they are tackling. If not, they ought to be men who are at least big enough to go to recognized authorities in the industry, or in the various localities affected, and learn from them the true picture of the situation before further wildcat and hamstringing regulations are issued. I hope this will be done, but if it is not done after a reasonable time, then it is up to us in the Congress to act—and act definitely.

I am not so certain that there may not be much more behind this curtailment of newsprint paper than presently appears on the surface. There are many of us in this country who are sincerely worried about our continued trends toward collectivism in this country—or call it totalitarianism, if you will. One of the first steps in the establishment of a dictatorship in a country, or dictatorship by bureaucracy, if you please, is by obtaining full and complete control of the avenues of communication and information in a country. We have witnessed many trends in the past toward this very thing and this is possibly just another step in the same direction. Because if the bureaucrats do succeed in so drastically curtailing the size of our large daily newspapers, these newspapers will of necessity not have sufficient space left with which to earn their bread and butter through advertising—which of necessity already has been drastically curtailed. Indeed, these newspapers will not have sufficient space left to cover the news fully and completely. In such a case, the result must inevitably be that the newspapers would have to seek a subsidy from the Government, and subsidy from the Government will, of course, mean that they will be completely and wholly subservient to the Government and they will then be even more drastically curtailed or censored in the dissemination of factual and unbiased news to the American people. These were the tactics adopted by Hitler, by Mussolini, and all the dictators of the past. We must not permit it to happen in this country. We must not under any circumstances permit the little weekly newspaper publisher—the man who, of necessity, generally buys his newsprint on a hand-to-mouth basis—to be put out of business. That would be a calamity second only to the complete stifling of the larger and smaller dailies.

To me it is not entirely inconceivable that some of these superworld planners might not be behind this effort to destroy the free press of America. Of all these post-war superworld planners, the Socialists and the Communists are the most frank, and we have plenty of them down here in bureaucratic Washington. These "crackpots" make no pretense of beating around the bush. They openly state that they are dedicated to the establishment of a new order when this war is over in which private enterprise will be abolished. As a matter of fact, they are not even ready to wait for the war to be won, but consider that the war itself is their great and golden opportunity to permanently fasten collectivism on America. This proposed rationing of newsprint paper may be entirely necessary. I do not know. But one thing is certain, if we curtail the freedom of the press in America, we are playing right into the hands of these "crackpots" and they know it full well. It is up to this Congress, operating under this Halleck resolution, or some similar measure, to get at the facts in all these rationing standardization and regimentation programs. We ought to be more fully informed of the need for those things. If they are needed to win the war, I will be the last to object to them. The American people are taking them in their stride, but we better be ready to account to the American people for our laxity if we do not satisfy ourselves that they are absolutely necessary for the winning of the war and that they are not a part of some one of these "crackpot" schemes or devilishly planned schemes to do away with what we like to call the American way of life.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the statement the gentleman has made and I am glad he has set himself to cleaning up this situation in the paper industry. I have had some experience in this field in contacting the agencies here. A line should be drawn between the O. P. A. people who are setting up these quotas and issuing some of these regulations and the people who are expected to administer them in the War Production Board. I have found a very fine understanding of the printing and publishing business in the office of the Chief of that Branch, William Chandler. I find, however, that they are circumscribed and

limited by unintelligent allotments and the unintelligent rules that have been set up by the O. P. A.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I am informed that the newspaper editors of the country, whether dailies or weeklies, are smothered by an avalanche of Government propaganda hand-outs, accompanied by urgent requests that all of those things be printed in the interest of public morale. Does not the gentleman think that a great deal of this scrap paper which comes from almost every Government department might well be curtailed?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. There is no question about that. There are thousands of people in Washington lying awake nights trying to think of some excuse for their jobs, and that is what they resort to. Whenever I am fortunate enough to return to my district and have the opportunity to visit the various newspaper editors back home, they complain about this very thing that the gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned. They tell me they literally receive tons of this junk year after year, of which they could not print one-tenth if they owned a printing establishment several times as large as they now use to get out their weekly and small daily papers.

If this administration would handle the manpower and price situation intelligently, we could meet the present situation without such tremendous upheavals in our domestic economy. And if we do not bring about a change, we are not carrying out the instructions we received from the voters in November. Coming from the pulp-producing area in Michigan, I hope the Halleck resolution will be adopted and that a thorough and complete investigation of the paper-producing situation will be approached with vigor and determination to do something about it. I would recommend that one of the first steps would be to invite other Congressmen from timber-producing States, for most of us know the situation at first hand and know that it is being hopelessly muddled by someone. If it is the determination of this administration to reduce the Washington Star, the Times-Herald, the Post, or News to a four-page publication, and put most of the newspapers and magazines out of business, we might as well know about it at once, for I am sure the Congress can, should, and will do something about it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse the demand of my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] that the Congress do something at once to meet the acute situation in connection with paper production. I understand from very reliable sources that certain elements in this administration are talking about cutting the consumption of printing paper, newsprint as well as book stock, down to about 50 percent of 1942 consumption. I want to see the men who are doing this planning and scheming questioned by a committee of the House.

Because some of our most publicized tourists to Great Britain found the newspapers in England practically driven into bankruptcy because of the war is no reason at all for anyone wishing a like fate to the press of the United States. There is a vast difference between England and this country in this regard. England's imports of printing paper were cut off from the Scandinavian countries and were either replaced by armaments from this continent or reduced to a trickle because of Axis submarines. In this country and in Canada any water haul involved in moving printing paper from mills to consumer is on inland waterways.

The excuse for very drastic curtailment of paper production is directly traceable to the hopeless bungling of the manpower problem and the peculiar mental gymnastics by which O. P. A. establishes price ceilings. I am not so sure that some of this bungling has not been designed for the purpose of wrecking the American press. I believe the problem is altogether too serious to permit the dreamers in O. P. A. or Civilian Supply, aided by the extremists in the War Department, who seem determined to wreck our civilian economy, to have their way. It is a responsibility of the Congress and an obligation of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to demand that this erratic program be halted and everyone connected with it compelled to explain what they are trying to do to us.

Reports reach us that the program is all cut and dried. Usually well-informed trade papers indicate that drastic curtailments are to follow the one already made. Unless we stop it, we must share some of the responsibility for the vast majority of newspapers and magazines in this country going bankrupt. You cannot block the production of fibers for a year or two and expect the industry to live on its fat. There are no reserves; and if our press is to be maintained, it must have somewhat near a normal supply of paper. A break in production for one year will have terrific impact for several years.

Just because we see evidence of prosperity in the volume of advertising carried by big metropolitan newspapers, such as we see in Washington or are published in New York, does not mean that the press elsewhere is equally prosperous. Curtailment of civilian goods has brought on a shrinkage in advertising. Any of us can verify this by talking to a few of the publishers in our home districts. They are in difficulty. Permit this unwise program to continue to its ultimate goal, and you will see many of them suspend publication. It is time for us to act. The Halleck amendment should be adopted without delay.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the Selective Service System announced new regulations under which the dependency deferments will be abolished, for all practical purposes. It is true that the new regulations affect certain designated occupations. However, this is the beginning; it is the entering wedge. Those announced cover only some occupations which quite evidently do not contribute to the war. Obviously, this was intentionally done. It is the program that the Selective Service System has apparently long sought to place into effect. Once this is done, the dependency deferment has gone for all time.

In October we had before us the amendment to the Selective Service Act permitting the calling of 18- and 19-year-old boys to the service. As it left this House it contained a provision that married men, men with families, would not be called until single men and men without families within their State had been exhausted. It met with practically unanimous support in the House, but, unfortunately, went out either in the Senate or in conference.

Let us get the matter clear. Nobody objects to taking every man in the United States, single or married, yes, and women and children also, if necessary to win this war. That is definite and no one argues with it. On the other hand, we find that our War Manpower Commission has until this good day formulated no program for the utilization of our existing manpower—we had Mr. McNutt before the Military Affairs Committee all morning yesterday and learned that he has no program formulated. We find that there is no program for the substitution of over-age or physically disqualified, or the use of women. We know that the addition of another 8-hour day in our defense factories would increase the available man-hours one-fifth, or 20 percent, although it would not increase labor to that extent.

Captain Rickenbacker has stated that absenteeism in our defense plants runs to the extent of 10 percent. We know there is inefficiency and that all of these plants are overstaffed. We are engaged in fighting a war to maintain our institutions. We will maintain such institutions as organized labor, if you please, and I will go along with that; the 40-hour week in peacetime—and I go along with that. I say to you we have another institution in this Nation, and I think that is the one that my boys from Texas are fighting for. I think it is the one that your boys are fighting for. That is the preservation of the family in American life.

Once you abolish this family relationship in the United States you have abolished our entire society. Then you have abolished everything that we believe to be worth fighting for in this Nation. Once you take the father of these children you send the mother off to work. Then you have deprived those children of the guiding hand of the mother and you have deprived them of the stern hand of discipline of the father. I say to you that we are on dangerous ground when we go so lightly into this program

when we have done nothing to utilize the manpower that we do have available in the United States. It reflects the opinion that has existed in the Selective Service System all along.

We have been somewhat surprised; I have been shocked, and I have had many letters from ministers in this country who are very shocked indeed that the Selective Service System presumes to pass upon the reason for which a child may have been begotten. They attempt to pass upon whether a child is in existence for the purpose of avoiding military service in time of war. This gives an indication of what they had in their minds when they come with this program, although they have done nothing to carry out a manpower program.

I have contended from the beginning, when we first adopted the Selective Service Act in 1940, that it contained a fundamental defect. The quotas of local boards are fixed, not upon the number of registrants at the board, but upon the number registered and not deferred. The local board therefore has it within its power to reduce the number of soldiers which that board furnishes by being liberal with the deferments it grants. I have contended from the beginning that it was fundamentally defective and that it needed to be changed. No one in the department has been willing to evidence any interest in it. I am sorry to say I have been unable to get anything more than casual interest in the Military Affairs Committee or in the Congress.

I have in my possession figures showing deferments by occupation. One would suppose that the great industrial centers such as Michigan or Ohio would be the highest. The national average is 4.12 percent. This is industrial or occupational deferment. The State of Michigan with all of its industry is below the national average with 3.59 percent. The State of Ohio with its industry is below the national average with 3.76; while in the State of North Dakota, where I am sure you will find there are not many war industries, and I am sure I have heard some of the Members from North Dakota complain about it, there is 11.23 percent occupational deferment. In the State of Washington the occupational deferment is 9.1 percent; in the State of Idaho the occupational deferment is 8.73 percent. You cannot say it is because of agriculture, because that is not correct either.

Let us go to the State of Illinois, which has a combination of industry and agriculture. It is below the national average with 3.57 percent. Let us take the State of Indiana: It is below the national average with 3.49 percent; and then we will drop down to the South, to South Carolina with 1.99 percent occupational deferment. Texas, with the largest percentage of volunteers and the greatest agricultural and beef-producing State, has but 2.6 percent of occupational deferment.

There is a leakage in our manpower. It is within the power of the Selective Service System and the Manpower Commission to determine where that leakage is. I suggest this is where a portion of it will be found.

You will find in the case of dependency deferments, both with children and without children, variation between States almost as great as you find in the question of occupational deferment. The same is true of those deferred for mental, moral, and physical reasons. You will find that the percentages vary as much as they vary in the instances I have pointed out. This is something that challenges the attention of Congress. We must see to it that the manpower of this Nation is so used that we can protect the families of our citizens just as long as possible. I know of nothing that can challenge your attention any stronger than this. I have introduced as a bill the provision carried as an amendment to the 18-19-year-old draft. I am pressing for hearings before the committee, for time is short. We must act quickly in this situation to prevent this catastrophe which I regard as being unnecessary.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman in my opinion is one of the best informed men in the Congress on the whole proposition of selective service and its operation. I want to commend him for this statement. If he will bear with me may I suggest that in my opinion this is just another case of administrative flaunting of the plain intent and will of the Congress. Further, it is an attempt to do by indirection what those who have been charged with the formulating of a manpower program have for some reason failed to do by direction. In other words is it not true that during all these months that the Manpower Commission has been supposed to be formulating a program to bring about the effective use of the manpower of the Nation no real program has been brought forward?

Mr. KILDAY. May I say to the gentleman from Indiana that on yesterday, when the Chairman of the Manpower Commission was before the Military Affairs Committee, he was unable to give us any program on any of these questions.

Another thing, at the time the 18- and 19-year-old draft was before us the bill contained a provision that these boys would be permitted to complete their academic year. It was adopted here practically unanimously. It was in the bill as it left the House, but very quietly it was dropped out. I imagine it is good strategy for those attempting to eliminate such things to attract as little attention here as possible. They took it out in the quiet of the conference room.

The departments took the position that they had to have these 18- and 19-year-old boys. They had been demanding them since 1940, and yet there was not one scratch of a program for the utilization of the colleges of the country, not a scratch of a pen of a program to continue the supply of doctors, engineers, physicists, chemists, and clergymen, if you please. Your entire supply of priests, rabbis, and preachers is being cut off under that provision.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the Navy now says frankly that they cannot use one of those in the college program until July 1943. The Army says that it hopes to use them in March, but I think they are entirely too optimistic. They are working hard to do it, but only a dribble will be here by the 1st of July. Had my provision remained in that bill under which they could have completed their academic year, they would still be in school and we would have that much of their education and preparation for service in the war effort. Instead of that, those kids left the day we passed that law.

Mr. HALLECK. Does not the gentleman think that a matter of this great consequence ought to be approached in an orderly way and that if we are going to say to a married man with dependents that we are going to require that he go from the job he now has to another job, we ought to meet that head on? If anything is to be done, should not the Manpower Commission and its directors come up here with some such proposal, rather than to distort the Selective Service Act that was designed solely to bring people into the military service? Is this not an attempt to do by indirection what they have not proposed directly?

Mr. KILDAY. I agree with the gentleman. We are at fault, and I mean collectively, in turning over too much power to certain people, as the gentleman spoke about a while ago. That is what we have done, and, as a result, we have a Government by decree.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman has spoken about the effect of the 18- and 19-year-olds being drafted. I am wondering, in connection with the talk which we have heard in the newspapers about a further educational program, about what is going to happen when we have a situation where these boys are taken in. They will be sent back to the colleges. What is going to happen to the colleges when those boys are sent out? How many of those colleges will be operating?

Mr. KILDAY. No one can tell.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

### THE FEDERAL WAR MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, it is vital that the Congress formulate at this time a clear, unified policy with reference to training of workers for the war industries. There is a manpower shortage in the skilled trades. In order to meet production goals this year, large numbers of partly trained youth will be required for shops and factories; other workers must receive advanced training. Seven

Federal agencies are engaged in the Federal training program, including the United States Office of Education and the National Youth Administration. These agencies are under the direction of the United States Manpower Commission.

One of these agencies—the National Youth Administration—was established in 1935 as part of the W. P. A. to provide work relief and employment for needy youth. In 1939, industrial training was added to the program. The N. Y. A. has received about $700,000,000 since 1935, including $53,000,000 for defense training and $8,000,000 for student aid in the current fiscal year. In July 1941 the average enrollment was 281,000; in November 1942 it was 53,000. The decline was due to improved employment and Army recruitment.

For the fiscal year 1942 we appropriated for N. Y. A. $154,795,000; of this amount $63,028,000 went for industrial defense training. For the current fiscal year we appropriated $61,274,000 for this agency. With the exception of $8,000,000 for student aid, this sum is allotted to preemployment training for youths of 16 to 24 years of age for the war industries. The N. Y. A. maintains 38,879 training stations or machines in use throughout the country. Courses are planned to run from 6 to 8 weeks. If there is an average of 53,000 students for each course, turned over 6 times a year, this means that some 318,000 youths would receive N. Y. A. training annually. Students are paid hourly rates for this work.

Many students have been drafted so the N. Y. A. is now training girls. On November 25 last there were 28,300 boys and 25,000 girls on the rolls. In 14 States there are more machines available than trainees. This means a very low rate of use per station. There are 37 States which have 17,655 stations not in use. The N. Y. A. has spent $28,117,576 for equipment of which $19,247,212 was bought in fiscal 1941. There are 1,700 N. Y. A. shops located in 700 training centers throughout the country. The average cost per month for resident youth is $77.80; for nonresident youth $59.34.

In October 1942 the N. Y. A. had 11,762 paid employees in the administrative personnel to train 53,000 youths or 1 to every 4½ trainees. Among these employees were 4,771 shop supervisors; 3,143 in management and service activities; 900 administrative employees; 854 in maintenance, transportation, and care of property, and 2,094 in subsistence activities.

Leading educational organizations are alarmed at attempts to make N. Y. A. a continuing agency because they think it duplicates the program of the United States Office of Education and suggests the beginning of national bureaucratic control of education. They cite the fact that $1,000,000,000 has been invested in regular school plants for industrial training and that there are adequate instructors and facilities to train 750,000 more workers as of a year ago. For the current fiscal year, the Office of Education is receiving $109,000,000 for industrial war training, which is similar to that of N. Y. A. The Office of Education use their equipment on an average so that two or three trainees per day use the machines. They have 56,053 stations giving training similar to the N. Y. A. program. During a day they train 85,915 in preemployment courses and 43,005 in supplementary courses, a total of 128,920 persons on these stations.

There is no doubt of the need of the war industries for hundreds of thousands of trained or partly trained new workers this year. We have an enoromus production program and manpower is limited. The Congress should see to it that all industrial war training is unified to these ends:

First. That every available training station or machine is in constant use.

Second. That administrative and supervisory staffs are consolidated for maximum efficiency at minimum cost.

Third. That all training given by the Government be strictly adjusted to the needs of the war industries so that every trainee can be immediately placed in war work when his training period is completed.

Fourth. That the N. Y. A. be abolished and its equipment be placed where it can be most effectively used by the Training Division of the War Manpower Commission.

Under the War Manpower Commission the following agencies are offering training and related services to employers and employees in war industries:

First. Training Within Industry Service.

Second. Apprentice and Training Service.

Third. Vocational Training for War Production Workers.

Fourth. Vocational Training for Rural War Production Workers.

Fifth. Engineering, Science, and Management War Training.

Sixth. National Youth Administration Program.

Seventh. United States Employment Service.

This program is designed for the following types of war workers:

First. Production operators.

Second. Skilled production specialists.

Third. All-round skilled mechanics.

Fourth. Engineers, chemists, physicists.

Fifth. Plant administrative and production supervisory personnel.

Sixth. Trainers and supervisors of training.

The program also covers preemployment training for war industries and agriculture for the following kinds of workers:

First. Production operators.

Second. Engineers, chemists, and physicists.

Third. Trainers for teachers.

Fourth. Trainers in labor relations.

The Congress should determine to what extent the War Manpower Commission has become another superagency in the training field, designed to create more Federal jobs and further expand our overloaded, overlapping bureaucracy; also the extent to which it has unified the various training programs into a coherent, efficient manpower plan for war production schedules.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

THE PROPOSED FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, recently the item which would give the go-ahead signal to the Florida barge canal project was supposedly killed when it was removed from an appropriation bill. But like the famous reported demise of Mark Twain, the suggested death of this measure may have been exaggerated or at least premature.

Fearful that this multimillion-dollar nonessential may be merely in a state of suspended animation, it seems pertinent, at this time, to review briefly the facts in order to waylay any Ocanala ghosts which might consider this a proper moment for reincarnation. To do this, it will be necessary to state the problem, to show how the proposed canal does not alleviate that problem, and then to indicate what can be done to meet the needs of the situation.

The problem, as everyone knows, is the urgent need for petroleum products on the eastern seaboard in order to relieve gasoline and fuel shortages. It is estimated that over 1,300,000 barrels per day of crude oil, fuel oil, and gasoline are required to relieve the pressure in this area. Of this amount, some 1,100,000 barrels a day may be delivered by railroads and pipe lines. The deficit must be made up by other methods.

To mitigate this need, a Florida barge canal has been proposed along the route of the defunct $250,000,000 ship canal. This new pork bill was shaved from the $250,000,000 figure to the comparatively modest sum of from $44,000,000 to $100,000,000. Estimates vary, and some even go beyond that. It would, on completion, ostensibly allow barges to carry northward 466,000 barrels of petroleum daily, enough when added to other available means, to alleviate the present shortage.

However, there is more than one fly in the ointment. The eastern seaboard needs fuel oil now. It needs gasoline now. Yet the proposed canal, on the basis of studies made by the only responsible people who would know, will take a minimum of 3 years to complete. There has been some loose talking lately to the effect that the canal can be completed in a year or 15 months, but Major General Reybold, Chief of Engineers in the War Department, who is the authority for the 3-year estimate, has refuted this. He has done this moreover, in the face of constant attempts by the proponents of the bill to have him lower this estimate. As a matter of fact his estimate was made against the advice of his own staff who would have added another 6 months to the total—making it 3½ years. And all this was on the supposition that three shifts would be run a day, that priorities would be secured, and that there would be a reasonably easy flow of material, equipment, and manpower. Three and one-half years for a canal, yet the East needs petroleum now. Nor is he alone in this belief. Mr. J. R. Porter, of the Office of Petroleum Co-

ordinator for War, has concurred with the Engineering Department to the extent that his study has led him to conclude that the new canal could not be completed in time to facilitate meeting the east-coast petroleum shortage.

Disregarding time, there are other insurmountable difficulties. One is lack of material—steel, iron, and rubber. It was estimated that the rubber used on bulldozers and tractors would put tires on every car in Florida for the duration. It was stated by the Office of Petroleum Coordinator for War that even were the proposed canal to make available the 400,000 barrels of oil needed daily, still, from the standpoint of steel efficiency it would not be justified because of the enormous horsepower involved. Maj. Gen. T. M. Robbins, Assistant Chief of Engineers, told the House Appropriations Committee that materials, equipment, and manpower shortage made building the canal improbable at this time.

The manpower necessary to build this proposed canal itself poses an almost insurmountable problem, taking as it will engineers, technicians, and laborers from sorely needed places in American industry. Despite this, according to the Tampa Morning Tribune, a well-known Senator from Florida on hearing that it would take several thousand men 4 years to build the canal, urged that several hundred thousand be employed to complete it in 1 year. Meanwhile, Florida farmers appeal for labor to cultivate crops which lie spoiling in the fields. Meanwhile draft officials in Florida, forced to defer farming and forestry key workers, hear that 20,000 more workers are required to maintain Florida farm production near normal. Meanwhile the State Department, the War Manpower Commission, and the immigration authorities study a proposal to import Bahama islanders to supply agricultural labor for Florida. Meanwhile the Farm Security Administration is attempting to recruit a mobile land army to save the sugar, citrus, and garden farms of Florida. Little wonder that Army engineers recommended that no funds be provided for the "chasm, which has split the State of Florida."

Then there is the cost of this canal to the taxpayers of the Nation. Major General Reybold estimates it at $44,000,000. Other estimates run much higher. The Florida Taxpayers Association fears that maintenance alone might cost a million dollars a year. The cost in money, men, and materials would be formidable in peacetime. It becomes a national affront in wartime to urge this useless ditch on a people straining every available muscle in prosecution of the war effort.

Particularly is this true when one views the alternatives, for there are alternatives. These involve the use of practical, available means of transportation today, not by waiting from 36 to 42 months for the first drop of oil.

In the first place, as has been proposed, a set of temporary pipe lines across Florida could shuttle petroleum from the Gulf of Mexico to barges waiting to carry it to New York on the inland waterway. It is estimated that these pipe lines—three of them would cost $10,000,000—would carry up to 120,000 barrels of petroleum daily. The advantages of this project are so apparent that even the Ocanala dreamers dare not object to it. In fact, they have all stated the necessity for these lines in lieu of the early completion of the canal.

In the second place, supplementing this there is available another Florida canal, now in use at the moment, from Fort Myers, on the Gulf of Mexico, to Stuart, on the Atlantic inland waterway. The Government has expended $25,000,000 on that canal. Why the proponents of the barge canal disregard this available canal one cannot say. Perhaps it is because repairs on the southern canal will cost only $208,000, as compared to a minimum of $44,000,000 to dig the more northern route. Perhaps it is because tugboats will take 4 days longer from Texas to New York by this route—4 days instead of 3 or 4 years. Perhaps it is because both Army and Navy are solidly in back of its construction, although they do not look upon the northern waterway as feasible at this time. Perhaps it is because the southern canal will not require the manpower, the steel, the machinery to put into operation that the other will.

Whatever the reason, there is a canal available, not in 3 years, but now. According to Rear Admiral Huttle, who, it will be remembered, made a test trip by tug and barge over its course, there is no reason why the waterway should not be used to capacity for deliveries from the Gulf to the Atlantic. Should this be done, it is estimated that from 288,000 to 300,000 barrels a day may be shipped by this route. That amount, plus the petroleum carried by pipe line, would relieve the east-coast shortage.

Army engineers have recommended at a cost of $3,000,000 continuation of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to Fort Myers, the western outlet of the existing canal. Were this to be completed, a safe and protected inland waterway would be provided all the way from Texas to Trenton, N. J., whether or not we even have this second barge canal.

Needless to say the proposed barge canal should die from lack of sustenance. The food which its ravenous maw would devour—that is, time, manpower, materials and money—the very nourishment so badly needed to build the sinews of war, should be allowed to remain in use to the Nation. It should not be expended for a post-war question mark.

In my opinion a majority of the people of Florida do not want this canal. The taxpayers of the United States do not want this canal. The Office of Petroleum Coordinator for War does not want it. The Army, the Navy, do not want it. Yet attempts have been made—and may be made again—to foist on the American people in time of war the building of this second canal, this duplicating ditch, this so-called short cut that will take 3 years before the first tug could navigate it.

This proposed canal authorization should die. It should die despite the hysterical arguments of its sponsors. Lacking plausible reasons for encouraging such a fiasco at this time, the advocates of the canal have even descended to using childlike reasoning. "If we go ahead and authorize the building of this canal," they say, "it will be a help in the propaganda to show the Nazis and the Japs that we actually mean to win." "Help in the propaganda." Ask the Office of War Information which they would rather have—$44,000,000 in war material or a Florida barge canal. No doubt the Nazis and Japs would agree that we should immediately throw ourselves frantically into this enervating activity.

The proponents of this bill disregard the apparent fact that efficient use of the suggested pipe line and of the existing canal would solve the problem of fuel for the East. They evidently would rather have for their forty-four to one hundred millions a Florida barge canal on paper, than 176 to 400 Flying Fortresses in the air.

The time has come when we must clearly register our disapproval of this pork-barrel measure. It is neither practical nor essential and is intended as a door opener for the Florida ship canal. We must repeal the authorization approved in the last Congress. I propose that we remove this threat to our war effort. The people expect this Congress to stop all unnecessary and nonessential spending. Let us remember we are at war—total war. I have introduced a bill to repeal the authorization for the Florida barge canal in the hope of saving $44,000,000 for vital war necessities.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to speak to the House this afternoon, but having just listened to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, perhaps I should. He has so incompletely given you the picture of the Florida barge canal matter until I feel that perhaps you should have other and correct information concerning it. Therefore, for the sake of the record and for your information, there are two or three things of which you should now be advised.

The House Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which I am a member, has from time to time held hearings on a Florida canal. First hearings and first reports by the committee were for a ship canal across north Florida connecting the Atlantic with the Gulf. Last spring, however, owing to the war emergency, this committee gave consideration to a proposal for a barge canal across north Florida to link the existing barge canal channel of the Atlantic coast with that of the Gulf of Mexico coast. This channel now extends from lower Texas to Trenton, N. J., with the exception of completion of a small necessary link across north Florida. Your committee had extensive hearings of departmental officials, private individuals, and organizations. The Army engineers, the Oil Coordinator's office, and other Government departments were heard before the committee.

General Reybold, Chief of the Army Engineers, told the committee that the barge canal could be completed in 2

years. Other engineering authority, extremely competent, indicated it could be completed in probably a year. It is my understanding that Gen. B. Somervell has indicated it could be constructed in a year. He has not told me this, but I understand he has told others this. He is the most competent man of all to speak concerning this project, because he conducted for the Army Engineers exhaustive surveys and findings concerning it. Gen. Charles P. Summerall, former Chief of Staff, United States Army, and a gentleman and soldier and engineer most extraordinary, I understand has recently said he knows the barge canal can be completed in less than 12 months.

All of the departmental witnesses appearing before our committee said that they desired the canal constructed and desired it now, in the interest of the war effort. They also said that completion of this barge canal was the best hope for, and practically the only hope for relief of the oil shortage which then occurred, and has now been intensified in the East Atlantic States. They said it offered practically the sole medium of assurance of conveying to the eastern war manufacturing plants sulphur, oil, zinc, lead, and other essential war manufacturing materials. On June 17, 1942, and after exhaustive debate, the House of Representatives approved by a splendid majority roll-call vote authorization of the project. A few weeks later it was approved by the Senate and signed by the President. I cannot understand why anyone now who is cooperating for the war effort can have the effrontery to undertake to repeal this authorization and to block appropriations for this all-essential war effort.

I am advised that you are now paying a million dollars a day to transport to our factories materials which this canal would carry if opened. I am further reliably advised that it is impossible to transport now, with existing facilities. war materials in adequate quantities and on time to our war plants. May I emphasize also that the War Production Board and the Office of Defense Transportation have urged immediate completion of this barge canal as war essential. Fuel oil scarcity is closing the schools of the East, closing necessary industrial war production, and even causing worshipers to sit in cold churches. The northeast section of our country now shivers in cold, damp houses and looks out on the snow and ice because this barge canal has not been completed. You gentlemen who have obstructed it and obstructed appropriations for it should think well as to whether or not you are responsible for your portion of this misery, lack of production, and loss of lives in battle which is now occurring.

And may I warn you now that if construction were started on this canal tomorrow, fuel oil, gasoline, sulphur, and all war essentials in adequate supply and quantity would, before December 15, 1943, traverse this canal and actually be delivered to the eastern seaboard of our country.

And mark my word, if you do not agree to an appropriation for this canal now and its immediate beginning, the misery now suffered in the northeast of our country will stagger into insignificance in comparison with that of 1 year from now. You can remedy this situation and I call on you as patriotic Americans to cooperate with the war effort and give the East fuel oil, gasoline, sulfur, salt, zinc, timber, and other war essentials which exist primarily in the Texas, Mississippi, Louisiana area. The same forces which have always fought waterway improvements and fought the canal in Florida are now fighting this. I cannot for the life of me see why they should, because this is a barge canal and for war purposes. Had this canal been in existence since hostilities in this war began, an enormous amount of tonnage and the lives of merchant crews would have been saved. I do not feel at liberty to mention the amount of these losses. But that is water over the dam. You can now remedy it by making this war auxiliary available by next December. The propaganda to the effect that this barge canal construction will take farm labor is hooey. The fact is it will require dredge and drag line operators and only a few of them. This farm labor scarcity bugaboo is a demagogic smoke screen thrown up to try to breed prejudice. It shows the great extreme to which those who are opposed to this war effort may go.

You can keep labor on the farms only by paying them a decent price for their produce. You cannot expect them to continue to produce corn, cotton, potatoes, peanuts, beef, pork, peas, vegetables, oranges, grapefruit, and other crops and fruits unless they can make at least a small profit. What they need and must have is a higher selling price at the farm for their produce.

Certain influences opposing this war effort may make high exaggerated statements. You may even hear it will take 10 years to build this little 20-mile-long 12-foot-deep ditch. You may hear it will require $300,000,000; that it is a boondoggling project; that the war officials do not desire it; that no one whomsoever desires it. But my colleagues, may I remind you that sinister influences have opposed practically every war effort which this Congress has advanced over the past 3 years. I warn you not to be misled but to support the war effort, and in this give needed material and fuel for our war factories of the East and fuel for the homes, schools, and dry automobile tanks of the East. When you obstruct completion of this project, you obstruct the production of airplanes, necessary naval vessels, Maritime Commission vessels, guns, ammunition—and yes, you even obstruct the delivery of necessary airplane and motor-vehicle fuel with which we must hope to defeat the Axis in actual battle.

What are you going to do about it?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. The language and the logic of my friend from Michigan flow about as fluently as the oil will flow through that canal when we get it. If you were permitted to hear only his side of the case you might be convinced that this is a fool boondoggling project. But you are going to hear the other side and I am going to help you hear it. I invite you to listen tomorrow to Judge MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, who had charge of this bill in the House when it was passed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. The gentleman from Michigan points out the great advantage of pipe lines, and he says also that the Chief of Engineers states it will take 3 years to dig this canal. I do not want to embarrass any engineer or anyone else in the War Department, but I can get an opinion from the War Department that this canal could be constructed and have barges going through it within a year's time. If we had started that canal when we authorized its construction last July, we would have relief for next winter.

The gentleman does not answer the fact that in my speech the other day I said that I had in my records a guaranty by one of the most prominent construction concerns in the United States. Nobody can question their ability, because they have already done $200,000,000 worth of work for the Army engineers. They guaranteed that they with three other contractors would finish this canal within 10 months, so that the barges could be going through it. We forget one thing. When the gentleman speaks of 3 years, he speaks of the completion of this project as set forth in the bill. That does not have to be done to get oil through there. You can get a channel through there in much less time.

Further, I say to the gentleman, when he speaks of essential materials, about these things, and the need of bombers, that these bombers may run dry unless we get fuel for them. Furthermore, when he speaks of essential materials, this bill specifically authorizes the engineers to use temporary structures, and I say that the pipe line that we are putting across Florida already has used as much essential material as it would take to build that canal. The pipe line running from Texas to Illinois has taken 10 times as much essential materials, and I challenge the gentleman to come to Florida and take a census of the opinion of the people down there. He says the people of Florida are against it. I do not care how he takes his poll, but I challenge him to come down there and he will find that not more than 15 percent are against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I did not know that this discussion would take place today. In order to keep the record straight, I call attention to the fact that the first time that this measure was up for consideration it was defeated, and

the second time it was considered it was passed by only 12 votes. In reply to my friend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN], who told us that a number of the administrative officials here in Washington spoke in favor of the project, all I need to do is to call attention to the fact that these same officials spoke for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project, and called attention to the imperative need of this waterway as a war measure. However, a short time thereafter the President recalled the project and indicated that it was not necessary, and it has been as dead as a dodo bird ever since.

Admiral Halsey said that the Japs can be licked in 1 year, and he said that they can be licked by supplying materials—planes, ships, and so forth. It seems to me more important to provide Admiral Halsey and our Pacific command with tools to lick the Japs than it is to build this ditch which is a smoke screen for the Florida ship canal. I say "amen" to the speech of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. I am glad that it has not been started. I am sure that we can divert this money to far better use by supplying things that our soldiers need in the Pacific with which to lick the Japs.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. On the question of time, the only authority that I have is the record of General Reibold, who appeared before the committee, and his testimony that this canal would take 3 years to build if everything went well. If the general, or any other engineer, has revised his testimony, I am not so informed; but we have the right to take the word of the Army engineers who come before the Rivers and Harbors Committee on every project that goes before it, and we should depend upon their testimony.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest on Monday afternoon to the able address of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and later read it with some care as it is recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Many of the sentiments expressed by the gentleman must be enthusiastically approved by every patriotic American. I agree with him, and I feel sure, with the majority of the House, that it is intolerable that various agencies of the Federal Government should employ in responsible positions men and women of professed communistic beliefs. Our Bill of Rights has given great latitude to the expression of political sentiment, even the most radical sentiment, but surely it is not necessary, in order to preserve civil liberties, that we elevate into responsible Government positions those who would by a class revolution destroy our fabric of political and economic life or those who place above their loyalty to America their loyalty to Marxism or to that country which has adopted Marxism as its official faith. If these men cited by the gentleman from Texas espouse such revolutionary doctrines as their writings and speeches would indicate, I agree with the gentleman that they should be summarily discharged from Federal employment.

Likewise, I hold no brief for those extremists who, because they disapprove of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and the methods of his committee, have labeled him as an agent of Hitler, as a Nazi, or a Fascist.

I think it is absurd to accuse any citizen of the United States—much less an elected Member of Congress—with a lack of patriotism or subversive intentions because of political, economic, or philosophical opposition to any of his ideas. I think that it is a fair assumption as well as the only workable basis for the solution of our parliamentary differences that all Members of this body, no matter how opposed their views, are working sincerely for what they believe to be the welfare of their country and are representing, as they understand them, the sentiments of their constituents.

But I hold it to be equally unfair that patriotic Americans of liberal or even extreme views who are willing to abide by the decision of the majority and abide by constitutional methods should, because of these views, be damned as Communists.

In his dissent to the majority report of the committee headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] aptly points out the difference between those who are subversive and those whose views do not agree with those of the majority. He says that the present tendency in America for so-called right wingers to shout Communist at liberals is doing America no good. It is dangerous as it associates in the public mind those words Fascist and Communist, not with those to whom they can properly be applied but with persons "whose patriotic devotion to America and her basic institutions cannot be questioned, whatever the feeling of their political opponents toward their particular views on particular subjects may be."

Let us then dispense with name calling and try to conduct our future discussions of this matter without the usual emotionalism and with a decent regard for facts.

I cannot discuss all the organizations or individuals or publications referred to in the address made by the gentleman from Texas. I do not have the knowledge as to the truth or falsity of these charges which would justify me in consuming the time of the House. I intend to speak of that which I know, to confine myself to matters within my personal knowledge or based upon sources which I believe to be reliable. I can safely state that in his accusations against the organization known as Citizens for Victory the gentleman from Texas has been inaccurate in his statement of facts and unfair in his indiscriminate grouping of this association with other organizations allegedly communistic without taking the trouble to differentiate between them or to inform the House that Citizens for Victory is as free of communism as the American Legion and the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Before discussing his address and before letting in a little light to dispel the confusion and suspicion toward this group, which the Members must have carried home from his remarks, I would like as briefly as I can to discuss the organization itself, its antecedents, its purposes, and its membership.

One of the greatest battles of ideas which has ever been waged in America took place between two contending schools of political thought in the year and a half before Pearl Harbor. As Hitler's conquests transformed the map of Europe and as Japan threatened to run berserk in the Pacific, many patriotic citizens, both in and out of public life, saw the shadow of the war fall across America. They urged that America, as yet inactive, take steps to build up her defense and to aid those countries who still stood between the might of the aggressors and our own safety. Outstanding among those who urged these measures of protection was our President and many of our leaders in both Houses. On the other hand, a strong minority in the House and Senate felt that we should withdraw more closely into ourselves, and should cease any international activity which might involve us in the conflict. The contentions between these two philosophies provided the material for a debate in the Halls of Congress which is now history, and which is too recent to necessitate a discussion at length. Echoing throughout the land were the reverberations of this debate. Everywhere public-spirited men took sides, associations were formed. Little Americans known as isolationists had their America First Committee, which held public meetings throughout the country. Addresses were given at these meetings by Members of Congress and by others who shared their views. Those who felt that this war was very much our business; that we must act promptly if we should avoid the fate of France, Poland, and the other countries of Europe; united in the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies; and later in the Fight for Freedom Committee. These two last-named committees likewise held public meetings.

Public officials, clergymen, representatives of the press, outstanding businessmen, all of whom saw the imminent peril of inaction, strove to awaken the country to the danger which confronted it. These latter two committees might be called the parents of the Citizens for Victory Committee, which has been assailed by the gentleman from Texas, for, although there was no formal merger of the Committee To Aid the Allies and the Fight for Freedom Committee into the new Citizens for Victory Committee, many of those active in the two former committees prior to Pearl Harbor formed in the main the nucleus of Citizens for Victory. Before meetings held by the

parent committees spoke such outstanding Americans as Rev. Henry Hobson, bishop of the Episcopal diocese of southern Ohio, who was the head of the Fight for Freedom Committee; Wendell Willkie, at a mass meeting in New York; Maj. George Fielding Eliot, outstanding military commentator; Senator Ernest Gibson, of Vermont, later the national chairman of the Committee To Defend America; Senator Claude Pepper, of Florida; Mayor LaGuardia, of New York; and many business and industrial leaders from the ranks of both labor and management.

Upon the outbreak of war the conflict between the so-called isolationists and so-called interventionists was resolved. Our attitude toward the World War was decided for us by the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor. But many of those who had been active to awakening America to the sense of its danger realized the fact that their task was not completed. Everyone wanted to win the war, but, after victory, what would come next? They realized that, although Hitler and the Japanese war leaders were the actors and the aggressors in this conflict, that the attacked nations were not without fault. They had by their suspicion and extreme nationalism set the stage for the success of the Axis Powers. They had demonstrated that the jealousies and mistrust between nations which prevent them uniting against a common aggressor provide a fertile field for selfish, well-armed robber nations to dispose of them piecemeal and at will.

These men remembered the debacle following the last war, when the might and wealth of America, thrown into Europe at the time of the crisis, determined the outcome of the war. They remembered that after victory the American soldiers marched home again, leaving the problems which had precipitated the war unsettled. They remembered that President Wilson pleaded for international cooperation as the only method of avoiding future conflict. They could not forget that America was deaf to his warnings; that, tired of war and foreign involvements, deluded by a false sense of security and self-sufficiency, we decided to let Europe go hang and tend to our own knitting. We saw the reflection of our individualism in the nationalism of every capital of the world, until finally war clouds loomed again and the countries once allies were now too far apart and suspicious of one another to band together to dispel them. When war came they formed the Citizens for Victory, determined that this hideous mistake should not be again committed. They banded together into an organization which sought to influence public opinion by education and which supported candidates for national office whom they felt, either because of their political professions or their past records, would work for maximum cooperation for a total victory and a permanent and just peace. By doing this they felt that they were doing their best to prevent a recurrence of a Third World War.

The membership of the Citizens for Victory Committee is in no sense politically partisan. It is composed of members of both political parties.

It is in no sense an internationalist organization except that it believes that a sovereign America must make and keep peace with other sovereign nations of the world.

It is in no sense an organization devoted to the destruction of the legislative body of our Government nor to the promotion of bureaucratic control.

It never, as was charged, attacked the majority of the Members of Congress but, on the other hand, published and disseminated its ideals and purposes and circulated the voting records upon important bills of those seeking reelection.

It is in no sense a communistic organization but rather a typical cross section of America. Among the members of its executive committee and honorary vice chairmen are such well known Americans as Rev. Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, executive secretary of the Church Peace Union and a member of the Federal Council of Churches; Douglas Auchincloss, associated with Time, Life, and Fortune magazines; Col. Henry Breckenridge, formerly Assistant Secretary of War; Ellsworth Bunker, president of National Sugar Refining Co.; Walter Millis of the editorial staff of the New York Herald Tribune; William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; Chester Rowell, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle; W. W. Waymack, editor of Des Moines Register and Recorder; William Allen White, editor of the Emporia Gazette, who may be called the dean of American newspapermen.

These men are not communists. Their opposition to the Axis commenced neither when Russia was invaded nor when Pearl Harbor was attacked. They have always been anti-Axis.

Now, to discuss details, Clark M. Eichelberger is not the directing genius of any purge groups as is charged, but he is executive director of the League of Nations Association. Incidentally, he has not been identified with Citizens for Victory since August 1942.

The next innuendo in the address of the gentleman from Texas concerns Frederick C. McKee, treasurer of Citizens for Victory. I have known Mr. McKee well for several years. The slur upon his name concerns me personally and it has largely prompted me to publish this refutation. Frederick C. McKee is one of the leading citizens of Pittsburgh. He represents the ideal of a man whose practical business sense has placed him in a prominent position in our business life, yet whose concern for the public welfare and unselfish devotion to his country consumes a large portion of his time and takes him away from his livelihood. I did not know until recently whether Mr. McKee was a Democrat or a Republican. I have known ever since I have had the privilege of his acquaintance that he is in the highest sense patriotic and devoted to the future of his country. I, personally, have been in accord with his convictions as to America's place in the world. They are substantially the same that are held by our President and our able Secretary of State, among others of the Democratic Party and they are similar to those held by Governor Stassen, Wendell Willkie and many prominent Republicans, including one of my own friends from Pittsburgh, James H. Duff, the newly appointed Attorney General of Pennsylvania. You may disagree with his convictions and you may do so honestly, but you cannot doubt their sincerity or his unselfishness. Some sarcasm can be noted in the gentleman's address in his statement that Mr. McKee is treasurer of the National Casket Co., which he is. The gentleman likewise says that he is secretary of this company. This is not true. I do not think it is disparaging to a man's patriotism that he is an official of a successful business concern. Neither do I think that success in business justified an inference of un-Americanism or communistic leanings. I do not think that many Members of the House will think the less of Mr. McKee for his business connections with a reputable and well-known industry.

The gentleman states that Jay Lovestone is one of the highest paid officials of the Citizens for Victory Committee and that he was formerly secretary to the Communist Party in the United States. Mr. Lovestone is not an official but an employee of the labor division of the Citizens for Victory. He was a Communist. He severed his affiliation 14 years ago and has since been outstanding in his hostility to communistic principles. It is interesting to compare his case with that of J. B. Matthews, research director of the Dies committee. Mr. Matthews was a party worker for the Communists until 1935. This is verified in his own book, The Autobiography of a Fellow Traveller. By his own admission his life until 1935 was largely devoted to the promotion of Communist front organizations.

The gentleman is again in error when he states that most of the officials who made up the Citizens for Victory are also in the Union for Democratic Action. There are 36 members of the executive board and honorary vice presidents in the Citizens for Victory. Only 1 of these who had never been active in Citizens for Victory, is also a member of the Union for Democratic Action.

To repeat, Citizens for Victory does not wish to discredit Congress nor to hamper it. It seeks only a total victory over the enemy in this war and a lasting peace after the war.

The gentleman from Texas quotes from the New York Herald Tribune a full page advertisement headed "Help stop votes for Hitler."

I have read the insertion and there is no suggestion therein that any Member of Congress sympathizes with Hitler or wishes him to be victorious. Citizens for Victory was of the opinion that every vote, no matter how pure and praiseworthy its motive, that was cast against preparedness, against lend-lease, and against fullest cooperation with our allies to win a total victory was a vote cast which helped Hitler. As I said before, you may disagree with these principles but there is nothing in them which

suggests a discrediting of the United States Congress or an attempt to establish either communism or bureaucracy in the United States.

I think that I have shown that in many instances the gentleman from Texas incorrectly stated the facts. What I am concerned with more than these misstatements is the more insidious effect which the gentleman achieved by including a praiseworthy and patriotic organization together with other allegedly communistic organizations without attempting to differentiate between them in the minds of his listeners. The gentleman cited several Federal employees whom he accuses of communistic utterances. He cited several public groups and publications that he accuses of communistic tendencies. He also discusses Citizens for Victory without, it is true, making any direct accusation of communism against this organization, but with the inevitable effect of linking Citizens for Victory with the other groups.

No one could listen to the gentleman's address without carrying away the idea that Citizens for Victory was, if not communistic, "pinkish" and very radical. This innuendo is unfair to decent, patriotic, responsible American citizens, and I think that the gentleman from Texas, one of the most persuasive orators of the House, has sufficient knowledge of the effect of his rhetoric upon his listeners that he should have been scrupulous in avoiding this imputation. I do not know whether his other statements are accurate. I suspect that some may not be. I do not choose to discuss them, as I stated in the beginning, because I do not have the facts to either controvert his charges or support them. I will, however, scrutinize very carefully these statements in view of his rash and intemperate remarks about Citizens for Victory.

The gentleman complains about intolerance in this country as manifested against those of southern birth. I can assure the gentleman and also the Members of this House I certainly have no such prejudice or ill feeling. Toward those from the South whom I have had the privilege of friendship I have the highest esteem and the warmest affection. As to others with whom I have but a speaking acquaintance, I might say that there is no group of people in this country for whose honor and patriotism I have a higher regard than I have for our southern Representatives.

When the votes were being counted prior to Pearl Harbor upon issues whose decision affected the safety of the entire world and the future of our own country, it was to the votes of these southern Members that America must feel grateful for assuring to us a foreign policy of honor, bravery, and international decency. I shall never forget the part that was played in the House by these gentlemen from the South. But I wish to state at this time that while the South was united for aid to the democracies we had no such union in the North and that the men who now compose the Citizens for Victory fought valiantly in our northern cities for the same cause which was supported almost to a man by the southern Members of the House.

I feel a debt of gratitude likewise to Citizens for Victory for their share in preserving our civilization. It is for this reason that I take the floor today to repel this imputation of un-Americanism, of hostility to Congress, of communistic leanings which have been made against this worthy group.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. McCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COURTNEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 1648, the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, 1944, had come to no resolution thereon.

## TO AMEND THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 99) for printing in the RECORD:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PLOESER was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

## PERSONAL PLEDGES

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, as I step for the first time into the Well of this assembly, there comes to me quite naturally a feeling of elation. That feeling, however, is tempered by one of gratitude and responsibility—gratitude to the people of my district who, through their confidence and support, made it possible for me to be here; and responsibility to the people of my Nation to carry on the ideals and principles of this great Government of ours—principles, many of which were laid down by men who once stood in this very Chamber, men who have long since passed to their reward, but men whose words and deeds shall ever be woven as golden threads in the fabric of American history.

We wonder as to the type of men who founded this Government of ours. So let us press aside for a moment that mysterious veil of yesterday and gaze backward down those long corridors of time into a dim and almost forgotten past. Let us parade upon the field of recollection those gallant men and women who gave their all that you and I might be a free and independent people. As they pass in review, those men who once stood in this Hall where we now stand, we are brought to the realization that you and I can take but little credit for what America is today. America of tomorrow is our problem. The law of life decrees that the torch of progress shall slip from the palsied fingers of age to be caught and borne aloft by the supple strength of youth, ever onward, ever upward, ever seeking to improve, that our America of tomorrow shall be greater than our America of today.

America is great not because of its mighty mountains, its beautiful rivers, its silent valleys, but rather it is great because it mattered not to the founding fathers of this great free land of ours whether they were merchant, prince, or laborer—their hopes and ambitions for their children were the same. The goal in life which the pioneer set for himself and because of lack of opportunity or lack of education he failed to attain, he wanted to see attained by his children, and there was no sacrifice too great for the pioneer dad and mother to make in their efforts to extend to their children the educational and other advantages which in so many instances they themselves were denied. Their hopes were in their children, and today history repeats, for again the future of America rests upon youthful shoulders; even as you and I assemble here, American sons, your sons and mine, are fighting upon the world's far-flung battlefields, fighting to preserve the liberties created within these very halls, fighting to preserve the liberties for which their forefathers died, while American daughters are filling many of the posts in munitions and other vital industries left vacant by American sons now on the battlefields.

A few short months ago those boys were with us. They are the same boys who were taught by American mothers to look toward heaven with smiling, trusting faces as the place from whence all blessings came, but today those boys look toward heaven with apprehension and anger, for from the heavens come bombers that rain death and destruction on them as they march through war's flaming hell.

We in America had prayed that war would never again come to this great free land of ours, for when we older folks think of war we remember 1917. It seems but yesterday that we stood in awed silence as Old Glory passed, held aloft by those stalwart sons of America. We heard the roll of drums and the echoing tramp of millions of marching feet as the legions of America marched off to war. We remember that the sky

above our cities glowed red with the reflected fury of mighty blast furnaces as they poured liquid molten metal into flasks and molds casting munitions of war. We remember that the very earth beneath our feet trembled with each driving smash of mighty trip hammers as the forges of America wrought guns and armaments for American troops. We remember that then, as today, the men and women on the farms worked from dawn to dusk to provide the food for our soldiers, and that down in the pits the miners worked long, weary hours wresting from mother earth the metals and coal so vital to the success of our troops. We remember the armistice and how the Nation, wild with joy, welcomed our returning soldiers, but folks, they did not all return, and today in America there are more than 100,000 dads and mothers whose hearts are heavy, for down through the years there comes to each of them the memory of a tousled-headed baby boy that once crawled across their kitchen floor. They remember him when he was just tall enough to stand on tiptoe and reach on the table and grasp at his daddy's pipe. They remember how they toddled him on their knee and taught him to love his country and to revere its flag and the things for which it stood. They remember how he came home in the evening from the little school and excitedly told of the lessons in history and of the patriots who had gone beyond. They remember how proud they were as he marched away in uniform, and they remember the telegram that came from their Government telling them that he would never again return, for their boy sleeps today and until eternity beneath a whited cross upon the battlefields of France.

He laid his life upon the altar of democracy in a war which he was told was to end all wars. He gave his life upon the battlefields of Europe, where the hatred of the classes of divided people have flared incessantly since the dawn of history. Today millions of American boys are following in that boy's footsteps, boys who are being told again that they are fighting a war to end all wars. The responsibility for those boys is upon our shoulders, even as it rested upon the shoulders of Congress a quarter of a century ago and a century and a half ago.

The spirits of American statesmen hover over this assembly, and by reviewing their lives we find a pattern that shapes our own destiny. They were men of action, men of honor, and men whose every act was motivated by the love of liberty and of country. They were men who were taught by American mothers at the family hearthstone that America was a land of opportunity and that no height was too great for any American to reach. They were men who were taught that individual initiative and a willingness to work would overcome all things and that sweat was the only cure for economic ills. They were men who were taught that public office was a public trust, that the Supreme Court was akin to holy and that the Constitution of the United States was sacred and should be held inviolate by every true American, no matter how high or how low his station in life.

Those men have passed forever. The curtain of time has forever closed the portals of their tombs. The mantle of authority has been transferred from their shoulders to yours and mine. Our duty is to carry on and preserve the type of government that made America great, the type of government that permitted the progress which during 150 years has placed America upon the pinnacle of world domination; the type of government built by incentive, ingenuity, and initiative; the type of government built by men who hewed an empire from a wilderness and who realized that nothing of any value was ever produced that was not the result of the sweat and toil of men's hands.

In acknowledgment of this duty I accept my portion of that responsibility and dedicate my efforts as a Member in Congress toward the preservation of the ideals of these revered statesmen, and to them as an American, standing where they once stood, I make the following pledge:

First. I pledge that I shall dedicate my efforts toward the saving of the "four freedoms" in this Nation before I attempt to guarantee them to the entire world.

Second. I pledge that I shall not permit the shimmering mirage of the Atlantic Charter to dim the brilliance of our own charter—the Constitution of these United States.

Third. I pledge that I shall oppose any additional grants of congressional power being removed from the Congress, as I would consider such action an open admission on my part that I did not feel competent to perform the duties of the office to which I was elected.

Fourth. I pledge that I shall support the proposed plan of building an army of 10,000,000 men only when it is proved that such an army would not place our Nation in the condition of the steamboat in Abe Lincoln's famous story which carried a whistle so large that each time they blew the whistle it used all the steam and stopped the boat.

Fifth. I pledge that I shall investigate the equity of our expenditure of $97,000,000,000 for the war effort in 1943 as against $21,000,000,000 expenditure by England during the same period, and shall base my final action upon my findings as to the respective ability to pay.

Sixth. I pledge that in voting funds for lend-lease I shall bear in mind the statement of Winston Churchill, who said, "I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire," and would inform him that neither do I intend, as a Member of this Congress, to bring about through bankruptcy the dissolution of these United States.

Seventh. I pledge that I shall check carefully all post-war plans which tend to create a fanciful Utopia among all nations, as history has taught us that in Europe the classes of divided people have fought incessantly since the dawn of history and will, in my opinion, continue until the end of time.

Eighth. I pledge that I shall endeavor to be tolerant at all times and shall support, without partisan bias, any measure I deem beneficial to public interest, regardless of its sponsorship, and by the same token shall oppose any legislation submitted by any bloc or clique, whether agricultural, industrial, or labor, that I do not consider to be for the best interest of a majority of the people.

Ninth. I pledge that I shall support only that tax legislation which is based upon the ability to pay and not that which is based on the idea of preventing the public from having money and shall oppose any measure masquerading under the pretext of sopping up surplus income to prevent inflation, as I consider such measures nothing more nor less than a deliberate and subtle attempt to bankrupt American individuals and American business.

Tenth. I pledge that I shall support any equitable agricultural program that does not advocate reduction or scarcity, as the law of economics has ever taught us that you cannot get something for nothing, and America must never go hungry.

Eleventh. I pledge that I shall not expand, by my vote, Government control of business, as I frankly believe that America is great today not because of Federal restrictions and regulations imposed upon business, but because of the 150 years of freedom enjoyed by American enterprise.

Twelfth. I pledge that I shall not support any legislation the intention of which, in my opinion, is to destroy business through taxation but shall vote to permit business to retain sufficient funds to meet adversities, ever bearing in mind the wisdom of the age-old story of the 7 fat years and the 7 lean ones.

Thirteenth. I pledge that I shall pursue a course dictated by my honest convictions, fully realizing that independent thought and action on the part of any public official is a badge that marks him as a target for the slimy pen of every demagogue with whom he disagrees.

Fourteenth. I pledge that when the war is won and the peace is ours I shall work tirelessly to remove from American business and the American public every shackle of Government control imposed upon them during the war period, so that our country and its people may return to normalcy and resume its march of progress which during 150 years has placed our country on the pinnacle of world domination.

Mr. Speaker, to this type of government, a government perpetuated by the consent of the governed, I pledge my feeble and untiring efforts, and as an American I ask only that history record of me that I had but one prayer—that this Government of ours, this great citadel of freedom, may stand forever as living, throbbing proof that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" has not perished from this earth.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. GROSS, for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

To Mr. McGREGOR (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio), for 1 week, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 4, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, February 4, 1943. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 1012, "To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes."

There will be a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Friday, February 5, 1943. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 649, "For the organization and functions of the Public Health Service."

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet at 10:30 a. m. Friday, February 5, 1943, in room 356, House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

138. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office amounting to $29.46 (H. Doc. No. 79); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

139. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $12,275.42 (H. Doc. No. 80); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

140. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a judgment rendered by the Court of Claims which has been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for payment amounting to $5,287,615.10 (H. Doc. No. 81); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

141. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States district courts as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department and which requires appropriations of $45,516.47 (H. Doc. No. 82); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

142. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the United States Coast Guard in the sum of $1,586.79 (H. Doc. No. 83); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

143. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the Navy, in the sum of $4,134.06 (H. Doc. No. 84); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

144. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damages due to military operations amounting to $2,701.85 (H. Doc. No. 85); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

145. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which have been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for their payment, amounting to $702,694.86 (H. Doc. No. 86); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

146. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Children's Bureau, Department of Labor, for the fiscal year 1943, in the amount of $1,200,000 (H. Doc. No. 87); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

147. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 88); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

148. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a schedule of claims amounting to $722,514.58, allowed by the General Accounting Office (H. Doc. No. 89); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

149. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, in the sum of $73,094.37 (H. Doc. No. 90); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

150. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1943 in the amount of $175,000 (H. Doc. No. 91); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

151. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition's East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

152. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all the facts in cases of certain aliens deportation which has been suspended for more than 6 months (H. Doc. No. 92); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and ordered printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 801. A bill to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 99. Resolution for consideration of S. 158, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 90). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1669. A bill to repeal the provisions of law authorizing the construction of a navigable barge canal across Florida; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 1670. A bill to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 1671. A bill to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1672. A bill to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1673. A bill to authorize the erection of a Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital and domiciliary facility in eastern Pennsylvania; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 1674. A bill to restore to active duty certain retired officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1675. A bill to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1676. A bill to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 1677 (by request). A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1678 (by request). A bill to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 1679. A bill to promote flood control in the basin of the Republican River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 1680. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1681. A bill to authorize deportation of aliens of countries allied with the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. Res. 98. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation with respect to contemplated requirements with respect to the labeling, production, marketing, and distribution of articles and commodities; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1682. A bill for the relief of Edwin H. Taylor, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 1683. A bill for the relief of Clay Long Edwards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1684. A bill for the relief of Frank P. Hoyt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1685. A bill for the relief of Eva C. Netzley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estate of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

73. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of sundry citizens of Marshalltown, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

74. By Mr. SCHWABE: Petition of Roscoe Enloe Post, No. 5, the American Legion, Jefferson City, Mo., urging that funds be appropriated for the resumption of medical and hospital obstetric and pediatric care for the families of the men in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

75. By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of Joseph Gotkin and 37 other citizens of Tucson, Ariz., asking support of a pharmacy corps in the United States Army, such as proposed in House bill 7432 and Senate bill 2690 of the Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

76. By Mr. ROLPH: Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 of the State of California, relative to petitioning Hon. Claude E. Wickard to alleviate the food shortage resulting from increased population in the State; to the Committee on Agriculture.

# SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet may go and the humblest work will shine and the roughest places be made plain.

Help us to be valiant pilgrims on life's dusty and dreary way, mindful of the fret and jar which any words or deeds of ours may bring to fellow travelers by our side. Deliver us from unlovely self-conceit. Make us forgiving and forbearing, gentle with others' failings and grateful for others' favors, remembering that the time for loving and serving is so short as the night cometh and swift to its close ebbs out life's little day. Teach us to toil and ask not for reward save that of knowing we do the things that please Thee. So upon our passing days may there rest the benediction of a faith that dares, a love that cares, and a service that shares, until by Thy grace we find ourselves by hands familiar welcomed into the Father's house, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 1, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to an order of the Senate, the Chair designates the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] to read Washington's Farewell Address on the 22d instant.

REGENT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to section 5581 of the Revised Statutes, the Chair reappoints the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] as a regent of the Smithsonian Institution.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under authority of Senate Resolution 66, authorizing the appointment of five additional members of the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, the Chair appoints as additional members of that special committee the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK].

DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA—NOTICE OF HEARING OF NOMINATION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., of Oklahoma, to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Friday, February 12, 1943, at 10:20 a. m., has been set for a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee room on this nomination. At that time and place all interested parties may make representations to the committee.

JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT—NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Charles D. Lawrence, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Friday, February 12, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., has been set for a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee room on this nomination. At that time and place all interested parties may make representations to the committee.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII—NOTICE OF HEARING OF NOMINATION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of J. Frank McLaughlin, of Hawaii, to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Friday, February 12, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., has been set for a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee room on this nomination. At that time and place all interested parties may make representations to the committee.

OPERATIONS UNDER FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION BY EMERGENCY RELIEF APPROPRIATION ACTS, 1942 AND 1943

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1943, I present herewith a report of the operations under funds appropriated to the Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration, by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts, fiscal years 1942 and 1943, to the end of the calendar year 1942.

This report is supplemental to that portion of the report presented by me to the Congress on January 11, 1943, which is related to operations to the end of the fiscal year 1942 under funds appropriated to the Work Projects Administration by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, and for fiscal years 1941 and 1942.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 30, 1943.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report giving all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 234 aliens whose deportation he suspended for more than 6 months, together with a statement of the reason for such suspensions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST INCIDENT TO EMERGENCY EVACUATION OF UNITED STATES ANTARCTIC SERVICE EXPEDITION'S EAST BASE, ANTARCTICA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition's East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT OF BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH IN THE FIELD OF TRANSPORTATION

A letter from the chairman and members of the Board of Investigation and Research, Washington, D. C., stating that circumstances

had delayed completion of its study and report on interterritorial freight rates and that the report will be submitted at a later date; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

IDA F. BRAUN ET AL. AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 270 (75th Cong.), a certified copy of the findings of fact, conclusion of law, and opinion in the case of Ida F. Braun, Alice Braun Menges, and Carl J. Braun, individually, and as executors of the estate of Hedgwig W. Braun, deceased, and as legatees and beneficiaries of the will of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as sole parties in interest by succession under the last will and testament of Herman W. Braun, deceased, versus the United States, Congressional No. 17749 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO.

A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

A letter from the President of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of the business of that company, together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## SENATOR FROM TENNESSEE—PETITION OF JOHN RANDOLPH NEAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of John Randolph Neal, Knox County, Tenn., praying that the Senate allow him to contest the election of TOM STEWART to the office of United States Senator and to produce proof substantiating the various charges and allegations made in the petition; that TOM STEWART be not allowed to hold the office of United States Senator, but that the petitioner, John Randolph Neal, be declared rightfully entitled to such office, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the city of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the enactment of pending legislation for the preservation of the home of George Washington Carver as a national shrine; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Whereas war and world conditions have placed upon all industries a great challenge, involving maximum production to meet the needs of our armed forces and those of our allies; and

"Whereas the production of food is of the greatest importance, and because of depleted manpower on our farms, lack of farm machinery, unfavorable priority rulings, and inability to compete in labor markets, agriculture is unable to meet the demands now made upon it;

"Therefore we respectfully submit the following facts setting forth the position of agriculture:

"(1) Milk, butter, cheese, meat, poultry, and vegetables are vital war foods of which there is now a shortage;

"(2) These are the foods which require a comparatively large amount of manpower in man-hours of work to produce;

"(3) They require skilled labor on a year-round basis as contrasted to peak harvest time and seasonal demands;

"(4) The manpower on the farms of Minnesota has already been seriously depleted;

"(a) Thousands of men have gone into our armed forces;

"(b) A considerable number of Minnesota farm laborers have gone into defense industries;

"(c) This transition of labor has been brought on in part by the prevailing high wages and overtime paid in these defense industries;

"(d) Farmers cannot compete with the prevailing high wages thus paid;

"(e) This automatically results in shortage of farm labor as well as a reduction in manpower hours for the Nation as a whole;

"(5) Since we are collectively engaged in a common struggle of winning the war, we urge that we share the sacrifices of the soldiers at the front, by foregoing special privileges whether we be laborers in the war industries or producers on the farms; that our loyalty and patriotism should find expression in a willingness to work longer hours, to the end that production may be intensified and the war quickly won;

"(6) Inasmuch as farm labor must be experienced and specialized, the general solution of the farm labor problem, therefore, can partially be solved by the release of men from our armed forces and defense industries who are experienced in farm labor;

"(7) The farm-labor problem can be further solved by release of essential farm machinery, repairs, and repairing material, which is a direct step toward replacing necessary man-hours on the farm. Much of the red tape now required by the Government at Washington should be eliminated and more authority delegated to the local agencies to handle these problems;

"(8) Electricity being a fundamental factor in increasing production on our farms, we urge that the War Production Board modify existing regulations that will permit the use of materials supplying electricity to farmers along existing lines;

"The above analysis of our farm problems coupled with a profound desire to do everything in our power to aid our Government in promoting policies most urgent to achieve victory in war, and after the war, to aid in reconstruction, prompts the Legislature of the State of Minnesota to urgently resolve that the Congress of the United States give immediate attention to these most pressing problems involving agriculture as well as the well-being of our entire Nation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we earnestly petition the President and Congress of the United States and all other national agencies concerned, to immediately correct these existing conditions as set forth in this resolution, adversely affecting agriculture in Minnesota, and thus hampering our efforts to sustain our Nation with food supplies; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we do earnestly petition the President and Congress of the United States specifically to bring to the attention of the War Manpower Commission and Selective Service the existing plight of agriculture, to the end that the present policies of these agencies be immediately modified so as to prevent further depletion of skilled farm labor and the consequent impairment of necessary food supply."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Hardtner, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor sales and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas hospitalization has been provided for veterans of all wars regardless of origin or nature of the disability; and

"Whereas veterans discharged from the present world conflict are eligible to hospitalization only in the event they are discharged for disability incurred in line of duty or in receipt of pension for disability incurred in line of duty; and

"Whereas discharged veterans of the present conflict are being denied necessary immediate hospitalization because of the requirements of the present laws under which the Veterans' Administration now operates: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America to take such action as is necessary and required to correct present inequities in Federal statutes pertaining to the hospitalization of war veterans to the end that a veteran of the present conflict discharged on or after December 7, 1941, be considered a veteran of a war and entitled to hospitalization for treatment as indicated or care of any disease or injury, regardless of the nature of origin, when such treatment is required; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Whereas the dehydration of Idaho potatoes on a large scale is essential in order to supply necessary food for our armed forces overseas; and

"Whereas the War Department is prohibited from purchasing dehydrated potatoes from any plant unless and until such plant is approved by the Joint Dehydration Committee of the Agricultural Marketing Administration; and

"Whereas the dehydration plant facilities in the State of Idaho are inadequate for processing all of the available supply of Idaho potatoes for such purposes; and

"Whereas said Joint Dehydration Committee of the Agricultural Marketing Administration has made an arbitrary and unjust ruling in which approval of any additional dehydration plants for the processing of Idaho potatoes is being withheld on the ground that the present plants are using as much of the total production of Idaho potatoes as such Committee deems proper to be diverted to that use, notwithstanding that there is an abundant supply of suitable potatoes available for such use and much time, effort, and expense have been put forth for the establishment of additional plants for processing such potatoes: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America to immediately take such action as may be deemed necessary to broaden and liberalize the administration of the duties of the Federal Joint Dehydration Committee of the Agricultural Marketing Administration so as

to permit the orderly establishment and development of dehydration plants and facilities in order that there may be an increased production of dehydrated potatoes, thus providing a more adequate supply of such product for our armed forces as well as developing a profitable market for Idaho potatoes and increasing the income of the growers of such potatoes and those who may be engaged in the work of processing the same; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to send copies of this memorial to the Honorable John Thomas, the Honorable D. Worth Clark, the Honorable Compton I. White, and the Honorable Henry Dworshak, members of the Idaho delegation in Congress assembled."

### FARM MACHINERY—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a concurrent resolution which has been sent to me by the Legislature of North Dakota, and which, at their request, I read into the RECORD. It is as follows:

Whereas the farmers of North Dakota are preparing to cooperate in the war effort by planting the largest acreage of wartime crops in history; and

Whereas the farm machinery in this State is more than normally in need of repairs and replacement because during the decade of the thirties the financial condition of the farmers did not permit purchases and what crops were raised were used to pay debts, and with plenty of cheap labor available machinery was allowed to wear out, with the result that new machinery purchases in the State of North Dakota in 1937, 1938, and 1939 were less than 50 percent of new machinery sales in the State during the years 1927, 1928, and 1929; and

Whereas restrictions on sales during the past 2 years and the drafting of farm labor has created an urgent need for labor-saving machinery especially for cultivating, haying, and harvesting purposes; and

Whereas there is a shortage of blacksmiths and mechanics as well as welding materials and supplies; and

Whereas the manufacture and distribution of labor-saving farm machinery is a slow process; and

Whereas farmers of this State must have immediate information on the harvesting facilities that will be made available before they dare plant 1943 crops on the scale needed for winning the war: Be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota assembled at Bismarck that, Congress and the appropriate Federal agency and directors should take immediate action as follows:

1. That farm machinery manufacturers who are equipped to build and distribute large labor-saving farm machinery be immediately ordered to proceed to construct additional quantities of machinery, particularly the cultivating, haying, and harvesting types.

2. That the present program of accelerating the release of repairs and parts be continually stressed.

3. That the remaining blacksmiths and mechanics be allowed adequate iron, steel, and welding supplies and materials for repairing farm machinery.

4. That the farmers of North Dakota be given immediate, definite, and final assurance of just what they may depend upon in the way of machinery for 1943; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent immediately air mail to Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; Henry L. Wallace, Vice President; Donald L. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board; George L. Gillette, chairman of the Farm Equipment Machinery Division of the War Production Board; to the Secretary of Agriculture; and to the Senators and Congressmen from the State of North Dakota.

I ask that the concurrent resolution be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

### A DECLARATION OF WAR BY THE UNARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—PETITION

Mr. BROOKS. There has been presented to me by Mr. Edwin B. Moran, president of the Rotary Club of Chicago, a petition containing the signatures of 9,154 Chicago citizens. It is stated that other Rotary Clubs have secured hundreds of signatures. The Kiwanians of the United States have also obtained 50,000 additional signatures.

These signatures are not only those of Rotarians and Kiwanians as employers but those of many thousands of employees and executives, both men and women, who are not members of service club organizations. They are a cross section of citizens from labor, management, and the professions. They have all signed as citizens.

This petition and accompanying declaration is the idea of the son of a Chicago Rotarian. His father promised, when the lad left for war, that he would do what he could to keep the home fires burning toward maintaining the liberties of the American people. The ideas of his son and himself are embodied in "A Declaration of War by the Unarmed Forces of the United States of America."

I request that the petition or declaration be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and appropriately referred, because I believe the subject to be of importance to members of this body.

There being no objection, the petition or declaration was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

More than 2,000,000 American young men have gone to war. They have set aside their hopes and dreams. They have left comfortable homes. Postponed careers. Declared a moratorium on life.

Turned abruptly from the ways of peace—they are now digging ditches, building roads, peeling potatoes, swabbing decks, emptying garbage, drilling, training, learning to shoot. We may thank our lucky stars they don't have to learn to die. They are Americans. They just don't like being kicked around.

They went cheerfully—went where they were sent, and no questions asked. Rich and poor. Republicans and Democrats. Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Gentiles, white and colored. Wealth, position, religion, color, politics—these don't matter when the question is one of freedom or slavery.

There are no limitations on the hours these boys work now. No rules decide their pay. They've got a grim, tough job to do, and they're doing it like men.

They're learning things every day—these boys we say we cherish. Learning a lot of things we should know, but stupidly refuse to admit.

They're learning that courage alone is a thin weapon against Axis planes and tanks.

They're learning the tragedy of losing for want of a few extra bombers in the right place at the right time.

They're learning the brutal, bloody cost of haggling and arguing and debating and stalling while our sons die.

We stood on the curb as they left. We cheered. We went with them to the station and shed a few tears. We drove home in our cars to warm firesides. Then in a week or two we stormed the stores when the demand for cloth to clothe them removed the cuffs from our pants.

In God's name, America, let's be men at least as big as our sons.

We are the unarmed forces of the United States. No one of us is without responsibility or duty.

While we haggle over an hour of overtime our sons are being slaughtered.

We live our comfortable lives back of the ramparts they watch. If they fail, there will be no life, but slow, living death.

Our supreme duty—our only duty—is to deliver to these young men the planes, tanks, guns, and ships they need. Deliver them at top speed and work as many hours making them as they willingly work using them.

They are out there now. Waiting with the coming of each dawn. And for their courage, their bravery, their sacrifice, they've asked just one thing of us—"Don't let us down."

This is our unequivocal answer—we whose names appear below. We declare war. War on partisanship. War on all political intrigue. War on special privilege. War on blindness and bickering.

We demand that every citizen of the United States, in or out of Government, in or out of management, in or out of labor, shall exert every human effort toward the production of war munitions and supplies in maximum quantity at maximum speed and at minimum cost.

As a sacred duty to our armed forces and to the Government and the people, we, the unarmed forces, declare war on all swollen salaries, dividends, bonus payments, or profits on war contracts for munitions or supplies in excess of profits made in peacetime under conditions of full and free competition. And we demand full and detailed public exposure of all violations.

We declare war on all rules, regulations, or agreements which may prevent any worker on any war contract for munitions or supplies from working as many hours, or as many days, or as he or she is willing to work, or doing as much work as he or she wants to do to increase production so long as normal health safeguards are maintained. And we demand full and detailed public exposure of organizations and individuals responsible for obstructing production.

We declare war on all acts, or failures to act, by Members of the United States Senate or House of Representatives which permit or encourage representatives of either capital or labor to increase costs or obstruct production on war materials. And we demand full public exposure of any Member of Congress guilty of failure to protect our armed forces and our people against saboteurs of production in either group.

The signers of this declaration of war are not concerned with political partisanship. We are neither for nor against any employer or group nor any group of employees.

We are concerned with action—full, unbridled, speedy action. And we propose to devote ourselves to these tenets as a sacred trust. We promise that when men die needlessly the responsibility shall be firmly placed insofar as it is within our ability to place it.

To our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States—to the armed forces and the people—we pledge ourselves to this unalterable view for the duration of this war.

### RESOLUTIONS OF COMANCHE COUNTY (KANS.) FARM BUREAU

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have just received a copy of resolutions

adopted by the Comanche County (Kans.) Farm Bureau, at its twenty-fourth annual meeting at Coldwater, Kans. Inasmuch as these resolutions are written and approved directly by farmers themselves, they may be regarded as actual farmer sentiment. I believe the Senate may find them of interest for that reason.

These resolutions point out that—

First. Farmers will have to have prices allowing them to compete, comparably, with war industries if they are to obtain necessary help to produce needed foods.

Second. Farm boys should be encouraged to remain on the farm until drafted, and feel they are performing as patriotic service there as in what are called "essential war industries."

Third. Farmers need new farm machinery and, even more, they need repair parts, and need them now.

Fourth. Immediate steps should be taken to release materials for needed wire fence staples, nails for minor but necessary farm repair and maintenance jobs.

Fifth. The meat shortage is going to be much worse unless protein supplement for livestock feeding is made available. "The need for this feed is now, and not a month from now," say the Comanche County farmers.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD in full at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the duly appointed resolutions committee, after having considered the general letter of G. M. GILLETTE, United States Senator from Iowa, and GEORGE D. AIKEN, United States Senator from Vermont, dated January 6, 1943, in which they discuss what they term several major questions that are still unanswered and that must be answered before farmers generally can obtain the maximum of production on their individual farms, state that the sentiment of this committee with reference to said questions is as follows:

1. It is the sentiment of this group that we express an appreciation to the President of the United States for his interest in farm mobilization and setting a date for same. We also express our appreciation to Senators GILLETTE and AIKEN for sending out their letter of inquiry concerning farm mobilization.

2. As to the labor problem, we feel that we as farmers must receive such prices for our marketed products as will enable us to compete with the wages offered in industry and other defense work. One way to accomplish this would be to raise the price ceilings on farm commodities. We feel that this will not materially tend to inflation as labor prices increased 113 percent from 1935 to 1939, while living costs for the same period increased less than half of this figure.

3. We think the farm-labor situation could be greatly helped if the boys now on the farm of the ages 17, 18, and 19 years could be convinced that they are rendering just as patriotic a service by remaining on the farm and supporting the men already in the service as they would be if they themselves were in the service. We feel that this frame of mind would be greatly cultivated if the farm boys had the assurance that they would not be drafted in some line of the service that does not appeal to them. Or to be more specific, if when they are given a deferred classification they would be assured that it would continue and we suggest that some form of formal recognition should be given to such boys.

4. We think that in the matter of farm machinery, we need some new machinery but the drastic need is an increased supply of repairs to be made available immediately. The amount of repairs made available should be at least 100 percent more than in former years. In this part of the country the demand for increased livestock production makes it absolutely necessary for us to have new machines, such as binders and field cutters, for harvesting our feed crops which must be produced and harvested with this equipment if we are to meet our livestock-the drastic need is an increased supply of equipment for this purpose is entirely inadequate.

5. We further state that immediate steps should be taken to release sufficient material for the production of wire-fence staples, nails, and other minor farm repairs needed every day on the farm and used only for necessary repairs. These products have never been and will not be hoarded if the farmers know they will receive sufficient quantities to keep their fences and other equipment in repair to meet their production goals. This lack of fencing materials and other repairs is definitely hampering our agriculture production and immediate steps must be taken to relieve the situation.

6. We also state that the lack of protein supplement for livestock feeding is our most urgent and immediate need. Unless protein feeds are released and placed in the hands of livestock feeders at once our production goals will not be met and our livestock will not be wintered with the usual gain in weight but will go on grass weighing less than normal. The need for this feed is now and not a month from now. These protein feeds must be obtained in the winter when grass and other green pastures are not available. With the big increase in the production of protein feeds in 1942 we feel that some steps can and should be taken to force the release of these feeds for livestock feeding where needed. At the present time it is impossible to purchase these feeds through the regular trade channels.

7. We endorse in full the Kansas State Farm Bureau resolutions as passed at its annual convention in Wichita, Kans., November 5, 6, and 7, 1942.

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF OKLAHOMA—DISTRIBUTION OF GAS, FARM MACHINERY, TRUCKS, AND SO FORTH

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I present a memorial from the State Legislature of Oklahoma. I ask that the memorial be inserted in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The legislature resolution presented by the Senator from Oklahoma will be appropriately referred and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the United States is now at war with Germany, Japan, and Italy; and

Whereas the farmers of America produce in the main, the goods, food, and clothing—three of the outstanding fundamental essentials necessary to carry on and win the war; and

Whereas agriculture is of vital importance to the United Nations as a whole; and

Whereas the President of the United States has declared that the United States shall become an arsenal of democracy and the United States must furnish the world: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the nineteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma and the House of Representatives concurring therein,* That we respectfully petition and memorialize the Congress and the President to enact a sane farm program containing the following pertinent provisions:

First. That the ceiling price of all farm products be set sufficiently high to enable farmers and producers to secure labor at a wage comparable to the wages now being paid common laborers employed in defense and industrial work.

Second. That Congress, the President, and the authorities in control of the manpower program take into consideration the necessity for farm labor and arrange, as far as possible, deferments for draftees called from the farms, to prevent a shortage of farm labor.

Third. That gas rationing and rationing of farm machinery and parts and repairs of farming machinery, including trucks, be furnished liberally to farmers and producers in order that the marketing of products and the other transportation items essential to the farming industry shall not be handicapped nor the production of farm products be curtailed.

Fourth. That the Congress and the President be memorialized and requested to call in representative dirt farmers from all parts of the country and consider with them in order that they may obtain a comprehensive and representative picture of the needs of agriculture; that a like and similar program be established for the livestock industry and for each branch of essential agriculture to the end; that a speedy and all-out victory be won for the United States and United Nations in 1943 or as soon thereafter as possible; be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and the Members of the United States Senate and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Oklahoma.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on the Library:

S. 319. A bill to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes; without amendment.

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. Res. 80. Resolution to continue the investigation relative to the production of industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, and synthetic rubber; without amendment (Rept. No. 31); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 52. A bill for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 32);

S. 167. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Kegel; without amendment (Rept. No. 33);

S. 171. A bill for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke; without amendment (Rept. No. 34); 34);

S. 173. A bill for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann; without amendment (Rept. No. 35);

S. 355. A bill for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 36);

S. 403. A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried

out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida; without amendment (Rept. No. 37);

S 404. A bill for the relief of Richard Barker; without amendment (Rept. No. 38);

S. 405. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ernestine Fuselier Sigler; without amendment (Rept. No. 39);

S. 418. A bill for the relief of Howard M. Sandus; without amendment (Rept. No. 40);

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 41);

S. 493. A bill for the relief of Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez; without amendment (Rept. No. 42);

S. 517. A bill for the relief of Vodie Jackson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 43); and

S. 518. A bill for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom; with amendments (Rept. No. 44).

### CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 60, submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] on January 14, 1943, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 307, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 9, 1940, and Senate Resolution 119, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to June 28, 1941 (providing for an investigation of airplane crashes), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not know that I have any objection. I thought inquiries of the nature of that covered by the resolution were under the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Commerce. Does this resolution relate to a subcommittee or the full committee or a special committee?

Mr. LUCAS. The investigation is being made by a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution of investigation was first referred to the Committee on Commerce, and was reported back by that committee.

Mr. McNARY. That explains the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. The resolution does not provide for any additional appropriation.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 60) was considered and agreed to.

### CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE INVESTIGATION WITH RESPECT TO FUEL IN CERTAIN AREAS WEST OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 61, submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] on January 14, 1943, and ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942 (providing for an investigation with respect to fuel in certain areas west of the Mississippi River), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

### DENIAL TO CERTAIN MUSICIANS OF RIGHTS IN CONNECTION WITH MECHANICAL REPRODUCTION OF MUSIC

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 81, submitted by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] on January 21, 1943, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 286, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 24, 1942 (authorizing an investigation of the action of the American Federation of Musicians in denying its members the right to play or contract for recordings or other forms of mechanical reproduction of music), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

### CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF GASOLINE AND FUEL SHORTAGES

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 28, submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] on January 7, 1943, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 156, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to August 28, 1941, Senate Resolution 189, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 9, 1941, and Senate Resolution 264, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942, providing for an investigation with respect to shortages of gasoline, fuel oil, and other petroleum products and solid fuels, is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

### REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation 3 lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS—NOMINATION OF CLAUDE S. GILLETTE TO BE A REAR ADMIRAL

As in executive session,

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs I report favorably several nominations for the Executive Calendar.

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Howard F. Kingman, May 10, 1942.
Claude S. Gillette, May 13, 1942.
Sherman S. Kennedy, May 13, 1942.
Frank A. Braisted, August 7, 1942.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reports will be received as in executive session, and the nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, through the thoughtful consideration and courtesy of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], I have an opportunity to indicate my very personal interest in one of the nominations which has just been reported. I realize that the nominations would lie over under the rule, but it will be impossible for me to be present in the Senate at the next session, and as one of the names presented is that of my only brother, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, to call the nomination up for consideration at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the request made by the able Senator from Iowa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Claude S. Gillette to be rear admiral in the Navy.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the Senate will understand the pleasure I have in moving that the Senate advise and consent to the advancement of Claude S. Gillette to the grade of rear admiral, United States Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer and/or promotion in the Regular Army; and

Sundry second lieutenants of the Army of the United States, who graduated from the United States Military Academy on January 19, 1943, for appointment in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law.

### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 625. A bill for the relief of A. C. Blount and Oscar Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 626. A bill for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle;

S. 627. A bill for the relief of Mike Chetkovich; and

S. 628. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Anthony, R. E. Murphy, Mary E. Armstrong, and R. E. Murphy, as administrator of the estate of Ella Murphy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 629. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Minnesota to such State for use for park, recreational, or wildlife-refuge purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 630. A bill to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the district court for the middle district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 631. A bill for the relief of William R. Tipton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 632. A bill for the relief of Henry Angell; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 633. A bill granting a pension to Grace L. Pierson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 634. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to bestow the Silver Star upon Michael J. Quinn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 635. A bill to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 636. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 637. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 638 (by request). A bill to amend section 321 of the Transportation Act of 1940 with respect to the character of military or naval property of the United States which may be transported at reduced rates; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 639. A bill to provide for the punishment of certain hostile acts against the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 640. A bill to establish official checking accounts with the Treasurer of the United States for clerks of United States courts and United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 641. A bill to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers;

S. 642. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

S. 643. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 644. A bill providing for the removal of local superintendents; and providing for the manner of calling elections; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 645. A bill to clarify the employment status of special-delivery messengers in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 646. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to the control of rents; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 647. A bill to provide for separation from the armed forces of men whose services would be more valuable to the war effort in certain essential civilian activities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 648. A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Norcutt; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 649. A bill to promote flood control in the basin of the Republican River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 650. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "To further extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak."; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 651. A bill to amend the act of April 27, 1916, establishing the Army and Navy Medal of Honor Roll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 652. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter; and

S. 653. A bill for the relief of Johnny Newton Strickland; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 654. A bill to establish a Chiropody (Podiatry) Corps in the Medical Corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 655. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a medical academy for training persons for service as commissioned officers in the medical branches of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 656. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Herbert R. W. Lauterbach, and others, for overtime labor performed at the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., in excess of the legal day of 8 hours; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 657. A bill for the relief of James L. Hill; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. TAFT introduced Senate bill 658, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 659. A bill prohibiting loss of retired pay to certain persons who accept essential employment during the present war; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 660. A bill to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 661. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Donna Pittel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 662. A bill to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes;

S. 663. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes";

S. 664. A bill to grant pensions to certain unremarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905; and

S. 665. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of July 30, 1942, Public Law 690, Seventy-seventh Congress, to provide increases of pension payable to dependents of veterans of the Regular Establishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the first day of each new year as Good Neighbor Day for the purpose of setting an example of neighborliness on the first day of the year, to serve as an inspiration and a standard for all the days to follow—leading to better relations at home, in all the Americas, and throughout the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ELVA BIRCH DAVIS

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I submit a resolution in behalf of the daughter of one of the employees of the Senate who passed away recently.

The resolution (S. Res. 89) was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Elva Birch Davis, daughter of Robert R. Birch, late an employee of the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

E. E. MOECKEL

Mr. STEWART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 90), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to E. E. Moeckel, of Washington, D. C., the sum of $69.75 as compensation for stenographically reporting hearings held before Members of the Senate on October 9, 1942, relating to the use of rayon instead of cotton in the manufacture of automobile tires, and furnishing a transcript of such hearings.

UNITED NATIONS POST-WAR PEACE CHARTER

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 91), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*Resolved*, That the Senate approves the program of purposes and principles embodied in Joint Declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, and known as the Atlantic Charter.

That the Senate advises and urges the President of the United States to take early action to initiate, formulate, and make a joint treaty agreement with each and all of the United Nations subscribing to a joint declaration dated January 1, 1942, to wit:

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, El Savador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, South Africa, Yugoslavia, and such other nations as have since

that date or which may hereafter become associated with the United Nations in the struggle for victory over Hitlerism and similar governmental philosophies.

The Senate urges and advises that such formal treaty enunciate and stress that—

The joint signatories neither seek nor desire aggrandizements, territorial or otherwise,

That they respect and will approve the right of all people under proper opportunity to choose the form of government under which they will live and will countenance the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been deprived of this choice,

That they will collaborate in the formulating of a just peace, embodying formulas for post-war collaboration to maintain peace and security throughout the world,

That they recognize the necessity for just and equitable collaboration by all signatories to secure for all nations an economic advancement, improved labor standards, social security, and access on fair and equal terms by all peoples to the raw materials and the international commercial channels of the world,

That the Senate suggests that such proposed treaty might be entitled "The United Nations Post-War Peace Charter."

## ABILITY OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE TO EXERCISE APPROPRIATE SUPERVISION OVER GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. AIKEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 92), which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation in order to determine whether the General Accounting Office, under its present organization, can properly carry out the functions, as an agency of the Congress, of maintaining constant supervision over expenditures in the executive agencies of the Government and of reporting, at least once each month and more often if required, to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate and House of Representatives with respect to (a) whether funds appropriated to the various governmental departments and agencies are being properly and economically expended; (b) whether there are duplications of services and efforts by such departments and agencies and, if so, means for eliminating such duplication; (c) whether services of such departments and agencies can be reorganized so as to increase efficiency; (d) whether agencies interested with the recapture of large sums of money have properly functioned, and whether such sums due the Government have been recaptured; and (e) whether contracts entered into by the various agencies of the Government have been in compliance with existing law. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## COST OF TAX COLLECTION AND DEFAULT IN INCOME TAXES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, there has been some unfortunate discussion across the country recently about the alleged high cost of tax collection through the United States Treasury. The subject was discussed in the Senate Finance Committee last week, and I asked Assistant Secretary Sullivan to furnish me with the facts for the RECORD. I am very happy now to present his letter which, far contrary to the reports which have been circulated, indicates that the cost of collection has been only 56 cents per hundred dollars, which is a thoroughly acceptable and commendable result.

Mr. Sullivan also presents, as bearing upon another phase of popular discussion at the present time, a table showing that the average default in the collection of Federal income taxes for the past 22 years has been only one and three-tenths percent.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Mr. Sullivan and the accompanying table be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
*Washington, January 30, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the hearing before the Senate Finance Committee yesterday you asked me to secure for you the figures which would show the cost of collecting Federal taxes. For the fiscal year 1941 the cost of collection of all Federal taxes was 81 cents for each $100 collected. For the fiscal year 1942 this cost was 56 cents per $100 collected.

For your information I am enclosing a table showing the individual income-tax collections and defaults over a 22-year period from 1921 through 1942 I think the remarkably low percentage of defaults in the past is reassuring for the future.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. SULLIVAN.

TABLE 1.—*Number of taxpayers, income tax collected from individuals, number of uncollectible individual income-tax items, and amount for the fiscal years 1921 through 1942*

| Fiscal year ending June 30— | Number of taxable individual income tax returns | Income tax collected from individuals | Individual income tax assessments abated as uncollectible | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Number of items | Percent of total collections | Amount | Percent of total collections |
| 1921 | 5,873,622 | $1,284,798,526 | 10,220 | 0.2 | $3,168,303 | 0.2 |
| 1922 | 3,701,970 | 1,056,398,000 | 13,395 | .4 | 4,152,336 | .4 |
| 1923 | 3,729,574 | 885,116,000 | 42,504 | 1.1 | 9,649,810 | 1.1 |
| 1924 | 4,305,422 | 762,120,000 | 32,709 | .8 | 6,045,492 | .8 |
| 1925 | 4,513,906 | 845,426,352 | 33,986 | .8 | 9,143,727 | 1.1 |
| 1926 | 2,557,681 | 879,124,407 | 60,389 | 2.4 | 24,229,562 | 2.8 |
| 1927 | 2,485,586 | 911,939,911 | 31,953 | 1.3 | 9,663,872 | 1.1 |
| 1928 | 2,455,411 | 882,727,114 | 22,885 | .9 | 23,658,666 | 2.7 |
| 1929 | 2,489,075 | 1,095,541,172 | 12,552 | .5 | 23,506,491 | 2.1 |
| 1930 | 2,515,623 | 1,146,844,764 | 7,137 | .3 | 20,476,846 | 1.8 |
| 1931 | 2,077,862 | 833,647,798 | 6,267 | .3 | 11,195,394 | 1.3 |
| 1932 | 1,575,271 | 427,190,582 | 7,769 | .5 | 20,204,213 | 4.7 |
| 1933 | 1,946,248 | 352,573,620 | 8,090 | .4 | 14,042,282 | 4.0 |
| 1934 | 1,781,809 | 419,509,488 | 11,696 | .7 | 13,942,533 | 3.3 |
| 1935 | 1,836,165 | 527,112,506 | 11,093 | .6 | 14,642,710 | 2.8 |
| 1936 | 2,160,330 | 674,416,074 | 7,371 | .3 | 6,994,447 | 1.0 |
| 1937 | 2,932,520 | 1,091,740,746 | 11,843 | .4 | 12,496,802 | 1.1 |
| 1938 | 3,397,552 | 1,280,311,882 | 7,841 | .2 | 9,491,776 | .7 |
| 1939 | 3,093,235 | 1,028,833,796 | 13,554 | .4 | 12,831,904 | 1.2 |
| 1940 | 3,985,482 | 982,017,376 | 20,194 | .5 | 11,552,021 | 1.2 |
| 1941 | 7,576,642 | 1,417,655,127 | 10,075 | .1 | 7,097,515 | .5 |
| 1942 | 14,608,267 | 3,262,800,390 | 12,050 | .1 | 9,837,622 | .3 |
| Totals for 22-year period | 81,599,253 | 22,053,845,361 | 395,573 | .5 | 278,024,325 | 1.3 |

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research — November 27, 1942.

Source: Bureau of Internal Revenue, Statistical Section, Income Tax Unit.

## AWARDING OF E FLAG TO WAR PLANT AT SUNCOOK, N. H.

Mr. TOBEY Mr. President, on December 16, 1942, I was present and took a small part in the ceremony at Suncook, N. H., on the occasion of the awarding of the E flag of the United States Army and Navy to a typical war plant in this small New England town. This plant is one that has pioneered in producing airplane material for many years.

I should like to read into the RECORD the invocation given there by the Most Reverend John B. Peterson, D. D., Bishop of Manchester, which applies so well to the industrial workers all over our country whose one aim is to work unceasingly until victory is achieved.

The invocation is as follows:

May the Lord Christ, a workman and the Son of a workman, lend His smile of approval to what we do here today.

Our Nation honors the working men and women of these mills, and of this town called Suncook—honors them for their complete cooperation in its purpose to keep men free. Freedom O God, is Thy precious gift to men—a gift that can be and is used for Thy glory by those who in justice and charity live their love for their fellowmen; and for Thee.

The spindles and looms of these mills sing of that love as they spin and weave the pinions that bear freedom's defenders on their mission of love, loyalty, and liberty. That love and that loyalty spring from the hearts of the liberty lovers who toil in these mills. We honor them for their toil. We honor their mills and their town, the active scene of their labors. We honor their State

and their Nation which are strengthened by their industry and their homes. We honor each one of them for what he or she has done and have given that freedom may still be ours and our children's. In honoring and thanking them, we of this Nation thank Thee, our loving God, author of liberty, whom by their toil and generous loyalty they honor. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

## CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR EFFORT BY OCONTO COUNTY, WIS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. Eldred Klauser, of Stiles, Wis., in which he points out that Oconto County has passed a resolution, which it has sent to the Secretary of the Treasury, advising him that it desires to invest its surplus in bonds of the United States Government in order to assist in the prosecution of the war.

The remarkable showing of this county in getting out of debt and the patriotic action of its county board, I think, are worthy of attention, and I therefore ask that Mr. Klauser's letter, copy of the resolution sent to the Secretary of the Treasury, and a copy of the letter addressed to him, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILES FARMS,
*Stiles, Wis., January 29, 1943.*

Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: At the direction of the Oconto County Board of Supervisors I am enclosing copies of a resolution and letter addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury for your information and with a request for cooperation. Oconto County, after many lean years both because of the depression and because it is one of the "cut-over counties" of northern Wisconsin, is now on its feet financially, and is planning to set up reserves for post-war work programs to employ its own people on their return from the wars. Our county government, while appreciative, has been restless under the necessity of accepting aids from other branches of government in addition to those that are shared by all. The same meeting unanimously adopted a memorial thanking the State emergency board for the special aids it had given in the past, and saying we do not need them any more. While this is probably an entirely unorthodox attitude, we feel that you will sympathize and approve of it.

Yours very truly,

ELDRED KLAUSER,
*Oconto County Planning Committee and County Auditor.*

---

Whereas Oconto County, Wis., has received aid from the Federal Government in various programs for meeting its emergencies during the depression, and has used these where possible toward its permanent economic rehabilitation; and

Whereas Oconto County wishes, insofar as possible, to establish a reserve for public-works programs, anticipating the necessity of providing immediate emergency employment for its men on their return from the wars, and wishes to have the cash then available to pay for this, and not to help the war effort of the Federal Government which has, in past county emergencies so generously aided it; and

Whereas Oconto County has, through the cooperation of its taxpayers, been enabled to establish cash reserves and provisions in the current tax levy to retire all of its county tax debt, whether due or not, and to provide for the anticipated costs of county government on a reasonable basis for the present year, including a provision for a first installment for building up such reserves for post-war work programs: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Oconto County Board of Supervisors this 21st day of January 1943,* That the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States be and hereby is petitioned to permit Oconto County to purchase United States Government securities for the purpose of its post-war emergency reserves, and that he be requested to designate the type of securities best suited from the standpoint of the United States Treasury to accomplish this purpose for the county and to aid the war effort; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this petition be mailed to our Senators and Congressman with the request for their cooperation in securing its purpose, and in so helping Oconto County prepare for providing insofar as is possible for the employment at its own expense of its own people on their return from the wars, and to have the cash then available for the purpose without the necessity of additional county tax levies when its own taxpayers will be passing through a period of post-war depression and adjustment.

---

OCONTO, WIS., *January 26, 1943.*

HENRY MORGENTHAU, Jr.,
*Secretary of the Treasury,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a certified copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Oconto County, Wis., which I am directed to transmit to you. Having been very generously helped by the Federal Government in a time of great distress during the early years of the depression, and partly as a result of using this aid wherever possible to build a new stability and earning power for its people, it is now in a position not only to carry on its normal functions of county government without aids other than those granted to all counties in established Federal programs but to retire all of its county tax debt, and to build up reserves against the time of adjustment which will come after the war, when it wishes, as far as pssible, to care for the immediate employment of its own people on their return, at its own expense.

In building up its reserves and in providing for the future retirement of such debt, not yet due, and on which the creditors decline to accept prior payment, it would like to purchase United States Government bonds or other obligations which should help the war effort at this time but which it will wish to cash when the time is ripe to meet the emergencies for which the reserves are being established. We wish to know what securities to purchase out of the various types offered by the United States Government.

There are the following reserves for which we wish to make purchases between now and tax-settlement time in the month of March:

1. Highway equipment replacement reserve: The proceeds of all equipment transferred to the United States Government with which we wish to purchase war bonds of some type plus the amount of depreciation charges on highway machinery and equipment now in use. Between $18,000 and $20,000 on the basis of present sales to the Government, plus additional amounts later.

2. County highway construction reserve: An annual tax levy provision for future construction, the first $60,000 of which will be ready for investment on settlement of the current tax levy in March.

3. County tax debt retirement reserve: $38,100 now ready for investment, to retire bonds at $5,000 per year for each of 6 years, plus interest of about $5,000 payable in 1944 and smaller amounts each year thereafter.

If you are interested in a brief review of how Oconto County has, through planning and the cooperation of its taxpayers, changed from its status a few years ago as one of the essentially bankrupt "cut-over" counties of northern Wisconsin to its present status of being able to stand on its own feet, and without the allotment to it of any new defense industries or camps to bring it a temporary prosperity, a brief statement is enclosed herewith.

Yours very truly,

OCONTO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
By ELDRED KLAUSER,
*County Planning Committee and County Auditor.*

## CELEBRATION OF TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not want to take the time of the Senate at any length. First I desire to thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding to me so that I may present a matter which I deem most important. We are fighting a war all over the world. The policy has been announced both by the head of this Nation and also by our Allies. In my opinion, none of the pronouncements with reference to freedom that have been made of late is anything new. Many years ago a distinguished and great American announced those policies, and I believe that due tribute should be paid to his memory. I beg the indulgence of the Senate and of the Senator from West Virginia while I read a few thoughts which I have penned.

Thomas Jefferson has been immortalized in the mind and heart of all freedom-loving peoples. He is to us Americans our first and truest emancipator. The battles of today's global war are being fought for the four freedoms given to the world by Thomas Jefferson when he penned the American Declaration of Independence. His high performance as a public official exemplified those freedoms possibly more than has that of any other servant of the people. Certainly this record alone is enough to recommend the giving of appropriate homage to the memory of this giant among men on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of his birth, April 13.

In 1932, the two hundredth anniversary of Washington's birth was fittingly commemorated. It is only just and proper that Thomas Jefferson, Washington's fellow Virginian, and like him one of America's greatest gifts to the world, should receive due recognition as a man whose personal character and political stature have seldom, if ever, been equalled.

On April 13, the beautiful marble monument on the shores of the Tidal Basin is to be dedicated to the memory of Jefferson. But America and the world owe more to Jefferson than can be repaid in the form of a stone structure, imposing as it may be.

The Congress of the United States should, at the earliest opportunity, appropriate the necessary funds to effect the organization of committees, publicity units, and other agencies to honor Jefferson the man, and the Jeffersonian principles which we today so highly revere. In the process of paying homage to this outstanding American, we will relish the

pleasure of refreshing our memories of Jefferson's exemplary life, and the youth of today and of tomorrow may be inspired to tread the paths of glory so effectively measured by his stride.

My plea is that Congress not delay the laying of all necessary plans to honor the memory of Thomas Jefferson, the author of our Declaration of Independence, the founder of the University of Virginia, the author of Virginia's statute for religious freedom—of an American whose activities and labors for the welfare of men call for the small payment of our eternal reverence.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. A representative of the Government, the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, has decided to dedicate the great memorial to Thomas Jefferson on the anniversary of his birthday this year. I thought that statement should be made at this time as a matter of information, because, of course, as a member of that Commission, I heartily endorse all that the Senator from New Mexico has said. There will be a great dedication on the 13th of April.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

### THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—EDITORIAL FROM BOWMAN COUNTY (N. DAK.) PIONEER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial published in the Bowman County (N. Dak.) Pioneer of January 28, 1943. The editorial, which is in behalf of the Farm Security Administration, was written by a farmer, Mr. Otto Schade, who is a member of the Bowman County Railroad Committee, and is entitled "What Are We Fighting For?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

(By Otto Schade, member of the Bowman County Railroad Committee)

The old slogan was, and still is, "We fight to maintain the principles of American democracy." Yes; that is worth fighting for, and our boys at the fronts are doing a great job of it right now. Even while thousands of our men are fighting and dying on the battlefields to uphold what we all like to think of as the American way of life, certain individuals representing certain interests in our country are today attempting to wreck the Farm Security Administration, which came into being as the answer to a drastic need for assistance to thousands of our farm families, who through the depression and drought found themselves literally stranded without the means or credit to reestablish themselves.

In 1936 we had nearly 1,700,000 farm families trying to live on an average income of less than $500 a year. To put it another way, more than 8,000,000 farm people tried to exist on about $2 per week. That is a long way from "the American way of life." That was the actual situation when the Farm Security Administration was organized.

Over a million farm families have now been given a fresh start with the help of the Farm Security Administration. The writer has been a member of the County Farm Security Administration Advisory Committee since the old Rural Rehabilitation Administration was first set up. I wish to ask those who are now trying to cripple the Farm Security Administration, a few definite questions:

1. Is it undemocratic for our Government to help low-income farm families to help themselves by extending loans at 5-percent interest, secured by a mortgage?

2. Is it undemocratic for our Government to back up these families with good sensible advice in order to increase food production?

3. Is it undemocratic for our Government to assist groups of farmers to purchase equipment on a cooperative basis, and to encourage and assist them in acquiring their own organization for selling, buying, and processing their own products?

4. Is it undemocratic for our Government to loan funds at 3-percent interest, secured by a real-estate mortgage, in order for tenants to purchase a farm of their own?

5. Is it undemocratic for our Government to assist nonvoting sharecroppers to become self-supporting American citizens?

The writer is quite certain that if our men who are right now doing the fighting for the rest of us had the opportunity to vote on these five questions, it would result in a practically unanimous "no" vote. Those who are willing to ruin the Farm Security Administration had better give some serious consideration to what plain Americanism stands for. It stands for a square deal for everyone. Yes; that includes even the unfortunate nonvoting sharecroppers.

I wish that the leaders of the wrecking crew could come out here and learn for themselves what the Farm Security Administration is really doing in assisting many families to gain complete rehabilitation. I am sure that such evidence would convince anyone of the true value of our work, which should not and cannot be judged on dollars alone, although even from that standpoint we can show a fine record. It should rather be judged from the standpoint of the dignity of people and their welfare. When seen in that light the Farm Security Administration represents what our boys are now fighting for, namely, the right of every man to work and earn a decent living and a square deal for everyone. That is the American way of life.

### FIRST NEW HOME PAID FOR FROM AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BANKHEAD

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Athens, Ala., on December 18, 1942, on the occasion of the delivery to Curtis C. Haraway of the note and mortgage executed by him to secure the purchase price for a farm under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

### THE RUML PLAN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLARK OF MISSOURI

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the Ruml plan, delivered by him on February 3, 1943, on the Washington Evening Star Forum, and broadcast from Station WMAL, which appears in the Appendix.]

### BROADCASTS TO JAPAN BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the messages addressed to the Japanese people broadcast by him in November and December 1942, and January 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

### ECONOMICAL DISTRIBUTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of economical distribution, delivered by Senator Murray in New York on January 11, 1943, before the National Retail Drygoods Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

### ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT ON ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF WILLIAM McKINLEY

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Niles, Ohio, on the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of William McKinley, which appears in the Appendix.]

### ADDRESS BY EUGENE B. CASEY BEFORE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Eugene B. Casey, Special Executive Assistant to the President, to the First Annual Convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at St. Louis, Mo., on January 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the legislative program of the National Grange for 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

### EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—LETTER FROM AMERICAN FEDERATION OF SOROPTIMIST CLUBS

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the chairman of the department of public relations of the American Federation of Soroptimist Clubs relative to the so-called equal-rights amendment proposed to the Constitution, which appears in the Appendix.]

### THE RUML PLAN

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time for Congress to Assert Itself," published in the Washington Times-Herald of February 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

### RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS—LETTER FROM JAMES C. SELF

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by James C. Self, president of the Mathews Cotton Mill, of Greenwood, S. C., regarding the renegotiation of contracts, which appears in the Appendix.]

### SCOTLAND GETS ITS OWN T. V. A.

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Scotland Gets Its Own T. V. A.," published in the Washington Daily News of Friday, December 18, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

### INVESTIGATION OF STEEL PRODUCTION—REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM (PT. 3 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, from the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program I have the honor to submit a report known as the steel report. Our committee has been studying the steel situation for some time. We have gone into the subject exhaustively. We have heard witnesses here in Washington and in steel centers, and the report, which is rather lengthy and which will be submitted for the RECORD, is one which I believe every Senator should read.

I shall preface submission of the report by making a few observations of my

own which will be very brief, and which will touch on only a few of the high points contained in the report itself.

Mr. President, steel, always the backbone of America's economy, is the keystone of our war production. But it has come very close to being the stumbling block. Almost all our strategic material shortages today could be relieved sooner if we had steel. The aviation gasoline program, the synthetic rubber program, the shipping program, the aircraft program, all have suffered for lack of steel. Our fuel oil and gasoline shortages, our farm machinery shortage, our railroad problems, our housing difficulties, could be relieved if sufficient steel were available.

On the other hand, we are producing steel in unprecedented amounts—86,000,000 tons in 1942 and over 90,000,000 tons expected in 1943. Our 1942 production came within 3,000,000 tons of equaling the total steel production of all the rest of the world—United Nations and Axis. The United Nations produced more than twice as much steel as their enemies produced.

The question which comes to mind is why there should be a famine amid such plenty. How does the Axis get along on so little? We now know that the Axis prepared for this war, built its plants, and stock-piled its armaments long before hostilities commenced. We, on the other hand, are hastening both to fashion the weapons and to build the plants at the same time. We must fill our present needs and those of our allies, and still attempt to build our stock piles of steel. That our needs are great is clear. The basic problems are whether we are making the best use of what we have, and whether we should create additional facilities to produce even more.

From its inception the committee has studied the steel picture continuously. Right at the start, early in 1941, we took the position that steel shortages would stall production lines. It was clear that immediate steps must be taken to increase steel facilities. The committee so advised the Office of Production Management, but steel expansion was delayed.

Three major factors are responsible for the steel shortage.

First, the armed forces seriously underestimated their needs. They are now using as much steel in 3 months as they previously stated they would need in a year. The sights were set too low. Throughout 1941 the Army and Navy Munitions Board freely granted necessary priorities for new armament plants, but refused clearance for steel mills to feed these plants.

The second contributing factor was the sluggishness of the Office of Production Management and the War Production Board in converting industry to a war-time basis. Far into 1942 untold tons of steel were poured into nonessential commodities. Not until the situation had become critical and the country's indignation had overflowed did the War Production Board eliminate those items, many of which may have been peacetime necessities, but all of which are unconscionable luxuries during an all-out war.

The third cause of the delay was the cupidity of the big steel companies. They were determined to keep control of the steel industry after the war. They feared the bugaboo of excess capacities when peace arrives. They dreaded the competition they might have to face should the smaller companies obtain some nourishment during the war program. The representatives and employees of Big Steel dominated the Iron and Steel Branch of the War Production Board. That was unfortunate. At first they failed to direct or even to allow expansion. Finally they concentrated a belated program in the eight largest companies. These Big Steel men and dollar-a-year men did just what they were accustomed to doing at home in normal times under normal conditions. To the eight largest steel companies they gave the lion's share of steel expansion. These eight companies produced approximately 80 percent of the steel ingots before the war. After the war they will still have the same control of the industry, but the small companies will not have kept even their meager dole of steel production. Before the war the small companies had approximately 20 percent of the ingot production. Unless the program is altered the larger companies will continue in the same strong position, while the weaker companies will have lost some of their pre-war standing.

Mr. President, the expansion program includes substantial tonnages for powerful newcomers in the industry, such as Kaiser and Koppers. The new companies' facilities will not affect the 80-percent control of Big Steel. Instead, it is the small companies which must move over to make room for the newcomers. Three companies alone—United States Steel, Bethlehem, and Republic—received a total of $696,128,000, or about 55 percent of the $1,283,667,000 which the Government is spending to expand the facilities of the entire steel industry. Apparently the Iron and Steel Branch of the War Production Board believed that only the big companies could make steel.

The Nation suffered for these shortcomings and for this selfishness. At the committee's hearings during August of 1942 we found an alarming shortage of steel ingot; that is, of unmilled steel produced by open-hearth and electric furnaces. This has not yet been relieved. As late as October 1942—the most recent month for which figures are available—the shipments of all types of steel amounted to less than one-half of the unfilled orders requested for shipment that month. If only those orders which were earmarked for the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission had been filled, there would have been no steel left for any of the country's other needs, such as synthetic rubber, high-octane gas, oil pipe lines, lend-lease, or railroads. This situation still prevails.

We cannot expect to reap the benefits of the expansion program for another 6 to 12 months. Had this program been started earlier it would have been well on its way before other competing programs created a steel shortage. The committee knows of one instance where a steel company was unable to use its own steel to build a sorely needed blast furnace for itself, because it had more urgent orders on its books. It has been necessary to postpone all of the steel expansion program which cannot be finished before July 1943; otherwise we would not have enough steel for actual armaments. We do not have steel to support both programs. One or the other must give way. The battle will not wait.

The outlook for 1943, therefore, is not bright, it is gloomy. We will produce sufficient steel to satisfy our major war necessities, but there is no assurance that we will also be able to fill all the needs of essential civilian industries. These will have a 2-year backlog of needed repairs, replacements, and additions. We may well experience another serious shortage if the war continues for so long a time and its scope so expands as to require us to replace or increase plant facilities. Throughout 1943 continued shortages of the most important specialized types of steel must be expected. Electric furnace alloy steels, particularly those requiring special heat-treatment facilities, which are most important for the aircraft program, will continue to be scarce throughout 1943. Insufficient facilities for castings also will probably trouble us through all of this year.

There are not enough raw materials and manpower in this country to increase steel-making capacity until it is sufficient to provide for all possible needs. We must, instead, determine the amounts of the various forms of steel we shall need to win the war, and proceed to obtain that steel. We must expect to have less than we could profitably use; but we can make certain that the steel which we have is allocated and used efficiently and skillfully.

I am happy to report that much progress is now being made under the direction of Mr. H. G. Batcheller, who became Chief of the Iron and Steel Branch last September. The Branch was overhauled and advanced to the status of a division, called the Steel Division. Mr. Batcheller has proven capable and able, and has undertaken to meet the problems of the steel industry. He has made remarkable progress.

However, much still remains to be done. What has yet to be done, together with the limited facilities for doing it, represents, in my judgment, one of the most serious worries or problems of the war. A study of that problem, and of the advance which is being made by American genius, will be one of the greatest stories to come out of the war.

Specifications must be reexamined. Those which are too exacting should be eliminated. Sizes and grades should be standardized. New melting techniques should be adopted extensively, particularly in electric furnace operations where we face the prospect of serious shortages.

The steel companies must overcome their reluctance to disturb their settled customer relations. That factor is out for the duration. They must outgrow the technical conservatism which developed during the period when management did not have to extend itself to survive competition.

The present haphazard price structure must be given attention. Further attention must be given to the allocation of the products among consumers.

The committee has not seen any evidence that the scrap situation has been competently or completely taken in hand. Steel production may well suffer seriously unless increased supplies of high-grade scrap are made available. We believe that ultimate control over the collection of steel scrap should be placed in the Steel Division, and that it must be methodically and continuously worked out. The Steel Division should also be in a position to insist that the Office of Price Administration fix scrap prices high enough to induce the scrap dealer to go out and get the scrap. That is a very important recommendation. If we are to obtain scrap, the price must be reasonable. This does not mean an inflationary price increase. It means payment for increased labor and harder work.

In July 1942 the committee suggested that representatives of both labor and small mills should be given a place on the Steel Division's important committees. We believe that should be done without delay. The Little Steel men of the country should be brought into the picture. This has been done only recently and in a most limited way. The committee believes that considerably more can be done along these lines. When it has been done it will be possible for the Steel Division to break the stranglehold which big companies have on the entire industry. Then, and then only, the Steel Division will be able to beat down the industry's reluctance to meet wartime conditions. We shall then see the development of the steel industry along new lines and in new areas. In this way we shall get the steel we need to win this all-out war.

Mr. President, before I conclude I desire to ask my colleagues to read the report. I also ask them to study the progress which is being made in the shifting and expansion of the steel-production program.

I make the prediction that before this all-out war increases its compelling need upon our economy to the degree of greater hardships, American genius will respond to the challenge and make our supply of steel meet every wartime requirement, and almost all of the very vital civilian requirements.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I move that Senate bill 607, which was introduced by the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and which is on the table, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, for hearings and consideration.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Exactly.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from New York to yield for a question, and he yielded to me. Therefore I have the floor.

I was watching for the conclusion of the Senator's remarks, as my beloved colleague the Senator from Florida was doing. He had the edge on me because he was standing to the rear of the distinguished Senator from New York, and he could more quickly tell when the remarks of the Senator from New York had been concluded than I could, and I had to beat him to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from North Carolina for the purpose he has suggested?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has concluded his speech. I asked the Senator if he would yield and he said he would be glad to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, if my distinguished colleague would only let me make reply to the Chair myself I should be obliged to him, and yet I might not be unfriendly to him.

It is true, Mr. President, that I had completed my speech; and it is also true that I thought I yielded for a question to come from my distinguished colleague the Senator from North Carolina, who now claims he has the floor. I thought I yielded to him to make some observations concerning my speech, or to have something inserted in the RECORD. However, if in yielding I should lose the floor, and there would be no opportunity for what I may modestly term "complimentary comment on the steel report," I might selfishly side against my distinguished colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am standing on the record. The RECORD will show that I asked the Senator from New York to yield for a question. He answered me by saying that he would yield for one question.

Mr. MEAD. Apparently I yielded for that one question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Will the Senator yield to the junior Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MEAD. It appears to me that I must first yield to Senators who will have something to say concerning the steel report. After that I shall be glad to yield the floor so that my distinguished colleague from North Carolina may obtain recognition.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am in favor of steel, more steel, and better steel.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina is apparently trying to steal the floor right now. [Laughter.]

I now yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have not concluded. I have just begun my comments on the subject of steel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor. He has declined to yield for the purpose explained by the Senator from North Carolina, and he now yields to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to propound a few questions to the able Senator from New York, who has just submitted an outstanding report on behalf of the Truman committee, which has done so much to improve war production.

The first question is, Have the Senator and the committee which he ably represents found in their investigation of steel production and the provision of steel facilities that steel production for war purposes has been impaired or diminished in volume because of any division of responsibility among Government agencies in seeing that facilities are provided for the maximum production of steel?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, let me say in reply to my distinguished colleague that an early concentration of authority would have expedited the steel program, but, unfortunately, living in a democracy and planning only for peace, and without any experience in planning for an all-out war demanding over 100 percent of many of our important materials, there was a necessary evolution of authority and the creation of several different agencies involving delay which resulted in the slowing up of the steel program—a situation which could be corrected by a concentration of authority or by a concerted exercise of authority over this particular industry.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Do the able Senator and his committee find that the claimant agencies which have to do with steel production and the development of steel facilities are likely to be pulling in different directions, and likely to follow courses which tend to diverge, unless there is above all the claimant agencies some authority which can coordinate the Nation's effort to provide the maximum of steel-production facilities and the maximum steel output for the Nation?

Mr. MEAD. I think that is logical. In reply I should say that, as in the past, the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission always will seek to exert authority and precedent and priority over what might be termed "indirect war needs or vital civilian needs," and there always will be that vying for supremacy. Perhaps that will interfere with the farm program, the program for the production of high-octane gas, and the program for the production of synthetic rubber, for emphasis will be placed by the War Department upon purely war needs. Emphasis may be placed by the War Production Board upon needs for the production of sup-

plies for the granary of the world, the agency having to do with the production of synthetic rubber might insist upon the necessity of developing the synthetic rubber program; and so there is need for an over-all directional head.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a further question, if the able Senator will further yield. Has it not been the discovery, therefore, of his distinguished committee that the matter of production for war purposes is essentially a single program, and that the facilities of the Nation must be mobilized as if the facilities in a single factory, if confusion, divided responsibility, and inefficiency are not to impair the whole war-production program?

Mr. MEAD. That is more true under present conditions in the all-out war than ever before was true in the history of the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I asked the Senator to yield in order, first, that I might compliment the committee for which he is speaking, of which the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is the chairman, for the study which went into the preparation of its most excellent report.

It seems to me that one or two words might be added to what has been said in the report and in the comment of the Senator from New York. The Senator has very correctly pointed to the tremendous concentration which has been going on in the war industries. That matter is not covered in the report, for reasons which probably are obvious. I think I violate no injunction of secrecy, however, when I point out that, as of the 30th of June 1942, the United States Government had awarded war contracts in the value of $55,400,000,000. Of that tremendous sum, which is actually beyond the capacity of the human mind to imagine, more than 70 percent was awarded to 100 companies. Worse than that, in excess of 50 percent of that $55,400,000,000 worth of contracts was awarded to 24 companies. In other words, 24 large corporations in the United States, headed by the General Motors Corporation, which alone received $4,500,000,000 worth of those contracts, have been awarded in excess of $27,000,000,000 worth of contracts. Not only is that true, but the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, operating through the Defense Plant Corporation, one of its subsidiaries, has expended in excess of $8,000,000,000 for construction of war facilities of various kinds; and many of the 24 companies which have received more than half of all the war contracts have also been beneficiaries under the facilities expansion program.

Mr. President, the statement of that rather startling fact is not meant to be a criticism of the War Production Board or of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It should not be so interpreted. It is merely a statement of a condition which is going to be the source of the most significant and important problem which the people of the United States will have to settle after this war. As the Senator has very well pointed out in the report, the production of steel in the United States has been increased from approximately 38,000,000 ingot tons in 1937 to 89,000,000 tons in 1942. However, even that great expansion is not sufficient to permit us to provide the steel needed for the war effort alone.

Let us take the case of shipping: The Maritime Commission last year produced 8,000,000 tons of shipping. Its goal this year is 16,000,000 tons, at least. It has the capacity of producing 20,000,000 tons of shipping. We need the 20,000,000 tons, because the German war effort this year is being directed in a submarine campaign for the destruction of every possible ship which the United Nations have and which the submarine campaign can reach. The submarine campaign for the destruction of American shipping is the last recourse of Hitler in his war effort. He has been hemmed around everywhere else, and his object now is to prevent the United States from getting the men and the supplies to the war front in Europe. Obviously, therefore, it is of tremendous importance that we should have increased capacity and increased production of steel if we are to manufacture the needed ships.

That is not enough. The Navy Department seeks to expand the construction of escort vessels in order to protect the convoys used in sending both men and supplies abroad. The construction of additional escort vessels requires more steel than it is possible for the War Production Board to allocate among the various agencies.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interject?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. MEAD. In view of the fact that I have a luncheon engagement, and also an embarrassing predicament facing me here, I wonder if I may steal away, and leave the floor with the distinguished Senator?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I did not mean to take the distinguished Senator from Wyoming off his feet. He was making a very able statement, and I trust that he will be permitted to continue. As I said, I have an engagement, and I should like to keep it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield the floor?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask the Senator whether his committee has in mind certain legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield in order that the Senator from Minnesota may direct a question to the Senator from New York.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask the Senator whether the committee which has submitted the report has in mind legislation to cure the situation?

Mr. MEAD. No. We have contained in our report, which will be printed in the RECORD, recommendations to alleviate existing conditions—recommendations which we trust will be acceptable to the War Production Board, particularly to the Steel Division and to the other services which require a portion of the steel which we have available and which we will have available. We do not recommend legislation, but we recommend a method of procedure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to conclude. I desire to call attention to the fact that not only does the Maritime Commission need steel, not only does the Navy Department need steel, but the Office of Petroleum Coordinator needs steel for the plants necessary for the manufacture of the high-octane aviation gasoline which is essential in order to carry on the war in the air. The director of the synthetic-rubber production program needs steel in order to manufacture synthetic rubber. The railroads need steel in order to build tank cars, more freight cars, and more locomotives to transport men and materials.

In other words, Mr. President, wherever we look in the war effort we find a crying necessity for more and more steel, and the worst factor of all lies in the fact that in the United States there is not sufficient scrap to enable us to continue to produce the amount of steel which we are now turning out. It is of the greatest possible importance that there should be increased collections of scrap and increased production of substitutes for scrap.

A small effort has been made in that direction. The Committee on Appropriations during the last year and a half, realizing this problem, has made appropriations for the purpose of meeting it; but always there has been some vague and indefinite opposition to the development of any program that would produce steel by anything but the blast furnace method.

In the State of Nevada at Boulder City, through the appropriation made by Congress, a plant now being operated by the Bureau of Mines is turning out from 8 to 10 tons of iron daily. A plant is being constructed at the University of Wyoming by the Bureau of Mines to test certain processes there. These efforts, however, are only scratching the surface. What is needed is an all-out program to produce iron by any and every method if we are to provide the materials needed for the war.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I know the great difficulty the able Senator from Wyoming has had, and I know the long struggle in which he has participated and which he has led toward providing additional steel facilities and raw materials for the country. I wish to ask the able Senator whether he has found that the division of authority and responsibility for doing what he last said, that is making the fullest use of the Nation's resources with respect to steel production, has, in his opinion, impaired or in any way impeded his efforts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Committee on Public Lands, which submitted a report or several reports during the past year and a half upon this general subject, recently, 2 or 3 months ago, submitted its report on petroleum, and there it pointed out, as this committee has also pointed out, the division of authority among five or six agencies. The same division of authority exists with respect to the production of other mineral resources. For example, the War Production Board has its agents working throughout the country; it has special representatives dealing with the production of minerals; the R. F. C. has a special corps of employees working on the production of minerals; the Bureau of Mines has officials working on the same subject as has the United States Geological Survey. I will state to the Senator that the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands, of which I am chairman, has contemplated using the same technique with respect to minerals that it has used with respect to oil, namely, to invite the heads or the representatives of each of the separate agencies to a round-table discussion, so that, across the board, they may, in public, discuss this conflict of authority which ought to be eliminated.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the able Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. As a matter of fact, was it not necessary for the able Senator, acting legislatively as chairman of the committee, with his committee, to get the various representatives of the departments having jurisdiction over this subject before the committee so as to obtain any coordination of their activities and efforts whatever?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is exactly correct.

Mr. PEPPER. In other words, the Congress, aside from the person of the President, was the only agency in Washington which could get a coordination of the activities of the Government dealing with a single subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it ought to be added there that the Congress, throughout the entire period of preparation for the war and during the war itself, has been constantly urging a greater degree of coordination among the executive branches of the Government; and the Congress, contrary to the representations which have been so persistently made, has never failed to urge greater and greater progress and efficiency in the organization of the war.

Now, Mr. President, let me add one word further, and I shall yield the floor. I desire to refer to the tremendous importance of the concentration which has gone on. It may have been altogether necessary, that this concentration should be made effective, if we were to get the results which have already been achieved; and in any criticism that is voiced of conditions which exist here, there ought to be an acknowledgment of the fact that a perfectly tremendous program of accomplishment is to the credit of all these agencies, even though they have been divided and even though there has been concentration represented by the fact that more than 70 percent of the total amount of contracts was awarded to 100 companies. What we must look forward to is this: When the war is ended and when the Government contracts are no longer flowing to these corporations and to others, when the workers who are now engaged in the war industries are being demobilized, there will arise the greatest economic and political question which has ever been presented to America, namely, how are we to provide opportunities for employment to those who have been gathered into these great enterprises for the production of war goods?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the subject of the great concentration which has taken place I believe we ought right here to go back in our thinking and in our history and remember that it was the problem of concentration which, in a small way, made so difficult the setting up of stock piles looking toward such a time as we have today. It is the habit of thinking on the part of people and certain governmental and industrial and labor notions about things that stand in the way at all times.

If, for example, there should be greater concentration on a larger scale, without a change of outlook, without a change of habit, the problems are going to be more difficult than they ever were.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me interrupt the Senator. I am happy he has raised this phase of the problem, because it gives me the opportunity to make the record clear, that it was the Senator from Utah who, as long ago as 1938, I believe——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. 1935.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator corrects me and says 1935—as long ago as 1935 he introduced legislation in this body for the purpose of enabling the accumulation of the necessary stock piles. The Senator from Utah was aware of what was going on in Europe, and he initiated the legislation and brought the legislation upon the floor calling for the accumulation of stock piles and the granting of all necessary authority for that purpose; but, nevertheless, it was not done or, at least, it was not done in sufficient degree to avert the shortage crisis in which we have found ourselves for the past year or more.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I wish to make a simple point that everyone can understand. The principal problem in setting up stock piles was the problem of price. Everyone could see that if great demand came there would be need for stock piles, but the large industrialists like to buy in a cheap market. The setting up of stock piles acts as the building up of reserves, making the commodity a little scarcer. So there was a fear on the part of many in business that if the Government, looking to the future, set up stock piles it might do one of two things: It might release the stock piles at an untimely moment and thereby deflate prices or put them down or it might, on the other hand, build up such immense stock piles that the price would rise to such an extent that ordinary industry could not buy that which it needed.

Mr. President, when we realize the habits of thought of our people we come to the conclusion that the trouble with our country was that the people of the United States had a fear of their Government. The irony of ironies has taken place. In a country such as ours, controlled by the people, where the Government is responsible to the people, where, in theory and practice, the Government must react to the people, the people themselves become frightened of the Government when it tries to do something to help them.

That is the basic irony of attempting to change anything, it does not matter what. If we move into the health field, it is the doctors who are frightened. If we move into the hospital field, it is the hospitals which are frightened. If we move into the insurance field, it is the insurance companies which are frightened. When the people of our country learn that the Government of the United States is on their side, taking steps which are designed to build up, then will come the right kind of prosperity and the right kind of cooperation between the Government and the people.

There is a natural tendency for a person who has a business to desire to make a monopoly of his business, to want to expand his business and to have no one come into the competitive field. Yet, in the history of competition, it has been competition itself which has caused the great expansion of the original producers of things. It has changed the habits of people, created greater demand and greater activity.

Now, we have before us such bills, for example, as the bill for the rehabilitation of returned soldiers, and persons who have been injured. Some have argued that bill and will argue the bill on the basis of State's rights, for example, whether the Government should execute the law or the States should do it.

Mr. President, why can we not think about the individual? If we can return to society a presently worthless individual, and make him an economic asset, does not that individual help industry? Does he not help his State? Does he not help his Government?

Why should there ever be these theoretical conflicts between Government and industry, between the States and the Nation, when we are trying to do something for the good of men, women, and children in the United States? Can we not see that if we separate the men, women, and children from the United States, we do not have the United States, and can we not see that wherever we create wealth, we bring about a stimulus for the creation of more wealth?

For these reasons I cannot help saying, since this remarkable discussion has started, that what we have to do is to understand the psychological aspects of these questions, the habit-forming aspects of the questions, and, above all, have the thing we call faith, and realize that, after all, 130,000,000 people are destined to a certain kind of leadership

in the world, as the result of the last 150 years of their history, and to understand that we cannot ever see our Government and our people take the place in the world which they must take without realizing the destiny that is forcing them on, and without realizing the position they have among the peoples of the earth.

The report submitted by Mr. MEAD from the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program was ordered to be printed (pt. 3 of Rept. No. 10) and entire is as follows:

DRAFT OF STEEL REPORT—SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Steel, always the backbone of America's economy, is the keystone of our war production. But it has come very close to being the stumbling block. Almost all of our strategic-material shortages today could be relieved sooner if we had steel. The aviation-gasoline program, the synthetic-rubber program, the shipping program, the aircraft program, all have suffered for lack of steel. We have been short of both gross tonnage and the specialized types of steel. Our fuel oil and gasoline shortages, our farm-machinery shortage, our railroad problems, our housing difficulties could be relieved if sufficient steel were available

On the other hand, we are producing steel in unprecedented amounts—86,000,000 tons in 1942 and over 90,000,000 tons expected in 1943. Our 1942 production came within 3,000,000 tons of equaling the total steel production of all the rest of the world—United Nations and Axis. The United Nations produced more than twice as much steel as their enemies.

The question which comes to mind is why there should be a famine amid such plenty. How does the Axis get along on so little? We now know that the Axis prepared for this war, built its plants, and stock piled its armaments long before hostilities commenced. We, on the other hand, are hastening both to make the armaments and to build the plants at the same time. We must fill our present needs and those of our allies, and still attempt to build our stock piles. That our needs are great is clear. The basic problems are whether we are making the best use of what we have and whether we should create additional facilities to produce even more.

The committee has studied the steel picture continuously since the committee's inception. During the spring of 1941, shortly after beginning its study of steel production, the committee took the position that shortage of steel, as well as almost all of our basic raw materials, would stall production lines. It was clear that immediate steps must be taken to increase production. In each case the committee so advised the Office of Production Management

Three major factors delayed steel expansion and are responsible for our current steel shortage.

First, the armed forces seriously underestimated the amount of steel they would need under war conditions. As late as November 1941 the armed forces estimated their steel requirements at a total figure much smaller than their present demands. They are now using as much steel in 3 months as they previously informed the Office of Production Management they would need in a year. The much discussed Gano Dunn report concluded in February 1941 that the then existing capacity would be sufficient for both military and civilian needs on the basis of these low estimates of military needs. The sights were indeed set too low, and this should have been evident to reasonable men. Throughout 1941 the Army and Navy Munitions Board freely granted necessary priorities for new end product plants but refused clearance for raw materials facilities to feed these plants.

The second cause of the delay was the desire of the big steel companies to prevent any expansion that might react unfavorably against their control of the steel industry after the war. They feared both the possibility of having excess capacities of steel-making facilities after the war, and the competition of smaller companies which might gain strength during the war program. The representatives and employees of big steel companies dominated the Iron and Steel Branch of the War Production Board. They first failed to direct or even to allow expansion. Finally they concentrated practically all of the belated expansion in the hands of the eight largest companies. The Office of Production Management, which was the predecessor of the War Production Board, failed to make proper estimates of steel requirements even after its delinquencies were called to its attention by the committee.

The third contributing factor to the present condition was the delay of the War Production Board in converting industry to a war basis. Untold tons of steel were permitted to be consumed until far into 1942. The priorities system was designed to assure at least that war industries would be supplied before any others. It failed to accomplish its purpose and did not stem the huge flow of steel into nonessential commodities.

The committee held hearings during August 1942. It continued thereafter to follow developments intensively and to discuss the steel program privately with the War Production Board. At the committee's hearings it found an alarming shortage of ingot, that is, of unmilled steel produced by open hearth and electric furnaces This has not yet been relieved. In October 1942 (the most recent month for which figures are available) the shipments of all types of steel were less than half of unfilled orders covered by preference ratings requested for shipment in that month. The total orders on the books of the steel producers which carried certification that the material was for the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission amounted to more steel than the entire country could produce in that month. Certainly it was more than could be consumed with existing fabrication facilities. If these orders had been filled there would have been no steel for defense projects (other than on direct Army and Navy orders), for lend-lease, railroads, or for any of the other civilian needs essential to our war production.

The full benefits of the present expansion program cannot be felt for another 6 to 12 months. Had this program been started on a larger scale at the outset of the defense emergency, it would have been well under way before other competing programs rendered it impossible to fill all urgent needs. The committee is informed of one instance where a steel company, making large quantities of the types of steel needed for an additional blast furnace it was constructing, was unable to obtain permission to use its own steel for the purpose because it had more urgent orders on its books. During the spring of 1942, it was found necessary to postpone those parts of the plant expansion program which could not be finished before July 1943. Otherwise we would not have enough steel for actual armaments. We do not have steel to support both programs. The battle will not wait.

Today it appears that we will barely produce sufficient steel in 1943 and thereafter to satisfy the major war necessities. The expansion program will be slightly delayed by the recent decision to advance the synthetic rubber, aviation gasoline, and aluminum plants. After July 1943 the most urgent demands for steel to be used in constructing new plants will have been filled as a result of the policy of finishing major plant construction by that date. Thereafter primary needs for steel will be for actual armaments, for fighting equipment, for the shipbuilding program, and for essential civilian equipment such as railroads and farm machinery. There is every reason to believe that there will be substantial amounts of steel for military purposes. But there is no assurance that we will be able to fill all the needs of essential civilian industries which will have a 2-year backlog of needed repairs, replacements, and additions. We may well experience another shortage if the war so continues, and its scope so expands as to require us to increase or replace plant facilities. The present prospects for over-all ingot tonnage may therefore be viewed without undue alarm, although not with complacency.

The outlook for specialized types of steel, on the other hand, is not as promising. A sufficient gross tonnage of ingot does not in any way assure that specific alloy steels and hardened steels, needed for the various programs and for the aircraft program in particular, will be available. Until the latter part of 1943 there will continue to be a shortage of castings and of electric furnace alloy steels, particularly those requiring special heat-treating facilities and other special facilities.

The shortages of raw materials and manpower in this country are such that we cannot expect to end the steel problem by simply increasing steel-making capacity until it is sufficient to provide for all possible uses. We must, instead, determine the amount of the various kinds of steel which we will need to win the war and then proceed to increase steel-making capacity to that amount. Consequently throughout the war we must expect to have less steel that we could profitably use and we must make sure that the steel which we have is allocated and used efficiently and skillfully.

Allocation of steel to consumers has been one of the vitally important jobs of this war. It is complicated by the need to plan facilities far in advance for the types of products which will be needed. Unless the various products balance, excesses in any line are simply wasted; not only is capacity lost but also the large quantities of steel and labor used in building the plants. In this way the task of allocation is very closely related to the task of planning production capacity. As a result of misdirected planning and shifts in emphasis by the armed forces, we are now facing overcapacities of facilities to produce armor plate, and deficits of alloy steels and of heat-treating and casting facilities. Throughout the second half of 1942 plate capacity far exceeded demand. Construction of some plate mills was canceled. But under the shipbuilding program for 1943 we again face a deficit.

Poor allocation of the product on hand was one of the most serious failures of the iron and steel branch during most of 1942. This committee ascertained during its hearings that the branch did not know the ultimate use to which a substantial part of steel deliveries was put. In the summer of 1942 it became apparent that the priority system was entirely inadequate for the task at hand Beginning in August 1942 an effort was made to install a system of allocations to replace the priority arrangements. The outgrowth of this is the controlled-materials plan, which corrects many of the weaknesses of the priority system. If the armed forces make their needs known sufficiently early and the administrative details are carefully handled, it should solve the problem. The system of controlling production by issuing production directives on rolled steel products to the various steel mills has also helped eliminate previously existing inefficiencies, although the priorities system is still impeding efforts to control the production of steel.

On September 21, 1942, Mr. H. G. Batcheller became head of the Iron and Steel Branch of the War Production Board. He has proven capable and able and has undertaken to meet the problems of the steel industry.

Under Mr. Batcheller's direction, the management of the steel situation has progressed considerably and should progress further in the future. The former Iron and Steel Branch of the War Production Board was advanced to the status of a division, called the Steel Division, centralizing jurisdiction over its activities in fewer hands. An effort was made to revamp the expansion program to the fullest extent possible at this late date.

At the time of the committee's hearings, the then Iron and Steel Branch depended almost wholly on trade associations for industry statistics. However, the present Steel Division's approach to the problem is to get as close to the industry as possible, and one of its new functions in this direction is the collection and analysis of its own statistics.

While much has been accomplished in the last few months, there still remains much to be done. It is too late to talk of readjusting the basic steel program. However, it is not too late to attempt to utilize what we have in order to get the most out of it and to provide much-needed special facilities.

Specifications must be reexamined with a view to elimination of too exacting requirements. Sizes and grades should also be standardized. The new national emergency alloys should be used much more extensively. These have the strength, and by utilizing most modern technique, save critical alloying metals. Centrifugal and pressure castings should be substituted for many types of forgings, with resultant savings of steel, time, labor, and facilities. Modern melting practices already developed to a high degree should be adopted extensively, particularly in electric-furnace operations. Much more open hearth alloy steel should be made. Mills should be required to limit their output to those items for which they are best suited, each mill specializing in some items. They should also discontinue making a range of items requiring loss of tonnage due to change-overs. The alloy steel field and the ferro-alloy field must be carefully studied, with a view to increasing emphasis on products now underproduced. The Steel Division is now working on most of these matters.

Many of the above problems arose because of the reluctance of the steel companies to disturb their settled customer relationships. Some result from the technical conservatism which has grown in big companies which have not had to perform miracles of production to survive in competition. Many result from a haphazard price structure. It is natural for steel consumers to purchase the cheapest articles that will meet their requirements. In too many instances the lowest prices prevail on the steels that are least desirable to the over-all steel program. The national emergency steels, for instance, have been developed to serve as adequate substitutes for steels rich in alloying elements. But the new steels are now more expensive. As a result steel consumers purchase and use, and have been allowed to purchase and use, the standard steels instead of the satisfactory new alloy saving steels.

The scrap-steel picture must be given careful attention, and the utilization of alloy steel turnings in particular is the most pressing problem. Production with present facilities can be expected to fall short of capacity, unless supplies of high-grade scrap are made available. The committee has not seen any evidence that the scrap situation has been competently taken in hand; certainly it has not been solved. Ultimate control over the collection of scrap steel should be placed in the Steel Division, with the power in that Division to issue directive to the Salvage Division, which is the organization within the War Production Board charged generally with the task of collecting scrap. The Steel Division should also be in a position to insist that the Office of Price Administration fix scrap prices high enough to induce the scrap dealer to go out and get it. This does not mean an inflationary price increase. It means paying for the increased labor of looking farther afield and working harder to collect the scrap.

Personnel changes in the Steel Division have improved the working force. However, the committee's suggestion made in July 1942 that representatives of both labor and small mills should be given a place on the Division's important committees has been followed only very recently and in a most limited way. The committee believes that considerably more can be done along these lines.

The big companies retain their stranglehold on the entire industry, and are still reluctant to adopt new melting practices or to adapt themselves to varying conditions of scrap and ore supply. This retards efforts to develop the industry along new lines and in new areas. The expansion program was arranged by War Production Board committees composed mainly of men associated with the big companies and loaned to the Iron and Steel Branch on a dollar-a-year basis. The program which was sponsored by these representatives of the Big Steel interest gave the lion's share of the expansion to the big steel companies at the expense of the small steel companies. The eight largest steel companies each have an ingot production of approximately 3,000,000 tons or more each. These are United States Steel Corporation, Bethlehem Steel Co., Republic Steel Corporation, Inland Steel Co., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, American Rolling Mill Co., Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., and National Steel Corporation. Prior to the war these companies produced approximately 80 percent of the steel ingots. They were unable to prevent new companies such as Kaiser and Koppers from obtaining a substantial portion of the increase in steel-making capacity, but they were able to see to it that those increases were made at the expense of the smaller producers of steel while Big Steel retained its 80-percent proportions of the industry. Three companies alone, United States Steel, Republic, and Bethlehem received a total of $662,888,000, or 53 percent of the $1,250,872,000 which the Government spent to expand the facilities of the entire steel industry.

Full discussion of the above is divided into three categories:

1. The steel expansion program.
2. Inefficiencies in utilizing existing capacity, including use of scrap, use of manpower, and scheduling of production.
3. Distribution of steel products.

THE STEEL EXPANSION PROGRAM

In 1938 total steel ingot production was approximately 38,000,000 net tons, and total capacity was 73,047,892 net tons. In 1942 production was 86,092,209 net tons, and capacity on November 1 was 89,454,000 net tons. At the end of 1943 capacity will be 97,115,000 net tons. Practically all of the new production facilities are scheduled for completion by the middle of 1943.

Before there can be full understanding of the task confronting this country in the expansion of steel-producing facilities at the outset of the defense program, it is necessary to consider the status of the steel industry at that time. We did not start with a normally healthy industry. It was instead engaged in a struggle for survival. In June 1938 pig-iron production was at its lowest point with a production of approximately 1,200,000 tons for the month. Similarly ingot production reached its lowest point in December 1937 with a production of approximately 1,700,000 tons for the month. When the objective of 5,900,000 tons of pig iron per month and 8,250,000 tons of ingot per month in December 1943 is considered, the full extent of our rapidly expanding program can be realized.

Because our steel production during the years 1937, 1938, and 1939 was much less than our capacity to produce steel we failed to produce 50,000,000 tons of steel which we could have made. This should be contrasted with the policy in the Axis Nations of producing steel at full capacity in preparation for war.

It was a difficult task even to bring production close to capacity. Plants had been abandoned, dismantled, and scrapped. Some of the weaker, nonintegrated companies had given up the struggle, their departure hastened by stronger companies. The big companies seized the opportunity to acquire their floundering competitors and accelerate the program of dismantling and scrapping as a method of eliminating competition.

Judged by these standards production has been tremendously expanded. But much more might have been done. The late start and the insistence on conventional methods have limited us mainly to conservative increases primarily raising the capacities of the larger companies. There is ample evidence that the west coast and the South could provide the raw materials for considerable expansion to supply demands in those areas. Some expansion there has been authorized. Considerably more could have been permitted had the program been started early enough when the steel necessary for construction was available. The expansion program hewed to the lines laid out by the big companies. As a result, it relied on the huge tonnages the few companies could produce and paid only slight attention to the possibility that in wartime the aggregate contribution of many small producers could be substantial. Practically no weight was given to the possible contributions of newcomers or of new processes.

Before the expansion program went into effect 8 companies producing more than 3,000,000 tons of ingots each, had a total of 79.8 percent of the pig iron capacity, 79.3 percent of the steel ingot capacity, and 68 percent of the finishing capacity of the country.

After the program the eight big companies will have substantially maintained their position in the industry as a result of obtaining a share of the expansion in capacity roughly proportionate to their domination of the original industry.

But although the big companies were able to extend their domination even in the Government program the small companies did not fare as well. Powerful newcomers in the business (Kaiser, Lone Star, Koppers) were awarded 11.5 percent of the total pig iron expansion and 8.1 percent of the ingot. The smaller companies therefore will emerge with a smaller proportion of the total production than they had before the war.

Moreover, the big companies prepared their expansion projects in such a way as to balance their facilities, that is, to use in their fabricating mills all of the steel ingot they produced. As a result the small companies which do not have steel-making equipment are having great difficulty in obtaining sufficient ingot to continue their operation. The Steel Division is now attempting to remedy this situation by allocation of ingot. Not a single instance can be found where a small company with only finishing facilities received steel-making facilities under the program despite the fact that applications for such facilities were made.

It appears that the dollar-a-year men from the big steel companies who directed this expansion had a conviction that only the big companies could make steel. Unfortunately, the War Production Board committees selected to pass on the expansion program were dominated by officials of the five largest steel companies and did not even have a representative of the small companies or of labor to voice any opposition. The public could hardly be expected to rely on the wisdom or impartiality of the committees so constituted. Nor could it be favorably impressed by the

delays in the expansion program and the favoring of Big Steel.

The expansion program calls for a total ingot capacity of 97,115,000 net tons at the end of 1943. Since over 7,000,000 tons will be in construction during 1943, total production in 1943 will be only 94,666,000 if production comes up to capacity. However, past experience indicates that ingot production is not likely to equal capacity. In 1941, despite a potential capacity of 84,152,292 net tons existing on January 1, 1941, the actual production of steel for the entire year was 82,836,946, or approximately 97 percent of capacity. Similarly, in 1942, production of 86,092,209 tons was attained with a potential capacity on January 1, 1942, of 87,862,000 net tons and a capacity on November 1, 1942, of 89,454,000 net tons.

Moreover, looking further into the figures behind the proposed capacity, other factors appear which cast further doubts on the likelihood that production will measure up to the forecasts.

The expansion program contemplates that to support a production of 97,115,000 net tons of steel ingots, the following materials will be necessary: Pig iron, 61,759,000 tons; home scrap, 27,192,000; purchased scrap, 14,386,000; ore to be fed directly into open hearths, 8,911,000; fluxes, 8,137,000 tons. It is not clear that all of these materials will be available.

On January 1, 1942, the existing blast-furnace capacity for the production of pig iron was 60,010,000. This, however, was not all available for the manufacture of steel, as 9,500,000 tons were used in the manufacture of ferroalloys, gray-iron castings, and other iron products, leaving 50,510,000 tons available for steel-ingot production. The expansion program is designed to increase blast-furnace capacity by 10,840,000 tons, resulting in a final capacity at the completion of the program of 70,850,000 tons. However, 9,500,000 tons will still be required for iron production and miscellaneous uses, leaving only 61,350,000 for steel making, as against the pig-iron requirements of 61,759,000 tons needed to support the contemplated ingot program.

Home scrap is the term used to describe scrap produced within the finishing departments of a steel plant and returned to its steel-making units. The program expected to produce 94,666,000 tons of ingots is based on a production of home scrap equal to 28 percent of ingots produced. The committee has been advised that, based on past operations, home scrap approximated 20 to 25 percent of the total ingot production. This would mean that 3 to 8 percent less of ingots produced would be utilized in final steel products so that the gain in ingot production would be offset by the loss in final products. On the 20- to 25-percent basis, the reoccurring scrap would approximate somewhere between 19,000,000 and 24,000,000 tons, if we assume a 94,666,000-ton production. The 28-percent figure which would yield the desired 27,192,000 tons is based on the expectancy that quality steels will be used in greater quantities in the future. These steels yield a larger amount of scrap than the common grades of steel. On the other hand, in peacetime operation the major portion of a steel plant's ingot production followed through the plant to the finishing departments. Today, much less ingot is finished in American plants due to the abnormal demand for ingots and for semifinished products to supply lend-lease requirements. As a result the supply of scrap can be expected to decrease.

The estimated 14,386,000 net tons of purchased scrap which is required for the program may or may not be realized. The persons charged with scrap collections are not in a position to advise the Steel Division whether it will be forthcoming. This situation is discussed more fully below.

It is doubtful whether the 8,911,000 tons of lump ores called for in the program will be available. High-density ores are required for feeding directly into open-hearth furnaces, a practice becoming more and more important because of the scrap shortage. There is a deficiency of lump ores of sufficient density for this operation so that it is necessary to treat the available ores to increase their density. This is called sintering. But it is questionable whether there is an adequate supply of the proper kind of sinter to make up for the deficiency of satisfactory ore. The melters who actually make the steel have stated that there is not enough sinter, but the Industry Advisory Committee and the Steel Division have not made a thorough study of the problem. One proposed step has been approved by the Steel Division, to assure an emergency supply of high-grade ore which could be fed directly to open hearths. This is a plan to drain Steep Rock Lake, now covering easily accessible high-grade ore deposits in Canada. But this ore will not be available in 1943.

Despite these failings in the program, it is only fair to mention the tremendous scope of the undertaking. Not only have facilities for finished and semifinished products been created, and for steel-ingot capacity and pig-iron capacity behind them; there was also provided a huge additional tonnage of coke, ores, and additional transportation to bring the ores to the blast furnaces—all essential to completed task. Only a well-organized and vigorous industry could do this job.

The most vexing aspect of the expansion program is the futile effort and wasted material which have gone into the creation of unnecessary facilities while we are begging for other urgently needed plants.

For the lack of balance of certain types of facilities in the expansion program the armed forces are largely responsible. The armed forces do not have any satisfactory mechanism to determine in advance of a program just how much of each raw material is needed and to recommend this proper amount to the War Production Board. There is an excess of capacity for rolled armor plate. The Army sponsored a 19,000-ton plant to be operated by Carnegie-Illinois at Gary, and then had to shift to other products so far as possible. Much of the plant was so near completion that it was not practical to change it. There is an excess of capacity for forged armor plate. Despite this excess the Carnegie-Illinois Co. is operating not only its own plant at Homestead, Pa., but the Government's Naval Ordnance Plant at South Charleston, W. Va. The committee found that some work that could and should have been done at South Charleston has been diverted to Homestead by keeping particularly skilled workers at Homestead. Both of these plants, as well as two other private companies doing similar work are running below capacity because the demand for their product has gone down. History has shown that the continued operation of the Government-owned plant is necessary and desirable as a means of keeping prices within reason by its very existence.

These overcapacities may be justified on the ground of caution. Facilities of this type cannot be created quickly. Their existence may be considered as insurance, albeit very expensive in terms of materials.

It is much harder to explain the instances where capacity falls short of requirements. As a result of the undercapacities for special alloy steels airplane construction will suffer. Heat-treated steels, forgings, and castings also will not be available in the required quantities. In spite of data which indicated that there was not sufficient heat-treating capacity, various expansions were held up or materially curtailed. Now the shortage is again acute, and will continue to be so as the demand for aircraft steels increases. These shortages could have been avoided if the demand had been foreseen in time. To a great extent they are the result of the armed forces' reluctance to prepare itemized bills of materials to cover their production programs. In one instance coming to the attention of the committee a special alloy steel was tested after deliveries had started and fatigue tests showed a slight variance. The order was canceled necessitating removal of large tonnages of steel from production lines and adapting the steel to the manufacture of another product.

Expansion of mining operations has followed the same pattern as expansion of steel-making facilities. For steel making in the Pittsburgh area by the big companies no ores can compete today with the high grade, cheaply, obtainable Mesaba ores of Minnesota. But in parts of the country distant from Mesaba steelmakers need ore supplies closer at hand. There are many such deposits in proximity to other necessary raw materials, although none are as cheap and plentiful as the Mesaba deposits. Their development, therefore, is dependent on the erection of steel-making facilities in their vicinity. A program has been undertaken to expand the production of iron ore in the eastern States to the extent of 3,750,000 tons, and other projects were initiated to develop production of iron ore in Texas, Southern California, and Utah. However, the vast tonnages in Texas, the South, and the Northwest are hardly being touched. And little use is being made of many fine ore deposits throughout the country because there are not sufficient steel-making facilities at hand.

Some thought is being given to the fact that the easily accessible high grade ores in the Mesaba Range will be depleted in 7 to 14 years at present rates. Further steps should be taken to develop new ore deposits in the country. If the war extends for many years, we shall have to be prepared to find means to continue a high rate of steel production with ores less accessible and of lower quality than the best Mesaba ores. For example, we must learn how to use commercially the huge quantities of taconite ore in the Lake Superior ranges if we are to continue the present steel industry located at Gary, Cleveland, Buffalo, and other points on the shores of the Great Lakes. A proposal to allocate money for testing methods of treating low grade ores has to date received a cold reception at the War Production Board. But the comparatively small sums of money required to test such projects are well justified as insurance for the future. The Axis nations have, by necessity, been forced to improve techniques so as to enable them to use lower grade ores. Each type of ore presents special problems. Farsightedness should dictate a policy of preparedness to meet any similar emergency arising in this country by initiating now our program of research. Moreover, it may be wise, after the war to preserve our best ore deposits for some future emergency period when steel will be needed in quantities obtainable only by stripping a range like Mesaba of its best ores. In this event we should be ready to substitute lower grades and less accessible ores for the peacetime operations of the steel industry.

Another problem in the facilities program was created by the serious shortage of scrap steel. Many proposals were presented for methods of creating high quality melting stock as a substitute for scrap. In essence the majority of these utilized sponge iron processes. The making of sponge iron has been a controversial subject in the steel industry for many years and it is not entirely clear that any of the processes will prove successful for large-scale operations. None the less, some of these offered promise and could have been tried out on a sufficiently large scale with comparatively small expenditures of steel and money.

The matter was delayed, however, until late in 1942 by indulgence in theoretical discussions and attempts to obtain the opinions of scientific authorities, whose statements only

emphasized our lack of knowledge and provoked further controversies. The committee had many private discussions on this subject with the War Production Board. Finally, the reorganized Steel Division adopted a logical solution that the expenditure involved in a reasonable working test of the projects with the most promise was justified because of the great need to develop a substitute for high-grade scrap. One proposal has been approved and the others are being considered. The committee agrees that, in view of the scrap situation, the small quantities of steel and money which must be risked are well worth spending on any proposal which appears to have a fair chance of providing large quantities of high-quality scrap. The one project which has been approved to date involves a process which requires high-grade magnetic ores and which would not, even if successful, prove the general utility of sponge-iron processes for other ores. Since high-grade magnetic ores are found in only a few parts of the country and are in great demand, it would be wise to approve at least one project which could use nonmagnetic ores of lower quality.

The War Production Board's experience with sponge iron is indicative of its unwillingness to originate and sponsor experimental projects. The desirability of providing synthetic scrap was clear long before any project was approved. The Steel Division made no effort to sponsor a synthetic scrap project and limited its action to formulating objections to those proposed to it.

INEFFICIENCIES IN UTILIZING EXISTING CAPACITIES

Many inefficiencies in operation, including the methods of collecting and using scrap, failure to utilize most productive melting practices, failure to revise standards, unscientific scheduling of production, and wasteful use of manpower must still be eliminated from the program.

Scrap collection presents the most serious of the unsolved problems. To maintain steel production in 1943, 14,386,000 net tons of purchased scrap will be needed in addition to the home scrap produced by the steel companies. Foundries will require a further 7,806,000 net tons of purchased scrap. This scrap must be found in the collective junk heaps and storerooms of America. While steel can be made with less scrap than the estimated requirements, operations would be seriously hampered and production would decrease substantially. The steel industry today is geared to using large quantities of scrap in its open-hearth furnaces to dilute the carbon content of pig iron in the manufacture of steel. Large quantities of purchased scrap are also needed in making electric-furnace steel. High-grade scrap is required for many operations, so that the most important steels will suffer most seriously if scrap is not found in sufficient quantity and quality.

Sponge-iron experiments cannot be expected to produce any substantial quantities of substitute scrap in 1943, even if wholly successful. The most that could be expected from sponge-iron development for the purpose of producing synthetic scrap would be volume production in 1944 or 1945. If we knew that we could count on such production we could use our existing supplies of scrap freely and rely on sponge iron for the future, but we have no such knowledge. Scrap collection and utilization, therefore, continue to be of vital importance.

The seemingly outmoded Bessemer converter has a new usefulness in connection with the scrap shortage, being used to produce a synthetic scrap which can be fed hot into open-hearth furnaces as readily as high-grade scrap. This practice has been adopted where facilities permit.

Even more useful, however, is the duplexing of bessemer converters with electric furnaces. This is valuable because of the serious shortage of high-grade scrap suitable for electric furnace production and the shortage of electric furnace facilities. Low-grade scrap is fed to a cupola to desulfurize it. The hot metal is then processed in a bessemer converter to remove carbon and silicon. Then it is fed hot into an electric furnace. The electric furnace's capacity is thereby increased 30 percent and its consumption of electricity decreased 50 percent. Where bessemer converters are close enough to electric furnaces to permit this practice they should be so used, as the alloy steels produced by the electric furnaces are critical in our war effort. A large proportion of the great quantity of alloy turnings can be melted in cupolas without appreciable loss of the contained nickel and molybdenum. One serious defect in this procedure is the loss of the contained chrome, and for this reason the subject is still being studied.

The civilian population responded patriotically to the various local scrap campaigns. People have been willing to do their share. But after the initial flourish civilians found that there was no organization established to guide them in their enthusiasm by telling them exactly what to do. Nor are citizens impressed by the sight of huge scrap piles lying unutilized over long periods.

It must be realized that many of the contributions of the individual householder make poor scrap because they are too light and too small. When this scrap is thrown into a furnace, much of it blazes away and is lost to the operation. It also is more difficult to handle and slows down the entire steel-making operation. It must also be realized that former reliable sources of heavy scrap are disappearing. With the conversion of the civilian durable goods industries to war production, people are less prone to junk what they have. Moreover, once the present supply has been junked, no more automobiles and other heavy articles will be available to replace them and in turn be junked. Railroad lines are being rehabilitated where formerly they were torn up and put on the scrap heap. When the heavy steel articles being made today are scrapped, we expect that they will not be available for use by the steel industry because of previous use on the battlefields abroad. In brief, the sources of scrap are drying up, and we must seek new supplies diligently and with an eye to the future.

The scrap collection program has proceeded haphazardly. The Salvage Division, which has succeeded the Bureau of Industrial Conservation, is in charge of finding scrap, of stimulating its flow, and of collecting it. This Division is responsible not for the steel-scrap program but for all salvage operations. It is organized along lines designed to conduct a salvaging job. It has not been able to seek out and find scrap steel to be used as an essential raw material for steel production. The Steel Division has no jurisdiction over the collection of scrap, but merely allocates it after it has been found by the Bureau of Industrial Conservation.

The Bureau has not been able to ascertain the amounts of available scrap or to survey the places where scrap will be found. As a result the collection has been a hand-to-mouth proposition. Scrap dealers are hampered by the labor shortage, complicated regulations as to the use of their equipment, stringent specifications, too much red tape, and lack of centralization of the program. The scrap dealer must cope with the Bureau of Industrial Conservation, with the Office of Defense Transportation, with the War Labor Board, with the priority authorities, and with the Office of Price Administration. Discussions with the War Production Board on the disposition of scrap must usually be suspended until the price has been adjusted by the Office of Price Administration. Scrap prices are too low to enable the dealer to take new measures and to find and haul new and remote sources of supply. Most of the scrap dealers are trying to do their job. The Government should utilize its employees to seek out new sources of scrap steel, rather than to check and recheck the scrap dealers.

One huge store of steel which should be readily subject to requisitioning and collection lay untouched during most of 1942 and to date has not even been inventoried. This is the huge stock pile of steel which pre-war industry, particularly the automobile industry, had on hand when operations were curtailed after Pearl Harbor. Estimates of the aggregate amount of this steel vary, but all agree that there are millions of tons. The quality is good. The War Production Board knows just where to find it, yet to date most of it is still unused and deteriorating, rusting usually in the open air. An organized effort to move these stocks began in the late fall of 1942, and is now under way. Some of it is of quality and type that could be immediately fabricated into such items as farm machinery.

But the farmers of America are being denied steel necessary to make the farm machinery which they and the Department of Agriculture assert is essential to the food program. The Petroleum Administrator cannot get steel for sorely needed pipe lines and barges. The railroads cannot get steel for cars, and the Maritime Commission cannot get steel for ships.

Other serious problems to be solved are the present waste of scrap due to failure of steel fabricators to segregate the various classes of scrap and due to the failure of the industry to absorb alloy steel turnings. There is in effect an order requiring segregation, but only the large producers have complied. The average scrap producer mixes all types of steel with the result that much of his scrap is wasted. The segregation order must be enforced. Alloy steel turnings now run about 100,000 tons a month. The steel companies advise that they cannot utilize over 40,000 tons a month with present facilities for preparing the scrap for melting. The Iron and Steel Branch and the Industry Advisory Committee were advised a year ago that there would be 100,000 tons a month of alloy turnings, but practically nothing has been done to handle this quantity. The alloying elements in the wasted scrap are of prime importance and vigorous efforts must now be taken to find a way of recovering the alloying metals in these turnings.

This is no time for halfway measures. The entire steel scrap collection program should be revamped. Ultimate responsibility for finding scrap for steel, as contrasted to salvage operations, should be in the hands of the Steel Division with power in that Division to issue necessary directives to the Salvage Division. The steel scrap collection program is no mere matter of salvage and conservation. It goes to the very heart of production.

Reports have come to the committee that the steel companies could operate more efficiently if production schedules were better adjusted to their particular facilities. The Steel Division cannot wait for the companies voluntarily to take action which would disturb their customer relations. Mills should not be permitted to roll various sizes of a given product where each particular size could be assigned to the particular mill best equipped for the job. Substantial production time and manpower is lost during time spent on turn-overs from one type of job to another. Some items, which should be used extensively, are not in demand because of the price structure. Low-alloy steels sell at prices higher than high-alloy steels, with a resultant waste of the alloying elements in cases where carbon or low-alloy steel would be satisfactory; the various ferro-alloy prices result in a tendency to produce the most profitable products rather than those which help the most in conservation. The solution of

this problem is in the hands of the Office of Price Administration. Prices should be adjusted to equalize profits or to make the more important products the most profitable.

The priority system also has affected production adversely in many instances. Under heretofore existing conditions steel companies have had to produce the items with highest priority numbers first, whereas they would be able to operate more efficiently if they could schedule a total maximum output of all products for a particular period and produce them in such a way as to achieve maximum efficiency. This condition will probably be cured when the Steel Division puts into effect a more inclusive production-directives system and integrates this with the controlled-materials plan. Under this system the mills will be specifically instructed with respect to the particular items they must produce in each month, with due consideration given to the plant's backlog of orders and its particular problems.

Abandonment of the priority system in favor of specific allocations will also eliminate other less important factors which unbalanced production. In the past the customer with the low priority number could shop around for a mill with a small backlog to fill his order, while another customer with a high priority number would go unsatisfied if he ordered his steel from a producer with a large backlog. Most large corporations maintained a retinue of scouts in the field to cope with this situation. The new system should eliminate these mechanical difficulties and also enable the War Production Board to know exactly how steel is being utilized. With such information it should be able to insure that the most important needs are satisfied first and that war production is maintained at the highest possible rate.

The system alone will not solve the problem. One situation which requires careful consideration is due to orders for certain types of products being placed seasonally in some cases, such as tin plate; this creates a serious problem. A large crew is required to turn out the job in a hurry when the pyramided orders arrive. In order to keep experienced crews of workers available against the time when the orders come in, the mills have shown a tendency to hoard these men. Although tin-plate production has been considerably curtailed for some time, manufacturers have believed that the packing of the incoming large food crop will result in a sudden rush for all available tinplate capacity. When it does come, they will need a full and experienced crew. Accordingly, workers are being held on although not needed. It would be preferable to place orders for this type of material well in advance, and to space production to avoid peaks and depressions, thus enabling the mills to utilize their plant and personnel uniformly over a long period of time and to release those workers whom it otherwise tries to save to handle a rush of work.

Specifications also should be reexamined with a view to making sure that they are not too exacting with a resultant loss in production. Wherever it is possible to relax specifications without sacrificing military effectiveness, this should be done. We cannot afford to sacrifice materials needed now to gain additional durability for articles which will certainly do their job and outlast the war. The new national emergency alloy steels do the job of old alloy steels and save substantial quantities of scarce metals. The Steel Division should take positive action to require the use of these steels, and the Office of Price Administration should look into the price situation with respect to them. At present high prices for these steels set by the steel companies are proving a deterrent to their use.

Centrifugal castings and pressure castings should be used more freely as a substitute for forgings and rolled bars. Consumers have been reluctant to make the change, although the castings have proved their merit and save great quantities of steel. Many forgings utilize as little as 15 percent of the steel which goes into their making, whereas in equivalent castings the yield often is as high as 80 percent. The finished casting requires much less machining than a forging. The change-over would not result in junking equipment. There is more than enough demand for all the forging facilities that would be available even if centrifugal and pressure castings were widely used. New equipment for this purpose can be built quickly and with much less critical material than rolling and forging facilities.

Testimony developed at the committee's hearings showed that orders for sheet steel were assigned to large mills, with equipment to produce a variety of items, whereas small mills equipped only to roll light sheet were operating far below capacity.

The committee recommended that, insofar as practicable, the small mills be given orders which would enable them to continue in business and at the same time release for other work facilities and employees of the large mills with varied operations to the extent of the work that can be given to the smaller mills. The manpower situation, in particular, would warrant this, since the small mills have their manpower at hand. If they are forced out of business, the manpower will drift away, probably to other industries, and certainly away from the housing facilities they now occupy, whereas the large mills could readily use the manpower which they themselves would release if they gave up some of these operations. To date, however, this situation has not been much improved, and the committee is of the opinion that more could be done to aid the small mill and at the same time help the war effort.

The Bessemer steel capacity of the country is not being fully utilized to date. In connection with the discussion of scrap in this report, the committee concluded that Bessemer converters would be most useful where duplexed in operation with open-hearth and electric furnaces. This is possible only where the two are close enough to permit the feeding of hot steel from the Bessemer to the open-hearth or electric furnace. But there are many Bessemer converters in places where such duplexing would not be feasible, and these are not producing Bessemer steel up to capacity. This steel is not suitable for most military purposes, due to its lower ductility. Nevertheless, it can be used to fill many essential needs which otherwise would go unfilled. Pre-war specifications, however, shunned Bessemer steel, and the armed forces and industry in general have not yet been willing to use it for purposes where they were accustomed to use open-hearth steel. Bessemer should be specified wherever possible.

DISTRIBUTION OF STEEL PRODUCTS

The controlled materials plan is rapidly being put into effect. Under it the armed forces and other consumers will state in advance exactly what they need and allocations will be specifically made to the extent that the materials are available. The principles underlying the plan appear to be sound, but its success will depend almost entirely upon how it is administered. Actual operation and practice have not yet proceeded far enough to enable an accurate appraisal of its efficiency to be made.

The priorities system of distribution depended on assigning an arbitrary priority designation to a particular steel purchase. The priority number was based on the best approximation of the urgency status of the particular purchase and the relative importance of the item to be produced as related to the entire defense program. No steps were taken to prevent a steel plant from favoring production of more profitable items over other items having a higher priority status. Nor was any program evolved to equalize the distribution of urgent priority orders uniformly between the various steel manufacturers. As a result, astute purchasers with low priority ratings were able to place their orders with manufacturers having less of the higher priority commitments and thereby improved their ratings.

The priority system was further predicated on the theory that the priorities would absorb all the ingot produced in order of their ratings flowing progressively from the highest to the lower ratings until all the production found its way into the program. But in actual practice many urgent programs with high priority ratings went begging for steel, while large tonnages of low priority ratings were being filled.

The black markets disclosed in the steel industry were patronized by producers of vital items who were unable to get quick deliveries of steel in any other way. These black markets were able to exist because of the absence of control of less than carload lots. A few jobbers took advantage of this to sell at exhorbitant prices, with a resultant disarrangement of the price and priority system. Black markets must be constantly sought out and eliminated when found. On the other hand, the jobbers can perform a most valuable function by stocking odd items of which individual purchasers order small quantities.

Under the priorities system, a shipyard could pile up inventories of plate even though failure of other deliveries made the plate useless. Low priority numbers on some items could and did hold up construction jobs which had high ratings on other items.

The Steel Division should check very carefully accumulations of large inventories at this time when so many urgent needs have not been satisfied. The armed forces, and some Navy shipyards in particular have supplies on hand for many months, in some instances for 8 to 10 months. Each case should be examined to determine whether, without prejudice to the war effort, the steel could be put to immediate use, and replaced by later production.

With programs as important as the synthetic rubber, oil pipe line, shipbuilding construction, and farm machinery, begging for steel, we cannot afford to wonder where steel ingot is going.

It is essential that every ton of steel produced by every mill be specifically allocated to the most important work at hand. It is essential that so far as possible this allocation be carried back as far as the ingot so that the quantities of each type produced can be adjusted to the facilities for finishing the most urgently needed products. This requires considerable planning and effort. It will require primarily that the armed forces determine their needs and state them correctly, conservatively, and in sufficient time to permit proper planning. It will emphasize, though not increase, the dangers of asking for the wrong finished products and then changing specifications in the midst of production. It should greatly lessen the all too prevalent practice of asking for too much on the theory that that is the best way to assure getting at least enough.

If this program is to be successful, the Army and the Navy will have to cooperate in it. There is too little leeway in the over-all requirements estimates for 1943 to justify any extravagance or waste. In the steel program, the requirements of the armed forces compete, not just with essential civilian requirements, but with programs essential to the actual fighting of the war.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1446) authorizing appropriations for the United States

Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1446) authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

INFLATION—BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we have been told for many months of the great danger of inflation. The President of the United States himself has sent us several messages dwelling on the damage which it would cause, and last September he regarded it as such a tremendous danger that he threatened to fix prices and wages himself without legal authority if Congress did not act promptly on the anti-inflation measure. I agree that a serious inflation would create hardship and injustice among our citizens and, if carried to extremes, might destroy our whole financial and economic structure.

I was the more surprised, therefore, to learn of the action of the Federal Reserve Board taken in December, resulting in the issue of $660,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes, which are the exact equivalent of greenbacks. I do not know any policy more likely to bring about inflation than the issue of paper currency without reserves and resting for its value entirely on the unsecured promise of the Government of the United States. In the name of preventing inflation, one department of the Government is subjecting the people to every form of Fascist control in the regulation of prices, wages, and rationing, while another department is engaged in inflating the currency.

On January 21 I addressed a letter to the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and another letter to the Secretary of the Treasury. I have received replies describing the procedure taken in connection with the issuance of $660,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes. I assume the facts to be as stated in those letters, but they do not change in any way my condemnation of the procedure.

I ask that the letters be printed at the close of my remarks, together with the enclosures, so that the whole story may be in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letters may be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. TAFT. These Federal Reserve bank notes are being issued under section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, as it was amended in 1933, at the time of the bank crisis. Amended section 18 was passed while the banks were closed, in order to provide a liberal supply of currency, in case there should be any runs on the banks when they were opened. That was its only purpose, and it provides that no note shall be issued under it after the President has declared by proclamation that the emergency recognized by him by proclamation of March 6, 1933, has terminated.

In other words, an act was passed for an emergency which existed in 1933. It was expressly provided that if the President should declare that emergency to be ended, the statute should be void. It happens that the President never has declared that emergency to be ended. I do not think he has ever declared to be ended any of the hundreds of emergencies which have occurred since 1933. The result is that legally this statute is still in effect. That emergency apparently never has been formally terminated, and so the Treasury now takes action under this act.

The act authorized any Federal Reserve bank to deposit Government bonds or commercial paper with the Treasury, and against the security of such obligations to issue its own notes, known as Federal Reserve bank notes. Any bank could bring its assets to the Federal Reserve bank, therefore, and the Federal Reserve bank could issue this currency to it in return. It was recognized at the time that this was not a permanently sound procedure, because it resulted in effect in the monetization of the national debt, that is, when bonds were actually deposited. Under the present action no bonds are deposited, but it is not a sound procedure even when bonds are deposited. It was not extensively used, only $265,000,000 being issued in 1933, and all but $18,000,000 of these have since been retired. Those eighteen million are apparently in safety deposit boxes, or lost, or have in some way disappeared.

Apparently someone in the Treasury found in some back drawer $660,000,000 of these notes which had been printed and never used in 1933, and he got the bright idea that they might as well be issued now. So a method was devised which is even more unsound than the original issue of the notes under emergency conditions.

Another provision of section 18 provides the method by which these Federal Reserve bank notes can be retired, that method being the same as the one pursued in the retirement of national-bank notes, that is, the notes issued by the ordinary national banks prior to the enactment of the Federal Reserve Act.

If any national bank or any Federal Reserve bank desires to retire any of these notes, it may deposit cash with the Treasury and take back its collateral. Thereupon it is provided that the liability for the note is transferred to the United States, and the national bank or the Federal Reserve bank is released from further liability. It is intended, of course, that this shall result promptly in the retirement of the notes. So apparently what happened in this case is that the Federal Reserve Board ordered the Federal Reserve banks, who knew nothing about the matter and had no need for such currency, to issue a proportion of these notes. Each Federal Reserve bank took its Government bonds and deposited them as collateral with the Federal Reserve agent. At least, that is what is claimed. They are not there now.

Immediately, and apparently as part of the same transaction, it notified the Treasury of its intention to retire the notes, withdraw its collateral, and meet the requirement for the deposit of cash by setting up a credit to the Treasury on its own books. Thereupon it relieved itself of any liability on the new Federal Reserve bank notes, and this liability was transferred to the United States. These Federal Reserve bank notes have apparently never appeared in any statement as a liability of any Federal Reserve bank. The net result of this transaction is that there are now outstanding $660,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes, against which there is no collateral, which are not liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks, but are liabilities of the Government of the United States. No effort was made to retire these notes, although probably they were still in the hands of the Federal Reserve banks, but they are being issued to the public from time to time. The net legal effect is the same as if the United States had issued greenbacks in the same sum. It is stated on the face of the notes that they are liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks, and that bonds have been deposited to secure their payment, but these are not facts. At least, they are no longer liabilities of the Federal Reserve bank, and no bonds are now deposited for their payment.

It may be that the procedure followed is legal, and that these notes are legal obligations of the United States. That is the opinion of Mr. Dreibelbis, general attorney of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, whose opinion is attached. Certainly Congress never intended such an issue to take place, and there is a complete violation of the spirit of the law. In the first place, Congress made clear its intention that no such notes should be issued after the 1933 emergency came to an end. The statement issued by the Federal Reserve Board frankly says that—

> Authority for Federal Reserve banks to issue Federal Reserve bank notes will expire when the President proclaims that the emergency recognized in his proclamation of March 6, 1933, has terminated.

Apparently no such proclamation terminating the bank emergency of 1933 is expected. It is quite true that the President has declared many emergencies since that time; but I have never heard of anyone claiming that that particular emergency is still in effect.

Secondly, the act was certainly passed for the benefit of the Federal Reserve banks to supply them with currency when they needed it. In the present case these banks knew nothing about the matter until they were ordered to take out the notes. It will be noted that the Secretary of the Treasury says that these notes are being issued by the Federal Reserve banks at the direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. There is nothing in the law which gives the Board of Governors power to issue any such order. However, the Federal Reserve banks ordinarily comply with what they are requested to do.

Thirdly, the statute permitting the retirement of the notes and the transfer of liability to the United States is not being complied with in good faith. The United States was only supposed to assume a liability between the time when the need for the notes had come to an end, as in-

dicated by the banks' desire to retire them, and the time when they could be retired. It was merely a step in the process of retirement. Instead of that, the notes are permitted to be issued after the notice of retirement has been given, and apparently it is the intention to keep the notes in circulation more or less indefinitely. The statement of the Federal Reserve Board says that—

The Federal Reserve bank notes will be canceled and retired as they become unfit for circulation.

In other words, when they are torn to pieces or worn out they will be retired, after a period of perhaps 3 or 4 years.

It may well be a number of years before this condition exists. I even question whether Government bonds were ever really handed to the Federal Reserve agent, although I assume that he perhaps saw them for a minute or two. Perhaps they were put in his hands for that purpose.

Fourthly, the procedure was so simultaneous that I rather doubt whether there was any moment at which the Federal Reserve banks were liable to anyone on these notes. Apparently they still held the notes when they withdrew their collateral. If so, the notes never were outstanding, and never were in fact Federal Reserve bank notes.

It is argued by the Board in effect that since they are issuing so many bonds anyway, it does not make much difference whether the unsecured notes are issued or not. Of course, that begs the question. Furthermore, these notes are a little worse form of currency than any other to which we have resorted. The Civil War greenbacks, of which there are still $346,000,000 outstanding, are secured by a 45-percent reserve of gold. The Federal Reserve notes are secured by reserves in gold of not less than 40 percent. Silver certificates are secured by silver, usually to the full value of the certificates. Bank deposits, both in commercial banks and in Federal Reserve banks, must have adequate reserves. But here is a series of notes resting solely on the promise of the Government of the United States, without collateral of any kind.

I realize that it is impossible at the present time entirely to avoid an inflationary procedure with reference to the currency, but there are certainly far more sound and conservative methods of dealing with the currency than this one. Fundamentally, inflation is caused by the creation of purchasing power through Government borrowing. Ultimately, the only way to avoid inflation is to reduce expenses, raise more taxes, and sell bonds to individuals and institutions which have really saved the money and have it available for investment. In time of war it is almost impossible to secure any great reduction in expenses. We are undertaking to tax up to the very limit that the people can bear without suffering more harm than the avoidance of inflation will do good. Even though we go the limit on taxation, the Government will have to borrow from fifty to sixty billion dollars next year. The most important policy for the Treasury to pursue is to put on a complete and all-inclusive bond-selling campaign to get the money, not by issuing notes, but by selling bonds to the people in return for their savings. It must provide the kind of bonds that people in different situations are interested in buying. It must sell those bonds by a house-to-house canvass on the same basis on which we conduct our Community Chest campaign.

For the first time, in December the Treasury turned toward such a policy, but even then $5,000,000,000 of the $12,000,000,000 of bonds sold were sold to commercial banks. The sale of bonds to commercial banks is simply the creation of purchasing power out of thin air, for the deposits created are passed on by the Government to individuals who have the money to spend. The holdings of commercial banks have increased approximately $10,000,000,000 in 1 year, and will increase more than twice that amount in the next year if we do not do a better job of selling bonds. The holdings of the Federal Reserve banks have increased approximately $3,700,000,000 dollars in 1 year. For various reasons the amount of currency outstanding has increased more than $3,000,000,000 in 1 year. If this inflationary process continues, I do not care how strong we make the dike of price control and wage control, it will be swept away by the flood of paper.

I have to admit that the sale of bonds to commercial banks has ultimately about the same result as the issue of unsecured paper money such as I have been discussing, but there is a substantial difference in the nature of the process. In the first place, the commercial banks do not have to buy bonds unless they wish to do so, and they cannot do so unless their resulting situation provides sufficient reserves. In other words, there is a limit to the process of selling bonds to commercial banks. The least dangerous form of inflation, therefore, is this method, which has been pursued too liberally by the Treasury up to this time.

The second method of financing the Government through inflation, somewhat more dangerous than that of selling bonds to the commercial banks, is the purchase of bonds in the open market by the Federal Reserve banks. This process has been authorized for years, and as a balance wheel to meet an increased or decreased volume of business, it is generally recognized as sound. When it is used, however, as it is now being used and has been used during the past year, to help finance the Government's war program, it is distinctly inflationary. I have pointed out that the Federal Reserve banks have increased their holdings of bonds by $3,700,000,000, and evidently they intend to go on increasing their holdings. The effect of this is to increase the bank reserves and to make it easier for the Treasury to sell bonds to the banks.

A still more inflationary procedure consists in the direct sale of Government bonds to the Federal Reserve banks. This was authorized by statute last year over my protest, and I understand that it has been used by the Treasury, although when the bill was passed they denied any intention of making use of it except temporarily to assist financing over tax day.

Finally, the most inflationary method of all, psychologically and practically, is the direct issue of paper money. Unfortunately, the statutes already permit this to be done in several ways. They permit it to be done in the case of silver certificates. Without further action by Congress, the Government today could issue $1,700,000,000 worth of additional silver certificates, representing the difference between the actual cost of the Government's silver and $1.29 an ounce, the monetary value. I hope the Government will not do so. So far, the Treasury has apparently no intention of doing so.

As a practical matter, however, the issue of this money while it would be pure inflation, would at least provide a substantial reserve behind the notes; because of course there would be that silver; and while it would not be for 100 percent, it still would be for from 50 percent to 60 percent of the face amount of the notes.

There is also some authority under certain circumstances to issue $3,000,000,000 worth of greenbacks under the Thomas amendment of 1933.

Now, Mr. President, the Treasury has dug up another method of printing paper money, and I should say that it falls in the most dangerous class of inflationary action. I might point out that if the Treasury can do this at all, if the Treasury can issue the $660,000,000 worth of notes—notes which were printed 10 years ago—it can also go on printing the notes in unlimited quantities. It can increase the issue from $660,000,000 to $10,000,000,000. If there is statutory authority for the issuance of $660,000,000 worth of notes there is statutory authority for issuing $10,000,000,000 worth of the notes. So the situation presents a wide-open field for pure inflationary issuance of paper money.

It is difficult for me to see how any responsible official of the United States Government can deliberately favor the issuance of unsecured paper money and at the same time inveigh against the dangers of inflation. The Federal Reserve bank notes should be immediately retired, and Congress should repeal the act which authorizes their issuance.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to introduce a bill for that purpose.

The bill (S. 658) to repeal the sixth paragraph of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXHIBIT A

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
*Washington, January 26, 1943.*

Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR TAFT: This is in reply to your letter of January 21 in which you inquire whether in the issuance of $660,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes the provisions of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act have been complied with and requesting

also an explanation of the exact procedure followed in the issuance of these notes.

With regard to the legality of the issue, I enclose a memorandum opinion by the general attorney of the Board which shows conclusively that the notes were issued in strict compliance with the law and the regulations thereunder. With respect to the procedure, I attach a memorandum prepared by the staff which gives the details of the procedure followed. You will note that it is in conformity with procedure followed in the past, both with respect to Federal Reserve bank notes and national bank notes.

In addition, I enclose a memorandum which Dr. Goldenweiser, Director of our Division of Research and Statistics, informally prepared after reading the open letter sent to Congress by the secretary of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy. Dr. Goldenweiser fully explained the matter over the telephone to the writer of this open letter and felt indignant that nevertheless the open letter had been sent in the light of the facts and the disturbance of public confidence which could result from a deliberate distortion of the truth.

I trust that this material will acquaint you fully with the facts, but if you desire more information, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

M. S. ECCLES, *Chairman.*

---

Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics at New York University, and secretary of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, addressed an open letter to Congress on January 20, 1943. In this letter he says that the issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes by the Treasury up to $660,000,000, or any other amount, is not authorized by law; that these notes must be issued by the Federal Reserve banks; that they are not being issued by these banks and are not liabilities of these banks, and that the statement on the face of these notes, that they are secured by United States Government obligations is a falsehood.

First, as to the law: The law and regulations thereunder authorize the Federal Reserve banks to issue Federal Reserve bank notes against Government securities pledged for the purpose and to extinguish their liability on these notes by depositing lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States. When the Reserve banks' liability has been extinguished in this manner, they are at liberty to withdraw the Government securities that were pledged against the notes. What was done is precisely that. The notes were issued by the Reserve banks and Government securities were pledged against them. Lawful money was deposited with the Treasurer of the United States by giving the Treasury a deposit account at the Federal Reserve banks, which is withdrawable at any time in gold certificates, silver certificates, or any other lawful money. In this way the liability on the notes was extinguished, and the securities back of the notes were then withdrawn.

The accusation that the words "secured by United States bonds" on the notes is a falsehood is specious. It is true that they are no longer secured by bonds because of the series of transactions which has been described. But they are secured "by like deposit of other securities" to wit, lawful money. The transaction is identical with the course followed in the case of Federal Reserve bank notes in 1921–24 and 1934–35. It is identical with the course pursued at the time that national bank notes were taken over from the national banks and made liabilities of the Treasury. These notes, the same as Federal Reserve bank notes, are no longer secured by United States obligations but by lawful money and require no other collateral.

The particular point that Mr. Spahr makes about the notes being labeled "national currency" would be puzzling if one did not know how it happened, as he should know. The reason the words "national currency" appear on these notes is that at the time of the banking holiday in 1933, when it became necessary to be prepared to meet currency withdrawals in case they should continue after the banks reopened, it was essential to print the notes in a hurry. For this purpose existing plates of national bank notes were used, with some overprinting. This was in accordance with law which provides that the Secretary of the Treasury has authority to determine the form of any United States currency that is issued.

The next question is as to the good faith of the Board when it stated that the purpose of issuing these notes was to save the paper and manpower necessary for printing other notes. The fact is that that was the sole purpose of the issue. These notes were in existence, they were lying idle, and it would have taken 225,000 man-hours, 45 tons of paper and some other scarce materials to produce a supply of other notes.

It is true that the Treasury, as a result of this transaction, got the use of $660,000,000 without interest for the period until these notes will have been retired. That this was not one of the objects of the issue is apparent, however, from the circumstances surrounding the issue. It costs the Treasury about three-eighths of 1 percent a year to borrow the money which it would have had to have if the notes had not been issued in the manner indicated. But in that case the Federal Reserve banks would have had to pay the Treasury one-half of 1 percent tax on the notes, so that, as a matter of fact, the Treasury sustained a nominal loss as a result of using the method of issuing the notes that was adopted.

All this, however, is within the realm of reasonable discussion and debate. But, beyond this point, Professor Spahr proceeds into a long discussion based on the supposition that the Federal Reserve bank notes will add $660,000,000 to the reserves of the Federal Reserve banks; that this amount will support, in round numbers, $1,900,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank deposits, and that this, in turn, will support about $9,500,000,000 of member bank deposits, or, if reserve requirements are reduced to 10 percent, as the law permits, it will support nineteen billions of member bank deposits.

It is in the figure of nineteen billions of deposits added to the paying medium of the country that Professor Spahr sees danger to the economy and inconsistency with the policy of the Government in trying to prevent inflation. The facts of the matter are that the $660,000,000 are not being added to the Federal Reserve banks' reserves, since they are being paid out into circulation as fast as there is a demand for them. A delay of some weeks in some instances may occur where the notes are in denominations of $50 and $100, which do not circulate rapidly. All of the notes, however, will be paid out in a relatively short time.

The other and much more important fact is that even if those notes were added to the reserves of the Federal Reserve banks this would be an act of supererogation. The Reserve banks now have eleven billions of excess reserves. On the basis of these reserves, following Mr. Spahr's calculations, they could build up a member bank-deposit structure of $300,000,000,000, in comparison with which the professor's nineteen billions would fade into insignificance. To build up a vast monster of inflationary danger by assuming such an addition to the reserves of the Reserve banks (even if it should occur, as it will not) and then to accuse the Government of an improper act on that score is to exceed the boundaries of responsible discussion.

---

ISSUANCE AND RETIREMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANK NOTES

JANUARY 23, 1943.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS:

(Mr. Dreibelbis, General Attorney.)

On December 12, 1943, the Board authorized the Federal Reserve banks to utilize the existing stock of currency known as Federal Reserve bank notes amounting to approximately $660,000,000. This currency is the remainder of a supply printed in 1933 and is identical with the Federal Reserve bank notes now in circulation.

I am informed that the procedure followed in issuing, redeeming and retiring Federal Reserve bank notes has been and is as follows. Government securities are pledged with the Federal Reserve agent as agent for the Comptroller of the Currency and upon their deposit the Federal Reserve agent delivers Federal Reserve bank notes to the Federal Reserve bank. However, it has been the practice of the Federal Reserve banks to reduce or extinguish their liability on such notes by establishing credits in the Treasurer's general account. When the credit has been established, the collateral is returned to the banks and subsequent retirement or redemption of the notes is effected by charges to the account.

My opinion has been requested as to the legal authority for this procedure.

The issuance and retirement of such notes are governed by the provisions of paragraph 6 of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act and regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury issued pursuant thereto.

The pertinent provisions of paragraph 6 of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act read as follows:

"Upon deposit with the Treasurer of the United States, (a) of any direct obligations of the United States * * * any Federal Reserve bank making such deposit in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be entitled to receive from the Comptroller of the Currency circulating notes in blank, duly registered and countersigned. * * * The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and empowered to prescribe regulations governing the issuance, redemption, replacement, retirement, and destruction of such circulating notes and the release and substitution of security therefor. * * * No such circulating notes shall be issued under this paragraph after the President has declared by proclamation that the emergency recognized by the President by proclamation of March 6, 1933, has terminated, unless such circulating notes are secured by deposits of bonds of the United States bearing the circulation privilege. When required to do so by the Secretary of the Treasury, each Federal Reserve agent shall act as agent of the Treasurer of the United States or of the Comptroller of the Currency, or both, for the performance of any of the functions which the Treasurer or the Comptroller may be called upon to perform in carrying out the provisions of this paragraph."

On March 11, 1933, Secretary of the Treasury Woodin issued a regulation which provides for the issuance of such notes and the deposit and maintenance of collateral as security therefor. The pertinent provisions of this regulation will be found in paragraphs 1 and 4 which read as follows:

"1. The Federal Reserve agent accredited to each Federal Reserve bank is hereby authorized and required to act as the agent of the Treasurer of the United States or of the

Comptroller of the Currency, or both, for the performance of any of the functions which the Treasurer or the Comptroller may be called upon to perform in carrying out the provisions of such sixth paragraph of section 18, as amended. The term 'Federal Reserve agent' as used in this regulation shall be construed to mean the Federal Reserve agent as agent of the Treasurer of the United States or of the Comptroller of the Currency, or both, as the case may be."

* * * * *

"4. Upon deposit with the Federal Reserve agent of the security required by such sixth paragraph of section 18, as amended, the Federal Reserve agent may deliver Federal Reserve bank notes to the Federal Reserve bank to which he is accredited."

On March 31, 1933, Acting Secretary of the Treasury A. A. Ballantine issued a regulation which provides for the retirement of such notes. The pertinent provisions of this regulation will be found in paragraphs 5 and 7 which read as follows:

"5. Deposits by Federal Reserve banks for credit in the redemption fund provided for under paragraph 10 of the regulations approved March 11, 1933, [or deposits to retire Federal Reserve bank notes as hereinafter povided may be made by credits in the Treasurer's general account or by payment through the gold settlement fund]". (Language in brackets indicates our emphasis.)

* * * * *

"7. Any Federal Reserve bank may at any time retire its Federal Reserve bank notes by the deposit of such notes with its Federal Reserve agent, or may reduce its liability for outstanding Federal Reserve bank notes by the deposit of lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States, and upon delivery to the agent by the bank of any of its Federal Reserve bank notes, or upon advice from the Treasurer [or the Federal Reserve bank] [1] that a deposit of lawful money has been made by the bank for retirement of its Federal Reserve bank notes, the agent shall have general authority to surrender an equivalent amount of collateral to the bank. Any Federal Reserve bank notes surrendered to the Federal Reserve agent by the bank may be reissued to the bank only on the basis of an original issue. The Federal Reserve agent shall daily report to the Treasurer of the United States, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Reserve Board the amount of Federal Reserve bank notes surrendered by the bank."

You are advised that, in my opinion, the procedure outlined above meets the legal requirements of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act and the applicable regulations issued thereunder.

---

STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO ISSUANCE OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANK NOTES

In December 1942 the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, with the approval of the Treasury Department, authorized the Federal Reserve banks to pay out the existing stock, approximately $660,000,000, of Federal bank notes which were printed in 1933. This was done to help meet the extraordinary demands for currency and at the same time conserve thousands of man-hours and valuable materials for other purposes. It was estimated that there would be a saving of 225,000 man-hours in printing alone and 45 tons of paper, in addition to substantial quantities of nylon and ink.

The issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes was authorized in the Federal Reserve Act as originally drawn in 1913. Such notes were issued during the period 1916–20, and again in 1933, when a shortage of currency appeared imminent at the time of the bank holiday. About $912,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes were printed in 1933 (none have been printed since that date), of which about $265,000,000 were issued to member banks for circulation purposes. Between February 28, 1934, when $194,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes were in circulation, and March 1, 1935, the various Federal Reserve banks extinguished their liability for Federal Reserve bank notes then outstanding by depositing an equal amount of lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States for their redemption, as provided in the Treasury Department's regulations of March 31, 1933, covering the issue and redemption of Federal Reserve bank notes. From then on the Federal Reserve banks had no liability for Federal Reserve bank notes in circulation. About $18,000,000 of these Federal Reserve bank notes are still in circulation.

In 1935 a similar procedure was followed in extinguishing the liability of national banks for approximately $654,000,000 of national bank notes which were in circulation at the end of July 1935, when the Secretary of the Treasury called for redemption all United States securities available as collateral for currency issued by national banks. The national banks deposited lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States for the redemption of their bank notes then outstanding, and thereupon the liability for such notes was assumed by the United States. There are still about $135,000,000 of national bank notes in circulation

The Federal Reserve bank notes now being put into circulation are issued by the Federal Reserve banks in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Reserve Act and regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury. For all notes issued to the Federal Reserve banks, Government securities were deposited by the Reserve banks with the Federal Reserve agents, acting as agents of the Comptroller of the Currency, pursuant to Treasury Department regulations. Instead, however, of leaving the bonds pledged with Federal Reserve agents as collateral for Federal Reserve bank notes issued by them to the Federal Reserve banks, and showing such notes as a liability, the Federal Reserve banks secured the release of the bonds by depositing lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States in an amount sufficient to redeem all Federal Reserve bank notes issued to them. The Federal Reserve bank notes will be canceled and retired as they become unfit for circulation.

If the Federal Reserve banks had left Government bonds pledged as security for Federal Reserve bank notes they would under the law have paid a tax of one-fourth percent semiannually upon the average amount of such notes in circulation. The method followed has the effect of relieving the Federal Reserve banks of the payment of the tax, and member bank reserves will be temporarily increased as the funds deposited in the United States Treasurer's general account are checked out. This effect on member-bank reserves will be reversed as the Federal Reserve bank notes are redeemed and retired from circulation.

Authority for Federal Reserve banks to issue Federal Reserve bank notes will expire when the President proclaims that the emergency recognized in his proclamation of March 6, 1933, has terminated.

---

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
*Washington, February 1, 1943.*

Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of January 21, 1943, in which you make several inquiries with respect to the issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes.

These notes, as you know, are being issued by the Federal Reserve banks at the direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The Board of Governors consulted the Treasury prior to directing their issuance and the Treasury approved this action.

All steps taken in connection with the issuance of these notes have been in compliance with the applicable statutes and regulations, and were approved by counsel for the Board of Governors and for the Treasury. I understand that you have already been furnished with a memorandum opinion by Mr. J. P. Dreibelbis, general attorney of the Board of Governors, fully explaining the legal basis of the action. Our own counsel concur in the conclusions reached in this opinion.

The issuance of the existing stock of Federal Reserve bank notes will result in a substantial saving of money. As Professor Spahr says in his so-called open letter to Congress, this saving will accrue immediately to the benefit of the Federal Reserve banks which are required by law to reimburse the Treasury for all expenses connected with the preparation of Federal Reserve bank notes. The saving will ultimately fall into the Treasury, however, as it will add that much to the surplus of the Federal Reserve banks which is the property of the United States subject to the disposition of Congress. More importantly, the issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes will result in substantial savings of scarce labor and strategic materials which cannot be adequately evaluated in terms of money.

Federal Reserve bank notes from the existing stock of $660,000,000 are being issued only as needed for actual circulation and will not be added to the reserves of the Federal Reserve banks. Even if they were so added, the issue would be negligible as the Federal Reserve banks have a very large amount of excess reserves. The issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes is no more inflationary than the issuance of a corresponding amount of Federal Reserve notes.

I am taking the liberty in this connection of sending you a copy of a memorandum on the economic effects of the issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes by Dr. E. A. Goldenweiser, director of research and statistics of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I understand that a copy of this memorandum has already been transmitted to you by Chairman Eccles. I agree completely with Dr. Goldenweiser's comments and share his indignation, referred to in Chairman Eccles' letter to you, that Dr. Spahr should have chosen to issue his "open letter" in the face of the actual facts of the situation.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
*Acting Secretary of the Treasury.*

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION—REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to make a motion in regard to Senate bill 607, to establish an Office of War Mobilization, and for other purposes, introduced by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and other distinguished colleagues.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there will be some discussion of the motion and the bill, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MCNARY. Just a moment. Did the Senator from North Carolina complete his motion?

[1] Language in brackets inserted by amendment dated December 14, 1942, to permit alternative advice by the Federal Reserve bank.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not so understand.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I was about to give my reasons as to why I thought the bill should be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the Senator completed his motion. He did not actually make the motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Then, I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is constrained to inform the Senator that he will first have to make a motion to have the bill taken up for consideration.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 607) to establish an Office of War Mobilization, and for other purposes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I now move that Senate bill 607 be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield to me to make the point of no quorum? I think Senators should be present when the motion is voted on.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | George | Overton |
| Andrews | Gerry | Pepper |
| Austin | Gillette | Radcliffe |
| Ball | Gurney | Reed |
| Bankhead | Hawkes | Reynolds |
| Barkley | Hayden | Robertson |
| Bilbo | Hill | Russell |
| Bone | Holman | Shipstead |
| Brewster | Johnson, Colo. | Stewart |
| Bridges | Kilgore | Taft |
| Brooks | La Follette | Thomas, Idaho |
| Buck | Langer | Thomas, Okla. |
| Burton | Lodge | Thomas, Utah |
| Bushfield | Lucas | Tobey |
| Butler | McClellan | Truman |
| Byrd | McFarland | Tunnell |
| Capper | McKellar | Tydings |
| Caraway | McNary | Vandenberg |
| Chandler | Maloney | Van Nuys |
| Chavez | Maybank | Wagner |
| Clark, Idaho | Mead | Wallgren |
| Clark, Mo. | Millikin | Walsh |
| Danaher | Moore | Wheeler |
| Downey | Murray | Wherry |
| Ellender | Nye | Wiley |
| Ferguson | O'Mahoney | Willis |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business for the Senate.

Mr. MCNARY. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is absent on public business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, our distinguished leader the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] was good enough a moment ago to suggest the absence of a quorum in order that I might have the opportunity of explaining to Members who were not then present my individual reason for believing that Senate bill 607, copies of which Senators will find on their desks, should be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs for consideration.

Mr. President, one has but to read the bill to know why it should go to the Committee on Military Affairs. In my opinion the wording of the bill itself implies that the only committee to which it can properly be referred is the Military Affairs Committee. I make that statement for the simple reason that the bill deals with the mobilization of the people of America for an all-out war effort. Let me read a few paragraphs of the bill:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That it is the purpose of this act to (1) inventory and mobilize all the economic resources of the United States, including manpower, facilities, materials, technical and scientific knowledge, and natural resources—

For what purpose? For one purpose only—

For maximum use in the provision of military and essential civilian needs—

Mr. President, that is the first purpose of the bill. That is its main objective. The second purpose of the bill is what?—

and (2) adjust and stabilize the economy in accordance with the needs of full mobilization and other conditions created—

By what?—

created by war.

Created by war, and by war alone.

Let us turn now to page 3, Mr. President, for the purpose of ascertaining the program as outlined by the bill, and what do we find? We find the following language in section 3:

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a Committee on Requirements and Program under the chairmanship of the Director and consisting of the Secretaries of War and the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Administrators of the four constituent offices of the Office of War Mobilization.

What shall the committee which the bill seeks to create do?

This committee shall develop, subject to the approval of the President, a comprehensive national program for maximum use of resources for military and essential civilian needs.

All those needs were created by one thing only, and that is by war itself.

This program shall be based on schedules—

Of what?—

Schedules of military requirements—

Furnished by whom?—

Furnished by the War and Navy Departments and determinations as to minimum essential civilian needs and available resources by the Office of War Mobilization.

Mr. President, the bill, as I see it, deals fundamentally, first, with the mobilization of the manpower of the Nation, and I contend that without first having the mobilization of the manpower of the Nation we cannot mobilize anything else; and insofar as manpower is concerned, the Committee on Military Affairs has for many months past and is even now today considering the question of mobilization. The committee has had before it innumerable witnesses. I should say we have had before us a minimum of 50 witnesses from the time we began hearings upon the question of manpower early last fall. Those witnesses have included representatives of virtually every branch of the Government.

Only last week there were before us high representatives of the War Department and also of the Navy Department, and of the Maritime Commission, and today we listened to a statement made by Mr. Donald Nelson, of the War Production Board. Tomorrow there will be with us for the second time the Honorable Paul V. McNutt. He will be followed on Monday by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard. We have already considered many phases which are involved, I might say, in the objectives of Senate bill 607.

Mr. President, I therefore argue that in my humble opinion the bill should go to the Committee on Military Affairs, inasmuch as it deals with more war mobilization, a subject in which the Committee on Military Affairs is vitally interested.

Mr. KILGORE obtained the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. For what purpose?

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to make a statement which will require approximately 3 minutes.

Mr. KILGORE. I think that what I have to say will not require much more time than that, and I should like to finish my statement before yielding again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia declines to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I move, to begin with, to amend the motion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs by striking out the words "the Military Affairs Commit-

tee," and inserting the words "the Committee on Education and Labor." I should like to discuss that motion for a moment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. I have no interest in the controversy between the eminent Senators, one of whom wants the bill referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and the other to the Committee on Education and Labor; but I am always interested in the observance of the Senate's rules and the parliamentary practice which should be followed.

It is my opinion that a motion of the kind just made by the Senator from West Virginia is not in order. It is not in order to move to substitute one committee for another, but a vote must come directly on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina—namely, reference of the measure to the Committee on Military Affairs.

I suggest my view to the Chair. If my view is the correct one, the procedure which I have suggested would entirely destroy and render unnecessary the motion made by the very eminent senior Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that the Senator from Oregon is correct, and sustains the point of order raised.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well, Mr. President. Then I desire to discuss some of the matters raised by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs with reference to his motion.

In the first place, I question whether he realizes the historical background in connection with some of his remarks. There was a time in the history of our Nation when his statement would have been more applicable than it now is. There was a time in the history of our Nation when the War Department handled all matters relating to our armed forces. Gradually we have built up other organizations; and gradually, in order to meet that condition, the Senate has built up other committees, so that now the Senate Committee on Military Affairs deals largely with the Army of the United States and its needs and problems. We have a Naval Affairs Committee, which certainly has some jurisdiction under the bill.

We have a Banking and Currency Committee which, due to its jurisdiction over economic stabilization, certainly has some jurisdiction with reference to a hearing on this bill.

We have a Commerce Committee which, due to its connection with the Maritime Commission, certainly has some jurisdiction with reference to this bill.

We have a Naval Affairs Committee which certainly should have something to say with reference to it.

We also have a Foreign Relations Committee which has jurisdiction over the lease-lend program, which is one of the most important parts of our present program of military expansion. That committee certainly should have some consideration because this bill also deals with lease-lend matters.

The Committee on Education and Labor has to do with measures affecting labor and, inasmuch as manpower has to do with labor, it should have some jurisdiction.

The Agricultural Committee has to do with manpower on the farm and, due to the fact that this bill bears directly on that question in connection with manpower mobilization, certainly that committee should have some jurisdiction.

So we have a bill the jurisdiction of which is divided. There is no over-all wholly appropriate committee in the Senate to consider the measure. For that reason, a motion to refer the bill to the Military Affairs Committee as one of the committees having jurisdiction is perfectly proper.

My position in the matter has been taken in the interest of the economy of time. I feel that the bill should be speedily considered by the appropriate committee to consider it, which is the committee of the whole Senate. My stand has been taken in the interest of getting this bill to the floor at the earliest possible date so that its merits and weaknesses may be discussed, and that the question of the war program may be threshed out with reference to the mobilization of our industry behind the war movement and the mobilization of our agriculture behind it and the economic stabilization behind it.

My effort on last Monday to have this bill referred to the Committee on Education and Labor was due to the fact that it had originally gone to that committee and that the Committee on Education and Labor on that original reference had conducted 10 days' hearings and had heard testimony of 32 witnesses—witnesses such as—

Frederick W. Conant, vice president, Douglas Aircraft;

W. H. Johnstone, assistant to the vice president, Bethlehem Steel;

Harry L. Cannon, president, National Canners' Association;

J. T. Hartson, executive vice president, Glenn L. Martin;

D. W. Siemon, personnel director, Glenn L. Martin;

D. B. Cole, priorities coordinator, Curtiss-Wright Corporation;

Raycroft Walsh, senior vice president, United Aircraft;

H. M. Horner, vice president, Pratt Whitney Aircraft Division;

S. A. Stewart, general manager, Hamilton Standard Propellers;

C. J. McCarthy, general manager, Vought-Sikorsky Aircraft Division;

M. F. Burke, personnel director, United Aircraft;

Ferdinand Eberstadt, Vice Chairman, W. P. B.—250 pages of transcript on Controls of Materials Plan;

Senator Truman;

Senator Kilgore;

Representative Tolan;

Representative Sparkman;

Representative Voorhis;

The top six men of the Tools Division, W. P. B.;

Capt. E. R. Henning;

Lt. Col. V. A. Armstrong, Tools Branch, Army-Navy Munitions Board;

E. D. Spicer, manufacturing vice president, General Electric;

Austin Elmore, production engineer, W. P. B.;

Charles E. Wilson, president, General Motors Corporation;

Charles E. Kettering, General Motors Corporation; and

Mr. Hunt, executive vice president, General Motors Corporation.

Fourteen hundred pages of testimony have already been taken and the subcommittee hearing that testimony is, or should be, ready to report, in fact at the previous session it tendered a report, of which there is a printed copy, I believe, on the desk of each Member of the Senate. I am trying to get the bill in a position in a committee which certainly has some jurisdiction, along with numerous other committees, so that the bill may be brought before the Senate as a whole at an early date. My interest in the matter was purely to get the bill on the floor for discussion.

Certainly there must be some need for discussion of this program. If it were not so, I question whether the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] would have delivered the address he delivered a short time ago with reference to manpower on the farm. Agricultural manpower has become a problem in this country. Shall that question be submitted to the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be deprived of any jurisdiction or the opportunity to have any hearing on it? That is a logical "follow through" from the pending motion.

I am a member of the Military Affairs Committee, and I wish it distinctly understood that I am not casting any reflections whatsoever on that committee. It is now carrying on a manpower investigation; but manpower is only a part of this bill. This is an over-all bill designed to coordinate the war effort, not to reorganize, not to disorganize, but to coordinate it. The bill provides a method whereby the manpower problem may be threshed out with representatives of the departments involved and interested in having something to say in an executive way, and not threshed out in the newspapers by controversies in the press between the heads of various departments of the Government, not threshed out on the floors of Congress, and not occasioning four concurrent investigations to be carried on by legislative committees of the Senate in addition to an investigation which has previously been conducted by a special committee of the

Senate on just one problem, that problem being manpower alone.

Certainly the questions involved should be brought up and discussed; certainly we should have some opportunity to get the bill on the floor speedily, and either make it workable and pass it or say we are wholly satisfied with the present condition; we want no reorganization; we want no change, no coordination.

For instance, there is certainly need for some coordination or the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] would not have had to carry on the extensive investigation as to the use of alcohol for rubber and why certain patents were not being used. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] some time ago was right about the farm-labor shortage and the farm structure. All that must be geared into the number of men taken for war. There is no need of putting a uniform on a man and taking him out of labor and putting him in a camp and having him stay there indefinitely. If he is put in uniform, he must be of use to the armed forces.

I should like to have the Members present again read the sections read by the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee without special emphasis on certain phases. Just read them as they stand in the bill before deciding whether the Military Affairs Committee should have jurisdiction, due to the fact that the Secretary of War is the first man mentioned. That fact, of course, was highly accented, but is no reason why the Committee on Military Affairs should be the only committee to consider the bill. Before deciding that all these problems are problems for the Military Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee alone, the Senate should consider that the Secretary of the Navy is also mentioned in the bill, and thus, through him, the Committee on Naval Affairs is involved; that agriculture is likewise involved, as is economic stabilization, which is under the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee. If the Senate should send the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs, I think we should change the name and call it a committee on the "total over-all conduct of the Nation in time of war."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. KILGORE. No; I shall not yield; I desire to finish my statement.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question or would he prefer not to be interrupted?

Mr. KILGORE. I should prefer not to be interrupted until I can get through with this phase of my statement.

We are now engaged, for instance, in north Africa in an offensive effort, and there everything must balance. A soldier over there without supplies is a dead soldier, and the tonnage in carrying him over has been wasted. Is it right that one department and one department alone and one committee and one committee alone should consider this bill, and delay the opportunity to bring it speedily to the floor of the Senate?

So I contend that the argument which was recently made is without the firm foundation on which it is alleged to have been placed. There is no single committee of the Senate that has this over-all jurisdiction. Many of them have partial jurisdiction, but none of them has over-all jurisdiction. The Senate, as a whole, would be the only body at present that could really have a reference of this bill.

It is my purpose—and I am not a member of the Committee on Education and Labor—to get this bill before the Senate as speedily as possible, and not to have it brought out months and months later, when it could do no good.

As evidenced by the newspapers, I believe the people of this country—businessmen, farmers, and all others—are urging a simple decentralized administration of the war effort and an opportunity to be heard without the delay incident to investigation and without controversies in the press, which we must admit cause disunity.

Mr. President, that alone impelled me to make this statement. It is intended as no reflection on the Committee on Military Affairs, as I trust the distinguished chairman of that committee will understand. Why should the Committee on Military Affairs occupy 2 or 3 or 4 months of its time, taking the same 1,400 pages of testimony and possibly some additional testimony, when, within a very few days, the committee to which the bill was originally referred when it was introduced in the last session, and which would have reported the bill to the floor of the Senate had the session lasted a few days longer, can take the bill, pass upon the evidence with the same membership, bring out a report on the bill and decide whether or not the bill should be submitted to the Senate, or whether it should be reported with a recommendation that it pass or what amendment should be made, and then let the Senate, as a whole, have the opportunity to pass on the question.

## CONSOLIDATIONS AND MERGERS OF DOMESTIC TELEGRAPH CARRIERS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate approved the bill providing for a merger between the Western Union Telegraph Co. and the Postal Telegraph Co. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and I sought, rather unsuccessfully, to secure some information regarding the financial structure of the Postal Telegraph Co., and as that information did not appear to be available, I voted against the bill. Since the passage of the bill, I have secured from official Government agencies the information which I sought. This information is such that, had I possessed it at the time the vote was taken, I would still have opposed the passage of the bill.

It appears to me that such legislation would establish an unwise and wholly unusual precedent, in that a certain few Wall Street brokers and their clients would be the principal beneficiaries and would be assisted in securing some rather unusual profits on their investments.

Since the agitation for the merger of the two telegraph corporations started, there has been a constant and a rather active trading in stock in what is generally considered to be an insolvent corporation. To bear out this assertion, I ask leave to have inserted at this point in my remarks a list of the principal stockholders of the Postal Telegraph Co., as taken from the 1940 report furnished by the Securities and Exchange Commission; a list of the principal stockholders as of December 31, 1941, and a list of the principal stockholders as of May 9, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Postal Telegraph, Inc., list of principal stockholders, 1940 report*

| | Common | Preferred |
|---|---|---|
| Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co | 6,640 | 24,586 |
| Wiley & Co., care of Manufacturers' Trust Co | 11,600 | 23,227 |
| Lehman Bros | 22,316 | 17,081 |
| E. Lowitz & Co | | 5,960 |
| Wertheim & Co | 2,600 | 4,755 |
| Nutt & Co | | 4,225 |
| Hayden, Stone & Co | | 2,350 |
| Henry J. Gaisman, care of City Farmers' Trust Co | | 2,000 |
| Hallgarten & Co | | 1,915 |
| Sigler & Co., care of Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co | 7,488 | 1,872 |
| H. Hentz & Co | 7,300 | 1,785 |
| Laird & Co | | 1,724 |
| University of Rochester | 6,500 | 1,625 |
| A. M. Kidder & Co | | 1,620 |
| Goldman, Sachs & Co | 24,632 | 1,569 |
| Orvis Bros. & Co | | 1,522 |
| Jos. A. Toledano & J. M. Pinto | | 1,500 |
| Smith, Barney & Co | 5,800 | 1,457 |
| Hurley & Co | 5,144 | 1,286 |
| Chas. Frederics & Co., care of Irving Trust Co | | 1,238 |
| Archer Milton Huntington | | 1,225 |
| Lazard, Freres & Co | | 1,225 |
| Dominick & Dominick | 8,700 | 1,075 |
| Goodbody & Co | 4,320 | 1,025 |
| Lake & Co., care of Manufacturers' Trust Co | | 1,000 |
| Higson & Co | | 1,000 |
| G. M. Dahl | | 1,000 |
| Kordula & Co., care of City Bank Farmers' Trust Co | | 1,000 |
| Faroll Bros | | 995 |
| Content, Zuckerman & Co | | 920 |
| Granberry & Co | 5,220 | ------- |
| Ernst & Co | 5,210 | ------- |
| Frederick W. Fielding, care of Jessey & Co | 5,000 | ------- |
| Minnie L. Taylor, care of Jessey & Co | 4,530 | ------- |
| Arabella Huntington, care of Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co | 4,500 | ------- |
| Mardick L. Baliozian | 4,000 | ------- |
| Bear Stearns & Co | 3,920 | ------- |
| Baar, Cohen & Co | 3,900 | ------- |
| Fuller, Rodney & Co | 3,600 | ------- |
| Fahnstock & Co | 3,550 | ------- |
| Ray L. Wise | 3,000 | ------- |
| Globe Telegraph Co | 2,910 | ------- |
| Newman, Worms & Co | 2,700 | ------- |
| Lawrence Turnure & Co | 2,700 | ------- |
| Krauss & Co | 2,600 | ------- |
| Shields & Co | 2,320 | ------- |
| Confederation Life Association | 2,460 | ------- |
| University of Nevada | 2,400 | ------- |

*Postal Telegraph, Inc., stockholders, Dec. 31, 1941*

| Name of security-holder | Address of security | Stocks | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Common | Preferred |
| Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co. | 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y. | ------- | 23,679 |
| Wiley & Co., care of Manufacturers Trust Co. | 55 Broad St., New York. | 10,750 | 22,427 |
| Lehman Bros | 1 William St., New York. | 20,828 | 17,016 |

*Postal Telegraph, Inc., stockholders, Dec. 31, 1941*—Continued

| Name of security-holder | Address of security | Stocks | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Common | Preferred |
| E. Lowitz & Co | 29 Broadway, New York. | | 5,960 |
| Nutt & Co | 46 Wall St., New York. | | 5,325 |
| Wertheim & Co | 120 Broadway, New York. | | 4,875 |
| Hayden, Stone & Co | 25 Broad St., New York. | | 2,375 |
| Laird & Co | 61 Broadway, New York. | | 2,100 |
| Keyes & Co., care of Bankers Trust Co. | 529 5th Ave., New York. | | 2,100 |
| Henry J. Gaisman, care of City Bank Farmers Trust Co. | 22 William St., New York. | | 2,000 |
| Hallgarten & Co | 44 Pine St., New York. | | 1,905 |
| Sigler & Co | 70 Broadway, New York. | 7,488 | 1,872 |
| H. Hentz & Co | 60 Beaver St., New York. | 7,300 | 1,785 |
| Farroll Bros | 50 Broadway, New York. | | 1,700 |
| Charles Frederic & Co., care of Irving Trust Co. | 1 Wall St., New York. | | 1,638 |
| University of Rochester. | Rochester, N. Y | 6,500 | 1,625 |
| A. M. Kidder & Co | 1 Wall St., New York. | | 1,610 |
| Hurley & Co | 55 Wall St., New York. | 5,144 | 1,286 |
| Lazard Freres & Co | 120 Broadway | | 1,225 |
| Tucker, Anthony & Co. | do | 4,624 | 1,156 |
| Goodbody & Co | 115 Broadway, New York. | 4,300 | 1,155 |
| Goldman Sachs & Co | 30 Pine St., New York. | 15,900 | 1,138 |
| Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., trustee for Arabella Huntington. | 70 Broadway, New York. | 4,500 | 1,125 |
| Dominick & Dominick. | 115 Broadway, New York. | 8,760 | 1,085 |
| Higson & Co | 30 Broad St., New York. | | 1,000 |
| Lake & Co | 55 Broad St., New York. | | 1,000 |
| T. L. Watson & Co | 40 Wall St., New York. | | 1,000 |
| G. M. Dahl | 20 Pine St., New York. | | 1,000 |
| McDonnell & Co | 120 Broadway, New York. | | 957 |
| H. Cassell & Co | 61 Broadway, New York. | | 919 |
| Robert Willicombe, care of Bonner & Bonner. | 120 Broadway, New York. | 16,145 | |
| Minna G. Werdman, care of Bonner & Bonner. | do | 12,000 | |
| Doreathea Campbell, care of Charles Hughes & Co. | 32 Broadway, New York. | 5,000 | |
| Frederick W. Fielding, care of Jessey & Co. | 2 Rector St., New York. | 5,000 | |
| Minnie L. Taylor, care of Jessey & Co. | do | 4,030 | |
| W. L. Baliozan | 10 West 33d St., New York. | 4,000 | |
| Barar, Cohen & Co | 39 Broadway, New York. | 3,900 | |
| Bear, Stearns & Co | 1 Wall St., New York. | 3,900 | |
| Fahnestock & Co | do | 3,550 | |
| Granberry & Co | 50 Broadway, New York. | 3,540 | |
| Fuller, Rodney & Co | 44 Wall St., New York. | 3,200 | |
| Bridget Flynn, care of Bonner & Bonner. | 120 Broadway, New York. | 3,200 | |
| John B. Cline, care of Charles Hughes & Co. | 32 Broadway, New York. | 3,000 | |
| Arthur L. McBain, care of Bonner & Bonner. | 120 Broadway, New York. | 3,000 | |
| Olga Schnepf, care of Bonner & Bonner. | do | 3,000 | |
| Smith, Barney & Co | 14 Wall St., New York. | 3,000 | |
| Bertha G. Wendehack, care of Bonner & Bonner. | 120 Broadway, New York. | 3,000 | |
| Raymond L. Wise | 80 Broad St., New York. | 3,000 | |
| Globe Telegraph & Trust Co. | Electra House, London, England. | 2,910 | |

*Postal Telegraph, Inc.—List of common stockholders of 2,000 shares or more and preferred stockholders of 500 shares or more, as at May 9, 1942*

| Name and address [1] | Number of shares | |
|---|---|---|
| | Common | Preferred |
| Abraham & Co., 120 Broadway | 329 | 2,160 |
| Allen & Co., 30 Broad St | 60 | 5,100 |
| Asiel & Co.: | | |
| 11 Wall St | 3,188 | 78 |
| 15 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J | 1,330 | |
| Baar Cohen & Co., 39 Broadway | 3,600 | 50 |
| J. S. Bache & Co., 36 Wall St | 1,262 | 1,420 |
| Mordick L. Baliozian, 10 West 33d St | 4,000 | 200 |
| Mordick L. Baliozian, 120 Broadway, care of Bonner & Bonner, Inc | 2,800 | |
| Harrington J. Barrus & Lois Marsh Barrus, care of Bonner & Bonner, Inc., 120 Broadway | 3,500 | 100 |
| Manuel Berdu, care of Bonner & Bonner, Inc., 120 Broadway | ?,000 | |
| Board of Regents of the University of Nevada, Reno, Nev | 2,400 | 600 |
| Boody, McLellan & Co., 111 Broadway | 2,000 | |
| Gertrude S. Brazier, care of Bonner & Bonner, Inc., 120 Broadway | 5,500 | 100 |
| Bucher & Co., care of Guarantee Trust Co. of New York, 524 5th Ave | | 500 |
| Leigh Caffey, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 4,000 | |
| Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., trustee, V. A. dated Apr. 10, 1901, with Arabella D. Huntington, deceased, for Archer Milton Huntington, 70 Broadway | 4,500 | 1,125 |
| John B. Cline, care of Charles Hughes & Co., 32 Broadway | 3,000 | |
| Clooney & Co., care of Fiduciary Trust Co. of New York, 1 Wall St | | 500 |
| Confederation Life Association, 12 Richmond St. East, Toronto, Ontario, Canada | 2,460 | 615 |
| Content Hano & Co., 39 Broadway | | 600 |
| Jacob S. Carre, care of Bonner & Bonner, Inc., 120 Broadway | 2,700 | |
| Cudd & Co., care of the Chase National Bank, 11 Broad St | 40 | 510 |
| G. M. Dahl, 20 Pine St | | 1,000 |
| Delafield & Delafield, 14 Wall St | 400 | 1,010 |
| Dominick & Dominick, 115 Broadway | 2,460 | 1,508 |
| Joseph M. Dragoni, 46 East 52d St | 2,500 | |
| Joseph M. Dragoni, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,500 | |
| Mary F. Drake, Cooperstown, N. Y | 2,100 | |
| Alexander Drucker, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,100 | 50 |
| Francis I. Dupont & Co. and Chisholm & Chapman, 1 Wall St | | 1,915 |
| Francis I. Dupont & Co. and Chisholm & Chapman, a single copartnership, 1 Wall St | 820 | |
| Charles Engelhard, 30 Church St | 2,000 | |
| C. A. Englan & Co., care of Chemical Bank & Trust Co., 165 Broadway | | 2,225 |
| Fahnestock & Co., 1 Wall St | 700 | 5,225 |
| Farroll Bros., 50 Broadway | | 2,675 |
| Filor, Bullard & Smyth, 39 Broadway | | 1,075 |
| Bridget Flynn, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 3,200 | |
| Fox, O'Hara & Co., 60 Broad St | 1,040 | 530 |
| Charles Frederic & Co., care of Irving Trust Co., 1 Wall St | 2,879 | 1,312 |
| French & Co., care of The Penna Co., Packard Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa | | 1,600 |
| Fuller, Rodney & Co., 44 Wall St | 3,000 | |
| William N. Gillette, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,000 | |
| Globe Telegraph & Tr. Co., Ltd., Electra House, Victoria Embankment, London, England | 2,910 | |
| Goldman, Sachs & Co., 30 Pine St | 13,448 | 587 |
| Marcus S. Goldnamer, Edinar Bldg., Washington, D. C | 2,000 | |
| Goodbody & Co., 115 Broadway | 4,664 | 1,550 |
| Anna H. Greenwald, care of Jessey & Co., 2 Rector St | 2,100 | |
| Joseph J. Haesler, 98 Overlook Rd., Upper Montclair, N. J | 2,500 | |
| Hallgarten & Co., 44 Pine St | 706 | 1,905 |
| Harris, Upham & Co., 11 Wall St | 4,388 | 1,313 |
| Hayden, Stone & Co., 25 Broad St | 200 | 1,000 |
| H. Heintz & Co., 60 Beaver St | 4,540 | 1,810 |
| Frank Herbst, 44 Wall St | 2,027 | 701 |
| Herzfeld & Stein, 30 Broad St | 2,000 | 600 |
| Miss Emma Hey, 39-01 Main St., Flushing, Long Island, N. Y., care of M. L. Gottlieb | 2,000 | |
| Mathilda Hickey, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 3,000 | |
| Higson & Co., care of Continental Bank & Trust Co., 30 Broad St | | 1,000 |
| Hirsh, Lilienthal & Co., 165 Broadway | | 2,310 |
| Hirsh, Lilienthal & Co., 25 Broad St | 4,380 | |

[1] Unless otherwise noted, addresses are in New York, N. Y.

*Postal Telegraph, Inc.—List of common stockholders of 2,000 shares or more and preferred stockholders of 500 shares or more, as at May 9, 1942*—Continued

| Name and address | Number of shares | |
|---|---|---|
| | Common | Preferred |
| William A. Hunt, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 3,300 | |
| Hurley & Co., 55 Wall St | 5,044 | 1,261 |
| A. M. Kidder & Co., 1 Wall St | 4,222 | 7,218 |
| Kidder, Peabody & Co., 17 Wall St | 3,076 | 441 |
| Spencer B. Koch & Co., 29 Broadway | 120 | 630 |
| Kordula & Co., care of City Bank Farmers Trust Co., 22 William St | 2,200 | 730 |
| Krauss & Co., care of Manufacturers & Traders Trust Co., 284 Main St., Buffalo, N. Y | 2,600 | 650 |
| Augusta Kubicek, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 7,700 | 250 |
| Laird, Bissell & Meeds, 120 Broadway | | 700 |
| Lehman Bros., 1 William St | 19,028 | 10,217 |
| Henry Lieferant, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,100 | |
| Alfonse M. Linderfelser, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,000 | |
| Alexander List, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,000 | |
| Frederick Lohl, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 5,000 | |
| Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., 61 Broadway | 1,100 | 16,294 |
| E. Lowitz & Co., 29 Broadway | 40 | 5,010 |
| McDonnell & Co., 120 Broadway | 2,660 | 4,082 |
| Robert B. McFalls, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,000 | 100 |
| Arthur L. MacBain, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 3,000 | |
| Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., 1295 State St., Springfield, Mass | 2,000 | 500 |
| Merrill, Lynch Pierce, Fenner & Beane, 70 Pine St | 1,433 | 2,470 |
| Richard Meyer, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,000 | |
| Newan Bros. & Worms, 25 Broad St | 5,150 | 8,245 |
| Nutt & Co., 46 Wall St | 100 | 625 |
| Orvis Bros. & Co., 14 Wall St | 1,840 | 757 |
| Donald F. Othmer, 99 Livingston St., Brooklyn, N. Y | 2,000 | |
| Parrish & Co., 40 Wall St | 200 | 1,450 |
| Pearl Assurance Co., Ltd., High Holborn, London, England | 2,182 | 540 |
| William Rosenblatt, 1125 Park Ave | 2,000 | 500 |
| Rudolph & Co., care of Manufacturers Trust Co., 45 Beaver St | | 1,300 |
| Salkeld & Co., care of Bankers Trust Co., P. O. Box 704, Church St. Annex | 2,020 | 505 |
| Henry G. Solomon, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,000 | |
| Ewald Schmitz, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,000 | |
| Olga Schnepf, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 3,000 | |
| Warren S. Schoenthaler, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,800 | |
| J. & W. Seligman & Co., 65 Broadway | 300 | 700 |
| Shields & Co., 44 Wall St | 2,300 | 775 |
| Sigler & Co., care of Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 70 Broadway | 8,048 | 1,887 |
| William Simon, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 4,000 | |
| I. M. Simon, 315 North 4th St., St. Louis, Mo | 2,000 | 100 |
| Smith, Barney & Co., 14 Wall St | 3,454 | 835 |
| Stephen J. Stroock & Co., 1 Wall St | | 600 |
| Sidney Susswein, 220 Broadway | 2,000 | |
| Sutro Bros. & Co., 120 Broadway | 1,760 | 700 |
| Hazel Thurnheir, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 3,600 | |
| Albert Tramer, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 7,000 | 200 |
| Tucker, Anthony & Co., 120 Broadway | 4,300 | 1,543 |
| University of Rochester, Lincoln Alliance Bank & Trust Co | 6,500 | 1,625 |
| Ward, Griever & Co., 40 Exchange Place | | 4,020 |
| Minna G. Werdermann, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 27,580 | |
| Wertheim & Co., 120 Broadway | 1,000 | 3,175 |
| White Weld & Co., 40 Wall St | 20 | 700 |
| Wiley & Co., care of Manufacturers Trust Co., 55 Broad St | 500 | 7,625 |
| Robert Willicombe, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 24,676 | 62 |
| C. King Woodbridge, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,200 | 125 |
| Total | 326,384 | 135,706 |

Mr. AIKEN. It will be observed that the principal stockholders are virtually all New York City brokers and their clients.

Although it was stated on the floor at the time the Senate passed the bill that the effect of its enactment would be to bail out the stockholders, yet, so far as I can see, the legislation would not necessarily result in all the original stockholders recovering what they lost, but rather would have the effect of rewarding speculators who have more recently acquired the stock at comparatively low cost.

It is significant that one Wall Street brokerage house and its clients are listed as holding 40,325 shares of Postal Telegraph stock on December 31, 1941, while as of May 9, 1942, 5 months later, according to the latest figures available, the Federal Communications Commission reports the same brokerage house and its clients as holding 121,656 shares of stock. It appears to me that this comes within the category of speculation rather than of investment.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator give for the RECORD the name of that New York brokerage house?

Mr. AIKEN. It will appear in the list of the principal stockholders. The Senator can see for himself how holdings of this particular brokerage concern increased from one period to the other. That is why I have asked leave to have the lists printed in the RECORD.

Mr. TOBEY. Very well.

Mr. AIKEN. It appears to me also that this speculation was prompted by the assumption that Congress would enact legislation permitting this merger. It is worthy of note that the value of the preferred stock, which is reported to have been as low as 9½ during 1942, has constantly risen, being quoted on January 23 of this year at 18⅞, and yesterday, 10 days after the passage of the bill, it closed at 19½.

I ask further leave to have inserted at this point a list of officers and directors of the Postal Telegraph Co., Inc., for the year 1940, as furnished by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS OF POSTAL TELEGRAPH, INC., 1940

Harris Berlack, 1 Wall Street, New York City; Curtis E. Calder, 2 Rector Street, New York City; Edwin F. Chinlund, 253 Broadway, New York City; William H. Coverdale, 120 Wall Street, New York City; Gerhard M. Dahl, 20 Pine Street, New York City; William J. Deegan, 253 Broadway, New York City; Frederick J. Fisher, Fisher Building, Detroit, Mich.; George S. Gibbs, 253 Broadway, New York City; Thomas Hitchcock, Jr., 1 William Street, New York City; Raymond C. Kramer, 1275 Broadway, New York City; James M. Landis, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass.; Harold F. Linder, 61 Broadway, New York City; Sidney Maestre, Mississippi Valley Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Hamilton Pell, 40 Wall Street, New York City; William Rosenblatt, 80 Broad Street, New York City; Cecil P. Stewart, 67 Wall Street, New York City; Ellery W. Stone, 253 Broadway, New York City; Harold E. Talbott, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York City; Paul E. Manheim, 1 William Street, New York City.

OFFICERS NOT DIRECTORS (ALL ADDRESSES ARE 253 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY)

John J. Lynch, Clinton B. Allsopp, John T. Logue, Walter P. Marshall, James C. Phelps.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it will be noted that all the officers and directors of this corporation, with the exception of three, namely, Frederick J. Fisher, of Detroit; Sidney Maestre, of St. Louis; and the Honorable James M. Landis, of Harvard Law School, now Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, are located in or near Wall Street.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is good policy to enact special legislation to bail out the stockholders of this company, some of whom at least must be classed as speculators in this matter. If it is good business to enact legislation especially designed to cover the losses of profits to these people, why should we not do the same for home owners who have lost their homes through inability to keep up payments, or farmers who have lost their farms because of crop failure or animal diseases? I believe that some Members of the Senate might have voted differently on this measure had they had a full knowledge of the facts at the time the bill was approved. It is also possible that some Members of the Senate may have been influenced to favor the proposed legislation because it was sugar coated with a provision requiring the authorized monopoly to find jobs for all the employees of the insolvent company, or to guarantee their present rate of compensation for a period of 5 years.

I have a great deal of information on this matter which has been furnished me by Government agencies, particularly the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Communications Commission. I shall gladly make any of this information available to any Member of the Congress. In fact, I should like to insert at this point the history of the case as given by the Federal Communications Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE POSTAL TELEGRAPH, INC.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
*February 1, 1943.*

Postal Telegraph, Inc., was incorporated September 20, 1939, under the laws of the State of Delaware, for the purpose of acquiring certain securities owned by the Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation (debtor) and its subsidiary, The Associated Cos. (debtor).

These securities were acquired as of January 31, 1940, pursuant to an order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in a proceeding under section 77–B of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, under which Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation filed, on June 14, 1935, a voluntary petition for reorganization, and under which, on June 21, 1938, The Associated Cos., a subsidiary of the Postal Corporation, filed similar voluntary petitions.

Prior to reorganization, the 35 operating companies constituting the Postal Land Line System, were controlled 100 percent by The Associated Cos., and The Associated Cos. in turn was controlled 91.4 percent by Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation. The latter corporation was controlled 100 percent by the International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation.

In the reorganization of Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation, approved on January 31, 1940, the Postal land line companies were divorced from the International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation, but as a part of the reorganization the land line companies executed contracts for exchange of traffic, etc., with the operating companies in the International Telephone & Telegraph group. Under the plan 4 new corporations were formed. This discussion relates to Postal Telegraph, Inc., which was formed to acquire the capital stock of The Associated Cos., the Postal Telegraph Sales Corporation, and the 35 separate telegraph companies that at that time comprised the Postal Land Line System.

Postal Telegraph, Inc., issued 256,769.9 shares of 4 percent noncumulative preferred stock without par value (entitled in liquidation to $60 per share), with a stated value of $10 per share, and 1,027,079.6 shares of common stock with a par value of $1 per share, all of which is now outstanding. A list of the common stockholders that held 2,000 shares or more, and of the preferred stockholders that held 500 shares or more, as at May 9, 1942, is attached. The company has negotiated loans with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and with the Bankers Trust Co., all of which are now outstanding. The outstanding securities of the Postal Telegraph, Inc., as of October 31, 1942 (except for the notes payable to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which are shown as of this most recent date, January 28, 1943), were as follows:

CAPITAL STOCK

Noncumulative 4-percent preferred stock, authorized 256,770 shares without par value (entitled in liquidation to $60 per share), issued and outstanding 256,769.9 shares, stated value $10 per share, $2,567,699.

Common stock, authorized 1,250,000 shares with a par value of $1 per share, issued and outstanding 1,027,079.6 shares, par value, $1,027,079.60.

NOTES PAYABLE

To Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for loans made from April 24, 1940, to January 28, 1943, $9,000,000.

To Bankers Trust Co., for loan made on February 5, 1940 (secured by certificates of deposit in various depositories and not subject to withdrawal), $1,200,000.

The current liabilities as of October 31, 1942, for unpaid money orders, unpaid wages, traffic balances, taxes, interest, etc., aggregated $4,120,648, as compared with current assets consisting of cash, materials, and supplies, accounts receivable, etc., totaling $7,121,354.

The company has established on its books a reserve for employees' benefits and pensions, but, as an offset to this liability, there has been no fund established or any other segregation of assets. The reserve requirement was determined by actuarial computations and is stated in the amount of $7,298,424 as of October 31, 1942, of which the sum of approximately $3,500,000 represents the present worth of future payments to be made to employees who have become eligible for retirement and are now on the pension rolls. For the first 10 months of 1942 the payments for employees' benefits and pensions amounted to $465,673. The Postal Telegraph, Inc. is also liable as guarantor for subsidiary companies on surety bonds aggregating $160,000.

The Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation (debtor) had outstanding at the date of reorganization, January 31, 1940, the following securities:

CAPITAL STOCK

Common stock without per value, 1,017,650 shares, stated value $25,441,250.

Preferred stock, 305,295 shares, par value $30,529,500.

LONG-TERM DEBT

Twenty-five year collateral trust 5-percent gold bonds, dated July 1, 1928, par value $44,630,500.

Twenty-five year collateral trust 5-percent debenture stock, dated July 1, 1928, par value $6,039,680.

Under the plan of reorganization the holders of the bonds and debenture stock of Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation were entitled to receive, for each $1,000 principal amount of bonds or £206 principal amount of debenture stock, the following:

1. Thirty-five dollars in cash.

2. Five shares of noncumulative preferred stock and 20 shares of common stock of Postal Telegraph, Inc.

3. One hundred and sixty dollars principal amount of Commercial Mackay Corporation income debentures (or scrip therefor), with attached warrants to purchase common stock of American Cable & Radio Corporation at the rate of 115 shares for each $1,000 of income debentures of Commercial Mackay Corporation;

4. Twenty dollars principal amount of All America Corporation income debentures, series B (or scrip therefor); and

5. Twenty shares of common stock of American Cable & Radio Corporation.

The holders of the 6,838 preferred shares of the associated companies outstanding in the hands of the public were entitled to receive, under the plan of reorganization, for each such share of the associated companies one-half share of the noncumulative preferred stock and 2 shares of the common stock of Postal Telegraph, Inc.

No provision was made in the plan of reorganization for the holders of the preferred or the common stock of Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation or the common shares of the associated companies because the court found that Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation was insolvent and the holders of the common shares of the associated companies had no equity in the assets of the associated companies.

The plan of reorganization of Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation was sponsored by Messrs. Robert Lehman, Walter H. Bennett, Harris Berlack, Charles V. Howard, Charles G. Meyer, Edwin L. Weisl, and Frazar B. Wilde as the protective committee for the Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation 25-year, collateral-trust, 5-percent gold bonds due July 1, 1953, and 25-year, collateral-trust, 5-percent debenture stock due July 1, 1953, and by Messrs. Cecil P. Stewart, Milton W. Harrison, Hamilton Pell, and William Rosenblatt as the bondholders committee for the Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation 25-year, collateral-trust, 5-percent gold bonds due July 1, 1953, and 25-year, collateral-trust, 5-percent debenture stock due July 1, 1953. On December 24, 1935, the Honorable Alfred E. Smith and Mr. George S. Gibbs were appointed temporary trustees of Postal, which appointment was made permanent by court order dated January 27, 1936. By order of the court dated September 8, 1937, Mr. Raymond C. Kramer was appointed a cotrustee, the appointment being made permanent October 5, 1937. On January 10, 1938, the resignation of the Honorable Alfred E. Smith as trustee was accepted as of December 31, 1937.

Under the provisions of the order of the court directing the consummation of the plan of reorganization of the Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation (debtor) and the associated companies (debtor) a special cash fund for reorganization expenses of $650,000 was allowed, of which the sum of $15,901.30 had been expended on January 31, 1940. This fund was placed with Postal Telegraph, Inc., and expenditures from the fund to January 30, 1943, amounted to $621,352. There is at present the sum of $28,648 remaining in this special fund for reorganization expenses.



Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I merely wish to make the observation that had the information the Senator is now giving the Senate been given prior to the final vote on the measure, I should have voted differently from the way I did vote.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his statement.

I do not wish to take more time this afternoon, when we have other matters before us, but I do wish to reiterate that in my opinion approval of the proposed legislation was unwise and established an unsound precedent. If we are to bail out Wall Street speculators, then there is no reason in the world why we should not bail out other unfortunate investors, particularly the poor people of our country who have sustained losses through no fault of their own. Such a general policy, however, would be unwise, and, in the long run, unworkable. Such legislation does not make for a sounder government.

## OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION—REFERENCE OF BILL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 607) to establish an Office of War Mobilization, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] to refer the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield for that purpose?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | George | Overton |
| Andrews | Gerry | Pepper |
| Austin | Gillette | Radcliffe |
| Ball | Gurney | Reed |
| Bankhead | Hawkes | Reynolds |
| Barkley | Hayden | Robertson |
| Bilbo | Hill | Russell |
| Bone | Holman | Shipstead |
| Brewster | Johnson, Colo. | Stewart |
| Bridges | Kilgore | Taft |
| Brooks | La Follette | Thomas, Idaho |
| Buck | Langer | Thomas, Okla. |
| Burton | Lodge | Thomas, Utah |
| Bushfield | Lucas | Tobey |
| Butler | McClellan | Truman |
| Byrd | McFarland | Tunnell |
| Capper | McKellar | Tydings |
| Caraway | McNary | Vandenberg |
| Chandler | Maloney | Van Nuys |
| Chavez | Maybank | Wagner |
| Clark, Idaho | Mead | Wallgren |
| Clark, Mo. | Millikin | Walsh |
| Danaher | Moore | Wheeler |
| Downey | Murray | Wherry |
| Ellender | Nye | Wiley |
| Ferguson | O'Mahoney | Willis |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Am I correct in assuming that the question before the Senate is the motion that Senate bill 607 be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the pending question before the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Another parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Is a substitute motion parliamentarily possible? For example, a motion that the bill be referred to a combination of two or more committees which have jurisdiction of the subjects thereof, since there are several subjects included in the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a motion would not be in order. Under the rules of the Senate a motion to refer a bill to a committee is not amendable by the substitution of another committee.

Mr. PEPPER. A third parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Then, in view of the present parliamentary situation, it is not possible for the Senate to determine anything except whether the bill shall be referred to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state his question again?

Mr. PEPPER. Then, if I understand correctly the advice of the Chair, the only thing the Senate can do, now that the motion has been made that the bill be referred to the Senate Military Affairs Committee, is either to agree or disagree to the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. That is the parliamentary situation.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah for that purpose?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Utah for the purpose of making a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah will state the inquiry.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, according to the ruling made by the Chair, I assume, then, that if the motion is not agreed to the bill will automatically go to the Committee on Education and Labor? Or will it be referred to some other committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Chair will state that if the motion does not prevail the bill will remain on the table until the Senate makes some reference of it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. And then the bill will be referred regularly by the Vice President to some committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Vice President has stated that he would submit this question to the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Then there will have to be positive, affirmative action following failure of the motion to prevail, if it shall fail to prevail?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, there will have to be positive, affirmative action as to reference of the bill. If the pending motion is defeated a motion to refer to another committee would then be in order.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wanted the parliamentary situation to be clear before I began the discussion of the motion.

I wish to make it very clear to the Senate that if the bill were for the first time coming to the Senate and this motion were made I would certainly have no objection to the motion, even if I did not concur in it. But the bill is not coming to the Senate floor for the first time. A similar bill, with a few immaterial variations, was introduced in the last session of the Congress in the Senate by the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the junior Senator from Florida. Upon the motion of the able Senator from West Virginia, and with the concurrence of the Senate, the bill was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. The able chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], appointed a subcommittee to consider that bill and to hold hearings thereon. That subcommittee consisted of the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], former Senator Schwartz of Wyoming, the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the junior Senator from Florida, who had the honor to be named chairman of that subcommittee.

We decided that we would begin as much as we could to put into practice here in the Senate some of the counsel we had been giving to the administrative agencies—namely, better to coordinate their efforts and activities than had been done in the past. Accordingly the subcommittee entered into consultation with the Tolan committee in the House of Representatives, which for some 2½ years has been investigating the subject of defense migration and various evolutions of that subject, which finally, in the logical circumstances, brought that committee to the consideration of the most efficient plan of war production for our country. The Tolan committee allowed the Senate Committee on Education and Labor the use of some of the members of its staff, without any cost to the Senate. I may say that the Senate Committee on Education and Labor never had a dime of money with which to employ a staff; only the expenses of the stenographer were incurred by the committee.

Our committee consulted the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] personally cooperated in every way he could in avoiding duplication of testimony in the hearings before the committee, and in bringing to the attention of the subcommittee, as far as he could, the knowledge which his committee had obtained on the general subject of civilian war production.

The Senator from Missouri participated in the first press conference which was held. Thereafter, and during the whole course of the deliberations of the subcommittee, the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] was a participant in the investigation, acting in two capacities; first, as chairman of the Special Committee on Manpower and of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, and second, as chairman of the subcommittee on technological mobilization of the Military Affairs Committee. A bill with respect to technological mobilization which had been introduced by the able Senator from West Virginia, was pending before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, and he had been appointed by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee to be chairman of the subcommittee dealing with the subject of technological mobilization.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of the Small Business Committee, sent from his home authority to be included at the press conference when this bill was first discussed with the press after its introduction. The Senator himself, as well as the members of his staff, gave all the cooperation they could give to the subcommittee in the consideration of this question.

The coordination of these five committees was so effective that every time there was reference in the press to this investigation it was spoken of as the five-committee investigation on the subject of civilian war production. We have brought together, in a fine spirit of coordination and cooperation, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, whose jurisdiction related primarily to manpower and production, as well as to vocational training; the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program; the Murray Committee on Small Business; the Manpower Subcommittee of the Truman committee; the technological mobilization subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee; and one committee of the House of Representatives, the Tolan committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. How many committees are investigating the manpower situation?

Mr. PEPPER. As I was saying, only one committee was conducting the investigation, but the committees which had kindred subjects under consideration collaborated with this committee by having contacts with it, consulting with its members, and making available, so far as possible, to the committee conducting the investigation, such discoveries as they had made.

Mr. LUCAS. It was my understanding the other day, when the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] made a report in which the Truman committee was eliminated from the consideration of the subject of manpower, that he said that at that time some three or four committees were studying the same question. I was occupying the chair at the time and I did not have an opportunity to interrogate the able Senator from West Virginia. I should now like to know whether or not the statement is accurate.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield and then I shall comment on the subject.

Mr. KILGORE. I believe that the question which was asked was misunderstood by the able Senator from Florida. He was discussing the committees which had collaborated on the subject. The announcement was made by me that in view of the fact that four legislative committees of the Senate, namely, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on Military Affairs, and the Committee on Education and Labor, were conducting hearings on the subject of manpower, the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program would suspend further hearings on the subject and make all the evidence which it had available to those four committees, or any other committee desiring to have it.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

In view of the statement which has now been made may I make one observation in the time of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As a result of the colloquy between the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Florida and myself with respect to the various committees studying the manpower question, I desire to make this observation:

Obviously, somebody ought to study the manpower question, and it ought to be studied with complete thoroughness. Every phase of the subject should be gone into by some committee of the Senate. However, it certainly seems most ridiculous and absurd for four different committees of the Senate to be studying the same question.

Mr. President, I do not believe the question is large enough to warrant four committees studying it, and I doubt if the proper results will be obtained by having four or five Senate committees, and one or more committees in the House, carrying on simultaneous investigations on this important question. I do not believe it would contribute to the war effort to require men like Mr. Paul McNutt and other responsible agents in the Government to be constantly in attendance before committees, spending hour after hour and day after day of their valuable time in consultation with the committees. That is exactly what must happen if each of these committees expects to conduct a proper investigation and examination into the subject. The men at the head of the various governmental agencies must appear before each committee to give testimony with respect to this very important problem.

Frequently Senators, in discussing on the floor of the Senate what is going on in the various departments at the other end of the Avenue, criticize and condemn the duplication of effort and division of authority which exist in various agencies of the Government which are promoting the war effort. Such criticism is proper. Senators are not amiss in their castigation and condemnation of

various agencies when they try to find some central authority which has the power to initiate a program and carry it through with effectiveness and efficiency in order to carry on the war and bring it to a close as soon as possible.

Mr. President, in the humble opinion of the Senator from Illinois, it does not behoove us to indulge in much condemnation and criticism if we have four or five committees in the Senate investigating this very question. I say, with all the seriousness that I possess, that four or five committees taking busy men away from their work would hamper the war effort instead of aiding it. I do not care which committee does the work, but one committee ought to do it. We ought not to have several committees continuing to harass these men, bringing them here from their various departments day after day and consuming valuable time when it is so necessary for them to get along with the work which they have to do.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I desire to make something clear to the Senator from Illinois. In the discussion which took place last Tuesday the Senator from West Virginia mentioned the committees which collaborated, and merely suggested that the chairmen of the respective committees, instead of summoning the officials to whom reference has been made for hearing, could have available the testimony which had been amassed over a long period of time in the various committees. The testimony could be placed in the record to save the time we are all trying to save. I believe that that effort to save time and avoid duplication is most laudible.

I am heartily in sympathy with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I very heartily and distinctly concur in everything the Senator from Illinois has said. That was the point to which I was coming. I was endeavoring to point out that this committee has done just as he has suggested. The so-called war mobilization bill has a great many subjects in it. It affects the Military Affairs Committee and several other committees. In the last session the bill had been actually referred by the Senate—and I did not have anything to do with that reference—to the Committee on Education and Labor. A subcommittee had been appointed to consider the bill. As chairman of the subcommittee, I tried to do what the Senator from Illinois pointed out, namely, to avoid duplication of anything that any other committee had done. We did not call Mr. McNutt or Mr. Donald Nelson. I do not think we duplicated the testimony of any witness. We called Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt. I do not recall that he was before any other Senate committee. He may have been before the Truman committee, but I doubt it. I doubt if a case of duplication of testimony of any witness can be found in that hearing.

On the contrary, the Tolan committee came in and submitted its record. Mr. TOLAN, chairman of the Tolan committee of the House, frequently sat in at the hearings and tried to be of assistance. Mr. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, a member of the Tolan committee, personally testified, giving us a summary of what the Tolan committee had done.

The chief of staff of the Tolan committee, Dr. Lamb, one of the ablest staff chiefs on Capitol Hill, gave the subcommittee a summary of the record of what the Tolan committee had done in more than 2 years of its investigation throughout the length and breadth of the country.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] personally appeared before the committee and summarized the results of the Truman committee's investigation of the subjects covered by the bill. Staff members of the Truman committee appeared and presented summaries and suggestions from their experience, which were helpful to the subcommittee. The same thing is true of the Small Business Committee, headed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. We thought we had done a pretty fair job in coordinating the committees having an interest in the subject, and in endeavoring to avoid duplication of effort.

Mr. President, we proceeded with the investigation for 10 actual hearing days. We heard a total of 32 witnesses. We took 1,400 pages of testimony. These are the prominent witnesses who appeared at our hearings:

Frederick W. Conant, vice president of the Douglas Aircraft Co.; W. H. Johnstone, assistant to the vice president, Bethlehem Steel Corporation; Harry L. Cannon, president of the National Canners Association; J. T. Hartson, executive vice president of the Glenn L. Martin Co.; D. W. Siemon, personnel director of the Glenn L. Martin Co.; D. B. Cole, priorities coordinator of the Curtiss Wright Corporation; Raycroft Walsh, senior vice president of the United Aircraft Co.; H. M. Horner, vice president of Pratt & Whitney aircraft division; S. A. Stewart, general manager of Hamilton Standard Propellers; C. J. McCarthy, general manager of the Vought-Sikorsky aircraft division; M. F. Burke, personnel director of the United Aircraft Co.; and Ferdinand Eberstadt, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, and in charge of the critical materials control plan. As I say, I do not know of any other committee which has called Mr. Eberstadt.

There also appeared at the hearing before the subcommittee the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], Representatives TOLAN, SPARKMAN, and VOORHIS of California; representatives of the Tools Division of the War Production Board; Capt. E. R. Henning; Lt. Col. V. A. Armstrong, of the Tools Branch, Army-Navy Munitions Board; E. D. Spicer, manufacturing vice president of the General Electric Co.; Austin Elmore, production engineer of the War Production Board; Charles E. Wilson, president of General Motors Corporation; Charles E. Kettering, vice president of General Motors Corporation; and Mr. Hunt, executive vice president of General Motors Corporation.

It will be noted, Mr. President, that we did not go to the department heads and ask the men who were representing the Government what their policies were. We got men from the field. We called witnesses from out in the country to tell us how the Federal program was functioning, whether adequately or deficiently. We did not take the time of any official of the Government. Not once did Mr. Nelson or any of the other top men in the governmental agencies working on the program come before us.

During the same period of time when the subcommittee was considering the bill—Senate bill 2871, as it was then, the bill for the creation of a war mobilization board—we were investigating, at the instance of the committee itself, the question of manpower, particularly with reference to the shortage of doctors in the civilian population of the country. Obviously the subject of manpower runs into many ramifications, and consequently we touched the perimeter of certain other subjects. Witnesses who appeared and discussed the subject of manpower and commented upon the subject of the war mobilization board were numerous, including the heads of the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the railway brotherhoods. All of them appeared, and numerous other witnesses likewise appeared. Those witnesses commented upon the general subject of the efficient use of the nation's facilities and manpower resources.

Mr. President, the committee concluded the hearings which were possible to be had before the holidays, and made a report to the full Committee on Education and Labor. The report of the subcommittee is printed, and I ask that the pages distribute copies of the report to the desks of all Senators, so that they may ascertain whether or not an honest and possibly a capable effort was made by the subcommittee to discharge its obligation to the Senate, whose agent it was, in the consideration of this subject. The printed report embraces 14½ pages. Since I had only a small part in the preparation of the report, I am presumptuous enough to believe that it will not be ridiculed or belittled by anyone who will give the subcommittee the courtesy of reading it.

The subcommittee tried to make an analysis of our civilian production problems. It was not out to "get" anyone. It did not disparage or discourage anyone, either personally or as an agency. We did not have any ax to grind. However, Mr. President, we were vitally aware of what civilian production means not only to the eventual determination of the issue, but to the length of time required to reach the end of the war. If there is division in responsibility among the administrative agencies, if there is inefficiency in their program, if there is lack of necessary authority, if there is too much evading and equivocation on the

part of the agencies affected, if there is no head to the war effort save in the person of the President of the United States, the committee ventured to think that it is time for the Congress to go into the matter seriously.

Mr. President, the bill is called the war mobilization bill. Perhaps as good a way as any for me to indicate to the Senate the nature of the bill is to say that its first and primary object is to provide a head for the civilian war effort of the Nation during this war; and that head, according to the provisions of the bill, would be the Director of the War Mobilization Board for which the bill provides. The Director would preside over two bodies.

One would be the War Mobilization Board itself, which we might say would have, by the provisions of the bill, the primary responsibility and power to get the maximum war production out of the Nation's facilities for production. Who would constitute the War Mobilization Board? It would be composed—to read from the bill itself—of 16 persons; 4 representatives of industry, 4 representatives of labor, 4 representatives of agriculture, and 4 public members at large, all to be appointed by the Director, with the advice and approval of the President.

Let me say that the Director himself is to be appointed by the President, not subject to confirmation by the Senate, and under the terms of the bill would be given a fixed salary, and would be required to give his full time to his duties, and to separate himself meanwhile from any private interest. We took away the power of confirmation by the Senate, in order to give the President the greatest possible flexibility in the administration of the program and the selection of the responsible personnel.

Mr. President, the War Mobilization Board, as I have said, is to be presided over by a director called the Director of War Mobilization, to whom I have just referred.

Another important adjunct of the organization is a committee on requirements and program, under the chairmanship of the director of the War Mobilization Board, and to consist of the following: The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the administrators of the four constituent offices of the Office of War Mobilization.

Imagine, if you will, therefore, the War Mobilization Board itself composed of 16 persons representing, respectively, industry, labor, agriculture, and the public, and then on the same plane with the War Mobilization Board itself a committee on Requirements and Program, consisting of the officers whom I have just named. That is what we might call the general staff of the War Mobilization Board.

Underneath the War Mobilization Board is to be set up the administrative, operating organization, which would consist of four pillars, Mr. President. One of those would be concerned with war production and supply or procurement, not merely for the Army, not merely for the Navy, not merely for the Maritime Commission, not merely for the Office of Lend-Lease, not merely for agriculture, but for the United States of America, one nation indivisible, waging war indivisibly. So imagine as the first pillar under the Office of War Mobilization, the Office of Production and Supply.

The next pillar, and essentially a vital one, would be the Office of Manpower Supply, in charge of manpower—not merely for the War Department or the Navy Department or some other branch of the Government, but for the Government of the United States waging and making war.

The third pillar would be the Office of Scientific and Technical Mobilization. As I said, provision for it was incorporated into the bill primarily because it is essential to efficient and effective war production that there be coordination of all the research of the country in order that it will be available to all the agencies of the Government engaged in production, so that it will be the instrument of the Nation and not merely of a particular company or of a particular division of the War Production Board or of the armed services.

The fourth pillar would be the Office of Economic Stabilization—the one which would have the responsibility for economic stabilization in the Nation—not merely for a part, not merely for only one class, not with respect to only one group, but economic stabilization in the United States of America.

So at the top we should have the Director of the Office of War Mobilization; and under the Director, and presided over by him, would be the Board of War Mobilization. Let me say that we did not believe in committees; we are trying to get away from committees, so that someone can decide something sometime; and, Mr.President,let me say that with respect to the matter of committees I suspect that I share the sentiment entertained by most, if not all, Members of the Senate. I have seen so much frustration by committees that I wondered whether I should prefer to go to heaven if my going there had to depend upon the eventual decision of a committee, if it would be like some of the United States Government coordinating committees located in Washington. I thought that I might as well go on to the other place, because that is usually where a project eventually goes if it has to run the gamut of committees, without anyone being the head of any one of the committees and responsible for its doing a job.

Mr. President, I digress here to mention two things which come to my mind in that respect. One of them was what a wag said during the impeachment proceedings against Lord Hastings.

That case rocked on for 7 years, I believe. The very able attorney who later came to be Lord Eldon, and who then was attorney for Warren Hastings, had the following practice: Every time a critical point came up he would make objection to the introduction of the testimony; and the House of Lords would rise solemnly from their seats, would solemnly parade out the doors to their secret chamber, would solemnly deliberate and debate upon the point made by the defense counsel, thereafter would solemnly arise, would solemnly walk back into the chamber, would solemnly sit down again, and would solemnly announce their eventual decision.

After, as I say, the case had gone on for 7 years, and had not concluded, it was said, "The court moves that the case stand still." Or I might refer, Mr. President, to what was said to have been the provision of a statute in one of the pioneer States of the early days which is supposed to have read, "When two trains shall meet neither shall proceed until the other has passed."

So I have said, at the top is the Director of the War Mobilization Board; under him is the War Mobilization Board itself, consisting of 16 different men, representing industry, labor, agriculture, and the public. Then, on the same level with the War Mobilization Board, is the Committee on Program and Requirements, consisting of the individuals I named a while ago. Then, under that, are the pillars of the structure, the Office of Production and Supply, the Office of Manpower Supply, the Office of Scientific and Technical Mobilization, and the Office of Economic Stabilization.

But again, Mr. President, we wanted unity somewhere, not just at the top but at the bottom, actually on the ground. Consequently, these four pillars, as it were, converge into a regional office in every region in the country, and we find that in each one of those regions there is not a division of responsibility and separation physically and intellectually in their policies, but we find the four principal operating agencies of the whole structure actually sitting together around the table presided over by a representative of the Chairman of the War Mobilization Board. That means that in a region, for example, there is somebody who can speak with authority, somebody who is chairman of the Board who can call them together, and have them sit around the table, and they know they have all the necessary authority. We would not have the spectacle of a little businessman going somewhere in an effort to get a contract and one agency saying, "We are sorry but it does not come within the scope of our authority," and another saying, "We are sorry but this does not come within the sphere of our duty," until the poor fellow is frustrated in his effort to find somebody who can speak before the Government of the United States acts.

So what we have done in the bill is to provide for a concentration of responsibility and authority, a decentralization of operating authority and power, and such a coordination of power that they can effectively function together, so that if a problem comes up there will be some one there whose duty it will be to deal with the problem.

Mr. President, at the present time it is a sad fact that the very lack of that kind of an organization or something similar to it is prolonging the war, even endangering the issue of the contest, and exacting a tragic toll of the lives of those who must bear the brunt of the prolonged fighting. In other words, discussing the merits of the bill, the American people

have become sorely tired of seeing agency after agency here in Washington fighting with one another, having conflicts over whether the octane gas or the escort vessel program or rubber production should get vital and critical materials, with no one able to tell how greatly either program would be affected by a separation of or a division of war materials. In other words, today there is not anywhere in Washington anyone who can tell any Senator if Mr. Jeffers' request for materials to carry on his synthetic rubber program is granted what it will do to the ship program of the Navy and what it will do to the octane gas program, because no one knows what facilities are really being employed in those programs, and the critical materials and the facilities in this country have not been so scheduled as to channel into the various operations. That is the essential deficiency at which this bill is striking.

Senators know what has been the evolution of the civilian war production and the war program. In the days before Congress passed the lease-lend bill the Government had no particular interest or any responsibility for efficiency in American production that went to the Allies. They came here; they negotiated; they bought, and delivery was made according to the law as it then existed. But in the spring of 1941 we passed the Lend-Lease Act, and then the Government of the United States committed itself to a war-production program.

Mr. President, as you know, we had a National Defense Advisory Committee in the first instance; then we had S. P. A. B.; then we had the Office of Production Management; finally, the Office of War Production; and, eventually, the Chairman of the War Production Board, acting pursuant to certain directives that were given by the President. We have never had a legislative organization of the war effort; it has been left solely to the administrative branch of the Government. The program has simply evolved. Many glorious achievements have been realized; but, Mr. President, I remind Senators that it is not what we have done that is important in respect to the Nation's production; it is whether we have done all that we could have done and are doing all we can do.

Every one of us shares immense pride in what we have accomplished; but, Mr. President, our obligation is to do our best and to remove any bottleneck, to supply any deficiency, to provide against any inadequacy that may keep us from doing the very best that this Nation is capable of doing. Yet, in spite of all the evolution that has been going on and all that has been accomplished, nearly every day the newspapers bring illustrations of the necessity for the centralization of war production in the hands of some persons and boards other than in the person of our great President himself.

Mr. President, war production in war is a gigantic, a colossal enterprise. The President cannot be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, exercise his civilian functions as President, and, at the same time, be the effective head to the extent that he would like to be of the war-production program of the country. Of course, he is the final authority in the Army, but he does not administer the details of the Army. When he wants to consult with the Army or give it a directive, he does not call in the Quartermaster Corps; he does not call in the Signal Corps; he does not call in a division of the Army; he calls in the Secretary of War or the Chief of Staff, and, under that great organization, are sprawled and stretched the mighty forces of our war organization.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been very much interested in what the Senator is saying, but as I understand his explanation, his plan really means that we would have two Presidents, would we not?

Mr. PEPPER. No; no more than we have two Presidents or two Chiefs of Naval Operations or two Chiefs of Staff. Mr. President, we should merely have one President to whom these various heads would be answerable; but there would be a sort of general staff for war production and somebody at the head of it answerable to the President.

Mr. TYDINGS. My question was prompted by a realization that if we had a single head and then, under that single head, had the various divisions which the Senator has outlined, and under them, had certain executives who would give the whole program motivation, so to speak, it seems to me that practically all the power, except tactical dispositions of the military and the Navy would be in the hands of a single individual who would be the director of war mobilization.

In other words, he would control economic stabilization, the manpower for agriculture and factory alike, and the material situation for both the war effort and the civilian population; so, outside of levying taxes and directing the tactical employment of the Army and Navy and the Marine Corps, practically all the power—and I am not criticizing it, understand—I am merely listening to the explanation—one man would have virtually all the power which we have given to the President, with the exception perhaps of his right as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and the congressional right to appropriate money. There does not seem to be much else in the picture. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me, I should say the Senator is wrong, for the reason that the President, as the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and as the President, has just come back from a great conference in Africa, where he was in consultation with the civil heads of other governments, where the civil heads, the military and naval heads, the supply heads, and so on, were in consultation.

The fact that the President had a Chief of Staff, a very able one, whom we all respect; the fact that the President had a distinguished Chief of Naval Operations; the fact that the President had various very efficient heads of the supply services did not mean that the President himself was not a very busy man, and did not have any obligations to fulfill. In other words, he did not sit in a place of isolation and say, "All I have to do is just to talk to my one man." Being Commander in Chief is a busy job, even when there is a magnificent organization under him, as the President has.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not taking issue with that phase of the matter, but as I listened to the powers which would all stem back to the director, I was trying to ascertain what he would not have the right to do, as well as what he would have the right to do.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I could answer the Senator in several different ways. For example, as I stated awhile ago, the President would have the power to remove the man who was the Director of the War Mobilization Board. Of course, he would be in constant consultation with the Director, just as he is with the Chief of Staff, whom he has the power to remove, or the Chief of Naval Operations. In addition to that, he would have to approve all the different appointees. They, too, could be removed by him.

Mr. TYDINGS. By whom; by the President?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the Senator has gotten the import of my question. I am not talking about the President; I am talking about the head man of the War Mobilization Board which the Senator would create. It seems to me he would have all the power—and perhaps it would be right to give it to him—possessed by the President under our Constitution, except the right to be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy; and, indirectly, to some extent he would have a pretty big voice in that. He would not participate in the power of taxation, and perhaps the power of legislation, in a formal way; but his decision, in the first or second or third or fourth category of the general set-up, would be so all-embracing that he would practically be king, would he not?

Mr. PEPPER. No; he would not be king. He would not be clothed, substantially, with any larger power than the President's directive vested in Donald Nelson. As a matter of fact, if the able Senator will refresh his mind about the Presidential directive to Donald Nelson, he will observe that, except as to the agencies which are not included, for example, those handling economic stabilization and technological mobilization, Donald Nelson substantially has, or was intended by that directive to have, subject to the President's control, practically all power over the mobilization and the operation of our war activities.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think that is a fair statement, and it goes back to my original observation. I am not in disagreement and I am not in agreement; I am merely seeking information.

Mr. PEPPER. I appreciate the Senator's attitude.

Mr. TYDINGS. It seems to me that what the Senator would really do would be to create two Presidents, one our regular, normal President, and under him the Senator would place a man to take the full responsibility of making the myriad

decisions in the ramified fields which the Senator has so ably described.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me, I agree, but with the deletion of the idea of "another President."

Mr. TYDINGS. That may be an unfortunate appelation, but I do not mean it in a political sense.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand what the Senator means. Getting at the substance of what the able Senator says, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Just as the Chief of Staff has broad powers over the control of the Army, just as the Chief of Naval Operations has broad powers over the Navy. The purpose of the bill, as the Senator correctly analyzes it, is to put in someone besides the busy person of the President the authority to reconcile the various conflicting and claiming agencies, and the authority to keep the whole thing in some sort of coordinated shape.

Mr. TYDINGS. So that if there were any dispute over manpower, over material, over economic stabilization, over technological information, and the four men at the top of the four divisions could not decide the questions or reconcile their differences, they would put any disputed point on the Director's desk, and he would say what was what; and that would be final?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct; except that the President would have the final say.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am greatly impressed with much of what the Senator has said. I do not know that I agree with all he has said, but I think his description of the problem is accurate and fair, and he has a solution for it, which is much more than many others have.

When it is all boiled down—and I do not mean this in any harsh or Nazi sense—the proposal is really to set up an economic dictator for the United States, with power to decide and act?

Mr. PEPPER. There again, we would be setting up a director of the war mobilization effort who would have the power to decide.

Mr. TYDINGS. To decide all these ramified economic questions, whether they touch men, or materials, or what not?

Mr. PEPPER. That is exactly correct. I am very much indebted to the able Senator for his inquiries and his statements.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened with much interest to the distinguished Senator. As I understand, we are discussing the question whether Senate bill 607 shall be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs or go back to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. I am not a member of either committee. I have listened with much interest to what we might call the report of the Committee on Education and Labor, in which the distinguished Senators have set forth their idea as to what the bill should be. If I understand, the bill now under discussion incorporates that idea?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. In other words, when the last session of the Congress ended, the committee had arrived at a conclusion, which is embodied in this report?

Mr. PEPPER. The subcommittee had.

Mr. WILEY. The subcommittee?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. Had the committee adopted the report?

Mr. PEPPER. It had not, nor had the subcommittee concluded its hearings. It made a kind of an ad interim report.

Mr. WILEY. I assume that if the bill were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, it would agree substantially with the essence of the report which I hold in my hand. I should like to know what the difference is between the idea of the Senator and what the Military Affairs Committee wants.

Mr. PEPPER. The bill was reintroduced upon the convening of this session of Congress, not by merely the two Senators who had previously introduced the bill.

Mr. WILEY. Perhaps I can best put my question in this form: Why does the Senator fear the bill going to the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. PEPPER. I will ask the Senator to permit me to finish the other statement. When Congress convened at the beginning of this session, instead of the bill being introduced by just the two Senators who previously introduced it, it was introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] for himself, joined by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], nine Senators in all, who joined in the introduction of the bill. I do not presume to say that those Senators have any preference as to the committee to which the bill should go, but we have the incident of this motion being made in the nature of a motion to discharge a committee engaged in the consideration of a bill. I was raising the question whether that was quite fair to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The able Senator might have asked his question the other way—what is it that the able chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs is afraid of? Even assuming that the Committee on Education and Labor should not have had the bill in the first place, it was given the bill by the Senate, a subcommittee was appointed, the subcommittee went about the investigation, honestly, at least, if not wisely, coordinating its efforts with the work of other committees.

Then they made an ad interim report to the full committee, which the full committee has never had a chance to consider; and the subcommittee had not concluded its hearings. It never had voted to conclude them. I do not know whether any subcommittee might desire to go along further. Then, when the last session terminated, at the holiday season, and the bill was on the calendar, and before the committee expired, no one thought of the subject as one that had been abandoned. While the committee had no technical right to conclude that their jurisdiction would continue, nevertheless the sponsors of the original bill, and the seven additional sponsors of the bill at this session when it was reintroduced, joined in its introduction. I suppose that some might have assumed that the bill would go back to the same committee which had already had jurisdiction of it, and was one of the committees which had a right to consider some of the subjects involved.

One Senator, the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], when the reference was about to be made, as I understand, to the Committee on Education and Labor, rose and raised the point that the bill should go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Frankly, there has been quite a bit of skirmishing going on. I am prepared to say that, unless I am incorrectly informed, representatives of the Navy and War Departments have committed the gross indiscretion of trying to influence the action of the Senate as to the committee to which this bill should be referred, and that, I suspect, is a confirmable fact. I do not discredit anyone's motive or disparage anyone's purpose, but it is a serious question as to whether anyone from either the War or the Navy Departments should take any part in deciding the way in which the Senate refers its bills, unless they have a purpose in their effort.

Mr. WILEY. If I were seated in the gallery of the Senate and were not particularly interested in the mechanics of this matter, I should ask the question which I have asked the Senator, namely, What is all the controversy about? In other words, if what the Senator says is accurate, why does the Committee on Military Affairs want the bill, or why does the Senator want the Committee on Education and Labor to keep it? The Senator knows why he wants the latter committee to keep it. In other words, he wants the bill to come out substantially in the form in which it now is.

It seems to me that Members of the Senate, who are not members of either committee, are entitled to know what members of the Military Affairs Committee believe the bill should contain instead of what it does contain. That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to add some further comments, but at this time I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Florida introduced Senate bill 2871 in the last session of Congress?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; together with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. CHANDLER. How did it happen that that bill was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. PEPPER. I understand that a suggestion of reference was made on the floor by the able Senator from West

Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], if I am correctly informed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then, because of the request of the Senator from West Virginia, the bill was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. PEPPER. That is my understanding. It was sent to that committee by the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Was that bill identical in terms with the bill now under discussion?

Mr. PEPPER. I think one might say that they are substantially the same. The sponsors think there has been some little improvement in the second draft over the first bill, although there has been no great departure in principle in the two bills.

Mr. CHANDLER. That was the basis on which the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, of which the Senator from Florida was chairman, proceeded to consider the bill and hold hearings on it?

Mr. PEPPER. When the bill was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor the chairman of the committee appointed a subcommittee, the personnel of which I named a while ago, and that subcommittee, in the manner I have described, began to hold hearings on the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. As I understand, this bill undertakes to create an independent agency, a brand new one, and place at its head a director, as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] suggested a moment ago, who would receive $20,000 a year, and who would not be confirmed by the Senate of the United States but would simply be appointed by the President. The new agency would take the place of all the presently constituted agencies of War and Navy, and all agencies which are now undertakiing to make war on behalf of the people of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. No, I would not be at all justified in assenting to what my friend the Senator from Kentucky has said. In the first place, if I understand correctly, Mr. Donald Nelson was not confirmed by the Senate. Neither would the director contemplated to be appointed under this bill be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. He would not be confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. He would be in charge, let us say, of four main divisions.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. The heads of those divisions would be under the director?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. The bill proposes that each of those administrators shall receive $15,000 a year, and then it proposes that deputy administrators be appointed, as many as the Director deems necessary, and each deputy administrator so appointed shall be compensated at the rate of $12,000 a year.

Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Florida this question: If the Senator were the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, or even the President of the United States—and the Senator might be either, or all, that is one at a time, and fill very capably any one of those offices, I might say——

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Kentucky for the imaginary compliment.

Mr. CHANDLER. In such event it would be the Senator's business to make war. The President of the United States, so long as he is President of the United States, is the Commander in Chief and the head of the Army and Navy of the United States, and it is his business to make war. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. PEPPER. The War Department——

Mr. CHANDLER. No; I am speaking of the President. It is his business to make war.

Mr. PEPPER. He is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. CHANDLER. Under the Constitution of the United States the Congress declares war, or the necessity for war, or says that we are in a state of war, but the Congress cannot make war. The President of the United States, under the Constitution, is the one who has to make war.

Mr. PEPPER. It depends on what the Senator means by the expression "make war." The President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. CHANDLER. He is the boss, is he not?

Mr. PEPPER. He is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. CHANDLER. Can he escape making any important decision, even if he should want to? It makes no difference whether he is in Casablanca or on Pennsylvania Avenue—he cannot escape making any important decision, can he?

Mr. PEPPER. I think he could have escaped making many decisions he has made if responsibility for making them had been properly delegated.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; but should he not make the important decisions?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me go further. If the Senator were Secretary of War, or Secretary of the Navy, and a bill was introduced in Congress which would tear up his Department, as the pending bill would do, or take from the Senator, as the head of the Department, the responsibility not only to assist the President in making the war, but to secure materials, and mobilize and train men, and make the war a success, he might feel that such a bill should go to the Committee on Military Affairs. I should think that such a bill should go to the Military Affairs Committee simply as a matter of plain sense. I do not understand why a member of the Military Affairs Committee should want to have the bill sent to the Committee on Education and Labor. One of the Senators who joined in introducing the bill is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PEPPER. Other Senators are also members of both committees.

Mr. CHANDLER. Why is not a bill which proposes virtually to root out the power and authority of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Procurement Division a matter of concern to Senators who are members of the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. PEPPER. I should be glad to answer that question.

Mr. CHANDLER. The fact that in another Congress a Senator suggested that a similar bill go to the Committee on Education and Labor does not mean that such a bill should go to that committee now. There was a time when Senators used to have bills referred to committees in which they thought they could get favorable action, and have the bills reported early. I should like to have bills in which I am interested so referred, and the Senator from Florida would also, but the rule with respect to the reference of bills has been changed. When I was a State legislator I tried to have bills in which I was interested referred to committees which would act favorably upon them, and that was done when I could persuade the presiding officer to do so. But here is a bill which a Senator suggests be sent to a committee whose main business is not helping to make war. On the other hand the main business of the Committee on Military Affairs is to help to make war.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the question is a fair one, and I will try to make a fair answer to it. This bill includes the whole subject of war production. It covers naval matters as well as military matters. The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee could just as well have made the motion as the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I interject at that point to say that the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee wants the bill to go to the Military Affairs Committee. Is that persuasive to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Kentucky will allow me to answer his question, I will say that I knew that, and I knew that the reason the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee wanted it so referred was that the Navy Department apparently wanted it done.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the question is that of making war and making war successfully, and if we here in Congress could conduct the war I should be in favor of making it here, but I am not going to support a proposal of the sort made by the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has yielded to me, and I should like to finish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to have the Senator from Kentucky finish, and if he wants to speak in his own time he knows I am one who would like to hear him.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not want to trespass unduly on the Senator's time.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand that.

Mr. CHANDLER. If I thought the Congress could make war more advantageously than the President of the United States, and the Secretary of War,

and the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of Staff, very well. I think, however, that the creation of another agency to usurp the powers of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, the head of which would be as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has said, an assistant to the President of the United States, would simply result in adding chaos to confusion. If the President wants that sort of an assistant he can appoint him. If I thought that the Congress could conduct the war better than the President of the United States can, that would be another thing; but, considering the fact that we are in the war now, and that we have a leader and responsible generals, we should leave the making of the war to them. We will not win the war by changing leaders.

If we cannot win with our present leaders the chances are we will be defeated. We cannot train new leaders now in the midst of the war. I do not want to support any bill which would result in hindering the war. We have a Commander in Chief, and I do not think we can change the Commander in Chief in time of war. We have to fight the war with him in command. At least we cannot change the Commander in Chief for the next couple of years, and if he runs for office at the end of that time I think he will defeat his opponents. Senators, we have a war on, and I think the Commander in Chief will defeat his opponents during the war.

Mr. PEPPER. Has the Senator finished?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Kentucky has spoken of the President of the United States, and the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, and he asked whether we thought that these gentlemen would be interested in a bill which would take away their powers or change their powers. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question. He knows that the full Senate Committee on Education and Labor has not even considered this bill. Hearings have been held on a similar measure by a subcommittee of that committee. Does the Senator from Kentucky, first of all, think that the Committee on Education and Labor would report a bill affecting the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy without calling upon those gentlemen?

The next question is as to interest. If the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are interested in this bill, does the Senator from Kentucky imply that they are interested to the extent that they would do the discourteous thing of suggesting that the bill be taken away from the Committee on Education and Labor and given to another committee, instead of coming out and testifying why they are opposed to the bill?

Mr. CHANDLER. No, Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky does not imply that anyone would do a discourteous thing. I did not say anything that would imply it. The Senator from Utah is a member of the Military Affairs Committee, and the Senator from Kentucky did not imply that he would not give earnest and careful consideration to any proposal that was of interest to the conduct of the war.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, may I ask further why a motion should be made by the chairman of another committee that the bill be referred to it when that committee has not heretofore considered the subject matter of the bill?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator will have to address that question to the Senator who made the motion, the Senator from North Carolina, who is the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Senators who listen to the discussion will find that there is a lack of understanding about certain things. Are the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy suspicious of the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator will have to ask them about that. I do not know.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator brought their names into the discussion, Mr. President.

Mr. CHANDLER. No, I said, "assuming that the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy"——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The names of the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy were brought into the discussion.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not bring them in. They were already in the debate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The question is asked, Would they not be interested in a bill affecting them? Of course, they would be interested in a bill affecting them.

Mr. CHANDLER. I said so.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Would the Senator from Kentucky imply that they would be so discourteous as to suggest that they would not testify before a certain committee?

Mr. CHANDLER. I would not suggest that. I do not believe they are.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I heard only a portion of the discussion which has just taken place. I should like to clarify the record. I wish to ask whether the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] infers by his remarks that the purpose of the bill is to demote or kick out a general or all generals, and to change the leaders during the progress of the war. The bill has no such purpose whatever. The use in the RECORD of the words "general" or "generals" might be misconstrued.

Mr. CHANDLER. Obviously the Senator from West Virgina did not hear all of my remarks because there is nothing in them like that.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as the able chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor has said, the motion made by the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee is in the nature of a motion to discharge one of the standing and major committees of the Senate engaged in the consideration of a bill before that committee has had an opportunity as a full committee to deliberate upon it or make any recommendations.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The statement made by the able Senator from Florida is in error. The chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor has just said that the bill has not been considered by the committee. It has not been considered because it was introduced only a short time ago.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I said that the motion was made before the subject had been considered by the committee as a whole. The subcommittee which had been considering it had made its report to the full committee, which has not had an opportunity to act.

Mr. CHANDLER. Even the subcommittee has not considered the new bill.

Mr. PEPPER. It has considered a bill which was the parent of the present bill, and substantially the same as the bill now being discussed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Several changes were made.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senate has already had an opportunity to see a little behind the scenes in this controversy. Let me put my finger where the flesh is tender and explain just what this is.

The bill would provide that procurement shall be in civilian hands and not in military or naval hands. It would set up a coordinating agency which would have three powers.

The first would be control of the critical materials, which is already vested in the requirements committee of the War Production Board, headed by a very able chairman, Mr. Eberstadt. The second power would be the power to schedule all production. The third power would be over-all production planning. Some of the military men have expressed themselves very strongly to me personally with regard to the struggle which is going on. They do not want the Services of Supply to be headed by a civilian, or to have a civilian vested with the principal procurement power in respect to the production program.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to conclude as soon as I can. I do not wish to yield for debate. The Senator may speak in his own time, but I yield for a question.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks that a civilian knows what caliber guns or what kind of ammunition the Army needs. I should like to ask him if he does not believe that the Army ought to be the one to say how many guns, and of what

caliber, as well as what ships and munitions it needs to fight with. Does the Senator believe that a civilian should make such decisions?

Mr. PEPPER. I believe that the answer to the first question is "Yes." The Army ought to have authority to prescribe specifications and the quantity of the equipment it desires, and should have the right to prescribe its character. It should also have the right to inspect it, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator think the Army ought to be required to debate with civilians as to whether its needs are real or imaginary?

Mr. PEPPER. No.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is what would happen under an arrangement such as this.

Mr. PEPPER. The pending bill does not provide for such an arrangement.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator just said that it would take away those prerogatives from the Army.

Mr. PEPPER. I said that it would take away procurement. If the Senator will be good enough to allow me to complete my remarks I shall try to answer his question.

Mr. President, of course, the armed services should prescribe specifications for their equipment, and should have the power to inspect its production. They should also have the power to specify the material which shall go into the production, and determine the quantity which is needed.

Mr. President, let me ask a question in reply. Does any Senator believe that military and naval men are as well qualified as are the best production men in America to obtain production from factories throughout the country? That is the essential question.

There are two questions. The first involves putting at the head of the program a civilian who is a production man, who knows how to mobilize the production facilities of America. If I were making the decision I should put a civilian, instead of a general or an admiral, in charge of such a program.

Mr. President, the first question is whether or not we want some central head for the whole program. If we answer "yes" to that question I think we will all agree on the necessity for a head for the war production program in order to avoid multiplication and division of authority, conflicts of interest, prostration to a considerable extent in the effort, and potential disaster in the result.

Generally speaking, who is better qualified to be the head, a civilian or a member of one of the armed services? If a member of one of the services is to be appointed, he must be a member of the Navy, the Army, the Marine Corps, the Air Corps, or some other division of the armed forces. Does the Navy want an Army man in charge of its program? Does the Army want a Navy man over its program? Does any of the services want a member of some other service over its program? In the long run, if one man must be in charge, would they not want the best production man in America in charge of the production facilities of America?

Let me give an illustration of the way this thing works out. Sometime ago we saw in the newspapers—and we received repercussions of it—evidence of the fight going on for Mr. Donald Nelson to get back the power which he had delegated to the armed services—power which the President gave him in the first instance, and which he ought never to have delegated. That was the power to schedule, the power to procure, the power to produce.

However, the War Production Board has not been a war production board. It has been an umpire among the claimant agencies for critical material. Donald Nelson has never exercised the power to command the production machinery of America, and to schedule production for the war effort.

A few days ago, while the President was in Casablanca, the rubber-production program was stymied for days while Mr. James Byrnes was endeavoring to reconcile the conflict among those who were claiming valves and turbines essential to the three programs of octane gas, escort ships, and synthetic rubber.

The Navy was afraid of the impairment which might result to its escort-vessel program, and yet no one in the Government could tell how many ships would be delayed, or whether any would necessarily be delayed. No one knew what valves or turbines were to go to what engines. It was like reaching out into the dark. It might be dangerous to run into a dark room, becauses one might hit something. We cannot have a hit-or-miss program and obtain maximum efficiency from the production machinery.

Mr. Nelson received a broad directive from the President. The President expected one man to be the boss—not a dictator, not an assistant king or assistant President, but in time of war the effective, courageous head of the war-production program, just as the Chief of Staff is the head of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations is the head of the Navy, and the President of the United States is the head of the Government and the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

Then Mr. Nelson saw the program breaking down and the President's goals not being met. We know that the President wanted more airplanes than he is going to get this year, because there was a bottleneck in aluminum production. All the Army had done was to make contracts with every aluminum company it could find to produce aluminum extrusions. There were not enough. The Army could not help it.

At that stage Mr. Nelson became disturbed because the program was out of balance and not coordinated. He set up a material control program to try to regain control over critical materials, to use the critical materials we had to the best advantage. He put an extraordinarily able man in charge of that program. He saw that was not enough, but that he had to have the power to schedule, to plan, and to procure if he would avoid conflicts and get the best results. That story is not strange to the Senate or to members of Senate committees.

I think it ought to be said that Mr. Nelson, with the collaboration of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Under Secretaries, and with the support of the President, obtained the services of Mr. Charles Wilson and made him Vice Chairman of the War Production Board. On the whole, Mr. Wilson has been doing a magnificent job.

He was given the title of vice chairman of the War Production Board, but actually he was not put in charge of anything except radar and airplane production, going on the theory that with the gradual expansion of his authority it would be found that he was actually in charge of war production.

There is no head of the War Production Board except in respect to radar and airplanes. All the rest of it is divided up among various claimant agencies, and a limited power is vested in the distinguished chairman of the War Production Board.

When Mr. Wilson took that job he began to look around and see what was going on. He found a deficiency of aluminum extrusions. He did not stop merely because all the aluminum factories were choked up with contracts for the armed services. He looked for facilities. He found that some of the copper processing facilities were not fully employed in war production in processing raw copper, so he changed those machines over so that they would make aluminum extrusions. In a little while the deficiencies began to disappear, the airplane program was accelerated, and American boys began to have something to fight with.

I could give a dozen illustrations. Mr. Wilson saw, before he ever got here, that this conflict would occur among the claimants of facilities for the production of octane gas, synthetic rubber, and escort vessels, because they all called on the same facilities engaged in the production of valves and turbines, and there was not enough to go around. No one had anticipated that to make so many ships, so much synthetic rubber, or so much octane gas would require so many machines making valves and so many machines making turbines. Government officials said, "We will make so many ships, so many airplanes, and so much octane gas," without knowing whether or not they had the facilities with which to make them. All the procurement agencies would do would be to take the priorities permit which they had and go on a hunting expedition to see if they could find someone who could make the things they needed. The first thing they would know three claimants would be after one thing, and then the President would have to get Mr. Jimmy Byrnes—an able and distinguished man, and certainly I should be glad to see him in any capacity, however high; but here I am talking about principles, not personalities—the President would have to get Mr. Jimmy Byrnes or someone else to work on the matter.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to say to the Senator that I thoroughly agree with what he has said about the situation as it exists today, and I have great sympathy with his purpose; because before the so-called Gillette subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry we have run into exactly the same difficulties which the Senator outlined a moment ago. However, the question in my mind, and the one which bothered me, is: Does not Mr. Nelson have the power to do the very things about which the Senator has been talking?

Mr. PEPPER. I should say "No" to the Senator, for two or possibly three reasons. In the first place, Mr. Nelson is just getting back, by the skin of his teeth, the powers which he once delegated, but he is getting them back impaired. In other words, if in the beginning he had actually exercised the full power vested in him under the President's directive, with the fair implications deducible from it, he would have been the head of it, as was Bernard Baruch the head of the War Industries Board in the last war.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. But our friend did not do so. Instead, for many reasons which may to him have seemed adequate and wise—I am not prepared to say as to that—he delegated to others the powers as to procurement and the making of requirements; and he himself really had only a sketchy authority over critical materials. In other words, for example, even as to critical materials he did not say to the claimants, "All right; you can have only so much, and I will follow it through to see where it goes, to see that you are not hoarding, to see that the prime contractors are not getting more than their share or are not delegating too much to some subcontractor." He merely divided it up, and let it go where it would.

The second point is that the President's directive, construed one way—which might be a possible construction—gave the chairman of the War Production Board only the power to direct as to a procurement policy. It did not give him the power actually to set up procurement machinery. The result was that, insulated from actual operations by the military personnel, which was a hierarchy, of course, of all the military categories, by giving only a directive he did not get all the results which perhaps he anticipated achieving when he wrote the directive.

The third answer to the question as to why the power referred to is not already in existence is that under the terms of the bill the Director of the War Mobilization Board would be vested with some authority not included in the present directive—for example, economic stabilization, scientific and technical mobilization, and control of the manpower supply. Those are three fields which are not now dealt with by the War Production Board.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, let me say that the President now has the power to do substantially the things provided for in the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; he has the power.

Mr. WHEELER. So it seems to me that there is a question whether we should pass legislation on the subject. I understand that when Mr. Nelson was first appointed the President gave him the power. It is true that Mr. Nelson delegated a part of his power to this man and a part to that one, and as a result we did not get from the War Production Board the kind of services which we should have had. I agree that the War Production Board has been in a rather bad state of affairs, and it has not improved to any extent over a period of 6 months at least. I think that something must be done about that. I do not think there is any question that something must be done about it.

However, the point I make is that at the present time the President has the power to do the very thing for which the Senator from Florida is contending; so the question is whether we should pass legislation to do something which the President already has the power to do.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to comment on that phase of the matter.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I think that the Senate has gone far afield in this matter. The motion before the Senate is one to refer the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I happen to be a member—and, by inference, not to refer it to the Committee on Education and Labor, which during the last Congress considered the corresponding bill. I think it is a most unusual thing for the Senate by vote to take a bill away from a committee which has not yet had a chance as a whole committee to consider it, before that committee has really had an opportunity to act upon it, and by an action of the Senate itself to transfer the bill to another committee.

If conditions were reversed, and if the bill had been under consideration by the Committee on Military Affairs, I should feel exactly the same way. I think it is an unusual precedent which the Senate is trying to set by taking the bill away from the Committee on Education and Labor which has been holding hearings on the corresponding bill, and which has not as yet had a chance as a committee to vote on it, and arbitrarily to refer the bill to another committee for exactly the same consideration. For that reason I shall not support the motion of the able chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. My question may be far afield, but I should like to ask the Senator another question on the bill, if I may do so. My question is in line with that propounded a moment ago by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. I was about to ask the Senator whether at the present time the President has the power to do the very thing for which the bill would provide? The answer of the Senator from Florida to the question propounded by the Senator from Montana was "Yes."

Mr. PEPPER. The bill contains certain provisions for authorization for appropriations, and the like, and I think it supplements the administrative power; but substantially the answer to that question is "Yes."

Mr. LUCAS. In addition to the authorization to set up the War Production Board, and giving Donald Nelson the power which he has under the directive, the President had the power to issue the directive at any time and to give the power to anyone.

Mr. PEPPER. There is no question about that.

Mr. LUCAS. Now I want to deal with the provisions of the bill as to functions and transfers of functions among agencies. I take it that is the meat of the bill; is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That is one of its provisions; yes.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, section 7 (a) of the bill provides:

> There is hereby transferred to the Office of Production and Supply the functions and personnel of (1) the War Production Board and the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

A number of the powers of the War Production Board would be transferred to just one of the agencies of the War Mobilization Board; would they not?

Mr. PEPPER. That power would exist—the power to make transfers to this framework of an organization.

Mr. LUCAS. Whatever power is now lodged in the War Production Board would be transferred to the other agency; is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The War Production Board would go out of existence so far as the War Production Board itself is concerned; is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. As to the Senator's second point—and as to it I see the trouble in connection with the bill, that it will not eliminate very many of the difficulties which we are trying to eliminate—let me read further from section 7 (a) of the bill:

> (2) Those subdivisions of the War, Navy, and Treasury Departments, of the Maritime Commission, and of the Office of Lend-Lease as shall be determined by the Director, subject to the approval of the President, as being related to, engaged in, or concerned with the procurement, manufacture, or other provision of war matériel.

My question is, Will there not be the same conflict and the same trouble between the various agencies named in subdivision (2) and the new agency provided for by the bill, insofar as those agencies may attempt to dominate or control the supply of various materials and various things which are set forth in that particular paragraph?

Mr. PEPPER. I should say "No" to the able Senator; because the War Mobilization Board, as adviser, and the Director of the War Mobilization Board, as Director, would have the power to recon-

cile all conflicts between the many subordinate agencies.

Mr. LUCAS. But they would not have the power to take the power away from the President, would they?

Mr. PEPPER. Of course not. No power is to be taken away from the President. Of course, he is the head of it all.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; and in section 7 (a), subdivision (2), of the Office of War Mobilization bill, reference is made to—

> Those subdivisions of the War, Navy, and Treasury Departments, of the Maritime Commission, and of the Office of Lend-Lease as shall be determined by the Director, subject to the approval of the President.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The point I make is that when the Director determines whatever is necessary, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Office of Lend-Lease, and all of the other agencies will start all over again the trouble which we are having at the present time, and the President will be between two fires, just as he is between two fires at this very moment.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; I would not agree with the Senator as to that point; because the Director of the War Mobilization Board would be the effective operating head of war production, and would have the power to lay down policy or to give instructions which would avoid or reconcile conflicts.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator as to that; but the Senator's statement does not answer my question.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senate has been very kind, and I wish to approach a conclusion of what I have to say.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to comment on the remark of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. The bill which the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] introduced, for himself and other Senators, in the last session, was not referred by the Senate to the Committee on Education and Labor. It was referred to that committee under the old rule whereby a Senator could write on the bill the name of the committee to which he wished to have it referred and by which he wished it considered.

The reference moved by the Senator from North Carolina would not result in having the Senate take away from a committee a bill which had previously been referred by the Senate, because the bill was never referred to the committee by the Senate.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, if that is not exactly what happened—that the bill was referred to the committee by the Senate—I do not know what we could call it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Well, Mr. President, if I wanted to have a certain committee conduct hearings on a certain subject, under the old rule I would pick out the committee which I thought would give me the best run for my money. I have no objection to that; but the bill which is the subject of the motion of the Senator from North Carolina is a bill which should have gone to the Committee on Military Affairs in the first place.

Mr. TRUMAN. Not necessarily; any one of three or four committees could have had jurisdiction of the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, the Senator and I do not agree about that. I say that the bill should have gone to the Committee on Military Affairs; I say it should have gone to the Committee on Military Affairs in the first place. However, it did not go there. I cannot help that but I am going to do the best I can to see that it now goes to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, there can be plenty of argument on that matter, because any one of four committees could have had the bill referred to it; any one of them has just as much jurisdiction of the subject as any of the others; and the chairman of any one of the other three committees could make the same motion the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has made.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me say that it is my judgment that, as between the various committees, the Committee on Military Affairs should have had the bill originally, rather than the Committee on Education and Labor. However, the bill was not at that time referred by the Senate to the Committee on Military Affairs. This is the first time that the matter has been before the whole Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to conclude what I have to say. As the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] has pointed out, the bill, having to do with the matter of war production, would properly come within the scope of a number of different Senate committees.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no objection if the other two want to get in, but it happens that two of us are contending, and it is my contention that as between the Military Affairs Committee and the Committee on Education and Labor, while the latter had it originally, yet if the question had been submitted to the Senate, I believe the measure would not have been sent to that committee; but inasmuch as the question was not submitted this is the first time the matter has been before the whole Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I started to say—and I should like to finish my remarks—as the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] has pointed out, this bill having to do with the whole program of war production would probably come within the scope of a number of different Senate committees. I mentioned a while ago the Naval Affairs Committee, because, of course, the bill affects the Navy in the prosecution of the war. The Military Affairs Committee, for obvious reasons, might also be included, and I might likewise include the Foreign Relations Committee, because it affects lend-lease. I could also include the Banking and Currency Committee, because the bill affects the Office of Price Administration, the legislation for which has been constantly handled by the Banking and Currency Committee. I might also include the Committee on Education and Labor, which has had to do with legislation pertaining to labor and vocational training.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Where the Senate has taken any position with regard to the reference of bills which include several subjects which, if separated, might have gone to other committees, the Senate has not, even under its own loose rule, adopted the practice of sending a bill to a committee which has jurisdiction merely of something which is more or less incidental to the proposed legislation and which might have been sent to another committee if it had been introduced separately, but where there has been any rule at all it has been the practice to send the bill to the committee that had jurisdiction of the major portion of the subject matter covered by the measure, although it included many subjects which, if separately introduced, could have gone to other committees. In the case of an omnibus bill, such as this is apparently, dealing with a good many subjects, which might have been dealt with separately by other committees, the Senate has ordered—and I think properly—the Presiding Officer to send the bill to that committee which had jurisdiction of the major portion of the subject matter under consideration.

It would be impossible to send this bill or any similar bill to all the committees which might have jurisdiction. If so, we never would get anywhere in finally enacting legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the able leader if he knows of a case where a committee which actually has jurisdiction of the subject and which had been given consideration of a bill has been discharged from the consideration of it unless the Senate felt it had been delinquent in its treatment of the measure?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot, without looking up the records, refer to any such situation, and I am willing to concede it has never occurred; but the question is where the bill ought to go and not where it was sent at the request of the author. The Senator from Florida will recall that when the former Vice President announced that obiter dictum from the Vice President's desk that any Senator could have a bill referred to any committee he wanted it referred, I challenged his statement; I protested against such a rule. It is not a rule, and it does not make for orderly procedure in the Senate. I protested against it and urged the Vice President then not to announce any such rule.

Later, when we came into the present session, the steering committee unanimously instructed me to protest to the Vice President against adherence to any such announcement as that heretofore made and to exercise the right to send bills to committees to which they should be sent.

I am not injecting myself into the argument of the Senator; but, in view of that action, I myself do not feel bound by any improper reference of a bill introduced at another session, if it was improperly referred at the time it was introduced. Whether I take any part in this debate or not is not material, but if I should do so I should feel

myself called upon to discuss that point because all pending measures die at the end of a Congress; every bill that has heretofore been introduced and not acted upon by both Houses has to be introduced anew. What the Senate would have done originally if this matter had been submitted to it when the bill was introduced by the Senator from Florida and the Senator from West Virginia I do not know; I would not prophesy as to that, although I presume we would then have been debating what we are now debating as to the propriety of the jurisdiction of two committees or any committee. I myself, however, do not feel bound, from a parliamentary or legislative standpoint, by any action of a previous Congress if the action was an improper action or if the reference, made under that loose rule, was an improper reference; and it is for the Senate to decide about that.

I do not feel bound by action taken, as might be said by unanimous consent, because no question was raised. When a bill is introduced and the authors of the bill name the committee to which they want it referred, as a rule, nobody makes any objection. Probably, as a rule, Senators do not know to which committee a bill is referred when it is introduced. When a bill is introduced, and the Chair says "the bill will be appropriately referred," Members do not inquire, as a rule, or have not heretofore, as to where the bill would go. If the question had been raised at the time the bill was originally introduced, the Senate might have acted differently; but, whatever it might have done, I do not feel its action applies now to my position as to the reference of this bill.

Mr. PEPPER. It seems to me that what the Senate would be disposed to do would be to reserve the power, which of course it has after the Committee on Education and Labor has concluded its investigation and after the full committee has had an opportunity to pass upon the bill and make its recommendations, to refer it to the Military Affairs Committee or any other committee before it came to the Senate floor. That is not an unusual procedure.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not desire to prolong the discussion, but I think it would be better for the Senate deliberately to refer this bill to the wrong committee, and let it stay there, than to refer it to the wrong committee with the understanding that it could vote it out and then the Senate could send it to the right committee before acting on it, assuming that the Committee on Military Affairs was the right committee, and the Committee on Education and Labor was the wrong committee. I would make the same statement as to any other committee.

I think the question of jurisdiction of the legislation itself ought to be settled by the Senate. I think it has brought about and is going to continue to bring about confusion and chaos and duplication. I agree with what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] said this morning, as well as what other Senators said, that the Senate of the United States has got sense enough to decide where legislation of this kind ought to go. It should settle the question once and for all, so that we would not have four or five committees investigating the same subject, which is not only expensive but the committees are likely to bring in conflicting reports, so that we would have difficulty in knowing which horn of the dilemma to take. I think it is exceedingly important for the Senate to decide the question of jurisdiction. When it has decided that question, I think the bill should remain in the committee to which it is decided it should go.

I cannot myself adhere to the suggestion that if for any reason a bill ought to go to one committee when that committee reports to the Senate it should then be referred to another committee for another report. Suppose the Committee on Education and Labor reported it favorably, and it went back to the Military Affairs Committee and they reported adversely, where would we be?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it is not an unthinkable experience where several different committees have legitimate jurisdiction of a bill that it should be submitted to more than one committee before it actually comes to the Senate floor. I know of a good many instances of that kind. For example, we had a treaty before the Foreign Relations Committee to set up an international bank in Central and South America. The Foreign Relations Committee reported favorably upon that proposal, but, upon the request of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the bill was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, and was subsequently considered by that committee, but was not reported.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that grew out of the fact that there was an international question involved of which the Foreign Relations Committee felt it had jurisdiction, and, at the same time, there was a banking question involved over which the Committee on Banking and Currency had jurisdiction; but before the bill was referred to any committee, as I recall, it was understood that it would be referred later to the Banking and Currency Committee if the Foreign Relations Committee reported it. I may be mistaken but that is my recollection.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator is in error there because it was only after the Foreign Relations Committee had considered it that the request was made, if I recall correctly, that the treaty be sent to the Banking and Currency Committee. The situation prevailing there is just the situation prevailing here. The Committee on Education and Labor, by virtue of having jurisdiction over labor legislation, is a legitimate holder of a part of this jurisdiction just as the Foreign Relations Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, the Naval Affairs Committee, the Military Affairs Committee, and other committees of the Senate.

Mr. President, all I was saying was that I thought it might be possible for a standing committee to conclude an investigation it had begun upon a subject with respect to which it had concurrent jurisdiction. We might as well settle that question also while we are settling the question, Is the Military Affairs Committee going to handle the whole manpower problem including civilian labor legislation because we happen to be in a war and it has jurisdiction over military supplies?

A few days ago the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] indicated a desire to propose a study of the subject of manpower. It is now being carried on by the Committee on Appropriations, because that was the only committee which had over-all jurisdiction. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had jurisdiction over agricultural labor, the Committee on Education and Labor had jurisdiction over labor legislation, the Committee on Military Affairs had jurisdiction over military personnel. But today the Senate Committee on Military Affairs is passing on the nominations to the War Manpower Commission, who are literally and exclusively civilian personnel. Does that mean that the military is to operate the civilian functions, as well as military?

A few days ago this same conflict arose between the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Military Affairs. I ventured to make the point on the floor of the Senate why nominations of civilian personnel should have to go before the Committee on Military Affairs. I am not questioning the personnel of that committee, which could not be improved on, but if we are to talk about fairness respecting the jurisdiction of the several committees, surely some of these other committees have a legitimate right, as well as our distinguished Committee on Military Affairs. If our committee, or if any other committee, had come in and made a motion to oust the Committee on Military Affairs from jurisdiction, I dare say very serious consideration would not have been given to the effort.

We are not trying to keep the Committee on Military Affairs from getting the jurisdiction, although it is singular that all of a sudden such great interest has been developed on the subject by the Committee on Military Affairs, and efforts made to take jurisdiction of the subject, notwithstanding the fact that it is being considered by another committee, and notwithstanding the fact that the question is not whether they shall consider it before it goes to the Senate or not. The question is whether one committee shall be stopped from considering it and the other committee given exclusive jurisdiction to consider it.

I am not coming here to block any other jurisdiction, I am not saying that there should not be half a dozen committees considering the subject. It affects a great many of them. Here is an over-all bill, and a committee is considering an over-all bill. Let me say it is a pretty general adage of the law that a man cannot sit in his own case. We are talking about taking power away from the Military and Naval Establishments in the public interest. I do not know but that that question can be better considered by a committee not so intimately related to those Establishments. We are

talking about over-all civilian production for war, and these agencies cannot be expected to support a measure which contemplates a diminution of their power. Yet, when the question of the diminution of their power is brought up, committees which are intimately and inextricably related to that subject personally, philosophically, and legislatively are called upon to make the sole decision.

Mr. President, I venture to say right now that production and procurement are likely to be affected if some agency which does not have that intimacy of relationship does hear other people, and approaches this matter from another point of view.

Small business is suffering in the United States because of the procurement program this Government has been following already in this war, and economic casualties are paying a terrific price because we have not really someone in charge of war production with the power to coordinate the procurement of the whole United States Government. I say that if something like this bill is not enacted, the war will be prolonged, and American soldiers and sailors and gallant airmen will pay in their blood for the deficiency of the Government and its agencies.

Able Senators have asked whether the President did not have power to do what is proposed. Yes; he does have the power. Should not the President have done it? Yes; he should have, if I may venture to say so. I make this as a constructive suggestion, as a friend of the President and of this administration. People are tired of frustration, and I am tired of it with them, and as a faithful Democratic New Dealer I am going to try to cure the deficiency of this administration; and it is a matter of principle and not of personality when I do it. I do not like to appear in the role of being critical of these distinguished gentlemen, every one of whom I admire and esteem, but I do not think the Army can handle procurement as effectively as I think civilians can handle it, if it is properly set up; and feeling that way, it is my duty to say so.

Consider what the Army did. They used to have six or eight different procurement agencies. What did the President do? He put them all into one. He divided the whole Army up into three branches only—air, ground forces, and procurement. Can the officials deny that a principle applicable to the Army is not well applicable to the whole production effort? We have consolidation of the control of critical materials under Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt—the critical materials of the whole country. We have concentration of authority over manpower—manpower of the whole Nation. Is it not well that all these various agencies be coordinated under some head? Can the President do everything personally? Or should not the Congress help him in trying to set up an effective administrative organization?

Mr. President, I had no idea of taking so much of the time of the Senate. I have seen these conflicts in the hearings we have had in the Committee on Education and Labor. I saw the Army and the Navy call on the Procurement Service to take doctors out of the civilian population, and they took them without the slightest regard for the effect upon the civilian population of those doctors being taken into the service.

When we were leaving some of our areas, like some of those in the South, with 1 doctor to every 7,000 or 5,000 people, when some States were contributing over 200 percent of their doctor quota, there was not anyone who had anything to do with the coordination of that program to the civilian and the military and naval economies. But when we made this investigation and pointed out what was going on, we discovered the situation, and the services themselves later came in and said that the matter should be corrected. Finally Mr. McNutt, given command over both civilian manpower and the acquisition of service doctors, said to the services, "Gentlemen, I am going to keep one doctor to every 1,500 people. That is all there is to it. You have to make the best use you can of these doctors you have." There was a case in which everyone was doing his job perfectly honestly, but the results were not coordinated until Mr. McNutt was made the head.

Right now we are discussing the size of the Army. No one has been considering just what actual effect the size of the Army would have on agricultural and industrial production. Finally it winds up in the Committee on Appropriations, who are trying to make some over-all disposition of the matter. Someone should have been able to come here from the administrative agencies and say, "Gentlemen, this is the way it works out. Take so many from here and so many from there. This is what we have left. This is what we have obligated ourselves to do. This is the way we plan to supply the deficiency." That would be control of the manpower resources of the Nation, and not a slipshod control of the effort.

If the Senate does not find that the committee has been lacking in diligence, or in the sincerity of its approach, if it has made some contribution to the subject, naturally the committee would like to continue until it feels that it can bring the matter to the attention of the Senate, or of some other committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Merely for the sake of the record, I should like to say I was a member of the subcommittee which made this report, and, without passing on the merits of the bill, I declined to approve the report, because I considered the evidence before the committee insufficient to support either the report or the bill. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator, and thank the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to take but a few minutes of the time of the Senate, on a matter which has already consumed a good deal of time. I have often wondered, during the course of the afternoon, whether we were discussing the question of the committee to which the bill should be referred, or were discussing the merits of the subject itself.

The subject matter of the bill has much merit, and I should be one of the first to agree that steps can be taken and should be taken to coordinate and centralize the control of our production set-up, and that we must take the necessary steps to avoid duplication and waste. But I do not believe that is the question which is at stake here this afternoon. We have before us the simple question of the committee to which the bill is to be referred. It is a simple question, and it is not at all an unprecedented question. I have known of a similar question arising during my fairly brief service in the Senate. It is not a question of insulting anyone.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. So that we may follow the Senator's argument, will he please cite a case in his experience like the instant case?

Mr. LODGE. While I have not looked it up, I can remember a similar case in 1937 or 1938, when there was a question of referring a bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency or to some other committee. I cannot give the details now, but I shall be very glad to look the matter up and furnish the details tomorrow.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Let me ask a Senator whether at that time one committee had taken the bill, had held hearings running into thousands of pages, and had brought out a preliminary report?

Mr. LODGE. I do not recall as to that.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Let me ask a further question of the Senator from Massachusetts, since he referred to the fact that a similar situation had arisen very often. Does he know of a single occasion when, in the midst of hearings and before a bill had actually been considered by the full committee to which it had been referred, the chairman of another committee rose in the Senate and asked that a bill under consideration be referred to his committee?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think that is what is happening now.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I do not yield at the moment; I wish to answer the question of the Senator from Utah.

I do not think that is what is happening here. There is no intention of taking the bill away from a committee in the middle of hearings. The last Congress came to an end in December. We have in the new Congress many new Members. We started in afresh in the beginning of January this year. It is not a question of taking a bill away from a committee in the middle of hearings.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to refresh the recollection of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. During the last session a bill was introduced which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The bill was introduced by the

Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and others of his associates on his committee took the bill away from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and had it referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, after the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds had had possession of a similar bill for a considerable time, and had done considerable work on it. The bill to which I referred was taken away from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, after it had considered similar proposed legislation, and it was referred to the same committee which now proposes to take jurisdiction of the bill under consideration. I make that statement to refresh the recollection of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Kentucky will continue to refresh his memory completely. It seems to me that the Senate Committee on Education and Labor had the housing question before it at the time to which the Senator refers. That committee had considered the legislation establishing the United States Housing Authority. The Senate Committee on Education and Labor found no objection at all when housing matters were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. But there came a time when it was suggested that the original committee should carry on. The chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor took no part at all in that controversy, except to vote.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] made the motion, and the same committee which is now trying to get jurisdiction over the pending bill, took over the other bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should rather continue with my statement now. I did not mean to get into a discussion as to past dealings in referring bills to committees, because I do not think that is a very significant aspect of this matter. It is a perfectly simple procedure, as we all know, for a Senator to write the name of a committee on a bill, and then to have the bill referred to the committee he indicates, unless some point is raised. It is perfectly well known that when the new session of Congress begins we start in afresh. We have a great many new Members; and it is not a question of taking a bill away from a committee, and it is not a case of reflecting in any way upon any committee. Certainly there is no better friend of national defense than the Senator from Utah. He is also a very faithful and valuable member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and there is no question at all of in any way reflecting on any member of his committee.

Moreover, I think the Senators who introduced this bill have performed a service in bringing up the subject. It is a subject which was brought up in the Stettinius report back in 1939, the contents of which, unfortunately, were not made available to the American people. The subject of coordinating and centralizing the control of the production of weapons is an old subject, and it is a great pity that there has been delay on the part of the administration in coming to grips with it for so many years. So as far as the measure being referred to the Committee on Military Affairs is concerned, there is no question of burying it. It will be considered. There would be no question of not reading all the testimony and going ahead.

I agree that there is no committee which has over-all jurisdiction, and that a bill of this kind raises so many different questions that one cannot say with any definiteness that it belongs in this committee or does not belong in that one.

A great many different factors are involved; but there is one factor which, in my humble opinion, has not been given due weight here this afternoon. We have heard about defense migration; we have heard about defense housing; we have heard about small business; we have heard about many different factors that are connected with war production, but there has not been sufficient emphasis, in my judgment, placed on the question of getting weapons for the soldier, and that is what this is all about. That is why this subject has always been considered primarily a military subject, because the goal and objective of all this effort is to supply weapons for the soldier.

When we look at the history of this war up to date, and look at the weapons the soldier has received, insofar as I have had any chance to have any personal experience, I think the job has been extremely well done. The weapons have been good. I think that in tanks, for example, we are ahead of the rest of the world. I call Senators' attention to the 105 caliber, self-propelled mount, which has had such a decisive effect in North Africa. One of the reasons why that weapon has been as good and satisfactory as it has been, and has given the soldier the best chance of coming out alive on the battlefield, is that the uniformed services have had control of the procurement of that article, because they have had the right to go into the factory and take a piece of chalk and mark the thing up, and get the thing done exactly the way they wanted it done. That is a tremendously important factor.

I do not say that perhaps the power of the Army should not be curtailed, or that the power of the Navy should not be curtailed. I do not say that the Senator from Florida is not right in saying that we should take it away from them, though he would have to be more eloquent than he has been this afternoon to convince me of it. But I do say that when that question is raised it should not be treated in a left-handed manner or as an incident. We should realize that we are making a major decision, and that we want to have it before a body which will entertain the views of the War Department as well as the views of others.

Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] earlier in the afternoon said that his sole object in asking that the bill be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor was so that we could get prompt action; that the Committee on Education and Labor had had the subject before it; that the committee had taken 1,400 pages of testimony on it; and that it had heard all the witnesses, and is ready "to shoot."

Then, Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] comes along and points out, I think very interestingly, that his committee had not heard all the witnesses interested; that they had heard largely from representatives of airplane factories, but they have not heard from the War Department or the Navy Department, and they have not heard from a number of agencies whose views, whether we agree with them or whether we do not, are entitled to be heard, are entitled to be weighed, and are entitled to be analyzed.

So it seems to me that we ought to be happy that this bill has had the consideration that it has had at the hands of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. We ought to be happy that we have gotten the testimony from the airplane manufacturers; but we ought also to recognize that there is a positive need for the bill to be considered from other standpoints from which it has never been considered at all. So for that reason I hope that the bill will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Could not the objective which the Senator from Massachusetts has stated very ably, and I think quite properly, be completely accomplished and all interest expressed here today be at the same time satisfied by allowing the Committee on Education and Labor to finish its study, for whatever it may be worth, and then allow the bill to go to the Committee on Military Affairs for such consideration as that committee might want to give to it, before it comes to the Senate floor?

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is the principal introducer of the bill. I am one of the cointroducers of the bill. Several other Senators are cointroducers of the bill. We are not in any sense of the word denying the right and the duty of the Committee on Military Affairs to consider those aspects of the measure which it deems important to consider, but would the Senator from Massachusetts think it inappropriate for other aspects to be considered also before the matter is disposed of? I was wondering if the Senator would not think that the best interest could be served by letting the study which is being made of the matter by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor be finished, and then let us have an understanding that immediately thereafter it be ordered by the Senate that before the bill shall come back to the floor it shall go to the Committee on Military Affairs for its consideration?

Mr. LODGE. I understood the Senator from West Virginia to say that the subcommittee action had virtually been completed.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; excuse me——

Mr. LODGE. Then there is a difference of opinion between the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the able Senator from West Virginia probably was not wholly correct in his surmise. The very reason that the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor had not called the Government's representatives was so that we could confront them with the major criticisms and instances of dissatisfaction and insufficiency that might have been experienced in the country by people who were participating or who were really effective in carrying on this production program. We intended in time, as soon as we got the other data before the committee, to give those people an opportunity to be heard. All we are asking now is that certain aspects of the matter in which we are interested be considered also. We are not trying to deny the jurisdiction of the Military Affairs Committee, but are asking that that committee wait a little while in claiming its jurisdiction, until we shall have finished our study.

Mr. President, I do not see how it could do any harm to have the bill referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. If that is not done it will mean that we shall be stopped in the middle of what we have contemplated to do, and that we will not get a chance, of course, to say anything more about those aspects in which our committee is interested.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it seems to me that one of the merits of the committee system in the Senate is that after a good many years it educates the Senators who are members of committees. I know that has been true in my case. A Senator serves on a committee and comes in daily contact with a certain set of problems and becomes educated in connection with them and obtains a certain familiarity with them. I am delighted that the members of the Committee on Education and Labor who have had a constant contact with questions of manpower and questions of civilian personnel have had a chance to study this bill. I think now the Senate would be best served if the committee which has been educated along military lines, of thinking of the soldier and thinking in military terms, should have a chance to pass on the measure.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wish to say only a word or two before the vote is taken, in order that we may keep the record straight with reference to what we have done as a committee.

First of all, I wish to say that a jurisdictional dispute is something which I have always tried to avoid. It is something into which I, as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, after having sat through 2 full years of discussion about jurisdictional disputes, would never attempt to enter unless I found it to be unavoidable.

So far as we are concerned, the whole point of the controversy seems to hinge on the question of whether the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor has done a good job. If there is any question on that score in the mind of any Senator, I shall remain on my feet for some time and present to the Senate some of the information which the subcommittee has obtained. I do not believe there is any question about it. There could not be.

At the last session a bill similar to the one under discussion was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. I do not know whether it was referred to that committee by request, but it came to me, and, as chairman, it became my task to appoint a subcommittee to consider it.

The subcommittee was appointed with care and forethought. It will be noted that because there seemed to be a conflict—especially with regard to the important question of manpower—between the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Military Affairs, the chairman saw to it that one of the coauthors of the military manpower bill was appointed as a member of the subcommittee. Then, in order that the Military Affairs Committee might not be put at a disadvantage in what it was doing, I deliberately chose another member of that committee to serve on the subcommittee. In that way ample opportunity was afforded to prevent duplication so far as the hearings were concerned.

Mr. President, any Member of the Senate who will examine the hearings of the Military Affairs Committee on its manpower bill, as well as the hearings on the bill conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor, will discover that there has been no duplication. The Committee on Education and Labor has been interested primarily in the discovery of manpower resources in the United States.

The Committee on Military Affairs has properly been interested in manpower from the standpoint of seeing that nothing is allowed to interfere with the proper growth and development of our Army as well as its proper care.

The chairman of the Education and Labor Committee happens to be a member of the Military Affairs Committee. There could not be any conflict in his mind with regard to jurisdiction. It seems to me that if the Senate is to enter into this type of controversy regarding jurisdiction, and the pending question is put to a vote—especially since there have been implications that certain persons who are sometimes called bureaucrats are interested in having the subject of the bill taken from one committee and transferred to another for their purposes—it will be one of the most dangerous things in which we can indulge.

Two or three days ago, Mr. President, I heard an extremely eloquent speech delivered by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], wherein he said that the issue before the people of the country is a simple one, namely, whether the Government of the United States shall be taken from the bureaucrats and given back to the people.

Mr. President, I shall watch with all the care that I can exercise how the voting on the pending question is done on the other side of this Chamber, because Members there know that an attempt has been made by certain persons, whom they label "bureaucrats," to have the subject matter of the bill transferred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

I am a member of the Military Affairs Committee. We discussed the bill in that committee. I do not believe that the suggestion of the pending motion had its origin in the Military Affairs Committee. That committee would not have thought of making such a suggestion if it had not received requests to do so. I do not believe that members of the Military Affairs Committee have read the hearings or even the report of the subcommittee on the bill.

From the standpoint of what the Senate should do in the matter, the question is quite different from that which has been argued this afternoon, namely, whether the bill should become law. I return to the question which I asked the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. If any of the persons to whom he referred desired to take care of their interests, would they not think that the proper way to do so would be by suggesting that the subject of the bill be transferred? As chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, I have a telephone. I am on pretty good terms with the heads of the departments. I have not had any trouble with them, and I would be as reasonable as any man on earth in seeing that full opportunity was given to the head of any department to present whatever appropriate argument he cared to present to the committee.

The chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor recalls very distinctly that at the last session the chairman of the Committee on Finance called attention to the fact that a part of a certain bill which our committee had reported vitally affected his committee. We never made any objection, and neither did the chairman of the subcommittee make any objection to the bill being referred to the Committee on Finance. We have never been jealous of any other committee.

In the last session, both the junior and senior Senator from Texas introduced separate bills pertaining to labor, and had them referred to the Judiciary Committee. Not one word of protest came from the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and not one protest will come now.

If the bill under discussion goes to the Committee on Military Affairs, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor will take part in the deliberations concerning the bill, and will attempt to inform the committee relative to the facts he obtained when hearings were held before the Committee on Education and Labor.

It seems to me that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has said exactly the right thing. All committees of this body are merely committees of the United States Senate. They have no final jurisdiction over anything. They merely report to the Senate. They all have an equal task. They act for the Senate in making preliminary arrangements, making reports, holding hearings, and making recommendations.

Mr. President, I trust that as a result of the vote which is about to be taken there will not go out from this Chamber the implication that a committee of the Senate is being reprimanded for the way in which it has handled a certain bill, and

that another committee of the Senate has decided to take possession of the bill because it does not like it. Without a duplication of effort, how can the Committee on Military Affairs consider the bill except by either starting over again or building upon that which the Committee on Education and Labor has already done?

Shall we ignore the work which has already been done, and turn the subject over to another committee, to start from the beginning? Shall we completely turn our backs upon that which has already been accomplished?

Mr. President, everyone knows that the bill is as controversial as any that can come before the Senate during wartime. Everyone, therefore, realizes that any chairman would like to be rid of such a bill. It would have been a joy had the matter been handled in the right way, and had jurisdiction been requested. A telephone call would have taken care of it, I am sure. However, that was not done.

Mr. President, the Committee on Education and Labor stands before the country rebuked by Members of the Senate who have not read the committee's reports or its deliberations, and have not given the committee an opportunity to make a report on the bill.

This matter is out of the ordinary, and every Senator knows it to be. I should not be fair to myself, my committee, or my subcommittee, if I did not say what I have said.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Was the Senator a member of the subcommittee which held hearings on this matter?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Utah is chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and appointed the subcommittee which held hearings on the bill. At the request of the chairman of the subcommittee, who had to be absent, the chairman presided over one hearing only.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Were hearings held, and was testimony taken?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Hearings were held and testimony was taken. Two volumes of the hearings have been printed and are available to Senators. One preliminary report has been made. The Senator has a copy of it on his desk.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator feel that the subcommittee finished its hearings and covered the ground?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; the subcommittee has not finished its hearings. As soon as the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor was informed that the bill had been ordered to lie on the table he asked the chairman of the subcommittee not to hold any more hearings until a meeting of the full committee could be held, otherwise hearings would be going on at this time.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Let me ask how long it has been since the subcommittee ceased holding hearings?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The subcommittee ceased holding hearings with the end of the last Congress.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, let me say that I have just read the preliminary report of the subcommittee. It seems to me it raises some very important questions. I should almost say that it is a severe indictment of our program of carrying on the war.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, does not that merely bear out all that I have said? That is talking about the bill itself. The bill has not had consideration by the committee; and until the committee has considered the bill it seems to me that the subcommittee and the committee itself should not be chastised for not considering it properly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is no further debate on the motion I suppose we might proceed to a vote. I think it desirable to dispose of the motion this afternoon. I think we should have a quorum present at the time when the motion is disposed of. Therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | George | Pepper |
| Andrews | Gerry | Reed |
| Austin | Gurney | Reynolds |
| Bankhead | Hawkes | Russell |
| Barkley | Hill | Shipstead |
| Bilbo | Holman | Stewart |
| Bone | Johnson, Colo. | Taft |
| Brewster | Kilgore | Thomas, Idaho |
| Bridges | La Follette | Thomas, Utah |
| Brooks | Langer | Tobey |
| Burton | Lodge | Truman |
| Bushfield | Lucas | Tunnell |
| Butler | McClellan | Tydings |
| Byrd | McFarland | Vandenberg |
| Capper | McNary | Van Nuys |
| Caraway | Maloney | Wallgren |
| Chandler | Maybank | Walsh |
| Chavez | Millikin | Wheeler |
| Clark, Idaho | Moore | Wherry |
| Clark, Mo. | Murray | Wiley |
| Danaher | Nye | Willis |
| Ellender | O'Mahoney | |
| Ferguson | Overton | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. Not knowing how the Senator from New York would vote on this motion, I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is necessarily absent on official business. He has been paired by transfer. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—39

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Austin | Ferguson | O'Mahoney |
| Barkley | George | Reed |
| Bilbo | Gerry | Reynolds |
| Bridges | Gurney | Russell |
| Brooks | Hill | Stewart |
| Burton | Holman | Thomas, Idaho |
| Bushfield | Johnson, Colo. | Tobey |
| Butler | Lodge | Tydings |
| Byrd | Lucas | Wallgren |
| Chandler | McClellan | Walsh |
| Clark, Idaho | McNary | Wheeler |
| Clark, Mo. | Maloney | Wiley |
| Danaher | Moore | Willis |

NAYS—28

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Kilgore | Shipstead |
| Andrews | La Follette | Taft |
| Bankhead | Langer | Thomas, Utah |
| Bone | McFarland | Truman |
| Brewster | Maybank | Tunnell |
| Capper | Millikin | Vandenberg |
| Caraway | Murray | Van Nuys |
| Chavez | Nye | Wherry |
| Ellender | Overton | |
| Hawkes | Pepper | |

NOT VOTING—29

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bailey | Downey | Hatch |
| Ball | Eastland | Hayden |
| Barbour | Gillette | Johnson, Calif. |
| Buck | Glass | McCarran |
| Connally | Green | McKellar |
| Davis | Guffey | Mead |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Murdock | Robertson | Wagner |
| O'Daniel | Scrugham | White |
| Radcliffe | Smith | Wilson |
| Revercomb | Thomas, Okla. | |

So Mr. REYNOLDS' motion was agreed to, and the bill (S. 607) was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND MARKETING OF WOOL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 93) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the membership of the special committee authorized by Senate Resolution 160, Seventy-fourth Congress, agreed to July 10, 1935, to investigate the producton, transportation, and marketing of wool, as extended, is hereby increased to six members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the terms of the resolution, the Chair appoints the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] a member of the committee.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn to Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 4, 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Hooker A. Doolittle, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Ernest de W. Mayer, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

THE JUDICIARY

Carl J. Werner, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois, vice William Ryan, deceased.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Clay Anderson, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. John R. D. Matheson, Corps of Engineers, to be relieved.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Aaron S. Merrill to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 9th day of September 1942.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Clara G. Ross, Bellamy, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Bobbie B. Hardegree, Talladega, Ala., in place of W. B. Hardegree, deceased.

Effie Sego, Waterloo, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

ARKANSAS

Kenneth B. Lasswell, Helena, Ark., in place of L. J. Wilkes, deceased

Lucy A. Steidley, Heth, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Oscar A. Teague, Hickory Ridge, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John S. Moses, McCaskill, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

David A. Massey, Palestine, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

CALIFORNIA

Alice E. Simmons, Alpine, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Bessie K. Gore, Glen Ellen, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Oliver W. Parkison, Felton, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mary C. Tierney, Freedom, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Michael L. Mery, Jr., Inverness, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Florence M. Smith, Laws, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Myrtle D. Jennings, Mount Eden, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mary L. Cogan, Santa Margarita, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Janet D. Watson, Tahoe, Calif., in place of J. D. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1942.

W. Howard Skinner, Vista, Calif., in place of A. D. Lawhead. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

COLORADO

Ethel A. Pfost, Arapahoe, Colo., in place of J. A. Pfost, resigned.

Flora G. Hier, Castle Rock, Colo., in place of F. G. Hier. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Marie E. Greenwood, Stratton, Colo., in place of E. V. Logan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

CONNECTICUT

Virgil C. Geddes, Brookfield, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John P. Mahoney, Long Hill, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Clarence H. Davenport, Washington, Conn., in place of C. H. Davenport. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

FLORIDA

Mildred K. DeLegal, Oakland Park, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

GEORGIA

Marjorie C. Barineau, McRae, Ga., in place of P. H. Girardeau. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942

Hattie C. Williams, Pinehurst, Ga., in place of H. C. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary H. Campbell, Plains, Ga., in place of M. H. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Bernard A. Dayries, Port Wentworth, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

IDAHO

Lola Rossi, Idaho City, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

ILLINOIS

Myron Craig, Alma, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Carolyn Carter, Ashmore, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Bernard G. Finnegan, Bradford, Ill., in place of B. G. Finnegan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lillian W. Tice, Chatham, Ill., in place of G. R. Bradley, transferred.

Fred O. Grissom, Kinmundy, Ill., in place of F. O. Grissom. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Fern Conard, La Moille, Ill., in place of Fern Conard. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Raymond M. Hartman, Mount Carroll, Ill., in place of K. P. Wilkerson, removed.

Roger C. Morris, South Pekin, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Clark R. Morris, Xenia, Ill., in place of Croy Howard, resigned.

INDIANA

Jacob N. Hight, Etna Green, Ind., in place of J. N. Hight. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ted E. Dill, Francisco, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Grover Wilson, Hebron, Ind., in place of J. V. Gidley, removed.

Emma Belle Wells, New Washington, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Esta Hildenbrand, Pine Village, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Arthur Miller, Uniondale, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

IOWA

Hans E. Eiel, Buffalo Center, Iowa, in place of H. E. Eiel. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rita A. Thomas, Keswick, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Michael R. Griebel, Lone Tree, Iowa, in place of M. R. Griebel. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rollin J. Gilchrist, Marengo, Iowa, in place of R. J. Gilchrist. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Gertrude C. Ward, Melrose, Iowa, in place of G. C. Ward. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Pearle M. Nelson, Modale, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Rose A. Stalder, Nodaway, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Joe H. Kout, Ocheyedan, Iowa, in place of A. B. Callender, retired.

Orlow L. Goodrich, Scranton, Iowa, in place of O. L. Goodrich. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

KANSAS

Hugo A. Simonton, Alta Vista, Kans., in place of H. A. Simonton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Jesse T. Poland, Barnes, Kans., in place of J. T. Poland. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Albert F. Cassell, Beverly, Kans., in place of A. F. Cassell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

James W. O'Connor, Chapman, Kans., in place of J. W. O'Connor. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John J. Menard, Clyde, Kans., in place of J. J. Menard. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Cyrus H. Wadsworth, Cottonwood Falls, Kans., in place of C. H. Wadsworth. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Elmer R. Eyman, Deerfield, Kans., in place of E. R. Eyman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mae S. Hodgson, Downs, Kans., in place of M. S. Hodgson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Henry A. Mason, Gypsum, Kans., in place of H. A. Mason. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Margaret A. Nelson, Lebanon, Kans., in place of E. C. Biggs, transferred.

William A. Harris, Le Roy, Kans., in place of W. A. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Jack W. Boyle, McDonald, Kans., in place of J. W. Boyle. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Nellie F. Walsh, Mayetta, Kans., in place of N. F. Walsh. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mathias A. Arnoldy, Tipton, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

J. Raymond E. Simmons, Wellsville, Kans., in place of J. R. E. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ernest B. Hedge, Whiting, Kans., in place of E. B. Hedge. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

KENTUCKY

Donald B. Hughes, Hardin, Ky., in place of D. B. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

W. Randolph White, Kuttawa, Ky., in place of C. W. Burnley, resigned.

LOUISIANA

T. Lucian Ducrest, Broussard, La., in place of T. L. Ducrest. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1942.

Flavia H. Wootton, Fisher, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Doris F. Williams, Good Pine, La. Office became Presidential April 1, 1942.

Edgar O. Joynes, Newllano, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Kate P. McDonnell, Pelican, La., in place of K. P. McDonnell. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

Leo L. Ehrhardt, Simmesport, La., in place of A. L. Dupont, transferred.

MAINE

Christine G. Davis, Eliot, Maine, in place of G. G. Plumpton, resigned.

Bertha M. Plummer, Raymond, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MARYLAND

Calvin L. Miller, Gambrills, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

William F. Keys, Mount Rainier, Md., in place of W. F. Keys. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

MASSACHUSETTS

Parker E. Wilson, Bryantville, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Susan S. Rogers, Manomet, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Nina M. Burr, Mendon, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lawrence D. Quinlan, Northfield, Mass., in place of L. D. Quinlan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ralph F. Manley, Teaticket, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MICHIGAN

Josephine Salsbury, Alto, Mich., in place of Josephine Salsbury. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clare E. Richardson, Augusta, Mich., in place of C. E. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Verne R. Moran, Carney, Mich., in place of V. R. Moran, transferred.

John P. Kelley, Deckerville, Mich., in place of J. P. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles L. Burns, Eau Claire, Mich., in place of C. L. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Leonora Johnson, Ferrysburg, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charles N. Davis, Hamburg, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Robert F. Allan, Holly, Mich., in place of R. F. Allan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John E. Rengo, Kaleva, Mich., in place of J. E. Rengo. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Harry A. Saur, Kent City, Mich., in place of H. A. Saur. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John E. Hogan, Linden, Mich., in place of J. E. Hogan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Sally A. Schulmeyer, Martin, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Maude E. Doane, Pewamo, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Max A. Hill, Vicksburg, Mich., in place of M. A. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hilan E. Pray, Williamsburg, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MINNESOTA

Anna C. Dallaire, Ah-Gwah-Ching, Minn., in place of A. C. Dallaire. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1942.

Joseph G. McRaith, Belle Plaine, Minn., in place of J. G. McRaith. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1942.

Antoinette D. Hall, Campbell, Minn., in place of A. D. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1942.

Catherine C. Burns, Glenwood, Minn., in place of C. C. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Eugene R. Sheridan, Hamel, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Tillman A. Brokken, Harmony, Minn., in place of T. A. Brokken. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

Flora P. Lowry, Hollandale, Minn., in place of F. P. Lowry. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1942.

Anton Malmberg, Lafayette, Minn., in place of Anton Malmberg. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1942.

Robert A. Collopy, Lake Elmo., Minn., in place of R. A. Collopy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Everett J. Kelly, Lake Benton, Minn., in place of F. L. Brady, resigned.

Reginald F. Ferrin, Mantorville, Minn., in place of R. F. Ferrin. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1942.

Michael H. Wadley, Millville, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John Claude Gowan, Ortonville, Minn., in place of J. C. Gowan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary J. Cain, Oxboro, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Otto J. Scharber, Rogers, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Andrew T. Sanvik, Starbuck, Minn., in place of A. T. Sanvik. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1942.

Lillian A. Peterson, Villard, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Esther E. Flynn, Westbrook, Minn., in place of M. G. Klasse. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1941.

MISSISSIPPI

Roy Scott Barber, Lake Cormorant, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Alice L. Robertson, Pope, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

James Vertner Gage, Port Gibson, Miss., in place of Joseph Davenport, resigned.

MISSOURI

Andrew J. Henson, Bell City, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Daniel C. Selvidge, Collins, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lulu M. Williams, Marston, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Roswell P. Lane, Naylor, Mo., in place of R. P. Lane. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Elmer S. Foster, Neelyville, Mo., in place of E. S. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hugh I. Holmes, St. Charles, Mo., in place of H. I. Holmes. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

Albert B. Iffrig, St. Peters, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charles F. Halligan, Union, Mo., in place of C. F. Halligan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEBRASKA

Max C. Jensen, Bridgeport, Nebr., in place of M. C. Jensen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Bert Winters, Broadwater, Nebr., in place of Bert Winters. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Edith E. Fahrlander, Brule, Nebr., in place of E. E. Fahrlander. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Tobie H. Wilken, Bruning, Nebr., in place of T. H. Wilken. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Curtis B. Benger, Callaway, Nebr., in place of C. B. Benger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Kenneth R. Newcomb, Cambridge, Nebr., in place of K. R. Newcomb. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William H. Leff, Carleton, Nebr., in place of W. H. Leff. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Gladys J. Brown, Crookston, Nebr., in place of G. J. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Loyd H. Metzer, Culbertson, Nebr., in place of L. H. Metzer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Don Dey Ermand, Dalton, Nebr., in place of Don Dey Ermand. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Russell Mooberry, Dorchester, Nebr., in place of Russell Mooberry. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Paul W. McCoy, Edison, Nebr., in place of P. W. McCoy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Walter O. Troxel, Elsie, Nebr., in place of W. O. Troxel. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Oscar C. Thomas, Franklin, Nebr., in place of O. C. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Bryan J. Snyder, Fullerton, Nebr., in place of B. J. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George L. Koehler, Geneva, Nebr., in place of G. L. Koehler. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John H. Holden, Gordon, Nebr., in place of J. H. Holden. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clifford R. Frasier, Gothenburg, Nebr., in place of C. R. Frasier. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Urv V. Dobbs, Grant, Nebr., in place of U. V. Dobbs. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Dorothy M. Porter, Haigler, Nebr., in place of D. M. Porter. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Henry T. Dunn, Harrison, Nebr., in place of H. T. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George A. Kittle, Hayes Center, Nebr., in place of G. A. Kittle. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clyde Yardley, Hemingford, Nebr., in place of Clyde Yardley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George H. Looschen, Hooper, Nebr., in place of G. H. Looschen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles L. Schunk, Kenesaw, Nebr., in place of C. L. Schunk. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hugo Stevens, Kilgore, Nebr., in place of Hugo Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Helen M. Cramer, Leigh, Nebr., in place of H. M. Cramer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Andres P. Peterson, Lindsay, Nebr., in place of A. P. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Juna M. Daly, Lisco, Nebr., in place of J. M. Daly. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ethel L. Ossenkop, Louisville, Nebr., in place of E. L. Ossenkop. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

James C. Nelson, Mason City, Nebr., in place of J. C. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary Walsh Morrow, Merna, Nebr., in place of M. W. Morrow. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Max R. Herrington, Millard, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

LaVern A. Breeden, Minatare, Nebr., in place of L. A. Breeden. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Eva G. Quick, Morrill, Nebr., in place of E. G. Quick. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Almira R. Boblits, Oconto, Nebr., in place of A. R. Boblitz. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Franklin D. Strope, Orchard, Nebr., in place of F. D. Strope. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Matthew T. Liewer, Osmond, Nebr., in place of M. T. Liewer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

James T. Haffey, Oxford, Nebr., in place of J. T. Haffey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Stanton A. Troutman, Palisade, Nebr., in place of S. A. Troutman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Oscar A. Pilger, Pilger, Nebr., in place of O. A. Pilger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Martin Sorenson, Plainview, Nebr., in place of Martin Sorenson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William M. Goding, Potter, Nebr., in place of W. M. Goding. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Bert S. Amos, Sargent, Nebr., in place of B. S. Amos. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Amos Frieden, Shickley, Nebr., in place of Amos Frieden. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Bessie L. Baughan, Stamford, Nebr., in place of B. L. Baughan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Josh B. Keene, Sumner, Nebr., in place of J. B. Keene. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Walter P. Flynn, Ulysses, Nebr., in place of W. P. Flynn. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Leo E. Kraft, Unadilla, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lula Newman, Wallace, Nebr., in place of Lula Newman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John Q. Kirkman, Wood Lake, Nebr., in place of J. Q. Kirkman. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1942.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

S. Lucy Weeks, Chocorua, N. H., in place of C. B. Weeks, deceased.

NEW JERSEY

Michael A. Nigro, Berkeley Heights, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Grace V. Willard, Crosswicks, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Edward M. McIntyre, Gibbsboro, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Georgia A. Barth, Landisville, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Edward J. Wagner, Marlton, N. J., in place of E. J. Wagner. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Annie Lester, Monmouth Junction, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Jeremiah B. Beaston, Mount Ephraim, N. J., in place of J. B. Beaston. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Salvatore Verde, Northvale, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mervil E. Hass, Riverton, N. J., in place of M. E. Haas. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Smith Kennedy, Roseland, N. J., in place of Smith Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Anthony J. Savarese, Woodcliff Lake, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NEW MEXICO

Callie C. Marshall, Bennett, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Rosalie Byrd, Elida, N. Mex., in place of Rosalie Byrd. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NORTH CAROLINA

Ovid Pullen, Harmony, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Marshall M. Tilley, Hoffman, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

W. Edgar Johnson, King, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Taft S. Putnam, Lawndale, N. C., in place of A. C. Burns, resigned.

Jessie B. Williams, Manchester, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Harold J. Young, Nantahala, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Dallas Lowdermilk, Norman, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John A. Williams, Oxford, N. C., in place of J. A. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John W. Ivey, Sevensprings, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NORTH DAKOTA

Andrew O. Williams, Bottineau, N. Dak., in place of A. O. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles C. Shearer, Flasher, N. Dak., in place of C. C. Shearer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Altha B. Waddell, Forbes, N. Dak., in place of A. B. Waddell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George A. Swen, Gilby, N. Dak., Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

George W. McIntyre, Jr., Grafton, N. Dak., in place of G. W. McIntyre, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Karl E. Fischer, Hague, N. Dak., in place of K. E. Fischer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Francis O. Johnson, Hillsboro, N. Dak., in place of F. O. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

J. Benus Kinneberg, Leeds, N. Dak., in place of J. B. Kinneberg. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John E. Hunter, Mayville, N. Dak., in place of J. E. Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Louis J. Allmaras, New Rockford, N. Dak., in place of L. J. Allmaras. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Arthur W. Hendrickson, Walcott, N. Dak., in place of A. W. Hendrickson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hans C. Nelson, Washburn, N. Dak., in place of H. C. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OHIO

Fred Durr, Bradford, Ohio, in place of Fred Durr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Farland A. Humbert, Howard, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Thomas Kyer, Jackson, Ohio, in place of Thomas Kyer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Perry L. Heintz, Jackson Center, Ohio, in place of P. L. Heintz. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ethel S. Reames, Lynchburg, Ohio, in place of E. S. Reames. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Garrett W. Bowen, Newtown, Ohio, in place of G. W. Bowen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Neile Stinebaugh, Republic, Ohio, in place of Neile Stinebaugh. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frankie Junkerman, Sugar Grove, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

OKLAHOMA

Laura Belle Williams, Braggs, Okla. Office became Presidential April 1, 1942.

William T. Gaddis, Catoosa, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Gladys M. Walker, Choctaw, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Ida C. Courtney, Copan, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Verna Russell, Dill, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Louia M. Amick, Jefferson, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

OREGON

Edwin Allen, Forest Grove, Oreg., in place of Edwin Allen. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1942.

Frank C. Allen, Lake Grove, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles W. Allen, Bedford, Pa., in place of H. E. Cuppett, resigned.

Clarence W. Scheuren, Collegeville, Pa., in place of C. W. Scheuren. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Eugene K. Richard, Elysburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Ne[illegible]le Boyle, Freeland, Pa., in place of Neal[illegible] Boyle. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

M[illegible]rgaret Mary Hughes, Greensburg, Pa., in plac[illegible] of J. T. Painter, retired.

H[illegible]ry A. McIntosh, Hollidaysburg, Pa., in plac[illegible] of H. A. McIntosh. Incumbent's commiss[illegible]n expired June 23, 1942.

W[illegible]lter A. Tiffany, Kingsley, Pa. Office beca[illegible]e Presidential July 1, 1942.

Fr[illegible]d W. Patterson, Lattimer Mines, Pa. Offic[illegible] became Presidential July 1, 1942.

R[illegible]bert P. Carson, Madera, Pa., in place of R. O[illegible] Lamborn, resigned.

M[illegible]d E. Culp, Maytown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Nona Tolbert, Millerton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Joseph L. Meehan, Montrose, Pa., in place of J. L. Meehan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frank J. Murphy, New Albany, Pa., in place of L. T. Cullen, transferred.

Russell W. Mosteller, Pen Argyl, Pa., in place of R. W. Mosteller. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1942.

Samuel G. Thomas, Port Kennedy, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mary A. Turner, Pricedale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Leonard Buranovsky, Ramey, Pa., Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Paul A. Martin, Roaring Spring, Pa., in place of P. A. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Jean Burke, St. Michael, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John F. Siegel, Saylorsburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Harold I. Haines, Thompsontown, Pa., in place of H. I. Haines. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lorena E. Port, Thorndale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Rosanna McGee, Towanda, Pa., in place of Rosanna McGee. Incumbent's commission expired June 22, 1942.

Gwilym Evans, Trucksville, Pa., in place of N. A. Staub, resigned.

Frederick A. Entrot, Union Dale, Pa., in place of F. A. Entrot. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rose C. Pierson, Villa Maria, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mary A. Brunski, Wanamie, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Hazel M. Herbert, West Decatur, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Margaret B. Glomb, Wexford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Edward C. Hardt, Wildwood, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

J. Richard Hancock, Williamstown, Pa., in place of J. R. Hancock. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frances B. Maines, Woodland, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Frank A. Crippen, Youngsville, Pa., in place of F. A. Crippen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

PUERTO RICO

Cesar Rossy, Ciales, P. R., in place of Cesar Rossy. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Paul F. W. Waller, Myers, S. C., in place of P. F. W. Waller. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Walker B. Graves, Pageland, S. C., in place of C. M. Graves, deceased.

Louise P. McCain, Richburg, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Reuben Vance Lanford, Woodruff, S. C., in place of R. V. Lanford. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

TENNESSEE

Orion D. Strawn, Hillsboro, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Claude L. Swaggerty, Kimberlin Heights, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Kathryn N. Suttle, Pleasant Hill, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Vance S. Reese, Raleigh, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Alma L. Wells, Sherwood, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

TEXAS

Ferris S. Gault, Agua Dulce, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Paul V. Bryant, Canadian, Tex., in place of P. V. Bryant. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Fern C. Fields, Clint, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Jack M. Wade, Dalhart, Tex., in place of J. M. Wade. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary V. Rollings, Dodson, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

A. Warren Dunn, Fort Stockton, Tex., in place of A. W. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Samuel C. Rhinehart, Iraan, Tex., in place of S. C. Rhinehart. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1942.

Lizzie Baker, Karnack, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Grace L. McKay, Madisonville, Tex., in place of G. L. McKay. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary F. Wakefield, Midway, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Joe W. Hartfield, New London, Tex., in place of B. D. Vick, transferred.

Benjamin F. Hobson, Paducah, Tex., in place of B. F. Hobson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mazel M. Reasoner, Pearland, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Grundy F. Wimberly, Sr., Perrin, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mills Awbrey, Presidio, Tex., in place of Mills Awbrey. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1942.

Marvin G. Prewitt, Ralls, Tex., in place of M. G. Prewitt. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lucile Cline, Seabrook, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John L. Brunner, Taylor, Tex., in place of J. L. Brunner. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1942.

Frederick I. Massengill, Terrell, Tex., in place of F. I. Massengill. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

UTAH

Hyrum A. White, Beaver, Utah, in place of H. A. White. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

Mildred G. Allen, Escalante, Utah, in place of M. G. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ewell C. Bowen, Hiawatha, Utah, in place of E. C. Bowen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Arnold C. Richins, Pleasant Grove, Utah, in place of F. D. Atwood, deceased.

VERMONT

Anson S. Hawkins, South Shaftsbury, Vt., in place of A. S. Hawkins. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

VIRGINIA

John T. Trevey, Big Island, Va., in place of J. T. Trevey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lena S. Perkins, Cedar Bluff, Va., in place of L. S. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William H. Smith, Jr., Charlotte Court House, Va., in place of W. H. Smith, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rufus G. Roberts, Culpeper, Va., in place of R. G. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clarence M. Sale, Falls Church, Va., in place of C. M. Sale. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Beveridge B. Cox, Gate City, Va., in place of B. B. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Robert E. Rodgers, Hampden Sydney, Va., in place of J. W. Rodgers, retired.

Edna H. Jennings, Hickory, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

James G. Albert, Honaker, Va., in place of J. G. Albert. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Joseph S. Rasnick, St. Paul, Va., in place of J. S. Rasnick. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rufus W. Garris, South Hill, Va., in place of R. W. Garris. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Warren P. Clarke, Woodbridge, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

WASHINGTON

Mary E. Theler, Belfair, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Bernt A. Hansen, Chinook, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Omar H. Snow, Cusick, Wash., in place of J. F. Lavigne, retired.

James B. Robertson, Kettle Falls, Wash., in place of J. B. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Anna I. Foy, Lacey, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Tormod A. Myklebust, Lacrosse, Wash., in place of T. A. Myklebust. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Harry A. B. Gavin, Malott, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Maston W. Carleton, Seahurst, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Pearl B. Burrill, Snoqualmie Falls, Wash., in place of P. B. Burrill. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1942.

Connie C. Wall, Winlock, Wash., in place of C. C. Wall. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WEST VIRGINIA

Torrence Cook, Amherstdale, W. Va., in place of Torrence Cook. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John J. Tamburini, Bayard, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Thomas M Deegan, Benwood, W. Va., in place of T. M. Deegan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

S. Cleveland Underwood, Bethany, W. Va., in place of S. C. Underwood. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mark V. Brown, Bridgeport, W. Va., in place of M. V. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Katherine C. Brannen, Cabincreek, W. Va., in place of K. C. Brannen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clark E. Heckert, Cairo, W. Va., in place of C. E. Heckert. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Anna S. Been, Camden on Gauley, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

James H. Moyer, Cass, W. Va., in place of J. H. Moyer. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

Maude Langdon, Chapmanville, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Margaret C. Farry, Eastbank, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Arthur J. Duncan, Fayetteville, W. Va., in place of A. J. Duncan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George O. Sinsel, Flemington, W. Va., in place of G. O. Sinsel. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John J. Walker, Follansbee, W. Va., in place of J. J. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John C. Blanton, Freeman, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Clarence L. Perkins, Gassaway, W. Va., in place of C. L. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William O. Umstead, Grantsville, W. Va., in place of W. O. Umstead. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mayme E. Marquette, Harpers Ferry, W. Va., in place of M. E. Marquette. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George W. Kilmer, Hedgesville, W. Va., in place of G. W. Kilmer. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1941.

Carl Hinton, Hinton, W. Va., in place of Carl Hinton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Dorothy Webb Proffit, Kingston, W. Va., in place of D. W. Proffit. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Della A. Kelly, Montgomery, W. Va., in place of D. A. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Justus O. Eakin, New Martinsville, W. Va., in place of J. O. Eakin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Russell W. Casto, Nitro, W. Va., in place of R. W. Casto. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Foster Mack Kiger, Paden City, W. Va., in place of Mack Kiger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Vesta Lee Connell, Pennsboro, W. Va., in place of V. L. Connell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Wilbur S. Moore, Pine Grove, W. Va., in place of W. S. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Julia T. Bradley, Power, W. Va., in place of W. E. Simpson, removed.

Durward P. Currey, Sandyville, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Newton S. Wood, Valley Head, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

WISCONSIN

Chris Kartman, Cassville, Wis., in place of Chris Kartman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Marie Gunn Dunham, Cumberland, Wis., in place of M. G. Dunham. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Will Riley, Darlington, Wis., in place of Will Riley. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Frank J. Shortner, Edgar, Wis., in place of F. J. Shortner. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Tessa B. Morrissy, Elkhorn, Wis., in place of T. B. Morrissy. Incumbent's commission expired June 15, 1942.

Reginald L. Barnes, Greenwood, Wis., in place of R. L. Barnes. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1942.

Frank M. Doyle, Ladysmith, Wis., in place of F. M. Doyle. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

Edward L. Murphy, Middleton, Wis., in place of H. A. Victora, deceased.

Viola Klassy, New Glarus, Wis., in place of F. J. Marty, retired.

Celestine D. Kaltenbach, Potosi, Wis., in place of C. D. Kaltenbach. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William Murray, Prescott, Wis., in place of William Murray. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Solon A. McCollow, River Falls, Wis., in place of S. A. McCollow. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John C. Reinke, Stone Lake, Wis., in place of J. C. Reinke. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

Charles M. Dunn, Taylor, Wis., in place of C. M. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Arnold A. Conklin, Vesper, Wis., in place of A. A. Conklin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WYOMING

Edward N. Greff, Chugwater, Wyo., in place of E. N. Greff. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

Lena M. Wilson, Midwest, Wyo., in place of G. W. Nance, resigned.

---

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 4, 1943:

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

*To be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the date stated opposite his name:*

Claude S. Gillette, May 13, 1942.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Father of our spirits, before whose eyes nothing is concealed, we rejoice that Thou dost know us and dost consider us in mercy. We pray for the discouraged, for the tempted and for all who are far from the covenant of promise. Give us the tranquillity of those feelings which rise above aspirations born in the things of time. Quicken us not only with a creed but with an experience, with inspiration rather than with restraint. Do Thou make us strong, have pity on what we are, reveal to us what we should be and with Thy saving presence help us to translate our visions of righteous duty into abiding reality.

Oh, crown us with the sacrificial spirit of service and with a living faith that cannot fail and which is ready to battle against those iniquitous lands which are staining the seas of the world with innocent blood. Oh, sustain our country with an unwithering and with an unwasting power of her great soul, that all dreams of a good world shall not perish from the heart of man. We pray for our chivalrous President, our Speaker, and all Members of the Congress; guide us through working hours and at evening time give us peace. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 1408, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I wrote to Secretary of Agriculture Wickard.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HON. GEORGE P. DARROW

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, my predecessor from the Seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania, the Honorable George P. Darrow, is 84 years of age today. He is full of years, fruitful years, of service to others. Those of you who know him, know that this, his birthday, will be a day of recollections and fond memories of those with whom he served in this House during 24 years. I know on the occasion of my visits to him that he valued most of all those recollections; and may I take the liberty of suggesting to those Members of this House who served with him that it would make his heart very happy indeed if you were to send him some communication on this his eighty-fourth birthday.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. As one who served with Mr. Darrow for probably two decades, I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that no man who has ever served in this House was held in higher esteem. You may send him this message, and I am sure it reflects the feelings of the Members at least on this side of the aisle. That we all wish for him an abundance of those things which Shakespeare said should accompany old age. Honor, love, obedience, and troops of friends.

Mr. SCOTT. And I know he will be glad to receive your message, and many similar expressions of good will from both sides of the aisle.

[Here the gavel fell.]

A PACIFIC WAR COUNCIL SHOULD BE CREATED

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, a separate Pacific war council should be set up at once. Every day of delay is dangerous. Every day of delay gives the Japanese precious time to dig in and fortify those areas so ruthlessly overrun. Nothing is more vital to the preservation of our American way of life than the defeat of Japan's war lords. Their ideologies and ours cannot exist side by side. We tried it. Pearl Harbor is the answer. As early as 1900 the citizens of San Francisco sponsored anti-Japanese legislation. In 1904 national sentiment had crystallized to the extent that the American Federation of Labor adopted resolutions asking permanent exclusion of the Japanese. We of the Pacific coast know whereof we speak. I cannot urge too strongly the supreme importance of the Pacific war area to our country's very existence.

LABOR DISTURBANCE IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANDERSON of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Billings Gazette published in Billings, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an item on lard from the Farm Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER]?

There was no objection.

FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House and the public must know by this time that ample production of food for our armed forces is essential if we are to win this war. We hear on the floor of the House every day, complaints against the several departments of Government, because the responsible departments have done little or nothing to help solve the agricultural problems or the man-labor problems of this Nation.

I hope you will read the resolution which I am asking to be printed in the RECORD. This resolution was presented by the farmers of western Nebraska and suggests the solving of certain problems in connection with agriculture if crops are to be planted and harvested. The need for more help on the farm will become more and more acute unless something is done to relieve the shortage. The farmers of America must be provided with sufficient farm machinery and parts for repair if they are going to produce the food so badly needed for our fighting forces. The farmer must also be guaranteed a profit for the crop he raises. Under the present conditions the farmers are finding it impossible to compete with defense industry in the matter of wages and hours of labor.

It is a responsibility of Congress to do everything possible to assist agriculture. Let us pray God that it will not be necessary to have several million hungry stomachs in order to make those in authority take the proper steps in seeing that the farmer is not only given the necessary machinery but a profit for his efforts and labor for the production of food.

MEETING OF THE HOUSE AT 11 O'CLOCK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit this afternoon during the session of the House in connection with the aviation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the San Francisco Labor Council signed by John F. Shelley, president, and John A. O'Connell, secretary, and attached statement with reference to interference on the part of the National Labor Relations Board with contracts now in existence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Lions Club of Riverton, Wyo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

MOVING THE CAPITAL OF THE UNITED STATES WEST

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, one of the Washington papers, the Washington Times-Herald, carries an editorial, Move the Capital, and proposes that the Capital of the country be moved to some point in the Middle West.

In this connection may I recall the fact that the White House was established and operated in the Black Hills of South Dakota for 3 months in the summer of 1927 and it was operated out there very successfully. I recall a special press conference for the National Editorial Association at which President Coolidge took occasion to comment on how easily he kept in touch with national and international affairs, having that morning dealt with a problem arising at a conference in Switzerland.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I recall very vividly while the White House was in South Dakota, President Coolidge complied with my request and removed a man by the name of Fenning who was plundering the crazy soldiers in St. Elizabeths Hospital.

Mr. CASE. There is no question but that the Coolidge experience proved that the idea is feasible. There is no question but that a more truly American and representative approach to our problems would result if the seat of government were more nearly in the heart of the country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to print an article by Frank Kent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address of the Governor of the State of Arizona.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article that appeared in the Sunday New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, because the salesman for Jergens Lotion undoubtedly has forgotten to mention it—he was so busy calling 14,000,000 Americans damn fools last Sunday night that it slipped his mind—I want to read a brief excerpt from the Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, page 42:

MISREPRESENTING COSMETICS * * *

Jergens-Woodbury Sales Corporation, Cincinnati: This respondent was ordered to cease and desist from representing its face powders and creams to be germicidal while in use or that its face creams and soap have any beneficial effect on the skin by reason of their vitamin content.

It is possible that Jergens-Woodbury Sales Corporation, of Cincinnati, is a different organization than the Andrew Jergens Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, and that the former is just a sales agency for the latter, or that there is no connection between the two, and that one or the other, or perhaps both, will in time disown the New York snooper.

For some time many people have known that, in addition to being a keyhole peeper, a purveyor of ofttimes false, salacious gossip, and of old, shop-worn, so-called news items which he distributed as advance, confidential information, Winchell was, as we used to say, "a mite teched—just a little queer." As a salesman, he certainly distinguished himself last Sunday night, when, as a representative of a Jergens product, he insulted some of that company's customers by calling them damn fools.

Members of Congress who are married should tell their wives, while those who are unmarried should be sure to give to

their lady friends the information just quoted from the report of the Federal Trade Commission. The ladies will certainly be interested in learning that a seller of face powders and creams was ordered to desist from misrepresenting its merchandise.

[Here the gavel fell.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—OPERATIONS UNDER FUNDS APPROPRIATED BY EMERGENCY RELIEF APPROPRIATION ACTS, 1942 AND 1943

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1943, I present herewith a report of the operations under funds appropriated to the Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration, by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts, fiscal years 1942 and 1943, to the end of the calendar year 1942.

This report is supplemental to that portion of the report presented by me to the Congress on January 11, 1943, which is related to operations to the end of the fiscal year 1942 under funds appropriated to the Work Projects Administration by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, and for fiscal years 1941 and 1942.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 30, 1943.*

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 4]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Baldwin, N. Y. | Gibson | Norton |
| Beall | Gross | O'Leary |
| Bland | Hagen | O'Toole |
| Bolton | Hays | Rabaut |
| Bradley, Mich. | Horan | Richards |
| Brehm | Jones | Rivers |
| Buckley | Kennedy | Shafer |
| Cochran | Kirwan | Short |
| Creal | Knutson | Smith, Ohio |
| Cullen | Lesinski | Starnes, Ala. |
| Domengeaux | Lewis, Colo. | Sumners, Tex. |
| Douglas | McGregor | Welchel, Ohio |
| Ellis | Marcantonio | Whelchel, Ga. |
| Ellsworth | Miller, Pa. | Winter |
| Engel | Morrison, N. C. | |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 390 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1648, with Mr. COURTNEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, such time as he may desire.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is the first of the supply bills. It is the first appropriation bill of the session and of the Congress—the first of a long line of bills appropriating money from the Treasury which it will be necessary for the committee to present to the House for your consideration during the Seventy-eighth Congress.

At this time I wish to express appreciation of the way in which the bill has been handled. I do not believe I have seen an appropriation bill more painstakingly prepared or more ably presented than the one here submitted by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], with the assistance and cooperation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and the ranking members of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], in collaboration with the other majority and minority members of the subcommittee. I have no doubt that the chairman will agree that the clerk of the committee, George Harvey, has also borne a share of the burden.

This bill is a legislative milestone. It marks the end of a notable legislative period and the beginning of what promises to be a still more notable period in the fiscal relations of the Nation and the conduct of the war. For that reason, it is appropriate that we pause for an instant at this time and take stock of where we stand; that we make an appraisal of what has been accomplished in the session just closed and outline future objectives.

The Committee on Appropriations has established a unique record. Never before has a committee of the House reported out bills carrying such extraordinary amounts—amounts unequaled in the budgets of the American Congress and unapproached in the records of any parliamentary body in the history of the world. Seldom, if ever, has a committee sat more continuously and through longer hours and may I venture to express the hope, Mr. Chairman, that measured also by the criterion of efficiency its work in the Seventy-seventh Congress also ranks high in the annals of the House.

And lest there be some question on that score, permit me to submit a factual summary based on the ultimate disposition of these appropriations in terms of service and material. Inasmuch as all values are relative, let us take as a yardstick similar accomplishment programs in the last two wars; the Spanish-American War and the First World War. Of merchant ships built in World War No. 1 we supplied a total of 257 units with a combined tonnage of 1,606,000 tons during the period from August 1, 1917, to July 31, 1918, a period of 1 year.

As against that we have built in 1 year of this war a total of 727 units, nearly three times the number in the first year of World War No. 1, and over 8,000,000 tons, which is about five times the tonnage in the first year of the last war. In the total inventory of military airplanes—and that is the weapon upon which this war turns—we produced in World War No. 1 during the entire period of the war a total of 12,000 planes, to be exact, 12,089 planes as against a total of 47,689 planes in the first year of this war.

In machine guns, coming down to the weapon of direct contact, we produced throughout the duration of World War No. 1, 226,000 machine guns, whereas in the first year only of this war we manufactured 670,000 machine guns, about three times the entire production of the First World War over the entire period of its duration. In small-arms ammunition, the vital common denominator in war matériel, we produced 3,500,000,000 rounds in the First World War, and against that item in the first year of the present conflict, 10,250,000,000 rounds. In artillery ammunition we provided in the First World War a total of 18,000,000 rounds, and by way of contrast, in the first year of the present war 181,000,000 rounds. That is a fair measure of production secured in the two wars.

Mr. Chairman, I wish it were possible at this time to put into the RECORD a complete tabulation showing production and delivery of all classes of armament and munitions, but for military reasons we are not permitted to divulge at this time, data indicating the extent of our remarkable progress in preparedness in other branches of the service. Suffice to say that, as compared with the last World War, the results secured in provision for this war more than bear out the ratios already cited.

In taking care of the personnel, there has been corresponding improvement. Whereas in the Spanish-American War there were recurrent scandals incident to the serving of spoiled meat, which will be remembered as the "embalmed meat scandals of 1898," there has been no instance in this war of any complaints either as to the quantity or of the quality of the rations served.

In 1898 we sent our forces into a tropical climate in winter uniforms. In this war, of all the millions of men we have outfitted, for every clime and region ranging from the Arctic Circle down to

the Equator, there has been no complaint about the character or suitability of the clothing issued to our men. In the previous war the men were paid $13 a month. In this war we are paying $50 a month. The camps of 1898 fostered disease from yellow fever to dysentery, and, in the First World War, contagions of influenza carried men away by the thousands. There has been no report in this war of any infection or contagion, and the Army and Navy maintain a health rate that even surpasses that of the civilian population. Measured by any criterion, we have prepared for war, more expeditiously, more efficiently, and with less mistakes or maladministration than ever before in the history of American arms. We have inducted more men into the service under better conditions, better fed, better clothed, better housed, better paid, better hospitalized than in any previous war in this country or in any other country.

It is a matter of record. There it stands—a record that cannot be disputed or denied. The war record of the Seventy-seventh Congress, unequaled, unchallenged, unimpeachable, and unassailable.

It is not a partisan record. On the contrary, it is a nonpartisan record, a bipartisan record, an American record. And I want to here make due acknowledgment of the service and participation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations and all minority members of the committee in that record. But for the warm cooperation of the gentleman from New York and his colleagues, their wise counsel, their patriotic collaboration, the task of the committee and the House would have been immeasurably more complicated and infinitely more difficult. It is a record in which all of us on both sides of the aisle may take satisfaction, and one of which every American citizen may be proud. It is a record which has turned the tide of the war. During this first year of the war we have passed through the entire gamut from crushing defeat and disaster on to the way to ultimate success and victory. We have now in every theater of the war passed from the phase of defense to that of attack.

The Seventy-seventh Congress laid the foundation on which the Seventy-eighth Congress will rise to victory.

The military experts of every nation, including Adolf Hitler himself, agreed that the turning point of the war would come in 1942. The Fuehrer announced over the radio to the people of Germany and the Axis Powers that in order to win the war they must win in 1942. Nineteen hundred and forty-two has passed, and they did not win. The year 1942 marked the turning point in our march toward victory. By the 30th day of June we will have completed out of funds provided by the Seventy-seventh Congress practically all of the construction work needed to carry out the war program. By the end of this fiscal year we will have designed, contracted, erected, equipped, tooled, and manned the facilities necessary to produce the matériel and the arms with which to win this war. From now on it is merely a matter of keeping these facilities in efficient operation, in achieving and maintaining peak production in those plants, shops, and factories already provided.

The Seventy-seventh Congress was the war Congress. The Seventy-eighth Congress is the victory Congress. The Seventy-ninth Congress should be the peace Congress; but both the victories of the Seventy-eighth Congress and the enduring peace to be negotiated by the Seventy-ninth Congress would have been impossible without the unparalleled achievements of the Seventy-seventh Congress. Had the Seventy-seventh Congress failed, America would have failed; the world would have failed.

But the war is not over. While victory is in sight, it is yet a long way off. It is still in the far distance, and we face now the most ruinous, gruelling phase of this war, heartbreaking losses, and emergencies in which every effort must be marshaled, every resource utilized. Especially must we husband the Nation's revenues.

While we must continue to provide ample appropriations for military purposes, we must in every way possible reduce nonwar expenditures. Already we have made a record in that respect. Notwithstanding the pressure under which we worked in the last Congress, we were able to cut by more than a billion dollars the nonwar appropriations which would have been made in normal times. Even under the urgent impetus of war, and carrying the heavy burden placed on the committee and on the House, we made record retrenchments. We hope to effect even greater reduction in nonmilitary appropriations in the coming session. In the last Congress under the whip of impending attack it was necessary at times to close our eyes and appropriate for war purposes generously. In many instances we had no choice but to take the recommendations of the Army and the Navy inquiries which involved delay. Money was necessary immediately, and we were not in position to deny it. On such occasions we proceeded on the theory that it was better to appropriate too much, better to be too soon and too generous rather than to run the risk of appropriating too little and providing that little too late. We could not gamble on the outcome. There was too much at stake. The maintenance of the Nation and the preservation of civilization was wavering in the balance. And be it said to the credit of the great Army and Navy leaders on whom we relied, we were never misled. Viewed in retrospect, the appropriations of the Seventy-seventh Congress were more than justified.

But now that the burden of the first phase of the war has been lightened, now that the construction era is passed, and the pressure of the emergency is somewhat relieved, we can return to the established routine of investigating fully before appropriating. We now propose to again scrutinize carefully every proposition to spend. In the bill before you, prepared under the able direction of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], we have scrutinized carefully all appropriations, and especially all nonwar appropriations. We expect to appropriate as accurately as possible, but on war appropriations, if we make any mistake, it still will be to make the mistake of being too generous. But on nonwar appropriations, if we make any mistake, it will be the mistake of cutting too deeply.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I wish the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee would tell us if in the judgment of the committee you will also scrutinize unexpended balances and not vote for so much money that these departments do not even have to come to us but can defy us in the future because they do not need any money, they have plenty already.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman can be assued that the committee examines into the balances on hand when we are considering new money. Also funds are appropriated on a fiscal year basis so that if they are not obligated in that fiscal year they will lapse and cannot be used and must revert to the surplus fund of the Treasury unless they should be reappropriated by action of Congress.

Of course, there are instances in which we have to follow a legislative mandate. There is legislation under which we have no authority except to appropriate; the money is automatically required under the law and we cannot stop it. In the matter of interest on the public debt, for example, that is a permanent appropriation, automatically recurring each year, without annual action by Congress. It is something over which Congress does not exercise any annual review. It would not accomplish anything to do so as the debt is a certain amount and the various interest rates are fixed and bondholders must be paid their interest. In the matter of veterans' benefits the rates are fixed by law and the appropriation automatically fixes itself by the number who qualify.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman spoke about retrenchments and cutting down the amount of the appropriations. Will the gentleman tell us, if that is correct, why it is for 1944 there are $1,938,000,000 more appropriated here in this bill than there was for 1943?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The figures to which the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] refers are the permanent appropriations which I have just referred to. The principal amount in the figure he has quoted is increase for interest on the public debt and it is automatic. We exercise no control over the amount. The volume of debt and interest rates govern it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The appropriation bill itself.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The amounts to which the gentleman refers are not contained in this bill. They are the so-called automatic appropriations and are printed in this report for information purposes. They have been appropriated by statutes previously enacted and will continue until repealed or modified. They are in the nature of fixed charges and are not subject to much, if any, discretionary determination.

We are not controlled by the Budget estimate. The fact that an estimate has been sent up to us for any amount, or that any amount has been asked for, does not mean we are going to grant it. When these estimates finally pass through the mill of the committee you will find that all surplus water has been squeezed out and all surplus money has been eliminated.

We have had the cooperation of the President. We have been furnished tables showing the amounts impounded by the Executive after the money was provided, where it was found possible under changing conditions to retain some of that money. The President in 1941 and 1942 impounded a vast sum, and we expect him to follow the same plan in the coming Congress.

For example, in the fiscal year 1943, out of every dollar spent by the United States, 94.8 cents goes for war purposes, and only 5.2 cents is for non-war purposes. We expect to continue that course and are outlining that as our policy. We are setting that as our objective. We are going to try to do even better in this Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Are the sums that the President has impounded turned back to the Treasury and do they come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly, at the end of the fiscal year they revert to the Treasury.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. They can be reappropriated only by the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They can be appropriated by the Congress only with the concurrence of the gentleman himself and his colleagues.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, a good many factors are involved in the consideration of this bill. It is not possible to make as large a percentage reduction in the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill as in some of the other bills, but a great many reductions have been made and a great many more should be made.

We found one place where a bureau was afflicted with the same type of governmental employee that constitutes the great bottleneck in the defense effort. Nothing has done more to impede, harass, and slow up the war effort than the presence of so many alleged economists on the Federal pay roll. They are in this bill in the item for expenses of loans, having to do with the promotion of the sale of Government securities. There they are messing things up, there they are holding up progress, there they are doing things that are keeping people from buying bonds and stamps, instead of promoting their sale.

In the Office of Price Administration they are delaying for weeks and weeks decisions on applications made by manufacturers and retailers and farmers as to prices, without having the slightest knowledge about the matters they are holding up. In the War Production Board they are doing the same thing, holding up and delaying the decisions with reference to priorities.

It is up to us just as far as we are able to get rid of those persons who have absolutely no business on the Federal pay roll, who are no asset but instead are a decided, direct, and positive liability to every bit of the war effort.

The other day the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] gave us a long list of people who, he said, are afflicted with communistic or subversive tendencies. Frankly, I have not been able to cover the ground with reference to them so that I would want to say whether or not the charges are correct. I do know that as to those whose records I have been able to cover, I have covered them in one way, and I have failed to find one of them who is performing a real service in the department, the bureau, or the agency to which he is assigned. I think every one of them will be found to be either a drag on the efforts of that bureau or department or totally incompetent and absolutely doing nothing and producing nothing. I know some of them are in that category. No harm would be done to governmental efficiency if every one of them was wiped off the pay roll.

The largest part of that group of so-called economists whose activities come under this bill are covered in the item relating to expenses of loans, are supposed to promote the sales of securities. This item was $13,636,739 for this current year. The way it is set up, after the cut the committee made, it is $9,347,000, and with that they will have more money than they will know what to do with in an efficient and intelligent way.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are the members of the group to which the gentleman refers just useless in that particular department, or does the gentleman mean that they should not be in the Government service anywhere?

Mr. TABER. Those alleged economists who are on the pay roll and who are holding up the war effort the way they are in the Office of Price Administration, in the War Production Board, and in the sales promotion efforts of the Treasury Department, should not be on the pay roll anywhere. They are totally inefficient and ineffective. They are doing more damage than good. Their only effectiveness is as a bottleneck to prevent things from being done. Sometimes they do things wrong, I will hand them that; but they have no grasp of the economic situation in this country, they have no capacity whatever to perform real service for the Government of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just one further question. The gentleman recalls that last year the Congress did name certain individuals and provided that none of the money appropriated in a particular bill under discussion should be expended to either pay or compensate them for any service or expenditure, and then those individuals were taken over into other departments.

Mr. TABER. That is true.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there any way to reach those people no matter where they may be, say, by a general bill providing that no funds appropriated or now on hand should be paid to any of them, naming them?

Mr. TABER. The only way you could keep them off every pay roll would be by limiting the payment in every single appropriation bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Could we not pass a general act?

Mr. TABER. We could, but the President could veto it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But suppose he does?

Mr. TABER. You would not be safe unless you placed an amendment in every appropriation bill and took them off the pay roll as you went along.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But we never could keep up with them.

Mr. TABER. Then they cannot get on any pay roll at all if the amendment is on every bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But they could be put back under the lend-lease or on some money on blank checks.

Mr. TABER. But there will not be any blank checks this year—not enough to carry the derelicts.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. HARTLEY. I ask the gentleman's indulgence in order that I may read a letter from a constituent of mine whose name I shall withhold, to demonstrate the confusion and trouble that is being caused by these crackpots who pass themselves off as economists. This letter reads as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARTLEY: This is a voice crying in the wilderness.

We employ about 60 people and are doing practically 100 percent war work. It is hard for us to determine our own importance but from the requests which we have had from the War Production Board and the Ordnance Department for shipment of materials to the Aluminum Co. of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, respectively, at least some of our products must be essential.

Since the first of this year we have had to complete and file:

SS-1a. Quarterly Federal old-age benefit return.

940. Annual Federal unemployment tax return.

UC-18A. Quarterly State unemployment return.

UC-27B. Quarterly State unemployment return.

WPB-732. Monthly Federal census report.

WPB-1440. Monthly Federal shipment and order report.

WPB-919. Monthly Federal salvage report.

BLS–790. Monthly State volume of employment report.

BLS–1219. Monthly Federal labor turn-over report.

We also have requests to prepare:

WPB–788. Semimonthly Federal machine capacity report.

PD–669. War Production Board notification of machine ordered.

PD–670. War Production Board notice of machine shipped.

PD–25F. War Production Board changes in P. R. P. requirements.

Next month we start on our income-tax return, with its attendant annual information return and report on Form 1099 covering individual earnings. In addition we are acting as collectors for the Victory tax and salesmen and collectors of War bonds.

And now we are working on the reports required by the controlled-materials plan. This is the prize of all the regulations which have been issued by the various governmental bureaus. If ever a Philadelphia lawyer was required to analyze and interpret the phraseology of a document, he is needed to determine the meanings of the rules and regulations covering the operation of the controlled-materials plan.

We in our plant, and I believe in industry generally, are straining every resource to produce whatever is given to us by the various war agencies, and we should devote our energies to production rather than to the preparation of many documents of questionable value. The services of an executive, familiar with the details of a business, are necessary to properly and accurately prepare the requested reports. This works a distinct hardship on a small organization such as our own where we do not have and cannot afford a large corps of highly paid executives.

I realize that certain reports are absolutely necessary for the conduct of the business of government and we cheerfully prepare and forward such reports. But I do request that you use your influence to have the number of required reports reduced, and to have those which are necessary phrased in language which can be understood and interpreted by the average layman.

I think it is high time that we did something about this thing.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has called attention to one of the worst things that the so-called economists and crackpots pull off. It is one of their ways of getting in the way of the steam roller. They have gotten so far out that the people of this country can see them, and I believe that we are going to have full support of the people in the efforts that we make to get rid of them and get rid of that type of governmental derelict.

Mr. Chairman, there are a good many items in this bill but I am going to refer to only a few of them. Take the item for reimbursement of mortgage interest to the Federal Farm loan bank. That was cut $1,000,000, because it did not figure out that they needed all the money that they asked. Then there is the item for the Farm Loan Corporation, which was cut $800,000 for the same reason. The Foreign Funds Administration in the Treasury was cut $200,000. Frankly, with the advent of the Alien Property Custodian and his taking over a large part of the business end of the business enterprises, that the Foreign Funds control had under their jurisdiction, I do not believe they need so much money. There is too much duplication between the operations of the two units, and I believe that they could take a further cut.

The Tax Research Division which is set up for the first time as a separate unit, was cut $59,810, down to $116,000. That outfit appeared before our committee, and it did not satisfy me that there was anything in the nature of competency. My only check on their capacity has been their appearances before our committee and the Committee on Ways and Means and the Finance Committee of the Senate, besides what they showed before us. Before these committees they told different stories upon several items in connection with the facts. They failed to have any grasp of reports that were filed as to earnings or anything of that kind with the Federal Communications Commission, and their evidence was entirely useless. My information from the Ways and Means Committee people is that they are of very little value. I question if we have not given them too much money.

The Customs Service we cut only $43,900. The earnings of the Customs Service today are down probably to less than one-half of that of last year, and about a third of the year before. That means that they have not anything like the items coming in and going out that they did have. I am getting reports from all over that their activities are nothing like they used to be, and that their help are in such a position that they are unable to find enough to do, and that we might save some money along that line. When we reach that item I expect to take it up.

I call attention to one item in the bill that is rather unusual, and that is the tax-refund item, the customs refund. Tax refunds we appropriated for at the rate of $59,000,000 last year. This year we have to bring in an unlimited amount, whatever is required, to meet the refunds that are required. We have to do that because with the Victory tax and the way it reads, there will be an enormous number of refunds that will have to be made, and it might run even as high as $300,000,000 or $500,000,000 because with the people with small incomes they have a $1,200 exemption in the income tax and only $624 exemption in the Victory tax, and they are entitled to whatever shows and whatever reductions they have on their income beyond that in the nature of taxes, interest, and that sort of thing. So that this item is entirely beyond our control at the present time.

Customs refunds are carried at the same amount they have been, $19,000,000.

There the refunds are required because items come into this country, the duty is paid and the goods go to manufacturers and are made up into products and again exported, and when they are exported the duty is refundable up to a certain percent—I think 99 percent. So that there we have a very large item of refunds on customs that we have not had in days gone by.

In the Post Office Department the only item of any moment that might require explanation is that of post-office inspectors. There we allowed 25 because of the war situation. They have run up since 1925 from 535 to 750 at the present time. There are 175 doing war work, of that increase. With this number they will have at least 100 more than they did have, in addition to those who are doing war work; but with all that number of inspectors, as appears at pages 358 and 359 of the hearings, the number of inspections of post offices has dropped down. We only allow them 25 additional on a temporary basis, and we have said in the report that they must do the main job that they have to do, that is, the inspection of post offices, and get it done.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Is the gentleman familiar with this pamphlet on Trends in Nonwar Expenditures, issued by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. TABER. I have seen it. I have not had a chance to read it yet.

Mr. BENDER. I suggest the gentleman read this, because it is a whitewash of these non-defense expenditures. The gentleman knows that the Bureau of the Budget is nothing more or less than an arm of the executive department. This publication was issued for the purpose of throwing sand in the eyes of the country and Members of Congress, and creating the impression that these nonwar expenditures are not nearly as bad as they are made to appear.

Mr. TABER. When we have it from the Budget and the Executive that the W. P. A. has to be wiped out and the money impounded, that the National Youth Administration has to be sneaked into the manpower set-up to cover up its existence, and that the Farm Security Administration is trying to hide under several other aliases, we do not expect that the people of this country will be dumb enough to absorb too much of the apology from the Bureau of the Budget on that subject. We all know that nondefense appropriations have run absolutely wild. We have a lot of them. Every single one of these agencies that has the worst record, is running around trying to take on other activities to cover up their past sins. When they are given other activities they will develop new sins that will be worse than the ones before, because if those people who have such a bad record in the civil activities of the Government once get their fingers into a defense program or a war program set-up, they will run hog wild and there will be absolutely no controlling the operations they indulge in. The only way we can get along with that kind of people is to wipe them out. They do not have any place in government employ.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. While the gentleman is explaining a few of these controversial items I believe he will recall we had this before us in the committee the other day, just why is it necessary to give to the city delivery two and a half million additional over the appropriation for 1943? And the second part of my question, just why is it necessary to add $1,200,000 to the Special De-

livery Service above that which we appropriated last year?

Mr. TABER. I will take the special delivery first, because that is easier to answer.

The special-delivery item was cut by the committee a small amount, but the special delivery item is a statutory matter, where the person who makes the delivery is entitled to a specific fee—I think it is 9 cents—on each special-delivery letter delivered. He is entitled to that, regardless of whether we make appropriations or not. The recent increase was allowed because there is an estimated deficiency in the current year. People have been obliged, because of the slowness that has developed in the Postal Service—and I am not criticizing that particularly because the facilities are not available to make it any better—people have been obliged to put special-delivery stamps upon a great many letters that they did not before. Because there have been so many issued and sold and so many more special delivery letters, the fees have piled up, and there will be a deficiency of all of that increase for this year.

Now, on the letter carrier proposition, the same situation applies. The city letter carriers are required to carry a great deal more mail. The volume of mail has gone up terrifically. I could show you from some papers I have on the table items that have been sent out by the promotion activities of the Government—great big, thick, heavy packages. It is estimated for 1944, unless we do something about it, that the cost of handling the penalty or free mail will run upward of $82,000,000. That is a fair sample of the way these things are going up, and that is one of the reasons why we are getting such a big increase.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I bring up this question because while we acknowledge a great increase in mail, immediately following these two particular items you will note $92,200,000 for rural route carriers. Of course, that great increase of mail should apply to the country. God knows we have had plenty of literature going out to the country. My point is if we give any increase at all for city delivery why is not some consideration given toward increasing the load on the rural route carriers?

Mr. TABER. The statement was made to us, as I remember it—I may be wrong, but the statement was made that there had been an allowance for all the most meritorious cases for extension of rural delivery routes provided here in this bill, a continuance of the allotment for new service in the Rural Free Delivery, and it is just as much as it was in the last 4 or 5 years. They are going to be able to spend probably double the amount that was set up in our bill of last year for extensions of Rural Free Delivery Service. I think we have a provision for a couple of hundred thousand dollars for those extensions, and I think they are going to spend at least $400,000 in this current fiscal year. They are effecting some savings on the operation of rural routes due to consolidations and an occasional discontinuance, but there have not been many discontinuances.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. One further question in conclusion, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am not criticizing what the gentleman has to say; fundamentally it is correct, but there comes to my mind an instance on my own home route. I am one of the few Members of Congress who live on a rural route, and this route is back in Minnesota. I have been refused by the Post Office Department consideration of four short extensions which would bring to these 12 neighbors of mine the opportunity not to have to travel three-quarters of a mile through knee-deep snow to get their mail. I feel, consequently, especially when I think of our apartment down here in Washington where they have cut city delivery to once a day that perhaps this $2,500,000 extra comes under the heading of nonessentials.

Mr. TABER. I can see why the gentleman feels as he does, but I do not think the items the gentleman refers to should have been denied; I think they should have been granted; I think they are in a position where, if the roads are so the carriers can get through, there is no question but what on meritorious matters they should give these rural route extensions.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Coming back to the first question, that in regard to special delivery, did I understand the gentleman to say that the increase in special-delivery mail is such that the increased revenue resulting from the sale of special-delivery stamps offsets the increased appropriation?

Mr. TABER. There is no payment out of this appropriation for the delivery of special-delivery letters except 9 cents on each letter—and the special-delivery stamp costs 10 cents; so there is 1 more cent going into the general pool of the Post Office Department or to the Treasury out of the sale of each special-delivery stamp. I will say that I have to use special-delivery stamps on my own letters if I want to get them to my home town in 1 day. I can get 2-day service by regular mail, but for 1-day service, I have to use a special-delivery stamp.

Mr. CASE. And for this $1,800,000 the Treasury will collect $2,000,000?

Mr. TABER. On $800,000, the Treasury will collect $900,000, the appropriation is $12,200,000, and the Treasury will collect about $13,500,000.

Let me say that I believe the committee has done as well as it could with this bill in every way, everything considered. There are some things upon which we did not agree entirely and some things that may have to be worked out here on the floor. There are a lot of problems. We probably have not discovered everything that might have been discovered in connection with this bill—one never does—but I may say that we have had complete, full hearings and have been permitted to go just as far as we wished. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], chairman of the committee, has been very gracious and has done the best he could to cut down appropriation and still allow funds to operate. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] sat at all the hearings of the committee and were very helpful. I appreciate very much the work of my two associates, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], have done upon the bill. I hope the Committee of the Whole, if it does anything to the bill, will improve it before we report it back to the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

THE "FOUR FREEDOMS"

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, in the last 10 years many strange doctrines and ideologies in derogation of our national Constitution have been practiced on the American people. From a republican form of government we have been gyrating to a government by bureaucrats, to a concentration of power in the administration which closely approaches a dictatorship and has greatly curtailed and restricted constitutional American freedom.

Since we have been in the war this has been greatly intensified; and not only that, but those of the American people who are most zealous in the protection of constitutional American liberty, have practically disarmed themselves, in their willingness to concentrate in the bureaucratic administration, at the risk of their liberty, all governmental power that is necessary to win the war. And yet, even in wartime, eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and while it is our duty to delegate to the administration all powers necessary to the winning of the war, it is equally our duty to resist the ideologies and usurpation of power which are foreign to both the war effort and our form of government.

One trend in this subversive movement has become very popular in the last year or more. Last Monday's newspapers reported speeches on it and it is the constant subject of radio commentators and others. This is the slogan that we are fighting for the "four freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

Administration leaders and bureaucrats adroitly use this slogan, or parts of it, as the panacea for the ills of the people of the United States or the peoples of the world, depending on the occasion.

A more insidious and dangerous ideology and propaganda could scarcely be invented or disseminated.

That document signed on August 14, 1941, somewhere in the Atlantic by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, was not and did not purport to be a charter of rights, but a statement of peace aims.

A charter is a grant of special rights from an absolute and sovereign monarch, from a dictator to his subjects. It is confined to rights and privileges granted in the charter and by implication excludes all rights and freedoms not so granted.

Such a charter, as we know, was granted by King John to the English people in 1215 and was known as Magna Carta, or the Great Charter. It marked the beginning of constitutional government. Under it Englishmen were for the first time entitled to certain rights in spite of a totalitarian monarch, such as trial by jury, a voice in tax matters, and certain other specified privileges. So there have been charters granted by the sovereign power to cities, colonies, and similar bodies politic.

I do not believe that either President Roosevelt or Prime Minister Churchill ever referred to that document as a charter, and certainly they both know that they are the servants, not the sovereigns, of their respective peoples, and, as such, cannot make a grant of any rights whatsoever.

In the second place that document stating the peace aims of the respective representatives of Britain and the United States says nothing about the "four freedoms" as such. The only reference to freedoms in that document is contained in the sixth peace aim, which reads:

> After the final destruction of Nazi tyranny they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

Obviously the fear and want referred to in this sixth peace aim is the fear and want caused by war, and the threat of war by the wanton attack, looting, raping, and murder of greedy aggressor nations such as has been suffered by the vanquished and stricken peoples of Europe and suffered to a greater or lesser degree by all depending nations from gangster peoples. Not by the remotest stretch of imagination can this be construed as a guaranty to the people of our Nation, or any other nation, as freedom from want and freedom from fear as a socialistic scheme of internal economy. And, mark you, freedom of religion and freedom of speech were in no wise mentioned in that document.

In the third place those so-called "four freedoms" are not freedoms in any sense unless accompanied and vitalized by a fifth and it should be the first and fundamental freedom, and that is economic freedom. Now remember that a charter is a grant of special rights and freedoms and excludes any right or freedom not expressly granted. And, therefore, as I said before, those "four freedoms" are not freedoms at all, or, if I may speak paradoxically, they are the freedoms of the slave.

Imagine, if you will, a slave before the days of the Civil War. His master, his owner, his dictator, had, or at least should have, no objection to allowing the slave freedom of speech or freedom of religion. He could have any religion or superstition he wished, he could talk or prattle to his heart's desire, provided, however, and with the always present limitation, that he must never indulge in those freedoms to the extent of saying or claiming that he was made in God's image and therefore the political equal of his master. He must never indulge in the concept of free speech and religious freedom to the extent of claiming that he was entitled to enjoy the fruits of his own labor, to come and go as he pleased or that he was entitled to a wife and family of his own. No, indeed; those and similar rights constituting economic freedom were denied that slave and in place of them the slaveholder guaranteed him freedom from want and freedom from fear just as he extended these to his other chattels, his cattle. I say to you, my friends, the so-called "four freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter are a myth and a snare to shackle the unwary, the bait for which is greatly extended social security, and unless the American people are vigilant the bureaucrats will have the shackles riveted on their limbs before they realize it. For these "four freedoms" are exactly the freedoms of the slaves of totalitarian states.

Mr. Chairman, the liberty of Americans is not confined to the "four freedoms" and finds its source not in a charter granted by a prime minister, a president, or a potentate, or bureaucrat. The foundation of American freedoms is found in the Declaration of Independence, in these words:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

The guaranty, the security of these rights, rests, not in a charter, but on a compact between freemen, the preamble of which reads:

> We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

These are the rocks upon which our temple of liberty, with its tripartite form of government, and its Bill of Rights, has rested securely for a century and a half. We are not restricted to a charter or "four freedoms," but to the enjoyment of all freedom by every individual inherently, restricted only by the requirements of a like freedom in every other individual.

And do not think when I call attention to the vice and danger in that ideology and propaganda of the so-called "four freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter, I am dealing only in remote and future danger.

The gyves are already on our ankles. The ground has already been broken in an assault on the Bill of Rights and the frittering away of religious freedom.

A little over a year ago a case was brought before the Supreme Court of the United States involving a claimed right under the Bill of Rights, and a religious freedom guaranteed thereunder. Unquestionably the sect which claimed this right had very narrow views. And the Supreme Court in an 8 to 1 decision held that their views were too narrow; that they were not entitled to what they claimed as religious freedom under the Bill of Rights.

But on June 8 of last year the same sect was again before the Supreme Court on another phase of their religion, which they claimed as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. Again they were convicted, but this time only by a 5-to-4 decision. But—and this is the point I want to emphasize—three of the four dissenters frankly confessed, "We helped make the law in the first case, but we now believe that that case was wrongly decided." However that may be, both cases are now the law of the land, and, according to four judges—three of them repentant—for the first time in over a hundred and fifty years we have taken two steps on the road away from the religious liberty guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. As Chief Justice Stone, in his dissenting opinion, said in substance, we are adopting tactics better adapted to the effective suppression of speech and press and religion, despite constitutional guaranties, than those which were a moving cause of the American Revolution.

There is now pending in the Federal courts a prosecution by the Department of Justice against the Associated Press, which is a free association of a free press to gather news for its members. In this prosecution the New Deal administration is seeking to destroy the freedom of the Associated Press and make it subject to Government domination and control, just as it dominates our railroads and other common carriers. This is, of course, seeking another step in the same direction.

These trends and ideologies have no bearing on and make no contribution to the war effort but are purely a quest for concentration of power by the bureaucrats bent on making over our Government. They should, however, offer a touchstone by which we may test the genuineness of many of the absolute powers sought by the administration under the guise of war powers. A constantly increasing number of the people are becoming awake to these trends and dangers, and there can be no question but that the last election constituted a mandate to the Congress to beware of foreign freedoms and especially the "four freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter and similar ideologies.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair kindly inform me how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has 36 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New York has 1 hour and 18 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] 30 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, for the past 2 years the shortage of gasoline and fuel oil on the North Atlantic seaboard has been an acute fact.

The annual consumption in that section was normally about 1,600,000 barrels per day. Before the submarine menace, the ocean tankers supplied more than 95 percent of that consumption. Under present conditions the tankers are eliminated entirely, and inland transportation of various types have been resorted to, all of which has been inadequate for the emergency. Railways, inland waterways, highways, and pipe lines have been brought into service, but all combined can only transport about 60 percent of the normal needs.

To supply the necessary transportation facilities for the movement of these essential commodities involves enormous expenditures of money, and the conversion of vast amounts of critical materials badly needed in the war effort. It also involves delays, the consequences of which cannot be foreseen.

The major portion of the shipments are now by rail but the roads were poorly equipped for the burden. Owing to the fact that rail transportation of petroleum and its products is too costly to compete with pipe lines and waterways, the roads have heretofore refrained from making large investments in equipment for handling such commodities. The tank cars now in use are practically all owned by the oil companies, and for the use of which the roads are paying a rental.

I am not advised as to the number of tank railroad cars now engaged in the movement of petroleum to the East. According to the report of the Temporary National Emergency Committee of the hearings held in 1939, as published by the American Petroleum Institute, there were then 141,949 railroad tank cars in existence, 130,985 of which were owned by oil companies. I am advised that many of these cars are old and in bad order, and some of them impracticable for use. Their capacity was said to be 8,000 gallons, or more, each, or about 191 barrels per car.

Mr. J. J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads, stated before a Senate committee on January 27 that the railroads were hauling an average of 770,000 barrels per day, and he expected that to be increased to 900,000 barrels. In addition to tank cars in use, they had borrowed 200,000 drums from the Army, and expected to get 500,000 additional drums, with capacity of about 600,000 barrels. These drums, filled with oil, were being hauled in box cars. Mr. Pelley also stated that he had asked the War Production Board for 878 new locomotives, in addition to the 1,000 requested the year before, but did not expect his request to be granted for more than 600 additional locomotives.

A 24-inch pipe line has just been completed from east Texas to a point in southern Illinois, and its extension to the eastern seaboard has been authorized. Its general course is to parallel the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. When completed, it will have a capacity of 250,000 to 300,000 barrels of oil per day. It is expected to have it in operation in time to furnish fuel oil to New England for the fall season of 1943. Its cost is estimated at $95,000,000, and 355,000 tons of steel will be required for its completion. Work was commenced sometime last summer. The course of this pipe line is several hundred miles longer than it would have been to have taken a more direct route. This, of course, adds to the cost of construction and operation, and adds enormously to the amount of necessary war materials involved.

If, instead of paralleling the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, the pipe line had first been laid from the Ohio to the eastern seaboard, the delivery of 300,000 barrels of fuel oil per day to New England could easily have been now in operation. The necessary wooden barges and tow boats for operation on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers could have been built in the same time the pipe line was being laid; the cost would have been far less than the cost of the transcontinental pipe line, and it could have been in operation for the present winter season.

We have a splendid intracoastal channel from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Trenton, N. J., with the exception of a 92-mile missing link across Florida, from the Gulf to the St. John River. This channel across Florida has been authorized by Congress, but opposing interests may be successful in delaying the construction indefinitely. For temporary use Congress also authorized the laying of a pipe line across Florida, but those in charge have only provided an 8-inch pipe to serve local needs.

We have heard a great deal of praise for the railroads for the part they have performed in moving oil and gasoline to the East. It is true, they have done a great work, and have accomplished much more than their operators themselves at first thought possible. They have also succeeded in moving many millions of tons of other war materials for which they have received no public acclamation, though the accomplishment was equally meritorious.

In transporting oil and gasoline, the railroads have done what they were employed to do, and for which they have received the regular compensation. In view of the fact that the cost of this transportation is approximately nine times greater than it would have been by water, this increased cost had to be met.

Such costs are usually paid by the consumers, but in this case the consumers have been relieved of that burden and rightfully so as I believe. They were in nowise responsible for the conditions that brought it about. The oil shippers pay to the railroads the regular rail charges for transportation. The differences between those charges and the water costs are refunded to them by the Government acting through the Defense Supplies Corporation.

The oil shippers, as I am advised, submit their claims for reimbursement to this corporation. Upon examination 75 percent of the claim is paid by check, and 25 percent withheld for more complete audit. The amounts paid for the month of December totaled, as I am advised, $15,666,000, representing 75 percent of the claims presented. When the other 25 percent is paid it will be seen that the Government is actually paying more than $700,000 per day on account of the oil shipments by rail.

When these oil shipments by rail are enormously increased as outlined by Mr. Pelley, the refunds will be correspondingly increased. An editorial in the Houston Post of January 28 calls attention to the fact that boxcars loaded with drums of oil as contemplated carry only 6,545 gallons whereas the tank cars carry 7,000 gallons or more. The editorial states that a Houston shipper had called attention to the fact that shipping drums of oil in boxcars would entail considerable extra cost which would be borne by the Government.

As will be seen from the refund payments made to the oil shippers for the month of December the Government is actually paying more than $250,000,000 annually on account of having those shipments go by rail. When the rail shipments are increased to 900,000 barrels per day, as the program now contemplates, and as stated by Mr. Pelley, then these refunds will be increased to approximately $400,000,000 annually. This extra cost can be eliminated in a comparatively short time if Congress will, without delay, construct the barge channel across Florida. If Congress should fail to construct this channel, this enormous burden will be upon the taxpayers for an indefinite period.

The cost of the canal is estimated at $44,000,000. The cost of 2,286 wooden barges and 1,143 steel barges, together with the cost of 1,170 tugboats, will amount to $260,550,000. This is the equipment estimated by engineers as necessary for the movement of 900,000 barrels of oil and gasoline per day from Texas to the northeastern area. The cost of this equipment is estimated at $40,000 each for the wooden barges, $60,000 each for the steel barges, and $95,000 for the tugboats.

These estimates are not of my own making. They have been prepared for me by very competent engineers. They will show conclusively that for each dollar in cost of equipment and each ton of steel used, the barge system will transport more petroleum than any other known system of transportation.

Petroleum and its products constitute one of the most essential commodities of this Nation in both war- and peacetime. Before the war it constituted slightly more than 50 percent of our traffic upon the high seas. I am advised by high authority that it now constitutes approximately 70 percent of the supplies going to our Armies and Navy overseas. Yet our internal transportation system is such that a few German submarines on the Atlantic Ocean have been able to almost completely paralyze this most essential industry. It is all due to a few missing links in our transportation system which can easily be eliminated. Just how long the American people will continue to permit such conditions to exist remains to be seen.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I want to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for the fine work he has done in regard to the development of our inland waterways and our harbor facilities. I note what he says in regard to the necessity for building this canal at the earliest possible time in order to provide fuel oil facilities for New England. I was told today that during the next 5 or 6 weeks—and this comes to me from a high authority in charge of our distribution program—the people of New England are going to suffer a good deal of hardship and privation during the next 5 weeks because they cannot get fuel oil. In line with the suggestions heretofore made, the gentleman has suggested this barge canal. We from New England have followed that suggestion during a long period of time and every one of us voted for the original authorization, as I understand it; but there seems to be a great conflict of opinion as to when this canal can be finished. We were told on the floor of the House yesterday by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], of the gentleman's own committee, that the Chief of Engineers says it will take 3 years. We were told by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] yesterday that he has it on reliable authority that it can be finished in less than a year and if necessary he can get from the War Department engineers an estimate of completion that it will take less than a year.

What has the chairman of the committee to say in regard to the possible time that it can be finished, through which barges can operate to bring fuel oil to the New England area?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. In reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I may say that the estimates vary from 8 months to 3 years. The Chief of Engineers states that in accordance with the usual procedure of securing appropriations from time to time, and in view of the fact that priorities have to be given for war materials, he estimates it will probably be 3 years before this barge canal can be completed. The head of the Arundel Corporation of Baltimore, perhaps the highest authority in this country on matters of this kind, a company that has done more work of this nature than any other concern in the United States or any place else, tells me that they can do it with the machines they have within 10 months. General Summerall, ex-Chief of Staff of the United States Army, a gentleman of great ability who succeeded General Pershing in that position, I believe, a graduate of West Point, and an engineer of great distinction, tells me he has from prominent contractors the highest assurance that it can be constructed in less than 1 year with the machinery that may be made available. It is all a question of machinery.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. With the information the gentleman has, does it appear to him that the Chief of Engineers is not taking that source of information as authentic or reliable?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The Chief of Engineers is a very careful man and very able man. He estimates, according to the way Congress usually appropriates the money for these purposes, that it will string out through a period of years and he takes that into contemplation when making his estimates. They invariably do that.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Has the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors ever suggested to the Chief of Engineers, or asked him if the Congress should immediately appropriate the forty or fifty million dollars required, how long it would take him to complete that job? What is his answer to that?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I have not conversed with him along that line.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. So that the original estimate of completion date so far as the Chief of Engineers is concerned, is 3 years?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. That was the Chief of Engineers, yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. He has not changed his opinion from that time to this?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That will not help us very well in New England.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. No, but this bill provides for a pipe-line across there. They could have put a pipe-line across there, about 195 miles, that would be conveying oil to New England today, instead of building a 2,000-mile pipe-line, clear across the continent.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What would the capacity of that pipe-line be?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It depends on the size and it depends on the pressure. If they put in the same size as they put in from Texas up to Illinois it would convey from 250,000 to 300,000 barrels a day.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. We do not care how we get oil up to New England. They are desperate for oil in order to keep warm and there is a great deal of suffering. If this barge line is going to take 3 years to build, as the Chief of Engineers says, it will not be of any value to us. If it can be built in a year's time, it will be of value.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. I asked the Chief of Engineers the other day if it could not be built in 2 years and he said yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Why does not the gentleman get a statement from the Chief of Engineers and put it in the RECORD showing just what he does say, so there will be some incentive for us in New England to give consideration to it?

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not possible for this canal to be used for the transportation of oil before all the locks and things are completed?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The bill provides for temporary works. They can build those locks for temporary use and they will serve for a period of many years.

Mr. WHITE. That would greatly shorten the period?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes and it would eliminate the steel that is necessary for the war program.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I would like to ask the gentleman two very brief questions and I will let him answer. Is it not true that General Reybold, in his testimony on this canal, said that it is an emergency and should be started at once? Did that not appear in the record of the hearings?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I think so; yes.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Yesterday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], spoke on this and he said that if we were going to have a canal, that there is already an existing canal in the State of Florida. I have always voted for the improvement of our waterways down there and for that existing canal that he speaks of, extending from Fort Myers to Stewart. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas, what are the possibilities of providing this canal in lower Florida to get oil to the eastern seaboard?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It would probably be 10 to 20 years before a canal could be constructed there that would be practical, and after you had it there is no approach to it from the west coast, or from the Gulf coast, except by tankers. That would not be an inland route and it would not be safe.

Mr. HENDRICKS. They would be subject to submarine attack?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes. Submarines have been sinking ships in the Gulf within 4 miles of the mouth of the Mississippi River.

The channel across there was adopted on a survey ordered in a bill from the Committee on Flood Control. If you recall, 15 or 18 years ago there was a terrible hurricane that blew the water out of Lake Okeechobee, killed several hundred people west of there and destroyed a great deal of property, and then went off into the Everglades. This was started as a flood-control project. The main part of the authorization and of the cost was for levees around Lake Okeechobee. Then we amended the bill so as to make a navigation channel there, but it is only 6 feet deep and 80 feet wide. It would cost many, many millions of dollars to make a practical channel of it, 125 feet wide and 12 feet deep, to correspond with the other. It runs through Lake Okeechobee and over to Stuart near the east coast, and from there up to Jacksonville there is a channel that is only 8 feet deep and 100 feet wide.

On that project you would have to order surveys and investigations and have hearings and all that through a long period of years, and then decide sometime in the future whether or not this would make a practical navigation channel and would be justified. It is 543

miles longer than the channel adopted by Congress. It would be 600 miles farther to go to the east, even if you had a channel all around, than the channel that has been recommended by the engineers.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman tell the committee what is the maximum amount of the annual subsidy now going to the railroads under the present arrangement?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The oil shippers are paying the railroads just their regular rates. The railroads cannot very well afford to haul it any cheaper. I am not blaming the railroads, for they have done a great work and are doing all they can, but that is the condition. They cannot haul it for any less. The cheapest they can afford to haul it for is nine times or eight and two-thirds times the cost of shipping the oil this way.

Mr. CULKIN. What is the estimated maximum amount of the subsidy?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It depends on how much oil they transport.

Mr. CULKIN. At the present and probable rate of transportation, as estimated by Mr. Pelley, it is approximately $400,000,000 a year.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I made that estimate on the supposition that it will be increased to 900,000 barrels, as he says. It is only about 700,000 barrels a day at the present time.

Mr. CULKIN. Is the gentleman sanguine about getting a bill through that will eliminate that subsidy?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The bill has already been passed by Congress, but the money has not been appropriated.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman realizes the forces that are at work against that project, representing the railroads?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes; I understand all that. I have had no misapprehension about that for 20 years.

Mr. CULKIN. They have spent some $31,000,000 last year for advertising and probably $100,000,000 for lawyers. I do not like to indict my own cult, but the lawyers got a great killing on that. Does the gentleman think he can overcome that?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. You cannot blame the railroad lawyers. I used to be one myself.

Mr. CULKIN. May I say to the gentleman that I believe the statement the gentleman has made is a definite challenge to the Congress. It should remember that good Americans are freezing to death in the Northeast.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. A year ago last September I wrote to Mr. Pelley suggesting that he use two railroads down there to transport this oil across Florida. One of them was 240 miles in length and the other was 317 miles in length. Engineers informed me that those two roads could easily transport 200,000 barrels of oil a day. Mr. Pelley did not take to the proposition. He wanted to haul the oil clear across the continent, and said it would make no problem for the railroads. He sent me a copy of his testimony before a Senate committee given that same day, in which he took that view. He did not seem favorable to the short haul across Florida.

You can take these railroad cars on that short haul and see the difference in hauling oil 200 miles as against 2,000 miles from Texas to Boston. Those cars go up there and then go back empty. They cannot go under burden both ways. You have to count the round trip in computing the time. It is the same way with the barges, although the barges could have return cargoes on their decks.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The bill authorizing the construction of the Florida barge canal became law at the last session of Congress?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes; last summer.

Mr. MOTT. Can the gentleman tell us what, in his opinion, is holding it up? Is not an authorization by the Congress usually considered by the Committee on Appropriations to be a mandate?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The Committee on Appropriations has not made any appropriation since that time for the civil functions of the War Department. These appropriations usually come in the War Department civil functions appropriation bill, and those appropriations are made in the spring. This bill was passed last summer, and there has not yet been considered a civil-functions appropriation bill.

Mr. MOTT. Then the Committee on Appropriations has not had an opportunity to pass on this question?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It has not had an opportunity to do so; no.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In the address of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] yesterday he made the statement that he did not want to embarrass any engineer or anyone else in the War Department, but that he could get an opinion from the War Department that this canal can be constructed and have barges going through it within the period of a year. This discussion has been going on for a year. We are very much interested in this project, and I should like to know about it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman from Florida has ever asked anybody in the War Department for such an opinion.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to answer that question?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. May I say to the gentleman that yesterday I said that I did not want to embarrass anyone in the War Department, but I said that I could get an opinion from someone in the War Department. I want to say this, and I cannot name the engineer, but he has given his opinion, one of the engineers, that this can be done in 10 months.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Why should not the Chief Engineer acquiesce in that?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I do not know.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes; if I have the time.

Mr. GREEN. For only one observation, as to the time element. This contracting concern is a strong reliable concern and they say that they will enter into a contract and guarantee to build it within that time.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. Has not this Florida ship canal been before us for a good many years?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The Florida ship canal is not before us now.

Mr. BENDER. Is not this just window dressing for that project?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It is not, if the gentleman will take my word for it.

Mr. BENDER. How much money has been spent in the last decade for river and harbor improvements?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I can answer that in the RECORD. I have not the figures now, but if the gentleman desires I shall put them in the RECORD.

Mr. BENDER. And this is for civilian functions?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. It is not an emergency war matter or appropriation?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Oh, that is up to the Congress. It is nothing to me whether they appropriate the money or not. I am not as much interested as dozens of others.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Can the priorities for the steel be secured? As I understand it everything is all ready for the pipe line.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Everything. There will be very little steel used if they use temporary material.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So it will be an economical unit?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes. At one time they used nothing but wooden locks, but, of course, steel is better, but in an emergency we do many things that are not the best.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They are taking additional oil and kerosene away from us in New England.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time I have, 3½ minutes, to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, when we reach the reading of the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill,

under the 5-minute rule, I propose to offer an amendment on page 12, line 22, as follows:

Page 12, line 22, after the word "Treasury" strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of William Pickens, Frederick L. Schuman, Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., Paul R. Porter, John Herling, Paul F. Brissenden, David J. Saposs, Maurice Parmelee, Harold Loeb, Sam Schmerler, Emil Jack Lever, David Lasser, Tom Tippett, Henry C. Alsberg, David Karr, Guiseppi Facci, David Wahl, Hugh Miller, Walter Gellhorn, Karl Borders, Jack Fahy, Nathaniel Weyl, Robert Morss Lovett, Merle Vincent, Alice Barrows, Arthur F. Goldschmidt, Marcus I. Goldman, Leonard Emil Mins, Henry T. Hunt, Mary McLeod Bethune, Harry C. Lamberton, T. A. Bisson, Katherine Kellock, Jay Deiss, Milton V. Freeman, George Slaff, A. C. Shire, and Edward Scheunemann."

This amendment is a bit unusual in that it includes William Pickens, who would be directly affected by this bill, and a list of the names of other people who would be affected later and this is the reason that I wanted to give the House notice that I was offering this amendment.

You may well ask why I include the other names in the amendment if William Pickens is the only man who would be directly affected by this bill under the present circumstances, and I want to explain the reason. The reason is to prevent hedge hopping. When we were working on the W. P. A. bill in 1941, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] offered an amendment which was adopted by the House and retained by the Senate and was enacted into law. The amendment provided—

That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of David Lasser.

As I said, the amendment was adopted and I want to ask you where do you think Mr. Lasser is at this moment? Mr. Lasser has now been employed by the War Production Board as senior economist, and with an increase in salary. When he was eliminated from this appropriation bill he was receiving $4,400 a year. He is now receving $4,600 a year. And Mr. Lasser's case is not the only one. I want to cite some other cases in which hedge-hopping has been done. In other words, when one of these gentlemen has been reported as having views not healthy to our form of government and has been discharged from one branch of the Government he just hedgehops into another branch. On March 28, 1942, the gentleman from Texas, Chairman DIES, wrote a letter to Hon. HENRY WALLACE, Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, calling his attention to the Communist affiliations of eight of his employees, and made particular reference to one Maurice Parmelee, principal economist of the B. E. W., at a salary of $5,600 a year. Mr. Parmelee had written several books advocating the practice of nudism in America. Two days later Parmelee was dismissed from the B. E. W. He was reemployed, however, on November 2, 1942, at the Railroad Retirement Board as an economist at $4,600 a year.

In 1938, David J. Saposs, chief economist of the National Labor Relations Board, was exposed by the Dies committee, and in 1939 by the Smith committee, investigating the N. L. R. B. As a result of these exposures David J. Saposs was dismissed from the N. L. R. B. He was later reemployed as an economist in the office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and just recently appointed assistant to the chief of the labor division of the War Production Board at a salary of $8,000 per year.

In 1938, Henry G. Alsberg was director of the Federal writers project of the W. P. A. This project was exposed by the Dies committee as being a tool of Communist propaganda, and in 1939 the House abolished the agency, which automatically removed Alsberg from the Federal pay roll. Alsberg has recently been reemployed by the Federal Government and is now senior feature writer in the Office of War Information at $4,600.

In 1935 Sam Schmerler was dismissed from the F. B. I. on account of his Communist activities. Several weeks later he was employed by the Social Security Board, and has worked there ever since. At present he is employed as a policy consultant at a salary of $3,800 a year.

In 1941 the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], in a letter to the President, exposed the Communist affiliations of Emil Jack Lever, then employed in O. E. M. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was never advised as to what action was taken against Lever; however, he is now employed as head labor adviser in the War Production Board at $6,500.

In the debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] said, in effect, "It is time that we indicate to the heads of the departments that we are not going to stand for these men being employed in the Government." But you will see it makes no difference what indication we give—that they will get around it some way—because Mr. Lasser is still on the pay roll.

I have heard leading Members of this House say that they believe action ought to be taken, but this is not the proper way to take it. Well, I want to disagree heartily. Any other measure that we may pass could be considered by the courts as an infringement upon the powers and prerogatives of the executive branch but an appropriation bill originates in the House of Representatives, and the House is entitled to put any limitation that they so desire on these appropriations.

The list of the names that I have included in this amendment are the ones which were given to us last Monday by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who is chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities. If this amendment is adopted certainly none of these people can hedgehop from any other department to the department for which this appropriation is made.

If this amendment is adopted, I propose to offer the same amendment, including the same names, to every appropriation bill, large or small, which comes before the House of Representatives in the future, and if the amendment is adopted we will know then that none of these men can hedge hop from one department into the other because they will be eliminated from all appropriations.

The time has come when the Members of this House should decide whether we do or whether we do not. In 1938, I believe it was, this House created by legislative action the committee known as the Committee on Un-American Activities, and from that time until the present that committee has spent $470,000, and I find now that there is a resolution for the continuation of this committee for another 2 years, and that the committee will no doubt ask for $75,000 more to continue their work, which will make a sum total of $545,000, or over a half-million dollars. We should either decide that we are going to accept the responsibility thrown upon us by this special committee when they submit these names to us as having improper views concerning our form of government and eliminate them from the appropriation bills, or we should decide that the committee is serving no purpose and cease to make further appropriations. The amendment which I shall offer when we come to the reading of this bill under the 5-minute rule will give every Member of this House the opportunity to decide that one thing. I sincerely request that every Member give this his careful consideration. If there is any other way to have these undesirables eliminated from the pay roll, certainly I shall be glad to know of that way, but up to the present time no one has suggested a method other than this, and under these circumstances I believe this is the only way and that the amendment should be adopted.

I propose to discuss the records of the people mentioned in this amendment at the proper time so that Members of the House will be able to determine themselves whether or not they are the people we desire on the pay roll of the Federal Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD. There are some things I did not have time to state.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I deem it a privilege to be able to serve on the Committee on Appropriations, and particularly this subcommittee, because of the opportunity it gives to serve with those distinguished members who have given years of service to the supply bills for the Treasury and Post Office Departments.

Unfortunately for me, the hearings began early in December, prior to my assignment to this committee, so that I did not have an opportunity to listen to those hearings, to the various witnesses, and to the justifications which were presented during the hearings, which continued for about 6 weeks. Consequently,

I am not qualified at this time to give you any specific information dealing with this particular bill, but I shall take a few minutes to present to you a few of the observations which I have made as a Member of this body prior to my assignment to this committee and which have been confirmed to some extent during the past few weeks while helping to write up this particular supply bill.

This observation is that ordinarily the Budget as submitted, as was pointed out a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], is more or less considered sacrosanct. Those estimates come up from the executive department and then hearings are held. Witnesses are called to justify those requests for funds. Ordinarily it is difficult for members of the Appropriations Committee to be well informed on those requests, so that they may act intelligently thereon.

Recently the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], submitted a resolution providing that personnel be made available for the committee so that help might be employed to investigate those requests which are submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, so that when the supply bills are submitted to this body for final consideration and action we shall know definitely that there has been no unnecessary duplication and unnecessary waste and extravagance which might well be eliminated.

Our committee chairman about an hour ago eulogized the Seventy-seventh Congress as the War Congress because of the gigantic sums which had been appropriated and made available to the executive departments with which to administer the various aspects of our war program. I am in accord with the statement made by the distinguished chairman, because I believe the Congress is not only providing ample funds but probably a surplus or excess of funds, for the use of the various executive departments. It is true that we cannot stint in our efforts in any way in making available funds for the War Department and the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission, and for that matter other bureaus and agencies dealing directly with the war effort. Yet I wonder if this body has considered whether or not those executive departments have done the same kind of an efficient job in expending those huge appropriations which are approved by Congress. We hear many criticisms, and there is a Nation-wide demand for greater efficiency and more economy, not only in our nonwar expenditures but likewise in our war expenditures, because most of these billions of dollars are devoted directly to war activities.

There are many committees of this body now making investigations and studies of the various programs under these war agencies. We have been told that probably $2,000,000,000 have been saved through the renegotiation of war contracts. Almost every day those various committees are holding hearings to determine whether or not there is that efficiency, and whether or not these mandates for economy by this body are being carried out as successfully, as the American people are now demanding. Unfortunately it is difficult to effect retrenchment or reductions in these personnel supply bills, because there are certain obligations which must be met, but I should like to devote a few minutes at this time to a discussion of the report issued just a few days ago by the United States Civil Service Commission as of November 30, 1942.

We will recall that during the first World War, 1917–18, the peak of employment in the civil branch of the Federal Government was approximately 918,000. At that time we only had about four and one-half million men in the armed services. Today we have approximately one-third more men in the armed forces of our country, but this report of the United States Civil Service Commission states that as of November 30, 1942, there was a total of 2,750,101 persons employed in the civil branches of our Government.

I shall ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a table from the report showing employment in the year ending November 1942:

*Civilian employment and pay roll in the executive branch of the Federal Government*

| Month | Number of employees | | | Pay roll [1] | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Entire service | In Washington, D. C., metropolitan area | Outside Washington, D. C., metropolitan area | Entire service | In Washington, D. C., metropolitan area | Outside Washington, D. C., metropolitan area |
| 1941 | | | | | | |
| November | 1,545,131 | 199,283 | 1,345,848 | $237,398,486 | $33,938,499 | $203,459,987 |
| December | 1,670,922 | 207,214 | 1,463,708 | 254,453,319 | 35,931,301 | 218,522,018 |
| 1942 | | | | | | |
| January | 1,703,099 | 273,493 | 1,480,616 | 259,404,945 | 38,717,067 | 220,687,878 |
| February | 1,805,186 | 233,403 | 1,571,783 | 262,106,949 | 39,626,787 | 222,487,162 |
| March | 1,926,074 | 238,801 | 1,687,273 | 309,764,679 | 41,258,486 | 268,506,193 |
| April | 1,970,969 | 248,100 | 1,722,869 | 317,207,094 | 42,582,221 | 274,624,873 |
| May | 2,066,873 | 256,457 | 1,810,416 | 336,568,306 | 43,921,811 | 292,646,495 |
| June | 2,206,970 | 268,383 | 1,938,587 | 353,364,409 | 45,286,667 | 308,077,742 |
| July | 2,327,932 | 274,001 | 2,053,931 | 382,373,859 | 48,021,151 | 334,352,708 |
| August | 2,450,759 | 275,362 | 2,175,397 | 391,502,171 | 48,124,986 | 343,377,185 |
| September | 2,549,474 | 281,423 | 2,268,051 | 414,594,644 | 48,591,176 | 366,003,468 |
| October | 2,687,093 | 283,692 | 2,403,401 | 445,135,852 | 50,001,609 | 395,134,243 |
| November | 2,750,101 | 284,158 | 2,465,943 | 454,415,055 | 48,833,436 | 503,248,491 |

[1] In the Washington, D. C., metropolitan area last pay-roll period ends on various dates. Pay-roll figures accordingly represent the total monthly pay-roll cost.

That figure of 2,750,101 is approximately three times the peak reached during the First World War, notwithstanding the fact that we have only about one-third greater personnel in the armed forces today. I should like to read one or two paragraphs from this report. I quote:

Civilian employment in the entire Federal service totaled 2,750,101 at the end of November 1942, compared with 2,687,093 a month ago and 1,546,131 a year ago. This was a net gain of 63,008 employees, or 2.3 percent during November—the smallest net change in recent months. The net increase of 1,204,970 employees over the 12 months elapsed since our declaration of war may be attributed largely to an expansion of civilian personnel of the military agencies. The War and Navy Departments combined increased by 1,048,019 during the year, most of which occurred in field establishments outside the Washington area. Total Federal employment in the Washington, D. C., metropolitan area increased 42.6 percent from November 1941 to November 1942 in contrast to 83.2 percent in all other areas combined.

Although war activities have resulted in increases in nearly all branches of the Government service, the combined employment of War, Navy, and war agencies more than doubled during the 12-month period while all other agencies together expanded only 7.4 percent. In November 1942, all war establishments combined showed employment gains of 58,444, representing a substantial proportion of the net gain during the month. The War and Navy Departments alone constituted 64 percent of all civilian employment in the Federal Government this month as compared with 46 percent 1 year ago.

We all recognize the necessity of employing extensive personnel in these war agencies such as the Army and the Navy, but it is significant that the War Department total of 1,213,088 is far in excess of the total civilian employment of all the executive branches and bureaus and departments during 1918. I quote from this report further, giving you first the figures of the past year as compared with November of 1941, which is approximately the date of Pearl Harbor, presenting a picture for the first year of our participation in this war:

War Department: 1,213,088; a year ago, 431,082. Navy Department: 547,786 compared with 281,773 a year ago. Maritime Commission: 6,667; a year ago, 2,856. Office of Censorship: 12,283 with no employees a year ago. Office of Price Administration: 37,817, with no personnel a year ago. War Production Board: 20,843, with only 5,268 in November of 1941.

We have heard much criticism in this body during the past month reflecting the Nation-wide resentment against this effort to regiment, and coerce, and control the activities of millions of Americans who are loyally cooperating and who are eager in every way to assist in our war program; yet we find the Office of Price Administration on November 30 with 37,817 employees. Is there anyone in this body who can successfully contend that this huge number might not be reduced to 25 percent of that total with better and more efficient administration as a result? Then they might successfully

enlist the united cooperation and support of the American people at this time.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am very much interested in what the gentleman is saying. I just wanted to observe that this House authorized an investigation of the civilian personnel in October of last year. I am very happy to see that for the first time in more than a year the November figures show a smaller increase than those for any of the preceding 12 months.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes; but this report shows that during that year there was an average increase of about 100,000 employees each month, and there was a consistent increase. The gentleman might be interested in knowing that a year ago the total pay roll for the 1,545,000 Federal employees was only $237,398,486—that is the monthly pay roll; whereas on November 30, 1942, the monthly pay roll had jumped to $454,415,055, or approximately doubled. Bringing this down to an annual basis involves a total of about $5,500,000,000 annually as the amount required to meet the civilian pay roll of our Nation—not taking into consideration our armed forces.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Are the figures the gentleman just quoted for the country as a whole or just for Washington?

Mr. DWORSHAK. They are for the country as a whole. The Federal pay roll for the city of Washington for last November was $48,833,436, an increase of about $15,000,000 as compared with November of the preceding year.

I call attention to these figures because I believe that manpower is today one of the most vital issues confronting our Nation. It is true we cannot economize much in curtailing this Federal pay roll; nevertheless, today, as there is a Nation-wide demand for manpower on the farms, in the mines, and in our armed forces and our production plants, we must recognize that it is not only a matter of dollars and cents but that the Federal executive departments should immediately discharge all those employees who are not required at this time.

Mr. Chairman, manpower is the most vital factor today in achieving a military victory; not only must our armed services be adequately implemented but in our factories, in the shipyards, on the farms, and in the mines adequate personnel is essential if we are to coordinate our war efforts successfully. Every man, woman, and child must contribute something toward winning the war.

It is demoralizing for Americans to know that on the Federal pay roll are thousands of persons whose services are almost completely lost because of failure to adopt greater efficiency in the executive branch of Government. There is unrefuted evidence indicating widespread duplication of effort, overlapping of bureaus, and faulty supervision. I do not charge Federal employees with being less loyal or less patriotic than other persons because they have as much at stake in this present conflict. The war must not be used as a subterfuge for cultivating a bureaucracy as sinister and as menacing to the preservation of constitutional government as the threat of the Axis Powers.

One million persons can be discharged in the executive bureaus and agencies of Government without jeopardizing our national war effort. If the executive departments fail to act in a forceful manner, Congress must take drastic action through sizable reductions in appropriations, and thus keep faith with those on the battle lines and on the home front. This war cannot be won in Washington, but it might be lost here. It is our responsibility to prevent such a debacle.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, general debate on an appropriation bill provides a wide latitude of discussion. Subjects that are likely to become controversial usually are discussed during general debate on an appropriation bill. It is an occasion that usually provokes some tinge of partisanship. Some of us are critical of and others are defenders of policies.

It seems to me that it might be well under this first appropriation bill to try to establish something that might be said to be the tempo of discussion for this session of the Congress; in other words, to try to find a latitude, the latitude that will enable the minority to discharge its obligations as the opposition party and then, of course, according to the majority, that defensive position which it may feel necessary to resort to as the attack becomes pointed and pertinent. With that in mind, and especially in view of the presence of my beloved and distinguished majority leader here, I want to express the hope that, during the present session, as we indulge in the debates the majority will not adopt the attitude which was resorted to at a meeting of the Democratic National Committee a few weeks ago. When a certain diplomatic post was under consideration for appointment and when criticism was directed against the proposed appointee, according to the New York Times, the Democratic National Committee declared that the criticism of the appointment was, "A dastardly, treasonable plot to hamper the Commander in Chief."

Having the confidence that I do have in my very esteemed friend from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, I feel confident that he will at no time resort to an expression such as that or, even, have the spirit which found expression in that statement as we debate the merits and the demerits of any bill. Hearing no objection, I assume that that latitude will be accorded to us and that we need have no fear that a similar slurring, smearing statement will be laid at our door.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts. I will always yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. McCORMACK. The fact the gentleman hears nothing has prompted me to feel that my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania is of the opinion that being present his observation merits recognition by me. May I say that any observation made by my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania who has the floor merits not only recognition by me but profound respect for his opinions, even when I might disagree. Without regard to discussing the quotations of the Democratic National Committee, but coming to the other observation made by my distinguished friend as to debates in the House and their relationship to myself, may I ask my distinguished friend if he has ever observed any indication on my part of an attempt, an honest attempt to engage in anything other than what might be considered debate that has met with the profound respect for the views of others, those on your side and those on my side with whom I might disagree?

Mr. DITTER. I should answer the distinguished majority leader by saying, and I attempt no flattery in this, that I know of no man who embodies a finer spirit of tolerance and a more complete sense of what democratic processes should be than my distinguished friend from Massachusetts. He commands my respect, my regard, and my esteem. There was no fear on my part as to what the distinguished majority leader would say in answer to my inquiry. However, I was fearful lest the enthusiasm of others on the majority side might not permit the same degree of tolerance that my friend from Massachusetts has always shown. Since my friend is taking a part in the debate, may I say to him that I had intended to refer to him and to pay him a compliment today?

Mr. McCORMACK. Before my distinguished friend proceeds, he may put me in a position where I might be precluded from making this observation temporarily.

Mr. DITTER. He will never be precluded from making any observation when I have the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. I realize that, but it might be that the gentleman from Massachusetts may feel precluded from making it temporarily because he would not want the gentleman to yield at that time. May I say that I join, not only as majority leader but as a humble Member of this body of which I am so proud to be a Member, in everything that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has said about the debate being upon a high level, no matter how much we may disagree. Now, I do not want to make this a Damon and Pythias stunt, but my friend from Pennsylvania and everyone who has served with us before, knows of the profound respect I have for him, and that I think he is the ablest advocate of clean politics and an outstanding example of a high type of gentleman that I have ever met.

Mr. DITTER. I thank the gentleman, and again I am inclined to blush.

The reference that I want to make to the distinguished majority leader is a quote in the New York Times as of January 5, 1943, in which the majority leader is quoted as having said:

> If too many Republicans start thinking of 1944 politics, it will interfere with and prevent the Congress from making its maximum contribution to the successful prosecution of the war.

On behalf of the minority I think that we should thank the majority leader for the advice that he gave to the minority; but then I feel that we should remind him that since he was most generous in admonishing the minority, we hope he will not lose the opportunity of bringing the same counsel and advice to the Members on the majority side. Under present circumstances my impression is that few Republicans need worry about 1944 and that most of the worries as to 1944 are on the majority side.

If November 3 of last year points the way, then we need not start thinking of 1944, for the people did the thinking and started the ball rolling themselves. The majority is more concerned than we are over the problems of the 1944 campaign. I hope my friend will admonish the majority as he has admonished the minority.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania has a little justification for boasting.

Mr. DITTER. I attempted no boasting.

Mr. McCORMACK. That construction might reasonably be put on it. However, I did not rise for that, I rose to suggest to my friend that I hope he will eliminate the word "admonished" and substitute therefor the word "advised."

Mr. DITTER. Having regard for that nicety for words my distinguished majority leader has at all times, I shall be glad to make the correction. I confess that as a member of the minority and realizing the position of the majority, I thought it was in the nature of an admonishment. If the gentlemen intended it as advice we will accept it as such.

In his message on the state of the Union, the President held out the hope to the American people that the cumbersome and complicated administrative procedure which the New Deal forged as shackles on efficiency in government would be simplified. That was indeed an encouraging note. It was encouraging to the burdened taxpayers who have carried on their backs the costs of this ever-increasing weight of nonsensical red tape. It was encouraging to the baffled and bewildered businessmen who have striven to survive, despite the avalanche of intricate forms and confusing questionnaires heaped on their desks almost daily by ambitious administrators. It was encouraging to those few courageous souls who having ventured as officials into the labyrinth of administrative procedure, soon found themselves in a maze of contradictions and conflicts from which they could see little hope of extricating themselves without inviting invective and abuse.

The cumbersome and complicated administrative procedure which the President promises to simplify has not come into being as a result of the war. True enough, it has become more irksome as each new agency connected with the war effort has added its contribution to the spider web of authority and power which has been spun here in Washington. The web, however, was well under way long before the war clouds gathered in Europe.

Many of us were apprehensive when the initial moves were made which have resulted in the present complications. Despite the warnings which we sounded and the objections which we registered, resort was had by the New Deal to every possible excuse for the creation of additional alphabetical agencies. Every new agency meant a new administrator. Every new agency meant a new jealousy. Every new agency meant a new ambition to exercise authority and to wield power. A keen competition was the natural result. Every new agency provided an additional opportunity for rewarding the faithful. The mushroom growth of administrative agencies was reflected in the ever-increasing number of Federal officeholders as patronage privileges were passed out with a generous hand. Defeated candidates for public office blossomed over night into full blown administrators and deputy administrators. And in passing we might add that the overnight miracle continues despite the proposed simplifications.

Parenthetically, I may say that I am sympathetic to those who fell by the wayside on November 3. My sympathy goes out to them. I can well understand why overnight blossoming is called for.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. If the gentleman wishes to amplify the suggestion I have made about this "Miracle Whip" program, I shall yield to him.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I do.

Mr. DITTER. Miracle Whip is a commercial product. I am reminded of Miracle Whip as I see these administrators and deputy administrators blossom overnight, after they were brushed aside by the voters last November.

Now I yield to my distinguished friend from Florida.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I should like to advise the gentleman that in the Democratic cloakroom there is a box of Florida oranges which I have just caused to be placed there. I should like to have the gentleman go back there and eat a couple of them, and I extend that invitation to all the other Members of the House.

Mr. DITTER. May I say that the offer is in line with the usual hospitality I have enjoyed at the hands of my distinguished friend from Florida at all times.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. The gentleman is very kind.

Mr. DITTER. I have enjoyed the hospitality of his home. May I say to the gentleman that I think his present generosity is due in no small measure to the fact that he has a charming wife who leads him in the right way.

The jealousies, the ambitions, the competition, to say nothing of the system of rewards, which was a vital part of the development, provided fertile fields for the harvest of confusions and complications that we are reaping today.

The President's assurance of simplification serves as an admission that the warnings, which were sounded in the past against the dangers of bureaucracy, were well founded. Obviously, there would be no need for simplification were there no complications. If the wheels of this gigantic administrative machine were moving smoothly, if the cogs in the wheels were meshing together, the process would need no correction. There would be no advantage to holding out the hope of simplification.

Nevertheless, it is refreshing and heartening to have this admission of fallibility. A studied effort has been made to clothe the imperfections of the New Deal with garments of omnipotence and infallibility. Some were inclined to insist on a pledge of fealty which had the substance, if not the form, of an earlier day when loyalty demanded of the subject the declaration that the king could do no wrong. To have, even at this late day, the admission of fallibility in administrative procedure augurs well for the future. It should mean that criticism is invited, that suggestions are welcome, that mistakes are possible, and that the New Deal is subject to the same human frailties as is every other man-made device.

Once we come to this point, we have come a long way. I want to impress that upon the new Members. For a long time the impression has prevailed here that this thing called the New Deal was far beyond the fallibility of human frailty, that it was something out of reach, almost wholly above us at times, a sanctum sanctorum that we had to approach with a great deal of trepidation and with obeisance. But this admission brings it down to the human level. Shortcomings and mistakes are possible. It is not infallible. It can be criticized. It can be subjected to the searching light of inquiry and investigation just as any other human institution can be.

Obviously, if the assurance of the President is to be carried out, radical changes must be made. There can be no simplification if the conditions which brought about the complications are permitted to continue. In fact, I doubt whether anything can be accomplished unless there is a change in some of the fundamental philosophy of the New Deal. The pantomime, which we are witnessing today, of the spenders of yesterday treading on each others' heels as they hurry to find a convenient place in the economy corner, will not simplify administrative procedure. Something more substantial and realistic must be done. There must be an about face on New Deal thinking—a change in what the New Deal conceives to be the place of the Federal Government in our system of government and in what it has assumed to be its place in the daily life of every citizen. There can be little hope of simplification if the sovereign rights of the States are to be absorbed by an ever-growing, colossal, centralization of power. Nor can there be such hope if every opportunity is seized upon by the Federal Government to extend its control over the thinking and the acting of every man and woman in the country. A supergoverment, such as has been imposed upon us, cannot be simplified. Certain policies make certain sequences

inevitable. If what we think, and what we wear, and what we eat, and what we earn, and where we go, and what we do, are all to be policed, I question the possibility of simplification.

I am not dismissing from my mind the claim which I know is made that much of this policing is a part of the war effort. Some of it undoubtedly is. But, the regulating and regimenting of today, the intrusions on the lives of the individual citizen by a varied assortment of Government agents, differ only in degree from that which was set in motion when the "blue eagle" first screeched its praise of the N. R. A. An administration which conceived codes of fair competition as coming within the framework of our constitutional Government could hardly be expected to look with disfavor on ration books and the all-over regulating of the individual citizen.

If administrative procedure is to be simplified there must be a disavowal of the philosophy which found expression in the declaration that we will "spend and spend, and tax and tax, and elect and elect." Need I remind the House today of the place presently occupied by the disciple of the New Deal who coined this phrase as the marching song of the spenders a few short years ago? I confess that I find it difficult to reconcile a disavowal of a doctrine with a promotion in power and responsibility of the expounder of the doctrine. Disavowals do not take that form.

The "spend and spend, and tax and tax, and elect and elect" program was a part of, and a very important part of the development of administrative procedure. The two fitted together perfectly. In fact, they were dependent on each other. As one after the other of the administrative agencies were created additional excuses were available for more and more Federal spending which had to be met in part at least by more and more Federal taxing. The electing part of the process became the simpler as the spending became more widespread and the appointments to jobs became the more plentiful.

The war has brought home to the average American citizen the full force of the term "simplify." He has come to know just what it means in his everyday life. To him, it means doing without. Doing without many of the things that he considered indispensable—necessary for his convenience and comfort. And doing without is what simplify must come to mean to the New Deal if the cumbersome administrative procedure with which we are now weighted down is to be lightened. If every citizen is expected to tighten his belt, it is not too much to ask the administration to do the selfsame thing.

The responsibility for putting into effect the assurance of the President is divided. The Congress must do its part. But it cannot do it alone. If every executive agency resorts to subterfuge and cunning, if they avail themselves of every excuse for the continuation of activities, if they set out to intensify the frictions and complications so painfully apparent to every American, if they conceal the facts and figures which are pertinent to their operations, if their paramount purpose is the perpetuation of their own place in the sun, and if they are permitted to do these things by the President the Congress may find it impossible to accomplish very much toward simplification. I take the position that the executive branch of the Government shares with the Congress the responsibility for simplifying administrative procedure.

I am convinced the Congress stands ready to discharge its duty. I believe it understands fully the mandate of last November, when the American people registered so emphatically their disapproval of a continued course of incompetency, waste, and profligacy and demanded the restoration of sanity and common sense in government.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, if this Congress permits the regulation issued by the Manpower Commission the day before yesterday to stand, we might as well admit that we are helpless to act as a legislative body through this emergency. Certainly there is not a Member of this House who will contend that the Selective Service and Training Act was ever intended to be used for the procurement of industrial labor. This new regulation will create a very difficult situation in my own congressional district. Within that district we have several large defense industries, such as the Colt Patent Firearms Co., Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Corporation, Pratt & Whitney Tool Co., and others, and we also have there the home offices of many of the country's largest insurance companies. These companies, for the past several months have found it difficult to keep their employees, as many of them have been attracted by the wages paid in defense industries. About the only inducement the insurance companies have been able to offer their employees has been future security. Now those who pass up the chance of going into defense plants and the opportunity of receiving higher wages find that they must now go into the military service, regardless of the fact that they are married with young children to support, or else go into a defense plant. I am at a loss to understand how anyone in the executive branch of the Government can issue such a far-reaching regulation when it is certainly contrary to the laws passed by Congress.

When the Seventy-seventh Congress last amended the Selective Service Act, when it left this House, it had very definite language defining what proceeding would be carried on by local draft boards. It was very clear that no married man with children should be called into the military service while there were men without children subject to military service within that State. Somewhere along the line, either in the other body, or in the conference, that language was stricken out, but if the intent of Congress means anything, and I have usually understood that it does mean something, then certainly those in the Manpower Commission know definitely now that it was not the intention of Congress that married men with children should be drafted ahead of single men.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard in the past month numerous speeches from Members on both sides of the aisle objecting to the actions of some of the so-called bureaucrats in Government service. We have heard a lot about bureaucrats and bureaucracies. Frankly, I do not think that we can blame the bureaucrats for all of our troubles. This Congress must assume some of the responsibility itself. We should not sit back and wait for the bureaucrats to solve the problems we now face. For a long time we have known that this manpower problem was acute, but now, 14 months after Pearl Harbor, we have not solved the manpower problem by legislation.

I also want to refer to another problem that we failed to solve—the problem of how to make the best possible use of the facilities of our colleges throughout the country. I have in mind one medical school in Boston where last September they had seven applicants for every student they could accept in their medical school. These young men were perfectly able and willing, with the help of a scholarship in many cases, to go through the medical schools. But now I understand they are telling them that they will be taken into the military service and put in uniform, and instead of paying their tuition themselves, the Government will pay not only the tuition but give them a soldier's pay. By so doing we have not increased the number of doctors who will be available 4 or 5 years from now. Those men were willing to accept Reserve commissions and go into active military service upon completion of their education, but if this plan that is being discussed and has been proposed is carried through, and every graduate of a medical or a dental school in the United States is in the Army not only after he graduates, but while he is in school, where is our future supply of civilian doctors coming from? We know that the Army and Navy cannot take and should not take all of the doctors and dentists that the civilian population requires.

While we are talking about problems that this Congress must solve, I want to call your attention to a problem that we must face very, very soon, and that is the problem of providing adequate care for those who will be coming home from the hell of modern warfare, wounded and disabled. I do not want to see this Government make the same mistake that was made in 1918 and 1919 when men were brought back from the war and discharged immediately upon reaching the United States, and sent home with only a few dollars in their pockets, so few dollars that if they wanted to eat the second week they had to go to work the first week they were home. Thou-

sands of veterans of the last war are now in mental and nervous hospitals and institutions who never would have been there for any length of time if they had had adequate and proper treatment during the first year they were home. Men were discharged from the Army who even a layman knew were nervous if not physical wrecks. If those men could have had 4 or 6 or 8 months in some kind of a convalescent home, in some camp or even in a hospital, to allow themselves to become adjusted from the terrific strain of modern warfare to the comparatively simple civil life, many of those men who broke down later never would have broken down.

So I urge upon the members of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to start in now making plans to provide sufficient beds and sufficient care for those men who are so soon coming back to us broken in mind and body. In my own congressional district we have a fine veterans' hospital at Newington, Conn., containing 304 beds. The power plant and all of the utilities, the nurses' home and operating rooms were built with the thought in mind that that institution would be expanded to a 500-bed hospital. Incidentally, General Hines has, on numerous occasions, testified before committees of this House that a 500-bed general hospital is the most economical unit to operate.

I urge that we now provide funds to increase that hospital from 304 beds to 500 beds.

The additional 196 beds can be added at a lower cost per bed than can be done by building a brand new hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, these are discouraging days for Congressmen. In my mail this morning there was a picture of an elderly man, a storekeeper in a small village near my home, looking at a questionnaire from the Government and saying, "I am selling out. I am done. I cannot fill out all these questionnaires of the Government. I am giving up."

In the same mail from the same village came a letter asking me to ask for an appropriation of $5,000,000,000 to reimburse the people for their expenses in going to and fro to get their fuel and rationing cards. He made a careful list of his expenses, forced upon him because he must go personally to the central authority. The amount of gas he used to get his gas-rationing card used up much of his allowance. Numerous, indeed, are these complaints. It is more discouraging because we cannot seem to do much about it, except vainly protest.

I received in the same mail yesterday a communication stating that 1,000 people in one end of my small city were unable to get any kerosene for heating and cooking. I fear the patriotism of my people has been badly scorched. No wonder you worry about bureaucratic government on the majority side. We heard the speech made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas on yesterday, and speeches that have been made by other gentlemen on his side, but do not their faces get red when they recall how they voted for the last 8 years?

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman will look at the votes I have cast, I do not think he will find any cause to take exception to them in hewing to the lines of democratic and American principles.

Mr. GIFFORD. I said that because I well knew that you had voted contrary to your party's program many times and I thought you would have been disciplined by this time. But you would not like to apologize for the other gentlemen's votes, would you—for instance, the gentleman who has lectured us so much lately?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Exactly who do they have in mind by bureaucrats? Do they have in mind Mr. Brown or Mr. Wickard, or who is it?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, I cannot particularize.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. There are probably 3,000,000 of these bureaucrats.

Mr. GIFFORD. It is such a hateful name to me. I do not indulge in name calling anyway.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Do you think that now since we are going to have our former colleague, Mr. McKeough, from the Kelly-Nash machine in Chicago out there in the Midwest where they produce food, he will be able to iron the thing out any better?

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not know; I presume he will do the best he can; he at least ought to have the viewpoint of a Congressman.

The House knows my humility. Yesterday I listened to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and he stirred me quite a little. I tried to interrupt him. While I usually yield to anybody who wants to interrupt me, he hesitated to yield to me when I wanted to ask him a question. He is so overpowering; I admire him, really. He is a man of great stature; he is powerful in argument; he is a good lawyer, and one could not possibly take exception to him in his absolute correctness in quoting the law. But I did try to interrupt; and I may say in very good nature: "Great vessels may venture more, but little vessels must hug the shore." I am a little vessel keeping safely near the shore.

Certainly, he quoted the law correctly, and I thank him and I appreciate what he was trying to do. I am glad he freshened our minds on the law. I ought to know the law; I have been on the committee a long time, but I cannot always call these laws to mind perhaps because of brain fag; I cannot quote exact dates and the exact law, but I know that we passed an act in 1933 providing for $3,000,000,000 of printed money, supposedly national bank notes. We feared we would have to print money because the people might not be able to buy even 4-percent bonds. For some time we have provided that Federal Reserve notes should be issued for snakes from Burma if a bill of exchange was presented or on many kinds of property similarly acquired. Lately we use the Federal Reserve notes, protected by United States bonds. The Government should, and probably would, pay 4 percent on long-term bonds. They do not pay much interest on short-term securities, sometimes not more than one-half of 1 percent. As the gentleman said yesterday, it was cheaper to use the printed money already available than to print new money. But bear in mind that we have outstanding a tremendous amount of demand debt that is so highly dangerous that I want to hug the shore; I am frightened to venture much farther.

The Constitution states—and I shall repeat this over and over again until it gets in your mind—Congress may coin money, and fix the value thereof—yes; for the benefit of its own citizens, but not for the benefit of a Government to pay its own bills. Do not try to interpret it otherwise. Secondly, Congress can fix the standards of weights and measures. That is provided in the very same section. This does not mean that the Government can have a small peck measure as against the private citizen having the standard peck measure.

The gentleman from Wisconsin pleaded yesterday that we not lose faith in our currency. I agree with him. But he left the impression that he would venture more along the line he defended. I agree that it would hurt our currency but little at the moment even if we used the full $3,000,000,000. The method is highly dangerous and should be limited to a very small amount. Every country that has ever tried printed money based only on national credit has had disastrous results. Examples are plentiful. We should profit by others' experiences. It should not be done and it is entirely unnecessary at the present time. If the Government needs money, let it borrow from its citizens the same as you and I have to borrow, and pay at least competitive interest on it. I suggest we should pay 4 percent to the people when we take away their money, not 1½ percent. Many rather poor people are buying bonds from a patriotic impulse and we want them to hold them for a long period after the war, but they cannot do that unless a fair return is received.

Certainly they should be entitled to more than 1½ percent. The Government should pay this tribute exactly as you and I pay it. There is, of course, plenty of gold back of Federal Reserve notes. But that gold does not belong to the Government; that gold belongs to the people; that gold came into the various banks as deposits. We forced them to send it to the Federal Reserve banks and the Government would not let even them keep it. The Government took it but gave a mortgage in the shape of a gold certificate for that gold which belongs to the people. But let the people try to get it back. This administration fears to give it back. If you were privileged to take a $20 note to the bank and receive a $20 gold piece, they would hand you a gold piece that would be about

one-half as large as formerly. Our people would then learn what we have been doing toward "watering the currency." The authority lies here in Washington to redistribute this gold, returning it to the people who really own it, but they seem to fear this practical demonstration of "coin clipping."

The question raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin yesterday was that they were within the law technically, although there was a reverse process. The Government did not furnish a bond to the Federal Reserve and get credit on its books; no, the Federal Reserve was expected to furnish only security to the Treasury with no interest or penalty attached.

It was the beginning of a process that we do not want continued—the step in procuring money without payment of interest.

We passed that $3,000,000,000 act in the belief that the public could not, or would not, buy bonds at that time. That act should have been repealed long, long ago. When you hint at silver worth 30 or 70 cents according to whether it is domestic or foreign, and issued at $1.29, I earnestly urge the immediate repeal of that act also.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, the course of the debate this afternoon has been on a high plane and to my way of thinking has been most constructive. Frankly, I have been very much encouraged by the indication on the part of the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee that they are determined to take the bull by the horns and cut here and there in a courageous manner so that economy may be practiced, so far as nondefense expenditures in our Government are concerned.

May I also express my admiration for the membership of this committee by saying that I feel from their remarks made on the floor here at least that they are equally determined to assert the authority of the Congress against a growing demand of an ever-increasing bureaucracy which is asserting its power and authority more and more over the people we wish to represent back home.

I was particularly encouraged when I heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] earlier this afternoon say that he was through giving any blanket checks or giving the executive department of this Government further permission to write blank checks to increase this bureaucracy as it has been increased during the past years.

In the time allotted me today I shall elaborate upon the remarks I made a short time ago on the floor of the House when I protested some of the various steps that have been taken to regiment and to regulate the daily lives of people of every district in this country. May I say here and now that if the prestige of this Congress is to be maintained, further encroachments upon its power and upon the powers of the judicial branch of our Government must cease. It is our duty today and from now on to regulate the Budget of this Government so that the bureaucrats will be cut in such a way that they will not exercise any further arbitrary influence and authority over the people of the United States.

I wish to point out at this time that I consider it my duty to rise in the House on every occasion that I can to defend the American principles and privileges of the individuals back home and to fight in every way that I can for their welfare and against the encroachments of bureaucrats upon the peoples' rights.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does not the gentleman believe that the plan proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] on yesterday, to limit use of the penalty mail on the part of the bureaucrats or the bureaus, or at least cut it down 50 percent, will be a good step in the direction to which the gentleman wishes this Congress to go?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It was my privilege and pleasure to listen to the gentleman from Wisconsin yesterday when he put forth his proposal. I heartily concur in what the gentleman from Iowa has just stated. When I heard the statement that $300,000,000 was used last year to pay the communications bill of the administrative departments of the Government I was amazed. I was shocked that such a condition existed. Yet I could only conclude the correct figure must be somewhere in that neighborhood because it was so staggering. It is evident that the authority they are using has gone beyond all reason and is superseding the right and prerogatives of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to protest the deliberate encroachment upon the authority of the Congress and to condemn the authority that has been given the administrative agencies of this Government. In my opinion, they are proceeding illegally on a good many fronts. They are assuming that Congress has given them authority in many cases, whereas the Congress has not done so, and it behooves every Member of the House, whether he is on the majority side or the minority side, to take cognizance of the way they are flaunting their powers in the face of the elected representatives of the people. I maintain that from now on it is either Congress or the bureaucrats. There can be no halfway course. Either you are going to surrender your powers to these administrative agencies of the Government or you are going to reassert your authority in this session of Congress before it is too late.

I maintain further that these people are proceeding with about 10 percent authority and 90 percent bluff. They are deliberately proceeding illegally in a good many cases that they are called upon to settle. They are made bold by the apparent hesitancy of Congress to question their prerogatives. They are made confident by the green light they have been given by those high in authority in this Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, everyone agrees with the gentleman's statement, if correct. I was wondering if the gentleman would give us a bill of particulars as to who was committing these illegal acts and what particular illegal acts they are committing. Of course, in court you would have to give a bill of particulars. You realize that?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes; and I am prepared at this time to give a big bill of particulars which the people of my district have passed on to me.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman would not make the statement unless he had some information particularly on the 10-percent law and 90-percent bluff proposition. That will be a pretty big bill of particulars, I know, but I am sure the gentleman can give it in his extension of remarks.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will give it right now. I say that the Office of Price Administration is assuming powers that were never meant to be assumed by that agency, so far as the Congress is concerned. When it tells a pleasure driver that he cannot have his coupons for gasoline or that he must have his license taken away from him if he violates a petty regulation that they have made, I say that is illegal. I say that the Congress of the United States is the authority which should first write into the law regulations of that kind, and I contend that the Congress has never given such a prerogative to the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to enter into any dispute with the gentleman because personally I want to get all the gas I can; but then I owe a responsibility to my country in war. Does the gentleman think the Congress could legislate from time to time 2, 3, or 4 gallons of gas, depending upon the exigencies abroad?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have never disputed the right of the rationing agency to limit me to 3 gallons per coupon or 2 gallons per coupon, but I do dispute the right of any agency of government to make their own rules which supersede the courts and also the powers of the Congress. I also protest their snooping upon this or that individual citizen. They are superseding the rights that have been given them by Congress, and I protest it as a Member of this body.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, in addressing the House at this time, I desire to tell our colleagues something about a special canteen service, sponsored and maintained by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of California, whose headquarters are in San Francisco.

This organization is making an outstanding contribution to the war program, and I am pleased that my fellow San Franciscans foresaw the need, and as a Member of Congress, I am glad to assist in furthering its splendid objectives.

This canteen service is entirely directed by veterans of previous wars, and has been in existence about 1 year. Through past experience these veterans are well equipped to understand and handle existing conditions in our present world crisis. The purpose is to furnish absolutely free, comforting necessities of life to the men in uniform. All branches of the Nation's war forces are served, whether hospitalized, en route, or overseas. This, of course, does not mean that the canteen service expects to give necessities to all the men in our services. That would be impossible, and would require a fund running into millions and millions of dollars, but as an instance, they serve men who are stationed in areas far from post exchanges. The supplies given out are sometimes only obtainable when the chaplain visits these distant posts. The men at these places, of course, are paid but cannot buy the articles. Many such places are scattered throughout the areas where our troops are operating. Then again, when men arrive at American ports without funds and awaiting orders to report to some other station.

Quantities of articles, far too numerous to list in full, have been delivered to our boys. To give an idea of a few, I have picked at random the following:

Over 11,000,000 cigarettes.

Over 200,000 bars of candy.

Over 20,000 bars of soap.

Nearly 40,000 packages of chewing gum.

More than 100,000 packages of razor blades.

Thousands and thousands of tins and sacks of tobacco.

About 2,500,000 pieces of writing paper and envelopes.

These items make an imposing list and this special canteen service may justly take pride in its accomplishments. Although it is organized and operated entirely by Californians, the service goes impartially to uniformed boys from all 48 States of the Union, as well as the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

Working entirely out of sight of the general public, and with all direct publicity prohibited because of wartime regulations, this canteen service works closely with the chaplains and morale officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. These officers are in best position to know where the needs are greatest, and are cooperating wholeheartedly in distributing the merchandise. Letters of acknowledgment and appreciation have been received from American boys in uniform throughout the world.

I would like to read two of these letters, one from the Army and one from the Navy. The Army letter, dated Fort Mason, Calif., September 19, 1942, and signed by Maj. William E. Millikin, special service officer, reads as follows:

I am writing to acknowledge receipt of and to extend my thanks for the two cases containing 20,000 Chesterfield cigarettes delivered to me September 17, upon my request to satisfy an urgent demand. These cigarettes were placed on a bomber early the following morning and flown to a task force in the southwest Pacific, where, I am sure, they will be thankfully received by men fighting the battle of the United Nations in that area.

I desire to express not only my personal thanks but the thanks of the special service officer and the men of this task force for this generous contribution from the canteen service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The Navy communication, on the letterhead of the twelfth naval district, Treasure Island, Calif., dated September 21, 1942, is addressed to J. R. Klawans, State administrator of Canteen Service, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and is signed by Enoch Jones, chaplain. The text is given in full herewith:

This is to express my thanks to you and to the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the splendid way in which you have responded to meet some of our needs here on "Treasure Island," by providing us with cigarettes, razor blades, soap, and other things for the health and comfort of many of our men here.

Those who made possible this aid to our men would be interested to know that most of the men who receive these articles are survivors of ships sunk by the enemy, some of them having survived two or three sinkings; therefore, they arrive here without these articles and with little more than the clothing they wear, which might be a discarded Australian soldier's uniform or a pair of discarded dungarees. Our friends therefore realize what a boost it is to the morale of these men to know that they have friends who welcome them back home with provisions for their health and personal comfort.

On behalf of these men, as well as myself, I wish to express our deep gratitude for the fine way in which our friends have responded to their needs.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Canteen Service is a nonprofit organization, maintained through voluntary contributions. In addition to some 70,000 display cards throughout California, many Veterans of Foreign Wars posts throughout the Nation contribute regularly each month, as well as do many private enterprises and individuals.

This special canteen service deserves every American's support, and I deem it a privilege to go on record offering my services in this worthy cause.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill down to and including page 3, line 7.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COURTNEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, 1944, H. R. 1648, had come to no resolution thereon.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole two brief tables from a Civil Service Commission report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to ask the majority leader if he can tell us the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to advise my distinguished friend and the House of the program for next week.

On Monday the bill providing for a merger of the Western Union and the Postal Telegraph companies will come up for consideration. There will be 1 hour of debate on the rule, and I believe the rule provides for 2 hours of general debate. If there is a roll call on the passage of this bill, or any other roll call on Monday, it is my intention, if it is agreeable to the House, that they be postponed until Tuesday.

On Tuesday the resolution providing for the extension of the life of the Dies committee will be considered.

On Wednesday and Thursday there will be general debate on the Independent Offices appropriation bill. That bill will not be considered under the 5-minute rule, which I may say for the information of the new Members is the amendment phase, until the following Monday.

Mr. TABER. There will be no votes on that bill until a week from next Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct.

Friday is the anniversary of Lincoln's birth, and, of course, many Members have speaking engagements for that day. I make this statement so that any Members having such engagements may know that there will be only general debate on Wednesday and Thursday, with no roll calls on those days, and they can make their plans accordingly.

I may say in connection with the appropriation bill now pending that we are meeting at 11 o'clock tomorrow in the hope that the bill may be passed tomorrow.

May I also say that in talking with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] earlier in the afternoon in connection with arrangements for general debate on the independent offices appropriation bill he told me he is very eager that when that bill is considered under the 5-minute rule a week from next Monday that the bill be passed on that day. I know the members of the committee on the Republican side will cooperate in every way possible to have that appropriation bill passed on that day.

That is the program for next week.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), the House, under the order heretofore adopted, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 5, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Friday, February 5, 1943. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 649, "For the organization and functions of the Public Health Service."

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet at 10:30 a. m. Friday, February 5, 1943, in room 356, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The Committee on the Public Lands will meet at 10:30 a. m. Friday, February 5, 1943, in room 224, Senate Office Building in a joint meeting with the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys for the purpose of hearing testimony on the George Washington Carver National Monument.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

153. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a report on alien registration submitted by the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service under date of February 1, 1943; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

154. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

155. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the cost of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

156. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowance to certain officers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

157. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the second report of the Attorney General covering the period from October 1, 1942, through January 31, 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 91. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 92. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 93. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1670. A bill to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PACE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1408. A bill to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, approved June 3, 1937, as amended, so as to include the cost of all farm labor in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities; without amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the Union Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 579. A bill for the relief of Barbara Healy; with amendment (Rept. No. 94). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1459. A bill for the relief of Alvertine Nast and Wayne Nast, minor son; with amendment (Rept. No. 95). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1584. A bill for the relief of Howard M. Sandus; without amendment (Rept. No. 96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1667. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 97). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1685. A bill for the relief of Eva C. Netzley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Redley, and the estate of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff; without amendment (Rept. No. 98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 1686. A bill authorizing the payment of necessary expenses incurred by certain Indians allotted on the Quinaielt Reservation, State of Washington, in securing their allotment; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 1687. A bill to regulate the practice of shorthand reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 1688. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 1689. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to the control of rents; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 1690. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1691. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 1692. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1693. A bill to place enlisted men in the Marine Corps on an equality as to pay with enlisted men of the Army of corresponding grades and ratings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 1694. A bill to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1695. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1696. A bill to exempt certain religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and education organizations from the requirement of withholding tax at source on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHIFFLER:

H. R. 1697. A bill to exempt persons in the military and naval forces of the United States from Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 1698. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to aid in stabilizing the cost of living," Public Law No. 729, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1699. A bill to amend section 12B and section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act during the continuance of the war and for 6 months after the cessation of hostilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 1700. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1701. A bill to protect and enhance the social-security benefits to all persons inducted into the military service, and to provide a cushion for post-war conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 1702. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1703. A bill authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in the honor of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary on June 1, 1946, of the statehood of the State of Tennessee, admitted to the Union on June 1, 1796; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 1704. A bill for the relief of owners of certain properties rendered inoperative by reason of restrictions arising from the war effort; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 1705. A bill to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class mailing fees upon resumption of publication; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1706 (by request). A bill to authorize and direct the Veterans' Administration to provide vocational rehabilitation and assistance in securing suitable employment for service-connected disabled veterans in need thereof and feasible therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 1720. A bill to extend air-mail services to all persons equally and to provide for the transportation of mail by air without surcharge; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. Res. 100. Resolution granting a gratuity to Mrs. Alyce W. Sinnott; to the Committee on Accounts.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1707. A bill for the relief of Antholula S. Maskas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 1708. A bill for the relief of Perley M. Silver; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 1709. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Sgt. Alvin C. York as a colonel in the United States Army and then place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1710. A bill for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1711. A bill for the relief of A. T. Steele and J. C. Corbitt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1712. A bill for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 1713. A bill for the relief of Charley R. Bayless; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 1714. A bill for the relief of Patrick Henry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of California:

H. R. 1715. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maia Virtudes Torres Steere; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 1716. A bill granting a pension to Clyde C. Delaney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. R. 1717. A bill for the relief of the General Exchange Insurance Corporation, Richmond, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Miss STANLEY:

H. R. 1718. A bill for the relief of Garnet Charles Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 1719. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eliza V. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

77. By Mr. HERTER: Petition of the Brookline Taxpayers' Association, Brookline, Mass., urging strict economy in Government expenditures and the adoption of a pay-as-you-go taxation plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

78. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Edmond C. Fletcher, petitioner, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to impeachment of the Honorable Wiley Blount Rutledge, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

79. By Mr. DWORSHAK: Senate Joint Memorial No. 2, adopted by the twenty-seventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging Congress to broaden and liberalize the administration of the duties of the Federal joint dehydration committee of the Agricultural Marketing Administration so as to permit the orderly establishment and development of dehydration plants and facilities to increase production of dehydrated potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

80. By Mr. DWORSHAK: Senate Joint Memorial No. 1, adopted by the twenty-seventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging Congress to take necessary action to authorize hospitalization of veterans of this war; that a veteran of the present conflict discharged on or after December 7, 1941, be considered a veteran of a war and be entitled to hospitalization for treatment as indicated or care of any disease or injury, regardless of the nature or origin, when such treatment is required; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We pray Thee, our Father in Heaven, to send us forth to meet the challenge of this day, whatsoever it may be. Let us become kings of truth and justice until grief and sorrow have fled and mankind no longer moans beneath the iron yoke of political and religious tyranny. Open all hearts, our Father, to accept the light of a good God, through Jesus Christ our Lord, humanity's King and Saviour.

We ask Thy richest blessings upon those who seek to help their fellows, who guard our homes, teach our youth, and minister to the sick. Grant that all hatred and resentment may be banished afar and melted into the peaceful fruits of love and contentment. Oh, lead us to take the things of the spirit and make them very real to our hearts, with the deep certainty that no earthly affluence can atone for poverty of soul. Wilt Thou glorify Thyself, O God, and let the royalty of Thy grace build up thy people in humility and sacrifice. Keep us all in the sincerest sympathy with those great souls who fanned the feeble embers of democracy into a glowing flame of freedom which is destined to sweep the heart of the world. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Historical Records Survey carried by the W. P. A. made a report on that work. It is of great interest to everyone interested in the history of the country, I think. The report will cost $22.50 more than is allowed in the regular congressional allotment. I ask unanimous consent that this may be published notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE MANPOWER SITUATION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving telegrams from furniture manufacturing companies and other civilian industries in my district protesting the latest order of Chairman McNutt. This is my answer:

This will acknowledge your wire of February 4 concerning the status of your employees.

This order "Work in necessary defense plant or be drafted" is one of the craziest of many crazy orders issued by McNutt. It would mean chaos in all nondefense industry. It is the same as removing the foundation from under a house and expect the house to stand up and continue to serve minus its foundation. Peacetime occupations that provide for the needs of the civilian population is the foundation under the entire war effort. Remove the peacetime occupations and the entire war program must fall. I cannot see how this crazy order can be carried out. Our civilian structure supports the war structure. Anything that tends to destroy the civilian structure must of necessity destroy the war structure. For that reason I call this order of McNutt's a crazy order. It should be revoked and I shall do what I can to have it rescinded.

N. M. MASON.

[Here the gavel fell.]

HON. RALPH R. ROBERTS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the employees of this great legislative body from the lowest to the highest are today feeling a thrill of pride over the election of one of their own number, Ralph R. Roberts, to the office of Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives. This reward has come to Mr. Roberts after 20 years of faithful service to the House. It is strictly a reward of merit and it will be stimulating and inspiring to all who have chosen, or will hereafter choose, a career of service to this, the greatest of all legislative bodies in the world. Mr. Roberts is a Hoosier by birth and comes from a fine old family at Rockport, Ind. The State of Indiana will deem itself honored by the honor which the House has fittingly conferred upon this worthy son of Indiana.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a news article appearing in the New York Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

YOU CANNOT SUBSIDIZE THE FARMERS OF VERMONT

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PLUMLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief editorial from the Dallas News on the subject of 1943 protein shortage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a joint resolution of the State Legislature of Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE FARM LABOR SITUATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, here is a letter along the same line as those read into the RECORD recently by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]. This comes from the wife of a farmer.

> Unless both Houses of Congress awaken we are going to be robbed of farm machinery, men, and food by the traitors who are both buying and selling us day by day.

Then she gives a list of farms in her vicinity that are going out of production for lack of machinery and farm help.

She adds a P. S. She cannot be very disloyal because she writes:

> I have three sons in the service and two more of draft age who are going.

But the woman is discouraged as are thousands of other women by the confusing orders of the administration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Mississippi Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I understand there has been a change in the program for Tuesday and I would like to make inquiry of the majority leader if that is so?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. In addition to the program I announced on yesterday, the Smith resolution will be taken up on Tuesday after the Dies resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is providing for the investigation of the different departments of government?

Mr. McCORMACK. The resolution gives them authority to conduct an investigation of any action, rule, procedure, regulation, order, or directive taken or promulgated by any agency, which I assume means department or independent agency of the Federal Government, where complaint is made that such action is beyond the scope of the power or authority granted by Congress. There are other provisions in the resolution, but it is more or less confined to an investigation to see whether these rules and regulations are beyond the scope of the authority granted by Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As I understand it, there have been issued as many of these orders having the effect of law as there have been laws passed by Congress in the past 10 years.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not be a bit surprised.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

UNSPENT WAR APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the President's Budget message, transmitted to Congress on January 11 last, contained the statement that—

> There are available about $170,000,000,000 of unspent war appropriations and authorizations; about two-thirds of this amount is already obligated or committed. Further appropriations will soon be needed to permit letting of contracts with industry for the next year.

It occurred to me on reading this statement that it might result in considerable confusion if a somewhat detailed statement were not presented to show the situation as of December 31, 1942, as it then existed, and projected to June 30, 1943, with respect to obligations, commitments, expenditures, unobligated balances, uncommitted balances, unexpended balances, and so forth, with respect to the entire war appropriation and contract authorization program of some $241,000,000,000 made during the period from July 1, 1940, to December 31, 1942.

Accordingly I requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to assemble and analyze all of the program finances from these standpoints so that I might make it available to the Congress and the country. The statement is an excellent one and presents a clear picture, both actual and prospective, as to the status of these funds. It should be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Public Printer estimates, in a letter to me of February 3, 1943, that this material will require four and three-fourths pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $213.75.

Briefly, the statement shows that all of this vast sum will have been placed under obligation by June 30 next with the exception of approximately $8,000,000,000.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including the statements from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, February 8, immediately after the address by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SELECTION OF DOORKEEPER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer a resolution (H. Res. 101), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That Ralph R. Roberts, of the State of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. Roberts appeared before the bar of the House and took the prescribed oath of office.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, February 10, 1943, after the legislative business of the day and other special orders, my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] may address the House for 30 minutes about China.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROVISION FOR THE READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS ON FEBRUARY 22

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on February 22, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] may be permitted to read Washington's Farewell Address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from John B. Weatherwax, attorney for the Associated Publishers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include certain letters and documents in the remarks I expect to make this afternoon in the Committee of the Whole.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944 and for other purposes

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1648, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, 1944, with Mr. COURTNEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Payments to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation on account of reductions in interest rate on mortgages: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation such amount as the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury is equal to the amount by which interest payments on mortgages and real-estate sales contracts held by such Corporation have been reduced during the fiscal year 1944, and prior thereto, in accordance with the provisions of section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, approved May 12, 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1016), as further amended by act of June 27, 1942 (Public Law 629); such payments to be made quarterly, beginning as soon as practicable after October 1, 1943, $7,400,000.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 3, after line 21, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used directly or indirectly during the fiscal year 1944 for the purchase, procurement, storage, guarding, checking, or transportation of silver under the provisions of the Silver Purchase Acts, namely, the act of June 19, 1934, and the act of July 6, 1939, or for the carrying out of any of the provisions of said Silver Purchase Acts."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield for a preliminary question?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the purpose of the gentleman to yield for questions that will give enlightening information?

Mr. CELLER. I will be very happy to yield reasonably.

Mr. Chairman as the result of the Silver Purchase Acts of 1934 and 1939 requiring the Treasury Department and/or the Federal Reserve to purchase all newly mined silver, there has been purchased to date something in the neighborhood of 3,000,000,000 ounces of silver, now a huge stock pile stored at West Point, N. Y. From the information of experts that I have received, it is there serving no useful purpose and is tarnishing, despite the fact that that silver is a highly important war product that should be used in the war industries, to help us destroy the Axis. My amendment is wholly in the interest of the war effort.

It is difficult to imagine the size of 3,000,000,000 ounces, but I will give you some concrete idea of what 3,000,000,000 ounces really are. Imagine a stack of silver dollars as tall as the Washington Monument, 555 feet high, and then imagine 65,000 of those identical stacks. This will give you an idea of what 3,000,000,000 ounces of silver are, when bunched together. The entire sterling and plated-ware industry could subsist on those 3,000,000,000 ounces for 178 prosperous years—prosperous years I emphasize.

Roughly, about one-half of that silver is used to back currency. The other half is what is known as free silver. Take out any bills that you have in your pockets, whether they be silver certificates, national currency, or Federal notes, and I wager you have rarely, if ever, looked at the reading matter on those bills. As currency, one is the same as the other. We do not need any silver to back our currency. Our great Nation, with its untold wealth, is sufficient backing to give full faith and credit to any promises on any currency certificates that the Government may issue. Any issue by our great and glorious Government in the hands of the public will be accepted as legal tender without question, silver backing or no silver backing.

The War Production Board has been importuning persons, particularly in another distinguished Chamber, to be permitted to use that silver as a substitute for copper, tin, stainless steel, antimony, aluminum, and lead—all needed in war industries—but the door is slammed in the faces of the representatives of the War Production Board.

The administration does not wish to have these purchase acts remain on the books and in testimony before the Treasury Department Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Secretary Morgenthau said last year and reiterated the same sentiment this year:

So far as I am concerned, I would be glad to see Congress strike the silver legislation completely off the books.

Thus the administration does not want these silver-purchase acts. It properly feels that to keep purchasing newly mined silver at the pegged price of 71 cents per ounce is asinine. It, in a word, feels that to keep augmenting that huge mountain of silver by continuing to buy more and more silver is ridiculous. It feels it is absurd to immobilize that huge stock pile of silver at West Point and prohibit its sale or use save for more limited purposes. I have bills pending before the Ways and Means Committee to do a real job of wiping out these useless, senseless statutes. It may take some time to get hearings on those bills, but meanwhile this Chamber should discharge its duty to the Nation and endeavor to indicate to the Nation its wishes; therefore I have asked that no moneys be appropriated for the Treasury Department for the purchase, procurement, transportation, for the storage and for the checking of this great vast monument of useless silver erected to false silver gods. I am sure that if William Jennings Bryan, the great exponent of silver, would come into this House of Representatives today and you were to ask him a question whether we need that huge stock pile of silver, he would answer in the negative. Therefore we should chisel through the base of this monument erected to a false god, this monument of folly, this obelisk of absurdity.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from New York has said that he has a bill pending to change the program in reference to the issuance of currency. Does it provide for eliminating the Federal Reserve banks and to have the Government issue the money directly?

Mr. CELLER. Oh, no; it has no such purpose and it is not the intent of my bill to bring about such a result. The primary purpose of the bill is to do away with continuous purchase of new silver.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Do I understand the effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to prevent the Government from buying silver, which will find a ready market in industry?

Mr. CELLER. We cannot very well in this appropriation bill prevent the Treasury Department from purchasing the silver, because unfortunately that silver is purchased by the Federal Reserve, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What does this amendment do then?

Mr. CELLER. All this does is to prevent the Treasury Department from making outlays of any money whatsoever in connection with the purposes of the Silver Purchase Acts, incidentally in connection with the purchase or storage or guarding of it, the checking of it, or the transportation of it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then the amendment is not really accomplishing much, although it might well be interpreted as the sentiment of the House.

Mr. CELLER. It is helpful in the sense that it is an indication of what the Congress intends to do. The gentleman may recall that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] attempted in another body to make certain changes in the Silver Purchase Acts in order to release that silver for war industries, but he was balked in his efforts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I was interested in one statement the

gentleman made about the War Production Board. Is it not a fact that the War Production Board is actually trying to put some of the industries out of business anyway? Certainly they have failed to fully cooperate in keeping plants going when it would have been easy to do so without interfering with the war effort.

Mr. CELLER. I would not say that. The War Production Board is hampered by these Silver Purchase Acts; it cannot get this silver to replace the strategic metals in the war work. It cannot allow the use of silver for civilian industries, for the silver-plate manufacturers, the photoengravers, and so forth.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The War Production Board is preventing many industries from using silver they have already bought and transported here from Mexico and now have in their factories.

Mr. CELLER. The War Production Board is taking the mere trickle that it gets from the Defense Plants Corporation, through the Treasury Department, for use in war industries. It is a mere trickle. This is how it is done, may I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts. The Treasury Department is precluded from selling its silver except at $1.29 per ounce. It purchases the silver at 35 cents an ounce, practically the world price. Nobody would buy it for $1.29. The price is too high.

This is what the Treasury does. By bypassing the Silver Purchase Acts it "lend-leases" a small portion of this metal to the Defense Plants Corporation as though it were lending the silver to itself. This certainly is a subterfuge, although supported by an opinion of the Attorney General. For example, when one of the war industries says, "We are in urgent need of copper; we cannot get enough copper; give us some silver to use as bus bars to conduct electricity"—and silver works as effectively as copper in that regard—then the Defense Plants Corporation lends these silver bars to the defense plants to be used as bus bars in the war effort. That is called a nonconsumptive use. It means that the identical silver bar must be returned to the Treasury after the war, in the same form, shape, quantity, and size. It cannot be used for a consumptive use. It cannot be melted down and used to make important implements or parts thereof, to be placed in antiaircraft guns, artillery, planes, submarines, tanks, and searchlights.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York that I am in sympathy with what he is trying to accomplish, because the situation at present is intolerable. I believe the War Production Board has not been very sympathetic and has been more or less negligent in handling the problem. However, I would not want people to get the idea that we are accomplishing very much here today, for we are simply making a gesture as to the intent of Congress. Other and more positive legislation will be needed.

Mr. CELLER. I admit that my amendment just indicates our intention. It marks whither we are going. We must do that. We must indicate to the people how ridiculous and woefully fallacious it is to keep these silver-purchase statutes on the books. Silver is a slacker metal. I want to put silver in uniform, to make silver fight. It is time to get mad about silver.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If you get "mad" about some other things, too, we will be all right.

Mr. CELLER. Let us get "mad" and adopt my amendment as the first move, as the prologue of what will follow. If the Axis came here with their saboteurs and did not find the Silver Purchase Acts on our books, they would pay $1,000,000,000 to have those laws written on our statute books, because they help the Axis by making us starve in the midst of plenty. They deprive us of a very important metal. We have plenty of silver and we cannot touch it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. For the sake of the record, who put these acts on the statute books?

Mr. CELLER. I reluctantly state that it was done by a Democratic administration in a moment of aberration. We made a mistake, but we will be making a greater mistake, Republicans and Democrats alike, if we continue the blunder. It has been made known to the gentlemen how ridiculous these statutes are. Let us take some steps to change them. We would otherwise be derelict in our duty.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes in order to answer some pertinent questions on the silver issue.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman states that silver is unavailable for war purposes. Does the gentleman know that there are 46,000 tons of free silver allocated to the defense industries? They were allocated in May, and the defense industries have been able to take 22,000 tons of this silver. There remain available 24,000 tons of the silver to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman admits it is proper to allow that mere trickle of silver to go to the War Production Board, then let us allow all of it to go. The W. P. B. wants all of it. Give it to them. Help win the war.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman call 22,000 tons a trickle?

Mr. CELLER. There is no need to have that silver where it is—at West Point—not an ounce of it. Whatever silver the W. P. B., by virtue of a most unusual opinion of the Attorney General, has been able to wheedle out of the Treasury Department can only be used for most limited purposes—nonconsumptive use, to wit, only practically for bus bars and the like. You have deprived silver of its many other chemical and metallurgical uses.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the gentleman's contention that 22,000 tons of silver is a mere trickle?

Mr. CELLER. I admit that that amount has been allocated, but with ridiculous lend-lease strings attached to it. It can be used only for the manufacture of bus bars, in electrical manufacturing plants, and that is the limit.

Mr. WHITE. But——

Mr. CELLER. Oh, wait a minute. The gentleman has asked the question and he has got to take what I have answered. Silver can be used only for bus bars and after the war must be returned to the Treasury, it cannot be used in airplanes, it cannot be used in tanks or guns, it cannot be used in searchlights; it must be used only for what is called nonconsumptive uses. I want no strings attached to the silver that may be used in the war effort. I want to use it so that the boys on the front can have use of the silver. As I said, I want to put it in uniform, and make it do war work. Today it is doing work for only some 60,000 people of the Silver States, and the only ones benefited by these acts are the 60,000 miners, and the potbelly owners of the mines, of 6 or 7 western Silver States, who have by a tremendous bluff forced these statutes on the Nation, and now it is time to puncture those potbellies and destroy this monument of silver, erected to asininity and selfishness.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, whatever the intent of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may be, his amendment, as it is drawn, will not put silver "in uniform," as he says he wants to do. The thing that the amendment proposes is to take away the possibility of keeping the guards and the records, and to take away the possibility of transporting the silver that the Government already owns. The amendment provides that—

No part of the money appropriated may be used for the purchase, procurement—

Those things may move in the direction he wants, but listen—

storage, guarding, checking, or transportation.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. Of silver acquired under the purposes of the Silver Purchase Act. I am sorry. The gentleman has had ample time. If you provide that no part of this appropriation may be used for the storage, guarding, or transportation of the silver purchased under the Silver Purchase Act, then the silver will be perfectly sterile, and it will not be put "in uniform" or anything done to put the silver into industrial use. It will effectually stop the Treasury from using the silver it now has for bus bars or any of the other purposes, such as the Treasury has found it can use the silver for, under existing law. In other words, whatever

the gentleman from New York has in mind, the amendment offered does not accomplish it. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is no difficulty in determining whose ox is being gored today. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] explained that thoroughly, and I agree with what the gentleman from South Dakota had to say about it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? My ox is not being gored.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, wait a minute. I am talking about the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. I cannot yield as to that.

Mr. CASE. I am glad, then, to have the record clear on that point.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not that funny? I was not talking about the gentleman from South Dakota at all, I was talking about the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who seemed to be speaking for the commercial users of silver. The gentleman from New York will recognize it. Here is what is plain as can be. The manufacturers of jewelry have been getting it in the neck, and I note the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] nods his head in the affirmative, yes. That is the reason we have this amendment. It does seem silly that nothing shall be done to protect the silver if nothing is done to prevent the purchase of the silver. The gentleman admits that we cannot stop them from buying it by this amendment. He says it is just a gesture, and then he goes on and admits that the Democrats—no, not the Democrats, but the New Deal administration—made a mistake when they passed this bill. I say to you Republicans, when the New Dealers come in here and confess their sins and repent, even if it is nothing but a gesture, let us help them in their gesture, and maybe their repentance will go down deep enough some time later so that they will come along with legislation that strikes at the evil. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] said he is in sympathy with the purpose of this amendment. We all want to vote for legislation that will repeal this Silver Purchase Act. I offered a bill in 1935 or 1936 for that very thing, so that if now they are only making the motion, let us help them, and soon we may have real action.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. COMPTON. If this amendment is adopted, who is going to take care of the silver and protect it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I suppose the same authorities who would take care of and protect any Government property. They would take care of the silver. I do not imagine they would give it all away, or let the gentleman or myself go down with a truck or a wheelbarrow and help ourselves.

Mr. CELLER. The silver is purchased by the Federal Reserve System, and that System has nothing to do with this bill. There will be plenty of guards, and the gentleman need not worry about that. The silver will not be left unguarded.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We can count on the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE], and the silver bloc in the Senate to protect all the silver we can buy.

The amendment should be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: On page 3, after line 21, add a new section, as follows:

"No part of any money appropriated in this title shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee who engages in, or directs or authorizes any other officer or employee to engage in or carry out section 3 of the act approved June 19, 1934, known as the Silver Purchase Act of 1934."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. As I heard the reading of the gentleman's amendment, it seems to me the intent of that is merely to stop the purchase of new silver?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, I find the same fault with the Celler amendment that was found by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. It will interdict the use, transportation, and storage of silver that we have already acquired. The principal purpose of the Congress, I think, and the principal objection to the silver purchase program as it now exists lies in the continuing purchase of silver and in the subsidy provision that is contained therein. For that reason I offer the same amendment that was offered last year, in the month of February, to be exact, to the same bill, and which was first approved by a vote in Committee of the Whole and subsequently defeated on a teller vote by only three votes.

Today I appeal to you for support of this substitute amendment. When it was offered last year, as recorded on page 996 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my good friend the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. LUDLOW] had this to say:

Personally I have a great deal of sympathy with the objective which my friend the gentleman from Illinois seeks to accomplish. I think the Silver Purchase Act is an indefensible subsidy. If he would introduce a bill and let it take its regular legislative course, I would talk turkey with him on it, because I really have strong convictions on the same side that the gentleman is on with respect to this proposition.

That came from the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] who is presently also chairman of this subcommittee.

May I say to him that I did introduce a repealer in the Seventy-sixth Congress, in the Seventy-seventh Congress, and in the Seventy-eighth Congress, and if energy permits and I am permitted by the grace of God and the sufferance of a generous constituency in Illinois to remain a Member of this body, I shall continue to introduce a repealer until this very indefensible act is taken from the books. It is inflationary, as indicated by the fact that silver certificates in circulation jumped from $401,000,000 in 1934 to $1,920,000,000 in 1942. Here is Mr. Henderson of O. P. A., here is Mr. Byrnes, the stabilizer; here are other agencies of Government that are seeking to put a capstone upon prices in the country and prevent inflation; yet here is an act upon the books which has multiplied the silver certificates in circulation by nearly 400 percent, and the Congress has been remiss in its duty in not having expunged it from the books before.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I cannot yield just now.

The Secretary of the Treasury is against this act and wants it taken off. On page 404 of the hearings last year he said:

So far as I am concerned I will be glad to see Congress strike all silver legislation from the books.

This year in the hearings he said substantially the same thing. In December at a press conference he said the same thing. Here is the man who presides over the monetary destinies of the country suggesting within the limit of his power to the Congress to expunge this from the books, and yet we have failed to do so.

The Economists National Committee on the 20th of April 1942, representing the finest monetary minds of the country, has memorialized the Congress to take this from the books.

On the 31st of October the Saturday Evening Post editorially said:

There is no use for the high priests of the silver set to continue this disastrous policy. It is time for less goggle-eyed statesmen to take over.

That is an appeal to the Seventy-eighth Congress to act, and to act today, upon this matter.

On the 18th of December the New York Times said:

The fight should be renewed promptly in the coming session of Congress, and this time the objective should be to sweep clean away the whole structure of silver subsidies.

Mr. Morgenthau, in his press comment on December 14, reiterated that very thought.

In the January issue of the American Mercury, Mr. Elliott V. Bell, who is superintendent of banking for the State of New York, provides an article entitled "The Scandalous Silver Bloc."

On the 20th of March 1942 there appeared this quotation from Marriner Eccles, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board:

In view of the war situation it is all the more urgent that the inflationary effects of the silver program be removed and that so far

as possible the materials, machinery, and labor now devoted to silver production be utilized in the war effort.

There is a big businessman. There is the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board.

Under a release of April 1942 he makes a public statement in which he says that the inflationary effects of silver should be removed.

The American National Retail Jewelers Association said in a letter addressed to all Members of Congress on the 28th of December:

Why, in the name of common sense, is it that the vast stock of silver is buried at West Point when it could be made available first and most important for all war industries, and, next, for the silver business?

I could go on and read testimony after testimony from authorities in high places that this is something to which the Seventy-eighth Congress should address itself in forthright fashion and now.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I wish to call attention to a fact in which I think all Members of the House are interested, namely, that the Ways and Means Committee, following the lead and suggestion of the Treasury and the group that believes that the thing to do is to tax the people to drain off their spending power to stop the threat of inflation, are defeating that effort by this very subsidizing of silver.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it not singular that Milo Perkins, Administrator of the Board of Economic Warfare, licenses every export of silver to make sure that it does not fall into the hands of Hitler, and yet we immobilize silver; we take it from one place in the earth and transport it across the country and then bury it in a hole in the ground at West Point surrounded with troops; so we are immobilizing a very valuable and critical war material. The time is now for the Congress to go on record and to strike once and for all this indefensible policy from the books. I recognize that the substitute has its limitations, but it at least will be a stimulant and an incentive for the House Banking Committee and the Coinage Committee to get busy at once and to repeal all of the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934. We have enough silver now to provide four dozen or more teaspoons for every man, woman, and child in the United States of America. What an amazing thing. It is immobilized, having no value, and yet the silver people, having so carefully conducted a campaign with the Treasury that when they release the silver it is only a temporary release for an emergency use and must be returned, it cannot be employed in so-called consumptive uses. It in fact is but a loan of silver for industrial uses and must be returned to the Treasury.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

The gentleman speaks of inflation. Does the gentleman know that the Federal Reserve currency has been inflated by two and a half billions in the last 6 months, and does he know that it is being inflated at the rate of half a billion dollars a month? And on top of that we are putting out $66,000,000 Federal Reserve bank notes that do not have a thing behind them in the way of security except the promise of the Federal Reserve bank?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Shall we try to remedy one wrong by adding another wrong to it? Both wrongs should be corrected instead of following the policy of our good friend from Idaho of loading one more wrong upon another; and so it becomes necessary today to begin attacking the problem. Do not be fooled by this talk that they have released 497,000 ounces of silver and that they are being generous to the war effort. Not an ounce of that silver but what has to go back into the Treasury for monetary purposes; that is the provision they tie to it. There was a mandate from the people of this country on the 3d of November 1942, and this will be our first real occasion in the Committee of the Whole to stand up and reecho that mandate to the people of the country and show that the Seventy-eighth Congress has got its feet on solid ground; and we propose today in a great swelling crescendo to say to the people that this is one of the first things we shall do in pointing the country in the direction of a policy that is fundamental, that is sound, that is sensible, and that is designed to get this country back once more on the high road of a sunlit prosperity.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us whether or not his substitute amendment will release some of this hoarded silver to the avenues of trade to get industries going and keep them in operation without putting them out of business?

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is directed entirely at the continuing purchase of silver under this subsidy plan through which we have already spent about $550,000,000 in subsidies to about 60,000 people who are identified with the silver industry. It is as far as we can go on an appropriation bill. Under the rules of the House we may not add anything that is legislative or anything that gives affirmative direction to the Treasury Department. We have got to do the best we can. We should rise in support of this amendment, and then direct the appropriate committee to take action looking to the complete repeal of the Silver Purchase Act.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can get an agreement on time?

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. LUDLOW. Can we make it 20 minutes?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment to the amendment pending at the desk on which I should like to be heard. This is perhaps the most important question that has been before this Congress this year. I do not think debate on this involved amendment should be cut in just 20 minutes.

I object for the time being.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes. Surely everyone can be heard in that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not think we should be foreclosed.

Mr. TABER. Is that on this section and all amendments thereto?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. Does that mean that the time will be divided among those who stood at the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. LUDLOW. There were only seven Members who stood up.

Mr. TABER. Thirty-five minutes ought to cover it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think this issue is too important to the people to be foreclosed by an abridgment of debate. It is untimely at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. And I want to reserve to myself 2 minutes to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I want at least 10 minutes to answer this argument, and I want it understood that I may have 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Chair announced that, without objection, something would be done. None of us heard what that was.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] asked unanimous consent to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to all three amendments, the original amendment, the amendment to the amendment, and the substitute therefor. I am not much of a parliamentarian, but it seems to me that this is an unparliamentary procedure to attempt to tack on an appropriation bill something which ought not be done that way, and I hope the committee will take note of that matter. It seems to me that this is an attempt to change the funda-

mental law of this country regarding money by a makeshift, slipshod, ill-considered method. Even if it were a commendable thing to do, this is not the proper manner in which to do it, on an appropriation bill.

What is the issue here? We have heard a lot said today about inflation. We have heard it said our use of silver brings about inflation. Talk about straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. It may be that our monetary supply is being increased slightly through the use of silver, but not more than increased business demands, and it is a very trivial increase compared with that increase which is taking place through the issuance of Federal Reserve notes and through the tremendous increase of bank credit. Such inflation as has occurred in this manner is but a drop in the bucket to the total inflation that is occurring in these war days.

Who is going to be benefited if we wipe out all silver legislation from the books? Evidently Members on both sides of the aisle who are proposing these amendments want to wipe out all recent silver legislation. I repeat, who will benefit thereby? This proposed measure, so far as it affects our money, indirectly goes contrary to article I, section 8, clause 5, of the Constitution of the United States, which every one of us has taken an oath to uphold and defend.

The Congress shall have the power to coin money.

The fathers who wrote the Constitution of the United States intended that we should have metallic money. We do not talk about coining paper bills or currency. Only gold and silver can be coined and made a legal tender in payment of debt, according to many men's view of the fundamental law. What do the movers of these amendments want?

I fear they want us to do away with the kind of money which the fathers intended we should have and substitute another kind of money, bank currency. I am not now condemning that kind of paper money, but I have some questions concerning it even on its own merits.

I want it understood, as the gentleman from South Dakota stated, that my ox is not being gored by these proposals. I have not a penny's worth of personal interest in any silver mines. It is true that my State produces silver, but it produces silver in connection with copper. If you are going to repeal any law, why not repeal the law of nature which places the precious metals along with the baser metal deposits in our land. Our copper mines, zinc mines, and lead mines all contain more or less silver. If you kill silver as a commercial product—while it is a critical metal—you will also do great harm to the other strategic materials, such as copper, lead, and zinc. The contention that we must put silver into the war is pure propaganda. That is a smoke screen to hide another purpose. Something else is wanted. Our war effort has not lacked for silver, statements to the contrary notwithstanding and I have heard the best friends of silver express desire to use silver fully in the winning of the war and the peace.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] for 4½ minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I think this House wants to be fair. I think its Members want to be informed about an issue as important to business security and the welfare of the American people as this issue is. I cannot present even the essential facts in the limited time of 4½ minutes. I therefore appeal to the House. I do not think the plan that is being followed here is fair to its Members or to the country.

In the brief time at my disposal I am going to proceed to give you a few facts.

What are the opponents of silver money seeking to strike down here? They are seeking to strike down the only monetary program of the Government on which the Treasury is making a profit—the monetization of silver under the provision of the present law—which provides for the use of silver produced in this country for money, just as gold produced in foreign countries is used for money at a handsome profit to the Government and at no expense to the taxpayers. I will read section 4 of the Domestic Silver Purchase Act:

SEC. 4. (a) Each United States coinage mint shall receive for coinage into standard silver dollars any silver which such mint, subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, is satisfied has been mined subsequently to July 1, 1939, from natural deposits in the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

(b) The Director of such mint with the consent of the owner shall deduct and retain of such silver so received 45 percent as seigniorage for services performed by the Government of the United States relative to the coinage and delivery of silver dollars. The balance of such silver so received, that is, 55 percent, shall be coined into standard silver dollars, and the same or any equal number of other standard silver dollars shall be delivered to the owner or depositor of such silver.

The provisions of the law are plain. There is no subsidy mentioned. The silver miners simply bring in the silver they produce and contribute 45 percent to the Government and receive in return the remaining 55 percent coined into dollars as their share, or its equivalent in money.

There is nothing in this law said there about price. We simply provide that the money metal produced by the miners of this country shall be coined into standard silver dollars, Uncle Sam taking 45 percent of that silver produced by our mines as his.

What has been accomplished under that law? Let me read from the monthly Treasury Bulletin and the statement of the Treasury that comes to your desk daily. I am going back to the 30th day of September and the Treasury Bulletin of that date. As a result of the operation of this law, the Treasury of the United States has put into circulation $2,000,000,000 in dollars and silver certificates. What profit have we made in doing that? On referring to the silver seigniorage tables on page 78 of the September Treasury Bulletin you will find that the Government has made $816,900,000 profit in the form of seigniorage in buying silver at the statutory and market price, revaluing it and putting it in circulation as money. Is there anything wrong about the Government's making a profit and putting money into the channels of trade without borrowing it from the banks and paying interest on it?

Let me show you from the Treasury's reports how the Government's silver accounts stand. The surplus silver obtained under the operations of this law as shown on the Treasury statement of September 30 amounts to 1,337,733,452.4 ounces. In other words, 45,000 tons of silver that has not cost the taxpayers of this country a nickel—silver that is now going into war industries.

I have no time to go into the testimony of Mr. Brownell, heading the company that is the largest buyer of silver in the world, and show you that there is no shortage of silver, but the nonconsumptive needs of the war industries are being met by allocating this surplus silver to the defense industries. The consumptive uses are being more than met by the allocation of foreign silver being imported at the rate of 100,000,000 ounces annually. The Treasury has another stock of silver on hand amounting to 5,000,000 ounces in a separate category that it is supplying to our war industries. The Treasury is permitting the jewelers, the very people who have laid down a barrage of misleading and false propaganda against silver, to buy all the silver they want for their uses at the domestic price of 71.11 cents plus the freight, but these jewelers do not want to do that. What they are driving for is cheap silver and the destruction of our interest-free silver money.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Does not the gentleman know that no silver is being imported at this time, that we cannot import it?

Mr. WHITE. If the gentleman will consult the Treasury and the War Production Board, as I have, he will find that silver is coming into this country at the rate of 108,000,000 ounces annually. Read the testimony of Mr. Brownell, president of the American Smelting & Refining Co., that I have here.

Mr. CELLER. Read the hearings.

Mr. WHITE. I do not have time to present the facts. It is too bad that an issue of this importance should be kicked about here and the Members of the House should permit parliamentary manipulation to keep them from having the facts. This issue means so much to the welfare of the people. We are heading into a Niagara of inflation. Let us leave one island of redeemable money in this deluge of irredeemable paper tokens that is flooding the country as an anchor for business and our national economy.

Surely the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois, who preceded me, are familiar with the regular daily and monthly reports of the Treasury that come regularly to every Congressman's desk—Treasury statements that show the profits the Government has made in purchasing silver and

using it as money. Can it be possible that these gentlemen have overlooked the silver-seigniorage table appearing on page 80 of the last monthly bulletin of the Treasury for January, which shows that the Government has made a profit of $245,700 in the form of the seigniorage on the minor coins alone, and when we come to the seigniorage on silver dollars and silver certificates we find that the Government has made $818,900,000. A part of this seigniorage profit is represented by the surplus silver amounting to 1,296,223,206.5 ounces, or 45,000 tons, appearing in the Treasury statement as an item in the general fund at its cost value of $627,773,861.13. To get some idea of the actual profit the Government has made on the Treasury silver purchases and the issuance of silver money, we can deduct the cost of the surplus silver from the profits shown in the seigniorage table of $818,900,000, and we find that the Treasury, besides obtaining this surplus silver, has made an additional profit of $191,126,139.

I say without fear of contradiction by either the gentleman from New York or the gentleman from Illinois or anybody else that no government of any country at any time has ever made as large a profit on any program that created and put redeemable money into circulation.

If these gentlemen have consulted the Treasury reports they must know that all the 45,000 tons of surplus silver has been allocated to the Defense Corporation for nonconsumptive use and is being delivered as fast as it can be used. The facts are that this allocation was made on May 26, 1942, delivery was started on June 6, 1942, and at this late day, February 5, 1943, only 22,000 tons or less than half of this silver has been taken by the Defense Plants Corporation for the use of our war industries, and if they have taken the pains to consult the Treasury and the War Production Board and ascertain the facts, they must know that there is a surplus of silver available now to supply both the consumptive needs and the nonconsumptive needs of the war industries. The consumptive needs of the war industries are being supplied by the allocation of foreign silver being imported at the rate of 108,000,000 ounces annually.

Besides the allocation of foreign silver for the consumptive use of the war industries the Treasury holds an additional and special stock of silver amounting to 5,000,000 ounces of so-called ordinary silver obtained by refining silver from mixed gold bullion of which 4,000,000 ounces remained to be delivered at 45 cents per ounce on priority allocations to the war industries. If they have consulted the Treasury and the silver bullion dealers as I have they must know that the silver requirements of the jewelers and silver manufacturers for civilian use can be filled by the purchase of domestic silver at the statutory price of 71.11 plus the freight by a special concession of the Treasury. The records disclose that there is an excess over their purchases on these terms amounting to 2,000,000 ounces in October, 1,200,000 ounces in November, and 500,000 ounces in December which these silver consumers permitted to flow to the Treasury. In face of these facts how can these gentlemen support the statement they have just made on the floor of the House to anyone cognizant of democratic and republican ideals, one dedicated to advancing the welfare of labor and the preservation of American living standards and the other pledged to the protection of American industry from the competition of cheap foreign goods, produced by cheap foreign labor.

The contention of my eminent colleague the Democratic Member from New York [Mr. CELLER] and the illustrious Republican from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], that the miners' share of money coined from the silver bullion they produce is a subsidy, is out of harmony with American ideals when we consider the policies of our Government in establishing and maintaining domestic price levels, particularly wheat and cotton by Government financing. As a result of this financing, the price of wheat at Buffalo is $1.50 per bushel. Across the line at Fort William, in Canada, the price of Canadian wheat is 90 cents per bushel. Cotton is selling for 7 to 8 cents per pound in Brazil, while our Government maintains a price of 20 to 21 cents a pound in our domestic market. The subsidy to maintain this price for wheat is costing the Government $50,000,000 annually. The cotton subsidy is around the same figure—$50,000,000 annually.

We were told yesterday by our colleague from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the petroleum industry alone is receiving a Government subsidy at the present rate of $250,000,000 per year and it is planned to increase these payments to $400,000,000 annually. Think of a $400,000,000 gift to the oil industry on one hand, and on the other hand this proposal to degrade our silver miners down to peon pay and living standards in order that a few selfish jewelers can buy 50-cent silver and a few profiteering bankers can swell their interest yield on unredeemable paper token money.

Fellow Members—we have a grave responsibility in this time of financial stress. We must not be stampeded by a few self-seeking profiteers into undermining the financial structure of our country by destroying the only redeemable money we have.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Celler amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT to the amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: After the word "purchase" in the Celler amendment, strike out the comma and insert the word "or", and strike out the words "storage, guarding, checking, or transportation."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in order to clarify this situation I am offering an amendment to the Celler amendment. If adopted, the Celler amendment would read as follows:

No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used directly or indirectly during the fiscal year 1944 for the purchase or procurement of silver under the provisions of the Silver Purchase Acts, namely, the act of June 19, 1934, and the act of July 6, 1939, or for the carrying out of any of the provisions of said Silver Purchase Acts.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will preserve the Treasury's right to store silver and guard it and transport it and check it, because it seems to me that is absolutely essential. I do not disagree with the purposes of the substitute amendment. I know the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has in mind the identical purpose I have in presenting the substitute amendment. However, it seems that, by perfecting the Celler amendment as I have sought to do, we meet the situation frankly and directly.

Just what is this situation in respect to silver? We can hardly discuss silver without taking into consideration the policies in respect to gold and the use of direct obligations of the Federal Government, bonds, as security for the issuance of Federal Reserve notes.

Back in 1934, when these acts were passed, we were faced with deflation, a noticeable appreciation in the value of our currency. We perhaps did not have enough currency in circulation to supply the demand. Now, however, we have too much, and must do an about-face, or we are going to have disastrous inflation in this country. We must repeal the silver acts; we must repeal the gold act; we must repeal the act which authorizes the use of direct obligations of the Federal Government as security for Federal Reserve notes, or this country will enter a chaotic inflation period from which it might never recover. This is the only effective way in which we can reduce the pressure against the inflation ceiling, and I hope it will be adopted.

Just in retrospect, let us see what has happened in respect to silver. A very estimable gentleman named Rene Leon appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency in 1933 and advocated a silver-purchase program as a means of expanding our foreign trade. We asked him in particular about China, a country which has a new nationalism and which is our frontier market today. He said that it would help China. We adopted the silver-purchase proposal. Under that we purchased all of the monetary silver China had, forced China off the silver standard, and forced her to tie to the British pound sterling. Every dollar of trade we have had with China since then has been through the back door of London, England. That is why this amendment should be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, the silver-purchase program of our Government for the past 8 years presents one of the most outrageous frauds upon the taxpayer that has ever occurred and, at the same time, is a monstrous absurdity in its denial of the use of silver for war purposes. It is unbelievable that the special interests of a few of the Western States of our country should have such complete control over these programs which have operated to the disadvantage of the rest of the country, but it is nevertheless the fact.

To arrive at a proper determination of our course of action today, it is perhaps well to trace the history of the origin and operation of the silver-purchase program. Shortly after President Roosevelt

took office in 1933, he issued a proclamation directing the mint to buy all domestic silver at a price of 64½ cents an ounce. At that time, the market price was 43½ cents and by the Executive order the silver producers were automatically granted a 50 percent subsidy. A few months later, the Congress enacted what is known as the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 which directed that the Government buy domestic and foreign silver without any limitation as to price or quantity until the ratio of silver to gold reached the point of 1 to 3. A year later, that act was amended to require the Secretary of the Treasury to pay 77½ cents an ounce for domestic silver with no limitation on the price for foreign silver but requiring the latter to be bought. Subsequently, the price was changed for domestic silver by legislative fiat to 71 cents an ounce regardless of the current market price. This is still the law and the purchase program must continue until the open-market price reaches $1.29 an ounce or until there is $1 in silver in the Treasury for every $3 in gold.

At the present time, the open-market price of silver is approximately 35 cents an ounce and the possibility of it reaching $1.29 is ridiculous. The last time silver reached $1.29 an ounce was in 1874 and although the current open-market price is 35 cents an ounce, were it not for our Government purchasing program, the price would immediately sink to 10 cents or 15 cents an ounce.

It is equally ridiculous to expect that our silver purchases will reach the ratio of $1 to $3 with gold. At the time the act was adopted, had we purchased slightly over a billion ounces, this ratio would have been reached, but along with it has been operating the gold-purchasing program so that we are today no closer to achieving the ratio than we were 10 years ago.

The purchase program cannot be substantiated on the grounds of augmenting our so-called good-neighbor policy with Latin America since out of the 20 Latin-American countries, only 2 produce silver in any quantity and even with those countries there is no reciprocal arrangement by which this country obtains some advantage in return.

Through the operation of the silver purchases, we have built up a stock of approximately two and a half billion ounces, the greater part of which lies dormant and unusable in the vaults at West Point. This quantity cost us $2,100,000,000 or an average purchase price of 84 cents an ounce. If the purchase program were to be suspended, it is variously estimated that the open market for silver would be from 10 cents to 20 cents an ounce. Taking the most generous figure as the basis for computation we come to the conclusion that the stocks of silver which cost us slightly over $2,000,000,000 are now worth not more than $500,000,000. In other words, during the 8 years of its operation, the silver-purchase program has cost the American taxpayer $1,600,000,000 and no great benefit or advantage has been obtained except for the few private interests in a few mountain States of the West.

But even more outrageous than the tremendous cost which the program entails is the fact that none of our stocks can be used in war industries, although there are countless ways by which it might be put to work in substitution for other strategic metals. True, a portion has been released for war purposes, but the representatives of the silver States have seen to it that their interests have been protected by attaching a requirement that any silver released for war purposes must be returned to the Treasury in bullion form at the end of the war. The result of this is to circumscribe very narrowly the uses to which silver might be put.

It is time for the representatives of the taxpayers and the public generally throughout the country to speak out their mind in open indignation against the continuance of such a program as this. While the immediate issue before us may not be the proper way technically to correct a bad condition, it is the only way available to us at the moment and should be done if for no other reason than for the Congress at this time to notify the administration of its complete dissatisfaction with this original "baby" of the New Deal.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I hope this committee will not vote on this matter without thoroughly understanding what we are voting on. There is only one issue. The Celler amendment is in effect, when finally analyzed, nothing more than a gesture. The substitute amendment and the amendment to the Celler amendment do only one thing, and that is admitted; it prohibits the payment of a subsidy to the miners of silver. Do you want to do that? That is the question I ask you gentlemen now. Every one of you who was elected, was elected upon the theory that you were coming here to do everything you could for the war effort. A vote for this amendment is a vote to stop the mining of copper, lead, and zinc, whenever it is mined in connection with silver, and about 35 percent of these strategic ores are mined in connection with silver. You have been paying men, who have been mining silver in connection with copper, in connection with zinc, and in connection with lead, a subsidy, and it is absolutely necessary to have so much money for silver in order to mine copper, to mine zinc, and to mine lead. Are you now willing to take the subsidy from silver, and say to these men who are working diligently in spite of the high prices of labor and material, who are struggling to keep their mines open in order to produce these strategic metals—are you willing to say to them we will take these subsidies away from you, although we have been giving you a subsidy for some time, but we will continue to subsidize cotton and we will subsidize practically every other commodity used in the war effort; but in the case of the strategic metals, which we must have to win the war, we will strike down in Committee of the Whole, without any hearing, without any record being made, without having these people given a fair chance to tell their story, without doing this job in a proper legislative manner—we are going to stop the production of the very things that will win this war if it is won, and that is copper, lead, and zinc? We cannot mine these strategic ores unless you pay us a subsidy on silver.

You say in this amendment that we are not going to pay a subsidy on silver; that we are going to strike out of the bill everything of that kind. You gentlemen are far too fair to do a thing like that. Do away with all this monetary talk, do away with all this talk about silver as a money, wipe that off the books, if you want to, but ask yourself the question whether or not, as proper legislators, you are willing, because there is some complaint on the part of the silversmiths in New York not getting sufficient silver, because they have raised a row about it and have a big lobby here in Congress—are you willing to stop the mining of copper, to stop the mining of zinc, to stop the mining of lead, when you know these minerals are necessary in order to win the war? Are you going to do that simply because you are not willing to pay a subsidy on silver when it has to be subsidized so that these other metals may be produced? That is what you are doing, and that is all that you are doing. You can talk about money all you want to; this is a matter of doing a thing that ought to be done in order to carry on this war effort, and you men are all pledged to do that.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it not true that if this amendment is agreed to it will be of great benefit to the manufacturers of silver jewelry—a nonessential?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Oh, so far as the manufacture of jewelry is concerned, that is not involved. It would not make much difference to them whether this is passed or not, because these people can get what silver they want by paying 71 cents for it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it not rather interesting that Governor Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, who comes from the gentleman's own State, who is interested in winning the war also, would like to see these statutes taken from the books?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I regret that my time is up and that I cannot answer your question.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I oppose all these amendments. The silver-purchase question is one close to me personally, not only because I happen to represent a district where this metal is mined very extensively but also because I have experienced throughout my life the effect of the removal of props or supports to industry by the Government.

Fifty years ago, my father started the manufacturing of silk gloves and hosiery in the town of Hornell in western New York. He was one of the pioneers in manufacturing in that part of the United States. Things went well until the Cleveland administration, when the tariff was removed and father was put in competition with the cheaply paid labor of France and Germany. His competitors were strong enough to take their factories to other countries and get other help there. My father finally was forced to sell out and close. This was my first experience with Government subsidies and tariffs.

As a young man I went to the State of Colorado and entered into the cattle-raising business and have ever since been so engaged. But never would I have been able to remain in that business had not there been a tariff to protect me from the importations of beef from Argentina and other countries where taxes, labor, and other costs of doing business were less. Our great livestock industry would be nonexistent, and the consequent development of the West would never have come about without such protection as we have had. This also applies to the beet sugar raised in my State and other farm and livestock products. There is a close analogy between the tariff on manufactured articles and farm products and the question presented by the silver legislation. The Government policy of buying silver from the western mines under the Silver Purchase Act had the simple effect of protecting the miners from the ruinous competition of foreign silver, mined by cheap peon labor. We would be unable to compete, just as we cannot make textiles to compete with those of India or Japan, or beef raised in the Argentine. If it is subsidization to pay our silver miners enough for their product to allow them to mine it, then such subsidization is imperative.

In wartime there is another aspect to the question. If silver were a metal of no strategic importance, if it were of no value to our economy of war or to the sinews of war, I would not be making this plea for the miners who dig it. No industry or class which does not have its contribution to make toward winning the war should have the attention of this body at this time.

Doubtless, most of you have read much concerning the new and varied uses to which silver itself is being put. It is a highly important metal for many war purposes, and it should be supplied in full measure. My colleagues from the West agree that it should be so used, and certainly no impediment should be placed in the way of the Government using all the silver it needs for materials. I am not going to dwell on that phase of the picture, however, because it is my intention to bring out another point with which many of you probably are not so fully acquainted.

Silver ore is not found, in the Colorado mountains, by itself, but is associated with other ores, especially zinc, copper, and lead. All of you know something of the critical shortages existing in copper and zinc. In Colorado, the sources of the zinc, copper, and lead now going into the war effort have been almost entirely silver mines. Silver has paid the bill in the great majority of these mines and without silver they would not now be open. Without the Silver Purchase Act, none of these vital metals would have been produced in a fraction of the quantity presently being mined. The exploration and development of new mining territories would not have been under way and our shortages of these necessary ores would have been desperately acute if not disastrous without this assistance. Withdraw the prop which is suppporting our whole mining program by removing the silver price, and the progress of the war program will be seriously impeded. Any effort toward the elimination of the Silver Purchase Act is a blow at the silver mines of our Nation and because silver is found with copper, zinc, and lead, it would further complicate the already serious bottleneck in our supply of strategic metals.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I resent the accusations that have been made against the mining industry of Colorado and other Western States by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. Since coming to this Congress I have formed a high opinion for the distinguished gentleman from New York. I admire his ability and recognize him as one of the leaders here, but I am sure that he did not mean to say what he did this morning, when he referred in unsavory terms to the mine operators of the West. Is it not a rather silly picture in which we find ourselves? Here we are called upon to produce more strategic metals for the war effort. Almost every day the War Production Board is issuing additional orders to promote the mining industry of the West in order that we may have the necessary strategic metals, and here on the floor of this House we have attacks being made on these mining men of the West, who are operating largely with their own capital, who are taking their own chances and doing business with very little return on their investments. This unwarranted attack is being made, not only on the silver industry, but on all of the mining interests of the West.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree with the gentleman from Colorado and I am sure they are honorable gentlemen who are engaged in the silver business. Certainly it does not reflect my views when they may be attacked in their personal character.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I appreciate that. I am sure that such a charge does not reflect the views of any Member of this House, and I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] will strike from the RECORD his reference to the mining people of the West, because there are no more patriotic citizens in this country.

Now, what do we have this morning? We have an attack upon silver. I am no monetary expert. If I wanted to, I could not go into the monetary value of silver and discuss that very elaborate and complicated question in the short time allotted me. We have heard a great deal lately about money and currency and questions have been raised concerning the validity of the currency which we are issuing. This is no time for us to go into the question of the monetary value of silver. I say this is nothing more nor less than an effort to regulate the price of silver. There is plenty of silver for everyone who wants to purchase it, provided they pay 71.11, the price which has been fixed.

I want to call attention to this fact. It has already been alluded to by some of the other speakers. Last year 32 percent of the silver which we obtained in this country was mined, along with what we call other strategic metals and known as complex ores—lead, zinc, and copper. In attempting to strike silver legislation from the books by these amendments you are going to have to consider further subsidies for the copper industry because mine owners cannot afford to produce copper and these other critical materials unless they are able to obtain a fair price for the silver which is found in these ores.

This is a policy that has been established in the mining industry over a long period of years, and now, when we are in the midst of the greatest war in history, when we are called upon to produce these critical materials in increasing amounts, we are having these attacks made. I say this is the wrong time for this to be done. I hope before you vote on these amendments you will stop and reflect upon what you are doing because I am sure this issue has not been accurately presented.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield briefly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In view of the statement made that I had not quoted Mr. Eccles correctly, I want to read again the statement that Mr. Eccles, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, made on March 30, 1942:

> In view of the war situation it is all the more urgent that the inflationary effects of the silver program be removed and that, so far as possible the materials, machinery, and labor now devoted to silver production be utilized in the war effort.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I am sorry; I do not have time to yield further now.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to be a member of the Ways and Means Committee, which is laboring with a tax bill and which will soon be engaged in laboring with another bill which is supposed to raise $16,000,000,000. The purpose of this bill is to drain the spending power of the people through taxation and prevent inflation, as well as to raise money. I believe it is our duty—not only the duty of our committee but the duty of every committee and every Member of the House and every department of Government—to implement the work that is being done by our committee to prevent inflation.

Another thing I believe is that every strategic material should be mobilized for the war purpose. There should be no slacker materials in this fight. Now, let us consider a few questions on that point.

There was exported to Japan from the United States during the period from 1936 to 1940, inclusive, 717,277,918 pounds of refined copper, enough to meet the combined copper requirements to build 179 cruisers, 179 destroyers, 110,805 flying fortresses, 10,680 field guns.

That is only a part of the shipment, because there were over 36,000,000 pounds of scrap copper sent in addition. Now, we are asking the school children to bring their pennies and turn them over to the Government. What is that exported copper now doing? It is fighting our soldiers in the jungles, on and under the water, and on foreign battlefields. It is being used to fight against our own flesh and blood. What have we in the way of a substitute? We have this silver buried at West Point. The time has come for that to go out and fight the materials with which we armed our enemies. Not only that, we cannot afford to fight a war on two oceans and to fight inflation as well. We talk about preserving the American way of life. Well, if there is anything that will destroy the American way of life it is inflation, and we are facing it. The spiral is going up all the time. There is a demand for increased wages and salaries, and prices will leap again. In no country where there has been inflation has it ever been possible for the increase in wages to keep pace with prices under an inflationary program.

So the time has come now, when we are stripped of copper and must substitute silver, when no man who really feels patriotic should take issue with the importance of putting this silver to work and replacing this copper to help save our boys on the battlefields.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to say to the gentleman from Colorado that I am sorry for any intemperate remarks that may have been attributed to me. In the excitement of debate sometimes one may say things one would not otherwise say. I hope I shall be forgiven for any indelicate remarks I may have made.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CELLER. I will yield if it is not taken out of my time.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to know how it is that a Member having already spoken 10 minutes under the 5-minute rule now gets an extra 5 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. I am speaking on an amendment to my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that two amendments are pending to the original amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. The Chair assumes the gentleman is speaking in opposition to or in favor of one or both of these amendments.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered to my amendment by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], for I feel that it strengthens my amendment. I have an abiding affection for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; I respect his judgment on all occasions, but I do believe his substitute amendment would be weak. I therefore hope that my amendment as modified by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will prevail.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It might be a good idea to straighten out the parliamentary situation. As I understand it, the vote will come first on the Wolcott amendment to the Celler amendment.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree with the gentleman from New York that if his amendment is implemented by the Wolcott amendment it will go infinitely further than mine, and be a pretty good one, I may say.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Wolcott amendment is adopted, I have no choice. It makes no difference to me whether the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York prevails or my substitute.

Mr. CELLER. I hope, then, that the committee will accept the Wolcott amendment, which strengthens my amendment, because while either the amendment or the substitute may be only a gesture, it is a mighty powerful gesture; it is, in common parlance, "a sock on the jaw" that we willfully deliver to those interests that are standing in the way of the war effort.

I ask you to listen to what a former expert of the Treasury Department, Mr. Bratter, an expert on silver, said:

If freely used in airplane and other engines, that Treasury silver would help the Navy sweep the Japs from the seas. If freely used in making vital parts of tanks and trucks, that silver also would help the Army annihilate Hitler. Put in searchlight reflectors it would help protect our skies. But buried at West Point, that silver is just a monument to folly. It there lies like a prisoner of the Axis, deferred from the draft by a couple of old monetary laws.

The War Production Board made the following statement, under date of December 26, 1942, in answer to questions propounded to it:

In accordance with request for information on the need for silver in the war program, we are submitting the following information conforming in general to the outline followed in the questions which you asked us to answer:

Any discussion of the possible contribution of silver to the war program must differentiate between the consumptive and nonconsumptive uses for this metal. Consumptive uses represent applications where the ownership of the metal changes hands and where it will be difficult to recover the metal at a later date in either the quantity or the form in which it was supplied. Nonconsumptive uses refer primarily to concentrated applications such as bus bars where title to the silver is retained by the United States Treasury Department, and the silver will be returned to the Treasury in the same form and quantity at the conclusion of the war emergency.

The discussion immediately following applies to consumptive uses of silver:

1. Question. If Congress made silver available to industry at a price not over 50 cents an ounce, would the opportunities for using silver in the war effort be greater than the available supply of Treasury silver now on hand?

Answer. Assuming an available annual supply of not more than 5,500 tons (2,000 tons domestic and 3,500 tons imported) we believe that the demand which would result if Congress enacted legislation guaranteeing the availability of silver at 50 cents per ounce would exceed the available supply.

2. Question. Is a shortage of cadmium holding up the use of silver for war purposes? If so, will that condition continue?

Answer. A shortage of cadmium is not necessarily a real restricting influence on the potential use of silver for war purposes. Sufficient cadmium is presently availabl for alloying with silver to the extent that the use of cadmium is now required for silver brazing alloys for war purposes. By a simple specification change the percentage of cadmium required to do the same work can be cut by one-half or two-thirds so that twice as much brazing can be done with the same amount of cadmium. Furthermore, by substitution of silver for cadmium in a small portion of the electroplating, a large amount of cadmium can be made available for brazing alloys. The new lead-silver solders require no cadmium whatever.

3. Question. What are the other war uses for silver which do not "bottleneck" through cadmium?

Answer. The following is the potential annual demand for silver in military and essential civilian applications (excluding decorative arts) if silver were freely available:

*Detailed list of estimated rates of the use for war production and essential civilian use at end of 1943*

[Millions of ounces]

| Use | Probable demand | Potential use |
|---|---|---|
| Engine bearings | 50 | 100 |
| Brazing alloys | 25 | 35 |
| Electrical contacts and wiring | 25 | 25 |
| Photographic and chemical | 15 | 15 |
| Electroplating | 5 | 15 |
| Lead-silver (soft) solder | 3 | 10 |
| Dental and medical | 3 | 5 |
| Miscellaneous | 50 | 50 |
| Total | 176 | 255 |

In addition to these specific war production requirements, there are other demands upon us—notably foreign coinage—which will bring total requirements to be filled out of supply available to us to considerably more than the totals listed above.

4. Question. For what strategic and critical metals would Treasury silver prove most useful as a substitute?

Answer. Copper, tin, cadmium, and nickel. The opportunities for substituting silver for copper are most promising because of its similarity to copper in electrical properties. Silver has already proved satisfactory as a substitute for tin, copper, and cadmium in engine bearings and for tin in soft solders. Silver has substituted satisfactorily for nickel and cadmium in electroplated coatings.

The following apply to nonconsumptive uses of silver:

5. Question. How much silver could be used in nonconsumptive form (such as bus bars), but not limited to bus bars, if we assume that the entire monetary stock of silver is released for such purposes?

Answer. Approximately 20,000 tons of silver had been certified by the War Production Board to the Defense Plant Corporation up to the end of 1942 for use as bus bars or transformer windings in new aluminum and magnesium plants, thus releasing practically an equal amount of copper for cartridge brass. A comparatively small portion of the above material represents replacement of existing or fabricated copper conductors, while most of the silver earmarked for nonsumptive use is going into service as a substitute for copper in new aluminum and magnesium plants. The aggregate tonnage of copper now installed as bus bars and other heavy conductors in power plants in this country far exceeds the total Treasury-owned silver stock of approximately 112,000 tons. All of the so-called free silver and silver held as backing for Treasury certificates could probably be utilized on a replacement basis for protected installations in power plants in the United States and Canada during 1943.

6. Question. As between giving the War Production Board power to (a) designate the use of Treasury silver for nonconsumptive purposes, and (b) designate its use for both consumptive and nonconsumptive purposes, which would be most helpful to the war effort?

Answer. It would be more beneficial to war production if the Congress authorized the use of Treasury silver for both consumptive and nonconsumptive purposes.

7. Question. What industries could use silver in consumptive form immediately?

Answer. (See answer to question 3.)

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, for many years this silver proposition has been before the House. First we tried to stop it entirely, and then we tried to stop only the purchase of foreign silver; but you must remember that this proposition involves, if it goes along, not only the purchase of domestic silver but the importation of the useless-to-us foreign silver in large and growing quantities. Foreign countries have been able by expediting and stepping up the mining of silver to crowd onto us their silver which means that we have paid for a good portion of their economic living system.

It is time our folks woke up; it is time we stopped with the silver subsidy. The time has come when there is a high enough market for copper, lead, zinc, and those other metals of which silver is a byproduct that the mines can produce for the war effort without considering silver as a factor of return; and it is time we voted to stop the purchase of silver by the Treasury of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, your Subcommittee on Appropriations is not taking a stand on the merits or demerits of the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act. I do call attention to the fact that what will be done by the adoption of either the substitutes or the original amendment will be to repeal an important policy of Congress and a substantive provision of legislation.

Both of these amendments should be defeated, and I will tell you why they should be defeated. They should be defeated because there is a growing feeling in the House that the Appropriations Committee seems to assert legislative authority, which is the farthest from the intent of that committee. It is a bad practice to insert legislative provisions in appropriation bills. These amendments should be defeated because their defeat will protect the integrity of the appropriating functions of the Appropriations Committee, and will help to preserve the line of jurisdiction between the legislative committees and the Appropriations Committee.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] told the House that he had a bill before the Committee on Ways and Means that would do "a real job" of repealing the Silver Purchase Acts. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] also told the House that he had a bill before the Ways and Means Committee. The proper way to approach this subject is through the legislative committees. The gentlemen recognized this fact when they introduced repeal bills and had them referred to the Ways and Means Committee.

Let us not confuse and destroy the differentiation between the appropriating functions and the legislative functions by legislating on an appropriation bill. It is likely to do incalculable damage. I ask the committee to vote down this amendment for these very good and substantial reasons.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the Congress has the right to put limitations upon appropriation bills under the rules of the House?

Mr. LUDLOW. Undoubtedly.

Mr. TABER. And that is the opportunity presented to us at this time?

Mr. LUDLOW. Undoubtedly, and if that were not the fact I should have offered a point of order. This amendment is legislation in the guise of a limitation, but it is a limitation nevertheless. It is not subject to a point of order. After all it is for the Committee of the Whole to decide whether or not it wants to continue these acts. I simply say that by so doing you are striking a blow at the integrity of the appropriation functions of the House and you are helping to confuse the two committee jurisdictions. You are helping to make it possible in the future that the legislative functions will be taken over by the Appropriations Committee. There is a right way and a wrong way and this is the wrong way to do what many would like to see done. This is a bad precedent and therefore this amendment and substitutes should be voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has all time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; all time has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I understand the parliamentary situation, the first vote will come on the Wolcott amendment to the Celler amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. After that has been disposed of, the vote will recur on the substitute that I have offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Wolcott amendment which we are about to vote on be reread.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will rereport the Wolcott amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Wolcott amendment to the Celler amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE) there were—ayes 111, noes 103.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. LUDLOW and Mr. WOLCOTT to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 163, noes 117.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to the original amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LUDLOW) there were—ayes 0, noes 10.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LUDLOW) there were—ayes 146, noes 114.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CELLER and Mr. LUDLOW.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 166, noes 103.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREIGN FUNDS CONTROL

Foreign-owned property control: For all expenses necessary in carrying out the functions of the Secretary of the Treasury under sections 3 and 5 (b) of the act of October 6, 1917, as amended (50 U. S. C. (App.) 3, and 50 U. S. C. (Suppl. 1941) 5 (b)), and any proclamations, orders, regulations, or instructions issued thereunder, including personal services (without regard to classification laws), printing, and reimbursement of any other appropriation or other funds of the United States or any agency, instrumentality, Territory, or possession thereof, including the Philippine Islands, and reimbursement of any Federal Reserve bank for printing and other expenditures, $4,100,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 4, line 10, after the comma, strike out "$4,100,000" and insert "$3,100,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to save what in these days is a small amount of money, $1,000,000, on the appropriation for the Foreign Funds Control.

Since the last appropriation for this purpose there has been established the Alien Property Custodian, and to the Alien Property Custodian have been transferred all the business activities and the business properties and the patents that were formerly under the control of the Foreign Funds Control. The Foreign Funds Control formerly had $5,000,000 to spend. The Alien Property Custodian now has $5,000,000 to spend. The Foreign Funds Control at the present time has the job of looking after the bank deposits and the securities, only, of foreigners, and of going into foreign countries where our forces go and taking possession of and setting up a control over the foreign-owned funds in those countries. The major part of their work has been taken over.

The Budget reduced this item $650,000, the committee reduced it $250,000 and I propose to reduce it $1,000,000 more, bringing it down to $3,100,000.

At the present time this organization has on its pay roll 1,400 employees, with a pay roll of $4,350,000. The Alien Property Custodian has a pay roll of $5,000,000. Both these organizations wanted the whole job, but to keep peace in the family two separate organizations were created, although one is all they ought to have.

What I have allowed here, $3,100,000, is plenty of money for them to do a good job. I do not believe that in making our appropriation for any agency of the Government we should give them more money than they need. This organization does not need more than $3,100,000. I am hopeful that we will start in some way to reduce the excessive number of civilian employees of our Government by cutting this item from $4,100,000 to $3,100,000. The reduction involved is a small one, but it paves the way for future savings.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if we reduce this item as indicated we are coming very near to interfering with operations that have become absolutely essential as a result of the war. This agency gave us a great deal of off-the-record testimony to the effect that it has been required to send a good deal of its personnel into north Africa on account of taking over the situation there.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The number of 6 went to north Africa out of 1,400.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think the gentleman is in error about that. I think it was considerably more than six. Anyway it was indicated that many more will have to be sent later.

Mr. TABER. No; I am not in error. That was the number.

Mr. LUDLOW. At any rate, it is opening a field that requires special attention and that promises to require a great deal of personnel in the high brackets. The transfer of Foreign Funds Control personnel to Africa has only started.

Further, it was testified that this is just the beginning of the possible requirements overseas, because if the United Nations invade Europe it will immediately mean a vast expansion of the field of the Foreign Funds Control Service in taking over operations in the occupied territories.

This activity has already been reduced very drastically. In a general way, I may say that it covers 35 countries. The funds of 35 countries have been taken over in the operations of the Foreign Funds Control. The total amount of this property is $8,500,000,000. It is an enormous operation. This appropriation cannot be cut any further than the Budget and our committee have cut it without interfering with most important and vital operations, especially in view of the fact that undoubtedly there will be an invasion of Europe, which will require a vast expansion of the service immediately. These are matters that have to be taken care of immediately when the situation arises. There is then no time to build up an organization. We do not know when or how quickly the picture will change; we do not know when the invasion will take place, and we do not know when additional personnel will be required far beyond the scope of the appropriation we have carried in this bill.

No one is more consecrated to economy than I or the other gentlemen on this side of our subcommittee, but these things ought to be done within reason and with a thoughtful contemplation of what we are doing here. This amendment would be a very ill-advised operation on this appropriation, and it would have a most serious repercussion. I ask that you vote down the amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not this agency have in its care and custody property of kinds other than money?

Mr. LUDLOW. The business enterprises have been transferred to the Alien Property Custodian, but there is a vast operation here in dealing with money and securities. It has most extensive ramifications, not only in this country but all around the world. This operation will be immensely and almost immediately expanded as a result of our military operations. I appeal to the patriotism of the House not to do something that may interfere most vitally with our war program.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 146, noes 121.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. LUDLOW and Mr. TABER to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 178, noes 115.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Expenses of loans: The indefinite appropriation "Expenses of loans, act of September 24, 1917, as amended and extended" (31 U. S. C. 760, 761), shall not be used during the fiscal year 1944 to supplement the appropriations otherwise provided for the current work of the Bureau of the Public Debt, and the amount obligated under such indefinite appropriation during such fiscal year shall not exceed $57,000,000 to be expended as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct: *Provided*, That the proviso in the act of June 16, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 761), limiting the availability of this appropriation for expenses of operations on account of any public-debt issue to the close of the fiscal year next following the fiscal year in which such issue was made, shall not apply to savings-bond transactions handled by the Federal Reserve banks for account of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKS: Page 12, line 22, after the word "Treasury", strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of William Pickens, Frederick L. Schuman, Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., Paul R. Porter, John Herling, Paul F. Brissenden, David J. Saposs, Maurice Parmelee, Harold Loeb, Sam Schmerler, Emil Jack Lever, David Lasser, Tom Tippett, Henry C. Alsberg, David Karr, Guiseppi Facci, David Wahl, Hugh Miller, Walter Gellhorn, Karl Borders, Jack Fahy, Nathaniel Weyl, Robert Morss Lovett, Merle Vincent, Alice Barrows, Arthur F. Goldschmidt, Marcus I. Goldman, Leonard Emil Mins, Henry T. Hunt, Mary McLeod Bethune, Harry C. Lamberton, T. A. Bisson, Katherine Kellock, Jay Deiss, Milton V. Freeman, George Slaff, A. C. Shire, and Edward Scheunemann."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment provides for the refusal of payment of salaries to individuals whose salaries are not provided for in this appropriation bill and, therefore, that the amendment is not germane. Further, I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I do.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman begins will he yield to me?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Yes.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to make a point of order upon an additional ground, and I think possibly the gentleman from Florida may desire to discuss that also.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I would be very glad to have the gentleman make his point of order.

Mr. FOLGER. Then I make the point of order that the amendment is divisible. Thirty-eight or forty names are included within the amendment, and I make the point of order that it is out of order for that reason. Each one must be taken separately. It is a divisible amendment.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] let me admit that the amendment does include more than one name, that it includes the names of those who would not be directly affected by the appropriation at this time. I admit that, but I do not admit that it is not germane because of the fact that this appropriation may be used to hire anyone that the Treasury or the Post Office Department desires to hire. An appropriation bill originates in the House of Representatives, and the House of Representatives has the right to put any limitation upon the appropriation that it desires. If the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department each has the right to hire anyone under this bill, then we have the right to put in the names of people in this bill that they cannot hire.

So far as the second point of order is concerned, that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, I am sure that the gentleman's contention will not hold, because we have identical language in other appropriation bills to which the point of order has been made, and the point of order was not sustained.

So far as the point of order made by the gentleman from North Carolina is concerned, I do not think that that will hold good, and I ask the Chair to rule on the point of order.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Does the amendment that the gentleman has offered attempt to deny the use of funds in any other appropriation bill?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Oh, no; the amendment applies only to this particular appropriation bill.

Mr. CASE. It applies only to the funds carried in this bill?

Mr. HENDRICKS. The amendment is limited to the funds carried in this appropriation bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Yes.

Mr. MASON. And the only point of order that can be raised is that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, and inasmuch as the amendment is nothing but a limitation on the funds that are under consideration in the bill, then the gentleman's amendment is in order.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair rules permit me to cite to the House the same provision in another appropriation bill which we passed in 1941. At that time we were working on the W. P. A. appropriation bill, and I refer the Chair to Public Act 143, Seventy-seventh Congress, where this provision is contained in the bill:

*Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of David Lasser.

To that provision, the point of order was raised, and was not sustained. That is the exact language I am using in this amendment.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard for a moment upon the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon my point of order that the amendment is out of order, because it is divisible and I insist on a division, voting on one at a time and not voting just in a lump on these 30 or 40 people about whom we do not know anything, in 1 amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COURTNEY). With respect to the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], amendments of this character have been inserted in appropriation bills heretofore. The amendment simply limits the appropriation. If Congress has the right to appropriate, Congress, by the same token, has the right to limit the appropriation.

With respect to the point of order made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER], the Chair would say that when it comes to voting on the amendment, should the House so desire, the amendment is divisible and a separate vote could be had with respect to each individual name.

So the Chair is constrained to rule that neither point of order is well taken, and therefore both are overruled.

The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, since this is an important subject and I have quite a file, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the Members for a few moments, I want to first state why I added the names of these other people to the one which appears first, that of William Pickens. Heretofore we have called the attention of various departments to the fact that the Dies Committee and also Attorney General Biddle have looked into the records and affiliations of certain employees of theirs and we have asked them to take them off of the pay roll. In some cases they have been taken off. In other cases we have been completely ignored in our request, and I could give examples of those cases, but I do not want to take the time.

I do want to give you a few examples of what has happened. In the bill that I just cited to you, which we were working on in 1942, we included a provision that no portion of the funds could be paid to David Lasser. Let me tell you where David Lasser is at this time. He was taken off of W. P. A. pay rolls, but at this time David Lasser is now in the War Production Board as senior economist at a salary of $4,600, whereas he was only getting $4,400 when we put that provision in the bill. Let me give you a few other examples.

On March 28, 1942, the gentleman from Texas, Chairman DIES, wrote a letter to Hon. Henry Wallace, Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, calling his attention to the Communist affiliations of eight of his employees, and made particular reference to one Maurice Parmalee principal economist of the B. E. W., at a salary of $5,600 a year. Mr. Parmelee had written several books advocating the practice of nudism in America. Two days later Parmelee was dismissed from the B. E. W. He was reemployed, however, on November 2, 1942, at the Railroad Retirement Board as an economist at $4,600 a year.

In 1938, David J. Saposs, chief economist of the National Labor Relations Board, was exposed by the Dies committee, and in 1939 by the Smith committee, investigating the N. L. R. B. As a result of these exposures David J. Saposs was dismissed from the N. L. R. B. He was later reemployed as an economist in the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and just recently appointed assistant to the chief of the labor division of the War Production Board at a salary of $8,000 per year.

In 1938, Henry G. Alsberg was director of the Federal writers project of the W. P. A. This project was exposed by the Dies committee as being a tool of Communist propaganda, and in 1939 the House abolished the agency, which automatically removed Alsberg from the Federal pay roll. Alsberg has recently been reemployed by the Federal Government and is now senior feature writer in the Office of War Information at $4,600.

In 1935 Sam Schmerler was dismissed from the F. B. I. on account of his Communist activities. Several weeks later he was employed by the Social Security Board, and has worked there ever since. At present he is employed as a policy consultant at a salary of $3,800 a year.

I have called your attention to the fact that Mr. Lasser is now with the War Production Board.

One other case:

In 1941 the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], in a letter to the President, exposed the Communist affiliations of Emil Jack Lever, then employed in O. E. M. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was never advised as to what action was taken against Lever; however, he is now employed as head labor adviser in the War Production Board at $6,500.

So you can see, Mr. Chairman, that no matter how we may call it to the attention of the heads of the departments, in some way or other these men are going to get around, they hedge hop from one department to the other. That is the reason I have offered this amendment, including the names of every one of those men whom the Dies committee has said had communistic leanings or views which were unfavorable to our form of government. I propose, if this amendment is adopted, to offer it on every appropriation bill that comes before this House, and if we adopt this amendment on every appropriation bill, then there will be no place else for these men to hedge hop.

I think the time has now come for the Members of this House to make one decision. We authorized the Dies committee in 1938. Since that time that com-

mittee has spent $470,000 in their investigation work, and I think they have done a good job. There will be a resolution coming before this House to continue that committee for 2 more years. They will probably ask for $75,000 more, which will make a sum total of $545,000, over a half a million dollars. From time to time they have submitted these names to the heads of the departments, and from time to time they have sent them to Congress, and they have asked us to take action, but we have never done it. I have heard Members say, "Well, something ought to be done, but this is not the way to do it." I have never heard one of them say how it should be done or how it was going to be done, and I have never seen it done. This is one effective way that it can be done. I say we should decide now whether we are going to do it, whether we are going to take the word of the committee for which we have appropriated $545,000. If not, then when this committee comes back for additional authorization and another $75,000 we should determine that it is not serving any purpose and discontinue the committee. That is the reason I offered this amendment, to give the House an opportunity to decide.

Now I want to go into the question of the one man who will be affected particularly by this bill, William Pickens. According to the Daily Worker of October 3, 1933, William Pickens was the speaker who followed Earl Browder at the opening mass meeting of the United States Congress Against War. The single quotation attributed to Pickens in this news story in the Daily Worker was significant and was as follows:

> To take the profit motive out of war we must take the class-profit opportunities out of our economic system.

Does that sound like the capitalistic system or communism? I leave it to you. Here is the Daily Worker, here are the headlines telling of a great meeting they held here:

> Resolve unyielding struggle against war, fascism, and for defense of Soviet Union.

Earl Browder spoke and then Pickens spoke. Let me say to you here that Pickens has denied any communistic activities and at times he has said he did not even know that these organizations were communistic. I want to point out to you, however, that if Pickens is worth $4,600 a year to the Government he is intelligent enough to know when he is in the wrong sort of company. The Daily Worker of October 3, 1933, carries William Pickens as a member of the national committee of the American League Against War and Fascism which was set up by the United States Congress Against War. The American League Against War and Fascism, later known as the American League for Peace and Democracy, has been branded as subversive by the Attorney General, Mr. Biddle.

I open another folder here of the Daily Worker in which Pickens' name appears as a member of that committee. There is his name right there, and I shall be pleased to give you these papers and let you look at this at any time.

I want to give you just a little further information. There was a publication, Fight, which has also been branded as subversive—fight against war and fascism—and as co-vice chairman on the masthead of that publication are William Pickens and Earl Browder. There is the company that Pickens is keeping. I could go on and give you more and more; I am not going to try to give you all of it; you can decide for yourselves what kind of company he is keeping. I want to give you just one or two more instances. According to the New Masses, a Communist weekly, for November 14, 1939, William Pickens was scheduled to deliver a lecture at the Workers' School at 35 East Twelfth Street, New York. The Workers' School is an arm of the Communist Party.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HENDRICKS. In closing, I want to say I hope the Members will investigate this file and decide for themselves whether he is a Communist or not.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I am a Republican and I have no sympathy with the Communist Party or with communism as we know it. I have great admiration for the way the Russian armies have been fighting the Allied cause, but I do not share the Communist point of view. I think it most unfortunate, however, for this purge amendment to be presented at this time, listing some 30 or 40 names of persons who are generally unknown to most of us. I read critical reports about many of you at campaign time. You were called everything imaginable—I have been—and I imagine some of the utterances of your opponents if used here would not make very pleasant reading. I do not want to be a party to the crucifying of persons without giving them a proper hearing, and condemning them, not only as employees or prospective employees of the Government, but as American citizens. I do not like this sort of thing; it is not American and it is not tolerant. In fact it fosters intolerance. As a Member of the Congress of the United States I would be ashamed to support an amendment like this. Take the case of Mr. William Pickens, who is secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. I understand the F. B. I. and the Secret Service have investigated him and have given him a clean bill of health. Now, regarding the Daily Worker, I have been quoted as some of you have been quoted in the Daily Worker. It is entirely probable that some of you have been headlined in the Daily Worker right alongside some outstanding Communist.

All of us have been maligned by our political adversaries time and again. I have been called a Communist, a reactionary, a rebel, a Socialist, a radical; I have been called everything under the sun, and so have you. Have you forgotten the last campaign when so many Members of Congress were attacked as Nazis and Hitlerites? How about Mary Bethune, whose name also appears on this purge list? She is a prominent colored lady who has done a great deal for her people. I do not want to vote for an amendment which includes her name as an undesirable citizen.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that all of us will be temperate, that we will act wisely here, that we will act in keeping with the Christian point of view. We are told that we are fighting for the "four freedoms." We talk about all these blessings. We have established a republic here, a government for, by, and of the people that Abraham Lincoln so feelingly portrayed. His birthday will be celebrated next week. I have too much respect for the memory of Abraham Lincoln and that which he represented to vote for this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. Chairman, regardless of this amendment I do not believe this is a good time to create strife and disunity among ourselves and our allies, if it were possible to do that in this country. All we have to do is to read the newspapers and see the kind of a hellish war this country is engaged in, on every sea, on every land, and in the air over every country. I realize that the cream of American manhood is dying every place for you and for me and for our country, and the very moment that we of this Congress do anything that will throw a doubt in their minds as to what those boys are fighting for, you may lengthen the time of this hellish thing in which we are now engaged.

Suppose these men have had communistic leanings? Who in the name of God today are stopping bullets that would be killing your boys and my boys and the boys of every other father and mother in this country were it not for the Russians? You may say they are fighting their own fight, and maybe that is true, but nevertheless every German that they kill is one we do not have to kill.

We are making an awful mistake here today, to adopt this amendment. We made a mistake the other day when we denied membership on a committee to a Member of this House because it was claimed that at one time he had a leaning toward communism. We should not take a single step to cause dissension or destroy, if you please, not only the Democratic Party but perhaps ourselves. The Republicans cannot lick the Democrats, but we can lick ourselves. Our enemies cannot lick the United Nations, but, remember this, we ourselves can lick the United Nations if we are not careful. This is no time to bring up matters of this kind. This is no time for making speeches that might destroy us.

Quoting Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower:

> We must all realize that we are fighting a touchy war and everything we do, day and night, must be directed toward the winning of that war.

I remind you once more of getting the word spread of my attitude toward irresponsible talk directed at any one of our allies * * * in unwarranted criticism of any ally we are playing into the hands of the Axis.

I have refrained many times during the present session of Congress from saying what was in my mind upon certain subjects, but I feel this is not the time. Every word and every act must be directed toward winning the war. I feel a loyalty to my country, I feel a loyalty to our boys who are giving up their lives, and they are making the sacrifices. We are not, compared to what they are doing.

I agree with the gentleman from Ohio. In addition to all that I have said, this is conviction without trial. It is not in accordance with the American tradition of fair play and trial by a jury of your peers.

Do you want to brand somebody that you do not know anything about on hearsay and by ex parte proceedings and say he is a Communist? I want you ladies and gentlemen here today to think these things over that you are confronted with and make up your minds what we are doing. The thing that is uppermost in the mind of every human heart in this country is to win this war. That is our job which we have to do. Every time we delay the day of victory for 1 minute or for 1 hour we are rendering a grave disservice to our country and to our boys.

This amendment should be defeated. I appeal to the Republicans and I appeal to the Democrats to defeat such amendments as this. Who are we fighting—Russia or Germany?

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman seriously appealing to this House to resent the suggestion or the proposal that these communistic rats that have been gnawing away at the foundation of constitutional government be put out of office?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will answer the question.

Mr. COX. Just what is it you have in mind?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have no more use for the so-called rats than the gentleman from Georgia has.

Mr. COX. Why this special plea for them then?

Mr. O'CONNOR. My answer is this: My country comes first with me; the winning of the war is first; and if I do anything that is going to create disunity in this country or among our allies, I think I am rendering a disservice to my country. That is my answer. We can later take care of the undesirables.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I think it is time to clear some of the dust out of our eyes and find out what the issue involved here is. The sole and only question involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida is whether one man, an employee of the War Savings Staff of the Treasury Department, should be taken off the pay roll. That is a Negro named William Pickens.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida is, in my opinion, one of the most peculiar pieces of legislation ever presented to this House. It proposes that no part of the money carried in this bill shall be used to pay the salaries of 40 persons, 39 of whom have no more connection with the Treasury Department than the man in the moon.

I have just picked up from my desk a resolution which authorizes a General Pulaski Memorial Day, October 11. The gentleman might just as well have offered his amendment to that bill for all the efficacy it would have. There is no money carried in that General Pulaski bill, and there is no money carried in the Treasury Department appropriation bill for these 39 employees. So it all simmers down to the one question, and that is whether one individual named William Pickens shall be dispossessed of his job in the Treasury Department.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Should he lose it?

Mr. LUDLOW. I think not, and I will tell the gentleman why.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I have a very limited time only.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Even though the others are not affected by this Treasury Department appropriation, if we do not adopt this amendment, they will be in there sooner or later.

Mr. LUDLOW. No; it has nothing to do with it at all.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Is it not true that, if this man is thrown off the pay roll in this Department, he can be taken on in some other department, as was the case with David Lasser? And is it not true that, if the other 39 are not eliminated now from being paid from this appropriation, they can, if they are taken off the pay roll of some other department, go right onto the pay roll of this Department?

Mr. LUDLOW. I have to say to my beloved colleague from Indiana that his question answers itself, I believe. Of course, there is nothing to prohibit the appointment of anybody in any department. It might be true or it might not be.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I cannot yield further, because I want to direct myself to the question asked me by my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. He says, Do I think this man should not be thrown off the roll? I say definitely that I think he should not be, for two reasons. In the first place, the Treasury Department denies categorically everything that has been said to the detriment of this man, and the Treasury Department is his employer. That is one reason. The other reason is that I do not believe any man should be thrown off of the roll in this off-handed way when we are the judge and the jury and the executioner, without any evidence whatever to support such action.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Should Communists in the first instance be put on the rolls?

Mr. LUDLOW. Of course not.

Mr. COX. If they are on the rolls, should they not be put off?

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman has not heard what I have to say about the merits of this man. It is denied that he is a Communist.

Mr. COX. Of course, he will deny it.

Mr. LUDLOW. The Treasury Department, which is his employer, denies it; and I think some respect and credence should be given to the report of the Department on this man. It has sent me a letter which with the permission of the House I shall now read. The Treasury Department investigated William Pickens through its very strict investigatory service conducted under Mr. Irey, and he is a real investigator, equal to J. Edgar Hoover, I will tell you that. He goes to the bottom of these things. I have Mr. Irey's report on this man and I have a letter from the Treasury Department, which states that he is a loyal citizen of the United States, and an efficient and faithful employee. This letter is from Harold N. Graves, assistant to the Secretary, and it reads as follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: In accordance with your request, I am glad to supply the following information about William Pickens—

Bear in mind, he is the only man involved here. Nobody else is involved out of these 40 named. None of them has any connection in the world with the bill before us, except William Pickens—

an employee of the War Savings Staff of this Department, who has been named, among others, by Congressman DIES as disqualified for employment in the Federal service by reason, it is assumed, of alleged membership in a political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States.

Mr. Pickens, himself a Negro, is in charge of a small section in the War Savings Staff, whose function it is to assist in the promotion of the War bond program among Negro organizations throughout the country.

I understand he has done a most valuable work in the sale of government securities.

Mr. Pickens was first employed in this capacity in May 1941, and since that time his principal duty has been to appear before colored groups in different communities with a view to inducing the participation of the Negro people in the war-savings program, and with a view to the establishment of special war-savings committees among the colored people to encourage them to invest their savings in War bonds.

Mr. Pickens has performed these duties to the entire satisfaction of this Department.

He has been diligent and successful in his work, and he and his small group have done much to bring about an understanding of the war-savings program on the part of the colored people and a steadily increasing participation by them in that program. In the period of his employment by this Department, nothing has transpired which would suggest that he is anything but a patriotic American, completely loyal to the traditions of this country and to its established form of government.

Mr. Pickens is a man with a distinguished record for work among the colored race. Our files show that he was born at Anderson, S. C., on January 15, 1881; that he is a graduate of Yale University and a member of Phi Beta Kappa; that he taught at Talledega College, Ala., from 1904 to 1914; that he was dean and vice president of Morgan College, Maryland, from 1915 to 1920; and that from 1920 to 1941 he was an officer in National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People, upon whose recommendation he was given employment in this Department.

As is well known, the statutes prohibit the employment in the Federal service of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence. As early as October, 1941, the Dies committee record concerning Mr. Pickens was brought to the attention of this Department, and an investigation was at that time made by the Treasury Intelligence Service to determine whether Mr. Pickens' employment was in contravention of the law. I quote the final paragraph of the report which was submitted to this office upon the conclusion of the investigation.

I beg your particular attention to the report of the Secret Service of the Treasury Department on this man. I quote as follows from that report:

This investigation has disclosed that William Pickens is now employed as a promotional specialist with the Defense (now War) Savings Staff and is entirely satisfactory in this capacity; that numerous references have been made in the Dies committee reports to his name without actually connecting him with any subversive organization; that he is exceedingly well recommended by his superiors and associates; that his character, reputation and loyalty to this Government are reported to be good; and that he is well qualified and suitable for the position he now holds with the Defense (now War) Savings Staff.

Mr. Graves concludes his letter by stating:

As you will see, this department has long been aware of the charges made by the Dies committee regarding Mr. Pickens. It will be appropriate to say that we are convinced that they are without any substantial foundation; and that we are satisfied that Mr. Pickens is completely loyal to the Government of the United States.

The Treasury Department and its Secret Service Branch under Mr. Irey give this man a splendid recommendation.

We are surely not going to adopt an amendment here that would do a tremendous injustice to a worthy employee who has been found to be loyal and faithful to this Government and who is doing a fine service for our country in promoting the sale of bonds to win the war.

I ask you to vote down the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, were my action in reference to the pending amendment to be motivated by emotion or hate, I would perhaps support it. The very voices that are now crying out against the adoption of this amendment, however are the voices that in the last campaign vilified me because of my pre-Pearl Harbor votes. These are the same men who speaking here today, are crying for tolerance.

As one who for many years was a public prosecutor, I say to you that never in that public service did I adopt the attitude that a person accused of crime was by virtue of that accusation alone guilty. I have always believed that a person accused of acts reprehensible or criminal in character is entitled to a fair trial and the right to face his accusers and make a defense. So I believe this Congress and this Committee of Congress have acted very wisely by incorporating the general provision in this very bill which you will find in section 302, and which reads as follows:

SEC. 302 No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence:

Now listen to this. This is what demonstrates that your Committee and the Congress of the United States believe in democracy and believe in not pre-judging and convicting an individual until he or she has had an opportunity to have a fair trial in a court of justice:

*Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment, the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

Now, then, there we give the expression of this Congress of a determination to uphold and maintain the real spirit of democracy. We say to any person, if you have proof that will stand in any court of law that William Pickens is a Communist or advocates the overthrow and destruction of this Government by force and violence, and he has filed an affidavit in order to take employment that he is not such an individual, then if perchance in violation of the terms of that affidavit you still believe that he is a Communist or that he is a member of an organization that believes in the overthrow of this Government by force and violence, you may take your proof to the proper United States district attorney and ask that an indictment be rendered against that individual. He will then be brought before the court charged with violating the law which I have just read. Then, if he is convicted he will be removed from the pay rolls. Thus you will have preserved the very essence and the spirit of democracy, and you will have given to every man charged with a crime the opportunity for a fair trial—a trial that the Constitution of the United States guarantees to every person. Mr. Chairman, even those despicable Nazi spies were given a fair and impartial trial before their execution. We are fighting to preserve constitutional government and democratic processes and not to emulate Hitler; and so, despite the fact that I am recognized not only in this Congress but in various parts of the country as one who has raised his voice time and time again against the infiltration of subversive elements on the pay rolls of the Government, I still will not destroy my faith in the democratic process by not giving an individual who is inferentially accused of a crime, an opportunity to be heard in a court of law. Let the accuser produce his evidence, and let the accused produce his evidence, and upon conviction he will not only be removed from the pay rolls but he will be forever stigmatized as a felon.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does the gentleman think that the Congress of the United States has no power, or that it should not use its purse power to take anybody off the pay roll unless he is guilty of a felony?

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, no; I am not taking any such position as that. I am not disputing the power of the Congress of the United States to take anybody off the pay roll; I am not disputing the power of the Congress of the United States to take a thousand people off the pay roll. And may I say that I am certain that the wheels of justice should be made to turn more rapidly and I am sure that when the facts are properly presented perhaps more than a thousand people should be removed from Federal pay rolls. The Congress of the United States undoubtedly has that power, but when an accusation is made against an individual, such as the accusation that was made against me in the last campaign, the mere making of the accusation does not in itself demonstrate a fact. Mr. Speaker, if I were guilty of the accusations made against me in the last campaign by people who claimed to be responsible, I would not be fit or worthy to sit among free men and women in this great legislative assembly. Those accusations were made. I knew, and the great majority of the voters in my district knew, they were false. I knew that I could successfully make my defense at the bar of public opinion. I did so and the voters returned their verdict. How bitter I would have been had I been denied a

chance even to answer my accusers. My colleagues, can't you see the point? I despise this gang of saboteurs that are endeavoring to destroy our system of government, and I say to you I would remove them all from the Federal pay roll. In their removal, however, I want the democratic process observed and not indulge in Hitler or lynch process. I want to accord that right to every citizen, no matter how high or how low he or she may be, or whether I may be in complete opposition to his or her views. In so acting, my fellow Members of Congress, we will be practicing the virtues that we are shedding our blood to defend, the virtues of real democracy at home.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman does not believe, in further answer to the question of the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER], that this Congress should go on record as branding somebody as a criminal without a trial.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman asking me a question?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to make the further observation that I was branded just the same as was the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] by the New Republic as being an agent of the Nazi government, and all that sort of thing. Therefore, I have no reason other than I stated for my position in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. I remember well the situation that existed in this country at the time of the last war. I know how emotions can be whipped up, and I feel that we should act deliberately in this matter with full knowledge of what we are doing. Under no compulsion of emotional appeal should we here destroy the very democratic process we are committed as a nation to defend——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the committee.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILSON. I ask the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] if he voted for the amendment to the W. P. A. bill which eliminated the name of David Lasser from the payment of those funds carried in that bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I will ask the gentleman from Montana to hold that just for a minute please. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I entertain some disconcert of spirit about the pending amendment. Several vital considerations are involved. If the Committee of the Whole should vote down this amendment today, it would appear to the country that we have nullified in one sense the work that the Dies committee has done. If, on the other hand, we approve this amendment, I fear that we do prejudge men without a fair trial. There are 38 names on this list. There are 4 names on this list that I would strike from the public rolls today, because I have heard the evidence in respect to them. Gentlemen will remember that 3 years ago I offered the amendment by which David Lasser was taken from the rolls. That action was sustained by the Senate. I did that, however, only after I had made what I thought was a substantial case against David Lasser.

He interviewed at least 100 Members of this House, but he never came to see me. I invited him and he came 3 times, and he admitted in the course of our conversations that I had done him no injustice on this floor.

I could vote today on David Lasser, but he is not on the Treasury pay roll. I could vote on Henry Alsberg, but he is not on the Treasury pay roll covered by the pending bill. I could vote on David J. Saposs, but he is not covered in the pending bill. There is only 1 of the 38 who would be affected by the pending appropriation bill. The remainder are in a state of anticipation and would be kept off of the rolls in case they were ever in some future period employed by the Treasury Department, and that future period would be limited to the fiscal year 1944.

I think we would be making a mistake to adopt the pending amendment, but I think on the other hand there is a way of solving this difficulty. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] has indicated that he will ask for a division of the question and under the rules he can do so. He can ask for a separate vote on every name on this list, because the fate and destiny of 38 separate and distinct individuals is involved. If so, there can be 38 votes on this amendment.

I would suggest to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] that this is the wiser course: Let us vote on the one name affected by this bill, William Pickens, and then let us adopt some language that will meet the situation of which the gentleman from Florida complains.

After I had made some effort to secure the separation of David Lasser from the Federal pay roll I found that he had been lodged in another spot. When I secured the separation of Mr. Foss from the public pay roll, from the Rural Electrification Administration, he was hired by the Board of Economic Warfare, and then upon subsequent investigation he was separated entirely. That will be the wiser course, to deal only with the only person affected by this bill, and later I will offer an amendment which will read substantially as follows:

> No part of any appropriation or authorization in this act shall be used to pay any part of the salary or expenses of any person, the payment of any part of whose salary or expenses from other appropriation or authorization is prohibited by any other act; but this prohibition shall be effective only during the period for which such prohibition in such other act is effective.

In consequence, we can deal with William Pickens today. When the supplemental or deficiency appropriation bill comes before the Congress, which contains the name of David Lasser and others, we can deal with them then. When the independent offices appropriation bill comes before the House, which contains the appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission, where Goodman Watson is employed, we can deal with him at that time By the adoption of this generic language it will be impossible for him to hop from one pay roll to another.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman has forgotten that unless this amendment before the House is adopted, the gentleman from North Carolina cannot call for a separate vote on any one of these people, because it only makes it possible when this amendment is adopted. I agree that the gentleman has given language that will cure the problem that confronts us without naming these men, but I do want to remind him of the fact that unless this amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] is adopted, no gentleman can call for a separate vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. TABER. A division of the question would have to be before the vote on the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is my opinion of the matter.

Mr. Chairman, I raise the parliamentary question now as to whether the question will be divided before the vote is taken on the amendment, so that there will be a vote on every individual name as they are demanded by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the division is made before the vote on the amendment is taken.

Mr. DIRKSEN. You are therefore apprised by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House that there will be a division of the question before the vote is called. If the gentleman from North Carolina persists in his request, he can have 38 divisions of the question.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. As I understand the gentleman's position, he does not hesitate to vote on certain individuals with whom he is familiar?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; that is right.

Mr. JACKSON. How can the gentleman expect Members of the House who are not acquainted with the background of these people to vote, or how can he expect or request the Members of the House to vote when they are not familiar with their background?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think in answer to the gentleman, and it is a very proper question, that he will find that when the various appropriation bills are reported

from time to time, the subcommittees will provide the background of every one of the gentlemen involved. We had the same thing last year in connection with Goodman Watson. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr STARNES] raised the question about him, so that question was decided on this floor.

So I shall offer this general language later and let us deal only with one gentleman, Mr. Pickens, now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to see if we can reach some agreement as to time for debate on this amendment?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am as strongly opposed to keeping Communists on the Government pay roll as any Member of this House could possibly be. I have supported every appropriation for the Dies committee and expect to vote for its continuance. At the same time I do not want to participate in any legislative lynching of men who have simply been charged with communistic affiliations without the submission of adequate proof to sustain the charges.

I want to direct your attention to one of the men on this list. I do not know about the great majority of them but on this list is the name of Harry Lamberton, who is connected with the legal counsel for the Rural Electrification Administration. About 2 years ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] published the name of Mr. Lamberton as a member of a Communist organization. After that Mr. Lamberton was before our Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and we were, of course, interested in determining whether he was a Communist or not. We questioned him regarding this charge. He said that he had never been a member of the organization in question, that he never had participated in its work in any way and that he had no sympathy with it. I advised the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] almost immediately after that of the statement made by Mr. Lamberton. He insisted that his committee had complete evidence to demonstrate that the man was an active member of this organization. I asked him to supply it for the use of our subcommittee. He has not done so. On last Monday he published the name of this same Mr. Lamberton in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a member of a certain communistic organization. I saw him immediately after his speech and said to him:

Our Committee on Agricultural Appropriations is just as interested in getting Communists out of the Government as you are. If you have evidence to show that Mr. Lamberton is a member of this organization, we should like to have it.

The gentleman from Texas very kindly promised to send to me a transcript of his committee's evidence, but until this good moment he has not been able to do so. I do not know whether he has the evidence or not. I assume from his statements that he must have but certainly I do not think this House ought to act upon the basis of a charge which has not so far been supported by the submission of adequate evidence to determine its truth or falsity. I feel that our subcommittee charged with the duty of preparing the appropriation bill out of which Mr. Lamberton is paid ought to hear evidence and determine whether or not from that evidence they believe Mr. Lamberton is a Communist, and if they so determine take adequate steps in the preparation of that bill to see that his connection with the Government ceases. I believe I am justified in speaking for the committee and saying that if such evidence is disclosed, the committee will take appropriate action; but until evidence of that character is produced, in view of what has transpired, in view of my request of the gentleman from Texas—and he is sitting immediately in front of me and knows those requests were made—and in view of the fact that so far he has failed to submit to our subcommittee evidence of Lamberton's membership in this Communist organization, certainly it seems to me this House would be going a long way today on an appropriation bill which does not carry any money for Mr. Lamberton or for his employment, to put a restriction in it providing that he shall not be paid any funds from the Treasury or the Post Office Department appropriations bill upon the basis of his alleged communistic leanings.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is present. If he desires to take issue with anything I have said I shall be pleased to yield to him.

Mr. DIES. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that the proof of Harry Lamberton's affiliation with and being an officer of some two or three Communist organizations is a matter of record in our hearings where he testified himself, admitted under oath and under subpena produced the records of the organizations which are part of our hearings.

Mr. TARVER. Yes; but answer this question: Did I not, 2 years ago, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, ask the gentleman to submit evidence showing he was a Communist?

Mr. DIES. The gentleman did.

Mr. TARVER. Did I not ask the gentleman last Monday again to submit such evidence?

Mr. DIES. The matter is of public record in hearings that are available to every Member of the House.

Mr. TARVER. Did not the gentleman promise to send that evidence to me?

Mr. DIES. The records of the committee are always available to the gentleman. I will see that he gets the evidence.

Mr. TARVER. Then let us wait before passing on the case of Mr. Lamberton until the appropriate subcommittee having jurisdiction has heard the evidence. I think that is fair, and I do not believe anything else would be fair.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, my question has just been answered. I yield back the minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I think our colleague from Florida has performed a splendid service in bringing this issue directly to the floor of the House. I have said to the House upon a number of occasions that my idea of handling not only these 38, but some 1,200 in all, is for us to have the opportunity to present the evidence to the Appropriations Committee and let the Appropriations Committee weigh the evidence and then take immediate steps to dismiss these people from the Federal service.

Insofar as the names submitted to you by the gentleman from Florida are concerned, the evidence will be found in my speech. If you will read my speech delivered last Monday you will find that in many instances I quoted from the language of the man nimself. There is not any question, in my opinion, that these people are not fit for public service, but they are merely a drop in the bucket.

All that we can possibly ask, and what I want the House to do, is to assure us of immediate action on this whole question. So far as I am concerned, for some years I have been pointing out that on the Federal pay roll were people who had subscribed to ideologies foreign to our country, people who belonged to organizations that are subversive. We have failed to obtain adequate action.

The gentleman from Florida said that he was going to force this issue in the House in the hope that the House would do something. Heretofore we have been unable to get action. The only recourse that any Member of the House has is to offer an amendment similar to the one that the gentleman has offered. Insofar as I am concerned, I would prefer that the Appropriations Committee hear not only these 38 but the whole 1,200 and take action, but up to this date we have no assurance that will be done. Since that is the fact, and since there is no other recourse open to me and to other individual Members of the House, I shall vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin stated that this

problem had been solved by the Appropriations Committee by including in the bill section 302. I want to read section 302 and say emphatically that is not a solution of the problem, and I want to point out why it is not.

Section 302 reads as follows:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

There is no person on the Federal pay roll today who advocates the overthrow of this Government by force, or who will acknowledge he advocates that, but there are many who advocated it in past years. I want you to get the difference. The question that you have to decide is whether John Jones, who 5 years ago with his own language, his own writings, his own associations and everything advocated it, but the same John Jones on the Federal pay roll today says, "I am not a Communist; I do not advocate the overthrow of the Government by force; therefore I am not a Communist." There is the point—"who advocates or who has advocated in the past."

Every one of these 38 have advocated that in the past. Their records will show it. They do not advocate it now and they can sign that affidavit saying, "I do not advocate it, I am not a member of that organization," and they cannot be brought before a court on perjury charges, because who can testify as to whether they themselves still advocate it? That is the whole sum and substance of this question.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the gentleman offer an amendment to cure that situation?

Mr. MASON. I think the amendment that is going to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois will take care of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am a Democrat from Detroit, Mich. I represent a great industrial area. I have the privilege of being not only a Michigan Democrat, but I have had the privilege of going down to Alabama when I was a boy 7 years of age. My father bought a farm of 160 acres down there. I was raised in the South. I played around with Alabama boys, and I went to school with them. I have always had a great admiration for men of the South ever since I came to this Congress. I voted for John McDuffie for Speaker of this House, a great leader from Alabama. I have the greatest respect for men like Joe Byrns, Bankhead, and our present Speaker. They are real Democrats. They are the men who are making our party great. They are men like Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. They were not men brought to the party with provincial ideas, with hatred and prejudice. The great leaders in our party are men who have built up our party in the opposite direction.

It hurts me, it grieves me, to sit here and see other men from the South, that I respect, playing what I think is petty politics, purely district politics, provincialism. That is not going to make our party great.

The Democratic Party has a great job to do. We do not have a great majority, and we are not so powerful. We have got to be a great party, we have got to be a liberal party, we have got to be a progressive party. We have to represent everybody. The Democrats of Detroit, Mich., who work in those factories, have to be represented by the Democratic Party here, as well as the cotton planters. Some Members of Congress may have some of the old ideas that were brought about by some of the misleaders of democracy who did preach hatred and things of that kind. We do not want appeals to hatreds and prejudices.

We have a great job to do. We must do that job. We have a great leader. We have a great President. We have a great man down here in the White House. The Democrats better stand together. We better fight to win this war, we better start fighting Mussolini, Hitler, and Tojo.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this is a nonpolitical or a nonpartisan question with me, I do not hesitate to take my stand on this side of the aisle. I do not know a single person on this list. I did not know until I was told here in the House that the first man named on that list of 38 or 40 people is a member of the Negro race, and I do not care about that. What I am opposed to is charging, trying, condemning, and punishing anybody without a trial, and that is what I regard this proposed action here today.

I am going to have to vote against the proposed resolution or amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois, if he offers it. He may be able, and I doubt not that he is, to pass on the question that he made mention of here, but if I did it as a Member of this Congress and sitting as a juror, I would have to do it upon hearsay evidence. They tell me that there is only one man now, and that I did not know, who would be immediately affected by this amendatory legislation, and that he is a Negro by the name of William Pickens. I do not know but that there are men listed in these 38 names who are now in the armed service of the United States.

What I am opposed to is relegating to a denial of consideration the provisions referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] that are ample. If a man swears that he is not in favor of the overthrow of this Government by force or violence, and it is found out that he does adopt such thought, he is then guilty of a felony. He will be tried in the orderly way.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against every part of this amendment because I do not feel that it is a proper thing for us to legislate in that way and virtually try men—38 of them together—in this fashion. If we cannot get that stricken out altogether, next I will ask for a division in order that maybe one man who might be in the armed service today instead of employed by the Government somewhere may not be stigmatized by what we do on this occasion. I am opposed to the whole thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I did not count the number of names mentioned in this amendment. The number has been variously referred to as 38 or 40. Debate has been limited to 30 minutes. That would be less than 1 minute per person, if the debate were devoted to a consideration of individuals, which, of course, it will not be. I cannot condemn people unless I know something about them. I have voted for continuation of the Dies committee before, and I expect to do it again. It has done good service and will do more. But I cannot condemn 38 individuals without knowing something of the evidence on each of them. I do not even know that each of these persons would be condemned by a majority of the Dies committee. I do not understand that more than one or two of these persons has ever had a hearing. Of most of them we know nothing.

Some years ago I served on a Federal grand jury. I have never forgotten the charge the old district judge gave to the members of that jury as we assembled for the first time. He told us something about the history of the development of Anglo-Saxon justice. I am perfectly willing to vote on a case where the evidence is clearly before us and the issue is joined, but I am not willing to condemn 38 men and women in 30 minutes on ex parte presentation without even a specific statement on each one of the individuals concerned. We are supposed to be fighting a war to sustain the Anglo-Saxon idea of justice. Let not this legislative body today give the lie to that by such a procedure as is here proposed. As has been suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], I cannot believe that Abraham Lincoln would vote for the proposition now before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, during the last several years of the life of the Dies committee I have made but one speech regarding it, and it contained very few words. I said, "I hope the committee will be continued until all the Communists in the country have learned to say, 'Never say Dies.'" That was a remark indicating that I favored the continuation of the committee.

Almost the entire membership of this House rose and cheered the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] the other day. Certainly we seemed to have approved his findings. Am I today to be told that each case must be proved before each and every member of the Committee on

Appropriations before the findings of the gentleman from Texas and his committee are accepted?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has robbed me of a part of my speech. Section 302 is indeed worthless, useless verbiage. No matter what views a man held yesterday, if he certifies that he is loyal today, he must be considered pure.

I want only loyal people in this Government, especially these days. Is it wrong that a man should be challenged because he has belonged to subversive organizations? Is it necessary that he advocate the overthrow of this Government by force and violence? Shall he be accepted if he only hisses and thumbs his nose at the Government? That is not violence, is it? If he raves and insults us, is that nothing? How easy for him to escape punishment, or even to be employed by that same Government.

How I appreciate these lawyers. I have no emotion or hatred as stated by others. I did not know a colored man was involved. But you have heard these lawyers today. Thank God I am not a lawyer. I can look at things with some balance, I think, but a lawyer wants a jury. He accepts no ex parte accusations. Are documented statements from a House committee exactly in that category? But the lawyer likes the trial proceedings: "When the cause goes hard the guilty man excepts and thins the jury all he can." Is not that illustrative? They attempt to claim there is some truth in section 302. Ridiculous! We can read and interpret even if we are not lawyers. If the usual forms of trial were used, treason would have to be proven against such men before you could separate them from the Government pay rolls.

Somehow I feel that I should support the Dies committee or vote to abolish it. That is mainly the question involved. They were the ones selected by us to make these determinations. They have documented their evidence. What more can they do? If they have not proven an impartial jury, let us do away with them. After such a recent demonstration of confidence in them, why now hesitate to accept their recommendations?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I think any American who believes in our form of government and a fair trial and justice as we know it cannot on an ex parte hearing condemn any man of a crime. I have had the privilege of serving as a prosecuting attorney, and I know I would not like to be on a jury and listen to the evidence submitted by the prosecution, refuse to permit the defendant to be heard and present his evidence, and then be compelled to render a decision. That is exactly the situation that is presented here.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that if these men are severed from the pay roll it does not mean they are even charged with any crime, it does not mean we have condemned them, and it does not mean we have tried them. The average man on the street knows these bureaus are run by Communists or that they have communistic influences, and he does not want us to appropriate money to further that course.

Mr. JACKSON. I am sure the gentleman understands that we are not sitting here as a grand jury today, I hope. The gentleman should know that by this action we will be branding these men in public print as such, and that while they are not charged specifically with a crime, perhaps, to all intents and purposes they will be branded as such and their reputation destroyed. The gentleman knows that as well as I do.

The most elementary procedure that could have been followed here was that these men should have a right to a hearing and notice thereof. Were these men subpenaed before the Committee on Appropriations and given an opportunity to present their case? All I am doing today is appealing to your fairness and sense of justice to all, whether we differ with them or agree with them. That is what we are supposed to be fighting for, among other things.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with everything that has been said by the previous speaker. I would be willing to say that if I were convinced, if we were all convinced of the fact that these people are Communists that possibly such action should be taken, but I submit that it was never the intention of anybody who voted for the extension of the Dies committee to give that committee so much power. We do not know what evidence has been brought to bear, nor what evidence has come out to show that these people are Communists. We do not know whether the accused had an opportunity to cross-examine any of the witnesses, or be represented by counsel. It does not seem to me fair or just, simply because a man's name appears on the list of the Dies committee, or because Mr. DIES or a member of his committee has called him a Communist, that we should find him guilty and deny him employment by the Government, or that money should not be appropriated to pay him where he has been employed. I do not believe anybody ever intended to give such power to the Dies committee. Such action is a departure from our democratic form of government. If we had some way of actually finding out the facts it would be a different situation. I would be inclined to agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that if sufficient proof was brought before us, then some action should be taken, but I submit in all fairness and in all justice that this is no way to do it. It is very easy these days to sear the reputation of a person by the branding iron of war hysteria. It is just as easy to call a person a Fascist or a Nazi as it is to call him a Communist. Because he is called a Communist does not necessarily establish the all-important fact that he is one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL].

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, here is another one of those old prosecuting attorneys. I want to ask a question before you gentlemen on either side criticize my vote, if I vote. I heard a name read here whose people I have known all my life. His brother is the commander of the American Legion post at home. His mother has the blood of Nancy Hanks flowing in her veins, and those people have lived in that community for four or five generations on both sides of the house, and never before have I ever heard their loyalty questioned, their patriotism or their public spirit, on any proposition. This man was educated at the Transylvania University. He was educated for a Christian preacher Now, I am to be asked to vote very shortly on a conviction or an acquittal. Thus you see that I would not be able to cast a vote without more information, for I am unwilling to vote on hearsay testimony against a friend and acquaintance. Unless you take the vote separately on each name, I shall be compelled to vote against it all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. How many other speakers are concerned in this matter?

The CHAIRMAN. There are 4 more minutes remaining, and two more speakers.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then somebody else will be denied the right to speak if this consent is granted?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I have 2 minutes granted to me, and I yield those 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr' CREAL. I do not care to accept them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we are all in thorough sympathy with the purpose of this amendment. I do not think there is a Member of the House who would take issue with the purpose sought to be attained by the amendment, but that question is not directly presented here. The question immediately before us is the penalizing of 38 men of whom we have never heard before, and here for the first time called to our attention by this unexpected amendment.

My good friend from North Carolina says that it is in effect an arraignment, a trial, a judgment, and an execution all in one, but on closer scrutiny, it has more the appearance of a lynching bee. The proposal here is that these men be

given short shrift. It smacks of the procedure in the French Chamber of Deputies, during the Reign of Terror.

Mr. Chairman, the House is no place for a trial of that character. To deprive men of civic rights in this summary and arbitrary manner, without notice and without opportunity to speak for themselves, is one of the most serious and drastic actions this body could take. This is neither the place nor the time, but there are means by which the matter can be properly and appropriately reached. The gentleman from Texas suggests that it be submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, where charges can be heard and where the accused be given opportunity to reply. That would be in keeping with American institutions. Under our law every man is entitled to his day in court, and if the matter is brought regularly to the attention and jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations the committee will be glad to hear it. I make this response to that suggestion contingent with the concurrence and approval of the minority members of the committee, and shall be glad to have an expression from the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I will cooperate with the gentleman in every way in having a full hearing, if the matter is presented to our committee.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I simply rise to say to the gentleman from Missouri that the independent offices appropriation bill will be on the floor of the House next week. Several names which have been under investigation and discussion by the Dies committee are on the pay rolls of some of the agencies in the independent offices appropriation bill. The distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], a member of the Dies committee, is a very useful member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Independent Offices. In line with the suggestion made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], those names were discussed with the several agencies, evidence taken on them, and I am sure when the bill comes to the House there will be a record that the House can act upon intelligently if it wishes to do so and not be called upon to act upon a great many names that we have never heard about before.

I trust the House will permit that procedure to prevail.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Let me appeal to the Members of the House to follow orderly procedure. Let us not lose our sense of perspective.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, under the rules of the House, after debate is once fixed, it cannot be changed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman correctly states the rule.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HENDRICKS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that the motion of the gentleman from Florida must be in writing.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is in writing.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is already a motion before the Committee, namely, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida, which must be acted upon before any other motion is considered.

Mr. HENDRICKS. This is a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. HENDRICKS. On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I simply point out to the Chair that this is a preferential motion, which takes precedence over all other motions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled and the gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I hate to take the floor again, but I have been here for 6 years now, and I am now beginning my seventh year. Practically ever since I have been here I have heard Members of the House, not only on the left side but on the right side—Democrats and Republicans—cussing the "bureaucrats and blockheads and damn fools" in the departments. I have also heard the Dies committee come in here and give us the names of people who should be removed. As I have before pointed out, we have given the Dies committee over $500,000. When the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] made his report to this House the other day and submitted the very names that I am giving you today every Member of this House rose to his feet and cheered, showing their confidence in the Dies committee.

Today, when I submit those names for you to take action, what do I find? Not only my chairman, whom I greatly respect, but the leaders on both sides saying, "This is not the way to do it." Every time we have attempted to do something about these people who we are convinced are Communists somebody has said, "There is another way to do it." As long as I have been here, I have not seen that other way to do it. I have been asked by Members on both sides to withdraw this amendment and to submit one name. I am going to submit the one name if this amendment is not adopted, but I am going down fighting on this one amendment. I am not going to withdraw it. As far as I am concerned, I am going to let the Members of this House take the responsibility.

Members stand here and tell me that they are convicting them without trial. Why, Mr. Chairman, they have convicted themselves by their own associations, and I challenge any Member of this House to take this record of William Pickens and carry it back to your people and tell them that you voted to keep him in the employ of the Government, and try to be reelected. Here he is. For your benefit you have the advantage of the files of the committee. I say that if you want to see whether this man is guilty or not look at these files and I challenge you as I submit the evidence of these files to say he is not.

We talk about the provision of the existing bill. I want to point out two things. You know what that provision is. Let me tell you what the Communist Party had to say about it, their instructions to their people as to what to do under circumstances of this kind. They would just as soon lie as not; they will give an affidavit that they are not Communists and come right in and get a job with the Government. Here is what they say:

The tactics to be assumed under police examination must be much more elastic than that. But the fundamental principle remains the same: No statements incriminating any comrade, no names, no addresses, not a single fact which could possibly be used directly or indirectly against the party, its organs, or individual members of the organization. No explanations in this respect. Absolute denial even when personally confronted with the persons and despite the evidence given by police spies and agent provocateurs. Whoever infringes, even but a little, these fundamental rules must instantly and mercilessly be ejected from the party.

Let me say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I am going to vote for this amendment. My leaders, my chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] whom I admire very much, said we had a way to get at this. We had an instance of that last year in the case of one Goodwin Watson, whose name was brought before us and whose case was acted upon in this House. We kicked him out of the Communications Commission, we thought, but he is still in the Communications Commission. That is all that happened.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman has made a preferential motion——

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am stating why I am against the bill and I am going to keep on stating it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking on his motion, as he has just said that he is going to vote for his own amendment. He is not therefore speaking to the preferential motion which is to refer the bill back to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The preferential motion is part of the amendment itself and the Chair thinks the gentleman from Florida is well within his rights.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. HENDRICKS. As to these promises that other means will be used to get rid of these men, to get them off the pay rolls, I do not believe that. I am going to stick to this one thing and then my record will be clear. If these men are found on the pay rolls at the end of the year you take your responsibility; I am taking mine today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a short observation?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I cannot yield for an observation; I have only 5 minutes. I am sorry.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we shall deliberate very carefully and without any emotion in voting on this amendment that is presently before the Committee. I do not have to say for those of you who have served in this Congress with me or for those who may care to look at the record that I have voted without exception in support of the Dies committee; I have voted not only to sustain the committee but to appropriate funds for its work. I think it has done some very fine work. I yield to no man in an utter disgust at the manner in which some bureaus and agencies have continued to hold on to people who have been investigated and who have been demonstrated not to be suitable for the Federal service; but, Mr. Chairman, the Members are being called upon here today to take a remarkable action. Only one man in this list is directly and personally before you. The committee bringing in the bill has had no hearings whatsoever on the subject; nobody has appeared before the Committee and suggested that this man was unfit for the public service. The only thing you have is the ex parte statement of the chairman of the committee.

I should like to ask if there is any reason why the Dies committee cannot bring in a bill to this House setting out the names of 1,200, 700, 500, or 38?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not just now.

They could set out their names and assert that they are unfitted for public service. Then we should have an issue before us that we could pass upon, evidence, and could decide what should be done as a matter of general policy. The Appropriations Committee is presently setting up machinery whereby we shall have the advantage of some investigators. We are going into these matters. Two or three of these names were called to the attention of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices. We had hearings on them, and I can say to the Committee here today that as a result of those hearings one of the men discussed is either already off the pay roll of the Government or will be before the bill is reported to the House.

Mr. MASON. That is not enough.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That may not be enough, but I may say to my friend from Illinois, who is a very useful member of the Dies committee, that if it is not enough when we bring in the independent offices bill, he can raise the issue while that bill is being considered; he can bring it up and discuss it.

I have no quarrel with this Committee today if it takes off the pay roll any man in this bill we are considering, because I think that is an issue properly before us. I do think, though, you should have given this subcommittee a chance to consider the matter. When you go beyond that and bring in a motion that no one has considered, that is something entirely different, and I venture to say that there are not 25 men on the floor of this House who know one scintilla of fact about any of these names.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Has not the Dies committee considered this matter with almost $500,000 of the people's money? Has the gentleman read the report? Every Member of this House should. I think the fault is they have not read it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Well, why can they not bring in a bill here and make that a direct issue for the House to consider?

Mr. CHURCH. The report of the Dies committee is here and has been here for days.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman knows that our committee has no right to report a bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We ought to give you that right. The House should give you that right. The House ought to give you the right to bring in legislation. I think it is idiotic to set up a committee to do that kind of work and then not implement it with authority to bring in legislation.

Mr. DIES. We have introduced some four or five or six bills, and that was the end of the whole matter.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. My friend has turned over to me a file containing certain information mentioned in a speech he made the other day and it is going to have the consideration of the Appropriations Committee. Every one of these things will have consideration. I want to appeal to the House today not to go on record in this manner.

Mr. DIES. If we will bring to your committee the records in writing of 1,200 men, will the gentleman give us time to present the cases against these 1,200 men?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They ought to be presented in connection with the bills involving the various departments in which they are working.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the enacting clause stricken out.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HENDRICKS. This is simply on the preferential motion, not on my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN to the amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKS: Strike out all after the name "William Pickens" in the Hendricks amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on this section and all amendments thereto.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 130, noes 137.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. LUDLOW and Mr. HENDRICKS to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 146, noes 153.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman in order in offering this amendment?

Mr. HENDRICKS. This is a separate amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say that the gentleman from Florida may offer another amendment, but there can be no debate on the amendment, because debate on this section has been closed.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman has no right to debate the amendment.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Was debate closed on the section?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Debate was limited on the section and all amendments thereto, and that time has expired. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKS: On page 12, line 22, after the word "Treasury", strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of William Pickens."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LUDLOW and Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 159, noes 102.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HENDRICKS and Mr. LUDLOW.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 163, noes 111.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

Salaries: For personal services in the District of Columbia, Office of the Treasurer of the United States, $2,940,000: *Provided*, That with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, there may be transferred (not exceeding a total of $410,000) to this appropriation and to the appropriations "Printing and binding, Office of the Treasurer of the United States" and "Contingent expenses, Office of the Treasurer of the United States," from funds respectively available for such purposes for the Agricultural Conservation and Adjustment Administration, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Federal land banks and other banks and corporations under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration, Railroad Retirement Board, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, United States Maritime Commission, Agricultural Marketing Administration, Farm Security Administration, National Youth Administration, Federal Housing Administration, Federal Public Housing Authority, Commodity Credit Corporation, and corporations and banks under the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, such sums as may be necessary to cover the expenses incurred on account of such respective activities in clearing of checks, servicing of bonds, handling of collections, and rendering of accounts therefor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 13, after line 22, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization in this act shall be used to pay any part of the salary or expenses of any person whose salary or expenses are prohibited from being paid from any appropriation or authorization in any other act."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall take just a moment to explain that this is the proposal I suggested to the committee earlier in the day. It would prevent an individual who had been interdicted from being on the Federal pay roll from hopping from one department or agency to another. I recall that on several occasions that has happened. After the House had passed upon an individual and ejected him from a department or agency pay roll, we discovered in a subsequent period that he was in some other agency. The net purport of this language is that once the Congress has taken him off the pay roll he cannot play hide and seek in the Government and turn up in some other spot. This amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the language of the gentleman's amendment cover a prohibition that we may put in a later act that may be passed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right; if the payment of his salary is prohibited by any other act hereafter passed, then he cannot be transferred to this particular pay roll in the Treasury Department.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, what I shall say may seem somewhat of an anticlimax.

As much as I may hate and despise the conduct of certain individuals, and however reprehensible their conduct might be, I question the right of Congress to legislate in the manner which is now attempted regarding the rights and privileges of certain selected and named individuals. The right to hold public office is an inherent right in the citizenship of this great Republic. It is an inalienable right. Certain restrictions have been placed upon the right to hold public office and those restrictions will be found in the fundamental and organic law of the land. Certain age limits have been provided. My recollection is that a citizen must have reached his twenty-first birthday before being qualified or eligible for membership in this House. I believe that the minimum age for membership in the Senate is 30 years and for the office of President it is 35 years of age.

In addition to these limitations we have placed another limitation upon the right to hold the highest office in the gift of the people, that of the Presidency of the United States. In addition to being 35 years of age, the President must be a native-born American citizen. A naturalized citizen cannot be President of this country. Likewise, we have laid down certain rules and regulations and enacted certain laws governing the conduct of individuals and provided that the breach or violation of certain laws which have been enacted may deprive an individual of his American citizenship and may disqualify him to hold public office. A person tried and convicted of treason or certain other high crimes and felonies may lose the right to hold public office, the sacred and inalienable right with which we are now dealing. We may provide other limitations and set other standards and establish other formulas, but such limitations and standards and formulas must be applicable to all of the people of this Nation. We cannot place burdens upon selected and named individuals which impair the integrity of their citizenship. We cannot convert this forum into a trial court. We have no right to make inquiry into an individual's political philosophies. We neither indict, try, nor convict individuals in this Chamber. Even a Communist might legally be elected to membership in this body.

Our Government tolerates no discriminations against individuals on account of either race, color, or creed. While I would like to free this Government of every incompetent, inefficient, and unpatriotic, crackpot bureaucrat, I believe that I appreciate fully the limitations upon the power vested in each Member of this House. We still have a Constitution. We still have a democratic system. We still have three separate and distinct branches of government.

My objection to this suggested limitation or legislation is fundamental and far from superficial. Personally, I should like to see the President arrange immediately for the discharge of every unpatriotic person who is now employed in the executive branch of the Government. We create agencies, clothe them with power, and set them in motion, but the entire responsibility for the success or failure of such agencies to function rests with the Executive. We neither hire nor fire the personnel. We, of course, may withhold appropriations. We, of course, may abolish the agencies we have created, but we cannot, in my opinion, constitutionally enact a law which will prevent Tom, Dick, and Harry from holding office.

Let us consider a hypothetical case. Let us suppose that the President has selected and named an individual as judge of the Supreme Court or of one of the inferior courts, and let us suppose that the Senate has confirmed the appointment of the person nominated by the President. Then let us further suppose that the House takes unto itself the authority to sit in judgment upon the action of the President and the Senate and specifically withholds the entire salary of the individual who has been nominated and appointed a judge and has entered upon the performance of his judicial duties. Do you believe that the courts of this country would hold that act to be constitutional? Of course, I do not think that such a thing would happen. In the first place, if the Senate had confirmed the appointment, it would not, in all probability, agree to the withholding of the salary, but if the House had taken such a position it would be plain to see the ridiculous situation in which we would be placing ourselves. Let us further suppose that the President should appoint one of the individuals listed in the amendments offered here today to some responsible position, either in the legislative or judicial branch of the Government. Could we by an act of Congress, either directly or indirectly, nullify the act of the Executive? Could we by an act of Congress deny the well-earned salaries of General MacArthur, General Eisenhower, and other many brave generals and officers who are now engaged in the grim and grave business

of winning this war? We have our own responsibility and that is quite enough. The President has his responsibility and that is now a great burden.

I commend to the legal minds and to the lawyers of this body for their consideration the observations which I have made. We are now facing what appears to me to be a very serious constitutional barrier and I do not think that we should regard it lightly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this amendment is clearly legislation, and that if anybody had made a point of order against it in time it would have been sustained. The trouble is that no point of order was made against it. This is clearly legislation not germane to this bill, because it refers to other acts of legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. My recollection is that the point of order was made and the Chair held that it was a limitation, and was properly before the House.

Mr. EBERHARTER. No point of order was made against this particular amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. My objection is fundamental. It is to the method of legislating with regard to individuals. As I have said, we can lay down standards, we can say that there shall be a certain standard for holding office, but that standard shall be applicable to all the 130,000,000 people of America. You cannot lay down one standard for one man and another standard for all the other people of America.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I agree with what the gentleman has said, but I do not believe the gentleman wants to be understood as saying that the Dies committee could not introduce a bill in support of what they think should be done to correct this situation.

Mr. COOLEY. In the first place, the Dies committee is not one of the legislative committees of the House. I even question the right of the Committee on the Judiciary or any other committee to pick out a single citizen of this great Nation and say that because of some beliefs that he entertains he shall not hold office.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is correct about that in my opinion, but I want to get this over, that there is nothing to prevent the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] from introducing a bill to correct the vices that he has found.

Mr. COOLEY. I think that the gentleman from Texas [Mr DIES] or any member of his committee would find it very difficult to draft legislation to correct these vices.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. If the gentleman is correct in his assumption that the House should not interfere with the right of people to hold office in the executive agencies, will he tell us what the remedy is when a person is appointed to office in an executive agency who spends his time not carrying out the mandate of Congress, but in doing a thing which is entirely subversive, which does the people no good, but on the other hand, does them harm? What is the remedy?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman propounds a pertinent question. I regret, and frankly confess that I do not know just how to deal with the problem. I agree with the gentleman that something should be done about it. I want to make this clear: That I would delight to do something to free the pay rolls of this country from the crackpots and others who should not be holding jobs.

Mr. MOTT. There is always a remedy both in the matter of an elected officer and in the matter of an appointed officer. If it is an appointed officer and his confirmation by the Senate is necessary, then the Senate has the right to act.

Mr. COOLEY. But does the House have the right to act?

Mr. MOTT. No; but if a man is elected as a Member of this House, then the House has the right to pass upon his qualifications for office.

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct. The House has the right to pass upon the question of seating or refusing to seat a Member.

Mr. MOTT. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. But suppose, as I suggest, that the President were to take one of these persons, which I pray he will not, and appoint him to the office of judge, and the Senate confirmed him, then could we as a legislative body withhold salary from him?

Mr. MOTT. Then I think our remedy would be by impeachment, but I do not understand that we can impeach every one of these subordinate officers who spends his time in carrying on subversive activities instead of carrying out the law of Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. The statement has been made that we were trying, convicting, and condemning these individuals.

Mr. MOTT. Oh, I think that statement is incorrect.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MOTT. If a man is a Communist it does not require evidence to convince me that he should not be on the Government pay roll, and if there is evidence before the Congress that a man is a crackpot and not capable of carrying out the duties of his position, then I think we should withhold his salary.

Mr. COOLEY. It has been stated that we have accused him of a great crime. We have not, because it is not a crime to be a Communist in America.

Mr. MOTT. If the Congress decides that they are people who are not working in the interest of the Government, they should not be on the pay roll, and I think it is perfectly proper by legislation to withhold their salaries.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But is it not a fact that we have people running on the Communist ticket for public office?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct. It is not a crime, however much I may differ with them who entertain that philosophy.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The power of appointment to office rests with the Executive, and the Executive is responsible to the people, and if there is any criticism to be made of that appointment, then criticism comes from the people in the direction of the Executive, and when we say that a person who has been appointed shall not be paid, we are infringing upon the right of the Executive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to see if I can get a time limit on this debate?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very important amendment. It is fundamental, and I think we should have ample time to debate it.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I am forced to move that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEWART) there were—ayes 97, noes 52.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I have always been very jealous of the fact that this House has acted in an intelligent, sound and sane way. I like to see legislation properly drawn and well thought out. I feel that this amendment has not been well thought out, and if the committee will merely understand what the amendment provides and what it is trying to do, there would be very few Members who would vote for it.

I am not discussing the merits of the amendment, but I am discussing the manner and method of trying to do something which is not logical and which accomplishes nothing.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] reads as follows:

> No part of any appropriation or authorization in this act shall be used to pay any part of the salary or expenses of any person as prohibited from being paid in any other act.

In other words, the gentleman says in this amendment that no money appropriated for the Treasury and Post Office Departments shall be used to pay the salary of anybody proscribed in any other act. That is the interpretation of this amendment. The amendment in effect says that if you deny use of Treasury

and Post Office money from employing Pickens in this bill, then you may not use Treasury and Post Office money to employ him in another department. That seems quite illogical to me.

I want to call the attention of the committee to this fact that section 302 of this act is in every appropriation act passed during the last Congress and no doubt will be in every appropriation act passed during this Congress, in which all of the people you are trying to keep off of the pay rolls are prohibited from being employed in his respective department.

In other words, the acts as they now stand, and as they will stand in this session of Congress, prohibits the employment of those people with subversive records. That stops everyone on the pay roll, and the Dirksen amendment attempts to go a little further and say that no money in this bill shall be used to employ such people elsewhere. Of course, it cannot be, and if the gentleman meant to stop employment in any other bureau, then his amendment would have been subject to a point of order. But he does not say that. He says none of the money in this bill shall be used to pay for the employment of a man in another branch. Well, it could not be done, since you appropriate only for the Treasury and Post Office in this bill. In the second place, it would be prohibited by the very bill dealing with the appropriation for that branch by a similar section 302 carried in every bill.

It seems to me that legislation of that sort is so meaningless, so involved, and so lacking in proper procedure that it should not even be entertained. And that has nothing to do with the merits of the individual case.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman's interpretation of section 302 of this bill is a very loose interpretation, because Harry Bridges could be hired by any department of the Government if he swore he was not a Communist now and did not advocate the overthrow of the Government.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman from Illinois, like this amendment, is trying to do something else. The amendment does not change that one particle. The amendment would not correct a situation of that sort.

Mr. MASON. I am talking about section 302.

Mr. O'NEAL. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has no basis for insertion in this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that five gentlemen were on their feet and that the 15 remaining minutes will be divided equally among those five gentlemen.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the time that was allotted to me.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the membership of this Committee has become somewhat impassioned over this subject matter today. It is obvious to me, and, in answer to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], may I state that in my humble opinion this House is the sole judge of its own qualifications and of its own standards, and just as the Senate can confirm or refuse to ratify, so this House can set any standards which it sees fit, respecting its appropriations and their restrictions, as to the amounts or who administers them.

As for me today, I have not made charges, I have not heard details of any charges, and I have not of necessity believed the charges that have been made, in deciding my votes today. I simply have acted on logic. If a man is an employee of this Government and if some people have seen fit to question his loyalty, and knowing, as I do, that he has no property right in the job which he holds, why can I not, as a Member of this House, vote to have him taken from the pay roll? Indeed, if I am empowered to use my wisdom or lack of it in arriving at the amount of an appropriation, by that same token I am empowered to use my wisdom or lack of it in restricting that appropriation. Whatever this Congress can create, this Congress can destroy, be it authority, an appropriation, or any other thing—including a job any person may hold. Therefore, if a man's character has come into question, be he Communist, be he white, black, green, or yellow, I say to you that arbitrarily, based again on our wisdom or lack of it, we can lop off the salary of any person as we see fit, and particularly are we bound in duty to do this when the loyalty of the person involved has been questioned. That is what I have done today. I did not of necessity believe the charges that I have heard. I may or may not believe them. I do believe that sufficient question has been raised to announce to this country that a man or woman does not have a property right in any Federal job. If their name or associations have led any prudent man to believe that they may have now or may have had in the past any communistic tendencies to overthrow our form of government with force and violence, that being true, we can certainly vote them out of any job that we see fit.

I do hope this Congress is not put in a false position. I have not of necessity subscribed to any charges I have heard today; I have exercised my privilege given me by those whom I attempt to represent. A man's loyalty has been questioned and also his fitness to hold the position. I therefore can report to my people that since his loyalty was questioned, I favored somebody for that assignment whose loyalty has not been questioned. This is what the House has done. To those, be they lawyers or laymen, who stand on this floor and allow the words to fall from their lips that the House today indicted, convicted, and executed certain people, I say to them, regardless of their profession, that they do not know whereof they speak; they are trying to hide behind something that does not exist. I say to you this man was fired, and he was fired because his loyalty to this Government has been questioned, and there are a lot of citizens to take his place whose loyalty has not been questioned; I am for them and so are you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the House this afternoon rejected the amendment presented by the gentleman from Florida, and I will give you my reasons. I reached the floor late in the discussion on the amendment—too late to obtain time to speak on it. I learned some interesting facts. The name of George Slaff, of Passaic, N. J., in my congressional district, is among the names in the list of 38. He was listed as chief attorney for the Federal Power Commission I called the Commission and learned this: He was chief attorney for the Commission, but he is no longer; he is in Algiers, Africa, serving with the American Red Cross after months of service in the British Isles—this after he tried on four different occasions to enlist in the Army but was prevented because he was classified 4F by his local board on account of physical disability. I called the American Red Cross and they told me he held a high administrative post; in fact, there was an indication that he was second in command over there with the Red Cross in Algiers, doing, the Red Cross reported, a magnificent job. This proves, I say to you, that we cannot meet this problem in the mass way we attempted to this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I think today will mark the beginning of a feeling on the part of the people of restored confidence in their legislative body. It makes no difference who is lopped off by an executive who has full discretion to hire and fire; it does not destroy anybody's political potentialities, but the framers of the Constitution gave us certain rights. We have given those rights to the executive. The power to give carries with it the power to take away. This may not be the mild way. We cannot see possibly the first 2 years of some person's interest in a subversive organization, but when those in authority and in a position to learn do not, or ignore what they learn, and fail to keep improper persons off the Government pay roll, our action in taking advantage of legislation by an amendment and striking them from the pay roll is going to meet with the approval of my folks. They are fed up with some of the things that have been going on.

It was my good fortune in the forty-first session of the Oklahoma Legislature to head a committee of the Oklahoma Senate which investigated subversive activities in our State. We found a school teacher in the university who owned 500 U. S. S. R. bonds at a time when the Communists were just as mad with us as the Germans are today. We fired him. He came to Washington and I am told got a $6,500 job—a hundred percent raise. Over in Oklahoma we are fed up with this kind of politics.

We brought this condition about by certain legislation, and all the errors are primarily chargeable to us. We may have some secondary excuse to pass the buck, but when it is all brought home we are responsible and chargeable with it, and justly so. Some of these days if we do not stick our neck up to that clock on the wall against this organized labor group running the country we are going to have here some people who are not going to be too much in sympathy with them. These are predictions from a freshman, but just put your ears out where the woods are burning and the grass is on fire and you will learn the truth of my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, by the action that the House recently took on the Pickens case and by that it will undoubtedly take on this amendment, it is, in my opinion, ignoring the realities of a world where nations and people are fighting for survival. We are ignoring the lessons that the blood-spilling of patriotic men is teaching the peoples throughout the world. We are ignoring the enemy's secret weapon and permitting it to be used successfully against us.

That lesson is that since 1922 both fascism and nazi-ism have used as their secret weapon in their technique for conquest the anti-Communist line. Mussolini marched on Rome with the slogan of saving Italy from bolshevism. Hitler advanced into power on the same vehicle. Later there was established in Berlin an anti-Comintern axis of Japan, fascist Italy, and Hitler.

This Axis has used as a technique for conquest from within, a technique which was successful in France and many other countries, the laying down of a smoke screen of anticommunism. Behind that smoke screen they have marched on and have captured and destroyed democratic institutions in their own countries and in the countries they have conquered. Only last Saturday Hitler again raised the anti-Communist cry. Hitler proclaimed to the world that he was fighting to save the world from bolshevism. He again raised the anti-Communist cry in order to defeat the men on the battlefield, our men and the men of our allies; raised it again for the purpose of winning his battles against the democratic peoples of the world. He used the anti-Communist cry, "Save the world from bolshevism" in the hope that he would divide the people of the various nations, in the hope he would split them and then conquer them. A comparison of Hitler's speech with some of those made here this week would shock our men on the battlefields by the similarity of words, ideas, and the line adopted. And again, today, the Congress of the United States, the greatest deliberative body in any democracy in the world, reechoes the anti-Communist line of Adolf Hitler and scores another victory against democracy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LUDLOW) there were—ayes 144, noes 45.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COURTNEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, 1944, H. R. 1648, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of other special orders previously granted, I may be permitted to proceed for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the Treasury-Post Office Department bill and its consideration will be continued on Monday?

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I am qualified to answer that. I assume it will. I am trying to locate the majority leader to see what his understanding is.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the Speaker can tell us.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was of the opinion that this bill would be concluded today.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, some statement ought to be made, in view of the statement yesterday by the majority leader that there would be no roll call on the resolution which comes up Monday, if it does come up.

The SPEAKER. That was the statement of the majority leader and that will be carried out.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I understand from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] that the majority leader has informed him that the business on Monday will be further consideration of the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. We will take it up on Monday.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order on Tuesday next for 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that that special order be extended to 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next at the conclusion of the legislation business in order for the day and the other special orders I may have 20 minutes, following the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a letter addressed to Senator THOMAS, of Oklahoma, together with a resolution of the Chamber of Commerce, Madill, Okla., and others, and a statement of activities of acquisition, Department of United States Army at Denison Dam project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, my constituents in the Denison Dam area are very much grieved with the price paid and the delay before payment is made for lands acquired by the Army in the construction of the Denison Dam. Most of these people are small landowners, and in most cases they are thrown into the Federal court, the cases are tried at Muskogee, Okla., the farthest court town in the eastern district of Oklahoma, despite the fact that 28 miles to the east is the city of Durant, a court town, and 28 miles to the west is Ardmore, a court town. The expenses of attorney fees, witness fees, and attending court are prohibitive in most cases. These citizens are subjected to accepting a price for their homes that is in many cases under the appraisement by the Government and they are compelled to wait from 6 months to 2 years for their money. In most cases this land represents the savings of a lifetime, and the appraisement was made back when land was of less value than today. These home owners cannot in any other location purchase with the money received from the Government a home comparable to the one acquired from them. They are entitled to relief from this body if our legal machinery is permitted to clog to the point

where delay will absorb their entire interest in their land.

The inadequate price paid for the land is but one grievance. There are 70 producing oil wells in the Cumberland oil field in Marshall and Bryan Counties, with a daily allowable of 8,000 barrels. No adjustment has been made with the royalty owners nor the operators of the leasehold estates, no material has been made available so the structures above the water line can be constructed. The depth of the water will vary from a few inches to 64 feet, and without an adjustment will close and shut down this field for an indefinite period of time. This letter, resolution, and statement of facts was compiled solely by interested citizens of Madill, Okla. If the Members of Congress will take time to read these written instruments, I believe they will convince each and every one of you. We believe this complaint of sufficient magnitude that Congress should interest themselves to looking into these complaints. The letter, the resolution, and the statement of facts are as follows:

FIDELITY AND GUARANTY FIRE CORPORATION,
*Baltimore, January 28, 1943.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
*United States Senator,*
*Washington, D. C.*

Hon. PAUL STEWART,
*United States Congressman,*
*Washington, D. C.*

Re Denison Dam.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing you this joint letter concerning the inundation of the oil field here at Madill. Most of the leases in the field are owned by the Pure Oil Co. and they have close to 70 producing wells. The allowable for the field is over 8,000 barrels daily.

All the existing wells will be included in the inundation and the depth of the water above the top of the wells is from inches to 64 feet.

I am informed that it takes steel and concrete and time to arrange for these wells to produce. I have also been advised that the Government expects to close the gates in July. The Government has made no good faith attempt to settle with the Pure Oil Co. or the individual landowners here. The holder of the lease cannot get steel and material to build a structure so that they can produce the well after the water is over it.

Under the circumstances, I believe that you should take some kind of definite affirmative action against the War Department. They are taking a third of our tax valuation in our county. It does look like they could either leave the gates open until material is available so we can complete our oil field. The oil field is the only thing we have left. It furnishes money for roads and for schools and we are all vitally interested in it.

I hope you gentlemen will do something about this at an early date.

Very truly yours,

M. E. EWING.

---

RESOLUTION OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MADILL, OKLA., AND OTHERS

Whereas there are about 70 producing oil wells in the Cumberland field in Marshall and Bryan Counties, east of Madill, Okla., and the undersigned have been advised that the Denison Dam Authority expects to close the gates in July of this year and thus inundate said oil field;

Whereas no adjustment has been made with the royalty owners nor the operators of the leasehold estates and no material has been made available so that structures above the water line can be constructed and said oil field continued in its operation; and

Whereas the depth of the water above said wells will be from inches to 64 feet in said oil field and will cause same to be closed and shut down for an indefinite period of time;

Whereas said Denison Dam Authority has taken approximately a third of the taxable wealth in Marshall County and has already seriously damaged the revenues of Marshall County, as well as many school districts thereof, and has made no attempt to adjustment; and

Whereas said Cumberland oil field now has an allowable of over 8,000 barrels daily: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Oklahoma delegation in Congress be advised by this resolution of the action on the part of the Denison Dam Authority with the request that they do everything possible to prevent the closing of the gates of the Dam until sufficient material is available so that proper structures may be builded and said oil field continued in its operation; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, Gen. George C. Marshall, War Department, Washington, D. C., the Oklahoma delegation in Congress, and Robert S. Kerr, Governor of the State of Oklahoma.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
*Madill, Okla.*
By REUEL W. LITTLE, *President.*
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.
By C. D. TURNER, *Chairman.*
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF MADILL, OKLA.
By B. E. ADAMSON, *President.*
CITY OF MADILL, OKLA.
By FRED C. BLALOCK, *Mayor.*
WENDYL WATTS,
*Chairman, Red Cross.*

---

STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES OF ACQUISITION DEPARTMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMY AT DENISON DAM PROJECT

About January 1, 1940, the Acquisition Department of the United States Army began acquiring land for the Denison Dam project. At this time practically all the land has been acquired. No material financial gain to any person can now be made. This statement is made out of a sense of loyalty and patriotism, so that the injustices perpetrated here may be corrected in the future at other places. The undersigned sincerely hope and trust that the most careful consideration will be given to this complaint.

The reason for this statement of fact is because of (1) inefficiency, (2) inadequate price, (3) chiseling on the part of the Acquisition Department.

These matters will be discussed in the order set forth above.

INEFFICIENCY

The inefficiency divides itself into: (1) Time, (2) red tape, (3) jealousies.

TIME

It has taken from 6 months to 2 years from the date an offer is signed to close an ordinary land transaction. The following tracts of land are cited to demonstrate the correctness of the above statement, to wit:

K-351-3, K-267-2, K-60-5, K-36-14, K-59-3, K-84-2, K-59-4, K-60-4, K-351-5, K-61-11, K-84-1, K-84-4, K-84-3, K-36-10, K-60-6, K-59-1, K-352-4, K-36-13, K-107-4, K-60-7, K-84-8, K-60-3, K-81-5.

The above does not include time for appraisement but dates from the time the owner of the land and the Department agrees on the price to be paid for the land.

In private business land deals are closed in a period of from 1 to 10 days.

Closing a land deal, after the price is agreed upon, consists only in an abstract showing title, a deed in accordance with the contract, and payment.

When the acquisition commenced here the contact men advised the home owners that the deal could be closed in from 60 to 90 days. These statements were relied upon to the detriment of the individual. It caused them great inconvenience.

RED TAPE

The undersigned do not know all the various forms involved in closing an ordinary land transaction with the Army, but do state that the following is a part of it:

The land is appraised by a Government appraiser. His report is filed at Denison, Tex. This is then forwarded to the division at Dallas, Tex., and, finally, through various departmental heads—majors, colonels, generals, and the like—it is reviewed at Washington, D. C. The man in Washington never looks at the land, but he must approve or disapprove the appraisement. After it is approved and corrected, it then takes the same circuitous rote back and finally it reaches the Denison office.

The home owner is then contacted. He is not shown the appraisement. The amount of the appraisement is not disclosed to him. He is not offered the amount of the appraisement. They do tell him that they can accept an offer for so much money. This, in most cases, is much less than the appraised value. Further details on this matter will be set forth under the subject Chiseling.

An offer is signed. The home owner knows he must move and he signs an offer. This written offer allows the Government an unlimited period of time to close the deal. The Department will not permit any time limit to be inserted in the offer. The offer is then sent by the Denison office from captain to major to colonel to general by way of Dallas and other points until it reaches the War Department in Washington, D. C. It is then either accepted or rejected and then it takes its circuitous route back to the Denison office and then the home owner is notified of the action taken.

An abstract is then ordered. The attorney at Denison examines it. The attorney at Dallas examines it. It is then sent from captain to major to general by way of Dallas and other points until it reaches the War Department in Washington, D. C. It is then transferred over to the Attorney General of the United States and he examines the abstract and also the opinions of the other attorneys and renders an opinion of title. It then takes a circuitous route from general to colonel to major to captain by way of several points back to Denison, Tex. We think it can be safely stated that no title in the Denison Dam area has passed without one or more rigid requirements.

The abstract and opinions are then given to the title division. They then determine whether the land should be condemned or an attempt made to cure the title. The home owner is not consulted and given an opportunity to cure any defect.

Most of the land is condemned. However, authority must be procured from Washington. This is done through the same circuitous method outlined above. When authority is given, the abstracts are redated and sent to the special attorney for the Department of Justice. He then examines the abstracts and files a condemnation suit in Federal court. Although the price is agreed upon, the home owner is served with an order stating that on a day certain title will be determined. It is usually about 4 to 6 months in the future. The title is usually determined at Muskogee, Okla., a distance of 180 miles or more from the home owner. He must be present or hazard the loss of all proceeds if someone appears and claims the land.

The Federal court then appoints three commissioners to value the land. This is true even though the Government and the home owner have agreed, by an offer and an acceptance, on a price for the land.

After about 30 days the commissioners make a return. They do not show a great

deal of speed for the reason they are paid $25 a day. When their report is filed, there is a 30-day waiting period.

After this time a written transcript, duly certified, is sent, by the circuitous route, to the Attorney General of the United States. He then examines the transcript and authorizes payment.

It is then in order to pay the home owner and the matter is referred to the finance section and the money deposited with the clerk of the court.

After this notice is given to all parties, that the funds will be distributed on a day certain, the court makes an order of distribution and checks are issued.

We have not included in this statement all the red tape, but we think enough has been shown to point out the defects.

If it did not work so many hardships it would be comical.

JEALOUSIES

In going through the red tape above if there appears any minor or insignificant error or omission it is referred back to the Denison office. It seems that the Department in Washington, D. C., delights in pointing out any error. There is little or no cooperation Voluminous reports are required by Washington constantly.

Then the head of the title division at the Denison office and the special attorney for the Department of Justice at Oklahoma City have been at outs constantly. The special attorney thinks the head of the title department incompetent and the head of the title department thinks the special attorney has the swell head. They may both be correct. It is thought the special attorney was too technical and the head of the title department too quick to recommend condemnation. The home owner was not second, third, or fourth His rights were never considered by either of the gentlemen.

There is some department at Washington that prescribes the rules and regulations regarding abstracts. In the early spring of 1942 they issued regulations regarding the preparation and the like of abstracts in this area. They took various regulations from various States in the Union and threw them together. Time will not permit a statement regarding these rules in detail. We say that none of the abstractors in Marshall, Bryan, Love, or Johnston County would bid under the terms of the regulations. Also, the rules and regulations were such that none of the abstractors like to talk about them. This retarded the closing of deals wherein acceptable offers were made almost a year ago.

By reason of the red tape involved it is necessary that an officer with the rank of major at the Dallas division office certify that the price to be paid for a given tract of land is in accordance with the appraisement. In the shuffle the original appraisements were in Washington. They had only mimeographed copies with the blanks filled in either on typewriter or pencil. Not having the originals the majors and higher ranking officials refused to sign a certificate. Fortunately, however, C B Sweltzer was in the Denison office when they were made He would gladly so certify if he were made a major. We do not know what finally happened in this matter.

INADEQUATE PRICE

In the years 1938–39 various officials of the Acquisition Department made surveys for the purpose of determining fair market value. On account of the depression, prices then were low when compared with 1941 and 1942 prices The value of the land was based, in the main on sales from absentee owners and loan companies to speculators Only a small number of sales from a resident owner to a resident owner were considered. Based on these valuations, the land was appraised. The home owners have been unable to relocate themselves with the amount received. Price of peanuts advanced from 75 cents per bushel to $2 per bushel Cotton advanced in price from 9 cents a pound to 18 cents a pound Corn advanced from 40 cents a bushel to $1 a bushel Oats advanced from 25 cents a bushel to 60 cents a bushel Hogs doubled and cattle were up a third Pecans advanced from 8 cents a pound to 20 cents a pound. Dairy products doubled. However, the Land Department kept its old appraisement and used the same old scale of values. Land in this vicinity has advanced from 25 to 40 percent, and thus the home owner who did not desire to sell has been compelled to consume the difference.

The Department admits they used the 1938–39 scale of values but states since further investigating that that scale of values is correct now.

CHISELING

Not being satisfied with the 1938–39 values as a value basis, the contact men for the Department would go to the home owner; tell him he could accept an offer for so much money and close the deal in from 60 to 90 days. Most of the home owners were not satisfied with the price and would so state. They would later follow up and state the land would have to be condemned in court. They would state that the amount they mentioned was the full amount they could pay and was the amount of the appraisement. These statements were false. They were not offering the amount of the appraisement and the deals were not closed within 60 to 90 days. Of course, our proof on this statement is limited. We think this happened in about 75 percent of the cases.

We do cite tract No. K–151–10. In this case J. O. Flynt was the owner. Her father, Gene W. Flynt, handled her business. He refused, at first, to take the amount the contact man said the Government would accept an offer for. Later he was contacted and advised the land would be put in condemnation. The contact man said $900 was the full appraised value; not another dime could be paid. Under the circumstances and knowing the cost of litigating with the Government, he accepted $900. The true appraisement, if not changed, was $1,400.

Also, we cite tract No. K–239–3. In this case Mary Catherine Little was the owner. Reuel W. Little was attending to her business for her. The contact man, Darwin Harbin, advised that $3,280 was the full amount of the appraisement and the full amount he was authorized to pay. After trying for about a year to get the amount raised the $3,280 was accepted by a letter written to the Denison division. The actual appraisement was $3,500 and the records will so show, if not changed.

It will be admitted by the acquisition department that the offers and the amounts paid are less than the Government appraisement. However, they will state that these offers were voluntarily made. The truth is, most were signed after being advised the land would be put into condemnation in order to avoid costly litigation.

JURY TRIAL

While it is true the home owner may refuse to sign an offer and in due course of time the Government will file suit, he is allowed to object to the report of the commissioners and demand a jury trial. This remedy, however, is only theoretical. It is not a practical remedy for these reasons:

1. Most of the tracts of land are small. The home owner, or his attorney, must travel 180 miles to Muskogee when title is determined. When his case is heard either at Ardmore, Okla., 28 miles away, or Durant, Okla., 28 miles away, or Ada, Okla., 50 miles away, he should have three good land appraisers view the land and appear as witnesses. He, or his attorney, must appear, usually at Muskogee, Okla., again when funds are distributed. This all costs at least $500.

2. The Department at Denison, under existing laws, has the power to take possession upon filing suit to condemn. When there is a dispute as to value this is always done. From the time the suit is filed until the case is tried usually a year elapses. The improvements, not being occupied, run down. The land looks its worst because not in cultivation. In some instances, they have cut down trees allowing them to fall across cultivating land. Then in each case they insist that the jury view the land.

3. The Department at Denison, before any case was tried, contacted nearly all experienced land men in the area and put them on the pay roll. They receive at least $10 a day. About twenty have been employed from time to time. Most of the remaining experienced land men have had some kind of trouble with the Department. This, of course, can be shown if they appear as a witness.

4. In times like these the ordinary juror feels inclined to favor the Government, and they, of course, know nothing of the background.

5. The judges allow the Government officials to open the evidence and close the evidence, and open the argument and close the argument.

EFFECT ON MORALE AND WAR EFFORT

The above depicted situation has a direct effect on the war effort for these reasons:

1. Manpower used is excessive. They have in the branch office at Denison, Tex., 35 regularly employed men and women. They have been there about 3 year. Hundreds are employed in the division office at Dallas. Thousands in this department at Washington, D. C One man, with authority could, with three lawyers, experienced in examining title in the area involved, and three good stenographers and four appraisers and a handy man, acquire the land involved at its fair market value in 6 months at the outside.

2. People who have been mistreated, even though they know it is not intentional on the part of their Government; and is only the men in charge, know they are helpless and cannot correct the evil. It thus affects adversely the sale of bonds, donations to Red Cross, collection of scrap iron, and the full production of food to win the war.

3. When people are compelled to leave homes they have cherished and built and cannot locate themselves because they have not been paid and have been chiseled in the deal and this is all done by the Army, they normally are proud of, it makes them think the Army is in charge of evil, selfish men.

The present system of acquiring land by the Army is un-American, undemocratic, and unlike the Army.

However laudable the intentions of the Government may be, if men, of evil design and selfish purpose, execute the program, it will fail.

Such acts, as the ones depicted here, will cause the present progressive administration to go down the next time it is judged by the American people, and will usher in an ultraconservative party.

We recommend the following:

1. When the Army in the future desires to acquire land the Secretary of War be authorized to appoint a man, not connected with the Army, to acquire it. He should be empowered to purchase abstracts, have them examined by attorneys of good repute, and employ competent appraisers, and pay for the land when conveyances are executed and delivered. No attempt should be made to purchase land for less than its fair market value. The man so appointed should not be permitted to employ any official in the Army nor any key man in the present set-up.

*Be it resolved* That this statement be furnished to the President of the United States with the request that he not be bothered with it, since his burdens on other matters are too heavy; but, with the request one of his able secretaries give it careful consideration. A copy be sent to the Oklahoma congressional delegation in Washington, D. C., and Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, and Gen. Henry Marshall, and such other persons as the president of the chamber of commerce may think proper.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MADILL, OKLA.,
By REUEL W. LITTLE, *President.*

MADILL, OKLA.,
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
By C. D. TURNER, *Chairman.*
REUEL W. LITTLE,
*Chairman of Bond Sales Committee.*
GEO. L. SNEED,
*Chairman of Scrap-Iron Committee.*
WENDYL WATTS,
*Chairman of Red Cross.*

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do this in order to clear up any misunderstanding that may exist. Do I correctly understand that the statement made by the majority leader on yesterday to the effect that there would be no roll calls on Monday still holds?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Of course, the present situation was not anticipated. However, if it is agreeable to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, it is to be understood that if there are any roll calls on this bill they will take place on Tuesday. If this bill is disposed of early Monday, we can then proceed with the merger bill.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, that does not mean we will not have votes in the Committee of the Whole on amendments that are offered on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We will complete the reading of this appropriation bill for amendment, and then if there are any roll calls they will go over to Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, there may be quorum calls. No one has any control over that.

Mr. LUDLOW. If the gentleman will yield, I believe it is understood on our side that a roll call will be demanded on one of the amendments to the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. Would the agreement the gentleman has made interfere with that, or would it postpone the final consideration of the Treasury-Post Office bill until Tuesday? We do not want that to happen.

Mr. McCORMACK. The agreement is that we will proceed with the consideration of this appropriation bill under the 5-minute rule on Monday, and then at the conclusion of that, if there are any roll calls, the roll calls will go over to the next day. I have already stated to the House, anticipating that we would dispose of this bill today, that the merger bill would come up on Monday and that if there were any roll calls on that bill it would go over until Tuesday

Mr. LUDLOW. This bill has been before the House a long time. It was our sincere hope that we could pass the bill on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. If you complete the consideration of the bill on Monday, then whatever roll calls there may be will occur on Tuesday. A roll call does not take much time. We could meet at 11 o'clock on Tuesday if necessary.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The roll call would be the first business in order on Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. From a practical angle, therefore, there would be no delay. However, I have already stated to the House that there would be no roll call on Monday, and some Members may have made their plans accordingly.

Mr. LUDLOW. I appreciate that. Of course, I do not want in any way to interfere with the gentleman's agreement, which I know the gentleman wants to respect.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. May I submit this observation for the consideration of both of our distinguished leaders, the majority leader and the minority leader. I think it is unfortunate when any agreement is made here which has the effect of letting Members think they can go off and stay and come back sometime and walk in and cast a vote. I think Members ought to be on the floor of this House when we consider the rest of this bill, all of it, and not just be here Tuesday when they vote. If this very clear-cut understanding we are working out now has the effect of letting Members on either side of the aisle leave here and not come back until Tuesday, I think it is unfortunate.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is absolutely correct. It is hoped that everybody will be here. My observation of yesterday in relation to the merger bill is no precedent as to the future. It was confined to that bill, in the anticipation that this appropriation bill would be disposed of today. Having stated that if there were any roll call on the merger bill it would be postponed to Tuesday, I feel that I am bound by that statement as far as this bill is concerned, if there is a roll call, inasmuch as it is now going over to Monday.

[Here the gavel fell.]

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.), under its order previously adopted, the House adjourned until Monday, February 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Monday February 8, 1943. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 649, "For the organization and functions of the Public Health Service."

### COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet at 10:30 a. m. Tuesday, February 9, 1943, in room 356, House Office Building

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

158. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1943, for the Navy Department and naval service, amounting to $4,000,000,000 cash and $210,000,000 contract authorization and increasing the amount of 1942 appropriations heretofore continued available to June 30, 1943, by $562,000,000, together with proposed provisions affecting certain existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 95), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 101. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 102. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 103. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 1721. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1722. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1723. A bill to extend the provisions of the Social Security Act, as amended, relating to old-age and survivors insurance benefits to employees of certain nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1724. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Ant-

arctic Service expedition's east base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr RAMSPECK:

H. R. 1725. A bill to authorize heads of departments and agencies to delegate to subordinates the authority to employ persons for duty in departments or the field service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr STEAGALL:

H. R. 1726. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WARD:

H. R. 1727. A bill to provide for the payment of a wartime bonus for employees of the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads

By Mr FULMER:

H. R. 1728. A bill to increase the supply of farm labor during the calendar year 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 1729. A bill providing that in determining need of individuals claiming old-age assistance only income and resources in excess of $240 shall be considered; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1730. A bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1731. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 1732. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, or citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1733 (by request). A bill to provide a night differential for employees of the Government of the United States and of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 1741. A bill to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. J Res. 78. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 102. Resolution establishing a select committee to investigate acts of executive agencies beyond the scope of their authority; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr CARLSON of Kansas:

H. R. 1734. A bill for the relief of Maj. Wilbur Rogers, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr HOFFMAN:

H. R. 1735. A bill for the relief of Leon Frederick Ruggles; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1736. A bill for the relief of Max Geissler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr McMILLAN:

H. R. 1737. A bill for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 1738. A bill for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1739. A bill granting a pension to Freda Boy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 1740. A bill granting a pension to Zola O. Honeycutt; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

81. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, urging passage of Senate bill 35, authorizing the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

82. By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, asking the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill 35, authorizing the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

83. By Mr. ROLPH: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9 of the State of California, relative to memorializing Congress to request the Jefferson Bicentennial Commission, Senator CARTER GLASS, chairman, to invite the nations and people of the world to join with the people of the United States of America in observing and celebrating the bicentennial of Jefferson's day of birth, April 13, 1943; to the Committee on Rules.

84. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 12 of the State of California, relative to memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture, the War Manpower Commission, and the Director of Selective Service in relation to grapes and raisins as essential farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

# SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, apart from Thee all is vanity and vexation of spirit. Thou hast taught us that our lives are the temples of Thy holy presence. Made in Thy image no despot may enslave our conscience. Against the defilement by impious hands of that sacred inner shrine we pledge a sacrifice from which no Gethsemane or Calvary can hold us back. Strengthen our will to halt the designs of the tyrants, who would bring us and other nations under their evil domination.

Give courage to our stalwart men who on the far-flung battle lines of freedom are baring their breasts to the fire of the foe and putting their lives a living wall between threatening danger and our destiny. Stir up in the whole body of the people an adventurous willingness, even as they pour out the crimson cost of war, so also for international good will to dare bravely; that on the ruins of man's hate we may build a new and fairer home for humanity worthy to house all the children of Thy love and care—as glorious from the heavens above shall come the city of our God. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 4, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON ALIEN REGISTRATION

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization on alien registration under date of February 1, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Immigration.

REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL ON CERTIFICATES FILED REQUISITE TO THE PROSECUTION OF THE WAR—WAIVING OF CIVIL ACTIONS UNDER ANTITRUST AND OTHER LAWS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of certificates filed by the Chairman of the War Production Board, for the period October 1, 1942, through January 31, 1943, as to the doing of any act or thing or the omission to do any act or thing requisite to the prosecution of the war by any person or persons for which no prosecution or civil action shall be commenced under the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation declaring certain lands to be a part of the public domain and providing for the administration thereof (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, two lists of papers and documents on the files of the Federal Works Agency which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, dealing with the hospitalization of veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented by Mr. CLARK of Idaho on the 4th instant, p. 567, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Fort Scott, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor sales in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Whereas a great highway is now being constructed from the Province of Alberta, Canada, to Fairbanks, Alaska, and the Pan American Highway from Mexico through Central America into South America is now being extended and these roads now being built and planned will, when completed, in conjunction with the connecting system of major highways in the United States, constitute a great inter-American transportation system linking the two continents and affording arteries for commerce and travel; and

"Whereas the Rocky Mountain States lie in the shortest and most direct line between the Canadian and Mexican border terminals of this international route; and

"Whereas four of our great national parks with splendid roads systems connect directly with this alinement, being Glacier, Yellowstone, Rocky Mountain, and Carlsbad Caverns National Parks, as well as Jasper and Banff National Parks of Canada; and

"Whereas completed major highways in the Rocky Mountain States constitute the greater portion of the route traversed, conveniently connecting these national parks and making accessible the entire scenic and recreational area of the Mountain States; and

"Whereas the improvements and construction of a great master highway between the Canadian and Mexican terminals of this international route will afford an opportunity for gainful employment during the post-war adjustment period and provide an activity for these States which do not possess normal industrial facilities to employ their population in the post-war period: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein)*, That it respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to now take such steps as will provide plans, ready for immediate execution upon the termination of the war, and the necessary appropriations, so that road improvements needed to create a great master highway north and south through the States of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas may be undertaken with the least delay, thus providing employment in the post-war adjustment period and an inter-American transportation system as in this memorial outlined: Be it further

*"Resolved*, That certified copies of this joint memorial be forwarded at once to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the presiding officers of the Congress of the United States, and to Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON and Hon. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Senators, and Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS, Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL, Hon. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, and Hon. ROBERT F. ROCKWELL, Representatives, from the State of Colorado."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.)

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Whereas the jewelry and silversmith industries have made for many years one of the most important contributions to the economic structure in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations and in New England; and

"Whereas in the past, thousands of citizens of this State and of the other New England States have depended upon these industries for livelihood, and will do so in the future; and

"Whereas, at the present time there are certain restrictions upon the use of silver that affect the said industries to the extent that, if remedial measures are not taken, it may mean certain economic collapse, not alone in said industries but in a far-reaching effect upon certain other manufactured goods that are depending upon the silver industry; and

"Whereas United States Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, had introduced into the United States Congress at its seventy-seventh session, a bill to provide increased authority for the use of Government-owned silver in furtherance of the war effort which authorized the President of the United States of America, upon the recommendation of the chairman of the War Production Board, to sell or lease any silver held or owned by the United States, upon such terms as the Secretary of the Treasury deemed advisable and which, among other things, would have permitted the use of silver in the making of munitions, the supplying of civilian needs in connection with the war effort, and the converson of existing jewelry plants for such purposes, so that consumptive as well as non-consumptive uses of silver might have been provided; and

"Whereas, since this bill was not reported out favorably, United States Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, having the welfare of our country in mind, the industry of our State and all its employees, has reintroduced a similar bill into Congress at this Seventy-eighth Session, namely Senate bill 35, entitled 'A bill to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States,' which bill has the endorsement of the War Production Board and the Treasury Department: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations be and it hereby does approve Senate bill 35, as presented by United States Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, and urges the Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States of America to pass said proposed legislation; and, be it further

*"Resolved* That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they hereby are respectfully requested to work for the passage of said Senate bill 35 and to express to the proper authorities the feeling of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations that this proposed measure is essential, particularly in view of the present war emergency; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of state be authorized to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency."

By Mr. GERRY:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas the primary aim of the Ruml plan is to put both the Government and all individual taxpayers on a current basis of tax payment on income, with the purpose of getting every taxpayer out of debt to the Government, without future income-tax claims against estates, a living man's wages or savings: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations now places itself on record as approving the Ruml plan now before Congress or any similar, genuine pay-as-you-go tax plan so that both the Government and all individual taxpayers may be placed upon a current basis of tax payment on income; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be, and they hereby are, requested to use every effort to have the Ruml plan, so-called, or any similar genuine pay-as-you-go tax plan enacted into Federal law; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

(Mr. GREEN presented a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

## RESOLUTIONS OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I present and ask to have appropriately referred a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina introduced by the aviation committee of the assembly.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has before it for consideration House bill H. R. 1012 and Senate bill 246 affecting air commerce; and

Whereas air commerce (air lines) represents a major part of civil aviation and private flying and fixed-base operations represent a major part of civil aviation whose operations are not interstate in character and therefore are of no concern of the Federal Government, the pending legislation would deny to the States their inherent rights to govern within their own State and would seriously jeopardize private flying and fixed-base operations; and

Whereas by applying the intent of this legislation to other forms of transportation our national economy would be seriously affected; and

Whereas there is no immediate need for this legislation as the President of the United States is vested with full power under the Defense Act to regulate all aircraft, civilian or otherwise, if necessary; and

Whereas those men who are serving their country in the various branches of service are unable to voice their sentiments or opinions on this proposed legislation at this time, and they are the persons who have contributed more to the development of aviation and are entitled to their place in aeronautics when and if they return from active duty; and

Whereas there is ample time for such legislation to be considered in the future since consideration has not been given future developments and improvements which will change methods now used in the regulation of aircraft: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the State Legislature of South Carolina respectfully requests that no action be taken on the above-mentioned bills or any similar bill or bills by Congress until the present war is over and peace is established; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the clerk of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the clerk of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of Congress, and to each of the South Carolina Senators and Representatives in Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MAYBANK. I also present and ask to have appropriately referred another concurrent resolution adopted by

the General Assembly of South Carolina introduced by Hon. B. D. Harrelson.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has been the experience of the tobacco growers and the tobacco buyers in this State that the system of selling tobacco by auctioning, to the highest bidder, as has been the custom in this State for a great number of years, is the fairest and most satisfactory way of merchandising the tobacco crops of this State: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the Government of the United States of America is hereby requested to acknowledge that the system used for merchandising the tobacco crops in this State is a fair and satisfactory manner of merchandising such crops, and said Government is further requested not to exercise any authority that would interfere with the manner in which tobacco crops are sold in this State; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the South Carolina Representatives in the Halls of Congress and to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America, with the request that the contents of this resolution be conveyed to the proper governmental authorities.

Mr. MAYBANK. I also present and ask to have appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina introduced by Messrs. E. V. Perry and Gardner.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the farmers in the State of South Carolina are putting forth their best efforts under adverse conditions to grow Irish potatoes, which are badly needed by the Government in the furtherance of the war effort; and

Whereas the increase in cost of production, including labor, fertilizer, materials, interest, taxes, and freight rates the farmers would have to pay approximately from 40 cents to 50 cents more for producing and marketing each bag of potatoes than they would realize from their efforts; and

Whereas the loss of these profits would not only cause the downfall of the farmers but would decrease the number of acres of potatoes planted and harvested for this year and in future years: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives*, That the Office of Price Administration investigate the costs and expenses which the farmers would be put to in the planting and harvesting of these potatoes and fix a ceiling price, so that the farmer would receive a profit instead of a loss therefrom.

*Resolved further*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. J. K. Galbraith, Deputy Office of Price Administration Administrator, a copy to Hon. James F. Byrnes, Stabilization Director, a copy to Hon. Burnet R. Maybank, a copy to Hon. E. D. Smith, United States Senators, and also a copy to each of the Congressmen from this State.

## RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE—BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Mr. REED. I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 7, adopted by the Kansas State Legislature, relating to the United States Bureau of Animal Industry.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By an act of Congress the United States Bureau of Animal Industry was created in 1884, under the direction of Dr. Solomon. The development and guidance of the Bureau has successfully brought about a disease-control program now operating under the direction of Dr. John R. Mohler, whose ability is recognized throughout the world as a genius in the control of livestock diseases and his administration of the present Federal meat-inspection program. Under his direction, foot-and-mouth disease has been eliminated from the United States, and the occurrence of such diseases as Texas fever, cattle and sheep scab, tuberculosis, anthrax, blackleg, hog cholera, malignant edema has either been minimized or practically eliminated in various sections of the United States. Through his endeavors, Federal meat inspection in the United States is recognized throughout the world, and through his scrutiny and effective quarantine programs we have been able to keep out many of the infectious diseases of foreign countries that are of untold values to the livestock interests of this country, as well as public health. Any curtailment of Dr. Mohler's authority could possibly bring about a serious menace to our livestock industry as well as to our meat food supply. The United States, Canada, and Mexico are reported to be the only three countries in the world today that are free of foot-and-mouth disease, which can be attributed directly to Dr. John R. Mohler's meat-inspection program, in cooperation with the Governments of Mexico and Canada.

Whereas we are advised that the Meat Inspection Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry has by Executive order been transferred from that Bureau to the new Food Distribution Division; and

Whereas no Government agency has functioned more efficiently in the interest of the livestock industry that the Meat Inspection Division in correlation with field inspection of the Bureau of Animal Industry in the quarantine and control of animal diseases: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Kansas Legislature*, That the Bureau of Animal Industry be restored to its full power as has existed since 1884, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Kansas United States Senators and to each of the Kansas Representatives in Congress.

## RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ASSOCIATION—GOOD ROADS

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I present, and ask to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the North Dakota County Commissioners Association on the 13th of January 1943.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has been called to the attention of certain members of this association that rural postal routes are now traveling upon township and county roads which cannot be maintained in a proper manner for prompt delivery of mail; and

Whereas the bad condition and poor maintenance of such roads is due to the lack of funds of townships to construct and maintain such roads; and

Whereas the rural carriers of the State have requested the county commissioners to devise ways and means of improving rural-route roads by a matching of township, county, State, and Federal funds, if possible: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this association by appropriate action seek means of improving postal routes throughout the State by the use of township, county, State, and Federal funds wherever possible and by matching of funds of the several subdivisions and that the matter be further referred to the Federal Bureau of Public Roads for such action as they may see fit to take; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of Congress from this State requesting them to work and vote for sufficient funds during the coming session of Congress and subsequent sessions to the end that funds may be appropriated for the purpose of improving not only the rural postal routes in this State, but throughout the Nation.

## WHAT THE PEOPLE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW—STATEMENT BY ALBERT D. NELSON

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I present to the Senate a statement by a citizen of Colorado, Mr. Albert D. Nelson, on the subject of What the People Would Like to Know, in which numerous questions are directed to the Congress. I ask that this document lie on the table where it may be available to Senators desiring to study the important questions which is raises.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Colorado will lie on the table.

## CONDITIONS IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Miguel Guerra-Mondragon, of San Juan, P. R., relative to conditions in Puerto Rico.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN JUAN, P. R., *February 2, 1943.*

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
*Senator from North Dakota,*
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: A recent press dispatch has quoted you as saying:

"(Translated from the Spanish text) Tugwell is doing a first-class work. The evidence for this is to be found in the violence of the opposition raised in Puerto Rico where a group of fortunate ones owns all the land and keeps the rest of the people in perpetual slavery. One of the outstanding things Tugwell has done there has been the elimination of monopolies and the offering to the poorer classes of an opportunity to govern. Naturally, the group controlling the island is opposed to that, and that has been the source of all difficulties."

You have sized up the situation. Needless to say all liberals in Puerto Rico have rejoiced over your statement. The immense majority of our people—the hundreds of thousands of the landless and hungry—have placed their faith and confidence in Governor Tugwell.

The Popular Party won the 1940 elections in Puerto Rico on a platform looking toward social reform (long overdue) and the curtailment of economic abuses. Most of the fundamental laws passed by that party since 1940 were signed before Tugwell took possession as Governor. The abuse heaped upon Tugwell is resented by all liberal-minded people in this island. Due to Tugwell's statesmanship our people have at last learned that there is another America besides the

America of ruthless commercialism and money changers. And in these times when over 20,000 Puerto Ricans are bearing arms in a common cause for democracy and freedom, Governor Tugwell has inspired our soldiers, mostly sons of the good common people, with the idea that they are not mere sardines fighting for a frying pan but good men fighting for a better world.

As soon as the Popular Party was able to, it passed several laws very similar to the ones unsuccessfully assailed in your own State of North Dakota.

As one liberal and as one Puerto Rican, permit me to thank you for your brave statement.

With assurances of my highest consideration permit me to remain, my dear Senator,

Very sincerely yours,

MIGUEL GUERRA-MONDRAGON,
*Ex-Speaker, House of Representatives of Puerto Rico.*

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 427. A bill to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 46); and

S. 495. A bill to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 45).

## REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

## PROPOSED NATIONAL WAR SERVICE ACT—BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. AUSTIN obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield for that purpose?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The CHIEF CLERK called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Ferguson | Mead |
| Andrews | George | Millikin |
| Austin | Gerry | Moore |
| Ball | Gillette | Murdock |
| Bankhead | Green | Murray |
| Barkley | Guffey | Nye |
| Bilbo | Gurney | O'Mahoney |
| Brooks | Hawkes | Overton |
| Buck | Hayden | Pepper |
| Burton | Hill | Radcliffe |
| Bushfield | Holman | Reed |
| Butler | Johnson, Colo. | Revercomb |
| Byrd | Kilgore | Reynolds |
| Capper | La Follette | Robertson |
| Caraway | Langer | Russell |
| Chandler | Lucas | Shipstead |
| Clark, Idaho | McClellan | Smith |
| Clark, Mo. | McFarland | Stewart |
| Connally | McKellar | Thomas, Idaho |
| Danaher | McNary | Thomas, Okla. |
| Davis | Maloney | Thomas, Utah |
| Downey | Maybank | Truman |
| Tunnell | Wagner | Wherry |
| Tydings | Wallgren | Wiley |
| Vandenberg | Walsh | Willis |
| Van Nuys | Wheeler | |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are conducting hearings in Puerto Rico on behalf of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

Mr. McNARY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are absent on important public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and I ask unanimous consent to make some remarks regarding the bill at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont may proceed.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 666) to provide further for the successful prosecution of the war through a system of civilian selective war service with the aid of the Selective Service System was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,*

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND INTENT OF CONGRESS

SECTION 1 (a) The Congress hereby declares that in view of the critical nature of the present war and in justice to those in the armed forces of the United States, it is necessary to provide further for the comprehensive, orderly, and effective mobilization of the manpower and womanpower of the Nation in support of the war effort.

(b) The Congress further declares as the general principle governing such mobilization that an obligation rests upon every person, subject to necessary and appropriate exceptions as herein defined or authorized, to render such personal service in aid of the war effort as he or she may be deemed best fitted to perform.

(c) The Congress further declares that there is no intention by this act to modify, reaffirm, or otherwise affect existing laws relating to maximum hours, minimum wages, overtime pay, or collective bargaining, or relating to mediation, arbitration, or other procedures for the settlement of any labor controversies or questions, the intention being that if and when any such subjects are dealt with by the Congress this shall be done by other legislation; and that nothing in this act shall be otherwise construed.

(d) The Congress further declares that there is no intention by this act to affect the integrity of the Selective Service System created under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; and that nothing in this act shall be otherwise construed.

LIABILITY FOR NATIONAL SERVICE

SEC. 2 (a) In order to provide for an adequate supply of workers in war industries and agriculture, and in other occupations, activities, and employments which the President shall from time to time determine to be essential to the effective prosecution of the war, and in order to maintain a proper balance between such workers and persons in the armed forces of the United States and among such workers themselves, each registrant and each person required to be registered under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 as amended and every woman residing in the United States between the ages of 18 and 50 at the time fixed for her registration under the provisions of this act, except as hereinafter provided, shall be liable to contribute by personal service to the war effort in a noncombatant capacity, according to his or her abilities, and as selected in accordance with the terms of this act and regulations prescribed by the President thereunder: *Provided*, That no service under this act shall be required from any of the following: (1) Persons relieved from liability for training and service under section 5 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; (2) commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, and enlisted men of the land and naval forces of the United States (including the Army of the United States); (3) commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, and enlisted personnel of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, the WAVES, the MARINES, and the SPARS; (4) persons serving in the Women's Auxiliary Ferrying Service; (5) persons deferred from training and service under section 5 (c) (1) or exempted from training and service under section 5 (d) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; (6) any woman who has living with her and under her care either a child or children under 18 years of age, or one or more other persons who, on account of illness or advanced age need her personal care; (7) any woman while she is pregnant, as certified by a duly licensed physician; (8) any person who is an officer or employee of any State or of any political subdivision thereof, or of any corporate instrumentality or agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, unless the Governor of the State in which such person is an officer or employee consents in writing to service under this act on the part or such person; or (9) any officer or employee of a corporate instrumentality or agency of two or more States or political subdivisions thereof, unless the Governors of the States concerned consent in writing to service under this act on the part of such officer or employee.

(b) No exception from registration and no exemption or deferment from service under this act shall continue after the cause therefor ceases to exist.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the term "between the ages of 18 and 50" shall refer to women who have attained the eighteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the fiftieth anniversary of the day of their birth.

METHOD OF SELECTION OF WORKERS; RESPECTIVE FUNCTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SEC. 3. (a) The Selective Service System, created under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 as amended, shall be utilized as the agency to register and classify those persons who are liable for service under section 2 of this act and who are not already so registered and classified, and to select as hereinafter provided those to be assigned for such service if and to the extent that it becomes necessary to make such selection: *Provided*, That in order to aid the local boards of the Selective Service System in performing the additional duties required of them under this act, the President may assign to such local boards, in an advisory capacity, representatives of such other agencies of the Government as he may deem advisable.

(b) Whenever the President shall determine that additional workers are needed in any war industry, in agriculture, or in other occupations, activities, or employments essential to the effective prosecution of the war, he shall by proclamation specify the numbers of such workers and the purposes for which they are needed. The President shall thereupon, if he deems it practicable without impairing or delaying the war effort, issue, through the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, a call or calls for volunteers, specifying the number of persons required, their qualifications, and, so far as practicable, the places where their work would be performed, and asking that qualified men and women volunteer their services within a specified time or times; and if and to the extent that the President shall deem it practicable, such calls for volunteers shall be issued before action is taken to obtain workers through the selective service process provided for by this act.

(c) If the President shall not deem it practicable to issue such a call or calls for volunteers, or if, after having issued such a call or calls, the required numbers of qualified persons have not volunteered their services within the time or times specified, the President, either directly, or through the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, shall direct the Selective Service System created under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to supply the required numbers of persons from those who are liable for service under section 2 of this act. The President shall also specify the quotas to be supplied, the qualifications desired in the persons to be selected, and, so far as practicable, the places to which the persons selected will be assigned. Thereupon the Selective Service System, through the local boards established under that system, shall proceed to select the required workers in the numbers, and, so far as practicable, with the qualifications, specified by the President. Such selection shall be made in a careful and impartial manner, and the decisions of such local boards shall be subject to appeal as in other cases to the appeal boards and agencies of appeal established under section 10 (a) (2) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

REGULATIONS; AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT; ASSIGNMENT OF WORKERS

SEC. 4. The President is authorized, either directly or through the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission—

(a) to prescribe the necessary regulations to carry out in an impartial manner the provisions of this act, such regulations to include appropriate provisions for the registration and adequate occupational classification of all persons who are liable for service under section 2 of this act and who have not been so classified under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or otherwise;

(b) in accordance with such regulations, to assign volunteers who have responded to a call under this act, and persons selected for service under this act by the local boards pursuant to section 3, to such noncombatant service in aid of the war effort as the President deems necessary to the successful prosecution of the war, including the production of war materials of every sort, transportation and agriculture, and training for the performance of all such work, at such times and in such numbers as the President may determine: *Provided*, That in making assignments to work under this act, due regard shall be had to assigning men or women to service in or near their home communities: *Provided further*, That no person shall be assigned to work under the provisions of this act at a location where reasonably suitable housing accommodations for such person and his or her immediate family are not available: *Provided further*, That whenever necessary, and so far as it is practicable to do so, persons assigned to service under this act (including accepted volunteers) shall, prior to such assignment, be given an opportunity of receiving aptitude tests and intensive training for the purpose of efficiently allocating them in places where they may render the most useful service and of redirecting or stepping up their skills in order that they may be competent for the tasks which they are to perform: *Provided further*, That every person assigned to service under this act (including every accepted volunteer) shall receive the compensation and work the hours applicable to the kind of work which he or she is required to perform in the place of employment to which he or she is assigned.

(c) in accordance with such regulations, to provide for the deferment from such service of those men and women whose continued service in any office under the United States or any Territory, or the District of Columbia, or whose continued employment in any occupation or activity is found by the selective service local boards, subject to appeal to the appeal boards and agencies of appeal established under section 10 (a) (2) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That the President is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act of (1) persons found by the selective service local boards, subject to appeal as above provided, to be unfit for such service by reason of physical, mental, or moral deficiencies or defects, and (2) persons with respect to whom such local boards find, subject to appeal as above provided, that such service would result in extreme hardship;

(d) in accordance with such regulations, to provide the necessary traveling expenses and subsistence allowances during travel and until commencement of work of persons (including accepted volunteers) assigned under this act to service or to training in a locality other than that of their residence, and, when necessary, during their return therefrom, and, in accordance with such regulations, to provide transportation for the dependents and household effects of such persons: *Provided*, That such traveling expenses and allowances shall be computed in the same manner and on the same basis as those now or hereafter provided by law for members of the armed forces of the United States;

(e) in accordance with such regulations, to provide for the occupational training at Government expense of persons volunteering or selected for service under this act, and to pay reasonable compensation to trainees during the continuance of such training; and

(f) in accordance with such regulations, to provide for the orderly and effective allocation of workers (including those employed or in process of training on the date of enactment of this Act) to the particular occupations deemed by the President to be essential to the war effort, and to the particular industries or areas in which the President finds that there is a shortage or a threatened shortage of manpower or womanpower, in order that such workers will be available where they are most needed and also for the purpose of preventing the "pirating" and the "hoarding" of labor by employers.

REEMPLOYMENT; SENIORITY RIGHTS

SEC. 5. Any person assigned to service under this act (including any accepted volunteer) who relinquishes regular employment to undertake such service, shall upon application to his or her employer within 40 days after the termination of such service, if such service terminates while this act is in effect, or within 40 days after the expiration of this act, if such service terminates after the expiration of this act, be entitled to be restored to his former position, or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay, unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make such restoration impossible or unreasonable: *Provided*, That if such person was in the employ of any State or political subdivision thereof, it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that such person should be restored to such position, or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 6. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall administer this act and shall have general responsibility, subject to the authority of the President and the provisions of this act, for all aspects of the mobilization of manpower and womanpower for service under this act.

PENALTIES

SEC. 7. Any person who refuses or knowingly fails to comply with any lawful order issued under the provisions of this act, or with any lawful regulation promulgated thereunder, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 6 months, or both.

PROTECTION IN EVENT OF INVALIDITY; PARTIAL INVALIDITY

SEC. 8. (a) The modification, withdrawal, or determination of invalidity of any provision of this act, or of any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, shall not result in damages or penalties in any Federal, State, or Territorial court on any grounds for or in respect of anything done or omitted to be done in good faith pursuant to such provision, rule, regulation, or order.

(b) If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EFFECTIVE DATE AND TERMINATION OF ACT

SEC. 10. (a) This act shall take effect immediately.

(b) This act shall cease to be in effect on and after May 1, 1945, or such earlier date as may be specified by the Congress in a concurrent resolution.

POPULAR NAME

SEC. 11. This act may be cited as the "National War Service Act of 1943."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the bill I have just introduced is Senate bill 666, and if it should be enacted into law it

may be cited as the National War Service Act of 1943. It is the product of several months of study, which was started on six bills introduced respectively in the Seventy-seventh Congress by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from Vermont, who is now addressing the Senate. All the testimony taken during the Seventy-seventh Congress is in print. Doubtless all Senators have read it. If not, it is available.

Mr. President, the bill I have introduced has had very careful service by men who have concentrated on the subject for years and years. The American Legion started on this subject immediately after World War No. 1, and have continued the study throughout the period since then, and up to the present time, and have worked diligently on the very text of Senate bill 666.

There has also been engaged in a study of the proposed legislation a Citizens Committee for a National War Service Act, the chairman of which is Douglas Arant, of Birmingham, Ala., formerly president of the Alabama Bar Association, now chairman of the Committee on the Bill of Rights of the American Bar Association. The vice chairman is Henry D. Cabot, of Boston, Mass.; secretary-treasurer, Grenville Clark, of New York City; executive secretary, Ernest L. Bell, Jr., of Keene, N. H., formerly State commander of the American Legion.

The purpose of the bill is to provide further for the successful prosecution of the war through a system of civilian selective war service, with the aid of the selective service system.

The work of the Committee on Military Affairs has continued since the Seventy-seventh Congress almost daily during the Seventy-eighth Congress, and hearings are still in progress. We held a hearing this morning at which Secretary Wickard testified on this subject. I believe that the committee is firmly convinced that legislation is more according to the American way of life than Executive order, and after months of hearings we feel that as a legislature, we should be in the position to say something concrete regarding what is the policy of the people, what kind of law they wish to have, and should be prepared to get it started.

I think it is clear, as well, that, no matter how cautiously this problem was approached in September and October of 1942, events in the world, and in particular reports from our own boys in the southwest Pacific and in north Africa, prove that it is not a matter to be inaugurated at some time in the future, when it will be absolutely necessary to pass such legislation, but that the time has arrived, is here now, and every day that we postpone such legislation we postpone the victory of our men who are in arms.

If we, ourselves, do not know it, we are persuaded by the testimony of observers on the ground that every blow struck at the battle front begins here. It begins in the mines, it begins on the prairies, it begins in the factories; the power and continuity of the blows struck depend on our noncombatant manpower here at home. I am talking about the necessity for such legislation as is proposed.

There is something else of great importance, namely, the feelings of the people. Men and women must have pride in order to continue the effort for an ever and ever higher standard of ideals and of purpose. Go to the farms where the crisis is most imminent; go to a dairy farm, where the mother and father are considering having to sell out the plant, as it were, and what do we find? If a young man on the farm has his choice between staying on the farm and going into the armed forces, he will go into the armed forces every time. Local boards cannot convince him that he should stay on the farm. They can say to him, "This is just as necessary as it is to be at the front with a bayonet, and your staying on the farm will help to win the war," but if he has his choice, he will take fighting and we know why. He has pride in serving his country; he has pride in appearing to serve his country, he has pride in not having the appearance of staying at home in noncombatant service when he is vigorous enough to be fighting at the front. So, if the Congress owes our people anything, it owes them the obligation to declare the policy in such definite terms that the men and women of America need not blush at any time merely because they are not fighting in the trenches but are staying at home fighting in the field or in the mine or in the factory. In other words, when we talk of the necessity of law, we are getting right at the very living soul of America.

We have founded our political life and our social life upon the doctrine of relative equality. Equality before the law is as essential to us as is the breath of heaven. Nothing will raise such anarchy as the existence of discrimination among the people of the United States. Let it exist in fact, and it will raise hell. Let it seem to exist, and there will be confusion, uncertainty, and trouble, and if it involves a great effort such as a total war effort, it causes the program to wobble and to fail. Therefore it is necessary to declare an equal liability of all mobile men within the range of 18 years and 65 years of age, and all mobile women within the ages of 18 and 50.

I use the term "mobile." I mean by that people who can be mobilized for the total war effort, for we cannot afford to break up the family; we cannot afford to destroy the prospects of proper nurture and care which all little children should have. We cannot uproot even the physical life of the family without putting something equally good in its place. Therefore we have to have a law, we have to have legislation, which says to everyone of these people, "You are all equal before the law. If you are able to perform service to back up our boys at the front, then we will take you over as volunteers or we will take you by selection, and we will put you in place at the time and in the manner which will accord with a grand plan which mobilizes this entire resource of the United States in the most effective manner for the prosecution of the war; but in so doing we will see that your family is taken care of."

No mother who has under her care a child less than 18 years of age would be liable under the proposed law. Neither would she be liable if she has a mother dependent on her, or if she has dependent upon her any other member of her family by reason of sickness or other infirmity. No family would be broken up by this plan. If a man or woman has to be transferred to another locality than that in which the person lives, provision is made in the bill for the transfer of the whole menage. Provision is made for payment of mileage and for the transfer and maintenance of the household goods necessary to keep the family together.

Again, looking toward the security of the fundamental thing in America, which is the home, no one under such a law as proposed by the bill would be transferred to any place where there is not provided in advance suitable housing. Can that be done under Executive order? No.

Mr. President, another objective, which is the answer to a demand is that if the bill should become a law it would establish and maintain a proper balance in numbers between men and women in the armed services, and, on the other side of the scale, men and women who are employed at home in noncombatant services. That is one plan which is sought to be put into effect.

There is another one, namely, the establishment and maintenance of a balance among those who are not engaged in military service, that is, a balance between those who are employed in the factories, in the mines, on the prairies and farms, in the shipyards, and in transportation. All the essential noncombatant war service is intended to be coordinated according to a grand plan, a master plan. Then quota calls would be made for volunteers, such calls occurring from time to time, and if the people of the country desired to maintain and keep going the voluntary system they could do it simply by responding to the calls.

Mr. President, the bill provides that if the voluntary system is carried through it shall be operated, not by some new organization, not by some additional bureau to be set up, but by an existing organization, namely, the War Manpower Commission, so long as the voluntary system works; and at all times, under either the voluntary system or under the selective plan contained in the proposed legislation, the War Manpower Commission is the body which would have charge of the preparation of the master plan. That Commission would be the policy-making body; it would be the central responsible organ of the Congress of the United States, if the proposed legislation should be passed, for the making of plans and the coordinating of all information as to the number of men needed here, and the number there are of the qualifications and character desired. This applies also to women.

If the voluntary plan should not work, however, and the President should have to make a call under the selective plan, then what would happen? We would carry on with an institution which is already in existence, which was created by Congress, and which has been the most admirable type of operating agency this country has ever seen, either in time of peace or in time of war, namely, the selective-service local boards. The local boards are the decentralized operating agencies which operate a way out on the ends of the branches of the tree. They work without pay. They do not have the smell of brimstone on their garments. They have no interest except the interest of serving their country. Their neighbors know the members of the boards, and know that their purpose is to serve their country, and when they pass judgment upon a boy or a girl the neighbors accept the decision in most cases. If they do not, or if the boy himself or if the girl herself does not accept the decision, the existing law, that is the selective-service law of 1940, provides for agencies of appeal clear up to the top, to the Commander in Chief. The rights of those affected are protected in an American way. That is the selective part of this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does the Senator prefer not to be interrupted?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not care. I am trying to explain the bill; that is all.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I understand that. Do I correctly understand that in case the voluntary plan should not operate, that the draft boards, so-called, would have authority to order a citizen into a private munition plant, into a navy yard, or onto a farm?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. I suggest to the Senator that my observation has been that most American youths want to go into the combat military service. I have heard that expression of desire from young men repeatedly. The impression among many seems to be that unless one has a military service record, after the war his opportunity for civic advancement, and for political preferment in the future, will be handicapped. Therefore, from my observation it seems to me that some plan will have to be worked out in the case of citizens who prefer military service to, let us say, farm service, so that those who are placed in other service than the military will enjoy the same rights and honorable status and will be recognized by law as having made the same contribution to the war effort as those who serve in the combat service. Why should not the young man ordered to work on a farm or in a private munitions factory enjoy, for example, the civil-service military preferment laws, hospitalization, compensation, and so forth, that are extended to officers and privates in the military service, who never perform combat duty but who render other useful and necessary war work?

I suggest these observations for the committee's consideration.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Massachusetts has made this valuable contribution to the subject. He is always very helpful, and he has aided us by the thought he has just expressed. I hope the suggestion he has made will be considered and will be incorporated in the measure before we conclude our consideration of it.

Mr. President, let me say that there is absolutely no pride of authorship about this measure which would bar amendments, changes, or even substitution of another bill for this bill. The effort today is to have something definite and concrete in front of us, to get down to close fighting with this very tough subject. Some persons think that the subject is an unpopular one, and that it is dangerous for a Senator to introduce or sponsor such a bill as this. Very well, if that be the case, I will gladly chance my political life for the thing which I think will help my son in his efforts over there in north Africa. If he is willing to give his life for his country, I am willing to give my political life for what the proposed legislation will bring about. On the contrary, however, I very much doubt that the subject is unpopular. My study of public opinion relating to this subject causes me to believe that we should answer the responsibility and do something about the matter, and not leave men and women of the country victimized under an Executive order.

What will result when the present Executive order goes into effect? Let us take a man over 38 as an illustration and ask ourselves if the public is going to like the condition which will prevail. A man over 38 cannot be drafted into the war service. Under the Executive order, he will be sent from one place to another place to work in a war factory. He works there a couple of days and then says he does not like it. He says, "I am going to quit." His employer will say, "Very well, if you quit, I will not give you a release. If you go to a plant which has a war contract and which has entered into a stabilization agreement, the door is closed in your face, and you will be an outcast; you will be blacklisted."

Mr. President, does our country want to live under that sort of indirect sanction? I know it does not. I know that the system of sanction in this country has to be founded upon law, or our people will not obey it. We are accustomed to having the question of whether a law has been violated tried by a court of justice. We are not accustomed to having such cases judged in advance and the accused being blackballed without a chance of trial based on the facts and on the law. That is the difference between operating under such a law as I propose and continuing to operate under an Executive order. My proposal would provide a moderate punishment for violation of the law, but would impose it only in the American way, that is, after the accused has had his case submitted to a court of justice and has been given an opportunity to be heard. If he were then found guilty he would be punished by fine or imprisonment, or by both, according to the grade of his offense. That is what the pending bill provides. That is the difference between the direct sanctions of the bill and those indirect sanctions which sneak up behind one unawares, with the public not knowing what the sanctions are, and being caught unawares. The known law is what we should live by. We can live by the law, but we cannot live by orders administered by bureaus.

I do not imply anything wrong concerning the orders which are in existence today. I do not undertake to criticize any of the men who administer them. I am talking about clean-cut American principles, which are as familiar to us as the landscape of the place where we were born. They are the oaken beams which support the entire superstructure of our political and social life; and not even in time of war will we give them up if we can save them. By such a measure as the bill which I am discussing they would be saved and made effective.

Observe the difference between a voluntary plan, which has only indirect sanctions, and a voluntary plan, which has always behind it the possibility of drafting. Senators know full well that if all the people in these two spheres of life realize that all of them are liable for the same amount of service and the same degree of contribution to the war effort they will have the impulse to serve. All they will desire is to be told where to go and what to do in order to fit into the plan. Some of them have told me, "If it is left to us to decide where we shall do this work, how can we fit into the general plan? We do not know what it is. If left to our individual wills, it will be hit and miss. So we want you, the Congress, to go ahead and create the liability, declare it, and let us all know that all of us are in it to the same degree, and then we will volunteer." If they know that the recalcitrants—those who are so few that it would be difficult to find them—can be reached, the spirit with which they will act will have all the characteristics of a voluntary spirit. They will volunteer much more freely.

This morning Secretary Wickard, in his testimony, made a statement concerning the farm boys. He was asked whether compulsion of law would be necessary, and he said "Yes," in effect. He said that it would ease the problem so far as their consciences are concerned. That was a very good statement of the same point which I am stating much less effectively.

The bill I have introduced makes in words the liability of all as follows:

> Shall be liable to contribute by personal service to the war effort in a non-combatant capacity, according to his or her abilities, and as selected in accordance with the terms of this act and regulations prescribed by the President thereunder.

Many more exemptions have been found necessary in a measure of this kind, which relates to all the population, than those granted in the case of the Selective Service Act, which related only to the fighting men. For example, we found it necessary to exempt officers of States, municipalities, and subdivisions thereof. In order to save the autonomy of the several States and to

maintain the theory of our Government of a federation of States in the great Union, we have made it clear that there is no liability on the part of officers of States, municipalities, and political subdivisions thereof. We have exempted any woman while she is pregnant, as certified by a duly licensed physician, and any woman who has living with her and under her care either a child or children under 18 years of age, or one or more persons who, because of illness or advanced age, need her personal care.

There are many other things of that character in the bill. We found as we made progress that education was necessary, and so there is a provision in the bill for training which will enable workmen to improve their status in life and industry and which will step up their skills. It is also provided that they shall receive compensation during the time when they are undergoing education and training, until they go to work. There is an excellent record of effective service in training during the past 6 months, and it is a source of supply of surprisingly good skilled labor for industry. It is a good feature of the existing practice to incorporate into law.

Another thing in the pending bill, in the nature of a grant or benefit which cannot be provided by an Executive order, is the establishment of reemployment and seniority of boys and girls who are taken out of their continuity of service and plunged into the war effort. The bill would provide for reemployment and seniority rights when the war is over, or when they return to their peacetime activities.

Mr. President, I shall close with a brief summary of the proposed legislation. I probably have omitted some features of the bill, because I am speaking without notes. However, I am sure it will be printed during the day and will be available quite soon.

The national war service bill, introduced today in the House of Representatives by Representative WADSWORTH and in the Senate by me, expresses the will of the people as we perceive it. It establishes equality of liability before the law in civilian supply of our military needs. It affords the means of coordinating over all and local war plans, maintaining balance between armed men and workers, between competing claimants for men and women in agriculture, mining, and manufacturing. It represents government by consent of the governed. By it the people, through their representatives, provide that if any mobile person refuses to perform his obligation, either through the voluntary or the selection method, punishment by due process of law is possible. If enacted it would be the people's instrumentality for complete effective mobilization of manpower and womanpower in winning the war.

The voluntary system would continue in effect so long as the people keep it doing the job. The possibility of the President putting into operation the selective system is the guaranty of vitality of total war resources. Civilian morale, health, and welfare are safeguarded.

The bill protects the sanctity of the home, the family, and the economic and social interests of employees. It affords opportunity for education in and stepping-up of skills. It makes possible an earlier attainment of victory. After the war it would help readjustment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Can the Senator give us any information as to what scheme or law is applicable in Great Britain? Is there anything which is equivalent to the proposed act in relation to manpower and womanpower?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. Unfortunately I do not have a copy of it on my desk, but I have examined it very carefully. If the able Senator from Wisconsin has a copy of the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, Seventy-seventh Congress, on October 21 and 26, November 5, 6, and 9, 1942, he will find in them a remarkably fine address by Daniel J. Tobin, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, delivered on September 26, 1942, upon his return from a survey of labor conditions in England.

In the address he spoke of the operations under the British system. I do not know how nearly our bill follows that system, but it is a system which has in it compulsory features in case the voluntary effort is not successful. Thus far in England they have had very few instances in which they have had to apply the compulsory features of the law. It has worked extremely well and apparently satisfies labor very well over there.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I heard considerable testimony by Mr. Tobin before a subcommittee. He told the story of what had happened in England. However, I think it would be an injustice to him to imply that he was approving of the same thing for this country at this time.

Mr. AUSTIN. I did not know that; I am rather surprised to hear that he does not approve of it. How long ago was it that he made the statement?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall look up the record; and if I find that I am in error about it I shall correct my statement.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have before me a statement by Mr. William Green which indicates that at a certain time the American Federation of Labor did not approve. Let me read it. The statement appeared in the legislative program published in the January issue of the American Federationist magazine:

MANPOWER

Under our present set-up workers in any particular industry or locality threatened by manpower shortages may be frozen to their jobs when the Government, management, and labor agree such action is necessary.

That is the situation I described awhile ago, when it is agreed that a person who leaves his employment will not be hired by another industry.

This is the democratic way—

So he thinks.

Meanwhile, proposals are being advanced for the enactment of national service legislation involving Nation-wide compulsory job freezing. Such complete mobilization of industrial manpower may ultimately be necessary.

He makes that admission.

We will cooperate fully in the realization of this objective when we become convinced that such drastic action is necessary.

But we are not yet so convinced. We oppose enactment of national service legislation at this time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think that probably was the gist of Mr. Tobin's statement.

Mr. AUSTIN. That may be Mr. Tobin's attitude. So far as his story of what has happened in Britain went, it showed a condition of affairs on the basis of which the Senate could decide whether or not the plan was good.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me ask the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont whether the testimony before his committee was of such weight as to show that we cannot have sufficient production without the enactment of the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I think it was. Let me call attention briefly to a few of the statements of witnesses who appeared before the committee.

On page 25 of the hearings to which I have referred appears the following testimony given when Chairman McNutt was on the stand:

Senator AUSTIN. I have in my file here material that is so startling and so tragic that we cannot delay; we must act; we must go ahead just as fast as it is reasonably possible to remedy by legislation this situation. Now, is it not your judgment that we must, by law, prevent these evils that you have mentioned, that is to say, piracy?

Mr. MCNUTT. That is right.

Senator AUSTIN. The voluntary transfers, selling out, going without the consent of the Government from one occupation to the other, losing time by being out on the street hunting a new job that will pay more money; don't you find that is the practice?

Mr. MCNUTT. No question about that.

Senator AUSTIN. We must do it, must we not, to stop that by law?

Mr. MCNUTT. As I said before, and I repeat, it is inevitable. The question of timing is in the hands of the President and of the Congress.

Senator HILL. Inevitable and inexorable, too.

Mr. MCNUTT. Yes.

Let us turn to the testimony of Mr. Nelson. On page 166 the following appears:

Senator AUSTIN. Not outside of the sentimental element that is involved in dealing with men and women, and let us see if we can forget it for the time being, I would like to ask your opinion as to whether or not it is not better that all men and all women shall be assured by an act of Congress that they shall be impartially treated on the subject of liability to either serve in the armed forces or to work?

Is it not wiser that we should establish a statute which fixes that liability rather than to leave it at the random judgment of the different men who are in the different places of responsibility and authority?

Mr. NELSON. In my opinion, sir, you will have to do it before we get through. I do not believe we should dilly-dally with this war. I think we have just got to put our teeth right into it and go out and with it. I think sooner or later we are going to come to that declaration by Congress—not that we want compulsions—so that the people will know what the problem is, and they will do it. People will obey. People want to do this, but they do not want to see slackers in the picture. The people, in my opinion, of this country, are going to demand that Congress do something of this kind before we get through.

It will be found that frequently throughout his testimony he was brought back to that subject by different Senators on the committee, and that he made it very emphatic that it is an inevitable thing.

Of course, the question with all those gentlemen was, has the time now arrived to do it? It is up to the President and Congress, as Mr. McNutt said. I think it is more up to the Congress than to the President to determine what are the needs and requirements of the people. We are the voice of the people. Even the smallest minority of the people has the right to be heard here. Here is the place for them to speak, and it is our duty to present their views.

Before leaving the testimony let me call attention to the testimony of General McSherry. On page 213 we find the following:

Senator AUSTIN. No; I said would you want to undertake these changes that are so obviously dislocating in our customary lives, without legislation?

General MCSHERRY. I think eventually we must have some sort of legislation which will give authority to handle these difficult problems, and I am speaking primarily of those problems where you have individuals or groups of individuals that do not want to go along with the national policies of making the best use of the manpower of the Nation for the war effort.

Now, that legislation would not necessarily mean that compulsion would be applied to every individual, because most individuals want to do what they can to win this war. It would be utilized only in the cases where someone was objecting to going along with the best policies which were considered necessary for the war effort.

On the next page, page 214, we find the following:

Senator AUSTIN. You have stated in the obverse what I was getting at. That is, what laws were intended to do, and that is to regulate the conduct of men in order to have orderly government, but the form of those laws must be such as to apply to all men——

General MCSHERRY. That is right.

Senator AUSTIN (continuing). Uniformly and with equality—that must be preserved by us in forming a statute, so we have to make the form of the law such that it applies to every man, and the fellow who gets tough can be handled by coercion just as the man you spoke of who just would not conform with the others.

I do not have any other questions, Mr. Chairman.

I have read sufficient to show that the testimony did indicate the necessity for legislation; and the view was always that such legislation is inevitable sometime in the future, and so forth. Those statements were made in October.

Finally I said to Chairman McNutt:

You have a great commission. You have the benefit of the advice of the joint chiefs of staff, of the War Production Board, of the Office of Economic Stabilization, of the Secretaries of Agriculture and Commerce, and of various other agencies. Why do you not come forward with a bill?

The reply was that they had not been able to do it as yet, but they would do it.

I asked, "When?"

Within 2 weeks; within 2 weeks we will come forward with a bill, and of course we will present it to the President first.

I had asked him:

Will you not let us see those bills of yours?

He had replied:

Would you consider them?

I said:

Why, Chairman McNutt, we are considering five bills now. We are not married to any one of them. We are trying to serve our country, and we ask you to produce your bills. We know you have them.

He admitted that he had made several drafts of bills, and he was going to produce them in 2 weeks. That was in October 1942, but we have not as yet seen them. That is why I say it is time that Congress got busy.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, let me suggest to the distinguished Senator——

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MCNARY. I consented to having the able senior Senator from Vermont make a statement in explanation of the bill, and I do not want to interfere now if the Senator from Vermont desires to explain the basis of the bill. However, if such an explanation is to lead to discussion I shall invoke the rule and call for the regular order.

I desire to say further that I have never liked the practice of using the morning hour for the purpose of making speeches on bills being introduced. It is only on one or more occasions that I have consented to such a presentation, and then have felt that a brief explanation should end the matter.

Today an hour has gone by. If the further explanation is to lead to discussion from the floor I shall invoke the rule and shall call for the regular order.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I did not choose to follow the course which has been pursued. I expected to sit down after a brief explanation. Some time ago I announced that I was ready to sit down, but I wanted to accommodate my fellow Senators and colleagues.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, let me say that I was not accommodated, but I shall sit down.

Mr. AUSTIN. So shall I.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The introduction of further bills and joint resolutions is in order.

Mr. GUFFEY obtained the floor and proceeded to make a statement regarding James G. Blaine and his interest in the principles of reciprocity in trade agreements and was interrupted by

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Under what order has the Senator from Pennsylvania obtained the floor to make a speech?

Mr. GUFFEY. I merely have one or two paragraphs more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania made a request for unanimous consent to put an article in the RECORD.

Mr. MCNARY. I do not think this is the time to make a speech in connection with a matter to be placed in the RECORD. I just sent word to my distinguished colleague from my State that I would object to him discussing at this time a resolution he desires to submit. I have always tried to have the rule enforced in the interest of orderly parliamentary procedure. It is a proper one. We have the remainder of the day for speeches, but Members of the Senate come here for the purpose of introducing bills and submitting resolutions and transacting the other business that comes in the morning hour. We are getting into a practice which I abhor.

I do not want to take the Senator from Pennsylvania off the floor, but after the routine morning business is finished the Senator can speak the remainder of the day. Let us, however, finish the routine morning business as prescribed by the rules.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I will make my statement in complete form after the routine business shall have been concluded.

Mr. MCNARY. Very well. I speak in all kindness. I did not desire to take the able Senator from Vermont off the floor, but I said that if others were to follow him along the same line there might be an interminable debate.

I wish to give notice here that whenever I am present, which I think will be most of the time, I shall object to the making of speeches during the routine morning business.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I wish to commend the statement made by the able Senator from Oregon. We have all been careless, and no one Senator more than another is to blame in regard to making speeches out of order, but many Senators are busy men, and if we adhere strictly to the rule governing the transaction of morning business, in 10 or 20 minutes we can go to our offices and perform our office work. We have been waiting here now for over an hour and 5 minutes to present some bills that should have been presented during the first 10 minutes of the session.

I hope the Senator from Oregon will adhere to the position he has taken. He has tried to do it before, but without much success. We have a rule as to the morning hour and after the morning hour other business before the Senate may be transacted. I do not want to be thought as objecting to the Senator from Pennsylvania proceeding, because I think all of us are guilty of the

same offense, but it would be very much better for us all and enable us better to take care of the day's work if the rules which we have made were adhered to.

BILLS INTRODUCED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The further introduction of bills and joint resolutions is in order.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. AUSTIN introduced Senate bill 666, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 667. A bill to provide domiciliary care for discharged disabled veterans pending adjudication of claim for pension; and

S. 668. A bill to authorize and to direct the Veterans' Administration to provide vocational rehabilitation and assistance in securing suitable employment for service-connected disabled veterans in need thereof, and feasible purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 669. A bill to provide pensions to members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who become disabled by reason of their service therein, equivalent to 90 percent of the compensation payable to war veterans for similar service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 670. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Prairie Band or Tribe of Pottawatomie Indians of Kansas and Wisconsin against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 671. A bill for the relief of Charles Francis Fessenden; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 67. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 673. A bill for the relief of Burton Bowen; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 674. A bill authorizing the payment of allowances in lieu of quarters or rations in kind to certain enlisted men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 675. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act to conscientious objectors; and

S. 676. A bill to amend an Act entitled "An Act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 677. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 678. A bill for the regulation and stabilization of agricultural and commodity prices and of our domestic economy through the regulation and stabilization of the value of the dollar, pursuant to the power conferred on the Congress by paragraph 5 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 679. A bill providing for railroad transportation at reduced rates for merchant seamen on authorized leave of absence; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for the immediate relief of farm manpower situation in the Middle West.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota will be appropriately referred.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 680. A bill to provide needed manpower for the production, conservation, and protection of food during the year 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TUNNELL:

S. 681. A bill to amend section 245 of the Criminal Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 682 A bill to prohibit the paid advertising of alcoholic beverages by radio in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. HILL, and Mr. DAVISQ:

S. 683. A bill to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF MAXIMUM PRICES ON PORK AND BEEF PRODUCTS AND BREAD AND OTHER BAKERY PRODUCTS

Mr. REED submitted a resolution (S. Res. 94), which was ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

Whereas the provisions of the act entitled "An act to aid in stabilizing the cost of living," approved October 2, 1942, expressly provide (1) that "no maximum price shall be established or maintained under authority of this act or otherwise for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity a price therefor" equal to the parity price for such agricultural commodity, (2) that no maximum price shall be maintained for any such processed or manufactured commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of the agricultural commodity the highest price received by them between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942, with certain qualifications: *Provided*, That the President may correct gross inequities in this respect, but that in no event shall a maximum price be established for such a processed or manufactured commodity which will not reflect parity to the producers of the agricultural commodity, and (3) that "in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing"; and

Whereas the act known as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 approved January 30, 1942, as amended October 2, 1942, expressly provides that the price-fixing powers "shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution established in any industry, except to prevent circumstances or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act"; and

Whereas the foregoing provisions have not been suspended or modified by any law or lawful action; and

Whereas on October 22, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued maximum price regulation No. 148, revised, now in effect as amended November 2, 1942, fixing maximum prices for pork products and using as a live-hog base approximately $13.60 per 100 pounds at Chicago, although the price of live hogs at Chicago since the promulgation of said revised regulation for a substantial period of time has been in excess of $15 per 100 pounds, causing a loss to the processors in violation of the provision of the act approved October 2, 1942, that processors shall be allowed a general fair and equitable margin; and

Whereas said maximum price regulation No. 148, revised, as amended is in violation of the act approved October 2, 1942, because the base of live-animal prices used was lower than the highest price received by producers between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942, and because there has been no action by the President to permit such a lower base on the ground of any gross inequity; and

Whereas on December 10, 1942 the Office of Price Administration issued maximum price regulation No. 169, now in effect as amended December 19, 1942, and January 2, 1943, fixing maximum prices for beef products on a basis which fails to yield to the processors generally fair and equitable margins; and

Whereas on April 28, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued the general maximum price regulation establishing as maximum prices for bread and other bakery products, together with other commodities, the highest price charged by each seller during March 1942 for each such commodity, and said maximum prices for bread and other bakery products have since been maintained at the same levels; and

Whereas said maximum prices for bread and other bakery products were and are in violation of the act approved October 2, 1942, because said products are processed and manufactured in whole from wheat and other agricultural commodities and because said maximum prices did not and do not reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodities either parity or the highest prices received by producers for them between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942; and

Whereas contrary to the statement of the Office of Price Administration at the time of issuing the general maximum price regulation that "every producer whose prices are stabilized is assured that his costs, which are based upon the stabilized prices of others, will not rise," the Office of Price Administration did not at that time place any maximum price or control, with minor exceptions, upon any of the costs of manufacturers of bread and other bakery products, and it was not until October 1942 that ceilings were placed upon flour, eggs, dry, evaporated, and condensed milk, certain other ingredients used in such products, and wages, by which time such costs had undergone a substantial increase, amounting to an average increase of one-half cent per pound in the case of bread; and

Whereas the costs of producing bread and other bakery products have continued to increase substantially since October 1942, as a result in part of increases in maximum prices for flour allowed by Maximum Price Regulation No. 296, issued by the Office of Price Administration on January 2, 1943, although no increase in the maximum prices for bread and other bakery products has been allowed; and

Whereas producers of bread and other bakery products, particularly smaller producers, are therefore being denied a generally fair and equitable margin in violation of the act approved October 2, 1942, and large numbers of such producers in fact are operating at a loss; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration, in violation of the provision in the act approved January 30, 1942, that the price-fixing powers "shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry," has used such powers to compel such changes in the bread and other bakery-products industry (as evidenced by its announcement upon the issuance of maximum price regula-

tion No. 296 that "this increase in flour prices should not necessitate an increase in the present retail bread prices because the higher flour costs, it is estimated, will be completely offset by simultaneously introduced savings in the manufacture, packaging, and distribution costs of bakers"), affected by food distribution order No. 1, issued by the Secretary of Agriculture under direction of the Director of Economic Stabilization after recommendation by the Office of Price Administration, limiting varieties of bread and rolls, prohibiting slicing of bread, limiting the amount of milk, shortening, and sugar in white bread, prohibiting certain methods of distribution and otherwise changing the practices of the industry for the purpose of maintaining present maximum prices for bread; and

Whereas said food distribution order No. 1, even could it be lawfully resorted to by the Office of Price Administration for the purpose of maintaining present maximum prices for bread, has not resulted in savings which allow producers of bread a generally fair and equitable margin as required by law; and

Whereas the meat processing and bread and other bakery-products industries are essential war industries and their continued operation and the foods they supply are essential to the national welfare and the successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas the policies and actions of the Office of Price Administration are threatening extinction of these industries or their concentration in the hands of a few large operators able to withstand the price squeeze imposed, by reason of large financial resources; and

Whereas the action of the Office of Price Administration in maintaining maximum prices for pork and beef products and for bread and other bakery products at present levels in violation of the foregoing provisions of law is defeating the intent of the Congress that producers of agricultural commodities shall receive fair and reasonable prices, due to the inability of processors to pay such prices: Now therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or through a subcommittee to be appointed by the chairman, is hereby authorized and directed—

(1) to investigate and study the policies and actions of the Office of Price Administration, the Office of Economic Stabilization, and any other governmental agency, their officials, employees, agents, and representatives, in respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum prices for pork and beef products and for bread and other bakery products; and

(2) to report its findings and to recommend further legislation or action by the Congress or the Senate if any, needed to insure compliance by any or all such agencies, officials, employees agents, and representatives with the provisions of the aforementioned act approved January 30, 1942, as amended, and the act approved October 2, 1942.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

## PREPARATION AND DISTRIBUTION BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES OF MOTION PICTURES, MAGAZINES, AND PERIODICALS

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and request its appropriate reference, and that I may be recognized after the morning business is concluded to make an explanation of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution (S. Res. 95) will be received and appropriately referred, and the Senator from Oregon will be recognized later.

## HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. SMITH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 96), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 20 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the message sent by the President to the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association convention at St. Louis, Mo., on January 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## WORLD ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION AND PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "World Economic Organization and Peace" delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah from Washington, D. C., on February 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ADDRESS OF CLYDE T. ELLIS BEFORE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION CONVENTION

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Clyde T. Ellis at the First Annual Convention of the National Rural Electric Association at St. Louis, Mo., on January 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## GOOD FAITH THE ISSUE—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Good Faith the Issue: John O'Donnell Wins $50,000 Verdict Against Philadelphia Record," published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 30, which appears in the Appendix.]

## PROHIBITION OF CHARGE ACCOUNTS AT FILLING STATIONS—EDITORIAL FROM POCATELLO (IDAHO) TRIBUNE

[Mr. THOMAS of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Will This Idiocy Ever Stop?" published in the Pocatello (Idaho) Tribune of January 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## IDAHO FARMING CONDITIONS—LETTER FROM E. T. TAYLOR

[Mr. THOMAS of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from E. T. Taylor, master of the Idaho State Grange, relative to the difficulties experienced by Idaho farmers, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The routine morning business is concluded. The calendar under rule VIII is in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

## RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like now to make the statement which I started to make a while ago.

Mr. President, for me to rise to place in the RECORD a statement extolling a Republican may be misunderstood unless I explain. I offer for the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 1, commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the death of James G. Blaine, who was born at West Brownsville, Pa. Mr. Blaine was Secretary of State during the administrations of Presidents Garfield, Arthur, and Harrison. He, of course, rose to political fame from his adopted State of Maine, but Pennsylvania was his birthplace.

My interest at this time, other than recalling the life of a distinguished American, is to point out that Secretary Blaine, among his many activities— and I might say his crowning achievement in international affairs—was instrumental in putting into effect the principles of reciprocity in trade agreements. Trade agreements as now negotiated by the President, and the Secretary of State have been of great benefit to the Nation and have served as a stimulus to trade and as a means of strengthening friendly ties with other nations.

The present Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, is much to be commended for his distinguished service in the accomplishment of economic stability through trade gained by current agreements. It is my hope that the able Secretary will not be thwarted in the further continuance of these negotiations by failure of Congress to renew the resolution extending the trade agreements.

May posterity record all of the many great achievements of Cordell Hull. As a great American and statesman of outstanding ability, Secretary Hull's personal efforts were responsible for procuring trade agreements with many of the important countries. His many acts of diplomacy have signalized America as outstanding among the nations of the world.

As was so in the case of the trade agreement activities of Secretary Blaine, who, as I have said, is nationally remembered as a Republican, there should not be any evidence of partisanship at the time of the renewal of the resolution continuing the present agreements.

I wish to quote from an address which Secretary Blaine delivered at the inter-American conference of 1889. His statement is as applicable today as when it

was made. In discussing the conduct of inter-American relations, he said:

We believe that hearty cooperation, based on hearty confidence, will save all American states from the burdens and evils which have long and cruelly afflicted the older nations of the world.

We believe that a spirit of justice, of common and equal interest between the American states, will leave no room for an artificial balance of power like unto that which has led to wars abroad and drenched Europe in blood.

We believe that friendship, avowed with candor and maintained with good faith, will remove from American states the necessity of guarding boundary lines between themselves with fortifications and military force. * * *

We believe that friendship and not force, the spirit of just law and not violence of the mob, should be the recognized rule of administration between American nations and in American nations.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 1 be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLAINE ANNIVERSARY

Wednesday last was the fiftieth anniversary of the death of James G. Blaine, an American exponent of world polity who, considering the lasting value of his achievements, should be better known to his countrymen. It is not too much to say in his behalf that he was the forerunner of the modern school of thought concerning the position of the United States as a compelling force in international affairs. He revived Henry Clay's doctrine of hemisphere solidarity and put into effect the principle of reciprocity in trade concessions. If only for those services, he merits a generous remembrance.

Mr. Blaine, born at West Brownsville, Pa., January 31, 1830, was educated at Washington College, and settling at Augusta, Maine, in 1854 became a practical newspaperman. His editorials in the Kennebec Journal and the Portland Advertiser introduced the word "Republican" to the East, and he thus may be regarded as one of the founders of the party so designated beginning in 1856. Elected to Congress in 1863, he was Speaker of the House of Representatives from 1869 to 1875. A Lincoln supporter and a faithful Unionist, he nevertheless "did not share the radicalism and vindictiveness of the extremists," opposed both Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner, disapproved "coercive measures" aimed at the South, and emerged from the reconstruction period "with the reputation of a liberal who could * * * be trusted even by the Grand Army." Chosen a Senator in 1876, he resigned to become Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President James A. Garfield in 1881 and occupied the same position in the administration of President Benjamin Harrison between 1889 and 1892.

Not a great lawyer nor an experienced student of diplomatic history, Mr. Blaine, however, was possessed of a prophetic vision which made him unique among the political characters of his generation. His appreciation of the necessity for American leadership marked him as a pioneer. He sought to bring together all the republics of the New World under the banner "America for the Americans." The Pan-American Conference of 1889, which he sponsored, laid the foundation of the Bureau of American Republics, which since 1910 has been called the Pan American Union.

Mr. Blaine also took the first steps toward saving the Hawaiian Islands for the United States. He negotiated important treaties having the effect of strengthening friendly ties with Great Britain, preserved the Panama Canal against foreign interference, arranged the first international copyright agreements and in many other ways set a pattern of procedure in American relations with other powers which still prevails.

PREPARATION AND DISTRIBUTION BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES OF MOTION PICTURES, MAGAZINES, AND PERIODICALS

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I now desire to discuss briefly the resolution which I submitted awhile ago and which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Oregon will be referred as requested by him.

The resolution (S. Res. 95) was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Appropriations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the preparation and distribution of motion pictures, magazines, and periodicals by departments and agencies of the Government, for the purpose of determining, among other things: (1) The authorization for such activities, (2) the appropriations from which such activities are financed and their cost, (3) the persons to whom such propaganda is disseminated, (4) the underlying purpose of these motion pictures, magazines, and periodicals, (5) all other pertinent facts necessary to enable the committee to render a full and complete report on these activities. The committee or subcommittee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the result of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the remainder of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, the resolution provides for a complete investigation of the preparation and distribution of motion pictures and magazines by departments and agencies of the Government. My purpose in requesting that it be referred to the Appropriations Committee is that, as a member of that committee, I am not aware of having authorized the expenditure of Federal funds for the specific purpose of the Government engaging in the magazine and moving-picture business. Yet, obviously, the executive department of this administration is now in the magazine and moving-picture business in a big way. However, I do not know to what total extent our well-financed executive department is engaged in this new business in these critical times, when our Nation is fighting to maintain its very existence, and the American taxpayers do not know how they are going to meet their tax bills; nor do I know how much money is being spent for this kind of personal propaganda, or who or how many persons on Federal pay rolls are occupied in this form of showmanship, who no doubt could be better employed in either the combat or productive forces of our country at war.

I shall call attention now to only one magazine and two moving pictures put out by the Federal Government. There are many others. I do not know how many or what they all may be.

On the evening of January 11 last when I was guest at the annual dinner of the American Legion in this city I viewed a moving picture entitled "A Prelude to War." This picture was preceded by an oral introduction by General Osborne of the Morale Division, War Department, who explained to the audience that it was the first of a series of moving pictures in the making, which would be shown under the over-all title of "Why We Fight." He stated that the purpose of making and showing these pictures was to inform the men in the combat forces of our country for what and why they were fighting.

At the conclusion of the picture I was convinced that Mr. Roosevelt intended to seek a fourth term in the Presidency. I was of the opinion that references to war, oppression, combat, and so forth, as they appeared in the picture are only window dressing and stage scenery for cleverly organized campaign material. It may have been only a coincidence, but the speech in Chicago 7 days later of Hon. Frank C. Walker, our Postmaster General, seemed to confirm the thought which the moving picture A Prelude to War had created in my mind.

I doubted if the purpose stated by General Osborne for making and showing this moving picture to the ultimately more than 10,000,000 men in our combat forces, who are prospective voters, was the only purpose of the picture. So that all other Members of the Congress may judge for themselves the justification for the making and showing of this picture at Federal expense and in official time, and as a proper war expenditure for every episode depicted in it, I have arranged with the War Department for a free showing of the picture in the Caucus Room of the Senate Office Building, on Tuesday, February 16, at 1:15 p. m. I hope every Member of the Congress will take advantage of this opportunity to see this sensational moving picture.

My attention has been called to another moving picture entitled "Spy Ship," but I have not seen it. I understand that it, too, is a propaganda picture which fosters disunity by those very persons who are continually shouting "unity, unity."

I now call the attention of Senators to this magazine which I have with me. It is entitled "Victory," and is No. 1, volume

1, of this new Federal venture in personal political propaganda. Except that it is published by the Government of the United States, and except for the statement communicated to me by letter signed by Mr. Armitage Watkins, Overseas Publications, Office of War Information, that "there is no public distribution"—of it—"within the United States," I know only what I see in this copy of the magazine itself. It weighs 13½ ounces, measures 10½ by 14 inches, contains 80 pages, and is printed upon the very finest book paper. It is profusely illustrated with excellent cut. A number of its pictures are in three or more colors.

I do not know what it cost to produce this copy, how many copies of this issue were printed, how often the magazine is to be issued, to whom it is to be sent, by what authority it is published, how it is financed, who and how many are on the pay roll of the staff, nor their rates of compensation; nor do I know what necessity there is for its existence in the all-out war effort of the American people; but from a perusal of its pages, observing its most prominent illustrations and reading its vainglorious text, again I have the impression that Mr. Franklin Delano Roosevelt is to seek a fourth election to the Presidency.

I now should like to read a few of the paragraphs in this publication which are intended to strike terror to our enemies, to cause the Japanese to retreat, and the followers of Hitler to lay down their arms. I read:

There are really two Franklin Delano Roosevelts. There is the forceful war leader of his country in the most perilous period of its history; a brilliant statesman of great sincerity, of deep perception, and a visionary whose social and economic philosophies once before saved his country in a crisis. The second Roosevelt is a warm-hearted, kindly and companionable man, whose personal charm has won him the love of millions of his loyal countrymen, and a man who in overcoming a serious attack of infantile paralysis in adult life proved his own insurmountable personal courage.

He is a kindly, loving, and beloved man, this leader of a nation which has been built on friendliness and neighborliness.

One of his closest friends over a period of years recently had this to say of the President:

"Both the President and Mrs. Roosevelt are instinctively the kindest people I have ever known. Along with their deep charm and their eager interest in people, their sincere liking for all sorts of people, they have an unselfish sense of tact and consideration I have never seen equaled.

"No one can be in the President's presence long and feel uncomfortable or embarrassed. He makes everyone, from the most humble to the most highly placed, believe that he is sincerely interested in them and in their problem of the moment. Even those who have not agreed with the President politically admit they are completely won by his gracious personality."

How terrifying that must be to the Japs!

Mr. DANAHER. If the Senator will yield, will he give us the name of the author?

Mr. HOLMAN. I have been trying to ascertain the name of the author. There is no name signed to the article, although the pronoun "I" is used in it. But I cannot find out who the "I" is. [Laughter.]

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLMAN. Would the Senator rather have me yield than to terrify the enemies of our country by further reading from this article?

Mr. DANAHER. Respecting the passion for anonymity of the author, insofar as the Senator from Oregon has sought his identity, can the Senator tell us what department puts out this particular publication?

Mr. HOLMAN. It comes from the Office of War Information.

Mr. DANAHER. The Office of War Information?

Mr. HOLMAN. I think that is what it is.

Mr. DANAHER. How does the Senator know it is not for publication in this country?

Mr. HOLMAN. Merely by the letter which accompanied the copy which, after considerable difficulty, I was able to obtain. In this letter Mr. Armitage Watkins says, "There is no public distribution [of it] within the United States." That is all I know about it.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to thank the Senator. I had no intention of interrupting his discourse. I thought he had concluded the reading. I, too, should like to know more about the publication, if the Senator chooses to read further excerpts.

Mr. HOLMAN. I have only a few more paragraphs to read.

"Franklin Roosevelt is a true aristocrat because he is a true democrat."

That is good. [Laughter.]

"And time and time again I——"

Here is the anonymous "I." That is the only identification I have in connection with the author of this article.

"And time and time again I have watched Mrs. Roosevelt, at a big reception, break away from a group that held especial interest for her and join someone who seemed alone and out of it on the sidelines. She would talk with this lonely one and without his noticing it, draw him into a circle she sensed he would enjoy. Then in a minute she would drift away again to rescue some other recluse in the party."

I can just see the Germans surrendering right now. [Laughter.] I doubt if any such incident ever occurred.

I shall not read further, but I should like to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks the paragraphs of the article I have marked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the paragraphs were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Just as they are a friendly, social couple, the Roosevelts have that deep love of family which characterizes America. They are happiest when one or all of their children are visiting either the White House or the Roosevelt country home in Hyde Park, N. Y. That pleasure is seldom enjoyed these days, however. Each of the four Roosevelt sons is in the military service, and their daughter is busy with war work on the west coast.

Whenever their country has been faced with the crisis of war or domestic upheaval, it has been the good fortune of Americans—or perhaps their good judgment exercised through an elective system of Government—to have at the helm a man of instinctive leadership.

George Washington guided his Nation through its first faltering days. Sage and spiritual Abraham Lincoln saved it from dissolution when civil war flamed. Idealistic Woodrow Wilson brought sanity to his country and a world at war in 1918. And today the man who holds the destiny of 135,000,000 Americans in his decisions is ideally fitted for the grave responsibilities of a wartime President.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt combines the two most important characteristics of a war leader. He is an unflinching fighter and he is a man of such broad vision that the peace he helps win will be a just one.

* * * * *

It has been said that in the long years of his confinement as an invalid, Roosevelt and his intelligent wife, Eleanor Roosevelt, slowly attained a political philosophy of broad social economic equality, which might not be expected from a man whose whole background and breeding would tend to temper his views with the toryism of the conservative reactionary.

Thus in 1932, when Franklin Roosevelt was swept into office as United States President by a Nation weary of reactionaries and seeking relief from a world-wide depression, he had just the program which could save the country from chaos. He called it the New Deal, and by it he promised to secure for others the advantages he himself had enjoyed.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, since I prepared my statement suggestion has been made that my resolution would more appropriately go to another committee than the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr HOLMAN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. We have created a special joint committee, of which the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is chairman to investigate nonessential expenditures. I ask the view of the Senator from Oregon as to whether appropriately his resolution should not be referred to that committee.

Mr HOLMAN. I am willing to accept the suggestion, and request that the resolution be so referred.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLMAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I myself should like to have an opportunity to glance over the resolution before agreeing that it go to any particular committee. I have not seen it or heard it read.

Mr. HOLMAN. Would the Senator like to see the illustrations in this publication?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think it is important where the illustrations may go. I am talking about the resolution the Senator is offering. By the way, what is the name of the publication from which the Senator has read?

Mr. HOLMAN. It is called Victory.

Mr. BARKLEY. What does the Senator's resolution provide?

Mr. HOLMAN. The resolution proposes an inquiry into the authority under

which this magazine is published, and the funds with which it is published.

Let me read what appears under the picture of the President:

"Liberty under God!" That is what Franklin D. Roosevelt pledges the United States of America to insure for all the future of all mankind. On the foundation of the four freedoms—of speech, of worship, from want, and from fear—this future will be built and forever maintained.

My point is that publishing this magazine is a waste of public funds, that the people of this country have a tremendous problem in trying to meet the necessary costs of government, and that really this entire magazine is merely window dressing for a personal political campaign.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let us understand what the status of the resolution is. Has it been offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think, under the circumstances, that is the proper place for it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the fact that the Senator from Oregon has requested that the resolution submitted by him go to the Committee on Appropriations determine the committee to which it should go?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not necessarily.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, if some of us deemed that this was a matter of peculiarly nonessential expenditure, which should be investigated by the committee already created for the investigation of such expenditures, might we not properly inquire as to whether that committee has jurisdiction?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The jurisdiction of that committee is defined by the act which created it. It has no authority whatever to report on a resolution.

Mr. DANAHER. It has no authority to report on a resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has no authority to do so, in the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, has it authority to inquire into nonessential expenditures?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has, yes, under the act which created it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the committee in question is not a Senate committee. It is a joint committee made up of members of both Houses and of outsiders. It has no legislative jurisdiction.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that I understand it is a joint committee, and I so referred to it. However, it does seem to me that such a matter as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] brings before us is so obviously a nonessential expenditure that it ought to be inquired into by our standing committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think my colleague has asked for a proper assignment of the resolution. It does not require legislation. An appropriation is required to continue this practice, and if it is a bad one it can be discontinued by withholding the appropriation. The Committee on Appropriations, having the right to appropriate public funds, can necessarily diminish the amount sought or entirely abate the appropriation. I think the resolution is correctly assigned.

## NATIONAL 4–H MOBILIZATION WEEK

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, this year the week of February 6 to 14 has been proclaimed National 4–H Mobilization Week. Its purpose is to mobilize, behind the war food production program, all rural youth not now reached, and to secure additional leaders to guide those volunteering to do their utmost in helping to win the war on the food front.

President Roosevelt has written a very fine statement in support of the National 4–H Mobilization Week program, which I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, December 29, 1942.*

*To all 4–H Club members of the United States:*

The turn of each year is symbolic of youth and renewed confidence. Never before has a new year presented to all youth a greater challenge to do their part in a democratic world. The whole Nation recognizes your self-reliance, your steadfast determination to attain your goals, and your patriotic devotion as individuals and as a group.

At this time it is particularly gratifying to learn of your extensive mobilization plans for 1943 to help the farmers of America to bring about still greater food production. May the observance of National 4–H Mobilization Week, February 6 to 14, reach into every rural home. We have faith in your ability to render a great service in this way. We know that you, like your brothers and sisters in the service, have the spirit and perseverance that will bring victory in the fight for human freedom and a world at peace.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. CAPPER. Permit me to point out further, Mr. President, that the 4–H boys and girls deserve all the recognition and support this body can give them. They are rural America at its best. Their achievements have always been inspiring. But now in their all-out war efforts they have excelled all previous records. Please note a few of the 1942 totals: 3,000,000 bushels of vegetables; 14,000,000 jars of fruit and vegetables canned; 600,000 head of livestock; 11,000,000 pounds of peanuts and soybeans; 6,500,000 birds in 4–H poultry flocks.

And would you Senators believe it, the 4–H members bought with the money earned through their own 4–H projects over $6,000,000 of War bonds and stamps. Moreover, people in my section of the country testify that these energetic young people have been just as effective in rendering other civic services, such as collecting scrap of all kinds needed in war work, eliminating accident and fire hazards, increasing farm fuel supplies and improving the health of the community. In fact, the whole 4–H program this year is being geared to war essentials and to those only. And do not forget, to this end many 4–H boys and girls are gladly making sacrifices. They are giving up more and more of those phases of the program which they like best in order that they may serve with the same spirit as the 500,000 former 4–H members who are now in the fighting forces. Right now, during Mobilization Week, each 4–H member is planning his work in terms of the number of fighting men who can be fed from the amount of food he can produce. Even last year in a number of counties throughout the United States 4–H boys and girls produced enough food to feed for 1 year all those in the armed forces from their respective counties.

These are the boys and girls, Mr. President, who know how to farm. These are the boys and girls who have proved that they will see every job through to the finish. More than that, these are the boys and girls upon whom we will have to rely most to produce the food which is now so vitally needed. Their older brothers and sisters have already left the farms of this country. Remember, these are the boys and girls, under the guidance of the oldsters and the dependable county extension agents, who will not only do men's work this summer but who will also effectively help unskilled city youth to get into the "harness" quickly and happily.

But if the 4–H members, now one and a half million strong, are to do all they can and get other boys and girls to do likewise—doubling, perhaps trebling, the final output—then they must have encouragement and, most of all, sympathetic guidance. That means more trained leadership.

Mr. President, at this time England, much harder hit by 4 years of war than this country, is giving considerable additional financial support to the expansion of their Young Farmers Clubs, comparable to the 4–H clubs here. England realizes only too well the importance of this youth program of learning to do on the job. At this crucial time when everything is at stake and food already at a premium, let us in America bend our efforts to seeing that this 4–H program of ours is also expanded. Speaking as a member of the national board of directors of the 4–H clubs for 21 years, I say that the 4–H members of this country—and there are no more loyal or finer young citizens anywhere—will do their full part if they have the guidance and the tools to carry on. Let us not fail them or our men at the front who are depending upon them.

## GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, over the week end I made a very interesting trip into the productive regions of western Pennsylvania. During my stay there, I had ample opportunity to observe, at first hand, the very deplorable conditions which exist in that section of the State by reason of the present gasoline-rationing policy. That policy has become so controversial that the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette has assigned its special staff writer, Mr. Ray Speigle, one of the most

eminent newspaper writers of the city of Pittsburgh, to make an investigation of this particular subject. Column after column is being printed about it in the newspapers, which no doubt will cause the voluntary organizations of that city to send representatives to present their views before the proper Government authorities.

Having received many letters of bitter complaint from my constituents in that section, I personally undertook to investigate the conditions about which they so rightfully complain. The people of this section of my State are patriotic. They are anxious and willing to undergo any sacrifice that is essential to the winning of the war. They work long hours, they pay taxes willingly, and they cooperate actively with every regulation our Government sets forth.

But the gasoline situation in western Pennsylvania is a very trying one, for there is no gainsaying the fact that this area of Pennsylvania has been forced in many cases to close down its refineries, remove its men from their jobs, and curtail the production of gasoline in every possible way—simply because the storage facilities are overtaxed with vast stores of gasoline which continue to remain idle.

Mr President, a situation of this kind is enough to test the patience of any man. These people know that something is amiss when the State of Ohio, just across the border is permitted to import gasoline from western Pennsylvania and, at the same time, to remain free of the drastic regulations which prevail in that section of my own State.

Moreover many counties in the State of West Virginia have recently been removed from this particular zone—a zone which is governed by the most drastic regulations possible. Yet the fact remains that western Pennsylvania, which produces more gasoline, comparatively, than the State of West Virginia, is not, under present regulations, permitted to use even a small fraction of its production

Mr. President, I submit that, in the interest of economy, in the interest of effective administration, in the interest of a rational and realistic gasoline program, this grave injustice which has been wrought upon the people of western Pennsylvania, by reason of the short-sighted program which the Office of Price Administration has invoked in that particular section, must be remedied.

In this connection, Mr Ickes, one of the best-informed administrative representatives on this particular problem, is reported to have said that he sees "no justice in inflicting special regulations as to gas rationing on those areas lying within oil-producing regions." I have made repeated appeals to the Fuel Coordinator's Office and to the Office of Price Administration. I have sent them volumes of letters which I have received from my constituents; but they have made no move, voluntarily, to correct these unpardonable conditions.

If the objective of this plan is to save rubber, why then is it necessary for the people of western Pennsylvania to be so strictly rationed, when the people of other States, not lying within oil-producing sections, are permitted a much greater mileage allowance?

The time has come for some plain talk about the gasoline-rationing situation in western Pennsylvania. Here is an area which produces more gasoline than it uses. Here is an area where storage facilities have become exhausted. Here is an area which remains subjected to the most rigid rationing restrictions. Here is an area which would willingly submit to any rationing program, if this fuel were being drawn off to supply less fortunate areas. But the fact remains that this gasoline is not being transported. It is being allowed to remain idle, and it is creating a very unhealthful situation throughout the State.

Mr President, I submit that western Pennsylvania should be taken out of the restricted area, and that the people there should be permitted the same rationing privileges which now prevail in 31 of the other States in the Union—many of which do not produce sufficient gasoline for their own needs.

### SEIZURE OF PATENTS BY THE ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, Senators recently have received from the Office of the Alien Property Custodian, Mr. Leo C. Crowley, a letter under date of December 7, 1942, in which he points out that the Alien Property Custodian has seized approximately 50,000 patents, most of which were owned by nationals of foreign countries. This letter is printed in a brochure in which Mr. Crowley says on page 9:

> For our part we pledge, first, that the patents directly controlled by this agency of government will be available readily and immediately to serve all American industry, and that active use of the store of technical knowledge which these patents represent will be fostered; second, we pledge that we shall encourage further research on these inventions for the lasting benefit of American industry, American labor, and the consuming public; and, third, we shall take all steps within our power to make certain that vested enemy patents are made available forever to American industry.

As to the first two points mentioned by Mr. Crowley, so far as I have perceived, there has been complete unanimity both of purpose and of objective. However, as to the third point, there has been very considerable question. On page 11 of the brochure Mr. Crowley points out, in further elaboration of the third item:

> Our third responsibility is undertaken on the specific instruction of the President. We shall refuse to sell or to release title to the enemy patents. The inventions covered by these patents will be made a permanent possession of the American people and, through freely granted licenses, they will be incorporated in our national industrial machinery. The ultimate disposition of the patents vested from nationals of enemy-occupied countries will be the subject of discussion with the governments in exile.

Mr. President, the point involved has divided the thinking of international lawyers who have viewed with considerable alarm in most instances the course which is represented by the promise of permanent seizure of these particular patents.

Secretary Hull, writing to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] under date of May 27, 1935, said:

> It is important from my point of view, therefore, that the United States should not depart in any degree from its traditional attitude with respect to the sanctity of private property within our territory, whether such property belongs to nationals of former enemy powers or to those of friendly powers. A departure from that policy and the taking over of such property, except for a public purpose and coupled with the assumption of liability to make just compensation, would be fraught with disastrous results.

The letter appears in volume 31 of the American Journal of International Law, at page 680.

Mr. President, there is raised the whole point. Granted a need in wartime for the United States to use enemy-owned patents which are within our control and subject to seizure by us, whether or not we have a right to seize and condemn such patents without affording compensation as a result of the seizure raises one of the most critical issues to be found in our entire foreign policy. If, in this way, we are to impair the sanctity of private property, and to depart from the rule which sustains it, and under which our Government in the past has grown great, I submit there is stated a challenge which requires our most considered study.

In connection with our thinking on the point I feel that we ought to have available to us an article which appears in the January 1943 issue of the American Journal of International Law. At page 92 of this publication there is an article entitled, "Nationalization of Enemy Patents." The article was written by Prof. Edwin Borchard, of the Yale University School of Law. I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks for the attention and study of Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### NATIONALIZATION OF ENEMY PATENTS

The Alien Property Custodian has recently announced that the "tens of thousands"[1] of enemy patents which have been seized by the United States Government are to be held as a "permanent possession of the American people." In a letter said to have been sent to American trade associations and industries, the Custodian invites American industry to apply for nonexclusive licenses to these patents which "we shall make * * * a permanent part of our industrial machinery

[1] John MacCormac in New York Times, Dec. 20, 1942, p. 20. They are said to number approximately 50,000. This number includes patents owned by nationals of Axis-occupied countries. Where pre-war exclusive and nonexclusive use licenses of actual enemy patents are already in existence, the royalties involved will be collected by the Custodian, but the licensee will have the option of canceling his exclusive contract and taking instead a standard, nonexclusive, royalty-free license. Licensees pay a basic $50 fee. White House press release Dec. 8, attaching Report of Custodian Dec. 7, 1942.

by refusing to sell them or release title in any way." After calling attention to the "great economic value" in these patents and in the "pending patent applications which represent the latest researches," also to be licensed when granted, the Custodian indicates that they will not only be put to work for existing war production but also for converting plants from peacetime to war activities. He offers "technical assistance to American business in bringing these patents into effective use," and offers to defend the licensees in any suits brought against them for alleged patent infringement. The proposed system also apparently contemplates the appropriation of patents belonging to nationals of countries occupied by the Axis Powers. But as to these, it is expressly stated that the interests of their owners would be safeguarded by making them royalty free only for the duration of the war and for 6 months after its close. After that, royalties "which are reasonable on a basis of prevailing commercial practice" will be charged on nonexclusive licenses to be issued for the life of the patent.

It thus appears that privately owned patents belonging to nationals of enemy States or of countries occupied by the enemy, are to be expropriated without compensation for the benefit of American industry, royalties being exacted only on those patents belonging to nationals of occupied states subsequent to the period beginning 6 months after the termination of the war.

If the proposed procedure is correctly understood, it looks as if private inventors and owners are to have their rights in patents confiscated. This goes further than the practice of the last war, in which the Alien Property Custodian sold to the Chemical Foundation some 4,500 patents, some valuable, at $50 each. That transaction, which Attorney General Stone, prosecuting the Chemical Foundation in the Circuit Court of Appeals, condemned as subversive of the future of the country,[2] was nevertheless sustained by the Supreme Court.[3] A vast body of literature was published after the war of 1917, pointing out the reciprocally destructive effects of the unlawful practice of confiscating private property and the ominous portents to the future of international investment, trade, cooperation, and peace which the practice necessarily implied.[4]

The policy with respect to foreign, particularly German patents, may have been partly motivated by the fact that the technological advance of the German chemical and drug industry has given the businessmen of that country a superior bargaining power, incidental to patent control, in concluding cartels and marketing agreements with foreign companies, a power, it has been said, coordinating in many instances with the economic policies of the German Government.[5] It is charged that patents have often been used to insure dependency on Germany for vital medicines, to block non-German research, to block newcomers in the field and to fix prices.[6]

[2] Oral argument of Harlan F. Stone; brief on behalf of appellant, United States of America, Circuit Court of Appeals, Third Circuit, March 1924, p. 499.

[3] 272 U. S. 1 (1926).

[4] Cf. Gathings, James A., International Law and American Treatment of Alien Enemy Property, Washington, D. C., 1940, and literature there cited, p. 131 et seq.

[5] The Strange Case of Sterling Products, by Walton Hamilton, Harper's for January 1943, p. 123.

[6] The Custodian announces that the "use [of the patents] in the furtherance of any monopoly or any similar exploitation contrary to the public interest" is to be prevented.

The question arises whether the protection of the American manufacturer and consumer against these abuses of the patent system could not be obtained without confiscation by a modification of the patent system, already under study, for example, possibly by compulsory licensing, by an obligatory public submission for approval by a Federal administrative bureau of any cartel and private licensing agreements, by limiting the scope of the monopolistic privileges necessarily attached to a patent.[7] Even short of such changes which the Seventy-eighth Congress may consider, it would seem that the advantages of American emancipation from foreign monopoly could be accomplished by compelling licensing with compensation, as contemplated by S. 2491, or by some means other than drastic nationalization, against which the United States has vigorously protested when undertaken by other countries.[8]

American statesmen throughout American history seem to have been aware of the disintegrating effects of confiscating enemy private property and have stoutly defended the rule of law which prohibited confiscation. Nothing more profound on this subject has been uttered than the statements of Alexander Hamilton in support of article 10 of the Jay treaty with Great Britain of 1794,[9] prohibiting the confiscation of private property. That the country as a whole is not committed to such violations of international law and economic good sense is indicated by the statement of Secretary Hull as late as May 27, 1935:

> Such action would not be in keeping with international practice and would undoubtedly subject this Government to severe criticism. Moreover, the confiscation of these private funds by this Government and their distribution to American nationals would react against the property interests (some very large) of American nationals in other countries. It would be an incentive to other governments to hold American private property to satisfy claims of their nationals against this Government and to pass upon such claims in their own way. It is important from my point of view, therefore, that the United States should not depart in any degree from its traditional attitude with respect to the sanctity of private property within our territory whether such property belongs to nationals of former enemy powers or to those of friendly powers. A departure from that policy and the taking over of such property, except for a public purpose and coupled with the assumption of liability to make just compensation, would be fraught with disastrous results.[10]

Citizens of the United States now have invested abroad some $11,000,000,000 in direct investments and $4,000,000,000 in indirect or portfolio investments. This country should therefore exert its influence to prevent the further corrosion of the institution of private property, since the United States and its citizens have more to lose by confiscation than any other country. If the safety of private property is to depend not on law but on the preponderance of force, there can be no end to the war system. It has often been said that the struggle to maintain elementary virtues is unceasing. The experience of Europe during the last decade lends support to the view that there never is any assurance of the permanence of social and legal advances. But in the face of the Secretary of State's repeated declarations that one of our aims is the "revitalizing of international law," it is hardly fitting that administrative officials of the United States should, wittingly or not, deliberately impair those institutions.

The implications of economic war do not appear to have been fully considered.[11] A war on private property has not since the eighteenth century been considered either legal or sensible, since it reciprocally undermines post-war relations. Faced with the desire and purpose not to aid the enemy, international law had reached the practical compromise of permitting, though not commanding a refusal to allow enemy nationals to derive benefits during war from their property abroad, but guaranteeing its safety against confiscation. If it did not have reciprocal advantages the institution would never have grown to such assumedly impregnable proportions. But with a general weakening of the respect for law manifest in recent times, no one can predict how much deterioration in established institutions will consume. If the Custodian's practice is confined as national policy—although Congress, which has exclusive power,[12] seems not to have authorized confiscation—that termination of economic war which Mr. Pasvolsky of the Department of State has asserted to

[7] This was the purpose of S. 2491, 77th Cong., 2d sess., introduced by Senators O'MAHONEY, BONE, and LA FOLLETTE, April 28, 1942. Hearings before Senate Committee on Patents, 77th Cong., 2d sess., 8 parts.

[8] See, e. g., Secretary of State Hughes' address at Philadelphia, Nov. 23, 1923, in referring to Mexican confiscations: "A confiscatory policy strikes not only at the interest of particular individuals but at the foundations of international intercourse, for it is only on the basis of the security of property, validly possessed under the laws existing at the time of its acquisition, that the conduct of activities in helpful cooperation, is possible. * * * Rights acquired under its laws by citizens of another state, [a state] is under an international obligation appropriately to recognize. It is the policy of the United States to support these fundamental principles." This Journal, vol. 18 (1924), p. 523, at p. 531.

[9] See Works of Alexander Hamilton (Lodge's edition), vol. V, p. 412 et seq. See the extended quotations from Hamilton and the references to the treaties concluded by the United States in Moore, John Bassett, International Law and Some Current Illusions (New York, Macmillan, 1924), p. 14 et seq. See also editorial in this Journal, vol. 18 (1924), p. 523, at 528, 529 (July 1924).

[10] Secretary Hull to Senator CAPPER, May 27, 1935, this Journal, vol. 31 (1937), p. 680.

[11] See, in this connection, recommendation No. VII of the Inter-American Conference on Systems of Economic and Financial Control, Washington, June 30–July 10, 1942, in which the countries of this continent are advised to "eliminate from the commercial, agricultural, industrial, and financial life of the American republics * * * the business, properties, and rights of any real or juridical person * * * whatever their nationality," who are "acting against the political and economic independence and security of such republics." The meaning of the last clause is unclear. The far-reaching character of this recommendation, which possibly includes all persons and firms on the blacklists, warrants consideration by internatio al lawyers. The extent to which it has been followed by legislation or administrative action it has not been possible to establish.

[12] *Brown* v. *United States* (1814), 8 Cranch 110. It is not believed that confiscation is authorized by the admittedly broad terms of section 301 of the First War Powers Act (55 Stat. 840): "* * * upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe such interest or property (of all aliens) shall be held, used, administered, liquidated, sold, or otherwise dealt with in the interest of and for the benefit of the United States, * * *." Executive Order 9095, establishing the Office of Alien Property Custodian, gives him ambiguous authority to vest any foreign property.

be a condition of peace and progress[13] can hardly be realized.

It must be said that there has been some disposition in the United States to deprecate and limit by statute the privileges attached to patents, including a demand for public recordation of sale and license agreements, invalidation of the patent when used unfairly to stifle competition or create an unlawful monopoly, if necessary by Government suit, restricting the pooling of patents by cross-licensing, limiting the grant of patents to major inventions or improvements, controlling price fixing and trade control, cutting down the period for pendency of patent and the period of protection, compulsory licensing under certain conditions where exploitation is long delayed, the invalidation of sales or licenses which restrict the extent, price, field, or area in which the patent may be used.[14] All these proposals are controversial. During wartime there has been no question that the Government could requisition patents or licenses thereof on payment of just compensation.[15] The custodian could have legalized his far-reaching proposal by providing for royalty compensation on the patents he licenses, the compensation to be held in trust for private owners. This would not have hampered the war effort and would lend support to the nonconfiscatory policy of the Department of State. Whether the Custodian's practice of freely licensing the patents in his trusteed custody will promote American industry remains to be seen. Compulsory licensing has not apparently proved a stimulus to industry in England, Canada, and elsewhere. But there is a question whether the United States Government should assume the obloquy[16] attached to confiscation for the benefit primarily of private industry. It would seem that the issue is so important that it should have been submitted to Congress for the exercise of its constitutional authority to deal with the subject after adequate deliberation.

EDWIN BORCHARD.

[13] "Lack of determination to abandon the policies and practices of economic warfare will be the greatest danger that can confront us after the war." Pasvolsky, Leo, "The Problem of Economic Peace After the War," Department of State Publication 1720 (Mar. 4, 1942), p. 18. See also his address before the American Economic Association, December 30, 1940, Some Aspects of Our Foreign Economic Policy, Publication 1595 (Jan. 11, 1941).

[14] S. 2491, supra. Report of the American Patent Association on the McFarlane bill of 1938, H. R. 2959, on compulsory licensing. Darby, Samuel E., Jr., the Alleged Abuses of the American Patent System (Boston, 1941); Kenyon, W. Houston, Jr., Sore Spots in the Patent System (New York, 1942). Same author, Abuse of Patent Licensing Privileges, Manuscript (New York, 1942). Woodward, W. R., A Reconsideration of the Patent System as a Problem of Administrative Law (April 1942) (55 Harv. L. Rev. 950). Hamilton, Walton, Patents and Free Enterprise, T. N. E. C. Monograph No. 31, 179 p. On December 12, 1941, the President created by Executive order the National Patent Planning Commission, to make recommendations for the amendment of the patent laws.

[15] See act of June 25, 1910, as amended July 1, 1918 (U. S. Code, title 35, sec. 68). Cf. the following bills introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress: (1) The Knutson bill, H. R. 6828, which proposes to include patent rights with other property rights subject to seizure under Public No. 274, of October 16, 1941; (2) the Kramer bill, H. R. 6852, to require the granting of licenses under patents in time of war; and (3) the Kefauver bill, H. R. 6878, which proposes to add to the First War Powers Act, 1941, a provision authorizing the President to permit the unlicensed use of inventions in time of war; (4) under S. 2303, not enacted, any patent was to be seizable upon mere notice. No provision was made for the return of the patent to the owner at the end of the war or for limiting the term of licenses. The Government was permitted to grant licenses under "reasonable royalty," to be fixed by the President without right of the courts to increase it.

[16] Term used by Chief Justice Marshall in *Brown* v. *United States*, supra.

## PRODUCTION OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Acting Governor of the State of Wisconsin has designated and proclaimed February 12, 1943, as Dairy Day in Wisconsin.

During the past year Wisconsin has had a record production of milk and manufactured dairy products in response to the Government's request for more food to supply the United Nations.

In Wisconsin our farmers have produced 14,500,000,000 pounds of milk, which is 12 percent of the national output and an all-time high for the State.

As is generally known, much of that record volume has been distributed among our allies in the form of cheese, dried whole milk, dried skim milk, and evaporated milk.

Consequently, it is most appropriate, particularly during wartime, that recognition be given to the Wisconsin dairy industry and its vital contribution to the food-for-victory program.

Mr. President, today we heard a notable address by an eminent Member of this body on the question of manpower. I have spoken many times on this floor on the same subject, and with special reference to what the lack of manpower is doing to the dairy industry. Wisconsin stands first in the production of cheese, casein, and malted milk; second in dried buttermilk, and third in butter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the very brief proclamation of Walter S. Goodland, Acting Governor of Wisconsin, designating February 12, 1943, as Dairy Day in Wisconsin, together with a very fine analysis of the dairy situation by Matt Wallrich.

There being no objection, the proclamation and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### A PROCLAMATION

Record production of milk and manufactured dairy products was achieved in Wisconsin during the past year in answer to the Government's request for more food to supply the United Nations.

Responding to the call for increased production, Wisconsin farmers produced fourteen and one-half billion pounds of milk—12 percent of the national output and an all-time high for the State. A great deal of that record volume was distributed among our allies in the form of cheese, dried whole milk, dried skim milk, and evaporated milk. In this way a distinct contribution was made toward winning the war.

Through several decades Wisconsin farmers have been building the dairy industry of this State into the greatest enterprise of its kind in the world. Through specialization in dairy breeds, dairy herd improvement work, proper feeding, and other good farming practices they have made Wisconsin universally famous for its dairy cattle and dairy products.

Through the years the influence of the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association, an organization which will hold its seventy-first annual convention in Madison February 12, has been important in developing dairying to its present high levels of productiveness.

This meeting, therefore, provides a timely occasion for reminding the people of Wisconsin of the splendid job the dairy industry is doing in supplying food needed to win the war.

Now, therefore, I, Walter S. Goodland, Acting Governor of the State of Wisconsin, do hereby designate and proclaim February 12, 1943, as Dairy Day in Wisconsin and urge that the occasion be observed with fitting exercises in recognition of the Wisconsin dairy industry and its vital part in the food-for-victory program.

WALTER S. GOODLAND,
*Acting Governor of Wisconsin.*

---

### THE DAIRY SITUATION, FEBRUARY 1, 1943

(By Matt Wallrich)

#### PRODUCTION

January production, despite the coldest weather in years, is showing a normal seasonal upward trend.

The impetus of higher farm prices in November and December is showing results. A partial check-up shows that cows are freshening earlier this year, which might partially explain lower November and December production.

#### BANG'S DISEASE

Agitation is developing to discontinue slaughter of productive cows during this milk shortage emergency.

Positive reactors have been immunized—several years of peak production still available.

Remedy: Government purchase; lease animals to supervised farms, perhaps under Farm Security Administration jurisdiction; vaccinate calves from those cows, and when production is adequate cancel lease and slaughter animals.

This would provide thousands of high-producing animals for small farmers to use as foundation stock for their herds.

Administrative burden practically nil.

#### ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION

During 1942 a hundred bulls in Wisconsin bred 50,000 cows, displacing 3,000 bulls which augmented the beef supply, and made room for 3,000 more dairy cows in overcrowded barns. Result: 18,000,000 pounds of additional milk, no extra feed or labor (University of Wisconsin release).

If the Government is definitely committed to a long-range program of rehabilitating the world, not only with food but with foundation dairy stock to replace slaughtered animals, now is the time to start.

Dairy feeds high protein, will be scarce. Labor is scarce. Barn room is limited.

Why not use a fractional part of the proposed subsidy to establish a country-wide system, on a county basis, of artificial breeding?

This would eliminate 3,000,000 useless herd sires; permit the feeding and care of 4,000,000 extra milk cows this year.

Let the Army loan 500 highly trained veterinarians to supervise the work; instead of keeping these trained technicians doing routine milk- and food-inspection work.

No herd under 10 cows could afford to keep a bull—and that is 80 percent of the dairy herds. In 5 years the boarder cow would be eliminated.

We have today 26,000,000 dairy cows; average milk production, 4,500 pounds per year; total production, 117,000,000,000 pounds per year; a 1,000-pound increase (Wisconsin average) equals 26,000,000,000 pounds additional milk; in all, 143,000,000,000 pounds per year.

This equals enough milk to take care of all requirements estimated for Army, Navy, lend-lease, and domestic consumption.

If 3,000,000 bulls were replaced by producing cows (5,000 pound average) an additional 15,000,000,000 pounds of milk would be available—no extra feed or labor.

Wisconsin made an enviable record in 1942, with the same productive acreage as in 1918.

| Milk production: | *Pounds* |
|---|---|
| 1918 | 8,000,000,000 |
| 1942 | 14,000,000,000 |

Over 15 percent of the Nation's production of milk marketed as whole milk comes from Wisconsin.

BUTTER

Production increasing rapidly.

Receipts at established markets not indicative. Local creameries and receivers are short-circuiting established channels.

The price ceiling regulation is not conducive to the continuance of the normal pattern.

Retail milk distributors, with high ceilings, are taking extra butter.

Butter is being sold locally—not in principal markets.

Freight to market is deducted on butter ceilings.

Freight to Plymouth is added on cheese ceilings.

Light cream order and curtailment of ice cream will definitely increase butter production. Requisition of 30 percent of the butter will overload the present cold-storage plants, as they are already loaded with pork, beef, cheese, poultry, etc.

When April, May, June, July production comes—remember D. P. M. A. in 1938.

CHEESE

Factories are still in a muddle on prices. Most of them are paying the old price, and promising the subsidy when they get it. Result: Chaos.

| | December cash price | Subsidy promise | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Cents* | *Cents* | *Cents* |
| Factory A, Wisconsin | 59 | 10 | 69 |
| Factory B, Wisconsin | 62.7 | 10 | 72.7 |
| Factory C, Wisconsin | 65 | 11 | 76 |
| Factory D, Ohio | 2.30+35 | | [1] 2.65 |

[1] Per hundredweight.

The Office of Price Administration estimated that 27-cent cheese would develop a farm price of $2.45 per hundredweight—using the old rule of thumb, namely, 2.6 times twins. Two factors were disregarded—increased value of whey fat and sale of whey.

Theoretically, here's how it really works out:

Hundredweight of 3.5 milk equals 9.5 pounds of cheese; price per pound, 27 cents; gross cheese yield, 2.565 cents; value 0.3 pound of whey fat, 0.138 cent; total, 2.703; cost of making, 2 cents per pound, 0.19 cent; net price, whey returned, 2.513 cents equals 71.8 cents per pound of fat; value of whey sold, 0.08 cent; maximum return for milk, 2.593 cents equals 75 cents per pound of fat.

Southern and eastern factories will have a higher ceiling, and a correspondingly higher farm price—at least, during shortage period.

MILK POWDER

Commercial ceilings on spray and roller are still out of balance. No way to justify a 2-cent difference. Correction should be on the way, with a 1- or 1½-cent differential—no difference for brands.

Sixty-one million pounds of whole-milk powder produced in 1942; 100,000,000 pounds needed in 1943—to be divided about equally between Army and lend-lease.

No limit on spray skim for 1943.

April, May, and June will soon be here. If evaporated production and ice cream are curtailed, drying equipment for human food will be inadequate. Some encouragement should now be given to roller skim for animal food, and for casein during the flush period.

The dollar cost will be negligible; the impetus to continue production tremendous.

FLUID MILK

Food Distribution Order No. 11 makes the following mandatory; and we hope the industry cooperates:

(a) Elimination of pints and half-pints to homes.

(b) No more than two handlers to a wholesale stop.

(c) Bottle deposit.

(d) No return.

(e) No milk loaded without prior order.

NOTE.—(a), (b), and (d) will effect savings; (c) and (e) will probably increase costs.

In several markets many corrections have been made during the last year:

1. Special deliveries.
2. Every other day delivery.
3. Elimination of returns.
4. Combining wholesale and retail routes.
5. Reducing items.
6. Elimination of special deals.
7. Loading trucks to capacity.
8. Adding helpers to trucks.
9. Uniform bottle.
10. Zoning territories.

Wage scales of wholesale drivers must be adjusted. No justification for continuing the penalty contracts that permit drivers to earn $6,000 to $8,000 a year while other drivers who do harder work earn $3 000.

Restrictions on loads must be eliminated.

The teamsters' union is at the crossroads. Either it must realize that we are in a war and thuggery is out or municipal distribution will come in.

Without question, millions of dollars can be saved without increasing the price to the consumer decreasing the price to the farmer, or reducing the average weekly earnings of the driver; but the driver must be willing to give a full week's work in an intelligent way, and permit supervision by the guy who pays his check.

ICE CREAM

New distribution order No. 8 effective February 1.

Limits use of total milk solids to 65 percent of December 1, 1941, to November 30, 1942, production. Army and Navy business, etc., are not included.

This is not serious

| Production: | *Gallons* |
|---|---|
| 1942 | 435,000,000 |
| 1937 | 281,000,000 |
| 1936 | 243,000,000 |
| 1935 | 199,000,000 |
| 1934 | 180,000,000 |

Sixty-five percent of the 1942 production is 282,000,000 gallons, but with a reduction in fat and solids content and a shifting to sherbets and ices, manufacturers can probably exceed their 1940 business for domestic uses and, by utilizing Army and Navy contracts, can keep capacity equal to 1941.

Food and Drug Administration estimates a saving of 97,500,000 pounds of butter and 68,000 pounds of serum solids. Unless there is a price increase, a curtailment of Army and Navy business, and a butterfat limit, we think this estimate is too hopeful.

Failure to adjust price ceilings on ice cream, coupled with this curtailment and the inability to obtain spray powder, will cause smaller manufacturers to have tough sledding before the year is through.

Wisconsin's ranking by States in the dairy industry: First in dry skim milk, dry whole milk, dry whey powder, condensed and evaporated milk, cheese, casein, malted milk powder; second in dry buttermilk; third in butter.

In addition, Wisconsin furnished over half the milk for Chicago, the country's second largest milk market.

Industrial production for the war emergency has been turned over to those who have demonstrated their ability to produce.

Dairy products' shortage is crucial. Maybe Wisconsin could produce the "know how" if consulted.

SMATTERINGS

Lend-lease to December 31, 1942, had shipped $1,040,000,000 worth of food in 22 months.

By March 15, 1942 (the first 12 months), it had purchased $800,000,000 worth of food.

This means that our shipments to December 31, 1942, were made up of the $800,000,000 of purchases made before March 15, 1942, plus an additional $200,000,000 of food purchases made from March 15, 1942, to December 31, 1942.

Yet, last March we had a burdensome surplus of milk, cheese, roller powder, casein, and evaporated milk, and were asking for supporting floors on almost every commodity.

Today a demoralizing surplus has been converted into a rationed shortage.

Our production in 1942 exceeded any year in history and practically exceeded every estimate.

Where has it gone?

If it's in warehouses in this country, let's have the figures.

If it's in the housewife's cupboard, let's have those figures.

Publication of the figures would stop the hoarding either by the Government or by the consumer.

After all, the armed forces are not going to eat more than twice as much as they did in civilian life, and that would require only an additional 5 percent of production.

Lend-lease shipments have taken less than 3 percent of our annual production.

Then tell the consumers that they are overeating. Don't blame rationing on either lend-lease or the Army.

Give the American people the truth—they can take it.

Submitted by Watt Wallrich.

## PREVENTION OF CERTAIN PRACTICES LEADING TO DENTAL DISORDERS

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect the public health by the prevention of certain practices leading to dental disorders; and to prevent the circumvention of certain State or Territorial laws regulating the practice of dentistry."

Mr. WHEELER. The purpose of the joint resolution is to amend a law which was enacted at the last session of the Congress in accordance with the intention of Congress at that time.

When the measure was reported from the Interstate Commerce Committee during the last session of Congress it was known as the dental bill. It was reported with the proposed amendment, but the printer overlooked the amendment and left it out of the bill. The report shows that it was in the bill, which was called up by unanimous consent. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], who handled the bill on the floor, did not know that the amendment had been left out. It is the unanimous opinion of the committee and of everyone else inter-

ested in the bill that the amendment should have been in it. The only purpose of the amendment is to provide that the act shall not take effect until 6 months after the date of its enactment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I had occasion to investigate this matter, and I find that the only thing involved is the correction of a clerical error. The joint resolution expresses only the intention of Congress, and I ask that it be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect the public health by the prevention of certain practices leading to dental disorders; and to prevent the circumvention of certain State or Territorial laws regulating the practice of dentistry" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That effective as of December 24, 1942, the act entitled "An act to protect the public health by the prevention of certain practices leading to dental disorders; and to prevent the circumvention of certain State or Territorial laws regulating the practice of dentistry," approved December 24, 1942, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 4 This act shall not be deemed to have taken effect until 6 months after the date of its enactment."

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Idaho in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

J. Saxton Daniel, of Georgia, to be United States Attorney for the southern district of Georgia; and

Carl J. Werner, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois, vice William Ryan, deceased.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Hervey Allen, from the State of Florida, to be information specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Dr. Paul C. Barton, from the State of Illinois, to be assistant director, at $5,600 per annum, for the Procurement and Assignment Service of the Bureau of Placement in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission;

Chester W. Hepler, from the State of Illinois, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Chicago area office of the War Manpower Commission;

William P. Edmunds, from the State of Ohio, to the position of area director, at $6,500 per annum, in the Cleveland area office of the War Manpower Commission;

Marion A. Gregg, from the State of Ohio, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Youngstown, Ohio, area office of the War Manpower Commission;

T. Hilliard Cox, from the State of Nebraska, to the position of program control technician, at $5,600 per annum, in the Kansas City, Mo., regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

William Parkinson, from the State of Nebraska, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Omaha area office of the War Manpower Commission; and

Merriam H. Trytten, from the State of Pennsylvania, to be principal employment specialist (physics), at $5,600 per annum, in the Bureau of Training of the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment or promotion in the Navy; and

Sundry officers for promotion and several citizens and meritorious noncommissioned officers for appointment as second lieutenants, all in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

## THE JUDICIARY—NOMINATION OF WILEY BLOUNT RUTLEDGE TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Wiley Blount Rutledge, of Iowa, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of explaining my reasons for the vote which I intend to cast opposing the confirmation of Mr. Rutledge to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Apparently it has been the custom of this body to confirm such nominations by the President of the United States when the nominees are found to be men of good character and members of the bar, unless they possess political philosophies or extreme economic views which are considered dangerous to the member voting. I cannot accept such tests as conclusive.

At the outset, let me state that I do not know Mr. Rutledge. I have no reason to believe him to be other than a man of uprightness, of honor, and of integrity.

The Constitution of the United States imposes a solemn duty on every United States Senator in the creation of a Supreme Court Judge. To my mind each Senator must accept the same responsibility as that assumed by the President himself whenever such a choice is made. I can hardly imagine a more important act in the United States Senate than casting a vote for the confirmation of a nominee for the high office of Associate Justice of our highest court. Every Judge now on that bench was placed there by this Senate. If any honest criticism is made of a single member of that Court then we must take our share of the blame because we placed him there.

We were reminded a few years ago that the Supreme Court must stand as the bulwark of justice in our land. It is the last hope for the protection from bias, from prejudice, and from passion in the enforcement of our sacred Bill of Rights. It is the same Court that so many Members of the Senate a few short years ago protested should not be "packed." Today the solemn duty rises upon us to put to proof the operation of our democracy, and take a courageous part in the performance of official duty. It would mean little by way of consistency if the Senate were to protest loudly any attempt made to change the fundamentals of this institution if it functions only in mild acquiescence when called upon to act.

This is not a matter of politics; it is not a matter of partisanship; it is not a matter involving personalities; it is not the exercise of privilege; it is the performance of a highly important duty to our country, to the people who have sent us here to stand guard. I do not believe that anyone should be appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States unless he has the widest practical experience, reputation, and renown, and has won his spurs at the bar, and fought his way up the ladder in the halls of justice in the Nation.

Second-best in production will not provide our soldiers with what they need in war. Second-best generals and admirals will not bring us victory and peace. Second-best justices or legal mediocrities will not insure justice in our land.

Among 135,000,000 inhabitants there are thousands of excellent lawyers in the country who have thus proven their outstanding ability to grace our Supreme Court. These men have earned the respect and confidence of the public through their right to eminence in our Nation, through sterling service as members of the bar. They know the problems of the people, not from reading books, but from actual experience and learning in their profession as advocates in actual practice at the bar.

These times are too solemn to permit a disregard of their abilities, and to place upon the highest court a man who, so far as I can ascertain, never practiced law inside a courtroom or so far as I know, seldom ever visited one until he came to take a seat on the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Before that, his contribution in any litigation has remained most obscure. I read his record as disclosed in the Congressional Directory:

Wiley Rutledge, associate justice; born in Cloverport, Ky., July 20, 1894; attended Maryville College (Tenn.); University of Wisconsin, A. B., 1914; Indiana University School of Law; University of Colorado, LL. B., 1922; LL. D., 1940; taught in high schools, Bloomington and Connersville, Ind., Albuquerque, N. Mex., and Boulder, Colo., 1915–22; associated with the law firm of Goss, Kimbrough & Hutchinson, Boulder, Colo., 1922–24; member of law faculties, University of Colorado, 1924–26; Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., 1926–35; the State University of Iowa, 1935–39; also dean, School of Law, Washington University, 1930–35; College of Law, the

State University of Iowa, 1935–39; nominated associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by President Roosevelt and confirmed by the Senate in April 1939; assumed duties May 2, 1939; member National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, from Missouri, 1931–35; from Iowa, 1936–.

Mr. President, it will be noticed that in the biography there is not one word to show that he ever practiced law at any time except from 1922 to 1924, when he says he was associated with the law firm of Goss, Kimbrough & Hutchinson, in Boulder, Colo. The record shows that at that time he was 28 years of age. It does not show whether he was a clerk or simply a stenographer. So far as the record shows, aside from that, he never practiced law 1 day anywhere in the country.

For what reason he was chosen to sit upon the circuit court, I am at a loss to understand, unless it was that he came last from Iowa City, the home of Harry Hopkins. Could that be the reason for his selection? I want to register an emphatic "no" to such a choice. I have never been able to accept the philosophy of government expounded by Mr. Hopkins; and if it be true that Mr. Rutledge is his alter ego on the bench, I must, in good conscience, say that I could find no better reason for disqualification.

The distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], announced to the press a few days ago that my vote would be the only one cast against this nominee. Surely my honorable colleague is not oracular. I know not where he gets his information or authority to speak for all 95 of the other Senators on this important subject. I have not noticed that he has claimed such power in other matters before the Senate up to now. Indeed, I was not sure that he could, with any reliability, even answer beforehand for the members of his own party in the Senate.

I was one of those who felt that it would not have been against the Nation's interest if the senior Senator from Kentucky himself had been named to this judicial position at this time. I congratulate him on his sportsmanship in his prompt acquiescence in the nomination and his spirited sponsorship in casting in the press 95 votes in a lump in favor of this nomination.

I should prefer to accept the foregoing conclusion rather than to believe that a political debt was being paid to Mr. Hopkins for past favors in Kentucky in 1938, when the advent of the junior Senator from Kentucky was momentarily delayed. Or perhaps neither was the reason. Perhaps it was impatience to get on with the important things in this Nation, and not to be bothered by debates or lengthy considerations on a post of the caliber of a position on our Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show my protest. Even with the great job we have undertaken in the four corners of the world, it is still of the highest importance to neglect no important, vital job to preserve our democracy at home.

I challenge the wisdom of the choice of this inexperienced member of the bar; I say that he is one of those who have failed to prove their worth at the bar at all, or their capacity and ability to occupy one of these precious nine positions.

The Court may be called upon to decide momentous issues upon which the preservation of our form of government itself may depend. None but the most highly qualified, Mr. President, should receive our approval.

Mistakes may occur in the selection of any Member of Congress or in the selection of a President. Such mistakes can be remedied in a space of time by the people, but the Supreme Court Justices are chosen virtually for life. Therefore, unless the nominee has already disclosed his capacity and his outstanding ability I feel that I should fail in my duty were I to vote a blind approval.

I believe we should exercise an affirmative as well as a negative test, and that we should do so as well as expect the Chief Executive to do so.

Searching the record objectively, and utterly without regard to personalities, I cannot find therein justification for advising and consenting to this nomination.

I have had called to my attention an important receivership matter wherein I believe the nominee failed to apply the law either equitably or accurately. I am sure that he attempted to do so, but I find evidence of what seems to me to be lack of care and inaccuracies in a matter which touched thousands of insurance-policy holders who had suffered loss of millions of dollars in premiums paid, without one cent of recovery over a period of 12 years. Mr. Rutledge did not appoint the receiver. That had been done years before, and much water had gone over the dam. But he was one of three who were called upon to bring a halt to the waste of the funds, and he held the law to decree otherwise.

I think if he had had more practical experience as a member of the bar he would not have fallen into that error. His findings meant much to a group who in order to protect their dependents had parted with their savings. They do not feel that their rights received fair consideration, and from my review neither do I. In the single instance in which Mr. Rutledge's record has come before me, I do not feel he has exhibited either learning or experience fitting him for this promotion.

Mr. President, we have a fair abundance of attorneys general now serving this country as justices of our highest court. The Court is not without a professor or two already. I say to my colleagues here, whom I honor and respect, I am sorry that my conscience will not permit me to vote for confirmation in this important instance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it may be appropriate at this point for me to say just a word or two about the action of the Committee on the Judiciary in filing its favorable report upon the nomination. Justice Rutledge was appointed to the court of appeals in April of 1939. His nomination at that time was referred to a subcommittee consisting of the then Senator from Delaware, Mr. Hughes, as chairman, the then Senator from Utah, Mr. King, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the then Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. The record shows that that committee, having met to consider the nomination, filed a favorable report with the Committee on the Judiciary, that thereupon a favorable report was filed with the Senate, and the nomination was confirmed.

In April 1939 Senator King, who at that time was chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, after the nomination had been confirmed, rose to say that if there had been a yea-and-nay vote he would have voted in the negative. It is my understanding, though he did not so state in the Senate at that time, that the principal consideration which moved him was that, in his opinion, there should be a selection to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia from the bar of the District. There may have been also some question, Mr. President, with respect to the nominee concerning the now famous "court expansion legislation" proposed in 1937; but the committee was satisfied that there was nothing in the record of Mr. Rutledge which would justify withholding confirmation of the nomination.

When the nomination now before the Senate was sent here and was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, a subcommittee was appointed, consisting of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who is now on the floor, our able colleague from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and myself. This subcommittee went very carefully into the matter. Report was made to the full committee a week ago today, and the report of the committee recommending the confirmation was approved by the Judiciary Committee without a negative vote. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and two or three others withheld their votes at the time.

I wish to say, Mr. President, speaking for myself—and I have before me all the decisions of the court of appeals in which Justice Rutledge participated—that we were satisfied from an examination of his record as a member of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, that the favorable report which was made by the Judiciary Committee in 1939 and the action of the Senate confirming his nomination at that time have been wholly justified by the record which Justice Rutledge has made.

He has not yet reached the forty-ninth anniversary of his birth, Mr. President. He is, therefore, a young man going upon the Supreme Court A reading of the opinions submitted by him demonstrates, I think, that he has the judicial capacity in a marked degree. It was our feeling that he is a judge who not only is able to write a lucid opinion, one which can readily be understood, but that he is capable of couching opinions of the Court in language which would grace the reports of any court.

Your committee, Mr. President, felt that the record of this man, both as a

citizen and as a judge, warranted the nomination and that the Supreme Court would profit by his elevation to that bench.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, several days ago I placed in the RECORD an excerpt from a Tennessee newspaper which embodied a short story of the Rutledge family, with particular reference to the father of Justice Rutledge, whose nomination is now before the Senate. I am surprised that there should be any objection to the nomination of Justice Rutledge as a member of the Supreme Court. His background, with which I am very familiar, is such that it could not fail to produce a man whose ideas of citizenship are thoroughly American and whose ability and courage may not be questioned. On every score Justice Rutledge is quite capable of filling this position or almost any other position to which he might aspire.

I have not known Justice Rutledge intimately in recent years, but he and I were boys together, so to speak, in Tennessee. His father was a minister in the Baptist Church and it was my privilege to hear him preach. The old gentleman, who is in his early eighties, lives today in Cleveland, Tenn.

Wiley Rutledge was educated principally in Tennessee. He attended Maryville College at Maryville, Tenn., a denominational institution which, incidentally, is owned and operated by the Presbyterian Church. His early life in the home of his father, who was a minister in the country section where I lived in Tennessee, was surrounded by the finest kind of influences. As to his ability, there can be no question. I have not kept in close touch with him in recent years, but I do know, by reputation, some of the work he has done in the Middle West, where he lived for several years.

I think that the decision of the Judiciary Committee was properly reached and that the committee were justified in reaching the conclusions they did. I talked to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and other members of the committee at the time the nomination of Justice Rutledge was being considered. I hope the Senate will confirm his nomination. He is a fine character and will reflect credit on the Court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? [Putting the question.]

The nomination was confirmed.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the other nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations under the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to know what committee reported the nominations of officials of the War Manpower Commission?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the nominations were reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to know whether any member of the Military Affairs Committee is present and prepared to indicate the full extent of the authorization which seems to be sketched by this rather amazing list of definitions of officers. I refer to—

A program control technician, at $5,600 per annum, San Francisco regional office. I presume there is to be a similar officer in every regional office.

I refer to a so-called head employment specialist, at $6,500 per annum, Bureau of Training, Washington Office.

I refer to a senior training specialist, at $4,600 per annum, San Francisco area office.

I refer to a labor utilization analyst, at $6,500 per annum, Washington regional office.

I refer to a field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, Boston regional office, and to other officers of similar title and salary, as designated by ditto marks.

I refer to a head labor utilization analyst, at $6,500 per annum, Minneapolis regional office;

Then, to a senior labor utilization analyst at $4,600 per annum, Minneapolis regional office;

Then, to an assistant labor utilization analyst (trainee), at $4,600 per annum, Washington regional office;

Then, to an area director at $4,600 per annum, Syracuse area office;

Then, to a senior agricultural employment specialist, at $4,600 per annum, Minneapolis regional office;

Then, to another area director in the Albany area, and another field supervisor in the Washington regional office.

Mr. President, before we start to confirm nominees for positions of this character, I, for one, should like a statement from the Senate Military Affairs Committee as to the extent of this total personnel program which we are about to confront.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that hearings were had by the Committee on Military Affairs, probably under the direction of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is unavoidably absent at this time.

I agree with the Senator that a full explanation should be made as to each of these nominations, and for that reason, if the Senator will permit me, I shall ask that they go over until Thursday, so that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] may give us full information about the matter. I agree entirely with the Senator that the Senate should have the information concerning each nomination.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his statement. I think the information needs to apply not only to the type of positions involved, but I should also like to know on what basis these men are chosen. For example, I should like to know how a nomination like that of Louis Bloch, of California, gets on anyone's list, and the explanation generally should be complete. If the Senator's request that the nominations go over is agreeable to the Senate, that is all I have to say at the moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, I venture to make a brief statement, because it was upon my motion that the War Manpower Commission, under Governor McNutt, was invited to come before the Military Affairs Committee to discuss precisely the type of questions which the Senator from Michigan has just raised.

I called attention to the various categories of nominees and the titles given to these various persons. I think it only fair to say that Governor McNutt made a very satisfactory presentation to the committee. He was before us for several hours, and I doubt whether there was any member of the committee who did not examine him. As I recall now, the Governor's testimony was to the effect that most of these persons whose names appear as nominees have been taken from other agencies under Governor McNutt. For example, several of them had already been employed in the United States Employment Service, and had some sort of civil-service status. The Governor stated that in many instances the Commission was having a great deal of difficulty in obtaining the character of persons, with the training and background necessary, for the very exacting duties of mobilizing our manpower. For instance, effort is made by the War Manpower Commission to recruit some of these officials from the personnel branches of large corporations, where men have had long experience in building up personnel organizations of one kind or another.

I was particularly impressed by the testimony of the Governor that in many instances men were on the rolls of the War Manpower Commission or the employment service at smaller salaries than they are able to get and which have been offered to them in private employment. The Governor gave several instances. Assurance was given to us that all these positions are within the divisions of the Classification Act as passed by the Congress.

Mr. President, having been the one who asked that Governor McNutt appear, I think it may be important that I give the testimony that I was satisfied the War Manpower Commission made a very careful attempt to select only competent people for these positions. Of course, we know that no task now before any Government agency is greater than the task of mobilizing our manpower, and for that reason the committee has been endeavoring, I think I can say with propriety, to expedite the confirmation of these officials, so that the charge cannot be made that the Senate is in any way delaying confirmation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan permit me to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The question I wish to ask is whether the testimony was taken down and printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has not been printed; it is available in the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. In typewritten form?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator said these nominations were all taken from within the classified service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would not say all, but many of them were; but with respect to the particular names now before the Senate I cannot say.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was wondering whether the Senator understood that the Manpower Commission, making these appointments, took the names largely or altogether from the civil-service lists.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They all passed through the civil service in a way. They do not acquire a civil-service status.

Mr. BARKLEY. They do not have to take a competitive examination——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. In order to get on an eligible list, as I understand, although in some way they do come under the civil-service requirement that they must be passed upon by the Civil Service Commission. They must "clear" the Commission, as I understand the expression is. I suppose that in those cases the age limits which would apply to any other civil-service employees apply to them?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my understanding that that is the case. I may say that at the outset of the war, in an appropriation bill which was approved by the Committees on Appropriations and passed by the Congress, an appropriation of $100,000,000 was made for emergency expenditures by the President, and he was authorized by that appropriation act to make personnel selections without regard to the civil-service law. It is my understanding that, notwithstanding that provision, instructions have gone forward to all the agencies which are exercising the power granted to clear all these nominees through the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission goes over the background of the nominees, and makes certifications.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, there may be a perfectly satisfactory explanation with respect to each of these nominees. I make no pretense to the contrary. I merely find myself challenged by the nature of the definitions of these positions and the rather substantial salaries attaching to each, and the implication, obviously, that this is only a very small preview of a very extensive list, to implement the entire country, which is to follow. Before we start confirming any of the nominees, I think a comprehensive statement from the Committee on Military Affairs is due the members of the Senate, so that they may reach an authenticated judgment. I certainly do not wish to hold up the work of the War Manpower Commission for a single instant, because Heaven knows it has held up its own work so many months beyond sufferance that there should not be any further interference. There will be none so far as I am concerned, in the presence of proper explanation, when the proper time comes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I note today that opposite the name of each person pending before the Senate for confirmation is a statement of the salary the person is to receive, and some description of the duties he is to perform.

In the case of O. P. A. and various other agencies of the Government, the right of confirmation was waived by the Senate, but even where the right of confirmation is retained it seems to me that we should in the future insist that the salary which a person who is to be confirmed by the Senate is to receive should be stated, as well as some description of the duties he is to perform.

I regret very much that the right of confirmation was waived by the Senate when that question was before us in connection with some bills which have heretofore been enacted. I am hopeful that hereafter the Senate will insist on its right of confirmation, and, if it be necessary, I should like to propose a rule that as to all confirmations, outside the judiciary, in which cases the salaries are fixed by law, and in the case of nominations in the Army and the Navy, and of postmasters, the salaries of nominees to be confirmed by the Senate, with a description of the duties they are to perform, be stated for the Executive Calendar.

In my opinion, heretofore a great many people have gotten into the Government service at particularly high salaries when, if we had had before us a statement of the salaries and a description of the offices, we might have been more efficiency-minded in giving our consent to the nominations.

I shall ask our leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], together with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the minority leader, to make provision that in the future, in such manner as may be expeditious we shall have a statement of the salary and a description of the duties of each nominee brought before us.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator from Maryland will remember that time and again in the Appropriations Committee the Senate has attached to bills the requirement that persons receiving a certain amount of salary or over must be confirmed on the basis on which the Senator is now speaking, and that such requirement has been consistently omitted every time there has been a conference on it with the House.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield to the Senator from Tennessee in a moment. What the Senator from Missouri has just said is true. That is the reason I feel the Senate ought to reassert itself. It ought not only to pass on the individual, but it ought to know the salary he is to receive, and it ought to know what duties he is to perform.

Mr. TRUMAN. We must then have conferees on the part of the Senate who will stand up for the position taken by the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have the opinion, which is based on some substantial information, that where there is no restriction on salaries, where the amounts of the salaries are not stated, and where the duties of the offices are not defined, executives are inclined to write a few extra naughts at the end of the salary figures, whereas if the furnishing of that information were a part of the confirmation procedure I believe it would conduce to economy throughout the Government, and likewise conduce to a reduction in the number of personnel, because the appointees would have to pass the scrutiny of the Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. As the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] has said, the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has attached riders to many of the appropriation bills, indeed to practically all of them, providing for Senate confirmation of all appointees receiving a salary of a certain sum or over. The House has heretofore objected to such riders but as to the bill providing appropriations for the War Manpower Commission the House waived its objections, and therefore the provision for confirmation is the law.

However, I wish to say to the Senator and to the Senate that at the beginning of the present session of Congress I introduced a bill which provides that nominations of appointees receiving salaries of $4,500 or more shall be confirmed by the Senate, just as the present nominations are being confirmed, and I wish to say that that bill went to the Committee on the Judiciary. The chairman of that committee very promptly appointed a subcommittee, which has the matter in charge, and we are hoping to receive a favorable report on that bill within the next few days.

I am glad the Senator takes the position he does, and I know he will be in favor of that bill, because it applies to all employees who receive salaries in excess of a certain amount. If the Senate will adopt the bill I am quite sure, from what I have heard, that the House will agree to it, and, in my judgment, it is a very proper measure.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Governors of all States, the members of the legislatures of all States, the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, together with the President are accountable to the people at regular intervals for their stewardship. That is the whole lesson of democracy. When we allow to grow up a bureaucracy which holds office for a long period of time, without some termination and reaccountability to its appointing and confirming source, in my judgment we destroy democracy, because we have then a group of persons who have very little accountability in a Government so large as this, and who

can pretty well by directive, or by order or regulation or by interpretation, not only destroy acts of Congress in some instances, but themselves write laws which Congress itself has never passed.

Mr. President, it has always seemed to me to be a weakness in our democratic system that persons who hold appointive office do not in the same way as those who hold elective office come up from time to time for reappointment. Anyone who advocates such procedure, as does the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], is liable to the charge that he does so for political purposes; forsooth that the Senator wants to control the patronage in his own State, forsooth that he wants to punish someone who did not vote right in the last election, or something of that sort. Men being human, there may be a small degree of accuracy in that rather sweeping charge. But, on the other hand, I think there are many Senators, in fact the great majority of them, if not all, who have a higher aim than the mere personal situation. I believe I can speak for one who does not ask for any patronage, who does not want any patronage of any kind or description at all because I find that I am much better off without it than with it. One of the great good fortunes that came to me was to be placed in that situation.

Mr. President, I believe that the only way we can control bureaucracy is to compel it to account occasionally to somebody in which there will be a review made of its functions, or its abuses of power, and also its good works, so Senators can reach an opinion as to whether or not the sum total of governmental progress is being achieved.

Mr. President, that leads to this point: The 15th of March is not far off. The 15th of March is going to cause a great deal of pain throughout this country. There are many persons who have been talking about taxes who, when they write the checks, will find that they have grossly underestimated the actual situation. I will say to my friend the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] that after the 15th of next March I believe it will not be necessary to try to get people to be more economy-minded. I believe that is going to be a natural consequence. I believe it will be spontaneous and instantaneous with the 15th of next March, because the war makes it necessary to levy high taxes. But coincidental with the writing of the checks for the first installment of 1942 income tax the people will insist that every measure of economy consistent with achieving full efficiency be taken by this body.

In that connection it is necessary that we have the names, the salaries, and the description of the offices of those persons who are going to administer this great bureaucracy. Such information will conduce to efficiency and economy in government. For that reason, providing that the civil service is protected in the measure, I shall be glad to do what little I can to help the Senator from Tennessee have his bill enacted into law.

Mr. President, I rose primarily at this time, however, for the purpose of asking the leaders if they will not request in any way they deem appropriate—or if it cannot be done, let us have a rule to that effect—that information be furnished the Senate in the future as to salary and the duties of the office of each person who may be passed upon for confirmation by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I simply wish to make one point in line with what the Senator from Maryland has been saying. When the nominations now before the Senate were being considered in committeee a fact was brought out, which I think should be of interest to every Member of the Senate as well as to all our people. Only a very small group in the War Manpower Commission is subject to confirmation. We make other appropriations in connection with which we do not provide for confirmation of appointees. We make appropriations for regional directors without touching the question of passing on the salaries and confirming those receiving certain salaries. The Senate does not confirm the appointment of persons to the War Production Board who receive a certain salary or more. The group now before us for consideration is simply a small group. I wish to say in fairness that in one sense of the word that little group is being penalized by having to be confirmed by the Senate. Yet when we fail to act, or voluntarily relinquish the right to confirm appointments to these positions, we take the responsibility for the actions of heads of all the bureaus when they make the appointments and fix the salaries. I think we waive our rights in that connection either actively or by reason of inactivity.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from West Virginia. I hope that hereafter, when confirmation of appointments or reappointments is required, there shall be placed on the Executive Calendar along with the name of the appointee the amount of salary he shall receive, and in brief the duty he is to perform.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think it is rather fortunate that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] have raised this question, because I have no doubt that when the reports about this session today are given to the country most of them will contain the charge that the Senate now is talking about confirmation because of a desire to assert some sort of partisan political control over patronage. It is the favorite device of those who want to make these appointments without any public scrutiny being made of them to accuse the Senate of being motivated solely by the desire to obtain political appointments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know the Senator from Michigan is going to say what I was about to say, but I yield to him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was going to say that inasmuch as I started this argument, and inasmuch as I could not receive any patronage even if I wanted it—and I would not want it if I could—at least the initiation of the discussion is not rooted at the point which the Senator fears the ountry may suspect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad the Senator has made that comment. I was about to point out that the Senate a few moments ago acted upon a nomination to the Supreme Court of the United States and by what was almost a unanimous vote confirmed the nomination of Justice Rutledge to the Supreme Court. The only vote that was cast against him was cast by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] upon grounds which were completely satisfactory to him. His negative vote was not cast upon any partisan ground or upon any personal ground.

What the critics of senatorial confirmation fail to convey to the public is, first of all, that it is the constitutional duty of the Senate to confirm appointments to the civil branch of the Government, unless Congress, by law, makes other provision.

They also overlook the fact that probably more than 95 percent of all the nominations sent to the Senate are confirmed without any partisan division, without any political division, and without any talk about patronage.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure that the Senator from Tennessee rises to call attention to the provision in the Constitution relating to the point which I have discussed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I rise for that purpose. I think it cannot be too greatly stressed, and I desire to read it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The able Senator from Tennessee deprives me of the privilege of reading it, but I shall be glad to have it read.

Mr. McKELLAR. Among the powers of the President, as defined in the Constitution, are the following:

> He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, * * * and he shall nominate, and * * * shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

As a matter of fact at the present time there is no law providing for the appointment of such officers. The laws which are enacted for the purpose of establishing various activities do not provide that the power to appoint shall be in the President, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments. Yet, we go on tamely without any action being taken. Many persons are being employed against some of whom scandalous charges have been made. Certainly the Congress ought to assert itself and see to it that the provision of the Constitution relating to appointments is faithfully carried out.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the Constitution I notice the words, "with the advice and consent of the Senate." Does the Senator believe that the word "advice" is necessary? Is it obsolete, or has it any real meaning in present-day parlance? If so, what is the meaning of the word?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that the meaning of the phrase "With the advice and consent of the Senate" was the subject of a discussion during the administration of George Washington. It was then decided that the word "advice" meant very little. The use of it is a formality. The principal word is "consent." During all the years since the adoption of the Constitution the Senate has been consenting to the appointment of persons in the civil arm of the Government without exercising the scrutiny which the framers of the Constitution felt should be centered upon every nominee for office in the United States Government.

As the Senator from Tennessee has very well pointed out, this provision of the Constitution is specific. No one can misunderstand it. The appointment of members of the Supreme Court of the United States could not be made under the Constitution without the concurrence of the Senate. It is frequently rather amusing to note that those who are most eloquent in condemning the Senate as a seeker of patronage when appointments to the bureaucracy are concerned are the very ones who call upon the Senate to exercise its constitutional power when nominations which do not meet their approval are made to the courts or to the diplomatic corps.

I feel that perhaps such power should be exercised in the public interest when persons are being selected for the civil arm of the Government.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. It is not my desire to prolong the debate. However, I take it the Senator does not mean that all appointments shall come to the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is not my meaning.

Mr. McNARY. It has been held by the Supreme Court that the provision to which reference has been made affects officers as distinguished from employees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. That is the reason for the provision in the pending bill. As the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has said, we are not foregoing any rights. We are exercising all the rights conferred on us by the Constitution. However, we do have a right in a statute further to extend the list of employees who must be confirmed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished Senator from Oregon has reversed the order of procedure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Exactly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Constitution contains the following phraseology——

Mr. McNARY. I have it before me, and I have read it many times.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know the Senator has read it, but I should like to read it, if he has no objection, for the benefit of those who may perchance read the RECORD. After reciting that the advice and consent of the Senate must be obtained for the appointment of Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and Judges of the Supreme Court, the Constitution continues—

> and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in heads of departments.

Therefore the question arises: Has the Congress, by any act, deprived the Senate of the right to confirm the appointment of officers in the War Manpower Commission, the War Production Board, the O. P. A. or any other war agencies?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is precisely my view. I have already stated that under the Constitution we do not include employees with officers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. However, we do have the right, within the Constitution, to expand and extend that list to include employees. We undertake to do so under the terms of the bill to which reference has been made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The thoughts of the able Senator from Oregon and my own are exactly the same; but my point is that the question is not with respect to our right to expand the list. We have the right and duty to confirm all officers unless, by act of Congress, we narrow it, because no law is greater than the Constitution.

Mr. McNARY. We do not expand the right. The right is given to us by the Constitution. I say that we have the right to expand the number of those who come within the folds of our confirmation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I do not believe there is any disagreement concerning the Constitution and the interpretation of it by the Supreme Court. However, as a matter of policy, is it the view of the able Senator from Wyoming that we should assume the responsibility of passing upon the qualifications of every appointee in the capacity of an employee of the Government?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not at all.

Mr. McNARY. Does the able Senator from Wyoming believe that we should pass upon those receiving salaries in excess of $4,500?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe we should pass upon some of them, but not necessarily all of them.

Mr. McNARY. The question which occurs to me is this: If we are to assume the obligation of passing upon every employee of the Government receiving more than $4,500, we should have full and complete data before us affecting the qualifications for each particular office and the necessity for the employment, such as the data the able Senator from Michigan has indicated. However, I say to the Senator from Wyoming that that is too large a responsibility for me to assume.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that what the Senator has said may be the view of a great many Members of the Senate. That is a point which will undoubtedly be considered by the Committee on the Judiciary when the bill of the Senator from Tennessee is under consideration; but, as I understand, that is not what is being discussed at the moment.

The problem which we are now discussing is the extent of the senatorial power and duty laid down in the Constitution, whether or not it has been modified, and if so, in what manner. Of course, it was modified with respect to the great civil establishment by the civil-service law, and Congress provided a way by which appointment without term could be made, and no salary limit was specified. Personally, I think that was probably a very wise rule, and I should hesitate to upset the civil service. However, it is another question to discuss the right and duty of the Senate, and the question of patronage. Through the civil-service law the Congress had divested itself with respect to appointments in the departments. Whether it has done so with respect to the war agencies is a question which will have to be passed upon.

A moment ago I cited one of the appropriation acts. It is Public Law 28 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. It contains the following provision:

> To enable the President, through appropriate agencies of the Government, to provide for emergencies affecting the national security and defense and for each and every purpose connected therewith, and to make all necessary expenditures incident thereto for any purpose for which the Congress has previously made appropriation or authorization and without regard to the provisions of law regulating the expenditure of Government funds for the employment of persons in the Government service, such as section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws; and any waiver hereunder of the provisions of any law regulating such expenditure or such employment shall not be exercised by any agency unless the allocation to such agency or subsequent action of the President in connection therewith permits any such waiver to be availed of; $100,000,000.

Mr. President, that is the only provision of law which I have been able to find dealing with the subject; but, obviously, it waives only the restrictions which have been imposed by law. It does not and cannot waive the constitutional right and duty of the Senate in the matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator is entirely correct about that point; and, furthermore, so far as I have been able to ascertain, the acts creating other agencies do not go to the same extent as does the $100,000,000 appropriation bill. So a tremendous number of officers and employees of the Government are being employed and paid without any law providing for the method of their employment, and in the list of such persons are to be found the names of many officers whose appointments really

should receive approval by means of the Senate's advice and consent. The Senator will recall that the Constitution provides that the President shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint. He may initiate the appointment, but the appointment cannot be made until the Senate approves it. We should make perfectly clear to just what officers the provision applies, and that is the purpose of the bill I have introduced.

So far as the patronage question is concerned, it is a matter of utterly no consequence to me. I care nothing in the world about any patronage connected with it. The truth of the matter is that, so far as I know, everyone in my State is busy enough and is not in need of appointments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may respond for a moment to the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], while I do not care to go into a discussion of the constitutional provisions as to confirmation, let me say that I think the determination of the matter is largely left to Congress. Insofar as the nomination and appointment of inferior officers are concerned, I know of no law defining inferior officers. I suppose that when the Constitution refers to vesting the appointment of inferior officers in the courts of law it might be interpreted to mean that we could pass a law authorizing the Federal courts to pass upon the appointment of inferior officers—that is, to say, marshals, and so forth—if we chose to do so. I supose that such cases would involve the appointment of inferior officers whom the courts could appoint. However, that is not the point I wish to discuss.

I suppose the reason why the Executive Calendar carries the salary for each nominee in the Manpower Commission is that in the appropriation bill for the Commission provision is made that all nominations to positions carrying salaries of $4,600 or more shall be confirmed by the Senate. Therefore, in order to make it perfectly plain that the nomination should be confirmed by the Senate, the salary is listed. I think it is a good practice. I do not know that it would require any rule. Of course, the matter comes about because in sending the nominations to the Senate, which referred them to the Committee on Military Affairs, I think the President himself in his message fixed the salary which each of the appointees is to receive, and the message indicated that all the positions were above the $4,500-salary limitation which we fixed; so that we should not have to inquire about that point in order to determine whether Senate confirmation of the nomination would be required.

However, I think the practice is a good one. I think it involves a matter of information for the Senate, and so far as I am concerned, I shall be glad to cooperate in having such information furnished in every case. It may be that the information would have to be obtained by the department concerned, after which the President could have the information given to the Senate in his message transmitting the nomination, so that it would be here, available to us. I think it not only wise but proper that the Senate should have the information.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to ask the Senator if he does not agree that some additional information might be furnished. I like the partially adequate way in which the matter is being handled on the Executive Calendar today; but I should suggest that the name of the position, perhaps something about the proposed duties of the office, and a very short statement as to the appointee might well be provided there for the information of the Senate. The Senate would pass on the appointments very promptly if such information were given it at the time when the nominations were sent to it. The President frequently does so of his own motion; and it seems to me that it would be a very fine thing to have it done in all cases, especially in connection with nominations for positions in new agencies which it is proposed to create.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out to the Senator that, as he well knows, it has been the policy of the Department of State in nominating persons for the Diplomatic and Consular Service to send to Senators a biographical sketch of the individual, together with a statement of his diplomatic experience, if any.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is, to the Senators from the State of residence of the nominee; is that correct?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; to Senators from the State of residence of the nominee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. That has been, in part, one way of carrying out the suggestion which I made and upon which the Senator from Tennessee has now enlarged. I think it would be very wholesome if we had a brief description of the duties to be performed by the nominee. In my judgment, that would be information to show whether the salary was commensurate—too large or too small, as the case might be. Without having the duties outlined in connection with a statement of the salary we should not know what the appointee would have to do if we confirmed his nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, Mr. President, we all understand the form in which the nominations come to the Senate. They come here on a sheet on which are listed the name of the nominee and the position to which he has been nominated. It would be helpful if all departments would convey in a brief letter to Senators from the State of residence of the nominee the information which the State Department now conveys to us in the case of Consular and Diplomatic Service nominations. In the case of the State Department most of the nominations are for routine promotions and appointments. In respect to a general practice, it would not make any difference whether the promotions or appointments were routine; but certainly I am in sympathy with any movement or practice which may be initiated which would give the Senate, in cases in which it has to confirm nominations, all the information it needs in order to pass upon the nominations intelligently.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. All nominations are referred to committees; and it would be a very simple matter for the committee concerned to ascertain the information which has been referred to, and to present it to the Senate at the time when the nomination is reported by the committee to the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In that way we could handle the matter very easily.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was about to say that even when a nomination is transmitted by the President without a statement of such information, the committee itself can obtain it and can have it printed in the Executive Calendar in the column opposite the nominee's name, so as to give the Senate full information about him.

Mr. President, let me say that I understand that the nominations under the Manpower Commission have been passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not as yet.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have asked that they go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. I make the request purely on the ground that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is chairman of the subcommittee, is not present and cannot give us the information we desire to have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations under the Manpower Commission will be passed over.

The clerk will proceed to state the remaining nominations on the calendar.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that all nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 11, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 8, 1943:

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERALS

Maj. Gen. Walter Krueger, United States Army, now invested with the rank and title of lieutenant general by virtue of his assignment to command the Third Army.

Maj. Gen. Millard Fillmore Harmon (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Joseph May Swing (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Louis Aleck Craig (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Edwin Jacob House (lieutenant colonel Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Idwal Hubert Edwards (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Waite Crawford (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Paul William Baade (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Nathan Farragut Twining (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps); Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Harris Marcy Melasky (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Ulysses Simpson Grant 3d, (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Claude McMahon (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Alfred Maximilian Gruenther (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Albert Pierson (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Wyburn Dwight Brown (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Verne Donald Mudge (major, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Huber Partridge (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Joseph Flood (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Chauncey Macon (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Clyde Charles Alexander (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Alton Armstrong, Jr. (captain, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, Air Corps.

Col. Herbert Ludwell Earnest (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Dennis Edward McCunniff, Infantry.

Col. Charles Leslie Keerans, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Bob Edward Nowland (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Henry Donaldson, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Wells Harper (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Jonathan Lane Holman (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Paul Edmund Burrows (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Kirkland Rice (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Jens Anderson Doe (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. John Gordon Williams (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Edwin Eugene Schwien (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Donald Old (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Alexander Oscar Gorder (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Frederick [illegible]wis Anderson, Jr. (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Marcellus Lowry Stockton, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Wilbur Eugene Dunkelberg (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Clarence Ames Martin (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert William Strong (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Walter Ernst Lauer (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Clarence Howard Kells (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Hugh Nathan Herrick (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Aubrey Hornsby (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Paul Bernard Wurtsmith (captain, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, Air Corps.

Col. Robert Kauch (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Norman Daniel Cota (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Ray Guy Harris (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Bryant Edward Moore (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Philip Edward Gallagher (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Leland Ross Hewitt (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. George Luke Usher (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Lawrence Whittaker (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Lester Smith Ostrander (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. George Platt Tourtellot (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Troup Miller, Cavalry.

Col. Truman Hempel Landon (captain, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, Air Corps.

Col. Horace Harding (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Alvan Cleveland Kincaid (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Pierre Mallett (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Lt. Col. Paul Everton Peabody, Infantry.

Col. James Cave Crockett (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. Harry Hubbard Johnson (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Richard L. Conolly, July 11, 1942.
Frank J. Lowry, August 27, 1942.
Ralph W. Christie, November 9, 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 8, 1943:

THE SUPREME COURT

Wiley Blount Rutledge to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

IN THE ARMY

All Army nominations appearing under the caption "Nominations," in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 1, 1943, beginning on page 464, were confirmed today.

IN THE NAVY

REAR ADMIRALS IN THE NAVY, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, TO RANK FROM DATE STATED OPPOSITE THEIR NAMES

Howard F. Kingman, May 10, 1942.
Sherman S. Kennedy, May 13, 1942.
Frank A. Braisted, August 7, 1942.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Good Shepherd of our souls, give us brave and happy hearts, conscious of Thy merciful direction when the day is over. We are aware, blessed Lord, that trial and difficulty are with us these times, yet we would not bemoan our duty but regard it as a privileged responsibility. Let our service be free and sincere that we may enter sympathetically into the hearts and woes of men, ever identifying ourselves with the burdened and perishing races of earth.

Almighty God, grant that we may meet the challenge of the appeal which comes from our day and generation. By example and precept we would keep free from evil speaking, from envy and hatred, and untainted from the turmoil of strife and confusion. Give unto us peace and faith which rebound to the enlargement of vision, calling the future and claiming it as our own. O Thou of the seamless robe, lay Thy hand on every sufferer; with Thy consoling voice give

cheer to every lonely heart and hush its lamentation. Thou who dost behold the ultimate triumph against the dark background with its voices of the past, rule in all our land, harmonize contradictions, subjugate all enemies and compel all events to serve our free and hospitable country. In the name of the world's Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 5, 1943, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short address delivered by Senator DAVIS at the Army-Navy E production award, the Babcock & Wilcox Tube Co.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill the title of which reads as follows:

To provide further for the successful prosecution of the war through a system of civilian selective war service, with the aid of the Selective Service System.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FOOD RATIONING

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, when war clouds were first settling over Europe, the Swiss Government encouraged its people to store up a 3 months' supply of food in each household. The Swiss Government even made loans to needy families for this purpose. The Swiss wisdom and foresight in this matter has been amply demonstrated since that stanch little Republic was quickly isolated.

Our Government now proposes to restrict each person in the United States to a supply of five 8-ounce cans of food on hand, under penalty of removing coupons from ration cards. It seems to me that our Government would do well and very wisely to take a leaf from the Swiss book and encourage householders in those areas of the United States which might be subject to invasion to store up similar stocks of canned goods and nonperishable food stuffs.

One of these areas which I certainly believe should be so treated is the west coast of the United States. Separated from the rest of our country by 1,000 miles of mountain and desert, it is connected only by a few thin miles of rail and road, easily severed. It is folly in these uncertain times to restrict householders in such areas to a few days' supply only. In my humble opinion the opposite course should be pursued.

[Here the gavel fell.]



PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the completion of the legislative program and the disposition of other special orders, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the regular business and any other special orders tomorrow I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief article from Time magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order recorded today for one-half hour. When I asked for it I did not anticipate there would be as much business as there will be today, but I wanted to tell the House frankly that I am going to claim my time and that I am going to speak about the work of the Dies committee and make some comments on the speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] which he made on last Monday. I do this for two reasons: First, because I think it is quite important; second, because I want my own position to be plain and not to have anybody say I did not make it so.

[Here the gavel fell.]

WILLIAM PICKENS

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HENDRICKS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial from the Northern Virginia Daily entitled "Through the Wringer."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a short excerpt from the testimony of General Reybold on the time element in the construction of the Florida Barge Canal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES CHARGED WITH SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Star of yesterday there was a statement that five of the people named by me were no longer connected with the Federal Government. That is not true if information furnished to me by the personnel department is correct. As a matter of fact, I have a letter from the War Production Board advising me that one of these people is still on the pay roll. For instance, Paul F. Brissenden, according to the Star, is no longer on the pay roll, but according to a letter written by the War Production Board he is.

Mr. Schuman is still in the Denver office, notwithstanding the story appearing in the Star. Several of them are on leave, or at least they took leave after the speech I made on September 24 exposing some of them; but none of them have lost their connection with the Federal pay roll.

I just wanted to make that statement so that the record will be straight. In the course of the day I would like to take some of the time of the House to discuss at length the record of William Pickens. I have it; I have the record that he made, a long record, and if I may have the indulgence of the House sometime today, for the benefit of those Members who want to know conclusively what the facts are, I have them here and am prepared to show them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials, one from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the inaugural speech of Gov. Earl Warren, of California.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MR. McNUTT AND THE MANPOWER PROBLEM

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order of 10 minutes today, but I should like to release this time. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. PLUMLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. HARNESS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two requests: First, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a concurrent resolution of the Joint Assembly of Iowa memorializing Congress; and, second, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I have written to a constituent who has collected and given a hundred tons of scrap metal to the Government.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a brief statement on the food situation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Kansas Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received on the Ruml tax plan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE SILVER-PURCHASE PROGRAM

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD a release of a speech I am making.

The SPEAKER. Under the established procedure the gentleman may not do that if it exceeds what could be stated in a minute's time; if it does it will have to go in the Appendix.

Mr. WHITE. I assure the Speaker that it will be less than a minute, that it will not amount to more than half a minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury silver-purchase program has been a godsend to the American people in the present financial and war emergency. In buying silver under the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act, the Government has acquired a stock pile of unobligated silver amounting to 45,000 tons which is now being delivered to our war industries, as fast as it can be used, through the Defense Plant Corporation. The allocation of the Treasury silver stock piles and the current importation of foreign silver is providing a surplus to supply every demand for silver both for consumptive and nonconsumptive needs of our war industries. As another result of the Government silver purchase program, we have $2,000,000,000 in circulation with the necessary legal silver reserve being held in a separate fund to redeem every silver certificate that has been put out. All of this silver has been acquired at no cost to the taxpayers. In buying this silver, we are also financing the production of the critical war metals, copper, antimony, zinc, and lead. To strike down the silver-purchasing program now, would be a blow at the very vitals of our war industry and would help Hitler and Japan by slowing up the production of munitions sorely needed by our boys at the front.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Springfield Union, of Springfield, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix by printing two speeches, one delivered by myself and one by Mr. Lasseter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FARM-LABOR SHORTAGE

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to call to the attention of Members of the House a bill I introduced last Friday, H. R. 1728. I hope you will get a copy of this bill and read it. Unless something is done, and done promptly, to help solve a serious problem confronting the farmers of this country in regard to labor shortage, we are going to have a problem in the near future of a serious shortage of food and fiber that is so necessary in not only winning this war, but the peace.

This bill will definitely solve the labor shortage, and it is so written that the administration of same cannot be messed up with the writing of rules and regulations governing the administration of the bill. Let us have a hearing on this bill before the Military Affairs Committee at once.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: One, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from a Bucyrus, Ohio, paper, and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and the other to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under a special order this afternoon, I have time in which I intended to discuss the advisability and the need of withholding further appropriations to the National Resources Planning Board. Owing to the large amount of business, I will probably not have the opportunity to give all of this discussion today and will have the same inserted in the RECORD. May I request all Members who are interested in abolishing this vicious body to read my extension.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests, one that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include an editorial and the other to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

WALTER WINCHELL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, last night the keyhole peeper gave us two pieces of news which he seemed to think of great importance to the Nation. He said that two women, and he named them, were about to experience the "blessed event." I hope that the Army and Navy, particularly the Navy in which he serves, takes notice of the valuable contribution to the war effort of this individual.

What he forgot was to advise the people of this annual report of the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942. I read from page 42 of this report a few days ago. On page 62 of the same report I find this statement:

> Jergens-Woodbury Sales Corporation, Cincinnati, sixth circuit (Cincinnati), misrepresentation of germicidal properties of cold cream and soap.

That is notice of a case which was then pending in the court at Cincinnati, Ohio.

He forgot to tell the people about that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, but I do it so in order to ask the gentleman a couple of questions.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. On Friday afternoon while we were real busy here the gentleman made some request about the observance of Washington's birthday.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; that is right.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I did not get the name, and I am not informed now and do not care to be, but I am wondering if it is really important that we observe Washington's Birthday any more for the duration.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly it is.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Further reserving the right to object, and I feel kindly to the gentleman——

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] is going to read Washington's Farewell Address to the House on February 22.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Did not the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Mississippi both vote for the third term?

Mr. RANKIN. We certainly did not vote for Wendell Willkie. Please do not insult us by that question. It is bad enough for the Republicans to have to listen to it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Well, you had Norman Thomas on the ballot.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, the gentleman says something about Norman Thomas. That may have been an outlet for his outraged feelings, but did he take advantage of it or did he eat the crow?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. On advice of counsel, I refuse to answer.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is bogging down very fast.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I have a high regard for the gentleman from Alabama, but I would like to know if he is just going to give us a little elocution when he reads the Farewell Address, some tinkling symbol and sounding brass in it. Does he believe what is in the Farewell Address? Is he going to put his heart in it?

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Alabama and I believe a great deal more in Washington's Farewell Address than the able gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] did when he fell for Wendell Willkie's bunk, or campaign oratory, 2 years ago, and I know the distinguished gentleman from Kansas will enjoy hearing our colleague from Alabama read Washington's Farewell Address.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ISOLATIONISM

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, on front page of the Christian Science Monitor of January 11, 1943, first two columns, we have the headline reading, "Americans lose illusions of safety in isolationism."

The American Council on Public Affairs sets out in that issue five things about the American people, and it says:

1. That with Pearl Harbor having blasted the Nation's illusions as to security against attack, the American people are today intellectually invincible.

Then they proceed to set forth four or five additional points and Mr. Schnapper, executive secretary of the council, makes this statement:

All things considered, the American public has been superbly armed with the facts during the past year. It has the benefit of constant and detailed information about every major aspect of its participation in the war. As a result, the American people are today fulfilling their responsibilities with a determination based upon facts rather than upon propaganda. They understand the fundamental issues of the war far more than is generally appreciated.

I bring up this point in connection with our liability to the country and to its war effort in paying those taxes assessed against us in 1942 and which we are now able to pay. I cannot understand why the men and women of this country who are able to pay and who participated in that income now want to duck the responsibility of paying that tax. I hope this Council on Public Affairs will look into that particular phase of the tax payment proposition. We now have over 39,000,000 nonagricultural workers on the pay rolls of our industry and economic activities. For all manufacturing industries—war and civilian—weekly hours averaged 44 a week in November as compared with 43.6 in October, and 40.3 in November 1941. Hourly earnings of 89.9 cents were 1.2 cents above the preceding month. Our people have to their credit in our banks over $74,000,000,000 of demand and time savings deposits—this includes individuals, partnerships, and corporations. Fifty million of our people have an equity of over $16,000,000,000 in savings bonds and about 25,000,000 pay rollees participated in purchase of savings bonds this last December. Our people have about $15,000,000,000 circulating outside the Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks and unquestionably several billions of this is in hiding—being hoarded. Yet, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee states that a great flood of demands for cancelation of the 1942 Federal tax liability is rolling into his office from our people. I submit these questions: Are the American people fulfilling their responsibilities? Are we today intellectually invincible?

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some editorials and an article from the press of the Nation's Capital, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein editorials from the Louisville Courier-Journal, the Anniston Star, and the Atlanta Constitution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech I made last week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SILVER

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as the lone representative of the silver State of Nevada, I appeal to you to reconsider the silver amendment that was adopted by the Committee of the Whole on last Friday. If you recall, it was the silver taken out of the mines of the Comstock lode, Virginia City, that saved the credit of this Nation during the Civil War. The amendment that was adopted on last Friday is purely in the interest of the silver manufacturers of this country. They can get all the silver they want if they will pay the Government the same price the Government is paying for the silver. We all know they make a net profit when they manufacture and sell their goods. I appeal to you to consider changing your vote when the question again comes to a vote on the floor of the House. If silver is allowed to remain as it is, it will save the credit of this Nation in this war. If I had my way I would prohibit the coining of all one-dollar bills and make everybody use silver dollars.

[Here the gavel fell.]

INVESTIGATION OF ACTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 102) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That a committee of five Members of the House of Representatives be appointed by the Speaker of the House, which said committee is authorized to conduct investigations of any action, rule, procedure, regulation, order, or directive taken or promulgated by any department or independent agency of the Federal Government where complaint is made to said committee that such action, rule, regulation, procedure, order, or directive—

(1) Is beyond the scope of the power or authority granted to such department or independent agency by Congress or by Executive order.

(2) Invades the constitutional rights, privileges, or immunities of citizens of the United States.

(3) Inflicts penalties for failure to comply with such rules, regulations, or directives, without affording those accused of violation an opportunity to present their defense before a fair and impartial tribunal.

The said committee shall report to the Congress from time to time the results of such investigations and such recommendations as they see fit with respect to the personnel of those administering any such department or independent agency, or shall recommend such legislation or amendments to existing legislation as they deem desirable.

The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to

sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the House is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by him. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this resolution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some editorials and articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem entitled "A Soldier Speaks."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an interesting letter received from John L. Rogers, Director of the Division of Motor Transport of the Office of Defense Transportation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was on objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 5]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bender | Furlong | McWilliams |
| Bland | Gallagher | Maloney |
| Bradley, Pa. | Hagen | Merrow |
| Brooks | Halleck | Myers |
| Buckley | Hancock | Norton |
| Capozzoli | Harris, Va. | O'Leary |
| Case | Heffernan | O'Toole |
| Celler | Johnson, | Pfeifer |
| Clark | J. Leroy | Pracht |
| Cochran | Kearney | Ramey |
| Crosser | Kennedy | Richards |
| Disney | Landis | Rivers |
| Domengeaux | Lane | Rockwell |
| Drewry | Larcade | Scott |
| Ellis | Lewis, Colo. | Somers |
| Elmer | Luce | Towe |
| Engel | McGranery | Treadway |
| Fay | McGregor | Wasielewski |
| Fish | McKenzie | Welchel, Ohio |
| Ford | McLean | |

The SPEAKER. On this call 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be permitted to sit during the sessions and the recesses of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution (H. Res. 103) which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on the District of Columbia, to rank as follows:

Third, THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr., Maryland.
Fifth, SAM M. RUSSELL, Texas.
Sixth, OREN HARRIS, Arkansas.
Seventh, F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Arthur Levefre, Jr., of Houston, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech I delivered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement on the submarine menace by Sir Percy Noble, of the British Admiralty, at present in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief editorial from the Houston Chronicle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter that I have written to the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend in the RECORD the text of several letters to which I expect to refer in debate this afternoon in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1648, with Mr. COURTNEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

Salaries and expenses: For collecting the revenue from customs, for enforcement, as specified in Executive Order No. 9083, of certain navigation laws, for the detection and prevention of frauds upon the customs revenue, and not to exceed $100,000 for the securing of evidence of violations of the customs and navigation laws; for expenses of transportation and transfer of customs receipts from points where there are no Government depositories; not to exceed $84,500 for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), but not to exceed $1,700 for any one person; not to exceed $500 for subscriptions to newspapers; not to exceed $85,000 for stationery; not to exceed $12,000 for improving, repairing, maintaining, or preserving buildings, inspection stations, office quarters, including living quarters for officers, sheds, and sites along the Canadian and Mexican borders acquired under authority of the act of June 26, 1930 (19 U. S. C. 68); and for the purchase (not to exceed 150), maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary for official use in field work; for the payment of extra compensation earned by customs officers or employees for overtime services, at the expense of the parties in interest, in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the act approved February 13, 1911, as amended by the act approved February 7, 1920, and section 451 of the Tariff Act, 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C. 261, 267, and 1451), the receipts from such overtime services to be deposited as a refund to the appropriation from which such overtime compensation is paid, in accordance with the provisions of section 524 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; for the cost of seizure, storage, and disposition of any merchandise, vehicle and team, automobile, boat, air or water craft, or any other conveyance seized under the provisions of the customs laws, for the purchase of arms, ammunition, and accessories; not to exceed $665,108 for personal services in the District of Columbia exclusive of 10 persons from the field force authorized to be detailed under section 525 of the Tariff Act of 1930, $22,481,585: *Provided*, That the offices of 7 comptrollers of customs, with annual salaries aggregating $43,950, are hereby abolished. The duties imposed by law and regulations upon

the comptrollers of customs, their assistants and deputies, are hereby transferred to, imposed upon, and continued in positions now established in the Customs Service by or pursuant to law, as the Secretary of the Treasury by appropriate regulations shall specify; and he is further authorized to designate the title by which such positions shall be officially known hereafter. The Secretary of the Treasury, in performing the duties imposed upon him by this paragraph, shall administer the same in such manner that the transfer of duties provided hereby will not result in the establishment of any new positions in the Customs Service.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 15, lines 22 and 23, strike out "$22,481,585" and insert "$20,481,585."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an effort to save $2,000,000 to the Treasury of the United States by reducing the appropriations for customs by approximately 10 percent. The work of the customs has gone away down. The collections are not more than a third of what they were a couple of years ago, and there are no importations of any great amount coming into the country at this time—a very small amount from England, and a small amount from South America. I am getting verbal reports from all over the country to the effect that employees of the Customs Service do not have enough to do to keep them busy, and that many of them are idle. The committee has cut the item only $43,000. It could really stand a cut of 20 percent instead of 10 percent, but I am being very careful about what I am submitting here and for that reason I am asking for only 10 percent, $2,000,000. Let us save $2,000,000 which can be done without the slightest impairment of service, simply putting those people in the Customs Service who do not have enough to do at work somewhere else. The Customs Service can get along without so many people, and these people can be sent to those departments of the Government which have not any duties as a result of the war.

It is our duty to see that the manpower of the Nation is conserved. The only way we can do it is to fail to provide funds to keep people in positions who are not needed.

I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is not difficult in an appropriation bill of this character to make just general statements and say, "Now, we should cut it," and not be specific. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is one of the most valued Members of this House. He is always careful, he is always practical, and in the committee there is very little disagreement in getting together on any cut that is justified. However, in discussing this item in the committee I do not recall that the gentleman from New York offered any such amendment. I do not recall any reason in the hearings how we could afford to make such a cut as $2,000,000 as proposed by the gentleman.

On the floor today I waited during his presentation of this matter to find out where he thought it could be cut and why and what specific services of the Customs Bureau should be curtailed. He made no such definition. He did not analyze it. The fact remains that he just offers a blank cut, simply on general principles.

Now, the gentlemen who testified before our committee were very frank in their statements. They said certain of their work had fallen off, but they had many other new duties imposed upon them. There is the censorship duty in connection with travelers going out of the United States. There is the policing of exports and imports. The border-patrol work has increased materially. They had to put on 600 new guards. I cannot see where this proposed amendment is justified on facts.

Not only that, there are a great many promotions and increases in pay under the Ramspeck bill, all of which have been absorbed by the Department in asking for what they had last year. Due to the fact that their personnel is busily engaged working on Government work—and no one is complaining that they are loafing and not doing their job—that their duties have increased during the war, I fail to see the logic of trying to make an automatic cut. I think when we cut in this way we are not acting the way we should act with reference to personnel matters and expenditures. Let us be able to know where and why a thing should be cut and not just cut it.

I think for that reason and many others the amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. The gentleman just said their duties have been increased during the war. Will the gentleman kindly point out specific instances on which we could base our judgment as to whether or not their duties have increased?

Mr. O'NEAL. The statement of these responsible officials is that their duties have increased; that they put on 600 new men, and that they have duties now which they did not have before war was declared.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] would have the author of this amendment reduce it to a bill of particulars and to specify the exact place in this appropriation where a reduction can be made. I have too much confidence in the ability of the gentleman from Kentucky to expect that he is really serious about that. He knows that in the appropriating machinery and technique it would be impossible, with the limited facilities at hand, for this subcommittee or the entire Committee on Appropriations to specify with absolute certainty whether or not each particular item in this huge Customs Service ought to be cut down a specified amount. We must operate by rule of thumb, as I remember the President once said. You simply cannot do it any other way. We make lump sum appropriations and must reduce them the same way.

Now why has the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] offered this amendment before the committee this afternoon? Let me call your attention to the fact that subsequent to these hearings and subsequent to their printing we called before our subcommittee the representatives of the Bureau of Foreign Funds Control and representatives of the Alien Property Custodian. Sometimes a little thing will pop up when you least expect it. When the appropriation for the Foreign Funds Control was under consideration, at this hearing Mr. Paley, head of that Division, testified, and it is notable that in connection with his testimony, and it must appear in the printed hearings when they are available, that he told our subcommittee of the tremendous amount of work which his organization was doing, and he referred to the fact that they had utilized much of the personnel of the Bureau of Customs. He said, "It is well known that the work of the Bureau of Customs has greatly receded," or words to that effect, and that they could take the personnel of the Bureau of Customs and use it in Foreign Funds Control work without interfering with the work of the Bureau of Customs.

Now I am not attempting to quote his testimony exactly, but any member of the subcommittee who was there—and they are all present—can take exception to what I have said if it is not the fact.

You will find that despite the fact that imports into this country have gone right straight down according to the findings of the Bureau of Customs which is affected by this bill, that the bill carries substantially $2,000,000 more in appropriations than has been requested since 1920. It is the largest appropriation by nearly two millions, the Bureau of Customs has asked for since 1920, and this in face of the fact that it appears conclusively to me from the hearings that the work of the Bureau of Customs has subsided very, very much.

If you will turn to page 331 of the hearings you will observe that in 1942 they had 8,309 employees in this Bureau; 1,879 are inspectors; 1,113 are guards; and 5,317 are in other categories. They can absorb a cut of $2,000,000 in the Customs Service without in any way interfering with the work of the Customs inspectors or the guards; they can absorb this cut and save $2,000,000. That is what the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York proposed to do.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and to supplement the strong presentation made by my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

It is traditional in the Customs Service that the amount of personnel required

is not based on the volume of customs receipts, but on the number of transactions; that is what they always tell us. I direct your attention to page 327 of the hearings where is set forth in detail the customs transactions for 5 consecutive years, including the last fiscal year, 1942. Looking at that you will find that in nearly every category of the Service there has been an increase in transactions. However, small a transaction may be, it requires as much personal service as one involving a much larger amount. This table shows that the total number of persons who entered the country in 1942 was 39,798,676 as against 36,900,584 in 1941—and immigration cases have not been the least of the transactions involving the Service. In nearly every category the number of transactions has increased instead of diminished. In addition to that, you will find that the Customs Service as a result of the national situation has taken on a new jurisdiction; it has had censorship added to its other duties.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The table of customs transactions shows a reduction in the number of persons entering the country from 52,000,000 in 1938 to 39,000,000 in 1942.

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes; but it shows also an increase for 1942 over 1941.

Mr. TABER. Very little.

Mr. LUDLOW. The jurisdiction of the Customs Service has been greatly enlarged, for it has taken on censorship. There has been a great increase of work at Miami, Fla., where the daily arrival of planes has reached 80 according to the testimony set out on page 326 of the hearings; and, as Mr. O'Neal has said, they have been obliged to increase their guard force by some 600 men throughout the Service. You will find that statement on page 321.

If you just want to cut these bills generally without any regard to rhyme or reason you can, of course, do it, but you will be cutting this Service far below its actual requirements if you adopt this amendment; there is no doubt about it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LUDLOW) there were—ayes 116, noes 69.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. LUDLOW and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the teller reported that there were—ayes 158, noes 92.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read, as follows:

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Salaries and expenses: For salaries and expenses in connection with the assessment and collection of internal-revenue taxes and the administration of the internal-revenue laws, including the administration of such provisions of other laws as are authorized by or pursuant to law to be administered by or under the direction of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, including one stamp agent (to be reimbursed by the stamp manufacturers) and the employment of experts; the securing of evidence of violations of the acts, the cost of chemical analyses made by others than employees of the United States and expenses incident to such chemists testifying when necessary; telegraph and telephone service, postage, freight, express, necessary expenses incurred in making investigations in connection with the enrollment or disbarment of practitioners before the Treasury Department in internal-revenue matters, expenses of seizure and sale, and other necessary miscellaneous expenses, including stenographic reporting services; for the acquisition of property under the provisions of title III of the Liquor Law Repeal and Enforcement Act, approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 872–881), and the operation, maintenance, and repair of property acquired under such title III; for the purchase (not to exceed 34), hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary, for official use of the Alcohol Tax and Intelligence Units in field work; printing and binding (not to exceed $1,606,850); and the procurement of such supplies, stationery (not to exceed $675,800), equipment, furniture, mechanical devices, laboratory supplies, periodicals, and newspapers for the Alcohol Tax Unit, ammunition, lawbooks and books of reference, and such other articles as may be necessary, $24,821,735, of which amount not to exceed $11,111,885 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not more than $100,000 of the total amount appropriated herein may be expended by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for detecting and bringing to trial persons guilty of violating the internal-revenue laws or conniving at the same, including payments for information and detection of such violation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, on Friday I took the floor and made the statement that during the period from 1936 to 1940, inclusive, there were exported from this country to Japan 717,277,918 pounds of refined copper, and in the course of my remarks I said further that we had exported during that same period 36,000,000 pounds of scrap copper; that the school children are now requested to bring their pennies to school in order to make up for the great deficiency resulting from the export of copper to Japan which she is now using to battle our boys in the Pacific. I was urging in those remarks that our silver be put to work now as a fighting metal to overcome this deficiency in copper, to replace it.

I was talking, of course, on the Celler amendment, as amended by Mr. WOLCOTT's amendment.

When the men who opposed the amendment took the floor they pointed out that if we failed to mine the silver we would cut down the supply of copper and these various other minerals which were essential to the war. I was interested in that, so I called an expert on Sunday and asked him to write me a letter with reference to that situation.

I have here a letter from Mr. Herbert M. Bratter, who is a student of the silver question, located at 3000 Thirty-ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. The letter is dated February 7, 1943, and reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 7, 1943.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: In response to your request on the phone today, I am pleased to give you below my comment on the arguments made on the floor by silver-State Congressmen in opposing the Celler-Wolcott amendment to the bill H. R. 1648.

It is interesting to note that the silver Congressmen no longer defend the silver program on monetary grounds, but frankly classify it as a subsidy to mining, which after 10 years of silver buying puts the discussion on the level where it belongs.

The silver spokesmen, in opposing the Celler-Wolcott amendment, asserted that the silver subsidy is necessary as a war measure, because it is in reality a subsidy to the miners of copper, lead, and zinc, with which three metals most United States-mined silver is produced. Thus, Congressman ROBINSON of Utah told the House (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 677):

"A vote for this amendment is a vote to stop the mining of copper, lead, and zinc * * * it is absolutely necessary to have so much money for silver in order to mine copper, to mine zinc, and to mine lead. * * * Do away with all this monetary talk * * * about silver as money, wipe that off the books if you want to, but * * * are you willing to stop the mining of copper, to stop the mining of zinc, to stop the mining of lead, when you know these minerals are necessary in order to win the war?"

The same argument was made by Congressman MURDOCK, Congressman WHITE, Congressman ROCKWELL, Congressman CHENOWETH, etc. What is the answer?

In the first place, a very large part of our production of copper, lead, and zinc does not depend on silver in any way, because any silver content of the ore is insignificant.

As to the remaining copper, lead, and zinc production, this is already directly and amply subsidized by the premium price plan, which the Office of Price Administration and the Metals Reserve Company introduced on January 13, 1942, to last for 2½ years, or through July 1944. Under that plan the Metals Reserve Company, through October 1942, paid out premiums of $12,573,000. What does this plan provide?

The premium price plan provides that all mine output of copper, lead, and zinc above that which could be reasonably expected from a mine is paid for as follows:

Copper, 17 cents a pound, instead of the ceiling of 12 cents.

Zinc, 11 cents a pound, instead of the ceiling of 8¼ cents.

Lead, 9¼ cents a pound, instead of the ceiling of 6½ cents.

Instead of ceiling prices, for all output above the quota fixed for a mine, that mine receives stratosphere prices. And note, too, that for some mines the quota is fixed at zero, thus giving the premium on the entire output.

Concerning the adequacy of the premium price plan without the additional aid of a silver subsidy to bring out copper, lead, and zinc we have the significant testimony of a War Production Board official, Mr. Harvey Anderson, before the House Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures on December 3, 1942 (pp. 29–30), testified:

"The survey made of prices of copper shows with a 12-cent ceiling originally established we would bring out slightly over 90 percent of the potential copper that could be pro-

duced in the country; with a bonus permitting payments up to 17 cents * * * we could bring out somewhere around 90 or 95 percent of the maximum total production; and beyond that further price increase offered as a stimulus to the operator for producing largely is bringing out relatively small amounts of high-priced copper. * * *

"There is [already] a financial incentive for a mine to turn out just as much copper as it can."

In connection with financial inducements, note further that the Revenue Act of 1942 exempts from the excess profits tax any bonus payments made by the Government under the premium price plan. The act also permits deduction from the income subject to excess profits tax of certain proportions of the earnings that come from production in excess of 1936–39 average production. Thus, the mining industry has been accorded material financial inducement through the tax law.

To sum up, the proper way to subsidize copper, lead, and zinc production for war purposes is directly, as is being done, and not through unnecessary additions to the Treasury's stock of monetary silver, impounded by statute at West Point and elsewhere. On the contrary, the legal bars to the use by war industries of the silver already so impounded should be repealed by Congress.

Yours very truly,

HERBERT M. BRATTER.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, we are discussing metals. If conditions that exist in northeast Nebraska respecting the procurement of radio batteries are general throughout the United States, thousands of radio listeners who must depend upon battery receiving sets will be cut off from valuable radio service.

Hundreds of owners of battery receiving sets in northeast Nebraska cannot get batteries. One radio station has told its listeners that because zinc is needed so badly for war purposes it may be impossible for them to get batteries, and as a result a great many letters have been received indicating that large numbers of radio receiving sets have already been put out of use.

There are hundreds of families in my district who do not have electricity. Many of them have applied for R. E. A. hook-up. In some parts of my district the poles, insulators, and transformers have been installed, but, due to the inability to get copper conductors, these projects must wait over until after the war for completion. This means that hundreds of people who have planned to convert their battery receiving sets to electric-powered sets will have to rely on battery sets for the duration.

A very great number of families that depend solely on radio for news and information are threatened with the discontinuation of this service because they can get no batteries, and the result will be that radio stations will lose thousands upon thousands of listeners.

There are many farmers in my district who do not take newspapers, who do not have telephones, and who have depended entirely on radio for news about livestock markets, and so forth.

One radio station in my district made a survey a few days ago and received over 300 letters from owners of battery receiving sets. Out of the first 234 tabulated, the report is that in a very small area 384 radio sets are now out of use or soon will be. Forty listeners mentioned the time that their machines have been out of use as follows:

One, 6 months.
Four, 5 months.
Eight, 3 months.
Twenty-five, 2 months.
Two, 2 weeks.

Radio is a valuable and absolutely necessary part of the life of the people of my district. The people there are most patriotic. They have sent their sons to war. With less than the needed amount of farm help, they have produced a record-breaking amount of food. They are preparing to follow the suggestions of our Government to plant more and more in order to raise more crops, and to produce more meat to feed our fighting men, our allies and our own civilian population. The work of our farms will be more important than ever before in the history of our country during the coming planting time and the time when harvest approaches. The farmer, his wife, and children are and will continue to be the busiest people in our land. They will work from the early dark hours of the morning until far into the night without regard to minimum hours or minimum wages. Their time is just as precious as is the time of the factory or the office in the cities. They must depend upon information about conditions of roads, weather, markets, and so forth, which is so vitally important and necessary to keep the farm business going. These farmers have conducted their business in spite of the fact that they face this labor shortage and have faced a shortage of farm machinery and repairs for that machinery. Many of them would like to have their farms electrified through the extension of R. E. A., which had to be curtailed because we could get no more copper and other material for projects, even those partially completed. Now, hundreds of them have a just complaint because they cannot get a battery to keep the medium of information—the radio receiving set—in condition to get the valuable reports which are so necessary to keep the farm fully informed on conditions as they exist in our country and elsewhere, the progress of the war, markets, and weather and road conditions. These farmers listen carefully to the Government-planned programs on drives for the sale of bonds and other matters so vital for the successful prosecution of the war. They invest heavily in bonds and the Treasury Department is largely dependent upon the information which the radio stations broadcast regarding the bond sales and other matters. Should the radio stations lose hundreds of thousands of listeners because these listeners can no longer get batteries for their receiving sets, our Government departments that depend upon the radio stations to furnish that information to these listeners, will lose, in my opinion, thousands of supporters of their programs and, as a result, the war effort will be the loser.

You may be interested to know that the Treasury Department, in its war savings program publicity, does not pay anything for radio announcements and radio programs which the stations use. The Department has prepared radio announcements and there is a little printing expense, but the radio stations have not charged the Government 1 cent for millions of dollars' worth of free publicity which has gone to our people over many of these stations.

I am not prepared to say that zinc or other materials which go into the construction of a radio battery are so scarce that we must now discontinue service for the people who have no means of receiving absolutely necessary news over the radio other than battery receiving sets. I feel that the situation is so serious that immediate attention should be given to it in order that something be done, if that is at all possible, to give these people some immediate assistance. If some assistance could be given to them now. I am sure that we will not only be aiding them to continue to receive the radio service to which they are entitled, but we will be doing a service to our war effort by keeping thousands of people fully informed, whereas, if the service is discontinued, our Government will lose the attention of some of the most patriotic people in our land. Do not forget that a radio receiving set is almost as necessary on a farm today as is a plow.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is with temerity and due humility that I have this day filed a resolution requesting the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to take up with the Lend-Lease Administrator the question of increasing the allocation of lend-lease materials to China from 2 percent, which it is at present, to 10 percent.

I have no quarrel with the Lend-Lease Administration for their allocations of 77 percent of the money available in 1942 to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and 17.7 percent to Russia. Unquestionably due in no small part to these allocations are the glorious victories that have been achieved by the Russian people and a large measure of the success achieved by Great Britain but I believe that equally great success would be possible of accomplishment provided a more equitable proportion of lend-lease materials were sent to China, which has received but 2 percent of the total; and of this 2 percent, less than one-fourth of the total of 2 percent, or a half of 1 percent, ultimately was received by the Chinese forces.

When we consider the accomplishments of the Chinese people during the past 12 years, fighting not only an exceptionally well-organized nation, the Japanese, but fighting the scourge of famine, which in one province in the year 1930 resulted in the death of six and a half millions of persons, and this famine more responsible than any other agency for the development of the cruel bands of brigands which left a trail of blood from one end of China to the other.

The group now in control of the Chinese Nation, as a consequence of the invasion of China by Japan, have developed a united China and this unity of

the Chinese has made it possible for them to carry on a warfare with Japan now in the sixth year with limited resources and with a reasonable measure of success.

The joint declaration of the United Nations sets forth, as follows:

The government signatory hereto, having subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter, being convinced that complete victory over their enemies is essential to defend life, liberty, independence, and religious freedom, and to preserve human rights and justice in their own lands as well as in other lands, and that they are now engaged in a common struggle against savage and brutal forces seeking to subjugate the world, declare:

1. Each government pledges itself to employ its full resources, military or economic, against those members of the tripartite pact and its adherents with which such Government is at war.

2. Each Government pledges itself to cooperate with the governments signatory hereto and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies. The foregoing declaration may be adhered to by other nations which are, or which may be, rendering material assistance and contributions in the struggle for victory over Hitlerism.

It must be exceedingly difficult for our comrades at arms, the Chinese, to understand just what this agreement between nations means insofar as China is concerned.

The report to the Seventy-eighth Congress of lend-lease operations is a staggering indictment of our neglect of the great storehouse of manpower represented by China with its population of 450,000,000; largely defenseless, they have carried on now in the sixth year against the Empire of Japan, and provided they had received in some degree the measure of consideration to which they are clearly entitled as an ally, it would be unnecessary to expose our boys today in the Solomons, Guadalcanal, and the other places to diseases, destruction, pestilence, and death. The allocation of lend-lease aid to the United Kingdom, including Australia, New Zealand, India, Egypt, and other British territories represents the staggering total of $6,353,143,000, as against one-quarter of this amount to the mighty fighting forces of Russia who have contributed more greatly in the last 6 months to the shortening of the war and the destruction of Hitler's army than any other agency. The total allocated to Russia has been $1,532,230,000, while China, in need of every character of armament, has received but $156,738,000 or one-fortieth as much to China as was sent to the United Kingdom and British territories.

China, with its cities burned, its defenseless women, children and men destroyed by air raids, obliged to leave their homes and seek shelter in far distant portions of China, exposed to pestilence, disease and famine due to the ravages resulting from the invasion of the Japanese, received no foodstuffs for the maintenance of its people from March of 1941 to December 31 of 1942, while $880,000,000 worth was sent to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

In the matter of aircraft and parts so essential to the combating of the Japanese Army and Air Forces, the total allocated to China represented but $37,336,000 and only one-fourth of this amount or a little not in excess of $9,000,000 ever reached the Chinese Army. While this amount was allocated to China, there was allocated to the United Kingdom and its territories $827,000,000 worth, the major portion of which reached its destination.

In the matter of tanks and parts the total allocated to China was but $922,000 worth as against $315,000,000 worth sent to the United Kingdom and its territories, a sum 340 times greater than that allocated to China.

In the petroleum products so vital to the operation of aircraft, tanks and motor vehicles, China received $3,237,000 worth while the United Kingdom alone, without its dependencies, received $2,252,862,000 worth or more than 8 times as much as was allocated to China.

I am in receipt of letters every day and undoubtedly, every Member of Congress is, directing attention to the physical disabilities resulting to our boys from fighting in the Solomons and Guadalcanal. These men are not inured to the privation and the hardship and the atmospheric conditions that obtain in these regions. This is a section where the yellow man fights best and why, in God's name, is not China, with its army of 5,000,000 trained, seasoned troops, with its reserve of 15,000,000 troops and its potential reserve army of 50,000,000 men, permitted to take the offensive through the back door of Japan, which they are ready and eager to do if given some of the resources vital to success.

When I say that arming China, putting it on the offensive, putting its vast armies into action, would result in the saving of the lives of 500,000 American boys, from the experience we have had in the Guadalcanal and the Solomons, I am setting the figure low. We owe it to America to save the lives of 500,000 American boys and the American people are asking again why it is not done. I appreciate that perhaps I am treading on dangerous territory when I present these facts since I am not a military expert or a strategist in any sense of the word, but I am voicing the opinion that is held by the average American who is continually asking "why" and will continue to ask "why" until we take advantage of this opportunity to crush and destroy Japan, our Far East enemy.

It is difficult for the average American to understand the underlying motive that prevents the adoption of a policy whereby the lives of American service men, the ships of the American Navy, and the cause in which we are engaged should be denied the services of the huge reservoir of manpower inured to hardship, borne to privation, and who by their courage, tenacity, patience, and vitality have earned the right to take their place among the nations of the world—the Chinese Republic.

Surely America or our great leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, would not, knowingly, be a party to the policy of openly condemning to death 500,000 or more American boys through failure to utilize the fighting forces of China.

The success achieved by Russia during the past 4 months could be achieved in the next 6 months in a similar manner by China provided we furnished the resources so that the termination of the war would be short-lived.

I believe the time has come to utilize the forces that have been developed in China not only for the defeat of Japan and the speeding up of the winning of the war in the East, through the utilization of the Chinese veterans which in active service, reserve units, and training camps represent a total of 20,000,000 men and with a reserve of 50,000,000 able-bodied men of military age available for service.

These are trained soldiers who from July of 1941 to June of 1942 fought nearly 5,600 engagements resulting in 180,000 casualties and the capture of over 5,000 Japanese soldiers. The failure to utilize this tremendous storehouse of trained manpower is a something that the average American citizen cannot comprehend. Personally, I want to see the Japanese and the Empire destroyed, but if it can be destroyed without the loss of a single American boy, then it is about time that the American public were informed as to the reason for the failure to provide the engines of war which is all that China asks to accomplish the destruction of Japan.

For more than 5 months American fighting forces have been carrying on under brilliant and able leadership in the Solomon Islands, thousands of miles from Japan and with an endless number of islands yet to be taken before direct assault is possible on Japan.

If it required 5 months of intensive fighting with a loss of many hundreds of American boys killed and maimed and the huge army of China with empty hands and empty guns waiting to enter Japan by the back door and destroy her, I submit that there is a duty which we owe to the mothers and fathers of America, and that duty is to put the weapons in the hands of the Chinese that will make possible the character of offensive that they have demonstrated they are capable of making. China found herself and became unified when invaded by Japan; it ceased to be a combination of warring groups raiding various provinces; unified, trained, inured to privation and hardship, this great army of nearly 20,000,000 men stands idly by while American fighting forces are struggling in the islands of the Pacific.

The invasion of Japan by China would relieve the pressure in the Pacific islands and would result in the saving of the lives of thousands of American boys.

I appeal to the President of the United States, in the name of the fathers and mothers of American boys who are destined to die to the number of perhaps 500,000 if we fail to do what is clearly our duty. The allocation of 10 percent of lend-lease materials to China would in nowise impair our present efforts in any of the other fighting areas. I have conferred with competent authorities

and have been informed that with 500 bombing, pursuit, and fighting planes and a reasonable amount of other war materials that success would be possible by the Chinese over the Japanese within a period of 6 months.

I want to see this war ended and ended quickly and provided at this crucial hour we can arm the Chinese and put them into offensive combat against the Japanese, I believe we cannot only speed up the winning of the war but we can accomplish that which is equally vital—preserving to American homes 500,000 or more American boys who are destined to die unless the war relief so vital to China and the winning of the war is made available.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 3 words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman second next preceding me, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], recalled a few things regarding the debate that occurred here on Friday and he read portions of a letter concerning arguments put up by some, including myself, who were opposed to the Celler and the other amendments pertaining to silver. Let me make this clear at the outset: I am not here solely or primarily in the interest of protecting the so-called subsidy for silver. I do have sincere doubts whether we may rightfully say the Government has been subsidizing silver, for a subsidy implies outgo without income to the Treasury.

If you will refer to my speech of Friday last I pointed out that silver comes in complex ores. Anything done to reduce production of silver will tend to reduce production of needed war minerals. I have this on the authority of mining men, and I know from the facts that exist in my own State, some of the greatest camps in Arizona, that there is a large admixture of silver in them. That is also true of the mining of lead, zinc, and other ores. I state without fear of contradiction that if we hamper or forbid the production of silver we are going to handicap the production of copper, lead, and zinc. I refer you to mining engineers for the proof of this and not to economists or theorists on money matters.

Mr. Chairman, let us get right down to the crux of this matter. The Celler amendment put in here on Friday ought to be subjected to a roll-call vote. I hope the leaders in charge of this measure will insist on a roll-call vote. I fear gentlemen on both sides of the aisle have given too little thought to what the Celler amendment tries to do to one of the greatest assets of our Nation—and claims to do it in the sacred cause of patriotism. I want to put these gentlemen on record by a roll-call vote when we get this bill back to the House.

The gentleman from New York tries to tell us through the letter which he has read that there is no need to favor silver in order to encourage production of copper, lead, and zinc, because, as is explained, the Government is furnishing a sufficient subsidy for them through a bonus price for such strategic minerals. Now, I happen to know something about that encouraging higher price which was allowed on copper, lead, and zinc. I fought with Leon Henderson for weeks and months when he pegged the price of copper at 12 cents per pound, telling him many times that it was not enough under these war conditions to bring out the production. A committee of western Congressmen, of which I was one, called in Leon Henderson and several mining experts on the pegged price of lead, and eventually the pegged price was bettered somewhat; it was placed up to 17 cents for copper.

Those better prices have done a little for the production, but not very much—not as much as our desperate need for war metals requires. The 17 cents is only for surplus copper over former production. Really the main price is the pegged price of 12 cents per pound for copper and relatively few companies get the 5-cent bonus price, and that on only a relatively small part of their total production. Do not let anybody kid you into believing the copper companies are getting too much of a good thing. The 17-cent price permitted new copper producers is not sufficient to bring many small, new mines into production. The present price for silver does help materially, and under the present system costs the Treasury nothing.

What is this whole controversy? The men who are offering these amendments are undoubtedly hoping to do more than the amendments would directly do. They want to repeal all the silver legislation on the books since 1934. Look at the act of 1934 and you will find that it gives a certain amount of discretion to the Secretary of the Treasury. I have heard it said here that the Secretary of the Treasury is not interested in this silver purchase legislation and would like to have it wiped out. Let us review some silver legislation. That may be true.

I call to your attention that back near the close of the last century, in 1878 and again in 1890, when silver legislation was put on the books, some discretion was lodged in the Secretary of the Treasury and he held down the purchase of silver to a minimum because he was unfriendly to the idea. Even so, in spite of an adverse Secretary of the Treasury, this country accumulated a great hoard of silver, which it had on hand at the time of the first World War, and found the possession of it a great advantage to have at that time.

We have accumulated a huge stock of bullion, which will be one of the greatest assets the Nation has at the peace table when we come to deal with the Orient and later with Latin America, where the white metal is as highly regarded as gold is in western Europe. Although the average cost of producing silver throughout the 400 years of record since the discovery of America has been 92 cents per ounce, they want our present store sold for 50 cents per ounce.

I have heard some of the most absurd statements made on this floor. If a chunk of anthracite coal were placed on this table and I should affirm that it was black in color, is there any man among us who would affirm that it was white? Yet equally contradictory statements have been made, diametrically opposed to each other, concerning the purchase of this silver. Somebody must be telling the truth and somebody must be in error.

I have heard it said that this huge pile of metal we have at West Point cost the taxpayers of this country so many hundreds of millions of dollars. I have heard other men say, and I know this cannot be successfully contradicted, that that hoard of silver has not cost the American taxpayer one penny in purchase price. Why? Because since 1939 we have taken 55 percent of it and converted it into money. The other 45 percent is virtually clear gain to the Treasury. The Treasury's profit on silver was even greater part of the time between 1934 and 1939.

Not only that, but in connection with putting silver into the war, that 45 percent, or about 47,000 tons of silver, has been turned over to the war effort. It was turned over more than a year ago. During that time less than half of it, only about 22,000 tons, has actually been put into uniform and put in the Army. However, some of it is now going steadily into the war effort just as fast as is needed.

What I have just said refers to Government-owned silver in nonconsumptive uses. There is plenty of silver from abroad going into consumptive war uses. In 1942, so I am informed, 90,000,000 ounces of foreign silver, purchased at a price ranging from 35⅜ to 45 cents per ounce went into our war industry, and 45,000,000 ounces went into the nonmilitary trades. Today silversmiths can get plenty of domestic silver at 71 cents per ounce.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

DID CONGRESS HEAR THAT MANDATE?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, last November by a majority of more than a million, the American people told candidates for Congress that the waste and extravagance, the muddling and the confusion, the crackpot plans and schemes of the starry-eyed New Deal dreamers should be brought to an end.

Since 1938 the Dies committee has turned up for the information of the public, and the perusal by Congress, the records of many of the so-called crackpots on the Federal pay roll. That committee has also demonstrated that there are on the Federal pay roll some who follow the Communist Party line. On at least two former occasions Congress directed that funds then being appropriated should not be used to pay named individuals. Nevertheless, those two individuals later were found on another Federal pay roll.

Last Monday Chairman DIES of the committee gave to Congress a list of 38 Federal employees who were by the committee deemed unfit for public service. Nevertheless, when the question of continuing to hire those individuals came

before Congress Friday, the administration was able to muster a majority of seven for their retention. The argument was made by some who overlooked the real issue that Congress should not try, condemn, and politically execute these individuals without a hearing. Those advancing the argument forgot that Congress was not sitting as a trial court, but as an employer.

The individuals named have no property right in the jobs which they hold; and if in the judgment of the people their theories of government run counter to those held by the majority, and proof of that proposition was given at the last election, then certainly the Congress, which appropriates the money for the jobs, has the right to say who shall hold those jobs or if it desires to abolish the jobs. We may even end the agency in which they are employed.

Congress may have overlooked the fact that the individuals sought to be separated from the public pay roll belonged to that group, or advocate theories of government similar to those held by the group, which for more than 2 years has been dissatisfied with our Constitution, our constitutional form of government, and desires to remake America.

We have had some 6 years of the advancement of that theory by that particular political faction, and it seems to some a little strange that a Congress which was elected in spite of the opposition of that group and with a clear-cut mandate to get rid of the bureaucrats, the crackpots, the Communists, and the New Dealers should now hesitate to obey the instructions given it by the voters on November 3 last.

Ever since election lame duck after lame duck, would-be officeholders and officeholders, rejected by the people, have by this administration been placed in positions of power where they can perpetuate the very theories and practices repudiated last November.

The Senate decreed that "Paving Block" Flynn should not go upon the public pay roll.

Are we to disregard the instructions of those who sent us here by continuing in public office, in positions where they can make the policies and continue to issue orders against this, that, and the other, those who were condemned by the voters? Is the will of the people who voted to end the New Deal to be thwarted by the action of Congress, which furnished the money and then permits the New Deal and the crackpots to continue in power? That is a question which if not answered correctly now may end the political life of those who refuse not only to listen but to act. Are we so naive, so silly, that we will vote the money to continue in power those who not only sought to destroy this Congress, but who are still seeking that same end?

The issue is not whether the individuals named by the Dies committee are Communists or something else. The issue is, do the people want on the public pay rolls those new dealers, those dreamers, those bureaucrats, those purge-smearers who have carried on as have those named by the Dies committee?

This Congress is sitting, not as a trial court, but as an employer, a hiring and a firing agency, charged with the expenditure of public money. The taxpayers indicated in no uncertain terms that they had grown weary and wanted fired employees who held views similar to those of the 38. Proof of that is found in the defeat of many a new dealer and in the election of some 69 new Members of Congress. Most of the 69 followed the mandate given them. A few old timers missed the point at issue.

Mr. Chairman, when we get to the last three sections of this bill, unless someone else does it I shall offer an amendment to the provision that none of the money appropriated by the bill shall be paid to any of those who advocate the overthrow of this Government by force or violence. My amendment will be, after the word "violence", add "or by subterfuge."

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I submitted that amendment last Friday.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We have not yet reached that section. Last Friday, when the question of discharging from the Government service some 38 people was under consideration, there was more or less talk on the floor of the House about discharging those people without giving them a hearing or a trial, and that Congress was sitting as a prosecuting attorney or a trial judge and executioner. To my mind, that is not the issue.

We were not sitting here then, and we will not be sitting here today when we come to this amendment in such capacity. We are here as a hiring and a firing agency. We appropriate the money, and we have the right to say who we want on the pay roll. Because I may not have made myself clear, let me restate the situation and the issue.

Last November, if you remember, I think it was on the 3d, some 69 Members of this House were discharged. They were fired. Those Members of Congress were not fired because they were Communists; they were not fired because they were disloyal or because they were unpatriotic; they were severed from the pay roll simply because the people did not want them any more. Do you get the idea?

Sitting here, this Congress is the agent of the taxpayers, appropriating money. We say whether we want to put money in the Florida ship canal, up on Passamaquoddy, or here, there, or any other place; whether we want to build dams in the West. We designate the project we want. So, too, we have the right to create jobs—positions—and then to determine how much, if any, money we will appropriate for those holding those positions. We have the right to say we do not want a certain class of people or certain individuals on the pay roll. It may be because their hair is red, because they are bald, or because they wear it down over their coat collars. It makes no difference at all. The money is the money of our constituents, and we are their agents to direct the spending of that money. The responsibility for the spending of that money rests upon our shoulders. We cannot follow through on every individual in the Government employ, because there are too many of them, but we can take a stand as to the kind of people we want, and, when necessary to protect our Government from wasters or incompetents or those with plans repudiated by the voters, to name individuals.

Let me go back. On November 3 our people said in no unmistakable terms, by a majority of over one million votes, that they were through with the crackpots, the new dealers, the planners, and this, that, and the other. In spite of the verdict of the people—and I placed in the RECORD today an editorial from the East which lists some of them—we find that almost all of those who were defeated are coming back and being appointed by the President and put on the pay roll. The people said they did not want them, nevertheless, the President intends to continue the new dealers in power.

The President is the Commander in Chief of our armed forces but is not our boss on civil matters. Nor did he receive a mandate last November. Quite the contrary. November 3 was the day, another Fourth of July when there was a declaration of independence. November 3 was the day Congress was given a mandate to kick the impractical theorists out the window.

The people did not want 69 of the Congressmen any longer. So they got themselves some new ones—and I hope the gentleman noted that when these new Members voted the other day, they were not deceived by any sophistry or specious argument, or by the plea that we might condemn someone without a hearing. Of course, those purgers and new dealers condemned us in the last campaign without a hearing, but we are trying to go along with the Golden Rule, and give them a hearing and on their loyalty they had one so far as that goes by the Dies committee. Suppose the Dies committee was mistaken? Still, we do not want those 38 because they are monkey wrenches in the Government machinery.

Mr. FORD. How does the gentleman know?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, bless your dear heart, by the counting of the votes. Did not the gentleman hear about the election? Did he not know that the people were sick and tired of the New Deal? They may not yet have heard about it in the White House, but come 1944, even the gentleman from California may hear of it, even he.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I shall not take up the 5 minutes as I simply want to take time to make an announcement to the effect that the committee that was appointed this morning during an informal meeting to discuss the pending Halleck resolution is asked to meet with Mr. LEA, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, out in the hallway here at 2 o'clock.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, after listening to the eloquent and illogical statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], I rise at this time to call attention to the fact that the House on Friday last, by a teller vote of 163 to 111, passed the Hendricks amendment to the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill, providing that "no part of any appropriation in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of William Pickens."

All I have to say is that I seriously question the authority of this House or of this Congress as a whole, including the other body, to pass such an act.

You ask me why, and my answer is—as every lawyer in this body knows or should know—that article I, section 9, of the Constitution specifically says, under the powers denied Congress, that "no bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed."

What is a bill of attainder? For the benefit of those members who are not lawyers, let me define a bill of attainder according to annotations of cases decided by the Supreme Court of the United States to January 1, 1938.

BILL OF ATTAINDER

A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. If the punishment be less than death, the act is termed a bill of pains and penalties. Within the meaning of the Constitution bills of attainder include bills of pains and penalties. A bill of attainder may affect the life of an individual, or may confiscate his property, or may do both. In passing such an act the legislative body, in addition to its legitimate functions, exercises the powers and office of judge; it assumes, in the language of the textbooks, judicial magistracy; it pronounces upon the guilt of the party without any of the forms or safeguards of trial; it determines the sufficiency of the proofs produced, whether conformable to the rules of evidence or not; and it fixes the degree of punishment in accordance with its own notions of the enormity of the offense.

The amendment is in fact a bill of pains and penalties, which being contained in the bill of attainder as to penalties less than death.

This amendment, which should be voted on in the House by a separate roll call, comes completely within the definition by the Supreme Court as a bill of pains and penalties, and it should not pass.

If it should pass, as have similar amendments, it will add one more blot on the escutcheon of Congress as a body that is going on record as preferring to legislate its prejudices in defiance of article I, section 9, of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I presume that the Members of this House are anxious to hear, or to have in the RECORD the complete incontrovertible record of William Pickens. I have the the record here, not a record based upon any verbal testimony, not a record based upon what anybody said of him, but a record which he himself made, a record which no one can dispute, and because of the importance of that record I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes, so as to discuss that record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, last week I brought to the attention of the House a long list of the bureaucrats who symbolize this disease of bureaucracy which threatens the parliamentary system of democracy as we have known it in this country from the days of our founding fathers. I want the House to know that I assume full responsibility for placing the names of these persons in the RECORD. As the question of appropriations for the respective departments and agencies arises, I will be prepared to back with incontrovertible and documentary evidence my assertions concerning these individual bureaucrats whom I name and many more whom I did not name in my recent address to the House. I described these individuals who are on the Government pay roll as irresponsible, unrepresentative, radical, and crackpot bureaucrats. I am prepared to prove just that and nothing less than that.

Today, I am prepared to take up in detail the case of William Pickens who is employed as promotion specialist in the Treasury Department at a salary of $5,600 a year. I have been informed that William Pickens gave, or caused to have given on his behalf, certain testimony before the Appropriations Committee of this House in which testimony Pickens denied that he was the same man as the person whose affiliations I cited in my speech on February 1, 1943. Such testimony, if given by Pickens or on his behalf, was absolutely false both in its general import and in its details. Such falsehood compounds the seriousness of the case against William Pickens, and we dare not let this false testimony go unnoticed.

In order to keep my speech within reasonable limits, I cited only seven Communist front affiliations which William Pickens has had as a matter of public record during the past 10 years. Furthermore, there is no question here of mistaken identity. This William Pickens of the seven Communist front affiliations is the same William Pickens who is now employed in the Treasury Department. Instead of the seven Communist affiliations which I cited on Monday a week ago, I shall cite three times seven such affiliations today.

I hardly need to point out that we labor under certain difficulties in having these radical and crackpot bureaucrats removed from the Government pay roll. One of these difficulties, perhaps the chief one, arises from the fact that their superiors or their associates in the respective departments and agencies are forever trying to whitewash them. Such an effort at whitewashing is illustrated by the letter of Harold Graves of the Treasury Department which was read on the floor of this House last Friday. Mark you, the case of William Pickens is not one of a man who comes forward and says frankly that he has had numerous important Communist affiliations in the past but that he now repents of and repudiates his former record. On the contrary, the Appropriations Committee is confronted with false testimony in an effort to conceal Pickens' past Communist record and this House itself is confronted with a feeble effort at whitewashing which ignores the incontrovertible facts in Pickens' public record. These tactics of concealment and whitewashing only add to the gravity of the charges against this Government employee.

First, I wish to call your attention to a circumstance in which the case of William Pickens is unique. In his decision in the case of the deportation of Harry Bridges, the Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, named four Communist-front organizations with which Bridges had been affiliated and found in Bridges' affiliation with these four organizations one of the principal grounds for ordering his deportation from the United States. Now imagine the utter absurdity of the Treasury Department's position when we find that William Pickens was prominently identified with three of these four Communist front organizations. In fact, William Pickens was far more prominently associated with these three Communist front organizations than was Harry Bridges. The three organizations to which I refer were the International Labor Defense, the All America Anti-Imperialist League, and the American League Against War and Fascism. I shall presently show the extent and nature of Pickens' affiliation with all three of them. If the Justice Department finds ground for deporting Harry Bridges in his affiliation with these three Communist fronts, what leg has the Treasury Department to stand on in keeping William Pickens on its pay roll.

It would be hard to find a man anywhere in the United States whose extensive affiliations with Communist-front organizations were of a more serious nature than those of William Pickens, especially in view of the effort which has been made to conceal those affiliations from the Congress. I now propose to take up those affiliations one by one in chronological order.

First. League Against Colonial Oppression and Imperialism: Early in 1927, the League Against Colonial Oppression and Imperialism held a world congress in Brussels, Belgium. William Pickens was one of four American delegates to this gathering. The Daily Worker of March 9, 1927, gave a complete roster of the delegates from all parts of the world. The list is headed by the name of William Pickens. The other three American delegates were Roger Baldwin, Richard Moore, and Manuel Gomez. Moore and Gomez were prominent leaders of the Communist Party of the United States—known at that time as the Workers Communist Party. Most of the delegates from other parts of the world were the leaders of the Communist movement in their respective countries. The League Against Colonial Oppression and Imperialism was under the direct and complete control of the Communist International.

Second. Daily Worker: William Pickens has written numerous articles which

have appeared in the Daily Worker. I cite three issues of this official Communist newspaper as samples of those in which many of his articles have appeared. They were the issues of April 5, April 7, and April 20, 1927. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] intimated in his remarks on last Friday that the name of William Pickens might have appeared in the columns of the Daily Worker simply as a part of some news story. I wish to assure him that such was not the case. His name appeared as an active and long-time collaborator with the Communist Party and its front organizations.

Third. Hands Off China Association: In his report to the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International, the secretary of the Communist Party of the United States gave a lengthy report on the work of his party in organizing Hands Off China committees in this country. Any doubt about the strictly Communist control of the Hands Off China Association may be removed by a perusal of the Daily Worker of May 9, 1927, where William Pickens' name appears as a member of the general advisory committee of this organization. In that issue of the Daily Worker, the names of the organization's speakers at a mass meeting in Union Square in New York are listed, and those names read like a roster of the leading Communist Party functionaries of that day. Furthermore, William Pickens, according to the Daily Worker was chairman of the Hands Off China Association. Furthermore, William Pickens, as chairman of this Communist front organization, was in close collaboration with Earl Browder who at that time was in China on an important organizing mission for the Communist International. The New York Herald Tribune of April 27, 1927, contains an excerpt from a letter which Browder wrote to Pickens from China, in which Browder appealed to Pickens for greater financial support for his work. Obviously, Pickens alone was in a position to release this letter to the press. It would appear that Pickens was not at that time concerned about concealing his relations with Earl Browder.

Fourth. All-America Anti-Imperialist League: The letterhead of the All-America Anti-Imperialist League for 1928 lists the name of William Pickens as a member of the national committee of the organization. The fourth national convention report of the Communist Party, a copy of which is in our committee's files, says: "Our party was largely instrumental in the establishment of the All-America Anti-Imperialist League * * *." I could provide a very voluminous file of evidence to show that this organization was one of the Communist Party's front organizations, but suffice it to point out that the Attorney General himself, in his decision on the deportation of Harry Bridges, has characterized it as a Communist front.

Fifth. International Labor Defense: William Pickens was a member of the national committee of the International Labor Defense, according to the organization's letterhead of February 1929. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn was then the national chairman of the International Labor Defense, and the organization was affiliated formally with the International Red Aid of Moscow. Earl Browder and a score of other prominent Communist Party leaders were comembers with Pickens on the national committee of the International Labor Defense. But here again, it ought to be sufficient to call your attention to the fact that the Attorney General in his Bridges decision has branded the International Labor Defense as a Communist front organization.

Sixth. League Against Imperialism: In July 1929, the League Against Imperialism held a world congress in Frankfort-am-Main, Germany. This organization was the parent body, internationally speaking, of the All America Anti-Imperialist League. William Pickens was not only a delegate to the world congress of the organization in Frankfort-am-Main, but he was also one of the leading speakers at the gathering. A portion of his speech at the congress appeared in the Daily Worker of July 30, 1929. The leaders of the congress were by and large avowed Communists of international reputation, and the Communist International was in complete control of the gathering.

Seventh. Prisoners Relief Fund: According to the July 1931 issue of Labor Defender, a Communist publication, William Pickens was a sponsor of the Prisoners Relief Fund whose avowed purpose was to assist in the support of class-war prisoners and their dependents. The Prisoners Relief Fund was organized under the auspices of the International Labor Defense and claimed as cosponsors with Pickens such prominent Communist Party members as Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Michael Gold, Jack Hardy, George Maurer, Anna Rochester, Grace Hutchins, and Bernhard J. Stern.

Eighth. National organizing committee of the United States Congress Against War: On the letterhead of this committee, the name of William Pickens appears as one of the members along with those of William Z. Foster, Herbert Benjamin, Clarence Hathaway, Robert Minor, Gilbert Green, and other equally prominent members of the Communist Party in this country.

Ninth. United States Congress Against War: The program of the United States Congress Against War, held in September-October 1933, lists William Pickens as one of the seven most prominent speakers of the gathering. Earl Browder was one of the other six speakers listed. The Daily Worker of October 2, 1933, carried an account of Pickens' speech immediately following that of Browder.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Pickens did not appear before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DIES. Who appeared for him?

Mr. TABER. The representatives of the Division of Expense and Loans came up with a statement signed by him indicating that he was not the same William Pickens.

Mr. DIES. Remember that the President last year established or had established an interdepartmental committee to determine what organizations are subversive and what organizations are not and that committee found some 12 organizations as subversive, including the National Federation of Constitutional Liberties that had the full page advertisement in this morning's paper. In that case the interdepartmental committee and the Attorney General found that the organization was not only Communist, but that its Communist nature was so well known and established they could not see how anyone could be innocent of the connection.

Furthermore, Pickens is quoted in the Daily Worker report of the meeting as having given voice to the following Marxist viewpoint:

> To take the profit motive out of war, we must take the class-profit opportunities out of our economic system.

Again I call your attention to the fact that the Attorney General has branded the United States Congress Against War a Communist front enterprise.

Tenth. National Committee United States Congress Against War: The Daily Worker of October 3, 1933, reported that William Pickens had been named to the national committee of the United States Congress Against War. This national committee was composed almost exclusively of well-known Communist Party members and a sprinkling of equally well-known Communist fellow travelers.

Eleventh. American League Against War and Fascism: Shortly after the meeting of the United States Congress Against War, William Pickens was made one of the two vice chairmen of the American League Against War and Fascism. The other vice chairman was Earl Browder. The Attorney General has branded the organization as a Communist front. Its program called for the sabotage of our national defense both in time of peace and in time of war.

Twelfth. Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy: According to the New Masses, Communist Party weekly, of September 27, 1938, William Pickens addressed a mass meeting of this organization which our committee unanimously found to be a Communist front. Speaking with Pickens on that occasion was the well-known and avowed Communist Edward K. Barsky.

Thirteenth. New Masses: William Pickens contributed an article for the issue of the New Masses of May 30, 1939. It is hardly necessary for me to point out that the New Masses is a strict Communist Party publication which has never deviated one jot or tittle from the Communist Party line.

Fourteenth. Workers School: The official school of the Communist Party where the party's members are trained in revolutionary tactics for the overthrow of the United States Government is known as the Workers School. According to the New Masses of November 14, 1939, William Pickens was a lecturer at this institution.

Fifteenth. American Rescue Ship Mission: According to the Daily Worker of December 2, 1940, William Pickens was one of the headlined speakers at a mass

meeting under the auspices of the American Rescue Ship Mission. The meeting and the organization which controlled it were both completely Communist. The tone of the meeting may be accurately gaged by the following Daily Worker account of the speech which the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] delivered on the occasion:

The fighting Congressman pledged that he would never cease his fight against the war which the American imperialists were rushing into headlong.

Sixteenth. Council for Pan American Democracy: According to the New Masses of December 3, 1940, William Pickens was one of the signers of a public manifesto issued under the auspices of the Council for Pan American Democracy on behalf of Luiz Carlos Prestes. Prestes was a member of the executive committee of the Communist International. In 1935, Prestes led an armed Communist insurrection in Brazil, and as a result of his treasonable enterprise was sentenced to a prison term of 16 years. It was on this Communist leader's behalf that William Pickens joined with a group of American Communists and fellow travelers. Earl Browder's own statement on the subject of Prestes' activities and imprisonment appeared in the Daily Worker of January 3, 1941, and is so enlightening that I quote it at this point:

Today when our own American ruling class is desperately trying to drag our country into the present imperialist war and is carrying through a policy of economic and political aggrandizement aimed at the further subjugation of the peoples and nations of this hemisphere, the struggle to liberate Luis Carlos Prestes becomes an integral part of the fight for freedom, peace, and against imperialist war * * * Facing his enemies and the enemies of his country—after being held in jail for more than 5 years—Prestes used this only opportunity to appeal to his people, encouraging them to unite and to follow the example of the great October revolution as the only path that can lead to their final liberation.

Seventeenth. United American Spanish Aid Committee: According to the New Masses of December 3, 1940, William Pickens was a prominent speaker for the United American Spanish Aid Committee. This committee was a strictly Communist Party enterprise whose executive secretary was the well-known and avowed Communist Party member, Fred Biedenkapp.

Eighteenth. National Federation for Constitutional Liberties: According to the Daily Worker of December 19, 1940, William Pickens joined in an appeal on behalf of the notorious Communist, Sam Darcy, who had been convicted in the State of California. The appeal was issued under the auspices of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which the Attorney General himself has branded as a subversive organization. Sam Darcy, whose real name is Dardeck, was candidate for Governor of California in 1937. At the seventh world congress of the Communist International, Sam Darcy delivered a speech against the United States which was so insurrectionary in character that the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, issued a vigorous protest to the Russian Government.

Nineteenth. American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born: According to the organization's letterhead, William Pickens was one of the sponsors of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. Our committee has found this organization to be a Communist front.

Twentieth. Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights: According to its own literature, William Pickens was one of the sponsors of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights This organization was one of the chapters of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which the Attorney General has branded as subversive

Twenty-first. American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom: According to its own literature, which is in our committee's files, William Pickens was also a sponsor of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. In our report to the House on June 25, 1942, our committee found this organization to be a Communist front.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the record of William Pickens' Communist affiliations. It is a long record which extends over a period of 16 years The record leaves absolutely no doubt about Pickens' close collaboration with the Communist Party and its front organizations.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said that William Pickens is a colored man, and that, therefore, there is some attempt to single him out. Let me make this very clear, that our committee has said or rather I know that I have said as chairman, and I am sure the other members of this committee concur in it, time and time again, that the great majority of the colored people of this country are loyal, patriotic Americans. In all the names that I have given to the Congress there have been only two or three who happen to be colored people. I want to make that absolutely clear, because I think it would be most unfortunate if it were to go out to the country that this amendment is based upon any prejudice whatsoever against William Pickens on account of his race. He happens to have been active in Communist movements, like James Ford was, but when you consider that 99½ percent of the colored people have been loyal at all times to the Government, that they have time and again rejected every appeal made by the Communist leaders in their attempt to capitalize upon prejudice or the feelings that might exist between races, in order to build up their strength, when you consider that, I think it is only fair that I and other Members of this House should pay a sincere tribute to the millions of loyal patriotic colored people in the United States.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I did not understand the statement of the gentleman with reference to what the Attorney General said about the organization.

(During the delivery of the foregoing Mr. DIES asked and received unanimous consent to print in full certain quotations and excerpts.)

Mr. DIES. The Attorney General designated in his Bridges opinion 4 organizations that were controlled by the Communist Party. William Pickens was prominently identified with 3 of those organizations. Then the Interdepartmental Committee, established at the instance of the President or Attorney General a year or a year and a half ago, found some 12 or 13 organizations to be subversive organizations. On the floor of this House last September, I placed in the RECORD the findings of this committee, a committee that did not confer with us, did not consult with us, but a committee selected down in the departments, and which confirmed what we had found. More than that, they found in stronger language than we ever did that those 12 organizations were controlled by Communists. Now, gentlemen, I read into the RECORD at the time the name of 19 officials of this Government who were officers and officials in one of the organizations which the Interdepartmental Committee and the Attorney General found were communistic, so communistic that no one could be mistaken about its identity. I then ask the Attorney General and the Department of Justice, "Under your own findings, you say these organizations are subversive, and here are the letterheads of the organizations showing Government employees who are officers in them."

Mr. COX. Let me ask the gentleman, was the organization that carried the full-page ad in this morning's Washington Post one of them?

Mr. DIES. Certainly.

Mr. FORD. Assuming all you say is true, are we still entitled to violate the Constitution by passing a bill that violates article 1, section 9?

Mr. DIES. The gentleman knows what I said on Friday. I said that I thought the proper procedure and what I wanted was for the appropriations committee to hear the evidence that we had, and then to bring the parties themselves before the committee. Certainly if that is done, if we cannot make out a case, then the Appropriations Committee can say, "Well, we heard this evidence, but we will not agree with it." What I want the gentleman to agree to is this, that if there are organizations that the Department of Justice and the Interdepartmental Committee and our own committee and everyone else in authority who has studied it, have found to be subversive organizations—organizations that the gentleman himself would not defend, and here are Government officials who are officers in those organizations—and many of the organizations are actively engaged in smearing Congress—that these Government officials must be dismissed.

Mr. FORD. Oh, everybody smears Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last sentence.

Mr. Chairman, I voted for the creation of the Dies committee and for its several extensions. I expect to vote for another extension, because I feel it is doing a

necessary work. But there is an angle to this question that I would like to discuss in the brief time that has been allotted to me, and that should not be overlooked.

This body is made up of 435 men and women, of whom 434 belong to the Caucasian race and 1 to the Negro race. I voted to expel from or to prevent any Government bureau employing the 38 Communists Chairman DIES read to the House one day last week. I am wondering what the country will say when the people find out that we rejected, by a small margin, the proposal to place an embargo upon their employment in Government service, but that when the name of this man Pickens came up, a colored man, a descendant from people who were brought here in chains and against their will, brought here in servitude, this great body singled out a poor colored man for punishment and practically gave what amounts to a whitewash to the 37 white companions who were equally or more guilty. I understand all these fine distinctions, or I hope I do, but the cold fact remains that we voted on Friday to bar from public employment one poor colored man and we refused to take similar action with 37 white men. My God, that is almost lynch law. It is what is termed shotgun justice out in my country.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes, I yield if I have any more time.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I think I can help the gentleman out. I know that the gentleman wants to be perfectly fair about this and he has shown a fair attitude, I know, when he went along with the other 38 or 39 persons.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is right.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I think we ought to expel all of them, but let me tell the gentleman why we returned to the one name. It was because this one man was the only one affected by this particular bill. When the whole amendment was not adopted, I turned around and got the one man affected by this bill. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that anybody can accuse us of having any feeling against the colored race, when we had two Negroes on the list and 37 or 38 or 39 white people. The only reason we singled this one man out was because he was the only one that was actually and directly affected by the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me say to the gentleman from Florida that the proposal to bar the 38 from Government employment was not made on a point of order. Had it been I would not be on my feet today. It was made by a vote of the House.

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. That changes the picture altogether.

Mr. HENDRICKS. But when the other bills come up we are going to take them also.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, maybe we will and again, maybe we will not. I am not going to gamble on what this House will do later. I cannot approve of what we have done. It is un-American and contrary to the spirit of the Bill of Rights.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes and to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes and to proceed out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, it is with the greatest measure of hesitation that I, a new Member, rise to address this august body at this time. I am sustained only by the knowledge that I can bring to this committee an understanding of the background of this subject matter better than any other person in this assembly.

I have known William Pickens for more than 40 years. I know his activities among my people; and when I say "My people" I am not one who is sensitive to color; I am not one who is ashamed of what God made me. I stand before you further sustained by the knowledge that no one can question the loyalty of WILLIAM L. DAWSON to the United States of America. During the last war although I was above draft age and did not have to go, yet, believing it was the duty of every citizen to rally to the colors in time of danger I volunteered, was commissioned a first lieutenant of infantry and led black Americans in battle. I saw them fight and I saw them die for this flag and country of ours. And if the years had not shattered this old frame of mine, and accident had not maimed me, instead of standing in Congress of the United States, I would today, if I had my way, be back once again defending the flag, the only flag we know.

William Pickens has been charged with being a Communist. The gentleman who recited the great organizations that he belonged to, and so forth, referred back to 1927. I wish I could command words well enough to convey to you something of the psychology of an underprivileged people, something of the psychology of a people who are told they have every right in fact, but who know they do not have those rights in actuality. I wish you could envision in your own minds how we struggle wherever we can to make the Constitution and our democracy a living reality. I know something about communism; I know how the Communists have tried to infiltrate among our people, playing upon the ills we have suffered, and so forth; and I know how often they did not come to us under the name of Communists, but came with loud-sounding names, talking of freedom, talking of democracy, and talking of inalienable rights, things that are dear to the heart of every American, be he white or be he black. At some time or other the names of many of us might have been found connected with some of these organizations before we knew their true complexion, because the more prominent the individuals were the more insidious was their approach. I am telling you things you know.

You refer back to 1927; that is a long time ago. Many names might be found on the rolls of some organization that has since been deemed a subversive organization.

I say to you that William Pickens is not a Communist and has never been a Communist. William Pickens has not knowingly affiliated himself with a Communist organization, knowing it was Communist. Certainly he might have spoken at communistic meetings; I have done the same thing; in fact, I do not fear Communists, I do not fear them, I fight them and I know that is the only way we can hold to our ideals. We have not yielded to them in their effort to infiltrate our group; and certainly I know the voice of William Pickens has been heard ever in defense of the high ideals of this country.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that his name has been used, but I know of my own knowledge that when he found it out he sent in his resignation. This has been done by many a loyal American, white and black, who went into the thing for an ideal only to find that the thing had been organized for another purpose.

Mr. Chairman, this thing is far reaching in its effects. I know this Congress will not condemn any man because of his race, and I am not standing here pleading for that reason, because I have seen the American sense of fair play demonstrated on many an occasion. The only hope "black" America has is the fundamental ideal of fair play that we know rests deep down in the bosom of the majority of the American public. So I am not saying that this thing is done on account of color, but I am saying to you that those who make the charge are not in a position to know of their own knowledge whereof they speak. I do not know who their agents are. I know William Pickens was never called before the committee and given an opportunity to answer any charge against him. I do not know who their agents are, but let me tell you their agents do not know William Pickens like we know him.

They only know what might be seen in a list of a certain number of organizations. But we know William Pickens in the flesh. We know that William Pickens has been the means of going up and down the length and breadth of this country teaching Americanism. I tell you of my own knowledge, and from my knowledge of doing work among my own group, that he was deserted by a certain crowd that was insistent on certain demands and William Pickens demanded that the Government be placed first. He was for the preservation of America above all domestic problems, and for that reason he was deserted by many of those who at one time had been associated with him.

He has been the means of millions of dollars of our money going into War bonds. One insurance company alone has bought over a million dollars' worth

of bonds. Others have bought up to the limit and will buy. The rank and file of us are going down in our pockets to buy. We do not care what the organizations may be, I may say to the gentleman from Texas, but this we do know, that William Pickens has never been a Communist. William Pickens is a true American and I state that with all the integrity of a man who would fight and die for America today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, if you will be so good as to think for just one moment with me, I shall try in my own humble way to assign another reason why this House took the action it did last Friday. We did not as a body—I know I as a Member did not—charge or believe in the charges that were made against William Pickens or any other of the 38. I did not try them before any bar of justice. They were not arraigned. I was not a juror nor was I a judge. I was a servant of the American people, and I believed then and I believe now that William Pickens and those other 38 members have no property right in those jobs which they now enjoy. I knew then and I know now that there are other Americans in this country whose loyalty has never been questioned, who in 1927 or in any other year did not subscribe their names to any roster not knowing what it was. Since they have no property right in those jobs, I believed then, and you and I believe now, that their loyalty has been questioned and that is a mandate that their names be stricken from any pay roll where they receive money of the taxpayers as their reward.

That is what this House did. This House tried no one. This House listened to no charges and as for me, and I think the majority of this membership, any man who has ever willfully with knowledge or without knowledge had his name appear in some funny organization that turned out to be not what they proclaimed, I say that in itself is quite enough for me insofar as my vote is concerned to strike his name from any taxpayers' pay roll.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I want to point out one other thing. The gentleman from Illinois made an able speech, and we all admire him for it. He says that the chairman of the committee investigating un-American activities, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] pointed out organizations in 1927. But William Pickens belonged to some of these organizations in 1940. If he has the educational background he claims he has, and he is worth $5,600 a year to the Government as a specialist, he has better sense than that.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. The more education and the more ability he has the more dangerous he is if his loyalty has ever been questioned.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. It ought to be pointed out that the Treasury Department appeared for him before the Appropriations Committee, as I understand it, and submitted an affidavit in which Pickens denied all these things. If he had come before the committee and said, "Yes, I was in them, but I was misled" or if any of these people would say that it might be different.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. The Treasury Department never appeared before the Appropriations Committee that I know anything about.

Mr. DIES. That is what the gentleman said a few moments ago. Did the Treasury Department submit an affidavit of William Pickens?

Mr. TABER. No; they came up here with a signed statement that they had in their files. I asked them to come up and show it to me. Mr. Adams, representing the Division of Loans and Currency, came up here and showed me his file.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I decline to yield any further.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry this House insists on operating on the theory that charges were placed or sustained or denied or were not denied. We have not operated on charges. Constitutionally, and as the mechanism is set up, you and I cannot entertain charges. But it has been sufficient for you and me to be informed that the character and the loyalty of the 38 persons have been questioned. That is enough for me to suggest, making it mandatory perhaps, that they be stricken from the pay roll, just as though I would fire an employee of mine who had been disloyal to this Government or disloyal to me.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. The gentleman knows as I know and every other informed Member of this body knows, that if these "reds" are ever stricken from the pay rolls of the Government, this Congress has got to do it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in defense of the dignity of this House, and I shall always take a place in the front line to fight for its prerogatives. Because of my jealousy for the standing of this legislative body I was troubled over the week end at the vote that was taken on Friday last, which in effect removes one, William Pickens, from the public pay roll.

I rise to express the hope that somehow this great body may be persuaded to strike from the pending Treasury-Post Office Department appropriation bill this amendment. I cannot believe that this House, custodian of the people's rights and liberties, will permit itself to follow a course of action which arbitrarily denies a citizen a right to be heard on charges against him. Such procedure makes us unworthy of our trust. It establishes a precedent foreign to American principles of justice.

That it is within the power of Congress to place this limitation in an appropriation bill, denying some officeholder a salary, I do not dispute. Nor do I question but that this is the only way we have to remove from public office people who are undesirable because of their subversive activities, in view of the apparent unwillingness of the executive branch of the Government to deal with the problem. It is because of this failure of the executive branch to carry out the expressed will and intent of Congress that we are required to act.

But, Mr. Chairman, we must not ourselves become arrogant and arbitrary in our acts. I am in sympathy with the suggestion made last Friday that each of these individuals alleged to be undesirable be given the opportunity to appear before the Committee on Appropriations to answer the charges made against them by the Dies committee and be confronted with that committee's evidence. We will then be in a position to act and to act judiciously. If the committee should find the charges to be substantiated and to be true in fact, and accordingly present its findings and recommendations to the House, we shall then be in a position to act on a limitation of this character.

In the instant case, Mr. Chairman, whereby William Pickens, of the Treasury Department, is being removed from his office, he has never had his day in court, so to speak. He has never appeared before any committee of this House to answer the charges made against him. He has never had an opportunity to deny, disprove, or even explain those things which some consider acceptable evidence of his undesirability as a public servant. I cannot approve such procedure. It is un-American in the fullest sense of the word.

Let us not forget that when we take such action as this against an individual we brand him for the rest of his life. As long as he lives he will be exploining this incident in his life. To convict a man is a serious act, and to convict a man without giving him an opportunity to be heard is arbitrary, to say the least.

I doubt if there are three Members who have ever seen Mr. Pickens. I did something I think any committee could have done. I sent for Mr. Pickens and he came up to my office. This I did as a single Member, having nothing to do with the investigation of subversive activities, but merely seeking the truth. I went over the charges made against him and Mr. Pickens denied categorically having any connection with any communistic body. I then contacted his immediate employer, the son-in-law of Mr. Frederick Delano, uncle of the President, a man by the name of Lawrence Houghteling, whom I have known all my life, and I asked him about William Pickens.

This man William Pickens has had an interesting and a very American history. Born of slave parentage, as a child he

carried on a little business of rowing a ferry boat across a river. After attending a secondary school he entered Talladega College, which he left to enter my own alma mater, Yale University. He graduated from Yale with Phi Beta Kappa key, taking the Ten Eyck prize, and standing among the first seven men of his class.

I would like only one thing to be done. I do not like ex parte, star chamber procedure to take place in our Government. If Mr. Pickens is convicted of committing one of the most heinous crimes for which a man can be indicted, that of being disloyal to his country in time of war, then let him pay the penalty, but give him a day in court.

I hope that when this Committee rises an opportunity will be given to do the American thing—to give this man a chance, together with the 38 others the Dies committee has listed, to defend himself before his peers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a lot of talk here today, and I want to get one or two things cleared up in the minds of everybody.

In the first place, there has been a lot of talk here about discrimination against the colored race. I say to you that any man coming from the South knows that a southerner does not refer to a colored man as "mister." When I started talking about this man and getting information on him I did not even know he was a colored man. I got in the habit of saying "Mr. Pickens" and made that statement on the floor two or three times, which is evidence to you that I did not even know he was a colored man and did not care about it.

If we are going to keep one of these Communists in the Government, let us keep them all, and keep William Pickens; but if we intend to get the others out in the bills by which they are covered, then let us get Pickens out, because Pickens is just as much of a Communist as anybody else.

You say he has had no day in court. We keep talking about court procedure here. I disagree with anybody that this is a court. If it were, let me give you just one little example of court procedure, and let you clear up your minds once and for all concerning certain people who have been heard in court.

We have had a sensational trial out in California for about 3 weeks, in which the actor, Errol Flynn, was charged with certain statutory crimes against young girls. Last Saturday, I believe it was, a jury came in and cleared Mr. Flynn of those charges after he had had his day in court. The jury, in effect, said that Mr. Flynn is not guilty. But I ask every Member of this House to ask himself this question: "In spite of the fact that the jury said Mr. Flynn was not guilty, would you want your daughter to take a trip with Mr. Flynn on his yacht to Catalina Island?"

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking within the purview of the bill and is not in order.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am talking within the purview of the bill. If the gentleman wants to have something to say against what I am saying, he can take time to speak against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am in order, I have been in order, and I expect to stay in order.

That was just one little example. It might have sounded facetious, but let us carry it a little further. I know good and well there are many men in this House who are loyal and who have sat upon juries and, after men have been acquitted of certain charges made against them, were still convinced that the men were guilty. It may be that we could not take any one of these men before a jury and convict him of being a Communist, but in our minds when we go back and look at the record we know good and well that they are Communists, and there is no question in our minds about it.

With regard to the day in court, let me give you an example of something that happened. When it was found out by the Treasury Department that an amendment of this sort was going to be offered they sent young Mr. Charles Adams to see the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. They thought he was going to offer the amendment. Then Mr. Adams came over to see me. He pushed in front of me the investigation made by the special investigator of the Treasury Department and said, "See here, they cleared him." I said, "I have a file, and I want to ask you some questions. Did you know so and so?" "No, I did not know that." I said, "Well, makes notes on it.

He did make notes on it, and said, "I will go back to the Department this afternoon and go into this matter fully." I said, "Well, hurry up; I am going to tell the House today that I am going to offer this amendment."

He went to the Department and took a deposition from William Pickens. He came back up here while I was on the floor telling the House I was going to offer the amendment when we reached the reading of the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule. Then I went out to see him. He said, "Here is the deposition we had from Mr. Pickens." I said, "Thank you. I will take it over to the office and read it." He said, "Wait a minute. That is the original, and I cannot let it go." I said, "Give me a copy." He replied that he did not bring a copy with him; and I said, "Why in the hell didn't you. You know I wanted one?" His reply was, "I don't know; I just forgot it." Then I said further, "Will you give me one tomorrow?" He said, "Yes." I waited for him all of the morning, and I instructed my secretary if Mr. Adams made any attempt to get in touch with me, to be sure that he got in touch with me, and until this day I have not had another word from Mr. Adams. I say to you that that deposition was nothing but a simple evasion.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Yes.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman will not agree with his colleague Mr. CANNON and myself, and many of us, in the statement if the Communists are ever taken off the Government pay roll, Congress has to do the job.

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is correct. Congress is going to have to do the job in spite of the Board that the President appointed, and I shall not consent to the withdrawal of my amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the Bureau of Narcotics, $4,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I shall try not even to use the 5 minutes, because as I said at the beginning of the day, I have a special order which I intend to use at the close of the day, to discuss this whole question thoroughly; but there is one thing that I am impelled to say at this time, because I do not think any more time should elapse before it is said. I am not addressing myself to the individual case of William Pickens, but to the general proposition. The list of the 39 people submitted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was, as he said himself earlier today, submitted by himself, and not by the action of the Committee on un-American Activities. Indeed, I have tried myself since the list was submitted, to see the evidence. The gentleman from Texas, of course, told me I could see it, but so far I have not been able to. It has not been available.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; not at this time. According to the statement of the gentleman from Texas himself he submitted this list, and he said it was not a list of people who necessarily were even charged by him with being Communists or having Communist affiliations. He said today, and he said before, it was a list of people who were covered by the category of being "crackpots." Those people are in that category in the opinion of the gentleman from Texas. He is entitled to that opinion, of course. But the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has defined the issue in all its great seriousness when he said he believed the House had a right to take people off the Federal payroll if in the opinion of the House there was something objectionable about them, regardless of what charge was made against them, regardless of whether they were loyal to our Nation, regardless of whether they were doing a good job. There you have the issue and for my part I am of course completely opposed to such arbitrary and unfair action. Over and over again it has been said today that this is an issue of disloyalty. It is no such thing. If it can be shown that these people are disloyal to this Nation, if it can be shown that they are Communists or Nazis or Fascists, that is a different matter. But this is not at issue.

This is an issue as to whether people are in the category of being crackpots

in somebody's opinion. Anybody in the House could rise and make up such a category and dump some Federal employees into it, but if the House proposes to proceed that way we are going to make terrible mistakes. On Friday last we might have passed an amendment if seven more votes had been given it, which would have proscribed a man in the Federal Army of the United States and another man elected by the votes of the Army and the Navy and the Maritime Commission to the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, and a woman whose character and loyalty are vouched for by a priest of the Catholic Church in a letter I have in my possession. Such mistakes ought not to be made. The House should not say that people who are more progressive in their thoughts than the majority of Members should be accused of disloyalty any more than you would want to say that people who are conservative in their thoughts, more so than the majority, ought to be proscribed. Let us be clear; let us be fair; let us call a spade a spade; and let us keep the issue where it really and truly belongs. It seems to me that it is perfectly fair and just, and the gentleman from Texas himself made this condition, that every last person should be heard by the Committee on Appropriations before the House takes action in a matter of that kind.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The country has the impression that this list was submitted to the Dies committee. Do I understand that the committee as such has never considered this list?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is correct. I think the gentleman from Texas himself made that point. It has not come before the committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Was it ever presented to the committee?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; it was not.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is the gentleman a member of that committee?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I was, but I am not at the moment because there is no such committee now.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman means that no list was ever submitted to him as a member or a former member of a former committee, as presented by Mr. Dies?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; it was not. I think it is important for the House to understand that. The gentleman had a right to make his speech. I believe the gentleman said himself he took the sole responsibility for it, but I believe before action like this is taken a committee of the House ought to go over these matters. I am positive that list, taken as a whole, is not a list where the charges of disloyalty, communism, and Communist affiliations can be fairly made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object to the gentleman's request, but I think we had better get along with this bill. We have had a great deal of speechmaking today on all sorts of things. After this I think I shall have to adhere to the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the request of the gentleman is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that has been made clear by this debate, and that is that the American people are opposed to communism in this country, and that practically every Member of Congress is either opposed to it or else lacks the courage to defend it.

That does not mean that we are criticising Russia about her form of government. That is Russia's business. But we are opposed to these American Communists who are dedicated to the overthrow of this Government; and it is our duty to see that they are every one driven from power, and from the Federal pay roll.

I am convinced that this Negro, William Pickens, who is now employed in the Treasury Department at $5,600 a year, is a Communist. The Dies committee has so found, after a most careful investigation. It is known that he has addressed Communist meetings in this country and abroad, and that he has been affiliated with 21 subversive organizations. But his supporters say that he was ignorant of the fact that they were Communist meetings; and yet they say he is a graduate of Yale. I suppose if he had taken a post-graduate course at Harvard he would have known when he was addressing a Communist meeting.

In my opinion he did know, he is bound to have known, that these were Communist meetings, and that these were Communist organizations he was joining, and serving. By all means he should be stricken from the Government pay roll.

When the Nation's life is at hazard, it is no time to quibble over a man who has been connected with 1 subversive organization, much less with 21 of them, even though he pleads ignorance of the probable consequences of his own acts and at the same time exhibits a diploma from Yale as an evidence of his qualifications.

To keep this Negro on the pay roll of this Government in a key position at $5,600 a year is simply unthinkable to me. Yesterday you voted to strike him from the pay roll because he was red; today you propose to vote him back on because he is black, although the facts have not changed.

I voted to strike him off when I thought he was a white man, and I shall certainly not vote to put him back on because he is a Negro.

The other day some Member arose and said that because we mention the word "communism" we are criticizing Russia. That is a mistake. As I said, we are not trying to dictate the form of government that Russia has. We are not trying to dictate the form of government that China has. But we do propose to perpetuate the form of government we have here—the one our forefathers established for us.

I call your attention to the fact that communism is disappearing in Russia today, if it has not gone entirely. I pointed out sometime ago that when these Communists who had been preying upon the people of Russia, as some of them in this country are preying upon us, saw guns given to the Ukrainians, the Cossacks, and the White Russians, and realized that those guns would shoot in any direction, they would take to cover. A short time ago it was announced that every political commissar had been driven from the Russian army. Why? Because those Russian people have gone back to their workship of God. They have gone back to the Christian religion. They have gone back to the fundamentals of civilization. When this war is over those men who are today baring their breasts to German bayonets are going to have their land back, their homes back, and their freedom back, and, above all, their right to worship God to suit themselves.

Now, to show that I was right in that contention, I want to read an article that appeared in the Washington Post this morning. It is very short and I want to call your attention to it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I will yield after I read this article. It is headed "Mold of communism broken," Russian writer declares here:

A noted Russian writer yesterday declared her homeland had "broken the mold of communism" and expressed the belief that the war may mark the end of the revolutionary form of government which Lenin established in 1917.

Addressing the Charles Carroll Forum in the Willard Hotel, Helen Iswolsky said communism never had expressed the "deep aspirations of the Russian masses" and that the people always had resisted both its methods and antireligious measures.

CURRENT TRENDS CITED

As indications of what the future may hold for Russia, she cited these current trends:

Current literary works no longer have Communist themes; many national heroes—"they weren't Communists"—have been revived; the slogans of Lenin do not furnish battle cries for Russian armies; military leaders rather than political commissars are now in control of the fighting fronts and largely of the home front.

And Stalin no longer leads the Russian people; he follows them, said the speaker, who is the author of Soviet Man Now and Light Before Dusk, and the daughter of the late Alexander Iswolsky, Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1906–10 and Ambassador to Paris during the last war.

"If the sins of bolshevism are great, and I do not seek to diminish them," she declared, "they have been washed in the blood and tears of the Russian people—in the blood and tears of the innocent," for the masses are not,

she said, and never have been, godless Communists. "Russia has entered upon a period of deep revival and purification."

ALWAYS CHRISTIAN LAND

Her homeland, Miss Iswolsky said, always has remained a Christian land, peopled by free, loving, and humane individuals.

She indirectly attributed the "miracle of faith" which lifted the siege of Leningrad and made of Stalingrad a graveyard of German ambitions to another "great miracle"—this one wrought by Hitler, who united all the Russian people against him and awakened their strong national spirit.

The speaker found in the guerrilla fighters, who have wrought such havoc upon German armies, something of the true spirit of Russia and said that they and people like them would have a large share in molding the Russia of the future.

"What they want," Miss Iswolsky reported, "is the freedom of all, the protection of the weak, and a good Christian peace."

But the unfortunate thing is that these Communists have flooded into this country, and some of them seem to have wormed their way into key positions in various departments of government.

Do you think when one of our boys on Guadalcanal sees a bush shake and observes a bayonet sticking over the brush and behind it a slant-eyed Japanese, that he is going to wait to investigate to see whether or not he is a friend or an enemy?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman, of course, knows that the question is the propriety or impropriety of striking these names off of the pay roll.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MAY. If the Congress has the power to appropriate money for the salaries of the directors of the different departments, has it not the power to withhold money from individuals employed in the departments?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly; and the Dies committee has found, on positive proof, that this Negro, William Pickens, has been connected with 21 of these Communist organizations that were dedicated to the proposition of destroying this Government.

There is a Japanese organization in this country known as The Black Dragon Society that is operating among the Negroes all over this country. It has been organizing the Negroes in every State in this Union, and members of that society have been praying for Japan to win the war. They have gone into the hardware stores in many places and bought up all the firearms and ammunition in stock. Do any of you doubt that? If so, make some investigation. They are all over the country. They are in Washington and on streetcars and busses today; they are stirring up all the trouble they can. Less than 3 days ago a secretary to a Member of Congress heard one of them say:

> Well, just wait until the Japs get through cleaning them up, and then we will have our own way.

Are we going to sit here and wait until this trouble comes, this revolution that Japan and her satellites have been praying and working for? This Black Dragon Society has been operating in this country for more than 30 years. Until Russia entered the war, it was linked up with the Communists throughout the world; and in my opinion it is linked up with the American Communists now.

The F. B. I. planted a dictaphone in a large hall in Harlem, N. Y., and recorded 3 hours of speeches made by members of this Black Dragon Society to a large audience of Negroes celebrating the Japanese victory at Pearl Harbor.

Several of those Negro speakers were tried and convicted.

In a trial held in East St. Louis a few days ago, in which some Negro members of this Black Dragon Society were convicted of subversive activities, they testified that there were hundreds of thousands of members of this organization among the Negroes of this country.

Their plan is to stir up trouble with the white people in every way they can. The better element of the Negroes are worried over the situation, and if something is not done to drag these traitors into the open, prosecute them, and break up this subversive movement, I fear we are headed for serious race trouble; and that is exactly what Japan and Germany want.

The Dies committee has rendered a wonderful service to this Nation. It has not been a pleasant duty for them to perform, to run down and expose individuals who occupy important positions in this Government of ours, which they were working to destroy. Now when this committee has performed that patriotic duty and laid the evidence before Congress, it is our duty to back them up; and I, for one, expect to do so and to vote to remove this Negro, William Pickens, as well as the rest of them from the Federal pay roll.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I serve notice that at the conclusion of the gentleman's speech I am going to ask that the reading of the bill be continued.

Mr. DIES. Let us have the full record of this case so the House may have the facts.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think it has been very full up to now.

Mr. DIES. I have no desire to talk at all, but I have here the full and complete record, and I think the House ought to have it. I did not finish when I had time before.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will proceed.

Mr. DIES. Let me say in the beginning, Mr. Chairman, that in only very few cases can you prove by direct evidence a man's membership in the Communist Party. We have had them before us many times. We undertook to subpena their membership records, but they came before us and perjured themselves and said they did not have any membership records. They come before us and deny that they are members of the Communist Party. It is a secret organization. Very few of them, with the exception of the recognized leaders, ever admit that they are members of the organization, yet we have membership cards that have been obtained under subpena showing that not less than 165,000 people in the United States are members. So if one were compelled to prove communism by membership cards, in 99 percent of the cases one would be unable to do so. The next best proof is to find out what the associations of a man have been, what organizations he has been affiliated with.

I have given for the RECORD 21 Communist front organizations that William Pickens has been prominently identified with. Let me read some more of them, so you will have the complete case up to 1940. Let us take, for instance, the Prisoners' Relief Fund.

Seventh. Prisoners' Relief Fund: According to the July 1931 issue of Labor Defender—a Communist publication—William Pickens was a sponsor of the Prisoners' Relief Fund, whose avowed purpose was to assist in the support of "class war prisoners and their dependents." The Prisoners' Relief Fund was organized under the auspices of the International Labor Defense and claimed as cosponsors with Pickens such prominent Communist Party members as Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Michael Gold, Jack Hardy, George Maurer, Anna Rochester, Grace Hutchins, and Bernhard J. Stern.

Eighth National Organizing Committee of the United States Congress Against War: On the letterhead of this committee the name of William Pickens appears as one of the members along with those of William Z. Foster, Herbert Benjamin, Clarence Hathaway, Robert Minor, Gilbert Green, and other equally prominent members of the Communist Party in this country.

Ninth. United States Congress Against War: The program of the United States Congress Against War, held in September–October 1933, lists William Pickens as one of the seven most prominent speakers of the gathering. Earl Browder was one of the other six speakers listed. The Daily Worker of October 2, 1933, carried an account of Pickens' speech, immediately following that of Browder.

Furthermore, Pickens is quoted in the Daily Worker report of the meeting as having given voice to the following Marxist viewpoint:

> To take the profit motive out of war we must take the class-profit opportunities out of our economic system.

And I am quoting Mr. William Pickens:

> To take the profit motive out of war we must take the class-profit opportunities out of our economic system.

Again I call your attention to the fact that the Attorney General has branded the United States Congress Against War as a Communist front enterprise.

Congress Against War and Fascism. That is an organization our committee found to be Communist, as did the President's Interdepartmental Committee, and the Department of Justice concurred in the findings.

Tenth. National Committee United States Congress Against War: The Daily

Worker of October 3, 1933, reported that William Pickens had been named to the national committee of the United States Congress Against War. This national committee was composed almost exclusively of well-known Communist Party members and a sprinkling of equally well-known Communist fellow travelers.

Eleventh. American League Against War and Fascism: Shortly after the meeting of the United States Congress Against War, William Pickens was made one of the two vice chairmen of the American League Against War and Fascism. The other vice chairman was Earl Browder. The Attorney General has branded the organization as a Communist front. Its program called for the sabotage of our national defense both in time of peace and in time of war.

Twelfth. Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy: According to the New Masses, Communist Party weekly, of September 27, 1938, William Pickens addressed a mass meeting of this organization which our committee unanimously found to be a Communist front. Speaking with Pickens on that occasion was the well-known and avowed Communist, Edward K. Barsky.

Thirteenth. New Masses: William Pickens contributed an article for the issue of the New Masses of May 30, 1939. It is hardly necessary for me to point out that the New Masses is a strict Communist Party publication which has never deviated one jot or tittle from the Communist Party line.

Fourteenth. Workers School: The official school of the Communist Party where the party's members are trained in revolutionary tactics for the overthrow of the United States Government is known as the Workers School. According to the New Masses of November 14, 1939, William Pickens was a lecturer at this institution.

Fifteenth. American Rescue Ship Mission: According to the Daily Worker of December 2, 1940, William Pickens was one of the headlined speakers at a mass meeting under the auspices of the American Rescue Ship Mission. The meeting and the organization which controlled it were both completely Communist. The tone of the meeting may be accurately gaged by the following Daily Worker account of the speech which the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] delivered on the occasion:

> The fighting Congressman pledged that he would never cease his fight against the war which the American imperialists were rushing into headlong.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes to complete this statement, because the Members ought to have it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, how does the gentleman react to the proposition that hours are being devoted here to a discussion of the political opinions of one darkey man over in Chicago when we had only 45 minutes in which to discuss one of the most important and complex monetary questions of this Government last Friday? I refer to the silver amendment.

Mr. DIES. I can only say to the gentleman that the real issue here is not William Pickens; that he is immaterial insofar as the real issue is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the issue here is this: We are asked to appropriate billions of dollars which must come from the taxpayers of America. We are asked to send our boys to the trenches to fight in defense of our constitutional form of government. Yet in the Government itself are men who over a long period of time have been identified with movements and organizations that are opposed to our form of government and are seeking to destroy it.

That is the issue involved, an issue as to whether or not we as Members of this Congress will place our stamp of approval upon employment by the Federal Government of anyone who is identified with any organization that does not believe in our form of government.

Council for Pan American Democracy: According to the New Masses of December 3, 1940, William Pickens was one of the signers of a public manifesto issued under the auspices of the Council for Pan American Democracy on behalf of Luis Carlos Prestes. Prestes was a member of the executive committee of the Communist International. In 1935 Prestes led an armed Communist insurrection on Brazil, and as a result of his treasonable enterprise was sentenced to a prison term of 16 years. It was on this Communist leader's behalf that William Pickens joined with a group of American Communists and fellow travelers. Earl Browder's own statement on the subject of Prestes' activities and imprisonment appeared in the Daily Worker of January 3, 1941, and is so enlightening that I quote at this point:

> Today, when our own American ruling class is desperately trying to drag our country into the present imperialist war, and is carrying through a policy of economic and political aggrandizement aimed at the further subjugation of the peoples and nations of this hemisphere, the struggle to liberate Luis Carlos Prestes becomes an integral part of the fight for freedom, peace, and against imperialist war. * * * Facing his enemies and the enemies of his country—after being held in jail for more than 5 years—Prestes used this only opportunity to appeal to his people, encouraging them to unite and to follow the example of the great October revolution as the only path that can lead to their final liberation.

Seventeenth. United American Spanish Aid Committee: According to the New Masses of December 3, 1940, William Pickens was a prominent speaker for the United American Spanish Aid Committee. This committee was a strictly Communist Party enterprise, whose executive secretary was the well-known and avowed Communist Party member, Fred Biedenkapp.

Eighteenth. National Federation for Constitutional Liberties: The Department of Justice said that this organization was clearly communistic; that it was doubtful if anyone could be mistakenly a member of that organization.

According to the Daily Worker of December 19, 1940, William Pickens joined in an appeal on behalf of the notorious Communist, Sam Darcy, who had been convicted in the State of California. The appeal was issued under the auspices of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties which the Attorney General himself has branded as a subversive organization. Sam Darcy, whose real name is Dardeck, was a candidate for Governor of California in 1937. At the seventh world congress of the Communist International, Sam Darcy delivered a speech against the United States which was so insurrectionary in character that the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, issued a vigorous protest to the Russian Government.

Nineteenth. American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born: According to the organization's letterhead, William Pickens was one of the sponsors of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. Our committee has found this organization to be a Communist front.

Twentieth. Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights: According to its own literature, William Pickens was one of the sponsors of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights. This organization was one of the chapters of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties which the Attorney General has branded as subversive.

Twenty-first. American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom: According to its own literature which is in our committee's files, William Pickens was also a sponsor of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. In our report to the House on June 25, 1942, our committee found this organization to be a Communist front.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the record of William Pickens' Communist affiliations. It is a long record which extends over a period of 16 years.

That is the record William Pickens has made for himself. Nowhere else, so far as I have been able to learn, has he ever repudiated his associations, his expressions, his identity with these organizations. If a man over a long period of time identifies himself actively with such organizations, then I submit to you that he should not be on the Federal pay roll.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I request that the Clerk read.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GIFFORD. How could the Chair rule me out and rule him in?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I asked a parliamentary inquiry. Why recog ze me, then rule me out and rule him in?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had not recognized the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I though he looked at me with a favorable expression on his face.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to recognize the gentleman later.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have been on my feet so many times I am really tired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on title I be concluded in 20 minutes, and I include all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman's request to be that all debate on title I and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Title I refers to the Treasury Department appropriation bill only?

Mr. LUDLOW. I understood there were no more amendments to title I and I think we can easily conclude it in 20 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. So there may be no question about this, the purport of the gentleman's request is simply to limit debate so far as the Treasury Department appropriation is concerned?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. That would permit reading of the Post Office Department appropriation bill and the offering of amendments thereto?

Mr. LUDLOW. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I did not want to speak today, but I found that under the rule tomorrow there is only going to be 1 hour on the Dies committee extension and I was fearful I could not get time, so I am taking this 5 minutes now.

I read that page advertisement in the morning paper. One of the pleas was that we should not extend the Dies committee because we are at war and it might offend Russia. Now, I want to go back 3 years, this week. I attended at that time the Youth Congress Convention in Washington which was held in Madam Perkins' big auditorium down there in the Labor Building. They were avowedly Communists. I stayed there all afternoon and all evening and it finished up with a speech of the First Lady of the land. There were four or five of their leaders housed in the White House. This was just 3 years ago this week and it was on Lincoln's birthday that I rose here to say something.

Finland at that time was our hero nation, but every time in that convention that the name of Finland was mentioned it was hissed, and every time Russia's name was mentioned the roof was raised. Remember that at that time Russia was a fighting ally of Hitler's. You cannot say that the influence of communism and the encouragement of communism have just been since Russia became our ally. She was the fighting ally of Hitler 3 years ago. Communism has been catered to in high places right here in the Capital City.

These delegates were told to visit the next morning the House and Senate galleries. It happened to be Lincoln's Birthday.

I got up here to defend John Hamilton, my constituent, acting chairman of the National Republican Committee, because he refused to send a delegate to speak at the Youth Congress. They hissed me roundly. I was the best hissed man, they said, this House had ever seen, because I congratulated John Hamilton for not sending a delegate to speak to them. The Democrats had.

I am just bringing this instance back to you. It happened 3 years ago. The last evidence the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] had was just 3 years old. That happened 3 years ago this week. Five of them were housed in the White House. They had their meeting in the Labor Building, the department of Madam Perkins. The First Lady of the land spoke to them the last thing Sunday.

While Russia was not our ally then—keep that in mind, Russia was not our ally then—we were catering to them because we loved them, we loved their kind. That is the reason they have been kept in high places in this Democracy of ours for the last few years, largely by that same influence.

Where does the labor racket get its influence, finally? Is it just Madam Perkins, after all, that holds it up? Who is responsible for Madam Perkins? I am fearful of what the set-up we have in America today will do after the victory to carry on the Communism that has come from over there and festered here.

I just wanted to recite this instance to you again. I was so proud of John Hamilton, my constituent, the acting chairman of the Republican Committee, because he had not sent a delegate to speak to them. I sat there till 11 o'clock at night, all through Sunday afternoon. Ate with them in the evening in the Labor Department dining room, which was thrown open to them.

They had Gen. Smedley Butler to speak to them a year before. A young Communist from Veracruz, introducing the general, undertook to chastise him for what he and his marines had done in Veracruz. Smedley, in his direct way, just walked up and pushed this young Communist away from the mike and started speaking himself.

I see here my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. He and I with others helped to bury the general the very first day of the Philadelphia convention, just out of that city.

Nobody denied what the background was of these people. This Youth Congress came here for years. This was only 3 years ago. Four or five of them were sleeping in the White House. The First Lady of the Land addressed them on Sunday night, and they hissed me here Monday morning when I congratulated John Hamilton for not sending a delegate to speak to them, and there was no excuse to defend it for the sake of battle unity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to be the most important feature of this bill. I do not think we are wasting time in considering this amendment. Many very prominent and able men regard this as a first step in violation of the constitutional rights of individuals and it makes me feel a little uncomfortable. I had thought that we were simply dropping from the rolls someone we did not want there. We have done it several times before. I can refer to the Saposs case. Not much protest was made, as I recall. But now, as indicated by this discussion it is deemed as important as a bill of attainder, as suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD]. How can the gentleman from California talk about a bill of attainder? By that process you put a man in jail and hold him. How about those native-born Japanese you put in concentration camps? Did you take each and every one of them and give them an opportunity to prove their loyalty? You did not.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. FORD. What would the gentleman do with them?

Mr. GIFFORD. If I followed the gentleman's principle, I would have to see that every one of them had a day in court, and then perhaps in the Supreme Court.

Mr. FORD. Does Mr. Pickens represent a country at war with the United States?

Mr. GIFFORD. I hope he does not.

Mr. FORD. Then, what would the gentleman do with him?

Mr. GIFFORD. I did not know anything about William Pickens until this debate opened. I did not even know he was a colored man. I do not like the idea of bringing the color issue upon the floor in this manner. Most of us did not know Mr. Pickens was a colored man. That should have nothing to do with it. Why drag that red herring across the trail? We love the colored man. I wish he was not colored, because my feeling is more favorable toward him in that he may have done something of which he was not fully conscious, in his enthusiasm to help his race. The gentleman from Illinois made a splendid speech of defense, but he stated that Mr. Pickens was deserted by those with whom he had formerly been in company. That is what I thought he said. How could he have been deserted if he had not previously been in company with them? This troubles me. If they had not been with him, they could not have deserted him, could they? Who were they, who deserted him?

This House is making a very serious matter of this. Maybe we should. I had not thought it was so serious.

I rather think that if those 38 men came before the committee personally, accompanied by their attorneys, their attorneys would as usual adyise those men that they ought not to talk. If they did come before the committee and the committee cross-examined them, the committee might even find something more that they might have to explain. Are some gentlemen trying to make us believe that we ought to employ a person we suspect of disloyalty until all legal processes of a trial are granted? Some claim they have had no trial by a proper tribunal. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] made a splendid defense of their rights last Friday. We sat here as a jury and listened to both sides. Were we not the jury? We heard the plea of these able lawyers regarding the principle involved and voted our verdict. True, there could be no exceptions taken by which the matter could go to a higher court. Of course, there was also no chance to challenge and "thin the jury." Each side of the question of principle was well and fully presented and we as jurymen voted as we felt we should. I really think that we are making too great an issue of this matter. Why was not the question raised when we acted in this manner in other cases? If these people really desire to be heard personally in their own defense, I do hope that privilege—it is only a privilege—will be granted. I do not think many would avail themselves of it. They would, of course, detail their friends to plead for them.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. If I had the time, I would be glad to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The fear has been expressed that if this House in its sound judgment refused to take the money of the loyal people of this country and pay it to men who have been affiliated with communistic organizations, that Russia will, on that account, quit fighting.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, really this is not germane.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order, if I am out of order.

Mr. LUDLOW. I dislike very much to object——

Mr. JENNINGS. Oh, everybody has been out of order, and I want the privilege myself. Secretary Wickard said the other morning that it was our food that was keeping Russia in the war. Russia is not going to strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. Russia is fighting a victorious war for the preservation of the liberty of her people, and the integrity of her nation, and I yield to no man anywhere in my admiration for the Russian people. I have voted for every appropriation to implement their great effort. It was said here awhile ago that we could not get these men off the pay roll because that would be a violation of article I, section 9, of the Constitution, which provides that the Congress shall pass no bill of attainder. That has not anything on earth to do with our right to withhold money for the purpose of paying any one of these ex-Reds. Of course, there are no Reds today. In the twinkling of an eye, in a time too short to put into words, they became red, white, and blue not long ago, and, of course, none of them is going to say now that he is a Communist. What is the language of this bill?

> No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

That is now. They are not now, of course, but they have been, and we do not have to employ a man who has been that sort of a fellow, or who has kept that sort of company. No man can say that I have any antipathy toward the colored man. The first vote that I cast on coming to this Congress was in favor of an antilynch law for the protection of the rights of the colored people in States where they had not otherwise been protected, and, for that matter, the rights of anyone whose rights were violated, and were not protected by the officers sworn to enforce the law. I voted for the bill to extend the right to the armed forces of this country to vote without the payment of a poll tax. I have always been a friend of the colored people, but the fact that a man's skin happens to be black does not give him a license to violate the law. If this man is a Communist, or has been a Communist or has associated with them, or if he has been in bed with them, I have a right to look at him with a suspicious eye. You cannot lie down with dogs without getting up with fleas, you cannot fool with pitch without becoming defiled, birds of a feather flock together, and when I see a fellow coming here from under that sort of influence, or emanating from that sort of organization, I do not have to ask myself whether he is that sort of a fellow today or not. Ordinarily men do not change themselves, and I do not know of but one instance where a man absolutely became transformed, as it were, in the twinkling of an eye, and that was Saint Paul, and he afterward went out for years in the wilderness and took a course in repentance before he became a real apostle.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I would rather not. I want to talk a little about this effort on our part to get rid of these Reds being in violation of the provisions of the Federal Constitution forbidding the passage of a bill of attainder. Let me give you the definition of a bill of attainder as it appears in Webster's dictionary:

> Attainder: Extinction of the civil rights and capacities of a person, consequent upon sentence of death or outlawry; as, an act of attainder. Formerly attainder was the inseparable consequence of a judicial or legislative sentence for treason or felony, and involved the forfeiture or escheat of all the real and personal property of the condemned person, and such "corruption of blood" that he could neither receive nor transmit by inheritance, nor could he sue or testify in any court, or claim any legal protection or rights. In England attainder upon judgment of treason, or felony was completely abolished in 1870.

And by article I, section 9, clause 13, of the United States Constitution it is provided, in reciting the powers forbidden to Congress:

> No bill of attainder of ex post facto law shall be passed.

It has been held by the Supreme Court of the United States that a statute excluding ex-convicts from the practice of medicine is not a bill of attainder, even when applied to a person who has been convicted of a felony and has served his sentence prior to the enactment of the law, and who was again practicing medicine at the time said law was enacted. What we are doing here is simply refusing to take any more of the taxpayers' money and turn it over to former enemies of our Government.

We are simply saying that we are not going to appropriate any money to pay people like Pickens, and that is all that we are doing, and no lawyer would ever say that there is a property right in an office, such as the appointive positions occupied by these pink and red persons we are attempting to rid the taxpayers of by refusing to appropriate money for their salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Office of the First Assistant Postmaster General, $570,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, charges made during the consideration of this bill relating to the loyalty of employees of the Government raise an issue requiring prompt and urgent attention. At any time—even in time of peace—the possibility that there are in the service of the Government employees who are disloyal, or who advocate disloyal theories or who are engaged in subversive activities should be investigated and acted upon with firmness and dispatch. It is even more imperative that charges of disloyalty be investigated in time of war when a single disloyal employee might imperil the safety of our armed forces or the delivery of critical material, or the maintenance of public morale itself.

For this reason, and in conformity with the understanding reached in my colloquy here on the floor Friday with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that a committee should be appointed which could hold hearings and take appropriate action without unnecessary delay, and after consultation with the leaders on both sides of the aisle I shall, in accordance with their views, introduce before the House adjourns today a resolution authorizing a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, composed of five men who have the confidence of the House to hear such charges against any employee of the Government,

and if the charges are sustained, take immediate action to see that he is promptly separated from the public pay roll.

This resolution will be presented to the Committee on Rules tomorrow morning and will be the first order of business when the House convenes for tomorrow's session. I trust the resolution will meet with the approval of the Members of the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman also recite the fact that this committee to be appointed from the Appropriations Committee immediately will hear whatever charges are made and consider whatever evidence may be in the possession of the Dies committee or any other agency against employees, and will also give ample opportunity to the employee to present his side of the case, and that will not only apply to future bills coming in, but it will apply to names which have been discussed and voted on in the last few days, the names of those in the Treasury-Post Office bill, and names which are in the independent offices bill, which will shortly be before the House? In other words, the House can be assured that there will be prompt and serious consideration given to those charges and that a report will be brought to the House from a responsible committee of the House and that the House will then be given an opportunity to act with all of the facts before it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the proposed resolution prompt attention will be given to charges against employees paid from funds provided by the two pending bills and all appropriation bills to be presented at this session of the Congress. If there are disloyal employees in any department, they should be removed without unnecessary ceremony or delay.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It seems to me that we are faced with this problem: Any limitation that is placed upon an individual appropriation bill relates, of necessity, only to the money that is carried in that particular bill. Many employees of the Government are on the pay roll out of funds that have previously been appropriated. Many of them will be on the pay roll out of funds hereafter to be appropriated. Unless there is authority to bring in a bill which limits anyone who is found guilty from receiving money from the Federal Treasury, that has heretofore or will hereafter be appropriated, we will accomplish nothing. That is what I conceive to be one of the things that might be accomplished under the gentleman's resolution.

In addition to that, it would give every person who is accused a fair and impartial trial before a special committee, that I understand the gentleman would appoint if the resolution were agreed to, and that the thing would be done promptly, just as rapidly as the committee could proceed. Do I understand the matter correctly?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman states the situation clearly and accurately. In other words, instead of leaving such men in the departments a day longer than necessary to reach them, this committee will meet and take summary action to dispose of such gentlemen without waiting for the next bill to be reported.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Do I understand this will offer a means of a fair trial in the case covered in this bill, the case of William Pickens?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. His case, if still pending when the committee is appointed, will be taken up first.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I want to get this point clear: Unless the House stands by its action which it has already taken in the William Pickens matter, this subcommittee to be appointed has no power to remove him from the pay roll?

The procedure involved here on Pickens is the only procedure we can follow in order to reach these men as we come to the various appropriation bills.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the reason the committee is being appointed. Under the present system there is no way to reach such cases except through the long and tortuous proceeding of amending an appropriation bill; and inasmuch as the salaries of many of them are provided for in bills which will not come before this House for months, the method provided by the amendment to the pending bill involves interminable delay. Under the proposed resolution such cases could be disposed of in the next few days.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the committee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If this proposal which the gentleman from Missouri is making goes through tomorrow as it is suggested, would it be contemplated that the cases included in the Independent Offices bill would be disposed of before that bill is read for amendment on the floor?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is not expected that the Independent Offices bill will be taken up in the House before Monday. In the meantime this committee will meet as soon as authorized and should be able to take up the seven cases in the Independent Offices bill before that bill is called up for consideration.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am in full accord with the plan the gentleman is now proposing. I proposed the same thing one year ago to the Appropriations Committee. I will be delighted to go along with one exception, and that is that when we have passed this bill today it is too late then to do anything about William Pickens. I am willing to go along with the procedure requested, but I say we should stick to this one amendment today.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We would be glad to comply with the gentleman's suggestion insofar as circumstances permit.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Did the gentleman understand that we were to permit this bill to go through with the amendment it now carries throwing Pickens off without his having an opportunity to be heard?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This resolution will be before the House in the morning before the vote is taken on the pending bill, and if the proposed committee is afforded time it will be glad to pass on the Pickens case. But, of course, action on the Pickens case is contingent on the disposition of the amendment—whether it is voted up or down when final action is taken on the bill tomorrow.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I am interested in the type of remedy this special committee will follow. After it has found that someone should be removed from the pay roll is it proposed to bring in legislation that must not only pass this body but also pass the Senate and have Executive approval to get these people out of Federal employment? Or does the gentleman expect to resort to the method we are following today, that of denying funds for their employment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We will bring in legislation in accordance with the findings of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. But that must be submitted to the Senate and also to the signature of the President.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly. It would be disposed of in the only way in which legislation can be disposed of.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say in reply to the gentleman from Nebraska that the procedure being followed in the present instance is no different, for this bill must pass not only this body, it must pass the Senate and must be signed by the President.

Mr. CURTIS. But this item is part of a larger bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is true. I believe, however, that there is some confusion here that ought to be

cleared up about the Pickens case, I may say to the gentleman from Missouri; I do not think that is clear.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Let me make it a little clearer: If it can be arranged to defer action on the Pickens case tomorrow, or if the House votes down the amendment, if a vote is taken tomorrow, this committee will have authority to take up the case and hear it, and bring in legislation for its disposition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. What is the purpose of asking for a special rule? I wish to clarify the situation; what is the purpose of asking for a special rule if it is not to send the name of William Pickens to the Appropriations Committee for their consideration? Is that one of the purposes in asking for this special rule?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The purpose in asking for the special rule is to authoritatively adjudicate all charges of disloyalty of employees who draw their salaries from funds provided by the supply bills.

Mr. FISH. All of them, including the Pickens case?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Including the Pickens case if it is not sooner disposed of by the House.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman intend to dispose of the Pickens case before this bill is completed?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We hardly have time. The pending appropriation bill is scheduled for final action tomorrow; but should the House fail to act on the Pickens case, or should it vote down the amendment then the proposed committee will deal with the Pickens case first.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is asking for a special rule—and I am in sympathy with him—to send the Pickens case to the Appropriations Committee with the other 37 names so they can decide on the merits of each case.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, if the House should prior to that time make final disposition of the case, that is something else.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the situation, it is this: The present bill has been amended, disposing of the Pickens case. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], suggests that his committee will submit to the Rules Committee a resolution creating a special committee consisting of members of the Appropriations Committee to investigate these Dies cases and all this type of cases. In these circumstances would it not be well to ask to vacate the proceedings by which the Pickens amendment was adopted, thereby dealing with the Pickens case exactly the same as we deal with all the other similar cases, including the 38 cases discussed in this debate? I am going to vote to continue the Dies committee. But in fairness to everybody, including our membership, I think the gentleman who offered the Pickens amendment—the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]—should assist in vacating the proceeding adopting the Pickens amendment in the committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Doubtless the gentleman would prefer to submit that question to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Is a question of vacating the proceedings on that amendment pending?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Michigan wishes to address a question to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Let me make this clear. I am perfectly in accord with the chairman's proposal to set up a committee. As I said a moment ago, I proposed that a year ago. We could have had it working now and we could have given everybody a fair hearing. I have just talked with William Pickens on the phone and I told him that this amendment may or may not go through, but in case it did, before it reached the Senate he would have an opportunity to be heard before this committee and if he cleared himself then the Senate could take it out or we would do it in conference. I do not agree to vacate these proceedings now because if we have passed this bill, even though he may be found guilty of communistic activities, we may not be able to reach him. I am in accord with the agreement on these other matters. I think we ought to give him an opportunity to clear himself and take it out in conference.

Mr. MICHENER. It might place many sincere, honest persons in this body in the wrong position when the roll call on the Pickens amendment comes tomorrow before the special committee has had an opportunity to give Pickens the same forum for a hearing the same as the 37 others accused. The Dies committee, something like a grand jury, has investigated and presents an indictment. Pickens should be accorded the same treatment as the other 37 indicted. I shall vote to give him consideration.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I know everybody wants to be fair, but under the evidence given this House up to now, I could not possibly agree to withdrawal of this amendment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would like to state to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that last year the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations eliminated a name from the pay roll. That man was called before the committee later on and before we made our final report, he was restored because he proved himself innocent. I feel every man should receive the same chance and opportunity.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the purpose of the resolution. Every man would have his day in court. There would be no star chamber proceedings.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield to see if we can reach an agreement on time?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this proposal close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the proposal correctly, it would authorize a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee to hold hearings. In turn if they found that someone should not be on the pay roll they would bring in special legislation barring that person from the Government pay roll. This means that we would rely on separate legislation that must pass that "other body" and be signed by the President.

It just will not work. I have seen legislation pass this House before, go over to another body and then disappear. Where is the Smith bill now? As well as other meritorious measures. The framers of this Government gave the House of Representatives the authority to start appropriation bills. I do not believe anyone here feels that we can take anybody off the pay roll unless we withhold the funds for that purpose. So far as I am concerned, this appropriation bill, in my opinion, ought to be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations until it holds a hearing and determines whether or not Mr. Pickens should be employed. I do not believe anyone here holds any hope that this proposed corrective legislation, if brought in by the Appropriations Committee, will be passed by the Senate and given Executive approval. Such a proposal would merely be a means for getting these appropriations through the House without amendments denying funds to subversive individuals.

Mr. JENNINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. If this committee reported Mr. Pickens or any one of those other 38 of his associates as communistic, and then brought in a bill providing that they be not eligible to appointment or to serve under this Government, does the gentleman believe such bill would ever become law?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not. But in the meantime the appropriations here discussed would have passed beyond our control. Furthermore, may I say that I am in favor not only of recommitting this bill to the Appropriations Committee, but I do not want the Appropriations Committee to bring in a bill for any amount

unless they have ascertained that none of it will go to subversive sources or persons. I believe this body has the right to expect that of the Appropriations Committee. If the Hendricks amendment is rejected because Pickens has not had a hearing, then the bill should be recommitted to give him one.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if we cannot arrive at a happy solution to this whole problem and enable the House to reverse its tentative proposition in reference to the Pickens matter without losing its authority of depriving him of a place on the Government pay roll by having a public statement of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee now that if this resolution which he will submit tomorrow passes he will withhold bringing the bill back from conference until the committee has disposed of the Pickens case and made a recommendation one way or the other?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman wants to postpone bringing this bill back from conference?

Mr. MUNDT. I would like to know whether the gentleman would be willing to assure the House that he will postpone bringing the bill back for final action until the Pickens case has been disposed of.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is a rather serious action to hold up a bill of this character carrying all the appropriations it does, but I may say that if an agreement could be reached with the gentleman from Florida under which we would vacate the proceedings, we would get much quicker action on the Pickens case than otherwise, because this bill will not be back from conference for 2 months, whereas the resolution we would introduce to dismiss all the men who are found to be disloyal will be back within a few days.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

I hope, however, that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will agree to have this bill recommitted so that they can determine the Pickens case before any money is appropriated for him by this House. The people back home do not want you to pay their money to subversive individuals. We should not pass this bill until the Appropriations Committee have held hearings concerning Mr. Pickens.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Did it require any legislation to put any of these people on the pay roll?

Mr. CURTIS. It did not.

Mr. DONDERO. If that is true, and it is true, then why should not the same power that put them on the pay roll remove them, without asking Congress to take action?

Mr. CURTIS. It should. At this time the Committee on Appropriations is sifting the activities to which they think money should be supplied. It should do the same thing in regard to these subversive individuals.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I believe the gentleman has presented to the House a very sound program indicating the way out, and that is simply this: There is no hurry about this legislation. It does not go into effect until the 1st of July. Why not hold up this legislation for a period of 1 week? It will affect the rights of nobody. Within a week the Committee on Appropriations can come back and decide on the Pickens case, if we present the rule tomorrow, and then we will have accomplished exactly what the gentleman wants.

Mr. CURTIS. They do not need a rule. The committee ought not ever to ask us to appropriate money for subversive individuals. Again I say if the Hendricks amendment is defeated the bill ought to be recommitted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, just so the Members may understand the situation clearly, I wish to make three or four statements.

It has been the practice when these persons who have been accused of subversive activities by the Dies committee have been removed by a limitation on an appropriation bill for them to slide immediately on to another pay roll, and there has been nothing to stop them.

There are one or two ways of reaching this situation, and these ways ought not to be attempted until the hearings can be completed. The carrying of this provision upon the appropriation bill will accomplish no immediate purpose. One way would be this. After hearings have been had upon all the 38, bring in a rider on an appropriation bill of a deficiency character, which could apply to every appropriation, past and future, so that none of those who were found guilty of subversive activities could draw pay. That would be effective, and it is about the only way you could be absolutely sure of having an effective means of carrying out your purpose. It would be more certain to be effective than a separate resolution, although a separate resolution would accomplish it if it could be passed by the Senate and signed by the President.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I believe one of the gentleman's plans is very good, but suppose we do pass a resolution with all these names in it, and then the President vetoes it, where would we be?

Mr. TABER. You would not be anywhere. You would have to start afresh. But if you had it tied on as a rider to a major deficiency bill it would go through quickly, and I do not believe it would have a veto.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I do not like the idea of either convicting or acquitting a man until we hear the evidence.

Mr. TABER. I do not, either.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Why not postpone action on this bill until this committee acts?

Mr. TABER. That could be done if the House elected to do that. Of course, that would have to be done with the approval of the leadership, and I would not have authority to make any such statement as that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to submit two questions. One is this. If this subcommittee is created, can it function quickly enough from time to time so as to meet the demands of the House before the appropriation is voted upon?

Question No. 2 is this: Will this committee as it functions from time to time depend upon the Dies committee to furnish names and give the stimulation, or will it have the effect of displacing or making unnecessary the Dies committee?

Mr. TABER. This committee will not in any way take the place of the Dies committee. It will not undertake an initial investigation or anything of that character. It will take the accusations that have been made, call in these people, ask them if they have any defense to offer, and hear that defense; and if it is necessary to hear rebuttal evidence, they will have to hear it so that they can make a decent determination of whatever is to be done.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What does the gentleman think as to the rapidity with which the committee can function?

Mr. TABER. I do not know how many cases there are. There are 39 or 40 to start with, I suppose. If there are 1,400, we could not possibly reach a determination upon that many in time to have it incorporated in a bill of this type.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But you might in a deficiency bill?

Mr. TABER. It could be done in a deficiency bill, but we would have to do it piecemeal if such a very large number were involved.

Mr. HENDRICKS. In regard to the bill that is before us now, there is only one man affected, and it would not take very long to clear that up, if the committee will recommit the bill until such time as the subcommittee has had to take care of the matter.

Mr. TABER. We do not need to recommit the bill. All we have to do is to leave it on the Speaker's table without calling it up for a final vote. In the present temper of the House, I do not think it is satisfied that the matter has been gone into far enough so that it is prepared to vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General, $460,000.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following preferential motion which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MUNDT moves that the Committee do now rise with instructions that it report the bill back with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, this is in no sense a pro forma amendment, but I offer it in strict sincerity, believing this is one effective way for the House to extricate itself from a rather difficult situation. Perhaps during my remarks or afterward somebody will propose some more convenient solution. We have just heard the ranking member on the Republican side of the Committee on Appropriations say that it would not in any way embarrass the functions of the Department if these appropriations and the decision upon the matter before us were postponed for 2 or 3 weeks. We have heard the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations say they could take up the case of Pickens and determine it on short notice, and it seems to me that we are not in a position to vote today either for or against Mr. Pickens, and unless we do recommit this bill we can have no assurance but that somebody will move to bring the bill to a roll call and thus compel us to vote yes or no. I think we should exercise our parliamentary function and recommit this bill or by some other device give the Appropriations Committee time to establish a special committee, to bring in evidence for or against Mr. Pickens, and bring back a recommendation that he should either be excluded from the pay roll or not. Then we can vote as intelligent legislators. I see no reason why we should debate this thing by 5-minute stretches all afternoon and into the evening. This is at least one positive way of disposing of it. Mr. Pickens will be given a fair hearing, and this House can proceed in an orderly manner.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to strike out the enacting clause. I hardly think the gentleman's motion will be taken seriously by the House, but it might be well to call attention to the routine that would result if the motion should be agreed to. To strike out the enacting clause would mean that the bill is dead. It would be reintroduced de novo and we would have to start all over again. While it would not be necessary to duplicate much of the detailed work we have already done on the bill, we would have to again start from the beginning and make up the bill, and the subcommittee would have to report it back to the main committee, and the main committee to the House, and in that way we would throw added work on already overburdened members of the committee and lose valuable time. We will have difficulty in getting all the supply bills through by the end of the fiscal year as it is, and to take such action as that contemplated by the motion of the gentleman would be to throw upon the committee and upon Members of the House a burden of unnecessary routine and would involve a delay which the House would not want to encourage or approve.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. POWERS. I agree with the gentleman that the bill should not be recommitted, but why can we not reach an agreement like this, that after the bill is read, that it should lie upon the Speaker's table, and we should not vote upon it and in the meantime a subcommittee could call Mr. Pickens and give him a hearing, and report back to the House in 2 or 3 days, and then we could vote on the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am anxious to cooperate with my friend from New Jersey in the matter, but this is a large and important bill. Many items are urgent. For that reason I would not feel warranted in delaying it on account of one comparatively inconsequential amendment, the disposition of which is not yet assured. For it should be remembered when the amendment comes up for a vote tomorrow, that the vote will not be on the merits of the amendment, but on the question of deferring action on the Pickens case until a committee can hear it and dispose of it and similar cases on evidence from both sides. As a matter of fact, when the amendment comes up for a vote tomorrow the question actually before the House will be whether it shall be disposed of with expedition and celerity by a special committee or whether it will be left in the bill to finally be acted on when this bill comes back from conference some weeks, if not months, after the special committee has reported.

A vote tomorrow would not be a vote on conviction, on whether a man is a Communist or is disloyal to his Government; on whether he should be taken off or left on the pay roll. The question would be whether you favor turning all such charges over to a special committee, authorized to dispose of them speedily and authoritatively, in accordance with the views expressed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. POWERS. Why is it necessary to form another subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to handle this matter? Why cannot the present subcommittee handle it, as the subcommittee on the Independent Offices bill has been doing?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The present subcommittees are authorized to hold hearings but are not authorized to take immediate action. They cannot take action until their particular bill comes up, which may be 4 months away, and if there are disloyal men on the pay roll, the quicker they are taken off the better.

Mr. TABER. The question raised by the gentleman from New Jersey is, if you carry a limitation in one appropriation bill, it relates only to that bill, and that same man can be on another appropriation. The whole thing ought to be cleaned up, and it ought to be cleaned up in such a way that it would relate to every appropriation out of the Treasury.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I just want to correct one impression which perhaps the gentleman did not intend to leave. If we adopt this amendment to this bill, that does not prevent your still taking action by your subcommittee, because even if we adopt this amendment, we can still go on and act.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Such a contemplated committee would not feel warranted in attempting to override formal action by the House. A member in heartiest sympathy with the amendment would be justified in voting against the amendment tomorrow in order to get quicker and more carefully considered action by the special committee.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I want to say to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and to the House that in consideration of this new resolution that the Rules Committee will bring up tomorrow, we should keep in mind that there are not just these 38 names. There will be hundreds of names, because as soon as this resolution is passed some members of the Dies committee will recommend to the investigators that they review all the files, and I daresay that we will be able to submit to your committee, if it is created, hundreds and hundreds of governmental employees who have the same kind of record that Mr. Pickens has.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Any employee against whom charges of disloyalty are brought should have a full and fair hearing. That is the purpose of the resolution; to expedite the proceedings and to secure prompt separation from the pay roll.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to interrogate the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, because I appreciate some of the difficulties he has set forth if my motion to recommit does prevail. I wonder if I were to withdraw my motion whether the gentleman from Missouri, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, would be willing to assure the House that he would carry out some such suggestion as that made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS], that is, to keep the bill on the Speaker's table until the Pickens problem could be decided by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is directly in charge of this bill. I am only one member of the committee.

Mr. MUNDT. May I ask the gentleman from Indiana, the chairman of the subcommittee, if we may have his assurance that if no motion to recommit is passed, and we proceed now in an orderly fashion, that he will keep the bill on the Speaker's table and not ask for a final

decision until the Appropriations Committee has had an opportunity to consider the Pickens case itself?

Mr. LUDLOW. I am afraid the gentleman is asking me something that I cannot promise.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. POWERS. As chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] should be able to tell you that. If he cannot, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is present.

Mr. MUNDT. May I ask the gentleman from Indiana, as chairman of the subcommittee, whether he will use his influence in that direction? May I direct my question to the majority leader to see if we can get an answer? We are all confronted with the same problem.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is a rather amusing situation. Just giving my individual views—I have kept out of this—personally I think the adoption of the amendment was unwise. The leadership on both sides have now offered a proposition which is fair. It is consistent with the fundamentals of decency and of Anglo-Saxon law. I do not want to be convicted without an opportunity to be heard. God knows I do not want the other fellow convicted without an opportunity to be heard. If my friend is asking me to portray to the country that this great House must hold up an appropriation bill carrying an appropriation of over $1,000,000,000 in order to determine the question of one man's status—well, as far as I am concerned, speaking personally—and I am only speaking personally now because my own individual views sometimes conflict with my views as majority leader—speaking personally I have too much love and respect for this House as an individual Member to see the House hold up final passage of a bill after it has been concluded because of this one question involved, when the leadership on both sides is presenting to the House a proposition that is based on fairness; that a man always be given a reasonable opportunity to present his side of the case. I do not know who Pickens is. I did not know what his color was. I do not care what a man's race, color, or religion is. We have to be tolerant and understanding among ourselves. One of the basic considerations of our democratic form of government is to give a man an opportunity to be heard when he is accused.

I do not know whether he is guilty or not. But we are giving him the opportunity. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] said there would be several hundred. That is all the more reason for a committee of this kind. We certainly cannot come before the country with the spectacle that has been gone through with here in the last few days, on every appropriation bill. All the more reason why a committee of this kind should be appointed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. POWERS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, who do you want it for? For yourself or somebody else?

Mr. MUNDT. I want time enough for the majority leader to finish his statement and then I have a comment to make.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems to me the leadership has presented to the House a fair proposition and it ought to be accepted. Anyone voting to eliminate this amendment is not voting on the merits involved, because certainly the debate this afternoon has clarified that situation. From my personal reaction, as far as the resolution is concerned, after participating in the conference, I think the resolution is for the best interests of the House. It is for the best interests of the integrity of the House. I think if we are going to give everyone else an opportunity to be heard by this committee, it is only fair that this particular gentleman whose name happens to be Pickens, should also be given the same opportunity.

Mr. MUNDT. Before yielding further I should like to say to the majority leader that I agree in everything that he says. Apparently he must have misunderstood my question relayed from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to the chairman of the subcommittee to him.

I am trying to seek some way in which we can apply the principle of giving this man Pickens a chance to be heard before we act either one way or the other; trying to find a concrete way in which that can be done. We find ourselves, however, in this position: An amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole is to be resubmitted for a vote in the House; so I was wondering whether the majority leader could explain some parliamentary device whereby we should not be called upon to vote either for or against Pickens on a roll-call vote until the case has been further heard. I suggested, or rather the gentleman from New Jersey suggested, that by letting the bill lie on the Speaker's table for a day or two until the Appropriations Committee had heard Pickens we could accomplish that.

Mr. McCORMACK. And it was to that suggestion that I addressed myself particularly. Personally I think it would be unwise because we would present to the country the spectacle of holding up final action on an important appropriation bill because of one individual employee of a department. That is not going to inure to the benefit of the House. Certainly we ought to be able to assume our responsibility, but as leader I naturally would confer with others, and in such conference—I will be frank—I would express my views as I have stated them now.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman appreciated that. Technically speaking, we are not voting either for or against Pickens in the present bill. There is no urgent rush about the passage of this appropriation act. The money cannot be made available before July 1 in all events. By deferring final action on this bill for a few days the Appropriations Committee can bring this House a special report after hearing what Pickens himself has to say.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I am getting a little impatient with all this talk saying this is a spectacle. We have done it before. Furthermore, this appropriation bill will not become effective until July, and even though this man's name is included this proposed special committee can still go ahead and make its findings. I see no reason why we should make a mountain out of a molehill.

Mr. McCORMACK. We would still be faced with the same proposition in the next appropriation bill, and in the next appropriation bill, and so on straight down the line. The leadership is offering a solution whereby the Committee on Appropriations can set up a subcommittee which shall have the power of subpena, to summon witnesses before it and pass upon the facts.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it the opinion of the majority leader that if the House reverses its position and exempts Pickens from this employment embargo, passes the bill in its original form, and should the Appropriations Committee later find that this man should be stricken from the rolls because of his subversive activities, would the Appropriations Committee representatives in conference be empowered to remove Pickens from the pay roll?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; they would not have that power, because if the bill passes the House with Pickens' name out and passes the Senate with Pickens' name out, the conferees, in my opinion, would not have the power to insert his name back in the bill. That is my opinion.

Mr. MUNDT. In that event, unless final action on this bill is deferred until the Appropriations Committee can investigate Mr. Pickens or unless the Senate votes Mr. Pickens out, we might still find him holding office after we had lost all power of ouster and given approval to his salary. I shall not press for a vote on my motion to recommit, but I hope some method may be worked out so this body, after having access to all the facts, can exercise its right to bar Pickens from the pay roll if no flaw is found in the evidence which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has presented and which makes a mighty damaging case against Mr. Pickens. I want him to have a right to be heard, and I want this House to have the right to remove appointees from office who may be either unfit or un-American, or both. I hope both of these rights may be protected in the case in point.

Mr. LUDLOW. I ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS], to simplify this situation and see that justice

is done, why he does not ask that the vote by which his amendment would pass to be vacated? I do not think we ought to make fish of one and fowl of another; I think Pickens should have exactly the same kind of trial as all the others. Why not vacate this vote and treat him as we treat the others? Why not treat all alike?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, replying to the gentleman from Indiana, I would remind him that last year we did not give David Lasser a hearing; we just cut him off. We did not call others in, and I do not see any reason why we should call this man in.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Dakota insist on his preferential motion?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Accounts, $300,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 33, line 13, after the word "account", strike out $300,000 and insert "$133,640."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think more debate should be allowed than that; I shall have to object.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is it the gentleman's intention to finish the bill today?

Mr. LUDLOW. That is our expectation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And vote on it today?

Mr. LUDLOW. No. We will vote on it tomorrow, but we will finish it under the 5-minute rule today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment reduces the amount which the committee allowed the Bureau of Accounts in this bill from $300,000 to $133,630, which is the same amount allowed this Bureau last year. This amount has been asked for to establish a new cost accounting system in the Accounts Bureau. I will read what it says here on page 14 of the report:

The amount carried in this bill, $300,000, is $28,200 below the Budget estimate of $328,200 and $166,360 above the total appropriation of $133,640 for 1943. The large increase in this item is required to establish a new cost accounting system in the Postal Service.

Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to serve on the Post Office and Post Roads Committee during the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses. During that time I learned something about the personnel and the functions of that Department and have the highest regard for the Department, but, strictly speaking, this is legislation on an appropriation bill. I think this should have gone before the proper committee, the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, before it went to the Appropriations Committee.

The Post Office and Post Roads Committee is headed by the able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH], for whom I have the highest regard. He has done a fine work, and the other members of the committee have done fine work. I know he would allow all the hearings necessary and the proper consideration to this new set-up.

It does not take a smart man to know that during these very abnormal times any cost ascertainment figures arrived at today will be completely upset and useless tomorrow, and this will hold true until the war is over and for quite some time afterward.

Mr. Chairman, this is no time to take 30, 40, or 50 people away from essential industries and put them in this new Bureau or in this new set-up. Every one of us has promised our people that we would not create any new or unnecessary governmental set-ups. Whether you call them bureaus or not, it is a new set-up. Our manpower problem is very desperate right now. We do not want to take these men from the farms or from the factories or from other essential industry and put them in this new set-up, which, in my estimation, will serve no good purpose, especially at this time.

I earnestly plead with the Members to think well before they vote, for certainly if we let the great reorganizers start reorganizing the Post Office Department, which has been almost simon pure for all these years, that Department will soon be in the very same fix as all other departments of the Government find themselves in today. I am sure none of us want to have that to happen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I could not hear all the gentleman said, but I got the idea that this is some new agency that is being set up.

Mr. JENSEN. It is not a new agency. It is a new cost accounting system which I maintain will be of no use. I contend that any costs which are arrived at today during these abnormal times in this Department will be of no use. They will not hold good for any length of time, anyway, and we are just wasting a lot of money starting another set-up here which will take the employment of 30, 40, or 50 people away from essential industry where they are so desperately needed now.

I can see no reason at all why this $166,640 of the taxpayers' money should be spent in this way.

If we want to do something for the Postal Service, if we want to spend some of the taxpayers' money we should give the star-route carriers the extra pay which they deserve, and also some other postal employees in the lower pay brackets.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. And we could give some service on the holidays we are going to have this year for the rural carriers?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; we could do a lot of things. Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], in my opinion, merits the support of every Member of this House. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has been a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads for the last 4 years. Personally I have served on that committee for one term, and I am glad to back him up in this amendment which will prevent the beginning at this time of another division of a bureau. The adoption of Mr. JENSEN'S amendment will keep from developing in this vast mushroom of bureaucracy another cell, to be nurtured by hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money, whose administrators will keep coming back to us year after year and not request a mere $166,000 but, in a short time, $500,000, perhaps in a few years, to keep 300 or 400 men instead of 40 now asked for in jobs. Such is bureaucracy. Give it free rein and it will throttle individual initiative and eventually bankrupt our Nation.

We have had a lot of discussion about bureaucrats and bureaucracy. Now is the time to act. If you Members of this House mean what you have been talking about, you will look over this amendment very carefully that has been offered by the gentleman from Iowa and try to cut the head off of this—beginning of another—division or another bureau before you let it proceed to swallow up $166,000. Yes; I know that $166,000 is mere chicken feed to some, but to me it still represents a sizable hunk of money. Unless we chisel away and knock off these corners, the savings that we have promised our people we would try to make will not be effectuated.

Up to now we have done without this division. Why do we need it just now? Is it not rather foolish to start in trying to establish a new section with which to ascertain cost in a division or in a department at a time when costs are abnormal? The Post Office Department has been able to give very good figures on cost of various operations to our committees heretofore. The time to have commenced such a division, if it ever has been needed, was a long time ago and not at a time when everything is out of kilter. Surely we can find a better place for these 40 or 50 men and women to work than to start another division or another bureau. The Lord only knows to what extent, in 20 years, this beginning of another octopus will expand.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman agree that this bill should go before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In my opinion, it is clearly legislation and should have gone directly before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads for authorization.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. This amendment involves about $160,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. One hundred and sixty-six thousand dollars; mere chicken feed, I will admit, in the belief of many who are accustomed to converse in terms of billions of dollars. To me, this represents at least 10 well-equipped and stocked quarter-section farms.

Mr. TABER. As I understand, the man who was Comptroller of the Post Office Department for years, Mr. Slattery, was finally crowded out.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. He was crowded out last summer, so I have been informed by parties who should know.

Mr. TABER. They put a new organization in there that has not as yet shown any evidence of competency to do this kind of a job.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is correct. In my opinion, this expenditure will not add one bit to the already splendid operation of the Post Office Department.

In conclusion, may I say that while this $166,000 may not seem to amount to very much, to ne it represents a little rivulet, and when many of these come together you have a stream of waste—waste of money which is criminal at this time—a waste which every individual in this Congress has promised the people who voted for him he would try his utmost to eliminate. This $166,000 as a fighting plane is much more worth while today. Let us give an extra plane to the boys in the Solomons and prevent 40 people from being used in a nonessential division of another bureau.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this amendment should be opposed by every businessman or every man who understands something of the problems of an executive. This is not a request coming from the subhead of some bureau, or from a small department, or from someone about whom we know very little. It is a request from the Postmaster General, the head of a $1,200,000,000 corporation, the Post Office Department of the United States. The head of the Post Office Department, one of the great departments of the Federal Government, handling $1,200,000,000 in appropriations for the citizens of this country every year, must necessarily know something about that business in order to conduct it properly. In the hearings before our committee he told us that in his opinion this is a most important item in the bill, in order for him to know what things cost and how to run his job.

The head of this $1,200,000,000 corporation says to the gentlemen in Congress, "In order to do my job properly and to know how to do it, in the interest of economy and in finding where to save, I ask you to give me $1,700 more than was allowed last year."

This is no new business. It is a new name. They had the cost accounting department last year and they set up a bureau of accounts, which the Bureau of the Budget cut $8,000,000, and part of it was taken from the cost accounting department. The item only represents an increase of $1,700 over last year.

Does the gentleman from Iowa want to say to the Post Office Department, "You shall have no cost accountants, you shall have no one to analyze your costs, to tell you what you are spending here and spending there? You can go ahead without a cost accounting department of that type."

I do not know any big business in the country that does not have a department of this type and that is not dependent upon it for intelligent analyses in handling its business.

These people must decide on the amount of money they pay the railroads for the space they use in handling the mail. Some of it is first-class, some of it is parcel post. They know little about the final analyses of those costs and they cannot talk intelligently about them unless they have a cost-accounting system. On the question of the rent they pay in so many places they must analyze and compare their rents. On the question of handling the heating charges of the hundreds of buildings they operate, they must know something about the handling costs, about the cost of coal, and about many other expenses. In handling a $1,200,000,000 operation, there is no chance for the Postmaster General to do any sort of an intelligent executive job unless you give him, as you would give to the manager of any plant or the head of any business, an adequate cost-accounting organization to tell him what things cost.

Again, let me say that this is not a new bureau. This is authorized by law. There is no new language in this bill, as the gentleman said. It is not a new business. This has been in the law. Incidentally, I may say that I have made inquiries as to the parliamentary system on that point, and it is not subject to a point of order.

What the gentleman is doing is saying to the Postmaster General of the United States, who is handling $1,200,000,000, "You may not have anyone who can tell you what your air-mail costs are or what you can afford to spend to put a new route into South America, or what it will cost you to start another route across the country; you cannot have anybody down there who can give you that information."

I cannot imagine an amendment of that sort being adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It seems to me that we are getting a little bit mixed in our thinking in this program. I agree with the gentleman who has spoken, that the head of any big corporation is entitled to have a cost accounting system, but I do not agree that the head of any corporation that desires to change its set-up should not present that changed or new set-up to the board of directors of the corporation, which is the policy-making board for the corporation, and get their approval, before putting it into execution. The natural and logical thing for the Postmaster General to have done when he wanted to establish a new set-up or change the present one, was to present that change to the board of directors, the policy-making group of that organization, which is the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives and not the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. If he had done that, and made his case, before the proper board of directors, then in all probability it might have been approved, and there would have been no question on the floor of this House; but instead of doing that he short-circuited the legislative group of this body that is supposed to consider those things and went direct to the Committee on Appropriations for the appropriation. I ask you men whether this body here, this House, should approve of the method of short-circuiting its legislative committees and go direct to the Committee on Appropriations. That is the whole question involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman tell me what piece of legislation would have required them to go to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads? They have had a Bureau of Accounts for years and it is still here. It is no new thing.

Mr. MASON. It is a new set-up in the post office, to audit accounts.

Mr. O'NEAL. It is just a little group to handle the matter.

Mr. MASON. They should have received the O. K. of the legislative group before presenting it on an appropriation bill.

Mr. O'NEAL. What is there to the set-up that they do not have already?

Mr. JENSEN. They have $133,644 in last year's appropriation bill, and we are leaving it in this.

Mr. O'NEAL. Oh, the gentleman should not shift his argument. They had a Bureau of Accounts, and they still have it.

Mr. JENSEN. It says that a large increase in this item is required to establish a new cost-accounting system in the Postal Service.

Mr. MASON. That is the testimony before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the

amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LUDLOW) there were—ayes 81, noes 64.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COURTNEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 1648, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the legislative business is concluded and other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] for 45 minutes.

NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, no more funds should be appropriated to the National Resources Planning Board. This agency is a grave menace to the American people and should be abolished forthwith.

The Subcommittee on Appropriations is again recommending an appropriation of funds to the National Resources Planning Board, and unless some other Member offers an amendment to strike this item out of the independent offices appropriation bill I intend to do so. In the ensuing discussion I shall state the reasons for my position.

I have in this study quoted a goodly amount of material. Practically all of it is taken from the National Resources Development Report for 1942. When it was not taken from that report its source will be indicated. The material quoted was selected with the view of giving as accurate and full a description of the activities of the Planning Board as possible without reading through many volumes of reports, pamphlets, and so forth, put out by it. The method has for its purpose the saving of time for those Members who are interested in this highly important subject, but who do not have the time to read the many reports. I feel quite certain the amount of material quoted is sufficient to give a good understanding of the subject.

The results of last November's election showed a strong protest against the Federal bureaucracy and its dictatorial tactics. They indicated that our people are at last coming to realize the growing menace to our liberties of the New Deal regime. I interpret last November's vote as a mandate to Congress to check the bureaucracy and to restore to the people the powers which the Constitution vested in them and which have been wrested from them by the Executive.

Congress is charged with a great responsibility and I think we should strive to the utmost to carry out the obligation we have assumed.

The National Resources Planning Board is supposed to stem from the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931, and has existed previously under various names—the National Planning Board, the National Resources Board, the National Resources Committee.

Now, so far as I can determine from the reading of the statutes, the National Resources Planning Board has no statutory authority to perform any other functions or to undertake any other activities than those prescribed in the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931. The Employment Stabilization Act of 1931 provided for certain construction agencies "to prepare a 6-year advance plan" of construction, and "such supplemental estimates as he"—the President—"deems advisable for emergency appropriations, to be expended during such period upon authorized construction."

From a reading of this act it is clear that by the term construction was meant the erection of physical structures, which, of course, were for the use of the Federal Government. There is not the remotest possibility of reading into the law any authority whatever for the performance of the wide range of functions that are now being carried out by the National Resources Planning Board. Certainly there is nothing in the act which gives this Federal agency any authority to plan a new economic and social order, as its activities clearly indicate it is undertaking to do.

The fact that at present the number of persons employed by this agency, and the amount of funds allotted to it, as measured in terms of New Deal standards, is small—about a million dollars a year—is apt to give a false impression of its importance and the scope of its activities.

Before taking up the consideration of the program of the National Resources Planning Board, let us examine its organizational structure.

First. It should be noted that this body is now, as the President puts it in his letter of January 14, 1942, transmitting and recommending to the Congress the National Resources Development Report for 1942, "the planning arm of my Executive office."

To comprehend the influence and power this agency can exercise and wield it is essential that we grasp the full significance of its position in relationship to the Executive office of the President. To more clearly elucidate this point it may be well to quote another portion of the letter above referred to:

> The National Resources Planning Board * * * is charged with the preparation of long-range plans for the development of our national resources and the stabilization of employment. At my direction it is correlating plans and programs under consideration in many Federal, State, and private organizations for post-war full employment, security, and building America. In this report the Board outlines some of our major objectives in planning to win the peace.

Thus, it is clear that the National Resources Planning Board is in itself powerless and is merely the instrument of the President. He alone is responsible for its activities.

It should be remarked here that there is a vast difference between the amount and quality of peacetime powers the Chief Executive now possesses and those possessed by the Executive in 1931, when the Employment Stabilization Act was passed. And it is only when we fully realize the extent and kind of powers the Executive has usurped and the Congress has given him in the last decade, as well as the use to which he has been putting these powers, that we can comprehend the importance of the role the President plays in the national planning scheme that is being promulgated in the name of the National Resources Planning Board. The extent and scope of economic and social planning the Board can undertake is as great as the powers the President possesses.

Armed with the powers of the President and the Federal purse, the National Resources Planning Board goes forth to promote the new social order.

The primary elements in the organizational structure of the Board are the Chairman, Frederick A. Delano, an uncle of the President; the Director, several Assistant Directors, and so forth, with offices in Washington.

Next in order are the nine Regional Planning Commissions, with offices located at Boston, Baltimore, Richmond, Va., Atlanta, Indianapolis, Omaha, Denver, Portland, and San Francisco. Alaska comprises another planning region.

Under regional office organization in the 1939 progress report we read:

> Regional office personnel: The regional offices operate under the executive direction of part-time regional chairmen, and are also provided with the technical direction of regional counselors. A full-time planning technician, assisted by a full-time associate technician, is in administrative charge of a nucleus staff in the field office which can be easily expanded to provide the necessary personnel to serve the needs of special studies or programs.

Below the regional planning units are the State planning commissions, then the municipal planning commissions. The following from the 1939 progress report gives some idea of the position of the National Resources Planning Board in relation to State and local planning units:

> Activities of the field staff have continued to develop in six main directions: (1) Stimulation and encouragement of State and local planning—

Stimulation and encouragement, keep in mind, with Federal grants-in-aid, loans, and largesse—

(2) provision of the committee's technical consultants to regional and State planning agencies; (3) interrelating planning activity between planning agencies; (4) sponsorship of drainage basin committees for water resources planning; (5) collaboration with special committees on regional studies within their areal divisions; and (6) acting as a clearing house for information.

It is of interest to note that of the more than 40 States having planning commissions, practically all of them were set up under legislative authority enacted since 1933. A similar situation can be found in the case of the State acts that were passed to permit the establishment of State and local housing authorities, all of which were passed at the instance of the United States Housing Authority. So it appears the Federal bureaucracy is engaged quite extensively in lobbying laws through State legislatures—another way to destroy State rights.

Under the Agricultural Department nearly all 48 States have special planning committees with 1,294 members, and 1,433 active county-planning committees with 34,494 members, all engaged in various kinds of planning schemes for the farmers—Agriculture Statistics, 1941, page 714.

The National Resources Planning Board has numerous other connections, and it is impossible to mention all of them here.

In addition to this vast organization a multitude of Federal agencies are cooperating with the Board in its planning. Under the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931 there were some 20 or 25 construction agencies listed. Executive Order 8455 not only added a great many more—about 70 new ones are listed by the Board—to the list, but brought in a new kind of agency. The Employment Stabilization Act of 1931 applied more particularly to Federal agencies which required construction work to be done for their own services. Under Executive Order 8455, however, agencies "which aid construction activity through grants-in-aid, loans, other forms of financial assistance, or through guaranties from the Federal Government" were added. This included such agencies as W. P. A.—suspended but not abolished—the Federal Housing Agency, the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, which consists of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, Home Owners' Loan Corporation and United States Housing Corporation; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; Rural Electrification Administration; Soil Conservation Service; Farm Security Administration and Farm Credit Administration.

Practically all of the lending agencies are under the control of the President, head of the Planning Board. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation alone is now authorized to make loans up to more than $12,000,000,000, and this amount is about to be increased by five billions, mostly for construction.

Nor is it likely the National Resources Planning Board is limiting itself strictly to the use of those agencies listed by it under the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931 and the ones added under Executive Order 8455. I notice in the National Resources Development Report the following:

Through the cooperation of Chairman Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board, Dr. Alvin Hansen of Harvard University is working on problems of fiscal policy in the post-defense period with particular reference to financing of public improvement projects.

Yet the Federal Reserve is not among the list of agencies given me by the Board. Dr. Hansen is a special adviser to the National Resources Planning Board, and plays a leading role in the formulation of its planning schemes.

Furthermore, their plans for social, educational, health, so-called security, and what not, would indicate the use of any and all State and local organizations interested in these subjects.

The slightest reflection will show that the use by the President of all these agencies becomes an immeasurable aid to him in his planning scheme. Thus it is seen that the National Resources Planning Board fronts a gigantic movement to plan the new social order.

What are the objectives of the National Resources Planning Board?

What and how does it plan?

Under the heading of "New Objectives" it says:

We look forward to securing, through planning and cooperative action, a greater freedom for the American people.

That is a pretty big order in itself, if it is meant that our people are to have greater liberty than was vouchsafed us under the Constitution and which was enjoyed by our earlier forebears. Apparently we are to believe the liberty we are now enjoying is as great as that which our forebears experienced, and the promise is that still more liberty is to be provided for us, for we are told by the planning agent the—

great manifesto, the Bill of Rights, has stood unshaken 150 years. And now to the old freedoms we must add new freedoms.

Further:

Any new declaration of personal rights, any translation of freedom into modern terms—

Note the phrase "modern terms"—

here and now must include—

Not tomorrow, or next year, but instanter—

1. The right to work, usefully and creatively through the productive years.

2. The right to fair pay adequate to command the necessities and amenities of life in exchange for work, ideas, thrift, and other socially valuable service.

3. The right to adequate food, clothing, shelter, and medical care.

4. The right to security, with freedom from fear of old age, want, dependency, sickness, unemployment and accident.

5. The right to life in a system of free enterprise, free from compulsory labor, irresponsible private power, arbitrary public authority, and unregulated monopolies.

6. The right to come and go, to speak or to be silent, free from the spyings of secret police.

7. The right to equality before the law, with equal access to justice and fact.

8. The right to education, for work, for citizenship, and for personal growth and happiness; and

9. The right to rest, recreation, and adventure; the opportunity to enjoy life and take part in an advancing civilization.

It would seem this list would include about everything required to usher in the fully perfected millennium, at least for those of us in the United States, but apparently it does not.

It seems the planning cult has discovered some new amenities and beneficences that the Apostle John had not known, which are necessary to full and universal felicity of genus homo.

There are "plans for the international scene."

The supermillennium cannot be brought about for our people alone. It must be for all or none, for the French, the Turks, Chinese, Hottentots, Hindus, Soviets, English, all—maybe not quite all—there might be a probation period for aggressors.

From this point on—

Says the planning cult—

the American people will never again make the mistake of believing that we can have prosperity while the rest of the world collapses; or peace while the rest of the world is at war; or freedom while the rest of the world is being enslaved. It is therefore assumed that after the war we shall make our international policy and the international private interests conform to our desires for peace and the elevation of human dignity everywhere.

Our foreign policy will have an important bearing upon our domestic employment program when peace returns. Through an extension of lend-lease we shall certainly help feed the starving peoples of Europe—

Which will probably include all of them, for likely all of them will be starving by the time the war ends—

until they can get on their feet. This will take all the food, shipping, trucks, and gasoline which we can muster and will call for plans now for the reorganization of this unprecedented gift to humanity.

After Europe's needs for food, clothing, and emergency medical care have been met, * * * perhaps then our greatest opportunity to help others economically will be found in Asia and in parts of North or South America, working in cooperation with the peoples and governments of those lands.

Asia alone is a pretty big place, and it will take a lot of milk to get a bottle a day to each one of its inhabitants.

The model—

That is the goal or program of the planners—

further presupposes a figure of $10,000,000,000 for military outlays—

That is per annum—

including post-war international loans financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as an integral part of some sort of international reconstruction finance corporation set up to engage in international lending and designed to facilitate the rehabilitation and reconstruction of countries devastated by the war, and the expansion of investment in industrially backward countries, including South America and China. (After the War—Full Employment.)

An international economic unit within the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is

studying the possible international effects of domestic economic post-war programs. The international balance of payments that would arise from a heavy United States draft upon world raw materials is being postulated. In the light of these possibilities the unit is examining the desirable conditions for a resumption of foreign lending.

Whole groups of the population are to be shifted from one locality or region to another just as Mussolini, Hitler, and Stalin have been doing in their countries.

What is the balance of farm and nonfarm families?—

The planning board asks, and then adds—

American agriculture * * * can provide all American balanced nourishment—and, indeed, feed some of the rest of the world—with 3,000,000 fewer people than now live on farms.

Mr. George D. Riley, in his column under the caption "Capital compass," in the Washington Times-Herald of February 3, 1942, says:

It seems the Bureau of Agricultural Economics wants to make 20 percent of the rural population of the United States move to cities after the war, whether the ruralites like it or not.

F. E. Elliott, Chief Agricultural Economist of the Department, says the plan to cut post-war rural population to its 80-percent level is in line with the projected revamping of American economy and possibly that of the entire world.

Nor are the city and town dwellers to be spared from being shifted en masse from one city or region to another.

Some mobility of population is essential in order that the labor supply may be adjusted to long-run regional differences in economic opportunity. There is much to be said, however, in favor of regulation of the rate of change and in many cases of restraining rapid movement. It is clearly inadvisable to attempt to maintain industry at or above previous levels in all areas. A shift of population may be the only way or the most efficient way of avoiding industrial misfits. Where alternative industries cannot be found, it may be necessary to aid in moving out population, to provide special training programs to adapt the populations to new types of work, and, in general, to shift the resource-use pattern of the region.

Labor is to be handled as chattel. Labor ought to see from this where it is headed for, what its real future security will be if the political planners have their way.

New industrial plants are to be located according to plan; old ones are to be shifted about like the tents of a moving army. The political hierarchy of planners in its infinite wisdom gives us the reason for this. It says:

In fact—

In fact, mind you, there being no theory or guesswork about it—

the location of industries in their most suitable relation to production requirements and markets is in practice among the least automatic of economic adjustments.

Implying, of course, that said hierarchy of brains can supply the deficiency.

But now notice the sudden and complete mental lapse. Under Locational Programs and Their Possible Application, we read:

Various programs have been proposed in different quarters—

That is, political planning quarters—

for the distribution of new industrial activity. Such programs have sought a variety of objectives, among which are: (1) urbanization—the placing of more industry in cities, particularly large cities—

How would the rural folks like that?—

(2) Ruralization—the encouragement of industrialization in small towns and farming areas—

But how would industrializing a rural community "ruralize," or make it more rural? And how would the city folks like that?—

(3) Suburbanization—the shifting of plants out of large cities to surrounding communities—

That is, somewhere between the city gates and where the "rustics" live—

(4) Delocalization—the breaking up of high concentration of single industries in particular areas;

(5) Dispersion—the spreading of industrial activity throughout the country more nearly in relation to population or area;

(6) Diversification—the encouragement of varied local economic structures; and

(7) Specialization—the concentration of an important part of local resources on the making of products for which the locality possesses superior advantages.

Which goes to show the utter lack of agreement, and confusion among the planners themselves as to what they would do with our industrial plants if they were given the power they seek to arbitrarily place and relocate them.

But regardless of utter lack of agreement among the political planners themselves on the subject, openly admitted by themselves, in spite of the fact that nowhere that I have seen do they exhibit any evidence of even elemental knowledge of why or how they propose to carry out this scheme, and notwithstanding the further fact that there is absolutely no demand by the public for this communistic program, they give us to understand that they are going ahead with it whether we like it or not. Feeling its oats, that is the vast powers usurped from the people, the State, operating through the National Resources Planning Board warns us that unless we accept this program willingly it has at hand the knout to bring us to terms. Here is its warning:

The balancing of locational programs and the most suitable means of implementation for public policy remain to be explored. Governmental authority is adequate to the means. Taxation, tariffs, price regulation, transportation and power regulation, labor legislation, public works, credit control, and financial assistance are all potentially effective instruments which the Federal Government may wield in its efforts to promote the development of a nationally integrated locational structure.

To force people to do things against their will we use weapons, not instruments.

Taxation, tariffs, price regulation, transportation and power regulation, labor legislation, public works, credit control, and financial assistance are all.

It might as well have added the police power, but it may have been considered a little early, for this is now to be used by the State as a weapon to bludgeon the American people into servility, into abject submission to its insatiable greed for power and spoliation.

And yet in the same breath the National Resources Planning Board says:

The basis of planning is not violence but reason, and the condition of most successful operation is not force but persuasion, cooperation, common participation in an effort for a common goal.

What duplicity and hypocrisy!

It is planned to raze our cities and rebuild them.

We must build—

The planners tell us—

not by the square block, but by the square mile.

And—

The task of making the Nation the better land we intend it to be is an enormous one. The neighborhood-in-the-city must be of a size and character that do not dwarf its inhabitants into anonymity, but provide a stage of sufficiently intimate scale so that the citizen can grasp it and play his role with satisfaction.

Millions of houses are to be built on farms and rural communities. Millions more in the cities.

T. V. A. is to be enlarged and made more powerful, and many more new T. V. A.'s are to be constructed throughout the country.

Transportation facilities, highways, flood-control education, water power, land use, and so forth, come under the planning program for development on a large scale.

Babies, children, and youth make green pastures for the political planners.

Children and youth cannot be kept in storage—

They say. Further—

They will not stop growing older merely because adults are preoccupied with the immediate aspects of national defense. For any view that looks to the post-war period, children and youth are the most significant among human beings. They are so significant because they are in process of becoming adults and because within limits that process can be guided. The care devoted to bringing young people safely along the paths to maturity will in large part be the measure of the contribution they will make, both as youth and adults, to our Nation's well-being.

We as a people cannot afford to cheapen the civilization we are defending by neglecting the quality of the generation for which we hold it in trust. There is no reasonable alternative to doing all in our power to insure young people the opportunity to grow into the best men and women they are capable of becoming.

Both the infant and the young child need the affection of emotionally mature parents and the atmosphere of security afforded by a stable household.

No wonder the National Resources Planning Board speaks of itself as a national resource when it can unearth such vital new truths as these.

But I do not find anything to show what color shirt they have selected for their youth movement.

And, of course, as could be expected, the schools are invaded. In the 1941 progress report we read:

Twenty-nine numbers of these (New England Planning Bulletin) have been published since October 1935. A major commission

activity has been reports designed to interest the New England people in the region's problems and planning as a means for their solution.

Popular among these is the pamphlet From the Ground Up, which presents a series of timely planning discussions, each limited to one page of text facing illustrations of good and bad examples. Several thousand copies are in use in junior and senior high schools, in civics, geography, economics, and sociology courses. Likewise, the commission prepared a report to stimulate interest in local planning, Is Planning Practical for Your Town?

Finally, the National Resources Planning Board reaches the nadir point of its spoliation plan. It proposes, not forthrightly and openly, of course, but insidiously and slyly, to invade the domain of sex life among our young people. Mark well this salacity.

At about this period boys and girls become eager to make new friends. They look for opportunities to meet one another informally, under suitable circumstances. They begin to think vaguely about marrying and rearing families of their own. They need to be informed of the many important factors that enter into founding a successful home. They need help in working out a functioning personal philosophy of life, an attitude toward themselves, their fellow men, and the world in general.

PLANS FOR FINANCING AND FISCAL POLICY

From whence is the wherewithal to be derived for completely razing the American economy and building it anew on another pattern? From the same principal sources to which the Federal Government has resorted in the last 10 or 12 years to pay for the vast public works and relief programs it carried on during that time, namely, taxes and Treasury deficit financing. The latter will probably assume, so perhaps the planners plan, the same forms as they have in the past; namely, first, sales of securities to the public; second, forced loans to the banks.

Also the same irrationalism, confusion, and sophistry are present in the minds of the planners as have dominated the financial policies of the New Deal throughout.

The following is from Dr. Alvin Hansen, of Harvard University, who is working in cooperation with Chairman Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board—

on problems of fiscal policy in the post-defense period, with particular reference to financing of public improvement projects:

All this expansion of services and improvements means governmental expenditures. The notion that we cannot finance our own production is quite without foundation. Every cent expended, private and public, becomes income for members of our own society. Costs and income are just opposite sides of the same shield. We can afford as high a standard of living as we are able to produce. But we cannot afford to waste our resources of men and material. We cannot afford to use them inefficiently. We cannot afford idleness, the idleness of $200,000,000,000 of income.

The public expenditures required to rebuild America, to provide needed social services, and to maintain full employment can be provided for out of the enormous income which the full utilization of our rich productive resources, material and human, makes possible. The costs of producing this income are merely payments to ourselves for the work done. There is not—there cannot be—any financing problem which is not manageable under a full employment income. From a $100,000,000,000 income we can raise large tax revenue—large enough to service any level of debt likely to be reached and to cover all other governmental outlays—and still retain for private expenditures more than we had left in former years under a $70,000,000,000 income with lower taxes. Taxes are merely one way of paying for social services and public improvement projects which we need. But it is not necessary or desirable under all circumstances to finance all public expenditures from taxes. Whether taxes should equal, fall short of, or exceed expenditures must be decided according to economic conditions.

The following are also excerpts from Dr. Hansen, taken from After the War—Full Employment:

Financial responsibility requires a fiscal policy (including governmental expenditures, loans, and taxes) designed to promote economic stability.

The tax funds collected to meet interest charges are not lost. They are paid right back again, largely to institutions that benefit the community as a whole. At the worst, the taxes are collected from one group of citizens and paid out to another group—the bondholders.

The public debt is something very different from private debt of an individual. An individual will always improve his asset position if he is able to pay off a part of his debt. But a nation may make itself poor by repayment of public debt. This is true because such repayment tends to cause deflation, depression, and unemployment. It is a good thing to pay off a part of the public debt if you want to check an excessive boom. It would be ruinous to pay off the public debt in a post-defense period when unemployment was spreading.

A public debt internally held has none of the essential earmarks of the private debt of an individual. A public debt is an instrument of public policy. It is a means to control the magnitude of the national income and, in conjunction with the tax structure, to affect income distribution.

In brief, it is reasonable to suppose that the ratio of consumption to income in a full employment economy would automatically tend to be higher than the ratio of consumption to income at the peak of a boom in a violently fluctuating economy. A full employment economy would tend automatically toward a distribution of income favorable to high consumption. This affords ground for optimism with respect to the feasibility of a positive program designed to maintain full employment. Such a policy, if successfully pursued, tends to develop repercussions upon the distribution of income which reinforce the program to maintain full employment.

Redistribution of income through progressive individual and corporate income taxes is less disruptive of these relations for the reason that such taxes apply only where the profit and income actually emerge.

The following from the 1942 National Resources Development Report:

We shall have to estimate the needed additions to private capital plant to meet consumer demands and the levels of national investment required to meet general public needs and to insure full employment.

There are many opportunities for government—Federal, State, and local—to aid private business in major fields of activity and investment where only new laws, new procedures, and new funds can unlock the door. Public action must, of course, be planned to meet general public needs. But, those needs which are met by private enterprise reduce by just that amount the remaining load on government.

Or did the persistence of this gigantic problem indicate that our economy of private enterprise and investment could not provide jobs for all?

Note the insinuation that private enterprise may be a failure.

If public provision of income on a substantial scale is not a temporary problem, but is to continue for a long time, are the several measures and methods which we have adopted to administer and finance these activities sound and constructive?

An important feature of the plan was the proposal for advances of funds to power equipment companies by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to insure continued peak production of turbine and generator units.

The full employment and prosperity which is coming with the war effort proves that we can have a full employment system and balance the production-consumption budget at a high level if we are determined to have it so, because we do have the necessary manpower, resources, productive plant, and organizing ability.

We have to make up our minds as a Nation that we will not permit a post-war depression to overwhelm us. We do not have to take economic defeat after the military victory is won. We can, if we will, maintain business prosperity. We can sustain a continuing demand for goods. We can keep industry going at high levels. We can maintain substantially full employment. We can achieve a society in which everyone capable of and willing to work can find an opportunity to earn a living, to make his contribution, to play his part as a citizen of a progressive, democratic country.

From the foregoing excerpts one also sees a continuation and accentuation of the trend of the last decade toward state intervention, control and ownership of property and the means of production and distribution.

Pump priming, though known to have been a total failure in eliminating unemployment in the thirties, nevertheless is to form an integral part of the plan.

In short, the same medicine that was applied by the New Deal in its attempt to cure the depression is now to be used to bring full employment, security for everybody, freedom from want, a higher standard of living for everybody, more leisure, more rest and greater liberty.

And the same medicine is to be applied to the other peoples of the earth to bring to them the good life.

The planners tell us the war has demonstrated that we can have full employment, and seem to think they have thereby found the key to end all unemployment. Mussolini and Hitler demonstrated that war can end unemployment. Just how the war formula is to be applied to achieve this result they do not say. However, the way the bureaucrats are using their powers in rationing, and so forth, it should be easy to see how that would be done.

One of the remarkable things about the New Deal planners is that they have now completely reversed their policy of promising us the good life by a program of scarcity, and instead, are now promising us the good life by a program of abundance.

The goal that is sought to be achieved by the President through the National

Resources Planning Board can no longer remain in doubt. The Planning Board, with the approval of the President, boldly speaks of "modified free enterprise," and it is clear, though there is lip service enough to the contrary, that the program outlined involves nothing less than the absorption by the state of all economic functions and the complete demolition of all free enterprise.

With the loss of all free enterprise would go, of course, all liberties—free speech, the right to petition, freedom of worship, and so forth.

Take just one promise alone, that of full employment. What does it connote? If the state undertakes to guarantee to every worker the right to continuous and full employment, the state must of necessity also assume full responsibility for the operation of all industry. This would involve assumption by the state of complete and unlimited control over all industry.

The state would become sole employer, would factitiously fix the value of all services, labor and goods, and working hours. It would use all the force at its command which would be the whole police power including the armed forces, to carry out its decrees. It would involve a dictatorship as absolute as any in the world today. Nor would any worker have any place to go to complain.

But we should not be so foolish as to think if the state were given this absolute power it would of necessity make good its promise of full employment, in the sense, at least, in which we conceive the term. Mussolini, Hitler, and Lenin all proclaimed the right to work and promised full employment. None of them could fulfill his promise except by going to war.

But even suppose it were possible for the state to make good this promise, who wants to live under a state of abject slavery?

The Board, which is the planning arm of the President, speaks approvingly and in support of its planning scheme of "the rise of the national state with its economic programs."

Indeed, and to what countries or country do the political planners refer as having taken on that mode?

Which of the western countries, leaving Russia out, in more recent times has led the way in aggrandizing the state and belittling the individual, where the state became all and the individual nothing? Was it not Germany that made the pattern of "the state with its economic programs"? Perhaps it may be apropos to mention here that Germany also set the example of providing state so-called social security. She began her social-security scheme more than half a century ago.

The state with its economic programs is nothing new. Indeed it is of most ancient origin. Egypt, many thousands of years ago, typified this kind of social organization.

Feudalism was a type of state with its economic and security programs, and all of Europe slaved under it for many hundreds of years. The Incas of Peru developed it to the *n*th degree. Aye, it was "the state with its economic program" that caused all of our American ancestors to run away from Europe and come to this country and found a free people under a true government, which was characterized principally by the absence of the state with its economic programs.

The political planning cult elevates itself to the region of the gods and modestly tells us it "is a national resource."

That we knew before it told us. But what kind of resource is it—good or evil? It is a resource for spoliation, and in its worst form.

Strip their model to the skin, remove the gilding with which they have adorned it, and what do we see? We see the state treasury. We see that bursary become a vast reservoir. We see pouring into it the earnings of our laborers. Behold, we see those fruits of labor being ladled out to placemen and bureaucrats.

Say what you will, here is the hub of their whole planning scheme. All their declamation, all their protestations for the poor and downtrodden, all their promises of Utopia revolve about it.

Oh, yes, they gild their model with strong feeling of pity and love for the distressed. That is old stuff. As Bastiat pointed out, spoliation has always placed the fulcrum of its lever in heaven and sacrilegiously prided itself on the complicity of the gods.

What? They say the Bill of Rights has stood unshaken 150 years and promise us more freedom, when they had already, before the defense program was started, reduced our people to the abject status where they were compelled, in great measure, to appeal to the law to give value to their services; when they had succeeded in reducing at least one whole group, the farming community, comprising a fourth of our population, to the servile condition so as to place its members wholly at the mercy of the law to give their services value. What mockery! How far above the level of slavery has the New Deal planning left the farmers?

But whatever may be our views with regard to merits or demerits of any of the schemes of the planners, it is the exclusive function of Congress to deal with these subjects. That is the purpose for which the people elected us. We shall fail altogether in our duty if we do not eradicate this anomaly from our governmental structure.

There is absolutely no authority in law for the National Resources Planning Board to do anything more than set up a 6-year construction program for Federal public works. The authority it assumes to make our Nation over into a totalitarian regime has been usurped, as so many of the powers the Executive holds have been arbitrarily wrested from us. I repeat, it is a grave menace to our Nation and must be abolished, root and branch.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### CONTINUING AUTHORITY OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 65) for printing in the RECORD:

*Resolved*, That the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, and continued under House Resolution 26, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued under House Resolution 321 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued under House Resolution 90 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and continued under House Resolution 420 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress and shall report to the House as soon as practicable, but not later than January 3, 1945, the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

### THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have asked this time in order to speak about the Dies committee and to make some comments on the speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], on Monday last, and subsequent events here in the House.

With much of what the gentleman from Texas had to say there can be no disagreement. That he stressed the importance of the vigor and independence of the national legislature every Member of this body will agree. When he states that Communists should not be employed by the Government everyone will agree, and will also add that no one who is a Nazi or Fascist in his loyalty ought to be so employed. When he appeals for national unity everyone will not only agree, but utter a fervent "Amen." But let us go beneath the surface a little in each of these cases.

There are certain things requisite to assure the vigor and independence of the national legislature and they run somewhat deeper I believe than the things mentioned by the gentleman from Texas. As I stated before in connection with a previous report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, it is my opinion that the Congress holds within its own hands the key to its own independence and power. I do not believe anyone from outside of Congress can hurt it greatly, provided the Congress itself and within itself is constructive, farsighted, determined, and unafraid. Neither do I believe that Members of Congress want to represent themselves as being properly immune to criticism or attack. I do not for a single moment excuse false accusations against Members of Congress, particularly when organizations of one kind or another make such accusations. I have suffered from this sort of thing myself on a good many occasions and especially in my last campaign, but I

have been inclined to put it down as one of the more or less inevitable consequences of public life in America and have attempted to do the best I could to combat such influences. Above all I do not think it should be represented as an un-American activity, for people who themselves have certain convictions about the right course for this country to follow, to attempt to oppose Members of Congress who do not agree with that point of view.

I have, of course, no defense for action by any organization which fails to consistently and carefully apply the standards it itself has selected for the judgment of Members of Congress records in making its appraisal of them. And I am frank to say that I think this was done by at least one of the organizations mentioned by the gentleman from Texas. It is true, however, that at the present time there are large numbers of people throughout this country who sincerely are committed to seeing that America does not lose the peace after this war is won. They feel desperately that had different policies been followed after the last war and had the leadership of Woodrow Wilson prevailed in this country, the present war might not have taken place. They do not want to see a repetition of those same mistakes. These people it seems to me have a right to express their point of view as freely as they see fit. Members of Congress will naturally want to rise up on this floor and oppose with all the vigor at their command people who attack them or are in opposition to their points of view or attempt to bring about their defeat. But to state or to imply that such action constitutes an un-American or unpatriotic activity is quite another matter and is in my judgment unjustified.

In the second place, the problem of preventing Communists from being employed in the Government is one upon which, as I have said, there will be no substantial disagreement in the House. I want to say that the head of one Government agency called me to ask if I would not help him to see the evidence bearing on one of the employees of that agency in order that he might take such action as seemed called for. I want also to say that I think this responsible head is doing exactly the right thing.

But the standard set up by the gentleman from Texas in his speech was not that of whether or not a person is a Communist, but rather whether or not they fell into a certain category which the gentleman characterized as "crackpot." Now I find it difficult myself sometimes to understand just why some of the governmental agencies cannot do a better job than they do of picking their personnel. Nor do I derive any satisfaction from finding from time to time that individuals with past records which are, to say the least, colorful, are occupying positions on the Government pay roll. But I think it a very dangerous thing, indeed, in America for us to attempt to set up any other standard than that of loyalty to our country as the basic test of whether or not a man is worthy of trust. That standard was not used.

It is important in the first place to understand clearly the circumstances surrounding the speech of the gentleman from Texas last Monday. The speech was delivered at a time when the Committee on Un-American Activities was not in existence. Needless to say none of the material contained in that speech constituted action by the Committee on Un-American Activities. And the speech, therefore, was an expression of the point of view of the gentleman from Texas personally and must be so understood. Nevertheless, the speech was based upon material obtained through the Committee on Un-American Activities by the use of its subpena power and its investigative staff, and it is, therefore, extremely difficult to draw the line between where the activities of the gentleman as an individual Member of Congress end and where his work as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities begins. No one will question the right of the gentleman from Texas to speak as freely as any other Member of the House in expressing his point of view, nor will anyone doubt the great effectiveness with which he always does this. But it is partly because of the inevitable confusion arising from this situation that I am now speaking.

The gentleman from Texas has, of course, a perfect right to set up his own individual standards and to protest the employment of any person he chooses. And it may be that in some cases, had I seen the evidence I might agree with him. The gentleman told me I could see the evidence, but so far, though I have tried repeatedly, I have been unable to see any of it.

But since I am convinced that a large number of Members of the House conceived the speech of the gentleman on Monday last to be an expression of opinion on the part of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I have been impelled to make this speech. For if the House is to undertake to scrutinize and pass judgment upon the personnel of the various Government agencies, it must have a standard which it can defend when it does so. The gentleman from Texas himself did not claim the list he submitted in his speech consisted necessarily of persons who were Communists or friendly to the Communist cause, though in some instances he did make that charge. In a number of cases, however, he himself stated specifically that the person in question was not a Communist, but that he fell into some other category roughly described as "crackpot."

A few examples will suffice to illustrate my point.

First, I am in receipt of a letter from Father R. A. McGowan of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, regarding Catherine Kellock, one of the persons mentioned by the gentleman from Texas. Father McGowan states he has known Miss Kellock for a long time and can vouch for her in every respect. I find it difficult to believe that a person who receives a recommendation like that can be subversive or dangerous to the country in any way.

In the second place I refer to the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT], regarding Mr. McKee, another man mentioned by the gentleman from Texas. Mr. McKee is a rather well-to-do businessman in Pittsburgh who has been spending his money for the purpose of promoting what he terms the proper foreign policy on the part of the United States, and specifically to try to bring about a greater degree of participation by the United States in international efforts to maintain peace after the war. Regardless of whether one agrees with Mr. McKee's point of view, it seems to me certain that he has a right if he chooses to spend his money to advance the ideas in which he believes for precisely the same reason that a person who diametrically disagrees with Mr. McKee's position has and frequently exercises the same right. It may be interesting as a sidelight on Mr. McKee's political point of view to state that he cast his vote for Mr. Herbert Hoover not only in 1928 but again in 1932.

In the case of Mr. Paul Porter, I am informed that Mr. Porter has been a strong anti-Communist throughout his whole life. And I would also call the attention of the House to the fact that he recently was elected Chairman of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee by the votes of the representatives of the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission. From what I can discover he is doing a very splendid job in keeping shipbuilding production moving. I just wonder whether this activity can be fairly described as dangerous to our country.

Finally, in the case of Mr. Guissepi Facci, mentioned by the gentleman from Texas. From what I can discover this man has been an ardent opponent of Mussolini and Italian fascism ever since that form of government was brought about in Italy. He has made a good many anti-Fascist speeches and in some instances those speeches, as I understand it, were made before groups which our committee has determined to be Communist front organizations. Mr. Facci states that he made no more speeches before any such organizations after he knew what their nature was. He has been very highly recommended by Mr. Henry F. Grady, the former Assistant Secretary of State of the United States, and presently the president of the Dollar Line Steamship Co., who has known Mr. Facci a great many years. It seems a bit strange that we should include on the list of those accused of un-American activities the name of a person because of the fact that he has been ardently active in opposition to the Italian regime with which the United States is at present at war.

On Friday last, the House came within 7 votes of taking what would have been recorded as one of the most unjust actions in the history of the Congress. It came that close to adopting an amendment which would have denied the opportunity to work for the Government of this Nation to 38 people, without giving any of them an opportunity to be heard in their own defense, without any committee of the House having recommended such action, and, in the case of a number of the people, without any charge having been lodged against them except

that in the judgment of one member they fall into the vague category of "crackpots."

In that group would have been included, as we now know, one man now serving overseas in the Army of his country; one serving in Africa with the Red Cross; three others who have been off the Federal pay roll for months; a man chosen by votes of Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission to head the work of stabilizing the work of the shipbuilding industry; an Italian-American whose main effort through the years, whatever his mistakes, has been to contact the influence among Italian-Americans of the Mussolini regime against which this Nation is now at war; a woman highly recommended by a priest of the Catholic Church.

As to some of the persons included in the list the gentleman from Texas may have a real case. If so, the facts should be determined, as he himself suggested, by the Appropriations Committee, with recommendations to the House.

I want to say at this point I very much approve of the suggestion brought forward by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations this afternoon.

But the main fact is still clear, and it goes to the very root of what I have been saying for 4 years: Things like this, mistakes like this, ought not to be laid in the lap of the House until the most mature consideration has been given them, not by one Member but by a whole committee working on problems of this sort.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Do you mean that you think this investigation should be by the Rules Committee or by this special committee proposed in the resolution?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, as I understood him, came forward with a proposal that a special group of the Appropriations Committee should be set up to deal with all cases of this character in connection with all appropriation bills, and make an appropriate report of their findings to the House. That is what I had reference to.

And there remains also the more fundamental issue—namely, that in my judgment it is all wrong to submit to the House a list of persons to be proscribed when the basis of that list is not communism, fascism, disloyalty, subversion, or any of these, but only a generalized charge that their views are somehow unacceptable to someone else.

Now, where does that leave us, and what is the ultimate result of such a point of view?

Well, if we are going in for lists of crackpots we ought to be even-handed about the matter. And it is quite as possible to make up a list of persons that one can describe as crackpot on one side of the fence as it is upon the other. A man can be a crackpot conservative as easily as a crackpot radical and you could find things written in the past to indicate it. My own very definite point of view is that unless a person can be shown to be committed to a philosophy of government which is contrary to the basic constitutional institutions of the United States, unless he can be shown to be disloyal to America, he ought not under any circumstances to be placed in the same category with those against whom such charges can be made. And furthermore if this is done, and the line becomes blurred between the real totalitarian at either extreme on the one hand and sincere American on the other, whether they be extremely reactionary or extremely progressive, we are in for trouble. The tendency to describe as unworthy, unfit, or un-American those with whom one does not agree politically will, in my judgment, if pursued far enough, lead inevitably to a situation which will play directly into the hands of the Communists on the one hand and the Nazis and Fascists on the other—and give them the very field and opportunity which they have used most effectively in the past in other countries. It is obviously to their interest to draw into the orbit of their influence as many people as possible and to confuse insofar as they can the public mind in order to lead people generally to think that there is little, if any, difference between a Fascist and a Conservative, or a Communist and a Progressive. If those charged with the task of exposing un-American activities lend credence to these very ideas they are rendering their own cause a disservice and greatly lessening the effectiveness of their work against real totalitarian elements. This has been my position from the beginning.

One of the cornerstones upon which our country has been built is that of the right of political minorities to exist and express their opinions. In speaking of political minorities, I am not talking about groups which seek by unconstitutional methods to undermine and destroy the structure of constitutional government and to impose a dictatorship by a class or group. I am talking about people who believe either in the necessity of very much more conservative policies than those being pursued by the Government or very much more progressive policies than those being pursued by the Government.

And I would like to state at this point that the course of my own political experience has led to the strong belief that progress for the common man is not by any means necessarily to be associated with increased power on the part of a central government, although in the case of certain types of problems governmental action seems to me to be absolutely necessary, if the weak are to be fairly protected and the strong appropriately restrained. The issue here, however, is one which becomes of tremendous consequence in time of war, for at that time the effort of every one of us should be to bind together the efforts of every American who is loyal and devoted to his country's cause.

The war has not yet burned deeply enough into the consciousness of many of us to scorch away the superficial differences which have existed in the past and to make us feel that kinship with other loyal Americans which we shall need before this struggle is over, and which above all we shall need in the reconstruction of our country and the finding of her proper place in the world after the war has been won. In England the experiences of the war have apparently led to that very result. It has for the time being at least obliterated many old antagonisms, has caused people to cling to one another regardless of their differences much more closely than ever before, and it has made people there welcome rather than scoff at proposals that offer substantial hope for a happier day tomorrow for the heroes who will come back from battle. The men who win this war will, as the gentleman from Texas said, want the basic structure of our constitutional Government to remain—they will want us to protect while they are gone a precious heritage of free institutions that no other large nation ever has known. But those men will also demand a chance, a full big fair chance, at a good job with opportunity to grow and develop. And they are going to get it.

The crux of this portion of my speech is a question. Once we depart from the standard of loyalty to our country in passing judgment on people, what standard are we to use? Are we to use the standard of who is a "crackpot" in the judgment of the gentleman from Texas, or in the judgment of the Department of Justice, or in the judgment of the gentleman from California who is now addressing the House? In every case that standard would obviously be different and in every case I submit it would be wrong. The whole future hope of America lies in not dividing ourselves politically between two bitterly hostile groups, one calling the other Fascist and the other calling the one Communist, when neither epithet is true or accurate. Our hope lies rather in our drawing political lines as nearly as we can between the real totalitarians of each extreme and the vast majority of us in the middle fighting out our political battles in the traditional American way.

I come now to a discussion of the necessity of national unity in America. I submit such unity can only be established around a certain point of view which stresses big issues and not little ones. Our greatest issue is the defeat of our enemies in this war. Another issue of importance is the place of the Congress in our National Government. And the third is the winning of the peace and the establishment of a condition of prosperity in our own country after the war.

In order to achieve unity around these issues it is necessary that we combat with all the effort at our command those forces abroad and at home who would give aid and comfort to our enemy. That enemy today is Germany, Japan, and Italy—the Fascist powers of the world. It is for this reason that I have tried to emphasize the importance of this committee's contributing to national unity by laying its major emphasis upon the problem of exposing the propaganda efforts of these powers and their friends and agents. In saying that, however, I want to completely disavow statements which have been made over the air to the effect that pre-Pearl Harbor isolationists were supposed to be included in such a category of people. I do not think there

is any more right to saying that a man is sympathetic to Nazis or Fascists because he was isolationist than it is to say he is a friend of the Communists because he entertains progressive political views. My own personal opinion is that the pursuit of an isolationist policy after this war will be dangerous to the future peace of this Nation and the world. But this certainly does not lead me to feel that anybody advocating such a policy is any more un-American that I am.

Concern has been expressed over the difficulty of determining what constitutes a person who is a Fascist or a Nazi in America. I want to say on this point in the first place that I deplore quite as much the tendency on the part of certain groups to shout Fascist at every conservative, as I do the tendency on the part of other groups to shout Communist at people who are not Communist at all. But when people ask "What is a Fascist?" I would reply by asking them "What is a Communist?" If to that question it is replied that a Communist is a member of the Communist Party, then I would set up a standard that a Fascist or a Nazi is a person who is a member of the German-American Bund or an Italian or a Japanese organization and who takes his line from such foreign sources. But if people are going to define a Communist in some big category of people who somehow seem to be too far to the left, then inevitably the corresponding definition of Fascist moves over to include people who in some other people's judgment are too far to the right.

How we can achieve national unity if we are going to use definitions of this sort I am unable to see.

The thing we must look for is efforts on the part of the Axis Powers to break down America's will to victory by various propaganda devices. Undoubtedly this is being attempted every day.

These are some of the forms that Axis propaganda will take:

First. "Germany and Japan can never be defeated, the least we can hope for is a draw. There is no use to count upon a real victory."

Second. "The American cause is being betrayed by our country's own leadership."

Third. "This war is not a battle for democracy, but is the result of a plot by international big business or the Jews or somebody else. Hitler and Hirohito are really not such bad fellows."

Fourth. "America cannot trust her allies so we had better not give any aid to them but instead keep all our material in this country to protect ourselves against invasion."

Fifth. "The President deliberately steered America into the war when it could have been avoided."

Sixth. "The American Government is honeycombed with disloyal people."

Seventh. "There is a plot being developed by capital or labor or new dealers or reactionaries or somebody to take over the country after the war is over. It is more important to prevent this than to defeat Hitler."

Eighth. "America cannot win the war without going bankrupt."

Ninth. "England is not doing her share of the fighting, so why should we?"

Tenth. "The only purpose of this war is to protect the British Empire."

Eleventh. "The war does not need to interfere with the normal way of living of Americans, but the Government deliberately creates shortages, maladjustments, and difficulties just so it can increase its power."

These 11 false ideas are some of the ones which our enemies will try to get the American people to believe.

This is not to say that those who make such statements are necessarily disloyal to the United States. But it does mean that this type of propaganda should be combated by all of us who are devoted to a real victory on the part of our Nation.

Achievement of national unity then calls above all things for the application of a test of loyalty about which I have already spoken, before we pass judgment on any of our fellow citizens.

Young people throughout all history have been inclined to venture farther into fields of new and progressive thought about mankind and its problems than have old people. In my opinion a terrific loss would be sustained by our country and by its free institutions if by the action of this Congress, or a committee thereof, young people were rendered fearful of thinking along progressive lines. I say this particularly because I anticipate that the men now fighting this war will want to have something to say about a constructive solution of the problems of the peace.

For the past 4 years I have been a member of the Dies committee.

As a progressive in my political beliefs, I believe the committee has rendered a service to the cause of true American progressives by exposing the methods used by Communists to attempt either to dominate, use, or destroy progressive organizations. I believe it has rendered a service to the labor movement by pointing out who the Communists in its ranks are. To a lesser extent the committee has rendered a service to sincere conservatives by pointing out how Nazi and Fascist individuals and philosophies have attempted to infiltrate into, to use, and, if possible, to dominate conservative organizations.

A committee of this sort can serve a useful purpose.

But during the past year, in addition to several dissents from personal statements of other members, I have twice dissented from reports of the committee. One of these occasions was that of the last annual report. I did not sign it but appended a statement of minority views to it instead. The New York Herald Tribune, among other established newspapers, agreed editorially and without qualification with the position I took on that occasion.

My position has been, and is, that the committee's work should constitute exposure of all types of prototalitarian activities, Communist, Fascist, or Nazi, and especially to expose disloyalty to the United States and propaganda seeking to undermine that loyalty. I do not believe it is in the committee's province to sit in judgment on the political views of any loyal American, be he reactionary or radical. With the outbreak of war between our country and the Fascist powers, I believed the major task of the committee lay in the field of exposure of activities friendly or helpful to our enemies, and the philosophies they represent.

It has been no particularly easy task to constitute a minority of one on a committee of this sort.

In previous years I have proposed rules of procedure to guide the committee's work and action. I have been 100 percent unsuccessful in getting any of them adopted. I shall attempt at this time to tell neither the House nor myself that such rules will be adopted by the committee. It just is not in the cards.

I believe there are things such a committee should do: first, to investigate with equal zeal all totalitarian movements; second, to avoid accusation against persons in the absence of either substantial documentary evidence or an opportunity to be heard; third, to act as a committee and to afford to all members an opportunity to carry out their responsibilities to the House and to the country as members; and so forth, and most important, to avoid so far as possible domestic political controversy and to give—so long as this war shall last—major emphasis in its work to the defeat of the propaganda of enemy powers.

As I have worked on this speech and thought about the whole matter of my own relationship to the committee I have naturally been confronted with the decision as to whether or not I should remain a member of it. I have told one or two people that I would stay on the committee and do the best job I could along the lines just outlined. But I want in all honesty to say to these people and to the House that as I think about this question it becomes more and more difficult for me to see my way clear to follow that course.

I should like to close by stating that I am devoted to this Congress. My service in it has been the greatest privilege I have ever known. I like to see congressional committees independent of influence from the Executive or any other place. Because, however, I am thus devoted to the Congress, I am at all times concerned that its work be dignified and effective, and I do not want anything done by us here to be recorded in the chronicles of the future as narrow-minded, bigoted, foolish, or unfair.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a chart and table showing inductions, enlistments, and registrations by States, and other information concerning our armed forces in a letter addressed to the chairman of the Texas delegation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 45 minutes.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my speech I will explain the necessity for having to take the time of the House at this late hour.

Mr. Speaker, once again the House is called upon to extend the life of the Dies committee. Heretofore on five separate occasions the request has been to extend its term for only 1 year. Now we are asked to grant it a 2-year lease on the power and prestige of the House. Just why 2 years on this occasion has not been explained. Is it because the decisive events of 1943 will reveal more vividly to the American people the exact and true role of the committee? Is it because the execution of the policy of our Nation and of the United Nations to force the unconditional surrender of the Axis Powers will make it clear that the role of the Dies committee is not only incompatible with such a policy, but in fact, a potential obstacle to complete attainment of that goal? Is it because it is necessary to have it on hand to use it as a spearhead in the drive by domestic Fascists to defeat a people's peace after a victorious people's war? Is it to insure its existence as a weapon to be used against Progressives and Liberals in the election of 1944, as it was utilized in the elections of 1938 and 1940? Is it because the chairman of this committee and its defenders fear to meet the test of 1943 and therefore refuse to submit themselves to a verdict of approval or disapproval at the beginning of 1944?

Certainly if the chairman of this committee and its advocates have confidence in its performance of the past, the present, and during this year, they should have no fear of judgment by the Members of this House and by the American people in January or February of 1944. Again I ask, why a continuance of 2 years, and why by virtue of this 2-year resolution, which the Rules Committee has now presented to this House, deprive this Congress of its right to pass upon the continuance of this committee for 1944?

Further, why the blitzkrieg method employed in reporting out this resolution? In the past, Members have had an opportunity, and so have representatives of organizations including labor, church, and civic groups, to appear before the Rules Committee and voice their objections. Why has this practice, which has been traditional in the House, been flagrantly disregarded this time? Why have the 6 or 7 Members who asked to do so been shut off from the opportunity to appear before the Rules Committee?

The resolution for the creation of a committee of this nature originates in the Rules Committee. From the standpoint of procedure it is in the same position as any bill before any of the legislative committees of the House. Members and nonmembers have never been barred from testifying as to the merits or demerits of any legislation before any committee. The resolution for the continuance of the Dies committee, as I have stated, is no different from any other bill and the Rules Committee in this case sits in no different capacity from any other committee of the House. Therefore, why the extraordinary procedure and why was this peculiar protection from the scrutiny of public opinion granted to this resolution?

Instead of allowing full and free discussion, we shall be constrained to vote this resolution up or down with only 30 minutes allowed to the opposition, and when that 30 minutes is divided, Members opposed to the bill who desire to speak will scarcely be allowed more than a minute or two in which to describe the devastating and dangerous role that this committee has played and will play in the most critical period in the history of our country. Just why has it become so necessary to surround this resolution for the continuance of this committee with all of this protection, which makes mockery out of the democratic procedure of this legislative body?

The setting aside of the democratic and traditional procedure of the House cannot be justified by the statement made by the author of the resolution that everybody is for the committee. That smacks too much of the glibness of the language employed by the Nazis to justify the destruction of democratic institutions. Further, the appearance of unanimity which the proponents of this committee seek to give us is not warranted by the facts. The other day 1,250 prominent American citizens signed a petition urging that this committee not be continued.

The following are a few, representing a cross section of these distinguished signers:

Fay E. Allen, member, City Board of Education, Los Angeles, Calif.; Frank E. Baker, president, State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wis.; Dean Harold Benjamin, College of Education, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.; Mary McLeod Bethune, president, National Council of Negro Women, Washington, D. C.; John W. Bollinger, president, Farmers Union Livestock Commission Co., Flasher, N. Dak.; Mary E. Branch, president, Tillotson College, Austin, Tex.; Mrs. Louis D. Brandeis, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Charlotte Hawkins Brown, president, Palmer Institute, Sedalia, N. C.; Zechariah Chafee, Jr., professor of law, Cambridge, Mass.; Alvin B. Christmas, State director, Pennsylvania Farmers Union, Centerport, Pa.; Harold G. Coffman, president, George Williams College, Chicago, Ill.; Rabbi Henry Cohen, Galveston, Tex.; George Dahl, professor of Old Testament, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.; John W. Davis, president, West Virginia State College, Institute, W. Va.; Rev. John Warren Day, dean of Grace Cathedral, Topeka, Kans.; Albert Einstein, Princeton, N. J.; Charles A. Ellwood, professor of Sociology, Duke University, Durham, N. C.; Dean Alvin E. Evan, law school, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.; Dr. Ernest Feise, professor of medicine, Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, Md.; Robert J. Harris, associate professor of government, Louisiana State University, editor, Journal of Politics, Baton Rouge, La.; Rev. W. H. Jernagin, chairman executive board, Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, Washington, D. C.; Helen Keller, Westport, Conn.; U. S. Lathrop, secretary, Lee County Taxpayers Association, Donnellson, Iowa; Ralph Linton, chairman, department of anthropology, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Yehudi Menuhin, violinist, Alma, Calif.; Dudley Nichols, film writer and director, Los Angeles, Calif.; John S. Nollen, chairman of War Savings Committee for Iowa, Grinnell, Iowa; Rev. G. Bromley Oxman, the Methodist Church, Boston, Mass.; Arthur Upham Pope, chairman, Committee for National Morale, New York, N. Y.; Bishop Reverdy C. Ransom, A. M. E. Church, Wilberforce, Ohio; Paul Robeson, concert artist; William Jay Schieffelin, vice president, American Bible Society, New York, N. Y.; Glenn J. Talbott, president, North Dakota Farmers Union, Jamestown, N. Dak.; Mary E. Woolley, president emeritus, Mount Holyoke College, Westport, N. Y.; William Lindsay Young, president, Park College, Parkville, Mo.

Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the executive council and the legislative conference of the C. I. O., speaking for 5,000,000 organized workers, have asked for the discontinuance of this committee.

Hundreds of American Federation of Labor locals have gone on record against the continuance of the Dies committee. Only last week the committee received the condemnation of conservative newspapers such as the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times and the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser.

Therefore I fail to see how "everybody," as its proponents say, has endorsed this committee. Unless, of course, by "everybody" they mean George Sylvester Viereck, now in a Federal penitentiary, convicted as a Nazi agent, who said:

I have the highest respect for the Dies committee and sympathize with its program.

Or perhaps by "everybody" they mean Fritz Kuhn, leader of the bund, and now serving a term in Sing Sing Penitentiary, in New York State, for grand larceny, who said:

I am in favor of it—

The Dies committee—

to be appointed again, and wish them to get more money.

Or perhaps they mean Mr. Colescott, imperial wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, who said in a pamphlet:

Behind the whole fight on the Ku Klux Klan has been that hand of an insidious alien influence. The vicious fight on the klan sprang from the same source which has fought the Dies committee from the day of its inception.

It is only natural that the klan endorses the Dies committee. Or perhaps by "everybody" they mean Mr. J. B. Matthews, who has been drawing a salary of $7,500 a year from the committee appropriation and who is, indeed, an ambidextrous performer. With one hand he drafts the reports of the Dies committee and with the other, or perhaps with the same, writes articles for the Kontra-Komintern — international propaganda sheet of Adolf Hitler. For a piece of disgusting intellectual debauchery I recommend his book, The Odyssey of a

Fellow Traveler, which contains the most lurid confession of duplicity and double-dealing. It is available in the Congressional Library.

I hold here in my hand a photostatic copy of Kontra-Komintern, containing the articles written for Adolf Hitler's propaganda sheet—articles written by none other than the chief investigator of the Dies committee. These are photostats. Any Member of the House who would like to examine them can do so now or come up to my office tomorrow and look at them.

When we indulge in the dangerous practice of withholding funds for payment of salary to employees in the executive branches, we have in Mr. Matthews a very good case for similar treatment for one on the pay roll of our own branch of the Government.

No, Mr. Speaker, it is evident that not everybody is for the committee, when we bear in mind that the Commander in Chief of the United States described the procedure of this committee as sordid; that the Vice President of the United States and the Attorney General of the United States have condemned its activities in even stronger terms.

I may also add the name of Wendell Willkie, titular leader of the Republican Party, among those patriotic Americans who has recently applauded the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS] for his statement in opposition to Mr. DIES.

Obviously, not everybody supports the committee, and it is precisely the opposition of millions of people that demands that the traditional democratic procedure of the House not be scrapped in order to protect this resolution and the Dies committee from a thorough airing and a thorough examination before the membership of this House.

As no adequate debate will be had on this resolution, I am compelled to avail myself of this opportunity of drawing the attention of the House to some of the salient points of argument against the continuance of the Dies committee.

The committee has recently published a report, to justify its existence and continuance. The report is divided into three parts, the third containing seven subheadings.

The high light of the first part of the report is:

That the committee originally had 3 file cabinets and now has 135 file cabinets, and that its index "contains over 1,000,000 cards, each containing information on individuals and organizations engaged in subversive activities." According to census reports, this means 1 card for every 130 men, women, and children in the country. I submit this record, without further comment, to the common sense of the membership of this House.

Part 2 of the report deals with so-called Communists in the Government, together with the narrative of Mr. DIES' quarrel with the Attorney General and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is true, as the report states, that Mr. DIES submitted 1,124 names to the Attorney General for investigation. However, it is likewise true that on September 2, 1942, Attorney General Biddle submitted his report to the House on the investigation called for, showing that only two of the total number were unfit in his opinion to remain in the service, and had been discharged. I pointed out that the Attorney General was assisted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and here we are asked in this report to accept Mr. DIES and Mr. Matthews as better investigators than the F. B. I. and the Department of Justice.

In the first two sections of part 3 of the report, Mr. DIES again raises the Red bogey and again Red-baits American labor. It is to be remembered that this report was published January 2, 1943, when American workers are giving their sons, their toil, their services, and their money for victory against the Axis. The publication of this Red smear on labor at this time furthers one objective close to the heart of the enemy, that is, to injure the reputation of American labor and thereby cause disunity in our ranks.

Subdivision 3 of part 3 is a rehash of the Yellow Book, which I exposed from the Well of this House last year. For the benefit of the new Members, I relate some of the facts in connection with that Yellow Book, issued as a report of the committee of its investigation of Japanese activities.

I charged and proved on the floor of the House that many of its pages were an exact, word-for-word, comma-for-comma, period-for-period copy of material on the Japanese contained in a 10-cent news letter, published by the News Research Service, Inc., located at 727 Seventeenth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., on July 16, 1941, months before the publication of the Yellow Book.

Former Representative Thomas Eliot, of Massachusetts, established beyond reasonable doubt that the other pages were taken from books and publications found in the Congressional Library. Mr. DIES sought to justify this action by producing on the floor of this House a telegram sent to him after my exposure, by the publisher of the news letter, in which he stated that Mr. DIES was at liberty to use this material. As if this changed the picture. The issue raised was not that of technical plagiarism. I exposed the fact that Mr. DIES sought to give to this Congress a report of the work, investigation, research, and findings of the committee which turned out to be written material contained in a news letter, written and circulated to the public at the price of 10 cents, by one not even remotely connected with the committee.

Under the same heading of Japanese activities, Mr. DIES in his report states as follows:

> A direct result of the committee's report on Japanese subversive activities in this country was the removal of the Japanese population from vital west coast areas.

Of course, the War Department had nothing to do with this, nor the President, nor the Department of Justice. If we are to believe this report, the removal of the Japanese was a direct result of the committee's report in the Yellow Book which, I repeat, was a reprint of publications in the Congressional Library and of a 10-cent news letter.

Is it any wonder therefore that we find a member of the committee itself, Mr. VOORHIS, referring to this claim of the committee, saying, in his minority report:

> But when the committee states in conclusion of this section that the removal of the Japanese from west coast areas was "a direct result of the committee's report on Japanese subversive activities in this country," I believe it is making an extravagant claim.

That is the language of one of the members of the committee discrediting one of the claims made by the committee in this report which we now have in the House.

In the light of this exposure the record stands clearly, that the Dies committee has done nothing to further our war against Japan.

In subsection 4 of part 3 the committee seeks to take credit for an alleged investigation of anti-Semitic activities. When this took place and how and where we are not told. All we do know, however, is that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] himself, only a week ago, sought to justify a lack of real investigation in this field by throwing a legalistic cloak around anti-Semitism In the record of his speech in the House—page 484, February 1, 1943—we find this language:

> I do not hold with those who condemn anyone on account of his race or creed, but there is no law against a man being intolerant as much as we deplore intolerance.

First of all, this is not true. Laws against intolerance exist on the statute books of many States, and an exposure of those who engage in this practice would help toward a suppression of it. Further, the people have not asked Mr. DIES to be a prosecutor in the courts. The request has been repeatedly made that those who engage in this subversive activity should be exposed.

The committee is supposed to investigate un-American and subversive activities. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] deny that intolerance is an un-American activity? Does he fail to realize that particularly anti-Semitism was one of the main subversive activities with which Adolf Hitler forced himself into power in Germany?

However, it is most illuminating to note what one of the most active anti-Semites and apostles of intolerance in America today, Mr. Gerald L. K. Smith, whose publication The Cross and the Flag was recently mentioned in an indictment as a publication employed in a conspiracy against the security of our Nation in time of war, has had to say in regard to the committee.

> As a national chairman of the Committee of One Million, the writer is proud to report that when Mr. DIES asked for a continuation of his committee, together with an additional appropriation, the Committee of One Million carried a petition bearing more than 400,000 names to Washington, calling for the continuation of the investigation. We placed this petition before the Rules Committee, and it was also presented on the floor of the United States Congress. Expert observers insist that this was the biggest and most effective single effort put forth to support the continuation of this statesmanlike committee.

As for subdivision 5, his attack on the Union for Democratic Action, I say as one who was attacked by this organization during my primary campaign, that this organization exercised its constitutional right in a democracy to call upon the voters to elect or defeat any candidate for public office. It is a violation of the basic principles of democracy for this committee of the House to use its privileges and powers to destroy the reputations of men and women because of their participation in electioneering.

In its subdivision 6 the committee in its report indulges in red-baiting generalizations against the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. That, of course, is readily understood when we bear in mind that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has exercised its constitutional rights in consistently opposing the Dies committee.

Finally, we come to the subject given the least attention by the committee, occupying less than 1 out of the 13 pages of the report. This indeed indicates the proportionate importance given by the majority of the committee to the problem of defeating our country's enemies, with whom we are now engaged in a life and death struggle. In this section of the report we find another extravaganza. It is a short, short story with regard to Nazi activities in which the committee seeks to take credit for the prosecution and conviction of Bund members and others, specifically mentioning G. Wilhelm Kunze, national fuehrer of the bund, and Kuhagen, Zapp, and Tonn, who, the committee claims, were convicted on the basis of evidence turned over by it to the Department of Justice.

I just wonder what Attorney General Biddle, Matheas Correa, United States district attorney for the southern district of New York, J. Edgar Hoover, and the F. B. I., who did the work, prosecuted and brought about the conviction of these Nazis, have to say about this section of the report.

The country was amazed to learn that this report was published without any opportunity for discussion or amendment.

Many House Members will be amazed to learn, and I am now quoting the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], a member of the committee that—

> There has been no opportunity for discussion or amendment of the report or for committee members to do any work upon it. No meeting has been held for its consideration. The report was presented to members on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. It is, in my judgment, wrong for such a document as an annual report of this committee to be treated in this manner, particularly at this time.

It is on the basis of this report that the committee asks for an extension of 2 years. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, all I ask is that you read this report, the committee's own report, consider the money expended by the Dies committee during the last 4 years—over $400,000—before you cast your vote on the resolution to continue the committee until past election time in 1944.

Let me examine further: What has been the conduct of this committee in regard to the un-American activities of domestic Fascists?

On January 4, 1943, the Department of Justice announced the indictment, charging 33 individuals and 1 corporation with a Nation-wide conspiracy to—

1. Interfere with, impair, and influence the loyalty, morale, and discipline of the military and naval forces of the United States, in violation of section 11, title 18, United States Code; and

2. Cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, and refusal of duty in the military and naval forces of the United States in violation of section 34, title 50, United States Code.

Named as defendants in the indictment were:

1. Court Asher, Muncie, Ind.
2. David J. Baxter, alias The Chancellor, alias John Pepper, alias John H. Rand, Colton and San Bernardino, Calif.
3. Otto Brennermann, alias Otto Brennemann, Chicago, Ill.
4. H. Victor Broenstrupp, alias the Duke of St. Saba, alias Count Victor Cherep-Spiridovich, alias Lt. Gen. Cherep-Spiridovich, alias Colonel Bennett, alias J. G. Francis, New York City, and Noblesville, Ind.
5. Oscar Brumback, Washington, D. C., and Luray, Va.
6. Prescott Freese Dennett, Washington, D. C.
7. Leon De Aryan, San Diego, Calif.
8. Hudson De Priest, New York City, and Wichita, Kans.
9. Hans Diebel, Los Angeles, Calif.
10. Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling, alias Rev. Frank Woodruff Johnson, Chicago, Ill.
11. Elmer J. Garner, Wichita, Kans.
12. James F. Garner, Wichita, Kans.
13. Robert Edward Edmondson, alias R. E. Edmondson, New York City, and Santa Barbara, Calif.
14. William Griffin, New York City.
15. Charles B. Hudson, alias Rev. Frank Woodruff Johnson, Omaha, Nebr.
16. Ellis O. Jones, Los Angeles, Calif.
17. William Kullgren, Atascadero, Calif.
18. William Robert Lyman, Jr., alias Robert Lanham, Detroit, Mich.
19. Donald McDaniel, Chicago, Ill.
20. Robert Noble, Los Angeles, Calif.
21. William Dudley Pelley, Noblesville, Ind.
22. Eugene Nelson Sanctuary, New York City.
23. Edward James Smythe, New York City.
24. Herman Max Schwinn, Los Angeles, Calif.
25. Ralph Townsend, San Francisco, Calif., Lake Geneva, Wis., and Washington, D. C.
26. James C. True, Arlington, Va., and Washington, D. C.
27. George Sylvester Vierek, alias J. B. Hamilton, New York City and Washington, D. C.
28. Gerald B. Winrod, Wichita, Kans.
29. George E. Detherage, St. Albans, W. Va.
30. Mrs. Lois de Lafayette Washburn, alias T. N. T., Chicago, Ill., and Seattle, Wash.
31. Frank W. Clark, alias G. P., Tacoma, Wash.
32. Paquita de Shishmareff, alias Paquita de Shismarova, alias Mrs. Leslie Fry, Glendale, Calif., and New York City.
33. Frank K. Ferenz, Los Angeles.
34. The New York Evening Enquirer, Inc., New York City.

(NOTE: The first 23 of these defendants were indicted on July 21, 1942, by another Federal grand jury in Washington, D. C., for conspiracy to violate sec. 11, title 18, and sec. 34, title 50, U. S. C.)

Named as coconspirator but not as defendant, was Ulrich Fleischhauer, of Erfurt, Germany.

The case was handled for the Department of Justice by William Power Maloney and John T. M. Reddan, special assistants to the Attorney General, under the personal direction of Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge, in charge of the Criminal Division.

The Attorney General stated that the defendants in this indictment included all 28 defendants named in an earlier indictment returned by a different grand jury in the District of Columbia on July 21, 1942, and, in addition, six new defendants: George E. Deatheridge, Mrs. Lois de Lafayette Washburn, Frank W. Clark, Paquita de Shishmareff, Frank K. Ferenz, and the New York Evening Enquirer, Inc.

The indictment returned today, the Attorney General said, was the result of intensive investigation by the present grand jury, covering a period of several months. This investigation was conducted by this new grand jury following the indictment returned on July 21, 1942, by the earlier grand jury.

The present indictment, in addition to adding six new defendants, contains additional allegations concerning the scope and extent of the conspiracy, Mr. Biddle said, alleging that the conspiracy began in 1933 and continued up to the time the present indictment was returned. It also names as a coconspirator, but not as a defendant, one Ulrich Fleischhauer, of Erfurt, Germany.

It began in 1933, 5 years before the creation of the Dies committee, and it also named 41 organizations and the same number of publications as being used at the time and as having been created for the purpose of carrying out this conspiracy.

Count 1 of the indictment charges that from January 1, 1933, to the date of the indictment the defendants "unlawfully, willfully, feloniously and knowingly" conspired to commit act in violation of section 11, title 18, United States Code, which would:

(i) Advise, counsel, urge and cause insubordination, disloyalty and mutiny and refusal of duty by members of the military and naval forces of the United States, and

(ii) Distribute and cause to be distributed written and printed matter advising, counseling, and urging insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, and refusal of duty by members of the military and naval forces of the United States.

The indictment charges that this conspiracy was carried on through the printing, publishing, distributing, and circulating of newspapers, books, magazines, leaflets, circulars, pamphlets, and other documents in the following places, among others: Washington, D. C.; Noblesville, Ind.; Muncie, Ind.; New York City; Chicago, Ill.; Wichita, Kans.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Newton, Kans.; San Diego, Calif.; San Bernardino, Calif.; Omaha, Nebr.; Arlington, Va.; Lake Geneva, Wis.; New Haven, Conn.; Seattle, Wash.; Tacoma, Wash.; Erfurt, Germany; Bremerton, Wash., and Stuttgart, Germany.

Among other publications employed in the conspiracy, the indictment charges, were the following:

1. The New York Enquirer.
2. The Defender.
3. The Octopus.
4. The Galilean.
5. X-ray.
6. Publicity.
7. Beacon Light.
8. The Roll Call.
9. Weckruf und Beobachter (also known as The Free American).
10. Industrial Control Reports.
11. World Service (also known as Welt Dienst, published at Erfurt, Germany).
12. Social Republic Society Bulletin.
13. America in Danger!
14. The Broom.
15. Patriotic Research Bureau News Letter.
16. Road to Victory.
17. Women Investors in America Bulletin.
18. Constitutional Educational League Bulletin.
19. Scribner's Commentator.
20. War Guilt and War Mongers.

21. Revolution and the Fifth Column.
22. Edmondson's Economic Research Service.
23. American Vigilante.
24. Citizen's No Foreign War Coalition Manual.
25. America Awake.
26. Lord Lothian versus Lord Lothian.
27. War, War, War.
28. The Cross and the Flag.
29. Cease Firing.
30. The White Knight
31. The Christian Free Press.
32. The National Liberty Party Bulletin.
33. Friends of Progress.
34. The Revealer.
35. Waters Flowing Eastward.
36. Liberation
37. The Hidden Hand.
38. The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion.
39. Books of the Hour.
40. Democracy on the Nile.
41. Double-Cross in Palestine.
42. Inhumanity Unlimited.

(NOTE.—The first 29 of these publications were listed in the indictment of July 21, 1942.)

The indictment further charges that in furthering the conspiracy the defendants organized or caused to be organized, supported, used, controlled, or contributed financially to the following organizations, among others:

1. Silver Shirts.
2. Black Legion.
3. Ku Klux Klan.
4. German-American Bund (also known as American-German Bund.
5. National Workers' League of America (Detroit).
6. America First Committee.
7. National Committee to Keep America Out of Foreign Wars.
8. Citizens Committee to Keep America Out of War.
9. Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee.
10. Islands for War Debts Committee.
11. War Debts Defense Committee.
12. Coalition of Patriotic Societies.
13. Crusading Mothers of America.
14. Citizens' No Foreign War Coalition.
15. American Guards.
16. Social Republic Society (also known as Socis).
17. Committee of Patriotic Organizations.
18. Protestant Gentile League.
19. Pioneer News Service.
20. Crusader White Shirts.
21. James True Associates.
22. Women Investors in America.
23. Constitutional Educational League.
24. We, the Mothers United.
25. Flanders Hall, Inc.
26. United Mothers of America.
27. We, the Mothers, Mobilize for America, Inc.
28. American Mothers.
29. Purdy Publishing Co.
30. Knights of the White Camellia.
31. American Nationalist Confederation.
32. Militant Christian Patriots.
33. National Liberty Party.
34. Friends of Progress.
35. Patriotic Research Bureau.
36. National Gentile League.
37. League of War Veteran Guardsmen.
38. Pelley Publishers.
39. Pan Aryan Conference.
40. Capital News and Feature Service.
41. Yankee Comrades.

(NOTE.—The first 29 of these organizations were listed in the indictment of July 21, 1942.)

I now charge that very very few of those individuals mentioned or the organizations mentioned or the publications mentioned ever received even the semblance of an investigation by the Dies committee.

Here we have 34 individuals, 41 organizations, 42 publications charged as conspirators against the Nation, carrying on their activities against America from Washington to Stuttgart, Germany, over a period of 10 years, and what has the Dies committee done about it, in fact what has it said about it, in reality, what has it whispered about it? We have not even been told what it has thought about it.

This gigantic conspiracy against our country in time of war completely escaped the attention of Mr. Dies and his committee, and their numerous investigators, with their 135 filing cabinets and their million index cards.

Were they too busy seeking out nudists in the Board of Economic Warfare or hounding genuine anti-Fascists, Communists, labor unions, and fighting against the Soviet Union to devote a few moments of attention to this conspiracy, which comes more squarely under the terms of the resolution creating this committee than anything it has done?

Of course, we will be told that of these 34 the committee sought to investigate William Dudley Pelley, James Smythe, George Sylvester Viereck, and George E. Deatherage.

Even though the committee seeks to take credit for the imprisonment of Pelley, the district attorney who handled this case knows better. Pelley's first imprisonment originated from stock frauds and had nothing to do with the committee's activities. When Pelley appeared before the committee he heaped his loathsome praise upon it.

As for Smythe, he has been in contempt of the committee ever since he was subpenaed for not appearing. Had he been a labor leader, a Communist, a progressive, or a liberal, he would have been haled by the committee before th bar of this House to be adjudged in contempt, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] did in the case of two members of the Communist Party.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. In other words, that great mountain from the plains of Texas labored and labored, and finally produced a mouse.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman from Texas did not pay any attention to and definitely overlooked the most gigantic conspiracy this country has ever seen in its history, the conspiracy which was revealed by the indictment of these 34 domestic Fascists, their 41 organizations, and their 42 publications.

The manner in which George Sylvester Viereck escaped investigation is a matter of public scandal. Mr. Viereck was subpenaed to appear before the committee on August 4, 1938. That night he took a boat to Germany where he received further instructions to carry on his dirty work which has finally landed him in jail. Since his return and throughout the period of his pro-Nazi activity, he was never interrogated by the committee nor was the subpena ever enforced.

As for George Deatherage, when he appeared before the committee, he defied it and refused to answer questions as to his organization, the Knights of the White Camellia, also mentioned in the indictment as a vehicle of sedition. He was permitted to go his way and continue in his seditious activities, and was never cited for contempt. He, too, was a domestic Fascist. Compare this treatment with that accorded leaders of labor, anti-Fascists, progressives, liberals, and Communists.

Not only is Mr. DIES' and his committee's record one of negligence and omission, and of failure to act in connection with these domestic Fascists but we find that one Walter S. Steele was the white-haired boy witness before the committee. He was called and considered by the committee an "expert" witness, and some of the committee reports were written on the basis of Walter S. Steele's testimony.

Who is Walter S. Steele?

None other than the representative and leader of the coalition of patriotic societies, listed as No. 12 of the 41 seditious organizations mentioned in the indictment, and a pal and collaborator of seditionist No. 22 in the indictment, Eugene Nelson Sanctuary; seditionist No. 26, James C. True; and seditionist No. 13, Robert Edmondson. What a situation. The leader of an organization involved in this conspiracy, the collaborator of at least 3 conspirators, is the fair-haired star witness of the Dies committee.

Walter S. Steele was following the anti-Communist line of Adolf Hitler before this committee. His testimony was one page after another of anti-Communist propaganda which we have now learned from the realities of the world of today has been and still is Hitler's technique of conquest from within.

And let us see what the chairman himself had to say about the organization mentioned in the indictment as one of the organizations which the conspirators organized or caused to be organized, supported, used, controlled, or contributed to financially. Mr. DIES, in a signed article in Liberty magazine of March 30, 1940, admitted his reliance upon and expressed his gratitude to the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies.

The tragic performance of this committee and its chairman has most definitely forfeited any claim to the confidence of the American people that they may have ever had. This abysmal, to say the least, negligence is merely a repetition of its failure to act in the case of Japanese activities prior to Pearl Harbor. The chairman last year in a speech in the House charged that he had information which, if it had been made public, would have prevented the tragedy of Pearl Harbor. He sought to place the blame for the failure to use this information on the administration. I picked up that charge and challenged it. I challenged it with the statement of Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, who authorized me to say that at no time had the State Department received any such information from Mr. DIES and at no time had they suppressed it.

The correspondence between Mr. DIES and the Attorney General is contained in the RECORD of last year. I pointed out and proved conclusively that Mr. DIES

never submitted any information to the Department of Justice which, as Mr. DIES said, would have prevented the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor.

What is the record of the chairman and of this committee in regard to our enemies from within and from without? A record of failure as to the conditions of Japanese espionage and sabotage in regard to Pearl Harbor; complete failure as to the Nazis, failure and callous indifference to the diabolical conspiracy against the country on the part of the 34 indicted domestic Fascists, their 41 organizations, and 42 publications.

Again I say that this committee was created to ferret out and investigate subversive and un-American activities. In time of war, it had the highest obligation to carry out the mandate of the Congress to deal with the enemy from within and the enemy's agents from without. Yes; enemies of our democracy, enemies of our institutions, enemies of the Nation itself making war upon us from within and from without. Mr. DIES and his committee failed dismally to live up to that obligation.

There is a reason why Japanese agents and Nazi agents and domestic Fascists escaped the attention of Mr. DIES. It is an old, old story. It is the history of the tragedies of democracies that have fallen. The diversion of the attack from the real enemy by the creation of the Red scare. The war on the Communists, on labor, liberals, progressives, new dealers, and on the Soviet Union, the war against the war administration, now called by Mr. DIES bureaucracy, was what kept Mr. DIES and his committee "too busy."

War against the Communists who, as an integral part of 130,000,000 Americans, are fighting and working like all other Americans for victory against the enemy; war against the Soviet Union, to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] dedicated his energies and his writings and his speeches; this was and is the policy of the Dies committee. But this, too, has been, and is, the war which Adolf Hitler has told the world that he is waging. Only the other day Hitler reiterated to the world in a statement read by Goebbels that he was fighting "to protect the European family of nations from the dangers of the East," and he continued to proclaim his "crusade against bolshevism." He used this anti-Bolshevik game to ride into power. Mussolini, too, raised the anti-Communist cry in his march on Rome in 1922. The Rome-Tokyo-Berlin Axis, which our enemies formed to conquer the world, was announced as a "crusade against communism." It called itself the anti-Comintern. The Lavals and the Petains used it in France. The anti-Communist slogan was and is Hitler's technique of conquest, conceived from the very inception of his plan for world conquest. The democracies that fell for it are no more—divided by this slogan, and then conquered by Hitler.

Hitler and the other two members of the Axis are today again beating the drums of the anti-Communist theme in an effort to split the United Nations and to divide the people within the United Nations.

Thus, while Americans are gloriously fighting at Guadalcanal and North Africa and the Red Army is smashing the enemy at Stalingrad and Rostov, Hitler and Mr. DIES are still crusading against communism.

It was a sin of omission to have disregarded the danger of the anti-Communist line in time of peace. Then it was part of Hitler's preparation for a war of conquest. To adopt that same line within our own country now, while Hitler and his anti-Comintern Axis partners use it as a weapon of war against us, would be suicidal.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. DIES and his committee guessed wrong. They missed the real foe. They have failed to see him, even up to now. To continue this committee, therefore, is to follow a policy which the realities of a world in which people and nations are fighting for survival have taught us to be disastrous.

Mr. DIES and his committee have followed and are following the anti-Comintern line, the anti-Communist line. Behind a smoke screen of anticommunism, fascism has marched on and destroyed democracy in its own countries, and democratic nations. To continue the committee in the face of realities of recent history would be a negation of everything for which Americans are fighting and dying, and would contribute toward dissipation of that unity which is being forged among the American people and the United Nations for the destruction of fascism.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. KEARNEY, at the request of Mr. VAN ZANDT, for 1 day, on account of sickness.

To Mrs. LUCE, at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. MCGREGOR, at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 4 weeks, on account of serious illness.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 9, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

#### COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet at 10:30 a. m. Tuesday, February 9, 1943, in room 356, House Office Building.

#### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, February 9, 1943. Business to be considered: To continue hearing on H. R. 1012, "To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes."

#### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, February 10, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 1671, and other business.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

159. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Petroleum Administration for War for the fiscal year 1943 in the amount of $685,000 (H. Doc. No. 99); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

160. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

161. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I.; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

162. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

163. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

164. A letter from the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, transmitting report No. 3 of action taken under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 102. Resolution establishing a select committee to investigate acts of executive agencies beyond the scope of their authority; without amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Concurrent Resolution 5. Concurrent resolution expressing to the National Assembly and people of the Republic of Panama appreciation of their friendship for the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 131. A bill to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 133. A bill to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 65. Resolution for the continuation of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities; with amendment (Rept. No. 108). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1462) for the relief of William H. Shultz; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 1588) for the relief of Raymond Crosby; Committee on Claims discharged and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1742. A bill to provide further for the successful prosecution of the war through a system of civilian selective war service with the aid of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 1743. A bill providing for railroad transportation at reduced rates for merchant seamen on authorized leave of absence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1744. A bill to provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1745. A bill to authorize issuance of suitable insignia to qualified aerial gunners or bombardiers of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 1746. A bill to authorize the Securities and Exchange Commission to suspend, so far as is consistent with the public interest, the exercise of its duties and functions under section 11 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 1747. A bill to authorize the filing of certain notices to serve as constructive notice of interest of United States in realty or personalty under facilities contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 1748. A bill to provide for payment of rental allowance to officers of the Navy under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1749. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 1750. A bill relating to the tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1751. A bill to establish a Women's Army Corps for service in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEWEY:

H. R. 1752. A bill to require quarterly returns of retailers' excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio:

H. R. 1753. A bill to provide for the extension of patents for a period equal to the period during which owners are unable to derive benefits from them on account of the war emergency; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 1754. A bill to provide for the enlargement of the Veterans' Administration facility at Newington, Conn.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. Res. 104. Resolution to increase the lend-lease to China to 10 percent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. Res. 105. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to examine into and determine the fitness of certain Government personnel to continue in their employment; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 1755. A bill for the relief of Broadus D. Boland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 1756. A bill for the relief of Smith Hayden; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 1757. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Kegel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1758. A bill for the relief of F. M. Maloy; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1759. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alethea Arthur; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1760. A bill for the relief of S. I. Wooten; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1761. A bill granting a pension to Mary E. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

85. By Mr. ANGELL: Memorial of the Forty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, asking for enactment of a pay-as-you-go plan for collection of personal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

86. Also, petition of the agricultural advisory committee of the United States Employment Service in Oregon, asking for adequate appropriation for the office of the agricultural statistician for Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations.

87. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, expressing its approval of the primary aim of the Ruml plan for income-tax payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

88. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution expressing the approval of the General Assembly of Rhode Island in the primary aim of the Ruml plan to put both the Government and all individual taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go income-tax plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

89. By Mr. FULMER: House resolution submitted by the clerk of the House of Representatives of Columbia, S. C., memorializing the Office of Price Administration to raise the price ceiling on Irish potatoes grown in the State of South Carolina from the maximum price recently established; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

90. Also, concurrent resolution submitted by the clerk of the House of Representatives of Columbia, S. C., requesting the Government of the United States of America to recognize that the manner of selling tobacco by auctioneering in this State is a fair and impartial manner of disposing of the tobacco crops in this State and requesting said Government not to exercise any authority which would interfere with such manner of selling tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

91. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the joint board of the Cloak, Suit, Skirt, and Reefer Makers' Unions of Greater New York, opposing any attempt to change labor laws; to the Committee on Labor.

92. By Mr. MRUK: Petition of the Buffalo Foreign Trade Association, Buffalo, N. Y., requesting that Congress restore to the National Budget an appropriation to maintain the field service and thereby the Buffalo district office of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

93. By Mr. ROLPH: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26 of the State of California, relative to the Pharmacy Corps bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

94. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 24 of the State of California, relative to the growing shortage of motortruck transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

95. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 22 of the State of California, relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Security Act in respect to earnings and other income of recipients of old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

96. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 14 of the State of California, relative to small business enterprises; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

97. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 27 of the State of California, relative to memorializing Congress in relation to retaining the administration of California fishery production in the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

98. By Mr. SCHWABE: Resolution protesting against the passage of House bill 1290 to admit aliens automatically to citizenship who have resided continuously in this country for a period of 16 years since 1924, upon reaching the age of 50 years; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

99. By Mr. STOCKMAN: Petition of the Hood River Chamber of Commerce, Hood River, Oreg., presenting resolution of the Hood River Post, No. 22, of the American Legion, Department of Oregon, relating to the definition of persons who can claim full citizenship under the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and urging in particular an interpretation which would deprive all American-born Japanese of their claims as United States citizens; that no persons of Japanese ancestry be returned to Hood River County, Oreg., until the termination of the present conflict, and, if possible, all persons of Japanese ancestry be permanently prohibited from Hood River County; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our God and our heavenly Father, Thou who art the life and the light of this wondrous world, forever be Thy name adored. We praise Thee for the new miracle of the dawn and for the fresh vigor which flows through our beings. We pray Thee to accept our thanksgiving for guiding influences and helpful friendships. We beseech Thee that we may be able to do Thy will and fulfill Thy purpose as this day brings us to the call of service.

Bless us all with the mercy of grateful hearts. Arise, O Lord, let not man prevail, let the nations be judged in Thy sight. Put them to fear, O Lord, that they may know themselves to be but

men. Arise, O Lord, lift up Thine hand and forget not the humble. In the midst of the world's tumult, let us feel the tides of deep emotion which the coming years will yield—the growing, glowing might that shall fuse the torn fragments of civilization until there shall be naught beside. We wait in the unbroken and solemn stillness and pray for those homes which are bereft of their knightly sons who are braving the shadows of the battle front; the Lord God be with them and bless them with rich and abiding peace. In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to amend the act entitled "An act to protect the public health by the prevention of certain practices leading to dental disorders; and to prevent the circumvention of certain State or Territorial laws regulating the practice of dentistry.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following agency:

Federal Works Agency.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may be allowed to speak on Lincoln on Thursday after disposition of the legislative program of the day and any previous special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the Executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 109), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH reserved all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a memorial from the Legislature of the State of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL FEDERATION FOR CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTIES

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a libelous statement published by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. This is a statement against a congressional committee, and it was placed in the desk of every employee of a certain department or departments in the War Production Board. It was placed in those desks within the last 2 days.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a matter that should be investigated by the Dies committee, it is this statement against a committee of the Congress, and I hope that when the Dies committee is continued one of the first things it will do will be to investigate the manner in which these statements were placed in the desk of employees of the War Production Board, and I hope also that the committee will investigate to its fullest extent the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received permission to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD the inaugural address of Gov. Earl Warren, of California. Subsequently the Government Printing Office advised me that this would run over the stipulated number of words. I have an estimate from the Government Printer stating that the cost will be $123.75. I ask unanimous consent to have this address inserted in the RECORD, notwithstanding the estimate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of the legislative business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]?

There was no objection.

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LEWIS of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a constituent, Mrs. Boyd Reid, of Corrington, Wyo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]?

There was no objection.

CONTROL OF AGRICULTURAL PRICES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, together with nearly every Member of the Seventy-seventh Congress I voted to keep the power to regulate agricultural prices in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture. I confess now that I regret I ever did so. I hereby accuse certain officials in the Department of Agriculture of selling the American farmer down the river, of deliberately failing to interpret the price law as Congress passed it. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time for the Congress to look into the way the bureaucratic officials of this Department are interpreting the laws which the Congress has made for the protection of all the people.

The Department of Agriculture, in my opinion, is no different than a long list of other bureaucrats down here in Washington in that it has departed from the proper interpretation of agricultural prices as Congress meant them to be interpreted. In a recent probe conducted by the Agriculture Committee of the House, it was admitted by officials from the Agricultural Department that no attempt had been made to follow the will and intent of Congress to maintain the highest monthly average for agricultural prices during the period from January to September 1942. I submit that the citizens of America have the right to expect fair treatment for the farmer and

for everything connected with agriculture.

[Here the gavel fell.]

GOVERNMENT BY BUREAUCRATIC MANDATE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SCHIFFLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Dies committee has convinced the House and the administration of at least one thing, that we ought to investigate subversive activities. You recall that the President appointed a committee for that purpose the other day when the situation got so hot up here. That may be a whitewashing committee. Now I notice by the newspapers that the House leadership is going, before the day is over, to have another committee to tackle the same proposition. Being unable to kick the Dies committee out the front door of Congress, the administration and a few others, including the C. I. O. and the Communists, propose to try to do the job by taking over the duties of the Dies committee and giving those duties to other committees, and so get rid of the Dies committee by kicking it out the back door. I hope every Member will tomorrow read the comment of the Daily Worker and PM on the situation. I think that by the time another election rolls around the people will be on to that sort of procedure, too, and there may be some more missing faces here in Congress when it meets again if we do not follow the directions given us at the last election.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CRITICISM OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, as I came in the Chamber this morning I looked at the headlines in the papers and saw that the Japs had been driven out of Guadalcanal, a place where the lives of many of our soldiers were sacrificed. As I came into the Chamber not one word was said about that. All you could hear was complaints about this, that, or the other. Then I thought back to the Continental Congress, which criticized Washington and everything that was happening at that time. In a few days we will celebrate the anniversary of the birth of Lincoln, yet in his day, during a war on that side of the aisle now the minority, there was the same criticism that is now going on against this administration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

INFORMATION AS TO THE STATUS OF WALTER WINCHELL

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 95) from the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the House of Representatives the answers to the following questions:

1. Does section 1534 of title 10 of the United States Code, among other things, provide that—

"An officer who uses contemptuous or disrespectful words against * * * the Congress of the United States shall be dismissed from the service or suffer such other punishment as a court martial may direct"?

2. Are officers of the Navy subject to the provisions of the section quoted in question No. 1?

3. If they are not, is there any Federal statute or rule or regulation of the Navy of similar import?

4. Section 1567 of title 10 of the United States Code reads:

"Any officer or cadet who is convicted of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman shall be dismissed from the service."

Section 1568 of the same title provides, among other things, that—

"Though not mentioned in these articles, * * * all conduct of a nature to bring discredit upon the military service * * *, of which persons subject to military law may be guilty, shall be taken cognizance of by a general or special or summary court martial, according to the nature and degree of the offense, and punished at the discretion of such court."

Are there any similar provisions of law, or any rule or rules, or regulation or regulations, of the Navy of like import?

5. Does article 8 of chapter 21 of title 34 of the United States Code provide, among other things, that—

"Such punishment as a court martial may adjudge may be inflicted on any person in the Navy— * * * who is guilty of profane swearing, falsehood, * * * or any other scandalous conduct tending to the destruction of good morals"?

6. In the August 22, 1942, issue of the magazine published under the name of Liberty is an article by Walter Winchell, which, among other things, charged (p. 54) that one Smith "now indicted, sabotaged the war effort by spreading disunity."

In the September 12, 1942, issue of the same magazine, on page 32, are the following words:

"A correction. On page 54 of the August 22 issue of Liberty it was stated that Gerald L. K. Smith had been indicted. This was an error and an injustice to Mr. Smith, against whom no indictment has been returned. We apologize for the error."

which is an admission that Lieutenant Commander Winchell, of the United States Navy, was guilty of a falsehood.

Have any proceedings been taken to inflict upon him the punishment specified in article 8 of chapter 21 of title 34 for the conduct made an offense by the first subdivision of said article?

7. On July 12, 1942, Walter Winchell, while an officer of the United States Navy, asked a radio audience,

"How about the voters going after those other saboteurs who landed in Congress?"

A few days later he inserted in his column published in the press the following statement:

"Another reason some Congressmen are demanding the eight saboteurs be shot is that they might talk too much."

On July 26, 1942, Walter Winchell, over the radio, made the statement that:

"Nearly everyone who printed seditious articles has been indicted except those who put the same things in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. * * * But, Honeychile—all of them will be confronted by the same charges after November 5."

If the making of such statements was "scandalous conduct tending to the destruction of good morals," what, if any, action has been taken by the Navy or any officer thereof to either punish the said Walter Winchell for the making of such statements, or to put an end to the making of such statements?

8. (a) During the month of January 1943, was Walter Winchell an officer in the United States Navy? And, if he was, what was his rank?

(b) If Walter Winchell was an officer in the United States Navy during January 1943, did he, on January 31, 1943, in a radio broadcast, or in his column as printed, in substance refer to American citizens who voted for certain Representatives in Congress as "damned fools who voted for them"?

9. What was the official position of Walter Winchell in the United States Navy during each of the months of 1941 and 1942?

10. During each of said months, what was his official designation and what, if any, rank did he hold in the United States Navy?

11. To what duties in the continental United States was Walter Winchell assigned by the Navy, and what portion of his time did he spend in the service of the United States Navy during each of the months of 1941 and 1942?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] introduced House Resolution 95, requesting certain information in regard to the status of Walter Winchell and propounding various questions. Under the parliamentary procedure, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, as it has jurisdiction of it.

We submitted the resolution to the Navy Department. Under the rules of the House, this being a privileged resolution, the information must be brought back to the House within 7 days. Today the Navy Department submitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs its answer to the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The House must understand that in submitting its report the Committee on Naval Affairs is not passing judgment on the answers at all. We are merely the instrument by which the information sought by the gentleman from Michigan may be brought to the House in a parliamentary manner.

I may say, however—and I think it is pertinent that I make this statement in the discussion of this matter—that it is the intention of the Committee on Naval Affairs, as soon as it can dispose of a very important bill that will be before the committee tomorrow involving a large sum of money, to have the proper naval officials brought before the committee, including the Secretary of the Navy, to give the committee more information than probably these answers to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan disclose. In other words, the Committee on Naval Affairs proposes to have before it probably the latter part of this week or the first of next week the proper naval officials to give the committee full information in regard to the subject of Mr. Walter Winchell's position in the United States Navy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In his broadcast Sunday night the gentleman referred to stated that the F. B. I. in an effort to stop a leak in Washington put out a purposely misleading story. The idea apparently was to see whether and how quickly this false story would reach Germany, and to apprehend, if possible, the persons who sent the message. Less than 24 hours later, according to the broadcast, the German short-wave radio announced the false news of the Canadian meeting, and as a result the men involved were trapped.

A spokesman for J. Edgar Hoover—

I am reading now from the New York Herald Tribune of the 9th—

Chief of the F. B. I., was ready to answer questions about the story today. He began by saying that he had been answering them all throughout last night since the radio broadcast of Walter Winchell, columnist for the Daily Mirror, of New York, had revived the reports.

The spokesman said there was no false rumor circulated, there were no men taken into custody by the F. B. I. And further, "the F. B. I. knows nothing about this particular case."

If Mr. Winchell is an officer in the Navy, he certainly should not be circulating false reports of this kind.

Here is a further statement, and notice where this comes from:

Efforts to check the War Department's G–2 (Army Intelligence) as to the veracity of the report likewise proved unavailing.

I hope the Members of the House will get this:

However, the War Department facetiously suggested that "Since Mr. Winchell is a commodore of some sort, you'd better contact the Navy."

Navy Department officials said they knew nothing of the matter, and the next suggestion was that the Federal Bureau of Investigation be contacted "since everyone knows J. Edgar Hoover feeds such stuff to Mr. Winchell." Apprised of this, the Hoover spokesman heatedly denied that Mr. Hoover feeds out anything to anyone.

If the statement of the F. B. I. be true, once more Mr. Winchell, an officer of the Navy, stands convicted of a public falsehood.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the House, and it is practically the opinion of the Naval Affairs Committee this morning, that next week at a public hearing, no closed doors, the Naval Affairs Committee proposes to call before it proper officials in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to ascertain the full status of the Reserve officer, Walter Winchell.

Mr. Speaker, if there is no member of the Naval Affairs Committee who desires time—does the gentleman from Minnesota desire time?

Mr. MAAS. No.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution, in view of the fact that the information that the Navy Department has before the House, do lie upon the table.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MAAS. There are a good many inquiries by Members of Congress, particularly in respect to the statement that he is alleged to have made about the damn fool Americans who voted for these Members of Congress, and I merely want to assure the House that is one thing that we will look into very thoroughly.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is a part of the resolution.

The answers of the Navy Department are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
*Washington, February 9, 1943.*

Hon. CARL VINSON,
*Chairman of the Committee*
*on Naval Affairs,*
*House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: House Resolution 95 "Requesting information as to status of Walter Winchell," was referred to the Navy Department by your committee with request for reply.

The questions propounded by the resolution are set forth below, with the answers thereto immediately following:

Question 1. Does section 1534 of title 10 of the United States Code, among other things, provide that—

"An officer who uses contemptuous or disrespectful words against * * * the Congress of the United States shall be dismissed from the service or suffer such other punishment as a court martial may direct"?

Answer. Yes.

Question 2. Are officers of the Navy subject to the provisions of the section quoted in question numbered 1?

Answer. No. This language appears in article 62 of the Articles of War. It is applicable only to "the armies of the United States" (10 U. S. C. 1940 ed. 1471).

Question 3. If they are not, is there any Federal statute or rule or regulation of the Navy of similar import?

Answer. No.

Question 4. Section 1567 of title 10 of the United States Code reads:

"Any officer or cadet who is convicted of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman shall be dismissed from the service."

Section 1568 of the same title provides, among other things, that—

"Though not mentioned in these articles, * * * all conduct of a nature to bring discredit upon the military service * * *, of which persons subject to military law may be guilty, shall be taken cognizance of by a general or special or summary court martial, according to the nature and degree of the offense, and punished at the discretion of such court."

Are there any similar provisions of law, or any rule or rules, or regulation or regulations, of the Navy of like import?

Answer. Yes.

Articles for the government of the Navy, articles 8 and 22, authorize the charges of scandalous conduct tending to the destruction of good morals, conduct to the prejudice of good order and discipline, and conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman. Section 99, Naval Courts and Board, provides that conviction of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman compromises an officer's position as such and exhibits him as morally unworthy to remain a member of the honorable profession of arms. The charges scandalous conduct tending to the destruction of good morals and conduct to the prejudice of good order and discipline include dismissal within the limits of punishment for conviction under those charges.

Question 5. Does article 8 of chapter 21 of title 34 of the United States Code provide, among other things, that—

"Such punishment as a court martial may adjudge may be inflicted on any person in the Navy * * * who is guilty of profane swearing, falsehood * * * or any other scandalous conduct tending to the destruction of good morals"?

Answer. Yes.

Question 6. In the August 22, 1942, issue of the magazine published under the name of Liberty, is an article by Walter Winchell, which, among other things charged (p. 54) that one Smith "now indicted sabotaged the war effort by spreading disunity."

In the September 12, 1942, issue of the same magazine, on page 32, are the following words:

"A correction: On page 54 of the August 22 issue of Liberty it was stated that Gerald L. K. Smith had been indicted. This was an error and an injustice to Mr. Smith, against whom no indictment has been returned. We apologize for the error."

Which is an admission that Lieutenant Commander Winchell, of the United States Navy, was guilty of a falsehood.

Have any proceedings been taken to inflict upon him the punishment specified in article 8 of chapter 21 of title 34 for the conduct made an offense by the first subdivision of said article?

Answer. No.

Question 7. On July 12, 1942, Walter Winchell, while an officer of the United States Navy, asked a radio audience,

"How about the voters going after those other saboteurs who landed in Congress?"

A few days later he inserted in his column published in the press the following statement:

"Another reason some Congressmen are demanding the eight saboteurs be shot is that they might talk too much."

On July 26, 1942, Walter Winchell, over the radio, made the statement that:

"Nearly everyone who printed seditious articles has been indicted except those who put the same things in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. * * * But, Honeychile—all of them will be confronted by the same charges after November 5."

If the making of such statements was "scandalous conduct tending to the destruction of good morals," what, if any, action has been taken by the Navy or any officer thereof to either punish the said Walter Winchell for the making of such statements, or to put an end to the making of such statements?

Answer. The above statements are not considered as "scandalous conduct tending to the destruction of good morals."

Question 8. (a) During the month of January 1943, was Walter Winchell an officer in the United States Navy? And, if he was, what was his rank?

Answer. Yes; lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve.

(b) If Walter Winchell was an officer in the United States Navy during January 1943, did he, on January 31, 1943, in a radio broadcast, or in his column as printed, in substance refer to American citizens who voted for certain Representatives in Congress as "damned fools who voted for them"?

Answer. Walter Winchell was an officer in the United States Naval Reserve with the rank of lieutenant commander on inactive duty on January 31, 1943, and, according to a transcript of his broadcast given at 9 p. m. eastern war time, over the Blue Network on that date, made the following statement:

"You bet I'm prejudiced against those in high office who guessed so wrong before Pearl Harbor. They're still guessing wrong. I am not in the least comforted by their confessions of ignorance. What worries me most are all those damn fools who reelected them."

Question 9. What was the official position of Walter Winchell in the United States Navy during each of the months of 1941 and 1942?

Answer. During 1941 Winchell was a lieutenant commander in the United States Naval Reserve. He was on inactive duty during 1941 with the exception of the period from August 1, 1941, to August 14, 1941, inclusive, when he was on active duty for training and was assigned to the public relations office of the third naval district.

From January 1, 1942, to March 17, 1942, Winchell was a lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve, on inactive duty.

On March 17, 1942, confidential orders were issued to him to active duty. This was special duty under the commandant of the third naval district. These orders are still in effect (February 5, 1943).

During the period December 1, 1942, to January 13, 1943, Winchell was assigned special duties under the commander of the South Atlantic Force.

Question 10. During each of said months, what was his official designation and what, if any, rank did he hold in the United States Navy?

Answer. From January 1, 1941, to April 2, 1942, Winchell was a lieutenant commander, volunteer special service, intelligence duties, in the United States Naval Reserve.

On April 3, 1942, this officer's designation was changed to deck, volunteer, special service (public relations), United States Naval Reserve.

Question 11. To what duties in the continental United States was Walter Winchell assigned by the Navy, and what portion of his time did he spend in the service of the United States Navy during each of the months of 1941 and 1942?

Answer. Lieutenant Commander Winchell was assigned training duty in the continental limits (third naval district) from August 1 to 14, 1941.

During 1942, from March 17 to the present, with the exception of the month of December 1942, Winchell was assigned active duty within the continental limits of the United States. During the month of December 1942 he was on active duty outside the continental limits of the United States.

Lieutenant Commander Winchell spent the period from August 1, 1941, to August 14, 1941, and from March 17, 1942, to the present in the service of the United States Navy.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK KNOX.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Naval Affairs Committee has performed its duty and brought the information back to the House, I move that the resolution lie on the table.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he insists on that motion?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MAY. If the resolution is tabled, would the Naval Affairs Committee then have jurisdiction to go into it—should it not be rereferred to the Committee on Naval Affairs?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We have jurisdiction without any such motion. We are not acting on Mr. HOFFMAN'S resolution in our inquiry next week, but we will use it as a basis, in view of the answers that have been submitted by the Navy Department.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia that the resolution lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 6]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Fisher | McGregor |
| Barry | Hagen | McLean |
| Bland | Heffernan | Maloney |
| Boykin | Johnson, J. Leroy | Morrison, La. |
| Byrne | Kearney | Norton |
| Clark | Kennedy | Poulson |
| Cochran | King | Reece, Tenn. |
| Crosser | Lambertson | Sumners, Tex. |
| Curtis | Lea | Treadway |
| Domengeaux | Lewis, Colo. | Winter |
| Elmer | McGranery | |
| Engel | | |

The SPEAKER. On this call 402 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. LUDLOW, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 105), which I send to the desk and ask to have read for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Appropriations, acting through a special subcommittee thereof appointed by the chairman of such committee for the purposes of this resolution, is authorized and directed to examine into any and all allegations or charges that certain persons in the employ of the several executive departments and other executive agencies are unfit to continue in such employment by reason of their present association or membership or past association or membership in or with organizations whose aims or purposes are or have been subversive to the Government of the United States. Such examination shall be pursued with the view of obtaining all available evicence bearing upon each particular case and reporting to the House the conclusions of the committee with respect to each such case in the light of the factual evidence obtained. The committee, for the purposes of this resolution, shall have the right to report at any time by bill, amendment, or otherwise, its findings and determination. Any legislation approved by the committee as a result of this resolution may be incorporated in any general or special appropriation measure emanating from such committee or may be offered as a committee amendment to any such measure notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI.

For the purposes of this resolution, such committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the period, strike out all of the language following up to the period in line 6.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the House consider the resolution?

The question was taken; and in the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the House determined to consider the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been approved by the leaders on both sides, for the purpose of expediting the business of the House. For 2 days we have been here debating and listening to speeches about men in the Government service who are charged with subversive activities, and if this resolution had not been agreed to, I fear that a great deal of our time would have been

taken up from day to day on what to most of us are unpleasant motions, and this no doubt would have delayed the consideration not only of this bill but of a great many other bills. This resolution gives the Committee on Appropriations the right to investigate all charges against Government employees who have been charged with subversive or un-American activities. I believe it is proper that the committee be given this power to investigate, because I do not feel that we should be called upon to vote upon the report on the 38 men the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] calls to our attention, who, his investigators charge with communistic activities or being guilty of un-American activities. I would like to know how many of you know these investigators, where they are from and why they have the power to assail the reputation of these men.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I am informed that of these 38 men, who have been so designated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] as being Communists or belonging to communistic organizations, 4 are now actually in our military service. Several others have long since ceased to be employed in the Government service. However, the separation of these men from Government employment seems to be immaterial to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and he has included them in his report. I do not have a personal acquaintance with any of them but, as I understand, none of them has ever held high supervisory official positions. They are men who have been engaged for the knowledge, technical training, and experience that they possess, which they have obtained through many years of hard study. If any one of them is guilty of any un-American or subversive activities they ought to be kicked out, and they cannot be kicked out too soon for me. I am against anyone, whether he is connected with the Government or otherwise, who is not at this time, especially, 100-percent loyal to the Government. He has no business to hold any public office whatsoever. But for us to ruin the reputation of men upon a report of highly paid investigators, of whose background and reputation for veracity we know nothing, seems to me to be manifestly unfair and unwarranted.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Committee on Appropriations should have the power to investigate. I have the utmost confidence in the chairman and the members of the great Committee on Appropriations and that they will make a fair and impartial investigation, and that if there is anything against any of these men they will refuse to appropriate for their salaries and force their separation from the service.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed strange to me that at this time especially those men who believe in the New Deal or the square deal, who, by chance, are members of progressive organizations, should be smeared as Communists. A few days ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] complained that they had been smeared and also that other Members have been smeared by certain newspapers or commentators. Undoubtedly, this was because some of these newspapers and commentators have printed or called attention to the voting record of some of the Members. Mr. Speaker, I concede that there has been a great deal of smearing—the smearing of some of our outstanding citizens just because they advocated legislation in the interest of the common people and because they have been connected with liberal organizations. As to these men accused by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], as I have stated, I do not know them and do not speak for them, but I do not feel that they would have been employed in the Government service unless those under whom they serve and the Civil Service Commission had not first satisfied themselves that they were not disloyal or guilty of any un-American activities.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that we have in this country hundreds and thousands, I might say, of Nazis and Fascists who are guilty of subversive and un-American activities, and I wonder why a report has not been made against them and why they should not be separated from their positions in the Government service. I hope and trust that you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Appropriations, will not only investigate those against whom charges are made that they have been affiliated with so-called communistic organizations but that you will investigate those who have been active under the leadership of the Nazi propagandists in this country against our country and the best interests of our Nation, and that you will obtain the list of names of the Nazi tools from the Dies committee which has been referred to by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and some of the members of his committee fail to realize that we are at war and seriously threatened by the Nazis, Fascists, and Jap plunderbund, as, from their statements and releases it would appear that we are at war with Russia, a Russia that has, as has been admitted by even its worst enemies, done more for the preservation of our country, its freedom and liberty than any other people under the sun.

I think it is to be regretted that we should continue to assail and attack people who formerly, perhaps misled or misguided, have joined some organization that might have some relationship to the Communist Party. But I know this, I know that Russia has not for a long time been guilty of anything that might in any way affect or endanger our form of government. All they desire and all they have fought for is their freedom and their liberties that this crazy man Hitler has been trying to deprive them of. Right here I wish to say that it should not be our concern what kind of form of government they have in Russia, and it should not be Russia's business nor should it be permitted, in any way, shape, or form, to change our form of government in the slightest degree.

Mr. Speaker, in the 2-hour speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], time for which he obtained on a question of personal privilege, he devoted himself to criticism of our administration and to so-called bureaucrats, charging that these 38 men were crackpots and responsible for a bureaucratic form of government, as if these men were the heads of any bureau, agency, or department. As I understand and as I have stated, all of these men hold minor, technical positions and are in no way responsible for the administration of any so-called bureaucratic bureaus or agencies. If there is any justification in charging that some of the agencies are bureaucratic, surely the responsibility, if such is the case, does not fall upon these men but upon the heads of the agencies in which they are employed. And it so happens, Mr. Speaker that the large majority of these heads were formerly associates, agents, or officials of the largest corporations and industrial interests in the United States. They came from the Standard Oil Co., the steel industry, the airplane manufacturing industry, and, in fact, from most of the big industries of our country.

Mr. Speaker, in view of these facts, I feel that in the interest of good government and a fair, square deal to these men this resolution should be adopted and the Committee on Appropriations given power to proceed with its investigation, not only of those few who have been mentioned but of all those connected with the Nazi organization that I know the Dies committee has had knowledge of heretofore, but unfortunately has failed to proceed against.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and yield now 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, now that the controversy on the other side has subsided, I yield 10 minutes to the minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of clarifying, if I can, the position the House finds itself in concerning William Pickens. It is not quite so difficult and involved as it might appear.

DIES COMMITTEE'S GOOD JOB

I believe it can be said the House has a fixed determination to separate from the Government pay rolls men and women with subversive affiliations who, for years, have been attacking our form of government and our way of life. And I believe the majority of its membership, on the whole, feel the Dies committee has done a fairly good job.

The determination of Congress in this respect has been in evidence for some time, and it is unfortunate the bureaucrats have been unable to appreciate the situation.

Congress believes and, because of the past actions of the bureaucrats, has every right to believe nothing will be done unless it takes definite, specific action. And, of course, the only practical way is through these appropriation bills. We

want to clean up the situation, but, at the same time, we do not want to do an injustice to any individual. Here in America we must give every man and every woman his day in court; justice must be administered fairly and with equality.

The Dies committee has made serious charges and has presented the evidence which, in their opinion, will substantially support the charges.

Under the resolution pending, these charges would be reviewed by a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. This is what my good friend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] says he advocated 1 year ago. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] says it is the course he would recommend.

Apparently we are in agreement upon a plan which will give both sides of the question an opportunity for justice. If these men are guilty of the charges preferred, they must be separated from the pay roll. If not, they are entitled to have vindication.

Upon the adoption of the resolution all against whom charges have been made will be given a hearing—all except one, William Pickens, a colored man, who happens to be the only individual under fire who works in either the Treasury or Post Office Departments, whose bill is now pending.

I know the membership of this House too well to believe anyone here wants to do an injustice to Mr. Pickens. Certainly it would be unforunate for the war effort and for our own home economy if we proceeded in a way to make any large part of our population believe we were discriminating against a man because of his race or color. It would be far better to let the one man escape trial rather than create that impression.

Fortunately, we are not obliged to do either. We do not need to act upon the Pickens case today. We can eliminate his amendment from the bill and this action will be well understood as not in the least prejudicing the case. Then Pickens can go before the subcommittee and we can take up his case later with the others. No harm will be done to those pressing the charges against Pickens, and Congress will have taken the position I am sure it will take—that every man and every woman shall have equal justice.

To those who fear they may be jockeyed into a position where they cannot act in the future, I want to remind them a majority of Congress cannot be denied its way if there is a determination to have it; and I believe we have here a majority very much determined to see this through.

If the Appropriations Committee or the leadership, and I am sure neither will, but if they did try to win a tricky victory, there is always the remedy of the Rules Committee to make the legislation in order on some other appropriation bill.

So my suggestion to the House is, let us adopt the rule setting up the committee to probe the charges and then let us all unite against the Pickens amendment, regardless of how we feel on the merits of the charges.

Let us give Pickens his day in court. That does not mean this House is to be shaken from its determination to eliminate from the Government pay roll all who are joining in attacking the American system of government.

The bureaucrats will never do the job; they dare not; Congress can and will. But let us do it in the orderly way, the just, fair way, and the American way.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution we are considering came before the Rules Committee this morning. It has but one single purpose, and that is to authorize the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to appoint a special subcommittee to hold hearings and investigate the charges made against 38 Federal employees and then to take suitable action on appropriation bills when they come before the House. This is the purpose of the resolution, and it comes to you with only one amendment, which limits the powers of the Appropriations Committee. We struck out certain lines in the original resolution which would have given legislative power to the Appropriations Committee, but under the resolution as it now stands they can accomplish exactly what I believe the House wants them to accomplish by striking off the Federal pay roll any individual found to be subversive and against our own form of government.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution and this whole debate that has lasted several days and prior to that in various Congresses about the fitness of certain Federal employees because of their affiliations with communism or organizations connected with Communists, would not be necessary at all if those who were responsible for their appointments, including President Roosevelt, had acted in the orderly way, had investigated their own appointees and had dismissed them from the Federal pay roll long ago for their Communist associations.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. In that connection, is it not a sad commentary that conditions in the Government service are such as to compel the great Appropriations Committee and the Congress of the United States to sink to the level of an employment agency?

Mr. FISH. I quite agree with the gentleman, and I could make it very much stronger if I did not want to make it a completely partisan issue, which it should not be; it is an American issue. We are determined to get rid of all Federal employees who seek to undermine our American system of government and to set up a totalitarian system, whether Fascist or Communist.

This is a new Congress direct from the people. The people want those Federal employees who are subversive, who are Communist, who seek to destroy our republican form of government guaranteed by the Constitution to every State, thrown off the pay roll; and the new Congress has come to Washington to do that very thing if those in administrative authority will not do it themselves.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Did the gentleman notice the other day what Walter Winchell had to say about the people who elected the new Congress?

Mr. FISH. Walter Winchell had this to say: He virtually said that 100,000,000 Americans were damned fools because 100,000,000 Americans were for keeping out of war until we were attacked at Pearl Harbor according to every poll taken at any time before we entered the war. I hope the Naval Affairs Committee will investigate that statement of Lieutenant Commander Winchell that reflects on the American people and on Congress.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman was not very much impressed with the fact that one damned fool tried to damn fool 100,000,000 American people, was he?

Mr. FISH. Is the gentleman referring to Walter Winchell?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thought my question was clear.

Mr. FISH. It was clear to me, but I have been attacked because I tried to keep the country out of war before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. O'CONNOR. So was I.

Mr. FISH. And I have not changed my views on that nor on any vote I cast in this House against measures that I considered as steps toward war or that would tend to provoke war.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Does not the gentleman think there are 100,000,000 people in the United States who think that Walter Winchell is a damn fool?

Mr. FISH. I should say that there are more than that. The gentleman is underestimating the intelligence of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee raised an issue that has no place here. He is a good friend of mine and we get along very well together, but this resolution involving the Dies committee and the whole question of communistic influences and subversive activities in America has nothing to do with the form of government in Soviet Russia. That is none of our business. Whether they have a communistic form of government in Soviet Russia is none of our business, and it is none of their business what type of government we have in the United States of America.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman knows that Congress appropriated $100,000 last year to provide for an investigation. The F. B. I. investigated about seven or eight hundred Government employees. Will this committee subpena the F. B. I. confidential reports, bring them to the com-

mittee, read those reports, and find out what the F. B. I. said, then compare it with what the Attorney General ruled?

Mr. FISH. I am supporting this resolution because I think it is the proper way to do it. I have asked the older members of the Appropriations Committee whether they are sincere and acting in good faith, whether they will get to the facts and actually investigate the 38 involved, and they promised to do it immediately. They will permit the gentleman to go there and make his charges, and if he asks that the F. B. I. be called in I am sure they will do that.

Mr. DIES. The real point is that the F. B. I. spent $100,000 of the taxpayers' money to investigate some eleven or twelve hundred people. Those reports are confidential. Does not the gentleman think that this committee by all means ought to have those confidential reports of the F. B. I., so as to find out what its agents found, then compare that with what the Attorney General stated to the public?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman believes that the Congress should have the power to do that and if the committee wants to do it, in executive session, they ought to do it that way if they are secret documents. Certainly the committee should do that in executive session, but whether they should do it outside of an executive session or not, I do not know.

Owing to the situation that has developed I do not believe that the House wants to make William Pickens a martyr, rightly or wrongly. Now that the racial issue has been raised in the House and back home, and as the people will not hear all the debate that goes on here, we do not want them to get the impression that we are discriminating against an American because of his color. It makes no difference to me whether a man is black or white, if he is a Communist he ought to be thrown off the pay roll; but in view of the situation that has arisen, in view of the facts confronting us at this time, I think it is to the interest of the Congress and our own Government not to permit the people back home to believe that we have discriminated against any American because of his race or color. I am in favor of giving Mr. Pickens identically the same treatment as all the others and an opportunity to defend himself before the Subcommittee on Appropriations. Therefore, I urge the adoption of this resolution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot said here this morning about some alleged indictment that Walter Winchell made of this Congress. I did not hear the broadcast, but, as I understood it, this broadcaster said one of two things: First, that the Congress was composed of damned fools, or else, that the people were damned fools for electing this Congress. But regardless of exactly what he said, I certainly hope that the Congress by its action today will not justify or give semblance of justification to what Mr. Winchell is alleged to have said.

A day or two ago this House said by its vote that this man Pickens, because of his subversive activities as disclosed by the Dies committee, should be stricken from his $5,600 job on the pay roll of the Government. The country—or at least a substantial portion of the country—approved this action. But now it seems that some politicians with an ear to the ground heard that this man Pickens was a member of the Negro race. So now what happens?

The political leaders get together and bring out this resolution. They say that we shall have to undo today what we did the other day. In other words, we must adopt this resolution so that we can take this Negro employee, Pickens, and put him back on the pay roll and investigate him along with all of the others.

I am for this resolution. I think it is a good one. But I made a fight in the Rules Committee this morning when this resolution was considered for its postponement until we had voted on the Pickens case. It is not true that Pickens is in the same boat with all of the other 38 mentioned. He is the only one who is on the pay roll of the particular department whose appropriation we are considering. I lost that fight in the Rules Committee by a narrow margin of 1 vote.

It has been heralded all over the country that we have a new Congress, and that those who sit over here on the left, the Republican side, are joining with the conservatives who sit over here on the Democratic side and that we are going to do great things toward ridding this Government of subversive influences in the Government and doing away with the bureaucrats, especially those of leftist tendencies. But what do we find? Instead of that wholehearted cooperation between the conservative groups we find politics as usual. What a sad spectacle. Here we have our distinguished, lovable and suave minority leader, a man whom we all love and a man who rarely takes the floor, today making an appeal for you to put this man on the pay roll. Who was it that the other day voted almost in a solid mass to take Pickens off the pay roll? Of course, it was the Republican side. But today we see an about-face since it has been learned that Pickens is a Negro. Somebody is playing to the Negro vote. And so today we are going to march down the hill as we marched up it the other day.

And in this connection permit me to say to my friends of the minority that if you really wanted to destroy some of this bureaucracy and to remove these left-wingers from this Government that you prated about so much, you have got to play the game fairly and squarely and you have got to shoot straight with those of us on this side whom you expect to go along with you. You cannot come in here and appeal to every minority group in this country looking toward election day and expect to get anywhere with it. I say to you—and you know it to be a fact—that if this man had been a white man you would not be taking this action today. But the fact that he belongs to a minority group causes you to reverse your position of yesterday.

In the words of another Member, privately expressed, "We voted this man Pickens off the pay roll on the theory that he was a 'red.' Then we found out that he was black and proceeded to place him back on the pay roll. Evidently that makes us yellow."

I am, as I have said, in favor of this resolution. However, I wanted to defer its consideration until we had disposed finally of the Pickens case. Let us pass the resolution but at the same time stick by our guns and at least keep one who has been shown to be guilty of subversive activities off the Government pay roll.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained at this point in the proceedings to try to clarify the situation for my dearly beloved brethren on the Republican side.

The other day when the so-called Pickens amendment came up, I voted against it, but I noticed how all of you on the minority side ran down to get into the teller vote and vote for the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is making a statement that is not true, and I know he does not intend to make it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. How many did not?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How many did?

Mr. BULWINKLE. The majority on that side did.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I may say for the benefit of the gentleman that I personally voted against the amendment, and a good many others on this side voted against it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The great majority on that side, the minority, did not vote against it and then they found out, forsooth, that it was a colored man they were voting against, and yesterday they were going out here in the hall to talk to Edgar Brown.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think the colored man is entitled to a little justice?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I do. That is the reason I voted against this amendment at the start.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How is the gentleman going to vote the next time?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am going to vote against the amendment, just as I have been doing in the past; but a great majority of you did not, and now, to clarify the political situation for yourselves, you should vote for this resolution.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. May I make this comment, apropos of what the gentleman has just been saying. Congress will pass this resolution and convict itself of being a feather-legged outfit.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, now that the explanation has been made and the atmosphere cleared insofar as the left-hand side of this aisle is concerned, perhaps we ought to do a little clearing of the atmosphere for the right-hand side of this Chamber.

As a member of the Dies committee, it is my firm conviction that that committee was never set up to act as a judge. It was set up to act as an investigating committee, to delve into the facts, find the facts as they are, and then present them to this House for its action or to the Committee on Appropriations for its action. It was not intended that the Dies committee should ever be placed in the position of being the judge on any of these matters. It was to be purely and solely an investigating committee.

The truth of the matter is that because of a parliamentary tangle or because of the action of the House the Dies committee has been placed in the position of being both an investigating committee and a judge.

As I see it, the resolution now before the House is to remove the Dies committee from the anomalous position of taking care of two things which it never was set up to do. If this resolution is adopted, it will at least relieve the Dies committee from that position, which is an embarrassing one.

It seems to me that the only thing the House can do is what the minority leader advised in his speech, adopt this resolution first, and then see to it that all 38 of these named individuals have the same opportunity to be judged by the proposed committee that is to be set up under this resolution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, to my mind this resolution represents a very practical and statesmanlike way of arranging for proper consideration of these individual cases. I have a further suggestion which will fit in with this arrangement, and prevent the embarrassment to the person involved, the agency employing him, and this body itself, when these amendments come up without prior consideration in committee. I have today introduced a resolution to amend the rules of the House as follows:

*Resolved*, That clause 2 of rule XXI is hereby amended by adding to the end thereof the following: *Provided further*, That no amendment prohibiting payment of all or any part of the salary or expenses of any named person shall be in order until such amendment shall first have been submitted in the Appropriations Committee, and the person, named in the amendment, shall have been given a reasonable opportunity to be heard before such committee or subcommittee thereof.

This amendment will insure a hearing for any person before he is by name taken from the Federal pay roll by law.

Congress has the power to refuse to appropriate for an individual just as it has the power to appropriate for an individual. We exercise both these powers constantly when we pass or refuse to pass private bills.

It is good legislative practice, however, and good business, and good sportsmanship, to give a man a chance for a hearing before taking action on his affairs. This is not a trial, for there is no criminal charge involved, and no one has a property right in a public job, but it is sound human nature to hear a man's story when dealing with his affairs and it will make us proceed more carefully. I think, however, we will have to proceed. We should not appropriate for Communists and fellow travelers in Government service, as soon as they are fully identified. On the other hand, we should give them not a day in court, for this is not a court matter, but a chance to have their say before we act.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I have not taken part in the Pickens argument as yet, but insofar as I am concerned, Pickens stands convicted of enough to warrant me in saying that he has no business being on the Government pay roll. Whether he be white or black is of no importance. He has gone with the wrong cattle. Unless Mr. DIES' records are incorrect, he was chairman of an American group that went to a meeting of the Communist Internationale some place in Europe. He is a graduate of Yale University. He came out of it as a Phi Beta Kappa. I presume that he is an intelligent man, and if he is, he knows whereof he has been walking, and if politics by reason of the fact that he is a Negro enters into it, then what are you fellows thinking about? There are a lot of Negro votes in my district. I do not know what kind of Negroes you have in yours, but my Negroes are red-blooded American citizens, and they do not want a Negro Communist on the pay roll of the Government any more than they want a white Communist on the pay roll of the Federal Government, and the fact that this man is a Negro should have no consideration in this matter. The Negroes in my district will not vote against me because I vote to kick a Negro Communist off the Government pay roll, and if I am afraid that they will, then I am not fit to be here. If the Negro complex has entered into this thing, let us not hide behind it. The Negroes have been kicked around enough. They think, they are red blooded, they are patriotic Americans, as you and I, and my Negroes will say, "Jack, if Pickens is a Communist, you vote to kick him out, and we will hold up your hand."

Of course, I shall support this resolution, and I hope that this committee will do the job that it has an opportunity to do. So far as I am concerned, I am not going to be able to reverse my position just because of this resolution. I am going to vote if I get the opportunity to kick Pickens off the pay roll, and that is what ought to be done to him, and we ought not to hide behind this thing. Talk to me about a man having a day in court, when he has a record from 1933 to 1940 that no one has disputed—tell me that he should be granted justice. He stands convicted today. So as any other man whose conduct is such, if he is a Government employee, that you or I have reason even to suspect his loyalty to his Government, he should be kicked off the pay roll first and tried later.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. In the event that the committee duly appointed by this body to investigate and give this gentleman his day in court, should find the man innocent of the charges, is it still the gentleman's intention to take him off the pay roll?

Mr. NICHOLS. They would have to convince me that he was innocent of the charges before I would change my vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I hope that a sense of proportion will indicate to us what is the important consideration in this whole matter. I am not so concerned about this one case, but I am concerned about the final result. For that reason let me suggest to you the operation that will be taken under the pending resolution, which I favor. The first thing, of course, will be to initiate a charge against an individual that he has been affiliated with some subversive force. That charge will be referred to the subcommittee and that subcommittee will conduct its examination. The subcommittee or the full committee will then make a report to the House of Representatives. That report, so I take it from the text of the resolution, will be privileged in nature and can be appended to any bill that is pending before this body. Let me raise this one question. Suppose after charges are brought and the examination has been made that there is no action, or suppose the gentleman has neither been exonerated nor convicted. Suppose it is one of those frustrations that are often experienced in government, and goodness knows I have experienced enough frustrations over the years. I have seen this House develop a feverish pitch and then walk down the hill again, which all reminds us of that old ditty about the King of France:

> The noble King of France,
> He had ten thousand men.
> He marched them up the hill,
> And then marched down again.

Do not be dismayed about a reversal of action by this House. It happens quite often. So what happened with this individual case is not important at the moment. The important thing is that we capitalize the spirit of the House, the determination that is being articulated for the first time in a great many years in dealing with this question of subversion. So, by way of implementation of this

resolution, I propose to offer an amendment to the pending Post Office appropriation bill which will provide, in substance, that when charges have been made under resolution 105, soon to be adopted, and the individual so charged has neither been exonerated nor has there been any disposition of his case, that no funds in the bill shall be used or allocated for the payment of his compensation until such time as action has been taken. I do not want to see us get away from our conviction, from our determination that after years of tortuous effort, we divest some of these people from the pay roll. Of that I can speak advisedly because I took the first man off 2 years ago, namely, David Lasser. I do not want to find the cup of bitterness again here, and I propose before the deliberation of the pending bill is over in Committee of the Whole, to offer an amendment to implement the procedure being taken here today. Either we mean business or we do not.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I want to ask the gentleman, who is a colleague of mine on the subcommittee, if this resolution is adopted, of course the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill will not be law until it is signed by the President?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Will this keep Pickens from being heard under this resolution, if the amendment is adopted?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I think Pickens can be heard.

Mr. HENDRICKS. He can be in the event your amendment is adopted?

Mr. DIRKSEN. He can be in the event that amendment is adopted; or he can be heard even though the amendment is not adopted.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. If I understand the amendment which the gentleman proposes to offer, it would, in substance and effect, be the same thing as if we vote him out now or vote to keep him out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not think so. It is general in nature and not aimed at any particular individual.

Mr. COLMER. Well, you convict him without a hearing in either instance?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not think so.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I helped create the Dies committee and helped keep it in force. We have spent a lot of time and money for them to go out and especially to investigate. Now I am wondering, with the powers that the Appropriations Committee will have and with what time they will have, if they can do a better job of investigating than the Dies committee. Will we find ourselves advancing or taking a backward step?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The committee will sit as a judge to take testimony from all sides. I am persuaded of the fairness of the members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They will have the same opportunity that the Dies committee has had.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But we can use this as a prosecuting instrumentality.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution should be adopted because it will provide a legal way to accomplish a most desirable purpose—the ascertainment of the loyalty or disloyalty of Government employees. Under the law as we wrote it there is not a scintilla of right in this Congress to remove any man from the pay roll of the Government unless he has been proven to advocate, or to be a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of this Government by force or violence. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], whose committee I voted to create and every appropriation for the continuation of which I have supported, in his speech yesterday based his argument in support of the actior taken on the theory that the Attorney General, Hon. Francis Biddle, in his decision and order in the Harry Bridges case, had predicated them upon the fact that Bridges was a member of or affiliated with several Communist-front organizations.

Mr. DIES said:

In his decision in the case of the deportation of Harry Bridges, the Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, named four Communist-front organizations with which Bridges had been affiliated and found in Bridges' affiliation with these four organizations one of the principal grounds for ordering his deportation from the United States. Now imagine the utter absurdity of the Treasury Department's position when we find that William Pickens was prominently identified with three of these four Communist-front organizations. In fact, William Pickens was far more prominently associated with these three Communist-front organizations than was Harry Bridges. The three organizations to which I refer were the International Labor Defense, the All America Anti-Imperialist League, and the American League Against War and Fascism. I shall presently show the extent and nature of Pickens' affiliation with all three of them. If the Justice Department finds ground for deporting Harry Bridges in his affiliation with these three Communist fronts, what leg has the Treasury Department to stand on in keeping William Pickens on its pay roll?

Mr. DIES was wrong; of course, honestly mistaken.

The Attorney General's findings of fact and order read as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. That Harry Renton Bridges is an alien, to wit, a native and citizen of Australia;

2. That said alien entered the United States at the port of San Francisco, Calif., April 12, 1920, as a member of the crew of the barkentine *Ysabel*;

3. That the Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception in 1919 to the present time, is an organization that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

4. That the Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception to the present time, is an organization that writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, or teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

5. That the Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception to the present time, is an organization that causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, and displayed, printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

6. That the Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception to the present time, is an organization that has in its possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, issue, and display, printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

7. That the Marine Workers' Industrial Union was a part of the Communist Party, dominated and controlled by it;

8. That the Marine Workers Industrial Union was an organization that believed in, advised, advocated, and taught the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

9. That after entering the United States the alien has been a member of the Communist Party;

10. That after entering the United States the alien has been affiliated with the Communist Party;

11. That after entering the United States the alien has been affiliated with the Marine Workers' Industrial Union.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

That under the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by the acts of June 5, 1920, and June 28, 1940, the alien, Harry Renton Bridges is subject to deportation in that:

1. After entering the United States he has been a member of an organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

2. That after entering the United States the alien has been affiliated with an organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

3. That after entering the United States the alien has been a member of an organization, association, society, or group that writes, circulates, distributes, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

4. That after entering the United States the alien has been affiliated with an organization, association, society, or group that writes, circulates, distributes, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

5. That after entering the United States the alien has been a member of an organization, association, society, or group that caused to be written, circulated, distributed, published, printed, and displayed printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
*Attorney General.*

MAY 28, 1942.

ORDER

I therefore order that the alien, Harry Renton Bridges, be deported to Australia at the expense of the Government on the charges that—

1. After entering the United States he has been a member of an organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

2. After entering the United States he has been affiliated with an organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

3. After entering the United States he has been a member of an organization, association, or group that writes, circulates, distributes, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

4. After entering the United States he has been affiliated with an organization, association, society, or group that writes, circulates, distributes, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

5. After entering the United States he has been a member of an organization, association, society, or group that caused to be written, circulated, distributed, published, printed, and displayed printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
*Attorney General.*

MAY 28, 1942.

From the Attorney General's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and his order, as he wrote them himself, you will see that he based his order, and made his order, solely upon the ground "that the Maritime Workers' Industrial Union was a part of the Communist Party, dominated and controlled by it"; and that Harry Bridges since coming here had been a member of, and affiliated with, the Communist Party, and affiliated with the Maritime Workers' Industrial Union.

It is true that in the preliminary part of the Attorney General's document he does mention as Communist-front organizations the International Labor Defense, the All America Anti-Imperialist League, and the American League Against War and Fascism, and Bridges' association therewith. But he did not base his order deporting Harry Bridges upon any such membership or affiliation or association.

Nor could the Attorney General, under the law he was administering in the Bridges case, have rightfully ordered deportation upon such a ground.

Now, my colleagues, we wrote the law, and the only law, for the guidance of the departments of the Government in the procurement of personnel. It provides against paying the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence. That is the rule we laid down, the standard we set up. Is it fair to the Treasury Department, that has been so careful in its personnel procurement that only one out of its thousands of employees is even under suspicion, to set up one standard for its guidance and then, when they have fully complied with this requirement, refuse to comply with it ourselves?

The Treasury Department has made three separate investigations of William Pickens—one before and two since his employment—to make sure that he does not advocate and has not advocated, and has never been a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States. Each time the report was that no evidence supporting any such conclusion could be found.

The F. B. I. in its investigation of William Pickens evidently found no such evidence.

It is admitted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], that his committee has no such evidence.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; with pleasure.

Mr. NICHOLS. I do not know what the record is before the Dies committee, but there is certainly ample evidence before the House, given yesterday by Mr. DIES himself, that Pickens is a Communist.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman is mistaken about that. In fact, I will state categorically on my honor as a Member of this House that that is not the fact.

Mr. NICHOLS. Did the gentleman ever know of a delegate being sent to a convention of the Communist International who was not a member of the party?

Mr. HOBBS. My understanding is that the gentleman is in error in the implication of that question, if he means to charge that William Pickens ever was a delegate to a convention of the Communist International.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, I do not know. That is what Mr. DIES said.

Mr. HOBBS. No. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I do not think he did. I listened to him very carefully and I have been studying the record ever since. What he said was that the evidence showed that this man appeared on the platform with Earl Browder and made a speech at the convention of the United States Congress Against War; that he went to Europe twice to Communist-front meetings. He ought not to have done any one of these things. He has acted the fool, of course, but the reason he did was probably his overzealous activity for what he conceived to be the advancement of his own race. I do not think he is fit for the position he occupies, but we wrote the rules as to who should be expelled from Government service and we ought to live up to them.

This resolution gives us a chance to do legally what Mr. DIES advocates. That is, to base separation from the pay roll upon evidence showing membership in, or association with, subversive organizations. Let me read you what the pending resolution says:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Appropriations, acting through a special subcommittee thereof appointed by the chairman of such committee for the purposes of this resolution, is authorized and directed to examine into any and all allegations or charges that certain persons in the employ of the several executive departments and other executive agencies are unfit to continue in such employment by reason of their present association or membership or past association or membership in or with organizations whose aims or purposes are or have been subversive to the Government of the United States.

The adoption of this resolution will change the rule, as we have a perfect right to do. Its passage would relieve us of the high degree of proof now required. Adopt this resolution, and instead of being required to prove advocacy of, or membership in an organization that advocates the overthrow of our Government, it will then be required to prove that an employee is unfit to continue in such employment by reason of his present association or membership or past association or membership in or with organizations whose aims or purposes are or have been subversive to the Government of the United States.

If you wish to liberalize the rule so as to assure our Government far greater protection from the employment of the disloyal and the unfit, pass this resolution and be fair.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the House on the unanimity with which it approaches this resolution. As a matter of fact, however, what is really accomplished by the resolution is out of all proportion to the attention given it here. Except in one minor detail the Committee on Appropriations has every power conferred by this resolution; it has the authority to do everything the resolution proposes. It has the authority to investigate and the authority to remove these men from their positions by the simple expedient of withholding their salaries. The only change provided by this resolution from the established order is that under the present system we have to wait until we reach the bill which carries that particular salary before taking action.

The one thing this resolution does, and it is infinitesimal in importance in comparison with the time we have spent on the subject, is that it permits us to take action at once instead of waiting for the appropriate bill to come along. In other words, this resolution permits us to take action on all such cases at one and the same time instead of taking them up one by one in bill after bill as the annual supply bills are reported to the House during the session.

But the one authorization which the resolution confers has three advantages:

In the first place, at a time when we are passing through world-shaking events, the defense of the Nation, the preservation of civilization itself, depends on the action of this body—the greatest representative body on earth—we are wasting hours and days quibbling about the political, social, moral, and economic views of some one individual down here in the departments nobody ever heard of. This bill permits us to get away from such inconsequential minutiae and turn

such details over to a committee, while we turn our attention to winning the war abroad and intelligently administering our own household affairs at home.

In the second place, instead of having each subcommittee handling these cases separately and in as many different ways, this plan will insure uniformity of action, standardize procedure, and permit disposition of all cases at one time and in the same way.

The third and the really important effect is that we will expedite adjudication and disposition of these cases and thereby serve both the accused and the Government. These men against whom charges are pending are faced with a serious situation. If they are not guilty they are entitled to prompt exoneration; on the other hand, if they are guilty, then the quicker the Government removes them the sooner and the more certainly will we protect the Nation against sabotage and fifth-column activity.

I trust the resolution will have the unanimous approval of the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this resolution by the House this morning will, in my opinion, be a declaration on the part of the House that now it does not place full faith and credit in the allegations of the Dies committee, because if this House had faith in the allegations of the Dies committee it would stand on the record the committee made last Friday when by a large majority, almost a unanimous vote of the Republican Members of the House, the Committee of the Whole voted to deny Mr. Pickens a trial and voted him guilty of subversive activities. Not a single bit of additional evidence has been presented to this House which could cause us to counteract that action taken last Friday. No other factor having entered into the picture since then, it must be concluded that it is political motives which actuate this new attitude.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. For myself, I voted against the amendment to strike Mr. Pickens from the roll and I can be consistent and vote for the resolution this morning and therefore vote to give him a fair trial.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this resolution. After careful consideration of the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] prohibiting the expenditure of any part of the appropriation in the pending bill to pay the salary of one William Pickens, I have come to the conclusion that we are acting contrary to the Constitution.

Pickens is a citizen of the United States. He is an educated and able servant of the Treasury Department. He stands charged with no crime against the laws of the United States. This House, however, has seen fit to deny him the protection with which every citizen is clothed under the Constitution.

Under the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

It is charged that Mr. Pickens is a Communist, and that, apparently, is the only charge against him. It is also denied that he is a Communist, and there the matter stands without any judicial determination.

Even granting that Mr. Pickens is a believer in communism, so far as he is concerned, it is a belief only. Belief in communism in Russia—that is, that communism is a good form of government for Russia—is quite a widespread belief throughout the world today. If all men who believed now that communism in Russia is a good thing for the Russians were to be denied their salaries while working for the Government, we would have a long list of the hungry—including a considerable number of the Members of this Congress.

In order to determine whether communism is a good thing for Russia, we have no comparison to make except with the former Government of Russia under the Czar. In light of the development of Russia, educationally and industrially and as a great intelligent military power, we are all forced to the conclusion that the new way in Russia is much superior to the dark days of ignorance under the Czar. If that is what Pickens believes, it is what millions of free citizens of the United States believe.

There is absolutely no evidence before us that Mr. Pickens wants to force this system of government on the people of this country, nor that he has done any overt act to bring that about. He, granting that he believes in communism, has been guilty of nothing except having a belief. There is no evidence before us that Mr. Pickens is not loyal to our war effort; there is no evidence that he has done any act to obstruct our war effort or destroy the Government. The only thing we have proved in this debate is that Mr. Pickens is a colored man, an educated man, an able official, and that he has a belief.

Does this Congress believe we can deprive a citizen of property without due process of law? Does this House believe that it can say—merely because a citizen has a certain belief and nothing more—that he is not entitled to the equal protection of the laws of this country?

All admit that Mr. Pickens is a citizen; all agree that he has not been convicted in any court of a crime against the laws of the United States forfeiting that citizenship. If he is a citizen, therefore, he is entitled to all the priviliges of such. He can vote—he does vote—I presume; he can run for office, and if he gets votes enough he can hold that office. I know of only one office he possibly could not hold and that is the office of a Member of Congress. The Constitution gives this House the power to determine its own membership. That is a constitutional prerogative. Being elected, Mr. Pickens could be refused a seat in this House for a good reason, a bad reason, or no reason at all. But no such power is granted this House as to any office except in its own body.

It is clear to me that the House cannot go outside of its own powers to say that a free citizen—holding some other office in the Government—shall be denied his salary and thereby be denied the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Constitution itself.

This Congress was just elected to do some big things for the people of the United States, and after 5 weeks' work, this House has emerged with an act to deny a citizen of this country the equal protection of the laws, and has thereby violated the Constitution of the United States. If this House cannot pass any legislation except that which is in direct violation of the clearly understood provisions of the Constitution, the people have not much to expect.

What would be the situation if the Treasury Department continued Mr. Pickens in office and caused this act to be reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States? There is enough for this Congress to do under the Constitution. If we let our prejudices, racial, religious, or political, direct our action, we are unworthy of the position we occupy in this great deliberative body. This is more strikingly true when we are engaged in a great war and have announced to the world the "four freedoms": The freedom of speech and expression; the freedom to worship God as we see fit; freedom from want and the freedom from fear of aggressor nations. As leaders in this great Nation we should practice what we preach.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I just wanted to say that if the interpretation placed on the action of the House by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct, I am forced to vote on a roll call against keeping Mr. Pickens on the roll.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the House is presented with a very practical situation. With all due respect to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, who has just taken his seat, I cannot agree with the observations he made. The membership of the House are not passing upon the merits or demerits of Mr. Pickens' particular case on this occasion; they are passing upon the question of whether or not they will adopt the pending resolution in order that a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations may consider all these cases called to the attention of this special subcommittee by the Dies committee or by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], or by any member thereof, I assume.

The question that confronts us is whether or not we are going to apply to Mr. Pickens the same procedure we apply to the others; whether or not we are going to do the right thing, the fair thing, and the decent thing after we adopt this resolution, of eliminating the Pickens amendment from the pending bill.

In my opinion, however, voting for this resolution or voting to eliminate the Pickens amendment is not passing upon the merit or the demerit of Mr. Pickens' loyalty or disloyalty.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the adoption of this resolution prevent a Member from voting separately upon the Pickens amendment at a subsequent time?

The SPEAKER. It will not. It is the right of any Member to ask for a separate vote on the so-called Pickens amendment.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1648, with Mr. COURTNEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, this bill has now been pending before the House for many days. In order to finish this evening the subcommittee serves notice that debate from now on will have to be confined to the bill. Any effort to speak out of order will be objected to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair trusts the Committee so understands.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rural Delivery Service: For pay of rural carriers, auxiliary carriers, substitutes for rural carriers on annual and sick leave, clerks in charge of rural stations, and tolls and ferriage, Rural Delivery Service, and for the incidental expenses thereof, $92,200,000, of which not less than $200,000 shall be available for extensions and new service.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARE: Page 39, line 20, strike out "$92,200,000" and insert "$94,000,000", and at the end of line 21, strike out the period, insert a comma, and add "including delivery service by substitute carriers on all holidays except Sundays."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against the amendment. The second provision of the amendment is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, under the regulations of the Post Office Department, substitute carriers are required to carry mail at any time a regular carrier is not available. The Post Office Department, in a special communication, says that it has the right to install delivery on every holiday except Sunday, and the only thing necessary is the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will direct this question to the gentleman from South Carolina: Is there any provision in the law for the payment of these substitute carriers on holidays?

Mr. HARE. That is what we are asking this increase for.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any law at the present time authorizing the payment to substitute carriers on Sunday? Is there any law presently that authorizes that payment?

Mr. HARE. No, except city carriers and clerks, a general authorization under the law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman care to be heard further?

Mr. HARE. I believe not.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. O'NEAL. No; except I insist there is no authorization. I must insist on the point of order, unless the gentleman would like to have me withhold the point of order until he has made his statement.

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. O'NEAL. I gladly withhold my point of order until the gentleman has completed his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, to my mind the Post Office Department contributes as much service directly to the benefit of the people of this country as any other department of Government. If we were to discontinue the operations of all of our departments for 1 week I doubt whether the cessation of the work would be felt more severely by the people of the Nation than that of the Postal Service.

For nearly 50 years the Congress has been providing postal services to people who live in rural districts. Services have been provided on every day except holidays. The services are now provided to patrons in villages and cities, at least one delivery on all holidays except Sunday. This year we are going to have 9 holidays; 5 of them will occur either on Saturday or Monday, and there will be five times this year when these people will be 3 days each time without postal facilities, whereas their neighbors and friends who happen to live in cities and villages will be furnished with postal service each day.

My amendment provides an appropriation or an increase in the appropriation of $1,800,000 to defray the expenses of delivering the mail on holidays, and it is estimated that the additional revenue arising to the Post Office Department by reason of this added service will be more than sufficient to pay this amount.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am very much in sympathy with what the gentleman is endeavoring to do. May I say that in a number of cases in the district I represent here in Congress there are regular bonded rural carriers who have enlisted in the armed forces of the United States. Their substitutes are performing the duties for them.

Mr. HARE. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As acting carriers. I am wondering if the gentleman's amendment will take care of that kind of a situation?

Mr. HARE. It provides that the substitute carrier on every rural route will be required to serve on each holiday, which will not deprive the regular carrier of his legal holiday. Substitute carriers are already provided by law, although they are not required by regulation of the Department to deliver mail on holidays. This amendment would authorize the Department to provide this service.

My thought is that the people on R. F. D. routes will need rural-delivery service more this year than at any previous time, because they have sons, brothers, and sweethearts in the Army and Navy at different places throughout the world. They watch patiently every day of the week for letters from these boys, and as I have already said there will be five times this year when there will be 3 days when these people will have no postal service whatsoever. They are entitled to this service and they want and we should be willing to provide it, particularly when we are providing similar services to people in towns, villages, and cities. I trust the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] will not insist upon this point of order and allow this amendment to be considered.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina reads as follows:

Strike out "$92,200,000" and insert "$94,000,000", and at the end of line 21 strike out the period, insert a comma, and add "including delivery service by substitute carriers on all holidays except Sundays."

The Chair knows of no authorization for the payment of such services. The gentleman from South Carolina very frankly concedes that he knows of no such authorization. The burden of proof being upon the gentleman from South Carolina, who offered the amend-

ment, the Chair is of the opinion that the point of order is well taken and sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Domestic Air Mail Service: For the inland transportation of mail by aircraft, as authorized by law, and for the incidental expenses thereof, including not to exceed $55,200 for supervisory officials and clerks at air-mail transfer points, travel expenses, and not to exceed $76,720 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $22,000,000.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take occasion during the reading of this bill for amendment to call to the attention of my colleagues of the Committee a very significant development in the operation of the air-mail service in the United States.

Many Members will recall the action of Congress approximately 4 years ago in establishing certain experimental routes for the carrying of air mail by what we have commonly come to know as the pick-up service. This system is based on an invention which allows a plane to come in and drop its cargo and pick up outgoing mail without using a landing facility or airport.

The operation of the experimental routes was so successful that the Post Office Department reported to the Committee on Appropriations the need for establishment of permanent routes. That was done. We are in a period of development in this forward looking enterprise. In 6 States we are carrying daily air mail by this method, and approximately 110 to 120 communities are being served.

Congress expressed its vision many years ago. We are today reminded of the judgment that was rendered at that time in establishing this service. Many communities with no rail service are served. The system is self-sustaining.

We are in the midst of a terrible war. Of course there can be no widespread development of this operation in the transportation of air mail by the pick-up system. I call your attention, however, to the fact that at the present time the Civil Aeronautics Board has before it for consideration the issuance of several new certificates of convenience and necessity. Applications have been made to the Board by many companies which desire to extend the air-mail pick-up system in the future, not for the few States and the approximately 120 communities now served, but for 35 States, with more than 2,000 communities to be brought into the scope of this development. These requests form the backlog for merited growth when victory over our enemies has been won.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I compliment the gentleman and congratulate him on the splendid work he did several years ago in bringing about the development of this air mail pick-up system. I understand the gentleman encouraged the inventive genius who worked out this method and he also fostered the legislation which gave the method a practical trial leading to adoption. Is there anything in this bill which encourages or discourages it?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate sincerely the very kind reference to myself. We have had encouragement of the service from the Post Office Department many times, including the testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee of this bill. The Post Office officials reported to the appropriations group, according to page 216 of the hearings on this measure, that the service in 6 States has been unsually successful, including Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Delaware, Kentucky, and New York. I am hopeful that when the war is over there can be a speedy extension of the air-mail pick-up system very quickly into 30 or more States of the Union. In a few days I will put in the RECORD a list of the points to be served if the new routes are allowed. There are communities that will never have the money to build or maintain airports, or that have uneven or mountainous terrain, making construction costly and difficult, and by pick-up service they will have the advantage of daily air mail, thus bringing them into 24-hour touch with all parts of the country.

In other words, what we have today brought to the front doors of America, from the standpoint of the expeditious dispatch of air mail, will then come to the back doors of America. That is as it should be.

When the struggle is over, which we trust will be soon, there will come back to our shores thousands of young men who have touched the great sphere of aviation for the first time. These pilots will funnel their services and their abilities back into a peacetime aviation trade. From dropping loads of bombs over Germany and Japan they shall come back to the purposes of peace. Air transportation will become a great industry. These seasoned young men will not stop flying. They will then pilot the hundreds of planes which will bring a great expansion of the air-mail pick-up system to the heart of America.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the subject I wish to discuss for a moment is not as dramatic as the interesting subject of air mail, but it is important. There is carried in this bill an item of $14,700,000 for Star Route Service. What I shall have to say is directed particularly to the members of the legislative Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, the able chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH] being on the floor.

For years we have sought to get legislation enacted which would take care of the problem of the star route carrier. Throughout the depression—before and since—star route bids have been let in a haphazard fashion of competitive bidding, and the grossest injustices have frequently resulted. Competitive bidding in matters of construction of Government installations is highly desirable, but this system of competitive bidding on star routes, which approximately correspond to rural routes, is all wrong. On the big commercial contracts where equipment is the main item and personnel is secondary a different situation might prevail.

There are about 12,000 star routes. Many of these routes, a majority of them, are more or less rural routes. They are let on the basis of competitive bidding, which has been wholly unsatisfactory, so unsatisfactory that 1,000 of these contracts last year were just given up, because the men who had bid on them were not able to carry out their contracts. Under the star-route system the country is divided into four different sections, and one of the four sections of the United States has a contract letting each year. This year there will be a lot of letting of contracts for the carrying of these star-route mails in one of the zones. It seems to me that before this present fiscal year comes to an end, it would be most desirable if the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads would bring here a bill which would provide that where men are now carrying star-route mail in a satisfactory way they may be permitted to renegotiate and readjust their contracts with the Government, and go on with their work, and not bring about the confusion in the Service which will be brought about by all this rebidding. Manpower demands are very pressing. The present carriers know their routes. This is no time for unnecessary changes. This long-delayed legislation should now be passed. This is legislation which all Members who know the problem have sought to have enacted for years, in order that we may put the star-route carrier on a proper basis, and thereby improve the service and carry out a proper service to which the patrons of the star route are entitled. The star-route carriers have been the forgotten men and women of the Postal Service. In many cases they have been shamefully underpaid. The whole system has been wrong.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate and am in sympathy with what the gentleman is trying to do, but if the star-route carriers in his section of the Nation are in the same position as a majority of the star-route carriers of Oklahoma, then very few of them would desire to negotiate for an extension of their contracts on the same basis of pay which they are now receiving. That ought to be made plain. Considering the present world situation, the shortage of manpower, the increased cost of living is going to require some readjustments if these men are to continue to carry Uncle Sam's mail.

Mr. MAHON. That is true. I would give the Department the right to renegotiate and readjust the contracts either upward or downward.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Then I agree with the gentleman and join with him in expressing the hope that such legislation will be presented to this body at an early date.

Mr. MAHON. That is one of the purposes of the proposed legislation.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. PRIEST. I have been much interested in this, and last year introduced a bill which would go a little further than the gentleman suggested with reference to renegotiation. I ask the gentleman what he thinks of that proposition at this time, which, in substance, would classify the star routes into two groups—class A, which are common carriers, and class B, which are competitive-bid routes—and place all class B routes on a basis of payment arrived at by so much per hour, so much per mile actually traveled in carrying the routes.

Mr. MAHON. I would not undertake to say how the legislation should be written. What I am saying is that in my judgment the committee should take cognizance of the two classes to which the gentleman refers and bring out a bill which would enable the star-route carriers in the districts to be advertised this year to go on with their work without all of this rebidding and the wasted manpower which will be incident to the readvertising of bids.

Mr. GRANGER. What would the gentleman have to say of such star-route carriers that have 2 years to go? Labor and everything else has increased, and they are working on low bids and most of them are going to bondsmen to carry them on.

Mr. MAHON. The Star Route Service is demoralized, and it is because Congress has not passed the type of legislation which would insure proper compensation to the star-route carriers.

Of course, I recognize that we cannot rectify the situation in this appropriation bill. Legislation is required, and I hope we can pass a bill at this session which will correct the present very bad situation. I point out that my remarks are directed principally to those star-route carriers who deliver mail on routes in a way somewhat similar to rural carriers. They constitute a majority of the star-route carriers.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 204. While the United States is at war, the Postmaster General may, in case of emergency, temporarily assign any post-office clerk to the duties of city delivery carrier or any such carrier to the duties of such clerk and in an emergency may assign any post-office employee to the duties of a railway postal clerk or any railway postal clerk to the duties of a post-office employee without change of pay-roll status, the compensation of any temporarily assigned employee to be paid from the appropriation made for the work to which he is regularly assigned.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against section 204 on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, not authorized by law.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. I say to the gentleman that the committee concedes the point of order is well taken. We do not resist it, but with the gentleman's permission I would like to say that this was put in the bill solely at the urgent insistence of the Postmaster General, who said that only through such temporary legislation would he be able to cope with the serious manpower problem that confronts him. Twenty-five thousand of his men have gone into the service, and he asked us to provide this interchangeability so that he could use for brief periods employees of one group in another service temporarily, if necessary. The gentleman will note in the first sentence of the section that it is specifically stated that it stands only while the United States is at war, but if the gentleman insists upon the point of order we concede the point.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, let me say in reply to the gentleman that I insist on the point of order because I do not want to put the members of the Postal Service under the whim and caprice of every postmaster throughout the United States, and I will say further if such legislation is needed, it ought to come from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

I will say further that if our committee will attend to the question of salaries and give those in the Postal Service the deserved raise they have waited for for the past 17 years, the situation in the Postal Service will be greatly improved.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COURTNEY). The point of order against the section of the bill is conceded. The committee admits that it goes into the realm of permanent legislation.

The point of order therefore is sustained.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: Page 51, line 14, after the period insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 204. (a) No part of the money appropriated in this title shall be expended for the purpose of collecting, sorting, handling, transporting or delivering free the mail of any officer in any executive department or administrative agency of the Government."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, in order that there may be no mistake as to the purport or intent of this amendment may I as clearly and as definitely as I can state exactly what this amendment proposes to do?

First, Is it the intent of the sponsor of this amendment to deny to the executive and administrative departments of the Government the use of the United States mail? The answer is absolutely "No." I want the executive and administrative agencies of government to use the mail in every reasonable way that is necessary to carry on the public business. There is nothing in this amendment that will prevent either the executive or administrative agencies of the Government from using the mail. The only thing that this amendment does is to place a limitation upon the pending appropriation bill, which does not become effective until the 1st day of July 1943. Therefore every agency of government, between now and July 1, 1943, has an opportunity to come to the appropriate subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and tell the Appropriations Committee their needs for postal service. I am certain that the Appropriations Committee will see to it that every executive agency and every administrative agency of government is supplied with sufficient funds to enable them to meter their mail and pay for it the same as every other citizen pays for his mail.

Let me show you some facts with reference to this situation. What kind of mail goes through the Post Office free? There are three kinds of mail that are carried free. One is the mail to which I am referring in this amendment, called penalty mail. Penalty mail is carried free. It is the mail of the departments and agencies of government. It is carried free when it is on official business. Up at the right-hand corner of the envelope it contains the very appropriate provision of a $300 penalty for use for any other than official business.

The second type of mail that is carried free is franked mail. Franked mail is the mail that is used by the legislative establishment of government to carry on its official business.

The third type of free mail is mail that is carried for the soldiers, and is just what it says. It is free mail. The soldier simply puts his name and station and rank on the envelope and writes the word "free" up where the stamp should ordinarily be, and that mail is carried free.

So we have the three types of free mail. Now, what do the first two types cost the Government of the United States? Had the departments of government this last year been compelled to pay the Post Office Department at regular rates for carrying their mail it would have given to the Postal Service approximately $71,000,000, according to the testimony of the Postmaster General himself.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot yield at this time. I will yield later.

It cost $71,000,000. The Post Office Department in 1942 handled 1,516,015,444 pieces of penalty mail. In 1941 they handled 1,123,000,000 pieces of penalty mail. The gain in 1942 over 1941 in the number of pieces of penalty mail was 34.9 percent, a tremendous increase in the number of pieces of penalty mail being sent out free by the various bureaucratic agencies of government scattered all over the United States. They not only sent more pieces of mail in 1942 than they did in 1941, but look at the other figure as disclosed on page 6 of the hearings. The number of pounds of mail carried in 1941 was 151,000,000 pounds, but in 1942 it had jumped to 236,000,000 pounds, an increase of 55.9 percent.

I do not need to talk to the Members of this Congress about the tremendous abuse by the departments in the use of

penalty mail. Every post office in the United States knows the fact. Every mail carrier in the cities or in the villages, every rural carrier is simply burdened down trying to distribute these millions and hundreds of millions of pieces of penalty mail, much of which is worthless and useless, that are flooding the entire United States, until it has become a national scandal and a national disgrace. Let me see if I cannot paint this picture to you in terms that will be understood. Do you know how much an average freight car carries? Let me tell you—40,000 pounds. Last year, on the figures of the Post Office Department itself, it took 100 trains, 100 trainloads, not carloads, 100 trains of 60 cars each, each car carrying 40,000 pounds of penalty mail in order to carry throughout this country and distribute this tremendous amount of mail material that is being issued by these various departments of the Government. I realize that in the case of the Army, the Navy, and other departments having to do directly with the war effort there ought to be and necessarily will be, an increase in the use of penalty mail; but let me call your attention to this, that when the O. P. A. and the W. P. B. are threatening to curtail the amount of newsprint paper to a point where the newspapers of this country perhaps will not be able to exist, it seems to me that the Congress of the United States ought immediately to take some action to curb the use by these departments of the privilege accorded them of penalty mail.

What does this amendment propose to do? All we say by this amendment to these departments is: You know how much mail you are sending out; you know the character of it and you know what your requirements will be in the next fiscal year. Now, we want you to come before the Congress of the United States and justify the necessity for sending out this material that you are sending out. We will let you have the postage to send out every bit of material that is necessary to carry on the public business.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] just calls my attention to the fact that you cannot send your local paper out to your boy or your friend's boy at the front; they will not carry it, but they are sending out tons and tons of this Victory publication and magazines of that kind published by these bureaucrats and sending it out there for these boys to read. I should like to call your attention to some testimony on this subject.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot yield at this point. I will yield later if I have time.

I direct your attention, if you please, to the testimony of the Postmaster General himself, which is found on page 49 of the hearings. I asked the Postmaster General certain questions on this subject. I read some of my questions and the Postmaster General's replies thereto:

Mr. KEEFE. There is absolutely no restriction or limitation whatsoever, then, upon these departmental agencies in the use of the mail? They can go just as far as they want to, except for the limitations as to weight and size of packages, and so on?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, sir; I know of no other restriction.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, if they were compelled to pay postage on that stuff, what would the situation be?

Mr. WALKER. Then they would have to justify that in their budget.

Mr. KEEFE. They would have to justify the necessity for all this stuff, would they not, when they come before the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEEFE. You would have some check on it there, would you not?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEEFE. You have not any check on it now, that I can see, at all?

Mr. WALKER. Except the reports under the O'Mahoney Act that are now eliminated, and the test checks that we make.

Mr. KEEFE. But those test checks are merely to show the amount of penalty mail being handled; they are no check at all on the use of it, whether it is necessary or whether it is not, and all that sort of thing?

Mr. WALKER. The answer is directly to the amount, and not to the control. We have no control.

These agencies down here can deliver a carload of pamphlets to the Post Office Department in penalty envelopes and it is the duty of the Post Office Department to see that they are delivered to the addressees. Now, I say to you Members who have been standing down in the well of this House protesting against extravagance that if you want to save some money to the taxpayers of the country here is an item that is costing somewhere between seventy and a hundred millions of dollars a year. There is not a person on this floor who is not familiar with the flagrant abuses that are being practiced by these departments of the Government in the use of penalty mail privilege.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I hope the gentleman will permit me to continue.

Now, let me compare, if you will, and I think I will answer the gentleman; let me compare, if you will, the complaints that have been made against the Congress of the United States in the use of franked mail. Congress is the one that is always attacked because of the franking privilege. There is this distinction between these bureaucrats and Members of Congress, however: We are elected by the people, and we are responsible to the people. If any Member of this House abuses the franking privilege that is accorded to him he can be called to account by the constituency he represents; but who is to call to account these bureaucrats down here who have never been elected by any constituency? And yet, when this subject is discussed as it is being discussed throughout the length and breadth of this land, to what do they refer? They never say a word about the abuses of the agencies of Government in the use of the penalty mail; they always refer to the abuses of Congress in the use of the franking privilege.

What did it cost last year for the franking privilege for the entire legislative department of the Government? I have the figures here, $767,000—$767,000 as against $71,000,000 used by these agencies of the Government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. KEEFE. I shall be pleased to yield; yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is a great deal of merit in the statement the gentleman is making. I should like to ask the gentleman, however, about the subsidy we are giving to second-, third-, and fourth-class mail of $128,000,000 a year. In 4 years we gave them half a billion dollars. How does the gentleman feel about that subsidy to the newspapers and magazines of this country? Does the gentleman believe the taxpayers ought to be assessed $128,000,000 a year for carrying that mail?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Answer that question.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What do you think about that?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite familiar, as we all are, with the yearly discussions and statements by the distinguished gentleman from New York on the subject which he raised, a subject, however, which is entirely foreign to the subject matter we are discussing here this afternoon. I do not intend to be dissuaded, distracted, or diverted from the subject I am trying to discuss by having anybody inject into this discussion a matter which is entirely foreign to the problem now before us.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Does the gentleman not think it important that half a billion dollars have been taken from the taxpayers in 4 years for these special mailing privileges?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield to the gentleman; I ask to be protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield. The gentleman from Wisconsin will proceed.

Mr. KEEFE. May I suggest to the gentleman from New York that if he is in earnest about what he says, that he attempt to place in this bill or some other bill an amendment to eliminate the evil of which he complains; then he will be doing something besides just talking about it. I am trying to meet an issue which is discussed all over this country, and I am trying to meet it in the only way I believe it possible to meet it and have this Congress retain its control over the expenditure of over $71,000,000. Now, the Post Office Committee will come out here, no doubt, through its chairman and say that we are interfering with the legislative prerogatives of that committee in this matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I am fully aware of the fact that the Post Office and Post Roads Committee has certain functions to perform, and other legislative committees have certain

functions to perform. But I have served here now through two sessions of the Congress, now starting the third, and I am becoming irritated at the failure of certain legislative committees of this Congress to bring legislation before the Congress to deal with problems of this character. I for one am no longer willing to sit down and wait while this great abuse is taking place until a legislative committee sees fit to bring in some legislation perhaps to deal with this subject.

Mr. Chairman, I am submitting this amendment to the greatest committee in the whole Congress, the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and I believe that we are capable and competent to deal with this problem and deal with it now, and not have it put off and delayed under the specious argument that we are attempting to bypass some legislative committee. You know what the facts are, you know what the situation is, you know what the purpose is behind this amendment, and I ask that you give it your support.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. If this money is saved in the transportation of penalty mail, would there not be a direct saving in printing and so forth if it curtailed the circulation of a lot of these pamphlets?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. So far as the actual saving is concerned, it would reflect itself down through the entire personnel, not only of the Post Office Department but the thousands of people who are spending their time sealing these envelopes and addressing them, the thousands of people who are spending their time writing these silly pamphlets that are being put out by the millions and scattered throughout the length and breadth of the land. The saving cannot be estimated at this time. We do not know what it may amount to, but any person who is familiar with governmental activities and government routine must know that if you curtail the use of this penalty mail and make these people come to the Congress and justify the necessity for it, you will have a tremendous saving not only in printing and the consumption and use of paper but in the personnel in these various agencies.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. The adoption of the gentleman's amendment will prevent an increase in the cost of postage stamps, which are to be raised to 4 cents, according to the Postmaster General.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman is on sound ground.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How many Federal employees, crackpot employees, writing the documents to which the gentleman referred, did we refuse to take off the pay roll this morning or yesterday?

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman's question answers itself. The RECORD discloses the action of Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How many of them were crackpots?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman pointed out the tremendous increase in the quantity and weight of the penalty mail. Will he not point out that in the same period and under the same circumstances the franked mail has been very substantially reduced?

Mr. KEEFE. I attempted to indicate that in the same period when the penalty mail was jumping by leaps and bounds the frank mail went down. In other words, in 1941 the frank mail cost $926,000, in 1942, $767,000, but as to the penalty mail it went up from $49,000,000 in 1941, according to the estimate that I have before me, to $67,000,000 for 1942, and the Postmaster General in his testimony said it would no doubt reach $71,000,000 in 1943.

Here is the first opportunity this Congress has had to effectively deal with a situation that involves million of dollars. Here is an opportunity for the Members to demonstrate by their action today whether they mean what they say when they stated that they intended to take back some of these powers that have been delegated to the bureaucratic agencies of our Government. Here is a question that is submitted squarely to the Members of Congress who will have an opportunity to vote and say whether they intend to endeavor to save at least $40,000,000 of the taxpayers' money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin told us yesterday in discussing the Pickens matter involved in the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, that he was a prosecuting attorney, and that his experience had been that of a prosecuting attorney. The gentleman undoubtedly was an excellent prosecuting attorney. He is a very capable Congressman and when he comes to presenting a matter on the floor he not only deals with the subject matter with vigor and enthusiasm but also attempts to carry his point by a certain amount of prejudice. The gentleman speaks as a prosecuting attorney usually does. He hits the high places, he emphasizes the points that will require a certain amount of blood to rush to your face until it will make you want to do something about it. But, Mr. Chairman, this is a deliberative body, not a criminal court jury.

Let us look at the facts in this case. They are very, very clear, and may I say that there is nothing more dangerous that I know of to do at this time when the war is on than that which the gentleman asks us to do. This amendment was not proposed in the committee. We did not consider it. Had we considered it, I do not believe there would have been a chance of its being reported favorably. I have not the time to correct every mistake suggested or stated by the gentleman.

First, I propose to show the cost. They testified—and you will find this on page 239—that, instead of costing $100,000,000, as the gentleman from Wisconsin said they testified, it costs $24,000,000 to handle it. That is the written testimony.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. O'NEAL. Just a moment.

Mr. KEEFE. I am sure the gentleman does not want to make such an outlandish statement as that.

Mr. O'NEAL. I referred the gentleman to my authority.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman knows that we have before us the figures right here.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I object to more unpermitted interruptions.

This is not a new proposal. This was done long ago by the Federal Government. We used to require postage to be put on, but we changed that. Why? Because it was found not satisfactory.

As to the cost of this thing, in my opinion it will not represent any economy whatever to do it in this way. If we require postage, the revenue will be $67,000,000 more, and we will have to put $67,000,000 more into the appropriation bill to buy the stamps.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, just for a correction?

Mr. O'NEAL. I regret very much that I cannot let prosecuting attorney methods interrupt my presentation.

Mr. KEEFE. I just want to let Mr. Walker say something about it.

Mr. O'NEAL. I decline to yield. I understand what the gentleman wants, but I should like to finish my statement, just as the gentleman wanted to finish his.

As I say this has all been tried before. The question is whether we should require all of these agencies to buy stamps rather than do it the way we are now doing it. I say there would be no economy. It would probably cost more to handle 1,500,000,000 pieces of mail. You cannot get stamp machines now, you cannot get the meters to handle this amount of mail. You would have to do it by clerks, and to handle that amount of mail and get it out in time would cost more money. To have the War Department material go out that must go out, and to have the Navy Department material go out, as well as the other mail important to the war, you would need such a large force of clerks under the civil service that the number you are now talking about would be increased by thousands and thousands. You could not handle this mail by machinery, you would have to handle it by clerks, and that would increase the vast number of people we now have on our civil-service rolls. Further, you would need additional office space for them.

The chief point of all, Mr. Chairman, is that while a war is going on you would increase the problems of the Army, the Navy, and the others who are preparing us for war. Do you think it would be practicable, when the Army says they cannot possibly stop to put stamps on every letter they write? Do you think it is right and fair to call upon the Army and the Navy now to stop and hire a lot of clerks, if a general wants to send out a letter or if somebody else in the Army or in the Navy wants to send out a letter? Of course, that is not practicable.

Let us see what the practical effect of this amendment would be. The Collector of Internal Revenue sends out 50,000 blanks, say. Every one of those would have to be stamped. The Selective Service sends out many letters. Eight million ration cards were sent out in 1 bunch. Of course, the volume of mail has increased. Think of the number of transactions that are carried on today with the business houses of the country. The Government is touching every phase of American life today.

This amendment does not relate only to some advertising or propaganda item, which we could stop in the Committee on Appropriations by asking the bureau officials what material of that kind the agencies are sending out. This applies to first-class mail, also to mail that is sent out in connection with business transactions or in connection with the numerous activities of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the other phases of wa. work.

Not only that, the work of the Collector of Internal Revenue, the Selective Service, and all the other work that is being done for the Government in the way of war production would be slowed down and the Post Office Department would have to handle that mail by hand. It simply is not practicable, it is not economical, and it is slow. This is no time to do it.

If the gentleman wants this matter considered thoroughly and fully, we have an intelligent Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, a group equally capable as the Committee on Appropriations. Some of what is proposed by the gentleman may be all right. The gentleman may have a good idea as to some of this penalty mail. But to slow down the work of the Army and the Navy and all the other agencies of the Government at this time certainly is not common sense. It is dangerous, and it should not be done.

Let the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads take care of this problem. If any department is sending out too much of one kind of mail, require them to stop it. But let us not say to General Marshall that every time he wants to send a letter or other communication to anyone he must dip into a drawer and pull out a stamp and stick it onto the envelope, thinking that in that way we will win the war. Let us forget this great amount of hullabaloo about the Government bureaus and agencies. Let us be practical and use some common sense. Refer this matter to a committee that can go into each individual item, and let that committee bring back a bill that is in line with the dignity of the House. We can then tell where to require this to be done and where not to require it. If we do that, we shall be acting in accordance with the best standards of the House of Representatives and we shall not impair the war effort and damage our cause by an attempt to bring about a little economy, when the attempt will really cost more than the economy we are trying to effect.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. O'NEAL. Now I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman referred to me as a prosecutor.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman referred to himself in that way.

Mr. KEEFE. No. The gentleman has referred to me as a prosecutor.

Mr. O'NEAL. In order to have the record straight, the gentleman yesterday made a very excellent speech—and I enjoy his speeches, as he always makes an excellent speech—and he started out by saying that his experience had been as a prosecuting attorney.

Mr. KEEFE. I did not say any such thing. I said I had been a prosecuting attorney, and I am mighty glad of it. It gave me the opportunity to catch fellows making misstatements on the floor such as the gentleman is now making.

Listen to this. On page 7, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], referring to the number of pieces of penalty mail:

> How would that be reflected in terms of dollars?
>
> Mr. WALKER. We estimate it is over $71,000,000 for penalty mail in 1942.

Does the gentleman mean to say that I am still mistaken?

Mr. O'NEAL. Oh, the gentleman is worse mistaken than ever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. I am talking about what it costs the Department. If the gentleman will look at the page referred to, the net cost of $23,000,000 is what I am talking about. I am not talking about the overhead alone. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'NEAL. Oh, just wait until I answer the question. I will have to answer the gentleman first before I yield. Where the gentleman is mistaken, and I am afraid his impetuosity lures him into making quick decisions, is this. On page 239, in a statement put in by the Post Office Department, the total penalty cost is $23,000,000. If the gentleman further considers his examination of the hearing he will find that the net cost is $23,000,000, not these hundreds of millions of dollars to which he refers.

Mr. KEEFE. One more question. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. Oh, I would be glad to carry on a conversation all the rest of the afternoon with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am in sympathy with the object of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. However, I do say that to adopt this amendment here today in my opinion would make a bad matter very much worse. With all of the different angles of the mail service, it would be impossible to set up a plan between now and the 1st of July by which it could be operated successfully. I feel that the penalty mail privilege has been very much abused, and I feel that something should be done by which it can be corrected, but I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, and other gentlemen here, that the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, through me and its legislative counsel and its secretary, for the last 2 or 3 weeks have been investigating this matter and getting up data from the time the different departments got their appropriations from the different legislative and appropriation committees. I think that was probably in the 1900's. We have been looking up legislation which has been enacted since that time, and the changes that have been made at different times as to how penalty mail should be administered. I hope this matter will be left to the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee. Without any undue delay, we hope, we are satisfied that we can bring a bill before you for consideration that will remedy the trouble that the gentleman is trying to remedy by his amendment. We will not delay action; we will take action; we feel that something should be done; but I repeat I urge that to legislate in this way will make the condition infinitely worse than it is at this time. The gentleman has given you the different kinds of mail. It is true that we have three, the franked mail, the penalty, and the free mail to soldiers, but we also have certain foreign arrangements, and this has been done by law, not by rules or regulations of the Post Office Department, and I refer to a law that was passed and approved February 14, 1929, which reads as follows:

> An act to grant freedom of postage in the United States domestic service to the correspondence of the members of the diplomatic corps and consuls of the countries of the Pan American Postal Union stationed in the United States
>
> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That under such regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe correspondence of the members of the diplomatic corps of the countries of the Pan American Postal Union stationed in the United States may be reciprocally transmitted in the domestic mails free of postage, and be entitled to free registration, but without any right to indemnity in case of loss. The same privilege shall be accorded consuls of such countries stationed in the United States, and vice consuls when they are discharging the functions of such consuls, for the exchange of official correspondence among themselves, and for that which they direct to the Government of the United States.
>
> Approved, February 14, 1929.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. Is it not a fact that the large increase indicated in penalty mail has been caused primarily by the increased demand owing to the war?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. To some extent that is the case. I think to the extent of the different activities of the different departments, but I do say that I think we should pass some legislation by which the departments should be compelled to justify their expenditures in postage. We should not leave the gate open for them to use the mail freely and without restriction. I think the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will bring in some legislation by which we may authorize the Committee on Appropriations to compel the various departments to justify their expenditures for postage.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated, and I say in conclusion that it would be very dangerous to adopt it at this time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to save what would be represented by postal revenues, $82,595,000. The propaganda of the bureaucrats has grown and grown for the last 10 years until it has become the habit for the increase to reach at least $10,000,000 in a single year. This does not mean that postage stamps would have to be licked on to the envelopes. These departments can get permits just as any business house does, and the whole thing can be printed right on the envelope just exactly the same as penalty mail envelopes are printed. There is not a bit more work to it. Even now a great many of these departments outside of Washington have to pay postage, and the postage which they pay runs to $1,820,000 in a single year. It simply means that these people would have to come here and justify their needs for postage. That would give the Congress of the United States an opportunity to check the terrific increase and waste that has come.

I have here in my hand 1 month's distribution to a country newspaper. If the country newspaper had printed it, it would have filled the paper for four times as many issues as they had issues in a month.

There were also sent under separate cover enormous quantities of mats already laid out to print, from one single unit in the Government. It is perfectly ridiculous for the Congress to sit here and let this thing go on any longer. Let us stop it. Put this amendment in here and it will stop it. Then the departments will have to come here and justify their needs just like everybody else. There is not any sense laying down on our job and failing to put this amendment in. Let us see to it that the departments quit this ridiculous propaganda stuff.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman any views to express on the congressional mailing privilege? Does the gentleman feel that that should be gone into also?

Mr. TABER. I do. I feel that there should be an allowance to the membership for postage just the same as there should be to the departments.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. It seems there is always somebody in the House who is calling our attention to the fact that third- and fourth-class mail is also subsidized. I wish to remind the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK] that if the newspapers were paid for all the advertising and the space which they give free to the Government, to the State, and to the towns and to the schools and to the churches, they would be willing to pay postage.

Mr. TABER. Of course, that is not in this bill. That is another sore that should be corrected, but I am not going into that question now.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. No. I have one thing that I want to tell you and I do not want to forget it.

Did you know that the Postmaster General had announced that he would like to see the rate of postage on first-class mail to the ordinary folks back home raised to 4 cents? Now, he is getting ready to take care of the expense of this penalty mail. Are we going to raise that postage to the folks back home to 4 cents so that we can avoid putting these bureaucrats in the departments under control? Personally, I do not believe that this House wants to do that. I believe they want to stop that waste.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, when I find myself in disagreement with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], as I do on this occasion, I almost feel like examining myself to see if there is anything the matter with me. In my close association with him on our subcommittee and from my observation of his stand on public questions in general I have found him so uniformly right that I hesitate to criticize his position on any matter. I think his speech in this Chamber last week on the proposed issue of Federal Reserve bank notes and the credit of the Government was one of the soundest and most patriotic addresses I ever have heard. It was a magnificent contribution to straight thinking in this troubled period.

Time after time the gentleman from Wisconsin has shown that he can and does place patriotism high above partisanship, which is a measure of true statesmanship.

But this proposal to wipe out the free mailing privilege that is enjoyed by the Chief Executive and the various departments, bureaus, and administrative units is too far reaching in its ramifications and implications to be dealt with through the back-door expedient of summarily taking away from these establishments all of the money required to enable them to send out official mail matter. It is too serious a proposal to be dealt with in this off-hand way. There should be a more constructive approach to the problem. It should be taken up and dealt with thoroughly by the proper legislative committee, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and I say to you that the able chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Virginia, THOMAS G. BURCH, tells me that this very matter has a place on the agenda of his committee for early consideration and that he himself has prepared and will introduce a bill as the basis for proper legislative action. We can safely leave it to this legislative committee, composed of outstanding Members of the House, to bring in a bill that will create adequate controls over the penalty mail without inviting the disastrous and calamitous repercussions that most certainly would follow the adoption of Mr. KEEFE's amendment today.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. LUDLOW. I have some letters to read and my time is limited; I cannot yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman will want this contribution in his remarks.

Mr. LUDLOW. I cannot refuse the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. May I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that on page 51 of the hearings he asked this question of the Postmaster General:

> Mr. LUDLOW. General, do you think it would be a salutary or advisable thing to repeal penalty mail altogether, and have Congress make appropriations for postage directly to the various activities of the Government?
>
> Mr. WALKER. I would like to give that a little thought. I am frank to say that I think something should be done about it. Whether that would be the best system or not, I would not want to say offhand.

Now——

Mr. LUDLOW. I cannot yield to my friend for a speech.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman recalls asking him that question?

Mr. LUDLOW. I do; yes.

No one appreciates more than I do the fact that curbs should be established on the exercise of the penalty-mail privilege, but whether this should be handled administratively through controls placed by the Bureau of the Budget, or otherwise, I do not know, but in any event it is a problem of such far-reaching consequences that it should be taken up and studied and handled by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and a decision reached after proper hearings and due consideration of all the factors involved.

The proponents of the amendment presently before us to strike out of this bill the money that would pay the cost

of the free-mailing privilege for executive establishments have in mind the substitution of a plan later on to make limited appropriations for postage to the various units. Let us consider for a moment how that might affect our military and naval operations, for instance. Suppose that in the midst of carrying on a vital military operation the Army should run out of postage. Surely it would not be expected that they would stop the war until they got another appropriation. The Bureau of Internal Revenue operates under penalty mail, and it is obliged to send out a mountain of forms to cover the tax liability of 8,500,000 taxpayers who are being brought into the taxpaying bracket for the first time. Suppose the Bureau finds itself without postage to contact some millions of taxpayers. Would it not be bad business and would it not work incalculable detriment to our revenue-producing operations?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. LUDLOW. I regret that I cannot.

Free mail is a vital necessity in carrying on the operations of the Selective Service System and the thousands of draft boards throughout the country. Are we going to handicap them by curtailing their necessary and vital mailings? We will if we are not careful.

No sooner had public mention been made of this proposed amendment than the Army and Navy landed on me like a ton of brick.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I cannot yield.

"For Heaven's sake," they said, "do not let this happen." They pointed out that when the war came on they secured the repeal of the O'Mahoney amendment for the reason that the preparation of the quarterly reports under it required the diversion of too much manpower which should be directed toward winning the war. They contended that the O'Mahoney amendment would have been a mere piker, compared with the diversion of manpower that will result, if it becomes necessary during the prosecution of the greatest war of all time, when the life and liberty of all Americans is at stake, to pause and weigh and put stamps on official letters and packages that should be rushed with the utmost speed to points of destination.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LUDLOW. It is hard for me to resist my beloved friend.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if during the 4 months between now and the 1st of July when this bill would take effect there would not be plenty of time to appropriate whatever amount of money might be needed by these agencies for postage?

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, the War and Navy Departments feel so deeply that the adoption of this amendment would slow down military operations and impede the war effort that they have asked me to express their opposition to it and to state their reasons why they think it should not be adopted. I ask your special attention to two letters I have received, one from Judge Robert P. Patterson, the Under Secretary of War, and the other from James Forrestal, the Under Secretary of the Navy. Judge Patterson's letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
*Washington, D. C.*

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: It is noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 3, 1943, page 543, column 2, that Mr. KEEFE (Republican, Wisconsin) states that he proposes to offer an amendment to the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, 1944, H. R. 1648, limiting and restricting the penalty-mail privilege of the executive departments of the Government.

I wish to take this opportunity to express and explain the objections of the War Department thereto. Due to the limited time available it has been impracticable to complete a thorough investigation of similar previous proposals, and review them here. However, the major and obvious objections are listed below:

1. The material increase in personnel which would be required for the stamping, weighing, and accounting all over the world.

2. The procurement of the great number of stamping and accounting machines, if available at all, would require the use of critical materials, which would seriously interfere with the war effort.

3. The additional space for handling which would be required.

4. The fact that there would be no net financial gain to the Government.

Apparently, the intention is to reduce the volume of mail and printed matter transmitted, on the principle that the necessity for placing postage on each piece and the cost of same would cause more care in avoiding unnecessary or excessive correspondence and literature. This same object can be attained by properly drawn and executed administrative directions.

There are attached hereto, for ready reference, the following enclosures:

1. Extract from the Post Office Department Appropriation Act, 19-0, approved May 6, 1939.

2. Extract from the Deficiency Appropriation Act approved June 30, 1939.

3. Extract from the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, approved September 9, 1940.

4. A copy of first endorsement dated May 29, 1939, from the office of the Judge Advocate General to the Adjutant General.

5. Copy of the Annual Report of the Postmaster General, 1941. (Pertinent passages and tables are marked.)

This subject has been highly controversial for many years. Doubtless there is much to be said on both sides of the question. However, in my opinion the time is most inopportune to change a comparatively simple and established method of handling the tremendous volume of military mail for a new method which will require additional personnel and machinery, both of which are already becoming increasingly difficult of procurement.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
*Under Secretary of War.*

I now read Mr. Forrestal's letter, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
*Washington.*

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
*Chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Appropriations, House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: A report has been received that action is being proposed in Congress to change the existing law concerning the penalty-mail privilege of executive departments of the Government.

A review of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated February 3, 1943, column 2, page 543, refers to remarks of Congressman KEEFE, of Wisconsin, who proposes to offer an amendment to appropriation bill, 1944, H. R. 1648, of the Treasury and Post Office Departments, limiting and restricting the penalty-mail privilege of the executive departments of the Government.

Due to the short notice which the Navy Department has had regarding this proposed amendment, it has been impossible to efficiently review the past records and letters on this subject. It is desired, however, to offer immediate objections of the Navy Department to the proposed amendment.

To place in effect such a far-reaching change as that proposed would seriously handicap the present organization of the Navy Department and definitely impede the war effort. It is believed that the solution to the abuse of the penalty-mail privilege lies in correct internal administration of various executive departments rather than a change in the law.

Among the many objections against changing the existing law are the following:

(a) Considerable additional space would be required by the Navy Department, and space at present is at a premium.

(b) No financial gain to the Government would result, and the same effect as far as the Post Office Department funds are concerned could be obtained by transferring funds from the various executive departments to the Post Office Department account.

(c) A considerable increase in civil service and Navy personnel would be required to care for the additional handling of stamping, weighing, and stamps themselves.

(d) There is a serious shortage of post-office equipment. At present we are unable to properly equip our outlying stations. To increase the demands on an already overburdened system of supplies would cause a break-down in our outlying postal supply system. As these supplies are made out of critical war materials, it is doubtful if they could be obtained.

(e) The physical handling of mail would be considerably slowed down by the necessity for weighing and stamping every letter. Mail delays at present are the source of many complaints from Members of Congress, Government agencies, and private citizens. This would be further aggravated by the lack of availability of automatic stamping machines and accounting instruments.

(f) The expense of additional personnel and equipment required to comply with the proposed change would be in excess of the benefit to be derived therefrom.

In view of the above objectionable features, as well as past records in this matter, it is considered that a change in the existing penalty-mail privilege would be highly undesirable, particularly at the present time.

The Navy Department has not, for lack of time, been advised as to the relationship of this report to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES FORRESTAL.

There is one other phase of this matter which I think I ought to discuss candidly in order that we may see the whole picture. If we adopt this amendment we will be inviting the biggest barrage against Congress since the memorable flare-up over congressional pensions. From my long association with the fourth estate I happen to know that editorial writers and newspaper columnists—whom many people regard as worse than fifth columnists—have got their fingers on the trigger and are prepared to put this question to Congress:

"You have seen fit to cut off the free-mailing privilege of the Commander in Chief, the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the mothers' allotment checks and the Selective Service System, including the draft boards, and now why should you not go a step further and give up your own free-mailing privilege?"

That is going to be a question that will be hard to answer. It is true that Congress has not abused its franking privilege and many of the bureaus have, but distinctions like that are overlooked when the guns begin to fire on Congress. We should face this with practical realism. It is my sincere belief that any Member of the House who votes for this proposal is voting to take away his own franking privilege and to place his office on a postage-metered basis. All of the considerations above referred to point to the inevitable conclusion that the best thing we can do here today is to vote down this amendment and allow this matter to be taken up by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in a cooler and more deliberate atmosphere.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot reach an agreement as to a limitation of time on this amendment?

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this question is sufficiently important that we should give it very serious attention. Frankly, I am somewhat surprised that the gentleman from Wisconsin has offered this amendment, because to me it seems to be so out of keeping with the present needs of the various departments of the Government.

I do not believe there is a man on either side of the aisle who would not like to vote to cut down and reduce the sending out by the various departments of a lot of unnecessary propaganda, and if the vote were on whether or not we should reduce the sending out of this propaganda I would vote for the amendment, and I think everybody else would vote for the amendment. But that is not the issue pending before the House at this time. The issue is whether or not the Government departments shall pay postage on the mail which is now being sent out by the Government departments, and that is an entirely different proposition.

This amendment, strictly speaking, would not stop one piece of propaganda. It would just mean that we would pay postage on it. The amendment does not require the reduction of the amount of mail that would be sent out, the thing which may first appear to those of you who have not considered this matter fully.

I know of no better-informed man in the Post Office than Mr. Jess Donaldson, Deputy First Assistant Postmaster General, who has been there for many years. He and many others who have been there longer than Mr. Walker, the present Postmaster General, have discussed this matter before our committee on a number of occasions and I have not heard one well-informed man say that from his experience we should require the departments to pay postage on the mail which they send out. Reduce, of course, the amount of Government mail. Let the House reduce the printing and binding appropriations. Let the House reduce the amount of money that may be spent for the publication and printing of all this stuff. Sure, do that, and it can be done. But when manpower is so precious, when the farmer is crying for help, when the Army and Navy are crying for help, why take the additional manpower, additional machines, additional precious metal to make permit prints or something of that kind on all of this mail that is sent out? There is no reason for it. There is no reason why any man on either side of the aisle should come up here on the basis of partisanship and vote for this amendment at a time when he must know in his heart that it will slow up the war effort.

How can we vote for it on a standing vote or on a roll-call vote when the Under Secretary of War and the Under Secretary of the Navy say, in effect, "For heaven's sake, do not burden us with this when we are trying to win the war in 1943."

Mr. Chairman, it is time to rise above petty politics and differences as between one side of the aisle and the other and come down here and carry on our functions as Representatives of the people in such a way that we may merit the confidence of the people. Let us cut down these publications; yes. It is always in order to offer an amendment reducing items of expenditure for this printing and binding. That should be done, and I will support you. Others will support you in an effort to reduce these expenditures. But let us not go to stamping the mail or using any other kind of contrivance that will take the time and manpower, when that time and manpower should be working every moment in the prosecution of the war, not in the counting of parcels of mail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, somebody spoke about the heat of a prosecutor. I think we had something like it in the gentleman from Texas. There are two things which I want to say. I want to answer the question of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] a while ago. It was not answered. He asked whether or not most of this penalty mail had not been since the war started. That is not the case at all. We would not be discussing it at all today, and the gentleman from Wisconsin would not have brought it up if the most of this had been since the war started. This thing has not been touched in the debate so far as I can recall. In all the set-ups in the Government in the last 10 years it is significant to note in every one of them there was created an information bureau. That was rather singular. Every one of the new set-ups from 1933 on was created with subdivisions involving an information bureau, the whole purpose of which was to think up things to send out to the people in the form of propaganda. There was an effort to make each set-up better than anybody else's. Nobody has referred to that fact. We created propaganda agencies in every bureau and division of a bureau for the last 10 years. Of course it is that which was aimed at when the gentleman asked the question. It was tremendously big before we got into the war.

The gentleman who just left the floor said it would not save a thing. If they have to come to the Appropriations Committee for their postage stamps, does not the gentleman think it is going to save a little, and I ask the gentleman from Texas that question, Do you not think we are going to save a little? I think we are going to save a whole lot, and you know it.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. They now come to this Congress for the money for every bit of propaganda which they print.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No.

Mr. MAHON. We have been giving them the money for that. Let us quit it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No. They cannot do it now. They could have gotten it 6 or 8 years ago, but they cannot get it now. We have a new kind of a Congress and we have shown that every day we have been in session.

Mr. KNUTSON. The rubber has been taken out.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Exactly.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think anyone who desires to be fair will admit this is going to save at least several million dollars a year in postage. How much more it will save in not sending out needless propaganda that goes into the wastebasket no one can say.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It will cut these information bureaus in two.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending at the desk and I would like to have it read before I proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the proposed amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Proposed amendment of Mr. CASE as an amendment to Mr. KEEFE'S amendment: After the words "executive department" in Mr. KEEFE'S amendment, insert the words "legislative."

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment concerns every Member of this body. The Keefe amendment reads as follows:

No part of the money appropriated in this title shall be expended for the purpose of selecting, sorting, handling, transporting, or delivering free the mail of any officer in any executive department or administrative agency of the Government.

My amendment proposes to insert the word "legislative" after the words "executive department" so that the restriction on free mail will apply to the Congress as well as to the other branches of the Government. It will then read:

Any officer of any executive department, legislative, or administrative agency of the Government.

The amendment is designed to meet the one point in the argument by the gentleman from Indiana that the Congress would lay itself open to a barrage of criticism comparable to that which attended the passage of the so-called pension bill.

My amendment proposes to make it necessary for the legislative branch of the Government to appropriate the funds to carry the mail of the Members of Congress and the legislative agencies of the Government the same as is proposed for the executive branch of the Government.

The matter of the amount will be left to what the surveys and the estimates will show to be necessary, the same as for any agency or department. Adjustments to varying needs can be made on a basis of population and distance to allow for volume and zone requirements. The amendment to the amendment, then, meets one of the two objections to the Keefe amendment.

The other objection the gentleman from Indiana raised related to the war. Time and tonnage in war operations. It was an argument that was dwelt upon at some length in the letters he read and the same argument was stressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. The time argument, however, does not really count for much if you analyze what has been done and can be done. We have used stamped envelopes for years. Stamped envelopes can be printed or modifications of stamped envelopes can be developed.

Mr. TABER. The Post Office Department issues permits the numbers of which can be printed right on the envelopes, just as the penalty statement is printed.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman is correct. Therefore, there will not be the additional requirement either of time or of weight of mail to be carried. That matter can be handled as a mere printing proposition.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. In regard to the proposed amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota, I call attention to the fact that when I addressed the Congress upon this subject a few days ago for the first time I gave all the facts and figures with respect to the franked mail, and I indicated at that time that the franking privilege enjoyed by the Members of the legislative branch of the Government cost an average of approximately $1,400 a year each. As far as I personally am concerned, I have no objection to the Appropriations Committee of this House placing upon me as a Member of Congress a reasonable limitation as to the amount of postage I may expend in the course of a year. I feel sure the Members of Congress intend to be realistic on that matter, and I also feel sure that the committee would give us an allowance sufficient for the reasonable use of the mails.

May I also direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that the War and Navy Departments are using the air mail today as never before. Every air-mail letter that is dispatched by the Army or the Navy must bear a stamp that must be bought and paid for. They have no penalty mail privilege for the use of the air mail. That seems to shoot a little bit of a hole in the great argument that has been adduced here. They have until July 1 to come up here and get a liberal allowance for postage. Who will say that the appropriations committees of the Congress will not give the Army or the Navy every dollar they need for postage?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair directs this question to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. The Chair was out of the Chamber temporarily. Did the gentleman from South Dakota offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. CASE. I did, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, aside from the great saving in postage costs, this amendment will further save a tremendous amount of paper now being used by Government departments for purely propaganda purposes.

While we are considering this amendment the Pulp and Paper Division of the W. P. B. is determining a new reduction in the amount of paper that may be consumed by the newspapers and other periodicals of the Nation. This additional reduction is said to be necessary in our war effort. Pulp formerly used in the manufacture of paper is now needed for munitions, containers, and other essential supplies for our fighting forces. Certainly, if our Nation's publishers and other users of all kinds of paper are called upon to reduce their requirements, we in Congress are not amiss in compelling bureaucratic agencies to reduce the amount of paper they are using for purely propaganda purposes, most of which finds its way into waste baskets without so much as being seen.

Although I have been assured by responsible authorities that the anticipated reduction will not work undue hardships upon, or handicap essential services of, the newspapers of the Nation, I have been informed that one division of government—the Office of Civilian Supplies—has been holding out for a straight horizontal cut of 40 percent in the consumption of newsprint from that used in the same period in 1941.

By adopting this amendment this Congress can make sure that Government departments will be forced to eliminate unnecessary and wasteful printing. The time for this Congress to begin to meet the mandate given us by the people last November is now. The argument that it will hamper the Army and Navy in the conduct of this war does not hold. There is nothing to prevent the Army and the Navy, and any other department from coming before the Appropriations Committee between now and July and obtaining the amounts necessary to meet their mailing requirements. When the amounts are appropriated, permits may be granted by the Post Office Department, thus wiping out the argument that extra manpower will be needed for licking stamps.

The time to take action is now. This amendment should be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary situation seems to be that the first vote will come on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. The amendment to the amendment proposes to include the legislative establishment within the terms of the amendment. When that is disposed of the vote will come on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin relative to the Executive Establishment.

First of all, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota will be voted down. Let us not forget that, after all, the franked mail, as distinguished from the penalty mail, is in the ratio of about 1 to 100. The abuse is not up here, it is at the other end of the Avenue. Do not delude yourselves about it. The abuse is at the other end. Do not kid yourselves about that.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me continue—and do not delude yourself as to whether this abuse springs from the war. It does not. Once we had a genial and distinguished gentleman, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Honorable Ed Taylor, one of the finest men I ever knew. He asked the Budget Bureau to investigate this matter in 1941, applicable to the fiscal year 1941, which began on July 1, 1940. The whole fiscal year had expired, before Pearl Harbor, and at that time they had 2,900 full-time scriveners on the pay roll, getting out all this miscellaneous information, such as speeches, lectures, radio scripts, and other matters. In addition they had 32,000 part-time people on the pay roll preparing lectures, radio scripts, manuscripts, and one thing and another.

That report from the Budget Bureau, not my report, shows they got out 300,000,000 publications in that year before the war, and 283,000,000 of those were not required by law. This abuse has been going on for a long time and do not be fooled as to whether it is dangerous to the war effort. It is a continuing abuse. There are 140 days to go by before this bill becomes law, and in 140 days they can cure some of these abuses. This amendment is designed to stimulate, and expedite a remedy, and it will not be conclusive until the bill has gone through the Senate, has completed conference, and has gone to the White House. In those 140 days to elapse from now, the bureaus ought to do something about this abuse. They have new mountains of stuff. How much did they spend in any single year for all kinds of written material, radio scripts, and lectures? They had $27,700,000 in the fiscal year 1941, and it gets worse now.

Here is the latest issue from the Landis organization, the O. C. D. Eighteen million of those will go into the mail. It is but a beginning of another paper deluge. Let us by our action serve notice now that this ought to be remedied before the end of the fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, during the last campaign the Republican and Democratic candidates for Congress campaigned on an economy platform, and advocated economy in nondefense expenditures. A certain gentleman from Virginia, Mr. HARRY FLOOD BYRD, is well known throughout Ohio. I believe he is a prominent Democrat. He is a leading exponent of economy in government. This is not a partisan issue. It is an issue that Republicans and Democrats can all agree upon. In fact in the last campaign I spoke from a rostrum that was shared by eight other candidates, Democrats and Republicans, and every one of us tried to outdo the other in a plea for economy. Many of us quoted Mr. HARRY FLOOD BYRD in our campaign speeches. Today there is a campaign going on in this country to get 850,713 typewriters allegedly for the armed forces. The plea is made that these typewriters are to be used on warships and overseas.

I checked the figures to find what they are going to do with these typewriters, and I find that they represent in propaganda publicity that these machines are for war purposes. They say that they need 1 for every 750 men in service. If this be true we would have an Army of 334,500,000 soldiers. Of course on the face of it the representation is absurd. On further inquiry we are told they need 446,500 typewriters for the War Department, 199,096 for the Navy Department, 12,600 for the Maritime Commission, and for the Board of Economic Warfare 47,390, for Lend-Lease 40,125, and for regular Government departments 105,000 more typewriters. I am told that we are now spending more money for civil functions than we are for the military functions of the War Department. Since 1937 we have produced two and a half million typewriters in this country. Here is an appeal for a third of them. Let us take some of the typewriters from the Post Office Department and the Treasury Department and every other nondefense department and give them to the War Department and not ask for 105,000 additional typewriters for non-defense departments. One way to do it is to vote for this amendment. Take the typewriters away from the bureaucrats and give them to the boys in the service.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE].

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, this is specific legislation, and I think it can be figured dispassionately and definitely upon the ground that it is an attempt to restrict one legislative appropriation. In the first place, I believe all Members of the House are anxious to obtain the same results, namely, to remove from the penalty mail privilege those departments that are exercising an abuse. Something has been said about the time they have to rectify their mistakes. In the first place, I am confident that no Member on either side of the aisle wants to put a blank amendment on appropriations that will hinder or obstruct an executive department or certain bureaus within the Army or the Navy or other departments that may be embarrassed by placing restrictions thereon.

If we are to find those departments that are exercising abuse of this penalty privilege, then it seems to me the whole matter ought to be referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in order that proper hearings may be held and the representative heads of the different departments be brought in to show that committee just what their use of the mails is, and that we may then bring in proper recommendation to this body for the enactment of a proper law to eliminate what you have indicated today are abuses and a costly privilege. The package of goods that was shown by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is the objective that we want to reach. We can only do that by ferreting out which are the departments and who are the officials that are issuing such mail.

I do not want to be a party to an amendment that will say to the President of the United States and his department that he shall state in cost what is necessary to carry on the business of the executive. I do not want to say to the Army and the Navy that they may ask the privilege after stating the amount of appropriation necessary for the mailing privilege, or even to hamper or hinder either of those Departments in the war effort. We have 4 months, and in that 4 months I hope that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads can bring this Congress a proper report.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. One of the Members asked me how Members' mail would be taken care of. That would be taken care of by providing stamps, under my amendment, the same as you get your air-mail stamps now.

Mr. ROWE. To which amendment is the gentleman referring?

Mr. CASE. I am referring to my amendment to the Keefe amendment. If there are any Members who have been abusing the franking privilege by sending out speeches promiscuously for political purposes, those would have to be paid for, of course, in addition to the appropriation that was made for Members themselves.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAGNUSON as a substitute: On page 51, line 14, after the period, add a new section as follows:

"Sec. 204 (a). No part of the money appropriated in this title shall be expended for the purpose of collecting, sorting, handling, transporting, or delivering free the mail of any officer in any executive department or administrative agency of the Government, except that restrictions under this amendment shall not apply to the Department of Navy, the War Department, or the Bureau of Internal Revenue."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed, of course, to the original Keefe amendment. I do not think it is practical. I do not think it will accomplish a great deal, but I am heartily opposed to that portion of the amendment that applies today to the Army, to the Navy, or to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. It may be all well and good for the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from New York to say that this can all be done very simply, but I am telling you that the Army and the Navy and the Bureau of Internal Revenue have enough trouble on their hands now, enough trouble fighting this war, without having to come to Congress every time they want a postage stamp or something on a letterhead. I do not think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] intended it to apply to the military. Maybe he did. But it is just one of those things that adds to the paper work down in the War and Navy Departments. You cannot lick the Japanese or the Germans by paper work or in front of congressional committees. Let us leave the Army and the Navy alone for a while and let them fight this war.

Secondly, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has an amendment. The purpose is good, but just think how impractical it is. Here are the Members of this House, and you will have to dole out a certain portion to every Member—an equal portion. There are Members of this House who represent districts with 200,000 people and others representing districts involving well over 1,000,000 people. How, practically, are you going to dole out stamps equally to the Members? The Members of this House do not abuse their franking privilege. This is an impractical way of proceeding.

The reason I offered my amendment was not because I favor the Keefe amendment, but I do think that if this amendment should pass, there should be a

brake so that the Army and the Navy will not have to take thousands of letterheads, throw them in the ashcan, and come up here or go to the Post Office Department to get a stamp, or go before the Appropriations Committee every time an admiral wanted to send a dispatch to Guadalcanal or some place else.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. LUDLOW. I would like to remind the gentleman that some of the other establishments that he has left out of the exceptions in his amendment are just as essential to winning the war as the Army and the Navy. For instance, the Treasury Department has an enormous load of disbursements due to the war; the Maritime Commission has a vast expansion due to the war, and many other activities are similarly affected. The gentleman's amendment would not affect those at all. They would still be badly crippled by the Keefe amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I entirely agree with the gentleman, but I am so fearful that if this does creep into this bill it will be something else that will hamper the War Department and the Navy Department.

Mr. LUDLOW. If you do not want to hamper the War Department or the Navy Department, we had better vote down the Keefe amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think it might be better if he withdrew his amendment and let us have a test vote on the issue without any restriction that would apply under his own amendment? Let us vote on the situation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to explain that my purpose, and my only purpose, in offering the amendment is that I am so fearful that if this does creep into the bill, here will be the Navy Department and the War Department with all these troubles on their shoulders—but in view of the promises of the committee that the whole matter will be discussed I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Let the country realize what the full effect of it would be.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] to close the debate.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to yield my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be most unfortunate from a legislative standpoint if any of these amendments were adopted. In the first place, no one has demonstrated where there will be anything like the saving that has been suggested. As I read the hearings, on page 239, the total cost of the penalty mail is about $23,000,000. The only way we could effect any appreciable saving would be if this amendment had the effect of stopping entirely all penalty mail; and this, of course, would not happen. There might possibly be some saving through making it necessary for the different agencies to come to Congress for appropriations, but the savings would not be great.

Let me point out just one or two instances where we would be getting in over our heads by trying to settle this complicated, technical legislative procedure by an amendment on an appropriation bill. In the first place, Congress, which is always subject to attack—it is always open season on Members of Congress—would find the Case amendment very difficult of application. How would one ever apportion postage to Members of Congress? Some Members, as has just been pointed out, have small districts and little mail; other Members have large districts and quantities of mail, legitimate mail that they ought to answer. Others are in the habit of sending out quantities of yearbooks, pamphlets, documents, and mail bag after mail bag full of stuff to their constituents, and speech after speech to their constituents. What a conglomerated, lopsided, cockeyed-looking list would be the list of postage you would get up for Members of Congress; and that is what you are putting into this bill if you adopt this amendment.

Just a few moments ago the gentleman from Indiana read into this RECORD a letter from Bob Patterson, the Assistant Secretary of War. No man will take the floor of this House and call Bob Patterson a crackpot bureaucrat. No man in the administrative service has rendered greater service to his country and greater service to America than the Assistant Secretary of War. He has been fair, square, open, and aboveboard always with the committees of this House; and he is not a new dealer; you cannot accuse him of supporting any particular philosophy. He states that in his judgment an amendment of this kind will slow up the war effort and will not result in any saving. Why? Because he would have to employ additional personnel and would have to get some kind of stamping machinery.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would prefer to go ahead and make my full statement. I have not taken any time so far. If the gentleman will permit I should like to finish my remarks without yielding.

Mr. TABER. A permit would cover the whole thing for all these departments.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; I know a permit would cover the whole thing. Now, what is happening? The Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Veterans' Administration, and the Treasury Department are mailing tons upon tons of vital important mail all over the world, not just in Washington alone; they are not just coming out of the departments here for distribution in this city only, but their mail goes all over the world.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If the gentleman will yield I would remind the gentleman from New York that there is no such thing as a permit for first-class mail.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further, I have only a minute or two.

Mr. Chairman, should we adopt this amendment we would slow up the war effort; the Secretary of the Navy says so. The Treasury Department is mailing out every day hundreds and thousands of allotments to veterans and their dependents. The Veterans' Administration has important mail that is going out in large quantities. This amendment will not accomplish any saving. I would remind the Members that we are just about to set up a new appropriations subcommittee whose investigators will go into these matters. In addition to that the legislative committee of this House on the Post Office and Post Roads, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Virginia, my colleague [Mr. BURCH], is going into this matter. He has told us—and we know that when he says a thing he means it and that it will happen—this committee is energetically going into this matter and will bring us substantive legislation whereby we can pass upon it.

So I plead with the committee today not to adopt this amendment in the belief that it will effect a saving of a few dollars, for I do not believe it will save anything. The incorporation of a drastic amendment of this kind on this appropriation bill will tie up the works and, as the War Department and the Navy Department says, will slow up the war effort and cause them great difficulty in sending important mail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered to the amendment by the gentleman from South Dakota to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LUDLOW) there were—ayes 157, noes 135.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. LUDLOW and Mr. KEEFE to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 176, noes 139.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 205. This title may be cited as the "Post Office Department Appropriation Act, 1944."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 52, after line 16, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Section 303. No part of any appropriation or authorization in this act shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any persons against whom charges have been brought under the terms of House Resolution 105 where such charges have not been disposed of by action of the House exonerating such person or by enactment into law of a bill or resolution making some other disposition thereof."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the amendment. I take it the gentleman from Illinois will concede the point of order?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not concede it. I think it is a perfectly proper limitation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to call the attention of the Chair on the point of order to the fact that this attempted limitation requires affirmative action, additional duties, on the part of some agency of the House or someone else. For the reasons stated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and this additional reason, it seems to me that a point of order lies. It is not strictly a limitation. It is purely legislation. It imposes additional duties and obligations upon someone else to perform, either a committee of the House or the House itself, by separate and distinct legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment constitutes a pure and simple limitation only. It requires no kind of legislative action. It simply relies upon a contingency before any money can be used out of an appropriation bill and for that reason I believe it is a very simple limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

While not identical, of course, with amendments along the same line and of the same general nature offered earlier in the debate, the Chair is of the opinion that this amendment partakes of the nature of those amendments offered earlier.

The Chair is of the opinion that this does not require affirmative action, that it does not get into the realm of affirmative legislation, that it is a limitation, and, as the Chair stated when the other amendments were under consideration, the Congress, having the power to appropriate, would by the same token have the right and the authority to limit the appropriation.

The Chair is constrained to hold that the point is not well taken. It is therefore overruled, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not trespass upon the good grace of the House at this late hour except to say that this is the amendment I alluded to earlier in the afternoon.

When someone has been charged with subversive activities or subversive affiliations and such charges filed with the committee that we created under House Resolution 105 this afternoon, my amendment provides that he cannot be paid out of this appropriation until those charges are disposed of. It does not recite the name of any individual, it is very general in its terms, and I think it meets the difficulty with which the House was confronted in connection with the Pickens case.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Under the provisions of the gentleman's amendment, the American principle that a man is innocent until proven guilty is scrapped for the proposition that he is guilty until he establishes his innocence because a person who has been charged with being guilty of subversive activities will not be paid until the committee has passed upon his case in his favor. If his case is not heard for weeks and weeks or months and months, under the provisions of the gentleman's amendment he will not be paid at all. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is exactly what the amendment is designed to do, to see that there is no frustration about these cases. The House by its action indicates that it demands action. I shall, in my humble way, endeavor to bring about such action.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is wholly inexpedient. In effect, it proposes a course which will inevitably delay these proceedings indefinitely.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The thing that appeals to me about this is that these charges as they are set up in the resolution can be so indefinite and come from so many sources that it is absolutely impossible from the viewpoint of administration to handle a thing of this kind. I would anticipate good faith on the part of the subcommittee the chairman will appoint; in fact, I may say that I am pleased with the majority selections that I understand have been made, and I have tried my best on the minority selections. I do not believe there will be any delay. I do not see how it could work. For that reason I do not see how I could support it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York has very well stated the situation. I ask for a vote.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Dirksen amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 101, noes 175.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment, the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BREHM: On page 52, lines 2, 7, and 10, after the word "violence", in lines 2 and 7 strike out the colon and insert "or by any other manner or means whatsoever"; and in line 10, after the word "violence", insert "or by any other manner or means whatsoever."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, at least to my mind, is different in that it is noncontroversial and self-explanatory, which from my observations is the exception rather than the rule.

It simply adds "or by any other manner or means whatsoever."

I maintain that more permanent and lasting damage can be done to our Nation's character, good name, and result in its ultimate overthrow by other means than so-called acts of violence.

It is these subversive activities which I fear more than acts of violence, and it is this type of un-American activities which I hope to take care of by this amendment.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BREHM. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. May I ask the gentleman if his amendment would include a prohibition against the overthrow of the Government by the ballot?

Mr. BREHM. If it were by subterfuge, I would say "Yes."

Mr. MOTT. I may say, then, that the gentleman would be running right in the face of the Constitution, because you can do anything by the ballot.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to assure the Members of this House that

my amendment was offered in good faith in order to take care of what I consider a serious situation, namely, a preplanned and, I may say, a prearranged plan to take over this Government, not by force and violence but by undermining the confidence of the American people in their Congress, and also by alining class against class and by using every known method, short of violence, to destroy our American way of life as we have learned to know and love it.

I do not fear the forces from without, but I am dreadfully concerned over this subtle force from within that has been ceaselessly at work to rise to power at the expense of the class hatred that has been promulgated in recent years and are even now taking advantage of the situation which has been created due to our involvement in this present war.

This war has afforded the one great opportunity for those who would overthrow our present form of government by subversive activities, the very situation for which they have been waiting. I cannot prove this fact, but from my observations I almost feel safe in saying that they planned it this way. We have been told, regardless of some of the positions in which we have found ourselves, that it had all been planned that way for us, so why am I not safe in saying that perhaps this present war was also planned to give them the opportunity which they so much desired?

I would not for 1 minute want to establish a Gestapo wherein a man would be hauled into court just because in a moment of anger he uttered some statement which might be construed as subversive. No; I am more tolerant than that. But I do maintain that those in our midst who are conniving and plotting and planning to overthrow our Government by means other than force and violence are not doing it in the spirit of a sudden burst of temper and have for the moment lost control. No, Mr. Chairman; they have perfect control and are operating "on the beam" at all times, and are pursuing a course long since mapped out and charted, and I insist that unless we put some penalty clause into the law to properly deal with these navigators of destruction they will ultimately arrive at the port for which their ship is charted. And I assure you that they are not sailing the ship of state on which Americans want to secure passage.

No, Mr. Chairman; they are sailing a pirate craft, and the flag flying at the mast has only one of the colors which we have in the Stars and Stripes, and that color is red, and very dark red.

Perhaps my amendment was too long and too all inclusive. If so, I was perfectly willing to withdraw it; but now having done that, I appeal to some of you, any of you, in this House who are possessed with a legal mind and more years of experience in drafting legislation, to get busy and draft the proper legislation to take care of these rats who are gnawing at the very vitals of our constitutional government.

An error in parliamentary legislation is excusable, but an error which might result in the eventual overthrow of our American form of government is never excusable. Some of you now have the opportunity to show whether it was the wording of the amendment or the principle of the amendment to which objection was raised. If it was the wording, you can easily correct that. If it were the principle involved, then I would like to hear that explained.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have entered into the debate on this bill except for the colloquy I had yesterday in reply to some questions asked of me. I would not have entered into it on this occasion if it were not for the serious import of this amendment. The gentleman who offers the amendment is a new Member, and I know he has offered it in good faith.

Several years ago I was chairman of the special committee that investigated communism, nazi-ism, fascism, and bigotry.

I am the author of the bill that compels foreign propagandists to register in the United States. That came out of my committee. At that time the only legislation against subversive activities was the Conspiracy Act, covering cases where two or more persons conspire to overthrow the Government by force and violence. That meant first that it was necessary to establish a conspiracy, and then to establish an overt act, and so, for all practical purposes, the so-called conspiracy act was a dead letter. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] introduced a bill, and on that bill, while it was on the floor, I offered an amendment making it a crime for anyone to knowingly and willfully advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. I put in the words "knowingly and willfully" deliberately. I did not want the bill to cover some man who was destitute because he could not get work, who was disgruntled and disturbed because every night when he came home and he was asked the question whether he had gotten employment, he had to say "No" and who would wake up in the morning and say, "I don't like this Government" or say something else of an inflammatory nature, so as to cause himself to be arrested and convicted because of what he said. I did not want to cover such a case, because I knew that that man would be emotionally moved. Therefore, I deliberately put the words in the statute, "who knowingly and willfully advocates" the overthrow of the Government by force and violence.

Mr. Chairman, we are living in America, thank God. Of course, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM] does not mean it, but the words "or by any other manner or means whatsoever," might make it possible for some man to interpret them as meaning possibly a communicant of this or that church. When we start using loose language in a statute of this kind it may become a very serious matter. We are living in a democracy, and this is not a political question, and that middle aisle means nothing to me or any other man, or should not, when we are dealing with a question of this kind. If we used loose language, we would never know where the end would be.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If this had been a law, how would we ever have gotten rid of the prohibition amendment?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, in making the remarks that I have I do not mean any reflection upon the gentleman from Ohio, a new Member, and I hope that anything I have said will be construed as temperate language. I know that the amendment is offered in good faith by the gentleman from Ohio, but if the gentleman will not withdraw the amendment, I am reluctantly constrained, not as leader, not as a Democratic Member of the House, but as a simple American, to ask that it be defeated. I hope the gentleman will consent to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to withdraw the amendment, although I may say that in offering it I did so after consulting some of the older Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COURTNEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 1648 and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, representing the Committee, we ask a separate vote upon the amendment which nullifies the Silver Purchase Act, and also a separate vote on the amendment providing funds for the penalty mail.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask a separate vote upon the so-called Pickens amendment.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Pickens amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered, and the Chair cannot entertain such a motion.

Mr. KNUTSON. Then this is going to keep us here all night. Let us vote tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN. No; let us get rid of it. There is plenty of time.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put the other amendments en grosse. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER as amended by the amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Page 3, after line 21, insert a new paragraph:

"No part of any money appropriated in this act shall be used directly or indirectly during the fiscal year 1944 for the purchase or procurement of silver under the provisions of the silver purchase acts, namely, the act of June 19, 1934, and the act of July 6, 1939, or for the carrying out of any of the provisions of such silver purchase acts."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE) there were—ayes 200, noes 104.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah and Mr. WHITE demanded tellers.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of ordering tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Twenty-six Members have risen, not a sufficient number and tellers are refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 51, line 14, after the period, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 204 (a). No part of the money appropriated in this title shall be expended for the purpose of collecting, sorting, handling, transporting, or delivering free the mail of any officer in any executive department or administrative agency of government."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE) there were ayes 157 and noes 162.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 204, nays 201, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—204

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Ill. | Buffett | Ellis |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Busbey | Ellison, Md. |
| | Butler | Ellsworth |
| Anderson, Calif. | Canfield | Elston, Ohio |
| Andresen, August H. | Carlson, Kans. | Englebright |
| | Carson, Ohio | Fellows |
| Andrews | Carter | Fenton |
| Angell | Case | Fish |
| Arends | Chenoweth | Gale |
| Arnold | Chiperfield | Gallagher |
| Auchincloss | Church | Gamble |
| Baldwin, Md. | Clevenger | Gathings |
| Baldwin, N. Y. | Cole, Mo. | Gavin |
| Barrett | Cole, N. Y. | Gearhart |
| Bates, Ky. | Compton | Gerlach |
| Bates, Mass. | Crawford | Gifford |
| Beall | Culkin | Gilchrist |
| Bender | Cunningham | Gillette |
| Bennett, Mich. | Day | Gillie |
| Bennett, Mo. | Dewey | Goodwin |
| Bishop | Dirksen | Graham |
| Blackney | Disney | Grant, Ind. |
| Bolton | Ditter | Griffiths |
| Bradley, Mich. | Douglas | Gross |
| Brehm | Dworshak | Guyer |
| Brown, Ohio | Eaton | Gwynne |
| Hale | Landis | Sauthoff |
| Hall, Edwin Arthur | LeCompte | Schiffler |
| | LeFevre | Schwabe |
| Hall, Leonard W. | Lemke | Scott |
| | Lewis, Ohio | Shafer |
| Halleck | Luce | Short |
| Hancock | McCowen | Simpson, Ill. |
| Harness, Ind. | McWilliams | Simpson, Pa. |
| Hart | Maas | Smith, Maine |
| Hartley | Martin, Iowa | Smith, Ohio |
| Heidinger | Martin, Mass. | Smith, Wis. |
| Herter | Mason | Springer |
| Hess | Merrow | Stanley |
| Hill | Michener | Stearns, N. H. |
| Hinshaw | Miller, Mo. | Stefan |
| Hoeven | Miller, Nebr. | Stevenson |
| Hoffman | Miller, Pa. | Stewart |
| Holmes, Mass. | Monkiewicz | Stockman |
| Holmes, Wash. | Mott | Sumner, Ill. |
| Hope | Mruk | Sundstrom |
| Horan | Mundt | Taber |
| Howell | Murray, Wis. | Talbot |
| Jeffrey | Norman | Talle |
| Jenkins | O'Brien, N. Y. | Taylor |
| Jennings | O'Hara | Tibbott |
| Jensen | O'Konski | Towe |
| Johnson, Anton J. | Phillips | Treadway |
| | Pittenger | Troutman |
| Johnson, Calvin D. | Ploeser | Van Zandt |
| | Plumley | Vorys, Ohio |
| Johnson, Ind. | Poulson | Vursell |
| Johnson, J. Leroy | Powers | Wadsworth |
| | Pracht | Weichel, Ohio |
| Johnson, Ward | Ramey | Welch |
| Jones | Reece, Tenn. | Wheat |
| Jonkman | Reed, Ill. | Wigglesworth |
| Judd | Reed, N. Y. | Willey |
| Kean | Rees, Kans. | Wilson |
| Keefe | Rizley | Winter |
| Kilburn | Robsion, Ky. | Wolcott |
| Kinzer | Rockwell | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Knutson | Rodgers, Pa. | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Kunkel | Rogers, Mass. | Woodruff, Mich. |
| LaFollette | Rohrbough | |
| Lambertson | Rolph | |

NAYS—201

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, La. | Forand | Madden |
| Anderson, N. Mex. | Ford | Magnuson |
| | Fulbright | Mahon |
| Barden | Fulmer | Manasco |
| Barry | Furlong | Mansfield, Mont. |
| Beckworth | Gavagan | |
| Bell | Gibson | Marcantonio |
| Bloom | Gordon | May |
| Bonner | Gore | Merritt |
| Boren | Gorski | Miller, Conn. |
| Bradley, Pa. | Gossett | Mills |
| Brooks | Granger | Monroney |
| Brown, Ga. | Grant, Ala. | Morrison, N. C. |
| Buckley | Green | Murdock |
| Bulwinkle | Gregory | Murphy |
| Burch, Va. | Hagen | Murray, Tenn. |
| Burchill, N. Y. | Hare | Myers |
| Burdick | Harless, Ariz. | Newsome |
| Burgin | Harris, Ark. | Nichols |
| Byrne | Harris, Va. | Norrell |
| Camp | Hays | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Cannon, Fla. | Hébert | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Cannon, Mo. | Hendricks | O'Connor |
| Capozzoli | Hobbs | O'Leary |
| Celler | Hoch | O'Neal |
| Chapman | Holifield | O'Toole |
| Coffee | Hull | Outland |
| Colmer | Izac | Pace |
| Cooley | Jackson | Patman |
| Cooper | Jarman | Patton |
| Costello | Johnson, Luther A. | Peterson, Fla. |
| Courtney | | Peterson, Ga. |
| Cox | Johnson, Lyndon B. | Pfeifer |
| Cravens | | Philbin |
| Creal | Johnson, Okla. | Poage |
| Crosser | Kee | Price |
| Curley | Kefauver | Priest |
| D'Alesandro | Kelley | Rabaut |
| Davis | Keogh | Ramspeck |
| Dawson | Kerr | Randolph |
| Delaney | Kilday | Rankin |
| Dickstein | King | Richards |
| Dies | Kirwan | Rivers |
| Dilweg | Kleberg | Robertson |
| Dingell | Klein | Robinson, Utah |
| Doughton | Lane | Rogers, Calif. |
| Drewry | Lanham | Rowan |
| Durham | Larcade | Russell |
| Eberharter | Lea | Sabath |
| Elliott | Lesinski | Sadowski |
| Fay | Ludlow | Sasscer |
| Feighan | Lynch | Satterfield |
| Fernandez | McCord | Scanlon |
| Fisher | McCormack | Schuetz |
| Fitzpatrick | McGehee | Sheppard |
| Flannagan | McKenzie | Sikes |
| Fogarty | McMillan | Slaughter |
| Folger | McMurray | Smith, Va. |
| Smith, W. Va. | Vincent, Ky. | White |
| Snyder | Vinson, Ga. | Whitten |
| Somers, N. Y. | Voorhis, Calif. | Whittington |
| Sparkman | Walter | Wickersham |
| Spence | Ward | Winstead |
| Starnes, Ala. | Wasielewski | Woodrum, Va. |
| Sullivan | Weaver | Worley |
| Tarver | Weiss | Wright |
| Thomas, Tex. | Wene | Zimmerman |
| Thomason | West | |
| Tolan | Whelchel, Ga. | |

NOT VOTING—29

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Dondero | Maloney |
| Bland | Elmer | Mansfield, Tex. |
| Boykin | Engel | Morrison, La. |
| Bryson | Heffernan | Norton |
| Clark | Kearney | Rowe |
| Clason | Kennedy | Sheridan |
| Cochran | Lewis, Colo. | Steagall |
| Cullen | McGranery | Sumners, Tex. |
| Curtis | McGregor | Thomas, N. J. |
| Domengeaux | McLean | |

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. McGregor for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Elmer for, with Mr. Cullen against.

Mr. Clason for, with Mr. McGranery against.

General pairs:

Mr. Bland with Mr. Engel.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Rowe.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hendricks: On page 12, line 22, after the word "Treasury", strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of William Pickens."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 136, nays 267, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—136

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Ill. | Cole, N. Y. | Hébert |
| Allen, La. | Colmer | Heidinger |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Cooper | Hendricks |
| | Costello | Hoffman |
| Anderson, Calif. | Cox | Howell |
| Arends | Cravens | Jarman |
| Arnold | Crawford | Jennings |
| Baldwin, Md. | Davis | Johnson, Anton J. |
| Barden | Dies | |
| Barrett | Dirksen | Johnson, Calvin D. |
| Bates, Ky. | Disney | |
| Beckworth | Drewry | Johnson, Ward |
| Bell | Elliott | Jones |
| Bennett, Mich. | Ellsworth | Kilburn |
| Bishop | Fisher | Kilday |
| Bonner | Fulmer | Kinzer |
| Bradley, Mich. | Gathings | Kleberg |
| Brooks | Gibson | Lambertson |
| Brown, Ga. | Gillie | Landis |
| Buffett | Gossett | Lanham |
| Burch, Va. | Graham | Larcade |
| Busbey | Grant, Ala. | McGehee |
| Butler | Grant, Ind. | McKenzie |
| Camp | Green | McMillan |
| Cannon, Fla. | Gregory | Mahon |
| Case | Hare | Manasco |
| Chenoweth | Harris, Ark. | Mason |
| Chiperfield | Harris, Va. | May |
| Church | Hartley | Miller, Nebr. |
| Clevenger | Hays | Miller, Pa. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Mills | Reed, N. Y. | Tarver |
| Murray, Tenn. | Richards | Thomas, N. J. |
| Newsome | Rivers | Vincent, Ky. |
| Nichols | Rizley | Vinson, Ga. |
| Norrell | Robertson | Vursell |
| O'Brien, N. Y. | Russell | West |
| O'Hara | Shafer | Wheat |
| Pace | Sheppard | Whelchel, Ga. |
| Patman | Sikes | Whitten |
| Patton | Simpson, Ill. | Whittington |
| Peterson, Fla. | Slaughter | Wickersham |
| Peterson, Ga. | Smith, Va. | Winstead |
| Pracht | Sparkman | Winter |
| Price | Starnes, Ala. | Woodruff, Mich. |
| Randolph | Stewart | Worley |
| Rankin | Stockman | |
| Reed, Ill. | Sumner, Ill. | |

NAYS—267

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson, N. Mex. | Goodwin | Merritt |
| | Gordon | Merrow |
| Andresen, August H. | Gore | Michener |
| | Gorski | Miller, Conn. |
| Andrews | Granger | Miller, Mo. |
| Angell | Griffiths | Monkiewicz |
| Auchincloss | Gross | Monroney |
| Baldwin, N. Y. | Guyer | Morrison, N. C. |
| Barry | Gwynne | Mott |
| Bates, Mass. | Hagen | Mruk |
| Beall | Hale | Mundt |
| Bender | Hall, Edwin Arthur | Murdock |
| Bennett, Mo. | | Murphy |
| Blackney | Hall, Leonard W. | Murray, Wis. |
| Bloom | | Myers |
| Bolton | Halleck | Norman |
| Bradley, Pa. | Hancock | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Brehm | Harless, Ariz. | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Brown, Ohio | Harness, Ind. | O'Connor |
| Buckley | Hart | O'Konski |
| Bulwinkle | Herter | O'Leary |
| Burchill, N. Y. | Hess | O'Neal |
| Burdick | Hill | O'Toole |
| Burgin | Hinshaw | Outland |
| Byrne | Hobbs | Pfeifer |
| Canfield | Hoch | Philbin |
| Cannon, Mo. | Hoeven | Phillips |
| Capozzoli | Holifield | Pittenger |
| Carlson, Kans. | Holmes, Mass. | Ploeser |
| Carson, Ohio | Holmes, Wash. | Plumley |
| Carter | Hope | Poage |
| Celler | Horan | Poulson |
| Chapman | Hull | Powers |
| Coffee | Izac | Priest |
| Cole, Mo. | Jackson | Rabaut |
| Compton | Jeffrey | Ramey |
| Cooley | Jenkins | Ramspeck |
| Courtney | Jensen | Reece, Tenn. |
| Creal | Johnson, Ind. | Rees, Kans. |
| Culkin | Johnson, J. Leroy | Robinson, Utah |
| Cunningham | | Robsion, Ky. |
| Curley | Johnson, Luther A. | Rockwell |
| D'Alesandro | | Rodgers, Pa. |
| Dawson | Johnson, Lyndon B. | Rogers, Calif. |
| Day | | Rogers, Mass. |
| Delaney | Jonkman | Rohrbough |
| Dewey | Judd | Rolph |
| Dickstein | Kean | Rowan |
| Dilweg | Kee | Sabath |
| Dingell | Keefe | Sadowski |
| Ditter | Kefauver | Sasscer |
| Doughton | Kelley | Satterfield |
| Douglas | Keogh | Sauthoff |
| Durham | Kerr | Scanlon |
| Dworshak | King | Schiffler |
| Eaton | Kirwan | Schuetz |
| Eberharter | Klein | Schwabe |
| Ellis | Knutson | Scott |
| Ellison, Md. | Kunkel | Short |
| Elston, Ohio | LaFollette | Simpson, Pa. |
| Englebright | Lane | Smith, Maine |
| Fay | Lea | Smith, Ohio |
| Feighan | LeCompte | Smith, Wis. |
| Fellows | LeFevre | Smith, W. Va. |
| Fenton | Lemke | Snyder |
| Fernandez | Lesinski | Somers, N. Y. |
| Fish | Lewis, Ohio | Spence |
| Fitzpatrick | Luce | Springer |
| Flannagan | Ludlow | Stanley |
| Fogarty | Lynch | Stearns, N. H. |
| Folger | McCord | Stefan |
| Forand | McCormack | Stevenson |
| Ford | McCowen | Sullivan |
| Fulbright | McMurray | Sumners, Tex. |
| Furlong | McWilliams | Sundstrom |
| Gale | Maas | Taber |
| Gamble | Madden | Talbot |
| Gavagan | Magnuson | Talle |
| Gavin | Mansfield, Mont. | Taylor |
| Gearhart | | Thomas, Tex. |
| Gerlach | Mansfield, Tex. | Thomason |
| Gifford | Marcantonio | Tibbott |
| Gilchrist | Martin, Iowa | Tolan |
| Gillette | Martin, Mass. | Towe |
| Treadway | Wasielewski | Wilson |
| Troutman | Weichel, Ohio | Wolcott |
| Van Zandt | Weiss | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Voorhis, Calif. | Welch | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Vorys, Ohio | Wene | Woodrum, Va. |
| Wadsworth | White | Wright |
| Walter | Wigglesworth | Zimmerman |
| Ward | Willey | |

NOT VOTING—31

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Domengeaux | McGregor |
| Bland | Dondero | McLean |
| Boren | Elmer | Maloney |
| Boykin | Engel | Morrison, La. |
| Bryson | Gallagher | Norton |
| Clark | Heffernan | Rowe |
| Clason | Johnson, Okla. | Sheridan |
| Cochran | Kearney | Steagall |
| Crosser | Kennedy | Weaver |
| Cullen | Lewis, Colo. | |
| Curtis | McGranery | |

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Engel.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. McGranery with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Rowe.
Mr. Boren with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Elmer.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 13, after line 22, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization in this act shall be used to pay any part of the salary or expenses of any person whose salary or expenses are prohibited from being paid from any appropriation or authorization in any other act."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LUDLOW) there were—ayes 254, noes 71.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

Mr. RANKIN. I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today on this bill and to include some excerpts from the Attorney General's report, from the law of the House and from the Supreme Court.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include a short statement and in another a radio broadcast by John B. Hughes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the future of the dairy farmers in America appears to be doomed. As a Representative from one of the principal milk producing areas of the United States, I was amazed to read in the morning's papers that the Office of Price Administration had issued an order which restricts milk plants and distributors from paying farmers a higher price in any instance than that received during the month of January. In view of a number of considerations which I will outline, this order seems preposterous. The Dairy Section of the Department of Agriculture has warned us time and again that even under the most favorable conditions, in view of military, lend-lease, and civilian requirements, we face an imminent shortage of some 30,000,000,000 pounds of milk during the calendar year 1943. Now, at this time of unprecedented demand for dairy products, what are some of the obstacles that our dairy farmers must hurdle in face of this price freeze on their product?

First is the question of a labor and machine shortage. During the past 2 years farm workers have left the farm at the rate of over one million per year. To replace these helpers substitute help is out of the question, and the employment of labor-saving machinery is next to impossible, due to the fact that allotments for farm machinery are only about one-third of normal farm purchases.

The second problem is that of increased farm wages and increasing industrial wages against which the farmers must compete. From 1940 to January 1943 the index of farm wage rates has increased from 126 to 232 and the index of hourly earnings of factory workers has increased from 317 in 1940 to 402 in 1942. But this in itself is not enough. There have been instances within the month where the United States Employment Service has actually circularized

dairy workers and appealed to their spirit of patriotism to leave their present employment and go into industry at rates ranging from 85 cents to $1 an hour.

A third obstacle to dairy production is the relative price of dairy products and other agricultural commodities which compete for the farmers' feed and available labor. In this I refer specifically to the great agricultural region of the Midwest where dairy and hog production are constantly in competition with one another. During the entire 20-year period of 1922 to 1941, 4½ pounds of live pork were required to equal 1 pound of butterfat in value, while during the past year only slightly more than 3 pounds of pork were required to equal 1 pound of butterfat in value. When we consider that under normal conditions labor costs represent only 10 percent of pork production, while they represent 35 to 50 percent of milk production, in view of the present labor shortage and high cost and the relatively much more favorable hog price, in what direction do you think that the farmers' production efforts will tend and what do you think will become of the Dairy Section's 1943 production goals?

Furthermore, the Dairy Section of the Department of Agriculture has attempted to hold down the cost of dairy products to the consumer by effecting long-needed economies in existing systems of dairy product distribution, particularly fluid milk. With price ceilings at the retail level and with a necessary price payment in order to get production from the dairy farmers, there has been a rather effective pressure on the milk distributors to bring about these needed economies, but what now will happen to this program if farmers' prices are frozen, thereby relieving distributors from pressure in one direction on their margin when their economy program has hardly gotten under way? Certainly they have done little toward reducing the tremendous part of distribution costs that are attributable to labor. In some sections milk drivers are making regularly from five to six thousand dollars per year and unionized milkers are being paid $200 per month, while some plants who have gone on every other day delivery have been forced to keep their full quota of milk drivers on full-time pay roll. Yet, in spite of the fact that the farmer gets only about 43 percent of the fluid milk consumer's dollar, the lid is to be clamped on the price paid to him while his feed and labor costs continue to rise.

In all fairness may we ask for whose benefit is such a program promulgated and what will be its almost immediate effect on the production of dairy products?

Now at a time when farmers are making their yearly production plans, when they are making their decisions as to whether they will retain heifer calves and the poorer producers and old cows, or any cows, or turn them into beef, and at a time when as farmers come into the rush of their spring work they ordinarily are hard put anyway to provide the great amount of labor required for dairy production, will not the effect of this program, in spite of the fact that every drop of milk that can be produced is sorely needed, be to dry up the fountain at its source? The answer is inescapable that dairy production in this country will continue on its downward trend and the result will be a continued forced curtailment of consumption of dairy products. Such a program is neither fair to the farmers nor conducive to effective prosecution of the war. Rather than further restrictions against the farmer, there must be greater inducements for him to increase his production and farm labor must be made available to him. It is altogether wrong that his price should be frozen, his costs allowed to rise, and his source of labor be rapidly drained. This situation is approaching a crisis and must be corrected.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded as voting "No" on the Keefe amendment. I desire to vote "Yea." I did not discover the error until after it had been made.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution from the National Automobile Dealers' Association in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I spoke following the Casablanca conference and suggested a program I considered very meritorious. Because of its importance, I am repeating once more that suggestion—namely, create dual boards of strategy; one for the Atlantic theater of war and another for the Pacific theater. Only through the medium of such dual boards can all the nations involved in this global war be fully and adequately represented.

The Casablanca conference was particularly noteworthy by reason of the absence at its deliberations of not only the rulers or leading statesmen of both Russia and China but also by the total absence of even military representation. The only explanation which can be given for this absence, if these countries were invited to attend, is the fact that Russia is not at war with Japan and China is not at war with Germany, and so neither country might properly enter into an over-all discussion of full military strategy looking to the conquest of the Axis Powers in both hemispheres.

Yet this obstacle might be quickly overcome by the creation of the dual boards of strategy which I recommended. Then Russia could join Great Britain and the United States in planning the destruction of the Axis forces in the Atlantic hemisphere, while China could join Great Britain and the United States in planning a like destruction of the Axis forces in the Pacific.

The rightful recognition of China in determining offensive strategy is only one of the many features of such a plan. The great benefit of such a recognition would be the tremendous increase in China's prestige amongst the Asiatic nations now overrun by the Japanese. Great though China is, she has nevertheless not been fully recognized as the leader in the Orient, and this lack of recognition has been the source of a flood of Japanese propaganda which has as its theme that they, the Japanese, are fighting a war for the supremacy of the yellow race against the white race which seeks to enslave all oriental countries. There is only one way to disprove this cunning Japanese deceit, and that is to demonstrate its falsity through our prominent recognition of China as a full and equal partner in the Pacific theater of war.

If it is not possible to fight the Japanese on the battle fronts of the Pacific with immediate offensives, that need be no excuse for our failure to wage war against Japan on the propaganda front. Europe and South America are being flooded with broadcasts at all times. Yet no effort is made to use that similar offensive weapon in the Pacific. We do not even get entertainment broadcasts to our own troops in the Pacific, thus completely failing to utilize this valuable means of sustaining the morale of our troops and of counterattacking the propaganda of our enemies. Although radio receiving sets in the Orient are not numerous, yet even a few receiving our messages would aid materially in combating Japanese propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, we give lip service to the importance of the war in the Pacific, the while we ignore totally the severity of its nature. There are those who still seem to believe that when Germany is whipped we can destroy Japan overnight by turning our full might against her. The fact is Japan is right now twice as difficult to defeat as Germany now is, or ever was at the height of her power. Japan will be thrice as hard to conquer the longer we neglect and ignore her.

Although it is not possible at the moment to engage in an offensive against Japan—still we surely can spare a few merchant ships to bring supplies within range of China, and surely we can spare a few more cargo planes to fly these supplies into China. The lend-lease trickle to China must be increased tenfold be-

fore it can be of material help, and certainly that small amount could in no way impair operations in the Atlantic.

The consolidation of Japanese gains into a vast empire of continental proportions is advancing more rapidly each day. The development of factories, railroads, highways, and huge supply bases should be hindered as much as possible. If we cannot fight a war of aggression against Japan, let us at least maintain a war of annoyance. Certainly let us not ignore Japan. Every interference to Japanese development which is accomplished today means the saving of billions in the cost of this war tomorrow, but more important it means the saving of tens of thousands of lives of American soldiers tomorrow.

Once more, therefore, I urge the immediate creation of dual boards of strategy, that China may be given due recognition in determining the course of the war in the Pacific. Likewise, I urge every possible increase in the amount of aid being sent into China. These things I urge in order that the Pacific may not become a forgotten war and in order that the Pacific victory may not cost too huge a price in men, materials, and time.

Aid China before it is too late. Recognize China by placing her on the Pacific board of strategy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain newspaper excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

Mr MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, a very distinguished citizen of my town, Mr. Henry Broderick, has submitted to me what he considers a fair analysis of the so-called Ruml plan. I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Portland Oregonian.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a distinguished farmer of my district, who calls attention to the important problems confronting the farmers of his community and calls upon the Congress to cooperate in bringing about a speedy solution of them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief editorial from Look magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Gary Post Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CELLER and Mr. ELSTON asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I ask if someone on the majority side who has authority and power will tell me when, if ever, we are going to vote on the continuation of the Dies committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair can answer that question. The first order of business tomorrow will be the so-called merger bill. The next business on the calendar will be the consideration of the resolution for the extension of the Dies committee. Unless the program is changed, the next business in order will be the consideration of the Smith resolution providing for an investigation.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

AMERICA IN THE POST-WAR AIR WORLD

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this occasion to thank the people of Fairfield County in Connecticut who elected me to this body? I am sensible of the honor they have paid me and proud of the privilege of serving them. I am particularly grateful to them today for they have given me the opportunity to speak on a most vital question—America's destiny in the air.

There is before this House a resolution to form a permanent standing committee on civil and commercial aviation, domestic and overseas. I know I am not fit by experience in this body to debate the organizational merits of creating such a committee. The jurisdictional jealousies or ambitions, the outside political pressures or necessities which militate either for or against it, are today as much Greek to me as they are to the public. But this I know, that the airplane has been the most dynamic instrument of this war and that the airplane will surely be the most dynamic instrument of the peace. The question of America's place in the present and post-war civilian air world is for this reason the most important question which confronts us today. If we fail to answer it intelligently, although the United Nations will win the war, America can lose the peace. The need for a strong congressional committee made up of the ablest civilian aviation experts in this House is, therefore, urgent and grave.

Often, since I came here, I have heard the charge hurled back and forth across this aisle by each party that the other has failed to clarify America's war or peace aims. This charge is also thrown at the administration, sometimes in good faith, sometimes to make political capital. For my part, I am resigned to facing the fact, with whatever fortitude and patience I can muster, that there is a vast area of specific war and peace aims which can never be clarified, stated or proposed, and certainly not enjoined upon the world, until we know what goes on in the mind of Joseph Stalin. The fixing of territorial boundaries, the stabilization of currencies, the integration of economies, the establishment and tutelage of those democratic European governments with which the United States and Great Britain and most of the United Nations would certainly prefer to deal, even plans for post-war policing and disarmament, are questions which all await the ukase of the master of Moscow and the gallant conqueror of Stalingrad. Not until we know whether we are to meet and confer with iron-hearted Stalin, or like-minded men, on the Vistula, or on the Rhine, or on the Seine, or at the great wall of China, or on the Yellow River, or in Tokyo, can we, or our other allies, realistically plan a post-war world. Let us pity and not condemn Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill that they find themselves, like us, floundering in a sea of uncertainty. Let us try to understand that in such a situation they have no choice but to indulge in monumental generalities and noble catch-alls, like the Atlantic Charter and virtuous platitudes like the Four Freedoms. Indeed, it would be infinitely dangerous, prestige wise, for Great Britain and ourselves to propose specific international settlements today which Stalin might specifically dispose tomorrow. The very proof that the State Department and the administration are facing this melancholy fact is their long, protracted official silence on precise international post-war aims. But hard as peace terms and war aims are for ourselves and the British to see in the Russian penumbra, I do not intend to say that we and our leaders must think nothing. Indeed, it is impossible to do so. Nature abhors a vacuum, even in the heads of statesmen. However irrational, thoughts do rush in. Today it is unfortunate that into many of the bone encased vacuums created by Stalin or by our refusal honestly to face the fact of Stalin in our post-war thinking, there are rushing two extreme ideas: on the one hand, there is a revival of isolationism.

Many people are naturally disgusted, not with the difficulty of wrestling with the gigantic post-war problems we know

we must face, but with the impossibility of discovering on what or whose terms we will do the wrestling. It is quite understandable that such naturally outraged people should propose, as the only "realistic solution," that we should wash our hands once again of all Europe's problems the day this war is over, make ourselves as domestically strong as we can, and when the next war comes, just improvise and play it off the cuff, as we did the two previous times. Then there is the other extreme group—the all-out post-war cooperationists. In a noble effort to formulate some master plan and some master economy which will cozily embrace not only our own capitalistic democracy but the British Empire and its colonial system, and Russia and its totalitarian system, the all-out post-war cooperationists have begun to shoot the works, at least verbally, for a bigger and redder and more royal New Deal for the whole world. Nevertheless, even between such extremes as the old isolationists and the New Deal utopians there is a solid area of agreement. Both agree, and all Republicans and Democrats agree, on what America does not expect to get at the peace table. We do not expect and do not want one inch of territory outside our own possessions. We desire neither to grab other people's land nor to dominate any race on earth. We believe that the world believes that in this we are utterly sincere. So that is what we do not want. What do we all agree that we expect to ask at the peace table—all of us on both sides of this aisle? We shall all demand henceforth to be secure from attack. We shall urge, wherever possible, a political climate in other nations, in which liberty may thrive. And I believe we desire at all costs to preserve our American living standards, seeking anxiously and ever to bring those of other nations up to ours, but not ours down to theirs.

To the realization of these minimum peace demands of ours America's position in the post-war air world is the key.

What was America's international air carrier position in 1941 before Pearl Harbor? We all know the answer. It was tops. But for the record, let us note that in October 1941 our American system's, Pan American Airways, route-miles were roughly two and one-half times greater than B. O. A. C.—British Overseas Airways Corporation. We had 99,000 miles of route as against the British system's 39,000. There are no reliable statistics on annual plane miles for the foreign carriers for 1941, so comparison is impossible. However, on a yearly basis, in early 1939, before the outbreak of the war, Pan American was flying more air miles than all the major European countries put together. The European countries were serving almost as many countries and colonies, however; Pan American served 38, B. O. A. C. 31, K. L. M.—the Dutch lines—27, Air France 15.

It needs no argument now to prove that our pre-Pearl Harbor domestic and overseas commercial carriers were crucial factors in our ability militarily to prepare this continent for a successful global war. But for the existent routes and volume of our civilian air operations, both at home and overseas, this war might already have been lost. Four years ago, in January 1939, President Roosevelt said:

> Civil aviation is clearly recognized as the backlog of national defense. * * * The country's welfare in time of peace and its safety in time of war rests on an economically and technically sound air transportation system, both domestic and overseas.

Four years after this war is over that statement will still be true. Transport pilots, mechanics, airport and ground personnel, meteorologists, communications experts, transport planes, messenger aircraft, and all their related production and repair facilities and personnel are now accepted as forming part of a modern country's air power. In times of peace it is impossible to attempt to maintain such personnel and equipment fully trained when not required by actual military service. Thus, an air commerce program complementary to and coordinated with military defense plans is vital for the future.

Yet, what is our civil air-carrier position today, with peace, so we are often told, just around the corner? Part of both our domestic and overseas aviation is still entirely civilian staffed and controlled. But the transport service, being operated by the military, every day is being expanded.

Now I have heard in this House both the advocates of the standing committee for civil aviation and those opposed to it announce repeatedly that the total militarization of our air lines is a vital military necessity. I, along with some perhaps in this House, and many outside of it, feel that this is not true. I wish there were time to give you the most interesting support to my arguments, by reading those advanced by British members of Parliament as late as December 17 last in the House of Commons, when they hotly debated the question of the increasing militarization of their own overseas civilian air system. I say "increasing" because although Great Britain has been at war over 3 years, the British overseas merchant airways structure has continued to operate in many parts of the globe, with civilian personnel, and civilian administration. And today, even in combat zones, B. O. A. C. operates as a purely civilian organization, subject only to military priorities, like all transportation in wartimes.

Furthermore, as you will see, by referring to the debate in Parliament on civil aviation which I have placed in the RECORD, there is the liveliest dispute in progress today about the urgent need, not only of planning ahead, but building up now with equipment and personnel the British overseas airway structure. Fortunately for the British, they, unlike ourselves, have wisely preserved everywhere the skeleton of their commercial carrier routes around the globe. On the very day the shooting stops, the British naturally desire to be in a position to put muscles and flesh on their international airways system. And perhaps even fat in some places—with lend-lease planes. I deeply applaud the wisdom of this policy. I wish it were ours and that there were here in Congress a committee which would see to it that it should be. But, because of the increasing militarization of our carrier systems, it is not. And in a war no one dast sass the general. But it is surely for us here to consider at once, as the patriotic members of the British Parliament are doing now, the ways and means by which we may rehabilitate our overseas civilian airways. Again, I draw your attention to the full account of the debate in Parliament on December 17 on civil aviation, which is now in the Appendix of the RECORD.

It is a document worthy of the minutest study of every Member of this House, for it shows the power, sagacity, and daring of British statesmen, which equally with the lion hearts of her sons, have made and kept the Empire great and strong. It also shows their desire to cooperate with us in the air, a thing they can do happily if they can persuade us shortly of their points of view. Make no mistake. Our farsighted British cousins have already clearly seen the vision of the air world of tomorrow. They have seen that the masters of the air will be the masters of the planet, for as aviation dominates all military effort today, so will it dominate and influence all peacetime effort tomorrow. Perhaps the Russians have seen this too, although we have no way of knowing. Certainly the Chinese know, because I have discussed it with many of them, that when peace comes it will then be too late to plan about America's future role in the air. The shape of all post-war air policy is being beaten out now on the anvil of war. The British, the Russians, the Chinese have searched the face of the heavens. They know what the air world of tomorrow looks like. Do we? Yes, some of us do.

It is a picture that has deeply entered the imagination of almost everyone in this country under 30 years of age. Young America is totally alive to the potentialities of a post-war air world. Today boys in grammar schools and high schools can give you details on air routes, on plane types and performances, both commercial and combat, that would not only amaze you, but leave you bewildered, for while they explained they would seem to be talking in another language. They are. They are talking the language of tomorrow, the language of the air. They do not even think in the same geographical terms that you and I do. For instance, they know that the direct route from Detroit to Tokyo is not west to San Francisco and across the Pacific to Hawaii—but north, over the Pole. You think Bombay and Singapore are south and west of us, as we sit here. Grammar school boys can tell you today that the best way to get to them is to fly north from Chicago, across the polar cap—in 40 flying hours. Incidentally, they never think in land miles, they think in flying hours. They know because they keep up on these things, that Lt. Gen. Hap Arnold flew from Australia to San Francisco in 7 minutes under 36 hours.

They know that, from the heart of the "isolationist" Middle West, which is ironi-

cally enough the geographical air hub of America's international post-war air traffic, there is not one important city in the whole world, in Europe, Asia, Africa, South America that cannot be reached by air within 48 hours. These grammar school and high school boys share this vision of the air world with all the pilots and the ground crews of our air force today, the thousands upon thousands of our young pilots, civilian and military, who have already felt the almost divine thrill that comes of man's mastery of the air. To you, and to me, aviation may seem "just another business." To a pilot it generally becomes a way of life, a philosophy. He is not far wrong. He looks at the globe, and he does not see as you and I do, a land-and-water world. He sees an air world. He does not think of the airplane as something that parallels shipping lines, and railroads, and trucking highways. Why should he? He knows such a concept was long ago outmoded, and betrays the user of it today as totally ignorant of the meaning of the air. Try to tell an American pilot who has flown the towering Himalayas, the vast trackless wastes of Tibet, the deserts and jungles of Africa, and who dreams tomorrow of taking part in the great air traffic that will burst across the Polar Cap—that he must be or ever will be "regulated" with reference to railroads and shipping, and he will laugh in your face. There is only one barrier in the use of the airplane, and that barrier is man's own inability to breathe and to keep warm in the stratosphere. This is a technological conquest which is not far off. Our American pilots also know that America, which produced the Wright brothers and Lindbergh and Rickenbacker, and scores upon scores of air pioneers and heroes, has not only the men and the tools, but the technical genius and the industrial capacity—in short, everything it takes—to let American pilots and passengers go everywhere in the world. For the post-war air policy of these hundreds of thousands of young air-minded Americans is quite simple. It is: "We want to fly everywhere. Period."

Now let us consider America's existent international air policy—the policy under which 5 years ago we became the foremost overseas commercial air power in the world, and under which we have gone nearly everywhere. And I know—because I have flown nearly everywhere in this world in the past 3 years with American civil pilots on American civil planes with the American flag painted on them.

What was that policy, specifically? It was the policy of the "sovereignty of the skies." Historically, this policy was adopted by most nations at the Versailles Conference. The principle of international law it recognized was "sovereignty of the skies" over a nation's own territory, and denial to free access to its airports. The principle was laid down, of course, largely for reasons of self-defense, and since that time it has only been dispensed with by any given country to another country or countries, in consideration of reciprocal air services, or other offsetting material economic gain, arrived at by unilateral or bilateral agreement. That was our policy, too, and operating under it and the free enterprise system—civilians of this Nation managed to build up, as we know, the greatest overseas volume of commercial operations, the longest mileage routes, and heaviest passenger lists in the world—with only the British close and very friendly contenders.

So until this hour, the sovereignty-of-the-skies policy has stood us in excellent stead, both commercially and militarily, and—I hope diplomatically.

Is that policy being challenged today? It is. By what? And by whom? It is being challenged by the advocates of a new policy, which we are beginning to hear a great deal about, called the Freedom of the Air. (I refer you again to the debate in Parliament which I have placed in the Appendix. For you will find all the things I discuss today there discussed from a British point of view, which is precisely the point of view they should be discussed from in the House of Commons.)

Now what is freedom of the air? In its ultimate extension by accurate definition, freedom of the air is the internationalization of all air space by international consent. Put into practice, it would mean that the civilian and commercial planes of any nation could fly, with impunity and without question, over the harbors, rivers, and mountains and all the land of any other nation. Freedom of the air, or internationalization of sky-space, would mean precisely that British planes in transit to Sydney from London, from Montreal to Kingston or Trinidad, could fly over the U. S. A. Russian planes, in transit to Mexico via the all-important Polar Cap, could fly over Canada, and the U. S. A. Chinese, Japanese, German, Italian, Dutch planes, or the planes of any other nation which could afford to subsidize air carriers could fly over this country at will. Since the technical possibilities of constructing ever longer-ranged flying cruisers is no longer questioned by anyone, it is likely that all nations would not only be very happy to fly over America, but would be perfectly able to do so.

We already know the danger in war of the enemy airplane to a nation's home front. It is elementary, or should be, that human nature being what it is, and some nations forever greedy and contentious, to grant this free transit, this free look-see to all nations of the world, might be very unwise, from our point of view.

And I doubt that the people of this Nation will countenance any such wholesale abandonment of the "sovereignty of American skies," deeply as we trust our British allies today and tomorrow, and as we may, I hope, trust all our allies tomorrow. But does anyone in America advocate such a course? I ask at this point unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD Appendix an article from the London Times of December 29 last. It is called Post-War Air Lines, and its subtitle is "Right of Innocent Passage," which turns out to be one aspect of Freedom of the Air. This article, written by the London Times correspondent in Washington, claims:

> There is good reason to believe that the United States Government is already seeking an understanding to cover the field of commercial flying after the war.

It then outlines this alleged understanding between our Government and the British, and suggests that our administration is even now negotiating with the British a freedom of the air policy. Can this be possible? One does not like to think that a complete reversal of a country's historic policy, a reversal that must affect profoundly the destiny of our country, the very lives of our children, can be in process of negotiation without any public debate or consideration. And yet we have some proof that such a new policy is in the minds of people in high places in this administration.

I call your attention to a recent article written by the Vice President of the United States, Mr. HENRY WALLACE, which has just appeared in the American magazine for March. It is called What We Will Get Out of the War. Now, in passing, I would like to say that I am a great admirer of some of Mr. WALLACE'S ideas. He has a wholly disarming way of being intermittently inspiring and spasmodically sound, and certainly in his American magazine article there is much that all men of good will must agree to. However, one usually finds that the higher the plane Mr. WALLACE puts his economic arguments upon the lower, it turns out, American living standards will fall. Mr. WALLACE'S article in the American magazine is on a very high plane, indeed. In it he does a great deal of global thinking. But much of what Mr. WALLACE calls his global thinking is, no matter how you slice it, still "globaloney." Mr. WALLACE'S warp of sense and his woof of nonsense is very tricky cloth out of which to cut the pattern of a post-war world.

I give you an example of what I mean from Mr. WALLACE'S article. After much sound and inspired talk about post-war needs, among which he names great global air highways, and an enormously increased international air commerce, Mr. WALLACE makes this statement:

> When this war ends we shall be only at the threshold of the coming air age. Freedom of the Air means to the world of the future what Freedom of the Seas meant to the world in the past.

Well, let us examine this. What did Freedom of the Seas mean to the world of the past? It certainly did not mean international peace. And it is a desire for international peace which, above all, inspires Mr. WALLACE'S plea for Freedom of the Air. As Freedom of the Seas prevented neither World War No. 1 nor No. 2, there is no reason to suppose that Freedom of the Air would prevent World War No. 3.

Now, I realize it is worse than bad taste—it is a cardinal sin in certain New Deal circles—to ask what the freedom of anything has meant, means, or may mean to the welfare of this country.

Nevertheless, I would like to consider exactly what freedom of the seas meant to the United States of America in the world of the past. For freedom of the sea, by Mr. WALLACE'S own definition, meant the internationalization of American ports, as, again by his own definition, freedom of the air means internationalization of American airports and air space. I cast my mind back to a week in 1929, when I lived high up in a hotel whose windows overlooked New York Harbor. What did I see in port? The great, sleek, shiny, queenly ships of the Cunard and White Star Lines, of the French, Italian, German, Dutch, Swedish, and Russian lines. And not only the shiny and beautiful passenger ships with their supercargo space, but swarms upon swarms of little grimy merchant ships of all the powers, great and small, jamming our wharves. And out in San Francisco, from the hill you could see the lovely Canadian Line boats, the slick liners, and multitudinous craft of the Japanese and Russian merchant marine. But where, oh where, in either port, was America's merchant marine? You know the answer as well as I do.

America's merchant marine had languished, and all but died, in the effort to compete, under the policy of freedom of the seas and internationalization of ports, with all the cheap labor, low-operating cost, government-subsidy countries of the world. By 1937 less than 30 percent of our own ocean-going dry-cargo trade was being carried in American bottoms. Outranked in old and new tonnage by Great Britain, Japan, Germany, France, and Italy, our merchant marine was indeed in a sorry state when this World War broke. This was a tragedy, not only for us but for our gallant allies. How many precious British, Dutch, French, Russian, Chinese, Norwegian, and Allied lives have already been lost in this World War No. 2, of which shipping is the bottleneck, because of the insufficiency of our merchant marine, no man can tell.

Freedom of the seas, in neither World War No. 1 nor 2, left us in a position to defend our sea lines effectively. Furthermore, the squeezing out of our merchant marine by heavily subsidized merchant marine lines of other nations was one of the contributing factors to the growth of the isolationist mind in this country. Men who go down to the seas in ships quickly come to learn the ways of the world. And men who go up in the skies in ships today have learned, too. Our pilots returning from all the continents of the world will yearn to keep America out of another world war—and they know how: by keeping America on wings all over the world. And yet, and yet, shall I stand on a plain, say in the heart of the gentleman from Kansas' fair land, in the year 1949, and see at the great central terminus that may be there the air liner Queen Elizabeth put in, the Stalin Iron Cruiser, the Wilhelmina Flying Dutchman, the Flying de Gaulle, the airships of all the nations on earth—perhaps even those of the German and Jap. But shall I scan, like Sister Anne, the skies in vain, searching for the shape of an American Clipper against the clouds? Shall freedom of the air, like freedom of the seas, in the year '49 or '59 have made it impossible not only for America's merchant airway systems to compete in the air against the low-cost countries of the world, but for America to protect her sky lines?

Now, I believe that the shipping analogy can be pressed too far, for reasons that concern the national economy of our British cousins. The British Isles live by export trade. We do not. Therefore, there was and is much reason for admitting to them a greater measure of the world's heavy-cargo shipping trade. The situation in the air is different in this respect and in many others, too. I only draw this freedom of the air and sea analogy since Mr. Wallace himself has seen fit publicly to slice another piece of globaloney off the apparently inexhaustible ration he keeps in his mental larder.

Not even the British among themselves make the case for freedom of the air, a policy which currently they are showing some disposition to urge upon us, in terms of heavy export trade. Rather do they make it in terms of their own national defense, passenger traffic, mail revenue, and rapid cargo, and of their political, moral, and cultural prestige. They know that the transport carrier plane will never surplant for heavy tonnage the railroad and the ship. Nor the short hop mobile truck or bus. They know that a vigorous, far flung civilian air carrier, constantly increasing the volume of operations and route mileage, is the single most persuasive instrument for a national defense policy, and for the social, political, and economic, and above all, moral and spiritual integration and rehabilitation of the post-war world. And this above all they know, and this is what we Americans must all get quickly and clearly in our heads, that when peace comes it will be too late for any great nation to plan for its future role in aviation. The future of every nation in the air today is being given shape inexorably by military and civilian policies now being practiced in the very middle of the war. Great Britain has for many years urged their Government to press for freedom of the air, and internationalization of ports. They have done so because in the view of patriotic Britishers they see the prestige, defense, and commercial advantages which will accrue to them by the resultant increase of their domestic production of planes and their volume of operations, made possible by their comparative wage scales. In the urging of this policy of freedom of the air you may be quite sure many low labor scale nations of the world will follow the British suit. For all, yes all, the cheap labor standard nations of the world will today and tomorrow have much to gain from exercising the freedom of anything we have, whether it be our soil, our harbors, our airports, our air space.

We have seen who is challenging our historic American air policy of sovereignty of the skies. Now, who is defending sovereignty of the skies? Well, until this moment no one in a high place in government has spoken out clearly in its defense, as we know they will, when they understand the importance of it to our Nation, and to the preservation of peace in the post-war world.

Why have they not spoken out yet? Well, it is, no doubt, owing to the confusion and delay that have sometimes prevailed in this administration on clarifying policies important to America's enlightened self-interest. For there is not a shadow of doubt that this country, claiming complete control of its own vast skies, and behaving with decency and dignity like the great creditor nation it is, by cooperating to the utmost with the United Nations to liberalize world air policy, could keep the air supremacy it now has, and take henceforth in the skies that position of enlightened democratic leadership Great Britain held and still holds on the seas. Is there some good and honest reason why we should not do this, other than that it would seem impolite to certain of the other United Nations? Well, make no mistake; I believe that we should maintain our position of international civil air supremacy for the greatest and best of all reasons: Our responsibility to the whole world and to ourselves, to assume democratic political leadership in this hemisphere and cooperate elsewhere with the United Nations in leadership, requires and demands a commensurate civilian air position. I want the people who elected me to know where I stand on this. But I do not mean by civil air supremacy that this country should monopolize the air traffic of the world. We are strong, and not only can we afford to be generous for the peace of the world; we must be. I have every desire to see the British Overseas Airways Corporation shoving us so closely in many regions of the world that there will always be the same cause for friendly rivalry and healthy competition as there is today. And I have every hope that the air commerce of all the United Nations will expand constantly.

Early last month the President appointed an interdepartmental committee which in turn appointed a working committee to study our international air policy, for present and post-war needs. Under the chairmanship of Adolf Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, are to be found on these committees a real body of American air experts: Robert Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air; Artemus Gates, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air; Wayne Chatfield Taylor; L. Welch Pogue, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board; Thomas Burke, Chief of the Division of International Communications; William Burden; Lt. Comdr. Malcolm Aldrich; and Col. Harold Harriss.

We eagerly await, and the Nation eagerly awaits, the findings of those committees. Meanwhile, one wishes that Mr. Berle would require them at every meeting to read a paragraph from a magnificent speech delivered in Maryland last week, by his chief, Sumner Welles:

> It can never be made too clear, nor reiterated too often, that the foreign policy of the people of the United States, exactly like their domestic policies, should only be determined from the standpoint of what the American

people believe is their real, their practical, self-interest. Our foreign policy must not be—and in the long run never will be—based upon emotional altruism nor sentimental aspiration. What we should all of us be asking ourselves day in and day out is, not only what policies this country should adopt after the war in order to make sure that our security and our best interests are safeguarded, but also what this country of ours could have done in the past in order to prevent, or at least to make less likely, the rise of the conditions which have permitted the outbreak of this great struggle in which we are now engaged.

But, meanwhile, the international aviation score stands: We have been insensibly but steadily losing, not gaining, our commercial air supremacy abroad. Perhaps owing to the overrapid scramble to militarize our air lines. Perhaps owing to the overhasty contracts with Allied high commands, drawn up for lend-lease air material and facilities by our Army officials. Now, nobody can tell the Army or Navy much these days, and when battle fronts or war material are the moot question, nobody should try to. Our pride in the extraordinary job they have so gallantly done in the face of great obstacles is boundless, our confidence in their ability to win this war is overwhelming. But this House, which has at long last found its voice, has the right to use it to tell the Army and Navy this: We beg them to be most careful not to fritter away our best chance of winning the peace—which is post-war civilian, as well as military, control of the air.

Therefore, we should urge most emphatically that the Army and Navy work in closest cooperation with the State Department and the administration in all matters of Allied agreements on landing facilities and lend-lease air material, which may affect our post-war civilian air position. We have invested hundreds of millions of dollars via lend-lease in terminal facilities, communications, weather control, and air-transport craft in foreign countries.

But, as Britain's Under Secretary for Air, Captain Balfour, said in Parliament, "On lines which may have commercial value, all bets are off after this war." Now, while we are vastly more interested in the question of a firm civilian air policy that will allow us to operate commercially the new planes we must blueprint now and build tomorrow than in the ultimate disposition of lend-lease aviation facilities or existent planes, which will be obsolete in a short time anyway, I cannot see why, during the post-war rehabilitation period, our lend-lease transport planes should not be pressed into service, operating for a limited time from bases that our lend-lease money has built, as great mercy fleets under the American flag—flying food and medical supplies, technicians and doctors, and educators and scientists, and men of God to all the beaten, starving, destitute, plague-ridden, soul-hungry peoples of the globe.

In passing, it may be pointed out that the effective and relentless control of the production of Japanese and German aircraft, not only of a combat character, but commercial, plus a control of the volume of these countries' civilian and military air operations and allied communication systems, will for many years to come disarm them. And until that control is relaxed they will stay militarily impotent until man, with his God-given but diabolical mind, invents some other more potent long-range precision instrument of destruction.

If the administration is working behind closed doors with United Nations representatives on the basis of a new air policy, I believe we Americans ought to know it. The time has come for the administration to redefine clearly what it believes our air policy is, or should be. Then it is up to the people to decide that they approve of it, and the State Department to negotiate those policies with all United Nations countries, in a generous manner, a manner consistent with our new and grave responsibility as the world's leading air power. And above all, it is for us here to review laws and make appropriations which will implement this responsibility forcefully. To this end, we must assemble here in this House that able body of men, of aviation-minded experts, who already exist, and allow them relentlessly to apply their full energies, time, and thought to this all-important question.

If in the next few years thousands upon thousands of our young men, who have flown the highest mountains, the deepest rivers, and widest jungles, who have navigated the seven green seas, dyeing them red with their blood; if the great air ground personnel which has sustained them overseas, and the hundreds of thousands employed in our aircraft factories, suddenly find that a new national air policy has robbed them of their professions and jobs—well, my colleagues, we, and this administration, shall answer at the bar of history rather sooner than we expect to young America.

Furthermore, I do not hesitate to say, if out of indifference or lack of foresight, this administration and this Congress espouse the wrong air policy for this Nation, we shall have most efficiently laid the groundwork for America's certain defeat in World War No. 3. Then indeed the air over our heads will be full of the sound of wings—the wings of the chickens coming home to roost, but to roost uncertainly in these steel girders above us, as the bombs of the enemy send them squawking in terror, and us squealing with shame out of this great hall.

To paraphrase the words of our gallant ally and that greatest of patriots, Winston Churchill, who sees, as he should see, nothing inconsistent between fighting a war for democracy and defending the interests of the noble nation which nobly sired him, "We, gentlemen, were not elected by our constituents, on either side of this aisle, to preside over the liquidation of America's best interests, either at home or abroad." The sky's the limit of those interests. The time is now.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I desire to make the observation that the very brilliant and statesmanlike address just delivered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut has been well worth the day that many in the gallery and on the floor have spent in waiting to hear it.

Mrs. LUCE. Thank you so much.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. We are all very glad to hear the observations made by the gentlewoman, but some of us cannot let pass unchallenged some of the statements the gentlewoman made, particularly those that were purely political in the sense that all the blame was placed on the Democratic administration and possibly none on the Republican. The gentlewoman must remember that right after the last war we had a vast amount of tonnage, vast numbers of ships, left riding in our harbors. That was during a Republican administration. Had those administrations taken the proper steps to keep that merchant marine intact, we would have had a worth-while merchant marine today.

Mrs. LUCE. If I may quote a line of verse: "The plow goes once around the pole, while a trained mind routs a righteous soul."

I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. I remind the gentlemen that many of these ships were so poorly constructed that had they not been tied to the docks, they would have sunk.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that so far as the condition of our merchant marine that is complained of is concerned, some of it was due to the strikes that we had during the past 2 decades?

Mrs. LUCE. And I would like to say that I am not defending the Republican ship construction of the years after the war.

Mr. KNUTSON. It was during the war, it was Democratic construction.

Mrs. LUCE. Or the Democratic construction during the war. I would prefer to stick to the main point of my argument, which will be the most useful one to all of us here, that freedom of the seas did not prevent two world wars, and freedom of the air will not prevent the next world war, and indeed I wish every one would think of this when the freedom of the air is advocated as a panacea for our troubles.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it is only fair to point out that there are moves on the part of the administration, on the part of the Army ferry, and also on the part of the military today, and that there is in existence a committee which is looking into this matter very carefully.

Mrs. LUCE. I think the gentleman will find tomorrow in the RECORD, because I did not wish to take the time here now, a full description of the interdepartmental committee set up by the President to consider our air policy, and

I have also asked that that committee which is set up in the State Department, I believe, headed by Mr. Adolf Berle, will report in some way to the Nation shortly as to what new air policy they are expecting to advance.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And to Congress?

Mrs. LUCE. And to Congress, if possible.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. Certainly.

Mr. LEA. I think in this connection it might be well to recall that under the Civil Aeronautics Act we have American sovereignty of the air.

Mrs. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. LEA. And that policy can be changed only by a treaty ratified by the Senate of the United States, so that whatever secret organization may try to discard that sovereignty——

Mrs. LUCE. Oh, I am fully aware, as the gentleman states, that under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, we still have sovereignty of the skies, but I would like to point out, as I hope I have pointed out, that it is being challenged. My only point, and I hope that all here are aware of the fact, is that it is being challenged.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAGNUSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DRIED MILK

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal very briefly with a subject which has always been important, but which now is critical. I am referring to the subject of food, a substance which we, all of us, I am afraid, take more or less for granted until we are deprived of it.

In a land which we have considered to be blessed with plenty, it is shocking to realize that the vast majority of our people have been and still are undernourished, improperly nourished. The effect of this inadequate food on health is borne out by any number of surveys and tests. The Pennsylvania State College says in part after an examination of 2,511 Pennsylvanians:

> Only eight were found free from dental decay and only two uniformly high in all tests. Approximately 60 percent of growing children, it appears, were more than 6 months behind in satisfactory skeletal development. The average diets of children studied were far below levels recommended by the National Research Council in protein, vitamins, and minerals. It becomes apparent that undernutrition in some degree is almost universal.

Robert S. Harris, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, before the American Dietetic Association, October 22, 1942, says:

> Our current nutrition program based on the milk-meat-vegetable theory is really addressed to the upper half of the population. The lower half is economically unable to follow this excellent advice, and this program evades and even intensifies the problem. Until solved, the poor continue as subjects for food charity or remain in a malnourished condition.

The war will not improve this unhappy state—the war and consequent food readjustments are going to make more undernourishment, more disease, more ill health—unless we stop talking about it and do something about it.

Already the Public Health Service has been tirelessly and intelligently plugging a nutrition program, stressing the need for vitamins. Too much credit cannot be given to Dr. Parran and Dr. Wilder, but still the job has only begun. The very practical problem remains, the problem of making available at low cost in money, manpower, and materials, the necessary foods.

At this time during the war, there is the utmost necessity for using a little ingenuity, a little imagination and enterprise in developing new types of food to meet new conditions.

Food habits are very conservative habits and you and I are very reluctant to change the bill of fare of our own free will, but unfortunately in this instance we no longer have a free will. We have got to change whether we want to or not. It is going to take more than talk, it is going to take a lot of work on the part of a good many people in the Government, the Department of Agriculture, the W. P. B., the Department of Health, and even the Army and Navy. It will mean a far-sighted policy, courage, daring, and initiative to, first, make available the new foods and, second, to sell them to our people. But it must be done.

Many of our standard foods will be scarce. Ask any housewife today about butter and meat. But there are many, many new forms and varieties of foods which we must substitute. Let us take up only one, dried milk. Even in our times of greatest prosperity we fell far short of supplying enough fluid milk. It is humanly impossible to supply too much milk for adults as well as growing children. The country has been hungry and still is hungry for this very common food. This is an acknowledged fact and not theory.

Powdered milk requires no change in agricultural production—all we need is just milk, separated milk, now going to waste and to hogs, requiring no great increase in manpower and surprisingly little critical material. At the present moment there are a hundred idle milk dryers and, of the ones being used, few are used to the full 22-hour-a-day capacity.

NOT LIKE THE SYNTHETIC-RUBBER PROGRAM

There can be installed more milk dryers at comparatively little cost in critical materials. In fact, the saving in transportation will far outweigh the critical materials allocated to further dryers.

At a time when there is an acute shortage of all transportation facilities, both rail, motor, and shipping, why devote precious space to shipping water? Fluid milk contains approximately 85 percent liquid which can be squeezed out by the regular drying process. By not following a dehydrating program, beween April 1941 and October 1942, the United States Navy convoyed 245,000 tons over water to Britain in one food alone—17,000,000 cases of evaporated or canned milk.

By dehydrating, all need for exceedingly scarce refrigeration is done away with. Milk can be bought by the housewife once a week, or even once a month, and daily deliveries by truck are unnecessary. Powdered milk is a natural for efficient distribution. Out of one of the most perishable and vital farm products, dried milk becomes one of the most imperishable, but still one of the most vital.

And do not think that because separated milk has been dried it is not a real food. Here is the analysis: In powdered form, protein 34.6 percent; fat, 1.9 percent; carbohydrates, 50.9 percent; calories, 359 per 100 grams, plus, in addition, calcium, minerals, and all of the most important vitamins.

At the present prices, a pound of dried milk is being retailed in Washington for approximately 23 cents a pound. Now please bear in mind that a pound of powdered milk is the equivalent of 5 quarts of fluid milk, healthful, necessary food, available to all dwellers in cities and in fact anywhere else at a price of 4.6 cents a quart.

Throughout the length and breadth of the land, there is a potential supply of separated milk which almost staggers the imagination. Roughly, 1 pound of butter takes cream from 10 quarts of milk. In June 1942 butter production was 203,000,000 pounds and it takes only very simple arithmetic to figure 2,000,000,000 quarts of separated milk for June alone, much of which can be made available for human consumption. In addition to this colossal amount, there are annually approximately a third of a billion quarts of buttermilk and approximately 4,000,000,000 quarts of whey—the byproducts from cheese. While there are no actual figures as to the exact consumption of separated milk, annually 20,000,000,000 quarts disappear from commercial use. It is assumed that this goes down the drain or to hogs and calves instead of to growing children and working adults—20,000,000,000 are a lot of quarts—a lot of food subtracted from what we have not got.

Not a substitute for the Beveridge plan, not a panacea for all ills of mankind, nevertheless a far-sighted dry milk campaign is a step forward. Why? Because it makes available a cheap food, a health food, and a good food, to large numbers of people, otherwise undernourished and handicapped in the bitter struggle for a normal life.

The virtue of powdered milk at the present time is so obvious that perhaps a good many people will ask, "Well, if it is so good, why hasn't something been done about it?" The answer to that one is twofold: First, the reluctance, as I have said before, of people to adopt a new form of food. Any new food is hard to sell, but in times like this when all foods are scarce, this obstacle is secondary in importance.

Second, there has been some opposition on the part of dairy interests in certain milksheds—opposition to a program which would interfere with their par-

ticular market for fluid milk. In other words powdered milk can be produced as a butter byproduct at great distances from centers of population and economically transported to such districts from the hinterland. Powdered milk from Minnesota would be available for distribution in cities along the Atlantic coast. This, of course, would obviously interfere with the market on fluid milk produced adjacent to such areas, transported, refrigerated, and delivered daily at twice the cost of powdered milk. Today, however, there is a scarcity of fluid milk; today powder would serve to ease the strain, to supplement rather than compete with fluid milk.

Where powdered milk has been tried, it has been uniformly successful. William Reinhard, manager of the Eastern Cooperative League, the Rochdale Stores in downtown Washington, began to sell dried milk in July 1942 at 4¾ cents a quart. Mr. Reinhard said, "This is like selling gold bricks at a discount."

Not an experiment, not a new theory, powdered milk has been used for years by some individuals and many processors. At the present time 62 percent of the bakers in the United States use it entirely. It has been put into ice cream and into certain packaged goods such as pancake and biscuit flour.

To get down to the practical problem of increasing the use and consumption of this vital commodity, a three-point program is necessary:

First. Raise the price of powdered milk to the farmer and the processor in order to insure greater production. The present 1 cent which the farmer actually gets is an insult. As we all know at the present time there are no free prices in the United States and all important commodities are controlled by the Government. It would be very simple to raise the wholesale price of powdered milk in order to bring in a larger amount of separated milk from the farms and local creameries. There is no stimulant to production like an increase in price. A raise of 50 percent would still make it a very, very cheap food for the consumer.

Second. It is necessary for the Government agencies involved to put on a rather extensive educational campaign to promote the consumption among people who are not accustomed to the new form of the same product which they have always used. The Public Health Service, the Food Administration, and the Department of Agriculture are equipped to do jobs of this sort. They have done it in the past, particularly in regard to vitamins.

Third. It will require the allocation of a certain amount of critical material for the building of new drying plants, but a few hundred tons of steel for dryers will save a few thousand tons of steel in shipping and transportation. From the standpoint of conserving critical metals, it is an exceedingly good investment. Donald Nelson said before the Kilgore committee that the Germans moved a hundred dehydrating plants into Russia and steel is very, very scarce in the Third Reich.

No, there is nothing new about milk—it is the oldest food in the world—likewise there is nothing new about the need for more milk in our national diet, and, lastly, there is nothing new about powdered milk. Under the circumstances of a wartime economy and the general scarcity of essential vitamin food, it is downright criminal not to take full advantage of this opportunity which is ours for the asking—criminal to gamble with food as we face a milk famine. The Department of Agriculture should be going ahead with an aggressive program of milk drying. In fact, this should have been started a year ago and be vigorously under way by this time. The plain truth of the matter is, we either use our ingenuity or we go hungry. Time is shorter than we think.

I am urging the Truman committee and the Tolan committee to investigate the lack of enthusiasm on the part of governmental agencies for a program of such obvious merit.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure the House appreciates the splendid and informative statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota. Does he not feel that the saving in steel which would ensue by lack of the necessity of building ships needed to carry much of the dairy products across the seas could well be used in building some of the powdered milk devices of which he speaks?

Mr. GALE. That is one of the points I have been making. I feel very strongly about it. I know it could be used to greater advantage.

Mr. MUNDT. I simply want to say I hope you have brought your worth-while paper to the attention of the lease-lend organization, because one of the difficulties before our Committee on Foreign Affairs is the shortage of ships to carry the products so badly needed by our allies in Russia and Britain. I think you have a very worth-while point in your talk.

Mr. GALE. I thank the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

## SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under the special circumstances, I think I will ask unanimous consent to have that permission transferred until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix the text of a parliamentary debate, together with an article, which exceeds the prescribed limit. In spite of the fact that the cost will exceed the limit, I ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CLASON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of illness.

To Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. VAN ZANDT), on account of illness.

To Mr. ROWE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for the rest of the week, on account of official business.

## SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to amend the act entitled "An act to protect the public health by the prevention of certain practices leading to dental disorders; and to prevent the circumvention of certain State or Territorial laws regulating the practice of dentistry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 10, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

---

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, February 10, 1943. Business to be considered: To continue hearing on H. R. 1012, "To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes."

### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, February 10, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 1671, and other business.

### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

The Committee on Public Lands will meet Wednesday, February 10, 1943, at 11 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to consider H. R. 837 and H. R. 838 and such other matters as may come before the committee.

---

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

165. A letter from Rear Admiral L. G. Allen, by direction of the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualifications therefor of each person commissioned in the Navy and Marine Corps from November 26, 1942, to January 25, 1943, and in the Coast Guard from December 1, 1942, to February 1, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

166. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of, funds used by, and donations to the regional research laboratories; to the Committee on Agriculture.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 1762. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 105. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to examine into and determine the fitness of certain Government personnel to continue in their employment; with amendment (Rept. No. 111). Referred to the House Calendar.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GAVAGAN: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 761. A bill for the relief of Charles T. Dulin; without amendment (Rept. No. 112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

### ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. House Resolution 95. Resolution requesting information as to status of Walter Winchell (Rept. No. 110). Laid on the table.

### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1322) granting a pension to Leona McCrary, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr WALTER:

H. R. 1763 A bill to grant the service bonus provided by section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 to certain commissioned officers of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve appointed to the line of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 1764. A bill to provide for the construction of a naval hospital in Florida; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHELCHEL of Georgia:

H. R. 1765 A bill to authorize the granting of pension for non-service-connected permanent total disability for World War veterans based upon 60 days' service; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1766. A bill to transfer to the Department of Agriculture certain functions of the Fish and Wildlife Service relating to the fisheries industry; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr LANHAM:

H. R. 1767 (by request). A bill to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 1768. A bill to restore to the active list of the Army and to active duty certain retired officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 1779. A bill to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowance to certain officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio:

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution directing the War Relocation Authority to cease and desist from the establishment and operation at relocation centers where enemy aliens, including persons of Japanese blood, are interned, of plants for the manufacture of pottery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VORYS of Ohio:

H. Res. 106. Resolution providing for an amendment to the House rules to provide a hearing for any person removed by name from the Federal pay roll by act of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 1769. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 1770. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to bestow the Silver Star upon Michael J. Quinn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 1771. A bill for the relief of August Svelund; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 1772. A bill for the relief of Henry Stovall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. R. 1773 A bill to refund to Lewis H. Frantz income taxes erroneously and illegally collected; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 1774 A bill for the relief of Cyril Doerner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1775 A bill for the relief of William Thomas Doyle; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1776. A bill for the relief of Edward Higgins Doyle; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 1777. A bill granting a pension to Lou King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 1778. A bill for the relief of Max Cyrus Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

100. By Mr BARRETT: Memorial of the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the State of Wyoming, asking for amendment of titles I and X of the Social Security Act to provide for grants to the States of 50 percent of State average payments of $40 per month in lieu of an individual basis, to enable the States to pay full budget deficiencies in all grants, so as to allow a more equitable payment to the States of Federal funds in the administration of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

101. Also, memorial of the twenty-seventh Legislature of the State of Wyoming, asking for amendment of titles I, IV, and X of the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to allow intermittent employment without impairment of grants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

102. By Mr. FULMER: Concurrent resolution submitted by the clerk of the house of representatives of Columbia, S. C., requesting the National Congress not to take further action on House bill 1012 and Senate bill 246 affecting air commerce until the present World War is over and peace established; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

103. By Mr. GWYNNE: Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 9, of the State of Iowa, concerning a proposed amendment to the social-security law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

104. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. C. A. Teeple, of Corsicana, Tex., favoring House Joint Resolution 1; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

105. Also, petition of Mrs. Ben Cocek, of Penelope, Tex., favoring House bill 997, the Pharmacy Corps bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

106. My Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of George W. Briggs and 59 citizens of the First Congressional District, urging the adoption of the Ruml plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

107. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Wisconsin Canners Association, Madison, Wis.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

108. Also, petition of the Wisconsin Canners Association, Madison, Wis.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

109. Also, petition of the Wisconsin Canners Association, Madison, Wis.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

### WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and loving Father, who abideth with us through the day season and art our guardian angel when the consciousness of our existence is lost in sleep, consider and hear us. We own Thy right to every service we can give and we are thankful for Thy divine guidance. Our decisions cannot be wrong if in harmony with Thee, whose teaching brings peace to all who seek and wait. So often the light fades beyond our view. Enable us to be patient in the realization that in human experiences there is no lyric without surprises and no epic without failures.

Almighty God, Thou knowest that we love our country, with its God-created personal rights waving in the cottages of the poor and in the homes of affluence; oh, let every heart bow in deep gratitude for America. Unselfish adherence to the ideals of our beloved Republic will outlive any type of genius when stamped with the "well done" of a just and righteous God. In every station of our citi-

zenship, grant that the narrow walls of self-will and personal aggrandizement may be broken down, never to find a place of assurance in the bosom of a free people. Dear Lord, carry us all up the mount of loyalty where all citizens shall be keyed with unswerving fidelity to our marshaling hosts who are in the throes of tragic war that we may live in the folds of freedom. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business in order on today be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House will very soon be called upon to consider the resolution to continue the Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities.

After listening to and reading about all that has been said for and against the continuance of the committee, I felt somewhat constrained to enter the lists against the committee's continuance.

Being no lawyer, I cannot approach the problem with a legal aspect, but I can approach it with the viewpoint of a businessman—an industrialist, if you please.

Its continuance is not good business, particularly at this time. Proper and sufficient returns have not been achieved for the taxpayers' money invested.

First, because the committee's work has not been done in accordance with good committee practice, as pointed out by the able and distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], a member of the committee, last Monday before this House—and every Member should read this address before voting.

Second, because it has caused confusion in the minds of the American people as to its value and as to its efficacy.

And third, because it is bad business practice to attack the principles of a competitor, Stalin, however much you might disagree with him, when you happen to have a profitable business relationship with him. It might destroy the relationship.

Therefore, in business, when you create a certain agency to perform a certain function to achieve certain definite results and those results are not forthcoming, you replace or discharge the agency. So I take the position that this committee, this agency, has not done these things, and, therefore, should be discharged.

I oppose the resolution. I cannot subscribe to its continuance. The people, the taxpayers, have not gotten full value for their money.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Mr. Telfair Knight, Director of the Division of Training, War Shipping Administration, outlining the training program under the War Shipping Administration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. LANDIS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article written by Wilbur D. Matson, of McConnelsville, Morgan County, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Implement Rationing Bureau, Fort Wayne, Ind., concerning tractor tires.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CAPT. RICHARD E. MILLER

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, Indiana today mourns the death of a favorite son and air hero of World War No. 2—Capt. Richard E. Miller, of Fort Wayne, a veteran of Jimmie Doolittle's raid on Tokyo, who was killed in action in North Africa on January 22, 1943.

Indiana is proud and saddened over the loss of this heroic bombardier—three times decorated for bravery since the outbreak of war.

The people of America—the free people of all the world—owe a debt of gratitude to Richard E. Miller and to the thousands of young men like him who are fighting and dying in defense of freedom and democracy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent in connection with my remarks regarding Captain Miller to extend in the Appendix of today's RECORD the newspaper account of his service to his country.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two particulars and also to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. CELLER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] express his contempt for anybody who criticizes this waste of money on the part of the O. W. I. It recently published a magazine filled with Negro pictures. I am told it published many millions of copies of that document at a cost of $84,000. Some say it cost a great deal more. They did not send that magazine to the white people of the country but circulated it among the Negroes.

I had not seen this publication to which the gentleman from New York has just referred, but I do not think we need the O. W. I. to tell the world what the Congress is doing or what the administration is doing or what our boys are doing on Guadalcanal or in North Africa, through a publication that is to be paid for out of the Public Treasury, or else supported by a group of advertisers who want to use an agency of this Government as a vehicle to carry their advertisements to the four corners of the earth.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. I would appreciate the gentleman reading that magazine. It has nothing to do with what the gentleman is saying.

Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman from New York will contend that the cost of this publication will be paid by these advertisers. But I submit this Government should not be used as a vehicle for these self-exploiting advertisers.

WALTER WINCHELL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, article 8 of title XXXIV of the code provides that any officer in the Navy may be punished for scandalous conduct or for a falsehood. Yesterday there was filed a report from the Navy which I shall cause to be printed in the RECORD so you may

read it, with reference to the conduct of Walter Winchell.

Among other statements in that report of the Navy is one that on March 17, 1942, confidential orders were issued to Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell, assigning him to active duty. This was special duty under the commandant of the third naval district. Those orders were still in effect on February 5, 1943. I assume they were still in effect on the 8th.

Here is what Walter Winchell said over the radio on the 8th:

Hitler is losing ground in Russia, in the air over Germany, and on the sands of Africa. He seems to win only in Congress.

When a lieutenant commander in the Navy states that Hitler is winning only in Congress, I say it is time that the Navy take action under article 8, of title XXXIV of the Code of the United States. The statement that Hitler is winning in Congress is a charge that the Congress is disloyal.

[Here the gavel fell.]

MERGER OF DOMESTIC TELEGRAPH CARRIERS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 99, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House ought to hear this measure, which I fear is a rather dangerous move toward monopoly of a great public enterprise, so I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment? There is an amendment to the rule and it is just technical.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the Members of the House ought to hear all the debate on this proposition. I think it is a measure that is going to permit monopoly of a very dangerous kind and I think the Members ought to be here to hear the debate.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 9]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Harness, Ind. | Outland |
| Arends | Hébert | Philbin |
| Barry | Heffernan | Phillips |
| Bland | Herter | Ploeser |
| Boykin | Hess | Reece, Tenn. |
| Brooks | Holifield | Reed, N. Y. |
| Camp | Izac | Rees, Kans. |
| Cannon, Fla. | Jenkins | Robertson |
| Case | Jensen | Rowe |
| Clason | Johnson, J. Leroy | Sadowski |
| Cochran | Johnson, Ward | Satterfield |
| Cole, N. Y. | Johnson, Okla. | Schuetz |
| Culkin | Jones | Sikes |
| Curley | Kearney | Simpson, Pa. |
| Curtis | Kennedy | Smith, Maine |
| Davis | Kerr | Smith, W. Va. |
| Dewey | Kilday | Snyder |
| Dingell | King | Sparkman |
| Dirksen | Kirwan | Starnes, Ala. |
| Ditter | Lambertson | Stewart |
| Domengeaux | Lewis, Colo. | Sumner, Ill. |
| Dondero | Luce | Thomas, Tex. |
| Durham | Ludlow | Thomason |
| Elliott | Lynch | Tolan |
| Elmer | McGranery | Vinson, Ga. |
| Elston, Ohio | McGregor | Voorhis, Calif. |
| Engel | McLean | Vursell |
| Fenton | McWilliams | Wadsworth |
| Fogarty | Maas | Wasielewski |
| Forand | Magnuson | Welch |
| Gallagher | Maloney | West |
| Gathings | May | Whitten |
| Gearhart | Mills | Wigglesworth |
| Gore | Norton | |
| Gregory | Mott | |
| Hall, Edwin Arthur | Murphy | |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 329 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

MERGER OF DOMESTIC TELEGRAPH CARRIERS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I offer an amendment to the pending resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLARK: On page 1, line 12 after the period, insert a new sentence as follows: "It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill."

And on page 2, line 3, after the word "and", insert "any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute."

And on page 2, line 3, capitalize the "t" in the word "the."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does that amendment provide for waiving points of order?

Mr. CLARK. No; the amendment to the rule simply authorizes the House to consider the bill reported by the committee as an original bill. The legislation before the committee was a Senate bill and the committee worked out its own bill, which was reported in the nature of an amendment to the Senate bill. This amendment to the rule allows the House to consider that amendment by the committee as an original bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Why not just consider it as an amendment to the Senate bill? Some of us have made some study of the debate of the Senate. You have the Senate bill before you. The bill as reported here shows the committee bill as an amendment. Why not just consider it as an amendment to the Senate bill?

Mr. CLARK. I may say to the gentleman that in the opinion of the Committee on Rules the procedure is a little more liberal by considering the committee bill as an original bill than as an amendment to the Senate bill. This rule leaves it open under the regular rules of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that this is one time I am just a little bit skittish of so-called liberality. I am afraid the liberality goes in the wrong direction.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I have no disposition to discuss the merits of the bill which this resolution makes in order. It authorizes the consolidation of the Western Union and Postal Telegraph Cos. but, as I understand, does not make such consolidation mandatory.

It appeared to the Committee on Rules when this matter was there for consideration that there was no division among the members of the great legislative committee from which this bill comes. In view of the fact that the rule authorizes 2 hours of general debate and also consideration under the 5-minute rule, I do not care to take more time to discuss it now.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule comes from the Committee on Rules with a unanimous vote. There was no opposition to it. We hope that after this bill is disposed of by the House it will be possible to bring up the Dies resolution from the Committee on Rules and dispose of that also this afternoon. Having that in mind, I believe it is the wish of the House to take as little time as possible under the rule so that we can proceed with the consideration of this bill and then take up the Dies committee resolution.

All that this rule provides is to make in order the consideration of a bill that permits the merger of the Western Union Telegraph Co. with the Postal Telegraph Co. This proposal has been pending for 5 years or more. It is merely permissive legislation. I am fearful that if the bill does not go through the Government will be obliged to take over the Postal Telegraph Co.

Mr. RANKIN. Why?

Mr. FISH. Because the Postal Telegraph Co. is running in the red about $300,000 a month. It already owes the Government some $9,000,000. Naturally, no private business can continue running in the red to that extent. I am afraid that if this bill does not go through it will mean the first step toward Government ownership, and I am against Government ownership.

Mr. RANKIN and Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky rose.

Mr. FISH. I would rather have this whole question discussed by the commit-

tee in charge of the bill. I could answer these questions, but I have allowed myself only 3 minutes in order to expedite action on the rule and consideration on the merger bill and the Dies report today.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman made a statement there, and I think he ought to yield for a question regarding it.

Mr. FISH. I yield for one question.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman indicates that we are trying to "pull" what he would term virtually a bankrupt corporation out of the hole. Has the gentleman observed that the principal stockholders of the two corporations are the same?

Mr. FISH. Yes. I was going further. There are several things about this bill that I do not like. I hope it will be thoroughly aired and discussed by the committee itself.

In the first place, it has come to the attention of most of us that there has been a large stock speculation in the stock of Postal Telegraph as a result of the action of Congress, and the price of the stock has risen from 9 to 19. The stock is in the hands very largely of certain banking houses and corporations in New York.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Another thing I do not like in this bill, and I hope it will be thoroughly discussed, is the fact that when we act we are, of course, creating a monopoly. In creating this monopoly by an act of Congress we are at the same time doing away with the 40-percent preference rate the Government has been receiving on its telegrams. I do not see any reason why we should wipe out this $1,000,000 a year saving if by act of Congress we create this monopoly and consolidate the Western Union and the Postal Telegraph into one company. That is a matter I should like to hear the gentleman from Mississippi and others discuss when the bill is being debated.

Mr. RANKIN rose.

Mr. FISH. But not now.

Mr. RANKIN. Let us have it now. Let us not cover up these owners of watered stock. Why not bring this whole question into the open and expose it now?

Mr. FISH. I am against this alleged speculation in Postal Telegraph stock. If anybody knows the facts, I hope they will be brought out. I rang up the Securities and Exchange Commission, but it did not give me any definite information. However, the gentleman who spoke to me said this stock had apparently been manipulated since the Congress began the consideration of this merger bill. I hope that will all be brought out and discussed openly and freely. The Congress is entitled to all available information on all phases of the bill.

In the meanwhile there is no opposition that I know of to the rule, and I have no further requests for time on this side.

I expect to vote for the bill because I do not want to take any chances with the possibility or probability of Government ownership.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have some time in opposition to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. It seems to me there is a great hurry to get this amendment through.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 132, noes 3.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] There are 217 Members on the floor. The Chair counts himself, which makes 218, a quorum.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the House Naval Affairs Committee to ask unanimous consent that that committee may sit during the sessions of the House during this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MERGER OF POSTAL TELEGRAPH AND WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANIES

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 158, with Mr. BARDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the question may be asked why the necessity for the bill which is now before the House for consideration, providing for amendments to the Communications Act of 1934 as amended to permit the consolidation and merger of the domestic telegraph carriers and for other purposes.

As everyone knows, there are two telegraph companies in the United States at the present time. One is the Western Union Telegraph Co. and the other the Postal Telegraph, Inc., and its subsidiary companies.

As already stated the object of this bill is to give permission under the law for the consolidation and merger of these telegraph carriers. The Western Union is by far the larger of the two companies and is solvent. The Postal Telegraph is insolvent and has been kept going for quite a while now by loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, amounting to some $300,000 per month, until the total indebtedness of the Postal Co. to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is approximately $9,000,000 or more. To my mind, it is doubtful that the Postal Co. could be operated without a loss even if it were reorganized again. For the last 13 years, or since the year 1929, it has been operated with a substantial deficit. The annual deficits for these years are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1930 | $2,182,800 |
| 1931 | 3,725,000 |
| 1932 | 3,268,000 |
| 1933 | 2,864,300 |
| 1934 | 2,521,400 |
| 1935 | 1,759,700 |
| 1936 | 1,372,800 |
| 1937 | 3,509,900 |
| 1938 | 4,042,500 |
| 1939 | 4,099,700 |
| 1940 | 3,024,600 |
| 1941 | 3,037,900 |
| For first 10 months of 1942 | 3,604,500 |

Mr. Chairman, in considering the telegraph merger bill, the question naturally arises in the minds of the Members of the House as to why the necessity for this bill. There is only one answer to this, and that is, on account of the financial condition of Postal Telegraph, Inc., it is necessary to take this step.

Hearings have been held three times before the Senate committees, and one hearing has been held before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House. The War Department, the Navy Department, the Department of State, the Department of Labor, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Board of War Communications are all unanimously in favor of legislation to provide for the merger.

A brief history of Postal Telegraph, Inc., is as follows:

The Postal land-line system was organized about 1884. In 1928 the Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation was formed to hold control of the Mackay companies, which had previously acquired Postal land lines and Commercial Cables, and was itself controlled in turn by International Telephone & Telegraph Co. After reorganization in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, the International Telephone & Telegraph Co. ceased to have any financial interest in it. The Postal land-line system emerged on February 1, 1940, as a separate entity known as Postal Telegraph, Inc. This

entity comprises 35 Postal Telegraph companies incorporated in the various States, and the Postal sales organization engaged in the electric-clock business. The outstanding securities of Postal Telegraph, Inc., are 256,769.9 shares of preferred stock of no par value, and 1,027,079.6 shares of common stock, $1 par value. There are no bonds and the principal liabilities, according to my latest information, consists of the debt to the R. F. C. of $9,000,000, current liabilities of a little over $4,000,000, and an accrued actuarial pension and disability liability to its employees in excess of $7,000,000. Postal Telegraph, Inc., has never paid a dividend.

As I have stated, the Postal Telegraph Co. competes with the Western Union Telegraph Co. and also with the written and oral services of the telephone companies, the telegraph services of the domestic radio companies, and with the air mail overnight business. In many instances, there is a wasteful duplication between these two companies. The latest report filed with the Federal Communications Commission for the first 10 months of 1942 shows that Western Union handled 84.4 percent and Postal only 15.6 percent of the combined business.

It might interest you as to the differences in the two companies as to operation, mileage, employees, and so forth. The Western Union employs about 53,000 persons, and the Postal Co. about 15,000. On December 31, 1941, the Western Union pole mileage in the United States was 209,527, while Postal's was 31,700. Western Union has 19,025 offices while Postal has 4,033. It is true that Postal reaches a few hundred smaller places in the United States which are not reached by Western Union, but on the other hand, it is equally true that the Western Union reaches thousands of places in the United States where Postal has no office. It might be well said that Western Union gave far more complete coverage in the places served by both companies.

You will no doubt be interested in a brief comparative statement as to the financial condition of both companies. Western Union has only one kind of stock outstanding; that is, 1,045,009 shares of common stock at the par value of $100. It has no important debt maturity until 1950, when $20,000,000 of its funding and real-estate mortgage bonds will become due. A little more than a year later, a further bond issue of $25,000,000 will become due and payable. Then, on March 1, 1960, the only other large or sizeable bond issue outstanding, amounting to $35,000,000, will become due and payable.

As I have already stated, Postal has operated each year since 1929 with a deficit. On the other hand, Western Union has operated at a profit, except in 1932 and 1938. For the first 10 months of 1942 the Western Union land-line gross revenues were $100,770,345, while the Postal gross revenues were $18,676,877—I omitted cable revenues amounting to $7,262,021 from the Western Union revenues for the reason that Postal has no cable properties—for the period of the 10 months of 1942 Western Union operated at a profit of $6,578,500 but Postal operated at a loss of $3,604,549, in spite of the large increase in telegraphic revenues on account of the war.

Every Member of the House, even as every member of the committee, can readily see the reason why it is necessary to pass legislation permitting a merger if it can be agreed upon. So what can be done in this situation? Would it be good business for the Federal Government to continue through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance $300,000 or more each month to carry the deficit for the Postal Co.? This, of course, could be done, or there is the alternative of letting the Postal Co. fold up and attempt to reorganize it. There is a third plan that some wanted and that was for the Government to take over Postal—but I am firmly convinced that this House and this Congress does not want, and will not vote for any bill which will permit the Federal Government to operate either of these telegraph companies, or both. The Postal Co. must be kept operating, especially in this present emergency, for the public and the Government.

There is another reason which may have been overlooked by some as to why this merger should take place, and that is, to safeguard the rights, or to aid the employees of Postal. You will ask what might be done to safeguard these employees, their jobs, and the retirement or pension fund. This question was given serious consideration by the Federal Communications Commission, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, and I believe that I am safe in saying that all have arrived at the conclusion that the best means to provide for the safeguarding of the employees and to give the Government and the public the necessary service is to permit a voluntary merger. That is, if it is possible to do so, to let the solvent company acquire the Postal. In the bill placing the telegraph companies under the Federal Communications Commission in 1935, it is my recollection that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House inserted a provision permitting the merger of the telegraph companies. This passed the House and was stricken out in conference. The Congress could have possibly been saved all this if this had been permitted to pass back then.

The merger, if it takes place, of the Western Union and Postal companies would terminate wasteful competition. It is my belief that in the end it will give better service.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce studied this question last year and hearings were held. The Senate also passed S. 158 in January. Your committee struck out all after the enacting clause and brought in a different bill in many respects. Both bills are permissive. No company is obliged to merge or consolidate under them. If a merger does take place, it is known by all that only one company in the domestic telegraph field is interested in acquiring the Postal Co. and that is the Western Union.

As I have stated, there are quite a number of differences between the Senate bill and the House bill, and your committee feels that the House bill will more nearly meet the situation and does not impose such terms and conditions upon the merged company as would make it impossible of merging.

This brings me to a more or less detailed explanation of the bill recommended by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This bill authorizes mergers or consolidations of domestic telegraph properties, facilities, or operations but does not permit the consolidation of domestic and international telegraph properties, facilities, or operations, or the merger of telephone and telegraph companies. It provides that whenever domestic telegraph carriers seek authority for consolidation they shall submit an application to the Federal Communications Commission. The Commission shall order a public hearing, shall give reasonable notice thereof in writing to the Governor of each of the States in which any of the physical property involved is situated, to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of State, and to such other persons as the Commission may deem advisable. If after such hearing the Commission find that subject to such terms and conditions and such modifications as it shall find to be just and reasonable, the proposed transaction is authorized, and conforms to all the applicable provisions of the bill, and is in the public interest, the Commission shall enter an order approving and authorizing the consolidation or merger. Moreover, in finding whether any proposed transaction is in the public interest, the Commission is required to give due consideration, among other things, to the soundness of the plan and the corporate and financial structure of the consolidated carrier. The bill prohibits any consolidation or merger if as a result more than one-fifth of the capital stock is owned or controlled or voted directly or indirectly by any alien, or the representative of an alien, by any foreign government or representative thereof, by any corporation organized under the laws of any foreign government, or by any corporation of which any officer or director is an alien. It also provides for the equitable distribution of international telegraph traffic between the several international telegraph carriers, and the telegraph carriers in Canada, Mexico, and Newfoundland. It contains labor protective provisions which are modeled substantially on the labor protective provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The labor protective clauses provide that in its order of approval the Commission shall include terms and conditions providing that during the period of 4 years from the date of such approval such consolidation or merger will not result in the employees of the carriers which are parties to the consolidation being in a worse position with respect to their compensation or character of employment, except that the protection so accorded shall not be required to con-

tinue for a longer period than the period during which such employee was in the employ of such carrier or carriers prior to the date of such approval. In other words, an employee who has been in the employ of any carrier which is a party to the consolidation for 4 or more years prior to the date of the consolidation is approved, must not be discharged as a result of the consolidation for 4 years thereafter, and any employee who had been so employed for a period less than 4 years shall be similarly protected for a period equal to the period of his prior employment. The object of these labor clauses is to protect the employees against the effects of consolidation or merger. They do not mean that every employee must continue to be employed for the periods provided, under any and all circumstances.

The bill also gives certain specific protections not required in the case of consolidations under the Interstate Commerce Act, as follows:

The bill gives a preferential hiring status to any employee who is discharged by the consolidated carrier.

I may call to the attention of the House at this point that when we passed what is known as the Transportation Act of 1940 the Congress then established a basis for abandonment or mergers of the rail carriers, and this is patterned, as I have stated, to a great extent after the provisions of that act, which were acceptable to all.

It is recognized that all employees in the consolidation of companies operating on a Nation-wide basis could not be given employment at the very places where they had worked before the consolidation. Therefore, the bill provides for the transfer of employees to other places but requires the consolidated carrier, when such transfers are made, to pay the employee in addition to his regular compensation, the actual traveling expenses of his family and himself, including the cost of packing, crating, draying, and transporting his household goods and personal effects.

Another provision is designed to place the employees of the telegraph carrier acquired in as favorable a position with respect to pensions as the employees of the acquiring carrier. Let me give an illustration: The pension rights of the Postal Telegraph employees today are in serious jeopardy because of the financial condition of that company. If Western Union should acquire the Postal Telegraph under this bill, it would be required to apply the Western Union pension plan to the Postal employees and to credit such employees thereunder with their Postal Telegraph service, so that any Postal employee employed by the Western Union after merger would have exactly the same Western Union pension rights that he would have had if he had been employed by Western Union all the time he was employed by Postal.

The bill, also, provides that any employee who since August 27, 1940, has left a position, other than a temporary position, to enter military or naval service, shall be considered to have been in the employ of the carrier during the time he is in such service, and upon making application for employment with the consolidated carrier within 40 days after he is relieved from military or naval service under honorable conditions, shall be employed by the consolidated carrier and entitled to the benefits to which he would have been entitled if he had been employed by such carrier during all such period of military or naval service.

Another paragraph of the bill provides that no employee of any carrier shall, without his consent, have his compensation reduced, or be discharged or furloughed, in contemplation of merger or consolidation during the 6-month period immediately preceding the date of approval of such consolidation.

The bill also provides that all employees shall retain the rights provided by any collective-bargaining agreement in force upon the date of approval of such consolidation until such agreement is terminated, and, finally, provides that for the purposes of enforcement or protection of rights, privileges, and immunities, the employees of the consolidated carrier shall be entitled to the same remedies as are provided by the National Labor Relations Act in the case of employees covered by that act, and that the National Labor Relations Board and the courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction and power to enforce and protect such rights, privileges, and immunities.

Finally, the labor protective provisions do not apply to any employee whose compensation is at the rate of more than $5,000 per year.

The bill also contains certain amendments to the Communications Act of 1934 which apply to all the carriers subject to that act.

The last provision of the bill corrects an injustice that has existed for some time. It permits the telegraph carriers to charge regular rates for Government telegraph service just as the telephone companies charge regular rates for Government telephone calls.

The bill as amended by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee takes into consideration all the interests, namely first, public service; second, the Government, particularly during wartime; third, postal employees; and, fourth, Western Union employees and stockholders. All these four interests are, in the opinion of the committee, adequately protected in the bill now under consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman stated in his opening remarks that the Western Union had had no preferred stock, and that it was all common stock.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Valued at $104,000,000; that is, 1,049,000 shares at $100 each. What is the common stock of the Postal?

Mr. BULWINKLE. If the House will indulge me, I can give the whole financial set-up of the Postal. As the memorandum of the Federal Communications Commission brought out, the common and preferred stock of Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation were wiped out in the reorganization proceeding. The book value of the common and preferred stock wiped out at that time was $55,000,000. The present security holders of Postal Telegraph, Inc., received their preferred and common shares in exchange for their investment in the bonds of Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation. For each $1,000 bond they received the following securities with the market values as indicated:

| | |
|---|---|
| Present market value: | |
| Cash | $35.00 |
| 5 shares Postal Telegraph, Inc., preferred, 19½ | 97.50 |
| 20 shares Postal Telegraph, Inc., common, 1¼ | 25.00 |
| $160 principal amount income debentures of Commercial Mackay Corporation, 63¾ | 102.00 |
| $20 principal amount income debentures, series B, of All America Corporation, $0.90 | 18.00 |
| 20 shares common stock of American Cable & Radio Corporation, 4⅛ | 82.50 |
| Total present market value | 360.0 |

Instead of the primary purpose of the reorganization and the proposed merger being to pay money to speculators, the effect of the plan if present market prices were received by bondholders would be that each holder who had put in $1,000 for bonds will have received a recovery of $360, or approximately one-third of the original investment. A recent study of the stockholders' lists indicate that there are approximately 5,000 holders of Postal preferred and common stock. Of the 5,000 present holders, 3,500 of them were owners of bonds and received their stock in the reorganization so that 70 percent of the present security holders are former bondholders. Since the bondholders received 5 different kinds of securities, it is only logical that some of them should have decided to sell and recover in cash some of their former investment.

Mr. RANKIN. So it seems in that reorganization they attempted to bail out the preferred stockholders.

Mr. BULWINKLE. When that reorganization came in 1940, it was before Judge Cox in the southern district of New York, and at that time going on for 5 years, and on the reorganization plan Judge Cox called in the Securities and Exchange Commission, which he did not have to do, to pass on the question of whether it was all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if those of us who are opposed to this measure are not going to be given some time. This is one of the most important bills before the Congress, and we ought not to have a unilateral trial of the case. Those of us who are conscientiously opposed to it ought to be given adequate time.

The CHAIRMAN. The House provided for the division of time, and it is to be divided 1 hour on the majority side and 1 hour on the minority, controlled by the majority and the minority. The gentleman would have to get his time from either the minority or the majority side.

Mr. RANKIN. I have been here for an hour and a half.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I have been here for an hour and a half and the gentleman never requested that I yield him any time. This is the first time that I have heard that he wanted any time.

Mr. RANKIN. But the gentleman knows that I am opposed to the bill, and I have been here since the House met. I ask the gentleman now to yield me some time.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the minority side yield me 5 additional minutes?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes' time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to the passage of this measure. When you get right down to the bottom of it you will find, with all deference to the committee, that the real result will be to bail out a lot of big preferred stockholders, or bondholders.

The trouble with the Postal Telegraph Co. is that, like a great many other corporations, it has been expanding at the top—"mushrooming"—and in that way piling up obligations into millions and millions of dollars that it now asks you to bail out at the expense of the people you represent, because that is where this money will come from.

If you will take the list of the principal stockholders, which I hope to place in the RECORD, you will find there are a lot of big financial interests in New York that are engaged in handling the watered stock of practically every big monopoly in America. There has never been a time when monopolies were striving harder, under the cloak of patriotism, to entrench themselves and strengthen their hold on the American people than they are today.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] said they owe the United States Government $9,000,000. Then we are supposed to have a first mortgage. We should come ahead of these bondholding, watered-stock-holding speculators who are to be bailed out in order that we may ostensibly get what we have advanced this insolvent concern.

This will eliminate competition altogether in the telegraph business. Do not misunderstand it. This creates a fixed monopoly of the most dangerous kind from which we will not be able to extricate ourselves unless you do follow the trend that is suggested in the threat here of Government ownership. Now, I am not for the Government owning the telegraph business, but I am for the Government regulating it and seeing that it charges reasonable rates, which neither one of them does now.

Of all times, when business is booming as never before, I submit this is no time to come here and ask Congress to bail out this enterprise, instead of permitting it to go through the courts and wring the water out of its stock, wring the water out of its investments, wring the water out of its loans. This is no time to pass legislation of this kind.

I made the same argument when you undertook to merge the telephone companies. I have made the same fight against the big power interests that are today sapping from the people you represent $1,000,000,000 a year in overcharges for their electric lights and power.

I want to make just one comparison, since my time is limited, and there seems to be such a hurry. These gentlemen who ran out on the Dies committee yesterday seem to be in such a hurry to recreate it, I hope they do not merely "keep the word of promise to our ear and break it to the hope of the people" of this country.

I want to show you what the telephone monopoly does now. I have a telephone in my apartment just across the street in a building in which there are 100 telephones or more. I pay a flat rate of $4.20 a month, whether I ever lift the receiver or not. I pay more for my telephone than I pay for my electric bill, even here in Washington. I pay more for my telephone than I pay for the gas with which we cook our meals. Where I live, in northeastern Mississippi, where we have squeezed the water out of the power companies' investments in the lines and in the distribution systems, where we are now paying wholesale twice as much for the same power as the power company was paying 10 years ago, we have reduced the retail rates to the residential electric consumers to less than one-third and in some instances to one-tenth of what they were at that time.

I can take that $4.20 a month I pay for my phone and go there and run every light in my house. I can run my radio, the vacuum cleaner, if I have one, and if I live outside of the reach of the waterworks I can run my water pump, my washing machine, my electric stove, and my refrigerator for $4.20 a month.

You bolstered the telephone monopoly and killed the only competition we had. Now you propose to do the same thing with this telegraph company in time of war when its business is booming.

I note the sop you throw out to the laboring people connected with these two enterprises. They do not want this monopoly.

Certain influences tried to keep Benjamin Franklin from establishing our Postal System. If the Postal System today were owned by the Postal Telegraph Co. and the Western Union, which is dominated by some big stockholders at the top, it would cost you 25 cents to send a postal card from Washington to Baltimore. It would cost you $1.75 to send a postal card from here to Omaha, Nebr. It would cost me at least a dollar to send a postal card from here to my home in Mississippi.

Yet here we find that instead of curbing that monopoly, squeezing the water out of the stocks of both of them and bringing their rates down to within a reasonable reach, you propose to perpetuate the monopoly, to bail out the owners of this watered stock and to see that they get theirs and unload the burden on the people you represent, without the slightest hope of reducing the rates in the least.

Yesterday you swung toward communism, today you perpetuate monopoly, and then wonder why the American people criticize Congress.

It will probably be done by about the same roll call, or almost, I am afraid, and maybe gain a larger majority for this than there was for the other.

Today, when our boys throughout the world are fighting the battles of this Republic, the very influences in a great many instances that opposed raising their base pay to a meager $50 a month bring this pressure to bear on Congress to bail out this great enterprise with all its watered stock and all its inflated loans.

You will find that, if you get right down to the bottom of it, that certain monopolies are largely responsible for our not having any rubber in this country; you will find that the same monopoly that is using boats that would bring this country all the coffee it needs is bringing manganese from a mine in South America when we could easily mine several times that amount of manganese in the United States.

Many of us do not understand these questions because we have not gone into them, but when this one comes up, an open-and-shut case, with the record before us of a company that is concealing the value of its preferred stock—there is where the water is—you propose to bail it out by the passage of this bill. One of the most distinguished men on my side of the House in the other body admitted virtually that that would be the result of the bill. Go back and read the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to fostering monopoly at the expense of the American people; I am opposed to bailing out the owners of watered stock whether it be in a power company, a telephone company, or a telegraph company, and I for that reason propose to vote against this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. How much time have I consumed, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 32 minutes exclusive of the time yielded to the gentleman from New York.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I have been following closely for the past year and a half proposals to bail out the corporations engaged in telegraphic communications. This bill—S. 158—seeks to accomplish this purpose.

We have heard a lot of talk about telegraph corporations being in bad shape and the necessity for merger legislation to get them out of a financial hole. But I find that the sponsors of merger have ignored the only important question involved—its effect on the war effort. Great concern has been shown for the interests of the stockholders, but no examination was given to the effects of

abandonment of facilities, for instance, during wartime.

The proponents of this legislation, in their haste to get the merger bill passed, have held no hearings on it, on the ground that a year ago, when a similar bill was proposed, they heard all interested parties. Since that time, however, a bottleneck has been developing in the industry, which is exceedingly harmful to the war. But the committee in charge of this legislation pay it no heed.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I know the gentleman is always anxious to be fair in any statement he makes. He is mistaken, however, when he states that hearings were held a year ago. There were hearings during July of 1942, this past July.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But since then the committee has had no hearings on this bill; is not that correct? There have been no hearings in this session.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. There have been no hearings on this particular bill for the reason that hearings were held on a similar bill in the summer of 1942 and consideration of the bill continued until November when we were ready to report the bill, but because of the legislative situation that existed in the House at that time it was impossible for us to present it; so it seemed useless to hear the same witnesses again whom we had already heard, it being the same bill we had previously intended to bring before the House.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Except that the gentleman ignores the fact that a terrific bottleneck has developed since hearings were held on this bill. Labor's representatives wrote the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from North Carolina, I believe, requesting a hearing on this bill at this session of Congress to point out the development of this bottleneck. It seems to me that when we consider legislation of this kind which deals with a situation that is so important, we should not deny an opportunity to the representatives of the men and women who are engaged in this industry to be heard, particularly when they want to point out the disastrous effect of this bottleneck which has been rapidly developing since the hearings last summer.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I should like to proceed, if the gentleman will permit; then later I shall be pleased to yield further.

I have found from experience that the people who actually do the producing have a substantial contribution to make. They know intimately what the problems of production are, and they can and do make constructive proposals for their solution. The workers in the telegraph industry, who are closest to the scene of production, found cause for concern in the developing chaos.

As far back as 1938 telegraph labor presented evidence to a congressional committee of worsening telegraph service. Nothing was done at that time. In 1939, at the request of labor, the Senate undertook an investigation of the telegraph industry. Instead of examining the operations of the companies with respect to service to the country, the Senate investigation confined itself to the financial problems of the carriers. Telegraph service continued to deteriorate, so that in July of 1942 the Federal Communications Commission found it necessary to order an investigation of wartime telegraph service. The order stated:

It appearing that rapid, efficient, and adequate Nation-wide and world-wide telegraph service is of the utmost importance in time of war; and

It further appearing that such investigation of telegraph service is necessary in the public interest and in the interest of successful prosecution of the war;

It is ordered that an immediate investigation be undertaken to ascertain the facts concerning recorded communications services provided by carriers subject to the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

There existed at that time and exists this very day, a critical situation with regard to labor supply and training. The turn-over rates in both telegraph companies are enormous. This large turn-over is traceable directly to the miserable wages prevailing throughout the industry. It is no wonder that skilled communications workers who had spent many years developing their craft, left their chosen profession to take work in other industries which would pay them a decent living wage. This large percentage of turn-over was one of the contributing factors to the serious deterioration of telegraph service.

Inasmuch as a high degree of skill is required in many of the telegraphic operations, it is necessary to provide a sound system of training for new employees replacing those who have left the industry. Unless the turn-over is met with a new group of adequately trained operators capable of manning the circuits with the proper speed and efficiency, service in the industry deteriorates still further.

If wages are kept at a substandard level, the prospect of becoming a telegraph operator holds no incentive to the novice.

Therefore, a manpower shortage is created, and the possibility of alleviating such a shortage, which is a critical matter in an industry as vital to the war effort as communications, is almost nonexistent so long as the wages paid are such as to drive workers out of the industry. The shortage of skilled workers in the industry prevented proper maintenance of facilities with a consequent break-down of machinery and equipment, and resulting inevitably in delays which could otherwise have been avoided.

While the companies were looking forward to the juicy prospect of a profitable merger, they were utterly indifferent to the poor service being rendered the country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If this corporation is not bailed out as provided in this bill but is compelled to go into the hands of the receivers and reorganize, these employees will still stay on the roll and continue this work.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There is no question about that. The important point which I hope to make later on in my statement is the serious effect on the war effort which will result from the abandonment of facilities. This bill does not guarantee the public against the abandonment of necessary facilities. This is very, very vital. Here we are at war; we need telegraph facilities more than ever before. There is nothing in this bill that will effectively govern or control the abandonment of facilities; and, mind you, by this bill in wartime we are legislating here for the curtailment of facilities. Instead we should do everything to increase facilities. This legislation will result in the curtailment of existing facilities in many, many places throughout the country—facilities which are so vital to the war effort.

Mr. RANKIN. Does that not also take away the Government's preferential rates?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I believe it does.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, it punishes the Government on rates, as I understand, and, as I said, takes care of these big stockholders or investors.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman made the statement just now in answer to the gentleman from Mississippi that there was no provision in here which takes care of abandonments.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I said guarantee against abandonment of facilities. May I answer the gentleman in this way? The only provision here and its language, in my opinion, while not intended to be tricky, nevertheless is. It states that where service is being given to a community——

Mr. BULWINKLE. No. The gentleman has the wrong place in the bill. I call the attention of the gentleman to page 23. It must be in the public interest.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is insofar as the merger is concerned. I am talking about abandonment of facilities.

Mr. BULWINKLE. It relates to everything that is involved.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Why not so state it in the bill? Why not state it in the bill if it relates to abandonment of facilities? Why not mention that in the bill? Why not do so?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I would like to proceed. Let me say to the gentleman from North Carolina, if I may have his attention for a moment, that the point I again emphasize is the question of abandonment of facilities. Who is going to regulate abandonment of facilities? You do not give any power to the F. C. C. On that point you simply say

that where the company gives service to a community it does not have to go to the F. C. C. to abandon any of its facilities.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I want to make an observation, and I have had some experience in the telegraph business. There is no regulatory body that can guarantee against the abandonment of telegraph facilities. The figures which the gentleman has given with reference to total mileage in the United States convey no indication of what telegraph facilities really exist. With two wires, a complete metallic service, they can transmit and take from them 144 circuits, just by the use of two constructed telegraph wires.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The present law does not prohibit any abandonment of facilities.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The point is that in this legislation you do not protect the public against the abandonment of facilities.

Mr. Chairman, before the investigation by the Federal Communications Commission, which I mentioned before, was completed, a bill for consolidation and merger of communications companies was introduced into the House. Hearings were held on this bill during the latter part of July last year. At these hearings, with one outstanding exception, all the evidence offered in testimony pointed to the financial problems of the carriers and requested alleviation, in the form of the present merger bill, from their losses. The exception was labor, which considered this legislation from the point of view of its effect on the war, and made what seems to me to be very constructive proposals for gearing the communications to the war effort.

These proposals were summarized briefly in five points:

First. The establishment of a goal of 20-minute service from sender to receiver.

Second. The elimination of all nonessential services, fixed text or otherwise.

Third. The institution of a program of labor recruiting and training to provide an adequate supply of efficient, skilled personnel; the maintenance and rehabilitation of plant.

Fourth. The raising of wages from their present substandard level in order to stabilize the industry by stopping the present disastrous labor turn-over and thereby bolstering morale.

Fifth. The Government to finance the conversion program as it has similar programs in other vital war industries.

These proposals were completely ignored, and a telegraph merger bill was reported out to the Seventy-seventh Congress providing only for improving the financial position of the companies.

In the meantime the war continued, and telegraph service did not improve. So bad did the situation become that the Board of War Communications, which was set up by Executive order to "determine, coordinate, and prepare plans" for the communications industry while our Nation is at war, found it necessary to take corrective measures. Based on the findings of the investigation conducted by the Federal Communications Commission, it issued an order in December 1942 which incorporates two of the proposals embodied in the war program presented by labor which I have mentioned before. This order was issued because—

> The Board of War Communications has determined that the national defense and security and the successful conduct of the war demand that immediate steps be taken to the end that the domestic telegraph industry shall be more closely geared to the war effort.

Now, in this Seventy-eighth Congress the same merger bill is presented to us. Are we to ignore the needs of the war efforts and the security of our Nation in order to provide a financial killing for a few stockholders? Shall we close our eyes to the fact that we are at war, as this proposed bill does, and see only the financial statements of the companies? Do we propose to supersede the order of the Board of War Communications for gearing the industry more closely to the war effort? If we pass this bill in its present form we will make it impossible to carry out even the partial remedies to chaos embodied in this order.

I propose an amendment which is designed to guarantee a communications system able to carry out its wartime responsibilities. It would prohibit the abandonment of any existing telegraph facilities without authority of the Federal Communications Commission, which would hold hearings to determine whether such abandonment is in the public interest. I have heard the sponsors of the merger bill declare their interest in an efficient communications system for the war effort. They can prove their devotion to this purpose by speeding the enactment of my proposed amendment to maintain all necessary existing facilities. If my colleagues are concerned with preventing the communications companies from folding because they are essential to the war effort, then they must support my proposal, which safeguards the efficient operation of telegraphic communications for the purposes of the war.

Now, as to the labor provisions in this bill.

In none of the clauses dealing with labor do I see any clear-cut proposals for protection of employees from the effects on their jobs of a merger. The bill attempts to give the impression of affording limited safeguards to certain employees against losing their jobs. But in actual fact, the proposals contradict each other, the language is vague, and nowhere did I find adequate provision for enforcement of even what questionable guarantees the bill presently contains.

There is, however, one section of which the meaning is unmistakable. I refer to section F-8 which makes null and void the collective bargaining agreements now in force in the industry, except with regard to hours of employment. Employees who have spent a lifetime in the service of the companies would be denied the job securities and promotional rights which they now enjoy through seniority provisions in their collective bargaining agreements. Wage rates guaranteed by contract could be reduced. Vacations, holidays, sick leave, the right to submit disagreements to impartial arbitration—all of these benefits gained by the workers and now incorporated in collective bargaining agreements would be destroyed overnight.

The unions in this country have long ago proven their devotion to the cause of winning the war. Organized labor has made many sacrifices for this cause, and their contributions to increased production have received public acclaim from the agencies of Government responsible for various phases of the war effort. It is therefore inconceivable to me that we should legislate to destroy the gains made by labor in this industry through years of collective bargaining. If we are going to put the interests of profit above the interests of our country such a proposition is in order. If, however, we are interested in victory for our side in this war against Fascist barbarism, we cannot attack the American working people and legislate to destroy their unions.

I propose a series of amendments to the labor sections of S. 158 which would provide a measure of protection to the workers in the industry.

The Communications Act of 1934 as presently in force provides no limit to the foreign ownership of stocks in the domestic telegraph companies. The bill before the House, S. 158, proposes to limit to not more than 20 percent ownership or control of the capital stock of the telegraph carriers. The proposal also would limit to 20 percent the capital stock owned or controlled by aliens in the owning or holding company.

While I do not have at hand information as to the distribution of stock in the telegraph companies and am therefore not in a position to state what percentage of it is currently held or controlled by aliens, I see no reason why, if we are limiting foreign ownership and control, we do not go all the way in securing the communications systems of our country and provide for complete American ownership.

In this connection I am also proposing an amendment to that section of the Communications Act of 1934 which deals with radio communications, and I am proposing that in international communications as well we provide for complete American ownership.

The act currently permits 20 percent ownership of stock in these companies.

Especially in time of war we cannot permit any possibility of Axis penetration or control. As you are all probably well aware, stockholders in a company have certain rights, including the right to find out the identity of the other stockholders. A stockholder may bring suit against a company if he feels that his rights are

not being respected, and, under suit, he can examine the books and properties of the company. A stockholder also receives a certain amount of financial information and perhaps also operating information about the company. I say that if we are legislating in the interest of the war effort we must provide for the security of our communications systems and we must not permit any loopholes through which the enemies of our country can penetrate into such a vital service as communications.

It should be interesting to note that in 1930, during hearings held on the amendments to the Communications Act, the question of limiting foreign ownership and control was discussed. At that time Mr. Sosthenes Behn, president of International Telephone & Telegraph, made the statement at the hearings, when he was opposing the limitation to 20 percent of alien ownership of stock, that these proposals came about as a result of an exaggerated bug-a-boo about national defense. Surely that argument cannot apply today when it is no longer a matter of hypothetical national defense but the question of our Nation engaged in a struggle for survival; when our entire economy has been turned over to war production; when the thoughts and efforts and energies of all of its people are devoted to the primary task of winning the war. At such a time, gentlemen, we should close the loopholes and take no chances in impairing the security of our country.

The stated purpose of this legislation is to improve the financial condition of the telegraph carriers, and that is what the legislation as presently drafted has as its primary concern.

I refer the Members of this House to the statement of Senator BARKLEY when this bill was discussed in the Senate, at page 349 of the RECORD.

> We might as well be frank about this proposed merger legislation. It is based upon the theory that two competing telegraph companies in this country cannot succeed, and we all know that one of them is now losing money and has been losing money. The stockholders of that company have received no dividends on their stock, and in order to bail them out, as it were, we are providing for this merger of the two companies. While no company is mentioned, we all know we have in mind the Western Union and the Postal Telegraph Co.'s. By the proposed legislation we would make it possible for them to merge and consolidate, which might result in what is commonly known as the bailing out of stockholders of one of the companies by reason of the merger. They would be put upon a more solid foundation with respect to their stock.

The stock movements of the companies which would benefit from this merger are interesting evidence of what this bill seeks to accomplish. A rise of almost 350 percent in the stocks of one company for instance, which has been losing money steadily, makes me wonder, and so forth.

The speculation in stocks which has been going on ever since merger legislation has been under consideration has caused a good deal of suspicion about this proposed bill.

It is my firm belief that the speculations which have occurred around the stocks of these companies bear investigation from the Government agency responsible in such matters, and I have therefore requested the Securities and Exchange Commission to investigate the following:

First. The rapid rise in recent months in the securities of corporations engaged in domestic and foreign communications by wire, cable, and radio, particularly the Postal Telegraph & Cable Co. and the International Telegraph & Telephone Co., and the relation of such rise to the proposed merger of telegraph, radio, and cable companies.

Second. I am informed that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made available to the International Telegraph & Telephone Co. a sum in the neighborhood of $40,000,000 for certain refinancing procedures. At the same time the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, through Mr. Jones, has adopted a contrary policy toward other segments of the communications industry.

Third. There is presently inadequate information available regarding the foreign share certificates of the International Telegraph & Telephone Co. and the relation of its foreign holdings and contracts and agreements to the policies of the American company, and the effect of consolidation proposals on further penetration of control of American communications systems of Axis-controlled companies.

Unless my proposed amendments are adopted, then the only conclusion I can reach is that the merger bill is being rushed through at the expense of the war effort, and such action is against the best interest of our country. I am perfectly willing to accept in good faith my colleagues' interest in the successful prosecution of the war. If the merger bill is designed for that purpose, then its sponsors should make every effort to secure passage of my proposed amendments, which actually guarantee that communications will be able to carry the wartime burden.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that I have prepared a certain number of amendments correcting the weaknesses in the bill. At the time I offer the amendments, I will demonstrate to the House that the bill has no guaranty against abandonment of facilities, no real protection for labor, and that this bill is not in the interest of the war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have been a little amused, if not amazed, at the turn of events here today. The gentleman from Mississippi has undertaken to lecture some of us because of the action that was taken by the House yesterday. I do not know whether he figures that his position today is strengthened by the fact he finds himself on the same side on this occasion with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Indiana found himself on the same side as the gentleman from New York yesterday.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I want to say that I am very gratified to have so many people on my side.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, we all understand that and we hold both of the gentlemen in the highest affection.

Mr. Chairman, before we get too excited by some of this talk, let us take a look at the facts. In the first place, this measure has passed the other body. It has been under consideration by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House for months. Hearings were started last July and they continued for a considerable time. Everyone was given an opportunity to appear and testify who asked to appear and testify, as is constantly the custom of that committee.

When the bill was under consideration by the committee, people in the industry, interested parties, and governmental agencies were being consulted and were being heard right down to the end of the last session of the Congress.

No bottleneck has developed, to my mind, that would make it desirable that the committee, having held those exhaustive hearings, having had all these people before the committee to give their views, and having done all this work, should start out again a few months later to duplicate the whole effort.

I believe that when a bill comes from a committee that includes 25 Members of the House, 15 on one side of the aisle and 10 on the other, who consider a measure of this sort without any partisanship at all, and who go over it carefully, write and rewrite it, listening to objections here and objections there, the measure as finally drafted should not be lightly cast aside. The committee should not be disregarded because a few Members of the House, undoubtedly acting in good faith, try to create some sort of an opinion about the bill that is not sustained at all by the facts.

Take this matter of the alleged possibility of loss of facilities. If the Reconstruction Finance Corporation stops advancing about $400,000 a month to the Postal Telegraph Co., you are going to lose some facilities awfully quick. This bill is not designed to deprive the country in wartime of any needed facilities, but rather to preserve and make more efficient the facilities that are here. That is the very purpose of the bill.

Talk about bailing out. The suggestion was made by the gentleman from Mississippi, attempting to draw a red herring across the trail, that you people are going to use the money of your folks

back home to bail out some stockholders in a corporation. Who has been doing the bailing out up to date? The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with some of that money that does come from the folks back home, if it is not repaid, has been bailing out to the tune of about $400,000 a month for so long that it is now $9,000,000 into the Postal Telegraph Co.

As to the statement that this corporation ought to go through a reorganization to wring out the stockholders, it has already been through a reorganization and the stockholders have already been wrung out. I do not know how you could wring them out much more than they have already been wrung out, according to the figures and the facts given by the gentleman from North Carolina, who knows more about this bill, I suspect, than any of us because he has given more time to it.

The fact of the matter is that we are trying to stop the bailing-out process. We are trying to get this to the point where we can have one good, efficient operating company that can handle the wire telegraph business of the Nation. When we get that done, it is to be hoped that we will get to the point where we will not have to continue to put money into it.

This is not a mandatory statute. No one knows for sure whether the Western Union will take over this company. Any offer of merger by Western Union will have to be approved by the Federal Communications Commission, and can you conceive of that Commission approving any sort of an operation or plan that will deprive this country of needed facilities or that will give a great big windfall to some stockholders somewhere? And certainly the Western Union is not going to be interested in putting up that much money to effect this merger. Remember, if this merger is effected, Western Union will have to put up the money to do it. The Government will not put up the money.

As far as the employees are concerned, what better time could you have than a time like this, when there is a real shortage of manpower, to effect one of these mergers? There are jobs for everyone who wants to work in this country if he is capable of holding a job.

In the second place, as the gentleman from North Carolina has pointed out, the employees who may be displaced by reason of the merger are given absolutely the same sort of treatment that has been developed in connection with railroad abandonments and mergers over a period of years. In those cases, certainly, labor has been diligent in protecting its interest. It does seem to me that when we go to that extent we have probably gone just about as far as reason would indicate we should go.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. In the A. C. A. News of Saturday, September 28, 1940, which I believe is the paper of the telegraphers' union of the C. I. O., after the passage of the Interstate Commerce Act there appeared this headline: "Railroad Men Protected by Merger."

The article following it stated in part:

Although the labor provision in the final version of the Transportation Act is considerably modified from that contained in the original Harrington amendment, it represents a standard which will inevitably be considered in relation to employees in the communications industry who are involved in a merger or consolidation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. It says nothing about the man who pays the freight being protected, however.

Mr. BULWINKLE. What does the gentleman want, may I ask?

Mr. HALLECK. Let me answer that question.

I have just as much concern for the man who pays the freight as has the gentleman from Mississippi. There have been a few times that he and I have disagreed about some things, but I will leave it to the judgment of the Congress and the country whether he has been more diligent in protecting the taxpayer and the fellow who pays the freight than some of the rest of us. He has suggested that if you defeat this merger proposal these Postal employees will continue on the pay roll of Postal. Maybe they will, if the Government through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation continues to put up $400,000 or more every month. The stockholders are not getting any dividends, so I suppose it is all going out for salaries, wages, and the actual cost of upkeep and operation. Therefore, it seems to me that the best we could do for those people would be to try to bring about a merger that would give us one strong, efficient, active operating company, protecting, as we have, according to established precedents, the rights of employees.

The gentleman from Mississippi apparently is very much disturbed about monopoly. I remember, and so do you, when we had a lot of express companies. Now we have one express company, and I do not know that anybody has suffered particularly by that. As a matter of fact, a telegraph company is a public utility. It operates as do other public utilities, under a franchise granted by the Government, which in effect is a governmental monopoly, but in return for that franchise the utility is subjected to Federal regulation and control.

It is the theory of regulation and control by Government that rates are fixed in the public interest, and if they are not so fixed——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. HALLECK. If they are not so fixed, then the fault is of Government, that seeks to regulate, and not of industry. I have always said that you cannot have your cake and eat it, too. If you are going to have utilities, grant them franchises, and subject them to regulation, you cannot in that same system maintain free and complete competition. So, I say that with the Federal Communications Commission having authority over rates and service we should be assured that the public interest will not suffer even though the merger should be effected and we should have just one wire telegraph company.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It has been stated here that one of these companies owes the Government $9,000,000. Is it contemplated that the Western Union, if this merger can be brought about, will take up that and take care of the debts?

Mr. HALLECK. As a matter of fact, as has been said, that is the intent of a first lien. Any merger that would be worked out would have to take into consideration first the $9,000,000 that the Postal company owes the Government.

There is another matter in connection with this alleged monopoly that I would like to talk about. Competition in the field of communications is not simply between the Western Union and the Postal. Competition in that field is between domestic radio communications and telephone communications, and now air mail communications, in ever increasing quantity. So there will be a constant competition for whatever effect it may have in bringing about operation of the telegraph in the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to be one of those individuals who do not stand for Government ownership of railroads. I do not stand for Government ownership and operation of radio, or for Government ownership and operation of wire telegraph companies. But, like the sheep raiser said to his banker one time, if he did not do something about giving him a loan or an extension or some more money, the banker was soon going to be in the sheep business. That is just the situation here. If we keep on advancing R. F. C. money to Postal, we are going to have to take it over, and the Government is going to own it unless we just let it fold up and quit. If you withdraw the governmental support, then the Postal fails and the public and employees will really lose.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. What does the gentleman say about the service you might expect? Suppose we should have only one railroad? No matter how much regulation you have, would you have the scientific development of industry that is brought about there, and would not that be true of telegraph?

Mr. HALLECK. Whenever you have duplication of service without full-capacity operation of both, it is inevitable that you will not have as good service as when you have one good strong operating company, able to carry on the business.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not true that telegraph service is close to the Post Office service in service to the people? The Post Office is operated by the Government, and the Government will practically operate this, in a way. It will serve everybody; but it will be under such rules and supervision that you cannot possibly have any better service than that you will get in this merger?

Mr. HALLECK. I think so. Indeed, I think that in some instances the Federal Communications Commission has been overly enthusiastic in some of its regulatory operations.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It seems to me that the importance of service depends upon the abandonment of facilities. I do not think there is any argument as to that. Why does this committee object to having an amendment put into the bill which would simply require that before this new corporation which results from the merger can abandon any existing facilities, it must obtain a certificate of permission from the Federal Communications Commission. The gentleman is not opposed to Government regulation and should not the Government regulate the abandonment of facilities?

Mr. HALLECK. My impression about that is that that authority is in the law so far as it is necessary to insure adequate facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Indiana said that if this merger occurs the Government will, in his opinion, be protected by a first lien. Suppose the merger does not occur, is not the Government already protected by a first lien on the properties of the Postal Telegraph Co.?

Mr. HALLECK. It looks to me as if the Government has a first lien on a bankrupt, insolvent company that is falling $400,000 short in operating expenses every month. If you think that is a first lien that is worth very much, you can see further than I can.

Mr. RANKIN. And so we must bail it out at the cost of the people.

Mr. HALLECK. We are not doing that. If the merger is effected, the merged corporation will take care of it.

Mr. RANKIN. You are bailing it out at the expense of the American people.

Mr. HALLECK. I have respect for the gentleman from Mississippi, but if anybody knowing anything about the facts and the provisions of the bill can follow that line of argument, he is a mental wizard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it is not important and probably it is not interesting, but I happened to be a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which worked on this bill for many, many weeks. I have listened to the debate, although I have not heard all of it. I am sorry to say I was not present when the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] spoke. However, something has been said about the abandonment of service. That was discussed at the greatest length in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and before the subcommittee—the so-called abandonment section. It is something that was gone into with the greatest of care, because we were insistent that no community or part of any community should suffer any abandonment as a result of the merger.

Of course, we all know that in certain communities the Western Union may have a telegraph office in the principal hotel and that right across the street there may be an office of the Postal Telegraph Co. Obviously, a merger might result in the abandonment of one or the other, because it is obvious that one office might be entirely sufficient for the community. But to make it certain, we inserted this language:

> No carrier shall discontinue service to a community, or part of a community, unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that neither the present nor future public convenience and necessity will be adversely affected thereby.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The Senate bill contained different language. The Senate bill amended section 214 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to prohibit, without Commission approval, "the abandonment of a line, plant, office, or other physical facility." You took out that language which was very clear and you substituted language about abandonment of service to a community which is loose and gives the public no safeguard against abandonment of facilities. That leaves a big loophole.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now I think I can cover that.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is a big loophole.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is not a loophole at all. I beg to differ with the gentleman from New York. We ran into the difficulty of defining what is meant by the term "a line." The average layman visualizes a telegraph line as a line of poles and wires, yet when you get into the technicalities of transmission of messages by telegraph you find that there are many, many other things which are a part of a line as you thus visualize it, and without which the line, so-called, cannot work. So the following language was inserted immediately following the language which I just read:

> As used in this section the term "line" means any channel of communication established by the use of appropriate equipment—

thus improving the provision in the Senate bill and making it extend over a much wider field technically and practically.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There has been quite a lot said about bailing out a lot of bondholders and stockholders. Is there anything in the bill that would require the Western Union or anybody else to assume obligations of that sort, unless they were founded on just and right principles?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The bill specifically provides that the terms of the merger shall be O. K.'d by the Communications Commission. All the financial details, all the physical elements in it, must finally be approved by the Communications Commission.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is it reasonable to suppose that the Commission is going to bail out a lot of valueless bonds or securities if this bill is passed?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot conceive of the Commission doing it. If the Commission did I cannot conceive of the Western Union consenting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the committee which brings this bill into the House; I do not claim to be familiar with all the advantages or disadvantages of this proposed merger. The information I have on the entire subject is very limited; it consists mainly of an address by Senator AIKEN which may be found on pages 590 to 593 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under date of February 4. It seems to me that anybody who will read what is contained in those pages will not vote for what I consider to be one of the biggest grabs that has been before Congress in a good many years.

Leaving wholly outside of the question the advantages of a merger, or the disadvantages, from other standpoints, the real thing that is coming before us this morning is whether we in Congress in wartime are going to permit a bill to go through here that means to put $12,500,000 into the coffers of a few men, most of whom live in New York City and are stockbrokers and stock manipulators. That is one big phase of the question.

I call attention to the fact that if the Postal Telegraph Co. is bankrupt, it is not a new thing, but something that has existed a long period of time, and its bankruptcy was caused in years gone by by high salaries and corporation mismanagement and stock-jobbing manipulations. That is what brought its bankruptcy. There was more water in its stock than the corporation could stand.

Here are some facts about this bill: When this merger came before the House, almost a year ago, there was one brokerage house in New York City which held 40,325 shares of Postal Telegraph stock. Five months later Congress took this bill up and there seemed to be a

good chance of its passage. The holdings of this one stock-holding-and-selling company increased to 121,656 shares. A money-wise stock-jobbing concern in New York City is sufficiently interested in a bankrupt corporation to invest that much money in that many shares.

Here is another thing: During 1942, while this bill was before the last Congress, the shares of stock sold as low as $9.50. It has continually risen and on January 23, 2 days before this bill passed the other body, it had risen to $18.78; and on February 3, about 10 days after its passage in the Senate, it had increased in price to $19.50. I do not know much about the number of shares of the Postal Telegraph Co.; all I know is what I read on page 592 of the RECORD, in which it is stated that there were 256,770 shares of preferred stock and 1,027,079 shares of common stock. Having this in mind, and considering the price of $9.50 in 1942, as against $19.50 a week ago, multiply it by the number of shares, and it is quite apparent that somebody over there in New York City, where they manipulate stocks, and where they are in this merger game and have been for years, stands to make a profit of approximately $12,500,000.

This bill amounts to a congressional license or authority for that lot of stock gamblers to grab that much money from the merger. It is easy to see why the big speculators bought the stock in a bankrupt company. They were counting on Congress passing this bill to make their deal profitable. If we pass it, they will be the gainers and the public will be the loser.

I have long been suspicious of merger bills, not because of my experience in the stock market, for I come from a long distance away and have had no experience in stock gambling, but I recall many times that when mergers were passed upon by Congress, somebody made a lot of money. There were the mergers and the reorganizations of numerous railway corporations, for instance. There were the machinations of the Pacific railways years ago through which bills passed Congress to authorize mergers, reorganizations, and nearly every form of corporation skulduggery, which cost our Nation billions of dollars. This is another measure of a similar type. Ostensibly intended to benefit a bankrupt concern, it reeks with the same kind of jobbery which all too often receives congressional sanction. I am opposed to the bill, and I shall vote against it. I wish I had longer time to discuss it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to take the time of the committee so much in this debate, but I want to keep the record straight. There has been some talk about pulling somebody out. Let us just get the facts; let me give them to you just as they are. The implication of this statement is that the present shareholders of Postal Telegraph, Inc., have acquired their stock at low prices and that they would make a substantial profit because of the passage of this legislation and the resulting consolidation of the companies. While it is undoubtedly true that some shareholders are in this position, the record clearly indicates that so far as the great majority of the shareholders are concerned, the legislation and resulting consolidation will neither produce a profit nor even restore to these investors their original investment in the company.

The shares of Postal Telegraph, Inc., came into existence as a result of the default and reorganization of the old Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation. That corporation had outstanding $50,670,210 of 5% bonds which was followed by $30,000,000 of preferred stock and $25,000,000 of common stock. That corporation paid interest on its bonds until January 1, 1935, after which the company went into bankruptcy and was reorganized. As part of the reorganization, the $30,000,000 of preferred stock and the $25,000,000 of common stock were wiped out and all the assets of the company were given to the $50,670,210 bondholders. These bondholders received for their original investment some cash and various securities of the new companies which were created to acquire the assets of the bankrupt company. Among these securities were the entire outstanding shares of Postal Telegraph, Inc., namely 256,769.9 shares of Postal Telegraph, Inc., preferred stock and 1,027,079.6 shares of common stock. The significant point which is here emphasized is that the shares of Postal now outstanding came into existence by virtue of an exchange of these shares for an investment which was originally represented by bonds.

The question now arises as to whether the outstanding shares are still retained by those people who originally held the $50,670,210 of bonds or whether they are now held by people who have been characterized as "speculators." It is certainly true that some part of the shares are held by people who were not originally investors in the bonds, but by far the great bulk of the present stockholders are those individuals who were original creditors of the old company. The following facts measure the relative size of these two groups.

The only way of ascertaining how many of the present shareholders were original creditors is by comparing the names and amounts of present shareholders with those who owned the old bonds for which they were exchanged. This is a laborious study to make, but such a study was made as of March 1, 1942, and the following figures are taken from that study.

As of March 1, 1942, there were a total of 5,269 stockholders of the present company owning 256,769.9 shares of preferred stock and 1,027,079.6 shares of common stock. Of these shareholders, 3,592 were formerly creditors of the old company who, incident to the reorganization, received shares of Postal Telegraph, Inc., in exchange for their original investment in bonds. These individuals now hold 202,392 shares of preferred stock and 809,513 shares of common stock. In other words, 78 percent of the preferred stock and 79 percent of the common stock are still held by people who originally held $45,518,539 of the old bonds. These people presumably are not speculators. They have retained their investment in Postal for many years and they have received no income since January 1, 1935. Their total investment has depreciated substantially from the original figure of $45,518,539.

Incident to the reorganization these original investors received in addition to the shares of Postal preferred and common stock, some cash and securities in the other companies which were formed to acquire the assets of the bankrupt company. The present value of all the securities and cash they received aggregates only $16,573,229, or substantially less than the original investment of $45,518,539. Expressed in terms of an individual, the original investor who invested $1,000 in the bonds of the old Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation has today cash and securities received in exchange for that investment which are valued at only $363. Even if the Postal preferred stock were to receive in consolidation its par value of $60 a share—as against its present price of $20 a share—the original investor would have recovered only $563 out of his original investment of $1,000.

From the facts this conclusion can clearly be drawn: The great majority of the present stockholders of Postal are people who originally invested substantial amounts in the Postal Telegraph system and who will not even recover their original investment in the event of merger. The so-called "speculators" who will make a profit as a result of merger are a small minority of the present stockholders and their holdings represent even a smaller portion of the total holdings.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I also yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, we are deciding here today really just one thing, one very vital, important, and fundamental issue. The thing we are deciding today is whether or not we want the Government to enter this field of business in competition with private enterprise or whether we want to permit this failing company to be taken over by way of merger with a substantial private concern that is now on its feet.

Mr. GWYNNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. What is the actual value of the physical property of the Postal Telegraph Co.?

Mr. BOREN. I cannot say exactly all of the value that is represented in their paper and everything else but I would guess in the neighborhood of $40,000,000.

Mr. GWYNNE. The Government could get its money out in any event?

Mr. BOREN. If the Government takes it over to get its money out and sells the physical property to the present company or any other source it may sell it to, the result would be the loss of the use of those facilities at this time, when

the use of the facilities is of value to the Nation.

Fundamentally, the question we are going to decide today is whether or not you want the Government to go into this field of business. It is not logical for the Government to go ahead with this constant lending that there is no hope for repayment on, other than the hope that is embodied in this bill by permitting—and I want to emphasize the fact that this is permissive legislation—this solvent company to meet that obligation that the Postal Telegraph Co. cannot meet.

We have heard a great deal of talk here about monopoly. I want to point out in the first place that the Postal Telegraph Co. does less than 15 percent of the communication business at this time in that field; so far as monopoly is concerned Western Union has closely approached that long ago.

The intimations that Western Union wants this consolidation is far afield from the truth. The only element of desire that could stimulate Western Union to want to take over this unprofitable portion of the communications business is what stimulation there would be to keeping the Government out of competition with them as a private business, and I am certain that is the basic motivation.

Postal Telegraph wants this merger for one reason only. They have got to do one of two things. They must continue to receive these ridiculous loans from the Government that they know they can never repay as they operate at present, or else they must fold up and let the Government take it over unless we permit them to salvage something by selling what they have to offer to a company that is solvent.

This bill is entirely consistent with the policy adopted by Congress in all similar cases. In the case of all public utilities that are under Federal regulation, we have permitted consolidation and merger.

The Federal regulation principle is the basis on which we have permitted consolidations and mergers of railroads, motor carriers, and water carriers, all of which is permitted under section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, and that has been established as a permanent policy on our part.

Consolidations and mergers of telephone companies are permitted under section 221 of the Communications Act of 1934.

Consolidations and mergers of air carriers are permitted under section 408 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. While we are talking about how vital aviation is in this war and in this Nation's future, may I say there was a provision where the Congress in its wisdom permitted the maintenance of these facilities and services where a company, because of its financial structure, could not go ahead, and permit a stronger company to step in to bridge the gap that would be created.

So far as I am aware, telegraph companies are the only public utilities now under Federal regulation that are not now—under the permanent legislative policy established by this Congress—permitted to effect consolidations and mergers.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal said about subjects tangent to this issue. I want to assure you that the seven men who studied this bill studied it with great care and concern. The great Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that reported this bill unanimously did so only after a careful consideration of all the factors that were involved. I myself particularly went into this question of possible profiteering in stock transactions.

In the first place, the fallacy of that assumption rests on the assertion that the Western Union will buy these securities at anything more than their actual value. Remember that this legislation is permissive. Remember that this legislation only extends to this field the principle and policy already established for all other fields where public utilities have been regulated by the Federal Government. That inference is strictly a fallacy. There is no logic at all in the assumption that the Western Union would buy in these shares at whatever their market price might be.

As far as the Government is concerned the vast amount of money we have invested in the form of a loan subsidy to keep Postal Telegraph going we hope to get back by this merger. Western Union is willing to assume these obligations to a point that is consistent with an economic program.

We have a second hold against any such manipulation or any such profits, charges concerning which have been made here. In the first place, the economics of it prevent it. In the second place, the Government regulation over such a merger prevents it. If you will read lines 13 to 15 on page 23 of this bill, I am sure any doubt that might linger in your minds on that point will be erased. That entire section deals with this very question.

You will notice that in the consolidation everything is to be combed for the public interest involved and every agreement reached must be O. K.'d by the Government agency that is going to look after the public interest in the event of consolidation.

There are a thousand and one things I should like to point out as erroneous in some of the discussion here, but I want to talk only a moment or two more. I do want to emphasize that the whole and sole point that is fundamental in this bill is the decision as to whether or not we prefer the Government to enter this field of enterprise, and that is what it will have to do or else continue forever this system of losses and maintain it under Government subsidy. We must determine whether we want the Government to enter this field or leave it in regulated private hands.

A great deal has been said about the employees and the treatment we have provided for them in this merger legislation. We have guaranteed to every employee of the Postal Telegraph Co. that there will be no alteration in the conditions of his employment. We have said in this bill what I really think is far more than justice dictates we should have said. We have said that for 4 years after the date of this merger no employee will have his employment situation changed in such a way that it will be less than the status of his present employment situation. In addition, we have guaranteed that any employees who may have gone into the service must be given a place in the merged corporation when they come back. We have extended to them other guaranties in the way of providing for the cost of the relocation of people transferred or removed.

I cannot imagine any man with reason wishing to ask anything beyond what we have accorded here. I do not mind telling you frankly that I felt that it was going too far to guarantee that their pay and conditions of employment would for 4 years not be made worse than their present situation, whether or not their services were needed. However, all agreed to it as a reasonable compromise.

Mr. Chairman, in order to save this country from Government entrance into this field and from what it would mean if the Government should operate this business, I urge my colleagues to permit this merger so that we can continue to have this business in the hands of private enterprise.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, seemingly there has been considerable heat as well as some light on this subject, and I can realize the reason for that, because legislation of this kind is very intricate and very much involved, and many times it is quite difficult for members of the committee themselves to understand some of the questions that are involved, even after weeks and weeks of study. Yet, in the short time I have today, I shall endeavor to sum up some of the questions that have been brought out here and perhaps give in a brief manner the answers to some of these questions.

Let us in the very beginning understand that under present conditions there cannot even be a discussion between the Western Union and the Postal Telegraph Cos. as to the possibility of a merger. In order that a merger can even be considered legally, it is necessary that Congress pass legislation giving permission for negotiations for such a merger. This bill does not make a merger necessary or mandatory. It simply gives permission for the merger to be made.

How is the merger to be made? After the legislation is enacted into law, the telegraph companies will discuss their problems as to how they may merge. Any agreement they may reach must be brought before the Federal Communications Commission, and that Commission must give its approval.

There is some talk here about the financial value or worth of the Postal Telegraph Co. Nobody knows exactly what that is. That will depend a great deal upon what the Western Union is

willing to give for it, what it is appraised at, and what the actual value is fixed at after all these consultations and conversations are over. It will also depend a great deal upon what the Commission itself believes it is worth.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FORD. Will the Government come out clean?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The Government will come out clean. Let me go ahead and I will explain that.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It has been alleged here by Members that this is a scheme to bail out security holders. May I ask for the sake of the record what that will cost the Government?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am glad to answer that question because the fact of the matter is that it will not cost the Government anything. Instead, it will save the Government money.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If that is the case, I should like to have someone here in the House tell me who is hurt.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No one is hurt under the bill; in fact, everyone is helped. That is the reason the legislation is here.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman explain section 6 of the bill, which eliminates the authority to grant preference rates to the Government on official business?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I will explain that in just one minute. I want to answer this other question first.

The Postal Co. has been running behind and has been a money-losing venture for many years. In 1940 it was necessary that the Postal Co. reorganize, and I think, at that time, if you will check the record regarding all this water that you have seen flowing around this Hall this afternoon, you will find that it was squeezed out of the Postal Co. at that time. Since that time Postal has continued to lose money, and the Government, in order to guarantee service to many of the communities, some of which are the site of great war plants and war industries, encampments, and military and naval establishments, have advanced money to keep this particular company in business, until the Government has loaned the company a total of $9,000,000. That amount of R. F. C. money is now invested in the Postal Co. If this bill is passed, of course, the Federal Communications Commission is not going to permit any merger that does not protect the interests of the Government, and let me say right there that the Federal Communications Commission, the Army, and the Navy, and every governmental agency that appeared before our committee favored this bill and this merger, and they all asked for it.

Some talk has been had that somebody is going to make some money by the stock going up. Of course the stock went up. Let us apply our own common sense to that question. If any of you men or women here had stock in a corporation which, under the law, you could not sell, and that company was losing money month after month, and it appeared that the only answer would be that you were just hanging on until you lost every cent of your investment, the company wiped out, and your stock become worthless; and then it reached the point where there was an opportunity to sell the company to somebody else, so that you would receive back whatever your equity might be worth, of course the stock might increase in market value and be worth something. But when you figure its present value at $19, and you know that the present stockholders started out with a $1,000 bond, then they are not going to get very much out of it. Of course some smart boy, if you want to say so, may have seen this thing coming and may have bought some of these shares, but there has not been much of that, and the Government first gets out its $9,000,000, and the Government is really the one that is being bailed out in this proposition.

This bill does give protection to labor. I have heard some discussions on the floor about what it does for labor. It guarantees to every man in the Postal Telegraph Co., every employee, that when the company is merged, he will be guaranteed employment equal to the time he has already served with the Postal Co., up to 4 years. In other words, if a man has worked for the Postal Co. 3 months, he is guaranteed employment for 3 months; if he has worked for the Postal Co for 4 years, he is guaranteed 4 years of employment, but if he has worked for the Postal Co. for 10 years, he is guaranteed only 4 years' employment, and if a man cannot sell himself and his work in 4 years, then he certainly is not entitled to be considered or to be held on for 10 years, because he would not be worthy of it.

Let me also say in this connection that this is the best time in the world to merge two companies like this, because of the employment situation. There is a shortage of manpower. These companies are looking for help right now, and it is certain that every one of these employees of both companies will have positions waiting for them. Talk about protecting the rights of labor. I wonder how much any retirement pension might be worth to any employee of the Postal Co. if the Postal Co. is forced entirely out of business? They are taken care of under this proposition. Those workers who have retired under the Postal retirement system continue to draw exactly the same amount, and that is provided for in this bill. They are blanketed under the Western Union system. There is one other thought, and I am going to speak frankly about it, because it has not been discussed so far. At the present time the employees of the Postal Co. are not receiving quite as high rate of pay as are the employees of the Western Union Co. What will actually happen is this, if these two companies are merged: The present employees of the Postal Co. who are taken over and will become employees of the Western Union will actually receive a wage increase. Why? Because the Western Union cannot possibly pay its own employees one rate of pay, and the other employees, the new ones that come to them, another rate of pay, and actually there will be an increase in pay for the employees who go to the Western Union from the Postal.

We have had a little quarrel among the labor boys and I think that should be cleared up by being frank about it. The employees of the Western Union, and there are about 38,000 of them, exclusive of the messengers, are organized by the American Federation of Labor. The employees of the Postal Co., exclusive of the messengers, and there are something like 9,000 of them, come under the C. I. O.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes more.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Naturally when these two companies merge, and all become employees of the Western Union, the great majority, being members of the A. F. of L., will swing the whole group to the American Federation of Labor membership. That is the provision of the National Labor Relations Board ruling, as I understand it, and, of course, the C. I. O. officials now representing the men in the Postal employ will be out, because there will be no business for them to do, and I do not blame them a bit for the fight that they have made to keep their own jobs.

I want to answer one other question, which came up in committee when I happened to be ill, and that is the provision as to Government rates. Let me say to you that the only form of communication that is giving any special rates to the Government is the telegraph companies. The Government pays full rates for all telephone messages. These telegraph companies insist that they have been handling Government business at a loss. They contend that it is not fair to make them handle Government business at a loss when they have received no help from the Government and permit other forms of communication to receive full compensation.

This measure would increase the telegraphic cost, over-all, to the Government, as I understand it, approximately $1,000,000 a year under present conditions, or about $500,000 a year under normal conditions. It would make the Government pay a fair rate for the communications that they send by telegraph and would put an end to having the telegraph companies handle Government business at a loss.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has made a fine explanation of that section of the bill, but there is one other argument that I think the membership ought

to know about. Here is a utility that is under governmental regulation. It requires a certain amount of income to transmit messages, Government and private. If the Government has a 40-percent deduction on its messages, then, of necessity, the rate that the individual has to pay is higher in order to compensate for that lower rate to the Government. Is it not more equitable that the rate be the same for everybody and that instead of the private sender of a message having to make up the deficit on the Government's message, that whatever is necessarily to be paid by the Government should be paid out of the revenues of the Government? In a word, the elimination of the 40-percent discount to the Government should result in a lowering of the rates generally to everybody?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think that is absolutely correct.

I want to go on from here and conclude by pointing out that all of the rates that are charged by telegraph companies, as well as by the telephone companies, come under the purview and control of the Federal Communications Commission. There is not going to be any monopolistic gouging of the public, because we have an agency of government established to see that that thing does not happen, and that the lowest possible rates are given to the public for the communications they use. I believe that each and every one of you who knows anything about the make-up of the Federal Communications Commission will agree with me that at least that Commission is not controlled by any public utility. Right in the midst of wartime they have compelled great reductions in telephone rates. Certainly they will not look with any particular favor at least upon granting rates to telegraph companies that will permit any large melons to be cut by the stockholders. The complaint that we receive in our committee is that the Federal Communications Commission is really too strict as to rates and really cut them too low.

I think this bill as a whole is absolutely necessary. Let me say it passed the Senate by an almost unanimous vote. It has the support of every agency of Government that has appeared before our committee. There is no objection by any agency of Government, and I believe it will receive the support of this House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as may remain.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Does the rate on international communications enter into this picture at all?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. No. Mr. Chairman, there is little to be said at this time other than what has already been said. I merely want to take the opportunity to impress upon the House the fact that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce gave this matter very careful and serious consideration over a period of months. This legislation was not brought to the floor of the House without due consideration. We recognized that principles and policies were involved that required the most careful consideration and study. After the committee had given it the careful consideration that it deserved, the bill was brought to the floor of this House with a unanimous report of the committee.

In addition to that, may I emphasize the fact that in the hearings which were conducted by the committee, opportunity was given to every department of Government that would be interested in the solution of this important matter. The result was that without exception every governmental agency that appeared before us or sent communications to the committee expressed unqualified approval of the merger of these two telegraph companies. In fact, anyone who will give the matter even cursory study will come to the conclusion that there was nothing to do under existing conditions other than to provide by appropriate legislation for the merger of these two companies. The existing circumstances leave no doubt that the Postal Telegraph Co. can operate only so long as the Government is willing to advance the necessary funds. It has already been stated that the Government, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is advancing to the Postal Telegraph Co. approximately $400,000 a month. As a result of these advances an indebtedness has arisen which at the present time is approximately $9,000,000. Under these circumstances only one of two things could happen. That would be either the closing down entirely of the Postal Telegraph Co. by refusal of the Government, through R. F. C., to advance additional funds, or for the Government itself to take over the operation of the Postal Telegraph Co. I have heard no expression of sentiment in this House, either on the floor or off the floor, that would indicate a desire upon the part of anyone to see the Government take over the operation of the telegraph system of the Postal Telegraph Co. or any other telegraph company. There is a very definite sentiment against Government ownership or operation of the telegraph systems of this country. Therefore there was no other solution left than to provide by proper legislation for the consolidation or merger of those two companies and the taking over thereby of the Postal Telegraph by the Western Union.

In fixing the conditions under which merger or consolidation could be accomplished, the committee was just as alert as any Member of this House who has spoken in opposition to this bill in making certain that nothing detrimental to the public welfare would result from a merger or consolidation of these two companies under the provisions of this bill. Any such merger would be subject to the approval of the Federal Communications Commission. The Commission is given power to approve or disapprove. Provisions were placed in the bill by the committee to eliminate the possibility of any conditions of a monopolistic character being created.

I doubt if anyone believes any such danger exists. The regulation that has been provided for under the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission is sufficient to protect the public welfare. In this connection it is also appropriate to point out that provision has been made in this bill to make certain that there shall be adequate service continued throughout the Nation even though there might be only one telegraph company operating. It is also important to realize that the terms of consolidation or merger must be submitted to the Federal Communications Commission before any proposed agreement becomes effective, and the Commission is given power under this bill either to approve or disapprove or to approve with modifications the proposed merger. Thus the public interest has been adequately taken care of by the provisions of this bill.

In the moment that remains may I emphasize the fact that the War and Navy Departments have given their approval of this act.

A statement was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] to the effect that it was a poor time, because of war conditions, to provide for such a merger. On the contrary, both the War and the Navy Departments have taken the position that it should be done now in order that the war may be fought effectively. May I read from the testimony of Brig. Gen. Frank E. Stoner, of the United States Army, before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce? He said:

> The War Department considers this bill a sound, realistic, and carefully considered approach to a solution of a grave problem in the communications industry of this Nation. The maintenance of a strong, cohesive, and far-flung communications system is vital to the successful prosecution of the war.
>
> The War Department favors immediate consolidation of the telegraph companies in the interest of economy in the use of critical equipment, materials, and personnel, all of which are necessary now for the use of important defense communications projects. A merger of the domestic telegraph systems of record communications will avoid duplication of facilities and result in a stable and comprehensive service.
>
> The War Department is vitally concerned with the security of its message traffic and the prevention of important military information from being viewed by disloyal personnel. Consolidation will limit surveillance to one commercial carrier, one list of operating personnel, and one operating procedure, thereby permitting a single and effective communications security plan.

A similar view was also presented to the committee in a communication from Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War. Likewise, James Forrestal, Acting Secretary of the Navy, gave his approval on behalf of the Navy Department. In his communication, addressed to the committee, he said:

> With reference to the proposed consolidation or merger of communication facilities

in the domestic field, the War and Navy Departments are in accord that present conditions demand congressional authorization to that end.

In conclusion, may I point out that in both the House and Senate hearings last spring and summer there was unanimous endorsement of the necessity for and the principle of legislation for consolidation of domestic telegraph carriers. This testimony was given by the Federal Communications Commission, the Board of War Communications, the Army, the Navy, the Department of State, the Department of Labor, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It was the testimony of all of these governmental agencies that consolidation of telegraph carriers was in the best interests of the public, the Government, the employees in the industry, and the prosecution of the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of title II the following new section:

"CONSOLIDATIONS AND MERGERS OF TELEGRAPH CARRIERS

"SEC. 222. (a) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'consolidation or merger' includes the legal consolidation or merger of two or more corporations, and the acquisition by a corporation through purchase, lease, or in any other manner, of the whole or any part of the property, securities, facilities, services, or business of any other corporation or corporations, or of the control thereof, in exchange for its own securities, or otherwise.

"(2) The term 'domestic telegraph carrier' means any common carrier by wire or radio, the major portion of whose traffic and revenues is derived from domestic telegraph operations; and such term includes a corporation owning or controlling any such common carrier.

"(3) The term 'international telegraph carrier' means any common carrier by wire or radio, the major portion of whose traffic and revenues is derived from international telegraph operations; and such term includes a corporation owning or controlling any such common carrier.

"(4) The term 'consolidated carrier' means any carrier by wire or radio which acquires or operates the properties and facilities unified and integrated by consolidation or merger.

"(5) The term 'domestic telegraph operations' includes acceptance, transmission, reception, and delivery of record communications by wire or radio which either originate or terminate at points within the continental United States, Alaska, Canada, St. Pierre-Miquelon, Mexico, or Newfoundland and terminate or originate at points within the continental United States, Alaska, Canada, St. Pierre-Miquelon, Mexico, or Newfoundland, and includes acceptance, transmission, reception, or delivery performed within the continental United States between points of origin within and points of exit from, and between points of entry into and points of destination within, the continental United States with respect to record communications by wire or radio which either originate or terminate outside the continental United States, Alaska, Canada, St. Pierre-Miquelon, Mexico, and Newfoundland, and also includes the transmission within the continental United States of messages which both originate and terminate outside but transit through the continental United States.

"(6) The term 'international telegraph operations' includes acceptance, transmission, reception, and delivery of record communications by wire or radio which either originate or terminate at points outside the continental United States, Alaska, Canada, St. Pierre-Miquelon, Mexico, and Newfoundland, but does not include acceptance, transmission, reception, and delivery performed within the continental United States between points of origin within and points of exit from, and between points of entry into, and points of destination within, the continental United States with respect to such communications, or the transmission within the continental United States of messages which both originate and terminate outside but transit through the continental United States.

"(7) The terms 'domestic telegraph properties' and 'domestic telegraph facilities' mean properties and facilities, respectively, used or to be used in domestic telegraph operations.

"(8) The term 'employee' or 'employees' (i) shall include any individual who is absent from active service because of furlough, illness, or leave of absence, except that there shall be no obligation upon the consolidated carrier to reemploy any employee who is absent because of furlough, except in accordance with the terms of his furlough, and (ii) shall not include any employee of any carrier which is a party to a consolidation or merger pursuant to this section to the extent that he is employed in any business which such carrier continues to operate independently of the consolidation or merger.

"(9) The term 'representative' includes any individual or labor organization.

"(10) The term 'continental United States' means the several States and the District of Columbia.

"(b) (1) It shall be lawful, upon application to and approval by the Commission as hereinafter provided, for any two or more domestic telegraph carriers to effect a consolidation or merger; and for any domestic telegraph carrier, as a part of any such consolidation or merger or thereafter, to acquire all or any part of the domestic telegraph properties, domestic telegraph facilities, or domestic telegraph operations of any carrier which is not primarily a telegraph carrier:

*Provided*, That, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, no domestic telegraph carrier shall effect a consolidation or merger with any international telegraph carrier, and no international telegraph carrier shall effect a consolidation or merger with any domestic telegraph carrier.

"(2) As a part of any such consolidation or merger, or thereafter upon application to and approval by the Commission as hereinafter provided, the consolidated carrier may acquire all or any part of the domestic telegraph properties, domestic telegraph facilities, or domestic telegraph operations of any international telegraph carrier.

"(c) Whenever any transaction is proposed under subsection (b) of this section, the telegraph carrier or telegraph carriers seeking authority therefor shall submit an application to the Commission, and thereupon the Commission shall order a public hearing to be held with respect to such application and shall give reasonable notice thereof, in writing, and an opportunity to be heard, to the Governor of each of the States in which any of the physical property involved in such proposed transaction is situated, to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of State, and to such other persons as the Commission may deem advisable. If, after such public hearing, the Commission finds that, subject to such terms and conditions, and such modifications, as it shall find to be just and reasonable, the proposed transaction, or an amended proposal with respect thereto, (1) is authorized by subsection (b) of this section, (2) conforms to all other applicable provisions of this section, and (3) is in the public interest, the Commission shall enter an order approving and authorizing such transaction upon the terms and conditions, and with the modifications, so found to be just and reasonable, and thereupon any law or laws which would otherwise make such transaction unlawful shall not apply with respect thereto. In finding whether any proposed transaction is in the public interest, the Commission shall give due consideration, among other things, to the soundness of the plan and the corporate and financial structure of the consolidated carrier.

"(d) No proposed consolidation or merger of telegraph carriers pursuant to this section shall be approved by the Commission if, as a result of such consolidation or merger, more than one-fifth of the capital stock of any carrier which is subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission will be owned or controlled, or voted, directly or indirectly, (1) by any alien or the representative of any alien, (2) by any foreign government or the representative thereof, (3) by any corporation organized under the laws of any foreign government, or (4) by any corporation of which any officer or director is an alien, or of which more than one-fifth of the capital stock is owned or controlled, or voted, directly or indirectly, by any alien or the representative of any alien, by any foreign government or the representative thereof, or by any corporation organized under the laws of a foreign government.

"(e) (1) In the case of any consolidation or merger of telegraph carriers pursuant to this section, the consolidated carrier shall, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, distribute among the international telegraph carriers, telegraph traffic by wire or radio destined to points without the continental United States, and divide the charges for such traffic, in accordance with such just, reasonable, and equitable formula in the public interest as the interested carriers shall agree upon and the Commission shall approve: *Provided, however*, That in case the interested carriers should fail to agree upon a formula which the Commission approves as above provided, the Commission, after due notice and hearing, shall prescribe in its order approving and authorizing the proposed consolidation or merger a formula which it finds will be just, reasonable, equitable, and in the public interest, will be, so far as is consistent with the public interest, in accordance with the existing contractual rights of the carriers, and will effectuate the purposes of this subsection.

"(2) In the case of any consolidation or merger pursuant to this section of telegraph carriers which, immediately prior to such consolidation or merger, interchanged traffic with telegraph carriers in a contiguous foreign country, the consolidated carrier shall distribute among such foreign telegraph carriers, telegraph traffic by wire or radio destined to points in such contiguous foreign country and shall divide the charges therefor, in accordance with such just, reasonable, and equitable formula in the public interest as the interested carriers shall agree upon and the Commission shall approve: *Provided, however*, That in case the interested carriers should fail to agree upon a formula which the Commission approves as above provided, the Commission, after due notice and hearing, shall prescribe in its order approving and authorizing the proposed consolidation or merger a formula which it finds will be just, reasonable, equitable, and in the public interest, will be, so far as is consistent with the public interest, in accordance with the existing contractual rights of the carriers,

and will effectuate the purposes of this subsection. As used in this paragraph, the term 'contiguous foreign country' means Canada, Mexico, or Newfoundland.

"(3) Whenever, upon a complaint or upon its own initiative, and after a full hearing, the Commission finds that any such distribution of telegraph traffic among telegraph carriers, or any such division of charges for such traffic, which is being made or which is proposed to be made, is or will be unjust, unreasonable, or inequitable, or not in the public interest, the Commission shall by order prescribe the distribution of such telegraph traffic, or the division of charges therefor, which will be just, reasonable, equitable, and in the public interest, and will be, so far as is consistent with the public interest, in accordance with the existing contractual rights of the carriers.

"(4) For the purposes of this subsection, the international telegraph operations of any domestic telegraph carrier shall be considered to be the operations of an independent international telegraph carrier, and the domestic telegraph operations of any international telegraph carrier shall be considered to be the operations of an independent domestic telegraph carrier.

"(f) (1) As a condition of its approval of any consolidation or merger under this section, the Commission shall require a fair and equitable arrangement, consistent with the provisions of this subsection, to protect the interests of the employees of any carrier which is a party to such consolidation or merger. In its order of approval the Commission shall include terms and conditions providing that during the period of 4 years from the date of such approval such consolidation or merger will not result in such employees being in a worse position with respect to their compensation or character of employment, except that the protection afforded to any employee pursuant to this sentence shall not be required to continue for a longer period, following such date of approval than the period during which such employee was in the employ of such carrier or carriers prior to such date of approval. As used in this paragraph the term 'compensation' shall not include compensation attributable to overtime not guaranteed by collective bargaining agreements.

"(2) For a period of 4 years after the date of approval of any such consolidation or merger, any employee of any carrier which is a party to such consolidation or merger who was such an employee on such date of approval, and who is discharged as a result of such consolidation or merger, shall have a preferential hiring and employment status for any position for which he is qualified by training and experience over any person who has not theretofore been an employee of any such carrier.

"(3) If any employee is transferred from one community to another, as a result of any such consolidation or merger, the carrier resulting therefrom shall pay, in addition to such employee's regular compensation as an employee of such carrier, the actual traveling expenses of such employee and his family, including the cost of packing, crating, drayage, and transportation of household goods and personal effects.

"(4) In the case of any consolidation or merger pursuant to this section, the consolidated carrier shall accord to every employee or former employee, or representative or beneficiary of an employee or former employee, of any carrier which is a party to such consolidation or merger, the same pension rights, and health, disability, or death insurance benefits, as were provided for, under comparable conditions, prior to the date of approval of the consolidation or merger, under any agreement or plan of any carrier which is a party to the consolidation or merger which covered the greatest number of the employees affected by the consolidation or merger; except that in any case in which, prior to the date of approval of the consolidation or merger, an individual has exercised his right of retirement, or any right to health, disability, or death insurance benefits has accrued, under any agreement or plan of any carrier which is a party to the consolidation or merger, pension rights, or health, disability, or death insurance benefits, as the case may be, shall be accorded in conformity with the agreement or plan under which such individual exercised such right of retirement or under which such right to benefits accrued. For purposes of determining and according the rights and benefits specified in this paragraph, any period spent in the employ of the carrier of which such individual was an employee at the time of the consolidation or merger shall be considered to have been spent in the employ of the consolidated carrier. The application for approval of any consolidation or merger under this section shall contain a guaranty by the proposed consolidated carrier that there will be no impairment of any of the rights or benefits specified in this paragraph.

"(5) Any employee who, since August 27, 1940, has left a position, other than a temporary position, in the employ of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger, for the purpose of entering the military or naval forces of the United States, shall be considered to have been in the employ of such carrier during the time he is a member of such forces, and, upon making an application for employment with the consolidated carrier within 40 days from the time he is relieved from service in any of such forces under honorable conditions, such former employee shall be employed by the consolidated carrier and entitled to the benefits to which he would have been entitled if he had been employed by one of such carriers during all of such period of service with such forces; except that this paragraph shall not require the consolidated carrier, in the case of any such individual, to pay compensation, or to accord health, disability, or death insurance benefits, for the period during which he was a member of such forces. If any such former employee is disabled and because of such disability is no longer qualified to perform the duties of his former position but otherwise meets the requirements for employment, he shall be given such available employment at an appropriate rate of compensation as he is able to perform and to which his service credit shall entitle him.

"(6) No employee of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger shall, without his consent, have his compensation reduced, or be discharged or furloughed, in contemplation of such consolidation and merger, during the 6-month period immediately preceding the date of approval of such consolidation or merger.

"(7) Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the discharge of any employee for insubordination, incompetency, or any other similar cause.

"(8) All employees of any carrier resulting from any such consolidation or merger, with respect to their hours of employment, shall retain the rights provided by any collective bargaining agreement in force and effect upon the date of approval of such consolidation or merger until such agreement is terminated, executed, or superseded. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, any agreement not prohibited by law pertaining to the protection of employees may hereafter be entered into by such consolidated carrier and the duly authorized representative or representatives of its employees selected according to existing law.

"(9) For purposes of enforcement or protection of rights, privileges, and immunities granted or guaranteed under this subsection, the employees of any such consolidated carrier shall be entitled to the same remedies as are provided by the National Labor Relations Act in the case of employees covered by that act; and the National Labor Relations Board and the courts of the United States (including the courts of the District of Columbia) shall have jurisdiction and power to enforce and protect such rights, privileges, and immunities in the same manner as in the case of enforcement of the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

"(10) Nothing contained in this subsection shall apply to any employee of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger whose compensation is at the rate of more than $5,000 per annum.

"(g) The authority conferred by this section shall be exclusive and plenary, and any carrier participating in or resulting from any transaction approved by the Commission under this section shall have full power to carry such transaction into effect without securing approval otherwise than as specified in this section."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, they continue to tell you that unless we pass this bill to bail out these great investors the Government is going to have to take over the Postal Telegraph Co., and that we shall have Government ownership. As a matter of fact, every well-informed lawyer knows that, if that should occur, all the administration would do would be to appoint a receiver to carry on the enterprise until it could be straightened out, the water squeezed out, and the corporation reorganized.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman believe a receiver could do any better job running this company, which is now running in the hole at the rate of $400,000 a month, than anyone else?

Mr. RANKIN. A receiver could do a great deal better job than is being asked here, for Congress to bail these people out of all these millions they have invested in watered stock, people who have never contributed anything to the operation of the company.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN. I will yield for a question; yes.

Mr. BOREN. The gentleman does not imply by the use of the phrase "bail out" that this Government is going to put up any money, does he? Or that the Government is going to pay any money to anyone?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, they are using the Government here as shock troops. The American people will bail them out; they will pay this in additional rates that will be piled upon them. We had an illustration of this in the Associated Gas & Electric case. We did not merge Electric Bond & Share with Commonwealth & Southern; we appointed a receiver to squeeze the water out and to reorganize the company or to dispose of its property.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Oklahoma has raised a question in my mind: Is the $9,000,000 that has been advanced by the R. F. C. secured, or would R. F. C. under a receiver become a general creditor?

Mr. RANKIN. The best information I have been able to get from members of the committee who have spoken here is that we have a first lien.

Mr. BOREN. That is right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman in his address to the House a while ago talked about the creation of a great monopoly and stated that the stock of both companies was owned by the same people.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; the gentleman wants now to sanctify that arrangement at the expense of the American people.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Please explain how you can have any more monopoly than you have if the same people run the two companies, anyway.

Mr. RANKIN. This bankrupt corporation should go through the same procedure as any other bankrupt corporation. You pass this bill and every time a railroad becomes bankrupt it will come here, especially where their preferred stock is owned by the same concern, and ask the Congress to provide that they may go into a railroad monopoly in order to be bailed out. They will come in and ask the Congress to pass a law to enable them to bail out and to pay these men, like the Lehman Bros.—and it is shown here that they are among the big stockholders—M. Loeb & Co., men of that character, who seem to indulge in speculation in watered stocks. You will be asked to pass a law to protect that merger or we will be threatened with Government ownership. There will be no governmental ownership if this bill fails to pass. Mr. Jones will simply appoint a receiver to squeeze the water out of these inflated valuations that the American people are now asked to pay interest and dividends on.

This is not a new trick, and I am not accusing the committee of anything. I think the members of that committee are more "sinned against than sinning."

This is the old trick of the corporations, the big corporations, that have been speculating in watered stocks ever since corporations have existed in this country.

The Ontario Power Commission does not have any water in its stock. We produce 12 times as much power in this country as they do. Twelve times what they have invested is a little less than $5,000,000,000, yet the private power interests in this country claim fourteen or fifteen billion dollars. You will find it is invariably the holding companies, just as those men at the top, that own the watered stocks and they contribute nothing to the success of the operation company.

This entire measure should be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, it may be absolutely useless for me to rise in opposition to this amendment to strike the enacting clause, for I realize just as a great many Members on the floor do that the gentleman from Mississippi has not studied this, does not know anything about it, and the only place he gets his information is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That is all he knows about it. He does not know even that in 1934 the Congress passed a law prohibiting interlocking directorates under section 12 of the Communications Act. That is the law today.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Committee to vote down the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi, as it should be.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I do not yield.

Mr. RANKIN. But it does not prevent the holding of watered stock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARCANTONIO: Section 222 (d) on page 23 shall be amended as follows: On line 19, strike out the words "more than one-fifth" and insert the word "any"; and on page 24, lines 1 and 2, strike out the words "more than one-fifth" and insert the word "any."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply substitutes the provision that there shall be no alien control of stocks in place of the existing provision which permits the control of one-fifth of the stock by aliens. This guarantees against any Axis penetration in our communications system.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. Chairman, may I point out that a considerable amount of this stock is owned by citizens of Great Britain, just as Americans own stock in some of the British-owned cable companies. This amendment would make it illegal for any citizen of Great Britain or France or any of our Allied Nations to own stock in this corporation or, if they did own this stock, it would prevent the merger. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment and I hope it will be voted down.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed not only to the pending amendment but to the bill itself. I wonder how many of you gentlemen who sit here have considered the fact that you can go down to the Union Station with 150 pounds of baggage and be transported on a train that is powered by a locomotive which cost over $100,000, in a coach that is worth $35,000, manned by a crew of the highest paid railroad employees in the country, on a railroad that cost $25,000 per mile, for the little sum of 2 cents a mile plus the tax? You can be transported bodily for that. But if you want to talk over a wire strung on a pole for 3 minutes it costs you about a cent a mile. Is there any difference between those two classes of service?

I want to talk to you about one of the most hateful monopolies in America. I want to talk to you about the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. I want to talk to you about a system that takes a toll from every businessman in these United States. I want to talk to you about the phone that sits on your desk—two instruments on one wire—for which this Government is paying $2 a month rental. And besides is paying rental, if you please, on every little telephone gadget in the room—little loops of wire, switches, and connections.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman listen to me?

Mr. WHITE. No. I want to talk to you about one of the most profiteering monopolies in America. You have no competition in the telephone business. I will say for the information of this House that I am a telegraph operator—a Morse operator—and I know something about the telegraph business.

Keep these two companies competing. The telegraph companies provide the finest communication service in the country outside of the post office. In fact, the service we are receiving in the House Office Buildings and in the Capitol of the United States from these two telegraph companies is really better than the post office, as good as it is, because you can always find an operator or somebody to handle your business, even after the House post office is closed.

I think everybody knows the service we are getting from these two companies. Do you want to strike that down? Do you want to create another monopoly in this country, a communications monopoly? Communications is a natural monopoly, and we now have a little competition.

I hope the Members of the House will vote "no" on this bill and strangle one more monopoly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARCANTONIO: Page 26, line 18, strike out all of the language of subdivision (f) (1) and substitute the following:

"(f) (1) Each employee of any carrier which is a party to a consolidation or merger pursuant to this Act who was employed by such carrier at the time of the approval of such consolidation or merger, shall be employed by

the carrier resulting from such consolidation or merger in the same community for a period of not less than 5 years from the date of the approval of such consolidation or merger at a rate of compensation and at a net weekly compensation not less than that received by such employee at the time of such approval, and, except with his consent, no such employee shall be assigned to work which is inconsistent with his past training and experience in the telegraph industry."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to do two things. First of all, I call your attention to the language of the bill at the bottom of page 26:

In its order of approval the Commission shall include terms and conditions providing that during the period of 4 years from the date of such approval such consolidation or merger will not result in such employees being in a worse position with respect to their compensation or character of employment.

My amendment makes that provision read 5 years instead of 4 years.

My amendment further guarantees against transfer. The omission of such a guaranty would permit the company to nullify the job-protection sections of the bill by requiring employees to uproot themselves from their present homes and move their families, bag and baggage, perhaps a thousand miles away. As the section presently reads in the bill, an employee living in Miami, Fla., could be told that under the guaranties provided in this bill he was entitled to continued employment and that a job was open for him in Seattle, Wash.

It is clearly evident that the payment of travel expenses would not compensate an employee for such a drastic upheaval in his life. Rather than give up family, cherished relationships, familiar environment, perhaps even a home which he might have acquired after years of saving, it is quite conceivable that workers confronted with such an alternative would be compelled to leave the employ of the merged company.

Therefore, by the mere offering of undesirable transfers it would be possible for the company to reduce the number of employees to whom these protective provisions would apply.

In other words, this bill seeks to protect the employees for a period of 4 years. It states that the company must keep the employees for a period of 4 years. However, all the company needs to do to vitiate that provision is simply to say to an employee who is working in the city of Washington, "Yes; we are going to keep you on 4 years, but you will have to work at our office in Seattle." The employee cannot accept that employment; that is very obvious. This is a loophole in the bill to destroy the protection which the committee intended to give the employee in the bill. I cannot see any objection to plugging that loophole and guaranteeing that the company will not abuse the right given it by this legislation by sending employees from one city to another, thereby vitiating the protection afforded the employee in the bill.

It is a fair proposal that I am making here. It is merely carrying out the intent of the provision of the bill as reported by the committee. It guarantees to the employee what you propose to give to him. Unless you guarantee against transfer, the 4-year tenure you give the employee will mean nothing, because by allowing the company to transfer him from one city to another, the guaranty you seek to give the worker could be completely destroyed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it may be well to call to the attention of the House what this amendment really does. In the first place, the gentleman from New York omits the words which would require the Commission to require a fair and equitable arrangements consistent with the provisions of this subsection to protect the interests of the employees.

Then, on the other hand, he does this: He says that every employee, no matter how long he might have worked prior to the merger, whether 1 day or 1 month or 1 year, would be guaranteed a job for 5 years in the community in which he lived at the time of the merger; and, further, that he would be guaranteed the same wages paid him at the time the merger went into effect, although we all know that the man might be getting overtime at the rate of time and a half.

I simply call that to your attention. It is no use for me to discuss it, because it is a violation of the policy we adopted in the Interstate Commerce Act of 1940. I ask that you vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 214 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 214. (a) No carrier shall undertake the construction of a new line or of an extension of any line, or shall acquire or operate any line, or extension thereof, or shall engage in transmission over or by means of such additional or extended line, unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that the present or future public convenience and necessity require or will require the construction, or operation, or construction and operation, of such additional or extended line: *Provided*, That no such certificate shall be required under this section for the construction, acquisition, or operation of (1) a line within a single State unless such line constitutes part of an interstate line, (2) local, branch, or terminal lines not exceeding 10 miles in length, or (3) any line acquired under section 221 or 222 of this act: *Provided further*, That the Commission may, upon appropriate request being made, authorize temporary or emergency service, or the supplementing of existing facilities, without regard to the provisions of this section. No carrier shall discontinue service to a community, or part of a community, unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that neither the present nor future public convenience and necessity will be adversely affected thereby; except that the Commission may, upon appropriate request being made, authorize temporary or emergency discontinuance of service, or partial discontinuance of service, without regard to the provisions of this section. As used in this section the term 'line' means any channel of communication established by the use of appropriate equipment, other than a channel of communication established by the interconnection of two or more existing channels: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to require a certificate or other authorization from the Commission for any installation, replacement, or other changes in plant, operation, or equipment, other than new construction, which will not impair the adequacy or quality of service provided."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to tell the Members a few things about the telephones in their own offices, and the only reason I am doing so is to make a comparison between the competition that exists between the two telegraph companies, and the monopolistic methods of a communication system that does not have any competition. In the first place the telephone in your own office costs for each instrument a dollar a month rental, and every little loop of wire, every little switch and gadget in your office is placed there on a rental basis. In addition to the dollar a month, you pay a rental for a long line of switchboards, and hire some 40 or 50 switch operators, just to handle the telephone calls in your own office in the Capitol Building, and you pay for that, not the telephone company. And then you pay a toll of 3 to 5 cents for every call that goes out of your office. I took the pains to look into this matter. I knew that we were being charged outrageously, but I was surprised that on a dead equipment in which we must furnish all of the manpower except a few fellows that may repair a wire once in awhile, and pay $85,000 a year here in this Capitol Building and in the Senate and House Office Buildings—$85,000 a year, and when you think a Member cannot put through 1 mile of long-distance call on that bill, when you think of the staggering amount the telephone company is taking out of these other Government departments in Washington, I say to you that it is colossal, and if there is any place in the United States where the Government ought to go into the communications business, it is right here in the District of Columbia, in interdepartmental work.

You can talk about easing taxes with Government debts that we cannot pay, with a thing like that going on, and money scooped out of the taxpayer's pockets by this telephone monopoly. Do you know that down here in one of these apartment hotels in which I have to live, it costs me 10 cents a call on every call I put out of the building, and a dollar rental for the instrument, and then they have the nerve to come around and say that if I would pay them a dollar and a half extra they will carry my name in the telephone book, and I simply told them to go to hell. I have a friend who has an apartment, and he has to pay a dollar and a half for an instrument, but as the toll on the calls that he makes at that rate is higher he had to have a special phone, and now he must pay a

rental on the regular phone in his room on the circuit, and he must pay an extra dollar for the idle phone. To change a name on their list for the idle phone you must pay the cost of a new installation. That is the way the business of this great monopoly is conducted, and that is what you are trying to saddle on the people under this bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. No. I am trying to get a wireless message to this House. Do you know that the telephone company has managed to get a clause in the law that in a broadcast you must not address another person. The Governor of the great State of Idaho prepared an address, a radio address, and because there was some party addressed in it, it was a violation of law, and the record had to be destroyed. They have provided that there will be no competition of radio with the telephone. Let us have a little competition in the form that exists today in the telegraph business between the Western Union and the Postal.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Speaking of a telephone monopoly, I call attention to the fact that we would never have gotten a reduction in rates from the telephone company in long-distance charges except that the Justice Department has almost forced the telephone company to give that reduction.

Mr. WHITE. Every doctor in this country, every lawyer, every professional man is loaded up with a telephone charge that is staggering and outrageous. Let us change it all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARCANTONIO: Section 2 of S. 158 shall be amended, as follows:

Under section 214 (a) on page 32, strike out the words "no carrier shall discontinue service" on line 21.

Strike out all of lines 22, 23, 24, and 25.

On page 33, strike out all of lines 1 to 13, inclusive, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) No carrier shall abandon a line, plant, office, or other physical facility, unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that the present or future public convenience and necessity require or will require the abandonment of such line, plant, office, or other physical facility: *Provided*, That the Commission shall not issue a certificate of public convenience for any abandonment, the effect of which would be to increase the load on remaining facilities to an extent which would reduce the quality of service below standards established by the Commission.

"(2) Upon receipt of an application for any such certificate, the Commission shall cause notice thereof to be given to and a copy filed with the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Governor of each State in which the abandonment of any line, plant, office, or other physical facility is proposed, and to all parties in interest, with the right of those notified to be heard; and the Commission may require such published notice as it shall determine.

"(3) The Commission shall have power to issue such certificate as prayed for, or to refuse to issue it, or to issue it for a portion or portions of a line, plant, office, or other physical facility described in the application, or for the partial exercise only of such right or privilege, and may attach to the issuance of the certificate such terms and conditions as in its judgment the public convenience and necessity may require. After issuance of such certificate, and not before, the carrier may, without securing approval other than such certificate, comply with the terms and conditions contained in or attached to the issuance of such certificate and proceed with the construction, acquisition, operation, or extension covered thereby. Any abandonment of a line, plant, office, or other physical facility contrary to the provisions of this section may be enjoined by any court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the United States, the Commission, the State commission, any State affected, or any party in interest."

The title of section 214 in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, shall be amended to read "Extension and Abandonment of Lines."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly to take the time of the Committee by offering these amendments, but I have been offering them on behalf of labor, organized labor, which is so vitally affected by this bill. The jobs of workers are placed in jeopardy. To them this legislation means everything. I do hope you will give me your attention on this last amendment that I am offering, because it goes to the very heart of the bill. I call attention to the committee report on the question of the abandonment of facilities and to the fact that the Senate had the following language in the bill. The Senate prohibited, without the approval of the Federal Communications Commission, the abandonment of any line, plant, office, or other physical facility. In other words, before the new corporation could abandon any facility, any line or office, it would have to obtain the consent of the Federal Communications Commission. That is what the Senate provided. The committee struck that out and substituted a provision that they could not abandon service to a community without the Commission's approval.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Or a part of a community.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Or a part of a community. What does that mean? That leaves the whole situation wide open. Suppose this company has four offices in a city and they abandon three of them. They do not require the consent of the Federal Communications Commission to abandon three, under the provisions of this bill. Why? Because they can contend that with the remaining one they are giving service to a community or to a part of a community. And you establish nothing in the bill to prevent such a construction.

I cannot understand why the House committee struck out the language of the Senate bill. I cannot understand why they struck out the language that was air-tight, an absolute guarantee against the abandonment of facilities without Government consent. Here we take out the guarantee and we substitute this language which leaves the field wide open for abandonment of facilities.

Now, remember, this will hit back. It will hit back when your constituents and mine are going to complain to us because of the bad service and the lack of real service which will take place by the exploitation of this new provision inserted in this bill.

Therefore I still ask the question, Why did you not leave the Senate language in that bill? I challenge the committee to explain that particular point. Why did you not leave the Senate language, which was airtight and an absolute guaranty against abandonment without the consent of the Government? You took away that airtight provision and you left in a provision which is open for debate, open for construction, wide open, to deprive the public of the essential service that is needed, and deprive the country of the service needed, particularly in time of war.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In support of the gentleman's statement, is it not true that any railroad company or any common carrier, rail, freight, highway or water, must obtain the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission before the abandonment of service?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is my understanding, but by this legislation as long as the company says they are giving service to a community or part of a community they do not have to obtain approval for the discontinuance of service. In other words, if they have four offices in a town and they take away three and leave one, they would say, "That one is giving service to the community or part of the community and it is not necessary to go to the Commission to obtain permission to discontinue the other three," irrespective of whether or not the people of that town needed the other three.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Practically every provision contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is taken care of in the original bill. The only difference of opinion seems to be over the abandonment of some physical property or some real estate. The committee, in considering this merger, came to the unanimous conclusion that the thing the American public is interested in, and the thing that Congress is interested in, is the continuance and maintenance of adequate service to each and every community and every part of every community. I do not believe that the Congress or the country is interested in whether the telegraph company should abandon or take out a certain insulator or pole or even close down one office, if the community is adequately served by another office. The only thing that the Congress and the country is interested in is adequate service.

Let me point out what I mean by that. All of you who know downtown Washington know that the Postal Telegraph Co. has an office next door to the Western Union Telegraph Co. in the National Press Club Building. If this amendment is adopted the merged companies

would have to keep both offices open until an application was made to the Commission, and permission was given to close one of these offices.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy would have to come into the picture also.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy would have to approve the closing of the office, where only one single wall divides the two rooms.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Assuming that what the gentleman says is true, why object to having the consent of the Communications Commission, and since we are at war, why object to obtaining the consent of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy? It is not going to harm this company to go before the Federal Communications Commission and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to obtain permission. It is the only way by which the public can be protected.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Now, I did not yield for a speech. I yielded for a question. The answer to the question is simply this, that under the gentleman's amendment the company would have to go to the Commission and to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy in order to change any physical equipment whatscever, and under the original provisions of this bill as the committee reported it out the company could not take away any service. In order to change the service in any way they would have to apply to the Commission and get its consent

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BOREN. Under the gentleman's amendment, if they wanted to simply move a wire from one House Office Building to the other, by way of example, they would have to go through the endless red tape of application and hearings and a certificate on the part of the Commission?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And have the consent of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy in addition.

Mr. BOREN. Is it not true also that the service itself would not be protected under the gentleman's amendment? They could abandon three-fourths of the service without abandoning any of this physical property because of the so-called secret coil system of expanding many communications over a single wire, so the gentleman would defeat the purpose he has in mind if his amendment were adopted?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is entirely correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARE: On page 32, at the end of line 11, insert "Provided such carrier shall be required to construct necessary lines to establish and maintain an office at every county seat with 2,000 or more population located within the territory served by such carrier."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, you will notice that this amendment is intended to effect the very opposite of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York; instead of preventing the discontinuance of service we are endeavoring to establish new services in those communities that do not have it.

A few years ago I had the privilege of introducing a bill somewhat similar to this amendment, because I learned that a good many towns in the United States, ranging from 1,500 to 3,500 population, had a kind of makeshift telegraph system or facilities. The telegraph company operating in the vicinity would establish an office in an adjoining town or a town 20 or 30 miles away, abandon the office in the first town and then expect the people to telephone their messages to the adjoining town. This required the people to pay a telephone charge in addition to the charge for the telegram. I do not know how true it is, but at that time the charge was made that there was an agreement, possibly collusion between the telegraph companies and the telephone companies to the effect that the telegraph companies would abandon offices because they could save clerk hire and increase the telephone business by requiring the person sending the telegram pay the telephone message to the point where a telegraph office was maintained. This amendment attempts to obviate that possibility to some extent. It would require the new company under the merger to establish and maintain an office not in every town but in every county seat with a population of 2,000 or more. I cannot conceive of a town of 2,000 or more people that cannot well support a telegraph office, nor can I conceive why the Congress in passing legislation of this character cannot protect those people and require the new company to establish an office in county seats of 2,000 people, obviating the necessity for the people to pay a telephone charge of 25 to 50 cents in order to send a telegram. I am anxious to see the amendment approved before I consent to support the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. With great pleasure.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I understand that under this bill it is proposed to take care of all those who are working for the Postal Co. That is true, is it not?

Mr. HARE. That is my interpretation of the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. If that is true, has the gentleman figured out how the Western Union can continue those people in employment and still undertake to set up the new offices he contemplates?

Mr. HARE. Yes; these few new offices will aid in caring for those Postal employees where there are two offices in the same town, because one of them can be discontinued under this bill and the new offices will provide work for them. However, the gentleman does not expect me to answer the question as to how the Western Union can make the money, because I am satisfied we both know the Western Union will be amply able to take care of itself. I imagine they are in favor of this bill.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Like the gentleman, I, too, want to help these small communities. I want these Postal offices kept open also.

Mr. HARE. I assume this will be done except in cases in small towns where they are now competitors. In that event one will probably be closed. This amendment serves two purposes: One is it insures the people residing in these county seats of 2,000 or more population telegraph facilities without having to pay extra for telephone charges, and it obviates possibility of collusion between the telegraph company and the telephone company to promote their own interests by eliminating telegraph in small towns while the telephone people in the adjoining town get the advantage of the increased rate required for the delivery of the telegram.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina states that he has two purposes in offering his amendment. The main purpose is the serving of the three county seats in his district.

Mr. HARE. Well, that is enough.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is just the point I wanted to find out.

Mr. HARE. Three in one district would mean from twelve to fifteen hundred throughout the United States.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I just wanted to find out what the underlying motive was; that is all.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman would insist also on an amendment to provide that main-line railroads run through all county seats, too?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I cannot answer that. I doubt if the gentleman from South Carolina has read the bill in its entirety. I read the new language of section 214 (d):

SEC. 5. Section 214 (d) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Commission may, after full opportunity for hearing, in a proceeding upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, authorize or require by order any carrier, party to such proceeding, to provide itself with adequate facilities for the expeditious and efficient performance of its service as a common carrier and to extend its line or to establish a public office."

Under the very language of the bill itself a community can get service if it is entitled to it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us take this case: Suppose we establish a new defense town of 10,000 people; under the language read by the gentleman the Authority can force the united company to give the service, can it not?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes; it can.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] said a moment ago that if this merger went through there would be no towns of this size that would not have service. If you want to guarantee the present service to all these towns, kill this bill. If the owners who control the Postal Telegraph Co. then undertake to fold it up, the Government will appoint a receiver and see that this service is carried on and that these towns are all provided with the service.

They tell you that this will not eliminate any employees. Then what are they trying to do? Are they going to employ all the same employees? What are they trying to do? To bail out, as I said before, those men at the top who own these inflated bonds, debentures, and watered stocks, who are in control, and they are the ones who have control of an invisible directorate over these corporations.

If you vote the entire bill down, and if they undertake to fold it up, the Government will then appoint a receiver to see that this concern is operated, that it is reorganized, and instead of bailing out these people who have invested in these inflated valuations, the company will continue to give the same service they are giving now to all the American people.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FORD. We are going to cut down the rates in this bill. Is not part of this bill to give the railroads a cut or a reduction, if we reduce these rates?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. They propose in this bill as written to raise the rates that the Government will have to pay on Government telegrams at a time when, I submit, if you will squeeze all of the surplus water out of these holdings, these rates could not only be held where they are but reduced 50 percent and probably 75 percent. As I said a moment ago, if this outfit owned the Post Office System it would cost you 25 cents to send a postal card from Washington to Baltimore, it would cost $1.75 to send a postal card from Washington to Omaha, Nebr., and it would cost $1 to send a postal card from here to my home in Mississippi. These rates could be drastically reduced if you would squeeze the water out of these alleged holdings, these mushroom investments that have no place in here and that contribute nothing to the legitimate operation of these companies. Then you will not throw people out of employment and you will not take away from these small towns the services that they have and that legitimate competition, the only thing they have been able to rely on up to date to hold rates down to where they are now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE.]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARE) there were—ayes 32, noes 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 214 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Upon receipt of an application for any such certificate, the Commission shall cause notice thereof to be given to, and shall cause a copy of such application to be filed with, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Governor of each State in which such line is proposed to be constructed, extended, acquired, or operated, or in which such discontinuance of service is proposed, with the right to those notified to be heard; and the Commission may require such published notice as it shall determine."

SEC. 4. Section 214 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Commission shall have power to issue such certificate as applied for, or to refuse to issue it, or to issue it for a portion or portions of a line, or extension thereof, or discontinuance of service, described in the application, or for the partial exercise only of such right or privilege, and may attach to the issuance of the certificate such terms and conditions as in its judgment the public convenience and necessity may require. After issuance of such certificate, and not before, the carrier may, without securing approval other than such certificate, comply with the terms and conditions contained in or attached to the issuance of such certificate and proceed with the construction, extension, acquisition, operation, or discontinuance of service covered thereby. Any construction, extension, acquisition, operation, or discontinuance of service contrary to the provisions of this section may be enjoined by any court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the United States, the Commission, the State commission, any State affected, or any party in interest."

SEC. 5. Section 214 (d) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Commission may, after full opportunity for hearing, in a proceeding upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, authorize or require by order any carrier, party to such proceeding, to provide itself with adequate facilities for the expeditious and efficient performance of its service as a common carrier and to extend its line or to establish a public office; but no such authorization or order shall be made unless the Commission finds, as to such provision of facilities, as to such establishment of public offices, or as to such extension, that it is reasonably required in the interest of public convenience and necessity, or as to such extension or facilities that the expense involved therein will not impair the ability of the carrier to perform its duty to the public. Any carrier which refuses or neglects to comply with any order of the Commission made in pursuance of this paragraph shall forfeit to the United States $100 for each day during which such refusal or neglect continues."

SEC. 6. Section 5266 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 47, sec. 3), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5266. Telegrams between the several departments of the Government and their officers and agents, relating exclusively to the public business, in their transmission over the lines of any telegraph company to which has been given the right-of-way, timber, or station lands from the public domain shall have priority over all other business. No part of any appropriation for the several departments of the Government shall be paid to any company which neglects or refuses to transmit such telegrams in accordance with the provisions of this section. No telegraph company shall, by reason of any benefit received under any provision of the Post Roads Act of July 24, 1866, as amended, be required to transmit such telegrams at rates less than those applicable to other telegrams in the same classes."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: On page 36, line 1, after the period, strike out all the remainder of line 1 and lines 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, the words stricken by my amendment are "No telegraph company shall, by reason of any benefit received under any provision of the Post Roads Act of July 24, 1866, as amended, be required to transmit such telegrams at rates less than those applicable to other telegrams in the same classes."

The effect of those words, which are now in this bill, is simply to wipe out the differential in favor of the United States Government. This is the same principle that this committee has brought before us several times in the past in regard to the railroad land-grant rates.

The Federal Government has given to the telegraph companies, and particularly to the Western Union Telegraph Co., certain rights and privileges, including certain properties, for which the Government was to receive an advantage in the telegraph rates on those messages sent in Government business. The sole purpose of this provision of the bill is to take that advantage away from the United States Government.

This bill starts out on the assumption that it will create an absolute monopoly of the telegraph business. This bill places all telegraph business in the hands of one company, giving that company the advantage of a Nation-wide monopoly of the business. If granted the monopoly created by this bill, giving all of the business in the country to one company, it will obviously make it a profitable business venture. We are told that they are already making a profit. We have the statement of the members of the committee here this afternoon that the Western Union Telegraph Co. is solvent and is making money today. It is proposed by this bill to give this company all of the business of the United States both public and private and then, rather than reduce the rate, which is what we could reasonably expect, if we give them that sort of advantage, it is proposed to give this one company not only the monopoly, not only all of the private business of this Nation, but to give it an increase of 40 percent in the rates that the Government pays.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman tell us how much that 40 percent amounts to?

Mr. POAGE. The United States Government spent approximately $6,000,000 for telegraph tolls last year. That is not

this fiscal year, but the last fiscal year. I do not know how high it will be this year, because the number of Government messages is increasing very rapidly. If you add 40 percent to $6,000,000, you will find that it will be approximately $10,000,000. Or rather I should put it this way: The present rates paid by the Government are only 60 percent of the commercial rates. This change would add considerably more than 40 percent to the present bill. The present cost to the Government, $6,000,000, is only 60 percent of what the same messages would cost if this bill should be passed without this amendment.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is a 40-percent discount.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; and it runs to nearly $4,000,000 per year.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That will simply increase the receipts of the Western Union Co. that much more.

Mr. POAGE. All of it would go to Western Union, and it would give Western Union all the business the Postal Telegraph Co. is now getting. Approximately $4,000,000 of new Government money would simply be given to the Western Union by reason of the fact that they would become the greatest monopoly in the telegraph field the world has ever known. In other words, the bigger you get, the more you can charge; the more powerful you are the more you can squeeze the little man. That is the way it always works.

But I have never before seen a committee bring in a report that brazenly said that they proposed to subsidize monopoly. But here is a committee telling us that "we have created a monopoly and to prove to you that we let them get their claws around the necks of the people, we first fasten the fangs of this monopoly on the throat of the United States Government." What do you expect for the poor little citizen, the person living out in one of the county seats for which the gentleman from South Carolina is trying to get service? What do you expect for the individual when the committee itself says, "We do not have the power to resist this great monopoly"? What can you expect for the people when the committee wants to increase the charges this monopoly would assess against the United States Government?

Mr. Chairman, this thing reeks with the proposition that somebody is going to dig the people of the United States, and the first one to suffer under the present terms of this bill is the United States Government.

Read the report. On page 11 you will find the report of this committee explaining this proposal. If you can find one single, solitary reason in that printed report justifying this proposal, I will stand here and apologize to this House and vote the other way. The committee may have some reasons for this gift at Government expense, but they have not put any such reasons in the report. They have not dared to write it down in black and white and tell you why they want to give the Western Union Telegraph such an unheard-of monopoly, such an opportunity to increase the money it is taking out of the United States Government, and particularly at a time when the telegraph business is greater than it has ever been in the entire history of the country. The Government business is growing by leaps and bounds. Presumably, under the general law of economics, when business is handling such a greatly increased volume of business, the cost per unit should be reduced, but, instead of that, the volume of business goes up to the sky but the unit cost is to be deliberately increased by this provision of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will recall what this committee has sought to have us do in behalf of the railroads. We have been asked to give the railroads all that the Government received in return for the land grants given them by the Government. Let us not do the same thing with the telegraph monopoly which this bill establishes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that I do not conceive this particular matter to be fundamental to the purposes of this bill. Whether or not this particular paragraph is stricken out has no relation to the real problem of merger. The merger provisions of this bill, all preceding the section the gentleman proposes to strike out, settle the question of whether or not we want the Government in this field as a competitor of private enterprise or whether we prefer to have this business in the hands of regulated private enterprise.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FORD. Does the Government take over every bank that goes broke, or does it take over every railroad that goes broke? Why should it take this over?

Mr. BOREN. The Government does not own a majority of the valuation of every bank that goes broke.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. This bill does not provide for the Government's taking over Postal Telegraph, it provides for the merger of Postal with another private company. The only danger of the Government's having to take Postal over arises from its continually putting $400,000 a month into that company.

Mr. BOREN. The gentleman refers to the loans we have made and are continually making, which would eventually make the Government the complete owner of this company.

On this particular question, the amount of money involved is something near $3,000,000 a year. It will cost the American public by way of paying taxes to support Government appropriations aproximately $3,000,000 a year to erase this discrimination. If we maintain this discrimination, it simply means that $3,000,000 a year will continue to be charged up to the paying public as an indirect tax.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If my memory is correct, the total amount involved would be $1,121,000 per year. That would be the highest figure.

Mr. BOREN. The gentleman has preceded me on a point I was about to make. Back in 1866, for no real material privileges that we were able to find out about but because it was an established precedent in other legislation, the Government simply saddled on to this particular type of company the burden of carrying the Government business at that reduced rate, 60 percent of the normal cost. Of course, some things such as poles and construction rights were provided, but so far as I know not to any extent ever utilized.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not a fact that the Government at that time did give these telegraph companies the right to go onto the public land and cut their poles without one penny of expense, that it did give them the rights-of-way they needed without any expense to them, that it did give them the land they needed to put their buildings on, that it did give them the physical assets of land and allow them to use the public domain from which to get the property they needed with which to build their lines?

Mr. BOREN. The gentleman is in error on a number of those points.

Mr. POAGE. Which ones?

Mr. BOREN. About the cutting of the poles I do not know, but these companies as far as I know do not own a single foot of land by way of right-of-way. Their rights-of-way are permissive clear down to the county commissioners' districts in which they operate. Each county commission or board can refuse to give them a right-of-way in any county over which it has jurisdiction, if it wants to. It is a question of easement not acquisition of land.

Going back to the point involved, if you take into consideration the bookkeeping cost, the red tape, and the dual expense to the Government alone, the net saving to the Government would be reduced to $1,121,000. It is a matter of principle as I see it. Why should any Government clerk have special rates not accorded to the public. It is the public that pays for that privilege. Should a bureaucrat be able to send wires to another bureaucrat without limit at special privileged rates when a mother wiring her son in the service has to pay in full.

I do not believe that a wire from Madam Perkins to John L. Lewis should be given a rate not accorded a wire between a mother and her son. That matter of principle I believe is involved and it is a privilege that the bureaucrats misuse and prostitute endlessly.

Why should the bureaus be privileged thus. I do not think it is important in this bill but I do think the provision is sound.

Then, of course, you are also requiring that double bookkeeping red-tape system on the part of the company.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to disagree with my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] on this section of this important bill, but since so much debate has occurred on what the act of July 24, 1866, really said, I think it would be in point to read it to the House at this time. It is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That any telegraph company now organized, or which may hereafter be organized under the laws of any State in this Union, shall have the right to construct, maintain and operate lines of telegraph through and over any portion of the public domain of the United States, over and along any of the military or post roads of the United States which have been or may hereafter be declared such by Act of Congress, and over, under, or across navigable streams or waters of the United States: *Provided*, That such lines of telegraph shall be so constructed and maintained as not to obstruct the navigation of such streams and waters, or interfere with the ordinary travel on such military or post roads. And any of said companies shall have the right to take and use from such public lands the necessary stone, timber and other materials for its posts, piers, stations, and other needful uses in the construction, maintenance, and operation of said lines of telegraph, and may preempt and use such portion of the unoccupied public lands subject to preemption through which its lines of telegraph may be located as may be necessary for its stations, not exceeding 40 acres for each station; but such stations shall not be within 15 miles of each other.

I say that this was more than an idle and meaningless gesture by the 1866 Congress in making the deal with the telegraph companies. I believe that when the 1866 Congress passed this law they knew what they were doing. I believe that they entered into a fair and square deal with the then young telegraph companies. Both were to gain by the deal.

The telegraph companies were, as I have read, enabled to obtain their rights-of-way, the poles, the stone, and even 40 acres of land every 15 miles along the line for stations—all free of cost to the telegraph companies for the enterprise. Some of these lines spanned the Nation, much across the public domain.

The Congress, wisely I believe, provided that they were to insure for the United States Government certain privileges, too. This principal one was that the Government would be entitled to certain preferred reduced rates on the official Government business handled by these telegraph companies.

Now, as we grant to the Western Union the right to absorb the Postal Telegraph Co., and thereby have a profitable monopoly on telegraph transmission, I hardly feel it behooves us to waive the right that the Government has to these telegraph rate reductions on its own military and official Government business.

Further, the testimony before the committee reveals that the Federal Government is the biggest user of telegraph service in the country. Surely, this great volume of official business should entitle the Government to a better rate than the person who sends one or two telegrams a year.

It is said that the telegraph companies are poor—but so is Uncle Sam just now. Because of this forthright deal made in 1866, because of the volume of business given the companies by the Government, I feel that the Government is entitled to 40 percent reduction in its special rate and that we, as a Congress, should not authorize the waiving of this right at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am rather surprised that my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] should assume that we are guilty of fraud in this. Let us realize the situation; let us get down to it. The United States Government pays for the full telephone message always. In the telegraph company they pay for 60 percent of the cost of the message. Long, long years ago if anything was given to the telegraph companies by the Government, the Government has reaped the benefit since that time. Is it right that we should sit here and say to this company, "You have got to do this even though it is a loss to you," and there is a loss on the Government telegrams. For instance, in the year 1941 the total operating revenue of the Western Union Co. was $107,165,290. The total net income was $7,053,733. There is bound to be a loss on it at that rate. It is a question whether this House is going to do as the Senate did. The Senate, after deliberation, twice reported from the committee and twice passed the bill in the Senate.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. Am I correct in understanding that this 60-percent rate is not fixed by law but is fixed by the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934, and that the Commission could change the rate if it desired to do so and make it 90 percent or 85 percent or any other percent, if it so desired?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I could not answer that, but I do not think so.

Mr. TARVER. Let me read the law to the gentleman.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I wish the gentleman would not take up my time.

Mr. TARVER. I am going to ask that the gentleman's time be extended for a minute or two so that I may get some information. In the gentleman's report he sets out the existing law which reads:

Telegrams between the several departments of the Government and their officers and agents, in their transmission over the lines of any telegraph company to which has been given the right-of-way, timber, or station lands from the public domain shall have priority over all other business at such rate as the Federal Communications Commission shall annually fix.

That is the present law. It is all in the discretion of the Federal Communications Commission, and why can we not leave it there?

Mr. BULWINKLE. They have to give them priority. It is a question of law. It is just a question of what is right, what this House should do in the circumstances. I am going to ask you to support the committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I readily recognize that this is the sort of amendment that may appeal to a great many members, particularly if they have not thought the whole proposition through. Probably for some reasons it might be just as well for some of us on our side of the argument to keep quiet and say nothing. But let us look at the principle involved.

Here is a utility that is performing a service for the public. Its customers include not only the United States Government, but private citizens who are taxpayers of the country. It is under the regulation of a commission which is charged with fixing rates. That commission is charged with fixing the rates at a point which shall bring about a fair return to the company, to the end that the service may be performed, operating charges made, and a fair return paid to the people who own and operate it. Rates should be no higher than that. I say that is the theory of governmental regulation of utilities, and it should be the practice. As I said earlier in the afternoon, if it is not the practice, if it does not work out in fact, it is the fault of the regulating body and not the fault of the industry.

Now we start with the proposition that a certain amount of funds must be available to the telegraph company to transmit these messages, public and private. It seems to me inevitable that if you reduce the rate to the government 40 percent—that is, 40 percent below the regularly established rate—immediately it becomes necessary for the private user of that facility to pay an added amount on his messages to make up the deficit that results from the reduced rate to the Government. Now, what is the end result of that? The result is that instead of assessing the taxpayers of the country generally to pay for this service rendered to the Government, as we do all through our governmental operations, with a few exceptions—and this is one of them—we, in effect, tax and assess individuals, private businesses, and industries which happen to have occasion to use the telegraph service to help pay for the service that is rendered the Government.

In other words, if this bill prevails as it is written and the Government pays the same rate as the average citizen pays, then if the regulation is effective the whole rate should come down, to the end that the private user of the telegraph service would pay a lesser rate, and whatever added expense to the Gov-

ernment there would be would come out of the taxpayers generally, rather than out of the private users of the same service.

I have listened to the arguments about Government economy. Without challenging anyone, may I say that I have stood here and fought for economy in Government expenditures when some of the people who contend so vigorously for this particular sort of economy seemed to be absent. But I say it is the sort of economy that cannot be justified.

They go clear back to 1866 to talk about a few telegraph poles or a little land or something of that sort that might have been given to or used by the telegraph companies. Could we on that alone set up in perpetuity the right on the part of Government to demand a 40-percent reduction in telegraph rates, knowing that the burden would be thereby shifted to private users? If you can justify a 40-percent reduction, why don't you go all the way and say, "Mr. Government, you can send your telegrams for nothing. We will take all of it out of the increased charges to the private people who are also using these services."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has suggested to us that perhaps some of us have not thought this entirely through. I only want to say that when I see a bill of this nature that conveys a $3,000,000 annual gift to the Western Union Telegraph Co. I do not need to think very long about it.

I realize that the Government has been entitled for a long time to this credit for sending telegrams at 40 percent less than the regular tariff rates. I realize that up until 1939 the Government sent telegrams at 60 percent less than the regular rates, but in order to help the companies out it has been changed to a discount of 40 percent. I submit to you on a purely economic basis that is good business for the telegraph company. The Government is the largest user of telegrams that this company will ever see. The Government sends not one telegram to a single place, but frequently the Office of Price Administration or some other agency sends a chain telegram, 50 or 500, or in one case of the old W. P. A. 1,900 telegrams at a single shot. I say to you that the government, doing a business of that nature, ought to have a quantity discount. We are entitled to it, and we ought to demand it and have it.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman was not very liberal about yielding, but I will yield to him.

Mr. HALLECK. Is the gentleman in favor of setting up, in the matter of rates charge i by utilities, a quantity discount? I thought we fought for years in this country to get rid of that.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I think if you will look at any gas rate or any electric light rate there are frequently power blocks set aside whereby the large users of power get a reduction. I think that is customarily true.

Mr. BROOKS. In the classification of what is a fair rate, the charge as set by the Communications Commission—as a matter of fact has not the property which was given by the Government to this company been capitalized in the fair rate?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman from Louisiana is entirely correct. As I was going to point out, it is not just a question of a few poles or of going out in some quarry and digging some rock; those things have all been set up as franchise values in the financial statement of Western Union years ago—set up to give value to its preferred stock and other issues—and the Government and the private users of its service have been paying on that for years and years and years.

I desire to point out also that there is a recognition of the right of a large user to a quantity discount in the fact that the press associations of this country are given special press rates. If you wish to send a press telegram from Washington to San Francisco, you do not send it at regular commercial rates; you send it at night press rates collect, or night press rate paid, and it is substantially below what other persons have to pay. Nobody objects to that; nobody talks about that; Western Union does not want to cut it out. They want only to take annually $3,000,000 of sucker money away from the American Government.

The president of the Western Union had the courage to testify before the committee. You ought to read what he said on page 74, where he talks about this land. He said that the act of 1866 never conferred any property rights; and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] told you how they used to get their poles and rock and material. He told you of the rights to use tracts of public land. Yet the president of Western Union would have you believe that the act never conferred any property rights. Go on to page 84 and you will see what the president of the Postal Telegraph Co. said. Read his testimony. He said the Government service was costing them money; that they are losing money on it every day. Yet, in these whole hearings there is not one figure of any kind to prove that statement—not one justification for one thing. Is it not amazing? Yet they would take $3,000,000 annual subsidy given by the Government on that flimsy showing. The Government borrows money at 1½ percent, does it not? At that rate of interest, what would $3,000,000 represent? A principal sum of $200,000,000 given to them? Do you want to give Western Union $200,000,000 to rehabilitate its system? If you do, then give that as a grant-in-aid; do not do it by a resolution like this. Support the motion of the gentleman from Texas to strike this subsidy from the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my purpose to support this bill and I probably will do so whether this amendment is adopted or not, but I consider the amendment to be a matter of very great importance. I hope the membership of the House understands as I do or believe I do from a reading of the language of existing law as set out in the report that the law as it exists at the present time does not provide for any rate of 60 percent for Government messages; it simply provides for the power on the part of the Federal Communications Commission to fix a just rate for Government messages.

The Commission, after considering the value of the properties which were given by the Government to the telegraph companies, after considering the volume of the Government business, may fix any percentage of the normal rate to be paid by the Government which it may deem to be fair. It may fix 75 percent of the normal rate, 90 percent, 99 percent, or even 100 percent.

The gentleman from Indiana says that we ought to be willing to trust the Commission to exercise its discretion in the fixing of rates which are to be paid by the citizens. I agree with that, but I want to know why, if the citizen must trust the Commission to fix the rates which are to be paid by him, it is not fair for the telegraph company or companies to trust the Commission to fix the rates that are to be paid by the United States Government? Are we willing to trust the Commission to be fair and honest in the fixing of the rates for the average citizen, for all the citizens throughout the country, but wish to indicate that we are afraid to trust the Commission when it comes to dealing with the rights of the telegraph company and therefore feel it necessary to strike out a provision which has been carried in the law for many years which would leave the Federal Communications Commission some discretion in this connection?

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I take great pleasure in yielding to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the House, I think there is a misunderstanding of what the effect of this provision is. This does not automatically deprive the Government of the right to a cheaper rate. This amendment is covered by section 201 of the act which provides first that the rates shall be reasonable and just; and then there is this provision:

> That communications by wire or radio subject to this act may be classified into day, night, repeated, unrepeated, letter, commercial, press, Government, and such other classes as the Commission may decide to be just and reasonable, and different charges may be made for the different classes of communications.

The regulation is left to the Commission. The Commission is not required, if this amendment passes, to be controlled by the act of 1866; they can still give the Government a cheaper rate, but they need to be just.

Mr. TARVER. I am sure the gentleman agrees with me that if the language

as reported by the committee is enacted into law, the Commission will be deprived of the discretion vested in it by the Communications Act of 1934.

Mr. LEA. No.

Mr. TARVER. And if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is adopted, the Commission will still have the authority to fix any rates that it may feel are just for payment of Government messages.

Mr. LEA. As I understand, the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas would be to strike out this language, while if you leave this provision in, you would still have the Commission with complete authority to fix the rates that are just and to classify the telegrams in a class by itself and fix what they believe to be a reasonable rate for those Government telegrams.

Mr. TARVER. I think the gentleman misunderstood my inquiry. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is adopted, the existing law, the Communications Act of 1934, relating to this particular subject matter will continue to be the law; and in that act, according to the language which I have before me, the Commission has the authority to provide rates for the Government at such a figure as the Federal Communications Commission shall annually fix. In other words, if we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, the Federal Communications Commission might, if it saw proper to do so, require the payment of the full normal rates by the Government, if it felt that was fair.

Mr. LEA. I think the gentleman is talking about something else.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. I hope the gentleman understands I am not partisan in this matter. I have been supporting his bill and expect to continue to do so, but I think that if this information is not correct the House ought to be fully informed on the subject.

Mr. LEA. I have the interpretation of this from the Legislative Counsel of the House and I am interested only in presenting the facts to the House so that the Members will not imagine that the presentation heretofore made is the correct position. The passage of the Poage amendment would require the Commission to be bound by the act of 1866, while leaving the bill as the committee proposes, it would be left in the hands of the Commission and the Commission would be permitted to fix a rate on Government traffic such as it thought reasonable and just.

Mr. TARVER. Was not the rate provided in the act of 1866 much lower than the rate which has obtained since 1934 and has not the act of 1866 been modified by the act of 1934 so as to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may fix such rate on Government telegrams as it sees fit?

Mr. LEA. It has been modified, but that referred only to lines on Government property, which is a comparatively small part of the total of the Government. If you will take the bill as the committee intended it, then you would have the Commission with the same regulatory power applying to every line in the country and at a reasonable and just rate based on the Government business.

Mr. TARVER. Does not the gentleman agree that under the law as it exists now the Federal Communications Commission does have the right to fix the rates which shall be paid on Government messages? Is that true?

Mr. LEA. Subject to the restriction of the act of 1866.

Mr. TARVER. According to the language of the law as stated in the report, there is no such limitation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I listened as closely as I could to the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in his colloquy with the gentleman from Georgia, but what I heard did not convince me that the sentence in question lacks meaning and is innocent. The fact remains that this final sentence of the bill as proposed reads—

> No telegraph company shall by reason of any benefit received under any provisions of the Post Roads Act of July 24, 1866 be required to transmit such telegrams at rates less than those applicable to other telegrams in the same classes.

If this sentence stays in the bill, then it certainly is clear that the Federal Communications Commission cannot demand on behalf of the Government the consideration of the reduced rates to which it is entitled under the provisions of the Act of 1866. I grant there is no guaranty that the Federal Communications Commission will assert the Government's right to reduced rates but if that sentence stays in, the F. C. C. will be prohibited from asserting the right on the basis of the 1866 act.

It has been suggested that abolition of the Government discount can result in a general rate reduction. There is no guaranty of that. There has been no guaranty or no suggestion of a guaranty of that in return for surrender of the right to allow the Government's discount. The only suggestion of any consideration here for a change in the 1866 law is that preceding sentences in this section provide for a priority in the transmission of Government telegrams. In other words, it is proposed here to surrender the discount advantage which the Government had by the 1866 act for a mess of pottage and the mess of pottage is that Government telegrams shall have a priority——

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. In just a minute.

Mr. POAGE. That is the present law.

Mr. CASE. Yes; that is the present law. That is why the consideration is a mess of pottage. The Government already and for other reasons has priority. Its right to receive a volume discount should be preserved, as has been so well stated by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Moreover, this bill itself gives to the telegraph company a far greater benefit than it ever received under the old land-grant, and that is a complete monopoly. That alone should entitle the Government to a discount. What company is there in the country that would not be willing to give a discount to the Government if it were granted a complete monopoly on all the business of its character in the country?

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas should be adopted. The sentence in question should be stricken from the bill. We should preserve for the Federal Communications Commission the right to grant a discount on Government business on the basis of the 1866 act. The adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will protect the Government in that right. The bill as drawn abandons it and prohibits its exercise.

Mr. BOREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. I believe that the gentleman is in error on that one point about whether or not the Commission would still be able to regulate. There is no doubt but what the Commission will still be able to give a special rate on such telegrams as are classified as governmental telegrams. There is a matter of principle involved in this. Does the gentleman really believe that Madam Perkins ought to be permitted to send telegrams to John L. Lewis at a rate cheaper than some mother in his district may send telegrams to her son at a post in the service?

Mr. CASE. I would get at that by cutting down the money that Madam Perkins would be permitted to spend.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas which provides that existing Government telegraph rates continue. My view of this bill is simply this. I do not believe there is any reason why the Congress of the United States should grant the Western Union Telegraph Co. a monopoly by law. Further, I think this bill is merely a softening-up process as a prelude to bringing in later a bill to give the railroads the benefits we now get from the land-grant rates.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from California that I agree with him on this amendment. I expect to vote for this amendment, but "all the perfumes of Arabia" would not sweeten this bill to the point where I would vote for it in its present form.

Mr. FORD. I second the motion.

It has been repeatedly stated here on the floor that the Reconstruction Finance

Corporation has been loaning the Postal Co. $400,000 per month.

Well, all I have got to say to that statement is that whoever in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is, or has been, responsible for that loan ought to have his head examined.

It may be argued that this was purely to keep the institution alive. It seems to me that since many of the top ranking financiers in the Postal are also top-ranking financiers in the Western Union, the inference that the Postal was not intended to pay, or was deliberately so managed as to lose money, is by no means outside the realm of speculative probability.

The passage of this bill gives the Western Union an absolute monopoly, subject only to such regulation as the Communications Commission sees fit to impose.

Anyone familiar with the involved technical procedure of these so-called regulatory commissions is welcome to any consolation they can get from that source.

Henceforth and from now on, the Western Union Telegraph Co. will be the sole vehicle by which a telegram or a radiogram can be transmitted.

Will this corporation reduce the rates? It will not. Why should it when Congress, in its deliberative wisdom, which although organized by the Democrats, is controlled by the Republicans, stands four-square for monopoly and still more monopoly?

This bill should be an indication to the country of what it can expect from Congress when controlled by the Republican Party.

It is, this bill, a classic example. It embodies the Republican philosophy at its worst.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 33, line 18, to correct the spelling of a word. The word "qled" should be "filed."

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, what is the purport of it?

Mr. BULWINKLE. "To cause a copy of this application to be filed" instead of "qled."

Mr. RANKIN. We certainly do not want it to appear that we would be glad.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee substitute for the Senate bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 186, noes 28.

So the committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BARDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 99, reports the same back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 201, noes 56.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### MME. CHIANG KAI-SHEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that some time in the near future, probably next week, there will be in the city a distinguished visitor, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, the wife of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, the leader of the Chinese people.

It is fitting and proper that the Members should have the privilege of meeting this distinguished lady. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess on any day during the visit of this distinguished lady to Washington to receive her as the guest of the House, such recess to be subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill just passed be permitted to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

### AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 107) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1605) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to farm-acreage allotments, the farm marketing excess of wheat, the use of excess corn as silage for feed to livestock on the farm, to provide for the adequate supply of peanuts for oil and other uses, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. BELL asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered over the radio last night by Mr. James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the anniversary of Lincoln's birth, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes to render a tribute to President Lincoln for the assistance he gave in creating a State out of the Territory of Nevada.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with regard to the Dies committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my

own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Kenneth M. Lloyd, of Youngstown, Ohio, on the subject of What the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal Means to Labor at War and in Peace.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, February 10, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes today after the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs placed in the RECORD, page 733, the answer of the Navy to certain questions which I had asked.

I am now asking that the Secretary of the Navy be directed to give the House the answer to the following questions:

First. Do the first two paragraphs of article 8 of title 34 of the United States Code read as follows:

Article 8. Persons to whom applicable. Such punishment as a court martial may adjudge may be inflicted on any person in the Navy—First (scandalous conduct). Who is guilty of profane swearing, falsehood, drunkenness, gambling, fraud, theft, or any other scandalous conduct tending to the destruction of good morals.

Second. Is not scandal, among other things, defined to be—

1. The heedless or malicious repetition of evil reports; aspersion of character.

2. Reproach caused by outrageous or improper conduct.

Third. Is not scandalous defined to be, among other things—

1. Causing, or tending to cause, scandal; * * * shocking to the sense of truth, decency, or propriety.

2. Consisting of evil or malicious reports; tending to injure reputation.

Fourth. Does not House Report No. 110, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, reported to the House of Representatives on February 9, 1943, contain, on page 2, under the answer to question 4, the following language:

Articles for the government of the Navy, articles 8 and 22, authorize the charges of scandalous conduct tending to the destruction of good morals, conduct to the prejudice of good order and discipline, and conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman.

Fifth. (a) On Sunday night, January 31, 1943, Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell, an officer in the United States Navy, said in a radio broadcast:

You bet I'm prejudiced against those in high office who guessed so wrong before Pearl Harbor. They're still guessing wrong. I am not in the least comforted by their confessions of ignorance. What worries me most are all those damned fools who reelected them.

(b) Was not the making of the statement, "What worries me most are all those damned fools who reelected them," referring, as it did, to American citizens who voted for certain candidates for Congress, scandalous conduct?

(c) Was not the making of the statement above quoted under paragraph 5 (b) conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman?

Sixth. (a) On the same occasion, to wit, on January 31, 1943, the same Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell, of the Navy, among other things, made the following statements:

Congressman HOFFMAN, it appears, had again stated that the 33 persons indicted on sedition charges were innocent victims of persecutors, to which Congressman MCGRANERY, of Pennsylvania, pointed out that Congressman HOFFMAN, of Michigan, was trying to delay the sedition trials, that HOFFMAN'S speeches since Pearl Harbor were still being franked by Nazi agents and propagandists—then, get this—that it is a matter of sworn record that Congressman HOFFMAN'S franking privilege was used by Charles V. Hudson, of Omaha, one of the 33 indicted for sedition. A couple of cute kids.

(b) The statement that Congressman HOFFMAN, of Michigan, was trying to delay the sedition trials was false; the statement that "it is a matter of sworn record that Congressman HOFFMAN'S franking privilege was used by Charles V. Hudson, of Omaha, 1 of the 33 indicted for sedition," is false; and Lieutenant Commander Winchell, having over the radio broadcast that falsehood, has he been punished under article 8 of title 34 of the United States Code?

Seventh. (a) On Sunday night, February 6, 1943, Walter Winchell, a lieutenant commander in the United States Navy, broadcast over the radio a statement which, in substance, charged that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in an effort to stop a leak in Washington, put out a purposely misleading story at the time of the Casablanca conference, to the effect that the President and Prime Minister Churchill were meeting in Canada.

(b) On the same occasion the same Walter Winchell, a lieutenant commander in the United States Navy, assigned to active duty, stated in substance that less than 24 hours after a misleading story had been put out by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, men who had been guilty of permitting a leak of confidential information were apprehended.

(c) On February 9, 1943, the New York Herald Tribune carried a story in which it was stated that a spokesman for the Federal Bureau of Investigation said that no false rumor had been circulated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; that no men were taken into custody by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and that "the F. B. I. knows nothing about this particular case," referring to the case to which the said Walter Winchell made reference.

(d) The foregoing shows that, over the radio, on Sunday night, February 6, 1943, Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell, of the Navy, was again guilty of falsehood. What, if any, steps have been taken, under article 8 of title 34 of the United States Code to punish him for the making of such false statements?

(e) Was not the making of the statements set forth in paragraphs 7 (a) and 7 (b) conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman?

Eighth. (a) In his column published in the New York Daily Mirror on February 8, 1943, Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell, of the Navy, among other things, wrote:

Hitler is losing on the ground in Russia, in the air over Germany, and on the sands of Africa. He seems to win only in Congress.

(b) Is not the making of, and the causing to be printed, the statement by Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell that "he"—meaning Hitler—"seems to win only in Congress" scandalous conduct?

(c) Is not the making of, and the causing to be printed, the statement quoted in paragraph 8 (b) conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman?

Ninth. (a) In the August 22, 1942, issue of the magazine published under the name Liberty is an article by Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell, of the Navy, which, among other things, charged—page 54—that one Smith "now indicted, sabotaged the war effort by spreading disunity."

(b) In the September 12, 1942, issue of the same magazine, on page 32, are the following words:

A correction. On page 54 of the August 22 issue of Liberty it was stated that Gerald L. K. Smith had been indicted. This was an error and an injustice to Mr. Smith, against whom no indictment has been returned. We apologize for the error.

(c) The foregoing shows that Lieutenant Commander Winchell, of the United States Navy, was guilty of falsehood. Have any steps been taken to punish him, under article 8 above referred to?

(d) Was not the making of the false statement set forth in paragraph 9 (a), and the causing of the same to be printed, conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman?

Tenth. (a) On July 12, 1942, Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell, of the United States Navy, asked a radio audience:

How about the voters going after those other saboteurs who landed in Congress?

(b) A few days later he inserted in his column published in the press the following statement:

Another reason some Congressmen are demanding the eight saboteurs be shot is that they might talk too much.

(c) On July 26, 1942, Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell, of the Navy, over the radio, made the statement that—

Nearly everyone who printed seditious articles has been indicted except those who put the same things in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. * * * But, honeychile, all of them will be confronted by the same charges after November 5.

(d) Was not the making of the statements above referred to in paragraphs numbered 10 (a), 10 (b), and 10 (c) scandalous conduct?

(e) What, if any, action has the Navy taken to end the making of such statements by Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell?

(f) Was not the making of the statements above referred to in paragraphs numbered 10 (a), 10 (b), and 10 (c) conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman?

(g) If the making of such statements was conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman, what, if any, action has been taken by the Navy Department to punish the said Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell therefor?

(h) What, if any, steps have been taken to punish him under article 8, of title 34, of the United States Code?

Eleventh. Were the statements, or any of the statements hereinbefore quoted as having been made by Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell a violation of any rule or regulation of the Navy or of any law of the United States?

Twelfth. If any statement quoted above was a violation of a rule or regulation of the Navy, or of any law of the United States, why has not action been taken to end the making of such statements and to punish Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell for making them?

Thirteenth. In the making of the foregoing statements, or of any of them, did Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell state or present the views or policy of the Navy?

Fourteenth. Is there not some rule or regulation which requires officers in the Navy, before making broadcasts or statements to the public, to submit their proposed utterances to some department of the Government?

Fifteenth. If there is such a rule or regulation, to what department of the Government should proposed broadcasts or statements be submitted?

Sixteenth. Should statements such as those indicated in paragraphs 5 (a), 6 (a), 7 (a), 7 (b), 8 (a), 9 (a), 10 (a), 10 (b), and 10 (c), before being broadcast or made public, be submitted to the Office of War Information?

Seventeenth. Were any of such statements submitted to the Office of War Information?

Eighteenth. (a) Is there not a regulation governing the conduct of officers of the Navy, which, in substance, prohibits the making of statements, or conduct, on the part of an officer which is prejudicial to good order?

(b) What are the words and figures of such rule or regulation?

Nineteenth. Why has not Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell been called to account, or been tried, for his conduct which is in violation of article 8 of title 34 of the United States Code?

Twentieth. Why has not Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell been called to account, or been tried, for his conduct which is in violation of article 22 of title 34 of the United States Code?

Twenty-first. What steps, if any, has the Navy Department taken to end the making of false statements by Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell?

Twenty-second. (a) The United States Code makes it an offense for an officer of the Army to use contemptuous or disrespectful words against the President, Vice President, the Congress of the United States.

(b) Is the use of contemptuous or disrespectful words against the President, Vice President, or the Congress of the United States contrary to any rule or regulation of the Navy?

Twenty-third. Is it permissible for officers of the Navy to challenge the patriotism of the representatives of the people elected to Congress?

Twenty-fourth. What steps, if any, have been taken by the Navy Department to prevent Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell from challenging the patriotism of Members of Congress?

Twenty-fifth. (a) In House Report No. 110, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, containing the answers of the Secretary of the Navy to House Resolution 95, which requested information as to the status of Walter Winchell, under the answer to question 8, on page 3 of said report, it is stated:

On March 17, 1942, confidential orders were issued to him (Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell, United States Naval Reserve) to active duty. This was special duty under the commandant of the third naval district. These orders are still in effect, February 5, 1943.

(b) What special duties has Lieutenant Commander Winchell been performing, and what special duties is he now performing, under those orders?

(c) And how much of his time is required in the performance of those duties?

Twenty-sixth. (a) In the House Report No. 110, referred to in paragraph 25, it is also stated on page 3, under the answer to question 10:

On April 3, 1942, this officer's designation was changed to "Deck, volunteer, special service (public relations), United States Naval Reserve.

(b) Is Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell acting as public relations representative of the Navy?

(c) What duties is he performing in that position?

Twenty-seventh. (a) Who issued the confidential orders, which, on March 17, 1942, assigned Walter Winchell to special duty?

(b) Were such orders issued at the request, or by the direction, of the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy?

Twenty-eighth. (a) Who issued the orders for the changing, on April 3, 1942, of the designation of the said Walter Winchell to "Deck, volunteer, special service (public relations)"?

(b) Were such orders issued at the request, or by the direction, of the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy?

Twenty-ninth. What compensation is being paid to Walter Winchell as a lieutenant commander in the United States Navy?

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter addressed to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three different matters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during the session of the House tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 65, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, and continued under House Resolution 26 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued under House Resolution 321 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued under House Resolution 90 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and continued under House Resolution 420 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress and shall report to the House as soon as practicable, but not later than January 3, 1945, the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out the period, insert a colon and the words: "*Provided*, That the special committee herein continued shall be composed of eight members."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and in the meantime yield 5 minutes to my admiring friend from Georgia, Judge Cox.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I must express my appreciation of the very great generosity of my colleague the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of my committee. This is my resolution. The committee reported it out with only two members making reservations, but the chairman saw fit, however, to report it and to seize all the time and yield 5 minutes to me.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are waging two wars, one against a

foreign foe, and one against enemies here at home. We have drafted the flower and bloom of our young manhood and sent them abroad to fight the foreign war. They are expecting those here at home to carry on the battle within our own borders. These boys that we are sending across the waters expect to return and find the America that they left and that they love, and it is that expectation that we must fulfill.

In combating the enemy within our own borders the Dies committee has done a noble job. They have had magnificent support given from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Catholic Church. I think it would be a mistake not to extend the life of this committee.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman whom he is quoting as spokesman for the Catholic Church of America?

Mr. COX. I will say again that the Catholic Church has done noble work in combating those that have been seeking to undermine the foundations of the Government we love.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I agree with the gentleman that the Catholic Church is unalterably opposed to communism, and so am I. But I repeat the question, I will ask the gentleman on whose authority he speaks for the Catholic Church?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], a distinguished member of the Dies committee.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I want to preface the few remarks I am going to make at this time by reading a telegram I have received this afternoon:

> Representatives of 60,000 United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organization, members in Midwest vigorously oppose extension of and appropriation to Dies committee, which has not filled purpose for which created. Demand you speak and vote against such action.
>
> ROY H. SPETH,
> *President.*

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I do not have time to yield. I have to get this off my chest.

This telegram undoubtedly went to every Member of this House, besides a barrage of other telegrams and letters from C. I. O. representatives all over the United States. I say that this telegram is an arrogant one, first because the signer proposes to speak for 60,000 C. I. O. members of the Midwest, 98 percent of whom are good Americans and at least 90 percent of whom are in favor of a continuation of the Dies committee, and they so showed at the last election on November 3 on the vote that sent me back to this House.

The second reason I say this telegram is arrogant is that it says to a Member of Congress "Demand you speak and vote against such action."

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. MASON. No. I have to mention a few points I want to make during this short time that has been granted to me.

About a year ago when the Dies committee resolution was considered, for a continuation of the committee, I set up as a standard or a measuring stick to evaluate the worth of the committee a list of the friends of the committee and a list of the foes of the committee, and I said if any Member of this House would study the character of the friends and the character of the foes of the committee, then they would know how to evaluate the committee. This House evidently did, because a 90-percent vote was given for a continuance of the committee, a vote of confidence in the committee and approval of the work the committee had done. In spite of the obstacles that had been placed in the way of the committee by high government officials, in spite of the ridicule that had been heaped upon it by high government officials, the committee was continued. I still say that that is a pretty good measuring stick to evaluate the work of this committee.

About 3 weeks ago I set up as another measuring stick or standard by which the work of this committee could be evaluated, and I said in substance, I quoted a biblical injunction, "By their fruits shall ye know them." Then I pointed out the fruits of the committee as listed in the annual report furnished to each Member of this House. I took the high points of that committee's report. At that time I did not have enough time to complete the list of fruits of the committee, so in the short time that is given to me I want to list two or three of those fruits today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MASON. First. The Dies committee has compiled and tabulated an invaluable stock pile or reservoir of facts and information concerning the subversive agents and organizations at work in America today.

Second. The files of the Dies committee are being consulted daily by representatives of the F. B. I., Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, Secret Service, and other Government agencies, and the information secured from those files used as a basis for action against these subversive agents and organizations.

Third. The activities of the Committee for Democratic Action, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, and other organizations that had for their chief purpose the undermining of the Congress and the smearing of many of its most outstanding members of both parties, were so thoroughly exposed by the Dies committee and their communistic tie-ups so clearly pointed out that these organizations were discredited and their activities nullified. As a result not one Member of Congress listed by these organizations for defeat was defeated.

Therefore, on the basis of the fruits that the Dies committee has produced during the past year, the committee is not only entitled to a vote of confidence but also to a new lease on life.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, a member of the Rules Committee [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I remember very well when the original resolution began hanging around the Rules Committee several years ago. At that time the chief object and purpose was stated repeatedly to be the investigation of the German Bund with later some mention of things that might be communistic. I took occasion today to go back and read the original resolution which the pending resolution proposes to continue. In my judgment we face a vitally different situation today from what we faced when the original resolution was adopted in 1938. Now, it authorizes an investigation of the extent, character, and object of un-American propaganda; it also authorizes the investigation of subversive and un-American propaganda emanating from foreign countries or arising domestically contrary to the principles guaranteed by the American Constitution, and such other facts as may be pertinent to enable Congress to legislate. That has been done. I have heretofore supported the Dies resolution, but I think we face a situation so completely changed that its usefulness is a thing of the past. I concede that it has done good work, but I think it has gone far afield from the language of the original resolution and has come to be more of a supervisor of personnel of executive departments, and getting even at that in a clumsy way that throws this House repeatedly into confusion and accomplishes nothing.

For the preservation of the principles guaranteed by the Constitution, we have six or seven million men under arms tonight; that is what they are doing. The whole power and strength of this Government is dedicated to the preservation of those principles. Last year we increased from a little under $25,000,000 to around $39,000,000 the money that the F. B. I. might spend in investigating anything that is un-American. I am not in a position to state the extent of it, but I do know that the Army and the Navy has a comprehensive and widespread intelligence set-up the purpose of which is to make these investigations; and it seems to me that we have passed the stage of propaganda. We are fighting a war to preserve the principles of the American Constitution and it seems unreasonable to me and foolish to have a committee, though it has done good work in the past, fooling around and making some investigation about some little propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New

Jersey [Mr. THOMAS], a member of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina made the statement that the Dies committee had been just fooling around lately. I do not know whether the gentleman from North Carolina has ever been up to the offices of the Dies committee, but if he had, or if he had visited its offices in the last few days, certainly he would never make such a statement.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thought I said "fooling around with propaganda investigation."

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I can see no difference whether the gentleman says "fooling around with propaganda" or "fooling around" with something else. The impression he was trying to leave was that the committee itself and the investigators of the committee were fooling around, which is absolutely not the fact.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I did not intend to leave any such impression; I was trying to make a contrast between propaganda and war.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Certainly; but the gentleman must nevertheless conclude that it would be very bad for us to stop fooling around, if he wants to refer to it as that, with the very people who are trying to fool around with our country.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Is it not a fact that during wartime the propaganda of all nations is intensified? It is more important than ever that we be alert to detect and expose enemy propaganda.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. No; I am sorry; I have only 5 minutes, and, due to yielding to other Members, my time is running out fast.

The importance of continuing the Dies committee may be measured by reference to some matters which are at stake in its work. I propose to outline a few of these things which are at stake as briefly and as pointedly as possible.

I believe it is correct to say that no other special committee in the entire history of the United States Congress has received as many as four mandates from the House of Representatives. Our committee has been functioning for almost 5 years, and now we are proposing to extend its life for an additional 2 years. These 5 years of investigation have provided us with a foundation and structure of experience which are absolutely indispensable to the Congress and the country at this critical juncture in history. It is absolutely unthinkable that this House or the overwhelming majority of American citizens would wish to halt our investigations into subversive activities at precisely the moment when subversion is more dangerous to the Nation than at any other time in the century and a half of its history. Furthermore acts and movements of subversion may become even more dangerous during the 2 crucial years that lie immediately ahead. I name, therefore, as our committee's first equipment, unparalleled experience.

In our committee's annual report to this House last month it was made clear that the mass of information which we have gathered during almost 5 years of work has grown to enormous proportions.

The seven rooms which now hold our committee's files here in Washington are crammed with the records of subversive activities which involve something like a million individuals or more than a thousand organizations. The files of our committee's New York and Los Angeles regional offices are proportionately large. All of this vast quantity of evidence is, in reality, in the possession of the House of Representatives which has voted the funds for assembling it. Certainly this is not the time to put a padlock upon these files. However, I have not the slightest fear that any appreciable number of Members here contemplates the sacrifice of either our committee's experience or its files of information.

So much, therefore, for the committee's competence to deal with subversive activities by methods of investigation and exposure. I come to the larger question of our free American institutions which are at stake in this national crisis. By calling attention to the internal dangers to our free institutions, I am not minimizing by one iota the paramount necessity of our building and equipping a military force with which to win a crushing and final victory over the Axis Powers. Nevertheless, there are grave internal dangers to the American system of government and the American way of life. The people of this country are becoming increasingly aware of these dangers, and they expect the Congress of the United States to take adequate measures for their protection. Some of us did not have to wait for the election returns to understand how seriously the American people take the question of preserving their form of government and their way of life from the insidious encroachments of bureaucracy, collectivism, radical crackpotism, or any other brand, style, or hue of totalitarianism. The American people are no more in favor of home-grown totalitarianism than they are of the variety spawned abroad. They have a profound distaste for it whether it goes by the name of nazi-ism, or facism, or bolshevism, or whether it is some anonymous totalitarianism invented by Washington bureaucrats.

And while I am on the subject of the bureaucrats, I want to say that bureaucracy is the backdoor entrance to fascism or nazi-ism. The German people entered nazi-ism by the backdoor of a gigantic socialist bureaucracy. The democratic constitution of Weimar was on paper, but the socialist bureaucracy was in office. A people long weary of bureaucracy and finding its legislative branch of government unable or unwilling to cope with that bureaucracy, turned to Hitler as the way out. Of course that was not the only factor which contributed to Hitler's rise to power, but it was one of the important factors and in any understanding of the widespread disease of totalitarianism we must bear it in mind.

Naturally, the Dies committee is not going to deal with the totalitarian threat to our institutions all by itself. But the Dies committee is one of the indispensable agencies for protecting American institutions by an incessant exposure of the Nazi, Fascist, and Bolshevist forms of this disease.

I am not one of those sentimentalists who would ignore these threats in the interest of liberalism, nor am I one who sees "reds" under the bed, but I am one who is certain that a real threat to our American institutions still exists. This threat may appear to some to be dormant today, but actually our entry into the war has accelerated it. The American Communists have cleverly used the war as a vehicle with which to gain power. As a result of the war, they have become accepted in strange places. At least it is safe to say they have made appreciable gains. Where formerly the American Communists operated as rats in the dark, they have now taken on the cloak of patriotism. This, of course, came about only when Germany attacked Russia. I am wondering what the American Communists would do were Russia to make a separate peace with Germany after Germany had been completely expelled from Russian soil.

And it is important to keep in mind that we have no assurance to date that Russia will not agree to a separate peace. We naturally hope and pray that they will not, but at least the possibility of it is there.

In addition to the ever-present threat from the American Communists, there is likewise the threat, especially in wartime, from the insidious agents, provocateurs, and saboteurs of our foreign enemies. I hope that none of us believe that foreign agents and spies have all been driven out of America. If you do, you may someday be in for a sad awakening.

So, taken all in all, America must be on guard, and the more Government agencies we have ferreting into those problems, the better off we will be. There is definitely a place in this picture for the Dies committee. The requests made of our committee by other agencies of the Government is proof enough.

When our fighting men come back from the shambles of Samoa, the sandy wastes of Africa, and the ruins of Berlin, they will expect us to have done our best to not only eliminate the foreign agents but to also preserve at home the free institutions and the American way of life. It would be a sad state of affairs were these boys to return to our great land only to find the Nation in the throes of disorder, the Government in

the hands of foreign sympathizers, and the economic and fiscal state in total chaos. You and I, as Members of this House, have a solemn obligation to these boys. We must above everything else protect the things back home that are so dear to them, and, therefore, we cannot afford for one second to close our eyes to the dangers which constantly becloud our institutions and our way of life. The Dies committee is one kind of national insurance against this, for which, if our soldiers, sailors, and marines had an opportunity to request, they would be for almost unanimously. The least that we can do today is to cast a vote for them.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in 1938 I received letters and telegrams from American Legion posts, from the automotive industry, from management, from chambers of commerce, from practically everybody in Detroit in favor of the Dies resolution. It is most significant that now we do not have anybody in favor of it; in fact, the two Detroit papers, the Detroit News and the Detroit Free Press, independent Republican, are opposed to the Dies resolution. Organized labor, both the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L., are opposed to it.

We find today a different situation than we had in 1938. The Dies resolution cannot serve any good purpose any more. I am voting against the Dies resolution.

I believe that we have the F. B. I. and we have Army and Navy intelligence that is taking care of the very thing that the Dies committee was supposed to do, taking care of people who are disloyal to the United States of America. We should not have a Congressional committee that is going to undertake to suppress the right of free speech, the right of a free press, the right of a man to express himself, to write an article, say, to a Communist paper in New York or any other paper. Every man has a right to write a letter, or a newspaper article, and speak out his mind on a matter of economics. The only question involved is: Is he loyal to the United States? Is he supporting our win-the-war program? Is he fighting the enemy—the Nazis, the Fascists, and the Japs?

This question here is not a fight against the Communist. It is a fight against American teachers, educators, and economists. They may disagree with you and I, but they have a right to express themselves. They are not hurting us in our war effort. They are cooperating with us in the war effort and they have proven themselves to be good, loyal Americans during this time of war. I do not see any reason for persecuting a man because he disagrees with me on a question of economics and indicting him as un-American. We have all been guilty of calling people who disagree with us "crackpots and radicals." I have done the same thing and you have done the same thing, but we are never going to accede to the proposition that that man has no right to express himself. This Congress should not take that position. While our Army and Navy is driving the Japs out of Guadalcanal; while our boys and our English allies are giving the enemy hell over in Africa; while our Russian allies are annihilating the Nazi hordes at Kursk, Kharkov, and Rostov, the Dies committee comes here for another fat appropriation to fight organized labor, teachers, professors, and economists who have worked to create higher living standards for the common man in America.

The important thing before us now is to win this war. To beat the Axis. To beat the Nazis, Fascists, and the Japs. The Dies committee was formed for the purpose of investigating un-American activities—to me this meant to get after the enemy, the Nazis and the Fascists.

Regularly, the chairman of the Dies committee has promised the Congress and the American people that his committee would produce facts and documents to expose the workings of Nazi and other pro-Fascist agencies and individuals in this country.

These promises have usually been made to coincide with requests for renewal of the committee's life or for new funds to keep it going. The latest such promise was made on January 3 of this year, when the chairman renewed a pledge made the previous July to bring out a 1,000-page documentation of such enemy activities.

With equal regularity, the chairman and the committee have failed to keep even a semblance of these pledges of anti-Axis investigation and exposition. Let us look at the record of these broken promises.

Speaking on the radio as far back as September 18, 1939, the chairman of the Dies committee said that he had evidence of collaboration between the Nazi bund and certain native fascists, including George Deatherage, recently indicted for seditious activity. No action was ever taken to follow this up, in fact, when Deatherage appeared and refused to answer the committee's questions, the matter was let drop.

On November 30, 1940, Representative DIES was quoted in the Philadelphia Record to the effect that he was about to reveal a bund plot to sabotage war industry. This plot against our country is still unexposed by the Dies committee.

In the same period, Representative DIES promised an exposé of a Nazi fundraising drive in this country. The exposé is still to come, though the chairman at the time said he had lists of some 220,000 names of people involved in the conspiracy.

July 1941, the gentleman from Texas, Representative DIES, made another promise, this time to expose anti-Semitic, pro-Fascist tie-ups. This promise is also still unfulfilled. In August 1942, the gentleman from Texas, Representative DIES, again promised an exposé of pro-Axis activities. This time he carried it to the length of demanding perpetual surveillance of some 17,000 individuals he said were Nazis or their agents. Nothing has come of this promise, as nothing has come of the others.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the record of unfulfilled promises is clear. At the same time, it is equally clear that numerous pro-Axis and native Fascist groups and individuals have felt perfectly safe and free to operate without interference from a committee supposed to combat un-American activities. Let us look at the record again for a minute.

This question is from George Sylvester Viereck, convicted agent of Nazi propaganda:

I have the highest respect for the Dies committee and sympathize with its program.

From Fritz Kuhn, Bund leader now in prison:

I am in favor of it [the Dies committee] to be appointed again and wish them to get more money.

From William Dudley Pelley, native Fascist leader now in prison:

I founded the Silver Legion in 1933—to propagandize the same principles that Mr. Dies and this committee are engaged in prosecuting right now.

From James A. Colescott, imperial wizard of the Ku Klux Klan:

His—

DIES'—

program so closely parallels the program of the Klan that there is no distinguishable difference between them.

None of these unsavory characters was ever exposed at any time by the Dies committee. Indeed, it would appear that they were actually sheltered by the committee. Those that have been indicted and punished have been brought to book without the aid of the committee.

While no promise to expose Axis agents and their activities has been kept, Chairman DIES did come out with one astonishing statement to the effect that he had evidence that would have forestalled Pearl Harbor, had he been permitted to make it public by the administration.

This statement, if true, would have branded our Government as incapable of looking after our national defense and therefore no longer worthy of the confidence of our people. It would also have branded Representative DIES as equally derelict in his duty for permitting such information to be buried. The newspapers have always been available to Representative DIES in unlimited space. If it were true that he held information to prevent the national disaster of Pearl Harbor, he had the duty to use every possible means of circumventing an administration censorship—if such a thing existed.

Actually, as we know, Representative DIES had no such information. Mr. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, issued a statement on behalf of the Secretary of State and the State Department completely contradicting Representative DIES' false claim.

Later it transpired that Representative DIES had refused to aid the Department of Justice in a request for information—on activities of Japanese agents—sent by Attorney General Francis Biddle in August 1941.

This is a partial record of the failures and refusals of the Dies committee to hunt down and expose the subversive activities of known pro-Axis and native Fascist groups and individuals.

On this record, the chairman of the un-American Dies committee appeals for a new grant of authority from this Congress. It should be apparent that the committee does not deserve the confidence of Congress, that it has wasted the authority and the money granted to date, and that its activities against the enemies of our country and their agents have aided those enemies rather than hindered them.

This Congress would be as remiss in its duty as the Dies committee itself if it were to grant that new authority.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in voting for this resolution, I do so after very careful consideration of all that is involved, and only because I regretfully believe the country does have need of some means of protest against the policy of the present administration to appoint and keep in positions of varying degrees of authority men and women whose purposes are to destroy our representative form of government.

If the existence of this committee is what its opponents claim it to be, namely a factor preventing unity so necessary to our war effort, it seems to me the blame, if there is any, should be placed at the right door, and the pressure applied to the cause rather than to that which is only a symptom.

However, the methods employed by the committee have been such that I have found myself in protest against them. They have given rise to doubts as to the stability of justice and of the great American principle of fair play.

With the need for increasing unity for victory such doubts take on larger proportions in some sections of our people than would ordinarily be the case.

I am completely agreed that the Congress has an important role to play in conducting proper investigations. I am exceedingly jealous of the prestige and the influence of all congressional action. This committee has done so much that is fine that it is particularly unfortunate that its methods have become increasingly such as to create doubt of its present value in many minds, including my own.

Fanaticism and intolerance seem to have been allowed to play a part in decisions that should rest upon calm judgment and incontrovertible fact. I am completely out of sympathy with all action stemming from such thinking.

In studying the protests being made by the groups opposing the continuance of the committee, I have found many things with which I agree. But when I discovered in them evidence of the same spirit of fanaticism and lack of fairness they protest against, it gave me pause.

In these last days the membership of the House has shown the Nation and the world that it still considers the fundamental principles of fairness and justice of first importance.

If in its action today the House continues the committee to investigate un-American activities, it would be well for that committee to take to heart what yesterday's vote indicated. In its insistence upon fair play for a man who holds the respect and love of thousands of our finest Negro citizens because of his constant and self-forgetting work in their behalf, it was a declaration that this body will assume anew the responsibility that is really ours to see that this committee we have created does its work in accordance with the highest ideals of American justice and in the interests of our American dream of freedom.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY].

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein some telegrams and an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, last week the gentleman from Texas grossly maligned a respected citizen of my State, a high-ranking official of the War Production Board, Paul R. Porter.

When Mr. DIES' investigator sought information about Mr. Porter from the W. P. B. he asked one question only—the size of his salary. I made inquiry about his character and the value of his work. I asked his boss, Donald Nelson. Mr. Nelson authorizes me to quote him as follows:

> I consider Paul Porter to be an outstanding public servant. I have observed his work closely and intimately. He is doing a first-rate job in one of the most difficult positions of the whole war effort.

I hold in my hand telegrams of praise for Mr. Porter from the general counsel of the Henry J. Kaiser Co., from Henry J. Kaiser himself, and from outstanding industrial and labor leaders.

The word of these men carries more weight with me than the insubstantial, reckless, and defamatory statement by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. Speaker, as a newcomer to the House, I shall shortly be called to cast a vote for the first time upon the continuance of the Dies committee. I have tried to approach this matter with an open mind. In this same spirit I intend to examine the accusations made on this floor a few days ago against a number of persons by the gentleman from Texas. The names of most of those persons are not known to me. Paul R. Porter is known to me personally. He is a respected citizen of my State, a man of excellent character and unimpeachable patriotism who enjoys high standing in his home community.

Mr. Speaker, if one wishes to know the character of a man or the worth of his work it would seem appropriate, indeed essential, to question his superiors and his associates. I would have supposed, therefore, that the gentleman from Texas or his investigators would have talked to Mr. Donald Nelson, the chairman of the War Production Board, or to high officials in the Maritime Commission, or the Navy Department with whom Mr. Porter has been closely associated. I would have supposed that Mr. Porter would have been called for a hearing. I find that none of these things were done, so I made my own inquiries. I found that Mr. Porter has the confidence of the highest officials in the War Production Board, the Navy, the War Department, the Maritime Commission, and that his work is highly regarded wherever he is known.

Mr. Porter is known for his work in helping to effect wage stabilization in the shipbuilding and aircraft industries, our two most vital war industries. What do the outstanding spokesmen of both management and labor in these two industries think of Mr. Porter's executive ability, his judicial temperament, and his devotion to our country? I ask approval to introduce into the RECORD telegrams and letters praising Mr. Porter's character and work from the general counsel of the Henry J. Kaiser Co., from Henry J. Kaiser, from officers of great shipbuilding and aircraft corporations, from officers of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, and from the C. I. O. Shipbuilders Union.

Mr. Speaker, the word of these men carries more weight with me than the insubstantial, reckless, and defamatory denunciation made last week by the gentleman from Texas. The gross injustice done to a man for whom I can personally vouch convinces me that there is something radically wrong in the operation of the Dies committee. The men who have been attacked by the gentleman from Texas come from many States. I hope that the Members of this House will ascertain which of those persons may come from their own State, or their own district, and will make their own inquiries as I have done.

My own inquiry compels me to believe that the so-called investigations made by the Dies committee have been made either with slipshod and irresponsible carelessness, or that information that this House is entitled to have has been, at least in some cases, withheld. Had this House been properly informed concerning Mr. Porter, for example, the report would have shown that the committee which he heads has established, and now supervises, voluntary wage stabilization agreements covering a million workers in our most vital war industry. The report would have shown that these agreements have been an important factor in enabling the shipbuilding industry to surpass the high production goal set for it last year. The report would have shown that sitting with Mr. Porter, as members of this committee, are high officials of the Navy Department, the War Department, the Maritime Commission, 12 high officials of the Nation's shipbuilding companies, and an equal number of representatives from both major labor organizations. The report to which this House is entitled would have included an evaluation of the chairman's work from those associates who are best qualified to make an appraisal.

A proper report should show that only last week Mr. Porter, in addition to his W. P. B. duties, was named to be Chairman of the Shipbuilding Commission of the War Labor Board, which commission will, in fact, be a little War Labor Board for the shipbuilding industry. The report would show that Mr. Porter was unanimously nominated for this second post by representatives of the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, by the shipbuilding industry, and shipbuilding labor.

A true report, Mr. Speaker, concerning Mr. Porter will show that he was recently borrowed from the War Production Board by the War Labor Board to help work out a wage-stabilization program for the Pacific coast aircraft industry, and that his report, now before the War Labor Board for its consideration, has been praised for its fairness to all parties concerned and for its soundness.

I think a proper investigation of Mr. Porter would have included some inquiry among his fellow townsmen at Kenosha, Wis. A true report would have shown that they esteemed him highly enough to elect him to that city's school board. A true report would include testimonials to his character and patriotism from ministers, civic leaders, workers, merchants, and manufacturers.

Mr. Porter, who has not even had the most elementary sort of hearing, is not on trial before this House. I therefore do not address myself to the so-called charges made by the gentleman from Texas. But I am fully convinced that should he be accorded a hearing that he could answer the flimsy and unsupported charges to the satisfaction of every Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of an investigation is it when only one question about Mr. Porter was asked of the War Production Board, for whom he works?

About 2 weeks ago some unidentified person from the Dies committee telephoned the War Production Board and asked one question—one question only—about Mr. Porter. That question was the size of his salary. It is a pity that at least a second question was not asked. That question might have concerned the status of another man denounced by the gentleman from Texas, a Mr. Paul F. Brissenden, who we were informed was an employee in Mr. Porter's office. I find that Mr. Brissenden, whom I do not know but who may be a very estimable gentleman, has never worked as assistant to Mr. Porter, that he worked for the War Production Board for a few weeks only on a special assignment, and that that was more than 18 months ago.

Mr. Speaker, I must frankly say that I consider a report so unreliable as the one presented to this House last week to be an offense to the intelligence and dignity of its Members.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to enclose in this evidence certain telegrams received by Mr. Paul R. Porter as a result of this dastardly attack. First, we have the following telegram from Mr. E. R. Perry, assistant to the president of the Boeing Aircraft Co., which advises:

Unexpected departure from Washington last week prevented my seeing you again personally to express the very sincere appreciation of myself and associates from Boeing Aircraft for your genuine helpfulness and understanding of our problems in the Pacific coast air frame wage stabilization matter which has carried on since July of last year through two meetings in Los Angeles and recent hearing before the National War Labor Board on your recommendation. We compliment you on the thoroughness and excellence of your report to the Board and appreciate your fairness and impartiality as chairman of the Los Angeles meeting.

Mr. John P. Frey, president of the metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor, wires as follows:

Following telegram forwarded to Congressman DIES: "Paul R. Porter as chairman of Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee attends to working conditions of over 1,000,000 shipyard workers. In that position he has won the respect and confidence of Government officials, of management, and of labor. He has contributed to shipbuilding in an outstanding manner. For his efficient services I am personally appreciative."

Mr. Monroe B. Lanier, president of the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation, and president of the Gulf Coast Shipbuilding Association, wires as follows:

I am taking the liberty of sending the following telegram to Congressman WILLIAM COLMER, Representative from our district of Mississippi, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.: "It has been called to my attention that Congressman MARTIN DIES has included the name of Mr. Paul R. Porter among a list of officials and employees of the Government who are alleged to be engaged in a campaign of defaming or casting reflection upon the name of Members of the Congress of the United States and others. I have not the honor of knowing Representative DIES and am taking the liberty of making a request of you as Representative from our district in Mississippi to immediately convey to Representative DIES following message:

"'As president of the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation and as a representative of all shipbuilders of the Gulf zone in the negotiation of the amendment to Gulf zone agreement between labor, Government, and industry and as a member of the shipbuilding stabilization committee of the War Production Board and an alternate of the Shipbuilding Commission of the War Labor Board I have been in frequent contact with Mr. Paul R. Porter, chairman of the shipbuilding stabilization committee. Prior to the organization of these agencies I have had frequent occasion to contact Mr. Porter when he was an assistant to Mr. Sidney Hillman in connection with labor disputes. I have found Mr. Porter to be conscientious, fair, and able in the many conferences, some of which have lasted continuously for a period of weeks. I have never heard him utter one word of disparagement or criticism of any men connected with the legislative, executive, or judicial branches of the United States Government. I consider him a man of the highest standards and ideals and patriotism, and in my opinion no charge of subversive action or speech could properly be attributed to him. I regret that anything might be said which will tend to hamper the highly constructive efforts of Mr. Porter in behalf of labor and industry in the vitally important shipbuilding industry.'"

Mr. Harry F. Morton, general counsel of the Henry J. Kaiser Co., and vice president of the Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, wires as follows:

I have today wired Congressman DIES with copy to Donald Nelson: "News dispatches from Washington yesterday indicate that in course of speech in Congress you mentioned Paul R. Porter, chief of shipbuilding stabilization branch of War Production Board, as 'typical of the irresponsible, unrepresentative, crackpot, and radical bureaucrats who are attempting to undermine the confidence of the people in Congress.' I am sure you must have been misinformed regarding Mr. Porter. For the past year or more I have been in close touch with Mr. Porter as an industry member of the shipbuilding stabilization committee, of which he is chairman, and I have been impressed by his unyielding devotion to the cause of our Government and to the successful prosecution of the war effort. His approach to the problem in the shipbuilding field has not been that of a bureaucrat or crackpot but rather that of a practical executive. Much of the success of the shipbuilding industry in meeting the President's program is, in my opinion, due to Porter's understanding of the problems which have arisen and his efficient handling thereof. I feel it my duty to advise you of this and respectfully suggest that you make inquiry among the other members of the committee."

Mr. Speaker, I should like to enclose as a part of this RECORD an editorial which appeared on February 3, 1943, in the Milwaukee Journal, which is Wisconsin's most important newspaper:

DIES DOES NOT HELP

Representative MARTIN DIES did some effective work in the days of the "isms" conspiracies. He exposed the lies of the Communists and the false fronts they set up.

It is equally true that Mr. DIES did not do a comparably good job exposing the Fascists, no matter what he says now. However, the Bundists, the Silvershirts and the Coughlinites were discrediting themselves, so that failure made little difference.

But we fail to follow DIES in his latest attack. It is true that what he terms bureaucracy has bungled some things and has often proceeded in contradictory directions. There are, in Washington, too many "chief and assistant analysts" of this and that; too many "policy consultants," "information advisers," "economists" and other gentlemen with pet and often fuzzy notions. They are as thick as fleas on a stray dog's back.

But over and above all this, perhaps in spite of it all, stands the fact that we have made amazing progress in the biggest job America has ever undertaken. We have accomplished so much more in the first year of this war than we did in the first year of the last that one can hardly make comparisons. Hasn't Mr. DIES anything to say for that?

Adolf Hitler would like nothing better than to have Americans think that they are ruled wholly by incompetent bureaucrats and conspirators in a system that is not worth fighting for. That would prove his charge of "decadent democracy" to the letter.

DIES, unwittingly of course, does his little best to get this idea spread throughout the Nation. And therein lies the danger of the present Dies performance. He can hurt America.

DIES says that the apostles of hate and disunity are the enemies of democracy. They are. But who are these apostles? Largely they are the men and the agencies that DIES is associating with now. They are a combination of unconvinced isolationists, unregenerated America Firsters—only, to be sure, a part of the original America First movement—political haters of Roosevelt who have more hate than either fairness or sense, economic Bourbons who want to put this country back where it was in 1890, and all those who are willing to play politics throughout this war period in order to be ready for a possible political overturn as soon as peace comes.

Why does not Mr. DIES say something about this group? He makes no more progress there than he did against the Fascists. He strikes a popular chord with Congressmen, no doubt,

by appearing to be the champion of a downtrodden Congress. The answer to this is that the record of Congress will be what Congress makes it—no worse and no better. It took one of the youngest Members, WILL ROGERS, son of the famous humorist, to puncture the Dies performance. Too many of the Congressmen, apparently, "ate it up." ROGERS has not been there long enough to accept a champion without examining his qualifications and aims.

MARTIN DIES is an example of a man who does not know where to stop. His extravagant performance discredits whatever case he may have.

Mr. Speaker, the following telegram was sent February 8, 1943, to the gentleman from Texas, Hon. MARTIN L. DIES.

Endeavored to reach you on the telephone today, but was unsuccessful, and since I am leaving on the streamliner today, want to state I have read of the effort of you and your committee to assist in expediting the war effort by removal of those whose activities and record of performance in this country's service is either directly or indirectly hindering the effort we all must make. You know how sincerely I feel that greater production is one of the prime factors in quickly winning this war and also the preservation of our national security in the post-war. I know how conscientious you are, and thought you would want to know my experience with Paul Porter, whom you mentioned. As to his record amongst others you are investigating, I would like to say that our contacts with him have been limited solely to his work on the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, of which I am a member. From this personal knowledge of Porter's activities in this field, I know him as one whose activities have been to attain more production with greater efficiency. Among other things Paul Porter's personal effort in forwarding the 7-day workweek in shipbuilding is foremost in my mind. I therefore felt it was my duty to advise you that as I know Porter in connection with his work on shipbuilding stabilization, he has been striving for greater production, and therefore I can conclude from my knowledge of Porter that in this emergency, he is making a contribution to the war effort.

HENRY J. KAISER.

Mr. Speaker, the following statement was made to me on February 9, 1943:

Paul R. Porter has been most unfairly maligned by Congressman DIES. I have known him for a number of years. He not only has the full confidence of labor, but I know that he is also respected by industrial management and Government officials charged with responsibility for war production. Porter has never been associated with any organization whose loyalty can for one moment be questioned. I know Porter to be a sincere and able defender of democracy.

JOHN GREEN,
*President, Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, Camden, N. J.*

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Henry Knight, of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, made the following statement to me on Monday, February 8, 1943:

I think Paul R. Porter has done one of the most outstanding jobs, with very many difficulties involved, in the airplane stabilization proceedings. His efforts have been well received by both labor and management. I have had lunch with him, that is, personally, about 10 or 15 times, and have discussed his views with him. He is sound in most of his reasoning, and I am convinced that he has a sincere interest in winning the war and furthering our total war effort. I feel he is a sincere American.

Mr. Speaker, the following telegram was sent yesterday, February 9, 1943, to Paul R. Porter:

Following wire was today dispatched to Hon. MARTIN DIES: "I am informed some question has been expressed regarding the character and ability of Paul R. Porter, of the War Production Board. May I respectfully advise you that I am personally acquainted with Mr. Porter and have personally observed his actions and activities as a representative of the War Production Board and a special representative of the War Labor Board, and I do not hesitate to vouch for his honesty, capability, and conscientiousness both as an individual and in his Government capacity. Robert E. Gross, president, Lockheed Aircraft Corporation."

LEONARD K. SCHWARTZ,
*Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, Burbank, Calif.*

Mr. Speaker, the issue of the Dies committee has overshadowed everything that we have done or tried to do in this session of Congress and has prevented this great legislative body from performing the services which our constituents and our country expect from us. Judging from my own experience here and from the irresponsible actions and words of the members of this committee, I am forced to conclude that those who love their country should vote against this un-American Dies committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule and I am opposed to the resolution and will vote against it. As a preface to my remarks let me say that the patriotism of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Dies committee, if at all, is exceeded only by his great ability as an orator. As an orator and swayer of audiences by oratory, I doubt if the gentleman has few equals and perhaps no superior today. It is my opinion that no Member of this House or member of any other legislative branch of the Government could move a body of women and men to the point that they would continue the life of this committee on the report and the arguments made by the distinguished gentleman. Nowhere can I find an excuse for its existence today as it has been functioning.

One would think we were at war with Russia instead of with Germany. Plenty could be found to do in connection with Nazi sympathizers in this country, but the Communists and those of communistic leanings are the ones at which the shafts are driven. Personally I have a deep affection and a great admiration for this distinguished gentleman, but I cannot go along with him in view of the record.

This resolution deals with the continuation of the committee. I doubt if the so-called Dies committee has been functioning as a committee. We know not the acts of this committee except as it reports to the House and what we are told. In the last report filed by a dissenting member of the committee to the membership of the House, I quote from:

1. There has been no opportunity for discussion or amendment of the report or for committee members to do any work upon it. No meeting has been held for its consideration. The report was presented to members on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. It is, in my judgment, wrong for such a document as an annual report of this committee to be treated in this manner, particularly at the present time.

2. Beyond this I have one major point and several of lesser importance which I am impelled to make. The major reason for my dissent is this: America is at war against Germany, Japan, and Italy. The very existence of freedom, democratic government, and all America has stood for hinges upon the outcome of that war. It is perfectly clear to me that under circumstances of this sort, the primary task of a committee on un-American activities is the exposure of the activities and propaganda of forces friendly to enemy countries and of groups in this country who wittingly, or unwittingly, promote their cause.

I further wish to quote from this minority report:

But I feel very profoundly that the main excuse for this committee's existence at the present time is that it may contribute to the maximum possible extent to stiffening of the resistance of the American people to open or covert pro-Axis propaganda and to the building of a vigorous and unified democratic sentiment in the United States. Its annual report offered an opportunity to strike a blow in that direction. That opportunity has been neglected.

I commend the reading of the minority report filed by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] to the membership of the House.

We Americans today have but one concern. We are imbued with but one thought, that is, the winning of this war as quickly as possible with the least possible loss of life and property. Our every word and our every act should be bent toward this one objective. Anyone who utters a word or commits an act that causes confusion or disunity which, in turn, would prolong the war for 1 hour or 1 minute is rendering a grave disservice to his country and to the boys who on land and sea and in the air are giving up their lives for you and me.

I am not going to charge that on the other side of the aisle there is nearly unanimity of support for this resolution for political purposes. Let the consciences of these gentlemen answer that. Neither am I going to say by implication or otherwise that this whole thing is a drive at the executive department of this Government. Again let us search our consciences.

I, too, was attacked in the last campaign by those bitter and prejudiced publications such as the New Republic, who deliberately falsified as to my record in Congress. I let those lies pass because I felt my people knew me better than these propagandists who were trying to put over something apparently nefarious to the interests of my country. My people chose not to follow their advice and lies.

There is an old expression that "a house divided against itself cannot

stand." I think we will all agree that the proof of that rests on elementary common-sense thinking. Now, that being true at all times, how much more true is it when that house is at war, and not just another war, but a conflict that were we to lose, the United States, that we know and love, might never again be as we now know it.

Japan today, controlling as it does about 90 percent of most of the vitally necessary raw materials and possessing as it does the hordes of cheap labor, is in a very advantageous position to compete and dominate in any world market. It, together with Germany, who has shown herself very adept at competing in a world market, would be in a position to keep us very much subjugated for a long time to come.

I seriously question the wisdom of extending the life of this committee, and let me say here and now that being neither a Communist nor a sympathizer of things communistic, my action springs not from a wish to protect those who would destroy our Government but rather, notwithstanding that abhorrence of communism, I feel that this is no time to create confusion, suspicion, doubt, and distrust in the minds of our soldiers and workers by giving them the impression that this great and awful struggle is all for naught—that if they win their freedom from the unholy forces alined against us they will find they have lost their freedom at home. From some of the daily papers one would get the idea that the end of the war will see the Communist Party in control of the administrative, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government. And, if this is the impression registered upon us, how abysmally apathetic—yes, even openly antagonistic—must it leave our great ally Russia. The recent publicity given this committee must be all the more embarrassing to our already embarrassed military and diplomatic group who must make daily contacts with Russia. I had heard that conditions were very strained, Lord only knows how they could be otherwise, and was very upset to see in the Times-Herald of February 4 an article which clearly shows that in at least one of our chief military theaters of war conditions had reached such an impasse that General Eisenhower felt forced to issue the following statement:

> We must realize that we are fighting a touchy war, and everything we do, day and night, must be directed toward the winning of that war. I remind you once again of getting the word spread of my attitude toward irresponsible talk directed at any one of our allies. All officers must be made to understand that in unwarranted criticism of any ally we are playing into the hands of the Axis, and in case of an American officer, he will be subject to direst punishment that I can possibly inflict administratively.

Strong words but conditions must warrant and necessitate a strong remedy because American officers are, as a general rule, not inclined to be autocratic.

After all is said, the fact remains that Russia is not only an ally, but the one ally but for whom the good Lord above only knows how far and to what extent Hitler and his cohorts would be successful, and while it is true that Russia is fighting her own war, do not forget even for a moment that in her heroic and costly struggle with the Germans she is also fighting our war, stopping bullets that your sons and mine are next in line to receive. May I suggest, on reading history, Russia and France were two of the greatest Old World friends this country ever had in the past.

If, for no other reason than those given, I think the question of communistic infiltration into our Government should be left to the Department of Justice who are at once both able and patriotic enough to see that our form of government is not lost while we devote all our energy, attention and thought to the quick and successful conclusion of this awful conflict.

I have on former occasions opposed the continuation of this committee save once—then following certain statements given to the press by the chairman of the committee when the appropriation came up for the committee, I opposed and voted against the appropriation. I only voted to continue the life of the committee because at that time I was assured by a member of that committee that they were going after our common enemies, Germany, Japan, and Italy and their friendly cohorts. Doubts of this nature were not appearing only to myself—the conservative and scholastically well thought of Washington Post in an editorial of March 31, 1942, had this to say of the sudden pursuit of this committee from our common enemy, Germany and Japan, to our ally Russia:

> Mr. WALLACE declares in his statement that the doubts and anger which this and similar statements of Mr. DIES tend to arouse in the public mind might as well come from Goebbels himself as far as their practical effect is concerned.

The Post says "this is strong language," but goes on to say "it cannot be said that it is undeserved."

I could justify the setting up of an altogether new committee sooner than I could justify my voting to continue this one. Such a new committee, for which I see an actual need more and more every day, would have as its sole purpose and function the seeing to it that while our soldiers and workers abroad and at home were fighting to protect the freedom and benefits they had won by hard and long years of toil and suffering that that same freedom and those benefits were not lost here at home. There is an ancient and fishlike smell about the way the committee has been directing its efforts. We had better pause in this trying moment of our history to decide whether or not we are going to throw away our liberties, scrap the Bill of Rights, throw our judicial traditions and admonitions of some of our greatest leaders into the discard and engage in a hysterical Nation-wide witch hunt, or whether we are going to preserve the principles on which this country was founded.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, that great and beloved American Jurist, penned an answer to the right of any group to defame and persecute any other group when he said:

> If there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other, it is the principle of free thought—not free thought for those who agree with us, but freedom for the thought we hate.

God forbid that we, by a misguided sense of patriotism, scrap freedom, democracy, and justice at the very time when that despotic triumvirate is seeking to do the same thing but for another reason.

I think it is not off the point, in making this plea to you to reflect and weigh the probable consequences of the act you are about to undertake, to tell you of an incident in another country which took place about 100 years ago. This story has to do with some young Irish home-rule advocates who in their way were considered with much more apprehension by the English than the Communists are in this country.

During the young Ireland disorders of 1848, nine young men were captured, tried, and convicted of treason against the Queen. The sentence was death.

The presiding judge read the names of the condemned:

> Charles Duffy, Morris Lyene, Patrick Donahue, Thomas McGee, John Mitchel, Thomas Meagher, Richard O'Gorman, Terrence McManus, Michael Ireland. Have you anything to say before the court passes sentence?

Thomas Meagher had been chosen to speak for them all:

> My lord, this is our first offense, but not our last. If you will be easy with us this once, we promise on our word as gentlemen to try to do better the next time. And the next time, sure we won't be fools enough to get caught.

The indignant judge sentenced them to be hanged by the neck. But passionate protest from all over the world forced Queen Victoria to commute the sentence. The men were transported for life to the penal colonies of the then savage Australia.

In 1871, a Sir Charles Duffy was elected prime minister of the Australian State of Victoria. To her amazement, Queen Victoria learned that this was the same Charles Duffy who had been transported for high treason 26 years before. She demanded the records of the other men who had been transported, and this is what she learned: McManus and Donahue were brigadier generals in the United States Army. O'Gorman was the governor general of Newfoundland. Morris Lyene had been attorney general of Australia, to which office Michael Ireland succeeded. McGee was president of the Council for the Dominion of Canada. Mitchel was a prominent New York politician who became the grandfather of the Mitchel who was mayor of New York. Meagher was Governor of Montana.

The moral of that story and the point I want to drive home is that perhaps time is a better and saner judge and adjuster of the new and the untried and that after all perhaps persecution sharpens rather than dulls the determination of those minorities with whom we find ourselves in disagreement from time to time.

Let us by our acts today take steps that will unify the people of our country as we cannot afford to take chances of a

division among ourselves. This war is not to be trifled with.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I hope that I can be one Member who will discuss this matter on its simple merits. I hold that certainly there is no man in this House who would desire to put a blind bridle on the Congress in these emergent times. I can see no wisdom whatsoever in permitting picayunish and other disputatious phases to enter into a proposition which has to do primarily with making it possible for this Congress to live up to the fullest possible degree to our respective oaths of office to defend the Constitution against enemies foreign and domestic.

There may be some comment concerning or objection to the modus operandi, but when it comes to the dead level test of whether you want to do a job in these emergent times, for God's sake let us keep the Congress advised, even if we do make a mistake about a man now and then concerning the enemies within our ranks.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, when this resolution was first before the House, in 1938, among other things I said, and I voted for the resolution originally:

> Any committee appointed by the Speaker will be fair, just, and impartial, both in its investigation and its findings.

I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, I was in error at that time, and events have not justified my optimistic hope. Not that I place any blame whatever on the Speaker, for I am sure he did not suspect the lengths to which it would go. However, 2 years later, after the committee had demonstrated the methods by which it operates, I said, on the floor of this House:

> It is indeed difficult to vote to continue a legislative committee which, in itself, has adopted methods which are a mockery on democratic processes.

I also said:

> Time after time persons and organizations have been accused of un-American leanings and, because of the manner of the committee in handling and disclosing the charges, have been found guilty, at least in the public's mind, without even being permitted to offer a defense. Practices of this sort are born of intolerance and beget hysteria in the public's mind.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should not, by its vote today, give further authorization to this committee because of its record of the past in following procedures which are violative of fair play and the sacred right of the accused to a fair hearing before being adjudged guilty. This Congress should not excuse and should not tolerate such conduct on the part of any committee conducting a legislative inquiry, for by so doing it will gradually lead to a contempt for established principles of justice.

Who is there who will say that unbridled demagoguery is not a menace to democracy and true Americanism?

This committee is bringing disrepute on the Congress. The Congress demonstrated only yesterday that it has no faith or confidence and places no reliance upon the charges and allegations of this committee. If we had faith in the charges and findings of the Dies committee, why did we, after it had named certain individuals as being linked with subversive elements, determine, with scarcely a dissenting vote, to appoint another special committee to investigate the same persons who were named by the Dies committee and make a report to us as to whether the charges could be sustained?

Perhaps we should go one step further and appoint another special committee to investigate the un-American procedures of the so-called Dies committee.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I say this committee has created suspicion, distrust, and disunity all over the United States. It has embarrassed the Department of Justice, it has embarrassed the State Department, and it has had a bad effect upon our diplomatic relations with other countries. This Congress can have no pride whatsoever in the operations of a committee of that sort and I hope that its continuance will not be authorized.

I cannot, by my vote, endorse a practice which adjudges a person guilty before the accused has had an opportunity to be heard in his own defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, a large number of us are afraid to vote against the continuation of the Dies committee. Afraid to vote our honest convictions because we are afraid of the misconception and the false impression which that committee, through abundant publicity, has built up in the American public.

We are afraid that a vote against the Dies committee is a vote for communism. I think most of us know better.

Investigating un-American activity under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has become as un-American as any cheap smear campaign. Only in this case the smear is paid for by the people and authorized by this august Congress, the last stronghold of popular government.

Is it un-American to make accusations, to defame character, without giving the accused the slightest chance to defend himself? That is what the Dies committee does. Maybe he is guilty and maybe he is not. Is this the American way? Most of the victims are set upon not on the grounds of treason, not on the grounds that they have committed a crime, but only on the grounds of being liberals.

The men in the Government selected for the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] are not accused of incompetence in office, inefficiency, or corruption, but of holding different opinions.

If there are seditious elements eating from within, sabotaging our war effort, that is for the F. B. I., who can do everything the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] does and do it a lot better.

Is this the American way? Freedom of speech? Freedom of thought?

A dangerous precedent to turn loose the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] to charge back and forth across the land, "investigating un-American activities."

What does "un-American" mean? Today it means Communists. Tomorrow perhaps Jews, perhaps Catholics, perhaps isolationists, perhaps Republicans.

A fine precedent—this Dies committee—poorly conceived and worse in execution. I hope we will have the courage to vote down this parody of the American way.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise at the risk of having my character examined to oppose this resolution. I am not afraid to have it examined. I am not afraid to declare my position.

My family left England in 1638 to avoid the kind of thing this committee tried to do yesterday, and they have been here since then. They have fought in every war of this country. If that be communism, make the most of it.

I believe that some of the important corporations on the boards of which I sit as director would like to know that if I oppose this resolution I am going to be declared to be favoring communism. I oppose it bitterly. I say to you that the best weapon against it is American fairness and a contented and a prosperous community. That is the only weapon that will prove effective against communism.

More than anything else, Mr. Speaker, I am opposing this resolution as I did last time because in discussing the matter with some of our military and naval leaders they told me this story, which I give to you. You can draw your own conclusions from it. They said, "Mr. BALDWIN, have you ever shot bird over a green dog that flushes birds so soon that most of them get away?" That is the way we feel about the Dies committee.

I hope this resolution will not prevail. I do not believe it is proper for a legislative body to have a permanent investigating committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from a soldier and one from Secretary Ickes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LET'S QUIET MARTIN—FOR THE DURATION

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to the continuation of the Dies committee. I speak as one who voted for the Dies committee in 1941, when it was my belief that the committee did some good work and little harm, but at that time we were at peace with the world. Now we are engaged in one of the greatest global conflicts in world history.

Yes, we are fighting for our very existence, our self-preservation, and if we are to succeed, we must mobilize the entire resources of the Nation and obtain the cooperation and unity of every man, woman, and child.

Fighting men, guns, ships, planes, and tanks alone will not win this war. It will require the ingenious exercise of tact and diplomacy to display a real spirit of harmony and unity with our allies and peoples in the countries occupied by American soldiers, as well as the development of public morale and a solidarity from within. We can succeed only if we are united. We know we must defeat all who would divide us. We know that the unity in America and the unity of America with all its allies must be complete. Furthering the cause of international unity, I quote a communique from the Allied headquarters in North Africa, February 3, 1943, which reports that—

Lt. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower issued a sharply worded memorandum warning that any American officer engaging in unwarranted criticism of any ally would be subject to the direst punishment that I can possibly inflict administratively.

"We must all realize that we are fighting a tough war and everything we do, day and night, must be directed toward the winning of that war" he said in a memorandum to all his staff officers.

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman DIES, charged that radicals and crackpots seek to overthrow the United States Government, but he failed to produce one scintilla of evidence that this condition is true. Does he make this assertion because a few Communists are on the pay roll? Is our country in danger of being overthrown because of these Communists on the pay roll? If that is true, then we certainly are in a sad condition. If these Communists plan to overthrow the Government, they can be prosecuted under existing law and we in Congress—including the gentleman from Texas, MARTIN DIES—know that to be fact.

Although the RECORD does not disclose these very words, I can recall the following statement made to this House last Monday a week by the gentleman from Texas, Congressman DIES: "The war against bureaucrats is more important than anything else." Is it more important to defeat Roosevelt and his administration than to lick Hitler?

The Dies committee by its hit-and-miss statements against certain Americans made in the past 2 years, is dividing the American people and creating distrust between the United States and our able ally, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I hate communism and everything it stands for. We all know that is the basic philosophy of the Russian Government, yet today we find ourselves allied with Russia, both of us fighting for the very same objective—the extermination of the barbaric German horde. The unconditional surrender of the Axis is the new key word of the Allies and the Russians are certainly doing their part to bring about our objective. Russia's cause is our cause; if she loses, we lose. We continually praise the Russian soldiers for their heroism and courage; we praise the Russian people for their great sacrifice. Yes; we pat them on the back with one hand and then place a time bomb under them with the other.

The primary function of the Dies committee was to ferret subversive and un-American activities that attempt to overthrow our Government. In 1942 the committee submitted a lengthy report and with the usual reckless hit-and-miss policy, a number of outstanding members of the Board of Economic Warfare, of which Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE is chairman, were mentioned as Communists, among them a David Vaughn, a splendid American who unequivocally denied any such communistic affiliation. David Vaughn entered suit against the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] realized that there was a man who called Mr. DIES' bluff, he publicly apologized before this House and then had the House Accounts Committee pay the costs of settling the suit. At that time the gentleman from California, Congressman JERRY VOORHIS, an outstanding young liberal member of the committee, filed a dissenting report in which he stated that DIES had not called a meeting of the committee, but issued the report without consulting him.

Two weeks ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] again published a list of "Communists" and made remarks on the floor against them and against many of our leading citizens who are as patriotic and as genuine Americans as any Member of this House, including the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. I speak particularly of Frederick C. McKee, of Pittsburgh, Pa. I want the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] to know that my people resent such unfair innuendos and misstatements of fact against Frederick C. McKee which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] made before the House. Even the Pittsburgh newspapers which are supporting the Dies committee through editorial comments resent the attack against McKee, and I quote a part of an editorial of the Pittsburgh Post Gazette:

The Dies committee has shown a lamentable weakness in confusing perfectly legitimate activities with those of un-American tinge. An example of this is the committee's reflections upon the Citizens for Victory Committee and its treasurer, Frederick C. McKee. This is no subversive agency of either the right or the left.

I know Frederick C. McKee personally. His family constitutes pioneer Americans, the type that help make America great. One of Mr. McKee's great grandfathers founded one of the first window-glass plants in Pittsburgh; another founded the first newspaper in Butler, Pa. His maternal grandfather was a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature; his father was an eminent lawyer and a member of the original select council of Pittsburgh, and one of its most successful business executives. Mr. Frederick C. McKee enjoys that reputation today.

In 1938 Mr. McKee founded an organization of Pittsburgh citizens to oppose the purchase of Japanese goods and to secure an embargo on shipments to Japan of scrap iron and oil while Japan was carrying on her war of aggression against China and expanding south toward the Dutch East Indies. Impressed with his objectives, in the Seventy-seventh Congress I introduced H. R. 4824 and H. R. 4825, which provided and placed an embargo on petroleum products and scrap iron exported to Japan.

Mr. McKee was a member of the National Executive Committee for Nonparticipation in Japanese Aggression of which Secretary of War Stimson and Admiral Yarnell were honorary chairmen. American purchases of Japanese silk were reduced 20 percent but enough people did not recognize the Japanese menace and the necessity of preventing the shipment of 20,000,000 tons of scrap iron which is now being used against us via Japanese ships, guns, and tanks.

Since when cannot citizen groups organize to weed out and purge Members of Congress who are obstructionists and are impeding the war effort? Since when do Members of Congress have an inviolate right to this office? Mr. McKee believed that the die was cast when the lease-lend policy was established by the majority of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and it was his belief and the belief of members of his committee that Congressmen who continued to oppose, snipe, and delay were obstructionists and that such Congressmen seriously interfered with our war effort, and as a result were placed on the committee's purge list. Is this a subversive act? Is an attempt to defeat any Congressman for any reason un-American? Of course not, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] knows better than that.

Again we find the gentleman from California [Congressman JERRY VOORHIS], of the Dies committee, disagreeing with his chairman, and I quote page 705, of the RECORD of Monday, February 8, 1943, where the Congressman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] states:

The list of the 39 people submitted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was, as he said himself earlier today, submitted by himself and not by the action of the committee. Indeed I have tried myself since the list was submitted to see the evidence. The gentleman from Texas of course told me I could see it but so far I have not been able to see it. It has not been available.

In this total war, I want the Federal Bureau of Investigation to represent this Nation and ferret subversive and un-American activities, and guard against sabotage and espionage. I quote J. Edgar Hoover who has done a magnificent job with his splendid F. B. I. staff:

There has been no foreign concentrated or directed act of sabotage in the entire United States of America in this World War to date.

I am familiar with dozens of arrests made of men in the mills in my district in which such plots or plans were nipped in the bud by the F. B. I. In time of war, I prefer the F. B. I. with its subtle, careful, well-planned, organized, and unpublicized manner of dealing with sabotage and espionage, and subversive

and un-American acts against the Government rather than the headline-seeking, advance-notice dangerous tactics of the Dies committee.

Leading newspapers of the Nation concerned only with our Nation's welfare ask for the elimination of the Dies committee. Among these is the Christian Science Monitor, Detroit Free Press, Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, New Orleans Times-Picayune, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Chicago Times, Harrisburg (Pa.) Telegraph, El Paso Times, Chicago Sun, St. Louis Star-Times, Dubuque (Iowa) Telegraph-Herald, and many others. Let me quote the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, one of the finest independent newspapers in the Nation:

He [DIES] has a tendency to confuse liberal, humanitarian, and progressive thought with communism. He often seems to be moved not so much by a deep and sincere wish to expose antidemocratic activities as by an eagerness for publicity.

I am attaching hereto a letter from Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, which clearly proves the hit-and-miss methods pursued by the gentleman from Texas, Congressman DIES, when he lambasts Hugh Miller, senior attorney in the Bituminous Coal Division, as a Communist in the Government's employ when Hugh Miller is now a private in the United States Army, having enlisted on September 26, 1942, and is assigned to the paratroops division now serving overseas. When any lawyer leaves his job to get into the paratroops service, he deserves the credit and plaudits of all Americans.

In view of DIES' reckless misstatements and in view of contradictions made by a member of his own committee, in the legal parlance which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] as a lawyer well understands, I say to him and his committee: Falsus in unus—falsus in omnibus. False in one—false in all.

This scrapping among ourselves is certainly not doing the public morale any good. But it certainly is excellent propaganda for Goebbels and his Axis cohorts.

I also attach hereto a letter from a soldier in the Mojave Desert, Calif., who is ready to die for his country and who pleads for the elimination of the Dies committee.

Martin, we are fighting for our very lives in this global war, and to win this war we need the fullest cooperation of every man, woman, and child in America, and the cooperation of every ally abroad—and this means Russia, too—so until the peace is written, let us suspend the activities of your committee. If we preserve the energy expended fighting each other and our allies and mobilize this energy in our fight against our common enemy, the Axis, victory in this war will be quick and certain.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
*Washington, February 8, 1943.*

Hon. SAMUEL A. WEISS,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. WEISS: This will acknowledge your wire of February 5 requesting information concerning Alice Barrows and Hugh Miller, mentioned in my recent press conference.

Miss Alice Barrows was employed on school building problems in the Office of Education, which was under this Department until July 1, 1939, when it was transferred to the Federal Security Agency under the Reorganization Act. She retired from the Federal service at the close of last August.

With respect to Mr. Hugh Miller, he was a senior attorney in the Bituminous Coal Division of this Department and went into the United States Army voluntarily as a private on September 26 last. He wasn't looking for a soft job and he wanted to fight his country's enemies. It is my understanding that he has been trying to get an assignment with the paratroops. Personally I think that when a lawyer leaves his job and tries to get into the paratroop service he deserves some credit.

In my opinion it is as bad as it is un-American to assail, without a hearing, those who might have the benefit of some official channel of defense, but it is shameful when they are no longer on the Federal pay rolls. It shows the recklessness of Congressman DIES and the lengths to which he will go to gain the spotlight when he thinks it to his advantage. If Congressman DIES' interest is merely in purging the Federal rolls of undesirables, why does he not confine his efforts to those who are actually on the job in the Government departments?

I could not but note that in his arraignment of Federal employees who had been given no chance to defend themselves, Congressman DIES made no reference to any possible investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of any of the persons he named. If there were such investigations fairness demanded that they should be put into the record. I know of my own knowledge that, with respect to some of the persons listed by Congressman DIES as being suspected of communistic connections or dispositions, this simply is not true, and even if it were I still insist that the good old American practice of not condemning unless a right to defend has been offered is a good one. The more troubled the times the greater the necessity for fair play.

If there are any Communists in my Department I would like not only the names, but the proof. I will not fire anyone unless my action is based upon facts. My position is the same with reference to employees of pro-Nazi sympathies. One thing that surprises me is that Mr. DIES can so readily find "Communists" and so rarely discover a Nazi, although the Federal Bureau of Investigation not only seems to find them but, in many instances, already has been able to prove in open court acts of actual aid and comfort to the enemy.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
*Secretary of the Interior.*

---

THURSDAY MORNING.

Time: 11:30 a. m.
Place: Mojave Desert, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Received both your letters today and it helped to bring up my morale a little more. I presume that we will be here in the desert for a month or two longer and then probably a trip home before we land, possibly in Africa, as this is only my guess.

I am glad to hear that Mother is visiting Mrs. Weiss for it keeps her mind from wandering to California. It is a shame that all those young kids have to come into the Army, but I guess it's for the best, for we all have to make sacrifices to preserve our great democracy, for I believe the same blood that ran in the veins of our forefathers at Valley Forge runs in the veins of American boys today.

I have great faith in our President, and that meeting between him and Prime Minister Churchill is encouraging news and has boosted the morale here in our battery 100 percent. He's got the kind of guts that is leading the way for us younger boys to emulate, and I am anxious to get into action and help end this struggle.

There is only one discouraging note and that is the Dies committee. Why doesn't he quit until the war is over, because I think his committee will divide the American people, and I don't think Russia will trust us as allies if the Congress continues to endorse him. I hate communism, but why stab Russia in the back when only by their courage and sacrifice have they made it possible for Uncle Sam to train us boys and prepare to lick our one common enemy, Hitler. Let DIES investigate the Fascists and the Nazis and blackshirts and he will be doing a damned sight more to promote national unity than he is today. Please, Sammy, help defeat him.

Give my regards to Mrs. Weiss, and the future Congressman, Jimmy, and oh, yes, my sweetheart, Joy (bet she'll like that).

Your pal,

JOHNNY.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am in very much the same position as the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN], who preceded me. I enlisted in the last war when I was 19, 2 days after war was declared. I served 22 months. I am a charter member of the American Legion of Vanderburgh County, and I think I enjoyed the support of 90 percent of the Catholic clergy in my district in this election.

To me, it is unfortunate that we have had personal matters brought into this discussion. I do not hold for 1 minute with those who have approached me filled with personal vindictiveness against this committee. I am not interested in those who profess their interest in the Constitution. A virtuous woman never has to profess her virtues. However, I think that this committee is a negative approach to Americanism. You will make Americanism work only by making democracy work, and that is a positive job in America and not a negative one.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to first read from the Daily Worker, which, if you have been keeping up with the Dies committee, you know is the official Communist organ of New York. I read from the issue of January 31. It concerns myself:

A pleasant and amiable young man, ROGERS has, in my opinion, one shortcoming which may interfere with his maximum effectiveness and may blind his vision on some issues—a strong, unreasoning anti-Communist bias.

For years in my newspaper I have vigorously attacked and denounced Communists. In my election they bitterly opposed me. They tried to split the

Democratic Party, and some of you gentlemen know how disastrous that can be. The Communist candidate who ran against me received 1,200 votes.

I speak today because one of these 38, of which so much has been spoken about, is an American paratrooper. I was recently in the Army, and came here directly from the Tank Destroyer Center at Camp Hood, Tex. I feel it unfair to accuse a man of seeking to overthrow the United States Government by force and violence when, indeed, he is intending to lay down his life to defend his country. I feel it unfair to attack this man without a hearing, without an adequate checking of the facts, and when that American soldier has no opportunity to defend himself. I feel strongly about this attack on a man in uniform, but there has been enough of hate here today and I do not want to add to it.

I agree with the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] that the hatreds raised by this committee has been on both sides, and I do not want it to go any further. I do not feel, gentlemen, that this committee should be continued. I ask you to vote for tolerance today.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to raise what might be called a personal issue in this House, but I must vote against this committee as presently constituted. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is personally very amiable, and he is a brilliant debater. I have no feeling against him. But in his activity he has succeeded in stirring up such animosity and division in this country by his reckless name calling and his prejudgments that I think he has done more harm than he has done good. It does not do any good to say that only the Communists oppose this committee. Many responsible newspapers do not favor this resolution, and many responsible and great Americans deplore the activities of the gentleman. He has injured the cause of labor by frequently referring to as friendly to communism those labor leaders who are really trying to drive communism out of the labor movement. He has by his insinuations cast suspicion upon our great President, who has been divinely appointed to lead us through this crisis. He has constantly attacked the most trusted advisers of the President.

He has tainted with suspicion men whose Americanism I would place as high as that of any Member of this House. He has been accuser, judge, and special pleader in this House against many good men, as well as a few rascals.

He has acted arbitrarily and alone, without consulting his committee. He has been the committee.

I am against communism—have no doubt of that. But I am also against unfairness, witch hunting, and legislating by emotion and prejudice rather than in the exercise of cool judgment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, we are being called upon today to vote on an issue that has far-reaching consequences—the continuance of the committee to investigate so-called subversive activities. I bow to no one in my hatred of all "isms" and in my fidelity to the United States of America. However, I cannot conscientiously vote to continue this particular committee. I have only a few moments, so I must cover ground rapidly.

Just what are subversive activities? Who is to be the judge? There have been people who have called the chairman of the committee subversive, which in my opinion is entirely incorrect. But the permitting of individual interpretation of just what is deemed subversive is a dangerous and un-American thing.

The essence of the American Constitution, which this committee claims to be upholding, is the Bill of Rights, those 10 amendments which guarantee, among other rights, individual freedom of speech, of press, and of assembly. When a congressional committee uses its power to denounce publicly individuals of liberal or progressive tendencies simply because such points of view do not coincide with those of the committee members, we are trampling on the Constitution, not upholding it. For example, of the 38 names that have been so frequently discussed on this floor, my colleague from California, a member of the committee, on Friday showed conclusively that, far from being subversive, many of these individuals are honorable American citizens, against whom such charges were baseless.

Mr. Speaker, this is dangerous business, and in my judgment the actions of the committee definitely indicate that it should be abolished, not continued.

If we do have un-American and subversive activities in our midst, what type would we expect them to be? We are at war all over the world with the forces of fascism and nazi-ism. Is it not logical to expect that it would be these elements that would be the real saboteurs? However, what do we find? We find approximately one-tenth only of the committee report devoted to these truly dangerous activities. On January 4, 1943, the Department of Justice charged 33 individuals with a Nation-wide conspiracy, interfering with the military and naval forces of the United States. The comittee in question did not even go into this matter except indirectly and certainly most inadequately. Many of these individuals were not even mentioned by the committee. If such a committee justifies its existence, such justification must come only after it has proved its worth, not by chasing red herrings, but by capturing yellow rats.

Leaders all over America are asking that we discontinue this committee. Great educators, outstanding editors, leading professional people are demanding that the Dies committee be relegated from the front pages to the obscurity to which it so rightly belongs.

Mr. Speaker, a nation at war must have unity. In my opinion, a far greater degree of unity can be achieved if this committee, which is setting one American element against another, which accuses without sufficient evidence, is not given taxpayers' funds with which to continue.

The chairman of the committee said on the floor the other day, "America must live; America shall live." I am in hearty agreement with him on that point. However, is America so weak and is American democracy so uncertain that it must have a committee to defend it? American democracy will survive long after committees which have occupied unduly the front pages have been forgotten.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, for 4½ years the tactics of the opposition have been to engage in personal abuse and in denunciation of the most vicious kind. Every effort has been made to stop this investigation or to sabotage it. What are the facts? The facts are that last year we received 138,000 requests from your Government agencies for information which they could not obtain from any other source. Sixteen hundred agents of this Government came to our committee offices in Washington to secure information that we were obtaining in 1938 when we were laughed at and ridiculed. They wanted information concerning subversive organizations, and I recall at the time that some people who are now opposing this committee ridiculed us for calling these organizations subversive, and yet when the President established his own committee last year they confirmed our findings in every respect. This committee in 1938 was ridiculed for calling the German-American Bund an espionage agency and for denouncing the Kyffhauser Bund and for denouncing Fascists and Communists and Nazi organizations, and no action was taken until the war was declared, and then suddenly they woke up to find we had in America groups and organizations not loyal to this country, and then they came to our committee every day for information. Finally they assigned men permanently as liaison officers for the various departments to secure information.

The truth is, and no one can deny it if he wants to be fair, that, in spite of errors that we made, errors that any committee would make when dealing with explosive and complicated matters of this character—in spite of that this committee, by reason of securing through its subpena powers all of the information that was then obtainable and which ceased to be obtainable after the war was declared, was able to furnish information that has been the basis for the prosecution and conviction of 98 percent of everyone who has been convicted in this country of violating our espionage and sabotage laws.

I do not appear before this House to ask as a personal favor that this committee be continued. As far as I am individually concerned, I have never dealt with anything in my life in which I and my family have been so completely and so incessantly abused and threatened and hounded from all sides. I have never been in anything in my life in which the agents of this Government and representatives of newspapers, such as PM, have gone into my district for the purpose of smearing me. They have fought me at the polls. They have de-

nounced me in thousands of pamphlets. It is not me alone that they denounce. They also denounce a majority of the Members of this House. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I say to this House, continue the committee, but only on one condition, that we will do our duty, the administration, the C. I. O., and other foes notwithstanding, and if this Congress and if this country does not want a fearless and courageous investigation, if you do not want this committee to expose these evils that threaten this country, then, Mr. Speaker, I submit, the investigation should be voted down and the committee discontinued.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to permit any personal attack upon me to provoke me into diverting the 2 minutes which have been allowed me to make any defense. I do not need it. My record will be judged by the American people, by time, and events.

I rise at this time to objectively, dispassionately discuss the role of this committee in a time when we are at war against Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Japan. Yes; we must defend ourselves against our enemies—our enemies there and our enemies here.

The record of indictments, the record of prosecutions up to this time do not disclose any plot on the part of labor, any plot on the part of those people who have been mentioned by the Dies committee—in fact, no plot at all on the part of the Communists against the safety of this Nation. All are fighting and working in the defense of the country.

However, I hold in my hand an indictment which tells the story of a most gigantic conspiracy against the safety of America, an indictment for conspiracy which was more powerful and widespread than the conspiracy of Aaron Burr against our internal safety. I hold here an indictment of 34 individuals, 42 organizations, and 41 publications of domestic Fascists, all indicted by a United States grand jury. For what? Interfering with, impairing, and influencing the loyalty, morale, and discipline of the military and naval forces of the United States; causing insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the military and naval forces of the United States. What did the Dies committee do about it since it came into existence in 1938? Not a single iota of evidence, not a piece of exposure since the inception of this conspiracy which began in 1933. I repeat, not a bit of attention was ever given to this gigantic conspiracy, to these traitors, to these enemies of the Nation by the Dies committee. The Dies committee failed in a crucial hour and on a crucial matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee has no time available for himself, and, therefore, I yield him 3 minutes and will keep the remaining 3 minutes for myself.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman very much. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I must conclude that in the opinion of some of my fellow Members, I am not a worthy Member of this body. I am not mad. I am sad. When I appeared before the Rules Committee a day or two ago to oppose the continuation of the Dies committee, a gentleman for whom I have the highest respect asked me if I believed in the Communist or communistic theory of government. All I could say was, "No." I am a Democrat. If I were not a Democrat I would be a Republican. I am not seeking third-party connections or affiliations in order to express my views on governmental questions.

I must oppose the continuation of this committee or go home to myself and have no further confidence in myself. I oppose it, my fellow Members of this Congress, because I believe it is almost slanderous to refer to it as a committee on un-American activities. If it were and were needed, I profess to you I would give my last drop of blood in order to maintain its activities. But I have been persuaded—I voted against it before—I have been persuaded that it is a Martin Dies committee and nothing else.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], a member of the Dies committee.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, for 4 years I have been a member of this committee. Three times before today I have come into the Well of the House, on similar occasions, and have made speeches in which I said that I believe, as I do now, that a committee of this kind could render a useful service; that I believed that this committee had done work which was important and valuable, that I had certain convictions about the mistakes that such a committee could make which would very seriously weaken if not ruin its effectiveness, and that so far as I was concerned I would pledge the House that I would use my best efforts to see that those mistakes were not repeated and that rules of procedure were adopted that would prevent their being made. It has been my conception that a committee of this kind should investigate all types of activity which were subversive of constitutional government with equal force and vigor. It has been my conviction that a committee of this kind should in time of war direct its efforts primarily against agents and propaganda of enemy powers. I believe a committee of this kind should act as a committee, and as a group; should consider carefully every public statement before it was made by any member. It is my conviction, deepest of all, that the effectiveness of the battle by any democracy against communism on the one hand and fascism on the other is to be won first and foremost by the kind of fairness, justice, and opportunity of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN] spoke, and that democracy is not helped if those charged with the task of investigating such matters are not very careful indeed to distinguish those who fundamentally do not believe in constitutional government from all those who are fundamentally loyal to constitutional government regardless of their political opinions.

The events of the last few months and especially those of the past week have impelled me to recognize that the direction in which this committee is now veering is away from and by no means toward my conception of the way this job ought to be done. I have seen it becoming more and more a political instrument of definite conservative bias, and less and less a dignified, impartial, and effective congressional committee. For when a committee or one member of a committee includes people, loyal to their country but whose opinions simply disagree with those of a majority of that committee on a list of those to be proscribed, and accused, then such action becomes dangerous to democracy itself instead of an exposure of un-American activities.

It seems obvious to me, in time of war especially, it becomes of fundamental importance that the emphasis of such a committee's work should be against the efforts of enemy powers and their agents to weaken our nation's war effort. I do not say the committee has done nothing in this field, for it has, but the real impact and emphasis of its work falls more and more in the field of domestic political controversy, less and less where, in my judgment, it belongs if our Nation's cause is to be served. I voted three times to continue the committee; I cannot do it this time. I am impelled by my own conviction and by the fact that I know perfectly well from my experience, that although I might try to urge that certain changes be made in the methods of the committee so mistakes might be avoided, I should not succeed. For this reason it seems to me that the only thing for me to do, is to vote against its continuance, and I shall do so when the roll is called. Under these circumstances, of course, I should not expect that I would be named as a member of it in the future.

Two reports of this committee, the reports of 1940 and 1941, carry my signature. Those reports I helped to prepare along with other members of the committee. I stand on what was said in those reports. The last annual report I could not sign. My minority views are appended thereto and represent, together with my speech of Monday last, my further reasons why I cannot vote to continue this committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of time. Unfortunately under the rules there is only allotted a short time for debate on this Dies resolution, and in my desire to yield time to the many Members who desired to voice their opposition, I have only a few minutes within which to give my reasons and expressions why the resolution should not pass.

Mr. Speaker, I was responsible for the passage of the first resolution creating a House committee to investigate un-American and subversive activities. I

have earnestly sought to be helpful and bring to light the activities of persons and groups whose actions and propaganda were inimical to the best interests of our country, and especially those who were in any way instrumental in bringing about disunity and discord. I oppose the pending resolution because of the evidence which has come to me in the thousands of letters and telegrams from ministers, priests, preachers, university professors, and various civic and labor organizations from every section of our country. I believe, you the same as I, if you read one-tenth of these communications in protest that you would in honor bound oppose the continuation of this committee, and I am satisfied if a secret vote were taken the resolution would not pass.

The committee was originally appointed to investigate subversive and un-American activities and un-American organizations. This they have not done. On the contrary, they have devoted themselves to investigating the so-called communistic organizations, or what they call fronts, all of whom, however, are cooperating 100 percent in the struggle against Hitler and the Japs in our efforts to win the war. They seem to forget that we are at war with Hitler and the Japs, and not with Russia. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has devoted his time to charging that he was being smeared by some newspapers that printed the records of those who voted against war preparedness and the President's defense program.

The gentleman from Texas did not give us a single reason in his 2-hour speech the other day, nor have other members of the committee, as to why the life of this committee should be continued. In that speech the major portion of his time was given to assailing those whom he termed "crackpots" and "bureaucrats" in the departments and executive agencies of the Government. He complains in his speech, as I have stated, that he was smeared by some newspapers and commentators. It would appear that he and the proponents of this resolution are past masters at smearing.

Hundreds of outstanding, patriotic men and women never were given a chance to defend themselves against his smearing, or the smearing of those who have similar views. Mr. Speaker, he charges about 20 organizations with being communistic, or having communistic leanings. One, two, or three of them possibly could have been classified as communistic before the war, but since the war they have demonstrated in every way their loyalty and patriotism, and are not trying to bring about discord and disunity Mr. DIES is apparently endeavoring to engender.

For the information of the House I insert a list of the organizations that the gentleman from Texas has branded either inferentially or directly as communistic, as follows:

National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance.

American Peace Mobilization.

Workers Alliance, of which Mr. DIES says:

A few years ago one of the largest and most influential front organizations of the Communist Party in this country.

Trade Union Conference for United States.

Federal Writers Project.

Student Congress Against War.

American Fund for Public Service.

National Student League.

National Conference on Constitutional Rights.

Robert Marshall Foundation, which he classifies, inferentially, as communistic.

Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights.

National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born.

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.

League of American Writers.

American Youth Congress.

National Negro Congress.

American Student Union.

National Lawyers' Guild.

These organizations, Mr. Speaker, are no more communistic than I am a Nazi ideologist. It is my understanding that this list of organizations was filed by the director of research of the Dies committee, and may I ask who is the director of research? Is it not a fact, Mr. DIES, that he himself formerly belonged to the Communist Party? I do not know the background of some of the personnel of your committee. May it not be possible that they, too, have been formerly affiliated with the organizations which you so unfairly and so unjustly denounce as communistic? It is to be regretted, as I said many times, that your committee should confine its work and energy, especially during the last year or more, to ferreting out what, to my mind, are nonexistent communistic activities, and failed to bring to light the activities of the Nazi-Fascist bunds and other un-American and subversive organizations, as well as exposing the hundreds of men who were used by Viereck and his stooges to undermine our form of government, aimed to bring about disunity, using the same methods that Hitler employed in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, there has been appropriated for the use of the Dies committee in its investigations the staggering sum of $495,000, many times in excess of the expenditures of any other House investigating committee heretofore appointed, and it is my observation, in view of the results obtained, that the committee should not receive any additional moneys. Because all their activities have been directed unfairly in a direction beyond the proper scope for the investigation for which the committee was appointed, in vilifying and abusing the administration's activities.

For the information of the House and the country I list the six specific appropriations for the investigations conducted by the committee, as well as the rates of yearly compensation paid to some of the employees of the committee.

*Appropriations for the Dies committee*

| | |
|---|---|
| June 9, 1938 | $25,000 |
| Feb. 9, 1939 | 100,000 |
| Jan. 25, 1940 | 75,000 |
| Sept. 26, 1940 | 35,000 |
| Feb. 11, 1941 | 150,000 |
| Apr. 28, 1942 | 110,000 |
| Total appropriation | 495,000 |
| Balance today | 20,000 |

*Compensation of employees of Dies committee*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 research director | $7,200 |
| 1 chief investigator | 4,800 |
| 3 investigators, each | 4,200 |
| 6 investigators, do | 3,600 |
| 1 translator | 3,600 |

In 1938 and 1939 the committee's hotel expenses and charges for subsistence amounted to $17,000 and transportation amounted to $18,000.

In 1940, 1941, and 1942, $22,000 was expended for hotel quarters and subsistence and $33,000 for transportation.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that the Republican membership should be misled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] as to the need for the continuation of the committee. Mr. FISH, ever since his return from Germany, cannot see or say anything but Red.

I want you to know that I am as patriotic as any person can be. I yield to no one my patriotism. I have been loyal and devoted and am willing to give my life today for my country that has done so much for me, in upholding its institutions, and I feel that it is my duty, in every way that I am able, to aid the cause of America, my country and your country, especially at this time when we are facing threatening dangers.

Mr. Speaker, as to the indirect vilification of the President and others in the administration, history tells us that Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and Wilson were similarly attacked and villified when they espoused or sought to aid the cause of the masses. Personally I know that the President can take these attacks because the people, if not the Dies committee, have confidence in him. Notwithstanding the attacks and centralized activities against him on the part of the misled forces of Fascists, Tories, and Nazis, the country will demand that he carry on with that courage, wisdom, determination, sincerity, and ability which is his and which is recognized the world over. And I am satisfied, as I was 3 years ago, that he will again be forced to continue. God grant him health that he may continue to safeguard our freedom and our liberty and to carry on, not only as the President, but as the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, to an early, positive victory, and permanent and everlasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I call upon the membership of this House that in the interest of fair play and in the present and future interests of our country that this resolution for the continuation of the Dies committee should not be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee has just

said that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has not presented a single reason for the continuance of his committee. The President of the United States has recognized by creating a departmental committee the fact that the Dies committee has made serious charges against numerous Federal employees that they are Communists and he is having those charges investigated. Certainly, there can be no compromise between Communism and Americanism.

I believe that there is more reason to continue the Dies committee now than ever before. If the administration and those in authority, including President Roosevelt, who have appointed Communists, Reds, and Fellow Travelers to key positions had ousted them from the Federal pay roll when they were exposed by the Dies committee, there would be no need to continue the Dies committee. But instead of throwing them out of the Government they have appointed more and more of them. Every Member of the House whether Republican or Democrat, takes a solemn oath of office to support and defend the Constitution against its enemies, foreign and domestic. At the present time we are engaged in a great war and all our forces are on the march to all-out victory. But it is up to us here in the House to see to it that we combat with every influence we possess those enemies from within, and particularly those communistic termites on the Government pay roll who are seeking to undermine and destroy the very foundations of the Republic. No individual has a right to receive pay from our Government who seeks to promote communism and overthrow our republican form of government guaranteed by the Constitution.

The Congress is determined to put an end to the un-American and communistic activities of our enemies from within especially those holding key administrative positions. That is exactly what the Dies committee is trying to do. Twenty-three Members, or one-third of those who voted against the continuation of the Dies committee last year, were left at home by the electorate.

I wish to deny a statement made heretofore that organized labor is against the continuation of this committee, as it is not a fact. I hold in my hand a letter signed by William Green, president, American Federation of Labor, favoring continuation of the Dies committee and funds to carry out its work against un-American and subversive activities.

I rang up the American Federation of Labor on the telephone and talked to Mr. Hushing, its legislative representative, and he had this to say:

The American Federation of Labor is very much in favor of continuation of the Dies committee. It is doing an excellent piece of work against very powerful opposition.

I hold in my hand a letter from the American Legion, signed by Francis M. Sullivan, executive director, national legislative committee, which has this to say:

At the same time we know that certain subversive individuals and groups, supposedly active in the prosecution of the war, are more interested in tearing down our democratic form of government.

As usual, the opponents of the Dies committee have set up arguments that to further continue its efforts would promote disunity, intolerance, hatred, and in fact would seriously interfere with the prosecution of the war. In our opinion, such statements are preposterous, and no loyal American need fear continuance of the Dies committee.

The letter concludes by urging that—

there be no interruption in the splendid work of this committee in investigating the activities of un-American individuals and groups whose major interest, in our opinion, is to substitute a form of government foreign to our American ideals of democratic government.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars and most patriotic organizations are united in requesting the continuation of the Dies committee. The Congress has a duty greater than ever before to use its power and influence to preserve our free American institutions and to safeguard representative and constitutional government. That cannot be done by remaining silent and thereby permitting Communists, Reds, and fellow travelers to remain in powerful key positions within our own Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 2, change the period to a colon and insert "*Provided*, That the special committee herein continued shall be composed of eight members."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] in that request.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 302, nays 94, not voting 38, as follows:

[Role No. 10]

YEAS—302

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Bennett, Mich. | Case |
| Allen, Ill. | Bennett, Mo. | Chapman |
| Allen, La. | Bishop | Chenoweth |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Blackney | Chiperfield |
| Anderson, Calif. | Bolton | Church |
| Anderson, N. Mex. | Boren | Clevenger |
| Andresen, August H. | Bradley, Mich. | Cole, Mo. |
| Angell | Brehm | Cole, N. Y. |
| Arends | Brooks | Colmer |
| Arnold | Brown, Ga. | Compton |
| Auchincloss | Brown, Ohio | Cooley |
| Baldwin, Md. | Bryson | Cooper |
| Barden | Buffett | Costello |
| Barrett | Burch, Va. | Cox |
| Barry | Busbey | Cravens |
| Bates, Mass. | Butler | Crawford |
| Beall | Camp | Creal |
| Beckworth | Canfield | Culkin |
| Bell | Cannon, Fla. | Cunningham |
| Bender | Cannon, Mo. | Curley |
| | Carlson, Kans. | D'Alesandro |
| | Carson, Ohio | Davis |
| | Carter | Day |
| Dewey | Johnson, Ind. | Ramspeck |
| Dies | Johnson, J. Leroy | Randolph |
| Dirksen | Johnson, Luther A. | Rankin |
| Disney | Johnson, Lyndon B. | Reed, Ill. |
| Ditter | Johnson, Okla. | Reed, N. Y. |
| Doughton | Johnson, Ward | Rees, Kans. |
| Douglas | Jones | Richards |
| Drewry | Jonkman | Rivers |
| Dworshak | Keefe | Rizley |
| Eaton | Kilburn | Robsion, Ky. |
| Elliott | Kilday | Rockwell |
| Ellis | Kinzer | Rodgers, Pa. |
| Ellsworth | Kleberg | Rogers, Mass. |
| Elston, Ohio | Knutson | Rohrbough |
| Englebright | Kunkel | Rolph |
| Fay | Lambertson | Russell |
| Fellows | Landis | Sasscer |
| Fenton | Lane | Schiffler |
| Fernandez | Lanham | Schwabe |
| Fish | Larcade | Scott |
| Fisher | Lea | Shafer |
| Flannagan | LeCompte | Sheppard |
| Fulmer | LeFevre | Simpson, Ill. |
| Gallagher | Lewis, Ohio | Simpson, Pa. |
| Gamble | Ludlow | Slaughter |
| Gathings | McCord | Smith, Maine |
| Gavin | McCormack | Smith, Ohio |
| Gearhart | McCowen | Smith, Va. |
| Gerlach | McGehee | Smith, Wis. |
| Gibson | McKenzie | Sparkman |
| Gifford | McLean | Springer |
| Gilchrist | McMillan | Stanley |
| Gillette | Maas | Starnes, Ala. |
| Gillie | Mahon | Steagall |
| Goodwin | Manasco | Stearns, N. H. |
| Gore | Mansfield, Tex. | Stefan |
| Gossett | Martin, Iowa | Stevenson |
| Graham | Martin, Mass. | Stewart |
| Grant, Ala. | Mason | Stockman |
| Grant, Ind. | May | Sullivan |
| Green | Merrow | Sumner, Ill. |
| Gregory | Michener | Sumners, Tex. |
| Griffiths | Miller, Mo. | Sundstrom |
| Gross | Miller, Nebr. | Taber |
| Guyer | Miller, Pa. | Talbot |
| Gwynne | Mills | Talle |
| Hall, Edwin Arthur | Monkiewicz | Tarver |
| Hall, Leonard W. | Monroney | Taylor |
| Halleck | Morrison, N. C. | Thomas, N. J. |
| Hancock | Mott | Thomason |
| Hare | Mruk | Tibbott |
| Harless, Ariz. | Mundt | Tolan |
| Harness, Ind. | Murray, Tenn. | Towe |
| Harris, Ark. | Murray, Wis. | Troutman |
| Harris, Va. | Newsome | Van Zandt |
| Hart | Nichols | Vincent, Ky. |
| Hartley | Norman | Vinson, Ga. |
| Heidinger | Norrell | Vorys, Ohio |
| Hendricks | O'Brien, N. Y. | Wadsworth |
| Hess | O'Hara | Walter |
| Hill | O'Neal | Ward |
| Hinshaw | Pace | Welchel, Ohio |
| Hobbs | Patman | Welch |
| Hoch | Patton | Wene |
| Hoeven | Peterson, Fla. | West |
| Hoffman | Peterson, Ga. | Wheat |
| Holmes, Mass. | Pfeifer | Whelchel, Ga. |
| Holmes, Wash. | Philbin | Whitten |
| Hope | Phillips | Whittington |
| Horan | Pittenger | Wickersham |
| Howell | Ploeser | Wigglesworth |
| Hull | Plumley | Willey |
| Jarman | Poage | Wilson |
| Jenkins | Poulson | Winstead |
| Jensen | Powers | Winter |
| Johnson, Anton J. | Pracht | Wolcott |
| Johnson, Calvin D. | Price | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| | Ramey | Wolverton, N. J. |
| | | Woodruff, Mich. |
| | | Worley |
| | | Zimmerman |

NAYS—94

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Baldwin, N. Y. | Dingell | Herter |
| Bates, Ky. | Durham | Holifield |
| Bloom | Eberharter | Izac |
| Bonner | Ellison, Md. | Jackson |
| Bradley, Pa. | Feighan | Jeffrey |
| Buckley | Fitzpatrick | Judd |
| Bulwinkle | Fogarty | Kean |
| Burchill, N. Y. | Folger | Kee |
| Burdick | Forand | Kefauver |
| Burgin | Ford | Kelley |
| Byrne | Fulbright | Kerr |
| Capozzoli | Furlong | King |
| Celler | Gale | Kirwan |
| Clark | Gavagan | Klein |
| Coffee | Gordon | LaFollette |
| Courtney | Gorski | Lesinski |
| Dawson | Granger | Luce |
| Delaney | Hagen | Lynch |
| Dickstein | Hale | McGranery |
| Dilweg | Hays | McMurray |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Madden | O'Konski | Schuetz |
| Magnuson | O'Leary | Sheridan |
| Mansfield, Mont. | Outland | Smith, W. Va. |
| | Priest | Somers, N. Y. |
| Marcantonio | Rabaut | Spence |
| Merritt | Robinson, Utah | Voorhis, Calif. |
| Miller, Conn. | Rogers, Calif. | Wasielewski |
| Murphy | Rowan | Weaver |
| Myers | Sabath | Weiss |
| O'Brien, Ill. | Sadowski | White |
| O'Brien, Mich. | Sauthoff | Wright |
| O'Connor | Scanlon | |

NOT VOTING—38

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Heffernan | O'Toole |
| Bland | Jennings | Reece, Tenn. |
| Boykin | Kearney | Robertson |
| Clason | Kennedy | Rowe |
| Cochran | Keogh | Satterfield |
| Crosser | Lemke | Short |
| Cullen | Lewis, Colo. | Sikes |
| Curtis | McGregor | Snyder |
| Domengeaux | McWilliams | Thomas, Tex. |
| Dondero | Maloney | Treadway |
| Elmer | Morrison, La. | Vursell |
| Engel | Murdock | Woodrum, Va. |
| Hébert | Norton | |

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Bland with Mr. Short.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Engel.
Mr. Robertson of Virginia with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Rowe.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. McWilliams.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Domengeaux.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Murdock.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

THOMAS ALVA EDISON

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, in the Seventy-seventh Congress a joint resolution was passed and signed by the President, proclaiming February 11 as Edison Day in commemoration of this great inventor's birthday. Accordingly, in 1942, the President and the Governors of the several States issued a proclamation for the observance of Edison Day.

On January 21 of this year I introduced House Joint Resolution 63, to urge the continuance of this commemorative day. However, in view of the organization program of the Seventy-eighth Congress, action could not be taken on this resolution. Yet I feel that the American public would not forget a man like Edison, even though war has possessed the world.

Thomas Alva Edison, through his more than 1,100 inventions, is helping the United States and our allies to win this war, not through mere inspiration, but in the very real sense of extra fire power and faster speed on the fighting front and more and better production at home.

Mr. Edison has been called, and rightly, "the father of American industry," and surely none of us doubt that it is American production which is now turning the tide toward certain victory.

Thomas Alva Edison was the real father of American industry. His great works actually created new industries, contributed mightily to others, and, in other cases, provided the means by which minor industries became major ones. Edison inventions and methods directly affect practically every industry in America, including our now all-important war industries. These contributions ranged from safety devices and measures to new and fundamental processes of manufacture; to creating new American markets and along with them outlets for the American worker.

It is not enough to refer to Mr. Edison merely as an inventor, the greatest one in history. It is not enough merely to associate him with the electric light, or the phonograph, or the motion-picture camera, or the storage battery. True, all of these and hundreds more are the products of his ingenious mind. But to fully appreciate the influence of Edison on America's gigantic war effort today, we must look beyond any recitation of his inventions and look to their effect in industrial use. Wherever you go, along our enormous production front, you would find Thomas A. Edison—be it far below ground in a mine, aboard a fast freight train, on a ship ploughing the seas, or in any war plant you would choose to name.

There is much inspiration for today's war worker in the life of Mr. Edison himself. He was a worker's worker who claimed that genius is "99 percent perspiration and 1 percent inspiration." A man who, while making industrial America possible, never became an industrialist himself in the ordinary sense of the word. A man who, in surmounting obstacles, worked to make the world a better place to live in.

To give here a detailed list of Edison's contributions to each individual industry would be an almost endless, but amazing, recital. It is a fact that Edison's inventions, placed at the disposal of other men, actually created some of our most war-vital industries. It would be difficult to name any industry that is not more efficient and more productive because of Thomas Alva Edison. What is true in industry, is likewise true on our fighting fronts. Every American plane, ship or tank is a better, tougher piece of fighting equipment because of Thomas Alva Edison. His efforts in the interest of a more peaceful and pleasant world will soon result in our customary way of life.

Since action on House Joint Resolution 63 would be ineffective for this year's celebration, I have introduced another House joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1944, as Edison Day, being mindful at the same time that the birthdays of Washington and Lincoln are also celebrated in the same month. His outstanding deeds and meritorious contributions to humanity warrant the continuance of this celebration, as I feel the American people could never have Thomas Alva Edison placed in obscurity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ACCELERATED ARMY MEDICAL PROGRAM, COORDINATION OF INTERNSHIPS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain excerpts from the Journal of the American Medical Association and certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, what I am about to say has no connection with the Ruml plan but, like the Ruml plan—which has been defined as being as simple as daylight saving—the very statement of the problem of Army use of interns should indicate the obvious solution of the problem.

The Pennsylvania State Board of Medical Education and Licensure are aware of the probable enactment of a Pennsylvania statute to permit the 9-month internship—in lieu of 1 year—for the duration of the war. While 33 States will not, as yet, permit the 9-month internship, information at hand indicates that many States may reduce this period shortly.

However, a substantial problem arises here: Before accepting a physician for commission the Army and Navy require a year of internship. This will mean, so far as many hospitals are concerned, that on the expiration of each 9-month period interns will be released from one hospital, lacking facilities for the retention of both incoming and outgoing interns, resulting in a 3-month time lag for these outgoing interns, who will be required to shop around at some other hospital in an effort to put in the additional 3 months required by the services.

Medical authorities have been unable to secure from the armed services any

information as to what type of training will be expected of these interns during the extra 3 months. When these interns leave the hospitals after completion of a 9-month rotating internship they will have qualified for the State board examinations. Hospitals in my district are not aware of any set requirements imposed by the Army for the additional 3 months, or of any total requirements as to how full internship should be distributed.

Another unanswered question is: What will happen to an intern who is in the Reserve and who is unable to obtain the 3 months service anywhere?

A recent issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association states:

The Surgeon General, United States Army, has issued general suggestions and recommendations pertinent to closer cooperation between hospitals approved for internship and the medical colleges under the accelerated medical program. The Surgeon General is loath to recommend that a graduate physician of an approved school be called to active duty with the armed forces prior to completion of a 12 months' general rotating internship. It is obvious that if the hospitals approved for internships do not cooperate with the accelerated program it would lose its effectiveness in releasing men for duty with the Medical Corps as soon as anticipated. There is now an urgent need for young, physically qualified medical officers for field troop duty.

Original directives from the War Department indicated that graduates were allowed 12 to 18 months for completion of essential internships. In many instances interns have interpreted this directive as being authority to utilize the additional time for hospital training before beginning the 12-month rotating internship. This has also allowed hospitals which customarily start their intern classes on or about July 1 of each year to maintain original schedules. It is believed that each hospital should establish a schedule of internships commencing on or about April 1, 1943, available to those who graduate in March 1943 under the accelerated medical program and thereafter as students graduate.

This obviously results in the doubling up of those who have not yet completed their 12 months beginning July 1, 1942, but it is hoped that these interns can be used in approved affiliated internships or in the capacity of subresidents to assist in the orientation of medical school graduates of March 1942. The most recent information available of the interns' situation indicates that there are excessive position vacancies over the supply of available interns.

Unless the situation demands it, the War Department does not desire to shorten the period of internship to less than the 12 months required. However, under the increasing pressure of our military needs, it is necessary to expect graduates to be immediately available, if physically qualified, 12 months from the time of their graduation. The War Department does not feel that the 18 months is necessary for completion of a 12-month internship, and this time will, therefore, no longer be allowed.

It is hoped that all interns will be trained in the rotating type of internship for the 12-month period; that is, one which provides training in medicine, surgery, pediatrics, and their related subspecialties, together with experience in laboratory and roentgenologic diagnosis. It is desired that house officers' positions be filled by those individuals not physically fit for military duty and those who are over-age for troop duty. By following this procedure and increasing the duties of house officers and the essential staff membership, it is believed that a greater proportion of each year's intern class will be made available for active military duty.

Attention is invited to the new War Department directive precluding the appointment of senior medical students or interns as medical officers, Army of the United States, until within 60 days of their proposed active duty date. Such students and interns are protected from call to active duty by the War Department by:

1. Selective-service agreement.
2. Medical Administrative Corps commissions.
3. Commissions as Reserve line officers, which they will receive on graduation from college.

This is accomplished under the authority of the War Department, A. G. O. letter dated May 8, 1942, subject Commissions for Medical Students, the main purpose of which is to protect the essential medical training program.

A letter from the committee on public health legislation of the Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania, addressed to the chairmen of intern committees of hospitals approved for internship by State board of medical education and licensure, under date of January 25, 1943, reads as follows:

DEAR DOCTOR: Inasmuch as medical schools are graduating medical students every 9 months because of the calendar reduction in the length of the course from 4 years to 3 years, there has been considerable confusion over the desirability of reducing the immediately subsequent student-intern year to 9 months.

The Surgeons General of the United States Army and Navy are on record as desiring a continuation of the 12 months' service; but advise, if necessary to reduce, that it might well be the interns' rotation in obstetrics and gynecology should be postponed or eliminated.

Hoping to become intelligently informed on this question, I should like to have your comments:

1. Whether your hospital and management have the facilities or desire to maintain double your quota of interns for a 3-month period of each year;

2. How many interns are required to meet your hospital's service needs during 1943–44?

Kindly answer as soon as possible, so that if it becomes necessary to grant the Department the authority of declaring, for the duration, 9 months as the regular intern year, appropriate legislation may be framed and introduced in the Pennsylvania Legislature during the next month.

Very truly yours,

C. L. PALMER,
*Chairman, Committee on Public Health Legislation.*

Dr. Palmer subsequently stated, on February 5 of this year, that bills in the Pennsylvania Legislature—

will be introduced next week requiring a minimum of 9 months internship as the necessary legal training for interns in a hospital approved for intern training. This will continue throughout the duration of the present war and 1 year after. Under such temporary measure the hospitals that desire to rotate their service for interns during the 9 months instead of the year will be able to do so.

My comments have been particularly directed to the dilemma arising from the failure of the Army, as yet, to coordinate its requirements with the new conditions arising as the result of the State medical programs. These programs were instituted in order to expedite the training of medical students at the request of the armed services and in consonance with the demands of the war. There is some reason to believe that the Procurement and Assignment Service contemplates the establishment of a central clearing agency for interns who can be given only 9 months' training, but no announcement has as yet been forthcoming, and it is difficult to understand why the Army does not adopt a procedure similar to that of the Navy. The Navy procedure will permit the immediate commissioning of interns after 9 months of service and will combine the usual naval indoctrination period with 3 months of intern training at a naval hospital.

The Army program has not made provision for absorbing the 3-month time lag between the termination of the 9-month internship and the 12-month period required by the Army. This is a waste of highly skilled manpower, desperately needed, and is most difficult to understand. The Navy program may be summarized as follows:

It is the present policy of the Bureau to order lieutenants (junior grade), MC–V(G), United States Naval Reserve, to active duty in a naval hospital in order to complete 3 months of intern training. These nominations are accomplished in cases where the hospital in which these Reserve officers are serving have adopted an accelerated intern schedule and it is not practicable to retain these officers for the full 12-month period. In the event the Reserve officers desire to complete 3 months of intern training at a naval hospital, they should be advised to submit the following statements in duplicate, signed by the medical director or superintendent of the hospital:

(a) That their hospital has adopted a 9-month schedule of intern training and it is not practicable to retain them at that institution for 1 year of intern training.

(b) That they are released from their contract without prejudice.

(c) List of the services which they have completed and the time spent on each service.

These statements should be forwarded to the Bureau as soon as possible in order that this Bureau may have sufficient time to nominate these officers for active duty.

A table is appended hereto relative to the estimated number of graduates of approved medical schools:

*Estimated number of graduates of the approved medical schools in the United States, July 1, 1942–June 30, 1945*

Dates of graduation:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1942 | |
| July 1–Dec. 31 | 275 |
| 1943 | |
| Jan. 1–Mar. 31 | 4,180 |
| Apr. 1–June 30 | 681 |
| July 1–Sept. 30 | 255 |
| Oct. 1–Dec. 31 | 4,444 |
| 1944 | |
| Jan. 1–Mar. 31 | 399 |
| Apr. 1–June 30 | 541 |
| July 1–Sept. 30 | 4,578 |
| Oct. 1–Dec. 31 | 380 |
| 1945 | |
| Jan. 1–June 30 | 5,296 |
| Total | 21,029 |

It is comforting to realize that, rather than permit this war to interfere with the education of physicians, the Federal authorities, in cooperation with medical schools, have adopted programs which will increase the output of physicians and at the same time retain the normal curriculum without any material lowering of standards.

Furthermore, the acute need of the Army is for young physicians for assignment to duty with troops. This need must be met, and there is here offered to recent graduates who have just completed internships an unusual opportunity for service. Reports indicate that there are still many qualified graduates of 1941 who have not yet applied for commissions in the Medical Corps.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote in part an article from the August 15, 1942, number of the Journal of the American Medical Association:

The 732 hospitals approved for intern training in February 1942 offered a total of 7,228 internship appointments annually. These in relation to the number of medical graduates—5,275 in 1941—would indicate a shortage of nearly 2,000 interns, but actually in view of the availability of second-year men the approved hospitals had only 927 unfilled positions at the time of reporting. The number of vacancies has since increased, however, because of the curtailment of many of the advanced training courses and the appointment of additional interns in some hospitals to compensate for the lack of residents. In this connection it would seem particularly essential that all hospitals cooperate in maintaining an equitable distribution of interns by limiting their appointments to actual minimum needs. As a general rule the ratio of house officers to patients should not exceed 1 intern to 600 annual admissions.

INCREASED PRODUCTION OF INTERNS

The present shortage of interns has a compensatory factor in the accelerated program of undergraduate training now adopted by most of the approved medical schools. Thus within 3 years there will be 4 graduating classes available totaling 21,029 students, as indicated previously in the section on undergraduate education. The first impact of this program will be felt in March 1943, when approximately 4,180 graduates will be ready to begin their intern service 3 months ahead of the usual date. Since the previous group will not have completed its service until July, there will be an overlapping of assignments for 3 months unless the older interns can be advanced to senior positions or be assigned to affiliate services in other hospitals that are short of house officers. If the affiliate plan is adopted, the original hospital should maintain supervision and be responsible for the entire educational period; otherwise it would not be in position to offer an internship certificate covering the last 3 months of training.

CHANGES IN INTERNSHIPS

The Council on Medical Education and Hospitals and the Association of American Medical Colleges have both recommended that internships should not be reduced below 12 months. The essential character of the intern service has likewise been recognized by the Army, Navy, and Selective Service, which have made provisions whereby medical students may be deferred from active military duty until they have completed a year of hospital training. The individual hospitals, however, are confronted with the problem of integrating the 1-year internship with the accelerated medical curriculum under which a new class graduates every 9 months. That intern services are rapidly being modified to coincide with the change in graduation dates is apparent from reports received in July 1942 indicating that 544 hospitals have recently readjusted their appointment schedule. At the same time there has been a reduction in the number of long-term assignments, as evidenced by the fact that 711 hospitals are now offering 1-year internships as compared with 608 last February. Five have scheduled an 18-month service, 9 a 2-year internship, and 14 a combination of assignments varying from 12 to 24 months. The corresponding figures at the beginning of the year were 17, 71, and 36. Of the hospitals currently approved, 687 offer a rotating service, 12 have mixed internships, and 19 provide straight assignments, while 21 have more than 1 type. Previous reports were 660, 27, 18, and 27, respectively. The list of approved internships published in this issue contains in addition to the clinical data up-to-date information concerning the number of interns required annually, type of internship, length of service, date of appointment, beginning of service, and monthly stipend. The approved hospitals now total 739; the approved internships, 8,349.

*Enrollment, 1942–43*

| | First year | Second year | Third year | Fourth year |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| University of Alabama | 58 | 51 | ------ | ------ |
| University of Arkansas | 82 | 74 | 70 | 66 |
| University of California | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| College of Medical Evangelists | 95 | 73 | 75 | 66 |
| University of Southern California | 63 | 54 | 52 | 51 |
| Stanford University | 62 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| University of Colorado | 61 | 54 | 58 | 49 |
| Yale University | 59 | 53 | 51 | 47 |
| Georgetown University | 104 | 69 | 65 | 68 |
| George Washington University | 75 | 75 | 65 | 74 |
| Howard University | 75 | 49 | 27 | 35 |
| Emory University | 68 | 54 | 50 | 53 |
| University of Georgia | 75 | 72 | 46 | 46 |
| Loyola University | 88 | 82 | 70 | 54 |
| Northwestern University | 130 | 133 | 150 | 156 |
| University of Chicago | 65 | 60 | 69 | 45 |
| University of Illinois | 166 | 173 | 163 | 152 |
| Indiana University | 120 | 120 | 115 | 114 |
| State University of Iowa | 100 | 79 | 66 | 65 |
| University of Kansas | 75 | 90 | 87 | 82 |
| University of Louisville | 93 | 91 | 89 | 92 |
| Louisiana State University | 100 | 84 | 82 | 83 |
| Tulane University | 140 | 123 | 125 | 120 |
| Johns Hopkins University | 78 | 68 | 73 | 74 |
| University of Maryland | 96 | 91 | 90 | 98 |
| Boston University | 68 | 63 | 46 | 46 |
| Harvard Medical School | 125 | 135 | 140 | 145 |
| Tufts College | 111 | 104 | 101 | 96 |
| University of Michigan | 160 | 113 | 121 | 100 |
| Wayne University | 80 | 74 | 60 | 64 |
| University of Minnesota | 126 | 125 | 113 | 114 |
| University of Mississippi | 30 | 30 | ------ | ------ |
| St. Louis University | 130 | 109 | 112 | 111 |
| University of Missouri | 45 | 31 | ------ | ------ |
| Washington University | 84 | 76 | 115 | 98 |
| Creighton University | 70 | 65 | 60 | 44 |
| University of Nebraska | 95 | 88 | 75 | 74 |
| Dartmouth Medical School | 24 | 21 | ------ | ------ |
| Albany Medical College | 44 | 39 | 37 | 34 |
| Long Island College | 104 | 106 | 97 | 90 |
| University of Buffalo | 78 | 72 | 63 | 70 |
| Columbia University | 115 | 125 | 107 | 96 |
| Cornell University | 84 | 74 | 80 | 76 |
| New York Medical College | 96 | 85 | 85 | 69 |
| New York University | 135 | 125 | 120 | 124 |
| University of Rochester | 65 | 64 | 61 | 57 |
| Syracuse University | 56 | 47 | 40 | 42 |
| Duke University | 68 | 70 | 60 | 61 |
| University of North Carolina | 49 | 42 | ------ | ------ |
| Bowman Gray School of Medicine | 50 | 36 | 33 | ------ |
| University of North Dakota | 28 | 26 | ------ | ------ |
| University of Cincinnati | 85 | 76 | 73 | 77 |
| Western Reserve University | 92 | 78 | 69 | 74 |
| Ohio State University | 80 | 75 | 72 | 68 |
| University of Oklahoma | 75 | 55 | 53 | 60 |
| University of Oregon | 75 | 71 | 64 | 35 |
| Hahnemann Medical College | 150 | 140 | 135 | 106 |
| Jefferson Medical College | 157 | 127 | 135 | 142 |
| Temple University | 118 | 103 | 123 | 120 |
| University of Pennsylvania | 133 | 115 | 133 | 132 |
| Woman's Medical College | 45 | 39 | 27 | 22 |
| University of Pittsburgh | 87 | 83 | 84 | 73 |
| Medical College of South Carolina | 50 | 45 | 50 | 50 |
| University of South Dakota | 27 | 24 | ------ | ------ |
| University of Tennessee | 140 | 135 | 126 | 114 |
| Meharry Medical College | 65 | 66 | 62 | 50 |
| Vanderbilt University | 53 | 52 | 51 | 51 |
| Baylor University | 84 | 76 | 80 | 76 |
| University of Texas | 100 | 107 | 98 | 89 |
| University of Utah | 40 | 36 | ------ | ------ |
| University of Vermont | 36 | 33 | 34 | 32 |
| University of Virginia | 78 | 70 | 60 | 61 |
| Medical College of Virginia | 80 | 80 | 72 | 71 |
| West Virginia University | 30 | 26 | ------ | ------ |
| University of Wisconsin | 72 | 80 | 57 | 62 |
| Marquette University | 100 | 95 | 72 | 78 |
| Total | 6,382 | 5,836 | 5,326 | 5,130 |

*Distribution by sex*

| | Students | | Graduates | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| University of Alabama | 93 | 5 | ------ | ------ |
| University of Arkansas | 285 | 7 | 65 | 1 |
| University of California | 223 | 30 | 100 | 11 |
| College of Medical Evangelists | 296 | 13 | 72 | 5 |
| University of Southern California | 205 | 3 | 49 | ------ |
| Stanford University | 227 | 15 | 55 | 2 |
| University of Colorado | 204 | 13 | 49 | 2 |
| Yale University | 190 | 16 | 49 | 2 |
| Georgetown University | 299 | ------ | 85 | ------ |
| George Washington University | 261 | 24 | 65 | 7 |
| Howard University | 173 | 13 | 31 | 4 |
| Emory University | 218 | ------ | 49 | ------ |
| University of Georgia | 203 | 9 | 41 | 1 |
| Loyola University | 262 | 13 | 63 | 4 |
| Northwestern University | 541 | 16 | 155 | 4 |
| Rush Medical College | 104 | 5 | 103 | 5 |
| University of Chicago, School of Medicine | 257 | 12 | 59 | 6 |
| University of Illinois | 597 | 41 | 153 | 12 |
| Indiana University | 482 | 25 | 98 | 10 |
| State University of Iowa | 266 | 16 | 45 | 1 |
| University of Kansas | 319 | 16 | 80 | 1 |
| University of Louisville | 352 | 8 | 85 | 3 |
| Louisiana State University | 326 | 19 | 83 | 2 |
| Tulane University of Louisiana | 473 | 23 | 117 | 4 |
| Johns Hopkins University | 257 | 33 | 69 | 6 |
| University of Maryland | 357 | 16 | 81 | 4 |
| Boston University | 194 | 23 | 47 | 5 |
| Harvard Medical School | 533 | ------ | 129 | ------ |
| Tufts College | 383 | 19 | 86 | 8 |
| University of Michigan | 431 | 25 | 99 | 6 |
| Wayne University | 241 | 12 | 51 | 3 |
| University of Minnesota | 445 | 32 | 109 | 8 |
| University of Mississippi | 52 | 3 | ------ | ------ |
| University of Missouri | 70 | 1 | ------ | ------ |
| St. Louis University | 443 | ------ | 94 | ------ |
| Washington University | 337 | 22 | 88 | 5 |
| Creighton University | 215 | 9 | 49 | 3 |
| University of Nebraska | 311 | 10 | 65 | 4 |
| Dartmouth Medical School | 46 | ------ | ------ | ------ |
| Albany Medical College | 134 | 16 | 32 | 1 |
| Long Island College of Medicine | 360 | 25 | 84 | 6 |
| University of Buffalo | 259 | 16 | 54 | 7 |
| Columbia University | 399 | 29 | 90 | 5 |
| Cornell University | 294 | 17 | 72 | 3 |
| New York Medical College | 360 | 28 | 70 | 7 |
| New York University | 465 | 41 | 114 | 11 |
| University of Rochester | 214 | 14 | 40 | 4 |
| Syracuse University | 161 | 10 | 32 | 2 |
| University of North Carolina | 84 | 2 | ------ | ------ |
| Duke University | 254 | 8 | 62 | 2 |
| Bowman Gray School of Medicine | 69 | 4 | ------ | ------ |
| University of North Dakota | 53 | ------ | ------ | ------ |
| University of Cincinnati | 290 | 17 | 73 | 4 |
| Western Reserve University | 283 | 10 | 58 | 2 |
| Ohio State University | 290 | 14 | 75 | 4 |
| University of Oklahoma | 224 | 11 | 52 | 3 |
| University of Oregon | 253 | 7 | 49 | 2 |
| Hahnemann Medical College | 531 | 10 | 130 | ------ |
| Jefferson Medical College | 530 | ------ | 131 | ------ |
| Temple University | 409 | 38 | 105 | 12 |
| University of Pennsylvania | 473 | 23 | 124 | 5 |
| Woman's Medical College | ------ | 114 | ------ | 18 |
| University of Pittsburgh | 303 | 12 | 70 | 3 |
| Medical College of South Carolina | 179 | 4 | 43 | ------ |
| University of South Dakota | 40 | ------ | ------ | ------ |
| University of Tennessee | 456 | 14 | 93 | 5 |
| Meharry Medical College | 220 | 11 | 48 | 2 |
| Vanderbilt University | 195 | 7 | 50 | 1 |
| Baylor University | 305 | 16 | 71 | 4 |
| University of Texas | 361 | 23 | 91 | 8 |
| University of Utah | 61 | 5 | ------ | ------ |
| University of Vermont | 122 | 5 | 31 | ------ |
| University of Virginia | 241 | 8 | 61 | 1 |
| Medical College of Virginia | 278 | 24 | 57 | 7 |
| West Virginia University | 47 | 4 | ------ | ------ |
| University of Wisconsin | 237 | 20 | 49 | 5 |
| Marquette University | 322 | 10 | 64 | 6 |
| University of Alberta | 180 | 14 | 43 | 4 |
| University of Manitoba | 203 | 20 | 51 | 3 |
| Dalhousie University | 160 | 4 | 42 | ------ |
| Queen's University | 266 | ------ | 41 | ------ |
| University of Western Ontario | 204 | 20 | 34 | 2 |
| University of Toronto | 740 | 64 | 109 | 7 |
| McGill University | 373 | 24 | 81 | 9 |
| University of Montreal | 201 | 8 | 48 | ------ |
| Laval University | 315 | 9 | 64 | 1 |
| University of Saskatchewan | 42 | 6 | ------ | ------ |
| Total | 23,551 | 1,333 | 5,397 | 305 |

*Distribution by sex in the United States and Canada, 1936–41*

| Year | Students | | Graduates | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 1935–36 | 24,219 | 1,254 | 5,388 | 268 |
| 1936–37 | 23,787 | 1,244 | 5,624 | 261 |
| 1937–38 | 23,234 | 1,307 | 5,459 | 252 |
| 1938–39 | 22,919 | 1,293 | 5,290 | 285 |
| 1939–40 | 22,903 | 1,291 | 5,430 | 273 |
| 1940–41 | 22,853 | 1,308 | 5,527 | 310 |
| 1941–42 | 23,551 | 1,333 | 5,397 | 305 |

*Schools, students, and graduates in the United States, 1905–42*

| | Schools | Students [1] | Graduates |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1905 | 160 | 26,147 | 5,606 |
| 1910 | 131 | 21,526 | 4,440 |
| 1915 | 96 | 14,891 | 3,536 |
| 1920 | 85 | 13,798 | 3,047 |
| 1921 | 83 | 14,466 | 3,186 |
| 1922 | 81 | 15,635 | 2,529 |
| 1923 | 80 | 16,960 | 3,120 |
| 1924 | 79 | 17,728 | 3,562 |
| 1925 | 80 | 18,200 | 3,974 |
| 1926 | 79 | 18,840 | 3,962 |
| 1927 | 80 | 19,662 | 4,035 |
| 1928 | 80 | 20,545 | 4,262 |
| 1929 | 76 | 20,878 | 4,446 |
| 1930 | 76 | 21,597 | 4,565 |
| 1931 | 76 | 21,982 | 4,735 |
| 1932 | 76 | 22,135 | 4,936 |
| 1933 | 77 | 22,466 | 4,895 |
| 1934 | 77 | 22,799 | 5,035 |
| 1935 | 77 | 22,888 | 5,101 |
| 1936 | 77 | 22,564 | 5,183 |
| 1937 | 77 | 22,095 | 5,377 |
| 1938 | 77 | 21,587 | 5,194 |
| 1939 | 77 | 21,302 | 5,089 |
| 1940 | 77 | 21,271 | 5,097 |
| 1941 | 77 | 21,379 | 5,275 |
| 1942 | 77 | 22,031 | 5,163 |

[1] Includes figures for schools of the basic medical sciences.

*Students in the United States by years, including the intern year when required for graduation, 1930–41*

| | Preclinical | | Clinical | | Intern year | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1930–31 | 6,456 | 5,538 | 5,080 | 4,908 | 1,025 | 23,007 |
| 1931–32 | 6,260 | 5,462 | 4,932 | 4,885 | 1,067 | 23,202 |
| 1932–33 | 6,426 | 5,479 | 5,017 | 4,948 | 1,106 | 23,572 |
| 1933–34 | 6,457 | 5,571 | 4,988 | 4,937 | 1,183 | 23,982 |
| 1934–35 | 6,356 | 5,624 | 5,142 | 4,905 | 1,233 | 24,121 |
| 1935–36 | 6,005 | 5,458 | 5,230 | 5,020 | 1,213 | 23,777 |
| 1936–37 | 5,910 | 5,269 | 5,140 | 5,158 | 1,255 | 23,350 |
| 1937–38 | 5,791 | 5,225 | 4,986 | 5,036 | 1,132 | 22,719 |
| 1938–39 | 5,754 | 5,160 | 4,947 | 4,921 | 1,152 | 22,454 |
| 1939–40 | 5,794 | 5,177 | 4,921 | 4,894 | 1,152 | 22,423 |
| 1940–41 | 5,837 | 5,254 | 4,969 | 4,849 | 1,058 | 22,437 |
| 1941–42 | [1]6,218 | [1]5,406 | [1]5,087 | [1]4,942 | 767 | 22,798 |

[1] Excluding enrollment figures for Rush Medical College 109 and the school of medicine of the University of Chicago 269, a total of 378.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent that this special order be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

USE OF SHIPPING SPACE FOR GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA MAGAZINE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time in order to call attention to another one of the bureaucratic activities of this Administration which is definitely hampering our war effort.

The Office of War Information has recently issued a pictorial magazine called Victory, and in an announcement on February 4 they call attention to the fact that 450,000 copies have been distributed in English and another run of 540,000 copies is now being printed in various languages for circulation through various parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

I think this activity is criminal, and I do not mean to say that it borders on that. It is clearly over the line.

I am not going to go into the history of the publication of Victory, even though it is placing the Government in the publishing business where they are soliciting advertising at the rate of $3,000 a page from the companies having war contracts and which have no other way to pay for the advertising except to charge it back to the Government in the cost of the products which they sell to the Government. It is Mr. Taxpayer who is footing the bill.

All this, however, is probably not as harmful to our war effort as the waste of shipping space which is entailed by sending this unnecessary publication abroad. The magazine itself, exclusive of any wrappings or container, weighs exactly 13 ounces. This means that the first two issues, totaling 990,000 copies, will rob 402 tons of shipping space that might better be filled with bombs or bullets for our enemies. Four hundred and two tons of bombs would do a lot more toward winning the war than 402 tons of Victory. It is a sad state of affairs when shipping space is so short that our soldiers cannot receive a carton of cigarettes or a box of candy or the home town newspapers from their families, but plenty of space seems to be available for such foolish publications as Victory.

I wonder how long it will take this administration to wake up to the fact that a war is going on and that we are up to our necks in a fight for survival. I know very well that a majority of the American people do not approve of this type of fighting and I am in hopes that they will find some way to impress the New Deal administration that it ought to wake up and realize the seriousness of our situation. If we have to use shipping space for sending articles abroad, it seems to me that the people living in those countries would obtain much more satisfaction from a loaf of bread, or the ingredients from which it is made, than they would from such magazines.

We have shortages in this country of everything that goes into the manufacture and distribution of this magazine. Newspapers are rationed; we are short on the dyes which go into the ink; we are short on manpower and shipping space in this country; we are short on overseas shipping space. Yet, in spite of all this, the O. W. I., under the direction of Elmer Davis, has brazenly gone ahead and carried on the publication of this useless magazine.

I only wish that we were not so short on brains in the O. W. I. It is time to limit such activities as this. The sooner we stop wasting our substance on such things the quicker we will win the war.

MATTHEW LYON

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, 142 years ago Representative Matthew Lyon, of Vermont, cast the deciding vote in this House electing Thomas Jefferson President of the United States on the thirty-sixth ballot. Today in my home city of Jacksonville, Fla., his great, great grandson, J. B. Lyon is celebrating his eighty-seventh birthday anniversary, in company with his brother, J. M. Lyon, who is 84 years of age.

They are directly descended in the male line from Col. Matthew Lyon, who served in this House from Vermont and Kentucky. Their father was James Benjamin Risley Lyon, son of Rev. Mason R. Lyon, who was the son of James Lyon, first son of the famous Colonel Lyon.

J. B. Lyon, my constituent, has for 60 years been editor and publisher of newspapers, author and columnist. His great grandfather, James Lyon, son of Col. Matthew Lyon, was apprenticed in his youth to Benjamin Franklin to learn the printing trade and newspaper profession. When his apprenticeship was ended Colonel Lyon bought a printing press from Franklin, on which he and his son printed the articles critical of President Adams, which led to the iniquitous alien and sedition laws, under which Colonel Lyon was imprisoned.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MALONEY, for the week beginning February 8, on official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 11, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, February 11, 1943. Business to be considered: To continue hearing on H. R. 1012, "To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

167. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman of the Board of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of October 1942, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 799. A bill to make temporary disability ratings of World War veterans permanent after 10 years; without amendment (Rept. No. 113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 1744. A bill to provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 1749. A bill to amend Veterans Regulations No. 10, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 107. Resolution granting consideration to H. R. 1605, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to farm-acreage allotments, the farm marketing excess of wheat, the use of excess corn as silage for feed to livestock on the farm, to provide for the adequate supply of peanuts for oil and other uses, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 116). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 1780. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 1781. A bill to require labor organizations to incorporate and file annual financial reports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H. R. 1782. A bill to further protect the rights of individual employees under the National Labor Relations Act through denying certain labor organizations their status and benefits as such under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 1783 (by request). A bill to amend the act of May 22, 1939 (Public Law No. 81); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 1795. A bill to exclude from gross income, for purposes of the Federal income tax, amounts received as compensation for active service in the military or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1944, as Edison Day, in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 108. Resolution requesting information as to conduct of Walter Winchell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to pay-as-you-go plan to be enacted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to favoritism for youth of Japanese extraction, in the advantages of higher education; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to diplomatic representatives and members of diplomatic or consular staffs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend title I, IV, and X of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to increase the Federal gasoline tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to cease action on House bill 1012 and Senate bill 246; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to correct such inequities in Federal statutes pertaining to hospitalization for war veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to realizing certain agricultural commodities to the farmers of Iowa; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 1784. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard Lewis Gay; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULLEN:

H. R. 1785. A bill for the relief of William Wrigley Jr. Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1786. A bill for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1787. A bill for the relief of R. S. Howard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 1788. A bill for the relief of Joseph Schepps; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1789. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nannie Lee; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 1790. A bill for the relief of Wymer Bowlin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1791. A bill granting a pension to Margaret M. Tupper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of Arthur G. Klein; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 1793. A bill for the relief of Baxter Campbell and Glestie Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 1794. A bill granting a pension to Amanda M. Evert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

110. By Mr. FISH: Petition of 181 taxpayers and residents of Dutchess County, N. Y., favoring adoption of the Ruml plan of collecting taxes, or one similar to it; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

111. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the Legislature of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, urging passage of House Bill 801; to the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation.

112. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 3134 of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, favoring resumption of construction on the Friant-Kern and Madera Canals of the Central Valley water project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

# SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dost speak to listening hearts in the holy hush of the dawn and in the brooding quietness of the evening, speak to us now in the heat and burden of noontide's toiling. May we regard the faithful service of the commonwealth as a sacramental task. As we come to the high altar of patriotism in this temple of a people's hope and trust, may it be with clear minds, clean hands, and courageous hearts.

Teach us to value a conscience void of offense and the royalty of inward calm above all the pedestals, prizes, and preferments earth can give. May the tyranny of majorities and the tirades of minorities be equally impotent to sway us from the right as Thou dost give us to see it. Forbid that any actions or attitudes of ours should ever deny or betray the white principles for which on land and sea, under alien skies, our brothers in arms are paying the last full measure of devotion. Along the road of this day and of every day may we walk with Thee in the bright fellowship of those who

fight the good fight and keep the faith. In the Redeemer's name, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 8, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Green | Pepper |
| Andrews | Guffey | Radcliffe |
| Austin | Gurney | Reed |
| Bailey | Hayden | Reynolds |
| Ball | Hill | Robertson |
| Bankhead | Johnson, Colo. | Russell |
| Barkley | Kilgore | Scrugham |
| Bilbo | La Follette | Smith |
| Bridges | Langer | Stewart |
| Buck | Lucas | Thomas, Idaho |
| Bushfield | McClellan | Thomas, Okla. |
| Butler | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Byrd | McKellar | Truman |
| Capper | McNary | Tunnell |
| Caraway | Maloney | Tydings |
| Chandler | Maybank | Vandenberg |
| Clark, Mo. | Mead | Van Nuys |
| Connally | Millikin | Wagner |
| Danaher | Moore | Wallgren |
| Davis | Murdock | Walsh |
| Downey | Murray | Wheeler |
| Ferguson | Nye | Wherry |
| George | O'Daniel | Wiley |
| Gerry | O'Mahoney | Willis |
| Gillette | Overton | |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are conducting hearings in Puerto Rico on behalf of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is detained on official business for the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The junior Senator from Oregon (Mr. HOLMAN) is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—QUESTIONNAIRES AND REPORTS REQUIRED FROM THE PUBLIC (S. DOC. NO. 4)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee relating to an investigation of the questionnaires and reports required from the public by the various agencies of the Government, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

On motion by Mr. BYRD, the report was ordered to be printed as a document for distribution and also to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

FEBRUARY —, 1943.

*Report to the President of the United States; the Vice President of the United States; President of the Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

In accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law No. 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, an additional report herewith is presented by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, introduced by Senators VANDENBERG and BYRD, was adopted by the Senate. This resolution is as follows:

*"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures be directed to investigate the existing methods of all departments and bureaus in respect to the manner and form of questionnaires, reports, and all other methods of inquiry to which citizens and/or corporations are required to respond in connection with all phases of the war effort; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the committee be directed to report any legislative recommendations which would either eliminate or simplify or concentrate these processes to the end that citizens and/or corporations shall be relieved of any needless irritation, labor, or expense in this connection and that the war effort shall be relieved of any needless obstacles or complications and that the Federal pay rolls shall be relieved of any needless personnel."

In accordance with the mandate contained in this resolution, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures made an investigation of the questionnaires and reports required from the public by the different agencies of Government.

The committee conducted public hearings and heard all the witnesses who desired to testify.

The committee required each agency of the Government to submit to the committee a complete list and a sample of all questionnaires sent out by the various agencies of the Government during the period from July 1, 1941, to December 1, 1942.

The responses made by the agencies show that a total of 7,025 separate and distinct Government reports and questionnaires were required by 48 agencies to be answered by the public.

This figure is exclusive of the reports requested by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, this information not having been furnished the committee.

This number, also, does not include a large number of letters asking for specific information and only includes the printed forms.

The committee has obtained sample copies of each of the questionnaires and reports, but has not been able to secure from the different agencies exact information as to the number of each report distributed, although it is indicated that the number sent to corporations and individuals will run into the millions. The Office of Price Administration, for example, has issued and requested statistical data on 7,715,229 report forms, exclusive of rationing forms and instructions.

*Number of separate and distinct forms required to be answered by the public*

| | Number |
|---|---|
| Agriculture | 642 |
| (Did not furnish figures for Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Farm Credit Administration or Bureau of Agricultural Economics.) | |
| Department of Commerce: | |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation | 87 |
| Census Bureau | 281 |
| Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce | 46 |
| Coast and Geodetic Survey | 5 |
| Civil Aeronautics Authority | 138 |
| Weather Bureau | 12 |
| Interior Department | 530 |
| Justice Department | 27 |
| Labor Department | 227 |
| Navy Department | 48 |
| State Department | 27 |
| Treasury Department | 38 |
| War Department | 109 |
| Executive Offices of the President: | |
| Office for Emergency Management: | |
| Alien Property Custodian | 25 |
| Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs | 1 |
| Economic Stabilization Board | 2 |
| Office of Civilian Defense | 21 |
| Office of Defense Transportation | 60 |
| Office of Scientific Research and Development | 2 |
| Office of War Information | 12 |
| War Manpower Commission | 178 |
| War Production Board | 741 |
| Board of Economic Warfare | 71 |
| Office of Price Administration | 1,096 |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 26 |
| Board of Investigation and Research | 28 |
| Civil Service Commission | 437 |
| Employees' Compensation Commission | 192 |
| Federal Communications Commission | 436 |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 5 |
| Federal Power Commission | 62 |

| | Number |
|---|---|
| Federal Security Agency | 258 |
| Federal Trade Commission | 92 |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 241 |
| Library of Congress | 78 |
| Maritime Commission (War Shipping Board) | 82 |
| National Archives | 1 |
| National Housing Agency | 244 |
| National Labor Relations Board | 2 |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 229 |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 138 |
| Tariff Commission | 28 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 6 |
| Administrative Office of United States Courts | 6 |
| Veterans' Administration | 10 |
| Federal Works Agency: | |
| Office of Administrator | 5 |
| Public Roads Administration | 43 |
| Total of separate reports required by various agencies of the Government | 7,025 |

(This does not include further information and reports asked for by letters and special requests.)

It would, of course, be a monumental task to analyze each of these carefully as to form and content, and this the committee could not accomplish without a long and exhaustive investigation, but the committee, after a careful survey, reports—

1. That there has been no attempt at uniformity of these numerous reports.

2. The purpose and use of many forms are not clear.

3. Identical information has been requested by several agencies.

4. The Budget Bureau's attempt at uniformity, simplicity, and conciseness has often been circumvented by the use of so-called administrative forms, which requested statistical data at great length.

5. Many of the questions are couched in language too technical for the small businessman.

6. The forms were not constructed with a view toward saving the businessman or the Government time and money and, in many instances, have been prepared without regard to the accounting practices of the particular industry.

7. Where the purpose of the form is clear many superfluous questions have been added.

8. The investigation of the committee indicated that many of these reports serve no useful purpose; that a great many are filed away by governmental agencies, and the information contained therein is not tabulated.

The committee, of course, appreciates that some reports are necessary, but the vast number of reports requested, and the complexity and details of the questionnaires have, in the judgment of the committee, constituted a serious obstacle to the full utilization of the resources of the country for the war effort. Many business enterprises have been compelled to divert trained personnel from essential and important war work in order to prepare reports, many of which thereafter serve no useful purpose. War production is vastly more important than reports.

It is impossible to estimate the cost of preparing, analyzing, and tabulating these reports on the part of the Government, but this cost is necessarily high. The nearest approximate estimate that can be used is that of Mr. Joseph I. Lubin, former chairman of the War Production Board Committee for Review of Date Requests From Industry, who stated that the War Production Board had eliminated 20 percent of the existing forms and reports and, according to Mr. Lubin, has thereby released the equivalent of 15,000 men working every day, which means a saving of 30,000,000 man-hours a year now consumed in compiling such reports.

The War Production Board issued 741 questionnaires; therefore, the elimination of approximately 140 occasioned this saving in manpower, which, if applied to the entire number of more than 7,000, in similar ratio, the saving of manpower and cost would reach very great proportions.

Mr. Lubin stated that he hoped to reach an elimination of at least 40 percent of these reports. The committee are inclined to the opinion that 60 to 75 percent of the reports now required can be eliminated without in any way impairing the necessary records of the Government.

On the part of private business the cost of preparing these reports has been colossal in comparison to the benefits derived by the Government, and the task of preparing them has confused and discouraged many private business enterprises engaged in essential war work.

An investigation of the more than 7,000 questionnaires impresses the committee with the importance of protecting the businessmen of the country in the emergency now existing from a continuation of the necessity of diverting thousands of trained men from vital war activity to useless paper work.

The committee is driven to the irresistible conclusion that much of this paper work involves an intolerable waste of time and resources not only for the victims of these needless inquisitions but also for the Government itself. The committee also could not escape the conclusion that one of the chief sources of unpopularity, irritation, and resentment in connection with rationing and price controls is the nature and extent of the needless complex reports too often required by the Government. While fully recognizing that the war effort unavoidably requires a substantial increase in the paper work which our unavoidable war controls entail, the committee believes that this necessity should be serviced with a minimum of red tape and a maximum of simplicity; and it condemns the excessive, costly, and often unintelligible quiz-mania which has been too often exemplified in some of these bureaucratic zeals.

The committee commends the action of the Bureau of the Budget in accepting all-over control of questionnaires and reports with a view to reducing this burden.

The committee commends the action of the Treasury Department and the War Production Board in voluntarily abandoning some of the paper work and commends this excellent example to other branches of the Government.

The committee is hopeful that its clear exposure of this hazard—a menace which frequently actually threatens the war effort itself through a needless diversion of time and effort—will contribute to curbing substantially these excesses, and that the supervision of the Bureau of the Budget will substantially reduce this paper output.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommends that the Budget Bureau, under the power it now has, or with additional power granted by Congress, should such be necessary, exercise full and complete control over the various agencies of the Government that are issuing questionnaires and reports not absolutely essential to the prosecution of the war; that the Budget Bureau endeavor not only to simplify but to eliminate most of these 7,025 reports now being required by the Government, and to coordinate the remainder; that, wherever possible, one annual, semiannual, or quarterly report be sent to the Budget Bureau as a central agency, containing the information required by the various agencies; that such reports be filed with the Budget Bureau and be accessible to the other agencies of government that need the information; that the entire question of these unnecessary reports is of such paramount importance that it be reviewed and simplified by further planning and coordination on the part of all Government agencies under the central control of the Budget Bureau; that the questionnaire mania be curbed by persuasion, if possible, and, if not, by strong congressional action.

The committee further recommends that the appropriation bills limit definitely the amount available to each agency of the Government issuing forms and questionnaires; that full information as to the number of reports issued, their character and purpose, be made a part of the records of the respective appropriations committees, so that such information will be readily available as to the number printed and distributed, and the cost thereof.

By exercising such careful supervision of that part of the appropriation available for the preparation, analysis, and cost of printing and distributing the reports, the Congress can retain in a very effective measure control over this questionnaire problem in the event proper cooperation of the various agencies affected is not forthcoming.

### ADDENDA TO THE REPORT

*Analysis of testimony and information received by the committee*

A survey of 89 companies in 10 war industries revealed that 84 of these units completed 3,479 Government reports in the second quarter of 1942. This is an average of 164 reports per company per year. Industries with the heaviest war production carry the heaviest burden of reports. To complete the forms, the 89 companies require a total of 495,480 man-hours a year. Of this total 13 percent is for nonrecurring and 87 percent for recurring reports. The machinery group of manufacturers believes that 43 percent of these reports are unnecessary.

In the Worthington Machinery & Pump Corporation, which employs 4,000 people, six departments must perforce devote full time to the preparation of 545 reports of 66 different types; in addition, there are 478 reports to 80 State, county, and city governments. Reports vary from 1 to 20 pages in length, and the number of questions varies from 10 to 100. The cost of the Federal reports for this corporation alone is approximately $90,000 a year.

Manufacturers declare that Federal red tape delays production and lengthens the war. Priorities and allocations involve entirely new sets of routines. Allocations of vital war materials to a plant must frequently wait until all other plants in the same production field have placed their requisitions.

In his testimony, Eric A. Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, told our committee that "it requires a Philadelphia lawyer or an Indian crystal gazer to figure out the answers to some Government questionnaires." He said the requirements for necessary and basic information in wartime are bound to place a great burden on individuals and business concerns. "That makes it all the more important," he declared, "that requests for information should be kept at a minimum and be put in such form as to make for practical replies and utilization of their contents."

The War Production Board reports that a large automobile company complained that preparation of Government forms cost $125,000 and required more than 100,000 man-hours. In another large industry elimination of a single form will save 400,000 man-hours annually and also 100,000 man-hours for the Government.

Senator VANDENBERG told the committee about a Chicago businessman who employs some 2,000 men. Excluding tax and social-security reports, it cost this firm $55,000 in 9 months to answer Government questionnaires.

A large drug manufacturer testified that some Office of Price Administration reports

are impossible to fill out, both from the standpoint of time involved and ability to understand what is wanted. For example, it would take months to determine how to proceed with Report 1-1071 PL of 5 ROBV-COS-WP, entitled "Report on New Proprietory or Cosmetic Product." This one dealt with new products. Later it was revised to include any alteration in the size, style, and shape of the container or formula of any existing product. Mostly at the request of the War Production Board, hundreds of these changes have occurred in products marketed before March 1942. Bottles are now used to replace cartons; corks to replace caps; glassine paper and label varnish have been eliminated. Now the company is asked by Office of Price Administration to go back to March and fill out forms for every change made in 450 products and about 1,200 sizes. This involves 600 to 800 changes requiring 600 to 800 reports. This would require months because it takes a competent man from 1 to 2 days to make a report. All this is supposed to be for price approval by the Office of Price Administration, although the law has already fixed these prices as of March.

The same manufacturer testified that his company has recently completed work on a product designed to reduce the mortality rate of 16 children a day who die of whooping cough. The Office of Price Administration was requested to act promptly on the price rate for this formula so that the company could market the product and save human lives. Weeks passed. Telephone calls brought no action. After 6 weeks a price was received from the Office of Price Administration. This procedure would be necessary for each of the 600 items.

The manufacturer presented to us another report, OPA Form Q-51, Budget Bureau No. 08-ST029-42. Completed, it would be 4 feet wide and 20 feet long. The company was unable to discover the purpose of the report, which was supposed to be completed in 4 days. The first page asked for the following: Name of product, unit ingredient cost, unit fabricating cost, unit factory overhead, unit administrative expense, unit sales, and advertising expense, etc.

To make matters worse, the Office of Price Administration asked for a type of cost breakdown different from that of the Treasury Department and different also from that of previous Office of Price Administration questionnaires. The manufacturer said that assignment of unit cost to a vitamin product would involve administrative expense and research which could not be estimated. He said the probable cost of filling out all Federal questionnaires would be over $100,000 annually if a firm of 3,600 employees. Office of Price Administration, War Production Board, the Treasury Department, and the Department of Commerce all require separate reports.

Another manufacturer testified the latest Office of Price Administration report was the straw that breaks the camel's back. Declaring there had been a 90-percent turn-over of personnel in his accounting department since January this witness could not determine when the report might be completed, although it was due November 7. It would require, he estimated, 300 to 350 additional hours of work by a highly experienced employee. In July, two men from the Office of Price Administration visited this manufacturer and asked for detailed information covering 31 sheets. They wanted the material in 2 days and a large number of people were taken from their work to prepare it.

In November the same Office of Price Administration man asked for much the same information on another vitamin questionnaire. The manufacturer told our committee that civilian needs and greatly increased war needs, plus a labor shortage, made the compiling of all this information virtually impossible.

A witness from a large industrial laboratory told us of duplication in questionnaires on vitamins issued by the Office of Price Administration, the Fish and Wild Life Service, the Bureau of the Census, and the Army-Navy Munitions Board. Two of these questionnaires have been changed from a quarterly to a monthly basis.

A representative of a large contractors' association said his office has sent out 178 bulletins explaining governmental regulations. These concerns must file 47 to 52 reports for the Treasury Department, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Office of Price Administration, and the War Production Board. Form No. 21 of the Office of Defense Transportation requires 6 or 7 reports, some recorded daily, some monthly. Involved questions are asked, such as tire mileage for each tire, mileage for each vehicle per year and an estimate for the next half year, number of trips, average load per trip, gallons of gasoline used, and so forth.

Senator VANDENBERG presented a letter to the committee from a Kansas farmer who had filled out a 2-page report in order to get a pair of rubber boots. If he lost the boots he was subject to a $10,000 fine or 10 years' imprisonment.

Eastman Kodak employs 84 persons 3,224 hours a week, enough to build 3 flying fortresses, to complete 409 reports for each quarter.

Constructive criticism includes:

1. Clarify subject matter.
2. Allow sufficient space for reply.
3. Eliminate superfluous requests for information.
4. Avoid "peaking" the reports required.
5. End duplication.
6. Don't penalize a company on priority by failing to win the "paper race."
7. Change method by which companies must wait until all similar companies have filed returns for priorities.

Mr. Fred A. Baughan, of the Retail Food Dealers Association of California, was the next witness. Mr. Baughan testified as to the complexity of regulations issued by the Office of Price Administration, pointing out that calculations must be made on 1,800 to 3,600 items by the neighborhood grocer. He also expressed the belief that Office of Price Administration regulations, red tape, and price ceilings will eventually force all small-size grocery stores out of business. According to Mr. Baughan, the lists which the retailers have compiled—tons and tons of them—remain piled up in the garages of California, unexamined by anyone, unclassified by anyone.

The average number of reports and questionnaires from a business of moderate size is as follows:

1. Federal Power Commission.
2. United States Department of Agriculture.
3. United States Department of Justice.
4. Federal Communications Commission.
5. War Production Board.
6. Interstate Commerce Commission.
7. Office of Price Administration.
8. Bureau of Internal Revenue.
9. Social Security Board.
10. Federal Trade Commission.
11. Salary Stabilization Unit—Bureau of Internal Revenue.
12. Federal Manpower Commission.
13. National War Labor Board.
14. Wage and Hour Division.
15. Alcohol Tax Unit—Treasury Department.
16. Board of Economic Warfare.
17. Defense Savings Staff—War Bonds—United States Treasury Department.
18. Collector of Internal Revenue—Richmond.
19. Collector of Customs.
20. War Department.
21. Navy Department.
22. United States Department of Labor—Labor Statistics.
23. United States Department of Commerce
24. Office of Defense Transportation.

One company furnished the committee with the following information as to the cost of the preparation of these reports:

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of Federal bureaus or agencies which requested information | 24 |
| Number of types of reports or questionnaires | 134 |
| Number of reports submitted | 24,160 |
| Man-hours required to prepare information | 132,560 |
| Cost of personnel | $192,500 |

The cost shown above does not include related expenses, such as traveling, telephone, telegraph, postage, and rent.

On the basis that there are 43,000,000 people gainfully employed (not including agriculture), it would indicate that the time of 188,000 persons is consumed in preparing Federal Government data. This number would be increased if it were to include the man-hours used in agriculture to prepare the many Federal returns required in that field.

The problem of answering questionnaires and making reports to the Government has become so great that it has been necessary to assign to an executive of the company the full-time job of following up this matter. This man is specializing in this field and at the present time one other man is devoting his full time to the study of priorities as it affects the company.

Mr. Hugh F. Hall represented the American Farm Bureau. Mr. Hall testified that the questionnaires sent to farmers had a deleterious effect in that farmers were overwhelmed by the enormity of the problem of estimating past and future gasoline consumption, mileage, etc. The impracticability of the questionnaires, the consumption of time in filling them out, the lack of understanding by officials of farmers' problems, all caused Mr. Hall to believe that the paper work required of farmers is overdone. Many will suffer. Some will not be able to harvest. Ultimately the purpose of the questionnaires will be defeated.

Mr. Fred Brenckman, of the National Grange, testified that farmers, for-hire operators, and large utility companies are harassed by complicated questionnaires which ask questions no one can answer.

Mr. Brenckman suggested suspending regulations that have been issued so far as they affect operation of farm trucks, and call in committees of practical farmers to assist in the preparation of a conservative program that will meet the desired objectives.

OBJECTIONS TO QUESTIONNAIRES AS REPORTED TO THE COMMITTEE

1. Severin Electric Co., San Francisco, Calif.: "Overhead costs due to questionnaires have increased 35 percent. Questionnaires have delayed vital work—cannot get manpower to do the job—has to put keymen on this job."

2. T. L. Rosenberg Co., Oakland, Calif.: "Questionnaires and Government requirements of forms, etc., have caused increase of 5 percent overhead—loss in productive manpower is 1 percent—increased field staff 7 to 10 percent."

3. Pacific Electric Motor Co., Oakland, Calif.: "Questionnaires and forms cause 14.6 percent direct increase in overhead, and a loss in productive manpower equal to five employees on a 44-hour week."

4. S. C. Sachs Co., St. Louis, Mo.: "Government questionnaires and forms has increased office personnel 55 percent."

5. Carl I. Schaeffer Electric Co., St. Louis, Mo: "Government forms and red tape have increased overhead 2 percent—loss in productive manpower equals 25 percent."

6. Hensley Electric Co., Fort Worth, Tex.: "34 percent of total man-hours devoted to Government forms, etc."

7. Mill & Marine Electric, Inc., Gastonia, N. C.: "Burdensome forms, questionnaires, etc., of Government costing us 30 percent more to handle business—taking into consideration inexperienced men overhead would be nearer 50 percent."

8. Charles A. Langlais, San Francisco, Calif.: "Object to Office of Price Administration and Labor Department questionnaires and forms—increased cost of doing business 25 percent and decreased available manpower 25 percent."

9. Huntington & Guerry, Greenville, S. C.: "Estimate questionnaires and forms increase expenses 10 percent and field staff expense increased 50 percent."

10. Electric Constructors, Inc., Pascagoula, Miss.: "Red tape increases overhead from 10 to 20 percent, aggravated by lack of manpower."

11. Paul Heydon: "Six contractors say increased overhead as follows: First, 5 percent; second, 10 percent; third, 5 percent; fourth, 5 percent; fifth, 7 percent; sixth, 3 percent—average, 5.83 percent."

12. National Electrical Contractors, Fort Worth, Tex.: "Contractors here say 15 to 20 percent increase in overhead and 30 percent loss in man-hours."

13. Webb Electric Co., Anderson, S. C.: "Red tape increased overhead and man-hours 48 percent."

14. Jack Moorman, Shreveport, La.: "60 percent office time used on red tape, 15 percent supervisor's time, 15 percent total manpower. Office of Price Administration form 251 is impossible."

15. C. C. C. Cadwallader, Detroit, Mich.: "12 contractors reporting show 12 percent increase in overhead; delays hard to estimate."

16. E. H. Herzberg, Milwaukee, Wis.: "Government red tape caused among contractors the following: One additional stenographer, 50 percent supervisor's time, 50 percent manager's time, 35 percent bookkeeper's time, 25 percent supervisor's time, 33 percent manager's time, overhead 20 percent higher, overhead 5 percent higher, overhead 10 percent higher, 80 percent manager's time."

17. Brocker Engineering Co., Detroit, Mich.: "Red tape causes increase in overhead of 25 percent; productive manpower loss, 50 to 75 percent; causes delay in executing contracts."

18. R. H. Bouligny, Inc., Charlotte, N. C.: "Loss is 5 percent; ties up keymen; time required 5 percent."

19. White Electrical Construction Co., Atlanta, Ga.: "Serious burden—increased overhead 10 percent; can't see what use could be made of information."

20. Enterprise Electrical Co., Philadelphia, Pa.: "Increased overhead 10 percent—no uniform procedure on Office of Price Administration forms, etc.; red tape is awful and hinders war effort."

21. Foshee Electric Co., Forth Worth, Tex.: "Increases overhead 25 to 30 percent. Information requested is useless."

22. Davenport Electric Contract Co., Davenport, Iowa: "Increases overhead 9 percent and we pass it off on the public."

23. Leithner & Weishar, Rock Island, Ill.: "Increased overhead 15 percent—caused us to refuse contracts over $500. Believe 95 percent of questionnaires are unopened by Government."

24. Tennessee Armature Electric Co., Knoxville, Tenn.: "Three contractors in city overhead jumped 30 percent; ours has jumped 45 percent."

25. Southern Electric Service Co., Inc., Charlotte, N. C.: "Increased personnel 7 percent and increased overhead of $1,200 per month."

26. Eugene Ashe Electric Co., Forth Worth, Tex.: "40 percent of total man-hours used on Government forms, etc."

27. Bryant Electric Co., High Point, N. C.: "Increased productive labor cost 6 to 7 percent."

28. Chewning & Wilmer, Richmond, Va.: "Increase in cost is 13 percent."

29. Ross Electric Construction Co., Philadelphia, Pa.: "Increased work 15 to 20 percent. Can't understand need for 20 copies of each form. Complained to the Office of Price Administration, citing drive on scrap paper, when so much was used in forms, etc."

30. Beacon Electrical Engineering & Construction Co., Buffalo, N. Y.: "Our members report increase in cost as follows: 30, 20, 40, 50, 50, 10, 40, 50, 40, and 40 percent. Strenuous objection to Form OPA 251."

31. Shreveport Electrical Contractors Association, Shreveport, La.: "Increase in cost of operation of members are respectively: 34, 38, 37, and 32 percent."

32. National Electrical Contractors Association, Los Angeles, Calif.: "Four-percent increase in overhead, 2½-percent loss of productive manpower, 2.43-percent increase in staff."

33. National Electrical Contractors Association, Atlanta, Ga.: "Increased cost, 20 percent."

34. Empire Electric Co., Fort Worth, Tex.: "Increased total job cost, 5 percent; increased overhead, 50 percent."

35. Robinson Electrical Co., Philadelphia, Pa.: "Increases cost of every job 1 percent and one extra employee."

36. Electrical Employers Association, Cincinnati, Ohio: "Eight contractors report average of 15.8-percent overhead increase, of 43-percent loss in productive manpower, of 25.4-percent increase in field staff."

37. Tri-City Electric Co. of Iowa, Davenport, Iowa: "Increase of 5 to 15 percent of overhead."

38. Robbins Electric Co., Moline, Ill.: "Increase overhead 2 to 5 percent per customer. Object to M. P. R. 251."

39. Richardson-Wayland Electrical Corporation, Roanoke, Va.: "Increased cost from 10 to 15 percent plus confusion due to nonconformity and lack of standardization of forms and answers. Objects to Office of Defense Transportation, Federal Works Agency, and Office of Price Administration red tape and confusion and duplications."

40. Independent Electrical Machinery Co., Kansas City, Mo.: "Increased clerical help, 20 percent; loss of productive manpower, 8 to 10 hours per day; increased cost, 15 percent."

41. Alber Electric Co., Kansas City, Mo.: "Increased overhead, 10 percent; 20-percent loss in productive manpower, 5-percent increase in field staff."

42. Evans Electrical Construction Co.: "Increase in overhead, 25 percent; loss in manpower, 20 percent; increase in staff, 15 percent."

43. Squire Electric Co., Kansas City, Mo.: "Overhead increased 33 percent, increase in field staff of 25 percent."

44. W. T. Foley Electric Co., Kansas City, Mo.: "Overhead increase, 10 percent; loss in manpower, 25 percent; increase in staff, 10 percent."

American Paper & Pulp Co., New York, N. Y.:

| | Company | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | A | B | C |
| 1. The approximate number received in quarter ending Sept. 30, 1942: | | | |
| A. Recurring | 62 | 154 | 48 |
| B. Nonrecurring | 7 | 4 | [1] 76 |
| C. Total | 69 | 158 | 124 |
| 2. Estimate of man-hours required to complete these reports: | | | |
| A. Recurring | 2,725 | ------ | 1,079 |
| B. Nonrecurring | 234 | ------ | 1,008 |
| C. Total | 2,959 | 3,442 | 2,087 |
| 3. Estimate of cost of completing reports: | | | |
| A. Recurring | $3,299 | ------ | $3,176 |
| B. Nonrecurring | 386 | ------ | 2,079 |
| C. Total | 3,085 | $3,966 | 5,473 |

[1] Includes PD 1A.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A confidential letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the personnel in the land forces under the provisions of law at a specified time; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

### LAWS OF MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

### REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of, funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### REPORT OF ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

A letter from the secretary-treasurer of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of the Commission from its establishment, June 5 to December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

### COORDINATION OF FORWARDING AND SERVICING OF WATER-BORNE EXPORT AND IMPORT FOREIGN COMMERCE

A letter from the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third report of action taken to provide for the coordination of the forwarding and similar servicing of water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Navy (2), Agriculture (6), and Commerce; the General Accounting Office, Civil Service Commission, and The National Archives which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas the tragedy of a world conflagration is imposing unprecedented financial demand upon the people of the entire Nation, in the form of greatly increased tax levies; and

"Whereas the Nation's all-out effort for an overwhelming victory over the Axis Powers will place upon our people from time to time in the months ahead new and increased financial burdens to meet the demands of the war program and insure adequate defense of our Nation and the American way of life; and

"Whereas these tremendous financial demands emphasize the need for holding State and local expenditures to the lowest minimum consistent with the public good; and

"Whereas rising living costs have greatly enhanced the problem of needy people receiving old-age assistance and assistance to the blind to subsist on the funds that may be reasonably available at this period; and

"Whereas the principle of individual self-help is a traditionally American one; and

"Whereas the Federal social security laws do not permit the matching of funds or grants to States unless the State program consider every source of income of the recipient; and

"Whereas the present manpower shortage renders it practically impossible for the people to obtain casual labor or to fill jobs of a temporary nature requiring only light work; and

"Whereas many recipients of old-age assistance, and assistance to the blind, are capable of obtaining and performing casual labor or to fill jobs of a temporary nature, and such recipients should be afforded an opportunity to perform such services for the period of the duration of this Nation's conflict with the Axis Powers; and

"Whereas it is deemed reasonable that recipients of old-age assistance or assistance to the blind be allowed to receive from personal earnings a sum not exceeding $240 annually, and this income, when received from any source, be disregarded in determining need in all such cases; and

"Whereas modification and liberalization of Federal social security laws is necessary to permit States to include this provision without loss of Federal grants: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the Fiftieth General Assembly of Iowa (the House concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to forthwith take such action as may be appropriate to modify and liberalize the Federal social security laws to permit recipients of old-age assistance and assistance to the blind to receive from personal earnings a sum not exceeding $240 annually for the period of the duration of this Nation's conflict with the Axis Powers, without having the same charged to them or considered in determining need in all such cases; be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is directed to forward a certified copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress (Senate and House of Representatives) of the United States from the State of Iowa."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

"Whereas Claude R. Wickard is Secretary of Agriculture, and there has been a demand by the United States Government for increased production of food in the war effort; and

"Whereas the progress of increased production is retarded by lack of protein feeds necessary to provide balanced rations for livestock; and

"Whereas, the Commodity Credit Corporation has protein feeds available in this territory, which should be immediately released to aid in meeting the demand for increased production; and

"Whereas, the 1939 Year Book of Agriculture emphasizes the fact that protein feeds to supplement the feed of home-grown grains are necessary in the economical production of pork, beef, and poultry: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the senate (the house concurring)*, That Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, be requested to immediately release and make available to the farmers of Iowa, protein feeds, especially soy bean meal, to supplement the home-grown grains in connection with the increased production and feeding of pork, beef, poultry, and other livestock necessary in the war efforts, and that the secretary of the senate is hereby authorized and directed to mail a copy of this resolution to Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Commodity Credit Corporation; be it further

*"Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, to Senator GEORGE A. WILSON, and each member from Iowa in the National House of Representatives."

---

"House Concurrent Resolution 12

"Whereas with the increasing demands on the farmers of the United States to meet the food requirements of our fighting men and lend-lease commitments, at the same time assuring the people of the United States of the proper amount of foodstuffs, it is essential for the war effort and the well-being of our people that a study be made of the complicated problems of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products; and

"Whereas farm products should be properly graded, and distributed when and where needed, and immediate steps should be taken for a coordination of efforts and the adopting of a comprehensive and workable plan in betterment of the interests of the producing farmer and the consumer; and

"Whereas House Resolution 38 has been introduced in Congress providing for the Committee on Agriculture to make a study and investigation of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products, which study and investigation are imperative at this time: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the Iowa Legislature urges Congress of the United States to enact House Resolution 38.

"That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Iowa Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress."

By Mr. MCNARY:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas it is desirable that the increasing burden of taxes be lightened by all means which will not interfere with the obtaining of revenues sufficient to carry on the war effort to its fullest extent; and

"Whereas the payment of income and victory taxes on a cash or pay-as-you-go plan, will not only render such burden easier, but should also result in more complete collection of such taxes; and

"Whereas your memorialists are advised that the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in the Seventy-third Congress assembled, has under consideration certain proposals to accomplish such results: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein)*, That your honorable body consider favorably and enact some pay-as-you-go plan or similar plan known as the Ruml plan, or such other plan and legislation as will in the opinion of your honorable body accomplish the desired result hereinbefore mentioned; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Secretary of State of the State of Oregon be authorized and he hereby is directed to forward immediately certified copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, President of the United States Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of the congressional delegation from the State of Oregon."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. GERRY:

Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States of America H. R. 801, a bill whose purpose it is to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans; and

"Whereas there surely can be no hesitancy upon the part of any American citizen to make all provision to anticipate the return of our fighting servicemen who will be the casualties of the holocaust of World War No. 2: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States of America be and they hereby are earnestly requested to use every effort to have passed H. R. 801 to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans in such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order that men of our armed forces may overcome the handicap of disability and may be fitted for employment consistent with the degree of disablement; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States of America."

(Mr. GREEN presented a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States did during the session of the Seventy-sixth Congress increase the Federal gasoline tax one-half cent per gallon, making such tax now a total of 1½ cents per gallon, despite the fact that every State in the Union now imposes a sales tax on gasoline averaging in excess of 4 cents per gallon; and

"Whereas such Federal gasoline tax during the past calendar year of 1942 has taken from the people of the State of South Dakota in excess of $1,875,000, which largely comes from the producers and from agriculture of South Dakota; and

"Whereas such tax at 1½ cents per gallon amounts to a 10 percent retail sales tax on such product, which is a necessity of the residents of this State; and

"Whereas it is the sense of this legislature that it is inequitable and unfair to impose

such an enormous sales tax upon a single commodity of this type, which is a necessity to persons engaged in agricultural and producing pursuits; and

"Whereas such tax is a revenue measure peculiarly adapted for the individual States for the purpose of construction and maintenance of adequate highway systems and means of transportation, and administrative machinery is well established in every State in the Union: Therefore be it

*"Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States should not increase such Federal gasoline tax or consider any increase in such tax, and should discontinue the same at the earliest possible time, and should refuse to reenact the same upon its expiration, and should thus leave this field of revenue entirely to the individual States for use in construction and maintenance of the various States' highway systems: Be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of South Dakota be, and they are hereby, urged by the legislature of this State to use their best efforts in opposing any suggested increase in the Federal gasoline tax or the reenactment or continuance of said Federal gasoline tax: Be it further

*"Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each Senator and Representative of the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States and to the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Represenatives to be by them presented to the proper committee in Congress considering or determining such aforesaid legislation."

By Mr. WHEELER:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Whereas farmers and ranchers of Montana are most anxious to contribute to the winning of the war by producing a maximum of food for our fighting forces, for our civilian population and for starving peoples over the earth; and

"Whereas Montana farmers and ranchers have the crop land and foundation herds of cattle and sheep to produce large quantities of badly needed food; and

"Whereas our Government is urging farmers to not only maintain normal production of grains and feed crops, but to greatly increase the production of livestock, hogs, and poultry, without taking into consideration that much additional help will be needed to carry on such a program; and

"Whereas the large-acreage farming practiced in this State requires the best of farm machinery in sufficient quantities, the securing of which has been difficult and of late impossible to obtain; and

"Whereas draft, enlistment, and war-production work has drained practically every able-bodied, experienced farm boy for military service or war work, even where the fathers are growing in years and infirmity; and

"Whereas experience has proven that floating, unreliable, and inexperienced labor is both inadequate and ruinous to costly and irreplaceable farm machinery; and

"Whereas farmers have contributed proportionately more of their older equipment, as scrap iron, to the war effort than any other class of citizens: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the twenty-eighth legislative session of the State of Montana (senate and house of representatives concurring)*, That we respectfully urge that a far greater proportion of necessary material be immediately allotted for the manufacture of badly needed farm machinery and repairs, in order that at least normal production of food may be produced for the duration; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That we urge that the War Department be requested to defer experienced farm boys that they may assist in planting and harvesting crops; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be submitted to the officials named in the first paragraph hereof."

A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

"Whereas the War Production Board, the War Labor Board, and the Director of Economic Stabilization have found it necessary to take jurisdiction and control over the production and price of all strategic metals, during the emergency; and

"Whereas, practically all of the copper produced in Montana has a fixed price of 12 cents per pound as compared to a price of 17 cents per pound in many other areas and this price is strongly contended to be not conducive to a fair and equitable profit for labor under war conditions; and

"Whereas, the bulk of the copper ore in Montana is very high in war material content, but at the same time low in the percent of copper in the ore;

"Furthermore, the copper mines in Montana, particularly in the Butte district, are of great depth, and necessitate very extensive equipment for hoisting of ore, pumping water and ventilation, with a marked increase in labor and power costs of operation; and

"Whereas the State of Montana is at the top of the list in furnishing manpower to the armed forces and the citizens of the State in general are in the forerank in the purchase of War bonds and stamps. Management and labor are striving earnestly and hard to produce the strategic metals for our fighting men at the fronts: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved*, That the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the Senate and House of Representatives concurring, hereby respectfully petition the President of the United States, the War Production Board, the War Labor Board and the Director of Economic Stabilization, to review and reconsider the conditions respecting wages, working conditions, and costs of production of copper in Montana, particularly in the Butte district, to the effect that a speedy and just arrangement in the price of copper be made immediately; be it further

*"Resolved*, That this memorial be entered on the journals of both houses, and that a copy be transmitted to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization; the War Production Board; and War Labor Board; the Honorable Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor; the Honorable Burton K. Wheeler and the Honorable James E. Murray, United States Senators from Montana; and to the Honorable James F. O'Connor and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Congressmen from Montana."

## RESOLUTION OF GEORGIA STATE SENATE—FAIR PRICE FOR PEANUTS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk for insertion in the RECORD in the usual form a resolution adopted by the Georgia State Senate asking that the dual price system on peanuts be abandoned. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, and referred as requested by the Senator from Georgia.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the House of Representatives of the Georgia General Assembly has passed a resolution urging that the United States Congress enact legislation which will abolish the bureau price system now in existence relative to the marketing of peanuts and urging that such dual price system be abolished, and urging that the quota system as affects peanuts be abolished for the duration of the war; and

Whereas the situation with the peanut farmers is critical and unless some action is taken immediately there will be a resulting shortage of acres planted in peanuts for the year 1943; and

Whereas it is the desire of the peanut farmers to cooperate in every way with their National Government in the war effort; and

Whereas they desire to comply with the wishes of the Government by planting the 5,500,000 acres requested by the Department of Agriculture of the United States; and

Whereas without some assurance as to the prices to be paid for the 1943 crop the farmers cannot afford to plant any additional acreage in peanuts, due to the fact that they suffered a tremendous loss under the existing system on the 1942 crop of peanuts; and

Whereas there can be no earthly reason or excuse for the maintenance of the now existing system when the peanuts are to replace the oil which has been cut off from the United States as a result of the war; and

Whereas it is absolutely necessary that as a contribution to the war effort these peanuts be planted: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Georgia Senate*, That this senate does heartily concur in the resolution passed by the house of representatives, introduced by Mr. Mimms, of Miller, and Mr. Drake, of Seminole, memorializing Congress to speedily take such action as is necessary to guarantee the peanut farmers a fair price for their product; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution shall immediately be transmitted by the Secretary of this senate to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States and to Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization, and a copy also be transmitted to each Member of Congress of the State of Georgia and to the Senators from Georgia, and to the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to the Secretary of the United States Senate, there to be presented and read.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Basehor, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor sales and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

## OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have in my hand and present a copy of Concurrent Resolution No. 5 adopted by the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma. The resolution in the form of a memorial is addressed to the Congress of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that it be appropriately referred and printed in full in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be appropriately referred, and under the rule printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Finance:

Whereas approximately 80,000 of the citizens of this State, by reason of age and physical infirmity, have qualified under the terms of the Federal Social Security Act, and are enjoying the benefits and needed assistance provided thereunder; and

Whereas a number of such persons are not only still able but desire to engage in various occupational work, as well as farming and the raising of livestock and poultry on a limited scale, and thereby augment the

moneys received from said social-security fund and, at the same time, increase the necessary production of agricultural products and foodstuffs necessary to the winning of the war, as well as to permit needed manpower to be used for other purposes; and

Whereas to permit same to be done would not in anywise destroy or interfere with the policy or purpose of the Social Security Act, but would lend encouragement to this class of people to utilize the principles of thrift and industry which they are still capable of exercising in a small contribution to their own welfare and comforts in their declining years, but also to the community, as well as to the all-out war effort of the Nation in winning the war: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by concurrent resolution of the State Senate and House of Representatives of the nineteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma—*

SECTION 1. That Congress of the United States be memorialized and urged to pass such legislation or amend the present law to the extent that each individual affected by the Federal social-security law be permitted to engage in work and the production of foodstuffs, etc., to an extent not to exceed a net income of $240 per annum, without affecting their assistance under the rules and regulations of the Social Security Board.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Following the incorporation of the resolution, I ask permission to introduce a bill and to have the bill printed in full immediately following the resolution.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 685) relating to old-age assistance payments under the Social Security Act was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That title I of the Social Security Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 7. The amount of old-age assistance payable under this title to any individual shall not be reduced or diminished in any manner by reason of the fact that the earnings of such individual amount to $240 or less during any calendar year, and no individual who is otherwise qualified to receive old-age assistance under this title shall be denied such assistance by reason of the fact that such individual has earned $240 or less during the period of 12 months immediately preceding the receipt of his claim for such assistance."

## RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE—PHARMACY CORPS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a second memorial from the Legislature of Oklahoma, and I ask that it be likewise appropriately referred and printed in full in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be appropriately referred and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States House bill 997 and Senate bill 216 to create a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army; and

Whereas there is a definite need in this war emergency for the capable handling of drugs, medicines, and pharmaceutics which are used in the treatment of diseases of our boys and girls in the armed forces; and

Whereas at the present there is no law providing for the creation of such a Pharmacy Corps: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Nineteenth Oklahoma Legislature (the Senate concurring therein)*, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to put forth every effort to see these two bills enacted into law; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the chairmen of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and House, and to the congressional delegation of Oklahoma.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 617. A bill for the relief of Homer C. Chapman; without amendment (Rept. No. 47).

By Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 630. A bill to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 50).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 621. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California; without amendment (Rept. No. 48);

S. 641. A bill to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers; without amendment (Rept. No. 52); and

H. R. 1446. A bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 51).

By Mr. NYE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. Res. 23. Resolution authorizing an investigation of commodity prices prevailing in the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 49), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. Res. 88. Resolution to investigate the labor shortage in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States with respect to the war effort; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

## INSPECTION OF JAPANESE RELOCATION CENTERS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 101), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof duly appointed by the chairman of the committee, hereby is authorized to visit, for the purposes of inspection, during the present session of Congress, the Japanese relocation centers in the United States, the expenses incurred in pursuance thereof, not to exceed $3,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

## CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably with an amendment Senate Resolution 33, and ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 33) submitted by Mr. REYNOLDS on January 11, 1943:

The amendment was, in line 3, after the word "investigation", to insert "by a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the provisions of Senate Resolution 303 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to on October 20, 1942, authorizing an investigation by a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs of the technological resources of the United States, be, and the same are hereby, continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

## ELVA BIRCH DAVIS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 89, and ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 89) submitted by Mr. BILBO on February 4, 1943, was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Elva Birch Davis, daughter of Robert R. Birch, late an employee of the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## E. E. MOECKEL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 90, and ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 90) submitted by Mr. STEWART on February 4, 1943, was read, considered, and agreed to as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to E. E. Moeckel, of Washington, D. C., the sum of $69.75 as compensation for stenographically reporting hearings held before Members of the Senate on October 9, 1942, relating to the use of rayon instead of cotton in the manufacture of automobile tires, and furnishing a transcript of such hearings.

## PRODUCTION OF INDUSTRIAL ALCOHOL, SYNTHETIC ALCOHOL, AND SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 80, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 80), which had been submitted by Mr. GILLETTE on January 21, 1943, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the authority of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,

or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 224, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to March 5, 1942, and Senate Resolution 318, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to November 30, 1942 (providing for an investigation with respect to industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, and synthetic rubber), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 96, and ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 96), which had been submitted by Mr. SMITH on February 8, 1943, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

### BUSINESS EMPLOYMENT AND SECURITY INSURANCE—OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys. We should have had such legislation years ago. Thousands are dead who needed it.

This new 1943 Townsend plan bill, streamlined and amended to fit a nation at war, is similar to the bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative CANNON.

In all essential respects the new bill is the same as the last. It contains the enforced spending clause, but its operation would be suspended until 6 months after the war. This was thought best by Dr. Townsend because, as he says, the war boom conditions make unnecessary at present the forced spending of all pensions. The age limit is 60. The bill is limited in its benefits to citizens of the United States. There is a provision for the totally and permanently disabled, and annuities shall be paid in monthly installments not only to all totally and permanently disabled persons between the ages of 18 and 60 years, but also to every widow, divorced, or separated woman who has the care of a child or children under 18 years of age.

The gross tax income has been changed from 2 percent to 3 percent, persons who owe just debts must pay at least 10 percent in monthly installments thereon, and the old provision with respect to refraining from a gainful occupation as a requisite for receiving the pension is also in this bill, while the penalty for violation of the act is a $5,000 fine or 5 years in the penitentiary.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the Senator from North Dakota reading a speech, or is he placing something in the RECORD?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am explaining a bill which I have introduced.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the explanation very lengthy?

Mr. LANGER. The explanation of the bill is brief.

Mr. BARKLEY. How long will it take for the Senator to conclude his statement?

Mr. LANGER. About 30 seconds more.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in order to prevent the gross income tax from becoming a burden on the lower income groups an exemption of $100 a month on personal income is provided, which means that the 3 percent gross income tax will apply only on a gross income of $100 a month. The tax does not apply to bank deposits, nor to amounts received under life-insurance policies, or accident insurance, nor to churches, fraternal societies, labor unions, civic leagues or hospitals.

The technical title of the new Townsend bill is "The Business Employment and Security Insurance Act."

Mr. President, I am for this proposed legislation. My coat is off and I am fighting for the new Townsend bill.

The bill (S. 706) to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

### REGULATIONS OF LABOR UNIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the regulation of labor unions, delivered by him on America's Town Meeting of the Air on February 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

### THE DAWN OF AVIATION—ADDRESS BY HON. JOSH LEE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Dawn of Aviation, delivered by Hon. Josh Lee at the Aviation Forum Luncheon of the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce, January 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

### BUREAUCRACY—ADDRESS BY PROF. FREDERICK D. BRAMHALL

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of Bureaucracy, delivered by Prof. Frederick D. Bramhall, of the University of California, which appears in the Appendix.]

### WHAT WE WILL GET OUT OF THE WAR—ARTICLE BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by the Vice President, entitled "What We Will Get Out of the War," published in the March issue of the American Magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 684. A bill for the relief of Lt. M. V. Daven; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma also introduced Senate bill 685, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 686. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luther S. Sykes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. TYDINGS):

S. 687. A bill to transfer to the Department of Agriculture certain functions of the Fish and Wildlife Service relating to the fisheries industry; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 688. A bill for the relief of Millie E. Clark and the minor children of Ernest B. Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 689. A bill to relieve Federal credit unions from the payment of certain fees upon resumption of business; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 690. A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1938, relating to the appointment of postmasters; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 691. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of alien Chinese wives of American citizens who are admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those authorizing exclusion on grounds of race or birth in a defined geographical area; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 692. A bill to provide compensation for personnel sustaining disease or injury while performing civilian defense duty, and to provide indemnities to the beneficiaries of such personnel in certain cases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 693. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Oregon-Washington Bridge Board of Trustees to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg.," approved June 13, 1934; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 694. A bill for the relief of W. G. Cornell Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 695. A bill for the relief of Joseph F. Bolger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 696. A bill to authorize the presentation of a Medal of Honor to J. Edgar Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 697. A bill providing that commissions on postal money orders be paid to postmasters of the first, second, and third classes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 698. A bill to amend part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); and

S. 699. A bill to amend Public Law No. 257, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 4, 1939, so as to provide pensions to peacetime veterans of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard suffering from arrested tuberculosis contracted while in the service; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. WAGNER introduced Senate bill 700, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 701. A bill to provide military or naval training for all male citizens who attain the age of 18 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 702. A bill to mobilize the scientific and technical resources of the Nation, to establish an Office of Scientific and Technical Mobilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 703. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to reopen and readjudicate the eminent domain case of Hugh B. Hutchinson against the United States, No. 34139 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

S. 704. A bill providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of North Dakota; and

S. 705. A bill relating to Sunday work for employees of the Government who are opposed because of religious training or belief to working on Saturday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 706, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 707. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 708. A bill to provide labor for essential agricultural production; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SUSPENSION OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION ASSESSMENT ON TREASURY BALANCES DERIVED FROM WAR-BOND SALES

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference. Introduction of the bill is requested by Mr. Crowley of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement explanatory of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 700) to amend section 12B and section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act during the continuance of the war and for 6 months after its termination was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. WAGNER in explanation of the bill is as follows:

### WARTIME SUSPENSION OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION ASSESSMENT ON UNITED STATES TREASURY BALANCES DERIVED FROM WAR BOND SALES

This bill, introduced today, suspends for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter the provisions of the law requiring the payment of assessments to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by insured banks on bank balances of the United States Treasury derived from the sale of War bonds, Maintenance with Federal Reserve banks of reserves by National and State member banks of the Federal Reserve System against these deposits is also suspended under the bill.

Approximately 40 percent of all Government securities are held by the banking system and in the December Treasury financing, when $12,000,000,000 of securities were sold, approximately 42 percent, or $5,000,000,000, were sold to the banks, exclusive of the amount sold to the public through the medium of the banks. A large portion of the proceeds derived from the sale of these securities are carried in the banking system in the so-called war-loan accounts to the credit of the Treasury pending disbursement by the Government. The banks have been required to pay the usual assessment to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation of one-twelfth of 1 percent per annum on these balances in the same manner as on all other deposits which they carry, although the Treasury balances, because of the heavy demands of the war, remain in the banks to the credit of the Government for a relatively short time only.

The bill will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, where early consideration is anticipated.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

## AMENDMENT TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. OVERTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the executive and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, ordered to be printed and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 65, line 22, section 205, after the words "the United States", strike out the period, substitute a semicolon, and insert the following: "*Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit is a citizen of the United States or a person in the service of the United States on the date of this enactment who, being eligible for citizenship, had heretofore filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen or who owes allegiance to the United States."

## PRESENTATION OF MEDAL TO THE PRESIDENT IN RECOGNITION OF HIS AFRICAN AIR TRIP

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7), which was referred to the Committee on the Library:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is requested to strike a gold medal of appropriate design with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary, for presentation to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in recognition of his contribution in inspiring confidence in aviation as a means of travel by his unprecedented flight to the "unconditional surrender" conference with Prime Minister Winston Churchill at Casablanca, North Africa.

SEC. 2. Any expenses necessary to carry out the purpose of this resolution shall be paid by The American Section of the Ligue Internationale des Aviateurs.

## LENDING FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, the text of which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD, together with a brief statement explanatory thereof which I have prepared. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the statement presented by the Senator from Nebraska will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) was referred to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study with respect to the various agencies of the Government which provide loans, advances, or extensions of credit and which are in competition, directly or indirectly with themselves or private lending institutions. In connection with such investigation and study the committee is authorized to obtain with respect to each such agency of the Government an outline of its lending activities, the amounts and numbers of loans, advances, and extensions of credit made by it and the purposes for which such loans, advances, and extensions of credit were made, a statement as to the soundness of such loans, advances, and extensions of credit and the extent to which they have been repaid, the costs of administration of its activities, and such other information with respect to the operations of such agency, the necessity for its continuance, and the extent to which its lending functions may be adequately absorbed by private lending institutions, as the committee deems advisable. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such investigation and study.

Mr. BUTLER. There is substantial agreement among most groups that individual enterprise must be preserved so far as possible during the war and extended wherever possible after the war. This is no longer a partisan issue.

To further this objective the Federal Government has a primary responsibility to eliminate, or at least reduce, all of its functions which can be and should be performed by individual enterprise.

During the distressed thirties, a variety of such functions were instituted by the Federal Government not only to compete with individual enterprise but to actually displace it. The reemployment

caused by the war has now made the continuance of many of these functions at least questionable, if not unnecessary and unwise. As a matter of fact, some of them are being liquidated and abolished.

However, it is human nature that the organizations which have been built around these functions will try to find justification for existence. This may lead to a further invasion of individual-enterprise fields. This apparently is happening and raises a new question of the threat to the post-war job resting upon individual enterprise.

One important group of these activities is Federal agencies with power to loan money. The power of extending loans also requires considerable overhead to service the loan. While all of the forty-odd credit agencies now in existence may not be invading and undermining the individual-enterprise field, there is a substantial number which do. Reports from rural sections indicate that some of these agencies are rivals for borrowers and are evidencing a keen competition all their own. With the war demands for both manpower and credit, to say nothing of the war on inflation, it is unthinkable that the Federal Government should by edict restrict credit extended through private channels and then continue or enlarge its own credit facilities.

This is a time when credit should be curtailed, especially when the distress purposes for which it was originally instituted are gone. Similarly, this is a time to liquidate both from the standpoint of the lender as well as the borrower. Therefore, Congress is requested to direct its Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to investigate and report to Congress on Federal Government credit agencies which invade the field of individual enterprise.

As one of its anti-inflation measures, this administration has urged our citizens to pay their debts or reduce them as rapidly as possible. The same logic applies to Government indebtedness. It will no doubt be wise to continue the Federal loan services to certain groups, but I see no reason for creating new agencies, or of continuing many of those now operating. It may be wise to have Government guaranties to replace direct Government loans, similar to the plans followed in some agencies at this time.

### ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANCE, COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 97), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ during the Seventy-eighth Congress an assistant clerk and an additional clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate, respectively, of $3,600 and $1,800 per annum.

### CONTINUANCE OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE VIOLATION OF THE RIGHTS OF FREE SPEECH AND ASSEMBLY, ETC.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 98), which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

*Resolved,* That the authority conferred under Senate Resolution 266, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, agreed to June 6, 1936, and under Senate Resolution 70, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, agreed to February 19, 1937, and under Senate Resolution 154, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, agreed to August 12, 1937, and under Senate Resolution 266, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, agreed to May 18, 1938, and under Senate Resolution 126, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, agreed to August 4, 1939, and under Senate Resolution 135, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, agreed to June 28, 1941, to investigate the violation of the right of free speech and assembly and interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively is hereby continued during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress for the sole purpose of concluding the printing of hearings and reports, and the limit of expenditures is hereby increased by $500.

### PROGRAM OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION FOR PEACE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 99), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the people of the United Nations will be confronted with tremendous problems of economic rehabilitation and reconstruction after the termination of the present war; and

Whereas the solution of such problems must be predicated upon a sound program of economic union and world cooperation; and

Whereas the formulation of such a program should be undertaken without delay if a lasting peace is to be secured: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That it is the sense of the Senate that action should be taken immediately with a view to planning and formulating a comprehensive program of international economic cooperation which will be just and equitable to all the nations of the world, and for that purpose and in order to lay the foundations for world economic stability and a lasting peace the President is hereby requested to call such conferences of representatives of the United Nations, and to take such other action, as he deems desirable and necessary.

### RELIEF FOR STARVING PEOPLES OF EUROPE

Mr. GILLETTE (for himself and Mr. TAFT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 100), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the small democratic countries of Belgium, Norway, Poland, the Netherlands, Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and others have been invaded and occupied; and

Whereas these small countries which are allied with us in the cause of democracy resisted to the limit of their strength the onrush of invading forces; and

Whereas the usual economic processes of these small countries have been completely dislocated as a result of being occupied by invading forces; and

Whereas the food supplies of all these nations are dangerously exhausted due to requisition of native food supplies by the Germans, and inability to secure their usual imports through the blockade; and

Whereas no relief can be brought to them unless there be international action through which their native supplies can be protected and imports be made through the blockade; and

Whereas starvation has already begun; and

Whereas a plan for feeding the people of Greece has been in effect for several months in Greece under supervision of the Swedish and Swiss Governments and the International Red Cross; and

Whereas after 6 months' trial this relief has been certified by the State Department as working satisfactorily and without benefit to the Germans; and

Whereas the Governments of Belgium, Norway, Poland, have requested that their people be given relief; and

Whereas there are food surpluses available in the United States and in South America; and

Whereas many of the small invaded countries have money with which to purchase the food needed to keep their people alive and have signified their desire to use funds for that purpose; and

Whereas the Swedish Government has ships not available to the Allies which could be used for transportation; and

Whereas the specter of mass starvation among friendly and noncombatant women and children is a tragedy that the compassionate heart of America wants to avert; and

Whereas Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Poland, Greece, Yugoslavia, and the Netherlands and others have lived in friendship with the United States during our entire national existence, and have sent us millions of our most useful and helpful American citizens, and now have no means whatever of securing the necessary agreements by which this disaster can be averted: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Senate of the United States does express the conviction that immediate steps should be taken to extend the Greek experiment and thereby prevent this impending tragedy of mass starvation heretofore named; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Senate of the United States respectfully urges that the Government of the United States, through the Secretary of State, endeavor as quickly as possible to work out, in cooperation with the British Government, and the Governments of Sweden, Switzerland, and the accredited representatives of the other governments concerned, the setting up of systematic and definite relief for all stricken and hungry countries where the need is now the most acute; this relief to be based on agreements by the belligerents for the protection of the native and imported food supplies, with rigid safeguarding of such relief so that no military advantage whatever may accrue to the civil populations or armed forces of the invading nations.

### CONSOLIDATIONS AND MERGERS OF DOMESTIC TELEGRAPH CARRIERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair

appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. HILL, Mr. TUNNELL, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. AUSTIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

## PURCHASE OF SILVER BY THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, on Tuesday last the House of Representatives adopted an amendment to the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act—H. R. 1648—which, in my opinion, was extremely unwise and rather irregular parliamentary procedure. The amendment I have in mind is the one directed against the silver legislation now on the statute books. There was no consideration whatsoever given to the amendment before the House Appropriations Committee. No hearings were had to afford either the proponents or the opponents of the amendment an opportunity to present their case.

In a talk I had yesterday with one of the Treasury officials I found that the Treasury is in very much doubt as to just what the amendment means and what its effect would be. The parliamentary procedure was irregular in that amendments of such character are of necessity legislative, and result in material changes in existing legislation. Such amendments should only be adopted after thorough consideration by the appropriate legislative committees. The adoption of such amendments by the procedure followed cannot be otherwise than unwise.

Mr. President, the February issue of the Mining Congress Journal contains an article entitled "Silver at Work in the War Program." This brief article carries a factual account of the importance of silver in the war program both prior to and since Pearl Harbor, as well as some statistics which, I am informed, have been gathered from authoritative sources, and which give enlightenment on the general subject of the importance of this precious metal both from an industrial as well as a monetary standpoint.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SILVER AT WORK IN THE WAR PROGRAM—TREMENDOUS DEMAND FOR THIS METAL AND ITS ALLOYS STEMS FROM THE NEEDS OF VITAL WAR INDUSTRIES. ESTIMATED CONSUMPTION FOR SUCH PURPOSES ALONE IN 1942 TOTALED 90,000,000 OUNCES; IN 1943, 175,000,000 TO 200,000,000 OUNCES WILL BE NEEDED

(By a special correspondent)

The position of silver at the present is unique. From the time money has been used in the form of coins silver has been a standard of values and a base in our monetary system.

Today silver has assumed new responsibilities and is proving indispensable to American industry. This trend commanded attention in 1940 and increased steadily during 1941, when it was discovered how efficiently silver could fill the gap created by the shortage of other metals. During 1941, prior to Pearl Harbor, 10,000,000 ounces of silver were consumed by American industries engaged in defense work. As our defense program expanded, the use of silver increased. Since we entered the war a terrific demand for this precious metal has developed, 90,000,000 ounces being consumed in 1942. That is aside from the 45,000,000 ounces consumed in 1942 in the manufacture of silverware, jewelry, and other civilian articles. It is authoritatively estimated that from 175 to 200 million ounces of silver will be needed during 1943 for war purposes alone. However, the arts in the United States will consume less than 10,000,000 ounces this year.

In some war uses, nothing else will do as a substitute for other metals. Silver is a commodity as inseparable from our present civilization as are iron, aluminum, tin, zinc, lead, and copper. Silver and silver alloys are the most desirable and durable high-temperature soldering and brazing materials used. They are employed extensively in ships, airplanes, tanks, guns, torpedoes, and bombs. Silver wire is superior to copper wire, and no other metal has proved as efficient as silver in bearings used in tank and aircraft motors. The ductility of silver gives a smooth-wearing surface, and silver's high-heat conductivity keeps these bearings cool with a minimum of lubrication. Silver is being used advantageously in war industries today where high-electric and thermal conductivity, tensile strength and ductility are a prime requisite.

There is available 47,000 tons of bullion silver which has been drafted for nonconsumptive uses in war plants. More than 22,000 tons of this Treasury silver has already been shipped from the vaults at West Point.

On July 29, 1942, the War Production Board issued a directive reserving all imported silver for use in war industries. During the past 3 months the Metals Reserve Co. has been buying the surplus imported silver that has come on the market and now has in excess of 5,000,000 ounces on hand for war industrial use. This amount will soon be increased to 10,000,000 ounces. That is made possible because the amount used in the arts has been drastically reduced, as the manufacturers of silverware and jewelry have been steadily converting their plants to war production.

### MINES PRODUCED LESS SILVER IN 1942

Silver production of the United States for the calendar year 1942 was 54,123,792 ounces. This is 21 percent less than in 1941.

Silver subsidiary coinage in the United States increased from $76,120,483 in 1941, to $102,054,773 in 1942, an increase of 13.4 percent. In minting United States and foreign coins in 1942 our mints consumed a total of 85,000,000 ounces of silver bullion, or 31,000,000 ounces more than the total domestic production. In 1942 73,952,734 ounces were consumed in United States coinage alone.

At the end of 1933 there were $29,337,523 silver dollars in circulation (33 cents per capita). At the end of 1942, the silver dollars in circulation had increased to $76,279,641 (57 cents per capita). The subsidiary silver coinage in circulation at the end of 1933 was $271,645,516 ($2.15 per capita), whereas in 1942 subsidiary coinage circulation was $574,941,715 ($4.27 per capita). The total silver certificate circulation at the end of 1942 was $1,751,011,834 ($13.01 per capita), which was 88.7 percent of the total silver certificates outstanding, $1,972,869,472. Silver exported from the United States during 1942 was valued at approximately $2,010,000. This figure is composed almost entirely of the value of the foreign coins we shipped abroad, though we did export 1,500,000 ounces of bullion in addition to the coins. The silver imported into the United States for the year 1942 amounted to about 110,000,000 ounces, the principal contributors being Mexico, Canada, and Peru.

In 1934 the greatest silver-buying program ever engaged in by a government was inaugurated. The Silver Purchase Act resulted in the acquisition by the United States Government from June 1934 to December 1942 of approximately 2,055,300,000 ounces of foreign silver and 500,600,000 ounces of domestically mined silver. United States industrial consumption during that period was 571,067,514 ounces, and the world consumption of silver in coinage systems was 902,923,368 ounces.

### SEVERAL GOVERNMENTS MELT DOWN SILVER COINS

It is difficult to account for all of the silver stocks held by governments throughout the world because of the practice resorted to by several governments in recent years of melting down and devaluing their silver coins, thereby reducing their fineness. This procedure enabled those countries to increase their coinage circulation without acquiring new silver. It also enabled them to use their surplus silver to meet demands in the various bullion markets where other countries were seeking silver for coinage and industrial use. The practice resorted to by governments of melting down their silver coins and dumping their surplus silver on the bullion markets, thereby depressing the world price, is regarded by many people as lending encouragement toward racketeering on the part of such governments, bullion brokers, and industrialists.

It also had the effect of increasing the monetary value of the silver remaining in the coins. In short, these governments withdrew from the silver coins a part of their intrinsic value, thereby destroying the value of the coin as well as the confidence of the people. Their purpose was to destroy silver as money and to deal with it as they do the base metal, copper, when coined into money. Silver is a precious metal, as is gold, and its rightful place as a medium of exchange as well as domestic currency should be restored and protected.

On March 16, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued a directive which placed a general ceiling on most of the commodities that enter into the economic life of this Nation. Silver was included under this general ceiling. The foreign price of 35⅜ cents an ounce and the domestic price of 71.11 cents an ounce were then made rigid. The pegging of the price of foreign silver at 35⅜ cents an ounce met with the enthusiastic approval of the silversmiths and jewelry manufacturers, as imported silver has been the source of supply for use in their industries.

But the growing demand for silver by war industries became so great that the War Production Board on July 29, 1942, issued an order which denied to these manufacturers the purchase of foreign silver, but permitted them to continue until October 1, 1942, to process the silver stocks then on hand. This period was later extended to November 15, 1942, since which date no foreign silver has been permitted to be consumed in the manufacture of these luxury goods. But these manufacturers can still buy domestically mined silver at 71.11 cents an ounce. By the end of 1942 the Treasury had practically stopped buying newly mined domestic silver. Slightly over 88 percent of the domestic production of 1942 was acquired by the Treasury, leaving the remainder for the civilian goods manufacturers.

### FOREIGN SILVER PRICE INCREASED TO 45 CENTS AN OUNCE

In spite of the increased demand for silver in the United States, the price of domestically mined silver has not increased since the act

of Congress of July 6, 1939, which established a net price of 71.11 cents an ounce. In reality, the price of domestically mined silver is $1.29 an ounce. The Treasury actually pays 71.11 cents for 55 percent of the ounce, the remaining 45 percent of the ounce being claimed by the Treasury as "free silver." Only the 55 percent portion is monetized; the rest is profit. However, the price of foreign silver was raised on September 1, 1942, from 35⅜ cents to 45 cents an ounce, chiefly because of the desire of the State Department to further the Good Neighbor Policy and to increase silver imports, as well as to extend financial aid to the Government of Mexico. As a result of this increase, the Government of Mexico received 4½ cents of the 9⅝ cents per ounce differential. The melting point of the Mexican peso is 53.7 cents an ounce, which acts as a barrier against a rise beyond that point in the price of Mexican bullion silver.

On September 14, 1942, Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, introduced a bill in the Senate, presumably intended to make Treasury silver available for use in war industries. This bill, in its original form authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of Treasury silver to war industries, to foreign governments whose defense is of vital importance to the defense of the United States, to any person, corporation, partnership, or Government department, for use in the manufacture of civilian goods not inconsistent with the war effort, and to silverware and jewelry manufacturers while their plants are being converted to war production. It also stated that the average price of all silver sold under this act should not be less than 50 cents per fine troy ounce, and that at all times the ownership and the possession of an amount of silver of a monetary value equal to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be maintained by the Treasury.

On December 7, 1942, Senator MCCARRAN submitted an amendment by way of a substitute for Senator GREEN'S bill (S. 2768). The aims of this proposal paralleled that of the Green bill insofar as releasing Treasury silver for war industries goes, but the methods employed were fair both to the producer and the consumer. It provided that the price for all silver sold under this act should not bring less than 71.11 cents per fine troy ounce, and carried the same stipulation with respect to the protection of the outstanding silver certificates as did the Green bill. It further provided that no Treasury silver shall be sold until all current supplies of imported and domestically mined silver shall have become reduced to an immediately available aggregate stock of 20,000,000 ounces or less, and that any silver leased under this act shall be returned within 1 year after the termination of the war.

It also provided that out of any silver stocks acquired by the various agencies of the Government (other than the Treasury Department) 30,000,000 ounces per annum would be reserved for the exclusive use of and purchase, at not less than the current market price, by domestic manufacturers (1) for the manufacture of silver articles for civilian use, and (2) for the converting of existing plants of such manufacturers to war production.

During 1942 unwarranted propaganda concerning silver has circulated through the mail and was published in several of the outstanding magazines and newspapers in the East. None of these articles had any foundation in fact whatsoever. The 12 Senators that represent the 6 leading silver-producing States of the West were accused of refusing to permit the release of Treasury silver for use in industries engaged in war production.

NEW ORGANIZATION SEEKS TO DEPRESS SILVER PRICE

Investigation has disclosed the fact that within the past 4 months a new organization has been formed in New York City under the name of the Silver Users' Emergency Committee. It is made up of jewelers, silversmiths, and other industrial consumers of silver. This organization is behind the movement to depress the price of silver, and to establish a precedent of making Treasury silver a stock pile for their industrial requirements at 50 cents an ounce. They would like to establish a world price for silver in the United States that would conform to the official price of approximately 50 cents in London and India.

The people of India lack confidence in the pound sterling. The exchange value of the rupee has declined since civil strife developed in India last August, but the price of silver in Bombay rose from 62 to 93 cents an ounce, which high price was reached in November. In spite of the fact that the melting point of the old rupee is approximately 87 cents an ounce the Indian authorities show no signs of apprehension with regard to the dehoarding of the old rupee silver coins of eleven-twelfths fineness, irrespective of their loss of legal tender status beginning in May 1943. In other words, the Indians prefer the old high-silver content rupee coins to the new low-silver content coins regardless of the loss of legal tender status of the higher silver content rupees.

POST-WAR ERA OFFERS EXTENDED USES FOR SILVER

The future holds many and varied opportunities for silver. Silver in industrial uses will assume a position of paramount importance in the post-war period. All of the tests to which it has been subjected have proven its superior qualities and the versatility of the metal.

Governments and industries throughout the world will be competing in the open market for silver soon after the cessation of hostilities. Post-war readjustments will demand a more extensive use of both gold and silver than has ever occurred in the history of the world. Silver will be by far the more useful of the two precious metals because of its demand for monetary circulation and industrial utilization. It will be used to supplant subsidiary paper money of extremely doubtful value. Silver coinage will continue to increase during 1943. As our troops are sent abroad in greater numbers, they will require greater amounts of small denominational coins. Silver and gold will be used concurrently in rehabilitating and stabilizing the currency systems of the impoverished nations and will act as a tonic in revivifying their commerce and restoring their international status. Gold will probably be confined largely to the settlement of international balances and to the function of backing for indirectly redeemable paper money, while silver will circulate both as coin and be held in bullion form for the redemption 100 percent of paper money backed by silver.

Those economists who insist on managed currencies as a basis for conducting world trade are doomed to disappointment and failure. No managed currency system has ever succeeded. The people of the world will demand both gold and silver, for which no satisfactory substitute has been found since time immemorial.

## RELINQUISHMENT OF EXTRATERRITORIAL RIGHTS IN CHINA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report back favorably, without amendment, Executive A, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, a treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China for the relinquishment of extraterritorial rights in China and the regulation of related matters signed at Washington on January 11, 1943, and a supplementary exchange of notes also concerning matters related to extraterritorial rights signed at the same time and made an integral part of the treaty, and I submit a report (Ex. Rept. No. 2) thereon. The report recommends the ratification of the treaty recently made with China relating to the surrender and abdication by the United States of certain rights.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to receiving the report as in executive session? The Chair hears none.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of the routine morning business the Senate proceed to the consideration of the ratification of this treaty as in executive session.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I desire to accommodate the Senator from Texas, but I gave notice Monday that at the conclusion of the routine morning business today I should like to discuss lease-lend, and the island bases close to the United States on which we are building military and naval establishments, the arrangement being on a 99-year basis. I assume that the treaty discussion will be brief, and that the treaty will be disposed of with dispatch, because it is pretty generally understood it is not a subject of wide controversy. Am I right in that assumption?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct, as he usually is. There will be very brief comment by one or two members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but there will be no extended debate, if the Senator from Texas knows the situation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to have the Senator amend his unanimous-consent request, if he will. I should like to proceed at the conclusion of the routine morning business. What I have to say will not possibly extend beyond half an hour, and if the Senator will make his request that the treaty be taken up immediately following the remark of the Senator from Maryland, I shall be very grateful to him.

Mr. CONNALLY. Anything that arouses gratitude on the part of the Senator from Maryland toward the Senator from Texas is always welcome, but I hope the Senator will not insist on his suggestion, for the reason that I know his remarks will be so interesting that they will provoke comments by other Senators, and the debate will probably run on for some time. I really do not think the consideration of the treaty will take over 15 minutes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, most Senators go to lunch around 1 o'clock, and I do not talk for the purpose of hearing my own voice. I therefore should not like to have it happen that when I rose the Senate Chamber would be empty, because I believe some of the observations I shall make will not be secondary in their ramifications and importance to the

ratification of the treaty with China. For this reason I should be grateful if the Senator from Texas would give me an opportunity to be heard at the conclusion of the routine morning business, and then have the treaty taken up. I promise I shall not abuse his confidence, if he will reword his request.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas is very much embarrassed by the request of the Senator from Maryland. The Senator from Texas is acting in conformity with a conference he has already had with members of the Committee on Foreign Relations on both sides of the aisle. They all are quite insistent that the proposed action on the treaty be had promptly.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall accede to the Senator's request, but I ask him to agree that if the debate shall extend beyond 15 minutes he will of his own volition make another request to give me an opportunity to speak. I do not wish to wait until 1:30 o'clock to make a 10-minute speech.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if that comes as a formal request, I shall object to it. I think observance of the right of the able Senator from Texas is secured by the rules which permit him to move an executive session. I see no reason why the able Senator from Maryland should not wait a few minutes, after the conclusion of the routine morning business, to make his speech.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will yield, I have no objection to waiting a few minutes, but I know that when Senators rise, usually in the best of faith, they underestimate their capacity of endurance, and having been a witness of what has happened on many occasions, I do not wish to be a victim of what usually happens.

Mr. McNARY. There is no parliamentary process for parceling out time on the floor of the Senate. I shall object to anything of that kind. I am willing to accede to the request of the able Senator from Texas if we take up the consideration of the treaty immediately following the routine morning business.

Mr. TYDINGS. I object.

### DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED BY FARMERS OWING TO LACK OF MANPOWER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a letter addressed to me by Hon. R. L. Hanna, of Fargo, N. Dak., together with an advertisement by the United States Employment Service published in the Fargo, N. Dak., Forum of February 2, 1943. I ask that the letter as well as the advertisement may be published in full in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

I may add that the advertisement which appears in this North Dakota newspaper calls for 33,428 men. It says that the starting wage is from $213 to $270 per month. Mr. Hanna farms 2,080 acres of land. He has a large herd of cattle, as well as a large number of hogs and sheep, and he says it is hard for him to keep help on the farm when advertisements of the sort referred to are published in North Dakota newspapers.

There being no objection, the letter and the advertisement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANNA STOCK FARM,
*Fargo, N. Dak., February 3, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
*United States Senator,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am enclosing newspaper page torn from the Tuesday evening, February 2, edition of the Fargo Forum. I wish to call to your attention an ad inserted at the bottom of the page by a Portland shipyard concern and sponsored by the United States Employment Service, a Government agency.

Advertisements of this type have been carried in North Dakota papers from time to time announcing enormous wages for workers. The farmers still left on the land are working under great difficulty because of lack of manpower. This is especially true now during the winter on livestock farms, but in the spring, summer, and fall all farms will feel the effect. How is it possible to keep men on the farm of any age when advertisements and radio announcements are continually used to lure the people of North Dakota to other parts of the Nation?

For many years I have owned and operated a farm in North Dakota. This farm comprises 2,080 acres of land. I have a large herd of Aberdeen-Angus beef cattle, a farm flock of 1,000 head of sheep, several hundred head of hogs, poultry, and dairy cattle. As you know, on a farm of this type, where we breed, raise, and feed our own livestock for the market, it takes experienced and competent men. Conditions are now such that it is almost impossible to farm, but we hope we will be able to continue to do our part in helping to produce food.

I note in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that you have taken great interest in our farm problems and I just wanted to call to your attention this angle of it.

With kind wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

R. L. HANNA.

---

Thirty-three thousand four hundred and twenty-eight men wanted by a large Portland shipyard. Transportation advanced. Starting wage $213 to $270 per month: Helpers, all crafts; sheet-metal workers; coppersmiths; pipefitters; electricians; chippers; riveters; shipfitters; boilermakers; painters; carpenters.

Complete immediate housing facilities for men guaranteed.

1-A, 2-A, or 2-B men will not be considered. Persons now engaged in essential industries or essential agricultural work will not be considered. Company representative will interview and hire 8:30 a. m. to 5 p. m., Wednesday and Thursday, February 3 and 4.

Apply United States Employment Service, War Manpower Commission, 630 First Avenue North, Fargo, N. Dak.

(Company representative will interview and hire at Grand Forks on Friday and Saturday, February 5 and 6.)

### THE CROSBY FAMILY AND AN F. S. A. LOAN

Mr. LANGER. I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Crosby Family of Eight Made F. S. A. Loan Pay Well," published in the Divide County Farmers Press of February 5, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CROSBY FAMILY OF EIGHT MADE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION LOAN PAY WELL—DILIGENT APPLICATION IN ALL-OUT EFFORT PROVES HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL

(Robert Butterfield family: Father, age 38; mother, 29; Darlene, 11; Carrollee, 9; Patricia, 7; Jack, 5; Juanita, 4; Walter, 3.)

An all-out effort can well be illustrated by the activities of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Butterfield and their six young children, who live in the outskirts of Crosby, N. Dak.

These small children, as well as their parents, are enjoying better diets than ever before because the family is producing the greatest part of their own food supply. With a $130 Farm Security Administration Food for Freedom loan made last April, the family purchased 1 cow, 2 pigs, 100 baby chicks, and $7 worth of garden seed.

In 1941 the family had a small garden which produced enough potatoes to last through the winter, but the canned and stored vegetables ran out before Christmas. That year they received surplus commodities.

Besides having an abundant supply of fresh vegetables during the growing season this past summer, the family stored 101 bushels and canned 210 quarts for this winter and spring use. They also produced and used at home 540 gallons of milk, 400 pounds of pork, 5 dozen eggs, and 100 pounds of poultry.

Mrs. Butterfield stated that they expect to increase the production of milk by 160 gallons, pork by 100 pounds, beef by 100 pounds, eggs by 235 dozen, and poultry by 450 pounds, thus assuring an even better diet for the family. She also stated that the cans of food they have purchased this year could be counted on her fingers. Their tomato plants froze last spring and since the family cannot afford to buy all the citrus fruit they need, it has been necessary to buy a few cans of tomatoes.

Although they have to buy some feed for the cow, hogs, and chickens they haul hay in from the country, stake the cow out in summer and manage to get most of the chicken feed by scraping up the grain spilled around the grain bins and elevators.

Mr. Butterfield works away from home on the railroad which leaves the food production enterprise pretty much up to Mrs. Butterfield and the children. Without the help of the children, Mrs. Butterfield says she could not manage so much. The two oldest girls do a lot of housework and run most of the errands, leaving their mother time to do the chores. All but the two youngest children helped to keep the garden free from weeds, but all helped to gather the vegetables and get them in the basement. Jack, age 5, was especially good help, says his mother.

In spite of all the work of producing and preserving this food and taking care of the family, Mrs. Butterfield has found time to knit for the Red Cross. Mr. and Mrs. Butterfield used to buy two $25 War bonds every 3 months, but now they are buying one a month. Darlene and Carrollee, ages 11 and 9, each have purchased $15.50 in War stamps with money they have earned themselves. As soon as they save $3.25 more they are going to turn them in for bonds.

On the first of each month, just as sure as anything, the two oldest girls call at the Farm Security Administration office and make a $5 payment on their loan. Mrs. Butterfield remarked that they have also been able to pay nearly all their old debts with money saved by producing their own food.

Mrs. George P. Homnes, chairman of the county war relief production for the Red Cross, reports Mrs. Butterfield's Red Cross knitting from January 13, 1942, to January 28, 1943, as follows: 1 pair child's socks, 2 pairs children's mittens, 4 small children's sweaters, 5 caps or beanies, 1 pair child's snow pants, 4 pairs men's regulation socks, 5 pairs men's spiral socks, 4 men's sleeveless sweaters, 2 Navy scarfs, 1 cap muffler, 2 long Army helmets, 2 neck-length helmets; total 33 knitted articles.

THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LANGER. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Question of Aiding or Ousting 3,000,000 Farms," published in the Bottineau (N. Dak.) Courant, of February 4, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTION OF AIDING OR OUSTING 3,000,000 FARMS

Behind the fight over the Farm Security Administration is the far more significant question of whether or not the Government should bow to the demand of the farm bloc and help to drive some 3,000,000 small farm families off their farms in order to supply cheap labor for about 200,000 large farmers and their friends in the National Association of Manufacturers. The farm bloc is trying to prevent the masses of farmers from discovering its Simon Legree intentions, for it knows that at the most, only 10 percent of the farms which get 50 percent of the farm income would fall in with such a diabolical scheme.

But with the businessmen in the city, the farm bloc seems to think that it can be more frank. Thus in the January 8 issue of the United States News, a magazine for busy businessmen, the plan is stated in unvarnished form:

"Out of the Nation's total of 6,000,000 farmers, 2,000,000, or about one-third, had incomes in 1940 of less than $400 on the average, and all together the 2,000,000 produced only 3 percent of the Nation's food. Another 1,000,000 farmers in the next higher income group also contributed very little to the country's food supply. Here is the biggest available reservoir of farm labor in the country. It is urged that a shift of part of this supply to farms producing the bulk of the Nation's food supply would result in a net increase in food production."

Only the farm bloc contends that a net increase in food production would result from forcing farmers to serve as farm workers. Such an idea could be supported only by the farm bloc, which has itself strenuously resisted the call for increased production.

While the O'Neal-Smith forces charge the Farm Security Administration with regimenting the farmers and accuse the Government of using the war as a cloak for carrying out social reform, we find that the farm bloc is trying to consign 3,000,000 farmers to the chain gang. Using the war as a cloak and a page from Mein Kampf as their guide, these would-be dictators are themselves plotting to take control of rural America and transform free farmers into wage slaves under their lash.

If the war is to be won, and won quickly, the power of the farm bloc must be broken. This minority group must not be allowed to exercise a veto power over the rest of the Nation. It is reported that five State organizations of the Farm Bureau Federation are planning to break loose from the O'Neal-Smith bureaucracy in disgust with its policies. Such action on the part of these five State Bureaus will strengthen the present progressive coalition of labor forces, the Farmers' Union, and church groups.

To defeat the farm bloc, however, it is essential that the Government formulate a broad, over-all program of practical aid to the family-sized farms so that maximum production may be achieved in 1943. Such a program, including centralized planning such as provided in the Pepper-Tolan bill, would cut the ground out from under the farm bloc, whose policy is one of creating chaos so that it can put the blame on the administration.

Not long ago Secretary Wickard named H. W. Parisius to head up the highly important production division in the Department of Agriculture. In keeping with his instructions, Parisius drafted a thorough-going plan for the reorganization of personnel and expansion of production programs, including aid to the family-sized farms.

It is reported that Secretary Wickard reversed himself on the Parisius plan and refused to act on it, because he is afraid of a kick-back from the farm bloc. Parisius realizes that no appeasement policy can possibly placate the farm bloc, and he was therefore forced to turn in his resignation (January 16).

Instead of trying to appease the farm bloc, Mr. Wickard should take his case to the people. If he comes forward with a broad plan of aid to the farmers, enabling the family-sized group to reach maximum production, he will win the support needed for a successful rout of the farm bloc.—Facts for Farmers.

Mr. LANGER. I further ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter dealing with the Farm Security Administration. It is from Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Staven, of Park River, N. Dak. Mr. Staven is the secretary of the Farmers' Union.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALSH COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
*Park River, N. Dak.*

We like to state our stand regarding Farm Security Administration. We feel in times like these with so much food needed and such a shortage of goods, now this could have been avoided to a large extent had plenty of money been allowed through the Farm Security Administration to have set up those millions of farmers who are handicapped for lack of equipment and unable to produce, in other words it would not only have raised the living standards of those people but it would have given the world more food. We see what the Farm Security Administration has done through its limited funds, what couldn't be done had more been allowed?

Then, too, we feel that when industry is borrowing money from the Government at 1½ to 2 percent interest and doesn't have to be mortgaged and made to pay it back if the war should end or if the factory is not a success. We feel farmers should be given equal rights and not have to pay 5 percent interest as stipulated by Wickard in a ruling made a little over a week ago. If his crop fails, according to this ruling, he still is obligated to repay. Is this fair?

How about the synthetic-rubber program? Why is it continually shelved? We hope our Senators and Representatives give bill S. 2600 by GILLETTE all the support in their power to give, and that it will be passed.

Machinery is needed. Not enough has been allowed, and we hope a change is made. Farmers must produce; how can they if they aren't allowed the equipment and repairs needed.

College girls and city women cannot fill the labor bill for the farm. One good hired man is needed, who knows how to operate and care for machinery on most family-sized farms.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ELMER STAVEN.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter received by me under date of February 3, 1943, from G. O. Hanson, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., dealing with the question of rationing.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., *February 3, 1943.*
HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
*United States Senator,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: * * * It seems to me, Mr. LANGER, that there is something pretty rotten in this rationing set-up. These fellows at the head of the rationing set-up—both State and Federal—either try to tell anyone who tries to find out something that that person is not patriotic, is helping Hitler, or some other damn nonsense. They do not help a darn bit in getting people to cooperate. I happen to know that if all ration boards are supposed to pass out rations equally, then certainly if a liquor salesman is allowed a C ration, certainly anyone is. Those officials know what I mean, and they know where these C rations are given out and to whom.

I know a salesman right here in Grand Forks, selling a commodity—one of the necessary food, shelter, or clothing items—who went to the local ration office and asked for a supplemental ration to hold out until March 1. He has a B ration and only asked for enough extra to get along. The outside clerk told him he was not eligible. He could not even get a chance to talk to any member of the ration board. This person spent a couple of years in a sanatorium with tuberculosis, and instead of doing like so many thousands have done—ask for relief or a Government job—has had the guts to get out and fight for a living like the rest of us have. You probably know him. His name is ———. He sells clothing direct to the consumer. Al is trying to make an honorable living, and trying to keep his health by doing this type of work which keeps him outside quite a lot. When we see these things happening, how do these officials expect us to take it and like it? When politics is knocked out of this rationing deal and other deals so that each person is given exactly what he is entitled to, then we will cooperate. As long as conditions are as they are though, there will be more people sitting down and saying what they think in black and white.

I had a hardware salesman tell me the other day that men in his line of sales work have had some of their job names changed from hardware salesman to production specialists so that they could be eligible for C or double C rations which give them about their normal amount of gasoline. This particular hardware salesman is still a hardware salesman with a B ration.

What do these officials mean by an "eligible" person? They can evidently make anyone eligible they want to—all depending on what they think.

In the paragraph where Mr. Brown mentions that persons in Devils Lake or Minot are subject to the same provisions as those living in Grand Forks, it certainly is not up to me to mention any names or other facts so that office can determine eligibility. You know what Mr. Krause said about the Minot situation. He blamed the citizens of Minot—chamber of commerce and other businessmen. It seems to me it is about time that these officials try to do something to cure this situation rather than to damn these citizens who, at least, dare to say something. Someday there will be an accounting, and the attitude of these officials will have to be

a lot different than it is now if they expect to stay on the job.

It seems to me that the judgment of the average businessman is certainly equal to, or better than, the judgment of a lot of these bureaucratic officials in Washington, Bismarck, or wherever they may be.

I want Congress to take back every bit of power it has unintentionally given to Mr. Roosevelt. He should not have any emergency powers. Thank the Lord I have never voted for that man—not even the first time. How can any intelligent person believe Roosevelt when he has broken every promise he has made?

I will tell you what I think of this whole mess. I believe Roosevelt is quite glad that this country is short of rubber, gasoline, too, meat, sugar, and all of the other necessary things we need. It is one way he can try to regiment the people who don't believe in him and the whole New Deal. We all know he has believed in an economics of scarcity, not one of plenty. Our margins over our consumption demands have been so small that we couldn't possibly have a surplus, and certainly someone must have seen this war coming a long time before we got into it. Roosevelt was too damn busy keeping his New Deal alive to bother with anything so important, or so trifling as to foresee the need to have some rubber, quinine, and other essentials on hand which we couldn't get except from some foreign country.

Certainly, Mr. LANGER, I am not the only one who thinks this way, as I personally know quite a few people who think this way. They are good Americans too, doing a lot more to win this war than Office of Price Administration, War Production Board, or any other alphabet officials who may criticize them.

Now, I would like to mention a few thoughts in regard to this business of drafting manpower. Not as long as this Government allows the 40-hour week to stand, and overtime pay to be paid, and slow-downs in war plants to continue, and twice the manpower on a ship job or any other job to continue should Congress or this Nation ever allow Paul McNutt or any other man to tell a man he has to leave his business and go elsewhere. There is no shortage of manpower, and that is attested to by so many people I personally know who do work in these plants, shipyards, etc. Where there might be a shortage, that can certainly be corrected without disrupting the whole national economy.

* * * * *

A man was home a short time ago from his job in the shipyards at Portland. His work is quite specialized, and he is highly paid. Just the same, he himself admitted that he couldn't possibly earn what he was paid, and there were twice as many men working on a lot of the ships as they could make use of. His brother-in-law told me about it. He wondered who was going to pay the bill for all that mismanagement, but said he would take it as long as he could get it. He said it was a shame the way manpower is being wasted, and then we have the Government tell us they are going to really make it tough. Does that all make sense to you, Mr. LANGER? It doesn't to me.

* * * * *

With best regards, I am,
Very truly yours,

G. O. HANSON.

## MAXIMUM PRICES ON PORK AND BEEF PRODUCTS AND BREAD AND BAKERY PRODUCTS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The resolution (S. Res. 94) submitted by Mr. REED on the 8th instant was read, as follows:

Whereas the provisions of the act entitled "An act to aid in stabilizing the cost of living," approved October 2, 1942, expressly provide (1) that "no maximum price shall be established or maintained under authority of this act or otherwise for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity a price therefor" equal to the parity price for such agricultural commodity, (2) that no maximum price shall be maintained for any such processed or manufactured commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of the agricultural commodity the highest price received by them between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942, with certain qualifications: *Provided*, That the President may correct gross inequities in this respect, but that in no event shall a maximum price be established for such a processed or manufactured commodity which will not reflect parity to the producers of the agricultural commodity, and (3) that "in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing"; and

Whereas the act known as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, approved January 30, 1942, as amended October 2, 1942, expressly provides that the price-fixing powers "shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumstances or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act"; and

Whereas the foregoing provisions have not been suspended or modified by any law or lawful action; and

Whereas on October 22, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued Maximum Price Regulation No. 148, Revised, now in effect as amended November 2, 1942, fixing maximum prices for pork products and using as a live-hog base approximately $13.60 per 100 pounds at Chicago, although the price of live hogs at Chicago since the promulgation of said revised regulation for a substantial period of time has been in excess of $15 per 100 pounds, causing a loss to the processors in violation of the provision of the act approved October 2, 1942, that processors shall be allowed a general fair and equitable margin; and

Whereas said Maximum Price Regulation No. 148, Revised, as amended, is in violation of the act approved October 2, 1942, because the base of live animal prices used was lower than the highest price received by producers between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942, and because there has been no action by the President to permit such a lower base on the ground of any gross inequity; and

Whereas on December 10, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued Maximum Price Regulation No. 169, now in effect as amended December 19, 1942, and January 2, 1943, fixing maximum prices for beef products on a basis which fails to yield to the processors generally fair and equitable margins; and

Whereas on April 28, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued the general maximum price regulation establishing as maximum prices for bread and other bakery products, together with other commodities, the highest price charged by each seller during March 1942 for each such commodity, and said maximum prices for bread and other bakery products have since been maintained at the same levels; and

Whereas said maximum prices for bread and other bakery products were and are in violation of the act approved October 2, 1942, because said products are processed and manufactured in whole from wheat and other agricultural commodities and because said maximum prices did not and do not reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodities either parity or the highest prices received by producers for them between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942; and

Whereas contrary to the statement of the Office of Price Administration at the time of issuing the general maximum price regulation that "every producer whose prices are stabilized is assured that his costs, which are based upon the stabilized prices of others, will not rise," the Office of Price Administration did not at that time place any maximum price or control, with minor exceptions, upon any of the costs of manufacturers of bread and other bakery products, and it was not until October 1942 that ceilings were placed upon flour, eggs, dry, evaporated, and condensed milk, certain other ingredients used in such products, and wages, by which time such costs had undergone a substantial increase, amounting to an average increase of one-half cent per pound in the case of bread; and

Whereas the costs of producing bread and other bakery products have continued to increase substantially since October 1942, as a result in part of increases in maximum prices for flour allowed by Maximum Price Regulation No. 296 issued by the Office of Price Administration on January 2, 1943, although no increase in the maximum prices for bread and other bakery products has been allowed; and

Whereas producers of bread and other bakery products, particularly smaller producers, are therefore being denied a generally fair and equitable margin in violation of the act approved October 2, 1942, and large numbers of such producers in fact are operating at a loss; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration, in violation of the provision in the act approved January 30, 1942, that the price fixing powers "shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry," has used such powers to compel such changes in the bread and other bakery products industry (as evidenced by its announcement upon the issuance of Maximum Price Regulation No. 296 that "this increase in flour prices should not necessitate an increase in the present retail bread prices because the higher flour costs, it is estimated, will be completely offset by simultaneously introduced savings in the manufacture, packaging, and distribution costs of bakers"), affected by Food Distribution Order No. 1, issued by the Secretary of Agriculture under direction of the Director of Economic Stabilization after recommendation by the Office of Price Administration, limiting varieties of bread and rolls, prohibiting slicing of bread, limiting the amounts of milk, shortening, and sugar in white bread, prohibiting certain methods of distribution and otherwise changing the practices of the industry for the purpose of maintaining present maximum prices for bread; and

Whereas said Food Distribution Order No. 1, even could it be lawfully resorted to by the Office of Price Administration for the purpose of maintaining present maximum prices for bread, has not resulted in savings which allow producers of bread a generally fair and equitable margin as required by law; and

Whereas the meat processing and bread and other bakery products industries are essential war industries and their continued operation and the foods they supply are essential to the national welfare and the successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas the policies and actions of the Office of Price Administration are threatening extinction of these industries or their

concentration in the hands of a few large operators able to withstand the price squeeze imposed, by reason of large financial resources; and

Whereas the action of the Office of Price Administration in maintaining maximum prices for pork and beef products and for bread and other bakery products at present levels in violation of the foregoing provisions of law is defeating the intent of the Congress that producers of agricultural commodities shall receive fair and reasonable prices, due to the inability of processors to pay such prices: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or through a subcommittee to be appointed by the chairman, is hereby authorized and directed—

(1) to investigate and study the policies and actions of the Office of Price Administration, the Office of Economic Stabilization, and any other governmental agency, their officials, employees, agents, and representatives, in respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum prices for pork and beef products and for bread and other bakery products; and

(2) to report its findings and to recommend further legislation or action by the Congress or the Senate, if any, needed to insure compliance by any or all such agencies, officials, employees, agents, and representatives with the provisions of the aforementioned act approved January 30, 1942, as amended, and the act approved October 2, 1942.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, as it deems advisable.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 94 was submitted by me on Monday of this week. Submission of the resolution was made in response to numerous requests received from bakers and small meat packers all over the United States asking for an investigation as to the relationship between the prices of live animals and of the ingredients out of which bread is made and the price ceilings fixed by the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Discussion of the resolution and the reference of it are likely to take up some time, because it involves the whole question of the rules of the Senate, the proper reference of a resolution, and the responsibility of the Chair in regard thereto. I wonder if the Senator from Kansas would not let that resolution go over until the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] shall have concluded what he has to say, and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has brought up the treaty with China and it has been acted upon? The Senator from Kansas will lose none of his rights by so doing.

Mr. REED. If the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Maryland will offer any guaranties with respect to the amount of time they will require——

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know that they have to. It does not make any difference. We will stay here until we dispose of these matters. The Senator from Kansas will lose none of his rights by deferring action on the resolution.

Mr. REED. I have no objection to doing so. When I obtain the floor I shall move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that the Senator will do so.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have not consented to a change being made in the program. Under the rule the resolution now comes before the Senate. Let it be understood that it comes up against the wishes of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. The resolution comes up automatically at the conclusion of the routine morning business. This is the appropriate time for it to come up. If I could obtain some understanding as to how much time the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Maryland will take in connection with the matters which they wish to bring before the Senate I might waive the rule, but I shall not do so until I have such information.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am not endeavoring to interfere with the rules of the Senate. I am simply asking to be recognized and obtain the floor. The Senator from Oregon is not going to outmaneuver me by the plausible way in which he puts his suggestion.

Mr. McNARY. I have the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will have it when the Senator shall have concluded.

Mr. McNARY. We will see about that. Mr. President, I have no desire to enter into a controversy over procedure. My whole theme is that we should go along in an orderly fashion. No Senator who desires to speak has the right to do so merely because he entertains the desire. If the able Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] desires to postpone consideration of his resolution, which now automatically comes before the Senate, I have no objection. I do not want him to waive any rights unless it is perfectly agreeable to him.

Mr. REED. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I am always glad to accommodate myself and to adjust myself to the desires and convenience of my colleagues. Consideration of the resolution is now in order. I have, however, no disposition to be too technical with respect to application of the rule. I realize at the same time the force and consistency of the position of the Senator from Oregon. He has been taking that position consistently in order to bring the Senate back to consideration during the morning hour of the business which it is supposed to transact in the morning hour. If the Senator from Oregon wants to make objection, and the Chair shall sustain the objection, I shall be very happy to have Senate Resolution 94 considered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, irrespective of the rules of the Senate, which I think should always be obeyed, I am willing to adhere to the wishes of my colleagues so long as they do not interfere with the orderly procedure. If the able Senator from Kansas is willing to postpone consideration of his resolution, that is agreeable to me. However, I do not want him to be forced into that position merely because some Senator wishes to make a speech. If he yields willingly and voluntarily, I shall not insist on the point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Chair to understand that the Senator from Kansas desires to delay bringing up his resolution until after the morning business is concluded?

Mr. REED. With the understanding that immediately after the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the remarks of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] I may have the floor to discuss Senate Resolution 94.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Texas for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the morning business been disposed of?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Kansas. The Chair assumed that the Senator from Maryland rose either to object or to reserve the right to object.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the question debatable, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A request for unanimous consent is not debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no motion before the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct; there is no motion before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. The question is whether any Senator objects to the request of the Senator from Kansas that consideration of Senate Resolution 94 be postponed until after the consideration of the Treaty with China and the address of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS).

The VICE PRESIDENT. That particular question is not debatable. Does the Senator from Maryland rise to object?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, what is the request? Let me see if I understand it. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] stated that with the general understanding that consideration of Senate Resolution 94 be taken up immediately after these other matters are out of the way, he would be delighted to forego bringing it up until then. I do not consider that to be a request made formally to the Chair, and I do not believe any fair parliamentary interpretation would so hold.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, one conversant with the rule would know that a resolution coming over from a previous day automatically has precedence over any other proposal before the morning business has been concluded.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the resolution before the Senate, Mr. President?

Mr. McNARY. I have not yielded.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not addressing the distinguished Senator from Oregon; I am addressing the Chair.

Mr. McNARY. It was laid before the Senate before the morning business had been concluded. As I understand the parliamentary situation, the able Senator from Kansas is willing to postpone consideration of the resolution until after the address by the Senator from Maryland and the address by the Senator from Texas. That should end the controversy.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, with the understanding that I shall not lose my parliamentary position——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Chair, first, if it is in order for me to proceed at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request made by the Senator from Kansas is pending at the moment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understood the able leader of the minority to say that the Senator from Kansas was willing to forego his right to the floor. That was the understanding. Therefore, no request is pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The understanding of the Chair is that the Senator from Kansas made a request.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the request debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it is not debatable.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it to be acted upon immediately?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? That is the only point.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 94.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is a correct statement.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the resolution is debatable, and I shall now proceed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

## THE LEND-LEASE PROGRAM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the so-called lend-lease program became a part of our national foreign policy long before we entered the war. In its broader aspects, it has always been a misnomer. In sum it means that the United States, in addition to supplying and utilizing its armed manpower in the air, on the sea, and on the land, and bearing its full share of the killed and wounded on the world's battlefields since Pearl Harbor, has undertaken at the same time to give—not lend, or lease—ships, planes, tanks, guns, shells, trucks, automobiles, clothing, medical supplies and foodstuffs to our allies, and, to some extent, to the people of occupied countries.

The only offset to the tremendous financial burden which lend-lease will place upon the shoulders of the American people is the trickle of things which our allies may make available where our armed forces are fighting on or near their own lands.

Outside this amount of compensation, lend-lease is a one-way street from the United States to our allies. The huge final unpaid debt will not be discharged by the foreign beneficiaries of our lend-lease policy. It will be paid for by the American people.

To date, according to the Lend-Lease Administrator, we have contributed to foreign governments $9,000,000,000 in weapons, supplies, and food. To date they have contributed to our armed forces located on their own soil a considerable amount of goods in return. However, the balance of war trade seems heavily in favor of the United States.

Already there has been appropriated by the United States Congress, directly and indirectly, for lend-lease, $63,000,000,000. It is assumed that in the ensuing months this sum will be used to continue the so-called lend-lease aid to our allies. We have not the money to do this. We are borrowing it. It will be a part of our national debt. It must be discharged by the present and future generations through the medium of very hard and burdensome taxation.

In view of our large contribution directly in fighting men to the battle fronts, and of supplies through the medium of lend-lease, for the Congress of the United States the question poses itself: Without serious hurt to themselves, what can any of the recipient foreign nations now give to the United States of America which will increase our security to the extent to which we have afforded increased security to foreign nations solely through the medium of lend-lease, both before and since our entry into the war?

Let me say that I fully understand and appreciate that lend-lease was not conceived and cannot be administered in any purely nationalistic, narrow, or selfish way.

The United States Government and its people are assuming the debt which lend-lease entails, and are making the sacrifices which lend-lease imposes in order to send supplies of all kinds to various foreign countries, both now and before our entry into the war. This is in the belief that it is being done in such manner as will aid in the defeat of the Axis countries and, wherever possible, evoke consideration of our problems where our allies have opportunity to reciprocate by aiding us in obtaining all the security we can.

I understand that food sent under lend-lease to Britain is sold by the British Government to the people of Britain through the retail outlets of Great Britain. We are told that this method is used, because it is the fairest, most labor-saving, and expeditious way the food can be gotten to the British people. The money so derived is kept in the British Treasury. So, insofar as articles are sold in Britain which we have sent to that country, they serve a double purpose. First, they supply the British people, as in the case of food, with what they must have in order to live, work, and fight; and, second, the money derived from the sale of articles which we have sent to Britain goes into the British Treasury and thus adds to the financial stability of Great Britain. To the extent that money is derived from the sale of the goods we send to Britain, it is just that much taxation which the British people would otherwise have to pay in order to sustain their Government. It is the same as if we sent an equal sum of money or credit to the British Government.

I realize that, regardless of the banking mechanics, there is in the lay mind a wide difference between giving and distributing such things as food to our allies, and permitting our allies, for example, to sell the food to their subjects and retain the money from such sales in their national treasuries. So far as payment to us is concerned, we are no worse off, whether they give the food away or sell it. The British are not paying us for it anyway, whether it is given away to their people or sold by them to their subjects.

But, in effect, the result is the same as if we were to take billions of dollars of United States credit or money and ship it over for use to these foreign countries. As I say, money and goods are synonymous.

Thus, to the extent that the money has gone already from us directly or indirectly into the treasury of any foreign nation, and knowing that many more billions will follow from us before the war is over, is it not pertinent in behalf of and in fairness to our own people, particularly since lend-lease was in effect before we got into the war, to ascertain what they can give us, particularly in exchange, for this money by way of present and future security for the United States of America?

We have built, at our own expense, on land that has been only leased, many bases on foreign soil in the Western Hemisphere. I understand that these bases of ours are built on a 99-year basis and that we have the right to land military and naval planes only at such places. Civilian planes are excluded by the condition of the arrangement.

Considering the extremely heavy balance of war trade in our favor under lend-lease, and considering that we shall in the air, on the sea, and on the land, make equal sacrifices in blood with our allies before the war is over and considering that these islands upon which we have built our bases have little economic and productive value, it appears that the present arrangement is not as fair to the United States as it should be.

Bases on these islands near the United States have no value, from a military standpoint, except as an offense against or a defense of the United States. Bases on these islands are vital to our security right now, and will be more so in the future. In view of all the lend-lease transactions, much of which transpired before we became a formal belligerent ourselves, it is astounding to me that our Government has not long since asked for the trade of these actual bases to us—not the whole islands, but the bases themselves—in fee simple, as being but a token

of appreciation for what we have done and are yet to do besides fighting for these foreign countries under the lend-lease arrangement.

Lest I be misunderstood, let me say that it is not my wish to hold the pistol at the heart of any of our allies in their hour of need and compel them to cede lands or give willy-nilly to the United States. However, I think everyone will agree with what Mr. Churchill has so magnificently stated, when he said that lend-lease was the most generous act ever performed by any government in the world's history. I take that remark of Mr. Churchill's at face value. I believe he is a great and sincere man. I am sure that his appreciation, comprehension, and understanding of lend-lease in all its ramifications is deep and wide and genuine. His elegant testimony supports my point of view. It causes me to say that, considering our efforts to bring aid, encouragement, and security to the British Empire, both before and after we got into the war, if the subject of the bases were properly presented to him and the British people, we should have the support of this outstanding statesman and of the British people as well in acquiring for our country and its people the counteraid and the countersecurity which Britain could give us at little or no cost to themselves, and which would make us in the future the strong nation defensively that we may need to be.

Keep in mind, Mr. President, that from Central and South America our supplies of oil, rubber, coffee, and other goods have come in large measure. It is apparent that from air bases located in the West Indies hostile planes could challenge the transportation of these needed supplies to the United States and its people. We know that all too bitterly right now, for this Nation has been subject to the rationing of oil, coffee, rubber, and other things because commerce in such articles has been interrupted by enemy submarines operating in this very West Indian or Caribbean territory.

Think how it could be interrupted from the West Indies in the future by quantities of long-range airplanes which by then will be in the full flower of their existence.

In order to present a comparable problem to the people of Britain and to Mr. Churchill, let us take the case of the Shetland Islands, which lie north of the British Isles. They are British; they are essential to Britain's defense. But if they were owned by some other country, they could have no real value except for offense against Britain. If we owned those islands away over there, essential as they are, and close to the British Empire, I should think that if lend-lease, as it is now being promulgated, were in reverse, they would have an extremely good case to ask us to put the British Isles in the state of defense which the circumstances would abundantly warrant.

Some may say let such questions wait until after the war. To do that would, in my opinion, be to commit a serious mistake, a fatal error. There will be enough post-war problems and enough post-war bickering without the inclusion of this matter, which, so far as nearby foreign-owned bases are concerned, would put us in the role of Uncle Shylock at the peace table if the matter should be postponed. Besides, all we are asking for is in value but a friendly gesture, which would not affect Britain's security per se, but which would greatly affect our own.

Mr. President, these remarks are not made for the purpose of attacking lend-lease. They are made with a full consciousness of the mutuality of our total war effort. I hope they are made, as they are intended to be, without unfairness to any of our allies and without any smallness of conception of the war as it applies to everyone concerned on our side.

I feel very strongly that we are not looking after our own country's security quite as well and as anxiously as all the ramifications which enter into this whole matter deserve under lend-lease. The 99-year arrangement, considering that lend-lease was in the picture before we entered the war, is, even though unintentionally so, a very poor return for the unprecedented assistance which America gave when she reached out across the sea to Britain at the very moment when she stood alone, and without which there might not have been a Britain. Of course, lend-lease was not altogether altruistic. It was selfish on our part to a considerable extent; but interwoven into whatever selfishness there might have been was altruism—our unstinted admiration for the people of a great nation, under a God-sent leader, who were standing there and battling the greatest military machine in the history of the world. No; there was more than money, more than supplies, more than food, more than selfishness, more than fear behind our lend-lease legislation. There was, I know, in no inconsiderable degree, the warp of altruism and true generosity woven into the woof of self-interest.

Our President and people and Mr. Churchill and the British people were not unmindful of the extreme importance to us from a defensive standpoint of these otherwise valueless island bases. The very fact that the British leased them to us for 99 years shows they recognized our great need for them whenever we might be attacked.

Perhaps in the circumstances, as the destroyer-bases transaction was made quickly, it could not have been otherwise at that time than an undertaking merely to let us lease those bases upon which so many millions of dollars have now been spent. But now, in view of all the circumstances, it would seem to me that the President and the State Department might properly suggest that our tenure be made permanent on those portions of the islands where bases have been built or have been started. I am unwilling to believe that overtures made by our Government to Britain would not receive over there the generous and fair consideration which all the myriad of circumstances seem to warrant.

At the same time, in the interest of international good will, it might be well to straighten out the title to some islands in the Pacific which bear some dual relationship to those of the Atlantic, where the titles are in dispute. Some of those islands are claimed by several countries besides our own, even though in many cases discovery of them was made by our citizens in our ships long before they were discovered by representatives of any other country in the world. But notwithstanding this historical fact, other countries have seized them and have held ostensible title to them.

I have had this matter up at some length with the Lend-Lease Administrator. He properly points out that the scope of the permanent acquisition of the bases is not within the scope of his activities. I am, therefore, giving voice to this matter on the floor in the hope that the British people will see that these bases in the West Indies, if not defended adequately by us, could be just as much a threat to our security and to our lines of communication as the Axis forces have been a threat to Britain during the whole length of this war. I feel that the British people, knowing the islands have no economic value of any consequence, will say that all the United States has asked for is the right to have such defense and such security for ourselves as our Government has given to them through lend-lease and other policies, both before as well as after we got into the World War. If these bases are turned over to us, it would be a generous act by the British people. And, looking down the corridor of time, who knows, it might bear rich and blessed dividends both for them and ourselves far beyond the comprehension of any person now living.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for a question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Does not the Senator think that it would also be wise at this time, while Russia is our ally, to negotiate with the Russian Government for the acquisition of Wrangell Island, which is located in the far north, in the Arctic Ocean, particularly in view of the fact that there is now a disagreement between the Russian Government and the American Government as to the rightful ownership of that property? In directing the question to the Senator, I might remind him that Wrangell is practically the size of Jamaica, which is an island of considerable proportions. By the way, in that connection, as the Senator knows, we have spent millions of dollars in developing bases about 5 or 10 miles from Kingston, the capital of Jamaica.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I, therefore, inquire does not the Senator think that, while we are considering national defense for the Western Hemisphere, and particularly our portion thereof, it would be well for us now, since, as the Senator has said, Russia is participating in the lend-lease arrangement that we have with our other allies, to negotiate with the Russian Government for the rightful acquisition of that property by way of personally ascertaining from the Russian Government what her attitude is toward relinquishing any claim she may have to an island that should belong to us and was discovered by us?

Mr. TYDINGS. In answer to the Senator's question, I should like, first, to say,

broadly that I do not believe the United States should ask for the land of any other government, to be used for military or naval purposes, if such acquisition would affect the defensive military ability of the government claiming title to the land in question. In other words, I should not ask that they give us any of their property without consideration of their problem; but wherever the consideration of their problem in its broader aspects is not hurt and our position is strengthened, and since we are dealing with lease-lend under which we may do as much for them as they for us, those matters ought to be considered.

In particular reference to Wrangell Island, if we have by discovery the right of title to it, that circumstance ought to be presented to the Russian Government and they should be asked their reasons for claiming title, and if no good reasons are offered, it seems obvious that an agreement should be reached, in that case, that we might own the island. If, however, the evidence shows that Russia has a title to Wrangell Island, let me say then that I would not want to dwell on that particular subject except in a general way, and that we have no right to ask any of our allies to cede to us land which might weaken their military security at home, because that would be the principal purpose for which we ask for the acquisition of land, namely, to strengthen our military security at home not for offensive but for defensive purposes.

In further answer to the Senator's question, let me say that I do not want to harm any of our allies, I do not want to grab land from any of them; but we already know in this war the tragedy of the Caribbean. It has been a graveyard for ships flying our own flag; it has been the cause of depriving our soldiers and sailors of supplies and munitions and weapons which they otherwise would have had. Yet we had to go to a foreign government in our own back yard and obtain the right to put bases on those islands, in the hope that we could cut down the losses in this vital American lifeline.

The islands are not worth 5 cents from a productive standpoint. The Senator and I have both been over a great many of them, as I happen to know, and they are not islands that contribute great riches to the Britsih Government, nor would they contribute much to us.

I am not asking that all the islands be ceded to us; I am asking only that we may have sufficient bases in our own right on the tip ends here and there of certain strategic islands as will permit the United States to defend itself. I am only suggesting, since our problem is right here at home, that they do for us without hurt to themselves what I believe we have very generously tried to do for them with their problem at home. In other words, I would make secure a two-way street insofar as it affected per se the nations involved.

I hope I have answered the Senator's question.



Mr. REYNOLDS. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for another question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In view of the fact that we are now cooperating with the Netherlands, the Dutch Government, does not the Senator think it might be well for us to suggest to the Netherlands that that Government consider according us the privilege of constructing bases upon islands of theirs which are in the Caribbean and occupy points equally as important as Bimini, Nassau, Jamaica, and innumerable other islands in the Caribbean. I have in mind for instance Aruba.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is one thing the Senator's question, so far as it is concerned, does not give me a chance to answer, so I am going to suggest to him this problem: These islands are not only essential to our security, but they are essential to the military security of the countries of South America. Obviously, if we were to obtain them, those countries might feel that, to some extent, we had put them in a position where we could coerce them. However, it is well known that, as things generally stand, they would not in most cases be able to build the kind of bases and support the kind of force that is essential in these areas.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Will the Senator pardon me for a moment?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield when I finish the answer.

Therefore, I do not think that the question ought to be approached from any narrow basis. The reason I have dwelt on the present 99-year leases is that we are already there; we have already built bases; we have spent millions of dollars on a great many of them. Some of them, perhaps, may not be completed, but others, no doubt, are completed. That, however, is an entirely different situation than if we should undertake to ask for something else. We already stand there in good title as lessee rather than fee simple owner. Therefore I would prefer, at this particular time, to confine the scope of my remarks to the question which seems to me to be so crystal clear, that we are not selfish or small or mean in calling attention to the respective situations of the two peoples.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. REYNOLDS addressed the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield, but I want to say that I hope Senators will not ask me many more questions, although I should be delighted to answer them. The Senator from Texas was very courteous this morning in trying to adjust the situation, and I do not want to take advantage of his generosity.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely desire to ask one question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I, too, have but one question to ask.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well. I yield, then, to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask, does not the Senator think that we ought to continue on the best of terms with our allies and not raise any questions at all that might bring about controversies between us and our allies until after we win the victory? Let us win the victory first. I see great merit in what the Senator says, but let us win the victory without any controversy between us and our allies, and, after we win the victory, we certainly will have the power at the peace table to make a proper peace.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is a great deal to be said for the viewpoint expressed by the Senator from Tennessee. I, myself, have given that matter some consideration, as my remarks indicate. However, I happen to be slightly acquainted with the post-war period which followed World War No. 1, and it so happens that at the peace table there quite often is not the same desire to give and take and to share in a rather equitable way the burdens of the world as there is when the war is going on. If we were not engaged in the lease-lend program before we got into the war as well as now, that might be a proper question, but we owe an obligation to the people of this country who will be called upon to pay back $63,000,000,000, a sum of money equal to $2,000 a family, rich and poor, black and white, high and low, in addition to all the other burdens they are called upon to bear.

In view of that circumstance, coupled with the fact that our boys will spill their blood on the various oceans and battlefields before the war is concluded, I feel that as to any of these countries, while all this money and all these goods and supplies are going forward, we should at least ask for the right to have now the security for our own people which we have given to our allies, not only since we got into the war, but when we were supposedly and formally a neutral Nation.

It is in no mean and small sense, as I stated, that I approach this question. Everyone who has visted these islands knows they have very little commercial value, and such portions as we might acquire would not deprive Britain of 1 penny of income she might derive from them. I am asking for that degree of security for my country which my country has already given abundantly to the countries concerned, not that we shall take advantage of them, but that we may provide for our security now, and make lend-lease a two-way security proposition now, because I am distrustful, to a mild extent, about the fulfillment of many important possibilities in the post-war period.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether my information is correct, that when the President of the United States undertook to trade and did trade 50 of our destroyers to Great Britain for certain privileges, those privileges embodied only our right to acquire property in the islands concerned for the purpose of building air fields.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, the planes of Great Britain have the right,

under the treaty, to use our bases; and I am not complaining of that.

Mr. REYNOLDS. After we secured the right to acquire land, the American Government, in addition to the 50 destroyers, bought the land itself upon which the air fields are constructed, as I understand. Is that correct?

Mr. TYDINGS. We bought it from the private owners who had title to it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Now the Senator seeks for our Government the privilege——

Mr. TYDINGS. Of transferring sovereignty.

Mr. REYNOLDS. He seeks to give us the privilege of buying the property in fee simple?

Mr. TYDINGS. Only of the bases, not the islands, and not the people.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not the islands, because they are an economic liability.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I wish to make a very brief observation. I share the views just expressed by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am delighted to know that.

Mr. McNARY. I think now is the accepted time to act. However, I wish to make an inquiry. I was interested in the Senator's statement that we had a leasehold estate for 99 years in portions of the islands, but that we could not use our holdings for civilian purposes.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I have heard—and I really want to check the statement—that there is a provision in the treaty whereby the leases can be canceled after reasonable notice.

Mr. TYDINGS. My information is not definite and may not be accurate, but my understanding is that that provision does not extend so far as to give Britain the right to cancel. However, I am not well informed on that phase of the matter.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I for one am very happy to have had the opportunity of listening to the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. It has been my pleasure to listen to him on many occasions, and I always find him extremely interesting, and he always provides us with something worth while. I agree with the Senator that unquestionably now is the accepted time and the proper time for us to enter into negotiations with the British Government with a view to acquiring fee-simple title to the properties which the Senator described in his address to the Senate a few moments ago.

I assume that when the Senator mentioned bases in the Caribbean in the form of island bases he likewise had in mind bases which are located on the continent of South America, on properties which belong to our brothers across the seas. I take advantage of the opportunity to make a few observations at this time in order that I may obtain for myself some credit which I think is due me.

A number of years ago I suggested that we acquire properties of the British, the Dutch, and the French in South America, in the Caribbean, and in the North Atlantic. I made those suggestions many years ago because I knew, as we all knew, that the time would come when we would become involved in another World War. I, for one, was interested first in the preservation of the United States of America. Perhaps unfortunately I love my country—perhaps unfortunately I love the United States—better than I love any other country in the world. As a result of my devotion to my country in preference to any other country upon the face of the earth, I felt that it was my duty, as I felt it was the duty of the American people, to look after the interests of the United States before looking after the interests of any other country in the world. I apologize to no one, here or elsewhere, for being more thoroughly interested in the preservation of America than I am interested in the preservation of any other country in the world.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. REYNOLDS. If the Senator will pardon me, I should prefer to yield later.

As a result of my preferring my country over any other, years ago I suggested on the floor of the Senate that we should interest ourselves in acquiring bases and points of advantage in the ocean and elsewhere for the protection of the northern portion of the Western Hemisphere, known as the United States of America.

Having made those suggestions many years ago, I followed them up from year to year, until in 1940 I introduced two joint resolutions in the Senate authorizing the President of the United States to enter into negotiations with Great Britain and with France for the acquisition of island bases in the Caribbean, for the acquisition of bases on the Continent of South America, and for the acquisition of bases in the northern Atlantic.

I ask that at this point there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the joint resolutions which I introduced 3 years ago.

There being no objection, the joint resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 221

Joint resolution for the acquisition of British islands in the Caribbean and British Honduras

*Resolved, etc.*, That the President is hereby requested to enter into negotiations in such manner as he may deem appropriate with the Government of Great Britain for the acquisition by the United States of the islands of the Bermudas; the Bahamas—Jamaica with the Turks, Caicos, and Cayman Islands; Trinidad and Tobago; Barbados; the Leeward Islands—Antigua, St. Kitts, Nevis, Dominica, Montserrat, and Virgin Islands; the Windward Islands—Grenada, The Grenadines, St. Lucia, St. Vincent; together with British Honduras, in part payment for the indebtedness of such Government to the United States.

Senate Joint Resolution 247

Joint resolution for the acquisition of French islands in the Caribbean and the North Atlantic Ocean

*Resolved, etc.*, That the President is hereby requested to enter into negotiations in such manner as he may deem appropriate with the Republic of France for the acquisition by the United States of the islands of Martinique, Guadeloupe, St. Pierre, and Miquelon, in part payment for the indebtedness of such Government to the United States.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I had in mind at that time that we could best provide for the protection of this country by establishing military fortifications, and by establishing air bases in Dutch Guiana, in French Guiana, and in British Guiana, located on the eastern side of the continent of South America.

I had in mind likewise the establishment of bases in Central America, in British Honduras, near the capital, which is Belize. In addition to that I had in mind the establishment of bases, as has later been done, in the Caribbean, at Jamaica, near Kingston, its capital; in Bermuda, near Hamilton, its capital; and at Nassau and Bimini, just off the coast of Florida, so ably represented by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida, who a moment ago asked me to yield, which I shall be glad to do in a few moments.

Then, Mr. President, proceeding northward, it was my intention at the time of the introduction of those joint resolutions to enter into negotiations with the French Government for the acquisition of bases on the islands of Miquelon and St. Pierre, which are off the North Atlantic coast, not far from a most important air base and shipping base for overseas cargoes on Newfoundland.

Mr. President, I say that now is the time for conferring with our friends across the seas, now is the time for conferring with the British Government and with the Dutch Government, for the permanent acquisition in fee simple, as suggested by the able Senator from Maryland, of these posts, these airfields, so that we may be the outright possessor of those properties, for the protection of the American Continent and for the protection of our brothers to the south of us in Central and South America.

Mr. President, I should like also to take advantage of the opportunity to say that at the time I made those suggestions a great many persons criticized me and others for even suggesting that we should like to have these properties for the benefit and protection and defense of our own country.

I recall, in connection with national defense, which was a subject of grave importance to us prior to the time we became involved in this the Second World War, that, being interested in the defense of my country, I visited Labrador and Newfoundland, and I felt then, as I feel now, that in order to provide the proper protection for the Atlantic seaboard, especially in the North Atlantic, we should certainly make some sort of an arrangement with our brothers across the sea, in addition, for the acquisition of Miquelon and St. Pierre, and perhaps make an arrangement whereby we might

have an air base or a sea landing off the coast of Labrador.

Mr. President, in 1938, realizing and recognizing as I did that perhaps sometime in the future we would become involved in another world war, realizing as I did that the day might come when we would be engaged in war with Japan, I visited Alaska, that vast territory which we purchased from Russia for a few million dollars in 1867. I visited that territory all the way from the Arctic southward and through the Aleutian Islands group. When I returned to Washington I spoke on the floor of the Senate advocating and urging that we give immediate attention to the fortification of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands. There in the north was a vast territory. There was a part and portion of the United States of America in the form of a territory which was subject to attack and invasion, as has been evidenced by the fact that the Japanese have made landings and established positions in the Aleutian Islands.

After returning to Washington I received the cooperation of a then United States Senator, Mr. Schwellenbach, now on the Federal bench, who was then representing the State of Washington. He and I endeavored then in this body to warn the American people, and impress upon them that Alaska and the Aleutian Islands should be fortified. Unfortunately, no heed was paid to what we had to say about the matter, and I now say that if our advice had been followed at that time, the Japanese would not be entrenched in the Aleutian Islands and particularly on the Island of Attu.

Mr. President, many people believe with me that in order to defeat Japan we must forego the idea of taking island by island, which no doubt would consume a number of years, and which no doubt would call for the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of American sons of American mothers. I for one am of the opinion that the quickest way and the best way to bring about the defeat of Japan is to bomb heavily her islands, whereon we find established the great commercial centers and the munitions and industrial plants. If today we had Attu in our possession, I feel confident that instead of bombing only Tokyo, as was done by the gallant General Doolittle, the time would not be far distant when, under the direction of our able military leaders, we would be in position to send hundreds of planes over Tokyo, Yokohama, and Kobe, and a great many other industrial centers of Japan.

Mr. President, in considering the building of a band of steel around the continental United States for the protection of our own mainland, for the protection of its 130,000,000 people, even years ago I suggested—at the same time that I made these other suggestions—that we enter into negotiations with our friendly neighbor to the south, Mexico, for the acquisition of the peninsula belonging to Mexico known as Lower California, recognizing then, several years ago, as I do now, that if we ever became involved with any nation to the west of us, that nation, no doubt, would endeavor to make use of a portion of the peninsula of Lower California, which belongs to Mexico, to establish air bases, or to conceal some of its undersea craft, or perhaps some of its other vessels in the vast expanse of water which is found between the Peninsula of Lower California and Mexico.

At the same time, proceeding further, I felt that we should acquire Cocos Island off the coast of Costa Rica, and, going southward, that we should make arrangements with another government in South America for the acquisition of the Galapagos Islands off the coast of Ecuador. I feel that if we had then carried out the suggestions which I made there would not be today the fear which some Americans entertain of an invasion from Asia or from Europe.

Mr. President, we have time to make our preparations for the construction of this band of steel around continental United States for the protection of the American people. I am more thoroughly interested in the United States of America than I am in any other country in the world, but at the same time, in providing for the protection of the United States of America by constructing a band of steel around this portion of the North American Continent, I feel that we would likewise be providing protection for our friendly neighbors to the north—the Canadians; protection to our neighbors just across the Rio Grande—the Mexicans; protection for every country in Central America, and certainly the Panama Canal Zone, and the countries on the coasts of South America, particularly Colombia and Venezuela.

Mr. President, I think that now is the time for us to enter into negotiations with our friendly allies for the acquisition of the title to this property in fee simple.

I wish to refer to one other matter, in conclusion.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall conclude in a moment. Does the Senator wish to ask me a question?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has made a remark in his speech with reference to the acquisition of these areas on behalf of our country. How long does the Senator think it would take this country and England and other countries vitally interested in these areas to sit down at this particular time and finally arrive at some satisfactory conclusion?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Oh, 2 or 3 days.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is more of an optimist than I thought he was.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very optimistic about that, because I believe that our brothers across the seas, our allies, are deeply appreciative of all the aid we have given them. I know Mr. Churchill is a man of broad vision. I heard the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] say that Mr. Churchill has stated in Parliament, or somewhere else, that he was deeply grateful for the billions of dollars which we had given the Allies; and having met Mr. Churchill here and found him to be a man of great vision, and a fine personality, who appears to me to be deeply appreciative of all we are doing, I am confident that he would not have to sleep over this matter. A man of his big heart and big soul would say "Yes. The United States of America came to our aid when we needed it. You did and are doing everything in the world you possibly can for us. Why should I sleep over this matter? Certainly we will let you have it." I do not think it would take over a day or two to come to agreement.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wonder if the Senator does not feel some concern as to what might be the impression made upon our allies when, according to the press of our country, yesterday a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives made a speech which emphasized that America must begin now to protect herself against her allies, Britain and Russia, and suggested in a most ambitious way that we should immediately safeguard ourselves against any competition we might experience from them or any jeopardy that they might cause to us in the future, and when the newspapers of tomorrow will say that the Senate devoted a considerable part of its session today to a discussion of our acquiring in fee simple some territory which is now territory of the British Empire.

In other words, in spite of the worth and the merits of everything the able Senators have said, I wonder if there are not many more questions that we will, in the final analysis of this problem, have to bring up to our allies and our friends. Perhaps there are some counter proposals they may wish to make to us. I wonder if this is not a matter of such magnitude that probably it will have to be the subject of a sort of world-wide conference anyway, as a part of the readjustment of a broken world, and whether we might not perhaps run the risk of getting into a row among ourselves before we get the enemy whipped, if we go into too much detail about the adjustment of territorial questions while we are engaged in a very serious war which is far from being concluded, as no one knows better than the Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to say that I do not apologize to anyone for speaking of what I believe to be in the interest of my country. I believe we have arrived at the time when we who are interested in our country should speak out in behalf of it. If I am to be criticized here or anywhere else at any time for speaking in what I believe to be the interest of the people of America and the defense of our continent, I can "take it." I see no reason why at this time, as suggested by the able Senator from Maryland, we should not mention something which we believe to be in the interest of national defense.

I stated a moment ago that I, among others, had had the great honor and

privilege of meeting Hon. Winston Churchill here. I repeat that, in my opinion, if I am any judge of human nature, Mr. Churchill would not have to sleep over the suggestion made by the able Senator from Maryland because that great statesman has said that he is grateful for and appreciative of everything we are doing for his country.

In order that my remarks may not be misconstrued, now or at any other time, let me say that I think that Winston Churchill is one of the greatest men the world has ever known. I know of no man upon the face of the earth for whom I have more profound respect, or greater admiration, than I have for Winston Churchill. He has proved to be a great source of inspiration to every living person upon the face of the earth. Why? Because Winston Churchill—God bless his soul—loves his country better than he loves any other country in the world. For that reason I respect and admire him. For millions of Americans he likewise has been a source of inspiration because he is a great patriot. He will go down in history as one of the greatest men the world has ever known.

Mr. President, I desire to say something further. A moment ago I directed an inquiry in regard to Wrangell Island. Many persons have never heard of Wrangell Island. It is located in the far North. It is about the size of the island of Jamaica. If one were flying from the metropolis of New York directly to Manila, the capital of the Philippines, he would fly over Wrangell Island. We all recognize that the day will come when aviation will take its rightful place in the transportation of the world.

Wrangell Island was discovered by an American. The first flag was planted there about 1850. The United States claims that it owns Wrangell Island by right of discovery. Some day it will be a most important point so far as the interest of the United States is concerned.

Once upon a time there was an American there with about 10 Eskimos. They lived and disappeared. None of them was ever heard from, according to my recollection of the history pertaining to this important point. Later our friends, the Russians, sent some of their citizens to Wrangell Island. It is my understanding that they have a few men there now. I believe that at the present time we should enter into negotiations with our friends, the Russians, with a view of ascertaining who really is the rightful owner of that property. I should hope that such negotiations would develop the fact that the property belongs to us, and that the Russians would be perfectly willing to turn it over to us.

In pursuance of that understanding, I introduced a resolution about 3 years ago, and an identical one approximately 2 years ago, authorizing the State Department to enter into negotiations with the Russian Government with the view of ascertaining who is the rightful owner of that property.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution to which I refer be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State is requested to make a report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date with respect to whether or not the United States has a valid claim to sovereignty over Wrangell Island.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In discussing Wrangell Island the Senator is discussing a very important question, of course, and he is vitally interested in it because, in addition to what the Senator from Maryland has said, he wants this country to negotiate with Russia with respect to Wrangell Island. The Senator is now discussing something which is very important, because it goes back to the question which I asked a moment ago as to how long the Senator thought it would take us to negotiate all these important problems. Once the problems of the Atlantic are brought in we immediately bring in the problems of the Pacific, and we immediately bring in the problem which the Senator is discussing, which is Wrangell Island in the north.

How long does the able Senator from North Carolina think we should be here discussing all those questions? If we take up the problems concerning one island it will be necessary to take up the problems concerning other islands of the Pacific, including Wrangell Island and all the other islands which the Senator thinks ought to belong to us from the standpoint of national defense. It seems to me that it would be utterly futile and useless for this country to start negotiating at this moment for islands which we think we ought to have as a defense to this country in the future, especially in view of the fact that we are now in the midst of a great war, at a time when all our efforts should be directed toward winning the war. It seems to me that we are at the crossroads. Such a proposal would take the time of the Senate, the State Department, the President of the United States, Winston Churchill, and the Government of Great Britain. In addition, the countries of South America are all interested in this problem. It would be necessary to have some sort of a conference if the work were to be done properly, and then it would be necessary to bring the matter before the Senate where it would be debated and discussed. It seems to me that the proposal is ill-timed. It would be impossible to accomplish at this time what should be accomplished.

As the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] said to the Senator from Maryland, what we want to do is to put all our efforts into winning the war, allowing these other problems to come up later.

Mr. REYNOLDS. And win the peace.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. Mr. President, if America is as tough as I think she will be in the coming peace, we will take care of that problem in no uncertain terms when the time comes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois and I are in thorough accord. He says that we ought to give all our time now to winning the war and winning the peace.

Mr. President, half the articles we read in the newspapers of today concern the kind of peace which we are to have after the war. That is a matter to which we should give consideration. If we interest ourselves now in winning the peace after the war why should we not at the same time interest ourselves in the defense of our country after the war? Now is the time to consider the defense of America.

I know of no subject of greater interest to the American people than the subject of providing the proper defenses for the United States immediately after the war has been concluded, and now is the time to consider the defense of the United States so that we shall have no fear of an invasion after the war.

We are concerned now with winning the war and winning the peace. So far as winning the peace is concerned, we here in America can best assure ourselves of peace by providing ourselves with strong defense outposts—a band of steel—such as I have previously suggested over the years and today.

So, as suggested by the Senator from Maryland, let us get those bases now, because if we do not get them now, we never will get them.

Every other nation on earth is looking after its interests, so why should we not now, at this late date, look after the interests and the defense of our country?

## RELINQUISHMENT OF EXTRATERRITORIAL RIGHTS IN CHINA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the treaty, Executive A, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, which was recently made with China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the treaty, Executive A (78th Cong., 1st sess.), a treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China for the relinquishment of extraterritorial rights in China and the regulation of related matters signed at Washington on January 11, 1943, and a supplementary exchange of notes also concerning matters related to extraterritorial rights which was signed at the same time and which is made an integral part of the treaty, which was read the second time, as follows:

TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA FOR THE RELINQUISHMENT OF EXTRATERRITORIAL RIGHTS IN CHINA AND THE REGULATION OF RELATED MATTERS

The United States of America and the Republic of China, desirous of emphasizing the friendly relations which have long prevailed between their two peoples and of manifesting their common desire as equal and sovereign States that the high principles in the regulation of human affairs to which they are committed shall be made broadly effective, have resolved to conclude a treaty for the purpose of adjusting certain matters

in the relations of the two countries, and have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America,

Mr. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

The President of the National Government of the Republic of China,

Dr. Wei Tao-ming, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of China to the United States of America;

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers found to be in due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I

All those provisions of treaties or agreements in force between the United States of America and the Republic of China which authorize the Government of the United States of America or its representatives to exercise jurisdiction over nationals of the United States of America in the territory of the Republic of China are hereby abrogated. Nationals of the United States of America in such territory shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of the Republic of China in accordance with the principles of international law and practice.

ARTICLE II

The Government of the United States of America considers that the Final Protocol concluded at Peking on September 7, 1901, between the Chinese Government and other governments, including the Government of the United States of America, should be terminated and agrees that the rights accorded to the Government of the United States of America under that Protocol and under agreements supplementary thereto shall cease.

The Government of the United States of America will cooperate with the Government of the Republic of China for the reaching of any necessary agreements with other governments concerned for the transfer to the Government of the Republic of China of the administration and control of the Diplomatic Quarter at Peiping, including the official assets and the official obligations of the Diplomatic Quarter, it being mutually understood that the Government of the Republic of China in taking over administration and control of the Diplomatic Quarter will make provision for the assumption and discharge of the official obligations and liabilities of the Diplomatic Quarter and for the recognition and protection of all legitimate rights therein.

The Government of the Republic of China hereby accord to the Government of the United States of America a continued right to use for official purposes the land which has been allocated to the Government of the United States of America in the Diplomatic Quarter in Peiping, on parts of which are located buildings belonging to the Government of the United States of America.

ARTICLE III

The Government of the United States of America considers that the international settlements at Shanghai and Amoy should revert to the administration and control of the Government of the Republic of China and agrees that the rights accorded to the Government of the United States of America in relation to those settlements shall cease.

The Government of the United States of America will cooperate with the Government of the Republic of China for the reaching of any necessary agreements with other governments concerned for the transfer to the Government of the Republic of China of the administration and control of the international settlements at Shanghai and Amoy, including the official assets and the official obligations of those settlements, it being mutually understood that the Government of the Republic of China in taking over administration and control of those Settlements will make provision for the assumption and discharge of the official obligations and liabilities of those Settlements and for the recognition and protection of all legitimate rights therein.

ARTICLE IV

In order to obviate any questions as to existing rights in respect of or as to existing titles to real property in territory of the Republic of China possessed by nationals (including corporations or associations), or by the Government, of the United States of America, particularly questions which might arise from the abrogation of the provisions of treaties or agreements as stipulated in Article I, it is agreed that such existing rights or titles shall be indefeasible and shall not be questioned upon any ground except upon proof, established through due process of law, of fraud or of fraudulent or other dishonest practices in the acquisition of such rights or titles, it being understood that no right or title shall be rendered invalid by virtue of any subsequent change in the official procedure through which it was acquired. It is also agreed that these rights or titles shall be subject to the laws and regulations of the Republic of China concerning taxation, national defense, and the right of eminent domain, and that no such rights or titles may be alienated to the government or nationals (including corporations or associations) of any third country without the express consent of the Government of the Republic of China.

It is also agreed that if it should be the desire of the Government of the Republic of China to replace, by new deeds of ownership, existing leases in perpetuity or other documentary evidence relating to real property held by nationals, or by the Government, of the United States of America, the replacement shall be made by the Chinese authorities without charges of any sort and the new deeds of ownership shall fully protect the holders of such leases or other documentary evidence and their legal heirs and assigns without diminution of their prior rights and interests, including the right of alienation.

It is further agreed that nationals or the Government of the United States of America shall not be required or asked by the Chinese authorities to make any payments of fees in connection with land transfers for or with relation to any period prior to the effective date of this treaty.

ARTICLE V

The Government of the United States of America having long accorded rights to nationals of the Republic of China within the territory of the United States of America to travel, reside, and carry on trade throughout the whole extent of that territory, the Government of the Republic of China agrees to accord similar rights to nationals of the United States of America within the territory of the Republic of China. Each of the two Governments will endeavor to have accorded in territory under its jurisdiction to nationals of the other country, in regard to all legal proceedings, and to matters relating to the administration of justice, and to the levying of taxes or requirements in connection therewith, treatment not less favorable than that accorded to its own nationals.

ARTICLE VI

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China mutually agree that the consular officers of each country, duly provided with exequaturs, shall be permitted to reside in such ports, places and cities as may be agreed upon. The consular officers of each country shall have the right to interview, to communicate with, and to advise nationals of their country within their consular districts; they shall be informed immediately whenever nationals of their country are under detention or arrest or in prison or are awaiting trial in their consular districts and they shall, upon notification to the appropriate authorities, be permitted to visit any such nationals; and, in general, the consular officers of each country shall be accorded the rights, privileges, and immunities enjoyed by consular officers under modern international usage.

It is likewise agreed that the nationals of each country, in the territory of the other country, shall have the right at all times to communicate with the consular officers of their country. Communications to their consular officers from nationals of each country who are under detention or arrest or in prison or are awaiting trial in the territory of the other country shall be forwarded to such consular officers by the local authorities.

ARTICLE VII

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China mutually agree that they will enter into negotiations for the conclusion of a comprehensive modern treaty of friendship, commerce, navigation and consular rights, upon the request of either Government or in any case within six months after the cessation of the hostilities in the war against the common enemies in which they are now engaged. The treaty to be thus negotiated will be based upon the principles of international law and practice as reflected in modern international procedures and in the modern treaties which the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China respectively have in recent years concluded with other governments.

Pending the conclusion of a comprehensive treaty of the character referred to in the preceding paragraph, if any questions affecting the rights in territory of the Republic of China of nationals (including corporations or associations), or of the Government of the United States of America should arise in future and if these questions are not covered by the present treaty, or by the provisions of existing treaties, conventions, or agreements between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China not abrogated by or inconsistent with this treaty, such questions shall be discussed by representatives of the two Governments and shall be decided in accordance with generally accepted principles of international law and with modern international practice.

ARTICLE VIII

The present treaty shall come into force on the day of the exchange of ratifications.

The present treaty shall be ratified, and the ratification shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

Signed and sealed in the English and Chinese languages, both equally authentic, in duplicate, at Washington, this eleventh day of January, one thousand nine hundred forty-three, corresponding to the eleventh day of the first month of the thirty-second year of the Republic of China.

CORDELL HULL [SEAL]
WEI TAO-MING [SEAL]

---

[SUPPLEMENTARY EXCHANGE OF NOTES]

CHINESE EMBASSY,
*Washington, January 11, 1943.*

Hon. CORDELL HULL,
*Secretary of State.*

EXCELLENCY: Under instruction of my Government, I have the honor to state that in connection with the treaty signed today by the Government of the Republic of China and the Government of the United States of America, in which the Government of the United States of America relinquishes its extraterritorial and related special rights

in China, it is the understanding of the Government of the Republic of China that the rights of the Government of the United States of America and of its nationals in regard to the systems of treaty ports and of special courts in the International Settlements at Shanghai and Amoy and in regard to the employment of foreign pilots in the ports of the territory of China are also relinquished. In the light of the abolition of treaty ports as such, it is understood that all coastal ports in the territory of the Republic of China which are normally open to American overseas merchant shipping will remain open to such shipping after the coming into effect of the present treaty and the accompanying exchange of notes.

It is mutually agreed that the merchant vessels of each country shall be permitted freely to come to the ports, places, and waters of the other country which are or may be open to overseas merchant shipping, and that the treatment accorded to such vessels in such ports, places, and waters shall be no less favorable than that accorded to national vessels and shall be as favorable as that accorded to the vessels of any third country.

It is mutually understood that the Government of the United States of America relinquishes the special rights which vessels of the United States of America have been accorded with regard to the coasting trade and inland navigation in the waters of the Republic of China, and that the Government of the Republic of China is prepared to take over any American properties that may have been engaged for those purposes and to pay adequate compensation therefor. Should either country accord the rights of inland navigation or coasting trade to vessels of any third country such rights would similarly be accorded to the vessels of the other country. The coasting trade and inland navigation of each country are excepted from the requirement of national treatment and are to be regulated according to the laws of each country in relation thereto. It is agreed, however, that vessels of either country shall enjoy within the territory of the other country with respect to the coasting trade and inland navigation treatment as favorable as that accorded to the vessels of any third country.

It is mutually understood that the Government of the United States of America relinquishes the special rights which naval vessels of the United States of America have been accorded in the waters of the Republic of China and that the Govenment of the Republic of China and the Government of the United States of America shall extend to each other the mutual courtesy of visits by their warships in accordance with international usage and comity.

It is mutually understood that questions which are not covered by the present treaty and exchange of notes and which may affect the sovereignty of the Republic of China shall be discussed by representatives of the two Governments and shall be decided in accordance with generally accepted principles of international law and with modern international practice.

With reference to Article IV of the treaty, the Government of the Republic of China hereby declares that the restriction on the right of alienation of existing rights or titles to real property referred to in that article will be applied by the Chinese authorities in an equitable manner and that if and when the Chinese Government declines to give assent to a proposed transfer the Chinese Government will, in a spirit of justice and with a view to precluding loss on the part of American nationals whose interests are affected, undertake, if the American party in interest so desires, to take over the right or title in question and to pay adequate compensation therefor.

It is mutually understood that the orders, decrees, judgments, decisions, and other acts of the United States Court for China and of the Consular Courts of the United States of America in China shall be considered as res judicata and shall, when necessary, be enforced by the Chinese authorities. It is further understood that any cases pending before the United States Court for China and the Consular Courts of the United States of America in China at the time of the coming into effect of this treaty shall, if the plaintiff or petitioner so desires, be remitted to the appropriate courts of the Government of the Republic of China which shall proceed as expeditiously as possible with their disposition and in so doing shall insofar as practicable apply the laws of the United States of America.

It is understood that these agreements and understandings if confirmed by Your Excellency's Government shall be considered as forming an integral part of the treaty signed today and shall be considered as effective upon the date of the entrance into force of that treaty.

I shall be much obliged if Your Excellency will confirm the foregoing.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

WEI TAO-MING.

---

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, January 11, 1943.*

His Excellency, Dr. WEI TAO-MING,
*Ambassador of China.*

EXCELLENCY: In connection with the treaty signed today between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China in which the Government of the United States of America relinquishes its extraterritorial and related special rights in China, I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of today's date reading as follows:

"EXCELLENCY: Under instruction of my Government, I have the honor to state that in connection with the treaty signed today by the Government of the Republic of China and the Government of the United States of America, in which the Government of the United States of America relinquishes its extraterritorial and related special rights in China, it is the understanding of the Government of the Republic of China that the rights of the Government of the United States of America and of its nationals in regard to the systems of treaty ports and of special courts in the International Settlements at Shanghai and Amoy and in regard to the employment of foreign pilots in the ports of the territory of China are also relinquished. In the light of the abolition of treaty ports as such, it is understood that all coastal ports in the territory of the Republic of China which are normally open to American overseas merchant shipping will remain open to such shipping after the coming into effect of the present treaty and the accompanying exchange of notes.

"It is mutually agreed that the merchant vessels of each country shall be permitted freely to come to the ports, places, and waters of the other country which are or may be open to overseas merchant shipping, and that the treatment accorded to such vessels in such ports, places, and waters shall be no less favorable than that accorded to national vessels and shall be as favorable as that accorded to the vessels of any third country.

"It is mutually understood that the Government of the United States of America relinquishes the special rights which vessels of the United States of America have been accorded with regard to the coasting trade and inland navigation in the waters of the Republic of China and that the Government of the Republic of China is prepared to take over any American properties that may have been engaged for those purposes and to pay adequate compensation therefor. Should either country accord the rights of inland navigation or coasting trade to vessels of any third country such rights would similarly be accorded to the vessels of the other country. The coasting trade and inland navigation of each country are excepted from the requirement of national treatment and are to be regulated according to the laws of each country in relation thereto. It is agreed, however, that vessels of either country shall enjoy within the territory of the other country with respect to the coasting trade and inland navigation treatment as favorable as that accorded to the vessels of any third country.

"It is mutually understood that the Government of the United States of America relinquishes the special rights which naval vessels of the United States of America have been accorded in the waters of the Republic of China and that the Government of the Republic of China and the Government of the United States of America shall extend to each other the mutual courtesy of visits by their warships in accordance with international usage and comity.

"It is mutually understood that questions which are not covered by the present treaty and exchange of notes and which may affect the sovereignty of the Republic of China shall be discussed by representatives of the two Governments and shall be decided in accordance with generally accepted principles of international law and with modern international practice.

"With reference to Article IV of the treaty, the Government of the Republic of China hereby declares that the restriction on the right of alienation of existing rights or titles to real property referred to in that article will be applied by the Chinese authorities in an equitable manner and that if and when the Chinese Government declines to give assent to a proposed transfer the Chinese Government will, in a spirit of justice and with a view to precluding loss on the part of American nationals whose interests are affected, undertake, if the American party in interest so desires, to take over the right or title in question and to pay adequate compensation therefor.

"It is mutually understood that the orders, decrees, judgments, decisions and other acts of the United States Court for China and of the Consular Courts of the United States of America in China shall be considered as res judicata and shall, when necessary, be enforced by the Chinese authorities. It is further understood that any cases pending before the United States Court for China and the ther understood that any cases pending beforee the United States Court for China and the Consular Courts of the United States of America in China at the time of the coming into effect of this treaty shall, if the plaintiff or petitioner so desires, be remitted to the appropriate courts of the Government of the Republic of China which shall proceed as expeditiously as possible with their disposition and in so doing shall, in so far as practicable, apply the laws of the United States of America.

"It is understood that these agreements and understandings if confirmed by Your Excellency's Government shall be considered as forming an integral part of the treaty signed today and shall be considered as effective upon the date of the entrance into force of that treaty.

"I shall be much obliged if Your Excellency will confirm the foregoing.

"I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration."

I have the honor to confirm that the agreements and understandings which have been reached in connection with the treaty signed

today by the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of China are as set forth in the above note from Your Excellency.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

CORDELL HULL.

I certify the foregoing to be a true copy of the original note.

CORDELL HULL,
*Secretary of State.*

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in effect the treaty now before the Senate for ratification, as a matter of grace, surrenders and abrogates the extraterritorial rights which we have heretofore enjoyed in China. Under those rights the United States maintained a court in Shanghai. Because of those rights and treaty obligations we maintained naval patrols—gunboats—on the rivers of China, and a marine garrison at Tientsin, and probably at other points in China. Great Britain has also negotiated with China a similar treaty by which Britain gives up and surrenders her extraterritorial rights. Those matters have been subjects of much international interest for a great many years. The United States has on a number of occasions considered the abrogation of extraterritorial rights. They grew cut of a situation beginning about 100 years ago. In 1844 the first treaty obligation was assumed by China with respect to the extraterritorial rights. They were somewhat enlarged in 1901 as a result of the Boxer Rebellion. As an outgrowth of the Boxer Rebellion the negotiation came about which extended the extraterritorial rights.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the report of the committee, which has been printed and is available, having been placed on the desks of Senators. In taking this action the United States is performing, I think, nothing more than a real act of justice toward China. The extraterritorial rights which we have enjoyed are extraordinary. They are beyond our rights under international law. They were secured from China because of disturbed and chaotic conditions in that country, because of the fact that China was not a strong military or naval power; and under the tremendous pressure of great interests the obligations were extorted from China.

So the Committee on Foreign Relations, after considering these matters and the history of the development of these extraterritorial rights, by unanimous vote voted to ratify the convention or the treaty, and to restore to China her historic rights in the premises.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the minority side of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee I wish to join in urging that the treaty be ratified with whatever added emphasis speed can give to our action. To yield our American extraterritorial rights in China is an act of faith in the sovereignty, the power, and the stability of the Chinese Republic. It is an act of faith in the dependability and the destiny of the new China. It is an act of faith in an utterly brave war ally, which, despite the long years of conflict, and notwithstanding a tragically limited arsenal, has never faltered in its hard-pressed devotion to the fighting freedoms for which we, too, are relentlessly marching to the battle front.

This faith, Mr. President, cannot be too wholeheartedly or too swiftly asserted on the part of the people of the United States. It is the unequivocal sentiment of our common heart. To yield up our American extraterritorial rights in China and thus to trust ourselves to China's character is not only an act of good faith; it is an act of justice; it is simple justice and fair play to recognize the right of the Chinese Republic, when it shall have been triumphantly reestablished, to administer the law within its own sovereign jurisdiction, and for us no longer to claim special immunities for our nationals. Justice, Mr. President, has too long been withheld from this incorrigibly courageous people. This act of justice on our friendly part, though relatively small within itself, cannot be too promptly attested by the Senate as the harbinger of the infinitely larger and more fundamental justice which shall be China's deserved destiny when, through common effort, this war is conclusively ended and unconditionally won.

Mr. President, China is one of the indispensable and nonexpendable members of the United Nations, particularly so far as our own highly critical problems in the Far East are concerned. While subordinating our personal judgments on military strategy to our high command, upon which we must depend for all of victory, some of us have been and are deeply anxious for greater immediate attention, if humanly possible, to the battle against Japan in the far Pacific. As a matter of enlightened self-interest we should not want to be guilty of "too little and too late" in that tender zone of danger where our primary American responsibilities are particularly obvious and particularly acute.

I hope there is no doubt of China's confidence in our relentless determination to end Japanese militarism for all time. I hope that this may become increasingly obvious to both China and Japan in the near future. At the moment the Senate has a significant opportunity to make a small payment on this ultimate account. The pending treaty is a symbol of the new day. The symbol cannot shine too brightly; it cannot flash too soon.

Therefore, Mr. President, I join in supporting the unusual procedure which brings the pending treaty to immediate, and to what I hope may be, unanimous ratification.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in ratifying this treaty, the Senate will consummate a most important act. In today's turmoil we have grown accustomed to great moves, great decisions, great deeds, great victories, in breathtaking numbers, almost treading upon the heels of one another in their whirling speed. We pick up our daily newspaper knowing that we may read of a nation invaded, a fleet sent to the bottom of the ocean, an army vanquished, a continent suddenly occupied.

Yet this simple act of affirmation, done in the quiet of this Chamber, will outlive in the memory of men many of the spectacular deeds whose echoes reverberate and almost deafen our ears from day to day. Like the humble fusillade at Concord which rightly—and for the same reason—became known as "the shot heard 'round the world," this treaty will live far into the unknown future, for both are expressions of the belief in the inherent right of any people to establish and maintain a nation in equality with other nations.

Our forefathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor in support of the proposition that all men are created equal. But they did more than that. They waged a war to establish forever the right of a free people to a free and independent nation. Today we hold out the hand of friendship to another free people, and endorse and underscore on their behalf that right for which we fought so many years ago to establish for ourselves.

It is not enough to say that relinquishing our alleged extraterritorial rights is an act of justice. It is more than an attempt to end a wrong and harmful relationship. It is supremely a twofold act. First, it is a recognition of the freedom and unity which China has achieved under the leadership and the principles of Sun Yat-sen, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and the Kuomintang. It has been well said that the equality of China which we are discussing is something that belongs to China. In an address celebrating the signing of this treaty a noted American asserted:

> It is not a generous gift from America and Britain. By abolishing the unjust and unequal system of extraterritoriality, America and Britain, like Russia, which in 1919 made a declaration of policy relinquishing its extraterritoriality privileges in China, are giving legal recognition to the fact that liberty belongs to the Chinese people, that the Chinese people are capable of discharging all the responsibilities of that liberty, and that under the political organization of the Kuomintang the Chinese people have liberated themselves.

Second, we are putting into practice the principles for which we are fighting this war. The treaty is in a sense independent of the war; but in a far deeper sense it is part of the very warp and woof of the war—a step among the many steps toward the liberation of man which this Nation is taking, and will take, today chiefly with fire and steel and shells and blood, tomorrow with the strong hands of protection and aid and guaranties of peace and justice. In taking this step today, in ratifying this treaty, we advance our cause immeasurably.

Under the rain of devastating fire from which the Filipinos suffered last year, and under the lash of the present Japanese occupants of the Philippines, the great people of the Philippine Islands stand firm in their knowledge that their independence, promised by the United

States, will surely come to pass. The people of the Far East, the people of the whole world, know that our 40-year history in the Philippines is an eternal symbol of our foreign policy, our beliefs about liberty, and our complete opposition to imperialism. This treaty with China becomes another symbol of the aims and the beliefs of the American people.

I know it must be in the minds of many that the Senate is considering this treaty on the eve of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. I shall not quote him now, but I submit that almost every one of his memorable phrases throughout his career would be appropriate in connection with what we are doing today in this act of recognition of the rights which China has achieved. Mr. President, the people of the United States believe today in what Lincoln believed. This treaty is the essence of what he believed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that brief remarks made by me at a meeting in commemoration of the ending of extraterritoriality in China, a meeting given in honor of Madame Soong, be made a part of my remarks and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, Madame Soong, Mr. Vice President, and ladies and gentlemen, I am so moved by this occasion that it is going to be hard for me to speak. The consummation of this struggle I hardly expected to see occur after one great disappointment after another, but it has happened.

On August 29, 1843, that which later was called extraterritoriality was imposed upon China by treaty arrangement. The idea was not wholly bad, and the imposition of the idea was not bad at all, because we had had experience with what the text writers called extraterritoriality ever since the days of the Roman Empire, and as we learned in textbook fashion about extraterritoriality, the idea in and of itself was not bad at all. It was when extraterritoriality grew up to be extraterritoriality in China that the idea became bad, and it was, of course, the things which fell in the wake of extraterritoriality which were the bad things, and not the practice in and of itself.

The Chinese, of course, could not have been loath to letting foreigners operate under their own law in their own land because they did not recognize foreign law. The Chinese did not come into the sisterhood of nations even as a treaty making power in the fullness of what that meant until after the Boxer treaties. So that in the economy of time, we have not been backward, and China has not been backward in occupying the place she now occupies.

Her experience with extraterritoriality in the eighth and ninth centuries with the Arabians, for example, is not a bad experience. The foreigners that imposed it upon China had found that it worked well in the western part of Asia and around the Mediterranean countries and Africa, and it wasn't imposed with any degree of meanness at all. That, I think, we ought to say. We ought to know the whole history if we are going to appreciate the new position which China occupies now, being entirely freed from the unequal ban which seemed to be hers.

And now, as the Vice President has said, that she has taken a position in the sisterhood of nations and is now spoken of in wartime as one of the big four of the great Allies, each of those two places is a place which China merits and to which China will contribute her full share. No thoughtful person would ever in any way deprecate the worth of this world of Chinese culture and Chinese contributions to the welfare of man in the world.

The great problem in China is still before her. She, coming through over 30 years of a revolutionary period of adjustment, will have to struggle harder than any other country in order that she may adjust herself properly. Her struggle today is so hard and so uncertain, even for those of us who are looking from the outside in, that we wonder even about a great event like that which we are celebrating today being able to contribute much to the misery which she is now going through. But it will be a spiritual tribute and, after all, the things of the spirit are definitely and decidedly worth while. I congratulate our country, I congratulate England, on saving the point that to do that which they can do today and not wait until tomorrow is the height of genius in international relations. That we have done it causes us to feel greater hope for tomorrow.

If we can also now go forth and realize that that which we have done we have done because it is the right thing to do and not because it was the expedient thing to do—if we can make those two changes in that which we have done in our attitude, we will go forward far toward bringing that type of unity which must come to the great four and to the United Nations before we can achieve success.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, ever since the dawn of the so-called modern age, China has been beleaguered and encroached upon from all sides. This vast land, rich in the resources of nature and certain luxuries unique with the Orient, has seen her resources diminished and her people exploited by almost every other nation in the world. Weakened by internal strife, lacking in unified leadership and dynamic nationalism, this historic land of some four hundred or more million souls found herself utterly unable to resist the recurring demands for this or that concession—demands which came with equal vigor from all quarters of the globe. Great Britain, the United States, France, Italy, Japan, and many other nations all took from China the right to govern vital sections of her own land, and brought these sections under a new system of law and order nebulous and unknown to the Chinese people.

Japan, not content with diplomatic concessions, has by ruthless force and unbridled aggression, laid waste vast portions of this land and brought millions of Chinese people under the galling yoke of slavery.

These incursions by diplomacy and conquests by force continued unabated until this renowned land, once the crucible of civilization and mortal attainment, became known only as a weak, defenseless power—a fountain of wealth yet unexploited.

For more than 10 years now, China has been locked in mortal combat with the little men of Nippon; for 10 years this land, whom few respected, and whom none assisted, has fought the continuing battle for civilization. The lives China has given, the privations she has endured, and the unquestioned valor she has displayed in this unequal struggle have contributed inestimably to the final victory which must inevitably come to the United Nations.

When that victory is won, Americans must never forget the valiant struggle of these stoic people. It is not for us to turn our backs upon this harried nation. It is rather for us to abide with China, to free her of all the impositions which have been wrought upon her in the past. It is for us to drive every last vestige of Japanese influence from the continent of Asia. It is for us to see to it that all extraterritorial rights, and all other diplomatic concessions which do not recognize the sovereignty of the Chinese Republic, are forever abandoned.

When the Senate ratifies this treaty and its attendant notes, we shall mark the way; we shall serve notice upon the world that the United States harbors no dreams of conquest; that we have voluntarily withdrawn from those so-called agreements which, in effect, denied the sovereignty of China.

But this treaty does not bring our obligations to an end. We must see to it that a free and sovereign China emerges from this war—a China governed by the Chinese, in and for the interests of China, and in accordance with a system of law and justice which the Chinese people themselves must devise and administer.

Out of this war a new China must emerge, a China that is capable of preserving, in cooperation with the United Nations, a period of progressive growth and enduring peace in all the vast reaches of the far Pacific, and on the far-flung continent of Asia as well.

I shall vote for the ratification of the treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank Senators for their courtesy and consideration in respect to this matter. The ratification of this treaty is the fulfillment of a national duty we owe to China. It is no more than according to her the respect and dignity of a sovereign nation; and the people of the United States, I am sure, will heartily approve the action of the Senate in surrendering back to China the elements of her nationality and the fundamental attributes of her sovereignty. So I ask that the treaty be ratified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the treaty will be reported to the Senate.

The treaty was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein)*, That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive A, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, a treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China for the relinquishment of extraterritorial rights in China and the regulation of related matters signed at Washington on January 11, 1943, and a supplementary exchange of notes also concerning matters related to extraterritorial rights which was signed at the same time and which is made an integral part of the treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the treaty, together with supplementary exchange of notes, is ratified.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in connection with the ratification of the treaty, I wish to advise the Senate that on next Thursday we hope to have Madame Chiang Kai-shek as a guest of the Senate of the United States, at which time she will probably deliver an address. The hour has not as yet been fixed, but it will be some time early after the convening of the Senate, and I hope that all Senators will be present at the time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Chair to state that the treaty was unanimously ratified by the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair stated that, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the treaty was ratified.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that no Senator voted against the ratification of the treaty?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No Senator voted against the ratification of the treaty so far as the Chair heard.

### ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF MAXIMUM PRICES ON PORK AND BEEF PRODUCTS AND BREAD AND OTHER BAKERY PRODUCTS

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Senator from Missouri proceeds, the Chair desires to state that, the morning hour having expired, under the precedents, Senate Resolution 94, submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection, I wish to say that the Senator from Kansas and I entered into an informal agreement by which the resolution was to go over until next Monday.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think, in all fairness to the Senator from Kansas, the resolution should go over under the rule and not lose any of its parliamentary advantage and status.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood that the Senator from Kansas had agreed that the resolution go over until next Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has no knowledge of any such agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, under the rule, the resolution would go to the calendar, but I agreed with the Senator from Kansas that it might go over and preserve its status.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas, and which came over under the rule this morning, now go over under the rule without prejudice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

### THE RUML PLAN

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for about a minute and a half?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I gave out a statement to the newspapers which I desire to have go into the RECORD.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not the floor. If the Senator from Alabama will wait for a few moments, what I have in mind will only take about a minute and a half.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have received a great many communications, especially from my State, regarding my attitude on what is known as the Ruml plan, and I have a statement relative thereto which I wish to make to the Senate.

So much has been said about the cancelation of the 1942 individual income taxes under the popular slogan "pay as you go" proposal that I feel it is my duty to say that in my judgment changing our tax plan during a war, and canceling a whole year's taxes when we need them more than we ever did in our history, does not make sense to me.

If there was ever a time when we ought not to cancel a whole year's or a part of a year's taxes, it is now. These taxes are to support our boys in the armed forces all over the world. These taxes are to prevent inflation. These taxes are to preserve the safety of this Republic in the greatest crisis it ever confronted.

Our taxpayers made more money in 1942 than they ever before made in our history, or than was ever made in the history of any country. They are in a better position today to pay 1942 taxes than they will ever be in again to pay any taxes. Most of the incomes have been made out of Government work, directly or indirectly, and the taxpayers should be glad to divide these incomes with their Government in this crisis. Because of the necessities of the war, if there ever was a time when we ought not to cancel a whole year's, or part of a year's, taxes it is now.

More than three-fourths of all the individual income taxpayers for 1942 are new income taxpayers, who have not paid income taxes heretofore. To cancel these taxes would destroy the morale of this enormous number of new taxpayers. It would in like manner destroy the morale of the old-line individual income taxpayers. We should not swap tax horses in the middle of the stream. We should not cancel taxes, with the necessity facing us of clothing and feeding our boys in the armed forces all over the world.

It is impossible to pay taxes monthly for 1943, because no taxpayer will know how much money he is going to earn during the year unless he is a salaried man and receives no promotions or reductions.

"Pay as you go" is a popular slogan, and it should be adopted by preserving the 1942 tax, but letting the taxpayer pay it in monthly installments every month in 1943. The American people made in 1942 the greatest incomes they ever received. They know exactly what they owe. They should be allowed to pay in any reasonable installments they desire, but they should pay on the 1942 basis. The present system has been fully tried out during a period of more than a quarter of a century, and has been found effective.

As I look at the Ruml plan, it appears to be the beginning of a strike by income-tax payers against our Government. I do not believe in strikes of any kind against our Government. There are times when strikes are proper, but that is not true of strikes against our Government.

### INVESTIGATION OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish at this time to make a brief statement concerning the investigation directed by the Senate to be made into the military establishments in continental United States and in the Territory of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands:

Pursuant to resolutions adopted by the United States Senate on July 23 and October 9, 1942, the Special Committee to Investigate Military Establishments has just completed an inspection of the Ninth Service Command, which comprises the States of Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington, a territory covering 863,926 square miles, and 28½ percent of the entire area of the continental United States.

The objective of the Ninth Service Command is to induct, train, equip, and ship troops, with the necessary equipment, to Australia, the South Pacific islands, Alaska, and the Canal Zone.

I am happy to report to the Senate that the fathers and mothers of this country can be assured that military and naval forces are doing a magnificent job in the first three objectives in the Ninth Service and Alaska Commands. They can be assured that the boys are being well cared for. The morale is excellent. They are being trained by able leaders. They are the best fed, the best clothed, and, with few exceptions, the best housed, and, on the whole, the healthiest soldiers who have served in any army in the history of this country.

The special committee found housing conditions, in a few places, that did not measure up to the proper standard. We have noted these exceptions in our report. Some were immediately corrected; others have been corrected since we inspected the area, and we are assured that proper steps are being taken in the remainder of the cases. The really serious situations affecting the campaign in the Pacific theater of operations deal with subjects other than these troops.

The Ninth Service Command includes the States I have already enumerated. The Western Defense Command includes the same area in the continental United

States, and Alaska. Alaska was visited by the special committee in August 1942, and a report, including recommendations, was submitted to the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. President, I am sure our people would be heartened if they could see, in the Aleutians and in Alaska, young Americans working, as they were at the time we visited them, from 4 o'clock in the morning until about 10 o'clock at night, in the muskeg and tundra, asking nothing save a package of cigarettes, a bar of candy, and a letter from home. They are doing their job in a magnificent way, one which deserves to be matched by the patriotic people in the homeland.

MONOPOLISTIC TENDENCIES OF THE WAR PRODUCTION BOARD—AID FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, there has been much interest this morning in the Senate in various matters, and I have been at some pains to yield to some of my colleagues because I thought it was in the public interest to do so, particularly in reference to the unanimous ratification of the treaty with China.

I shall take the present opportunity to tell the Senate about the largest business monopoly in the history of the world, which has been created in Washington under the very eyes of the Congress. In my opinion, it threatens to impair or destroy many of the social, economic, and political gains made by the everyday citizen and businessman through constructive legislative enactments during the past decade.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator really has something to say which Senators should hear. Will the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Green | Pepper |
| Andrews | Guffey | Radcliffe |
| Austin | Gurney | Reed |
| Bailey | Hayden | Reynolds |
| Ball | Hill | Robertson |
| Bankhead | Johnson, Colo. | Russell |
| Barkley | Kilgore | Scrugham |
| Bilbo | La Follette | Smith |
| Bridges | Langer | Stewart |
| Buck | Lucas | Thomas, Idaho |
| Bushfield | McClellan | Thomas, Okla. |
| Butler | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Byrd | McKellar | Truman |
| Capper | McNary | Tunnell |
| Caraway | Maloney | Tydings |
| Chandler | Maybank | Vandenberg |
| Clark, Mo. | Mead | Van Nuys |
| Connally | Millikin | Wagner |
| Danaher | Moore | Wallgren |
| Davis | Murdock | Walsh |
| Downey | Murray | Wheeler |
| Ferguson | Nye | Wherry |
| George | O'Daniel | Wiley |
| Gerry | O'Mahoney | Willis |
| Gillette | Overton | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I shall continue from the point where I left off when the absence of a quorum was suggested.

Public Law 603 was unanimously enacted by Congress so as to mobilize aggressively the productive capacity of smaller business concerns in order successfully to carry out the war program. Previous to its enactment, several efforts had been made so that small business might obtain its rightful share of war contracts. By "small business," I mean primarily those businesses which employ from 5 to 500 men, and whose capital investment is from $10,000 to $10,000,000.

Mr. Robert Mahorney headed the first attempt with very limited success. He was followed by Floyd Odlum. Both of these men tried honestly and conscientiously to help small business. Both failed because they had no procurement powers and little or no cooperation from the armed services and the War Production Board.

Government statistics show that at the beginning of the war program there were about 175,000 firms in the United States employing millions of people, who, between them, produced about 70 percent of the Nation's manufacturing.

The remaining 30 percent was produced by 100 or more major corporations, commonly termed "blue chips of Wall Street." This peacetime-production balance was sound and provided a firm foundation for the social, economic, and political life of our democracy.

Let us see what has happened to this foundation upon which this country has grown and prospered. Big business has sifted into our bureaucratic agencies, such as the War and Navy Departments and the War Production Board. It has placed thousands of its representatives in key positions in Washington, so that today the purchasing power of our Government is funneled into the big corporations.

In 2 short years the peacetime-production balance of America has been put in reverse. Today 100 corporations enjoy 70 percent of the war and essential civilian contracts, while the 175,000 smaller companies have been reduced from their former 70-percent position to a mere 30 percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator have a list of the corporations which have received 70 percent of all the war contracts?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes; I have the list. It was given to me confidentially, but I notice that two or three of those who are on that list have been placing full-page advertisements in the newspapers, publishing the figures in more detail than those which I have.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want any confidential information to be revealed, but I think it would be interesting, not only to the Senate, but to the whole country, to have a list of the large corporations which have received 70 percent of all the war contracts which have been given out under the jurisdiction of the War Production Board, the War Department, the Navy Department, or any other department which has anything to do with the letting of contracts.

Mr. TRUMAN. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] some 3 or 4 months, perhaps 6 months ago—I do not remember the exact date—placed in the RECORD a list of the 100 companies. Their positions since then have changed somewhat, but the present list is practically the same as that which the Senator from Wyoming placed in the RECORD. I will say that the companies now at the head of the list are the same as those which were at the head of the list at that time.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a matter of fact, then, the information is not confidential.

Mr. TRUMAN. It was given to me confidentially, and that is the reason I have not made it a part of this speech for the RECORD. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader, that there have been about $85,000,000,000 worth of war contracts signed, and about $60,000,000,000 worth of those contracts have gone to the first 100 companies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that in January 1942, when we were discussing the price control bill, before its passage by the Senate, I put into the RECORD the list to which the Senator from Missouri has referred, of 100 companies which up to that time had been awarded considerably more than 70 percent of all the war contracts that had been let up to that time. It is only fair to say, however, that the percentage of the contracts awarded to the 30th of June 1942, to 100 companies, is somewhat less than it was at the beginning. Senators who were here at the time when the report of the Temporary National Economic Committee was submitted to the Senate will recall that that report also contained statistics indicating not only the concentration of war contracts in terms of companies, but the concentration in terms of geography. Following that the War Department and the Navy Department did make an attempt to award contracts — subcontracts at least — to others than the huge companies.

Only a few days ago, when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] were making a report from the Truman committee on the subject of steel, I pointed out that General Motors Corporation had received the largest amount of contracts. As I recall the figures at this time, General Motors had received about four billion eight hundred million dollars' worth of contracts.

Mr. TRUMAN. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that according to the confidential report which I have, the figure is very much larger than that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The list which I had was as of June 30, 1942. At the present time the figure is probably much greater.

I was about to say that it was stated to me by one subcontractor under General Motors that probably fifteen or twenty thousand smaller corporations had subcontracts from General Motors. I have not had an opportunity to check that figure.

Mr. TRUMAN. I believe that is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. However, I have checked this information: The Defense Plant Corporation has awarded loans for the construction of facilities and 31 facility plants for General Motors have been built with R. F. C. funds.

Mr. TRUMAN. I was about to say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that in order to accomplish the 70-percent reverse about which I was speaking, more than $10,000,000,000 of Government money has been available to these 100 companies for new plant facilities and new machine tools.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With respect to machine tools, I think it is only fair to say that the Defense Plant Corporation has made arrangements with some of the companies for the machine tools to be farmed out, loaned out, and made available to many smaller corporations.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. While I am interrupting the distinguished Senator from Missouri, allow me to refer to something which he has said with respect to Mr. Mahorney and Mr. Odlum, the first two who were called in to try to do something for small business. Both those men had plans for the distribution of contracts, and they were eliminated from the picture in order to prevent them from accomplishing the object which they had in mind.

Mr. TRUMAN. I believe that is what is happening now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. Odlum had prepared and presented what seemed to me at the time to be a very complete and efficient method for guaranteeing that small businesses of the country should be given their proper share of war contracts However, that was not the road which was followed. The War Production Board followed another road, and now we find our whole industrial structure to be stemming out of the 100 companies which on June 30, 1942, had over $39,000,000,000 of the $55,400,000,000 which had been awarded in contracts up to that time.

Mr. TRUMAN. At the present time the figure is $60,000,000,000 out of $85,000,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With respect to the confidential nature of this information I wish to say that these figures were collected by the statistical branch of the W. P. B. Mr. Stacy May is the head of that branch. The figures are available to the War Production Board. I am sure they are available to the committees of Congress. I had no difficulty in obtaining them, and I assume that if it were desired to make them a matter of public record in the Senate there would be no objection to it. I personally feel that it should be done because they are most illuminating. They point to the tremendous problem which Congress will have to face some day, and in my judgment the sooner it does so the better.

Mr. TRUMAN. I believe the Senator is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The question which I wish to ask bears directly on that point. I should like to know if the able Senator cannot obtain a release from the confidential nature of his information and put it in the RECORD? I think it is exceedingly essential that we should know just how and to whom the contracts are let. It would be very enlightening information. I think every Member of the Senate should have the information, and I am wondering if the Senator cannot obtain a release and put this very desirable information in the RECORD. If that is not done, some of the committees—of one of which I happen to be a member—will be obliged to ask for it and will be obliged to tell the W. P. B. that it is not secret information. I hope the Senator can obtain a release from the confidential nature of the information.

Mr. TRUMAN. I shall be very glad to follow the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I will say that, as acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee may subpena the figures at any time he desires to do so. I shall try to obtain an order from the War Production Board releasing the information to the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. On what theory were the figures held to be public property last January, but not at the present time?

Mr. TRUMAN. I do not know. I cannot answer the question. However, the figures were handed to me, and I was told that they were confidential.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it a fair question to ask the Senator who advised him not to give the information to the public?

Mr. TRUMAN. I was not told. I was told not to give the figures out. However, the figures were furnished to the counsel of the special committee of which I am chairman, and they were furnished to him confidentially. I believe we will be able to have the figures released.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of what the distinguished Senator from Missouri has said, and what has occurred in the past, it seems to me that the time is ripe for us to know the exact amounts which the corporations to which reference has been made are obtaining in the way of contracts.

Mr. TRUMAN. I have the exact amounts.

More than $10,000,000,000 of Government money have been made available for new plant facilities and new machine tools. The availability of such plant facilities and machine tools to the big corporations after the war will enable them to continue, and even to increase their 70-percent stranglehold on the country's industry.

For nearly 2 years I, as well as other Members of Congress, have realized this tendency and have fought it. The Smaller War Plants Corporation was set up by the Congress to aid the small businessman.

The sound plans, patient actions, and persistence of Mr. Lou Holland, as Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and also as Deputy Chairman of the War Production Board in charge of the Smaller War Plants Division, have laid a foundation from which I hoped that a great deal might be accomplished for the small businessman. This foundation includes the revision of the procurement policy of Government agencies. Most governmental purchases have always been made through the larger manufacturers of this country. Through the coordination established by Holland, means now exist whereby the facilities of the smaller manufacturer are now utilized and will be further utilized, which is in accord with the wishes of Congress.

I have known Lou Holland for many years; and a finer, more honest and sincere man never came out of the Middle West or any other part of this country. He came to Washington at the request of Mr. Nelson, of the War Production Board, and I did not know he was coming until I was asked whether he was all right.

Mr. President, at this point I request that three letters concerning the ability and standing of Mr. Holland be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF KANSAS CITY—LOU E. HOLLAND

The board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City at a meeting held December 13 adopted the following declaration:

"For the first time in the history of the chamber of commerce or its predecessor, the commercial club, a man was called to serve as president for 2 years. That man was Lou E. Holland. This necessitated changing the bylaws toward the end of his first year in order that he might be continued in office to enable him to put his ideas and plans for a great forward movement for Kansas City into operation.

"At the first meeting of the board of directors a year ago, at which he was reelected, the board for the first time went outside of its own membership for a president, guaranteeing him their enthusiastic support as a condition of his acceptance of the office.

"Mr. Holland's leadership has established a new standard for Kansas City by uniting all business interests in a way to insure a greatly increased budget for a period of 5 years. During this period, it is planned to so direct the chamber's work, particularly along industrial lines, so that new industries will be brought here in greater number, and those already here will be assisted in ways to make them more successful.

"For all of this Kansas City should be and is indebteded to Lou E. Holland for a new brand of citizenship, he having taken all the separated and indefinite ideas and ambitions of the community and welded them into one great forward movement for not only Kansas City but for the territory it serves. Under his generalship there has been presented to Kansas City a new order of things for its civic and industrial development."

CONRAD H. MANN,
JOHN HENRY SMITH,
HERBERT M. WOOLF,
*Committee on Resolutions.*

THE NEW YORK TIMES,
*Times Square, June 23, 1925.*

LOU HOLLAND, Esq.,
*President, Associated Advertising Clubs, New York.*

DEAR MR. HOLLAND: I cannot permit your retirement from the position of president of the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World without an expression of admiration for your accomplishments while holding that position. Your powers of organization, your invariable courtesy and never-failing ability to deal with complex matters achieved for the Associated Advertising Clubs the successful issue of numerous plans designed for their honor and success.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,

LOUIS WILEY.

---

LONDON, *July 7, 1925.*

LOU E. HOLLAND, ESQ.

In the House of Lords of Advertising there is no system of patronage whereby a man of the mental and moral caliber of Lou E. Holland can receive due recognition. Yet this man, the strength and sweetness of whose character is a byword among his friends, gives of his best in the interests of public service.

Lou E. Holland is no more American than I (who was born in Scotland). His qualities are universal and he belongs to the whole world.

He is the possessor of a unique and wonderful personality which immediately recalls to the mind of one who meets him the great figures of the past. To the American he recalls Lincoln; to the Frenchman, Napoleon; to the Englishman, Drake; and to the Scot, Burns. Like all great men he has a touch of the merchant adventurer, missionary, statesman, seer, and poet, and the quality of his appeal is universal.

We in Britain know him to be the embodiment of all the qualities which public men should possess. It is not too much to say that his influence permeates far beyond the limits of his own profession; great as his value is to advertising and advertising men, it does not stop there but reacts on all who come in contact with the rare and refreshing qualities of his mind.

Britain will never forget the great international advertising convention held in London in 1924—its great leader will always be inseparably associated with the memory.

W. L. CRAWFORD.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. Holland has had a great deal of experience. He is a small businessman, and he sees the situation from the small businessman's point of view. He came to Washington and found that he had no procurement powers whatever. He then made an attempt to obtain cooperation of the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission. He secured that cooperation, and was just at the point of making this a very successful venture when along came the thing which usually happens to men who try to make small business successful, and out he went.

I have another document which I shall place in the RECORD at the conclusion of my address.

Mr. Holland tackled his job in a realistic, actual, and honest manner. His results reflect credit on him, on the purchasing agencies, and on Congress.

The President signed Public Law 603 on June 11, 1942. Mr. Holland was not appointed until July 11. Two months elapsed before the War Production Board issued a general administrative order setting up the Smaller War Plants organization and giving Mr. Holland authority to function. During that interval, he worked with borrowed help and in makeshift quarters. No satisfactory explanation has yet been given to anyone for the unnecessary delay in issuing this administrative order. Despite these handicaps, Mr. Holland made progress through almost daily meetings with officials of the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Treasury. Mr. Holland believed that in order to carry out the wishes of Congress, it was necessary for him to work out with the procurement officers the policies, plans, and procedures whereby procurements could be allocated to the Smaller War Plants Division for distribution to distressed small business. Through his patient efforts he obtained cooperation and help from the procurement agencies. In fact, he succeeded in obtaining more cooperation from them than he did from the War Production Board, although with unfailing loyalty to his superiors he has never complained about the lack of cooperation within the War Production Board.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to read into the RECORD paragraph (d) of section 4 of Public Law 603 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which provides that the Corporation—and I am speaking of the Smaller War Plants Corporation of which Lou Holland was Chairman—shall have the power—

to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of the business of the Corporation; to define their authority and duties, require bonds of them, and fix the penalties thereof; and to prescribe, amend, and repeal, by its board of directors, bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its general business may be conducted and the powers granted to it by law may be exercised and enjoyed.

There is the language of the Congress with respect to the powers of the Smaller War Plants Corporation; and it is my understanding that the War Production Board has bypassed that Corporation ever since the time when it came into existence.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The War Production Board has really treated it as more or less of a stepchild, something which was to be played with, rather than giving it the power to do what Congress intended. Does the Senator agree that I am correct in that respect?

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator is absolutely correct. The War Production Board ignored the Corporation completely until it was on the verge of success in spite of all the handicaps, and now the War Production Board has broken it up.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STEWART. I have listened with interest to the contribution made by the Senator from Illinois. It seems to me that to quote from the statute which sets out the power of the Smaller War Plants Corporation shows that the Smaller War Plants Corporation has, as a matter of fact, rather comprehensive power; but the act also provides, as I recall, that the Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, who has been the Senator's friend, Mr. Holland, and who I think is a very fine gentleman, by the way, is also the Vice Chairman of the War Production Board; that is, he is second to Mr. Nelson. As I recall, when the act was passed it was insisted by several of those in the War Production Board that such provision be made—that is, that the chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation also be vice chairman of the War Production Board.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. As I see the situation, it has worked itself around to a point where a man who serves as chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and vice chairman of the War Production Board is practically in the position of serving two masters; because I say with frankness and with rather serious feeling about the matter that certain interests are being served in the War Production Board by men who are there that have deliberately undertaken to sabotage and wreck the Smaller War Plants Corporation and to destroy every single effort which that organization has tried to make and which the committee of which I have been a member has tried to make.

Mr. TRUMAN. And they are doing it very successfully.

Mr. STEWART. Yes; they are doing it very successfully.

I have my finger on some matters relative to this situation, and in the next few days I expect to make some statements on the floor about it. The Smaller War Plants Corporation has been able to allot only about $200,000,000 worth of contracts to the smaller business concerns, as we classify the smaller business concerns throughout the entire United States.

Mr. TRUMAN. For the benefit of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, let me say that I have the complete report of all the activities of the Smaller War Plants Corporation from its inception until the first day of February.

Mr. STEWART. In that event let me ask the Senator whether the figures I have stated are correct.

Mr. TRUMAN. No; they are too small. The amount is about $846,000,000.

Mr. STEWART. At any rate, less than a billion dollars. Of course, that is a lot of money; but when we take into consideration the fact that General Motors itself already has been given practically $5,000,000,000 in contracts—more than five times as much as has been received by all the smaller business concerns throughout the entire country—we must see what is happening to the small businesses. In short, they are going to hell; that is all there is to it. I am afraid it is now too late to help them, but certainly we should make every effort to do so.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator is extremely conservative in his figures.

Mr. STEWART. I think so, too.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the law as enacted by Congress the Smaller War Plants Corporation was made an integral part of the War Production Board.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not so certain that that was not a mistake.

Mr. TRUMAN. It is perfectly apparent that it was a mistake.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it would have been better for Congress to have set up the Smaller War Plants Corporation as an independent organization; but, because of the desire of the War Production Board not to have separation of jurisdiction or division of authority with respect to the letting of contracts, Congress yielded to importunities to make it a part of the War Production Board set-up. The members of the board of directors of the Corporation were to be appointed by the Chairman of the War Production Board. They were appointed by the Chairman of the War Production Board, and they took office more than 6 months ago—approximately on the 1st of July, I think.

Mr. TRUMAN. On the 11th of July, as I recall.

Mr. BARKLEY. The 11th of July. They have been in office now nearly 8 months.

Does the junior Senator from Missouri know whether the members of the War Production Board or any member of the War Production Board, including the Chairman, has ever permitted the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to come into the office of the War Production Board and sit down and across a table discuss the problems of small business or the problems of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation? Can the Senator tell us whether they have ever been allowed to sit down and across the table discuss their problems so that they might receive some encouragement and help from the War Production Board itself?

Mr. TRUMAN. I know positively that they have never had that privilege.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know one member of the Board of Directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation who tried for 2 months to secure an interview with the Chairman of the War Production Board in order to lay before him some of the problems which faced them. He never was able to get before him, but finally was able to talk to one of his subordinates, who told him that he might as well go home; that he ought to go back to his residence that they did not need him there anyway; that if they should need him, they would send for him; and that probably his family would be glad to see him come home. That is the way the members of the Board of Directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation have been treated in their effort really to carry out the intention of Congress in doing something for small business in this country.

So far as I am concerned, I want to say to the Senator from Missouri, and to the Senate, and to everyone else concerned, that I have held my tongue in my cheek as long as I am going to hold it there about this situation.

Mr. TRUMAN. I thank the Senator for his statement. It pleases me immensely.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not talking about my tongue hanging out, it is just out of my cheek. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEWART. I am glad to hear the Senator from Kentucky make such a frank statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say in that connection that it is my opinion that a majority of the members of the Board of Directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation have from the beginning desired to carry out the intention of Congress.

Mr. TRUMAN. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BARKLEY. They have desired to carry out the intention of Congress in helping to aid small business, not simply by lending money, which is only one part of their function, but by giving contracts to small business, which is what they were authorized to do by the law which Congress enacted. From the beginning the Smaller War Plants Corporation have desired to carry out the intention of Congress; but in my judgment they have been handicapped, hobbled, and restrained and have not been permitted to carry out the will of Congress in giving aid to small business.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Kentucky if he thinks that an amendment to the act which would entirely release the Smaller War Plants Corporation from the War Production Board would be the answer to the problem—legislation which would entirely divorce the Smaller War Plants Corporation from the War Production Board.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it would be a very long step toward solving the problem, because I have no doubt whatever in my own mind that the reason why the Smaller War Plants Corporation has not functioned as Congress intended that it should function is because it has not been allowed to do so by the Board of Directors of the War Production Board, under whom the directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation are supposed to serve.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I should like to interrogate the Senator from Missouri once more. Does the Senator have access in the report he mentioned to figures which indicate the number of small business concerns which have gone entirely out of business within the last 12 or 15 months?

Mr. TRUMAN. No; I do not have such figures. They are now being compiled, and will be available in a week or so.

Mr. STEWART. I have been attempting for weeks to obtain such figures, because I am anxious to make a speech on the subject, to tell of the inequities and some of the practices in connection with small business concerns throughout the country. It is my opinion that certain groups within the War Production Board—I say this by way of repetition—have undertaken absolutely to develop a complete monopoly which would have for its purpose and effect the complete destruction of small business from the Pacific to the Atlantic.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I simply want to make one observation in line with what the able majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], has said about the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Congress set up under the act five different things which the Smaller War Plants Corporation could do. It is my understanding that the Corporation has been thwarted by the War Production Board on four of them. The only thing it has been permitted to do has been to make loans. Am I correct about that?

Mr. TRUMAN. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that that is true.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Smaller War Plants Corporation has no procurement powers whatever.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I am quite sure that the Senator has a misconception about that matter. I think the Smaller War Plants Corporation has been given rather full and complete authority by the act itself.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not talking about the act. I am talking about how it has been thwarted by the War Production Board in failing to carry out the intent of Congress.

Mr. STEWART. The Smaller War Plants Corporation itself has a right to make contracts with the Government and more or less, so to speak, to sublet the contracts to the smaller businesses. As a matter of practice, the War Production Board has not permitted that to be done, where it could prevent it; and I think that one of the main difficulties has been the lack of assertion of authority on the part of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. It has had authority which it has not used.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, let me make a statement at this point in my own time. The procurement and the making of contracts is all in the hands of the war agencies; that is, the War Department appropriations are made directly to the War Department, and no one can spend that money except the War Department. The same thing is true as to the Navy Department and as to the Maritime Commission. Unless they, out of the goodness of their hearts, see fit to let the contracts out to small business, and unless they are satisfied, they can ruin any small businessman in the country by means of their inspectors. That is the reason why Mr. Holland has spent most of his time trying to get the complete cooperation of those agencies. He got the cooperation, but now they are beginning to upset the apple cart.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator has just said what I desired to make inquiry about, namely, that the War Production Board has the control of procurement for the United States Government. That

is not true. The Army and Navy and the Maritime Commission make their own procurement under their own contracts. In my own time I desire to speak about that matter, but at this time I wish to make the point perfectly clear. Unless the Smaller War Plants Corporation obtains the cooperation of those who have to do with procurement, they are stymied in seeking to help small business.

Mr. TRUMAN. And if they make contracts and do not have the money to pay under the contracts, small businesses are as badly off, if not worse off, than if they did not have the contracts.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make one further observation. I wish to join the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Tennessee in what they have said about divorcing the Smaller War Plants Corporation from the War Production Board. I think in the beginning of the Small Business Committee, and when the Senate was originally thinking about the organization of this corporation, it was felt by the Senate and the committee functioning that that was the way it should be handled.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I do not think that would do a particle of good unless the appropriations which are made by the Congress are made in such a way that the War Department and the Navy Department and the procurement agencies are forced to follow out the intent of the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. I was coming to that. I agree with the Senator, because the appropriation provided last year does not do what the Senators say should be done in order to carry out the functions of the corporation set up as a separate entity.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know whether or not we could accomplish any more for small business by separating the Corporation or divorcing it from the War Production Board; I am not sure; I do not know; but certainly little business at the present time, as the result of what the War Production Board is attempting to do to the Smaller War Plants Corporation, is getting the little end of nothing whittled down to a fine point.

Mr. TRUMAN. And we were just on the point of seeing a way out. I think that is one of the reasons for changing the present situation.

Mr. LUCAS. I think that is perhaps the real reason. In other words, small business was getting to the point where it looked like, through the President's board, some relief was going to be afforded some day.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Now they depose the chairman and, as I understand it, are ready to depose the other members of the Board, who have done an honest job in attempting to aid small business. The members of the Board of the Smaller War Plants Corporation were certainly small businessmen from different sections of the country; the members of the Board were selected because of their familiarity with the little businessman. The big businessmen are now attempting to squeeze them all out, and, as I understand, a man by the name of Colonel Johnson, a real big businessman, is about ready to take their place.

Mr. TRUMAN. I will tell all about that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Some of the functions of the Smaller War Plants Corporation are set out on page 4 of the pamphlet which contains the law. The provision reads as follows:

> In any case in which the Chairman of the War Production Board certifies to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Director of the Procurement Division of the Treasury, or to any other officer of the Government having procurement powers, that the Smaller War Plants Corporation is competent to perform any specific Government procurement contract to be let by any such officer, it shall be the duty of such officer to let such procurement contract to such Corporation upon such terms and conditions as may be specified by the Chairman of the War Production Board. Such subcontracts may be let upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may deem appropriate in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed under section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

Under that provision it is the duty of the Chairman of the War Production Board to certify to any of the departments that have anything to do with procurement that the Smaller War Plants Corporation is competent to carry out a contract or a subcontract. Does the Senator know whether any such certification has ever been made, and, if so, to what extent the Smaller War Plants Corporation has ever been certified by the Chairman of the War Production Board as being competent to carry out any contract or subcontract for materials or procurement or anything of that sort?

Mr. TRUMAN. I have a complete report on the subject, and I do not think any such certification has ever been made. I will make a complete report.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to anticipate what the Senator may have to say in his remarks, but the whole situation, the whole set-up, the whole performance in the War Production Board since the creation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation has been of such a character as to create considerable confusion in the mind not only in the Senate but of the Corporation itself as to what it can do and what it cannot do in order to carry out the intent of Congress.

Mr. TRUMAN. I think that is correct. If I may speak for a few moments I think I will cover some of the points in which the able leader of the majority is interested. As I started to say a while ago, Mr. Holland asserts that the War Production Board failed to give him control of the necessary field organization until January 7, 1943, when an administrative order was finally issued giving him authority to appoint men in the regional and district offices of the War Production Board. Prior to this time Mr. Holland had no field organization directly responsible to him. During all this time he continued his difficult and laborious work under many other handicaps. Despite this Mr. Holland made substantial accomplishments, especially during the last several months.

At no time did Mr. Nelson ever criticize Mr. Holland's administration or his activities. On the contrary Mr. Nelson, again and again, has complimented Mr. Holland on the progress being made in the face of enormous difficulties. Mr. Nelson told five members of the special committee, of which I am chairman, that he assumed full responsibility for the delay in getting the Smaller War Plants Division under way.

I am not making this statement as a report from my special committee; I am making it as the junior Senator from Missouri because I think one of the ablest constituents I have has been very badly mistreated in this set-up.

It is to Mr. Nelson's credit that he has always been quick to assume personally the responsibility for the derelictions of those by whom he is surrounded, many of whom he inherited from the old Office of Production Management, which made such a poor record. The responsibility for the delay in vesting in the Smaller War Plants Division the necessary powers and authority to act belongs on those within the War Production Board who were not desirous of seeing it made a success and who took every possible occasion to delay and hamstring the Division.

But the powers were slowly obtained and progress was being made. During last month, January 1943, $60,200,000 of prime contracts were placed with 447 distressed concerns, and $21,900,000 of subcontracts were placed with 948 small companies. These and other accomplishments are set forth in the report of Mr. Holland. I told the Senate I would make Mr. Holland's report—a chronological memorandum of the W. P. B. procedure—a part of the RECORD when I got through my remarks. I now ask unanimous consent that a copy of it be placed in the RECORD at this point, and also a memorandum dated February 2, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALLER WAR PLANTS DIVISION,
*February 11, 1943.*

To Donald M. Nelson, Chairman, War Production Board.

From Lou E. Holland, Deputy Chairman, War Production Board.

REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF SMALLER WAR PLANTS DIVISION AND SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION DURING THE LAST 60 DAYS

It is with a good deal of pleasure that I submit this report of our activities during the last 60 days. The agreements and understandings which we perfected with the armed services and other Government procurement agencies as a result of long and arduous negotiations are now proving their worth. Contract placements during the past 60 days and especially during the past few weeks clearly indicate that these negotiations have provided a firm foundation for an increasing volume of business which is rapidly being built.

The operations of both the Division and the Corporation have gathered momentum.

Many vexatious problems with which these organizations were confronted during their formative days have been cleared away. And many fields which were not originally open to us we have now entered with confidence.

1. PRIME CONTRACTS TAKEN BY THE SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

The Smaller War Plants Corporation, acting pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (f) of the act approved June 11, 1942 (Public Law 603, 77th Cong.), has taken its first prime contract. It is with the Federal Public Housing Authority for metal and wood furniture for dormitory apartments, single house dwellings, multifamily dwellings, infirmaries, nurseries, and cafeterias, valued at $20,000,000. At the present time Grand Rapids, Mich., is one of the more distressed cities in the country and has a large bank of unemployed, many of whom own their own homes and are now out of work as a consequence of the necessary curtailment of civilian furniture production and cancelation of other war contracts in that area. This prime contract was taken by the Corporation to insure our ability to take care of the need of Grand Rapids for contracts on a wholesale basis as an experimental project designed to relieve community distress occasioned by the war.

The subcontracts for the production of the items called for by this prime contract have not yet been awarded. Our next bimonthly report will include the names of the subcontractors and the amounts involved.

2. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO SMALL CONCERNS

The Smaller War Plants Corporation by February 6, 1943, had received 230 applications for financial assistance totaling $22,458,523.57. Loans made through December 5, 1942, by the Smaller War Plants Corporation were reported to the Congress, as required by section 5 of the Smaller War Plants Act, Public Law 603, Seventy-seventh Congress, in the report of December 11, 1942. During the period December 6, 1942, through February 6, 1943, both dates inclusive, agreements to make the following 38 loans, totaling $2,568,770, have been entered into by the Corporation:

| | |
|---|---|
| Acro Electric Co., Cleveland, Ohio | $85,000 |
| Annville Stone Co., Lebanon, Pa | 100,000 |
| Beechwood Precision Tools, Inc., New Rochelle, N. Y | 12,000 |
| Breeders Supply Co., Watkins Glen, N. Y | 11,000 |
| Carworth Farms, Inc., New City, N. Y | 28,000 |
| Champion Gauge Co., Carona, L. I., N. Y | 20,000 |
| Delloy Metals Corporation, Philadelphia, Pa | 10,000 |
| Dixie Shirt Co., Spartanburg, S. C | 100,000 |
| Eastern Handle, Richmond, Va | 10,000 |
| Eugene Greene, Inc., New York City | 14,000 |
| Everlasting Knitting Mills, Philadelphia, Pa | 10,000 |
| G & M Screw Products Co., Long Island City, N. Y | 20,000 |
| Griffin, Palmer A. d. b. a., Griffin's Mill, Kingman, Maine | 16,500 |
| Haslett Chute & Conveyor Co., Oaks, Pa | 30,000 |
| R. J. Heyne Machine Shop Co., Phoenix, Ariz | 10,000 |
| Hunt Bros. & Rasin, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa | 34,000 |
| Inland Manufacturing Co., Inc., Kansas City, Mo | 44,000 |
| Leitch Manufacturing Co., Middlesex, N. J | 50,000 |
| Medical Fabrics, Inc., Newark, N. J | 15,000 |
| Merrimac Mills Co., Methuen, Mass | 450,000 |
| Meyer Corrugated Box Co., Cleveland, Ohio | 5,000 |
| New Goodwin Preserving Co., Louisville, Ky | 125,000 |
| Northern Indiana Producers, Inc., Valparaiso, Ind | 50,000 |
| Norwood Engineering Co., Florence, Mass | 50,000 |
| Pennsylvania Aircraft Instrument School, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa | 5,000 |
| The Penn Tile Works Co., Aspers, Adams County, Pa | 5,000 |
| Renown Stove Co., Owosso, Mich | 100,000 |
| Ramsey Package Corporation, Suffolk, Va | 125,000 |
| Riverside Boat Yard, Inc., Miami, Fla | 7,500 |
| The Standard Sand & Gravel Corporation, Fairfax, Va | 4,000 |
| The Strickland Aircraft Corporation, Topeka, Kans | 98,770 |
| The Strippit Corporation, North Tonawanda, N. Y | 50,000 |
| Talbot Refining Co., San Francisco, Calif | 3,500 |
| United States Plating Co., Cincinnati, Ohio | 7,500 |
| Van Buren-Madawaska Corporation, Portland, Maine | 700,000 |
| Victor Lumber Co., Allentown, Pa | 12,000 |
| Wellward Tool, Inc., Detroit, Mich | 10,000 |
| Harold G. and J. H. Wyse, d. b. a., Wyse Laboratories, Dayton, Ohio | 141,000 |

Together with the 12 loans totaling $605,500, reported in the third bimonthly report, the Smaller War Plants Corporation to date has approved a total of 50 loans for an aggregate of $3,174,270. Four other applications for loans totaling $497,000 have been approved subject to conditions which have not been complied with by the applicant. The names of the concerns and the amounts of these loans will be included in a subsequent report.

In addition to making loans, the Corporation is empowered "to purchase or lease such land, to purchase, lease, build, or expand such plants, and to purchase or produce such equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or supplies as may be needed to enable the Corporation to provide small business concerns with such land, plants, equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or supplies as such concerns may require to engage in the production of such articles, equipment, supplies, or materials," and "to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of to any small business concern any such land, plants, equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or supplies."

To February 6, 1943, the Corporation has approved the purchase of $559,780.50 worth of equipment and facilities for lease to 14 concerns. The concerns involved and the amounts of equipment to be leased to them follow:

| | |
|---|---|
| Argo Lamp Co., Philadelphia, Pa | $6,000.00 |
| Crown Machine & Tool Co., Fort Worth, Tex | 60,000.00 |
| Eastman Products, Dallas, Tex | 25,000.00 |
| Harvey-Whipple, Inc., Springfield, Mass | 22,250.00 |
| L. V. Johnston Tool Co., Nashville, Tenn | 49,575.00 |
| Leitch Manufacturing Co., Middlesex, N. J | 138,136.00 |
| Henry F. Meyer, d. b. a. Aircraft Parts Manufacturing, Nashville, Tenn | 4,750.00 |
| The George P. Pilling & Son, Philadelphia, Pa | 30,625.50 |
| Reliable Tool & Machine Works, Milwaukee, Wis | 40,615.00 |
| Renown Stove Co., Owosso, Wis | 101,475.00 |
| Roberts Gordon Appliance Corporation, Buffalo, N. Y | 4,129.00 |
| Roller-Smith Co., Bethlehem, Pa | 40,000.00 |
| Henry J. Smith, d. b. a. Smith Devices, Philadelphia, Pa | 19,225.00 |
| R. G. Wright Co., Inc., Buffalo, N. Y | 18,000.00 |

To enable the Smaller War Plants Corporation to provide small business concerns with equipment, facilities, machinery, material, supplies, rights, and services required to engage in war production, the Corporation has let a contract to the Pedersen Arms Corporation, Springfield, Mass., for the development and production of drawings and specifications for the fixtures, tools, and gages needed for the manufacture by small business concerns of a rifle. This contract is let at cost, without payment of a fee, and cost is estimated at approximately $100,000.

3. CONTRACTS ARRANGED BY THE SMALLER WAR PLANTS DIVISION

Although the War Production Board Smaller War Plants Division has no procurement powers, it does recommend small business concerns and assist them in their negotiations to obtain contracts from Government procurement agencies. To February 5, 1943, 1,191 firms recommended by the Division had received prime contracts totaling $195,400,000.

The overwhelming portion of these contracts have been consummated in the last 60 days, although in some cases the Division has been actively engaged for several months in the negotiations leading to them. The number of small business concerns obtaining contracts through our direct efforts in the last 60 days has increased more than fourfold, and the dollar volume more than sixfold over what we were able to previously report.

Of the contracts arranged by the Division to date, 84 percent are with the various supply services of the Army. More than half the dollar volume of the Army contracts are with the Ordnance Department. Both the Quartermaster Corps and the Air Corps are, however, the source of considerable additional volumes. The Navy bureaus, all of which are represented, account for 11 percent and other procurement agencies, principally Treasury Procurement, for 5 percent of the total dollar volume.

As a result of the Division's activities all of the wooden cargo truck bodies scheduled for 1943 are being produced in plants operated by small business concerns. During 1942 most of these bodies were produced by chassis builders. Late in the year educational orders were obtained by the Division for 37 concerns. The 1943 orders were placed with 28 of the 37 participating in the educational orders. The importance of this shift goes beyond the fact that small concerns have been given business which they can handle. It has also operated to change the locality of the work from overcrowded production centers to areas distressed through lack of employment.

The Division also was instrumental in the placing of contracts for 262 barges with 9 concerns located along the Mississippi River, the Gulf and the Atlantic coasts. An additional 25 barges have been reserved for a production group made up of small boatbuilding yards located in Florida.

The contracts arranged by the Division include a wide variety of items, including textiles, medicines, hardware, small tools, ordnance, aircraft and ship parts, and packaging.

During the past 60 days the placement of more than $75,000,000 in subcontracts has been reported to our Washington office.

4. INCREASED OPERATIONS THROUGH FIELD OFFICES

On February 1, 1943, operations were started on a program worked out jointly with the Services of Supply of the United States Army for decentralizing our prime contract placement activities. Previously, distressed firms capable of handling specific procurements have been recommended by the Washington office of the Division to the Washington office of the procurement services. Under the new program, recommendations of small distressed firms will be made by our regional offices directly to the field offices of the various divisions of the Services of Supply.

After the Division obtains a specific procurement from one of the services of supply, it is allocated among the 12 War Production Board regions according to the available capacity and needs of the distressed

plants in the various regions. It is then up to the Deputy Regional Directors for Smaller War Plants to obtain, through their district offices, information on the capacities and needs of distressed plants located in their region and to recommend such of these distressed plants as are capable of producing the procurement item in question directly to the procurement services' field offices through a Division liaison man stationed there.

Although this plan has been in operation for only a few days, there has already been allocated, from among the procurements which have arisen during this short interval, to the various War Production Board regions procurements totaling $14,400,000.

5. ACTIVITIES OF THE PROCUREMENT AGENCIES

Pursuant to section 2 (7) of the Small Business Act (Public Law 603, Seventy-seventh Congress), I have requested the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Maritime Commissioner to provide each month a tabulation of the contracts let by their respective agencies, classified by the size of concern to which the contract is let. The size of the concern is to be measured by the number of employees.

While these tabulations are being prepared by the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission results are not yet available. Such tabulations have been obtained from the seven supply services of the Services of Supply and the Air Corps.

During the months of November and December 1942 seven supply services of the Services of Supply awarded 61,507 contracts for a total value of $3,543,447,000. Of this total 43,065 contracts for $846,177,000 were awarded to firms employing fewer than 500 employees. This means that during these 2 months 24.9 percent of the dollar volume of price contracts let by these seven supply services went to concerns employing fewer than 500 employees.

Since the major procurement of the Air Corps are complete planes, it appears that small concerns can best participate in aircraft production through subcontracting. Only a small fraction of the total Air Corps procurement is suitable for production in plants operated by smaller business concerns on a prime contract basis. During November and December 1942 a total of 1,314 contracts amounting to $76,789,000 were awarded to concerns employing fewer than 500 employees. For the 2 months this represented only 2.5 percent of the total dollar volume of contracts awarded by the Air Corps. It is significant, however, that the share of the total dollar volume of contracts going to firms employing fewer than 100 employees increased by 175.0 percent from November to December.

6. DIVISION REPRESENTATION ON POLICY BOARDS

On January 13, 1943, General Administrative Order No. 2-68 was amended to include among the membership of the Procurement Policy Board a member appointed by the deputy chairman on Smaller War Plants. This board is concerned primarily with the policy problems which simultaneously involve more than one procurement agency and continuously reviews the performance of the respective agencies in carrying out policy determinations. The principal policy determinations regarding procurement are embodied in directive No. 2, amended. This directive issued by the chairman of the War Production Board establishes the order of importance of the criteria which must be considered in the placement of contracts by all Government procurement agencies.

One of the activities of the War Production Board Procurement Policy Division was to establish by Division Administrative Order 509-4, dated January 11, 1943, a Critical Labor Area Appeals Board. Two representatives of the Smaller War Plants Division are included on this Board. Its function is to advise the Director of Procurement Policy with respect to request that he authorize the placement of war-procurement contracts with particular firms or in particular localities located in areas which have been certified by the War Manpower Commission to be areas of acute labor shortages. The absence of such an appeals board would mean that plants located in critical labor areas, as defined by the War Manpower Commission, would be precluded from obtaining contracts except in the special situations where comparable productive facilities were not elsewhere obtainable.

On invitation the Smaller War Plants Division appointed a representative to sit on the Controlled Materials Board. This Board reviews and advises in the development of revisions of the controlled materials plan, and in the developments and procedures for effectuating the plan. It is not necessary to elaborate on the importance of materials to small concerns holding war contracts.

7. SPECIAL PROGRAMS

In several cases small concerns can best participate in war production through subcontracting and this has required the establishment of procedures in organizational units for handling these subcontracting activities on a Nation-wide rather than a district or regional basis.

We have established, in cooperation with the Navy, a shipbuilding unit located in Boston. It is the duty of this unit to assist in selecting from the requirements of the shipyards working on the Government shipbuilding program items suitable for subcontracting in the various War Production Board regions. Small concerns can effectively participate in the production of the many components of a ship although they are not in a position to undertake the construction of a complete ship.

About the same situation obtains in the Air Corps although in this case much Government-furnished equipment can be undertaken by small concerns on a prime contracting basis. Consequently, we have established a branch of our Washington office at Wright Field. This branch is in constant contact with the Army Air Corps procurement officers and works with them both in selecting items suitable for production by small concerns either on a prime or subcontracting basis.

The Navy Department has examined its list of requirements for the coming months and selected a list of items which they believe suitable for production by small concerns. The Smaller War Plants Division has transmitted this list to its field offices and is obtaining information on the availability of facilities for the production of these items, which are valued at approximately $67,000,000.

8. SMALL PLANTS IN CRITICAL LABOR AREAS

As a result of my appearance before the War Manpower Commission and repeated negotiations with procurement officials, smaller concerns located in critical labor areas are now systematically allowed to receive war contracts when (1) their current number of employees is 100 or less, and (2) when the circumstances surrounding the award are such that the Smaller War Plants Division certifies the concern for the contract.

9. DISTRESSED CONCERNS

In a recent series of news releases we asked all distressed concerns to provide us with simple, basic information regarding their present business condition and their ability to produce war or essential civilian products. The responses have been numerous. We are now organizing this information with a view to directing the attention of officers of the Government having procurement powers to the productive capacity and needs of plants operated by smaller concerns as directed in section 2 (2) of the act approved June 11, 1942 (Public Law 603, 77th Cong.). Of necessity the availability of this information is restricted to officers of the Government directly concerned with the placement of contracts.

---

FEBRUARY 2, 1943.

Subject: Examination of files of the War Production Board relating to the Smaller War Plants Division and Corporation.

Files of the following divisions of the War Production Board have been examined by committee investigators:

1. Smaller War Plants Division.
2. Smaller War Plants Corporation.
3. Office of Assistant to the Chairman (Mr. Sidney J. Weinberg).
4. Files of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the War Production Board (Donald M. Nelson, William L. Batt).
5. Program Vice Chairman (Ferdinand Eberstadt).
6. Files of Director General for Operations (Ernest Kanzler and Curtis Calder).
7. Files of Deputy Director General for Operations in charge of field offices (Wade T. Childress).
8. Planning committee (Robert R. Nathan, Chairman).

The files of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and Smaller War Plants Division of the War Production Board disclosed the following:

On June 11, 1942; Public Law 603 was enacted. This law created the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the principal purposes of which were to accept prime contracts and subcontract them among small business, and negotiate loans with small business firms and plants throughout the country, thereby bringing such organizations into war production and production for essential civilian needs; and created a deputy chairman of the War Production Board to head up a Smaller War Plants Division in that agency.

On July 10, 1942, Mr. Lou Holland was selected by the Chairman of the War Production Board to become Deputy Chairman of the War Production Board on Smaller War Plants. Mr. Holland was also selected as a director of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. The first meeting of the Smaller War Plants Corporation was held on July 16, at which time Mr. Holland was elected Chairman of the Corporation by the board of directors. Mr. William S. Shipley was elected Vice Chairman of the Corporation, the other members of which were Mr. S. Abbott Smith, Mr. Albert M. Carter, and Mr. James T. Howington. At the first meeting of the board of directors the general organization was discussed and preliminary plans were made for formulating policies.

On July 28, at Mr. Holland's request, Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, called a meeting attended by the following representatives of Government departments:

War: Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary; Brig. Gen. William Harrison, Director of Procurement.

Navy: James G. Forrestal, Under Secretary; Admiral Robinson; Capt. W. A. Buck; Frank B. Folson.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Jesse Jones and John Snyder.

United States Maritime Commission: Col. W. Rockwell and Charles E. Walsh, Jr.

At this meeting Mr. Holland stated the objectives of the Smaller War Plants Division and the Smaller War Plants Corporation. He stressed the fact that the law did not give him any procurement powers and that the success of the smaller-plants program would have to depend upon the complete cooperation of the procuring agencies of the Government.

The offer of fullest cooperation was extended by the officials from each of the agencies present at the meeting and each agency designated certain officials to work with Mr. Holland in developing an over-all plan of operation. Daily meetings were held for a

period of approximately 1½ months during which each agency presented suggested plans and discussed the most appropriate methods by which the program could be carried forward.

In order to supplement the views of the representatives of the American agencies, Mr. Holland requested that an official of the British Government having the most knowledge of the small business problems in England be brought to the United States and asked to participate in the meetings being held for the purpose of formulating the program. Mr. Holland was of the opinion that such an official could make a real contribution in developing the program. Mr. A. Hedley Williams arrived from England in time to attend the major portion of the meetings during this period.

Coincident with the meetings held with representatives of the procuring agencies, Mr. Holland sought to have the established procedure of the War Production Board regarding the creation of a new division carried out. This procedure requires that the chairman must issue an order creating such a division and outlining its duties and functions. Nine drafts of such an order were prepared for submission to the Chairman of the War Production Board before one was finally approved on September 8, 1942. This was identified as Administrative Order 2–51. The draft which was finally approved, however, was criticized by Mr. Holland, who thought it was inadequate to accomplish the mandates of Congress contained in Public Law 603 creating the Smaller War Plants Corporation. The points upon which Mr. Holland disagreed with other officials of the War Production Board in the original draft were:

1. Control of Smaller War Plants Division field offices.

2. The existing Facilities Branch of the War Production Board.

3. Maintenance of personnel of the Contract Distribution Branch and the Bureau of Finance.

In connection with the control of field offices Mr. Holland took the position that unless his field men reported directly to him the projected program could not succeed. He was overruled by the Administrative Order 2–51.

It appears, however, that Mr. Holland's contention was sound as on January 7, 1943, the Chairman of the War Production Board signed an order amending 2–51, by which amendment control of field activities and personnel were placed directly under the Deputy Chairman in charge of the Smaller War Plants Division.

The duties and functions of the Facilities Branch of the War Production Board were and are now identical with those outlined in Public Law No. 603. This has resulted in a duplication of work by that branch and the Smaller War Plants Division which has not yet been remedied. On August 13, 1942, Mr. Holland wrote to Mr. Nelson and asked for a decision regarding who should have control of the Facilities Branch. No reply was received.

The original draft of Administrative Order 2–51 provided that the entire personnel of the Contract Distribution Branch and the Bureau of Finance should be taken over by the Smaller War Plants Division. This was finally changed in the last draft to provide that only the duties and functions of the above-mentioned offices would be taken over by the Smaller War Plants Division. The objection to incorporating the personnel of these offices in the Smaller War Plants Division was twofold, namely, the lack of qualifications on the part of a large number of these people and the feeling that because of previous unsatisfactory relationships with procuring agencies their approach to the procurement offices would upset the cordial relations in the process of development at that time by the deputy chairman of the Smaller War Plants Division.

After the duties and functions of the Smaller War Plants Division had been set forth in Administrative Order No. 2–51 on September 8, 1942, daily conferences with representatives of the various branches of the Government interested in procurement were continued and on September 24, 1942, formal agreements were reached with the War Department and the Maritime Commission outlining the manner in which these departments would cooperate with the Smaller War Plants Division in spreading contracts among the smaller companies of the country. A similar agreement was reached with the Navy Department on October 27, 1942. The Navy had objected to certain language in the agreements entered into by the other agencies. These agreements were used by the departments mentioned as the basis for directives which were issued to their procurement officers all over the country, and it was not until such directives had been issued that any aggressive steps could be taken to channel Government contracts to small business.

In Administrative Order No. 2–51, it was provided that the Deputy Chairman of the War Production Board in charge of the Smaller War Plants Division would be a member of the committee on concentration of production. The Smaller War Plants Division also endeavored to obtain representation on the Procurement Policy Board of the War Production Board, but it was not until January 11, 1943, that such representation was granted. A similar effort has been made to obtain representation on the Controlled Materials Board. While these efforts started in August 1942, no adequate representation has been obtained as yet.

In his biweekly report dated January 12, 1943, to the Chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Holland, Deputy Chairman, said that two of the major impediments to the successful operation of the Smaller War Plants Division at the end of the year have now been removed. He was referring to the General Administrative Order No. 2–75, of January 7, which gave the Smaller War Plants Division control over their field offices and to the Division Administrative Order No. 509–4, dated January 11, which gave the Smaller War Plants Division representation on the critical labor areas appeals board. He also pointed out that the next important step to be taken would be to provide the Smaller War Plants Division a definite place in the formulation of policies governing the Controlled Materials Board.

On January 19, 1943, the Chairman of the War Production Board announced at his press conference that Col. R. W. Johnson had been appointed Vice Chairman of the War Production Board in charge of Smaller War Plants Division. At the time he praised the work that had been done by Mr. Holland and stated his hope that he would remain as Colonel Johnson's assistant.

Mr. TRUMAN. An announcement was made through the White House on January 19 that a Col. Robert Wood Johnson had been appointed to the position of Vice Chairman of the War Production Board and Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Mr. Sidney Weinberg, of the Wall Street banking firm of Goldman Sachs & Co., acting as personnel adviser for the War Production Board, had been seeking this appointment for Colonel Johnson last June. Colonel Johnson may be a fine gentleman for all I know, although I distinctly was not impressed by the reports concerning Colonel Johnson which I found had been made to Sidney Weinberg by his own investigators.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the able Senator is not informed, is he, as to whether or not the President personally wanted to approve the appointment or in reality to appoint Colonel Johnson to this position some time ago, but Colonel Johnson was not disposed even to accept it; so that the initiative in this matter came as much from the President as it did from Mr. Weinberg?

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator is much more in the confidence of those who know about that than I am. My files show the whole proceeding.

But whether Johnson is or is not qualified, I can see no reason for replacing Holland who has been successful in obtaining the cooperation of the procurement agencies, which is vitally necessary for the success of any program in the interest of small business, just when he has been granted the power to achieve the job that Congress wants done.

Moreover, Mr. Johnson is one of those businessmen who, although never a Regular Army officer, has been made a colonel in the Ordnance Corps, and as such is subject to orders from the Service of Supply of the Army, the most important procurement agency with which he will have to deal.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that Johnson is still in the Army and under Army orders?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes; he is still wearing an Army uniform and still subject to the orders of the Chief of Ordnance.

Mr. LUCAS. And, as a colonel in the Army, he is now accepting the job of vice president of the War Production Board?

Mr. TRUMAN. He is signing all his mail "Colonel, Ordnance, Vice Chairman, War Production Board."

Mr. LUCAS. How could that be? How a man could serve in such a dual capacity I cannot understand.

Mr. TRUMAN. Neither can I.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. It is my advice that Colonel Johnson stated this morning that he was on assignment to this job while he holds his present commission as a colonel in the Army, having been for a number of years, some 10 or 12 years, a Reserve officer in the Army; and he has been back in the service in uniform for about a year. I understand no longer than this morning he stated, in response to inquiry, that, while he still is assigned to this position and retains his status as an Army officer, if he finds it conflicts with the performance of his duties in the way he thinks proper, he is prepared to resign his commission in the service.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Illinois may be pardoned a further observation, I think Colonel Johnson ought to resign now because I cannot see how——

Mr. TRUMAN. Will the Senator allow me to elaborate on that point?

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. TRUMAN. I want to yield to all Senators, but I desire to make a point in connection with this vital matter, and then I desire the Senator from Illinois to continue his remarks because they will fit in with what I have to say.

I do not object to businessmen being retained in the Army and Navy to handle procurement because we all know that procurement is a business function and not a military function at all, and that only businessmen can handle the job of placing orders and obtaining factory production. But I do object to such men parading in uniform. I believe that uniforms should be reserved for the purpose for which they were adopted; namely, to distinguish the combatants on the field of battle.

There is no more reason for putting an officer's uniform on a businessman ordering trucks for subsequent Army use than there is for putting a soldier's uniform on the mechanics in the factory producing the trucks. These so-called officers are not interested in military or naval careers and, of course, expect to take their jobs back after the war. Some of them still draw pay or other emoluments from the big companies from which they came.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not take any issue whatsoever with the distinguished Senator from Missouri, but he is certainly misjudging a very patriotic man when he levels criticism at Bob Johnson.

Mr. TRUMAN. I do not know Mr. Johnson personally, I will say to the Senator. I never saw him more than once.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will permit me to make a brief statement now, I shall comment at length a little later. Colonel Johnson was a reserve officer, but in active business. He was invited to come to Washington to take a responsible assignment. He came a little over a year ago. He was detached from the office here and sent to New York, to the New York Ordnance Office, to clean up and to clear up a situation there which had grown somewhat unsatisfactory from the standpoint of the Army.

I happen to know that he was not an applicant, and had no desire on earth to be assigned to the work of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. He came here, having gone definitely into the Army, and having been in service some months, he was detached for this particular service, and is here performing it. Mr. Johnson is a citizen of New Jersey. He is not a resident of my State.

Mr. TRUMAN. I understand he is a potential candidate for the Republican nomination for governor in New Jersey.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; Mr. Johnson is a Democrat. If all the Senator's information is as incorrect as that, then he is very badly informed.

Mr. TRUMAN. I understand he is a liberal Republican, that he is a New Deal Republican.

Mr. GEORGE. He is not a resident of my State, as I have said, but he is the managing head of Johnson & Johnson, the makers of Red Cross surgical and hospital supplies.

I undertake to say that Mr. Johnson is a very liberal-minded man. I have known him for a long time. He is not always agreed with me with respect to policies. He is definitely supporting the liberal government in New Jersey, and he is not a candidate for any office. I am quite sure he would never become a candidate while he wore the uniform of the American Army.

Mr. President, I do not know what information may have come to the committee, but whatever record leaps to light, Bob Johnson never will be ashamed. There is not a more honorable man in any vocation or calling in these United States.

Mr. TRUMAN. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I am making no attack on the character or ability of Colonel Johnson. I am attacking the system which has placed Colonel Johnson in what I think is a very embarrassing position.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not see that he is placed in an embarrassing position, and that is what I wanted to say. He is in the Army.

Mr. TRUMAN. He has no business in this job, if he is going to stay in the Army. That is my opinion, and that has been the thing I have been fighting ever since I have been chairman of the special committee. I think this is a civilian program. Production and procurement is entirely a civilian program.

Mr. GEORGE. That may be true, Mr. President. Congress created the program. But an officer in the Army, and with special fitness for a particular job, who goes where he is assigned in response to an assignment, in my opinion should not be criticized because of that fact. I cannot quite appreciate such a ground of criticism. If there is anyone in this country who can do a job in this position, I will not say Colonel Johnson is the only one, but I will say that he is one of those men who can do the job. That is why he is in the position, not from his choice, not from his desire.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I understand the criticism of my colleague, it is not directed at Colonel Johnson personally.

Mr. TRUMAN. Not at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no reflection on Colonel Johnson's capacity as a private businessman or as an Army officer. As I understand my colleague's criticism, it is directed to the fact that it has been an acknowledged policy of the United States Army to put the small businessman out of commission, that it has been the acknowledged policy of the War Department to let their contracts to a few big contractors, that the policy of the W. P. B., as announced, as enacted by Congress in setting up the agency of which Mr. Holland was the head, was to counteract that policy and undertake to preserve small business.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If I understand my colleague's position correctly, it is that no Army officer, no matter how honorable, can possibly act under the War Department and carry out the purposes of the small business agency which Congress thought it was setting up.

Mr. TRUMAN. How can he place an order for a piece of ordnance, if the major general who is the Chief of Ordnance tells him to put it somewhere else? He has not a chance to do anything except what he is ordered to do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know Colonel Johnson——

Mr. TRUMAN. Nor do I. He came to see me once, and asked me not to make this speech.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know Mr. Holland; so far as I recall, I never saw him; but I have heard some things which disturbed me a little about Colonel Johnson's attitude toward small business, and I hope the rumors are not well founded, if he is to be the head of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

As I understand, Colonel Johnson inherited Johnson & Johnson, or a large part of it, which is the largest concern in the world manufacturing surgical appliances and surgical supplies of various kinds. I understand he was in charge of the New York area for some six months in the distribution of contracts; that the Chief of the Quartermaster Department, General Somervell, had sent over to New York recommendations concerning the awarding of contracts to small corporations, under the Act of Congress and in the pursuance of the policy which was supposed to be the purpose of Congress in the enactment of the law, but that Colonel Johnson diverted those contracts from small corporations to large corporations within that area. I do not know whether those rumors are correct. I do not wish in any way to charge Colonel Johnson with any such diversion of the instructions of what I suppose would be regarded as his superior Army officer, but if that has been his attitude, it would disturb me considerably.

Mr. TRUMAN. I cannot verify what the Senator has said. I never have heard of that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Can the Senator give me any information about it?

Mr. TRUMAN. I cannot answer the Senator, because I have no information on the subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator another question. I am also informed—and I do not know whether the information is correct—that even today a conference has been in progress looking toward the elimination of all the members of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and the substitution of Army officers and dollar-a-year men for them on the board to conduct the affairs of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Mr. TRUMAN. I am reliably informed that the Senator is correct in that surmise, that it is intended to fill the direc-

torate with dollar-a-year men, and that the chief assistants of Colonel Johnson will be Army and Navy men, I am informed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a statement?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In response to what the able senior Senator from Kentucky just said by way of inquiry, I may say that the chairman of the Small Business Committee, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], being obliged to be absent from the Senate today, asked me, as a member of the committee, to attend to this matter when it came up, and to express some of the views he personally entertains, and state some of the knowledge he has gained as chairman of the Small Business Committee.

I may say that it is my information from that source that Colonel Johnson, instead of diverting directions for procurement to larger business enterprises, increased the number of subcontractors in the New York office, and worked out a tying of the New York Ordnance Office with the Smaller War Plants Corporation in a way to elicit the commendation of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

I can attest that the Senator from Montana, and I know other members of the committee, feel very favorably toward Colonel Johnson, although they have no disparagement whatever to offer against Mr. Holland. It is their advice from other sources, as it is my advice from them, that the President several months ago asked Colonel Johnson if he would not take this job, and that he declined it, but later on he did agree to accept it, so that Colonel Johnson is not in any sense a seeker after the place.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say, if I may, that I do not think the President ought to be brought into this matter at all. I think this is a conspiracy on the part of the War Production Board to break up the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and I think it was engineered in Sidney Weinberg's office, because he wanted Colonel Johnson put in there in the first place. I do not think the President did anything but follow the advice of the persons upon whom he relied when this appointment was made.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does not the Senator know from his own files that that is the fact?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is the fact.

Mr. LUCAS. When back last June Weinberg wrote Johnson to that effect?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Apparently the President did not know anything at all about it at that time.

Mr. TRUMAN. I do not think he did.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Discussion occurred a moment ago as to the intent of the new organization to place Army officers alongside Colonel Johnson as members of this Board.

Mr. TRUMAN. No; not as members of the Board. As I understand, they expect to put dollar-a-year men in as members of the Board, but Colonel Johnson's assistants will be men in uniform from the Army and the Navy. They will be under his direction. They will not be members of the Board.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I agree completely with both Senators from Missouri with respect to the dual capacity in which Johnson is operating, as vice president of the War Production Board and head of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Colonel Johnson cannot serve two masters and he should resign from one place or the other. He should not accept both positions.

With respect to small business, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri, if he knows, what the capital stock is, for instance, of Johnson & Johnson?

Mr. TRUMAN. I cannot answer the question. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has left the Senate Chamber. I thought perhaps he might be able to answer. I can get that information, however, and place it in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to read into the RECORD what Congress intended when it passed the legislation setting up this Corporation:

> The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of five directors, deemed to be familiar with the problems of small business, to be appointed by the Chairman of the War Production Board. The board of directors shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among the members of the board.

It is my understanding that Holland was selected by the members of the board originally appointed by Mr. Nelson, and I am wondering if the present board has had anything to do with the selection of Johnson as the new chairman to succeed Holland.

Mr. TRUMAN. No; not a thing in the world.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will my colleague yield again?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is a fact, is it not, that the only criticism of Mr. Holland that has come from any source whatever is simply on the ground that he thought Congress actually meant what it said, and in carrying out the intent of the Congress in essence he was actually trying to help small business.

Mr. TRUMAN. I think that is true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There has been no criticism of lack of zeal on his part. As I understand, there is nothing in anything he has done that could be properly criticized, except that he actually thought Congress meant what it said.

Mr. TRUMAN. I think that is true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And that he actually was trying to help the small businessman. My colleague is familiar with the fact, of course, as I am in my own State at least, that under the policy of the War Department the so-called prime contracts have in many cases been made with big concerns which are not at all engaged in the business involved, but which have in turn sublet the contracts. For example, a concern engaged in making steel casings may have received a prime contract, and then let out subcontracts for wood cabinet work. That is an extreme example; but that has been the policy of the War Department. I cannot to save my life understand how an Army officer, who is necessarily subject to that policy of the War Department, can oppose the policy of the War Department, and protect small business.

Mr. TRUMAN. I agree thoroughly with my colleague, and I want to thank him most sincerely for his addition to the record.

I wish to continue further and say that if we are going to continue the policy of appointing uniformed men for these jobs, there is no use in our making any effort to try to keep the procurement and production program in the hands of the civilian set-up of the Government.

Mr. President, even if we are to continue that practice, as the Army men urge, there is no justification whatever for allowing these businessmen to retain their Army uniform and rank when they are administrating a civilian agency of the Government, in which they are charged with the duty of acting independently and sometimes in opposition to the Army and Navy. If that kind of thing is going to be permitted, we will gradually be placing all functions in this country under the military, contrary to the principles of the Constitution.

For the above reasons I do not believe that an Army officer should be placed in charge of the Smaller War Plants program to do the job that a civilian is now performing in a successful manner. I believe that this contemplated change will disrupt the present progress and retard the participation of small business in the war program. Also I believe that the contacts between small business and the Navy and the Maritime Commission should not be assigned to an Army officer.

The War Production Board has altogether too many persons whose business apparently is to pull down men like Holland who have the guts to do a job. In examining various files in regard to the Holland situation, I was surprised and disgusted at the smallness of some supposedly "big men."

Mr. Charles Wilson, who, in my opinion, has done a fine job to date, is being made the same sort of a victim as Mr. Holland, and unless the Chairman of the War Production Board is willing to back up his good men and eliminate the utterly selfish conspirators with whom he has permitted himself to be surrounded, the country's entire war effort will suffer.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses

thereon, and that Mr. BULWINKLE, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BECKWORTH, Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

### UNITED NATIONS POST-WAR PEACE CHARTER

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I am aware that a number of Senators desire to address the Senate on the subject matter which has been under consideration. I have sought recognition to discuss an entirely different subject matter, but in order that Senators may have an opportunity of discussing the matter which has just been discussed, at a time when the subject matter is clear in their minds, I shall ask unanimous consent that a short address which I intended to make may be printed in the RECORD as having been delivered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, much as I regret to do so, I shall have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Objection is heard.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was going to remark in that connection, that I recall that last fall a very unhappy situation resulted from such action. What the Senator has requested to have done is not in accordance with the procedure of the Senate, and much as I admire the great Senator from Iowa, I shall have to object in his case and in every other similar case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, of course, I appreciate the reason for the position taken by the very able minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that he does not understand that there will be any objection to the statement being printed in the RECORD as a statement, if the Senator from Iowa desires to have that done.

Mr. McNARY. It may be printed as a statement, but not as having been delivered. That is what I objected to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Oregon would not object if the Senator from Iowa should ask to have the statement printed in type which would indicate that it was merely a statement, and not a speech delivered on the floor.

Mr. GILLETTE. With that understanding of the rule, and the further thought that my only purpose was to show some courtesy to those who desired to discuss the matter previously under consideration, I prefer to proceed with my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, a week ago today I introduced in the Senate a Senate resolution which in some respects may be unique in legislative history. The resolution is known as Senate Resolution 91. At the time of the introduction I purposely refrained from discussion of the proposal on the floor, because of the unusual features which seemed to pertain in the wording of the resolution. In brief, the resolution expresses the approval by the United States Senate of the cardinal principles and purposes of the joint declaration made on the 14th of August 1941 by President Roosevelt of the United States and Prime Minister Churchill of Great Britain and popularly known as the Atlantic Charter.

There is, of course, nothing unique or unusual in this declaration of approval, but the resolution further provides that the Senate advises and urges the President of the United States to take early action to negotiate, formulate, and make a joint treaty agreement with each and all of the United Nations subscribing to a joint declaration dated January 1, 1942, and it further urges and advises that such formal treaty enunciate and stress certain enumerated cardinal basic and fundamental principles as the basis for the policies and goals of the United Nations in the joint war enterprise in which they and we are now engaged.

Two main questions immediately present themselves in connection with this resolution. First, is it essential or even advisable at this time for the United Nations to take such action as proposed? Second, if it is advisable, is the adoption of such a resolution as the one proposed the proper method or channel of approach to the contemplated action? I shall discuss these two questions in reverse order to the one in which I have just stated them.

Is the proposed resolution a constitutional and proper course to initiate the desired action for the attainment of the desired goal?

There is widespread belief and conclusion throughout our Nation that the conduct of our international relations and affairs is assigned by the provisions of the Federal Constitution to the executive department of the Nation. This general belief is understandable, and the conclusion has much of justification in the sequence of acts and policies that have almost universally been followed and almost universally acquiesced in for over a century of our history. Recently, however, there have been heard, both in and out of the Congress, rumblings of question, mutterings of interrogation, as to where the Federal Constitution has actually placed the exercise of power and responsibility in the field of international relations, and it is certainly advisable that in the welter of action and opinion which will surely be incident to the readjustments of the world's political, financial, industrial, commercial, and rehabilitation economy after this war's close, there should be no fog of dispute, no haze of indecision, no mist of contention in these essential matters so far as our Nation is concerned.

The more I reread and ponder that most remarkable document, the Constitution of the United States, the more I am impressed with the superlative and almost inspired wisdom of the constitutional fathers. In the Constitutional Convention they pondered long and they debated long; but the words and sentences of the final document were unbelievably brief and concise when one considers the magnitude and scope of this great organic document. Every word was chosen with meticulous care. Each such choice had a purpose and a coordinated relationship with every other word and sentence throughout the document. Not a word was used for the purpose of embellishment or rhetorical adornment. Not a word was wasted, and not an opportunity left for misconstruction.

If it had been the purpose or desire of the framers of the Constitution to place the handling of our foreign relations entirely in the executive department, how easily this could have been clearly stated in one brief sentence similar in form to these which appear in the Constitution: "The Executive power shall be vested in the President of the United States." "He shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States." "He shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States." But, Mr. President, one may search the Federal Constitution from Preamble to the last added amendment, and no such authority to conduct the foreign affairs of the Nation was given to the executive department. I am fully aware that many able writers have said that such grant of power in expressed terms was unnecessary, and that such power is inherent in a sovereign administrator. But our Constitution contains no grant of power to any governmental agency wherein that delegated authority could be construed as inherent or subject to constructional enlargement; and to make assurance doubly sure they added the Tenth Amendment to obviate any question whatever as to the residuary of inherent power and authority.

Let us quickly review the constitutional provisions which deal with international relationships. Section 8 of article I gives to the Congress the following powers: To regulate commerce with foreign nations; to establish uniform rules of naturalization; to regulate the value of foreign coin; to declare war; to grant letters of marque and reprisal; and to make rules concerning captures on land and water. Section 9 of article I especially provides that no State shall enter into any agreement or compact with a foreign power, with certain limitations, without—and mark this well—the consent of Congress.

Now let us turn to the judicial branch of the Government. Article VI provides that the Constitution, the laws adopted under it, and all treaties shall be the supreme law of the land, while section 2 of article III confers on the judiciary original jurisdiction of cases arising under treaties and all cases affecting Ambassadors, Ministers, and consuls. The same section confers jurisdiction on the judicial authority in cases between a State and citizens of another State and between a State or the citizens thereof and foreign states, citizens, or subjects.

The only provision in the Constitution which confers Executive authority with reference to the conduct of foreign affairs other than as Commander in Chief

of the military forces in time of war is found in section 2 of article II:

> He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court—

And so forth.

It will be well worth our while to analyze carefully the language under which these authorities were delegated and conferred on the executive department. First, with reference to the selection of Ambassadors, Ministers, and so forth, where was the authority to initiate these selections placed? In the President of the United States, and in him alone. There were four steps to be taken before an Ambassador, Minister, or consul could enter upon his official duties. First, he was to be nominated. No right or vestige of right can possibly be construed to be vested in the Senate or in any other agency of the Nation other than the President himself, to initiate action for the selection of these foreign ministers. The President shall nominate; that is the genesis of the action, and it is more than probable that this exclusive right to take initial action was placed in the President in order to remove that primary step as far as possible from the field of partisan or sectional contention. By no possible construction or misconstruction could the Senate initiate or nominate a man for one of these appointments. Even though the President should send up a hundred names and ask the Senate to consider the nomination, and each of those names should be rejected by the Senate, further initial action must still come from the authority where it was placed by the Constitution itself. It is understandable that with the right of the President to take the first step, a basis would thereby be laid for asking the Senate to advise and consent as to the name proposed, and if approved the appointment and qualification by oath would follow as the third and fourth steps requisite to these official selections.

In the treaty authority which was conferred by the same paragraph, however, no such provision was made for initial action by the President on which the advice and consent of the Senate could be based. Neither was there prohibition of the right of the Executive to take preliminary action. But the carefully chosen language states that the President shall have the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties. There is no preliminary step provided on which the advice and consent of the Senate can be predicated. To hold, therefore, that the Senate has no power to initiate action preliminary to the making of a treaty is to negate the clear purport of this constitutional provision. How could it be possible for the Senate to advise preliminary to the making of a treaty if it should be concluded that each initial action must come from the executive department? It seems to me beyond cavil that to deny to the Senate the right to initiate the negotiation of a treaty agreement in the way of advice to the Chief Executive is clear and unmistakable; and no plausible platitudes, no lulling lullabies of construction, and no soporific sophistries can relieve the United States Senate of such power and authority and consequent responsibility if such action is indicated. After this initial step, the power is clearly given to the President to take the next necessary steps to negotiate and bring into being the international agreements which become effective on final signature and Senate consent.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to refer very briefly to the advisability of taking such action as is contemplated in the resolution which I have introduced.

When our great President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain and Northern Ireland met on the 14th day of last August and announced to the world a categorical list of eight common principles in the national policies of their respective countries, and when the joint declarants made public statements in their respective countries and to their respective legislative authorities, each supporter of the philosophy that the peace and happiness of the world could be best conserved through the agency of representative democracies freely chosen felt a depth of joy and confidence in the triumph of our cause which could have come with equal potency in no other way. When on the 1st day of January 1943 the nations which are joined in this terrific war effort against the Axis Nations and their satellites, each and all approved the principles of the Atlantic Charter by signing an abbreviated statement of its principles and made specific pledges for joint war effort, there was renewed confidence in the success of our arms and the consummation of our purposes.

But, Mr. President, there continually come to our ears reports of mutterings and discontent in that the so-called Atlantic Charter has no legal, national, or international substance, and that it is binding on no one. Many of the great peoples of the Orient are seriously disturbed when agents of Japan call their attention—and, Mr. President, they do call their attention day after day—to the argument that the Atlantic Charter may not apply to the Pacific area, and that it is not a Pacific charter. They find themselves beset with doubts when these same Axis agents contend that the charter is simply an expression of opinion of two men who have never seen fit to submit it to their respective countries for action and approval. These same agents are assiduous indeed in directing attention to the high mortality rate of recent history in well-conceived and well-intended international peace plans and charters. They point with evil purpose to the graves of the Nine-Power Treaty, the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact, the League of Nations Covenants, and the lofty idealism of ex-President Wilson's 14 points of policy, and they ask our allies how much confidence they can place in enunciated opinions which have received no endorsement or authoritative approval of the nations for whom these refined and sublimated formulas for happiness were designed.

The resolution which I have introduced has a dual purpose: First, to set at rest, and if possible eliminate, the doubts of all nations associated with us in the honesty, integrity, and genuineness of purpose in the Atlantic Charter principles; second, to assure their confidence that those principles apply with equal force anywhere in the world; third, to give them added assurance that these policies and principles have the endorsement of all the United Nations and that they have been given legal substance through legislative action provided in the constitutions of the respective adherents.

I had intended, Mr. President, to discuss this particular purport of the resolution more at length, but my attention was called to an article which appeared in the February 8 issue of the Washington Star over the by-line of Dorothy Thompson. Miss Thompson discusses the resolution which I have introduced; and she so clearly, concisely, and completely points out certain values in the purpose of the resolution, that instead of longer detaining the Senate by a discussion at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Dorothy Thompson be printed at this place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GILLETTE RESOLUTION REPRESENTS STEP TOWARD CLEAR POLICY FOR UNITED STATES AND FIGHTING ALLIES

(By Dorothy Thompson)

A short time ago in this column, I pointed out that one of the most distressing features in this war was the American uncertainty, the doubt in many minds whether, when the war was over, the United States would be counted on to participate in the reconstruction of the world. Over the heads of all our allies hovers the recollection of the last war, when President Wilson's peace was repudiated by Congress. So far, the Atlantic Charter is merely a personal declaration of President Roosevelt.

Now, Senator GILLETTE of Iowa has introduced in the Senate a resolution which would remedy this state of affairs. His resolution would instruct the President to make a joint treaty agreement with each and all of the United Nations, this treaty to embody the basic principles of the Atlantic Charter.

ASSURES CHOICE IN RULE

These are, first, that the signatories seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise; second, that they respect and will approve the right of all people under proper opportunity to choose the form of government under which they will live, and will countenance the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been deprived of it by force; third, that they will collaborate in formulating a just peace embodying formulae for post-war collaboration to maintain peace and security throughout the world; fourth, that they will recognize the necessity for just and equitable collaboration for all signatories to obtain for all nations economic advancement, improved labor standards, social security, and access on fair and equal terms by all peoples to the raw materials and international channels of the world.

The Senator suggests that such a treaty might be entitled "the United Nations post-war peace charter."

Since the present Congress probably will have to deal with the peace, and since as the whole world knows, it is by no means a "Roosevelt Congress," such a resolution would assure the world of what America as a whole is fighting for, and commit us now to collaboration for the future. At once the American uncertainty would be removed and the way be opened for a clear policy on the part of all the other fighting nations.

WOULD STABILIZE UNITED STATES

It would give the United States a foreign policy—not merely the State Department and the President. And the lack of a clear American foreign policy has been one of the most most disturbing factors in the world for the past generation.

The creation of such a treaty would have numerous consequences, all of them desirable.

First, it would remove the issue of foreign policy from the next elections. It would permit the American people to choose their representatives without fearing that changes might upset the whole world situation. It would remove the temptation to the opposition to use foreign policy as an issue merely for the sake of opposition and for wholly internal reasons.

Secondly, it would make clear to the world that our expediencies during the war are really just expediencies and no modification of fundamental war aims.

TO REASSURE BRITAIN, RUSSIA

Third, it would reassure Britain that she can base her own policy on permanent collaboration with the United States and must not, therefore, be hedging bets.

Fourth, it would reassure Russia that she must not make her own policy in anticipation of a possible reactionary reconstruction of Europe which would try to isolate her from collaboration. A permanent reconciliation between Russia and the western world would be implied.

It would mean that the eastern European powers would have to find their place in such a world, not as the outposts of an inimical western world against Russia, a situation which would be catastrophic for them and catastrophic for future peace, but would be in the favorable position of being a bridge between the western world and Russia, mutually guaranteed.

As far as Russia herself is concerned, it would mean that she would have to adopt a good-neighbor policy toward them. That this is not only possible but has been the traditional Russian policy is illustrated by her relations for more than 20 years with the small state of Turkey.

DEFINITE ON CHINA

Fifth, China would know that the policy of equality between nations, regardless of their racial construction, is assured, and that the western nations are not going to advocate one thing for Europe and another for the Far East. For the same reason it would assuage the frictions in India.

Sixth, it would be a powerful weapon in our political warfare against the Axis, a weapon which has been lacking up to now.

The demand for unconditional surrender would be accomplished by the certainty of existence and the hope for later equality. It would break down the loyalty of the Axis satellites, who are all looking for a way of escape. And to a country like Italy, where the propaganda that "one man and one alone is responsible" has served only to strengthen Mussolini, it would put matters into a large and intelligible perspective.

And last, but not least, it would increase and restore the prestige of the United States Senate. It would prove that our democratic institutions and our party system are capable of producing political unity where political unity is essential.

THERE MUST BE CENTRALIZED PROCUREMENT TO GIVE SMALL BUSINESS A CHANCE TO PRODUCE FOR WAR

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, with practically all of the principles expressed by the able junior Senator from Missouri I am in hearty accord. Only with respect to the conclusion which might lead to the assumption that it was an error to entrust the job of the chairmanship of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to Colonel Johnson, if the able Senator intended so to intimate—and I am glad to have his assurance that he did not intend to make such intimation—would I have any difference of opinion.

As I said, Mr. President, I am authorized to say by the chairman——

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the distinguished junior Senator from Florida yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. I had no personal acquaintance with Colonel Johnson. My objection to Colonel Johnson was the fact that he is absolutely under the control of the Ordnance Department of the United States Army, and I do not think he can do the job successfully under those conditions.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for making it clear that it was a question of policy as to whether or not a man in uniform, upon active assignment, should hold any position of that character, and not Colonel Johnson personally which caused the able Senator concern.

I have been examining the President's order of January 16, 1942, in order to ascertain what powers were vested in the War Production Board by the President. I think it is well for the Senate to have constantly in mind what the President intended in setting up the position of Chairman of the War Production Board.

There are two matters to which I propose to address myself, Mr. President: First, that the system which has been in effect in respect to Federal procurement inevitably leads to the result which the able junior Senator from Missouri and other Senators have pointed out, that little business does not get an appreciable share of our total war production; second, to suggest that as to the matter of the appointment of the Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation or the members of its board of directors, the Chairman of the War Production Board is vested by statute with authority to make such appointments. For reasons which seemed satisfactory to himself, he appointed Colonel Johnson. All of us—including our able friend the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]—agree that Colonel Johnson as an individual is a very able gentleman to have in that place.

Mr. President, what I started to say was that upon examination of the President's order of January 16, 1942, as to the duties of the War Production Board, I find, among other things, the following:

First:

The Chairman of the War Production Board, with the advice and assistance of the members of the Board, shall—

(a) Exercise general direction over the war procurement and production program.

(b) Determine the policies, plans, procedures, and methods of the several Federal departments, establishments, and agencies in respect to war procurement and production, including purchasing, contracting, specifications, and construction; and including conversion, requisitioning, plant expansion, and the financing thereof; and issue such directives in respect thereto as he may deem necessary or appropriate.

Again:

(e) Report from time to time to the President on the progress of war procurement and production; and perform such other duties as the President may direct.

Again:

3. Federal departments, establishments, and agencies shall comply with the policies, plans, methods, and procedures in respect to war procurement and production as determined by the Chairman; and shall furnish to the Chairman such information relating to war procurement and production as he may deem necessary for the performance of his duties.

Mr. President, it is very clear that in the original order establishing the Chairman of the War Production Board the President did intend to centralize the procurement and production policies of the Government, but it must be admitted that Mr. Nelson did not exercise those powers conferred upon him by the President, and did not centralize the procurement and production program of the United States for war purposes, but, as I ventured to state here the other day, the Chairman delegated those powers, for reasons which he deemed adequate, to the armed services, to Lend-Lease, to the Maritime Commission, and to other agencies of the Government, with the result that there never was and there is not yet a single procurement and production policy and authority of the United States Government.

Mr. President, when we have procurement for the Army vested in what is relatively, as far as practice has worked out, an independent procurement agency; when we have procurement for the Navy relatively disconnected from procurement for the Army or from any other Federal agency; and when we have the same situation existing with respect to other arms of the Government carrying on the war, of course, we do not have a coordinated plan and policy and program which will make it possible for any part of the Government effectively to deal with such a challenge as is presented by small business to the Government.

So, Mr. President, the only way, I venture to say, that small business can possibly hope to have a fair share in war production and in the carrying on of the business necessitated by the war is for there to be a coordinated procurement and production policy of the United States Government.

As I said, Donald Nelson first delegated his procurement powers to the procurement agencies. Mr. President, since that time he has had the fight of his life in endeavoring to get back the powers over

procurement for any phase of production which he originally did not assume or which he delegated to the armed services or the other procurement agencies of the Government.

Just to indicate the problem with which he has had to contend, let me say that I am informed that a little while ago, after he attempted to reassert the powers which I venture to believe from the Executive order the President intended him to exercise from the beginning, he appointed, as we all know, Mr. Charles Wilson as vice chairman of the War Production Board, an exceptionally able, capable, and qualified man, a man whose company—the General Electric Co.—has one of the best production records, so I am informed, of any corporation in the country. Mr. Nelson, I believe, seeing his mistake in letting those powers get away from him, in letting all the several agencies go in their several directions without close coordination of policy and program, put in Mr. Wilson as vice chairman of the Board, gave him—as I understand—general jurisdiction over production, and gave him specific jurisdiction over airplane production and radar because there were bottlenecks in the production of those two categories of implements needed for the war.

Mr. President, it is not gossip or rumor, but it is a fact, attested on the front pages of nearly every Washington paper, that Mr. Wilson has had an extremely difficult task to get the other agencies of Government to cooperate with him in the performance of duties with which Mr. Nelson vested him and which are essential to a coordinated procurement and production program of the Government. I think even we laymen who are not skilled in the technique of production can understand what I am informed has been attributed to Mr. Nelson as a statement, namely, that three things are essential to an adequate procurement and production program: One is control over critical materials in a single head; another is procurement control in a single head; and the third is the power to schedule, in order that the several component parts of end products shall be brought together in the right place, at the right time, and in the right quantity and proportion.

Mr. President, let me tell a story which I believe to be reliable, and to be subject to confirmation. Mr. Wilson got into the picture; and as there was a shortage of steel products necessary to produce larger quantities of war materials, he began to investigate from his over-all position and perspective what was the bottleneck in increased steel production. I understand that he discovered that a point at which production might be increased—a bottleneck, if you please—was in blast-furnace production. He had in consultation an expert who had designed blast furnaces for the principal steel companies of the Nation, and it was his recommendation that if production in blast furnaces could be increased, production in end products could be enlarged.

Then what happened? My information is that within 2 days after that advisor and counsellor informed Mr. Wilson and Mr. Nelson that steel production could be increased by increasing the production of blast furnaces, that advisor received telegrams, letters, and other communications from the steel companies of the Nation telling him they hired him to design steel plants, not to tell them how to run them.

Mr. President, that looks dangerously like obstruction of the war effort.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not the Senator's understanding that the War Production Board last year issued an order curtailing the construction of any additional blast-furnace facilities or any steel-production facilities which would not be completed by the 30th of June 1943, and that that policy has not been changed, although it still remains true that the production of steel is the chief obstacle to our producing the increased quantities of the commodities and materials that are overwhelmingly needed to carry on the war?

Mr. PEPPER. I understand what the able Senator suggests to be true; yes.

Mr. President, I realize that there is room for an honest difference of opinion as to whether it is better in advancing the war effort to take a given quality of steel or raw material for the production of steel and put it into implements of war or into steel fabrication facilities. I say I admit there could be an honest difference of opinion about that question, but what I am talking about now is the capacity to increase the quantity of raw materials out of which steel is to be made in the processing facilities we already possess.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the able Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been following the Senator with much interest. As I understood, he said that Mr. Nelson was trying to break the bottleneck in steel which appeared to him to be caused by the lack of blast furnaces in the steel industry, and he wanted to have more blast furnaces in the steel industry so that that difficulty would be eliminated. Then, I understood the Senator from Wyoming to say that the War Production Board had issued an order forbidding an increase in the number of blast furnaces, in other words, "freezing" the bottleneck where it was, and, as Mr. Nelson is the head of the W. P. B., I have rather become confused as to whether or not the Senator's position is fully stated or whether the position of the Senator from Wyoming does not lay the blame at Mr. Nelson's door. I think we ought to have that cleared up so that we may better follow the argument of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. As usual, the Senator from Maryland contributes valuably to any discussion in which he takes a part. It did seem a little inconsistent that I should have made my first statement, and then should have answered "yes" to the question. This is the basis upon which I answered "Yes"; I think Mr. Nelson cannot and probably does not desire to shirk his just share of the responsibility for the bottlenecks which have developed in this program, and what I give him credit for is his recent, determined, and courageous effort to correct some of the earlier mistakes which I think perhaps he would admit having made; and this is one of them. If I, being a layman and not particularly informed about the matter, may express an opinion, I think Mr. Nelson, not being a steel man and not being a production man—we all know that Mr. Nelson has been engaged in handling commodities and not in making them—naturally relied upon his steel advisers who, in substance, were merely the iron and steel institute brought here to Washington.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator has completely cleared up the matter. Mr. Nelson, when he got the report of the blast furnace experts evidently put the question up to the steel people.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. And the steel people told him whatever the reason may have been, that it was not practicable; and Mr. Nelson, not being a steel man, accepted, in good faith, that advice which turned out later not to have been wise advice.

Mr. PEPPER. Exactly.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is no reflection on Mr. Nelson, because, obviously, anybody would have had to go to the people who run the business to find out the ins and outs of it. Am I correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That is substantially correct except that I am inclined to think that the facts are that Mr. Nelson perhaps time and time again in consultation with the steel section perhaps made inquiry and consulted with a view to increasing the steel output, but I think they did just what the able Senator suggested, namely, they advised him against an effort to increase the number of blast furnaces.

Later on, when Mr. Charles Wilson, the head of the General Electric Corporation, himself a production man of long and great experience who knows something about the technique of production, came down here and was put in charge of production he started ferreting out these bottlenecks, and it was then, as I understand it, chronologically, that he was a party to, if not responsible for, the last investigation by the expert I have in mind who recommended that by increasing the blast furnace facilities production could be increased, but, even before he actually acted upon the suggestion, when the steel companies heard about it they vigorously rebuked and reprimanded this expert whom they had previously hired to design their furnaces, telling him that they hired him to design their facilities and not to tell them how to run them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Another word should be added to clear the apparent confusion. The reason the War Production Board issued the order forbidding the construction of any new facilities which could not be completed by the end of June 30, 1943, was that steel is necessary in order to build these extensive facilities; in other words, great quantities of steel are needed in the building of blast furnaces. Therefore, the War Production Board came to the conclusion that it was better for the immediate equipment of the Army and Navy to devote the steel which was necessary for the expansion of the blast furnaces to the manufacture of tanks and ships and other elements.

The explanation of the curious instance which the Senator from Colorado has just described, which I now hear for the first time, namely, that the blast furnace expert was reprimanded by the large steel companies for having recommended the expansion of the blast furnaces, is that the large companies have not wanted to allow the manufacture of iron and steel to get away from the blast furnace method.

For more than a year the contention has been made here upon the floor and elsewhere that by the so-called direct process of applying heat to iron ore, great quantities of iron can be made from the undeveloped iron deposits of this country; but if those direct processes were adopted they would tend to compete with the blast furnaces because they would make it possible for an iron reduction plant to be built at the mouth of every iron mine in the country. The big steel companies, desiring to retain control over the steel business when the war is over, have not wanted to see this competitive enterprise, this local enterprise, come into the field under the sponsorship of Government contracts. That, Mr. President, has been the explanation which was given to me for this serious conflict of action by the War Production Board. Personally, I do not believe that any blame attaches to Mr. Nelson about it. I think it only fair to say that there has been a tremendous increase in production. I noticed in the newspapers this morning that Mr. William L. Batt was quoted while addressing a group last night as having said that a larger proportion of the natural resources of the United States are being currently used than is the case in any other country with the possible exception of Germany; but it is not enough.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida allow me to make a brief observation before he takes up the thread of his argument?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like the RECORD to show that I am not informed on this question; I might not have been a member of any committees which have been considering it. I rose simply to get information, and I hope no remark I made, by inference or otherwise, may be construed as reflecting on Mr. Nelson, Mr. Wilson, the steel people, or the architect. I am only sitting here listening to this recital, and I do not want the RECORD to appear in such shape that any unfavorable inference might be drawn by any of the parties to this controversy, for I have not heard the evidence.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad the Senator mentioned that subject, because I, too, want to make it clear that I arose with no purpose whatever to disparage anybody who has had anything to do with any phase of this program. The point to which I was bringing my remarks was that we have got to have a coordinated production program; we have got to have someone in charge of it able to synchronize and harmonize all aspects of it; and for this production program it is necessary to have a man who knows the technique of production. Lawyers, doctors, bankers, businessmen who have not had experience of that sort, I venture to suggest, are not as well fitted as a man who is essentially a production man to do this production job.

Mr. President, the second point to which I desired to call the attention of the Senate is that I am informed that escort vessels, which are now so essential to the convoy program, to get the implements of war to the men abroad and to our allies, have been held up due to the fact that for months a controversy raged within the Navy over what type of propulsion machinery was to be employed in the escort vessels, whether steam or something else, and it was only after the War Production Board, through Mr. Wilson, and with Mr. Nelson's backing, and perhaps with the backing of others, finally took the best technical advice available and gave an order, "We will build ships using this type of engine," that they got the escort vessel construction program under way. That is a matter subject to confirmation, too.

Again, think of an escort program being held up while technicians in a certain department argue as to whether one type of engine was better than another. What Mr. Wilson did, if I understand correctly, when he was vested with production responsibility and authority, was to say, "Now, gentlemen, let us get on with building escort vessels. Let us take one type. Let the matter be settled, and let us get those things into production." That, again, shows emphatically and dramatically the necessity of having some authority over all these various agencies who can reconcile such conflicts, resolve a doubt, make a decision, and go ahead with the execution of the program.

I started to say, Mr. President, that Mr. Nelson must share a large part of the responsibility, in my opinion, for the conditions the able junior Senator from Missouri has described; namely, that the small business of this country has not been given an appreciable share in war production. Mr. Nelson himself did not have control over production or procurement.

This order the President issued to Mr. Nelson I think very clearly intended not that he should actually sign the contracts for procurement but that he should lay down the policy, develop the program, prescribe the principles, and issue the directives which should cover the procurement policies of the procurement agencies.

As the able junior Senator from Missouri pointed out, Congress has a measure of responsibility in this matter too, because our appropriations, as the Senator stated, vest the money for procurement in the procurement agencies themselves, not in the War Production Board, and not in any other authority. So the power over procurement he has is not as clear an authority, no doubt, as the Chairman of the War Production Board would like to have. It is executive in character, and not legislative.

At the same time I will state, and I think Mr. Nelson deserves the compliment of it being said, that when Mr. Nelson discovered that he had let these powers get away from him, and that with the best of intentions the armed services having charge of procurement were going in different directions far too much, he tried to reestablish himself as the one to carry out the order that was literally given to him by the President when he was appointed, and I think ever since that time Mr. Nelson has been working in that direction, and I think it is a regrettable fact that Mr. Nelson and Mr. Wilson have been receiving a great deal of very serious, capable, and determined opposition from the services. Again, I do not discredit their motives or disparage their convictions that they should have this power. It is a matter of judgment.

I am not an expert; I can only venture an opinion as a layman, but when we find that agencies are competing in the open market for the same facilities or the same raw materials; when we find that the procurement program is scattered in all different directions and not coordinated; that the Army has one, the Navy has one, the Maritime Commission has one, Lend-Lease has one, and other agencies have their own separate procurement programs, we may expect, of necessity, such a condition as confronts the small business of this country today.

One of the impelling reasons which influenced those of us who introduced the war mobilization bill, which was the subject of discussion here recently, was the desire for coordination of these powers in some head or committee outside the person of our great President, so that he or they could coordinate the procurement programs and make harmonious the policies of the several procurement agencies of the Government. In other words, instead of all these agencies having procurement programs, the Government of the United States would have one program.

If there is a single authority for war production and the complaint is made that the facilities of small business are not fully employed, an agency which has the whole procurement power of the Federal Government has the power to correct the situation. If it does not, there is no question of who has the responsibility for the fault and failure.

I was coming to the conclusion of saying that if this appointment of Colonel Johnson actually led to the Army taking over the policy of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and directing that organization as the procurement program and

policy of the War Department, I should be as strenuous in my opposition to it as is the junior Senator from Missouri. We have been working together on this subject of trying to get civilians in charge of this program as far as possible, but I cannot bring myself to the conclusion that a capable man is disqualified just because he happens to be in uniform and to be an officer in the Army.

Remember, Colonel Johnson was detached and assigned to this duty as Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. He is not acting under any brigadier general or major general or lieutenant general, or even under any general. So far as I know, General Marshall has no power to give directives to Colonel Johnson about the running of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, any more than the Secretary of the Navy has authority to give directives to Dr. Calver, who is assigned to us here in the Congress. He could revoke his assignment, perhaps, but in this case the assignment was made by the President, as I understand the record, so I assume it would take the President to reassign Colonel Johnson anywhere else.

It is admitted on all sides that Colonel Johnson is personally qualified to fill this post, and no finer tribute could have been paid any man than was paid Colonel Johnson by the able senior Senator from Georgia a few minutes ago.

As a matter of fact, Colonel Johnson has long been recognized as one of the able management specialists of this country. I think that is why he was given this job. He went to New York and took a badly disorganized ordnance office, and, instead of increasing the percentage big business was given, he increased the volume little business received, by making the prime contractors break down their contracts to subcontractors and, as I have stated, tying in the Smaller War Plants Corporation with the Ordnance Office of the Army at New York.

As a matter of fact, Colonel Johnson came and testified before the Senate Small Business Committee. I was not a member of the committee at the time, although I attended some of the sessions, but I know how, for example, the chairman, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], for whom I am largely speaking here today, although I myself am a member of the Small Business Committee, was impressed by the help Colonel Johnson gave to small business while he was performing his duties in the Ordnance Office in New York.

Therefore, Mr. President, while I thoroughly agree with the general principle that there should be someone in charge of this whole program who would coordinate it all, and that normally such a person, for example, the head of the War Production Board, or the Chairman of the Board of War Mobilization, if our bill were passed, should be a civilian, substantially the same thing is achieved, even though it be an Army man, if he is detached from routine service and entrusted to do this job.

I do not think the Senate would wish to reverse the decision of the Chairman of the War Production Board on an assignment that was made of this officer by the President to these duties, and we would not wish to come to a premature conclusion that it was not for the purpose of bettering conditions for small business that this assignment was made. I think Colonel Johnson and the Chairman of the War Production Board are entitled to a fair trial and the fair exercise of their discretion as to what man might better do the job. Then, if Colonel Johnson fails in the performance of his duties, if the fears of the able Senator from Missouri are corroborated and confirmed, that will be the time for the Senate to take action which will give prompt and effective redress.

I am sure that there has not been a word said by his superiors, or certainly any of us who have confidence in Colonel Johnson, which would in any sense of the word cast any reflection upon the ability or the excellence of the record of Mr. Lou E. Holland, of whom I personally entertain a very high opinion.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. I merely wanted to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida whether he is in sympathy with what I believe to be reliable information which I have, that Colonel Johnson wants to appoint dollar-a-year men as directors of this corporation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, not only do I not sympathize with that, but as a member of the Small Business Committee, if that is Colonel Johnson's policy, to the limit of my ability I shall oppose it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not as well informed on some of these subjects as some of the Senators who have discussed them and who have heard the testimony, but I do not think it is wise to say, unless we are to have a national policy, that men should be excluded who otherwise are patriotic and have great and outstanding ability merely because they want to serve the Government for a dollar a year. It seems to me the thing to do is to get the man, and if he is a dollar-a-year man, all well and good, or if he has to have a salary, all well and good, but unless we are to have a national policy of paying everyone—and there is a good deal to be said for that—we must consider the policy now controlling. By that remark I do not want it understood that we should make it possible, where men have selfish motives, that they could come in and sabotage for their own selfish purposes.

But I mean in the large, if a man is able, willing, and competent, and patriotic, and wants to serve for a dollar a year, I do not think he ought to be abused because of that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator was just saying a moment ago that he had great regard for the ability and the patriotism of Mr. Lou Holland, who has just been superseded by Mr. Johnson, largely, as I understand, because of his zeal for carrying out the policy of Congress—the preservation of small business. Does not that statement of the Senator from Florida seem to a very large extent to be in line with the old rhyme:

Perhaps it was right to dissemble your love,
But—why did you kick me downstairs?

If Mr. Holland was doing a good job, why did they supersede him with Mr. Johnson or anyone else?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the able Senator from Missouri is perfectly right in making that query. Here is the answer I offered a while ago, and I think it was a reasonable one. Under the statute which the Congress passed, the Chairman of the War Production Board was given the responsibility and the duty to make this appointment. The Chairman of the War Production Board has made the appointment pursuant to the order of Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He appointed Mr. Holland, did he not?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And then he fired Mr. Holland?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Florida, while defending the appointment of Mr. Johnson, said that Mr. Holland had made good. Why did the Chairman of the Board fire Mr. Holland except for his zeal in carrying out the wishes of Congress in helping small business?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it is a characteristic American principle that no man shall be condemned before he is heard. I think all of us commend the action of our sister body recently when its Members receded from a previous decision condemning a person, because he had not been given an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. When was Mr. Holland heard, if the Senator from Florida will permit me to ask him? He was fired without being given a hearing.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the statute does not limit the Chairman of the War Production Board in changing men who hold these positions. Mr. Donald Nelson did not appoint these men for a term. They were not confirmed by the Senate. They were removable at the pleasure of the Chairman of the War Production Board.

Mr. President, if the able Senator wishes to indulge the presumption that Mr. Nelson acted out of spite, or pettiness, or improper motives, then, of course, that would be a reflection upon Mr. Nelson, which I believe able Senators would not care to make. I am assuming, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that Mr. Nelson acted in good faith; that he acted upon good cause in his opinion. We vested him with the discretion, and if it is an honest decision that he made, unless we propose to constitute ourselves into a body of appeals on administrative decisions which are made, and powers of discretion which are exercised, he is entitled to a presumption of good faith, although

there may be an error of judgment in the exercise of that power.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Gladly.

Mr. TRUMAN. I wanted to say to the Senator from Florida that Mr. Nelson acted, I think, on the advice of, what I termed in my statement, conspirators in whom he had placed too much confidence. I think those gentlemen are there for the purpose of representing big business, and have no other purpose, and when Mr. Holland was on the point of achieving success, they succeeded in upsetting the whole apple cart and taking a new start, and no matter what Mr. Johnson may do, if he is honestly going to try to help little business, and if he reaches a point where he is about to make a success of it, they will do exactly the same thing to him.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the evidence, after a reasonable opportunity for confirmation, should disclose even the suggestion of what the able Senator from Missouri has said—and he is chairman of a special defense investigating committee and may keep a careful eye on the conduct of this agency—then Mr. Donald Nelson not only needs to be impeached by Congress, as far as that is possible, but to be driven with discredit out of the high office he holds. That, Mr. President, it seems to me would be an inevitable judgment upon such wrongdoing.

If he has conspired against the small business of this country, which is the heart of America, he is an enemy to the majority of the people of this country, or he is a wholly misguided man. I am not prepared to convict the Chairman of the War Production Board of that charge until he has had a fair hearing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have asked the Senator to yield in order that I might put in the RECORD the specific list to which reference was made earlier in the day, but I do not wish to interfere with the Senator in the statement he is now making.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator from Wyoming wish to make some remarks in connection with inserting the list in the RECORD?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to make some comment about it; yes.

Mr. PEPPER. I am just about to conclude my remarks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will yield to me for that purpose before he concludes, very well.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. President, I may offer my own explanation as to why there is a great disparity in the quantity of war production which has been given to big business compared to that given little business. That is, that the procurement agencies of this Government have not gone out looking for facilities in small business. They have not gone out with an eye to trying to harness its potentials. They were looking for an existing company which had a good record and a large personnel, and a large capacity, to which they could give a contract, and essentially regard themselves as done when they gave the contract. I will agree with my able friend and say this, that the armed services are not qualified, generally speaking, to be the procurement agencies and instrumentalities of the Government, when, in war, the total facilities of the Nation must be put into a single vast production program.

I say that that job should go to a production man. The reason the big companies were given these large contracts was because it was a lot easier to do that than it was to go out and nurse little business up into productivity, by seeing that it got contracts that it could perform, seeing that it got machine tools necessary to the performance of a contract, seeing that it got critical material, seeing that it got manpower, seeing that it got priorities, and seeing that it got the other essential components of war production.

I do not want to exclude from that catalog skilled engineering advice and counsel which would be necessary in manufacturing war instruments of nice precision.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the Senator from Florida should add to his list the fact that it is also much easier for the big concerns to maintain high-priced representatives in Washington, and that the big concerns are much better entertainers than the small ones.

Mr. PEPPER. I thoroughly agree with every word that the able senior Senator from Missouri has spoken. The poor little fellows come looking, and they do not know where to go, they do not know what they can do, they do not have the essential elements of production, and, as the able Senator has said, they are in substance stepchildren in the Government program and policy. But they will never be fully utilized until some one man is in charge of the war production program of the United States of America and an industrialist who knows how to produce puts them to work in an effective way.

Mr. President, I differ with my able friend, the junior Senator from Missouri, only in my surmise that for all practical purposes this man Colonel Johnson is an industrialist, although he has been for 15 years a Reserve officer, and he has had on a uniform for a year; he is much more an outstanding, capable management and industrial specialist than is a West Point officer who has not had industrial experience in his career.

Just this last subject, Mr. President, and I am done. I apologize for the time already consumed. The last thing is this. In this morning's Washington Post there is an editorial headed "Row in the W. P. B." That editorial comments upon what has been in the newspapers for the last 2 or 3 days, an advertised dispute in the War Production Board between two exceptionally able men, Mr. Charles E. Wilson and Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt. Those two men are two as able men as I have ever met in my life, and I have had the good fortune to meet and converse with both of them. They have both had a rich industrial and business background. They are both men of strength. They are men who fought their way up in the world from humble circumstances and adversity to positions of security and competence. The country needs the services of those two men, Mr. President. I hope Mr. Donald Nelson will so organize the W. P. B. that he personally will be the boss, with the strength and courage to be the boss personally of his agency, and will see to it that everybody whose duty it is to obey his directives do obey his directives, and then that he will put in charge of an appropriate sphere in his organization Mr. Charles Wilson, who will be responsible for all production and scheduling in this country and for the procurement policy of the Government for war, and that a place of equal power and responsibility will also be preserved for Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt, who has been one of the strong men of that organization in the control of critical materials and priorities.

In other words, so that those two men may be a team pulling dynamically together for war production, and their duties and spheres so divided that they will be a part of the same team pulling together forward, instead of diverging elements pulling in opposite directions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may make a comment upon what he has just said?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I will yield in a moment. Mr. President, Mr. Donald Nelson is facing a crisis, in my opinion. He has to solve the small-business problem. He has to solve problems of his own organization. He has to exercise the full power and responsibility his President gave him. The discussion of this afternoon will attest that the Congress of this country is looking primarily to Mr. Donald Nelson to see that he mobilizes and uses the Nation's economic strength to win the war of production, but at the same time that he does not break the Nation's backbone—small business.

CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the discussion which has taken place this afternoon would not be complete if it were not called to the attention of the Senate, and to those who read the RECORD, that the conclusions in respect to the problem of war production of big business and little business cannot be drawn in black and white. It cannot be said that one group is altogether wrong and that another group is altogether right. It cannot be said that the War Production Board is altogether at fault, and that other agencies are not at fault. It cannot be said that the War Department is making no mistakes, and that the War Production Board is making many mistakes.

No one should lose sight of the fact that in the past 2 years the industry of America has made a truly magnificent contribution to the war effort. No one should lose sight of the fact that airplanes, guns, tanks, and all the materials which go to equip an army, and which have been manufactured in the United States, are now being used on every sin-

gle fighting front. They are being used in the South Pacific, in China, in Russia, in North Africa, and wherever American soldiers are fighting. They are being used wherever the United Nations, which are benefiting from lease-lend, are fighting. American industry has made that contribution.

It might be very easy to assume from what has been said here today that industry is all wrong and that the War Production Board, the Army, and the Navy have done little or nothing. That certainly is not true. It has been a wonderful contribution, such as no other nation and no other industrial group in all the history of the world has made. Yet, we should not close our eyes to the fact that there has been a concentration in a few hands; and it is in order to call attention to the specific figures for which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] asked earlier in the afternoon that I rise at this time.

Before referring to the figures, let me say that I am advised that there have been fewer failures among the so-called small business firms of America during the past year than at any time since 1920. There has been a great deal of distribution, but not as much as there should be by any means. The distribution which has taken place has in many respects been due to the fact that the business has been handed down through the large corporations to which the prime contracts have been granted. Thus, we have another example of the situation which has characterized all political and economic discussions in the country from the earliest time. Some have contended that the Government should take care of the big ones and the big ones should take care of the little ones. That is not, and never has been, the theory of the American people. The theory of the American people has been that equal opportunity should be extended to all, and that we should build from the ground up.

I have before me a list prepared by the statistical branch of the War Production Board. It shows that through November 1942 there have been awarded a total, in dollar value, of $84,978,300,000 worth of war contracts. Of that total, the sum of $59,557,900,000 has gone to 100 companies. It amounts to 70 1/10 percent of the total awards.

If one looks at the first 10 companies on this list he sees immediately that one of the causes for this concentration is that most of the large contracts have been awarded for the construction of airplanes, naval vessels, and cargo vessels. The largest total volume of contracts was awarded to General Motors Corporation, amounting to $7,251,100,000. Next was the Curtiss-Wright Corporation. Next was the Bethlehem Steel Corporation. Next in order were Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., United Aircraft Corporation, Ford Motor Co., Boeing Airplane Co., Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, United States Steel Corporation, and Chrysler Corporation.

If one reads the next 10 companies in the list he finds the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, Aviation Corporation, Glenn L. Martin Co., manufacturers of airplanes; Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., General Electric Co., Todd Shipyards Corporation, North American Aviation, Inc., American Telephone & Telegraph Co., E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., and the Sperry Corporation.

From a reading of this list it is clear that the largest contracts have been granted for the manufacture of the implements of war which are most needed if we are successfully to fight the war.

Under these circumstances it is easy to understand why the War Department and officers in charge of the services of supply should feel that they should be the ones to decide what materials are necessary, and to whom the contracts for the materials should be awarded. The services of supply feel that upon them is the responsibility of procuring materials with which the soldiers are to fight and win the war.

However Mr. President, there is a circumstance in connection with this list which is worthy of a moment's comment. The list is prepared in two forms: First, in the order of the size of the contracts; and secondly, in alphabetical order, showing the subsidiary corporations of some of the giants to which parts of the contracts have been farmed out.

Let us take, for example, the American Car & Foundry Co. Under that heading come the American Car & Foundry Co., the American Welding Co., J. G. Brill Co., Carter Carburetor Corporation, and Hall-Scott Motor Car Co.

Under American Locomotive Co. come the American Locomotive Co., Alco Products, Inc., Heat Transfer Products, Inc., and Railway Steel Spring Co.

Under Bethlehem Steel Corporation we find Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., Bethlehem-Sparrows Point Shipyard, Inc., Bethlehem-Hingham Shipyard, Inc., and Bethlehem-Alameda Shipyard Co.

Under General Electric Co., from which the W. P. B. has recruited Mr. Wilson, we find the following list of companies: General Electric Co., Carboloy Co., Inc., Edison General Electric Appliance Co., Inc., Elmira Foundry Co., Inc., General Electric X-ray Corporation, Trumbull Electric Manufacturing Co., and Warren Telechron Co.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have both of these lists printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*100 corporations or independent companies holding greatest amount of war supply contracts awarded June 1940 through November 1942* [1]

[Millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| General Motors Corporation | 7,251.1 |
| Curtiss-Wright Corporation | 4,613.1 |
| Bethlehem Steel Coroporation | 2,953.6 |
| Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc | 2,373.1 |
| United Aircraft Corporation | 2,342.6 |
| Ford Motor Co | 2,036.1 |
| Boeing Airplane Co | 1,826.1 |
| Consolidated Aircraft Corporation | 1,758.5 |
| United States Steel Corporation | 1,682.5 |
| Chrysler Corporation | 1,562.0 |
| Lockheed Aircraft Corporation | 1,372.0 |
| Aviation Corporation | 1,347.6 |
| Martin, Glenn L., Co | 1,328.7 |
| Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co | 1,165.0 |
| General Electric Co | 1,128.8 |
| Todd Shipyards Corporation | 1,037.8 |
| North American Aviation, Inc | 978.3 |
| American Telephone & Telegraph Co | 881.2 |
| du Pont, E. I., de Nemours & Co | 867.0 |
| Sperry Corporation | 849.3 |
| Bendix Aviation Corporation | 823.8 |
| American Car & Foundry Co | 722.3 |
| Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corporation | 649.8 |
| Bell Aircraft Corporation | 624.8 |
| Kaiser Co., Inc | 609.2 |
| United States Rubber Co | 549.0 |
| Consolidated Steel Corporation, Ltd | 546.6 |
| Pressed Steel Car Co | 486.7 |
| Baldwin Locomotive Works | 484.7 |
| Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co | 474.4 |
| International Harvester Co | 473.9 |
| Sun Oil Co | 468.7 |
| Pullman, Inc | 451.4 |
| Republic Aviation Corporation | 437.9 |
| American Locomotive Corporation | 430.8 |
| Western Cartridge Co | 338.8 |
| Bath Iron Works Corporation | 338.5 |
| Continental Motors Corporation | 337.5 |
| White Motor Co | 326.8 |
| Electric Boat Co | 319.5 |
| Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co | 317.7 |
| Diamond T Motor Car Co | 290.3 |
| Moore Dry Dock Co | 289.0 |
| American Woolen Co | 286.4 |
| Fairbanks Morse & Co | 277.7 |
| Nash Kelvinator Corporation | 268.5 |
| Brown Shipbuilding Co | 266.4 |
| Brewster Aeronautical Corporation | 257.3 |
| Dravo Corporation | 246.2 |
| Ingalls Ironworks | 226.6 |
| Studebaker Corporation | 225.5 |
| Beech Aircraft Corporation | 224.6 |
| Packard Motor Car Co | 222.6 |
| California Shipbuilding Corporation | 222.2 |
| Willys-Overland Motors, Inc | 222.0 |
| Cramp Shipbuilding Co | 203.0 |
| Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corporation | 201.9 |
| Standard Oil of New Jersey | 200.3 |
| Briggs Manufacturing Co | 197.8 |
| Western Pipe & Steel Co | 194.5 |
| Permanente Metals Corporation | 189.0 |
| Northern Pump Co | 185.9 |
| Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co | 185.7 |
| Autocar Co | 180.5 |
| Smith, A. O., Corporation | 176.4 |
| Jack & Heintz, Ltd | 174.1 |
| Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation | 171.5 |
| Auto Ordnance Corporation | 169.5 |
| Radio Corporation of America | 161.7 |
| Hercules Powder Co | 157.5 |
| Budd, Edward G., Manufacturing Co | 155.5 |
| Remington Rand, Inc | 152.4 |
| Northrop Aircraft, Inc | 147.9 |
| Cessna Aircraft Co | 145.7 |
| York Safe & Lock Co | 141.4 |
| Anaconda Copper Mining Co | 141.3 |
| Mack Trucks, Inc | 138.5 |
| Tampa Shipbuilding Co., Inc | 135.7 |
| Hudson Motor Car Co | 135.1 |
| Colt's Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co | 133.5 |
| Goodrich, B. F., Co | 130.5 |
| Firestone Tire & Rubber Co | 126.3 |
| Electric Auto-Lite Co | 124.7 |
| Republic Steel Corporation | 124.0 |
| Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation | 122.5 |
| Missouri Shipbuilding Corporation | 120.0 |
| Ryan Aeronautical Co | 119.5 |
| Lake Washington Shipyards | 116.0 |
| American Can Co | 114.9 |
| Lima Locomotive Works | 114.4 |

[1] Includes all supply contracts of $50,000 and over reported as awarded through November 1942 by the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, Treasury (only defense aid awards of the latter agency), and the purchasing missions of foreign governments for manufacture in the United States. Foreign contracts cover the period since September 1939.

| | |
|---|---|
| Crucible Steel Co. of America | 112.6 |
| Pacific Car & Foundry Co | 112.1 |
| A. O. G. Corporation | 111.3 |
| Singer Manufacturing Co | 107.9 |
| Jacobs Aircraft Engine Co | 107.2 |
| Worthington Pump & Machinery Corporation | 106.5 |
| Manitowac Shipbuilding Co | 106.0 |
| Kelsey Hayes Wheel Co | 104.6 |
| Caterpillar Tractor Co | 104.3 |
| McQuay Norris Manufacturing Co | 103.3 |
| Total for companies shown above | 59,157.9 |
| Percent of total for all companies | 70.1 |
| Total for all companies | 84,978.3 |
| A. O. G. Corporation | 111.3 |
| Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co | 185.7 |
| American Can Co | 114.9 |
| American Can Co | 7.6 |
| Amertorp Corporation | 98.0 |
| Ammunition Container Corporation | 9.3 |
| American Car & Foundry Co | 722.3 |
| American Car & Foundry Co | 665.2 |
| American Welding Co | 3.7 |
| Brill, J. G., Co | 8.3 |
| Carter Carburetor Corporation | 12.9 |
| Hall-Scott Motor Car Co | 32.2 |
| American Locomotive Co | 430.8 |
| American Locomotive Co | 426.1 |
| Alco Products, Inc | 2.9 |
| Heat Transfer Products, Inc | 1.6 |
| Railway Steel Spring Co | .2 |
| American Telephone & Telegraph Co | 881.2 |
| Bell Telephone Laboratories | .2 |
| Western Electric Co., Inc | 881.0 |
| American Woolen Co | 286.4 |
| Anaconda Copper Mining Co | 141.3 |
| Anaconda Copper Mining Co | .8 |
| American Brass Co | 96.0 |
| Anaconda Wire & Cable | 44.4 |
| International Smelting & Refining Co | .1 |
| Autocar Co | 180.5 |
| Auto Ordnance Corporation | 169.5 |
| Aviation Corporation | 1,347.6 |
| Aviation Corporation | 65.0 |
| American Propeller Corporation | 14.2 |
| New York Shipbuilding Corporation | 861.4 |
| Vultee Aircraft Co., Inc | 407.0 |
| Baldwin Locomotive Works | 484.7 |
| Baldwin Locomotive Works | 304.8 |
| Cramp Brass & Iron Foundries Co | 4.1 |
| Midvale Co | 113.8 |
| Standard Steel Works Co | 55.2 |
| Whitcomb Locomotive Corporation | 6.8 |
| Bath Iron Works Corporation | 338.5 |
| Beech Aircraft Corporation | 224.6 |
| Bell Aircraft Corporation | 624.8 |
| Bendix Aviation Corporation | 823.8 |
| Bendix Aviation Corporation | 784.5 |
| Bendix Aviation, Ltd | 15.0 |
| Bendix Westinghouse Automotive Airbrake Co | 8.1 |
| Jaeger Watch Co., Inc | 5.7 |
| Peco Manufacturing Corporation | 10.5 |
| Bethlehem Steel Corporation | 2,953.6 |
| Bethlehem Steel Co | 2,081.9 |
| Bethlehem — Fairfield Shipyard, Inc | 221.0 |
| Bethlehem — Sparrows Point Shipyard, Inc | 112.1 |
| Bethlehem — Hingham Shipyard, Inc | 433.7 |
| Bethlehem — Alameda Shipyard Co | 104.9 |
| Boeing Airplane Co | 1,826.1 |
| Boeing Aircraft Co | 1,826.1 |
| Brewster Aeronautical Corporation | 257.3 |
| Briggs Manufacturing Co | 197.8 |
| Brown Shipbuilding Co | 266.4 |
| Budd, Edward G., Manufacturing Co | 155.5 |
| California Shipbuilding Corporation | 222.2 |
| Caterpillar Tractor Co | 104.3 |
| Caterpillar Tractor Co | 70.6 |
| Caterpillar Military Engine Co | 33.7 |
| Cessna Aircraft Co | 145.7 |
| Chrysler Corporation | 1,562.0 |
| Colt's Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co | 133.5 |
| Consolidated Aircraft Corporation | 1,758.5 |
| Consolidated Steel Corporation, Ltd | 546.6 |
| Consolidated Steel Corporation, Ltd | 203.0 |
| Consolidated Steel Corporation of Texas | 343.6 |
| Continental Motors Corporation | 337.5 |
| Continental Motors Corporation | 294.8 |
| Continental Aviation & Engineering Corporation | 42.7 |
| Cramp Shipbuilding Co | 203.0 |
| Crucible Steel Co. of America | 112.6 |
| Curtiss-Wright Corporation | 4,613.1 |
| Curtiss-Wright Corporation | 2,444.9 |
| Wright Aeronautical Corporation | 2,168.2 |
| Diamond T. Motor Car Co | 290.3 |
| Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc | 2,373.1 |
| Dravo Corporation | 246.2 |
| du Pont, E. I., de Nemours & Co | 867.0 |
| du Pont, E. I., de Nemours & Co | 377.1 |
| Krebs Pigment & Color Corporation | 0.1 |
| Remington Arms Co., Inc | 489.8 |
| Electric Auto-Lite Co | 124.7 |
| Electric Auto-Lite Co | 122.9 |
| American Leather Products Corporation | 0.1 |
| Presto-Lite Battery Co., Inc | 1.7 |
| Electric Boat Co | 319.5 |
| Fairbanks Morse & Co | 277.7 |
| Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corporation | 201.9 |
| Firestone Tire & Rubber Co | 126.3 |
| Firestone Cotton Mills, Inc | 1.0 |
| Firestone Rubber & Latex Products Co | 6.2 |
| Firestone Tire & Rubber Co | 100.1 |
| Nebraska Defense Corporation | 12.2 |
| Schacht Rubber Co., Inc | 6.8 |
| Ford Motor Co | 2,036.1 |
| General Electric Co | 1,128.8 |
| General Electric Co | 1,079.2 |
| Carboloy Co., Inc | 1.5 |
| Edison General Electric Appliance Co., Inc | 37.2 |
| Elmira Foundry Co., Inc | 0.1 |
| General Electric X-ray Corporation | 6.2 |
| Trumbull Electric Manufacturing Co | 0.7 |
| Warren Telechron Co | 3.9 |
| General Motors Corporation | 7,251.1 |
| General Motors Corporation | 6,182.2 |
| Yellow Truck & Coach Manufacturing Co | 1,068.9 |
| Goodrich, B. F. Co | 130.5 |
| Goodrich, B. F. Co | 85.1 |
| Lone Star Defense Corporation | 45.4 |
| Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co | 474.4 |
| Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co | 188.1 |
| Goodyear Aircraft Corporation | 241.8 |
| Goodyear Engineering Corporation | 11.5 |
| Kelly-Springfield Tire Co | 32.6 |
| Windsor Manufacturing Corporation | 0.4 |
| Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corporation | 649.8 |
| Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation | 122.5 |
| Hercules Powder Co | 157.5 |
| Hudson Motor Car Co | 135.1 |
| Ingalls Ironworks | 226.6 |
| Ingalls Ironworks | 0.1 |
| Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation | 226.5 |
| International Harvester Co | 473.9 |
| Jack & Heintz, Ltd | 174.1 |
| Jacobs Aircraft Engine Co | 107.2 |
| Kaiser Co., Inc | 609.2 |
| Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co | 104.6 |
| Lake Washington Shipyards | 116.0 |
| Lima Locomotive Works, Inc | 114.4 |
| Lockheed Aircraft Corporation | 1,372.5 |
| Lockheed Aircraft Corporation | 934.5 |
| Vega Airplane Co | 438.0 |
| Mack Trucks, Inc | 138.5 |
| Mack Manufacturing Corporation | 138.5 |
| Manitowac Shipbuilding Co | 106.0 |
| Martin, Glenn L., Co | 1,328.7 |
| McQuay Norris Manufacturing Co | 103.3 |
| Missouri Shipbuilding Corporation | 120.0 |
| Moore Dry Dock Co | 289.0 |
| Nash-Kelvinator Corporation | 268.5 |
| Nash-Kelvinator Corporation | 256.6 |
| Electromaster, Inc | 5.3 |
| Ranco, Inc | 6.6 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co | 1,165.0 |
| Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co | 1,076.5 |
| North Carolina Shipbuilding Co | 88.5 |
| North American Aviation, Inc | 978.3 |
| Northern Pump Co | 185.9 |
| Northrop Aircraft, Inc | 147.9 |
| Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation | 171.5 |
| Pacific Car & Foundry Co | 112.1 |
| Packard Motor Car Co | 222.6 |
| Permanente Metals Corporation | 189.0 |
| Pressed Steel Car Co | 486.7 |
| Pullman, Inc | 451.4 |
| Pullman Co | .7 |
| Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co | 450.7 |
| Radio Corporation of America | 161.7 |
| RCA Manufacturing Co., Inc | 156.3 |
| Radiomarine Corporation of America | 5.4 |
| Remington Rand, Inc | 152.4 |
| Remington Rand, Inc | 134.0 |
| Andover Kent Co | 18.4 |
| Republic Aviation Corporation | 437.9 |
| Republic Steel Corporation | 124.0 |
| Republic Steel Corporation | 111.8 |
| Howard Supply Co | .1 |
| Trucson Steel Co | 12.1 |
| Ryan Aeronautical Co | 119.5 |
| Ryan Aeronautical Co | 112.4 |
| Ryan School of Aeronautics | 7.1 |
| Singer Manufacturing Co | 107.9 |
| Singer Manufacturing Co | 106.0 |
| Singer Sewing Machine Co | .5 |
| Diehl Manufacturing Co | 1.4 |
| Smith, A. O., Corporation | 176.4 |
| Sperry Corporation | 849.3 |
| Ford Instrument Co., Inc | 197.3 |
| Sperry Gyroscope, Inc | 602.1 |
| Vickers, Inc | 40.3 |
| Waterbury Tool Co | 9.6 |
| Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey | 200.3 |
| Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey | 138.9 |
| Colonial Beacon Oil Co | 5.6 |
| Gilbert & Barker Manufacturing Co | 34.4 |
| Humble Oil Co | 17.8 |
| Stanco, Inc | .2 |
| Standard Oil of Louisiana | 3.3 |
| Standard Oil of Pennsylvania | .1 |
| Studebaker Corporation | 225.5 |
| Sun Oil Co | 468.7 |
| Sun Oil Co | 8.6 |
| Arrow Oil Co | .2 |
| Martin & Schwartz, Inc | 3.3 |
| Sun Shipbuilding & Drydock Co | 456.6 |
| Tampa Shipbuilding Co., Inc | 135.7 |
| Todd Shipyards Corporation | 1,037.8 |
| Houston Shipbuilding Corporation | 67.5 |
| Seattle Tacoma Shipbuilding Corporation | 842.1 |
| South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation | 83.5 |
| Todd-Bath Iron Shipbuilding Corporation | 44.7 |
| United Aircraft Corporation | 2,342.6 |
| United Aircraft Corporation | 2,236.1 |
| United Aircraft Corporation of Missouri | 106.5 |
| United States Rubber Co | 549.0 |
| United States Rubber Co | 547.8 |
| Mishawaka Rubber & Woolen Manufacturing Co | .8 |
| United States Rubber Products, Inc | .4 |
| United States Steel Corporation | 1,682.5 |
| United States Steel Export Corporation | 99.9 |
| American Bridge Co | 52.4 |
| American Steel & Wire Co. of New Jersey | 64.4 |
| Carnegie Illinois Steel Corporation | 140.4 |
| Columbia Steel Co | 6.2 |
| Federal Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co | 1,234.6 |
| National Tube Co | 56.9 |
| Oil Well Supply Co | 5.9 |
| Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co | 19.4 |
| Universal Atlas Cement Co | .8 |
| Virginia Bridge Co | 1.6 |
| Western Cartridge Co | 338.8 |
| Western Cartridge Co | 226.7 |
| United States Cartridge Co | 112.1 |
| Western Pipe & Steel Co | 194.5 |
| Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co | 317.7 |
| Bryant Electric Co | .1 |
| Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co | 279.3 |
| Westinghouse Electric Elevator Co | 36.6 |
| Westinghouse X-Ray Co | 1.7 |
| White Motor Co | 326.8 |
| Willys-Overland Motors, Inc | 222.0 |
| Worthington Pump & Machinery Corporation | 106.5 |
| Worthington Pump & Machinery Corporation | 106.0 |
| Worthington Gamon & Meter Co | .5 |
| York Safe & Lock Co | 141.4 |
| Total for companies shown above | 59,557.9 |
| Percent of total for all companies | 70.1 |
| Total for all companies | 84,978.3 |

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall content myself with adding only this additional statement:

This list of huge contracts awarded to 100 large companies, as well as the list of the subsidiary corporations among which the contracts have been divided, indicate how important it is for the people of America to give consideration to the industrial organization which we are to have after the war.

Because it felt that the production of these materials was the first essential, so that its military forces would have arms, the Government has followed the policy of abandoning antitrust suits. It is of more than passing interest that the small-war-plants bill contained a section which was added in the other House, and which finally passed in a much modified form, the purpose of which was to do away with antitrust or monopoly suits.

I have in my hand, Mr. President, a memorandum which was sent to the Committee on the Judiciary by Attorney General Biddle. It contains a list of the cases and proceedings which have been postponed under the arrangement set up by the reply of the President to the letters of the Attorney General and the Secretaries of War and Navy, with respect to monopolies and the abandonment of antitrust suits. I ask that the memorandum be also printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1943.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ATTORNEY GENERAL RE CASES AND PROCEEDINGS POSTPONED UNDER THE ARRANGEMENT SET UP BY THE REPLY OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE LETTERS OF ATTORNEY GENERAL BIDDLE AND THE SECRETARIES OF WAR AND NAVY

Allied Chemical & Dye Corporation et al., Criminal 753–C: Postponement requested by Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, in letter dated May 25, 1942. Letter from Stimson not filed with court. Letter from Attorney General to Judge Phillip Forman, dated June 11, 1942, requesting postponement. Press release June 11, 1942.

American Optical Co. et al., Civil 10-391: Postponement requested by Acting Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson in letter dated August 17, 1942, and by Acting Secretary of the Navy Ralph A. Bard in letter dated September 5, 1942. Letters not filed with court but judge notified antitrust staff on October 13, 1942.

American Surgical Trade Association, Criminal 8874: Postponement requested by Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, in letter dated May 28, 1942, and by James V. Forrestal, Acting Secretary of the Navy, in letter dated June 8, 1942. Letters not filed with court, but Attorney General notified Judge William H. Kirkpatrick in letter of September 12, 1942

Central Supply Association, et al., Criminal 16750: Postponement requested by Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, in letter dated July 10, 1942, and by James V. Forrestal, Acting Secretary of Navy, in letter of July 10, 1942. Court notified by District Attorney Don C. Miller in accordance with request from the Attorney General contained in letter of August 3, 1942. Press release July 30, 1942.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., et al., Criminal 878–C: Postponement requested by Acting Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson in letter dated August 29, 1942, and by Acting Secretary of Navy Ralph A. Bard in letter dated September 2, 1942. Letters not filed with Court, but Judge informed by members of Antitrust staff. Press release September 10, 1942.

Rohm & Haas Co., Inc., et al., Criminal 877–C: Same as Criminal 878–C (above).

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. et al., Criminal 1266: Postponement requested by Acting Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson in letter dated July 31, 1942, and by Acting

Secretary of Navy James V. Forrestal in letter dated August 4, 1942. Letters not filed with court, but court notified by members of antitrust staff. Press release October 1, 1942.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. et al., Criminal 1268: Same as Criminal 1266 above.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. et al., Criminal 1269: Same as Criminal 1266.

Monsanto Chemical Co. et al., Criminal 1265: Same as Criminal 1266.

Mutual Chemical Co. of America et al., Criminal 1270: Same as Criminal 1266.

Victor Chemical Works et al., Criminal 1267: Same as Criminal 1266.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. et al., Criminal 9733: Postponement requested by Acting Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson in letter dated June 10, 1942. Letter not filed with court, but court notified by members of antitrust staff.

General Electric Co., Fried. Krupp Aktiengesellschaft et al., Criminal 110–412: Postponement requested by Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson in letter of April 20, 1942, and by Secretary of Navy Frank Knox in letter dated April 21, 1942. Letters not filed with court, but court notified by Assistant Attorney General Arnold in letter of May 8, 1942. Press release April 25, 1942.

General Electric Co. et al., Criminal 108–172: Same as Criminal 110–142 (above).

Southern California Gas Co. et al., Criminal 14832: Postponement requested by Acting Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson in letter dated August 25, 1942. Letter not filed with court, but court notified by member of antitrust staff.

*United States* v. *Illinois Freight Association:* Postponement requested by Joseph B. Eastman, Director of Office of Defense Transportation, in letter dated December 11, 1942, and concurred in by Acting Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson and Acting Secretary of Navy James V. Forrestal. Also by Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, in letter dated December 19, 1942. Concurred in by James V. Forrestal, Acting Secretary of Navy. Letters filed with court. Press release of January 4, 1943.

*United States* v. *Central States Motor Freight Bureau et al.:* Same as Illinois Freight Association (above).

*United States* v. *Illinois Freight Association and Central State Motor Freight Bureau et al.:* Same as Illinois Freight Association.

American Brass Co., et al., Criminal 112–154, 112–155.—Postponement requested by Acting Secretary of Navy James V. Forrestal in letter dated July 18, 1942, and by Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, in letter dated July 20, 1942. Letters not filed with court, but court notified by members of antitrust staff.

Hawaiian pineapple industry investigation: Postponement requested by Acting Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson in letter dated September 10, 1942, and by Acting Secretary of Navy James V. Forrestal in letter dated September 30, 1942. Request was made by both Patterson and Forrestal that entire matter be kept strictly confidential in view of political situation in Hawaiian Islands. Agreed to by Attorney General.

THURMAN ARNOLD,
*Assistant Attorney General.*

## NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR NATIONAL CORPORATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In justification of all this, it has been argued—and probably with some good reason—that we should not permit our concentration in preparing for and waging the war to be dissipated by legal controversies which could as well be settled after the victory has been won. It will be tragic, however, if the country does not realize that the structure of American industry which has grown out of the war represents the destruction of local economic independence.

The first 10 companies on this list have each received from the Federal Government awards the dollar value of which far exceeds the taxable resources of most of the States. These corporations, and the others on the list, with the huge facilities which have been provided for them as a result of these contracts, will be in the position after the war of dominating our peace economy as they now dominate our war economy. That, in turn, will mean, unless we take steps to remedy it, that the economic life of all the people of America will be in the hands of the managers of these enterprises. We shall then have a struggle for the control of the industrial structure.

It is not too much to say that the fate of free, independent enterprise is at stake. Unless Congress finds a way of protecting local business and little business from the control of this tremendous concentration of economic power, there will be an inevitable demand for the Government to take over the enterprises. That, of course, is the road to socialism.

I think there is a remedy for this problem. I shall not discuss it today, except to call attention to the fact that on numerous occasions in the past 9 years I have urged the enactment of a law to establish national standards for national corporations. We must fix the powers and responsibilities of all these economic organizations if we have any hope or design to preserve what we are pleased to call the American way.

## BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, under authority of the act approved July 15, 1939, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce is required to appoint two Senators to serve on the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

As chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I announce that I have appointed the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] as members for the committee.

## MR. HOOVER'S ADVICE AS TO FOOD AND MANPOWER

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the people throughout the country are becoming more and more concerned with the manpower and production problems now facing the Nation by reason of the tremendous war responsibilities we have assumed. Many informed sources have given their views on these particular issues.

Probably the most trenchant and clear-cut statement of this entire problem was given by former President Herbert Hoover, who recently appeared before a Senate Committee and testified as to the needs and capacities of our agricultural economy and set forth his ideas as to the best manner in which our manpower might be allocated.

It is my belief, Mr. President, that Mr. Hoover is probably the best informed man in America on these particular issues. The statements he made and the conclusions he reached were not based upon any theoretical or statistical approach; they were based, rather, on broad experience and thorough, first-hand knowledge.

By reason of his experience in the World War, during which he administered the food program; by reason of his experience as Secretary of Commerce and President of the United States; and by further reason of his broad travel and world knowledge, Mr. Hoover, probably better than anyone else, is familiar with the production capacities of the United States. He is no less familiar with the tremendous needs for a part of that production in other parts of the world. He is, moreover, well aware of the difficult problems of manpower, production, supply, and incentive that must be solved if the food-production and war-production programs of the Nation are to be successfully carried out.

It is my belief that the ability, knowledge, and experience of Mr. Hoover should be incorporated in the administration of our Government's domestic manpower and food-production programs, as well as in the programs designed to meet our lease-lend commitments abroad. I believe that the administration would be strengthened and that public confidence would be restored if this step were taken.

During his testimony, Mr. Hoover also pointed out that the resources of the United States, both as to manpower and as to the endowments of nature, are limited. He clearly admonished us that we must not attempt to do everything at once. He made it clear that we should first provide the farmer—who, afte all, is the backbone of this effort—with the manpower necessary to perform his great task, and that we must do so without destroying the incentive of competition which has given to the American farmer his great productive powers.

Mr. Hoover also made clear that we must provide suitable and ample manpower for our vast war production enterprises, and that we must do so without destroying the incentive of free enterprise, which has given to American workmen the most advanced standard of living, the best working conditions, and the highest wages enjoyed by any workmen in the world.

I believe that the Congress and the administration should heed well the words of Mr. Hoover, for he is well informed on every aspect of these important problems. I further believe that the Congress and the administration should see fit to call upon Mr. Hoover and urge that he devote himself actively to the administration of one or more of these critical war programs.

Since Mr. Hoover appeared before the Senate committee, public reaction along these lines has been very pronounced; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a brief editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News of February 9, entitled "Hoover, Food, and Manpower."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOVER; FOOD, AND MANPOWER

It's too bad that Herbert Hoover's testimony yesterday before a Senate committee wasn't made public immediately and in full. Mr. Hoover's views on the necessity for greatly increased food production, to win the war and the peace, seem to us so important that they ought to have the widest possible hearing.

On wartime food questions Mr. Hoover is the world's foremost authority, by right of successful experience. His warning that American failure to produce more meats and fats would endanger military success and mean starvation for millions in Europe after the war—that carries tremendous weight. His plea that agriculture be treated as a munitions industry, which indeed it is, cannot safely be ignored.

Mr. Hoover's public remarks following his testimony indicate he told the committee that the farms, the oil fields, and the metal mines should have this year some 4,000,000 more workers than are now in sight. Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, before another Senate committee, is said to have testified that at least 3,100,000 more farm laborers must be recruited to produce the crops needed this year.

To go much longer without great success in solving the farm-manpower problem can mean disaster. So, we think, Mr. Hoover's suggestions for solving that problem and stimulating meat and fat production—by furloughing large numbers of soldiers for the planting and harvest seasons, importing temporary supplies of Mexican labor, moving workers from other industries to the farms, recruiting boys, girls, and elderly people for light agricultural work, modifying price policies—should have the Administration's earnest and immediate consideration. We hope Congress will insist that they have it.

We find it hard to enthuse over the manpower bill introduced by Representative WADSWORTH, of New York, and Senator AUSTIN, of Vermont, Republicans both, for drafting men between 18 and 65 and women between 18 and 50 for any jobs to which the Government might assign them through the draft boards.

The bill is defective in not specifically guaranteeing to persons drafted for war work the right to join or refuse to join unions. And we still believe that there is little sense in talking about drafting labor while the Government continues to waste manpower on its overstuffed pay rolls, and the labor unions continue to waste manpower by their "featherbed" practices and their resistance to proposals for lengthening the artificially short workweek in civilian industries.

## GASOLINE RATIONING IN WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, since I made my recent address about the gasoline rationing situation in western Pennsylvania, there has come to my attention other information which I feel may well be presented on the floor of this Chamber.

This morning my colleague and I joined a group of 75 prominent representatives from the western Pennsylvania area and met with Mr. Harold L. Ickes and Mr. Prentiss Brown. We presented to them a description of the peculiar situation which exists in that region of Pennsylvania. It was pointed out that in Allegheny County the terrain is so rugged, the roads are so difficult, and the distances to and from work are so great, that the gasoline allowances to the individual workers are woefully inadequate to meet their essential transportation needs.

It was also pointed out that in Allegheny County there are thousands of vital war production plants, the finished products of which are absolutely essential to the attainment of victory.

In the Westinghouse factory alone, the thousands of workmen there are turning out a carload of finished war equipment every 11 minutes. Since the plant is operating on a round-the-clock schedule, that means that, from that one plant alone, 131 carloads of finished war material move toward the front every day. Those cars, if joined together, would make a freight train more than a mile long. I repeat that the Westinghouse plant is but one of thousands of such plants which are operating in that strategic area of western Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, if we are to attain victory on the home front and on the battle front, it is essential that the vital and necessary work which those thousands of people are doing be maintained. It cannot be maintained unless a more liberal gasoline allowance is immediately forthcoming to those workers, many of whom must travel a distance of 40 miles to and from their work. The achievement of our war aims and the success of our armed forces are being unnecessarily jeopardized by reason of the gasoline rationing policy which prevails in western Pennsylvania at this time.

However, I am gratified to say that the presentation of the situation described by the representatives of western Pennsylvania and their Members of Congress was well received by Secretary Ickes and Administrator Brown; and I feel confident that their continued study of those conditions will bring about a more reasonable and effective gasoline rationing program in western Pennsylvania.

Because the correction of the conditions described by the representatives referred to is so very important, and because it is quite clear that the conditions they have described exist over a large area, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement which was prepared by the western Pennsylvania group, and which was ably presented to Mr. Ickes and Mr. Brown by Representative JAMES A. WRIGHT, of the Thirty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania, in the hope that a knowledge of the conditions peculiar to that area may result in a more enlightened administration of the gasoline rationing program in western Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Mr. Secretary Ickes, Mr. Brown, Honorable Senators and Representatives:*

This is, I believe, the fourth time since last spring that a delegation representing western Pennsylvania has made an appeal to this office for the easing of restrictions on the sale and use of gasoline in the western Pennsylvania district.

Our appeal is not based on self-interest. It is not selfish. If we felt that the present severe restrictions on western Pennsylvania contributed to the winning of the war, we would not be here today. However, we feel strongly that these restrictions are having a contrary effect on the war effort of western Pennsylvania. We are convinced that there is plenty of gasoline in the 25-county district that we are referring to. The stocks are increasing instead of diminishing and the facilities are not available to move them to the eastern seaboard.

The whole theory of rationing as conceived and applied is a plan to meet shortages of necessary products essential to our economic life and the winning of the war. We have no shortage of gasoline in western Pennsylvania. The daily average of crude run in the stills of Pennsylvania refineries at the present time is producing 1,102,500 gallons. The production of the Gulf Refineries at Pittsburgh is 262,500 gallons and the production of natural gasoline for blending motor fuel is 46,200 gallons, making a total of 1,411,200 gallons. To this should be added the quantity delivered daily by barge from the Ashland Refining Co., of Ashland, Ky., which is 300,000 gallons. This makes a total of 1,711,200 gallons as the average daily supply at the present time in the 25-county district west of the Allegheny Mountains.

These figures are based on reports of the Oil and Gas Journal of February 4, 1943, and on carefully assembled figures gathered by a special investigator assigned to the task by the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

Of course, we were very much interested a few days ago to learn that western West Virginia would be placed in district 2. We think this was a proper move and we are gratified at the success of our West Virginia neighbors in receiving this consideration. However, it is interesting to note that the crude oil production of Pennsylvania in the year 1942 was 16,841,000 barrels, as against 3,492,000 barrels for West Virginia. As an oil-production area producing 5 times the volume of West Virginia, we feel that we are justified in presenting the appeal that we are making today.

Now, as to consumption, the daily consumption of gasoline in the 25-county area during 1941 was 2,000,000 gallons. During the first 5 months of 1942 this consumption had dropped to 1,500,000 gallons daily. During January of this year, under the full effect of rationing, the daily consumption had dropped to 600,000 gallons.

Comparing our production with our consumption, we have a daily production in the 25-county area of 1,711,200 gallons as against a consumption of 600,000 gallons. This is the simple explanation of why we have plenty of gasoline in western Pennsylvania and why stocks are increasing.

Our consumption figures are conservatively estimated. We show that our consumption is about 40 percent of what it was a year ago. Surveys of sales by the larger gas companies indicate that they are selling only 30 to 40 percent as much gasoline as they did a year ago.

In support of this drastic decline of consumption, consider the traffic figures of the Pennsylvania Turnpike. In December 1941, 126,616 cars used the turnpike. In December 1942, month before last, 35,220 cars used the turnpike—a drop of 72 percent.

As against this drastic reduction in consumption, I repeat, gentlemen, that we have plenty of gasoline in western Pennsylvania. The stocks of motor gasoline on hand in Pennsylvania refineries at the end of December last was 21,674,352 gallons. On January 21 it was 21,446,250 gallons, and on January 28, only 2 weeks ago, the stocks of the Pennsylvania refineries were 21,901,866 gallons. These are the figures of the National Petroleum Association.

If these large stocks of gasoline were being made available for the war effort, I assure you there would be no protest from western Pennsylvania. Month after month our people of western Pennsylvania have been told

that these stocks were being moved or were to be moved to the East; that they were necessary to the war effort, but the fact remains that the acute transportation problem has prevented their being moved. The facilities apparently are not available to move the gasoline to the East where it is needed. Then the natural question arises: Why cannot at least a limited amount of this excess gasoline be made available in an area where its use will be a direct contribution, as we think, to the winning of the war?

Throughout western Pennsylvania our common carriers are loaded to extreme capacity. The Pittsburgh Railways Co., whose trolleys and busses serve the entire Allegheny County industrial district, handled a total of 237,735,000 passengers on their trolley cars last year and 16,000,000 passengers on their busses. As an example of the increased demands on the common carriers, the traffic of this company's trolley system increased 40 percent in January of this year as against January 1942.

In the war plants of western Pennsylvania the expanded personnel has brought workers from the farms and rural areas and large numbers of war workers travel 35 or 40 miles to and from their work. Every additional gallon of gasoline made available to them eases their burden and contributes to improved morale.

In the great centers of industry like Pittsburgh and its industrial suburbs, the problem of transportation is becoming increasingly serious. The great Westinghouse Co. at Pittsburgh reports: "We have in East Pittsburgh 26,000 people with only a small percentage using either steam or streetcar transportation in coming to work or going home. East Pittsburgh is a relatively small town and only a small percentage of our people live there. Our superintendent of transportation estimates that at least 70 percent of our 26,000 people there must rely on automobiles. It is evident that if through present drastic or future even more drastic restrictions, sufficient discontent is aroused to result in a large number of privately owned cars being disposed of by their owners we would have a serious transportation problem confronting us.

"The streetcars and steam transportation facilities are now pretty well taxed to their limit in handling the number of people who use them. The present situation whereby western Pennsylvania is treated the same as eastern Pennsylvania is causing a great deal of discontent among our people. This is confirmed by the recent apparently well-founded reports that excessive amounts of gasoline are available here and storage facilities are being taxed beyond their capacity.

"May we add that the director of intelligence, Third Service Command, visited our East Pittsburgh operations January 20 last, and during general discussion of working conditions and morale, the vice president and chief executive officer of our company at East Pittsburgh, Mr. A. C. Streamer, told him that this single phase of the situation was contributing more to the destruction of worker morale than anything that has happened yet, and that unless relief shortly was forthcoming, the situation would further deteriorate. The director of intelligence took the matter under advisement, but so far there has been no action."

This Westinghouse letter brings out an important point. The severity of gas rationing in western Pennsylvania and the great difficulty of thousands of our working people in war plants, who will not go through the process of obtaining supplemental ration cards, etc., is causing increasing numbers of workers to put their cars up or to sell them. Pittsburgh daily papers contain scores of advertisements enticing motorists to sell their cars. These used cars are being sold at high prices and in the Pittsburgh district alone between 150 and 200 cars per week are being bought by roving agents who ship them to the west for resale. The constantly shrinking number of passenger automobiles available is increasing the burden and the problem of the already overtaxed common carriers.

The Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation reports that: "Our Clairton works have indicated that the bus transportation facilities are encountering considerable difficulty in the maintenance of their equipment. One fleet of 32 motorbusses have 7 out of commission due to the need of extensive repairs. These repairs are delayed because of inability to obtain spare parts. All plants contacted have been of the opinion that mass transportation facilities to and from the plants are taxed to the maximum at present and that transportation by privately owned automobiles is the only available method of insuring the presence of employees in numbers sufficient for operations. Several of the plants have indicated that quite a few employees have expressed a desire to transfer their places of employment in lieu of available gasoline for transportation. This, of course, further complicates the problem of migration of labor which is the major personnel problem to industry."

This situation of having plenty of gasoline as against acute problems of transportation in the conduct of general business in the great war production area of western Pennsylvania brings us again strongly to the conviction that there is just one solution to our problem; that is to take our 25-county, western Pennsylvania area, out of the eastern seaboard district, known as district 1, and put it back where it was originally located, and we think logically belongs, in district 2.

We have nothing in common with the New England and Atlantic seaboard district in this matter. We are in an oil-producing area, and they are not. We are divided by a mountain range that formerly was regarded as the natural and logical dividing line. We think that this dividing line should be reestablished. While we have been told that it is necessary to use State lines for boundaries, this cannot be true because boundary lines have been established without respect to State lines in Florida, West Virginia, and in Tennessee.

At a meeting held in Pittsburgh on Monday of this week and attended by representatives of 15 cities in western Pennsylvania much evidence was produced to show the confusion and trouble that has arisen in districts like Erie, Sharon, and New Castle, close to the Ohio-Pennsylvania line. The old dividing line nearer the central part of the State ran for the most part through rural and thinly populated districts and thus avoided the troubles that have arisen through establishing the Ohio-Pennsylvania line as the boundary.

I believe, Mr. Secretary, that you have said publicly and I know that our President has said, that it should not be necessary to ration areas where there is a plentiful supply of gasoline. Surely this must apply to western Pennsylvania at the present time. Our manufactured gasoline is a byproduct in the production of the finest lubricants in the world necessary in great quantities for our armed forces. The volume production of these lubricants is one of the reasons why our storage tanks are full of gasoline.

Why can't we use it in our important war effort, and to maintain as nearly as possible a normal economic life that will contribute so much to morale?

May we again make a plea for western Pennsylvania, that it be taken out of district 1 and placed permanently in district 2. We assure you that it will raise the morale of our people, it will help the war effort, and it will be, in our opinion, an act of fairness and justice.

## THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF ORGANIZATION OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, 33 years ago today there was organized here in this Capital City a youth movement which has served this Nation well in the past and now is doing a man-sized job on the home front. I refer to the Boy Scouts of America.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans are helping to observe the Boy Scout birthday throughout the Nation. It is a fact that few communities throughout the country are without Scout troops. Even in our rural areas, with which I am quite familiar, Rural Scouts and Lone Scouts live by the Scout oath and law. In the far-flung outposts of our democracy, Scouts live and work to help win the war. Today their total active strength is 1,570,000 Scouts and Scouters. Through the 33 years of its existence the Boy Scouts of America have counted more than 11,000,000 members, men and boys, who have been influenced by Scouting.

What does this mean to us as citizens of the United States? It means several things. We have thousands of men, now in our armed forces, who were once Scouts. As Scouts they took the Scout oath and promised to obey the Scout law. To those who do not know the portent of this statement, let me repeat the oath and law. I always feel more hopeful for the outcome of this struggle and the peace that will follow when I read it. I quote:

> On my honor, I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country, and to obey the Scout law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake and morally straight.

These lines should give us all hope. Our men who are now fighting for freedom in remote corners of the earth, these former Scouts, had this oath ingrained in them as boys during their most formative years.

How, I ask the people of America, can we fail in our duty when we have men who hold vital their duty to God and their country? Duty to God—love of country! These are virtues which are entirely strange to the Axis countries which replace both God and country with ruthless megalomaniacs.

Mr. President, the boys fighting on the battle line so that you and I and the rest of the world can be free—free in every respect—know that they must crush the lustful, selfish, cruel international vagrants, as they will do, with God's help.

Backing up these men, on the home front is the legion of fine boys, bred to the same oath and law—boys who, at fifteen, know why America has entered the fray. They would like to be able to fight alongside their older brother Scouts, but they realize they cannot; so they pitch in wholeheartedly to do what they can.

Of course, we all know what amazing amounts of wastepaper these boys collected—300 million pounds, I am told. Prior to that effort Scouts gathered in 87 percent of all the old aluminum collected in the United States.

Right now Boy Scouts have assumed an all-inclusive salvage collection responsibility from coast to coast, after sectional campaigns have yielded millions of pounds of scrap rubber, metal, rags, and other waste items.

Mr. President, every Government agency concerned with the war has felt the effects of Scout assistance. The Office of Civilian Defense has particularly felt the strength of Scouting in its use of boys for messenger and warden aide service. The American Red Cross, the U. S. O., and many other agencies serving our armed forces have received assistance from Scouts. Yes; these boys are doing good, and seeking more to do. They are our home front.

The Boy Scouts of today are the men of tomorrow who will help maintain peace. Many of the older ones may yet be in the armed forces, and at the making of the peace, which this time we mean to make permanent. They are grounded in the solid fundamentals of strong democracy. They know what freedom means; they know how important it is to all people, including their brother Scouts in all the world.

Ten years from now, 20, 50 years from now, the Boy Scout who knocks today on the door for the last piece of scrap will still be living according to the Scout oath and law. Contact with Boy Scouts leaves an indelible mark. For my part, I like their contribution to our life. It is the kind of healthy sign we need to help us keep our heads high. With it, we will win the war, and we will win the peace.

### INSPECTION OF JAPANESE RELOCATION CENTERS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably Senate Resolution 101, which has been favorably reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 101) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof duly appointed by the chairman of the committee, hereby is authorized to visit, for the purposes of inspection, during the present session of Congress, the Japanese relocation centers in the United States, the expenses incurred in pursuance thereof not to exceed $3,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Assistant Dental Surgeon James O. Blythe, Jr., to be passed assistant dental surgeon in the Public Health Service, from November 20, 1942.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Hooker A. Doolittle, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America;

C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America; and

Ernest de W. Mayer, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion and temporary appointment in the Army of the United States.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

The following named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service:

Richard L. Conolly
Frank J. Lowry
Ralph W. Christie

### WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION NOMINATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour, and the probability that there will be some discussion of some of the War Manpower Commission nominations, I ask that they be passed over, and that we begin with nominations in the Judiciary, at the bottom of page 2 of the calendar.

In this connection I wish to say that I think the nominations to the War Manpower Commission should be disposed of at the next session. The Senate has taken the responsibility of confirming these appointees, and I do not think we should delay them unduly. I hope we can dispose of them at the next session.

Mr. McNARY. I do not think there will be any further delay in the matter.

### THE JUDICIARY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning at the bottom of page 2.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Saxton Daniel to be United States attorney for the southern district of Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carl J. Werner to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

### THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

### THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all these confirmations.

### GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the President of the United States today sent to the Senate the nomination of Dwight David Eisenhower to be a general in the Army of the United States. He is to be the commander in chief of the Allied forces in the north African theater of operations. I have consulted with the majority leader, and my distinguished friend, the minority leader, and it is agreeable to them that I make request that the nomination be confirmed immediately. I know that we all join in expressing our good wishes to this superior soldier, and in wishing strength to his arm and to his men in their great undertaking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dwight David Eisenhower to be a general in the Army of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the President is to be notified immediately of all confirmations of today?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

### IMPORTANCE OF THE RAILROAD INDUSTRY AND ITS EMPLOYEES TO THE PROSECUTION OF THE WAR

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, having been in the chair for some time I have not had an opportunity to be recognized, and I should like to make a brief statement now as in legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On February 2 the Railway Labor Executives' Association gave out a release. I think all persons who have been giving any study to the problems which confront us on the domestic front will recognize that railroad transportation, and the morale of the men serving the railroads of this

country, are of vital and supreme importance to successful conduct of the war. I read one paragraph of the statement:

The heads of rail unions representing the 1,500,000 railroad employees declared today that railroad workers had about concluded they were not employed in industry essential to the winning of the war and that unless they are promptly accorded treatment equal to workers in war industries they would take action to get in industries where they will be recognized as doing their part to win the war.

I think it is very unfortunate that any such feeling should have grown up in the minds of the representatives of the men employed in the railroad systems of the United States and of the men themselves. In order that this may be brought to the attention of the Senate and of the country I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

I also wish to call attention to a letter I received under date of February 9th from Mr. J. G. Luhrsen, executive secretary-treasurer of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, in which he points out in detail, and amplifies, some of the reasons which prompted the railroad labor executives to issue this statement. It is true that one of their complaints has been to some extent met today by the nomination of two members to the Mediation Board. It is rather an anomalous situation that that Board should have been without a quorum, practically, during all these critical months. I am glad these nominations have been made. But there are many other things to which Mr. Luhrsen calls attention which I think should have the attention of Congress and of the executive branch of the Government. It is for that reason that I have made this comment, and ask that the letter and the statement be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, D. C., February 9, 1943.*

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: For your information I am attaching hereto copy of a press release issued February 2 by the Railway Labor Executives' Association.

Our feeling, I believe, is well expressed in the very first paragraph. The lack of proper consideration of the essentiality of the railroad industry and its employees seems to have been relegated to the bottom of the class. Too many other people believe, even though without practical experience, that they know more about the industry than the railroad employees and their representatives.

With respect to point No. 1, although the presidential emergency boards recommended to the President of the United States certain increases and improved conditions, quite a number of the railroads have declined to accept such recommendations. Under the Railway Labor Act, section 10, unless modified by an Executive order of the President, it is necessary to take a strike vote indicating the substantial interruption of transportation in order to induce the National Mediation Board to recommend to the President that he create and appoint an emergency board for the final disposition of such wage dispute. As patriotic citizens we dislike any publicity with respect to a threatened strike and did request that the President issue an Executive order which would circumvent the necessity of such threats. This the President did do on October 3, 1942, and up to the present time there is contention on the part of some Government agencies who insist upon carrying out what they consider their prerogative with the net result that nothing has as yet been accomplished through which wage disputes can be settled until final determination is made as to what agency will have the definite and final authority.

The War Labor Board wants to retain authority for giving approval to any recommendation that may be made by a panel of three chosen from nine men appointed by the President after such panel has heard the case and which brings about a very inconsistent condition. In other words, we feel that a board of three chosen from the panel after making its recommendations to the President should not require the further approval of another governmental agency such as the War Labor Board.

Paragraph 2 of our release shows the situation of the National Mediation Board at the present time. For more than a year we have had only two members on the National Mediation Board, and the term of one of these two expired on January 31, 1943, and the vacancy has as yet not been filled; thus the Railway Labor Act, or the law, is made inoperative, since one member of the Board does not constitute a majority or a quorum. To have the National Mediation Board vacancy filled, and which vacancy has existed now for more than a year, has been our constant endeavor but with no success. One of the members of the Mediation Board requested and did receive a leave of absence, and has for the past year devoted his entire time to the Office of Defense Transportation, thereby creating a continued handicap so far as the successful operation of the National Mediation Board is concerned.

If we had the full membership on the National Mediation Board and because of the complications now encountered with respect to the War Labor Board wanting to retain certain jurisdiction, we could during the interim and until finally settled continue to move forward under section 10 whereby the National Mediation Board could recommend board to handle present pending disputes. However, having only one member on the National Mediation Board, that member alone cannot comply with the law and make a recommendation for such an emergency board.

With respect to No. 3, it must be clearly obvious to anyone exercising sane judgment that men will not remain in the railroad industry at an average wage of 74 cents per hour (and we have thousands of employees receiving only 46 cents an hour) while the average for all the industries is 96 cents per hour. Furthermore, right now the Office of Price Administration is arguing before the Interstate Commerce Commission for the rescinding of the passenger and freight rate increases granted subsequent to the 1941 Emergency Board wage increase recommendations which are bound to further interfere with a settlement of the pending wage-increase movement. Obviously those industries outside of the railroad industry will benefit from a lower freight rate, particularly so that they should be able to exceed their present 96-cent average rate, thus spreading still further the now-existing differential between the low railroad industry and that of other industries.

Yesterday there was a further hearing with respect to the importation of Mexicans for track labor in the Southwest, particularly the Southern Pacific and Santa Fe railroads, before the War Manpower Management-Labor Policy Committee. I want to give you some of the highlights concerning the evidence presented by the railroads.

For more than 2 years the Southern Pacific Railroad has made endeavors to get authority to import Mexican track workers; the State Department having turned them down some time ago, the opportunity was ripe to seek it through the Manpower Commission. After hearing, on December 4, the policy committee voted for the importation of Mexicans for track labor. I, as one member of the committee, voted for it on the definite understanding that certain conditions would first have to be agreed to before Mexicans could be imported for track workers. This, however, was not done, and subsequently I appealed to the full Manpower Commission in opposition to the policy committee's action. However, the order went out, nevertheless, and the State Department is now working with the Mexican Government to work out an agreement permitting the importation of Mexicans.

I then moved later on to reconsider the action and rescind the policy committee's action, because of subsequent developments justifying the rescinding of the former action. Management representatives of the policy committee insisted on the railroads, the Army and other interests then also being heard. This was granted and such an open hearing was held on Friday, February 5.

Both the Southern Pacific and Sante Fe railroads had their representatives appear and presented their side exceptionally well, having the full support of the Army and the Office of Defense Transportation. (For your information our railroad employees do not have a single person on the Office of Defense Transportation as representative of labor, although it has been in existence for more than a year. We have tried repeatedly to get representation but without success.)

Our railroad retirement board placement bureau service has furnished the Southern Pacific and the Sante Fe with thousands of men, including Negroes, but the railroads claim they will not stay and leave about as fast as they are sent out. This is but natural when the railroads have a rate of pay of 46 cents an hour, at some points it runs as high as 52 cents an hour. But that is not alone the striking reason why our domestic labor declines to stay with the railroads, when they can go across the street and get 88 cents to a dollar an hour in other industries for work of a similar occupation. It is the deplorable housing conditions, the State of California having investigated reports 5 or 6 camps out of 14 in Los Angeles County alone as being unfit for habitation.

Recently because of heavy snows, rains, and other acts of God, and which is not dissimilar as compared with other years, the Southern Pacific representative declared they could not get Negroes to work in the snow and it was necessary to use soldiers of the Army to help clear some of these conditions. The Army gave them the men and when the Southern Pacific was asked who paid these men, they said they could not pay them and that they received the regular Government pay. Therefore the United States Government is furnishing help free to the Southern Pacific which railroad is the second highest in net earnings of the Nation, the Pennsylvania being the only one to exceed it. The Southern Pacific representative stated they would and wanted to pay for the soldiers' work but could not do so, but that they intended to do something to repay the Government, and the only suggestion made was to utilize that money so gained to improve their own commissary conditions.

Furthermore, this same railroad while absolutely declining or refusing to grant 1 cent of increase over and above the 46 cents per hour minimum to the representatives

of these section laborers only last month subcontracted this service to a private contractor who pays these same men doing the same identical work with the company's tools and materials 75 cents to 85 cents an hour. When asked what the additional costs were to the Southern Pacific as payment to the contractor they gave the answer as not knowing what that amounted to.

The Railroad Retirement Board furnished information to the effect that their own regional men had reported that there was a supply of approximately 40,000 unemployed domestic labor available if the substandard conditions would first be improved to levels paid in other industries, in fact, believed that domestic labor would go at 75 cents an hour with a guarantee of decent and humane treatment as to living quarters, food, etc.

However, when final decision was made by the policy committee, it was a resolution to the effect that the facts presented as of December 4, when original motion to permit the importation of Mexicans was adopted, plus the further consideration presented on February 5, reenforced their former position for the necessity of track workers being furnished these railroads, and recommeded further that the chairman immediately do what he could to have the conditions complained of corrected, including the wage structure. This, of course, is a meaningless gesture since the chairman has no control with respect to wages, and so forth.

Much more could be said concerning the general attitude of the railroads showing a decided preference for Mexicans as against domestic, especially Negro labor. The entire picture can well be summarized in the terse statement that these railroads are set on the importation of foreign labor in order to maintain their present substandard conditions after the duration.

With respect to point No. 4, our association was successful in having the President agree to issue an executive order which would obviate taking a strike vote under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, but since that time there has been a jurisdictional claim by the War Labor Board, insisting that whatever their adopted policies may be, they should apply to the railroad industry and ever since that time wage adjustments have been stymied until it may be determined by another executive order of the President as to who has final and conclusive jurisdiction. Such an order was finally issued on February 4, but it is far from satisfactory to the railroad organizations as it now stands. There is a possibility of it working to some extent but far from being the equivalent of what we feel is necessary to have it work successfully.

No. 6 shows what we have been up against and the serious delays it has caused. The War Labor Board has persisted on it holding control, while we claim to do so, interfering with the successful operation of the Railway Labor Act. It has been our very definite understanding that the President intended under his original order issued in May 1942 that the railroad industry should continue with its Railway Labor Act, separate and distinct from that of the War Labor Board.

This is a brief comment and very much more could be said of how labor generally suffers, regardless of its every and best efforts to do everything possible to win the war as quickly as possible.

The many and diversified agencies now each having a part of authority should be integrated and some final authority over all of them must be vested in some head, for as long as it remains divided as it now is, we are but prolonging the war and furthermore destroying the morale of the people as a whole. Everyone is more than anxious to exert its life and soul to the cause and give its last hearthrob to the saving of this great Nation, but it realizes the many blocks to the paths of a sublime ambition if present methods are to be followed and continued.

It should be and is the earnest and solemn prayer of every red-blooded American that the legislature, which is the real avenue through which they can appeal, that this great body be impressed to see the danger which lies ahead. Selfishness and private enterprise should be curbed and made to fall in line with the goal of ambition of the rank and file to win the war and win the peace.

Sincerely yours,

J. G. LUHRSEN,
*Executive Secretary.*

---

FEBRUARY 2, 1943.

The heads of rail unions representing the 1,500,000 railroad employees declared today that railroad workers had about concluded they were not employed in industry essential to the winning of the war and that unless they are promptly accorded treatment equal to workers in war industries they would take action to get in industries where they will be recognized as doing their part to win the war.

They said:

1. Many railroad workers have not received an increase in wages since 1937, although two Presidential emergency boards recommended to the President of the United States that the wages of these workers be raised. Some railroads refuse to accept these recommendations.

2. For nearly 2 years the National Mediation Board, the heart of the machinery of the Railway Labor Act, has been impaired by inadequate members and now there is only one member. Thus the law is made inoperative. Many, many efforts have been made to have this situation corrected, but the condition gets worse instead of better.

3. Railroad employees work 48 (some 56 and even 63) hours per week for straight time. All other industrial workers get straight time for 40 hours, one and one-half time for the sixth day and double time for the seventh day. The average hourly earnings of all workers in the railroad industry is 74 cents, while the average for all other industries is 96 cents. These low wages and bad conditions in the railroad industry are a hangover from the 10 years of depression.

4. The unions requested the President to and, in May 1942, he did issue an Executive order which made it unnecessary to take a strike vote and fix a date to strike to get an emergency board to investigate and report to the President how a dispute should be settled.

5. The President issued an Executive Order October 3, 1942 announcing the wage stabilization policy. The unions since that date have been trying to get the procedure for applying that policy to the railroad industry clarified. Several Government officials and agencies have been urging their pet views and claiming jurisdiction notwithstanding the President of the United States has stated several times just what he wants done.

6. Is this pulling and hauling all a part of a well laid plan? The railroad employees are asking for and will, if given a chance, prove they are entitled to a wage increase. The railroads now have the money to grant the employers' request. The country knows these facts. The Office of Price Administration knows these facts but they demand railroad freight rates and passenger fares be reduced. They press their demand and action thereon is expedited while at the same time the employees wage case is stalled by this pulling and hauling and delay to act. Is the purpose to subsidize other industries who are paying higher wages by taking money from the railroads so they will have a better claim to continue paying low wages? Are the railroad workers in the war effort or are they not?

If they are a part of the war effort then stop the raid on rates and fares, clear the way and raise these low wages—give the employee a square deal and thus assure them they are part of the army fighting to win the war.

They are moving more business now than in the last war, or any other period, with about half as many employees. They know the vital part they are playing in winning this war, but they feel their loyal service is not appreciated by those in Government or elsewhere who are exerting themselves to deny or delay them in using the machinery of the R. L. A. to secure the just treatment long overdue.

## ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 15, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 11, 1943:

### UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Thurman W. Arnold, of Connecticut, to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Wiley Blount Rutledge.

### NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

William M. Leiserson, of Ohio, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1946.

Harry H. Schwartz, of Wyoming, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the remainder of the term expiring February 1, 1944.

### SECRETARY, TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Edward L. Bartlett, of Alaska, to be secretary of the Territory of Alaska (reappointment).

### UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

John J. Keegan, of Florida, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for a term of 6 years from March 15, 1943 (reappointment).

### IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, for temporary appointment as general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 127a, National Defense Act, as amended.

### IN THE NAVY

Capt. George L. Weyler to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 19th day of August 1942.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 11, 1943:

### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

J. Saxton Daniel to be United States attorney for the southern district of Georgia.

### UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Carl J. Werner to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

*To be general*

Dwight David Eisenhower for temporary appointment as General in the Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Aaron S. Merrill to be rear admiral, to rank from September 9, 1942.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE

*To be captains*

Cornelius W. Flynn
Armit C. Thomas
Edmund E. Brady, Jr.
Frank G. Fahrion
Simon P. Fullinwider, Jr.
Robert G. Tobin
Theodore M. Waldschmidt
Joseph W. Gregory
Francis C. Denebrink
Lester J. Hudson
Samuel B. Brewer
Merrill Comstock
John B. Heffernan
Edward J. Moran
Elliott M. Senn
Robert L. Porter, Jr.
Ward P. Davis
Earl W. Morris
Robert W. Fleming
Allan R. McCann
Forrest P. Sherman
Ralph S. McDowell
William R. Nichols
James Fife, Jr.
William W. Warlick
Charles W. Styer
Thomas L. Sprague
Einar R. Johnson
John J. Ballentine
Stanley D. Jupp
Albert F. France, Jr.
Julian D. Wilson
Henry Y. McCown
Henry E. Thornhill
Jacob H. Jacobson
Gordon Rowe
Jerauld Wright
Harry W. Need
Earle W. Mills
John D. H. Kane
James W. Whitfield
Peter K. Fischler
Herbert B. Knowles
Kenneth M. Hoeffel
Henry S. Kendall
Olton R. Bennehoff
Arthur T. Moen
Ralph H. Henkle
Ellis H. Geiselman
Watson O. Bailey
Wallace M. Dillon

*To be commanders*

Edwin M. Crouch
Carl H. Sanders
Ralston B. Vanzant
George M. Brooke
Wakeman B. Thorp
Louis G. McGlone
Elmer P. Abernethy
Willard R. Gaines
Joseph R. Barbaro
Francis J. Bridget
Leland D. Whitgrove
Frank R. Walker
John A. Hollowell, Jr.
Robert W. Bedilion
Edgar A. Cruise
Isaiah Olch
William B. Ault
Robert H. Smith
Howard B. McIntosh
Emory P. Hylant
Thomas T. Beattie
Augustus D. Clark
Howard B. Hutchinson
Robert A. Knapp
William W. Cone
Albert L. Toney
John Connor
Robert McC. Peacher
Worthington S. Bitler
Alexander F. Junker
Delbert S. Cornwell
Robert A. J. English
Charles W. Crawford
John P. W. Vest
John Y. Dannenberg
Joseph B. Dunn
Kenmore M. McManes
Francis B. Johnson
Daniel W. Harrigan
Francis J. Mee
John B. Pearson, Jr.
Frank T. Ward, Jr.
Harry Sanders
John W. King
Frederic S. Withington
Selden B. Spangler
Albert C. Murdaugh
William V. O'Regan
John G. Crommelin, Jr.
William B. Ammon
William H. von Dreele
Alfred C. Olney, Jr.
Harry H. Keith
William A. Riley
Elliott B. Strauss
John M. Ocker
Harold D. Krick
Arleigh A. Burke
Le Merton E. Crist, Jr.
Harold N. Williams
Elbert L. Fryberger
Gordon J. Crosby
Robert L. Dennison
Roland M. Huebl
Richard W. Ruble
Stanhope C. Ring
Charles F. Coe
Thomas B. Williamson
Paul F. Dugan
Aaron P. Storrs 3d
William L. Hoffheins, Jr.
William K. Mendenhall, Jr.
Richard M. Scruggs
Frederick A. Edwards
William E. Hennigar
Joseph L. Kane
John D. Kelsey
John S. Keating
Leon N. Blair
Harry D. Felt
Percival E. McDowell
John M. Will
Karl G. Hensel
Robert H. Rodgers
Frank E. Shoup, Jr.
Frederick Moosbrugger
Francis M. Hughes
Edwin R. Peck
Murvale T. Farrar
Howard L. Young
Marvin M. Stephens
Josephus A. Briggs
Robert P. Wadell
William M. Haynsworth, Jr.
Arthur L. Maher
Henry M. Cooper
Louis N. Miller
Frank Monroe, Jr.
Thomas J. Casey
John V. Peterson
Frederick J. Nelson
Joyce A. Ralph
William D. Anderson
Murr E. Arnold
William M. Hobby, Jr.
Philip R. Coffin
Wells L. Field
Homer B. Hudson
Horace C. Robison
Thomas H. Hederman
Valentine L. Pottle
Philip D. Lohmann

*To be a lieutenant commander*

Clarence M. Bowley

*To be lieutenants*

Eugene B. Fluckey
William C. Hembury
Marshall H. Austin
William H. Hazzard
Wilson R. Bartlett
Benjamin E. Adams, Jr.
James S. Clark
Leonard J. Baird
John S. C. Gabbert
Sam C. Loomis, Jr.
Fred Borries, Jr.
Cecil E. Blount
John N. Ferguson, Jr.
Francis R. Drake
Russell Kefauver
Gould Hunter
Chester W. Nimitz, Jr.
Walter V. Combs, Jr.
Charles R. Eisenbach
John M. Oseth
Floyd T. Thompson
Robert J. Williams
Francis A. Greenup
Philip E. Shetenhelm
Albert B. Furer
Dallas M. Laizure
William B. Parham
Ellis B. Orr
Parker L. Folsom
Joseph A. Coppola
Ralph W. Arndt
Frank G. Law
Charles E. Houston
James W. O'Grady
Richard L. Fowler
Ray S. Thompson, Jr.

*To be a lieutenant (junior grade)*

Earl E. Carlsten

*To be passed assistant dental surgeon*

Estes W. Murphy

*To be an assistant dental surgeon*

John F. Chimienti

*To be pay director*

William A. Best

*To be paymaster*

John K. Chisholm

*To be passed assistant paymasters*

John P. Kilroy
Charles R. Beaman
Richard L. Myers
Randolph Meade, Jr.

*To be assistant paymasters*

Alfred I. Pollack
William F. Mims
Robert L. Clark, Jr.
Jacob H. Kettler
James F. Ellison
John D. Sullivan
Howard L. Van Orden, Jr.
Oliver W. Fraser, Jr.
James D. Browder, Jr.
Thomas J. James
Rodman P. Kypke
William A. Mann
Joseph D. Kennedy, Jr.
Richard R. Powell
Charles E. Lee
Joseph P. Quinn
Stuart A. MacCaffray
William J. Carter 3d
Richard D. McIntosh, Jr.
Herbert A. Ingley, Jr.
James W. Cartee
Robert McDonald
Francis E. Jepson
Ernest M. Clark, Jr.
Robert W. Van Evera
Robert E. Tidrow, Jr.
Ira C. Dockrey
Walter R. Finn
John R. Griffith
Ralph L. Meilandt
Richard M. Hoag
Frederick M. Rosseland, Jr.
William W. Alexander, Jr.
Alfred P. Boileau
William H. Miller
William W. Chisholm
Benjamin J. Kerr 2d
Theodore B. Purvis, Jr.
Morgan C. Marshall
John H. Haig
Harold L. Henkel
Charles D. Tandy
Robert J. Everett
Julian S. Macaulay
James H. Hennessy
John McCormack
Stanley R. Juch
Frederick H. Vogt
Donald E. Williams
Carroll H. Stephens
Charles W. O'Toole
Douglas H. Lyness
Ralph E. Williams, Jr.
Martin J. B. Kahao
John K. Walker
Harry L. Miller
Joseph D. Miller
David J. Watson
John D. Custer
John R. Arnzen
Henry S. Nisbet, Jr.
Robert F. Lautze
Rex A. Bradley
John F. Culp 3d
Richard S. Balch
Peter M. Lindsay
Roger W. Hatch
John M. Law
Edward F. Hines
William M. Wilson, Jr.
Robert H. Tobias
James L. F. Hennessy
Tyler R. Matthew
Houston A. Brice, Jr.
Allen M. Paget
Ronald E. Kinney, Jr.
Loyd S. Bjorlo
Roy B. Bursch
Robert E. Holt
James W. Bridges
Louis H. Litchfield, Jr.
Howard G. Luyendyk
William F. Tobin
Richard T. Power
Benjamin S. Gantz, Jr.
Gerard F. Dunican
Robert R. Baines
Oscar W. Leidel, Jr.
James E. Raynes

*To be assistant dental surgeons*

Thomas A. Morris, Jr.
Mark Dodge
J. Kenneth Hall

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TEMPORARY SERVICE

*To be brigadier general, Marine Corps Reserve*

Littleton W. T. Waller, Jr.

*To be brigadier general, Marine Corps, for temporary service*

Lewie G. Merritt

REGULAR SERVICE

*To be lieutenant colonel*

Gregon A. Williams

*To be second lieutenants*

John D. Hayes
John J. Kalen
Cyrus N. Morgan
Roger F. Seasholtz
Warren F. Lloyd
Dudley R. Carr
William E. Lunn
Benjamin F. Royal, Jr.
Rufus B. Thompson, Jr.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Marjorie C. Barineau, McRae.
Hattie C. Williams, Pinehurst.
Mary H. Campbell, Plains.
Bernard A. Dayries, Port Wentworth.

IDAHO

Lola Rossi, Idaho City.

INDIANA

Jacob N. Hight, Etna Green.
Ted E. Dill, Francisco.
Grover Wilson, Hebron.
Emma Belle Wells, New Washington.
Esta Hildenbrand, Pine Village.
Arthur Miller, Uniondale.

KANSAS

Hugo A. Simonton, Alta Vista.
Jesse T. Poland, Barnes.
Albert F. Cassell, Beverly.
James W. O'Connor, Chapman.
John J. Menard, Clyde.
Cyrus H. Wadsworth, Cottonwood Falls.
Elmer R. Eyman, Deerfield.
Mae S. Hodgson, Downs.
Henry A. Mason, Gypsum.
Margaret A. Nelson, Lebanon.
William A. Harris, Le Roy.
Jack W. Boyle, McDonald.
Nellie F. Walsh, Mayetta.
Mathias A. Arnoldy, Tipton.
J. Raymond E. Simmons, Wellsville.
Ernest B. Hedge, Whiting.

MASSACHUSETTS

Parker E. Wilson, Bryantville.
Susan S. Rogers, Manomet.
Nina M. Burr, Mendon.
Lawrence D. Quinlan, Northfield.
Ralph F. Manley, Teaticket.

MICHIGAN

Josephine Salsbury, Alto.
Clare E. Richardson, Augusta.
Verne R. Moran, Carney.
John P. Kelley, Deckerville.
Charles L. Burns, Eau Claire.
Leonora Johnson, Ferrysburg.
Charles N. Davis, Hamburg.
Robert F. Allan, Holly.
John E. Rengo, Kaleva.
Harry A. Saur, Kent City.
John E. Hogan, Linden.
Sally A. Schulmeyer, Martin.
Maude E. Doane, Pewamo.
Max A. Hill, Vicksburg.
Hilan E. Pray, Williamsburg.

NORTH CAROLINA

Ovid Pullen, Harmony.
Marshall M. Tilley, Hoffman.
W. Edgar Johnson, King.
Taft S. Putnam, Lawndale.
Jessie B. Williams, Manchester.
Harold J. Young, Nantahala.
Dallas Lowdermilk, Norman.
John A. Williams, Oxford.
John W. Ivey, Sevensprings.

TENNESSEE

Orion D. Strawn, Hillsboro.
Claude L. Swaggerty, Kimberlin Heights.
Kathryn N. Suttle, Pleasant Hill.
Vance S. Reese, Raleigh.
Alma L. Wells, Sherwood.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, the holy Giver of all gifts, in Thee there is no darkness at all. We never could have understood Thy Fatherhood except for the advent of Thine only begotten Son. We pray that in His spirit we may solve all vexed problems, enabling us to prove ourselves worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called.

Almighty God, when force seems stronger, when rude passions dominate the finer feelings, subdue them that the spirit of sacrifice may be magnified and exalted. Beyond all selfish and group interests, oh, let the thought of our country's life and destiny come first in word and deed, strengthening the vanguard of freedom with its blessings for all. For the welfare of our Republic we pray for love to serve our fellowmen, for light to see the goal ahead, and for peace throughout all our favored land. Blessed Lord, where the battles rage and the surging winds sweep, and where the innocent are drugged with pain and death, have mercy, have mercy. With a solemn breath at Thy altar, Heavenly Father, we pray for our President; oh, be with him in Thy sustaining presence that he may be assured of Thy blessing and the loyalty of every section of our country. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday during the quorum call, roll call No. 9, the members of the Ways and Means Committee remained in session on important business, and it is for that reason that they did not respond to their names.

PERSONAL APOLOGY

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday when the resolution to continue the Dies committee was pending, I made an ill-tempered and ugly reference to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], and to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] which should not have been made. I was provoked into the making of that statement by the chairman of the Rules Committee, who, though he opposed the resolution to continue the Dies committee, saw fit to take the time and submit the matter to the House. However, that was not justification for the unkind reference that I made to those gentlemen nor for the breach of the etiquette of the House.

Upon protest of those gentlemen I was permitted, with the kind consent of the House, to withdraw the remarks; but that is not quite sufficient. It does not completely satisfy my feelings. I wish now to humbly tender my apologies to those gentlemen and to the House. I regret having spoken in an ill-tempered and unkind manner.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just wish to make the observation—I did not know my friend was going to make these remarks—that it is a big man who recognizes when he makes a mistake, and it is a bigger man who, as our friend, the gentleman from Georgia, has done today, makes the apology that he has made.

Mr. COX. I thank the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SALE OF W. P. A. MATERIAL

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein some clippings from the local press.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. BELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. SLAUGHTER] be excused for 3 days, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT WASTE

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to the fact that those of us who have offices in the Old House Office Building this morning were the recipients of a graph from the Treasury Department. I think Members who are in the new building will perhaps get them later in the day. It is a graph concerning information touching the extent of participation in the pay roll savings plan for War Savings bonds and the sale of War bonds.

To my astonishment I found that it was in one container and then that the container was in a second container apparently with tin ends. I have had it weighed. It weighs 1 ounce less than three-quarters of a pound. I think it is something we can well carry in mind as we consider these appropriation bills on the floor of the House in the weeks to come. I hope the membership will keep this item in mind. This container is strong enough to be sent to Guadalcanal for a soldier to read, from there to Alaska for a Navy man to read, from there to Iceland for an aviator to read, and thence come back to Washington to us to read. It is a sturdy package.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I received one of those containers this morning and the same thought was running through my mind; that it was an utter extravagance.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. It is made of strategic material. They are considering cutting down the use of paper to the newspapers of the country, yet this one container used to send a few sheets itself contains nearly three-quarters of a pound of pulp.

Mr. SHAFER. How did the gentleman vote on the Keefe penalty mail provision in the Treasury Department bill?

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter from the New England Council to council directors, council members, and executives of some 1,300 commercial and industrial associations in New England.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. LUDLOW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein the text of a bill I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE MEAT SITUATION IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, roll call No. 9 of yesterday notes the absence of a number of members of the California delegation. We were attending an important conference with Secretary of

Agriculture Wickard and Mr. Brown, Director of the O. P. A., with reference to the alarming meat shortage in California.

The meat shortage in California is greater than in any other State and our population is increasing faster than in any other State. Men engaged in hard and laborious work in shipyards, mines, airplane plants, and on the farms have gone for a week or 10 days without meat. We hope for relief as a result of yesterday's conference.

THE PENALTY MAILING PRIVILEGE

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SATTERFIELD] voted against the so-called Keefe penalty mail amendment to the Treasury Department appropriation bill only day before yesterday, his remarks today are most interesting.

I, too, received one of the mailing tubes to which he has referred and in my opinion it completely justifies the adoption of the Keefe amendment, which it will be remembered was opposed by practically every Member on that side of the House. The vote was close, 205 to 200, if I recall correctly.

Now this amendment should stay in the bill when it comes back from the other body and we will need the gentleman's vote to keep it there.

This mailing tube of which he speaks is conclusive testimony in favor of the Keefe amendment. Not only that, it is a wicked example of the abuse of the penalty mail privilege and an example of governmental waste of money and critical war materials that could well be termed "criminal."

Sealed at both ends with heavy tin and containing two sheets of paper showing unnecessary charts relating to War bond sales, this mailing tube weighs 11 ounces. Every Member of Congress got one and only the Lord knows how many thousands were mailed to banks and other agencies throughout the country. Think of the bonds that had to be sold to pay the cost of this monstrosity. Keep the Keefe amendment in the Treasury appropriation bill. It will put a stop to such uncalled for waste.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the New York Times by Godfrey N. Nelson entitled "Pay-as-you-go Tax Only a Correction."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1842, at Springfield, Ill., Abraham Lincoln said:

> This is the one hundred and tenth anniversary of the birthday of Washington. We are met to celebrate this day. Washington is the mightiest name on earth—long since mightiest in moral reformation. On that name a eulogy is expected. It cannot be. To add brightness to the sun or glory to the name of Washington is alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In solemn awe pronounce the name, and in its naked, deathless splendor leave it shining on.

Could any spoken words be more adequate today in commemorating the one hundred and thirty-fourth anniversary of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln?

Little did this young lawyer—33 years of age—dream that his own name would take its place alongside of Washington as one of the greatest Americans who ever lived.

Realizing as I do that the inadequacy of any attempt on my part to add luster to the name of Lincoln, I do feel that we might recall some of the ideas and ideals of this great American as expressed by him during his lifetime.

In another speech at Springfield, Ill., in 1840, he said:

> Many free countries have lost their liberty, and ours may lose hers, but if she shall, be it my proudest plume, not that I was the last to desert, but that I never deserted her. If I ever feel the soul within me elevate and expand to those dimensions not wholly unworthy of its Almighty Architect, it is when I contemplate the cause of my country deserted by all the world beside, and I, standing up boldly and alone, hurling defiance at her victorious oppressors. And here, without contemplating consequences, before high heaven, and in the face of the whole world, I swear eternal fidelity to the just cause, as I deem it, of the land of my life, my liberty, and my love. And who that thinks with me will not fearlessly adopt the oath I take?

Such were the ideals of the young Lincoln of his country and great love for it. Such are the ideals of young Americans fighting throughout the world today to protect and preserve the free institutions of our country as well as to avail other nations and other people the blessings of freedom and liberty.

Mr. Speaker, in every place, everywhere, the thoughts of not only Americans but all peoples are turned this day to Abraham Lincoln with reverence and affection. The influence of his life and character is reflected in the minds and hearts of all men and women, an inspiration to those who fight and to those for whose freedom and liberation the fight is being waged.

Let us all rededicate ourselves to his great principles that all nations "shall, under God, have a new birth of freedom, and that the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject of the pay-as-you-go income tax.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THOMAS A. EDISON

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert three different memorials from the Montana Legislature in the RECORD, one having to do with the price of copper, one having to do with the lack of farm machinery, and one having to do with the shortage of farm labor in Montana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have three unanimous consent requests; first, that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some correspondence on the farm problem; second, that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the future of the liberal arts colleges during the prosecution of the war; and, third, that I may be permitted to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the 48-hour week order set forth by the administration, through the President and the heads of agencies, causes me to once again say publicly what I have said on many occasions in the past, and that is that the House Labor Committee has itself a responsibility to consider corrective legislation in the field of labor during the prosecution of this terrible conflict.

Desirable as this longer work week is to our war production, it is regrettable that Congress was not the leader in securing its adoption. We should have acted months ago.

I regret exceedingly the illness of the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey, the chairman of that committee. I know I express the feeling of her friends in this body when I hope for her complete recovery and an early return to this forum. I feel, however, that the Labor Committee should proceed promptly to survey the production field and take appropriate action at an early date to correct many of the inequities now existent.

Mr. Speaker, during the Seventy-seventh Congress the Labor Committee, of which I am a member, was charged with failure to properly consider desirable legislation. I trust that condition will not again exist. Rightful gains of the worker must be preserved. Our committee can be constructive and propose desirable corrective measures.

If we fail to assume leadership I am certain enemies of unionism and sound labor practice will act destructively and

thus impair unity during the war effort. That must not take place.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] may extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a newspaper release.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]?

There was no objection.

RELEASE OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, heretofore a special order was granted to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] to address the House for 10 minutes today. He asked me to convey to the Speaker the information that he releases this special order.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a Lincoln Day address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correctly, it was 81 years ago today that Abraham Lincoln left Springfield, Ill., to become the Chief Magistrate of this Nation. As the train was departing from Springfield, the ladies of that town gathered at the railroad station and tendered to him a silken banner. On that banner they had stitched the ninth verse, first chapter of Joshua. If I remember that verse correctly, it is as follows:

> Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: For the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest.

That was a great comfort for a great man in an hour of tribulation, and I think a great comfort for a courageous Congress in an hour of tribulation in the world's history.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LIBELOUS BOOKS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, we have been requested to not introduce bills or resolutions if we can help it, in order to comply with our economy program, so I hope this message goes out to the libraries of the Nation and that you will take this thought to your libraries.

We honor and revere our great and good men by addresses, and it is fit and proper that we do so. Post mortem eulogy is only back pay. For our living good and great we have epithets, for our dead, epitaphs. As long as one is doing good work he is maligned; however, as he becomes incapacitated we cheer up, but not until the doctor has signed the death certificate do we give proper praise and send flowers where we begrudged him bread. Lincoln was no exception to the rule.

In several cases cowardly would-be authors have assailed the great, the good and pure after they have passed on. Inasmuch as the right of action for libel and slander dies with the passing of the one unjustly maligned these so-called writers feel secure. How treacherous. And thus they hide behind the counterfeit mask of the debunker. I fear, however, that what we honor is nullified by the libelous books, especially as to Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Warren Harding, Grover Cleveland, and others. Such as Judge Felix Ally, Gaston Means, Edward F. Daken, Felita Springer, and Nan Britton have so written, and their books have reached many libraries.

I hope that the Members will convey this information to the libraries, that the libraries will read the RECORD, and pay heed in order that these books may not be read by the youth of the land. For every man who hears a good address about Lincoln, other great and good men, hundreds of our youth are getting these libelous books from the library. I hope they may be discontinued voluntarily by the libraries without the necessity of a bill or a resolution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on the lease-lend report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short poem from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with regard to Thomas A. Edison, and to include therein an address I made in the House with reference to him some time ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

THE BLACK DRAGON SOCIETY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the most dangerous organization in America is the Black Dragon Society, which is organized and financed by Japan. It is today the greatest espionage organization this Nation has ever known. The people on the Pacific coast are alarmed over this situation. My mail from that section is piling high because of what I have said here about the Japanese menace. The people are demanding action now.

On yesterday the House had the wisdom to extend the life of the Dies committee. We are now demanding, and shall continue to demand, that the Dies committee begin now to investigate this Black Dragon Society, which has its loathesome tentacles not only on the Pacific coast but extended into every city in America and even into the Federal departments. Their representatives are even on the Federal pay roll. Today every town in America of any size is honeycombed with them. When the Dies committee goes to the bottom of this situation it will reveal an espionage organization that is today serving Germany, Italy, and Japan, and is one of the most dangerous subversive agencies that has ever threatened the safety of the people of this country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 109), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 839) to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208) by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute an additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker after we have concluded the consideration of the Smith resolution today I am going to ask for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 105, giving the Committee on Appropriations the authority to investigate certain matters.

I announce further that on Tuesday the Committee on Rules will hear all gentlemen who desire to appear before the committee in regard to the Hobbs bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CIVILIAN PILOT TRAINING

Mr. NICHOLS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 110), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1670) to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INVESTIGATION OF ACTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 102, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That a committee of five Members of the House of Representatives be appointed by the Speaker of the House, which said committee is authorized to conduct investigations of any action, rule, procedure, regulation, order, or directive taken or promulgated by any department or independent agency of the Federal Government where complaint is made to said committee that such action, rule, regulation, procedure, order, or directive—

(1) Is beyond the scope of the power or authority granted to such department or independent agency by Congress or by Executive order.

(2) Invades the constitutional rights, privileges, or immunities of citizens of the United States.

(3) Inflicts penalties for failure to comply with such rules, regulations, or directives without affording those accused of violation an opportunity to present their defense before a fair and impartial tribunal.

The said committee shall report to the Congress from time to time the results of such investigations and such recommendations as they see fit with respect to the personnel of those administering any such department or independent agency, or shall recommend such legislation or amendments to existing legislation as they deem desirable.

The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the House is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by him. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is necessary for me to explain the resolution that is before us now. I take it you paid attention to the reading of the resolution. It provides for the creation of a special committee of the House that would have jurisdiction to hear any and all complaints that might come to it, from any source, that any department or any agency of the Government has issued rules, regulations, procedures, and so forth, beyond the scope of the power or authority granted by Congress or placed an erroneous construction or interpretation on any legislation passed by the Congress.

Personally, I fully appreciate that this resolution will pass, just as I knew full well yesterday that the Dies resolution would pass. Nevertheless, I felt in honor bound then to express my views on it and oppose it.

I was very glad to hear the gentleman from Mississippi today express his view that there is a certain organization guilty of un-American activities that has not been investigated.

I hope that organization and any other organization or individual guilty of un-American or subversive activities, I care not who they are, will be investigated.

I regret that this resolution, like many others which have been forced through the Committee on Rules by those Democrats opposed to the President with the aid of the Republican members, not only to harass and embarrass the President, but certain departments and agencies as well. I repeat that we could devote our time and energy to better advantage if we tried to cooperate and aid the President in this tremendous task in the winning of the war and ultimate permanent peace.

It is my observation that while the Republicans, though promising their constituency at home and reiterating their promises on the floor that they would cooperate with the President in the winning of the war, their actions invariably belie their assurances. I feel that they will gain nothing and from the hundreds of communications that come to me, a great number of which have come from Republicans, the people at home are beginning to understand these political activities.

The final result as to the attacks upon the President and the administration will be the same as in 1936 and 1940.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] was peeved because I filed the report on the Dies resolution, as the gentleman from Georgia himself introduced that resolution. In justification of my action may I say that ever since I have been chairman of the Rules Committee I have endeavored to give each and every Member opportunity to express his views upon any measures coming before the House.

Unfortunately, on two occasions when other gentlemen reported rules the previous question was ordered within such a short time that the opponents of the rules had no opportunity to be heard. It was for the protection of the minority of the House, for the protection of those who were opposed to the bill, and who appealed to me for time, that I felt compelled and I felt it my duty as the chairman of the committee to carry out the wishes of the Committee on Rules and report the resolution.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman cannot find it possible to agree with me that the practice adopted by the gentleman of taking resolutions reported by his committee and appearing upon the floor of the House and opposing them is one of doubtful propriety. In other words, in the instant case the Committee on Rules, as I recall, reported the pending resolution without a dissenting vote. The gentleman, however, has declared his opposition to the resolution. He reports it and assumes the responsibility of sponsoring it here on the floor, although yet, as I understand, he is still opposed to it.

As to the Dies resolution, the gentleman disclosed to his committee that he was opposed to it. However, he did not vote against reporting it. It was a resolution that I introduced. The gentleman reported the resolution and took 25 of his 30 minutes in opposition to a resolution reported by his own committee. Is that not a practice of doubtful propriety?

Mr. SABATH. No; I do not think so. With all due respect to the gentleman from Georgia, I think the House will agree with me that I have never purposely been unfair in anything I have done. I would be the last man to want to be charged with unfairness. However, the chairman of a committee has certain duties to perform, and I feel it to be my duty to perform them to the best of my ability. I regret that I do

not possess the ability of the gentleman from Georgia; nevertheless, acting as I do under a handicap frequently, I assure the gentleman and I assure the House that I am trying to carry out my duties to the best of my ability.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SABATH. In a moment. I just want to answer something first. The gentleman is in error when he says that I voted for the Smith resolution and for this resolution in the committee. I did not vote for these resolutions. The gentleman knows how they were gotten out of the committee. It was a forced procedure, and I did not want to set myself up against that majority here for this resolution. I did not wish to be contrary and delay consideration of it.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] knows that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], the ranking minority member of our committee, also favored his resolution, and if he and the gentleman from New York controlled the time, where would the minority opposition have been accorded time in which to express their resentment and their views in opposing the adoption of the resolution? Strictly speaking, it is intended, under the regular rules of the House, that those favoring and opposing legislation shall have equal time for general debate, but, as has happened in so many instances where both the majority and minority Members having control of the time, those Members who were opposed to the legislation have not received an equal share of the time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I do not think this controversy serves any good purpose. I do not think the gentlemen should discuss what happened in the executive meeting of the Rules Committee. It is entirely out of order, and I hope the gentleman will not proceed any further.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman appreciate the fact that this is the last time, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, in my judgment, he will be permitted to perform in this manner?

Mr. SABATH. No; I do not. As usual, the gentleman assumes too much, and I presume his statement has been made for publicity effect.

Mr. COX. I assume nothing. I just simply have the conviction that our committee does not propose to permit practices of this kind to continue.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. In this connection let me say that on all the committees on which I have served, and I have been chairman of one for many years, whenever a bill is reported out that the chairman is opposed to, usually a motion is submitted that some other member report it, and while the chairman may be charged with the responsibility of calling it up on the floor, it is his duty to yield to the man who did report it, but that is a matter that should be taken care of in the committee.

Mr. SABATH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. From now on I would like to see legislation on the floor handled by men in sympathy with it, and not opposed to it.

Mr. SABATH. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi, and, therefore, I feel that I am within my rights, because no motion was made in the committee, and I feel that the House agrees with me that no one was injured, and no harm was done, and that all those in opposition, the minority, had an opportunity to be heard, and that was my main and only reason. I knew that the resolution would pass, and we all knew it would pass. My main object was to protect the rights of the minority, and if I am guilty of any transgression, I am very sorry, but I do not think I was.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. For a question.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. For just a moment, and while the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is still on the floor. In view of what both gentlemen said in reference to the investigation of the Black Dragon Society, I am glad to inform the House and the gentleman that this group has already been under investigation by the Dies committee, and that a report is in course of preparation, and that we do find it to be a dangerous society.

Mr. SABATH. I am mighty glad, and if the gentleman's committee had made a report to the House, or had so informed the House, I presume the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] would not have raised the question. A similar question was raised by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], that an investigation had been made of Nazis and the activities of Nazis, and of Fascists, and that no report has as yet been made, and it still reposes in the committee. Be that as it may, although I have taken the floor, I know this resolution will, of course, pass, but I am taking the floor only to call attention to a few matters.

From time to time we have been hearing on the floor something of the bureaucrats and the crackpots writing the laws. Many years ago, as far back as 30 years ago, measures would come here from the various departments, to be submitted to the committees, and the committees would go over those proposed bills. About 20 or so years ago, yes, 22 years ago, the House saw fit to appoint a special drafting bureau giving the Members and the committees opportunity to prepare their own bills or resolutions. Ever since that time I am informed that this drafting bureau of the House has been active, and all those bills or resolutions that came here from the various bureaus have been submitted naturally by the committees to the special drafting bureau of the House. After that bureau has been called upon to perform its work, and has passed on the verbiage, whether it is within the rules and regulations, whether it complies with the legal questions that might be raised, the committee has then acted on the recommendation as to the legality of the provisions of the bill. So I say I feel today that the new membership, as well as some of the older Members, should know that there exists such a bureau, and that it is ready and willing to aid the Members in drafting any bills they may desire to prepare on any subject which may be near and dear to their hearts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does this take in the War and Navy Department?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; as I understand it, and I think the gentleman knows that the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee submit their bills to the drafting bureau of the House.

Mr. GIFFORD. And they will report as against the personnel as well as action?

Mr. SABATH. This has nothing to do with the personnel.

Mr. GIFFORD. But the resolution reads that they shall make recommendation as they see fit with respect to personnel.

Mr. SABATH. They have no jurisdiction, of course, to say what personnel should be discharged or engaged or hired. All they have is jurisdiction to pass on the verbiage and form of the bills of the various committees as they are drafted or submitted or prepared on any subject by the committee.

Mr. GIFFORD. This is plainly readable—"They shall make recommendations."

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is referring to the pending resolution?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes. "This committee shall recommend action as to personnel." Does that mean that they should remove them?

Mr. SABATH. I was not referring to the resolution before us. I was refering to the activities of the drafting bureau in drafting bills.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a brief question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. COX. I have canvassed practically all members of the committee except the gentleman from Illinois and one of our colleagues on this side, and it is the wish of the vast majority of the Rules Committee that the number of the committee be increased from five to seven. I wonder if the gentleman, in the light of what I have just stated, would yield to me to offer such an amendment to the resolution, or if the gentleman would be kind enough to offer it himself?

Mr. SABATH. So far I have at all times complied with the wish of the majority of the committee and I shall not deny them the right to request that the number of the membership should be increased.

Mr. COX. With the assurance I have just given the gentleman, will he not be kind enough to offer that amendment?

Mr. SABATH. I will later on, as soon as I am satisfied, because I always want to confer with the minority, which it has been my habit to do. If that is the wish of a majority of the committee I will be only too pleased to carry it out.

The only thing that puzzles me about the Smith resolution is this: This committee would pass on complaints, as to

whether the rules and regulations are in variance with the laws that we have passed. I do not know whether this committee sets itself above the judicial branch of our Government or not. I, for one, do not feel that we should attempt to deprive the judiciary of the rights which they have been given under the Constitution. I think it will be up to the courts to pass upon whether any rule or regulation is in violation of or contrary to the verbiage or the intent of Congress.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think I understand the gentleman's point. With regard to the second provision of the bill at the top of page 2, it seems to me there is some danger of what the gentleman points out; but with regard to No. 1 and No. 3, the question is whether or not an executive agency has exceeded the power that the Congress intended to give it, frankly it seems to me, and I am compelled to say, I think that is the proper function of the Congress. My own view has been, however, that the standing committees of the House ought to do that job. But I do think it is a job that Congress needs to do, and probably right at this time particularly needs to do.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. This resolution apparently will involve considerable display of legal acumen and legal knowledge. I wonder whether or not those who would be in charge of the destinies of the committee would not use the Judiciary Committee of the House, because of its knowledge of the Constitution, its interpretation, its knowledge of Federal and State court decisions? There must be correlated the rules and regulations of the various agencies and departments with the Constitution and with the basic statutes. There must be correlated the actions of the various individuals in the departments and agencies with the basic statutes to see whether or not there are any discrepancies between what they have done or should have done or what they have the right to do.

While I do not speak for the Judiciary Committee as a whole, there are members of that committee who would be most anxious to cooperate wholeheartedly and give unremitting toil in the interest of the deliberations and activities of this committee.

Mr. SABATH. I will say in conclusion that I have the utmost confidence in the Judiciary Committee, but we also have other Members who are good lawyers who are not fortunate enough to be members of that committee. But I know the Speaker will endeavor to select the most able and fair men on this committee.

I will reserve the balance of my time, and I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] as much time as he may desire to perform one of his usual kindly acts.

FAITHFUL EMPLOYEE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday last marked the thirty-fifth anniversary of Sam Hardy's appointment as messenger to the Ways and Means Committee and the members of that body saw fit to recognize Sam's long, faithful, and entirely satisfactory service with appropriate remarks which appear in the printed hearings of the committee for that day.

In order that the entire membership of the House may know what manner of man Sam Hardy really is, and with the high esteem in which he is held by the members of the Ways and Means Committee, I desire at this time to incorporate in my remarks that portion of the printed proceedings for Tuesday which set forth the expressions of good will already referred to:

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX—PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAXATION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
*Washington, D. C.,*
*Tuesday, February 9, 1943.*

The committee met at 10 a. m., the Honorable Robert L. Doughton (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

The chairman would like to call the attention of the committee to a rather important matter that I am sure the committee will be interested in. This is the thirty-fifth anniversary of the service of Sam Hardy, the messenger to this committee. Thirty-five years ago today he began work for this committee. It is also the thirtieth anniversary of his wedding. He began working for the committee 35 years ago and was married 30 years ago, and in view of his most faithful and efficient service to the committee, and his unfailing courtesy, I would like to make some expression of our appreciation for his services.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure all the members of the committee join in conveying to Sam our hearty congratulations on this occasion, marking the thirty-fifth anniversary of his becoming an employee of this committee. No man in the Government service has rendered more loyal and efficient service than has Sam Hardy, and I am sure we all appreciate the valuable service and assistance he gives us as members of this committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to endorse all that has been said with regard to Sam Hardy. He is more than faithful, he is an indefatigable worker; he can lay his hands on any document that we want at a moment's notice. He is always cheerful and obliging and the Ways and Means Committee would not be the same without Sam. I think we should give him a day off, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REED. I have had the opportunity of watching the service rendered by Sam Hardy for more than 24 years. I don't know how anyone could give a better example of loyalty to the Government than Sam, and I congratulate him on that service. It has been a splendid example of what a Government servant can be. I personally congratulate him.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure that I voice the sentiments of all members of the committee when I say that Sam Hardy is regarded as a most faithful employee of the committee, and a more valuable employee of the Government could not be found anywhere.

Mr. KNUTSON. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the chairman of the Rules Committee that he might now yield to the author of the resolution in order to explain the resolution to the House? I think that is his privilege and right.

Mr. SABATH. I did expect to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia in the opening, but he preferred to close the debate. That is the reason I did not yield to him.

Mr. FISH. This is an original resolution, and I think it is only fair that the author should explain it. This is an original bill; there is nothing to follow.

Mr. SABATH. It was the desire of the gentleman from Virginia to close the debate, and I am carrying out his wish.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I felt that if questions were raised during the consideration of the resolution I wanted to be in position to explain them. I do not know how much time the gentleman is going to use, but I suggest that he go ahead. I do not know what questions may be raised that I may want to answer. I should like to close if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. FISH. There is no opposition on this side that I know of. If the gentleman prefers I will go ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am for this resolution and I hope it is speedily adopted.

In a word, what this resolution seeks to do is to set up a committee of Congress which will be the agency of Congress to "ride herd" on some of our administrative agencies and see to it that they stay within the law. There is no reason that I know of why we should not have the right to expect that administrative agencies charged with carrying out the enactments of the Congress be required to stay within the scope of the authority of the statute creating them, and the Constitution. If this resolution is adopted a committee will be named. I take it that men who understand the law and who have had experience in these matters will be on that committee.

When complaint is made that an administrative agency is acting outside the scope of its authority, or seeking to inflict penalties without full and fair hearing, the agency or individual involved—the committee first having decided that there is some justification for the criticism—would be called before the forum which we are here creating to explain what authority, if any, there is for the assertion of the action on his or its part.

We have, of course, had to develop a tremendous amount of administrative procedure. We have had to concentrate a lot of authority. We have had to delegate a lot of power to administrative agencies. This has been inevitable in this great crisis. But this does not excuse us from the continuing responsibil-

ity of seeing to it that the authority of the statute creating the administrative agency is not violated.

Wide discretion in respect to matters involving the judgment of the agency must be granted. It may be said that courts furnish a guarantee against illegal acts, but we are all familiar with the substantial evidence rule of judicial review, and we know how difficult it is to attempt to set up a judicial review which can check the excesses of administrative agencies. This committee with the power that will be granted by this resolution, can certainly do much to keep the agencies in line, first, by pointing out actions outside the law, and second, by recommending legislation.

If the people of this country indicated anything last November, it was that they wanted the Congress to reassert its authority. They wanted the Congress to see to it that in the administration of the laws and of the Constitution administrators shall be held to account and kept within the bounds of their authority. While of necessity discretion, where discretion is permitted, must be vested in them, we do not want them inventing remedies, inflicting penalties, issuing rules and regulations that not only are outside the scope of the authority which created the agency, but which often are clearly in contravention of it. Any one of us could recite a lot of circumstances and situations in which there has been such an abuse of administrative authority and I am happy indeed to know that the House of Representatives here today is taking this action.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Is the scope of this resolution broad enough to give the committee jurisdiction over an order issued directly by the President which is carried out, of course, by an agency, but an agency having nothing to do with the making of the order?

Mr. HALLECK. My interpretation of the resolution is that it would not specifically permit or authorize the committee to inquire into the Executive order as it comes directly from the President. But, if the gentleman will permit me, I think almost without exception the rules and regulations about which complaint is made come from the agencies under the original directive of some sort which comes from the President. Therefore, I think the resolution is broad enough to reach those things about which there is real complaint.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the pending resolution. I am not an enthusiast about investigating committees, but, in view of the arrogant attitude of some of the executive agencies and their misuse of the power granted by Congress, it is imperative we take steps to see that Executive agencies and bureaus follow the law and confine themselves to the authority granted.

I have asked for this time in order to bring to the attention of the House a specific instance of the abuse of power by the Office of Price Administration. I refer to the recent action of that office in placing a price ceiling on corn at less than parity and in placing a price ceiling on wheat flour at a price which would reflect less-than-parity prices to the producers of wheat. The imposition of both of these ceilings is in direct violation of Public Law No. 729, Seventy-seventh Congress, the amendment to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.

Section 3 of Public, 729 reads as follows:

SEC. 3. No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity under authority of this act or otherwise below a price which will reflect to producers of agricultural commodities the higher of the following prices, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture—

(1) The parity price for such commodity (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials) or, in case a comparable price has been determined for such commodity under and in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, such comparable price (adjusted in the same manner), or

(2) The highest price received by such producers for such commodity between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942 (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials), or, if the market for such commodity was inactive during the latter half of such period, a price for the commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in line with the prices, during such period, of other agricultural commodities produced for the same general use; and no maximum price shall be established or maintained under authority of this act or otherwise for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity a price therefor equal to the higher of the prices specified in clauses (1) and (2) of this section: *Provided*, That the President may, without regard to the limitation contained in clause (2), adjust any such maximum price to the extent that he finds necessary to correct gross inequities; but nothing in this section shall be construed to permit the establishment in any case of a maximum price below a price which will reflect to the producers of any agricultural commodity the price therefor specified in clause (1) of this section: *Provided further*, That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs: *Provided further*, That in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing: *Provided further*, That in fixing price maximums for agricultural commodities and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, as provided for by this act, adequate weighting shall be given to farm labor.

In the case of both corn and wheat the price at the time of the enactment of Public, 729 was below parity. It is now below parity. Therefore, under the plain terms of the act no maximum price can be established for corn below parity and no maximum price for flour can be established which will not reflect parity to the producers of wheat. In utter defiance of these provisions, maximum prices have been fixed on corn and on wheat flour which are far below parity.

The Office of Price Administration admits that the prices fixed are below parity but makes the contention that in fixing prices it is authorized to include Government payments made to agricultural producers. I submit that there is not one word in the act in question which permits of any such interpretation. The language is clear, direct, and unequivocal. It refers to prices, not to income, and states definitely that no price may be fixed below parity. If Congress had intended that Government payments should be taken into account it could have said so specifically or could have provided that no price should be fixed which did not reflect to producers parity income. In all the discussion of this legislation before Congress there was nothing to indicate that it was the thought of any Member of either House that the language with reference to ceilings on agricultural products meant anything other than what it said or that there was any intention that Government payments should be taken into consideration.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the author of this resolution. I assume that he will be a member of the committee to be appointed if the resolution is adopted. After the committee is appointed it is my intention to bring this situation formally to the attention of the committee. Doubtless there are many other cases where power and authority have been abused just as flagrantly as has been the case here. I hope that the resolution will be adopted, and that the committee appointed pursuant thereto will vigorously follow up this and all like matters which may be brought to its attention.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, some time when the patience of the American people is impaired to the point where they are going to get up on their hind legs they shall say, "By what warrant, by what authority do these Federal agencies operate?" And then the answer will be, first of all, they were created by the Congress and they got all their authority under that very celebrated phraseology which says:

The Administrator is empowered to make all necessary rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this act.

That is where the damage is really done and that is the reason for the hue and cry today about abuses and outrages by the bureaucrats in Washington with respect to the authority that they think they enjoy. The people are going to say that the Congress created the agency, the Congress delegated the authority, and then it is going to be our responsibility. We are going to have to go into this a little further. I am for this resolution, of course, although I approached it from a different angle.

Two weeks before this resolution was introduced, I offered a bill to set up an administrative committee on review, consisting of eight Senators and eight Members of the House. Before they could make any rules of general applicability effective, they would have to send it up here on the request of the committee. That committee would look at it and for 10 days the rule could not become effective. Then if this legislative review committee says, "There is objection," it could not become effective for 40 days. The committee would make a report to the Congress. Then if they undertook to issue these rules, forms, and regulations on their own responsibility, the people would be fully advised as to what was going on.

I think we have to go infinitely further and constantly supervise and scrutinize the technique and the procedure of the administrative agencies of our Government. If we create them, if we give them the power, then it is also our constitutional responsibility to say how that power shall be exercised, and sooner or later out of this investigation I trust there will come a committee on administrative review so that we can discharge the responsibility where it properly belongs.

Some day, as I indicated, the American people will see through this and when we go home to give an accounting of our stewardship, they will say: "After all, you created the O. P. A., you gave them the power." Now that these rationing programs are as a spiritual affront to the people, sometimes administered by people who are uncivil as they deal with the American public, then it will be in our laps and when that time comes I think the Congress will point definitely in the direction of a permanent committee on administrative review.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am for the gentleman's proposal, but I am inclined to believe that those who are presently in favor of the bureaucratic system of making law by rules and regulations would say that the gentleman's proposal would be a restraint upon the Executive.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is entirely possible, but I am thinking of a great organic act that was adopted 150 years ago which puts the responsibility on us.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is there anything in the gentleman's resolution that would provide for well-qualified people to administer the law? I find that most of the objectionable regulations come from people who do not know anything about what jobs they are doing, and they do things that are absolutely unnecessary, although the broad policy of the Congress is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would give to such a reviewing committee broad powers to see that that element is taken into account.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 102, as introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], to create a board of review with powers to investigate and examine the manner and methods, as well as the manpower, of the various bureaus which have been established, either by Congress or by Executive order. I urge the Members of this House to support this resolution as an important step in the direction of recapturing for Congress some of the authority which has been gravitating into the hands of bureaucrats during the past 8 or 10 years. I believe passage of this resolution will go far toward reestablishing the position of Congress as a coordinate factor in the Federal Government and toward curbing and eliminating some of the abuses of bureaucracy gone wild from which this Republic has been increasingly suffering during the past decade.

It will be recalled by many Members that this resolution, which comes to us today from the House Committee on Rules, conforms precisely with the proposal I made to this House the last day of the Seventy-seventh Congress. My suggestion will be found in the second paragraph of the second column of page 9644 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 16, 1942, when I said, in part, and I quote from my talk in the House on that date:

> Mr. Speaker, I think that our new Congress might well give consideration to setting up a congressional board of review comprised of competent, experienced, hard-headed, and distinguished Americans nominated by Congress and empowered to pass upon the directives, orders, regulations, limitation orders, rationing rules, and what not being so generally issued by bureaucratic overlords these days. This board of review need have no powers of review or veto on any order dealing strictly with a military matter or the production of supplies of war. But on civilian matters it might well be that when a concurrent act of Congress demands it this board of review should be given power of review, amendment, and veto, if necessary, over bureaucratic rulings affecting our civilian economy, our production of food, our use of gasoline, fuel oil, and rubber, and other matters not directly concerned with problems of military preparedness or production. We have already surrendered much of our authority. Perhaps this would be a way to resume some of the functions and duties which we have too freely delegated to others over whom it seems we presently lack all control. I am not sure this would be the answer to these problems, but it is at least a constructive suggestion which I wish you would ponder over between now and when we convene again on January 6.

Mr. Speaker, I am naturally gratified that my suggestion has borne fruit in the form of the resolution before us today. I have conferred with many Members since first making it on December 16 and it is my conviction that this resolution will today be adopted by an overwhelming vote. While my original proposal would have exempted the military departments from inclusion in this resolution, the Rules Committee members felt it unnecessary and unwise to make such exemptions inasmuch as the Board of Review can be depended upon to use sound and patriotic judgment in not interfering with military matters and to include such an exemption might tend to cover into the exempt class a great variety of nonmilitary bureaus which might claim to be functioning primarily for war purposes. Thus I feel we can safely pass the resolution in its present form and rely upon the members selected to use due judgment and good sense in determining when and when not to utilize their authority.

One final thought, Mr. Speaker, before I conclude. Had President Roosevelt not vetoed the Walter-Logan bill which we passed in the Seventy-sixth Congress, today's resolution would be unnecessary. The Walter-Logan bill would have provided an appropriate means of checking misuse of bureaucratic power and of protecting the rights of private citizens. Unfortunately, President Roosevelt vetoed that legislation. I believe the work of the Board of Review which I predict we shall today establish will bring out many evidences of need for some such legislation as the Walter-Logan bill and it is entirely possible that these findings will be great enough so that the Walter-Logan bill can once again be passed with sufficient support, if necessary, to win approval over a Presidential veto. Americans, Mr. Speaker, are determined not to surrender this Republic in its entirety to bureaucrats over whom the people have no control, for none of whom the people have voted, many of whom, in fact, are "lame ducks" rejected at the polls by the people themselves, and who have all too frequently forgotten that they are the servants and not the rulers of the people of America. Passage of this resolution will serve notice to the world that this Congress understands the position of American citizens in this connection and that it proposes to keep faith with constitutional principles of self-government.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment this resolution provides a step, and a very long step, in the right direction. I hope it will be adopted. It will at least afford some manner of regulation of these Federal agencies which are performing legislative, judicial, and executive functions. I hope that a little later it will be followed and supplemented by the adoption of a bill I have introduced, H. R. 83, to have a staff of our own, an Office of Fiscal Investigations as an agency of the House of Representatives, to follow up appropriations in order that

we may know in detail how the money we appropriate is expended and may make the necessary corrections to prevent abuses that have crept into our governmental system.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the appointment of a congressional committee to investigate and report violations of bureaus and other Government agencies who act beyond the scope of authority by issuing orders and regulations that have the effect of decrees and edicts, as binding as the law itself.

The legislation before us comes, I think, as a demand on the part of a majority of the people of this country who are concerned lest a growing bureaucracy destroy the very foundations of the American way of life and of American Government as we know it.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are fully aware that during this crisis it is necessary that extraordinary power and authority must be given the Chief Executive, who is also Commander in Chief of the armed forces. No one disputes that. No one wants to interfere with authority or the authority of those responsible to him in the prosecution of the war to a successful conclusion.

Our people also understand the need of certain general emergency controls required during the war period. They are not only cognizant of these matters but want to approach them in a patriotic manner. They really want to cooperate under such controls to whatever limit is required. Of course they want to cooperate—5,000,000 of our own boys are involved in one way or another in this terrible conflict.

But, Mr. Speaker, while our country is thus engaged in this mighty struggle, we have bureaus and agencies by the score, some remotely related to the war effort, who insist on extending their edicts and decrees, unnecessarily on our people, even in some instances, that result in impeding rather than helping in our Nation's distress. This conduct of rule and regimentation by agencies not directly responsible to the people, has been growing steadily during the past few years, even before the present defense and war effort got under way.

Mr. Speaker, the people are deeply concerned. They want to know, and make sure, that the flickering light of representative democracy is not smothered out by the ever-increasing, and overlapping bureaucratic control and ideolcgy that have crept into so many departments of our Government in the past few years. While our boys are fighting for the "four freedoms" in all of the corners of the world, our people want to know these same freedoms are not lost on the home front.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, the overall picture as we see it today of the administrative performance of our Government is this. By the gradual delegation of power on the part of the Congress to the executive, the power of the executive has grown out of all proportion to that of the legislative branch of the Government. By reason of judicial interpretation there has been a construction, as it were, of our legislative power. By the same token the delegation of this power to the administrative agencies of the Government has become such that they have arrogated unto themselves not only the interpretation of Executive orders but the imposition of penalties far beyond that contemplated in these orders.

As I view this resolution, it is purely ministerial and procedural. It should go hand in hand with the plan outlined by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and that suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] as a complete composite, bringing back into our hands the power we have allowed to slip away from us. This Government, in its legislative functions, must be streamlined. It must be brought back to where it commands the respect and confidence of the American people.

James Madison, when he submitted the original 12 amendments, said, in substance, to the First Congress of the United States:

> You never need to fear the power of the executive, because it will always be weak, but you must fear the power of the courts and the legislature.

A complete transition has occurred, and today the executive has grown and grown and grown until it is all-powerful.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, who wants additional time on the other side, 4 minutes instead of 5. I am sorry we did not have the additional time left.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to be in favor of this resolution, although it is a broad and sweeping one. It will undoubtedly be approved. I hope that infinite care will be taken by the chairman and the members thereof to see that no injustice is done.

One of the provisions of the resolution is that the committee shall examine rules, regulations, and directives to see that those who may be accused by administrative officials of being guilty of violation thereof are permitted to present an adequate defense and have a fair and impartial trial. I hope the admonition that is contained in the resolution will likewise apply to the members of the committee. I am sure it will. I am sure the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who has been here a great many years and who will be chairman of this committee—an intelligent, fearless, and erudite gentleman—will be fair and equitable. Sometimes, however, intentions are not carried out and great injury may result if the activities of the committee are not fairly and judicially administered. With that in view, he and his colleagues on that committee can do a highly constructive job.

Our revered Chaplain, Dr. Montgomery, this morning prayed that rude passions would not dominate our finer feelings. I hope this committee will calmly and dispassionately examine, consider, and deliberate. I hope the committee will not follow the example of another committee which has, indeed, allowed rude passions to dominate their finer feelings. I hope the Smith committee will be fair, judicious, and, I hope especially, nonpolitical. I say humbly as to this other committee that it would appear to be the policy that if there be anyone whose political ideology does not gibe with the views of the chairman, why, just put him on a proscribed list, or if anyone has liberal views on government, place a bar sinister upon him. Unfortunately, this procedure smacks somewhat of witch burning. I hope this newly constituted committee will shun such practices. See how far afield this other committee has gone. If you examine the doctrines, the teachings, and the writings of Thomas Jefferson, John Quincy Adams, and Ben Franklin, and were they alive today, they would surely find their place among the 38 names against which the chairman of that other committee fulminated.

Indeed, I repeat, the committee I mentioned has gone far afield. I read from the Opinions of Oliver Allston, by Van Wyck Brooks, published by E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., which by the end of November 1941 was in its eleventh printing:

> From our Revolution sprang the French, and that Jefferson and Paine were the forerunners of Russia. * * * The Declaration of Independence speaks of "all men." Is there not something collective (communistic) in this conception? And have we forgotten that John Quincy Adams wished to make our economy collective? This Republican President, mark the word, hoped to develop the national wealth on a collective, not a competitive basis. * * * John Quincy Adams promoted the study of science, while he fought with all his might against the bankers, who stood for competition and disruption. I do not have to speak of Andrew Jackson. I have only to return to the Adamses; to Henry Adams, who, holding in mind his grandfather's faith, said of himself in his Education, "by rights, he should have been a Marxist." * * * Collectivism exists in our tradition, even our Republican tradition—for one does not have to mention the Democrats, not to speak of the Socialists in our tradition, the Brook Farmers, Bellamy, the novelist Howells. * * * Benjamin Franklin wrote to Robert Morris: "All property, except the savage's temporary cabin, his bow, his match-coat, and other little acquisitions, absolutely necessary for his subsistence, seems to me the creature of public convention. All the property that is necessary to a man, for the conservation of the individual, and the propagation of the species, is his natural right, which none may justly deprive him of; but all property superfluous to such purposes is the property of the public, who, by their laws, have created it, and who may therefore, by other laws, dispose of it, whenever the welfare of the public shall demand such disposition. He that does not like civil society on these terms, let him retire and live among savages!" Was Franklin a collectivist, or was he not? This was the patriotism of our Revolution. * * * If there was ever a man who had a right to speak for patriots, Edward Everett Hale was this man. Well, Dr. Hale, in a book called We, the People, recommended old-age pensions and the Government ownership of coal mines; and he said: "The people own the roads, the schoolhouses, the lighthouses—why then object to the

ownership of wealth in common?" Dr. Hale made this statement in the very year, 1903, in which he became the chaplain of the United States Senate. I do not say that Dr. Hale represented all our tradition, but who can say that he was disloyal to it?

Assuredly many other patriots could be mentioned whose opinions could not square with that of the chairman of the committee I criticize. They would all be ostracized.

In conclusion, everything depends upon the mode and manner in which the proceedings of this committee, soon to be constituted, are conducted. If the committee is channelized along the lines adopted by the other committee, it would be most regrettable.

Numerous agencies of the Government have invited a resolution of this sort and the setting up of this committee. A number of the officials have run amok. They have almost gone berserk in the issuance of regulations, but that is no reason why we should "tar and feather" everybody. We should not visit the sins of the few upon the many.

I repeat the substance of a question I propounded to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] when I said I hope when this committee is constituted it will use the Judiciary Committee. A number of its members will be willing to help to carry out the laudable purposes of this resolution and help steer it in the proper channels.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment excessive powers have been granted to the departments and bureaus of the Government, but in addition to those powers granted, vast powers have been assumed beyond the delegation of authority made by the Congress. I earnestly urge the adoption of this resolution. It will do more than one thing. I think it will let the people of America know our attitude toward the assumption of discretionary power by these bureaus, power outside of the jurisdiction of law. I believe this is one of the greatest possible steps that can be taken toward guaranteeing the permanent security of the American form of government under the Constitution, and as intended it should be by the body of American laws. It will do much to correct the assumption of regulatory powers beyond the grant of authority by the Congress. This is a forward step, an important step in the right direction and one that we have been all too slow heretofore in taking.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, with the general purpose of this resolution I am in accord. Indeed, I believe it an important function of Congress to see that the laws it passes are carried out in accordance with the intent of Congress. And in this time of war, when extraordinary powers must be granted to executive agencies, it is a duty of Congress to see that those powers are not exercised in an arbitrary or capricious manner. It is my understanding that this resolution does not empower the committee to call in question any Executive order of the President. Certainly in wartime such a committee should not exercise such a power, for in total war the Executive carries so tremendous a responsibility that he must be able to carry through that responsibility with dispatch and effectiveness and Congress ought to do nothing that could be interpreted as interference with the most vigorous possible conduct of the war.

It is my opinion that the resolution, in seeking to give to a congressional committee the function of attempting to review action where constitutional rights, privileges, or immunities have allegedly been infringed, does invade a field of the judicial department of the Government, worthy as the general objective may be.

It is my further belief that important as is the task assigned this committee it ought really to be done by the standing committees of the House, each in the field of its own particular jurisdiction, as would be provided by my resolution, House Resolution 60. This special committee is given the power to recommend legislation and amendments to existing legislation. It is altogether likely that in almost all cases such legislation would be of such a character that some standing committee would have special knowledge and experience in the matter.

I am going to vote for this resolution because, as I stated before, I believe Congress has the duty not only to pass laws but also to see that they are administered and carried out in accord with congressional intent. But I am frank to say that I think a broad and general mistake is made every time a special committee is created to do a job which some standing committee or a subcommittee of a standing committee could do.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the resolution at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, again Americans everywhere will pause to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln, a great President, a great American, and one of the outstanding men of the known history of man.

These are tragic days in the history of our American people. We are in a total war. Not only our principles, but also our liberties, are in danger.

The tragic days that Abraham Lincoln was called upon to face long ago ended in a new triumph for the system of government in which he so thoroughly believed. The special threat to our form of government in Lincoln's time has passed away, but if he were here today, he would undoubtedly see new threats of discontent and the threat of concentrated power in the hands of a few, of the rise of an army of officeholders with the makings of petty dictators in them.

The American people will do well to study and heed the clear logic of Lincoln's statesmanship. We would do well to return to Lincoln for counsel to light our way in a distracted world. He would tell us that our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us and in our will and our courage to defend it.

It was the hope of our forefathers to limit and balance the powers of the legislative branch, the judicial branch, and the executive branch in such a way that no one of them could seize the power with which to rob each other or the individual of his freedom.

When our first war for freedom was over, in order that the world might know why they fought, our forefathers wrote a statement of principle and faith. That statement they called the Declaration of Independence. Since then we have had to fight wars for principles and ideals, but in none of them were we fighting for actual freedom of the people in these United States from foreign tyranny.

Again we have set our armies in motion; again the stake is our freedom from a foreign despot. On many a far-flung fighting front Americans are dying that we may prove again to an anxious world that the torch of real human freedom which our fathers lighted in 1776 has not gone out and will not go out as long as our love of freedom remains with us.

When this war is over there will surely come peace. That peace will bring problems and needs as great as those which have been occasioned by this war. The advent of this war caught us unprepared. We must not let the problems of the peace catch us unprepared.

Therefore, it would be well for all of us to take a searching look at those things for which we are fighting for now. For unless we know what we are fighting for today we cannot be prepared to establish as a post-war condition the ideals and principles for which we fight.

It might help us to look backward into our own development. For 150 years we had a government of law under the Constitution of the United States, with a governing body which acted as an umpire only. For a hundred and fifty years taxes were levied for the most part for revenue only. For 150 years our compelling urge was the profit motive. That century and a half brought this Nation from obscurity to greatness; from poverty to prosperity; from dependence to security. We progressed to become the envy of every other nation on this earth.

But a marked change has taken place since we have begun to experiment with a government of bureaus, and the change into this so-called planned economy has made such rapid strides that the distance we have traveled in the past 10 years from a government by law toward a government of men is startling. What is worse, with all its experimenting the so-called planned economy has failed to solve the very ills which it boasted it would cure.

Even in the midst of war, every real American should compare the more rea-

sonable process of congressional law with the confused, hastily written regulations of the bureaus and decide which is best, which cost the least and which is easier to keep honest. We should weigh carefully our chances of remaining freemen when we are controlled by men whose purposes we do not understand. We must decide which will be more responsive to the people—the Congress which the people elect or the bureaus whose heads are appointed and dismissed at the will of the Executive. We must judge whether, in doubling the number of employees who are engaged in nonproductive government we have not acted to the detriment of the farms—the industries—and even the war effort.

And as for the planning by the so-called experts—what has it done for us? Can it even be justifiably called a plan when it did not foresee either war or the critical shortages which would hurt us so in that war? It is pertinent to find the answer as to who fumbled the rubber situation for so many costly months, Congress or the bureaus to which its solution was assigned.

We now have a mystic maze of bureaus and agencies and each man who comes into the Government as head of a bureau must have a little power to correct a little economic ill and thereby finds he must have more power or he cannot bring the situation back where it was when he began to tinker with it. When one bureau tries to administer a law it throws other functions of the Government out of gear, therefore another agency has to be set up to correct the disrupted function. Each move further dislocates the delicate machinery of government and this requires more bureaus and agencies to make the Government run again. Is this not exactly what Washington and Lincoln feared? Is this not exactly what the framers of the Constitution feared?

But we are now in this war for our very lives and for our freedom. We cannot stop to tear up any system. We cannot afford to fight among ourselves because all of our energies and our efforts must be given to fighting a foreign foe and we cannot afford to let anything interfere with our all-out aid to our boys who are fighting for us. We are all willing to make whatever sacrifices may be necessary not only to win this war but to win it quickly.

As we pause to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln, there comes calling to us from beyond the years the challenge of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and the Unknown Soldier, whose body now rests in Arlington Cemetery, to preserve the liberty for which our forefathers fought.

We must lay our blueprint for freedom now and we must support it vigorously. What better blueprint for freedom could we have than that we shall reinstate the Constitution of the United States and return to a government of laws.

No man can see what the future may bring. However, we should plan now to erect again the edifice of constitutional liberty. It will be well for us to remember the words of Abraham Lincoln as he stood on that cold day in November 1863 in the field of Gettysburg.

That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

So long as these words are remembered by our Republic, this Republic shall live.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution—House Resolution 102. We have heard many complaints covering a long period of time from Democrats as well as Republicans on the floor of the House. Like complaints have been voiced on the radio and in the press. We have been told in these complaints that we now see bureaucracy at its worst.

There is a rising tide of resentment throughout the Nation from the people against those in charge of the executive departments, bureaus, commissions, and other agencies of the Federal Government, charging, first, they constantly exceed the power or authority granted to such departments, bureaus, commissions, and other agencies of the Government by the Congress or by Executive order, in rules, regulations, and orders issued by them; second, they have been and are now invading the constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities of the citizens of the United States; and third, they even go so far as to inflict penalties for failure to comply with their rules, regulations, and directives without affording those accused of such violation an opportunity to present their defense before a fair and impartial tribunal, without authority of law.

This resolution gives the Speaker of the House of Representatives the authority to appoint a committee of seven Members of the House of Representatives to make diligent and careful inquiry into these complaints and report their findings and recommendations back to the House. In my opinion, the results of last November's election were largely due to the resentment of the American people against bureaucracy, and in many cases autocratic control of our Government and the affairs of the American people. They clearly indicated their desire to see constitutional Government restored and that this powerful bureaucracy made up of some three million civil office holders be brought to account for their actions, and that they be restrained from further invading the constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities of the citizens of the United States.

The American people have expressed in no uncertain terms their displeasure of a subservient Congress and their determination to have their constitutional rights restored to them. They desire the Congress to function as one of the three great coordinate branches of the Government. It is the only branch of our Government that can make laws, grant their powers, provide penalties, and levy taxes. This new Congress has given many evidences of its purpose to again assert itself as one of the three great coordinate branches of our Government as provided by the Constitution of the United States. The adoption of this resolution will give further assurance to the American people of the high purpose and independence of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The adoption of this resolution will be one of the most important steps taken by this Congress in a decade. This committee will have a great and patriotic duty to perform. In carrying out the purpose of this resolution, this committee will render an outstanding service to the Congress itself, and more especially to the American people. Bureaucracy has run wild for a long time. This really puts them on notice that they must not take any action, adopt any rule, procedure, regulation, order, or directive which goes beyond the scope of the power granted them by the Congress itself or by Executive order. They must not by any such action invade the constitutional rights, privileges, or immunities of the citizens of this country. They must not inflict penalties for failure to comply with their rules, regulations, or directives without affording those accused of such violations an opportunity to present their defense before a fair and impartial tribunal as provided by law.

The adoption of this resolution will give notice to those of the executive branch of the Government that their powers are limited to those granted by the Congress itself. They cannot, as they have for a number of years, make the laws through rules, regulations, and so forth, interpret the laws, and, at the same time, execute them.

The Constitution provides that Congress alone can make the laws, the courts interpret them, and the executive branch of the Government execute them.

Many of those who have denied constitutional rights to our own citizens and have imposed penalties without a fair and impartial hearing on the citizens of this country for violating mere rules and regulations promulgated by the bureaucrats without authority of law have expressed great interest in democracy for the peoples in every other part of the globe and at the same time deny democratic processes and the American way of life to our own people.

More than 10,000,000 of the flower of American manhood have or will be called into the service in the name of liberty and freedom, millions of lives may be lost, and hundreds of billions of dollars in treasure may be expended, and a debt of two hundred and fifty billion or more dollars will be loaded upon the American people, and then after it is all over and our boys come home, unless we are vigilant and take vigorous steps, such as are being taken today, they will find out that we won the war for freedom across the seas but we lost the war for liberty, freedom, and constitutional government here at home.

It affords me very great pleasure to give this resolution my unqualified support, and I am sure our able Speaker will appoint a committee qualified by training and experience to undertake this great task, and that the committee

will carry through the high purpose set forth in this resolution. After all, our first and great duty as Members of the Congress is to preserve constitutional government in our own land.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, of course, I am in favor of this resolution, and I suggest that the committee when appointed will be a very busy committee, but I also wish to make it plain that the Navy and War Departments seem to be included in this resolution, and to suggest that it may be advisable to remove them from its jurisdiction. The second paragraph of the resolution gives the committee power to determine constitutional questions, and I suggest that if that remains in the resolution, there might be some very embarrassing matters upon which the committee might have to pass.

Also, the committee is supposed to make recommendations as to the personnel of the departments, and I suggest to the author of the resolution what he might properly recommend to the House as to the personnel different than the Dies committee and its review committee recently set up. Would the gentleman attempt to impeach them, take away their salaries, or to dismiss them from the service? In many instances citizens who have disobeyed O. P. A. regulations have been allowed to escape the courts by accepting certain suggested settlements. In such circumstances, would they claim to this committee that they have not had a fair tribunal? I again suggest that we had better take out the War and the Navy Departments, and also remove paragraph 2.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the resolution at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I arise to support House Resolution 102, known as the Smith resolution, the purpose of which is to put some restraint upon those many bureaus of the executive department which in many instances distort legislation to their own ends to the extent of ignoring the intent of Congress as expressed in the laws enacted by Congress.

The people have been so afflicted with these misinterpretations and have suffered so many penalties as a result of the wrong interpretations placed upon the laws that there is an overwhelming sentiment in favor of Congress' reasserting its independence and, in so doing, insisting upon the correct interpretation of the laws which it enacts.

We have reached the point where some of these Executive agencies do not seek legislative authorization for the penalties which they inflict upon the people but exercise the assumed power until prohibited from doing so by Congress.

Is Congress the law-making body of a free people today? No. The laws neither originate in nor are the laws being made by the Congress of the United States. Who initiates national legislation, writes its provisions, imposes penalties, provides against court review? The legislating is now being done by such executive agencies as the N. L. R. B., S. E. C., I. C. C., A. A. A., T. V. A., T. F. C., F. C. C., the Office of Production Management, the War Production Board, and other executive agencies.

What does the attorney do who wishes to keep up with contemporary laws? Does he turn to the statutes enacted by the Congress? Not at all. Instead he turns to the rulings and records of the executive agencies.

Let us not forget that section 1, article 1, of the Constitution of the United States provides:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the presentation of House Resolution 102 today constitutes the culmination of an oft-expressed desire on the part of a great majority of the people that the bureaucratic power be curbed in this country. This proposed resolution seeks to do that very thing. When this resolution is passed by the Congress, and the committee is set up thereunder, the activities of the various departments of government will come under the scrutinizing eye of a special committee which has the power to ascertain the facts, and to report such facts to the Congress for action.

To my mind this pending resolution is of the highest importance to the people, and to our country. The people have been ruled, largely, for the past several years by bureaucrats. Those bureaucrats were not elected by the people and they are not responsible to the people; they were appointed to their respective positions and they are responsible to but one person—the one who appointed them to their position.

We must remember that ours is a government by law, and not a government by men. In the various departments of government a growing tendency has been observed to promulgate rules, orders, and regulations, all of which have the force and effect of law, and these same rules, orders, and regulations have largely been promulgated by the heads of bureaus, boards, and commissions—all without any legislative action. But those very rules, orders, and regulations, so promoted by various departments of government, become the rule of action—they have the force and effect of law—and the people are largely controlled and governed thereby. That tendency has grown to the point that such rules, orders, and regulations have become too numerous for the people generally to know what they should do, or not do, in order to observe them. It is now impossible for the people generally to know what the rules of action are, and what they should do, in the ordinary course of action, to observe them.

Mr. Speaker, it is lamentable that such action has not been taken long ago. The course of life of many people has been altered by the numerous rules and regulations enacted by the bureaucrats in our agencies of government, and, too, many people have lost the savings of a lifetime because of some of those rules and regulations which were adopted by some agency in our Government. The Congress had no part in the making of such rules or regulations, and the same were never adopted as a law of our land, but such rules were promulgated by and through the whim or caprice of some individual, in some department of government, who is unknown, generally, to the people of this Nation.

This resolution will tend to curb that unholy practice. And, may I say, that when the committee is selected, which is provided by this resolution, it will have the power to investigate the question of whether the rules, orders, and regulations are beyond the power and scope granted to such department or agency by Congress, or by Executive order. In addition, the committee will have the power to determine whether the action of the agency, or department of Government, invades the constitutional rights, privileges, or immunities of the people of the United States. The investigations to be made, by the committee, may also embrace the question of whether the rules, orders, or regulations inflict penalties for a failure to comply therewith without affording those accused of a violation thereof without opportunity to present their defense before a fair and impartial tribunal. Those matters, sought to be determined by such committee, merely give everyone a fair chance to protect property, the good name, and the right to a fair hearing—that which is guaranteed to every citizen under our Constitution. No one will contend that any citizen is not entitled to that protection, regardless of whom he may be.

This legislation is very essential now. This does not embrace the war effort, or those who are in good faith engaged in the prosecution of the war. Everyone is agreed that our paramount problem is to win this war as quickly and decisively as possible. Therefore, the Army and the Navy will not encounter any difficulties of any kind if this resolution is passed. This resolution is merely a protective measure to assure the people that the Congress is trying, in every possible way and in extreme good faith, to recapture some of the powers which have been taken away from the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of any other element—regardless of peace or war—we must not permit our form of government to be frittered away. Bureaucratic government in this country must end. This is government by the people, under law. That policy must continue throughout the future ages. The provisions of the pending resolution are purely and completely American, and the policies therein enunciated will tend to preserve those sacred traditions which have descended to us from the founding fathers.

It is my hope that this resolution will be passed without a dissenting voice. Every American wants to preserve the American way of life, and I am certain

every American wants to preserve our form of government. When the boys come home, after victory is won, we want them to be secure in our form of government under the Constitution. Now is the time to stop bureaucratic control in this country, and now is the time for Congress to assert its prerogatives as the legislative branch of our Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I could vote for this resolution with far greater enthusiasm if the scope of the investigations it would authorize were broadened so as to support inquiries into alleged abuses and misuses of so-called delegated legislative powers by the Chief Executive himself. The limiting of the anticipated investigations to the executive departments and independent agencies is to but invite further denunciation of the legislative branch of the Government for subserviency.

Investigations of small fry, of petty officials, even of department heads, will not satisfy anyone. It is only because the investigations which the resolution will authorize may bring to light something of importance, something that will inspire throughout the country an irresistible demand for the widening of the inquiry to include every official and every branch of the Government, that I am persuaded to assent to the measure now under consideration. Actuated alone by this consideration, I shall cast my vote for the resolution.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. It is essential legislation if we are to halt the march to social revolution and dictatorship in America. The people, by an overwhelming vote last November 3, protested against government by decree and its gestapo methods, and this resolution meets that mandate.

Bureaucratic government, national socialism, and totalitarianism have been repudiated by the people, and we, the representatives of the people, must abide by the mandate given. We must reestablish constitutional government. We must reestablish free enterprise and we must protect and maintain the "four freedoms" in the United States while our soldiers and sailors are fighting for them throughout the world.

As you know, I am sincerely disturbed over the threat now being made against the press of the Nation—our free press and free speech. This resolution will make possible a review of actions now being taken by the War Production Board which threaten the very existence of our free press and associated industries.

I refer to the reduction in the consumption of newsprint and book paper. Only yesterday the W. P. B. announced in a press release that an additional cut of 10 percent, over the amount used by publishers in 1941, will be made April 1, making a total cut of 20 percent since January 1. And, mind you, this additional cut is to be made before the effects of the first cut—made only a month ago—can possibly be ascertained.

One of the first tasks of this committee, if this resolution is adopted, should be to establish whether such an additional reduction in the use of paper is necessary. At the same time the committee should determine just why the Office of Civilian Supply refused to abandon its demand for a straight, horizontal cut of 40 percent until Members of Congress organized a voluntary committee to oppose such a reduction, which, incidentally, would have put out of existence the majority of newspapers in America. Mr. Weiner, Chief of the Office of Civilian Supply, should be one of the first to be brought before the committee. Remember, he is the same Mr. Weiner who brought about the 70 percent reduction in the manufacture of farm machinery, while other high officials of Government demanded food for our citizens, Army, Navy, and all of the rest of the world.

But getting back to the newsprint problem, I am reliably informed that only today a leading paper industry source in New York expressed the opinion that complete inquiry into the latest developments in W. P. B. would fail to disclose any need for a second cut in the use of newsprint. I am told this source would issue a newspaper release to that effect before the end of the day.

This paper industry official admits that there are some intangibles, but that the logic of the situation would be to wait until next summer or autumn before deciding upon the advisability of any further cut, in view of the amount of raw materials now in sight.

I shall vote for the establishment of this so-called Smith committee and I urge that one of its first tasks will be a complete and thorough investigation of the W. P. B. newsprint reduction orders.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it the intent of this resolution that in the event that any of the 130,000,000 citizens of the United States feel that any action of any department infringes their constitutional rights, instead of hiring a lawyer they can come to Congress and have Congress act for them?

Mr. FISH. I believe the gentleman is correct, but I would prefer to have the gentleman ask that question of the sponsor of the resolution, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who will conclude the speaking on the resolution, because he has made a thorough study and he knows exactly what is in the resolution, and what the intent is and I assume that he will be on the committee. I am giving the gentleman only a guess answer, but I believe it is the correct one.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution which will be debated for only an hour, is perhaps the most important and far-reaching resolution that has come before any Congress in the last 10 years. It represents and is typical of the spirit that pervades the United States today. It really emanates from the American people themselves, who are asking for immediate relief from a bureaucratic form of government, and from rules and regulations by bureaucrats instead of by law.

Certainly on this side of the aisle the Republicans were elected primarily on a mandate from the people to restore representative and constitutional government in the United States. That is the fundamental purpose of this resolution, in order to bring back to the Congress those powers and prerogatives that we have surrendered during the last 10 years and to set up in Congress a special committee that can make a thorough and detailed investigation and bring before them those bureaucrats, whether their names are HENRY WALLACE or Harry Hopkins, or anyone else, and ask them by what authority of law, by what authority of Congress is he doing this or doing that, from the lowest bureaucrat to the highest. This is, in its essence, the restoration of what everybody wants, of legislative power to the Congress so that it will be as it should be, the sole legislative Federal authority in the United States.

Mr. McMURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. McMURRAY. Did you say that HENRY WALLACE was a bureaucrat?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman might interpret it that way if he wants to. I said this special committee would have the power to ask him to come before it and tell by what authority the organization B. E. W., of which he is the head, is operating and to ascertain whether it has exceeded the scope of the powers conferred on it by Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman think that this power conferred upon the committee would justify the committee in even calling the President to account for some Executive orders which he has made?

Mr. FISH. I had hoped that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] would take the floor so that we could ask him that question. I hope the gentleman will ask that of the gentleman from Virginia when he addresses the House.

Mr. COOLEY. I know the gentleman from New York would delight very much to have that opportunity to examine the President and make inquiry.

Mr. FISH. Why, certainly. I think we ought to be able to ask the President by what right he issues Executive orders which transcend the powers granted him by Congress in defiance of the Congress and of the Constitution. Is not the gentleman for that himself?

Mr. COOLEY. No, sir; I am not.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman mean to say he wants the Chief Executive, representing the executive department of

the Government, to have legislative powers?

Mr. COOLEY. No, sir; but I want him to have full and complete executive powers in this great crisis in which we are now engaged.

Mr. FISH. Even in defiance of the Constitution and our three separate and independent branches of the Government?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not want any superman committee appointed by the Congress to review the activities of the President.

Mr. FISH. The very reason for this resolution, and it emanated from the people, is to oppose one party and one man or totalitarian government in the United States. This resolution is aimed at the menace of bureaucratic rule and attempts to establish a government by personal edicts, rules, regulations, and Executive orders instead of a government by law. If Executive orders usurp the powers and functions of Congress, it is our right and duty to investigate them; any other course would be supine and cowardly and a violation of the Constitution. I do not want the RECORD to intimate that the Congress will not investigate Presidential or Executive orders whenever it deems it necessary. Congress will not compromise with any form of totalitarianism in the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the action contemplated by the creation of this committee is long overdue.

I would not vote for this proposal if I felt the group to be chosen for the important work would engage in any embarrassment of the constituted authority of the President of the United States. I feel certain that the Members chosen will desire very earnestly to help, rather than hinder, our war effort.

Mr. Speaker, we need as a Congress to reassert our prerogatives. In this connection I have no doubt that certain agencies and persons therein have undertaken by regulation to amend statutes adopted by the legislative branch of the Government. I quote in part from my remarks:

> Congress has written certain legislation, which has actually been rewritten by agents of our Government, who were not elected as legislators from districts or States. I, for one, as a Member of this body, believe that the intent of Congress has been misused by some of these individuals who are in leadership in agencies of Government. I think the Congress, if it has the courage, must retake these powers unto itself.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this resolution. I think it is just another antilabor resolution. This Smith investigating committee will be just another Dies committee. Its purpose is nothing more than to further embarrass the Commander in Chief, the administration, and organized labor.

Now when we are at war is no time to create misunderstanding, confusion, and discontent. Our petty peeves should be submerged, and we should stand united in our national efforts to win this war over the Axis enemy.

The Rules Committee of this House is fast becoming a special "House of Lords" in this Congress. They have been turning out so many special investigating committees with special appropriations since this Congress convened that it is beginning to look like one grand grab-bag proposition. It seems that nearly every member on the Rules Committee is now a chairman of some special committee and is clutching some special appropriation in addition to his regular salary.

Some day this thing will end. I have voted for investigations before, and I am going to vote for the Cannon resolution, authorizing the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to investigate that committee's own appropriations. That in my mind is proper. But I am not going to vote to permit congressional Don Quixotes on the Rules Committee to ride roughshod over every other Member and legislative committee in this House, and usurp power and authority that they have no right to possess. This thing is going entirely too far.

I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] that if we shall have investigating committees, the investigators shall be members of the legislative committee that has proper jurisdiction of the matter involved.

We must put a stop to these super investigators, the members of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I will use this time to try to clarify some of the doubts that appear to have arisen during this discussion. Perhaps I can do it more quickly by eliminating those things which, as far as I had any idea in the drafting of this resolution, will not be investigated.

In the first place, I do not think that any committee of this Congress would now want to interfere with the War Department and the Navy Department. I do not think that any committee which would be set up would undertake in any way to investigate the war effort. I want to get that out of everybody's mind. I do not think that this committee or any other committee ought at this time to undertake to investigate the acts of the President of the United States. I want to state that very clearly, because that impression has been in the minds of some.

As a matter of fact, I have redrafted this resolution three times in an attempt to clarify it to the extent where it would be understood that this would apply to those who undertake to carry out the Executive orders and those who undertake to carry out the acts of Congress. I hope I have made that clear.

It seems to me hardly necessary to answer the rather gratuitous remark of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] that this was another labor-baiting expedition.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not at this time. I want to say to this House that this is not any sort of a "labor baiting" expedition or any sort of a baiting expedition for anybody or for any one particular department or agency of this Government. It is in response to the almost universal complaint in this country that persons employed in the executive agencies of the Government are daily exceeding the authority granted them by the Congress or by the Executive order which created such agencies.

I feel that during this emergency there is one thing that we ought to be very careful to try to preserve. We are in a great war, it is true, and we must win it, but I do not want us to awaken after we have won the war and find that we have lost the Government that our forefathers fought for 150 years ago. I think we should be very careful in this Congress to take every step that is necessary to see that our form of government is preserved during this emergency. I see no reason why we should not do it. I think this committee can do a great deal of good in a proper and dignified way by calling the attention of the heads of the agencies to instances of violation of the law that come to our attention.

Somebody asked what I proposed to do about investigating the personnel of Federal agencies. I do not believe this committee will undertake a general investigation of personnel, but here is what I have in mind. If we find that a certain agency of the Government has acted in direct conflict intentionally, and willfully with the mandate of an act of Congress or an Executive order I think we ought to go to that department and find out who put that order out and find out the individual who was responsible. If we find an individual in the executive department of the Government who has deliberately violated an act of Congress we ought to bring that to the attention of this Congress. What Congress may want to do about it I do not know. This committee will make its investigation and report, and recommend legislation with which the Congress may do as it pleases.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is merely seeking to set up a forum for the aggrieved citizens of this Nation. Has not the gentleman a concrete case to bring to our attention? Can he not tell some of the experiences which led him to seek this action?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry; I do not believe I am going to have time to do it, and I do not want to tie this investigation to any one department or agency; I want it distinctly understood that it applies to all, to one just as much as to another. This is no time to go after any particular agency or any particular individual.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Congress has already authorized the Military Affairs Commit-

tee to make an investigation, the Naval Affairs Committee to make an investigation, the Dies committee to make an investigation, the Ramspeck committee to make an investigation——

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman ask his question if he has one?

Mr. COOLEY. I am asking, What other agencies does the gentleman have in mind that need investigating at this point? Can the gentleman tell the House?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will answer the gentleman's question; I do not yield further. I could not tell the gentleman just how many agencies of the Federal Government there are; there are hundreds of them, many of them set up by order of Congress and many of them set up by Executive order. If complaint is made against any one, then this committee, so far as I am concerned, will not be afraid to investigate.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I direct the gentleman's attention to page 2, line 2, of the resolution reading as follows:

Invades the constitutional rights, privileges, or immunities of citizens of the United States.

Does this mean that any individual can make a complaint to this committee? Or does it mean that it has to be a group of citizens? It is sufficiently specific to cover an individual cause of action.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think that would be within the discretion of the committee; it would depend upon the circumstances of the particular case.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. I still do not quite understand the scope of this resolution and should like to ask a few questions setting up one or two specific examples. For example, would this committee have authority to investigate the action of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission in carrying out the President's 48-hour work order?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If that was an order issued by the Manpower Commission.

Mr. MOTT. No; this order was issued by the President, and Mr. McNutt is carrying it out.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think, so far as I am concerned, as a member of any committee I would not feel justified in this time in undertaking to investigate an order of the President.

Mr. MOTT. Let me go a step further. The papers this morning stated that the C. I. O. was demanding a guaranteed pay for 48 hours' work, presumably whether the worker worked a full 48 hours or not. Suppose the Chairman of the Manpower Commission should issue an order to that effect; there would be no authority of law for it. Would the committee have the authority to investigate and report to the Congress?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I want to make these answers general. I think any executive officer who goes without the scope of the Executive order or goes without the scope of an act of Congress under which he is acting may and should be investigated.

Mr. MOTT. Here is the other one: For example, would the committee have authority to investigate the action of the Treasury Department in carrying out the President's order relative to the $25,000 salary limitation?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not remember what is in the Executive order, but I say again that if any agency of the Government goes beyond the four corners of the Executive order which empowers them to do anything, I think it should be investigated by the committee.

Mr. MOTT. In other words, if the President himself issues an order, whether he has any authority in law to make it or not, the gentleman would not inquire about that order, no matter what agency executed it?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The committee would make inquiry about anything that is within the scope of the resolution now before the House.

Mr. MOTT. It is the resolution I am speaking about.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution, in line 1, instead of "5" make it "7"; namely, increase the number of members from 5 to 7 as originally contemplated.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH: Page 1, line 1, strike out "5" and insert "7."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, although I have been in Washington but a few days, from my observation and from the letters and wires received, it becomes increasingly evident that the bureaucrats have been enjoying a field day, riding herd on American business and American people. Business, both large and small, has been patiently taking a terrific beating from the vague, impractical dreamers who are going to make over this good old U. S. A. The fortitude of the American people, a free people, is remarkable, and their ability to restrain themselves as long as they have deserves commendation. However, indications reveal that they have accepted the challenge and are now about to do battle against entrenched bureaucracy. One or the other must go if we are to remain a free, liberty-loving people. The man of business has been restricted, regulated, harassed, haunted, and strangulated with regimentations to a point of utter exhaustion.

Between questionnaires, cross examinations, interrogations, regimentations, the average businessman knows not which way to turn. The alphabetical organizations came at him so fast and so furiously in the last few years his mind became fogged to a great extent. However, it is now starting to clear; November 3, 1942, proved that, and he is now aroused, indignant, and enraged to a point where he is demanding action on the part of the new Congress to secure relief. We Americans are naturally a patriotic and cooperative people. It is wholly unnecessary to drive us to make sacrifices to get results. We in America will make any necessary sacrifice in this all-out effort to win the war. However, the methods now being employed are certainly shocking the man on the street.

This Seventy-eighth Congress has been wisely called the Victory Congress, whose first objective is all out to win the war, and if it takes everything that we have we will willingly give it, and it is worth it. No sacrifice is too great for the American people to make for our boys who are fighting at Guadalcanal, in north Africa, in the air, on the high seas, and under the seas. They are doing a great job, and we Americans are only too willing to tighten our belts, forego some of the comforts we enjoy, and get down to the all-important job of winning the war.

After winning the war, I trust the Seventy-eighth Congress will be a victory Congress in a sense that it will return this Nation of ours and those blessings we enjoy back to that saneness, soundness, and stability that has traditionally marked the course of this Nation. This Congress has a job to do to preserve our constitutional form of government, our industrial system of free enterprise, and our American way of life. Let me say right now that we can well get along without the experimentation and regimentation, and if we will pause in the hurry of our everyday lives to look around at this glorious country of ours, we have done plenty well for ourselves, and we can do plenty well for ourselves if the long arm of bureaucracy does not reach out and strangle us. I know, at least on the Republican side of this Victory Congress, there will be a hard-hitting, militant outfit carrying on the fight against what the gentleman from Indiana, Representative HARNESS, calls ballooning bureaucracy. The American people are entitled to and should be given immediate relief from this cancerous growth of bureaucracy which is eating the heart out of our American way of life.

I urge the adoption of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the resolution.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 125, noes 25.

Mr. COOLEY and Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania objected to the vote on the ground a quorum was not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 294, nays, 50, not voting 90, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—294

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Gavagan | Merrow |
| Allen, La. | Gavin | Michener |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Gearhart | Miller, Nebr. |
| | Gibson | Mills |
| Anderson, Calif. | Gifford | Monkiewicz |
| Anderson, N. Mex. | Gilchrist | Monroney |
| | Gillette | Morrison, La. |
| Andresen, August H. | Gillie | Mott |
| | Goodwin | Mruk |
| Angell | Gore | Mundt |
| Arends | Gossett | Murphy |
| Arnold | Graham | Murray, Tenn. |
| Auchincloss | Grant, Ala. | Murray, Wis. |
| Baldwin, Md. | Grant, Ind. | Newsome |
| Barden | Gregory | Nichols |
| Barrett | Griffiths | Norman |
| Barry | Gross | Norrell |
| Bates, Ky. | Guyer | O'Hara |
| Bates, Mass. | Gwynne | O'Konski |
| Beall | Hall, Edwin Arthur | O'Leary |
| Beckworth | | O'Neal |
| Bell | Halleck | O'Toole |
| Bender | Hancock | Pace |
| Bennett, Mich. | Hare | Patman |
| Bennett, Mo. | Harless, Ariz. | Patton |
| Bishop | Harness, Ind. | Peterson, Fla. |
| Blackney | Harris, Ark. | Peterson, Ga. |
| Bloom | Harris, Va. | Philbin |
| Bolton | Hart | Phillips |
| Bonner | Hartley | Pittenger |
| Boren | Hébert | Plumley |
| Bradley, Mich. | Heidinger | Poage |
| Brehm | Hendricks | Poulson |
| Brooks | Herter | Powers |
| Brown, Ga. | Hess | Pracht |
| Brown, Ohio | Hill | Price |
| Bryson | Hinshaw | Priest |
| Buffett | Hoeven | Ramey |
| Bulwinkle | Hoffman | Ramspeck |
| Burch, Va. | Holifield | Randolph |
| Burdick | Holmes, Mass. | Rankin |
| Busbey | Holmes, Wash. | Reed, Ill. |
| Butler | Hope | Reed, N. Y. |
| Camp | Horan | Rees, Kans. |
| Canfield | Howell | Richards |
| Cannon, Mo. | Hull | Rivers |
| Carson, Ohio | Izac | Rizley |
| Carter | Jarman | Robertson |
| Chapman | Jeffrey | Robsion, Ky. |
| Chenoweth | Jenkins | Rockwell |
| Chiperfield | Jensen | Rodgers, Pa. |
| Church | Johnson, Anton J. | Rogers, Mass. |
| Cole, Mo. | | Rohrbough |
| Cole, N. Y. | Johnson, Ind. | Rolph |
| Colmer | Johnson, J. Leroy | Russell |
| Cooper | | Sasscer |
| Costello | Johnson, Luther A. | Satterfield |
| Courtney | | Sauthoff |
| Cox | Johnson, Lyndon B. | Schiffler |
| Cravens | | Shafer |
| Crawford | Johnson, Okla. | Sheppard |
| Creal | Johnson, Ward | Sikes |
| Crosser | Jones | Simpson, Pa. |
| Cunningham | Jonkman | Smith, Maine |
| Curley | Judd | Smith, Ohio |
| Day | Keefe | Smith, Va. |
| Dewey | Kefauver | Smith, Wis. |
| Dies | Kerr | Snyder |
| Dilweg | Kilday | Somers, N. Y. |
| Dirksen | Kinzer | Sparkman |
| Disney | Knutson | Springer |
| Ditter | LaFollette | Stanley |
| Doughton | Lambertson | Starnes, Ala. |
| Douglas | Lane | Steagall |
| Drewry | Lanham | Stearns, N. H. |
| Durham | Larcade | Stefan |
| Dworshak | Lea | Stevenson |
| Eaton | LeCompte | Stewart |
| Elliott | Lemke | Stockman |
| Ellis | Lewis, Ohio | Sullivan |
| Ellison, Md. | Luce | Sumner, Ill. |
| Ellsworth | Ludlow | Sumners, Tex. |
| Englebright | McCord | Sundstrom |
| Fay | McGehee | Taber |
| Feighan | McKenzie | Talle |
| Fellows | McLean | Tarver |
| Fenton | McMillan | Taylor |
| Fish | Mahon | Thomas, Tex. |
| Fisher | Manasco | Thomason |
| Flannagan | Mansfield, Tex. | Tibbott |
| Forand | Martin, Iowa | Tolan |
| Fulbright | May | Towe |
| Gathings | Merritt | Troutman |
| Van Zandt | Wheat | Winter |
| Vincent, Ky. | Whelchel, Ga. | Wolcott |
| Vinson, Ga. | Whitten | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Voorhis, Calif. | Whittington | Woodruff, Mich. |
| Ward | Wickersham | Woodrum, Va. |
| Wasielewski | Wigglesworth | Worley |
| Wene | Willey | Zimmerman |
| West | Winstead | |

NAYS—50

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bradley, Pa. | Gorski | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Burchill, N. Y. | Granger | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Burgin | Hoch | O'Connor |
| Capozzoli | Jackson | Outland |
| Celler | Kee | Rabaut |
| Coffee | Kelley | Robinson, Utah |
| Cooley | King | Rogers, Calif. |
| Cullen | Kirwan | Rowan |
| Dawson | Klein | Sabath |
| Delaney | Lesinski | Sadowski |
| Eberharter | Lynch | Scanlon |
| Fitzpatrick | McMurray | Schuetz |
| Fogarty | Madden | Sheridan |
| Folger | Mansfield, Mont. | Smith, W. Va. |
| Ford | | Weaver |
| Furlong | Morrison, N. C. | Weiss |
| Gordon | Myers | Wright |

NOT VOTING—90

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Ill. | Gerlach | Martin, Mass. |
| Andrews | Green | Mason |
| Baldwin, N. Y. | Hagen | Miller, Conn. |
| Bland | Hale | Miller, Mo. |
| Boykin | Hall, Leonard W. | Miller, Pa. |
| Buckley | | Murdock |
| Byrne | Hays | Norton |
| Cannon, Fla. | Heffernan | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Carlson, Kans. | Hobbs | Pfeifer |
| Case | Jennings | Ploeser |
| Clark | Johnson, Calvin D. | Reece, Tenn. |
| Clason | | Rowe |
| Clevenger | Kean | Schwabe |
| Cochran | Kearney | Scott |
| Compton | Kennedy | Short |
| Culkin | Keogh | Simpson, Ill. |
| Curtis | Kilburn | Slaughter |
| D'Alesandro | Kleberg | Spence |
| Davis | Kunkel | Talbot |
| Dickstein | Landis | Thomas, N. J. |
| Dingell | LeFevre | Treadway |
| Domengeaux | Lewis, Colo. | Vorys, Ohio |
| Dondero | McCormack | Vursell |
| Elmer | McCowen | Wadsworth |
| Elston, Ohio | McGranery | Walter |
| Engel | McGregor | Weichel, Ohio |
| Fernandez | McWilliams | Welch |
| Fulmer | Maas | White |
| Gale | Magnuson | Wilson |
| Gallagher | Maloney | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Gamble | Marcantonio | |

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Bland with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Carlson of Kansas.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Elmer.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Dondero.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Compton.

Mr. Spence with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Short.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. McGranery with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Fulmer with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Schwabe.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Whelchel of Ohio.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.

Mr. D'Alesandro with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Green with Mr. Miller of Missouri.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson.

Mr. Lewis of Colorado with Mr. Kean.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Hayes with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Clason.

Mr. White with Mr. Miller of Connecticut.

Mr. Hagen with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Marcantonio with Mr. Engel.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 158) entitled "An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. HILL, Mr. TUNNELL, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. AUSTIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Civil Service Commission.
5. General Accounting Office.
6. The National Archives.

MERGER OF DOMESTIC TELEGRAPH CARRIERS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes, with the House amendment thereto, insist upon the amendment of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BULWINKLE, BOREN, BECKWORTH, WOLVERTON of New Jersey, and BROWN of Ohio.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 69, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Appropriations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees thereof appointed by the chairman of said committee for the purposes of this resolution, is authorized to conduct such studies and examination of the organization and operation of an executive department or any other executive agency (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) as the committee may deem necessary to assist it in connection with the determination of matters within its jurisdiction.

For the purposes of this resolution, such committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attend-

ance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution does not create a special committee but gives the Committee on Appropriations authority to make certain investigations. It authorizes the Committee on Appropriations to conduct such studies and examination of the organization and operation of any executive department or any executive agency, including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States, as the committee may deem necessary to assist it in connection with the determination of matters within its jurisdicton.

The only restriction on this authority, if it can be called a restriction, is found in this language, "in connection with the determination of matters within its jurisdiction."

The Committee on Appropriations has jurisdiction to appropriate, and in that connection has the right to investigate any and all matters coming within its jurisdiction to appropriate money for any need of the Government or any governmental agency. We have created quite a few agencies which are owned by the Government. This committee will have jurisdiction to investigate such agencies as well as any bureau or department. Personally, I feel that if there is one committee that should have the right to investigate, it is the Committee on Appropriations, before it appropriates.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY. What is the difference between this resolution and the resolution adopted by the House just a few moments ago?

Mr. SABATH. There is quite a difference. The resolution we adopted earlier, the Smith resolution, gives the committee to be appointed under that resolution jurisdiction to pass upon the rulings of a department or agency, to determine whether or not such agency exceeded its authority or adopted rules and regulations in conflict with the laws we have enacted.

I stated then, and I thought I made myself clear, that that committee might assume jurisdiction which belongs to our courts in that it would determine whether or not an act of such agency was beyond the scope of the authority granted to it. The final power of passing upon legal questions should be vested in the courts.

We have adopted that resolution, but it is not the only one we have recently adopted. We have adopted more resolutions to investigate during the last 6 weeks than during any session of Congress that I can recollect during the 36 years of my service. But you gentlemen, the majority of the membership, desire these investigations. Some of them may be wholesome but some of them, I think, will retard the activities of the Government and some of them will harass the President and the administration in performing the important duties that devolve upon them in the most critical period by far in the history of the country.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Is not that the purpose of the resolution?

Mr. SABATH. I do not know that this resolution may not be justified because of the charges that have been made that there are many men on the pay rolls who are not needed. The Committee on Appropriations should know whether or not the appropriations it is called upon to recommend to the House are needed. Of all the resolutions for investigations we have adopted, perhaps this and the Ramspeck resolution are the most deserving.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Just what is it the committee cannot do now that this resolution proposes to give it authority to do?

Mr. SABATH. This resolution gives that committee power of subpena for books or persons from any place to ascertain whether or not the demands made on the committee for appropriations are justified.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. They do not possess that subpena power at the present time?

Mr. SABATH. No; they do not possess that power now. That is what we have been doing with the resolutions we have been passing here that you gentlemen have voted for. Personally I think it is unfortunate that so many different investigations should be going on at this time when we should be devoting all our energies and efforts to winning the war. I think it is unfortunate that our attention should be distracted by all these investigations.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman tell me the difference between House Resolution 105 and House Resolution 69? What is the principal difference? I am asking for information.

Mr. SABATH. House Resolution 105, which we passed a few days ago, gave special power to the Committee on Appropriations to investigate certain matters not covered in this resolution. It had to do mainly with investigating certain employees of the Government who, it has been claimed, do not have the requisite patriotism and loyalty; in other words, it has been claimed that they have belonged to organizations that have been guilty of un-American activities.

I do not desire to take any more time. I am very tired; I am worn out. I am trying to perform my duty as best I am able to but I have only a certain amount of energy.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. Is this resolution proposed solely for the investigation of un-American activities? The gentleman is aware of the fact that I have a bill pending providing for a staff of our own, not Members of the House of Representatives, but employees of the House of Representatives, to investigate how our appropriations are expended, just how they are expended in detail. As I understand it this resolution is not to supersede any such action as that, or to take the place of any such action, but merely relates to the investigation of un-American activities?

Mr. SABATH. No; this does not do that. We passed a resolution in respect to un-American activities last night. This is a broad resolution giving the Appropriations Committee full and complete power to investigate any and all requests and demands that are made for appropriations, and in view of the charges that have been made that a great deal of money has been unnecessarily expended it is believed that this great Appropriations Committee, with its able membership, will make such thorough investigation that will bring about a saving to the Government of large sums of money, and I know that that is the aim of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and also the aim of the amiable gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Now, I have explained to the best of my ability the purpose of this resolution, and yield to the gentleman from New York, reserving the remainder of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, by unanimous direction of the committee, for the purpose of providing the committee with authority to subpena witnesses, to look into matters where it is believed that money can be saved, to swear witnesses, to subpena documents. It will also provide the committee with the services of individuals who can be brought in, who may, if so required, make a survey of the operations of an agency or a department for the purpose of determining whether or not it is being efficiently and economically managed, and whether or not we could save money in that particular department.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. May I pursue the inquiry I made a moment ago? I am in sympathy with any movement to save money, but where is the authority in this resolution for the employment of such persons to make the investigation?

Mr. TABER. That would automatically come from a resolution presented

by the Committee on Accounts, and after the adoption of this resolution it will be necessary for us to go to the Committee on Accounts and ask them to provide us the funds with which to operate. In our standard set-up we would carry the money to pay them in the regular legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. LANHAM. The bill I introduced is pending before the Committee on Accounts, and, of course, the members of the Committee on Appropriations are entirely too busy to carry on this investigation themselves. That is the reason that I have provided in the measure that I have introduced that we have a staff of experts of our own on a year-round basis making investigations of this character, not only for the Committee on Appropriations but for the various committees of the Congress, in order that we may all have detailed information as to what is being done with the money that the taxpayers are paying into the Government, and some of them now are people of very low income, and they are having to pay, in addition to indirect taxes, direct taxes, and they are very anxious to know what is being done with the money that is being furnished to the Government.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. O'NEAL. Does not the gentleman think that it is really a misnomer to call it an investigating committee? It appears to me that it is merely implementing the Committee on Appropriations and giving it services necessary to analyze the testimony given by those who represent the bureaus requesting these funds.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. O'NEAL. It is not an investigating committee.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no.

Mr. O'NEAL. We could do a more satisfactory job if we are given authority whereby we can take evidence that what they are asking for is deserved.

Mr. TABER. That is exactly what we have in mind.

Mr. LANHAM. And it is not supposed to obviate the necessity of the measure that I have introduced.

Mr. TABER. Not in the least. This is the picture. The Government has grown so rapidly that with 3,000,000 civilian employees, almost as many as we have in the Army, it is felt that we should have better facilities, and that we will require better facilities than we have had in times when the number upon the Federal pay roll of civilian employees was down to 100,000. That is the picture.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understood one of the gentlemen just speaking to say that one of the purposes of this committee or this legislation is to learn in what manner the money is expended.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments met and performed its full duty, would not they reach the same end, or would they?

Mr. TABER. They would not have the power to check, for instance.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you mean the power of subpena?

Mr. TABER. Oh, they might have that. That might be given to them. For instance, we need to know where appropriations are too large, so that we might step in and, if the money is being wasted, we could reappropriate the funds carried in a particular appropriation to something else and get rid of that agency just as quick as a bill could be enacted into law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Could the gentleman tell me why the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has not had something to do along this line in the last 6 years?

Mr. TABER. Oh, I would not want to have anything to say about some other committee. I know they have not done anything of that kind.

I hope this resolution will be agreed to and that the committee may be implemented so that it may go ahead and do some of the things that are absolutely crying to be done.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. If the committee saw fit to look into the Rubber Reserve Company, one which seems to qualify as described in the bill, is there anything that company is doing that would come under your jurisdiction? That is in connection with their activities? Are they not entirely outside the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. TABER. They are, but I will be frank and say I think the employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Rubber Reserve Company, and all of them ought to justify their requirements for personnel.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good resolution. I notice the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, is present. Can the gentleman explain to me why it is that that committee lacks the power to look into this or has not looked into it? I am a member of that committee and I have often wondered why we did not have anything to do. I am also a member of the Labor Committee. We do not have anything to do there.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am not chairman of that committee, but I will undertake to respond to the gentleman's inquiry by saying that as far as I am concerned I am not betraying any secrets when I state to you, as I have stated to the chairman of that committee, that personally I favor that committee conducting hearings, asking not only the heads of departments but the Comptroller General to appear before the committee and give the committee the benefit of any suggestions he is able to submit to the committee, and I have every reason to believe that hearings will be initiated at an early date.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. I notice the ranking member on the minority side is present. I have been a member of that committee for 6 years. While I think I am earning my money in taking up with the departments the demands of my constituents and attempting to get them what they want, and doing my work on the floor, still I would like to render full service by doing something on that committee and on the Labor Committee as well.

Mr. GIFFORD. I cannot believe my own ears. Is it possible that the gentleman from Mississippi makes that statement?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; I made that statement.

Mr. GIFFORD. In view of the past, I cannot believe my ears.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We live in a day of surprises.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman means he does not believe the statement?

Mr. GIFFORD. Well, it cannot be true.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We were talking about unemployment. Here I am. I go down to the departments and I go to the office, but I have a little unexpended time that I would like to put in on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, but that committee does not call any meetings. The Labor Committee does not have any meetings. I am trying to find out where I can get a job; an opportunity to do some of the things that must be done.

Mr. GIFFORD. I can make a suggestion. The recent election has brought about many changes of heart, but I await with the greatest of interest for the order to be issued or any suggestion of an examination by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I am so surprised that I cannot express myself about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. On those two committees the new dealers have us hog-tied and gagged. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to promote economy. Its objective is the retrenchment of expenditures and the reduction of disbursements of funds from the United States Treasury.

It is not a resolution of investigation. In that respect it is a departure from the general trend. We are doing a great deal of investigating these days. Perhaps overdoing it in comparison with the results obtained. At this rate we shall soon have to begin investigating the investigators. But this is not a resolution of investigation as resolutions of investigation go. It differs from such measures in three essential particulars.

In the first place, it is pre-appropriation. It provide for pre-appropriation action. It authorizes studies which to be

effective must be concluded before an appropriation is made, whereas the usual resolution of investigation becomes effective after the action under scrutiny has been concluded.

In the second place, it is not the purpose of the committee, acting under this resolution, to hold hearings and call in witnesses for examination. Under authority conferred by the resolution the activities of the committee will be limited to studies conducted by its employees who report direct to the committee and its subcommittees.

And last, and most important of all, the authority conferred by the pending resolution is limited strictly to matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations.

We cannot go outside the jurisdiction of the committee. As the last sentence in the enabling paragraph provides, the committee "is authorized to conduct such studies and examinations * * * as the committee may deem necessary to assist it in connection with the determination of matters within its jurisdiction."

There is the purport and purpose of the resolution in a nutshell—and both are limited to matters within the jurisdiction of the committee. And it is a matter of astonishment that this authority has not been given long ago. As a matter of fact the Committee on Appropriations has had practically such power all along but this resolution emphasizes and implements it beyond any possibility of question or objection.

Here is the routine. The departments apply for funds through budget estimates. They say in effect: "We need so much money for certain purposes." But when we meet to consider these requests we have in support of their application for appropriations only their views and opinions as expressed in the justifications which they submit and the testimony of the departmental representatives who appear at the hearings. The proceeding is wholly ex parte. The only evidence submitted is evidence for the plaintiff. No evidence is submitted for the defendant. The plaintiff, the department, appears and presents its case. But the defendants, the Treasury of the United States and the taxpayers, are unrepresented. No one appears in their behalf and no evidence in their behalf is available.

And there is where this resolution begins to operate. Under the authority granted by this resolution the committee has an opportunity to consult evidence and argument in rebuttal. Request for such authority is not an indictment of the departments in any respect. All requests and recommendations by bureaus and departments are based on opinions and interpretations of laws, needs, and collateral conditions and circumstances. The divided opinions of any court are proof that there are two sides to every question, and the committee is entitled to hear both sides. Furthermore, the departments necessarily look at the one problem involved in the expenditure which they recommend, while the committee must look at the problems offered by the many other ways in which the money requested can be expended. Need is relative, and although the purpose for which the department requests an appropriation may be justifiable, there is never enough money to provide for all justifiable purposes, and the committee must have evidence on which to base a decision as to which of many purposes is the most justifiable.

So, as between many alternatives offered, the committee must be in position to make an intelligent and justifiable decision: First, if the proposed project or activity is justified; and, second, if justified is the amount of money requested to carry it necessary to finance it; and third, we must consider whether that money could not be better expended in some other way. We must also exercise care to avoid conflict, duplication, and overlapping as between bureaus and departments, and to cooperate in securing efficiency and cooperation.

These are old problems—problems which have confronted the committee and the Congress for many years. In fact, ever since the formation of the Committee on Appropriations there has been acute need for such a service as is provided by the pending resolution. In my early days on the committee we had this service in practically the form in which it is here proposed to reestablish it.

When I first became a member of the committee, we drew on the old Bureau of Efficiency for investigators, examiners, and accountants. We used their operatives regularly and continuously, with salutary effect. When the Bureau of Efficiency was suddenly abolished because it investigated a little too thoroughly and efficiently, we were left without a staff on which we could call upon for examination and study of preappropriation matters, and have been without one ever since.

There has been a steadily growing need for service of this kind, and in every succeeding session of Congress proposals have been offered and bills introduced to supply the deficiency. At least half a dozen or more of varying degrees of practical operation are pending now. The delay in reaching some earlier solution of the matter has been largely occasioned by two major difficulties, the difficulty in building up an organization which through its intimate association with the members of the committee would slowly but surely increase its salaries, its personnel, and its jurisdiction until it became in effect a Frankenstein which could not be controlled or dislodged, and, second, the establishment of an organization amenable to political manipulation which could be used for partisan purposes. We believe that in the arrangement here sought to be effected we have successfully avoided both evils and that the service here provided will be economical and flexible and at the same time insulated against even the remote contingency of political prostitution.

And in this connection, in order to relieve pressure already being brought to bear on members of the committee since the introduction of this resolution, may I make the announcement that no new positions will be created. All personnel will be drawn entirely from civil-service positions in the various departments. The plan is to requisition personnel already in the service, bring them up here at their going salaries, place them on definite assignments for a day or a month, as required, and then when they have discharged their duties, return them to their respective departments without prejudice to their civil-service status.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does it come within your jurisdiction to investigate the R. F. C. or any of the subsidiary corporations they control?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Any agency of government for which the Bureau of the Budget submits estimates will be subject to our scrutiny.

Mr. GIFFORD. They do not come to the Appropriations Committee for money, do they?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All administrative expenses must be appropriated for and any requests for money for that purpose brings them within the purview of this resolution.

Mr. GIFFORD. Exactly; but does the R. F. C. come to the Appropriations Committee for money? Does the Rubber Reserve come to you for money? Does the B. E. W. come to you?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No governmental agency, including those indicated by the gentleman, can operate for a day without funds provided by Congress.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; but these agencies I have asked about get their money through the blank check you give the President. Am I not right?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Any Government bureau or Government agency, including the R. F. C., must come to this House for funds with which to pay its personnel and operating expenses; and when they come asking funds to pay salaries, traveling expenses, communication accounts, or any expense incidental to their overhead or their operation, we are in a position under this resolution to send men down to inquire as to how they are expending money so provided, with what efficiency they are operating, and what economy can be effected.

Mr. Speaker, may I express at this time appreciation of the debt which all those interested in this resolution owe to our absent colleague and friend [JACK COCHRAN]. He has been interested in this proposition from the beginning and has collaborated with us at all times and has rendered invaluable service. It was hoped that he would be able to be on the floor when this resolution came up, that he might participate in the debate and in the formulation of this legislation. While he is rapidly convalescing and he is on the way to speedy and complete recovery and we expect to have him with us within the next week or two, I am sorry to say he is not able to be with us today; and I take this opportunity to express the interest of those with whom he served in his early return to the floor and our thanks for the service he rendered to the committee and the country in this connection.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I join with the gentleman in his tribute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. May I ask him this question: He is chairman or acting chairman of another committee that we discussed a little while ago—the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Would Mr. COCHRAN be in favor of this resolution?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have not had the opportunity to consult with him on the final draft of the resolution, which was only recently drawn, but I will say to the gentleman that he is in the heartiest accord with all the purposes that this resolution is expected to effectuate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is fair to say in response to the question asked by the gentleman from Illinois that Mr. COCHRAN is not now the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures. He is chairman of the Committee on Accounts. Mr. O'LEARY is chairman of the Committee on Expenditures at this time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the interest manifested by my colleague from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] was not at any time, so far as I recall, taken as a member of any particular committee, but always due to his broad and general interest as a Member of the House of Representatives and the Congress, in all measures calculated to effect economy and bring about orderly and effective retrenchment of the expenditure of Government funds. That is the prime purpose of this resolution. Under its authorization we propose to ferret out as far as possible every instance in which a dollar is being spent which is not absolutely necessary to the economical and efficient operation of the Government. For that purpose we ask the passage of this resolution in its present form.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to pay a high tribute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY] will probably never act. Mr. COCHRAN, as you know, serves as acting chairman when he is there and I want to say he has been very loyal.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. COCHRAN has always exhibited a deep interest in economy of expenditure. He has been instrumental in the saving of millions of dollars to the Federal Treasury. In my opinion no Member of the House has, during my service here, effected greater savings in Government funds. I trust this resolution, on the perfection of which he and many others have collaborated, will have the unanimous approval of the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last fall and ever since the American people have been telling us in no uncertain terms that they are out to win this war and that they are willing to put up with any necessary sacrifices or inconveniences in order to bring about a speedy and victorious conclusion to the war. Also, on last November 3 they gave Congress a mandate which directed that we better be ready when we go back home to tell these people that these sacrifices, this regimentation, this rationing, are necessary in the prosecution of the war, and we better be ready, Mr. Speaker, when we go back home, to answer them with factual proof. To do that we will have to satisfy ourselves that these inconveniences are absolutely necessary. Now we are patriotically appealing to the people of this country to buy War bonds to the best of their ability in order to support the boys at the front. The Treasury Department handles the sales of War bonds and War stamps.

This morning you and I received one of these beautiful paper tubes about a quarter of an inch thick, capped on each end with metal, a strategic material. We are also told that the paper is a strategic material, so much so that they are trying to cut down on the newsprint of this country. They claim there is a terrible shortage of newsprint paper and therefore they have to cut down and stifle the press. Yet here is the Treasury Department, charged with the sale of War bonds, sending each Member of Congress, and Lord knows how many more people around the country, in this great heavy carton here, just two charts. I do not know how much these cartons cost, but I am told by men in the paper business that if you and I tried to buy one, it would cost 8 or 10 cents. And, Mr. Speaker, if either you or I tried to buy these right down in the House stationery room, we would find that there were no more available—not even to Members of Congress—they just are not making them any more except for war purposes. Here are just two charts printed on the finest of paper. This is information we ought to have, but could not the great Treasury Department of ours have put it on two sides of one mimeographed sheet, stuck it in an envelope and mailed it to us? If they had done that, we would have the same information. Surely the over-all mailing cost would have been much less. That is one of the reasons why we on this side of the Capitol better be certain that the Keefe amendment adopted yesterday to curtail the free use of the mails by these Government departments remains in the Post Office appropriation bill because if we definitely and by positive appropriations limit the amount of postage to which these various departments and agencies are entitled they will see to it in the future that already overtaxed transportation systems of the Nation are not further burdened down by this wanton and wasteful dissemination of propaganda of all kinds and especially in heavyweight cartons such as this.

How much longer are the American people going to stand putting their money into war bonds and seeing it thrown away like that? Why, Mr. Speaker, I weigh 200 pounds, and I can jump up and down on that tube without crushing it. We are throwing away money for that sort of stuff. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is time that we have these investigating committees find out who is throwing away this money and why we are throwing it away, because when the boys come back from the front, and we pray God that may be soon, they do not want to come back to a bankrupt Nation. They want to come back to the America that they left and it is up to us to see that it is the America that they left and not a communistic or collectivist America, among other things.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say this. I was very much interested yesterday in the exposé of the magazine Victory by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. He pointed out that the 900,000 copies of this beautifully printed magazine in its original issue to be carried all over the world weighed approximately 400 tons, and he said that 400 1-ton bombs carried overseas by our already-hard-pressed merchant marine would be much more effective in winning this war. I agree with him.

I cannot, for the life of me, see why our Government should be going into the magazine business in competition with private industry and I fail to see any justification whatsoever for the Government compelling our war contractors into paying for advertising space at the rate of $3,000 per page in the Victory magazine. It's the old newspaper shake-down but much worse in this instance because, Mr. Speaker, you and I as taxpayers pay for it in the war bill.

Furthermore, a number of us are very much concerned about the continued curtailment of newsprint papers for the newspaper industry and paper for the magazine publishers under the guise of a war necessity. If private industry shall be so cut, why not governmental publications? Yet I was told yesterday by the Chief of the War Production Board's Division of Printing and Publishing that they had no authority whatsoever to regulate or restrict the amount of paper being distributed to or demanded by the various departments of the Government.

It is the old story so popular for the past 10 years to "do as I say—not as I do."

I have been informed that the Victory magazine will be expanded to 8,000,000 copies per issue. That means—if my rough and crude arithmetic is correct—that our overstressed merchant marine will be required to carry to all corners of the earth in this propaganda organ the equivalent of 3,000 1-ton bombs per issue. Oh, Mr. Speaker, if our Air Force could just have the opportunity—just once—from air bases strategically located in Russia, built under lend-lease funds, to drop these 3,000 1-ton bombs on the cities of Tokyo and Yokohama the little Jap rat might be suing for peace the day after.

Let us stop wasting the taxpayer's money and our resources and get to work on winning this war.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of this body, I was very much interested in the explanation of this resolution by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. May I say to the gentleman and also to the Appropriations Committee that I was shocked as a new Member to understand him to say that they had no power or authority to investigate why appropriations were needed. I know I would hate to go back home and tell my people, if I were a member of the Appropriations Committee, that the New Deal agencies come up here and say, "This is how much money we want. You must give it to us," and that we have no power to investigate and make them tell why they really need the money they are asking for.

I am in favor of this resolution and I hope it passes. I trust the Appropriations Committee will make the necessary investigations of all funds asked by these New Deal agencies, because it is only right and proper that the taxpayers be protected. I think the taxpayers expect authority to be given to the Appropriations Committee for the examination of all vouchers, expense accounts, and so forth. As far as I am personally concerned, I do not favor giving a blank check to any agency, be it executive or otherwise.

I came to this Congress from my district in Nebraska promising not to vote for any appropriation that was not needed unless it was in connection with the effort to win the war, and I think the people of Nebraska and the people of this country want to see us keep faith with that thought.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I hope the gentleman will not meet with too many discouragements when the whitewash reports come in from the majority-controlled committee. I have endured those a long time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman and appreciate his statement. I am wondering if that is not one reason we have such a tremendous debt facing us now, that there has not been enough minute scrutinizing of these appropriations.

I happen to be a surgeon out in Nebraska. I have taken out a great many gangrenous appendixes. I am wondering if there are not a number of gangrenous spots in the Government that need some sharp surgery used upon them.

Let us give more power to the Committee on Appropriations to investigate carefully the expenditures to be made in this Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give my hearty approval and support of House Resolution 69. This resolution gives to the Appropriations Committee of the House the power to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, or vouchers by subpena or otherwise in the taking of testimony that may be helpful to this great committee in finding out if the enormous sums that are being appropriated are necessary and are being expended in an honest effort to win the war and to carry on the business of our Government.

I commend the Committee on Appropriations for making the request for this power.

The President has indicated that he desires the American people to pay into the Treasury approximately $52,000,000,000 in taxes this year, and since this new Congress met on January 6, the President has asked the Congress to appropriate for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943, the enormous sum of $113,000,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is $113 for every minute since the dawn of Christian era.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes; it is an enormous sum of money. No human mind can grasp the amount.

We will soon have 10,000,000 of the flower of American manhood in our armed forces. Most of us have boys in the Army or the Navy. It now appears that before this war is over our country will have a national debt of perhaps $300,000,000,000. That enormous sum represents almost the entire estimated national wealth of this Nation. You and I and the American people are willing to pay heavy taxes, buy bonds and spend every dollar necessary to win the war but, at the same time, neither you, nor I, nor the American people are willing to see their taxes, their bond money and a great national debt created or want this money squandered and wasted or any individuals or groups receive enormous profits. The American people insist that their money be expended only for the purpose for which it was contributed.

Investigations by committees of the Congress have disclosed that some concerns and individuals have made from 3,000 to 4,000 percent profits on war contracts. These profits came out of the people's taxes and bonds and stamp money and have helped to create this enormous debt. At the close of the last war there were 900,000 on the civil pay roll of the Government. We then knew we had thousands and thousands of people on the civil pay roll that were unnecessary. We have only been in this war about a year and the civil pay rolls now approach or perhaps exceed 3,000,000. Many well-informed persons assert that at least 1,000,000 of these or more are unnecessary, and the Government has been charged by administration officials as the great hoarder of manpower, at a time when there is a great shortage of manpower on the farms, in industries, in business, and for our armed forces.

This resolution will enable the Appropriations Committee to bring any and all those connected with the executive departments of the Government before it with their books, vouchers and other documents and find out whether or not the people's money is being squandered and wasted, and whether or not agencies are duplicated and that if we have an excess of persons on the civil pay roll of the Government. I have every confidence that this great committee will do a real job and thereby raise the morale of the people, increase their faith in their Government and lessen the burdens which they now carry and keep down as low as possible our growing national debt. They can, and I believe they will, render a real service to the American people and contribute greatly to the winning of the war.

On today we adopted Resolution 102, providing for the creation of a committee that will investigate fully bureaucratic control of our Government. It was a great forward step in restoring the liberties of the American people, the establishment of constitutional government and the assertion that Congress has found itself and has again become one of the three great coordinate branches of our Government as it was intended by the founding fathers of this Republic.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] decried the fact that there are so many investigations going on. I believe in more and better investigations, with the emphasis on the "better." He said we are now investigating the investigators, and that is exactly the point. I believe it is about time that we started investigating the investigators.

I have here an article from the Cleveland Press, a democratic daily newspaper in my home city, written by John M. Johnston. It reads as follows:

THAT LUSCIOUS WHIZZER WAS A UNITED STATES QUIZZER

Government quiz-bees are not rationed, and Washington officials are hard up for reading matter, it was apparent today from the latest Federal project to get under way in Cleveland.

A luscious young woman appeared at this reporter's door last night and introduced herself as "from the Division of Progress Reports of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics," all in one breath.

She was armed with a half-hour's catechism designed to bare the questionee's secret thoughts on matters of gasoline rationing and other agricultural matters, and incidental opinions on the kind of job being done by the administrators.

Samples:

Question. "How are you getting along on your A card?"

Answer. "All right, thank you."

Question. "How well could you get along if your ration was cut in half?"

Answer. "Half as well as I do now."

Question. "Do you think you'll get new tires?"

Answer. "Yes. I believe that tires-for-everybody stuff."

Question. "Ever hear of people getting gasoline on a friend's coupons?"

Answer. "No."

Question. "What would you think of getting gasoline that way?"

Answer. "That would be wicked."

The surveyor explained that most of the questions were designed to test public understanding of the rationing programs. Like, "How many kinds of gasoline books are there and how much gasoline does each get?"

The ones, "Is gasoline rationing necessary?" and "Are the rations fair?" seemed to your reporter to assume a somewhat greater degree of omniscience than the average citizen possesses.

Out tumbled the questions and out tumbled the answers until, hurt at not being asked about his operation, your reporter joined the game and learned that 16 such surveyors were loosed upon Cleveland from Washington, headed by Dorothy J. Hedner, whose headquarters are in Hotel Allerton.

A cross-section of the populace was obtained by taking each 118th ration card, and the interviewer said she averaged between two and three quizzes daily.

Arithmetic suggests that the survey will thus take 200 days. The request for an opinion on the kind of job being done by the administration also suggested some political significance, but on these matters your reporter was referred to Miss Hedner, the head lady.

Miss Hedner proved a slight disappointment. Her job is to give quizzes, not to answer them.

"Any information about this survey will have to come from Washington," she said.

Mr. Speaker, I understand these "luscious whizzers" have asked the Appropriations Committee for a supplemental appropriation. I trust the committee will not grant it. Here is a nuisance we can get along without.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in the language of the old Methodist camp-meeting hymn, "this is the day for which I long have sought and mourned because I found it not."

For the 10 years that I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have been advocating the setting up of an adequate staff of auditors, who will try to get independent information for the Committee on Appropriations, in order that when we came to pass on a case, we would not have to rely entirely upon the evidence of the plaintiff. Year after year in presenting the independent offices appropriation bill I have spoken of that. Three sessions of Congress ago I introduced in a full meeting of the Committee on Appropriations a resolution for such a staff.

In the wisdom of my colleagues it was not deemed appropriate at that time to enter upon that project. I am glad that we are about to get it now. I do not believe, however, there is a very clear understanding of what is proposed. It is not in any sense of the word an investigating committee. As a matter of fact I do not think this resolution is necessary at all, except perhaps if we should wish to have hearings of the Committee on Appropriations when Congress is not in session, or should wish to subpena witnesses and documents. Except for those two things, we would not even need this resolution, because the Committee on Appropriations has ample authority to summon any department before it and inquire about an appropriation, past or present, and what has been done with money already provided. That is what we propose to do. This is not going to bring about the millennium, it is not going to break up all the abuses that we all know about, but it will do this; if we are able to get a staff of experts and I think we can, and they can be added to the fine bunch of clerks that we have now—and may I say parenthetically and most emphatically that the clerks we have on this committee, from Marc Sheild down to the messenger, are not exceeded in excellence by any other group of Government employees, there is none more intelligent, more diligent, more industrious; but with a $100,000,000,000 program of spending, it is physically and humanly impossible for these men to do more than they are doing. What we want to do is this. We want to have a corps of splendidly equipped auditors whom we can put on a certain project, who will go out and bring us back the facts. Let me mention two or three other things. There is the item of personnel. We have 3,000,000 people on the pay roll, or will have by the 1st of July next, we are told.

There is no need to get up and make speeches about how many people were in the Army 100 years ago, or how large it is now. We are in a global war and all precedents have been thrown aside. Everything is on a scale so much larger than we have done before or ever conceived and the only way you can do is to go into the situation for facts. Let me suggest that you go into the departments and see whether you see messengers there sitting around twiddling their thumbs, or whether they have more stenographers than they ought to have. If that is the case, then they should be put somewhere else where they will do some good, and we want to have a set of auditors who will be able to do just that. Then there is the matter of communications, and I know there is a great abuse there. I am confident that there are agencies of the Government where they would rather pick up the telephone and talk long distance to San Diego about a matter than sit down and write a letter and send it out air mail. I know that is being done, and the only way that we can correct it is to go out and get the facts. Then there is the matter of travel. I know there are men traveling all over the country today and that a lot of that traveling could be eliminated if the Appropriations Committee could have the facts. Also there is the matter of the field officers. If these auditors or investigators, if you wish to call them—I do not like the word—could go out into the field and bring us a comprehensive statement in respect to the field offices that are set up and the various Government set-ups, it would be of very great assistance. Every Congressman knows that when he goes into a town back home he will find many offices, particularly if it is a large city, of various Federal agencies. There is widespread duplication and unnecessary expenditure of funds, and there are places where there could be consolidations and coordination, and we propose to send these men out to make a study of that and to bring us back authentic facts on which we can act when the time comes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this resolution. On one or two occasions I tried to offer amendments to appropriation bills which I thought would do this very thing, but the amendments were ruled to be out of order. This resolution puts into the hands of a standing committee of the House certain power which will enable that standing committee to do its job better than it could otherwise do it. No one will disagree with the purpose of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], passed by the House a short time ago, but let me make this observation. All kinds of people are talking about strengthening the hands of Congress, and upholding its position in the Government of the United States. The way in which that can be done best is to strengthen the standing committees of the House, and I submit there ought to be careful consideration given by the House in respect to giving to the standing committees whenever possible the power to follow up their legislation by reviewing the work done by the agencies of the Government, which administers the laws in question to see whether that is done in accordance with the intent of Congress, efficiently and thoroughly.

Mr. LANHAM. And may I say to the gentleman that the bill that I have introduced in Congress this session will do that very thing.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am glad to know that. I introduced a bill on the first day of the session which would give to every standing committee the power to continuously review the work of all agencies administering laws within the jurisdiction of the various committees, to determine whether they were done in accordance with the intent of Congress when we passed the legislation.

I have asked for this time to simply state that this whole question of bringing Congress into closer touch with the work of the executive agencies ought to be considered in a broad aspect. Otherwise we will be passing all sorts of resolutions and creating a lot of special committees which might do very good work, but which, after the work is done, will pass away. The way to really strengthen Congress is to build its regular standing committees to the greatest possible extent.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Before the gentleman starts, may I suggest that he bring out the fact that the safest sort of an investigating committee should be composed of a majority from the minority side?

Mr. FISH. I am in entire accord with the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, I always listen with interest to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. I was

happy to hear him say that at long last the Congress is going to give the Appropriations Committee the power to investigate expenditures that he has been trying to secure for years.

I hate to resurrect disagreeable things in the House of Representatives, in which I have served for many years, and my father and grandfather before me, but it seems to me that facts are facts, and although disagreeable sometimes, it is necessary to bring them up in order to clear the atmosphere and start afresh.

During the last 10 years this Congress has surrendered its powers to such an extent that it became dominated by the President, who actually believed that he owned the Congress and controlled the legislative branch of the Government. To a large extent it was our own fault, because we permitted, and by that I mean the New Deal majorities, permitted individuals outside of the Congress to formulate measures and have them introduced into Congress as "must" bills. We were told that we had to pass them without change, and, unfortunately, on many occasions we did exactly that.

The President absorbed the legislative powers and so dominated Congress that it sunk to the lowest level, during the last 10 years, in the history of the Congress of the United States. Thank God, this last election has changed the entire spirit of the House, Republicans and Democrats alike, except for a minor minority of ardent new dealers. The House is determined not only to restore representative and constitutional government, but to restore its own independence and initiative to write legislation by itself and to give the committees of Congress the power to investigate the conduct of the administration and the Government. That is one of the basic functions of the Congress, not only to legislate but to know exactly how the laws passed by Congress are carried out. We have forgotten that right during the past decade of New Deal rule. Happily the day has now come where Members of the House on both sides enthusiastically and almost unanimously pass this type of legislation empowering its committees to investigate the activities of the administration and the Government.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I will be glad to yield to the charming and intelligent lady from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Some of us have felt that this could cost millions and millions of dollars, or it could cost very little. I am sure it is very worthy, but even though it be most worthy, we would like to have some estimate of the cost.

Mr. FISH. I do not have the faintest idea what the cost will be. I know the amounts of money that we appropriate run into billions of dollars a year, and I want some committee of Congress to have the power to investigate all those expenditures. No matter what it costs, whether it is $25,000 or $50,000, I want to assure the lady from Illinois that it will bring the greatest possible saving to the Treasury of the United States, probably running into hundreds of millions of dollars.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I have so often criticized other people for having a blank check that I dislike to do the same thing.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would like to say to the gentlewoman from Illinois and to the gentleman from New York that this resolution does not provide for any funds at all. We must yet get a resolution from the Committee on Accounts for whatever funds will be allowed.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I understood that, but I presumed you had some estimate of the possible cost.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It will not be a large amount, I can assure the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mr. FISH. I hope the amount is adequate. Whatever is necessary to carry out this program I believe the Congress will gladly provide because in doing so you will save a great deal of money and stop administrative waste. That is one of our functions that we have overlooked or ignored. We are not simply a legislative body; we have the right and duty to control what is going on in the Government. It is our duty to safeguard the rights of the American people and taxpayers in all departments and agencies of the administration. I do not think anybody will deny that, although we have neglected that duty under the New Deal regime largely, I assume, because of the huge New Deal majorities recently in Congress.

So I am very happy that the day has come when the Congress is no longer a rubber stamp for the administration, for the New Deal, or for any individual. We are restoring to ourselves the powers that belong to us under the Constitution to investigate and legislate. I am in favor of more and bigger and better investigations until we have cleaned the New Deal bureaucratic house as we should, and safeguard the money of the taxpayers and stop the waste and incompetency in the administration, which is not only our right but the duty of Congress to do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that the pending resolution is the most deserving and worthy of passage of any of the investigating resolutions which we have enacted in the present session. I am sure that the committee, given the powers under its provisions, will be able to effectively investigate and place the responsibility for any wasteful expenditures where it properly belongs.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans and a few Democrats assert day in and day out that the so-called bureaucrats and crackpots are to blame for waste and unnecessary expenditures. These charges are published in Republican newspapers and many people are actually believing them to be true. It is a fact that the minor officials and Government employees who have been designated bureaucrats and crackpots actually do not have anything to do with expenditures of moneys or jurisdiction of the funds which we appropriate. It is the heads of the departments, agencies, and Government-controlled corporations who hold the purse strings and upon whose authorizations disbursements are made. And, Mr. Speaker, who, in the main, are these heads but Republicans? Carrying from Secretary Stimson and Under Secretary Patterson, of the War Department, it also applies to the head of the Navy Department, Secretary Knox, one-time candidate for the Vice Presidency, under whose jurisdiction billions are being expended and by those under him. Mr. Stettinius, Administrator of the Lend-Lease Act, and most of his under officials are Republicans, as is Mr. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, a splendid gentleman, and many heads of the divisions in this Board.

And so it is through all of the departments and war agencies, and even to the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration, where billions are being expended, I have reason to believe the supervisory heads are Republicans. Therefore, those Republican Members of the House who continuously charge bureaucratic administration are labeling men who belong to their own party. I concede that the President appointed most of them and, as I have stated before, when appointing them he expressed the hope and urged that they would protect and safeguard the interests of our Nation and that economy would prevail. The President cannot be everywhere and keep a watchful eye on the functioning and expenditures of the Government agencies, and must of necessity rely upon those whom he has appointed. Therefore, when charges are made of extravagance or reckless expenditures, it cannot be justly charged to the President, but to the Republican heads in these important positions. I say those who are attempting to create resentment against the administration by charging unnecessary expenditures and waste will fall short because their criticism will be found to be hitting men in office with Republican affiliation.

Undoubtedly, if the President had not listened to the clamor of the Republican press and the Republican leaders and, instead of appointing Republicans in these important positions, had appointed Democrats, I know there would not have been unjustified criticism against wastefulness. I know that Democrats would have been mindful of their responsibility and carried out the admonitions of the President for the careful expenditure of funds. So henceforth, Mr. Speaker, the charges of reckless expenditures and waste by the bureaucrats will fall where it should properly fall, upon the Republicans.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter which appeared in today's New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 15

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to ask the majority leader about the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The program for next week, so far as it has been prepared at the present time, is this:

Monday: The Unanimous Consent Calendar will be called. Following the calling of the Consent Calendar the independent offices appropriation bill will come up under general debate.

Tuesday: The Private Calendar will be called, and following that general debate will continue on the independent offices appropriation bill. I do not want to stand committed to the following statement, but I assume that the independent offices appropriation bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule on Wednesday. In any event, the independent offices bill will continue to be the order of business until disposed of.

Thereafter, unless the lend-lease bill is reported out, in which event it will be the next order of business, it is the plan to take up the bill (H. R. 1605) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to farm acreage allotment, the farm marketing of excess wheat, the use of excess corn and silage for feed to livestock on the farm, to provide for an adequate supply of peanuts, and for other purposes, on which a rule has been issued providing 2 hours' general debate. This bill relates to the agricultural situation, particularly with respect to wheat acreage and corn excess, and particularly there is a peanut provision in there in which many Members are interested. In fact, I know the bill more from that angle than from the other.

Following the so-called peanut bill we will take up the Columbia Basin project, on which a rule has been granted.

Then we will take up the bill amending the Civilian Pilot Training Act, on which a rule has been reported providing for 1 hour's debate.

That is the general program for next week.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I may say to the gentleman that the civilian pilot training bill ought to go through by unanimous consent, at least, in a very short time, since we have a rule on it.

Mr. MICHENER. That does not have anything to do with the special committee to study aviation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill has nothing to do with that.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. FISH. I understand there will be a meeting of the Rules Committee tomorrow, at which time there will be a vote on the bill to create a new committee on civilian aviation in the House. If that bill should be reported out tomorrow, would the gentleman from Massachusetts be inclined to call it up next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want any answer of mine to be misconstrued, because I try to bring up for consideration of the House all these things as quickly as I can.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman realizes that there is a good deal of interest in this type of legislation at the present time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am aware that there is interest in it, but I will not construe the word "interest."

I understand that two of these bills are rather important, and, insofar as I am able to, they will be expedited; but I think the program I have announced will precede any action taken by the Rules Committee, because I am sure the Rules Committee would not want to put me in the position of being rushed or stampeded. If, of course, they felt I was trying to delay things unreasonably, that would be another matter; but I am sure they know I am not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

TO AMEND THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until Saturday at 12 o'clock midnight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 1012) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that is the bill which the committee has been considering, which amends the Civil Aeronautics Act, is it not?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is it contemplated that the hearings will be completed by that time?

Mr. BULWINKLE. It is contemplated that the hearings will be completed and the bill will be reported out.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have information to the effect that there are a number of gentlemen who have not yet testified but who want to testify before the committee.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Everyone has testified who has requested that he be heard.

Mr. HINSHAW. I will have to take the gentleman's word for that.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is my understanding. Nobody spoke to me about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

APPEARANCE BEFORE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, there will be a meeting of the Rules Committee on next Tuesday to consider the anti-labor-racketeering bill. I think this has already been announced, but some Members have asked me to make the additional announcement.

If there are Members opposed to that bill who wish to testify, this is notice to them that they will have the opportunity to appear against that measure. The members of the Rules Committee dislike to be put in the same position they were put in when consideration of the Dies resolution was had that Members who could have appeared against that resolution did not take advantage of that opportunity and the Rules Committee was blamed. Therefore at this meeting on Tuesday anyone may appear who wants to be heard and they will have the opportunity, according to the announcement of the chairman of that committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ANNOUNCEMENT OF VOTE

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the Chamber at the time the vote was taken on the Smith resolution. Had I been present I would have voted "no."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY]?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF VOTE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent when the vote was taken on the Smith resolution today. If I had been present I would have voted in the negative.

STORING OF FOOD

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are other special orders, but if there is no objection, the gentleman will be recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I called attention to the fact that before the war in Europe commenced the Government of Switzerland recommended to its people that they store up supplies of food equivalent to a 3-month supply in each household, and

that the Swiss Government even made loans to needy families for that purpose.

As far back as March 11, 1942, the Office of Civilian Defense, west coast area, asked the people out there to also store up a supply of food in the event of some emergency. A suggested list of such foods was prepared and distributed by the block wardens. Now the Office of Price Administration comes along and demands that these stocks be reduced under penalty of taking coupons from the rationing books of the people. It is proposed that each person may have only five 8-ounce cans stored, which is not adequate for a defense area such as exists out there, in my humble judgment and in the judgment of the O. C. D. I hope that the Office of Price Administration will modify its order to permit householders in areas that may have to be evacuated to keep on hand emergency stocks of nonperishable foodstuffs. It is essential that these stores be maintained.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks to include an editorial from the Pasadena Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to follows:

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE ASKS BOOST IN CANNED GOODS QUOTA ON WEST COAST—JAMES M. LANDIS PLACES MATTER BEFORE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION FOR IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION

Hope that some change in the 5-can-per-person allowance of staple goods on hand when rationing goes into effect might be modified for Pasadena and other communities in the Pacific coast combat zone was held last night when it was learned that the Office of Civilian Defense is interceding for a modification. As was pointed out editorially by the Star-News Friday, the regulations as they stand now will penalize those persons who have complied with Office of Civilian Defense and local Civilian Defense Council requests to keep an emergency supply of canned goods on hand. As far back as March 11, 1942, the Los Angeles Defense Council issued a bulletin in which all persons were urged and cautioned to keep an emergency food shelf supplied.

EMERGENCY SUPPLY NEEDED

Ernest E. East, evacuation chairman for the Office of Civilian Defense, southern sector, pointed out that all evacuation plans being prepared under his supervision require that citizens to be affected should have an emergency supply of food on hand to feed their family for several days.

"Nothing should be done to curtail residents of southern California from having a reasonable emergency supply of canned foodstuffs on their shelves," Mr. East said. "It should not be forgotten that we are in a combat zone and these emergency supplies might some day be the means of saving lives and preventing suffering."

Willard W. Keith, Office of Civilian Defense, southern sector director, who has been in communication with high officials on the matter, was informed yesterday by James M. Landis, Office of Civilian Defense National Director, that he had placed the matter before the Deputy Office of Price Administration in charge of rationing with a request for immediate consideration.

HERE'S STATE COUNCIL FOOD RECOMMENDATION

The list of canned and packaged goods suggested last August by the State Defense Council's Emergency Nutrition Committee as an emergency food supply designed to take care of four people for 3 days, follows:

Six cans of meat, 3 packages of cheese, 9 cans of evaporated milk, 5 packages of shredded wheat, one pound of coffee, one-half pound of tea, 12 bouillon cubes, 3 large cans of baked beans, 6 cans mixed vegetables, 2 cans chocolate syrup, 6 cans orange, lemon, and tomato juices, 4 packages of dried fruits, 1 gallon of water.

At that time the defense council committee suggested storing this food away for use only in emergency. This, however, represents about four more cans than allowed under rationing.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time I have for today may be transferred to Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for 5 minutes tomorrow in which I had expected to pay tribute to President Lincoln. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN]?

There was no objection.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as tomorrow is Lincoln's birthday, and as President Lincoln played a great part in causing the creation of the State of Nevada out of the Territory of Nevada, I desire to render tribute to him at this time.

The political questions growing out of the Civil War caused President Lincoln to term the admission of the Territory of Nevada into the Union as a State a matter of the very greatest importance. His administration had concluded that the Constitution should be amended so that slavery be abolished.

To thus amend the Constitution requires that the proposed amendment be ratified by three-fourths of the States. When that question came to be considered the administration found that the States it could rely upon were one short of the necessary number. The genius of President Lincoln solved the problem. He would create a State out of the Territory of Nevada for that purpose, and rely on the patriotism of its people to ratify the amendment.

In March 1864 the question of allowing Nevada to form a State government came up in the House of Representatives. There was strong opposition to it, but President Lincoln threw his strength into the breach and the measure was carried. It was shortly preceding this vote that President Lincoln made the following statement:

Here is the alternative, that we carry this vote or raise another million and fight no one knows how long.

So, on October 31, 1864, Nevada became a State, and from the mines of the Comstock there were poured forth into the Nation's lap millions of dollars, which enabled the Government to maintain its credit.

Nevada is called the battle-born State, and she well deserves the proud distinction, for in the Civil War, in proportion to her population and wealth, she contributed more to the Federal cause than any other State in the Union. With less than 40,000 inhabitants, she sent 1,200 men to the Army. Without being asked, she voted her proportion of the war debt. She contributed upward of $200,000 to the sanitary fund, which was similar to the Red Cross of today.

In World War No. 1 Nevada led all the States of the Nation in the patriotism shown by her citizens. Nevada is the only State that has the proud distinction of having executed the first draft call without one cent of expense. Nevada was the first State to furnish its quota of volunteers to the Army, and before she was through she furnished 11 times her quota. One out of every 9 men of military age of Nevada was a volunteer. One out of every 4 men of military age was in either the Army or the Navy. Nevada was the first State to subscribe its quota to the first Liberty loan campaign, and before she was through she oversubscribed 92 percent.

Nevada has justified the faith shown in creating her a State.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CAMP, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 15, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

168. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period December 1, 1942, to January 31, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

169. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National War Labor Board for the fiscal year 1943 amounting to $3,648,000 (H. Doc. No. 100); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

170. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 101); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

171. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for 1943 and prior fiscal years, amounting to $35,664 (H. Doc. No. 102); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

172. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations of the War Department (H. Doc. No. 103); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 109. Resolution authorizing consideration for H. R. 839, a bill to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NICHOLS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 110. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 1670, a bill to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1012. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 218. A bill for the relief of H. F. Mathis; with amendment (Rept. No. 117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1639. A bill for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublien and Mrs. Ethel Bowers; without amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1736. A bill for the relief of Max Geissler; without amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1757. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Kegel; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1771. A bill for the relief of August Svelund; without amendment (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on War Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1413) for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc., and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1796. A bill to provide that nominal income from personal services may be disregarded in computing payments to be made as old-age assistance and aid to the blind under the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1797. A bill to extend the provisions of articles I and II of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to individuals employed by the United States outside the States of the Union and the District of Columbia for war purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1798. A bill to provide protection against total permanent disability for persons granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1799. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide optional retirement annuities for totally and permanently disabled individuals who have completed 20 years' service, and to provide for a minimum annuity payment of $50 per month; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 1800. A bill to establish a pay-as-you-go plan of paying income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 1801. A bill to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the board of trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 1802. A bill to suspend the payment of certain refunds under the Civil Service Retirement Act for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1803. A bill extending classified civil service to clerks or assistants in certain post offices of the third class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1804. A bill to authorize voluntary agreements between employer and employee for the performance of labor without additional compensation for overtime employment; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1805. A bill to amend subparagraph (e), paragraph I, Veterans Regulation No. 11 (U. S. C., title 38, ch. 12, appendix), promulgated under the act of March 20, 1933 (Public, 2, 73d Cong.); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1806. A bill to provide military or naval training for all male citizens who attain the age of 18 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 1807. A bill to make permanent the rate of postage on mailable matter of the first class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 1808. A bill to authorize the payment of necessary expenses to be incurred by certain Indians, who were allotted as the Miami Indian Nation of Indiana, or the Miami Tribe of Indians of Indiana, under treaty of June 5, 1854 (10 Stat. L. 1093), maintained and promulgated between said Indians and the United States of America, and the lineal Indian chief, Rev. Peter Bondy's descendants; and to direct the Secretary of the Interior to pay his agents and other general expenses for accounting, investigation of the land and lineal descendants of the said Miami Indians of Indiana, not necessarily residing in the State of Indiana, but wherever they may be, whether of record or not, who are descendants of the Miami Indians of Indiana, under treaty of June 5, 1854 (10 Stat. L. 1093); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 1809. A bill to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1810. A bill to equalize overtime compensation for employees of the field services of the War Department for employment during 1942; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 1811. A bill to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval personnel and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIES:

H. Res. 111. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. Res. 112. Resolution providing additional compensation for clerk of Committee on Roads; to the Committee on Accounts.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 1812. A bill for the relief of the Cowden Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1813. A bill to authorize the presentation to William B. Kelley of a Distinguished-Service Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. R. 1814. A bill for the relief of Harold Byrne; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1815. A bill for the relief of Sarah T. Hambilton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 1816. A bill for the relief of Leonard Larson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1817. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Pieraccini; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

113. By Mr. ANGELL: Senate Joint Memorial No. 1 of the Forty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture.

114. By Mr. DWORSHAK: House Joint Memorial No. 1 of the twenty-seventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress to give preference to and complete at the earliest

possible moment the irrigation project known as Palisade Dam in Bonneville County, Idaho, which development will supply supplemental irrigation water to about 1,000,000 acres of land along the Snake River Valley, which is now inadequately irrigated, and also may irrigate approximately 150,000 acres of farming land in Cassia and Twin Falls Counties, Idaho; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

115. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States of America to use their best efforts to have passed House bill 801 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, passed by the general assembly on the 4th day of February A. D. 1943; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

116. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of E. E. Schoenlein, Leland L. Miller, T. R. Buckles, V. L. Todd, Robert Langdon, and many others, urging adoption of the Ruml pay-as-you-go tax plan and expressing opposition to Treasury proposals for double taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

117. Also, petition of Gerald E. Bosserman and 400 members of the First Church of the Brethren, Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of that section of the Selective Service Act which recognizes the right of conscientious objectors to refuse combatant service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

---

# SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in all the agony of this seared and sundered earth we bless Thee that through the blackness breaks the dawn, for our eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord. We thank Thee for prophetic glimpses of a new world, a radiant world in which, under all skies, reverential altars of worship shall be freely reared, none daring to molest nor make afraid—a world where no fetters shall coerce minds or silence speech; a world where the earth's abundance anywhere shall be channeled to human need everywhere. May our glad hearts rejoice that the day of salvation draweth near as against the vilest tyranny of the ages Thou hast loosed the fateful lightning of Thy terrible, swift sword.

In humility and penitence that our own democracy has fallen short of the glory, we are grateful that America has come to the kingdom for such a time as this; not flaunting her strength as a great giant, but as a Good Samaritan bending in helpfulness over a sick and wounded world. Help us to seize the whole of life and build Thy glory there. In the name of the Master of all good workmen, we ask it. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 11, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## NOTICE OF HEARING—NOMINATION OF THURMAN W. ARNOLD

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Thurman W. Arnold, of Connecticut, to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Wiley Blount Rutledge, resigned.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Tuesday, February 23, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., has been set for a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee room on this nomination. At that time and place all interested parties may appear and give such testimony concerning the fitness and qualifications of this nominee as may be properly received.

## INFORMATION CONCERNING NAVAL PERSONNEL

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have before me a letter from Rear Admiral Jacobs which is very brief and which I should like to read for the information of all Senators. The letter is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
*Washington, D. C., February 11, 1943.*

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
*Chairman, Naval Affairs Committee,*
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be advised that this Bureau has established as of this date, a Congressional Information Service for the purpose of answering requests by telephone from members of Congress concerning factual information relating to naval personnel.

The telephone number of this service is Republic 7400, Extension 7600. Lt. Paul Whitehead, U. S. N. R., is the officer in charge.

It is suggested that Members of Congress continue to address to the Bureau of Naval Personnel by written correspondence inquiries concerning the policies of the Bureau and requests for information which are not of an urgent nature and, therefore, do not require immediate reply by telephone.

Sincerely yours,

RANDALL JACOBS,
*Rear Admiral, United States Navy,*
*The Chief of Naval Personnel.*

## QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege to make about a 1-minute statement concerning remarks made over the radio by a commentator last night.

Mr. Drew Pearson, in his statement "A prediction of things to come," said that the powerful Truman committee—he was, no doubt, referring to the special committee authorized by the Senate of which I am chairman—would very shortly recommend to the President of the United States that the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, and the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, should be dismissed from their offices. The committee of which I am chairman has no such thing under consideration, has never had any such thing under consideration, and does not expect to go into the conduct of the war. We very carefully followed the lines laid down by the resolution as authorized by the Senate to investigate contracts and the production program, and we have, under no circumstances, considered appointments in strategic places. That was one of the things that caused difficulty in the Civil War on the part of the Committee on the Conduct of the War. They suggested to the President of the United States that he appoint certain generals, and that committee was responsible for the appointment of General Burnside, General Hooker, and General Meade. They then investigated the conduct of those generals in the field. If we, as a committee, should attempt to tell the President of the United States who ought to be Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy or who should occupy any of the other executive offices, we would be acting entirely outside the purposes for which the Senate authorized the special committee.

I merely wanted to make it plain that there was absolutely no foundation, in fact, for what Mr. Pearson said last night over the radio.

## REPORT OF UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE PHILIPPINES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by section 7 (4) of the act of Congress approved March 24, 1934, entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Sixth Annual Report of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, covering the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1941, and ending June 30, 1942.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 15, 1943.*

## ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—TRAVEL BY GOVERNMENT-OWNED AUTOMOBILES (S. DOC. NO. 5)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, relating to the elimination of nonessential

traveling by Government-owned automobile, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I request that the report relating to Government-owned automobiles be printed in the body of the RECORD and also printed as a Senate document. I will discuss the report later on in the day.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed as a document and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law No. 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, an additional report herewith is presented by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The investigation of the cost of passenger automobiles, both owned and rented by the United States Government, convinced the committee a year ago that very substantial economies could be effected by eliminating all nonessential traveling by automobile.

The committee decided last year, and so reported to Congress, that the traveling expenses of the different agencies of government were exorbitant and should be carefully supervised by the Appropriations Committees, and a substantial reduction required.

The committee now presents to Congress a report on the number of automobiles owned and operated by the various Government agencies, exclusive of those used by the Army and Navy.

Despite the growing automobile crisis, both in tires and gasoline, the investigation of the committee indicates that for the first 4 months of the present fiscal year (July 1 to November 1, 1942) the various agencies of the Government, exclusive of the Army and Navy, continued for the most part to use as many passenger cars, to drive as many miles, and to consume about as much gasoline as did these agencies in a comparable period of the previous year, and this, notwithstanding the efforts of the Government to reduce the consumption of gasoline and to conserve rubber.

The committee believes that the same standard of strictly essential driving should be applicable to Government employees as it now applies to individual citizens. This, the committee is convinced, is not being done, assuming that the latest figures available for the first 4 months of this fiscal year are a criterion for the current fiscal year.

In the last fiscal year the Federal Government owned 17,305 passenger automobiles, exclusive of the Army and Navy, and exclusive of trucks and motorcycles. It now owns and operates 18,953 passenger automobiles, which represents an increase of more than 1,600 cars over the number owned and operated during fiscal year 1942.

In th last fiscal year the cost of operating these passenger automobiles, exclusive of interest and depreciation on the cars, was $4,243,602. The cost of operating these cars for the first 4 months of this fiscal year was $1,308,023, or, on a yearly basis, the cost would be $3,924,069, which is substantially the same.

In the last fiscal year these Government-owned cars traveled 203,550,280 miles. In the first 4 months of this fiscal year they traveled 66,610,310, or 199,830,930 miles on a yearly basis.

The amount of gasoline used by Government-owned cars in the past fiscal year was 13,793,594 gallons. For the first 4 months of this fiscal year the amount was 4,284,511 gallons, or, on a yearly basis, 12,853,533 gallons.

Considering, therefore, the cost, the mileage traveled, and the amount of gasoline consumed for the first 4 months of this fiscal year (according to the latest information available), there has been no appreciable decline in the use of these Government automobiles by peacetime agencies, although the Government itself is compelling the private citizen to reduce the use of automobile travel and ban all nonessential driving.

But these figures by no means tell the entire story of travel by employees on Government business. The various departments allow their employees to use privately owned cars for official business on a reimbursable mileage basis. The figures from all the agencies are not available to the committee, but 5 agencies out of 47 have reported the mileage of these cars for the fiscal year 1942. The extent of the use of privately owned cars as reported by these 5 agencies shows that they traveled 145,606,241 miles at a total cost of $7,261,856.32. Adding this mileage of 145,606,241 to the 203,550,280 miles traveled by the Government-owned cars, and making reasonable allowance for those agencies not reporting, it would appear to be conservative to estimate that in the fiscal year 1942 the various agencies of the Government operated passenger cars to the extent of from 400,000,000 to 500,000,000 miles and used from 25,000,000 to 30,000,000 gallons of gasoline.

The committee desires again to call attention to the great extravagance of the traveling costs of the various agencies of Government, and in more detailed statement which will be made to the Congress later, but at this time the committee regards, as most important, the complete elimination of nonessential operation of motorcars by the Government. In a crisis such as this the Government itself must set an example to the people. It should not ask sacrifices of the people which the employees of the Government do not themselves make. The committee has had presented to it many instances of duplicated travel of these thousands of Government employees who travel in separate cars instead of using the same car. The committee finds this practice especially reprehensible in the Department of Agriculture, which in the fiscal year 1942 traveled 143,206,000 miles in rented cars and 49,856,594 in Government-owned cars. The committee is of the opinion that a large proportion of this travel is unnecessary and should be dispensed with, and for much of the balance the same car can be used by different employees of the Agriculture Department.

It is, of course, true that in certain agencies of the Government, such as the Department of Justice, there is justification for a reasonable increase in the cars operated, due to the enlarged activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In fact, the increase of 551 cars in the past year in the Department of Justice for the most part may be attributed to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. On the other hand, in the judgment of the committee, there is no justification for an increase of nearly 100 cars in the Agriculture Department, which already had 4,359 passenger cars, or an increase of 120 in the Federal Works Agency, as in this latter Agency the activities have been greatly reduced. An increase of 34 in the National Housing Agency, as well as other increases, are noted in the itemized statement which is a part of this report.

The committee further believes that substantial economies can be made in the employment of full-time and part-time chauffeurs. In the last fiscal year there were 403 full-time chauffeurs; now there are 439, an increase of 36. In the last fiscal year there were 695 part-time chauffeurs; now there are 693, a reduction of 2.

In the last fiscal year the salaries of full-time chauffeurs was $555,295 while it is estimated their salaries this year will be $590,000, in addition to these the Government employs many chauffeurs on a part-time basis.

The committee believes the plan which the Office for Emergency Management has adopted to regulate use of the cars assigned to it, is a step in the right direction. They require every person using a car to sign a statement for permanent record that the person is traveling on official business, and to give the destination and reason for the use of the car. Such a plan adopted by the other agencies, combined with a decentralized automobile-pooling arrangement, would do much to reduce the use of Government-owned automobiles and greatly reduce the cost to the Government.

The information gathered by the committee has been very useful to several departments of the Government concerned with this problem. Last year the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Defense Transportation availed themselves of the information to be used as a basis for their regulations and to effect economies in the use of Government owned and operated cars and trucks.

In a statement to the press on February 7, 1943, Harold D. Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, pointed out that—

"Preliminary surveys conducted by the Bureau and data provided by the Byrd committee indicated approximately 100,000 tires will be pooled as a result of the order, which means that until now Government cars have had an average of 6½ tires each. This is an 'unwarranted situation.'"

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommends:

1. That the Appropriations Committees carefully survey the need for the existing passenger cars of each of the agencies of Government and adjust accordingly the operation for the necessary cars.

2. That all Government officials and employees give complete endorsement to the Office of Price Administration's mileage-conservation program as it relates to automobiles used in the public service.

3. That there should be established immediately in Washington for the duration of the war a passenger-automobile pooling arrangement to transport Government employees engaged in official business when no other transportation is available within the metropolitan area of Washington. Each agency shall certify the names of those persons entitled to use official cars on official business, and at no other time, by no other person, and in no other way shall they be used.

4. That any Government official or employee who uses or authorizes the use of any Government-owned or leased vehicle other than for official purposes shall be summarily removed from office, and may, also, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

5. That every Government automobile have displayed in a conspicuous place a sign such as the following: "Owned and operated by the United States Government —— agency."

The following is a list of passenger automobiles as reported by the various agencies. This list does not include the cars that are rented by the various agencies, neither does it include trucks, pick-up trucks, or motorcycles, and is exclusive, also, of all passenger automobiles and trucks owned and operated by the Army and Navy.

*Automobile (passenger)*

[Re questionnaire dated Oct. 31, 1942]

| Agency or department | Number owned | | Cost of operating | | Number miles traveled, fiscal year 1942 | Number miles traveled this fiscal year to Oct. 31, 1942 | Number of chauffeurs | | | | Chauffeurs' salaries, full time | | Number gallons gasoline used | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Full time | | Part time | | | | | |
| | Fiscal year 1942 | Fiscal year 1943 | Fiscal year ending June 30, 1942 | This fiscal year to Oct. 31, 1942 | | | Fiscal year 1942 | Fiscal year to date | Fiscal year 1942 | Fiscal year to date | Fiscal year 1942 | Estimated for fiscal year | Fiscal year 1942 | Fiscal year to date |
| Agriculture Department | [1] 4,359 | [1] 4,454 | $1,004,601.59 | $275,722.81 | 49,856,594 | 13,722,621 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 7 | $9,780 | $8,280.00 | 3,153,706 | 858,023 |
| Alley Dwelling Authority | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Board of Economic Warfare | 5 | 5 | 782.05 | 655.20 | 55,435 | 18,300 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4,140 | 4,140.00 | 2,972 | 1,719 |
| Budget Bureau | 3 | 3 | 706.90 | 186.31 | 23,467 | 9,573 | | | 5 | 5 | | | 2,063 | 662 |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 17 | 20 | 3,414.49 | 1,765.01 | 265,369 | 95,172 | 1 | 1 | | | 1,380 | 1,380.00 | 11,823 | 5,571 |
| Civil Service Commission | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commerce Department | 414 | 489 | 98,281.87 | 36,940.32 | 5,488,266 | 2,039,667 | 9 | 9 | | | 13,140 | 13,140.00 | 322,864 | 117,764 |
| Federal Communications Commission | 148 | 175 | 30,321.98 | 15,159.16 | 1,851,428 | 728,780 | | | | | | | 85,511 | 36,439 |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Federal Power Commission | 16 | 16 | 4,779.80 | 1,582.00 | 197,530 | 48,231 | 1 | 1 | | | 1,500 | 1,500.00 | 11,742 | 2,902 |
| Federal Security Agency | [1] 1,983 | [1] 1,940 | 417,279.26 | 194,034.20 | 18,296,948 | 8,003,590 | [2] 97 | [2] 103 | 37 | 30 | 132,123 | 132,984.00 | 1,220,091 | 509,052 |
| Federal Trade Commission | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Federal Works Agency [3] | 565 | 685 | 83,213.68 | 32,822.74 | 5,344,323 | 2,274,961 | 15 | 15 | 2 | 3 | 20,880 | 21,180.00 | 344,299 | 126,412 |
| General Accounting Office | 2 | 2 | 76.44 | 35.76 | 9,204 | 3,118 | 1 | 1 | | | 1,620 | 1,620.00 | 924 | 278 |
| Gorgas Memorial Institute | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Government Printing Office | 4 | 4 | 1,418.68 | 346.01 | 30,366 | 8,777 | 4 | 4 | | | 7,502 | [4] 2,757.84 | 2,940 | 719 |
| Interior Department [5] | 3,911 | 3,758 | [6] 807,891.50 | [7] 204,939.13 | 33,269,049 | 8,864,983 | 9 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 12,840 | 4,080.00 | 2,345,889 | 631,521 |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 130 | 130 | 29,680.16 | 10,782.95 | 1,362,140 | 447,825 | | | | | | | 80,189 | 22,925 |
| Justice Department | 2,367 | 2,918 | 636,615.65 | 192,283.74 | 33,407,575 | 13,211,990 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 14,640 | 14,640.00 | 2,337,852 | 904,811 |
| Labor Department | 6 | 6 | 2,046.15 | 615.81 | 73,000 | 10,078 | 3 | 3 | | | 5,200 | 4,620.00 | 7,118 | 961 |
| Library of Congress | 1 | 1 | 144.13 | 73.51 | 8,425 | 3,269 | 1 | 1 | | | 1,320 | 1,320.00 | 671 | 255 |
| Maritime Commission [8] | 15 | 20 | 2,326.91 | 847.10 | 81,481 | 39,502 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4,500 | 2,820.00 | 6,249.85 | 2,556.3 |
| National Advisory Commission for Aeronautics | 15 | 15 | 929.06 | 677.16 | 72,867 | 42,487 | | | | | | | 5,137 | 2,448 |
| National Archives | 1 | 1 | 80.88 | 24.26 | 6,148.5 | 2,090.8 | 1 | 1 | | | 1,320 | 1,320.00 | 477 | 147 |
| National Capital Park and Planning Commission | 2 | 2 | 107.70 | 6.91 | 8,576 | 592 | 1 | 1 | | | 1,440 | 1,440.00 | 536 | 37 |
| National Housing Agency | 108 | [9] 142 | 10,236.51 | 7,567.51 | 472,549 | 411,027 | 15 | 15 | 2 | 2 | 20,700 | 20,700.00 | 32,900 | 26,696 |
| National Labor Relations Board | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| National Mediation Board | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Office of Censorship | 10 | 10 | 350.77 | 662.30 | 23,377 | 31,935 | 11 | 11 | 8 | 8 | 15,120 | 15,120.00 | 1,280 | 3,580 |
| Office for Emergency Management [9] | 206 | 150 | 15,336.07 | 14,062.79 | 883,478 | 406,853 | 60 | 89 | | | 73,560 | 118,200.00 | 69,259 | 34,555 |
| Office of Price Administration | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Office of Strategic Services | 20 | 18 | 4,117.04 | ([10]) | 135,854 | 77,918 | 14 | 14 | | | 16,920 | 18,840.00 | 12,405 | 5,054 |
| Panama Canal | 1 | 2 | 174.63 | 43.78 | 6,838 | 897 | | | 2 | 2 | | | 521 | 236 |
| Post Office Department | 51 | 52 | 14,284.24 | 4,709.24 | 278,805 | 90,191 | 2 | 2 | | | 3,000 | 3,180.00 | 27,271 | 8,080 |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 5 | 5 | 758.70 | 212.62 | 39,973 | 8,301 | [11] 5 | [11] 3 | | | [11] 7,080 | [11] 4,140.00 | 3,211 | 852 |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation and subsidiaries | 16 | 21 | 756.33 | 417.12 | 36,165 | 25,648 | 4 | 4 | | | 5,340 | 5,760.00 | 3,660 | 2,127 |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 1 | 1 | 257.84 | 43.12 | 4,850 | 651 | | | | | | | 441 | 51 |
| Selective Service System | 25 | [12] 143 | 4,818.03 | 8,767.57 | 696,043 | 633,514 | 5 | 10 | | 2 | 6,240 | 13,560.00 | 23,618 | 41,147 |
| Smithsonian Institution | 1 | 1 | 198.84 | 26.50 | 6,030 | 1,810 | 1 | 1 | | | 1,380 | 1,320.00 | 670 | 201 |
| Supreme Court of United States | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| State Department | [13] 51 | [13] 53 | 18,919.71 | 6,515.15 | 870,515 | 264,455 | 4 | 4 | | | 5,700 | 5,700.00 | 55,055 | 13,713 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | [11] 760 | [11] 835 | 502,454.84 | 111,142.89 | 12,467,862 | 2,514,545 | 7 | 6 | | | 8,100 | 6,840.00 | 808,742 | 154,662 |
| Treasury Department | 2,505 | 2,491 | 476,219.00 | 164,652.00 | 34,420,943 | 11,540,738 | 5 | 5 | | | 7,460 | 7,460.00 | 2,463,099 | 684,476 |
| U. S. Tariff Commission | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Veterans' Administration | 385 | 385 | 70,021.12 | 19,700.42 | 3,498,807 | 976,212 | 104 | 104 | 620 | 620 | 151,410 | 151,410.00 | 348,509 | 83,874 |
| Total | 17,305 | 18,953 | 4,243,602.55 | 1,308,023.10 | 203,550,280.5 | 66,610,310.8 | 403 | 439 | 695 | 693 | 555,295 | 590,051.84 | 13,793,594.85 | 4,284,511.3 |
| Civilian Conservation Corps (not included in total) [14] | [14] 1,179 | | 405,896.00 | | 16,655,261 | | 23 | | | | 28,560 | | 1,665,526 | |

[1] This report excludes Civilian Conservation Corps cars.
[2] 65 Public Health chauffeurs used for driving trucks and tractors also.
[3] Does not include Work Projects Administration cars.
[4] Actual salary paid.
[5] Cars from the Division of Territories and Island Possessions not included. Civilian Conservation Corps cars not included.
[6] Cost of operating not complete for all divisions.
[7] Includes War Shipping Administration.
[8] 34 of these cars acquired in September 1942 from the Federal Works Agency from cost-plus-a-fixed-fee projects on a recapture basis. No records on them available.
[9] Does not include all War Relocation Authority cars. No operating cost available on War Relocation cars.
[10] Not available.
[11] Average for period.
[12] 42 Foreign Service cars and station wagons not included.
[13] 52 Foreign Service cars not included.
[14] This report on Civilian Conservation Corps cars not included in Federal Security Agency. Report does not include cars put in storage, due to contraction of operations, by Civilian Conservation Corps units within War Department, Agriculture Department, and Department of the Interior. No report on Civilian Conservation Corps this fiscal year to Oct. 31, 1942, because it is in process of liquidation; 883 cars transferred to Army, Navy, Civil Aeronautics Administration, and other agencies, as of Jan. 29, 1943.
[15] Does not include 28 Civilian Conservation Corps cars transferred to the Alaskan Highway.

Source: Replies to questionnaire sent out by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. Does not include the legislative branch, the Architect of the Capitol, the Botanical Gardens, the White House, or the Army and Navy Departments. Rental and mileage payments for use of private cars not included.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### Activities of Smaller War Plants Division and Corporation, War Production Board

A letter dated February 11, 1943, from the Chairman of the War Production Board, submitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Smaller War Plants Division and Smaller War Plants Corporation during the last 60 days, and making certain comment on the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Smaller War Plants Division and related activities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

### October 1942 Report of Reconstruction Finance Corporation

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Corporation for the month of October 1942, containing statement of loan and other authorizations made during the month (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memoralizing Congress not to increase the Federal gasoline tax and to discontinue the same as soon as possible and to refuse to reenact such tax; to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. BUSHFIELD on the 11th instant, p. 819, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas title I, section 2 (a), clause (7), reads as follows: 'Effective July 1, 1941, provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming old-age assistance'; and

"Whereas title IV, section 402 (a), clause (7), reads as follows: 'Provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of any child claiming aid to dependent children'; and

"Whereas title X, section 1002 (a), clause (8), reads as follows: 'Provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming aid to the blind'; and

"Whereas these provisions restrict the States from allowing recipients of relief in these categories from accepting intermittent employment without impairment of their grant; and

"Whereas deduction of all such earnings from grants reduces the willingness of recipients to accept such employment; and

"Whereas, due to the shortage of manpower in all lines of industry during the war emergency, it is necessary that all manpower be made available to the United States Government to successfully prosecute the war effort; and

"Whereas it is imperative that all people be employed wherever they can make a contribution to the war effort: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring)*, That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend titles I, IV, and X, section 2 (a), clause (7), section 402 (a), clause (7), and section 1002 (a), clause (8), to allow for intermittent employment without impairment to the grants of recipients; be it further

*"Resolved*, That certified copies of the memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate and Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to United States Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Edward V. Robertson, Congressman Frank A. Barrett, and to the Honorable Arthur J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board."

A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*"To the President; the Secretary of State; Secretary of the Department of Agriculture and its associated agencies engaged in selecting labor in foreign countries for importation into the United States of America; War Manpower Commission; to the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs; United States Employment Service; Board of Economic Warfare; and the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The strongest pillar of the moral structure upon which stands the determination of free peoples to carry the present World War to a victorious conclusion is faith that out of the smoke and grime of battle will emerge a formula for the outlawing of war for many generations to come.

"There is unanimous agreement among students that this faith may be justified only through a closer bond of unity between nations, and that such unity may be secured only through a more accurate and more sympathetic mutual understanding of the problems, customs, ways of thought, aspirations, and ideals of the peoples of the world.

"A highly important if not an essential step toward the creation of such an understanding is a thorough knowledge on the part of official national diplomatic representatives of the language and customs of the country and the people to which they are accredited.

"Wherefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, respectfully prays:

"1. That all diplomatic representatives and members of diplomatic or consular staffs, in the service of the United States, accredited to or employed in any foreign nation or country, be required to have a speaking knowledge of the language of the country to which sent, and in all possible cases, familiarity with its national customs and habits."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

*"To the President and Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialists respectfully represent:

"Upon the shoulders of American boys, 18 years of age or over, has been placed the responsibility of forming a part of the armed forces engaged in the present titanic struggle for world liberty. They are proud to accept this responsibility, and their parents and loved ones are proud to share it with them.

"Apart from the physical aspects of the sacrifice our younger men are thus called upon to make, is the matter of their education. It is a serious and a momentous thing, to them and to their country, to interrupt, perhaps to prevent, their academic and professional training. This, of course, was well understood when the policy was considered of including teen-age men in the draft, and was waived only from necessity.

"However, it now appears that it is the purpose of The War Relocation Authority of the United States to accord eligibility to some 2,500 young Japanese-American students, located in war relocation centers, to leave such centers and enter any of a large number of colleges and universities—in other words, to accord the privileges of higher education to a group of young people, citizens by virtue of their birth in this country, whose loyalty and patriotism are rendered doubtful because of their racial extraction, thereby unfitting them to be soldiers, while denying a similar opportunity to our own young men of unquestioned loyalty.

"That these Japanese-American young men will pay their own way is no justification for such discrimination. Our young men also pay their way, and it is to the credit of American courage and determination that many of them pay their way under the most difficult circumstances.

"It is admitted that practically all of the Japanese-Americans to whom higher education is to be afforded are physically fit and capable of performing services which would be useful to the war effort, where their patriotism might be demonstrated without placing them in a position where possible disloyalty might be perilous.

"Wherefore your memorialists, the Sixteenth State Legislature of the State of Arizona, urgently request:

"1. That steps be taken, through executive intervention or order, or by means of legislation if necessary, to prevent according to Japanese-American youths the privilege of leaving concentration centers and securing an education in American colleges and universities while the same privilege is denied to loyal American young men called to military service.

"2. That no discrimination be shown in the matter of educational advantages, between America's young citizens, of whatever race or nationality—in short, while young men of undoubted loyalty and Caucasian extraction are required to serve in the armed forces, that these young men of Japanese ancestry and less certain loyalty be given opportunity to serve the war effort in ways in which their racial extraction will prove no impediment.

"3. That if any Japanese-American youths have already been given the privilege of attending colleges and universities, they be returned to their relocation camps."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of members of the First Methodist Church, of Clay Center, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor sales in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

## COMPUTATION OF PARITY—RESOLUTION OF GEORGIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GEORGE. I present and ask to have referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Georgia Legislature urging the passage of the Pace parity bill, to incude all costs in the computation of parity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, and referred as requested by the Senator from Georgia.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas there has come to the attention of the House of Representatives of Georgia that there is now pending in the National Congress certain legislation intended to include the cost of farm labor in figuring parity on agricultural commodities; and

Whereas the certain legislation is known as the Pace parity bill; and

Whereas the cost of farm labor has increased 100 percent within the past 12 months; and

Whereas with the cost of farm labor increasing as it has, unless adequate legislation is passed immediately, it will be utterly impossible for the farmers of the Nation to compete with industry in the payment of labor, and the food program will thereby be hindered immensely; and

Whereas as a part of the war effort it is necessary that the food program be carried out: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Georgia House of Representatives*, That the National Congress be memorialized, and that the Georgia delegation in Congress and in the Senate in particular be memorialized, that the passage of the Pace parity bill is urgent, is imperative, and is necessary; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted immediately to the Clerk of the National Congress and the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, there to be read and presented to the Congress in session, and that a copy of this resolution be sent by the clerk of this house to each Member of Congress from Georgia and to the Senators from Georgia, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to His Excellency, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

## AUTHORITY OF BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY—RESOLUTION OF KANSAS VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association regarding the division of the authority of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association has always cooperated with the officials of the State in the protection of livestock against infectious and contagious diseases; and

Whereas we are mindful of the correlation of the Meat Inspection Division with the field inspection of the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry in giving to this country a most effective system of livestock disease control; and

Whereas we believe that taking the Meat Inspection Division from the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry and placing it within the Food Distribution Division will greatly reduce the efficiency of animal-disease control of this State and Nation, thereby making it more difficult to raise livestock and subsequently greatly reducing food supply, which is so vitally needed during this emergency. Moreover, we believe that with the Division of Meat Inspection within the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry, the effective control of infectious and contagious diseases of animals has been an important public-health factor through the suppression of those animal diseases which are transmissible to man: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That for the best interest of the entire country the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry be restored to its original authority and remain as an intact working organization with all its forces under the unified direction of a veterinarian as chief.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 180. A bill to provide vocational rehabilitation education, training, and other services to persons disabled while members of the armed forces, or disabled in war industries or otherwise, and to render such persons fit for service in war industries, agriculture, or other useful civilian industry, and for other purposes; with an amendment in the nature of a substitute (Rept. No. 53); and

S. Res. 98. Resolution continuing the authority for the investigation of the violation of the right of free speech and assembly and interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 707. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General; without amendment (Rept. No. 54).

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 709. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to appoint Lawrence L. Myatt as a commissioned officer in the United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 710 (by request). A bill to amend Public Law No. 607, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 711. A bill for the relief of the indigent and dependent heirs of Ted Vaughan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 712. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BALL introduced Senate bill 713, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 714. A bill for the relief of the commissioned officers of the U. S. S. *St. Louis* during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 715. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1937, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. VAN NUYS):

S. 716. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the seventh judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 717. A bill for the relief of Cinda J. Short; and

S. 718. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of the legal representatives of the estate of Robert Lee Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 719. A bill for the relief of Angelina Chartier; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 720. A bill to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 721. A bill authorizing the printing, with illustrations, of the proceedings of the national encampments of various veterans' organizations in the United States as separate documents; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 722. A bill providing for cancelation of certain loans to farmers in case of crop failure; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 723. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 724. A bill to extend the time within which certain employees in the legislative branch of the Government may come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 725. A bill to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. O'DANIEL introduced Senate bills 726, 727, and 728, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution providing for awards of honor for agricultural production; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution suspending certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## AMENDMENT OF PRICE CONTROL ACT—WAGE RATES

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the price and wage stabilization law enacted by Congress last October, by writing into the law the letter "(a)" after "SEC. 4"; and by adding at the end of section 4 thereof the following new subsection:

(b) Except as hereinafter provided, no employer shall increase the salary or the straight-time hourly wage rate of any of his employees unless such increase has been approved by the President or such agency as he may designate to administer this subsection. No increase in salaries or in straight-time hourly wage rates above those being paid by the employer for the same work on September 15, 1942, shall be so approved unless such increase (1) does not raise such salaries or straight-time hourly wage rates more than 15 percent above the average salaries or straight-time hourly wage rates for the same work prevailing in the affected industry on January 1, 1941, or (2) is found by the President or such designated agency to be necessary to correct gross inequities. This subsection shall not apply in the case of (1) any salary increase which does not increase the salary of the affected employee to an amount in excess of $5,000 per annum, (2) wage increases which do not increase straight-time hourly wage rates of affected employees to an amount in excess of 60 cents per hour, (3) wage increases which affect fewer than 25 employees of a particular employer, or (4) any salary or wage increase which compensates the affected employee for added responsibility or added work resulting from a promotion. The President or such designated agency shall define the conditions under which such approval shall be required in the case of salaries or wages paid to new employees by an employer.

The bill (S. 713) restricting certain increases in wage rates to aid in carrying out the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942 was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## NATIONAL WAR SERVICE—AMENDMENT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I intend to propose to Senate bill 666, to provide further for the successful prosecution of the war through a system of civilian selective war service with the aid of the Selective Service System, and I ask to have it printed in the RECORD at this point, and printed for the use of the committee to which the bill was referred, and of the Senate.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed, to be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

On page 8, line 24, to insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That every person assigned to service under this act, including every accepted volunteer, shall have the right to join any union or organization of employees, but no such person shall be obliged to join any such union or organization if he or she should not freely choose to do so."

## POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask that the clerk read the first section, and that thereafter the resolution be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolution to create a special committee on post-war economic policy and planning

*Resolved*, That there is hereby established—

SECTION 1. (a) A special committee to be known as the Committee on Post-War

Economic Policy and Planning (hereinafter referred to as the special committee).

(b) The special committee shall be composed of 10 Members of the Senate, 6 from the majority and 4 from the minority, appointed by the President of the Senate.

(c) It shall be the duty of the special committee to investigate all matters relating to post-war economic policy and problems; to gather information, plans, and suggestions from informed sources with respect to such problems; to study the plans and suggestions received; to report to the Congress from time to time the results of findings made and conclusions reached. It is the sense and purpose of this resolution to make accessible to the Congress, through the special committee, the most complete information respecting post-war economic policy and post-war problems that is available, to the end that Congress may be advised respecting those problems and in a position to formulate solutions with respect to them which will result in the greatest contribution by the Congress to achievement of a stable economy and a just peace. It is intended that full authority to accomplish this general purpose shall be granted by this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Georgia will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The resolution (S. Res. 102) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there is hereby established—

(a) A special committee to be known as the Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning (hereinafter referred to as the special committee).

(b) The special committee shall be composed of 10 Members of the Senate, 6 from the majority and 4 from the minority, appointed by the President of the Senate.

(c) It shall be the duty of the special committee to investigate all matters relating to post-war economic policy and problems; to gather information, plans, and suggestions from informed sources with respect to such problems; to study the plans and suggestions received; to report to the Congress from time to time the results of findings made and conclusions reached. It is the sense and purpose of this resolution to make accessible to the Congress, through the special committee, the most complete information respecting post-war economic policy and post-war problems that is available, to the end that Congress may be advised respecting those problems and in a position to formulate solutions with respect to them which will result in the greatest contribution by the Congress to achievement of a stable economy and a just peace. It is intended that full authority to accomplish this general purpose shall be granted by this resolution.

HEARINGS; SUBPENAS; DISBURSEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. The special committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of said committee, and shall be served by any person designated by him. Amounts appropriated for the expenses of the committee shall be disbursed by the chairman.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES; APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION

SEC. 3. The special committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation fixed under sections 661–663, 664–673, and 674 of title 5 of the United States Code for comparable duties. Officers and employees of the Government shall be detailed to the service of the special committee on its request, without additional compensation, and such officers and employees shall be paid from the appropriations regularly available for their salaries.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution I present a brief statement, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this resolution is to provide for systematic study of economic policy in the period of post-war readjustments by the Senate as a branch of the Congress. The committee system, excellent as it is, makes it difficult to deal systematically and comprehensively with the economic problems of the post-war readjustment period. It is hoped that a special committee, though lacking in legislative power, will be of service to the standing committees and to the Senate in the shaping and solution of post-war economic policy and plans.

Post-war economic policies and plans may be elsewhere developed. Finally the responsibility rests with the Congress. This resolution recognizes the responsibility of the Congress to the people of the United States for our post-war economic policy. In order that the Senate as a coordinating branch of the Congress may be able to function with the whole economic picture before it, the resolution is offered.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] be assigned to service on the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. McNARY. I do not believe I have any objection to the request, but I wish to inquire whether this completes the allotment based upon our understanding?

Mr. BARKLEY. It does. The steering committee authorized me to fill these two places on this committee.

Mr. McNARY. There has been no enlargement of the committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. There has been no enlargement, except that to which we agreed.

Mr. McNARY. That is, based on the ratio of 3 to 2, or 1½ to 1?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, it was

*Ordered*, That the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] be assigned to service on the Committee on Education and Labor.

PAYMENT OF FARM-SECURITY LOAN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article headed "Kreller Pays Up Farm Security Administration Loan—A Success Story," published in the Washburn (N. Dak.) Leader of February 11, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KRELLER PAYS UP FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION LOAN—A SUCCESS STORY

It was about 2 years ago now that Joseph Kreller, of Underwood, quit his job on Work Projects Administration there and secured a standard rehabilitation loan from the Farm Security Administration. This past fall Mr. Kreller retired his indebtedness to the Farm Security Administration in full.

When the Farm Security Administration made their initial advance to Mr. and Mrs. Kreller they had $1 in cash, 62 chickens, $72 worth of feed, an old automobile, and household goods. Today they have 15 head of cattle; of this number they are at present milking 6, the cream checks amounting to about $50 per month. In another month they will be milking 8 cows. They have 4 horses and 70 chickens.

They have five sows which are to farrow this spring. Incidentally Joe has a self-feeder made out of a barrel, a wheel, on a platform in his hog lot. Joe feels that it is little things like this that count and "the big things often take care of themselves." Right along the same line he rather boastfully states that he has only lost two calves since the secured his Farm Security Administration loan, and he states frankly that these losses were his fault. He feels that death losses in the case of calves is brought about by poor feeding, irregular feeding, and cold milk.

The Krellers started operating on a one-half-section farm three and a half miles north of Underwood. They secured a 5-year lease with an option to purchase this farm from the Federal Land Bank. It is their plan to execute this option just as soon as they feel they are financially able to, as they consider the farm their permanent home. In the spring of 1941 they set out 2,000 trees, and in the spring of 1942 another 500.

Each year they have attempted to have a good garden and can and store a lot of foodstuffs in line with the Farm Security Administration's policy in this respect. This past year the canning suffered from too much shocking activity, according to Mrs. Kreller. She was, however, able to can 80 quarts of rhubarb, 100 quarts of fruit, 30 quarts of corn, 13 quarts of beans, 2 bushels of carrots, 17 quarts of peas. Incidentally they also had some frost and hail in their garden during the season.

When queried about his plans for the future, Joe stated that he did not know of any in particular with the exception of purchasing the farm and making the farm turn out all the food and fiber possible to facilitate the prosecution of the war. He said that his cows were doing right well by the war effort at this time; that he felt his five sows would come through in good shape and that he was adding 25 acres of flax to his crop program this year.

According to Henry P. Sullivan, rural-rehabilitation supervisor, this story is not unusual, but is typical of how some of the borrowers of the Farm Security Administration have responded under their rehabilitation program. While the Farm Security Administration was set up as a rehabilitation agency, since Pearl Harbor food production has been its main goal with rehabilitation a byproduct of the process.

There have been 97 standard loans paid in full in McLean County since the inception of the program, states Mr. Sullivan.

JEFFERSON'S CREED

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in the New York Times magazine of Sunday last, I

find a very interesting dissertation upon Jefferson's creed. America's two immortal emancipators, Lincoln and Jefferson, are associated, along with their other great outstanding events, by the proximity of their birthdays. We have just paid tribute to the great Lincoln. His statement "that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth" is universally recognized as one of the greatest utterances of man.

On April 13 we shall celebrate the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, who wrote and expounded the unperishable principles of democracy. Lincoln, in unlocking the shackles of slavery, carried out the thoughts enunciated in Jefferson's creed of democracy.

The principles upon which we base our participation in this global war are the Jeffersonian principles of freedom of man. I ask, Mr. President, that the quotations from Jefferson's writings be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the quotations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times magazine of February 14, 1943]

JEFFERSON'S CREED: A CREED FOR TODAY

FREEDOM AND SACRIFICE

We have counted the cost of this contest and find nothing so dreadful as voluntary slavery. Honor, justice, and humanity forbid us tamely to surrender that freedom which we received from our gallant ancestors and which our innocent posterity have a right to receive from us. We cannot endure the infamy and guilt of resigning succeeding generations to that wretchedness which inevitably awaits them if we basely entail hereditary bondage upon them.

Our cause is just. Our union is perfect. Our internal resources are great, and, if necessary, foreign assistance is undoubtedly attainable. * * * We most solemnly, before God and the world, declare that, exerting the utmost energy of those powers which our beneficient Creator hath graciously bestowed upon us, the arms we have been compelled by our enemies to assume we will, in defiance of every hazard, with unabating firmness and perseverance, employ for the preservation of our liberties; being with one mind resolved to die freemen rather than to live slaves. (Declaration of the Causes of Taking Up Arms, July 6, 1775.)

RIGHT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

What has destroyed liberty and the rights of man in every government which has ever existed under the sun? The generalizing and concentrating all cares and powers into one body, no matter whether of the autocrats of Russia or France, or of the aristocrats of a Venetian senate. And I do believe that, if the Almighty has not decreed that man shall never be free—and it is a blasphemy to believe it—the secret will be found in the making himself the depository of the powers respecting himself, so far as he is competent to them, and delegating only what is beyond his competence by a synthetical process, to higher and higher orders of functionaries, so as to trust fewer and fewer powers in proportion as the trustees become more oligarchical. * * * Where every man is a sharer in the direction of his ward-republic, or of some of the higher ones, and feels that he is a participator in the government of affairs, not merely at an election one day in the year, but every day, when there shall be not a man in the state who will not be a member of some one of its councils, great or small, he will let his heart be torn out of his body sooner than his power be wrested from him by a Caesar or a Bonaparte. (To Joseph C. Cabell, February 2, 1816.)

FIRST PRINCIPLES

The diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. (The First Inaugural Address.)

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Well aware that the opinions and belief of men depend not on their own will, but follow involuntarily the evidence proposed to their minds; that Almighty God hath created the mind free, and manifested His supreme will that free it shall remain by making it altogether insusceptible of restraint; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments, or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy author of our religion.

We the General Assembly of Virginia do enact that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods, or shall otherwise suffer, on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities. (Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom.)

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Reason and free inquiry are the only effectual agents against error. Give a loose to them, they will support the true religion by bringing every false one to their tribunal, to the test of their investigation. They are the natural enemies of error, and of error only. * * * The Newtonian principle of gravitation is now more firmly established, on the basis of reason, than it would be were the Government to step in, and to make it an article of necessary faith. Reason and experiment have been indulged and error has fled before them. It is error alone which needs the support of Government. Truth can stand by itself. Subject opinion to coercion: whom will you make your inquisitors? Fallible men; men governed by bad passions, by private as well as public reasons. And why subject it to coercion? To produce uniformity. But is uniformity of opinion desirable? No more than of face and stature. (Notes on Virginia.)

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

I am for * * * freedom of the press and against all violations of the Constitution to silence by force, and not by reason, the complaints or criticisms, just or unjust, of our citizens against the conduct of their agents. And I am for encouraging the progress of science in all its branches and not for raising a hue and cry against the sacred name of philosophy. (To Elbridge Gerry, January 26, 1799.)

THE JUDICIARY

The dignity and stability of government in all its branches, the morals of the people, and every blessing of society, depend so much upon an upright and skillful administration of justice, that the judicial power ought to be distinct from both the legislature and executive, that so it may be a check upon both, as both should be checks upon that. The judges, therefore, should always be men of learning and experience in the laws, of exemplary morals, great patience, calmness, and attention; their minds should not be distracted with jarring interests; they should not be dependent upon any man or body of men. (To George Wythe, July, 1776.)

EDUCATION

I think by far the most important bill in our whole code is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised, for the preservation of freedom and happiness. * * * Preach, my dear sir, a crusade against ignorance; establish and improve the law for educating the common people. Let our countrymen know that the people alone can protect us against these evils, and that the tax which will be paid for the purpose is not more than the thousandth part of what will be paid to kings, priests, and nobles who will rise up among us if we leave the people in ignorance. (To George Wythe, August 13, 1786.)

PILLARS OF PROSPERITY

Agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and navigation, the four pillars of our prosperity, are the most thriving when left free to individual enterprise. Protection from casual embarrassments, however, may sometimes be seasonably interposed. (First annual message to Congress, December 8, 1801.)

ESSENCE OF A REPUBLIC

I believe with you that morality, compassion, generosity are innnate elements of the human constitution, that there exists a right independent of force, that a right to property is founded on our natural wants, in the means with which we are endowed to satisfy these wants, and the right to do what we acquire by those means without violating the similar rights of other sensible beings, that no one has a right to obstruct another, exercising his faculties innocently for the relief of sensibilities made a part of his nature; that justice is the fundamental law of society, that the majority oppressing an individual is guilty of a crime, abuses its strength, and by acting on the law of the strongest breaks up the foundations of society, that action by the citizens in person, in affairs within their reach and competence, and in all others by representatives, chosen immediately and removable by themselves, constitutes the essence of a republic. (To P. S. du Pont de Nemours, April 24, 1816.)

BLESSINGS OF AMERICA

I sincerely wish you may find it convenient to come here; the pleasure of the trip will be less than you expect, but the utility greater. It will make you adore your country, its soil, its climate, its equality, liberty, laws, people, and manners. My God! how little my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of, and which no other people on earth enjoy. * * * Come, then, and see the proof of this, and on your return, add your testimony to that of every thinking American, in order to satisfy our countrymen how much it is their interest to preserve, unaffected by contagion, those peculiarities of their governments and manner to which they are indebted for those blessings. (To James Monroe, from Paris, January 17, 1785.)

SOURCE OF THE DECLARATION

Neither aiming at originality of principle or sentiment, nor yet copied from any particular and previous writing, it was intended to be an expression of the American mind and to give to that expression the proper tone and spirit called for by the occasion. All its authority rests, then, on the harmonizing sentiments of the day, whether expressed in conversation, in letters, printed essays or in the elementary books of public

right, as Aristotle, Cicero, Locke, Sidney, etc. (To Henry Lee, May 1825.)

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

I have a right to nothing which another has a right to take away. And Congress will have a right to take away trial by jury in all civil cases. Let me add that a bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular, and what no just government should refuse or rest on inference. (To James Madison, December 20, 1787.)

THE RIGHTS OF MAN

May it [the Declaration of Independence] be to the world what I believe it will be (to some parts sooner, to others later, but finally to all): The signal of arousing men to burst the chains under which monkish ignorance and superstition have persuaded them to bind themselves and assume the blessings and security of self-government. That form which we have substituted, restores the free right to the unbounded exercise of reason and freedom of opinion. All eyes are opened or opening to the rights of man. The general spread of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth that the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred ready to ride them legitimately by the grace of God. These are grounds of hope for others. (To Roger C. Weightman, June 24, 1826, 10 days before Jefferson's death, on the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration.)

TRUST IN THE PEOPLE

Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves therefore are its only safe depositories. And to render them safe, their minds must be improved to a certain degree. This indeed is not all that is necessary, though it be essentially necessary. An amendment of our Constitution must here come in aid of public education. The influence over government must be shared by all the people. If every individual which composes their mass participates of the ultimate authority, the Government will be safe; because the corrupting the whole mass will exceed any private resources of wealth; and public ones cannot be provided but by levies of the people. (To the Abbé Arnoud, July 19, 1789.)

MAN'S VAST FUTURE

I am 81 years of age, born where I now live, in the first range of mountains in the interior of our country. And I have observed this march of civilization advancing from the seacoast, passing over us like a cloud of light, increasing our knowledge and improving our condition, in so much that we are at this time more advanced in civilization here than the seaports were when I was a boy. And where this progress will stop no one can say. Barbarism has, in the meantime, been receding before the steady step of amelioration, and will in time, I trust, disappear from the earth. (To William Ludlow, September 6, 1824.)

## THE MANPOWER SHORTAGE ON THE FARM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter addressed to me by L. W. Hamm, on the subject of the manpower shortage on the farm.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PIERCE CO.,
*Fargo, N. Dak., February 10, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: Possibly you have heard that there is a manpower shortage. It is not only affecting farmers but some of the rest of us as well.

It so happens that within the past week two letters have come to my attention which have some bearing on this shortage and I thought that you might be interested.

The first letter came from a young man who is a graduate chemist. He is working for a large eastern corporation and took a position with them to help out with the war work. He states that the job would be O. K. if it were not for the fact that they have 100 men in a laboratory that could be operated by 6 men. As a result he has nothing to do.

The second letter was written by a man in California. He is a man of some means and not compelled to work for a living. He took a job in an airplane factory in southern California because he thought his help was needed. After hanging around for weeks he grew tired of asking for something to do and quit the job.

I am sure that these are not isolated cases but why doesn't somebody build a fire under some of these corporations and make them let our men alone until they are really needed?

We are losing men right along and cannot replace them. We are willing to lose them and do the best we can without them if they are to go into the armed services or into necessary war work. We are not willing, however, to let them go when they go to a large corporation which uses them to swell the pay roll in order to get more of our tax money on a cost-plus basis contract.

* * * * *

Yours very truly,

L. W. HAMM.

## ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT WHITE HOUSE CORRESPONDENTS' ASSOCIATION DINNER

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States on Friday evening, February 12, 1943, at the annual dinner of the White House Correspondents' Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHITE ON FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF JAMES G. BLAINE

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on James G. Blaine, delivered by Senator WHITE on January 27 before the Pan American Union, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ANNIVERSARY OF SINKING OF THE BATTLESHIP MAINE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GILLETTE

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator GILLETTE on February 15, 1943, the anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, which appears in the Appendix.]

## EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH OF SENATOR HOLMAN AT PONTIAC, MICH.

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a speech delivered by him in Pontiac, Mich., on February 10, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

## THE SURVIVAL OF REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HAWKES

[Mr. AIKEN asked to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Survival of Representative Democracy," delivered by Senator HAWKES, at the fifty-seventh annual dinner of the National Republican Club, New York City, February 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## POWER FOR WAR—POWER FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ICKES

[Mr. WALLGREN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Power for War—Power for Peace," delivered by the Secretary of the Interior before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at St. Louis, Mo., on January 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## CONTROL BY THE PEOPLE—ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Control by the People," delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon before the Republican Lincoln Day banquet at Omaha, Nebr., on February 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ADDRESS BY PROF. LOUIS J. A. MERCIER

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a digest of an address by Prof. Louis J. A. Mercier, of Harvard University, before the Hampden County Teachers Association of Massachusetts, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE UNIONS AND THE ORDER—EDITORIAL FROM THE PORTLAND OREGONIAN

[Mr. MCNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Unions and the Order," published in the Portland Oregonian of February 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## PETTIFOGGERS—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pettifoggers," published in the Philadelphia Record of February 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## PROTECTION AGAINST LYNCHING—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW REPUBLIC

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Section 52 Is News," by Helen Fuller, appearing in the February 15, 1943, issue of the New Republic, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THOMAS JEFFERSON—EDITORIAL FROM LYNCHBURG (VA.) ADVANCE AND PARAGRAPH FROM WILL P. KENNEDY'S COLUMN

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Thomas Jefferson," published in the Lynchburg (Va.) Daily Advance, and a paragraph on Jefferson from the column of Will P. Kennedy in the Washington Evening Star of February 7, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

## ABSENTEEISM—EDITORIAL FROM OREGON JOURNAL

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Absenteeism," published in the Oregon Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

## HOME FURNISHINGS FOR WAR WORKERS

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from a furniture dealer of Oregon regarding home furnishings for war workers, which appears in the Appendix.]

## FOOD PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION—COMMENTS BY ROBERT A. HUDSON

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD comments and suggestions by Robert A. Hudson, president of the Hudson-Duncan Co., regarding food production and distribution, which appear in the Appendix.]

OUR PRESIDENT — NEWSPRINT — EDITORIAL FROM THE DELAWARE NEWS

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our President—Newsprint," published in the Delaware News, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN AND THE FIFTH FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Lincoln and the Fifth Freedom, delivered by Senator WILLIS at the Thirteenth Annual Lincoln Banquet of the Alexander Hamilton Club of Maryland, at Baltimore, Md., February 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MAXIMUM PRICES ON PORK AND BEEF PRODUCTS AND BREAD AND BAKERY PRODUCTS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day.

The resolution (S. Res. 94) submitted by Mr. REED on the 8th instant is as follows:

Whereas the provisions of the act entitled "An act to aid in stabilizing the cost of living," approved October 2, 1942, expressly provide (1) that "no maximum price shall be established or maintained under authority of this act or otherwise for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity a price therefor" equal to the parity price for such agricultural commodity, (2) that no maximum price shall be maintained for any such processed or manufactured commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of the agricultural commodity the highest price received by them between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942, with certain qualifications: *Provided*, That the President may correct gross inequities in this respect, but that in no event shall a maximum price be established for such a processed or manufactured commodity which will not reflect parity to the producers of the agricultural commodity, and (3) that "in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing"; and

Whereas the act known as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, approved January 30, 1942, as amended October 2, 1942, expressly provides that the price-fixing powers "shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumstances or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act"; and

Whereas the foregoing provisions have not been suspended or modified by any law or lawful action; and

Whereas on October 22, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued Maximum Price Regulation No. 148, Revised, now in effect as amended November 2, 1942, fixing maximum prices for pork products and using as a live-hog base approximately $13.60 per 100 pounds at Chicago, although the price of live hogs at Chicago since the promulgation of said revised regulation for a substantial period of time has been in excess of $15 per 100 pounds, causing a loss to the processors in violation of the provision of the act approved October 2, 1942, that processors shall be allowed a general fair and equitable margin; and

Whereas said Maximum Price Regulation No. 148, Revised, as amended, is in violation of the act approved October 2, 1942, because the base of live animal prices used was lower than the highest price received by producers between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942, and because there has been no action by the President to permit such a lower base on the ground of any gross inequity; and

Whereas on December 10, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued Maximum Price Regulation No. 169, now in effect as amended December 19, 1942, and January 2, 1943, fixing maximum prices for beef products on a basis which fails to yield to the processors generally fair and equitable margins; and

Whereas on April 28, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued the general maximum price regulation establishing as maximum prices for bread and other bakery products, together with other commodities, the highest price charged by each seller during March 1942 for each such commodity, and said maximum prices for bread and other bakery products have since been maintained at the same levels; and

Whereas said maximum prices for bread and other bakery products were and are in violation of the act approved October 2, 1942, because said products are processed and manufactured in whole from wheat and other agricultural commodities and because said maximum prices did not and do not reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodities either parity or the highest prices received by producers for them between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942; and

Whereas, contrary to the statement of the Office of Price Administration at the time of issuing the general maximum price regulation that "every producer whose prices are stabilized is assured that his costs, which are based upon the stabilized prices of others, will not rise," the Office of Price Administration did not at that time place any maximum price or control, with minor exceptions, upon any of the costs of manufacturers of bread and other bakery products, and it was not until October 1942 that ceilings were placed upon flour, eggs, dry, evaporated, and condensed milk, certain other ingredients used in such products, and wages, by which time such costs had undergone a substantial increase, amounting to an average increase of one-half cent per pound in the case of bread; and

Whereas the costs of producing bread and other bakery products have continued to increase substantially since October 1942, as a result in part of increases in maximum prices for flour allowed by Maximum Price Regulation No. 296 issued by the Office of Price Administration on January 2, 1943, although no increase in the maximum prices for bread and other bakery products has been allowed; and

Whereas producers of bread and other bakery products, particularly smaller producers, are therefore being denied a generally fair and equitable margin in violation of the act approved October 2, 1942, and large numbers of such producers, in fact, are operating at a loss; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration, in violation of the provision in the act approved January 30, 1942, that the price-fixing powers "shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry," has used such powers to compel such changes in the bread and other bakery products industry (as evidenced by its announcement upon the issuance of Maximum Price Regulation No. 296 that "this increase in flour prices should not necessitate an increase in the present retail bread prices because the higher flour costs, it is estimated, will be completely offset by simultaneously introduced savings in the manufacture, packaging, and distribution costs of bakers"), affected by food distribution order No. 1, issued by the Secretary of Agriculture under direction of the Director of Economic Stabilization after recommendation by the Office of Price Administration, limiting varieties of bread and rolls, prohibiting slicing of bread, limiting the amounts of milk, shortening, and sugar in white bread, prohibiting certain methods of distribution and otherwise changing the practices of the industry for the purpose of maintaining present maximum prices for bread; and

Whereas said Food Distribution Order No. 1, even could it be lawfully resorted to by the Office of Price Administration for the purpose of maintaining present maximum prices for bread, has not resulted in savings which allow producers of bread a generally fair and equitable margin as required by law; and

Whereas the meat processing and bread and other bakery products industries are essential war industries and their continued operation and the foods they supply are essential to the national welfare and the successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas the policies and actions of the Office of Price Administration are threatening extinction of these industries or their concentration in the hands of a few large operators able to withstand the price squeeze imposed, by reason of large financial resources; and

Whereas the action of the Office of Price Administration in maintaining maximum prices for pork and beef products and for bread and other bakery products at present levels in violation of the foregoing provisions of law is defeating the intent of the Congress that producers of agricultural commodities shall receive fair and reasonable prices, due to the inability of processors to pay such prices: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or through a subcommittee to be appointed by the chairman, is hereby authorized and directed—

(1) to investigate and study the policies and actions of the Office of Price Administration, the Office of Economic Stabilization, and any other governmental agency, their officials, employees, agents, and representatives, in respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum prices for pork and beef products and for bread and other bakery products; and

(2) to report its findings and to recommend further legislation or action by the Congress or the Senate, if any, needed to insure compliance by any or all such agencies, officials, employees, agents, and representatives with the provisions of the aforementioned act approved January 30, 1942, as amended, and the act approved October 2, 1942.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, as it deems advisable.

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

I wish to ask the Senator from Kansas, and also the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY],

to allow the resolution to go over without prejudice. I should very much like to have it go over until a later session of the Senate, which would deprive no one of any right, since it is not very convenient for me to discuss it today because of other matters which are to come up, especially the call of the calendar. If we get into a discussion of the resolution, it will probably take some time, and I should very much appreciate if it could go over.

Mr. REED. I always like to accommodate my colleagues, especially the Senator from Kentucky. I am reluctant, however, to agree to his suggestion for a further delay of the resolution. Last Thursday, when it was in order for it to be brought up, I was very glad to yield to the requests of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and other Senators, who desired to present specific matters.

One of the reasons for my reluctance to agree to further delay is that I should like to read a telegram which is typical of the attitude of the smaller packers and the smaller bakers in this country under the order of the O. P. A. I have before me a telegram from Kansas City, dated February 11, addressed to me, in which it is stated:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *February 11, 1943.*
Senator REED, of Kansas,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: I have just finished reading with considerable interest Senate Resolution 94 that you have presented to the Seventy-eighth Congress for consideration.

You may be sure that we appreciate your interest in the situation and from the thorough manner in which you are investigating the unfair margins under which the packer is now forced to operate I am sure you have a thorough knowledge of our problem.

We have just received under date of February 9 a mandatory order from the field headquarters office of quartermaster general in Chicago, Ill., for 250,000 pounds of fresh chilled carcass beef to be delivered at Office of Price Administration ceilings in carload lots between February 15 and February 20. To fill this order would cost this firm in excess of $7,500 for the 5 days' operation.

We are already operating on a weekly loss from $2,000 to $3,000, but the additional loss that would be imposed by the acceptance of this order would be unbearable.

Government business as price order No. 169 now defines it, is less profitable in the commodity of carcass beef than domestic business because we are forced to sell carload lots to the Government at 75 cents per hundredweight less than we are permitted to sell the domestic trade in less-than-carload lots.

In addition, Government regulations require that carcass beef delivered them must be sold on delivered weights. This involves an additional 1- to 2-percent shrink, which on the price of livestock today is a considerable item. Regulations further require that carcass beef must be quartered and then each quarter individually weighed and wrapped. This expense amounts to approximately 25 cents per hundredweight, for which there is no provision in regulation No. 169. A further insult has been added to injury. Government purchases in carload lots call for shipment on Government bills of lading.

The initial icing and salting charge, which is included in domestic business on shipments from the West to the East by virtue of the $1.50 spread between Kansas City and the eastern seaboard, is not permitted to be charged to the Government on such Government bills of lading. All in all, our position has become intolerable.

We trust that you cannot question our patriotism, for we have within the past 6 months delivered from 40 to 50 percent of our entire production to the armed forces directly. If we were financially able to subsidize the armies of our United States, we would be happy to do so. Unfortunately, we are not in this financial position, and, furthermore, do not feel that the Congress of the United States has any such desire. Your prompt reply will be appreciated.

A. B. MAURER,
MAURER PACKING CO.

Mr. President, this telegram is typical of dozens of telegrams and letters I have received from the smaller packers and the smaller bakers in every State of the Union. They are being forced out of business, contrary to what I believe is the plain intent of the Congress. Day by day and week by week more and more of them are going out of business.

The whole question of an adequate food supply, whether through production by the farmers or by processing, is in such chaotic condition that there is no more important question before the people of the United States at this time.

Senate Resolution 94 does not seek to change the law. All it proposes to do is to direct the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate to make an investigation. The whole question between the distinguished majority leader and myself is whether the resolution shall go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It will not take me more than about 10 minutes to tell why I think it should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think we can dispose of the whole matter in 30 minutes. I do not see any necessity for a prolonged discussion. Therefore, though I have great reluctance in refusing to accede to any request of the Senator from Kentucky, which I seldom do, I prefer to proceed at this time.

Mr. President, there is nothing new, nothing novel, in the directions contained in Senate Resolution 94 and the request for its reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Last year I, myself, submitted Senate Resolution 308, which was referred to that committee. On October 26 the committee held a hearing on this subject, and this very question of meat ceilings and meat prices was discussed before the committee at length.

On the same day the committee had before it Mr. Byrnes, Mr Wickard, and Mr. Henderson. The hearings have been printed, and on pages 51 to 62 is contained a discussion of this very question with Leon Henderson, Mr. Wickard, and Mr. Byrnes. Nothing was done about the matter at that time.

Later the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and I submitted Senate Resolution 312, which, again, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Again, on November 19 and 20, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held hearings on this subject.

The same subject, and nothing else, is covered in Senate Resolution 94. This is not a new question; it is not a question of jurisdiction as between some other committee and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, there is no question that is new and fresh and novel. It merely involves a continuation of the consideration of matters which were brought up last fall. Senate Resolution 312 was then approved by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It went to the calendar, and remained on the calendar to the close of the last session of Congress, when it died. Now the question comes up again.

Mr. President, there is no question about the serious, in fact, the desperate situation of the small bakers and the small meat packers. If these small businessmen cannot continue to operate on a competitive, free enterprise basis, then they must go out of business. I am not going to sit in this Chamber and bear my share of responsibility and fail to raise my voice when businessmen in the United States are put out of business by arbitrary orders from bureaucrats downtown—orders which have no foundation in the mandates or instructions given those officials by the Congress of the United States. That is what is happening now. That is what we ought to stop.

The only question involved in the resolution is that of investigation. Investigation of these very same subjects was begun after we passed the price-control measure, which was signed on October 2 of last year. These subjects have been under continuous consideration. Hundreds of businessmen have been forced out of business by the arbitrary orders which have been issued. All that Senate Resolution 94 contemplates is an investigation by a standing committee of this body, and that standing committee should be the committee which already has dealt with this subject, is dealing with it now, and which has made public announcement within the last few days of its intention to make a thorough investigation of all the facts and circumstances surrounding the production, the processing, and the distribution of food products. Why there should be any question about the proper committee to consider the subject matter of the resolution is not clear to me.

Mr. President, a question of psychology is involved. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that five times I refused the requests made by the bakers, through their organization, before I finally consented to frame and submit the resolution. I have shown a reluctance, I think about an equal number of times, to take up the question at the behest of the small packers. They finally convinced me, however, of the seriousness of their situation, and I prepared the resolution, submitted it, and hope to obtain its prompt consideration.

The resolution has been framed in such a way as to be very thorough. It contains 12 whereases, which set out for the information of Senators the various infringements of the law on the part of the Office of Price Administration. That information is given by date and verse and chapter; that is, the number of the regulation and the date upon which it was issued.

One of the whereases, standing by itself, would cause the resolution to be sent to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] mentioned to me last week that one or more of the whereases touched a subject matter which should be considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I agree, so far as one whereas is concerned, that, standing alone, it should be the subject of investigation by that committee. With that one whereas, standing by itself, the resolution should go to that committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I hesitate to interrupt the very distinguished Senator from Kansas. I have just read the resolution itself—not the whereases—and am strongly of the opinion that the resolution does not confer any additional authority to that now possessed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make the proposed investigation. The Senator from Kansas well recalls that 2 weeks ago today the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, in connection with the resolutions favorably reported from that committee, said that a reserve of $5,000 was provided for all the major committees save three—the three being the Committees on Finance, Appropriations, and Foreign Relations, which were provided with $10,000 for the purpose of making investigations.

I presume the situation now to be that if the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or a majority of its members, should ask for this investigation, the committee would be able to conduct it without the adoption of the Senator's resolution, to the point of expending $5,000. Expenditures beyond that amount would require additional legislation and additional appropriation. The right to subpena witnesses is inherent in the committee. The committee does not claim the right to employ counsel. Probably a word or two should be omitted from the resolution, that is as to places and times, of holding hearings. The hearings would be held by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, it appears very plainly to me that the resolution does not confer any rights which are not inherent in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the committee could just as well make the investigation without the adoption of the resolution.

For that reason—while the inquiry is a long one, and is awkwardly propounded—I wonder why the resolution is proposed, concerning a matter over which the committee now has jurisdiction, unless there is a reluctance on the part of the chairman of the committee to function under the terms and philosophy of the resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am always happy to be interrupted by my good friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry can investigate all these matters at any time it feels like doing so. Any standing committee of the Senate can investigate anything which comes within its jurisdiction, and the things which are within its jurisdiction are generally the things which it feels like investigating.

It is customary, however, when especially important questions involving definite interests are raised, to prepare a resolution, and name therein the proper committee to make the investigation. I submitted this resolution before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had announced its purpose of making a general investigation. I did so because I thought these particular questions ought to be investigated at the earliest possible time. There is no dispute with respect to the seriousness of the matters involved. Not even the distinguished majority leader questions the seriousness of the situation. Therefore I think we ought to proceed.

Let me say again, and then I shall conclude, that it is true that the Price Control Act came out of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is also true that the way the measure was handled last year left some unpleasant memories. I have no desire to revive those memories—I want them to lie quiet—but there is a question of psychology involved. Those who came to me requesting that I submit a resolution with respect to the matter, and who, after five refusals on my part, induced me to take up their case, asked only one thing, and that was an investigation to be conducted by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. They said they would be satisfied with that. If they can have that kind of an investigation, then whatever the result of it may be, whatever the finding of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may or may not be, they will be content, and, at least so far as I am concerned, they will have to be content. But if we send the resolution to a committee which they believe lacks friendliness, if it is not actively hostile, then we shall fail in the purpose both of the resolution and of satisfying those who have a just complaint.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. REED. I yield the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to ask the Senator from Kansas a question. If the only conflict of jurisdiction rests in the whereases, why not drop the whereases from the resolution, and simply refer the resolution itself to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and thus avoid all possible friction?

Mr. REED. The distinguished Senator from Michigan has before him a copy of Senate Resolution 94. The whereases have no binding or probative force of any kind, and are merely explanatory. The whereas on page 2, the beginning of the first paragraph on that page, is as follows:

> Whereas the act known as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, approved January 30, 1942, as amended October 2, 1942, expressly provides that the price-fixing powers "shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumstances or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act."

That language is taken from the act itself. I agree with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] that if the resolution contained only that one whereas it might properly go to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am deeply in sympathy with the purpose of the resolution, and so far as that is concerned, I am deeply in sympathy with the whereases. But after all is said and done, the whereases are simply an indication of the reasons for submitting the resolution, and do not actually add anything to it. As the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has suggested, the whereases tend to cause a dispute with respect to jurisdiction. Much as I am in sympathy with the whereases, I am in favor of deleting them.

If the Senator from Kansas will permit me, I wish to say that I think the situation in question is a very desperate one. If the O. P. A. continues the present policy of putting a ceiling on prices of processed meat and processed flour, while at the same time leaving the production costs without any ceiling, I think they are going to put out of business every independent baker and every independent miller in the United States. There is no question on earth about that. When they do that they will very seriously interfere with the food supply of the Army and the Navy, of all the armed forces of the United States and her allies, as well as the civilian population.

I think the resolution should be adopted, but if it will lend any facility in the reference of the resolution, I think the Senator from Kansas, having already had the resolution published in the RECORD with the whereases in it, could well afford to let the whereases be stricken out.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Missouri has said precisely what I rose to say in further reference to my suggestion to the Senator from Kansas. I wish to see his resolution acted on today. I think he removes all reasonable chance for an argument when he strikes the whereases out of it. Why not strike the whereases, inasmuch as they have no probative force anyway, and thus circumscribe the argument to a point where there cannot be any question?

Mr. REED. I may say to the Senators from Michigan and Missouri that I do not understand the objection of the Senator from Kentucky to be lodged against the whereases. I understand that the objection of the Senator from Kentucky goes to the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. So far as I am concerned, I do not care anything about the whereases. We put them in the resolution only for the purposes I have stated. If Senators

will read the whereases they will find that they give Senators the chapter and verse—that is, date and regulation number. They give all the information any Senator needs, if a Senator wishes to examine the RECORD with respect to the facts and the documents behind the resolution. That is all they do.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Would it not serve a useful purpose to have the resolution printed in the RECORD as a part of the remarks of the able Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED. The resolution, including the "whereases," has already been printed in the RECORD in full. I am perfectly agreeable to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], to drop the "whereases" if that will meet the objection of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks in my own time with reference to the subject now under discussion, if the Senator from Kansas is through.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. With reference to the possible assignment of the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency, am I to understand that my friend from Kansas implies that the friends of agriculture feel that it should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry rather than to the Committee on Banking and Currency, because the Committee on Banking and Currency is thought to be hostile to agriculture?

Mr. REED. I have not said that the Committee on Banking and Currency is hostile to agriculture.

Mr. TOBEY. Is there any implication that the Committee on Banking and Currency is hostile to the agricultural interests?

Mr. REED. No; I did not mean to leave that inference. What I stated was that the small packers and small bakers, who have consulted me individually and through their organizations, have stated to me that they would be satisfied if they could get an investigation of this question by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have said, as is well known, that price-control measures were handled by the Committee on Banking and Currency and reported to the Senate by that committee. There are some unpleasant memories in that connection which I should dislike to revive.

If the resolution goes to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, those who are now complaining will be satisfied. I cannot give that assurance should the resolution be referred to any other committee.

Mr. TOBEY. The only reason I ask the question is that I thought I distinctly understood the distinguished Senator from Kansas to state that the Committee on Banking and Currency is hostile to agriculture. I desire to correct the RECORD in that regard, because among the stalwart supporters of agriculture in the Senate there is a large group on the Committee on Banking and Currency.

As a member of that committee, and as one who believes in agriculture, I can assure the Senator that on that committee there are those who recognize the needs of agriculture, and that should the resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency it would receive a square deal from that committee in connection with any matters pertaining to agriculture.

Mr. REED. My friend the Senator from New Hampshire is the ranking minority member of that committee. My equally good friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is also a member of that committee. There are other members of that committee who are just as good friends of agriculture as is any other Member of the Senate. I am talking about the psychology of meeting the complaints by letting the committee which would be satisfactory to those making the complaints conduct the investigation. I have said at no time that I hold any belief that the Committee on Banking and Currency is unfriendly to agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me discuss for a moment my request that the resolution go over without prejudice. The other day, when it went over until today, I did not know that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], could not be present today. The distinguished Senator from Kansas is not responsible for the absence of the chairman of the committee, and neither am I. I believe that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I believe that no harm could result from another postponement of the resolution. Out of courtesy to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who is unavoidably absent, I believe that the resolution should go over for the present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky allow me to make a personal statement?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. REED. I have no warmer personal friend among the Members of the Senate than the distinguished and able Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kentucky will recall that a couple of years ago, on a close vote, it was proposed to call the Senator from New York back from Florida, where he was recuperating. I asked the secretary of the minority not to require the Senator from New York to return. I told him that I was willing to be paired with him, to take care of his vote on that important question. The Senator from New York and I have carried a general pair during all these years. No one likes him better than I do, and no one is less desirous than I of doing him any discourtesy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate what the able Senator from Kansas has said, and I am sure the Senator from New York will appreciate it as well.

These requests frequently involve mutual concessions and courtesies. The Senator from Kansas was the sponsor of a measure which was placed on the calendar on January 11, 1942. The purpose of the bill was to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act. On the surface, the Senator apparently thought that the Committee on Education and Labor, to which it would naturally be referred, should be bypassed. Because the Senator from Kansas was absent for 2 or 3 weeks, consideration of the bill was postponed until he could return.

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that the attitude of the Senator from Kansas was not "on the surface," but was the result of mature consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not doubt the accuracy of the Senator's statement. However, if a bill of that nature could be placed on the calendar without any consideration having been given to it by any committee, I could introduce a tax bill and, by the same method, have it put on the calendar and considered by the Senate without being referred to the Committee on Finance. At the proper time we shall have to discuss the question of the reference of that bill. I regret to say that I fear that a chaotic situation is developing in the Senate with respect to the reference of bills and resolutions.

I have discussed that situation on several occasions. I hope I shall not become monotonous or boresome to the Senate in my effort to bring some order out of chaos in the matter of proper reference of proposed legislation. I hope the Vice President—and I say this with the greatest affection and respect for him—will not persist in his inclination, which seems to have developed in the past week or so, to leave it to the Senate to vote on the question when there seems to be any doubt as to where a bill should go. It is conceivable that in the midst of the war we may be debating for hours the question of where a bill should be referred, when in my judgment the reference should be made by the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

I realize that the rules of the Senate are somewhat vague and chaotic; but in national or county conventions, without any precedents under general parliamentary law, the right is inherent in the presiding officer to refer resolutions to the appropriate committee. The rules of the Senate do not specifically require the Vice President to do so, but ever since there has been a Senate the Vice President has been following that procedure.

I desire to say frankly that, rather than remain in this chaotic situation, in which, every time a bill or a resolution is introduced, we must have a joint debate with reference to where it should go, I shall propose an amendment to the rules which would require the Presiding Officer to exercise that function. I have no doubt that the Vice President would be glad to exercise the function if he were assured that he should do so. Senators can see what a chaotic situation will develop in the future if every time a controversial bill or resolution is introduced we must have a debate on the floor of the Senate before it can be determined to what committee it should be referred, and then vote on the ques-

tion of reference according to the inclinations of Senators, depending upon what they think they will get from a given committee, rather than to follow the parliamentary and logical procedure of referring bills to the committees to which they should be referred.

Mr. President, let me return to the pending resolution. It contains five pages of "whereases," and every one of them refers to the administration of the Price Control Act by the Office of Price Administration. Even if the whereases were eliminated, the resolution would authorize the committee to investigate and study the policies and actions of the Office of Price Administration. I dare say that if I were to offer a resolution authorizing an investigation into the conduct of the Bureau of Internal Revenue—the agency of the Government which collects taxes—that resolution would go to the Committee on Finance without any question whatever, because the Committee on Finance sponsors, writes, and puts through the Senate all legislation with respect to the collection of taxes. I do not believe anyone would seriously question the propriety of referring to the Committee on Finance a resolution to investigate the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

There is no question that if any Senator should submit a resolution providing for an investigation of the manner in which the Federal Reserve Board has conducted the financial operations of its department, pertaining to the currency of our country, Federal Reserve notes, and the entire law affecting the situation pertaining to currency and banking, such a resolution would go to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction of legislation dealing with subjects of that nature. A similar situation would obtain in the other House.

I have no doubt that if a resolution were offered providing for an investigation of the way in which the Secretary of Labor has conducted her office, or the course which has been pursued by the National Labor Relations Board in its administration of the Wagner Act, such a resolution would go to the Committee on Education and Labor, which sponsored the legislation and put it through the Senate.

Here is a resolution to investigate the whole set-up, the whole policy, the whole course of action of the Office of Price Administration in regard to the matters set forth in the whereases as well as in the resolving portion of the resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Kentucky would want to add that the investigation would apply only insofar as the establishment and maintenance of maximum prices for pork, beef, and bakery products are concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I understand that; but the Senator from Kansas could just as well have included in the resolution clothing and shoes and everything else.

The bill providing for the control of prices was sent to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It was properly sent there because the bill provided for legislation designed to prevent inflation, which is directly associated with the question of our currency and the value of our currency. Inflation is a term which is applicable to our currency, the amount of it, and the value of it in terms of purchasing power; and the bill was properly referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The bill was debated in the committee and was reported from the committee; and I think I can say for the committee, and I believe that every member of the committee will agree with me—including the ranking minority member, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who was and is a very valuable, able, and sincere member of the committee, and one of the outstanding advocates of fairness to the farmers of the country—that the committee has had the interests of farmers at heart. I, myself, claim a little credit along that line. For 30 years I have been voting for legislation to help the farmers of the country. As I have said heretofore, I voted for the original McNary-Haugen bill, which was going a good distance; but I never regretted doing so. I thought it was the best measure offered, and I never apologized for voting for the bill. Of course, at that time I was not a Member of this body. If I had been a Member of the Senate at the time, and had had the benefit of my very warm, intimate and delightful association with the author of the bill, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], I might have been even more enthusiastic for the bill than I was. But even in the House, where I was very well acquainted with the Member of the House who was one of the sponsors of the bill, Mr. Haugen, I with some enthusiasm and conviction voted for the McNary-Haugen bill; and all my life I have been an advocate of legislation to help the farmers of the country.

In the Committee on Banking and Currency we finally went further in the provisions for the benefit of agriculture than the farm organizations themselves had already advocated. So I think there is no evidence which would convict the Committee on Banking and Currency of any dereliction or any lack of enthusiasm or any hostility whatever toward the interests of the farmers of the United States.

We all studied psychology when we were in college, I am sure. The question here is not one of psychology. It is a question of the orderly procedure of legislation and the reference of bills to the committees having jurisdiction of them, and which should have jurisdiction of them. I suppose the Senator from Kansas means that, from a psychological standpoint, if the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry made the investigation and did nothing, then those who are complaining would be better satisfied with nothing coming from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry than they would be with nothing coming from the Committee on Banking and Currency. However, I do not think the question under consideration is a purely psychological one. We have to bring some form of order out of the legislative and parliamentary chaos which has grown up in regard to the reference of bills.

Let me show what the resolution would do. All of it refers to the manner in which the Office of Price Administration has administered the law which we passed. The fact that the resolution is limited to pork and beef and bakery products does not change the situation. It might have included shoes and clothing; it might have included everything upon which the Office of Price Administration has fixed a ceiling.

It begins:

Whereas the provisions of the act entitled "An act to aid in stabilizing the cost of living," approved October 2, 1942—

That is the second price control act which came out of the Committee on Banking and Currency—

And so forth. Then over on the next page:

Whereas the act known as the Emergency Price Control Act—

And so forth. Then further down:

Whereas on October 22, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued Maximum Price Regulation No.—

So-and-so; and—

Whereas said Maximum Price Regulation No. 148—

And so-and-so; and—

Whereas on December 10, 1942, the Office of Price Administration—

Did so-and-so; and—

Whereas on April 28, 1942, the Price Administrator—

Did so-and-so; and—

Whereas—

All the way through it—

The Price Administrator—

Or—

The Price Administration—

Has done something under the act that is a subject of protest from a large number of people in the country—and with whom I sympathize let me say to the Senator from Kansas and other Senators. The whole resolution is based upon the situation set out in the whereases; and then finally:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry * * * is hereby authorized and directed—

To investigate and study the policies and actions of the Office of Price Administration * * *.

So the whereases are forerunners of the resolution itself which orders the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to investigate the way in which the Office of Price Administration, created by a law which was enacted on report from the Committee on Banking and Currency, has conducted its affairs in the certain respects enumerated. If that is to be done, there certainly would be created such a situation that the Senate would never know how its future conduct would be charted.

I sympathize with the meat packers. Some of them have been in my office. In my State of Kentucky, as well as in other States, there are packers. Kentucky is not the location of large packers, but we have many small packers in Louisville, Covington, Newport, and various other localities in the State. I realize the hardship which is being done to them. They are being squeezed. I read the telegram which the Senator from Kansas had

placed in the RECORD. It is only a repetition of what certain of my constituents have told me in my office. So there is no dispute about the fact that the small packers have been squeezed. That condition has grown out of a situation for which the Office of Price Administration may not have been responsible originally. It may have been that the War Department and Navy Department, in the making of contracts with the large packers who are supplying the Army and Navy, have had some part in bringing about the situation which contributed to the condition complained of—not altogether responsible for it, but making some contribution to it.

However, regardless of that, and be that as it may, undoubtedly the small packers are in a bad way and are losing money. I have taken up the matter with the Office of Price Administration, first under Mr. Henderson and, since he has been out of office, under Mr. Brown; and I think that if they can find any formula under which they can remedy the situation they are anxious to do so. They have not as yet been able to find one.

I do not want to take the time of the Senate by discussing the matter further at this time, because I hope that the calendar may be called in a few minutes; but, in view of the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who I think desires to have a little something to say about the situation, I do not think any harm can come if the resolution goes over again. I hope the Senator from Kansas will agree that that may be done.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as I tried to say, I have none but the warmest feelings for the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The Senator from Kentucky has emphasized what I said: This matter has been running for months. The small processors of meat products which are essential to the welfare of the country have been going out of business and are going out of business every day and every week. I think this is a matter which should be disposed of.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a question. Undoubtedly the Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction of legislation amending the Price Control Act. I do not suppose that will be disputed. Does not the Senator think that if the investigation is made by the committee which sponsored the legislation, if it should find that the policies inaugurated under the legislation are not being carried out according to the intention of Congress, it would be more likely to report proposed legislation dealing with and correcting the situation than would another committee which has not had jurisdiction of the legislation?

Mr. REED. I do not. In the first place, the heart of the question is going to be the price of hogs and the relation of the price of hogs to the wholesale price of meat—not the retail price, but the wholesale price. I think that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry knows more about the price of hogs, and ought to know more about the price of hogs and its relationship to the price of meat, than does the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The investigation would be confined to subjects having to deal with price ceilings, with going market prices, with parity prices—all of which have always been considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the final judgment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has had weight with the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be that the individual members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry know more about the price of hogs than do the individual members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, although I doubt it. But in spite of any such superior knowledge on the part of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, it has never reported any measure dealing with the price of hogs. It has suggested legislation dealing with corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, and rice. I do not criticize it for not bringing in legislation dealing with hogs; because we all agree that the basic products should not have included cattle or hogs at the time when the Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed. However, I am not prepared to agree that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has any greater knowledge in regard to hogs than does the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There are a lot of hogs in the banking business.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to "hog" the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am through. I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request, if it is necessary, that the resolution go over without prejudice until Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. REED. What was the request, Mr. President?

Mr. BARKLEY. I asked that the resolution go over without prejudice until Thursday.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me inquire whether it is in order to move to postpone consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No motion relative to reference of the resolution is before the Senate at the present time; and a motion such as that to which the Senator from Kentucky has referred is in order.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if I have not done so, I was about to make a formal motion that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We have now, acting under a resolution which covers this very subject, appointed a subcommittee, and have subpenaed certain witnesses to come before us; and the identical matter is included in the resolution which the Senate adopted and under which we are acting. I am of opinion that meat is a part of the food of the Nation, and we are investigating the food situation—f-o-o-d, not f-o-o-l. We hope to have a hearing. If the resolution should go to any other committee, it would merely be cumulative of the work being done by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection, unless the Senator from South Carolina wishes to proceed further, I desire to say that I agree with the position taken by the Senator from Oregon. Any standing committee of the Senate has a right under, its own authority, to investigate any subject upon which it might bring in legislation. We do not have to authorize the Finance Committee to investigate taxes; we do not have to authorize, by resolution, the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate the banking and currency laws. The standing committees, practically all, if not all, of them, have been given an appropriation of $5,000 each to conduct investigations, and if any committee can show reason why it should have more, it, of course, will be given more. But the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on Banking and Currency, and every other committee has the right, without any specific resolution or authority, to investigate any subject over which it may have legislative jurisdiction.

Nobody can ever tell, when an investigation is inaugurated, whether it will result in legislation. We have investigations that do not result in legislation and we sometimes have legislation that results in investigations; but still the committee would have the right to go forward, according to what I understand was its action last Friday, and investigate the food situation and any collateral matter that might pertain to the food situation.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I agree with what the Senator from Kentucky has said and what the Senator from South Carolina has said, but this thought came to me: In the first place, if the Committee on Forestry is already doing the work, why have a resolution at all? If the resolution is adopted by the Senate, and another investigation is authorized, perhaps by the Committee on Banking and Currency, we would have two committees investigating identically the same thing. That is the reason I asked why the necessity for the resolution at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. I doubt the wisdom or necessity of it, but the point is this, if I may emphasize it: In our legislative course here and in the reference of bills and resolutions to committees we must try to preserve some order of sequence in the reference of bills and resolutions of various kinds. I think it would be a bad precedent to take this resolution or any other resolution proposing to investigate the administration of the price-administration laws from the committee that fathered the original legislation and

refer it to another committee. I should infinitely prefer that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry go ahead with its own investigation in its own way than to have a resolution investigating the O. P. A., which was promoted by the Banking and Currency Committee, taken away from that committee and by action of the Senate referred to another committee.

Mr. SMITH. The only thing which urged me to make a statement was the fact that the resolution is pending. The committee of which I am chairman is operating and has charge of the food situation. I am under the impression that meat comes in that category. Meat is becoming pretty scarce; the committee is investigating that very thing. As the Senator from Kentucky has said, it looks as if it is proposed rather to multiply investigations from different angles. I do not know but that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is in duty bound to find out what is the matter with all the miserable mess, for that is what it is. Almost every branch of the Government seems to want to regiment something; they want to deal things out, and now they have gotten down to the heels of women's shoes, which must not be more than so long, and all that kind of thing. Such actions have caused the American people to reach a point where they are just about ready to say, "All of you quit."

I cannot, for the life of me, see why a question of food should not be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I do not know that food is produced by chambers of commerce or in banking houses. I really think that the resolution of the Senator from Kansas would result in a duplication of what we are already doing.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Under what resolution is the Senator's committee now investigating?

Mr. SMITH. Under a resolution—I have forgotten its number—under which the committee is to go into all food products.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the able Senator, a subcommittee has been appointed by him as chairman to do, in connection with a number of other things, the very thing proposed by the resolution of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SMITH. To do the identical thing. We deal with transportation and its effect upon the price of food products; with processing; with the price paid the original producer and then the difference in price of the processor, the wholesaler, and the retailer. We want to get some line on what is being done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may do so, I move that the consideration of this resolution be postponed until next Thursday without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, am I to understand that the motion of the Senator from Kentucky takes precedence over the motion made by me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Kentucky takes precedence.

Mr. REED. Let me discuss the question for a moment.

I am somewhat surprised at the Senator from South Carolina. A constituent of his, a meat packer, sent me a telegram received by him from the Senator from South Carolina saying that the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had considered Senate Resolution 94 and desired that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who raised the question about an investigation already announced to be made by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that I submitted my resolution in advance of the public announcement made by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

If I had had that announcement before me possibly I would not have submitted the resolution; but it was presented at the request of numerous small business organizations representing small businesses which are being squeezed out of business. Starting with the President, continuing through the Cabinet, through various agencies, and including Members of the Senate and the House, if you please, we talk about small businessmen, and here are a number of small businessmen being squeezed out of business under a process that has been going on for months without anything being done about it. That is the reason the resolution was drafted and offered in the Senate.

Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that the committees are agencies of this body and nothing else. No committee has any jurisdiction except such as this body gives it. If this body says that the investigation should be conducted by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—and I think all the argument is that way—certainly no discourtesy would be done by the Senate to any subordinate agency of the Senate. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the roll is called, I inquire what is the question before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky to postpone the consideration of the pending question until Thursday. The clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Byrd | Guffey |
| Andrews | Capper | Gurney |
| Austin | Caraway | Hatch |
| Bailey | Clark, Idaho | Hawkes |
| Ball | Clark, Mo. | Hayden |
| Bankhead | Connally | Hill |
| Barkley | Danaher | Holman |
| Bilbo | Davis | Johnson, Colo. |
| Bridges | Downey | Kilgore |
| Brooks | Ferguson | La Follette |
| Buck | George | Langer |
| Burton | Gerry | Lodge |
| Bushfield | Gillette | Lucas |
| Butler | Green | McClellan |
| McFarland | Reed | Truman |
| McKellar | Revercomb | Tunnell |
| McNary | Reynolds | Tydings |
| Maloney | Robertson | Vandenberg |
| Maybank | Russell | Van Nuys |
| Millikin | Scrugham | Wagner |
| Moore | Shipstead | Wallgren |
| Nye | Smith | Walsh |
| O'Daniel | Stewart | Wherry |
| O'Mahoney | Thomas, Idaho | White |
| Overton | Thomas, Okla. | Wiley |
| Pepper | Thomas, Utah | Willis |
| Radcliffe | Tobey | Wilson |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are conducting hearings in Puerto Rico on behalf of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky. The yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky will state his inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. The vote will come on my motion to postpone the consideration of the resolution of the Senator from Kansas until Thursday, will it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct, to postpone the consideration of the resolution until Thursday.

Mr. BARKLEY. If my motion shall be agreed to, then the resolution will be laid before the Senate automatically Thursday, if the Senate shall adjourn until Thursday, at the end of the routine morning business, just as it has been today?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be laid before the Senate just before the conclusion of the routine morning business, just as it was today.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate more than a moment or two to express my views as to the reference which should be made of the resolution of the Senator from Kansas.

I think that the subject matter touched upon by the resolution involves one of the most serious questions now

confronting the American people. In my opinion, it involves a situation which in the very near future is likely very seriously to affect the food supply of the United States. Since it involves the disposition entirely of agricultural products, and since it does involve the food supply not only for the civilians of the United States, but for the armed forces of the United States, in my opinion the reference of the resolution should be to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the committee which has been specially charged over a long period of time with jurisdiction of the production, marketing, and distribution of agricultural products.

What has happened in this situation is that the O. P. A., through a lack of understanding of the agricultural problem, by putting a ceiling on processed agricultural products and not on the production of agricultural products, has brought about a situation which in the immediate future is likely to put out of business all the processors engaged in processing agricultural products, taken in connection with the practice of the Government in issuing mandatory orders which have to be filled, even though they are filled at a loss.

It is entirely true that the O. P. A. was the putative child—and I say "putative" because everyone knows it was not the actual child—of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Everyone knows that the child was the product of the brain of Mr. Ginsberg, whose services were too valuable to the O. P. A. to permit him to go into the Army, as a man of his age would ordinarily be expected to do. That being true, the Committee on Banking and Currency has a shadow of claim to jurisdiction of the resolution; but the purpose of the resolution is to get something done for the agricultural interests of the United States, and that includes the producers as well as the processors.

I suggest that the way to get something done to correct the present situation is to refer the resolution to a committee which is interested in agricultural production, rather than to a committee which, as I have said, is the putative parent of the O. P. A., and therefore is naturally interested in trying to show that it did not make a mistake in the law as it was originally passed.

I say that any one member of this body who is interested in having something done to correct the present situation should vote to refer the resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and not to postpone consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate very long in the discussion of the resolution offered by the Senator from Kansas, which is now before the Senate for determination. I am as much interested in the packers' problems as is any other Senator on the floor at the present time. Many of the problems of the small packers have come across my desk, and I have attempted, in my limited way, to contact O. P. A. and other officials in Washington with the view toward having those packers given some relief.

Mr. President, that is not what disturbs me at this moment. We have heard from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who says point blank, and without any equivocation, that the question covered by the resolution is now being considered and discussed by a subcommittee which has been appointed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It should be sufficient for the Members of the Senate that this very problem is now being discussed and investigated and debated by a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

What disturbs me is that the Members of the Senate, at least a great number of them, are constantly complaining about the duplication of effort, the duplication of authority, and the lack of an organized program in the bureaus of the executive branch of the Government. Yet, here on the floor of the Senate, in our own body, there is a discussion consuming almost an hour and a half over a resolution covering a subject which is now being considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. What interests me about the resolution more than anything else is that it specifies two products which are to be investigated, when our committee proposes to investigate the whole field affecting food. If we take the resolution up and it shall be agreed to, we will specify and give preference to two products, which I do not think are more important than others.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his contribution. The resolution under which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is now investigating is all-inclusive. It does not cover merely two particular subjects in which some Senator may be interested because he lives in a particular section of the country, and because that problem involved commands his interest. The resolution to which the Senator from South Carolina referred covers the entire field, as he has so ably said.

So, Mr. President, here we are, wasting an hour and a half—and we did the same thing last Thursday—on a resolution which in my opinion has no place whatsoever before the Senate, because it is cumulative, it will do no good, whether it goes to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Its reference will make no difference, because the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is now in the course of an investigation of the entire subject.

I wish to elaborate upon what the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the minority leader, has said with respect to this kind of a resolution.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I have examined the general resolutions applying to committees which have come before the committee, and I believe I know what each committee's duties are with respect to investigations. I have examined the resolution which is now before the Senate. In my opinion, there is no question that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has, under the general resolution authorizing it to hold hearings, which has hertofore been adopted, full and complete authority to do the very things contemplated by the resolution now before the Senate. Similar investigations have been made many times. If the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry desires the Secretary of Agriculture to come before the committee and testify upon any question that we agree should be investigated, he will do so. Such a thing has been done many times without the adoption of a special resolution.

I am as much interested in this question as is any other Senator on the floor, but what I am complaining about is the fact that we as members of the Senate stand here constantly condemning bureaus and bureaucrats because of their duplication of authority and because of their bungling efforts, yet here we ourselves have a perfect case of bungling in the submission of this resolution and the taking up of the time we have taken here on two different occasions to debate it.

So far as I am concerned, I do not care to what committee the resolution is referred. It ought to go into the waste basket. That is where it belongs, so far as doing any good is concerned, because the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is doing more, under the general resolution adopted with respect to that committee, than can possibly be done under the specific resolution now before the Senate.

### THE RECENT RUSSIAN VICTORIES

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, dispatches last night and today bring the news and the confirmation that the Russian city of Rostov, heretofore in the hands of the Nazis, has capitulated, and that Russian forces are now in possession of that strategic point.

Late news dispatches also reveal that Russian forces are rapidly investing Kharkov, another industrial and commercial center to the north of Rostov, now and for the recent past a center of German supplies and munitions and activities.

Mr. President, I simply wish to take a few moments of the Senate's time to express a message of admiration to the Russian people for the heroic and gallant conduct of the Russian armies. The winter season has presented many difficulties to military campaigns, but notwithstanding these natural impediments the Russian forces have moved forward and driven back the lines of the invaders to what they say are "new positions," but in doing so, the Russians have redeemed large territories of Russian soil, and have no doubt stiffened and increased the granite resistance of the Russian people until they will be encouraged and stimulated to greater and more heroic efforts to carry the war to a successful conclusion.

Russia has amazed the United Nations. There were many who believed that under the impact of the hammer blows of the Axis, Russia would collapse for

lack of organized industrial power and for lack of military training and stamina, but Russia, throughout the entire campaign, from the time of the initial attack to this moment, has revealed an astounding ability for the organization of her industry and the supplying of her vast forces. She has likewise similarly astounded the people of the United Nations by her military organization, by her strategy, and by all the elements of warfare upon a grand scale.

I am gratified to know that American supplies and munitions are now reaching the Soviets in a larger volume than they have for a considerable period in the past. The details of that situation cannot be properly discussed here, but our convoys are now reaching Arctic ports with much smaller losses than they have in the months which have preceded.

Mr. President, not alone have the Russians shown unflagging resistance to the invader but they have been able, through their gallant attacks, their heroic campaigns, not alone to arrest the invader but to drive him back toward his own boundaries.

I wish to say a further word regarding Russia. Mr. President, Russia's domestic policies and internal institutions are not the proper concern of the United States to the extent of intervention or interference with those institutions. Whether we like them or whether we do not like them, it is not a matter for the United States to undertake to determine for Russia her political institutions or her economic system. We must remember that Russia is relatively a new nation. The Soviet Republic's form of government has been in existence for only a quarter of a century, and she has behind her only 25 years of development and advancement, but I think it will be the judgment of history that during that time Russia has shown to the world a power of self-government—a power of caring for her resources and ability to organize her industry—that few of us realized in the years that are gone.

So while I do not subscribe, as I know most Senators do not subscribe, to the political concept of Russia and her people, my own hope is that God may grant her strength to develop her institutions in a manner suited to the needs of her own people and to enable her to meet her international obligations as she shall be forced to meet them in the future into which we look.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Texas has just stated, entirely accurately in my judgment, that Russia in her resistance has amazed the United Nations. I know the Senator will agree with me that she has not only amazed the United Nations, but she has amazed Germany as well, and I think Germany will be even more amazed at the wonderful progress of Russian armies than United Nations are.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the eminent Senator from Tennessee for his observation. I have no doubt that Germany and her master, Hitler, at the moment that German armies swept across the Russian frontier in their campaign of invasion and conquest, believed that Russia within a few weeks would suffer the same fate that befell Poland in 1939 when the German infantry and panzer divisions poured over the plains of that unhappy country. I think Germany had a concept that Russia was a great inert, unorganized mass which would succumb to the organized military power, the organized military strategy of the great machine which has swept over the face of Europe and crushed under its feet practically every nation on the continent of Europe that did not subscribe to the policies and did not accept the suzerainty of the German authority and power.

Mr. President, I wish to say that Russia, great nation that she is, with 160,000,000 people, sovereign over vast areas both in Europe and in Asia, cannot be ignored in post-war arrangements and in consideration of what shall follow victory by the United Nations.

There are those who seek now to bring about an arrangement among the United Nations as to what shall immediately follow peace. Mr. President, my own view is that the most that can be accomplished along those lines at the moment is simply an agreement upon a few general policies, a few general principles, that shall actuate the United Nations when victory is achieved. It is manifestly impossible for us to peer into the uncertain dramas of the future in detail and to settle definitely now the various and multitudinous issues which shall come before the peace conference.

However, what I rose to say, as a citizen of the United States, if my voice can be heard by any Russian citizen, or any representative of the Russian Government, is that I believe that by her sword Russia has earned the right to be consulted at the peace table. She has earned her right to stand among the great powers of the earth and have her voice heard in whatever arrangements may take place when victory shall have been accomplished by the United Nations.

Mr. President, the collapse in part of the German forces in South Russia and, I hope, in the Caucasus, is one of the encouraging and stimulating things which have recently been brought to our attention. I wish to salute Russia, the great leadership of her armies, and the striking power which has enabled them to drive back the greatest military machine that modern times have known.

Mr. President, when the Soviet Union was first established it seemed that Russia then had some ambitions of propaganda among other nations, to convert them to her political concepts. However, my information is that that movement has been abandoned and that no longer will she undertake, at least in the United States, to press those concepts. I have no fear of the Russians undermining or attacking the institutions of the United States. I welcome her comradeship in arms in this titanic struggle in which she and her armies have played so valiant and so heroic a part.

## SHORTAGE OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, New England, and particularly Massachusetts, is at this time suffering the dire consequences of an acute shortage of all petroleum products. I regret to say that much of this suffering is due to the public confidence in promises made by various governmental agencies which have had to do with oil. I am advised that a series of contradictory regulations, imposed one upon another, has baffled the public, prevented the fair functioning of the oil industry, and caused one of the greatest disasters which this section of the country has ever faced. There is an extreme difference between the suffering, privation, or self-discipline imposed by war conditions and the misery caused by departmental stupidity, lackadaisical action, and unplanned, unthought-out, unworkable rules and regulations. New England, and particularly Massachusetts, always has been and always will be willing to make any sacrifices necessary when fundamental principles and the winning of the war are involved. But New England will not willingly be nailed, drawn, and quartered on the rack of administrative incompetence.

Last May the present oil shortage was forecast by men of practical experience in the oil industry. One of them, Joseph F. White, president of the White Fuel Co., evolved a plan which depended upon tank car movements from the oil fields into New England. Backed by representatives of every major oil company in New England, he tried to convince officials of O. P. A., O. P. C., O. D. T., and W. P. B. that immediate action was necessary. That was in May. In June, July, August, September, and October he and other oil men together made a series of trips and visited the bureaucracies which control oil from the moment it leaves the ground until it reaches the consumer. Their visits were in vain. The White plan went into effect in November.

I became alarmed at the oil situation last August, and after considerable study I introduced a bill to have placed under one man definite control of the whole petroleum situation. That bill did not become law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of the bill which I introduced, which would establish a single Petroleum Administrator. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD following the bill a statement which I made at that time explaining the proposal.

There being no objection, the bill and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Emergency Petroleum Act of 1942."

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act, unless the context otherwise indicates—

(a) The term "Administrator" means the National Petroleum Administrator.

(b) The term "petroleum" means petroleum and motor vehicle fuels, fuel oils, and other fuels produced from petroleum.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created and established an agency of the United States to be known as the National Petroleum Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "Administration"). At the head of the Administration there shall be a National Petroleum Administrator, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive a salary at the rate of $10,000 a year. The Administrator shall have no other vocation or employment and shall have no financial interest in any enterprise with which he transacts business in his official capacity.

SEC. 4. The Administrator shall employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and shall make such expenditures, as may be necessary for carrying out his functions and the functions of the Administration. The Administrator is authorized to accept gifts or loans of real and personal property and to utilize voluntary and uncompensated services. With the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, any officer or employee of any department or agency of the Government may be assigned to assist in the work of the Administration. Any function of the Administrator may be exercised by such officers or employees of the Administration as he may designate for that purpose.

SEC. 5. (a) The following functions are hereby transferred to and vested in the Administrator:

(1) All functions of the Office of Petroleum Coordinator for War.

(2) All functions of the War Production Board and its Chairman, of the Price Administrator, and of the Office of Defense Transportation, relating to the production, transportation, distribution, sale, or price of petroleum.

(b) The Petroleum Conservation Division of the Department of the Interior is hereby transferred to the Administration and shall perform its functions within the Administration subject to the direction and control of the Administrator. All powers and duties of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the functions performed by such Division are hereby transferred to and vested in the Administrator.

(c) The Administrator is authorized to formulate and require the execution of such policies, programs, and measures as he deems necessary to provide for the coordination of the functions of departments and agencies of the Government relating in any manner to the production, transportation, distribution, sale, or price of petroleum and to provide for the execution of such functions in such manner as the Administrator deems best. All officers and agencies of the Government authorized to perform any such functions shall, in performing such functions, conform to such policies, programs, measures, and requirements as the Administrator may prescribe in the execution of the powers vested in him by this subsection.

(d) The Administration is authorized to direct the manner in which and the purpose for which transportation facilities available for the transportation of petroleum shall be used, and shall have authority to direct the shipment of any petroleum to any particular destination.

SEC. 6. (a) Such personnel and property (including office equipment and records) of the various departments and agencies of the Government as have been employed in the execution of the functions transferred to the Administrator or the Administration by this Act and as may be determined by the President shall be transferred to the Administration upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe.

(b) Such appropriations or other funds as have been available for expenditure in the execution of the functions so transferred by this Act and as may be determined by the President shall be transferred to the Administrator on such date or dates as the President may prescribe, and shall be available for expenditure by the Administrator in carrying out his functions and the functions of the Administration.

SEC. 7. The Administrator is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to delegate to any department or agency of the Government any of the functions vested in the Administrator. Any functions so delegated shall be performed by such department or agency upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator may determine. The Administrator is authorized to reimburse, out of any funds available for expenditure by him, any such department or agency for expenses incurred in the performance of such functions.

SEC. 8. All rules, regulations, orders, and requirements issued or made in the exercise of any function transferred by this act, and in effect when this section takes effect, shall continue in effect until modified, terminated, superseded, set aside, or repealed by the Administrator, by any court of competent jurisdiction or by operation of law.

SEC. 9. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations and to make and issue such orders and directives as may be necessary for carrying out his functions.

SEC. 10. Such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 11. The provisions of sections 5 and 8 of this act shall take effect on the tenth day after the date of its enactment.

SEC. 12. This act shall cease to be in effect upon the termination of 6 months after the end of the present war, or upon such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

---

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

I am today introducing a bill to establish the Office of National Petroleum Administrator. This bill seeks to remedy several defects in the present system, and in particular to meet three major criticisms of our present petroleum policy.

1. This bill sets up a Nation-wide control in place of the present sectional control which is confined to 17 Eastern States.

2. It sets up a unified authority replacing the present divided authority which has led so many people to complain that they were victims of "passing the buck." The mayors of Massachusetts and a great many of the petroleum dealers have strongly expressed themselves as favoring the unified control of this great problem.

3. It confers a grant of power sufficiently broad to enable the Government to compel petroleum shipments into critical areas.

I believe the need for Nation-wide control is already apparent to many people and will be apparent to the entire Nation within a short space of time. I understand that it is by no means certain that the Middle West will continue to enjoy an abundance of petroleum products. Moreover, the need to conserve rubber is just as great in one section of the country as it is in another, and control of petroleum is a practical way to conserve rubber. I believe that Nation-wide control not only appeals to one's sense of fairness and justice, and that it not only would meet a criticism which is being voiced within the rationed area, but that it would be definitely in the interests of the Nation as a whole.

In a telegram to me of recent date, Mr. Joseph B. Eastman, Coordinator of Defense Transportation, stated that the oil shortage was "not a matter to be controlled alone through distribution of tank cars, because neither the railroads nor I can bring buyers and sellers together nor require shippers to make consignments to a particular destination."

This message makes it clear that there is at present a lack of authority to compel oil shipments. Although the granting of such authority might normally be repugnant to our notions of free enterprise, we are confronting an emergency which justifies the taking of effective steps to see to it that people in our Northern States do not grow cold during the winter, and that essential war industries in all the rationed States are enabled to continue war production. I believe this is a proper delegation of power in time of war.

I introduce this bill with the hope that it will be enacted into law, and in the belief that in any event it sets up a standard to which those of us who are so vitally interested in the petroleum situation can repair. Obviously it would be much quicker if this same object were to be achieved by action of the executive branch. I still hope that this may be the case. This bill, however, represents the thoughts of a great many people who are vitally concerned with this problem.

In the final analysis this bill centralizes control and definitely places responsibility on a very vital concern of the home front.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on September 4, 1942, I addressed a letter to the President of the United States in which I called his attention to the seriousness of the situation. I received a reply under date of October 1, 1942, in which the President agreed with my contention that the control of the entire oil problem should be unified under one agency. I ask to have a copy of my letter, together with the reply from the President, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 4, 1942.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
*President of the United States,*
*The White House, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Only the seriousness of the problem would justify me in taking your precious time with a letter, and I would not think of doing so unless the matter about which I write carried such a grave threat to our program for the production of weapons.

I refer to the impending shortage of fuel oil in New England. This shortage will not only threaten the health of all people who must live in a cold-weather climate, but it menaces the many industries in this section which need fuel oil in order to manufacture weapons. The seriousness of these two dangers must not be minimized. In studying this question, and in conferring with the numerous agencies of the Government having to do with it, I have been led to the conclusion that, while the shortage is real, its effects could be considerably reduced if two principal things were done:

First. Unify the control of this problem under one head instead of distributing the authority, as is now the case, among a number of different Federal agencies.

Second. Institute a Nation-wide rationing or conservation plan so that amounts of fuel oil now being used for nonessential purposes in other parts of the country could be made available to this section.

In order to accomplish this purpose, I have drafted legislation which confers additional authority on the Executive. I enclose a copy of the bill and would be deeply obliged to get your reaction.

I recognize that legislative action is slow and that many of the things embodied in this bill could be done by you without legis-

lation. I hope that you will take cognizance of this important matter and act early so as to avert the dangers which threaten New England and which have such grave implications to the Nation as a whole.

With assurances of my esteem and high regard,

Faithfully and respectfully yours,

H. C. LODGE, Jr.

---

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, October 1, 1942.*

Hon. H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE: I have read with much interest your letter of September 4, and the enclosed copy of S. 2716, a bill to establish a National Petroleum Administration, which you have introduced in the Senate.

I share your view that governmental control and direction of the problem of petroleum supply should be centralized in a single agency. An intensive study has been under way for some time to determine the type of organization best suited to accomplish this objective and so designed as to fit into the over-all pattern of organization of the war agencies. A decision on this matter may be expected within the near future.

Since statutory powers already exist to create, by Executive order, an agency with adequate power and responsibility to deal with the oil problem, I do not think that new legislation in this field is necessary at this time.

Steps have already been taken to ration fuel oil in the States on the Atlantic seaboard and in the Midwest in order to distribute the available supplies equitably among all affected. Affirmative action has also been taken to increase both the production of fuel oil and the ability of our transportation system to move such oil to the areas of shortage.

I have been assured by the agencies that are primarily concerned that there will be adequate fuel oil supplies for all military and essential industrial requirements, and that all possible measures are being effected to minimize the shortage of fuel oil for civilian consumption.

I appreciate your interest in this matter and I am glad to have had the opportunity to express to you my views on it.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. LODGE. In his reply the President stated that he thought the idea of a unified petroleum administration was good, and thanked me for my interest. However, nothing was done, until December 3 when, at long last, Mr. Ickes was given some of the authority that he needed. I say some of the authority, because he still has not enough power to do the things which he knows should be done.

I spoke of contradictory regulations. Let us look at the record. Originally, the Office of Price Administration conceived the beautiful theory—and I use the word "theory" advisedly—that in order to ration the New England public to 75 percent of the amount of oil consumed last year they would freeze the industry and allow oil companies to sell 75 percent of the amount sold last year to their respective customers. This policy resulted also in freezing the customers. If a major oil company, for example, sold to a number of oil marketers a certain amount of petroleum products in the fall of 1941 and the spring of 1942, then he could this year sell but 75 percent of that amount in the fall of 1942 and the spring of 1943.

The public, through various rationing boards, were given coupons. These coupons were supposed to represent about 75 percent of the amount of oil each consumer used in the last heating season. That rule, of course, did not work. Some companies had gone out of business. Their customers could get no oil from anybody under that ruling. Some oil companies discriminated in favor of their better customers; and so the O. P. A. changed the rule. It promulgated another rule 3 weeks ago. The new rule stated that any person with money and coupons would have to receive oil. Chaos followed the rule. A small oil company which bought its oil from a major company and which had depended upon the major company for supplies for years was told that no longer could it be sold its supplies.

So the picture changed for the worse. Small independent oil marketing were forced to drive their trucks from one major oil company to another major oil company in the hope—often a vain hope—that they could buy oil for their customers. About half the time they could not buy anything. The cupboard was bare. On February 3 that order was revoked. As if those conditions were not enough to drive oil marketers and consumers to the belief that they were the forgotten people of this country, the Petroleum Administration for War issued a decree in December setting forth a list of priorities which, said P. A. W., must be provided with oil. These priorities naturally included hospitals, transportation companies, and all departments having to do with the public safety and public health. The utilities of necessity were listed on this priority scale. So the major oil companies found themselves facing a fine of $10,000 from W. P. B. if they did not sell their product to those on the priority list established by W. P. B. They faced another fine from O. P. A. if they refused to sell oil to anyone who proffered coupons and cash. Orders and cancelations of orders came too fast. Rules clashed, confusion resulted and still continues.

I ask, in all fairness, how any honest, intelligent human being or industry could operate under such conditions.

Those are only the most recent examples of bungling. Let us go back to the time when the O. P. A. announced that coupons would be good for 10 gallons. They are no longer worth 10 gallons; they are worth 8 gallons. Let us think back to October 13. At that time the Governors of the six New England States came to Washington and consulted with Mr. Ickes and with the President of the United States. Mr. Ickes told them that they would receive 75 percent of last year's consumption. What the President told them I do not know. All I can say is that the Governors said they were very optimistic after having talked with the President; so it is reasonable to assume that he reassured them.

It must be remembered that such technicalities as "degree days" and the relationship of "degree days" to the consumption of oil are technical matters about which the New England public has had no cause to be concerned. "Degree day" is a technical expression. It means the number of degrees on any day below 65°. If, for example, the temperature on any given day averaged 30°, that day would be a 35° day. Oil companies use the "degree day" system and know when customers' tanks are empty. The practical public knows only that the colder the weather the more oil they burn, which is enough for them to be concerned about. So when O. P. A. blithely announced that the public would receive 75 percent of its last year's consumption, a few commented that the season of 1941 and 1942 was about 10 percent warmer than average. The authorities either knew or should have known that 1941-42 was not a normal year and that by promising 75 percent they aroused false hopes on the part of the public.

Let me put it another way. The last heating season was a 90-percent heating season. Seventy-five percent of 90 meant that the public, at most, would receive only 66 percent of the oil it needed for a normal year. O. P. A. founded its rationing plan on what it thought was the rock of temperature, but it knew, or should have known, that actually it founded the rationing plan on the shifting sands of New England's varying temperatures.

So far—to make conditions worse—the winter in Massachusetts is 12 percent colder than normal. Rationing coupons for the present heating period have been cut in value from 10 gallons to 8 gallons, a reduction of 20 percent. Hence, the public who looked with confidence to our Government and who naturally expected to receive 75 percent of their normal oil requirements have found—what? They have found that they have coupons for only 50 percent of the oil they need in order to keep warm for the remainder of the winter. There is no assurance that they will receive even that much oil.

At this point let me take up the question of conversions. People were urged to convert their heating plants from oil to coal.

They made inquiry and found there were no parts available. Later the W. P. B. made available some iron with which to make grates. Gradually the public started again to take heart. But on October 14 O. P. A. got busy. On that date a ceiling price was placed on grates. Grates at the foundry were priced at 11 cents a pound. The wholesalers bought the grates from the foundry at 11 cents. But O. P. A. put a ceiling price on the wholesalers, too. That ceiling price was 13.75 cents a pound—a so-called profit of 2¾ cents a pound. For that sum the wholesaler was supposed to truck the grates from the freight yard to his warehouse, inventory them, sell them, and pay the freight on them when he sold them. The wholesalers lost money on every transaction. So they stopped handling them. People who wanted to convert could not get the necessary parts.

That ceiling price lasted from October 14 to November 26—during the very 6 weeks when conversions would have been made. So, on the one hand, people were urged to convert, and then price ceilings made it impossible for them to get the parts. Meantime, O. P. A. officials kept repeating that the public would get 75 percent of its oil. The price ceiling was lifted to 15.75 cents a pound to the wholesaler only after cold weather had set in. Planned economy!

I believe that the people have the right to look to their Government for help in time of crisis. Those who did look to their Government for help were sadly misled. But let us go on.

It is tragic but true that if the disaster now confronting Massachusetts and New England could better be seen, more help from the Federal Government would be forthcoming. I know how the American people react to a visible catastrophe. When the Mississippi overflowed its banks and people were driven from their homes, the generosity of the American public sent food and clothing and materials to the flood victims. But the tragedy in New England is not visible. It is hidden behind the four walls of each home. A temperature of 65°, as was promised by the O. P. A., might be comfortable, but temperatures running in thousands of homes as low as 50° are not comfortable or conducive to health. These low temperatures have caused sickness and hardship and suffering. But the tragedies cannot be seen.

Let me speak for a moment about the 500,000 persons in New England who depend upon kerosene for their only fuel. Kerosene is distributed by peddlers. The peddlers buy their kerosene from an oil company and peddle it up and down the streets. The families to whom they sell the kerosene usually buy 5 gallons at a time, enough to last a day or 2, depending upon the weather. But in Boston, Lowell, Lawrence, Brockton, Fall River, New Bedford, and other of our communities the peddlers were unable to get the kerosene they needed in order to take care of their customers. For weeks in October and November the peddlers were instructed by O. P. A. not to take oil coupons from their customers. They were told to accept promises that the coupons would be given to them later. The reason is simple—the coupons were not then available. The rationing boards did not have them. After between fifteen and eighteen million gallons of kerosene had been sold the coupons became available. The consumers went to the rationing boards and got their coupons. Many of the peddlers are of foreign extraction. So are many of their customers. Many of the peddlers cannot read or write and are unable to digest ever-changing rules, and say so frankly. Neither can many of their customers. So we have the picture of a situation developed by O. P. A. where a peddler, unable to read or write, or harassed by complex procedure, was supposed to get from a customer who could neither read nor write a promise that when coupons were available he would turn them over to the peddler. The result, of course, was chaos. Some customers refused to pay the peddler for kerosene and said the Government would do it. Some refused to give their coupons to the peddler in spite of their promises. Coupons worth 15,000,000 gallons of petroleum products are still floating around. I have been told, although I do not know it of my own personal knowledge, that there is a black market on them now.

Meantime, however, someone conceived the idea of shipping oil, both kerosene and furnace oil, in steel drums which hold 53 or 54 gallons. The drums could be packed in freight cars. Each freight car—and there are still enough freight cars available, although tank cars are short—could be packed with 195 drums. So packed, each boxcar could carry about 10,000 gallons of precious oil. That is as much as even the largest tank cars can handle. The Army had thousands of those drums, and were not using them.

At first the idea was pooh-poohed. Then it was said that the cost would be too great. As though cost should be allowed to matter. Finally it was agreed that the Defense Supplies Corporation would pay the extra freight and handling charge. So some freight cars were shipped full of kerosene oil. They arrived in Boston, and 20 of them were unloaded on a specially built unloading platform. It was zero weather. Because of those 20 cars, some 40,000 families received 5 gallons of kerosene—a whole day's supply. I hope there is a thought there that the authorities here will develop and take prompt advantage of.

Now comes the other side of the picture. The Defense Supplies Corporation now refuses to pay the extra charges. Oil dealers find themselves unable to collect for the costs. Is this America?

Let me stress the importance of this matter not only in regard to the people who live in New England and whose health and the welfare of whose children depends upon an adequate supply of fuel oil, but from the standpoint of war production; because in the area where I live a very large war industry is located.

In Massachusetts and, I believe, in other sections of New England, a great many plants making goods that are needed by the armed forces have been forced to curtail operations and in some cases to stop.

It is incidental that schools have been closed in 17 different communities in Massachusetts. Only by the dint of the greatest ingenuity and effort have some essential war industries been kept operating. That picture is bad enough, but when I say to the Senate that bowling alleys, country clubs, and other nonessential plants have been furnished petroleum for heating while our war industries have been in danger of closing, and in some cases have been closed, because of lack of fuel oil, Senators can see for themselves the absence of foresight and brains on the part of the bureaucracies involved in this petroleum mess.

Even institutions such as hospitals have been in danger of closing. I cannot understand why some form of priority has not been evolved for the utilization of fuel oil just as in the case of every other material resource of war.

Vainly did I plead with W. P. B. to have petroleum placed on priority just as are steel, copper, manganese, rubber, and other war essentials. This war is being fought for and by petroleum. Yet we have the picture of the War Production Board—notice the word "War"—and the Petroleum Administrator for War—again note the word "War"—saying that the war was responsible for the shortage of oil for heating. It is said the military authorities unexpectedly seized the supply of petroleum destined for New England. I talked with the military, and they said: "If the choice is between the homes of New England and the troops of north Africa, we will give your people every consideration. But as long as it is a question as between pleasure resorts and the troops in north Africa, the troops in north Africa will come first." I agree; I cannot disagree.

Mr. President, in the name of New England, and particularly in the name of my own State, Massachusetts, I ask that 1,500 more tank cars be assigned immediately to bring heating oil into New England. In the name of Massachusetts, I ask that all nonessential buildings burning oil for heat be denied oil until this crises is over. In the name of Massachusetts, I ask that more 53-gallon drums of oil be shipped in box cars from the oil fields into New England. In the name of Massachusetts, I ask that inventories be published daily or weekly so the public may know what to expect. In the name of Massachusetts, I ask that the minimum essential civilian needs be met forthwith, to the end that the suffering of mothers and children may cease, and that our war work may be maintained.

### MERGER OF TELEGRAPH COMPANIES—AUTHORITY TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to file a conference report on Senate bill 158 during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session. The request is made solely for the personal convenience of the Senator from Arizona. I desire to be out of town on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me say that it is hoped, or at least the Senate conferees hope, that a complete agreement with respect to the bill will be reached at a conference to be held this afternoon. I understood that the Senator from Arizona desires to leave town for a short while, and that his request contemplated only permission to file the report during the recess or adjournment of the Senate, if the report should be agreed upon this afternoon.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

### RESCINDING OF 3-PERCENT INCREASE IN AGRICULTURAL FREIGHT RATES—STATEMENT BY FRED BRENCKMAN

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a summary of a statement made before the Interstate Commerce Commission by Mr. Fred

Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange. Mr. Brenckman made the statement in support of the application by the National Grange and other farm groups to have rescinded the 3-percent increase in railroad freight rates on agricultural products, which went into effect March 18, 1942.

While I have the floor, I wish to state that I am in complete accord with the position taken and the statement made by Mr. Brenckman. The railroads today are receiving the highest revenues in their history. I call attention to Mr. Brenckman's statement that operating revenues for the first 11 months of 1942 increased 39 percent over the corresponding period in 1941, that passenger revenues increased 97 percent, and that net income increased 41 percent.

I also call attention to the fact that after the I. C. C. order allowing the 3-percent increase in agricultural rates went into effect, a transportation tax of 3 percent was levied under the 1942 Revenue Act, making the increase in effect 6 percent. I cannot see the reason for the 3-percent increase in freight rates on farm commodities when manifestly the railroads do not need the revenue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In appearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission on behalf of the National Grange, in January 1942, with reference to the petition of the railroads for a 10-percent increase in freight and passenger rates, we opposed any increase in the freight rates on agricultural commodities but offered no objections to an increase in passenger rates.

We were perfectly sensible of the fact that the increase in wages for railroad workers recommended by the mediators appointed by the President would call for increased revenues on the part of the carriers. However, we expressed the opinion that the increase in traffic of all kinds occasioned by the war emergency would provide ample revenue to meet the situation. We also had in mind the fact that passenger traffic would reach new high levels, and that an increase of 10 percent in passenger fares would probably produce hundreds of millions of dollars in added revenue.

As figures of the Interstate Commerce Commission itself so conclusively demonstrate, these expectations have been fully realized. The record shows that the operating revenues of the railroads for the first 11 months of 1942 amounted to more than $6,763,000,000, as compared with $4,867,000,000, for the same period in 1941. This represented an increase of 39 percent. During the first 11 months of 1942 the revenues derived from passenger traffic rose to $909,000,000, compared with $460,818,000 in the first 11 months of 1941. This represents an increase of more than 97 percent. Comparing November 1941 with November 1942, the increase in revenues from passenger traffic amounted to more than 166 percent.

After paying all operating expenses and making allowance for tax accruals, the carriers had a net income of $1,473,762,000 during the first 11 months of 1942. This was an increase of more than 41 percent as compared with the previous 11 months.

We hold that it is not in accord with sound public policy for the railroads to earn so much in excess of all their expenses. While freight and passenger rates should, of course, be compensatory, the excess earnings of the roads under present conditions cannot be justified.

One of the most important battles we have to fight on the home front is the battle against inflation. The Government has set up elaborate machinery to protect the country against the evils of inflation, but in spite of all the efforts that have thus far been put forth, prices continue to rise and the inflationary spiral threatens the well-being and security of every man, woman, and child in the country.

Higher transportation rates are naturally reflected in the price of commodities transported. Higher transportation costs also reduce the net returns of agriculture. The farmer pays freight rates both ways, and he is hit both coming and going by the higher rates that are now in effect.

The farther the farmer lives from market, the more he is penalized by higher transportation rates. As an illustration of the hardships under which agricultural producers on the Pacific slope are laboring, it should be kept in mind that the intercoastal steamship service has been discontinued. To clearly illustrate what this means, let me quote just a few preemergency intercoastal steamship rates and compare them with current railroad rates in carload lots: Wool in bags, $1.18 per hundred pounds, and $2.40; canned fruits and vegetables, 58 cents and $1.08; dried fruits, 69 cents and $1.28; eggs, $1.50 and $1.91; apples, $1.10 and $1.25; rye grass seed, 60 cents and $1.03; agricultural implements other than hand, 77 cents and $1.98; wheat to Savannah, Ga., $6 per net ton and $22.20 per ton. Steamship rates quoted apply from principal Pacific ports to principal Atlantic ports of the United States, and rail rates except on wheat, apply from north Pacific terminals to New York City and related points.

In addition to this, it is pertinent to say that since the 3-percent increase in freight rates on agricultural commodities took effect, under the present revenue act a 3-percent tax on all transportation of property within the United States was levied. To all practical intents and purposes this amounts to the same thing as a 6-percent increase in rates on agricultural commodities.

The task devolving upon the American farmer in this hour of crisis is to produce the food and fiber needed to feed and clothe our armed forces and the civilian population, besides making up the deficiencies of our allies. This is a huge responsibility, and the farmer is already laboring under many severe handicaps, including the most acute shortage of labor in our agricultural history. He is short of equipment and supplies, and the returns he receives for his products are insufficient to enable him to compete with the war industries for skilled and competent labor. Rescinding the 3-percent increase in freight rates which is now in effect would materially assist agriculture in achieving the production goals that have been set by the Government itself.

In recognition of the supreme importance of maximum production of meat, dairy, and poultry products, in particular, prices of corn and wheat have been fixed to bring these grains within easier reach of the livestock producer, the feeder, the dairyman, and the poultryman.

According to an inventory made by the Department of Agriculture, nearly 2,000,000 hogs, including pigs, are on the farms of the Dakotas, and nearly two and one-half million in Nebraska. The figure for the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho is over a million. California alone has close to a million.

In normal times very little corn is produced in the mountain-Pacific area. Formerly most of the corn consumed on the Pacific coast was transported by water. Today all feed grains are carried by the railroads.

Lower freight rates in this connection will stimulate our food-for-freedom program.

## FARM PRODUCTION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the American farmer is being called upon these days to make superhuman efforts to produce food for a good part of the world. And he is being asked to do this with diminished manpower—reports are that this shortage amounts to more than 3,000,000 men—and with inadequate machinery.

It is true that farm income, measured in dollars, is the highest in history. But it also is true that production costs are rising, and rising rapidly.

Several governmental agencies having to do with farm production and farm income are proposing, in fact, trying to put into effect a huge subsidy program, through which instead of receiving fair prices for his products, the farmer will receive subsidies from the Treasury.

I feel, and have felt all along, that if our American way of life is to be preserved on the home front, the farmer should receive fair prices for his products, not prices admittedly below cost of production, the difference being made up by means of subsidies.

I am not one of those who believe that the way to maintain the economic freedom of the farmer is to make him dependent upon the Federal Treasury for his income. That is the road to national socialism, the other word for which is nazi-ism. I know the farmers feel the same way about it. Farmers want to produce on their own; they want to market on their own; they want to feel that they are earning their own way in the world, not that they are being supported by a paternalistic government. They know that a paternalistic government soon becomes a despotic government.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a joint statement from the heads of three major national farm organizations of America.

As spokesmen for the great bulk of family farm production in the Nation, Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange; and Ezra T. Benson, executive secretary of the National Council of Farm Cooperatives, assert in this statement that only the American farm family stands between the United Nations and hunger. They are unanimous in their opinion that an immediate right-about-face by Government in many of its agricultural policies and programs is imperative if we are to avert grave food shortages.

There being no objection, the joint statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today the American farm family stands between a large part of the world and hunger.

Only through the initiative, the ingenuity, and the hard work of our farm families can our people, our armed forces, and our allies possibly be fed.

American farmers are handicapped and the food supply for the United Nations jeopardized by:

(1) The Government's manpower and labor policies;

(2) The confusion and loss of confidence created by an impractical and wasteful bureaucracy more concerned with social experimentation than the production of food;

(3) The policy of using subsidies in lieu of a fair return to the farmer in the market place.

As spokesmen for the national farm organizations, which represent the great bulk of family farm production in the Nation, it is our unanimous opinion that an immediate right-about-face by government on these policies is imperative.

We emphasize the vital necessity on the part of Government to take such steps promptly as will restore the confidence of farmers and end confusion.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of subsidies in lieu of a fair return in the market place. The Department of Agriculture has announced a program of so-called incentive payments for the production of certain crops. We insist that these payments as now projected are nothing but subsidies disguised. Despite repeated protests, it continues to be the policy of the administration to restrict returns to farmers by ceilings and to attempt to compensate them by subsidies with their attendant uncertainties. For the first time in 20 years, normal adjustments in the national economy, if permitted to function, would put the farmer on an equal basis with American labor and industry.

We warn that any economy which does not pay the cost of its food bill will inevitably collapse. If this situation persists, we consider it a grave danger to the Nation.

We insist upon price-control policies which will assure maximum production as the best protection against both inflation and hunger.

We urge an immediate reduction in nondefense expenditures and in the volume of directives sent out from Washington. We also urge a decentralization and restriction of the enormously expensive bureaucracy which polices these orders.

Finally, we recommend that immediate assurance be given American farmers by the Congress and the administration of their intention to preserve agriculture as an independent and self-supporting industry.

ALBERT S. GOSS,
*Master, the National Grange.*
EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
*President, American Farm Bureau Federation.*
EZRA T. BENSON,
*National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.*

## MAXIMUM PRICES ON PORK AND BEEF PRODUCTS AND BREAD AND BAKERY PRODUCTS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of Senate Resolution 94 be deferred until next Thursday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, automatically the resolution goes to the calendar.

Mr. REED. I am asking unanimous consent that it remain in its present position.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should have to object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces that the morning hour having expired, the resolution, under the precedents of the Senate, will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. REED. I serve notice that at the next meeting of the Senate I shall move to take it from the calendar and make it the business of the Senate.

## ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed with the calling of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. In order that Senators may be present, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Green | Radcliffe |
| Andrews | Guffey | Reed |
| Austin | Gurney | Revercomb |
| Bailey | Hatch | Reynolds |
| Ball | Hawkes | Robertson |
| Bankhead | Hayden | Russell |
| Barkley | Hill | Scrugham |
| Bilbo | Holman | Shipstead |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | Smith |
| Brooks | Kilgore | Stewart |
| Buck | La Follette | Thomas, Idaho |
| Burton | Langer | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bushfield | Lodge | Thomas, Utah |
| Butler | Lucas | Tobey |
| Byrd | McClellan | Truman |
| Capper | McFarland | Tunnell |
| Caraway | McKellar | Tydings |
| Clark, Idaho | McNary | Vandenberg |
| Clark, Mo. | Maloney | Van Nuys |
| Connally | Maybank | Wagner |
| Danaher | Millikin | Wallgren |
| Davis | Moore | Walsh |
| Downey | Nye | Wherry |
| Ferguson | O'Daniel | White |
| George | O'Mahoney | Wiley |
| Gerry | Overton | Willis |
| Gillette | Pepper | Wilson |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Clerk will report the first bill on the calendar.

## BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 217) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States, approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect" was announced as first in order.

Mr. McNARY. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## RELIEF OF CERTAIN ARMY DISBURSING OFFICERS

The bill (S. 218) to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think these bills relating to Army officers should be explained by the author. I have asked that the first bill go over for today. To the second I have no objection. The first one I believe has gone over.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, Senate bill 218 provides that the General Accounting Office shall relieve any disbursing officer of the Army charged with responsibility on account of loss or deficiency, while in line of duty, of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in his charge, when such loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on the part of the officer.

The bill also provides that the Secretary of War shall have determined that the officer was in line of duty, and that the loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on his part. It further provides that the determination by the Secretary of War of the aforesaid questions shall be conclusive upon the General Accounting Office. Provision is also made that all cases of relief granted under this authority during any fiscal year shall be reported in detail to the Congress. It is further provided that the bill shall be applicable only to actual physical loss of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers, and shall not include deficiencies in the accounts of disbursing officers of the Army resulting from illegal or erroneous payments which might have been made by the disbursing officers.

In 1919 Congress enacted into law the act of July 11, 1919, which provides for the relief of disbursing officers of the Navy under circumstances similar to those proposed in the pending bill. The language of the bill now before us follows that of the act relating to the Navy, the only changes being those made necessary by reason of its application to the Army instead of to the Navy.

Heretofore, when Army disbursing officers lost records by reason of fire or storm or under unusual circumstances, the facts of each case were presented to Congress and relief requested for each officer. Under present conditions accountable disbursing officers are required to make shipments of funds, vouchers, records, and papers, by every means of transportation, such as the airplane, boat, and so on. It is a hazardous undertaking, and if loss occurs in making such shipments the Department, without the proposed legislation, would have to submit each loss to Congress for relief, as heretofore they have done, or as they did prior to the enactment of a similar law applying to disbursing officers of the Navy.

Under present war conditions the physical loss of funds and of vouchers, records, and papers, resulting from enemy action or due to accidental circumstances, might occur with increasing frequency.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Are there such cases? Have such cases been reported? Is there some specific case to be settled, or is this a provision for the future?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is a general provision such as has been made for the disbursing officers of the Navy. As I have just stated, prior to this date, in the case of every loss by accident or otherwise, it has been necessary to make specific reports to Congress. For instance, recently moneys were sent to South Africa, and it was the understanding of all of us, through the columns of the press, that

great sums of money were lost. That is a specific instance of a loss. From time to time there will be occurrences of this sort. This measure is merely to cover the disbursing officers of the Army as heretofore the naval disbursing officers have been covered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, there is one provision of the bill which does not meet my approval at all. On page 2 of the bill it is provided:

> The determination by the Secretary of War of the aforesaid questions shall be conclusive upon the General Accounting Office.

The General Accounting Office is set up by the Congress for the purpose of ascertaining the very things mentioned in the bill. For instance, suppose a claim is made, which the Secretary of War allows in due course, probably never looking at it, some subordinate examining it, but suppose it is approved and is sent in. Suppose the General Accounting Office, which we have set up to examine into just such claims, finds the facts to be diametrically opposed to what is sent up by the Department. It is provided in the bill—

> The determination by the Secretary of War of the aforesaid questions shall be conclusive upon the General Accounting Office.

I do not think such a provision should be in the law. I doubt the wisdom of the general authority proposed, because we have the General Accounting Office to examine into such matters, and the Congress will always appropriate the necessary money in cases where the General Accounting Office reports in a way favorable to the claimant. It seems to me this would be very unwise legislation. It is too general; it is too all-inclusive; it rules out the General Accounting Office, which is a congressional set-up, not an administration set-up, an agency provided by Congress to pass on just such things as are covered by the bill.

I think I shall ask that the bill go over for today, if the Senator is not too insistent on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

### EQUALIZATION OF CERTAIN DISABILITY BENEFITS FOR ARMY OFFICERS

The bill (S. 219) to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will not the Senator from North Carolina explain the bill?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The purpose of the bill is to place all officers of the Army of the United States on the same basis, with respect to certain benefits, now authorized for disability incurred in line of duty.

Under existing law, officers of the Regular Army, the National Guard of the United States, and of the Officers Reserve Corps, if retired or relieved from active duty by reason of physical disability, receive retired or retirement pay, computed on the basis of their commissions in the respective components of the Army of the United States to which they belong. The fact that they may have held or are holding temporary higher rank in the Army of the United States would have no effect, although undoubtedly a majority of such officers will be holding higher temporary rank.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Who is supposed to be discriminated against and for whom is the bill presented?

Mr. REYNOLDS. My understanding is that the discrimination is between those holding temporary higher rank and those holding permanent higher rank in the same category.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. If I understand the bill, it makes the law now applicable to similar officers of the Navy applicable to officers of the Army?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is quite true.

Mr. LODGE. It puts the civilian officer, the National Guard officer, or Reserve officer on the same footing with the Regular officer.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is the purpose of the bill. Thus, an officer in the Officers' Reserve Corps, commissioned therein as a captain but holding temporary rank in the Army of the United States as a lieutenant colonel or a colonel, would, if relieved from active duty because of physical disability, receive the retirement pay of a captain, although his service until the time of disability may have been in a much higher temporary grade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That any officer of the Army of the United States or of any component thereof, except an officer of the Regular Army, who incurs physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade and becomes entitled to retirement pay because of such disability shall receive retirement pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such higher grade.

SEC. 2. Any officer of the Regular Army who heretofore or hereafter has been or may be retired for physical disability determined or incurred while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade shall have the rank and receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law officers of such higher grade.

SEC. 3. Any officer of the Regular Army on the retired list who shall have been placed thereon for reasons other than physical disability, shall, if he incurs physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade, be promoted on the retired list to such higher grade and receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law for an officer of such higher grade retired on account of physical disability incident to the service.

SEC. 4. Any officer of the Regular Army on the retired list who shall have been placed thereon by reason of physical disability shall, if he incurs additional physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade, be promoted on the retired list to such higher grade and receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such higher grade: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War, or such person or persons as he may designate, shall find that the additional physical disability is incident to service while on active duty in the higher grade and not less than 30 percent permanent.

SEC. 5. Any officer of the Regular Army on the retired list who shall have been placed thereon for reasons other than physical disability shall, if he incurs physical disability while serving on active duty in the same grade as that held by him on the retired list, receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such grade retired on account of physical disability incident to the service.

SEC. 6. The benefits of this act shall apply to officers of the Army of the United States who were retired subsequent to April 6, 1917, or who may hereafter be retired for physical disability in line of duty in time of war or any emergency declared by the President, or within 6 months thereafter, determined or incurred while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade, including any officer given a temporary appointment in a higher grade under the act of June 16, 1936, who has been retired for physical disability in a lower grade.

SEC. 7. The provisions of this act shall not apply in any case unless proceedings to obtain the benefits provided herein are initiated within 6 months from the termination of the temporary appointment held at the time when the disability is incurred or the disabled officer's release from active duty, whichever occurs earlier: *Provided*, That such proceedings may be initiated within 6 months from the date of the approval of this act in any case where such termination of appointment, retirement, or release from active duty occurred prior to such approval. The Secretary of War is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to limit the power of the President under existing law, or to affect the right of any officer of the Regular Army to have the rank and retired pay of a higher grade than herein provided, or of any other officer of the Army of the United States to have the retirement pay of a higher grade than herein provided, if entitled thereto under other provisions of law.

SEC. 9. No back pay shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act. The provisions of this act shall not otherwise affect the method in which officers are to be retired.

### "THEY PLOTTED 'BUNDLES FOR CONGRESS' "—ARTICLE FROM PIC

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, about a year ago there was enacted by the Congress of the United States and signed by the President a pension law, and subsequently that pension law was repealed. We all remember the campaign which was conducted to smear Congress and to vilify certain Members of Congress relative to their activities and their votes on that measure. I did not happen to be present at that time; I was sick in the hospital; but I followed it with a good deal of interest.

Recently, there has come to my attention an article in a magazine called Pic, which discusses the two authors of the move for "Bundles for Congress" and the campaign to vilify and smear Congress because of their action on the pension bill. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to these two men. One is a man by the name of Joe Albi. He was a representative of the Italian Government. He was an Italian consul in the western part of this country, and served as the acting consular agent for the Italian Government until July 15, 1941, when the consular office was closed by order of the President.

The second is a man named Ashley Holden. He was connected with the Spokane Spokesman-Review. He was secretary of the Seattle Japan Society. He assisted the Japanese Government in this country, and he aided in the publication of the All-Japanese Society Bulletin. He admitted that he had taken a trip to Japan, and that expenses had been paid by the All-Japanese Society.

It is an interesting thing that in a very critical era of this country, when Congress passed a pension bill, regardless of the merits of that plan, the leadership of the campaign to smear and vilify Congress was taken by two men who had official or friendly connections with two governments with which we are now at war, namely Italy and Japan, as I have indicated. I think it is well that we take note of the record. These men inspired the campaign. It was at their instigation that the move was made which swept all over the country.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the article from the magazine Pic entitled "They Plotted 'Bundles for Congress.'"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY PLOTTED "BUNDLES FOR CONGRESS"

Shortly after the passage of the act which authorized members of Congress to enter the retirement system applying to Government employees, one Joe Albi, of Spokane, Wash., who is the leading spirit of a play organization known as the Athletic Knights of the Round Table, conceived the idea of the bundles campaign. In order to publicize it, he sought and received the assistance of one Ashley Holden, a political and editorial writer on a newspaper called the Spokesman-Review of Spokane, Wash., which is the largest daily in eastern Washington. The campaign to smear Congress was then set in motion by these two men.

Their previous affiliations are all the more interesting by reason of their authorship of this campaign of vilification.

Joe Albi is an American-born Italian, and is a practicing attorney in Spokane. On November 11, 1929, he was appointed acting consular agent of the Italian Government. He served in this capacity until July 15, 1941, when, on the President's orders, all Italian consular offices were closed. Italy is under a dictatorship, and dominated entirely by the personality of one man—Mussolini. Serving in the capacity mentioned, Albi thus became and remained the personal representative of Benito Mussolini until July 15, 1941.

As a coauthor of the Bundles for Congress campaign, his past connection with the Fascist government is interesting—and significant.

Ashley Holden is influential in shaping the editorial policy of the Spokesman-Review. He had been frequently regarded by citizens of the State of Washington as a publicist of Japanese business interests. He had appeared in the political picture of the Pacific Northwest at times when protests were being registered against the sale of scrap iron to Japan. His expressed friendship for the Japanese and the Japanese Government made his attitude in such matters very evident to the people of that section.

A Japanese lawyer by the name of Thomas S. Masuda was recently placed on trial in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, at Seattle. Ashley Holden had been in touch with an agent of our Government, and gave that agent certain information about Masuda. The Government then subpenaed him as a witness, but when he appeared at trial time he surprised the Government attorneys by stating that he did not recall making the statements to the agent attributed to him, whereupon the Government dismissed him as a witness. Holden immediately was examined by Masuda's lawyer and became a favorable witness on behalf of the defendant, who was charged with being an unregistered agent of the Japanese and acquitted.

Holden testified at the Masuda trial that he has been in the newspaper business for approximately 20 years; that he had resided in Spokane for 6 years, and, prior to that time, had resided in Seattle for about 15 years. He testified that he had known Masuda for at least 15 years, and that he had had business, professional, and social contacts many times with the defendant, Masuda. He further testified that he had been a member and also secretary of the Seattle-Japan Society, which was an American organization, composed of businessmen, professional men, educators, clergymen, and outstanding Japanese businessmen. The primary purpose of the organization was to promote trade and commerce between this country and Japan.

He stated that he had been personally acquainted with all the Japanese consuls in Seattle since 1919. He stated that when Masuda graduated from law school, he (Holden) endeavored to help him get established in the legal profession. He testified that he had met Masuda at Olympia, the State capital. He stated that Masuda was much interested in the resolution before the legislature which called for an embargo on material being shipped to Japan.

In response to questions by counsel for Masuda, he testified that out of his experience and acquaintanceship with Japanese, it was quite customary for the Japanese to make gifts to friends or acquaintances, and to those who had done favors for them, and that he had been the recipient of such gifts upon numerous occasions, including gifts from the last Japanese consul in Seattle.

Holden stated that the Japan Society published a bulletin for its own members called the Japan Society Bulletin, and that he assisted.

Holden testified that the Japan Society of Seattle was organized in 1923, and that he served in a purely honorary capacity until about 1927 or 1928, at which time he was paid a monthly stipend for 2 or 3 years, until he resigned the position to leave Seattle. He testified that he had run for a post on the city council of the city of Seattle, and that at that time he had been known as "Banzai" Holden; that he had been the subject of cartoons which identified him as "Banzai" Holden. He stated that the term "banzai" is a sort of salutation in Japanese. He further testified that he had made one trip to Japan in 1939, which was financed by the Japan Society, of which he was then secretary. He stated that the Seattle Japan Society did not furnish all the money for this trip, but that he took the trip "as its secretary."

He testified that the present Mrs. Masuda (wife of the defendant) was his secretary while he was acting as secretary of the Seattle Japan Society.

The long-time official agent of Benito Mussolini and the long-time friend of Japan must chuckle to themselves as they contemplate their cleverness in enlisting a considerable part of the press of the country in their campaign. Some good may come out of it since we now know how our domestic experts in smear technique set about to discredit a parliamentary body.

## PROTECTION ON NAVIGABLE WATERS ENDANGERED BY BOMBING OR FIRING PRACTICE

The bill (S. 221) to amend sections 1 and 2 of chapter XIX of the Army Appropriation Act approved July 9, 1918, relating to protection of life and property in water endangered by activities of the Army, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 1 of chapter XIX of the Army Appropriation Act approved July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 892), be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Protection of life and property in waters endangered by activities of the Army of the United States: That in the interest of the national defense, and for the better protection of life and property on the navigable waters of the United States or waters under the jurisdiction of the United States, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and empowered to prescribe such regulations as he may deem best for the use and navigation of any portion or area of said waters endangered or likely to be endangered by the Army of the United States while engaged in bombing or firing of any kind in target practice, or otherwise, in proving operations at any proving ground or elsewhere, or any other activities, and of any portion or area of said waters occupied by any plant or facility engaged in the execution of any public project of river and harbor improvement, or by submarine mines, mine fields, submarine cables, or other material and accessories of the Army of the United States: *Provided*, That the authority hereby conferred shall be so exercised as not unreasonably to interfere with or restrict the food fishing industry, and the regulations prescribed in pursuance hereof shall provide for the use of waters included in such regulations by food fishermen operating under permits granted by the War Department: *Provided further*, That said authority shall also be exercised as not to conflict with any duly authorized and promulgated order or regulation of the President or appropriate United States naval authority governing persons or vessels within the limits of any defensive sea areas or maritime control areas heretofore or hereafter established, or with any of the powers conferred on the Secretary of the Treasury by section 1, title II, of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220; U. S. C., title 50, sec. 191), or on the Secretary of the Navy by section 2 of the act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat. —; U. S. C., title 50, sec. 191a)."

SEC. 2. That section 2 of said act be, and is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That to enforce the regulations prescribed pursuant to this section, the Secretary of War may detail any public vessel, craft, facility, or agency in the service of the War Department, or, upon the request of the Secretary of War, the head of any other department may enforce, and the head of any such department is hereby authorized to enforce, such regulations by means of any public vessel, craft, facility, or agency of such department."

## CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO PUERTO RICO

The bill (S. 222) to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, it is the purpose of this bill to transfer to the people of Puerto Rico a strip of land con-

taining 1.26 acres, which is a part of the military reservation of San Juan, Puerto Rico, and no longer required by the Army. The property involved is a strip of land comprising a portion of the main reservation of the post of San Juan set aside by Executive order dated June 30, 1903. The strip fronts on property of the Government of Puerto Rico, and is bounded on the north by the Atlantic Ocean. This land is of no strategic value to the military post, and is desired by the people of Puerto Rico in connection with the extension and beautification of the land adjoining the Capitol building and the School of Tropical Medicine.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 222) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to convey to the people of Puerto Rico a strip of land containing 1.26 acres, more or less, located at Ward Puerta de Tierra of the municipality of San Juan, P. R., adjoining Salvador Brau Boulevard on the north, and comprising a portion of the San Juan Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R.

### EXCHANGE OF LANDS AT FORT SILL, OKLA.

The bill (S. 223) to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to transfer to the control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior that portion of the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla., now occupied by the Department of the Interior under revocable permit from the Secretary of War dated January 23, 1942, and in exchange therefor the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to transfer to the control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of War that portion of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, Okla., now occupied by the War Department under permit from the Secretary of the Interior dated October 2, 1941.

### EXCHANGE OF LANDS IN THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The bill (S. 224) to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to convey to the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard deceased, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a triangular parcel of land containing 13,715.84 square feet, more or less, situated at the northeast corner of and comprising a portion of the Philadephia Quartermaster Depot, Pa., and fronting on Oregon Avenue east of Twenty-first Street in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., and to accept in exchange therefor the fee-simple title to a strip of land containing 9,819.75 square feet, more or less, and being the northern portion of what was formerly Johnston Street west of Twentieth Street in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., the exchange herein authorized to be made under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of War may prescribe.

### BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 220) to provide for payment of certain travel costs of dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Army and the War Department on a mileage basis in order to promote efficiency and economy in such payments was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

### LOANS FOR MINERAL DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES IN TIME OF WAR

The bill (S. 12) to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes, as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war," was announced as next in order.

Mr. BRIDGES. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. RADCLIFFE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to recur to order of business No. 11, Senate bill 12.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill would increase the discretion which may be exercised by the R. F. C. in making loans to companies engaged in the development and production of minerals. As the law now stands, before such a loan can be made it is necessary that the R. F. C. find in advance that if the loan were made the company would probably be in a position to operate at a profit.

In view of the fact that the need for the development of mineral ores is increasing steadily the present restriction is onerous. All the bill would do would be to enable the R. F. C. to make a loan without first ascertaining whether the company could operate at a profit. The bill would suspend for the duration of the war the requirement that the R. F. C. make a finding in advance that the project can probably be operated at a profit.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I call the Senator's attention to order of business No. 13, Senate bill 381, which deals with the same subject. It is a bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war. What is the relationship between the two bills? If one should be passed, why should the other one be also passed?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I believe that both bills should pass. The bill to which the able Senator from Michigan has made reference refers mainly to loans made to companies preparing to go into business. At present it is necessary that a company be already engaged in business. Under the provisions of Senate bill 381, a company would not be required to be in business at the present time. Therefore that bill would permit the R. F. C. to make loans to companies which are planning to go into business. In other words, Senate bill 381 is more or less of a companion bill to the one which we are now discussing, namely, Senate bill 12. It is certainly not antagonistic to it in any way. Senate bill 12 does not make any reference to new companies. It provides that it shall not be necessary to show that a profit would result from the intended operations. It might be that that point would be covered by the bill to which the able Senator from Michigan has referred. I am by no means sure, however, and I believe it would not be wise to act on such an assumption. Consequently we have both bills.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is there a difference between the bills in the basis upon which loans are to be made?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Since I have not charge of Senate bill 381, to which the Senator has referred, I hesitate to be positive in my reply as to the exact respective bases of the two bills.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is it not true that under the present law a company must actually be engaged in mining operations before a loan can be made to it?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; that is the situation.

Mr. HATCH. Under Senate bill 381, if a company were planning to go into business it could apply for a loan. That is the only difference.

Mr. VANDENBERG. During the morning hour today the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] had a great deal to say about confusion and chaos in the reference of Senate bills and resolutions. The two bills now under discussion were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Have they been correlated in any way?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. They have both been studied by the Committee on Banking and Currency; and it is quite possible that both bills could have been incorporated in one measure. However, they have been submitted as two separate bills and it seems to me to be advisable to allow them to continue to be considered as separate measures.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the Senator's answer to my question, as to whether they provide different bases for making loans?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is this difference: Under the terms of the first bill, Senate bill 12, a company applying for a loan must already be engaged in the mining business. Under the terms of Senate bill 381, if a company, though actually not engaged in the mining business, desires to go into the development of mines, it may make an application for a loan. As the Senator from Maryland has said, the bills might have been combined, but they were not. They were introduced by different Members of the Senate, and for that reason they were reported separately.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would not the provisions of Senate bill 12 apply to the provisions of Senate bill 381, which also appears upon the calendar, if they should both be enacted?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think so. I do not think the basis for the loans provided for in Senate bill 12 is the same as that in Senate bill 381.

Mr. BRIDGES. If Senate bill 12 were passed would it be necessary, under the provisions of Senate bill 381, to show that the company would be in position to earn a profit as a result of its operations?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If Senate bill 12 were passed and became a law, it would not be necessary for the R. F. C. to submit an opinion in advance that a profit could be made. I presume that would apply as well to Senate bill 381.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. To help clarify the situation, let me say that in 1934 I introduced a measure which became section 13 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, providing for loans to companies engaged in small mining operations. Senate bill 381 would amend that act and make it apply also to those who desire to engage in mining instead of only to those who are actually engaged in mining.

That is substantially the only change that would be made. Senate bill 381 has little or no connection with Senate bill 12, which is for the purpose of authorizing loans for mineral deposits based on ore development. The two bills are for different purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Nevada one question pertaining to these two bills. Would the proposed authorization apply to strategic minerals only or to all minerals?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. It would apply to all minerals. However, it would apply primarily to strategic minerals. The section to which I referred applied originally to gold, silver, and tin. It was later amended to include all strategic minerals.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then it includes all minerals, and is not limited to strategic minerals.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. The objection I have to the proposed legislation, as I understand it, is that the proposal is made by Senate bill 12 to allow the R. F. C. to loan money to mining companies without first finding that a profit could probably be made, and to apply the authorization to all minerals, not limiting it to strategic minerals. I could see a reason for the proposed legislation if it were to be limited to strategic materials. I cannot see a reason for it if it is to be left wide open to all minerals.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, the able Senator from New Hampshire realizes that this is permissive legislation. It would merely permit the R. F. C., whenever it seems to be necessary and desirable to make such loans, to go ahead and make them. It may be possible to define exactly what is strategic and what is not strategic, but the dividing line is not very clear and not very simple. It varies from time to time, and therefore it seems desirable that the R. F. C. should have wide discretion to make these loans without the previous finding which it now is required to make. I do not know whether it can be determined just where the dividing line should be. If the able Senator from New Hampshire can suggest some language by which that distinction can be outlined and emphasized, I shall be glad to consider it in the hope that a bill helping to provide substantially for what is required by our war program in such matters may be passed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. As I understand the existing law, if a mineral were strategic and most vital the R. F. C. could not make a loan to a company producing such material unless it could show it could make a profit. Senate bill 12 is to correct that situation, is it not?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is the situation, exactly. It would eliminate for the time being the necessity of showing that operations can probably be conducted at a profit. I believe it is not desirable that such restrictions as exist at the present time should continue. It also seems that there should be a wide discretion in the R. F. C. in the making of these loans. We know that the needs of our war program in regard to metals vary. New needs arise from time to time for metals already regarded as strategic. Also now and then needs develop for metals which had not heretofore come under the classification of strategic or vital materials. I think it may be assumed that the R. F. C. will not launch upon a general campaign of making loans to companies where there is not any real need for strategic materials.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator have any objection to inserting in the bill the words "or strategic minerals," or "minerals to be used for the purpose of aiding the prosecution of the war effort," or something of that kind?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I should have no objection to such an idea being incorporated in general terms in the language of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think it would be most unfortunate to circumscribe the permission with a great many rules and regulations. Some ores are complex. Some of the minerals in the complex ores may not be strategic, while others are very strategic; and restrictions placed in the bill by the kind of definition suggested by the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] might entirely defeat the objectives of the bill. As a matter of fact, almost no minerals are now being produced which are not critical or strategic. "Strategic" is a very technical term, and I believe it would be most unfortunate if the bill should be encumbered with any language of that kind.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to have the bill go over until further study can be made of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. RADCLIFFE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of Calendar No. 11, Senate bill No. 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 12) to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, on page 2, line 7, after the word "war" to insert "or on December 31, 1944."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That so much of section 14 of the Act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934, as amended (54 Stat. 897; U. S. C., title 15, sec. 606 (d)), as reads as follows: "when, in the opinion of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, there is sufficient reason to believe that, through the use of such loan in the development of a lode, ledge, or vein, or mineral deposit, or placer gravel deposit, there will be developed a sufficient quantity of ore, or placer deposits of a sufficient value to pay a profit upon mining operations," shall be suspended during the period commencing upon the date of enactment of this Act and ending 6 months after the termination of the present war or on December 31, 1944, or at such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 40) to provide that the term of the Governor of Puerto Rico shall expire upon the enactment of this act and at the end of each 2-year period thereafter was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

R. F. C. LOANS TO PERSONS PRODUCING MINERALS OF VALUE TO UNITED STATES

The bill (S. 381) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war was announced as next in order.

Mr. BRIDGES. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. SCRUGHAM subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of Calendar No. 13, Senate bill 381.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The clerk will read the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 381) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I would have the same general objection to that bill that I had to Calendar No. 11, Senate bill No. 12. I believe the bill should be confined to strategic materials.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that the bill passed without objection during the closing hours of the last session. In view of the lack of time it was not considered by the other House. It applies to minerals needed in the war. There is a difference between strategic minerals and critical minerals. Strategic minerals, generally speaking, are those which are not produced in sufficient quantity in the United States. A critical mineral is any mineral which is needed critically in the war program.

The bill is intended to apply to both strategic and critical minerals, but only to minerals needed in the war.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the bill so state?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator read the part of the bill which so states?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I ask that the bill be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 14 (authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for mineral development purposes) of the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934, as amended (54 Stat. 897; U. S. C., title 15, sec. 606 (d)), is hereby amended by inserting in the second sentence of such section, after the words "engaged in" the words "or desiring to engage in."

SEC. 2. Section 14 of the act approved June 19, 1934, as amended (54 Stat. 897; U. S. C., title 15, sec. 606 (d)), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and adding the following: *"Provided further,* That nothing contained in this section, as amended and supplemented, shall be construed to limit or modify the authority to make mining or other loans vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by subparagraph 2 of the fourth paragraph of section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, or by any other act of Congress or Executive order."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not see anything in the bill of the character indicated by me. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCRUGHAM subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of Calendar No. 13, Senate bill 381.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 381) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, I offer a clarifying amendment: On page 2, line 2, after the words "engage in", I move to insert the words "producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to one further point. Calendar No. 11, Senate bill 12, dealing with the same subject or a related subject, is definite in its terms in respect to being restricted to the war period. Apparently the bill now under consideration very definitely should be restricted to the war period.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I have no objection to having such a provision added to the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest that language similar to that contained in Senate bill No. 12 be added to the bill now under consideration, and in that connection, on page 2, after line 13, I suggest that the following language be added: *"Provided further,* That the authority herein contained shall end 6 months after the termination of the present war or on December 31, 1944, or at such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate."

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That amendment is acceptable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 14 (authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for mineral-development purposes) of the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934, as amended (54 Stat. 897; U. S. C., title 15, sec. 606 (d)), is hereby amended by inserting in the second sentence of such section, after the words "engaged in," the words "or desiring to engage in" producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war.

SEC. 2. Section 14 of the act approved June 19, 1934, as amended (54 Stat. 897; U. S. C., title 15, sec. 606 (d)), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and adding the following: *"Provided further,* That nothing contained in this section, as amended and supplemented, shall be construed to limit or modify the authority to make mining or other loans vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by subparagraph 2 of the fourth paragraph of section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, or by any other act of Congress or Executive order. *Provided further,* That the authority herein contained shall end 6 months after the termination of the present war or on December 31, 1944, or at such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate."

## BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 17) to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police and the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this bill and the bill immediately following should be passed over in the absence of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 17, Calendar No. 15, and Senate bill 18, Calendar No. 16, will be passed over.

The bill (S. 414) for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] favor us with an explanation of Senate bill 414?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like permission to return to that bill in a moment. I do not have a copy of the report of the committee before me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

## PREVENTION OF SPECULATION IN LANDS OF THE COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

The bill (S. 408) to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? I see the Senator who reported the bill from the committee is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation has considered this measure fully at this session, and considered a similar bill at the previous session of the Congress. The bill now before the Senate, except in comparatively minor aspects, is in exactly the same form as the bill which was passed at the last session. Its purpose is to permit an agreement between the State of Washington and the Bureau of Reclamation to organize and develop the Grand Coulee Dam project. Its purpose is to safeguard the investment of the Federal Government in the Columbia Basin and to safeguard, also, the investments of the settlers upon that project. It is in harmony with the program which has been followed for the last 20 or 25 years by the Interior Department and the Congress with respect to projects of this kind.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], one of the authors of the bill, is in the Chamber, and perhaps he might add a word or two

about the measure. I should say, first, however, that the bill was most thoroughly examined by the committee in a full session. It was not referred to a subcommittee, but represents the unanimous judgment of the entire Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, I should like to say that the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and I would both like to see this bill passed at the present time, because whatever we do here must be ratified by the State legislature of the State of Washington, which is now in session. We are anxious that the proposed improvement be made in the act of 1937.

Mr. McKELLAR. The bill does not change the ownership of the projects? It is merely to prevent speculation in lands there?

Mr. WALLGREN. It does permit the ownership of more land than the act of 1937 permits. It provides for the establishment of farm units up to 160 acres, instead of 40 acres, as under the last bill.

Mr. HATCH. Does the bill fix a limitation on the price of the lands?

Mr. WALLGREN. No; it does not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation with amendments.

The first committee amendment was, on page 13, line 4, after the word "lands", to insert "to improve such lands, or other lands within the project under contract with the owners or organizations thereof as herein provided, by clearing, leveling, and preparing them for handling of irrigation water."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 1, after the word "thereon.", to insert "Contracts for repayment of costs incurred by the United States in clearing, leveling, and preparing lands for the handling of irrigation water may, in the Secretary's discretion, be made with individual water users or any form of water users' organization satisfactory to him."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 14, after the word "therein" to insert "after it is"; and in line 15, after the word "act", to insert "and before execution by the United States of a contract of sale covering it."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 22, to strike out down to and including line 7 on page 15, as follows:

(b) Any lands or interests in lands acquired by the United States under the provisions of this act shall be subject to all provisions of the laws of the State of Washington relating to the organization, government, and regulation of irrigation, reclamation, and conservancy districts and shall be subject to liens for charges legally assessed by any such district, to the same extent and in the same manner as public lands subject to entry are or may be subject to said laws and charges by the provisions of sections 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7 of the act of August 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 506), as amended by the act of May 15, 1922 (42 Stat. 541).

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) Any public lands within the project and any lands or interests in lands acquired by the United States under this act, beginning at such date or dates and subject to such provisions and limitations as may be fixed or provided by regulations made under section 8, shall be (i) subject to the provisions of the laws of the State of Washington relating to the organization, government, and regulation of irrigation, reclamation, and conservancy districts, and (ii) subject to legal assessment or taxation by any such district, and to liens for such assessments and taxes and to all proceedings for the enforcement thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands of like character. The United States does not assume any obligation for amounts so assessed or taxed; and any proceedings to enforce them shall be subject to any title then remaining in the United States, to any prior lien reserved to the United States for unpaid installments under land sale contracts made under this act, and to any lien for any other charges, accrued or unaccrued, under and by virtue of such contracts or any contract between the United States and the district in which the land is located. Regulations to carry out this subsection shall be effective when filed for record in the manner provided in subsection 2 (f).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 5, to strike out the word "upon" and to insert "(c) In addition to taxation or assessment under subsection 5 (c) upon"; in line 12, after the word "enforced", to strike out "by the sale of the lands"; and in line 14, after the word "lands", to strike out the colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the title or interest which the State or political subdivision thereof may convey in any tax proceeding shall be subject to whatever title remains in the United States and to any prior lien reserved to the United States for all unpaid installments upon the contract of sale, whether accrued or otherwise, and any other charges upon said land which have accrued or may accrue under and by virtue of said contract of sale or the contract between the United States and the district in which the land is located."

And to insert in lieu thereof "subject to the limitations in favor of the United States that govern the enforcement of district assessments or taxes as provided in subsection 5 (b). If lands under any such contract shall at any time revert to the United States before transfer of title under the contract by reason of default thereunder, all liens or tax titles resulting from taxes levied pursuant to the authority of this subsection upon such lands shall be thereupon extinguished; and the levying of any such tax by such State or political subdivision shall be deemed to be an agreement on its part in the event of such reversion, to execute and record a formal release of such lien or tax title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act of May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. In addition to the primary purposes for which the Grand Coulee Dam project (hereafter to be known as the Columbia Basin project and herein called the 'project') was authorized under the provisions of the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028), the project is hereby authorized and reauthorized as a project subject to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and the provisions of each of those two acts together with the provisions of this act shall govern the repayment of expenditures and the construction, operation, and maintenance of the works constructed as a part of the project.

"SEC. 2. (a) No part of the funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated or allotted for project construction or for the reclamation of land within the project shall be expended in the construction of any irrigation features of the project, exclusive of Grand Coulee Dam and appurtenant works now under construction and of the pumping plant and equalizing reservoir and dams, until the requirements of the following subdivisions (i) and (ii) of this subsection (a) have been met:

"(i) All lands within the project shall have been impartially appraised by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter called the 'Secretary') and evaluated at the date of appraisal without reference to or increment on account of the construction of the project. Reappraisals may be made at any time by the Secretary, and will be made upon the request of the landowner concerned accompanied by an advance to the United States of $15 for each quarter section or fraction thereof involved, on account of expense thereof. In such reappraisals the Secretary shall take into account, in addition to the value found in the first appraisal, improvements made after said appraisal, such irrigation construction charges on the land as have been paid, and other items of value that are proper, other than increments on account of the construction of the project. The term 'appraised value' as used in this act shall mean appraised values determined as provided in this subsection.

"(ii) Contracts shall have been made with irrigation, reclamation, or conservancy districts organized under State law embracing the lands within the project providing for payment thereby of that part of the cost of construction of the project determined by the Secretary to be the part thereof to be repaid by irrigation. Each such contract shall conform to the requirements of this act, shall require repayment within the maximum period permitted under the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto (hereinafter called the Federal reclamation laws), and provide that payments shall be enforceable by all means and remedies provided in said laws.

"(b) (i) The lands within the project shall be developed in irrigation blocks, as that term is defined in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. The Secretary shall segregate the lands in each irrigation block into farm units of sufficient acreage for the support of an average-sized family at a suitable living level, having in mind the character of soil, topography, location with respect to the irrigation system, and such other relevant factors as, in his judgment, enter into the determination of the area and boundaries thereof; and shall establish the units as hereafter provided. No farm unit shall contain more than 160 or less than 10 acres of irrigable land, except that any nominal quarter section comprising more than 160 acres of irrigable land may be included in one farm unit, and except that lands owned by the United States may be established into units of lesser size for part-time farming purposes.

"(ii) Prior to the initial delivery of water to an irrigation block, the Secretary shall prepare a plat of all the farm units in the irrigation block and shall publish a notice of the intention to establish such farm unit plat in 6 weekly issues of a newspaper of general circulation in the county or counties in which any part of the irrigation block is located.

From the date of first publication, a copy of the plat shall be available in the county auditor's office of each of said counties for public inspection during the business hours of the office. Any interested landowner shall have the right to file written objections to the plat with the county auditor of the county in which his lands are situated before the close of the period of publication. After expiration of the period of publication the Secretary shall consider and determine all such objections, draw the plat in final form, and file it for record in said county auditor's offices. With the consent of the owners of all farm units affected, the Secretary may revise the plat or any part thereof from time to time, and place the revisions of record with the original plat.

"(iii) Water shall not be delivered from, through, or by means of the project works to or for lands not conforming in area and boundaries to the farm units covering the lands involved, nor to or for more than one farm unit held by any one landowner, except that as to lands held by the one having equitable or legal title on May 27, 1937, or the heir or devisee of such owner, delivery may be made to or for a total irrigable area not exceeding the maximum provided in this section. The limitations of this subdivision shall not apply to lands owned by the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof, corporate or otherwise.

"(iv) Lands within the project in excess of one farm unit held by any one landowner shall, except as otherwise provided in this act, be deemed excess land: *Provided*, That if excess land is acquired by foreclosure or other process of law, by conveyance in satisfaction of mortgages, by inheritance or by devise, water therefor may be furnished temporarily for a period not exceeding 5 years from the effective date of such acquisition, delivery of water thereafter ceasing until the transfer thereof to a landowner duly qualified to secure water therefor.

"(v) As used in this act, the terms 'owner,' 'landowner,' and 'any one landowner' denote any person, corporation, joint-stock association, or family; the term 'family' denotes a group consisting of either or both husband and wife, together with their children under 18 years of age, or all of such children if both parents are dead; the term 'their children' includes the issue and lawfully adopted children of either or both husband and wife; and the term 'lands within the project' denotes those lands within the boundaries of the existing Columbia Basin irrigation districts, or revisions thereof approved by the Secretary, which the Secretary determines may be supplied water from through, or by means of the project works and are required to be included to provide for sound development and operation of the project. Lands shall be deemed to be held by a family, if held as separate property of husband or wife, or constitute a part or all of their community property, or if they are the property of any or all of their children under 18 years of age.

"(c) As a condition precedent to receiving water from the project and in consideration thereof, each landowner shall be required to execute, within 6 months from the date of the execution of the contract between the United States and the district within which the land is located, a recordable contract covering all his lands within that district, agreeing as to such lands for and on behalf of himself, his heirs, successors, and assigns to the provisions set forth in this subsection (c): *Provided*, That any landowner, having failed to execute such a contract within this period, may be permitted to execute such contract within 1 year after the date of judicial confirmation of the validity of the contract between the United States and the district but only in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed under section 8 concerning this privilege.

"Each such recordable contract shall provide—

"(i) That the landowner will conform his lands by purchase, sale, or exchange at the appraised values to the area and boundaries of the pertinent farm unit or units shown on the plats filed under subsection 2 (b) and will dispose of excess land then or thereafter owned by him at its appraised value; that the Secretary is thereby given an irrevocable power of attorney to sell in behalf of the landowner any such excess land at said appraised value; and that the United States is thereby given, without further consideration, an option to buy any such excess land at said appraised value: *Provided*, That sales under such power or such option, unless otherwise provided in writing by said owner, shall be only for cash and only such that surrender of possession by the owner of any area of excess lands then operated as a single unit for dry farming or grazing may be effected substantially at one time.

"(ii) That in the period from the date of execution thereof and to a date 5 years from the time water becomes available for the lands covered thereby, no conveyance of or contract to convey a freehold estate in such lands, whether excess or nonexcess lands, shall be made for a consideration exceeding its appraised value, and in connection with any conveyance of, or contract to convey, such an estate within such period the grantor or vendor or the grantee or vendee or any lien holder thereof shall, within 30 days from the date of such conveyance or contract, file in the office of the county auditor in the county or counties in which the land is located an affidavit describing the conveyance or contract and the consideration therefor.

"(iii) That in the event that within such period such a conveyance of, or contract to convey, is made without filing within said 30 days the affidavit required in (ii) of this subsection, or is made for a consideration in excess of the appraised value, the Secretary, at any time within 2 years of the day on which there is filed for recording in the official county records the contract or deed involved, whichever is filed earliest in the event both the contract and deed are filed in a given transaction, may cancel the right of such estate to receive water from, through, or by means of the project works by a written notice of cancelation: *Provided*, That said power to cancel as to any given parcel of land may be waived by the Secretary at any time within said 2-year period by a written notice of waiver: *And provided further*, That after any such cancelation a project water right for the estate involved may be acquired only on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary.

"(iv) That should any freehold estate in land covered thereby be conveyed or contracted to be conveyed within the period defined in (ii) of this subsection, the transaction, and any mortgage or other lien covering any deferred consideration thereunder, shall be subject to all the provisions of subsection 3 (b) hereof.

"Any or all of the provisions of this subsection (c) required to be included in the recordable contracts may be made covenants running with the land when said recordable contracts expressly so provide.

"(d) Each contract made pursuant to subdivision 2 (a) (ii) shall provide that no water will be delivered from, through, or by means of the project works except in accordance with the provisions and limitations of section 2 hereof.

"(e) Each district contract may include provisions—

"(i) Requiring that all lands within the district not covered by recordable contracts provided for under subsection (c) or otherwise not eligible to receive water shall be subject to assessment in the same manner and to the same extent as like lands eligible to receive water, subject to such provisions as the Secretary may prescribe for postponement in payment of all or part of such assessments but not beyond the expiration of the period during which the price limit under subsection 2 (c) applies.

"(ii) That, without compliance with other provisions of State law for the exclusion of lands, lands may be withdrawn from the district by filing a written notice of withdrawal with the district board on or before such date fixed by such board between a date 10 days after the official notice of the election on the contract between the United States and the district and the date of such election. The date limiting the time of such filing shall be announced in the official notice of the proposed election, and lands for which such notice is filed shall be deemed excluded from the district for all purposes as of the time of such filing. Thereafter lands so withdrawn and excluded so long as they remain in private ownership shall not be entitled to receive water from, through, or by means of the project works.

"(f) Any instrument, action, determination, rule, or regulation of the Secretary or his duly authorized representatives under the authority of this section 2 which is or may be determinative of the title to lands or interest in lands in private ownership within the project shall be effective as to any given parcel of land, as against purchasers for value without actual notice, only from the time of the filing for record in the office of the county auditor of the county or counties in which the lands affected are located of a copy thereof authenticated in the manner authorized by law. Such filing shall impart legal notice to the public of the matters and things set out therein.

"SEC. 3. (a) Fraudulent misrepresentation as to the true consideration involved in the conveyance of, or contract to convey, any freehold estate in land covered by a recordable contract made under subsection 2 (c) hereof, in the affidavit required by that subsection shall constitute a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"(b) Should any freehold estate in lands subject to the recordable contract made under subsection 2 (c) hereof be conveyed or contracted to be conveyed, after the date of execution of such recordable contract and within 5 years from the time water becomes available for such lands, at a consideration in excess of the appraised value of said estate, the transaction, and any mortgage or other lien covering any deferred consideration thereunder, shall be invalid and unenforceable by the vendor or grantor, his successors or assigns as to that part of the consideration in excess of the appraised value of the estate involved. In the case of any such transaction involving deferred payments, said invalid portion of the consideration shall be deducted first from the deferred payments in the inverse order of their due dates.

"The vendee or grantee in any such transaction, at any time within 2 years from the date of any such conveyance or contract and on filing a correct affidavit as required in subdivision 2 (c) (ii), may recover from the vendor or grantor, or the successors or assigns thereof, an amount equal to the payments made in excess of the appraised value.

"In connection with any judgment or decree hereunder in favor of a vendee or grantee, said vendee or grantee shall have the right to recover court costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

"SEC. 4. (a) For the purposes of assisting in the permanent settlement of farm families, protecting project land, facilitating project

development, preventing speculation in project lands, and providing for the general welfare, the Secretary is authorized to administer public lands of the United States in the project area and lands acquired under this section; to sell, exchange, or lease such lands; to improve such lands, or other lands within the project under contract with the owners or organizations thereof as herein provided, by clearing, leveling, and preparing them for handling of irrigation water; to establish town sites on such lands; to dedicate portions of such lands for public purposes in keeping with sound project development; to acquire in the name of the United States, at prices satisfactory to him, such lands or interest in lands, within or adjacent to the project area, as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of the project; to accept donations of real and personal property for the purposes of this act; and to disseminate information by appropriate means and methods. Any moneys realized on account of donations for purposes of this act shall be covered into the Treasury as trust funds.

"(b) Contracts, exchanges, and leases made under this section, shall be on terms that, in the Secretary's judgment, are in keeping with sound project development. In addition, land-sale contracts shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, provides for the return in a reasonable period of years of not less than the appraised value of the land and improvements thereon. Contracts for repayment of costs incurred by the United States in clearing, leveling, and preparing lands for the handling of irrigation water may, in the Secretary's discretion, be made with individual water users or any form of water users' organization satisfactory to him.

"Qualifications of applicants for the purchase of land for irrigation farming shall be prescribed as provided in subsection C of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 702), notwithstanding any other provisions of law.

"SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary may enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or political subdivision thereof with respect to any real property situated therein after it is acquired pursuant to the authority of this act and before execution by the United States of a contract of sale covering it, out of funds derived from the leasing of such lands. The amount so paid for any year upon any such property shall not exceed the taxes that would be paid to the State or subdivision as the case may be upon such property if it were not exempt from taxation thereby.

"(b) Any public lands within the project and any lands or interests in lands acquired by the United States under this act, beginning at such date or dates and subject to such provisions and limitations as may be fixed or provided by regulations made under section 8, shall be (i) subject to the provisions of the laws of the State of Washington relating to the organization, government, and regulation of irrigation, reclamation, and conservancy districts, and (ii) subject to legal assessment or taxation by any such district, and to liens for such assessments and taxes and to all proceedings for the enforcement thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands of like character. The United States does not assume any obligation for amounts so assessed or taxed; and any proceedings to enforce them shall be subject to any title then remaining in the United States, to any prior lien reserved to the United States for unpaid installments under land sale contracts made under this act, and to any lien for any other charges, accrued or unaccrued, under and by virtue of such contracts or any contract between the United States and the district in which the land is located. Regulations to carry out this subsection shall be effective when filed for record in the manner provided in subsection 2 (f).

"(c) In addition to taxation or assessment under subsection 5 (b) upon execution by the United States of a contract of sale of any lands within the project, the lands under contract may be taxed by the State or political subdivision thereof in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands of a like character. All taxes legally so assessed may be enforced in the same manner and under the same proceeding whereby said taxes are enforced against privately owned lands subject to the limitations in favor of the United States that govern the enforcement of district assessments or taxes as provided in subsection 5 (b). If lands under any such contract shall at any time revert to the United States before transfer of title under the contract by reason of default thereunder, all liens or tax titles resulting from taxes levied pursuant to the authority of this subsection upon such lands shall be thereupon extinguished; and the levying of any such tax by such State or political subdivision shall be deemed to be an agreement on its part, in the event of such reversion, to execute and record a formal release of such lien or tax title.

"SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such moneys as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, to be reimbursable to the extent required by this act. All revenues received in carrying out the provisions of section 4 hereof shall be covered into the General Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Amounts equal to appropriated funds requisitioned by the Secretary and made available for disbursement on the books of the Treasurer of the United States shall be debited in a special account in the Treasury, to be known as the Columbia Basin Land Development Account. Amounts equal to revenues covered into the General Treasury as miscellaneous receipts shall be credited in said special account. After such credits equal the amount of the debits with interest thereon at the rate of 3 percent per annum from the respective dates of the debits, additional credits in said special account shall be made by the Secretary, in the manner determined by him, the basis of corresponding credits to the construction cost obligations of the district or districts entering into contracts under section 2 hereof.

"SEC. 7. No water shall be delivered for irrigation within the project until the State of Washington, by appropriate legislation, shall have adopted, authorized, ratified, and consented to all the provisions of this act insofar as such provisions or any of them, in whole or in part, may come within the scope of State jurisdiction or authority or be applicable to State lands.

"Legislation otherwise conforming to the standards above stated in this section will meet the requirements of the section even though, by reason of limitations in the State constitution, the contracts required under subsection 2 (c) cannot be executed pursuant to such legislation as to the State's school and other public lands. As to such lands, the provisions and requirements of subsection 2 (c) shall remain effective, but if these constitutional limitations have not been removed at least 6 months prior to the expiration of the time provided for the execution of the contracts, the time is hereby extended for a period ending 6 months after the removal of the limitations.

"SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized to perform such acts, to make such rules and regulations, and to include in the contracts hereinbefore provided for such provisions as he deems proper for carrying out the provisions of this act; and in connection with sales or exchanges under the act, he is authorized to effect conveyances without regard to the law governing the patenting of public lands. Wherever in this act functions, powers, or duties are conferred upon the Secretary, said functions, powers, or duties may be performed, exercised, or discharged by his duly authorized representatives.

"SEC. 9. The consent of the United States is hereby given to the sale of school lands and any other public lands of the State of Washington comprising a part of the lands within the project at prices not to exceed their appraised values, determined as provided in subsection 2 (a) hereof.

"SEC. 10. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 11. This act may be cited as 'The Columbia Basin Project Act.'"

## EASEMENTS FOR RIGHTS-OF-WAY OVER NAVAL RESERVATIONS

The bill (S. 301) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for rights-of-way over, across, in, and upon naval reservations, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, Calendar No. 19, Senate bill 301; Calendar No. 20, Senate bill 176; Calendar No. 21, Senate bill 184; Calendar No. 22, Senate bill 303; Calendar No. 23, Senate bill 304; Calendar No. 24, Senate bill 305; Calendar No. 25, Senate bill 306; and Calendar No. 26, Senate bill 393, were introduced at the request of the Navy, all were favorably reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs, and all were passed by the Senate during the last session, but failed of approval by the House of Representatives for want of time. They have all been before the Senate before, and most of them have been explained. I hope that favorable action will be taken on them so that they may go to the other House for consideration.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me inquire whether Calendar No. 22, Senate bill 303, is the bill concerning which I previously interrogated the Senator?

Mr. WALSH. It is the same bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And is the bill now in the same shape as it was when it had the Senate's approval during the last session?

Mr. WALSH. Exactly. I think the Senator approved of the committee changes which had been made in the original bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct. I wanted to be sure it was the same bill.

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 301?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 301) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for rights-of-way over, across, in, and upon naval reservations, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "telephone" and the comma to insert "telegraph" and a comma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 301) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him, to grant easements for rights-of-way over, across, in, and upon naval reservations and other lands under his control for gas, water, electric, telephone, telegraph, power, and sewer pipe lines, and roads and highways, to any citizen, association, or corporation of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any State of the United States or political subdivisions of a State of the United States: *Provided*, That such rights-of-way shall be granted only upon a finding by the Secretary of the Navy that the same will be in the public interest and will not substantially injure the interest of the United States in the property affected thereby: *Provided further*, That all or any part of such rights-of-way may be annulled or forfeited by the Secretary of the Navy for failure to comply with the terms or conditions of any grant hereunder or for nonuse or for abandonment of rights granted under the authority hereof: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall include in his annual report to the President a full and complete statement of each and all easements granted, which statement shall also include the name and address of the grantee, the purpose of the grant, and the benefits accruing to the United States or to the public therefrom.

### AUSTIN L. TIERNEY

The bill (S. 176) for the relief of Austin L. Tierney was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That Private Law No. 99, Seventy-fourth Congress, an act for the relief of Austin L. Tierney, is amended as follows: ": *Provided*, That compensation, retirement pay, back pay, or other benefits shall be held to have accrued and that this man will be entitled to the benefits, privileges, and rights conferred upon an honorably discharged sailor by reason of the passage of this act."

### PRESENTATION OF SILVER MEDAL TO MEMBERS OF THE PEARY POLAR EXPEDITION

The bill (S. 184) to provide for the presentation of silver medals to certain members of the Peary Polar Expedition of 1908–9 was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be made, at a United States mint, silver medals of an appropriate design to be presented, in the name of Congress, to Matthew A. Henson, Capt. Robert A. Bartlett, Ross G. Marvin, Dr. John W. Goodsell, George Borup, and Donald B. MacMillan, in recognition of their efforts and services, as members of the Peary polar expedition of 1908–9, in the field of science and for the cause of polar exploration, by aiding in the discovery of the North Pole by Admiral Peary.

SEC. 2. If any of such persons has died, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to make the award posthumously by presenting such a medal to the widow or other member of the family of such deceased person.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for carrying out the provisions of this act.

### EXTENSION OF JURISDICTION OF NAVAL COURTS MARTIAL

The bill (S. 303) to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in addition to the persons now subject to the Articles for the government of the Navy, all persons, other than persons in the military service of the United States, outside the continental limits of the United States accompanying or serving with the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard when serving as a part of the Navy, including but not limited to persons employed by the Government directly, or by contractors or subcontractors engaged in naval projects, and all persons, other than persons in the military service of the United States, within an area leased by the United States which is without the territorial jurisdiction thereof and which is under the control of the Secretary of the Navy, shall, in time of war or national emergency, be subject to the Articles for the government of the Navy except insofar as these articles define offenses of such a nature that they can be committed only by naval personnel: *Provided*, That the jurisdiction herein conferred shall not extend to Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, except the islands of Palmyra, Midway, Johnston, and that part of the Aleutian Islands west of longitude 172 degrees west.

### CAPT. RICHARD ROTHWELL, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The bill (S. 304) for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $53 to reimburse Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as a result of the flooding of public quarters No. 425, Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., during the absence of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

### MASTER GUNNERY SGT. EUGENE M. MARTIN

The bill (S. 305) for the relief of Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps, the sum of $1,796.60, which sum represents the value of personal property lost as a result of a fire which occurred in public quarters No. 143, United States Marine Barracks, Parris Island, S. C., on September 21, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

### REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVAL PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST AT ANTARCTICA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 306) to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as a result of the disaster at the East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. WALSH. The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of $1,203.84 to pay claims of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as a result of the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expeditions' Antarctic base on Neny Fjord, Marguerite Bay, Palmer Peninsula, Antarctica.

The facts and circumstances of this case are substantially as follows: Navy personnel manned the above-mentioned base from March 1940 until an emergency evacuation on March 21, 1941. The two ships attached to the expedition, the U. S. S. *Bear* and the U. S. motorship *North Star*, proceeding on their assigned mission of evacuating the expedition's two bases, reached the vicinity of Marguerite Bay, Palmer Land, and encountered impenetrable ice pack which prevented their reaching East Base.

After approximately a month of fruitless effort to negotiate the ice pack, it was decided to evacuate the personnel of the base by airplane, and to abandon all equipment, supplies, and materials at the camp. On March 21, 1941, the personnel of the camp, 26 in number, were evacuated by airplane in 2 flights to Mikkelsen Island, 112 miles to the north, at which point they were picked up by the U. S. S. *Bear*. The extremely hazardous nature of the evacuation operations and the limited capacity of the single Condor airplane available for the purpose, necessitated the abandonment of practically all the personal belongings of the camp personnel.

The Navy Department Claims Board has considered the claims of loss sustained by the Navy personnel and has found the value of the property lost to be $1,203.84.

There is no other authority of law pursuant to which these claims may be adjusted by the Navy Department and therefore the matter is submitted to Congress for its approval. The additional cost to the Government would be not to exceed $1,203.84. The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department and is approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Assuming, for example, that there was a naval base in the Aleutian Islands, and that certain naval personnel stationed at the base were renting homes, not on Government property, and had their own personal furniture in the homes, and that it became necessary to evacuate the base, with resultant loss of the furniture and other personal belongings, what is the background of the policy of the Government relative to such personal losses? Let me say that I desire to ascertain whether the bill under consideration is consistent with our past policy.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, where naval personnel meet with losses at sea by reason of fire, explosion, or other disaster, the Navy Department has authority to adjust the losses without coming to Congress; but where losses occur on shore, as the loss covered by the pending bill occurred on shore, at the Aleutian Islands, or at Quantico, or at any other naval base, the practice is for the Navy to set up a claims board to determine whether the Navy Department is responsible for the loss or whether the personnel who claim the losses are in any way responsible. The claims board makes its finding, and then the Navy Department prepares for introduction a bill or bills for the payment of the claims.

The pending bill is one of the bills introduced at the request of the claims board of the Navy, who heard the claims in the particular case.

Do I make the matter clear to the Senator?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. I ask the Senator to follow me one step further. In a case such as the one I cited, what has been the usual practice? Does the Navy Department or the Claims Board pass upon and adjust the claim, and ask for action by Congress?

Mr. WALSH. They find the cause of the disaster or the evacuation, as in the case of the pending bill, and the circumstances attached to it, so as to eliminate the element of negligence on the part of those who filed the claim. When the claims board is convinced that the loss of personal property occurred while the property was in the custody of the Government, the board finds that fact, and the bill is introduced for congressional approval.

Mr. BRIDGES. In such case there must be no question of negligence on the part of the personnel involved; is that correct?

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,203.84, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expeditions' Antarctic base on Neny Fjord, Marguerite Bay, Palmer Peninsula, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

## TRANSPORTATION OF PETROLEUM BY PIPE LINE

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On behalf of myself, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to submit a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be read at the desk for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received out of order, and, without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 103), as follows:

Whereas the production of ships, the making of high-octane gasoline, and the construction of synthetic-rubber plants have been and are being delayed because of the shortage of necessary materials; and

Whereas it is now proposed to construct a steel pipe line from points in Texas northeast to a point in Indiana for the transportation principally of petroleum products; and

Whereas the construction of such pipe line will consume materials and labor in competition with the above-mentioned projects and will cost a vast sum of money; and

Whereas the diversion and use of vast quantities of critical materials and labor would be justified only if alternative means of transportation for petroleum products, such as barges and railroad tank cars, are not and cannot be made available, and then only if the projected pipe line is so located and of such character as to provide the maximum increase in the required transportation capacity for petroleum and petroleum products; and

Whereas it has been contended that recently announced plans of the War Production Board and the Petroleum Administrator for War for projected additional pipeline construction do not meet these requirements, and that consideration should be given to constructing other pipe lines in other locations and to alternative means of transporting petroleum products: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That a full and complete study and investigation be made for the purpose of determining (1) the necessity and desirability of constructing any additional pipe line; (2) the extent to which any projected pipe line would unduly compete for scarce materials and labor with other programs necessary to the war effort; (3) the type, location, and use of any projected pipe line and the functions to be performed by it; (4) the availability of any alternative means of transportation for petroleum products, such as barges or railroad tank cars; and (5) the possibility of increasing the efficiency of present facilities for the transportation of petroleum by rerouting or otherwise.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it is my purpose to ask that the resolution which I have just submitted on behalf of myself and other Senators may be referred to the special committee headed by my colleague and which is known as the Truman committee, the official title of which is the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I understand that some preliminary investigation has already been made by the committee headed by my colleague.

It seems to me that the resolution involves an extremely important matter. The Office of Petroleum Coordinator is about immediately to proceed with the construction of the pipe line referred to in the resolution. The net effect of the construction of the pipe line, as it seems to Senators from the midcontinent area immediately concerned, would be, at the conclusion of the war, to turn over the control of the whole petroleum industry of the United States to some big companies and put the independents out of business.

It is also our opinion, based on the most expert advice the Senators who have submitted the resolution can obtain, that, so far as relieving the shortage of gasoline and petroleum products on the eastern seaboard is concerned, it would be far more preferable to reverse the contemplated process and build a pipe line from Indiana to the eastern seaboard rather than from Texas into the great petroleum field of Illinois, and to use the tank-car service, which is available and which everybody agrees must be used to the very utmost, on the western end of the oil shipment program rather than on the eastern end, which would enable the Government and the public at the present time to utilize the great midcontinent oil fields as well as the Texas fields and the Illinois oil field. It is with that purpose in view, Mr. President, that the resolution has been submitted. I should like to ask my colleague a question.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I do not wish to interfere with the wishes of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, but he must remember that the Truman committee, than which none is more effective, industrious, and capable, is an investigating and exploratory committee. If the resolution contemplates legislation, it must go to the committee having juris-

diction of the subject matter. So the question naturally arises, in my mind, What is the main purpose? Is it for the committee to report to the Senate legislation, or is it merely to investigate?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can say very frankly to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that the purpose of offering the resolution is in some manner to develop facts in the quickest possible manner that might prevent Secretary Ickes, the Petroleum Coordinator, from going ahead with this scheme of his. It was discussed among the Senators who offer the resolution as to whether it should go to the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or the Truman committee, and it was believed, in view of the fact that the Truman committee, as we understood, had conducted some preliminary investigations and had an investigatory staff already set up, that it would be better to send it to the Truman committee in order that the facts might be developed before Secretary Ickes had time to build the pipe line.

Mr. McNARY. I am not contentious about the matter, but I wish the rule observed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Oregon said a moment ago, that, ordinarily, it is better to refer resolutions to a standing committee than to a special committee. We are not asking to have any special committee set up; we are not asking for any appropriation. We simply submit the resolution as a means of calling this matter to the attention of the committee which has already set up an investigatory staff which might develop facts, as we believe, at a very early day, and, possibly, prevent the construction of this pipe line which we are apprehensive might be a national disaster.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair correctly understand the Senator from Missouri to ask unanimous consent to refer the resolution?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have not as yet done so. I was proposing to ask my colleague, who has just come into the Chamber from a meeting of his committee, as I understand, what the situation is as to the preliminary investigation which has already been made.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to his colleague?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. We have made some preliminary investigation of this whole situation; in fact, we held a hearing at Kansas City on the program and the situation as it now is. There are pipe lines already in existence from the proposed terminus at the southwestern end of the line which are not now being used to full capacity; in fact, they are full of gasoline and they have no outlet for it either at the Chicago end or the East St. Louis end of the pipe line.

It seems to me to be good common sense to make use of the pipe lines already in existence in the southwestern section of the country, and, if it is necessary to build a new pipe line, such pipe line should be built from the terminus of the present fuel-oil line in Illinois or from East St. Louis or Chicago to the east coast.

I am not hunting for any more jobs so far as the work of the committee of which I happen to be chairman is concerned, because we have already a tremendous amount of work to do. We have made some preliminary investigations of this very situation, and had expected, in a very short time, to make a report on it; in fact, I have asked for a hearing with Mr. Ickes and some others on Wednesday of this week on this very subject. If the Senate deems it proper that the resolution should be referred to the special committee, of course, I shall be glad to do whatever the Senate asks me to do in the matter.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield first to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I wish to make a very brief observation. If this pipe line is to be built, I think no one would object to its construction; but investigation before several committees, to my certain knowledge, discloses that we have a bottleneck in shipping, the reason for which is the shortage of steel for building ships; likewise we have a bottleneck in the production of octane gasoline, the reason for which is the lack of steel with which to construct the refineries; and likewise we have a bottleneck in the construction of plants for the production of synthetic rubber, the reason for which is a lack of steel necessary to build the plants; and so the synthetic rubber program has been limited to 55 percent.

Further investigation shows that we have a new pipe line which has just been constructed from the Southwest to Illinois. Further investigation shows that we have now constructed and in operation a pipe line from Texas to Chicago. That pipe line is not in use; it is full of gasoline, but there is no place to store it in Chicago. However, the pipe line is there, and could be used, but it is not in use. Some of us were not satisfied under the conditions to sit idly by and let this new pipe line be constructed until we were sure that it was necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. My inquiry goes to the possible duplication of investigations. The Senator, of course, will recall that in the closing days of the last session we created a special committee under resolution offered by him and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], as I recall——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And several other Senators.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and several other Senators—to investigate the oil situation or the gas situation in the section contiguous to Kansas City and that general area.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is the chairman of another special committee investigating the general oil situation. At the time the Senator's resolution was adopted, in the last Congress, question arose as to whether the Truman committee had full jurisdiction to go into a matter of that sort or whether the Maloney committee had the same jurisdiction. Notwithstanding those inquiries, which apparently were not very satisfactorily answered, the other special committee was set up. What is the particular reason why either the Maloney committee or the committee sponsored by the Senator from Missouri in the last Congress would not be qualified to hold this hearing, and will the Senator inform me whether there is duplication, or whether all these oil committees should function?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should be very glad to explain the matter to the Senator from Kentucky. The committee to which he refers, which was appointed under the resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and myself and several other Senators, was a committee whose jurisdiction was confined to the fuel situation in a particular area, namely, the area between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains. The jurisdiction of that committee was specifically limited and purposely limited to that great fuel-producing area, in which a great shortage of fuel had been brought about by conflicting Government orders.

The committee headed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], while it is to look into the general fuel situation, is particularly intended to consider the supply of oil and gasoline on the eastern seaboard.

Mr. MALONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is my understanding. If the Senator from Connecticut wishes to correct me, I should be glad to yield to him for that purpose. That at least is the real purpose of the committee.

It has not been felt by the members of the committee of which I am chairman, since we are confined to the area between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains, and with primary regard to fuel, that we had a right to go into the question of the pipe line for petroleum products designed for the shipment of oil to the East; but we do feel it concerns our area very strongly, and we feel that it concerns the whole United States very strongly, whether the control of petroleum products in the United States at the conclusion of the war shall be turned over to a few large oil companies which happen to be very heavily represented in the Office of the Petroleum Administrator.

Therefore we have believed that the Truman committee, with their investigatory staff already set up, is better qualified to make the investigation than we are. I say very frankly that I do not believe it is necessary to adopt the resolution to give the Truman committee jurisdiction, because I believe they have jurisdiction under their general authority, already provided; but my colleague informed me that the Truman committee had not proceeded with the matter, although they had made a preliminary investigation, by reason of the fact that they thought that either the

committee headed by the Senator from Connecticut, or the other committee, headed by me, had taken that matter into consideration, and they did not wish to duplicate the work.

It seems to me that the Truman committee, having made a preliminary investigation and being ready to proceed, is the proper committee to make the investigation. As I have said, I do not think it is necessary to confer jurisdiction on the Truman committee. I do think it is very desirable to impose specifically that jurisdiction on the committee, or call the attention of the committee to it. It is for that reason that we have submitted this resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I ask the Senator whether this pipe line is in process of construction?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have been informed by the Office of the Petroleum Administrator that the construction of the pipe line has not actually been started, but that it is imminent.

Mr. BARKLEY. This has no relationship, then, to the pipe line that was started from somewhere in Texas or Oklahoma up to Salem, Ill.?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The pipe line to which the Senator refers starts at Longview, Tex., and ends, at the present time, I believe, at Norris City, Ill. It is proposed to start this products line from a point somewhere in the vicinity of Beaumont, Tex., join up with the other pipe line some place in Arkansas, and use the same right-of-way. It is our contention, based on all the information we can obtain, that the construction of the pipe line, if it is to be constructed at all, should be started at the other end, should start from Illinois, rather than duplicate the facilities in the Southwest.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator for his courtesy. We are considering the calendar, and many Senators are in their places for that purpose. Unanimous consent was given to read the resolution. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is the continuance of the call of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, the resolution will go over under the rule.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, under the parliamentary situation am I entitled to 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is entitled to 5 minutes on any bill which may be under consideration. The clerk will report the next bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 393) for the relief of William Kovatis.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the so-called oil shortage committee of the Senate, I am very much concerned, and I expect that committee will be greatly concerned, with the resolution just submitted by the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. Obviously any one of several Senate committees might very properly, with or without the resolution, proceed to make such investigation of this situation as the members of those committees desire. The Committee on Interstate Commerce might do it, the Commerce Committee might do it, the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri himself might do it, the Truman committee might do it, the Oil Shortage Committee, of which I am chairman, might do it. I do not think a resolution is necessary. But I believe it would be probably extremely dangerous if we should undertake at this particular moment to do anything which would delay the construction of a pipe line.

Because of the reference made during the brief statement of the Senator from Missouri, I think I should point out that the committee of which I am chairman has Nation-wide jurisdiction, and that it is not, as the Senator supposed, a committee created to deal only with the petroleum situation on the Atlantic seaboard. The committee has authority to deal with the petroleum problem throughout the land.

Mr. President, I am told that the temperature was 35° below zero in some sections of New England this morning. Because of the petroleum shortage there has been great mental anguish all through the Northeast for many months past. I do not know that there has been much actual physical suffering, but I am told that today, and for the past few days, the oil situation in New England—and probably over a broader area—has been seriously acute. I should not be surprised if there was actual suffering, and I think the Senate will make a grave mistake if it now undertakes to consider a resolution that might result in delaying the construction of the proposed pipe line.

I am assuming from what I heard the able Senator from Missouri say that the resolution is submitted, in part, because of a fear of what may happen after the war, in the post-war period, a fear that certain major oil companies may take control of the situation at the expense of the so-called independents.

I have no desire to set aside or delay any proper investigation, and I cannot be absolutely sure that one is not now necessary. But I should like to point out to the Senate that the Army, the Navy, the War Production Board, and various petroleum committees, and every interested agency of the executive branch of the Government, have made a study of this pipe-line situation.

In effect, the pipe line is under way. Much of the preliminary work has been done. I do not think a shovel has been put into the ground as yet, but——

Mr. WALSH. To what pipe line does the Senator refer?

Mr. MALONEY. The so-called products line, the 20-inch line. Engineers are engaged, surveys are under way, and I should like to point out that a large part of the suffering of the last year has been due to the fact that the construction of the original 24-inch pipe line was too long delayed. I am able to say, on my authority as chairman of the Special Petroleum Committee, that the situation is exceedingly dangerous, and there is reason to believe that next winter, in the northern area of the country, the Northwest as well as the Northeast, we may have great trouble. We may not be so fortunate as we have been this winter, when, by living on a hand-to-mouth basis, it appears we may just about get by without breakdown or epidemic. The people of New England have lived for months in the shadow of pneumonia and influenza. There is some indication that such a situation might yet exist in the Northwest, because the situation might get tight there, too.

There has already been great trouble in the northern part of the country, aside from the Northeast—in Michigan, Wisconsin, and other areas—and I hope the Senate will not now do a thing that would delay the construction of this so-called 20-inch line.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator has spoken of various sections which have been affected. I should like to say to the Senator that when I was in Kansas City about 2 weeks ago, holding hearings on this very situation, the temperature was about 15 below zero. As a matter of fact, it was very much below that in Chicago as I came through. That is, in a section which produces between 75 and 80 percent of the fuel oil of the United States under an irrational system of rationing, there has been very great suffering, right at the door of the wells and the refineries.

Mr. MALONEY. The able Senator from Missouri leaves the subject under discussion. I quite agree with him that there have been rationing mistakes, and that as a result thereof there has been some suffering, at least mental suffering, and we may have more of that. But I am concerned with providing fuel oil for the homes of the North, not particularly the northern section whence I come, but it so happens that that section of the country has been most seriously hit.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. MALONEY. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator from Connecticut will yield, I should like to inquire of the Senator whether his committee has made a survey of all the proposed pipe lines, or if he knows whether any other committee has done so.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I do not know just what the Senator from Massachusetts means by a survey. We have made a study of the pipe-line situation over the country.

Mr. WALSH. I have in mind to ask the Senator whether he knows what progress has been made and to what extent the proposed pipe line to the East has been undertaken.

Mr. MALONEY. I assume the Senator has reference to the so-called big-inch line, the 24-inch line from Texas to Illinois?

Mr. WALSH. No; from Illinois to the eastern seaboard.

Mr. MALONEY. It is the hope of the Office of Petroleum Administrator for War that that large pipe line can be completed to the East by next December. I should like to point out that even with the so-called 24-inch pipe line completed by that time we are faced with very great danger, taking into account the constant need for the withdrawal of petroleum products to satisfy the needs of our forces in Africa and probably in other places before another winter comes.

Mr. WALSH. I am informed that the money has been appropriated for the building of this pipe line to the eastern coast, that the plans have been prepared, and that the only reason it has not been built is that it has been impossible to obtain priorities for its building. Is that information correct?

Mr. MALONEY. Scarcity of materials has contributed to the delay.

Mr. WALSH. I refer to the pipe line from Illinois to the East. The Navy is very much interested in the pipe line, as is also the civilian population. The Army is also interested, but the Navy is particularly interested in it. My information from the Navy is that the bottleneck situation referred to by reason of inability to obtain priorities has been removed and that the pipe line is going to be built. I am wondering if the Senator's committee has that information.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; we have.

Mr. WALSH. So that, so far as we know, that is a program which is going forward, and the construction will proceed during the next year, and the pipe line will be ready for operation in the fall?

Mr. MALONEY. Late this year.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to ask the Senator one other question, and I thank him for yielding to me. I hope some Senate committee will give us a detailed and complete account of all proposed pipe lines. I sat in an unofficial committee recently, a committee of Senators from the Northeast, and there was presented to us a plan for a pipe line through to the Carolinas from Texas. Apparently there are a great many plans for pipe lines. I think some committee—and I believe the committee headed by the Senator from Connecticut is in the best position to do so—ought to inform us what pipe lines have been built, what can be built, what is the reason they are not being built, and how soon they will be put in operation.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to point out that some of the matters the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has dealt with are quite delicate. There is a great need, as every Senator knows, for the early and rapid construction of escort vessels. There are great shortages of materials. Some have thought that valves and pumping equipment which would be needed in connection with the construction of this or any other large pipe line might rob materials needed in the construction of escort vessels. But this entire pipe-line matter has been studied by the Army and Navy, and if the Navy were to suggest that we would rob the armed forces of so much as one escort vessel, I should be reluctant to disagree with the Senator from Missouri. I am assuming, however, that they, the Army and Navy, have taken all those things into account. We do not want to jeopardize our ship-construction program, particularly so far as escort vessels are concerned. But let me point out, Senators, that a great bulk of the war production of this country is centered in New England, and we need oil to run the plants there, as well as to keep the homes of the war workers reasonably comfortable. If we should be so unfortunate as to encounter a shortage of oil for a very long period of time next winter, in this distressed section of the country, the entire war program might suffer a very damaging blow.

I shall not trespass longer on the time of the Senate, because I am now almost out of order, having taken up so much of its time, but I do want to admonish the Senate that this is a very serious subject and situation, and I hope it will be dealt with very carefully.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is tremendously interested in the problem which is now being debated before the Senate. I have great respect for the opinions of the chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate Gasoline and Fuel Oil Shortages and the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]. I also have equal respect for the opinions and the conclusions of the chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. My position in this matter at this moment is based solely and wholly upon what the junior Senator from Missouri has said. His committee has found a bottleneck with respect to the transportation facilities to speed the oil to the eastern seaboard after it is received in my section of the country. He states positively, and he is present now, that his committee is able to show that refineries in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Illinois are now filled to overflowing, and that a products pipe line running from Texas into Chicago at this moment cannot be used because there is no transportation facility out of Chicago to the East to deliver the oil.

Mr. President, no one is more interested than the Senator from Illinois in alleviating the suffering in the East or in supplying oil for ships to transport supplies to our soldiers across the sea. Frankly, I do not know who is right and who is wrong. We have to assume in the first instance that those who are dealing with a great project of this kind know what they are doing. No one in the Senate Chamber has been more faithful in supporting the Army and the Navy in their war efforts and endeavors than has the Senator from Illinois, and I will sink or swim with them on nearly all propositions, because if we do not do that then we are all lost.

But, Mr. President, here is a domestic problem, which individuals can at least analyze and to which they can give some thought of their own, just as we are doing here constantly to other domestic problems. After listening to what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] had to say about this matter, I had no hesitancy in joining with this small group of Senators in directing the attention of the Secretary of the Interior, who is the coordinator of the petroleum industry, to the question of the necessity of building an additional products pipe line.

Mr. President, it does not affect the fuel pipe line at all. That is almost completed. The only thing it does is to call attention for the moment at least to the facts that are being developed by the Truman committee relating to what seems to me an important question, and the question solely is as to whether or not the pipe line should be built from Texas to Illinois, or whether the pipe line should be started in Illinois and built on to the East. It is not a question of trying to deny the East anything. It is a question of who is right and who is wrong. I think we all agree that sometimes the officials downtown make mistakes, and I am not so certain that the Secretary of the Interior is completely familiar with all the facts involved in this proposition, although I may be wrong on this point. We all realize his tremendous responsibilities.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to call the Senator's attention further to the fact, as was discussed in the meeting the other day at which the Senators presented this resolution, that the best information we could obtain and the best authority is that the bottleneck in railroad transportation is east of the Mississippi River rather than west of it. In other words, the available tank-car facilities might be better used at the western end of the oil-shipment program rather than at the eastern end. The bottleneck is east of the Mississippi rather than west.

Mr. LUCAS. Where the bottleneck is I am not sure, but the evidence will develop it, and perhaps the evidence with respect to the bottleneck has been developed by the committee headed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] who is now on his feet, and to whom I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that neither do I know the answer to that question. I now have no objection to the matter going to the Truman committee. I have nothing but applause for the Truman committee. My concern is that there be no unnecessary delay on the pipe line. I am told that in connection with these plans the Office of the Petroleum Administrator for War went into careful detail with the railroad people, as they did with all other agencies concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. Be that as it may, I know that the Truman committee has done more than all the other committees put together in discovering many serious mistakes which have been made by the various agencies of the Government. The job is so big that honest mistakes are bound to be made. No one will deny that fact. Even the Truman committee has made mistakes, and I have not always agreed with them. At times I have defended certain individuals who have been condemned by that committee, but no one will deny the fact that the committee has been worth its weight in gold and has saved many million dollars to the taxpayers of the country. It has certainly aided the war effort. As a result of the standing which the Truman committee has with the American people, whenever the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] makes a statement we are bound to give it weight.

I do not wish to delay the construction of any pipe line, Mr. President. I do not desire to cause any delay whatever in connection with the transportation of vital oil to the East. However, there is a problem involved; and when I am told that the pipe lines are filled to overflowing, when I am told that the refineries in my section of the country, in Kansas, and in Oklahoma, are filled to overflowing, and that oil cannot be taken from them because of lack of transportation facilities, I say that it is only a fair proposal that we at least make a preliminary investigation through the proper committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague needs no assistance from me, either by way of argument or factual data, to support and sustain the point which he previously made before the Senate. Even while the discussion was in progress I received over the telephone a telegram from the mayor of Bridgeport, which reads as follows:

> Range oil and petroleum situation desperate in Bridgeport. Terrible suffering among peoples in this war-production city. With subzero temperatures, less than one day's supply of kerosene and range oil on hand. It is being doled out to sick and to families with infants and in ridiculously small amounts. Action is imperative and must be taken at once.
>
> JASPER MCLEAVY,
> *Mayor of Bridgeport.*

Mr. President, last week in the city of Hartford distributor tank trucks came to central distributing points where authorities had sought to collect such range oil and kerosene supplies as were available so that the trucks might pick it up and deliver it in small quantities to people who were on the preferred list—preferred by virtue of the dire circumstances in which they found themselves. Day after day went by and no oil came in. Women came with gallon containers, from homes where there had been no heat for 2 or the 3 days. They wept bitterly. That is the situation in Connecticut.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. How would the proposed pipeline affect the situation to which the able Senator from Connecticut has made reference?

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the able Senator from Illinois that I know nothing about any quarrel which may exist on the part of independent producers in the Missouri and Kansas oil fields or whether they do or do not receive access through a pipe line to tie into one running from the Texas Panhandle to Norris City, Ill. That is not the point at all. The point my colleague was making was that he wanted to see no action of any kind taken which might interfere with expediting consideration of the problem as it affects the Northeast. That is all I understood my colleague to say.

Mr. MALONEY. The answer to the inquiry of the able Senator from Illinois is something like a difference of 200,000 barrels of petroleum a day.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, is it not also true that in offering the resolution today the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] stated that he hoped prompt action would be taken on it so as to postpone construction of the pipe line?

Several Senators rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield and if so, to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. I prefer not to yield at this time. I make the point that for many months—as long ago as last March or April—those of us in the affected areas, where the plight is so serious, urgently sought to call attention of this body to the precarious situation. Later, in May, the Senate joined with us in an amendment to a bill then before this body which would provide not less than $20,000,000 to supply oil barges to carry oil and build up reserve stocks in the summer.

We had testimony then—and the Senate acted upon it—to the effect that those barge lines could have assisted, by their conversion to fuel oil carrying potentialities, within 150 days at the very most. However, it was not until December 20 that the affected agencies agreed on how they would get together.

I am not quarreling, by way of recrimination, over what has happened. That gets us no more oil or gasoline. My point is that the situation which many of us thought would become acute this winter has materialized into a very dire and desperate plight. Mr. President, I submit that we can brook no action which would involve further delay.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word in support of the position of the Senator from Connecticut.

The oil situation has been badly mismanaged. It has been bungled in such a way that havoc has been raised in my section of the country. Last summer I stood upon the floor of the Senate and predicted the situation that might occur in New England and in the Northeast. The conditions I predicted might occur have occurred. Today it is 32 degrees below zero in my State of New Hampshire. People are suffering; sickness is prevalent; conditions are desperate and some people are still talking of investigating. We want action, not investigation. I cannot understand statements to the effect that people have suffered only mental anguish. When I went home before Christmas, for the Christmas holidays, the morning I arrived in Boston I picked up a copy of the Boston Post and read in scareline headlines that 10 people had died because they could not obtain sufficient oil to keep them warm. People have died and we still want to investigate.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I desire to correct the statement made by the Senator from New Hampshire. I said it was no less than mental anguish.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was not referring to what the Senator said. I know he realizes the situation and is doing all he can. However, it has been stated that there was some mental anguish. It is much more than mental anguish that is taking place in New England today. The situation is serious. People are suffering and will continue to suffer. There is no reason for further delay in taking action. Any action which will obtain the relief which is needed should be taken at once.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. How many persons in the Senator's State listened to the Fuel Administrator when he requested more than a year ago that users of fuel oil convert to coal?

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe that as many as could obtain the material with which to convert, converted to the use of coal.

Mr. GUFFEY. During the last World War I was in Washington as a member of the Petroleum War Service Committee. I have been in the oil business all my life. We had some problems then, but they were child's play as compared with the transportation problems which confront us today. As I recall, not a single tanker was sunk by a submarine during that war. We were bringing oil up from the Gulf of Mexico with tankers in ample quantities. At the end of the war we had more production than we had when the war started. There is ample production at the present time. The problem is purely one of transportation. The Oil Coordinator has been trying to tell people in the East, in the North, and in Pennsylvania that there is a shortage in transportation and not in the production of oil.

During the present month, a 28-day month, the East Texas oil field, with which I am familiar, was shut down 10 days. If it were operating all the time it could produce an additional 3,800,000 barrels of oil a day; but there are no transportation facilities.

A great many Senators criticised the Oil Administrator when he advised people to change their heating methods from oil to coal, and they did not do so. They would receive one report from the Senate and another from the House. One report would be to the effect that there was no shortage, and another report would announce a shortage. The shortage was not in the oil, but in transportation. Any person who studied the problem could find that out.

Two weeks ago the railroad men of the country, at the suggestion of the president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, got together and arranged to transport 150,000 barrels more oil in tank cars and in containers. We have not advised our people at home, and did not do so last year, to convert from fuel oil to coal. If that had been done, most of the present trouble would have been averted, but we did not ask our constituents to convert at the right time.

There will be another shortage in transportation in from 6 months to a year. Every time we send more troops overseas we must send more fuel oil and gasoline so that they may be properly supplied. I predict that before another 3 months shall have elapsed we shall have to send overseas 200,000 barrels more oil a day than we are sending at the present time. Therefore, Senators may as well educate their constituents to the conversion of oil-heating equipment to the use of coal. I believe that situation will prevail in Pittsburgh, in the West, and wherever transportation is inadequate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator from Pennsylvania in favor of building a pipe line?

Mr. GUFFEY. Yes; I am in favor of it. I did not criticize Secretary Ickes when the recommendation was made for the so-called Big Inch pipe line, but I think that the pipe line should be extended to the Atlantic coast.

Mr. BRIDGES. So do I.

Mr. GUFFEY. If Senators would consult Secretary Ickes and his oil committee—and he has the brains of the oil industry on that committee—they would receive the proper answers to all these questions in 1 hour's conference. I hope those in doubt about the situation will do so.

### WILLIAM KOVATIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 393?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 393) for the relief of William Kovatis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That William Kovatis, formerly of the United States Marine Corps, shall be entitled to medical care at Government expense at a facility of the Veterans' Administration, until a finding by competent authority that no further improvement can be made by continued treatment, for the injury sustained at the naval prison, Portsmouth, N. H., on November 3, 1941: *Provided*, That no compensation, retirement pay, back pay, pension, or benefits other than benefits provided for herein shall be held to have accrued prior to or subsequent to the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act shall operate to change the nature of the discharge given to William Kovatis on May 18, 1942.

### PERMANENT LOAN TO THE UNITED STATES BY THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 319) to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky tell us whether or not the Government now is making an appropriation to the National Gallery of Art and, if so, in what annual amount?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is an appropriation, the amount of which I do not now recall, for the maintenance of the National Gallery of Art. The bill relates to a $5,000,000 bequest, which it is desired on the part of the donor to give to the National Gallery of Art.

We already have such bequests which are loaned to the Government through the Treasury, and they bear a rate of interest which is fixed in the statute. Heretofore, from time to time bequests of this kind have been made in cash or in its equivalent. The policy has been to loan the money to the Government through the Treasury, and it bears a uniform rate of interest of 4 percent.

The bill is simply for the purpose of carrying out the policy heretofore adopted of accepting the bequest and authorizing that the money be loaned to the Government at a rate of interest fixed in the act itself, and it is in harmony with the policy which the Library of Congress and the National Gallery of Art have followed with respect to such bequests.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that, of course, the point which struck my notice with reference to the bill was that we could borrow $200,000 a year at a rate of interest a very great deal less than 4 percent, and could annually appropriate $200,000 in perpetuity to the National Gallery of Art. That is what we are really doing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it is true that we could borrow money at a lower rate of interest than 4 percent; but that is the percentage which has been fixed by law in regard to all such bequests; it is a uniform rate and, of course, offers itself as an inducement for such bequests which rich people wish to make to the Library of Congress or to the National Gallery of Art. It is in order that that may be done that passage of the bill is necessary.

Mr. DANAHER. I can understand that it could not be done unless we had such a bill on the statute books; but it is going to cost the Government $200,000 a year in perpetuity, or at least the difference between that amount and the cost of borrowing that same amount if we were to appropriate the money directly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that is true in a sense, but we would not have the benefit of the bequests if we simply endeavored to finance directly.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 319) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to receive into the Treasury from time to time as a permanent loan by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art to the United States sums in cash of not to exceed $5,000,000 in the aggregate, and to pay interest on the principal amount of such loan at the rate of 4 percent per annum, payable semiannually. Such interest is hereby permanently appropriated for payment to the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art.

### CHARLES F. KEGEL

The bill (S. 167) for the relief of Charles F. Kegel was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $450 to Charles F. Kegel, of Turner, Mont., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the loss of his truck, such truck having been destroyed on December 5, 1936, by a fire which burned a garage at Turner, Mont., in which it was stored for the purpose of safeguarding its load, consisting of property used in connection with Resettlement Administration projects: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

### ARTHUR A. SCHIPKE

The bill (S. 171) for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arthur A. Schipke, of Meriden, Conn., the sum of $148.15, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for property damage resulting from a collision between his automobile and a Department of Agriculture truck in Union, Conn., on March 10, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

### DR. PAUL ROGER ZAHLMANN

The bill (S. 173) for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $51, to Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann, of New Haven, Conn., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for payment for professional services rendered to Charles Huelsman, an employee of the Work Projects Administration, who sustained injuries while engaged in the performance of his duties as such an employee: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid

or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 355) for the relief of R. S. Howard Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the bill is a most unusual one. I wonder if we may have an explanation of it from the Senator from Louisiana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Neither the author of the bill nor the Senator who reported it is present at the moment.

Mr. DANAHER. Then I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under objection of the Senator from Connecticut, the bill will be passed over.

CLAIMS GROWING OUT OF MEDITERRANEAN FRUITFLY ERADICATION CAMPAIGN

The bill (S. 403) for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as a result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. VANDENBERG subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with calendar No. 32, Senate bill 403, which was passed over, it being a bill to run back into the ancient history of Florida's fruitfly, and to reach forward into the Treasury for about $10,000,000, I should like to have pending a motion to recommit the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion will be pending.

RICHARD BARKER

The bill (S. 404) for the relief of Richard Barker was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard Barker, of Lockport, La., the sum of $1,500, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred in moving his residence adjoining the Government right-of-way due to caving of the bank of the Intracoastal Waterway Canal, at Lockport, La., during the year 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provision of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MRS. ERNESTINE FUSELIER SIGLER

The bill (S. 405) for the relief of Mrs. Ernestine Fuselier Sigler was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Ernestine Fuselier Sigler, of Oberlin, La., the sum of $1,200, in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by her and for expenses incurred as the result of an accident, involving an Army truck engaged in Third Army maneuvers on September 25, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

HOWARD M. SANDUS

The bill (S. 418) for the relief of Howard M. Sandus was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,700 to Howard M. Sandus, of Waukegan, Ill., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for hospital and medical expenses incurred, and for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as a result of the motor vehicle in which he was riding as a passenger being struck by a United States Army truck, at the intersection of United States Highway No. 41 and Illinois State Highway No. 22, on April 16, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 439) for the relief of Perkin's Gins, formerly Perkin's Oil Co. of Memphis, Tenn., was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, is the Senator who sponsored the bill present in order that he may explain to us something about the proposal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not observe either the author of the bill or the Senator who reported it on the floor at the moment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the bill is apparently the predecessor of 220 contract claims of similar nature, dating back to 1918. We had better have an explanation of it. Therefore, I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over, under objection.

HAZEL M. LEWIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 52) for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$5,738.85," and insert "$1,798.85"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, to Hazel M. Lewis, of Powers, Oreg., the sum of $1,798.85, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for damages as a result of personal injuries sustained by Hazel M. Lewis when assaulted by Richard T. Foster, an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps assigned to Camp China Flats F-105, Fifty-four Hundred and Forty-third Company, on September 5, 1938, at Powers, Oreg.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VODIE JACKSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 517) for the relief of Vodie Jackson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,686", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Vodie Jackson, of Obion County, Tenn. (post-office address, Fulton, Ky.), the sum of $3,686, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him when his wagon, in which he was riding, was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck near Fulton, Ky., on October 18, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT T. GROOM, DAISY GROOM, AND MARGARET GROOM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 518) for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "Margaret Groom", to insert "Turpin"; on page 2, line 3, after the words "Robert T. Groom", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$952"; in line 5, after the words "Daisy Groom", to strike out "$5,500" and insert "$4,000"; at the end of line 5, to strike out the words "personal injuries sustained" and insert "all damages, in-

cluding hospitalization, suffered"; at the end of line 7, to strike out the comma and "$7,500" and insert "Turpin, $3,500"; and at the end of line 8, to strike out "personal injuries sustained", and insert "all damages, including hospitalization, suffered", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, his wife, and Margaret Groom Turpin, his daughter, all of Murfreesboro, Tenn., the respective sums hereinafter specified in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States arising out of a collision which occurred near Murfreesboro, Tenn., on October 21, 1941, when an automobile driven by Robert H. Pate, a United States mail carrier, ran into the automobile of the said Robert T. Groom: To the said Robert T. Groom, $952 as compensation for property damage and other damages sustained by him; to the said Daisy Groom, $4,000 as compensation for all damages, including hospitalization, suffered by her; and to the said Margaret Groom Turpin, $3,500 as compensation for all damages, including hospitalization, suffered by her: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom Turpin."

EMILIANO LOPEZ AND ELIZA R. LOPEZ

The bill (S. 493) for the relief of Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez, Santa Fe, N. Mex., the sum of $615.30. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the said Emiliano and Eliza R. Lopez for damages arising out of an accident in which Patricio Lopez, minor son of the said Emiliano and Eliza R. Lopez, suffered personal injuries when the truck which he was driving collided with a truck owned by the United States and used in connection with Indian Service operations in the Pueblo Nambe, Santa Fe County, N. Mex., on August 12, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

The bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the bill or its general objectives. I should like to have the chairman of the committee explain it, if he is available. If not, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under objection of the Senator from Oregon, the bill will be passed over.

(This bill was subsequently considered and passed.)

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR PERSONNEL OF ARMY ASSIGNED TO DIVING DUTY

The bill (S. 427) to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That enlisted men of the Army of the United States assigned to the duty of diving shall receive additional pay, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, at the rate of not less than $5 per month and not exceeding $30 per month: *Provided*, That officers and enlisted men employed as divers in actual salvage or repair operations in depths of over 90 feet, or in depths of less than 90 feet when the officer in charge of the salvage or repair operation shall find in accordance with instructions prescribed by the Secretary of War that extraordinary hazardous conditions exist, shall receive, in addition to the foregoing, the sum of $5 per hour for each hour or fraction thereof so employed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 617) for the relief of Homer C. Chapman was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in connection with Calendar No. 43, Senate bill 617, let me say that the report in the file would indicate that the claimant sought to enlist in the United States Army on June 9, 1899; that 4 days later he entered a hospital; that a month and a half later was discharged from whatever service he had rendered; and that at this late date, having all the time been found to be mentally defective, he would be restored, under the bill, to all the benefits enjoyed by honorably discharged soldiers. I assume the restoration would date back to 1899. I note that the Secretary of War filed an adverse report recommending that the bill be not passed. If there be any reason why the facts, as I understand them, should justify the adoption of the measure, I shall be glad to have an explanation made accordingly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to comply with the request of the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill was passed by the Senate at the last session, having been unanimously recommended by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. It was also recommended by the House Committee on Military Affairs. It has been rerecommended at this session because the facts of the case, while they are as the Senator has described and as they are set forth in the bill, are clearly that this man became ill of the "flu" or some similar disease, and while he was suffering from a high fever was inconsiderately diagnosed as insane. As soon as the fever passed, the man recovered his normal mental condition and has been an outstanding and effective citizen of Wyoming ever since. The purpose of the bill is to correct what was an obvious error and rather an unfair decision against the soldier.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. How much will it cost the Government to reinstate this beneficiary on the rolls back to 1899?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no statement to that effect in the report of the Secretary of War, and I assume, therefore, that it was not considered that such would be the result. My understanding is that the bill authorizes the beneficiary to obtain whatever pension benefits there may be from now on.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it may well be that the explanation which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will completely dissipate whatever doubts I may have with reference to this measure, but I should like to ascertain what the facts may be with respect to the monetary benefits which will accrue. I, therefore, respectfully ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over under objection.

MEDITERRANEAN FRUITFLY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I was temporarily out of the Chamber, having been called to the telephone. I wish to ask what disposition was made of calendar No. 32, Senate bill 403, for the relief of certain claimants in Florida who suffered losses and damages by reason of the campaign conducted for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can assure the Senator that the bill went over.

GRANT TO SAN DIEGO OF CERTAIN LAND

The bill (S. 621) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and is hereby, authorized to grant and convey, under such conditions as may be approved by the Secretary of the Navy, to the city of San Diego, State of California, for use as a public street, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a strip of land containing 5,950 square feet contiguous to Lytton Street between Barnett Avenue and Rosecrans Street at the United States Naval Training Station, San Diego, Calif.

SEC. 2. That if any part of the above-described lands hereby granted to the city of San Diego shall be used for any other purpose or purposes, or shall cease to be maintained by the city of San Diego for the

purpose for which granted, such part shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 660) to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over under objection.

ADDITIONAL SHIP-REPAIR FACILITIES

The bill (H. R. 1446) authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a few days ago the very able and courteous Senator from Massachusetts spoke to me about the bill when it was placed on the calendar. I suggested that consideration of the bill should wait until the call of the calendar. I should like to have an explanation of the bill from the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this is a bill of considerable importance to the Navy. It authorizes the appropriation of $210,000,000 for ship-repair facilities, principally floating drydocks. The losses the Navy has sustained at sea and the damages which have occurred otherwise to its vessels have necessitated a great expansion in the building of floating drydocks. Such drydocks are of various sizes, some designed to take care of cruisers which are damaged, others to service destroyers, and others submarines. In many instances such floating docks accompany the fleet. The Navy has estimated that it needs $133,000,000 to acquire mobile drydocks for the present year and $77,000,000 is the estimated cost of collateral facilities and work incidental thereto. Heretofore $385,000,000 have been authorized for ship-repair facilities, all of which has been allocated except $20,000,000.

It has become very important to the naval program to increase in every possible way the floating-dock facilities. Drydocks, as we all know, are all in constant use in the building of new vessels. The floating drydocks are built rapidly and in such a way that they are able to go out to sea, so that when a vessel with the fleet is damaged it may be returned to use immediately the repairs are made, and often they can be made at sea without the necessity of taking the vessel to a drydock on land.

I think that covers the explanation. The report is rather long, but it will be noted from the report that the Navy is of the opinion that the deficiency in such floating-dock facilities will increase as the Navy itself expands. The deficiency in drydocks for cruisers and vessels of similar size for 1943 is estimated at 4 and in 1945 as 7. This bill provides for the building of 5 cruiser floating docks. In the case of destroyers and vessels of similar size, the estimated deficiency in drydocks for 1943 is 9, and for 1945 it is 45. The number of floating drydocks recommended is 18.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to attract the attention of the distinguished Senator to this language in the report:

There is a pressing need for vastly increased drydocking facilities all over the world to aid in the prosecution of the war.

Are we building for our own use or for the use of our partners in the war?

Mr. WALSH. These are entirely for our own use. They are not embraced or included in any lend-lease program.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I was next going to ask. These drydocks are floatable, of course?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. And can be maneuvered from one place to another and eventually can be returned to our own country or its possessions?

Mr. WALSH. Exactly; that is true.

Mr. McNARY. I wanted to have that made plain.

Mr. WALSH. The report is rather interesting and rather complete. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 51) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1446) authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize an appropriation of $210,000,000 for additional ship-repair facilities, to consist of floating drydocks and collateral equipment and facilities. The bill also provides authority for the acquisition of land, but it is not now definitely known that it will be necessary to exercise this authority. The bill is similar to previous authorization acts of this nature, and is, accordingly, phrased so as to permit flexibility in this, as in other particulars, in order to provide for the changing developments of the war.

The Navy Department has estimated that, in order to provide essential mobile drydocking facilities, there will be required a total of $210,000,000. Of this sum, $133,000,000 is the estimated cost of the required mobile drydocks, and $77,000,000 is the estimated cost of collateral facilities and work incidental thereto.

There is a pressing need for vastly increased drydocking facilities all over the world to aid in the prosecution of the war. The increase in the United Nations' navies and merchant marines, and the extension of the operations of our fleets, will accentuate and aggravate this need. In addition, the British Admiralty has made urgent requests for this country to provide it with docking facilities in the active theaters of war.

Mobile floating docks are recommended as the most efficient and satisfactory for the purpose. The advantages of mobile docks include the following: They will be able to follow or accompany the fleets, thus facilitating prompt repairs. By affording quick service wherever it is most needed, they will serve to maintain units in active service in all spheres of operation and will thereby increase the striking power of the navies. The construction of graving docks and other types of drydocks require long periods for construction in locations where the difficulties of transportation of men, equipment, and materials from the United States will be considerable and will involve the employment of vessels. The construction of mobile docks will require less time and will not require the use of vessels needed for other war services.

The committee understands that the Navy Department has made a comprehensive global study of the drydocks available to the United Nations for accommodating the various types and sizes of vessels which will be involved in the prosecution of the war. This study is summarized briefly in the table below. The table shows that there is a great deficiency in available drydocks, and that the mobile docks proposed to be authorized will satisfy the need only in part. The table also summarizes the estimated costs.

| Type of vessel served by drydocks | Deficiency in drydocks | | Number of floating drydocks recommended | Estimated cost | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1943 | 1945 | | Per unit | Total |
| Cruisers and vessels of similar size | 4 | 7 | 5 | $11,200,000 | $56,000,000 |
| Destroyers and vessels of similar size | 9 | 45 | 18 | 3,000,000 | 54,000,000 |
| Patrol craft and vessels of similar size | 75 | 93 | 25 | 900,000 | 22,500,000 |
| Total | | | | | 133,000,000 |

All deficiencies cannot be met because of the requirements for other war purposes. The drydocks recommended are reported to be within the quantities of materials available to the Navy Department under present allocation programs.

Although the Navy Department has definite plans for the use of the drydocks to be provided by this bill, the committee was not informed as to where they will be located. This will be determined by the needs existing when such docks become available.

The committee is advised that the Navy Department has given careful consideration to the steel requirements for the proposed mobile drydocks and has designed a program for their construction under which the average steel requirement will be 5,811 tons a month and the maximum in any one month will be 11,000 tons. This has been correlated with other naval construction so as to keep the total consumption of steel plate in any one month below the present allocations of steel to the Navy Department. The whole program is designed to be completed in 20 months. The maximum consumption would occur in August 1943. When the landing-craft program is completed, the Navy's steel requirement will be lessened.

The Navy Department reports that it will be possible to construct the docks without impairing the essential shipbuilding program. If, in any one month, there is insufficient steel to carry on all of the shipbuilding programs together with the drydock program, the construction of the docks will be temporarily suspended.

The recommended docks will be self-contained as far as possible, but they will require certain collateral facilities and incidental work in order to make them fully effective. Such facilities and work may include berthing piers, temporary shop buildings, tools, temporary power supplies, and other services, as well as dredging and the moorings of the drydocks. The estimated cost of these facili-

ties and work is $77,000,000. The total appropriation is therefore $210,000,000.

This authorization is in addition to existing naval authorizations for ship-repair facilities totaling $385,000,000, substantially all of which has been committed, or tentatively committed, except for a necessary small reserve for contingencies.

The need for the recommended mobile docks is very urgent and commencement of construction at the earliest possible date is necessary. In order to expedite such commencement, the Navy Department requested the approval of the President to contract for the entire program, within the estimates herein submitted. This approval was given subject to the condition that the Navy Department could complete the drydock program out of its present assignment of steel without impinging on its essential programs. Arrangements have been made to conform to this condition.

Pursuant to the above Presidential approval, contracts were made for 48 drydocks with the following contractors:

*For cruisers and vessels of similar size*

[Each drydock consisting of 7 sections]

| Number of sections | Contractor | Location |
|---|---|---|
| 12 | Chicago Bridge & Iron Co. | Morgan City, La. |
| 5 | do | Eureka, Calif. |
| 8 | Pollock-Stockton Shipbuilding Corporation. | Stockton, Calif. |
| 6 | Everett-Pacific Co. | Everett, Wash. |
| 4 | Pittsburgh-Des Moines Co. | Pittsburgh, Pa. |

*For destroyers and vessels of similar size*

| Number of drydocks | Contractor | Location |
|---|---|---|
| 18 | Pacific Bridge Co. | Alameda, Calif. |

*For patrol craft and vessels of similar size*

| Number of drydocks | Contractor | Location |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | Chicago Bridge & Iron Co. | Newburgh, N.Y. |
| 6 | Quincy Barge Builders. | Decatur, Ill. |
| 6 | George D. Auchter Co. | Jacksonville, Fla. |
| 6 | Doullut & Ewin | Mobile, Ala. |
| 4 | The Foundation Co. | Kearney, N. J. |

Section 3 requires the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Congress every 60 days, or more frequently, all acquisitions of land effected under the authority of this bill.

Section 4 provides that any ship, boat, barge, or floating drydock of the Navy may be leased in accordance with the Lend-Lease Act but that they cannot be otherwise disposed of and that title thereto shall remain in the United States. The committee is of the opinion that, while it may be in the national interest to lease the above items to other members of the United Nations, still, where it is practicable to do so, title thereto should remain in the United States.

There are confidential details of the contemplated program with which members of the committee have been acquainted but which for obvious reasons are not included in this report.

The following letter from the Secretary of the Navy to the Speaker of the House of Representatives sets forth the views and recommendations of the Navy Department on this bill. This letter is hereby made a part of this report:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
*Washington, January 22, 1943.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize additional ship-repair facilities.

There is a pressing need for vastly increased ship drydocking facilities all over the world. As the United Nations' navies and merchant marine increase in number and as the operations of our fleets are extended into new areas, this need will be accentuated and aggravated. This prospective condition indicates the necessity for the construction of highly mobile floating docks which can follow the fleets or accompany them. In addition, the British Admiralty has made urgent requests for this country to provide it with docking facilities in the active theaters of war.

Mobile floating docks are considered the most desirable to meet our current and prospective needs, not only because of their mobility but also because graving docks and other types of drydocks require long periods for construction in locations where the difficulties of transportation of men, equipment, and materials from the United States will be considerable. Furthermore, by constructing mobile docks, it is possible to have such facilities ready for use wherever they are most required.

A comprehensive global study has been made of the drydocks that will be available to the United States for accommodating the various types and sizes of vessels which will be involved in the prosecution of the war. The results are summarized briefly in the table below, which also indicates the number of floating drydocks recommended to partially eliminate the deficiencies, as well as the estimated costs of the drydocks themselves.

| Type of vessel served by drydocks | Deficiency in drydocks, December— | | Number of floating drydocks recommended | Estimated cost | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1943 | 1945 | | Per unit | Total |
| Cruisers and vessels of similar size | 4 | 7 | 5 | $11,300,000 | $56,500,000 |
| Destroyers and vessels of similar size | 9 | 45 | 18 | 3,000,000 | 54,000,000 |
| Patrol craft and vessels of similar size | 75 | 93 | 25 | 900,000 | 22,500,000 |
| Total | | | | | 133,000,000 |

All deficiencies could not be met because of the requirements for other war purposes. The numbers recommended are considered to be within the quantities of materials available to the Navy Department under present allocations.

In order to expedite the drydock construction, approval of the President was requested and granted to contract for the entire program within the estimates herein submitted. This approval was given subject to the condition that the Navy Department could complete it out of its present assignment of steel without impinging on its essential programs. Arrangements have been made to meet this proviso.

Although the drydocks will be self-contained as far as possible, they will still require certain collateral facilities and incidental work in order to make them fully effective. These facilities and work may include berthing piers, temporary shop buildings, tools, temporary power supplies, and other services, as well as dredging and the moorings for the drydocks. The estimated cost of these items is $77,000,000. The total request for authorization, therefore, is $210,000,000. Such authorization is required at this time because existing authorizations for ship-repair facilities totaling $385,000,000 are already committed or tentatively committed, except for a necessary small reserve for contingencies.

The Navy Department recommends enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL, *Acting.*

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts to explain section 4 of the bill. What is the purpose of that section?

Mr. WALSH. Section 4 reads as follows:

Hereafter any ship, boat, barge, or floating drydock of the Navy may be leased in accordance with the act approved March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 31), but not otherwise disposed of, for periods not beyond the termination of the present wars, but title thereto shall remain in the United States.

That amendment was placed in the bill in the House of Representatives. This, by the way, is a House bill, and, probably, if passed by the Senate today, and enacted into law, will become Public Law No. 1. The provision referred to was put in for the purpose of retaining the control and title to these floating docks, so that, at the end of the war, they will return to the possession of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, it has the effect of putting a limitation on that part of the Lend-Lease Act?

Mr. WALSH. It certainly has.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## RENTAL ALLOWANCES TO CERTAIN OFFICERS

The bill (S. 641) to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I assume this is to be supplemental to the Joint Service Pay Act of 1922?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Which I think was later modified in 1942?

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. What change does it effect?

Mr. WALSH. The committee took occasion to write a rather extended report, as the Senator will observe, and went into the whole question of pay of naval officers, and allowances of various kinds, so that all the information would be in a document available to all Senators.

The bill now before the Senate deals only with the rental allowances of officers of the Navy, the Army, and the Marine Corps who are without dependents. Officers who have dependents would not be affected by the proposed legislation.

In the act increasing the pay of enlisted men and officers enacted in 1942 provision was made that rental quarters should not be given to officers who were without dependents and who were longer than 3 months in the field service. The Comptroller General's Office ruled that every Army officer and every Marine Corps officer is in the field service, now that we are in war. Previous to the war, entering the field service meant participating in maneuvers, being away from one's habitation or home, and where the Government itself would furnish quarters.

When an officer is at sea, if he is without dependents, he is not given rental allowances, but if he is at sea for less than 3 months, or is in the field service, he is given the rental allowances, on the theory that he will be away only a short time, and when he returns he will have a home to which to go.

The proposed legislation is necessary, for if it is not enacted and the rental allowances permitted, the Navy and the Army will have to spend millions of dollars in providing facilities for all their officers. As we know, facilities for living quarters are now provided at a post of duty, and rental allowances are made when they are not. Therefore the Comptroller General realizes that his ruling is probably not in compliance with the intention of Congress, or with the spirit of existing law, and he has suspended putting into operation his ruling until March 1, in order that the proposed legislation may be enacted, which, briefly, will give officers who are without dependents rental allowances when the Government does not furnish them with a place to sleep. When they are with troops, they are not given allowances, when they are with ships they are not given allowances, but when they are in Washington and have dependents, they are given rental allowances. Under the ruling, if they have no dependents, they are not given rental allowances. This bill would permit them to get rental allowances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, from a hasty examination of the report and the bill, I am unable to find any estimate of the cost to the Government.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is correct. The Navy Department is unable to give an estimate, but I call the attention of the Senator to page 6 of the report, wherein it is stated:

> The Navy Department is unable to make any worth-while estimate of the cost to the Government if the proposed legislation is enacted into law. Without such legislation, however, it may be necessary to construct quarters for officers throughout the country at a tremendous cost and use of critical materials; enactment, therefore, could result in an over-all saving.

Mr. McNARY. In the days gone by, what have these men done?

Mr. WALSH. They lived in bachelor quarters or were paid rental allowances.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator says this applies only to bachelors.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; practically; to those without dependents. If a man has a dependent mother, he is given a rental allowance.

Mr. McNARY. During all the years covering the history of the country, these men have gotten along without quarters being furnished them. Why now are we supplying them quarters, and what is the immediate urgency?

Mr. WALSH. Such an officer is furnished Government quarters. In the absence of quarters he is paid a rental allowance. Heretofore he has either been furnished quarters or been paid the rental allowance. Now there are no quarters for him, and the Comptroller General under a recent ruling will not authorize the payment of rental allowances. At the Naval Academy at Annapolis, for instance, there are not nearly enough quarters for married officers or for those with dependents.

Mr. McNARY. I understand.

Mr. WALSH. When they go outside, there is a rental allowance. When there is no room for them and they have to go to a hotel, they are given rental allowances.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that, but what I want to know is why we now find ourselves without the required quarters. Is it because we have enlarged the armed forces?

Mr. WALSH. Absolutely. There has been a tremendous expansion, as the Senator knows. Heretofore we have not had this problem.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I desired to have brought out. Heretofore we have gotten along without the expenditure. Now the necessity is due, if at all, to the expansion of the armed forces.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has correctly stated the situation.

Mr. McNARY. I have no idea of objecting, because I can see some reason for the proposed legislation, but I am sorry that the naval authorities, and my very able friend the Senator from Massachusetts, are unable to give any estimate of the liability that would fall upon the Treasury of the United States to implement the proposed legislation. Perhaps the information can be obtained by the other House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 641) to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the fourth paragraph of section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"No rental allowance shall accrue to an officer having no dependents while he is on field duty unless his commanding officer certifies that he was necessarily required to procure quarters at his own expense, or while on sea duty, except for temporary periods of sea duty not exceeding 3 months, nor shall any rental allowance accrue to an officer with or without dependents who is assigned quarters at his permanent station unless a competent superior authority of the service concerned certifies that such quarters are not occupied because of being inadequate for the occupancy of the officer and his dependents, if any, and such certifications shall be conclusive: *Provided*, That an officer although furnished with quarters shall be entitled to rental allowance as authorized in this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters."

Mr. WALSH subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the discussion on the floor, I ask to have printed in the RECORD the report from the Committee on Naval Affairs on Senate bill 641.

There being no objection, the report (No. 52) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 641) to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 so as to permit the payment of rental allowance to an officer without dependents while on field duty, when his commanding officer certifies that he was necessarily required to procure quarters at his own expense, or while on sea duty for temporary periods not exceeding 3 months. The bill also provides that whenever competent superior authority certifies that quarters are not occupied because of being inadequate, such certification shall be conclusive.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF SERVICE PAY

The Joint Service Pay Act of June 10, 1922, fixed the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service. For officers of these services, the law prescribed pay and allowances according to rank, consisting of pay, subsistence allowance, and rental allowance. In addition thereto, officers and enlisted men were entitled to 50 percent additional pay for duty involving flying.

The subsistence allowance was fixed at $18 per month for all officers without dependents, and an allowance for officers with dependents ranging from $18 to $54 per month according to the rank of the officer.

Rental allowance was provided for officers with dependents in amounts ranging from $40 per month to $120 per month, according to rank; the rental allowance being allowed to officers with dependents; except when Government quarters were assigned for the officers and dependents. Officers without dependents were not entitled to rental allowance while on field or sea duty, nor when assigned Government quarters.

The Joint Service Pay Act of June 10, 1922, also provided pay for enlisted men of all the military services at rates ranging from $30 per month to $157.50 per month, according to rating and length of service. This act also provided for a money allowance for quarters and subsistence for enlisted men not quartered or subsisted in kind, at rates prescribed by the President, not to exceed a total of $4 per day.

EXPLANATION OF THE PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

The Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, Public Law 607, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 16, 1942, reenacted in substance most of the provisions of the Joint Service Pay Act of June 10, 1922, but increased the pay in the case of ensigns of the Navy, and officers of corresponding rank in the other military services; and generally increased the rates of rental and subsistence allowance in the case of officers.

This act also increased the pay of enlisted men and increased the maximum allowance for quarters and subsistence allowance to $5 per day. In addition, it provided for payment of a quarters allowance to enlisted men of certain grades (chief petty officers, and petty officers, first and second class) with dependents, for periods during which public quarters are not provided and available for his dependents.

The following tables show pay and allowances of officers and enlisted men:

TABLE I.—*Pay of officers and warrant officers in active service*

[Act of June 16, 1942; effective June 1, 1942]

| Grade | | Pay period | Annual base pay | Monthly rates | | | | | | | | | | Rental allowance and subsistence allowance (30-day month) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | With dependents | | No dependents | |
| Army | Navy | | | Initial monthly pay | Over 3 years' service | Over 6 years' service | Over 9 years' service | Over 12 years' service | Over 15 years' service | Over 18 years' service | Over 21 years' service | Over 24 years' service | Over 27 years' service | Over 30 years' service | Rent | Subsistence[1] | Rent | Subsistence[1] |
| General | Admiral | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lieutenant general | Vice admiral | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Major general | Rear admiral (upper half) | | $8,000 | $666.67 | $666.67 | $666.67 | $666.67 | $666.67 | $666.67 | $666.67 | $666.67 | $666.67 | $666.67 | $666.67 | $120 | $42 | $105 | $21 |
| Brigadier general | Rear admiral (lower half) | | 6,000 | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 | 120 | 42 | 105 | 21 |
| Colonel | Captain | 6 | 4,000 | 333.33 | 350.00 | 366.67 | 383.33 | 400.00 | 416.67 | 433.33 | 450.00 | 466.67 | 483.33 | 500.00 | 120 | 42 | 105 | 21 |
| Lieutenant colonel | Commander: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Over 30 years' service | 6 | 4,000 | 500.00 | | | | | | | | | | 500.00 | 120 | 42 | 105 | 21 |
| | Less than 30 years' service | 5 | 3,500 | 291.67 | 306.25 | 320.83 | 335.42 | 350.00 | 364.58 | 379.17 | 393.75 | 408.33 | 422.92 | | 120 | 63 | 105 | 21 |
| Major | Lieutenant commander: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Over 23 years' service | 5 | 3,500 | 393.75 | | | | | | | | 408.33 | 422.92 | 437.50 | 120 | 63 | 105 | 21 |
| | Less than 23 years' service | 4 | 3,000 | 250.00 | 262.50 | 275.00 | 287.50 | 300.00 | 312.50 | 325.00 | 337.50 | | | | 105 | 63 | 90 | 21 |
| Captain | Lieutenant: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Over 17 years service | 4 | 3,000 | 312.50 | | | | | | 325.00 | 337.50 | 350.00 | 362.50 | 375.00 | 105 | 63 | 90 | 21 |
| | Less than 17 years' service | 3 | 2,400 | 200.00 | 210.00 | 220.00 | 230.00 | 240.00 | 250.00 | | | | | | 90 | 42 | 75 | 21 |
| First lieutenant | Lieutenant (junior grade): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Over 10 years' service | 3 | 2,400 | 200.00 | | | | 240.00 | 250.00 | 260.00 | 270.00 | 280.00 | 290.00 | 300.00 | 90 | 42 | 75 | 21 |
| | Less than 10 years' service | 2 | 2,000 | 166.67 | 175.00 | 183.33 | 191.67 | | | | | | | | 75 | 42 | 60 | 21 |
| Second lieutenant | Ensign: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Over 5 years' service | 2 | 2,000 | 175.00 | | 183.33 | 191.67 | 200.00 | 208.33 | 216.67 | 225.00 | 233.33 | 241.67 | 250.00 | 75 | 42 | 60 | 21 |
| | Less than 5 years' service | 1 | 1,800 | 150.00 | 157.50 | | | | | | | | | | 60 | 42 | 45 | 21 |
| | Chief warrant officer: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Over 20 years' commissioned service and with creditable record | 4 | 3,000 | 325.00 | | | | | | | 337.50 | 350.00 | 362.50 | 375.00 | [2]105 | 63 | 90 | 21 |
| | Over 10 years' commissioned service and with creditable record | 3 | 2,400 | 230.00 | | | | 240.00 | 250.00 | 260.00 | 270.00 | 280.00 | 290.00 | 300.00 | 90 | 42 | 75 | 21 |
| | Less than 10 years' commissioned service | 2 | 2,100 | 175.00 | 183.75 | 192.50 | 201.25 | 210.00 | 218.75 | 227.50 | 236.25 | 245.00 | 253.75 | 262.50 | 75 | 42 | 60 | 21 |
| | Warrant officer | 1 | 1,800 | 150.00 | 157.50 | 165.00 | 172.50 | 180.00 | 187.50 | 195.00 | 202.50 | 210.00 | 217.50 | 225.00 | 60 | 42 | 45 | 21 |

[1] Allowances in this column are on the basis of a month of 30 days. For a month of greater or less number of days the amounts should be correspondingly increased or decreased.

[2] The maximum allowances which will accrue to a commissioned warrant officer will be such that the total of base pay, pay for length of service, and allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters will not exceed $458.33 per month. Deduction of the necessary amount should be made from the rental allowance.

NOTES

All commissioned officers are entitled to a 10-percent and warrant officers to a 20-percent increase in base pay for any period of service while on sea duty or duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

Admirals are entitled to a personal money allowance of $2,200 per year. Vice admirals are entitled to a personal money allowance of $500 per year.

No person, active or retired, shall suffer, by reason of this act, any reduction in pay, allowances, or compensation to which he was entitled upon the effective date of this act (sec. 19, act of June 16, 1942).

Officers and warrant officers shall receive an increase of 50-percent of their pay when detailed to duty involving flying (sec. 18, act of June 16, 1942).

Retired officers and warrant officers shall, when on active duty, receive full pay and allowances of the grade or rank in which they serve on active duty (sec. 15, act of June 16, 1942).

TABLE II.—*Pay of enlisted men in active service*

[Act of June 16, 1942, effective June 1, 1942]

| Grade | | Pay grade | Base under 3 years' service | Plus 5 percent over 3 years' service | Plus 10 percent over 6 years' service | Plus 15 percent over 9 years' service | Plus 20 percent over 12 years' service | Plus 25 percent over 15 years' service | Plus 30 percent over 18 years' service | Plus 35 percent over 21 years' service | Plus 40 percent over 24 years' service | Plus 45 percent over 27 years' service | Plus 50 percent over 30 years' service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | Navy | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Master sergeant | Chief petty officer (permanent appointment)[1] | 1 | $138 | $144.90 | $151.80 | $158.70 | $165.60 | $172.50 | $179.40 | $186.30 | $193.20 | $200.10 | $207 |
| | Chief petty officer (acting appointment)[1] | 1A | 126 | 132.30 | 138.60 | 144.90 | 151.20 | 157.50 | 163.80 | 170.10 | 176.40 | 182.70 | 189 |
| First sergeant | Petty officer, first class; officers' stewards, first class and officers' cooks, first class. | 2 | 114 | 119.70 | 125.40 | 131.10 | 136.80 | 142.50 | 148.20 | 153.90 | 159.60 | 165.30 | 171 |
| Staff sergeant | Petty officer, second class; officers' stewards, second class; officers' cooks, second class; and musicians, first class. | 3 | 96 | 100.80 | 105.60 | 110.40 | 115.20 | 120.00 | 124.80 | 129.60 | 134.40 | 139.20 | 144 |
| Sergeant | Petty officer, third class; fireman, first class; officers' stewards, third class; officers' cooks, third class. | 4 | 78 | 81.90 | 85.80 | 89.70 | 93.60 | 97.50 | 101.40 | 105.30 | 109.20 | 113.10 | 117 |
| Corporal | Nonrated men, first class (except fireman, first class; and musician, first class); fireman, second class; musician, second class; mess attendants, first class. | 5 | 66 | 69.30 | 72.60 | 75.90 | 79.20 | 82.50 | 85.80 | 89.10 | 92.40 | 95.70 | 99 |
| Private, first class | Nonrated men, second class (except fireman, second class; and musician, second class); fireman, third class; mess attendants, second class. | 6 | 54 | 56.70 | 59.40 | 62.10 | 64.80 | 67.50 | 70.20 | 72.90 | 75.60 | 78.30 | 81 |
| Private (first 4 months) | Nonrated men, third class (except fireman, third class); mess attendants, third class. | 7 | 50 | 52.50 | 55.00 | 57.50 | 60.00 | 62.50 | 65.00 | 67.50 | 70.00 | 72.50 | 75 |

[1] This pay grade also includes officers' chief stewards and officers' chief cooks.

FAMILY ALLOWANCE

The dependents of enlisted men of the fourth to seventh pay grades (apprentice seamen to petty officer third class) are entitled to a family allowance consisting of a contribution from the Government and an amount deducted from the pay of the man. The amount paid to dependents varies according to the number and class of dependents. The family allowance is payable to wife and children without requiring a showing of dependency. For other classes of dependents—i. e., mother, father, brother, or sister—the allowance is payable only where the person is dependent on the enlisted man for substantial support. For the purpose of payment of allowances in the case of dependents of enlisted men, determination of the question of dependency is made by the department concerned. The law providing for family allowance is operative only during war and for 6 months thereafter.

EFFECT OF THE AMENDMENT IN S. 641

The Comptroller General has decided that under the provisions of section 6 of the act of June 16, 1942, which prohibits the payment of rental allowance to officers without dependents "while on field duty," all officers serving on shore, with troops, either within or without the United States, are on field duty. This construction of the law prohibits payment of rental allowance to officers without dependents, serving ashore, with troops, even though they are not assigned public quarters. The Comptroller General also decided that officers without dependents serving on seat duty for temporary duty not exceeding 4 months, are entitled to rental allowance only where the department concerned certifies that the shore duty is paramount to the duty he is required to render at sea.

The amended language in S. 641 will have the following effect:

(a) It will permit payment of rental allowance to an officer serving on field duty if his commanding officer certifies that he was necessarily required to procure quarters at his own expense.

(b) An officer without dependents will be entitled by law to rental allowance while on temporary sea duty for not to exceed 3 months.

(c) Payments of rental allowance will be authorized in the case of an officer who is assigned quarters, provided a competent superior authority certifies that such quarters are not occupied because of being inadequate for the occupancy of the officer and his dependents.

The Navy Department is unable to make any worth-while estimate of the cost to the Government if the proposed legislation is enacted into law. Without such legislation, however, it may be necessary to construct quarters for officers throughout the country at a tremendous cost and use of critical materials; enactment, therefore, could result in an over-all saving.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department. It meets with the approval of the War Department and has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

Mr. O'DANIEL obtained the floor.

Mr. REYNOLDS and several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. O'DANIEL. For what purpose does the Senator from North Carolina desire to interrupt?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wish to ask unanimous consent that we return to Calendar No. 41, Senate bill 495, to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States. Unfortunately, a moment ago I was called out of the Chamber to answer a telephone call when the bill was reached on the calendar.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I gladly yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina that the Senate recur to the consideration of Calendar No. 41, Senate bill 495?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I objected when the bill was reached on the calendar, in the absence of an explanation. The able Senator from North Carolina is now present, and I shall be glad to give him an opportunity to explain the nature of the bill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the bill provides the same benefits for members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps that are granted members of the armed forces. For instance, it provides for increased pay for overseas service, and transportation in many instances, to which they are not entitled now. It also provides for uniform allowances. In other words, up to the present the members of this corps have not been in the Army, and the enactment of this bill would make them a part of the Army. Every woman who becomes a member of that force relieves some man for combat duty.

In further explanation of the bill, it will authorize the appointment and the enlistment of women in the Army for the duration of the present war, plus a period of 6 months.

Mr. McNARY. If the proposed legislation shall be enacted, would it place the WAACS on a legal parity with the WAVES?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is my understanding.

Mr. McNARY. At the present time the boat is unbalanced, as it were?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is unbalanced at the present time. I see in the Chamber the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, and I believe he will agree to that.

Mr. McNARY. I am willing to accept the Senator's word without any verification or supporting testimony.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. So the purpose of the bill is to place women serving in the Army and those in the Navy on an absolute equality?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Exactly.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. For what purpose?

Mr. DANAHER. For further inquiry with reference to Senate bill 495.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Certainly I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Texas. I notice that in lines 1 to 5, inclusive, on page 3, of Senate bill 495, we depart from the form hitherto utilized in legislation as to the period within which the bill would operate if it should become a law. The Senator will notice, beginning with line 25, on page 2, the words "That there is hereby established in the Army of the United States, for the period of the present war," and so forth. The Senator will certainly see that it does not say "until the cessation of hostilities in the present war." In other words, the very terminology employed differs from the provision we have hitherto relied upon in legislation, to end the legislation at about a given time, at the time of the cessation of hostilities in the present war, or at a fixed date.

My point is that in order to make this language uniform with that which we have hitherto adopted in legislation temporary in character, we should strike out the word "of" after the word "period" in line 1, page 3, and insert "until the cessation of hostilities in"; and on page 3, line 4, after the word "prescribe", insert "or until January 1, 1945, whichever is earlier."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That there is hereby established in the Army of the United States, for the period of the present war and for 6 months thereafter or for such shorter period as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation shall prescribe, a component to be known as the "Women's Army Auxiliary Corps."

SEC. 2. The enlisted personnel of such corps shall consist of women enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the concluding paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (54 Stat. 213). All laws and regulations now or hereafter applicable to enlisted men or former enlisted men of the Army of the United States and their dependents and beneficiaries shall, in like cases and except where otherwise expressly provided, be applicable respectively to enlisted personnel and former enlisted personnel of such corps and their dependents and beneficiaries.

SEC. 3. The commissioned officers of such corps shall consist of women appointed as officers in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the joint resolution of September 22, 1941 (55 Stat. 728), and ordered into the active military service of the United States. They and their dependents and beneficiaries shall have all of the rights, privileges, and benefits accorded in like cases to other persons under that act.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War is authorized to prescribe such additional regulations applicable to such corps and to the members thereof as he may deem necessary. The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps and the Army Nurse Corps shall be the only women's organizations in the Army of the United States.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no woman appointed as an officer in the Army of the United States under the provisions hereof who has previously held an appointment as an officer of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps established pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 14, 1942 (Public Law 554, 77th Cong.), shall be entitled to any uniform allowance payable to officers of the Army of the United States.

Such officers who have not received a complete issue of uniforms, insignia, accessories, and equipment prescribed under the provisions of section 8 of such act of May 14, 1942, may be issued the remainder of such prescribed articles, and all such officers who have heretofore received, or may hereafter receive such complete issue, or any part thereof, may retain such articles as their personal property.

SEC. 6. Effective on the last day of the second calendar month following the date of the approval of this act, the act of May 14, 1942, as amended, except section 11 thereof, is hereby repealed. Section 11 of such act of May 14, 1942, shall not be applicable to enlisted personnel or commissioned officers of the corps established by this act except in cases in which its applicability is based upon the status of such enlisted personnel or commissioned officers as former members of the corps established by such act of May 14, 1942. Enlistment or acceptance of appointment under the provisions of this act shall terminate service under the act of May 14, 1942, and personnel who were enrolled or appointed under the act last mentioned who do not so enlist or accept appointment hereunder will be discharged. The Secretary of War is authorized to provide transportation and sleeping accommodations, or an allowance in lieu thereof at the rate of 5 cents per mile, for the travel from her last duty post to the place of her acceptance for appointment or enrollment to any member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps established pursuant to the provisions of such act of May 14, 1942, who is not appointed or enlisted in the Army of the United States pursuant to the provisions of this act.

Mr. DANAHER. I move to amend the amendment of the committee in the particulars I have indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment of the committee, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 1, after the word "period", it is proposed to strike out the word "of" and to insert "until the cessation of hostilities in," and on page 3, line 4, after the word "prescribe," to insert "or until January 1, 1945, whichever is earlier."

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have no objection to the amendments.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

## THE WORK OF THE OFFICE OF CENSORSHIP

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, one of the most difficult problems of a free government during time of war is to enforce restrictive supervision over communications. This responsibility touches the people of America in their most sensitive privilege—freedom of expression. It requires supervision of matter which may be safely printed in the newspapers, broadcast over the radio, or transmitted through the mails without damage to our war program.

The Director of Censorship, Mr. Byron Price, is administering this duty with a minimum amount of friction or shock to the American people. Recently he submitted to the Vice President of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report of the objectives and methods of the Office of Censorship. I have had the privilege of examining that report, and I believe that a summary of it will be informative to the Members of the Senate. With the consent of the Vice President, and of the Director of Censorship, I ask unanimous consent to have the summary printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1943.

The Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE,
*President, United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

SIR: In the hope that Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress will familiarize themselves with the work of the Office of Censorship, and will give constructive thought to improvements, I take the liberty of outlining below the objectives and present operations of this war agency.

Censorship has always been an integral part of armed combat. In most of our previous wars, communications to and from, and within, zones of combat have been censored directly by the military under the general constitutional powers of the Commander in Chief. In the limited cases where civilian censorship agencies have been set up, a direct link with military requirements has been preserved. Censorship can have no possible justification in a free country except as an aid to the armed forces in their contact with the enmy.

The present Office of Censorship is under civilian direction, but the basis of its operations in the field of communications was formulated by the War and Navy Departments. Long before Pearl Harbor, Army and Navy officers were detailed to plan for censorship. A comprehensive study of American experience in this field, and of the methods employed by other democracies, was made by a joint Army and Navy Board. Schools were set up in the departments and certain officer personnel was trained for war service in censorship.

On the night of December 7, 1941, this personnel was put to work on the mails and cables at the direction of the President. Subsequently, in Section 303 of the First War Powers Act, Congress underlined the operation through statutory enactment. On December 19, 1941, the President issued Executive Order No. 8985 which established the Office of Censorship and gave it discretionary authority to censor communications of all types entering or leaving the country.

The Army and Navy personnel already employed in this work was detached from the departments and detailed to the Office of Censorship. Since then some of these officers have been withdrawn, but cable and radio censorship remains today under the direct supervision of Capt. H. K. Fenn, a regular naval officer, while examination of the international mail is supervised by Col. W. Preston Corderman, of the Regular Army. Both Captain Fenn and Colonel Corderman serve as Assistant Directors in the Office of Censorship.

At the very beginning, we adopted two rules of procedure as basic to this operation. These rules have been reiterated time after time in instructions to our personnel.

First, no information is to be allocated to anyone, or even copied from private communications, unless it relates to the war. The regulations which are constantly before all of our censors begin with the cardinal statement: "That which does not concern the war does not concern censorship." We have assumed that Congress in no wise intended that censorship should be used to enforce peacetime statutes or discover personal or political foibles.

Second, the greatest care must be taken to restrict the distribution of such information within the Government, and to make certain that none of it is circulated outside the Government. To that end our examination of the mail and cables is conducted in guarded rooms by employees who have been acquainted with those sections of the Espionage Act which relate to unauthorized disclosure, and who have signed the most binding pledge of secrecy; allocation to other Government agencies is according to a closely restricted plan based entirely on war interest; delivery to the agencies is by locked and guarded pouch, receivable only by designated officials who have been required repeatedly to give the most positive assurances that the material will be used only for war purposes; and each page of the material itself carries a special warning that no copies are to be made, and that the information is to be communicated only "to those officials whose knowledge of it is necessary to the prosecution of the war."

As a result of experience and consultation, we have been constantly narrowing the scope of this distribution. The responsibility resting with censorship, we have declined numerous applications from other Government agencies for classes of information which cannot be convincingly connected with the war effort.

It has been a cardinal principle also that censorship must not unduly delay the mails and cables. Our stations are required to operate with dispatch. In the case of cables, the delays are a matter of minutes, except for the small percentage of cases where inquiry appears to be necessary. In most instances letters now are cleared and returned to the mails the same day they are received by censorship. Many delays due to shortage of shipping space and other war dislocations have sometimes been attributed without warrant to censorship.

The rank and file of our personnel, recruited through civil service, has been selected with a view to general and specialized ability and has undergone continuing training. Many have come into the service at a personal sacrifice.

Aside from the military, which in the main occupies executive posts, our staff has been recruited under the civil-service regulations. Recruiting continues, since we have not yet been able to assemble qualified personnel to achieve the degree of control contemplated by the original Army-Navy plan and apparently also by Congress. It has been found necessary to do the bulk of our work outside of Washington, and censorship stations have been set up at various points of easiest access to the mail routes, cable heads, and radiotelegraph stations. Altogether, our censors have available to them daily more than 1,000,000 pieces of mail, and some 70,000 messages sent by electrical means of communication.

In section 303 of the First War Powers Act, the Seventy-seventh Congress saw fit to express its intent only in general terms. Both objectives and methods were left to administrative discretion. We have, therefore, laid out policies and formulated procedures based on the lessons of the past and the requirements of common sense.

Our operation is directed toward these two purposes:

To keep information from the enemy.

To gather information which can be used against the enemy.

These objectives closely parallel the recognized purposes of censorship of communications in the First World War. In fact, the

same two principles have activated censorship in all free countries in all wars.

The methods which must be followed to carry out the first objective—suppression of information of value to the enemy—are fairly obvious. In practice we have applied the remedy to all persons without discrimination, deleting military information from mails and cables whether it appeared in communications from suspected spies or in innocently intended but indiscreet letters or messages sent by loyal American citizens. The usefulness of such information in the hands of the enemy would be the same in either case.

As to the collection and treatment of information which will aid affirmatively in defeating the enemy, many complications arise. Manifestly, such information often will be of border-line utility. Manifestly, if it is to be of any use at all, it must be communicated to other governmental agencies, and the problem of proper allocation involves important and sometimes difficult decisions.

Schools have been set up for all examiners of correspondence, and special instruction is given those who operate in such specialized fields as trade and finance. Our stations now are able to censor communications in 133 languages and dialects. We have established specialized units to handle such subjects as exported and imported motion-picture films, and philatelic enclosures, which in past wars have been a medium for transmission of code messages as well as a means of effecting transfer of funds. We have established small but competently staffed laboratories to examine letters for secret writing.

Through daily liaison we cooperate closely with a score of agencies concerned with the prosecution of the war. These agencies do not, however, exercise censorship functions, except in a few special instances. The Army and Navy censor the communications of their own personnel, at a great saving of expense and without any overlapping or other complication with the work of the Office of Censorship. The armed services likewise censor press dispatches sent from north Africa and other zones of combat. The Bureau of Customs examines mail and other written material sent by freight or express or carried by travelers, and the Board of Economic Warfare has certain censorship authority, under the statutes, in the field of technical data when transmitted in international communications.

The benefits which have resulted from censorship cannot be calculated. An infinite amount of military information, which otherwise would inevitably have reached the enemy, has been removed from circulation. Intercepted information turned over by censorship to the intelligence agencies, such as Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has assisted in the apprehension and conviction of enemy agents and the breaking up of conspiracies of various kinds to actively aid the enemy. The actual monetary saving to the Government, through arresting violations of wartime funds-freezing regulations, etc., has more than paid the expenses of the Office of Censorship for the current fiscal year. Public disclosure of details would be unwise because many cases still are under investigation, but full information will gladly be given in confidence to any committee of Congress which desires to have it.

Section 303 of the First War Powers Act, which deals with censorship refers only to communications between the United States and foreign countries. It does not mention communications between continental United States and the Territories and possessions, or between those Territories and possessions. Such communications have been censored since December 7, 1941, under the general constitutional power of the Commander in Chief, since in every instance they pass to and from, or through, zones of combat. Some criticism of this operation arose during the last session of Congress and a bill relating to the subject, known as H. R. 7151, was considered but failed of passage. The legal aspects of the situation were discussed by the Attorney General at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing of December 14, 1942, the record of which is available in printed form.

In addition to the responsibilities in the field of communications, placed on the Office of Censorship by Executive Order No. 8985, the President designated this Office as the agency to supervise the voluntary efforts of press and radio in withholding certain information from the enemy. The personnel employed in this branch or our activity is small, but the results are large and significant. One of the most effective factors in preventing the enemy from learning our military secrets is to keep the information from general circulation domestically.

On January 15, 1942, we issued a Code of Wartime Practices for the American press, drawn up after extensive consultation with other Government agencies and with the industry. The code was in the form of a request to newspapers and all other publications to refrain from publishing information on a given list of subjects, such as the movements of troops and ships, exact war production statistics, and the development of new military models, unless such information was given out officially. The code has been revised from time to time in the light of experience, and many border-line questions arising under it are settled daily by a highly experienced staff in our Washington headquarters.

A similar code was issued for domestic broadcasters. In addition to the request that news items be carefully screened for unauthorized military information, radio stations were asked to discontinue certain types of "quiz" and "open microphone" programs to preclude the possibility that enemy agents might gain possession of the microphone on their own motion and send messages over the air in code. The staff of trained radio personnel which administers this code also supervises the censorship of the short-wave stations which are beamed to foreign countries.

In dealing with press and radio, the Office of Censorship has confined its request strictly to the field of information. In no case has it sought to control editorial or other opinion, or criticism. Publishers of all classes—covering the field of newspapers, magazines, books, trade publications, etc.—and the entire group of large and small broadcasters have cooperated magnificently in this voluntary endeavor. As a result, an incalculable amount of dangerous military information is being kept out of general circulation every hour of every day.

Indeed, the cooperation of the country as a whole has been highly gratifying. Censorship in all its forms is so repugnant to a free people, so un-American in its concepts and its operations, that public uneasiness and widespread criticism would normally be expected. Instead, with very few exceptions, the public has been patient and understanding, quick to realize that censorship is a necessary evil and annoyance in wartime, and conscious that the staff is doing the best that human endeavor can do to administer censorship fairly and evenly and with no motive but to serve the national good. Mistakes have been made, and we have sought always to profit by the experience.

The Office of Censorship now has 14,377 employees of whom 968 are in Washington. Of the total 12,726 are civilian, and 1,651 military. Our expectation is that the grand total will be increased by the end of the current fiscal year to 18,180, which was the number contemplated by the House Appropriations Committee in the last Congress. Our current annual appropriation is $26,500,000, and we hope to keep our expenditures within that figure.

I have written similarly to the Speaker of the House.

Respectfully submitted.

BYRON PRICE,
*Director of Censorship.*

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am compelled to leave the Senate for a few minutes for a conference. I move that the Senate now proceed to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kentucky for that purpose?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing a nomination), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

John J. Keegan, of Florida, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the term of 6 years from March 15, 1943 (reappointment).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

J. Frank McLaughlin, of Hawaii, to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii, vice Ingram M. Stainback.

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles D. Lawrence, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Frederick W. Dallinger, resigned.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. George L. Weyler to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 19th day of August 1942.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

## WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the first name on the Executive Calendar, under the heading of War Manpower Commission is that of Louis Bloch, of California, to be program control technician. I move that that nomination be recommitted to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs for further consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina to recommit the nomination first appearing on the Executive Calendar to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this is the first group of new positions created by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission under his blanket authority. I am wondering whether the Military Affairs Committee has any information regarding the nature and extent of the organization which is thus being created? Can the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] tell me how large this organization in total personnel is to be?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not recall at the moment the exact number of employees who will be under the direction of Mr. McNutt.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Michigan will turn to page 53 of the hearings I think the answer to the Senator's inquiry will be found. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] asked this question of Governor McNutt:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to get some clear answers as to the 64,000.

It having been said that including the selective service there would be 64,000 persons over-all under the jurisdiction of the War Manpower Commission.

I started to get it and was interrupted. I think it would definitely clarify my mind on it.

We have a total number of people that you are going to get of 64,000. What part of that 64,000 is selective service?

Mr. BARNETT—

He was with Mr. McNutt—

Twenty-eight thousand.

Senator GURNEY. Twenty-eight thousand?

Mr. BARNETT. That is right.

Senator GURNEY. That leaves 36,000?

Mr. BARNETT. That leaves 36,000.

Mr. MCNUTT. Of which 21,000 are United States Employment Service.

Senator GURNEY. That leaves 15,000 or more.

Mr. BARNETT. Then 12,000 of them are in National Youth Administration.

Senator GURNEY. That leaves 3,000.

Mr. MCNUTT. That leaves 3,000.

Senator GURNEY. What is the 3,000 made up of? Three hundred and fifty men above $4,500?

Mr. BARNETT. You have got the existing training within industry staff, which we now have of 298, I think, and then the apprentice training, which is 333 people. The national roster already established has 350.

Then there is a table which was presented afterward, and which is published in the hearings on page 54, giving the complete break-down departmentally and in the field, as follows:

*Number of authorized positions in the War Manpower Commission*

| | Departmental |
|---|---|
| Office of the Chairman | 18 |
| President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice | 33 |
| Office of the Executive Director | 491 |
| Bureau of Placement | 878 |
| United States Employment Service | |
| Bureau of Program Planning and Review | 379 |
| Bureau of Training | 44 |
| National Youth Administration | 231 |
| Training Within Industry | 76 |
| Apprentice Training Service | 55 |
| Bureau of Manpower Utilization | 17 |
| Bureau of Selective Service | 1,430 |
| Regional offices | |
| Total | 3,652 |

In the field service, similarly broken down, the total is 60,184—an over-all total of 63,836.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator now tell me what is the relationship between the United States Civil Service Commission and these Manpower Commission appointees?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I pointed out the other day when the Senator first raised this question—and I am speaking now because I looked into the matter personally and asked for the hearings at which Governor McNutt appeared—the law which appropriated $100,000,000 for the President for the purpose of setting up necessary agencies to carry on the war, authorized him to appoint personnel without regard to the Civil Service laws; but in spite of that blanket clearance, the practice has been installed and followed of having each of these positions and appointees cleared through the Civil Service Commission. As a matter of fact a representative of the Civil Service Commission—his name appears in the hearings—sits on the War Manpower Commission, and in response to questions asked by me and others it was brought out that in every instance these places are cleared through the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to ask a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has the floor. Does he yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Last week Mr. Mitchell, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, was present before the Committee on the Judiciary and testified in connection with another bill. He said that the Civil Service Commission made examinations of these new set-ups, so far as the personnel here in Washington was concerned; that in the field they did not have the force and they did not have the time to make such examination; but that upon the recommendations of new agencies, they certified the appointees pro forma, without making the examination, as I recall his testimony, and I think I recall it accurately. That testimony has not as yet been printed, but I have seen a copy of it today. The kind of certificate made is purely perfunctory, according to the testimony of Mr. Mitchell, the Chairman of the Commission.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, we are now discussing the specific nominations which are before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that, but the question was asked as to whether the Civil Service Commission aided in the selection of these appointees. The Civil Service Commission does aid in the way which I have described, which is substantially no aid.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the afternoon, while we were discussing Executive nominations, I made the statement that Mr. Mitchell had testified that the Civil Service Commission did not have jurisdiction over certain matters in the field. I did not have his testimony available at the time when I discussed the matter, but I have it now, and I desire to cite it.

On page 17 of the record made in the Committee on the Judiciary, the following occurred:

Senator MCFARLAND. Don't you approve the qualifications of these men in the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. MITCHELL. We approve some of the regional directors.

Senator MCKELLAR. Don't you approve all the regional directors?

Mr. MITCHELL. Very recently, since you passed the resolution.

I do not know to what resolution he referred.

I resume the quotation:

When the Office of Price Administration was first set up it operated with funds from the President, but they were left in part outside of the civil-service system. Then, later on, when Congress authorized the establishment of the Office of Price Administration as a statutory agency, these positions were placed under the civil-service system and Mr. Henderson was made head of it. The order at that time was that the work be started and to watch it. We had no eligible register and they nominated these people to us for these different types of jobs. We passed on their qualifications in general.

Again, on page 36, I find the following:

Mr. MITCHELL. No. I don't personally; I don't know who they are, but may I interject here that again the salaries, outside of Washington, are not fixed by the Civil Service Commission, by the Classification Division. The salaries in the field are not fixed.

Senator MCKELLAR. That is very—well, gentlemen, the thought here that Mr. Mitchell has made, is a very enlightening statement. He says the salaries of all these people out in the field are not fixed by the Civil Service Commission. Well, most of these salaries are out in the field. If the Civil Service fixes the salaries in the city of Washington, how is it that the Civil Service Commission does not fix the salaries outside of the city of Washington?

Again, on page 37:

Mr. MITCHELL. The Civil Service Commission had nothing to do with salaries until 1923. At that time Congress enacted a law which provided that the classification system be established giving them jurisdiction over salaries in the departments in Washington. Later a bill was passed, the Ramspeck bill,

which provided that the classification system be extended to the field, upon the request of the Civil Service Commission, by the President.

Again, on page 38:

Senator McFARLAND. Mr. Mitchell, wouldn't it be almost impossible for you to extend that service to the field with your present personnel? Aren't you worked to death now with all these new jobs coming in?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; you are absolutely right in that, Senator. Of course, if it is a desirable thing to do, I think in the long run, it would be extended to the field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts from Mr. Mitchell's testimony given a day or two ago before the Committee on the Judiciary be printed in the RECORD at the place where the nominations were discussed and where I made a statement concerning Mr. Mitchell's testimony.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask who fixes the salaries?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The salaries are fixed under the Classification Act, and it is because of the apparent desire to comply with the Classification Act that the rather long and involved titles to which the Senator drew attention the other day have been adopted. I asked precisely the same questions of Governor McNutt and his associates.

May I now call attention——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senator from Wyoming leaves that point, I notice on page 2 of this list of nominations, for instance, that there is the position known as area director. At one point such a position pays $5,600 a year, at another point $6,500 a year, and at another point it pays $4,600 a year. In each instance an area director is involved. Is that difference in pay the result of discretion in the appointive power?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I cannot lay my finger on the exact testimony, but my understanding of that is that it results from the difference in the sizes of areas, in the amount of work that has to be done in the areas, the geographical extent of the areas, and the population.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think Chicago would voluntarily confess that it is smaller than Cleveland, although the pay seems to be smaller for the area director in Chicago whose name appears on this list.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The chances are that there is some difference in the responsibility.

I was about to answer the Senator's first question. The senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] propounded this question, which appears on page 46 of the hearings:

Senator JOHNSON. The point I am trying to get at, suppose the Senate confirms one of these nominations, then does it have to be approved, before or afterward, by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BARNETT. The Civil Service has approved them before their submission.

Senator JOHNSON. That is necessary?

Mr. BARNETT. Not legally required, but we want their approval of the qualifications of every man we appoint.

Then, omitting a few lines, the Senator from Colorado again said:

Senator JOHNSON. What I am trying to find out is to what extent civil-service rules apply in these appointments. I think it is a very important point for this committee to understand.

Mr. MCNUTT. Well, as a matter of policy we clear these nominations with Civil Service before they are sent to the Senate.

Senator JOHNSON. And to what extent does their investigation go?

Mr. BARNETT. I could clear that up.

Mr. MCNUTT. Go ahead.

Mr. BARNETT. The Civil Service, upon request, investigates all these war-service appointments primarily on the question of loyalty and character.

The previous employment record will be checked, if we have any question about it, and ask them to check it. Ordinarily, the previous record of appointment has been checked by our regional director before he recommends the case to us.

We ask Civil Service to make the study of the man's qualifications, to see if it meets the standards that we have agreed upon with them for these jobs, and to check his character and loyalty.

After having spent about 2 hours questioning Governor McNutt and his associates, I was satisfied that they were doing the best they could to comply with the standards of the civil service and the Classification Act, which is being followed by the civil-service agency of the Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have a great deal of respect for the opinions of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate the Senator's kind word.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to advise the Senator from Michigan that I have consulted the Civil Service authorities and find that they certify appointees on 24 hours' notice without having an opportunity to consult them or know anything about them. If they do not certify them in 24 hours they are accused of impeding the war effort. So far as these appointees are concerned, from what I have learned, the Civil Service Commission does not count.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I have the same impression as has the Senator from Vermont. I will say to the able Senator from Vermont that if the War Manpower Commission desires to employ someone it sends his name to the Civil Service Commission. If he is approved, his name is submitted, and if he is disapproved another name is submitted.

Mr. AIKEN. And the Civil Service Commission is expected to give its approval within 24 hours.

Mr. WALSH. When approval is not given, it is embarrassing to the Senator whose endorsement accompanies the submission of the name. It is merely a matter of form. No thorough investigation is made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then the practical effect would be that the Manpower Administrator can name whom he pleases to whatever position he wishes to create, at approximately whatever salary he desires the employee to receive, within the rather loose general framework of the civil service law and the Classification Act.

Mr. WALSH. I believe that to be true. However, I also believe that if it were apparent that the applicant had had a criminal record, or was completely lacking in educational qualifications, the Civil Service Commission would not approve his appointment.

I repeat that the embarrassing thing is that instead of a Senator being asked to recommend someone from his locality or State, he is submitted a list of names of those whom the Civil Service Commission will approve. Therefore a Senator is first denied any initiative in the matter, and secondly, he is placed in the position of apparently rejecting a civil-service nomination instead of a nomination which has only the appearance of civil-service approval.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If that is the practice followed in the case of the Senator from Massachusetts, I think he has been given a rather unusual degree of supervisory authority, because no such submission has ever been made to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WALSH. Did the Senator from Wyoming ascertain that the nominees from his State were approved by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Apparently those in authority over the region in which the State of Wyoming is located have been cleared in this manner.

I believe, Mr. President, that there may be some misunderstanding of the situation. In order that my position may be understood, it should probably be called to the attention of the Senate that, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, while sitting as a member of the deficiency subcommittee, of which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is chairman, during the past year I have repeatedly questioned the heads of war agencies about the manner in which selections were made. There can be no doubt that a great deal of authority, power, and discretion has been extended to the agencies in the selection of their personnel, but it was done upon the authority of Congress. When Congress made the appropriations, under which the emergency agencies were created, and waived certain laws, it did so in the belief that speedy action was required, and that in the interest of the successful mobilization of our forces, as well as in carrying on the war, a great deal of discretion should be vested in the President and in the heads of the various agencies whom he selected.

Mr. WALSH. I think we all agree on that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will be through in just a moment. I am trying to lay the ground work——

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator is only laying the ground work now, he has embarked upon quite a long address.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not desire to make a long address, but I do wish to answer the Senator. I wish to satisfy him that the compliment which he paid the Senator from Wyoming a little while ago is perhaps not altogether misplaced. In the Appropriations Committee and in the Military Affairs Committee a sincere effort was made by the members of both committees to make certain that competent employees and officers were selected.

In the instant case I see on the desk of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] a file which was built up as a result of several questions asked by myself, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], and other members of the committee. It contains a dossier on each of these nominations. A great many of the nominees are already in the Government service.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is a dossier so lacking in certain phases of information that the distinguished chairman had to change his mind with respect to one of the nominees when he obtained a little more light on the subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That may have been the result of a suggestion from one of the Senators from the State involved.

My feeling is that we should not impede the action of the War Manpower Commission with respect to these nominations unless there is definite evidence that there has been an abuse of discretion. I believe that all the members of the committee sought in good faith to determine whether or not there had been any abuse of the discretion which had been vested in Governor McNutt, and I think there was not.

I do say, however, that in the past the various agencies, as well as the Civil Service Commission, have not given as much attention as they should give to the selection of personnel. Over a long period of years—long before the war began, and, indeed, long before this administration began—it has frequently been the practice of administrative bureaus to arrange for positions and salary groups by creating imposing names of the character mentioned here.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have no desire to interfere in any way with the personnel of the War Manpower Commission. I do not want to have anything to do with the selection of any nominee or employee which the Manpower Commission may have. I agree that, under the circumstances, broad discretionary powers must be allowed. I also agree that in the first instance lump-sum appropriations must be made for personnel.

However, Mr. President, I return finally to the conviction that, since that is the war system under which we must operate, there should be at least one point where these positions, when created, pass in review before the Senate. I know of no possible way in which that may be done except by enactment of the McKellar bill, and that is why I am in favor of it.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Michigan, as well as other Members of the Senate, to page 53 of the hearings, from which I read as follows:

> Senator HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an observation. If we are organizing an administrative force here of some 64,000 people, and we are going out into civil life to get those people to staff this organization, we are augmenting the very thing that we are expected to cure, are we not?

Then skipping a few lines:

> Senator HOLMAN. I understand that; but by taking out the needed employees from the domestic economy of our country, who should be devoting all their time to the war effort, we are just augmenting a situation which we should be attempting to cure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remaining nominations in the War Manpower Commission will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ernest James Jaqua, of California, to be head employment specialist in the Bureau of Training, Washington office.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is to be no further discussion of these nominations, I ask that they be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remaining nominations in the War Manpower Commission are confirmed en bloc.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James O. Blythe, Jr., to be passed assistant dental surgeon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> I hereby withdraw the nomination of the following-named officer to be Brigadier General: Paul Edmund Burrows.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, pursuant to the message from the President, the nomination of Paul Edmund Burrows to be brigadier general should be withdrawn from the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination is withdrawn from the calendar.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I move that the remaining nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed during today's session.

LABOR CONDITIONS AND PRACTICES—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Without objection, the Senate will recur to the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I believe most Senators are familiar with my views regarding racketeering in labor by unscrupulous labor leaders during this great war crisis. Such activity has seriously retarded our war effort, and still is retarding our war effort, while millions of our brave sons are fighting on foreign battlefields, and many of them are dying because of insufficient weapons of war with which to protect themselves against the ruthless enemies. The shortage of war equipment is caused by strikes, slow-downs, absenteeism, and other rackets of the big labor barons engaged in such business for their own selfish, personal profit and prestige.

This is a new Congress; and for the benefit of the new members of this body, I want to take a little time today again to explain my views on this important subject. From the first day when I became a United States Senator I have stated my views and have introduced bills and offered amendments intended to stop the racketeering and to speed up war production. The Seventy-seventh Congress failed to act on my bills. I introduced them again early in this session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and it is my sincere hope that this Seventy-eighth Congress will enact all of them. They include the following: Senate bill 189, introduced on January 7, 1943, to outlaw the use of force and violence in preventing any person from engaging in any lawful vocation; Senate bill 190, introduced on January 7, 1943, abolishing restrictions which encourage the 40-hour week; Senate bill 191, introduced on January 7, 1943, abolishing the closed shop; and Senate Joint Resolution 4, introduced on January 7, 1943, giving to all of our citizens freedom to work.

Because I have so long and so consistently advocated lengthening the workweek beyond the limit of 40 hours, I am glad that our President finally has proved by his actions in issuing an Executive order on the subject that he, too, recognizes the urgent necessity of lengthening the workweek. However, I cannot bring myself to the belief that the matter should have been handled by Executive order instead of by legislative enactment, because I believe in constitutional government, and our Constitution plainly states that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." The order, as issued, is very confusing and impractical, and has all the earmarks of class legislation by Executive order. It jumps minimum workweek hours the distance of 8 hours in one long jump without providing for sliding it up gradually to best suit the conditions of employers and employees of individual institutions of various character, except insofar as it gives to the Manpower Commission some latitude in its administration. It completely ignores the interests of the overburdened taxpayers of the present generation and of future unborn generations who must pay the enormous additional cost of labor based on time and one-half for so-called overtime. It widens the present disgraceful disparity of income between our farm population and our nonfarm population by, over night, increasing by 30 percent the income of all affected nonfarm labor now working 40 hours per week, and decreasing the income for our farm population by preventing further increases in prices of farm products which are being produced at increased cost. It will tend to increase inflation by increasing buying power and decreasing production of consumer goods. It will further lower the morale of our already grossly mistreated and greatly discouraged dwindling farm population by attempting to force many of our highly qualified farm mechanics who have gone into factories, to return to the farm at almost starvation farm wages or farm income, or have their deferments canceled and be placed in the armed forces at an earlier date.

During the past several months I have stated at various times on the floor of this Chamber that, to my way of thinking, our policies with reference to agriculture were unfair and unjust and, because of that, were sure to bring on a serious food shortage in this country. That very thing has now happened, and at this time the food shortage in this Nation is so acute that strict rationing has been imposed on many articles. Unless we immediately reverse the trend of our unfair treatment of farmers, and give them treatment as fair and just as that which we give to our nonfarm population, I am convinced that the present serious food shortage will fast become more acute, and may reach famine proportions. Such a condition, of course, would seriously affect our war effort unless the war is won very soon. I say that with the full knowledge that our farm population is composed of sturdy, uncomplaining, and patriotic people, and regardless of their personal welfare, they will continue to work and sacrifice and do everything else within their power to produce enough food and fiber to feed and clothe our armed forces, our civilian population, and our allies. But the handicaps and Government restrictions which have been imposed upon the farmers are so great that maximum food and fiber production simply is impossible.

While I deplore the miserable and unjust treatment which has been cooked up and dished out to our farmers and ranchers by our impractical and inexperienced, bungling bureaucrats in Washington, it is not entirely for their personal welfare that I am fighting. It is chiefly for the welfare and safety of our Nation as a whole that I am fighting; because without sufficient food and fiber we cannot win this war, and now is no time to kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

The farmers of the Nation have always constituted the backbone of our Nation; and for our Government to freeze the prices of their products to a point where their average per capita income amounts to only approximately 26 percent of the average per capita income of our nonfarm population, and then overnight by Executive order to raise the income of all affected nonfarm 40-hour-week workers 30 percent is, in my opinion, very unfair and unjust, and I believe it is wholly unnecessary. Those and many other features of the Executive order add to its impracticability and the confusion which its operation will create.

Being a sincere advocate of lengthening the workweek as a means of helping us win the war at an earlier date, and now having the definite assurance that our Commander in Chief also favors lengthening the workweek, I hope the Congress will recognize its legislative responsibilities and duties and will do the job the right way, by legislation. I hope the Senate will consider promptly the bills which I have already introduced and those which I shall introduce today which, I believe, if enacted will end much of the confusion, help abolish many injustices, foster some Government economy, and hasten victory for us and our allies.

Mr. President, ever since the United States started on its national defense program it has become increasingly evident day by day that our national defense effort has been seriously retarded because of labor conditions, strikes, and production restrictions throughout the industries of the country; and since we have entered the war period I have been impressed that there has been a continuation of all of those conditions which retard the war effort, except that actual strikes have been reduced in number.

I should like to invite the attention of Senators today to some of the more fundamental aspects of this question. Why was it that when this country first started on its general program of national defense, we had a wave of strikes throughout the entire Nation? We are told about how good the labor unions have been during recent months. I think it is well in this connection to look at the whole picture.

Back in 1940, Congress, at the request of the President, passed the National Guard Act and other laws which authorized the calling of the boys of the Nation to the armed services as a means of training them to defend the Nation against attacks which even then appeared to be imminent. Now let us see what the record shows. The statistics published by the United States Department of Labor show that from September 1940 to the end of 1941, we lost in this Nation, in round figures, 26,000,000 man-days on account of strikes. Did the strikes stop after Pearl Harbor? No.

The figures of the United States Department of Labor show that from the date of Pearl Harbor, through October 1942, strikes in the United States caused a loss of approximately four and one-half million man-days. When the Nation is facing the emergency which it now faces and which it has faced since 1940, why is it that the Nation has been swept by mass strikes?

Why was it that when we started out to build Army camps in which to house our soldier boys, it became the regular, established practice at nearly all of the buildings projects that a representative of the labor unions was present and that no man could work on many of the jobs until he had first paid his part of the tribute to those organizations?

Why is it today that throughout the country working rules which result in the unnecessary use of labor are being enforced in industries, at a time when the Nation faces a great manpower shortage? Why is it that we have maintained in this country the limitations of the 40-hour workweek when the farms of the country have been practically depopulated of labor in order to furnish workmen to carry on our war industries? Why is it that we have to endure the spectacle of seeing the War Labor Board render rulings which require employers to discharge their employees who for any reason decide they do not want to pay the union dues?

There can be no honest, sincere disagreement that all those things are interfering with the war effort. On the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House, we hear speeches in criticism of organized labor and in criticism of the various boards and bureaus of the Government. I think that the American people are entitled to fix the responsibility for those conditions. So far as I am concerned, I want to state as my very definite opinion that responsibility for the conditions which are slowing down the war effort does not lie entirely at the hands of the labor union racketeers throughout the Nation, but rests upon the Congress of the United States, which has by legislation enthroned in power in the Nation all elements of organized labor, both the good and the bad. Responsibility comes because the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation which has resulted in producing these conditions of which we now complain. But it is not enough for us to say here that the Congress of the United States in earlier sessions was responsible for creating the conditions of which we are now complaining.

The power to make laws is vested in Congress. It is not vested in the executive department of government or in the

judicial department of government. If we have in this country today a rule of the bureaucrat, who is not selected by the people, who is not responsible to the people, then we cannot escape the fact that this condition has come about because Congress has become the willing tool of other departments of government to write the laws they were told to write, and these laws have resulted in the conditions which I have already described.

We stand today as representatives of the people of this great Nation and we have the responsibility to correct conditions which threaten not only the present war effort, but which threaten the very fundamental principles of democratic government itself. Shall we content ourselves by simply standing on the floor of the House of Representatives or on the floor of the Senate and complaining about the activities and the abuses of the power of these agencies which the Congress of the United States has created?

I hope not. I hope that there lies in the hearts of the Members of the United States Senate, and of the Members of the House of Representatives, a determination to do something more than merely talk about the evils which exist. I hope that there lies in the minds of my colleagues here in the Senate a determination to do something about them. And with that thought in mind, I want to suggest some very definite and concrete things which I think we can do about it, and which I think it is the responsibility of this Congress to do. The subjects which I shall now discuss are in addition to those I have already suggested.

The first matter I wish to discuss is the National Labor Relations Act. Respect for the time of the Members of the United States Senate precludes the possibility of my reviewing in full the history of the workings of this piece of legislation. It is not necessary for any of us to rely upon outside sources entirely in order that we may appraise fully the extreme abuses of the principles of democratic government inherent in the actions which have been taken by the National Labor Relations Board. For a detailed study of this, I most respectfully invite the attention of the Senate to the report of the House committee headed by the Representative from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

I do not believe any Member of the Senate could read this report without reaching the opinion that the actions of the National Labor Relations Board, under authority of the National Labor Relations Act, when viewed collectively, constitute the blackest chapter in the history of governmental agencies in the United States. Here we find reports which show that the Board deliberately selected as trial examiners men who any reasonable man would have known were very partisan; men who the Board, apparently, knew would give no consideration to the rights of the employer, and but little, if any, even to the rights of organized labor if it did not happen to be the particular branch of organized labor with which these partisans were in sympathy.

We have here the record to show that the power of the Government was used to blackmail and to force employers to take action which they were not required to take under the law. We have in this report facts to prove that representatives of the Board conspired to have charges filed against employers, and then later to sit as judges as to what should be done about them. There are in the record of this investigation facts to show that the administration of the Board was absolutely soaked with communism.

I do not believe any impartial man can read this report without arriving at the conclusion that the action of the Board during the period covered by the report was such as to serve to absolutely intimidate every employer in this country, and to create in the mind of every employer a feeling that he had no option except to go ahead and do whatever the wild-eyed labor racketeers demanded that he do, that his case would be prejudged before it ever reached the National Labor Relations Board, and therefore he would have no chance to secure fair and reasonable consideration.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I gladly yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to ask the Senator whether he thinks the abuses he has enumerated as disclosed in the Smith report were the result primarily of the law, or of the functions of the National Labor Relations Board, or of both.

Mr. O'DANIEL. My answer would be, of both.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, Congress has no power to appoint the members of the National Labor Relations Board, and assuming that the Board violated the spirit and the letter of the act, as the Senator has alleged, then, of course, the Congress has no remedy.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Except insofar as the legislation is concerned.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. So I think that when the Senator fixes the responsibility for the abuses, there should be a distinction between those which may properly be laid at the door of the Congress, and those which may properly be laid at the door of the executive department. Otherwise we will be assuming a larger share of the responsibility than our constitutional functions require.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Maryland for his observation, with which I heartily agree.

It was the attitude of the National Labor Relations Board disclosed in the report which was used so effectively as the club by organized labor to destroy or dominate American industry, and it was this situation which laid the foundation for the power of the various phases of organized labor to reach such a point that they believe they can stand today, if necessary, and defy Government itself.

What I should like to impress upon Members of the Senate is the fact that responsibility for all this does not rest on the National Labor Relations Board; it does not rest on the executive department of Government, which recommended this legislation; the responsibility rests upon the Congress of the United States, which alone, in our form of government, had the power either to pass or decline to pass the National Labor Relations Act. I say, furthermore, that so long as we sit in the United States Senate as representatives of the people, and so long as we are content to allow this National Labor Relations Act to remain on the statute books of this Nation, just that long the responsibility for the things which happen in its administration becomes our own responsibility, and we cannot shove it aside and say that somebody else is responsible.

We in the Seventy-eighth Congress have the power to repeal the National Labor Relations Act if we so desire; we in the Seventy-eighth Congress have the authority to modify and amend the National Labor Relations Act if we wish to do so; and I say that we have more responsibility than the Congress which enacted the law because it may be said that those in the Congress who enacted the law did not realize at the time the dangers which this type of legislation carried with it. But we today can act in the light of experience; we do realize the danger; we have seen the law in operation; we have seen the National Labor Relations Board use the power of this act to blackmail American employers; we have seen the law used as a means of advancing the interests of the C. I. O. over the interests of the A. F. of L.; we have seen the law used at other times to advance the interests of the A. F. of L. over the interests of the C. I. O. We have seen its partisan use against both the employer and against particular labor unions which did not suit the representatives of the Government who at that time might be dealing with a particular situation under the law.

Therefore, we are charged not only with the same responsibility that faced the Congress of the United States which passed the law, but we are also charged with the additional responsibility of permitting the law to remain on the statute books even when we know of its abuses, even when we know of its dangers.

I realize the argument will be presented that all the facts to which I have referred, which were brought out in the report of the Smith committee, represented conditions that existed during the administration of persons who are no longer members of the National Labor Relations Board, and that we now have on this Board men who have adopted a more reasonable attitude in the administration of the law. I am willing to admit that the present members of the National Labor Relations Board are a great improvement over those who preceded them, but I am not willing to admit that

the present administration of the National Labor Relations Board is such as to demonstrate that it is possible to so administer this law that it will be fair among all those whom it affects, nor am I willing to admit that we now have an unbiased and unprejudiced administration of the act.

In this connection, I wish to call the attention of Senators to the decision rendered by the United States Supreme Court a few days ago—January 18—in the case of the National Labor Relations Board against the Indiana & Michigan Electric Co. This is a most interesting case and, I think, reveals very clearly the workings of the minds of those who compose the National Labor Relations Board. I shall not take time to quote all this decision, but I do want to refer to some items in it.

In this case Local No. B–9, of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, had gone to the company and claimed they represented a majority of the employees of the company. There was a controversy about this; the company questioned the fact that this local did represent a majority of its employees. The case went to the National Labor Relations Board. The Board rendered a decision against the company, but after the opinion of the Board was delivered, the company appealed to the Board to permit it to submit additional evidence, as it claimed it would be able to show to the Board a course of depredations, including dynamiting of property for which the company alleged this union was responsible. The Board declined to reopen and review the case. The case was taken to the court of appeals, and the court of appeals ordered the Board to reopen this case and hear the evidence which the company proposed to submit.

Right here, in order to get the facts of this case before Senators and correct in the RECORD, I want to quote from the decision of the United States Supreme Court; the opinion of the Court having been delivered by Mr. Justice Jackson. Here are the apparent facts in this case as summarized by the Supreme Court:

For present purposes we take to be true the facts stated in the petition or offer of proof on the basis of which the court below directed a remand. These facts were stated on oath, and have not been denied. Petitioner says that we must hold that even if true they are immaterial. On this assumption of truth the case is as follows:

On November 12, 1938, Samuel Guy, the business manager of Local B–9 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, filed in amended form with the Board charges that the company had been guilty of several unfair labor practices. On the same day the Board through its regional director issued a complaint against the company, setting November 28, 1938, as a hearing date, and events of violence ensued in the following sequence as related to the company's steps in defense of the case:

The company filed its answer on November 23, 1938. On the following day, 4 days before the hearing, cables at one of the company's South Bend substations were dynamited. The hearings proceeded, and the trial examiner's intermediate report recommended generally against the company.

On September 1, 1939, the company filed its exceptions to the intermediate report. On September 5, three of its transmission line poles were sawed off, and on September 8, a transmission line tower was dynamited. On October 17, 1939, the oral hearing on the exceptions was set before the Board at Washington for November 9, 1939. Two days later another transmission line tower was dynamited. On October 28, two transmission poles at different locations were dynamited. Another transmission tower was so destroyed on October 30, 10 days before the oral hearing, and two more at different parts of the system on November 23, 1939. All carried high-voltage lines, and some were located along public highways or railroad tracks.

On February 19, 1940, the company filed with the Board a petition to reopen the case and receive further evidence. This petition alleged the commission of the depredations upon its property as set forth above and further that: John R. Marks, assistant business manager of Local B–9, and Earl Freeman, one of its members, both of whom had been witnesses against the company and three others, were arrested after February 1, 1940, and charged with the commission of some or all of the depredations, and with having conspired to commit them all. Except Marks, each had made confessions stating that Marks paid them sums of money aggregating $2,325 for committing such acts.

One of them states that Marks had caused the first dynamiting to intimidate the company in connection with the hearing, and three stated that he had caused later ones to intimidate it in connection with the oral argument. The company proposed by the evidence of dynamiting to discredit Marks and Freeman, on whose testimony the trial examiner appeared to rely. It also sought to discredit Guy, who also had been a witness, on the claim that he knew, or must have known, of the use of the $2,325 of the union's money for the purpose of destroying respondent's property. But it claimed more. It asserted evidence of a conspiracy to destroy property to influence the pending case, which it contended was not a good faith labor controversy, but an unlawful effort of Local B–9 to coerce respondent to require its employees to join the union.

On February 28, 1940, the Board denied the company's petition. It held that "the matters recited therein have no relation to the issues in this proceeding." The Board went on to make findings on the issues, expressly reciting that it did so "upon the entire record in the case." While the Board did not designate all of the testimony for printing, it has certified it all to us, it has stricken no testimony of any witness in question from the record, and has made no finding that any specific parts of it were not relied upon.

Now, Mr. President, let me impress here the statement made by the Board as quoted in the opinion of the Supreme Court. I want to call the Senate's attention to the fact that it was the expressed opinion of the Board that even if all the charges which the company alleged to be true, were true, that the matters recited therein have no relation to the issues in the case. I say that that is a remarkable statement. Here we have a case where the company alleged its property was dynamited, that transmission poles were destroyed, that the lives of its employees and the lives of citizens generally were jeopardized, and the company alleged further that this was accomplished by the same agents of this labor union whom the Board was ordering the company to bargain with, but still the Board says that even if all this were true, the Board's original opinion directing the company to bargain with this union still stands.

I appeal to my fellow Senators as fair-minded men, charged with the responsibility of protecting the rights of the American workmen and the rights of the citizens of this Nation, to answer in their own minds, what labor conditions may we expect to develop in this country in the future if we permit a law to remain on our statute books under which an agency of this Government may say deliberately and officially to an employer that, "All you say about these people, with whom we have ordered you to engage in collective bargaining, being dynamiters, may be true," under which the Board says to the employer, "It may be that this labor union dynamited your transmission lines in order to force you to bargain with them; it may be that they are criminals; but, nevertheless, they represent the union and you must bargain with them."

Mr. President, I say that if this is what the law means, if the National Labor Relations Board is right when it says that under the law a thug or a dynamiter may serve as the representative of employees in collective bargaining, and that the employer must, irrespective of this fact, meet with such thugs and dynamiters around the conference table to negotiate a contract to cover his employees, then it is high time that such a law be taken off the statute books of this Nation.

Later the National Labor Relations Board ordered the reinstatement of some of the employees, and payment of back wages, and the Board petitioned the circuit court to enforce this order. Later the company answered this petition and at the same time petitioned the circuit court to remand this case to the Board for further hearing. In this petition the company referred to its earlier petition in which it stated under oath that the employee, Freeman, whom the Board had ordered the company to reinstate along with two other members of the brotherhood, had been convicted in the courts of the dynamiting described in the first petition which had been filed, and had been sentenced to a term of from 2 to 14 years in the State penitentiary, and that two others had pleaded guilty to similar acts. One of those sentenced said he had obtained the money to purchase the dynamite and to pay the dynamiters from the treasury of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. B–9.

The company pointed out in its petition that during the hearings the trial examiner had urged the company's attorney to settle the case, and that the attorney for the company had brought to the attention of the trial examiner the dynamitings which had occurred, and had also referred the Board representative to practices and methods of the officers of this union and to the record in the case of Michael J. Boyd, the international vice president of the union, who had previously been convicted in a similar case. The company stated in its petition that the examiner of the Board replied:

Well, your company will be required sometime to recognize Local B–9 and you might as well do it now.

Mr. President, I most respectfully invite all Senators to read this entire opinion of the Supreme Court, because even thus far I have not brought out all the facts in this case: I think it is to the credit of the Supreme Court of the United States that by a majority opinion the National Labor Relations Board was ordered to review this case and to consider all the evidence. But it is significant to consider in this connection the fact that the National Labor Relations Board, in its construction and interpretation of the law, felt that it had a right to contend that a dynamiter already convicted in the courts and already sentenced to the penitentiary, as well as others guilty of destroying company property, still had a right to claim to be the legal representatives of the employees of this company.

I introduced at the last session of Congress a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, designed to protect the right of every man in this country to join a labor union or to stay out of a labor union as he might see fit. I have reintroduced this joint resolution at this session of the Congress, and I shall aggressively urge its adoption.

I am not unmindful, however, of the fact that the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States is a slow process, and, therefore, I feel that it probably would not be wise at this time absolutely to repeal the National Labor Relations Act, because it does have some sections which, if properly administered, would serve the interests of the great rank and file of the working people. I say frankly that if the constitutional amendment which I have proposed were adopted, there would be no need for the National Labor Relations Act, because the Constitution itself would be the guaranty to employees throughout this Nation that their rights to act individually or collectively to improve their labor situation would be protected in that Constitution.

But until this is done, it might be better to amend the National Labor Relations Act and take out of the act some of the most glaring objections and some of the things which have been the basis for much of the undemocratic action taken by the National Labor Relations Board. I have, therefore, prepared and will introduce today bills to amend the National Labor Relations Act. In the proposals which I am offering to amend this law, I have not sought to remove all the objectionable features of this law, but rather to deal only with those cases in which the abuse of power has been most glaring.

At this time I invite the attention of the Senators to three bills which I am proposing to amend the National Labor Relations Act. I am not trying to rewrite the act. Certainly I am not trying in any way to take away from labor any of the protection which it is guaranteed by the act. The three bills which I am proposing will, I believe, meet with the approval of this body. I believe they will be approved by those who believe the general purpose of the National Labor Relations Act to be good; and I believe they will be approved by those who doubt the value of this law.

The first bill which I offer to amend the law is the following:

Amend subsection (3) of section 2, by adding at the end of this subsection the following:

"*Provided, however,* That the Board shall have no power to order the reinstatement of an employee or order payment of back wages to an employee where the employee has willfully engaged in violence or unlawful destruction or seizure of property in connection with any labor dispute or in connection with any effort to organize the employees of said employer; nor shall any employer be required to accept as a collective-bargaining agency to represent his employees any person or organization that has willfully engaged in violence or unlawful destruction or seizure of property in connection with any labor dispute or in connection with any effort to organize the employees of said employer."

It is obvious that this bill is designed to accomplish two purposes, and two purposes only: First, it is designed to guarantee that employees who become thugs and who dynamite and unlawfully seek to destroy the property of their employer will thereby sacrifice any protection which, as employees, they would be entitled to under this act. In other words, it says to the employer that the National Labor Relations Board shall not have authority to order him to reinstate and pay back wages to employees who have unlawfully engaged in violence and the destruction of his property.

The bill has another purpose, and that is to say to the employer:

You will not be required under this law to accept as collective-bargaining agents to represent your employees persons or organizations who have willfully engaged in violence or the unlawful destruction or seizure of your property.

We know that under the present law employers are being ordered to reinstate and pay back wages to employees who have engaged in these practices, and we know that under the present law employers are being ordered to accept as collective-bargaining agents individuals and organizations who have been guilty of violence and the unlawful destruction of property. I believe that it is the responsibility of the United States Senate to see that these practices are stopped, and that is all that the bill would do.

The second bill which I am proposing is to amend section 8. This bill would amend that section by adding at the end of the first line of the section, following the word "employer", the words:

A labor organization, or an officer, member, or employee of a labor organization, or any other person or persons.

In other words, if this bill amending the act should be passed the law would then provide that it would be an unfair labor practice for any employer or labor organization or anyone else to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed to them under the law. As the law now stands, it is a violation of the law for the employer to coerce and intimidate his employees, but a labor organization can use all the coercion and intimidation it may desire to use without in any sense violating the law.

It is my conception that this law was designed in the beginning to protect the rights of employees, and that it was never the intention of the law that powerful labor organizations should be allowed to use all the power and coercion they desired to use, but that the employer, and the employer alone, should be restrained from such action. If this bill should be enacted, every restraint which the law now carries against the employer attempting to coerce his employees would still remain in the law; the only thing this bill would do would be to put labor organizations under the same restraint which the employer is now under. They, too, would be prevented from using coercion and intimidation.

The third bill which I propose to amend the law would read as follows:

Amend section 8 by adding a new subsection to be numbered subsection (4) to read as follows:

"(4) Nothing in this act shall be construed as preventing the employer from expressing his opinion concerning any matter affecting the relationship between employer and employee. The employer shall be free to state to his employees his opinion and preferences concerning any labor organization, or organizations, seeking to secure the right to represent his employees and such right shall include the right of the employer to free, open discussion of all the issues involved: *Provided,* That the employer in such discussion shall not threaten to deprive his employees of any rights which they have under the law."

This bill is submitted on the theory that employers throughout this country are not all crooks. It is submitted on the theory that the employer should have the right, so long as he does not attempt to coerce his employees, to express to them his opinion concerning any proposed effort to unionize his plant. It may be said, and I think it can truly be said, that the Supreme Court of the United States has already upheld this right under the present law; but the fact is that the National Labor Relations Board still seeks to use the law as a means of intimidating employers, and it will continue so to use it unless the law is amended. I believe that we, as representatives of the American people, should realize that there are thousands upon thousands of small employers throughout the Nation who are not able financially to spend the amount of money which they must spend to take a case to the Supreme Court of the United States. Therefore, these small employers are intimidated by the rulings of the National Labor Relations Board, and they are deprived of the right to discuss these matters with their employees.

I therefore believe that the law should be so amended as to take out of the present act the power which the National Labor Relations Board has so successfully used to intimidate and coerce the small employers throughout the Nation and to deprive them of the right of free speech and the right to discuss these matters frankly with their employees.

Let me summarize the results which would be achieved if the three bills which I am offering to amend the National Labor Relations Act should be enacted. First, we would serve notice on the people throughout the Nation that the Senate of the United States is opposed to the use of force and violence and the destruction of property by employees of a company, and that employees who engage in such action and the labor organizations which willfully aid them in such action will not be allowed in the future to operate under the cover of the law.

Second, we would extend the protection which the law now gives to employees against the coercion of their employers, and we would provide that in the future all employees of every company in the United States shall be free to exercise their rights under the law and that they shall be protected not only from the coercion of employers, but also from coercion of labor organizations and all other persons.

Third, we would announce to the world the policy that the Senate of the United States believes in protecting the right of free speech and believes in allowing such vital matters as the relationship between employer and employee to be the subject of free and open discussion based on the merits of the controversy.

I believe that the adoption of three bills to amend the law in those ways would tremendously improve its operation. Therefore, I introduce three bills having those purposes, and ask that they be referred to the proper committee for prompt consideration.

The bills (S. 726) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, (S. 727) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, and (S. 728) to amend the National Labor Relations Act were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate Monday, February 15, 1943:

#### UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named passed assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite their names:

James S. Miller, February 1, 1943.
Gordon G. Braendle, February 16, 1943.

#### PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR NAVY

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Floyd C. Camp, December 16, 1941.
Bosquet N. Wev, January 1, 1942.
Clarence E. Coffin, Jr., January 1, 1942.
William A. Deam, January 1, 1942.
Paul F. Johnston, January 1, 1942.
William M. Searles, March 1, 1942.
Albert C. Burrows, March 1, 1942.
Irwin F. Beyerly, March 1, 1942.
Stephen H. Ambruster, March 20, 1942.
Thomas A. Donovan, June 30, 1942.
Frank McD. Nichols, June 30, 1942.
Richard E. Hawes, June 30, 1942.
Charles E. Weakley, June 30, 1942.
Henry S. Persons, June 30, 1942.
Samuel C. Anderson, June 30, 1942.
Joseph B. Berkley, June 30, 1942.
Jacob W. Waterhouse, June 30, 1942.
Edward F. Hutchins, June 30, 1942.
John A. Collett, June 30, 1942.
William H. Watson, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Clayton C. Marcy, June 30, 1942.
Roy S. Benson, June 30, 1942.
Samuel B. Frankel, June 30, 1942.
John Andrews, Jr., June 30, 1942.
William M. Walsh, June 30, 1942.
Kemp Tolley, June 30, 1942.
Frederic S. Keeler, June 30, 1942.
Clayton C. McCauley, June 30, 1942.
Finley E. Hall, June 30, 1942.
William I. Darnell, June 30, 1942.
William J. Galbraith, June 30, 1942.
Royce P. Davis, June 30, 1942.
Harry N. Coffin, June 30, 1942.
James T. Hardin, June 30, 1942.
David J. Welsh, June 30, 1942.
Lloyd K. Greenamyer, June 30, 1942.
Donald T. Eller, June 30, 1942.
Gustave N. Johansen, June 30, 1942.
Frank P. Mitchell, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Rob R. McGregor, June 30, 1942.
Daniel Carlson, June 30, 1942.
Edward J. Burke, June 30, 1942.
Francis D. Jordan, June 30, 1942.
Erle V. Dennett, June 30, 1942.
John P. Rembert, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Adolph J. Miller, June 30, 1942.
Almon E. Loomis, June 30, 1942.
John Raby, June 30, 1942.
Alexander H. Hood, June 30, 1942.
Roderick S. Rooney, June 30, 1942.
Egbert A. Roth, June 30, 1942.
Donald F. Weiss, June 30, 1942.
Edward C. Stephan, June 30, 1942.
Jacob W. Britt, June 30, 1942.
Charles R. Fenton, June 30, 1942.
Whitmore S. Butts, June 30, 1942.
Carl A. Johnson, June 30, 1942.
Charles E. Brunton, June 30, 1942.
George L. Kohr, June 30, 1942.
James H. Flatley, Jr., June 30, 1942.
George A. Sharp, June 30, 1942.
William S. Stovall, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Leroy C. Simpler, June 30, 1942.
Thurlow W. Davison, June 30, 1942.
Augustus R. St. Angelo, June 30, 1942.
Carl E. Giese, June 30, 1942.
Philip R. Osborn, June 30, 1942.
Carl G. Christie, June 30, 1942.
John H. McElroy, June 30, 1942.
William J. Richter, June 30, 1942.
James H. Hean, June 30, 1942.
Griswold T. Atkins, June 30, 1942.
Peter H. Horn, June 30, 1942.
Charles B. Martell, June 30, 1942.
James H. Howard, June 30, 1942.
Bruce E. S. Trippensee, June 30, 1942.
Donald W. Gladney, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Frederick V. H. Hilles, June 30, 1942.
Paul L. de Vos, June 30, 1942.
William B Epps, June 30, 1942.
Manley H. Simons, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Richard R. Briner, June 30, 1942.
Harry B. Dodge, June 30, 1942.
Kleber S. Masterson, June 30, 1942.
Herman N. Larson, June 30, 1942.
Joseph A. E. Hindman, June 30, 1942.
John R. Craig, June 30, 1942.
Marshall E. Dornin, June 30, 1942.
Volckert P. Douw, June 30, 1942.
Frank I. Winant, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Raymond W. Johnson, June 30, 1942.
Richard M. Nixon, June 30, 1942.
James A. Adkins, June 30, 1942.
Ephraim P. Holmes, June 30, 1942.
Wilfred A Walter, June 30, 1942.
Walter M. Foster, June 30, 1942.
William C. Butler, Jr., June 30, 1942.
George B. Chafee, June 30, 1942.
Frank L. Johnson, June 30, 1942.
Francis E. Bardwell, June 30, 1942.
William H. Kirvan, June 30, 1942.
Lot Ensey, June 30, 1942.
Peter R. Lackner, June 30, 1942.
Hugh T. MacKay, June 30, 1942.
Herman A. Pieczentkowski, June 30, 1942.
Thomas B. Haley, June 30, 1942.
Mell A. Peterson, June 30, 1942.
Burrell C. Allen, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Samuel M. Randall, June 30, 1942.
Alexander S. Heyward, Jr., June 30, 1942.
John O. Kinert, June 30, 1942.
Martin C. Burns, June 30, 1942.
Donald F. Krick, June 30, 1942.
John W. Alles 3d, June 30, 1942.
Edward S. Carmick, June 30, 1942.
George C. Seay, June 30, 1942.
Dudley W. Morton, June 30, 1942.
John R. McKnight, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Lynne C. Quiggle, June 30, 1942.
William S. Estabrook, Jr., June 30, 1942.
John E. Lee, June 30, 1942.
Henry O. Hansen, June 30, 1942.
Bernhart A. Fuetsch, June 30, 1942.
Jack S. Dorsey, June 30, 1942.
Otis J. Earle, June 30, 1942.
Gifford Scull, June 30, 1942.
Howard G. Corey, June 30, 1942.
Alfred E. Grove, June 30, 1942.
Lance E. Massey, June 30, 1942.
Eugene T. Sands, June 30, 1942.
James W. Davis, June 30, 1942.
Clyde B. Stevens, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Frank P. Luongo, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Kenneth McL. Gentry, June 30, 1942.
Thomas L. Wogan, June 30, 1942.
George M. Holley, June 30, 1942.
Robert J. Esslinger, June 30, 1942.
William M. Drane, June 30, 1942.
Albert S. Miller, June 30, 1942.
Joseph E. Dodson, June 30, 1942.
James D. L. Grant, June 30, 1942.
Frank B. Miller, June 30, 1942.
Warren H. McClain, June 30, 1942.
John B. Gragg, June 30, 1942.
Robert H. Taylor, June 30, 1942.
Edgar J. MacGregor 3d, June 30, 1942.
Paul P. Blackburn, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Parke H. Brady, June 30, 1942.
Edward C. Renfro, June 30, 1942.
Charles W. Lord, June 30, 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Rollin E. Westholm, July 1, 1941.
Alfred D. Kilmartin, July 1, 1941.
David Nash, December 8, 1941.
Francis D. Walker, Jr., December 16, 1941.
Eli T. Reich, January 1, 1942.
John J. Flachsenhar, January 1, 1942.
William C. Thompson, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Robert B. Kail, January 1, 1942.
Ross E. Freeman, January 1, 1942.
Marion F. Ramirez de Arellano, January 1, 1942.
Norvell G. Ward, January 1, 1942.
Jack M. Seymour, January 1, 1942.
Ted A. Hilger, January 1, 1942.
Thomas R. Mackie, January 1, 1942.
Howard S Westin, January 1, 1942.
William S. Sampson, January 1, 1942.
Arthur V. Ely, January 1, 1942.
Walter J. East, Jr., January 1, 1942.
William S. Guest, January 1, 1942.
Eugene A. Barham, January 1, 1942.
George Philip, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Amos T. Hathaway, January 1, 1942.
Samuel Nixdorff, January 1, 1942.
Edwin Denby, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Dennis C. Lyndon, January 1, 1942.
Louis H. Bauer, January 1, 1942.
Slade D. Cutter, January 1, 1942.
Francis X. Maher, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Harold W. McDonald, January 1, 1942.
Stanley W Lipski, January 1, 1942.
Frederick R. Matthews, January 1, 1942.
Page Knight, January 1, 1942.
Robert Van R. Bassett, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Manning M. Kimmel, January 1, 1942.
Harold H. Larsen, January 1, 1942.
John M. Ennis, January 1, 1942.

Edward F. Scott, January 1, 1942.
Ralph L. Ramey, January 1, 1942.
Stephen H. Gimber, January 1, 1942.
Kenneth G. Schacht, January 1, 1942.
Turner F. Caldwell, Jr., January 1, 1942.
George R. Lee, January 1, 1942.
Theodore H. Winters, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Thomas A. Baldwin, January 1, 1942.
Ronald K. Irving, January 1, 1942.
George A. O'Connell, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Horace C. Laird, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Earle G. Gardner, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Rodney J. Badger, January 1, 1942.
Allan C. Edmands, January 1, 1942.
George S. Lambert, January 1, 1942.
Henry G. Shonerd, Jr., January 1, 1942.
John G. Downing, January 1, 1942.
Sibley L. Ward, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Robert M. Hinckley, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Joseph W. Antonides, January 1, 1942.
James L. Jordan, January 1, 1942.
Philip K. Sherman, January 1, 1942.
Joseph E. Rice, January 1, 1942.
Jack R. Crutchfield, January 1, 1942.
Joseph A. Crook, January 1, 1942.
Otto F. Kolb, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Millard J. Smith, January 1, 1942.
Earl R. Crawford, January 1, 1942.
George A. Wagner, Jr., January 1, 1942.
John H. Turner, January 1, 1942.
Ovid McM. Butler, January 1, 1942.
George W. Grider, January 1, 1942.
Harry B. Stark, January 1, 1942.
David R. Connole, February 1, 1942.
Walter F. Schlech, Jr., February 1, 1942.
David S. Brown, February 10, 1942.
William G. Holman, February 20, 1942.
Henry C. Schwaner, Jr., March 1, 1942.
John F. Ryder, March 1, 1942.
Donald W. Wilson, March 1, 1942.
Carl W. Heywood, March 1, 1942.
Robert A. Bonin, March 1, 1942.
David C. Richardson, March 1, 1942.
Thomas K. Kimmel, March 1, 1942.
Charles S. Manning, Jr., March 25, 1942.
Thomas B. Dabney, March 28, 1942.
James R. Hansen, April 21, 1942.
John N. Boland, May 1, 1942.
Porter W. Maxwell, May 7, 1942.
Bennett C. Oelheim, May 9, 1942.
Theodore C. Lyster, Jr., June 1, 1942.
John V. Noel, Jr., June 1, 1942.
Hoyt D. Mann, June 1, 1942.
George H. Whiting, June 3, 1942.
Malcolm C. McGrath, June 5, 1942.
Jack C. Moore, June 10, 1942.
Paul E. Summers, June 24, 1942.
William A. Small, June 27, 1942.
Gilven M. Slonim, June 30, 1942.
William A. Ellis, June 30, 1942.
Donald G. Gumz, June 30, 1942.
Paul C. Stimson, June 30, 1942.
Everett M. Link, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Marshall F. Thompson, June 30, 1942.
Richard R. Pratt, June 30, 1942.
Joseph B. Icenhower, June 30, 1942.
Gordon Fowler, June 30, 1942.
Frank E. Hayler, June 30, 1942.
John K. Fyfe, June 30, 1942.
James W. McCauley, June 30, 1942.
Ed R. King, June 30, 1942.
David Zabriskie, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Bruce R. Ware 3d, June 30, 1942.
Richard W. Meyers, June 30, 1942.
Robert H. Caldwell, Jr., June 30, 1942.
James B. Rutter, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Richard S. Bull, Jr., June 30, 1942.
David S. Seaman, Jr., June 30, 1942.
John H. Carmichael, June 30, 1942.
Daniel M. Entler, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Forrest W. Simoneau, June 30, 1942.
Phillip G. Wild, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Harlan G. Kirkpatrick, June 30, 1942.
Robert C. Morton, June 30, 1942.
Harry F. Holmshaw, June 30, 1942.
Samuel G. Shilling, June 30, 1942.
Jud F. Yoho, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Fred D. Michael, June 30, 1942.
Donald G. Dockum, June 30, 1942.
William H. Shea, Jr., June 30, 1942.
William H. Wright, June 30, 1942.
Edward J. Huxtable, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Ormond G. Sexton, June 30, 1942.
Walter W. Boyd, June 30, 1942.
John R. Millett, June 30, 1942.
Ralph A. Embree, June 30, 1942.
Renfro Turner, Jr., June 30, 1942.
William J. Lederer, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Paul H. Bjarnason, June 30, 1942.
Louis J. Gulliver, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Van Ostrand Perkins, June 30, 1942.
Frank C. Graham, June 30, 1942.
Thomas W. Samuel, June 30, 1942.
Paul B. Ryan, June 30, 1942.
John J. Kircher, June 30, 1942.
William E. Lewis, June 30, 1942.
Ralph R. Humes, June 30, 1942.
Edward E. Hoffman, June 30, 1942.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942:

John J. Wells
Thomas W. McDaniel, Jr.
Harold E. Gillespie

Assistant Surgeon Robert C. Ray to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Jerome B. Casey, August 1, 1941.
Clarence R. Connell, January 1, 1942.

Assistant Paymaster Charles H. Keyser to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

Acting Chaplain Joseph P. Mannion to be a chaplain in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Charles W. Collins, Jr., January 25, 1942.
Ralph N. Westfall, January 25, 1942.
Samuel Zurik, January 25, 1942.
Richard W. Rommel, January 25, 1942.
Walter F. Fitzpatrick, Jr., January 25, 1942.
Marshall Eskridge, January 25, 1942.
George L. Abrums, January 25, 1942.
John L. Tullis, January 25, 1942.
George E. F. Stocker, January 25, 1942.
Paul F. Maness, January 25, 1942.
George D. Broyles, Jr., January 28, 1942.
Harold E. Williamson, February 2, 1942.
Murray H. Brown, February 16, 1942.
Atlee B. Hendricks, February 20, 1942.
Francis E. Schlueter, March 9, 1942.
Thomas A. McGoldrick, Jr., March 12, 1942.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Frank G. Reynolds, A-V(N), United States Naval Reserve, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of November 1940.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Melvin V. Young, DC-V(G), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 13th day of August 1942.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

John C. Hetler, November 7, 1940.
Stephen B. Lee, November 7, 1940.
Robert P. Kelley, November 19, 1941.
Joe B. Scatchard, Jr., November 19, 1941.
John M. Malloy, November 19, 1941.
Stanley J. Scott, November 19, 1941.
George C. McCarten, November 19, 1941.
Frederick W. Beck, November 19, 1941.
Jay W. Martin, November 19, 1941.
Clarence W. Linden, November 19, 1941.
Robert H. Wilson, November 19, 1941.
Stuart H. Smith, November 19, 1941.
John D. Smith, November 19, 1941.
Robert C. Roesler, November 19, 1941.
James R. Miller, Jr., November 19, 1941.
Woodford L. Flowers, March 23, 1942.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Harlan F. Winn, December 15, 1940.
William C. Owens, December 15, 1940.
George T. Swiggum, December 15, 1940.
William F. Weaver, December 15, 1940.
Wilfred J. Williams, December 15, 1940.
William E. Davidson, December 15, 1940.
Edward F. Grable, December 15, 1940.
Gordon A. MacDonald, December 26, 1940.
Robert E. Bennett, December 31, 1940.
Harry F. MacKay, January 8, 1941.
Frederick T. Ebersole, January 13, 1941.
Don L. Clark, February 3, 1941.
John A. Dominy, February 21, 1941.
Vincent G. Lauters, February 24, 1941.
Edgar G. Crawford, May 18, 1941.
Antoine P. Parker, May 18, 1941.
Charles J. Simandl, May 18, 1941.
William F. Luce, May 26, 1941.
John D. Burky, November 18, 1941.
Walter M. Enger, November 18, 1941.
Thomas J. Doyle, January 19, 1942.
Donald M. Rait, October 1, 1942.
Joseph J. Newman, December 1, 1942.
William W. Olmstead, December 1, 1942.
Richard D. Pinkerton, December 1, 1942.
Thomas E. Barnett, February 20, 1943.
William E. Norcross, February 20, 1943.
William H. Patterson, February 20, 1943.
Donald R. Rooke, February 20, 1943.
Peter H. Smith, February 20, 1943.
Dennis K. Culp, February 20, 1943.
William S. Ralston, February 20, 1943.
Wilburn J. McFarland, Jr., February 20, 1943.
James C. Young, February 20, 1943.
Miltiades J. Prassas, February 20, 1943.
John A. Erickson, February 20, 1943.
Joseph R. Braheney, February 20, 1943.
Everett H. Bourquard, February 20, 1943.
Spencer R. Smith, February 20, 1943.
William T. Maley, Jr., February 20, 1943.
Verne M. Tregonis, February 20, 1943.
Charles Allegrone, February 20, 1943.
Donald H. Bennett, February 20, 1943.
Warren S. Bellows, Jr., February 20, 1943.
John H. McAuliffe, Jr., February 20, 1943.
Sidney Mank, February 20, 1943.
Norman L. Martinson, February 20, 1943.
Edward G. Underhill, February 20, 1943.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Eugene C. Lytle, DC-V(G), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 28th day of October 1942.

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate Monday, February 15, 1943:

### In the Army

Col. Paul Edmund Burrows to be a brigadier general, for temporary appointment, in the Army of the United States.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Monday, February 15, 1943:

### Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Hooker A. Doolittle to be a consul general of the United States of America.

C. Burke Elbrick to be a consul of the United States of America.

Ernest de W. Mayer to be a consul of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

James O. Blythe, Jr., to be a passed assistant dental surgeon to rank from November 20, 1942.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Ernest James Jaqua to be head employment specialist, at $6,500 per annum, Bureau of Training, Washington office.

Charles W. Patrick to be senior training specialist, at $4,600 per annum, San Francisco area office.

George D. Penniman, Jr., to be labor utilization analyst, at $6,500 per annum, Washington regional office.

Daniel J. Boyle to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, Boston regional office.

Frederick J. Graham to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, Boston regional office.

David G. Nagle to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, Boston regional office.

Harold L. Rothschild to be head labor utilization analyst, at $6,500 per annum, Minneapolis regional office.

Carlos Stageberg to be senior labor utilization analyst, at $4,600 per annum, Minneapolis regional office.

Louis C. M. Abolin to be assistant labor utilization analyst (trainee), at $4,600 per annum, Washington regional office.

Thomas J. Corcoran to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, Syracuse area office.

Donald Theodore Larin, to be senior agricultural employment specialist, at $4,600 per annum, Minneapolis regional office.

Aloysius J. McGinty, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, Albany area office.

Edward L. Stevens, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, Washington regional office.

Hervey Allen, to be information specialist, at $4,600 per annum, Atlanta regional office.

Dr. Paul C. Barton, to be assistant director, at $5,600 per annum, for the Procurement and Assignment Service of the Bureau of Placement, Washington office.

Chester W. Hepler, to be area director at $5,600 per annum, Chicago area office.

William Parkinson, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, Omaha area office.

T. Hilliard Cox, to be program control technician, at $5,600 per annum, Kansas City, Mo., regional office.

William P. Edmunds, to be area director, at $6,500 per annum, Cleveland area office.

Marion A. Gregg, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, Youngstown, Ohio, area office.

Merriam H. Trytten, to be principal employment specialist (physics), at $5,600 per annum, Bureau of Training, Washington, office.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

*To be lieutenant generals*

Walter Krueger
Millard Fillmore Harmon

*To be major generals*

Joseph May Swing
Louis Aleck Craig
Edwin Jacob House
Idwal Hubert Edwards
Robert Walter Crawford
Paul William Baade
Nathan Farragut Twining
Harris Marcy Melasky
Ulysses Simpson Grant 3d
William Claude McMahon
Alfred Maximilian Gruenther

*To be brigadier generals*

Albert Pierson
Wyburn Dwight Brown
Verne Donald Mudge
Frank Huber Partridge
William Joseph Flood
Robert Chauncey Macon
Clyde Charles Alexander
Frank Alton Armstrong, Jr.
Herbert Ludwell Earnest
Dennis Edward McCunniff
Charles Leslie Keerans, Jr.
Bob Edward Nowland
William Henry Donaldson, Jr.
Robert Wells Harper
Jonathan Lane Holman
John Kirkland Rice
Jens Anderson Doe
John Gordon Williams
Edwin Eugene Schwien
William Donald Old
Alexander Oscar Gorder
Frederick Lewis Anderson, Jr.
Marcellus Lowry Stockton, Jr.
Wilbur Eugene Dunkelberg
Clarence Ames Martin
Robert William Strong
Walter Ernst Lauer
Clarence Howard Kells
Hugh Nathan Herrick
Aubrey Hornsby
Paul Bernard Wurtsmith
Robert Kauch
Norman Daniel Cota
Ray Guy Harris
Bryant Edward Moore
Philip Edward Gallagher
Leland Ross Hewitt
George Luke Usher
Frank Lawrence Whittaker
Lester Smith Ostrander
George Platt Tourtellot
Troup Miller
Truman Hempel Landon
Horace Harding
Alvan Cleveland Kincaid
Pierre Mallett
Paul Everton Peabody
James Cave Crockett

*To be major general*

Harry Hubbard Johnson

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

*To be rear admirals*

Richard L. Conolly
Frank J. Lowry
Ralph W. Christie

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Clara G. Ross, Bellamy.
Bobbie B. Hardegree, Talladega.
Effie Sego, Waterloo.

ARKANSAS

Kenneth B. Lasswell, Helena.
Lucy A. Steidley, Heth.
Oscar A. Teague, Hickory Ridge.
John S. Moses, McCaskill.
David A. Massey, Palestine.

CALIFORNIA

Alice E. Simmons, Alpine.
Bessie K. Gore, Glen Ellen.
Oliver W. Parkison, Felton.
Mary C. Tierney, Freedom.
Michael L. Mery, Jr., Inverness.
Florence M. Smith, Laws.
Myrtle D. Jennings, Mount Eden.
Mary L. Cogan, Santa Margarita.
Janet D. Watson, Tahoe.
W. Howard Skinner, Vista.

CONNECTICUT

Virgil C. Geddes, Brookfield.
John P. Mahoney, Long Hill.
Clarence H. Davenport, Washington.

MARYLAND

Calvin L. Miller, Gambrills.
William F. Keys, Mount Rainier.

MISSOURI

Andrew J. Henson, Bell City.
Daniel C. Selvidge, Collins.
Lulu M. Williams, Marston.
Roswell P. Lane, Naylor.
Elmer S. Foster, Neelyville.
Hugh I. Holmes, St. Charles.
Albert B. Iffrig, St. Peters.
Charles F. Halligan, Union.

NEBRASKA

Max C. Jensen, Bridgeport.
Bert Winters, Broadwater.
Edith E. Fahrlander, Brule.
Tobie H. Wilken, Bruning.
Curtis B. Benger, Callaway.
Kenneth R. Newcomb, Cambridge.
William H. Leff, Carleton.
Gladys J. Brown, Crookston.
Loyd H. Metzer, Culbertson.
Don Dey Ermand, Dalton.
Russell Mooberry, Dorchester.
Paul W. McCoy, Edison.
Walter O. Troxel, Elsie.
Oscar C. Thomas, Franklin.
Bryan J. Snyder, Fullerton.
George L. Koehler, Geneva.
John H. Holden, Gordon.
Clifford R. Frasier, Gothenburg.
Urv V. Dobbs, Grant.
Dorothy M. Porter, Haigler.
Henry T. Dunn, Harrison.
George A. Kittle, Hayes Center.
Clyde Yardley, Hemingford.
George H. Looschen, Hooper.
Charles L. Schunk, Kenesaw.
Hugo Stevens, Kilgore.
Helen M. Cramer, Leigh.
Andres P. Peterson, Lindsay.
Juna M. Daly, Lisco.
Ethel L. Ossenkop, Louisville.
James C. Nelson, Mason City.
Mary Walsh Morrow, Merna.
Max R. Herrington, Millard.
LaVern A. Breeden, Minatare.
Eva G. Quick, Morrill.
Almira R. Boblits, Oconto.
Franklin D. Strope, Orchard.
Matthew T. Liewer, Osmond.
James T. Haffey, Oxford.
Stanton A. Troutman, Palisade.
Oscar A. Pilger, Pilger.
Martin Sorenson, Plainview.
William M. Goding, Potter.
Bert S. Amos, Sargent.
Amos Frieden, Shickley.
Bessie L. Baughan, Stamford.
Josh B. Keene, Sumner.
Walter P. Flynn, Ulysses.
Leo E. Kraft, Unadilla.
Lula Newman, Wallace.
John Q. Kirkman, Wood Lake.

NEW MEXICO

Callie C. Marshall, Bennett.
Rosalie Byrd, Elida.

NORTH DAKOTA

Andrew O. Williams, Bottineau.
Charles C. Shearer, Flasher.
Altha B. Waddell, Forbes.
George A. Swen, Gilby.
George W. McIntyre, Jr., Grafton.
Karl E. Fischer, Hague.
Francis O. Johnson, Hillsboro.
J. Benus Kinneberg, Leeds.
John E. Hunter, Mayville.
Louis J. Allmaras, New Rockford.
Arthur W. Hendrickson, Walcott.
Hans C. Nelson, Washburn.

OREGON

Edwin Allen, Forest Grove.
Frank C. Allen, Lake Grove.

PUERTO RICO

Cesar Rossy, Ciales.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Paul F. W. Waller, Myers.
Walker B. Graves, Pageland.
Louise P. McCain, Richburg.
Reuben Vance Lanford, Woodruff.

UTAH

Hyrum A. White, Beaver.
Mildred G. Allen, Escalante.
Ewell C. Bowen, Hiawatha.
Arnold C. Richins, Pleasant Grove.

VIRGINIA

John T. Trevey, Big Island.
Lena S. Perkins, Cedar Bluff.
William H. Smith, Jr., Charlotte Court House.
Rufus G. Roberts, Culpeper.
Clarence M. Sale, Falls Church.
Beveridge B. Cox, Gate City.
Robert E. Rodgers, Hampden Sydney.
Edna H. Jennings, Hickory.
James G. Albert, Honaker.
Joseph S. Rasnick, St. Paul.
Rufus W. Garris, South Hill.
Warren P. Clarke, Woodbridge.

WASHINGTON

Mary E. Theler, Belfair.
Bernt A. Hansen, Chinook.
Omar H. Snow, Cusick.
James B. Robertson, Kettle Falls.
Anna I. Foy, Lacey.
Tormod A. Myklebust, Lacrosse.
Harry A. B. Gavin, Malott.
Maston W. Carleton, Seahurst.
Pearl B. Burrill, Snoqualmie Falls.
Connie C. Wall, Winlock.

WEST VIRGINIA

Torrence Cook, Amherstdale.
John J. Tamburini, Bayard.
Thomas M. Deegan, Benwood.
S. Cleveland Underwood, Bethany.
Mark V. Brown, Bridgeport.
Katherine C. Brannen, Cabincreek.
Clark E. Heckert, Cairo.
Anna S. Been, Camden on Gauley.
James H. Moyer, Cass.
Maude Langdon, Champmanville.
Margaret C. Farry, Eastbank.
Arthur J. Duncan, Fayetteville.
George O. Sinsel, Flemington.
John J. Walker, Follansbee.
John C. Blanton, Freeman.
Clarence L. Perkins, Gassaway.
William O. Umstead, Grantsville.
Mayme E. Marquette, Harpers Ferry.
George W. Kilmer, Hedgesville.
Carl Hinton, Hinton
Dorothy Webb Proffit, Kingston.
Della A. Kelly, Montgomery.
Justus O. Eakin, New Martinsville.
Russell W. Casto, Nitro.
Foster Mack Kiger, Paden City.
Vesta Lee Connell, Pennsboro.
Milbur S. Moore, Pine Grove.
Julia T. Bradley, Power.
Durward P. Currey, Sandyville.
Newton S. Wood, Valley Head.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the eternal source of life and light, in all our ways we would acknowledge Thee, praying that our lives may be kept clean, upright, and secure. When all time and creation were in the cradle of immensity, Thou wert and art and evermore shalt be. Wilt Thou bless abundantly the United Nations with directive wisdom that all groanings and travail in pain and all requiems which have filled the years may be no more and a stricken humanity shall emerge and look up at the open sky and fear no cloud.

Dear Lord, we given tribute today to Christian womanhood, strong and courageous; we rejoice that it is the heart of the Church and the conscience of the State. With consuming zeal and sacrifice it is toiling in distant lands, teaching, healing—the publisher of peace and the bearer of glad tidings in a world of flame and dread. We are grateful that it blesses our homes with ideals and standards which bulwark the children of tomorrow. With heart and soul it is fighting the most valiant battles ever fought, smiting ancient forms of wrong and rebuking each wrathful alien land. In Thee, enable us all to be nobler and more unselfish and find more incentive in our blessed Redeemer and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 11, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by Croil Hunter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short article by William Philip Simms.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROSECUTION OF TRUSTS

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, many of us regret the removal of Mr. Thurman Arnold as head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. Thurman Arnold was a diligent, courageous, aggressive, nonpartisan prosecutor of all kinds of illegal trust combinations. It is hoped that other men of his stature and caliber will carry on the good work that he has begun. It is hoped that his promotion to the bench is not simply the removal of an effective trust buster, and is not the abandonment of antitrust prosecution by the Department of Justice, and is not evidence of a change in the Arnold policies on the part of the Government.

The grim business of war has, of course, suspended much domestic activity. Although some may be dormant, gigantic and illegal combinations in restraint of trade and competition still exist in this country. If we are not careful, these big trusts will completely dominate and control the post-war markets in their respective fields. Thurman Arnolds in the Department of Justice will then be greatly needed.

Many examples of needed trust busting could be enumerated. The Farm Machinery Trust is one such combination that certainly ought to be destroyed. The American Federation of Musicians, headed by Racketeer Petrillo, is another example. Other trusts threaten in the petroleum industry, the transportation industry, and the automobile industry. It is certainly hoped that Mr. Arnold's successor in the Department of Justice will be, as was he, aggressive and courageous in this business of antitrust prosecutions.

Mr. Arnold, we hate to see you go.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. And I say to the gentleman that I do not believe Congress had any right to create a telegraphic monopoly a few days ago.

Mr. GOSSETT. I voted against that merger.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SMALL VEGETABLE CANNING FACTORIES

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HARNESS of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION OF FOOD

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

INCENTIVE PAYMENTS TO FARMERS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GILLIE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain correspondence I have had with a publisher on the west coast. Also, Mr. Speaker, to include excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of more than 20 years ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JOHN J. WILLIAMS AND FAMILY

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the House will be glad to hear the story of the family of John J. Williams and the late Mrs. Carrie Williams, of Marianna, in Jackson County, Fla., for in this family there are six sons; six fine, stalwart boys of which any American family could well be proud. Each of those six sons is now serving in some branch of the Nation's armed forces.

I am sure that the Congress, appreciative as it always is of efforts toward winning the war, will join me in sincere praise and cordial congratulations for Mr. Williams and his six fine sons. This American family deserves the recognition of the entire Nation.

The boys are Warrant Officer John J. Williams, United States Army Air Forces (overseas); Corp. Max E. Williams, Camp McCoy, Wis.; Edward A. Williams, Fort Benning, Ga.; Frank I. Williams, United States Marines, Parris Island, S. C.; Willard D. Williams, United States Marines, Pearl Harbor, T. H.; Sgt. Tommy Williams, Camp Polk, La.

The youngest member of the family, Miss Betty Jean Williams, is not yet old enough to be a WAAC or a WAVE.

All together they are doing a great job for the cause of freedom.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein a statement with reference to King College, one of the reservoirs of Americanism.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE SILVER PURCHASE ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SULLIVAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of H. R. 1728, which has for its purpose the relief of the shortage of farm labor, and a copy of a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LEA asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix.)

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MEETINGS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Military Affairs may sit during the sessions of the House for the remainder of this week.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has a suggestion to make, if nobody else does it. The Chair thinks it is very bad procedure for committees to sit during the sessions of the House when bills of large proportions are being read under the 5-minute rule, but the Chair will put the gentleman's request.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would hope very much that the Military Affairs Committee would not be in session when the independent offices appropriation bill is being read for amendment, which I think will be on Wednesday. I have no objection to that committee sitting today and tomorrow, but on Wednesday I think the membership should be present when the bill is considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, let me make an explanation as to why the request was made. There are all kinds of legislation pending before the House Military Affairs Committee, not only in the form of amendments to the Selective Training and Service Act, but relating to the question of farm labor and deferments for industrial workers in this country. They are all vital to the welfare of the country. The only reason I wanted to sit during the sessions of the House was that we might discuss these matters and arrange some way to bring in legislation on some of the subjects. I do not want your committee placed in the attitude of being derelict in the performance of any duty, especially when it is one of such importance as these questions involve.

I will modify my request for the time being and ask unanimous consent that the House Military Affairs Committee may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House today and tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a speech by Maury Maverick delivered to the Holland Society of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include A Tribute to the Flag.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. J. PARNELL THOMAS, may be excused for 1 week due to the death of his beloved mother on Friday last.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BY-PASSING LOCAL BANKING INSTITUTIONS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a resolution and two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HILL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial from one of the papers in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PLIGHT OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include therein a letter addressed to Mr. Brown, Price Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. GROSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of Georgia referring to H. R. 1408.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of Members of the House what appears to me to be an interesting statement, which will be found in full in the Appendix of the RECORD. This statement was taken from page 6 of the supplement to Fortune, December 1942, and is attributed to the editors of Fortune.

The editors of Fortune boldly assert, in substance, that there is no need to worry or be concerned about the size of the Federal debt because holders of Government securities are prevented by law from collecting, and that the Government does not have to pay. It should be noted the editors of Fortune seem to approve this arrangement.

It is clear from a reading of the views of the editors of Fortune, as expressed in the above-mentioned supplement, that they are in full agreement with the National Resources Planning Board's program to do away with the Constitution and free enterprise and set up in its place a totalitarian regime.

The views of the editors of Fortune are substantially the same as those of the National Resources Planning Board as expressed in their annual reports to the President and Congress and their other printed matter. In fact, they appear to be mere repetition of the stated schemes of that agency.

Coming as it has, in December 1942, this supplement of Fortune has the earmarks of being propaganda to influence Congress to appropriate funds for continuing the National Resources Planning Board.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein my testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on Saturday last.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

IS WILLKIE DEAD POLITICALLY?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my sympathy to the Republican Party.

While a majority of them contend that Wendell Willkie is dead—some of them that he is now merely the osculating "somnambulist of a vanishing dream," others that he is the galloping ghost of a Republican nightmare—yet this morning news comes out of Indiana to the effect that the same group that forced his nomination before is going to attempt to nominate him for them again. I believe it was Dryden who said:

Oh, 'tis a fearful thing to be no more,
Or if to be, to wander after death
And when the darkness comes
To glide in paths that lead to graves;
And in the silent vault where lies your own pale shroud
To hover o'er it, striving to enter your forbidden corpse.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS (H. DOC. NO. 111)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by section 7 (4) of the act of Congress approved March 24, 1934, entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the sixth annual report of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands covering the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1941, and ending June 30, 1942.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The WHITE HOUSE, *February 15, 1943.*

SUSAN B. ANTHONY

The SPEAKER. The Chair is now going to recognize Members to make short memorial addresses.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER].

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, we celebrate today the birthday of a great pioneer, Susan B. Anthony. Being from Kansas I speak with direct knowledge of her and her distinguished family. All the Anthonys were pioneers, and her two brothers, George T. Anthony and Col. Daniel R. Anthony took part in the struggle that made Kansas a free State. George T. Anthony became Governor and Col. D. R. Anthony made and unmade governors by reason of the influence of his powerful newspaper, the Leavenworth Times, which still carries on under the editorship of his grandson, Daniel R. Anthony 3d. Probably no single family in Kansas has more strongly influenced the life of Kansas. Miss Anthony, in her frequent visits to Kansas and her powerful appeals on the rostrum made Kansas one of the leading States in the cause of equal suffrage.

Today I only briefly express my appreciation of this truly heroic woman and the gratitude of Kansas to this great benefactress, not only to the members of her sex, but to the whole Nation. The mighty revolution which she above all others led can be visualized when I tell you that in my brief lifetime Susan B. Anthony was arrested, tried, and convicted of conspiring against the peace and dignity of the United States for merely attempting to vote under the authority of the fourteenth amendment. History has made a huge joke of that trial and its verdict. Nowadays we do not even arrest women for running for Congress, however much some of their rivals might wish to.

The influence of Susan B. Anthony still lives in Kansas though her life work culminated when on August 26, 1920, the nineteenth amendment to the United States Constitution was proclaimed in effect which granted the right of suffrage without regard to sex.

Susan B. Anthony was one of the great dynamic leaders of America. She possessed all the great attributes of a crusader. In her character was woven those traits that triumph over all difficulties and discouragements. A powerful will that was stubborn as twisted steel. A determination that scorned denial. A soul sensitive to every injustice and tyranny over the mind or soul. A self-confidence that acknowledged no defeat. A courage that counted no cost, no odds. A creed that acknowledged responsibility only to her conscience and her God. In all American history she has few equals as a moral leader, and no superior.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the keynotes to the character of Susan B. Anthony were courage and a desire for justice. What is often lost sight of is the fact that she wanted justice for men as well as for women.

Born on a farm near Adams, Mass., Miss Anthony later moved to Battenville, N. Y., where her father ran a mill. It was his ambition to build up an industrial community which should be a model. He paid good wages and had good working conditions for those days. He established schools for both his men and women employees, thus founding a feeling of comradeship between employer and employees. Miss Anthony early resolved to work against injustice toward both men and women in labor, and it is due to her pioneer work and those who helped and followed her that working conditions for both men and women have been steadily improved.

Miss Anthony was preceded in my own district of Lowell, Mass., when the women in the textile mills in the early part of the nineteenth century were the first to organize to improve their working conditions, just as she is still followed by women working for equal rights for all.

She was a pioneer in more than the suffrage movement. She was for justice alike for both sexes and all colors and races. It is the courage of women following in the footsteps of Susan B. Anthony that has brought about the conditions in the United States today where women may do anything they are physically able to do.

This is in direct contrast with the countries under Hitler's domination, where the status of women has been set back generations. If Susan B. Anthony

were alive today she would be leading the fight to release the women of Europe from this decadence. With women in every phase of war work from the WAAC's and WAVES to welders it is only justice that they should have equal rights with men.

Courage and determination are New England traits, and it took tremendous courage for Miss Anthony to persist when even the women for whom she was fighting drew their skirts aside and turned their backs on her. Miss Anthony died in 1906. A month before, in her last speech, she said:

When will men see that what we ask is not praise but justice?

Ending with the dauntless words:

Failure is impossible.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BYRNE].

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, Susan Brownell Anthony was born in South Adams, Mass., on the 15th of February 1820, and died at Rochester, N. Y., March 13, 1906. She taught school in New York during the years 1835 to 1850. In 1852 she assisted in organizing the Women's New York State Temperance Society, and in 1854 and 1855 she conducted conventions in many counties in New York State in behalf of female suffrage. In 1858 she advocated the coeducation of the sexes. In 1860, through her influence, she secured the passage by the New York Legislature of the act giving married women the guardianship of their children and the possession of their earnings. In the year 1868, with Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Parker Pillsbury, she started the publication of The Revolutionist, a paper devoted to the emancipation of women.

It was in 1872 that she cast her ballots at the State and congressional elections in Rochester, N. Y., to test the application of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments of the Constitution of the United States. For this she was indicted for illegal voting and was fined but the fine was never exacted.

Her last notable appearance was as a delegate to the International Council of Women in London, England, in the year 1899. In 1900 there was a great popular demonstration in our National Capital in celebration of her birthday, and in that year she retired from the presidency of the National American Women's Suffrage Association, which office she had held for a great number of years.

The day is past when Susan B. Anthony can be classed with propagandists and special pleaders—she belongs with the history makers of the Republic.

It is interesting to note that February is the birth month of the three great emancipators of American history—George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Susan B. Anthony, whose natal day, February 15, we are today commemorating.

Susan B. Anthony changed the mind of our Nation. More than anyone of her time she changed the fabric of our civilization by improving the status of women—politically, socially, economically. While she neither began nor ended woman's struggle for equality, she has left upon the movement the stamp of an imperishable personality. She is the spiritual mother of all enfranchised women in the world today, and of all future generations.

An obscure school teacher, at the age of 33 she swore to change the mind of the ruling class of men as to the degraded position of women. Until the day of her death, at the age of 86, she never faltered in her determination to win equality for women.

My own State of New York has a prominent place in the history of the struggle of women to secure their emancipation. The first woman's rights convention in the world was called at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in 1848. New York was also pioneer in a reforming of the English common law, so barbarous in its treatment of women.

The State of New York was the home of Susan B. Anthony during most of her life. Largely through her leadership it came to be known as the battleground for the rights of women. I want at this time to salute and pay tribute to Miss Anthony and to all of those splendid New York women who stood shoulder to shoulder with her in the fight for the ballot until it was attained.

Women who took up the struggle where Susan B. Anthony left off are now asking Congress to enact the equal rights amendment. America has always led in the emancipation of women. Surely we do not wish to lose this leadership. It is my considered opinion that no time should be lost in passing the equal rights amendment. This is the most fitting tribute that we, Members of Congress, can pay to Miss Anthony.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my word of appreciation of that great Christian character, Susan B. Anthony, and especially to her ideals. I am glad that at least a part of her ideals have been realized, and I would to God that her moral ideals could be further realized at this time.

If the moral security espoused by Susan B. Anthony could be realized at this time, it would certainly give relief to the millions of mothers of America whose sons are fighting the battles for decency, security, and democracy.

All honor to the memory of this great woman, and may America yet fully realize the fullness of her moral ideals.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, every session of Congress from 1869 to the year of her death in 1906 found Susan B. Anthony in Washington pleading the cause of suffrage and full equality for women before the Congress of the United States. Fourteen years after her death the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution became part of the law of the land. Women are still laboring for complete equality.

To that end they have drafted and had introduced in Congress a measure to give equal rights before the law, regardless of sex. When this amendment is passed and ratified, the work begun by Miss Anthony in 1850 will be completed, so far as this can be done by law.

California is one of the early suffrage States in the country, and women of California have taken a particularly big part in the move for the emancipation of women. Among the outstanding women in California who have given their utmost to this great cause was my friend Mrs. Amy Ransome and her coworker, Mrs. Phoebe Hearst.

I am one of those who are working for this amendment, and am proud and happy to carry on the work begun by Miss Anthony so many years ago.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ELLISON].

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is eminently fitting that Maryland pay tribute to Susan B. Anthony, leader in the extension of the rights of women, on this one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of her birth.

If but one State in the Union allowed woman to speak for herself it should be Maryland, which was named for a woman, whose capital was named for a woman, and whose Mistress Margaret Brent was one of the earliest crusaders for equality.

It was in Maryland in 1648 that Mistress Brent demanded place and voice in the assembly as the executrix and representative of her kinsman, Lord Baltimore. Her petition was denied but she must have had some gallant supporters, as the archives record that the question of her admission was hotly debated.

It was not until some 200 years later that the demand for full equality for women was made again in Maryland—this time by that peerless leader, Miss Anthony herself, who lectured in Baltimore in the early 1870's. Immediately, associations were set up throughout the State to carry on the fight and these groups proved strong factors in the final ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment.

Time will not permit me to name the complete roster of those citizens of my State who have been prominent in this fight, from Mistress Margaret Brent to Edith Houghton Hooker today, for many years president of the Maryland branch of the National Woman's Party.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be associated with these honored citizens of my State. In fitting tradition, Maryland takes her rightful place in urging the adoption of the equal rights amendment so that henceforth women shall have at last a place and voice as Mistress Brent demanded back in the seventeenth century; so that henceforth the law of this land shall be in the immortal words of Susan B. Anthony, "man's rights and nothing more, woman's rights and nothing less."

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, the history of every great nation is marked

into epochs by the work of its pioneers, those extremists and cranks—for so they were regarded in their day—who have cleared a space for others to come after them.

The discovery of this great continent was such an epoch—from the first known voyages of the Norsemen to the discoveries of Columbus to the arrival of the covered wagon on our Pacific coast.

In the history of humanity Mary Wollstonecraft, who in 1792 in London published a fiery appeal entitled "The Rights of Women," was the Leif Ericson who sighted a new world for women. Susan B. Anthony, before whom we pay homage today, was the indomitable Columbus who, in spite of opposition and ridicule, sailed on and on till the eyes of faint-hearted friends were gladdened by the sight of the good green isles adjacent to a grand continent which surpassed all their expectations.

Florida is proud of our pioneers who, in writing pages in its own history, have thereby added pages to our Nation's history.

Miss Anthony lived through a long period of ridicule. She gained the respect of the whole country. Let us, in this Seventy-eighth Congress, write that respect into the Constitution so that American women can stand as equal citizens before the bar of justice.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, we Americans are noted for our respect and deference for our women folk. We have uniformly conceded to women an individuality, an independence, and a freedom of conduct that are recognized as characteristic of the social, economic, and political life of our Nation.

The American home is the unit of that solid foundation on which has been built that structure of loyalty to the elemental virtues, the reverential religious conceptions of life, pride in character, sympathy for the unfortunate, self-sacrifice for the good of others, integrity, loyalty to duty, and that quality which finds happiness in doing good. Presiding over that home as the living embodiment of those qualities has been the wife and mother. The influence of that home on our early years has been such that it has been commonly true that erring youth, though he may temporarily depart from its precepts, in later years finds it drawing him away from his mistakes and back to the homely virtues of his boyhood home.

Out of these homes have come the stabilized and sturdy character of the people of our country, which today is manifested by the youth of our land on the battlefields and the seven seas of the world.

I have had the happiness of going through life with the thought that for me there was no better woman in the world than my mother. Countless thousands have that same inspiring memory.

Notwithstanding the superior place we have given to women in our civilization, it is true there have been relatively few women who, through a long course of years, have had a Nation-wide fame. One of these has been Susan B. Anthony. She had a great conception of a new and enlarged sphere for women in the social, economic, and political life of our country. To that cause she unselfishly, effectively, and with rare persistence and ability devoted her life. In her case it was the dedication of a life to the service of others. The years rewarded her efforts. Her memory and fame have remained through the decades as an inspiration to millions who revere her as a symbol of those high qualities great souls give and which become the common assets of a nation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to Susan B. Anthony I also pay tribute to the pioneer women of Arizona, my State, who likewise possessed courage, foresight, and understanding and the desire to promote those principles of womankind which have given them equality with men. The women have earned the right to be free. Through their courage and foresight the women of Arizona now have the right to hold property and to enjoy an equal share in the community with their men. They are no longer chattels. They have equal rights in the political institutions and exercise the privilege of expressing their views and exerting their influence in governmental affairs, in religion, and all matters pertaining to our economic life.

I therefore pay tribute to this great woman today because her anniversary commemorates the beginning of the freedom for women and their right to be on an equal footing with men.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, the first expression of the woman's rights movement in Maine was in 1868. It turned on the question of women being eligible for service on school committees. Here, as in Vermont, the men inaugurated the movement. The editor of the Portland Press endorsed the movement saying:

> There is nothing in the way of the general adoption of such ideas but a lot of antiquated and obsolete notions, sustained by the laughter of fools.

The same year we have the report of the first suffrage society in Maine, which seems to place Maine in the van of her New England sisters. This report read:

> A society has just been organized here called the Equal Rights Association of Rockland. It bids fair to live, although it requires all the courage of heroic souls to contend against the darkness that envelops the people. But the foundation is laid, and many noble women are catching the inspiration of the hour.

The Honorable John Neal, foremost in all good work in Maine, in a letter to the newspaper The Revolution, describes the first meeting called in Portland, in May 1870, to consider the subject of suffrage for women. He says:

> The weather was unfavorable; nevertheless the small room, holding from 60 to 75, was crowded * * * with educated and intelligent women, and brave, thoughtful men, so far as one might judge by appearances, and about in equal proportion.

On August 12, 1871, the announcement that Colby University would be open for girls gave general satisfaction to the women of Maine. A press comment of the day says:

> Four New England colleges are now open to women: Bates, at Lewiston; Colby, at Waterville; Vermont University, at Burlington, Vt.; and Wesleyan, at Middletown, Conn. Let's have no more women's colleges established, for the next decade will make them unnecessary, as by that time, all the colleges of the country will be opened to them.

October 26, 1872, another advance step was heralded abroad—Mrs. Clara Hapgood Nash, of Columbia Falls, was formally admitted to the bar as an attorney-at-law, having passed a more than creditable examination.

In a summary of progress in Maine for 1873, the Portland Press said:

> Mrs. Mary D. Roberts has been licensed to preach by the Methodists; Mrs. Fannie U. Roberts, of Kittery, has been commissioned by the Governor to solemnize marriages; Clara H. Nash has argued a case before a jury in the Supreme Court; Miss Mary C. Lowe, of Colby University, has taken a college prize for declamation. They are the first Maine women who have ever enjoyed honors of the kind.

The right of women to hold office was asserted in the message of Governor Dingley, in January 1875, and the legislature passed the bill for this purpose recommended by the Governor.

Maine ratified the Nineteenth Amendment as the nineteenth State on November 5, 1919.

It is fitting to mention some of the faithful friends in Maine of the equal-rights movement.

First, Mary and Lavinia Snow, of Rockland, were active in the organization of the first society in 1868.

Second, Gail Laughlin, lawyer, member of the State legislature and leader of the Woman's Party in Maine and in the Nation.

Third. Mrs. Robert Treat Whitehouse, leader of the National Woman's Party in Maine at the time of the suffrage victory.

Fourth. John Neal, who sent out notice of the first suffrage meeting in Portland; Neal Dow, that untiring reformer; and Hannibal Hamlin, Lincoln's first Vice President, who presided at the first hearing of the National Woman's Suffrage Association before the Committee on the District of Columbia in 1870.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL.]

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a pleasure and a privilege to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of this truly great American. The gaining of the ballot by women unquestionably constitutes one of the most significant reforms of history. To this cause Susan B. Anthony devoted her life, giving unreservedly of time and energy. Miss Anthony forged this great reform movement for the rights of women out of the steel of her times. She was skillful and courageous. No mob crying "shame on the women" intimidated her

in her heroic stand for the rights of women. She was the most persecuted woman of her day, but she was one of the most honored in the closing years of her life.

In honoring Miss Anthony I wish also to honor those women who pioneered for suffrage in my own State of Oregon. Oregon was one of the first States in the Union to grant suffrage to its women. Especially do I want to honor the memory of the late Abigail Scott Duniway, of Oregon. Mrs. Duniway, an outstanding leader in this movement, attended the Equal Rights Convention in Albany, N. Y., in 1884. She returned fired with enthusiasm and determined to win the vote for women. To the day of her death she never ceased to champion women and their rights. Her memory is honored in my State as a great leader in this worthy cause.

The visit of Susan B. Anthony to Oregon in 1896 was a red-letter day for the State. She came to address a Congress of Women held in Portland, in my district. She exerted a tremendous influence in the crusade for the ballot for women in our State.

The achievement of woman suffrage was, however, only a part of the program for women envisioned by Susan B. Anthony. She foresaw complete equal rights for women. The crusade in which she took such an important part still goes on. The passage of the equal-rights amendment, which has already been introduced in this session of Congress, would not only insure to the women of this and future generations equal rights with men, but would constitute the greatest possible tribute to the woman we honor today, Susan B. Anthony.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Wyoming, whom I have the high honor to represent, I wish to pay tribute to those sturdy pioneers who by their indomitable courage builded an empire on the prairies of Wyoming. There in old Cheyenne, in the Territory of Wyoming, nearly three-quarters of a century ago, women were first granted the right of suffrage.

It is significant also, Mr. Speaker, that Wyoming was the first State in the Union to install a woman Governor. Many women in the history of the world have presided over states, but never before did the free people of any state choose a woman to rule over them. Queens have ruled by the laws of inheritance, but in Wyoming the free people conferred upon Nellie Tayloe Ross a high distinction that will always remain in recorded history.

Wyoming is justly proud of that distinguished lady who served her State so well as its chief executive, and who now serves the Nation as Director of the Mint. By her outstanding service she ably promoted the cause of women in their battle for equal rights.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, during the appropriate expressions in memory of Susan B. Anthony I take occasion to pay tribute to the splendid services being performed by American women on the home front during the prosecution of this war.

A year and a half ago in a conversation with an aircraft manufacturer I queried him about the problem of manpower and he expressed the fear that the men taken into the armed services would leave the production of that great plant in a bad condition. I asked him, "What about women?" He said, "I do not believe they can do the job." It so happens that approximately 3 weeks ago I talked with him again on the same subject and he told me that 13,000 women had taken the places of the men, and were doing an excellent job in his aircraft factory.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, of the approximately 630,000 workers in this industry today, it is noteworthy to record the fact that of this number 175,000 are women. Of the new employees in 1943 we find more than 35 percent are women.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to this great American woman, I also pay tribute to the entire womanhood of America.

It has been said that if it had not been for the women of the South the Confederacy would have collapsed before it did; if it had not been for the women of the North the Confederacy would have won in the early stages of the war.

If it were not for the influences of women of the world today our civilization would collapse, Christianity would become a thing of the past, government would lose its power, society would lose its charm, and man would sink to the level of beasts.

Giving the women the right to vote has at least placed in their hands the use of a weapon by which they can manifest their consciousness of their responsibility. This woman, Susan B. Anthony, stands at the head of the list of those American women who brought that condition about. I would say of her, in the words of Shakespeare:

> Age cannot wither her, nor custom stale
> Her infinite variety.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay my tribute to one of the foremost pioneers of woman's suffrage, Susan B. Anthony. In connection with this great lady's work, it is interesting to note that the battle for equal rights for women still goes on. This battle is now being waged by the National Woman's Party, among whose leaders are numbered several distinguished women in my congressional district.

I was interested in the remarks of one of the other speakers about women's contribution to defense and war industry. I had the privilege of talking not long ago with an entrepreneur who told me that women are capable of doing better work in war production than men, because they are more conscientious; they are more careful, and they are more interested in their work. Therefore, they are making a vital contribution and can take the place of the men in defense plants who are called to war.

Fortunate it is for the Allied side that our women are assuming a more and more prominent part in the war effort. They are taking over men's responsibilities on the home front, thus assuring America of adequate fighting forces.

On this day of commemoration of the life of Susan B. Anthony, I salute the women of our country and pledge to them my unqualified support of their cause in attaining equal rights in a society in which they have always shouldered an equal share of burden and hardship.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. WILLEY].

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, they who blaze the way for the races of mankind are not always among the throng when the end of the trail is reached.

Fourteen years after the death of Susan B. Anthony, the suffrage amendment which she wrote was ratified by the States. For more than 50 years she had labored for that triumph. Through all that time, with pen and by means of logical and eloquent speech, she pleaded for justice for women.

In addition, Miss Anthony's ideas, freighted with hope and carried afar by the power of sincere conviction, helped to form the purposes of many others who, in widely scattered communities, have carried on her tradition.

Outstanding among Delaware women who have pioneered in the cause of political equality is Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles, twice chairman of the National Woman's Party. A White House picket, facing and serving a sentence of 60 days in the workhouse, within a short distance from the Capitol, working in France with Anne Morgan and with the American committee to reconstruct that devastated country, she has demonstrated an unflinching purpose and courage. She has led the equal-rights campaigns in the Delaware Legislature during a number of sessions.

The background of Mrs. Hilles explains in part her aptitude for leadership. Her father was United States Senator, Secretary of State under President Cleveland, and our first Minister to the Court of St. James's to have the title of Ambassador. She descends from other Senators of the United States, and her brother, the late Honorable Thomas F. Bayard, also served in our highest legislative body. Within recent months she participated in exercises held in Wilmington, Del., commemorating the adoption of the Federal Constitution, upon invitation of our Governor, the Honorable Walter W. Bacon. In this capacity she acted as a direct descendant of one of Delaware's signers of that immortal document.

Truly, it can be said that the Susan B. Anthony tradition is ably carried on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in these very difficult and disturbing days it is refreshing and inspiring to turn our attention to a woman who did so much to give us the right to call ourselves a democracy. I refer to the great Susan B. Anthony, whose name and memory we venerate today.

The Quaker inheritance of this great leader of the suffrage cause and her early training aroused in her a realization of the injustices to her sex. From out of the past we hear again the words of this great American woman, who has long since taken her place among the women of history:

Principle, not policy; justice, not favor. Men, their rights and nothing more. Women, their rights and nothing less.

Now, with consecration to the great cause to which Susan B. Anthony and her noble band of supporters gave their lives, women of today go forward. The National Woman's Party has taken up the torch lighted by these intrepid pioneers, and is waging a battle for the passage of the equal rights amendment which would outlaw all injustices and discriminations. This amendment provides that:

Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.

Today in the offices, in the factories, in the fields of our all-out war effort—even in the armed forces themselves—do we find that the women are assuming their full part of the responsibility. Surely it would seem that they are now entitled to have those equal rights for which we are fighting all over the world. Many National and State organizations of women, notable among which is the Michigan Federation of Women's Clubs, have endorsed this amendment. This Congress should give it every consideration.

Liberty, justice, equality are fine words. Let us make them come true for the women of this country by giving careful consideration to this amendment at this session.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in the month of February we commemorate the birthdays of three of the greatest emancipators of the race. George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and a most distinguished woman, Susan B. Anthony.

In each generation there are men and women who stand out among the mass of our people—men and women who not only have more than ordinary talents, but who are eager and willing to sacrifice their lives, if necessary, in order to extend certain outstanding contributions for the good of the generations who live after them.

We honor, today, the memory of a great woman. She was an illustrious character. She had unusual talents. Most of all, because of the basic concepts and beliefs to which she adhered and ever remained steadfast.

Susan B. Anthony was born of Quaker parentage February 15, 1820. She was nurtured and reared in the atmosphere of those surroundings and was impressed with those homilies of right thinking, right living, fair play, thrift, and industry.

During the adult years of her life she worked unceasingly for the cause of woman's suffrage. It was appropriate that Miss Anthony should come into her sphere of leadership after the foundation had been laid for the building of a greater humanitarian structure.

It is well that we pause to pay homage to the memory of a woman whose life work has become so important a part in the history of our country. It was for Susan B. Anthony to kindle the spark of public opinion in the great cause of the right of women to cast their vote.

We are honored today in paying tribute to a truly great woman, one of the great history makers of this republic.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, a great many testimonials have been paid to Susan B. Anthony. Among others was a beautiful testimonial from Theodore Tilton, who had been for many years a resident of Paris, in which he said:

At the present day, every woman who seeks the legal custody of her children, or the legal control of her property; every woman who finds the doors of a college or a university opening to her; every woman who administers a post office or a public library; every woman who enters upon a career of medicine, law, or theology; every woman who teaches a school, or tills a farm, or keeps a shop; every woman who comes to Congress, every one who drives a horse, rides a bicycle, skates at a rink, swims at a summer resort, plays golf or tennis in a public park, or even snaps a kodak; every such woman, I say, owes her liberty largely to Susan B. Anthony and to her earliest and bravest co-workers in the cause of woman's emancipation.

So I pay my tribute not to Susan B. Anthony alone but to the bevy of noble women who assisted her.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, on a bright Sunday morning, shortly after the first gun was fired at Lexington, the old minister at Cheshire, Mass., closed his sermon; then, his voice trembling with patriotic fervor, he asked every man who was ready to enlist in the Continental Army to stand forth. Young Daniel Read, with a bride of 2 months, was the first to step out into the aisle of the little meeting house.

Daniel Read was the maternal grandfather of Susan B. Anthony, whose memory we honor today. She, too, was chosen and commissioned to do high service for her country.

Miss Anthony's convictions as to equality stemmed from her deeply religious heritage. Her maternal grandparents were Baptists and the Anthonys were Quakers as far back as the sect was in existence. She herself attended the Unitarian Church but retained her membership in the Society of Quakers.

In spite of the fact that many churchmen saw that the principle of equality was founded in Christian doctrine, certain clergy of Miss Anthony's day had to have the scales removed from their eyes, some by devious devices. Miss Anthony told of one Baptist minister who refused the loan of his church for a meeting and yielded only after several of the richest pew holders declared they never would pay another dollar toward his salary if he did not. He then made his appearance at the meeting, opened it with his blessing and closed it with his benediction.

Once when Miss Anthony was asked if she had not grown discouraged in those olden times, she replied, "Never—I knew my cause was just, and I was always in good company." Tennessee, I am proud to say, has had a share in that "good company." In January 1895 Miss Anthony was welcomed in Memphis. During the next month after her visit over some 500 women in Tennessee signed a petition urging political equality for women. And in our day, Mrs. Crozier French, Miss Sue White, and others have carried on the work begun by Miss Anthony.

In harmony with the deeply spiritual nature of the State of Tennessee, which does not wander far from "the ancient landmarks which the forefathers have set," Miss Anthony has said of her work:

I go in the strength of right, to make the right triumphant on the earth; I go in the name of the undone right to make it real; I go in the name of the forgotten justice to make it remembered in high places and in low; I go in the name of the silent and the silenced ones to give them voices.

Let us take her bequest to us to do this unfinished work, that her dreams may be realized—to establish the new justice and equality of right.

## CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CHURCH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two letters, one from a judge in my district and another from the State board of agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. W. Arthur Simpson, of Vermont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein concurrent resolutions of the General Assembly of Iowa, memorializing Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the other day I called attention to a magazine called Victory issued by the Office of War Information. This is absolutely useless—just propaganda. It is being sent across the waters.

I hold in my hands, and I shall call attention to it at greater length later, a letter from the State War Ballot Commission of New York indicating that shipping space was so scarce that they could not send any ballots to the boys overseas so they could vote. That is about the way they are running this thing. They do not want the boys to vote but they want to send out a lot of cheap propaganda. I think it is about time that these fellows were hauled up short.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to include a letter from Judge R. V. Fletcher, vice president of the Association of American Railroads; in another to include a letter from Mr. Joseph B. Eastman in regard to transportation, and in the third to include an article from the National Grange upon the subject of transportation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] at Winston-Salem, N. C., a few days ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar (H. R. 702) to permit the prepayment of the purchase price of certain housing sold to individuals by the Farm Security Administration, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the purpose of the bill it is to permit a debtor of the Farm Security Administration to pay his debt in advance of its maturity. This is certainly a worthwhile measure. The surprising part of it is that legislation is necessary to permit it to be done. I realize that a similar bill passed the House late in the session last year, and, of course, this measure should be passed. My purpose in reserving the right to object at this time is to inquire if any other farm-credit agencies prohibit a debtor from paying his debt before it is due. If the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], the author of the bill, is in possession of that information, I would appreciate learning it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In answer to the gentleman I may say that in all sales made under the Farm Security Administration for the past 10 years it has been sought to tie the purchaser up for a period of from 20 to 30 years before final payment could be made and title delivered to the purchaser.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does the gentleman mean by that that by passing this act and permitting a farmer to pay his debts, the personnel of the Farm Security Administration will be drastically curtailed?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Their authority will be curtailed in that this compels them to give a warranty deed to the property when payment is tendered of principal and interest.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know what change has been made by the Farm Security Administration, but I see on the front page of the paper this morning, I think in an Associated Press dispatch, that a Negro farmer in my State has paid his loan entirely off, getting a clear deed to his farm. The contract was supposed to run for 40 years. Can the gentleman give us any information as to whether or not a change has been made so as to permit these farmers to do that.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, I cannot give the gentleman the information, because I have not got it, but I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, it is optional and discretionary with the officials in the Farm Security Administration as to who is to be permitted to pay and who is to get a warranty deed to the land?

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman's bill propose to amend that so as to give every man that right?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Every man who wants to pay up the purchase price, plus the interest, is entitled to get a deed under my bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Does that also apply to the Housing Administration, these houses that are being purchased from the Housing Administration?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That applies to every agency or corporation in the Department of Agriculture only, where long-term contracts have been made by purchasers.

Mr. RANKIN. How about the rural houses? I am interested in them because a large number of my farmers have purchased those houses, and many of them would like to pay for them and get a deed and be through with it. Would the gentleman's bill reach them?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If they come under the Farm Security Administration or any other agency in the Department of Agriculture. Let me give the gentleman an illustration. Out in my district we have a place called Austin Acres. Approximately 50 families bought a home, each home having 1 or 2 acres in connection with it.

Mr. RANKIN. Farm homes?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; they were started under Mr. Tugwell. The gentleman will remember the rehabilitation program that went on for some time. Most of these people work in Austin, Minn., in the factories and business institutions of that place. They were tied up under long contracts, for a period of from 20 to 30 years. Most of them are making pretty good money at the present time, and many of them have reached the age of 50-odd years, and they feel that they would like to pay up their indebtedness and get title to their property. But the Farm Security Administration, which agency has jurisdiction over these homes, has refused to take payment, and give the deed to the property.

Mr. RANKIN. I can express my philosophy in respect to this matter in a few words. I am in favor of permitting every man to pay his home out and take title to it "from the center of the earth to the dome of the sky," if he can get the money. I am opposed to tying them up with these governmental agencies, to be supervised by some person in some bureau who does not know anything about farming, and who has no particular interest in these matters.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This bill will accomplish the result the gentleman mentions.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. In reference to the practice in the Farm Security Administration, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that last year in the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, our attention was called to charges of this character as having been made against the Farm Security Administration. Those charges were vigorously denied by officials of that Administration, who contended they had never in any instance refused to allow a borrower to make payments when he desired to do so except as to a reasonable period after purchase by borrowers in the farm-tenant land-purchase program. I am wondering from what source the gentleman obtained information upon which he bases the statements that he has made to the House.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is one of the officials down there named Baldwin.

Mr. TARVER. He is the Administrator.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; I talked with him and I have talked with various subordinate officials on particular cases, where people have wanted to pay out, and they have refused to accept the payment in full and give a deed.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Baldwin is the gentleman who gave the subcommittee the testimony to which I referred a moment ago. In view of the evident confusion

with regard to what the facts are in the case of the Farm Security Administration, I shall be compelled to object to the present consideration of this bill, because I want to make some further investigation before we proceed further.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. I think a part of this confusion comes from the fact that there is written into the contract usually secured from the farm tenant or those purchasing the land a provision that they cannot pay out under 5 years. I think there is a 5-year provision in the contract, but, as I understand it, this would enable a man to pay off his land when he became able to pay for it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right. You will find the provisions of the contracts written for 20 years, and they will tell you that a man cannot pay up his last payment until the end of the 20 years, because they want to keep control over his conduct in the handling of that property.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman may have in mind cases which were called to our attention, where a farmer has a farm which is desired by somebody else, perhaps a farm-tenant borrower who has paid nothing on his farm, and where a third person comes in and offers him a profit and seeks to pay up his debt for him, for the purpose of taking over his farm. That, of course, is a different matter from the case in which the farmer himself has the means and desires to finish paying for his farm and discharge his debt to the Farm Security Administration acting in his own behalf. When some real estate speculator wants to pay it for him for the purpose of taking over the farm himself, I think the gentleman will agree with me that that is a different matter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is a different matter and is not involved here.

Mr. RANKIN and Mr. FULMER rose.

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, chairman of the committee.

Mr. FULMER. I hope the gentleman will not object to the passage of the bill. If the gentleman wants to go into this matter fully, there will be plenty of time between now and the time when the bill is considered in the Senate. You have read about certain tenants having paid up for the land and having obtained title to the fee, but I believe they are simply for publicity purposes. The tendency on the part of the Farm Security Administration is to do everything possible to continue with employees spending money, regardless of what the Congress intended them to do. It is the purpose of my committee sooner or later to go into a thorough investigation of this matter and to weed out some of the things they are doing and have them do the things that Congress intended them to do. Now, certainly, if they can do it now, this bill would not do any harm, but they want to continue that fellow, making additional loans and sometimes grants on his farm, to have people on the farm to tell him when he shall get up and when he shall go to bed and what to do on the farm. Certainly this bill will not hurt anything.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman will yield, may I say to the gentleman that the investigation which he proposes is something that is very desirable, but action should be deferred until after the investigation and not taken before.

Mr. Speaker, I shall object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will call the next bill.

### TRAINING OF NONFARM YOUTH FOR FARM LABOR

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 75, to provide for the training of nonfarm youth for farm labor, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in order to reply to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], who spoke with reference to the other bill. This joint resolution seems to be somewhat on "all fours" with the previous bill.

The gentleman from Georgia said that they can stop these men from selling their farms to people who want to speculate. Whenever you say to a man, "You cannot sell your farm to anybody," if that is not personal government gone to seed I do not know what it is. As a matter of fact, there are not many speculators who want these small farms. But if a man is in debt or if he has a son who has gone to the Army and he has nobody to work the farm for him and he wants to sell it, by the eternal gods, under the Constitution of the United States he ought to be permitted to sell it. I am not willing to give some agent down here in the Bureau the right to say when a man shall sell his farm or to brand some other man as a culprit because he wants to buy it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. Has the gentleman any information, aside from something he may have read in the newspaper, that in cases such as he has referred to the Farm Security Administration has refused the borrower the privilege of paying his debt?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not as much disturbed over the attitude of the Bureau as I am the attitude of the gentleman from Georgia. If his philosophy is written into the law of the land, it will mean personal supervision over every farm and every farmer by some agent down here who wants to say that this man, although he claims to be a farmer, although he has calluses on his hands, although he owns some mules and has a little money in the bank, he is a speculator and they do not propose to have this man sell his farm to him. I say that we do not want personal government in this country. We want constitutional government, and constitutional government would provide that a man may sell his land to anybody who wants to buy it if he has the money and is willing to buy it, provided the owner is willing to sell it.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. May I point out that I announced no philosophy? I simply made inquiry in order to determine the facts upon which gentlemen were making speeches, and I find, regretfully, that they know nothing about the facts except what they may have read in the press.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not talking about that. I am talking about the suggestion made by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I would like to state that this is bringing to the attention of Congress one of the dangers I have foreseen in this method of getting our farmers back on the farm. If you will read these contracts you will see that they carry in them a provision that the farmer must follow every direction from the Department of Agriculture in the operation of his farm or else he can be moved off of that farm by the Department of Agriculture. I have been contending all along that we should have legislation whereby the propositions of the operation of a farm and the ownership of a farm were separate and distinct. As long as we keep this under the Department of Agriculture and under an agency that is primarily dealing with the operation of farms, we are going to run into this problem.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON] that in my opinion this is the most dangerous tendency toward the regimentation of the farmers of this country that I have ever known.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that a bill was brought in here at a previous session of Congress which dealt with the question of farm ownership entirely separate from that of farm operation. I regret that the House did not give that bill consideration, and I hope we can get a similar measure up for action by this Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me call attention now to another very dangerous tendency; it is this: For the Housing Administration to go out and buy an acre or two of land, build a house on it for a farm tenant and sell it to him but holding a string on him that he cannot pay for it for perhaps 40 years. If he can pay for his home he ought to be permitted to pay for it. I am not for the taking of all the land by the Government and turning it over to a lot of bureaucrats. I may say to the gentleman that I feel he is striking at one of the most dangerous invasions of the fundamental

rights of the American people that I have witnessed in all the years of my experience.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I have information from a source I consider unimpeachable, namely, the members of the War bond selling committees in my district, that some of the Federal security organizations are going to the people who have F. S. A. loans and telling them not to pay the principal on their debts, but to buy bonds instead.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I am not going to object, but will let them proceed with this bill, but I do most vigorously protest against any further steps toward the regimentation of the farmers, the putting of farmers in strait jackets. The way to gain more production is to take the ceiling off farm prices, let farm prices rise to their normal levels, and then you will not need even the Manpower Commission to regiment men for the farms. The people will respond themselves, and on top of that we shall not depart from real Americanism.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the regular order is demanded then I must object.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. Speaker, my reason for objecting to House Joint Resolution 75, the Fulmer bill, is because it provides for a host of Federal agencies to take a hand in the educational program to train youth for farm labor. I want to keep the youth of our country out of the hands of the Federal bureaucrats. Their interest is primarily the promotion of their own interest, and if they were given the authority this bill would confer they would use it to train the youth in the virtues of a politically planned economy and how not to farm.

Let the farmer receive adequate prices for his produce and leave it to him to train any help he may need for he knows how to do it.

God spare our youth from the baneful influences of the Federal bureaucracy.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1294, to authorize the sale or transfer of property belonging to the Government for other purposes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the purpose of this bill is to approve the transfer or sale of any equipment owned by the Government. It is not to be used in military establishments.

I call attention to the final sentence of the bill which directs that the funds derived from the sale of this property shall be placed in a special fund in the Treasury. Is it intended that after this property has been sold and the funds placed in this special account that Congress will appropriate out of that account for replacement, or is it automatic?

Mr. LANHAM. I think it would be automatic with reference to the replacement of the mechanical equipment that is taken out.

May I say to the gentleman that the bill as amended by the committee is exactly the same as the bill that passed the House last December. It was so late when that bill passed that the Senate did not have a chance to consider it.

Mr. COLE of New York. The funds are to be placed in a special account, yet is to be subject to appropriation by Congress, why would it not be simpler to cover this money into the general funds of the Treasury and thus save the employment of more accountants and bookkeepers?

Mr. LANHAM. As a matter of fact, it was testified before our committee that no additional personnel would be required.

It is the intention, under this bill, that this machinery, which is needed not for the comfort of someone in these various plants but for the actual production of war necessities, shall be sold, with the head of the department concerned agreeing, at whatever the replacement value may be of the mechanical equipment that is taken out. It was suggested to the committee that quite possibly after the war it might not be necessary to replace some of this equipment because it might not be needed where it was used before. Under such circumstances there would likely be additional legislation needed to free such funds; but there was an apprehension upon the part of the committee that, if these funds were not kept in a special fund to replace this equipment, it might be difficult when the war is over to get an appropriation for its replacement.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it not the intention of the provision of the bill to which I called attention to require additional appropriations to be added to the special fund in order to replace any machinery that is taken under this bill?

Mr. LANHAM. In my judgment it would not require additional appropriations because the bill contemplates sales for cash at replacement figures.

Mr. COLE of New York. What agency then has authority to determine whether a replacement shall be made or not?

Mr. LANHAM. Well, it would come largely under the Public Buildings Administration. For instance, this is the situation in which replacements may not be necessary: There are many Government buildings around the United States in which are boilers that have never been used and which are very much needed now in the war effort. The reason they have not been used is that they were put in, not for immediate use but as an assurance that commercial concerns would not charge too great a rate for the services which those boilers could perform. If those rates did get to be exorbitant, then the boilers could be put into use. There are a great many of them that are idle around the country that may be devoted to the war effort. It may not be necessary after the war to replace some of those. The only necessity I should think for additional legislation, in view of the fact that this mechanical equipment is to be sold at full replacement for cash and the funds to be used for the replacement of this mechanical equipment, would be with reference to those cases where there was no necessity after the war to replace the equipment.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In view of the statement made by the gentleman from Texas, it seems to me that a point of order should be made against the sentence providing for the setting up of a special fund to receive the proceeds of these sales. The usual rule is that incidental funds received from the sale of Government property shall go into the Treasury, and, of course, it would require an appropriation to take it therefrom. Apparently it is attempted here to set up a special fund which could be expended without action by Congress, and there would be in that fund money from the sale of pieces of equipment not necessary to replace. Under the explanation given by the gentleman from Texas it would require special legislation to get the money from that fund into the general funds of the Treasury; consequently I shall be constrained to offer a point of order against that particular provision.

Mr. LANHAM. As a matter of fact, the committee was very much of the impression that we should have a definite special fund to replace this mechanical equipment where it is needed after the war, otherwise the money might be used for some other purpose, then they would come back to the Congress for appropriations to replace this equipment.

Mr. CASE. That is what they should do. The money could not be taken from the general funds of the Treasury and used for any other purpose except by direct appropriation by the Congress. Under the gentleman's statement there would be received a fund from the sale of unnecessary property that need not be replaced. It should not be in a special fund, because then it could be used by the agency without an act of Congress whether it was needed or not, as the gentleman from New York has shown.

Mr. LANHAM. In that instance I do not think it could be used where it was not going to be used for replacement, and, as I stated, I think legislation would be necessary. I do not know that it will be necessary to replace all of this equipment. But let me make this statement, Mr. Speaker: Some of this equipment is very urgently needed today in the production of our war materials. Private industries all over the United States, department stores and institutions of that kind have voluntarily been permitting the Government to use such mechanical equipment, and they have suffered the sacrifices incident to giving up that equipment. This is nothing on earth but an effort for the Government to follow in the course of the practice now being engaged in by private capital to promote the war effort. We have had it impressed upon us by the War Production Board that this is urgently necessary in order that this equipment for plants that are now begging for it may be had for the production of synthetic rubber and a few other things that are vital to the war effort. I may say that with that explanation, together with the

committee amendment, this bill is in exactly the same terms as the one which passed the House in December.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my opinion there should be a provision for restoration of this property, of course, but that the funds should go into the general Treasury. Therefore I object.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, the point of order I expect to make will be made only against the sentence which provides that the money shall go into a separate fund to be expendable without appropriation. I do not desire to delay the basic purpose of the bill and will not do so. The good purpose that the gentleman from Ohio desires to accomplish would be accomplished by the making of a point of order against the one sentence, and that will not interfere with the acquisition of the equipment for the prosecution of the war. It is important that the bill be passed. I understand that some of the equipment that will be released is wanted for some of the synthetic rubber plants.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Could not the same thing be done more properly with an amendment?

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a point of order against a sentence in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The bill is not up for consideration as yet. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

## REHABILITATION OF VETERANS DISABLED IN THE PRESENT WAR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 801, to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point and to insert the bill and the report thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 1, title I, Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 20, 1933, be amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection known as subsection (f) and to read as follows:

"(f) Any person who served in the active military or naval forces on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of hostilities in the present war shall be entitled to vocational rehabilitation, subject to the provisions and limitations of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, part VII."

SEC. 2. Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new part to be known as part VII and to provide as follows:

"PART VII

"1. Any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war, who is honorably discharged therefrom, and who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, or would be but for receipt of retirement pay, and is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement: *Provided*, That no course of training in excess of a period of 4 years shall be approved nor shall any training under this part be afforded beyond 6 years after the termination of the present war.

"2. The Administrator shall have the power and duty to prescribe and provide suitable training to persons included in paragraph I, and for such purposes may employ such additional personnel and experts as are deemed necessary, and may utilize and extend existing Veterans' Administration facilities and utilize those of any other governmental agency as well as those maintained by joint Federal and State contribution; and, in addition, he may, by agreement or contract with public or private institutions or establishments, provide for such additional training facilities as may be suitable and necessary to accomplish the purposes of this part.

"3. While pursuing training prescribed herein, and for 2 months after his employability is determined, each veteran, if entitled to pension in an amount less than the amount payable in accordance with the compensation rates for total and temporary disability, including additional amounts for wife, child, or children and dependent parents, provided by section 202, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 475), shall be paid increased pension which when added to the amount of pension to which he is otherwise entitled will aggregate an amount equal to such rates: *Provided*, That when the course of vocational rehabilitation furnished to any person as herein provided consists of training on the job by an employer, such employer shall be required to submit monthly to the Administrator a statement under oath showing any wage, compensation, or other income paid by him to such person during the month, directly or indirectly, and based upon such sworn statements, the Administrator is authorized to reduce the pension of such person to an amount considered equitable and just, but not below the amount of pension or retirement pay to which he would be entitled for service-connected disability if not following a course of vocational rehabilitation.

"4. Where any person while following a course of vocational rehabilitation as provided for in this part suffers an injury or an aggravation of any injury, as a result of the pursuit of such course of vocational rehabilitation, and not the result of his own willful misconduct, and such injury or aggravation results in additional disability to or death of such person, the benefits under laws applicable to veterans of the present war shall be awarded in the same manner and extent as if such disability, aggravation, or death were service connected within the meaning of such laws; except that no benefits under this paragraph shall be awarded unless application be made therefor within 2 years after such injury or aggravation was suffered, or such death occurred.

"5. The purpose of rehabilitation to restore employability lost by virtue of a material and permanent handicap due to service-incurred disability. The Administrator shall have the power and duty to cooperate with and employ the facilities of other governmental and State employment agencies for the purpose of placing in gainful employment persons trained under the provisions of this part.

"6. The Administrator is hereby autnorized to make such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary in order to promote good conduct and cooperation on the part of persons who are following courses of vocational rehabilitation provided by this part. Penalties for the breach of such rules and regulations may, with the approval of the Administrator, extend to a forfeiture by the offender for a period of 3 months of such portion of the pension herein provided as will leave him not less than the amount of the monthly pension or retirement pay to which such person is entitled for service-connected disability, and such penalties may also extend to permanent discontinuance of all further benefits of this part.

"7. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary for the granting of leaves of absence to those following courses of vocational rehabilitation provided by this part where in his opinion such leaves do not materially interfere with the pursuit of such courses. Such leaves of absence shall not in the case of any person be granted in excess of 30 days in any consecutive 12 months except in exceptional circumstances as determined by the Administrator: *Provided*, That during leave of absence under this paragraph such person shall be considered to be pursuing his course of vocational rehabilitation under this part.

"8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, available immediately and until expended, the sum of $500,000 to be utilized by the Veterans' Administration under such rules and regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, as a revolving fund for the purpose of making advancements not exceeding $100 in any case, to persons commencing or undertaking courses of vocational rehabilitation under this part, and advancement to bear no interest and to be reimbursed in such installments as may be determined by the Administrator by proper deductions from any future payments of pension or retirement pay.

"9. The Administrator shall have the power to provide courses of instruction for personnel and may detail employees to attend the same and may detail any such personnel to attend courses conducted by other than Veterans' Administration agencies, including private organizations, and such employees in addition to their salaries shall be entitled to the payment of expenses incident to such detail, including transportation and tuition, as the Administrator by rules and regulations shall provide; and also in his discretion, to make, or, as by agreement with other agency or institution, cause to be made, studies, investigations, and reports inquiring into the rehabilitation of disabled persons and the relative abilities, aptitudes, and capacities of the several groups of the variously handicapped and as to how their potentialities can best be developed and their services best utilized in gainful and suitable employment, including the rehabilitation programs of foreign nations engaged in the present war. For this purpose he shall have the power to cooperate with such public and private agencies as he may deem advisable and to call in consultants who shall receive as compensation for their services a reasonable per diem, which the Administrator shall by rules and

regulations provide, for each day actually spent in the work provided for herein and shall in addition be reimbursed for their necessary traveling and other expenses. For the purposes of this part, the Administrator may accept uncompensated services upon such agreement as he may deem feasible."

SEC. 3. The appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, "Salaries and expenses, medical and hospital, and compensation and pensions", shall be available for necessary expenses, including but not confined to necessary medical care, and pension payment, payment or reimbursement of expenses in connection with supplying suitable training under this act; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amount or amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

---

PROVIDING FOR REHABILITATION OF VETERANS DISABLED IN THE PRESENT WAR

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 801) to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the veterans regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes, having considered the same, submit the following report thereon, with the recommendation that it do pass.

This bill is identical with H. R. 7661 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which was drafted in cooperation between the committee, representatives of the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Veterans' Administration, except that H. R. 801 makes specific inclusion for increased rates to trainees having dependents. After hearings by your committee thereon October 7, 1942, H. R. 7661 was reported favorably and passed the House of Representatives, October 19, 1942. Hearings on this bill, H. R. 801, were conducted February 2 and 3, 1943. The representatives of the service organizations heretofore referred to strongly endorse and recommend immediate passage of this particular measure. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has advised the committee that this bill will accomplish the purposes sought and represents the most simplified manner of drafting by utilizing, as far as practicable, the existing laws pertaining to veterans. By making the act a part of the present system of beneficial laws there will be for application all of the administrative, regulatory, and penal provisions thereof.

Your committee are convinced that the matter of rehabilitation of the disabled veterans of the present war must be recognized as a separate and distinct function of the Federal Government as it has been heretofore recognized for disabled veterans of World War No. 1. The measure recognizes the necessity for administration of all veterans' benefits by one agency, namely, the one established for this purpose, the Veterans' Administration. Facilities of the Veterans' Administration are already established and will be utilized, as far as practicable, in the administration of this measure. The measure provides that the Administrator shall have the power and duty to provide suitable training to persons included in the act, and to utilize and extend existing Veterans' Administration facilities and to utilize, with or without compensation as may be agreed, those of any other governmental agency, as well as those maintained by joint Federal and State contribution; and also provides for contract with public or private institutions for such additional training facilities as may be suitable and necessary under the act.

Enactment of this proposed measure will facilitate a most economical method of administering rehabilitation, with the assurance that it will be administered in correlation with related benefits and by an agency fully informed regarding the problems of veterans generally as well as having the complete information pertaining to the individual disabled war veterans.

The proposed measure contains provisions designed to profit by the experience in administration of rehabilitation for World War No. 1 by the Veterans' Bureau, and will minimize duplication of existing agencies. This measure also avoids the complications, duplications, and impaired service to veterans which existed prior to August 9, 1921, when World War No. 1 veterans' benefits were administered by separate agencies. The act of August 9, 1921, placed rehabilitation with other World War No. 1 benefits under the Veterans' Bureau. Further consolidation of laws pertaining to veterans was effected by the act of July 3, 1930. This measure, H. R. 801, is in accord with such principle and policy.

No course of training in excess of 4 years may be approved nor may any training be afforded beyond 6 years after termination of the present war.

While pursuing training under the act and for 2 months after, until his employability is determined, each veteran, if entitled to pension in an amount less than the amount payable in accordance with the compensation rates for total and temporary disability, including additional amounts for wife, child, or children, and dependent parents, provided by section 202, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended shall be paid increased pension, which when added to the amount of pension to which he is otherwise entitled, will aggregate an amount equal to such rates.

The rates of compensation under this provision will be as follows:

If the disabled person has neither wife nor child, $80 monthly; if he has a wife but no child, $90 monthly; if he has a wife and one child $95 monthly, and $5 for each additional child; if he has no wife but one child living, $90, with $5 for each additional child; if he has a mother or father, either or both dependent on him for support, $10 for each parent so dependent.

Speedy enactment of this measure is urged in order that rehabilitation will be available to our disabled veterans of the present war at present entitled thereto, and to discharge our obligation in this regard to the future eligibles.

The program of benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration, such as hospital care, out-patient treatment, prosthetic appliances, and pensions, will be rounded out by extending the care to include rehabilitation—that is, care, training, and placement in gainful occupations in accordance with the liberal policy of the Government toward its war disabled.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is for the rehabilitation of the veterans of this war. It has the support of the veterans' organizations.

We do not want the veterans of this war placed under Social Security. We do not propose for the veterans of this war to be used as a common carrier to rake down billions of dollars of appropriations in years to come in order to take care of people some of whom never have worked or fought either. For that reason we have reported this bill which provides for the rehabilitation of the veterans of this war through the Veterans' Administration just as we did after the last war.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This bill is identical with one that passed the House last year without any difficulty at all.

Mr. RANKIN. We brought this measuse before the House during the last Congress and it passed without any controversy. However, since that time there has been a rising tide of social security sentiment among certain bureaucrats, and they now insist on putting the veterans under Social Security.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order. As I understand, the bill was objected to.

Mr. RANKIN. No; the bill was not objected to.

Mr. BARDEN. I understood the gentleman from Michigan to object to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded by the gentleman from North Carolina. The question is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. I object, Mr. Speaker.

COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 839, to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand a rule has been granted on this bill. For that reason only, I object to its consideration at this time.

REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS FOR PERSONS IN THE MERCHANT MARINE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 131, to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill gives persons serving in the merchant marine the same reemployment rights that are given to members of the Army and the Navy, but restricted to May 1, 1940. I yield to no one in my admiration for the splendid work being done by the members of the merchant marine, but the situation in this case is different from that in the case of the Army and Navy. The men in the merchant marine receive high pay. Certainly, to the majority of those who enlisted in May 1940, the pay question was an important factor. I realize that today enlistments in the merchant marine are motivated largely by patriotism, but this was not the case in May 1940. I should think it would be better if this is made applicable only after Pearl Harbor.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. In the absence of the distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, may I point out to the gentleman that every argument he has made against this bill is equally applicable to the other legislation

Congress has passed for citizens going into the armed services.

Mr. KEAN. Certainly not, because the men in the armed services receive small pay, while in the merchant marine they receive very high pay.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is true, of course, that they get more pay in the merchant marine than they do in the armed services, but they do not get a lot of the protection that is given to the men in the armed services. I do not mean to do anything but praise the men who go into the armed services, but these men go voluntarily into the merchant marine, we do not draft them. Certainly it is not too much to give them the right of reemployment which we have given to the civilian employees of the Government and to employees from private industry who have gone into the armed services. These men have lost a larger proportion of those who served than any other branch of our activities connected with this war.

Mr. KEAN. I would certainly be glad to support the bill if the date were changed to December 7, 1941.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question of my colleague the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the War Shipping Board or the Maritime Service, should I say, is conducting a recruiting campaign to attract the attention of the young men of the country on the same basis as the recruiting campaigns being carried on by the Army and Navy?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. There is nothing more vital to our war effort than the manning of a cargo ship. We cannot fight unless we can send supplies. I hope the gentleman from New Jersey will not object to the consideration of this bill. We are not trying to give these men anything we have not given to others. As I recall, the date in the bill is the same as in other legislation passed for similar services.

Mr. KEAN. If the gentleman will not accept an amendment, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

### WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 133, to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a very complicated bill. Will the gentleman from Georgia give an explanation of the bill to the House?

Mr. RAMSPECK. May I say to the gentleman from New Jersey that this bill was reported in the last Congress and passed the House in almost the identical form in which it is presented here. It has a great many provisions in it which are wanted by the War Shipping Administration. It has a few changes, none of any great importance, which were made to conform with amendments presented in the Senate during the last session. The bill did not pass the Senate. We have not included in the bill, however, one controversial amendment which the Senate put in its bill, an amendment dealing with section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, which has to do with the enhancement clause of the Merchant Marine Act. That was left out because we did not want anything controversial in this bill.

This bill deals with seamen's benefits, with insurance protection for seamen and their dependents, with the procedure of the requisition of vessels but not the payment of the price under section 902, and with the insurance administration, and coverage of vessels, and it contains some miscellaneous provisions.

I may say to the gentleman that I am not as familiar with the bill as the chairman of the committee would be if he could be here, but I can assure him that the bill passed the House once without any question and has been reported in the Senate with the provisions in the bill which are now presented.

Mr. KEAN. This is a unanimous report?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is.

Mr. KEAN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That (a) officers and members of crews (hereinafter referred to as "seamen") employed on United States or foreign-flag vessels as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration shall, with respect to (1) laws administered by the Public Health Service and the Social Security Act, as amended by subsection (b) (2) and (3) of this section; (2) death, injuries, illness, maintenance and cure, loss of effects, detention, or repatriation, or claims arising therefrom not covered by the foregoing clause (1); and (3) collection of wages and bonuses and making of allotments, have all of the rights, benefits, exemptions, privileges, and liabilities, under law applicable to citizens of the United States employed as seamen on privately owned and operated American vessels. Such seamen, because of the temporary wartime character of their employment by the War Shipping Administration, shall not be considered as officers or employees of the United States for the purposes of the United States Employees Compensation Act, as amended; the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended; the act of Congress approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.); or the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or detention of employees of contractors with the United States and certain other persons or reimbursement therefor", approved December 2, 1942 (Public Law 784, 77th Cong.). Claims arising under clause (1) hereof shall be enforced in the same manner as such claims would be enforced if the seaman were employed on a privately owned and operated American vessel: Any claim referred to in clause (2) or (3) hereof shall, if administratively disallowed in whole or in part, be enforced pursuant to the provisions of the Suits in Admiralty Act, notwithstanding the vessel on which the seaman is employed is not a merchant vessel within the meaning of such act. Any claim, right, or cause of action of or in respect of any such seaman accruing on or after October 1, 1941, and prior to the date of enactment of this section may be enforced, and upon the election of the seaman or his surviving dependent or beneficiary, or his legal representative to do so shall be governed, as if this section had been in effect when such claim, right, or cause of action accrued, such election to be made in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator, War Shipping Administration. Rights of any seaman under the Social Security Act, as amended by subsection (b) (2) and (3), and claims therefor shall be governed solely by the provisions of such act, so amended. When used in this subsection the term "administratively disallowed" means a denial of a written claim in accordance with rules or regulations prescribed by the Administrator, War Shipping Administration. When used in this subsection the terms "War Shipping Administration" and "Administrator, War Shipping Administration" shall be deemed to include the United States Maritime Commission with respect to the period beginning October 1, 1941, and ending February 11, 1942, and the term "seaman" shall be deemed to include any seaman employed as an employee of the United States through the War Shipping Administration on vessels made available to or subchartered to other agencies or departments of the United States.

(b) (1) Section 1426 of the Internal Revenue Code (53 Stat. 177, 1383; 26 U. S. C. 1426) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Officers and members of crews employed by War Shipping Administration.—The term 'employment' shall include such service as is determined by the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, to be performed after September 30, 1941, and prior to the termination of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, on or in connection with any vessel by an officer or member of the crew as an employee of the United States employed through the War Shipping Administration, or, in respect of such service performed before February 11, 1942, the United States Maritime Commission. The term 'wages' means, with respect to service which constitutes employment by reason of this subsection, such amount of remuneration as is determined (subject to the provisions of this section) by the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, to be paid for such service. The Administrator and such agents as he may designate for the purpose are authorized and directed to comply with the provisions of the internal revenue laws on behalf of the United States as the employer of individuals whose service constitutes employment by reason of this subsection, but the Administrator and his agents shall not be liable for the tax on any employee imposed by section 1400 (unless the Administrator or his agent collects such tax from the employee) with respect to service performed before the date of enactment of this subsection which constitutes employment by reason of the enactment of this subsection."

(2) Section 209 of the Social Security Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 42, sec. 409), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(o) (1) Officers and members of crews employed by War Shipping Administration: The term 'employment' shall include such service as is determined by the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, to be performed after September 30, 1941, and prior to the termination of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, on or in connection with

any vessel by an officer or member of the crew as an employee of the United States employed through the War Shipping Administration or, in respect of such service performed before February 11, 1942, the United States Maritime Commission.

"(2) The Social Security Board shall not make determinations as to whether an individual has performed services which are employment by reason of this subsection, or the periods of such services, or the amounts of remuneration for such services, or the periods in which or for which such remuneration was paid, but shall accept the determinations with respect thereto of the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and such agents as he may designate, as evidenced by returns filed by such Administrator as an employer pursuant to section 1426 (i) of the Internal Revenue Code and certifications made pursuant to this subsection. Such determinations shall be final and conclusive.

"(3) The Administrator, War Shipping Administration, is authorized and directed, upon written request of the Social Security Board, to make certification to it with respect to any matter determinable for the Board by the War Shipping Administrator under this subsection, which the Board finds necessary in administering this title.

"(4) This subsection shall be effective as of September 30, 1941."

(3) Section 907 of the Social Security Act, amendments of 1939, is amended by inserting, after the phrase "attaining age 65", the following: "and 1 percent of any wages paid him for services which constitute employment by virtue of subsection (o) of section 209 of the Social Security Act, as amended,".

(c) The War Shipping Administration and its agents or persons acting on its behalf or for its account may, for convenience of administration, with the approval of the Administrator, make payments of any taxes, fees, charges, or exactions to the United States or its agencies.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 222 (f) of Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 523, 77th Cong.), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "and, whenever the Commission shall insure any risks included under subsection (d) or (e) of this section, or under this subsection insofar as it concerns liabilities relating to the master, officers, and crews of such vessels or to other persons transported thereon, the insurance on such risks may include marine risks to the extent that the Commission determines to be necessary or advisable."

(b) Whenever the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, finds that, on or after October 1, 1941, and before 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, a master, officer, or member of the crew of, or any persons transported on, a vessel owned by or chartered to the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration or operated by, or for the account of, or at the direction or under the control of the Commission or the Administration, has suffered death, injury, detention, or other casualty, for which the War Shipping Administration would be authorized to provide insurance under Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended by this act, the Administrator may declare that such death, injury, detention, or other casualty, shall be deemed and considered to be covered by such insurance at the time of the disaster or accident, if the Administrator finds that such action is required to make equitable provision for loss or injury related to the war effort and not otherwise adequately provided for: *Provided*, That in making provision for insurance under this subsection the Administrator shall not provide for payments in excess of those generally provided for in comparable cases under insurance hereafter furnished under the said Subtitle—Insurance of Title II, as amended: *Provided further*, That any money paid to any person by reason of insurance provided for under this subsection shall apply in pro tanto satisfaction of the claim of such person against the United States arising from the same loss or injury. The declarations, findings, and actions of or by the Administrator under this subsection shall be final and conclusive.

SEC. 3. (a) The second proviso of section 1 of the act of June 6, 1941 (Public Law 101, 77th Cong.), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That such compensation hereunder, or advances on account thereof, shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, and the fund so deposited shall be available for the payment of such compensation, and shall be subject to be applied to the payment of the amount of any valid claim by way of mortgage or maritime lien or attachment lien upon such vessel, or of any stipulation therefor in a court of the United States, or of any State, subsisting at the time of such requisition or taking of title or possession; the holder of any such claim may commence prior to June 30, 1943, or within 6 months after the first such deposit with the Treasurer and publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register, whichever date is later, and maintain in the United States district court from whose custody such vessel has been or may be taken or in whose territorial jurisdiction the vessel was lying at the time of requisition or taking of title or possession, a suit in admiralty according to the principles of libels in rem against the fund, which shall proceed and be heard and determined according to the principles of law and to the rules of practice obtaining in like cases between private parties, and any decree in said suit shall be paid out of the first and all subsequent deposits of compensation; and such suit shall be commenced in the manner provided by section 2 of the Suits in Admiralty Act and service of process shall be made in the manner therein provided by service upon the United States attorney and by mailing by registered mail to the Attorney General and the United States Maritime Commission and due notice shall under order of the court be given to all interested persons, and any decree shall be subject to appeal and revision as now provided in other cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction."

(b) The Administrator, War Shipping Administration, may determine at any time prior to the payment in full or deposit in full with the Treasurer of the United States, or the payment or deposit of 75 percent, of just compensation therefor that the ownership of any vessel (the title to which has been requisitioned pursuant to sec. 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, or the act of June 6, 1941 (Public Law 101, 77th Cong.)), is not required by the United States, and after such determination has been made and notice thereof has been published in the Federal Register, the use rather than the title to such vessel shall be deemed to have been requisitioned for all purposes as of the date of the original taking: *Provided, however*, That no such determination shall be made with respect to any vessel owned by citizens of the United States after the expiration of a period of 2 months after the date of delivery of such vessel pursuant to title requisition except with the consent of the owner. Upon the written recommendation of the Secretary of State, such a determination may be made by the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, with respect to any vessel, the title to which has been requisitioned pursuant to the act of June 6, 1941 (Public Law 101, 77th Cong.), which shall have been lost or destroyed or converted to naval or military use by the United States.

(c) In the event that a vessel the title or use and possession of which is requisitioned or taken pursuant to section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, or the act of June 6, 1941 (Public Law 101, 77th Cong.), is in the custody of any court, State or Federal, it shall be the duty of all agents and officers of the court having possession, custody, or control of said vessel, forthwith upon the filing with the clerk of said court of a certified copy of the order of requisitioning or taking, and without further order of the court, to comply with said requisitioning or taking and to permit the representatives of the United States Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, as the case may be, to take possession, custody, and control of said vessel.

(d) Section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end of subsection (d) thereof a paragraph to read as follows:

"The existence of any valid claim by way of mortgage or maritime claim or attachment lien upon such vessel shall not prevent the taking thereof pursuant to this section: *Provided, however*, That in the event any such claim exists the United States Maritime Commission may in its discretion deposit such portion of the compensation hereunder, or advances on account thereof, as may equal but not exceed the amount of such claims in respect of the vessel, with the Treasurer of the United States, and the fund so deposited shall be available for the payment of such compensation, and shall be subject to be applied to the payment of the amount of any valid claim by way of mortgage or maritime lien or attachment lien upon such vessel, or of any stipulation therefor in a court of the United States, or of any State, subsisting at the time of such requisition or taking of title or possession; the holder of any such claim may commence prior to June 30, 1943, or within 6 months after the first such deposit with the Treasurer and publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register, whichever date is later, and maintain in the United States district court from whose custody such vessel has been or may be taken or in whose territorial jurisdiction the vessel was lying at the time of requisitioning or taking of title or possession, a suit in admiralty according to the principles of libels in rem against the fund, which shall proceed and be heard and determined according to the principles of law and to the rules of practice obtaining in like cases between private parties, and any decree in said suits shall be paid out of the first and all subsequent deposits of compensation; and such suit shall be commenced in the manner provided by section 2 of the Suits in Admiralty Act and service of process shall be made in the manner therein provided by service upon the United States attorney and by mailing by registered mail to the Attorney General and the United States Maritime Commission and due notice shall under order of the court be given to all interested persons, and any decree shall be subject to appeal and revision as now provided in other cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction."

(e) (1) The second sentence of section 223 of subtitle—Insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 523, 77th Cong.), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "but the Commission may allow fair and reasonable compensation to any company authorized to do an insurance business in any State of the United States for servicing insurance written by such company as an underwriting agent for the Commission, and such compensation may include an allowance for expenses reasonably incurred by such agent but such expenses shall not include any commission paid by such agent in excess of 5 percent of the premiums in respect of such insurance."

(2) The last sentence of such section 223 is amended by striking out the clause in parentheses, and by inserting before the period at the end of such sentence a comma and the following: "but in no case shall such allowance to the carrier provide for payment by the carrier of commissions in excess of 5 percent of the premiums paid for that portion of the direct insurance so reinsured."

(f) Section 224 (a) of subtitle—Insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 523, 77th Cong.), is amended by inserting after the word "subtitle" and before the comma following such word the words "or in section 10 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended."

(g) Section 225 of subtitle—Insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 523, 77th Cong.), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "All persons having or claiming to have an interest in such insurance, or who it is believed might assert such an interest, may be made parties to such suit, either initially or upon the motion of either party. In any case where the Commission acknowledges the indebtedness of the United States on account of such insurance, and there may be a dispute as to the person or persons entitled to receive payment, the United States may bring an action in the nature of a bill of interpleader against the persons having or claiming to have any interest in such insurance, or who it is believed might assert such an interest, in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, or in the district court in and for the district in which any such person resides. In either of such actions any person claiming to have an interest in such insurance, or who it is believed might assert such an interest, if not an inhabitant of or found within the district within which either of such actions is brought, may be brought in by order of the court to be served personally or by publication or in such other reasonable manner as the court may direct, and if it be shown to the satisfaction of the court that persons unknown might assert a claim on account of such insurance, the court may direct service upon such persons unknown by publication in the Federal Register. Judgment in any such action shall discharge the United States from further liability to any parties to such action, and to all persons where service by publication upon persons unknown is directed by the court. The procedure herein provided shall apply to all actions now pending against the United States under the provisions of this subtitle, as amended."

(h) Section 226 (f) of Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 523, 77th Cong.), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(3) The term 'risks of war' shall include those losses which, in accordance with commercial practice prevailing from time to time, are excluded from marine insurance coverage under 'free of capture and seizure' clauses or clauses analogous thereto."

(i) Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 523, 77th Cong.), is amended by adding at the end thereof a section to read as follows:

"SEC. 229. In addition to the insurance functions authorized by the other sections of this subtitle, the War Shipping Administration may insure directly, or may reinsure in whole or in part any company authorized to do business in any State in the United States and which shall insure directly, any person who shall perform services or provide facilities for or with respect to any public or private vessel against legal liabilities (except liability to employees in respect of employer's liability and workmen's compensation) that may be incurred by such person in connection with the performance of such services or the providing of such facilities, whenever in the opinion of the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, such insurance or reinsurance is required in the prosecution of the war effort and cannot be obtained at reasonable rates or upon reasonable conditions from approved companies authorized to do an insurance business in any State of the United States."

(j) The clause in parentheses in the first sentence of section 3 (b) of the act of June 6, 1941, as amended (Public Law 101, 77th Cong.), is amended to read as follows: "(including any interest or liability of the owner, charterer, or agent)."

(k) The second sentence of section 4 of such act of June 6, 1941, is amended by inserting after the words "national defense" and before the semicolon a comma and the following: "and when so chartered or operated may be insured as provided in said section 3."

SEC. 4. The United States shall, with respect to vessels owned by or chartered to the War Shipping Administrator under bareboat charter or time charter or operated directly by such Administrator or for his account, be entitled to the benefits of all exemptions and of all limitations of liability accorded by law to the owners of vessels. With respect to any such vessel, the term "the United States" shall include agents or other persons acting for or on behalf of the Administrator in connection with the operation thereof.

SEC. 5. The provisions of section 1 (a) of this act shall remain in force until the termination of title 1 of the First War Powers Act, 1941. The termination of the provisions of such section shall not affect any act done or any right accruing or accrued, or any suit or proceeding had or commenced in any cause before such termination, but all rights and liabilities under law as modified by such provisions shall continue and may be enforced in the same manner as if such provisions had not terminated. The authority conferred upon the United States Maritime Commission by any provision of this act shall be vested in and exercised by the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration in conformity with the Executive order of February 7, 1942 (No. 9054; 7 F. R. 837), as heretofore or hereafter amended.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 12, line 12, strike out "January 1" and insert "June 30."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAINING OF AIR PILOTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1670) to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I do so to get an explanation of the bill.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I do not see the chairman of the committee on the floor, but this bill is made necessary because of the new training program by which Civil Aeronautics Authority is entering into an agreement with the War and Navy Departments to train Army and Navy pilots who are in the service.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not believe the gentleman is explaining the bill correctly. This bill provides for some change in the Civil Aeronautics Act. I notice that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], the author of the bill, has come into the chamber, and I ask him to explain the bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Administration was engaged in the training of civilian pilots. Now they are training entirely sailors and soldiers from the Army and the Navy. They cannot expend any of their appropriation on that, under a decision of the Comptroller General.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand the gentleman, he says that all of the trainees in the Civil Aeronautics training program are in the armed forces.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. In active service.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. STFFAN. And under the act the C. A. A. cannot expend money except to train civilians.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. For the training of any enlisted reserves if they are in active service status?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Heretofore their money was confined to the training of civilians?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Do I understand there will be an increase in civilian pilots?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No, because they will not train any more. It is a matter of accounts.

Mr. STEFAN. Who is going to pay for this training?

Mr. BULWINKLE. The War Department wanted the Civil Aeronautics Authority or the Board to pay it from their appropriation, instead of from the Army and the Navy appropriations.

Mr. STEFAN. Who pays it under this change?

Mr. BULWINKLE. The Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the Civilian Aeronautics Administration have to pay for the training of enlisted reserves in active service? Will they have to pay them $50 a month, instead of that coming out of the Army appropriation?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No; the whole thing, all expenses, will come out of the Civil Aeronautics appropriation.

Mr. STEFAN. I believe the gentleman is in error about that, because there would not be enough money in the civilian pilot training program to do it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. But that is a matter that they will ask the Appropriations Committee for.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I ask the gentleman further about the program: What is to be established with reference to the new men of the Army and the Navy to be trained? Are they to be trained at existing civilian pilot training fields?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes, and at schools and colleges and at the fields.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. At the present time there are many fields not at the schools and colleges, where men are being trained. Will those fields be continued or abandoned?

Mr. BULWINKLE. They will not be abandoned. It is not contemplated to use any new fields.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. My information from the Civil Aeronautics Administration does not check up with the statements the gentleman has made. They have advised me that fields close to colleges are to be used, and if they are at a distant point from the colleges those fields cannot be used in the present Army program. As far as the Navy is concerned, it will continue to use the civilian pilot fields, but that is not true of the Army.

Mr. BULWINKLE. To be frank with the gentleman, I do not understand it that way.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. It is the present contemplated plan of the Civil Aeronautics Administration to reduce the contract fields under the Civilian Pilot Training Program, probably 60 to 70 percent.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. TABER. The Civil Aeronautics Board sent around people to work up sentiment for airfields in certain localities, and after the sentiment is locally worked up, then they tell them they cannot do it. I wonder how much of that is going on.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Certain communities have increased their school facilities. They have gone to the expense of housing facilities and apparently, under this program, as far as the Army is concerned, many of the present fields used by flight contractors for training civilian pilots will not be used by the Army.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. In regard to the question raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I am disappointed to hear what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] said about closing down 70 percent of the training fields in the United States, for the reason that the W. P. A. and the Civil Aeronautics Administration have gone into various communities and urged the communities to vote bonds and go into debt to buy airports, to expand airports, to buy additional land, indicating that they would improve them or that there would be some Federal assistance toward completing them. Many communities did this, thinking they were helping the defense program. The result is that in my district we have unfinished airports that are practically completed. The only thing left is to pave the runways. Here are fine airports with fine pilot instructors left high and dry. With the liquidation of the W. P. A. the citizens in my district are alarmed as to what is to become of the great investment they and the Government have made. Here are airports almost ready to be used which we are now told may be abandoned by the very Federal agencies which came to these communities and urged the people, induced them to vote bonds and go into debt to build these airports and to buy property. If what the gentleman from Oklahoma says becomes a fact, a great outlay of community and Federal funds will represent waste. How can we justify such acts?

Mr. TABER. And they are still out urging people to do that sort of thing. In addition to that, after they get them worked up to the right pitch, then they let them down.

Mr. STEFAN. They must not abandon them. Our investment in them is too great.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The reduction program which the gentleman speaks of will not apply to this bill at all.

Mr. STEFAN. No, this bill has nothing to do with that. But it may affect the training program on fields in danger of abandonment.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the bill go over until we can look into the program a little closer with reference to the Army and their arrangement with the C. A. A. in connection with the flight training schools.

Mr. LEA. I would like to say to the gentleman that it is undesirable to do that unless he feels there is something of importance that is required, because this is laying the foundation for the new training program which will take in about 30,000 men a month. So it is important for them to know whether or not they can proceed under this plan.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Can the gentleman from California tell us how many of the existing flight fields which the Civil Aeronautics Administration is now using will be used in connection with the present contemplated program?

Mr. LEA. I cannot tell you the number, but this bill does not affect that question any more than it simply provides that those men who are in an active enlisted status can have training under the C. A. A., which the Comptroller General has held they cannot, under the present act, because the present act provides only for civilian training.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. The C. A. A. has advised me that unless the flight training fields are in close proximity to the colleges that have been selected, the present fields will be abandoned and not be used for pilot training purposes.

Mr. LEA. That may be true, but that is not dependent at all on this bill. This bill has nothing to do with that.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. As I understand this bill, in the original act regarding civilian pilot training we allowed around $72,000,000 for that purpose last year. Now there is a balance left in the appropriation of about $25,000,000. I understand that the Navy has turned over for civilian pilot training the sum of $25,000,000 for the training of personnel for the Navy. Now this bill is to take care of the personnel within the Army, and to use the balance of the funds for the purpose of training the personnel of the Army.

Mr. LEA. It is the Army contract that caused this to be brought up at this time, but it does apply to both the Army and the Navy. It permits them to be trained by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, but it does not change the burden of expense in doing it.

Mr. RABAUT. But it shifts the burden of expense out of the Army appropriation to the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Mr. LEA. Not for the pay, but for the training.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the Army and the Navy ought to get together on this. Every time we hold hearings for an appropriation for the C. A. A. program we are up against some question of procedure between the Army and the Navy. They never seem to get together on civilian pilot training program. We are in a war. There must be cooperation in everything we do toward winning that war.

Mr. LEA. This bill affects only the appropriations made to the C. A. A. It permits those funds to be used for training the men on the active list, which otherwise could not be done.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Consent Calendar.

### TRANSFER OF CERTAIN MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to No. 2 on the calendar, the bill (H. R. 1294) to authorize the sale or transfer of property belonging to the Government for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my objection to this bill was that the funds should revert to the general fund of the Treasury, and not in any special fund. With the understanding this feature would be corrected, I have consented to again call the bill up for passage.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That whenever during the continuance of the present hostilities the President shall determine that any mechanical equipment appurtenant to any building or other real property owned by the Government and devoted to a particular use is urgently needed in the conduct of the war, and cannot otherwise be provided, the head of the department, agency, or establishment having control thereof, in order to fulfill such need, is authorized to sell such property for cash for a price equal to the full replacement value thereof. Any funds realized from the sale of such property shall be deposited in appropriate special funds in the Treasury and shall be available, as the President may prescribe, for replacement of such equipment: *Provided*, That funds not obligated for such replacement within 2 fiscal years after the cessation of the present hostilities shall be covered into the surplus fund of the Treasury.

With the following committee amendment:

That whenever during the continuance of the present hostilities the President shall determine that any mechanical equipment now owned by the Government and devoted to a particular use is urgently needed in the conduct of the war, and cannot otherwise be provided, the head of the department, agency, or establishment having control thereof, in order to fulfill such need, is authorized to sell such property for cash for a price equal to the full replacement value thereof. Any funds realized from the sale of such property shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury and shall be available for replacement and for the restoration, repair, and renovation of any buildings or other property from which it may have been taken.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the final sentence in the committee amendment on the ground that it constitutes an appropriation in a legislative bill reported by a legislative committee.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the committee thought the provisions of the bill as reported were preferable, I concede the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will report the committee amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

That whenever during the continuance of the present hostilities the President shall determine that any mechanical equipment now owned by the Government and devoted to a particular use is urgently needed in the conduct of the war, and cannot otherwise be provided, the head of the department, agency, or establishment having control thereof, in order to fulfill such need, is authorized to sell such property for cash for a price equal to the full replacement value thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last week, in announcing to the House what the program for this week would be, I stated that the Private Calendar would be called tomorrow. I have been asked to request that the calling of the Private Calendar be dispensed with this week in order that general debate on the independent offices bill may proceed for the balance of today and all of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with on tomorrow, Tuesday, but that the Private Calendar may be called some day this week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why not set a definite date for the calling of the Private Calendar so that Members interested may know when the bills will be called? Why not make it Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not make my request specific because, as the gentleman will realize, it is rather difficult to foretell when consideration of the independent offices bill will be concluded and the bill disposed of; but I will ask for a definite date for the consideration of the Private Calendar.

Mr. Speaker, I modify my request and ask now unanimous consent that the calling of the Private Calendar on tomorrow, Tuesday, be dispensed with, but that it may be in order to call individual bills on the Private Calendar on Friday, February 19, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOSPITALIZATION OF VETERANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 1749, a bill to "amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended."

Mr. BARDEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. This bill, let me state to the gentleman from North Carolina, is one which provides for hospitalizing the veterans of this war on the same terms that we hospitalize veterans of the last World War. We are receiving a great many complaints of hardships to veterans of the present war.

Mr. BARDEN. When was the bill introduced?

Mr. RANKIN. The bill was introduced some time ago.

Mr. BARDEN. And was it reported by the gentleman's committee?

Mr. RANKIN. It is on the calendar; it is the last bill on the calendar, No. 21.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman just desires to move it up on the calendar.

Mr. RANKIN. It did not get on the calendar in time to be considered today, without unanimous consent. It lacked only 1 day.

Many of these boys are suffering, some are having to go to jails and private hospitals, and some of them are being sent to their homes without any treatment at all. They ought to be taken care of promptly.

Mr. BARDEN. Does not the gentleman believe that if it is so urgent, somebody should have a copy of the bill? The gentleman knows I am not opposed to hospitalization of veterans. I have been a member of veterans' organizations just as long as the gentleman from Mississippi, and I do not like to be put in the position of making a reservation of objection on a bill that is as apparently as important as this is.

Mr. RANKIN. The only difference is this: This provides for the hospitalization of not only disabled enlisted men but women who are actually in the military service and who are entitled to this hospitalization.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I have a case where an enlisted man while in the service went crazy. His mentality went wrong. He was taken back to my State and under the law of the State of Kentucky if he is sent to an insane asylum or a State hospital it must be at the expense of his estate or some member of his family who is able to pay it. Will this regulation, as amended, by the pending bill cover a case of that kind, and will he be hospitalized in a veterans' hospital?

Mr. RANKIN. He will be hospitalized in a veterans' hospital.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. In view of the statement made by the gentleman from Kentucky relative to a young man who suffered a mental disability, may I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to this situation: There is evidence that a very large number of young men going into the military service have become mentally disabled and then are discharged with the statement that the disability existed prior to entering the service. There is a much larger number of such disabilities in this war than in the last war. The percentage is greater. These young men may have no chance to go to a veterans' hospital, they certainly receive no compensation, and I have a feeling from evidence submitted that possibly a considerable number of these young men have been mentally disabled because of faulty or defective serum or inoculations, and I think the law should be amended requiring such disabilities to be considered as having arisen in the service.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks in reference to H. R. 1749, I ask unanimous consent to insert a copy of the bill and the report in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

H. R. 1749

A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, is hereby amended, by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting therefor a colon and the following: "Any officer, enlisted man or woman, member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) or Navy Nurse Corps (female) employed in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of the present war."

---

REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H. R. 1749

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1749), entitled "A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended," having considered the same, report favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The bill has for its purpose the granting of medical and hospital treatment, domiciliary care, and burial benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to certain veterans of World War No. 2. The existing law requires that the veteran must have been discharged for disability incurred in service in line of duty or must be in receipt of pension for service-connected disability in order to receive treatment or care for disabilities which the man has been unable to prove to have been incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service.

Your committee conducted hearings on H. R. 1185 (78th Cong.), a similar bill, February 2 and 3, 1943. Many cases have been

brought to attention, warranting immediate action of the Congress, where veterans, after being accepted for active service, have by change of environment and due to active service become seriously disabled and in need of treatment. In some instances they have been sent home without necessary care and, not infrequently, in mental cases retained in a jail pending transfer to a State institution. In some cases adequate care is not available. The Federal Government must assume its just obligation to care for these distressing cases, having taken the man into the active service in the first instance.

While the committee have been informed of efforts of the service departments and the Veterans' Administration to institute procedures tending to alleviate the above situation, your committee have determined, on the basis of facts presented to it and which undoubtedly have come to the attention of the Members of Congress generally, that no further delay should be entailed to insure the proper treatment and care of these disabled veterans. Such procedures as are referred to cannot be satisfactory under any circumstances due to the drastic restrictions under the existing law.

By amending paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, the veterans of the present war will be brought within the technical definition of a "veteran of any war" under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. They will thus be entitled to medical and hospital treatment and domiciliary care and burial benefits on a parity with veterans of World War No. 1. While your committee recognize the reasons why these veterans of World War No. 2 have not been included for these benefits as veterans of any war, it is believed that the Congress must remove this inequality and injustice at the earliest practicable date.

In accordance with the provisions of clause 2a, rule XIII, House of Representatives, the changes in the present law made by the bill H. R. 1749 are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is in black brackets; new matter is in italics; existing law in which no changes are proposed is shown in roman):

"The term 'veteran of any war' shall include the following persons: World War—Any officer, enlisted man, member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) or Navy Nurse Corps (female) who was employed in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after April 6, 1917, and before November 12, 1918; provided, however, if the person was serving with the United States military forces in Russia the dates herein shall be extended to April 1, 1920; Spanish-American War—Any officer or enlisted man who was employed in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after April 21, 1898, and before August 13, 1898, including those women who served as Army nurses under contracts on or after April 21, 1898, and before August 13, 1898, and including any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States between August 13, 1898, and July 4, 1902, both dates inclusive, and who left the continental United States under orders for military or naval service in Guam, Cuba, or Puerto Rico, between such dates; provided, that for the purposes of hospitalization the term 'veteran of any war' shall include persons who served overseas as contract surgeons of the Army on or after April 21, 1898, and before August 13, 1898; Philippine Insurrection—Any officer or enlisted man employed in the active military or naval service of the United States, including those women who served as Army nurses under contracts, who actually participated in the Philippine Insurrection on or after August 13, 1898, and before July 5, 1902; provided, however, if the person was serving in the United States military forces engaged in the hostilities in the Moro Province, the ending date shall be July 15, 1903; Boxer Rebellion—Any officer or enlisted man, including those women who served as Army nurses under contracts, employed in actual participation in the Boxer Rebellion on or after June 20, 1900, and before May 13, 1901[.]: *Any officer, enlisted man or woman, member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) or Navy Nurse Corps (female) employed in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of the present war.*"

The SPEAKER. The Chair agreed to recognize the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to call up this bill, which is on the calendar. The Chair trusts there will be either a green light for the consideration of the bill or objection made to its consideration soon, because it is desired that the House proceed with the other business of the House. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 12, 1943.*
Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have been tentatively assigned to both the Post Office and Post Roads Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee of the House.

In view of my understanding that it will be necessary for me to relinquish membership on one of the above committees I am writing to tender my resignation from the Post Office and Post Roads Committee of the House.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE J. SULLIVAN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. MCKENZIE] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter, and also that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two topics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the South San Francisco Packing & Provision Co. with reference to the meat shortage in California which has reached a desperate stage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with H. R. 1294.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1762, making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate shall continue throughout the day, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1762, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of demand for time for debate and speeches, most of which I hope will not pertain particularly to this bill. I am not going to consume a lot of time myself going over the individual departments and items in the bill because I am sure when we get to the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule whatever interest there may be in those agencies will develop and we can go into that, perhaps with more profit.

At the outset I want to express my appreciation for the cooperation of the members of the Independent Offices Subcommittee in the consideration of this bill. We had long hearings, we went into each item painstakingly and carefully. It is a large bill and covers a great many departments, requiring a great deal of time in its consideration both in the committee and on the floor of the House. I want to thank not only my Democratic colleagues who cooperated with me but also the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for their very intelligent, aggressive, and sometimes too persistent attention to the bill.

I may say that we do not often have any very violent differences of opinion in the Independent Offices Subcommittee. I do not believe there are very many items in this bill on which we do not agree. There may be some differences of opinion as to amount, but I do not believe, in fact, that even that will develop.

We have gone through this bill very carefully with the idea of trying to pre-

pare it and bring it here in line with what we believe to be the sentiment not only of this House but of the country. We believe that every dollar should be cut out of Federal expenditures, except those funds which are absolutely necessary in the prosecution of the war. We have approached the consideration of the bill with that in mind.

The Budget estimate for this bill is $2,627,552,585. That is a lot of money. I call your attention to the statement which I shall put in the RECORD, part of it being in the report on the bill, which will show you that 87.7 percent of the funds in this bill are directly related to the major war effort. Additional funds are in the category of items that you probably could not do anything with in the way of curtailment. For instance, the salary of the President of the United States. Perhaps some people would like to cut out that salary entirely. I do not believe, however, there would be many in favor of that, but perhaps there would be a few. There are also funds for the civil-service retirement fund, for the Canal Zone retirement fund, for the Alaska Railroad, for the operation of public buildings in and outside of the District of Columbia, which refers to public buildings for a number of activities, and funds for the General Accounting Office. Some of those items are for large amounts of money, but we have audited the appropriations very carefully.

You could arbitrarily cut off $100,000,000 here and there if you wished to do so. I do not believe you could find any logical or legitimate basis on which to do that, however. Of course, we could cut out this $175,000,000 for the civil-service retirement fund, but even with putting that amount of money in the fund we are still way behind what the Government owes the fund actuarially. So I just point out that while these items are large sums of money they do not offer very much opportunity to those of us who would like to make a drastic curtailment.

The other larger items in the bill which constitute 87.7 percent are such items as the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Public Roads Administration—which is devoting all of its activities now to strategic highways, war access roads, and roads that are approved by the Army and Navy departments—the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Maritime Commission, which has in this bill $1,289,000,000 for building ships, and the Veterans' Administration, which has nearly $900,000,000 in this bill. So we have here a bill covering more or less old-line agencies which are on a wartime basis and which account for practically 95 percent of this bill. However, we have gone through the bill carefully and have made cuts in the bill, some of which are drastic to the point, perhaps, of leaving out an entire agency, such as was done in the case of the National Resources Planning Board. We have also made cuts in the Civil Service Commission and other agencies where we thought funds could be cut after a careful analysis.

The bill is $6,448,206 below the Budget estimate, so those are cuts we have made that we think can be justified. I will insert the statement I have referred to at this point:

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations provided in the bill specifically earmarked for war purposes or on account of war: | |
| Civil Service Commission | $10,000,000 |
| Federal Communications Commission | 5,590,314 |
| Federal Power Commission | 519,255 |
| Public Roads Administration | 88,000,000 |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 299,000 |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 19,454,500 |
| United States Maritime Commission | 1,289,780,000 |
| Veterans' Administration | 887,017,000 |
| Total | 2,301,485,069 |
| Total percent | 87.7 |
| In addition, other items not specifically earmarked bring the total for war purposes up to 92 percent. | |
| Other items or parts of items which cannot be reduced are as follows: | |
| Salary of the President | $75,000 |
| Civil-service retirement and disability fund | 175,104,000 |
| Canal Zone retirement and disability fund | 1,177,000 |
| Alaska Railroad retirement and disability fund | 175,000 |
| Operation and maintenance of public buildings in and outside District of Columbia due to war program | 16,215,600 |
| General Accounting Office (65 percent due to war) | 17,168,650 |
| Total, additional items which cannot be reduced | 209,915,250 |
| Add items specifically provided for war | 2,301,485,069 |
| Grand total (95 percent of bill) | 2,511,400,319 |
| Total of bill | 2,621,104,379 |
| Less items which cannot be reduced | 2,511,400,319 |
| Total, items in bill which could be reduced | 109,704,060 |
| Reduction made by committee | 6,448,206 |
| Total of items considered which could be reduced | 116,152,266 |
| Percentage of reduction in items available | 5.5 |

I want to say this before I refer to some of the individual agencies in the bill. I think the House and the country may feel that we are entering upon a more or less new era in our method and manner of making appropriations. Some of us have fought for years for the reforms we are now putting into effect. It is fair to say that perhaps in other years when appropriations were not nearly so large and not nearly so complicated the Committee on Appropriations would naturally have more time individually and collectively to go into these things carefully item by item, but with a seven- or eight- or ten-billion-dollar budget for ordinary purposes and nearly $100,000,000,000 for war purposes, the time just does not exist in 24-hour days for any committee or the personnel of any committee to make the careful analyses and study of individual items that we think should be made. Therefore, we have set up some machinery in the Committee on Appropriations.

Before I discuss that, however, I want to state that I think it is a splendid thing that we have set up a subcommittee, and a very fine subcommittee, to go into this very complicated and very troublesome matter of dealing with personnel who are charged with being disloyal and subversive. I think we are approaching that in a judicial and a legislative manner. We have a splendid subcommittee that is going into those charges carefully and will make recommendations to this House. It will be for the House then to accept or reject the recommendations of that committee. However, when we come upon the floor of the House again, I am happy to say we will not be in the position we were a few days ago when all sorts of charges were hurled around the Chamber. We knew nothing about them; we had no carefully prepared record to go on, and we were put in the position of either voting against some man we did not know anything about or putting a vote on the record that might look as if we were condoning some person unfit to serve the Government. Hereafter we will have the carefully considered report of a committee as a basis for our action.

Returning to my reference to the need for study and analysis of individual items, the Committee on Appropriations is taking on a special staff of experts. We are going to draw them from some of the departments, men who are carefully trained in government procedure, and who will be taken off the pay rolls of the departments from which they are drawn and placed on the pay roll of the House of Representatives.

They will be our agents, and not the agents of a department. They will be under the supervision of highly trained men from one of the investigative departments of the Government and it will be their duty under the instructions of the Appropriations Committee to make surveys and audits and investigations of establishments and departments where we think information can be gotten that will be helpful to the committee. For instance, with this rapidly expanding Government that we have, engaged as it is in global war, raising an army not just for America, but for the world, raising a navy not for one ocean but for all the oceans of the world, suddenly faced with the duty of supplying not only that army and that navy, but the other nations of the earth who are our allies, it is an economic and commercial proposition that staggers the imagination. We find ourselves confronted with a civil pay roll of staggering sums. Two and a half or three million people are on the civil-service rolls in a civilian status in addition to the armed forces. If we begin to consider the matter by comparison, of course, we are shocked. We will say that in the World War we had so and so, and now we have so and so. Gentlemen, that does not mean anything. There is no basis whatever whereby you can reach any conclusion

that is worth anything to you by considering what we are trying to do in this war and comparing it with what we did in the last war. It just does not make sense. You have got to go at it in a different way. We want these experts to go into some of these departments, not particularly the agencies in this bill because we do not have the so-called war agencies in the independent offices bill.

The places where I think there is overstaffing is in some of these departments that have grown up quickly, the so-called mushroom agencies. We will send trained personnel into those departments to make careful audit and check and bring back to the Appropriations Committee definite, authentic information that we can rely on, so that we can tell whether they have too many or too few. Also, if some other agencies need personnel, instead of employing new people, we can go into one of these overstaffed agencies, and take the oversupply there and put them into another place where they are needed.

In addition to the matter of personnel, there is the item of travel. If you go through all of these appropriation bills you will see that item rise into a colossal sum, and of course travel is an important item with all of these agencies, and with the war scattered all over the United States and in foreign countries, it is even difficult for the bureau or the agency itself to keep track of it. We want to know something definite about that. Also, we want a check made of long-distance telephone calls, and also to determine to what extent those calls are made and to what extent they can be substituted by air mail and telegraph. If we are successful in doing what I think we can do, I believe when we come here a little later with appropriation bills we will be better prepared to say to the House and to the country that we know we have culled out of here everything that can be taken out of this bill.

In addition to that, another field of operation for these experts will be in the matter of field offices. I am sure it is the experience of every Congressman, especially if he lives in a community of any size, that he is impressed by the number of field offices in his community. They are there by the score. There is no question that these field offices, regional offices and State offices is another very fertile field for investigation. We believe our trained investigators and auditors can go into that field and come back to the Appropriations Committee and to the Congress with helpful and constructive suggestions.

The independent offices appropriations subcommittee, if I may say without being too immodest, has, down through the years, been a pioneer in the field of trying to hold down expenditures and in the unnecessary growth of Government agencies. I remember a good many years ago when I first went on this committee as the newest member and a minority member that our late distinguished lamented friend, Mr. Will Wood, of Indiana, was the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, and that our late friend from New Hampshire, Mr. Wason, was the chairman of the subcommittee having in charge the independent offices appropriations bill. We set about then to try to do the same things we are doing now. I remember one agency we went into, the old Shipping Board—and gentlemen, let me say that overstaffing and overpaying is not a product of any one particular administration. It has always been in the Government and I can say that somewhat in defense of the administration at the present time.

We had in the independent offices appropriation bill then a bill where salaries were paid as high as $10,000, $15,000, $18,000, and $35,000—products left over, stuff from the World War. Many of you perhaps will remember when the Chairman of the old Shipping Board received $35,000 a year, when the manager was paid $18,000 a year, and the general counsel $15,000. Some of you may remember the old Farm Board that some of us were instrumental in liquidating. The general counsel for the old Farm Board received $20,000 a year, and if I remember correctly one gentleman who is now on the Supreme Court of the United States was general counsel for another agency receiving $20,000 a year and his feelings were much hurt when the independent offices appropriations bill subcommittee put him back to $10,000. We are not paying any salaries of that kind now in the Government service. And now I am going to venture where angels fear to tread.

I am going to say a kind word for some men who are perhaps thoughtlessly placed in the category of bureaucrats. That is a term that we handle very loosely sometimes. We speak of a bureaucrat and immediately attending what we say, is a great deal of odium. We throw it out in blanket form and it envelops everybody in the Government service. I want to say to you there are men in the Government service who do not reflect a lot of credit on it. There are heads of departments who are not good administrators; who think more about playing politics than they do about serving the United States Government. There are some of them who think perhaps more about building up a large mushroom agency with a lot of political power than they do about the job that Congress has given them to do. But do not overlook the fact, if you please, that there are in the Government service today, in the bureaus and departments, men of high integrity, outstanding administrative ability, who are working for the United States Government at an infinitesimal part of what they would be paid if they were working for private industry. I could mention many of them.

Admiral Land, head of the United States Maritime Commission, with all of the hot spots he has had to sit on in this great shipbuilding program, and having made, as he will admit, some mistakes and blunders, is performing a service, and has performed a service in this war effort second to no man who wears the uniform. If he were employed by private industry the salary he could secure would make the small amount of money we are paying him seem infinitesimal.

Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, handling in late years almost a billion dollars a year, has done an administrative job that cannot be excelled in the Government service. The finger of suspicion has never been pointed to the great Veterans' Administration since Gen. Frank T. Hines has administered its affairs.

So I might go on down the line. You might go into the Army and the Navy. In a year and a half we have not performed the industrial miracle that we performed in this country; we have not raised a great army and a great navy and put them in the field; we have not built a great air force of over a million men with bureaucrats and crackpots. There have been some leaders and men of administrative ability, men who are devoting their lives to the work they are doing. I know some of them who are about to be casualties of this war, just as much as men who dropped in battle on Guadalcanal or Buna or in some of these other places.

So let us not make the fatal blunder of pointing the finger at every bureau and every department, but let us rather be discriminating and try to pick out the men who are doing a good job, and when they do a good job, support them and stand behind them. That applies not only to the departmental heads, but it applies all the way down the line, even to the smaller paid employees.

Now, our Appropriations Committee hopes that with this new machinery we are setting up we will be able to bring you much more definite and specific data than we have been able to bring you in the past.

I want to talk a little now, if I may, about some of the items in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

If you care to turn to the report, which is available, you will find on page 4 a statement of the general provisions which are carried in the bill. In some of these instances we have in the past carried certain specific authorizations, limitations, and restrictions in different departments. It has been thought best by the Budget, and the committee thinks it is best, to carry certain general provisions which will apply to all of the departments. You will find them set out in this paragraph at the bottom of page 4.

For instance, there is a general provision authorizing the use of travel funds for expenses of travel from one official station to another. That is particularly necessary because of our decentralization program.

Authorizing the use of funds for the transportation of household goods and effects of employees. We have found that in moving so many agencies out of Washington to other places it has only been fair to take some account of the expense to which employees were put in moving their household goods.

Section 202 relating to the purchase and operation of Government passenger-carrying vehicles.

Section 203 authorizing funds derived from the sale of old cars to be applied as part payment toward the purchase of new cars.

Section 204, authorizing purchases in amounts of $100 or less without advertising under section 3709 of the act requiring competitive bids.

Section 205 prohibits the use of funds to pay the salary of persons not citizens of the United States, with certain exceptions.

Section 206, relating to the designation of officers or employees to administer oaths.

So much for the general provisions.

We have approved a total of $2,712,000 for the Bureau of the Budget. This is an actual increase of $452,000 over the current appropriation. Of this increase, $246,500 is required to carry for a full year personnel and expenses now provided on a part-year basis. The remainder of the increase, $205,500, will provide initial funds for the establishment of a field service. This sum will be sufficient to establish four field offices and a small supervisory staff in Washington. We feel that this staff will permit the Bureau to secure information at first hand which would not otherwise be available and that it will increase the effective and efficient service the Bureau is now performing.

I would like to speak a minute about the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission has had a colossal job to perform. Some of us have found things to criticize about it, and I am sure some of that criticism has been justified. But they have had a large job to perform, especially when we have made an effort, in building up these war agencies, to try as far as possible to have them taken from the civil-service rolls, in order to prevent, as far as we could prevent it, the turning of those agencies into purely political patronage. They have had a hard job, and their job is not lightening very much on account of the tremendous turn-over in these departments. This data shows that on an annual basis the placements in 1944 will be about one and one-half million; turnover in the Government work; people taken out, going into the armed services, moving from one agency to the other on account of being more valuable to one agency than the one in which they were working.

So they have asked for a large sum of money, and we have found that it would be possible to make some reduction in this activity, so we have reduced their regular fund appropriation by $581,600. That is a pretty heavy cut, but we think they can take it.

In their appropriation for war activities we have made a reduction of $1,426,552—another pretty heavy cut—but we think the Civil Service Commission has probably passed over the peak of its recruitment program and that it ought to be able now to revamp and revise its procedure in such way as to absorb certain of the cuts we have made.

The bill contains the total estimate as submitted in the Budget for the General Accounting Office, $26,413,645. This may appear to be a vast sum unless the tremendous task the General Accounting Office has to perform is taken into consideration. For instance, it includes funds for auditing lend-lease and emergency relief, in addition to all other governmental activities. It is estimated that during the fiscal year 1944 this Office will audit accounts and settle claims and do related work on expenditures amounting to $85,000,000,000, as compared to a total of $60,000,000,000 during the current fiscal year. The examination and audit of accounts unquestionably has a wholesome effect on the spending agencies, and savings from such auditing are far in excess of the appropriations made for that purpose.

Another place in the bill to which I should like to call your attention is one that shows quite a marked increase, and I think this is something the committee will be interested in. One of the very few items in which there is an increase in personnel is in the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The Independent Offices Subcommittee has carried this item in its bill for many years and has been generous in appropriations for research and experimentation in the field of aeronautics. We were told in the hearings by Dr. Lewis, the Executive Director of the N. A. C. A. that they felt that the generosity and sympathetic understanding of the Congress in making adequate appropriations in the field of aeronautic research and experimentation could be credited with our present supremacy in the air in the world conflict. Let me say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the United States fliers in the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps do not have to take their hats off or apologize to any group of fliers in the world.

Our planes, individually and collectively, coming now as they are into mass production, are just the last word in aeronautical perfection. This game of aeronautics however is one thing today and another thing tomorrow; it is a rapidly changing picture, and we are called upon to keep busy and keep working, especially in the field of research, and this is the reason we found it advisable—unanimously, I may say; I do not think there is a discordant note in the whole Appropriations Committee on this—to give the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics the funds they consider adequate to permit them to go ahead with their research and experimentation in this very necessary field of operations.

Another item to which I wish to direct attention is one in which we have made a pretty drastic reduction, the Securities and Exchange Commission. The Securities and Exchange Commission received a Budget recommendation of $4,798,000 for 1944, which is $862,000 less than we appropriated last year; and a cut of $750,000 in the estimates. Some of us think this sum should provide them with sufficient funds to carry on the normal functions of the Commission in this time of war.

Perhaps the chief item in the bill outside of the Veterans' Administration is the United States Maritime Commission. The Budget estimate is $1,289,780,000. This will be used to liquidate contracts heretofore entered into for ship construction. Let me say that the Deficiency Appropriation Subcommittee met this morning on an item from the Maritime Commission for a contract authorization of $5,250,000,000 and an appropriation of $4,000,000,000. These are large sums of money, but the funds carried in the independent offices bill which is presently before you, plus the funds which will shortly be before you in the deficiency bill are the funds which will be used by the Maritime Commission to take care of 2 programs: the programs inaugurated in 1942 of 2,242 ships, of which 554 have already been delivered and the remainder are under construction; and in addition to that a new program of 2,161 ships. This makes a total of something like 4,400 ships under the present program of the Maritime Commission, and the funds carried in this bill plus the funds which will shortly be in here in the deficiency bill will be used to pay for those vessels in progress payments as and when they are delivered from the shipways.

This gives us a very fine, high-powered, high-speed shipbuilding program which I think all of us readily recognize as being one of the most important places in the whole war effort. We are getting these vessels, as you perhaps know, at the rate of more than 100 a month; a little better than 3 vessels every time the sun sets slip down the ways into the water. These are the merchant-carrying vessels, not taking into account the small craft. This in itself is an industrial achievement which pays tribute not only to business management but to the workers of America. Every time the sun sets 3 vessels have slipped into the water to carry the cargoes of this country not only to its troops abroad but to the other nations to whom we are under obligation to assist. This does not indicate that we do not need more ships; we do, and, as Admiral Land said, this expanding effort that we are making is going to call for a maximum of all the shipbuilding resources this country can get; but so far as America is concerned we are on top of the submarine proposition, and with this shipbuilding effort that is now supported as it has always been supported by this Congress, I think we have every reason to look forward to an era where our commerce, our food, our weapons of war, our munitions, and our medicine and surgical supplies will have the necessary bottoms to carry them where they are needed in this great World War.

In his letter to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, inserted in the independent offices bill hearings, page 1179, the Director of the Budget has pointed out that certain language has been eliminated from various appropriation paragraphs as surplus and unnecessary. It is my understanding that this is the case in connection with appropriations for the Maritime Commission and

that it is not intended to restrict the use of funds made available to the Commission in the pending bill because of such elimination. I have just received a memorandum from Admiral Land on this subject which I would like to insert at this point:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
*Washington, February 6, 1943.*

Memorandum for Hon. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives:

The proposed appropriation language for the United States Maritime Commission for inclusion in the independent offices appropriation bill, 1944 (Budget for the fiscal year 1944, p. 104), has been greatly condensed and simplified in cooperation with the Bureau of the Budget. Several items formerly carried in the appropriations for the Maritime Commission (as well as for other agencies) have been eliminated as legally unnecessary or because they will be covered in general language in the Independent Offices or other appropriation bills.

In order to avoid any misunderstanding of the purpose of these changes and omissions and to avoid any possible contention that the omission of specific items not otherwise covered is intended to preclude expenditure of the appropriation for such use, it is suggested that the committee call attention to this situation in its report on the bill, or in any explanatory statement submitted to the House by the Member in charge of the bill during debate. It would avoid unfortunate misunderstanding or controversy if it were clearly indicated that the condensation and the improvement of the appropriation language with respect to the Maritime Commission, involving in some cases deletions of items formerly carried in the appropriation language, is not to be construed as a refusal or failure to make the appropriation available for any such items unless it otherwise clearly appears that the appropriation is not to be available for the item in question.

E. S. LAND, *Chairman.*

In connection with the Maritime Commission I would like to insert memoranda from the Commission dated February 12, 1943, and February 15, 1943, with reference to acquisition by the Commission of certain privately owned vessels in which the question of the so-called enhancement clause is involved:

FEBRUARY 12, 1943.

Within the last few months the Comptroller General has submitted to Congress three reports of alleged irregularities on the part of the Maritime Commission and rendered a decision pertaining to the meaning and application of the requisition authority contained in the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, challenging the interpretation placed on the statute by the War Shipping Administration.

The controversy over the requisition authority (which is the basis of two of the Comptroller's reports) involves the interpretation of the so-called enhancement clause, which was intended to prevent a repetition of the Government's experience with fantastic ship prices in the First World War.

The question in this controversy is not the objective, but how to attain it.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives has conducted hearings on the transactions involved in the Comptroller's report on the Tampa Shipbuilding & Engineering Co. and the Waterman Steamship Corporation and has asked the Maritime Commission for its comment on the more recent report pertaining to the purchase of a vessel from the United States Lines, Inc.

The chairman of the committee has expressed his intention to conduct full hearings on the controversy relating to the requisition authority. It is anticipated that these hearings will get under way as soon as Judge BLAND is able to return to his office.

The facts with respect to all of the differences between the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration on the one hand, and the Comptroller General on the other, will therefore be fully developed by the House committee that is responsible for merchant marine legislation.

---

FEBRUARY 15, 1943.

1. The Waterman Steamship Corporation: Extensive hearings on the transactions involved in the Comptroller General's report have been held by the Merchant Marine Committee. Witnesses for the Waterman Steamship Corporation, representatives of the General Accounting Office, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission were heard. The Merchant Marine Committee has not completed its examination of this record.

2. Tampa Shipbuilding & Engineering Co.: Hearings were also conducted by the Merchant Marine Committee on the matters discussed in the Comptroller General's report. Representatives of the company, the Commission, and the General Accounting Office were heard. The Committee has issued no formal statement with respect to its conclusions.

3. South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation: Hearings were also conducted by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Truman committee of the Senate and reports issued by both committees. The Maritime Commission has taken steps to remedy the conditions that existed at the yard.

4. Requisition authority in section 902: The Chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee has announced his intention of examining fully into the differences of opinion between the Comptroller General and the War Shipping Administration as to the proper meaning and application of the requisition authority contained in section 902.

The decision rendered by the Comptroller General in November 1942 is not concerned with values payable for ships on which construction-differential subsidies have been paid. Such subsidized vessels have been acquired (for title or use) in accordance with the formula prescribed by section 802 of the 1936 act directing valuation upon the basis of the depreciation cost to the owner.

The fantastic prices paid for ships during the First World War are not to be paid again. There is no disagreement about that. The differences of opinion between the General Accounting Office and the War Shipping Administration turn upon questions of law. It is a matter upon which no lawyer would express an opinion without examining both contentions.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I reciprocate the sentiments of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. It is always a pleasure for the minority members of this subcommittee to work with the majority members. We appreciate the consideration accorded us at all times.

Mr. Chairman, the people demand the elimination of waste, of inefficiency, and of corruption. They demand that bureaucracy be curbed and that hypocrisy be terminated. They demand that Congress resume its full powers except insofar as their delegation is essential to the maximum war effort. They demand that loyalty throughout the Federal service be assured.

They key to all these things is congressional control over expenditures. That control was placed in the hands of the Congress by the founders of our Government and in the light of the world's experience. Its retention is vital. To surrender it is to substitute for action by the Congress action by the bureaucrat. This is one of the bitter lessons of the past 10 years.

The problem of reasserting proper control over expenditure is not an easy one. We are confronted by a whole series of Government corporations with a lending capacity of over $32,600,000,000 wholly outside of the Budget. We are confronted by the President's emergency funds and other blanket authorizations over which the Congress has no detailed control. We are confronted by a Bureau of the Budget which, in my judgment, has not to date obtained satisfactory results and which recently has been subjected to severe criticism. We are confronted by a tremendous ever-increasing force on the rolls of the Federal Government. We are confronted by the fact that many agencies fail to account to the General Accounting Office or challenge its jurisdiction.

These matters must be dealt with if we are to control expenditure. Heretofore, in recent years those desiring control have been in the minority. Efforts to establish it have been swept aside. Today the situation is changed. The control by the Congress can and must be reestablished. Every cent required for victory must be made available. Every cent requested for nonessentials must be eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries a total in new appropriations of over $2,621,000,000. In addition it carries reappropriations of over $62,885,000; authorizations for expenditure out of funds otherwise available of over $31,250,000; and permanent appropriations of over $1,261,700,000, a grand total of about $4,000,000,000.

Do not be deceived by the Budget statement indicating that this bill carries $212,000,000 less than provided for the same agencies in the current fiscal year. The fact is that on a comparable basis there is an increase reflected of over $643,700,000. The apparent decrease is brought about only by taking as reductions certain items which do not appear in this bill at all, but which may very likely appear in subsequent bills and by also taking as a reduction $136,100,000 in respect to the T. V. A. when we are in fact called upon to make available out of reappropriations the sum of $62,858,000.

It is true that the greater part of the increase referred to is reflected in a few items; in the civil-service retirement fund item, in the N. A. C. A. item, in the Public Roads item, in the Maritime Commission item, and in the Veterans' Administration item. It is also true that your committee has made numerous reductions. These restrictions, however,

when added together give a total of only $6,448,000, which is a reduction on a percentage basis of something like one-quarter of 1 percent of the total carried in this bill, or if you put it on the basis suggested by the chairman and apply the percentage only to that portion of the total which the Budget classifies as for nonwar purposes, it is a reduction of about 3½ percent.

Personally I do not believe that such a reduction is going to be satisfactory to the people generally, faced as they are by increased costs of living, by income tax, Victory taxes, forced savings, and a desire to subscribe to War bonds. I hope that further reductions will be possible before this bill is enacted into law.

The bill covers a tremendous territory. The time available makes it impossible to go into detail. All that can be done is to refer to certain of the more important items and certain of the more important information developed in connection with their consideration.

EMERGENCY FUNDS FOR THE PRESIDENT

First, I want to say a word about the emergency funds for the President, because while there are no such funds carried in this bill, there is a complete picture of their use to date embodied in the hearings and because requests for further funds will no doubt be made during the course of the present session of Congress.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In connection with the request for additional funds, is it not true that we shall have a very large request for increases in pay-roll funds? These estimates are confined simply to the salaries without application of the increases involved in the pay-increase bill?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman is entirely correct.

The record shows that there have been made available as emergency funds for the President something over $631,500,000. Of this total, something over $392,000,000 has been available for expenditure in the current fiscal year and as of the time of the hearing about $101,000,000 had yet to be allocated and was therefore available during the first 6 months of the calendar year 1943.

For what purpose were these funds made available? They were made available as the name indicates, for emergency purposes. They were made available for purposes either confidential in character or so urgent in character as to require making funds available without taking the time to come to the Congress.

How have these funds in fact been spent? If you will look at the tables commencing on page 1181 of the hearings, you will see the entire picture.

Item after item in the list of allocations fails to meet either test I have just referred to. Item after item fails to qualify as emergency expenditure. Item after item has been expended which should not have been expended until brought to the Congress for consideration and approval.

The emergency fund, Mr. Chairman, has been misused. It has been used in a manner to deprive the Congress of its proper control over expenditures. It has been misused despite frequent warnings both on the floor of this House and in committee to the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget. In my judgment, no further funds should be made available on the present basis.

THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

A word as to the Bureau of the Budget. There is no agency in the Government in a position to contribute more to the proper control over expenditure than the Bureau of the Budget. In my judgment, the results obtained by this agency to date have not been satisfactory. The recent Budget has been severely criticized as being misleading, as confusing war expenditure with nonwar expenditure, and as failing to give all the facts.

I do not know that it is true, but during the past year on three separate occasions persons who have appeared before the Budget Bureau have given it as their opinion that the Budget Bureau has acted more as counsel for the appropriation desired by the agency in question than as the hard-boiled judge of the merits of the appropriation.

The primary responsibility of the Budget Bureau is, of course, to the Chief Executive and not to the Congress. It may be that an inquiry by the Congress is desirable to ascertain why we have not been obtaining better results.

I call attention in passing to the fact that the request of this agency for 1944 is just about 300 percent in excess of the appropriation for 1941; that the average salary runs as high as $3,500; that the work to which the Bureau has devoted itself of late includes work on the problem of manpower; work in developing a program for the Food Administration; work in planning for the handling of insurance premiums by the Veterans' Administration and the War Department; work in the field of taxation, rationing, prices, wages, credit, subsidies, and the like, and work in the field of Federal-State fiscal relationships, all of which work seems to me in large measure outside the normal scope of operations of the Bureau, presenting the question if the request of that agency may not well be reduced.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The Civil Service Commission testimony will be found at page 820 of the hearings. The recommendation of your committee for the Commission, exclusive of retirement funds, amounts to about $15,145,000 as compared with $17,159,000 for the current year.

The record indicates that even at this time there is a net addition each month to the rolls of the Federal Government of as much as 100,000 employes; that we had or the pay rolls as of November 30 last about 2,750,000 employees; and that we may anticipate a total as of the end of the fiscal year of over 3,000,000 employees, a total about three times the size of the total on the Federal pay rolls on November 11, 1918, at the end of World War No. 1.

The following table tells the story:

EXHIBIT 1

*Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, November 1942*

| Department or establishment | Inside District of Columbia | Outside District of Columbia | Entire |
|---|---|---|---|
| EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT | | | |
| Executive staff | 733 | 118 | 851 |
| Maintenance force (White House) | 99 | | 99 |
| WAR ESTABLISHMENTS | | | |
| Office for Emergency Management: | | | |
| Alien Property Custodian | 459 | 586 | 1,045 |
| War Production Board | 14,099 | 6,744 | 20,843 |
| War Shipping Administration | 608 | 942 | 1,550 |
| All other, Office for Emergency Management | 8,837 | 10,264 | 19,101 |
| Office of Censorship | 800 | 11,483 | 12,283 |
| Office of Price Administration | 4,928 | 32,889 | 37,817 |
| Office of Strategic Services | 916 | 186 | 1,102 |
| Board of Economic Warfare | 2,571 | 245 | 2,816 |
| Selective Service System | 731 | 26,640 | 27,371 |
| EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS | | | |
| State | 2,567 | 5,206 | 7,773 |
| Treasury | 24,283 | 47,123 | 71,406 |
| War | 60,887 | 1,152,201 | 1,213,088 |
| Justice | 8,523 | 21,860 | 30,383 |
| Post Office | 6,841 | 318,910 | 325,751 |
| Navy | 48,225 | 499,561 | 547,786 |
| Interior | 5,041 | 37,800 | 42,841 |
| Agriculture | 10,645 | 64,968 | 75,613 |
| Commerce | 12,728 | 12,817 | 25,545 |
| Labor | 2,252 | 2,860 | 5,112 |
| INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS | | | |
| Alley Dwelling Authority | 241 | | 241 |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 5 | | 5 |
| Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel | 42 | | 42 |
| Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System | 429 | 9 | 438 |
| Board Investigations and Research | 168 | | 168 |
| Civil Service Commission | 3,859 | 3,524 | 7,383 |
| Employees' Compensation Commission | 34 | 485 | 519 |
| Export-Import Bank | 50 | | 50 |
| Federal Communications Commission | 1,104 | 1,083 | 2,187 |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 287 | 2,231 | 2,518 |
| Federal Power Commission | 535 | 277 | 812 |
| Federal Security Agency | 8,458 | 56,891 | 65,349 |
| Federal Trade Commission | 508 | 74 | 582 |
| Federal Works Agency | 15,191 | 12,027 | 27,218 |
| General Accounting Office | 7,934 | | 7,934 |
| Government Printing Office | 7,840 | | 7,840 |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 1,698 | 794 | 2,492 |
| Maritime Commission | 2,623 | 4,044 | 6,667 |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 134 | 2,938 | 3,072 |
| National Archives | 430 | 14 | 444 |
| National Capital Park and Planning Commission | 21 | | 21 |
| National Housing Agency | 3,828 | 12,411 | 16,239 |
| National Labor Relations Board | 417 | 478 | 895 |
| National Mediation Board | 27 | 52 | 79 |
| Panama Canal | 228 | 32,459 | 32,687 |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 22 | 1,850 | 1,872 |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation | 3,798 | 3,493 | 7,291 |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 14 | 1,364 | 1,378 |
| Smithsonian Institution | 817 | | 817 |
| Tariff Commission | 339 | 11 | 350 |
| Tax Court of the United States | 131 | | 131 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 9 | 37,340 | 37,349 |
| Veterans' Administration | 6,164 | 38,691 | 44,855 |
| Total | 284,158 | 2,465,943 | 2,750,101 |

There is abundant testimony that agency after agency is over-staffed to the point of inefficiency and impaired morale, at a time when the Nation is crying for

manpower for the war effort. Senator BYRD, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures, in an address in Boston recently gave it as his "firm and conscientious belief" that "one-third of those now engaged in clerical work could be dismissed to the advantage of the service and for the promotion of the war effort."

The President in a memorandum of December 12, referring to the 48-hour week, stated:

> Obviously, this will permit reduction in personnel in some agencies and eliminate the necessity of filling vacancies in others.

Again, in his Budget message the President said:

> Pay increases should be met largely by reducing the total number of employees proportionate to the increase in the workweek.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Does the gentleman recall any agency which offered to take care of the pay increases in that way?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I recall the Interstate Commerce Commission's stating that certain vacancies had not been filled in the current year and that they hoped to be able to get along without filling them in the next year, but I think the answer, generally speaking, to the question raised by the gentleman from South Dakota is in the negative.

Mr. CASE. In other words, these agencies are not going to follow the recommendation of the President?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I see little evidence of plans to that effect in the testimony before our committee.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman expect to come to a discussion of the appropriation made for the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am going to come to that a little later, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. In connection with the manpower problem, will the gentleman agree with me that one of the very serious factors in that problem is the waste of manpower, particularly in our Government agencies?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I agree entirely with the gentleman. That is the point I am trying to emphasize in this connection. It has been said that "waste of manpower is a crime in peace and a greater crime in war." I think the Ramspeck investigating committee has a tremendous responsibility and a tremendous opportunity to contribute to economy, efficiency, and the manpower needs of the country.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

The General Accounting Office testimony will be found at page 257 of the hearings. This, of course, is another agency which is in a position to contribute tremendously to the control of expenditure. The request of $26,413,000 compares with the appropriation for the current year of about $20,000,000. I believe, however, that the increase is justified. There is an enormous increase in the work confronting this agency. It is estimated that there will be $85,000,000,000 of expenditures to be audited in the fiscal year 1944, and that vouchers will be three times the number of those audited in 1942 and twice those audited in 1943. If this amount is allowed, the expense of auditing will amount to only approximately 32 cents per thousand dollars.

I call your attention to the fact that the record indicates that some 32 agencies of Government fail to account to the General Accounting Office today; that nine others account, but account on a partial basis only; that relations with the Commodity Credit Corporation and with the Navy Department are unsatisfactory; and as I understand it several agencies of this Government challenge the jurisdiction of the Comptroller General.

EXHIBIT 2

AGENCIES INCLUDING CORPORATIONS WHICH DO NOT RENDER ACCOUNTS, INCLUDING SOME WHICH ARE EXEMPT BY LAW FROM RENDERING ACCOUNTS, TO THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

1. American President Lines, Ltd. (U. S. Maritime Commission).
2. Central Bank for Cooperatives.
3. Dairy Products Marketing Association, Inc.
4. Defense Homes Corporation.
5. Defense Plant Corporation.
6. Defense Supplies Corporation.
7. Disaster Loan Corporation.
8. District Banks for Cooperatives (12).
9. Federal Home Loan Banks (12).
10. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
11. Federal intermediate credit banks (12).
12. Federal land banks (12).
13. Federal National Mortgage Association.
14. Federal Reserve System (Federal Reserve Board).
15. Federal savings and loan associations.
16. State-chartered savings and loan associations (Home Owners' Loan Corporation).
17. Federal Subsistence Homesteads Corporation.
18. Inland Waterways Corporation.
19. Metals Reserve Company.
20. Panama Railroad Company.
21. Production credit corporations (12).
22. Production credit associations.
23. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
24. Rubber Reserve Company.
25. The RFC Mortgage Company.
26. The Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.
27. United States Spruce Production Corporation.
28. War Finance Corporation.
29. Alaska Rural Rehabilitation Corporation.
30. Smaller War Plants Corporation.
31. United States Commercial Company.
32. War Damage Corporation.

CERTAIN AGENCIES INCLUDING CORPORATIONS WHICH RENDER ONLY PARTIAL ACCOUNTS TO THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE, OR ACCOUNTS WHICH ARE NOT ENTIRELY IN ACCORDANCE WITH PRESCRIBED PROCEDURES

1. Commodity Credit Corporation.
2. District of Columbia.
3. Electric Home and Farm Authority (in liquidation).
4. Export-Import Bank of Washington.
5. Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
6. Federal Home Loan Bank Administration.
7. Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.
8. Surplus Marketing Administration.
9. Virgin Islands Company.

Steps must be taken to remedy this situation. Control over expenditures is impossible in the absence of proper accounting.

I call attention also to three statements on behalf of the agency, the first showing unvouchered expenditures, the second showing the list of pending investigations of the United States Maritime Commission, and the War Shipping Administration matters, the third, indicating that over $7,000,000 of illegally spent W. P. A. money down in Louisiana discovered in the course of the investigation of the W. P. A. several years ago, is yet to be allowed.

EXHIBIT 3

STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR UNVOUCHERED EXPENDITURES AND FOR OBJECTS OF A CONFIDENTIAL NATURE

Unvouchered expenditures in amounts authorized by the President to be reported in gross sums so authorized not itemized:

| Agency | Authority | Amount |
|---|---|---|
| Emergency Fund for the President | First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, Public, 247, 77th Cong., as continued by Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, Public, 630, 77th Cong. | $2,500,000 |

Expenditures for objects of a confidential nature, in which case the certificate of the expending agency as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed to be a sufficient voucher:

| Agency | Authority | Amount |
|---|---|---|
| Federal Bureau of Investigation | Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1943, Public, 644, 77th Cong. | $20,000 |
| Immigration and Naturalization Service | do | 25,000 |
| Federal Bureau of Investigation | First Supplemental National Defense Act, 1943, Public, 678, 77th Cong. | 50,000 |
| Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. | First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943. | 500,000 |
| Office of War Information | Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, Public, 763, 77th Cong. | 500,000 |
| Emergency Fund for the President | Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, Public, 353, 77th Cong. | 10,000,000 |
| Do | First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, Public, 678, 77th Cong. | 25,000,000 |
| Do | Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, Public, 763, 77th Cong. | 25,000,000 |

*Appropriations and allocations by agencies*

| Agency | Unvouchered expenditures-allocations | Objects of confidential nature | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Appropriations | Allocations | |
| Executive Office of the President | $5,000 | | | $5,000 |
| Office for Emergency Management | 5,000 | | | 5,000 |
| Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs | | $500,000 | | 500,000 |
| Coordinator of Information | 2,000,000 | | $3,500,000 | 5,500,000 |
| Board of Economic Warfare | 102,400 | | 10,000,000 | 10,102,400 |
| Office of Strategic Services | | | 28,000,000 | 28,000,000 |
| Office of War Information | | 500,000 | 50,000 | 550,000 |
| Navy Department (Chief of Naval Operations) | 50,000 | | 500,000 | 550,000 |
| War Department | | | 922,666 | 922,666 |
| State Department | | | 5,050,000 | 5,050,000 |
| Justice Department: | | | | |
| Federal Bureau of Investigation | | 70,000 | 1,902,000 | 1,972,000 |
| Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization Services | | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| Public Buildings Administration | 65,000 | | | 65,000 |
| Federal Security Agency | | | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Total | 2,227,400 | 1,095,000 | 49,974,666 | 53,297,066 |

EXHIBIT 4

ACQUISITIONS OF TITLE TO AND CHARTERS OF VESSELS FOR WAR EMERGENCY PURPOSES, AND WAR-RISK INSURANCE EFFECTED ON VESSELS CHARTERED FOR SUCH USE

Investigations in connection with the acquisition, charter, and insurance of vessels by the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration are under way at present, but no definite conclusions have been reached. The transactions now under investigation involve the following steamship owners:

Vessel acquisitions: American President Lines, United States Lines, American Mail Line, Baltimore Mail Steamship Co., Southern Pacific Co. (Morgan Line), Matson Navigation Co., New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co.

Vessel charters and war-risk insurance: Hawaiian Steamship Co., American Export Lines, American Foreign Steamship Co., American President Lines, Atlas Trading Corporation, Boyd, Wier & Sewell, Inc., Calmar Steamship Corporation, Isthmian Steamship Co.; Lykes Bros. Steamship Corporation, Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc., Matson Navigation Co., McCormack Steamship Co., States Steamship Co., Pacific Atlantic Steamship Co., Norwegian Shipping & Trade Mission, Shepard Steamship Co., Union Sulphur Co., United States Lines Co., Waterman Steamship Agency, Ltd., Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Federal communications testimony appears on page 1212 of the hearings. The recommendation of your committee is $7,609,000, as compared with the appropriations for the current year of $7,386,000. The recommendation reflects a reduction in the Budget estimate of over $479,000.

It is difficult to escape the conviction that there is a good deal of duplication of effort between the F. C. C. on the one hand and the Army and the Navy on the other. The Army, I understand, has thousands of people in its radio intelligence companies. The Navy also has its own set-up. The F. C. C. admits that both services advised at one time that they did not require what the F. C. C. was furnishing them. The Bureau of the Budget, in its testimony, recognizes the conflict.

This agency shows a tremendous number of promotions in the past year or so, 1,806, to be exact, at an increase of $145,100. Details were furnished the committee with reference to the Legal Division and the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service. I shall not encumber the RECORD with those details. I may say in passing, however, that the number of promotions was not only enormous, but that in many instances the same individual has been given more than one promotion in the same year. Among other examples is one individual receiving $3,400 increase, or 105 percent, within a period of 8 months, another receiving $1,400, or a 75-percent increase, in 6 months, and another receiving $2,200, a 110-percent increase, in 16 months. There are many other examples that I could cite.

The record also indicates a request by this agency for deferments from the draft to the number of 442. Of this number, there have been granted 391, in respect to which Chairman Fly expresses the hope that the deferments may be for the duration. All of these deferments may, in fact, be justified. It may be stated, however, that neither the description of the positions held, nor the salaries paid, nor the fact that many of them joined the force after Pearl Harbor, lends force to this conclusion in the first instance.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. With reference to the deferments of this agency, does the gentleman mean deferments from going into the armed forces?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. COX. It is common gossip all over town that there is a higher percentage of draft dodgers in the Communications Commission than in any other department of the Government. If the gentleman will indulge me further, I am very much surprised to note the success of Mr. Fly in obtaining this large appropriation carried in this item. Apparently he is the witness that appeared in behalf of the Commission, on whose testimony the committee bases its finding. The Commission is divided, and that division differing with Mr. Fly says that the essential work of the Commission can be carried on and carried on effectively with a large reduction of personnel and a large reduction in appropriations. To be exact, it is contended by those in the know that with $2,000,000 the work of the Commission can be carried on. Mr. Fly, who heads the Commission, had no knowledge of communications, other than experience that he obtained as a switchboard operator before he was placed in the chairmanship. At the present time we find the Army and the Navy subordinated to him, and if the committee had found it possible to have consulted the Army and the Navy, disclosures would have been made to it that Mr. Fly is a terrible handicap to them in his effort to dominate completely the secret communications of the Army and the Navy.

Others in the know have said to me that the larger part of the appropriations that are made for this Commission are wasted; that you might as well shovel the money out of the window as to expend it in the manner in which the Commission does expend it. In view of the investigation that is going on, the item ought to be stricken from the bill altogether, and later the Congress will be able to make an appropriation that is proper.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I was about to answer the gentleman by saying that the suggestion he makes was in fact made in the subcommittee, to the effect that inasmuch as an investigation has been authorized by the House to go into the activities of this Commission, it might be just as well to delete this item wholly and allow it to be considered later as a deficiency item. The money, of course, will not be required until the first of the fiscal year, July 1.

Mr. COX. I agree with the gentleman that the circumstance demands that the entire item be deleted until later on.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The same logic would apply to the War Production Board, and to the Army or the Navy, and to any other agency of the Government that is under fire by anybody. That is, put them out of business, convict them, and then afterward, if they are able to prove that they are innocent, give them enough money to carry on. I submit right here in the midst of the colloquy between my two friends that that is not a logical approach to the problem. I feel confident that the investigation of the Federal Communications Commission in the able hands of my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] will be thoroughgoing.

We may rest assured that long before July 1, when this bill will become law, those gentlemen will apprise Congress of everything they can find that would justify putting the Federal Communications and Mr. Fly out of business. In the meantime it is an agency that Congress has set up to do business and has delegated to it important war functions. The monitoring work of the Federal Communications Commission is very important. However we may feel about individuals in it, let no Member of this House be under any misapprehension

that they are performing a very vital and critical service in the war effort. Somebody has to perform that service.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. May I say to the gentleman from Virginia that I certainly do not want to place myself in the position of failing to accord this agency every consideration to which it is entitled. It does not seem to me, however, that the deletion of this item has anything to do with the findings which may be made in the course of the investigation. Of course, the Commission must have the money that is necessary on July 1, but it does not need any part of these funds until that time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not recall any evidence before our subcommittee that the Federal Communications Commission was a handicap to either the Army or the Navy. Does the gentleman recall any such testimony?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] interrogated the representatives of the agency along that line, and I think substantiated the statement I have made.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am referring to the statement contained in a question asked the gentleman as to whether or not they were a handicap to both the Army and the Navy.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. A duplication.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. "Handicap" was the word used.

Mr. COX. I used the word "handicap" and I used it advisedly, and if the gentleman will take the pains and manifest sufficient concern in the public interest to call upon the Army and the Navy he will find that the statement is justified.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman will permit, I will say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] that as soon as I can get to a telephone I shall certainly make inquiry of the responsible heads of the Army and the Navy, and if any of those gentlemen say that the Federal Communications Commission is a detriment to the war effort, I will take advantage of my seniority in the proceedings to move to delete the item myself. Now will the gentleman join me in saying that if the Army and the Navy say they are performing a useful war service, he will give them a chance to have a fair trial before he executes them?

Mr. COX. I am not trying to execute anybody.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Just take their money away from them?

Mr. COX. No; I am not. I am insisting that in view of existing circumstances the appropriation should not be made available at the time. I can tell the gentleman something that would interest him.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In spite of the demands throughout the country for economy, it would appear that most of these agencies are attempting to expand their functions under the guise of defense and war activities. In that respect, will the gentleman explain the item of $206,160 for a War Problems Division under the Law Department, and explain why that is being created? Is there not some existing agency which already has jurisdiction over such activities?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That matter was given consideration by the committee in reducing the request $479,000 below the budget.

I shall not dwell further upon this item, in view of the fact that an investigating committee has been set up to consider the activities of this Commission in detail.

I may mention in passing, however, first, that the record indicates continued approval of the transfer of stations or control of stations for considerations far in excess of the value of the physical assets transferred, with all the danger we have seen in other fields in the capitalization of Government franchises.

Second, that the serious charges said to have been made in connection with former Commissioner Pickard and others have apparently been whitewashed to the satisfaction of the Commission and the Department of Justice in the absence of further evidence.

Third, that 3 of those included in the list of 38 recently published by the Dies committee are to be found on the pay rolls of this agency.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

I want to say a word about the Federal Works Agency and the testimony appearing at page 347 of the hearings. This Agency consists of the Office of the Administrator, and under his general supervision the Public Buildings Administration, the Public Roads Administration, the Public Works Administration, and the Work Projects Administration. The over-all request made is for $168,666,000, as compared with the current appropriation of $140,496,000, most of the increase being due to road construction.

What I want to emphasize to the committee is the fact that W. P. A. is folding up. We are assured it will be put out of its misery before June 30, with the recapture of at least $80,000,000 already appropriated.

P. W. A. is also folding up. Only $27,000 of reappropriations is requested, and we are assured that P. W. A. will be wound up in the course of the fiscal year 1944.

This leaves therefore for supervision by the Administrator only the Public Buildings Administration and the Public Roads Administration, and a little supervision in connection with war public works. The Agency requested $386,000, as compared with $350,000 in the current year. This figure added to $245,000 coming from constituent agencies would make available almost $632,000, as compared with $594,000 in the present year.

There are 15 people on the pay rolls drawing salaries between $6,400 and $12,000. There are 192 on the rolls, all told, with an average salary of $3,200.

The increase in this appropriation seems entirely without justification, in view of the decrease in the over-all work, and I am inclined to think that the committee recommendation in this instance can and should be further reduced.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

The testimony of the National Housing Agency, appears at page 931 of the hearings. The Agency requests authorizations totaling $31,250,000 compared with $42,523,000 for the current year; and appropriations for annual contributions amounting to $11,350,000 as compared with $13,000,000 in the current fiscal year.

This Agency reflects an attempt to bring order out of chaos in the housing field. You will recall that a year ago there were some 16 different agencies or units operating in the field of defense housing. The situation was so chaotic that even today the Bureau of the Budget cannot furnish the number of employees or the dollars spent by the predecessor organizations. All housing is supposed to be under this set-up now except Army and Navy construction on military and naval reservations and the Farm Security Agency's rural program which for some reason has not been brought under the Agency.

The N. H. A. consists of the office of an administrator and three principal subdivisions.

The first subdivision is the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, including the Home Loan Bank Board organization with 3,800 members and assets of $5,600,000,000; the Federal Loan Insurance Corporation with 2,300 institutions and assets of $3,500,000,000; and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation with 800,000 accounts aggregating $1,600,000,000.

The second subdivision is the Federal Housing Administration which has issued insurance aggregating $6,300,000,000, a total of $3,800,000,000 being outstanding.

The third subdivision is the Federal Public Housing Administration which is the catch-all for the various constructing agencies I have referred to and which has an over-all building program of about $5,778,000,000, of which $3,200,000,000 is private housing and the rest public housing.

I call attention to the fact that the administrator plans to maintain five regional offices during the next fiscal year at a cost of $665,575 despite the fact that there are four other sets of field offices in this agency. If this item cannot be reached in this bill it seems to me that it should be eliminated in the consideration of other housing appropriations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

Mr. Chairman, before closing I want to refer to two other agencies or more if time permits. The first is the Home Owners' Loan Corporation which is a part of the national housing agency just referred to.

The power of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to refinance distressed home mortgages terminated way back on June 12, 1936. Its functions today are those of loan servicing and property management. Of the million loans made, aggregating about $3,000,000,000, 251,000 have been extended for periods of from 15 to 25 years. Today there are outstanding something like 800,000 loans aggregating $1,675,000,000. There are on hand 41,629 pieces of property.

I call attention to this fact in respect to property sold: On property with a book value of $738,000,000 Uncle Sam has taken a loss to date amounting to $227,000,000. There are still on hand properties with a book value of some $266,000,000 which, if sold with similar success would probably net Uncle Sam a further loss of not less than eighty million dollars.

We have put up something over $250,000,000 for the administrative expenditures for this agency. We are asked to put up $10,000,000 more for the fiscal year of 1944, and we are assured by Mr. Fahey that this sum of $10,000,000 is, in his opinion, bedrock for the agency.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the time has come to liquidate the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. I understand that the private mortgage institutions of this country stand ready to take over the assets of the Corporation. I believe that the loss Uncle Sam will sustain will be greater the longer we put it off. I am fearful that if we do not take some step to bring about liquidation at this time we shall find 25 years from now that this Corporation, like the War Housing Corporation and the War Finance Corporation today, will still have to be liquidated.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In just a minute.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has a carefully prepared amendment in this connection. I believe he is on sound ground, and I hope the House will give him its support.

Only 2 days ago I received a letter from a cooperative bank, not in my district but from the State of Massachusetts, which expresses my ideas in this connection so largely that for the benefit of the House I shall insert it in the RECORD at this point:

EXHIBIT 5

GRAFTON COOPERATIVE BANK,
*Grafton, Mass., February 8, 1943.*

Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I understand the House subcommittee, of which you are a member, is considering appropriation requests for the several corporations of the Government of which one is the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

I trust in considering the appropriation for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation that you consider the possibility of the Corporation closing out its business according to a bill coming before the House, known as H. R. 1283. It would seem to me very appropriate at this time to close out the Home Owners' Loan Corporation for the following reasons:

1. There are ample funds in the hands of mortgage institutions seeking investment in mortgages and the Corporation can liquidate by the sale of its mortgages and other assets at this time in a good market and upon the most favorable basis.

2. Mortgage institutions will negotiate for and purchase the mortgages and home purchase contracts at this time with the greatest confidence because current payments are at their highest level and real estate values are stable and increasing. These things were not true 5 years ago and are not likely to be true in the future when mortgage institutions can secure an outlet for their funds by the making of good mortgages on new homes.

3. The sale of such assets at this time will enable the Corporation to retire its outstanding bonds which the Government has guaranteed and thereby relieve the Government credit of a large contingent liability.

4. The sale of these assets at this time will contribute to the solution of the manpower problem by releasing nearly 4,000 employees of the Corporation. Such sale will also release office space which is much needed in the war program.

5. Such sale will also release a substantial volume of typewriters, adding machines, and other office equipment which is needed in the war program. Existing mortgage institutions which are ready, willing, and able to buy such assets are confronted with decreasing mortgage portfolios, and can buy such assets and administer them without increasing their personnel, space, or equipment.

6. The Corporation is confronted with the necessity at some time of selling its assets in bulk or in blocks because the administration of the declining unpaid balances upon its mortgages will eventually be too expensive to be justifiable. The present mortgage market offiers the Corporation its best opportunity to sell at good prices and thereby avoid excessive losses. It is believed that the assets of the Corporation can be sold at this time for an amount approximating its obligations. If it proceeds to a slow liquidation over a total of 25 to 30 years from its organization it is evident that the losses will be much greater.

7. The Congress expressed its intention as to the prompt liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation when its purposes were accomplished in section 5 (k) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, by providing: "The Board shall proceed to liquidate the Corporation when its purposes have been accomplished and shall pay any surplus or accumulated funds into the Treasury of the United States." The purposes of the Corporation were long since accomplished. It has made no loans since 1936. No steps have been taken toward its liquidation as contemplated by law.

I trust that you and your committee will arrange to reduce the appropriation of this Corporation sufficient so that it will be necessary to liquidate this Corporation within the shortest possible time and in that way avoid carrying on this department of Government and save taxes to the people of this country. I do not believe that this Government should be in business. To my mind it is the Government's business to make laws governing business.

I trust you will give your full support to this idea.

Yours very truly,
H. A. SIMMONS, *Treasurer.*

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to my genial colleague from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Before the subcommittee it was stated that if we liquidate now close to 300,000 people will lose their homes, that it will cost the taxpayers of this country between four and five hundreds of millions of dollars, and at the same time the very building and loan associations that we bailed out the gentleman wants to rescue now and turn over to them 50 percent. The other 50 percent who are slightly in arrears will lose their homes. Does the gentleman consider this to be the proper thing to do at this time? There is no question but what they will lose their homes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just to show how much sound and fury there really is in that contention, let me say that when Mr. Fahey testified before the committee, his testimony was that altogether—if you will examine the table—93.6 percent of all these home loans are current to within 3 months. That would leave only 6½ percent of the total number of vendee homes, namely, 811,000. There would be 48,000 in arrears. The country is so filled with money today, every finance company, every thrift institution, every insurance company, every bank is so loaded with money that they are very anxious indeed to have these mortgages and in consequence you can take all of them over on a current basis virtually. If I do not miss my guess, we could actually get a premium on the great bulk of these at the present time, whereas if we do not perform this operation now, and if we wait until after hostilities have terminated and you get a debacle in the market, then we will have 811,000 homes, the average age of which is 26 years old at the present time, competing with hundreds of thousands of homes built under a post-war plan. Then we are really going to hold the sack.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The very building and loan associations referred to we bailed out. There were foreclosures of a thousand a day when that bill was passed. He realizes that. Now he wants to return to that organization that charged the people from 6 to 12 percent interest in this business. They have a lobbyist here getting $25,000 a year, with a suite at the Mayflower, sending out pamphlets asking that that be done so we will return those secured mogtgages and homes and let the other 272,000 people lose their homes. You know that, and so does the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will yield to me further so that a fair and accurate picture is presented to the Members, may I say that the fact of the matter is that the scale-down on the value of these properties when the Home Owners' Loan Corporation took them over was in excess of $200,000,000. That is point No. 1. Secondly, when you talk about bailing out finance and thrift institutions, let me advise the gentleman from New York that every State law in the land contains a provision relative to those institutions that are State chartered whereby they are governed by State laws, and while I cannot tell what the exact provision is in a good many States, I know in my own

State the law provides that when an account is 6 months in arrears it is mandatory for a thrift institution to foreclose for the very good reason they are cooperative ventures and the only money with which they have to work is the money that is saved by the laboring men, the average family, and placed in there on share account. So the State law protects them and compels these foreclosures in most cases. When you talk about bailing out, we might just as well have the whole story and show how these institutions had to operate under the pressure of the State statutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. The gentleman from New York will have ample time to debate the amendment when offered.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

I want to say something more about the United States Maritime Commission before I conclude. The United States Maritime Commission testimony will be found at page 660 of the hearings. The request is for $1,289,000,000, as compared with the current appropriation of $980,000,000. Of the total, there is provided for administrative expenses $23,000,000 as compared with $16,625,000 in the current year. The personnel increase amounts to 1,959, mostly for the Purchase and Supply Division, Finance Division, the Technical Division and the four regional offices. The War Shipping Administration appropriation is not included in this bill but will be presented to the House as a separate matter.

Since July 1, 1940, contract authorizations for ship construction have amounted to $5,976,000,000. There is pending before the deficiency committee now a further contract authorization request of $5,520,000,000, giving a total of $11,226,000,000, if allowed, in contract authorizations for ship construction.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriations to date aggregate $3,685,000,000 in respect to which there is an unexpended balance of $2,091,000,000. The request here is for $1,289,000,000, and the request pending before the deficiency committee is for $4,000,000,000. If both requests are granted, there will be a total of $7,300,000,000 to be expended in the next 18 months as compared with a total of $1,600,000,000 expended in the last 30 months. This seems a tremendous total, but we are assured that the rate of $400,000,000 a month in expenditure was actually reached in November last and that the total requested or allowed by the Budget is some $900,000,000 less than the request.

The item in this bill is for administrative expenditures and for application in the construction of 2,242 ships under contract as of October 31 last. The item in the bill pending before the deficiency committee is in respect to 2,161 additional ships, bringing the total up to 4,400 ships over all.

The members will find in detail the four construction programs of the agency on page 661 of the hearings. Also testimony as to the goal in terms of deadweight tonnage of construction for the years 1942, 1943, and 1944. Also a statement as to the increase in construction of ships all the way from 50 ships in 1938 up to 1,000 in 1943.

Coming from a shipyard district as I do, I know the magnificent contribution that the workers in this industry have been making to the war effort. They have made a record which has never been approached in the world's history, and I know they can be counted upon for even greater results.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is another side to this question in respect to which the Congress has an inescapable responsibility. Serious charges have been made. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has some of these charges now under investigation. My able colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will go into these matters in some detail. I do not wish to cover the ground which he will cover. I would be remiss in my duty, however, if I did not refer briefly to certain matters developed in the course of the hearings.

It has been charged, Mr. Chairman, that exhorbitant prices have been paid for ships purchased; that section 902 of the Maritime Act eliminating any enhancement in value due to the emergency has been violated; that sums in excess of three times the proper value of ships purchased have in fact been paid.

It has been charged that excessive charter hire agreements have been entered into. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] recently put in the RECORD an example, I believe, of 11 ships having a value of $786,000 which in a period of about 1 year earned over $3,300,000.

It has been charged that excessive insurance has been allowed and paid on ships, sometimes amounting to several times the value of the ship. I call attention in this connection to the letter from the Chairman of the Commission to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], on page 721 of the hearings, with respect to the *President Coolidge*. This letter indicates an insurance of 200 percent of the value of the vessel if the construction subsidy is not first deducted. It indicates an insurance to the extent of 700 percent of the value of that ship if the amount of ship construction subsidy be first deducted.

I have requested in this connection three separate tables from the Commission, seeking a complete picture since July 1, 1940.

In respect to prices, I have asked for the name of each ship purchased, the name of the seller, the date of purchase, the age of the ship, the original cost of construction, and the price paid.

In regard to charter hire, I have requested the name of each ship, the company, the date of the charter-hire agreement, the age of the ship, the original construction cost, and the earnings, if any, under the agreement.

With respect to insurance, I have requested the name of each ship, the company, the date insured, the age of the ship, the original construction cost, the insurance placed, and the insurance paid.

These tables, Mr. Chairman, to date have not been furnished.

It has also been charged that excess profits due the Government have not been collected. I have requested the Commission to furnish me with a statement showing the amount collected and the amount accrued. This information has not yet been furnished. It is admitted on the record, however, that all that is due has not been collected. It would also appear that the failure to cancel operating subsidies has served to make collection impossible and resulted in tax exemptions probably running into many millions of dollars.

The report of the Comptroller General in regard to the Waterman Steamship Co. transaction, with an apparent excess payment of $2,800,000, is public information and before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The report of the Comptroller General in regard to the Tampa Steamship Co. transaction, indicating an excess payment of $1,900,000, is in a similar category.

The report of the Comptroller General in reference to the sale of the steamship *President Roosevelt*, indicating an excess payment of over $421,000, has recently been sent to the Congress.

The other investigations which the Comptroller General now has in hand will be found listed at page 269 of the committee hearings.

The situation at the South Portland yard, indicating fees to the extent of $5,000,000 on an initial investment of $250,000, has been the subject of an investigation by a congressional committee.

The situation in the Savannah yard was recently aired in the public press.

I think the committee will wish to read the letter from Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, to Senator WALSH, of Massachusetts, and the reply of the Chairman of the Commission, appearing at page 752 of the committee hearings.

I realize fully, Mr. Chairman, the vital importance of ship construction in the war effort. I have already paid my tribute to the splendid work accomplished in this field. I report the matters just referred to as a matter of duty.

The charges made must be investigated. They must be proved, explained, or disproved. Personally, as one vitally interested in the merchant marine, I should be glad if they can be disproved. I hope they will be dealt with at the earliest possible moment. The truth must be ascertained. It is vital if the welfare of the merchant marine on its present basis is not to be jeopardized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder if the gentlemen can tell the Committee what led to the action of the subcommittee in striking the whole appropriation of the National Resources Planning Board.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am afraid I do not have time to go into the matter at very great length. I think, however,

I can say for the committee that it was felt that the work done by this agency was very largely limited to that of correlating or duplicating the work undertaken by other agencies of the Federal Government or to assisting the States and localities in respect to problems belonging to State and local units.

While I think the committee appreciates fully the importance of proper planning, I think they did not feel that the continuance of an agency with some 350 people and an annual budget of $1,400,000 to correlate the work of other agencies and to advise the States how to do their own jobs was warranted in view of the conditions facing the country at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There was no information, however, that what work the National Resources Planning Board is doing is not a proper work and a valuable contribution to the Nation? In other words, it was a question of there being a duplication of procedure? I hope the committee did not feel that the necessity for national planning does not exist any more and that, therefore, you are going to cut out all appropriations for the agencies that may be doing this type of work.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following comments on other agencies included in this bill:

EXHIBIT 6

THE NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

The National Resources Planning Board testimony will be found on page 50 of the hearings. This agency requests $1,400,000, as compared with $774,000 appropriated and $243,000 allocated from the President's Emergency Fund during the current year. It requests an increase in personnel from 252 to 350.

I have never been impressed by the work of this agency. Much of it has been devoted to the correlation or duplication of the work of other agencies. Much of it has been devoted to assisting the States and localities in fields which should be taken care of by the States. Forty-four States now have their own set-ups.

A break-down of the work of the agency under seven headings will be found on page 57 of the hearings. These include general overhead; economic and industrial trends; public-works programs, both Federal and State; security and services, dealing with such matters as health, nutrition, youth, and education; functional programs, dealing with water and land plans; urban conservation and development; area studies, assisting States and localities; and post-war agenda and reserve.

A very large part of the work in prospect is work which falls primarily within the jurisdiction of other agencies or the States.

The Board states "Our immediate responsibility is to correlate post-war plans." It further states it is important "to make clear the things we are fighting for" and "to give assurance not only to our people but to other people that the four freedoms will be made realities everywhere in the world."

It further states: "In one sense the appropriation for planning might be regarded as insurance. The post-war plans which the Board prepares may never have to be used."

I believe in planning. I believe also that every agency that is worth its salt is planning. I am not impressed with the need of a Board of 350 people, costing $1,400,000 a year, to correlate the plans of other agencies and to tell the States how to solve their problems.

Frank Kent is authority for the statement that the Executive Office staff in World War No. 1 numbered 48 at a cost of $164,520 as compared with the Executive office staff of today numbering 906 at a cost of $2,999,460, or an increase of about 1,800 percent.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The testimony from the Securities and Exchange Commission will be found on page 308 of the hearings. This agency administers seven acts under three of its divisions. The Public Utility Division administers the Public Utility Holding Company Act. It requests $720,000, the same amount as was appropriated for the current year. Sixty-eight percent of the registration work has been completed and substantial progress made in respect to the rest.

The Trading and Exchange Division administers the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 and the Investment Advisers' Act of 1940. This division is requesting $352,890 as compared with $382,890 in the current year, a reduction of 7½ percent. The record indicates a decline in investigations of 60 percent, a decline in filings of 50 percent, and a substantial decline in broker-dealer applications and reports.

The Corporate Financial Division administers the Securities Act of 1933, the Trust Indenture Act, the Investment Company Act, and chapter 10 of the National Bankruptcy Act. For this division is requested $1,010,840, as compared with $1,023,840, a decrease of 2 percent. The record indicates a decrease in filings under the Securities Act of 30 percent and a decrease in reorganizations under the Bankruptcy Act of 45 percent.

It indicates also a general reduction of activities in the financial world reflected in tables relating to loans, exchange memberships, number of tickers and electrical boards, and daily average sales on national securities exchanges.

The committee reduction of $750,000 would seem to be fully justified.

TARIFF COMMISSION

The testimony of the Tariff Commission will be found on page 280 of the hearings. The committee recommendation of $760,000 compares with the sum of $868,200 available in the current year and is $103,000 below the Budget estimate. When added, however, to the sum of $282,625 to be received from other agencies, the total to be made available amounts to $1,042,025, as large a sum I think, as has ever been available to this agency. The record indicates that except for a little work done on trade agreements and a little work under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the work of the Commission has been primarily work for other agencies, such as the Bureau of Economic Warfare, Office of Price Administration, and the War Production Board. The real basis for this request appears to be the desire to preserve a staff expert in tariff matters until after the conclusion of the war. The question presents itself whether or not this agency should be continued under the circumstances for the duration.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The testimony of the Tennessee Valley Authority will be found on page 456 of the hearings. Much of the data presented is regarded as restricted by the Office of War Information. The record indicates 24 dams built or under construction at an ultimate cost of $687,700,000. It indicates sufficient power for all foreseeable demands at least until the end of the fiscal year 1944. It includes statistics as to completion dates for dams, steam plants, transmission facilities, the fertilizer program, related property operations, and development program.

No new projects and no new appropriations are contemplated. The agency asks the use of $62,000,000 of its own revenues and $62,800,000 of reappropriations, a total of $124,800,000 to meet estimated expenditure of $107,300,000. The balance of $17,500,000 is requested as a reserve fund on the theory that projects which have been deferred by War Production Board may be released during the coming fiscal year. It should be noted in this connection that money has been provided for preliminary studies and for the design of plants for future construction wholly apart from the $17,500,000 reserve fund.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The testimony of the Veterans' Administration will be found on page 209 of the hearings. The total requested amounts to $887,017,000 as compared with $601,195,088 in the current year, an increase of almost $286,000,000. The request reflects an increase in personnel from 7,932 to 8,350 departmental and from 38,206 to 38,833 in the field, a total increase of 1,045.

A break-down of the request into seven items appears on page 211 of the hearings. Ninety-seven percent of the increase is in respect to three items, namely, Army and Navy pensions, $48,000,000 military and naval insurance, $8,600,000; and national service life insurance, $222,230,000. The record indicates under national service life insurance as of January 1, 1943, 6,000,000 policies, aggregating $38,000,000,000.

The increase in personnel is for work in respect to national service life insurance, for increased costs of supplies, materials, and hospitalization, for additional beds and for travel.

The record indicates as of June 30, 1942, 62,453 hospital beds, 18,771 domiciliary beds, a total of 81,224 beds. It indicates as of June 30, 1944, 63,776 hospital beds, 18,849 domiciliary beds, a total of 82,625 beds. The over-all program of the Veterans' Administration is 100,000 beds, the speed of completion depending upon priorities. The Veterans' Administration program in connection with the Army and Navy program now under way calling for 103,000 beds is believed to be adequate for any foreseeable demand.

The work of placing veterans of World War No. 1 in employment has continued with marked success. The total payments in behalf of the veterans of all wars since 1790 have amounted to $15,106,893,986.81.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TARVER).

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, on February 10, the President transmitted to Congress an estimate of $100,000,000 for the agricultural appropriation bill for the next fiscal year to provide for the making of so-called incentive payments, "to encourage an increased acreage of Irish and sweet potatoes, dried beans, dried peas, soybeans, peanuts, grain, sorghums, flax, and certain vegetables."

The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations of which I serve as chairman, departing from its usual custom of not announcing action upon any Budget estimate until after the bill is reported, has today by a majority vote disapproved this estimate and announced that fact to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the country. The announced purpose of this action was to advise the Secretary and the farmers of the country that so far as the subcommittee is concerned the amounts projected for incentive payments will not be appropriated by Congress, and to make this announcement in time so that

a different plan may be devised and put in operation for increasing the production of these essential crops. It is felt by a majority of the committee that the announcement of the program has been so recently made that farmers have not yet incurred any expense in making plans to cooperate in it, the program having been announced under date of January 27, 1943, and that the Secretary of Agriculture who is also Food Administrator and the farmers of the United States should be promptly advised that the funds for the incentive payment program will probably not be made available.

The matter is one of such tremendous and far-reaching importance that I feel it is incumbent upon me as chairman of this subcommittee to outline to the House my own feeling with regard to it. Since my views are not in all respects in accord with these of a majority of the subcommittee, I approach the discussion with some reluctance, but at the same time I feel that it is a subject which should be thoroughly discussed and thoroughly understood. I shall certainly not speak in criticism of anybody who entertains contrary opinions. I am concerned only with laying the facts as I understand them before the House.

I feel that the action of the subcommittee has been occasioned by a considerable number of reasons, which I believe I must appropriately leave in large part for expression by those who have been responsible for the action taken. So far as the merits of the proposal are concerned, if this House were here and now empowered to determine it definitely, and to substitute a different method of increasing production of these essential crops, I should be in accord with most of the reasons advanced. I do not, however, consider that to be the case.

The act of October 2, 1942, amending the Emergency Price Control Act, provides—

> That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes.

That is the direction given by Congress in an act approved by the President as to how increases of production of agricultural commodities needed for war purposes shall be brought about. It is a legislative mandate which in my judgment should have been followed. I do not conceive, however, that it was within the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to follow it. It could only have been done by the Office of Price Administration under the direction of the President.

Had that power been exercised by the Office of Price Administration, there is no question but that the Secretary of Agriculture would have had authority of law to establish so-called support prices which would have furnished all necessary incentive for additional production, thus giving to the producers of these commodities the prices to which they are entitled, not from the Treasury of the United States as a subsidy, but in the market place. That, in my humble judgment, is what should have been done.

The danger of inflation at this time in my opinion does not come because of threatened increases in farm commodity prices. The American farmer is not profiteering. The inflation danger comes largely from huge and unconscionable profits in war industry, and from wages in war industry entirely out of proportion to agricultural prices.

There is a further very important problem connected with the whole question involved. It is whether or not a saner and more satisfactory approach to the goal of increasing agricultural production would not have been through proper steps to increase the supply of farm labor, through deferment of necessary labor from military service, and furloughing for agricultural work essential farmers already in the service; whether provision of additional farm implements and machinery, adequate supplies of fertilizers, and other steps of that sort might not have been tried to stimulate agricultural production. Personally, I do not believe that the American farmer today needs any monetary subsidy or incentive to cause him to produce for his country in this time of emergency to the very limit of his capacity. I believe that all his Government has to do is to tell him what it wants him to do, and see to it that he gets the means to do it with. I do believe, however, that he ought not to be made the goat of this continued movement toward inflated prices, which is tending to increase by leaps and bounds the cost of the products of industry, including of course the things the farmer has to buy, and at the same time is endeavoring to so restrict the farmer's income as to allow everybody else to profit at his expense.

I cannot discuss all of these questions now. I say I think the powers that be should have followed the mandate of Congress in attempting to increase production of essential agricultural products. They should have raised the prices of those products in the manner provided by law. They did not do it. They are now refusing to do it. Members of Congress and great farm organizations are incensed because of that failure. They feel that the authority of Congress has been flouted, that the law has been ignored, and that it is incumbent on Congress to protect its authority and see to it that its mandates are observed.

Under ordinary circumstances, I would be in full accord with that feeling. But we have here no ordinary circumstances. We are advised by the Food Administrator, charged with the duty of maintaining the national food production to a level sufficient for the needs of our armed forces and our allies as well as of our civilian population that the increased production of the essential crops named in the Budget estimate is absolutely necessary. More than that, we are advised that all of this sought-for increase in production in these several crops above what would otherwise be production levels is intended for the use of our armed forces and of our allies. The Food Administrator, the Director of Economic Stabilization, and the President have all approved this plan, this $100,000,000 extra for incentive payments. I do not like the plan. You, perhaps, do not like the plan. We feel that the laws enacted by Congress have been flouted. Shall we now, in order to maintain the dignity and authority of Congress, enter a contest with the administrative branch of the Government to see whose will shall control, who shall be boss, and, whether we are right or wrong, run the risk of decreasing below needed levels supplies of essential foods to the boys in our armed forces and to our allies?

You can take that responsibility if you want to. I refuse to have any part of it.

I call your attention to this fact: The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1935, section 16, United States Code, title 16, section 590p, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to create obligations for benefits under the act not to exceed $500,000,000. He has to create those obligations before the beginning of a crop year. The law contemplated that he should do so. If he waited each year until the agricultural appropriation bill is approved in midsummer, it would be too late. He has incurred obligations for the crop year before the beginning of the year and before the money has been appropriated by Congress for every one of the 7 years since the act was passed. Now, he has undertaken under that authority to pledge the credit of the Government for this additional $100,000,000 for the coming crop year. It was only a few days ago, but it has been done. Farmers may not have done much in endeavoring to meet his offer, but thousands of them may have, and doubtless have, made some plans, incurred some expense, and would have their plans thrown out of gear by the withdrawal of his offer.

Who has authority to direct him to withdraw it? Nobody except Congress with the approval of the President. Congress undoubtedly did not contemplate in passing the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act that the power given him in section 16 would be used for such a purpose; it directed in the Emergency Price Control Act as amended that he use a different method for increasing essential agricultural production for war purposes; but it never repealed the authority given him in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and he is at least within the letter if not the spirit of that act.

I repeat, who can direct him to withdraw his $100,000,000 offer to the farmers of the country? The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations has no such authority; even the full Committee on Appropriations would have no such right. The House of Representatives by itself alone cannot do it and will not even have the opportunity until the agricultural-appropriations bill comes before the House, perhaps a couple of months from now. You cannot even have a vote on it now to see how the majority feel.

In the meantime the news goes out to the farmers of the country that the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations has disapproved the estimate for the $100,000,000. That will destroy the incentive-production program. No farmer would feel safe in incurring added expense to cooperate in the program when uncertainty exists as to whether the Government will be able to keep its contract.

Then, you say, let the administration do this thing in the manner directed by Congress—that is, by providing adequate price increases for these commodities to spur production. Perhaps it will be the administration's fault if it does not. Perhaps, however, the administration will say that not a subcommittee, but the two Houses of Congress, must determine whether this money will be appropriated, and that the Secretary had legal authority to bind the Government up to $500,000,000, and therefore invite the farmers of the country to proceed on the basis of the Secretary's offer. Certainly the program would be a flop; certainly the goal of increased production would not be achieved; and while the Congress and the administration settle the question of each other's prerogatives, a war need is not filled, American soldiers and sailors and their allies go without necessary food, and the day of victory in this world-wide struggle is to some extent postponed. Yes; it might even be that failure to furnish these extra foodstuffs would make the difference between victory and defeat.

There may be men who want to take that responsibility. I want none of it. Law or no law, congressional dignity or lack of it, I am going to wash my hands of any responsibility for throwing any sort of a monkey wrench into the war machinery. I voted to approve this Budget estimate. If further opportunity is offered me to support it again, I will do that. I hope that the administration, in view of the situation which has arisen, will withdraw it and resort to the methods provided by the Emergency Price Control Act to accomplish the same ends, but if it does not, I shall not participate in any contest with administrative authorities which could only result, no matter who is right or who is wrong, in adding to the danger of our war effort, to that of the men who are carrying on in that effort on sea and on land throughout the world, and in their failing to receive, no matter through whose fault, the kind of backing to which they are entitled.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is not the gentleman aware that all leading farm organizations have recently taken action over a joint statement in opposition to these incentive payments as being necessary to stimulate expanded food production.

Mr. TARVER. I am aware that representatives of two farm organizations appeared before our subcommittee on Friday of last week and expressed opposition to the making of incentive payments, in lieu of increasing prices. I was unable to secure from the representatives of those farm organizations, a clear and definite statement of what their attitude would be toward incentive payments, if the movement for increasing prices should not be successful.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Virginia to yield me 1 minute.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois, my colleague on the committee was on his feet and I thought perhaps he would like to ask a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I listened to the gentleman from Georgia with interest, and he made a fine statement of the case except I think he overemphasized the question of the conflict between the executive and congressional branches of the Government as distinguished from some other considerations in the minds of the subcommittee, when that subcommittee took action this morning. The gentleman will bear me out, I think, that the committee was of opinion that it was embarking on a subsidy program in the first place, and secondly, that there was no assurance that it would work.

Mr. TARVER. And let me say that $200,000,000 of the $400,000,000 first estimated for the 1944 Budget, for the soil conservation and domestic allotment program serves the identical purposes to be served by this $100,000,000. This $100,000,000 is merely on top of that. In other words, $200,000,000 of $400,000,000 in the original Budget estimate is to make payments to the identical types of farmers to whom it is proposed to pay this additional amount, and if this is a subsidy, that is a subsidy, and yet nobody has ever suggested the elimination of the $20,000,000 from the original Budget. While that $200,000,000 is allocated to producers of the five basic crops payment is conditional on their producing the same types of crops designated in this supplemental estimate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And let me say that the vote of the subcommittee this morning on the request of the Secretary of Agriculture for $100,000,000 was rejected by a vote of 5 to 1, those voting in the affirmative being the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], Mr. LAMBERTSON, myself, Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. WENE, and my colleague from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] voted in the negative.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, I correct the gentleman by stating that the majority was 6 to 1.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; that is correct. I forgot to mention that Mr. SHEPPARD was not there at the time.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, yes; he was. All of the subcommittee voted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then it was 6 to 1, and that 6 was made up of 3 Republicans and 3 Democrats.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I believe it is fitting that any Member of this House or of the other Chamber to criticize severely, and criticize up to the hilt, the activities of any officials or any members of any executive bureaus with whom they emphatically disagree. I do, however, feel that it is quite unfair and unsuitable for Members to endeavor, by way of venting their personal spleen, to cut off appropriations because of their disagreement with individual members of the departments and agencies. I do not think it is proper to cut off the appropriations for those agencies and departments for any such reason. That is an unfair method of dealing, and as a humble Member of this Congress I certainly will fight against any efforts of that sort.

I want to spend a bit of time today on Joseph L. Weiner, Office of Civilian Supply Director of the War Production Board. In his official capacity as such, his vote is essentia. in connection with the cutting down of the source of supplies of many industries and services. In connection with the wood pulp and paper-products industry numerous drastic orders have recently been issued, some of them without rhyme or reason and without appropriate consultations with the heads of the industry, or the consuming public which is also concerned. A group of Members of this House asked about an attempted 40-percent cut in the raw materials used in the manufacture of newsprint paper.

Members of the Paper and Pulp Division, I am informed, among them Messrs. Sterling, Wakeman, Gay, Snow, and Chandler have been reasonable and eminently fair in the matter and other matters. My contact with a number of these men have been most agreeable and satisfying. Indeed I found them most pleasant and cooperative. They wish to confer with the industry's groups and want their point of view. They do not want to ride roughshod over anyone. They object to this 40-percent cut, but Joseph Weiner is or was obdurate and adamant. He would not think of any modification. The 40-percent cut would materially affect, if not put out of business, hundreds of small newspapers of this country. Now more than ever, newspapers are essential in this country for obvious reasons. Jefferson once said, "If I were given a choice of government without newspapers and newspapers without government, I would choose the latter."

Efforts are now being made to cut out paper and paper products gradually not drastically—as the needs appear. As to the material for the manufacture of newsprint papers, up to a maximum of 10 percent is all that is necessary at this juncture and Weiner will have to agree—or else. He will have to agree on other matters—or else.

Let me give you another side light upon the aims and aspirations of this gentleman, who, apparently, does not know his backside from a hole in the ground. He actually tried by a "Weiner ukase" to return us to prohibition by the back door.

This man Weiner has the gall, the cheek, in the face of the fact that we

repudiated prohibition not so many moons ago, to recommend cutting down legalized liquor to the extent of 99 percent, leaving only the smallest modicum, 1 percent, for medicinal purposes. I endeavored to take up the matter with Mr. Weiner himself, and get his report, but I was not able to get Mr. Weiner on the telephone. He was "in conference" whenever I phoned. That excuse will not wash with me. He did not show enough courtesy to call back. Finally his secretary told me that the report was not for publication. Yet, extracts were found in all of the newspapers, and if the newspapers could get portions of the report the entire report should be at our disposal. I was told by someone in his office that the newspapers had no right to the portions of the report. That sounds fishy or that office was negligent in letting a confidential report leak out. Anyway, the press did a public service in reporting the portions of the report it got hold of. We have, by our protests, nipped in the bud a damnable attempt again to "dry" the country.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. CLEVENGER. This same Joseph Weiner, is the man who is depriving agriculture of its farm machinery down to a very small percentage of what it should have. I do not believe that he knows a hay tedder from a corn sheller.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman's opinion is probably better than mine. But the gentleman should keep after him. He has no right to be in that position of power. He has already shown his unfitness. I do not, however, say that we should cut off the appropriations for the War Production Board because of the derelictions of one man in that Board, as some people would have us do.

I have been all through prohibition from the start, and in order to show, for example, with what ease liquor was obtainable during the prohibition era, right here in Washington, I brought into this chamber and placed on this table 12 bottles of liquor, back in 1926, three bottles of alleged "Scotch," 3 bottles of apparent "bourbon," and 3 bottles of presumed "rye" that I had purchased that very morning in drug stores and from bootleggers in Washington. I had violated the law. Most everybody did. It was the fashion. No one cared a hoot for the eighteenth amendment or the Volstead Act.

Gentlemen, it is very strange to relate that before my speech was over, the bottles had disappeared, indicating that although members even in this chamber had voted "dry," they also, like the whole Nation, were drinking "wet." They coveted and took the bottles from this table. I never got them back. I did not want them. I would not have touched the stuff. I had too much respect for my "tummy."

This new dry proposal, more fantastic than any thus far advanced by even the most fanatical prohibitionist agitator, clearly calls for further explanation from Mr. Joseph L. Weiner, director of that governmental bureau. Of course, the Weiner report itself has not yet been fully published. We have only a newspaper story with no identification as to the authority for it, so that the American people have no means of knowing exactly what the report says fully on this subject nor any explanation as to the reasoning behind such an absurd recommendation. We only know Weiner sponsored it.

Viewed from an economic standpoint, and as a war conservation measure, the proposal is manifestly ridiculous. According to the newspaper accounts, Weiner believes that with respect to the alcoholic beverages we should cut out distilled spirits and permit the production and sale of beer and wine up to two-thirds of 1941 consumption. Let us take a look at the facts.

First. The distilling industry is now completely converted to war production of alcohol for use by the armed forces and in manufacture of synthetic rubber.

Second. The country has on hand 3 to 3½ years' supply of distilled spirits already manufactured.

Third. The continued sale of this product will return approximately $1,000,000,000 in revenue to the Federal Government and State treasuries each year. This revenue is vital to the individual States of the Union whose need of revenue is greater than ever before with the loss of income from automobile license, gasoline, and other taxes.

Fourth. Out of every dollar spent for distilled spirits, from 66 to 68 cents goes to the support of Government.

Fifth. The beer and wine industries employ over 40,000 persons in production alone and sales of these products are much more lightly taxed than distilled spirits, yielding the Federal Government somewhat less than half a billion dollars a year. Moreover, what is more important, there is only about 90 days' supply of beer in the country at any time.

In other words, Mr. Weiner is suggesting that the country should continue to devote manpower and materials to the production of one type of alcoholic beverage, which still has to be made, and which yields the Government a relatively smaller amount of revenue, and eliminate the sale of another type of alcoholic beverage which is already produced, ready for sale and which yields enormous revenue both to the Federal Government and to the sorely-pressed State governments.

The proposal is even more dangerous when viewed from the social side. If adopted, it would inevitably return the country, to a very considerable extent, to the evils of the prohibition era. Mr. Weiner is probably mentally too young to understand that part of the picture. He was probably in his mental diapers when this country went through the terrible crimes of prohibition, with its hip-pocket flask, bay-rum cocktails, bootleg scotch, and the racketeering, banditry, and gangsterism which went along with them.

What background has Weiner to understand civilian tastes and demands for liquor? Even the Army refused to make the country dry—it is feared for the morale of soldier and civilian alike, but Weiner would bludgeon the Nation into prohibition. Who abides with him? What groups held his pen as he wrote? It is worth investigating. Perhaps we should tell him that no more whisky can be made—all distilleries have been commandeered for the making of alcohol in order to produce smokeless powder and synthetic rubber for war use. All distillers and dealers have already voluntarily rationed supplies. The stretching of the limited stocks under reasonable control by the O. P. A. and the W. P. B. would satisfy the Nation and would, I am sure, be agreeable to the administration and particularly to James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization.

This is prohibition by stealth—through the back door—despite the fact that the country fought overwhelmingly for and won the repeal of the eighteenth amendment.

The American people want none of this kind of ridiculous regimentation. It is unnecessary, unsound, and uneconomic.

I went back to my old files and I found some interesting newspaper clippings of what happened during that awful period called prohibition.

Here is a clipping from Aurora, Ill., of March 26, 1929:

> State dry agents today stormed the home of Joseph DeKing, 40, after bombarding it with gas bombs, killing Mrs. DeKing, 35, and clubbed her husband into unconsciousness.
>
> Their terror-stricken son, Gerald, 9, seized a revolver and shot one of the raiders in the leg.

Another clipping from New York, my own city, of December 28, 1921:

> Three men and a woman died yesterday from the effects of wood alcohol which they drank during the Christmas holidays under the impression they were drinking gin and whisky. Two of the men were brothers. * * * The drinks did not affect one of the brothers until yesterday about noon, when he became suddenly ill and began to lose his sight. He feared that he had drunk wood alcohol and went at once to the hospital. He became steadily worse in spite of everything the physicians could do, and at 6 o'clock was blind. He went into convulsions soon afterward and died in great pain about 10 o'clock.

I commend to Weiner a reading of these records.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. I could tell you more about those dreadful years under the prohibition era. The noisome scent of bathtub gin still quivers our nostrils. The headlines are still fresh in our memory, as follows: "Beer baron slain," "Senator shot by dry agents," "Booze convoy hijacked," "Coeds in rum orgy."

The Lord deliver us from another era of prohibition. I once said on this floor the return of prohibition would be just like a dog returning to his vomit. That is strong but fitting language. That is the only way I can adequately describe it, because prohibition was that vile.

Now, this man Weiner, when he found that we were getting after him, sort of apologized and said as follows:

There is no indication whatever that we shall at any time in the discernible future get down to rock bottom and be compelled to distribute liquor on a bedrock basis. On the contrary, there is on hand today sufficient liquor to provide normal consumption for several years. It should be added that the entire bedrock economy report submitted to the Director of Economic Stabilization by the Office of Civilian Supply was a study and not a recommendation.

When he was caught with his "pants down" he calls a recommendation a mere study, but anyone who has any knowledge of prohibition, who lived through it or would take the trouble to read about prohibition, would neither make a study nor a recommendation that we should be regimented into prohibition again, particularly after we had in this House and in the other Chamber passed a repeal which was ratified by the necessary number of States. The Nation does not want any more of prohibition and we do not want any more ukases, edicts, orders, studies, or recommendations coming from this man Weiner. Of course, nothing is going to come of that report now after we have scotched him, as it were, as far as Jimmy Byrnes is concerned. He is too practical, too sensible. He knows the temper of the people. As Congressman, Senator, judge, and right-hand man of the President, he will not be fooled by any such asinine study or report.

The report, however, is going to have a bad effect in another direction, in that it is going to be used by all the dry organizations all over the country as proof positive that we must have this prohibition regimentation again. This man has created a tremendous amount of havoc because of what he has said. The drys will quote him up hill and down dale.

Last Saturday and last Monday in New York, and probably in other States and other places, there was a veritable run on all liquor stores, after the publication of this Weiner report. All liquor stores were cleaned out of liquor because of the dumb statement made by this man.

I repeat to the gentlemen who have grievances against him, come here and air those grievances to the end that he will be put back where he came from—my own city of New York, I am unhappy to state. He comes from New York and was formerly in the office of corporation counsel of the city of New York under the LaGuardia administration. I do not know whether he is a Democrat or a Republican. But at any rate he has no place in the War Production Board personnel.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. It might interest the gentleman to know that I have this morning received from one county farm bureau a list of 14,700 acres of very rich land that will not be in crop production this year, probably for two reasons: First, the lack of manpower, and, second, the lack of machinery. Your city of New York is vitally interested in that, because after all, milk does not run out of a faucet.

Mr. CELLER. I am very much interested and I will be glad to cooperate with the gentleman to bring about proper relief.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, we are now considering the second of the so-called departmental bills. After many weeks of diligent and painstaking work, the Appropriations Committee, by and through the approval and recommendation of the very able subcommittee, has submitted for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole House this bill, which I understand provides for contemplated expenditures by the various governmental agencies provided for in the bill, the approximate sum of $2,621,104,379.

I concede, of course, that the Members of the Congress who comprise the Appropriations Committee, and more particularly those of the subcommittee, who have heard the evidence adduced at the hearings, are in a much better position to pass upon the merits of the bill and the individual items which make up the whole of the sum total than are we, who have not been privileged to hear the testimony or read the very voluminous record of the hearings. Each of us, however, has his own individual responsibility to the particular people he represents, not only in his own respective congressional district and State, but the Nation as well.

I am personally fond of every Member on either side of the aisle who makes up this splendid subcommittee. I do not challenge their sincerity of purpose, their good intentions, or the fact that they may honestly feel that they have used the pruning knife to its full capacity. On the other hand, I am not unmindful of the fact that in our respective committees we are sometimes oversold by those with whom we so often come in contact and who are directly interested in the bureau, department, or agency for which we are appropriating or legislating either for or against; and I doubt whether there has ever been an appropriation bill reported that could not stand further drastic reductions. That is especially true in this particular period of our country's history, so far as nondefense expenditures are concerned.

This Congress has a solemn obligation to the people of this country to trim, and trim to the core, and to cut, and cut to the quick, all expenditures that are not absolutely essential to the winning of the war. I do not pretend to be a fiscal expert or to know all the answers to governmental economics. I doubt whether anyone else does. I do recall that in 1932 it was stated and proposed as a sound governmental principle that a government, like a family, could not long keep on spending in excess of its income without being bankrupt and going upon the rocks. Of course, no one in authority since that time has advocated any such doctrine since that campaign, although it seems to me to be fundamental.

In view of the unprecedented demands that are being made of our people in order to finance this war, I do want to point out a few facts which disturb me and which speak for themselves, and which certainly stress the absolute importance of cutting out of every appropriation bill everything that is not absolutely esesntial for the successful prosecution of the war.

Some of the things which I shall say and some of the comparisons that I want to call to your attention, I may say are not made without some trepidation upon my part, for I realize that any statement that might be made which someone might construe to mean that Uncle Sam is still your favorite, and in making comparisons of our own expenditures in connection with the war with those of our allies, may bring down the wrath of the gods upon our heads and that some vociferous, self-styled guardian of American freedom or self-appointed spokesman of American policies is likely to label us as an isolationist or a tool of Hitler and claim that we are not interested in winning the war because we dare call attention to these war expenditures.

I am sure, however, that the vast majority of the people in this country have well caught on to that class of self-styled gentry and are quite certain that those of us whose sons are fighting on the far-flung fields of battle and who subscribe to the various war chests, are the folk who are not only eager and anxious to win the war as speedily and effectively as possible and get our boys back home, but are likewise anxious that they have, if possible, a solvent Government, and some semblance of the sort of American ideas and ideals to return to when they get back over here.

The New York Times under date of January 12, contained an article setting out the war budgets for 1943, which are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| United States | $100,000,000,000 |
| England | 21,000,000,000 |
| Russia | 15,000,000,000 |
| Canada | 4,000,000,000 |
| Germany | 34,000,000,000 |
| Italy | 8,000,000,000 |
| Japan | 7,000,000,000 |

According to those figures, the total war budget for 1943 of England, Russia, Canada, Germany, Italy, and Japan, approximates $89,000,000,000, while our own war budget is $100,000,000,000. In other words, our war budget contemplates our expending for the war effort about $11,000,000,000 more than our principal allies—England, Russia, and Canada—plus the budget of all the Axis Powers.

After noting this bit of interesting information concerning the war budget for 1943, I thought it would also be interesting to make some comparisons of the expenditures in dollars and cents of our own Government which has been in the war a comparatively short time, with

those of our allies and the Axis Powers; so I asked the Legislative Reference Division of the Library of Congress for information about the war budgets of our allies for the entire period from 1932 to 1943, inclusive. I also requested that I be furnished the information as to not only what our allies had expended during that 10-year period, but also as to the entire expenditures of the Axis Powers during that same period.

The Legislative Reference Service directed my attention to the Foreign Commerce Weekly under date of February 6, 1943, and also to the Federal Reserve Bulletin for January 1943. For the information of those who may not have had the privilege of making these comparisons, I include herein as a part of my remarks, the information as set out in the Foreign Commerce Weekly, in a very interesting article by Mr. Leon S. Wellstone, Division of Commercial and Economic Information, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce:

COST TO UNITED STATES

Leading in the cost of military expenditures, though late to enter the war against Hitler—December 11, 1941—is the United States. During the fiscal year 1940–41 these expenditures amounted to $6,700,000,000; in 1941–42 they were $28,300,000,000; for the fiscal year ending the coming July they are estimated at $77,300,000,000; while for the fiscal year 1942–43 the President, in his recent address before the new Congress, estimates such outlays at $97,000,000,000.

Taking only the expenditures already used or now appropriated, we arrive at the total of $112,300,000 for the last 3 years.

UNITED KINGDOM

The military expenditures by the United Kingdom since the advent of the Nazis in Germany are given (in pounds sterling) in the following table:

*Defense and war services, Apr. 1 to Mar. 31*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1932–33 | £102,990,000 |
| 1933–34 | 107,872,000 |
| 1934–35 | 113,870,000 |
| 1935–36 | 136,949,000 |
| 1936–37 | 186,072,000 |
| 1937–38 | 262,117,000 |
| 1938–39 | 382,456,000 |
| 1939–40 | [1] 1,141,451,000 |
| 1940–41 | 3,220,000,000 |
| 1941–42 | 4,085,000,000 |
| 1942–43 (estimate) | 4,500,000,000 |

[1] £241,201,000 total defense votes; £408,500,000 votes of credits; £491,750,000 amounts met from issues under Defense Loans Acts.

This makes a total of £14,239,000,000.

The yearly average exchange rate of the pound sterling during the foregoing periods has been as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1932 | $3.50 |
| 1933 | 4.23 |
| 1934 | 5.03 |
| 1935 | 4.90 |
| 1936 | 4.97 |
| 1937 | 4.94 |
| 1938 | 4.88 |
| 1939 | 4.43 |
| 1940 | [1] 4.035 |
| 1941 | [1] 4.035 |
| 1942 | [1] 4.035 |

[1] Official rate.

Translating the United Kingdom expenditures into dollars, we find a total for the period of $58,200,000,000.

This makes a grand total of $112,300,000,000 plus $57,700,000,000, or $170,500,000,000.

CANADIAN EXPENDITURES

Canadia expenditures on national defense between 1939 and 1943 (fiscal year in Canada ends Mar. 31) were as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1939 | $34,000,000 |
| 1940 | 127,000,000 |
| 1941 | 778,000,000 |
| 1942 | 1,351,000,000 |
| 1943 | 3,000,000,000 |

The figure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1943, is conservative and may have already been increased.

The total expenditures in the years cited amount to $5,290,000,000 (Canadian), or approximately $4,814,000,000 (United States) at the rate of 91 cents per Canadian dollar.

This increases the grand total from $170,500,000,000 to about $175,300,000,000.

SOVIET UNION

The military expenditures by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics since the advent of Hitler have been as follows, in rubles (the estimate for 1942 is not yet available):

| | *Rubles* |
|---|---|
| 1932 | 1,500,000,000 |
| 1934 | 1,700,000,000 |
| 1935 | 6,500,000,000 |
| 1936 | 14,800,000,000 |
| 1937 | 20,000,000,000 |
| 1938 | 27,000,000,000 |
| 1939 | 41,000,000,000 |
| 1940 | 57,000,000,000 |
| 1941 | 71,000,000,000 |

This makes a total of 240,000,000,000 rubles during the 9 years. Owing to the unreality of the foreign-exchange value of the Soviet ruble, it is, at best, difficult to translate it into dollars. But it will not probably be far wrong, in terms of the value of industrial production involved, to equate the 240,000,000,000 rubles to about $96,000,000,000, at an average rate of 40 cents per ruble.

The figure brings the grand total to $271,300,000,000.

FRANCE

The expenditures for national defense by the Republic of France from 1933 to the time of the armistice on June 17–18, 1940, were as follows, in francs:

| | *Francs* |
|---|---|
| 1933 | 12,618,000,000 |
| 1934 | 11,157,000,000 |
| 1935 | 10,270,000,000 |
| 1936 | 14,112,000,000 |
| 1937 | 21,730,000,000 |
| 1938 | 30,300,000,000 |
| 1939 | 113,672,000,000 |
| 1940 (estimate) | 249,000,000,000 |
| 1933–39 | 213,859,000,000 |
| 1933–July 1, 1940 [1] | 338,359,000,000 |

[1] In making this computation half of the total figure for 1940 has been used to obtain the figure for the whole period; the 1940 figure is therefore a very rough estimate.

This makes a total from 1933 to July 1, 1941, of 338,000,000,000 francs. The rate of exchange during those years follows:

| | *Cents* |
|---|---|
| 1933 | 5.0 |
| 1934 | 6.6 |
| 1935 | 6.6 |
| 1936 | 6.1 |
| 1937 | 4.0 |
| 1938 | 2.9 |
| 1939 | 2.5 |
| 1940 | 2.1 |

Converting the franc into dollars, we find the total expenditures of France amounting to about $10,000,000,000.

This brings the grand total up to $271,300,000,000 plus $10,100,000,000, or $281,400,000,000.

THREE BRITISH DOMINIONS

The war expenditures of Australia in recent years were as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1939–40 | £56,000,000 |
| 1940–41 | 171,000,000 |
| 1941–42 | 320,000,000 |

This makes a total of £547,000,000. At the rate of exchange of the Australian pound, $3.22 to the dollar, the sum amounts to $1,760,000,000.

The war expenditures of New Zealand follow:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1939–40 | £7,000,000 |
| 1940–41 | 32,000,000 |
| 1941–42 | 60,000,000 |

This makes a total of £99,000,000, or $319,000,000.

The war expenditures of the Union of South Africa were as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1939–40 | £4,000,000 |
| 1940–41 | 60,000,000 |
| 1941–42 | 72,000,000 |

This makes a total of £136,000,000, or (the South African pound being $3.98) $541,000,000.

Bringing together the war expenditures of Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa and adding them to the total makes a grand total of about $284,000,000.

POLAND

Poland, first victim of the overt Hitler war, had these military expenditures, in zlotys:

| | *Zlotys* |
|---|---|
| 1933–34 | 2,230,000,000 |
| 1934–35 | 2,300,000,000 |
| 1935–36 | 2,340,000,000 |
| 1936–37 | 2,210,000,000 |
| 1937–38 | 2,400,000,000 |
| 1938–39 | 2,500,000,000 |

This amounts to 14,000,000,000 zlotys for the period, or (as the zloty was worth about 19 cents to the dollar) $2,660,000,000.

In addition to the above expenditures for military purposes, Poland had a number of extraordinary budgets from which funds were appropriated for war ends, so that the estimate of $2,660,000,000 is conservative.

The grand total now, therefore, is $284,000,000,000 plus $2,660,000,000, or about $286,700,000,000.

THE NETHERLANDS

The fiscal year in the Netherlands is the same as the calendar year. Defense expenditures in guilders and the extraordinary credits were as follows:

| | Ordinary | Capital services |
|---|---|---|
| 1933 (provisional results) | 87,600,000 | 300,000 |
| 1934 (estimates) | 87,900,000 | 200,000 |
| 1935 (estimates) | 87,700,000 | 300,000 |
| 1936 (estimates) | 87,646,000 | 323,000 |
| 1937 (probable results) | 87,532,000 | 2,726,000 |
| 1938 (probable results) | 117,798,000 | 38,943,000 |
| 1939 (legally established) | 134,775,000 | 98,839,000 |
| 1940 (proposed) | 147,797,000 | 84,232,000 |
| Total | 838,748,000 | 225,863,000 |

In September 1938 (when the terrible menace of Hitler had become crystal clear) an extraordinary credit of 100,000,000 guilders was voted for the call to arms and another credit of 100,000,000 guilders for a supplementary budget.

On September 6, 1939, an extraordinary credit of 60,000,000 guilders was approved for the Ministry of Economic Affairs for the purchase of foodstuffs, raw materials for industries, and similar necessities in case of threatened war.

In October 1939 there were allocated 116,549,410 guilders from the book profit arising

from the revaluation of the gold stock of the Bank of the Netherlands—for extraordinary expenditures.

On February 19, 1940, a bill provided 40,239,219 guilders to supplement the defense budget of 1939. Of this amount 1,548,719 guilders were allocated to the ordinary service budget and the remainder, 39,690,500 guilders, to the capital service budget.

This makes a total of 1,481,000,000 guilders or, at an average exchange rate of 60 cents, $889,000,000—bringing the grand total to $287,600,000,000.

BELGIUM

The defense expenditures of Belgium, just before Hitler overran it, were as follows, in francs:

| | Ordinary | Extraordinary |
|---|---|---|
| 1933 | 894,386,000 | 29,248,000 |
| 1934 | 862,281,000 | Not available |
| 1935 | 766,586,000 | Not available |
| 1936 | 903,508,000 | 427,450,000 |
| 1937 | 981,000,000 | 550,243,000 |
| 1938 | 1,122,000,000 | 480,000,000 |
| 1939 [1] | 1,271,000,000 | 5,000,000,000 |
| 1940 | 1,329,000,000 | [2] 5,260,000,000 |

[1] Actual mobilization expenditures September–December 1939 amounted to more than 3,000,000,000 francs.
[2] 4,810,000,000 francs for mobilization; 450,000,000 for antiaircraft defense.

This makes a total of about 20,000,000,000 francs, or about $3,400,000,000 at an average exchange rate of 17 cents per franc, bringing the total to $291,000,000,000.

NORWAY

The following were the national defense expenditures of Norway, in crowns, as the northern kingdom saw the Hitler threat becoming ever more ominous:

| | *Crowns* |
|---|---|
| 1936–37 | 45,800,000 |
| 1937–38 | 52,700,000 |
| 1938–39 | 53,600,000 |
| 1939–40 | 235,000,000 |

This makes a total of 387,000,000 crowns or, at the rate of 24 cents per crown, $93,000,000, bringing the grand total to $291,100,000,000.

YUGOSLAVIA AND GREECE

Military expenditures of Yugoslavia since 1938 (largely attributable to fear of the looming power of Hitler) have been as follows:

| | *Dinars* |
|---|---|
| 1938–39 | 2,770,000,000 |
| 1939–40 | 2,930,000,000 |
| 1940–41 | 3,870,000,000 |

As the dinar during the above period was worth about 2.3 cents, the amount in United States currency is $220,000,000.

The military expenditures of Greece, justly apprehensive of Axis incursions, follow:

| | *Drachmas* |
|---|---|
| 1937–38 | 5,000,000,000 |
| 1938–39 | 3,300,000,000 |
| 1939–40 | 3,600,000,000 |
| 1940–41 | 6,500,000,000 |

This makes a total of 18,400,000,000 drachmas, or about $165,000,000, the drachma during this period being worth about nine-tenths of a cent.

The war expenditures of Yugoslavia and Greece together bring the grand total to $291,500,000,000.

To this must be added about $1,500,000,000 of military expenditures by Czechoslovakia during 1933–39, bringing the grand total to $293,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, thus it will be seen that while we have been in the war for little over a year we have expended almost as much as all the combined expenditures of our allies.

Now, let no one misunderstand the point I am trying to make. God knows the dollars-and-cents cost of this war is a minor consideration compared with the cost of human suffering, privations, death, and destitution that the war has wrought, and, of course, if it takes every dollar of wealth that this country has accumulated since its beginning to bring this war to a successful conclusion, we shall spend it and spend it gladly.

Let no one claim by these comparisons that I am attempting in any way to evaluate or underestimate the efforts of valiant and courageous Russia or any other of our allies in the sacrifices they have made, and are continuing to make. Ours are to date infinitesimal when compared to theirs.

What I am trying to make crystal clear is that we have got to quit spending for nonwar essentials. Personally, I think it would be possible to cut the so-called civilian pay roll in practically every department of this Government 25 to 33⅓ percent. I think we could and should consolidate or do away entirely with hundreds of boards, bureaus, and agencies which overlap, compete with each other, and are not needed.

We all know the acute situation with respect to manpower, not only in the Army but on the farms and in the factories. Notwithstanding all of this, we see the Civil Service Commission advertising every day attractive jobs, stressing the overtime-pay features of such jobs. Only this morning there came to my desk two very interesting bulletins from the Civil Service Commission—one of them advertising for social scientists, with salaries ranging from $2,600 to $6,500 per year.

Let me call your attention briefly to this document. In black-faced type it sets out:

SOCIAL SCIENTISTS NEEDED, $2,600 TO $6,500 A YEAR (PLUS OVERTIME)

For civilian war service as head historical specialist, $6,500 a year; principal historical specialist, $5,600 a year; senior historical specialist, $4,600 a year; historical specialist, $3,800 a year; associate historical specialist, $3,200 a year; assistant historical specialist, $2,600 a year.

Now the duties of these various specialists are likewise very interesting, and I quote:

I. DUTIES

The positions to be filled from this examination involve archival and administrative records work and the preparation of studies and reports on administrative and operational subjects. Activities include collecting, selecting, analyzing, and classifying documents and records of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government. More specifically, the duties are to develop or assist in the development of plans for determining which documents and records are significant and worthy of preservation for future reference; to prepare or assist in the preparation of plans for the preservation of selected materials; to write or supervise the writing of a chronological account of the background, origins, authorizations, administrative structures, developments, activities, and other events of possible historical significance of a particular agency; or to record and describe noteworthy interagency relationships and the manner in which officials solved difficult administrative and operational problems.

And here is another one:

CROP PRODUCTION SPECIALISTS NEEDED $2,600 TO $8,000 A YEAR (PLUS OVERTIME)

For a standard workweek of 48 hours (which includes 8 hours overtime) the present rate of compensation for overtime increase the above annual salary about 21 percent of that part of the basic salary listed above not in excess of $2,900 a year, provided that such increase shall not make the aggregate compensation more than $5,000 a year.

For positions of chief crop production specialist, $8,000 a year; head crop production specialist, $6,500 a year; principal crop production specialist, $5,600 a year; senior crop production specialist, $4,600 a year; crop production specialist, $3,800 a year; associate crop production specialist, $3,200 a year; assistant crop production specialist, $2,600 a year.

Let me quote further from this very interesting document:

I. DUTIES

The duties of appointees will be to develop and administer programs in connection with the establishment and operation of research stations or establishment of plantations growing rubber or oil-producing plants. Research stations and plantations will be located principally in the South and Central American countries. Somewhat similar duties will be performed by appointees having experience with other tropical plants. These duties will involve making surveys of the country to determine the selection of proper sites, soils, and other essential factors, as well as development and maintenance of research stations and demonstration rubber or oil-producing plantations situated for the most part in remote and primitive areas. The degree of responsibility involved will depend upon the grade of position to which appointment is made.

And this is at a time when our boys overseas and our allies and civilian population might go hungry for lack of ordinary farm hands.

Mr. Chairman, I realize these are indeed small matters compared with the billions we are expending—but there must be a stopping point somewhere. My people are alarmed—they constantly inquire of me, "What is the limit?" They ask me just how far can we go in our spending? Is there a limit even for war purposes?

These are some of the questions they are asking me. As for my part, I shall vote not only to reduce the items in this bill which I think can be eliminated without hurting the effort of our Army and our Navy, and shall continue to do so as the other bills come before the Congress from time to time.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman in the course of his remarks stated that some of these agencies overlapped in their activities, duplicated their efforts. Will the gentleman give us a list of some that overlap so we will know where cuts can be made?

Mr. RIZLEY. I shall be very happy to answer the question. We have the Farm Credit Association, we have the R. A. A. C., we have the Farm Security

Administration, all presumably making loans to distressed farmers and actually competing with each other. They should be consolidated and some of them eliminated entirely.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We can agree with what the gentleman says, but, of course, none of the agencies he mentions are in this bill.

Mr. RIZLEY. I appreciate that. However, the H. O. L. C. and some others are in this bill. We should eliminate them now and the others you mention when the bill comes here for consideration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman might have included a half-dozen other agencies that are handling farm credit. The gentleman also knows that there are certain groups within the administration that want to set up a Government bank in every community to handle all of the credit for agriculture and take it away from other private institutions that might be able to handle it.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am fully aware of that.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will the gentleman state what are the duties of some of these people to whom he has referred?

Mr. RIZLEY. Gladly. I am including in my remarks the full statement of the Civil Service Commission as to the purported duties.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Does the gentleman remember that on the 3d of February I put in the names of seven different agencies training manpower that overlapped?

Mr. RIZLEY. I recall that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Have they put out a call for psychiatrists?

Mr. RIZLEY. That may well come along soon.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the independent offices appropriations bill covers the widest range of Government activities of any of the regular appropriation bills. I have often thought that a new Member of the House could learn more about the activities of the Federal Government by studying the hearings on this bill than those for any other appropriation bill. Between 30 and 50 agencies are ordinarily covered in the independent offices bill. The bill before us has 34.

The easy thing to do these days is to condemn unnecessary expenditures. I have done it. The easiest thing to do is to assert that there is a vast field for economy in operating on the nonessential, nondefense expenditures of the Government. All of us want to do what we can. At first blush many people reading the report of the committee or reading this bill would assume that certainly a bill which runs to over $2,000,000,000 should afford a vast field for economy. I am not entirely satisfied with the bill as reported. There are many items in the bill where some members of the subcommittee suggested far greater cuts than are evidenced in the figures reported.

There is some give-and-take in this bill, as there is in most bills. The net result was more savings than there would have been if each member of the subcommittee had insisted on his own particular version of what the cuts should be. The committee would like to have brought in a much larger total saving. I know that. But we labored against a difficult problem. Of the $2,300,000,000 in this bill, nearly 90 percent is for agencies that it is practically impossible to do much about in the midst of a war. I refer to the items for the Veterans' Administration and the Maritime Commission. The Veterans' Administration appropriation alone accounts for $887,000,000. The Maritime Commission, which is the agency that builds the ships which we need today and will need in increasing number, accounts for over $1,250,000,000. In other words, out of the $2,300,000,000 in this bill considerably more than $2,000,000,000 of it is accounted for in those two agencies alone.

The subcommittee, as the hearings show, was particularly concerned over possible overlapping of agencies. Reference has been made earlier this afternoon to interrogations I directed toward the Federal Communications Commission. It developed that the Federal Communications Commission is making examinations for the Army and Navy in the licensing of certain inspectors and operators. It was difficult to get the Federal Communications Commission to admit that was a duplication of service because they said that the Army and the Navy wanted this done and asked them to do it. At that I said: "Well, it may assist them, but it still may be a duplication of the facilities they have," and the reply was, "But we only do it for the War Department, and if we do it for them they in turn do not duplicate that examination." Then I commented, "But they may have the personnel to do it," and their answer, "They might, yes, sir."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the gentleman ever heard one of the employees of an administrative agency of the Government admit that their work was in duplication of that of some other agency? I should like to have the refreshing experience sometime of actually hearing somebody admit that.

Mr. CASE. Never in principle. The incident cited was about as close to it as we have come. So practical problems are involved in cutting this bill. Let us take up the Veterans' Administration for a moment. The testimony before us was that many of the hospitals are understaffed. It is difficult now to get proper personnel, doctors and nurses, to staff the veterans' hospitals as they would be normally staffed. The competition is keen by reason of wages. It is also keen because many of the nurses and the doctors would much prefer to be wearing a uniform and be on the front line today than to be in these hospitals. General Hines in fact suggested to us that it might be worthy of study by the Congress to give the Veterans' Administration the authority to set up a limited pay schedule for people doing limited duty, in order to take over some of the duties that are being slighted, perhaps, at this time.

Every member, I know, desires to have proper hospital care for every boy who comes back from the front and needs hospitalization. Not one member is urging a cut in hospital facilities. We want them ready when the Army and Navy release the boys. We cannot wait until they come. The committee was assured that the Veterans' Administration will be ready—is ready—in fact. There are about 5,000 vacant beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals at this time. General Hines testified that they have a total of about 81,000 beds, and are building to a goal of 100,000 beds which, it is believed, will be sufficient, taken in conjunction with the Army and Navy's own hospitals.

This afternoon, after the consideration of the Consent Calendar, consideration was sought of a bill which would have had the effect of admitting to the hospitals a class of veterans of the present war who are not eligible under present law. It had not been on the Calendar the required number of days, however, and will be called later. In the meantime, I hope that those of you who are interested in the problem of hospitalization will read the testimony of General Hines and the interrogations by the gentleman from New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and other Members as well as myself on the hospitalization of men who are being discharged for physical disabilities allegedly not incurred in line of duty and existing prior to service.

On pages 243 and 244 you will find that General Hines agreed that the burden of proof ought to be on the Government where men are taken from civil life into the Army or Navy, kept there for 6 months, or a year in some cases, and then turned loose with the statement that they are being discharged for physical disability incurred prior to their induction or enlistment in the service.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK] pointed out that if these men had stayed in civil life it is possible they would not have had this breakdown. General Hines, agreeing, said that you could take many strong men and put them through the rather intensive training and it would cause some of them

to break. Existing law, however, does not provide for their hospitalization unless the Veterans' Administration conducts a study and makes a finding contrary to that already announced by the Army or Navy.

It was the feeling of the subcommittee that there is a definite responsibility on the part of the Government for these men, but under existing law, if the Army or the Navy discharges them and says the disability was not incurred in line of duty and existed prior to service, they are not entitled to hospitalization. I think the Committee would be glad to see that corrected by proper legislation. In the Seventy-seventh Congress we passed a bill in the House designed to take care of this situation; it died in another body. I have introduced a special bill to cover tubercular and neuro-psychiatric cases, H. R. 1453. It should be passed without delay and without a dissenting vote. A broader bill, H. R. 1749, was passed over this afternoon because it had not been on the Consent Calendar long enough and perhaps because it is so comprehensive that many Members wanted a chance to study it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Can the gentleman tell me, inasmuch as I have not had a chance to study the hearings thoroughly, in what classification are these 5,000 empty beds? Are they NP or general medical?

Mr. CASE. They are largely general medical and domiciliary. Some of them may be NP. I cannot give the exact break-down.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Was there any testimony or discussion as to any study the Bureau may be making at this time as to the need for beds after this war, or during this war, for that matter?

Mr. CASE. Yes; there is considerable testimony on that in the hearings and I urge all Members to read it. I may say that in the Veterans' Administration item carried in the bill there are funds to add 160 NP beds at Knoxville, Iowa, and 160 NP beds at Lexington, Ky. There are also some other construction items designed to work toward the 100,000 goal that I have mentioned.

I made reference to the Maritime Commission. That is a most difficult agency to cut in any large figure under present circumstances. Statements will be made before the committee and should be made that the members of the subcommittee have grave doubt as to some of the practices of the Maritime Commission at the present time. I think we were particularly startled by the valuations that have been allowed for certain ships purchased. However, as to the basic job the Maritime Commission is doing, the providing of ships, the committee, rightfully, I think, felt that it could not do very much in reducing the amount of the Budget estimate.

It is absolutely futile to talk about building tanks and planes, and training men, and furnishing lend-lease supplies, and so forth, if we are not going to produce the ships to get them across the water where they are needed.

In the consideration of this problem of transportation, as I have heard it discussed during sessions of the House in this session, a great deal of attention has been given to the subject of air transportation, until the feeling has developed, I think, that instead of building ships we perhaps ought to be building air transports, big cargo ships. My feeling is that we should do both—each for the job that belongs to it.

There is a definite field for air transport, but testimony which has come to my attention not only on this subcommittee but in the subcommittee on War Department appropriations convinces me that there is a lot of generalized thinking on the subject of air transportation which does not consider the actual facts in the case.

Some time ago members of the War Department committee had a discussion with General Somervell, commanding Services of Supply, at which he made some general statements about the tonnage that is involved. He made the statement that in some of the theaters of operation it would take more ships to maintain a supply of gasoline and other things necessary to maintain air transportation than it would to carry the cargo in the first place. I wanted to be sure of that statement and the facts on it so I addressed a letter to him the other day and in his absence received a reply from General Styer, his executive officer, commanding, during his absence, in which General Styer stated:

I am enclosing a brief summary indicating an analysis of shipping requirements by plane and by cargo ships to four different areas.

It will be apparent from this summary that for large-scale operations to any distant area, the planes and their personnel will require so many tankers and cargo ships to supply them that these alone are greatly in excess of the ships which could carry the cargo in the first place.

Then he called attention to the fact that the commercial air lines realize this, and sent a copy of an address delivered by W. A. Patterson, president of the United Airlines, before the National Industrial Conference Board at New York last November, saying: "His remarks closely follow our thoughts." Referring to the problem of refueling for an air transport supply system to Australia of a given number of tons, in this address Mr. Patterson said:

Nearly 15,000,000 gallons of gasoline, weighing over 45,000 tons, would have to be transported to intermediate points and to Australia every 2 months by oceangoing tankers. Three such tankers would be required for this purpose so that actually 144 airplanes plus 3 tankers would be required to do the job that could be accomplished by one oceangoing freighter in the first place.

I submit in the light of testimony like that it is essential to be building ships.

The summary to which General Styer referred compares the items involved in water transportation or air transportation of 100,000 cargo tons per month from the United States to four theaters of operations. The figures are so important to clear thinking on this matter that I am placing them in the RECORD at this point under permission granted by the House.

*General analysis—Airplane versus seagoing vessels*

SUMMARY

SHIPMENT BY WATER TRANSPORT

| Routes | Cargo tons per month | Water route miles (statute) | Number of cargo vessels (C–1) | Fuel tons required per month | Crew personnel required |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| United States to Australia | 100,000 | 7,575 | 54 | 16,640 | 3,780 |
| United States to United Kingdom | 100,000 | 3,610 | 34 | 7,930 | 2,380 |
| United States to Alaska | 100,000 | 1,415 | 16 | 3,110 | 1,120 |
| United States to Suez | 100,000 | 14,100 | 96 | 30,950 | 6,710 |

SHIPMENT BY AIR TRANSPORT

| Routes | Air-route miles (statute) | Number of cargo planes (C–46A) | Fuel tons required per month | Crew personnel required | Number of tanker vessels required to transport aircraft fuel | Number of cargo ships required to maintain planes and personnel |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| United States to Australia | 7,565 | 6,550 | 1,012,000 | 78,500 | 228 | 69 |
| United States to United Kingdom | 3,879 | 1,900 | 295,500 | 22,500 | 52 | 20 |
| United States to Alaska | 1,505 | 563 | 105,500 | 4,150 | 9 | 2 |
| United States to Suez | 10,016 | 5,885 | 837,300 | 58,370 | 85 | 59 |

I trust the Members will study this little table. It is brief, but it gives the picture very quickly, and for illustrative purposes at this time let me mention the Australian situation again. To transport 100,000 tons to Australia by water transport would take a crew personnel of 3,780. The crew personnel for air transport would be 78,500. The fuel tons required per month would be 1,012,000 for air transport, as against 16,000 fuel tons for water transport, which would be carried by the transport itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I trust that Members will look at the figures given in this table because they are

authentic, and bear mightily on the problem of air versus water transportation for a sustained operation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Why does the gentleman think that a mistake is made in the added amount of fuel that must be used in air transport rather than a water transport? It vitally affects us on the east coast. Does the gentleman think it is maladministration?

Mr. CASE. I do not quite get the connection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman stated that it would take more for air transportation than for water transportation.

Mr. CASE. I do not know that a mistake has been made. The Army is using water transportation, except for transportation of critical repair parts and matters of emergency.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In other words, the gentleman thinks that boats should be supplied.

Mr. CASE. Yes. For basic transportation, there must be water transportation for any large operation.

There are two other subjects to which I direct attention briefly. One is the subject of foreign service pay adjustment.

Some Members of Congress will be misled, I fear, by the figures in this bill, as they will by the figures in other bills on the items allowed for salaries. In this bill it shows up in two ways.

We have an item here for foreign pay adjustment of $385,000. That is the amount of money that we are appropriating to make our dollar come up to the dollar of the country in which some civilian employees of the Government are operating. I listened with interest to the statement by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] the other day about the importance of having faith in the security of United States currency. He made an inspiring speech but actually the thing that makes the dollar good throughout the world is the amount of gold behind it. The proof of that is that here we are appropriating $385,000 to bring our dollar up to par in certain countries, and this applies to the civilian employees alone. We were not given any estimate for the amount that must be appropriated to take care of pay adjustment for the officers and men of the armed forces. What I am saying is that in addition to the 10 percent allowed an officer and the 20 percent allowed an enlisted man for foreign service, an appropriation will be asked of this Congress to make up the difference between our dollar and a gold dollar for the amount of pay that is paid men while on duty in foreign countries.

There is another way in which this bill and other bills at the present time are not revealing as to the full pay bill of the country. They do not include estimates for the amount of money that must be appropriated to take care of the pay increases granted in the bill passed last December. Under that bill it will be recalled a 10-percent increase was ordered on fixed salaries up to $2,900, and time and a half pay was ordered for every hour above 40 hours where payment is on an hourly basis. Time and a half above 40 hours on a 48-hour week means that for that additional 8 hours you pay for 12 hours of time. That 12 hours is 30 percent of 40.

So, to find out the true Federal pay bill, today, you want to add about 30 percent. Your error will be only for the portion of salaries over $2,900. That will be true up to the expiration of this temporary raise of pay which I believe is the last of April.

There is pending before the Congress legislation designed to establish a permanent pay increase, and I hope these facts will be kept in mind when that comes before us. Remember, we are going to have estimates come in deficiency bills to add to the pay appropriations in this bill and in all other bills thus far presented by approximately 30 percent. There has been an increase in time of 20 percent at least. The President, as the gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out, in approving the pay bill, recommended that the agencies seek to absorb much of this additional cost by cutting down personnel, pointing that they were receiving an increase in personnel.

They will receive approximately 20 percent additional time if the agency is working on a 40-hour basis. On a 44-hour basis they will get 4 additional hours, which would be one-eleventh, or approximately 9 percent. If the experience of our committee is any criterion, however, few of the agencies are making any effort to follow the President's suggestion. All of them but one, I think, told us there would be a supplementary request to meet the deficiency caused by the increase in the pay scales.

Members of the House find it easy to talk about cutting these bills, but I hope they will remember that the responsibility for increases rests upon every Member of the House when he votes for or permits pay increase bills to go through on the Consent Calendar.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, since the pending bill makes provision for the continued operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, I deem it to be in order at this time to give to the House some figures which I believe should be of the greatest interest to the people of the United States.

The figures covering power operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority vindicate the wisdom of Congress in 1933 in establishing T. V. A. as a Government corporation with wide powers and discretion to carry on a comprehensive conservation program.

While the figures relate to the financial success of the T. V. A. in the generation, transmission, and sale of electric power to consumers in six States in the Southeast, I do not want to leave the impression that this is a story of financial success only. The Nation is reaping dividends in many other ways from the investment in the Tennessee Valley. Some of the dividends are in the form of fighting and bombing planes now in action on fronts all over the world, constructed of aluminum which might never have been manufactured in the present proportions except for T. V. A.; some of the dividends are in the form of water transport on a new navigation channel, relieving the wartime load on other forms of transportation; some are in greater quantities of food produced on soils enriched by phosphorus; others are in munitions ingredients produced for the armed forces.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was established in 1933, and it is now rounding out a decade of service. During that decade, in addition to its many other activities, the Authority has built up one of the largest power systems in the country, producing nearly half as much power as the entire United States in World War No. 1. Based on the water resources of the Tennessee River and its tributaries, this system has brought the benefits of low-cost power to half a million consumers.

The Federal investment has paid not only in terms of economic betterment but financially as well. From June 11, 1933, when power operations of T. V. A. commenced, up through December 31, 1942, T. V. A.'s gross power revenues have amounted to a total of $89,393,000. After provision for all power expenses, there remained $44,000,000 representing funds paid into the United States Treasury and reappropriated by Congress. Of this amount $21,683,000 consisted of provisions for depreciation and amortization of acquisition adjustments and $22,319,000 of net income. Thus the Authority has paid back to the people of the United States more than 14½ percent of the $300,883,000 invested in T. V. A. power facilities at the close of 1942.

Moreover, much of the decade of T. V. A. operations was necessarily devoted to building up the system and the market, and most of the revenues required to make this showing have been received in the last 3½ years; thus, gross power revenues received since July 1, 1939, total $77,154,000.

It has sometimes been charged that power operations of the Authority have been successful only because a part of the investment in the system of multipurpose dams had been allocated to navigation and flood control. The figures dispose of that contention. The navigation and flood-control investments can stand on their own feet; the benefits that are being achieved are sufficient justification. But it is interesting to note that the $44,000,000 in depreciation funds and net income so far returned to the Government from the power program is sufficient to absorb the net expenses of the flood-control and navigation programs, totaling $4,603,000 before depreciation charges, and to pay back to the Treasury almost 9½ percent of the $416,063,000 investment in all three programs.

The Authority at present is operating 16 generating stations, including both hydro and steam, and is producing and selling power at the rate of nearly 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually;

and this output, due to the continually increasing demands of war, will soon be greater than ever. It is selling power to 83 municipal and 45 cooperative electric systems which have invested more than $100,000,000 in electric facilities. Through these systems T. V. A. power reaches more than half a million residential, rural, commercial, and industrial customers who save—those who had electric service prior to T. V. A.—more than $9,500,000 annually, as compared to their former rates. Home users of electricity use more than 1,500 kilowatt-hours a year on the average, or 50 percent more than the average for the Nation; and they pay about 2 cents per kilowatt-hour on the average, or about 45 percent less than the 3.7-cent-per-kilowatt-hour average for the Nation. And selling power at rates substantially below the national level, the municipalities and cooperatives purchasing power wholesale from the Authority are showing substantial net incomes annually on their over-all, combined operations.

The results, I believe, establish the T. V. A. as an efficient, flexible, going business organization. Its development as such an organization has its roots in its charter as a Government corporation, the T. V. A. Act, which, in the words of President Roosevelt in 1933, established it as an agency "clothed with the power of government but possessed of the flexibility and initiative of a private enterprise."

In other words, the T. V. A. was set up—so far as its power operations were concerned—on a business basis, in a position to adapt itself quickly to altered circumstances, make expenditures as needed to preserve its reliability of service, and to meet extraordinary conditions as they arose in the course of serving with electricity an area as large as England. One of the most important considerations in this connection is the fact that the Authority has had full use of its power revenues to meet its current expenses, a freedom which is recognized as essential to any business enterprise, public or private.

One of the best measures of business efficiency is the ability to meet unexpected or emergency situations in stride, and the T. V. A. provides several examples. I touched on one of these examples earlier when I mentioned that planes are now in action over north Africa, Europe, and the South Pacific, which might not now be in the air if it had not been for the ability of T. V. A. to supply electricity for the manufacture of aluminum. This is true of other war materials also.

Everyone will recall that during 1941 power demands were mounting because the national defense program then was getting into full swing. More aluminum, more planes, more of everything was being demanded. And at the same time, one of the worst droughts of all time descended upon the Southeast, cutting down the power production of hydro projects throughout the area. One of the hardest hit private hydro systems was that serving one of the largest aluminum mills in the country in the Southeast area.

Privately owned public-utility systems were likewise hard hit. Into this breach stepped T. V. A., an agency of the Federal Government. I do not mean to say that the T. V. A. promptly produced all the electricity that was needed out of its own plants. It did, due to the conservative estimates of its power engineers, have a considerable reserve which it could, and did, utilize to keep aluminum plants, producers of ships' boilers, and many other defense plants in full production.

But, beyond that, it was able to act as a balance wheel, a clearing house for power, which was able to integrate the power resources of a tremendous region that extended far outside of the Southeast. It happens that many of the surrounding utility systems generate their power largely by steam, as contrasted to hydroelectric generation and this enables them to facilitate the most efficient use of the total power-generating resources over a large area. When the load falls off on a steam system, plants must reduce their output because there is no use for the power they can produce. T. V. A., however, was able to take the power produced during the so-called off-peak hours, at night and over week ends, and use it on its own system; at the same time, it reduced generation at its own hydro plants, saving the water—and hence the energy—that otherwise would have been used. To do this, interconnections with utilities were used to the limit, new interconnections were established, power was interchanged from system to system, and power was purchased.

And by these means the T. V. A. was able over the period of a year to supply an average of 140,000 kilowatts of continuous power to a single large aluminum plant over and above the amounts it was obligated under its long-term contracts to supply. It was able not only to provide power to keep the existing plant running at capacity, but to supply power for new plants and plant expansions. By skillful operation, by assisting in making the most of every available source of power, by taking advantage of every opportunity, the Authority was able to assume a key role in supplying wartime industrial power during a period of crisis.

The industrial demand for power to produce war goods continues to rise. In the fiscal year 1941, T. V. A. sold 1,809,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power to large industries; in the following year, 2,410,000,000 kilowatt-hours; and in the first 6 months of the current fiscal year, 1,926,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Industrial demands on the municipal and cooperative systems likewise are on the increase. In the fiscal year 1941 such agencies sold 1,215,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and in the 12 months ending last November, 1,544,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Further drastic increases are in the offing, and T. V. A. is preparing to meet them on schedule by construction of new plants and storage reservoirs on schedules unheard of a few years ago.

Here is a record of achievement on the part of a Government agency of which every American can feel proud. Not only are we getting the power and more power that we need to produce the war materials to whip the Axis, but we are getting it on a business basis from an agency that is not only paying its own way but in fact is making substantial returns to the Federal Treasury. T. V. A. was set up with the essential freedom of initiative of a private business enterprise and, from any angle, the results have fully justified that course.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] may extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, one very vital problem that continues to receive a super abundance of lip service and a negligible amount of action is the farm-labor problem. Unless something is done soon by Government authorities who are empowered to act, this country and our allies face a critically serious shortage of food. So much has been said on this subject that most of us are getting tired of hearing about it, but the fact remains that the situation is desperate, little has been done about it, and we must have an ample supply of food to win this war.

This subject is of immediate interest to representatives from every agricultural State in the country. The State of California, in which my district is located, is the producer of a larger variety of farm crops than any other State and consequently encounters a greater variety of farm manpower problems. However, the farm labor shortage question is serious no matter where it is found and a sound solution is necessary for the welfare of farmers throughout the Nation.

In discussing farming and farm labor requirements it is well to remember that there are a lot of farmers in the country who are engaged in growing many farm products other than the so-called basic commodities. Fruits and vegetables, poultry, dairy products and many other food items are all a part of our modern diet and highly essential from a standpoint of nutrition and health. We cannot live properly on a diet of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco. We have got to have our vitamins.

Last fall the Secretary of Agriculture issued a statement to the country in which he outlined 1943 production goals for winter and spring vegetable crops. The Secretary stated that—

> The goals are designed to bring about increases in production of vegetables of most value in the wartime diet and are aimed toward substantial shifts away from less essential crops.

Particular emphasis has been placed on the value of certain vegetable crops. A substantial percentage of increase is requested for some while others are to be produced at approximately the 1942

levels. The Department release then went on to point out—

That at least a part of the land which ordinarily would be used for producing such crops as cantaloupes, cucumbers, cauliflower, eggplant, watermelons, bleached celery, head lettuce, green peppers, asparagus, and artichokes, should now be shifted to crops more essential to the wartime diet.

The Department further said that measures would be taken to assist farmers who are engaged in producing the so-called essential crops to obtain transportation, labor, fertilizer, containers and other production supplies. However, no such assurance is given to the producers of the crops which have been designated as less essential. In fact, the Department stated it could not assist with the production or marketing of the less essential winter vegetable crops.

Mr. Chairman, the farmers in the United States are patriotic enough to get squarely behind any sound and carefully thought out program that will guarantee maximum production of necessary foodstuffs. However, they need more specific information than has been made available so far and they need it immediately. The planting season for numerous winter and spring crops is already well under way in certain sections of the country.

If the Secretary of Agriculture is prepared to state what percentage of increase is required for certain crops he should also inform the farmers as to the percentage of decrease that is demanded in others. The farmer is no mind reader and he knows from long experience that the Department of Agriculture is notoriously slow in announcing various phases of its annual farm program. If we are to avoid a very serious shortage of food products, this is one time when the Department cannot afford to be too late with too little—information.

Definite steps toward the procurement of an adequate supply of farm labor for 1943 is one assurance that the farmers must have if they are to come anywhere near meeting production goals. Regardless of what claims are made by Government experts, who are supposed to know, I can say, from personal observation and experience, that there was a definite shortage of agricultural labor in California in 1942. This was due primarily to an inexcusable lack of foresight and planning on the part of the various Government departments most directly concerned.

Many of you will recall that when the President returned from his swing through the western United States he mentioned the fact that certain crops had been saved only because businessmen had closed their establishments and gone into the fields to help with the harvest. Mr. Chairman, that happened not once but many times in the district I represent. If it had not been for the patriotic efforts of men and women from every walk of life, for the school children, and even the voluntary efforts of men in the Army and Navy, I hesitate to think of the amount of vital foodstuffs that would have gone to waste.

Are we to be faced with a similar situation during the coming year, or will the Government get busy and make obtainable a sufficient supply of labor at a wage that will permit the farmer to harvest his crops at a reasonable profit? If ever stabilization of wages was needed, it is on the farm front. Farm producers simply cannot compete with the wages paid by defense industries and remain in business. It will undoubtedly surprise many of you to learn that farm workers in California have been demanding and have received wages that run as high as a dollar an hour—and that is no fairy tale; it is an absolute fact.

Members of the California congressional delegation have been working on the farm labor shortage problem for well over a year. I find in my file correspondence with various supposedly interested Government agencies dating back to November 1941. In response to a flood of desperate communications from farmers and farm organizations who realized what was coming, some of us began urging the proper Federal departments to take the preliminary steps that would be necessary in order to import Mexican farm workers.

We met with representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the United States Employment Service, as well as the Lend-Lease Administration and the War and Navy Departments, all of whom are, or at least should be, interested in insuring an orderly harvest of food crops for our civilian population and our armed forces and our allies.

What happened? Well, frankly, not much, for a long time. I guess most of the officials we talked to come from Missouri. They certainly had to be shown. They would not take the advice of Members of Congress from farm districts or from farm organizations who know what they are talking about. They investigated for months, and a lot of the investigating must have been done by persons who did not know their business.

In order to point out just exactly what I mean, Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent I intend to insert a letter which I received from John J. Corson, Director of the United States Employment Service, in October 1942. It follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD,
*Washington, D. C., October 22, 1942.*

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: This is in reply to your letter of October 14 requesting information on the steps that have been taken to date to insure an adequate supply of Mexican labor for 1942 and 1943 and further requesting information as to when the importation of Mexican labor was first taken under consideration and the successive steps that were followed before the Mexicans were brought across the border.

In regard to your first question as to the steps taken to date to insure an adequate supply of Mexican labor for 1942 and 1943 the United States Employment Service has certified to an importation of 3,000 Mexicans for California for the 1942 season. These workers have been primarily employed in the sugar-beet industry and it is contemplated that they will be used in other agricultural pursuits as soon as this activity is completed. If work is available it is our intention to renew their contracts in order that they may be fully employed as long as there is need for their services. If it becomes necessary to import additional Mexican workers for the 1943 season and funds are available to take care of required expenses such as transportation, a further certification will be made for additional workers. As you know the Mexican Government has reserved the right to designate numbers of workers that may be recruited in Mexico and areas in which they may be obtained. The 1943 program for use of Mexican workers will be predicated upon need, availability of workers in Mexico, and availability of funds with which to finance any necessary importation of workers.

In response to your second question I am very happy to review for you the successive steps that were followed before the first Mexicans were brought into California.

1. On May 15 the United States Employment Service certified to the Immigration and Naturalization Service to an immediate need for the importation of 3,000 Mexicans into California.

2. Prior to allowing this importation various governmental agencies indicated that there was a need for deevlopment of standards to prevent the recurrence of conditions which prevailed as a result of Mexicans being brought into the United States during the last World War. Accordingly a committee was established by the War Manpower Commission composed of representatives from War Manpower Commission, Department of Agriculture, Department of State, Department of Labor, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Employment Service, and others.

3. Standards thus developed were submitted through the State Department to the Mexican Government with a proposal that available Mexican workers be allowed to come into the United States for agricultural employment.

4. Before action was taken on the above request representatives of the Department of Agriculture contacted Mexican officials in Mexico City and signed an agreement containing certain definite specifications relative to the importation and use of Mexican workers. Included in this agreement were regulations governing the employment of these workers, conditions of employment, and guarantees.

5. After this agreement was completed the United States Employment Service certified to the Department of Justice that the available domestic labor supply had been exhausted and that there was need for the importation of 1,500 Mexican workers to assist in the harvesting of the sugar-beet crop in California.

6. On September 23 the United States Employment Service again certified as to the need for an additional 1,500 Mexican workers for California.

7. The first group of these workers arrived in California on September 29. The Farm Security Administration reports that all of the 3,000 workers for which certification was made have now arrived in California and are employed in the sugar-beet harvest.

The United States Employment Service early last summer recognized the possible need for additional agricultural workers in California to supplement the number available in this country. We have, as a consequence, worked diligently to recruit all men and women in this country who were available for this work. As it has become apparent that this supply would not suffice we have certified to the need for Mexican workers. While there has been less labor available than in previous years when a surplus of manpower was characteristic of the times, we have as yet encountered no evidence that would indicate that essential crops cannot be harvested if all available manpower and womanpower is used to its fullest capacity.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN J. CORSON, *Director.*

Mr. Chairman, now let us just look briefly at what this letter discloses. In response to my first inquiry Mr. Corson says, among other things, that—

> The 1943 program for use of Mexican workers will be predicated upon need, availability of workers in Mexico, and availability of funds with which to finance any necessary importation of workers.

Well, the need is great, there is no evidence that workers are not available in large numbers in Mexico and certainly Congress will grant the necessary funds. Let us have some action from the Government agencies whose job it is to handle the program.

In response to my second question Mr. Corson outlines the successive steps that were followed before the first Mexicans were imported in 1942.

First. The need for importing Mexican workers was first certified on May 15, 1942, almost 6 months after members of the California delegation first requested this type of assistance.

Second, third, and fourth. All of these preliminary steps could have been taken early in 1942 instead of letting them go until the need was acute.

Fifth. A belated certification of 1,500 workers after crops had already spoiled in some areas because of a labor shortage.

Sixth. More of the same.

Seventh. Note particularly that the first group of workers arrived on September 29, 1942—over 4 months after their need had been certified and almost 10 months after some of the California congressional delegation had gone to work on the matter. Talk about procrastination and delay—this is the sort of thing that drives the American farmer to distraction.

Mr. Chairman, we are constantly being told by supposedly well informed Government officials that there was no serious loss of food crops because of a farm labor shortage in 1942. Such statements are not supported by the facts. Following are some estimates of crop losses in California as compiled by the California Farm Bureau Federation. These figures are beyond the normal discard of unmarketable products.

Apricots, 3,000 dry tons, or 15 percent loss; peaches, 20,000 fresh tons, or 5 percent loss; tomatoes, 200,000 tons, or 25 percent loss; peas, 25 percent loss; asparagus, 3,700 acres, or 20 percent of crop; cherries, 30 percent loss; sugar beets, 7,000 to 9,000 acres lost in spring, due to lack of labor and 10 percent loss in harvest; dairy, 5 percent loss over 1941 despite attempted 10 percent increase in production—slaughter of dairy cows 46 percent above normal; vegetables, approximately 10 percent loss in both planting and harvesting; cotton, at least 20 percent loss.

Those are just a few of the losses, in one State. I wonder what the actual totals are for the entire Nation. How can anyone tell us that such losses have not had a serious effect on the supply of food commodities to our civilian population and our armed forces?

We are now entering on what may well be the most critical war year this country has ever faced. Our farmers have been asked to raise more food than they have ever produced before. What assurance can we give them that their crops will be harvested after they are planted? Do we continue to muddle our way through or can we expect some forthright and constructive action on the part of our Federal administrators?

Here's a suggested program:

First. Guarantee every farmer a price for his produce that will give him cost of production at least. Many farmers produced their crops at an absolute loss last year.

Second. Stabilize farm wages. Agriculture cannot successfully compete with war industries.

Third. Assure our farm producers that they will be able to obtain at least a minimum supply of farm machinery for planting, growing, and harvesting their crops.

Fourth. Guarantee the farmer enough rubber and gasoline to carry out his production program and in the name of common sense relieve him of the burden of filling out such a vast number of complicated forms and applications.

Fifth. Insure an adequate supply of trained and qualified workers for the canning, processing, packing, and storage plants that must handle and prepare the farmers' produce for market. What useful purpose is served in growing and harvesting crops if they are lost before they reach the final consumer because of a lack of manpower or facilities somewhere along the line?

Sixth. Give careful consideration to the following farm labor program which has been suggested by the California Farm Bureau Federation:

(a) Deferment from draft of all trained farm workers.

(b) Complete reorganization of Farm Placement Service in order to eliminate as much as possible all competition between individuals within an industry and also competition between industries for men and women.

(c) Development of a housing program that will allow for a maximum utilization of present facilities on a farm, which can be converted for essential housing, and development of a project for making movable or permanent housing of new construction type available.

(d) Development of a coordinated transportation program to enable workers to be at locations of need during periods of peak labor load.

(e) Creation of program that will keep each worker producing on a minimum of 6 days per week. Farm labor is now working less than 4 days per week per person.

(f) Creation of coordinated program for placing volunteer labor groups, such as members of the Y. M. C. A. school groups, women's volunteer groups, business and other groups.

(g) Placing the production of food necessary for war purposes on a patriotic basis, so that a desire is created within each individual to produce to his maximum ability.

(h) Definite recruitment program to obtain labor in other areas of the United States.

(i) Importation of Mexican labor, preferably those trained in and obtained from agricultural areas in Mexico.

(j) Authorization of Farm Placement Service to transport workers from other States, within the State and from Mexico.

(k) Adjustment of laws within States that forbid recruitment of labor from outside of the State in order to allow maximum utilization of all labor where needed.

We can have an increase in farm crops this year, only if the above facts are not neglected.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I was very much interested in your statement of sugar-beet production. I just came from my district and I find that they have cut the tonnage allowance to about $1.50 a ton in the Ohio area. The farmers tell me they cannot produce them for that amount, and will not plant them; so we will be short of sugar. The best figures I could find show that even with a favorable growing year we cannot expect more than 85 percent of the production of last year in essential food crops. The unofficial estimate is that a million dollars' worth of soy beans in my district was lost this year.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I would say in response to the gentleman from Ohio that I will be tremendously surprised if we are able to produce 85 percent of last year's food crops. I have mentioned the situation as it affects our own State, because I am more familiar with it. Had it not been for an equable growing season and a fine season for harvesting, our losses would have been much larger than the figures I quoted earlier in my remarks.

Mr. CLEVENGER. The county agent writes me this morning that there are 47 fertile farms without an operator. There are 15 to 35 acres on many fertile farms without production. In my mail there are three instances where the last operator has been drafted from his farm for military service.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think all of us are getting the same type of complaint from every district in the United States.

Mr. CLEVENGER. We want to win, but if we denude these farms, who is going to feed the boys over there?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. We cannot win unless we are able to feed our armed forces.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I would feed them on nightingales' tongues if that is what they want and we could get them, but I want them at least to have beans, bacon, and beef.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In addition to the facts you have given, have we not had two or three extremely favorable growing years?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. All the farmers in your district know that that cannot continue. Therefore we are facing probably an unfavorable year, which has not been taken into consideration by the Department.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Those matters certainly are not being taken into consideration by the Department, because nothing concrete has been proposed to insure us that we will have enough labor to harvest our crops.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, one of the great bottlenecks in the defense effort at this time is the efforts of a lot of these civilian agencies to do things that do not need to be done and which do not contribute to the war effort.

The other day I called attention to a magazine known as Victory. They have already printed 450,000 copies of it, according to a press release, and they are going to print 540,000 more in various languages for distribution as propaganda in foreign countries. This is a ridiculous magazine, made up almost entirely of propaganda—propaganda of a local, domestic, political character here in this country. It is something that should not be printed by any governmental agency. It is absolutely ridiculous for us to print a book weighing 13 ounces and send it across the water at a time when the boys cannot be sent their local papers or cigarettes or anything of that kind, and at a time when I have a communication here from the War Ballot Commission in New York stating that the War Department proposed that the ballots be sent in bulk to prevent divulging of any military information concerning the whereabouts of soldiers:

> This met with our hearty approval and we prepared the ballots and booklets required under the law only to be met with the refusal to ship the ballots. The excuse given us was that it would take up shipping space needed for war purposes. In our answer we called attention to the fact that these bulk shipments would be going to diversified posts and camps and the amounts of ballots shipped to any one would be small in number, with the possible exception of those in England and France.

But they would not send them. Those ballots were not anything like the 402 tons that the 2 editions of this magazine, with all its cheap political propaganda, weighed.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Do I identify the magazine as the one on the table printed in three or four colors?

Mr. TABER. I am afraid the gentleman is in error when he says three or four colors; there are a good many more than that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Whose picture appears there?

Mr. TABER. That is part of the fourth-term propaganda.

Mr. GIFFORD. Read what he promises.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has he not a message for us?

Mr. TABER—

> Liberty under God.
>
> That is what Franklin D. Roosevelt promises the United States of America to insure for the future of all mankind on the foundation of the "four freedoms" of speech, of worship, from want, and from fear. This future will be built and forever maintained.

But he says nothing whatever about giving the freedom or the right of a man to work, or the right of a man to go out and make something of himself as generations of Americans have loved to do for years and years.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is the message, the one the gentleman just read, which compensated for the cigarettes it displaced in the shipments.

Mr. TABER. I am glad there is somebody who feels that this outfit has a proper apology for existence. The gentleman feels that these neutral countries can be satisfied with propaganda. That is something I should hate to espouse.

Mr. KNUTSON. It should be very popular over in China.

Mr. TABER. Where they are getting nothing.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; well, yes.

Mr. TABER. Except bald statements.

Mr. CASE. As the gentleman was reading that statement I thought I saw a full page picture of the Vice President.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman did.

Mr. CASE. I think on the opposite side there is a message from him. Will the gentleman read that also?

Mr. TABER. I do not know; I naturally expect so. There is his picture, and this picture is in different colors from the other picture. That is one of the documents. You know this is the same outfit which last fall was going to teach some 30,000,000 pulp writers—what they are I do not know—how to write love stories, this O. W. I.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Were any copies of this magazine printed for the Mohammedans?

Mr. TABER. I do not know.

Mr. CLEVENGER. There are some 300,000,000 of them in that area.

Mr. TABER. I should not be surprised to learn that they were.

Then they put out another magazine known as Negroes and the War. This magazine is something like 50 pages in size and most of it is devoted to political propaganda and to building up certain Negroes who have taken an active part in New Deal propaganda. Six pages out of the 50 are devoted to the Negro himself and his effort in the war. This is rather a large order. I expect this individual copy of this mazagine must weigh at least 10 ounces, and I understand it is going to be given general distribution.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Is that going to be sent abroad, too, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. TABER. I do not know; I should not be surprised; at any rate, it will be distributed under penalty mail if it is distributed in this country and will tend to protect the deficit of the Post Office Department.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. This is butchering time on the American farms, the time when they butcher hogs and cattle and process them. Is there a recipe in there on how to make "globaloney"?

Mr. TABER. That has been made already.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, that has been made?

Mr. TABER. That has been made. What is the use of telling how to make it after it has been made?

There is a peculiar thing about these books that come from this organization. They issue a press release—I have it here—stating that they have printed 450,000 copies in English and that they are going to run 450,000 in different languages to send to Europe, but the next day the head of the organization comes out in the newspapers and states that they are printing only 230,000. This press release that I have here is dated February 4. So, within 2 or 3 days they are as far apart as the four winds on the number they are going to print.

I have called attention to this as one of the organizations that is providing bottlenecks. I understand they have secured a great number of deferments from the draft for these young fellows who are doing the writing for them. They have to be protected. It is such an important activity that that is necessary. I understand, though, that the War Department is not satisfied.

I have in my office a magazine known as Battle Neck, gotten out by the Bureau of Ordnance, and in that thing there is not a single article that would tend to help in any way the production of war material. A letter has been sent out by the Chief of Ordnance telling the contractors of the War Department that they ought to subscribe to that magazine.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. Many of these people have felt that they had to subscribe to the magazine, but there is absolutely nothing in it. "Battle Neck" is another "bottleneck."

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Referring back to this question involving the magazine Victory, my attention has been called today to a project that they have under way down there to publish a daily newspaper here in Washington to be sent out all over the country, another propaganda sheet. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. TABER. No; but I intend to do what I can to see that they do not get any more money for it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Whereas the War Production Board claims it has the responsibility for curtailing newsprint use to civilians, nevertheless they blandly

tell us that they have no authority to curtail the Office of War Information use or that of any other Government department.

Mr. TABER. It is about time that somebody had some authority. I think this House has the authority and I hope that the House will exercise it when it gets down to things.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman write the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures and ask him to look into this matter? I think it would get sympathetic attention.

Mr. TABER. I think that should be done. I would hope, though, that he might read the RECORD.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman has made a very interesting statement. I wish he would show, however, that the items he complains of are not in this present bill.

Mr. TABER. Oh, they are not in this bill, but general debate is not confined to this bill here. I admit that I am going outside the pale of this bill, but these things are so outstanding in their absurdity and ridiculousness that I feel the attention of the Congress ought to be called to them.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does the gentleman get my point? Will he write a letter requesting the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures to look into this matter?

Mr. TABER. Surely.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is the orderly procedure.

Mr. TABER. Surely, I will do that.

Mr. GIFFORD. Then it will get sympathetic attention, will it?

Mr. TABER. I hope so. Such things never have, but I would hope it might.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. One of my fellow Members has just called my attention to a copy of this Victory magazine. I notice on page 18 a picture of both the President and his wife at their country home estate in my district. It also includes the little dog, Falla. He is there, too. Is this to be sent abroad? Are a million copies of it to be sent abroad?

Mr. TABER. I understand it was all sent abroad. What they would do with 450,000 copies abroad I do not know, in these neutral countries especially.

Mr. FISH. Naturally I am only too glad that my district have this publicity and inasmuch as this charming picture was taken in my district, I am wondering just where these appropriations come from to send this out. I would like to report it back to my own constituents.

Mr. TABER. The appropriation was for the Office for Emergency Management, as I remember it, with an allocation to the Office of War Information. It was thought at the time that we reduced the appropriation we were going to eliminate propaganda involving things in this country and confine it entirely to suitable propaganda in connection with the war effort, not to gorgeous, high-costing documents such as this.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman means to say that the money for this propaganda comes out of the taxpayers' pockets?

Mr. TABER. Certainly it comes out of the taxpayers; so does the money for this propaganda come out of the taxpayers.

Mr. FISH. What can the Congress do to put an end to this New Deal propaganda?

Mr. TABER. The only way we can put an end to it is to refuse to give them any more money.

Mr. FISH. Can we get a vote on that later?

Mr. TABER. Not on this bill. We will get a vote later on though.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman mentioned another magazine entitled "The Negro and the War" and he specifically said, which is correct, that out of 36 pages only the last 6 pages referred to the war.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Does this propaganda also come out of the taxpayers' money?

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman know how many of these magazines are sent out to the colored people of America?

Mr. TABER. I have not the slightest idea, but I intend to find out before I get through.

Mr. FISH. This is an entirely different magazine.

Mr. TABER. This is one for circulation in this country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FISH. This is an entirely different method of propaganda. The other magazine, Victory, went abroad, but this is circulated to the colored people in America.

Mr. TABER. That is right. This is pure propaganda.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman know how many thousands or millions of these are being sent out?

Mr. TABER. I understand a very large number are being sent out, but I have no definite information as to the number.

Mr. FISH. I hope to speak tomorrow on this magazine, because I regard it as an insult to all the colored people. The very first sentence reads as follows:

> Some Negro Americans say that it makes no difference who wins the war.

To my mind, that is a reflection on the Americanism and the patriotism of all Americans of colored blood.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman and I know that the colored people of America are among the most patriotic of any group. I do not think any writer has any business to put out such a statement as that.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. May I say that the interesting colloquy between my two friends suggests the fact that the publication and the speech we are to hear tomorrow look as if we are going to have a contest as to who can do the most propagandizing of the Negro?

Mr. TABER. That may be, but it ought not to be done on false representations by a department with public money.

Mr. FISH. And it ought not to be done by any attacks on the patriotism or loyalty or Americanism of the Negro.

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. FISH. To me that is the stupidest kind of propaganda.

Mr. TABER. I am hopeful that something may be done to stop a lot of this propaganda and stop a lot of the things that are hampering and impeding the war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. May I say in furtherance of what the gentleman from New York has just said in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] that I have today introduced a resolution calling for an exhaustive inquiry into the whole question of the printing situation in this country, within the Government as well as without the Government.

### O. P. A. IS THE ROAD TO DESPOTISM

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, the people whom I have the honor to represent here are ordinary average Americans of every race and creed. They understand plain facts and simple truths. It is in their language that I want to place before the House the danger of slavery and despotism that faces America today—not from without but from within.

American boys are dying all over the world today, in every land and on every sea, in the name of freedom. But if that freedom is lost at home their sacrifice will have been in vain. They will have been betrayed by their own people, behind their backs. No tragedy could be greater for both.

We hear today a great outpouring of words and flowery phrases about freedom. But I believe this House is seeking the facts, as opposed to the delusions of grandeur associated with the setting up of milk routes in the Fiji Islands. The facts are that never in the history of America have our citizens found their daily lives so restricted by their Government as today. There are a lot of wordy excuses for these commands and edicts eliminating liberty of action. And for every restriction that is decreed, there is a soothing alibi.

The administration, through the O. P. A., is conducting a great experiment in price fixing, with the noble objective of preventing inflation. The O. P. A.

cannot prevent inflation, because rising prices are the result and not the cause of inflation. Rising prices are a brake against inflation, because they inform the people that the economic machinery is out of gear. You cannot prevent the passage of time by stopping your watch, and neither can you stop the course of inflation by fixing prices. The effect is about the same as disconnecting the speedometer on your car as you start down a steep hill. If you would watch the disconnected speedometer and not use the brakes, you would have a smash-up. Price-fixing schemes which ignore the natural economic laws will inevitably lead to a similar crack-up.

In a problem of this magnitude I would rather have my path lighted by the lamp of experience than by the clever logic of bright-witted new dealers, whose every economic experiment for 10 long years, a full decade, has been a failure. The O. P. A. is a reasonable facsimile of the former holder of the price-fixing championship of the world—the Law of the Maximum in France during the French Revolution. Let me give you a summary of that law and what happened.

First, the price of each article of necessity was fixed at one and one-third its price in 1790. Second, all freight costs were added at a fixed rate per league. Third, 5 percent was added for the profit of the wholesaler. Fourth, 10 percent was added for the profit of the retailer. Nothing could look more reasonable, and great was the jubilation in France. What happened?

The first result of the maximum was that every means was taken to evade the fixed price imposed, and the farmers brought in as little produce as they possibly could. This increased the scarcity of food, and the people of the large cities were put on an allowance. Tickets—ration cards—were issued authorizing the bearer to obtain at the official prices a certain amount of bread or sugar or soap or wood or coal to cover immediate requirements.

I could go on at length to describe the results of the law of the maximum. Let me summarize by advising you that it did not keep prices down. It imposed strict penalties, even death, but it simply resulted in the wholesale demoralization of society. Why? Because it attempted to evade and thwart the law of supply and demand.

But you say our case is different because we are at war. It was said in France that price-fixing penalties were made necessary by the war then going on. They had the same sickness, and they were given the same patent medicine.

The administration will not face this problem honestly. Double talk solves nothing. A few days ago Mr. Byrnes explained a 48-hour week order, terming it a measure to prevent inflation. Nothing could be further from the truth, indicates an editorial of the New York Times, dated February 11, 1943. The Times said, and I quote:

> And far from preventing inflation, it (the 48-hour week order) is the most inflationary single positive step that the administration has yet taken.

Confusing and tricking the American people during their hour of trial is a tragic misuse of power.

The American people are told they must now prepare for huge casualties of our youth. Their diet of blood and tears must not be paralleled by a domestic menu composed of alibis, lullabies, and hushabies. Truth and frankness are vitamins necessary to freedom.

The great disaster of France's O. P. A. was not economic, although that calamity was tragic enough. The greatest loss was the moral and spiritual chaos that resulted from these "crackpot" schemes. Speculation, black markets, gambling, and dishonesty were rampant. Corruption, greed, and cheating of all kinds resulted, and the people lost faith in the honesty of one another and of the Government as well.

Mr. Chairman, that is the history of the O. P. A. of an earlier day. Today it is apparent we are moving down that same road. I say it is time for this House, the elected guardians of the sacred liberties of the American people, to overhaul this instrument of oppression.

If price control is necessary to a limited extent, and I am sure that it is, let it be revamped immediately along the lines that worked during the First World War, with improvements based upon that experience. That is common sense.

Mr. Chairman, there is only one brand of slavery. There is not first-degree slavery or second-degree slavery—Japanese slavery or German slavery, American slavery or foreign slavery—there is just one deadly word "slavery." Our boys on the fighting fronts are eliminating the danger of slavery from without; it is up to this Congress now to eliminate it from within. Lenin said the surest way to overturn the existing basis of society was to debauch the currency. That has been going on in America now for 10 years. Under rationing and price fixing, money will not necessarily buy what you desire. Either I work for a money reward that can be used to buy the things I want, or I work with a whip over my back. Persistently freezing labor and fixing prices will lead to slave labor. No new combination of words or phrases can change this simple truth.

Mr. Chairman, the decisive battle for freedom in this generation will be won or lost in America. It will be won or lost in this Congress. It can only be won, Mr. Chairman, by a Congress that will immediately slash Government expenditures by the billions and courageously levy new taxes by the billions. If there were another road whereby we could save our honor and our liberty, I would gladly explore it, but there is none. There is no road to liberty and happiness but obedience to natural laws, including the law of supply and demand, and there is no way to secure God's blessing for America except adherence to His laws. I plead with the Members of this Congress—the last great hope of our bleeding Christian civilization—to meet this challenge courageously.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. RAMSPECK] having assumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the Independent Offices Appropriation bill, 1944, H. R. 1762, had come to no resolution thereon.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] be permitted to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein a letter from the Social Security Board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] be permitted to extend her own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter she received today from Mrs. Helena Hill Weed, daughter of the late Congressman Ebenezer I. Hill, of Norwalk, Conn., containing certain excerpts and observations relative to Susan B. Anthony, who was memorialized on this floor today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein certain tables and extracts from the hearings and a letter I received in reference to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New Haven Journal-Courier, and that he further be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address he delivered over the New Haven station, WELI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therein a letter and a brief table to which I referred as coming from the War Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on Russell H. Conwell, founder of Temple University, the one hundredth anniversary of whose birth is being celebrated in Philadelphia today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a concurrent resolution passed by the Utah State Legislature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a most timely editorial entitled "Strange Panaceas," which appeared in the Clinton Daily Item, of Clinton, Mass., on Thursday evening, February 11, and which was written by the distinguished and talented editor of that highly esteemed publication, Hon. Orra L. Stone.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER], for 10 minutes.

## LET US REMEMBER WE ARE AT WAR; AND BE MINDFUL OF WHO ARE OUR ENEMIES AND WHO ARE OUR FRIENDS

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a self-appointed attorney for and advocate of the men and boys of America, Great Britain, Russia, China, and all other of our allies, who are fighting today for our freedom.

I have been much impressed in the last few days because of my renewed recollection of the great man Abraham Lincoln, all of whose reproduced photographs indicate an intensive sadness. We need not be astonished at that, when we remember that it is probably truly said that those of his own household were divided against him. I turn to appeal for unity. One has said, and truly so, that united we stand, divided we fall.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to try to bring to our remembrance that we, the American people, with our noble allies, are yet called on to defend and protect liberty and freedom in the world, and to ask that we be impressed with the continuing enormity of our task. It makes one shudder to take account of the disruptions, disorganizations, hardships, and losses that we and our allies have been compelled to suffer on account of the meanness of two nations and the lack of stamina and character of another. Of course, I refer to Nazi Germany and Japan and to Mussolini Italy.

I am thinking of those people who would like to think of nations and peoples as societies of friends—devoted to the doctrine of the good neighbor; not grasping and selfish but liberal and fair. About the time we had begun to hope that people would regard each other as brothers, that security of feeling and helpfulness of hope were ruthlessly attacked by Germany and Japan.

Germany, through Hitler and the military caste of that country, has lost her soul. They became a force of nature and also the superachievement of man, the hero. Under nazi-ism to them there is no longer God. They are wild and fearless—fearless after a fashion; ruthless and cruel, grasping and unkind, covetous and mean. So must and surely will be anyone whose God is not the Lord.

God is love and apart from God there is no love. Where love does not abound, hate will abound.

Listen to Hitler:

> For liberation something more is necessary than an economic policy, something more than industry; if a people is to become free, it needs power, it needs pride and will power, defiance, hate, hate, and once again I say hate.

Over against this we find:

> If the truth shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.

For God and righteousness and truth the German volk has been substituted. The German volk is bound by no law. It does not even like the truth. It is force, self-egotistical superiority, hate for everything it is not pleased to call German; yea, German nazi-ism. Hitler boasted that he was, in his youth, a bad little boy. To him the woods, the meadows, and the fields were battlefields where the ever-present conflicts were fought out. Along with the doctrine of man, the hero, force and hate had come. A long time ago the Kaiser had said "Me und Got"; Hitler came to say, "Not God but me. I am your fuehrer, your leader. I am worthy; I am that I am." Hitler abandoned all concept of right. It matters not to him whether even the sons of German people live or die, except as their living and fighting may contribute the more to the realization of his unholy ambitions; not the least of which is to kill and destroy.

In this unholy manner of life, however, he cannot be alone. The Nazi military and military-minded castes of Germany must surely furnish him a deal of support, making possible the ruthless conduct of wars he has carried on against those who had never indicated a gesture other than of general good will toward Germany and all other nations.

The Nazi program is one of world possession, without regard to right. Deification of the mind, force, ruthlessness, and hate have been substituted for all else. These became plans and processes and sole means by which an unjust end was to be attained. And thus we have Germany waging undeclared wars and wars declared without reason or right. A veritable campaign of death and destruction, subjugation and starvation. In this campaign another nation took partnership and stealthily began active participation in this murder by attacking the United States while their deceitful overtures of peaceful understandings were being considered. In this act there was brought to light, or, better said, perhaps, again brought to light the hypocrisy, the treachery, and the meanness of that nation. I have long wondered how long the good people of Germany and Japan, if any, will continue to allow their sons to die upon battlefields to satisfy the thirst for blood and unholy conquest of Hitler and his militaristic gangs and those of Japan in like manner disposed and without any concept of justice or mercy or truth. Italy has joined them. Probably through a lack of manhood than otherwise. Mussolini must be regarded as in truth a puppet of Germany and even now of Japan.

It has been apparent and continues so that these powers, especially Germany and Japan, set about to divide and conquer, possess and enslave the rest of the world.

This they have proposed to do by resort to trickery, untruth, deception of all kinds, and by resort to destruction of the peoples of other countries, including, if you please, definitely the United States of America.

The only mistaken prediction I have made is that this war of conquest would have ere now reached our own shores with a fury and effect that would have alairmed us by now in its proportions. Our allies, Great Britain, China, and Russia, have prevented this, aided by the material help we have been wise enough to give them.

The war is not, however, over. We shall win, but the solemn and serious question remains: How long will it be?

How many of our sons shall we have to lose before it is won and won, as it must be, in unconditional surrender of those countries which have constituted themselves and remain our awful enemies?

I am making a plea for unity at home. Every division among us results in the loss of lives; the lives of our own men and boys, and the lives of our noble allies who are fighting with such bravery and determination to beat back the hounds of hell, who, themselves, have lost their souls and devote themselves to hate and unholy aims and the murdering of all who, loving liberty and freedom, must oppose them.

There is too much carping; too much disunity; too much complaining; too much of intensifying of the relatively minor things and too little realization of the most important—the early winning of this war that involves everything to us and to the world.

I make mention of my opposition to the Dies committee. I have nothing personally against the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. I do not know him except as one may know another

by observation of his speech and conduct. My intense opposition to his activities has been solely my firm conviction that all he has done, as chairman of the Dies committee, has been to interfere with our fight against Hitler and Japan, which means our fight for country and home. The publicity of complaint offered and indulged in against men in departments of our Government on account of his accusations against them of having been connected with, or being connected with, what he so often calls Communist fronts, positions sometimes well taken and more often resulting in accusations against loyal citizens, has tended to divide. I would have been glad had he devoted some of his time and spent some of the people's money in investigating Nazi spies and spies of Japanese enemies.

I have not been always pleased with activities of departments of the Government, or with what is so often referred to as bureaus, but I have suffered more in apprehension for the welfare of our fighting men and boys from the disposition of men to be dissatisfied with everything and satisfied with nothing, than I have on account of any mistakes made by those who were, perhaps, trying to do the best they could in hard circumstances.

I have admiration and a feeling of the deepest gratitude for our allies; the British people, Russia, China, the Fighting French, and those who have turned and those who, I knew, would turn themselves to battle for the freedom and rights of men; and as well every country and every people who have joined us by actual war and by announcement and preparation in this battle for freedom and the right. How can we do or allow anything that would tend to divide men engaged in such a noble enterprise?

Would we, for the sake of personal or political advantage, engage in a course or do things that tend to interfere with our war effort or program? I warn you that to do so will react and the boys and men who do come home will call you to account.

Let us think of the men and the boys of our own and, yes, of every one of our allies who are baring their breasts to enemy bullets, not knowing whether they shall live or die, but willingly doing this that men may be free and free as the truth makes us free.

Is Secretary Knox right when he says:

> History is repeating itself. The present administration has been subjected to the same familiar charges of 80 years ago. Partisan advantage still seeks to obstruct the larger purposes and critics still clamor that, because of the exactions of war, the common man will be deprived of liberty.

Am I more anxious about my returning to Washington from the 1944 election than I am for the well-being of our men in arms? Let each of us put first things first, and let our daily inquiry of ourselves be, What is good for our fighting men and our cause?

How can I best contribute to the great task before us? I would not advocate inattention to any of the needs of our people; I would not counsel supineness in the acceptance always of things as they are. If we may, as Congressmen, study to show ourselves approved in our own work and at the same time, by patient consideration, point out to others needs to be considered, all right. But let us not give our time to carping criticisms of others, as a habit, lest, perchance, we should fail in the duty assigned to us.

I invite suggestions as to my own course, and these are often, if not always, helpful; but I have never received any aid from a chronic complainer.

This is a time for cooperation, not division. Our cause is a common one; it is just. Let us, each of us, whatever our situation or position may be, do our full part to the end that men may be free, that our victory may be complete, and that this complete victory may come on the earliest possible day, with the least loss of life that can be. I am not willing to do or to neglect anything that may cause the loss of one mother's son.

I know it is only necessary that we be reminded of the solemnity of our tasks and the import of that in which we are engaged.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order heretofore adopted, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 16, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, February 17, 1943, for consideration of unfinished business.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

173. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed general provision for the Office for Emergency Management and drafts of proposed provisions for the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and the Office of Defense Transportation, constituent agencies thereof (H. Doc. No. 104); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

174. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1943 and 1944 in the amount of $525,000 (H. Doc. No. 105); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

175. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1943, to remain available until December 31, 1943, in the amount of $65,075,000 (H. Doc. No. 106); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

176. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of the legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John in Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

177. A letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting the fourth report upon the operations of the Chairman of the War Production Board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

178. A letter from the secretary-treasurer, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting a report of the operations of Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission for the period of its existence from June 5, 1942, to the present date; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

179. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations of the War Department (H. Doc. No. 107); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

180. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1943, for the Navy Department and naval service, amounting to $250,000,000 contract authorization (H. Doc. No. 108); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

181. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, Government Printing Office, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $3,269,430 (H. Doc. No. 109); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

182. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $337,000 (H. Doc. No. 110); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1671. A bill to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Small Business. House Resolution 18. Resolution dealing with wartime problems of southern industry; without amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 926) for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Ford, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1818. A bill to amend section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act to provide for the deduction of certain credits from assessments due the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by certain insured banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 1819. A bill to extend certain provisions of law relating to overtime compen-

sation to employees in the Library of Congress; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1820. A bill to provide for the advancement in rank of certain commissioned officers of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey:

H. R. 1821. A bill to suspend the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission under section 14 (a) and section 14 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act to issue rules relating to the solicitation of proxies, consents, and authorizations during the period of war emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 1822. A bill to amend title II of the act entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve," approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1175), in order to give credit for active duty performed by enlisted men subsequent to transfer to the Fleet Reserve, in computing their retainer or retired pay; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 1823. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1824 (by request). A bill to establish more equitable procedure governing the determination of service connection of diseases or injuries alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service in the present global war, campaign, or expedition; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1825 (by request). A bill to amend Public Law No. 242 of the Sixty-eighth Congress as amended so as to extend monetary benefits to veterans of the present global war and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1826 (by request). A bill to provide for presumption of soundness at enlistment after 6 months' active service in the armed forces during the present global war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1827 (by request). A bill to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die while in the armed forces of the United States during the present global war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1828 (by request). A bill to grant burial allowances in cases of certain deceased veterans of the Regular Establishment who served in a recognized campaign, expedition, insurrection, or occupation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1829 (by request). A bill to provide dental service for veterans of the present global war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1830 (by request). A bill to authorize payment of compensation or pension for partial service-connected disability, plus such percentage of the amount of pension payable for his permanent total disability, nonservice connected, as is equal to the difference between 100 percent and the degree of his service-connected disability; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1831. A bill providing for a delegate to the United States Congress from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARD:

H. R. 1832. A bill granting to post offices of the third class an allowance for additional clerk hire during the period of annual and sick leave of the postmaster; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 1857. A bill to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT:

H. Res. 113. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate problems relating to production of war essential, critical, and strategic minerals and metals; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. Res. 114. Resolution to create a special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. Res. 115. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation with respect to plans contemplated for the curtailment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. Res. 116. Resolution providing an allocation from the contingent fund of the House to the Committee on Appropriations for the expenses of studies and examinations under House Resolution 69; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 117. Resolution suggesting the need for developing a plan for furnishing food and supplies to the stricken and hungry peoples of Belgium and other countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 118. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 801, a bill to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEWEY:

H. R. 1833. A bill to provide for the reappointment of Maj. Harry A. Musham, retired, to the active list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 1834. A bill for the relief of M. F. Diller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 1835. A bill for the relief of Frederick Lee Littlefield; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Henry Tschudy and family; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1837. A bill for the relief of Manuel G. Souza and Manuel Souza, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1838. A bill for the relief of Lucia Humble; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1839. A bill for the relief of Ruth E. Studley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1840. A bill to amend the military record of Walter Gordon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1841. A bill granting an increase of pension to Clare D. Fielding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1842. A bill for the relief of certain trial examiners of the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 1843. A bill granting a pension to Ella Noe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHILBIN.

H. R. 1844. A bill granting a pension to Katherine R. Salmon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 1845. A bill for the relief of the estate of Ted Vaughn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 1846. A bill for the relief of Frank Franklin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 1847. A bill for the relief of Richard Zielinski and his parents; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 1848. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Vaclav Rasin; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1849. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Alex Ranieri against the United States for the amount of such actual losses, damages, or compensation as shall appear to be due him; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1850. A bill for the relief of Soterios G. Stamoulis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1851. A bill for the relief of Kresimir Matijevic; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1852. A bill for the relief of Rozalja Golba (nee Piotrowska), alias Joanne Piotrowska; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1853. A bill for the relief of John Boska; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Ethel Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1855. A bill for the relief of Alois Hlad; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1856. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Pasko and Ksavery Frances Pasko (nee Fyalowna); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

118. By Mr. BURDICK: Senate Concurrent Resolution F of the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly, State of North Dakota, Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

119. By Mr. BURGIN: Joint resolution of the North Carolina General Assembly, urging the Federal authorities to apply price ceilings to the flue-cured tobacco crop by a method which will not destroy the auction system of selling tobacco; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

120. By Mr. CARTER: Resolution No. 12403 of the Oakland City Council, Oakland, Calif., requesting the Federal Government to adopt regulations to insure the immediate distribution of meat for civilian use within the limits of the quota fixed by the Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

121. Also, senate joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California, urging the enactment of House bill 7667, by Representatives LEA and WELCH, providing that all Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge pay tolls for the duration of the present emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

122. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Senate Joint Resolution No. 7 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

123. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

124. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 27 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

125. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

126. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 24 of the State Legislature of California; to

the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

127. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 23 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

128. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 22 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

129. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 20 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

130. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 14 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

131. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

132. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 12 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

133. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of Theodore Dague, James F. Halberstadt, Ben McCullough, B. P. Johnson, Nevin Miller, and 100 other citizens of Adams County, Ind., representing the United States Constitutional League, urging Congress to retrieve all powers which have been unconstitutionally assumed by the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

134. Also, memorial of E. A. Nuttle, J. H. Kieler, and 200 other citizens of Allen County, Ind., representing the United States Constitutional League, urging Congress to retrieve all powers which have been unconstitutionally assumed by the executive branch of the Government, to the end that we may again resume government of the people, by the people, and for the people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

135. By Mr. HALE: Two petitions of the United States Savings and Loan League, in behalf of its nearly 4,000 member savings and loan associations located in all parts of the country, tendering its assistance and cooperation to facilitate a more speedy liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, thereby accomplishing the purposes of its original creation, and reducing further the nonessential expenditures of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

136. By Mr. HOCH: Petition of the Berks County Cooperative Association, Pennsylvania, repudiating the so-called farm bloc as spokesman for farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

137. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of Harold Addis and 26 other farmers of Rockford, Mich., and vicinity for the elimination of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency program as an unnecessary waste of public funds and a hindrance to the production of adequate food supply for our armed forces, the Allies, and our own Nation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

138. By Mr. TOWE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, urging and petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to preserve and safeguard the shad fishing industry in the Hudson River; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be Thou, O Lord God of hosts, at the beginning of another day we ask Thy gracious guidance. We trust that we shall not begrudge our best even in the humblest tasks, responding in sympathy to all opportunities for service. We pray Thee to set our minds on worthy objects, keeping them filled with pure thoughts, and be in us the power that makes for righteousness.

Heavenly Father, gather within the folds of Thyself the business, the life, and the very soul of our Nation; thrust from it every hindering thing, distrust and greed, and let Thy mercy be upon us as our trust is in Thee. We pray that our temporal prosperity may be measured by our spiritual vision, standing on those great substantial verities which will carry us through all dangers. It is thus that summer comes to the roots of the soul and makes it bud to a noble opening, given fruitage by the river of life, rich with the promise of an abundant harvest. Oh, let Thy blessed presence disturb us with the joy of elevated thoughts and with a sense of Thy sublimity; then will the light of the rising sun show forth the glory of a morn in a world where all is changing, but God; and Thine shall be the praise, through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1446. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 12. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war;

S. 52. An act for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Charles F. Kegel;

S. 171. An act for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke;

S. 173. An act for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann;

S. 176. An act for the relief af Austin L. Tierney;

S. 184. An act to provide for the presentation of silver medals to certain members of the Peary Polar Expedition of 1908–1909;

S. 219. An act to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers;

S. 221. An act to amend sections 1 and 2 of chapter XIX of the Army Appropriation Act approved July 9, 1918, relating to protection of life and property in waters endangered by activities of the Army;

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 223. An act to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior;

S. 224. An act to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased;

S. 301. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for rights-of-way over, across, in, and upon naval reservations;

S. 303. An act to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States;

S. 304. An act for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps;

S. 305. An act for the relief of Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps;

S. 306. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as a result of the disaster at the East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941;

S. 319. An act to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes;

S. 381. An act to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war;

S. 393. An act for the relief of William Kovatis;

S. 404. An act for the relief of Richard Barker;

S. 405. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ernestine Fuselier Sigler;

S. 408. An act to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute an additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes;

S. 418. An act for the relief of Howard M. Sandus;

S. 427. An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty;

S. 493. An act for the relief of Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez;

S. 495. An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States;

S. 517. An act for the relief of Vodie Jackson;

S. 518. An act for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom Turpin;

S. 621. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the City of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California; and

S. 641. An act to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers.

### JAMES F. SCANLON

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, today is an anniversary to which I would like to call the attention of the House. The Honorable Swagar Shirley, who was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, 25 years ago today brought to Washington Jim Scanlon. Mr. Scanlon from that date to this has been a devoted employee serving with the Appropriations Committee. He has been highly intelligent, ever loyal and faithful. He has a personality which has brought sunshine into the work of that committee every day he has been there. He makes friends easily, and he keeps them indefinitely.

I am sure that I speak for everyone from my home city, Louisville, Ky., as well as the membership of this House in

wishing him long life and healthful and happy service with his committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I also join with my distinguished friend from Kentucky in everything he has said, and suggest just one outstanding quality in addition to that fine personality and that wholesome character; that is, his intense loyalty. In my opinion, that is one of the most important elements that any human being can possess in the journey through life, loyalty to friendship and loyalty to principle.

Mr. O'NEAL. I appreciate that, and Jim Scanlon has that to a marked degree.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, when I first became a member of the Appropriations Committee 20 years ago, James Scanlon was there. He was a Democrat and I was a young Republican just coming into the House. I can never forget his unfailing courtesy and kindnesses to me during all the time I have been a member of that committee. He has been loyal to the committee. It is his first thought; it is his first effort to try to make the work of the Appropriations Committee fine and clean.

I wish to join in paying my tribute to Jim Scanlon, to the work that he has done in 25 years of real service to the Appropriations Committee, to the House, and to the Nation. Jim's work is in charge of the administrative end of the office, and he does not come in contact with us so much on the floor, but with the Members who have occasion to go into the office, he is the man we most frequently see. We really appreciate the kind of service that he is giving.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1918, was a red-letter day for the Committee on Appropriations. On that day, just 25 years ago this morning, James F. Scanlon, of Kentucky, was enrolled as a member of the staff of the committee and has served with singular fidelity and ability in that capacity from that day to this.

He is serving today as assistant clerk to the committee, and in all the years I have been connected with the committee I have never heard a criticism of him or his work. I wish I could say as much of my own service.

For 25 years he has been not only an assistant but a personal and appreciated friend to every member of the committee. And after 25 years he is still the youngest member of the staff—young in spirit and in enthusiasm for his work and his friends.

I am certain I voice the heartfelt sentiments of every member of the committee, if not of the entire House, in congratulating him on his quarter of a century of eminent and devoted service to the committee and the country and in wishing for him another quarter of a century of equally eminent and effective service in the same capacity.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I have not served on the Appropriations Committee as long as the gentlemen who have just addressed the House, but I have served there long enough to be fully appreciative of the very fine and efficient service which has been for these 25 years rendered to the committee and to the Congress and the country by Uncle Jim Scanlon, of Kentucky.

I want to add this to the thoughts that have been expressed: Mr. Scanlon attends to the preparation of committee hearings for the Public Printer, and in connection with his work in this capacity he frequently calls to the attention of subcommittees the inclusion of unnecessary data by departmental witnesses and voluminous statements intended to support their claims for desired items of appropriation, which often comprise many unnecessary pages and which, if they were permitted to go into the hearings, would cost the Government a great deal of money to print, and, as a result, unnecessary volume is eliminated. In this respect and in the suggestions that because of his experience he has been able to make to subcommittees regarding items of appropriation, "Uncle Jim" Scanlon has, during the 8 years I have served on this committee, saved the Government, in my judgment, many thousands of dollars, perhaps a great deal more than the salary which has been paid him. I want to join in the tribute which has been rendered by my colleagues to his efficiency, and to express the hope that he may be spared to continue his useful service for a great many years.

He has the love and respect of all of those with whom he has been associated in his years of service.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I just cannot let this opportunity pass without expressing my appreciation of the very valuable assistance and cooperation rendered to new members of the Appropriations Committee by this man Scanlon who has so ably served on this committee's secretarial staff for 25 years.

All that has been said of him and with respect to him by those who preceded me is true; he merits more. He is one of the most efficient and valuable members of the clerk's organization of and for the Appropriations Committee, and although his work is not publicized, it is genuinely appreciated by those who realize what he does. May the celebration of his twenty-fifth anniversary of usefulness be only the beginning of anniversaries for him. If you count Jim Scanlon your friend you are rich.

### 1942 INCOME TAXES

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a word in behalf of the millions of loyal, patriotic taxpayers who had not filed their income-tax returns by February 1.

I commend the efforts of Secretary Morgenthau, Senator GEORGE, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], in their radio appeal of last evening asking the taxpayers to file their income-tax returns at once. I do not criticize the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for his testimony on February 2 before the Ways and Means Committee, emphasizing the small percentage of people who have paid their income tax as of January 29 of this year, as compared to previous years.

To correct a general impression, widely publicized in the press, that the taxpayers are apparently withholding filing returns and paying first installments of 1942 taxes, because of their belief that a pay-as-you-go plan will be enacted shortly, it is my opinion that this delay has been due in part to inability of taxpayers to secure the necessary forms on which to make returns. In substantiation, one of my constituents, a businessman in Chicago, under date of February 12 wrote me as follows:

> In fact, they were—
>
> The income-tax blanks—
>
> in a printing plant in this county and had not even been shipped when our office repeatedly called the Internal Revenue office in Chicago, and it has only been this last week that we were able to obtain copies of form 1040.

In fact, the envelope in which I received my own form was postmarked January 23, 1943.

I call this to the attention of the Members of this House, because I think it is only fair that you know that the Treasury Department is to some extent responsible for the slowness of income-tax returns.

All the blame should not be put upon the taxpayers.

### THE LATE HONORABLE DONALD C. DOBBINS

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform you of the death of a former highly distinguished Member of

this body, Donald C. Dobbins, a resident of Champaign, Ill., who represented the Nineteenth District of Illinois in the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses.

Donald C. Dobbins was born in Champaign, Ill., March 20, 1878, educated at the University of Illinois and George Washington University, of Washington, D. C., and departed this life yesterday, February 14.

He was a practicing attorney in his home city of Champaign, Ill., at the time of his election to Congress and he retired from Congress to again take up the practice of law upon the death of his brother, who was a senior partner in the law firm of Dobbins & Dobbins.

Mr. Dobbins was a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, where his ability made him a valuable member. He was a fine lawyer and a valuable Member of Congress.

His sterling qualities and outstanding ability won for him the esteem and respect of all with whom he came in contact. His life was marked by many worthy achievements and his name will long be remembered as that of one who was always willing to take an active part in every worthy cause in which his community was interested.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Members on this side of the aisle join the Illinois delegation in mourning the passing of our distinguished friend and former colleague, Donald Dobbins.

I have never served with a finer character in all my years in this House, a man who seemed to be imbued with higher ideals or one who had a more conscientious regard for the feelings of his fellow members than Donald Dobbins of Illinois.

All I can say of him is that Illinois has lost one of her most distinguished sons, the Members of this House have lost a valued and cherished friend.

I would say of him what William Cullen Bryant has so eloquently said:

Thou'rt gone, the abyss of heaven
Hath swallowed up thy form; yet on my heart
Deeply hath sunk the lesson thou hast given
And shall not soon depart.
He who, from zone to zone,
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will lead my steps aright.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to correct a misunderstanding which has grown out of my remarks of last Wednesday when the Dies resolution was before this body.

In those remarks, I spoke of the Home Rule Advocates or Young Ireland group as they were called, who around 1848 banded together for the purpose of giving Ireland her independence. On one occasion eight of the leaders of that group were arrested by the English, tried for treason and sentenced to death. The multitude of protests from all over the world caused Queen Victoria to change the sentence to banishment to Australia. About 24 years later that same Queen found her Australian Prime Minister to be one Sir Charles Duffy—the same Charles Duffy she had banished. This so startled her that she had the history of the other seven traced only to find that all of them had attained eminence and respect in both political and social life. I related that story in attempting to illustrate, as I said, that time often shows the true character of men in a different and more favorable light than it would appear at the moment.

I have been given to understand that a certain organization has construed those remarks as comparing that young Ireland group to Communists.

I want to say that not only was that not my intention but it is not my conviction. The Irish Home Rule Advocates of 1848 were young nationalists who wished to see Ireland given her independence and while their methods were not always free of violence it must be remembered that force begets force. They asked only independence and freedom for Ireland. Communists and the philosophy they espouse are poles apart from the philosophy of those Irish nationalists. Russia is now an ally of ours and sufficient is for me to say that as much as I admire the truly great stand they have made against the greatest military machine up to now seen, nevertheless, I abhore the thing communism stands for—to me it is an odious and an alien philosophy. Those being my views I do not think I should be censured for something I do not hold.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

THE MAGAZINE VICTORY

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include excerpts from a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week attention of the membership of the Senate and the House of Representatives was called to volume 1, No. 1, of the magazine Victory prepared by the Office of War Information for foreign distribution.

In reply to a telephone request to Mr. Armitage Watkins of the Office of War Information for a copy of the magazine, Mr. Watkins stated that although he was reluctant to distribute any copies domestically one copy would be sent to my office. I am happy to say that it was received this morning with a letter of enclosure from Mr. Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information.

I can say that as a magazine it is a beautiful piece of workmanship, turned out on a fine grade of glazed paper, and resplendant with beautiful examples of photographic work, color plate and printing. So far I have been unable to discover any information in its contents that could not be given to the American people, but in his letter of enclosure Mr. Davis makes this request:

I must ask that, in view of the fact that the entire distribution is foreign, you treat it as a confidential document.

I will, of course, be glad to comply with the request and keep the copy in my office.

It is my understanding that the magazine has, and will be, distributed to our troops abroad as well as to the population of foreign countries as soon as some 540,000 copies of foreign language prints can be run.

The foreign propaganda value of the publication remains to be seen, and althought our boys in service abroad will welcome it as something from home to read, I am inclined to believe they would prefer letters from home that could be shipped in the space required for 990,000 copies of this super deluxe edition of Victory.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BALDWIN of New York addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two places and to include certain material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]?

There was no objection.

MRS. ALYCE W. SINNOTT

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 100, which provides for the payment of funeral expenses and a year's salary to the wife of our deceased Doorkeeper and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Alyce W. Sinnott, widow of Joseph J. Sinnott, late Doorkeeper of the House, an amount equal to 1 year's salary compensation, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 to defray funeral expenses of the said Joseph J. Sinnott.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD twice, one of them on the subject Get Rid of the Japs, and to include therein a letter and a resolution from the Native Sons of the Golden West, the other one on the subject of power companies, and in which I ask to insert an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a simplified method of computing overtime in the Postal Service, compiled by Albert F. Waite, of Sioux City, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 15, 1943.*

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
*The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith submit my resignation from the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.

Very truly yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

CONGRESS ASSERTS ITS RIGHTS—USES ITS POWER OF THE PURSE—SAVES $100,000,000 FOR THE TAXPAYERS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House, through its Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, has asserted itself in no uncertain terms.

Mr. Byrnes said the other night that the farmer must expand output in the face of apparent inadequate supplies of fertilizer, lack of material for, and inadequate replacements of equipment and inadequate manpower, due to the draft and employment elsewhere.

It cannot be done as proposed. As an attempted cure-all, Mr. Wickard has offered the farmers $100,000,000 to do the impossible. It is a subsidy, pure, simple, and unadulterated. Calling it anything else does not make it smell any sweeter to the farmers and farm organizations, all of which are opposed to it.

Money cannot be used as fertilizer, nor to cultivate crops, nor to employ a nonexistent manpower, even if he had the right to make the offer, which he did not have.

This is not the way out. The proposal involved payment to each farmer on the basis of the amount which the farmer exceeds 90 percent for certain crops up to 110 percent of the goal. That would put a premium on the failure of the slacker to produce and insult the overwhelming might of those farmers who have already gone and done all in their power. Moreover, the proposal is unauthorized and in direct contravention and flagrant defiance of the first supplemental defense appropriation for 1942, wherein Congress specifically went on record as against subsidy payments of this very type.

The committee is entitled to the wholehearted support of the Members of Congress, and, for saving $100,000,000 of the taxpayers' money, the people ought to signify their approval.

And this is just the beginning. The sun of the day of executive directives, unauthorized by law and in direct contravention of the intent of Congress, has set.

There is a way out, and a lawful method of procedure, and Congress has shown the way.

Subsidization of one group and discrimination against another group of farmers will not produce more food.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS]?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that debate continue throughout the day, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and myself, and that at the conclusion of the debate today the first paragraph of the bill be read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1762, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

A DECADE OF T. V. A.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, there has been a good deal of criticism in this House lately, criticism of what we call bureaucracy. I believe we are justified in our impatience with the red tape and delay which seem to be characteristic of the operations of some agencies of the executive branch of the Government, and especially with their lack of understanding of the problems faced by the citizens who are our constituents and with whom they deal. But I think we ought to be just as prompt to commend an agency when it does a good job, when it carries out the program Congress directed it to do efficiently and responsibly, and when it has earned and enjoys the confidence of an overwhelming majority of the citizens in the area in which it operates.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is such an agency. In my judgment its record for performance is unequaled. It has kept faith with Congress and with the people. It has given us a heartwarming demonstration of how a Federal program can be administered at the grass roots, strengthening local institutions instead of destroying them, increasing the confidence of the people in their Government instead of undermining the faith of the average man. And bad administration of government does just that.

The management of T. V. A. deserves great praise for the way it has carried out its work. But the Congress deserves credit, too, for the vision it displayed when it created the statute under which such extraordinary results have been achieved. It could not have been done if governmental traditions in organization had been accepted as the final word by Congress, or if conventional methods, weak from obsolescence, had been employed by the Authority itself. We ought to know more about the relation of the kind of statutes we enact to the administrative methods employed to enforce them. For Congress cannot wholly escape responsibility when administration of the laws we make goes wrong. Perhaps there are pitfalls in the very statutes. Perhaps the laws we make invite red tape and delay. We censure the directives of swivel-chair bureaucrats because they fail to understand the conditions of every town from Oregon to Maine. And in the same breath we say "aye" to roll calls that pile up more responsibilities here in Washington, that mean more sweeping regulations, more orders issued from the National Capital. We lose our tempers and our sense when things go wrong, and try to right them by interference in the details of management and administration. I admit the provocation and I share the irritation, but in my judgment, that is not the way to work out the appropriate relationship between the legislative and executive branches of

this Government. It is not the road to achievement in peace. It is the road to chaos in war.

I think we might learn more if we paid less attention to the failures and mistakes of Government bureaus and departments and more to the successes we encounter. Perhaps in that way we might find some remedy for the difficulties that plague us.

I am no expert in public administration. I have had no vast experience in the selection and training or supervision of personnel. I have never managed a billion-dollar enterprise. But I know a good job when I see it. I can measure results. And 9 years' close association with this one Federal agency has convinced me that its record could not have been achieved without good management. It takes good men using good methods to do a good job. In the history of the T. V. A. I think this Congress may find some guide to a solution of the problem we must solve—a solution we cannot postpone much longer. We have got to find out swiftly how a central government of this size can be run efficiently, what kind of statutes will encourage decent administration, will increase the loyalty, and not arouse the ire of individual citizens. We have got to determine how we can carry out the decisions of the National Congress without smothering all signs of vigorous local self-government. We found a formula when we created T. V. A., but almost none of us appreciates the remarkable job we did.

HOW THE T. V. A. STATUTE DEFINES THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CONGRESS AND THE AUTHORITY

Remember, the Congress invented a special type of organization in the T. V. A. Act. We created an independent regional agency. We sent it away from Washington. We set up broad policies to govern its acts, but we gave the Authority flexibility to make its own decisions with respect to detail. In the basic act the major purposes of the legislation were carefully set forth. The Congress declared that the Tennessee River should be transformed into a navigable waterway from its mouth near Paducah, Ky., 650 miles to Knoxville, Tenn. We provided that the dams to be constructed on the Tennessee and on its tributaries should be designed and operated not only to create the navigation channel but also to provide storage for the control of floods for the protection of people living in the valleys of the Tennessee and Mississippi Rivers. We directed that those dams should be used to develop the maximum amount of power consistent with their use for navigation and flood control. We did not even leave it to the administrators of this act to determine the basic policy considerations that were to govern in the distribution and sale of the electric energy generated at these projects. We legislated on that subject by making it clear that the Authority was not to dispose of this Government power by sale to the existing electric-utility monopolies, but was to distribute it on as wide a basis as possible throughout the area of its operations at the most reasonable rates consistent with making the power investment self-liquidating.

I mention these matters because it is important to note that in creating this agency we did not delegate legislative power as we sometimes accuse ourselves of doing. We rightly reserved the control of general policy to ourselves. And that control has been exercised on repeated occasions when the Congress has seen fit to amend the basic law either for the purpose of clarifying questions upon which the original intent was doubtful or for the purpose of enunciating new policies as conditions changed and the project developed. Not only were we careful to retain the exercise of legislative function in the Congress but we made sure that this agency should remain accountable to the Congress and the public for the manner in which it carried out the legislative policies. To that end we provided that the books, records, and accounts should be be subjected to a continuous audit in the field by the representatives of the Comptroller General, and we charged the Comptroller General with the responsibility for reporting directly to the Congress any irregularities that he might find in the operations of the Authority. In addition, in 1935 we specifically required the Authority to submit to us a comprehensive engineering report setting out in some detail the way in which it proposed to carry out the legislative policy for the development of the river system in order that we might have the opportunity of reviewing those plans. Finally, we have required this agency to appear before the Appropriations Committees of each House annually to justify in detail its expenditures during the preceding fiscal year and to explain its proposed program for the next fiscal year. By these devices we have kept within our own control the major policy decisions affecting the program of this agency.

Yet at the same time the Congress was sufficiently far-sighted, in setting up the administrative framework for this organization, to take into consideration the nature of its work and to give to it many of the attributes of flexibility, initiative, and responsibility characteristic of our better organized business enterprises. That this was done deliberately is shown by the report of the conference committee on the original Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, which makes it clear that it was the considered intention of Congress to make it possible for this agency to conduct the highly complex electric-power business according to the best business methods. The provisions of the statute vested in the management of T. V. A. sufficient authority and sufficient discretion to deal with the day-to-day problems that arise in the conduct of any business and to make promptly those decisions upon which the success or failure of such an enterprise so often depend. We worked out and expressed a relationship specially suited to the task we gave the Authority to do. We gave T. V. A. the whole job to do, and made it alone accountable to us and to the people. We did not divide responsibility for the development of this river among a dozen agencies. We did not split authority into pieces, then prayerfully sit back and hope that a coordinating committee of supermen would iron out inevitable disputes of jurisdiction.

WHAT T. V. A. HAS DONE IN LESS THAN 10 YEARS

Let us stop and see how that system has worked. What are the results achieved after 9 years' operation under this statute? Ten multipurpose dams have been built by T. V. A. since 1933, and six are under construction at war tempo today. A giant plant to produce electricity by steam has been erected. Munitions plants have been built and other lesser projects undertaken.

This is the biggest engineering project in the history of the world. This Government has done it directly. There have been no outrageous profits, no startling bonuses, no rackets or kickbacks on this job. Forty thousand men and women were employed at the peak of construction activities last September. Yet there never has been a strike against the management nor an interruption of war work by a single day. Material worth millions of dollars has been purchased all over the United States, and there has never been a hint of scandal in procurement. More than $600,000,000 had been disbursed through the end of the past fiscal year and every penny has been accounted for. Not a single T. V. A. employee has been charged with corruption. They have mobilized a river and a valley for war, and in record time, down there. Look at what has happened in 9 years. Let me summarize the record.

THE T. V. A. POWER SYSTEM TODAY—T. V. A. POWER IN WAR

The Authority now has under construction the second largest power system in the country. Its installed capacity is approximately 1,500,000 kilowatts, of which more than 950,000 kilowatts represents T. V. A. construction since 1933. The balance comes from Wilson Dam, which the Authority inherited, and from structures which have been acquired by purchase. In the fiscal year 1944 T. V. A. expects to produce more than 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power. This electric power spells war power in our fight for freedom and security. Let me translate this for you. For years this area has produced most of our aluminum and here we have the world's largest aluminum plant. In this area we have the largest chemical-warfare arsenal in the world. We have munitions plants, explosive plants, foundries, and factories turning out the equipment of battle. That power will produce aluminum for ships and planes; chemicals for explosives; bombers whose wings will cast shadows of disaster over Axis countries; smoke screens to protect our ships in battle; incendiaries to consume the war industries of our foes. All these things will come from the power created in the Tennessee Valley.

T. V. A. POWER IN PEACE

In addition to 9 large war industries served directly by the Authority, approximately 450,000 customers receive T. V. A. power through the distribution

systems of 83 municipalities and 45 cooperatives. You can realize what T. V. A. has accomplished when you remember that in 1933 there were no electricity cooperatives and only a few scattered municipal systems in that area. The farmers did not have electricity in the South because the private power companies thought they could not pay the the bills. Now electric power replaces human energy on our farms. These kilowatt-hours are fighting our shortage of food.

That record of construction, of organization and operation, is unbeatable. And it is going to pay out. It is in the great American industrial tradition. For all time it explodes the outworn notion that the operations of a Government agency are bound to be clumsy and expensive. T. V. A. balance sheets respect the obligation of a business enterprise to make returns on an investment. In the next fiscal year—1944—T. V. A. revenues from the sale of power are estimated to amount to $38,500,000. That is enough to pay all expenses of power operation (and note that these expenses include payments in lieu of taxes and provide reserves for depreciation), and in addition to produce a return of approximately 4 percent on the investment in power facilities. The actual revenue for this fiscal year will amount to approximately $33,000,000. The consumers who had electric service prior to T. V. A. will save almost $10,000,000 annually in comparison with the rates they were formerly paying. This is an achievement in which the Congress should take pride. Within the normal span of life the consumers of power in the Tennessee Valley will pay back to the Federal Treasury all the money the Congress has provided to make that power production possible.

NAVIGATION

When I said the river had been mobilized for war, it was not alone of power I was thinking. The navigation channel Congress directed T. V. A. to build in 1933 is now almost completed. It is a highway for the movement of military supplies. Jeeps, amphibians, ambulances, and huge Army trucks are being unloaded at the docks in the Valley today. A tow of more than 2,000 of these vehicles were unloaded at my home city of Guntersville recently. Think what that means in the saving of gas and rubber or of railway flatcars, and the relief given to our overburdened rail-and-motor transportation facilities. Figure the lowered cost to the Government. Already the expenditure for navigation is beginning to be paid back too. There were plenty of doubting Thomases about the future of river use for commerce when the T. V. A. development started. We stopped doubting in Alabama a couple of years ago when we saw barges with grain from the Midwest, automobiles from Detroit, and petroleum products from the Gulf begin to use a half-completed channel. We knew what it was going to mean before we saw the steady flow of war equipment that moves on the river today. Next year it is estimated that the movement of freight on this waterway will exceed 500,000,000 ton-miles. Four public-use terminals, now under construction, will make it a free highway for the use of all kinds of public and private business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, prior to T. V. A. we had almost no protection from floods in the Tennessee Valley, and our capricious river poured its turbulent waters to add to the disaster of floods in the lower Mississippi. Today T. V. A. has provided approximately 6,700,000 acre-feet of useful storage, much of which is available for control during the flood season. Already we have seen what that means. Just last December, T. V. A. reduced a flood crest at Chattanooga by 3½ to 4 feet and prevented damage estimated at more than a million dollars. The completed system will provide more than 15,000,000 acre-feet of storage and will have considerable effect on the floods of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. Kentucky Dam alone, providing 4,500,000 acre-feet near the mouth of the Tennessee, will be capable of reducing crests at Cairo, Ill., by 2 to 3 feet. Two to three feet is the difference between disaster and safety in floods. And the benefits will extend all the way down river. This reduction alone has been estimated to be worth $200,000,000, or almost double the cost of Kentucky Dam. Flood control here spells safety to private enterprises, homes, and the people all down the mid-continent area to New Orleans.

FERTILIZER FOR PEACE AND MUNITIONS FOR WAR

The Muscle Shoals development started in World War No. 1. In the years of peace T. V. A. converted the plants to the production of plant food. Now once more these huge Government facilities are turning out munitions. They are producing elemental phosphorus, ammonia, and ammonium nitrate for the War Department. They are making the ingredients of synthetic rubber for the Rubber Reserve Company. The amounts and distribution of these war products are not disclosed for publication, because, as was said of the annual report this year, "It might give aid, though certainly no comfort, to our enemies."

THE FERTILIZER PROGRAM

I can speak, however, of the concentrated phosphatic fertilizers that have been developed by T. V. A. at Muscle Shoals since 1933. The finest and highest concentration of phosphatic fertilizer in the world has been successfully developed here, meto-phosphate. They have meant new hope for the exhausted lands of the South and the Nation. Fields and hills that were bare and sterile are green and living now, and farm production has increased. Through June 1942 more than 185,000 tons of T. V. A. plant food had been distributed for use in a demonstration program on 42,000 farms totaling 6,200,000 acres. This program is Nation-wide, and every Member of this House ought to know just how it has been carried out, because some of the material has gone to every State. I think the method used by T. V. A. to carry out this program in the Tennessee Valley shows why the organization has had such tremendous success in all its activities. Let me describe it to you briefly:

Congress directed the Authority to experiment in the production and use of new and cheaper forms of plant food and to demonstrate its use. Now the development of the fertilizer, the laboratory part, is easy compared to the demonstration of the product in use. Because these new plant foods had to be tried out on farms and the farms had to be used at the same time to provide a living for American families, T. V. A. had to face the practical problems of the largest private business in this country, the private enterprise of farming. Here is the way they did it:

They decided to work through existing institutions—the Extension Service and the land-grant colleges. They did not hire thousands of agents themselves and set up a lot of new offices. In cooperation with existing institutions, the farmers of a county were invited to come together to hear about the program. The farmers themselves selected one of their number, who agreed to permit his farm to be used as a demonstration area. He took a risk. He paid the freight on the fertilizer which T. V. A. provided at no cost. He had to change his farm management. He agreed to keep books. He got help from scientists and specialists and cooperation in working out his problems—but never a directive nor a quota. His farm became a kind of school for the whole community.

T. V. A. did not run this program from some distant headquarters. Their men walked over the land. They saw the troubles that developed. It is not easy for a farmer to conserve the Nation's soil for posterity and at the same time buy shoes for the children. Yet that is just what has to be done if this Nation is going to survive. T. V. A. discovered that new and cheaper equipment was needed for the farmer who could not afford to have hired help. They saw that a way must be found to make the growth of soil-restoring crops pay cash. It was not all a matter of national policy and good will. So what did they do? They did not equip a lot of new and fancy laboratories. They went to the educational and scientific institutions of the South. They made contracts with them. They worked on designs together. And community refrigerators came into use, new farm machinery was developed, a quick-freezing process came out of it, and new uses for wood products. The T. V. A. took these inventions through the stage of practical demonstration. Then licenses were issued and private enterprise took over. All the way through from trestle board to the finished product existing local institutions, public and private, were used. Other Government agencies do not work that way.

We who live there have seen what has happened to these test demonstration

farmers. Their mortgages are paid, their buildings are better equipped. They have more livestock. They live better. They are buying more things in town. They have money in the bank. Most important today, they are producing more food for war. This program should be vastly expanded when materials for building additional plant capacity are again available, when production of munitions can decline.

This year these products are being shared with our allies. A major portion of T. V. A.'s fertilizer products will go abroad so fields in England can raise the products we should otherwise be obliged to send. We need it here, but it is sound sense to save bottoms. Phosphatic fertilizer is easier to send than cereals.

The summary outlined hits only the high spots of the record of this agency we created in 1933. We outlined the program in Congress. We gave them the job to do and held them responsible. They have kept faith with us. In the accomplishment of this record, the Authority has never failed to meet its promises to Congress as to the schedules of construction time, and T. V. A. has had to face the same problems of manpower and material shortages as private industries. Somehow it has always come through and without any fanfare. Until the recent extreme price increases, which have dislocated all estimates, the Authority has never spent more on a dam than it told the Congress it would cost. Those are tests of achievement. That is how a job should be judged. T. V. A. has met every contractual engagement. Steadily its unit cost of operations has been reduced, and its overhead administrative costs curtailed from year to year until they now stand at less than 4 percent—a remarkably low level for any similar enterprise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY RECORD

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Look at T. V. A.'s standing in the field of industrial safety. Accidents always increase when industry speeds up, and the accident rate today is an acute manpower problem. When you find a good safety record combined with a swift production schedule you find good management, trained supervisors, and intelligent and alert employees. In 1940, for example, T. V. A. had an accident frequency rate 60 percent lower than the average rate for all companies engaged in similar operations reporting to the National Safety Council, and its accident severity rate was less than half as much as the others. In August 1941, a rising accident rate, national in scope, was of sufficient extent to be called to public attention by the President. The T. V. A. did not go with the trend in this respect. Their rates went down. Its frequency rate was reduced by 11.6 percent, as compared with its own record in 1940, and the severity rate went down by 22.4 percent. Yet during this period the number of man-hours of work on T. V. A. construction projects increased by 67.8 percent.

WHY AND HOW T. V. A. IS DIFFERENT FROM OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

T. V. A. methods, developed under an unusual charter, are responsible for its success. Achievements like these are not accidental. I do not believe any other public or private agency can match them. What I want to emphasize is this, that record has been made possible because T. V. A. is different from other Federal agencies. Its statute is different, its methods are wonderfully different, and I submit that its accomplishments are startlingly dissimilar from customary performances. It lives and works in the field. It does not operate from Washington, although every once in a while some expert with a blueprint gets worried about that "difference," and decides that T. V. A. should be made a part of a Washington department and enjoy the superlative advantages of red tape, absentee management, and remote control. T. V. A. works in the Valley, close to the people it serves. You do not hear complaints about questionnaires sent out by T. V. A. They rarely need to use that sterile way of getting information. They meet local groups in conference in villages, on farms, and in towns. The people know why information is required, what use is going to be made of it. Nobody resists that kind of inquiry.

The novelty of a regional agency is too much for some people and they suggest that the work of T. V. A., which they profess to admire, should be partitioned among old-line Government departments—that some other agency should buy the land or handle its litigation, or that its employees should be selected by another outfit. They say, "Why should T. V. A. be different?" In my judgment—and the record supports my conclusions—the reason T. V. A. gets things done is because it is different. For one thing, they see their job as a whole. Land buying, for example, has to keep pace with dam construction and family relocation. T. V. A.'s land-buying program has been the most successful ever undertaken by a Federal agency. Look at this record: Of 871,416 acres purchased for reservoir and highway purposes up to June 30, 1942, over 90 percent was acquired by purchase, and of the remaining, 2.3 percent of the cases in condemnation involved only questions of title, with price undisputed.

They have a different system of condemnation procedure in T. V. A., and some people suggest that it should be changed because it is different. I live in the area and I give daily thanks for the difference. Congress put section 25 in the T. V. A. Act deliberately. It was an effort to create a condemnation system that would avoid the abuses of traditional methods and would be fair alike to the owners of land and to the Government. It has worked admirably. Whenever there is large-scale purchase there will be disgruntled individuals. But in the area generally it is recognized that the method has been fair and swift.

It is at times suggested that the method of selection of T. V. A. employees should be changed, that they should be chosen either by the Civil Service Commission or with the approval of Members of the Congress. I am against any such proposal. The Authority has an independent merit system, and I have never heard any responsible person level charges at T. V. A. for politics, favoritism, nepotism, or any other "ism" in the selection of its workers. Everyone admits the T. V. A. system is fine. But some worry because it is different. They want T. V. A. to have every problem and every drawback of every other department. They do not seem to see the relation between cause and effect. T. V. A. has recruited skilled and unskilled workmen in an area which had no vast reservoir of industrially trained manpower. It was not an easy job. But they have done it. As of February 1, 1943, T. V. A. employment totaled approximately 35,000. Of these 35,000 employees, more than 25,000 are skilled workers, operators, engineers, chemists, and other highly technical and professional personnel. These are the men who have designed and built the dams, the powerhouses, transmission lines, and substations. They are maintaining and operating them today. They have designed and built and now they are operating the fertilizer and munitions plants. I do not know where T. V. A. found them, but they must be well chosen, well trained, and well directed, because they are the men and women who are doing a superlative job. Whatever methods T. V. A. has developed, I want them continued. I should like to see them adopted by other agencies of the Government. I think we need some more different agencies. Maybe if we drafted a few more statutes with the vision we showed when we created T. V. A., perhaps we would have more records like this.

Every once in a while another thoroughly specious proposal is advanced. That is that T. V. A. power revenues should be paid directly into the Treasury of the United States and that the organization should come to Congress for all the money it requires to operate its system. The idea is that this Congress, not T. V. A., should manage the details of operation of this great electricity system.

Now Congress wrote section 26 of the T. V. A. Act in another fashion. We catalogued there the purposes for which T. V. A. could use its revenues. We outlined limits beyond which T. V. A. could not go, but we recognized that continuity of electricity service could not depend on annual appropriations. We recognized that in this sort of enterprise operating estimates could not be accurate so far in advance as Federal Budget and appropriation procedure requires. We had sense enough to see that you cannot know, more than a year in advance, every expenditure that may have to be made to take on new business or to repair the sudden ravages of storms or flood. Why if such a provision had been in the law in September 1939, the Authority could not have made additional power available to the plant of the Aluminum Co. in Alcoa, Tenn. The business was unanticipated. Alcoa had no power contract to cover the new demand for aluminum for airplanes. No surplus hydro power was available. So high cost steam plants had to be put

into operation. The Authority spent over a million dollars to provide the service. I will not put a money value on the production of that metal. But I will point out that the Authority had a net return of some $300,000 on the investment.

That is just what a private business would do. That is what T. V. A. has done, and that is why they have been able to serve war industries without delay. They have not had to come to Congress for a deficiency appropriation for every little line and substation for every ton of coal beyond anticipated needs. We cannot run an electricity business from Washington and we should not try. The method we have followed so far is right. This Congress has laid out the general policies and has held T. V. A.'s management strictly accountable for carrying them out. We require them to submit their plans, and to report their acts in detail.

I sometimes wonder why, when an agency is so outstandingly successful, anyone should propose to mangle it or to interfere with its management. Is it jealousy? Is it a desire to make possible the failure of a public enterprise? Is it some strange kind of politics? Or cannot we learn? Cannot we learn that when the result is successful, the charter must be good, and the methods used are bound to be right? Instead of trying to make T. V. A. like other Government bureaus, I propose we try to make the other bureaus a little more like T. V. A. This organization brings a breath of fresh air to clear the murky atmosphere of bureaucracy.

So I will be opposed to any proposal that will change T. V. A.'s organization or force it to alter its methods until it can be proven there are better ways for it to accomplish its purposes, or until there are abuses in its management which must be corrected. I am opposed to any suggestion that would yield any of its independence in making its decisions of operation, either to any other executive agency or to Congress. I like the way they are doing the job now.

I want Congress to study the methods of T. V. A. and to take pride in its achievements. I want us to give praise where it is due. And it is due T. V. A. I believe that David Lilienthal, Chairman of its Board, is one of the ablest, most loyal, and devoted public servants this country has produced. He has headed a program which is changing the economic picture of the South, which has permitted us to be in truth the arsenal of democracy. It is a program which has brought to my part of the country not only massive dams and power houses, not only a useful river highway, but a new concept of the relationship that can exist between the common man and his Central Government—a relationship that must exist if this democracy is going to solve the problems of the post-war world.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

DECENTRALIZATION OF THE STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the independent offices appropriation bill, now under consideration, includes the appropriation of the necessary funds for the administration of the United States Merchant Marine by the Maritime Commission.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, has been referred to as the magna carta of our American Merchant Marine. It is the organic law specifically defining the duties of the Maritime Commission. Section 101 states:

> It is necessary for the national defense * * * that the United States shall have a merchant marine * * * capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency.

Thus the United States merchant marine is an integral part of our national defense. From the outbreak of this war the cry has been for ships, ships, and more ships. It is the duty of the Maritime Commission to exert every effort of which it is capable to furnish these ships in sufficient quantity to guarantee the winning of the war.

In almost every speech made by members of the Maritime Commission, from the chairman on down, over the radio, before public bodies, and in their statements they have made before committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, they refer to the steel shortage existing in this country as the primary reason why they cannot produce more ships. It becomes apparent that the only way we are to get more ships is by increasing the production of steel to meet every requirement of the Nation. If steel production is to be increased it can only be accomplished by the decentralization of the steel industry which will break the strangle hold these steel masters have held upon this Nation in both wartime as well as peacetime.

You and I know that more ships are required to furnish the ammunition, guns, tanks, and supplies to our ever-increasing military forces in Africa, the Solomon Islands, Australia, and India. These ships are absolutely essential.

Mr. Chairman, more ships are needed to carry food to the destitute and hungry women and children of Puerto Rico, and in turn to bring back to this country the 300,000 tons of sugar now stored in Puerto Rican warehouses. The crying need for food to be shipped to these citizens of our own United States is almost beyond human description, as has been testified to by their elected representatives before the Committee on Insular Affairs, of which I am a member.

Large sections of our population are being relocated to carry on shipbuilding and manufacturing for the war effort. Agents of the Maritime Commission, as well as other agencies of Government, are recruiting labor from the Middle Western States. These workers are sent at Government expense to the Pacific Coast, large numbers of whom go to the San Francisco Bay area, where they are forced to live under conditions of squalor and filth in tents and campwagons, by reason of a lack of housing. Housing cannot be furnished because of the lack of steel. It is a sorry picture, indeed, in a country which has the greatest stands of virgin timber in the world—of redwood, pine, and fir—but no hardware with which to assemble and build houses. This critical situation has caused an alarming labor turn-over amounting in many instances to as much as 20 percent per month.

The greatest bottleneck in all history exists in the shortage of steel, fostered and nurtured by the steel masters of this Nation that they might continue to control its production and price structure in the post-war period. This self-centered, self-satisfied group, too long tolerated by a nation fighting for its very existence, have built up an empire of steel production in a very limited area of our Nation, outside of which they exert every effort to prevent the production of steel from the natural resources of great areas of our Nation. They have established a dividing line, over which they stand guard, separating the remainder of the Nation from the great mineral resources of the West. They defiantly maintain that there shall be no decentralization of the steel industry beyond that dividing line, while the security of the Nation demands that those western resources shall be used.

Evidence of their defiance of the development of our western resources was brought out before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries which was appointed by the chairman to investigate the steel shortage, and of which I am a member. It is again more recently found in the mouthpiece of the steelmasters, the weekly magazine the Iron Age. In the issue of January 21, 1943, by ridicule and contempt, they attempt to discourage and destroy the enterprise of Henry J. Kaiser in his effort to meet the expanding needs of steel on the Pacific coast by building a steel plant with his own financial resources. And this notwithstanding the fact that the Federal Government has poured almost a billion dollars into the laps of these steelmasters for the expansion and modernization of their plants.

The Government of the United States, more than a century ago, found it necessary to insure the safety of our country by building its own navy yards. That policy has proven itself to be farsighted and admirable. Our merchant marine is one of the four important links in our national defense, along with our Army, Navy, and Air Forces. The merchant marine is dependent upon steel. Up until the present crisis these same steelmasters, who own the mines, the smelters, and furnaces, and the mills, also owned or controlled the entire shipbuilding industry at the outbreak of this war. Their stranglehold extended beyond steel production. It is now time that the Government itself shall step into the picture and establish its own steel-producing plants, for no other group in this country is sufficiently large to overcome the obstacles which will be placed in their way by the present steelmasters.

In order to utilize the full natural resources of the entire Nation in the interest of national defense and the security of the Nation through the construction

of all the ships required to win this war, it is the bounden duty of the Maritime Commission to demand the decentralization of this steel octopus whose tentacles reach into every phase of our national economy.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, on February 8 former President Hoover appeared before the Manpower Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee in a closed session, and thereafter, following his testimony, distributed to reporters a memorandum or statement for the press which was given wide publicity.

In his release to the press he said, in part, "We should not try to do too much too fast" and this is so because "time runs in our favor."

Let us analyze this statement, "Time runs in our favor," and what would probably happen if our Government and the United Nations followed his views.

Time did run in our favor, but that is not so now. It is not correct to say that at this stage of the war. Ever since Nazi Germany started this war, those nations opposing Germany had to wage a defensive warfare, and time was their ally. After Pearl Harbor, we also had to wage a defensive war—and time was our ally, but that situation has changed. The United Nations are now on the offensive in all parts of the world, with the exception of China, where offensive action will occur in the reasonably near future. Time is not the ally of those nations possessing the offensive.

Until Hitler failed to conquer England by air attack, and later to destroy the Russian armies, the Nazi blitzkrieg was a race against time. Divide people within by propaganda, by hatred, by racial, religious, or other appeals; through fear, by any means, to soften up a people; to employ deceit and hypocrisy whenever it could be done effectively, even lulling into a feeling of safety, then the sudden attack by air and tank followed by infantry consolidation; playing one nation against another, so he could attack one at a time and conquer them quickly, and then accomplishing the objective with quick success.

The Nazi blitzkrieg consisted of attacking and conquering quickly one nation at a time, as long as that policy could be followed. It was a race against time.

The Nazi blitzkrieg's days are now over. The attempt to quickly compel Britain to submit by the vicious, powerful air attacks was prevented by the courage of the people of England, their ability to stand the pain and suffering of the air blitzkrieg.

Then Hitler turned on Russia, to remove that country as a threat to his rear or flank before the actual land invasion of England took place. The quick removal of Russia from the war, then the strong concentrated attack on England to conquer that country, or to compel it to sue for peace, before the United States could reach a stage where we could play an important and telling part in the war. That was the blitzkrieg in operation.

The second setback for the blitzkrieg type of military campaign took place on the plains and in the mountains of Russia; when the Nazi failed to capture Moscow and Leningrad last year and Stalingrad this year and, above all, when the Nazi failed to destroy the intactness and effectiveness of the Russian Army.

That means that Hitler's race against time—an important and necessary element of a successful blitzkrieg—is over.

We witness through the press of the victories of the Russian Armies, the defeats of the German Armies, their seeming confusion. That is the time to strike hard, to follow up successes, no let-up to permit the enemy to reorganize and form new lines of defense. In Russia time is the ally of the Nazi. The Russians are not letting them use time as an ally. With a victory and the demoralization that has followed, the Russians are not delaying or resting, content with the victory they have won, thereby allowing the Germans to use time as a means of reorganization, of bringing up reserves and needed weapons of war, to resist successfully the next attack. The Russians apparently recognize that with the Germans on the run, badly shaken, that is the time to attack—and attack—that actions can be taken that could not be when and where the enemy was not badly shaken—that to get the maximum results it is a race against time.

No, former President Hoover; as you were so badly mistaken in your judgment before December 7, 1941, when you opposed President Roosevelt in his recommendations to prepare our country for defense against the then impending danger, so is your judgment again wrong when you said that "time runs in our favor."

Time is now the ally of the Axis. With Germany on the defensive and with Hitler admitting that time is his ally as he did in his speech in the latter part of September, for anyone to take the position that time is our ally is to take a position in favor of a negotiated peace, of unadulterated appeasement. If that is what former President Hoover stands for, why does he not say so—frankly state to the American people that he stands for a negotiated peace instead of using deceptive words to hide his true thoughts.

I do not charge that former President Hoover, whom I respect personally, stands for appeasement, but if we follow his advice the result will be a stalemate of the war, a wave of appeasement sentiment, and a negotiated peace. Such a peace would be a victory for our enemies and constitute only a short truce until our enemies have regained their strength and again start on the road of world conquest; the destruction of the democratic way of life; of a decent world in which to live; and of the religious civilization we possess and which is the origin of everything that decent men and women stand for and aspire to obtain.

Last September Hitler admitted that time is the ally of the Axis. His speech was followed up by speeches along the same lines by Goebbels and Goering. The controlled press of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy upon the orders of their masters took up the same line. Later events have supported the fact that the Nazis are waging a defensive warfare. This does not mean they are not dangerous. They are. This does not mean they will not engage in offensive attacks and actions. They will, if the opportunity presents itself. But it does mean that the blitzkrieg is over. Germany has failed to remove Russia as a potent factor in this war before the United States and England, and particularly the United States, because of our recent forced entry into the war, have developed to the point where our resources could be thrown into the conflict with telling effect.

Instead of being weak, Russia has shown great strength; the United States and England have developed their resources and armed forces to a powerful extent, and while the enemy is weakening we are growing stronger.

Time is the ally of Nazi Germany and of Fascist Italy, as it is also becoming the ally of Japan.

We have captured Guadalcanal, an offensive action. General MacArthur has also recently won an offensive victory in New Guinea. The African situation is known to all of us. That is also an offensive action. Are we to sit back, using time as our ally, and rest content with what we have done? Does anyone think that such policy will win the war? This is what Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and imperialistic Japan would like to see us do.

Yes; "time was once on our side," but not now, Mr. Hoover. If you were President now, former President Hoover, and charged with the duty and responsibility of leading our people to victory, of preserving our country, which is the specific duty of a President in time of war, under conditions as they now exist, would you adopt the policy of using time as an ally?

If you did, you would probably go down in history as a President who meant to do the right thing, but who was unable to grasp and meet the problems of our country in war, just the same as you failed to grasp, understand, and meet the problems of the economic war of 1929 to 1933. You would go down in history as a President who failed in his trust.

With our recovery from Pearl Harbor, with the victories of MacArthur in New Guinea, with the capture of Guadalcanal, with our naval victories in the Far East, and with what will take place in that area and in China in the future, with the African expedition, with the defeat of Rommel, relieving the threat to Alexandria, the Suez Canal, and to India, with the successes of the Russian armies, the whole basic course of the war has changed. The United Nations are no longer on the defensive, and time, our valuable ally of past days, is no longer our ally now. Time is an ally of defensive powers in a war. It is now the ally of the Axis, admitted by word and conceded by deed. Before New Guinea, Stalingrad, Rommel's defeat, the Afri-

can invasion, Guadalcanal, our naval victories over the Japs, it was different.

One year ago and less the picture for us looked bad. Thank God, that picture has changed. Of course, we have hard days ahead of us, but one thing is certain, as we view world happenings of recent months, and look underneath the surface and analyze those events, their meaning and results, one has been to change the basic conduct of the war. We have changed from a basic policy of defensive warfare—using time as an ally as much as we could, to the basic policy of offensive warfare. Hitler and his allies have been compelled to concede the defeat of the blitzkrieg method and to change from the offensive to the defensive.

If we use time as former President Hoover indicates we should, we will thus permit the enemy to recover from his defeats, and thereby permit a recovery that might enable the Axis to regain the offensive again. To permit that to happen would constitute criminal negligence, willful and reckless disregard on the part of those charged with the conduct and the winning of the war.

I wonder if former President Hoover were President today, charged with the grave responsibilities that rest upon the Commander in Chief in time of war, with the duty of leadership that will save our country, if he would say in the light of world conditions as they exist today, that "time runs in our favor." If he did, thereby permitting Hitler, and he is the main enemy in Europe, if not in the world, to have time to build strong lines of fortified places, so that when the flower of our youth and the youth of our nations united with us were killed or wounded in large numbers where such fortified places were attacked—the result would probably be a rise of the feeling of appeasement, and a negotiated peace. A negotiated peace is a partial victory for our enemies. Such a peace would be a defeat for us. When time becomes the ally of both sides to a conflict, it usually means that both sides are so exhausted that neither one cannot administer the knock-out blow to the other. The result is likely to be an armistice—a temporary stay, under the guise of a compromise peace.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Massachusetts is trying to make it appear that Mr. Hoover stands for appeasement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was the gentleman here during all of my remarks?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman hear me say that "I do not charge that former President Hoover, whom I respect personally, stands for appeasement, but if we follow his advice the result will be a stalemate of the war, a wave of appeasement sentiment, and a negotiated peace"?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman understands Mr. Hoover has on many occasions said that he is in this war to fight it to a decisive finish?

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman agree with former President Hoover that time is now our ally?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not know what Mr. Hoover had in mind at that time. If he had in mind that the United States because of its tremendous productive possibilities is getting stronger with each succeeding day, his remarks might well be interpreted that time was on our side. Of course, one can interpret words whichever way one desires to have them interpreted. What I rose particularly to find out is whether the gentleman wants to make a serious charge that Mr. Hoover is working with the Nazis or is trying to appease them.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has no right to try to read into my remarks thoughts that are not there, because nobody has for an instant said that of Mr. Hoover. If anyone did say it, I would be the first to challenge him.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Having regard for the unity we are trying to have in this country, I do not want the gentleman to try to read anything into the motives of Mr. Hoover.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts talks about unity. Nobody has fought more than I have for unity.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman, and I dislike to see him try to raise a discordant note at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman need not feel disturbed about the extent to which he must apologize for what Mr. Hoover said. What Mr. Hoover said speaks for itself. Mr. Hoover has said that time now runs in our favor, and I challenge that statement.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman believe that from now on we will be stronger, that time will make us stronger?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not material to my discussion today. Time is not running in our favor. The fact that we get stronger is no reason for thinking that time is running in our favor. We are on the offensive.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And we want to keep on the offensive; we are demanding that we go on the offensive, but at the same time, time is in our favor; we are getting stronger.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman makes that statement, he puts himself in the same category as former President Hoover.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No; I do not; and the gentleman from Massachusetts knows better than that, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Am I to conclude from the gentleman's remarks that it is his opinion that it might be better to expend the blood of American boys than the ammunition that is in the making?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's question has no relationship to this. We are producing. Until recent months we were on the defensive and now we have taken the offensive. To consider time as an ally now would be to follow a policy that would be favorable to our enemies. Of course, Mr. Hoover is a fine American—nobody questions that—and any attempt to inject that into this discussion is irrelevant, immaterial, and not pertinent; I might say impertinent in the sense it was intended as such, but certainly it is not pertinent to the issue. However, Mr. Hoover did make the statement that time is our ally, but the fact is that we are now on the offensive, and time is not the ally of the nations that are on the offensive—that are waging an offensive war to victory.

Of course, the increasing production of the weapons of war is important, but are we going to sit back and wait and rest content, with the enemy on the run—on the defensive—and let them consolidate their forces and reorganize and fortify themselves, which would result in a greater loss of life when our American boys undertake to attack them in the places we permitted them to fortify strongly, simply because we held back from making an attack when the time was ripe for us to do so?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not mean to interpret from anything that Mr. Hoover said, at least as far as he read it here, that Mr. Hoover wants this to be an appeasement.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am discussing the results that would follow, if the policy of Mr. Hoover was adopted.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think that he has gone far afield in trying to interpret these things?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. I am justified in interpreting Mr. Hoover's remarks. The gentleman himself undertook to interpret them a moment ago.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. When he undertook not to take issue but to undertake to defend Mr. Hoover in that statement.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I was trying to show that time was really in our favor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, Mr. Hoover said that, but it is not now.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I said the productive forces of America were gathering every day, and as that momentum gathers force we are getting stronger.

Mr. McCORMACK. But time is not necessary; we have taken the offensive.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why do you not do it now?

Mr. McCORMACK. Why do we not do it? If we should depend upon our friend from Massachusetts and former President Hoover—could the gentleman conduct the war any better than the President?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am not saying that I could.

Mr. McCORMACK. Apparently the gentleman would leave that impression. I am glad to see my Republican friend so excited.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am not so excited at all, and I am sure the gentleman must be excited, or he would not make this charge against me.

Mr. McCORMACK. What charge have I made against the gentleman?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Oh, the gentleman can read the remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is the gentleman himself who is making the charge.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am not.

Mr. McCORMACK. In general you are putting yourself in the same position that Mr. Hoover has put himself in, but I have never considered you in that position in your attitude here, and I want to say that for my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the people on this side of the aisle have given the gentleman more support in this war than any minority ever did.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have said that, and I have stated that I am not attacking the conduct of the minority. I am not saying a word about the Members on that side. I am discussing a remark made by former President Hoover that had wide publicity and presented serious implications to the American people, so that proper public opinion would be aroused and state what the results would have been likely to be, if we had followed the advice of former President Hoover. I have said that this House has cooperated on war measures, and if anyone should undertake to attack the House I would resent it. Any remark that I made is in no way directly or indirectly to cast an aspersion on anyone who sits on the Republican side of this House. I have said there is no organized opposition to the President in this war. I said before that the President of the United States has received the best support in this war that any President in war had ever received from any Congress. I stand by that statement and my remarks today are not inconsistent with it in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the United Nations have only started. We have wrested the affirmative or the offensive from the enemy, and under able military leadership we can continue to ultimate victory.

I am looking forward to the day when I will hear former President Hoover utter as a former President the stirring appeal to courage, action, and quick victory that I am confident he would utter if he were in the White House. I am looking forward to the day when I will hear him supporting affirmatively President Roosevelt in his courageous leadership instead of being generally, as he has in the past the negative critic, the man of uncertainty, the man who indicates a confused state of mind.

Uncertainty of mind and action will never win this war.

We can all thank God that in this crisis we have as our President and Commander in Chief a man of courageous thought and action. His most bitter enemy; without or within, will admit that President Roosevelt is a man of courage—a leader who does not know what fear is.

No; former President Hoover, time now runs in favor of the Axis. Now is the time for the United Nations with our military leadership using sound judgment, to follow up our advantage—to keep the enemy on the defensive, to administer blow after blow—to keep wearing the enemy down—to break the morale of the enemy on the civilian front, which will rapidly spread to the enemy armed forces, and bring about as early a victory as possible.

Time—now—is Hitler's ally—no longer ours. It is up to our military leaders to see that Hitler and his allies cannot make such use of time as to bring about a stalemate that will result in a compromise or negotiated peace.

The American people are far ahead of most of our men in public life in their determination to win a clean-cut victory. They want the menace of a pagan controlled world removed from our midst. They want as early a victory as is possible, and thereafter a just peace that will mean a termination of this war—and not a mere cessation—with another war following this—when the next generation of youngsters have grown to the age where they can again be used as cannon fodder.

The people of America do not want a negotiated peace—they are opposed to the appeasers within our midst.

Whether or not he meant it, with the enemy on the defensive, and on the run, so to speak, if we now adopt the policy "that time runs in our favor" as stated by former President Hoover, such as holding back, taking it easy, going slow, when the enemy is badly shaken, and with swift telling blows that would produce demoralization, chaos, a collapse of morale and resistance, the results would be in the directions of negotiated peace and not the clean-cut victory that the vast majority of American people want and recognize is necessary for our future peace and safety, and for a future decent world in which free people can live.

It is only a few weeks ago the world was electrified by the meeting of President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, both men of courage and determination. Was that a meeting based on feeling "time runs in our favor"? Out of that meeting has already come great events; and greater will come—all offensive, not defensive.

Churchill thereafter visited Turkey. Was his visit based on the presumption that we still had to stall the enemy as much as we could, that we had to continue to use "time," or was it a part of the offensive warfare now being carried on by the United Nations?

We read in the papers of the meeting in China of General Arnold in command of our American air forces and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. Was that just an ordinary conference coming after the Casablanca meeting? Are there any connections between that meeting and the stirring speech of President Roosevelt Friday night when he served notice of carrying the fight, not island by island, in the far Pacific, but to the heart of military Japan, as well as to the heart of the Nazi machine in Europe?

The United Nations have agreed there will be no appeasement, and no compromise peace will come out of this war. President Roosevelt has well said that the fight will be carried to an "unconditional surrender" of the enemy. Time does not run in our favor if we are to accomplish such a victory.

On one hand we have the honest but misguided opinion of former President Hoover that "time runs in our favor," resulting, even if not intended by him, in appeasement, and in a negotiated peace.

On the other hand, we have the far-seeing courageous leadership of President Roosevelt who used time as our ally when it was necessary to do so, but who recognizes that that day has gone by—and whose leadership is the only kind that will produce what we seek—the unconditional surrender of the enemy.

Under the leadership of President Roosevelt the whole world picture has changed within the past year. One thing is certain: If we followed Mr. Hoover's advice before Pearl Harbor, even if England had survived and held Hitler in Europe without lend-lease assistance, without the destroyers transaction and other things that took place, our country would have been for all practical purposes defenseless on December 7, 1941.

Fortunately, the advice and recommendations of President Roosevelt were followed, and we were sufficiently prepared to withstand the shock of Pearl Harbor, and to recover from that catastrophe. It was due to the leadership of President Roosevelt and not the advice of former President Hoover that we were able to carry on after Pearl Harbor. It will be due to the leadership of President Roosevelt and not the wrong advice of former President Hoover that we will win this war.

We now witness former President Hoover again giving us advice—which sounds nice and pleasant, tends to lull us to sleep and inaction and is the same kind of advice he gave before Pearl Harbor, always too late, but which, if we followed it, would produce results disadvantageous to the best interests of our country and to our cause.

The American people want action that will produce results. They want the type of leadership of action, not inaction.

No one questions the high motives of former President Hoover, but I do question and challenge his judgment.

His judgment, if followed to date, would be the road to defeat.

The leadership of President Roosevelt is the road to victory.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, the colossal disbursements made and proposed

by the administration for merchant marine amount to the sum of $19,500,000,000. This sum staggers the imagination and upon Congress is imposed the sacred duty of seeing that this money is expended in a manner which will conserve the interests of the country, not only during the war but during the post-war period to follow.

Shipbuilding and operation are technical performances and to the average layman are overlaid with much mystery. I was delighted therefore to find that the members of this subcommittee seem to have a full and decisive understanding of this question. Reading of the minutes of this subcommittee discloses that—and I desire to express the appreciation of the country and the Congress for the very able and understanding manner in which Messrs. WIGGLESWORTH and DIRKSEN of the minority examined the shipping experts and the members of the Maritime Commission. I am encouraged to believe that Congress is indeed coming into its own in its knowledge of these expert matters. It is no longer content with sham, subterfuge, and deceit in the departmental presentations of their budgets.

90 PERCENT UGLY DUCKLINGS

With this vast sum of $19,500,000,000 we plan to build and operate 4,400 ocean-going merchant ships. We have already completed approximately 700 ships. I wish to stress particularly at this point that 90 percent of these ships are the so-called Liberty ships, which were nicknamed the "Ugly Ducklings" by the President of the United States. These ships are supposed to be 10-knot ships of about 10,000 tons burden and were built, I am advised, from an English design. Originally the English were to build 60 of the ships, 30 at Portland, Oreg., and 30 at Portland, Maine. This phase of the shipbuilding subsequently became lend lease and we have now taken it all over. National wisdom requires us to consider of what use these ships will be after the war. We know that they are a present handicap in the conduct of the war. I have made diligent inquiry of American operating concerns and their experts as to the availability of these ships in the post-war period. I have been advised by the coastwise, intercoastal, and Atlantic operators that these ships will be of no value in the post-war period. They are too slow. They lack stability. I am told that the average speed of these ships in a head sea does not exceed 7½ knots per hour. It should be remembered that Japan 10 years ago had combination passenger and freight ships that did 25 knots an hour. All the other maritime nations long since got into ships that were 18 or 20 knots on hour.

UNFITTED IN PEACE OR WAR

I protested the building of these "ugly ducklings" when the program started, calling attention to the fact that they tied up the escorting naval ships for long periods. A voyage to Australia now is interminable when these boats are in the convoy. It is my opinion that the program is mistaken and adverse to the successful prosecution of the war and that they will not be worth a dime a dozen when the day of peace comes. I should perhaps say that they are much slower than the slowest submarine and some of the new underseas boats run over twice as fast today. It is a matter of recent history that we lost some 650 boats off the Atlantic and Caribbean coasts. I am told that very few of these ships were of the 18-knot type, although none of them were convoyed. It shows that in fighting the submarine speed is a highly important factor. It has been estimated that one C–3 ship, with a speed of approximately 18 knots, is more useful from the standpoint of trans-Atlantic carriage than 5 of the Liberty type. It is claimed there was difficulty in obtaining material and engines for the faster ships. That is the present alibi, but I do not believe it is a substantial one. It has been my belief from the beginning that the Commission should shift into the building of C–3's with all convenient speed so that when the war ends we will be in possession of ships which are usable in the post-war trade.

HISTORY OF MALADMINISTRATION

Members of the House are generally familiar with the unhappy and venal history of shipbuilding and ship operation in the United States. The Black committee investigation of shipbuilding construction and operation gave a truthful picture of the waste, extravagance, and looting of the Treasury during the years that followed the close of World War No. 1. I read the report over recently, and find that it parallels in its conclusions much that is now going on under our very eyes in the present Maritime Commission. For several years I have been living in a fool's paradise about the present Commission, but my concern has been aroused by the recent reports of the Comptroller General and other facts that have come to my notice. The Black report is dated in 1935 and followed an investigation into the spending of $2,000,000,000 by the Government in an effort to create an efficient merchant marine, which would serve our commerce in times of peace and act as an auxiliary to the Navy in time of war. The report indicts the public officials who betrayed their trust and flayed the individuals who, posing as patriots, prostituted the law for their private profit. It found that after spending this vast amount we only had built 9 ships that were comparable to those of Great Britain, Japan, and even little Norway. At the date of the report Great Britain had 735 such ships.

AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES

I very much fear that under the present auspices we are heading for a similar debacle. In the Black report, for example, they recite the case of the Dollar Line which made a $7,000,000 profit on an investment of $500. Ships were sold on credit to the ship operators for one-tenth of their actual cost and even that sum was not forthcoming. It is interesting to note that this same outfit is today operating as the American President Lines. This line today enjoys outlandish sales prices for its vessels and exorbitant insurance and charter rates under the present emergency. After the death of former Senator McAdoo, Assistant Secretary of State Henry Grady, a friend of the President, was elected president of the company at a salary of $25,000 a year. His first act was to go to the Far East and attend a conference of shipping interests. We have an unsubsidized company operating trans-Atlantic at Mobile, Ala.. known as the Waterman Co. They had applied for admission to the eastern trade. The British were opposed to this and Mr. Grady cast the vote of the American President Lines, which is controlled by the Maritime Commission, against the admission of the Waterman Co. to that trade. At a later time I will refer more fully to this illustration of the maladministration of the present Maritime Commission. Suffice to say that Mr. Grady does not know the difference between the bow and stern of a ship. He could not tell you which is port and which is starboard, but here he is in full glory drawing down $25,000 a year as President of this line. I suggest that Judge Smith's new committee look into that incident. They will find it a flagrant example of the illegal acts of a Government department.

At the close of the last war vast flotillas of ships numbering more than 2,000 lay between wind and weather rotting themselves apart.

The picture set forth in the reports of the Comptroller, reported and unreported, shows many of the same sad conditions that existed in 1935, are again coming into vogue. I have lost confidence in the present Maritime Commission and believe that it is untrue to its trust. I state this fact regretfully. It shocks me more than it will the average Member of the House for I had, until recent developments, a full measure of confidence in the integrity and loyalty of the present Commission.

I wish to show the reasons for my change of heart. My suspicions were aroused in the first instance by the outrageous cancelation of the Higgins contract. My belief is that the moving factor in this performance was the Shipbuilding Trust, which has menaced the American merchant marine since the beginning. You will recall that Higgins, a diamond in the rough, but a genius in the shipbuilding field, had a contract for the erection of a large number of ships. He was getting his shipyard ready and had spent approximately $9,000,000 of Government money on the proposition. Under his unique plan of construction 300,000 man-days would be saved on the construction of each ship. This procedure would, of course, destroy the Shipbuilding Trust. The contract was canceled on the theory that there was a shortage of steel. Mr. Nelson, of W. P. B., denies this, and other large yards were brought into being even after the cancelation. Mr. Higgins brought his case

to Washington, where he found the atmosphere extremely hostile. His assertion was that the Association of American Shipbuilders had brought about the cancelation of his contract because his type of yard would revolutionize construction of ships and reduce the cost thereof more than one-third.

Based on what I have learned during my 9 years' service on the Merchant Marine Committee, I believe that the Higgins plan for construction would enable the Government to get away from the rigged bids that were presented by the Association of American Shipbuilders. Their prices were so high it made ship operation uneconomical. To keep the record straight, I wish to state that a subcommittee of the Merchant Marine Committee gave the Maritime Commission a clean bill of health on this incident. I dissent from that most vigorously, and I want the House to note the sequel to this performance.

FEDERATION INVESTIGATION

The American Federation of Labor organized its own investigation into this cancelation and retained as special attorney former Attorney General Margiotti, of the State of Pennsylvania. He is a very able lawyer and conducted an exhaustive examination into the question, filing his report and findings at the White House. No copy of this report is available, but I have talked with some people who have seen it and told me of the remarkable and savage character of the findings contained therein. It tore the mask from the face of the shipbuilding group and asserted, among other things, that they controlled promotions in the Navy. Four days after this devastating report was filed in the White House, the President sent for Higgins and gave him a contract of $180,000,000 to build freight airplanes. I have endeavored to get a copy of this report from every available source, but the door is closed on it. I think it is fair to infer that, upon the granting of the contract, it was arranged that this report be supressed and never see the light of day. I should perhaps say that when Higgins returned to the yard which he had in part organized he found the whole place dismantled, the buildings torn down, and everything disrupted.

May I emphasize at this point that this group of shipbuilding lobbyists are actually imperiling the safety of the Nation. I make bold to call upon the President himself and the other law-enforcement agencies of the Government to smash up this trust and compel them to obey the law. There seems to be no patriotism or love of country in this shipbuilding crowd.

MR. JOSEPH W. POWELL

If you are interested in this question, I suggest that you read the majority and dissenting opinions of the Supreme Court in the case of the United States against Bethlehem Steel Co., handed down in 1941. In that case the dissenting opinion cited a finding from the district court as follows:

> The managers for the contractor (Bethlehem Steel Corporation) adopted the famous Rob Roy distinction, who admitted he was a robber but proudly proclaimed that he was no thief.

Both the majority and minority opinion savagely condemn the unpatriotic and unethical attitude of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation but gave judgment to the steel concern in the amount sought. The profit on this contract was something like 22 percent or $30,000,000.

The gentleman who negotiated this contract was Mr. Joseph W. Powell, an official of the Bethlehem Corporation. Mr. Powell was educated by the Government and is a graduate of Annapolis. Despite this unconscionable performance, Mr. Powell now sits in seats of the mighty. He is adviser in chief on shipbuilding to Secretary Knox of the Navy, and has been put there of course by this shipbuilding ring. By virtue of his present position he exercises a powerful influence over the Maritime Commission and all naval construction. If the interests of the Nation and its program of national defense differs from the program of the shipbuilding crowd, where will Mr. Powell be? We know where he was at the time of the last war when he occupied a similar position under Secretary Daniels. This shipbuilding ring is powerful and bold. They take a man smirched by the Supreme Court and put him in a commanding position in our scheme of national defense.

KENNEDY KICKED UPSTAIRS

Let me give you another illustration of the performances of this group. Mr. Joseph P. Kennedy, of Boston, was appointed by the President as chairman of the Maritime Commission. The President told him to build a merchant marine that would do the Nation credit. Bids were called for on C–3 ships. The bids were so outrageously over the estimate that Kennedy canceled the bids and denounced the performance. He called for new bids and stated that unless the bids were reasonable in character he would build the ships in England where the costs were about one-half.

I was hopeful at the time that we at last were effectively on the trail of the shipbuilding ring. Not so. In the midst of this struggle, Mr. Kennedy was sent to the Court of St. James's as Ambassador. This was a Presidential act but I do not charge the President with complicity in this performance. My judgment is that the steel and shipbuilding boys were so powerful that they were able to get Kennedy kicked upstairs for the purpose of having some more flexible gentleman in charge of the Maritime Commission. I want to say that Mr. Kennedy was a splendid official in both capacities and always remained an American. I mention the fact now for the purpose of showing you the great power of this group who place their own filthy interests above that of the country.

A RAID ON OUR TREASURY

The Maritime Act of 1936 under which we are now operating, was placed on the books for the purpose of creating a worth-while merchant marine, which would operate free from the larcenies of the old system. I was present during the writing of that law and we added to it certain safeguards that would prevent the Treasury from being looted as in the old Shipping Board style. We knew we could not pay exorbitant prices for ships and operate them successfully. It is obvious that the overhead under those circumstances, with rigged bids the order of the day, it would render the economic operation of ships impossible. We intended to build ships that would be comparable in speed and character with ships of the other maritime nations.

In regard to section 902 it was the avowed purpose of the act to make these ships available in times of war or national necessity without enhanced cost, so we wrote into the act a provision known as section 902, which provided that the Government might requisition ships in an emergency declared by the proclamation of the President. Section 902 further recites:

> When any such property or use thereof is so requisitioned, the owner thereof shall be paid just compensation for the property taken, or for the use of said property, but in no case the value of the property taken or used shall be deemed enhanced by the cause necessitating the taking or use.

The House knows that shipping has been highly subsidized, both in construction and operation. In effect, we made a trade with the operators that in consideration of the subsidy the United States could take these ships in time of war and the price paid for them should not be enhanced by the fact that we were in an emergency. The very able Comptroller of the United States has given an opinion on this question maintaining the legality and effect of section 902. For many months this section has been under attack by the shipbuilding interests and by every lobbying influence in the Capital.

DISLOYALTY OF PUBLIC OFFICERS

I have been shocked to note that certain members of the Maritime Commission, their lawyers and advisers, are now in the saddle attempting to nullify this section. The Comptroller has gallantly stood in the breach on this proposition and has defeated an attempt to steal a billion dollars from the Federal Treasury. I charge the members of the Commission and their lawyers with being unfaithful to their official oaths. I say they are not representing the Government. Their function is to assert the integrity of this section and uphold the Comptroller in his stand. I have examined some of these gentlemen in committee. They speak in reverent and hushed tones in regard to the constitutional provision on the taking of property. They are eloquent and tearful on this. In the last session of Congress an attempt was made to emasculate this section. It was killed by the diligence of Members of the House and Senate. It means more than a billion dollars will be taken out of the Treasury for the benefit of the highly favored ship operators and owners if this law is changed. I invite the cooperation of the House in fighting this proposal to the limit and venture the hope that the Maritime Commission and other agencies of the

Government will not continue to misrepresent the Nation in such matters as this. Their present position does little credit to their official loyalty and does not display a proper concept of their official oath.

I fully realize that some of these gentlemen will wrap the flag about themselves and claim that they are winning the war. I say that if we legalize larceny in this country and permit groups of shipbuilders, or indeed any other group, to raid the Treasury during such a time as this, we will be in as bad shape as though we lost the war.

We certainly will lose what we are fighting for because popular government cannot survive in America unless administered honestly, free from the taint of influence or venality.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

A PROGRAM FOR PEACE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today for the first time in this House, sooner than I had intended. I am fully conscious of my deficiencies in experience, and otherwise, for this task, but nevertheless, for all new Members there must be a first time, so I beg the indulgence of this House for the time at my disposal.

The reason I am speaking sooner than I had intended is simply this: Although I am not unconscious of the sparkling beauty and suavity of manner of the honorable lady from Connecticut, yet I find that I am not as susceptible to her logic and to her persuasion, at least on the floor of this House, as some of my colleagues appear to have been.

I realize that I cannot expect as large and as rapturous a gallery, or as attentive an audience in this House, as the honorable lady had. Neither will I have the sympathetic and universal press. Certainly I cannot expect Life magazine to support my views in its editorial policy. Nevertheless, and in spite of these obvious and perhaps fatal disadvantages, I feel constrained to offer a few thoughts for the consideration of this House in opposition to those of the honorable Member from Connecticut. Further, I might add that since the honorable lady is a new Member of this House, I thought it might not be considered inappropriate for me, likewise a new Member, albeit not a very glamorous one, to take exception to her views on the extremely important and delicate issue that she raised in her address to this House a week ago today.

Some of the reasons and conclusions of my honorable colleague may be summarized rather briefly. She says that specific war and peace aims can never be clarified until we know what goes on in the mind of Josef Stalin; she says that we should pity Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill for floundering in a sea of uncertainty, and that the Atlantic Charter is a monumental generality and noble catch-all, and the four freedoms a virtuous platitude—I presume just pieces of paper. She says indeed it will be dangerous for us to propose specific international settlements today which Stalin might dispose tomorrow.

She brushes aside the isolationists and "the bigger and redder and more royal" international new dealers. With her inspired, feminine intuition she reveals that we all agree, on both sides of the aisle, that—I quote—

> We shall all demand henceforth to be secure from attack.

The key to this noble aspiration, she says, is America's position in the postwar air world. The air policy of all young, air-minded Americans is they want to fly everywhere. This statement would seem to indicate that freedom of the skies throughout the world is the desire of young America.

AMERICAN AIR POLICY

From this point on, the train of her thought is difficult to follow, so I hope that I may not be held strictly accountable if I should misinterpret certain passages. The argument apparently is that the United States has achieved supremacy in the commercial aviation field by a policy of sovereignty of the skies over a nation's own territory and the denial of free access to its airports. She is fearful that our Government is now negotiating to abandon the sovereignty-of-the-skies policy for a policy of freedom of the skies. It is at this point that I confess I get lost. The argument seems to reduce itself to this: That our policy must be to exclude all foreign aircraft from our skies and airports and at the same time proceed to establish air lines and airports over and in all the other countries of the world.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Following your practice, I prefer to finish my statement and then I will yield.

It is inconceivable to me that anyone could seriously urge, in these modern days, except in connection with a plan of imperialistic expansion by force, à la Nazi, that we can adopt an exclusive policy with regard to our own country and a freedom-of-the-skies policy for all other countries. What will our friends of the United Nations think of such a noble and altruistic policy, or should I say sinister policy?

Of a similar nature is her argument that since freedom of the seas did not prevent World War No. 1 and No. 2, that freedom of the air will not prevent World War No. 3. With equal force, it seems to me, one could argue that since freedom of speech and freedom of religion in this country did not prevent two world wars and will not prevent a third, therefore we should abandon these principles as useless to our Nation. It seems superfluous to observe that freedom of the seas was not the culprit; it was merely the innocent bystander and no more caused this war than did Holland, Denmark, or Norway.

Being unable to follow any serious logic in this reasoning, I am compelled to conclude that the point of this passage was to ridicule the Vice President of the United States. Her witty and scintillating remarks about Mr. WALLACE were quite equal to the sophisticated style of Walter Winchell and Time magazine. Not only is Mr. WALLACE spasmodically sane, but he is full of "globaloney," a wonderful word which convulsed the gallery and will certainly live for many seasons in the folklore of Broadway. There is no denying it, our honorable colleague is a wit.

In the concluding paragraphs of the address there was an effort to create the impression that the British are aware of the importance of air power and that we had better begin immediately to grab every base and air route before the war is over and while the British are preoccupied with Herr Hitler. She even hints that the British might use lend-lease planes to help rebuild their air routes after the war.

WORLD WAR NO. 3

The most astounding and at the same time the most significant passage of the address is the next to last paragraph. I quote:

> I do not hesitate to say, if out of indifference or lack of foresight, this administration and this Congress espouse the wrong air policy for this Nation, we shall have most efficiently laid the ground work for America's certain defeat in World War No. 3.

The way to avoid this calamity, she infers, is that we must now, before this war is over, begin to prepare for the next war, World War No. 3, by adopting her version of sovereignty of the skies.

It must be admitted, of course, that the air policy advocated by the Honorable Member is probably the most effective method imaginable of bringing on a Third World War. If we initiate this aggressive program of expanding our international air routes and at the same time exclude everyone from our skies, do any of you have any doubt what the effect would be on our British, Russian, and Chinese Allies?

In the course of the speech a statement by Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles was used to fortify the imperialistic arguments of the gentlewoman. I want to draw the Members' attention to a more recent statement by the same Mr. Welles, printed in the Washington Post February 12. I quote:

> There could be no surer road to disaster, no surer means of bringing about unmitigated havoc in the future, than for the United Nations to enter the post-war period as rivals and opponents in their commercial and financial policies, rather than as collaborators in a common task of seeking and achieving international economic stability and general well-being. Together we can solve this gigantic problem; opposed to one another, no one of us will profit.

This, I submit, is a thoroughly sound policy and is directly opposed to that of our honored colleague.

THE BRITISH POLICY

With regard to the statement of the British Under Secretary for Air, Captain Balfour, quoted by the gentlewoman as justification for our pursuing the old game of grab, the whole debate in Parliament, printed in the RECORD of February 9, certainly does not justify the impression given by that quotation standing alone. In fact, I think it is directly to the contrary. For example, Mr. Perkins, M. P., said:

> I am not in any way antagonistic to the great American Nation. I believe that it is

vital that in the future we should cooperate with the Americans in air transport.

Again, Captain Wright, M. P., said:

But if we are to return to a condition of insane, unrestricted international competition, the future of civil aviation, as of so many other features of reconstruction, will be exceedingly black.

The debate as a whole, filling seven and one-half pages of the RECORD, certainly makes no threats in any way to our air supremacy. On the contrary, the British recognize that the necessities of war have given the manufacturing of large transport planes to the United States and left the small fighter planes for the British. They acknowledge that Pan-American Airways has practically taken over the world's commercial air transport. Mr. Perkins stated that there were only two civil aircraft in all England, of their own make, capable of flying the Atlantic.

These circumstances clearly indicate that our interests will best be served by a policy of freedom of the skies in order that we may obtain the bases for our aircraft throughout the world. There is no question as to our predominance in the manufacturing field.

It seems to me a very unwise and dangerous move for us, at this critical time, to adopt a policy of proceeding now to gobble up all the commercial advantages possible, while we and our allies are desperately fighting to defeat the common enemy. Furthermore, I think it exceedingly unfortunate to assume at this time that nothing whatever can be done about controlling the savage and violent elements of the world; to assume that World War No. 3 is just around the corner. Such an assumption is a most powerful inducement to that very result.

I submit that the only rational policy for this great Nation of ours, is to assume, what I believe to be true, that the peoples of this earth have learned something by experience, that they earnestly desire to avoid and to prevent another world war, and that they are willing to make reasonable sacrifices to attain this end. Upon this assumption, our representatives should begin negotiations at once with our allies to formulate a specific and concrete system for collective security of the nations of the world. I, for one, believe that such a system is possible, providing the people of this Nation, especially our national Representatives, are willing to discard our traditional isolationism, now often disguised under the name of Americanism, and to approach the problem of war and peace with a determination to do everything possible to find a practical solution.

Mr. Chairman, I propose that this Congress, instead of assuming a defeatist policy with regard to war, immediately authorize and direct its Committee on Foreign Affairs to undertake a thorough study of all proposals for post-war international organizations designed to prevent war. That committee should be instructed to make a report of its findings to this House in the near future. It should develop specific recommendations regarding this vital matter for the consideration of the executive branch of this Government and the people of this Nation.

The time is getting short for the development and consideration of a program for peace. It must be done now, while the minds and hearts of the peoples of this world are concerned with universal and fundamental issues—while danger and sacrifice give us humility and understanding. With the return of peace and even temporary security from danger, our personal and domestic problems distract our attention and overshadow our will to cooperate for the common good.

I do not propose that we undertake some sentimental and idealistic enterprise. I believe that our own selfish interests—in fact, our very survival as a great nation—is dependent upon an intelligent and practical system of collective security—a system by which brute force and mechanical force can be controlled so that it is no longer available to any gang of outlaws who may happen even temporarily to control a nation. It seems to me that in international relations, as in domestic affairs, force can be made to serve instead of to destroy our society.

I do not think we need to wait for Joseph Stalin to take the lead in the clarification of our war and peace aims. If we can clarify our own aims and give Mr. Stalin some assurance that we are sincere in those aims, I have no doubt that he will be glad to cooperate if those aims are fair and reasonably practicable. Further, I cannot agree that Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill are floundering aimlessly about. Somehow it has never occurred to me to pity those two gentlemen as aimless wanderers in a sea of uncertainty. Surely, the gentlewoman has not forgotten already who it was that warned this Nation, long before Pearl Harbor, of events to come and who insisted upon enlarging our Navy, in spite of the violent protest of the isolationists. Likewise, in Britain, whose was the great and prophetic voice that condemned the appeasers of Munich and inspired the British people to an heroic defense? No; I cannot agree that these two men are short-sighted and aimless wanderers in a sea of uncertainty.

PLATITUDES

The Atlantic Charter, it seems to me, is no more of a monumental generality or virtuous platitude than is the preamble of our own Constitution or our own sacred Declaration of Independence. Noble aspirations, nobly expressed, have served and, I believe, will serve a useful purpose in the progress of mankind. They are introductory to the specific and difficult business of creating a sane and practical machinery for the guidance of a turbulent human race. It may be expected that such platitudes have no place in a policy of shortsighted and adolescent, nationalistic, imperialism.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the only substantial benefit this Nation can realize from this war is the assurance of a peaceful world, based upon a world-wide system of collective security. Such a system can be achieved only with the genuine cooperation of our gallant allies.

The narrow, imperialistic policy of grab, advocated by the honorable lady, carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction. An exclusive policy with regard to our own airports obviously will induce the same exclusive policy in all other sovereign nations. But the most evil consequence of that policy is that it will so arouse the suspicion and distrust of our allies as to our purposes that we can never convince them that we have a sincere desire to stop, once and for all, the recurrence of these frightful wars which are so rapidly destroying the vitals of our Christian civilization. I, for one, do not wish to base our policy on the assumption that a third world war is just around the corner. On the contrary, I believe this great Nation of ours now has, or shortly will have, the power to turn this ghastly, barren tragedy into a tremendous opportunity which, with imagination, intelligence, and determination, will enable us, together with our allies, to create the world of the future.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If my time has not expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mrs. LUCE. The young and very able gentleman from Arkansas has spoken rather loosely of what he calls my freedom-of-the-air policy. I would like to ask a very specific question of the gentleman. By his definition of what he calls a proper air policy for the United States, does he intend that this country should control its own skies or airports, or does he intend to relinquish that control?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot imagine that this country can relinquish control of the skies and airports any more than it has relinquished control of its seaports under our traditional policy of freedom of the seas.

Mrs. LUCE. I would like to ask the gentleman another question. At several points the gentleman said I had inferred this or that. I inferred nothing. I implied and the gentleman from Arkansas did the inferring. Now, would the gentleman from Arkansas be good enough to give me the precise passage, the precise quote from the text of my speech in which I said that America must control the sovereign skies of any other nation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I do not think I said that. You proposed that America gain control of air bases and air routes.

Mrs. LUCE. Will the gentleman be good enough to give me the exact text and quote in which I implied or inferred or stated specifically that this country acquire bases and routes from sovereign nations without free negotiations between those nations and ourselves?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would you like me to read your speech again to this audience?

Mrs. LUCE. I should like you to read that portion of it which you say says such a thing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is implicit throughout the speech, if I recall correctly.

Mrs. LUCE. You are inferring.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, there is a section in the bill that is before us that deals with various increases in research fields, giving recognition to the splendid work being done to improve, through research, our air services to the utmost degree. Certain increased and necessary personnel needs can now be met and the work greatly accelerated. I am, of course, aware of the splendid work being done at Langley Field and in the Ames Laboratory at Mott Field, but I know more about the great research engine laboratory at Cleveland. Need for a three-shift set-up has become increasingly evident, and this recognition by the committee and by the Budget is particularly gratifying to those of us who know something of the enthusiasm, the consecration, and the grim determination that is going into the work there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

GEORGE WASHINGTON AND THE NEW DEAL

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the strain and wear and tear on New Deal heroes is not alone terrific, it is devastating. You will recall that the President started out with Old Hickory as his hero, to whom he claimed spiritual kinship. Indeed, the tie was so close that we were, once upon a time, told by him that he often communed with that great national hero in the long hours of the night. Not only did Jackson provide the New Deal with the necessary spiritual leadership for those who longed to make America over, but Old Andy had a decided monetary value to the New Deal when it came to holding pay-as-you-go dinners.

We vividly recall the first Jackson Day dinner at the Mayflower Hotel, back in the early days of the New Deal, when the faithful, both those who were members of the official family as well as those who hoped soon to be in that happy situation, gathered at the festive board and like a swarm of locusts proceeded to eat off gold plates at $100 per plate.

Similar feeds were given all over the country, but at somewhat reduced rates because fourth-class postmasters, as a rule, do not have $100 to spare for such doings after having paid the cost of framing their diploma in high finance. These dinners, whether they cost $100, or some lesser amount, were held under the auspices of the Democratic National Committee, and the proceeds devoted to making the country safe for the New Deal.

Old Hickory continued to retain his high standing at the White House until the proposal to pack the Supreme Court, sometimes called the remount station, came up. Then someone suddenly discovered that Old Hickory had been strong for the Constitution and constitutional government. That placed too great a strain on the fellowship that had until then existed between his spirit and the Chief Executive, so Andy was thrown into the discard and little has been heard about him since.

Other heroes such as Confucius, Joseph and the Pharaohs, Jefferson, and even Theodore Roosevelt, followed in rapid succession, but one and all developed some weak spot, some defect in their philosophy of government which necessitated their being shoved into the background.

Lo and behold, the new dealers have now adopted a new hero—George Washington—and on February 22 the Democratic National Committee will sponsor dinners all over the country to honor the memory of that great American and, incidentally thereto, garner in more sheckels for the cause.

This is an age of incongruities and certainly nothing can be more incongruous than the new dealers honoring the memory of George Washington at so much per plate. As I recall, George Washington not only refused a crown, but he also spurned a third term because he felt that if the same individual were kept in the White House longer than 8 years there was the possibility and danger that he might seek to perpetuate himself in power.

George Washington was against just about all that the New Deal stands for. He was for a balanced Budget; he abhorred debts; he stood for national solvency; and above all he stood for government by law rather than by men. More especially was he against government by crackpots and dreamers, but these considerations will not be permitted to bar the use of his name in order to raise money for the campaign to promote a fourth term.

The name "Washington" is revered, honored, and beloved throughout the land. No loyal American should refuse to buy one or more tickets to a dinner given to honor his birthday, but how the idea must lacerate the feelings of those who are expected to buy tickets. Evidently, not all Democrats will do so. Let me read an Associated Press story from the St. Cloud (Minn.) Daily Times Journal of February 8, which shows that the program to again milk the faithful is meeting with various and indifferent responses. By the way, this newspaper has been most loyal to the New Deal.

I read:

SUGGESTS CHANGE IN JACKSON DAY ANNUAL BANQUET

ST. PAUL, MINN.—Responding to an invitation to the annual Democratic Jackson Day dinner to raise party funds, John Regan, Mankato, 1940 party nominee for Senator, suggested that the date should be changed to the birthday of Texas Guinan, who greeted her "victims" with, "Hello, Sucker."

Regan expressed his sentiments in a letter to Elmer F. Kelm, of the party State central committee. Saying he was in receipt of Kelm's letter asking for a $25 contribution to the national committee, Regan added:

"I also note that if I pay the $25, I'll be invited to a dinner to be held at the Hotel St. Paul on February 22, Washington's Birthday. Heretofore these dinners have been held on Jackson's birthday. As you know, he was the one who coined the expression, 'To the victor belongs the spoils.' I would like to suggest that the day of the dinner be changed to Texas Guinan's birthday. She at least greeted her victims with, 'Hello, Sucker.' "

Regan asserted that these dinners have resulted in the national committee taking $100,000 out of the State in the past 5 years, although New York, Illinois, and New Jersey contributed nothing. "Our State doesn't enjoy one major appointment held by a Democrat, either in Minnesota or in Washington," he continued.

"No State has been so completely ignored and insulted by the Democratic National Committee as has Minnesota," he continued. "Any time that the Democrats of Minnesota wish to hold a dinner or raise a fund for themselves, I'll be only too glad to attend and contribute, but when it comes to donating to a group such as Flynn, Ewing, and the rest of them, I want you to know here and now I am not to be counted on."

To many Mr. Regan's letter came as a melancholy revelation. To me it is saddening to contemplate the growing discord among the new dealers. Little did I ever expect to live to see the day that John Regan, one of Minnesota's stalwart Democrats, one time candidate for Governor and United States Senator on that ticket, would longer refuse to be played for a sucker. Surely "the world do move."

Purely in self-defense may I not submit my plea to those who are manipulating the wringer that is squeezing out the shekels that the cost of the banquet tickets shall not exceed $50. One hundred dollars per ticket might place a strain on my admiration for Washington, and I am also fearful that it may greatly strain the bond of loyalty of those who are devoting their fine talents to breaking the tradition against a fourth term. Above all, let us have harmony.

How long will the New Deal cleave to George Washington, you ask? My reply is that it will depend on how long his drawing power holds out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KNUTSON. Those are just some observations. I was not dealing with any controversial subject. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] with regard to the "pay-as-you-go" dinners proposed by the Democratic Party will not lead to any "Ruml-rousing" sessions on those occasions, but I would like to comment to this extent, having in mind the fact that many who will attend will still be hungry after the dinner is over, hungry for office, may I ask whether the gentleman will accept an amendment to his suggestion that they be called, rather than "pay-as-you-go" dinners, "pay-as-you-yearn"?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I intended to start my speech by complimenting the House on the high caliber of the debate that has taken place today. It seems to me we have had opportunity to listen to some very important and ably delivered speeches on matters which must concern us all. Whether or not the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota fall into this category I leave to himself and the House to judge.

The majority leader, in the remarks he made a short time ago, left a message which can briefly be summed up like this: That since the advantage in this war has now passed to the United Nations, this advantage should be pressed as vigorously as possible. With this sentiment I think few Americans will disagree.

There are certain problems which it is incumbent upon this House to look forward to, one of which has been very ably dealt with already by the gentleman from Arkansas—the establishment of a genuine peace between the nations instead of another period of armed truce such as followed the last war.

I turn my attention to a subject somewhat more difficult to discuss and fraught perhaps with more disagreement than that handled by the gentleman from Arkansas, for I want to talk about the importance of having the Congress look forward to meeting the domestic problem which will confront us after the war has been won. At the conclusion of the last war America turned with great desire in her heart to a thing that was held out before her, called normalcy. Normalcy, after people had a chance to examine it turned out to mean a deliberate deflation of the medium of exchange, widespread unemployment, and countless foreclosed farms. Beginning in May of 1920 a collapse of farm prices began which in about 8 months reduced those prices to one-half of what they formerly had been, and they never recovered from that collapse until World War No. 2 was upon us. For a few months immediately after the war there was indeed a boom due to dammed-up buying power, but thereafter a collapse came upon the Nation which meant unemployment and economic distress. I believe that it is of basic importance that these things be prevented after this war has ended.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish to proceed for just a moment.

Talk to a man in the armed services and you will find when you ask him what is the one charge he would make to you and to me, and he will tell you his charge to us is to see to it that another war does not happen in the future and to see to it that he has some sort of real job when he has finished his work of fighting. Click magazine not very long ago contacted many men in the armed forces and asked them to check the five things they felt were most important in their own minds as to what ought to be done by those not in the armed forces. The one that received twice as many checks as any other received was that there should be jobs and opportunities for them when they returned home.

This thing, Mr. Chairman, is not just going to happen. I take issue directly at this point with those who feel that we can simply forget about the matter, that we can be done with what are termed "plans for the post-war period," that we do not need to pay attention to these problems and that everything will somehow take care of itself. I believe with all those Americans who want freedom of economic opportunity and enterprise preserved into the future, but I tell you there is one way to do it and only one way, and that is to develop methods other than those of governmental controls and regimentation whereby you can assure to the people of this Nation full employment, and to the producers, agricultural as well as industrial, a full market at home for a volume of goods and services equivalent to the total output of American farms and factories at a level of full employment. As a matter of fact, not only do we fight a military war today, but there is being tested free democratic government, and free democratic government will be tested in the future to see whether we by means of our institutions of freedom can solve the difficult economic problems of this machine age. I am confident in my heart that it can be done, but I do not think it can be done without the application of intelligence.

In this bill there might have been an appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board, but I notice that that appropriation has been eliminated from the bill. I do not know why. I want to say that I am sorry it has been eliminated, for I believe that this agency is doing a worth-while job, rather quietly going about its work, and I have felt that it had its work to do rather well in hand.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will yield in a moment.

I want to say this, that I would not have any particular quarrel with this committee for having taken the action they did if only they and the House would recognize at the same time that if we do not want an executive agency to do this over-all job, then this job comes back to us into our own laps, where, in my judgment, it really belongs; in other words, my appeal today is not going to be critical of the committee and the action it has taken, though I disagree with that action, but to say that it seems to me that if you carry through this action and say to this executive agency, "We do not want you to do this job of preparing for the post-war period," then it becomes even more incumbent than it has ever been before—and as I have stated many times before—that the Congress should itself undertake as a national legislature the job of looking ahead in practical fashion and undertaking the job of developing those measures and policies upon which we can depend to guide our domestic economy safely through that difficult period which must necessarily follow this war.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is voicing the very motives which inspired the committee to take the action it did take, and I shall discuss the matter after a while.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will be glad to hear what the gentleman has to say. At the moment there are all sorts of post-war plans going on and even some by those people who make the most fuss about post-war plans. For example, I fear there are some representatives of big corporations in this country who are doing a type of post-war planning looking toward the preventing of effective competition with those corporations after the war is over. This is why there should be more representatives of small business in the War Production Board.

On the constructive side, you have many private agencies, one committee of American business headed by Mr. Harold Hoffman, president of the Studebaker Corporation. You have a committee of the American Federation of Labor which is making studies in this field. You have a number of other agencies which are making studies, working on the problem as to how America will solve this matter after the war. In addition you have a good many of the governmental agencies that are doing this. Every agency I can think of that may logically enter this field has already entered it with the single exception of the Congress of the United States, which, to my mind, is the most logical and central one that should do the job.

For 2 long years I have had before this House a bill to create a national commission on post-war reconstruction, to be composed first of Members of Congress; and, second, to be composed of representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, finance, the churches of the Nation, cooperative organizations, organizations of consumers, war veterans, and other groups.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, that measure was reported unanimously by the committee to which it was referred, but it was never acted on by the House. On the first day of the present session I reintroduced that measure, adding to it two provisions, one that of the representatives from business at least one must be a representative of small business and among the veterans at least one must be a combat veteran of the present World War.

There are two possibilities with regard to the post-war period. The first one is that you will have a situation where the predominant sentiment of the Congress will be one which will again yearn for "normalcy," so, in effect, nothing will be done except to say "the devil take the hindmost," and we will hope that there will be a prosperous condition. If that

is done, mark my word, before many months have passed we will find ourselves in economic distress, we will find that we have not made good on our pledge to the men now on the fighting front to see to it that they will have, in fact, jobs and opportunity when the war is over.

The other possibility is that the Congress, having neglected to democratically develop certain measures entirely consistent with free economic enterprise in this Nation and growing out of the very matrix of legislative action, will conclude with accepting some over-all emergency recommendation on the part of an executive with Members voting for it and declaring how sorry they are but they have to do it to meet an emergency. That situation ought not to be permitted, especially not by people who are concerned about the position of the Congress in the National Government.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from California spoke awhile ago about the depression that succeeded the last war. That depression was brought about by W. P. G. Harding, president of the Federal Reserve Board, and those who were working with him in raising the rediscount rate and calling in loans.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, squeezing the currency, and the panic that destroyed the Hoover administration was brought about in the same way. That condition has not yet been cured.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Exactly.

Mr. RANKIN. Unless something is done to prevent those highbinders of high financing putting on these periodical depressions, they are going to come, war or no war.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman, and I may say that I have written a book on that subject, which I hope to be able to present to the gentleman very shortly.

Mr. RANKIN. I will be glad to read it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to add that the significance of the meeting of the Federal Reserve Board to which the gentleman refers was in a statement by Mr. W. P. G. Harding, in which he said it would be nice if our industrial production could continuously expand, but we must understand that the possibility of that expansion must always be limited by the "availability of finances," to my mind the most mistaken statement ever made in the economic field.

I have in this little folder here the mail that I have received in one short 5-day period in support of the measure providing for this national commission on postwar reconstruction about which I spoke. I will conclude by saying that I do not care whether it is my bill that is passed or not, but I do feel the Congress should undertake now to create a commission composed primarily of Members of Congress but inclusive of the American people generally in order that the people may not only present demands as pressure groups but can sit down and take a part of the responsibility for seeing how the general welfare of the entire Nation can be served.

May I say further that the one thing which will put more spirit and heart into our people at home than anything else that I know of is if they can see clearly that the future is secure and that people who are responsible for that future are giving attention to it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Like the gentleman from California, I am very much distressed at the committee cutting out the appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board. I also know something of their work, and, as the gentleman stated, they have done their work in a quiet way.

Yesterday I asked a question on the floor about that and I was told that the main reason was duplication of their work. Like the gentleman from California, I think this work should go on. If somebody else is doing it, that is one thing, but I hope he will make that clear, otherwise it is my intention to submit an amendment to this bill at least to keep the skeleton organizations going in order to do the very thing that the gentleman from California talks about.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, it seems that many of the things we are doing today are still at cross purposes. Numerous functions of government initiated and carried on during the depression are no longer necessary or advisable. Then, why in the name of all that is reasonable can we not stop doing the unessential and unnecessary when conditions no longer warrant consideration of problems once important. The war has indeed changed our economic status. Untold thousands, yes even millions, now have money in their pockets, money to burn we might well say. No longer do the people have to come to a beneficent government and say "give me" or "help me out." And since we must certainly, when opportunity affords, clear ourselves from paternalistic apron strings, why do we have departments of government so determined and intent on keeping as many individuals as possible under their rule and thumb.

I now speak directly on only one of such activities, namely the credit agencies within the Department of Agriculture. When they might well be curtailing their activities, we find the Production Credit Corporation, Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, Farm Security Administration and feed and seed loan agencies all out on the firing line trying to drum up business amongst the farmers who may temporarily need funds to carry them through this crop year. I am informed that these departments have over 20,000 employees. Possibly they are trying to keep them busy with and on your money and mine. Right now banks throughout the country have ample and sufficient funds to meet the requests of any farm borrower. Banks want to loan their money to such individuals and they are entitled to have the business.

Why should they be forced to compete with Uncle Sam in making loans. Banks need to make money to pay taxes. They do pay large taxes. Every such institution carries great investments in Government securities. They carry Commodity Credit Corporation loans on which they draw 1½ percent. In most of the small rural communities the bank is the hub of the wheel which makes possible the many activities carried on within the area served. The bankers and their employees serve on all kinds of local and district committees, selective-service boards, head up Government bond selling groups, and spend hours of their time and efforts to help promote the interests of all war projects. Such institutions are valuable assets to our American way of promoting community life. So I deplore and regret to find the Government going far afield and taking unnecessary steps to solicit business from the farmers, which business should and can be handled by these local commercial country banks.

Now is the time for us to serve notice on the many departments of government that we expect them to stop such practices as they are now conducting. If these department heads do not believe in private enterprise or the right of the individual or corporation to carry on without Government competition, then the quicker we know about such a state of affairs the sooner we can act to handle such agencies by refusing to appropriate the funds they use.

Frankly, there must be unity of purpose on the part of all, but such foggy thinking by those who feel that the Government must fight and harass and be in competition with all private business, must be dispelled and right now. Every individual, every corporation, every department of government has a job to do. Through cooperation we can accomplish our goal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am aware that the subcommittee, as well as the full Committee on Appropriations struck from the bill the appropriation it contained for the National Resources Planning Board. I am taking this occasion to discuss the nature and work of this agency in anticipation of a possible attempt to reinsert the appropriation in the bill on the floor. But I shall discuss this subject for a more fundamental reason than that.

Unless one has made some study of the organizational structure of the Planning Board, its connections, objectives, means for carrying on its program, and the extent of its activities, one cannot realize the dangerous threat to our country that

is involved in this combination of elements. The extent of the forces engaged, and their nature, considering the vulnerability of present disordered economic and social processes, make this political arrangement potentially capable of completely destroying all hope of restoring free enterprise and constitutional government.

To me it is truly alarming that such a destructive force as this could grow up to its present size and power without the Congress and the country becoming more aware of its dangers than it apparently has.

The Planning Board, in itself, is at present, perhaps the least significant part of the arrangement. Its permanent and temporary employees in its Washington office, together with its professor-economist consultants and experts numbered in the spring of 1942 about 425. The amount of appropriations made to this agency has averaged about a million dollars annually, which is not much when judged by New Deal standards.

The all-important thing is the forces back of this body. These are, as we shall see, so all-embracing as to include most if not the whole economy.

The first thing to be observed is that the Planning Board is merely an instrument of the President. He refers to it as "the planning arm of my Executive Office." It is responsible to him and to no one else. In a letter transmitting and recommending to the Congress the National Resources Development Report of 1942, the President said:

> The National Resources Planning Board * * * is charged with the preparation of long-range plans for the development of our national resources and the stabilization of employment. At my direction, it is correlating plans and programs under consideration in many Federal, State, and private organizations for post-war full employment, security, and building America. In this report the Board outlines some of our major objectives in planning to win the peace.

Thus, it is clear that the National Resources Planning Board in itself is powerless; that it derives all of its authority from the President.

It is when one reflects upon the vast powers the Executive possesses over the whole economy, the availability to him of the resources of the Nation and above all, upon the fact that he himself is committed to a politically planned economy, as his record shows, and also as is shown by his approval of the Planning Board's reports, that one becomes aware of the real forces that are involved in the Planning Board's schemes. The extent and scope of economic and social planning the Board can undertake are virtually coextensive with the powers of the President.

Armed with the powers of the President, which, of course, means the Federal purse also, the National Resources Planning Board goes forth to promote the politically planned economy.

The personnel in the organizational structure of the Board are the chairman, Frederick A. Delano, an uncle of the President; the director, several assistant directors, and so forth, with offices in Washington.

Next in order are the nine regional planning commissions, with offices located at Boston, Baltimore, Richmond, Va., Atlanta, Indianapolis, Omaha, Denver, Portland, and San Francisco. Alaska comprises another planning region.

Below the regional planning units are the State planning units, then the municipal planning units. The following gives some idea of the relation of the regional planning units to State and local ones:

> Activities of the field staff have continued to develop in six main directions: (1) Stimulation and encouragement of State and local planning—

Stimulation and encouragement, keep in mind, with, among other means, Federal grants-in-aid, loans, and largess—

> (2) provision of the committee's technical consultants to regional and State planning agencies; (3) interrelating planning activity between planning agencies; (4) sponsorship of drainage basin committees for water resources planning; (5) collaboration with special committees on regional studies within their areal divisions; and (6) acting as a clearing house for information.

Under the Agriculture Department nearly all 48 States have special planning committees with 1,294 members, and 1,433 active county-planning committees with 34,494 members, all engaged in various kinds of planning schemes for the farmers—Agricultural Statistics, 1941, page 714.

THE USE OF FEDERAL AGENCIES AS MEANS FOR CARRYING OUT PLANNING

In addition to the twenty-odd construction agencies designated in the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931 for the preparation of construction plans, the President, under Executive Order 8455, added about 70 new ones—a list of which was furnished me by the Board. What is important here, however, is that he brought in an entirely new kind of agencies, namely, those which aid construction activity through grants-in-aid, loans, other forms of financial assistance, or through guaranties from the Federal Government.

This included such agencies as W. P. A., suspended but not abolished; the Federal Housing Agency; the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, which consists of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the United States Housing Corporation; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; Rural Electrification Administration; Soil Conservation Service; Farm Security Administration; and Farm Credit Administration.

Imagine the power these lending agencies alone provide for the Planning Board to carry out its program.

But the Board is not limiting itself to the use of the ninety-odd Federal agencies listed for me by it. We know that Dr. Alvin Hansen, Harvard professor and special adviser to the Board, is working in cooperation with Chairman Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, on problems of fiscal policy in the post-defense period, with particular reference to financing of public-improvement projects.

Yet the Federal Reserve is not among the list of agencies given me by the Board. Dr. Hansen plays a leading role in the planning cult.

Indeed, there is evidence to show that the process of planning development is rapidly approaching the stage where it will embrace the use of all Federal Government agencies and elements. In this connection I should like to refer the Members to an article written by Charles E. Merriam, vice chairman of the Planning Board, in Public Administration Review, winter 1941, volume 1, No. 2, where, among other statements showing the wide connections of the Board with Federal agencies, private organizations, and so forth, he says:

> A long-time program for public works which spreads over and involves the cooperation of practically all of the agencies of the Government.

The following, taken from the 1942 progress report, should convince the Congress and country of the almost limitless powers that are already in the hands of the political planners. In speaking of their plan to relocate the industrial plants of the Nation—that is, to shift them from one region to another, they say:

> Governmental authority is adequate to the means. Taxation, tariffs, price regulation, transportation and power regulation, labor legislation, public works, credit control, and financial assistance are all potentially effective instruments which the Federal Government may wield in its efforts to promote the development of a nationally integrated locational structure.

Here we also have some forewarning as to the means that would be used to induce us to accept the ideas of the planners.

With the availability to the political planners of all the Federal powers that are involved in taxation, tariffs, price regulation, transportation, and power regulation, labor legislation, public work, credit control, and financial assistance, what is left to hinder them from doing just about what they please with our economy and lives? What is there to stop them from completing the totalitarian state?

It is to be noted that while the planners uttered this threat out of one corner of their mouths, from the other corner came this soothing promise:

> The basis of planning is not violence but reason, and the condition of most successful operation is not force but persuasion, cooperation, common participation in an effort for a common goal.

WHAT ARE THE STATED OBJECTIVES OF THE PLANNERS?

We can do no more here than give a brief outline. Under "New Objectives" they state:

> The Bill of Rights has stood unshaken 150 years. And now to the old freedoms we must add new freedoms.

And then list the following, some of which are wholly inconsistent with each other:

> Greater freedom for the American people. The right to work * * * to fair pay

* * * adequate food * * * clothing, shelter, and medical care * * * to security, with freedom from old age, want, dependency, sickness, unemployment and accident. * * * to life in a system of free enterprise, free from compulsory labor, irresponsible private power, arbitrary public authority, and unregulated monopolies. * * * to come and go, to speak or be silent, free from spyings of secret political police. * * * to equality before the law, with equal access to justice in fact * * * to education, for work, for citizenship, and for personal growth and happiness; * * * and the right to rest, recreation, and adventure; the opportunity to enjoy life and take part in advancing civilization.

Following the line of Hitler, Mussolini, and other dictators, the planners are planning to shift whole groups of the population from one place to another.

They plan to arbitrarily shift millions of farmers from their farms to cities, 3,000,000 according to their reports, and more than twice that number according to Mr. George D. Riley in his column in the Washington Times-Herald of February 3, 1942.

They plan to lift bodily, en masse, town and city dwellers from their homes and transplant them to cities and towns in other regions. They tell us—

A shift of population may be the only way of avoiding industrial misfits.

Thus, labor is truly to be handled as a physical commodity, indeed, as simple chattel.

Just as laborers and farmers are to be moved from place to place, so industrial plants, too, are to be shifted about like the tents of a circus.

They speak about "urbanization, the placing of more industry in cities"; of "ruralization, the encouragement of industrialization in small towns and farming areas"; of "suburbanization, the shifting of plants out of large cities to surrounding communities"; of "delocalization, the breaking up of high concentration of single industries in particular areas"; of "dispersion, the spreading of industrial activity throughout the country more nearly in relation to population"; of "diversification, the encouragement of varied local economic structures"; and "specialization, the concentration of an important part of local resources on the making of products for which the locality possesses superior advantages."

In making our Nation over, the planners plan to raze our cities and construct them all anew.

"We must build," they tell us, "not by the square block, but by the square mile."

The planners take in the whole world. They do not intend to be eclipsed by any total war but intend there shall be global planning also. There are, they say, "plans for the international scene * * *. Through an extension of lease-lend we shall certainly help feed the starving people of Europe," which will probably include all of them, for likely all of them will be starving by the time the war ends, "until they can get on their feet."

Then they tell us, "after Europe's needs for food, clothing, and emergency medical care have been met, perhaps then our greatest opportunity to help others economically will be found in Asia and in parts of North or South America."

Asia alone is a pretty big place and has a lot of people, a billion or so. It would take a lot of cows to furnish a bottle of milk a day for man, woman, and child on that vast continent.

There is to be "some sort of international reconstruction finance corporation set up to engage in international lending."

Imagine lending anything to Europe after the war.

Naturally the schools are invaded. Pupils are already being taught the blessings of bureaucratic planning. We read in the planners' report of a pamphlet, From the Ground Up, which, it says:

Presents a series of timely planning discussions, each limited to one page of text facing illustrations of good and bad examples.

The good examples showed, of course, the work of political planners; the bad ones that of the status quo boys. They tell us further that somewhere in New England several thousand copies of the good and bad examples pamphlets are in use in junior and senior high schools, in civics, geography, economics, and sociology courses.

Since Mrs. Roosevelt tells us in her little book, This Troubled World—page 16:

Our real and ultimate objective must be a change in human nature.

The planners boldly undertake to bring about the proper alteration.

"Children and youth," they tell us, "cannot be kept in storage." So they propose to take them out of storage, thaw them out, soften them up, and mold them to the mode of the planning cult.

Apparently we are to believe parents by and large are too immature emotionally to be trusted with the care of their offspring.

"Both the infant and the young child," they inform us, "need the affection of emotionally mature parents."

But just how the planners hope to bring parental emotions to ne plus ultra they do not venture to say. But that does not seem to bother them much. They seem to think they can do it, and that is enough.

In the attempt that is now being made by the planning cult to invade the public schools and to absorb into the Federal Government the educational functions of the States and local communities, one is reminded of the method used by Prince Bismarck. In Germany, at that time, it was the prerogative of the church to inspect public and private schools. Prince Bismarck accused the Jesuits of intriguing against the Empire. As a means to counteract their work he asked the Prussian Parliament to pass a law taking the inspection of all public and private schools out of the hands of the church and placing it entirely in the hands of the state. In connection with this episode Bismarck said:

Being convinced that we are confronted with hostile forces, our motto must be, "Principiis obsta."

Which in English means, to block the beginning. Then continuing, he said:

We do not wish, as advised by some, to cut down people, but rather to educate them in such a way as not to make it necessary for us to cut them down. (Prince Bismarck, by Charles Lowe, vol. 2, p. 277.)

The law requested by Bismarck was enacted, and from that day down to the present the German state has been using continuously more and more the schools to mold the minds of German children to its will, until we see today the end result of that policy, one of the most frightful scourges that was ever visited upon mankind, namely, nazi-ism.

The very instrument Bismarck claimed he sought to keep from cutting down his own people is now being used to slay not only them and millions more in other countries, but civilization itself.

Finally, we see the bureaucratic planners reaching the nadir in their spoliation program when we find them sneaking into the domain of sex life of our young people. Mark well this sadistic expression:

At about this period boys and girls become eager to make new friends. They look for opportunities to meet one another informally, under suitable circumstances. They begin to think vaguely about marrying and rearing families of their own. They need to be informed of the many important factors that enter into founding a successful home. They need help in working out a functioning personal philosophy of life, an attitude toward themselves, their fellow men, and the world in general. (P. 113, National Resources Development Report for 1942.)

PLANS FOR FINANCING AND FISCAL POLICY

From whence is the wherewithal to be derived for completely razing the American economy and building it anew on another pattern? From the same principal sources to which the Federal Government has resorted in the last 10 or 12 years to pay for the vast public works and relief programs it carried on during that time, namely, taxes, and Treasury deficit financing.

Also the same irrationalism, confusion, and sophistry are present in the minds of the planners as have dominated the financial policies of the New Deal bureaucracy throughout.

In substance, the planners propose to use the full taxing power and credit of the Federal Government to provide funds to guarantee full employment and adequate wage payments; freedom from want, fear of old age, dependence, sickness, unemployment, and accident; the right to education, rest, recreation, and adventure; for the razing of our cities and building them anew; for the shifting of a large part of the farm population to cities; for the shifting of workers and industrial plants en masse, from one region to another; for the building of millions of homes in the country and cities; to construct a bigger and more powerful T. V. A. and more T. V. A.'s; to revamp and greatly increase the transportation facilities; to undertake huge flood-control, power-development, land-use, and other similar projects; to promote on a large scale the absorption by Federal Government of State and

local educational functions; to engage in foreign so-called lending by the billions, and in lease-lend to feed and otherwise aid more than a billion and a half of people in Europe, Africa, Asia, and other parts of the world; to give instructions in the public schools to our children and youth in the planning cult; to manage the emotions of parents; to take our children and youth out of storage and shape them to fit the bureaucratic model; to regulate the sex life of our young folks—to do all these things and many more the bureaucratic planners propose to pay for with taxes and deficit financing.

But there is one project for which the planners are planning and for which they propose to raise funds by taxation and deficit financing about which they tell us nothing in any of their reports or anywhere else. They are silent as night about that one. Yet it is the most gigantic and costly project of them all, and the one dearest to their hearts. In fact, it is the very soul of the whole planning scheme. That project is the bureaucracy to operate the planned society. It is being planned to perfection, and make no mistake about that. To plan, manage, and supervise all the schemes the planners already have on their agenda, and the new ones their fertile brains keep hatching out daily, will take an army of bureaucrats that will make the present one look small indeed. Where the members of the social group are now plagued and hounded and browbeaten with one bureaucratic restriction or order, they will be plagued and hounded and browbeaten with 10 bureaucratic restrictions or orders.

But should it not be expected that the bureaucrats' first interest would be in themselves, that they would leave no stone unturned to make themselves as strong as they could so as always to be sure to get the first helping and of the best?

It is noteworthy to observe that the bureaucratic planners, who, just a few years ago, planned and put in operation an economy of scarcity, which they promised would bring us full employment and the good life, have now abandoned that scheme and have gone to the opposite extreme, in theory, at least, and tell us the way to full employment and the good life is to be had in a program of abundance.

They tell us they have found the key to full employment in the war economy. It would appear from an examination of their scheme that they think they can lift the formula for full employment out of the war economy and make it work in a peace economy the same as it now works in the war economy. Nor need we be long, when we consider the nature of their plans and the contents of their printed matter, in sensing the true significance of this idea. They see total war bringing full employment. They see this full employment come about through a totalitarian economy. From this premise they seem to go on the assumption that if a totalitarian economy can produce full employment in wartime it can do the same in peacetime. Ipso facto, they go on the further assumption that a totalitarian economy is just as necessary and just as desirable in peace as in war.

Since this solution of the unemployment problem harmonizes fully with the fundamental nature of bureaucracy, if it does not find its wellspring in its very soul, namely, the ever present dynamic appetite to promote its own interests in acquiring power and domination over the producing group, it is but natural that the bureaucrats should embrace with loving tenderness the opportunity to impose upon us a fully developed regime of status, that is, a complete dictatorship.

When one gets right down to the meat of the proposition of the planners, that the war has provided them with a new and effective formula for ushering in the more abundant life, one finds there is nothing at all new about it. Their war formula is different from the prescription they applied to cure the depression in only one respect, namely, in that the exigencies of the war provide them with greater opportunity to impose upon us the totalitarian state than did the needs, synthetic and other, of the depression.

They propose to use precisely the same medicine to bring us Utopia after the war as they used to cure the depression, only in bigger doses.

The goal that is sought by the President through the National Resources Planning Board can no longer remain in doubt. The Planning Board, with the approval of the President, boldly speaks of modified free enterprise, and it is clear, though there is lip service enough to the contrary, that the program outlined involves nothing less than the absorption by the state of all economic functions and the complete demolition of all free enterprise.

With the loss of free enterprise would go, of course, all liberties—free speech, the right to petition, freedom of worship, and so forth.

Take just one promise alone, that of full employment. What does it connote? If the state undertakes to guarantee to every worker the right to continuous and full employment, the state must of necessity also assume full responsibility for the operation of all industry. This would involve assumption by the state of complete and unlimited control over all industry.

The state would become sole employer, would factitiously fix the value of all services, labor and goods, and working hours. It would use all the force at its command, which would be the whole police power, including the armed forces, to carry out its decrees. It would involve a dictatorship as absolute as any in the world today. Nor would the worker have any place to go to complain.

But we should not be so foolish as to think, if the state were given this absolute power, it would of necessity make good its promise of full employment, in the sense, at least, in which we conceive the term. Mussolini, Hitler, and Stalin all proclaimed the right, by state law or decree, to work and promised full employment. None of them could fulfill his promise except by going to war.

But even suppose it were possible for the state to make good this promise, who wants to live under a state of abject slavery?

The Board, which is the planning arm of the President, speaks approvingly and in support of its planning scheme of "the rise of the national state with its economic programs."

Indeed, and to what countries or country do the political planners refer as having taken on that mode?

Which of the western countries, leaving Russia out, in more recent times has led the way in aggrandizing the state and dwarfing the individual, where the state became all and the individual nothing? Was it not Germany that made the pattern of "the state with its economic programs"?

Perhaps it may be apropos to mention here that Germany also set the example of providing state so-called social security. She began her social-security scheme more than half a century ago.

The state with its economic programs is nothing new. Indeed it is of most ancient origin. Egypt, many thousands of years ago, typified this kind of social organization.

Feudalism was a type of state with its economic and security programs, and all of Europe slaved under it for many hundreds of years. The Incas of Peru developed it to the *n*th degree. Aye, it was the state with its economic programs that caused all of our American ancestors to run away from Europe and come to this country and found a free people under a true government, which was characterized principally by the absence of the state with its economic programs.

The bureaucratic planners tell us the Bill of Rights has stood unshaken for 150 years and promise us additional freedom to that provided in the Constitution, when they had already, before the defense program was started, reduced our people to the abject status where they were compelled, in great measure, to appeal to Federal law to give value to their services; when they had already succeeded in reducing at least one whole industrial group, the farming community, comprising a fourth of our population, to the servile condition where its members were wholly at the mercy of Federal law to give their services value.

What mockery.

How far above the level of slavery is the producing or social group when its members, individually and collectively, are forced to look to Washington and be told by the bureaucracy how much their labor is worth, how much of the things they produce they shall be allowed to keep?

O Jefferson, how far have we strayed from your ideal:

> A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, this seems to be the time to talk of many things, in-

cluding cabbages and kings. We have heard a discussion of the movement of the hands of the clock, and who shall rule the air waves, and George Washington's birthday, and the planning commission. I should like to talk with you a minute about the cabbages, using that vegetable as a symbol of the food on our tables.

On yesterday the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations which handles agricultural appropriations by a rather decisive vote declined to approve a request of the President to authorize the appropriation of $100,000,000 for incentive payments. It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that that committee, the entire Committee on Appropriations, and this House will reconsider that action and give it more sympathetic consideration.

It does not matter now what happens, there is nothing that can be done in the next few weeks that will prevent a shortage of food in this Nation. The only question before us now is, will that shortage be so acute as to become a national disaster?

This $100,000,000 incentive payment can be termed the liniment for a tired body. After the farmer has worked his 12 hours a day, after he has done his best, it is an inducement for him to carry on another hour or another 2 hours.

The action of the committee strikes me as rather peculiar. In this House for the last 2 or 3 years, particularly on the Republican side of the House, there has been complaint that the payments to the farmers have been used and made for the purpose of reducing production. The argument has been made that they should not be used for that purpose but rather to increase production. Here we have a specific request from the Department of Agriculture and from the President of the United States to appropriate $100,000,000 to be used for the sole and single purpose of increasing the production of food necessary to feed this Nation, our armed forces, and our allies.

More than that, Mr. Chairman, up until yesterday morning, if things went wrong with the food supply the Congress could blame other agencies. We could say it was brought about by the Selective Service System in the drafting of our farm boys. We could say it was brought about by the War Production Board in not allowing sufficient farm machinery to the farmers. We could say it was brought about by the Department of Agriculture in not making adequate allowances for fertilizer. There were many things to which the Congress could point as bringing about this condition.

If the action of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations yesterday morning stands, however, then you and I unhappily have entered the breach. If that dreadful condition which I anticipate comes about this fall, millions of our own people will be without food. Then we will be in the position where the Secretary of Agriculture can lift his hands and say, "I did my best," and Mr. Nelson can lift his hands and say, "I did my best, but while the Congress was appropriating in excess of $100,000,000,000 to prosecute the war it declined to appropriate the sum of $100,000,000 in order to get sufficient food to feed the people of this Nation and our armies and allies."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman believe the payment of $100,000,000 as a subsidy or the payment of any amount as a subsidy would actually increase production?

Mr. PACE. I am compelled to differ with the gentleman as to the term. It is not a subsidy. I feel just as the gentleman does about subsidies generally. I wish they were not necessary. But this is not a subsidy. This proposition is that after they have gone to your farm and worked over plans with you and given you a goal for every acre of land you have, even the fence corners, if you will produce the full amount and as much as 10 percent more than your goal, they will give you an allotment sufficient to pay for that extra effort and that extra labor.

Let me give the gentleman this illustration. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] one of the most distinguished and able Members of this body, told me that he had a letter from one of the farmers in his district who who had started gathering sugar beets. After he had finished the first day the farmer figured up the price of his sugar beets, and figured up the amount he had to pay the workmen to gather those beets, and out there I understand it is $5 or $6 a day. The farmer said that the price of all the sugar beets gathered that day lacked $12.50 of paying for the labor required to gather them.

I was not told, but I assume that the farmer stopped gathering sugar beets because he could not carry on with such loss. However, with this inducement payment we could go to the farmers and say, "We need those vegetables, those potatoes, and so forth. If you will carry on we will pay you an extra $10 or $15 or $20 after you have gathered 90 percent of your crop, up to 110 percent."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. In just a moment. I first yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Of course, what the gentleman says is true to the extent that we must guarantee to the farmer that he will be able to come out whole on his production. I agree with the gentleman, but is not the method that ought to be followed one of giving him fair prices for what he produces, rather than giving him something of the character he describes, whether it is called a subsidy, or an incentive payment, or time and a half for overtime, or a dole? The proposition is to give him enough to make him whole, but does not the gentleman think that if we would do that—give him a price, give him machinery, and the labor, and the fertilizer—that no farmer will need any kind of an inducement or incentive payment? Are we not overlooking the big problem in trying to give the farmer a little miserable subsidy to take the place of our neglect in not giving him adequate machinery and labor?

Mr. PACE. Of course, that is the proper way to go about it, but at this late hour we do not have and may not have sufficient labor, machinery, and fertilizer, and this special payment is to try to urge and reward the farmers in producing without them. The workingmen of this Nation were assured last week that they would get time and a half if they would work an extra 8 hours, and your Government is today paying two prices for every pound of copper that is mined. That is an incentive payment to drive the miners longer hours, because we need that copper, but I say to you at this time that in less than 12 months we may need something to eat worse than we need copper. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, regarding the letter received by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], I would like to say in connection with the gentleman's remarks that we are still rationing sugar in America and if I understand Mr. LEA's letter, sugar beets are not being sold for enough to justify the farmer in paying the necessary labor costs to gather them.

Mr. PACE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there is quite a difference between a subsidy payment and inducement payment for extra production. I feel this way about it. You and I have voted for appropriations for defense purposes during the last 2 years in sums that are stupendous. The majority of the Members of this House could never determine, not being present in all of the hearings in committees, the justification for each item, but you and I have supported the recommendations of the committee on the ground that it is far better to appropriate too much for the defense of our Nation than too little. Those of you who know the farm conditions, those of you who know the shortage of farm labor, those of you who know that the wives must wield the hoe, and that children from 8 to 10 to 12 years of age must go to the fields, must realize that if there is not to be a critical shortage, the smart thing for this Congress to do, if, for no other reason than protect ourselves 6 months or 12 months from now, from the finger of scorn, is to make an appropriation requested by your President, and that is recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture, in order that, so far as you and I are concerned, we will have done our full part to feed the people of this Nation.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman does not contend that it is the fault of Congress for not appropriating money to pay these subsidy payments, does he?

Mr. PACE. I do most respectfully submit that in my judgment the subcommittee was in error in denying an appropriation of $100,000,000 as an incentive payment for the producer of Irish potatoes, beans, vegetables, and those things that we need so badly.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does not the gentleman recognize that the fault lies with the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration in not clarifying matters so that they can fix maximum and minimum prices, to handle the labor question?

Mr. PACE. No man is more bitter in his feelings than I toward the policies now carried on by the Office of Price Administration. The last Stabilization Act directed the Administrator to adjust prices, in order to increase production. They have consistently refused to do so, but so far as I am concerned I do not want on my shoulders the responsibility of the people in this Nation getting no food merely because some other agency is not acting according to my opinion.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The fault does not lie with the farmer, nor with the processors. The farmers in my district and in the State of Indiana who want to produce these vegetables are ready and willing to produce them, but the fault lies with these administrators here in Washington who will not clarify these directives and give them sufficient authority to go ahead and contract for acreage to grow vegetables. They are willing as patriotic Americans to do it, and they do not want any subsidy payment for it.

Mr. PACE. I cannot deny that confusion exists, but I do say that if the farmer, in view of the emergency, agrees to plant two or three times as much as he ever planted before and to work long hours and use old machinery, use the members of his family, then it is our duty, in view of the policy that has been followed by this Government for years, to give him an incentive and urge him on and assure him a fair return for his labor.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that personally I am sympathetic with the attitude taken by the subcommittee. For the life of me I do not see how you will increase production merely by giving the farmer more money to produce his commodities.

We have heard on the floor in the last couple of days statements by Representatives from California that after a year's effort they finally have gotten permission to use some Mexican labor. A Representative from California this afternoon exhibited here a statement from the Department of Agriculture telling the farmers of California to use these Mexican laborers, and they gave them a menu to follow. Under that menu they had to feed those laborers beef six times a week, and under the rationing program and the scarcity of meat they cannot even get beef for the farmers themselves. Now, how can you reconcile the fact that the Department of Agriculture will not clarify, along with the Manpower Commission, the question of labor, the question of farm machinery, and try to side-step the thing by handing the farmers a few extra dollars? What good will the dollars do if they cannot get the machinery and labor to produce more crops?

Mr. PACE. I do not believe anyone has devoted more time or effort than I have toward getting these things clarified. They are ridiculous and absurd. But this incentive payment is for this purpose, it is to assure the harvesting of the last 10 percent, at least, of the goal for the farm. It comes about by experience. Last fall, due to the high price of labor, which could not be obtained in some sections, and due to low prices, there were from 10 to 15 or 20 percent of the crops left in the fields. Just like this man who is gathering his sugar beets. This is an incentive payment, not only to plant it and cultivate it, but to harvest it and move it to market, so that the people may have the benefit of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Right on that point, will an incentive payment give those farmers any more labor or any more machinery or any greater ability to harvest that last 10 or 15 percent of the crop? That is what bothers me and I think it is bothering a great many other Members. The essential things that the farmer needs are machinery, labor, and fertilizer to make the crop.

Mr. PACE. Of course it is.

Mr. HOPE. I do not believe the farmer is going to be satisfied and I do not think we can feel that we have done our duty if we fail to give him those things, and then say we are going to give him a little incentive payment to see if he cannot work a little harder, do a little more than he has been doing, when, as a matter of fact, he has done everything he could do with the things we have given him to work with.

Mr. PACE. Please do not understand that I have even suggested that this is solving the farm problem.

Mr. HOPE. No. The gentleman is too well versed in the farm problem to offer any such suggestion.

Mr. PACE. I termed these incentive payments as a liniment for a tired body. After a man has worked all day, it is an inducement for him to work into the night. After the price of labor has gone so high that it is not profitable to gather his crop, it gives him a little more in order to pay more for labor, in order to insure the gathering. This is an incentive for harvesting the crop.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Virginia that $27,000,000 of the $125,000,000 — not $100,000,000 — $100,000,000 out of the soil-conservation fund and $25,000,000 out of section 32, that is what they asked for—$27,000,000 is to be devoted to an increase in soya beans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute. Twenty-seven million dollars is to be devoted to soya beans. Fifteen percent of this year's soya bean crop in the State of the Secretary of Agriculture and in my own State are still in the fields, partly because of weather and partly because of of manpower and partly because of machinery. The Secretary told us yesterday morning that he had not solved the manpower problem and he had no agreement with Mr. McNutt or anybody else, and he could not assure us that he had settled the problem of machinery with the War Production Board. So why initiate a new incentive program which later on will come back to dog us, when they will say, "You gave us $125,000,000 for eight items. Now there is a meat shortage. There is an egg shortage. There is a butter shortage. There is a cheese shortage. Give us some extra millions for these incentive payments." We will have embarked upon a program the end of which we cannot see and which we cannot be sure will work.

Mr. PACE. Whether other like requests will be made I do not know. Whether we can bring about a quick and satisfactory solution of the farm problems of manpower, machinery, fertilizer, and price by refusing to cooperate with Secretary Wickard and refusing to let this House pass upon his recommendations in a matter of this kind is very doubtful to me. But this I do know. We now face the real danger of a critical food shortage and we should do everything possible to prevent such a shortage. The Secretary had announced the programs providing these incentive payments, and I know there is today utter confusion and disappointment among the farmers.

I also know that the Congress has appropriated and will continue to appropriate billions and billions of dollars for incentive payments to every worker and contractor for the construction of every Army camp in the Nation and for the production of every ship, every plane, every tank, every gun, and every bullet used in this war. It seems strange to me that it should be regarded as such a terrible thing to do when the farmer and the production of something to eat is involved.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, we have been listening during the present day and for many weeks and months in the past to speeches with respect to shortages of many of the necessities of life. This afternoon in the time I have to discuss this matter with you I wish to call your attention again to the very desperate fuel-oil situation existing in our part of the country, namely, the New England area.

Mr. Chairman, the fuel-oil and gasoline situation, for many months, has been of vital interest to most Members

of this House, and the rationing of which is affecting nearly every section of the country and bringing to our offices a deluge of criticism from an irate and confused citizenry back home. Editorials galore have been printed on this question and for a long time it has been the subject of front-page comments in all the newspapers of the Nation.

We all fully realize what brought this condition about, but a brief review is timely. Prior to the war, practically 95 percent of all the petroleum products brought into the eastern seaboard was by means of water-borne tankers that plied between the Gulf coast and the entire Atlantic seaboard. Less than 5 percent came by railroad tank cars. The year 1942, however, was a fatal one for the seagoing tankers, for early in that year and continuing through the summer, the German submarines took a terrific toll of these ships. As a consequence, for several months, practically no tank ships plied the eastern seaboard. It was obvious then that an extremely critical situation in that part of the country would develop, and that unless some substitute means of transportation were found for these tankers, the people in the eastern seaboard would suffer great hardships during the present winter.

Not only was it necessary to provide for the domestic needs but also the ever-increasing military requirements. Altogether, the situation needed immediate as well as careful attention in order to meet the estimated requirements of 1,500,000 barrels a day for this section of the country. In order to find an adequate substitute for the tankers—which today are almost nonexistent in our area—it was necessary to bring into action every possible facility available for the transportation of petroleum products. These included railroad tank cars, existing pipe lines, and barges used in the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and along the seacoast and all other facilities available. To say that those in charge had a herculean task before them would be putting it mildly.

There were many mistakes made and considerable blundering due to lack of cooperation between the authorities in charge, and even today we find an estranged feeling existing because of the lack of coordination and bickering that has taken place in the past. Whether this is owing to departmental jealousy or some other reason I do not know, but it is there. Many times in the past we have been forewarned about an imminent crisis in our fuel-oil and gasoline supplies by one department head, only to have his statement refuted by another department head the next day to the effect that we had no need for worry. Such statements naturally slowed up the conversion program from oil to coal that was under way in our section of the country.

We have been able to flounder through so far. This in a large measure was made possible by the widespread conversion program on the part of the home owners and the industries, but these late changes did not permit an inventory to be built up and used to carry us over the critical period. The result has been that so far as oil is concerned, New England, literally speaking, has been living from hand to mouth. A most rigid rationing program has been put into effect, and industrial and household users have been reduced drastically below their normal needs. The householders have cooperated well to the suggestions of the rationing boards to close many rooms in their homes, and the industries have been reduced to 60 percent of last year's requirements in order to save fuel in every way possible. Nevertheless, there has been real suffering because of the inability of some to get fuel oil. The local rationing boards, composed of public-spirited men and women serving without pay of any kind, have been on the alert and have given immediate relief to such cases when called to their attention. It has been a real battle on the home front, and even today some sections of New England are only 2 or 3 days' supply ahead of their minimum needs.

I have been informed within the last few minutes, by the Office of the Petroleum Administration for War that in the Boston area there is less than 1 day's fuel oil ahead of our needs, and in that great area less than 2 day's supply of industrial oil—this in a period when the temperature is below zero. Today I understand it is 14° below. The weather in Washington the past few days is typical of what we experience in New England during the winter period.

The next 6 weeks will be critical because of the very limited stock on hand. If we get by this period, the worst will be over as the normal needs drop off substantially as the month of April is reached. The Office of Petroleum Coordinator informs me that everything is being done in order to meet our demands and even box cars are used to transport oil in drums furnished by the War Department from Texas.

It may be interesting at this point to say that the railroads which, previous to the war brought less than 5 percent of petroleum products to the east coast, are now, with their tank cars, bringing in approximately 75 to 80 percent. The railroads have done a most remarkable job in developing their tank-car program within such a short period of time and have, in my opinion, averted a great disaster on the eastern seaboard with all of its attending suffering, privation, and death among our people. Let us hope and pray that we will be able to surmount the difficulties that will face us during the next 6 weeks, and from our bitter experience resolve that insofar as it lies in our power the people of the country will not be placed in such jeopardy again. This brings me to the main purpose of my address today.

What are we going to do about our oil needs next winter? I am in receipt of a letter from the Governor of Massachusetts, calling my attention to the fact that in his opinion the winter of 1943–44 will be far more serious than the present one.

He says:

> If there is not some improvement in the situation New England will face a worse crisis in its fuel supply next winter than it is facing at the moment. The peak of our crisis in my opinion for this winter has not yet been reached except in the supply of kerosene.

If that is so—and I believe it is—the time is now at hand when we should take immediate steps to meet that contingency. The people of the entire country are on a rationed plan so far as fuel oil and gasoline are concerned. Even the far Northwest is feeling the effects of this program, according to complaints published in the newspapers of that section.

This problem is of extreme interest to us all because it affects the very lives of our people, and some solution must be found and found immediately. A fleet of 300 tank ships that once brought in 95 percent of the oil to the east coast has been completely eliminated from that service as a result of transfers to military needs and sinkings by enemy submarines. These tankers were bringing well over a million barrels of oil a day to the eastern seaboard, but no more from that source may be expected, having in mind our growing military requirements all over the globe. What source or means can we now turn to for additional means of bringing oil to our section?

The railroad tank cars, I have stated, have taken over the greater part of the load formerly carried by the tank ships—namely, from 70 to 80 percent. These tank cars have an average age of 22 years. They were built for a low speed of 20 to 30 miles an hour, but during this emergency they have been pulling them at a speed of 50 to 60 miles an hour in order to cut delivery time of oil to the shortest possible period. In 1 month, I am told, they had a breakage of 22 percent due to this tremendous increase in speed. Having in mind this breakage, also the fact that the cars are getting older, that no new tank cars are being built to take their place, can we depend on this source of transportation to meet our minimum requirements in the long, cold winter which Governor Saltonstall says will be more critical than the present one?

The only bright spot on the clouded horizon is the completion of the 24-inch pipe line running from Longview, Tex., to Norris City, Ill., thence to New York. It is not expected, however, that this pipe line will deliver oil to the New York area before August 1. The capacity will be 300,000 barrels a day. This is less than one-fifth of our requirements on the eastern seaboard.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell us whether this pipe line that is going to be constructed will be of any use for the civilians of New England?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. We must find other means of supplementing this pipe line, because, as I said a moment ago, it will carry less than one-fifth of our requirements. It will be necessary to build more pipe lines and

also take advantage of the waterways through which we can get oil quickly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is not intended to be used for military purposes only?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is not altogether known at the present time what our military requirements will be; but it is essential to develop every available facility in order that both military and civilian needs can be met.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In other words, this is not a solution at all; we have got to do more.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is only a part of the general program. This pipe line will bring only 300,000 barrels a day to meet a need of 1,750,000 barrels a day.

Approval has recently been given by the War Production Board for the construction of another 20-inch line from the Houston and Beaumont, Tex., refineries to Norris City, Ill., and Seymour, Ind. This pipe line will carry gasoline and kerosene and is expected to be finished July 1. This will shorten the tank-car haul by approximately 550 miles. It is, however, 800 miles to New York and it is my firm conviction that consistent with our war requirements, we should lose no time in extending this 20-inch line to the New York area.

This pipe line for the full distance has already received the unanimous approval of the Pipe Line Management Committee created by the Petroleum Administration for War and the Petroleum Industry War Council. The Petroleum Administration for War has also concurred in these recommendations. I have discussed this matter at quite some length with officials in charge, who inform me that they prefer to wait until May 1 when they will have had the benefit of winter experience with tank cars, barges, and pipe lines and added data as to military demands before they will consider recommending the extension of this 20-inch line to the New York area. They further claim that such a delay will not slow up the completion of the line to the East before the heating season next winter.

Perhaps the bitter experiences we are going through this present winter in New England have given us a pessimistic viewpoint in regard to such statements, and I do not for one moment challenge the reliability or the sincerity of those that made them, but having in mind previous statements by the same authorities in connection with the completion date of the 24-inch pipe line from Longview, Tex. to Norris City, Ill., I am compelled to doubt the estimated completion date of the 20-inch line to New York City if they wait until May to make up their mind as to whether we need it or not. We were told that the completion date of the 24-inch line to Norris City, Ill., would be December 1, 1942. It was designed to carry 300,000 barrels a day and as soon as finished would be put in operation for the above capacity, but here we are into the middle of February and only a trickle of that amount has flowed out of the Norris City end of the pipe line the past few days, and we are now informed that the full capacity will not be reached until April 1, because of unforeseen delays in getting equipment. I do not desire to be too critical of the first completion date estimate as I fully realize the many difficulties in securing material and equipment and also the further uncertainties connected with construction work of this kind, but I do want to point out these facts so that we may approach a related problem with a better perspective.

The need of this extended 20-inch line is admitted. It has the unanimous endorsement of those best qualified to judge our needs and who know what facilities we have to meet them. Why procrastinate and delay? We are further told that sufficient construction equipment is not available but it seems to me that there must be some way by which this additional equipment can be obtained, having in mind the fact that the emergency building peak has been reached and is now rapidly declining. Two or three months difference in the completion date will make a lot of difference in a problem so vital as this.

It will mean warm homes if completed before the heating season starts or it will result, as the Governor intimates, in another long, cold bleak winter and intense suffering for the people of New England if we delay. Why take a chance on a matter of such great emergency? Why does not the Petroleum Administrator for War, who has approved the extension to New York, seek the approval of the War Production Board now, and if such approval can be given, lay the ground work now, develop the plans, order the material, and get ready to do the job as soon as the material is available. If this material can be spared from our war effort, let there be no further delay on a situation so deeply affecting the welfare of our people.

You likely wish to know why I press so hard for the pipe line at this time. First, because it is the quickest known way to get oil to the east coast; secondly, because it is the cheapest way to get oil to the east coast. I repeat, there is no other means of transportation that can deliver oil to that section as cheaply as the pipe lines. For years the Rivers and Harbors Congress has been espousing the cause of river and harbor improvements, and we have spent actually hundreds of millions of dollars to widen and deepen the channels of our rivers and harbors and inland waterways in order to get the benefits of such low-cost freight rates.

These low freight rates, in all probability, do apply to general cargo, but not to the transportation of crude oil, gasoline, or kerosene. Let me emphasize the point that pipe lines are cheaper. I have given much time to this question in connection with my studies of the fuel-oil and gasoline situation, and I have in my hand—and which I will place in the RECORD—comparative figures showing the cost of transportation of oil by railroad tank cars from the Texas oil fields to the New York area, in comparison with transportation by tank ships and pipe lines.

The figures for the pipe lines have been compiled by the Office of Petroleum Administration for War. The Interstate Commerce Commission has prepared the railroad tank-car cost and the War Shipping Administration for seagoing tankers. These figures represent what the Government is paying today, either in time charter hire for the tank ships, the subsidy for the railroads to take care of the excessive cost, and the estimated cost of pumping oil through the pipe line. The pipe-line cost includes provisions to take care of ad valorem taxes in the communities through which the pipe line runs. There can be no doubt whatsoever, after reading these figures, that pipe lines are the cheapest, in addition to being the quickest and most effective, means of dealing with our vital problem.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. TALBOT. The gentleman is making a great contribution to a solution of the whole oil problem. I should like to state to the gentleman that I was in New England on Sunday night, in Connecticut. It was 20° below zero. The Governor of Connecticut told me that all Connecticut cities were out of kerosene.

I wonder if the gentleman has read the most recent report to come out of the office of Mr. Davies, the Deputy Oil Coordinator, in which he stated that up until January 1 more than 75 percent of last year's oil supply had been delivered to New England.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Yes; I read that statement.

Mr. TALBOT. Does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I have no information on it, but there is one thing we all know, and that is that New England is without oil, and I know that the thing we ought to be interested in is what can we do to help New England and New York, where the fuel-oil reserve is so low? Less than a day's supply in the Boston area and less than a day's supply in the Albany, N. Y., area. What are we going to do about our industries that will have to close down, according to the headlines in the papers, close down because there is but a 2-day supply of industrial oil? What are we going to do about it? Whom are we to believe? Last year Mr. Ickes told us there were no tank cars available, but Mr. Pelley, of the railroads, said there were 20,000 laying idle in the freight yards of the country. Today over 65,000 tank cars are pulling oil into the eastern seaboard.

We should urge the completion in the quickest possible time of the 24-inch pipe line from Norris City, Ill., and the 20-inch pipe line from Beaumont, Tex., to New York. We will need both of them very badly next winter. I have figures in my hand which show the pipe line to be by far the cheapest means of transportation of oil. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that we are now paying a subsidy of over $20,000,000 a month to the railroads for the transportation of fuel oil into the eastern seaboard. This is necessary because we know that railroad transportation is far more expensive

than tank ships or pipe lines, and it is the only available means we have to meet our oil requirements.

I am informed by the Interstate Commerce Commission that we are paying $1.48 to $1.80 a barrel for transportation of gasoline and kerosene and fuel oil by railroad tank car. I am told by the War Shipping Administration that we are paying 40 to 50 cents a barrel to bring in gasoline and oil by tank ships. I am told by the Petroleum Administration for War Office that we will pay 38 cents a barrel for kerosene and gasoline and 31 cents for furnace oil to bring it in through the pipe lines. Charges in this cost are sufficient to amortize the entire cost of these pipe lines in 5 years, after which we shall be able to get oil and gasoline through the pipe lines for 13½ cents a barrel, based on maintenance cost.

In this same connection I read the following table showing the relative cost of transportation per barrel of petroleum products from Texas oil fields to New York:

*Relative cost of transportation per barrel of petroleum products from Texas oil fields to New York*

| | Railroad tank cars [1] | Tank ships [2] | 20-inch pipe line [3] | 24-inch pipe line [3] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gasoline and kerosene | $1.802 | $0.40 | $0.38 | |
| Heating oil | 1.558 | .42 | | $0.31 |
| Crude oil | 1.481 | .50 | | .31 |

[1] Figures prepared in Office of Interstate Commerce Commission.
[2] Figures prepared in Office of War Shipping Administration.
[3] Figures prepared in Office of Petroleum Administration for War.

NOTE.—These pipe lines are being built by Oil Emergency Pipe Lines Corporation, a Government agency under the direction of the Defense Plant Corporation, which is an agency of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, the thing I want to urge upon the Members of the House and all those in authority is the necessity for providing at the earliest possible time facilities and more facilities to meet our fuel-oil and gasoline requirements along the eastern seaboard.

Mr. Chairman, supplementing the table I have just referred to, and which by the way was prepared by myself, I read the following letters. These are the basis supporting the table:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
*Washington, February 4, 1943.*

Hon. GEORGE BATES,
*House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: In accordance with your request there is shown below the estimated railroad costs and the railroad transportation rates between Longview, Tex., and New York City, on gasoline, kerosene, residual oil No. 2, bunker C oil (heavy fuel oil), and crude oil. The costs and rates are stated on the basis of per hundred pounds, per barrel (42 gallons), and per barrel-mile. The estimated railroad costs were prepared by the cost section of the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics. The rates (in cents per 100 pounds) were furnished by the rate branch of the Bureau of Traffic and converted to a rate per barrel and per barrel-mile by the cost section.

*Railroad full distributed costs, including 4 percent return and allowance for passenger and less-than-car-lot deficiencies*

| Item | Cost per hundred-weight | Cost per barrel | Cost per barrel-mile |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Cents* | *Cents* | *Mills* |
| Gasoline | 79.7 | 214.3 | 1.20 |
| Kerosene | 78.4 | 220.4 | 1.24 |
| Residual oil No. 2 | 76.2 | 223.9 | 1.26 |
| Bunker C oil (heavy fuel oil) | 71.6 | 248.4 | 1.40 |
| Crude oils | 74.2 | 233.7 | 1.31 |

The above figures are based upon 42 gallons per barrel and 216 barrels per car. The assumed weight per gallon is as follows:

| | *Pounds* |
|---|---|
| Gasoline | 6.4 |
| Kerosene | 6.7 |
| Residual oil No. 2 | 7.0 |
| Bunker C oil (heavy fuel oil) | 8.25 |
| Crude oil | 7.5 |

Based on 216 barrels per car and 42 gallons per barrel, this resulted in the following average loads upon which the costs were based:

| | *Tons* |
|---|---|
| Gasoline | 29 |
| Kerosene | 30 |
| Residual oil No. 2 | 32 |
| Bunker C oil (heavy fuel oil) | 37 |
| Crude oils | 34 |

The cost figures are based on the United States average for all territories compiled for the year 1939.

The rail rates are as shown below and include the ex parte 148 increase:

*Railroad rates from Longview, Tex., to New York City*

| Item | Rate in cents per 100 pounds | Rate in cents per barrel | Rate per barrel-mile (mills) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gasoline | 67.0 | 180.2 | 1.01 |
| Kerosene | 67.0 | 188.3 | 1.06 |
| Residual oil No. 2 | 53.0 | 155.8 | .88 |
| Bunker C oil (heavy fuel oil) | 53.0 | 183.9 | 1.03 |
| Crude oils: | | | |
| New York City | 71.0 | 223.6 | 1.26 |
| Bayway, N. J. / Bayonne, N. J. | 47.0 | 148.1 | .83 |

It will be noted that the two rates are shown on crude oil. The higher rate of 71 cents applies to New York City where no storage is available. The lower rate applies to Bayway and Bayonne, N. J., where storage is available. Most crude oil moving to New York is moved there via Bayway or Bayonne at the rate shown for these points. The rate per hundred pounds was converted to a rate per barrel and a rate per barrel-mile on the basis of the pounds per gallon listed above.

Based on a comparison of the railroad rates with the railroad costs shown above, it appears that the petroleum products are being handled at a rate which is something below the fully distributed cost but at the same time above the out-of-pocket cost.

Very truly yours,

W. P. BARTEL,
*Secretary.*

---

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D. C.*

Hon. GEORGE J. BATES,
*House of Representatives,*
*Old House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We refer to your telephone conversation of yesterday afternoon with our Mr. McGuire, at which time you requested information as to freight rates applicable on shipments of petroleum and petroleum products in tank vessels from United States Gulf ports to New York.

There is attached for your information a copy of our rate order No. 38, listing, among others, authorized rates for shipments of the nature referred to when made in tank vessels of over 3,000 gross tons operated for account of this Administration, and effective on all cargoes moved on and after April 20, 1942. For your convenience we list hereunder the basic rates applicable from any one United States Gulf loading port to New York Harbor on the grades of petroleum and its products, in which you are particularly interested:

| | *Cents per barrel* |
|---|---|
| Gasoline or kerosene | 40 |
| No. 2 and No. 3 heating oils | 42 |
| Bunker C and other fuel or crude oils of 10° to 19.9° A. P. I. | 48 |
| Crude and heavy fuel oils of less than 10° A. P. I. | 50 |

As was explained to you verbally, the above-listed rates are the noncompensatory or subsidized rates that were placed in effect by this Administration during the spring of last year upon request of the Office of Price Administration as a means of maintaining maximum price ceilings for petroleum and its products. They represent rates necessary to cover an owner's normal tank-vessel operating costs, including reasonable allowance for management and profit factors, and are considered to be generally comparable to rates effective in this trade prior to outbreak of the war in Europe during September of 1939. They do not take into account any of the very heavy extra cost occasioned by operation by this Administration under wartime conditions, such as costs of war-risk insurance, crew bonuses, loss of vessel time due to convoyed or directed routings, etc., all of which costs are absorbed by this Administration, which now has under time charter all privately owned American registered tank vessels of the size to which these rates are applicable.

You also inquired as to the measure of rates effective for these tanker trades prior to the entry of this country into the war, and while we have no detailed information in this respect, we can advise generally that the demand for tanker tonnage increased after outbreak of the war in Europe late in 1939 to an extent that brought about an appreciable increase in voyage charter freight rates, with the average rate for the Port Arthur-New York service during the latter part of 1940 being, roughly, 60 cents per barrel for gasoline. After the passage by the Congress of an act approved July 14, 1941, known as the Warrants Act, giving authority for control over rates of all vessels operating under the warrants provided for in that act, the United States Maritime Commission fixed a scale of maximum time charter rates for tanker vessels which brought about a corresponding average voyage freight rate for this trade of approximately 50 cents per barrel for gasoline, with appropriate additional charges for the heavier oils. During the latter part of November 1941 this authorized basic maximum rate was reduced to 40 cents per barrel, and after the entry of this country into the war there were authorized during the early months of 1942 various and increasing surcharges designed to compensate vessel owners for the rapidly increasing extra wartime expenses. Such authorized surcharges remained effective until this Administration requisitioned the American tanker-vessel fleet and placed into effect the noncompensatory or subsidized basis of rates above outlined.

It is hoped that the above information and attached schedule of detailed tanker voyage freight rates will give you the desired data,

but if anything further is needed in this connection please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Very truly yours,

J. F. McART,
*Director of Freight Rates and Surcharges.*

---

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
*Washington, January 30, 1943.*

Hon. GEORGE J. BATES,
*House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. BATES: Pursuant to your telephone conversation on January 20 with Mr. W. C. Kinsolving, Assistant Director of Transportation, we wish to give you the following facts and estimates on construction and operating costs of the 24-inch pipe line now being built and the 20-inch products line which we have recommended to be built and which were discussed in more detail in my letter to you of January 21.

In our letter to you of July 22, 1942, we pointed out that a tariff rate of 48 cents per barrel had been proposed for the operation of the war emergency 24-inch line from Longview to New York, and based upon capacity operations this tariff would pay all operating expenses and amortize the line in 5 years. In our letter to you of January 21, 1943, we stated that this line would probably not post a tariff but operate directly for the account of Defense Supplies Corporation. Based upon present labor costs, power costs, and other operating costs, we now believe that the actual operating cost per barrel based upon capacity operations will be in the order of 31 cents per barrel, including a 20-percent annual depreciation and amortization charge. Inasmuch as this project will cost approximately $95,000,000, the yearly amortization cost would be $19,000,000. Figuring a throughput of 300,000 barrels per day, this would be approximately 17½ cents per barrel; subtracting this from the 31 cents would give about 13½ cents per barrel as actual operating cost.

On the same basis, as mentioned in my letter of January 21, 1943, the 20-inch line would cost about $75,000,000, and the annual amortization cost will be $15,000,000. In a like manner, figuring the full throughput of 235,000 barrels per day, the amortization cost per barrel would be about the same, namely 17½ cents per barrel. Similarly, the operating cost of this line would be the difference between 38 cents and 17½ cents, or about 20½ cents per barrel.

It should be pointed out in the above that these costs are based upon maximum capacity for each day of the year. This, of course, cannot be physically realized, and a correction factor would have to be applied. If we assume a 90-percent throughput, these rates would, of course, be increased by 10 percent.

Just prior to the war, tanker rates varied between 40 and 50 cents a barrel from Gulf coast ports to north of Hatteras, dependent upon the product hauled; the lighter gasoline and products being at the lower rate and the heavier crudes and residual fuels being at the higher rate. It will, therefore, be seen that even with this high amortization rate for pipe lines, they compare favorably with tanker rates. It should be pointed out, however that this is only applicable to large-diameter lines of a large continuous throughput.

In our original estimate, requesting authorization of this line, to the War Production Board made on May 15, 1942, we estimated the cost of the line from Longview to Norris City at $35,000,000. In our subsequent report of October 1, 1942, requesting authorization for the extension from Norris City to the eastern seaboard, we estimated this cost at $60,000,000, making a total cost of $95,000,000 for the completed project from Longview to New York-Philadelphia.

The line from Longview to Norris City is now 95 percent complete and will be placed in initial operation far a limited throughput early in February. Based upon the best information available from the main construction office of the War Emergency Pipelines, Inc., in Little Rock, with the known expenditures to date, it is estimated by their office that the total expenditures on this first section will be well within the estimated cost of $35,000,000. We are, therefore, safe in assuming that the completed project will likewise be well within the estimated cost.

We trust that the above information will be of interest to you and we offer these facts as firm evidence that our representations to the War Production Board have been sound, not only from an actual necessity standpoint to meet the essential civilian demands and the on-shore and off-shore military requirements, but also from an economic standpoint.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. PARTEN,
*Director of Transportation.*

---

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
*Washington, January 21, 1943.*

Hon. GEORGE J. BATES,
*House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. BATES: Pursuant to telephone conversation you had with Mr. W. C. Kinsolving, Assistant Director of Transportation, on January 18, I am giving you the following memoranda concerning the facts on the proposed 20-inch products line which we are presenting to the War Production Board for its approval.

This proposed line will be constructed by the War Emergency Pipelines, Inc., as agent for Defense Plant Corporation in a manner similar to the procedure followed on the 24-inch line now under construction. The first leg of the line will extend from the Houston and Beaumont refineries to a point on the 24-inch line near Little Rock, Ark., and then parallel to the 24-inch line into termini at Norris City, Ill., and Seymour, Ind. The distance from Beaumont to Seymour, Ind., is approximately 836 miles, and a feeder line will run from Beaumont to Houston refineries, approximately 85 miles in length. The line will be 20 inches in diameter, with the exception of the Houston-Beaumont leg, which will be 16 inches. It will handle approximately 235,000 barrels per day of products at a pressure of approximately 750 pounds per square inch. It is estimated that this section will cost approximately $44,000,000. The total tonnage of steel needed for this leg is approximately 165,000 tons.

The second leg of this line, from Norris City and Seymour to New York-Philadelphia, will require approximately 554 miles more of 20-inch pipe and approximately 114 miles more of 16-inch pipe for feeder lines into the New York-Philadelphia area. This will require approximately 120,000 tons of additional steel and cost an additional $31,000,000. It will, of course, be for the same capacity.

As we are now presenting our proposal, we are recommending the construction of the first leg of this line to start as soon as men, equipment, and materials are available and build the line to Norris City and Seymour so that transshipment can be made to the east coast in the early fall. By the first of May, when we have reviewed our winter transportation experience and when we have further information regarding offshore petroleum demands, we will again scrutinize the situation with a view toward recommending the continuance of the line to the east coast.

While no final operating costs are available as yet, we anticipate that this line can operate on an approximate 38-cent tariff to the east coast and amortize itself in 5 years, provided full capacity of the line can be maintained. This assumes that current operating expenses would remain at substantially the levels which are now prevailing for power, labor costs, and the like.

It is probable that the line actually would be operated directly for the account of Defense Supplies Corporation without formal posting of tariffs as a carrier. Such plan of operation is being followed in the case of the 24-inch war emergency pipe line in the interest of maintaining maximum throughput at all times. The cost estimate given above would be applicable to either plan of operation.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. PARTEN,
*Director of Transportation.*

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss in these few moments a subject in which I have been interested for a number of years and in connection with which I might refer anyone to my legislative record. I take this time to discuss the situation confronting us in connection with the operations of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and I am motivated to do that because of the colloquy that appears in the RECORD of today and the proposed action that will be taken when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule.

It will be sought immediately to liquidate the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, a very salutary objective if it were practical; however, in any consideration of the forced liquidation of the Corporation at this time, the interests not only of the investing public or of mortgage and financing institutions should be considered, but the interest of the taxpayer as well as the mortgagors of the Corporation should be considered. It has been estimated that if the corporation were precipitously liquidated at this time the resulting loss to the Treasury of the United States would amount to approximately $301,000,000 and the items making up that total would be: First, the loss that the Corporation would necessarily suffer from the sale of its existing mortgage-loan accounts, the sum of $54,000,000; second, the loss from the forced sale of its present real-estate holdings, the sum of $53,000,000; and third, the loss of the net operating income of the Corporation through the next 8 fiscal years, the sum of $148,000,000. To this estimated operating loss of $255,000,000 would necessarily have to be added the additional bond interest expense that would result from any liquidation at this time. That additional expense that would flow by way of interest on outstanding Corporation bonds which are not now and will not be for some time callable is $46,000,000. In other words, an immediate liquidation of this Corporation would result in an added burden to the taxpayers of this Nation of approximately $301,000,000.

It is hard, therefore, for me or for anyone who is familiar with the operations of that Corporation to justify the further imposition upon the taxpayers of this Nation of that sum.

At the present time the Corporation holds mortgages of approximately 782,171 home owners. About 500,000 of those mortgages are in the class that might be described as prime mortgage investments. About 282,171 are those mortgages that had to be refunded under the terms of the Barry-Mead bill, and those 282,000 mortgages presently held by the

Corporation, in my opinion, would be nonlegal investments for any savings and loan association or any other mortgage financing institution under the provisions of the laws of the United States or of any State in which those institutions operate.

The problem for this House to determine therefore is what would happen not only to the investment represented by those 282,000 mortgages, but over and above that what would happen to those mortgagors? The past record of these loans is such that the mortgages necessarily obtained on a bargain and discount basis would be foreclosed upon default.

The loan accounts of that Corporation may be properly divided into five groups—those in which the loans have been reduced in excess of 30 percent, those in which the reduction of the loan is 20 to 30 percent, 10 to 20 percent, 0 to 10 percent, and those which have not been reduced in any amount.

The best mortgages held by the Corporation total 500,000. These are the Corporation's loan accounts, which are presently eagerly sought after by financial institutions engaged in the mortgage investment field. These companies cannot and certainly will not take over the loans in the less favorable groups, except at large discount. If they should take over those loans, foreclosures would inevitably follow with resultant disastrous effects upon the entire real-estate market. Many of these associations are members of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, so that, even if losses should result to such associations, the Government, through the Insurance Corporation, could be called upon to make good to the shareholders up to $5,000 each.

These are the mortgagors who were sought to be benefited by the original Home Owners' Loan Act, and who are last to be able either by reason of increased income, readjustments, or otherwise to meet their mortgage obligations. Those accounts are in a state of suspense now, and I say that we should give very careful consideration before we precipitously force the liquidation of a Corporation that already has the mandate of the Congress to liquidate as quickly as possible; a Corporation that in less than 8 years since its lending operations terminated has retired its bonded indebtedness to less than 55% of its total. That Corporation, like any agency of government that has a specific job to do, wants to do that job and wants to do it as quickly and as well as it can. That Corporation, in my opinion, has done an efficient over-all job, considering the fact that the eligibility of an applicant for a mortgage from the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was virtually his proving his inability to pay. Those mortgages taken over by the Corporation were on the average of 2 to 3 years in default during the lending period of 1933 to 1936 and of over a million cases this Corporation has put on a current basis upward of 500,000 such loans. That represents the justification for our having had the faith we did have in the home-owning people of this country, who, having a home, wanted to keep it and with the aid of this Corporation they were able to do so. They have now been rehabilitated to the point where upward of $700,000,000 of mortgages held by this Corporation are prime investments for any mortgage financing institution.

Certainly these financing institutions want to get them. Who would not have faith in the home-owning people of this country? Who would not want to invest his money with those decent, honest Americans who have justified the faith that we had in them? But we say, give consideration to the problem not only of those people, not only the financial institutions that are seeking to tap this fertile field for investment, but the whole over-all problem.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call to the attention of the House the fact that in the RECORD of yesterday there was inserted a letter from a savings and loan institution in Massachusetts dated February 8, 1943. I have in my hand a circular issued by the United States Savings and Loan League under date of February 3, which circular lists seven reasons why the Corporation should be liquidated. The letter inserted in the RECORD on yesterday lists seven reasons why the Corporation should be liquidated. In that letter the first six reasons are taken in haec verba from the circular of the Savings and Loan League and the seventh is the same as the seventh in the circular, but in different language.

Certainly they want to invest in that field, but that represents the type of investment that you and I knew would be good. It represents the investment this Government made in the faith and in the honesty of the American people. It represents investments that we took over, among others, to the extent of almost $1,000,000,000 from the various savings and loan associations that today want them back—the savings and loan associations that today are indebted to the Corporation in excess of $120,000,000 for advances made under the provisions of the original Home Owners' Loan Act and amendments thereto. The associations would in effect be using Government money to the extent of the $120,000,000 to buy good assets of the Government and thereby greatly increase the Government's losses and debt. They did not want these investments in 1933. They should not get them today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel rather reluctant to impose myself on the House at this hour of the afternoon, yet I feel somehow that there are some facts and some information about this bill that should be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and be made available to the Members. The only way I can get them inserted in the RECORD, since they are not in manuscript form, is to impose myself on you probably for so much as an hour.

It has been rather interesting to hear all the charges rung today—the shortage of fuel oil in Massachusetts, which would indicate some administrative dereliction in Washington, the freedom of the air, and the action of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, which, by a vote of 6 to 1, consisting of three Democrats and three Republicans, rejected the request of the Secretary of Agriculture yesterday morning for a $125,000,000 allowance for the purpose of paying subsidies on eight groups of agricultural commodities together with a vast variety of subject matter which has been ably and thoroughly ventilated.

As I think of that and think of what I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every day, the unkind things we have to say about the administrators of the bureaus and the bureaucrats, I think we should be mindful of the fact that we, too, have a real responsibility. In fact, we have a primary responsibility in giving direction to and supervising the conduct of government. After all, every bureau in Washington and, for that matter, every bureau in the United States, exists by the sufferance of Congress. Aside from those offices that are set up in the Constitution, there would be no bureaus unless they were created by the Congress of the United States. In proportion as we are the creator, so we have a responsibility to supervise the creatures, we have a responsibility to carry through and to determine whether or not the powers that are delegated to these bureaus are being exercised efficiently and properly and within the limitations of law.

There are various ways we can supervise these creatures of Congress. The O. D. T., O. C. D., W. P. B., O. P. A., and all the rest are our concern. If they are created by Executive order, they are created only because Congress gave the Executive the authority, so it just offers another step which leads back to Congress. We have the responsibility of supervising them, and we can do it in various ways.

First of all, we can be careful in scrutinizing delegations of power. We had an illustration of it yesterday morning. You would be amazed how the solicitor of the Department of Agriculture had to strain in his interpretation of the Soil Conservation Act and the kindred acts in order to find authority for this extra $100,000,000 requested by the Secretary with which to make incentive payments over and above a 90-percent quota and on up to 110 percent. It is proposed that if a farmer's potato quota was 100 acres he would not get any bonus on the 100 acres. He would have to grow over the 100 acres before he would get a subsidy. That would be true of soybeans, potatoes, and flax, and it would be true of sorghum and of certain categories of vegetables.

The point I leave with you is that they searched everywhere like so many adventurous explorers to find the proper authority, and even referred the matter to the Attorney General. I affirm to you that I was here during the deliberations on the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and the acts before up to 1932, and I never heard anyone discuss upon the floor of Congress that we had in mind dipping into the Treasury and paying subsidies for incentive production. It was never mentioned. Thus, the experts in semantics, the artists of etymology, the legalistic folk can then take it apart, phrase by phrase, and finally put their finger right on it and say, "See, there is the power that Congress delegated," and then go further and say that that expresses the intent of Congress, when it was never discussed.

This fact is equally true of the President's order relating to the $25,000 limit on salaries. Here again is an usurpation of authority which, in my humble opinion, was in fact never delegated by Congress.

I say there is a responsibility as other legislation goes across this floor to spell out very carefully every bit of delegated authority, because it is going to rise like Banquo's ghost at the table sometime in the future to haunt us even as this strained interpretation haunted us only yesterday morning, 1, 5, 6 years after that act was submitted to the statute books.

The first thing, then, is care and caution. The second thing I would submit to you is legislative review. We passed the investigating resolution offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and we are authorizing a committee of this House now to examine the rules and the forms and the procedures and regulations that are issued to see whether they infringe upon the constitutional rights of the citizen, to see whether they are departures from the delegated authority. We realize that they have departed, so now we are going to investigate. We should not even bother to investigate; we should set up a legislative review committee right now, consisting of half a dozen Senators and half a dozen Members of the House and give that committee authority to request every bureau to send its regulations and rules to the Congress before they are issued, to stamp them with a time stamp, and for a period of 10 days to keep them from becoming applicable to the people of the country.

And if that committee, armed with a technical staff, would then say, "We object to some of these things," they could not become effective for at least 40 days, and when the Congress had been so advised, we would repeal the legislation under which it was done, if we were so disposed. There must be bureaucratic discipline. That is what we need today, and it must emanate from the Congress, from the people's Representatives who are elected to office to whom the people look. So, first, there must be scrutiny of delegated power and, secondly, there should be review. I am persuaded that a great many of the bungling procedures in the Office of Price Administration, a great many of the severities in the rationing program, could have been avoided if a group of legislators could sit down with a staff and examine them meticulously and straighten them out and send them back and say, "With these modifications, they are all right." So we need legislative review. I commend to your attention the concurrent resolution which I introduced to create a Joint Committee on Administrative Review which would review the regulations, rules, and forms of executive agencies and cause the elimination of injustices and impractical provisions before they are applied to the public. This would discharge its full responsibility to the people.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. GWYNNE. I agree with the gentleman so far as legislative review is concerned. Does not the gentleman think we might call upon the courts?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was coming to that next.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. KEOGH. And I call attention to the existence of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, a standing committee of this House, charged as it is with codifying the general laws, and say that we could very well be implemented with technical assistance such as the gentleman suggests.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I quite agree with the gentleman, and let me say to him, and to the House, what I have often wanted to say before, that I think he has done a splendid job as Chairman of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws in keeping Members notified from time to time and supplying them with the laws, in excellent form so that they are current in every Member's office.

The next item of concern of Congress is the enactment of a measure which would provide adequate judicial review of administrative decisions. For several years the Walter-Logan bill became a household rule and was in fact passed by this House but failed in the Senate. It is hard to believe that the protection of the people which was vested in the courts has in truth and in fact been impaired and to a considerable extent nullified by delegating to bureau heads and administrators the power to make decisions which if not complied with invoke a fine or penalty or both without adequate authority in the courts to review the decision of such a bureau. The growth of administrative law can become a positive menace to representative government and the time at at hand when Congress must deal with this problem by the enactment of the Walter-Logan bill or a similar measure which will preserve in the courts the power to shield and protect the citizen against his Government.

If we follow out the things that some folks downtown want to do, after a while our whole court system, and its powers, will be nullified.

The growth of administrative power has developed a new ideology in this country which threatens to make Congress a mere adjunct of government. It has some skilled, redoubtable, and keen exponents who are scattered through the Government today who would like nothing better than to make the country definitely subservient to the executive branch. I refer particularly to Dr. Alvin Hansen, adviser to the Federal Reserve Board and as I recall adviser to the Budget Bureau. In June of 1942 he gave an interview to the Chicago press which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 27, 1942. Dr. Hansen's language is so eloquent that it clearly speaks for itself and I shall read it for your edification.

> Congress will surrender to the administration the power to tax, keeping to itself the right only to establish the broad limits within which the administration must move. Congress will appropriate huge sums of money, will surrender its power over directing when and how the money shall be spent. Other extraordinary powers, such as for instance to effect wholesale social reforms, will be delegated to the administration, which will retain most, if not all, of its present extraordinary wartime powers. It is folly to think that we can return to normal after the war.

That is from a man high in authority. Do not try to laugh off Mr. Hansen. He has a brilliant intellect. He knows where he wants to go. He has coined the term "administrative democracy," and what he wants in effect is for Congress to pass a five-line bill which would say in substance:

> The power to tax is delegated to the Chief Executive, to be exercised according to his own discretion, and to be delegated to any agency that he may indicate.

That is what Dr. Hansen contemplates. He says, in effect, that Congress should pass a short appropriation bill. There is no use of wasting any time on the pending bill in spelling out of the things, but just a five-line bill will do:

> There is hereby appropriated for the use of the Executive, as to him shall see fit, the sum of $100,000,000.

Under Dr. Hansen's theory, there would be no need for long and arduous hearings by any appropriation subcommittee. It would be unnecessary to investigate and examine the agencies of government. Having delegated the broad authority, it would remain for the President to determine how and where the funds should be expended. Truly this is high testimony to the belief in some quarters that the legislative branch of government is a superfluous interstatement.

Dr. Hansen says the extraordinary wartime powers in control shall remain. It is a great spectacle, is it not? A great spectacle for the millions of young men who are beating out their energies on the sands of Africa, who are wrestling with malaria and disease and Japanese gunfire at Guadalcanal. Oh, what a spectacle to come back to, to come back to this beloved Republic, with another victory in their grasp, to raise their eyes like Ishmael in the wilderness, on their return and then to contemplate the language of Dr. Hansen. A republic which was circumverted and destroyed

while they were fighting for freedom, a country where the very bulwarks of freedom have been casually taken over while millions of young Americans were offering their lives to bring the "four freedoms" to the ends of the earth. Great God! Is that what they are fighting for?

Indulge me a personal allusion. I served over on the other side for 17 months in the last war. I felt all the thrills of righteous idealism when I read of the great cause that carried us across submarine-infested water to fight for democracy, to make the world safe for democracy, to fight a war to end all wars. Consider the years which have intervened. Consider the fool's paradise in which we lived in the years immediately after that conflict. Consider the valley of shadows through which they have walked as we battled the main depression. Then consider that only 24 years after the war to end all wars we are again throwing every resource of the Nation into the struggle for the preservation of freedom and the expansion of democratic processes. Young men have bled and died for this great Republic. Young men have dared to fight in all corners of the earth that liberty in its full flower might be preserved. So it comes as a shock and as a distressing commentary on keen and brilliant citizens of this Republic that they would by a skillful process dismember and break down the very essence of the finest Government in all the earth.

Here is one of those gentlemen in Washington who you cannot laugh off. They frighten me. They talk now about administrative democracy and about the retention of the extraordinary wartime control. Frankly, gentlemen, we should be whipped out of Washington as the people's representatives if we ever let that happen to this great Republic. If there is ever abdication, if this great, sacred organism under which men have prospered and which has made us the greatest country in all the world is ever destroyed, the fault will be ours for having failed in our scrutiny, for having failed in our proper vigilance, for having failed to create and preserve those safeguards which assure balanced government and the authority of the elected representatives of the people to examine meticulously into its every activity and make it function and operate as they would have us do.

So we must scrutinize these delegations of power. There must be legislative review. There must be judicial review, and finally there must be careful and skillful exercise of the power of investigation, which is one of the truly great weapons of the legislative branch in dealing with bureaucracy and abuses in government.

The British have a great system, namely, the so-called royal commissions. The men who serve on royal commissions in Great Britain receive no remuneration for their services. Places on those commissions are readily sought after by the finest minds and the best talent in the Empire. They do a great work. They become royal commissions of inquiry. The Congress can follow that idea by using its investigatory power, one of the great implements of the legislative branch, to follow along in a very constructive channel and to disclose the truth, unearth abuses and incompetence, and make it the basis for legislative enactment. Sometimes we get off the course a little.

Recently I went to the trouble to do a little checking on the investigations proposed in the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses. Do you know that in the Seventy-sixth Congress bills were dropped into the hopper calling for 150 investigations? There was a resolution to investigate Madam Perkins, a bill to investigate John L. Lewis, a resolution to investigate insects in onion seeds, a resolution to investigate the Board of Trade in Chicago, resolutions to investigate the Alaskan fisheries and the Alaskan merchant marine, the Florida ship canal, express highways, Passamaquoddy, the Philippines, petroleum production, working conditions in metal mines, banking and monetary policies, Government purchase of Argentine beef, need for constitutional amendments, efforts of the utilities to control public opinion, foreign loans by the United States, trading in futures, propaganda by executive agencies, radio, railroad financing, P. W. A. in Nebraska, wildlife, wool, woodpulp, the capsizing of the *Normandie*, social security, the sinking of the *Squalus*, the European situation, farm machinery prices, Puerto Rico, wire tapping, prison-made goods, silver, tobacco prices, technological unemployment, crab-meat production, foreign agents, physical education, resources, and a host of other things.

If every investigation which had been sought by the authors of these resolutions had been enacted, it would have required the entire time of every Member of Congress for the 2-year life of the Seventy-sixth Congress in making those investigations.

This is a happy commentary upon the selectiveness with which we approach this great power. If we do not guard this investigatory power and keep it on a high plane and make it a fruitful and constructive instrument its effect will be lost. So we must carefully guard it.

I have an idea that perhaps one of the good things we could do would be to set up an investigatory pool, to let the House leaders pick men on both sides and assign them to that pool as a kind of legislative commission of inquiry. Then when somebody proposed something that had merit, we would simply refer it to that investigating pool. I have to examine it somewhat but I do know that it is a powerful weapon in the hands of the legislature, and it must be carefully exercised. Let me commend to your earnest attention and your best thinking such a proposal in the hope that out of the composite thinking of the Members of this House, some such proposal may be evolved to keep the investigative on a high plane and make it a true instrumentality for the highest public good.

So I enumerate again, that we must scrutinize delegated power. There must be legislative review of administrative regulations. There must be judicial review of administrative decisions. There must be careful exercise of the investigatory power and finally, and over and above everything else, there is the power of the purse with which we deal today.

We have no true idea of what we really can do on this floor through the instrumentality of the appropriation bills. We can revamp this country. We can save it. We can save the Republic and all the glory of its structure, through the instrumentality of appropriation bills. There would not be any O. P. A. unless there were funds. There would be no Office of Defense Transportation unless there were funds. There would be no Interstate Commerce Commission, no Federal Trade Commission, no Federal Power Commission, no Bureau of Plant Entomology, no Bureau of Animal Industry, no Department of Commerce without funds. It is money bags that talk.

By skillful use of the power of the purse we can determine the size of any agency in Government. We can solve problems of personnel, overstaffing, efficiency, and economy, give direction to Government, eliminate incompetence, eradicate abuses, and improve the public service.

The framers of the Constitution appreciated that fact. What did they do in the sacred law? At that time the House was the only elective body. Senators were selected by the State legislatures. What did they do? They said, first of all, the exclusive revenue authority shall be in the most numerous branch—that is this branch of Congress—because with a 2-year term we are close to the people. If we abuse it, if we impose too much of a burden and belabor them with too much tax severity, it is only 2 years until they can take us out of office. The founders of the Republic were wise men. They had had experience with kings. They knew that the power to tax was the power to destroy. They knew it could be easily abused. So they created a safeguard. The power to initiate taxes was placed with us. If abused, they knew the remedy was at the polls. A further implication of that was the appropriating power. They therefore provided in the Constitution that no money could be taken from the Public Treasury except in consequence of appropriations made by law, and provided further that a receipt and accounting of all funds must be made.

Not a dollar can be otherwise provided. The President cannot get his pay until the Congress votes it across this floor. The humblest clerk in Government cannot be paid except as it is provided by Congress. No battleship can be built; not a single motorcar can be purchased; no soldier can be inducted, clothed, fed, armed; no administrator can be hired; no judge can ascend to the bench and dispense justice; no public building can be constructed except as the authority and the funds are provided by Congress. Do you grasp the full implication of the authority which we exercise and the power of control and direction which reposes in that authority?

So here we are this afternoon dealing with the independent offices appropriation bill, consisting of some 30 agencies,

which are depending upon our action. In proportion as we use the power of the purse to discipline if necessary, to give direction if necessary, to bring the operations, the functions, the activities, the authority, and the composition of these agencies within the concept of balanced and coordinated government, so do we rise to that appraisal of the legislative branch of the Government made by President Monroe when he said that—

The whole system of the National Government may be said to rest essentially on the powers granted to this branch. They mark the limit within which, with few exceptions, all the branches must move in the discharge of their respective functions.

I seek to impress upon you that appropriating public funds is serious business. The Members who are here today ought to realize that this is serious business because this is the great instrumentality of the Congress for giving direction to the affairs of this Republic. We should be staffed for this job. We should be staffed for appropriating scientifically and intelligently, far more so than we are, and far more so, I would say, than is allowed by the resolution that was enacted not so long ago, although we have made a start, I am happy to say. I have felt so frustrated and so foolish at times, sitting across the committee table from the folks in the executive branch, when they had all the answers and we had none.

No man and no group of men can properly do a first-class job for the people of this Nation in regulating the flow of funds from the Federal Treasury, in procuring the best type of public service, in providing efficiency and economy, in eliminating extravagance and waste, in eradicating abuses and excesses, and in obtaining for the people a dollar's worth of value for every dollar expended unless an adequate, complete, and continuous examination is made of the host of Federal agencies. Such examination must be a constant function performed by experts under the direction of Congress. They must be "congressional commandos," with spirit and talent, who sally forth into the labyrinths of Government, bring forth the facts and the truth, and then sit at the elbow of congressional committees to furnish advice and recommendations. If Congress expended a million dollars for this type of service, it would result in hundreds of millions of economies. Private corporations spend vast sums to plug leaks, promote efficiency, and save waste. Why cannot this technique be adapted to and applied to the greatest business on earth—the Government of the United States?

Let me give you an illustration: The Maritime Commission to date has had almost $6,000,000,000 in authorizations; $5,250,000,000 are to be requested in a supplemental message; $570,000,000 of lease-lend funds have been made available for ship construction and $71,000,000 of lease-lend funds for facilities. This totals about $11,000,000,000 for one agency of Government—$11,000,000,000. This is four times the total annual expenditure of this Government prior to 1932. That agency will employ 6,700 people, an increase of 1,750 over the last fiscal year.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Briefly.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder how far this country can go in the expenditure of these tremendous sums?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We can go so far as the common people, who are the bone and the sinew of the country, will not run out on us; that is the answer. Mr. Chairman, you cannot draw a dollar sign and a certain amount against an iridescent sky and say that is the debt the American people can stand whether it be $100,000,000 or $200,000,000 or $300,000,000,000 or any other figure. I do know that it is a psychological limit. When the people are filled with apprehension about the future and they begin to put the fruit of their thrift under the mattress and in the sock that is the day you are done. When that happens you will know that you have reached the limit. That fact makes every dollar important. It is a serious business, this business of nondefense expenditures. When people run out because they are apprehensive, look out. That is when the day of reckoning is at hand. That is the day that Gabriel blows the fiscal trumpet.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In a minute, if the gentleman will permit me to continue.

Now, here is the Maritime Commission with over 6,700 people and $18,000,000 for administrative expenditures.

Think of the magnitude of this operations with eleven billions of funds to be made available, a personnel of 6,700 for administrative purposes, a program calling for 1,000 ships in 1943, plus authority to pay construction and operating differentials and the further authority to sell and purchase ships and establish charter hire rates. It is so very necessary that an operation of this magnitude be circumspect, efficient, and carefully administered. Let us consider one item. Do you know—and I am speaking from the record now, all of which you will find in the hearings—that the Maritime Commission sold to the Waterman Steamship Co. 5 ships, which were built in 1920. They sold them in 1941 or 1942; they were, roughly, 21 years old. They were old ships. Do you know what they received for those ships? Waterman paid the Maritime Commission $596,000. Then the Commission turns around and buys 5 other ships, equally old, from Waterman; and how much do they pay for 5 which they purchased? As much as they bought the other ships for? No, indeed. They paid $3,374,000. They gave away about $2,800,000 of the taxpayers' money. I said to Admiral Land—and you will find it at page 741:

We gave you a policy.

I said:

We wrote it in the law. It is what we wanted you to do, and now you superimpose yourself upon Congress and you write the policy.

Then he stated himself on page 731:

I am not saying that we were right or wrong, but I believe we were right.

What a weak answer for a loss of $2,800,000 of public money. We had a memorandum from the Comptroller General on this thing. Here is an agency with an item of $18,000,000 for administrative expenses, with 6,700 people on the pay roll. They have all the lawyers and all the accountants; and on the other side of the table sit we with no counsel, no experts, no investigators, to explore this operation and ascertain the full facts. By cross-quizzing and by direct question we try to build up the story. Mr. Chairman, we cannot run this Government that way efficiently. It is our responsibility to do something about it, because we are going to have to go back home and give an accounting of our stewardship.

The subcommittee should have been provided with a wealth of expert investigators to thoroughly examine into shipbuilding operations in every section of the country if the taxpayers are to receive full value for money expended. A few years ago a special committee under the chairmanship of Senator Black of Alabama was created in the Senate to investigate the maritime industry and when its labors were completed, it developed a scandal of national proportions. I do not wish to see a recurrence of such a thing because it is devastating to public morale and weakens the faith of the people in the integrity of government. It is, therefore, far better that we exercise a close and expert supervision from day to day to prevent a situation of that kind from arising.

The Maritime Commission has also conducted a shipbuilding operation in Maine in the yards of the South Portland Ship Building Corporation. This operation has been investigated by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House, and a report was filed on November 24, 1942. It was also investigated by the Truman committee of the Senate, and I present to you but a few quotes from the report of the Truman committee:

The trucking situation was ineptly handled.

Travesty of competitive bidding.

Mr. Wall, of the Maritime Commission, is not a proper or competent representative of the Maritime Commission.

The employment of Louis J. Brann, former Governor, as labor consultant, may be justified by the events, but there was nothing to indicate his particular qualification in the field of labor relations, and his retainer had unfortunate implications and political repercussions on public opinion.

The labor relations for the Todd Shipbuilding Co. being handled by Mrs. Elinor Herrick.

At one time Mrs. Herrick was in the employ of the Federal Government.

Existing management has not produced the results expected.

The contract should be renegotiated and there should be a reduction of fees to preclude the making of an exorbitant profit.

Here is an operation involving huge funds, the efficacy of which was assailed by the Truman committee and severely criticized by both the majority and minority members of a House committee to the degree to which they could devote time to this operation in the field. Then comes our subcommittee which

must pass upon the estimates and appropriations requested to carry on the far-flung work of this Commission on the Pacific coast, along the Gulf coast, on the Great Lakes, and on the Atlantic seaboard, and how helpless one feels when he realizes that involved here is nearly eleven thousand million dollars of the taxpayer's money.

Time will not permit going into all the aspects of the Maritime Commission; I wish I could; but there is one thing I am going to read to you in connection with all this and that is what the Merchant Marine Committee of the House said about it. They investigated it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Even the majority report of this committee states:

SOUTH PORTLAND SHIP'S POSSIBLE PROFIT

The fees paid to South Portland Ship as of October 31, 1942, amounted to $450,000. These fees are, for all practical purposes, net earnings of South Portland Ship. Its total investment is $250,000. All costs and expenses incurred by it, including salaries of officers, even $6,575 of the $10,000 salary paid to Mr. Newell, are being reimbursed to it by the Maritime Commission. It has already received a return on its investment of almost 200 percent. Under its contracts with the Commission it is to build 84 ships. Judging by its performance to date, its fees will not exceed $60,000 per ship, as on the ships built so far the penalties imposed for bad performance keep the fees at the minimum figure. Even at the minimum figure, however, its total fees will amount to $5,040,000, or a return of 2,000 percent on investment. This high return on investment must be considered in the light of the fact that South Portland Ship incurs no risk. Up to the present time it has financed its operations by short-term bank loans, a simple matter when one is enabled to borrow on the security of a Government contract. Incidentally, even the interest expense incurred on such loans is reimbursable.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The question presented is whether or not the performance by South Portland Ship has been such as to warrant the payment of fees of not less than $5,040,000. To summarize the relevant facts in the light of which an answer to this question must be framed, South Portland Ship contributed substantially nothing to the performance of the facilities contracts other than the lay-out of the yard and the lay-out is bad. It delegated the performance of the facilities contracts to the architect and the general contractors. Until the original facilities were nearly complete, it supplied no experienced or able supervision over the work of either the architect or the general contractors. The original management was removed at the insistence of the Maritime Commission. Were it not for the Maritime Commission's insistence at that time, to wit, the spring of this year, there is no indication but that the then existing management would have been continued and the yard would be in even worse shape than it is today. Since the appointment of Mr. Klitgaard in May 1942, and the granting to him of complete authority without any control by either the officers or directors of South Portland Ship, it has delegated to him the performance of the ship construction contracts. For long periods of time and until very recently it followed a policy of not paying any bills rendered to it until those bills were first approved by the Maritime Commission auditors in the yard, thus assuring it that the items paid would be reimbursed. Its investment of $250,000 is insignificant when compared with the moneys necessary even to meet the pay rolls in a yard employing some 13,000 men, and now with the addition of the Todd-Bath facilities, some 25,000 men. It has delegated to banks the task of supplying the necessary funds for the financing of its work without cost to it since the interest expense incurred is paid by the Maritime Commission.

The inevitable conclusion is that South Portland Ship is receiving a fee for the trouble of incorporating a company, choosing a name for that company, holding an occasional directors meeting and delegating the performance of its contract duties.

Your committee conceives that it would not be doing its full duty if it merely reported the above facts and did not suggest a remedy. It is clear to your committee that to continue in force the existing contract with South Portland Ship would be to throw away millions of dollars needlessly. As indicated above, South Portland Ship has already received fees representing almost 200 percent of its invested capital. The contracts may be summarily canceled upon payment of fees earned to the date of cancelation. In the alternative the contracts may be terminated at any time without payment of fees when the contractor has failed to exercise due diligence. South Portland Ship has already received more than enough. There is ample cause, as recited above, for the termination of its contracts.

In a hearing held about a month ago, your committee suggested to the representatives of the Maritime Commission, including two of the members of the Commission, that the contracts be terminated immediately because of the failure of South Portland Ship to exercise due diligence in their performance. While the Commission members conceded freely that they were not satisfied with conditions at the yard, they demurred to the suggestion that the contracts be terminated giving as an excuse that there is bad management in other yards also.

The record of South Portland Ship is the worst of any company engaged in the construction of Liberty ships. Your committee is unable to subscribe to the principle that South Portland Ship should be paid $5,000,000 for its incompetence, inefficiency, and obvious inability to perform its contract duties solely because other yards furnish examples of bad management. There is no room for incompetence, inefficiency, and incapacity, the only effect of which is a hampering of our war effort. In the opinion of your committee, the proposition that the contracts enjoyed by South Portland Ship should be terminated immediately is so clear that it admits of no debate. The other yards which, it is said, furnish examples of bad management will be very carefully examined, if your committee is authorized to continue its investigation.

One other reason was suggested by the members of the Maritime Commission for their reluctance to terminate the contract of South Portland Ship, to wit, that there is a dearth of available managerial skill. Your committee believes to the contrary. In this connection it must be stressed that the job at South Portland is not a technical shipbuilding job but a construction job. Experience in other yards has demonstrated that the chief executive need not possess shipbuilding experience.

The specific suggestion of your committee is that the contracts with South Portland Ship should be terminated immediately and that the existing top management should be replaced by a single qualified executive who, with the existing staff of superintendents and foremen, can carry out the task of constructing the remaining ships. Under such an arrangement millions of dollars would be saved and there is every reason to believe that ships would be coming off the ways and out of the basins with ever-increasing speed.

You ought to read that report, because it is a great document.

And then our good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] wrote the minority views in which he states:

MINORITY VIEWS

I concur in the recommendation contained in the report to terminate the contract of the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation with the Maritime Commission, but believe it should go further for the following reasons:

1. The report indicates that the Maritime Commission has been fully aware of the condition existing at the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation yard from its inception and it has been the responsibility of the Maritime Commission to eliminate the conditions existing without congressional investigation or action. The Maritime Commission has been derelict in its duty in not terminating this contract many months ago.

2. Members of the Maritime Commission have testified to the Commission's incompetency as set forth in the following language on page 38 of the typewritten report:

"In a hearing held about a month ago, your committee suggested to the representatives of the Maritime Commission, including two of the members of the Commission, that the contracts be terminated immediately because of the failure of South Portland Ship to exercise due diligence in their performance. While the Commission members conceded freely that they were not satisfied with conditions at the yard, they demurred to the suggestion that the contracts be terminated giving as an excuse that there is bad management in other yards also."

RICHARD J. WELCH,
*Member of Congress.*

I want to refer to one more item, and this is in a letter from our good friend, Lindsay Warren, at one time a Member of this House, and one of the most brilliant Members who ever sat in this House. I write him every once in a while in his capacity as Comptroller General about various things. Here is a current letter, dated February 11, 1943. The Comptroller's letter refers to the purchase by the United States Maritime Commission of the steamship *President Roosevelt* from the United States Lines, in which the Comptroller takes the position that the Commission paid an excessive amount for this vessel. In his letter the Comptroller states:

Since then I have transmitted to Congress a special report dealing with the acquisition by the United States Maritime Commission of the steamship *President Roosevelt* from the United States Lines, and that report, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 22, page 328, was referred to the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

What is the story about this ship-purchase item? The Comptroller alleges that in 1931 the United States Lines acquired this vessel from the United States Shipping Board for the sum of $262,500. By the formula which the Commission itself uses in estimating the depreciation of a ship, its value in October 1940 should properly have been only $178,531. Notwithstanding this formula the Commission has itself devised and purchased this ship from the United States Lines in

October 1940 for about $600,000 with a resulting loss to the taxpayers of this country in excess of $400,000. The Comptroller also points out that when this vessel was operated by the United States Lines, the Government absorbed a loss of about $3,000,000 in the operation of this ship for a period of seven years. Up to this time I have seen no valid reason to support this transaction and it constitutes a fruitful field in which the Appropriations Committee can function in the interest of complete integrity and efficient supervision of executive operations.

The law which Congress wrote in 1936 specifically provides in section 902 (a) that during any national emergency "declared by proclamation of the President it shall be lawful for the Commission to purchase any vessel or other water craft owned by citizens of the United States or under construction within the United States or for any period during such emergency to requisition or charter the use of any such property. The termination of any emergency so declared shall be announced by a further proclamation of the President. When any such property or the use thereof is so requisitioned, the owner thereof shall be paid just compensation for the property taken or for the use of such property but in no case shall the value of the property taken be deemed enhanced by the causes necessitating the taking or use." Note the last clause in that sentence to the effect that in no case shall the value of the property taken or used be deemed enhanced by the causes necessitating the taking or use.

That language is so clear and so unequivocal that it cannot be misinterpreted. Yet in the light of that language does it not appear that the Commission has purchased vessels and permitted their enhancement in value because of the emergency and clearly made a purchase which is in contravention of the law?

Perhaps I should observe at this point that a definite effort was made to secure a revision of that provision of the law. When the repeal measure reached the Senate, it became the subject of inquiry, and so it failed, but the effort to secure its repeal has gone steadily forward and you will find from the hearings that the Chairman of the Maritime Commission has in recent weeks addressed a letter to the Comptroller General of the United States in which he seeks to obtain a reinterpretation of section 902 of the act of 1936. That request will be found on page 733 of the hearings. In addition to all this you will find in the hearings on page 795 a report made by the Comptroller General on alleged irregularities in the construction of certain vessels by the Tampa Shipbuilding & Engineering Co. and in the sale of those vessels to the Navy Department. All of which was done under contract with the Maritime Commission.

In recent days you may have observed from the press that an investigation is also going forward with respect to the contracts for the construction of concrete barges.

Here, then, is the unpleasant sequence of charges and allegations which involve huge sums of public funds, and it is the solemn responsibility of the Congress, as the guardian of the Public Treasury, to leave no stone unturned in ascertaining full facts with reference to this matter. It is a time for heroic action irrespective of who might be hurt thereby, and I shall continue to press for a thorough investigation of the whole shipbuilding program.

Here is the power of the purse. We must exercise it intelligently and skillfully so that we can make a proper accounting to the people. How are you going to do it when so many dollars are involved and there are so many experts on the other side of the table? One is like a lawyer trying a lawsuit when you have neither witnesses or evidence. That is not a very happy commentary upon Congress' own dereliction in staffing itself the better to do this job.

Now a few words about the National Resources Planning Board, which has been discussed rather freely here. You may have observed that the subcommittee struck out the appropriation for that agency. I heard someone observe that he proposed to restore this appropriation if he could, but I am afraid he cannot. If I remember correctly, it is subject to a point of order, and I shall make the point of order if an amendment is offered to that effect.

Let me tell you why I think the committee took this action. I speak for myself, and I believe also for my colleagues. We are getting a little bewildered about this planning business. It has so many ramifications one cannot tell where it is going. There are 157 activities of government making an allowance for duplications that are in the planning business today. Almost every State has a planning authority, almost every metropolitan center has a planning authority, and I have listed here all the planning agencies in the Federal Government today.

Many bills have been introduced on this subject. There is one by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], one by myself, one by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], one by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], one by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], and one by Senator PEPPER. I think Senator GEORGE is about to introduce a bill on this subject of planning, also. You can develop a mountain of literature on the subject and it seems that it has neither end nor beginning, it has neither rhyme nor reason. I am anxious that we strike this thing and compel some action on the part of the Congress. It is our solemn duty now to set up some kind of a committee and implement it with a staff. If we do not, you know what is going to happen. The planning is going to be done by the same people who spend the money and that is going to be a very unhappy and unsalutary situation when it finally arrives. Do you recall the unhappy expression of Mr. Hopkins some years ago when he said "We will tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect"? That sort of thing must never happen again. I have a ton of literature right here before me, including the latest publication of the National Resources Planning Board that we struck out of the bill, dated June 1942. This tells us what is going on in various States. It is amazing how this planning idea has gotten into the consciousness of everybody everywhere. We will have to deal with the problem. I am very much interested in it, but I want to see the Congress deal with it because we are going to have to appropriate the money and we ought to have something to say about the planning.

I do not want them building any more four-story hen houses in the District of Columbia; I do not want them building any more monkey cages around the country; I do not want to see them develop any other rat-catching program as they did down in New Orleans that cost $2.97 a rat; I do not want them building another race track that was turned over to Bing Crosby's brother out at Delmar, Calif., where we have a million dollars of the taxpayers' money invested. You will find these facts in the hearings of the investigating committee of the Appropriations Committee several years ago. If we are going to escape that, if we are going to give the people a show for their money and the hard-earned dollars that we are going to sweat out of them, then it is time that we get busy on this planning business. The National Resources Planning Board conducts a sort of general staff operation. It picks up all of the planning that is done by all the other people in the country and brings it together. It is a coordinating agency. When they get through they will have coordinated so much that we will have to build a building as big as the new Census Building if we are going to hold all of these plans.

I am informed that in the Federal Works Agency there are over 30,000 projects scheduled right now. Some of the old timers are still there. Is it not time that we take a look at all this thing and see that the authority is up here, that we do a little bit of this planning? If we do not, I do not know what the ultimate implication is going to be. The subcommittee is unanimous in its belief that there must be post-war planning. It is also unanimous in its belief that this is the prime responsibility of those who are keepers of the public purse and it is to be hoped that Congress will take action in the very near future. In fact Congress should make general financial provision for such a planning operation within the legislative branch. The executive agencies are not niggardly about looking after this planning and research business in the executive branch of the Government. I had the Library of Congress go through every agency of the Government and find out how much money is being expended for research, and have it tabulated. Do you know how much is being spent for research of all kinds? One hundred and sixty-four million dollars a year! Do you not think we could spend a couple of million dollars on ourselves to set up a planning and reconstruction service with

engineers and experts to give it guidance? We are going to save hundreds of millions of dollars for the people if we do. Here is $164,000,000 for all kinds of research and it is about time we take a cue from the executive branch and lavish a little research money upon ourselves. Until we do I am not willing to see this item restored. I want to do anything I can to compel some action on the part of this body.

I do not know how effective my humble efforts may be in compelling legislative action on a planning proposal, but I shall persist in that effort until something has been accomplished because Congress has the responsibility for the funds which must be appropriated, and so it must also assume the responsibility for the way and manner in which those appropriations are expended. So I will resist any restoration of the National Resources Planning Board until the Congress sets up some kind of a staff of its own.

Look at today's issue of the Washington Daily News. It contains an editorial about a half column long, which states that Senator GEORGE is proposing now the creation of some kind of a joint committee and a planning staff. Thank goodness that the Senator has done that. If we cannot initiate it over on this side, I hope perhaps it can be initiated over on the other side and we will get this thing going.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. In that regard, may I say that the resolution introduced by Senator GEORGE does not provide for a joint committee but a separate Senate committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is all right.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I may say to the gentleman that yesterday I introduced a verbatim copy of that resolution, except that it sets up a House committee. May I ask the gentleman if he can tell the House how much money is being spent by the various agencies for planning?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I just gave the figure, $164,000,000. It has been brought up to date. So that is something that must be done.

I do not have time for everything. I wish I had 2 or 3 hours to just visit about this bill, but I must be content to hit the high spots.

There is, for instance, the Securities and Exchange Commission. I want to tell you something about them. We struck out $750,000 from the Budget estimate. We should have cut their appropriation half in two, but I propose to defend the action of the subcommittee. I will tell you why I think we could cut their appropriation in two.

It is my humble opinion that they are manufacturing business down there. The procedures for securities regulation and exchange regulation, investment adviser regulation, broker-dealer regulation, and the operations under section 77B of the Bankruptcy Act have all been pretty well patterned now, and surely there ought to be some retraction from the high ground they have reached. They ought to be able to save some money and still do the business they ought to do without serving to harass the industry of the country.

Let me illustrate. There was a bill pending in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to prevent the S. E. C. from putting into effect these newly proposed proxy rules. I do not know whether or not there was an arrangement of some kind, but in any event they waited until most of the Members of Congress left town to go home for the Christmas recess and then they imposed these proxy regulations. Businessmen are smarting. They find themselves in the midst of a war effort harassed by a change of rules which was wholly unnecessary and seemingly quite capricious. It imposed upon business an unnecessary and an unwarranted burden. They have to hire extra help. The war industries are the ones that are most affected thereby. The Securities and Exchange Commission would pick out a time like this to load up business with proxy, consent, and authorization requirements of one kind and another until it becomes a truly menacing burden.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The gentleman could explain what that proxy circular means. It means that stockholders in various parts of the country who are being asked for their proxy do not under the present set-up know anything that is going to transpire at the meetings. The idea of this is to place in the circular a description of the matters on which the stockholders are going to vote and on which they are requested to send in their proxies. I think every stockholder in the United States ought to know for what he is signing his proxy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, how my friend deludes himself. The volume of material they are going to have to send to the average stockholder would take him a long time to read and, after he read it, he would wonder about the technical terms that are used. Then the lawyers and the crackpots will have their field day and they will be dictating to a good many of the corporations in the country. Examine every financial journal in the country and there you can find quotes galore as to what this thing is doing. Many businessmen have come to town on this matter, hoping that perhaps they could get sufficient relief so they could go ahead with their war operations and not have to detach a good many of their best minds for the purpose of dealing with this problem. It is a terrific thing.

I recognize that Ganson Purcell, the Chairman down there, is a fine young fellow. He has been with the Commission since 1934. But I see now from the public statements he has been making from time to time that he has developed a punitive complex toward business. In an extension of remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A349, inserted by Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY, of New York, Mr. Purcell, the Chairman of the Commission, is quoted as having said:

> Management feathering its nest at the expense of its stockholders as well as that of the Government. We see more and more today.

It is high time that somebody stands up in the Well of this House and has a kind word to say for business. Business is the backbone of the country. It is the place to which we are going to go for the taxes. It will furnish the bone and sinew for the growth of this country. I, for one, will not stand idly by and see a Federal administrator, no matter how brilliant he is, seek to castigate and punish the business of the country that has made us truly great and has provided the employment for the far-flung millions from one ocean to the other.

The statement made by Mr. Purcell shows a definite reflection upon business, as if he does not trust them, as if there is no integrity in the businessmen. We know better than that. Yes; and we are not going along with that kind of philosophy.

I have examined many editorials and news accounts of the effect of the new proxy rules. One journal discusses it under the title of "Proxy Rules Seen Causing Disputes Between Management and Stockholders." Another discusses it under the title "S. E. C.'s Proxy Rules an Example of Reform in Reverse." Still another discusses it under the title "New S. E. C.'s Proxy Rules Held Burdensome to Listed Corporations."

I am also advised that this action was taken on the basis of only a few letters received by S. E. C. from various parts of the country and no real justification has been advanced or shown for imposing this extra burden upon a war-burdened industry at a time when there is a manpower shortage in the country and when industry is expected to provide the guns, the tanks, and the other weapons for the young American warriors, who fight upon the far-flung combat fronts of the world today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry I cannot submit it in this bill, because of the rule against legislation in an appropriation bill, but one of these days I am going to make a proposal that we liquidate the Securities and Exchange Commission as an independent agency of Government and put it in the Department of Commerce. I am willing to see some young fellow who has a good head and some business judgment give direction to it, but it needs stability. We have entrusted to the Department of Commerce lots of component agencies and lots of activities of the Government, and they can stand another. If we put this agency there, we will not get quite the treatment that business is getting at the present time, when the Securities and Exchange Commission undertakes to make it so difficult for business to do business.

In any event, we have the satisfaction of cutting them back $750,000, and I

trust that it is but the beginning of a bit of directive discipline to show them that after all the Congress is the law-making body of the country, that the Securities and Exchange Commission is, after all, only a creature of Congress, and that we propose to have something to say about the preservation of that source from which the revenues of the country must come if we are going to stave off the evil day that lies ahead. The pattern of securities' regulations has been established. It must be fair. It must not be capricious. It must be just, but I doubt that it will be sensibly administered so long as it lies in the hands of those who seek to tie up the regulation of business with a social modification. There has been this tendency of using every weapon of government to develop social reform to the point where we approach the day when we kill the goose which lays the golden egg. Here again Congress can assert its proper authority.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Having in mind particularly Douglas and Henderson who once guided the affairs of the S. E. C., I am wondering if the gentleman, having weighed the good and the evil, would say which overbalances the other.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not so sure but that the evil overbalances the good in its destructive effect.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have spoken on this many times, and I am positive that the wrecking business carried on by that agency has far exceeded the good that has come out of it. I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me on that. I have felt very strongly about it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think I agree.

Mr. GIFFORD. They do not wait for the aggrieved party; they want more power. Have the committee voted that reduction?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes. It was quite unanimous on that $750,000. Now, let me say a word about the Civil Service Commission. A bit of history might be appropriate. You may be interested in knowing that in 1789 we had 300 employees in the Federal Government. The State Department had 4; the Treasury Department had 315; the War Department, 23; the Post Office Department, 3.

By 1816—which was 27 years later—it had risen to 6,327. When Abraham Lincoln took this country into the Civil War, or, rather, when Congress took it into the Civil War, in 1861, we had 49,200 people on the pay roll. In 1881 it had risen to 107,000. What will it be as of July 1, 1943, projected? Mr. Flemming, of the Civil Service Commission, tells us——

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. CREAL. Of those 1,800 the gentleman spoke of, how many were Republicans?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to my amiable friend from Kentucky that I do not know; but if I were selfish, I would certainly wish all were. I know from the direction the Government is taking that only a few could be Republicans, because we know Republicans could do an infinitely better administration job; but here is the figure: July 1, 1943, immediately ahead, 2,972,000. They are going to ask for 600,000 new positions in the fiscal year 1944. Think of it. Six hundred thousand new hopeful citizens, young and old, who will be recruited from the highways and byways of the country, to come in and find a job with Uncle Sam.

But that is not the whole story. In addition to the new positions there will be 840,000 turn-overs—people who left because they can make more money elsewhere, who retire or resign, who die, or who migrate. And so they must go out now and find 840,000 to take care of the turn-over in a single fiscal year. Thus there will be 1,540,000 new faces show up on the Federal pay roll in the next 365 days, beginning July 1, 1943.

We have 1,594 agencies scattered all over the country that have more than 100 people in their employ. From this you get some idea of the magnitude of this thing. There will be more people on the pay roll than the population of the city of Chicago, the second largest city in the land. It is an amazing thing. I do not know where it is going to stop. As a matter of fact Mr. Flemming said to us he expected it might be 3,500,000 in view of what has been happening in the last few months. Think of the size of these agencies. For instance there is the War Production Board with 20,343 employees. Mr. Nelson ought to be able to do a good job I think with those, and he ought to have had this rubber problem solved a long time ago, with enough people to make up two infantry regiments. Then there is the O. P. A. with 37,817. They have more than 4,800 in Washington, and are moving it up to higher personnel levels. The Veterans' Administration has over 44,000, the Agriculture Department 75,613, and that does not count the field committeemen.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Nor the county agents.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. Then the Federal Security has 65,349. I thought you would be interested in the figures. They need no interpretation on my part. You do not have to dramatize those figures. They speak for themselves. I thought you might be interested in the ultimate personnel objective which the Civil Service Commission contemplates and with which it is charged to recruit and employ at a cost, I think, of $4.99 a head. How are we going to meet it? So long as these people go on, there will be new functions, a digging in of a bureaucracy to find new work, and a constant growth in Government personnel. It is only fair to say, however, that this is not the fault of the Commission, nor should we penalize the Civil Service Commission. We give them a job to do and say, you do this job, and then we take away $1,600,000. But I did not want to do it at first, but we have to do it, we have to stop these functions and streamline this Government, otherwise the Civil Service Commission will go for larger and larger amounts. Of course, they will be without blame, because we are putting a job in their laps which springs from the demands by other Federal agencies. The remedy lies in a thorough investigation of the operations of Government to prevent overstaffing and incompetency, the elimination of unnecessary activities and the development of efficient techniques in Government.

Mr. ARENDS. Could not Mr. McNutt use any of these fellows and give them a job in the Army or the Navy, those between 18 and 37?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know. I had hoped somewhere that they would solve this farm problem, but they have not done it, and may I allude to the fact that when we were charged with dereliction for having refused to give the Secretary of Agriculture those additional $125,000,000, I said to Mr. Wickard, "Have you solved the farm labor problem?" No. "Have you solved the manpower problem or the farm machinery problem?" No. Then I ask him whether he had effected an understanding with the Army, Navy, and War Manpower Commission. No. Then, "Have you made formal representations to the Army and the Navy to see about keeping some of these experienced young farmers on the farm?" And the answer was that he had not, and that no agreement had been reached. Mr. Chairman, I for one will not vote them any more money until I can see ahead and see some possibility that we are going to succeed in the program. The other thing is that it is something of a reflection upon our farmers. I do not believe you have to give a farmer an extra $15 per acre to produce soybeans, in order to get him to go out and work a couple of hours longer.

He is not that kind of an American. Out in our country those folks who beat the soil, who work early and late, are real patriots. I said to Mr. Wickard, "Have you canvassed opinion? Have you gone around and asked some of the farmers, just man to man or over the radio, 'Won't you please raise more soybeans, more sorghum, more flax, more peanuts, more vegetables, more sweetpotatoes, and more Irish potatoes?'" There is no indication that such representation was made to the farmers or that they were asked to come in as a patriotic effort to do it. That is the whole story.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I would like to ask my distinguished colleague from Illinois this question: Do you believe that the farmer, ought to be asked to go out and produce food for the civilians of this Nation and for our armed forces and for our allies, at a loss?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, definitely not.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Then you do agree that we must do something to get the farmer adequate pay for the materials we are asking him to go out and slave for, 10 or 12 or 14 hours a day, if necessary?

Mr. DIRKSEN. All you have to do is to get him some help and get him some machinery. You have got machinery down to the point where 30 percent as

much machinery will be manufactured this year as in the base year of 1940. What is he going to do when his binder rusts out? What is he going to do when he cannot get a corn picker? How is he going to milk a lot of cows when he has no milker? He has to be mechanized, and they have not solved it. Give the farmer a fair price for his products and permit him to obtain labor, machinery, seed, tires, and such equipment as is necessary to produce and market and he will do the rest.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In the Tenth District of Missouri a million bushels of soya beans are rotting in the fields because we cannot get combines allocated to the farmers to harvest those soya beans.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Surely. We raised 51 percent of the soya-bean crop in the State of Illinois last year and 15 percent of last year's beans are still in the field.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. A short time ago you mentioned 37,000 people employed by the Office of Price Administration. I am wondering if the farmers might not be helped a little by having somebody in the O. P. A. who knew something about what it cost to produce a given commodity on the farm, in the fixing of prices. It is not a proposition of giving hand-outs. It is a question of letting the farmer attend to his own business and get a reasonable price for his produce.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely so.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the lady from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. What gets me is they are always arguing whether the farmer is an American or not. Take the industrialist, if you want more products they will pay a higher price. If they want the farmer to produce more they say that he ought to work because he is a good American. Do they not think that the farmer works with the profit motive?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, definitely.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. And is that not a part of Americanism?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely so. I do not like the idea that you have to go to a farmer and say, "Now, Mr. Jones, cannot you boost your soya beans 5 acres? If you do we will give you $15."

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It is not quite that simple. The farmer will have more money. The farmer can go into town and say to the druggist who is a good, big husky fellow, "You come out and help me. You are a big, husky fellow." But he cannot do that if he does not have the money, can he?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, indeed.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt whether there is time to discuss fully one other matter that is important, and that is the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. I think I shall forego it at this time and discuss it tomorrow at greater length.

However, I do want to give you the figures on the emergency funds that we have provided the President. From June 30, 1940, to October 6, 1942, we passed 13 separate acts in this Congress in which we carried emergency funds. Have you any adequate idea how much we gave him? Here is the figure: $631,533,000. It is a huge sum. It is the blank check provided to the President to be allocated and expended at his discretion. I can see good reason for some emergency funds, but it looks to me like many of those agencies who have gotten money out of the emergency fund could come up and lay their cards on the table before the Congress and justify their expenditures. Why should not the Office of Censorship come up here? Why should not the item for the alteration of the Public Health Bureau come up here? Why should not funds to transfer employees in the Treasury come here? Why should not the Board of Economic Warfare, that received $10,000,000 for confidential purposes, come up here? Can they not trust at least one committee of Congress? Can they not as much as trust one subcommittee with a dozen honorable House Members to examine into the purposes for which funds are requested? Yet here is $10,000,000 for confidential purposes for the Board of Economic Warfare out of the emergency fund. In addition, they got $216,000 for salaries and $337,000 for travel in foreign countries. It is all out of the Federal Treasury. Do you not think we ought to examine into those items and justify them?

Here is Mr. Rockefeller's office for the establishment of an insurance fund for the Inter-American Navigation Corporation requiring $1,000,000. Here is the Office of War Information, Mr. Davis' office, which for the establishment of the office, received $1,699,000. Perhaps if we had had a better look at it when it first started and let it be created a little more slowly and develop a little more slowly it would have been a better agency and more efficiently operated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired and the gentleman has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the rule, to extend my time for 5 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have been trying all afternoon to get 5 minutes and have been unable to do so. I will not object provided the gentleman's side will give me 5 minutes. I cannot get it on this side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has control of the time. I will be glad to speak to him rather confidentially.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is within the control of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard to the request for an extension of the rule.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I express my regret. Tomorrow, however, there will be a number of amendments as we read the bill; some will be extremely important, including an amendment to bring about the progressive liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, to which I shall devote myself at considerable length. I am grateful for your gracious indulgence.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, if it were not for the fact that the gentleman from Virginia, the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, is ill and therefore cannot be here today I would not take the floor. Numerous Members on yesterday and today have spoken in criticism of specific matters in relation to the shipbuilding program and the activities of the Maritime Commission.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to enter into any controversy with those who have spoken or particularly to take issue with the sentiments they have expressed, although I do not agree with everything they have said here on the floor.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] referred to Liberty ships and criticized their speed. He did incidentally mention the fact that propulsion machinery was hard to get and I think he knows that is the solution. I think that is the reason we are building slow ships. He referred to the Higgins contract and criticized the action of the Commission in canceling the Higgins contract. A subcommittee of the Merchant Marine Committee investigated the matter most thoroughly and came to the conclusion by unanimous vote, as I recall it—if I am mistaken about that, anyway by a majority vote—that there was not enough steel to operate the plant Higgins was constructing at Government expense and at the same time supply the steel being used by shipyards already in existence. It would therefore have been foolish to have continued the expenditure of Government funds to complete that plant.

Mention has been made of the Waterman Steamship Corporation construction. Extensive hearings on the transactions involved in the Comptroller General's report have been held by the Merchant Marine Committee. Witnesses for the Waterman Steamship Corporation, representatives of the General Accounting Office, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission were heard. The Merchant Marine Committee has not completed its examination of this record.

In the South Portland Shipbuilding case hearings were also conducted by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Truman Committee of the Senate and reports issued by both committees. The Merchant Marine Committee, after an exhaustive investigation, recommended the cancelation of that contract. The Senate committee took a little different position about it. The Commission has so far declined to cancel the contract but has given the company 60 days, as I understand, in

which to straighten out their situation, and they have put a new manager in there in the hope that that may be done.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman from Illinois was discussing these appropriations a while ago. During the course of his remarks he said he sought some remedy. It seems to me if they were concerned about the Maritime Commission they should have asked some members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to appear before the Appropriations Subcommittee and tell them what they had found and what could be done to bring about a solution.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman has made a strong suggestion. With reference to the question of acquiring ships under section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act:

The chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee has announced his intion of examining fully into the differences of opinion between the Comptroller Genera' and the War Shipping Administration as to the proper meaning and application of the requisition authority contained in section 902.

The decision rendered by the Comptroller General in November 1942 is not concerned with values payable for ships on which construction-differential subsidies have been paid. Such subsidized vessels have been acquired (for title or use) in accordance with the formula prescribed by section 802 of the 1936 act directing valuation upon the basis of the depreciation cost to the owner.

Within the last few months the Comptroller General has submitted to Congress three reports of alleged irregularities on the part of the Maritime Commission, and rendered a decision pertaining to the meaning and application of the requisition authority contained in the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, challenging the interpretation placed on the statute by the War Shipping Administration.

The controversy over the requisition authority, which is the basis of two of the Comptroller's reports, involves the interpretation of the so-called enhancement clause, which was intended to prevent a repetition of the Government's experience with fantastic ship prices in the First World War.

The question in this controversy is not the objective, but how to attain it.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives has conducted hearings on the transactions involved in the Comptroller's report on the Tampa Shipbuilding & Engineering Co. and the Waterman Steamship Corporation, and has asked the Maritime Commission for its comment on the more recent report pertaining to the purchase of a vessel from the United States Lines, Inc.

The chairman of the committee has expressed his intention to conduct full hearings on the controversy relating to the requisition authority. It is anticipated that these hearings will get under way as soon as Judge Bland is able to return to his office.

The facts with respect to all of the differences between the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration on the one hand, and the Comptroller General on the other, will therefore be fully developed by the House committee that is resonsible for merchant-marine legislation.

The House authorized that investigation, and I feel that in the interest of orderly procedure and getting all the facts, that it is wise for Members of the House not to form too certain opinions about the conduct of the Maritime Commission until these investigations have been completed and reports made to the House. I am not here to defend the Maritime Commission; I do not agree with everything they have done. I simply ask the membership of the House to withhold its judgment on these comments and criticisms that have been made here on the floor until the proper legislative committee which has been authorized by this House to do so can complete its investigation and make its report to this body, at which time there will be facts available upon which to form an intelligent opinion.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] said he had lost confidence in the Maritime Commission. I was sorry to hear him make that statement. I hold no brief for members of that Commission, but I may say in passing that Admiral Land had been retired from the Navy on good retirement pay but came back to one of the toughest jobs in this whole war set-up when he could have taken life easy without worrying about this situation.

The shipbuilding record made by the Maritime Commission in the past few months is without parallel in the history of the world. May I call your attention to the fact that in the last war, although we spent approximately $3,000,000,000 constructing ships, so far as I am informed not one single vessel ever sailed across the seas before the 11th day of November 1918? Many of them were unserviceable when they were finished after the war was over. Last year alone we built more ships under this program conducted by the Maritime Commission than any country ever built in a like period in the history of the world and while they are not as fast as we would like to have them, they are carrying the goods and the equipment to our boys in the far-flung battle lines throughout the world. The Maritime Commission on the whole has done a most excellent job under many difficulties.

When we started this program we had practically no shipyards in operation in this country. We had built practically no cargo vessels for many, many years, yet we turned out last year more than 700 ships with a total tonnage of over 8,000,000. Ships are being delivered today for cargo service at the average rate of 4 per day. So in spite of all the mistakes the Commission has made, in spite of the faults that have been developed in their program, I think it is fair to say that on the whole Admiral Land and his associates on the Commission have done one job in this war effort that has exceeded the expectations and hopes of everybody who knew anything about it when it was started. I hope therefore the Members will reserve judgment on those criticisms.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, for the past 60 days I have been at meetings of both the Office of Price Administration and the Agricultural Department having to do with meat, meat problems and food. Hourly, various members in those departments are figuring up new red-tape ideas to strangle more every day the production of the American farmer.

In my State of California I happen to represent the richest agricultural Congressional district in the United States and my people have come to the point that if the O. P. A. and the Agriculture Department cannot divorce themselves from the red tape that hourly, as I stated, is being placed upon the American farmers not only in my State but the rest of the States of the Union, we are going to awaken and not too far in the future find ourselves hungry people. The responsibility must be placed in the departments which are bringing that about. My people have not been able to have meat for as long as 3 or 4 weeks at a time and these people include those engaged in manufacturing ships as well as airplanes and other things. Our farmers have bee: unable to secure meat, eggs, and butter in some localities, yet the Farm Security Administration in California has come out with new rules and regulations governing the feeding of Mexican nationals that will be brought into the State of California to work.

In this program they are asking that the Mexicans be fed meat 6 days out of every week when the farmers in my State and men working in the shipbuilding yards and airplane manufacturing plants have not had a speck of meat on their own table for as long as 3 or 4 weeks. Yet the departments down here have not worked anything out to correct the meat situation. They have refused a committee, of which I have been serving as chairman, representing the entire California delegation, any kind of a solution. Now they come out with this sort of a program:

STANDARDIZATION FOR MEXICAN EXTRA GANG LABORERS

Butter is to be served at each meal.

Bacon squares or meat in some form for breakfast six times per week and ham one time per week.

Eggs should be served every morning, and no limit placed on the number consumed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes. The gentleman is reading a statement from the Farm Security Administration of California?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes. It is a menu sent to me which the Farm Security Administration is requiring the agricultural employers in California to use in feeding the Mexican nationals brought in as agricultural workers.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. In which they are imposing conditions on the California farmers that they have

got to feed the Mexicans according to the menu which the gentleman is reading, is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Go on, read some more of it. It sounds pretty good.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Thanks. I want to read it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would like to hear it read. It is fine that the Mexicans may get it even if we cannot get it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, here are some more provisions:

Milk should be diluted with one part water and placed on the table for all meals.

Beef should be No. 1 grade cow. If quarters are used, shanks and plates should be taken off. Smaller cuts of beef should be consisted of rounds and chucks, preferably boned round and chucks.

Pork should be served about once every week or 10 days.

No veal is to be served.

Mr. Chairman, the farmer is glad to eat veal if he can get the veal, but he cannot get but very little veal under the program at the present time.

I read on:

Other kinds of meat should consist of bologna, tripe, beef hearts, pig's feet, beef or hog liver, frankfurters, hamburger.

Mr. BENDER. Is that agency going to serve the American tripe and boloney?

Mr. ELLIOTT. How many of you know what tripe is? Does the gentleman know?

That is what they are asking the farmers to serve the Mexicans. It is good meat.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Did the gentleman overlook the idea of giving them butter every day?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; I did not overlook it. I read about butter.

Here is the rest of the program:

GENERAL POINTS CONCERNING MEXICAN EXTRA GANGS

(a) Seasoning of food: It is recommended that you find out how the Mexicans prefer to have their food prepared and seasoned. If consistent, have your cooks prepare it in the manner most palatable to same.

(b) Quality and amount: These laborers should receive good wholesome food and plenty of it.

(c) Elimination of fancy types of dishes: The fancy, expensive dishes should be eliminated since the Mexican laborers do not particularly enjoy them.

SUGGESTED MENUS FOR LOW BOARD RATES

*Breakfasts*

Oatmeal, bacon squares, fried pinto beans, fried potatoes, syrup, hot biscuits, coffee, eggs.

Oatmeal, bacon squares, hot cakes, syrup, hashed brown potatoes, hot biscuits, coffee, eggs.

Oatmeal, beef hash and potatoes, syrup, hot biscuits, coffee, eggs.

*Dinners*

Roast beef, pinto beans, Spanish macaroni, stewed fruit, hot corn bread, tea or coffee, potatoes.

Tripe, pinto beans, Spanish rice, pudding, hot corn bread, tea or coffee, potatoes.

Spanish hearts, pinto beans, spaghetti, boiled rice, potatoes, stewed fruit, tea or coffee.

*Suppers*

Beef hash, pinto beans, macaroni, cake or stewed fruit, white bread, corn bread, potatoes, tea or coffee.

Irish stew, pinto beans, rice or spaghetti, stewed fruit or pudding, white bread, corn bread, potatoes, tea or coffee.

Chili con carne, pinto beans, spaghetti, rice pudding, potatoes, white bread, corn bread, tea or coffee.

NOTES ON THE MENUS

Serve cooked cereals only, not corn flakes.

Always give sweetpotatoes at dinner and supper when they are reasonable since the Mexicans like them.

The type of pudding should be cornstarch, bread, or rice.

Potatoes should be served at dinner and supper.

Usually try to have only corn bread at dinner; biscuits and white bread at supper. Sometimes white bread is required at dipner and supper as well.

In the winter specialize in hot cakes.

In the summer, iced tea or root beer should be served.

Use plenty of seasoning in preparing the food.

Inexpensive fresh vegetables can also be worked into the above menus. A proper amount of fresh vegetables should be used in all camps to insure variety and the resultant saving over the use of canned vegetables. This economy and increased satisfaction holds true if there is no waste from a surplus of same.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Does that specify whether the beef should come from the male or female steer?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Take a glance at the menu for breakfast, dinner, and supper and tell me where meals of this quantity and quality can be found in the homes of our farmers who are producing the food for the war effort. When American farmers are themselves working 15 to 18 hours per day with shortages of all kinds of food and earning much less than 30 cents per hour, an agency of the United States Government has the audacity to attempt to establish minimum wages, hours of work, and collective bargaining principles upon the American farmer contrary to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the National Labor Relations Act, and is requiring them to be fed in a style which is impossible for the farmer himself under the food regulations laid down by the Department of Agriculture.

Add to this the fact that when they request the right to purchase more meat to feed these Mexican workers the Department tells us nothing can be done about it, and the farmers are having to use food with which they would normally feed their families to feed the Mexicans in a style in which the American himself cannot live. It certainly must be far above that to which the Mexicans have been accustomed in their own country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, is agriculture a war industry? The answer to this seems to depend upon whether one refers to talk or action. If we go by talk, the farmer is a very important man in this country, and the American farm is a great defense plant.

Last November Secretary Wickard expressed this idea when he said:

We know that food is as essential to the winning of victory as tanks and planes and guns. We also know that with the victory won, food will be essential in the building of peace.

On January 12 farmers were asked to attend county mobilization meetings to discuss food goals for 1943. In connection with this mobilization there was a Nation-wide radio broadcast at which Economic Stabilization Director James F. Byrnes read a message from the President and speeches were made by the Secretary of Agriculture; Lord Woolton, British Food Minister; Maxim Litvinov, Russian Ambassador to the United States; Admiral William Brent Young, Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Supplies and Accounts; and others. The President, in his message, said:

Food is a weapon in total war—fully as important in its way as guns or planes or tanks.

He further said:

We are using food to earn the friendship of people in liberated areas and to serve as a promise and an encouragement to people who are not yet free.

Lord Woolton said, among other things, that Britain is depending upon the farmers of this country "not to fail, so that we can go on fighting and producing planes and tanks and ships as we have for the past 3 years."

Ambassador Litvinov said that food for the Soviet Armies was helping to "reinforce the common front" and that American contributions—

have played no small part in making it possible for the Soviet troops, with that courage, determination, and spirit of self-sacrifice which characterize them, to deal mighty blows at the Fascist troops when they were attacking, and now to go over to the attack themselves, to destroy Nazis by the hundred thousands and drive them back.

Admiral Young said:

It may seem far from a farm to a beachhead in the Solomons, but actually a direct life line reaches from every farm in America to every American battle zone in the world.

Sentiments similar to the above from men of prominence in official, military, and business life could be quoted by the page. The question is, Does this oratory mean anything when it comes to giving the farmer the labor, machinery, and equipment with which to work? If agriculture is a war industry, then it should be treated like one. We do not draft men out of munitions plants or airplane factories unless there are trained replacements to take their places. Yet, in the past 2 years governmental policies have resulted in 3,000,000 men going from the farms to industrial plants or to the Army without any trained replacements to take their places. In most cases it is not even possible to train people to take the places of those who have left. In the main, farmers are expected to fill the ranks of those who have gone with people who cannot secure

employment elsewhere. Women and children, Mexican labor and the lame, the halt, and the blind are expected to take the places of the skilled workers who have left the farm.

The direct responsibility of the Federal Government for this critical situation cannot be denied. Selective Service has taken hundreds of thousands into the Army. Others have volunteered, knowing that as far as the Federal Government was concerned, agriculture was not considered an essential industry except for conversational purposes. Other hundreds of thousands have been lured away from the farm by the wage policies of this administration and a large number of them actually recruited from the farms by the United States Employment Service.

Even now, with the possibility of hunger staring us in the face within the next few months, men are being taken off our farms and into the armed service. The proportion has slowed down somewhat but it is still going on. All this in spite of legislation passed by Congress providing for the reclassification and deferment of every registrant found by a local board "to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or agricultural endeavor essential to the war effort."

Next to manpower, our greatest need for agricultural production is increased supplies of machinery. As manpower declines machinery becomes even more necessary. Yet, last October, the War Production Board issued an order covering the period from November 1, 1942, to October 31, 1943, limiting farm equipment production to 20 percent of the average for 1940–41, and the production of repair parts to 130 percent of the average for 1940–41. Later, the percentage going to repair parts was increased to 160 percent of the 1940–41 average and allowance for equipment production has been increased to what is said to be approximately 40 percent of 1940. In percentages, this means that considerably less than 1 percent of our total steel production for 1943 has been allocated for new farm machinery and equipment and repair parts. Furthermore, a part of this goes for exports. All of this while agriculture is being proclaimed as a great war industry—a great war industry and yet receiving only a small proportion of the equipment and machinery which it actually used in 1940, when production was much less and labor was plentiful.

What about fertilizer? What about farm transportation? Are we handling those problems as if agriculture were a war industry? You know how gasoline rationing hit the farmer. Efforts are being made to undo the chaos created by the admitted incompetent rationing of gasoline to every farmer in this country from the office in Detroit, Mich. But how does the farmer know that next week or next month some equally ridiculous regulation will not be put into effect by some other of the numerous agencies attempting to regulate his affairs?

Farm operations must be planned months in advance. Farmers must know what they can depend upon in the way of labor, machinery, fertilizer, and fuel. What greater folly could there be than to plant crops with no assurance of labor or machinery to harvest them?

Is agriculture a war industry? Listen, war industries get priorities on material. They get machinery. They get labor. Every agency of the Government is directed to see that their requirements are met. Would we expect the Boeing Aircraft Co. to increase its production with fewer men, less machinery, and less material? When we expand the operations of an Army do we give it less material and fewer men? Yet, the administration is telling the farmers of this country today to produce more than they ever have before, lest the country go hungry, lest our armed forces lack vital supplies, lest we fail to meet our commitments to feed the hungry in occupied countries. Yes; to produce 25 percent more than they did in 1940 with 30 percent less labor, 60 percent less machinery, less fertilizer, less fuel, less of everything except hampering Government regulations and red tape.

Thank God, the farmer is no quitter. He is going ahead. He will perform miracles. Even miracles, however, will not enable him to produce what we must have if we are to avoid disaster on the food front. It isn't a farm question. It is a national question. It can be solved only by treating agriculture as a war industry. This means, among other things, a minimum program to embrace the following:

First. Stop the induction of farmers into the armed forces.

Second. Return to the farm large numbers of experienced farmers already inducted or enlisted.

Third. Allocate machinery and supplies adequate to do the job.

Fourth. A price level which will enable farmers to procure and retain help in competition with other industries.

Fifth. Assurance that in all things agriculture will have the status of other war industries.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

THE FOOD PROBLEM

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the necessity of producing more food to win the war is becoming more apparent each day. The following table from the January issue of the Agricultural Situation, issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, shows the food and fiber goals of 1942, the production attainments of 1942, and the goals for 1943:

*Production goals for 1943, with comparisons*

| Commodity | Units | 1942 goal or expected | 1942 reported [1] | 1943 goal or expected |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | *Thousands* | *Thousands* | *Thousands* |
| Wheat | Acres | 55,000 | 52,533 | 52,500 |
| | Bushels | 793,000 | 981,327 | 651,000 |
| Rye | Acres [2] | 3,550 | 3,837 | 3,600 |
| | Bushels | 48,000 | 57,341 | 40,000 |
| Rice | Acres | 1,320 | 1,505 | 1,380 |
| | Bushels | 65,000 | 66,363 | 66,800 |
| Corn | Acres | 93,750 | 91,011 | 95,000 |
| | Bushels | 2,675,000 | 3,175,154 | 2,834,000 |
| Oats | Acres | 40,000 | 42,656 | 37,300 |
| | Bushels | 1,200,000 | 1,358,730 | 1,137,650 |
| Barley | Acres | 16,000 | 19,433 | 18,000 |
| | Bushels | 360,000 | 426,150 | 392,000 |
| Grain sorghum | Acres | 10,000 | 9,755 | 10,000 |
| | Bushels | 120,000 | 149,795 | 127,000 |
| Hay, all | Acres [2] | 72,000 | 72,744 | 71,100 |
| | Tons | 94,000 | 105,328 | 94,500 |
| Flaxseed | Acres | 4,500 | 4,691 | 5,000 |
| | Bushels | 36,000 | 40,660 | 36,250 |
| Soybeans for beans | Acres [2] | 9,000 | 10,762 | 10,500 |
| | Bushels | 153,000 | 209,559 | 189,000 |
| Peanuts picked and threshed | Acres [2] | 5,000 | 3,690 | 5,500 |
| | Pounds | 3,750,000 | 2,504,440 | 3,712,500 |
| Dry beans | Acres | 2,600 | 2,135 | 3,300 |
| | Bags [3] | 20,400 | 19,608 | 25,542 |
| Dry peas | Acres | 665 | 501 | 665 |
| | Bags [3] | 6,450 | 7,160 | 6,078 |
| Cotton | Acres | 25,000 | 23,310 | 22,500 |
| | Bales [4] | 12,000 | 12,982 | 11,300 |
| Tobacco: | | | | |
| Flue-cured | Acres [2] | 841 | 792 | 841 |
| | Pounds | 750,000 | 824,115 | 750,000 |
| Burley | Acres [2] | 383 | 351 | 421 |
| | Pounds | 350,000 | 331,005 | 385,000 |
| Other domestic | Acres [2] | 272 | 237 | 272 |
| | Pounds | 286,000 | 262,068 | 286,000 |
| Sugarcane for sugar and seed (sugar) | Acres [2] | 330 | 329 | 340 |
| | Tons | 525 | 537 | 525 |
| Sugar beets (sugar) | Acres | 1,050 | 1,049 | 1,050 |
| | Tons | 1,900 | 1,664 | 1,900 |
| Potatoes | Acres | 3,060 | 2,793 | 3,160 |
| | Bushels | 384,000 | 371,150 | 390,600 |
| Sweetpotatoes | Acres [2] | 850 | 707 | 757 |
| | Bushels | 70,000 | 65,380 | 63,361 |
| Commercial truck crops [5] | Acres [2] | 1,840 | 1,692 | 1,676 |
| Hay crop seeds | Acres [5] | 4,919 | 3,392 | 4,709 |
| Hemp for fiber | Acres | | | 300 |
| Fruit (fresh equivalent) | Tons | 15,018 | 14,718 | 14,610 |
| Cattle and calves on farms, Jan. 1 | Number | | 74,600 | 76,200 |
| Cattle and calves slaughtered | Number | 28,000 | 27,900 | 30,400 |
| Dressed weight | Pounds | 9,585,000 | 9,980,000 | 10,910,000 |

[1] Revised through Jan. 18.
[2] Harvested.
[3] 100-pound bags, uncleaned.
[4] 500-pound bales.
[5] For fresh market.

*Production goals for 1943, with comparisons*—Continued

| Commodity | Units | 1942 goal or expected | 1942 reported | 1943 goal or expected |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | *Thousands* | *Thousands* | *Thousands* |
| Sheep and lambs on farms Jan. 1 | Number | | 56,000 | 55,000 |
| Sheep and lambs slaughtered | Number | 22,900 | 26,000 | 24,100 |
| Dressed weight | Pounds | 940,000 | 1,060,000 | 990,000 |
| Hogs: | | | | |
| Spring pigs | Number | | 61,013 | 70,200 |
| Fall pigs | Number | | 43,721 | 50,300 |
| Hogs, slaughtered | Number | 83,000 | 80,000 | 100,000 |
| Dressed weight | Pounds | 11,125,000 | 10,940,000 | 13,800,000 |
| Lard | Pounds | 2,820,000 | 2,500,000 | 3,400,000 |
| Milk cows | Number | 25,200 | 25,200 | 25,720 |
| Milk | Pounds | 125,000,000 | 119,500,000 | 122,000,000 |
| Chickens, dressed weight | Pounds | 3,118,000 | 3,118,000 | 4,000,000 |
| Eggs, total production | Dozen | 4,200,000 | 4,414,000 | 4,780,000 |
| Turkeys, dressed weight | Pounds | 500,000 | 485,000 | 560,000 |

What does an analysis of this table show? You will note that in connection with many food products the acreage goals were not attained, but due to a most favorable season the production goals were obtained rather satisfactorily. For example, you will note the wheat acreage, the corn acreage, the peanut acreage, the dry-bean acreage, the potato acreage, the sweetpotato acreage, the hogs for slaughter, the lard goal, and the milk goals were not attained.

In 1943 we have the increased problems of food production. These not only include transportation, manpower, lack of high-protein feeds but many other factors. It is surely fair to ask if we should not face these production problems in the light of their importance. One fact is important. Our Federal political agriculturalists should devote every minute and every energy to the farm crops of 1943. They should not be found devoting too much time and energy to the vote crop of 1944.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] absolutely misrepresented Mr. Hoover's statement to the Senate committee when he said Mr. Hoover advocated a negotiated peace. On the contrary, Mr. Hoover published a book last June which has had an enormous circulation, and in the very introduction of which he states flatly that a lasting peace can be based only on a victory for the Allies. He states:

> There are certain fundamentals upon which peace must be based. First, that a satisfactory, endurable peace must be founded on victory. Many of its essentials would crumble with compromise.

The whole discussion of the book is based upon that thesis. Mr. Hoover has reiterated this statement many times since and as late as in an address on December 17 in Chicago.

Mr. Hoover's presentation before the Senate Committee was that we must maintain our food, mineral, and oil production if we are to win the war; that we are taking too many men from these industries and endangering these supplies; that the submarine has made a bottleneck on the transportation of troops which limits the number of men we can send abroad in 1943 and 1944; and that therefore we do not need to raise the full strength of the Army all at once. He did not question the ultimate need for the full military strength demanded by our military leaders. He was discussing the best possible use to be gotten out of our manpower to attain complete victory. He proposed that in view of the grave situation in these particular industries the Army does not need in 1943 to draft more men from them. His views have been adopted by General Hershey, who now says agriculture will be exempted.

When Mr. Hoover stated that time ran in our favor he was talking from the book. Every writer and everyone familiar with the degeneration in food and other supplies in Germany and Italy, together with the enormous losses of their troops, knows that they are getting weaker and weaker. In the meantime, we and the British are gaining in strength. His final conclusion was the absolute necessity to maintain food and mineral production, and that the bottleneck and the fact that Germany is getting weaker made it possible to assign more manpower to the home front and thereby make sure of ultimate victory.

The gentleman's remarks are an entire distortion of Mr. Hoover's statement.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand Form MR20 from the United States Department of Agriculture, November 1942. It is entitled "Application for Purchase Certificate for New Farm Machinery and Equipment," all to be filled in and to be presented to the county farm rationing committee. This application has on it 13 questions. I hope you will note carefully the thirteenth question, because I hope it is an ill omen for the gentleman or persons devising such a devilish contract.

There are 12 more questions which with 3 subdivisions makes a total of 25 questions the farmer must answer before he has his application filled out properly.

On the opposite side of the page you will find an agreement between the farmer purchasing the equipment and the county farm rationing committee. The one redeeming feature of this form is that they do use two sides of the paper, which shows some realization of a shortage in paper supply.

Not satisfied in having a very simple agreement for this farmer to sign, the farmer must take an oath that everything he said in filling out the questionnaire is nothing but the truth, the whole truth, so help him—the Federal bureaucrats in Washington notwithstanding.

Now after the farmer has affixed his signature to the contract, it says:

> Any person who makes a false statement or representation on this application is subject to a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 10 years or both, under the provisions of section 35–A of the United States Criminal Code 18–USC–80.

All of this is followed by a blank part II called Action by county farm rationing committees, and provides spaces for them to (a) approve; (b) disapprove; (c) approve in part; the serial number of the certificate; the county farm rationing committee name; and then the committee member approving it. Notice, it says "member" and not "members," so I assume the contract means that one member of the county committee is all that is necessary to approve the contract. Then the instructions for filling in the form follow, which, you see, is about one-half the back of the page.

There are 14 separate and distinct instructions, but we are not through after we have read the instructions. When the farmer appears at the business firm in the little town or village wherein he usually buys his equipment, he must walk up to the counter and sign the contract with the dealer selling him the farm equipment. I want you to listen carefully while I read this dangerously un-American contract:

> Every purchaser of a new piece of farm machinery must sign the following: I hereby agree—

Remember, this is the farmer talking—

> in consideration of the transfer for value of said new farm machinery and equipment and for other good and valuable consideration, that all my right, title and interest in and to the afore-mentioned new farm machinery and equipment shall immediately vest in the United States upon the happening of the following conditions, namely:
>
> 1. (a) That there has been determination by the county farm rationing committee, in writing, that I am not complying with or conforming to or have failed to comply with or conform to the uses to which I stated in my application, that I would put said new farm machinery and equipment, or to the agreement which I signed in said application, or to any other statement set forth by me in said application.

Now, remember, that is the first and (a) under the first.

Here is (b) under the first:

> That there has been a determination by the county farm-rationing committee in writing that I made a false statement in preparing said application, or that I did not make in good faith any statement or agreement signed by me in said application.

No. 2:

> That there has been a determination by the State board in writing that such vesting is necessary to protect the best interest of the United States.

I hope you noted that this was the State board, so the farmer in truth is signing two contracts in one. The first

part of the contract has to do with the county farm rationing committee, and this part has to do with the State board. He is hitched up, as the farmer would say, in double harness.

To finish:

The county farm rationing committee referred to in these agreements means the county farm rationing committee or the State board which issued this purchase certificate.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is the supreme effort in bureaucratic domination of any industry. This is State socialism, this is communism, this is everything that goes with a communistically and socialistically planned agriculture. Nothing is omitted, not even the title to the farm machinery.

Mr. Chairman, what does this mean? Have the leaders of this administration no confidence whatsoever in the honesty and integrity of the agricultural population of this great Nation? From the questions asked, the details required, and the penalty inflicted, there is but one conclusion that may be deduced from this type of questionnaire; and that is that these simple-minded souls, sounding off over the radio, in the press, and otherwise throughout our country, who would be our directors and leaders, have fully concluded in their own minds that our farm folks are not to be trusted and are held in no regard for the truth or the respecting of their signatures to notes, contracts, and public instruments.

Evidently, these leaders think the farmers are selfish, unneighborly, and unwilling to assist one another in this hour of need. Consequently, they presume to write an iron-bound contract to curb these treacherous creatures of the far-flung agricultural frontiers and to show them and direct them how to attend to the most intimate affairs of their own farm and their communities.

Mr. Chairman, listen closely while I quote:

That all right, title, and interest in and to the aforementioned new farm machinery and equipment shall immediately vest in the United States upon the determination in writing by the county rationing committee.

Mr. Chairman, who is this county rationing committee that can sit in judgment without a trial, without any evidence, without any jurors, and determine to move into a farmer's lot and hitch onto his new machinery and carry it away and turn it over to another farmer some 10, 15, 20 miles away, and after the farmer had paid his good money, traded in his old machinery? There he would be, with his crop half tended and partially cultivated, without equipment. Now I submit to you, that is no regulation; that is confiscation without due process of law.

But that is not all. Let us consider the content of subdivision No. 2. It states that the county rationing committee, by writing, may determine that a false statement has been made by the farmer as to the use he was going to put this machinery. Then they have the right to walk in and say to the farmer: "According to your statement you did not make this contract in good faith." Who are they to question a man's faith? Why, my friends, this whole great Nation of ours has been built on the faith that men have with one another. That is the base of all our business relations. I have faith that when I ship a consignment of goods to a dealer he will pay me; therefore, I ship the goods, not with the bill of lading attached but open shipment. Our firm, a hardware store in the city of Fort Collins, has been in continuous business since 1907, and I venture that more than 98 percent of all the goods that had ever been sent to that store had come in open shipment. Now we have come to a place in the life of our business and industrial relations when the faith of our people in the communities throughout our country are questioned by a group of dreamy-eyed, swivel-chair economists in Washington.

This, my friends, would be ludicrous if it were not so serious and bordered so close to tragedy. Consider the precarious position of a farmer who bought a piece of equipment to plant barley or oats and then found that the seed he intended to use was not obtainable or that the seed was not fertile and could not be planted. Ordinarily he would use this equipment not in early spring, but late in August to plant millet and other late types of crops so as to complete his regular farming operations.

Now, my friends, according to that clause I have just read you, that farmer would be subject to a $10,000 fine and 10 years in the penitentiary or both. Ridiculous, my friends, and impossible of execution.

Mr. Chairman, every farmer, every farm family who reads and understands the English language should refuse to be a party to any such vicious contract, regardless of the character of the county rationing committee, who should not consider enforcing the provisions contained in this scrap of paper.

I think the agricultural population of our country would be justified in tearing this sheet of paper to pieces, rolling it in a wad and stuffing it down the throats of these would-be economists who think they can force the agriculturalists of this country to become serfs and slaves directed by bureaucrats here in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, there are no more patriotic citizens in America than the farm population. In the last war they gave their sons, they gave of their time, they gave of their effort, they gave everything that this Government demanded of them fully and freely in the prosecution of World War No. 1. In World War No. 2 the farmers have proven conclusively their wholehearted love for their country by equaling and surpassing the record of World War No. 1.

Mr. Chairman, in this present crisis the farmers have given their sons, their daughters, the hired help, and now we have left to care for the farm only the old, the lame, the sick, and the afflicted. So dangerous has it become that some of our leaders tell us that we face a dangerous food shortage.

The farmers do not whimper, but quietly and determinedly go about their everlasting task to produce the milk, the meat, the vegetables, the fruit, the oils, the cotton, the wool, and the grain so necessary to save our Nation in its time of crisis. Yet these men in Federal agencies would tie them up to such contracts as only men would ask of a slave, a serf, or an irresponsible incompetent.

I am fully convinced that it is high time for the Congress to take some definite action to stop the issuance of such regulations by the various bureaucratic agencies of the Federal Government. Not a single man in this Congress believes that this contract is necessary or required in dealing with the farmers of America. If I did not have the actual evidence before me, I could not believe that such a schoolboyish, dictatorial method could emanate from the Department of Agriculture. How red must be the faces of the real men in that Department, whom I know and have worked with, and whom I realize have worked and slaved for the Department in season and out of season to bring about a better agricultural program for these United States.

I would like to have the history of this contract; indeed, I would like to know the very inside of the man who concocted this wild, wierd brain child, this un-American contract. Where did it spring from, or, should I say, where did it sprout? Regardless of the condition of his old machinery, no good and true American farmer should ever stoop so low as to sign such an unconscionable contract. No, my friends, he should let his ground stand idle and the city folk of this country do without food before he becomes a party to any such contract. No red-blooded county agricultural agent—no matter how steeped in New Deal regulations and red tape he may be—should think of asking his farm taxpayer, who provides his salary and his expense account, to sign such a Fascist article.

It would be an easy matter for the Committee on Agriculture, the Appropriations Committee, and the Department of Agriculture to meet and evolve an agricultural program the American way—our way, if you please, the patriotic way, the way civilized men should deal with one another—honorable and forthright.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I listened to the gentleman's reading of the contract. I just want to be sure that I heard aright. May I ask the gentleman if I am correct in my understanding that when the farmer signs this contract he agrees that a local agency, a county board, shall have the right to determine whether or not he has violated the provisions of the contract, that that board is to be the prosecutor, judge, and jury, and that if that board finds that he has violated the contract he must turn over the machinery he has purchased to the Federal Government without any compensation or any further determination of his rights in the matter?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly right, and, furthermore, that county board could

order that piece of machinery taken 5, 10, or 15 miles away from the farmer that bought it, and as far as I am able to discover, not one word in this contract says anything about repaying the farmer for the machinery. With the permission of the House, I shall include the contract in my remarks. Another thing about the contract, on the opposite page there is a contract that the farmer makes with the dealer when he purchases the new equipment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. Is the gentleman putting the agreement and the contract which he read into the RECORD as a part of his remarks?

Mr. HILL. That is my intention.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to obtain that permission in the House. He may revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole.

Form MR-20
United States
Department of Agriculture
(November 1942)

APPLICATION FOR PURCHASE CERTIFICATE FOR NEW FARM MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT

(This Information To Be Filled in by County Farm Rationing Committee)

Application No._____ Farm Serial No._____ Date received_____

PART I. INFORMATION TO BE SUPPLIED BY APPLICANT

A separate application must be filed for each type of farm machinery and equipment

1. Applicant's name_____
2. Applicant's address_____
(Street or R. F. D.) (City) (State) (Telephone)
3. Description of farm machinery and equipment for which this application is made_____
4. When is this farm machinery and equipment needed?_____
5. The farm on which this farm machinery and equipment will be used contains_____ acres, and is located in_____ Township_____ County.
6. Is this farm machinery and equipment to replace similar worn-out farm machinery and equipment?_____
   A. Can your old farm machinery and equipment be repaired?_____
   B. If repaired, to what extent will it meet your need?_____
   C. Will you turn in your worn-out farm machinery and equipment if you are allowed to purchase new farm machinery and equipment?_____ If not, explain_____
7. Could your need for this farm machinery and equipment be satisfied by—
   A. Purchasing or renting used farm machinery and equipment?_____
   B. Custom work by others?_____
   C. Exchange of work of farm machinery and equipment with others?_____
8. If you are allowed to purchase this farm machinery and equipment, would you be willing to—
   A. Rent it to others?_____ } If not, explain_____
   B. Do custom work?_____ }
   C. Do cooperative or exchange work?_____ }
9. If you are applying for farm machinery and equipment because you are changing from farm machinery and equipment suitable for horses or mules to mechanical power equipment, give complete reasons for change_____
10. If you are applying for farm machinery and equipment to replace hand labor, state why you wish to make the change and what efforts you have made to obtain hired labor_____
11. Give the number, size, and description of similar usable farm machinery and equipment which you now have_____
12. This farm machinery and equipment and that described in item 11, above, are to be used during the current crop year in connection with the following acreage of crops (or number of livestock or poultry, or quantity of meat, dairy, and poultry products).
   A. My own operation_____
   B. Custom work_____
   C. Cooperative work_____
13. Give any other reasons why you need this farm machinery and equipment_____

If this application is granted in whole or in part, I agree to turn in to the dealer from whom I purchase farm machinery and equipment pursuant to this application or to whomever the County Farm Rationing Committee may designate, for rebuilding or for the salvage of all usable parts, or for scrap, the farm machinery and equipment, if any, being replaced. I agree to carry out the foregoing unless I establish to the satisfaction of the County Farm Rationing Committee that some other disposition of my old farm machinery and equipment would better serve the national interest or that it is impossible so to dispose of my old farm machinery and equipment or parts.

I also agree to rent, or do custom work with, or let others use, such new farm machinery and equipment as I shall purchase, on such terms and conditions as the county farm rationing committee may deem necessary.

I also agree to use the new farm machinery and equipment purchased by me in accordance with the agreements and statements made in this application; and I further agree that, if the county farm rationing committee determines after a hearing that I have failed, without regard to the existence of fault on my part, to comply with or conform to said agreements and statements, or that I have made a false statement in preparing my application for new farm machinery and equipment, or that I have not made in good faith any statement or agreement signed by me in said application, (1) I will not object to the entry of a judgment ordering and directing me to comply with and conform to such agreements and statements, and (2) I will rent or sell the new farm machinery and equipment to such person or persons as the county farm rationing committee may designate, upon such terms and at such rental or sales price as I shall agree upon with the county farm rationing committee, or in case of disagreement, at such rental or sales price as may be agreed upon by a majority of arbiters, one to be appointed by me, one to be appointed by the county farm rationing committee, and one to be appointed by such arbiters. I agree to abide by the decision of the arbiter appointed by the county farm rationing committee if I fail to appoint an arbiter as agreed upon above.

The county farm rationing committee referred to in these agreements means the county farm rationing committee or the State board which issues a purchase certificate pursuant to this application.

---

I CERTIFY that the information furnished by me and included in this application is true and correct; that I have not submitted an application for this farm machinery and equipment with any other county farm rationing committee; and that I will not transfer the certificate of purchase if one is issued to me.

_____
(Signature of applicant)

Any person who makes a false statement or representation on this application is subject to a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both, under the provisions of section 35A of the United States Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. 80).

PART II. ACTION BY COUNTY FARM RATIONING COMMITTEE

A. Approved [ ] B. Disapproved [ ]

C. Approved in part [ ] as follows_____

Serial number of certificate issued_____

For the_____ County Farm Rationing Committee,

By_____
(Member of committee)

Date_____, 194____.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILLING IN FORM MR-20

GENERAL

A separate application must be made for each type of machinery and equipment. However, one application may cover a machine and the attachments that are generally sold with such a machine. One application may cover more than one machine of the same type.

If more space is needed, use an extra sheet of paper. Number the answers to correspond to the items on Form MR-20.

INFORMATION TO BE SUPPLIED BY APPLICANT

1. Applicant's name:
   (a) An individual shall state his name as he customarily signs business documents.
   (b) A partnership shall enter the name of the partnership.
   (c) A corporation shall enter the name of the corporation.
   (d) A State or political subdivision thereof shall state its name: For example, South Dakota Rural Credit Board, Missouri State College, etc.
   (e) A fiduciary should state his own name, his official capacity, and the name of the principal.
2. Applicant's address.—Enter the local address of the applicant. If the applicant has his home address outside the county and this application is made by a local representative of the applicant, enter the address of the local representative.
3. Description of machinery and equipment.—Give a full and complete description of the machinery and equipment for which this application is made. This description should indicate the type of machinery and equipment, the size or capacity, and all other essential details necessary to identify the machinery and equipment.
4. In answering question 4, enter the date that the applicant expects to start using this machinery and equipment.
5. Give the total acres in the farm, the township, beat, ward, or other local designation, and the county in which the farm is located. If the machinery and equipment is to be used on more than one farm, write the information for the other farms on the margin or on a separate sheet of paper.
6. In answering question 6A, answer "Yes" if it is possible to repair the old equipment so that it can continue to be in service. Answer "Yes" even though the cost of the repairs would ordinarily be considered uneconomical. The answer to 6B may be given in percent, such as 25, or 75 percent. If the answer to 6C is "No," state the reason.
7. The answers to parts A, B, and C may be either "Yes" or "No." You may write an explanation of the answer, if you so desire.
8. The answers to parts A, B, and C may be either "Yes" or "No"; however, you may give details on a separate sheet of paper, if space provided for explanation is insufficient.
9. State complete reasons for changing from horse or mule power to motor power.
10. Explain your reasons.
11. In answering question 11, indicate the number of machines you now have which are similar to the one that you are applying for. For example, if you need a grain drill, give the number and size of the grain drills that you now own. If the new machine is a combine, give the number and size of combines, grain binders, headers, and reapers that you now own.
12. In reply to question 12, give the total amount of work which the new machine and others like it which you now have will be expected to do. If the new machine is a grain drill, indicate the total acres to be planted by all grain drills which you own, including the one to be purchased. If the new machine is a combine, include the acres of grain to be harvested by binders, headers, reapers, and combines, including the new combine to be purchased.
13. The applicant may add any other information not included in items 1 through 12.
14. The applicant shall affix his signature in accordance with the method provided in ACP-16.

Every purchaser of a new piece of farm machinery must sign the following:

"I hereby agree, in consideration of the transfer for value of said new farm machinery and equipment, and for other good and valuable consideration, that all my right, title, and interest in and to the aforementioned new farm machinery and equipment shall immediately vest in the United States upon the happening of the following conditions, namely:

"(i) (A) That there has been determination by the county farm rationing committee in writing that I am not complying with or conforming to, or have failed to comply with or conform to, the uses to which I stated in my application that I would put said new farm machinery and equipment, or to the agreement which I signed in said application, or to any other statements set forth by me in said application; or

"(B) That there has been a determination by the county farm rationing committee in writing that I made a false statement in preparing said application, or that I did not make in good faith any statement or agreement signed by me in said application; and

"(ii) That there has been a determination by the State board in writing that such vesting is necessary to protect the best interests of the United States."

The county farm rationing committee referred to in these agreements means the county farm rationing committee or the State board which issued this purchase certificate.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to direct your attention to a recent order of the Office of War Information. It requires that other departments and agencies will be expected to channel their interviews, their news and information through the O. W. I. before it is given to the press and the public. I call specific attention to a direction made to Mr. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, a few days ago. Mr. Wickard was informed that statements made by him concerning the problem of food production should first be passed upon by this Executive agency, before the people could have it. If the O. W. I. thinks it is all right, then it may be published. The O. W. I., however, can work it over or prevent its release.

We all understand that information of value to the Axis Powers must not be given publicity. No one disputes that at all. But, Mr. Chairman, when it is required by this executive agency that practically all information and statements from the other agencies must pass through and be edited by an agency, created by Executive authority, the matter bears pretty careful scrutiny. The Secretary of Agriculture, as well as other department heads, are not going to disclose information helpful to the enemy. If we cannot trust our own officials in high places in this respect, then whom can we trust, I ask you?

Mr. Chairman, I do not challenge the good intention of the Office of War Information. Our Government must be careful in the dissemination of information that may be of use to the Axis Powers. But, Mr. Chairman, after all we live in a democracy. The American people are entitled to have all the news and information whether it is good news or not. All they want is the uncolored, untarnished facts. Americans are not children and do not want to be treated as such. Under other forms of government the situation might be different—but not here.

Mr. Chairman, the Office of War Information is a powerful agency. It employs approximately 3,000 full-time, and almost that many part-time employees. It takes millions of dollars to support it.

In this great democracy, where we have always stood for free speech, and for freedom of the press—let us make sure in these critical times that those rights are most carefully guarded and preserved. Of course the American will accept censorship, along with other restrictions—but they do expect and demand that their Government and its Representatives protect the right of free press, and that they have the untarnished news and information concerning the affairs of their country and their Government, with one reservation only that such information shall in no way impede or interfere with the prosecution of the war.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in hearing about the kind of food being furnished the Mexican laborers in California, consisting of tripe, frankfurters, and bologna. Some Member asked what bologna and tripe were. I hold in my hand a magazine I consider to be both tripe and baloney. It is entitled "The Negroes and the War." To the new Members in the House who did not know the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] it is their loss, as well as that of the House that he is no longer here, because if any useless expenditure of this sort came up he arose on his hind feet in the Well of the House and asked the question "Where are you going to get the money?" That is what I would like to know. Where are we going to get the money to send out this inane political propaganda volume of 36 pages, and only the last 6 pages have anything to do with the Negroes and the war, which is the title of this New Deal publicity?

I ask again, Where are you going to get the money? Of course, the answer is that you will get it from the Congress and from the taxpayers, but the taxpayers do not know that the money goes for this kind of needless and stupid propaganda. They are being squeezed dry, and their taxes are being used to send out this type of bureaucratic New Deal propaganda, in the midst of the greatest war in our history. Do not these New Deal bureaucrats know that a war is going on instead of playing politics as usual? Certainly it is not in the interest of the Negroes and the war, because in the first paragraph it contains a gratuitous insult to all Negroes, which reads in this way:

> Some Negro Americans say that it makes no difference who wins the war; they say things could not be any worse under Hitler.

That is a dastardly reflection and a slander and a libel upon 13,000,000 American Negroes. It is malicious to start this

political propaganda off with a sentence of that kind, questioning the patriotism, the loyalty, and the Americanism of the Negro.

I think the Committee on Appropriations ought to look into it and find out who wrote it, and who is responsible for it, and how many are being mailed out. I have no knowledge myself whether they are sending out a million copies or a hundred thousand copies. I know it is being mailed, broadcast extensively, to Negroes around Washington and in the State of Virginia. Of course, I admit I could not object to that portion of the propaganda which refers to the regiment in which I happened to serve in the last war, along with the gentleman from Connecticut, Representative RANULF COMPTON, who represents the New Haven district. It has this to say about that particular regiment:

Among the regiments famous for gallantry in combat were the Eighth Illinois, which became the Three Hundred and Seventieth Infantry and fought as part of the French Blue Devil Division, and the Fifteenth New York, which became the Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth Infantry, and fought as part of the French Red End Division.

The Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth was the New York regiment to which I refer, in which the gentleman from Connecticut, Major COMPTON, and I served.

The record of the Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth itself is one to inspire all Americans. It was under fire 191 days in France, suffered casualties in killed and wounded of 1,500 men, never lost a prisoner, never lost a foot of ground in defensive operations, and took every objective except one in offense operations. At that time there was a lack of artillery support. Some record. Some regiment.

I do not mind having the record of that regiment boosted, as it deserves it, but as long as it refers to a colored regiment in the last war, I would like to raise this issue. Does the War Department propose to use any colored combat troops in this war? Are there any colored infantry regiments either in Africa or in the far Pacific at the present time? In the last war after we had been in the war 1 year the regiment about which I just read, the Three Hundred Sixty-ninth, or the Fifteenth New York, was in front-line trenches and had suffered casualties. We declared war 14 months ago, and as far as I know not a single colored infantry regiment is in a combat zone, in Africa or the far Pacific. Nor do I believe there is a colored artillery regiment in any war zone today except antiaircraft. What I want to know is what does the War Department propose to do? What is its policy? Are colored soldiers to be kept out of combat zones? Do we propose to draw any color line among the soldiers wearing the uniforms of our country? I have written a letter to Mr. Truman Gibson, who is in charge of the colored troops under the Assistant Secretary of War. I wrote it on February 13 and I thought this would be a good time to put it into the RECORD and wait for an answer, when I will discuss the matter further. I offered the amendment which was adopted in the Selective Service Act to permit colored selectees to serve in all branches of our Army. I am interested in finding out if the purpose of this amendment is being carried out.

The letter is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., February 13, 1943.*

TRUMAN GIBSON, Esq.,
*Department of War,*
*Pentagon Building, Arlington, Va.*

DEAR MR. GIBSON: In accordance with our conversation over the telephone today, I am writing to ask if you will kindly furnish me with the following information:

(a) How many colored troops are there now in the Army of the United States;

(b) How many colored troops are now in Africa and in the far Pacific;

(c) If there are now any Infantry, Artillery, or Air units either in Africa or in the far Pacific; and

(d) Has a policy been determined by the War Department as to the use of colored infantry and artillery and armored units and air forces in fighting missions on the same basis as the use of white combat troops as they were in the last war?

I would like also to know the number of colored citizens in our combat units, such as Infantry, Artillery, and Air—omitting the Engineers.

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

Mr. Chairman, that raises the whole question, and 13,000,000 colored people are entitled to know the answer. They are entitled to know all the facts, and so are all other Americans, whether we propose to discriminate against those colored troops or whether we are going to use them in battle.

As one who served with them and saw them sacrifice their lives just the same as any other Americans, I would deplore it if it is the intention of the War Department in any way to keep colored combat troops out of battle zones and war missions. I mean using colored Infantry, Artillery, tanks, and air squadrons in combat areas, taking the same risk and making the same sacrifices as any other outfits. I do not believe that this is the intent of the War Department, but I am told that up to the present time, after 14 months, no Infantry, no Artillery, no tank units, and no air outfits composed of colored soldiers are in the war zones outside of some antiaircraft artillery on islands far from the actual fighting.

Mr. Chairman, I will take care of the latter proposition that I have been speaking about, but I cannot do anything about preventing the circulation of this kind of costly and useless propaganda. I believe it is the duty of the Congress to protect the American people, the taxpayers, when we are asking them for every dollar we can get, and to safeguard our paper supply when there is already a shortage for the legitimate use of established American newspapers. The only committee that can stop it is the Committee on Appropriations. Probably we cannot do it on this bill, but certainly the Committee on Appropriations now has the power, vested in them by the Congress, to call those who are responsible in the Office of War Information to appear before them and give them the reasons why this type of fourth-term propaganda is being sent out and why our people's money is being spent, in the midst of war, for the distribution of this type of New Deal propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The Clerk may read.

The Clerk read down to and including line 5, page 2.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 1762, the independent offices appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MME. CHIANG KAI-SHEK

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to make the announcement that Mme. Chiang Kai-Shek will be in the Senate Chamber on Thursday at 12:15 o'clock, and in the House Chamber between 12:30 and 12:45 o'clock.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] that he may extend his own remarks and include therein an editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by including therein a speech delivered by the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] at Columbus, Ohio, on Lincoln's Birthday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] may include several letters in the remarks he made this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different subjects.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] may extend his own remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks twice in the RECORD and include some extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein certain data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon and include a table from the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BURGIN (at the request of Mr. BULWINKLE), for 7 days, on account of a death in his family.

### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] is recognized.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, instances are multiplying in which the executive and administrative departments and bureaus are either usurping the functions and prerogatives of the Congress or are issuing regulations having the force and effect of law in defiance of the expressed will of the Congress.

At a time when our chief concern is the winning of the war, these instances of bureaucratic usurpation of congressional functions and defiance of congressional authority render a great disservice to the Nation and cause the people to be gravely uneasy. However well intended these acts may be, I think there is no question but that they will seriously and adversely affect the morale of the Nation and in that way may well contribute to delaying the winning of the war.

One instance which has attracted less attention than some others, because it is much more subtle and less dramatic, is to be found in the new proxy rules promulgated by the Securities and Exchange Commission on December 18, 1942. These new proxy rules were issued purportedly pursuant to authority granted by section 14 (A) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934. It has been represented by those instrumental in devising and promulgating these new regulations that they would eliminate many of the objectionable features of the rules issued in August of last year. A careful analysis of the new requirements governing solicitation of proxies clearly indicate, however, that there are several burdensome and onerous stipulations contained in these regulations—stipulations requiring additional labor on the part of hard-pressed corporate organizations which are trying to devote their full energies to winning the war, and involving such waste of manpower, such additional activity, as to amount to a delay in the prosecution of the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, I would be the last person in this House to try to detract from the praiseworthy work of the Securities and Exchange Commission. I do not even challenge their aims. My observations are prompted by the fact that the new proxy rules do not accomplish their intended purpose but will tend to confuse the stockholders, rather than to clarify their knowledge of corporate affairs. At the same time, they impose a serious and objectionable burden upon industrial management, which is working top speed 7 days and several nights a week, trying to meet the military demands on the industrial production front. Anything which interferes needlessly with our industrial production on the home front can be as serious as something which would interfere with military strategy or operation on the battle fronts. This modern and awful war in which we are involved is in reality two wars. It is conflict of arms on the fighting lines, and a struggle behind the lines on the home production front to provide continuous quantities of machines, munitions, and supplies of war to our fighting forces and those of our allies. At the same time we have taken on an enormous task of helping to feed other peoples of the world.

I have not the time to go into the details of these new regulations issued by the Securities and Exchange Commission. I am informed that they were devised and worked out by legal counsel of the Commission under direction of a Mr. Milton V. Freeman. I have not talked with Mr. Freeman or with any member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, therefore, I am assuming—and I think properly so—that no doubt Mr. Freeman's intentions and those of the Commission are wholly praiseworthy, but I believe their efforts are misdirected.

[Here an interruption by Mr. MASON, of Illinois, member of the Dies committee, to advise Mr. BOREN as to information the Dies committee has regarding Mr. Freeman.]

I am informed by those who have studied these regulations very carefully that it appears the Commission has considerably exceeded the scope of authority intended to be granted to it by the Congress in the act. Such power may be included in the act, but I am sure Congress did not intend to delegate such authority.

I am also informed that the objectives sought by the Commission might better be attained by the Congress with due deliberation rather than by an emergency ruling by the Commission at a time when such additional obligations and duties on corporations can serve only to impede the war effort. The war effort would be definitely impeded because of the very complicated procedures set up by the Securities and Exchange Commission for carrying out these new regulations. I am sure that could not have been the intention of the Commission. Neither do I believe it was their intention to exceed the bounds of their authority as outlined by the Congress in the Securities and Exchange Act.

In order that my colleagues may get a little better picture of this situation, I would like to discuss some aspects of these new proxy rules and attempt in my humble way to estimate their probable effects.

As I understand these new regulations, they would require the inclusion in the proxy statement of any corporation any proposal submitted by any security owner for action at the stockholders' meeting. Furthermore, under the Commission's new ruling, it would be mandatory upon the corporation to include a 100-word statement prepared by anyone submitting a proposal explaining that proposal.

This ruling has attracted little public attention because so few people except those immediately concerned are familiar with the amount of work involved in getting out proxy statements. Those familiar with corporate affairs readily recognize, of course, the very burdensome aspect of such a requirement. Any stockholder taking what might be termed a distinct position may demand space for a resolution of any length, in addition to his statement of 100 words. We can see, of course, particularly in view of the valuable information the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has contributed that this might be used as a device by professional trouble makers to indulge their pet schemes or philosophy of life, using "whereas clauses" to expound their personal views and requiring industrial management to present their position on any subject.

Obviously such a situation would be welcomed and could be utilized as "a soapbox" by many disgruntled individuals who might seek notoriety, or who might be hostile to our American free enterprise system. This situation could be exploited as an outlet by impractical stockholders for visionary ideas. As a matter of fact, strange as this may seem, these rules actually could be utilized for the purpose of overburdening management if someone desired to do that.

It is startling when we stop to realize there is no limit fixed on the number of statements any one stockholder may submit for inclusion in a proxy statement. Nor is any means provided for excluding statements which might be misleading, untrue, scurrilous, libelous, or abusive. This latter oversight is in itself a most serious one. It runs directly counter to one of the original and fundamental

purposes of the Securities Exchange Act, namely, the prohibition of misleading or untrue statements to security holders.

Not only would this aim of the Commission be defeated if irresponsible stockholders were allowed to express themselves promiscuously through the proxy statement, but there are no rules which would subject the individual making an untrue or libelous statement to the penalties of the act. On the other hand, it would permit libel action to be brought against the management or corporation as the publisher of statements over which it had no control.

Certainly no corporation could object to printing the statement of a conscientious stockholder sincerely interested in improving the operation of his company. But I believe opportunity was provided for this in the previous regulations which were construed as requiring the inclusion of a proposal by a stockholder but not an additional 100-word statement.

There is a further objection to this new regulation, as well as to others, which necessitate inclusion in proxy statements of a greatly expanded amount of material. This objection is based on the valid grounds, it seems to me, that the resultant statement would be a lengthy, confusing, and bulky document taxing both the patience and comprehension of the stockholders, and imposing an unreasonable burden on the management personnel of industry.

I think we will all agree that such a consequence would be unfortunate. It certainly would be contrary to the Commission's avowed intention of simplifying the procedure so the stockholders would have a complete, but concise account of operations; informing them, but not compelling them, to wade through a mass of detail, a dismaying amount of technicalities, or an avalanche of irrelevant issues.

Under these new rulings, corporations now attempting to draft proxy statements to comply with the Securities and Exchange Commission's order of December 18 estimate, I am informed, that their proxy statements will be at least three times as long as would have been required if the prior rules had continued in effect, and industrial managements find that the work and expense involved have been multiplied many times.

For instance, there is the requirement under the new rules that the corporation must describe, and I quote:

> Any interest, direct or indirect, of each person who has acted as a director of the issuer during the past year and each person nominated for election as a director and any associates of such director or nominee in any transaction during the past year or in any proposed transaction to which the issuer or any subsidiary was or is to be a part.

An important bearing on this is found in the greatly enlarged definition of the term "associate." I understand that this term is now interpreted as meaning any corporation of which a director is an officer, or any partnership in which he is a partner, or any trust in which he is interested. It would appear that as a result of this regulation it will be necessary for a corporation to include in its proxy statement a mass of information, and a voluminous review of transactions, which would be of no interest or aid to the stockholders.

It becomes perfectly clear, as one examines into the additional work imposed by these new rules, that the inclusion of all this material will impose an arduous task upon the corporation at a time when their experienced personnel has been depleted by military demands. Under our present conditions demands should give way to the supreme primary task of winning the war instead of further involving industry in red tape and the task of assembling additional needless reports. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, since the ultimate responsibility for such statements rests with the executive officers of the corporations, these new demands appear to constitute additional and unnecessary drains on the time and energy of the very key administrators of the Nation's war production program whose efforts are most vitally needed in that production program.

From the standpoint of the shareholder, thus confronted with a confusing and voluminous proxy statement, it would seem clear that the effect will be to increase his reluctance to try to digest such a mass of material. It will make more difficult the securing of quorums necessary to hold annual meetings of corporations to transact necessary business.

Further examination of these new regulations reveals that the annual report of the corporations must be included as a part of the proxy soliciting material.

The practical result of this maneuver on the part of the Securities and Exchange Commission is to make every director and officer responsible under the stringent criminal and injunctive provisions, and possibly under the civil provisions, of the Securities Exchange Act for every word contained in the annual report.

As we get further into the situation, we find there may very well be a double consequence. In the first place, in addition to unduly hastening the considerable amount of work necessary in preparing the annual report, and placing a severe burden on the accounting personnel, the regulation probably will reduce the annual reports to little more than financial statements, or transform them into legalistic documents which would be largely unintelligible to the average stockholder. Certainly this result would be regrettable in view of the recent attempt of corporations to make their annual reports more readable and more readily understandable.

These new regulations, it would appear, are bound to increase the difficulties now being experienced by corporations in obtaining competent directors. Potential nominees are hardly to be expected to serve with eager willingness when they are subjected to additional severe penalties and held responsible for statements not heretofore legally required as a part of the material included in the proxy solicitation.

Finally, and, in my opinion, possibly one of the most serious objections to these new regulations is the provision covering procedure for obtaining authority from shareholders for future issuance of stock or other securities in accordance with the laws of the State of incorporation.

In the past corporations obtained prior stockholder consent for such transactions in order that the sale of securities could take place promptly when the corporation needed funds without the delay involved in holding a stockholders' meeting. The detailed facts in respect to the transaction in which the securities would be issued cannot be known at the time the stockholder action is requested.

These revised Commission rules make the past procedure impossible. Now a stockholder's consent to an increase in authorized securities can be obtained only after furnishing the stockholders with the complete details of the transaction in which the securities will be issued. It seems improbable that the Commission would have taken such a step if it had fully realized the consequences. The only explanation I find is that the members of the Securities and Exchange Commission failed to anticipate the practical results of their regulation.

Such a requirement very seriously impedes prompt financing by corporations engaged in the war effort, and in many cases the need for funds might be imperative. The delays and difficulties involved in operating under this particular provision of the new rules certainly cannot be viewed as being consistent with the fundamental needs for Government and industry to expedite war production in every way possible.

Here again is an example of the Securities and Exchange Commission's tendency to exceed the power that Congress intended to grant. It would seem to me that the Congress might well undertake to clarify all the powers of the Securities and Exchange Commission and define the limits of its authority because the Commission's action governing future financing radically restricts corporations in a sphere of substantive law heretofore subject only to the jurisdiction of the States.

## AMENDMENT OF RULES 10 AND 11 OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, presented the following report on the resolution (H. Res. 23) to amend rules 10 and 11 of the House of Representatives (Rept. No. 131), which was read and referred to the House Calendar, and ordered printed:

*Resolved*, That the Rules of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, amended as follows:

To rule X add the following:

"40 B. On Aviation, to consist of 21 members."

To rule XI add the following:

"40 B. To Aviation, other than appropriations therefor, including all commercial and civil aviation."

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's

table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 12. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 52. An act for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 171. An act for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 173. An act for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 176. An act for the relief of Austin L. Tierney; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 184. An act to provide for the presentation of silver medals to certain members of the Peary Polar Expedition of 1908–9; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

S. 219. An act to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 221. An act to amend sections 1 and 2 of chapter XIX of the Army Appropriation Act approved July 9, 1918, relating to protection of life and property in waters endangered by activities of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 223. An act to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 224. An act to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee, under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 301. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for rights-of-way over, across, in, and upon naval reservations; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 303. An act to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 319. An act to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 381. An act to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 393. An act for the relief of William Kovatis; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 404. An act for the relief of Richard Barker; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 405. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ernestine Fuselier Sigler; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 427. An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 495. An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 517. An act for the relief of Vodie Jackson; to the Committee on Claims.

*S. 518.* An act for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom Turpin; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 621. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego, for street purposes, a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1446. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow, Wednesday, February 17, 1943.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, February 17, 1943, for consideration of unfinished business.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 100. Resolution granting a gratuity to Mrs. Alyce W. Sinnott; without amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 23. Resolution to amend rules X and XI of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the House Calendar.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1785. A bill for the relief of the William Wrigley, Jr., Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1786. A bill for the relief of the Fairbanks, Morse & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1787. A bill for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. Lane:

H. R. 1858. A bill to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine who served during the World War as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who served during such war; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 1859. A bill to authorize the purchase of certain interests in lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1860 (by request). A bill to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan:

H. R. 1861. A bill to exclude from gross income, for purposes of the Federal income tax, compensation received as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1862. A bill to provide full payment of compensation to veterans without dependents while receiving care in a governmental institution; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 1863. A bill to authorize service in the employ of municipal corporations to be included in certain cases as employment covered by the old-age and survivors insurance benefit provisions of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 1864. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 1865. A bill to safeguard the homing pigeon; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1866. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 1867. A bill to provide a revolving loan fund in the Disaster Loan Corporation, to which worthy citizens may apply for loans to procure prosthetic, orthopedic, or other appliances or devices, to enable such citizens to become wholly or partially self-supporting, and thus contribute to needed manpower to win the war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 1868. A bill for the relief of Christos Nicolaou Markopoulos; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 1869. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1870. A bill for the relief of Jane Thayer; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1871. A bill for the relief of George A. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 1872. A bill for the relief of J. E. McCoy & Son; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 1873. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. E. Harper; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of California:

H. R. 1874. A bill for the relief of Robert P. Sick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 1875. A bill for the relief of Carl Swanson, Geraldine Cecelia Swanson, a minor, and Almer Swanson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

139. By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Resolution of the State of New Mexico, relating to the potash industry, requesting Congress to take proper steps looking to its protection; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

140. By Mr. DWORSHAK: Senate Joint Memorial No. 3 by the twenty-seventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, petitioning the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to have the allocation of farm machinery increased in order to permit the fullest use of the manpower and energy of the farmers in the production of food; and calling attention to the need for immediate action, so that adequate machinery may be available for use in planting the 1943 crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

141. Also, Senate Joint Memorial No. 4 by the twenty-seventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, requesting that the Congress of the United States of America give the matter of development of synthetic rubber its immediate attention, and aid in every possible way the development of the manufacture of synthetic rubber; and urging that restrictions now in effect by any and all agencies of the Government, preventing an immediate development of synthetic rubber from any and all sources, be removed by congressional action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

142. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Resolution of Connell Commercial Club of Connell, Wash., urging that steps be taken to begin the construction of the Columbia Basin project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

143. Also, petition of 52 members of the First Presbyterian Church of Yakima Wash., urging legislation to curtail home consumption of all liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

144. Also, petition of 61 members of the Yakima Methodist Church, of Yakima, Wash., urging that Congress pass a war measure to ration the home consumption of all liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

145. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of George N. Edwards, of Corsicana, Tex., favoring House bill 1493; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

146. By Mrs. NORTON: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, urging and petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to preserve and safeguard the shad fishing industry in the Hudson River; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord God, in the citadel of our souls we would hear the quiet footfall of our Master as we tarry at the altar of prayer. As Thy holy nature is manifested in humanity, so may wisdom be justified of her children and the justice of Sinai be in our minds and the compassion of Calvary in our hearts. Such a state is kingly and glorifies the ways of truth and peace and fills the days with tender toil and patriotic ministry.

O God, we pray that this pauperized world may be an open book of Thy most gracious Providence, the King eternal leading on in the toilsome way until freedom wears a crown of glory the world over. We pray that an unconquerable faith may ever be our anchor and our strength; there is no other wealth nor power that will bring us to the summit of our aspirations. Oh, arm us all with conviction without bigotry, self-respect without vanity and with humility without cowardice. Heavenly Father, there is dire need everywhere; put the spirit of the Good Samaritan in all hearts that the poor may not suffer or become cynically destructive. We beseech Thee to break the chains which bind us to selfish things and give us helping hands that may lead the paths of pain to the overflowing cup of Thy merciful goodness. For the sake of our Saviour and in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: first, that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by Frederick E. Hasler, president of the Pan-American Society, at the thirty-first anniversary of the founding of the society, celebrated at a luncheon at the Bankers Club, February 15, 1943; and, second, a radio address delivered by Capt. William J. Pedrick, collector of internal revenue, second New York district, over station WOR, on Wednesday, February 3, 1943; and, Mr. Speaker, may I say that this is the first district in the country that has collected over $1,000,000,000 during the past calendar year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter received by me from Gill Robb Wilson, State director of aviation for the State of New Jersey, in reference to a standing committee on aviation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include some tables that I have had prepared on the power question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial published in El Mundo, leading daily newspaper of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1762, with Mr. ZIMMERMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary for the work of the Bureau of the Budget, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, contract stenographic reporting services, traveling expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings when necessary in furthering the work of the Bureau of the Budget, lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals and newspapers, maintenance, repair, and operation of three passenger-carrying automobiles for official use, and not to exceed $25,000 for temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, $1,835,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 3, after line 22, and after the word "amended", strike out "$1,835,000" and insert "$1,655,000."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is to reduce the over-all request of the Bureau of the Budget by $180,000. This is, in my judgment, a conservative proposal, and I will tell you why.

From the record it appears that the Bureau of the Budget has been concerning itself not only with its normal activities but with other activities included among which are work on the problem of manpower, work on the development of a program for the Food Administration, work on a plan for handling insurance premiums for the Veterans' Administration and the War Department, work in the field of taxation, rationing, prices, wages, credit, subsidies and the like, work in the field of Federal-State fiscal relationships, and so on.

You will note that the Budget request is divided into three items. There is a request for national defense activities of $825,000. Every single dollar of that would remain available if my amendment is adopted. There is a request for $52,000 for printing and binding. Every cent of that would remain available if this amendment is adopted. There is a request for $1,835,000 for regular activities which compares with the current appropriation of $1,450,000, an increase of $385,000. My amendment would reduce this figure by $180,000 stopping at

that point in order to allow $205,000 for four offices in the field which the agency requests.

The over-all request for this agency is about 300 percent of what was allowed for this fiscal year, 1941. The average salary for those on its pay rolls is as high as $3,500. I think the Bureau can easily stand this reduction without anything being hurt. I hope the House will approve of the amendment suggested.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. In the town from which I come there is a practice of some lady coming in and staying at one of the leading hotels for 4 or 5 days to get the recapitulation and sum total of figures concerning the fiscal conditions of the city. That is available in the State auditor's report at a moment's notice. Am I to understand that this is the Department that has these different persons out in the country doing that work?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is that a Federal official?

Mr. ROWE. Yes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I assume it must be. I cannot speak with certainty, but the record does indicate that the Bureau of the Budget has been concerning itself with matters of Federal-State fiscal relationships. I should guess that the matter referred to is included.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is an effort to save $180,000. The Bureau of the Budget was created by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, designed to save money. The Budget at this time is serving every function except that of trying to reduce the expenditures of the Government. They have a tremendous staff. They send in here Budget estimates that require cutting all the way down the line in almost every bill. We must cut every single item or we are not going to keep the departments in any kind of shape on their nondefense activities. But worse than anything else, the Budget has begun to reach out. If a Congressman asks for information from a department and it involves the giving of any information that relates in any way to another organization than the department that is being questioned, they must submit the letter and the proposed answer to the Budget. That is the condition to which the Congress has shrunk at this time with bureaucrats going out and telling the departments what they can say to a Congressman and what they cannot say. It is about time that such performances of the Budget are stopped.

This cut is not near enough. It is not near enough to get them down to the work of supervising and cutting down the expenditures. That is what they should be doing, but they are not doing it. The adoption of this amendment will indicate that this Congress insists upon its right to get information from the departments.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I have information before the Committee on Education that, in addition to the things the gentleman from Massachusetts has cited as being done by the Bureau of the Budget, the Budget has concerned itself with the writing of legislation now before our committee.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. It is about time that we begin to say to this agency they must comply with what they were authorized to do by the Budget and Accounting Act. Let us adopt this amendment and put them in some kind of shape under the law.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of any more unwise action this Congress can take than to adopt the amendment which has been suggested. It would be a colossal illustration of being penny wise and pound foolish. Day after day in the well of this House Members have called upon the Government to economize, to investigate appropriations, to know what they are doing, and not to act blindly, yet the first amendment offered on this bill is an amendment which seeks to cut out funds and personnel for the only agency we now have which undertakes to reduce requests for appropriations before they come before the Congress for consideration. We will appropriate over $26,000,000 in this bill for the General Accounting Office to audit the expenditures of the Government. The Bureau of the Budget, which is the agency representing the President that has to investigate these matters and report to him and to the Congress, has less than $3,000,000.

The gentleman from New York is mistaken in his statement that the Bureau of the Budget requires submission to it for approval of every letter addressed by the departments to a Member of Congress. No such order has been entered.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, I have had experience in that connection myself.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman has had such an experience, I would assume that he has written a letter asking something about some legislation. If that is a fact, the response to such an inquiry is supposed to go through the Budget.

Mr. TABER. It was with reference to the employment of certain persons.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. An order was issued by the Budget on June 1, 1942, to the different departments that when inquiries are made respecting legislation, if they involve expenditures of funds, they should go through the Budget.

In all honesty and candor, Mr. Chairman, we have taken out of this bill the National Resources Planning Board, an agency of the President—an agency in which the President is very much interested, but it was taken out of this bill entirely—and the only other agency the Chief Executive has in these turbulent days to give him confidential information and advice is the Bureau of the Budget. There is not in Washington today a more conscientious, sincere, and hard-working public servant than Harold Smith, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Go through these appropriation bills from cover to cover and you will see where the Bureau of the Budget has cut down substantially expenditures asked for by the different departments. Certainly they have had to go out and investigate matters. We have a spending program of $104,000,000,000.

The President of the United States has no information on those matters unless someone gets it for him. Under the very terms of the General Accounting Act, the President of the United States calls upon the Bureau of the Budget to give him information and to go out and investigate this program and the procedure calling for the expenditure of funds. The Bureau of the Budget is his personal representative, and when they make a recommendation to the Congress, they are making it for the President of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have only a moment. Do not let us come here in one breath and do away with a part of its functions, and seek to throttle an agency that is doing a grand job. Part of these funds are for the setting up of four field offices, which should have been set up a long time ago. My complaint about it is that they have not enough personnel to go out and examine this estimate which is in excess of $100,000,000,000, and make a proper report, which not only the President but the Congress expects them to make. Time after time the Appropriations Committee has asked the Budget Bureau to give us information, and we have the report filed here. They have worked day and night, overtime, Sundays, and in every other way in a conscientious effort to serve the Congress. Even my distinguished friend from Illinois, a member of the committee, said to the Director of the Budget as follows, which will be found on page 1211 of the hearings:

> Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that is all, Mr. Chairman.
>
> Mr. Smith, I like to be very unsparing in criticism, but on the other hand I like to be very unsparing in commendation also. I note with real interest and pleasure the results of your work in investigation and coordination.

Gentlemen, I ask you to seriously consider this matter. I am willing to go along with you when you want economies, but this is not an economy. It is an effort to strike down this agency, and the business people of the country and your constituents would not regard it as a saving. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia) there were—ayes 84, noes 36.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

For all expenses necessary for the work of the American Battle Monuments Commission authorized by the act of March 4, 1923 (36 U. S. C. 121-138), and by Executive Order No. 6614 of February 26, 1934, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries for carrying out the purposes of said act and Executive order without submission to the Attorney General of the United States under the provisions of section 355 of the Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 520; 40 U. S. C. 255); employment of personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; including not to exceed $3,000 for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a); purchase and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments in Europe at a cost not exceeding $500; travel expenses; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries which may be paid for in advance; the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles which may be furnished to the Commission by other departments of the Government or acquired by purchase; printing, binding, engraving, lithographing, photographing, and typewriting, including the publication of information concerning the American activities, battlefields, memorials, and cemeteries in Europe; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder, and, when ordered or approved by the Commission, expenses of travel of dependents of employees when transferred from one official station to another, and the temporary transfer of employees by the Commission between places in foreign countries or between foreign countries and the United States, including transfers incident thereto, or, in the case of new appointments, transfer from place of appointment, may, if ordered or approved by the Commission, be regarded as a transfer from one official station to another for permanent duty for the purpose of authorizing the payment of travel of dependents and for the purposes of said act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; and the purchase of maps, textbooks, newspapers and periodicals; $45,530: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the requirements of existing laws or regulations, and under such terms and conditions as the Commission may in its discretion deem necessary and proper, the Commission may contract for work, supplies, materials, and equipment in Europe and engage, by contract or otherwise, the services of architects, firms of architects, and other technical and professional personnel: *Provided further*, That when traveling on business of the Commission, officers of the Army serving as members or as secretary of the Commission may be reimbursed for expenses as provided for civilian members of the Commission: *And provided further*, That the Commission may delegate to its chairman, secretary, or officials in charge of either its Washington or Paris offices, under such terms and conditions as it may prescribe, such of its authority as it may deem necessary and proper.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to supplement the observations I made yesterday with respect to the National Resources Planning Board, which was stricken from this bill by action of the subcommittee. I notice in the press this morning that the President took occasion to comment on the action of the committee. I quote from the press in its report of the conference with the President:

His eyes twinkled when he referred to himself as a Treasury watchdog—a role of his which he said had not been given sufficient publicity—but his smile disappeared when he began defending the National Resources Planning Board.

I have a keen appreciation of why the President did not smile when he was discussing the Board. It may be that he prefers that there be 150 activities in the Government that concern themselves with this matter of planning. It may be that the President is more interested in having the spenders doing the planning at the same time.

If gentlemen will examine the hearings of the National Resources Planning Board they will find that it has been devoting some of its energies to economic and industrial trends, to public works programming, to security and services including security, health and nutrition, youth and education, science roster and miscellaneous. It also includes functional plans for water and land, urban conservation and development area studies, and post-war agenda and reserve. They have been duplicating efforts which have been making a study in synthetic rubber, in fuel, oil, and food, notwithstanding the fact that we have a Rubber Director, a Petroleum Conservator, and the Department of Agriculture to look after food, which is really a terrific thing. I call attention to their own bulletin, issued November 1942. There is a very interesting statement about four items, and there is a post-war agenda of the National Resources Planning Board. Take No. 9 of this post-war classification:

Plans for international collaboration, the maintenance of world peace and promotion of higher world standards of living.

They ask these questions:

What part will the United States play in the relief of destitution in war-devastated areas; what will be the role of the United States in promoting better world-wide utilization of resources and world advancement in living standards; what influences will the domestic program of the United States have upon world relations; what repercussions upon domestic policy will result from the United States tariff, currency, lending, commodity stabilization and other foreign policies; what institutions of international government are required?

Mr. Chairman, that is not the business of the Planning Board. I do not know why they should be interested in a W. P. A. for China at the present time, when we have problems of our own. I know of no reason why they should be planning all over the world, when their business is really to give some concern to the economic maelstrom in which we may find ourselves when the present conflict is over. Yet they have a department and a planning general staff for the very things indicated, and I am of the opinion that it is necessary for the Congress to give direction to this activity. I stated yesterday that the Washington News remarked editorially:

POST-WAR PLANNING BY CONGRESS

Senator GEORGE's proposal of a special joint congressional committee to study post-war economic problems is another sign that the legislative branch is stirring from its long lethargy.

Many of the administrative agencies are formulating such plans. So are many industrial, labor, and academic organizations, and lobbyists. Now Congress at last is showing interest in this job.

Next to the war itself, many Americans are worried most by "executive dictatorship." That cussword exaggerates the fact. Certainly there is an unhealthy trend, accelerated by war necessities, to center government in the White House and the bureaus. But critics who harp only on executive usurpation seem to us to miss a point: the frequency with which Congress has defaulted its powers and responsibilities.

Whatever the post-war plans for the domestic economy may turn out to be, Congress must pass the laws and appropriate the funds. If it lacks the initiative and intelligence to study the problems and offer solutions, it demotes itself to the role of either rubber stamping or obstructing the plans of a foresighted Executive. Under our governmental system of coordinate branches, the legislative and executive should pool their facts and judgments for the final joint action.

Such cooperation should begin at home—with a joint House and Senate committee, welcoming suggestions from public groups as well as from Government administrative experts.

The problem of post-war planning in foreign affairs is related, but differs from that in the overlapping domestic field. In domestic legislation Congress has the primary responsibility, and the President has a veto power. In treaties and foreign relations generally the roles are reversed, with the President having direct responsibility, and Congress (chiefly the Senate) a veto power.

But in both cases the final responsibility is joint. It would be as absurd for the Senate to neglect to inform itself in advance on post-war international problems as for the Executive to take no thought of domestic planning.

Americans are particularly concerned about the relation between the President and the Senate in planning peace because of the disastrous absence of such cooperation during and after World War No. 1. President Roosevelt at least has the tragic experience of President Wilson to warn him. Unless the Senate is part of the peace planning, and of the peacemaking, it probably will balk when the time comes for ratification.

Now is the time to prevent that. Mutual recriminations after the war will not avail. The interests of the President and of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are the same American interests. How futile to talk of nations with conflicting interests working together in the solution of world problems, if two coordinate branches of our own Government cannot mature America's peace plans together.

We have nearly 150 planning activities today in the Government. They deal with administrative problems, agricultural planning, city and county planning, commercial policy, consumers' spending, education, employment, fiscal policies, health and welfare, housing, immigration, income distribution, industrial policies, investment, nutrition, population, public power, production and

productivity, and a great many others. It is just about time that the elected Representatives of the people take a good look at this thing and eliminate all of the duplication, and bring some order out of chaos.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This is just a pro forma amendment.

Mr. CASE. I wish to talk on the National Resources Planning Board for a few minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 10 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have 5 minutes following the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I said yesterday that in my judgment this job of preparing for the future was a job that should center in Congress. I believe it should. But I do not agree with the implications of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that the National Resources Planning Board has been a bad thing. I think it is doing a good job. I think the committee made a mistake in eliminating it. An amendment to put it back is subject to a point of order by any one Member of the House and, therefore, could not succeed, but I cannot refrain from saying one or two things about these matters.

In the first place, we have heard repeatedly in this House, particularly in recent months, speeches made which, in effect, seem to me to deprecate any attempt to apply intelligence to the problems of this country. We have problems that cannot be solved except by the application of intelligence; neither can they be solved by a lot of specific work by individual industries, individual labor organizations, individual groups of business people, or individual Government agencies which work in a particular field. The more important job is for us to marshal the agreement of the great middle-of-the-road opinion of America behind four or five or six avenues of broad general policy which can give us the foundation of a generally prosperous condition over a period of time in this country after this war shall have been won. That is a job which I thoroughly agree should center in the Congress. I do not believe, however, that the detailed work can or should be done by congressional committees. I think such a group has to draw upon the specific work being done by other groups and sift it before the bar of public opinion to see whether it is good or whether it is not good. Frankly, I have felt that the National Resources Planning Board, as an agency of the executive department to gather together a lot of work being done specifically by a lot of particular agencies, public and private, was a good thing and served a useful purpose. The Congress inevitably is going to have the disposal of whatever is done or whatever is proposed. It can pass or refuse to pass any suggestions that are made to it.

I would only like to amend what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said about the joint congressional committee by saying that this is a job broader than government. It is a job even broader than the work Congress can do. It is a job that has to enlist the earnest and patriotic thought and effort of all groups of this population, and they have to approach it not from the standpoint of their demands but from the standpoint of working out together that which can serve the general public interest. Over and above all things else, let us not strain at the gnat of some big words that may have been used by a governmental agency and then swallow the camel of failure to prepare against the day when men are coming back from this war, when they will be entitled to real jobs and opportunity. Our first duty is to provide the sinews of this war. Our second duty is to go forward along the lines laid down by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] yesterday and lay the groundwork for a just and lasting peace. The third duty is to see to it that when this war is over our people will not face a situation of economic concern and distress and confusion, but will be able to carry forward freedom in America on the basis of assurance of the full employment of all willing workers and a full market for the products of agriculture and industry in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I may not take the full 5 minutes, but I want to talk for a moment or two, to make clear, if I can, the position of some of us on the Republican side.

The remarks of some of the speakers might be interpreted to indicate that the Republican or minority position is one opposed to post-war planning. I think that would be a misinterpretation of our position. In the subcommittee I supported a proposal that would have made a very modest appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board, with the understanding that its function then would be limited strictly to what was contemplated in the original Federal Employment Stabilization Board created by an act of Congress. But the difficulties that have developed for the National Resources Planning Board rest upon a feeling in some quarters that it has become too much of a superreview board, setting up a superengineering agency, setting up a superplanning organization, with veto power over the responsibilities of the regularly created executive departments.

It has never seemed to me that when the Corps of Engineers, for example, passes upon the engineering features of a particular improvement project, it should be necessary for the National Resources Planning Board to have a superengineering body to give superengineering review to that which has been passed upon by the Corps of Engineers. But there is a definite field—and I think that is the conviction of the Members on my side of the aisle, as well as Members on the other side of the aisle—for the coordination of public works, and there is a definite field for an orderly approach to it.

Some of us believe that can be accomplished by the creation of a committee of representatives from the various executive agencies on the executive side of the picture and a coordination of the planning activities of the regular legislative committees of the Congress on the legislative side of the picture. For this purpose it would not be necessary to have as large a body as the present National Resources Planning Board. For myself, I hope that legislation is passed to create and finance a proper committee to coordinate post-war planning of public works.

While I am on my feet I want to call attention to another agency for which no appropriation is made in the pending item for the Civil Service Commission, and that is the Board of Legal Examiners. Some of you may recall that last year we had a great deal of discussion on the appropriation for the Board of Legal Examiners and in the conference finally agreed to an appropriation for it, with the understanding that they would get legislative authority for their existence before an appropriation was made this time. The legislative authority has not been given up to this time; consequently there is no appropriation in the civil-service item for the Board of Legal Examiners. I think it is fair to state, however, that the members of the subcommittee thought that on the whole the Board of Legal Examiners was doing a pretty good job; at least it was improving the situation. I am not a lawyer, but many Members of this body are. All of us are interested in the method of selection for lawyers who enter the Federal service.

Last year I placed in the RECORD a table showing the geographical location and institutions from which lawyers in the Federal service were coming. You will recall that it showed preponderantly that lawyers in the Federal service were coming from Harvard, Yale, and a few special institutions. This year I asked that the hearings carry a table showing the changes that had come, giving the exact facts of the origin of these lawyers. In this connection I call your attention to the tables you will find on pages 916–919 in the hearings. You will also find there the committees of examiners as named in each committee. They will be of interest to every Member of the body.

Let me just say this in summary: That of the 2,082 lawyers who were appointed between July 1941 and July 1942, before the time the Board of Legal Examiners was operating under the appropriation we gave them last year, 861—that is 41 percent—came from 12 institutions. Out of 2,127 lawyers appointed in the 6 months following the appropriation to set up the Board with State committees, only 453 came from those 12 institutions, reducing their percentage to 22 and representing a much better distribution of lawyers throughout the country. The record shows a definite improvement and warrants consideration of the necessary legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this is not the beginning of a drive to stop the development of public power. If so I want to warn you now that you are sitting down on a live wire again. As I said you were doing in 1938, when you went on a "sit down strike" against rural electrification, you got so badly scorched that many could not sit down in a congressional seat for the next 2 years.

If you are starting in to kill this program of public power I want you to remember that you are attacking the greatest development that has ever taken place for the economic improvement of this country. It is about the only thing that has ever been done for your farmers that really helped more than it hurt them. You have done a good deal to the farmers in the last 40 years, but very little for them. The greatest thing that has been done for the farmers of this country has been the development of our waterpower resources and the distribution of it to the farmers at rates they could afford to pay.

I am more or less prejudiced in favor of the Army engineers, as I am the T. V. A. and the Power Division of the Department of the Interior. In their realm I think the Army engineers are without equal; but there are fields they do not invade, and the distribution of public power to the farmers is one of them.

There are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power a year going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries. When this war is over we are going to have to find employment for all these men who come back from the war.

One of the greatest things we could do would be to pass the bill which I have introduced for eight regional authorities to develop this hydroelectric power and distribute it to the American people at rates they can afford to pay. I expect to show you before the day is over that your people were overcharged last year more than a billion dollars for the electricity they are now using. The household or domestic consumers paid more than $900,000,000 for electricity that should have cost them around $250,000,000—almost four times what they should have paid.

If you had worked out some kind of program for the distribution throughout that area before Boulder Dam was finished and before the southern California Edison outfit got in to paralyze the greater part of its distribution; if you had had some kind of program similar to that of the Tennessee Valley Authority to put into operation on the Columbia River, think what it would have meant; and remember that when you cluttered up the Ohio River, you men from Ohio, you men from West Virginia, you men from that section of the country——

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit an interruption, I make the point of order that the House is not in order.

Mr. RANKIN. You cannot get order amongst a certain element in this House when a Member talks about supplying the people their own electricity at what it is worth.

I want to call your attention to the fact that they cluttered up the Ohio River, one of the greatest streams in all the world, with low dams under the pretense that that river was fit only for navigation, and the people along that great stream, from Pittsburgh down to its mouth, have been deprived of this great wealth of hydroelectric power that would go to enrich every home and every business establishment within a radius of 250 or 300 miles of that river.

That is what I am protesting against. If you want to commit political suicide just continue to try to outlaw public power development in this country, which means rural electrification, because the American people have radios in their homes now and they know what is going on. They are not going to stand for their Members of Congress coming down here and keeping the "word of promise to their ear but breaking it to their hope." They are expecting and demanding that the natural resources of this nation be developed and used for their benefit.

I am not in favor of all these plans to reorganize human nature; but I am in favor of developing the great natural resources of this country.

I received a letter from a man in New Jersey yesterday, who ought to freeze, appealing to me to kill the Florida barge canal. If we had the Florida Canal today we would have all the oil and gasoline on the Atlantic seaboard the people need. Then they would not be shivering in this cold, as they are doing now. It just shows how those selfish interests that are more interested in their own affairs than in the welfare of the country are trying to destroy every development that would make America a richer and a better place in which to live.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. What does the gentleman think about the construction of a pipe line from the Tinsley field to the east coast?

Mr. RANKIN. That pipe line would be of great service and I have advocated it; but a pipe line will not carry the other necessary articles that must be transported through this canal.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, national defense: For all necessary expenses of the Civil Service Commission in connection with the recruitment and placement of civilian personnel required in connection with emergencies affecting the national security and defense, including personal services in the District of Columbia, traveling expenses not to exceed $820,818; and other items otherwise properly chargeable to appropriations of the Civil Service Commission for salaries and expenses and printing and binding, $10,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 10, line 2, strike out period, insert a colon, and the following: "*Provided*, That upon the expiration of 60 days after the cessation of hostilities between the United States and the principal enemy powers or after the date of an armistice between the United States and the principal enemy powers, this appropriation shall cease to be available for obligations unless Congress shall otherwise provide by law."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me suggest to the Committee of the Whole that the appropriation for the Civil Service Commission is roughly divided into two parts, the first for the regular establishment for salaries and expenses and necessary expenditures incident to that work; then, in addition, we have set up a special item for national defense, on page 9 of the bill, reading:

Salaries and expenses, national defense: For all necessary expenses of the Civil Service Commission in connection with the recruitment and placement of civilian personnel required in connection with emergencies affecting the national security and defense.

And so forth.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. As far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment. I understand it means 60 days after cessation of hostilities none of these funds shall be available. If they can stop the war in 60 days, I would be willing to cut it all out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would be, too. I am trying to develop a little pattern now.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I just want to say to the gentleman that I have no objection to his amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am grateful to the gentleman from Virginia. We are going to have to deal with this problem and impound this money sometime. They have nearly 4,800 people who are engaged in this recruitment work. My notion is that when hostilities stop, these defense expenditures for personnel ought to stop also. If there are any

subsequent expenditures, the Congress can take care of them at that time.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend this amendment to the favorable consideration of the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, national defense: For all expenses necessary to enable the Federal Communications Commission, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, to perform its functions related to national defense, including radio monitoring and foreign broadcast analysis, including all of the items of expenditure for which the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Federal Communications Commission," is available and not to exceed $9,000 for salary of Director of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service; not to exceed 56 passenger-carrying automobiles; not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, without regard to the civil service and classification laws and, in the case of language or other experts, without regard to any requirements of this act with respect to citizenship, where citizens qualified to perform such work are not available; allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light (not exceeding $1,700 for any one person), as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a); and printing and binding, $5,590,314.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE: Page 11, line 3, after the words "disability fund", strike out the balance of page 11 and all of page 12 and lines 1 to 4, inclusive, of page 13.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. We have passed that paragraph.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In what respect?

Mr. CASE. I will shorten it.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman was on his feet.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. You have got to do more than get up on your feet to offer an amendment.

Mr. CASE. What is the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is that the Clerk had passed reading the current paragraph that the gentleman seeks to strike out.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Passed several paragraphs beyond that.

Mr. CASE. My amendment is to strike out the entire section dealing with the Federal Communications Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the gentleman that he will have to offer his amendment at the conclusion of the reading of the paragraph that he proposes to strike out. As the Chair understands it, the gentleman's amendment embraces the paragraph beginning line 3, page 11, and extends down to and including line 4, page 13.

Mr. CASE. My amendment as offered was to strike out the entire section, from page 11 to the end of the section on page 13.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We are reading by paragraphs, and such an amendment would have to be offered to each paragraph as read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order that the amendment is not to the paragraph under consideration?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BENDER. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENDER. Where is the Clerk reading?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk had concluded the reading of line 4 on page 13.

Mr. TABER. The Clerk had not read line 10 on page 12. I was watching that.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the recollection of the Chair, and that recollection is confirmed by the Clerk, that the Clerk had read line 4 on page 13.

Mr. CASE. I should like to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I understand the Chair has already ruled on the point of order made by the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has made a point of order. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I shall insist that the Clerk read every word if these steam-roller tactics are in order when amendments are offered. I am against the gentleman's amendment, but I insist that he be heard. He asked for recognition and was in order. The Clerk was reading the paragraph in question when the gentleman offered his amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the paragraphs beginning on page 11, line 3, have not been read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order, because the paragraph under consideration begins on line 10 on page 12.

Mr. TABER. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the Clerk has not read beginning with line 3 on page 11. Does the Chair care to hear me on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Reading one word and the total amount is not reading the bill. If the Chair cares to make a ruling the other way, I intend to appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. TABER. I make the point of order that the Clerk has not read beyond page 11, line 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York and to the Committee that the Chair understood that while the Clerk was reading fast he had read line 4 on page 13. However, in order to be fair to the Members who were undertaking to listen, and inasmuch as there was not good order in the Chamber, without objection, the Clerk will again read the title beginning on page 11, line 3.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For salaries and expenses of the Federal Communications Commission in performing the duties imposed by the Communications Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1064), the Ship Act of 1910, approved June 24, 1910, as amended (46 U. S. C. 484–487), the International Radiotelegraphic Convention (45 Stat., pt. 2, p. 2760), Executive Order No. 3513, dated July 9, 1921, as amended under date of June 30, 1934, relating to applications for submarine cable licenses, and the radiotelegraphy provisions of the Convention for Promoting Safety of Life at Sea, ratified by the President July 7, 1936, including personal services, contract stenographic reporting services, rental of quarters, newspapers, periodicals, reference books, lawbooks, special counsel fees, supplies and equipment, improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings, not to exceed $5,000, purchase and exchange (not to exceed 8), maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in the field, travel expenses, including not exceeding $1,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings which in the discretion of the Commission are necessary for the efficient discharge of its responsibilities, reimbursement to ships of the United States for charges incurred by such ships in transmitting information in compliance with section 357 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, $2,000,000, of which amount not to exceed $1,218,260 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, including compensation of employees of the Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE: On page 11, strike out lines 4 to 25, on page 11, and lines 1 to 7, on page 12.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, with two succeeding amendments which I propose to offer, would leave the title "Federal Communications Commission" in line 3 but strike out the appropriations relating to the Federal Communications Commission and defer their consideration until later. I had expected to offer the amendments together in the thought that that would save some time. However, this will accomplish the same result.

The purpose in offering this amendment is to permit an intelligent appropriation to be made. The House has adopted a resolution authorizing a select committee to investigate the Federal Communications Commission. In view of the action already taken by the House it would be nonsensical for us now to attempt to appropriate for the Federal Communications Commission for the fiscal year that begins after July 1. How can we appropriate intelligently in this bill when there is pending a detailed investigation of the activities of the Commission? Some of us believe we cannot so appropriate at this time. Consequently, we believe this appropriation should be deferred.

This does not mean we expect the Federal Communications Commission to be

abolished or its activities to be ended. I, for one, would be opposed to that, and so would the other Members of the House. We are acquainted with the work the Federal Communications Commission is doing, in a large way. Most of it should be continued; possibly some of it should not. Of course, the Deficiency Committee is meeting regularly, and it can handle appropriations for this Commission; or if the special committee makes its report before the appropriation is considered in the Senate it can be handled there.

There are reasons for raising some question about this appropriation. We asked the Commission for its figures on the draft deferments it had asked for its employees, and found that the Commission had asked for 442 deferments, receiving 391. It is true that the Federal Trade Commission has to have some highly trained technical men. It is probably true that those men in the service of the Federal Communications Commission can do just as effective work as they could if they were in uniform. However, until the select committee is satisfied that these deferments, for example, are justified, we ought not to make appropriations to carry on activities which we may not approve.

Not only that, but there was evidence before the committee that the Commission was doing some work the Army and Navy have the personnel to do. We asked direct questions on that point about some of the inspections and some of the examinations the Federal Communications Commission was making.

It was testified they were doing this at the request of the War and Navy Departments, but upon pursuing the question, it was apparent that the Army and the Navy had the personnel to do these same things. If there is a shortage of manpower, why should we be deferring men to put them in the Federal Communications Commission in jobs that the Army and the Navy have personnel to do? Not only that, but there was some questioning of the promotions made in this agency during 1942. They totaled 1,800, at a total cost of $145,000. Doubtless some of them were necessary to hold personnel but they should be examined in detail. They should be gone into more fully, and the House has already provided for that. Then, why should we make this appropriation, based upon activities, some of which we may want to abandon after the committee has made its report?

There is another reason. Three or four of the men who are on the list about which there has been a great deal of debate are some of the employees of the Federal Communications Commission. If we were to get into a debate upon the entire appropriation, I have been told those names would come up, and until they have been investigated either by the select committee or the special committee of the Committee on Appropriations which have been authorized to hear these people, we could not appropriate intelligently. I for one do not want to pass judgment on them until they have been heard. It seems to me that we would save time and appropriate more intelligently, if we wait until we have a report from the special committee.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Is not the same logic applicable also to the Army and the Navy and the appropriations for those Departments?

Mr. CASE. They are not under specific investigation by select committees of the House. Their appropriations are not before us yet and we hope the regular committees will keep the subcommittees currently informed of matters that come to their attention. Remember that I am not striking out this activity. The amendment does not strike out the title in line 3. And as I have already stated there will be ample time to appropriate for this agency before July 1. Of course, if the select committee has not reported by July 1, then we will have to appropriate for Federal Communications as best we can. And the gentleman knows we will appropriate for the Army and the Navy in due course when their estimates come before us.

Mr. RAMSPECK. And the same thing is true about all of them.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I was not on the floor yesterday when the very able floor leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], made his speech attacking Herbert Hoover, who in the minds of a great many people is the greatest living American. He made the direct charge that Mr. Hoover had opposed recommendations to prepare our country for defense, and then went on to cast a long line of suspicion about Mr. Hoover being for appeasement. I want to dismiss it by using the words of the gentleman himself that he used on a recent occasion:

> Any such thought is without foundation, and if the gentleman had the courage to make the direct accusation within the rules, I would say that he is making a complete misstatement of the facts. Outside of the House anyone making such statements, I would say, tells a deliberate lie.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am astonished that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] takes the position he does in this matter. He is generally a very level-headed member of this subcommittee, but the proposal he makes today seems to me to be absurd. He bases his amendment upon the theory that we should not appropriate money for this agency, which was created by this Congress, because we have authorized an investigation under the leadership of my colleague from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. If his reason is sound and logical, then we should not bring in any appropriation for the Army or the Navy or practically any other agency of the Government until these investigating committees report. We have also authorized the Smith committee to look into the actions of all of the agencies of the Government practically, to see whether they are operating in accordance with the acts of Congress. It seems to me that this type of legislation that is contained in the amendment which we are to vote on here this morning is a type of action that brings Congress into disrepute in the eyes of the country. It is demagoguery, and while I do not impute any motive of that sort to the gentleman from South Dakota, I do say that the critics of Congress will look upon it in that way, and to me I think that criticism will be justified. It is our duty as Members of Congress to finance the agencies that Congress sets up. We have a splendid gentleman from my own State who is going to investigate the operations of this Commission.

He is going to do a good job, and if there is anything wrong with this Commission I am sure that the gentleman from Georgia will find out about it, and Congress then can take such action as the facts justify, but this is not the proper method of legislation, it is not in keeping with the dignity and the importance of a legislative body, for us to say that we are not going to appropriate any money for an agency we created, an agency that is doing important war work. If the subcommittee could not get the information it desired in the usual manner it could have resorted to the subpena power recently given to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CASE. The committee did not have that power when this bill was prepared.

Mr. RAMSPECK. We have a committee appointed, headed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], that has the power of subpena and all the power of this Congress with it, and that is the orderly way to act. That is the orderly way to do it. The gentleman did not take the same position the other day about William Pickens. Did we not vote to investigate first before we took him off the pay roll? Are you going to take all these men off the pay roll who are monitoring war messages from across the seas? No; that is not the way to legislate.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CASE. Does not the gentleman feel that the Congress would be in a more ridiculous position if it appropriated money for this independent agency and then the special committee set up by the House came in and said, "Here is something that should have been cut out" and the money has already been appropriated?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I certainly do not. I think that is the orderly way to proceed. We have a committee to investigate them and we should not usurp their functions through an appropriation bill.

Mr. CASE. We are not usurping their functions; we are simply withholding action until the full story is before us. The gentleman knows, of course, that this

does not touch a dollar of their current appropriation.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am aware of that fact.

Mr. CASE. And there is plenty of time to appropriate for next year between now and July 1 after the special committee has a chance to report.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes, and there is plenty of time to cut off their appropriation after the committee makes its report, if we should so desire.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. If it is abolished between now and July 1 the appropriation will not be necessary.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is correct. If as a result of this investigation the Congress decides to abolish the Commission or change its function or its personnel, then the appropriation would not be effective.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. FORD. Is this not about equivalent to convicting a man in advance without an investigation?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Well, that is true, too. It is an interference with the prerogatives of the investigating committee headed by my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I welcome one of the first opportunities that I have had to cast my vote against the rising tide of bureaucracy that is daily encroaching upon the prerogatives and powers of the people's Congress. I welcome this opportunity, and I hope I will have many more occasions to cast my vote against these bureaucrats who are day by day destroying the people's rights with the excuse that they are justified in so doing because they are doing it to win the war. I question very much whether using iron-handed tactics such as the Federal Communications Commission has used over individual and separate radio stations, in choking off free expression as they have done on numerous occasions, is contributing very much to winning the war.

In my locality, just as in every other section of the country, there is a radio station that I believe is serving the community in a patriotic manner. It has opened its air waves to every call of the Government. It has functioned just as the Federal Government would have it function, and it has given wide expression to wishes of the Government in helping put on War bond sales, in making announcements for the Army and the Navy, in giving out uncensored information of all kinds. I submit today that this same radio station of which I speak has every right to conduct its business in a private and individual way. I maintain that the Government has no right to step in and question its patriotism, its right to proceed in an orderly, patriotic manner.

Therefore, I welcome the opportunity today to cast my vote for this amendment. I will welcome any other such opportunities. I hope this is but the beginning of an attempt to place the power where the people originally intended it to be placed, to bring prestige back to the House and the Senate. Heaven knows within the past 2 years, due to the encroachments of these bureaucrats, we have lost plenty, at least with the folks back home, and they are the ones who count.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. HARE. Assuming that the statement of the gentleman is correct, what would happen in case this amendment were adopted and the war would continue beyond July 1 of this year and the communications systems of the world would be free to communicate any message to inform our enemies? Does not the gentleman think there would be chaos in our war program and in our war effort?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am informed by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that nothing will happen before July 1, as far as the continuation of this Commission goes. Furthermore, I would be the first to raise my voice in indignation against the insinuation of any Government bureau that the people in the radio station in my community would be guilty of any unpatriotic act or of disseminating any propaganda over the radio that would in any way obstruct the war effort.

I pledge my vote to this amendment and I welcome the chance to cast it this way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I know there are those of you who think I am sometimes too severe, and yet I speak the truth when I say to you that there is not one of you to whom I would not give the coat off my back did I think you were cold.

My position on this amendment is not an easy one. You know that I happen to be a member of a special committee that has been set up to investigate this agency of the Government. For that reason I am not going to appeal to my friends to support the amendment. That is a matter that they will have to determine for themselves without any appeal on my part. I will not under the circumstances vote on this amendment.

I have no brother nor son—no kinsman—who holds a job with the Federal Communications Commission whose continuance in service is dependent upon my support. On the other hand, I have been maligned, blackmailed, and criminally misrepresented by this agency of the Government.

I have expressed my views heretofore and you know what they are. Exception was taken to an observation I made on the floor that the Chairman of this Commission was in the hair of everybody in Washington, and particularly the Army and the Navy. I would have liked it better had the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] made his statement before I submitted these remarks to you. I think I know that he is this morning armed with a statement furnished by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy negativing the statement that I made the other day. I am wondering if the gentleman from Virginia on Monday, after the colloquy we had on the floor, communicated over the telephone with Mr. Fly with respect to this matter and if he knows that Mr. Fly appealed to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy for the statements which I think he holds. And I am wondering too if the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] happens to know that this Uriah Heep of the Commission brought political pressure to bear upon the Secretary of the Navy and forced into retirement the man who knew more about communications than any other man connected with the Navy, Admiral Hooper?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not urging that you take one position or the other; I will say, however, that I do not consider this motion to strike as being a piece of demagogery.

You will remember that at the beginning of this session we talked about the use of the appropriating power of this Congress as a means of repressing the bureaucrats who are governing America at this time. Now, I know this statement is disappointing to some of my friends, and I regret to make it, but I would feel ashamed of myself if I did not manifest sufficient courage and sufficient decency to say something on this subject. I could say more; I could say much more if the proprieties of the moment made it permissible; but I will say this to you: That I am not the only Member of this House who has been criminally maligned and falsely represented by this Commission; there are others I could name, and I could name them now; and if challenged I might do so.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets to inform the gentleman that debate on this amendment has been limited and time allocated. The Chair feels constrained to recognize the gentleman from Virginia. If time remains after the gentleman from Virginia has concluded, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is recognized.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it may be that because of the great disparity of numbers, that one who tries to defend the action of this subcommittee is crying in the wilderness.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Where are the Members on the gentleman's side?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is what I should like to know. If the gentleman could inform me where they are, I should like to know; certainly they are

not helping me very much today, I will say to the gentleman.

On a strictly political division of the House awhile ago, strictly political, every Member on the Republican side stood up in support of a motion and every Member on the Democratic side stood up; and there were 84 Republicans and 36 Democrats, I think. I feel that the people should know that, I feel that the Democrats of the country should know that.

But I have got a little bit of a job to do here and I am going to try to do it. First I should like to try to relieve my dear friend from Georgia, because he has been worried as to what I might have said to the Chairman of the Communications Commission and what he might have said to somebody else. Well, I did not call the Chairman of the Communications Commission; I had a clerk call him and tell him that it had been stated on the floor of the House that his agency was a detriment to the war effort; and to tell him that if that was so I could not defend it. Mr. Fly replied that he had already gone to the War and the Navy Departments some time ago when the charge was made and that he did not like to annoy them again but that he would enclose me copies of the letters they had written. This he did, and the gentleman from Georgia is already familiar with them.

I have here, though, Mr. Chairman, a little folder which he sent me, about 12 or 15 sheets. I cannot read them; I cannot put them in the RECORD. Their nature is so highly confidential, so vitally concerned with the heart of the war effort—they are from high-ranking Army and Navy officers, and State Department officials showing the vital, critical work this Federal Communications Commission is doing. I will be delighted, if any Member interested wants to come to my office, to lay them before him and let him read them; and I think he will agree when he sees them that they could not be made public because of their confidential nature.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. It would be possible for the investigating committee to proceed with its efforts and make a report promptly and to have whatever appropriation might be needed for the Commission provided before the first of July. In this way the Appropriations Subcommittee could have the benefit of the work the investigating committee does.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; I do not think that position is tenable at all.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virigina. Not for a few minutes; I have but limited time and several very important things I want to say.

Our committee felt there was some duplication in certain of the activities of the Federal Communications Commission and we cut the appropriation over $400,000 because of the suggestions made by the gentleman from South Dakota, and brought out in the hearings, which showed that some of the work the Communications Commission was doing the Army was doing and had the personnel to do it. We made that cut in the appropriations.

Here is the core of the whole business. If you want to take the responsibility you may do so. The Federal Communications Commission in its monitoring work, in its control of the airways, has to have highly technically skilled, trained personnel, mostly young people, and that is the reason for the high number of deferments in that branch. They have had the greatest difficulty in keeping their people. They have had to get young people, train them, start them at the bottom and work them on up, hence the great number of promotions. They have had great difficulty in keeping this personnel. They are jittery anyway.

Let the Congress today strike out this appropriation and those twelve or fifteen hundred people, who want to work, who want to eat, and who want to serve, not knowing where they are going to be, or when their jobs are going to be cut off, or whether they will have a job after July 1, and, I say to you, you have demoralized that agency, you have thrown confusion into the work of this vital, critical agency, and I do not believe any Member of this House ought to be willing to take the responsibility for doing that.

We have an investigating committee, with full powers, a zealous investigating committee, if you please. You and I may rest with the greatest feeling and security that speedily and thoroughly everything about the Communications Commission will be brought to us and the Congress may then take action.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I think I have a right to speak on this amendment because I happened to be the chairman of the committee that reported the bill to set up the Communications Commission and was the author of the bill. Before that time there was chaos in communications throughout the length and breadth of the land. The telegraph and telephone business had hardly been touched by the agencies that were supposed to handle them, the Interstate Commission. The old Radio Commission was devoting a little time to broadcasting and to broadcasting only. It was thought at that time that all communications should come under one commission of the Government. This was done back in 1934.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota should be brushed aside as sheer demagogy, that would be one thing. If the begging of the question by the gentleman from New York that if the investigating committee reported between now and the first of July were convincing, that would be another thing. I do not appeal to your prejudices or to your passions, and I do not accuse people of demagogy, but I do want to counsel with your reason—with your reason, I repeat, with all the earnestness I can command. A great war is on, the world is aflame and the air is full of propaganda from every conceivable portion of the earth. There is only one agency in the United States of America, let me say to you, that has any control whatsoever over the air of the United States. Do you by your vote at this time want to strike down that only agency?

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE) there were—ayes 87, noes 162.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair say at this time, that it is only fair to advise the Members that the Clerk, in the absence of any amendments on the desk and in the absence of any objection from members of the committee, was pursuing the course heretofore followed in the reading of bills.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, national defense: For all expenses necessary to enable the Federal Communications Commission, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, to perform its functions related to national defense, including radio monitoring and foreign broadcast analysis, including all of the items of expenditure for which the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Federal Communications Commission," is available and not to exceed $9,000 for salary of Director of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service; not to exceed 56 passenger-carrying automobiles; not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, without regard to the civil service and classification laws and, in the case of language or other experts, without regard to any requirements of this act with respect to citizenship, where citizens qualified to perform such work are not available; allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light (not exceeding $1,700 for any one person), as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a); and printing and binding, $5,590,314.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 13, line 14, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That upon the expiration of 60 days after the cessation of hostilities between the United States and the principal enemy powers or after the date of an armistice between the United States and the principal enemy powers, this appropriation shall cease to be available for obligations unless Congress shall otherwise provide by law."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DWORSHAK: Page 13, line 4, strike out "$5,590,314" and insert "$5,384,154."

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply proposes to eliminate $206,160 which has been provided in the bill for the use of the War

Problems Division of the Law Department of the Federal Communications Commission. Unlike the amendment which has just been disposed of, I do not believe there will be much opposition or controversy over this proposed amendment. I believe the subcommittee which has considered this bill probably will be inclined to support my amendment. In proof of that assertion I quote one paragraph of the committee's report:

The committee calls attention to the provisions in the bill providing $206,160 for a war-problems division under the law department. The committee has not eliminated these funds, because they are requested as a national defense measure, but it does regard the value of such projects with some skepticism and recommends that the Commission carefully consider the desirability of discontinuing them.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is our responsibility, not that of the Federal Communications Commission, to determine whether this particular division shall be continued or discontinued.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Was any attempt made by an official of the Commission to justify this appropriation?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes. The officials pointed out in the hearings that this new War Problems Division was created early in 1942 to take care of the peculiar problems arising because of our participation in the war. However, the normal functions of the Law Department certainly can be carried on and expanded in wartime. The hearings disclosed that normally the Law Department employs 56 attorneys. The War Problems Division has 15 attorneys and 8 other employees.

I call attention to the fact that while it has been said that the proposed funds for this Commission have been cut by $479,686, that is only reduced from the Budget request; and even with the adoption of my amendment this bill carries more than the amount provided during the current year for the operation of this Commission.

May I stress the point that for the regular activities of this Commission $2,000,000 is provided, and that under the heading of national defense activities more than $5,000,000 is provided, so that with the adoption of my amendment no effort will be made to interfere with or frustrate the work of the Commission insofar as the war program is concerned.

Much has been said about duplication; that it is time to eliminate 1,000,000 Federal employees of the 3,000,000 now on the pay roll. The only way we can retrench is to retrench. It seems to me this is an evidence of the good faith of Congress in serving notice upon these commissions that existing peacetime personnel should be readjusted and utilized to the fullest extent, so that the emergency activities arising from our participation in the war can be carried on successfully and efficiently.

I do not want to interfere with the operation of this Commission, but I believe it is time to consider the serious aspects of the manpower problem now confronting our country.

I ask the Committee at this time to support this amendment, which eliminates only $206,160 for a War Problems Division. Let us serve notice that the regular Law Department of the Federal Communications Commission should carry on effectively.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I direct the attention of the Committee especially to the fact that this is a part of the national-defense program of the Federal Communications Commission, a particular appropriation for that purpose, not a part of their regular activities.

The War Problems Division, a very small unit, with a small amount of money involved, was set up by the Federal Communications Commission at the request of the Board of War Communications, which is composed of representatives of the Army, the Navy, the State Department, the Marine Corps, and the other agencies interested in communications. It has to deal and it is the only agency having to deal with the broad subject of international communications, the priority of war communications, the sufficiency of telegraph and telephone communications, and the various and sundry complicated legal questions that arise.

When we are establishing and maintaining this intensive network of international communications which are brought about by this war effort, as our committee says, we felt and we suggested that the Federal Communications Commission ought to survey it carefully to see whether it is necessary. They say it is necessary. The War Communications Board say it is necessary. The Army and the Navy say it is necessary. It is a small item, and I believe we ought not now to delete it and deprive them of the functions of that activity.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DWORSHAK) there were—ayes 76, noes 99.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

National defense activities: For all necessary expenses (except printing and binding) to enable the Federal Power Commission to perform additional activities in connection with the national security and defense, including activities under the provisions of the Federal Power Act, activities under Executive Order No. 9165, dated May 19, 1942, and activities for the protection of the electric power supply against hostile acts, such expenses to include all items of expenditure for which the appropriations under the heading "Salaries and expenses, Federal Power Commission," are available, $519,255: *Provided*, That the Commission may make expenditures in addition to the foregoing, for duties connected with the national security and defense, from other appropriations available to it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 14, line 21, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That upon the expiration of 60 days after the cessation of hostilities between the United States and the principal enemy powers or after the date of an armistice between the United States and the principal enemy powers, this appropriation shall cease to be available for obligations unless Congress shall otherwise provide by law."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have no objection to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

*Office of the Administrator*

Salaries and expenses: For salaries and expenses in the Office of the Administrator in the District of Columbia, including the salary of a General Counsel at $10,000 per annum; printing and binding (not to exceed $4,000); actual transportation and other expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence to persons serving, while away from their homes without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Administrator; purchase (including exchange), of lawbooks and other books of reference, purchase of newspapers and periodicals (not to exceed $150); preparation, shipment and installation of photographic displays, exhibits, and other descriptive materials; travel expenses; not to exceed $1,500 for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the Administrator, at meetings or conventions relating to the work of the Agency; not to exceed $6,000 for the employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise, for special services determined by the Administrator to be necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and classification laws, $300,000: *Provided*, That the Federal Works Administrator may, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, authorize the Commissioner of Public Roads and the Commissioner of Public Buildings to make appointments of personnel for such administrations.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Page 16, line 17, after the words "classification laws", strike out "$300,000" and insert "$200,000."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is simply to make a further, and I think a moderate, cut in the funds available to the office of the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency.

The Administrator, as you know, is supposed to supervise the work of four other agencies—the Public Buildings Administration, the Public Roads Administration, the Public Works Administration, and the Work Projects Administration.

We are told that the Work Projects Administration is folding up and will not be in existence after June 30 next. We are also told that the Public Works Administration is winding up and will be liquidated during the course of the fiscal year 1944. So the Administrator's pri-

mary function will be that of supervising two agencies instead of four.

The Administrator requested $386,000, as compared with $350,000 for the current year, and advised us that he anticipates $245,000 from the constituent agencies, or a total, if his request had been granted, of $632,000, or thereabouts, primarily for the overseeing of these two agencies. For the current year the total was about $595,000. The record shows 15 people on the rolls of the Administrator with salaries between $6,400 and $12,000. It shows all told on the rolls 192 people with an average salary of $3,200.

The committee reduced the request from $386,000 to $300,000. This amendment, if adopted, would cut another $100,000, leaving a total for the Administrator, including funds from the constituent agencies, amounting to $445,000. I think that is ample for the reduced work by which he is confronted. I hope the House will adopt the amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I should like to inquire, in view of his statement that certain funds are to be transferred from constituent agencies, whether there is anything in the law or practice that would prevent the making up of $600,000 from one of the subordinate agencies that comes under the Federal Works Administrator?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the answer is no, but, of course, to the extent that a transfer is made, it would reduce the funds available to the constituent agencies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the language came to us there was provision whereby funds could be transferred from component agencies to the Administrator, but we left the language out of the bill.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman from Illinois is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do I understand it is not possible to make the transfer from constituent agencies to the Administrator?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct in view of the action referred to.

Mr. TABER. The total that this outfit has under its jurisdiction in all departments will be reduced, as compared to last year, by upward of $800,000,000 when the W. P. A. goes out. Is not that correct? The appropriation for the W. P. A. is $800,000,000 for this year, and that is not proposed to be carried for the next fiscal year. Therefore there is a cut in the total activities of three-quarters, and this only gives them $186,000 below the current year budget.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is true. And, of course, the P. W. A. is only asking for $27,000 next year, as compared with $168,000 in the current year, so there is a material cut there also.

Mr. TABER. And with a quarter of their activities a cut of only $86,000 has been made, so that when you add this cut of $100,000 you are only getting down to where you are giving more than they had this year.

Mr. HINSHAW rose.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I just want to ask the gentleman from Virginia a couple of questions.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make that 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the way budgetary matters have been handled, and that interest has been aroused through discussion with gentlemen from several of the departments downtown. Apparently whenever they run out of money in one department they can transfer it from some other source into that department, and in that way the very able work of the gentleman's committee can certainly be avoided. I wonder if there is going to be any provision in law or whether there is such provision which will make the appropriations made through the gentleman's committee stick to the department for which the appropriation is originally made?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is no power in the department to transfer funds to another agency or even to a division within an agency unless there is specific power given by the Congress. As pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], language of that kind was proposed, but it was stricken out. There is no such power. This happens sometimes, and perhaps this is what the gentleman has in mind: An agency will do work for another agency on a reimbursable basis. That is where this Federal Works Agency will get some funds, as pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], because of work that it will do for other agencies on a reimbursable basis, which has the effect of augmenting the amount appropriated to that agency.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is quite true, but what I want to know is whether this business of transferring funds for administrative purposes from subagencies will continue?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They will not do that unless they are given specific authority for it. None is given in this particular bill.

Mr. Chairman, I think the cut suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts is quite drastic. The committee has cut $86,000 from this item, which brings it well below the appropriation for the current year. Under the reorganization plans the office of the Administrator is charged with supervision of the Public Buildings Administration, the Public Roads Administration, both of which are moving full speed ahead. It is true that the Work Projects Administration and Public Works Administration are in process of liquidation, but even then there are certain important duties to be performed for them by the Administrator's office.

I think the gentleman's cut is a little too heavy. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia) there were ayes 90 and noes 78.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 155 and noes 121.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

General administrative expenses: For architectural, engineering, mechanical, administrative, clerical, and other personal services, including the salary of the Commissioner of Public Buildings at $10,000 per annum; traveling expenses, printing and binding (not to exceed $20,000), advertising, testing instruments, lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and such other contingencies, articles, services, equipment, or supplies as the Commissioner of Public Buildings may deem necessary in connection with any of the work of the Public Buildings Administration; ground rent of the Federal buildings at Salamanca, N. Y., and Columbus, Miss., for which payment may be made in advance; $1,225,000, of which not to exceed $675,900 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed $386,100 for personal services in the field: *Provided*, That the foregoing appropriations shall not be available for the cost of surveys, plaster models, progress photographs, test pits and borings, or mill and shop inspections, but the cost thereof shall be construed to be chargeable against the construction appropriations of the respective projects to which they relate.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I make a point of order, Mr. Chairman, against the language on page 17, line 15, beginning with the word "including" and ending with the word "annum" in line 16, the language reading "including the salary of the Commissioner of Public Buildings at $10,000 per annum," upon the ground that that particular wording is legislation upon an appropriation bill and is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman objects to the language beginning in line 15, after the word "services"?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. After the word "services" and including the word "annum" in line 16.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the item had the unanimous support of the subcommittee, but it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the prosecution of construction projects or planning programs assigned to the Public Buildings Administration for which funds are provided by direct appropriation or transferred under authority contained in section 35 of the act of June 15, 1938 (40 U. S. C. 265), an amount administratively determined as necessary for the payment of salaries and expenses of personnel engaged upon the preparation of plans and specifications, field supervision, and general office expense, may be transferred and consolidated on the books of the Treasury Department into a special account for direct expenditure in the prosecution of said work, such expenditures to be subsequently allocated and reported

upon by projects in accordance with procedures prescribed by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman a couple of questions.

On page 21 in line 10, "contracts for telephone switchboards." I would like to know what you mean by that. Is that a rental proposition or a buying proposition?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They rent them from the telephone company in many of the departments.

Mr. WHITE. It is a contract to rent, then?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION

General administrative expenses: For the employment of persons and means, including rent, advertising (including advertising in the city of Washington for work to be performed in areas adjacent thereto), printing and binding (not to exceed $27,000), purchase (including exchange) of lawbooks, books of reference and periodicals, and the preparation, distribution, and display of exhibits, in the city of Washington and elsewhere for the purpose of conducting research and investigational studies, either independently or in cooperation with State highway departments, or other agencies, including studies of highway administration, legislation, finance, economics, transport, construction, operation, maintenance, utilization, and safety, and of street and highway traffic control; investigations and experiments in the best methods of road making, especially by the use of local materials; and studies of types of mechanical plants and appliances used for road building and maintenance, and of methods of road repair and maintenance suited to the needs of different localities; for maintenance and repairs of experimental highways; for furnishing expert advice on these subjects; for collating, reporting, and illustrating the results of same; and for preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins and reports; to be paid from any moneys available from the administrative funds provided under the act of July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355–359), as amended, or as otherwise provided.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the paragraph just concluded mentions appropriately experimental highways and the building and maintenance of same.

When the mechanized hordes of Hitler rolled into the Lowlands of Belgium, Holland, and France it was over the perfectly constructed six-, seven-, and eight-lane highways leading from the heart of Nazi Germany itself that those troops came into the territory of the countries opposing the invasion. On the other hand, there were the narrow one- and two-lane roads in the oppressed countries I have mentioned.

The result was that the force of the equipment and the manpower of Hitler crushed the opposition. Stuka bombers from the skies blasted columns of ground troops coming to meet the Germans because those soldiers were bottlenecked against the fleeing humanity of the civilian population.

The reason I recall this part of the Nazi conquest is to remind the members of this Committee of the absolute necessity for the United States preparing very carefully now to think in terms of post-war construction of so-called superhighways or express roads.

When the war broke over America the 75,000 miles of strategic highway network in this country were in a deplorable condition. Only one-third of that entire highway system met even the minimum requirements of our military strategists.

I call your attention today to the need for a planned program when this war will have been concluded. We need the speedy construction of a great highway system, not only in America but linking this Nation more closely with Alaska on the north and our South American neighbors below the border. I say this advisedly because I can well realize that there will be those who, when this war will have been ended in our victory, will once again go back to the ill-advised proposition of putting our people to work on projects that are not fundamental and will not aid in the essential wealth of our Nation. Build highways. Build airways. Be constructive in post-war planning.

I direct your attention to the success of the experimental dream, as it was called, of the Pennsylvania Turnpike between Pittsburgh and Harrisburg.

That streamlined four-lane road was somewhat facetiously called a foolish guinea pig, yet we know that in peacetime 2½ hours' travel time is saved between Pittsburgh and Harrisburg. After the war is over we are going to have many of these roads linking the great cities and rural regions of our country, and we are, of course, going to extend them throughout the world. A link should, at the war's end, be built from Harrisburg to Philadelphia. Washington to Baltimore is another demanding action as soon as possible. In West Virginia a desirable link in such a system would be from Morgantown to Charleston.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The bill carries $3,000,000 for advance engineering plans, but this $3,000,000 is restricted for the development of a strategic network of highways that bypass municipalities and metropolitan areas.

The thing the gentleman has in mind was discussed by the committee and I think the committee favored an appropriation for road planning outside the municipal areas. It was, however, felt that the item in the form in which it was submitted to us would be subject to a point of order. That is the only reason there is not an item in this bill for post-war planning of rural roads as well as city roads.

I may say in this connection that evidence was brought before the committee that unless some steps are taken in that direction now a post-war program may be concentrated in large cities. It is highly desirable that there be a proper planning of roadways throughout the country to avoid that situation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I note that the money included in this bill for highway purposes, including access roads, is hardly as much as is devoted in a biennium in one or two of the larger States, such as my own State of California, for road construction work. How can it be expected that a Federal road construction program can be put through with such relatively small appropriations? Let us take the east coast road between Boston and Miami; it is in perfectly terrible condition; so far as use as a military highway is concerned, it is not worth anything; there are numerous stretches of two-lane road, inadequate bridges, ferry crossings, and all that sort of thing. Anyone who has driven even a small part of it in the past knows perfectly well that the road is not adequate.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct. In particular in the New England States we find thousands of miles of roadway that are not suitable for war use or even to meet the increasing peacetime needs. As a member of the Roads Committee I am sure we recognize the primary importance of the subject of post-war highway construction, and I believe we have a responsibility to get ready now, so there may be no delay when peace comes again.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope the gentleman's committee can get every dollar of the gasoline tax that is being collected by the Federal Government for use in construction of highways throughout the Nation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. As the gentleman states, the present situation in Federal highway construction is such that not much money is being devoted to that purpose. It has always been my opinion that the tax money collected from the sale of gasoline should be used for road work and not diverted by the States or Nation for other purposes, as has happened all too frequently.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I see two gentlemen on their feet; I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to supplement the idea advanced by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who just preceded me, with reference to the construction of a supermilitary highway in this country, and I ask for these few minutes to call attention to H. R. 56, a bill introduced during the early days of the session. This bill provides for the

construction of a supermilitary highway extending the Alaska Highway from somewhere near Minot, N. Dak.—I hope the gentleman from North Dakota will get that point—from somewhere near Minot to the vicinity of Chicago, to Cincinnati, through Kentucky, Tennessee, northern Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, or Arkansas, and through Texas to connect up with what is known as the Pan-American Highway. From El Paso up through New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, or Utah, Idaho, or Wyoming, and through Montana to Glacier Park, and from there to connect with the Alaska Highway at Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. In addition to this circle traversing the middle eastern part of the United States, the middle western part of the United States, giving us access to the North and to the South, there would be added six auxiliary roads to the east and west coasts. One from some point near Cincinnati, Ohio, to Boston, Mass.; another from near Knoxville, Tenn., to Charleston, S. C.; a third from near Birmingham, Ala., to Pensacola, Fla.; a fourth from Los Angeles to the main line; a fifth from San Francisco to the main line; and a sixth from Seattle to main superhighway.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I commend the gentleman for his interest in this superhighway construction. I think it might be interesting at this point to develop whether the gentleman proposes to have constructed toll roads or establish them free without cost for the vehicles and passengers traveling thereon?

Mr. HARE. The bill provides that they shall be toll roads.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I shall say to the gentleman that in connection with the operation of the Pennsylvania Turnpike under peacetime travel—of course, during the war we can make no comparison—the bonds with which that road was constructed were being retired twice as fast as anticipated in the financial set-up of that highway, showing that it can be done, and that motorists of every type, commercial and private, are eager to use such facilities.

Mr. HARE. I am very glad to have that information from the gentleman and I sincerely trust that he will assist in having this bill reported at this session of Congress in order to make the necessary surveys so that when the emergency is over that part of the work will be done and construction can begin immediately.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Of course, I think that we should report this character of legislation. Of course, I am zealous for the bill that I first introduced in 1937 and which in the present Congress is H. R. 776, but I am sure also that the gentleman's idea is sound.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. I hope to address myself to this proposal in more detail as soon as I am able to secure time.



Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, from my experience in pioneering in the West it is my belief that in this discussion we are dealing with one of the most important activities of the Government at the present time. Ever since I have taken up my duties as a Member representing one of the great undeveloped sections of the West I have endeavored to assist and work for the construction of roads. In connection with the activities of the Government in the defense of our country, I wonder if the majority of the Members of the House know what the conditions are today in the West and if they know of the bottlenecks in roads that exist in the Rocky Mountains. We have only a few main arterial roads crossing from the East to the West through the Rocky Mountain section of this country, none of them up to standard. There is not a four-lane road over the mountains of the West. I could take you on some of our most important arterial highways out there and show you how the road is winding and dangerous. If we were forced to transport heavy traffic over that road in connection with supplying our forces in the theater of hostilities in the Pacific, we would be stymied. There are bottlenecks throughout the Rocky Mountains that it would be impossible either by rail or truck transportation to overcome. I wish that the Members of this House would give more attention to the construction of roads throughout the mountain sections of the Northwest and the West.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. What the gentleman says is correct. I remember that prior to America's entry into the war, military maneuvers, especially in the West and Southwest, were impeded because the roads were not in shape to take care of the guns of a certain weight used in those tactics.

Mr. WHITE. I doubt that there is a road between Canada and the State of Utah, in the 600 miles of the north and south limits of the State of Idaho, that ordinary artillery could traverse today. I know that the main artery of the Northwest, Highway No. 10, is in such shape that it would be practically impossible for the truck and trailer or the ordinary long pieces of artillery to negotiate the curves. I was appalled to see work discontinued on one of the bottlenecks around Lake Coeur d'Alene in the State of Idaho, on Highway No. 10.

I hope this bill will pass and that there will be no disposition to cut any of these road appropriations, and that we will do what they did in Germany, build roads on which our troops may move freely and the supplies also in the theater of activities in the Pacific.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM

For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355-359) and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of said act, as amended, including not to exceed $1,135,000 for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, and including the salary of the Commissioner of Public Roads at $10,000 per annum, $40,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which is a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1942 by section 1 of the act approved September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 867): *Provided*, That none of the money herein appropriated shall be paid to any State on account of any project on which convict labor shall be employed, except this provision shall not apply to convict labor performed by convicts on parole or probation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $55,000 of the funds provided for carrying out the provisions of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (23 U. S. C. 21, 23), shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles: *Provided further*, That, during the fiscal year 1944, whenever performing authorized engineering or other services in connection with the survey, construction, and maintenance, or improvement of roads for other Government agencies the charge for such services may include depreciation on engineering and road-building equipment used, and the amounts received on account of such charges shall be credited to the appropriation concerned: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1944 the appropriations for the work of the Public Roads Administration shall be available for meeting the expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment stored therein for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Public Roads Administration, and for sale and distribution to other Government activities, the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling) to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment are procured from the appropriation chargeable with the cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment: *Provided further*, That the appropriations available to the Public Roads Administration may be used in emergency for medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of employees engaged on hazardous work under that administration: *Provided further*, That the appropriations for the work of the Public Roads Administration shall be available for necessary expenses (not exceeding $9,000) of attendance at meetings and conferences of highway departments, associations, organizations, and other agencies concerned, and (not exceeding $15,000) for the temporary employment, by contract or otherwise, of technical consultants and experts without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and classification laws.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 24, beginning with line 5, reading as follows: "and including the salary of the Commissioner of Public Roads at $10,000 per annum."

The point is that it is an appropriation without authorization.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, including contracts for personal services in the making of special investigations and reports; traveling expenses of members and employees, including not to exceed $2,500 for attendance upon meetings of technical and professional societies; periodicals and books of reference; equipment, maintenance, and operation of the Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory, the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, and the aircraft-engine research laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio; purchase and maintenance of cafeteria equipment; maintenance and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; not to exceed $319,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia, including one Director of Aeronautical Research at not to exceed $10,000 per annum; and not to exceed $2,500 for temporary employment of consultants, at not to exceed $50 per diem, by contract or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; in all, $15,672,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

*Office of the Administrator*

Salaries and expenses: In addition to the amounts otherwise available (which amounts shall be transferred to this authorization for expenditure hereunder) for the administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator, National Housing Agency, in carrying out the provisions of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1521), such amounts, not exceeding $508,780, as the Administrator determines are required for the expenses of the Office of the Administrator, National Housing Agency, in the performance of administrative and supervisory services relating to the constituent units of said agency shall be transferred, from the funds available for the administrative expenses of such constituent units for the fiscal year 1944, to this authorization for expenditure hereunder and shall be available until June 30, 1944, for all necessary expenses of said Office of the Administrator, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals and newspapers (not to exceed $500); preparation, mounting, shipping, and installation of exhibits (not to exceed $500); maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; not to exceed $5,000 for temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, for legal or other special services without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; payment, when specifically authorized by the Administrator, of (1) actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence to persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the agency and (2) not to exceed $1,500 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the agency when specifically authorized by the Administrator; reimbursement for the actual cost of ferry fares and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls and an allowance not to exceed 3 cents per mile for all travel performed in privately owned automobiles by employees engaged in the inspection of property within the limits of their official posts of duty when such travel is performed in connection with such inspection: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the consolidation effected by Executive Order 9070, section 7 of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1936, shall continue to apply to administrative expenses of and for the constituent units of the National Housing Agency mentioned in said section 7 and shall also apply to such expenses of said National Housing Agency in connection with the functions and purposes of said constituent units, and none of the funds made available by this act for such administrative expenses shall be obligated or expended unless and until an appropriate appropriation account shall have been established therefor pursuant to an appropriation warrant or a covering warrant, and all such expenditures shall be accounted for and audited in accordance with the Budget and Accounting Act, as amended.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the chairman of the committee what is the amount of money asked for here for the administration of the United States Housing Authority, since the consolidation of the United States Housing Authority with the National Housing Agency?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is all consolidated in one item under the National Public Housing Authority, I may say to the gentleman. After the consolidation of those agencies I do not know that there would be any way to segregate it and tell how much of it would go to the activities formerly carried on by the Federal Housing Authority. The agencies have been consolidated, as the gentleman knows, to cut out a great many other agencies dealing in the field of public housing. There is a pretty full statement in the report on it. The figure here of $3,400,000 is to carry out the housing activities.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is that for the administration alone or does that include the annual Federal contributions?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No contributions are in that. This is the administration. This is what was formerly known as the United States Housing Authority. I believe that is what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is right, and I understand that is principally under Mr. Emmerich.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. So that you have $3,000,000 in this appropriation for purely administrative purposes for the United States Housing Authority?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. May I call attention to the fact that in addition to that sum for administrative expenses the bill carries for annual contributions the sum of $5,750,000, in addition to the unexpended balance, which I believe amounts to another $5,600,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman means $10,000,000 altogether?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes; about $11,000,000 over all, as compared with $15,000,000 in the current year.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is in another part of the bill, however?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; it is under the Federal Public Housing Authority.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What I was trying to get at was the purely administrative expenses of what is now left of the United States Housing Authority.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: Not to exceed a total of $12,142,200, to be derived from the same sources as the funds made available for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and Home Owners' Loan Corporation by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, and from the special deposit account hereinafter mentioned, shall be available during the fiscal year 1944 for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration (Executive Order No. 9070 of February 24, 1942), which term and the term "administration," wherever used herein, shall unless otherwise qualified include and apply to said corporations but shall be exclusive of any corporation organized in pursuance of authority contained in the act of May 16, 1918 (40 Stat. 550), and any amendments thereof, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833); expenses (not to exceed $7,500) of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of said Administration when specifically authorized by the Administration; printing and binding; lawbooks, books of reference, and not to exceed $1,250 for periodicals and newspapers; rent in the District of Columbia; the immediate purchase of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle; maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; payment, when specifically authorized by the Administration, of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Administration; use of the services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies of the Government, including the use of services and facilities within the Administration; the amounts so derived to be credited upon the books of the Treasurer of the United States in such account or accounts as the Administration may determine, and the Administration in its discretion may utilize the facilities of the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department for the disbursement of funds in or derived from such account or accounts relating to said corporations: *Provided*, That (1) all necessary expenses in connection with the liquidation of insured institutions, (2) all necessary expenses (including services performed on a force account, contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation or in which it has an interest, and (3) all necessary expenses (including services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the handling, including the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That except as herein otherwise provided, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the administration shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22, 1932,

as amended (12 U. S. C. 1421–1449), the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1461–1468), and title IV of the National Housing Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1725–1732): *Provided further*, That all moneys and funds heretofore deposited in the Treasury of the United States under the last sentence of section 19 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended (including unexpended balances of moneys appropriated therefrom for administrative expenses), and hereafter all moneys and funds which would, except for this provision, be so depositable thereunder, shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States in a special deposit account and shall be available, retroactively as well as prospectively, for expenditure for all purposes of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, subject to subsections (a) and (b) of section 7 of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1936.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 39, lines 19 and 20, strike out the sign and figures "$12,142,200" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,310,734, and such Corporation shall be liquidated as provided by section 4 (k) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to the extent necessitated by the reduction of administrative personnel herein required, and the expenses incident to such liquidation shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation shall not incur for administrative expenses in excess of $833,333.33 for any month from July to December 1943, inclusive, nor in excess of $208,333.33 for any month from January to June 1944, inclusive."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in 1933 Congress created the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. This Corporation ceased to make any new loans on the 12th day of June 1936. It has, therefore, made no new loans in the last 6 years. At the peak of its business when the making of new loans was discontinued, it had made a little over 1,000,000 loans for a little over $3,000,000,000. That is rather easy to understand in round figures. On the 30th of June 1942 the number of loans had gone down to 811,521, and the amount outstanding was about $1,675,000,000, so that it has been reduced from the original amount by approximately $1,400,000,000. At one time they had more than 20,000 employees. For the next fiscal year they are asking for 3,832 employees.

Let me present to you some figures on the operations of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. They did a good job in the emergency because, after all, it was a relief institution and we anticipated that there would be losses. If you will examine the testimony of Mr. Fahey, the Director, you will find that he states that everybody knew that losses were inevitable. So do not be misled by any talk about whether or not there will be more money lost, because money will be lost any way you take it.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation is just like any other institution in protecting its assets. If a borrower is in arrears, it has no choice except to foreclose, like a bank or thrift institution. It has foreclosed 156,586 properties. You see that is Uncle Sam foreclosing. It is not one of these grabbing banks, or one of these flinty hearted savings and loan corporations. This is old Uncle Sam, whiskers and all, who is doing the foreclosing, and so we have foreclosed 156,000. In addition, they have on hand another 41,269 properties, so that roughly speaking, out of a million loans made, there have been about 200,000 foreclosures of which we, the people, represented by the H. O. L. C., own 41,000 pieces of property. In addition to that, when the borrowers got into difficulties Congress passed the so-called Mead-Barry Act, in which the loans were extended from 15 to 25 years. Thus, in addition to the 200,000 foreclosures, there has been an extension of time on 251,170 loans.

The average age of these properties when the Home Owners' Loan Corporation made these loans was 17 years. Add 10 years to that, and that makes 27 years, so the average age of the properties they hold at this time is 26 or 27 years. Imagine the competition between those old properties and the new housing now being built, and the great quantity of post-war housing which we are assured and promised under the planning system will be built when the war comes to an end.

Let us take a look at the expenditures. It has been repeated on this floor time and time again, that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation does not cost the Treasury anything. No; but it costs 811,000 citizens something, because these expenditures come out of the citizens. Moreover the ultimate losses will come out of the taxpayers.

For administration expenses since they have been in business, they have had $248,000,000. That is money for the pay roll, for management, for administration since the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has been doing business. They have had $248,000,000 administrative expenses. But that is not all. You notice in this bill there is a provision for contracts, fees, and other services and they shall not be considered as administrative expenses, and that means they spent that money for property management and commissions with only a nominal accounting therefore as nonadministrative expense. In addition to the $248,000,000 for administrative expenses, they have expended $91,000,000 for these nonadministrative purposes such as legal fees, legal costs, brokers' commission, management commission, sales commissions and all the other things that go along with the management of a large number of properties.

For this last fiscal year the legal costs were $1,200,000. Attorneys got $2,300,000 outside of the Government, sales brokers got $1,400,000 for selling these properties, and the management brokers got $2,000,000, making nearly $13,000,000 for the fiscal year ended in 1941.

Now, let us look at the losses. On sales of properties they have lost $190,654,000. That is about $10,000,000 short of $200,000,000 in losses. On fees, they have paid into those properties another $37,000,000, so that their cumulative loss is $227,000,000. What is the reserve? I had a difficult time to get at that matter of reserve but we finally succeeded.

When we got through we found that there was not a dollar in reserve. There are no bonds in reserve. The only thing they have in reserve to protect the loss are 41,000 properties, the average age of which is 26 years, and those properties are being carried on the books at book value without depreciation having been taken. That is the only reserve they have. And so Mr. Fahey is eminently right when he says there are going to be inevitable losses. The H. O. L. C. was the emergency operation, and is there any reason why it ought to be continued indefinitely? The law provides that it should be liquidated. The law of 1933 provides that when its purposes have been accomplished, the Board shall liquidate the Corporation, and I propose by this amendment to earmark and restrain their funds in addition to a cut in the funds, so that they will have to start liquidating this year, and then progressively to carry out the entire liquidation.

I do not believe that I am telling any tales out of school when I say that I talked to a high official in the executive branch of the Government only last night, and he has indicated that there are others on the other side of the Capitol who are very much interested in the liquidation of this Corporation, and that they are trying to work out some plan now. If that be true, and it is true, then the proper thing for the House to do at the present time is to give it an impetus, and adopt this amendment and say to Mr. Fahey and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation that it is the policy and desire of Congress that they liquidate expeditiously.

There is no disposition to liquidate. That is the trouble. That is the trouble with bureaucracy. That is the trouble with an emergency bureau, once it becomes entrenched. Once they get entrenched, they do not want to liquidate. They do not want to let loose. Mr. Fahey is now taking over 5,000 pieces of property from the Federal Housing Authority for war-conversion purposes, to convert them, and modernize them, and make them available as defense houses, and so they will dig in a little bit further, and they will be just like the United States Housing Corporation in the last World War.

Mr. Fahey is liquidating that corporation now. From 1918 to 1943 is 25 years. He testified to us in the committee a few weeks ago that only now is he liquidating the United States Housing Corporation from the First World War. While he says in so many words that he wants to liquidate, there is no doubt in my mind that he does not want to liquidate unless we compel him to do so. He wrote a letter to the president of the United States

Savings and Loan League, in which he says:

The newspapers released here recently the following statement concerning the United States Savings and Loan League. "Private lending institutions, its officers said, would take over the mortgage burden borne by Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which has outlived the emergency status granted at its foundation. Signatory officers of the organization were Ralph H. Cake, John F. Scott, W. M. Brock, and Morton Bodfish." If this release is correct, I want to say in the friendly and cooperative spirit which I trust will always obtain between the league and this office, that I consider this action a serious mistake on two counts.

Mr. Fahey then proceeds to set forth his reasons. Can this statement of attitude leave any doubt as to whether or not Mr. Fahey on his own initiative proposes to liquidate the Corporation? He will advance reason after reason, year in and year out, as to why the Corporation should not be liquidated and there is but one way for Congress to procure definite action and that is to mandate the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation now.

He says:

Contrary to the impression which has been conveyed to some of the lending institutions, such an activity of liquidation would not effect great savings to the Federal Government, but would increase the Home Owners' Loan Corporation's losses, and, in turn, increase the national debt.

Congress authorized the H. O. L. C. to issue more than $4,000,000,000 of contingent certificates. They are all guaranteed as to principal and interest. He talks about the fear that there may be an increase in the national debt, when, as a matter of fact, if we liquidate this Corporation we will retire those contingent obligations, and for all practical purposes be liquidating and diminishing the obligations of the taxpayers of this country. Do not forget that those bonds are guaranteed, both as to principal and as to interest, and constitute a charge against the Nation. If we liquidate the H. O. L. C. the funds derived can then be used to retire the outstanding bonds.

So, from what I can see, I say that Mr. Fahey is not disposed to liquidate the corporation.

I can see many reasons why it ought to be liquidated.

In the first place, Mr. Fahey also runs the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. He makes every building and loan association, every insured institution get rid of its bad real estate. Why should not the Home Owners' Loan Corporation abide by the same rule?

Only recently he got out a regulation compelling insured building and loan associations to divest themselves of real estate. If it is a good rule for others in the country it is a good rule for Mr. Fahey.

There is only one way to liquidate and that is to liquidate. When Uncle John Sherman was Secretary of the Treasury, and the question was being considered about resuming specie payments, they sent a committee down to the Treasury, and do you know what historic answer he gave? He said:

The way to resume is to resume.

You cannot argue with that. In like vein, I say the way to liquidate an emergency agency that ought to be liquidated now is to liquidate. That is the only answer.

Are we going to wait until the war is over? The country is filled with money today. I just had a postcard from a fellow downtown who says if you have got a loan on your insurance policy, even at 6 percent, they are willing to give you the money at the bank and take it at 3 or 4 percent. The very fact that banks are seeking to refinance loans on insurance policies at lower rates is an indication of how abundant money is today and a further indication that this is the time to initiate liquidation of this emergency corporation.

Mr. Fahey said to me in answer to my question that he did not think the thrift institutions of the country could do this. Yet he had made a release to the New York Times and other papers just 3 weeks ago in which he was lamenting the fact that the thrift institutions, savings banks, and mortgage institutions were luring away his borrowers. If he is right on one count, then he is wrong on the other. The only reason they are luring them away today is because the country is so full of money that they do not know what to do with it, and this money wants to get into real estate mortgages, into paper that is represented by property scattered in the 48 States of the Union If we continue the Corporation there is going to be one of two answers. Either we are going to continue to bleed the borrowers or we are going to have to pay it out of the Federal Treasury.

Notwithstanding the case they try to make about losses resulting from selling the assets of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, we are going to have indefinitely larger losses unless we take advantage of the money market at the present time. The money is here. Savings and loan companies have written me from all over the country indicating their interest in this matter.

I know a little about the business of these thrift institutions. Early in life I was taught that the three great institutions which made this a great Nation were the churches, the schools, and the building and loan associations. These thrift societies are the voice of the common man. He owns them. When he becomes a shareholder and pays a few dollars each month, he becomes a full partner in the enterprise. He not only saves his own money but enables himself and his neighbor to become home owners, by their own efforts, without the interposition of the Federal Government. He becomes a community builder and I am proud that years ago I had a humble part in all this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I did ask the gentleman from Illinois one day what the building and loan association was paying $25,000 a year for a lobbyist. Will you explain what he is doing for that money?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, the gentleman from New York can ask any member of the Banking and Currency Committee what Morton Bodfish, vice president of the United States Building and Loan League, is doing. He frequently appears before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and if the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], is on the floor, I will ask him whether or not Mr. Bodfish does not beget more confidence from that committee than most anybody who comes before it. He knows his business. He is no lobbyist. He is just serving millions of home owners who are represented in the United States Savings and Loan League. They have the savings—savings of humble citizens. They seek investments for those savings. They would like to take over these mortgages. They would like to put some of their money into them and so serve the useful purpose of taking Uncle Sam out of the mortgage business after he has concluded the emergency. To me it is amazing that anyone should seek to keep the Federal Government in the lending business when funds for all purposes are so plentiful.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BELL. I just wanted to ask the gentleman this question, and I am seeking information: Will there not be a tendency to turn over to the building and loan companies the good loans and to leave the bad loans for Uncle Sam to handle? I am not saying that that will be the case, but I would like to have the gentleman's reply to that question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They have put them entirely on a business basis, as they said. Why do they not put them up in packages, the good with the bad, and sell them that way, just like Mr. Fahey discounts an asset. Of course, as for our solicitude for those who may be in difficulties, as a matter of fact, has not Mr. Fahey foreclosed 200,000 of these people? If anyone feels that a mortgagor should be nursed along, no matter how far he may be in arrears, then we should properly continue the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, empower it to make new loans, provide it with unlimited funds, take over all the home mortgages in the land, and forget about the possibility of bankrupting the country. But Mr. Fahey does not operate that way. The thrift institutions which he insures do not operate that way, because he, as the boss of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, does not permit it. The loans of insured institutions must be current. Bad assets must be liquidated. If Mr. Fahey makes the thousands of thrift institutions do that, why should he not be compelled to operate his own Corporation in that fashion?

I venture the opinion that if the Corporation were in business for 50 years, there would still be loans in arrears.

Should that constitute a reason for the continuance of this emergency operation, now that the emergency is over?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman has pointed out very forcefully and very truthfully, I think, when he discussed this matter a day or two ago that private institutions because of State laws were compelled to foreclose; they could not carry these people in a depression.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Hence the necessity of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Now if we provide for its forced liquidation, speeded-up liquidation, which the gentleman suggests, of these lending accounts, there are some 800,000 of them that will be affected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. These homes have been saved because of these acts. Turn these accounts back to the private bankers and, as I have heard even some people on the gentleman's side of the aisle say, suppose there comes another depression after this war with further widespread unemployment, will the private bankers be able to carry these accounts through such a period any more than they were in the other depression which brought about the necessity for this action by the Government to save these homes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Virginia makes the best argument possible for just forever keeping the Government in this business. If we are ever going to get out, we have got to make a start. If this lending agency will make no move on its own part to liquidate itself we must give it a little push.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN I yield.

Mr. SHORT. How can we expect to have any period when average wage rates or general employment will be higher than it is at the present time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We cannot expect it, and this is the best opportunity we shall ever have to liquidate these obligations. It is now or never. Liquidation is really a great service to the Nation. It would be sound preparation for the difficult times that may lie ahead when the war is over and the credit of the country is taxed to the limit by the post-war demands.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. Is not the gentleman from Illinois of the opinion that this liquidation could be brought about this fiscal year if there were a serious and sincere attempt to liquidate, without its having to go further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely. As it is we have simply reduced their administrative expenses for the next fiscal year, and they would be allowed to continue for some time after that into the following fiscal year. This is a kind of progresssive liquidation and serves notice on the Corporation that Congress wants it done.

If the agency will take no steps to liquidate itself, as I stated before, when everything indicates that they should be liquidated, then the Congress itself must do it for them.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. As a matter of fact there are five-hundred-odd-thousand loans that are liquidating themselves. These loans are paying the Government 5 and 6 percent interest on money the Government is getting for 4½ percent. This earning will take care of the losses on the two-hundred-odd-thousand bad loans.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a table in the hearings showing that only 6½ percent of these loans, according to Mr. Fahey's own figures, are 3 months or less in arrears. There are thousands of loans that are not current.

Mr. BARRY. That is not the fact.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The figures are in the book.

Mr. BARRY. There are over 500,000 good, sound loans.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know where the gentleman gets his figures, but I do know what Mr. Fahey put in the hearings, and it is there for all to read.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I think that in his general statement the gentleman from Illinois is correct, that the banks do have a lot of money and that they are willing to take over the good properties; but I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in almost every city there are what is known as blighted areas. We have one of these blighted areas in Detroit, over in the old boulevard section. The banks are not willing to go into that old section and take up these home owners' loans that were made on old properties, old houses that are owned largely by workers or people who labor on small salaries. They are so-called undesirable loans. What bank is going to take them over?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why not take them over, the good and the bad together, liquidate those that must be liquidated and get the most out of it at a time when there is the best market we can ever expect for them?

Permit me to summarize the reasons for the step which is here proposed for the liquidation of the Corporation.

The insured thrift institutions of which Mr. Fahey is the directing head are compelled to liquidate bad assets and divest themselves of real-estate holdings. Why should not the Home Owners' Loan Corporation be compelled to do likewise.

Second. The only way to liquidate is to liquidate.

Third. The properties owned by H. O. L. C. and on which loans are carried are aging. Their average age is around 26 years. The longer the H. O. L. C. remains in business, the older these properties become and the smaller the real equity of the Government.

Fourth. The emergency is over and since this corporation was created only to meet an emergency, the logical step to take is to bring about its liquidation.

Fifth. If we fail to take this step, it will be a cue for other agencies of government to continue in business when the need for their continuance has passed.

Sixth. It appears from the records of the Corporation with respect to the decrease in the number of properties held, that left to itself it will require 30 years or more to wind up its business. Shall we duplicate the experience of the United States Housing Corporation which was created in the days of the First World War and which is only now being liquidated?

Seventh. Everybody is agreed, including the Chairman of the H. O. L. C., that losses are inevitable so that prudence and common sense dictate that we should take the losses now and retire from this operation.

Eighth. Liquidation will reduce the contingent debt of the Government since the H. O. L. C. bonds are guaranteed both as to principal and interest. The sale of the H. O. L. C. assets and the transfer of its loans to private institutions which have an abundance of money will enable the Corporation to retire outstanding bonds and so reduce the contingent debt.

Ninth. Never has there been so favorable a market for the liquidation of the Corporation as now and we should take advantage of market conditions without delay.

Tenth. The Corporation will carry 3,832 persons on the pay roll in the fiscal year 1944, and whatever proportions of these are retired will become available to ease the present manpower shortage. It may be argued that the number taken from the rolls will be pitifully small compared with our manpower needs, but no matter how many are involved, it is still a contribution to our manpower requirements.

Eleventh. As the Corporation continues in business, its money balances decline in an amount so that on a percentage basis it becomes increasingly expensive for the Corporation to operate and administer its loans and the property which it now holds.

Twelfth. Sales of its assets and the retirement of bonds will make additional funds available for the purchase of War Savings bonds and stamps at a time when the Treasury is doing its utmost to develop sales of such bonds to carry on the war effort.

Let me add one last thought. It has been repeatedly stated on this floor that the Federal Government bailed out the bank and thrift institutions when they were holding distressed loans and thereby served such institutions as well as the distressed home owner. Let me observe that when the H. O. L. C. took over these thousands of mortgages the thrift institutions of the country scaled down the value of these mortgages by more than $200,000,000. They, too, took substantial losses as a result of this operation. Finally let me observe, as I listen to the charges and allegations that the thrift institutions of the country are but a greedy, flinty, hard group of exploiters, that those which operated under the State laws of the country were compelled by law and not by choice to foreclose mortgages where they were in arrears

beyond a certain time. This should be answer enough to the unsupported accusations which have been leveled against them from time to time. I sincerely hope that the membership will strike a blow for sound government by adopting the pending amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, let us try to straighten out one point right away. As pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY], a moment ago, there were, as of December 31, 1942, 586,776 loans which are being paid out on schedule; which confirms his statement.

When this matter originally arose, it was my intention on the floor of this House to oppose the continuance of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. I had had letters from several loan groups. I have, myself, had some dealings with the matter. I thought it was the propitious time to make this liquidation which the gentleman from Illinois has suggested. But there is one unfortunate thing that happens to a new member of the Appropriations Committee. If he tries to be conscientious, he will go through the hearings. I read page by page with rather poor eyesight the entire 1944 hearings, then I went back and read all those hearings for 1943 which related to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Not being completely satisfied, I then went to the officials of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and asked them for other and particular information that I might use on the floor of this House in an effort to straighten out matters that concerned me very deeply and which did not appear to me to be going right.

I desire in this time to give the House the benefit of this information. Let me say at the outset that I was at the time the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was organized a director, officer, and stockholder, in what was probably the largest mortgage institution in my State handling this type of loan. Our company was very happy to turn over to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation thousands of dollars' worth of paper which we regarded as poor and which, upon my motion, my company had written down on its books by a very substantial amount. I am very happy to see the Home Owners' Loan Corporation make pay what we could not make pay.

May I say that the way to liquidate H. O. L. C. is by an orderly process, not by a rout. I think it can be done orderly and not in the pattern of a panic. If there is to be a move to liquidate, it should not be done by cutting off the appropriation for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation but should be accomplished by specific legislation through the Banking and Currency Committee, the proper policy-making committee to handle the matter. Bear in mind there have been no new loans since January 12, 1936. That is in itself liquidation.

Let me give you some particular points, first as to the amount of the loans and advances. The peak was $3,481,000,000. At the end of the present fiscal year the balance will be $1,472,000,000. That is 57-plus percent. It lacks only a few million dollars of being a 60-percent liquidation on the total amount advanced. That, Mr. Chairman, is orderly liquidation.

Then as to property acquired, the gentleman from Illinois has correctly stated that 194,000 pieces of property were acquired by foreclosure. I again remind you that on June 30, 1942, but 35,190 of those were in the hands of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, another fact indicating that they were going through the process of liquidation. But let me remind you that in the last few months people feeling that the ownership of property was a hedge against inflation have started paying up loans that otherwise were in distress and the rate of liquidation has dropped to almost nothing. Three out of five liquidations that are started now are stopped by the borrower paying up and becoming current. At the end of this fiscal year it is anticipated there will be only 23,477 houses on the list.

The gentleman from Illinois suggests that the head of this organization, Mr. Fahey, should take the medicine that he has prescribed for the building and loan leagues when he requires them to sell property. The fact he has sold houses and brought the number down from 194,000 to 35,000 indicates he has long been taking his own medicine.

May I say that liquidations reached their peak in 1937 when there were 68,000 until they were down to 2,808 in the last fiscal year.

Now, as to personnel. At the peak there were 21,000 employees in this agency. There are contemplated by this next bill only 3,822. That, Mr. Chairman, is orderly liquidation.

Finally, as to administrative expenses, we spent at the peak $35,000,000 per year. We will spend during the next fiscal year $10,000,000. I suggest also that is a step in the right direction.

What about this administrative expense? Is it too much? If it is, here is an agency that I submit you can trust. In the year 1941 this Congress gave it $22,000,000 and they spent $19,786,745. For the fiscal year 1942 they were allotted $19,400,000 and they spent $15,501,609. In the last 5 years they have turned back out of a total of $125,000,000 the sum of $9,000,000 to the Treasury of the United States. They will not throw away any of this $10,000,000.

Liquidation is being accelerated at the present time, and I give you certain indices by which you may judge. The first index is this: Total collections from borrowers. Those of us who have been in the business of making monthly payment loans know that as the loan progresses and becomes older the amount of interest goes down and the payment on principal builds up. If H. O. L. C. should receive $80,000,000 a year, year after year, the amount of principal payment would be increasing annually. But that is not the whole story. These H. O. L. C. borrowers paid $80,000,000 in 1936, but at the present time they are paying what? One hundred and ninety-seven million dollars last year and more than $200,000,000 during this fiscal year. I say that is liquidation because the great bulk of that is not for interest. It is for principal. The great increase is for the repayment of these loans and the rapid liquidation of the Corporation. I can give you those figures year by year to anyone interested. They are available.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Before the gentleman concludes, and I do not want to divert him from his intended remarks, will the gentleman make some observations for the benefit of the House as to what in his opinion will be the result if there is a forced liquidation of the mortgages owned by this agency and the probable damage to the Federal Government?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I will try to do that. Let us take the second index as to delinquencies. Of 851,000 loans in 1940, 500,000 were paid on time. When the number of accounts dropped to 780,000 in 1942, 586,000 paid on time. So, with 71,000 fewer accounts, 76,000 more were paying. That is a change from an actuarial standpoint of 25 percent and is a good indication.

As to delinquencies, there were 851,000 accounts. Two hundred and fifty-three of those moved into extended loans, which is under a provision passed by this House to make possible the holding of home owners' property. Those were the worst loans. They represented the bottom of the financial barrel in this transaction. But with 197,000 extended in 1940, 85,324 are now paying on schedule. Yes; there are 231,986 of these extended loans as of December 31, 1941, and 146,327 of those, the poor loans, the bottom of the barrel, are now being paid right on schedule every month.

I say to you that is a pretty good indication that this Congress passed a wise piece of legislation.

One more index in reference to the cure for delinquencies. During the fiscal year 1942 there were 701,000 new cases in delinquency. I do not want to mislead the House. Those were not 701,000 different loans. Sometimes a person got delinquent time after time, but nevertheless there were 701,000 red tickers that showed up in the collection register and 701,000 times they were corrected. Today, as the gentleman from Illinois very fairly pointed out, only 6 percent of all the loans are seriously in default.

Now, another matter: take the rate of acceleration of liquidation. The President asked us a while ago to pay up debts as a part of the program against inflation. I call your attention to the fact, however, that these people who are borrowers from the Home Owners' Loan Corporation were supposedly all in the

lower financial brackets and in financial distress; yet 100,000 of those people have accelerated and increased their payments within the last year.

Now, I wish to take up this question of losses. I recognize there have been losses. As I said, as an official of a mortgage company, handling this type of business, I marked down paper on our own books that we subsequently passed to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. We anticipated that there would be losses. The Congress anticipated there would be losses. It was said on the floor of this House that the losses upon this $3,000,000,000 of H. O. L. C. loans would be a total of $1,000,000,000. I say to you that I have studied the balance sheet of this Corporation as carefully as I know how. You will find it on page 1045 of the hearings. I have asked H. O. L. C. for operating statements, the profit-and-loss statement, for their balance sheets. I have all sorts of special figures. Upon my responsibility, I say to you that as carefully as I can analyze it, as honestly as I can say it to you, the loss today is about $72,000,000. I stake my reputation as a person who has some financial responsibility when I say that, because, while it is true that this Corporation has taken some $220,000,000 of losses on real estate, at the same time, its operating statement shows $155,000,000 worth of earnings. I do not have to tell any Member of this House that when you have a deficit on one side and income on the other you have a right to balance it and come out with a net-loss figure of about $70,000,000. That is our loss to date, and nobody can successfully deny that.

So where are we now? I want to give you a sample of what I considered in reaching my decision on this item. Put it on results in your own district. Analyze it from the standpoint of your own home town or county. What does it mean to you? I have taken my district, my home State. In my State 2,462 loans were made by this Corporation for $5,417,000. As of December 31, 1942, 1,880 were still on the books, but they owed $2,286,678, demonstrating the same sort of liquidation that is going on all over this country. One thousand three hundred and seventy-eight of those loans are being paid regularly on schedule. Of the bad loans, 434 were extended; and 148 of those got in arrears. That is not bad for slow paper. We acquired 197 properties in my State; and 193 of them, all but 4, have already been sold. I say to you, that is liquidation.

There are 14 building and loan associations in my State at last report. They had total cash in the bank in that report of $513,000. How can they acquire $2,286,678 worth of paper? It cannot be done, except by what? By issuing building and loan stocks for the Federal Government to take in exchange for its perfectly good bonds. That is what will be the next step in this picture. I say to you, as persons trying to watch the public money, that you ought not to take that step. You ought to keep these home-owners' loan bonds which the Government has advanced. You ought not to take building and loan stock from any individual company in payment for them, and that is what you will have to do if you liquidate too rapidly.

What will be the effects if we liquidate it? I am not as pessimistic as the gentleman from New York. I do not think that 800,000 loans will immediately be foreclosed by the persons who might take over this paper because I know when you have made an installment-payment loan to a borrower as long as that borrower comes in every month with a check there is nothing you can do about foreclosing. You are going to allow that loan to run to maturity. So I say that in the great majority of cases there will be absolutely no difference, but in some cases there will be. Every time a loan gets into distress—every time that little red tag shows up to tell you there is a loan that bears watching—that individual company may not be able to do what the Federal Government has done. It may not be able to cure 701,000 cases of delinquency within a single year. When that happens and people become discouraged and get further and further behind, you know the rest of the credit story as well as I do.

Who wants this? Well, there is a trust company in Cleveland that says that this ought to be turned back. That very company took $22,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in exchange for bad paper it had. It took $19,000,000 from the H. O. L. C. in exchange for additional bad paper. Now, with money in its till, it wants to grab off some of this prime paper that now belongs to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

I say that that is not the way to do it. The little company I was in sold our paper and were glad to sell it to the Federal Government, and we are not going to take it back because a burnt child fears the fire.

But let me finally give you the fact that of all the loans that were extended, half of all these loans that were bad are now being regularly paid, and 50,000 of them are paid down now to where the home owner has more than a 30-percent equity in his home. I submit to you that the way to handle this problem is to continue the orderly liquidation that has been started.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] refer to the fact that the only reserve this Corporation held was repossessed or foreclosed real estate which had not been depreciated by a single dollar. The gentleman has a mortgage company of his own. Would the gentleman regard that method of doing business as good, sound business dealing in his own mortgage company? In other words, if the gentleman's own company took back large quantities of real estate, would the gentleman feel it to be sound business not to depreciate that real estate over a period of years?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Without getting into a controversy with my friend from Illinois, who is a very fine, studious and serious Member of this House, that is not the only reserve possessed by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation, to be sure, has set up what I regard as a very poor system of establishing a reserve. It sets aside out of its current income $40,000,000 a year. I do not think H. O. L. C. should do it just that way. I think it should take this money out of earnings or not at all.

Yes, there have been losses, but they are not substantial. They are now but $72,000,000, and that is a figure vastly below what anyone dreamed was possible when this organization was started.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. To be equally divided between the two sides?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The Chair will handle that all right.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A number of years ago, more years than I now like to count, I went home from a college oratorical contest, stating to my freshman roommate that I would like to hope that sometime I might be able to speak half as well as the gentleman from New Mexico, CLINT ANDERSON, did that night. Today I join in the appreciation expressed by the Members of the House when the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] concluded his remarks. I have known him for many years and I have the utmost admiration for him today as I had that night when he walked off with the college oratorical contest.

Mr. McCORMACK. And I suppose the gentleman on that occasion profoundly respected his penetrating logic, the same as he expressed it today.

Mr. CASE. I profess profound respect for his ability to deal with an audience, but today I must question the premise on which most of his argument was based, due, I think to his not having the exact text of the amendment before him. I shall try to point that out so clearly that I think it will appeal even to the gentleman from New Mexico himself. I was impressed by the appeal of the gentleman from New Mexico for orderly liquidation, but his argument was based on the assumption that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] calls for an immediate and complete liquidation of the poor loans as well as the good loans. That is not the situation. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois provides for a reduction in the amount appropriated from $12,100,000 to $8,300,000, and then provides that such Corporation shall be liquidated as provided by law "to the extent contemplated by the reduction of administrative personnel herein

required, and expenses incident to such liquidation."

In other words, the proposal of the gentleman from Illinois is not a proposal for a complete liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. It is a proposal for an orderly liquidation of it. It proposes a reduction of one-third in the administration expenses allotted with corresponding liquidation. The testimony all through debate has been that some 72 percent of the loans of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation are not in default. If there is to be an orderly liquidation, if the Government is to make the best possible showing in its H. O. L. C. operations, then it must dispose of its paper at a time when the market is good, when it may even get a premium for some of its paper, and that market is now. There is nothing in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois that requires liquidation of the bad paper. It merely provides for a liquidation proportionate to the reduction in administrative funds allowed. That will permit the liquidation of whatever paper the directors of the H. O. L. C. think is most salable, selling it when the market is good. That is the only time there will ever be a chance for the Government to make any profit on the good paper and getting the maximum return from the poorer paper. And, of course, selling the paper will not change the terms of the payment contract nor change its value.

I approach this question a little bit differently from the two gentlemen who have spoken. I was on the other end of the financial picture in 1933 and 1934. I had received a loan on my home from the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. I have never been a director of a building and loan corporation. I appreciated what that loan meant to me and my family at that time, and if we were in such a crisis again, I would be in favor of the Federal Government acting, but I call attention to the fact that today the Home Owners' Loan Corporation cannot make a single new loan. Its authority to make any new loans expired in 1936, so that all we have before us is the question of whether or not there shall be an orderly liquidation of the Home Owners' Corporation, to the extent provided by the reduction of the funds, making it at a time when we can sell some of this paper at a premium.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. If this amendment carries, it simply means that the taxpayers get penalized to the extent of approximately $300,000,000 by the savings and loan associations, banks, insurance companies, and other mortgage lending institutions for rescuing them from extreme difficulties—if not bankruptcy—7, 8, and 9 years ago. It is the old story of biting the hand that fed you.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the effect of the passage of this amendment will be a raid on the Treasury to the amount of $300,000,000?

Mr. BARRY. I said it would amount to that. I say if these loans are liquidated now, and the mortgage companies do not take the sick loans, but leave them to be liquidated by the Government, then it will cost the Government approximately $300,000,000. To try and take advantage of your Government after it has nursed you back to health or saved your life is not what one would expect from American mortgage lending institutions. But that is precisely what the institutions supporting this legislation propose to do.

They say forget that we once held these mortgages which were then in default for 2 and 3 years. Forget that we had no alternative except foreclosure in a rapidly sagging real-estate market. Forget that you bailed us out with good, sound Government securities. Forget that you spent tens of millions of dollars to nurse these mortgages back to health. Forget that you foreclosed on several hundred thousand homes that could not be saved and took a substantial loss. After all, it is only the taxpayer's money, and he is used to being a sucker. With all the tremendous sums being appropriated for the war effort, what is a mere three hundred million more?

These lending institutions know that the five-hundred-thousand-odd mortgages they would like to grab will offset considerably the loss that may be anticipated on the two-hundred-thousand-odd mortgages now kept alive by reason of the Barry-Mead Act, which I sponsored in 1939. They are not concerned about what will happen to those two-hundred-thousand-odd families when they are are again in the hands of private owners. They are simply impelled by an uncontrollable desire to raid the H. O. L. C. portfolio at the expense of their Government and the taxpayers. They know that H. O. L. C. eventually will liquidate itself, and, judging by the past, it will make the cost of its existence less expensive to the taxpayers as its end approaches.

If it is to be liquidated now or in the immediate future, it should be done so that the distressed mortgages are taken as well as the sound ones, and that the distressed ones are protected in some measure from unnecessary foreclosures by the lending companies, especially during the war period.

I, therefore, urge that the pending motion be defeated.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, these statistics of past years are very confusing. These historical recitations of the activities of previous years are interesting and somewhat sentimental. My committee helped set up this agency. Many of us would now like to discontinue it. There are other agencies of this sort that should be liquidated. We gave the H. O. L. C. $200,000,000 to get going, in 2-percent bonds, and because they could get 4½ percent or more for their loans they often declared they would probably not lose any money. That is what we heard for several years. Now we find they have probably spent the $200,000,000, which is represented by the foreclosed properties that they own.

This House must have some courage in these matters. Now is the time to liquidate real estate while the market is good and money plentiful. We know that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has not always been too patient with its mortgagors. They claim that if they dispose of the loans that they now have it will cost $54,000,000. If they should sell the real estate that they own, it would be at a loss of $53,000,000, or a total of $107,000,000. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY], who just addressed you, attempted to assure you that it would be at a loss of $331,000,000. To get at this amount of loss they state that if we let them go 5 years more they will have had $148,000,000 profit on the operating expenses. What an argument to prove a loss. That does not need further comment. The $107,000,000 is probably stretched to the limit of their imaginations.

Let us liquidate now and lose only $107,000,000. Five years later the real-estate market may be in a slump and we may lose five times as much.

What worries me is that the chairman of this committee is quoted in the hearings as saying that we should hold on to the good loans so as to be able to finance the bad ones. Why do you not let them take more new good loans so as to make a real profit? At their rate of interest they could easily get them. Should we change the law to let them increase rather than decrease their activities? Certainly we should not let them compete with private lending agencies by subsidy from the Government.

We set up many organizations and gave them authority to sell 2 percent bonds and loan out the money at 4½ and 5 percent. These would be in the red if they did not have that subsidy. Now these agencies are seeking good loans. They are actually competing with the banks and we are now hearing protests from the bankers. We favored the formation of these agencies with the full understanding that they would not take loans without assurance that the necessary credit could not be procured at the banks. I am sorry to read that the chairman of this committee said, "Hold on to those good loans so as to take care of the losses." If we are pursuing that policy, we will never get anywhere toward liquidation.

This amendment does not provide for immediate liquidation. It will simply give it impetus, as the sponsor of the amendment stated. It is a gradual withdrawal of funds to carry on, forcing a gradual liquidation. This is fair and proper. I do not want my Government to keep on taking loans simply because we can get money at 2 percent and loan it at 4½ percent and further compete by virtue of this subsidy. It is not a nice way to hide our losses. The emergency has passed. Do not let these fervid sentimental addresses influence us too much. They refer to the past unfortunate era. "I could also bore for water." But my tears must not roll during this session

of the Congress over conditions that do not now exist. We have the plain duty to liquidate now and repeal many of the emergency operations placed on the statute books.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] have both pointed out to you that this amendment does not provide for the entire liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. I want to say that is the weakness of the amendment. The fact of the matter is that, that when all of this talk was going on about liquidating this Corporation, we discussed it in the subcommittee, and not once have we had a single proposal where these building and loan associations have come in and offered to take over all of these loans. It is true that the amendment does not call for the entire liquidation of the Corporation, but what does it provide? Simply for the partial liquidation, and what part of that is going to be liquidated. In other words, this amendment will force the Corporation to liquidate a portion of the Corporation, and the only thing they can get these building and loan associations to take is the good loans, and then at the end of the year when the Home Owners' Loan Corporation comes back to us for an appropriation we have to appropriate more money for them to finance the bad loans.

The beginning of this whole thing was probably because of the fact that the building and loan association—and I will give them a lot of credit for seeing the danger of this—wanted to take over these good loans when they saw they were beginning to pay. There was a resolution passed by the United States Savings and Loan League in Chicago in 1942, in which they commended the Home Owners' Loan Corporation for the fine work they did when they first started out. Then they go on to say:

> With the steadily increasing improvement in economic conditions throughout the country, we feel that the time has now arrived when private capital is in a position to assist in and expedite the liquidation of the Corporation's affairs by purchasing and locally servicing a large proportion of the Corporation's present mortgage holdings.

They say they want to assist by servicing a portion. They do not say all. This resolution was sent to me by one of my constituents who is executive vice president of one of these associations. I wrote to him and told him we had discussed that matter in the committee, and that whenever these associations arranged a plan or proposed a plan to the committee or to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation whereby they would take over all of the obligations of the corporation and finance them and we could arrange for protection of the home owners, then I would go along with him. He wrote back and said:

> I have gone over your letter very carefully and I think, as you, that if the Federals take over this task that they should take it over in toto, for the reason, as I see it, that there would be no economy so far as the Government is concerned or the Loan Corporation in turning over current assets.

In other words, he agreed with my position. Let me tell you something that has happened—and these loan associations have a right to do this—but they have gone in and canvassed some of those who have borrowed from the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. They did not canvass those who were behind in their payments. They did not canvass any of these bad loans. The inducement they gave was not a lower rate of interest, it was a longer period and a larger loan. And in passing I may say to my friend from Illinois, who knows that I do not want the Government in business any more than he does, that some of these concerns that have been working this are in his own State, and through their methods throughout the country these associations have deprived the Home Owners' Loan Corporation of about $40,000,000 in interest alone on their good loans—that is the interest which they could be using to finance these bad loans.

I hope the members of this committee will not adopt this amendment at this time, because I do not believe it is sound financial policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that I find myself opposing the distinguished and capable gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], but I do. I have lived in Brooklyn, in New York City, all my life. I have witnessed there during the past 10 years what this Corporation has done for the people in that and the neighboring communities. While the case for this Corporation has been stated much better than I can state it, let me briefly review for you the operations of what is perhaps the largest home-financing program the world has even seen, an operation that in the short space of 3 years effected over 1,000,000 loans to the extent of three and one-half billions of dollars, and in a period of less than 7 years since the termination of its lending operations has, as the gentleman from Illinois has so well pointed out and as is supported by figures advanced by those who oppose his amendment, liquidated to the point that it has in an orderly, efficient, businesslike manner; liquidated upward of 55 percent of its bonded indebtedness, disposed of over 60 percent of the properties it took by way of foreclosure; has rehabilitated the mortgagors presently in its portfolio to the point that it has; a Corporation that in that period advanced to the savings and loan associatons who now want to skim the cream upward of $1,000,000,000, which savings and loan associations today are indebted to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in the sum of about $120,000,000 for advances made to them under the authority of the original Home Owners' Loan Act and the amendments thereto. This Corporation has accepted and has steadfastly observed the mandate of Congress and has proceeded to liquidate with a speed and dispatch the like of which no other governmental operation has done.

We should not only consider the taxpayers of the country for the loss they would sustain by a speedy and precipitous liquidation—and make no mistake, the liquidation of an operation of this size within 1 year would virtually be a forced liquidation—we should consider the effect upon the morale of the 800,000 home-owning mortgagors who would be faced with a return to the same type of private financial institution and mortgage supervision with which they were faced in 1933. I say to you members of the Committee in all seriousness that instead of our implying condemnation toward the operation of this Corporation we should rather today extend to them our vote of confidence and respect that they have, in a most efficient, businesslike manner completely rehabilitated, completely preserved, over 800,000 home units in this country. When the historians of the future point to the operations of this agency for the preservation of the American home and family during this great decade, they will say I am sure it was the greatest single influence that has preserved the American home and the American way of life.

I hope and I trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be voted down.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I admire the eloquent gentleman who just preceded me; he is always on the alert for his New York constituents; but his eloquence is of a little different brand than the eloquence of the figures I am about to present. The figures speak eloquently of the losses sustained in the State of New York on sales of this property between July 1, 1940, and June 30, 1941. Here are the figures for New York State: Properties acquired, 3,763; properties sold, 5,029. Sales price, $22,267,785; capital value, $37,746,034. The losses on these transactions total $15,478,249; the average loss per property is $3,077.80; and the selling expense—listen to this—the selling expense and broker's commission amounted to $1,448,085. The total loss amounted to $16,926,334. This makes an average loss per property of $3,365.75.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Not just now.

It is about time that the taxpayers of this country had some relief from this kind of financing. Some folks would have you believe that this agency is easy to get along with. Many of my constituents have found them cruel, cold, and heartless. They have been arbitrary and officious. I am for the Dirksen amendment—it is another step in the direction of putting our own house in order.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that there are only 46,000 of these mortgages that are in default more than 3 months and that that default of 3 months is something that is largely due to the machinery of bookkeeping in the organization?

Mr. BENDER. There is no question about that statement at all.

Mr. KEOGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. The gentleman went into great detail to give some figures with respect to the operations of this Corporation. Does the gentleman think that there is any private syndicate or private individual who would take the 35,000 pieces of property the Corporation now owns and pay any more than private purchasers in an orderly manner have paid over the years? Does the gentleman think so, as a matter of business?

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, if we are going to take this tremendous loss from month to month and year to year, we had better take it all at once and without shedding crocodile tears. No business would survive for very long if the same condition prevailed. We are throwing good money after bad.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a matter of fact, Mr. Fahey testified before our committee time and time again that the losses were inevitable. That is the word he used. He knows it and everybody else does. Yet they would hold onto and nurture this thing on the basis of a declining balance, while the cost of doing business goes up year after year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield the 4 minutes allotted me to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that may be done.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think we all have in mind that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was set up as an emergency measure to prevent the forced liquidation of homes during the depression and that it has served a very worthy purpose. When it was set up in 1933 we all anticipated that the Government would take a large loss. It was referred to as a relief measure, and it has always been considered a relief measure. We never anticipated a profit through the operations of the H. O. L. C. We have always anticipated a loss, and I think Mr. Fahey and his organization should be commended for keeping the loss down to as small an amount as they have.

I am sorry to see the controversy this afternoon apparently take sides as between the building and loan associations and the banks on the one side, including the insurance companies, and the H. O. L. C. on the other, because at no time during the operation of H. O. L. C. could not any of these financial institutions purchase these obligations under any terms which were satisfactory to the home-loan bank in the district in which they operated.

My worthy friend, the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], has on two or three occasions this afternoon indicated that there would be forced liquidations if this amendment was adopted. The gentleman from New Mexico referred to forced liquidations, the two gentlemen from New York referred to forced liquidations or forced sales. The impression might have been created on the floor that these thousands of pieces of property would flood the market all of a sudden and that the prices would be forced down and the present owners lose tremendously.

Mr. Chairman, I have been in contact with a man in the Government, one who has the confidence of every member of the Banking and Currency Committee and deserves the confidence of every Member of the Congress, and he told me as late as last night that the purposes of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation have been served and that it should be liquidated as soon as possible. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] yesterday admitted that the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation is a very salutary objective if it were practical. So the whole thing turns on whether it is practical at the present time.

We have set up home-loan banks throughout the United States—all within this one roof—the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. They are all in the same building; they are all in the same house; they are all living together; they were set up to make it easy for banks, insurance companies, building and loan associations, and Federal savings and loan associations to get advances on real-estate paper; they were set up for purposes, if necessary, of advancing loans to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Now, in the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, do not think for a moment that we are going to throw these homes on the market all at once. This amendment should be passed to force an orderly liquidation through the home-loan banks of this Nation.

These properties will be turned over to the home-loan banks and the personnel of the home-loan banks today, and they have virtually nothing else to do because the banks are not doing much, could handle the entire matter. It is not practical for the banks to discount paper with them at the present time. These employees have little or nothing to do and they could liquidate the H. O. L. C. loans just as orderly and with the same limitation on time and the extension of time and opportunity as the Home Owners' Loan Corporation does today. All Mr. Fahey has to do is to contact his own board, of which he is chairman, and say, "I want an advance from the home-loan banks of this Nation to liquidate the H. O. L. C.," and every bit of this paper, good and bad, will be transferred to the Federal home-loan banks for orderly liquidation under the terms of the insurance and the mortgage as it now exists. These Federal home-loan banks are authorized to extend these mortgages under even more favorable terms than the mortgagors have today. They are authorized to reduce the interest, they are authorized to continue even beyond the limits of the Barry-Mead amendment the terms by which these mortgages might be amortized.

What is more desirable than that we turn over to the war effort, if we want to put this on a war basis, the 3,800 employees of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and let the employees in the Home Loan banks throughout the Nation function as the liquidators of this corporation, thereby not only giving the home-loan banks an opportunity to return to the Treasury $5,000,000 each of capital which the Treasury has subscribed to the Federal home-loan banks, but also save the taxpayers the administrative cost of employing 3,800 people in Washington and elsewhere. For these reasons impetus should be given to this movement which is recognized as essential by every sound-thinking man in the Government, including the gentleman to whom I have referred. I wish I might quote him directly, but I am not going to. He has had more to do with this situation than any other individual in Washington.

I would not have taken this attitude had he not assured me that it could be done in an orderly manner with a saving of hundreds of thousands if not millions of dollars to the taxpayers by turning the H. O. L. C. over to the Federal home-loan banks for orderly liquidation.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact there are millions of dollars not only in the hands of banks and trust companies all over this country but in the hands of individuals whose owners are unable to loan them and would be glad to invest in these securities?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Too much idle money is lying around. The banks, insurance companies, building and loan associations, and Federal savings and loan associations do not know where to go to invest their money; yet we have this agency continuing in competition with private industry.

What is the result? Instead of the depositors in banks and the subscribers to shares in building and loan associations getting a fair return on their deposits, in some instances they are getting nothing on their deposits and in many instances are not getting more than 1 percent because the Government is in direct competition with them. Mr. Chairman, you do not hurt anyone but the deposi-

tors by continuing these agencies in competition with private industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, one of the prime purposes of this amendment is to get the Government out of business and out of competition with private enterprise. A further purpose is to rid the Federal pay roll of a lot of people with whose services we can very well dispense at a saving of millions of dollars to American taxpayers.

I rode home last night with a man who heretofore has been in the real-estate loan business. He told me he had no business now. He said the Federal Government with its cheap money and through the agency of the very kind of thing we now propose to liquidate had put him out of business.

I have recently talked to many people in my district who have been paid outstanding loans on which they have been drawing interest, and they can find no opportunity to invest their money in loans on real estate for the reason that agencies like this have put them out of business and rendered them unable to make profitable investment of their money.

When this proposal is made, there are some here whose heads are transformed almost into fountains of tears and they want to revert to a period when money was hard to get and when this Corporation was set up virtually as a relief agency. But conditions now are wholly changed. When do you want to sell, anyhow? Is it not when somebody wants to buy, and when the purchaser has money with which to make the purchase? People are looking for just the sort of investment that will be made available by the liquidation of this governmental agency.

It has been said that there are some bad loans and that they probably cannot be sold. The average man, even though he wants to sell his horses, would not expect to sell a sick horse.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I understood the gentleman from New Mexico to say that in the case of the average loan the owner had about one-third equity. That is a salable loan. They should not take losses because banking concerns and building and loan associations will pay for such loans.

Mr. JENNINGS. They are eager to get these loans. Now, in this floodtime of industry, when everybody has work who wants to work, it would seem to me that a person who owns a piece of property should be able to make substantial payments on the mortgage, and that there should be but few foreclosures.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Is it not a further object of this amendment to recapture to Congress the direction of liquidation rather than to leave it in the hands of the men in charge?

Mr. JENNINGS. That is probably a good reason for adopting this amendment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. How does the gentleman feel on the subject of private corporations taking over the farm mortgages throughout the country which are paying only 3½ percent? Would the gentleman favor doing that?

Mr. JENNINGS. I am in favor of getting the Government out of business. It has been in competition with its citizens long enough, to the eternal loss and destruction of the taxpayers of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, first I want to tell you what the situation is with reference to these loans that are in arrears. The only loans in arrears are 41,000 loans running up to 12 months and 3,300 that are in default more than 12 months. Of the total of 1,700,000 loans, only 5½ percent are in arrears more than 3 months. Every one of those loans is probably in arrears at least 15 days and maybe 30 days less than they are reported to be, because the way this organization does business their machinery takes so long to work that they report loans in arrears that are really not in arrears. Of the 230,000 loans reported in arrears, 185,000 are less than 3 months in arrears.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Does not the gentleman know that the 230,000 loans he says are only 3 months in arrears have already been spread 10 years by the Barry-Mead Act, and they now have 25 years in which to pay out?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I understand that, but these loans have been reduced about 30 percent now and most of them are good mortgages that are salable; all except a very few. There may be 50,000 mortgages that may have to be liquidated by the organization. There is $39,000,000 worth of real estate they have taken over that they have not gotten rid of.

There are about $39,000,000 of real estate that they have to get rid of. Their problems are entirely restricted to that 5½ percent of their total loans, which come to less than $50,000, and that $39,000,000 of property that they have on hand. It is absolutely ridiculous for us to be carrying $12,000,000 a year to look after that property, and to look after those loans. They could be serviced by the banks in the localities, or by individuals, who would take the mortgages over without any extra expense to these organizations. Why we should not take advantage of our opportunities to do that, and put this thing on a business basis, I cannot understand, and I do not believe that anyone can explain. If we go ahead and do this and require them to turn over these mortgages which are all good enough now so that people could carry them and which are practically all—all except 5½ percent—right up to date, there would not be any reason at all why we could not get by with it all right. They could liquidate this thing and not have to have a pay roll of over a million dollars a year while doing it. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FITZPATRICK rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 4 minutes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; I yield to the lady from Illinois for a brief question.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The point is made that there ought to be an orderly liquidation. I would like to understand the amendment. They have a whole year in which to liquidate it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; but a year is not a sufficient length of time. They should be permitted to do it in an orderly way, as they are at the present time.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Is it not true that any piece of paper now owned by the H. O. L. C. can be picked up by any loan association any time the purchaser desires?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is correct. When the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was first inaugurated, they made loans to 1,017,821, in the amount of $3,480,000,000. At that time foreclosures in this country were at the rate of 1,000 per day. Our Government not only went to the rescue of the home owners but it went to the rescue of the building and loan associations, together with the banks throughout the country. At that time they claimed at least 95 or 98 percent of all of these mortgages taken over by the H. O. L. C. would have been foreclosed if the Government had not intervened. Yet today the building and loan associations and the banks throughout the country want to take over the good loans now held by the H. O. L. C. and have the Corporation retain the bad ones, notwithstanding the fact that the Government took over all loans, good and bad. Today, these loan associations are looking for good paper of about 500,000 to 600,000 mortgages now in fine condition.

You will find in the committee hearings that there have been 250,000 loans extended under the Mead-Barry amendment from 15 to 25 years. Without any question these mortgages will be foreclosed if this amendment is adopted, and the taxpayers of this country will lose anywhere from $250,000,000 to $450,000,000. What for? To turn over to the building and loan associations of this country those sound mortgages, now held by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. As it has been stated, the number of foreclosures in 1937 were 68,880, and in 1941 there were 11,498 foreclosures, while

in 1942 they were down to 2,808. From these figures you can see that the H. O. L. C. was gradually getting into a fine financial condition and they would eventually be able to liquidate in an orderly way, which they are doing at the present time. I hold in my hand a bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] now before the Banking and Currency Committee to liquidate the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

I am in favor of liquidation providing the building and loan associations throughout the country will take over all the mortgages now held by the H. O. L. C. and not just 60 percent, which is the amount of the good mortgages. I am going to ask my friend whether or not it would be more advisable to take over the entire amount of mortgages.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a matter of fact they made overtures to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to take all these in, and bid them on the market, but Mr. Fahey would not agree.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman get a statement from the building and loan associations that they will take them all over? If he will, I will support it, but at the present time to make the record clear, they are willing to take over only the sound loans. Because of the number of good loans taken over by the building and loan associations, the H. O. L. C. has lost about $40,000,000 in the past year.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed by the committee, but there remains 4 minutes for the gentleman from Virginia. If he does not consume them the gentleman's request will be put. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Last Friday night I listened with great interest to the radio address delivered in Pennsylvania by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, and I assure you his remarks were worth listening to.

He stated that the program of the Republican Party is to take care of all of the workers of our country. He went into great details as to their plans, stating their purpose is to help and do justice to the workers of the country, also the farmers, the small business men, and last but not least the capitalists, and they in turn would all work in cooperation as one big family, and after the war every man and woman seeking work would find a position. He certainly pictured the country as a paradise. However, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, 5 days later the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a member of the Republican Party, offers an amendment to liquidate the H. O. L. C., and from the best information I can get if this amendment is adopted, 200,000 to 300,000 home owners will lose their homes through foreclosure and the Government will lose from $300,000,000 to $450,000,000. Surely that is not in keeping with the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], because if this amendment is adopted two or three hundred thousand workers in this country will lose their homes.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. In regard to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], about the building and loan companies offering to take over the assets of the Corporation, I think at one time they did make an offer to take over all the assets of the Corporation and issue back to the Government shares which the Government would finance for 10 years.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The gentleman is correct. I understand the building and loan associations have here in Washington a lobbyist receiving a salary of $20,000 per annum. His job is to send out circulars to the different building and loan associations throughout the country requesting them to contact their Congressman and try to have him support the Dirksen amendment so that the good mortgages will be turned over to the building and loan associations and banks; which loans the Government bailed out at the time the H. O. L. C. was established. If this is a sample of the Republican Party's program I cannot see that it agrees with the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] in his recent radio address. I hope this amendment will be defeated and we will save the homes of many Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were ayes 141 and noes 136.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The request comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The request comes too late. The Clerk will read.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. There was so much confusion in the room that the vote as announced by the Chair was not heard. I ask unanimous consent that the Chair repeat the vote at this time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote was announced, and the Chair rather hesitated before announcing that the amendment was agreed to. The Chair will restate, for the information of the gentleman, the vote was 141 yeas and 136 noes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY

Salaries and expenses: In addition to the amounts available (which shall be transferred to this authorization) for the payment of the administrative expenses of the Federal Public Housing Authority in carrying out the provisions of section 201 of the act of September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 872), the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1521), and the acts of March 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 14), May 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 197) and December 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 810) relating to war housing, including temporary shelter, and in carrying out the provisions of sections 3 of the acts of June 29, 1936 (40 U. S. C. 423 and 433), relating, respectively, to the operation and maintenance of the projects transferred pursuant to Executive Order No. 7732 of October 27, 1937, and of the projects transferred pursuant to paragraphs 1 (g) and 6 of Executive Order No. 9070 of February 24, 1942, not to exceed $3,400,000 of the funds of said Authority derived from its operations under the act of September 1, 1937, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1401), shall be available for all necessary administrative expenses of said Authority, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, for legal or other special services, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; payment, when specifically authorized by the Commissioner, of (1) the actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $5,000 in connection with payment of $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence to persons serving, while away from their homes and without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Authority and (2) expenses of attendance (not to exceed $5,000) at meetings or conventions concerned with the work of the Authority; printing and binding; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference and periodicals; and photographing equipment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this paragraph is vague and nonspecific as to the amount of appropriation, and ask to be heard on the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will indicate the point of order more particularly.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe I will have to be heard on it. The language in the bill apparently appropriates——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman indicate the language to which he directs the point of order?

Mr. MONRONEY. I make the point of order that the language contained in line 3, page 46, is nonspecific as to the amount, and I ask to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, in making this point of order, I am merely trying to carry out what is in my understanding the obligations of the Congress in making these appropriations. I take

this paragraph as an example of abuses that have grown up under a system where Congress loses the authority to control the purse strings of the governmental agencies. It is my claim that this paragraph is not in order, since the appropriation contained therein is not specific as to the amount it seeks to appropriate. The only figures shown in the bill purport to appropriate "not to exceed $3,400,000 of the funds of said Authority."

I hold that this is vague, indefinite and misleading, and nonspecific, in that the actual intent of the appropriating committee is to give the agency a total of $12,400,000. But, in fact, even this amount is not the amount that they are permitted to expend by the language of this paragraph.

On pages 13 and 14 of the report accompanying the bill is this language:

The committee has recommended an authorization of $3,400,000, which is a reduction of $100,000 under the Budget figure. In addition to the sum herein made available the Federal Public Housing Authority will have access to $9,000,000 for administrative expenses in connection with funds for war housing heretofore provided by allocations from emergency funds for the President or by appropriations made available by the Congress.

I hold that this amount of $9,000,000 to come under the interpretation of precedents as follows:

CANNON'S PRECEDENTS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, VOLUME 7, PAGE 228 (1936)

1156. Reappropriations of unexpended balances to be in order on appropriation bill must specify amounts and from what previous appropriation remaining, and be for similar objects.

On January 30, 1915,[1] the naval appropriation bill was under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, when the following paragraph was read:

"Aeronautics: The sum of $1,000,000 is hereby reappropriated, out of the total unobligated balances of all annual appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and made available for aeronautics, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for procuring, producing, constructing, operating, preserving, storing, and handling aircraft and appurtenances, maintenance of aircraft stations, experimental work in development of aviation for naval purposes, and such other aeronautical purposes as the Secretary of the Navy may deem proper."

Mr. James R. Mann, of Illinois, made a point of order against the paragraph.

The Chairman [2] rules: "The point of order is made by the gentleman from Illinois. It appears that it has heretofore been decided that a reappropriation of an unexpended balance for an object authorized by law may be made on an appropriation bill for a similar object."

On February 12, 1897, the Post Office appropriation bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole when the paragraph was read:

"The Postmaster General is authorized to apply to the payment of the salaries of letter carriers for the fiscal year 1897 the sum of $23,000, being an unexpended balance of $13,500 of the appropriation for the current fiscal year for street letter boxes, posts, and pedestals, and an unexpended balance of $9,500 of the appropriation for the current fiscal year for package boxes."

On February 14, 1907, when the naval appropriation bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole, this proviso was read:

"*And provided further*, That the unexpended balances under appropriations 'Provisions, Navy, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1905 and 1906,' are hereby reappropriated for 'Provisions, Navy, for fiscal year ending June 30, 1908'."

It was held that that was in order, but in this case the reappropriations asked for do not point out from what appropriations this reappropriation is asked, nor the specific amounts; nor does it appear that this appropriation is for a similar object. Therefore, the Chair, differentiating these decisions which hold that a reappropriation is in order, is constrained to arrive at the conclusion that when the reappropriation is asked for it must specify from what appropriation, heretofore made, the reappropriation is asked, and the specific amounts to be reappropriated. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, it will be argued, I am sure, that the report satisfies this requirement, but with that I cannot agree. We have here an appropriation bill making the appropriation for "salaries and expenses," and in the much involved language and citations carried in the paragraph, even a Philadelphia lawyer cannot tell what amounts we are giving to this agency unless referring to the report.

Suppose, for example, it was the desire of this House to reduce the agency by 50 percent of their funds of $12,400,000. It would be impossible to reach any of these $9,000,000 in funds so being transferred, reappropriated, or given to the agency.

Throughout the precedents run the same theme that Congress should make specific appropriations in its bills and dating back to Jefferson's time it has been recognized that indefinite appropriations transgressed good governmental policy.

HINDS' PRECEDENTS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, VOLUME 4 (1907)

SEC. 4032. The creation and history of the Committee on Appropriations, section 3 of rule XI

Reference to the establishment of the system of specific appropriations.

(7) On March 12, 1828, Mr. J. S. Barbour, of Virginia, precipitated a discussion of a proposition that the appointment of the disbursing and accounting officers of the Treasury should be taken from the President and be lodged in the House. This discussion (1st sess., 20th Cong. Journal, pp. 406, 436; debates, pp. 1954, 1963, 1971, 1998) reviewed somewhat the usages of the Government and attributed the habit of making specific appropriations to a suggestion of President Jefferson. This suggestion was probably contained in the following paragraph of his first message, December 8, 1801 (see vol. I, p. 329, of Richardson's Messages and Papers):

"In our care, too, of the public contributions intrusted in our direction it would be prudent to multiply barriers against their dissipation by appropriating specific sums to every specific purpose susceptible of definition; by disallowing all applications of money varying from the appropriation in object or transcending it in amount; by reducing the undefined field of contingencies and thereby circumscribing discretionary powers over money, and by bringing back to a single department all accountabilities for money, where the examinations may be prompt, efficacious, and uniform."

On February 3, 1830, the Committee on Retrenchment made a report recommending that the useful practice of specific appropriations be applied to the contingent fund of the two Houses. (Rept. No. 150, 1st sess., 21st Cong.)

Further, I wish to call attention to the Chairman to the language in this paragraph and to point out that in no way is any ceiling or limitation as to the amount this agency can spend on its administrative salaries and expenses, either in Washington or in its several regional offices. Bear in mind that these appropriations mentioned herein are not used for the management or operation of these defense housing properties on the sites of the buildings. All are for the Washington overhead and their regional office overhead.

The language I object to is as follows:

Salaries and expenses: In addition to the amounts available (which shall be transferred to this authorization) for the payment of the administrative expenses of the Federal Public Housing Authority in carrying out the provisions of—

And so forth. It enumerates specifically the act of October 14, 1940. Reading section 6 of that Lanham Act we find this language:

SEC. 6. Moneys derived from rental or operation of property acquired or constructed under provisions of this act shall be returned to the appropriation authorized by this act, and shall be available for expenses of operation and maintenance including administrative expenses in connection therewith, and the unobligated balance of the moneys so deposited shall be covered into the Treasury at the end of each fiscal year as miscellaneous receipts.

Thus, I believe you can see, that all the rentals from these defense housing projects, amounting soon to millions of dollars, will become available, without limitation by any act of Congress, for the payment of overhead or expenses incurred in connection with the "holding company" activities of the Federal Public Housing Authority.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, reading this section 6, and the language of the paragraph in the appropriation bill, appropriating "in addition to the amounts available—which shall be transferred to this authorization—for the payment of the administrative expenses," and so forth," you can readily see that this is in no way anything but a blank check plus the $3,400,000 which is specifically spelled out in the bill.

The purposes of sound legislation require, Mr. Chairman, that such vague, indefinite, and nonspecific paragraphs as these in appropriation bills be discontinued, so that Members of the Congress may have before them, in "showcase" style, if you please, the amounts of money that are being appropriated for the salaries and expenses of these agencies.

I respectfully ask that the Chair sustain this point of order and permit the Appropriations Committee to offer a substitute, limiting this agency to the amount that it intends it should have.

[1] 3d. sess., 63d Cong., RECORD, p. 2750.

[2] James Hay, of Virginia, chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Very briefly, if the Chair will permit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The language is the customary language which is used in appropriation bills where we authorize the use of funds already under the control of an agency. The language authorizes the use of $3,400,000 of the funds of this agency. If there is anything indefinite about it it would be very easy to strike out the words "not to exceed." These words are superfluous anyway.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Vriginia. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. This paragraph does make an appropriation of $12,400,000; does it not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; but it authorizes specifically the use of $3,400,000 for this specific purpose.

Mr. MONRONEY. But how does Congress know, Mr. Chairman, how much we are actually appropriating unless some Member happens to pick it up in the report or in the Budget recommendation?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the language is sufficiently specific on this point. It simply states "$3,400,000 of these funds may be used"; and they cannot use any more than that.

Mr. MONRONEY. But they will use $12,400,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the point of order ought to be overruled.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes a point of order against language appearing on page 46 of the bill, particularly the language in line 3 reading:

Not to exceed $3,400,000 of the funds.

This language involved a reappropriation. The point is made that the amount to be reappropriated exceeds the amount of funds in the hands of the agency.

The proposition advanced by the gentleman from Oklahoma has been passed upon previously. Among other rulings was one by Speaker Gillett in which he announced the proposition that a reappropriation of an unexpended balance may be amended by a proposition making a direct appropriation for the same purpose.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Annual contributions: For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1410), $5,750,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1943: *Provided*, That except for payments required on contracts entered into prior to April 18, 1940, no part of this appropriation shall be available for payment to any public-housing agency for expenditure in connection with any low-rent housing project, unless the public-housing agency shall have adopted regulations prohibiting as a tenant of any such project by rental or occupancy any person other than a citizen of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise again to ask the chairman of the committee a few questions about this $5,750,000. As I understand, the total amount for annual Federal contributions is $11,600,000. Is that correct?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct; yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is based on construction amounting in terms of dollars to $448,000,000. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the average annual Federal contribution rate that is paid out of the Treasury to cover that?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know the average; I know the maximum.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But I want to know the average annual contribution rate upon which this appropriation is based.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I cannot give the average. I am not sure whether it is in the hearings or not; I do not have it at hand, at any rate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe there is any such thing as an average annual rate, because it shifts from $6,000,000 to $15,000,000. It is the difference between the ascertained economic rent and what a family in one of these dwellings can pay. What the rate may be and what the family might be able to pay varies from place to place; it shuttles up and down.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It does not shuttle up and down like that. These contracts are made, I believe, for a term of 5 or 10 years; I have forgotten which.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The average annual contribution that the gentleman refers to will vary every time a group of houses is completed. Every time new construction is undertaken the amount of the contribution changes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the rate, then; what is the annual contribution rate upon which this request is made?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman will permit, it varies in different sections of the country. In some sections they have an economic rent of $4 a room, and in others it is $1 a room. I could not give the gentleman the figures because there are none on that basis. There are figures in the record showing what it is for the different localities.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the average, now, for all the projects in this $448,000,000 construction; that is what I want to get, the average rate?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not sure that the average rate either on a unit basis or for the entire country has been calculated. I know I have not seen any figures along that line.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The appropriation is not arrived at in that manner, I may say to the gentleman from Ohio. I do not think therefore that anyone has ever even thought of the complicated process of trying to figure out an average, or ever thought that to do so would be very helpful. We have authorized a general amount for annual contributions, and those amounts are appropriated as and when they are needed and the amounts are figured on the basis of the best information we can get as to the differential.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. These annual Federal contribution contracts are written and there must be some average figure for all the projects. This is rather important.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I cannot give the gentleman the information he seeks, I am sorry. It did not occur to the committee that those figures were particularly important.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The disparity would not be particularly important anyway because these funds are earmarked for contributions and if they are not needed they revert to the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

For salaries and expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia, of the Securities and Exchange Commission in performing the duties imposed by law or in pursuance of law, including employment of experts when necessary; contract stenographic reporting services; purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, directories, and periodicals; not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase of newspapers; travel expenses, including the expense of attendance, when specifically authorized by the Commission, at meetings concerned with the work of the Securities and Exchange Commission; garage rental; foreign postage; mileage and witness fees; rental of equipment; operation, maintenance, and repair of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle; and purchase of rubber gloves; $4,000,000.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, the reading clerk got past the matter of the securities and exchange section and I ask unanimous consent to go back to that section for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Illinois has an amendment in advance of the amendment I wish to offer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I proposed to offer an amendment but I withheld it.

Mr. DISNEY. Does the gentleman intend to offer it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DISNEY: Page 48, line 3, insert a colon, and add the following: "No part of this appropriation shall be used to promulgate or enforce any rule or regulations known as the proposed rule or regulation F-9 and F-10, and providing in substance (1) the engineers' reports shall be mandatory, (2) require the disclosure of the cost of purchase price, and (3) an abridgment of the right to appoint an agent, all with reference to the sale of oil and gas royalties and lease under the jurisdiction of the Oil and Gas Division of the Securities and Exchange Commission."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve a point of order against the amendment until I

have an opportunity to examine the language of the amendment.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, down in my State where men make a living from the royalty business and the sale of oil and gas leases, this matter has reached an almost revolutionary state. There are just as many campaign managers against us down there as there are men engaged in the oil and gas business and royalty business. Regulations F–9 and F–10 are what has excited them. I could not properly represent my district unless I called the attention of the Committee to the situation. I realize, of course, that legislation in the nature of substantive legislation is not proper in an appropriation bill, but this is sometimes the only way to get at these things. These bureaus use their nuisance value to drive people out of business, which is exactly what is going on down in my country and in the other oil States which you gentlemen represent.

One of the things that is required under this F–9 and F–10—not yet put into force—I would not be frank with the Committee if I did not tell you that—is that an engineer's report shall be mandatory before an oil or gas lease or royalty can be sold or offered for sale at a public offering. An immense number of documents have to be filled out before the most trivial lease or royalty could be sold. The object is to prevent fraud, but fraud is often really operated by the department against the legitimate businessmen.

The next extraordinary thing that is proposed in these two documents is the requirement that they must advise exactly what the property costs before they can sell it. A new innovation in American institutions is the spectacle of a bureau taking that power; that is, the power to require one before selling to advise the buyer the cost price of the article or subject matter being sold except large public issues of stocks or bonds. Of course that drives these smaller business men out of business.

This procedure is the only way to get at this matter involved in these two documents. Of course, unless we pass some inhibition against their being placed in the regulations, these features will be put in the regulations and become the law of the land, to the complete exclusion and the putting out of business of those men who make a living in that way.

Another thing is that these orders require, even though the agent shall operate only within the State, that the Bureau hopes to direct supervision over who the agent shall be and prescribe rules for his conduct. I have never seen bureaucracy run so rampant as in the Securities and Exchange Commission, especially with reference to this matter and the so-called proxy rule. I was taken by surprise when the Dirksen amendment was not offered to dispose of the proxy rule of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Let me give you this illustration. I was talking the other evening with a man high in the councils of the Government and with another gentleman now in private business of importance who has been a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission. They were raising veritable hades about the way the Securities and Exchange Commission was handling things. I said, "I have sometimes almost come to the stage of voting to abolish the Securities and Exchange Commission and place its functions in the Federal Trade Commission or Commerce." "Oh, no," they both said. One of them, as I told you, was formerly a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission. "No; don't do that. That is not the proper way to do it. Refuse to let them have the money to operate this way."

I inquired, "What is the trouble down there?" They replied, "The thing is being run by a lot of men down in the divisions who want to increase their authority and make themselves more important and more powerful."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I continue to reserve my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. I have placed this matter before you just as it is. This little bureau, the oil and gas division, composed of three or four of the nicest fellows who ever lived, have acquired a thirst for power that makes any chronic alcoholic blush with shame, and they are going to continue to do that.

Good citizens, men in whom you would repose confidence, whom you would accept as social and business friends, are being pushed and crowded out of a legitimate business down in those oil States.

You heard me a few weeks ago tell you that we are running into a national oil shortage. Under the power these men in the bureaus have assumed, the drilling of wildcat wells is tremendously hampered by the restrictions that are placed around the legitimate operation of that business. Men do not endure those things forever. They finally quit and go into some other business. Leases and royalties have to be routed to Washington and go through all types and kinds of red tape, and businessmen wind up finally so disgusted not only with the business in which they are engaged, curbed as it is, but with their Government itself. Nobody can dodge the blame. The blame rests right here in the Congress.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Is it not true that in some instances it would be absolutely impossible under any circumstances to furnish information about the property you are about to sell, for the simple reason that perchance it has never been studied by any living character?

Mr. DISNEY. Of course, and who ever heard in America, except in sundry bureaus, of your being required to state publicly in the offering sheet how much the property cost you? You do not do that when the profit motive is involved, and we still operate under the capitalistic system.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am in thorough accord with what the gentleman has said. I proposed here yesterday that the S. E. C. be transferred to the Department of Commerce so it will have a little stability, a little bit better direction, and a little more seasoning for some of these young fellows who see so much on one side and not on the other.

Mr. DISNEY. What became of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is legislative in character, and could not be offered here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the amendment is so indefinite it would be impossible for the Chair or anyone else to know whether this is a limitation on anything or what it limits. The gentleman says the funds herein are not to be used for the purpose of enforcing certain orders known as so-and-so and so-and-so. Even after listening to our friend, to whom we always listen with pleasure and profit, those wayfarers who, like myself, are not versed in the parlance of the Securities and Exchange Commission are not able to determine what the amendment means.

Mr. DISNEY. Why not take a chance on it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not like to take a chance.

Mr. DISNEY. You are taking no chances.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. My experience has been that when we legislate in haste without knowing what we are doing, and we often do that, we do not get very far. I think that on its merits this ought not to be considered now, but aside from that, it is subject to a point of order, and I insist on the point of order.

Mr. DISNEY. May I inquire when such a matter could be considered? That is where the futility of these things comes in.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is a legislative committee of this House that set up and established the Securities and Exchange Commission. It is a splendid committee, headed by the distinguished gentleman from California, who succeeded our distinguished Speaker, who helped to write this law. I am sure the doors of that committee are open to my friend any time he wishes to enter.

Mr. DISNEY. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this amendment puts a limitation on the use of the funds appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The Chair is ready to rule.

The appropriation under consideration involves $4,000,000 for salaries and other expenses of the Securities and Exchange Commission. A lump sum is thus appropriated. The practice has grown up of undertaking to limit these lump-sum appropriations by preventing expenditures for particular purposes. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] undertakes to limit this appropriation by providing that no part of this appropriation shall be used to promulgate or enforce the three rules and regulations mentioned in his amendment. The Chair holds that the amendment constitutes a limitation and overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia) there were—ayes 161, noes 98.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE ALLEY DWELLING AUTHORITY

For the maintenance and operation of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Authority Act, $12,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAGNUSON: On page 53, line 14, insert a new title:

"NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING COUNCIL

"For all salaries, expenses, including post-war planning research, there shall be appropriated for the National Resources Planning Council the sum of $415,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph on the ground that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I reserve the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that it is not in order at this point of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment at this point although I appreciate that it is technically subject to a point of order. However, I would feel somewhat derelict, as would other Members I know, if we did not make the record clear at this time regarding this body. Of course, the Committee on Appropriations knocked out the entire appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board. I stated the other day that many of us deplored that fact. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] stated to the committee that the main reason for denying this group the appropriation was that they were conducting a lot of duplicate work with other departments. It is true that there is a certain amount of planning in every department of the Government, and it is also true that there had never been a clearinghouse for this work. I happen to know, and I know some other Members who appreciate the work of this Board. I know something about the work that the Planning Board has done, and my amendment does not call for the full amount asked. This would merely set up a skeleton organization to continue the work. It seems to me that it would be false economy on the part of the House to cut out a board of this kind and deny this. I think we should set up some comprehensive scheme for not only planning at this time, but for post-war planning.

In the field of jobs planning alone we will spend millions of dollars after this war is over for the returned soldiers and sailors to guarantee them jobs, and it seems to me that we should have somebody to do that, and no one as yet has questioned the integrity of the fine work that this National Resources Planning Board has undertaken and done. They have done a studied, intelligent job, and it has been a source of research for Members of the House and members of the committees of the House. I offer the amendment at this time so that the House may know that the appropriation for this Board was stricken out entirely. It seems to me that it is false economy, and the country should know it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am a member of the subcommittee, and I voted against cutting out the Board.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, may I express my agreement with the idea that the gentleman from Washington is presenting?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the people of this country ought to know that there has been a body working on planning, whether we disagree with its findings or not. I have not yet found anyone on either side who will criticize the fine work this Board has done.

Mr. TABER. The work of that Board has been useless and it has been a menace to the country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to have the gentleman express his opinion.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Did the gentleman read the RECORD today?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Did the gentleman read any part of my remarks? If he had, he would have found that I was against it.

Mr. MURDOCK. In general, I am in favor of the gentleman's proposition, although it may be subject to a point of order now, and I want to go on record as being against the deletion earlier of a similar appropriation. If there ever was a time in the history of America calling for careful planning for national safety, that time is now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for having reserved the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois insist upon the point of order?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment to insert a new title in the bill, as follows:

NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING COUNCIL

For all salaries, expenses, including post-war planning, research, there shall be appropriated for the National Resources Planning Council the sum of $415,000.

The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no law warranting this appropriation. No law has been pointed out to the Chair, and the Chair is aware of no statute that would authorize the appropriation. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: For all salaries and expenses of the Veterans' Administration, including the expenses of maintenance and operation of medical, hospital, and domiciliary services of the Veterans' Administration, in carrying out the duties, powers, and functions devolving upon it pursuant to the authority contained in the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to consolidate and coordinate governmental activities affecting war veterans," approved July 3, 1930 (38 U. S. C. 11–11f), and any and all laws for which the Veterans' Administration is now or may hereafter be charged with administering, $117,677,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $3,500 of this amount shall be available for expenses, except membership fees, of employees, detailed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to attend meetings of associations for the promotion of medical science or for the betterment of insurance practices and conventions of organized war veterans: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available also for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including traveling expenses; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field, including actual expenses of subsistence or per diem allowance in lieu thereof; furnishing and laundering of such wearing apparel as may be prescribed for employees in the performance of their official duties; purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; for passenger-carrying and other motor vehicles, including purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of same, including not more than two passenger automobiles for general administrative use of the central office in the District of Columbia; and notwithstanding any provisions of law to the contrary, the Administrator is authorized to utilize Government-owned automotive equipment in transporting children of Veterans' Administration employees located at isolated stations to and from school under such limitations as he may by regulation prescribe; and notwithstanding any provisions of law to the contrary, the Administrator is authorized to expend not to exceed $2,000 of this appropriation for actuarial services pertaining to the Government life-insurance fund, to be obtained by contract, without obtaining competition, at such rates of compensation as he may determine to be reasonable; for allotment and transfer to the Federal Security Agency (Public Health Service), the War, Navy, and Interior Departments, for disbursement by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration, including minor repairs and

improvements of existing facilities under their jurisdiction necessary to such care and treatment; for expenses incidental to the maintenance and operation of farms; for recreational articles and facilities at institutions maintained by the Veterans' Administration; for administrative expenses incidental to securing employment for war veterans; for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration accruing during the year for which this appropriation is made or prior fiscal years: *Provided further*, That the appropriations herein made for the care and maintenance of veterans in hospitals or homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration shall be available for the purchase of tobacco to be furnished, subject to such regulations as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall prescribe, to veterans receiving hospital treatment or domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration hospitals or homes: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for continuing aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled volunteer soldiers and sailors, in conformity with the act approved August 27, 1888 (24 U. S. C. 134), as amended, for those veterans eligible for admission to Veterans' Administration facilities for hospital or domiciliary care: *Provided further*, That the Administrator is hereby authorized to employ medical consultants for duty on such terms as he may deem advisable and without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the purchase directly from sources authorized by the common carriers of printed reduced fare requests for use by veterans when traveling at their own expense from or to Veterans' Administration facilities.

No part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home, or for the purchase of any hospital or home; and not more than $2,500,000 of this appropriation may be used to repair, alter, improve, or provide facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and the purchase of materials.

For printing and binding for the Veterans' Administration, including all its bureaus and functions located in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, $200,000.

Pensions: For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities, and allowances, now authorized under any act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon, or which may hereafter be authorized, including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities, the administration of which is now or may hereafter be placed in the Veterans' Administration, accruing during the fiscal year for which this appropriation is made or in prior fiscal years, $493,000,000, to be immediately available.

For military and naval insurance accruing during the fiscal year for which this appropriation is made or in prior fiscal years, $21,458,000.

Adjusted service and dependent pay: For payment of adjusted-service credits of not more than $50 each and the quarterly installments due to dependents of deceased veterans, as provided in the act of May 19, 1924, as amended (38 U. S. C. 631–632, 661–670), $125,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended.

National service life insurance: For transfer to the national service life insurance fund, in accordance with the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, on account of payments of benefits in excess of the reserve of the policy in case of death, or for premiums waived in case of total disability, in cases where the death or total disability of the insured shall have been determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be the result of disease or injury traceable to the extra hazards of military or naval service, and to reimburse the national service life insurance fund for payments made therefrom when recovery of such payments is waived by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under the authority of section 609 (a) of said act, $250,000,000, to be immediately available.

Hospital and domiciliary facilities: For hospital and domiciliary facilities, $4,557,000, to reman available until expended: *Provided*, That this amount shall be available for use by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, with the approval of the President, for extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 1 and 2 of the act approved March 4, 1931 (38 U. S. C. 438j): *Provided further*, That not to exceed 3 percent of this amount shall be available for the employment in the District of Columbia and in the field of necessary technical and clerical assistants to aid in the preparation of plans and specifications for the projects as approved hereunder and in the supervision of the execution thereof, and for traveling expenses, field office equipment, and supplies in connection therewith.

Total, Veterans' Administration, $887,017,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL: Page 60, line 19, after "$887,017,000", insert "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes, except for cooking purposes."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have just offered is in the appropriation bill for the independent offices for the present year. It was put in the first bill back in 1931. The object was to make sure that the patients in the veterans' hospitals should be permitted to have butter instead of oleomargarine. That provision of law has been in every appropriation bill from that time until this. Now, this bill is brought in with that particular provision stricken out, without any explanation in the report as to why it is stricken out. My object is to have it reinstated.

There are about 65,000 patients in the veterans' hospitals, or there were last October. About 5,000 of those are tuberculosis cases, and of the others about 35,000 are neuropsychiatric cases, making about 40,000 of the 65,000 patients who are especially deserving of the very best kind of food, in order to protect their health as far as possible. Every other patient is entitled to equal consideration. That was the object of putting that provision in the bill in 1931.

At this time there is a scarcity of butter, and General Hines, in his appearance before the committee, offered that as an excuse for feeding the patients oleomargarine instead of butter. As a matter of fact, we are producing just about as much butter this year as usual, about 1,750,000,000 pounds.

Thirty percent is reserved for the purposes of our armed forces; 10 percent, or about 170,000,000 pounds, has been set aside for lend-lease operations. About 130,000,000 pounds are to go to Russia and the remainder to Britain and others of the United Nations. Neither Russia nor Britain want oleomargarine. That leaves approximately 1,000,000,000 pounds of butter for the civilian population of the United States.

There is one sure way to increase the supply of butter and that is to encourage the dairy people out in the Northwest, who produce 50 percent of all the butter and more than 50 percent of all dairy products, to produce more cream and permit the manufacture of more butter. That is the way to do it.

There is no quicker way or easier way to discourage those dairymen than to take up at this time, when it is so desired to have unity for all practical purposes, on the floor of the House in particular, and throughout the country, this oleomargarine question and tell the farmers that the Government is going to take the butter away from hospital patients and feed them oleomargarine. Some 3,400 of those patients in the veterans' hospitals at present have been brought back from Guadalcanal, New Guinea, and Africa, suffering of wounds and other disabilities. Unless this amendment shall be adopted, the Government is going to take butter away from them and feed them oleomargarine. It seems an outrageous treatment of our soldiers.

In the district I represent, the farmers are having difficulty in maintaining the production of dairy products. They are short of help and machinery. The action of the committee, in promoting the use of oleomargarine and restricting the use of butter, is particularly demoralizing and discouraging to the dairy industry.

On behalf of the patients in the hospitals who need nourishing butter—on behalf of those patients who have come from Australia, Guadalcanal and Africa, those patients who have been accustomed to the use of butter, I, and all other veteran patients in Government hospitals, ask that you shall vote this amendment back into the law, with the hope that it will remain there at least for the duration.

There is another side to this. Previously when this matter has come before Congress it has always been urged that it is a matter of economy to feed the patients in the various hospitals oleomargarine, because it costs less than butter. That is a mean and cheap form of economy. One way to increase the supply of butter, one way to do it, would be to give to the dairy farmer who produces butterfat a price which would permit as much profit per pound of butterfat as the oleomargarine manufacturers get per pound of oleomargarine. Guarantee cost of production and a reasonable profit and provide farm help and facilities, the dairy farmers will increase butter production.

I ask you to put this amendment back into the bill on behalf of war veterans in Federal hospitals and also on behalf of those farmers in the Northwest who are struggling under difficulties to increase the supply of all dairy products, including butter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Of course, no one has said or would say to the veteran that he could not have the very best that is obtainable any time, any place. This Congress would not say that; least of all, would the Veterans' Administration say that.

Without going into the question, which would be immediately controversial, about the merits or demerits of oleomargarine or any other butter substitutes, I might say that one could present here the very highest hygienic and medical authority which would say that there are many fats that can be used that are just as nutritious, when they are fortified with the appropriate vitamins, that would be just as good for the human body as butter. I do not say that——

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; not now. In order not to get into any argument, I withdraw the statement.

Mr. HULL. You might give me a chance to ask one question.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. HULL. Would the gentleman advocate the abolition of the dairy cow and the initiation of oleomargarine as a great health savior to the American people?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No, I would not do that. The committee would not have deleted this amendment except for the fact that General Hines, than whom the veteran has no better friend in the United States anywhere, anxious and solicitous for his welfare, told the committee, on page 254, that he wished to have this language deleted because there were certain instances in certain cases where he could not get butter, and that in those cases he would like to have authority to use oleomargarine. Where he could get butter he would use butter, but where he could not get it, he ought to be permited some flexibility in connection with the use of substitutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman, of course, has no way of promising anything. I should like to say to the gentleman from Virginia at this time that in taking this action we are not setting any precedent for the future, that this is only for the duration.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This is only for this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that if he lived out in my State he would be lucky to have even oleomargarine in these times.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; and if he happened to be a laborer in Mexico he could get beef every day and all the eggs he wanted.

Mr. HINSHAW. Precisely; and all the butter, too.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know about the butter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HULL) there were—ayes 80, noes 109.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that many of the members of the Committee make it a habit to go to veterans' hospitals from time to time, visiting the patients and perhaps examining the condition of the physical plants. These hospitals are visible signs of the country's appreciation of the patriotic service rendered by the men who have served in our various wars who need medical and nursing care.

I happen to be less interested in paint, plaster, furnaces, and roofs, important as they are, than I am in the actual care that is being given the men.

With the increased need of nurses for active war duty, the veterans' hospitals and the other hospitals caring for veterans have shared in the problem caused by a general shortage of graduate nurses. I shall not go into this matter at the moment as I anticipate giving the House before long something in the nature of a report of this nursing shortage and to discuss the ways now in progress and under consideration to increase the actual number of nurses and to take up the slack generally.

The Veterans' Bureau has been very cooperative and forward looking and its nursing service has not hesitated to make use of new methods, even though some of these have seemed revolutionary to certain of the Government departments.

One of my reasons for speaking to this section of the bill is to emphasize the fine attitude of the Bureau in its efforts to meet the needs of the hospitals under its jurisdiction. In addition, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the recently resigned head of the nursing service of the Veterans' Bureau, Mrs. Mary A. Hickey. Only those closely connected with the Veterans' Bureau can know the beauty of her long and faithful service to the men of our many forces. With unusual wisdom she saw that the heavy burden of war would bring dramatic need for reorganization and increased responsibility. She resigned her position in order to make it possible for a younger woman to take up the work she has so conscientiously performed and carry it into new areas created by all-out global war. I feel certain that all of you join with me in hoping for Mrs. Hickey many years of happy memories of the days of joyous consecration to the welfare and the comfort of our Veterans' Administration. Even so do I know that you extend to her successor, Miss Gwen H. Andrew, congratulations and all possible good wishes for her in the very heavy task she has had the courage to undertake.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I know of nothing controversial in the remainder of the bill. I have conferred with the gentleman from Massachusetts. I wonder if it would be satisfactory to consider the remaining sections of the bill as having been read for amendment, they to be printed in the RECORD, and to be open to any amendment any Member may care to offer?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the remaining sections of the bill be considered as having been read, that they be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that amendments may be in order to any of these paragraphs. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The remaining paragraphs of the bill read as follows:

SEC. 102. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the salaries of the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Commissioners of the United States Maritime Commission, with the exception of the Chairman so long as the office is held by the present incumbent, and the Commissioners of the United States Tariff Commission shall be at the rate of $10,000 each per annum.

SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 104. Where appropriations in this act are expendable for travel expenses and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for travel expenses may not exceed the amount set forth therefor in the Budget estimates submitted for the appropriations.

SEC. 105. Where appropriations in this act are expendable for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures therefor under each such appropriation may not exceed the amount of $50: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to the purchase of scientific, technical, trade, or traffic periodicals necessary in connection with the performance of the authorized functions of the agencies for which funds are herein provided.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 available for expenses of travel of civilian officers and employees of the executive departments and independent establishments shall be available also for expenses of travel performed by them on transfer from one official station to another when authorized by the head of the department or establishment concerned in the order directing such transfer: *Provided*, That such expenses shall not be allowed for any transfer effected for the convenience of any officer or employee.

(b) Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the fiscal year 1944 available for the transportation of things shall be available, in accordance with the act of October 10, 1940 (5 U. S. C. 73c–1), for expenses incurred in the transfer of household goods and effects of civilian officers and employees of such departments and establishments when transferred from one official station to another for permanent duty.

SEC. 202. Unless otherwise specifically provided, no appropriation available for the executive departments and independent establishments for the fiscal year 1944 in this act or any other act shall be expended—

(a) To purchase any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station wagons), at a cost, completely equipped for operation, and including the value of any vehicle exchanged, in excess of such amount as the Secretary of War, in the case of the War Department, the Secretary of the Navy, in the case of the Navy Department, the Commissioners, in the case of the government of the District of Columbia, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in the case of other essential governmental needs, may determine necessary to obtain satisfactory motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, but in no event shall the price so paid for any such vehicle exceed the maximum price therefor established by the Office of Price Administration and in no event more than $1,500, which amount shall be in addition to the amount required for transportation.

(b) For the maintenance, operation, and repair of any Government-owned motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle not used exclusively for official purposes; and "official purposes" shall not include the transportation of officers and employees between their domiciles and places of employment, except in cases of medical officers on out-patient medical services and except in cases of officers and employees engaged in field work the character of whose duties makes such transportation necessary and then only as to such latter cases when the same is approved by the head of the department or establishment concerned. The limitations of this subsection (b) shall not apply to any motor vehicles for official use of the President, the heads of the executive departments, Ambassadors, Ministers, and chargés d'affaires.

SEC. 203. In purchasing motor-propelled or animal-drawn vehicles or tractors, or road, agricultural, manufacturing, or laboratory equipment, or boats, or parts, accessories, tires, or equipment thereof, the head of any executive department or independent establishment or his duly authorized representative may exchange or sell similar items and apply the exchange allowances or proceeds of sales in such cases in whole or in part payment therefor.

SEC. 204. Section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), shall not apply to any purchase by or service rendered to any executive department or independent establishment during the fiscal year 1944 when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $100, but this section shall not be construed as affecting any provision of law authorizing purchases or services without regard to said section 3709 in amounts greater than $100.

SEC. 205. Unless otherwise specified and until July 1, 1944, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States, or of any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States, whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person is a citizen of the United States or a person in the service of the United States on the date of this enactment who, being eligible for citizenship, had theretofore filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen or who owes allegiance to the United States. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Commonwealth of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the prosecution of the war: *Provided*, That this section shall become effective on the date of enactment of this act and shall supersede and be in lieu of similar provisions in appropriation acts restricting the expenditure of funds during the fiscal year 1943, but any exemptions from such superseded provisions shall remain in force in connection with the operation of this section until June 30, 1943.

SEC. 206. Hereafter any officer or employee of any of the executive departments or independent establishments, including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States, designated in writing by the head thereof for such purpose, is hereby authorized to administer the oath required by section 1757, Revised Statutes, as amended (5 U. S. C. 16), incident to entrance into the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any other oath required by law in connection with employment therein, such oath to be administered without charge or fee and to have the same force and effect as oaths administered by officers having seals.

SEC. 207. This act may be cited as the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee whether there is any provision in the remainder of the bill to prevent the hedgehopping around of employees from one department to another when they have been specifically prohibited employment? I have such an amendment to offer, similar to the one that was adopted in the last appropriation bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman read it for information? As I recall it I would have no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The amendment reads as follows:

SEC. 4. No part of any appropriation or authorization in this act shall be used to pay any part of the salary or expenses of any person whose salary or expenses are prohibited from being paid from any appropriation or authorization in any other act; but this prohibition shall be effective only during the period for which such prohibition in such other act is effective.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It merely means that if he is prohibited in one agency he cannot hop over into another agency.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have no objection to it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 62, after line 2, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 4. No part of any appropriation or authorization in this act shall be used to pay any part of the salary or expenses of any person whose salary or expenses are prohibited from being paid from any appropriation or authorization in any other act; but this prohibition shall be effective only during the period for which such prohibition in such other act is effective."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Dirksen amendment relating to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment. If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 39, lines 19 and 20, strike out the sign and figures "$12,142,200" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,310,734 and such corporation shall be liquidated as provided by section 4 (k) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to the extent necessitated by the reduction of administrative personnel herein required, and the expenses incident to such liquidation shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation shall not incur for administrative expenses in excess of $833,333.33 for any month from July to December 1943, inclusive, nor in excess of $208,333.33 for any month from January to June 1944, inclusive."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 224, nays 159, answered "present" 2, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—224

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Ill. | Gerlach | Monkiewicz |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Gifford | Morrison, La. |
| | Gilchrist | Mott |
| Anderson, Calif. | Gillette | Mruk |
| Andresen, August H. | Gillie | Mundt |
| | Goodwin | Murray, Wis. |
| Angell | Gossett | Norman |
| Arends | Graham | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Arnold | Grant, Ala. | O'Hara |
| Auchincloss | Grant, Ind. | O'Konski |
| Baldwin, Md. | Griffiths | Phillips |
| Baldwin, N. Y. | Gross | Pittenger |
| Barrett | Gwynne | Ploeser |
| Bates, Ky. | Hagen | Plumley |
| Bates, Mass. | Hale | Poage |
| Beall | Hall, Edwin Arthur | Poulson |
| Beckworth | | Powers |
| Bell | Hall, Leonard W. | Pracht |
| Bender | | Ramey |
| Bennett, Mich. | Halleck | Reece, Tenn. |
| Bennett, Mo. | Hancock | Reed, Ill. |
| Bishop | Harris, Va. | Reed, N. Y. |
| Blackney | Hartley | Rees, Kans. |
| Bolton | Herter | Rizley |
| Boren | Hess | Robertson |
| Bradley, Mich. | Hill | Rockwell |
| Brehm | Hinshaw | Rodgers, Pa. |
| Brown, Ohio | Hoeven | Rogers, Mass. |
| Buffett | Holmes, Mass. | Rohrbough |
| Burch, Va. | Holmes, Wash. | Rolph |
| Busbey | Hope | Rowe |
| Butler | Horan | Satterfield |
| Canfield | Howell | Scott |
| Carlson, Kans. | Jeffrey | Shafer |
| Carson, Ohio | Jenkins | Sheppard |
| Carter | Jennings | Short |
| Case | Jensen | Sikes |
| Chapman | Johnson, Anton J. | Simpson, Ill. |
| Chenoweth | | Simpson, Pa. |
| Chiperfield | Johnson, Calvin D. | Smith, Maine |
| Church | | Smith, Ohio |
| Clevenger | Johnson, Ind. | Smith, Va. |
| Cole, Mo. | Johnson, J. Leroy | Smith, Wis. |
| Cole, N. Y. | | Spence |
| Colmer | Johnson, Ward | Springer |
| Compton | Jones | Stanley |
| Cravens | Jonkman | Stearns, N. H. |
| Culkin | Judd | Stefan |
| Cunningham | Kean | Stevenson |
| Curtis | Kearney | Stewart |
| Day | Keefe | Stockman |
| Dewey | Kilburn | Sumner, Ill. |
| Dies | Kilday | Sundstrom |
| Dirksen | Kinzer | Taber |
| Disney | Kleberg | Talbot |
| Ditter | Knutson | Talle |
| Domengeaux | Kunkel | Taylor |
| Dondero | LaFollette | Thomas, Tex. |
| Douglas | Lambertson | Tibbott |
| Durham | Lanham | Towe |
| Dworshak | LeCompte | Troutman |
| Eaton | Lewis, Ohio | Van Zandt |
| Ellis | Luce | Vincent, Ky. |
| Ellison, Md. | McCowen | Vorys, Ohio |
| Ellsworth | McGehee | Vursell |
| Elmer | McLean | Wadsworth |
| Elston, Ohio | McWilliams | Walter |
| Englebright | Maas | Ward |
| Fellows | Mansfield, Tex. | Weichel, Ohio |
| Fenton | Martin, Iowa | West |
| Fish | Martin, Mass. | Wheat |
| Fisher | May | Wigglesworth |
| Gale | Merrow | Willey |
| Gallagher | Michener | Winter |
| Gamble | Miller, Conn. | Wolcott |
| Gavin | Miller, Nebr. | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Gearhart | Miller, Pa. | Woodruff, Mich. |

NAYS—159

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Capozzoli | Eberharter |
| Allen, La. | Celler | Elliott |
| Anderson, N. Mex. | Coffee | Feighan |
| | Cooley | Fernandez |
| Barden | Cooper | Fitzpatrick |
| Barry | Costello | Flannagan |
| Bland | Courtney | Fogarty |
| Bloom | Cox | Folger |
| Bonner | Creal | Forand |
| Boykin | Crosser | Ford |
| Bradley, Pa. | Cullen | Fulbright |
| Brooks | Curley | Furlong |
| Brown, Ga. | Davis | Gathings |
| Bryson | Delaney | Gibson |
| Bulwinkle | Dickstein | Gore |
| Burchill, N. Y. | Dilweg | Granger |
| Byrne | Dingell | Gregory |
| Camp | Doughton | Hare |
| Cannon, Mo. | Drewry | Harless, Ariz. |
| Harris, Ark. | Magnuson | Rogers, Calif. |
| Hays | Mahon | Russell |
| Hébert | Maloney | Sabath |
| Heffernan | Manasco | Sadowski |
| Hendricks | Mansfield, Mont. | Sasscer |
| Hobbs | | Sauthoff |
| Hoch | Marcantonio | Scanlon |
| Holifield | Merritt | Slaughter |
| Hull | Mills | Smith, W. Va. |
| Izac | Monroney | Snyder |
| Jackson | Morrison, N. C. | Somers, N. Y. |
| Jarman | Murdock | Sparkman |
| Johnson Luther A. | Murphy | Starnes, Ala. |
| | Newsome | Steagall |
| Johnson, Lyndon B. | Nichols | Sullivan |
| | Norrell | Tarver |
| Johnson, Okla. | O'Brien, Mich. | Thomason |
| Kee | O'Connor | Tolan |
| Kelley | O'Leary | Vinson, Ga. |
| Kennedy | O'Neal | Voorhis, Calif. |
| Keogh | Outland | Wasielewski |
| Kerr | Pace | Weaver |
| King | Patman | Weiss |
| Kirwan | Patton | Wene |
| Klein | Peterson, Fla. | Whelchel, Ga. |
| Lane | Peterson, Ga. | White |
| Larcade | Philbin | Whitten |
| Lea | Price | Whittington |
| Lesinski | Priest | Wickersham |
| Lynch | Rabaut | Winstead |
| McCord | Ramspeck | Woodrum, Va. |
| McCormack | Randolph | Worley |
| McGranery | Rankin | Wright |
| McMillan | Richards | Zimmerman |
| McMurray | Rivers | |
| Madden | Robinson, Utah | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

| | |
|---|---|
| Burdick | Ludlow |

NOT VOTING—49

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Guyer | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Buckley | Harness, Ind. | O'Toole |
| Burgin | Hart | Pfeifer |
| Cannon, Fla. | Heidinger | Robsion, Ky. |
| Clark | Hoffman | Rowan |
| Clason | Kefauver | Schiffler |
| Cochran | Landis | Schuetz |
| Crawford | LeFevre | Schwabe |
| D'Alesandro | Lemke | Sheridan |
| Dawson | Lewis, Colo. | Sumners, Tex. |
| Engel | McGregor | Thomas, N. J. |
| Fay | McKenzie | Treadway |
| Fulmer | Mason | Welch |
| Gavagan | Miller, Mo. | Wilson |
| Gordon | Murray, Tenn. | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Gorski | Myers | |
| Green | Norton | |

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Gavagan against.

Mr. Wilson for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Schiffler for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. Miller of Missouri for, with Mr. Cannon of Florida against.

Mr. McGregor for, with Mr. Burdick against.

Mr. Schwabe for, with Mr. Schuetz against.

Mr. Clason for, with Mr. Ludlow against.

Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Pfeiffer against.

Mr. Robsion of Kentucky for, with Mr. Fay against.

General pairs:

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Burgin with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Engel.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Tarver with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Harness.

Mr. D'Alesandro with Mr. Landis.

Mr. Green with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. Folger with Mr. Lemke.

Mr. Lewis of Colorado with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on this roll call I voted "nay." I have a pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McGREGOR. I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on this roll call I voted "nay." I have a pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. CLASON. I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk have authority to correct the section numbers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute for the purpose of finding out what the program will be for the rest of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Tomorrow the first order of business will be the consideration of a bill from the Appropriations Committee involving three items of an emergency nature, but I understand there is no controversy over them despite their being of an emergency nature. The bill will be called up before the 1-minute speeches—that procedure being followed because of the importance of the immediate passage of the bill.

Madame Chiang Kai-shek is to be our guest tomorrow, and, of course, the order of business otherwise tomorrow will be dependent upon the time of her arrival in the Capitol.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When is she expected to arrive here?

Mr. McCORMACK. She is expected to arrive at the Senate at 12:15 and here at 12:30, but it is my opinion that she will arrive here about 12:45.

A resolution from the Committee on Accounts concerning an appropriation for the Dies committee wil' also be considered tomorrow. I do not know if there are any other reports from the Committee on Accounts to be submitted tomorrow. Usually those matters are acted upon without debate.

The bill H. R. 1605, which it was announced last week would be taken up tomorrow, is an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to farm acreage allotments, the farm marketing excess of wheat, the use of excess corn and silage for feed to livestock on the farm, and—I assume this is probably the important part—to provide for the adequate supply of peanuts for oil and other uses.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why does the gentleman say that peanuts is the important part?

Mr. McCORMACK. Many Members are interested in it. I am glad my friend asked me to interpret it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not mean that it is peanut legislation?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; peanuts are involved in the legislation.

Last week I announced that the Columbia Basin project bill would be considered this week, but because of changed circumstances it will not come up until next week, if I can put it on the agenda for next week.

On Friday the Private Calendar will be called. I understand that the conference report on the telegraph merger bill will be filed tomorrow, and that will be called up on Friday. If time permits, we will also take up on Friday the bill H. R. 1670, amending the Civilian Pilot Training Act, which I announced last week would be taken up on Friday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman know whether or not that bill is controversial?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state as to that, but my recollection is that there is probably not much controversy over it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The program for next week has not yet been arranged?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state now the program for next week.

THE LATE PAUL R. GREEVER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I inform this House of the death of the Honorable Paul R. Greever. He was accidentally killed yesterday at his home in Cody, Wyo. I have known and admired Paul Greever for nearly a quarter of a century. He was my friend and had countless friends over our State. He served Wyoming with honor and distinction in the Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses. He was born at Lansing, Kans., and was a graduate of the University of that State, and served in the Three Hundredth and Fourteenth Trench Mortar Battery, Eighty-ninth Division, in the American Expeditionary Forces in World War No. 1. Paul Greever came to Wyoming immediately after receiving his discharge from the Army. He served as mayor of Cody, Wyo., and was a member of the board of trustees of the University of Wyoming. Mr. Greever was one of the leading members of the bar of the State of Wyoming. He was truly an outstanding citizen of Wyoming, and his passing will come as a distinct shock to his countless friends over my State, as well as to many of you who served with him in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, the news that has just been given us by our colleague from Wyoming comes to me as a distinct shock. Paul Greever and I were neighbors at home. I think I was his nearest congressional neighbor, although we lived in separate States. He was a good neighbor, and he was a good legislator. He was one of the best-balanced and most fair-minded men in the House. I think every man who had the opportunity to know him or serve with him will join me in saying that we respect his memory and know that the State of Wyoming has lost a good citizen, an outstanding man, whose untimely death is a misfortune to his community, his State, and the Nation. We are sorry, and we are sad to hear that he is gone.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am shocked and deeply grieved by the tragic news of the death of our former colleague, Paul Greever, of Wyoming. He was one of the first Members of the House I met when I came here in 1937. Knowing him meant very much to me.

He was a man from the plains and mountains, a typical westerner, which may account in part for his friendliness and breadth of vision. I had many consultations with him. When I wanted information regarding matters pertaining to the livestock industry, or of mining, or even of irrigation or anything else that pertained to the great West, I consulted with Paul Greever. I found him to be a statesman of the first order and also a friend in whom I could have full confidence.

I take this short moment to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family and to the State of Wyoming in the loss they have sustained in his going.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the work of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration and include certain quotations and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert a brief article from today's Washington Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address delivered by the distinguished minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., at the Lincoln Day Dinner before the Republican Club of Allegheny, on Friday night last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow after the completion of the legislative program and any other orders that may heretofore have been granted, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INVASION IN BUREAUCRATIC CONTROL

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert a short article from the New York Times of the other day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow afternoon, after the special order entered on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], I may address the House for 12 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point and to include therein two letters addressed to Mr. David Stern, of the Philadelphia Record, under date of February 16, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15, 1943, of an editorial in the Philadelphia Record commenting upon certain remarks alleged to have been made by me, it is clear that the party inserting them did so without any prior investigation as to the facts, as such investigation would readily have revealed that the alleged remarks consisted of misquotation and distortion, so that the entire quotation was utterly different from the remarks actually made by me. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., February 16, 1943.*

Mr. DAVID STERN,
*Philadelphia Record, Philadelphia, Pa.*

SIR: I enclose herewith a letter to you with the request that it be published at the earliest possible date in the Philadelphia Record, but only in its entirety. I do not wish the meaning of this letter to be destroyed as you attempted to warp and distort the meaning of statements I was supposed to have made at a Lincoln Day banquet. Since you have undoubtedly inspired attacks upon me in the Pennsylvania Legislature and in the United States Senate, on the part of those who are undoubtedly indebted to you for past favors, I believe I have the right to expect you to print my reply to your insidious political charges.

I may add that for one reporter prepared to distort my remarks there were hundreds at the banquet who would undoubtedly be glad to affirm that I did not make the statements as quoted by your paper. I did say that the Republicans had great contributions to make to the country's war effort, of grit and brains

and backbone. The American people evidently thought so, too, last November.

Yours very truly,

HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.

---

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., February 16, 1943.*

Mr. DAVID STERN,
*Philadelphia Record, Philadelphia, Pa.*

SIR: I should think you would be ashamed, in order to secure some imagined political advantage, to give currency on the front page of your edition of February 15 to certain statements alleged to have been made by me.

These statements were incorrectly quoted and the entire alleged quotation was ripped from the context of my remarks. I positively did not say anything indicating any possible opinion on my part that the war could end too soon. The war can't possibly end too soon to please me. I did not reflect upon the very great and valorous victories of the Russian armies and I did not either smear my country's allies nor keep silent about my country's enemies. The contrary is true, as those who heard the speech (except your reporter) know very well. The rest of the alleged quotation was badly garbled and does not convey the thought expressed by me, except that I do not deny that I said that "they (the American people) are tired of fools in high places." This goes for a certain type of newspaper publisher (if the cap fits you may wear it with my compliments), as well as for greedy, small-minded men in government.

Again, let me repeat that I said nothing at the Lincoln Day banquet which any American could resent; I can see how fellow-travelers along the Communist Party line might well resent any American doctrine which I endorse.

In giving currency to a misquotation you have made it possible for Axis radio to pick up your ill-timed editorial and seek to create dissension among us. Your callous misinterpretation of what you allege to be my statements is a great contribution to national disunity. Perhaps the plaintiff in the last libel suit will present to you an iron cross.

Yours very truly,

HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to renew my request of yesterday to place in the Appendix an editorial which will cost a little more than the usual allowance. I have an estimate from the printer that it will cost $135.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a telegram from the Passaic County (N. J.) Board of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Endicott Daily Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### THE LATE HON. PAUL GREEVER

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the passing of the late Honorable Paul Greever at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, Paul R. Greever was born at Lansing, Leavenworth County, Kans., in my district in 1891. He received his early education in the public schools of Leavenworth and was graduated from the University of Kansas Law School. He served in the Three Hundred and Fourteenth Trench Mortar Battery, Eighty-ninth Division, from April 1917 to March 1919. It was my pleasure to know him first when he was in the law school at Lawrence, Kans.

He leaves to mourn his loss several relatives in northeast Kansas and a wide circle of friends over the whole State. He was a good, conscientious, able Congressman—a level-headed fellow with a large stock of common sense. He was not easily stampeded, did his own thinking, and had the courage of his convictions.

I am very proud to have known him in his earlier life and to have served with him here as a colleague. We all regret very much his sudden and untimely death while yet so comparatively young.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LAMBERTSON was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials from the Des Moines Register.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by remarks in the RECORD and include a short bill that I introduced today and a letter concerning the same.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. MUNDT] be allowed to extend his remarks and include a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SHAFER was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HARNESS of Indiana was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LEFEVRE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of illness.

To Mr. GAVAGAN, on account of illness.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a hearing of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, February 23, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., for the consideration of postal employees' salary bills.

---

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

183. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended to the Archivist by certain agencies of the Federal Government for his disposal; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

184. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

185. A letter from the Chairman, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

186. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the Federal inspection of grain and similar agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

187. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Office for Emergency Management amounting to $2,973,000 for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 113); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

188. A letter from the Consumers' Counsel, Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, transmitting the annual report of the Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel covering the period November 1, 1941, to December 31, 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

189. A letter from the Chairman, The National Archives, transmitting the annual report of the National Archives Trust Fund Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942; to the Committee on the Library.

---

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Interim report on investigations of the national war effort pursuant to House Resolution 30, Seventy-eighth Congress. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the national war effort; without amendment (Rept. No.

132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 133. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1692. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1681. A bill to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MOTT: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1748. A bill to provide for payment of rental allowance to officers of the Navy under certain conditions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1846) for the relief of Frank Franklin, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1876 A bill to require all Department of the Navy contractors and subcontractors to file information with respect to absenteeism; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 1877. A bill to provide for decentralization of authority under administrative procedure and to carry into effect the intent and purpose of Congress in stabilizing rents under provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1878. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 1879. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1880. A bill to promote the national defense and to facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment and essential to domestic requirements through safe and adequate inland waterways, by the immediate authorization and construction of the New York Bay-Delaware River section of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway as now connected and made navigable from New England to Florida; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1881. A bill to make authorization for deductions of premiums for national service life insurance from active service pay effective whether or not such deductions are in fact made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 1882. A bill to grant the Chinese rights of entry to the United States and rights to citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WALTERS:

H. R. 1883. A bill to confer the power of arrest without warrant upon officers, agents, special agents, or duly accredited representatives of the Counter-Intelligence Corps or Military Intelligence Division of the Army of the United States in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1884. A bill to authorize and empower officers, agents, special agents, or duly accredited representatives of the Counter-Intelligence Corps or Military Intelligence Division of the Army of the United States to administer oaths in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 119. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the activities of the Farm Security Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 120. Resolution to provide for the expenses of investigation authorized by House Resolution 119, a resolution creating a select committee to investigate the activities of the Farm Security Administration; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. Res. 121. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to investigate the progress of the defense housing program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COX:

H. Res. 122. Resolution providing for the expenses of the Select Committee Investigating the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. Res. 123. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1692, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legisture of the State of Georgia, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass the Pace parity bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to study marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation to safeguard the shad fishing industry in the Hudson River; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 1885. A bill for the relief of the Fitzpatrick Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Charles Fred Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARD JOHNSON:

H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Dalton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JEFFREY:

H. R. 1888. A bill for the relief of Charles Knox; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Andrew Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1890. A bill for the relief of the Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1891. A bill for the relief of W. G. Byars; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1892. A bill for the relief of the General Heat & Appliance Co. of Boston; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 1893. A bill for the relief of George H. Crow; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1894. A bill for the relief of George W. Derrickson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 1895. A bill granting a pension to Nola Forrester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

147. By Mr. MOTT: Senate Joint Memorial No. 1 of the Forty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, urging that the President and the Congress of the United States cause to be promulgated appropriate orders, rules, and regulations designed to encourage maximum production of essential food commodities by assuring to the farms of Oregon and of the United States generally that their requirements for production will be met and designed further to assure the people of the State of Oregon and other Pacific Coast States, as well as those in other parts of the country, a fair and reasonable distribution of all available food commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

148. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 1 of the Forty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider favorably and enact some pay-as-you-go plan or similar plan known as the Ruml plan or such other plan and legislation as will accomplish the desired result; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

### THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who hast made of one blood all nations of men to dwell upon the face of the earth, we give Thee thanks for the increasing revelation that under the canopy of Thy everlasting mercy, in Thee there is no east or west; and that the seamless robe of a united humanity is being woven out of the strands and colors of all peoples. In the courage, the faith, and the hope made flesh in the queenly representative of a great nation we clasp this day the hand of our brave ally, a half world away, yet near to our hearts. As we bring our grateful homage to this Lady with a

Lamp—the glowing lamp of an ancient and magnificent culture, of justice and freedom, and of a radiant reliance on Thee, we see illumined a page of Thy Holy Book: "The heart of her husband trusteth in her, and he shall have no lack of gain. Strength and dignity are her clothing. She openeth her mouth with wisdom and the law of kindness is on her tongue. Many daughters have done virtuously, but she excelleth them all. A woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised; her works praise her in the gates."

We thank Thee, God of the freedoms, that, under the valiant leadership of this servant of Thine and of her warrior companion, by faith China has quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, waxed valiant in fight; out of weakness has been made strong; being tortured has not accepted deliverance that she might obtain a better resurrection, but that enduring as seeing the invisible has put to flight the army of aliens. By faith bring us, we beseech Thee, with her to united victory, keeping step with the eternal purpose for mankind as Thy truth goes marching on. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 15, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 133. An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1294. An act to authorize the sale or transfer of property belonging to the Government for other purposes; and

H. R. 1762. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1446) authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hatch | Reed |
| Andrews | Hawkes | Revercomb |
| Austin | Hayden | Reynolds |
| Bailey | Hill | Robertson |
| Bankhead | Holman | Russell |
| Barkley | Johnson, Colo. | Scrugham |
| Bridges | La Follette | Shipstead |
| Brooks | Langer | Smith |
| Buck | Lodge | Stewart |
| Bushfield | Lucas | Thomas, Idaho |
| Butler | McClellan | Thomas, Okla. |
| Byrd | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Capper | McKellar | Tobey |
| Caraway | McNary | Tunnell |
| Clark, Mo. | Maloney | Tydings |
| Connally | Maybank | Vandenberg |
| Danaher | Millikin | Van Nuys |
| Davis | Moore | Wagner |
| Eastland | Murray | Wheeler |
| George | Nye | Wherry |
| Gerry | O'Daniel | White |
| Gillette | O'Mahoney | Wiley |
| Green | Overton | Willis |
| Guffey | Pepper | Wilson |
| Gurney | Radcliffe | |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are conducting hearings in Puerto Rico on behalf of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are necessarily absent as members of the Truman committee on a trip of inspection of airplane plants.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

VISIT OF MME. CHIANG KAI-SHEK

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senate is to be honored today by a visit from one of the outstanding women of the world and of this generation. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, to reassemble following the visit of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, and that the Chair appoint a committee of five to escort her into the Chamber. I also ask unanimous consent that the morning business be postponed until the Senate reassembles following Mme. Chiang Kai-shek's visit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, pursuant to the requests of the Senator from Kentucky, it is so ordered.

The Chair appoints the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] as the committee to escort Mme. Chiang Kai-shek into the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m., under the order previously entered, the Senate stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess,

The Chief Justice of the United States, and Associate Justice Reed, Associate Justice Frankfurter, Associate Justice Jackson, and Associate Justice Rutledge of the Supreme Court of the United States, accompanied by Charles E. Cropley, Clerk, and Thomas E. Waggaman, Marshal, entered the Chamber and took the seats assigned them to the right of the Vice President.

Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, and Hon. Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, entered the Chamber and took the seats assigned them to the right of the Vice President's desk.

Members of the party accompanying Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, including Mr. L. K. Kung, Dr. Wei Tao-ming, Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the United States from China, and Mme. Wei, Mme. T. V. Soong, Dr. H. T. Tong, Miss Jeanette Kung, and Capt. L. C. Kung, entered the Chamber, and were escorted to the seats assigned them to the left of the Vice President's desk.

The committee appointed by the Vice President, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate (Edwin A. Halsey), and the Sergeant at Arms (Wall Doxey), and consisting of Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. CAPPER, and Mrs. CARAWAY, entered the Chamber at the main door and escorted Mme. Chiang Kai-shek to a seat at the desk immediately in front of the Vice President.

(Mme. Chiang Kai-shek was greeted with prolonged applause, Senators and guests of the Senate rising.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators, distinguished guests, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, wife of the Generalissimo of the armies of China, will now address you. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY MME. CHIANG KAI-SHEK

Mr. President, Members of the Senate of the United States, ladies, and gentlemen, I am overwhelmed by the warmth and spontaneity of the welcome of the American people, of whom you are the representatives. I did not know that I was to speak to you today at the Senate except to say, "How do you do? I am so very glad to see you," and to

bring the greetings of my people to the people of America. However, just before coming here, the Vice President told me that he would like to have me say a few words to you.

I am not a very good extemporaneous speaker; in fact, I am no speaker at all; but I am not so very much discouraged, because a few days ago I was at Hyde Park, and went to the President's library. Something I saw there encouraged me, and made me feel that perhaps you will not expect overmuch of me in speaking to you extemporaneously. What do you think I saw there? I saw many things, but the one thing which interested me most of all was that in a glass case there was the first draft of one of the President's speeches, a second draft, and on and on up to the sixth draft. Yesterday I happened to mention this fact to the President, and told him that I was extremely glad that he had to write so many drafts when he is such a well-known and acknowledgedly fine speaker. His reply to me was that sometimes he writes 12 drafts of a speech. So, my remarks here today, being extemporaneous, I am sure you will make allowances for me.

The traditional friendship between your country and mine has a history of 160 years. I feel—and I believe that I am not the only one who feels this way—that there are a great many similarities between your people and mine, and that these similarities are the basis of our friendship.

I should like to tell you a little story which will illustrate this belief. When General Doolittle and his men went to bomb Tokyo, on their return some of your boys had to bail out in the interior of China. One of them later told me that he had to bail out of his ship, and that when he landed on Chinese soil and saw the populace running toward him, he just waved his arm and shouted the only Chinese word he knew, "Mei-kuo, Mei-kuo," which means "America." [Applause.] Literally translated from the Chinese it means "Beautiful country." This boy said that our people laughed and almost hugged him, and greeted him like a long lost brother. He further told me that he thought that he had come home when he saw our people; and that was the first time he had ever been to China. [Applause.]

I came to your country as a little girl. I know your people. I have lived with them. I spent the formative years of my life amongst your people. I speak your language, not only the language of your hearts, but also your tongue. So coming here today I feel that I am also coming home. [Applause.]

I believe, however, that it is not only I who am coming home; I feel that if the Chinese people could speak to you in your own tongue, or if you could understand our tongue, they would tell you that basically and fundamentally we are fighting for the same cause [great applause]; that we have identity of ideals; that the "four freedoms," which your President proclaimed to the world, resound throughout our vast land as the gong of freedom, the gong of freedom of the United Nations, and the death knell of the aggressors. [Applause.]

I assure you that our people are willing and eager to cooperate with you in the realization of these ideals, because we want to see to it that they do not echo as empty phrases, but become realities for ourselves, for our children, for our children's children, and for all mankind. [Applause.]

How are we going to realize these ideals? I think I shall tell you a little story which just came to my mind. As you know, China is a very old nation. We have a history of 5,000 years. When we were obliged to evacuate Hankow and go into the hinterland to carry on and continue our resistance against aggression, the Generalissimo and I passed one of our fronts, the Changsha front. One day we went into the Heng-yang Mountains, where there are traces of a famous pavilion called "Rub-the-mirror" pavilion, which was built over 2,000 years ago. It will perhaps interest you to hear the story of that pavilion.

Two thousand years ago near that spot was an old Buddhist temple. One of the young monks went there, and all day long he sat cross-legged, with his hands clasped before him in an attitude of prayer, and murmured "Amita-Buddha! Amita-Buddha! Amita-Buddha!" He murmured and chanted day after day, because he hoped that he would acquire grace.

The Father Prior of that temple took a piece of brick and rubbed it against a stone hour after hour, day after day, and week after week. The little acolyte, being very young, sometimes cast his eyes around to see what the old Father Prior was doing. The old Father Prior just kept on his work of rubbing the brick against the stone. So one day the young acolyte said to him, "Father Prior, what are you doing day after day rubbing this brick on the stone?" The Father Prior replied, "I am trying to make a mirror out of this brick." The young acolyte said, "But it is impossible to make a mirror out of a brick, Father Prior." "Yes," said the Father Prior, "and it is just as impossible for you to acquire grace by doing nothing except murmur 'Amita-Buddha' all day long, day in and day out." [Applause.]

So, my friends, I feel that it is necessary for us not only to have ideals and to proclaim that we have them, it is necessary that we act to implement them. [Applause.] And so to you, gentlemen of the Senate, and to you ladies and gentlemen in the galleries, I say that without the active help of all of us our leaders cannot implement these ideals. It is up to you and to me to take to heart the lesson of "Rub-the-mirror" pavilion.

I thank you. [Great applause, Senators and their guests rising.]

Following her address, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek and the distinguished visitors accompanying her and the other guests of the Senate were escorted from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the Vice President.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### Report of Persons Commissioned in the Army of the United States

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period December 1, 1942, to January 31, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee of Military Affairs.

### Acts of Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

### Report of Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel

A letter from the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of his operations for the period from November 1, 1941, to December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

### Reports of the Librarian of Congress and Register of Copyrights

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and the annual report of the Register of Copyrights for the same period (with the accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Library.

### Amendment of Employees' Compensation Act

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

### Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, Navy (3), Agriculture (8), and Commerce; United States Civil Service Commission (2), National Housing Agency (2), and the Alley Dwelling Authority which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 13

"Whereas this Nation is now engaged in a world-wide war which has brought about a

tremendous demand upon our transportation facilities; and

"Whereas it is recognized that a serious problem has arisen relative to the continuation of our transportation facilities because of the shortage of rubber, and our Government has urged, as a result of investigations and conclusions reached by the Baruch committee, a development of synthetic rubber to alleviate the shortage; and

"Whereas it is a desire of this State to cooperate in every way possible with the Federal Government and its committees and to make available its surplus commodities which are essential in the manufacture of synthetic rubber; and

"Whereas in the State of Iowa raw materials are available for the manufacture of alcohol used in the production of synthetic rubber; and

"Whereas it would be economically advantageous to erect factories for the production of synthetic rubber in the area where the necessary raw materials are produced, and where the high protein byproducts are urgently needed for animal feeds: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the house (the senate concurring)*, That Rubber Administrator William M. Jeffers and our two Senators, Hon. George A. Wilson and Hon. Guy M. Gillette, and our eight Congressmen be urged to use their best efforts to help unsnarl the present situation relative to the production of synthetic rubber from agricultural products; that such plants be located in the surplus crop area, including the State of Iowa, to the end that our State, Nation, and humanity be benefited and also to the end that this war be brought to a successful and more rapid conclusion; be it further

*"Resolved by the house*, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Vice President Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard, Rubber Administrator William M. Jeffers, Senator Guy M. Gillette, Senator George A. Wilson, and our eight Members of the House of Representatives and that this resolution be spread upon the house and senate journals of the Fiftieth General Assembly of the State of Iowa."

A resolution of the Senate of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 1

"Whereas the Legislature of Puerto Rico has passed certain laws tending to improve living conditions and to protect the welfare of the people of Puerto Rico;

"Whereas among these laws are to be found the following:

"Land law of Puerto Rico;

"Law creating the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority;

"Law creating the Puerto Rico Transportation Authority;

"Law creating the Puerto Rico Development Company;

"Law creating the Development Bank of Puerto Rico;

"Law creating the Puerto Rico Planning, Urbanizing, and Zoning Board;

"Law creating the Puerto Rico Communications Authority; and

"Law regulating the sugar industry in Puerto Rico;

"Whereas some of these laws were sanctioned by the direct vote of the people of Puerto Rico and all were passed by the Legislature of Puerto Rico in the exercise of the power delegated to it by the people of Puerto Rico;

"Whereas Congressman FRED L. CRAWFORD, of Michigan, has introduced a resolution in the Congress of the United States of America with the purpose of having the Congress annul these laws, thus despoiling the people of Puerto Rico, in the midst of the great sacrifices it is making in the military and civil fields for the defense of democracy, of all enjoyment of democracy;

"Whereas this constitutes an unheard-of assault against the liberties of the people of Puerto Rico, the doctrine of President Roosevelt and the American Nation, in America and throughout the world, and its adoption would imply a sinister loss of prestige to that doctrine;

"Whereas if such a resolution is adopted, not only the people of Puerto Rico but all small peoples would see democracy declared a fraud, a lie, and a farce by the Congress of the Nation which is directing the war for democracy and which will fundamentally influence the formation of world liberties following victory;

"Whereas if the precedent is established by which the will of the people and of its legislature in Puerto Rico expressed in the eight laws mentioned has no value at all, the same procedure could be applied to all the legislation and all the democratic acts of the Puerto Rican people and of its legislature: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of Puerto Rico:*

"1. To condemn, as it hereby condemns, in the most energetic and unequivocal terms, the assault against democracy in Puerto Rico and against the principles of democracy outside of Puerto Rico which the Crawford resolution constitutes.

"2. To condemn, as it hereby condemns, in the most energetic and unequivocal terms, as the representatives of a people struggling for democracy, the fact that in the very Congress of the United States of America a resolution has been introduced of such nature that it brings into disrepute and stains the high motives of the Government of the United States of America in directing the present struggle in the defense and affirmation of democracy.

"3. To declare, as it hereby declares, that, although confiding in the spirit of righteousness of the Congress of the United States and believing that it will not permit the adoption of such sinister resolution, it affirms the unbreakable will of our people to oppose such violation of liberty and democracy by all legitimate means which free men can and should employ to defend themselves against tyranny and oppression.

4. To declare, as it hereby declares, that in the employment of the necessary means for the defense of our democracy and our liberty against such sinister assault our people will act in such manner that our fellow citizens of the north, descendants of Washington and Jefferson, will not have to feel ashamed of us.

"5. That copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Possessions of the Senate, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the American press, to the legislatures of the 48 States, and to all parliamentary bodies of America and of the world which function free of totalitarian tyranny."

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 1

"Whereas title I, section 2 (a), clause (7), reads as follows: 'Effective July 1, 1941, provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming old-age assistance'; and

"Whereas title IV, section 402 (a), clause (7), reads as follows: 'provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of any child claiming aid to dependent children'; and

"Whereas title X, section 1002 (a), clause (8), reads as follows: 'provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming aid to the blind'; and

"Whereas these provisions restrict the States from allowing recipients of relief in these categories from accepting intermittent employment without impairment of their grant; and

"Whereas deduction of all such earnings from grants reduces the willingness of recipients to accept such employment; and

"Whereas, due to the shortage of manpower in all lines of industry during the war emergency, it is necessary that all manpower be made available to the United States Government to successfully prosecute the war effort; and

"Whereas it is imperative that all people be employed wherever they can make a contribution to the war effort: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring)*, That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend titles I, IV, and X, section 2 (a), clause (7), section 402 (a), clause (7), and section 1002 (a), clause (8) to allow for intermittent employment without impairment to the grants of recipients; be it further

*"Resolved*, That certified copies of the memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate and Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to United States Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Edward V. Robertson, Congressman Frank A. Barrett, and to the Honorable Arthur J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board."

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for Mr. MCCARRAN):

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 4

"Assembly joint resolution memorializing Congress to amend the law on the collection of income tax to a pay-as-you-go basis

"Whereas the Congress is considering the amendment of the income-tax law to provide for the collection of such tax on a current basis; and

"Whereas inflationary forces in the economy of the United States are at work due to the unparalleled expenditures for defense; and

"Whereas we have seen the effect of uncontrolled inflation during the following World War No. 1 and in certain foreign countries; and

"Whereas the war effort of the United States requires that the unusual income due to these expenditures should be made available to the Treasury of the United States as it is earned; and

"Whereas the unprecedented requirements of the United States Government in meeting its war obligations may otherwise result in delinquencies in the payment of income taxes under present or prospective rate; and

"Whereas such a situation might result in comfort to the enemies of our country and in a lack of confidence from our people: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada*, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to adopt an income-tax program which will provide for the payment of such taxes as income is earned; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of Nevada further suggests the adoption of measures providing for a compulsory savings program or tax during the duration of the war which will insure the accumulation of savings

guaranteeing a satisfaction of the improving standard of living presently sacrificed to insure the victory; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That properly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada to our Senators in the United States Senate and to our Representative in Congress."

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A house concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution E

"Whereas during the past 25 years the economy of the Nation has been so fundamentally based on rubber that unless rubber is immediately forthcoming the Nation's economy is doomed to a disruptive breakdown which will drastically curtail the all-out war effort and endanger ultimate victory.

"For the past year, high officials of our Government have been attempting to make synthetic rubber out of petroleum. From the best information available, 33 rubber plants have been authorized, all with the Standard Oil Co. and members of their patent pool. Grants have been made by Jesse Jones, head of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, providing all necessary funds to the extent of a half a billion dollars or more.

"Since this arrangement has been made, plants have reached only the blueprint stage. One or two plants may be in operation by 1944. From the time that has elapsed since the construction of these plants was authorized, without results, it is self-evident that the making of synthetic rubber is still in the experimental stage and that the experience so far has been in the wrong direction.

"The Russian Government has successfully been making all of their rubber for the last 10 years or more, and they offered to this Government over a year ago their formula for making synthetic rubber out of agricultural products. Nothing has been done to take advantage of this.

"The Gillette committee findings of last year established the fact that plants for making rubber out of agricultural products can be built with one-third of the amount of critical materials required by the petroleum plants and one-third of the cost in about one-half of the time. That at this time we have a surplus of certain agricultural products, all of them containing carbohydrates.

"In fact, rubber can be made from any thing that grows out of the ground, including waste products.

"Whereas it appears that no results are apparent at this time from the action that has been taken by the Government to make synthetic rubber: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring),* That we ask the reintroduction of the Gillette bill and its immediate passage, so that speedy arrangements may be made for the building of plants to make rubber from agricultural products as well as from petroleum products, so as to assure an adequate supply of synthetic rubber to be used in winning the war and to insure the all-out war effort and speedier victory by preventing the disruptive break-down of our national economy; now be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to each Member of Congress from North Dakota, including both Senators and Representatives; Mr. Gillette, of Iowa; the President of the Senate; the Speaker of the House; the President of the United States; Mr. Jeffers, Rubber Administrator; Jesse Jones; and to the speaker of the house and president of the senate of the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Montana, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Illinois, Michigan, South Dakota, and Colorado."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial No. 2

"Whereas titles I and X of the Social Security Act provide for old-age assistance and assistance to the blind of a maximum payment of $40 per month; and

"Whereas the United States participates in the grant paid to the individual in the amount of 50 per centum; and

"Whereas all grants are determined by compilation of a budget of need in each individual case; and

"Whereas this procedure does not allow the payment of deficiencies in the budget in excess of $40 per month; Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring),* That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend titles I and X of the Social Security Act to provide for grants to the States of 50 per centum of State average payments of $40 per month in lieu of an individual basis, to enable the States to pay full budget deficiencies in all grants, and be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies of the memorial be sent to the President of the United States and to United States Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney and E. V. Robertson, Congressman Frank A. Barrett, and to the Honorable Arthur J. Altmeyer, chairman of the Social Security Board."

By Mr. LANGER:

A House concurrent resolution of the Assembly of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution D

"Whereas apparently there has been no determination made by responsible officers of the Government of the total required production of essential food and fiber for the duration of the war and for the reconstruction period following the war; and

"Whereas food and fiber goals have thus far been established only on a short-time basis; and

"Whereas the War Manpower Commission was created for the purpose of analyzing and giving proper weight to the minimum manpower requirements of all war industries including agriculture, the armed forces and the necessary civilian economy; and

"Whereas, although several months have elapsed since the creation of said Manpower Commission, the drain of agriculture's trained manpower into industry and the armed forces through the Selective Service System continues at substantially the previous rate, notwithstanding the fact that thousands of auction sales have been held and that breeding herds of sheep, hogs, and both beef and dairy cattle continue to be reduced through shipment to market as a result of the manpower shortage already existing throughout this area; and

"Whereas, notwithstanding the fact that agriculture in the Great Plains area, normally renews completely its mechanized equipment every 10 years, and the further facts that this area has just come through a 10-year period of depression and crop failure which made normal replacement impossible, thus multiplying many times the minimum requirements for both new machinery and repair parts; and

"Whereas, notwithstanding the recent increase of 30 percent over previous allocations of iron and steel for farm equipment granted by the War Production Board, the seeded acreage of field crops in this area will be substantially reduced as compared to 1942 for the combined reasons of manpower shortage and inadequate machinery and repair parts; and

"Whereas North Dakota now has 40,000 of its young men serving in the armed forces and being wholly an agricultural State it is self-evident that a very large percentage of the men now in service and a similar percentage of any subsequent drains on our manpower have and must come from our farms; and

"Whereas, if North Dakota is to contribute her best in this prosecution of this total war, it can only be done through maximum utilization of its one great resource, namely, agriculture; and

"Whereas this can be done only if immediate and realistic consideration, followed by positive action, be given to the minimum requirements of our farmers in the fields. Manpower, machinery, repair parts, tires, gasoline, credit availability, credit cost, nonrecourse production, loans, equitable relationship between price floors and ceiling to production costs, the relationship of production costs to the added risks incident to the efforts to meet expanding production goals under wartime conditions, the apparent necessity for lifting all acreage restrictions on wheat as has already been done for corn: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring),* That we earnestly recommend and ask that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry make an immediate and thorough investigation of all the agricultural "musts" to the end that the requirements of sufficient manpower, sufficient current credit, proper price relationship between production costs, ceilings and floors, sufficient farm machinery and repair parts, gasoline, rubber, fertilizer, and other necessary supplies be definitely determined on a long-time basis, not only for the war years but for the reconstruction period following the war and allotted to agriculture so that sufficient food and fiber may be forthcoming to meet increasingly expanding goals and to supply the requirement of our armed forces, the civilian population, the lease-lend commitments to the Allied Nations, and food for occupied countries, and that such investigation include the careful weighing and consideration of the interrelationship and division of authority and responsibility among the following agencies in connection with such determination: United States Department of Agriculture, Office of Price Administration, War Production Board, War Manpower Commission, Office of Petroleum Coordinator; be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each Member of Congress from North Dakota, presiding officer of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representaties, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, Office of Price Administration, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, president of the Senate and speaker of the House of Representatives in the States of Montana, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, Michigan, Texas, Missouri, and Illinois."

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A concurrent memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"House Concurrent Memorial 1

*"To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"By act of April 20, 1927, the Legislature of Arizona created the Arizona Children's Colony, an institution for the care and education of mentally defective children.

"Under the provisions of the act of March 19, 1929, a tract consisting of 80 acres of irrigated farming land, situated near the city of Mesa, was purchased as a site for the institution, in a location possessing surroundings highly favorable for its purposes.

"One legislative impediment after another, but chiefly the economic fear of adding to the tax burden through appropriations for operation, intervened to delay the carrying

forward of this important humanitarian enterprise, but the act of March 19, 1941, recognized its urgent need by making appropriation for the construction of initial buildings, which would have been erected and occupied by this time but for the difficulties attendant upon procuring building materials.

"The Arizona Children's Colony ranks in its objectives with the other social, educational, and charitable institutions for which grants of land were made to the State of Arizona under the terms of the Enabling Act of June 20, 1910, and which have proven of great benefits in the maintenance of hospitals and schools for the insane, the deaf, dumb, and blind, and disabled miners, as well as of educational and correctional institutions.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress enact legislation granting to the State of Arizona 100,000 acres of the surveyed, unreserved, unappropriated, and nonmineral public lands of the United States within the limits of this State, for the purposes of an institution for the care and education of mentally defective children."

A concurrent memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Concurrent Memorial 2

*"To the President and the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The urgent need for zinc, lead, copper, and other so-called strategic metals is a condition which calls for no explanation.

"That everything possible must be done, as a war measure, to meet this need is admitted.

"Labor conditions, priorities, transportation, and perhaps other factors, may be numbered among the impediments to maximum production.

"The chief factor, however, is found in the ceiling prices currently effective for these metals.

"These prices may have been just and adequate when set, but such is not the case now. Since these prices were fixed, wages, supplies, and everything entering into the cost of mining has increased, and mine operators, particularly the small operators, find themselves with depleted budgets and inadequate loans, and unable to realize full production.

"As a matter of simple justice, also, the mining industry should be enabled to operate on a fair and equitable basis of security and profit equal to that enjoyed by other war industries.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Sixteenth Arizona State Legislature, the Senate concurring, respectfully prays:

"1. That steps be taken, by the Chief Executive, or by the appropriate Federal agency, and if necessary by the Congress, through the medium of legislation, to insure a substantial increase in the price of strategic metals, and particularly zinc, lead, and copper."

## PRICE CEILINGS FOR FLUE-CURED TOBACCO—RESOLUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, for my colleague the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and myself, I present to the Senate a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, which is now in session. The resolution, being a joint one and known as Senate Resolution 142, interests itself in ceilings upon tobacco, and I take this opportunity to read the first paragraph thereof:

A joint resolution urging the Federal authorities to apply price ceilings to the flue-cured tobacco crop by a method which will not destroy the auction system of selling tobacco.

Mr. President, the resolution is signed by the Honorable R. L. Harris, President of the Senate of the State of North Carolina, and by the Honorable John Kerr, Jr., Speaker of the North Carolina House of Representatives. I may add that Mr. John Kerr, Jr., is the son of John Kerr, who served in the National House of Representatives for many years. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 142

Whereas the growing and marketing of tobacco is one of North Carolina's foremost industries, affecting the lives, prosperity, and property of a large number of its citizens; and

Whereas by the free choice of the tobacco growers the auction system of selling tobacco has been adopted and now prevails in North Carolina; and

Whereas the preservation of the auction method of selling tobacco, with its competitive features, is essential and necessary in order to preserve a free market where tobacco can be offered and sold according to its true value, subject only to a price ceiling of Office of Price Administration; and

Whereas the price ceilings on buyers' averages as enforced in the sale of the 1942 flue-cured crop was in the main satisfactory to growers and tended to preserve the auction system and its competitive features: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Carolina (the House of Representatives concurring):*

SECTION 1. That the United States Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration be requested and urged in establishing price ceilings for the 1943 crop of flue-cured tobacco to establish such ceilings on buyers' averages, but not on individual baskets of tobacco, in order to protect and preserve a free market for the sale of leaf tobacco at auction.

SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of Congress from North Carolina and to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Office of Price Administration Administrator.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in effect from and after its ratification.

## RESOLUTION OF THIRTIETH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE STATE UNION OF NEBRASKA—CEILING PRICE ON LIVESTOCK

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the interest of food production, I present a resolution adopted at the thirtieth annual convention of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative State Union of Nebraska, February 10 and 11, 1943, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED AT THE THIRTIETH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE STATE UNION OF NEBRASKA, FEBRUARY 10 AND 11, 1943

There still seem to be a few groups who are working to have the Office of Price Administration set a ceiling price on live meat animals. Everyone acquainted with the livestock business knows that this would be practically a physical impossibility. We urge the continuance of every possible means to prevent this.

EUGENE HULTQUIST.
JOHN E. SIEMERS.
HAROLD H. HUMMEL.
HENRY SCHLAUTMAN.
ARTHUR C. MANN.

## LETTER FROM THE KOREAN NATIONAL REVOLUTIONARY PARTY, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BRANCH

Mr. GILLETTE presented a letter from the Korean National Revolutionary Party, United States of America Branch, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KOREAN
NATIONAL REVOLUTIONARY PARTY,
*Los Angeles, Calif., February 12, 1943.*

Senator GUY M. GILLETTE,
*Senate Foreign Relations Committee,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: We are most grateful for your humanitarianism and understanding of Korea and the Korean problems. Your introduction of the Korean students bill was the means of saving many of the Korean students from being deported before December 7, 1941.

Your recent Senate Resolution No. 91, urging the United States Senate to give full legal backing to the Atlantic Charter is another proof of your generous understanding of the subjugated peoples of the Pacific, and particularly of Korea.

We fully realize the responsibility of the Koreans in general toward the United States, and the United Nations' war efforts for an early victory. We are also cognizant of the far-reaching moral influence your Senate Resolution No. 91 will have over more than 1,000,000,000 people in the Near and Far East in the support we may give to America in the Pacific.

Therefore, we are mindful of our acts and response to the call for effective cooperation between the United States and the Koreans who are now engaged in their struggle to whip the Japanese militarists.

In view of the many kind things you have done in behalf of us, we thank you most heartily and sincerely. We pray that God may continue to give you health, happiness, and the success you so deserve.

Gratefully yours,

DIAMOND KIM,
*Chairman.*
LOWELL KWAHK,
*Secretary.*
D. S. SHYNN,
*Chairman, Political Council.*
JAMES PENN,
*Public Relations Chairman.*
N. Y. CHOY,
*Treasurer.*

## PROTECTION OF SMALL BUSINESS—RESOLUTION OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION OF ST. LOUIS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution or statement adopted as a part of the platform of the Mississippi Valley Association of St. Louis setting forth its interest in the small businessmen of the United States and urging that Congress enact legislation to protect small businesses. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution or statement was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and or-

dered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Small businesses and manufacturing plants are an integral part of private enterprise and free competition. There are more than 160,000 small businesses employing more than 3,000,000 workers and their existence is threatened by war priorities and the shortage of manpower. We urge that the Congress give serious attention to measures to protect and preserve small businesses.

PROPOSALS TO RESTRICT THE MAKING OF FLOUR—LETTER FROM DR. F. D. FARRELL

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a letter I have just received from Dr. F. D. Farrell, president of the Kansas State College, at Manhattan, Kans. I have been in close touch with this college for more than 40 years; in fact my first public office was membership on the board of regents for the institution approximately 30 years ago. Dr. Farrell is an unusually high-class citizen of Kansas, in addition to being one of our most distinguished educators and scholars.

In his letter Dr. Farrell calls attention to proposals being made to restrict the making of flour for bread to four types—whole wheat; high extraction; wheat flour combined with soybean, peanut, or cottonseed flour; and enriched white flour. He says in his letter to me that this is neither necessary nor desirable, and adds:

To require ultra-high extraction or the addition of protein supplements would probably injure both the wheat industry and the consumer because of the effect of such a requirement on the consumption of bread. The palatability of bread for most consumers would be seriously reduced by ultra-high extraction or the addition of protein supplements, and bread consumption no doubt would be correspondingly reduced.

I may add, Mr. President, that while there is no shortage of wheat or flour, livestock feeders are having considerable difficulty in obtaining protein supplements for animal feeding; so it would seem unwise to divert the use of protein supplements for making bread while this shortage of livestock feed exists.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Farrell's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks and be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE,
*Manhattan, February 8, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: A proposal has been made a time or two by a representative of one of the war agencies, probably the War Production Board, involving the Kansas wheat industry. As I understand it, the proposal is that throughout the period of the war only four types of flour be available in this country for use in bread making: (1) Whole wheat flour; (2) high extraction (not less than 85 percent) flour; (3) wheat flour combined with protein supplements such as soybean flour, peanut flour or cottonseed flour; and (4) enriched white flour.

In our judgment, it is neither necessary nor desirable to require the use of ultrahigh extraction flour or of flour combined with such protein supplements as peanut, soybean, or cottonseed.

There is no present scarcity of wheat or flour. Just now there seems to be no prospect of an acute scarcity within the next year or two at least. To require ultrahigh extraction or the addition of protein supplements would probably injure both the wheat industry and the consumer because of the effect of such a requirement on the consumption of bread. The palatability of bread for most consumers would be seriously reduced by ultrahigh extraction or the addition of protein supplements and bread consumption, no doubt, would be correspondingly reduced.

A further objection to the proposal lies in the fact that whereas there is no shortage of wheat or flour, livestock feeders are experiencing serious difficulty in obtaining protein supplements for their animals. This fact makes it seem particularly undesirable to divert the use of protein supplements for the making of bread.

I do not know what the status of the proposal now is in Washington but I thought that you should know about it if you have not already been informed regarding it so that you may be prepared to deal with it if it should approach the stage of official adoption.

Very truly yours,

F. D. FARRELL,
*President.*

EDITORIAL FROM UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred an editorial from this week's issue of the United Mine Workers' Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COAL MINERS HAVE THE RIGHT TO PROVE $2 DAY WAGE INCREASE IS JUSTIFIED

The old game of damning American coal miners and their leadership is on again in full force.

And again, we have with us the learned special purpose writers, aided and abetted by that legion of "crystal-gazing" radio commentators, all picturing to the American public the whys and wherefores of just how the American wheels of industry are to be stilled on March 31 because it has been said some time in the past:

"The United Mine Workers do not work without a contract."

These news analysts "plum" forget to use, "or the equivalent of a wage agreement," and that equivalent is and has been a retroactive wage agreement, making retroactive the wage rates and working conditions finally determined and ultimately agreed upon. Simple reflection by these learned writers and commentators would have revealed that, in 1941, the United Mine Workers worked during May, June, and up to the 5th of July, under a retroactive agreement in many coal fields. And it has been done in other years. So why all the scare publicity at this time?

The answer to this is rather simple. Certain Washington "burrocrats" and certain politicians have certain grievances against the United Mine Workers. These grievances are both political and economic. They do not exactly regard a coal miner as one who is entitled to conditions of employment or wage rates commensurate with those employed in certain other trades.

Like economic and political grievances are entertained by certain editors in control of big circulations and so their game is to do the best job possible in selling the public against the mine workers' demands in advance of the wage negotiations.

The mine workers believe the $2 a day wage proposal is economically sound. They believe they have a right to present their case and their argument in support of their demands without being condemned as economic villains in advance of that opportunity. The United Mine Workers believe that when the wage conference convenes and the whole economic structure of the coal industry is laid bare that the facts developed will substantiate the ability of the industry to meet the $2 proposal without serious injury to the public purse.

During 1942, the United Mine Workers increased production 70,000,000 tons with 70,000 less men employed. No other country in the world can show any such record on a per capita man-day basis. The basic wage rate upon which 1942 coal was produced was 50 cents the day less than it was 20 years ago. The cost of living in the coal-mining camps of America is the highest level of any other geographical area in the United States. The coal miner is the innocent victim of short line, excess railroad freight rates, as well as company and high margin stores, which take all the traffic will bear.

Why don't these same writers and commentators who are so hell-bent on arousing public opinion against the United Mine Workers, simply because the mine workers dare pursue the economic right of American citizens, dig into the facts and learn something about how coal production costs f. o. b. mines affect the American purse, and what the cost of coal really totals to the selling price of the manufactured products coal produces and transports?

Even with the granting of the $2 a day increased wage, the total cost of coal f. o. b. the mine to the selling price of all manufactured products would remain less than .0075 of a cent per sales dollar.

Why don't some of the "burrocrats" who spend hours reminiscing in swell Washington dining rooms about the sporting events of their younger years, and then rush madly to their respective offices to arrive before quitting time so that they can sign the commitments to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on projects and for goods without blinking an eye—who in many instances do not know the premise of their economic doings—try to learn how things can be done—how the coal industry can meet the economic necessities of the men who mine the coal?

We are just about fed up with this constant damning of the Americal coal miner. It seems that every time the American coal miners formulate wage proposals, they are characterized as a coercive force trying to destroy set formulas and economic standards of American industry. Who gave to whom the right to say that the American coal miner is not entitled to enjoy comparative American standards of life with other Americans?

We think it is about time that American society, American industry, and Government "burrocrats" began to appreciate the work performed by American coal miners employed in the most hazardous industry of all the basic industries of the Nation—the full consideration which is their just due.

And, in this viewpoint, we believe we are fully sustained by a large segment of the American press located in coal-producing areas, who know first hand the economic plight of the coal miner, as pointed out by the Scranton Times in an editorial discussing the wage proposal, when that paper said:

"When they get to the War Labor Board the mine workers are entitled to have their wage scales considered on the basis of pure merit and without prejudice by reason of political or personal differences between public officials and the leaders of the mine workers or any prejudices arising from the recent anthracite strike."

REPORTS OF BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

The following reports of the Committee on Banking and Currency were submitted:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 677. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 55).

By Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. DANAHER):

S. 700. A bill to amend section 12B and section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act during the continuance of the war and for 6 months after its termination; with amendments (Rept. No. 56).

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF WOOL

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Special Committee to Investigate Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool, submitted, pursuant to Senate Resolution 160, Seventy-fourth Congress, and Senate Resolution 12, Seventy-eighth Congress, a report with particular reference to the Government stock pile of wool and the disposition of the domestic clip, which was ordered to be printed as Report No. 57.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR INSPECTION OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 104), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the authority contained in Senate Resolution 298, agreed to October 9, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly appointed subcommittee thereof, to visit, for purposes of inspection, during the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, any part of the Military Establishment in the Western Hemisphere, hereby is extended from the end of the said session to and including January 6, 1943.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. NYE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. BILBO, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. BARBOUR, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MOORE, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. VAN NUYS, Mr. HILL, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. WILLIS, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. REED, Mr. LANGER, Mr. ROBERTSON and Mr. SCRUGHAM) introduced Senate bill 729, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. NYE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. BILBO, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. VAN NUYS, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. REED, Mr. BUCK, Mr. LANGER, Mr. ROBERTSON and Mr. SCRUGHAM) also introduced Senate bill 730, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 731. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States in the Missouri River Basin to negotiate and enter into a compact for a division of the waters of the Missouri River; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 732. A bill to enable the people of Puerto Rico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the States; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REED:

S. 733. A bill to amend Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 734. A bill to provide for the transfer of Granville County to the middle judicial district of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OVERTON:

S. 735. A bill to amend section 7 (e) of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY introduced Senate bill 736, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 737. A bill to suspend the provisions of sections 314, 325, 339, 348, and 356 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 738. A bill to amend section 212 (a) of the act of June 30, 1932 (Economy Act); and

S. 739. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States as students at educational institutions and other places"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. REYNOLDS also introduced Senate bill 740, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 741. A bill regulating compensation of United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CAPPER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 33, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE AND RELEASE OF AGRICULTURAL LABOR

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I introduce two bills for appropriate reference, and desire to make a brief statement regarding them.

One of the bills provides for the deferment of agricultural labor. The bill has 40 cosponsors.

The other bill would authorize the Secretary of War to release on furlough all men in the land forces of the United States who are located in the United States on the date of enactment of the act and who, immediately prior to their induction into such forces, were regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor or were employed in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity as their principal occupation. This bill has 30 cosponsors.

In view of the importance of the measures, I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations, introduced by Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. NYE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. BILBO, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. BARBOUR, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MOORE, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. VAN NUYS, Mr. HILL, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. WILLIS, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. REED, Mr. LANGER, Mr. ROBERTSON, and Mr. SCRUGHAM) was read twice by its title; referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(k) Every registrant who is regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor or whose principal occupation consists of employment in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States; and no such registrant shall leave such occupation or endeavor or cease to be employed in connection with such production or harvesting unless, prior thereto, he requests his selective service local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to engage in some other occupation or endeavor, to be employed in some other work, or to become a member of such land or naval forces."

The bill (S. 730) to provide for releasing certain persons in military service to aid in agricultural production, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. NYE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. BILBO, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. VAN NUYS, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. REED, Mr. BUCK, Mr. LANGER, Mr. ROBERTSON, and Mr. SCRUGHAM), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in order to further relieve the shortage of farm labor and to assist in the adequate production and harvesting of agricultural commodities es-

sential to the war effort, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to release on furlough, until January 1, 1944, all men in the land forces of the United States who are located in the United States on the date of enactment of this act, and who, immediately prior to their induction into such forces, were regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor, or were employed in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity as their principal occupation, as determined by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 2 (a) Each man who is so released on furlough shall be required to enter into an agreement (1) that during the period of such furlough and until January 1, 1944, he will engage in such work in connection with the production, planting, cultivating, or harvesting of agricultural commodities as he is qualified by experience to perform, (2) that in the event that a shortage of farm labor exists in any area in connection with the production, planting, cultivating, or harvesting of any agricultural commodity, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture, he may be assigned to work in such area, and (3) that his furlough shall be immediately terminated for failure to comply with the terms of such agreement.

(b) While any man so released on furlough is employed as herein provided he shall be entitled to receive compensation for his services at the prevailing rate of pay therefor in the community in which such services are performed, but if such amount is less than the amount such man would have received as a member of the land forces of the United States he shall be entitled to receive the latter amount.

(c) The Secretary of War is authorized to make such regulations, and to enter into such contracts with respect to the employment and compensation of men released on furlough under this act, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

## APPLICATION OF NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE ACT TO WAR CORRESPONDENTS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I now reintroduce a bill which I introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress, affecting war correspondents. The bill I am now introducing reads as follows:

A bill extending the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to American war correspondents.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 601 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "and (6) an officially accredited American war correspondent."

SEC. 2. Section 601 (c) of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "and the term 'active service' in the case of an officially accredited American war correspondent, includes all periods of time during which such person is serving in his official capacity as an American war correspondent with any branch of the land or naval forces of the United States."

In this connection, Mr. President, I may say that, unfortunately, the committee to which the bill was referred at the last session of Congress did not see fit to pass upon it favorably, and it will, of necessity, return to the same committee that has been considering matters of that nature and category insofar as the National Insurance Act is affected.

I wish to state further, at this opportune time, that I trust seriously that the members of the committee to which the bill will be referred will give to it not only immediate consideration but that they will likewise certainly give to it favorable consideration, for I believe that newspapermen and war correspondents who are at the front are entitled to the benefits of the National Life Insurance Act.

In connection with this matter I wish to call the attention of the Members of this body to a very interesting article which appeared in a newspaper published in the city of Washington, namely, the Times-Herald, issue of February 10, 1943, under the caption "Capital compass," written daily by Mr. George D. Riley and Mr. Page Huidekoper. I quote from the article, as follows:

Some American correspondents in England are being given an intensive indoctrination course in bombing etiquette at the headquarters of the Eighth Air Force of the United States Army.

They have just completed their first week, which concentrated mainly on high altitude flying, use of oxygen masks during flight, and learning air force lingo. Next week they will be taught how to pack parachutes, and how to use them if the need ever arises.

Later they will go on operational raids with bombers of the Eighth Air Force and write about the raids for their respective papers at home.

Objective of all this, according to an air force colonel, is to see that the American people get the best technical reporting possible on the activities of the air force. After a little while, he said, the reporters will pick up a vast amount of intimate flying knowledge and their stories will be consequently far more graphic and accurate.

To that statement I heartily agree.

WRITERS OF WAR

According to the Joint Army and Navy Credential Board, the unit which supplies the necessary papers, there are nearly 500 newspapermen with American Army, Navy, and Air Forces abroad.

The casualty list of journalists in this war indicates the constant danger to which they are exposed. So far there have been 11 killed in action, 2 are missing, 21 wounded in line of duty, 18 captured in battle, and several score interned, of whom more than 40 have already been exchanged.

Among the correspondent heroes have been such reporters as Witt Hancock and Larry Allen, of the Associated Press; Byron Darnton, Warld War veteran, who was killed in New Guinea while covering the war in the South Pacific for the New York Times; Stanley Johnston, of the Chicago Tribune Press Service, who wrote the epic story of the sinking of the aircraft carrier *Lexington;* Don Bell, who stuck to his National Broadcasting Co. broadcasting post throughout the bombing of Manila; Clark Lee, of the Associated Press, whose dispatches from Bataan won even the praise of the austere Infantry Journal; Harold Guard, of the United Press; Cecil Brown, of the Columbia Broadcasting System, who was on the *Repulse* when she was torpedoed; Harold Denny, of the New York Times, who was captured by the Germans in Libya, and Harry Crockett, of the Associated Press, who was recently killed on duty in the Mediterranean.

Mr. President, without taking up further time of the Senate, I ask that the remainder of this brief but timely article, in the interest of American war correspondents of the newspaper fraternity of America, be printed in the RECORD at this juncture as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN WORLD WAR NO. 1

In World War No. 1 there were no United States correspondents killed in action; one died of influenza, half a dozen were slightly wounded, and two were gassed.

None was captured or interned except for those who were caught in Germany or Austria-Hungary when war broke out.

A lot of names of newspapermen of the last war stand out, but perhaps one of the most battle-scarred of the correspondents was Frederick Palmer, of the New York World. He had already covered the Greek War in 1897, the Philippines campaign, the Boxer uprising, the taking of Tientsin in 1900, and the Macedonian, Russo-Jap, Turkish, and Balkan wars and insurrections when World War No. 1 broke out.

Palmer was the only American correspondent accredited to the British Army and fleet from 1914 to 1916, and his stories were carried by Associated Press, United Press, and International News Service.

GREATS OF THE PAST

Richard Harding Davis had also already made a great name for himself in the field of journalism when World War No. 1 broke out. He had covered, among others, the Cuban campaign, and when he wasn't writing dispatches about the war he was fighting alongside Theodore Roosevelt's Rough Riders.

John T. McCutcheon, the Chicago Tribune's famous cartoonist, was a reporter in the Spanish-American War.

James Creelman, a Hearst man and another of the most famous correspondents of the last war, had also covered the Spanish-American War.

J. W. Pegler (he didn't start using his second name, Westbrook, until years later), who was then with the United Press, was another World War correspondent, but he gave it up to join the Navy.

Among the many other famous ones were Heywood Broun, Damon Runyon, Irvin Cobb, Edwin L. James, and Paul Scott Mowrer.

But no matter how much action these men saw, the Army Air Corps colonel said, it will look like nothing compared to what newspapermen in this war will see—and the Army is glad to give them technical training so they can understand the shape of the battle.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 740) extending the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to American war correspondents, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, for a number of years I have considered it my high privilege and solemn duty to introduce in the Senate in each Congress a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would make it possible for the people of the District of Columbia to participate with their fellow Americans in the Government of our country.

As a firm believer in the fundamental principles of our form of government, I hold that all Americans, wherever they reside in our country, should possess the right and the privilege of participating in the legislation of the Nation through legislators of their own choosing. Likewise, I hold that all such Americans are justly entitled to participate, through their duly chosen electors, in the election of the President and the Vice President of the United States.

With the single exception of those Americans permanently residing in the District of Columbia, the way is open for all others to participate. And, strange as it may seem, the Congress, which under the Constitution is given the broad power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the seat of the Government of the United States, has not the power to correct this grievous wrong.

Last week that wise elder statesman, Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas, introduced a joint resolution in the House of Representatives to correct this serious omission from the Constitution and thus grant to the Congress a new power which it should by all means possess. I am much impressed with this new simple form of amendment, and learning that it has the approval of local civic leaders, I offer it for the consideration of the Senate in lieu of the more elaborate forms which I have heretofore introduced. Other proposed amendments introduced in the past have carried details which should be decided by subsequent legislation and are naturally of a controversial nature.

Mr. President, the amendment which I now offer is a simple, broad enabling provision which grants to Congress the power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President Members elected by the people of the District of Columbia. The number of such Members and their powers are to be determined by the Congress. The amendment is as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be proposed for ratification by the legislatures of the several States, which when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years of the date of its passage, shall be valid as a part of said Constitution, namely:

"The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President Members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

Mr. President, under this amendment the Congress would not surrender or in any way lessen its constitutional legislative control over the Nation's Capital. The amendment would increase the power of the Congress to cure this gross and un-American injustice at the heart of the Nation and to do this in the manner and to the degree which the Congress, in its wisdom, may determine.

The amendment concludes with a provision that, "All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal." This is to insure definitely that the Congress in the exercise of the proposed new power will not then expend its power beyond recapture through amendment and repeal.

Mr. President, the un-American conditions prevailing in the Capital of the Nation do not make sense. They are entirely out of harmony with the fundamental principles of our Government or the much-heralded "four freedoms." If there ever was an excuse or reason for the creation of so anomalous a situation, it could have been only for the protection of the national interest. I am satisfied that the protection of the national interest does not require these fine Americans of the Capital to be the subjects of the United States of America. They are of right and ought to be recognized as full participating citizens of the Republic.

Now, as thousands of the voteless and unrepresented men of the District of Columbia are serving in the armed forces of our and their country in this greatest of all wars, is the time for Congress to undertake the task of removing this great injustice. Yes, it will require a constitutional amendment to clothe the Congress with power to make a complete job of this long-delayed act of justice and I do not believe that that Congress should be too busy to undertake so urgent a patriotic duty.

There is nothing controversial in the amendment I am introducing. It provides a straightforward grant of power to the Congress, by appropriate legislation, to apply to the seat of the Government those cherished, fundamental American principles of our Government now denied. The time is now ripe for affirmative and curative action. This unwise and indefensible un-American condition must be erased before we can, with a clear conscience, preach freedom and democracy to the rest of the world.

Mr. President, I beseech Senators not to let this matter slumber but to give it their early and sympathetic consideration and favorable action.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 33) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## LOANS FOR MINERAL DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES—RECONSIDERATION OF BILL

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I desire to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill No. 12, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes, as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war," was passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be entered.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I move that the House of Representatives be requested to return the bill to the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

## CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 105), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the authority contained in Senate Resolution 246, agreed to April 17, 1930, authorizing a special committee to investigate the conservation of wild animal life, hereby is continued from February 1, 1943, to the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress; and the said committee hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $6,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for such purpose.

## COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. MCNARY, and by unanimous consent, it was

*Ordered*, That the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] be excused from further service on the Special Committee to Investigate Production, Transportation, and Use of Fuels in Areas West of the Mississippi River, and that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] be assigned to service on said special committee.

## THE ARMY MOTION PICTURE—A PRELUDE TO WAR

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, yesterday I transmitted to the Senate Committee on Appropriations some correspondence between General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and me. For the benefit of the Senate I request that the letter of General Marshall addressed to me under date of February 9, and my reply thereto under date of February 16, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The correspondence is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
*Washington, February 9, 1943.*

Hon. RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have just read this morning in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, page 712, your comments regarding the Army motion pictures, and in particular the first of a series of five, A Prelude to War, which General Osborn explained to an audience of the American Legion the other day.

I want to say this: That I personally found the lectures of officers to the men, as to what we were fighting for and what the enemy had done, so unsatisfactory because of the mediocrity of presentation that I directed the preparation of this series of films. Further, that the President, Mr. Roosevelt, had never heard of their preparation, because this was a matter of Army training responsibility, until after A Prelude to War had been shown to probably a million troops.

The few civilians who did see the picture were so insistent that the public should be given the benefit of seeing it that I had the reel sent to the White House and suggested that the President see it, with a view to its release for public distribution, less the quotation from a talk by me to the graduating class at West Point. Up to the present time this release has not been authorized.

From reading your remarks I felt that you had been misled as to the responsibility for these films. It is purely mine. The actual preparation of the films, of course, was worked out by General Osborn and Frank Capra, one of the most skillful movie direc-

tors. We are in this war to defeat the Germans and the Japs, and I consider that this series of films will be definitely helpful toward that end.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL,
*Chief of Staff.*

---

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
*February 16, 1943.*

Gen. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
*Chief of Staff, War Department,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: I acknowledge your note of the 9th instant and reply to it now since I have just returned to my office after spending the last hour and 45 minutes in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building, where for more than 40 minutes, myself and others were required to view a picture which I had never before seen and had not requested be shown. Then the picture which I saw at the American Legion annual dinner on the evening of January 11 last was shown, but not in its entirety according to my impressions and memory of the text.

Very cordially yours,

RUFUS C. HOLMAN.

## LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day speech delivered by him at a dinner sponsored by the Manitowoc County Republican Club, Manitowoc, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

## ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ICKES AT TESTIMONIAL MEETING FOR FORMER SENATOR GEORGE NORRIS

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Secretary Ickes at a testimonial meeting for former Senator George Norris, at Chicago, Ill., on February 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## CIVILIAN MORALE—ADDRESS BY ROBERT H. McNEILL

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our Civilian Morale, and How We Can Improve It," delivered by Robert H. McNeill to the Civitan Club of Washington, D. C., on January 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE CULT OF COMPETENCY—ADDRESS BY H. W. PRENTIS, JR.

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Cult of Competency, delivered by H. W. Prentis, Jr., president of the Armstrong Cork Co., of Lancaster, Pa., at the midwinter commencement of the University of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia, Pa., February 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## FARM PRODUCTION PROBLEMS—LETTERS BY LOUIS BROMFIELD AND W. E. CUMMINGS

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD letters on the subject of current farm production problems, one addressed to the press by Louis Bromfield, of Lucas, Ohio, and one addressed to him by W. E. Cummins, of Willard, Ohio, which appear in the Appendix.]

## THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD AND WAR PRODUCTION—LETTER BY JOHN P. FREY

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by John P. Frey, president of the Metal Trades Department of the A. F. of L., published in the Washington Star of February 12, 1943, under the headline "N. L. R. B. assailed by labor spokesman," which appears in the Appendix.]

## POST-WAR PROBLEMS—ARTICLE BY ROBERT MOSES

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Consult the Average American About the Post-War World," written by Robert Moses and published in the Reader's Digest for February, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS ON EXPANSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials from several American newspapers favoring consideration of an expanded program of social security in the post-war period, which appear in the Appendix.]

## THE FLUID-MILK SITUATION

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement covering the fluid milk situation, presented by representatives of the International Association of Milk Control Agencies before Federal Government officials on February 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## JUDGE JOHN B. WHITFIELD, OF FLORIDA

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Gazette of Kissimee, Fla., of October 17, 1941, entitled "A Great Judge Retires," which appears in the Appendix.]

## ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 739) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States as students at educational institutions and other places," reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 58) thereon.

## MERGER OF TELEGRAPH COMPANIES—CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 142)

Mr. McFARLAND submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of Title II the following new section:

"'CONSOLIDATIONS AND MERGERS OF TELEGRAPH CARRIERS

"'SEC. 222. (a) As used in this section—

"'(1) The term "consolidation or merger" includes the legal consolidation or merger of two or more corporations, and the acquisition by a corporation through purchase, lease, or in any other manner, of the whole or any part of the property, securities, facilities, services, or business of any other corporation or corporations, or of the control thereof, in exchange for its own securities, or otherwise.

"'(2) The term "domestic telegraph carrier" means any common carrier by wire or radio, the major portion of whose traffic and revenues is derived from domestic telegraph operations; and such term includes a corporation owning or controlling any such common carrier.

"'(3) The term "international telegraph carrier" means any common carrier by wire or radio, the major portion of whose traffic and revenues is derived from international telegraph operations; and such term includes a corporation owning or controlling any such common carrier.

"'(4) The term "consolidated or merged carrier" means any carrier by wire or radio which acquires or operates the properties and facilities unified and integrated by consolidation or merger.

"'(5) The term "domestic telegraphic operations" includes acceptance, transmission, reception, and delivery of record communications by wire or radio which either originate or terminate at points within the continental United States, Alaska, Canada, Saint Pierre-Miquelon, Mexico, or Newfoundland and terminate or originate at points within the continental United States, Alaska, Canada, Saint Pierre-Miquelon, Mexico, or Newfoundland, and includes acceptance, transmission, reception, or delivery performed within the continental United States between points of origin within and points of exit from, and between points of entry into and points of destination within, the continental United States with respect to record communications by wire or radio which either originate or terminate outside the continental United States, Alaska, Canada, Saint Pierre-Miquelon, Mexico, and Newfoundland, and also includes the transmission within the continental United States of messages which both originate and terminate outside but transit through the continental United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall prevent international telegraph carriers from accepting and delivering international telegraph messages in the cities which constitute gateways approved by the Commission as points of entrance into or exit from the continental United States, under regulations prescribed by the Commission, and the incidental transmission or reception of the same over its own or leased lines or circuits within the continental United States.

"'(6) The term "international telegraph operations" includes acceptance, transmission, reception, and delivery of record communications by wire or radio which either originate or terminate at points outside the continental United States, Alaska, Canada, Saint Pierre-Miquelon, Mexico, and Newfoundland, but does not include acceptance, transmission, reception, and delivery performed within the continental United States between points of origin within and points of exit from, and between points of entry into, and points of destination within, the continental United States with respect to such communications, or the transmission within the continental United States of messages which both originate and terminate outside but transit through the continental United States.

"'(7) The terms "domestic telegraph properties" and "domestic telegraph facilities" mean properties and facilities, respectively, used or to be used in domestic telegraph operations.

"'(8) The term "employee" or "employees" (i) shall include any individual who is absent from active service because of furlough, illness, or leave of absence, except that there shall be no obligation upon the consolidated or merged carrier to reemploy any employee

who is absent because of furlough, except in accordance with the terms of his furlough, and (ii) shall not include any employee of any carrier which is a party to a consolidation or merger pursuant to this section to the extent that he is employed in any business which such carrier continues to operate independently of the consolidation or merger.

"'(9) The term "representative" includes any individual or labor organization.

"'(10) The term "continental United States" means the several States and the District of Columbia.

"'(b) (1) It shall be lawful, upon application to and approval by the Commission as hereinafter provided, for any two or more domestic telegraph carriers to effect a consolidation or merger; and for any domestic telegraph carrier, as a part of any such consolidation or merger or thereafter, to acquire all or any part of the domestic telegraph properties, domestic telegraph facilities, or domestic telegraph operations of any carrier which is not primarily a telegraph carrier: *Provided*, That, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, no domestic telegraph carrier shall effect a consolidation or merger with any international telegraph carrier, and no international telegraph carrier shall effect a consolidation or merger with any domestic telegraph carrier.

"'(2) As a part of any such consolidation or merger, or thereafter upon application to and approval by the Commission as hereinafter provided, the consolidated or merged carrier may acquire all or any part of the domestic telegraph properties, domestic telegraph facilities, or domestic telegraph operations of any international telegraph carrier.

"'(c) (1) Whenever any consolidation or merger is proposed under subsection (b) of this section, the telegraph carrier or telegraph carriers seeking authority therefor shall submit an application to the Commission, and thereupon the Commission shall order a public hearing to be held with respect to such application and shall give reasonable notice thereof, in writing, and an opportunity to be heard, to the Governor of each of the States in which any of the physical property involved in such proposed consolidation or merger is situated, to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, representatives of employees where represented by bargaining representatives known to the Commission, and to such other persons as the Commission may deem advisable. If, after such public hearing, the Commission finds that the proposed consolidation or merger, or an amended proposal for consolidation or merger, (1) is authorized by subsection (a) of this section, (2) conforms to all other applicable provisions of this section, (3) is in the public interest, the Commission shall enter an order approving and authorizing such consolidation or merger, and thereupon any law or laws making consolidations and mergers unlawful shall not apply to the proposed consolidation or merger. In finding whether any proposed consolidation or merger is in the public interest, the Commission shall give due consideration, among other things, to the financial soundness of the carrier resulting from such consolidation or merger.

"'(2) Any proposed consolidation or merger of domestic telegraph carriers shall provide for the divestment of the international telegraph operations theretofore carried on by any party to the consolidation or merger, within a reasonable time to be fixed by the Commission, after the consideration for the property to be divested is found by the Commission to be commensurate with its value, and as soon as the legal obligations, if any, of the carrier to be so divested will permit. The Commission shall require at the time of the approval of such consolidation or merger that any such party exercise due diligence in bringing about such divestment as promptly as it reasonably can.

"'(d) No proposed consolidation or merger of telegraph carriers pursuant to this section shall be approved by the Commission if, as a result of such consolidation or merger, more than one-fifth of the capital stock of any carrier which is subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission will be owned or controlled, or voted, directly or indirectly, (1) by any alien or the representative of any alien, (2) by any foreign government or the representative thereof, (3) by any corporation organized under the laws of any foreign government, or (4) by any corporation of which any officer or director is an alien, or of which more than one-fifth of the capital stock is owned or controlled, or voted, directly or indirectly, by any alien or the representative of any alien, by any foreign government or the representative thereof, or by any corporation organized under the laws of a foreign government.

"'(e) (1) In the case of any consolidation or merger of telegraph carriers pursuant to this section, the consolidated or merged carrier shall, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, distribute among the international telegraph carriers, telegraph traffic by wire or radio destined to points without the continental United States, and divide the charges for such traffic, in accordance with such just, reasonable, and equitable formula in the public interest as the interested carriers shall agree upon and the Commission shall approve: *Provided, however*, That in case the interested carriers should fail to agree upon a formula which the Commission approves as above provided, the Commission, after due notice and hearing, shall prescribe in its order approving and authorizing the proposed consolidation or merger a formula which it finds will be just, reasonable, equitable, and in the public interest, will be, so far as is consistent with the public interest, in accordance with the existing contractual rights of the carriers, and will effectuate the purposes of this subsection.

"'(2) In the case of any consolidation or merger pursuant to this section of telegraph carriers which, immediately prior to such consolidation or merger, interchanged traffic with telegraph carriers in a contiguous foreign country, the consolidated or merged carrier shall distribute among such foreign telegraph carriers, telegraph traffic by wire or radio destined to points in such contiguous foreign country and shall divide the charges therefor, in accordance with such just, reasonable, and equitable formula in the public interest as the interested carriers shall agree upon and the Commission shall approve: *Provided, however*, That in case the interested carriers should fail to agree upon a formula which the Commission approves as above provided, the Commission, after due notice and hearing, shall prescribe in its order approving and authorizing the proposed consolidation or merger a formula which it finds will be just, reasonable, equitable, and in the public interest, will be, so far as is consistent with the public interest, in accordance with the existing contractual rights of the carriers, and will effectuate the purposes of this subsection. As used in this paragraph, the term "contiguous foreign country" means Canada, Mexico, or Newfoundland.

"'(3) Whenever, upon a complaint or upon its own initiative, and after a full hearing, the Commission finds that any such distribution of telegraph traffic among telegraph carriers, or any such division of charges for such traffic, which is being made or which is proposed to be made, is or will be unjust, unreasonable, or inequitable, or not in the public interest, the Commission shall by order prescribe the distribution of such telegraph traffic, or the division of charges therefor, which will be just, reasonable, equitable, and in the public interest, and will be, so far as is consistent with the public interest, in accordance with the existing contractual rights of the carriers.

"'(4) For the purposes of this subsection, the international telegraph operations of any domestic telegraph carrier shall be considered to be the operations of an independent international telegraph carrier, and the domestic telegraph operations of any international telegraph carrier shall be considered to be the operations of an independent domestic telegraph carrier.

"'(f) (1) Each employee of any carrier which is a party to a consolidation or merger pursuant to this section who was employed by such carrier immediately preceding the approval of such consolidation or merger, and whose period of employment began on or before March 1, 1941, shall be employed by the carrier resulting from such consolidation or merger for a period of not less than four years from the date of the approval of such consolidation or merger, and during such period no such employee shall, without his consent, have his compensation reduced or be assigned to work which is inconsistent with his past training and experience in the telegraph industry.

"'(2) If any employee of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger, who was employed by such carrier immediately preceding the approval of such consolidation or merger, and whose period of employment began after March 1, 1941, is discharged as a consequence of such consolidation or merger by the carrier resulting therefrom, within four years from the date of approval of the consolidation or merger, such carrier shall pay such employee at the time he is discharged severance pay in cash equal to the amount of salary or compensation he would have received during the full four-week period immediately preceding such discharge at the rate of compensation or salary payable to him during such period, multiplied by the number of years he has been continuously employed immediately preceding such discharge by one or another of such carriers who were parties to such consolidation or merger, but in no case shall any such employee receive less severance pay than the amount of salary or compensation he would have received at such rate if he were employed during such full four-week period: *Provided, however*, That such severance pay shall not be required to be paid to any employee who is discharged after the expiration of a period, following the date of approval of the consolidation or merger, equal to the aggregate period during which such employee was in the employ, prior to such date of approval, of one or more of the carriers which are parties to the consolidation or merger.

"'(3) For a period of four years after the date of approval of any such consolidation or merger, any employee of any carrier which is a party to such consolidation or merger who was such an employee on such date of approval, and who is discharged as a result of such consolidation or merger, shall have a preferential hiring and employment status for any position for which he is qualified by training and experience over any person who has not theretofore been an employee of any such carrier.

"'(4) If any employee is transferred from one community to another, as a result of any such consolidation or merger, the carrier resulting therefrom shall pay, in addition to such employee's regular compensation as an employee of such carrier, the actual traveling expenses of such employee and his family, including the cost of packing, crating, drayage, and transportation of household goods and personal effects.

"'(5) In the case of any consolidation or merger pursuant to this section, the consolidated or merged carrier shall accord to every employee or former employee, or representative or beneficiary of an employee or former

employee, of any carrier which is a party to such consolidation or merger, the same pension, health, disability, or death insurance benefits, as were provided for prior to the date of approval of the consolidation or merger, under any agreement or plan of any carrier which is a party to the consolidation or merger which covered the greatest number of the employees affected by the consolidation or merger; except that in any case in which, prior to the date of approval of the consolidation or merger, an individual has exercised his right of retirement, or any right to health, disability, or death insurance benefits has accrued, under any agreement or plan of any carrier which is a party to the consolidation or merger, pension, health, disability, or death insurance benefits, as the case may be, shall be accorded in conformity with the agreement or plan under which such individual exercised such right of retirement or under which such right to benefits accrued. For purposes of determining and according the rights and benefits specified in this paragraph, any period spent in the employ of the carrier of which such individual was an employee at the time of the consolidation or merger shall be considered to have been spent in the employ of the consolidated or merged carrier. The application for approval of any consolidation or merger under this section shall contain a guaranty by the proposed consolidated carrier that there will be no impairment of any of the rights or benefits specified in this paragraph.

"'(6) Any employee who, since August 27, 1940, has left a position, other than a temporary position, in the employ of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger, for the purpose of entering the military or naval forces of the United States, shall be considered to have been in the employ of such carrier during the time he is a member of such forces, and, upon making an application for employment with the consolidated or merged carrier within forty days from the time he is relieved from service in any of such forces under honorable conditions, such former employee shall be employed by the consolidated or merged carrier and entitled to the benefits to which he would have been entitled if he had been employed by one of such carriers during all of such period of service with such forces; except that this paragraph shall not require the consolidated or merged carrier, in the case of any such individual, to pay compensation, or to accord health, disability, or death insurance benefits, for the period during which he was a member of such forces. If any such former employee is disabled and because of such disability is no longer qualified to perform the duties of his former position but otherwise meets the requirements for employment, he shall be given such available employment at an appropriate rate of compensation as he is able to perform and to which his service credit shall entitle him.

"'(7) No employee of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger shall, without his consent, have his compensation reduced, or (except as provided in paragraph (2) and paragraph (8) of this subsection) be discharged or furloughed during the four-year period after the date of the approval of such consolidation or merger. No such employee shall, without his consent, have his compensation reduced, or be discharged or furloughed, in contemplation of such consolidation and merger, during the six-month period immediately preceding such approval.

"'(8) Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the discharge of any employee for insubordination, incompetency, or any other similar cause.

"'(9) All employees of any carrier resulting from any such consolidation or merger, with respect to their hours of employment, shall retain the rights provided by any collective bargaining agreement in force and effect upon the date of approval of such consolidation or merger until such agreement is terminated, executed, or superseded. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any agreement not prohibited by law pertaining to the protection of employees may hereafter be entered into by such consolidated or merged carrier and the duly authorized representative or representatives of its employees selected according to existing law.

"'(10) For purposes of enforcement or protection of rights, privileges, and immunities granted or guaranteed under this subsection, the employees of any such consolidated or merged carrier shall be entitled to the same remedies as are provided by the National Labor Relations Act in the case of employees covered by that Act; and the National Labor Relations Board and the courts of the United States (including the courts of the District of Columbia) shall have jurisdiction and power to enforce and protect such rights, privileges, and immunities in the same manner as in the case of enforcement of the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

"'(11) Nothing contained in this subsection shall apply to any employee of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidition or merger whose compensation is at the rate of more than $5,000 per annum.

"'(12) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (7), the protection afforded therein for the period of four years from the date of approval of the consolidation or merger shall not, in the case of any particular employee, continue for a longer period, following such date of approval, than the aggregate period during which such employee was in the employ, prior to such date of approval, of one or more of the carriers which are parties to the consolidation or merger. As used in paragraphs (1), (2), and (7), the term "compensation" shall not include compensation attributable to overtime not guaranteed by collective bargaining agreements.'

"SEC. 2. Section 214 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 214. (a) No carrier shall undertake the construction of a new line or of an extension of any line, or shall acquire or operate any line, or extension thereof, or shall engage in transmission over or by means of such additional or extended line, unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that the present or future public convenience and necessity require or will require the construction, or operation, or construction and operation, of such additional or extended line: *Provided*, That no such certificate shall be required under this section for the construction, acquisition, or operation of (1) a line within a single State unless such line constitutes part of an interstate line, (2) local, branch, or terminal lines not exceeding ten miles in length, or (3) any line acquired under section 221 or 222 of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Commission may, upon appropriate request being made, authorize temporary or emergency service, or the supplementing of existing facilities, without regard to the provisions of this section. No carrier shall discontinue, reduce, or impair service to a community, or part of a community, unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that neither the present nor future public convenience and necessity will be adversely affected thereby; except that the Commission may, upon appropriate request being made, authorize temporary or emergency discontinuance, reduction, or impairment of service, or partial discontinuance, reduction, or impairment of service, without regard to the provisions of this section. As used in this section the term "line" means any channel of communication established by the use of appropriate equipment, other than a channel of communication established by the interconnection of two or more existing channels: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to require a certificate or other authorization from the Commission for any installation, replacement, or other changes in plant, operation, or equipment, other than new construction, which will not impair the adequacy or quality of service provided.'

"SEC. 3. Section 214 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Upon receipt of an application for any such certificate, the Commission shall cause notice thereof to be given to, and shall cause a copy of such application to be filed with, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Governor of each State in which such line is proposed to be constructed, extended, acquired, or operated, or in which such discontinuance, reduction, or impairment of service is proposed, with the right to those notified to be heard; and the Commission may require such published notice as it shall determine.'

"SEC. 4. Section 214 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(c) The Commission shall have power to issue such certificate as applied for, or to refuse to issue it, or to issue it for a portion or portions of a line, or extension thereof, or discontinuance, reduction, or impairment of service, described in the application, or for the partial exercise only of such right or privilege, and may attach to the issuance of the certificate such terms and conditions as in its judgment the public convenience and necessity may require. After issuance of such certificate, and not before, the carrier may, without securing approval other than such certificate, comply with the terms and conditions contained in or attached to the issuance of such certificate and proceed with the construction, extension, acquisition, operation, or discontinuance, reduction, or impairment of service covered thereby. Any construction, extension, acquisition, operation, discontinuance, reduction, or impairment of service contrary to the provisions of this section may be enjoined by any court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the United States, the Commission, the State commission, any State affected, or any party in interest.'

"SEC. 5. Section 214 (d) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(d) The Commission may, after full opportunity for hearing, in a proceeding upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, authorize or require by order any carrier, party to such proceeding, to provide itself with adequate facilities for the expeditious and efficient performance of its service as a common carrier and to extend its line or to establish a public office; but no such authorization or order shall be made unless the Commission finds, as to such provision of facilities, as to such establishment of public offices, or as to such extension, that it is reasonably required in the interest of public convenience and necessity, or as to such extension or facilities that the expense involved therein will not impair the ability of the carrier to perform its duty to the public. Any carrier which refuses or neglects to comply with any order of the Commission made in pursuance of this paragraph shall forfeit to the United States $100 for each day during which such refusal or neglect continues.'

"SEC. 6. Section 5266 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 47, sec. 3), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 5266. Telegrams between the several departments of the Government and their officers, relating exclusively to the public business, in their transmission over the lines of any telegraph company to which has been

given the right-of-way, timber, or station lands from the public domain, shall have priority over all other business at such rates as the Federal Communications Commission shall annually fix. No part of any appropriation for the several departments of the Government shall be paid to any company which neglects or refuses to transmit such telegrams in accordance with the provisions of this section: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall limit the authority of the Federal Communications Commission, under section 201 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the classification of communications and the prescribing of different charges for different classes of communications, and such authority of the Federal Communications Commission to fix rates for Government communications may be exercised with respect to any or all communications to which section 201 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and this section apply: *Provided further,* That the term "Government" as used in section 201 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and the term "departments of the Government" as used in this section, shall be held to refer only to the established departments, independent establishments, and agencies in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Federal Government.'"

And the House agree to the same.

ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
LISTER HILL,
JAMES M. TUNNELL,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

A. L. BULWINKLE,
LYLE H. BOREN,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
CLARENCE J. BROWN,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, of course, under the rule it is a privileged matter. I should like to have an explanation of the new language inserted in the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, before moving the adoption of the conference report on Senate bill 158, the so-called telegraph merger bill, I will make a brief factual explanation of the provisions of the bill, as finally agreed to by the managers representing the Senate and those representing the House of Representatives on the conference committee.

If Members will bear with me without interruption, at the conclusion of the explanation I shall also comment generally on the purpose and intent of the measure, and perhaps answer some of the questions which were raised on the floor during the consideration of the bill, and subsequent to its passage by the Senate.

First, as to the form of the bill: The Senate conferees have receded from the Senate's disagreement to the amendment of the House, and have agreed to the House amendment, as amended. What this means, in nontechnical language, is that the conferees have agreed to a measure which represents, in the viewpoint of the conferees on the part of the Senate, the best features of both the House and the Senate bills. We have accepted the House arrangement of the bill, placing the definition subsection first, instead of last, as in the Senate bill.

Subsection (a) is the definition subsection. For the most part, the definitions in both bills were either identical or substantially the same. The House conferees accepted several clarifying changes to make more clear the meaning of several definitions by inserting the words "or merged" in referring to a "consolidated carrier" so as to make the bill read "consolidated or merged carrier." The House conferees also accepted a Senate proviso in one definition to make clear that international communications' companies may continue to operate offices in certain gateway cities in the United States.

Subsections (b) (1) and (2) gives authority for the merger of domestic telegraph companies or properties. The authority is permissive, not mandatory. It is subject to the approval of the Federal Communications Commission. It does not permit merger of international communications' carriers, nor the merger of a domestic carrier with an international carrier. The House and Senate language was practically identical in these paragraphs, and the House language was accepted.

Subsection (c) (1) sets out the method and conditions for submission of a merger proposal to the Federal Communications Commission. The House conferees receded and accepted Senate language which included the Attorney General of the United States as one of the officers to be notified of the proposed merger plan. They also accepted a Senate provision requiring notice to representatives of employees when represented by bargaining agents, or otherwise known to the Commission.

Paragraph (2) of this subsection provided for the divestment by the merged carrier of any international operations which it was carrying on, so that the merged domestic carrier would not be put in a position to compete unfairly with other international carriers by giving preference to its own international lines. The House bill had no such section, and the House conferees receded and accepted the Senate amendment.

Subsection (d) carried forward the present proscription against more than 20-percent foreign ownership of stock in the merged carrier. House and Senate subsections were identical on this point.

Subsection (e) (1), (2), (3), and (4) provided for an interchange of traffic between the merged domestic carrier on the one hand, and international carriers, or foreign carriers operating in contiguous foreign countries such as Canada, Mexico, Newfoundland, St. Pierre and Miquelon, or Alaska, on the other hand. The carriers are permitted to work out their own traffic arrangements, but failing in such an agreement, the Federal Communications Commission is given authority to fix a formula which will be fair and equitable, in the public interest, and in accordance with the existing contractual rights of the carriers.

In this connection, I should like to point out that some question was raised as to whether the Senate language in regard to the contractual rights of the carriers would permit the Federal Communications Commission to take into consideration the public interest when determining the formula to be prescribed. It was feared that the Senate provision might lead to an interpretation which would require the Commission to recognize contracts which were directly against the public interest. The House provision was therefore accepted because it eliminated this question. The accepted language means that the Federal Communications Commission shall give due regard to the contracts which each carrier had before the merger in prescribing a formula. However, in any event, the formula must be in the public interest. The reference to the contractual rights of the carriers is not intended to continue the life of the contracts beyond the period provided therein. These four paragraphs were substantially identical in both bills, but the House language was used in the interest of slightly greater clarity of meaning.

Subsection (f) is the so-called labor provision of the bill. Paragraph (1) extends to senior employees; namely, those employees who were employed before March 1, 1941—protection against discharge for a period of 4 years from the date of the approval of the merger, except that if an employee has had less than 4 years' service, he will have job protection only for the period equal to the time he has been an employee. The Senate conferees receded and accepted the House provision for 4-year protection instead of 5 years, as the Senate bill provided originally. The House conferees receded and accepted the remainder of the Senate language.

Paragraph (2) provides severance pay for employees who were employed after March 1, 1941. The severance pay is limited in the following particulars: It shall not be paid to any employee who is discharged 4 years after the merger, it shall not be paid to an employee who is employed after the merger, it shall not be paid to an employee who is employed after the merger for a period equal to the time he worked before the merger, severance pay is 1 month's salary for each year of employment by any carrier which is a party to the merger or the merged carrier itself. The House conferees receded and accepted the Senate provision on severance pay.

Paragraph (3) extends a preferential hiring status to all discharged employees. House and Senate provisions were identical on this point.

Paragraph (4) provides for the payment of traveling expenses for any employee who may be transferred as a result of merger. The House bill provided for traveling expenses for the employee and his family and the crating and removal of his household effects. The Senate limited the traveling expense to the family and provided a bonus of 2 months' pay in addition thereto. The difference was that the House provided for payment of expense of moving household effects, and the Senate provided for the 2 months' salary. The Senate conferees receded and accepted the House provision.

Paragraph (5) provides for extending to employees the protection accorded to them by pension, health, disability, or other benefit plans which had been operated by their employers. The Senate provision would have required existing pension and benefit plans of both carriers to be maintained in full force and effect by the merged carrier. The House provision would have permitted that pension plan which covered the greatest number of employees in the merged carrier to cover all employees.

As a practical matter, in the event of merger, this means that the Western Union plan would be the operative plan for all employees. Under certain circumstances, the Postal pension plan is slightly more beneficial, particularly to dependent beneficiaries of deceased employees, the Senate conferees were reluctant to waive those benefits. However, employees who are already retired under the Postal plan will continue to receive all the benefits provided under the Postal plan; moreover, Postal employees would, in the event of a consolidation or merger, be looking toward a solvent company for their benefits, instead of running the risk incident to receiving slightly larger benefits from the hands of a company which is steadily losing large sums of money. Those factors impelled the Senate conferees to recede, and to accept the House paragraph.

Paragraph (6) gives to those employees of the merged carrier, or parties to the merger, who have entered the armed service a seniority standing for purposes of employment upon their return from the war. The section is similar to one enacted for Government employees, and was substantially similar in both bills. Because the House provision contained a clause which made clear that the employer was not liable for benefits for any injury sustained while the employee was on active service, the Senate conferees receded, and accepted the House provision.

Paragraph (7) provides that, except as provided for in other paragraphs, no employee may, without his consent, have his compensation reduced, or be discharged or furloughed, within the period of 6 months before the merger, in contemplation of merger, or within a period of 4 years after the merger. This paragraph does not, of course, vitiate provisions already referred to, which do permit discharge or severance pay to certain classes of employees; nor does it prohibit employees, through their collective bargaining agencies, from negotiating wage changes. The provision as agreed to by the conferees represents a redraft of comparable Senate and House language. Mr. President, its only purpose is to prevent the reduction of wages at the time of the approval of the measure. In the case of wages which may be increased after the merger, the language is not intended to prohibit the company from reducing them to the amount of the wages received by the employees at the time of the approval of the consolidation or merger.

I believe it is desirable to interpolate here that the term "without his consent," used in several paragraphs of the labor protection subsection and which refers to the employee's consent, is intended to include consent by bargaining agents. It is not intended to prevent employer and employee from negotiating new agreements affecting wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment. It is the intent of the conferees that the employee, through his collective-bargaining agents, shall be free to make whatever changes or modifications he deems desirable with respect to his working conditions.

Paragraph (8) makes clear that any employee may be discharged for incompetency, insubordination, or other good cause; paragraphs (9) and (10) provide, respectively, that the merger shall not vitiate collective-bargaining agreements now in force between employer and employees with respect to hours of employment and give the National Labor Relations Board authority under the Labor Relations Act with respect to any matters arising under those paragraphs. The language of all three paragraphs was practically identical in both bills.

Paragraph (11) provides that employees paid more than $5,000 per annum shall not come within the provisions of the labor subsection of the bill. This paragraph was identical in both bills.

Paragraph (12) makes clear that the protection afforded to employees under paragraphs (1) and (7) shall not extend for a longer period after merger than the period during which the employee worked before merger. In short, an employee who had worked for 1 year before merger would have 1 year's protection, a 2-year employee would have 2 years' protection, and so on. This paragraph also provides that overtime not guaranteed by collective-bargaining agreements shall not be included in the term "compensation," where such term is used in paragraphs (1), (2), and (7) of this labor subsection.

Sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the bill are amendments to the existing sections 214 (a), (b), (c), and (d), respectively, of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, in order to make them conform to and be pertinent with respect to the merger authorized by the pending bill.

Section 2 in the Senate bill would have required Commission authorization before a carrier could abandon a line, plant, office, or other physical facility. The House bill provided that the measuring stick should be service to a community and required Commission authorization if service were to be discontinued to a community or a part of a community. The Senate conferees agreed that the Senate language might act too restrictively upon carriers, requiring them to file literally thousands of applications for what are, in effect, minor installations or abandonments. The Senate, however, insisted upon language somewhat more restrictive than that employed by the House. The conferees agreed that no carrier shall discontinue, reduce, or impair service to a community or a part of a community without first receiving Commission approval. The effect of the amendatory words "reduce or impair," it is believed, will be to make certain that no community or part of a community anywhere in the United States will be deprived of any element of service presently received from telegraph or telephone companies.

The House subsection also included a definition of the word "line." This has long been a troublesome point, the Communications Act not having heretofore included such a definition. The absence of such a definition in statute law has led to the practice of having the regulating agency define what is a "line." The tremendous scientific advance in communications has outmoded the old belief that a line is a copper wire strung on poles. Modern scientific development has made it possible by the installation of such gadgets as "phantom circuits" and "repeater coils" to carry on as many as 244 simultaneous conversations over a single pair of wires. As a result, carriers have felt that they have been unduly burdened by having to file applications for installations, or for abandonments, in which major installations, or reductions of major installations, were not at issue. This has added to the book and paper work of the Communications Commission and of the carriers. The definition of "line" proposed in the House bill conforms in substantial degree with the definition heretofore exercised by the Commission, and it is my understanding that the Commission has no objection to its inclusion in the law. The Senate conferees, therefore, receded and accepted the House definition of "line."

The House subsection also carried a proviso which seeks to make clear that any installation, replacement, or other changes in plant, operation, or equipment, other than new construction, shall not require a certificate or other authorization from the Federal Communications Commission. The Senate conferees accepted this proviso. However, I desire to make clear at this point that it is not my understanding, nor do I believe is it the understanding of other members of the Senate conference committee that this proviso is intended to permit communications carriers to escape Commission regulation in any major degree. I believe it is the intent of the framers of this legislation and those who worked on the adjustment of differences between House and Senate bills, that the carriers shall not be unduly burdened by unnecessary paper work, particularly in these wartimes. On the other hand, I am equally sure that it is not intended that this proviso shall permit communications carriers to make major installations or abandonments, or to modify existing installations to a degree that service is affected, without first going to the Government regulatory agency for the authorizations duly provided by law. It was for this very reason that the Senate conferees insisted upon the inclusion in this section of the words "reduce or impair" the service.

Sections 214 (b), (c), and (d) were modified to conform with section 214 (a) which I have just explained in detail. The principal changes concerned the addition of the words "reduction, or impairment" so that service may not be "discontinued, reduced, or impaired" to

a community, or a part of a community without prior Commission authorization.

Section 6 is an amendment of the old Post Roads Act of 1866, which, among other things, provided that carriage of Government telegrams was to have priority and a preferential rate. The bill, as it passed the Senate, would have eliminated this preferential rate to the Government, on the theory that the benefits to the carriers have long ceased to exist, or have been paid for, and that there exists no equity when telegraph carriers are required to give a preferential rate while telephone carriers are not. However, this amendment was stricken by the House during consideration of the bill on the House floor. The Senate conferees receded and adopted the original provision of the Post Roads Act which leaves intact the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to fix a preferential rate for Government telegrams. However, the conferees have adopted amendatory language of some importance, which would remove the present preferential Government rate for telegrams of cost-plus and fixed-fee contractors.

I believe a word of explanation is necessary here, so that the Senate may understand what is taking place, and what the bill would do in this respect.

The present preferential rate for Government telegrams is 60 percent of normal; in other words, telegraph companies transmit Government mesages at 40 percent under established tariff rates. Some months ago, the Comptroller General, in a formal ruling, held that this same Government rate shall be extended to all cost-plus and fixed-fee contractors of the Government. This means that every prime contractor holding Government contracts sends messages at the special Government rate. It also means that such contractors have the privilege of this special rate in telegraph communications with their subcontractors, and the subcontractors with their subcontractors, and so on ad infinitum. The managers of the conference on the part of the House and the Senate agreed unanimously that this is an unhealthy practice—a form of subsidization exacted from the telegraph carriers which is warranted neither by the intent of the law nor by the facts. To meet this situation, the conferees have adopted an amendment which defines the word "Government" in section 201 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and the words "departments of the Government" in the Post Roads Act to mean established departments and agencies of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Federal Government. It is clearly the intent and purpose of the conferees that this amendment shall stop the practice of making available to cost-plus-and-fixed-fee contractors the special Government preferential rate for telegrams.

Moreover, I believe this is an excellent point at which to call the Senate's attention to a situation which has been referred to and deplored on numerous occasions by able Members of this body, namely the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce [Mr. WHEELER] and the ranking minority member of that committee, the able Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. That practice is the wasting of public moneys by officials of the Government departments and agencies by the inordinate and extravagant use of telephone and telegraph. I cannot overemphasize the extent to which this has gone. The annual telephone and telegraph bill of the Federal Government is fantastic; it is virtually impossible to get accurate figures, because of the intermingling of appropriated funds. I am well aware that this Nation is at war, and that wartime exigencies do not allow of cautious use of communications facilities; but this waste of public moneys for communications existed before the war, and has merely grown with the war. There is, for example, no excuse for a Government agency to send out several thousand identical telegrams having to do with a rationing order which was not to take effect for 30 days thereafter. Too many Government officials think nothing of propping their feet on the desk, picking up the telephone receiver, and telling the operator, "Get me San Francisco," or Hawaii. They would probably call Australia if they could get a line through, just for the sake of calling. I do not intend to criticize the armed services in their use of world-wide communications; I believe we all realize that the strict chain-of-command procedure under which they work makes it very likely that there is no needless or wasteful use of communications facilities by the services; but I am quite sure that a competent communications supervisor, should it be possible to have such a person exercising authority over the civilian departments, could cut the cost of Government communications services by one-third without impairing in the slightest degree the efficiency or speed of Government agency functioning.

I have concluded my explanation of the telegraph merger bill, as agreed to by the conferees of the two Houses. Before requesting adoption of the report, I should like to make clear to the Senate certain other facts in connection with this legislation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As a member of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, which had original jurisdiction over the bill, and as a member of the conference committee, I wish to say that I agree with the Senator from Arizona as to the intents and purposes of the different provisions of the bill as he has given expression to them. I think he has very accurately and very clearly interpreted the provisions of the bill and their meaning and purposes.

I think I should add that the Senator from Arizona has done yeoman service in carrying this bill through the different parliamentary stages. It was not an easy bill to draft; it was one which presented many difficulties, and which involved conflicting interests of various kinds. I congratulate the Senator on the splendid work he did as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce and on all the good work he has done in bringing this proposed legislation out to its final stages.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator for his kindly remarks.

Mr. President, I am a relatively new Member of the Senate, but I am reliably informed that few bills in the last decade have had as much time, attention, study, and serious questioning devoted to them as has the telegraph merger bill.

I do not intend at this time to go into a long recital of the history of this bill. I think I can say without hesitation or equivocation that no essential fact relating to this subject has escaped those who have worked on this matter.

It has been stated here on the floor that this bill would "bail out" some Wall Street speculators. To my knowledge, this Government has not yet passed a law prohibiting its citizens from purchasing and selling securities, nor specifying who may and who may not purchase or sell securities. I do not see anything wrong about making known who are owners of Postal or Western Union securities. Nor do I know any way by which people can be prevented from purchasing the securities of these companies. However, for the information of the Senate, I am very reliably informed that slightly more than 70 percent of the securities of the Postal Co. are held by the former bondholders; and if anyone believes that such bondholders are going to get rich out of this merger, let me inform the Senate that the present market value of all of the securities held by a former $1,000 bondholder—securities which he got in exchange for his $1,000 bond when the Postal Co. went through a Federal court supervised reorganization—is about $360. In other words, the man who invested $1,000 in Postal bonds some years ago can now get for his $1,000 investment $360. It is true that Postal preferred stock, the senior security of the present landline company, has risen from $9 a share to $19 or $20. However, I desire to point out the fact that there is no way of determining at this time what the value of this security will be in the event of a merger. We all know that securities fluctuate frequently on the market upon a mere suspicion or hope that their value will be increased. I, for one, am not guided or interested by what the people in Wall Street do in this regard. My chief interest in this proposed legislation is to give the people of the United States a better communications service, and to give protection to the employee who has spent years in preparation for his profession.

There also was inserted in the RECORD some days ago a copy of the reorganization plan of the Postal Co. Some Members may have thought that this was a hard-to-get document; that the Senate was being let in on something hot and exclusive. The reorganization plan has been in the files of our Telegraph Investigating Committee for more than 2 years; it has been studied by members of the committee. Incidentally, it is, in my

opinion, an excellent reorganization plan, and Federal Judge Alfred Coxe, of New York, is to be complimented in supervising a reorganization which did not lead to the iniquities of so many other reorganization plans about which we have heard.

It has also been said here, and in another Chamber, that we are creating monopoly by this legislation. I should like to call the Senate's attention to the fact that some very famous antimonopolists have had a very important and guiding hand with respect to the pending legislation. The chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, who supervised the investigation of the telegraph industry which led to the official Senate report recommending merger in this industry, is no friend of monopoly, I am sure most Members will agree. Nor is the Senator from Arizona an advocate of monopoly.

The plain facts of the matter are, as adduced after the most careful and searching examination, that merger of these competing telegraph companies is a public convenience and necessity. It is no more rational, in fact, far less rational, to have two national telegraph companies than it is to have two national telephone companies. One company is losing large sums of money each month, from $300,000 to $400,000. That company has borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation some $9,000,000, which is, incidentally, a first lien on its property and must be repaid first by any purchaser. It is only a matter of time—a very short time—before that company will be forced to the wall, or be taken over by the Government. To abandon essential communication facilities in wartime is nonsensical and hazardous, and I, for one, do not approve the Government going into the private business field.

Should a merger eventuate—and I am sure that one will—the Nation will have a sound and strong telegraph company. The employees of Postal, who could not expect to have either job security or better wages from a weak company which could not make ends meet, will be in a much improved situation. They will be employed by a financially sound carrier which should be in a position to raise wage standards to levels in comparable industry, and to give them job security.

Moreover, so long as we have the telephone and the air mail there is little danger of monopoly in the domestic communications field. Properly regulated in the public interest, there is every reason to believe that not only will there be a great improvement in service to the public by both the telephone and telegraph after the war, but that the user can confidently expect major rate reductions in both fields.

One word in conclusion. I believe it is incumbent upon me to state that the objective of those in charge of the proposed legislation was to legislate with the purpose of achieving a merger. We have sought to avoid any harm to the interests of the employees; and I believe we have succeeded. Certainly we have gone further in affording labor protection than Congress ever has gone heretofore. But at the same time we have here a bill which should afford every facility in consummating a merger. We confidently expect the carriers to get together—and to get together quickly—in the public interest, and in their own interest. There can be no valid reason, with enactment of such legislation, why there should not be a quick merger in the telegraph industry, and I am sure that the Federal Communications Commission will exercise every facility and precaution to see to it that merger is consummated without delay.

I desire at this time to express my deep appreciation and thanks to the members of the conference committee for their patience and devotion to duty in working out this proposed legislation. I should be less than frank if I did not pay my respects to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]; the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL]; the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], whose excellent background knowledge of this subject has been invaluable to us; and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], whose patient and expert advice on legal points has materially helped in perfecting the bill.

Unless there are questions to be propounded, I move the adoption of the conference report on Senate bill 158.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the report?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this conference report refers to one of the most important bills that has been before the Congress in a great many years. It would create monopoly in the hands of one of our great service companies. I am not urging that thought in opposition to the report. The Senator has made a long and an able speech, little of which I have been able to obtain through the sense of hearing because of noise in the Senate Chamber. Because of the importance of the report, and the measure with which it deals, I should like to have the report go over until Monday, so that we may have an opportunity to read in the RECORD the very able speech of the Senator from Arizona, and to study the report. Personally, I have a matter which I desire to discuss, after a little study regarding an addition to the last section of the bill, which provides more particularly with reference to the Government agencies which control the cost of Federal communications. I point that out only as an incident. Several Senators who were unable to follow completely and closely the splendid speech of the Senator from Arizona have spoken to me of their desire to study the speech and the report. For these reasons I should like to have the report go over until Monday.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the request is acted on, I desire to be recognized for about 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. McNARY. I think we can settle this matter now.

Mr. McFARLAND. I desire to point out to the Senator from Oregon that the proposed legislation has been pending a long time. I have been anxious for some time to devote myself to several other important matters, but the pendency of this proposed legislation has prevented me from doing so, and I am desirous of completing action on this matter.

The Senator understands that I shall be glad to answer any questions in respect to the conference report. I call his attention to the fact that the conferees worked on the bill 4 days. I am sure it is the best bill that can be worked out, that it is the only one to which we can agree. I do not believe there could be any advantage in delaying this report or returning it to the conference committee.

Mr. McNARY. I do not want the report to go back to the committee of conference. I ask for a delay of 3 or 4 days so that some others may have an opportunity to read the Senator's speech and study the conference report. I am merely asking delay in the consideration of the conference report; I do not want the report to go back to the conference committee. It may be a perfect report, it may have analyzed the whole situation precisely as it should be analyzed. I have no criticism to offer at this time, but, along with many other Senators who have not been members of the conference committee, I desire to have an opportunity to read the very able speech of the Senator, and to study the long report, inasmuch as it involves a very important piece of legislation. I can see no reason for acting at this moment, for acting impetuously. I am merely asking for accommodation, not for myself so much but for other Senators who are not familiar with the conference report.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I can see nothing to be gained by putting off the enactment of the legislation. There is nothing new involved in the report, nothing that was not involved in the bill and discussed on the floor of the Senate heretofore. The bill is substantially the same, except in the few particulars which have been pointed out.

I should like very much to finish the consideration of the conference report today. Handling this bill was a job which I assumed at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I have worked on it for a long time. I have other important matters which I cannot turn to until this bill shall be finally completed; and the other matters are extremely important. I assure the Senator that it is important that we dispose of the proposed legislation today.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is rather unusual to have denied a request of the kind I have made. Of course, the able Senator from Arizonia is familiar with the conference report and with the bill; but he is only one out of 96 Senators. I am not familiar with the report. I am not familiar with the contents of the speech of the able Senator from Arizona. Other Senators are in the same situation in which I find myself in that regard. I desire to have an opportunity to study the report. I do not accept conference reports merely because someone says they are perfect, or that they satisfy his judgment. I am asking as a matter of courtesy that I may have an opportunity to study the conference report.

Otherwise, I shall resort to whatever parliamentary action I may invoke.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not want to deprive the Senator from Oregon of the opportunity of studying the report. If I agree that the conference report go over until Monday will the Senator agree to permit the Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures a little additional time in which to finish its work and make a report?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am dealing with one piece of legislation or one matter at a time. I am asking that the report go over so that we may have the benefits which will come from a study of the report and of the Senator's speech.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask only for a few days additional time to prepare a report from the committee.

Mr. McNARY. What is the report?

Mr. McFARLAND. The report of the Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to that. I suppose I am trading.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I am not trying to trade with the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. I say that I should like to dispose of one thing at a time. If the Senator will let the conference report go over, very well, otherwise I shall oppose its consideration today.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator consider it sufficient time if consideration of the conference report be postponed until Monday?

Mr. McNARY. I am only asking for postponement until Monday, and I will cooperate with the Senator from Arizona in bringing it before the Senate then.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

Mr. McNARY. It may be that the conference report is a perfectly fine one. It may be that the proposed legislation is in the best of form. I want the opportunity, however, and other Senators join with me in wishing to have an opportunity to read the Senator's speech—we are all sorry we did not hear it in detail—and also to read the conference report.

Mr. McFARLAND. I appreciate the kind remarks of the Senator that my explanation of the bill was a good speech.

Mr. McNARY. It was an excellent speech, one of the best I have heard this month. I am sure it is the best I have heard this week.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

Mr. McNARY. Then I understand that the conference report will go over until Monday, and that the request is made by the Senator from Arizona for additional time for the Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures to make a report?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. May we agree upon the amount of additional time to be given the committee?

Mr. McFARLAND. Would 10 days additional time be agreeable?

Mr. McNARY. That would be perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will make the motion, then, that——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before the Senator from Arizona makes his motion, I ask him if he will yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are in the morning hour, and I wish to address the Senate for about 4 or 5 minutes. I am not willing to agree to the motion until I shall have addressed the Senate for 4 or 5 minutes. I ask the Senator from Arizona to withhold his motion for a few minutes.

## EXTENSION OF TIME FOR REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to obtain unanimous consent for additional time in which the Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures may make its report.

Mr. McKELLAR. So far as I am concerned, I will give my consent to that request after I shall have finished my address.

Mr. McFARLAND. My request is that the Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures be continued in full force and effect for 10 additional days. On January 25, 1943, the time was extended by Senate Resolution 86 until March 6, 1943. I now ask that the time be further extended to March 16, 1943.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## MERGER OF TELEGRAPH COMPANIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let us finish the matter which is now before us before proceeding to something else. Then, consideration of the conference report will go over until Monday next?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is recognized.

## CONFIRMATION BY SENATE OF ADDITIONAL FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there was published in Wednesday morning's Washington Post an article describing a press conference with the President, in which appears a question by Irving Brandt, editorial writer of the Chicago Sun, who asked the President about the McKellar bill to take 70,000 employees out of the civil service and require Senate confirmation of their appointments.

Brandt said that if there was a Senate debate on one out of every hundred of the appointees, and even if the debate lasted only 5 minutes, it would take 45 minutes out of each day that the Senate is in session for the entire year. He figured this out based on the 157 legislative days of last year.

I read from the article, as follows:

"I should like to ask you," he inquired of the President, "couldn't the Senate, in wartime, be better employed."

The President said he would reply by quoting a little line in the Bible: "Thou hast said it."

Mr. President, I shall not criticize either the President or Mr. Brandt, but in order to keep the record straight I desire to say that during 1942 the Senate confirmed 3,118 postmasters, and 1,039 other civilians, 5,068 Army officers, 2,868 Navy officers, and 766 Marine Corps officers, or a total of 12,859, and that the confirmation of these officers did not take one one-hundredth of the time suggested by Mr. Brandt and apparently acquiesced in by the President. The Senate has confirmed 100,328 such officers and officials in about 9 years, and in not more than one one-fiftieth of the time suggested by Mr. Brandt.

Not only that, Mr. President, the Senate has confirmed 33,966 postmasters, and the best kind of postmasters, without a charge having been made, so far as I can recall, of there being a Communist, a defaulter, or an unpatriotic person among them. The nominations of 34,020 Army officers of the highest grade and character have been confirmed without a charge being made, so far as I have heard, that any one of them was tinctured with a lack of patriotism, or was communistic or dishonest.

The nominations of 20,928 naval officers of the highest type and kind have been confirmed, without any one of them being charged with dishonesty, communism, lack of patriotism, or being inefficient. Likewise, the nominations of 3,964 Marine officers, fine fighting men, the best ever, were confirmed without a charge having been made, so far as I have heard, that they were unpatriotic, communistic, or inefficient in any way.

In like manner, 7,450 civilian officers of the finest kind have been appointed, concerning whom there has been no scandal, so far as I know.

The statement that the confirmation in 1942 of more than 12,000 officers took something like 17 days of the Senate's time is so incorrect as to be laughable. I shall submit a table giving the facts and figures.

The statement that my bill takes 70,000 Federal employees out of Civil Service is without foundation in fact, and therefore, Mr. Brandt's question to the President was entirely misleading and not founded on facts, though I am sure he did not intend it to be.

He was simply misinformed about the matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I previously referred be printed in the RECORD, as well as the article entitled, "Roosevelt Says He's Post-War Money Saver," published in the Washington Post of February 17.

There being no objection, the table and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Classified table of nominations, with totals and grand totals received each session of Congress, Mar. 4, 1933, to Dec. 16, 1942*

| Session and Congress | Postmasters | Army | Navy | Marine Corps | Other civilians | Totals by sessions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Extra session 73d, Mar. 4 to 6, 1933 | None | None | None | None | 16 | 16 |
| 1st sess. 73d, Mar. 9 to June 16, 1933 | None | 519 | 431 | 34 | 272 | 1,256 |
| 2d sess. 73d, Jan. 3 to June 18, 1934 | 4,753 | 1,310 | 1,139 | 126 | 494 | 7,822 |
| 1st sess. 74th, Jan. 3 to Aug. 26, 1935 | 5,115 | 6,714 | 1,958 | 564 | 647 | 14,998 |
| 2d sess. 74th, Jan. 3 to June 20, 1936 | 3,975 | 1,744 | 849 | 148 | 773 | 7,489 |
| 1st sess. 75th, Jan. 5 to Aug. 21, 1937 | 1,297 | 2,287 | 2,929 | 419 | 769 | 7,701 |
| 2d sess. 75th, Nov. 15 to Dec. 21, 1937 | 351 | 516 | 325 | 32 | 161 | 1,385 |
| 3d sess. 75th, Jan. 3 to June 16, 1938 | 3,439 | 1,249 | 856 | 70 | 630 | 6,244 |
| 1st sess. 76th, Jan. 3 to Aug. 5, 1939 | 3,916 | 2,910 | 3,025 | 652 | 838 | 11,341 |
| 2d sess. 76th, Sept. 21 to Nov. 3, 1939 | None | None | None | None | None | None |
| 3d sess. 76th, Jan. 3, 1940, to Jan. 3, 1941 | 6,222 | 7,350 | 2,680 | 435 | 1,045 | 17,732 |
| 1st sess. 77th, Jan. 3, 1941, to Jan. 2, 1942 | 1,780 | 4,353 | 3,868 | 718 | 766 | 11,485 |
| 2d sess. 77th, Jan. 5 to Dec. 16, 1942 | 3,118 | 5,068 | 2,868 | 766 | 1,039 | 12,859 |
| Totals of each classification, Mar. 4, 1933, to Dec. 16, 1942 | 33,966 | 34,020 | 20,928 | 3,964 | 7,450 | |
| Grand total of all nominations received—Mar. 4, 1933, to Dec. 16, 1942 | | | | | | 100,328 |

ROOSEVELT SAYS HE'S POST-WAR MONEY SAVER—SEES CONGRESS AS SPENDTHRIFT IF IT KILLS PLAN AGENCIES

President Roosevelt said yesterday at his press conference that, so far as post-war planning was concerned, he was a great saver of money, a watchdog of the Nation's pocketbook.

The spendthrifts, he said, will turn out to be Members of Congress if Congress votes to abolish agencies like the National Resources Board, which are planning for a post-war America.

Mr. Roosevelt's eyes twinkled when he referred to himself as a Treasury watchdog—a role of his, which, he said, had not been given sufficient publicity—but his smile disappeared when he began defending the National Resources Board.

FUND ELIMINATED

Members of Congress, told about the President's statement, said that they too favored post-war planning, but were opposed to any more "superboondoggling."

The House Appropriations Committee recently eliminated from the Independent Offices bill an estimate of $1,400,000 to run the National Resources Board, which is headed by the President's uncle, Frederic A. Delano. The appropriation bill is now before the House.

President Roosevelt praised the Board warmly, saying it had been doing good work in planning a backlog of jobs for the day when the soldiers come marching home. Most people, he said, think that it is only necessary for Congress to appropriate money to create jobs in public-works projects and the like.

But the fact is, the President said, that there must be a great deal of planning in advance—planning by engineers, architects, and others. This, he said, is the kind of planning the National Resources Board has been doing, and he estimated that this planning would save the country several billions of dollars in preventing unemployment and other post-war problems.

If we are going to wait until the war is over to do such planning, he went on, it is going to cost the American taxpayers a lot of money.

At this point, the President pictured himself as a watchdog and placed the onus of spendthrifts on Members of Congress if they let the National Resources Board die.

What started the President off was a question by Irving Brandt, editorial writer of the Chicago Sun, who asked him about the McKellar bill to take 70,000 Federal employees out of the civil service and require Senate confirmation of their appointments.

Brandt said that if there was a Senate debate on 1 out of every 100 of the appointees, and even if the debate lasted only 5 minutes, it would take 45 minutes out of each day that the Senate is in session for the entire year. He had figured this out on the 157 legislative days of last year.

"I should like to ask you," he inquired of the President, "couldn't the Senate, in wartime, be better employed."

The President said he would reply by quoting a little line in the Bible:

"Thou hast said it."

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF PIPE LINE FROM TEXAS TO INDIANA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 103, to investigate certain matters in connection with the proposed construction of an additional pipe line from Texas to Indiana, would automatically come before the Senate under the rule. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has agreed that the resolution go over without prejudice until Monday. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, newspaper columnists have expressed their views on many subjects, whether always justly or not, depending on what they were discussing, but surely they have not spared the administration policies.

When one finds a columnist so eminent as Frank R. Kent, of the Baltimore Sun, in the issue of February 3, 1943, prophesying dire calamity to the Republican Party should it fail to support the administration's economic program in promulgating trade agreements, one may say "this is news." Mr. Kent is to be congratulated on his alertness in respect to the subject he discusses, and I think he is reasoning very clearly when he points out in his article entitled "Traps for Republicans"—extracts from which I shall quote—that the Republican Party will make a great mistake if it does not support the Hull trade agreements when the time comes for their renewal, but I think he is more than slightly mistaken when he says that the administration does not rank these treaties as wholesome and far-reaching.

Mr. Kent stated in his article:

The administration politicians are proceeding on the assumption that, politically, the Republican leadership in Congress is foolish and, itself, can be depended upon to nullify the advantage which the November elections have given its party. Perhaps they are right about that, and within a short while the Republican attack will be of such character as to rob their 1944 prospects of their present charm.

Certainly, it requires no particular discernment to see one of the pitfalls into which the rejuvenated and strengthened Republicans may easily fall.

These are the treaties with which for 10 years Secretary of State Cordell Hull steadfastly has tried to break down the tariff barriers that blocked the international channels, and open up a clear and unrestricted flow of trade between nations. Against opposition (or, anyhow, lukewarmness) inside the administration as well as outside, with undeviating persistence, he achieved a remarkable degree of success. The strength of his ideas and his quiet courage in fighting for them have made him the outstanding member of the Roosevelt Cabinet, and rendered him immune to the sniping from the inside as well as the outside, to which he is constantly subjected. Recent bitter criticism of his north African policies, which were fully approved by the President, has been singularly ineffective in shaking confidence in either his integrity or his wisdom.

Though the new dealers do not list them as such, these reciprocal trade treaties rank as the most wholesome and far-reaching achievement of the Roosevelt regime. They constitute the one expression of international cooperation during the years when the administration was as isolationist in its color as any we have had. If, now, these treaties should be repudiated, it would be a disastrous backward step toward the old high-tariff protection system for which there would be neither defense nor excuse.

In this connection, I should like to quote from the remarks made by the titular leader of the Republican Party, Mr. Willkie, in his address at Indianapolis on February 11, last Saturday night, taken from the New York Times:

In his address tonight Mr. Willkie criticized the "stenciled" characterization of a Republican as "a socially unconscious, hidebound conservative," and said that the principle of reciprocity in trade had been advocated by such "high tariff" Republicans as President McKinley, James G. Blaine, and William Howard Taft.

"The Hull trade treaties are an adaptation of that principle," he said.

Declaring that the present trade treaties and lend-lease had become "symbols to millions of an enlarged vision of the world's economic problems," Mr. Willkie said:

"Our opponents are trying to create the impression that we lack that vision, though we first developed the principle of reciprocity and though lend-lease was passed only with the help of millions of Republican citizens."

"There can be no doubt concerning our responsibilities toward the great social aims of our times," Mr. Willkie went on. "But we must take the leadership in converting those aims into realities. There must never again be any question of the right of workers to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, or of the fundamental right of all our citizens to be free of racial discrimination.

"And we must recognize that we, through our Government, have a duty toward every citizen in this land to protect him or her

against economic calamity. For every citizen owes to every other citizen basic protection against the hazards of unemployment, old age, accident, and ill-health."

I note with pleasure that the titular leader is still 100-percent Republican, and I quote the closing paragraph of his speech:

This should be a challenge to Republicans. For the Republican Party is the party of production. It should be the party of expansion as well, and of dynamic industrial evolution.

I know my friends on the other side are glad to hear him again announce his position as a Republican for that, I know, should assure and encourage them as they approach the campaign of 1944.

MANPOWER — ARTICLE BY SENATOR LODGE AND LETTER FROM SOLDIER ON GUADALCANAL

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I desire to make two unanimous-consent requests. One of them relates to the study which has recently been made in Congress of one of the most important questions, namely, that relating to manpower.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Why an Army of Seven and One-half Million Men?" written by our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and published in The Republican, the national party magazine, for February 1943.

I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for this great public service. Our people need to know the facts relating to the number of men who are necessary for the armed forces in order to know what to do about mobilization of all our men and women who are competent to serve in noncombatant duties. The two subjects must be united in order to arrive at any rational balance between men who are in the armed services and those who are engaged in industry, as well as to establish a necessary and proper balance among the various kinds of work, namely, agriculture, industry, mining, and miscellaneous war activities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks a letter which bears directly upon the question of manpower. It was published in the Virginia Legionnaire for February 1943. The letter is from a boy in the service on Guadalcanal, and it pictures a situation which is sure to fix the interest of the people of the United States upon a comparison between the man over there in the swamps, sacrificing or willing to sacrifice his life for the cause, and the man in the shop, or shipyard, who is referred to in the postscript of the letter as follows:

P. S.—Was just talking with the pilot of a B–17 that arrived from the States less than an hour ago. He said that one day last week there was quite a heavy rain at Seattle and that at a certain shipyard 1,064 men didn't come to work. I wish he hadn't told me that.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I WISH HE HADN'T TOLD ME THAT"

A letter written by a former employee of the Lake Washington Shipyards at Houghton, Wash., to two of his friends working at the yard was printed recently in the employee's paper, On the Ways.

Written from Guadalcanal where this ex-shipyard worker is now fighting with America's armed forces, the letter, which appears below, packs a punch that ought to make us here at home stop short and think anytime we are tempted to give our jobs anything but the very best we've got as we begin this new year.

HENDERSON FIELD,
*Guadalcanal.*

DEAR TOM AND HARRY: I've wanted to write you for some time but for the past 10 days our gang has been in hell. We chased the Japs across the river and held our ground against mortars, dive bombers, artillery, snipers, bayonets, and belly knives.

Eight of us had to lay in jungle slime up to our mouths for a whole day because the Japs had the bead on us from two sides. Charlie, next to me, whispered, "I think I can make it," and raised his head for a cautious look. I saw him grin as he drew his Garand forward. That was all. Thank God he died instantly. But his blood oozing out over the slime, reaching at us in waving fingers, nearly drove us mad.

A Jap mortar almost got us when a shell exploded about 40 feet away. We practically dug our graves that time. I spit blood for an hour. After nightfall the seven of us quietly slithered out of that stagnant pool like crocodiles. The Japs knew we were flanking them and fired wildly. There was about 6 inches of water and when Ed got hit in the spine with shrapnel, I think he purposely went under. A single sound would have told the Japs our location.

About the time you fellows on the swing-shift were knocking off to go home, we hooked up with our platoon again, gave the captain the exact position of the Japs. A runner crawled to the rear and in 15 minutes our artillery finished off that pocket of rice-eaters.

An hour after dawn we had our first food in 24 hours. Dead tired, we tried to sleep on some palm fronds. But a bunch of Zeros came over and spit at us. Louis was carrying some canteens of drinking water and—his number was up.

Yep, this is quite a war. You live your life in a split second lots of times. Sometimes I wish every fellow I know could spend just 1 day and 1 terrifying night out here with us. There would be more aching bellies and not so much bellyaching.

One of the great thrills—if there can be thrills in this business—is to see men come of age under fire. They grow up as shells burst. They work like mad. They fight like mad. Time and again I've seen one of our boys dash across open country, directly in the line of fire, to help a buddy in trouble. The only whistles on Guadalcanal are the screaming kind that go overhead.

Got a job to do tomorrow I don't particularly like. We've got to bury about 200 Japs. They are commencing to stink up the place pretty bad.

Wish there was more to write about, but there isn't. Remember me to the gang in the yard. I'll write again if I get a chance.

So long and good luck,

PETE OLESON.

P. S.—Was just talking with the pilot of a B–17 that arrived from the States less than an hour ago. He said that 1 day last week there was quite a heavy rain at Seattle and that at a certain shipyard 1,064 men didn't come to work. I wish he hadn't told me that.

PETE.

MINING ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] under a misapprehension. I was certain that the distinguished Senator rose to make some comment concerning the able speech of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] about the alleged Republican policy on trade agreements.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I was so pleased with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that I did not feel impelled to make any allusions to his address.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sorry that the Senator was so pleased because for myself I dislike to see the Democratic Party follow the errors of the persons mentioned by the able Senator from Pennsylvania. Reciprocity without the concurrence of the Congress or of the Senate on the specific agreements is an example of what I regard unwise delegation of legislative power, a position which I have taken before in this body and which I think I shall take in the future.

However, Mr. President, I did not rise for the purpose of discussing that subject. For the past year and a half or more the Senate Committee on Public Lands has been conducting through a subcommittee a study of the possibility of developing mineral resources upon the public lands of the United States.

I rise now to introduce a bill which has been the result of the time and attention which I have given to that problem. I believe the bill is worth mentioning even at this hour, because it attempts to correct a recent tendency, which has been manifest in some of the executive departments, to expand their jurisdiction and activities without the benefit of statute.

From the earliest time the public lands of the United States have been administered by the General Land Office which is now a part of the Interior Department. Recently, however, there has been a disposition on the part of some agencies to handle the public lands without regard to the specific policies which have been laid down by Congress.

For example, in recent years the Department of Agriculture has, in accordance with law, acquired some 30,000,000 acres of land. Some of that land was purchased under the laws providing for the extension of the national forests. Some of it was acquired under the Bankhead-Jones Act. Some of it was acquired under the laws of Congress authorizing, for the purposes of the emergency, the purchase of submarginal lands. Some 900,000 acres, for example, have been acquired in that manner.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am interested in knowing the amount of acreage owned in fee simple by the United States Government at the present time. Could the Senator enlighten me? I make the inquiry for the reason that recently I have read in the press various criticisms of the United States Government for acquiring so much land. Yesterday or the day before I read an article by a newspaper columnist to the effect that the Government had acquired land equal in area to a large part of the New England States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Actually the United States owns considerably less land now than it previously had in its history. However, that, of course, is because the public domain has been largely disposed of, although there are millions of acres of national forests, grazing districts, oil reservations, Indian reservations, and the like. The distinguished Senator from North Carolina is referring to the fact that since we became involved in the war the Government has been compelled to acquire very large areas for bombing sites, air training centers, ammunition depots, and facilities of similar nature. The Defense Plant Corporation has acquired huge areas for building plants for the construction of airplanes and other instruments of war. That is a part of the recent trend of which I speak. The acquisition of those properties was necessary.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I understand that criticism has been directed to various departments of the Government for having purchased outright certain property. The Senator from Wyoming, being a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, will recall that when the subject of manpower was being considered a few days ago before our committee there was some discussion regarding the purchase of the Stevens Hotel and the Congress Hotel, both being located in Chicago, as well as the outright purchase of other real-estate properties in America. A great many persons believe that the Government should have acquired those properties temporarily by way of lease rather than by purchase, and that prompted my inquiry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That policy was adopted largely, I think, by reason of the fact that it was impossible to build the facilities which were needed by the Army. For example, it is now impossible to obtain priorities for the construction of adequate housing. How much more sensible it is for the War Department and the Navy Department to acquire a hotel for use as a school or training place for aviation cadets—as has been done in the case of the Stevens Hotel—than for them to try, and to fail, in the effort to construct such a place.

However, Mr. President, that was not what I had in mind. We have, for example, on the statute books, and have had since February 25, 1920, a law providing for the leasing of oil lands upon the public domain. The Department of Agriculture has developed its own leasing program, and has already made, I am told, some 15 or 16 oil and gas leases upon the lands which have been acquired by the Department. The leases no doubt have protected the interests of the Federal Government, but they were not issued under the leasing act enacted by the Congress. They were not administered by the Department of the Interior. The Department of Agriculture, having acquired the lands for other purposes, assumed to itself the power and authority to develop a leasing system of its own without reference to Congress, without consulting any of the committees of Congress.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that since it has been the universal practice of the Government to act under laws of Congress, not by Executive order alone, Congress should do something about this system, particularly because of the extreme need for efficient administration.

Of what value is it—perhaps I should say how absurd it is—to have two or three departments of Government operating in exactly the same field? Why have the Geological Survey, the General Land Office, and the great public land department in the Department of the Interior administering the leasing of oil and gas lands, and then have the Department of Agriculture set up a competitive system?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely want to suggest that the Senator from Wyoming is a member of the Appropriations Committee and, I believe, of the agricultural subcomittee of that committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. At any rate, that is my recollection. I am wondering if the Senator cannot use his very ingenious and very efficient mind to put a stop to that practice by means of granting or not granting appropriations. Manifestly, the Department of Agriculture is exceeding its powers. Manifestly, the oil lands of the country should be controlled by the Department of the Interior; and for the Department of Agriculture to obtain the lands for other purposes and then set up a bureau of its own is entirely without constitutional grounds. The Department of Agriculture should be made to carry out the law and the Constitution, just as other organizations are made to do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as the Senator from Tennessee has well said, the constitutional duty and the responsibility of disposing of the public domain, of the public property of the United States, belong to the Congress, and only the Congress can lay down the law under which such disposition may be made. Whenever any executive bureau of its own volition, without consultation with Congress, undertakes to set up machinery for administering the lands of the United States, acquired for another purpose, for purposes for which Congress has created the Department of the Interior, its policy is obviously a mistaken one, to use very mild language. I use that mild language because I know that the Department of Agriculture has been actuated by the best of good motives; but sometimes I am inclined to believe that those who have entered the executive arm of the Government without proper training in the Constitution and the law and the history of the Government, seem to imagine that the executive bureaus have the power and the right to lay down policies of their own, without reference to Congress.

Mr. President, without taking up more of the Senate's time, I introduce the bill and ask that it be appropriately referred. Of course, I think that an appropriate reference would be to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Mr. President, before I take my seat let me add that the leasing act to which I have referred provides that the royalties which are received by the Federal Government, under the leases which are granted to oil and gas and other mineral lands, shall be distributed in a particular manner. It was provided, for example, that 37½ percent of the royalties should go to the States within the boundaries of which the deposits were found. The purpose of that provision obviously was to compensate the States for the loss of revenue by reason of the retention in the Government of title to the lands.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me ask at this point whether the Department of Agriculture recognizes that law?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does not. That is the point I was about to make.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator that, so far as I personally am concerned, I shall be glad to join him in helping to regulate the Department of Agriculture in that respect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to add that from the very beginning of the Reclamation Service, 52½ percent of the royalties have gone to the reclamation fund, to be used for the construction of reclamation projects throughout the United States, and only 10 percent have gone to the Federal Treasury for its administration. The bill I have introduced would extend that system to the lands acquired by the United States.

Mr. President, lest there be some misapprehension, I should add a further word: The measure specifically exempts national parks and national monuments and holdings of that kind. There is no intention to set up a system which would militate against the proper use of lands properly acquired by the United States. So the bill provides that if there is a conflict of use between the surface use for which the lands were acquired by any department and the use for mining, the matter may be determined; and the paramount use, if it be the use for which the lands were acquired shall, of course, have control. There is a specific exemption, so that there shall be no interference with the military use of lands, with power projects, with reclamation projects, or with any other essential service which the United States has set up.

The bill (S. 736) to promote the mining of minerals on lands acquired by the United States, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the morning hour has automatically terminated and further morning business is thereby precluded.

MANPOWER HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to say that the Committee on Military Affairs is nearing the conclusion of the manpower hearings which have engaged the attention of the committee since last October. Week after next, Mr. President, we will conduct hearings upon what is known as the Austin-Wadsworth mobilization bill, Senate bill 666, which, I might say, is the first bill arising out of the volume of hearings, during which we have heard many witnesses relative to this all-important subject which is engaging the attention of the American people at this time. I wish to say that the hearings on the bill will be public; they will be held in the Senate Office Building in an appropriate place, and will begin on Tuesday, March 2, 1943, at 10:30 a. m. I wish further to say that we shall welcome any and all individuals or organizations who may wish to be heard, for or against the bill, and, to use the language of one of the authors of the bill, "employees, employers, contractors, patriotic and civic organizations and any other citizens, will be heard, and their statements considered."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] continued: "This is a people's war, and legislation must express the people's views and cooperation."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and a joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 133. An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 1294. An act to authorize the sale or transfer of property belonging to the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 1762. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

APPOINTMENT OF CHARLES E. WILSON AS EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD following my remarks the press release of Hon. Donald M. Nelson of February 16, 1943, relative to the accession of Mr. Charles E. Wilson to a position which gives him now a new opportunity to further war production in this country, and to enable us to keep the commitments this Nation has made to our allies and to our gallant men and women of the armed forces.

Following this, I ask that there be printed in proper succession the Executive orders of the President, beginning with the order of January 16, 1942, setting up the War Production Board and providing for the duties of the Board and the Chairman thereof relative to war production.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chairman Donald M. Nelson today appointed Charles E. Wilson as executive vice chairman of the War Production Board, in charge of all War Production Board programs, and asked Ferdinand E. Eberstadt, program vice chairman, for his resignation.

In assuming authority over all phases of War Production Board programs and activities, Mr. Wilson will report to the Chairman. He takes over all the duties formerly vested in the program vice chairman, including control of industry divisions and the operations of the controlled materials plan.

Mr. Nelson said:

"I have made this move in order to solve organizational problems which have come about because carefully scheduled production is now the most pressing problem before us.

"It is my conviction that this change will bring harmony to War Production Board and end the jurisdictional questions which, if permitted to continue, could only hamper the war effort.

"Mr. Eberstadt has worked hard and diligently in setting up the controlled materials plan, and I regret the circumstances which make it necessary for me to transfer his functions to another. However, Mr. Wilson is a production man and our job today is primarily a production job.

"Because our entire effort must now center about the production line, and because this involves the closest control over scheduling, it is essential that two things be true—first, that a production man be in full charge; second, that all related problems be within the jurisdiction of that production man.

"In the early days of this organization and its predecessors, we faced problems of a somewhat different nature. Even a few months ago, the problem of controlling materials flow was of major importance. It does not now lose any of its importance, but the emphasis has shifted; scheduling—both of end items and components—is the over-all job of first importance that must be pushed.

"And because the total war program has become more closely integrated, it follows that the man in charge of production cannot discharge his duties adequately unless he also controls the flow of materials into production channels.

"In other words, materials control and production control today are all one integrated job. They cannot be considered separately. They must be directed as one job, not two.

"Under my supervision, Mr. Wilson will have full authority to make the necessary decisions to carry out the War Production Board production programs for aircraft, escort vessels, rubber, high-octane gas, merchant vessels, and all other war items. I am confident that he will continue to keep production going up."

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 9024 ESTABLISHING THE WAR PRODUCTION BOARD IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND DEFINING ITS FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States, as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and in order to define further the functions and duties of the Office for Emergency Management with respect to the state of war declared to exist by joint resolutions of the Congress, approved December 8, 1941, and December 11, 1941, respectively, and for the purpose of assuring the most effective prosecution of war procurement and production, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. There is established within the Office for Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President a War Production Board, hereinafter referred to as the Board. The Board shall consist of a chairman, to be appointed by the President, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Federal Loan Administrator, the Director General and the Associate Director General of the Office of Production Management, the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, the Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, and the special assistant to the President supervising the defense aid program.

2. The Chairman of the War Production Board, with the advice and assistance of the members of the Board, shall:

a. Exercise general direction over the war procurement and production program.

b. Determine the policies, plans, procedures, and methods of the several Federal departments, establishments, and agencies in respect to war procurement and production, including purchasing, contracting, specifications, and construction; and including conversion, requisitioning, plant expansion, and the financing thereof; and issue such directives in respect thereto as he may deem necessary or appropriate.

c. Perform the functions and exercise the powers vested in the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board by Executive Order No. 8875 of August 28, 1941.

d. Supervise the Office of Production Management in the performance of its responsibilities and duties, and direct such changes in its organization as he may deem necessary.

e. Report from time to time to the President on the progress of war procurement and production, and perform such other duties as the President may direct.

3. Federal departments, establishments, and agencies shall comply with the policies, plans, methods, and procedures in respect to war procurement and production as determined by the Chairman, and shall furnish to the Chairman such information relating to war procurement and production as he may deem necessary for the performance of his duties.

4. The Army and Navy Munitions Board shall report to the President through the Chairman of the War Production Board.

5. The Chairman may exercise the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by this order through such officials or agencies and in such manner as he may determine; and his decisions shall be final.

6. The Chairman is further authorized within the limits of such funds as may be allocated or appropriated to the Board to employ necessary personnel and make provision for necessary supplies, facilities, and services.

7. The Supply Priorities and Allocations Board, established by the Executive order of August 28, 1941, is hereby abolished, and its personnel, records, and property transferred to the Board. The Executive Orders No. 8629 of January 7, 1941, No. 8875 of August 28,

1941, No. 8891 of September 4, 1941, No. 8942 of November 19, 1941, No. 9001 of December 27, 1941, and No. 9023 of January 14, 1942, are hereby amended accordingly, and any provisions of these or other pertinent Executive orders conflicting with this order are hereby superseded.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1942.*

---

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 9040, DEFINING ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF THE WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and for the purpose of assuring the most effective prosecution of war procurement and production, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. In addition to the responsibilities and duties described in paragraph 2 of Executive Order No. 9024, of January 16, 1942, the Chairman of the War Production Board, with the advice and assistance of the members of the Board, shall:

(a) Perform the functions and exercise the powers heretofore vested in the Office of Production Management.

(b) Perform the functions and exercise the powers vested in the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board, by Executive Order No. 8942, of November 19, 1941.

(c) Perform the functions and exercise the authority vested in the President by section 120 of the National Defense Act of 1916 (39 Stat. 213).

2. Paragraph 1 of said Executive Order No. 9024 of January 16, 1942, is amended to provide that the lieutenant general in charge of War Department production, and the Director of the Labor Division of the War Production Board shall be members of the War Production Board vice the Director General and Associate Director General of the Office of Production Management.

3. The Chairman of the War Production Board may exercise the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by this or any other order through such officials or agencies and in such manner as he may determine; and his decisions shall be final.

4. The Office of Production Management, established by Executive Order No. 8629 of January 7, 1941, is abolished and its personnel, records, property, and funds are transferred to the War Production Board.

5. Executive Order No. 8629, of January 7, 1941, is rescinded, and Executive Order No. 9024, of January 16, 1942, and any other Executive orders the provisions of which are inconsistent with the provisions of this order, are amended accordingly.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 24, 1942.*

---

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 9125 DEFINING ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS, DUTIES, AND POWERS OF THE WAR PRODUCTION BOARD AND THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States, as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and for the purpose of assuring the most effective prosecution of war procurement and production, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. In addition to the responsibilities and duties described in Executive Order No. 9024, of January 16, 1942, and in Executive Order No. 9040, of January 24, 1942, the Chairman of the War Production Board, with the advice and assistance of the members of the Board, shall perform the additional functions and duties, and exercise the additional powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon the President of the United States by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942.

2. The Chairman of the War Production Board may perform the functions and duties, and exercise the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by this or any other order through such officials or agencies, including the Office of Price Administration (created by the act of January 30, 1942, Pub. Law 421, 77th Cong., 2d sess.), and in such manner as he may determine. In any and all such cases the decision of the Chairman of the War Production Board shall be final.

3. The Chairman of the War Production Board is authorized to delegate to the Office of Price Administration or the Price Administrator such of his functions, duties, powers, authority, or discretion with respect to priorities or rationing, as he may deem to be necessary or appropriate for the effective prosecution of the war; and in the administration of enforcement of any such priorities or rationing authority or any priorities or rationing authority heretofore conferred upon the Office of Price Administration or upon the Price Administrator by the Office of Production Management or by the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Price Administrator is hereby authorized:

(a) To exercise all functions, duties, powers, authority, or discretion with respect to such priorities or rationing in the same manner, and to the same degree and extent, as if such functions, duties, powers, authority, or discretion had been conferred upon or transferred to the Office of Price Administration directly by Executive order.

(b) To delegate the functions, duties, powers, authority, or discretion mentioned in subparagraphs (a) and (d) hereof, including the authority and power to sign and issue subpenas, to such person or persons as he may designate or appoint for that purpose, to be exercised by such person or persons in any place and at any time.

(c) To institute civil proceedings in his own name to enforce any such priority or rationing authority or any regulation or order heretofore or hereafter issued, or action taken, pursuant to such authority, and to intervene in any civil proceedings in which any such regulation or order is or could be relied upon as ground for relief or defense or is otherwise involved, in any Federal, State, or Territorial court. The Price Administrator shall be represented in any such proceedings by attorneys appointed or designated by him.

(d) To exercise, to the extent necessary for the purposes of this order, the functions, duties, powers, authority, or discretion conferred upon the President by paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1941 (54 Stat. 676), as amended by the act of May 31, 1941 (Pub. Law 89, 77th Cong.), and by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (act of March 27, 1942, Pub. Law 507, 77th Cong.).

4. War Production Board Directives No. 1 of January 24, 1942 (7 F. R. 562), No. 1A of February 2, 1942 (7 F. R. 698), No. 1B of February 9, 1942 (7 F. R. 925), No. 1C of February 28, 1942 (7 F. R. 1669), and any other authorizations of the Office of Production Management or the War Production Board with respect to priorities or rationing, and all regulations or orders issued, or actions taken, by the Office of Price Administration or the Price Administrator pursuant to such directives or authorizations, are hereby, until withdrawn or superseded, continued in full force and effect, as if issued pursuant to this order or under authority conferred pursuant to this order. No provision of this order shall be construed to impair the right of the Administrator to maintain pending, or to institute, civil proceedings, or to take any other action with respect to violations prior to the date of this order of any priorities or rationing regulation or order heretofore issued.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 7, 1942.*

---

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in addition to the offering of these statements, I wish to say that those of us who have had opportunity to see Mr. Charles E. Wilson, who was the head of the General Electric Co. until he came to the War Production Board here, feel great confidence in Mr. Wilson's ability, in his courage, and in his character.

He is a practical production man. I understand that one of the reasons why he was chosen was the fact that his company, the General Electric Co., has made such an outstanding production record. They have had very large responsibility and have discharged it with great credit.

I believe Mr. Wilson will break the bottlenecks of production which have been retarding production progress. I believe he has the skill, the experience, the personality, and the strength of will which will make it possible for him very noticeably and conspicuously to forward our whole production effort. I know that the Congress is going to look upon Mr. Wilson's assuming this responsible place with confident hope, and that we will back him up and allow nothing to interfere with him in doing the big job which he has undertaken for the country and our kind of a world.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Col. Clay Anderson, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission, provided for by law, vice Col. John R. D. Matheson, Corps of Engineers, to be relieved; and

Several employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for appointment to the positions indicated:

Alvin C. Thorson from December 2, 1942, and Joe C. Partington from December 4, 1942, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineers with rank of lieutenant commanders; Glenn W. Moore, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant, from January 4, 1943; and Emerson E. Jones, to be aide, with rank of ensign, all in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Leroy Allison West, from the State of Colorado, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Denver area office of the War Manpower Commission;

James Vernon Doucet, from the State of Colorado, to be program control technician, at $4,600 per annum, in the Denver regional office of the War Manpower Commission; and

Julius Cohen, from the State of West Virginia, to be principal attorney, at $5,600 per annum, in the Office of the General Counsel of the War Manpower Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles D. Lawrence to be judge of the United States Customs Court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Frank McLaughlin to be judge of the United States District Court of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Keegan to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George L. Weyler to be rear admiral in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified at once of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. McKELLAR. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 22, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18, 1943:

MEXICAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be members of the American-Mexican Claims Commission:

Edgar E. Witt, of Texas.

Samuel Marshall Gold, of New York.

Charles F. McLaughlin, of Nebraska.

THE JUDICIARY

Hon. James V. Allred, of Texas, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, vice Hon. Rufus E. Foster, deceased.

Hon. Curtis L. Waller, of Florida, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit (additional position).

Chase A. Clark, of Idaho, to be United States district judge for the district of Idaho, vice Hon. Charles C. Cavanah, retired.

Julius E. Hilgard, of Montana, to be United States marshal for the district of Montana, vice William W. Crawford.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Michael W. Straus, of Illinois, to be First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice Ebert K. Burlew, resigned.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Kildroy P. Aldrich, of Illinois, to be First Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, vice Ambrose O'Connell.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Charlotte E. Carr, from the State of Illinois, to be assistant to the Deputy Chairman, at $6,500 per annum, in the War Manpower Commission.

Alexander C. Martin, Jr., from the State of Texas, to be principal manpower utilization consultant, at $5,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Wallace P. Studencki, from the State of Indiana, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Chicago regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Stephen R. MacRae, from the State of North Carolina, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Washington regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Bernard L. Gorfinkle, from the State of Massachusetts, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Boston regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Russell C. McCarthy, from the State of New York, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Rochester area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Olaf K. Fjetland, from the State of Michigan, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Saginaw area office of the War Manpower Commission.

George W. Caylor, from the State of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in New York regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Wilberforce D. Simmons, from the State of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in New York regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Luke White, from the State of Indiana, to be senior attorney, at $4,600 per annum, in the office of the General Counsel of the War Manpower Commission.

Paul N. Devine, from the State of Maine, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the New Bedford-Fall River area office of the War Manpower Commission.

John D. Howard, from the State of Texas, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Beaumont area office of the War Manpower Commission.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

First Lt. Albert Junior Bauer, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. John Barry Brady, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Arthur Abbitt Kirk, Medical Corps Reserve.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Maj. Harold Victor Roberts, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 30, 1942.

Capt. Thomas Joseph Marnane, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1941.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. James Lee Massey, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 10, 1942.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Henry Brooks Wilson, Cavalry (temporary captain), with rank from June 14, 1941.

Second Lt. John Munroe Anderson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. John Marion Baker, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Robert William Beers, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Leon Bilstin, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Jack Lester Bogusch, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. James Savage Braden, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Richard Patrick Brice, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Phillip Marshall Costain, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Charles Campbell Ettlesen, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Charles Carroll Fishburne, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Thomas Taylor Gallowey, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. John Emory Gimperling, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Samuel Hampton Henton, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Carl Columbus Hinkle, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Fred Ernest Holdrege, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. George Chambers Hozier, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Philip Simon Isis, Chemical Warfare Service, with rank from February 20, 1942.

Second Lt. Chester Reed Ladd, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. George Thomas Mehalko, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 20, 1942.

Second Lt. Bliss Leon Mehr, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1941.

Second Lt. Lowell Stanley Nickodem, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Campbell Palfrey, Jr., Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Charles Eugene Robbs, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Frank Clark Scofield, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Richard Martin Scott, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Robert Bryan Short, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Howard Westley Slaton, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. William Franklin Smith, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Wilbur Deane Snow, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Albert John Wetzel, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 20, 1942.

Second Lt. Paul Berkshire Woodward, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONEL WITH RANK FROM JANUARY 27, 1943

Lt. Col. Frank William Milburn, Infantry (temporary major general).

TO BE COLONEL WITH RANK FROM JANUARY 30, 1943

Lt. Col. Isaac Gill, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).

TO BE COLONELS WITH RANK FROM FEBRUARY 1, 1943

Lt. Col. John Kennard, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Bellinger Thompson, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Hamner Huston, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Jens Anderson Doe, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Lester Leland Lampert, Infantry (temporary colonel).

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Laurance N. McNair, United States Navy, retired, to be a rear admiral in the Navy on the retired list, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of United States Naval Mission to Peru, to rank from the 11th day of February 1943.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

James G. Brown, Atmore, Ala., in place of J. G. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Melvin L. Gill, Normal, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Leon W. Richardson, Oakman, Ala., in place of A. T. Sanders, resigned.

Claude P. Johnston, Somerville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

ARIZONA

Robert B. Anderson, Ajo, Ariz., in place of R. J. Huddleston, deceased.

Ralph H. Trueblood, Glendale, Ariz., in place of J. H. Little, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Nannie L. Connevey, Bauxite, Ark., in place of N. L. Connevey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

S. Tillman Tipton, Biggers, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Harmon T. Griffin, Lake City, Ark., in place of H. T. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Sue M. Brown, Luxora, Ark., in place of S. M. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Maud Jackson, Sherrill, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Fred W. Knickerbocker, Sparkman, Ark., in place of F. W. Knickerbocker. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

CALIFORNIA

Harry A. Hall, Bigpine, Calif., in place of H. A. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1942.

Barbara J. Slack, Boron, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Louis H. Little, Fairfield, Calif., in place of S. M. Maus. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

Eva C. Disinger, Imperial Beach, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Howard Edwin Cooper, La Canada, Calif., in place of H. E. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Howard K. Goodwin, Long Beach, Calif., in place of H. K. Goodwin. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1940.

COLORADO

Velma M. McNair, Kirk, Colo., in place of R. J. Preuss, transferred.

George S. Niebuhr, Walsenburg, Colo., in place of G. S. Niebuhr. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

CONNECTICUT

Timothy J. Sullivan, New London, Conn., in place of J. R. May, deceased.

Edward A. Bowes, Saybrook, Conn., in place of E. A. Bowes. Incumbent's commission expired May 11, 1942.

Thomas P. Horan, South Norwalk, Conn., in place of T. P. Horan. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

Arthur J. Caisse, South Willington, Conn., in place of A. J. Caisse. Incumbent's commission expired May 11, 1942.

Albert F. Ricci, Stafford Springs, Conn., in place of W. B. Hanley, removed.

Emanuel Kurtz, Trumbull, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

DELAWARE

Zora B. Tatman, Frederica, Del., in place of J. W. Conley, resigned.

FLORIDA

Carrie B. Flowers, Crescent City, Fla., in place of E. C. Miller, removed.

Robert G. Crosby, Yukon, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

GEORGIA

Joseph T. Bohannon, Grantville, Ga., in place of J. T. Bohannon. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Sarah Short Barnett, Leary, Ga., in place of E. A. Barnett, deceased.

Farris K. Mize, West Point, Ga., in place of J. J. Walker, Jr., resigned.

IDAHO

Donald E. Springer, Headquarters, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

ILLINOIS

Herbert R. Whitsitt, Knoxville, Ill., in place of C. W. Brewer, retired.

Ralph Van Matre, Olney, Ill., in place of Ralph Van Matre. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clarence A. Holl, Sadorus, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

INDIANA

Heber A. Loyce, Lowell, Ind., in place of S. T. Henry, deceased.

Dale E. Hughes, Perrysville, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Nelson H. Minthorn, Royal Center, Ind., in place of F. L. Hand, removed.

Iver C. Bain, Russellville, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Hugo J. Thalmann, Union Mills, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

IOWA

Carroll O. Lightfoot, Onslow, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Clayton P. Norris, Red Oak, Iowa., in place of K. P. Thomas, resigned.

Gladys G. Ayers, Shannon City, Iowa, in place of H. J. Kelley, transferred.

KANSAS

Beulah H. Stewart, Baldwin City, Kans., in place of B. H. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1942.

KENTUCKY

Wilcie Brandenburg, Booneville, Ky., in place of Frank Brandenburg, deceased.

Rebecca B. Forsythe, Greenup, Ky., in place of R. B. Forsythe. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1942.

Ezra C. Williams, Russell, Ky., in place of P. B. Hyden, removed.

Emma K. Riley, Sparta, Ky., in place of E. K. Riley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Leta W. Hobbs, Woodburn, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

LOUISIANA

James L. Treadway, Alexandria, La., in place of Samuel Haas, resigned.

Mildred M. Gleason, Belcher, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Nora F. Zeringue, Destrehan, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Maurice Primeaux, Kaplan, La., in place of Maurice Primeaux. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Gladys C. Dragon, Pointe a la Hache, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

William S. Montgomery, Saline, La., in place of W. S. Montgomery. Incumbent's commission expired April 29, 1942.

MARYLAND

Henry J. Paul, Linthicum Heights, Md., in place of H. J. Paul. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary G. Van Edsinga, North Beach, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lawrence M. Taylor, Perryman, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charles W. Elgin, Poolesville, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MASSACHUSETTS

William Bacon, North Oxford, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

William B. Barnes, Petersham, Mass., in place of K C. Smith, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Simon F. Blake, Bellaire, Mich., in place of J. W. Foster, deceased.

Helen E. Daly Carrollton, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Marian A. Cleary, Clawson, Mich., in place of M. A. Cleary. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary Elliott, Haslett, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Helen B. Martin, Indian River, Mich., in place of H. B. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1941.

Nellie I. Blemaster, Maple Rapids, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Anna C. Kulish, Minden City, Mich., in place of A. C. Kulish. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hallie C. Bunting, Port Hope, Mich., in place of H. C. Bunting. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Elizabeth J. Shannon, Powers, Mich., in place of E. J. Shannon. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Byron O. Gillies, Prescott, Mich., in place of B. O. Gillies. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lawrence D. Larke, Rogers City, Mich., in place of C. A. Vogelheim, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Thomas Hughes, Bemidji, Minn., in place of Thomas Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Oscar L. Flo, Bricelyn, Minn., in place of O. L. Flo. Incumbent's commission expired February 26 1942.

Johannes H. Risius, Brownsdale, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Harriet E. Pederson, Clements, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John R. Forsythe, Cohasset, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Gladys M. Freeman, Franklin, Minn., in place of G. M. Freemen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Isaac C. Stensrud, Hartland, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Joseph R. Keefe, Redwood Falls, Minn., in place of J. R. Keefe. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

MISSISSIPPI

John S. Rimmer, Camden, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Ethel P. Weissinger, Cary, Miss., in place of A. D. Powers, retired.

Brooksie J. Holt, Duncan, Miss., in place of B. J. Holt. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Aubrey C. Griffin, Jackson, Miss., in place of A. C. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1942.

Carson Hughes, Oakland, Miss., in place of Carson Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Royal C. Hayden, Vaughan, Miss., in place of F. C. Hayden, deceased.

Annie K. Mauldin, Water Valley, Miss., in place of A. K. Mauldin. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1942.

MISSOURI

John L. Thomas, Bevier, Mo., in place of Ordell Gross, removed.

Morris D. Greenwood, Fredericktown, Mo., in place of P. S. Cohen, resigned.

John H. Dickbrader, Washington, Mo., in place of J. H. Dickbrader. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

MONTANA

Harry H. Howard, Bozeman, Mont., in place of H. H. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Glen Mace Cox, Shelby, Mont., in place of G. M. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired, June 23, 1942.

NEBRASKA

Plato C. Redfern, Big Spring, Nebr., in place of P. C. Redfern. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Edmund A. Hall, Fairmont, Nebr., in place of E. A. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Marion M. Kenroy, Long Pine, Nebr., in place of M. M. Kenroy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles F. Beushausen, Loup City, Nebr., in place of C. F. Beushausen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary E. Krisl, Milligan, Nebr., in place of M. E. Krisl. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Marie Weekes, Norfolk, Nebr., in place of Marie Weekes. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Vera B. Baugh, Oakland, Nebr., in place of William Vogt, Jr., removed.

George C. Thurman, Peru, Nebr., in place of G. C. Thurman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Beth H. Clary, Seneca, Nebr., in place of Beth Clary. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles E. Major, Trenton, Nebr., in place of C. E. Major. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hester E. Lowe, Wolbach, Nebr., in place of H. E. Lowe. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEVADA

Charles E. Merkel, Beatty, Nev., in place of Virginia Castillo, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

S. Herminah Smith, Brigantine, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Louis C. Parker, Gloucester City, N. J., in place of L. C. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Edward J. Lennon, Stone Harbor, N. J., in place of E. J. Lennon. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ethel B. Carr, Stratford, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NEW MEXICO

Ray S. Soladay, Carlsbad, N. Mex., in place of R. S. Soladay. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

James A. Walsh, Central, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

NEW YORK

Jeannette S. Catalano, Derby, N. Y., in place of E. L. Benjamin, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clarence H. Rosebro, Cleveland, N. C., in place of C. H. Rosebro. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

French W. Graham, Elkin, N. C., in place of F. W. Graham. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William D. Coble, Guilford College, N. C., in place of R. S. Doak, deceased.

Frederick R. Jones, Hayesville, N. C., in place of F. R. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired April 7, 1942.

John V. Highfill, Mayodan, N. C., in place of J. V. Highfill. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NORTH DAKOTA

John F. Leonard, Marmarth, N. Dak., in place of P. J. Bott, retired.

Robert A. McLean, Niagara, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

OHIO

Mary P. Mowl, Aurora Station, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Albert D. Owen, Austinburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charles T. Wilford, Avon, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Harold Q. Overholser, Camden, Ohio, in place of H. Q. Overholser. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Agnes M. Jones, Columbia Station, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Earl J. Brulport, Fayetteville, Ohio, in place of E. J. Brulport. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Leslie O. Campbell, Georgetown, Ohio, in place of L. O. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Myrtle I. Grant, Grove City, Ohio, in place of Myrtle Grant. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Samuel E. Fleming, Manchester, Ohio, in place of S. E. Fleming. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Karl S. Schiller, Petersburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Thomas F. Short, Seaman, Ohio, in place of T. F. Short. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hugh M. Parker, Windham, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

OKLAHOMA

Frank Ferguson, Camargo, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Branson N. Bills, Gotebo, Okla., in place of B. N. Bills. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Priscilla P. Edgar, Langston, Okla., in place of P. P. Edgar. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Dennis F. Almack, Moore, Okla., in place of D. F. Almack. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OREGON

Louis C. Bliem, Dufur, Oreg., in place of L. C. Bliem. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Claude H. Reavis, Enterprise, Oreg., in place of C. H. Reavis. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

PENNSYLVANIA

Wilbert E. Rankin, Black Lick, Pa., in place of E. D. Stoneback, retired.

Leo Walker, Clairton, Pa., in place of Leo Walker. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

John A. McShane, Clifton Heights, Pa., in place of J. A. McShane. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Viola Primozic, Curtisville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Dorothy M. Nice, Esterly, Pa., in place of C. H. Adams, deceased.

William P. Kohler, Glassport, Pa., in place of W. P. Kohler. Incumbent's commission expired April 29, 1942.

Robert A. Rupp, Hamburg, Pa., in place of R. A. Rupp. Incumbent's commission expired Feb. 20, 1938.

Laura M. Caughey, Haysville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Harry E. Trout, Mercersburg, Pa., in place of H. E. Trout. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary C. Adams, Milesburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Anna E. Hinkel, Milford, Pa., in place of F. W. Cross, deceased.

Ralph B. Mushler, Norwood, Pa., in place of R. B. Mushler. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mayme A Moore, Oakdale, Pa., in place of M. A. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

Walter A. Ringler, Reading, Pa., in place of W. A. Ringler. Incumbent's commission expired June 28, 1940.

Oliver L. Young, Warrendale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charles L. Druschel, Zelienople, Pa., in place of W. F. Burr. Incumbent's commission expired Feb. 6, 1941.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Hattie C. Sherard, Calhoun Falls, S. C. in place of H. C. Sherard. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John A. Howell, St. George, S. C., in place of J. A. Howell. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

William A. Powell, Yemassee, S. C., in place of Loring Terry. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

SOUTH DAKOTA

John H. Evans, Agar, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mary L. Gaynor, Springfield, S. Dak., in place of James Gaynor, retired.

TENNESSEE

Robert R. Andrews, Morristown, Tenn., in place of J. E. Burke, resigned.

Marshall Lee Partridge, Western State Hospital, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

TEXAS

Andrew J. McDonald, Alvord, Tex., in place of A. J. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Martin N. Guest, Aspermont, Tex., in place of M. N. Guest, resigned.

Helen E. Arrington, Boyd, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Earl E. Frost, Bridgeport, Tex., in place of E. E. Frost. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Naomi E. Ballard, Channelview, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Alva Spencer, Crowell, Tex., in place of Alva Spencer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Chester L. Woods, Hitchcock, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Henry W. Hoffer, Kaufman, Tex., in place of H. W. Hoffer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John R. Gantt, Princeton, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

George J. Bolton, Schertz, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

VERMONT

Clarence J. Coon, Bomoseen, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Bernis H. Snyder, Townshend, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

VIRGINIA

Otho H. Brewbaker, Buchanan, Va., in place of W. R. Allen, resigned.

Albin O. Haley, Front Royal, Va., in place of J. H. Shiner, resigned.

WASHINGTON

James F. Tostevin, Retsil, Wash., in place of J. F. Tostevin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WEST VIRGINIA

Edwin Caperton, Alloy, W. Va., in place of Edwin Caperton. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1941.

Lois E. Henderson, Osage, W. Va.. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Myrtle Blackman, Parsons, W. Va., in place of Myrtle Blackman. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1941.

WISCONSIN

Frances A. Hollister, Clinton, Wis., in place of Edwin Foley, removed without prejudice.

George C. Smith, Downing, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

William L. Lee, Drummond, Wis., in place of W. L. Lee. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Alphonse J. McGuire, Highland, Wis., in place of A. J. McGuire, transferred.

Leone E. De Muth, Hollandale, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Letha G. Sherman, North Prairie, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Minnie O. Bartelme, Okauchee, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Louis H. Schultz, Reedsburg, Wis., in place of L. H. Schultz. Incumbent's commission expired June 15, 1942.

Grover E. Falck, Seymour, Wis., in place of G. E. Falck. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Louis H. Rivard, Turtle Lake, Wis., in place of L. H. Rivard. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

Howard J. Merryfield, Wild Rose, Wis., in place of T. A. Wiora, transferred.

WYOMING

Walter H. Sieczkowski, Monarch, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 18, 1943:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Charles D. Lawrence to be judge of the United States Customs Court.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

J. Frank McLaughlin to be United States district judge for the District of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

John J. Keegan to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for a term of 6 years from March 15, 1943.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

George L. Weyler to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from August 19, 1942.

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Mildred K. DeLegal, Oakland Park.

LOUISIANA

Kate P. McDonnell, Pelican.

MINNESOTA

Anna C. Dallaire, Ah-Gwah-Ching.
Joseph G. McRaith, Belle Plain.
Antoinette D. Hall, Campbell.
Catherine C. Burns, Glenwood.
Eugene R. Sheridan, Hamel.
Tillman A. Brokken, Harmony.
Flora P. Lowry, Hollandale.
Anton Malmberg, Lafayette.
Robert A. Collopy, Lake Elmo.
Everett J. Kelly, Lake Benton.
Reginald F. Ferrin, Mantorville.
Michael H. Wadley, Millville.
John Claude Gowan, Ortonville.
Mary J. Cain, Oxboro.
Otto J. Scharber, Rogers.
Andrew T. Sanvik, Starbuck.
Lillian A. Peterson, Villard.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

S. Lucy Weeks, Chocorua.

OKLAHOMA

Laura Belle Williams, Braggs.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles W. Allen, Bedford.
Clarence W. Scheuren, Collegeville.
Eugene K. Richard, Elysburg.
Neale Boyle, Freeland.
Margaret Mary Hughes, Greensburg.
Harry A. McIntosh, Hollidaysburg.
Walter A. Tiffany, Kingsley.
Fred W. Patterson, Lattimer Mines.
Robert P. Carson, Madera.
Maud E. Culp, Maytown.
Nona Tolbert, Millerton.
Joseph L. Meehan, Montrose.
Frank J. Murphy, New Albany.
Russell W. Mosteller, Pen Argyl.
Samuel G. Thomas, Port Kennedy.
Mary A. Turner, Pricedale.
Leonard Buranovsky, Ramey.
Paul A. Martin, Roaring Spring.
Jean Burke, St. Michael.
John F. Siegel, Saylorsburg.
Harold I. Haines, Thompsontown.
Lorena E. Port, Thorndale.
Rosanna McGee, Towanda.
Gwilym Evans, Trucksville.
Frederick A. Entrot, Union Dale.
Rose C. Pierson, Villa Maria.
Mary A. Brunski, Wanamie.
Hazel M. Herbert, West Decatur.
J. Richard Hancock, Williamstown.
Frances B. Maines, Woodland.
Frank A. Crippen, Youngsville.

TEXAS

Ferris S. Gault, Agua Dulce.
Paul V. Bryant, Canadian.
Fern C. Fields, Clint.
Jack M. Wade, Dalhart.
Mary V. Rollings, Dodson.
A. Warren Dunn, Fort Stockton.
Samuel C. Rhinehart, Iraan.
Lizzie Baker, Karnack.
Grace L. McKay, Madisonville.
Mary F. Wakefield, Midway.
Joe W. Hartfield, New London.
Benjamin F. Hobson, Paducah.
Mazel M. Reasoner, Pearland.
Grundy F. Wimberly, Sr., Perrin.
Mills Awbrey, Presidio.
Marvin G. Prewitt, Ralls.
Lucile Cline, Seabrook.
John L. Brunner, Taylor.
Frederick I. Massengill, Terrell.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In Thy name, O Saviour of the world, we offer our prayer to the Father of the children of men. Enable us to realize that the epochs in our lives are not in our calling nor in the things seen, but in prayer and in silent meditation by the way. Thus we learn to understand ourselves, our perceptions, our judgments, and the wise road to take. In the chamber of the soul weaknesses are disclosed and the armor of defense is made. This above all: "To thine own self be true and it must follow as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man."

Almighty God, we rejoice that the age of chivalry continues and that the blessings of heaven come to those who seek, hope, and quietly wait. When hunger and suffering were old and getting older there were those who saw above the torn clouds and heard the whisper of the morning. Oh, we praise Thee for those who stand resolute, strong of will, even while the warm blood of their native soil is filling the cup of hate. Voices are calling while doors of humanity are bolted, as the shadows of slavery and death are hanging above them like a pall. Oh, help America to spread the reign of justice with open hands, and with earnest minds, dispelling the gloom, and forget them not who fight as the vanguard of freedom in yonder distant land. In the name of our Elder Brother. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, presented the following report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943 (Rept. No. 137), which was read a first and second time, referred to the House Calendar, and ordered printed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 82 to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could reach some agreement with the gentleman from New York, inasmuch as time is limited, that discussion be limited to 5 minutes a side, at the end of which time a motion will be offered.

Mr. TABER. That will be satisfactory to us.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate

on the resolution be limited to 5 minutes a side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, namely:

LEGISLATIVE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Special and select committees: For an additional amount for expenses of special and select committees authorized by the House, fiscal year 1943, $250,000.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

*War Manpower Commission*

Selective Service System: For an additional amount for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, including the objects specified under the head "Selective Service System" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, $21,160,000: *Provided*, That such combined appropriation shall not be subject to the provisions of section 5 of such appropriation act nor to the provisions of the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, in paragraphs 3 and 13 under the head "Office for Emergency Management," title I, and section 203, title II.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF TREASURER OF UNITED STATES

Salaries: For an additional amount for salaries, Office of Treasurer of the United States, fiscal year 1943, $1,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this bill is limited to three items: The first provides a quarter of a million dollars for the expenses of the special and select committees of the House of Representatives. The second appropriates $21,160,000 for the Selective Service System of the War Manpower Commission. And the third supplies a million dollars to take care of the deficit in the Office of the Treasurer of the United States.

These three items would, in the regular course of events, have been included in the general deficiency bill which is to be reported to the House next week. But as the result of unforseen contingencies, due entirely to the war, funds for these three agencies have been exhausted, or will be exhausted before the end of the month, and immediate funds must be provided unless all three are to be appropriation bill can be enacted.
brought to a standstill before the general

In the first instance, all funds available for the expenses of the select and special committees of the House have been completely exhausted. The amount available for this purpose for the current fiscal year is $150,000. But the number of these committees has been increased until authorizations for the purpose now total $222,000 and further authorizations are yet to be made.

The $34,745,000 appropriated for the fiscal year 1943 for the Selective Service System was estimated prior to Pearl Harbor. That figure was based on the proposed induction of a maximum of 800,000 selectees. Due to the subsequent declaration of war the number actually inducted exceeds 4,000,000, and, of course, the original appropriation is wholly inadequate.

The Office of Treasurer of the United States was granted an original appropriation of $1,700,000 for salaries for the current fiscal year. This likewise was prior to the declaration of war. The increased volume of Government disbursements for the war program is expected to practically double that originally anticipated, and as result the additional $1,000,000 carried by the bill will be required to take care of the necessary personnel.

All three are routine activities which must be provided for. The additional fiscal requirements are due entirely to war conditions. And the imperative nature of their requirements makes it necessary to take them up in a separate bill which can have prompt attention in both Houses.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Can the gentleman give us the names of the special and select committees whose expenditures are involved in this measure?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All of the special and select committees are involved. All are without funds.

Mr. RANKIN. Does it cover the appropriation for the Dies committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes, the Dies committee is included along with all other special and select committees.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. How much is provided for the select committees, for what committees, and how much for each?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars is provided. It is the amount authorized by Congress on reports from the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. SABATH. How much is provided for the different committees, may we know? I think we are entitled to know how much is for each committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The amount is named in the various resolutions reported by the Committee on Accounts and varies with each committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is brought in by unanimous report from the Committee on Appropriations. I do not see how we can possibly escape approving it.

For the special committees the amount of $250,000 goes into the general contingent fund of the House, and it is available only by resolution that has been adopted or will be adopted by the House with reference to any committee. The committees can have no funds until the Committee on Accounts has audited and approved the bills. There are five or six such committees, the Dies committee, for which a resolution has not yet been adopted from the Committee on Accounts, the Committee on Appropriations, for which resolution has not yet been adopted, and the Smith committee to investigate the different activities of the Government. Undoubtedly the resolutions that are approved for all these committees will exceed the amount that is carried here, but it is only desired to provide here for enough money to cover these activities until the 1st day of July, and we hope that it will do that.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand it, after this resolution is passed, then resolutions will come in from the Committee on Accounts covering these individual allotments, is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is correct, and that is the time the House will pass on them. This goes into the pot subject to draft by the Clerk of the House with the approval of the Committee on Accounts after the House has passed a specific resolution authorizing the spending of that money. This really sets up a fund in the hands of the Committee on Accounts and the Clerk of the House subject to draft upon it by resolution of the House itself.

Mr. RANKIN. Then the resolution for the funds for the Dies committee will have to be approved by the House?

Mr. TABER. The time to talk about that is when that particular resolution comes from the Committee on Accounts, and the time to talk about the Smith resolution is at that time, and likewise in reference to money for the Appropriation Committee. There are two or three other committees besides that. This is not the giving of any specific money to any specific committee. You do not get that until we get to the other proposition.

Mr. FOLGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. If I understand this correctly, this carries these activities only to July 1?

Mr. TABER. It is only intended to put up money enough to carry the special committees until July 1. It may not do it. On the other hand, there might possibly be a balance. We cannot tell. We have done the best we could to estimate it correctly.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, this resolution has just been reported.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman be kind enough to tell the House how much is the total amount covered by the resolution and how much for each of these three propositions indicated?

Mr. TABER. There is a total of $22,410,000. The first item is for the select committees of the House, $250,000. The second item is for the Selective Service operations, $21,160,000, and the third item is for the Treasurer of the United States, $1,000,000.

I will tell you what these items are other than for the select committees of the House. At the time the original appropriation was made, as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has stated, the estimates were gotten up before Pearl Harbor and they were put through the House on that basis. They called for $34,000,000 plus. I cannot give you the exact figure at this time. The result of the increased number of people who have had to be inducted into the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps has meant additional expenses for the local boards, for the administration here, and other things to such an extent that we are obliged to send in this recommendation of $21,160,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, for the benefit and convenience of the Members of the House and Senate, has arranged for an exhibit of photographs demonstrating the extent of damage inflicted upon our German enemies by airplane bombing raids to be placed on display in the House caucus rooms through the courtesy of Mr. Robert Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air.

The photographs are enlargements from negatives made by the Royal Air Force and also may be inspected in three dimensional form by use of special stereoscopic equipment which has been installed.

Similar photographs were exhibited to members of Parliament in London and to legislators of other Allied Nations and have proved most helpful in clarifying their impressions of the ability of bombing aircraft to inflict damage on the enemy.

An officer of the R. A. F. and also an officer of the United States Army Air Forces will be present in the House caucus room to interpret the photographs and to answer questions while the exhibit is open.

Members of the House and Senate and their assistants will be welcome between the hours of 9 a. m. and noon and between the hours of 2 and 4 p. m. daily starting Friday, February 19.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the Civil Aviation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENNINGS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Herald-Tribune of today entitled "A Guest of Our Nation," and another from the Washington Post entitled "Missimo."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of House Joint Resolution No. 1 of the State Legislature of Montana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LYNCH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter setting forth the endorsement of a standing committee on aviation by the president of the National Aeronautic Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Jewish Review of February 11, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LOCATION OF CAUCUS ROOM

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, answering the inquiries of the new Members with respect to where the caucus room is located, may I say that it is in the Old House Office Building on the third floor, just above the main lobby.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a news release from the Government, certain other material, and one list.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MEAT SHORTAGE IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Omaha World Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter on the subject of meat restriction, and so forth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed to me by Hector P. Baida, president of the Santa Monica Bay Parlor, No. 267, together with a resolution adopted by that organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SCARCITY OF MEAT

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KLEIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Boston Globe of Wednesday, February 10, 1943, headed "Victorious risk."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUPPRESSION OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BREHM addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 8 last, I made some remarks on the Tennessee Valley Authority that I have not been able yet to revise. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in those remarks separate tables I have had prepared on the power statistics for the whole country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by Hon. Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the F. C. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the Governor of Ohio on February 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MME. CHIANG KAI-SHEK

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee to escort Mme. Chiang Kai-shek into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Pursuant to the order of the House of February 10, 1943, heretofore adopted, the Chair declares the House now in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

RECESS

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess at the call of the Speaker.

At 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m., the committee, headed by the Sergeant at Arms and the Doorkeeper, escorted Mme. Chiang Kai-shek into the Chamber, and she took her place on the Speaker's rostrum, at the side of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, it is a proud day for the United States of America to receive and to do honor to one of the outstanding women of all the earth. She is the helpmeet and the coworker of one of the outstanding figures of the world. It is my great pleasure, my high privilege, and my distinguished honor to present to you Mme. Chiang Kai-shek.

ADDRESS OF MME. CHIANG KAI-SHEK

Mme. CHIANG KAI-SHEK. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, at any time it would be a privilege for me to address Congress, more especially this present august body which will have so much to do in shaping the destiny of the world. In speaking to Congress I am literally speaking to the American people. The Seventy-seventh Congress, as their representatives, fulfilled the obligations and responsibilities of its trust by declaring war on the aggressors. That part of the duty of the people's representatives was discharged in 1941. The task now confronting you is to help win the war and to create and uphold a lasting peace which will justify the sacrifices and sufferings of the victims of aggression.

Before enlarging on this subject, I should like to tell you a little about my long and vividly interesting trip to your country from my own land which has bled and borne unflinchingly the burden of war for more than 5½ years. I shall not dwell, however, upon the part China has played in our united effort to free mankind from brutality and violence. I shall try to convey to you, however imperfectly, the impressions gained during the trip.

First of all, I want to assure you that the American people have every right to be proud of their fighting men in so many parts of the world. I am particularly thinking of those of your boys in the far-flung, out-of-the-way stations and areas where life is attended by dreary drabness—this because their duty is not one of spectacular performance and they are not buoyed up by excitement of battle. They are called upon, day after colorless day, to perform routine duties such as safeguarding defenses and preparing for possible enemy action. It has been said, and I find it true from personal experience, that it is easier to risk one's life on the battlefield than it is to perform customary humble and humdrum duties which, however, are just as necessary to winning the war. Some of your troops are stationed in isolated spots, quite out of reach of ordinary communications. Some of your boys have had to fly hundreds of hours over the sea from an improvised airfield in quests often disappointingly fruitless, of enemy submarines. They, and others, have to stand the monotony of waiting—just waiting. But, as I told them, true patriotism lies in possessing the morale and physical stamina to perform faithfully and conscientiously the daily tasks so that in the sum total the weakest link is the strongest.

Your soldiers have shown conclusively that they are able stoically to endure homesickness, the glaring dryness, and scorching heat of the Tropics, and keep themselves fit and in excellent fighting trim. They are amongst the unsung heroes of this war, and everything possible to lighten their tedium and buoy up their morale should be done. That sacred duty is yours. The American Army is better fed than any army in the world. This does not mean, however, that they can live indefinitely on canned food without having the effects tell on them. These admittedly are the minor hardships of war, especially when we pause to consider that in many parts of the world, starvation prevails. But peculiarly enough, oftentimes it is not the major problems of existence which irk a man's soul; it is rather the pin pricks, especially those incidental to a life of deadly sameness, with tempers frayed out and nervous systems torn to shreds.

The second impression of my trip is that America is not only the cauldron of democracy, but the incubator of democratic principles. At some of the places I visited, I met the crews of your air bases. There I found first generation Germans, Italians, Frenchmen, Poles, Czechoslovakians, and other nationals. Some of them had accents so thick that, if such a thing were possible, one could not cut them with a butter knife. But there they were—all Americans, all devoted to the same ideals, all working for the same cause and united by the same high purpose. No suspicion or rivalry existed between them. This increased my belief and faith that devotion to common principles eliminates differences in race, and that identity of ideals is the strongest possible solvent of racial dissimilarities.

I have reached your country, therefore, with no misgivings, but with my belief that the American people are building and carrying out a true pattern of the Nation conceived by your forebears, strengthened and confirmed. You, as representatives of the American people, have before you the glorious opportunity of carrying on the pioneer work of your ancestors, beyond the frontiers of physical and geographical limitations. Their brawn and thews braved undauntedly almost unbelievable hardships to open up a new continent. The modern world lauds them for their vigor and intensity of purpose, and for their accomplishment. You have today before you the immeasurably greater opportunity to implement these same ideals and to help bring about the liberation of man's spirit in every part of the world. In order to accomplish this purpose, we of the United Nations must now so prosecute the war that victory will be ours decisively and with all good speed.

Sun-tese, the well-known Chinese strategist said:

In order to win, know thyself and thy enemy.

We have also the saying:

It takes little effort to watch the other fellow carry the load.

In spite of these teachings from a wise old past, which are shared by every nation, there has been a tendency to belittle the strength of our opponents.

When Japan thrust total war on China in 1937 military experts of every nation did not give China even a ghost of a

chance. But when Japan failed to bring China cringing to her knees as she vaunted, the world took solace in this phenomenon by declaring that they had overestimated Japan's military might. Nevertheless, when the greedy flames of war inexorably spread in the Pacific following the perfidious attack on Pearl Harbor, Malaya, and lands in and around the China Sea, and one after another of these places fell, the pendulum swung to the other extreme. Doubts and fears lifted their ugly heads and the world began to think that the Japanese were Nietzschean supermen, superior in intellect and physical prowess, a belief which the Gobineaus and the Houston Chamberlains and their apt pupils, the Nazi racists, had propounded about the Nordics.

Again, now the prevailing opinion seems to consider the defeat of the Japanese as of relative unimportance and that Hitler is our first concern. This is not borne out by actual facts, nor is it to the interests of the United Nations as a whole to allow Japan to continue not only as a vital potential threat but as a waiting sword of Damocles, ready to descend at a moment's notice.

Let us not forget that Japan in her occupied areas today has greater resources at her command than Germany.

Let us not forget that the longer Japan is left in undisputed possession of these resources, the stronger she must become. Each passing day takes more toll in lives of both Americans and Chinese.

Let us not forget that the Japanese are an intransigent people.

Let us not forget that during the first 4½ years of total aggression China has borne Japan's sadistic fury unaided and alone.

The victories won by the United States Navy at Midway and the Coral Sea are doubtless steps in the right direction—they are merely steps in the right direction—for the magnificent fight that was waged at Guadalcanal during the past 6 months attests to the fact that the defeat of the forces of evil though long and arduous will finally come to pass. For have we not on the side of righteousness and justice stanch allies in Great Britain, Russia, and other brave and indomitable peoples? Meanwhile the peril of the Japanese juggernaut remains. Japanese military might must be decimated as a fighting force before its threat to civilization is removed.

When the Seventy-seventh Congress declared war against Japan, Germany, and Italy, Congress for the moment had done its work. It now remains for you, the present Representatives of the American people, to point the way to win the war, to help construct a world in which all peoples may henceforth live in harmony and peace.

May I not hope that it is the resolve of Congress to devote itself to the creation of the post-war world? To dedicate itself to the preparation for the brighter future that a stricken world so eagerly awaits?

We of this generation who are privileged to help make a better world for ourselves and for posterity should remember that, while we must not be visionary, we must have vision so that peace should not be punitive in spirit and should not be provincial or nationalistic or even continental in concept, but universal in scope and humanitarian in action, for modern science has so annihilated distance that what affects one people must of necessity affect all other peoples.

The term "hands and feet" is often used in China to signify the relationship between brothers. Since international interdependence is now so universally recognized, can we not also say that all nations should become members of one corporate body?

The 160 years of traditional friendship between our two great peoples, China and America, which has never been marred by misunderstandings, is unsurpassed in the annals of the world. I can also assure you that China is eager and ready to cooperate with you and other peoples to lay a true and lasting foundation for a sane and progressive world society which would make it impossible for any arrogant or predatory neighbor to plunge future generations into another orgy of blood. In the past China has not computed the cost to her manpower in her fight against aggression, although she well realized that manpower is the real wealth of a nation and it takes generations to grow it. She has been soberly conscious of her responsibilities and has not concerned herself with privileges and gains which she might have obtained through compromise of principles. Nor will she demean herself and all she holds dear to the practice of the market place.

We in China, like you, want a better world, not for ourselves alone, but for all mankind, and we must have it. It is not enough, however, to proclaim our ideals or even to be convinced that we have them. In order to preserve, uphold, and maintain them, there are times when we should throw all we cherish into our effort to fulfill these ideals even at the risk of failure.

The teachings drawn from our late leader, Dr. Sun Yat-sen, have given our people the fortitude to carry on. From 5½ years of experience we in China are convinced that it is the better part of wisdom not to accept failure ignominiously, but to risk it gloriously. We shall have faith that, at the writing of peace, America and our other gallant allies will not be obtunded by the mirage of contingent reasons of expediency.

Man's mettle is tested both in adversity and in success. Twice is this true of the soul of a nation.

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings occurring during the recess will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

## SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 122, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of the study and investigation by the select committee created by House Resolution 21, not to exceed $60,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee conducting such investigation and study or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EXAMINATIONS CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 116, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the studies and examinations authorized by House Resolutions 69 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Appropriations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $100,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such study and examination or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I say, in response to applications for positions under this resolution that no new personnel will be appointed. All employees will be drawn from persons now employed in the various departments. While the committee will have authority to employ personnel without restriction, under the plan agreed upon all auditors and examiners will be appointed from those now serving in civil-service positions.

In this way we expect to secure trained and experienced personnel and—inasmuch as the salaries of the staff constitute the largest item of expense in such investigations—we expect to conduct these investigations at the lowest cost of any investigations authorized by the House involving comparable scope and subject matter. Employees requisitioned from the departments will be taken from their rolls and entered on our rolls at the same rate of pay. When returned to the departments they will be separated from the committee rolls and again entered on the departmental rolls without prejudice. If in the employ of the committee only a few days, it will not

be necessary to fill their places in the department and the cost to the Government will be nothing as the committee pay will merely take the place of the departmental pay. Of course if retained by the commiteee long enough to require an additional employee in the department it will constitute an additional charge on the Treasury, but even then the rate of pay will be that of the classified service from which drawn.

We do not expect to require anything like the $100,000 asked, but request this amount in order to be equipped to undertake any investigation requiring attention.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The $100,000 provided in this resolution applies to the committee that has been appointed, the special committee of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. PATTON. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; that is true of the appropriations provided for the special committee authorized to investigate subversive affiliations, but not to this appropriation. This appropriation merely implements the additional powers of investigation given to the committee for the purpose of authorizing inquiries in the various departments. It does not relate to a new subcommittee but to an extension of the powers of the present committee.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTON. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. As my colleague knows, this is a matter in which I have been very specially interested and have a bill pending that goes further than the present one. Personally, I do not think there should be any limitation whatever upon the competence and efficiency of those selected for this service. I think it would be quite in order to go outside of the governmental ranks for such personnel, because there we might find some especially able people to carry on this work, who would not be under any suspicion whatever of being in sympathy with things we are trying to abrogate and rid ourselves of.

Personally, I trust we can take still further steps in this regard, in order that each committee that has important legislation to follow up to see how the expenditures are made, will have access to such experts and agents entirely of our own and not in any other way connected with any other department of the Government. They would have very definite tasks and purposes as servants of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, under the latitude given the committee under this resolution we are authorized to select and employ operatives anywhere. We can call into service men both inside the Government and outside the Government, but under the plan agreed upon by the committee, we expect to call only individuals already employed by the Government and under the civil service. It will be recalled that our investigations are entirely preappropriation, and we expect to get auditors, inspectors and examiners from departments other than those being examined and in that way will be in a position to secure the most expert and best trained operatives at the least cost.

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 124 (Rept. No. 140), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective January 3, 1943, the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, and continued under House Resolution 26 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, House Resolution 321 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, House Resolution 90 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, House Resolution 420 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and House Resolution 65 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the special committee appointed to investigate un-American activities in the United States and related questions, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000 in addition to the unexpended balance heretofore appropriated for this purpose during the Seventy-seventh Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. That the official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTON. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Of course, Mr. Speaker, this is the appropriation for the Dies committee which passed this House by a vote of 3 to 1. This resolution passed the Accounts Committee unanimously. As a matter of fact, the chairman of that committee [Mr. DIES] and other members of the committee wanted the amount reduced, but the committee would have given him twice or three times the amount he has asked for. I hope the resolution is agreed to unanimously.

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago I wrote to the Committee on Accounts, and I wrote that letter because I felt the Accounts Committee is the business committee of the House. It is a sort of watchdog of our Treasury as to the appropriation of funds for the various committees. The letter I wrote is, among other things, as follows:

You have before your committee a request of Chairman DIES of the House Committee on Un-American Activities that Congress pay $611 as an "expense" incurred in connection with two libel suits brought against him in his personal capacity.

The gentleman from Texas was accused of libeling one David Vaughan of the Board of Economic Warfare by demanding his resignation because Mr. DIES alleged Mr. Vaughan was the founder of the League for Peace and Democracy.

I am informed Mr. Vaughan sued Mr. DIES personally for $75,000. Mr. Vaughan withdrew his action after Mr. DIES apologized and said it was a case of mistaken identity. The discontinuance was apparently upon the condition that the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] pay the counsel of Mr. Vaughan $611.

Now our colleague wants this $611 paid by the House, presumably either out of the contingent funds of the House or out of the appropriation for the Dies committee.

I, for one, do not feel that the House can pay out this money. It is a personal expense incurred by a Member's error. A Member cannot ask the House to pay for his own improvidence. It is not an expense of Mr. DIES' own committee. In libeling a citizen he was acting beyond the scope of his authority as chairman and member of the Committee on Un-American Activities and beyond the scope of his authority as a Member of the House. His remarks could not have been privileged, otherwise Mr. DIES would have had a complete defense. He admitted the libel.

Suppose the expense would have covered a long and protracted trial and had been $60,000. Could Mr. DIES determine the size of the expense to be saddled upon the House? Could he make it as small or as large as he wished? There is involved a dangerous precedent. The House has never gone to such extremes.

If we were to defray legal expenses of suits against a Member, why not the expense of suits brought by a Member? Then a distinguished Member of our body who has actually instituted a series of libel suits might well ask the House to finance his litigations.

Mr. DIES seeks to justify his claim by saying that the libel was a result of his official actions. I deny this. The libel was the result of his own deliberate, personal mistake.

If Mr. DIES would prevail in his contention, then any Member would be privileged to libel and slander at will anyone he chose, claiming official license and resting secure in the thought that the House would pay all punitive damages and expenses.

The only case I know of where the expense of a Member's litigation is paid by the House is in an election contest.

Mr ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I may say that the members of the Accounts Committee went into that one whole morning. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] appeared before the committee, and we unanimously, every one of us, thought he did a swell job in what he had done. I believe the gentleman from New York is probably the only Member of the House who feels the way he does.

Mr. CELLER. That may be so, but I am duty bound to express my opinion. I feel emphatically that the House should not be saddled with this bill. A highly dangerous precedent is established. At least from henceforth onward let the gentleman from Texas never repeat the mistake and let us never again pay or approve payment of such a bill, such an expense.

What I have said involves nothing personal. I have an affectionate regard, personally, for the gentleman from Texas, although I must vigorously, whenever possible, express my opposition to his political and economic ideology and also to some of his methods. I believe he is sincere and is an avid champion of his cause. His sincerity and forcefulness, to my mind, makes his activities all the more dangerous.

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly amazing to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], after all his abuse and criticism of the Dies committee and all his defense of the members of the League for Peace and Democracy, get up here and criticize the Dies committee and accuse the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] of willful libel for saying a man belonged to that iniquitous organization.

I do not know anything about the small amount of expense, but he had the unmitigated temerity—I will not say "gall"—I ought to say "gall" but I will say "temerity"—to get up here and say that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] deliberately libeled a man by calling him a member of an organization that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has been defending for the last few months.

This is just another method of attacking the Dies committee—a committee that is doing a wonderful job in exposing those un-American activities, those dangerous activities, that threaten the very existence of this Republic at a time when our boys are fighting and dying to preserve it. I say "our boys," for practically every Member of the House today has some relative in the battle of north Africa; every Member of the House has a relative in Guadalcanal or in the southwest Pacific. While our boys are fighting and dying to preserve this Republic, I say it comes with poor grace for a Member of Congress to get up here and abuse the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] who without any hope of compensation has led this fight to protect America from those dangerous un-American influences that threaten the very life of this Republic.

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, this is a typical illustration of the many misstatements that are made constantly about this committee. I wish some of these gentlemen who are repeating gossip and rumors would have the courtesy to come to the committee offices, take our hearings, our files, and go through them for themselves before they repeat something without knowing the facts.

What are the facts? The facts are these: The Attorney General and the Interdepartmental Committee established by him found that 12 organizations were subversive, including the American League for Peace and Democracy, and further the Attorney General's memorandum stated that it was so subversive that one could not be affiliated with it and not be aware of its subversive nature.

I wrote a letter to the Vice President, as the head of the Board of Economic Warfare, calling his attention to certain employees of the Board who were affiliated with organizations that the Attorney General had found to be subversive. Before I wrote that letter the investigators were instructed to check these Government employees and to make certain of the identities of them. The investigators reported to me that in their attempt to do so they were met with contempt. In fact, some of the departments refused to give us access to the personnel records. I impressed upon them the necessity of being very, very accurate, and they were accurate in every case except one. I do not know how many names we had. There were a number of names called to the attention of the Vice President, and he was by public opinion compelled to discharge Parmalee and Gratton, who had written the introduction to the German White Paper. Parmalee was the author of books on nudism. The Vice President was compelled to discharge those two, and Parmalee was later employed in another department. It is true that David Vaughn was different from the David Vaughn appearing upon our list and upon the stationery of the organization. He was a different David Vaughn than the David Vaughn in the B. E. W.

When it was definitely established that this David Vaughn, having the same name and coming, as I recall, from the same section of the country, was not the same person and that the investigator had been mistaken, of course, I apologized to him. Not only did I apologize to him but may I say that we had no lawyer. The reason we did not have any lawyer was because we could not hire a lawyer under $700 or $800 a month. We had no lawyers and we were not paying out any expenses for attorney's fees.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Could not the gentleman have raised the question of personal privilege as a Member of the House or stated that the statement was made in his official capacity as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. DIES. This was the only case out of the hundreds that had been named. Here was a man who came forth and said, "Now, you have the wrong man. Here are the facts, and I want to satisfy you to that effect." He had been hurt by this statement—that is, he thought he had—although high officials of the administration that he worked for had ridiculed us for branding the American League as a Communist-front organization. He felt so aggrieved by the statement of his alleged association with that organization that he was hurt.

Mr. CELLER. Why did the gentleman not go on with the trial if he had an adequate defense?

Mr. DIES. It was not a question of going on with the trial. Here was a man who had incurred legal expenses for $500, not $611. He had incurred a legal expense for $500. We had no attorney. I submitted the facts to the Committee on Accounts and that committee felt in view of those facts that it would be justified in paying an attorney fee of $500.

Mr. CELLER. Does not the gentleman think that is a very dangerous precedent to establish?

Mr. DIES. Well, as all gentlemen who are chairmen of committees know, we must rely upon our investigators to a large extent. I suppose that the gentleman from Georgia, who is doing a thankless job, appreciates that.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am in almost the same fix that the gentleman is in now, and I hope the Congress will establish a precedent that where a committee acting as the agent of the House is involved in litigation the House will take care of the litigation.

Mr. CELLER. Why did the gentleman not avail himself of the Judiciary Committee's functions? We would be very happy to aid the gentleman on questions of law and that sort of thing.

Mr. DIES. I did not know that. I did not know that your committee tendered such services. We will be glad to avail ourselves of it in the future.

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demand by Mr. DICKSTEIN and Mr. KENNEDY) there were—ayes 133, noes 29.

Mr. DICKSTEIN rose.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted.

Evidently a sufficient number.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet making a point of order that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present. The call is automatic.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 278, nays 66, not voting 90, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—278

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Angell | Bender |
| Allen, Ill. | Arends | Bennett, Mo. |
| Allen, La. | Arnold | Bishop |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Auchincloss | Bland |
| Anderson, Calif. | Barden | Bolton |
| Anderson, N. Mex. | Barrett | Bonner |
| Andresen, August H. | Barry | Boren |
| | Bates, Mass. | Boykin |
| | Beall | Brehm |
| | Beckworth | Brooks |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Brown, Ga. | Harris, Ark. | Phillips |
| Brown, Ohio | Harris, Va. | Pittenger |
| Bryson | Hartley | Ploeser |
| Buffett | Heidinger | Plumley |
| Busbey | Hendricks | Poage |
| Butler | Hess | Poulson |
| Byrne | Hill | Powers |
| Camp | Hinshaw | Price |
| Canfield | Hobbs | Ramey |
| Cannon, Mo. | Hoch | Ramspeck |
| Carlson, Kans. | Hoeven | Randolph |
| Carson, Ohio | Holmes, Mass. | Rankin |
| Carter | Holmes, Wash. | Reece, Tenn. |
| Case | Hope | Reed, Ill. |
| Chenoweth | Howell | Reed, N. Y. |
| Church | Hull | Rees, Kans. |
| Clevenger | Jarman | Rizley |
| Cole, Mo. | Jenkins | Robsion, Ky. |
| Cole, N. Y. | Jennings | Rockwell |
| Colmer | Jensen | Rodgers, Pa. |
| Compton | Johnson, Anton J. | Rogers, Mass. |
| Cooley | Johnson, Calvin D. | Rohrbough |
| Cooper | Johnson, Ind. | Rolph |
| Costello | Johnson, Luther A. | Rowe |
| Courtney | Johnson, Okla. | Russell |
| Cox | Jones | Sasscer |
| Cravens | Jonkman | Satterfield |
| Crawford | Kearney | Schiffler |
| Culkin | Keefe | Schwabe |
| Cunningham | Kennedy | Scott |
| Curtis | Keogh | Sheppard |
| Davis | Kilburn | Short |
| Day | Kilday | Sikes |
| Dewey | Kinzer | Simpson, Ill. |
| Dies | Knutson | Smith, Maine |
| Dirksen | Kunkel | Smith, Ohio |
| Ditter | Lambertson | Smith, Va. |
| Domengeaux | Lanham | Smith, Wis. |
| Dondero | LeCompte | Snyder |
| Doughton | LeFevre | Sparkman |
| Drewry | Lemke | Springer |
| Dworshak | Lewis, Ohio | Stanley |
| Elliott | Ludlow | Starnes, Ala. |
| Ellis | Lyle | Steagall |
| Ellsworth | McCord | Stefan |
| Elmer | McCowen | Stevenson |
| Elston, Ohio | McGehee | Stewart |
| Englebright | McWilliams | Stockman |
| Fay | Maas | Sullivan |
| Fellows | Mahon | Sumner, Ill. |
| Fenton | Maloney | Sundstrom |
| Fernandez | Manasco | Taber |
| Fish | Mansfield, Tex. | Talbot |
| Fisher | Martin, Iowa | Talle |
| Flannagan | May | Tarver |
| Fulmer | Michener | Taylor |
| Gallagher | Miller, Conn. | Thomas, Tex. |
| Gamble | Miller, Mo. | Thomason |
| Gathings | Miller, Nebr. | Tibbott |
| Gavin | Mills | Tolan |
| Gearhart | Monkiewicz | Towe |
| Gerlach | Monroney | Troutman |
| Gibson | Morrison, La. | Van Zandt |
| Gifford | Mott | Vincent, Ky. |
| Gilchrist | Mruk | Vinson, Ga. |
| Gillette | Mundt | Vorys, Ohio |
| Gillie | Murray, Wis. | Vursell |
| Goodwin | Newsome | Walter |
| Gore | Nichols | Ward |
| Gossett | Norman | Wasielewski |
| Graham | Norrell | Weichel, Ohio |
| Grant, Ala. | O'Brien, N. Y. | Welch |
| Grant, Ind. | O'Hara | Wene |
| Gregory | O'Neal | Wheat |
| Griffiths | Pace | Whitten |
| Gross | Patman | Whittington |
| Guyer | Patton | Wickersham |
| Gwynne | Peterson, Fla. | Wigglesworth |
| Hall, Edwin Arthur | Peterson, Ga. | Willey |
| Hall, Leonard W. | Pfeifer | Winstead |
| Halleck | Plumley | Winter |
| Hancock | Poage | Wolcott |
| Hare | Poulson | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Harless, Ariz. | Powers | Woodruff, Mich. |
| | Price | Woodrum, Va. |
| | Ramey | Worley |
| | Ramspeck | Zimmerman |

NAYS—66

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Baldwin, N. Y. | Fogarty | Kee |
| Bates, Ky. | Folger | Kefauver |
| Bradley, Pa. | Forand | Kelley |
| Bulwinkle | Fulbright | Kerr |
| Burchill, N. Y. | Furlong | Kirwan |
| Capozzoli | Gale | Klein |
| Celler | Gordon | LaFollette |
| Coffee | Granger | Lesinski |
| Creal | Hale | Lynch |
| Cullen | Hays | McMurray |
| Delaney | Heffernan | Madden |
| Dickstein | Herter | Magnuson |
| Dilweg | Holifield | Marcantonio |
| Dingell | Izac | Merritt |
| Durham | Jackson | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Ellison, Md. | Jeffrey | O'Connor |
| Fitzpatrick | Kean | O'Konski |
| O'Leary | Sabath | Somers, N. Y. |
| Outland | Sadowski | Voorhis, Calif. |
| Priest | Scanlon | Weaver |
| Rabaut | Sheridan | Weiss |
| Rogers, Calif. | Smith, W. Va. | Wright |

NOT VOTING—90

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Hagen | Myers |
| Baldwin, Md. | Harness, Ind. | Norton |
| Bell | Hart | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Bennett, Mich. | Hébert | O'Toole |
| Blackney | Hoffman | Pfeifer |
| Bloom | Horan | Philbin |
| Bradley, Mich. | Johnson, Ward | Pracht |
| Buckley | Judd | Richards |
| Burch, Va. | King | Rivers |
| Burdick | Kleberg | Robertson |
| Burgin | Landis | Robinson, Utah |
| Cannon, Fla. | Larcade | Rowan |
| Chapman | Lea | Sauthoff |
| Chiperfield | Lewis, Colo. | Schuetz |
| Clark | Luce | Shafer |
| Clason | McCormack | Simpson, Pa. |
| Cochran | McGranery | Slaughter |
| Crosser | McGregor | Spence |
| Curley | McKenzie | Stearns, N. H. |
| D'Alesandro | McLean | Sumners, Tex. |
| Dawson | McMillan | Thomas, N. J. |
| Disney | Mansfield, Mont. | Treadway |
| Douglas | Martin, Mass. | Wadsworth |
| Eaton | Mason | Wasielewski |
| Eberharter | Merrow | West |
| Engel | Miller, Pa. | Whelchel, Ga. |
| Feighan | Morrison, N. C. | White |
| Ford | Murdock | Wilson |
| Gavagan | Murphy | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Gorski | Murray, Tenn. | |
| Green | | |

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Crosser with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Joseph Pfeifer with Mr. Pracht.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Clason.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Andrews.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Robertson of Virginia, with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. West with Mr. Engel.

Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. McLean.

Mr. D'Alesandro with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Ford with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Green with Mr. Sauthoff.

Mr. Lea with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Disney with Mr. Englebright.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article published in the Boston Sunday Herald of February 7 by Bill Cunningham.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 107.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1605) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to farm-acreage allotments, the farm marketing excess of wheat, the use of excess corn as silage for feed to livestock on the farm, to provide for the adequate supply of peanuts for oil and other uses, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 14]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Hagen | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Baldwin, Md. | Harless, Ariz. | O'Toole |
| Barden | Harness, Ind. | Outland |
| Bell | Hart | Pace |
| Bennett, Mich. | Hébert | Pfeifer |
| Blackney | Hoffman | Pracht |
| Bradley, Mich. | Hope | Rizley |
| Buckley | Johnson, Okla. | Robinson, Utah |
| Burgin | Johnson, Ward | Rowan |
| Cannon, Fla. | Judd | Schuetz |
| Clark | Kee | Shafer |
| Clason | King | Slaughter |
| Cochran | Kleberg | Stearns, N. H. |
| D'Alesandro | LaFollette | Stefan |
| Dawson | Landis | Stockman |
| Day | Lemke | Sumners, Tex. |
| Disney | Lewis, Colo. | Thomas, N. J. |
| Douglas | McCormack | Treadway |
| Drewry | McGregor | Wadsworth |
| Eaton | McKenzie | Weaver |
| Elmer | Martin, Mass. | Wene |
| Engel | Mason | Whelchel, Ga. |
| Ford | Morrison, N. C. | Wilson |
| Gavagan | Murray, Tenn. | Winter |
| Gorski | Myers | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Gossett | Norton | Zimmerman |

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 356 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and insert certain excerpts, and then within the 10 minutes to speak out of order on a matter of considerable interest to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order H. R. 1605, reported by the Committee on Agriculture, which proposes aid to the peanut growers of the country. I do not recall whether or not there was any opposition in the Committee on Rules to the granting of the rule. However, in view of the fact that the farmers of the country are interested, I presume there will not be much opposition to the rule or to the bill, and therefore I can leave it to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to further explain the bill and what it undertakes to do for the peanut growers of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who is extremely well posted on all matters, somehow or other does not seem to realize that we are not at war with Russia, and that we are actually at war with Japan and Germany. I was under the impression that after that strong, impressive speech, made by the great lady, Madam Chiang Kai-shek, representing the great Chinese Government and its people, nothing would be said on the floor that would in any way detract from her plea to aid in every conceivable way the winning of the war.

With regret I noticed in the newspapers today a headline to the effect that our Army in Tunisia is almost cut in half by the Yanks' retreat. Surely that is not encouraging news.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I take the privilege of referring to a speech which I delivered nearly 5 years ago, in which I called attention to the danger that confronted America and the world. I said then that our country was facing a situation whereby it became absolutely necessary that we should do all in our power to prepare to safeguard our interests.

I pointed out that Hitler was ready to take Czechoslovakia; that he would take it; that he would take the Polish Corridor and that he would take Poland; that he would take the city of Danzig; that he would take Rumania; and that he would take the smaller countries; and also, due to the discord and disunity in France, that he would probably bring about the defeat of France, and after that would hope or try to bring about the defeat of Britain. I then asked the question how far Hitler would be if he should succeed in defeating Great Britain. I pointed out all of these dangers that confronted our country, but, unfortunately, many people at that time refused to believe that it would be possible for Hitler to attack us. They refused to believe that he could cross the ocean or in any way bring about a situation that would require us to prepare against such danger.

My predictions on the floor 5 years ago have come true. Many people during those 5 years did not believe, and there are still some people who refuse to realize, that we are in danger, and that it is necessary to have complete unity, coordination, and cooperation. The reason I am taking the floor is to urge that we should eliminate any and all differences that we might have and realize our duty to our country, to our form of government, to the future of humanity. That was my purpose in asking that I might revise and extend my remarks and include today extracts from the speech I made 5 years ago. I wish time would permit me to read the speech. I know that the gentlemen who heard me then would now agree that I knew what I was talking about at that time, when I said that there was a tacit agreement between Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese war lords, when I called attention to that in 1935, 3 years before.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. I congratulate the gentleman for having such foresight, but did the gentleman at the same time call attention to the fact when he made that speech, that we were supplying Japan with 54 percent of the war materials she was using against China?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman again is attempting to inject a little politics by his statement. Personally, I wish to assure the gentleman that I did call the situation to the attention of the administration, but the administration, fearful of being drawn into war with Japan at that time, endeavored to appease them. We knew that they had been preparing for years and would obtain these war materials by force from adjoining countries had we refused to comply with the continuous demands of American manufacturers to supply them. Our own unpreparedness was such at that time that we were hopeful that our action would appease them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield me 5 minutes more?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I wish the gentleman from Illinois would answer the gentleman by reminding him that in the month of September before Pearl Harbor, we passed the extension of the draft bill by only 1 vote, and there were only 12 votes on that side of the Chamber.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. Speaker, when I asked for this time I was hopeful that what I might say would help bring about unity and a better understanding and feeling among all of us so that we would have that harmonious cooperation which is so sadly needed. I did not wish to hurt the feelings of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and had I thought he would be hurt or that any gentleman would be hurt by anything I said, I would not have alluded to him or to anything that might create any discussion. I want you to know that I am extremely desirous of being of service to my country. I was here during the first war. I have been more or less familiar with our situation. I have studied the foreign situation. I know something about it, but I do not claim to be an expert in international affairs and familiar with all foreign intrigues, but I fully realize the situation that confronts our country. What I want is harmony, unity, cooperation, so that we may, in the shortest possible time, help to bring about a victory, and then an everlasting peace for humanity and the preservation of our democratic form of government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Regardless of the content of the address 5 years ago by the gentleman from Illinois or his remarks today, I should like to say there are those of us who are younger in years and point of service in this House who appreciate the gentleman's character, and the vigor for the time of service that the gentleman from Illinois still brings to this Chamber.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman. I assure you I am not seeking any glory, because within a few days I will be 77. I do not know how many more years I have, but those days and years that God will grant me I want to devote to a country that has been extremely kind to me, and which has done so much for me. I look upon America as the greatest country in the world, where justice, humanity and fairness prevail, and I hope to God liberty and freedom will forever be ours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave given me, I insert extracts from the speech which I made on this floor March 18, 1938, nearly 5 years ago, as follows:

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if an archangel were to come down from heaven and make an observation in the interest of peace, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] would criticize it.

* * * * *

EXPRESSED BELIEF IN SECRET CONSPIRACY 3 YEARS AGO

Three years ago I voiced belief that a secret or tacit agreement existed between Hitler, Mussolini, and Japan, but my warning went unheeded. The strategy practiced by those countries conformed exactly to that predicted by Professor Masaryk, who was intimately aware of Germany's ambitions.

In the Orient Japan pursued a course toward domination of the yellow races, apparently with preassurance that Italy and

Germany would so engage the attention of the European democracies that interference in China would be impossible.

In Ethiopia Mussolini's war machine grinded to its conquest while Hitler's silence gave approval.

Internal dissent in Spain, nourished by the dictator countries, finally flamed into civil war, and the legions of Italian and German soldiers took stand in battle against the established government.

Hitler, demanding the return of Germany's lost colonies, only cloaked his purpose of European aggression, and it was long ago clear that he would one day climax the years of planned propaganda in Austria by an invasion of that country. His seizure of Austria is but a prelude of more ambitious plans. Peace- and liberty-loving Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and the other small independent nations now see his shadow across their lands—Memel, Danzig, and the Polish Corridor, Alsace-Lorraine, and the much-desired Ukraine.

For the time being, engaged in consolidating his gains, he may utter reassuring words to Poland and Yugoslavia. But they have only to recall his utter disregard of treaties, and his oft-repeated statements as to his ultimate aims, to realize how necessary it is that they prepare to resist invasion, for invasion is bound to come.

IL DUCE MAY BE MAKING SAD MISTAKE IN TRUSTING HITLER

Whether Il Duce is as smart as he thinks he is in cooperating with the imperialistic-minded Hitler only the future will tell. But there are many sapient observers who have their doubts. They believe that Hitler will not hesitate to throw his now comrade, Il Duce, overboard when and if he becomes strong enough to be able to get along without him.

* * * * *

AMERICA MUST TAKE NOTE OF WHAT IS GOING ON IN THE WORLD

One may properly ask, How does all this affect America? Who knows? In this fateful hour, with all the civilized world well nigh breathless, I do not feel that we should follow the vacillating policy of Great Britain, who, in the opinion of many well-qualified students of international affairs, may be the next prey of the remorseless triumvirate. Many ripe scholars feel that the suppression of Great Britain will mean the consummation of a plan to form three great powers outside of North and South America. I doubt very much that France, which is fighting domestic problems with her back to the wall, and Russia, despised by the capitalistic groups of the world, could, after the disappearance of the other countries I have named, long withstand being dismembered also. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind but that Hitler, Mussolini, and the raving-mad Japanese war lords are in a conspiracy to divide the entire world among themselves, or at least as much of it as they can manage to grab.

POLISH LEADERS SHOULD NOT FORGET TREATMENT ACCORDED POLES IN PRUSSIA

Great Britain, rather late, is commencing to realize its danger. Does Poland realize her danger?

The leaders in Poland might well hearken back to other days, and consider the former treatment of Poles in Prussia. I remember in 1908 how Prussia prohibited, by edict, the teaching of the Polish language in their own schools, and how they proposed in their Parliament a compulsory dispossession of the homes of Polanders. For 2,000 years the Poles and their fathers before them had occupied this land, but notwithstanding and in contravention of the Congress of Vienna of 1815, and in violation of Prussia's organic laws prohibiting distinctions between citizens of the Kingdom, that Kingdom's Parliament even then showed its prejudice and discrimination against the Polish.

At the time I speak of, Congressman Arthur L. Bates, of Pennsylvania, was impelled to introduce into this House a resolution extending good wishes and sympathy to the Poles in Prussia in their efforts to maintain their property rights.

Recalling this, and viewing the present prejudice which governs in Germany, Poland should properly estimate the future insofar as her relations with that country are concerned.

AMERICA MAY NOT BE AS SAFE AS SHE FEELS

Up to about 12 years ago we confidently believed ourselves properly protected against possible attack from any and all quarters; but in view of the increased and ever-increasing knowledge of aviation and mammoth airplane carriers, are we really free from military danger?

If this nefarious triumvirate should effect the dismemberment of the great British Empire, what would become of Canada? Could we still feel free and at ease without present-day Canada?

* * * * *

In view of all this and our enemies within, I feel that it behooves us adequately to protect ourselves against even the remotest eventuality. I have heard it said with plausibility that if England had stated her position unequivocally in the early days of 1914, and if America had been prepared in 1916, these acts would have had a most salutary effect, and it would not have been necessary to send millions of our young men across the sea and expend billions of dollars. Consequently, and repeating, I feel that we owe it to ourselves to prepare for any, even the most imaginable possibility. Therefore, I am ready to vote for the construction of a navy and an air force that will be unmistakably adequate for our proper defense.

DO NOT CLAIM TO BE MORE PATRIOTIC THAN THOSE WHO DISAGREE

It is not my aim to try to make anybody believe I am more patriotic than those who do not favor this increased naval plan. We all recognize among that group a highly patriotic impulse. They, too, think their judgment would be better for the country. The only interest I have in the problem of national defense is the welfare of our whole country, to which I owe much and for which I am ready to give everything I possess. This great country of my adoption has been kind to me, and if I leave behind only one legacy, I want it to be a contribution, weak though it be, to the defense, not offense, and the promotion of the welfare of the land that made me whatever I am and gave me whatever I have.

Let me say that I feel a grave mistake was made by some of the political leaders of 20 years ago, who, for purely political purposes, prevented the United States from joining other peace-loving nations in a hopeful effort to outlaw war and all its frightful consequences by the League of Nations. That failure unquestionably weakened the League at the outset, and it has in no small measure destroyed its usefulness.

I well remember when President Wilson returned from his first trip to Paris and invited the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to the White House to hear his explanation of the League plan, because I was at the time a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The only sitting members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are Senators Pittman and Borah. I am the only sitting Member of the House who participated in that historic meeting.

Mr. Wilson made a confidential report to the members of these two committees, and in a 3-hour session he endeavored to obtain the advice and consent of those present. All present were asked to question the President on each and every provision, which many, as I recall, did, and all were apparently satisfied by the President's lucid and masterly exposition of the infinite possibilities of that great humanitarian plan. In addition to securing the advice and consent of the members of those two committees, Mr. Wilson consulted such eminent Americans and Republicans as former President Taft, former Secretary of State Elihu Root, and others, all of whom acquiesced in the President's conclusions. I especially remember that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of that time, Mr. Lodge, of Massachusetts, propounded to President Wilson many questions and appeared satisfied, yet a few months later, unfortunately, the same Senator Lodge who had given unmistakable assurance of accord with the plan, became, in his important official position, the spearhead, largely for political purposes, of the opposition to the League plan. It is a fact that there was opposition to the League of Nations, simply because it was the only issue Republican leaders of that day could evolve in opposing the Democratic Party. In this opposition they were aided by the disgruntled, vitriolic Jim Reed, then a Senator from Missouri.

It was alleged that the League Covenant provided for sending our boys across the sea; while in fact there was nothing in the League Covenant that justified such a conclusion. I maintained then, and I repeat, that the underlying opposition to the League, aside from the political consideration, was the objection of industrial leaders of the Nation to the international labor provisions, which provided, in article 20 of the covenant of the League, that—

"The high-contracting parties will endeavor to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women, and children, both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extended, and to that end will agree to establish as part of the organization of the League a permanent bureau of labor."

BELIEVE AMERICA'S MEMBERSHIP OF THE LEAGUE WOULD HAVE BEEN BENEFICIAL

I am confident today, beyond all doubt, that had the United States joined the League of Nations it would have strengthened and preserved the League in full vigor and effectiveness and we would not have present-day conditions, with all democracies of Europe either destroyed or on the verge of destruction. I still believe that under the terms of the League Covenant we could have precluded the mad rearmament race by close adhesion to and renewal of the provisions of the Washington Arms Conference after the 10-year limit, to the lasting benefit of all civilization. At the conclusion of the Washington Arms Conference the United States felt fairly easy; and it was only our absence from membership in the League that led first Germany, then Italy, and, shortly thereafter, Japan to withdraw from membership in the League. Then trouble began. The plot thickened. Now we have the fruit.

Moreover, I feel that if Great Britain and France had taken a firm stand against the initial rearmament of Hitler, Mussolini, and Japan, and had not been lulled to sleep by undependable peace assurances, they would have been in position 2 years ago to stop Mussolini and Hitler in their mad rush toward a menacing world conquest. Should we, then, follow the vacillating and always unloading policy of Great Britain or should we be ready to properly defend ourselves and our possessions against any and all?

I LIKE TO FEEL THAT I CAN CHANGE MY VIEWPOINTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH CHANGED CONDITIONS

And so, in conclusion, let me say that in view of the alarming world conditions to which I have alluded, I shall vote and work for the passage of the pending bill. This may be surprising to some of the critics who have accused me of being a pacifist, charging that I was against adequate national defense; but let me say to them it is not they who have changed my view. I was just as conscientious when I opposed large Army and Navy appropriations in past years as I am conscientious today in supporting this bill. I have changed my views because and only because world conditions have changed. When I get so old or so benumbed of brain and character that I cannot change my view in accordance with changing conditions and a changing world, it is time for me to be carried out feet first, and I want to be.

I have criticized conditions and things at times, and I shall do so again whenever I see anything that I think merits criticism. But I love this country. I will vote any amount of money necessary to protect it from enemies either within or without. Today, perhaps more than at any other time in its history, the United States of America stands out against the dark and stormy seas of racial persecution, intrigue, conspiracy, and jealousy as the one and only enduring beacon light of hope.

I am grateful to the people of my district for having permitted me for so many years to be a Member of this great American Congress, the greatest democratic legislative body on earth, wherein every man is accorded the unfettered right to say what he pleases. Let us strive to preserve and promote this priceless heritage for ourselves and posterity. I do not expect to be here forever, but I do want the Stars and Stripes and a democratic form of government to endure here forever.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that a reading of these extracts from my 5-year-old speech should satisfy the membership that I then possessed information to some degree of the Hitler-Mussolini-Jap aims. With the partial fulfillment of those aims we, today, should recognize that in order to combat the viper propaganda of these insidious and treacherous forces and to win this war we should join hands and forget our personal views and differences. Our every effort, thought, and action henceforth should be guided to that one goal of bringing defeat to the ruthless Axis combination that, contrary to treaties and agreements, has devoted many years in preparation for the building of war machines with the avowed purposes of destroying our form of government and the democracies of the world. And, Mr. Speaker, who will deny that we should, in all fairness, recognize and appreciate that Russia, under the leadership of Josef Stalin, is contributing more than any other nation in bringing about the defeat of our enemies?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Member from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] went into a frantic diatribe about my statement a few moments ago and seemed attempting to leave the impression on the House that I was not in line with the policy announced by the speaker who appeared here representing China today. That is absolutely without foundation. There is my speech. What he is ranting about is that we passed the resolution continuing the Dies committee to investigate un-American activities. I am happy to do that.

Mr. SABATH. I did not speak on the Dies resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman tried to get time to say something against the Dies committee and could not get it. He would destroy the Dies committee if he could. He does not seem to be interested in the things the Dies committee is bringing out, but we are.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, I created the Dies committee.

Mr. RANKIN. And now when it is doing its duty you want to destroy it.

Mr. SABATH. No, no; not at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, certainly I do not intend to intrude on the quarrels on the Democratic side of the House, but I must say that I think that Members of the House on both sides, who insist on resurrecting pre-war controversial issues, which divide this House and the country, are doing a disservice to national unity and to our all-out war efforts to be continually dragging in such issues.

I know the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is a sincere, honorable, and distinguished Member of this House, but I wish he would not raise these ghosts and bring them back for discussion in the House, because every time he does he starts bitter discussions which open up other controversial issues such as the draft or the extension of the draft, and so forth. Every Member of the House today was united in welcoming the First Lady of China, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, who gave us a soul-inspiring address, which all of us, on both sides of the House, applauded. I interpret that wonderful applause to mean that both sides of the House were in entire sympathy with that part of her address where she called for more aid to China and greater military efforts in the far Pacific; that a Japanese sword of Damocles was hanging over the heads of the world, and unless we did more to meet that threat by sending more powerful forces over to the far Pacific to fight the Japanese, they would benefit by the natural resources from their conquered territories and be much stronger and consequently more difficult to defeat.

I think we are all agreed that Japan attacked us 14 months ago but that we are still fighting around the fringes of the Japanese Empire, amongst its fingers and the toes 3,000 miles away from Tokyo, that all of us want to carry this war to final conclusion by attacking the heart and the head of Japan.

The gentleman talks about what he said 5 years ago. Only a few weeks ago in this House I took the floor and pleaded that General MacArthur be placed in supreme command of all our armed forces in the far Pacific, that more aid be given to China, that 500 fighting airplanes, and 500 bombers be given to her so she could turn from the defensive to the offensive.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mrs. LUCE. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Chinese have no airplanes of their own at the moment, or at least no quantity of planes anywhere near commensurate with her great position as one of our equal partners in this war?

Mr. FISH. I am making a plea, and have been pleading, that we do everything in our power to send immediately 500 fighting airplanes and 500 bombers to China, and more if possible.

I ask the gentlewoman from Connecticut: If the Chinese had a thousand fighting airplanes and a thousand bombers could she not then turn from the defensive to the offensive and bomb Japan?

Mrs. LUCE. So it has been often said by experts out there. I believe, however, the gentleman from New York misses my point. All the planes which are now being sent to China are being sent to the American air forces there. The point I make is that the Chinese, who are supposed to be our equal partners in this great war effort, are being sent no planes, so far as I am informed, whatsoever, for their own national use in fighting the Japanese. I wondered if the gentleman was aware of that, and if perhaps the gentleman did not feel that the Chinese people should have some air strength of their own in this war under lend-lease arrangements?

Mr. FISH. I am sure everybody in this House on both sides would agree with the statement made by the gentlewoman from Connecticut, and hopes that we can send more and more airplanes not only for our own fliers but particularly for the Chinese air pilots. The thought uppermost in the minds of most Americans is that we should concentrate our efforts to help China and attack the heart of Japan. When are we going to bomb Japan either from China or from our own air carriers? Before Pearl Harbor it was freely predicted that we could destroy the Japanese Navy in 2 weeks and Tokyo in 3.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman knows we have been doing our utmost to aid in the training of Chinese pilots at Thunderbird Field, which I believe is in Arizona, and that we have just recently completed some training classes. The Chinese, of course, would have great difficulty in using these planes without proper training.

Mr. FISH. I want to be fair; I think everybody on both sides of the aisle wants to be fair. It is difficult to get these airplanes to China. If we could do so, we would arm five or ten million Chinese and fully equip them with weapons of war. If we do that, they could take care of themselves and drive the Japanese out of China. We certainly ought to be able to get airplanes into China. I

have suggested on the floor of this House that it is not going too far to ask Soviet Russia to permit American airplanes flying from Alaska to land in Siberia, not for the purpose of bombing Japan, but to land in Siberia for the purpose of hopping on to China. We have given Soviet Russia over a billion dollars of lend-lease supplies in the last year. Certainly this is not asking too much, and it is one way of expediting getting airplanes into China for our own pilots and for the Chinese pilots.

Mr. Speaker, I have digressed considerably from the consideration of the pending legislation under the rule and I have done so largely in answer to the opening remarks of the chairman of the Rules Committee. This is called a peanut bill, but it is far from being peanut legislation, even though one called it a jumbo peanut bill; that would not describe the purposes of the bill.

This is a far-reaching, vital, and important agricultural measure. The whole question of subsidies is involved, and you Members of the House must decide whether you are in favor of continuing subsidies or not. The Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture after considering this question of subsidies voted, 6 to 1, against an appropriation of $100,000,000 for a subsidy program backed by the Secretary of Agriculture. I should like to be corrected if I am in error, but I have been informed by members of the Committee on Agriculture that there were no hearings on this peanut provision which may call for a sum of $50,000,000 annually.

The peanut acreage has been increased from almost 2,000,000 acres in the last few years to 4,000,000 acres; yet they come in and ask for more subsidies and more acreage. It raises a question for the House to decide whether it wants to continue this program of subsidies. We are confronted today with the greatest agricultural tragedy that has ever been witnessed in the United States of America, the shortage of food. We have never been faced with a shortage of food in the entire history of this country. We are told daily that we will have a shortage of food, that we will not be able to even feed our own people in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that we cannot even feed our own people in this country when most people are talking about feeding the whole world with American farm products. You cannot pick up a paper without reading some article about our feeding Europe, Africa, and Asia, and particularly Great Britain, Russia, our allies and our partners in the war. How are we to take care of the people in the war-devastated areas when in the very near future we may not be able to take care of 130,000,000 Americans? Something is very wrong with American agriculture.

If you go back a few years, you can see what is wrong, the program of destruction, the program of scarcity, the plowing under of crops, the killing of herds, and the birth control of pigs, which has brought America down to the very lowest depths where we are now faced with serious food shortages and striving to feed our own people for the first time in history.

This is no peanut bill; it involves the whole agricultural program and is a matter that ought to be considered in the House most carefully because it was not considered carefully in the Rules Committee or by the Committee on Agriculture. The gentleman sponsoring this bill is one of the ablest Members of this House, and I refer to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. There is no better Member; he is a trained legislator; but the trouble is he is too trained, he is too good, he is able to accomplish for his people, for the peanut people down in his State of Georgia and adjoining States, certain advantages which they transcend what should rightly be passed by Congress for either the peanut growers or any others engaged in agriculture. I want to congratulate him because I know he represents his people well; but what I am fearful of is that he has brought this bill in here without the usual hearings by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman has been misinformed. I am sure every member of the Committee on Agriculture present will tell the gentleman that the bill was not only considered by the committee but was considered for days and we appeared for 2 separate days before the Rules Committee. The gentleman was detained elsewhere 1 day. But we went into the matter as exhaustively as we were permitted to and the gentleman should not charge against us because we did not have perhaps a week before the Rules Committee.

Mr. FISH. As I understand it, no hearings at all were held by the Committee on Agriculture on the peanut schedule.

Mr. PACE. This also involves merchantable wheat and corn.

Mr. FISH. But the major one, and the one I am discussing now, is the peanut section which may call for an appropriation of $40,000,000.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman has been misinformed.

Mr. FISH. I understand there were no hearings by the Committee on Agriculture on the peanut schedule and have been so informed by members of that committee. Does the gentleman deny that?

Furthermore, as far as the Rules Committee is concerned, may I say to the gentleman that I voted to report this bill out. I just took it for granted the Committee on Agriculture had held hearings, that they knew what it was all about, and when the gentleman came there with his very persuasive arguments I naturally followed him as I always like to do. Since then I have been given other information and have had an opportunity to study the bill.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I would like to say on behalf of the gentleman from Georgia that there were plenty of hearings in our Agricultural Committee. I am a member of that committee and I will say there were plenty of hearings.

Mr. FISH. Plenty of hearings, but not on the peanut schedule.

I am reliably informed that no outside witnesses were heard.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Oh, yes; there were.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, my concept of this bill is to the effect that section 4 is really the meat of the bill and that the purpose of section 4 primarily is to increase the production of vegetable oil for the use of our people and those with whom we are now associated. In looking over the record I find that our domestic vegetable oil supply comes primarily from corn, cottonseed, peanuts, soybeans, and flaxseed.

I think at the very beginning of this debate we should get fixed in our minds somewhat of a concept of where our vegetable oils come from; therefore I am going to use just a moment or two to give a few basic figures. As probably most all of us know, corn oil is a byproduct of the grinding of corn, with about 1 to 1½ pounds of oil per bushel of corn ground.

With reference to cottonseed, about 80 percent of the cottonseed of the country is crushed. Cottonseed has about a 15½-percent crude-oil content with about 440 pounds of cottonseed per acre as against 450 cotton linters per acre and about 69 pounds of crude cottonseed oil per acre of seed, or 442 pounds of seed.

On soybeans we have a yield of about 18.9 bushels of beans per acre, with about 9 pounds of oil per bushel of beans, or, say, 170 pounds of oil per acre from the soybeans.

In connection with linseed oil from flaxseed, we get about 8.8 bushels of flaxseed per acre, with an oil yield of about 19.4 pounds per bushel, or, say, 171 pounds of linseed oil per acre, and that would be raw linseed oil.

With reference to peanuts, that crop being perhaps one of the greatest foods we can possibly produce in this country, we have about 741 pounds of peanuts average production per acre, with an oil content of roughly 29 percent or approximately 215 pounds of oil per acre of peanuts produced.

Then in connection with peanuts we have those that are grown for the confectioner or table trade, for edible purposes. We also have the peanuts grown for the purpose of crushing and converting into peanut oil and peanut meal in the way of highly concentrated protein feed that we can use for poultry, livestock, and other purposes.

For some years we have had more or less of a peanut program here, which will undoubtedly be explained by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr.

PACE], as the debate goes on, so I shall not go too much into that subject.

We have at the present time, as I understand the Department of Agriculture, a top price of 13 cents per pound for peanut oil in the refined form. I believe that is the price which has been set, the ceiling price. That is for oil, $27.95 per acre; and per ton of peanuts for oil use say about $75 to $85 per ton. Peanuts for edible purposes have recently sold for as high as $175 per ton, so there you get an illustration of the value of peanuts going into oil as against the value of peanuts going to the table in the form of butter or, if they go to the confectioners, in the form of peanut candy and other items along that line.

Virginia grows what may be termed "the jumbo peanut," and that product has recently sold as high as $325 to $350 per ton as against the Southwestern-grown peanuts, grown down in the great State of Texas, which have sold for oil as low as about $84 per ton within the last 60 to 90 days.

Now we have in section 4 a proposal that for any peanuts produced in the years 1943 and 1944, delivered to such agencies as the Secretary of Agriculture may designate, regardless of their utilization, that is, regardless of whether they go into oil or whether they are used for edible purposes, the producer shall be paid prices determined by the Secretary at not less than 85 percent of the parity price for peanuts as of July 15 of the year in which such peanuts were produced. But I direct your attention to the proviso at the close of section 4.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In the bill as it was originally introduced there was a proviso which penalized any peanut farmer for selling his peanuts to anybody but the Government. The penalty was 3 cents a pound. That section of the bill was stricken in the committee. I am bringing that out because the gentleman is talking on that subject.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes. I thank the gentleman for that contribution. I think it is very important for us to discover first that people have beer penalized for growing peanuts at the rate of 3 cents, just referred to. It is also important to find that the committee is striking out that penalty in connection with the language I just read. However, the whole crop for oil purposes and edible purposes is now brought into what we will term the "purchase program." If you will refer to page 1036 of the RECORD of February 16, 1943, which is at your seat, you will find that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has inserted a table showing production goals for 1943, with comparisons.

Roughly, you will find there that the production goal on peanuts is around 5,500,000 acres for the coming year. My rough figures indicate that with 5,000,000 acres of peanuts grown for the current year, with roughly 750 pounds of peanuts per acre, there will be a total of 1,875,000 tons. With, roughly, 200,000 tons of that going back to the farmers for seed and general farm use, leaving available for commercial use 1,675,000 tons, and with 500,000 tons of the last figures being used for edible purposes, there would be about 1,175,000 tons to be devoted to the production of vegetable oil or, we will say, for oil use.

In connection with the revamping of the parity formula, to include the cost of farm labor and which, I understand, we shall probably consider here within a few days, I would say that, roughly, 85 percent of parity, as stated on page 5 of the bill now under consideration, would call for a price of around $139 per ton. With an oil value of, let us say, $85 per ton, or a loss on peanuts devoted to oil use of about $54 per ton. Then, calculating the 1,175,000 tons for oil use at $54 per ton would give you a rough figure covering the subsidy of, say, $63,450,000 involved in this bill.

If, on the other hand, you take the 500,000 tons which are used for edible purposes and calculate that at a parity of about $163, with 85 percent of that being $139, you have a difference there of, roughly, $24 as between the full parity and 85 percent of parity.

If you imposed upon the consuming trade, and I understand this matter has been discussed more or less, a $24 tax, we will call it, that being the difference between the full parity and 85 percent of parity, and if you actually made that stick and made the consumers of peanuts for edible purposes carry that burden, and sold to them, say, the 500,000 tons carrying a $24-per-ton tax, you would recapture $12,000,000 to bring back and apply against the $63,450,000 subsidy, giving you a net loss to the Government of, roughly, $51,450,000, under the concept I am here considering. A lower estimate of the total crop and more peanuts to the trade would change the figures.

I trust that those who are thoroughly familiar with this study, and particularly the gentleman from Georgia, will, if possible, refute all of these figures I am presenting, because if this is not the general approach, let us have the facts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the talk that the gentleman is making about peanuts, but I would not want the impression left that this bill deals only with peanuts. The wheat section is an important section, and it does not impose any penalties.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The only reason that I am putting all of my time on this question of peanuts is because I think we have reached the time in agricultural history and we have reached the hour in government when this Congress should know something more about this crop, and the type of legislation that we have been supporting here for 4 or 5 years in connection with this subject. That is why I am taking all of my time on this section of the bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The only reason for this legislation is the fact that the O. P. A. will not raise the price ceiling on oils. It could be done in another manner undoubtedly by the Department of Agriculture, but I should like to make it clear that this legislation is sought, and is necessary because they refused to do that down there.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me see if the gentleman does not agree with me in this. Is this not because of the step taken by the Committee on Appropriations within the last few days, to the effect that it is opposed to subsidizing farm prices generally? In other words, if this bill goes through in this form, we are giving from twenty to fifty million dollars, something like that, for the purpose of subsidizing peanuts, while the Appropriations Committee has gone on record as against the $100,000,000 subsidy.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is doing something by law that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation will do if the law is not passed. At the present time the Secretary has the power to suspend national marketing quotas for peanuts in time of national emergency. He could do that, and they would function the same way they function in respect to soy beans, flax, and so forth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman the remainder of the time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And may I ask the gentleman this question. I appreciate the information that he has given, but if we endorse this, as here presented, do we not in fact endorse something which the Appropriations Committee within the last few days has opposed, in going against the $100,000,000 subsidy.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman refers undoubtedly to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having in charge the agricultural bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then I ask a member of the Committee on Appropriations if that is not so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so. We are making a back door approach, when the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having in charge the agricultural appropriation bill, turned it down by a vote of 6 to 1.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am not very strong for this peanut section, but irrespective of the action that we take here, if we defeat this, the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture and the O. P. A. are going to pay these subsidies.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And that is a further reason why I say we have reached the hour when this Congress should understand what it is doing, not only with reference to peanuts, but with reference to other crops.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. My position is the same as the gentleman's on subsidies, but I call his attention to the fact that there is not anything in this bill that establishes or creates subsidies. The subsidy that is being paid peanuts is paid under the act of July 1, 1941, reported out by the Banking and Currency Committee, giving the Secretary of Agriculture authority to establish floors under the price of certain commodities.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But the gentleman will agree that this bill puts the entire crop of a farmer under sec. 4 and works a double purpose, which is something that present law does not do.

Mr. HOPE. The only thing this bill does is to do away with the quotas on peanuts for 2 years. This puts the growers in the same class, if we pass this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. For the next 2 years.

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON].

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in the four terms that I have served in this House I have seldom asked your indulgence, but this morning we heard a most eloquent address by a great lady, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, and she reminded us of the responsibility of this Congress in "pointing a way to a winning of the war." I want to discuss this afternoon very briefly action which this Congress could take next week that would do more to produce the weapons of warfare than anything that this Congress has done.

Today, when every plane, every tank, every rifle bullet counts, when the Nation is straining every nerve and sinew to supply these things to our armed forces in volume and in time, a most serious charge is being brought against American labor—a charge based on the high percentage of absenteeism now shown on the records of our war plants. I do not think that we can fling this blanket accusation against all American labor. I do not believe that we can lay the responsibility for this avoidable work failure upon the great body of loyal, patriotic Americans who are giving to the farthest limit of their energies and skills to produce the tools of war. Nine out of ten of these workers are giving of the best that is in them. I do not think, in fairness to them, that we can allow the tenth—the loafer, the inexcusable absentee, the slacker—to hide his own identity among them and by that means shift the burden of blame for his own personal act of disloyalty to the whole body. It is up to us to devise a means of finding out who is who, name by name—and once in possession of this knowledge, to disinfect our war plants of them—and our Selective Service has a very potent disinfectant for this type of vermin. Once this is accomplished, the great majority of our war workers will be given the exoneration which they so thoroughly deserve. To those who have made this exoneration necessary, we say, "The draft board will get you if you don't watch out."

"Absenteeism" is a fancy word for a very plain, very stark, very ugly situation. The plain, ugly fact is that we are not doing a good enough job of work to win this war. The workers in our war plants, for causes which we have not yet ascertained, are not on the job long enough, steady enough, reliably enough. The responsibility for this we have not yet placed. The reasons we have not yet plainly and accurately analyzed. All we do know is that we are not doing the job required of us and that "we" means not only the worker, where the first surface fault appears; it means, labor, management, and those of us in Government who are looked to for the home-front command.

America wants to know why this absenteeism, what to do about it, how to stop it. The "why" comes first. When we have the "know why," our Selective Service has a pretty effective "know how." The principle of work or fight is sound if wisely administered. It is a pretty persuasive argument. But it is effective only when we know what we are talking about, and setting about to do. In the hands of the ignorant and the malicious, it is a weapon that can hurt us worse than it hurts Hitler.

To date, aside from a great deal of loose talk on absenteeism from all sides, we have not found out the "why"of it. While we are stewing in an unsavory mixture of bias, while we listen to bickering and charges and countercharges, and endure the oratory of those who try to oppose the interests of the factory worker and the man in uniform when those interests are and will always remain the same—while all this heat is being generated, we are still without light.

Our Army needs soldiers but our soldiers need guns, and tanks, and ships. Upset the balance, take the labor force out of the plants that make these things, and you hurt us worse than you hurt Hirohito. The workers who can, will, and do produce these things must be kept on the job. If there are workers on that job who cannot, who will not, and who do not produce, we must find out why. When we know that, we are in a position to do one of two things:

First. Correct the conditions that are causing absenteeism where they can be corrected; and

Second. Wherever the causes cannot be corrected, transfer the absentee workers into the armed forces.

It appears that we have both kinds. And it, therefore, appears that we have a task of picking and choosing. In fairness to the men in the armed forces, in fairness to the civilian population, and in fairness to the loyal patriotic majority of our war workers this picking and choosing must be accomplished. That is the sound application of the work or fight principle, as opposed to indiscriminate transfers into the armed forces regardless of the need of labor in the plant.

To accomplish such picking and choosing our local draft boards need guidance. They must have direct, explicit, individual information. They need to know the "why" in each case. Today they are wholly without any such guide. They must decide whether a man must fight without knowing whether he can work, and if we need the 10,000 bullets he can make, worse than we need the 10 Germans or 10 Japs he could kill, it does not make sense to shove him up front even for those 10 Germans or 10 Japs. Yesterday, as an opening wedge to crack this problem of absenteeism by a method of fact finding rather than fault finding, I introduced an amendment to a measure before the Committee on Naval Affairs. In principle, the amendment provides that—

> Each navy yard and station shall on or before the 10th day of March, June, September, and December of each year, file with the appropriate selective-service local board a verified statement setting forth:
>
> (1) The name of each employee subject to the jurisdiction of such selective-service local board who has been absent from his employment without prior authorization;
>
> (2) A brief description of the nature of the duties performed by such employee;
>
> (3) The period of time during which such absence continued; and
>
> (4) An expression of the opinion of the navy yard or station as to whether such absence was justified and, if so, the reasons therefor.

The committee adopted this amendment unanimously.

If that procedure is sound and profitable as applied to the civilian employees of the navy yards and stations, it is sound and profitable as applied to all workers or war contractors, or subcontractors—to each man in America to whom the principle of work or fight is applicable. I have, therefore, submitted for the consideration of this House a bill which broadens the field covered by the amendment introduced in the Naval Affairs Committee yesterday.

This measure provides that:

(a) Each employer who, pursuant to the terms of any contract, agreement, or arrangement with the Department of the Navy, is engaged in the production of goods, wares, merchandise, or anything of value for, or the furnishing of any service to, the Department of the Navy, shall on or before the 10th day of March, June, September, and December of each year file with the appropriate selective

service local board a verified report setting forth:

First. The name of each employee subject to the jurisdiction of such selective service local board who has been absent from his employment without prior authorization by such employer;

Second. A brief description of the nature of the duties performed by such employee;

Third. The period of time during which such absence continued; and

Fourth. A statement of fact setting forth the reasons therefor, together with any justification which the employee wishes to submit; and

(b) In the event that such employer enters into any contract, agreement, or arrangement with any other employer whereby such other employer in any manner whatsoever is to assist in or further the performance of the employer's contract, agreement, or arrangement with the Department of the Navy, such employer shall require as an express condition to the contract, agreement, or arrangement with such other employer that such other employer furnish to the appropriate selective-service local board the verified report required by subsection (a) hereof, and in any event such other employer shall furnish the verified report required by subsection (a) hereof.

The Selective Service Board must know its men, and the only thing that will enable it to do so is the record. What has this man done? How capable is he as a worker, and, above all just now, how often is he off the job and why? Those are the things our boards must know. Without them, the sound principle of work or fight becomes as haphazard as a lottery and as dangerous as a choice between two unlabeled bottles in a medicine chest.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. CREAL. While I am in sympathy with everything you say, will that not make another great detailed report to be filled out by the contractors?

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. May I say it does not involve another Government report. It merely involves the submission of a copy of the individual employee's time record.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope the gentleman does not think it is a punishment for a man who goes A. W. O. L. in industry to be allowed to serve in the armed forces of the United States. It seems to me it is a privilege to serve in the armed forces, and it should not be used as a punishment.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON] upon the introduction of his bill, and since the gentleman seems to have the ear of those who control things, I hope he has some assurance that his legislation may receive the right-of-way, and that something may be done about it.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, a week before Pearl Harbor I introduced a bill which would make it unlawful for sit-down strikes, for slow-downs, for strikes in war industries, and for conspiracies to bring about strikes. My bill, like the one introduced by the gentleman, would make these parties subject to the draft. I reintroduced that bill this year, a year after Pearl Harbor, and for over a year that bill has been nestled over in the Committee on Military Affairs. If I had any assurance that the gentlemen on the Naval Affairs Committee would give my bill some consideration I would like to have it referred to that committee.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If we had jurisdiction over it we would act on it promptly. Let me make this statement for the information of the House. Absenteeism is one of the most serious problems confronting the Government today. In the month of December 1942 there were 12,700,000 man-hours lost on account of absenteeism. During the year 1942 only 170,000 hours were lost on account of strikes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a reference to the bill to be considered under the pending rule?

Mr. COLMER. I am sorry; I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. BROOKS. We cannot discuss the rule that is going to be voted upon?

Mr. COLMER. I am sorry; I do not yield at this time.

I hope that the gentleman from Texas will join with me and those of us who have been pressing for some action upon this very serious matter which he has brought to your attention, and allied things in connection therewith. I again want to commend him for the very splendid stand he has taken. I know one reason why he has taken it is because he flew in a plane as a member of the armed forces of this country in the South Pacific and saw what was going on over there. He got the soldier's point of view. The gentleman from Texas saw the suffering, the bleeding, and the dying which was going on over there by our soldiers and sailors. He learned that there was no absenteeism by our men over there, no striking, no slowing down. And now the gentleman wants something done about it. I wish every Member of this House could go over there as the gentleman from Texas did, and I am sure then we could do something about it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1605) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to farm-acreage allotments, the farm marketing excess of wheat, the use of excess corn as silage for feed to livestock on the farm, to provide for the adequate supply of peanuts for oil and other uses, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1605, with Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Insofar as I know, the preponderant number of members of the Agriculture Committee are for this bill, but there are some of us, of course, who oppose certain sections. I am wondering what we are going to do about a disposition of time. I think those who are opposed ought to be yielded some time on this matter and that a suitable arrangement should be made by those who control the time. We should not like to be foreclosed from presenting our side of the case.

Mr. FULMER. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] controls 1 hour to be used as he sees fit, and I control 1 hour on this side. I want to be fair to everybody so far as I can with the time allotted to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to analyze the bill briefly, and I hope the Members will give serious thought to the real purpose of this bill and what it is intended to do at a time when we are short millions of tons of fats and oils, when Russia and other countries engaged in the war on the side of the United States today, are begging for oils not to cook with but to spread on their bread.

The purpose of the first section of the bill—and this appears on page 2—is in the nature of protecting certain farmers who are operating under legislation previously passed governing quotas of certain basic crops where these farmers were assigned definite quotas. The first section of this bill provides that should any of these quota farmers be called into the service or should they plant other crops requested during the duration of the war, so badly needed at

this time, that after the war is over they will not lose their quotas to which they would otherwise have been entitled had they continued planting their full quotas for the duration. This applies also in the case of those farmers who cannot plant the acreage required because of labor shortage or other reasons beyond their control. The second provision of the bill is in line with a bill I introduced last session, and that Congress passed and which was vetoed by the President of the United States, which had for its purpose permitting farmers who had certain penalty wheat on hand that came under the provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to feed that surplus wheat to their own livestock, poultry, cattle, hogs, and so forth, without any penalty. Under this provision farmers can utilize any penalty wheat on hand carried over from 1941–42 and for the duration. The third provision of the bill proposes to permit farmers who are operating under the soil-conservation program being limited in planting certain crops to plant additional corn acreage without penalty, to be used as silage to help in this great emergency in feeding cattle for slaughter and dairy cattle.

The fourth provision is the peanut provision. I regret exceedingly that some of the Members who have already spoken on the rule have made statements that apparently are altogether out of line with the real facts and the real purpose of the bill. There would not be any use of bringing in this bill, Mr. Chairman, if it were not for the fact that certain peanut growers in a number of States have been operating under a quota system and have already voted quotas for 3 years—1942, 1943, and 1944. Under the quota system they received in 1942 a price anywhere from $140 to $160 per ton for peanuts to be used as edible peanuts.

Last year the Secretary of Agriculture begged farmers to plant and produce all the peanuts they could for oil because of the tremendous shortage of oil, and that they would be guaranteed $82 a ton. Farmers with quotas and many other farmers planted peanuts for oil purposes but those farmers found they could not produce peanuts for $82 a ton. Peanuts call for considerable fertilizer and they are very destructive to the soil. Some months ago we worked out a program with the Department that those quota farmers would relinquish their quotas and nonquota farms plant and produce all the peanuts possible and they would be guaranteed 90 percent of parity, one price to all farmers, about $130 per ton.

Something has been said about a subsidy in connection with this bill. Mr. Chairman, I am as much opposed to a subsidy as any Member of this House, but let me point out to you this: We are in one of the greatest emergencies ever experienced in the history of this country and, take it from me, we can keep on quibbling and fighting and at the end of this year we are going to wind up with not enough food to feed our own people, our own soldiers, let alone being able to furnish our allies tons and tons of food that they need so badly and will continue to need if we are going to win this war. Russia, where they are splendidly fighting our fight and saving the lives of many of our boys, is begging for more food.

According to my understanding of the bill, there is no provision or even a request for a subsidy. The gentleman from Georgia, who will close this debate, is well posted on peanut legislation and the real purpose of this bill and I beg you to listen to him as I have allotted him plenty of time to explain the bill, as well as answer your questions.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman mentioned what I was going to ask him—if there is any subsidy in this bill. Of course, he has correctly stated that there is not. May I ask him if it is not true that whatever subsidy may be paid on peanuts or upon any one of perhaps 15 or 20 different crops, the production of which we are seeking to increase, will be paid entirely by a different piece of legislation?

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. May I state under this bill the farmer who has a quota will yield his quota, as well as the parity quota price, and accept the $130, which will amount to millions of dollars, and the difference saved on the edible peanuts and the average price 90 percent of parity for all peanuts, the Commodity Credit Corporation tells me, will take only about $25,000,000 additional money to make payments of 90 percent of parity, and they have not indicated at any time that they will come to Congress for a single dime; and if so, it will be up to the Appropriations Committee of this House and not this bill or my committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have served in this Congress for 22 years, and I have endeavored to be impartial and fair to every Member of this House and every section of this country by introducing and advocating legislation for the best interest of all the farmers of this country. My committee is interested in and responsible for the passage of legislation that is fair and in the best interest of all farmers, and it is the responsibility of the Appropriations Committee should the Department of Agriculture or any other department come in at any time and call for funds. That is the time for those who are interested in subsidies to make their fight if you want to take the chance of losing this war by defeating an increased production of food.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Does not the gentleman feel that the quicker we get away from the subsidy idea and substitute for it a fair price for what the farmer gets for his produce and his goods the quicker we will attain the goal which we hope to attain in the food-for-victory program?

Mr. FULMER. I agree with the gentleman, but, as I stated, they are planting peanuts now in Georgia and Texas and they are wondering what we are going to do about this. I wonder if there is a single Member of the House who can tell me that we have any chance whatever to remedy many of the serious situations confronting us in various departments and agencies here in Washington at this time. In the midst of this great emergency, I may say to the gentlemen that I am anxious for the time to come that we may revamp various pieces of legislation passed during the past years, as well as put an end to a great many things that are going on, but I say to you that in the midst of this emergency when we may wake up this year with not food enough to feed our own soldiers and civilians, let alone our allies, we better do the best we can to bring about a production which we are not going to have unless we remedy the serious labor situation on the farm and see to it that farmers receive fair prices, even subsidies or incentive payments, during this emergency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, at this time I do not propose to talk about the bill generally. I do wish, however, to speak about section 2 of the bill with reference to wheat and especially call attention to what I think is a remarkable decision of the Supreme Court of the United States of America on wheat.

You know we passed a bill providing for penalties for those who sold an excess amount of wheat. They were allotted so much and if they sold in excess of that or fed to their own livestock in excess they were penalized, as it turned out, 49 cents a bushel. They were not permitted to raise wheat on their own farms and feed it to their own chickens or hogs or cattle in excess of the quota unless they paid a penalty for the excess of 49 cents.

Many people were dissatisfied with that and they took the matter into the courts. A United States District Court in Ohio decided the case of Wickard against Filburn, which finally went up to the United States Supreme Court, and on the 9th day of last November the Supreme Court decided that case, and passed down a remarkable decision and one which should invite your attention.

The Court held in that case that even though one has engaged in growing a product or vegetable on his own farm, and even though the farmer was thereby engaging in a local endeavor, and even though it could not be regarded as commerce, yet under certain conditions the Congress of the United States under the interstate commerce clause could regulate such endeavor. Let me illustrate it this way: If I go through my potato patch and plant or drop potatoes every foot—if you had been a boy with me on the farm you would have planted potatoes—I am then and there engaged in a local thing. I am not engaged in interstate commerce. I am not engaged in commerce at all, but this Supreme Court has held that even though such endeavor may not be re-

garded as commerce it may still, whatever its nature, be reached by the Congress under the commerce clause, if my endeavor exerts a substantial economic effect on interstate commerce, and this irrespective of a thing that has heretofore been held in all of the interstate commerce cases, and definitions, namely, that the thing I am doing must have a direct effect on interstate commerce. But on November 9 the Court held that that was not so any longer, and especially called attention to the former cases, but went on to distinguish such former cases, and said that if my endeavor exerted a substantial effect on interstate commerce even though it was a local endeavor, and even though it could not be regarded as commerce, still it could be regulated by Congress under the commerce clause of the Constitution if it exerted a substantial effect upon commerce—

Whether said effect is what at some earlier period has been defined as direct or indirect, still the Congress has authority to regulate.

That has marked a new definition of interstate commerce and will result in extending the powers of Congress immeasurably. Under this particular decision those who raise wheat and feed it to their own cattle or hogs or chickens on their own farm were held to be engaged in interstate commerce and amenable to the laws of Congress and were required to pay 49 cents penalty per bushel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, this irrespective of what the results of that thing would be. I am not particularly anxious about this so far as it relates to the bill now before us, only to say that in this wheat provision the Committee has provided that a man may raise wheat and feed it to his own chickens or his own cattle without being subject to that 49 cents penalty.

I should like to talk a little further about this decision. I call it to your attention because it is certainly a new thing in our jurisprudence to say that when I raise my own wheat and feed it to my own chickens I am engaging in interstate commerce and am subject to the control of Congress, if this thing that I am doing exerts a substantial economic effect on interstate commerce, and this irrespective of whether such effect is what at some earlier time had been known as direct or indirect.

I now quote from the decision as follows:

Even if appellant's activity be local and though it may not be regarded as commerce, it may still, whatever its nature, be reached by Congress if it exerted a substantial economic effect on interstate commerce and this irrespective of whether such effect is what at some earlier time had been defined as "direct" or "indirect."

I shall talk if I am allowed time about other features of the bill later.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.



Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MAGNUSON). The Chair will count. [After counting.] 110 Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I take a little bit of satisfaction today in observing that this great Committee on Agriculture of the House that has heretofore opposed recommending amendments to permit farmers to feed what is known as excess wheat to livestock and poultry, without penalty payments; and to permit excess corn to be put in silos free of penalties, now favors the passage of these measures. I am glad to see it. The majority of the committee did not see fit to support me when I tried to get similar legislation through the House 2 years ago, and 1 year ago.

One of the most unreasonable things this House has done in the past, and I am glad they see fit to change it, is to say to a farmer, "Because you happened to raise a little more wheat than the program set by your Government fixed for you, you cannot feed it to your own chickens or your own hogs or your own cattle without paying 49 cents a bushel penalty on it." And, by the way, if this measure is not passed, the penalty will be more than 49 cents next year.

This is absurd, and we should get rid of such a restriction immediately. Right now with an acute shortage of meat, when we need to feed this livestock to produce more cattle and to produce more hogs farmers are sitting back with excess wheat in their bins that they cannot feed to their own hogs unless they pay the penalty. They have to buy other feed, because of this law that was put on the statute books and the Supreme Court has upheld.

I am going to offer an amendment at the proper time, to repeal the penalty provisions of the law with respect to so-called excess wheat. Here we are on the one hand saying to the farmers, "You ought to produce more and more food." Then we turn right around and fix ceiling prices and say, "Of course, you cannot go any higher than a certain amount on the product." And furthermore warn them if they attempt to produce too much wheat, there will be a penalty for doing it.

In view of the acute demand for food, I fail to see how restriction on the production of food and restriction on the price of it go together. And yet, assess and penalize the farmer who raises more wheat than the amount allotted to him by his Government. It ought to be observed that, as I said before, the penalty will not be 49 cents a bushel this year but somewhere between 50 and 60 cents a bushel.

Somebody is going to say, "Why, it is perfectly all right, because we have so much wheat on hand." Yet we are told on the other hand how thousands and thousands of people throughout the world are starving because they do not have food. Here we are, offering and delivering food to people who are in want, and need it to sustain life itself, and yet restrict its production. Mind you, it will not be long until we will not have a surplus of wheat. Not with the program ahead of us. So I say to you it is not right, it is not fair to penalize anybody for raising too much food at this time. I trust that if you view this situation as I do, you will support my amendment. I should add, that my amendment does not change the present law that restricts loans, parity payments, insurance benefits, and soil conservation payments to those who want to comply with the restrictions of the law. It simply means, that if a farmer decides to raise more wheat than his restricted quota, he will not be compelled to pay a penalty in addition thereto.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I had the impression that this bill carried a provision that would do what the gentleman says he desires to do.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It does not. This bill simply states that a man can feed his own wheat to his own livestock and poultry just during the war period, and after that it goes out. The other section permits farmers to put their excess corn in the silo, without being considered as excess corn.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman desire the quota removed, so that we may produce all we can produce?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, several years ago I stood in the Well of the House and with tears literally running down my cheeks asked that some action be taken to relieve the hard-pressed farmers of my district. They were completely bereft of hay and other sustenance feeds, due to the fact that a terrible flood had raged through that territory and also that my section of the country had suffered from one of the most devastating droughts ever known.

I proposed at that time that the farmers be subsidized to the extent of transporting hay and other fodders into my section so that they would be able to keep their dairy herds alive and continue to raise these herds which were producing the milk consumed by the metropolitan districts of the State in which I live.

Since then I have departed somewhat from that philosophy, the philosophy of subsidizing the farmers throughout the country. I have come to the conclusion that, if the farmer were able to obtain a decent and wholesome price for the goods he produces, he would be able to exist, regardless of whether the Government paid him for raising this crop or curtailing the production of that crop.

I am in hearty agreement with the points the gentleman from Kansas [Mr.

HOPE] has emphasized and with those that the gentleman from Minnesota has mentioned regarding wheat and corn penalties. I believe the farmer ought to be able to feed his surplus wheat to the livestock on his farm. I also think that in the case of the gentleman from Minnesota he ought to be able to feed his surplus silage to the stock on his farm.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GILCHRIST. The bill does not provide that the silage must be fed to the stock on the farm or stock owned by the farmer.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman will recall we had several discussions on that in the committee meeting, and I think the gist of the thought was that it would give consideration to the livestock on the farmer's particular property.

Mr. GILCHRIST. But this administration does not go by the thought behind closed doors of a committee.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am talking about what is in the bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In reply to the gentleman from Iowa, I would say that section 305 of the bill provides that the corn-harvested silage is fed as fodder corn feed to livestock on the farm.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further. As I have said, I have departed from the philosophy of subsidies, and I think it is high time that the Department of Agriculture got down to business and tried to interpret some of the laws that this Congress has passed. I think it is high time that we woke up to the fact that the bureaucrats are running hog wild.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. The thing that disturbs me is where the end will be in any subsidy program. Just the other day our Committee on Small Business listened to representatives of the packing industry, and one of the alternatives suggested for them is that the Government subsidize them in their operations, to the end that they continue in business. I wonder where the gentleman thinks we are going to stop.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is correct. I agree with him thoroughly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I hear a good deal of condemnation on the floor of bureaucrats. Now, the people of this country are not going to look to bureaucrats to solve these problems. This is a responsibility of Congress. Let us lay the blame where it belongs and stop blaming the bureaucrats.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Then I will say that it is up to the Congress during this session to take action, as we have in the past 2 weeks. We have started in the right direction, but I am frank to say that I think there is plenty of room for improvement. As time goes on we should make every effort to prevent the progress of these bureaucrats.

Mr. GRANGER. I wonder if the gentleman has changed his mind about subsidies because the farmers in his district at the moment do not happen to suffer from the drought.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the gentleman wants to put it in that is all right, but I guess other Members are guilty of the same thing. They were not particularly interested at this time because their sections are not affected as was mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I confess a great distaste to find myself in a position called upon as I am to vote for a measure which, in the first instance, is for the relief of the producers of an agricultural commodity from which oil is made. Oil is a war material, and in this case this bill is here because of farm conditions that could have been avoided, but which, as a matter of fact, come from a situation which arises out of the efforts and impact of our own Government upon agriculture. If one but analyzes for a moment the price which the Office of Price Administration fixed upon peanut oil—and I do not know where they got the formula upon which they based the price—you will find it based upon the formula which set a price from which it was impossible for the farmers to expect to get more for their oil from peanuts than about $82 a ton, which is about 55 percent of parity. Think of it. The Congress wrote definitely into the price-control law a prohibition on the fixing of a ceiling on any agricultural product that would reflect to the farmer a ceiling price below a definite price per ton considerably above 55 percent of parity. Here we are called upon to consider the passage of an act which is occasioned by only one thing and that is a set of wheels within wheels, built by a combination between those who desire to control and the earnest and misguided friends of the farmer who voted for the legislation. I am trying to call back to you the situation. It is perfectly patent that in time of war, above all times, every patriotic citizen should be given an opportunity, unabridged, to do his dead-level best to serve his country in whatever line of effort he happens to be engaged, particularly in those lines of effort where in the case of priorities, if we take first things first, the first priority should exist not only in the form of relief from bondage, but as a matter of fact, if priorities had been started on the basis of first things first, the first priority would have been granted to the plow. In 5 minutes one has no time in which to discuss a matter from the standpoint I desire to discuss this legislation, because I want to go into the fundamentals. If you vote against this bill you are confronted with this proposition. You are actually and effectively hampering a war effort, because certainly no man should be expected to produce a commodity at a price which is far below the cost of production.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEBERG. I cannot yield now. I do not think we ought to investigate anybody, just to be doing something. There ought to be a reason for it. But there is in this bill a provision providing for the sale of oil-producing peanuts only to certain designated Government agencies, under the guise that those agencies are cooperative. I call your attention earnestly to the fact that if the truth were known and the facts brought into the full light of an American day, in the eyes of Americans fully awake to conditions here at home, the cooperative proposition might develop into a complete change of adjectives, and the ugly word of conspiracy for purposes of monopoly, might well be substituted for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I say with great reluctance that I am afraid I shall have to oppose this bill, it contains so many strange and abstruse provisions. My principal contention is that in this bill we set up several devices for torpedoing the basic 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act. If production is our goal, if we need production for war purposes, why does not the committee bring us a bill to simply take off the restrictions for a limited period and say to the farmers, "Go ahead and produce to your heart's content." But look what we have here. We propose now to say to the wheat farmers that where they have grown too much wheat and they feed their excess wheat on the farm, the penalty will be adjusted or it will be reduced. So it is in competition with other cereal grains, particularly grains used for feed.

Secondly, there is a provision in this bill, and a permanent provision it is to be, which alters the 1938 act with regard to putting corn in silage. It is not for the duration. It is a permanent change in the 1938 act. So we say to the farmers, particularly in the noncommercial corn areas, "If you grow too much corn, if you exceed your marketing quotas, you can dump it into a silage tank and you can feed it that way," and in consequence you are developing, it seems to me, an unfair advantage against those farmers in the commercial corn-producing areas who just have to take the tail with the hide, and who have but a single outlet for their corn. Is this fair to patriotic corn farmers who are willing

to make every sacrifice and supreme effort with other sections of the Nation?

We had that proposal up before. It was offered by the gentleman from Minnesota in April 1941. We defeated it in this House by a vote of 89 to 32. Here is the old ghost back again. Frankly, I cannot go along with a permanent change in the 1938 act which will be looming up like a great tower some day when normalcy returns and we do not have this dislocation for feed, fats, and fibers.

So it is a disturbing provision to me.

Finally, I am disturbed about section 4. I will tell you how I think section 4 is going to work out. It is going to work out precisely as it has worked out for soya beans. The Commodity Credit Corporation is going to take over this crop. How else will they provide these guaranteed prices to producers unless they do?

Then no matter how you utilize peanuts, whether you buy them for edible purposes or whether they are put between the crushers and squeezed into oil, this says, regardless of their utilization, the producer shall be paid at prices determined by the Secretary at not less than 55 percent of parity. Why? Because the O. P. A. refuses to raise the ceiling. What a strange thing that is. Here is an agency we created that refuses to do justice by the peanut growers, so it is alleged, so we put our tails between our legs and confess that because they refuse to do it we have to go on the back track and do something else.

I am not going to make that kind of confession, but I will tell you how it will work out. The Commodity Credit Corporation will take over the crop. They will sell one-third of it to the people who roast peanuts and they will make a profit on it. I will give you the figures I have. We will sell one-third to the edible trade and on that we will make a profit of $20,000,000. On that portion sold to the oil trade we will lose $60,000,000. So in consequence the net loss is going to be $40,000,000. We doubled the peanut crop once before by taking off the quotas and giving them a little better price. Mr. Wickard made that confession to us in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill the other day. It seems to me it is high time to get sensible about this program and do the right thing. Let these prices go up and then say to the farmers, "Go ahead and produce to your heart's content," and they will take care of all the war needs and the needs of our soldiers and the needs of lease-lend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. I am much in agreement with what the gentleman has said as far as the fats-and-oils program is concerned, but the gentleman knows, as I know, that as far as soybeans is concerned the program which he describes is being carried out without any such legislation as we have here affecting peanuts, and I am sure he also realizes that whether we pass this peanut provision in this bill the Commodity Credit Corporation will still go ahead and carry out the program along the same lines that he has described.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I ask my friend at this point if that is the case, then why is this bill here?

Mr. HOPE. The only reason this bill is here is in order to do away with the quota system on peanuts for the next 2 years so as to put all peanut producers upon the same basis as far as prices are concerned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But there is an emergency provision in the 1938 act which would give the Secretary such authority as he needs, if he thinks he needs it.

Mr. HOPE. There is a provision in my judgment and it could be used. It might be used if we do not pass the legislation. I do not know, of course.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So I say to my friend, with tolerance, I do not know why the Secretary of Agriculture should be passing the buck back to Congress constantly; either let him administer the act or not administer it. That is the way we should do it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman made some reference to the provision dealing with wheat, and I am sure that he has noted that that is only for the period of the emergency.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. HOPE. But at the time the need is for livestock feed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the silage provision is for everything after 1943; it is a permanent amendment to the act of 1938.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will concede that the gentleman is correct on the corn silage provision; it is permanent legislation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But does the gentleman know that just a short time ago the Secretary of Agriculture offered a loan provision in the noncommercial corn areas equivalent to the loan provision prevailing in the commercial corn areas?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; and I think the thing is wrong. As I read it, it merely means that they have all the emergency authority they need to raise such corn as they need out there.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I wish the gentleman would raise a little hob with the Secretary for giving the noncommercial farmers the commercial corn rate instead of stopping the thousands of small dairy farmers throughout the country from raising enough feed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I share the solicitude of my friend from Minnesota as he raises his voice for the folks back home.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL].

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, it is not often, but I find myself this time not in complete accord with my friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], on the question of silage which has been before this House and has been before our committee and at times voted down. It comes up, gets by, and gets to the House, gets voted down; then it comes back again, like the cat with nine lives.

Along with that proposition the question of precedent is always a dangerous thing. Down in my area a man who raises a lot of corn hardly ever sells any corn; he just buys more hogs and feeds it to the hogs. All right, if you are going to let them grow corn for silage for cattle in Minnesota why should not the Kentucky farmer be enabled on the rich river bottoms to double, treble, or quadruple his corn crops and feed it to his hogs? Can you show me any reason why not? The dairy cattle is for profit; the hog is for profit. Look at that discrimination. I cannot go along on that silage proposition for the dairy farmers in other areas; that is an unfair advantage. It is dairyman discriminating against dairyman.

But there is a fact you overlook: There is no use condemning the law as a whole; it is not your law; you merely submitted a referendum to the people. Everyone of these items in here was voted for by a majority, a substantial majority, of the farmers themselves, in some areas more than 90 percent. You can take the referendum away from them if you want to, but they voted it, not you. You merely gave them the power of voting like they would in any other election. It is their law, and in none of these commodities where they have ever voted for quotas have they ever expressed by resolution or otherwise any intention of wanting to undo it. We merely voted for the referendum. So there is one thing from which I beg to be excused when you condemn Congress for this law, when you submitted only a referendum.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is the gentleman opposed to an amendment to this measure that would permit a farmer to put his own corn, green corn, in his silo to feed to his livestock and not include it in the quota? Is there anything wrong about that?

Mr. CREAL. Yes; unless you allow them to feed it to his other stock, poultry, hogs, or sheep, jackasses, or what not; but this would be limited just to silage.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is not the crux of this whole thing the fact that we give him that power and still pay them parity?

Mr. CREAL. Exactly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Still give him the loan value.

Mr. CREAL. I claim that it is an unfair advantage over his fellow dairymen in other sections, over others who had raised corn, not to let it be fed to other than dairy cattle.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But the gentleman understands there is no loan on this ensilage we are talking about; it is just green feed. I do not believe the gentleman ever had anything to do with filling silos and feeding all kinds of feeds in a practical way.

Mr. CREAL. My section has plenty of silos full of silage, and I have not had any of those farmers writing me and asking me for this law for a special privilege herein proposed to be granted to only one kind of corn growers.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman is on the Committee on Agriculture. I am interested particularly in the provisions pertaining to peanuts.

Mr. CREAL. I am not capable of discussing that subject at all. Other members on the committee from peanut-growing areas will explain that section.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I hope somebody will discuss it.

Mr. CREAL. They will.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman referred to the referenda among the farmers. As I understand, there has never been any vote on corn quotas; that is, the corn farmers have never voted in any referendum election.

Mr. CREAL. I believe the gentleman is right; but on the wheat that was discussed here so much, you did, and on tobacco.

Mr. HALLECK. The compulsory quotas which were first provided for in the *1938* revision have never been invoked in respect to the production of corn.

Mr. CREAL. Very well. Those people have foregone the raising of corn in order to get their soil payments. Every Member should be for section 1, and I have no objection to section 4. My main objection is to section 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, this bill has three distinct and separate parts. It is not wholly a peanut bill. One part deals with wheat, another part deals with corn, and another part deals with peanuts. Possibly the Members coming from wheat-producing districts, such as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], will rightfully be advocating the bill largely because it is beneficial to wheat. The commercial corn-district Members, like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will be opposing it because their districts are interested in commercial corn—selling corn as corn. They see in the bill an advantage given the user of silage over the seller of the corn. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] and the other representatives of great dairy districts will be for the part of the bill which gives silage the greatest benefit. So that after all is said and done, I venture the suggestion that possibly this bill is on the floor today because the peanut representatives on the Agriculture Committee were willing to accept the corn provisions and the wheat provisions as a condition precedent to including the peanut provision, and likewise the corn and wheat representatives were willing to accept the peanut provisions in order to get consideration for the staple agricultural products of their respective bailiwicks.

In fact, the Committee on Rules was told by members of the Committee on Agriculture that this bill should come to the floor where it might be considered and amended. One Member appeared before the Committee on Rules and called the bill a three-headed monster, and while favoring the rule opposed the bill.

So, for the benefit of the new Members, who have not gone through the debates in connection with the A. A. A. as it affects the various crops and sections of the country, let me suggest to you that when a Member makes his argument for or against a particular provision of the bill you give weight to whether or not he is speaking largely for his district or for the country as a whole. I am not criticizing a Member who is an advocate of the best interests of his own district. That is his duty, but in the final analysis we must appraise the entire field and vote for the greatest good to the greatest number of our people. If the corn section of the bill does not meet that specification, then it should be eliminated and the same treatment should be accorded the wheat and the peanut provisions. There is some good in the bill and let us preserve that good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I have studied this bill from every angle, the laws on the lawbooks, and what the bill contemplates. I do not see why we should work up to the point of worrying about subsidy, where a few peanut farmers and wheat farmers and other kinds of farmers should be the benefactors of the Government, and get excited about it. I do not know of any business in America that has not at some time had something handed to it by the National Treasury. Farm conditions are deplorable. We have a shortage of feed for cattle and a shortage of food for people. We should encourage more farming from every angle, and support every law, with as little bureaucratic interference as possible, to aid agriculture. I do not want you to put in this bill any of these menus the Department of Agriculture was asking to be prescribed for Mexican labor, in the case of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman has made a good statement with reference to not restricting the farmer further. Can the gentleman tell me whether the farmer who proposes to plant these peanuts can buy his feed from any source?

Mr. STEWART. Oh, you cannot buy a pound of feed or a plow clevice without living up to an O. P. A. order in my part of the State. We do not know how to use baling wire, but we have got to the point where most of the farm boys are in the Army. The problem is, Where are you going to get people to carry on the work on the farm? Are we going to get them out of drug stores or law offices or blacksmith shops, and can we make farmers out of them? That is the problem. The farmers make good soldiers. He does not have to stay over here as a military police, but they just give the farm boy a gun, and he gets out into the fight to win.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. No; the gentleman will pardon me. I have not the time. I had several things that I wanted to touch upon. I was amused at my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], when he said that 5 years ago he stood for subsidy. I remember that every bank stood for it, and every industry stood for it, and everybody else was on his knees, begging for help. I remember that back in those days the stock of the present Executive was very high, but, like other things, when we get back to where we can do business ourselves, we want it turned back to us, and we want to enjoy a free market. The law of supply and demand is still the rule that we eventually hope to follow. We cannot continue to depend upon the Government to live in a Garden of Eden and let South America feed us, so everybody can run for Congress and drive a 12-cylinder limousine. Some of us have to work more than 40 hours a week, at least during this emergency, and the people I represent put in from 70 to 96 hours a week in the agricultural areas. There are coal mines and oil fields also, and now let us all unite. Do not you boys go wrong on this bill, because you stand for the gold standard in your own mind as the medium on which to base the dollar, and that high tariff is protection—do not you boys go off on a tangent, but let everybody be a good fellow, and let us vote for the good of the country. Let us disregard this center aisle. That is what I am trying to do. I am going to offer an amendment to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I come from a section of America where agriculture is a business and a science, but, gentlemen, my section of the country has suffered from malpractice in agriculture in various other districts of the United States—single cropping. Of course farmers suffered in other places of the United States, and in some places it was cotton, other places corn, induced

by land speculations in the Great Plains States. Some places it was tobacco and other places it was wheat, but those three crops are the worst offenders—always the result of single cropping and soil mining. Many of you will remember that from the districts east of the Ohio River there was very little demand for this farm legislation, for we follow sound crop practice and conserve our soil. The rest east of Illinois largely followed the same sound practice. It is the practice in Pennsylvania and New York, and there would have been very little demand for crop regulation from the rest of the country had they been practicing crop rotation and soil building all of these years. I want to take you down the road a little ways on this oil problem, take you back a couple of years. You remember the time we had 4½ cents on hogs in 1940. That was about exactly the price of a pound of imported vegetable oil, plus the duty. It was about 4½ cents that it cost to bring in palm oil and coconut oil, cottonseed oil from Brazil, and so forth. It set the price of hogs and thus the price of our corn. It brought distress and distress brought legislative panaceas.

I want some of you to remember when this 10,000,000 acres of peanuts is expanded as recommended what problems we are going to have. In 1940 they came here and got the restriction on a million and a half acres, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has told us that it is well to extend it to somewhere around 10,000,000 acres. Gentlemen, Henderson Field is right in the middle of Lever Brothers' coconut grove. It may be pleasant during the war to have these oils, but I say to you men from the Corn Belt you may see cheaper hogs than $4.40 because the duty is gone now. It will come in duty free.

I am going to offer an amendment to this second section of the bill to make permanent this right of a man to feed this wheat on the farms where it is produced—not just during the war emergency. If this were not a war emergency I would be down here today asking you to junk the whole A. A. A. program during the war. If you do not want to take my word for it, go back and check commodity prices a week before the World War broke out in 1939. You will find that the price of wheat at Liverpool was the lowest since the day of Queen Elizabeth. It was kept at 55 cents a bushel on our western farms by a subsidy averaging 28 cents per bushel in 1939. You have not felt the full result of this ill-advised farm legislation that we have been fooling with. The war came, and that was a shock absorber. When the test comes, you will get the full impact of it.

As a man who was born on a ranch and who has grown up in the Great Plains States and spent 25 years of my life in Ohio, I am somewhat conversant with these conditions in the various districts. I say to you I did not support this bill. The chairman will tell you that after listening to all these arguments, this plea for oil and winning the war, I voted "present but bewildered." And I am still bewildered. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] came very close to the truth. Here you have two or three thin slices of turkey—one of silage corn, one of feed wheat, and the other peanuts. I am afraid there is an awful lot of turkey buzzard in the peanut part of this bill, and we are going to be asked to eat the buzzard in order to get the turkey.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman goes along with me, I believe, in favor of the sections dealing with the feeding of ensilage and making it permanent?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Absolutely.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And also on the feeding of wheat to livestock?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Certainly. It is the most effective way to meet the corn-borer menace also. It disposes of the stocks where the pest hibernates; it is most essential to the dairy people, and we need dairy products.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think the gentleman knows I have tried to get this through the House for the last couple of years, but does not the gentleman agree that this is the time to take off the penalties and allow the people to raise more wheat?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Oh, yes. Take the hobbles off of them and you will not be talking about a famine. Give them the machines and the men and let them alone. Three hundred thousand full-time and part-time men, like termites, are eating the arms off of the farmers of this country. They should be mobilized for work or fighting. Set the farmers free and they will feed you, and feed you with plenty. Let us take the hobbles off the farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have a saying back home when I meet fellows who try to be smart, "Well, you are not dumb. You are just acting dumb." I think there never was a time when I could apply that to the Committee on Agriculture and to this House as I can right now. I cannot see why the Committee on Agriculture cannot once and for all lay selfish interests and community interests aside and come out here and scrap the whole A. A. A. program from beginning to end. There is no room for it. There is no need for it. There is no economy in it today. We talk about food. If we have plenty of corn and wheat in this country that will mean more eggs, more butter, milk and more food all around. I am afraid, through selfish interests, we are cutting our noses off to spite our faces.

Down in the Agricultural Department it is dominated by fellows such as were spoken of the other day in California, where they tried to set a ceiling price on eggs and milk. The man from the O. P. A. said, "Well, you fellows are not fair." When asked to explain his statement, he said, "You are not taking into consideration the eggs you get from your broilers and your capons."

Now, that would be funny if it were not tragic, but that is what we get from these long-haired boys downtown. The actions of this House should be on a little higher plane.

I always credited the Committee on Agriculture with being a lot of good, honest men, with the interests of the country at heart, but today I find myself completely confused. I find the people of the country confused. What we need today to win the war is a green light for the farmers to produce the crops to feed the world.

This bill provides for subsidies to produce more of some grains and penalties for producing others. In my neighborhood in 1942 I have known farmers with 30 acres of wheat who paid as much as $200 penalty for overproduction. As the law now stands a farmer who wants to may get one check for producing and another for producing less. This just does not make sense and the farmers know it. They don't want this money and they don't want to pay a penalty. They simply want to be left alone to live their lives and farm their farms as only they know how.

If they were allowed to do this and were permitted to have equipment which they sorely need, and experienced help to operate that equipment, the fear of a food shortage would be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

OUR DOMESTIC FOOD POLICY

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we have had the Atlantic Charter, Lend-Lease, and the "four freedoms," and master agreements in the consideration of our foreign policy, but we do not appear to have a very well defined charter for our domestic programs, which are unalterably tied up with our foreign policy. There is no use in talking about lend-lease as far as food is concerned unless we have some produced food with which to do the lease-lending.

I asked for this time today to bring before you one of the most far-reaching pieces of agricultural legislation which has come before us for some time. What we do with H. R. 1605 should be indicative, not only of the opinions of Members of Congress but of the sentiments of the people we have the honor to represent.

If these were normal times, I would call your attention to the fact that this bill, H. R. 1605, has all the earmarks of a log-rolling or pork-barrel piece of legislation in that it affects three different groups. These are not normal times and this legislation must be approached from the viewpoint as to the contribution its provisions must make in helping to win the war.

Section 2, whereby the excess, or penalty, wheat is allowed to be fed by its producers to their own livestock. This section was passed by the House as a bill in the Seventy-seventh Congress but did

not become a law. You will note that the farmers who have already paid their penalty are not to be reimbursed but the ones who have not paid the penalty will be relieved of the responsibility of doing so. Since the penalty was changed from 15 to 49 cents a bushel after the wheat crop had already been planted and since the wheat involved is only 25,000,000 or 30,000,000 bushels—which will be converted into poultry, eggs, and other livestock products, to win the war—this section should have little opposition. It should be noted here and now that the same wheat leadership here in the House that put the increase and penalty on the statutes are now asking its repeal, which should teach us to look a little ahead as to the effects of the legislation we pass. It might also be called to your attention that it is regrettable that any legislation has to be tacked onto some measure that has enough majority approval to get it enacted into law.

We now come to section 3 in regard to corn payments and loans. This problem has been under discussion for at least 5 years. This section should determine whether the control on controls are to be eliminated for the duration as far as corn is concerned.

PEANUTS

When the last piece of peanut legislation was enacted into law, I concluded that from then on, it would be very desirable to at least have the Members know what agricultural legislation was being passed. This previous peanut legislation was tacked onto a Senate bill, agreed to by the conference committee, became a part of the law of the land upon agreement of the conference committee. It was never even discussed on the floor of the House. I asked for a couple of minutes when the conference committee reported to the House. I was advised that no discussions were to be allowed and none were allowed.

We are now to section 4, the far-reaching part of this present proposed legislation. Hearings were never held on this section of the bill. Growers of peanuts did not express their wishes to the committee. The men in the peanut business did not express their views and the manufacturers of peanut products did not appear before our committee to give their approval or disapproval of this section. No one submitted any evidence to show that an increase in production is any more needed than the increase in other fats and oils are needed. The peanuts produced in 1942 were one-third less than the 1942 peanut goal and the soybeans produced in 1942, in terms of pounds, was one-third greater than the goal of 1943. On the face of it, one would conclude that if soybean oil equals peanut oil, it should be much easier to increase vegetable oil by increasing the soybean acreage. There was estimated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture to be seven times the amount of soybean oil produced in 1942 as there was peanut oil in 1942.

According to the United States Department of Agriculture, the production of peanuts in the United States in 1941 showed Georgia producing 37 percent, North Carolina 12 percent, Alabama 18 percent, Florida 10 percent, Texas 8 percent, Virginia 7 percent, and Oklahoma 2 percent, and Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, Tennessee, and South Carolina, together, producing less than 1 percent each.

The forerunner of H. R. 1605 was H. R. 1561. Section 4 of this H. R. 1561, page 4, line 20, is stated as follows:

> All peanuts produced in the calendar years 1943 and 1944 may be marketed by producers through agencies designated by the Secretary of Agriculture or to other producers for seed without the payment of penalty; the marketing of any peanuts produced in such years in any other manner or through any other person shall be subject to a penalty of 3 cents per pound.

We have heard considerable about men having to join a union to secure work to win the war but did not you know that a farmer might have to pay a penalty of 3 cents a pound to furnish the food to win the war? One of our colleagues questioned the wisdom of this paragraph and now we find in H. R. 1605:

> All peanuts produced in the calendar years 1943 and 1944 may be marketed by producers through agencies designated by the Secretary of Agriculture or to other producers for seed without the payment of penalty.

Please note the language "may be marketed." It will be reassuring to these peanut producers that they may market their peanuts through agencies designated by the Secretary of Agriculture. Is not this language rather indefinite in the light of our past experience with bureaucratic interpretations?

This legislation, if passed, would no doubt be followed by other products with more than one ceiling price. For example, take milk—with a 46-cent ceiling for butter, the milk would be around $1.90 per hundredweight. For cheese, it would be $2.45 per hundredweight and for condensed milk around $2.65 per hundredweight, and for city milk from $3 to $4 per hundredweight. Since fluid milk is usually about one-third of the national production, would not the other two-thirds of the industry expect to obtain the ceiling price of the O. P. A. of the city fluid milk, and would they not be equally entitled to the same consideration?

According to the January 29, 1943, Agricultural Prices issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, the parity price for peanuts for edible purposes was 7.58 cents per pound, or $151.60 a ton. The comparable parity price for peanuts used for oil was 3.71 cents per pound, or $74.20 a ton. This was computed under Section 3B of the Price Control Act. In fairness, I think this comparable price may be subject to considerable criticism and most justly so. The farmer on January 15, 1943, received $3.97 per hundredweight, or $79.40 a ton, although on January 15, 1942, he had received the full $80 per ton. The price for peanuts for edible purposes was $5.94 per hundredweight, or $118.80 a ton, and on January 15, 1943, the farmer received $6.23 per hundredweight, or $124.60 a ton.

This bill has nothing to do with the incentive payments of $30 per acre for peanuts, $15 per acre for soybeans, and $10 per acre for flax. You might note that incentive payments of $30 per acre for the average acre of peanuts would be 678 pounds times 29 percent fat, or 196 pounds per acre; would make incentive payments $30 divided by 196 pounds—would make the incentive payment 15 cents per pound or more than the selling price or the 13 cents per pound as set by the O. P. A. This, of course, would apply only to the extra acres above the allotted acres.

No one can give an approximate amount that this bill will cost. The subsidy is dependent upon whether the price set will be 85 percent or full parity of 100 percent. You will note the bill states, on page 5, line 4:

> At not less than 85 percent of the parity price for peanuts as of July 15 of the year in which such peanuts were produced.

If we produce the goal of 1943 we would produce 3,712,000,000 pounds, or 1,856,000 tons. If they were all sold for oil, which they, of course, will not be, on the basis of $80 a ton and after paying $130 for them, we could expend $50 times 1,856,000 tons, or $92,800,000. The amount retained by the producer for seed and the amount of profit from peanuts sold for edible purposes, of course, would be deducted from this amount. What this amount really will be is difficult to ascertain. There is also the possibility $150 per ton might be paid instead of $130 in which case the cost, of course, would be increasingly more.

WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

The production of fats and oils for 1942 was—

| | *Pounds* |
|---|---|
| Vegetable oils: | |
| 1. Cottonseed products | 1,445,000,000 |
| 2. Soybean oil | 1,440,000,000 |
| 3. Linseed oil | 730,000,000 |
| 4. Corn oil | 248,000,000 |
| 5. Peanut oil | 200,000,000 |
| Total vegetable oils produced in 1942 | 4,063,000,000 |
| Animal fats: | |
| 1. Lard | 2,500,000,000 |
| 2. Beef and mutton fats, edible | 300,000,000 |
| Total animal fats produced in 1942 | 2,800,000,000 |
| Total vegetable oils and animal fats produced in 1942 | 6,863,000,000 |

We then have the peanut oil in 1942, representing less than 5 percent of the total vegetable oil in the United States and less than 3 percent of the oils and fats of the Nation. No recent discovery has been made—at least not called to the committee's attention—showing that peanut oil was any more of a war necessity than any of these vegetable oils. We no doubt are losing more lard, which is being sold along with our meats at 30 and 45 cents per pound and also being lost due to the fact that these hog products are not being marketed through the normal channels of trade, than we will produce by passing this bill.

I have made every effort to keep from discussing this legislation from a sectional or partisan standpoint. I do, however, think that the membership is entitled to the facts. As I said before, these facts were never presented to the committee.

In conclusion, then, the section 4 should be eliminated from this bill because, first, there has never been any testimony before the committee to show the importance of additional subsidy to peanut oil over other vegetable oils; second, because the industry and growers have never been heard by the committee; third, the subsidy together with the contemplated incentive payments would be out of line with other vegetable oil crops; fourth, we most assuredly should not be legislating anyone out of the peanut business or any other business without the courtesy of a hearing. If we do we surely cannot support our colleague, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, and the good work that he is doing with his Small Business Committee; sixth, there is not any sense to passing legislation and turning these crops over to the so-called bureaucrats and then turning around and spending hour after hour on the floor of the House criticizing the bureaucrats for doing the things we ask in the legislation that we pass ourselves right here on the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has consumed 7 minutes.

The Chair may say to the gentleman from Kansas that he has 15 minutes remaining; the gentleman from South Carolina has 35.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAGNUSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1605) amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, had come to no resolution thereon.

### MERGER OF TELEGRAPH COMPANIES

Mr. BULWINKLE filed a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, for printing under the rule.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a table prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture dealing with per capita income.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I obtained unanimous consent to extend a speech by Hon. Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, entitled "Cooperatives and a United Nation." I am advised by the Public Printer that it exceeds the ordinary limits of an extension, the total amount being three and a half pages and the cost being $157.50. I renew my request that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I make a similar request. I have permission to extend my own remarks and to include a speech by Hon. Maury Maverick. It has been returned to me by the Public Printer with the statement that it will take three and two-thirds pages and that it will cost $165. I renew my request that it be printed in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include two letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] had a special order of 30 minutes following the business of the day. I ask unanimous consent that the order may be rescinded and that the gentleman may have 30 minutes tomorrow following the business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### SELECT COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 65, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Special Committee to Investigate un-American Activities to fill the existing vacancies thereon the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY], the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], and the Chair appoints as an additional member of such committee pursuant to the authority granted him by House Resolution 65, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

### SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ACTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THEIR AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 102, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as Members of the Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Beyond the Scope of Their Authority, the following Members of the House: Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. VOORHIS of California, Mr. DELANEY of New York, Mr. PETERSON of Georgia, Mr. HARTLEY of New Jersey, Mr. JENNINGS of Tennessee, Mr. BENNETT of Michigan.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 12 minutes.

### THE FLOWERING OF BUREAUCRACY IN AMERICA

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the other day in presenting the Treasury and Post Office Departments' appropriation bill to the House, I referred to the flowering of bureaucracy in the United States.

Today I ask your indulgence while I present some illuminating facts and figures showing how bureaucracy has really flowered in our country.

As a background for the figures which I shall present, showing the mushroom growth of bureaucracy, I call attention to the fact that, generally speaking, there is no difference between a public law and an Executive order, except that laws are enacted by Congress in the manner prescribed by the Constitution when it created the legislative body, while Executive orders, as their name indicates, are orders originating in the executive establishment of government, which the founders of our country intended should execute, but should not make the laws.

Executive orders usually have their genesis in the bureaus and are expressions of bureaucratic minds. When promulgated they have the force and effect of law. Those who originate them are not elected by the people. They do not represent anybody. They stand for their own peculiar ideas and hobbies and do not speak for any well-established philosophy or any political party. They are intent, as a rule, on promoting their own notions and enhancing their bureaucratic power and authority. Many of them are theorists who think they know how to remake the world but who overlook the laws of Nature and the immutable principle of sound economics.

The following table shows in one column the number of Executive orders issued each year during the last 10 years and in the other column the corresponding number of public laws enacted by Congress in each year:

| | Executive orders issued | Public laws enacted by Congress |
|---|---|---|
| 1933 | 658 | 93 |
| 1934 | 472 | 446 |
| 1935 | 390 | 482 |
| 1936 | 275 | 505 |
| 1937 | 257 | 494 |
| 1938 | 249 | 425 |
| 1939 | 287 | 454 |
| 1940 | 309 | 551 |
| 1941 | 382 | 397 |
| 1942 | 286 | 453 |
| Total | 3,565 | 4,300 |

These figures show that the bureaus have been about as busy legislating as has been the branch of government that was created and ordained to make the laws of our country. It will be noted that in 1 year, 1933, the number of Executive orders issued was 700 percent more than the number of laws enacted by Congress. In the next year, 1934, the number of Executive orders exceeded by 26 the number of laws enacted by Congress. In 1941 the 397 laws enacted exceeded the number of Executive orders issued by only 15. The figures as to the

number of Executive orders issued were furnished to me by the office of the Federal Register.

It is not my purpose to try to fix the blame for the gross usurpation of the legislative function by the bureaucrats. As a matter of fact, I think there is a divided responsibility for this untoward development. I think on the one hand that there has been an excess of zeal on the part of the executive department in grasping for authority, and on the other hand a pusillanimous weakness on the part of Congress in meekly surrendering its powers.

In the early days of the New Deal when the President was displaying rare courage in proposing new and untried expedients to meet critical situations, I frequently heard influential Members of the House say, "If he wants to stick his neck out let him do so; it will keep the heat off of us."

In those days congressional weakness was about in proportion to Presidential daring. Congress neither recognized nor rose to its responsibilities. It was always willing to pass a "hot potato" over to the President and let him handle it. An atmosphere was created in which blanket checks became very popular and bureaucracy flourished like a green bay tree.

Today it is a condition and not a theory that confronts us. Bureaucracy has grown until, with its vast dominion of authority and its ever-increasing yen for more and more power, it is threatening to change the entire form and mold of our Government. It is high time for our people to become aroused and to insist that Congress shall move immediately and decisively to recapture its powers. Otherwise, we may wake up one of these days to find every act of our lives ordered and directed by a great bureaucratic Frankenstein in Washington.

With the knowledge that this bureaucracy does exist; that it is developing into a great menace, and that it does exert a disintegrating and corroding influence on our institutions and our American way of life it is the patriotic duty of all of our leaders in the executive establishment no less than in Congress to pay attention to the danger signals and to cooperate in bringing our Government back to its proper place within the four corners of the Constitution.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I secured permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD two letters from the Department of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent to include with those letters a summary of price-support programs which accompanied them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. VOORHIS of California]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 19, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a hearing of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, February 23, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., for the consideration of postal employees' salary bills.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

190. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and the Annual Report of the Register of Copyrights for the same period, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Library.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of XII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 82. Joint resolution to approve urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 122. Resolution providing for the expense of the Select Committee Investigating the Federal Communications Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 116. Resolution providing an allocation from the contingent fund of the House to the committee for the expenses of the studies and examinations under House Resolution 69; without amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 140. Resolution to provide for the further expenses of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NICHOLS: Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents. House Resolution 33. Resolution continuing for 90 days the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents; without amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1438) for the relief of Pedro Sagazeta; Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 1554) granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reopen and readjudicate the eminent-domain case of John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), and revise its judgment heretofore entered therein; Committee on Claims discharged and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 1896. A bill to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act approved June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 262), relating to the establishment of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia, and to grant the consent of Congress to such States to enter into a compact providing for the acquisition of property for such park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 1897. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 1898. A bill to provide for post-war planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 1899. A bill to authorize the sale to the States of Washington and Oregon of the properties owned by the Federal Government in connection with the Grand Coulee and Bonneville projects; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 1900. A bill to prevent the payment of excessive fees for services in connection with negotiating or securing contracts to furnish articles, materials, and supplies for the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1901. A bill to reclassify and adjust salaries of supervisors in the first- and second-class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 1902. A bill to establish the grade of admiral of the fleet of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 1903. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1904. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1905 (by request). A bill to liberalize the provisions of existing laws governing the granting of service pensions to certain soldiers and widows of deceased soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JEFFREY:

H. R. 1906. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Holtmeier; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 1907. A bill for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1908. A bill for the relief of Joseph Lee Hauser; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 1909. A bill for the relief of Edward Pittwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1910. A bill to fix the compensation of the Commissioner of Public Buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

149. By Mr. FISH: Petition of 25 residents of the city of Poughkeepsie, Dutchess County, N. Y., opposing double taxation and plans advanced by Randolph Paul and the Secretary of the Treasury as an unsupportable burden on the American taxpayers, and favoring the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan of taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

150. Also, petition of 304 citizens of Beacon, N. Y., urging passage of the Reynolds-Starnes immigration and alien bill now pending in Congress; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose Name is above every name, be pleased to hear our supplication. Thou who art the redeemer of the lost and the avenger of the oppressed, grant that our hopefulness may never forsake us and our helpfulness for our fellow men never desert us. We beseech Thee that the valor of heroism may be in our blood like a vein of iron and in our voice like the sound of a trumpet.

Almighty God, we pray that America may be a land in which the grandest note is unity and in which young and old flee from vanity, luxury, and irreverence. Guard us, dear Lord, against a grudging and a contentious spirit that we may prove ourselves to be irreproachable in the midst of a perverse world. We pray that every citizen in public and in private life may make himself altogether worthy of his country, bowing in gratitude and lifting his soul in praise for every loyal heart which beats beneath a soldier's uniform; we are debtors to these guardians of our freedom, whether highly placed or lowly born. Heavenly Father, mercifully be with these martyrs of liberty and with these prophets of brotherhood. Keep us true to our sacred trust and forbid that we should ever fail and Thine shall be the praise through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had—

*Ordered*, That the Secretary be directed to request the House to return to the Senate the bill (S. 12) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes,' as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. National Housing Agency.
6. The Alley Dwelling Authority.
7. United States Civil Service Commission.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WARD JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Long Beach West Telegram entitled "Business Fights for Life."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and place in the RECORD a memorial from the Iowa State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GILCHRIST addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech I recently made in Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some extracts from an address by Alfred H. Cosden, delivered at the Union League Club.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SHIPBUILDING IN RESPECT TO NAVAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, last fall the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], appointed a special committee to investigate shipbuilding as it pertains to naval construction. That committee was composed of myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]. We proceeded to the west coast and spent about a month on the job, interviewing scores of witnesses. We were ably assisted up and down the coast by other Representatives of Congress, and I see my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH], who was one of them, and we made an exhaustive study of the shipbuilding industry on the west coast. Yesterday we filed a report with the House Naval Affairs Committee, of which 500 copies are printed, and I hope that the Members of the House will get a copy of it and read that report, because it covers the subject well. It covers the matters of labor, of absenteeism, and relates just how we are progressing in our shipbuilding program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

MR. NELSON AND THE WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express the thankfulness that I have for Mr. Nelson's action of Wednesday. Thank God, somebody in this town has worked up the backbone to fire someone. The W. P. B. has at last established a clear line of authority, and if we do not meet our production schedules we and the country will know where to place the blame.

In my humble opinion Mr. Charles E. Wilson is the best thing that has happened to the W. P. B. since it was established. He makes decisions, production decisions, and makes them stick. He does not run to the White House over every little trifle and keep everybody in an uproar because he cannot or will not make up his mind. He is the kind of American production genius that we need in the W. P. B. If the other war corporations would follow the lead of General Electric and give us their finest production men instead of their sales managers, lawyers, or bankers, we would get the stuff we need to win a whole lot faster.

FOOD SITUATION ON WEST COAST

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the food situation throughout the country is acute, and Mayor Angelo J. Rossi, of San Francisco, has sent me the following telegram:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *February 18, 1943.*
Congressman TOM ROLPH,
*Washington, D. C.:*

The food situation in San Francisco for the general public is chaotic and discriminatory. It should be recognized that in the last year the population of San Francisco has increased by nearly 100,000 and other cities in the bay area in proportionate amounts. It must be recognized that the basic American diet is dairy products, eggs, meat, bread, potatoes, green vegetables, and fruit. Because of lack of rationing formulas, due to Federal official hesitation, much of these foods have disappeared from the local markets and are impossible to obtain even in limited quantities, and as time goes on they will become scarcer and the average citizen will not be able to obtain them. Have been advised that cities east of the Rockies are not suffering the food shortage that has been visited upon the Pacific coast. Whether this is due to rationing or larger allotments of food I do not know, but I do know that if some relief is not given at once the health of the people of San Francisco and surrounding communities will be impaired and the result will be detrimental to the general war effort. I therefore urge immediate correction of discrimination in food allotment and distribution to San

Francisco and bay area. San Francisco like her sister cities intends to dig to live with victory gardens, but victory gardens do not produce meat and other staple foods necessary for the health of their people. It is therefore imperative for you to present this chaotic food situation to the proper authorities, and if necessary to urge the adoption of legislation which will bring relief to the Pacific coast.

ANGELO J. ROSSI, *Mayor.*

OIL PIPE LINES

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I do this to bring to the attention of the House a condition which I do not believe Members know exists at this time. Last August, when we were considering the Florida barge canal bill, we passed as an amendment to that bill a provision for the construction of a pipe line from the Tinsley field in Mississippi to Charleston, S. C., and/or Savannah, Ga., to take care of the armed services. Since that time we have been unable to get any consideration from the Interior Department, under whose jurisdiction the construction of these lines comes. This bill passed the House without a dissenting vote and also passed the Senate. It was sent to the President and signed by him, and now the Secretary of the Interior says he does not think we need the line. Whose judgment is better, that of the Senate and the House of Representatives and of the President or one man in the Interior Department?

Let me give you some figures:

Seventy thousand barrels of oil a day, or 3,000 tank cars a day, will be released. One million and ninety-five thousand tank cars a year will be released from that field alone for the benefit of the frozen people of the east coast.

Who is going to run this Government, the bureaucrats or the Congress?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a certified copy of a resolution passed by the Missouri State Senate on February 16, 1943, calling to the attention of the Members of Congress the fact that there has been no war industry allotted to the northern half of Missouri by our Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therewith an address delivered by a former member of this body, Hon. John J. Dempsey, now Governor of New Mexico.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

APPLAUSE AND OTHER DEMONSTRATIONS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday Mme. Chiang Kai-shek spoke in both the House and the Senate. Unfortunately an order was issued by the Speaker some time ago forbidding the reporters to report demonstrations on the floor of the House, with the result that while this lady received one of the greatest demonstrations here ever given anyone in all the history of this country, and while the RECORD shows round after round of applause in the Senate and a standing demonstration at the close of her address, the RECORD would indicate that we sat here like a bunch of mummies. No applause, no demonstrations whatsoever were recorded.

I submit this is a question for the House, as to whether or not these demonstrations should be excluded. They have not been excluded in the Senate. They have never been excluded in the British House of Parliament. It is a question for the individual Member to strike out, if he desires to do so, whatever demonstrations are indicated by the transcripts of the official reporters when his speech is taken down.

If that policy had been followed—that time-honored policy that began with the Government and only ended something like a year ago—America would be reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today the speech by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek in her appeal for the Chinese people who are being brutally destroyed by the savage Japanese, showing the greatest demonstration she has ever received in her life, and one of the greatest ever given anyone in this House.

I am introducing a resolution to restore to the Congress the right to have those demonstrations recorded.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

JAPANESE IN THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on matters of a purely military nature I like to agree with the War Department officials when possible to do so. But the question of taking Japanese into the United States Army is not purely a military question, and I regret to say that I have my doubts about the wisdom of that action. Our experience with the Japanese during this war has been such as to create in the minds of many of us grave doubt that we should permit any of them to get into our armed services. That they can be of service to our country no one will question, but the people of that nation have shown themselves to be so depraved and so utterly lacking in the elements of human decency that I am not certain that we can trust them in our armed forces. When we place them in the Army they occupy a position where they can be of greatest harm to our Nation, and, incidentally, of greatest service to their own if they choose to pursue that course. It will be argued that since those taken into the Army are American-born Japanese, they do not share the same concept as the older and native-born Japanese. But I doubt that the perfidy, the treachery, and the complete lack of elementary human principles which have been instilled into a people for centuries can be removed with one generation. I think the risk is too great to take. The few thousand taken in could not hope to contribute a great deal to the effectiveness of our fighting forces, but a few dozen in that group might do irreparable harm. Mr. Speaker, I am not here condemning the War Department for its action in this matter, but I am so skeptical of the Japanese that I regret that the War Department has consented to take this step, and I hope, at least, that it will proceed with the greatest caution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received permission to insert in the RECORD a very able address by the Honorable Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The Government Printing Office informs me it would cover three pages instead of the two pages allowed and that the cost of those three pages altogether would be $135. I could cut this speech in two and put in a portion of it under the permission granted me on yesterday, but it is a very able address, and I would like to have the entire speech go in. So I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD as requested.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a recent address by Rabbi Charles E. Shulman, who is now chaplain in the service of the armed forces of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a petition with reference to rent control.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell me what the program will be for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot at this time; I will later in the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, I have heard many Members during my 8 years here come in on what is called an automatic roll-call vote and say afterward they misunderstood the question. Yesterday I did that for my first time.

I have voted each time for the extension of the Dies committee; I have voted each time for the appropriation, and when I came in the question was under discussion, and all the debate I heard was as to whether or not an item for some $600 for defending a lawsuit should be included in the appropriation. I think it should not have been; I would have voted to cut it out. But when I read the RECORD it was the whole appropriation of $75,000 on which I was recorded as voting "no," which, of course, is very inconsistent and unreasonable, for I am on record as voting to extend this committee. This explanation is the only way to correct it. I thought I was voting to eliminate the lawsuit item instead of voting against the appropriation. I just wanted this to go in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN WORKS

Mr. DELANEY, by direction of the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 123), which was read and referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 1692, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the Private Calendar will now be called.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

EMILIANO LOPEZ AND ELIZA R. LOPEZ

The Clerk called the first bill, H. R. 158, for the relief of Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill S. 493, a similar bill, for H. R. 158.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez, Santa Fe, N. Mex., the sum of $615.30. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the said Emiliano and Eliza R. Lopez for damages arising out of an accident in which Patricio Lopez, minor son of the said Emiliano and Eliza R. Lopez, suffered personal injuries when the truck which he was driving collided with a truck owned by the United States and used in connection with Indian Service operations in the Pueblo Nambe, Santa Fe County, N. Mex., on August 12, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 158) was laid on the table.

O. T. TRAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 170) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. T. Travis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. T. Travis, of Newport News, Va., for alleged damages sustained to the power boat *Dorothy Frances*, as the alleged result of striking on June 12, 1937, the improperly and insufficiently marked wreck (U. S. 232) in navigable waters on the west side of lower Chesapeake Bay, southeast of Back River (Va.) light.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIKE L. BLANK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 203) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Mike L. Blank.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT and Mr. CANFIELD objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

GROWERS FERTILIZER CO., A FLORIDA CORPORATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 204) for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT and Mr. CANFIELD objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 205) conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons who have claims for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment, respectively, upon claims of all persons who have claims for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., by the War Department, and from the overflow of salt waters resulting therefrom or caused thereby, or for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of said waterway by the War Department, which damages or losses, if any, it is alleged could have been prevented by the exercise of reasonable care and diligence on the part of the War Department or its agents.

SEC. 2. Suits upon such claims, respectively, may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations, and proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in cases which such court has jurisdiction under the Judicial Code, as amended.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act, the word "persons" shall be interpreted to mean any person or persons, individual or individuals, copartnership, firm, or corporation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOURS APARTMENT HOTEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 227) for the relief of the Tours Apartment Hotel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Tours Apartment Hotel, of Des Moines, Iowa, the sum of $699.25. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained on account of the erroneous issuance of United States Savings bonds of series C–1938 and D–1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful,

any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BLANCHE E. BROAD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 241) for the relief of Blanche E. Broad.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT and Mr. CANFIELD objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

GERTRUDE RICKETTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 249) for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gertrude Ricketts, of Holcombe, Wis., the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries received as a result of the explosion of a gasoline stove operated by a supervisor of a Works Progress Administration home economics class on May 19, 1937, in the town hall, Ruby Township, Chippewa County, Wis.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES H. DOUGHERTY, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 250) for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $135.62 to Charles H. Dougherty, Sr., of Ozone Park, Queens County, N. Y., being in full settlement of all claims against the United States by reason of extra labor above the legal day of 8 hours performed by Charles H. Dougherty, Sr., between the 8th day of March 1878 and the 20th day of September 1878, while employed at the Brooklyn Navy Yard: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANKLIN E. LUDWIG, MARY TAYLOR, AND FRANK A. TAYLOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 251) for the relief of Franklin E. Ludwig, Mary Taylor, and Frank A. Taylor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $350 to Franklin E. Ludwig, of Ozone Park, N. Y.; the sum of $135 to Mary Taylor, of Richmond Hill, N. Y.; and the sum of $50 to Frank A. Taylor, of Richmond Hill, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage suffered by them when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by an Army ambulance, bearing license No. W717, at the intersection of Liberty Avenue and One Hundred and Nineteenth Street, in Queens, N. Y., on the 8th day of February 1941, at 12:10 p. m.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE KENNEDY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 279) for the relief of George Kennedy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000, to George Kennedy, of Belvidere, Ill., in compensation for injuries sustained February 5, 1940, in the city of Monmouth, Ill., from fall down Monmouth (Ill.) Federal Building steps, caused by ice which was permitted to remain on the steps.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill change the period to a colon and insert the following: *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK T. BEEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 402) for the relief of Frank T. Been.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank T. Been the sum of $2,000 in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for the loss of his personal effects in the fire which destroyed the superintendent's residence in Mount McKinley National Park on October 23, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDITH M. POWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 478) for the relief of Edith M. Powell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edith M. Powell the sum of $5,000 in full compensation and settlement for all claims and demands of Edith M. Powell growing out of, or arising from, injuries suffered in an accident on Government property near Newport in Lincoln County, Oreg., on or about August 2, 1926: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRENE DIAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 517) for the relief of Irene Dial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Irene Dial, of Austin, Minn., the sum of $12,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her on the night of August 8, 1939, as the result of falling into a sewer ditch which had been dug by employees of the Work Projects Administration, in Austin, Minn.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$12,000" and insert "$3,000."

Page 1, line 11, change after the word "Minnesota" the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN P. VON ROSENBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 533) for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John P. von Rosenberg, of Chicago, Ill., the sum of $8,972.64 in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries and expenses incident thereto and on account of death of his wife, Elsie C. von Rosenberg, and expenses incident thereto, as a result of a collision involving a vehicle of the Bureau of Internal Revenue at the intersection of Willow Street and Baker Street in the city of Lake Geneva, Wis., on June 3, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. J. BLEXRUD ESTATE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 546) for the relief of H. J. Blexrud estate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. PRIEST, MOTT, GRANT of Indiana, and CANFIELD objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

SHUMATE INVESTMENT CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 605) for the relief of Shumate Investment Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriate, to Shumate Investment Co., of San Francisco, Calif., the sum of $21,691.61, in full settlement of all claims of the said Shumate Investment Co. against the United States for property damage sustained on October 1, 1941, when a United States Army training plane crashed into certain buildings located on the Troy farm near Sunnyvale, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$21,691.61" and insert "$18,768.11."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN CARDILLO AND PHILIP CARDILLO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 769, for the relief of John Cardillo and Philip Cardillo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to John Cardillo, a minor, of New York, N. Y., or to his guardian, the sum of $23,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States as compensation for personal injuries sustained by the said John Cardillo when he was struck by a United States mail truck in New York City on May 6, 1939; and (2) to Philip Cardillo, the father of the said John Cardillo, the sum of $2,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for damages and for compensation for hospital and medical expenses incurred by him on account of the injuries so sustained by the said John Cardillo: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", insert "the legal guardian of."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "or to his guardian."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$23,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$4,500."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "his" and insert in lieu thereof "all."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "as compensation."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "$2,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "his" and insert in lieu thereof "all."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "for damages and for compensation."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT L. DEMUTH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 845, granting jurisdiction to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit to reopen and readjudicate the case of Robert L. Demuth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. MOTT, CANFIELD, and PRIEST objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

HOWARD E. DICKISON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 940, for the relief of Howard E. Dickison.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Howard E. Dickison, Cass Lake, Minn., the sum of $2,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained by the said Howard E. Dickison on account of the death of Ronald Dean Dickison, his minor son, as the result of an accident on January 15, 1938, near Cass Lake, Minn., involving a motor vehicle in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MYRTLE C. RADABAUGH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 946, for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh.

The SPEAKER pro tempore Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CANFIELD and Mr. GRANT of Indiana objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MR. AND MRS. SEBASTIAN EGER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 976, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Sebastian Eger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Sebastian Eger, of McKeesport, Pa., the sum of $2,000 and to Sebastian Eger, of McKeesport, Pa., the sum of $612.85, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained when the car in which they were riding was struck by a United States Army ambulance on February 27, 1940, near Clarksburg, Md.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE OF OREGON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1047, for the relief of the State of Oregon, Department of Forestry of the State of Oregon, and certain organized protection agencies in the State of Oregon for protection of unappropriated public-forest lands intermingled with Oregon and California lands from July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,852.54 for reimbursement of the following-named organized protection agencies in the State of Oregon for protection of unappropriated public-forest lands intermingled with Oregon and California lands from July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939: The State of Oregon, Department of Forestry of the State of Oregon, Clackamas-Marion Counties Forest Protective Association, Coos County Forest Protective Association, Douglas County Forest Protective Association, Eastern Lane County Forest Protective Association, Klamath Forest Protective Association, Linn County Forest Protective Association, Polk County Forest Protective Association, Southwest Oregon State Unit, and Western Lane Forest Protective Association.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTINE LUND

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1048, for the relief of Christine Lund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN and Mr. CLEVENGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

H. HERFURTH, JR., INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1094, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. Herfurth, Jr., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. Herfurth, Jr., Inc., for reimbursement for the alleged loss of salvage material and additional costs incurred by such company as a subcontractor in the performance of a contract with the Department of the Treasury for the construction of the agriculture extensible building, dated May 16, 1932 (contract No. T1sa–3167). The general contractor in such contract has assigned all claims against the United States on account of such loss and costs to the said H. Herfurth, Jr., Inc. Such suit shall be brought within 1 year from the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE J. PEREZ

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1099, for the relief of Jose J. Perez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jose J. Perez, of San Elizario, Tex., the sum of $1,660, being the amount paid by him to the United States Government for a tract of land which is useless to him due to the fact that the International Boundary Commission, American section, has failed to provide the means of furnishing water to this land for irrigation purposes and states its inability to provide such water.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, after "him", strike out the remainder of line 8 and all of lines 9, 10, and 11, and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JAMES A. HENDERSON, DECEASED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1100, for the relief of the estate of James A. Henderson, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,500 to the estate of James A. Henderson, deceased, formerly of Fairmount, Ga., in full settlement of all claims against the Government on account of injuries sustained by the said James A. Henderson on June 10, 1931, while riding in a truck on a Government road in Cherokee National Forest because of negligent construction and maintenance of said road, on account of which injuries the said James A. Henderson died: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNICE JAMES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1128, for the relief of Bernice James.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bernice James, of Birdsong, Ark., the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages arising out of the death of her husband, Golie James, from injuries sustained when the car in which he was riding, driven by an employee of the United States Secret Service, collided with a truck on May 25, 1933, near Marion, Ark.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLA FOWLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1131, for the relief of the estate of Ola Fowler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Ola Fowler, late of Fairfield, Ill., the sum of $5,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Ola Fowler, as the result of an acci-

dent on July 29, 1941, at Arkadelphia, Ark., resulting from a collision between the automobile in which she was riding and an automobile belonging to the Civil Aeronautics Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NANNIE MAY BLYTHE AND CLAUDIA BLYTHE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1142) for the relief of Nannie May Blythe and Claudia Blythe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Nannie May Blythe and Claudia Blythe, jointly, both of Natchez, Miss., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of their 17-year-old brother, Earl Alexander Blythe, who was killed on October 23, 1913, while on duty as a special-delivery messenger for the post office in Natchez, Miss.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANFIELD: Page 1, line 7, after the word "of" where it first appears in the line, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. E. COTTON CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1162) for the relief of R. E. Cotton Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow and pay, from any moneys not otherwise appropriated, the claim of R. E. Cotton Co., for the amount of a judgment awarded by the Court of Claims in the case of "Valley Construction Co. to the use of R. E. Cotton Co.," No. 44669, in the amount of $5,360, the amount appropriated to satisfy such judgment having been covered into the Treasury, as in partial satisfaction of a debt owed the United States by Valley Construction Co. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for refund of liquidated damages assessed against and deducted from moneys due R. E. Cotton Co., Valley Construction Co. having no claim or interest in such moneys, under contract for the construction of certain levees in the Mississippi Valley.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after the enacting clause, strike out the remainder of the bill. Insert in lieu thereof: "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to R. E. Cotton Co., of Milledgeville, Ga., the sum of $5,360 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for refund of liquidated damages assessed against and deducted from money due R. E. Cotton Co., for the construction of certain levees in the Mississippi Valley: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATES OF ROBERT C. MEALS, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1270) for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals, and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following persons the amounts indicated:

(1) The administratrix of the estate of Robert C. Meals, of Shiremanstown, Pa., $15,992.50, for distribution as part of the personal estate of the said Robert C. Meals;

(2) The administratrix of the estate of Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, of Shiremanstown, Pa., $5,684.50, for distribution as part of the personal estate of the said Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret;

(3) Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, of Shiremanstown, Pa., $3,496.94;

(4) The guardian of Donald Meals, a minor, of Shiremanstown, Pa., $2,616.50; and

(5) The guardian of Betty Wrightstone, a minor, of Shiremanstown, Pa., $4,043.50.

The payment of such amounts shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of a collision on November 25, 1939, on Trindle Road, near Carlisle, Pa., between an automobile driven by the late Robert C. Meals and a United States Army truck operated by a unit of the Pennsylvania National Guard. Such collision resulted in the death of the said Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, in personal injuries to the said Mrs. Margaret Meals, Donald Meals, and Betty Wrightstone, and in damage to personal property.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", strike out the bill through line 9, page 2; insert in lieu thereof: "to the estate of Robert C. Meals, the sum of $5,742; to the estate of Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, the sum of $4,000; to the legal guardian of Donald Meals, the sum of $2,616.50; to Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, the sum of $2,996.94; to the legal guardian of Betty Wrightstone, the sum of $4,043.50."

At the end of the bill add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIMON M. MYHRE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1273) for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. Kyle Anderson, Waupaca, Wis., as attorney for and for the use of, the following-named persons, heirs of the late Simon M. Myhre, the sum of $1,080: Mahna Braastad, Ole G. Lindvik, Karoline M. Braastad, Halvor G. Lindvik, Haakon Braastad, Anna L. Braastad, Else Braastad, Olava Mathilde G. Lindvik, Anna Elisa G. Bue, and Ludvik K. Braastad, all of Norway, and Eliza Myhre, Osborn Stamstad, Ole Myhre, Emma Myhre, Mathilda Stamstad, Freeman Myhre, Helen Bergen, and Milo Myhre, all of Waupaca County, Wis. Such sum represents the expenses incurred by the aforesaid persons in defending themselves against a deficiency assessment erroneously assessed against them by the Collector of Internal Revenue by reason of the alleged failure of their ancestor, the said Simon M. Myhre, to file a Federal income-tax return for the year 1921. Such return had in fact been filed and reposed in the office of the Collector of Internal Revenue in Milwaukee: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEE WATTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1279) for the relief of Lee Watts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,115.50 to Lee Watts, of Irvindale, Calif., in full settlement of all claims

against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him as a result of a collision between the automobile in which he was riding, and a United States Army truck, license number U. S. A. 2015216, said collision occurring on July 29, 1941, on Highway 99, immediately south of Tulare, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "Irvindale" and insert "Irwindale."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. W. V. JUSTICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1319) for the relief of Mrs. W. V. Justice.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. W. V. Justice, of Jackson, Miss., the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries received by her on September 6, 1940, when the car which she was driving collided with a United States mail truck, at Jackson, Miss.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CLARA E. FREEMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1423) for the relief of Clara E. Freeman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clara E. Freeman, the sum of $30,000 for damages sustained while in the employ of Ernest P. Leavitt, superintendent of the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., in the capacity of nurse, from an explosion of liquefied petroleum gas, which demolished the home of the superintendent which he was renting from the National Park Service. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of damages sustained.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, after the name "Freeman", insert a comma and add "of Tehama County, Calif."

Line 6, strike out the figures "$30,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

Line 9, after the word "gas", insert "on February 5, 1937."

Line 11, after the word "Service", strike out the remainder of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNEST P. LEAVITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1424) for the relief of Ernest P. Leavitt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ernest P. Leavitt, the sum of $7,401.84, for damages sustained while in the employ of the United States Government, as superintendent of the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., from an explosion of liquefied petroleum gas, which demolished the home of the superintendent which he was renting from the National Park Service. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of damages sustained.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, starting with the figures "7,401.84", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof "$4,910 in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of property damages and expenses incident thereto and on account of the death of his wife, and expenses incident thereto, resulting from an explosion of liquefied petroleum gas, which demolished the home in which he lived as superintendent of the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., on February 5, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. F. A. N. YEAGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1426) for the relief of Mrs. F. A. N. Yeager.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. F. A. N. Yeager, widow of F. A. N. Yeager, Boydell, Ark., the sum of $4,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of her husband, F. A. N. Yeager, on December 20, 1935, while acting and being assistant postmaster at Boydell, Ashley County, Ark., and while in lawful charge, control, and custody of the mail, money, and other property of the United States at Boydell, Ark., by two persons robbing him of said property, and murdering him in the perpetration of said robbery, while he was defending said property of the United States, and in the performance of his duties; the two robbers later being apprehended, convicted and one of them electrocuted: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "and in the performance of his duties; the two robbers later being apprehended, convicted, and one of them electrocuted."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL W. MANKIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1428, for the relief of Paul W. Mankin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul W. Mankin, of Knoxville, Tenn., the sum of $379.55, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages sustained by him as a result of his Dodge four-door automobile being run into and wrecked by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck, No. 82862, on the 26th day of July 1940, on the public highway between Knoxville, Tenn., and Sunshine, Tenn., said Civilian Conservation Corps truck at the time of said collision being operated by a member of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person

violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. H. ATKINS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1464, for the relief of J. H. Atkins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. H. Atkins, of the city of Tazewell, Tenn., the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States, for personal injuries sustained by him on May 21, 1934, near Lone Mountain, Tenn., when a Civilian Conservation Corps truck from Tennessee Valley Authority Camp No. 25 caused the horse which he was riding to fall, throwing said J. H. Atkins off and breaking his leg: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. SAMUEL AZER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1468, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Azer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Azer, of Nesquehoning, Carbon County, Pa., the sum of $1,445, which sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for damage to property of said Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Azer as the result of the blasting operations on a Works Progress Administration project: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$1,445" and insert "$750."

Page 1, line 10, after the word "project", insert the words "on May 19, 1939."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.



DONNA PITTEL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 535, for the relief of Donna Pittel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Donna Pittel, the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the said Donna Pittel, on account of personal injuries sustained by the said Donna Pittel when she was struck and injured by a United States mail truck on June 23, 1941, at Chicago, Ill., which mail truck was operated by an employee of the United States Post Office Department in connection with his employment by the Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", insert "the legal guardian of."

Page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", strike out "$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be", insert in lieu thereof "$7,500."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "by."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "the said Donna Pittel, on account of", insert in lieu thereof "for."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "and injured."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Donna Pittel."

PETER CUCCIO ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 575, for the relief of Peter Cuccio, and Jasper and Pauline Cuccio (minors).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Peter Cuccio, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $1,404.50, in full settlement of all claims for personal injuries and expenses, and the further sum of $10,000 to said Peter Cuccio, father of Jasper and Pauline Cuccio (minors), in full settlement of all claims against the United States by reason of the deaths of said Jasper and Pauline Cuccio (minors) growing out of the crash of a United States military airplane at Jerusalem and Florence Avenues, Hempstead, Long Island, N. Y., on September 2, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the name "Cuccio", insert "and Violet Cuccio."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$1,404.50", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$6,954.50."

Page 1, beginning with line 7, strike out the bill through line 3, page 2, insert in lieu thereof "against the United States as compensation for the death of Pauline Cuccio and Jasper Cuccio, minor children, and for loss of time and funeral expenses incident thereto, as a result of the crashing of a United States Army plane at Jerusalem and Florence Avenues, Hempstead, Long Island, N. Y., on September 2, 1941."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Violet Cuccio."

THELMA CANNON McGROARY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 598, for the relief of Thelma Cannon McGroary.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim of Thelma Cannon McGroary for disability due to tuberculosis alleged to have been contracted by her while she was employed as a nurse at Gallinger Municipal Hospital, Washington, D. C., in 1934, to determine said claim upon its merits under the provisions of said act, and to award benefits from the date of the original disability if said claim be approved: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be made within 90 days from the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELIZA WARD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 637, for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Eliza Ward, of Macon, Ga., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the said Mrs. Eliza Ward for damages arising out of an accident in which George W. Ward, husband of the said Mrs. Eliza Ward, was killed when the horse which he was riding was struck by a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 80, near Tobesofkee Creek, Ga., on July 9, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating

the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "of", strike out the balance of line 6, all of lines 7, 8, 9, and the word "Ward", in line 10, and insert "$5,245, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for the death of her husband, George W. Ward, who."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EL PASO ELECTRIC CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1098, for the relief of El Paso Electric Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to El Paso Electric Co., of El Paso, Tex., the sum of $160, in full settlement of the claim of this company for funds advanced on account of immigration head tax, which sum was refunded to aliens by this company upon their leaving the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and insert *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORDIE UNDERWOOD AND WILBUR KEA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1153, for the relief of Cordie Underwood and Wilbur Kea.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cordie Underwood, of Soperton, Ga., the sum of $925.50 and to Wilbur Kea, of Soperton, Ga., the sum of $769.50, in full satisfaction of all claims of said Cordie Underwood and Wilbur Kea against the United States for damages for personal injuries and in payment for treatment therefor, said injuries having been sustained by them when their automobile was struck by War Department vehicle No. W-418102, driven by Pvt. Ralph Dewalt, of the Coast Artillery, United States Army, in line of duty, at Soperton, Ga., on September 26, 1941.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$925.50", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$500."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "$769.50", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$500."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "claims" strike out "of said Cordie Underwood and Wilbur Kea against the United States for damages for personal injuries and in payment for treatment therefor, said injuries having been sustained by them when their automobile", and insert in lieu thereof the words "against the United States for personal injuries sustained when the automobile in which they were riding."

At the end of bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAYMOND W. BALDWIN AND MATTIE BALDWIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1276, for the relief of Raymond W. Baldwin and Mattie Baldwin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,887.75 to Raymond W. Baldwin and Mattie Baldwin, of Houston, Tex., for property damage as a result of a United States Army plane crashing into their home at 2224 Riverside Drive, Houston, Tex., on July 30, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following amendment:

Page 1, line 7 after the word "Texas", strike out the balance of line 7, all of lines 8 and 9, and insert "and to pay to Clement B. Baldwin, of Houston, Tex., the sum of $5,707.45 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage and the death of Ida Beatrice W. Baldwin, wife of Clement B. Baldwin, as a result of a United States Army plane crashing into their home at 2224 Riverside Drive, Houston, Tex., on July 30, 1942:

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Raymond W. Baldwin, Mattie Baldwin, and Clement B. Baldwin."

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1538, to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as a result of the disaster at the East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar bill, S. 306, be substituted for the bill H. R. 1538.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,203.84, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expeditions' Antarctic base on Neny Fjord, Marguerite Bay, Palmer Peninsula, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 1538, was laid on the table.

MASTER GUNNERY SGT. EUGENE M. MARTIN, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1539, for the relief of Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 305) for the relief of Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps, be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps, the sum of $1,796.60, which sum represents the value of personal property lost as a result of a fire which occurred in public quarters No. 143, United States Marine Barracks, Parris Island, S. C., on September 21, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 1539) were laid on the table.

CAPT. RICHARD ROTHWELL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1540, for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 304) for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps, be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $53 to reimburse Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as a result of the flooding of public quarters No. 425, Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., during the absence of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider and a similar House bill, H. R. 1540, were laid on the table.

ESTATE OF DR. DAVID O. CLEMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1582) for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the administrator of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased, formerly of Gloucester County, Va., the sum of $7,216 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for the value of a wharf located on the York River, approximately 3 miles from Gloucester Point, Va., built and owned by Dr. David O. Clements and destroyed in January 1918 by ice broken by United States Navy ice-breaking tugs in clearing the York River, used at that time as the base for the Atlantic Fleet: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CUBAN-AMERICAN SUGAR CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1587) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of The Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim, together with interest thereon, of The Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States for a refund of taxes erroneously and illegally assessed and collected as excess-profits taxes for the period from January 1, 1917, to September 30, 1917. That for the purpose of arriving at the correct determination of the tax for this period the Court of Claims is to apply the method of computation under sections 201 and 203 of the Revenue Act of 1917, based upon the invested capital of the corporation amounting to $39,848,530.85, which was the invested capital of The Cuban-American Sugar Co. according to the decisions of the Board of Tax Appeals, all dated December 16, 1932, which decisions were based upon the stipulation entered into between The Cuban-American Sugar Co. and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, whereby it was agreed that the sum of $39,848,530.85 was the invested capital of The Cuban-American Sugar Co. for the calendar year 1917.

SEC. 2. In the proceedings upon such claims before the Court of Claims the United States shall not avail itself of the defense that the General Counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue acted without legal authority in making such stipulation of settlement.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time, laches, the form or any content or the time of filing of claims for the refund and alleged amendments thereto, heretofore filed or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and appeals from the payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE S. WOLBERT, RECEIVER, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1598) for the relief of George S. Wolbert, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT, Mr. PRIEST, and Mr. CANFIELD objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

BARBARA HEALY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 579) for the relief of Barbara Healy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Barbara Healy, Lowell, Mass., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages on account of personal injuries received by the said Barbara Healy, on June 15, 1937, in Lowell, Mass., when she was struck by a baseball bat which slipped from the hands of a player in a baseball game arranged for by a Works Progress Administration recreational project.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, after the word "to", insert "James B. Healy as legal guardian of", and after the name "Barbara Healy" insert "a minor of."

Line 6, strike out the figures "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$3,000."

Line 9, after the name "Healy", insert a comma and "his daughter."

At the end of bill, add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERTINE NAST ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1459) for the relief of Alvertine Nast and Wayne Nast, minor son.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alvertine Nast and Wayne Nast, minor son, both of Belleville, Ill., the sum of $46, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation on account of personal injuries and expenses thereto as a result of a collision involving a Government truck operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, in Giant City State Park, near Makenda, Ill., on July 4, 1936: *Provided*, That no part of the amount allocated in this act in excess of 10 percent shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount allocated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Alvertine", insert in lieu thereof "Albertine."

Page 1, line 5, strike out "and Wayne Nast, minor son, both."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "compensation on account of personal injuries and expenses thereto", and insert in lieu thereof "medical expenses incurred by Mrs. Albertine Nast and Wayne Nast."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Albertine Nast."

HOWARD M. SANDUS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1584) for the relief of Howard M. Sandus.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill (S. 418) for the relief of Howard M. Sandus, a similar Senate bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,700 to Howard M. Sandus, of Waukegan, Ill., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for hospital and medical expenses incurred, and for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as a result of the motor vehicle in which he was riding as a passenger being struck by a United States Army truck, at the intersection of United States Highway No. 41 and Illinois State Highway No. 22, on April 16, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider, and a similar House bill (H. R. 1548) were laid on the table.

MOUNT VERNON, ALEXANDRIA & WASHINGTON RAILWAY CO., A CORPORATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1667) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria, and Washington Railway Co., a corporation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria, and Washington Railway Co., a corporation, and to award said corporation compensation for losses or damages, consequential, incidental, or otherwise, if any, which such corporation may have suffered by reason of the acts of the Secretary of the Treasury and/or other agency of the United States, done in pursuance of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), and the act of January 13, 1928 (ch. 9, 45 Stat. 51, 52), or otherwise, in compelling the abandonment and removal of its terminals, tracks, and structures, within the area between Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues, and between Sixth Street and Fifteenth Street NW., and elsewhere in the District of Columbia, and in destroying, rendering useless, and valueless its franchise, rights-of-way, and/or other easements, its terminals, tracks, and structures, its going business and/or goodwill, and other property rights, if any, regardless of whether or not there was a taking by the United States of the said franchise, rights-of-way, and/or other easements, tracks, structures, terminals, going business, and goodwill and other property rights, and/or whether or not any act of the Secretary of the Treasury or other agency of the United States was unlawful or tortious, and to enter a decree or judgment against the United States for such compensation with interest thereon.

SEC. 2. Suit for such claim may be instituted at any time within 4 months after the approval of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time, any statute of limitations, or that the same may be a tort action, and such proceedings hereunder shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended. Either party may at any time within 6 months after the entry of the judgment by the Court of Claims appeal therefrom as of right to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVA C. NETZLEY ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1685) for the relief of Eva C. Netzley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eva C. Netzley, of Naperville, Ill., the sum of $1,000; to the administrator of the estate of Clyde C. Netzley, deceased, late of Naperville, Ill., the sum of $5,000; to William G. Stuff, of Mercersburg, Pa., the sum of $1,000; to William G. Stuff, as administrator of the estate of Sarah C. Stuff, deceased, late of Mercersburg, Pa., the sum of $2,000; to Lois Stuff, nee Greenawalt, of Mercersburg, Pa., the sum of $3,500; and to Harry E. Ridley, of Naperville, Ill., the sum of $168.85; in all $12,668.85, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, death, and property damage sustained in a collision with a National Park Service truck, operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, on August 24, 1935, at the intersection of Thirty-first Street with Illinois State Highway No. 54, near Hinsdale, Du Page County, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES T. DULIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 761) for the relief of Charles T. Dulin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to allow credits in the accounts of the proper disbursing officers of the War Department and Post Office Department in the sums of $186 and $96.44, respectively, being amounts paid to Charles T. Dulin for clerical services rendered by Charles T. Dulin in the War Department from July 18, 1918, to September 30, 1918, and in the Post Office Department from April 8, 1919, to May 8, 1919, inclusive, notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of May 10, 1916, as amended by the act of August 29, 1916, relating to dual compensation, said Charles T. Dulin having been carried during said employments on the pay roll of the House of Representatives as a transcriber in the office of the official reporters of debates, at the basic rate of compensation of $1,200 per annum plus an additional so-called wartime bonus of $120.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. F. MATHIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 218, for the relief of H. F. Mathis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to H. F. Mathis, Bardstown, Ky., the sum of $3,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States Government for damages done his Galion 10-ton chief roller by an Army plane at Fort Knox, Ky.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "Kentucky", insert "on August 1, 1941."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK AND PAULINA RUBLEIN AND MRS. ETHEL BOWERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1639, for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublein and Mrs. Ethel Bowers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Rublein and Paulina Rublein, father and mother of Ernest J. Rublein, deceased, the sum of $5,000, and to Mrs. Ethel Bowers, mother of Richard Bowers, deceased, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for damages for fatal injuries suffered by their sons on the 15th of August 1934, on Route No. 28, about 3½ miles east of Newberry, Mich., when the automobile in which Ernest Rublein and Richard Bowers were riding was struck by a motortruck owned by the United States and driven by Richard Hobson, an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps Camp No. 1688, located at Newberry, Mich.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAX GEISSLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1736, for the relief of Max Geissler.

Messrs. CANFIELD and MOTT objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

CHARLES F. KEGEL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1757, for the relief of Charles F. Kegel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, S. 167, for the relief of Charles F. Kegel, be substituted for H. R. 1757 now being considered by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $450 to Charles F. Kegel, of Turner, Mont., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the loss of his truck, such truck having been destroyed on December 5, 1936, by a fire which burned a garage at Turner, Mont., in which it was stored for the purpose of safeguarding its load, consisting of property used in connection with Resettlement Administration projects: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 1757, was laid on the table.

AUGUST SVELUND

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1771, for the relief of August Svelund.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to August Svelund, of Puyallup, Wash., the sum of $2,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred resulting from a collision on or about the 15th day of January 1932, in which the car being driven by August Svelund collided with a United States Army truck in Tacoma, Wash.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM WRIGLEY, JR., CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1785, for the relief of the William Wrigley, Jr., Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $106,662.77 to the William Wrigley, Jr., Co., as equitable reimbursement and in full and final settlement and satisfaction of the damages and losses incurred and suffered by it, and for which it has not yet been reimbursed, in moving its equipment from the space in the Bush Terminal Buildings to its new location, and in otherwise complying with United States Navy Commandeer Order No. N-3255, dated June 18, 1918: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAIRBANKS, MORSE & CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1786, for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,058.28 to Fairbanks, Morse & Co., as equitable reimbusement and in full and final settlement and satisfaction of the damages and losses incurred and suffered by it, and for which it has not yet been reimbursed, in complying with the United States Navy Commandeer Order No. N-3255, dated June 18, 1918: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. S. HOWARD CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1787, for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $57,216.54 to the R. S. Howard Co., as equitable reimbursement and in full and final settlement and satisfaction of the damages and losses incurred and suffered by it, and for which it has not yet been reimbursed, in moving its equipment from the space in the Bush Terminal Buildings to its new location, and in otherwise complying with United States Navy Commandeering Order No. N-3255, dated June 18, 1918: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOANS FOR MINERAL DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES BY FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Senate:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
*February 18, 1943.*

*Ordered*, That the Secretary be directed to request the House to return to the Senate the bill (S. 12) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes,' as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war."

Attest:

EDWIN A. HALSEY,
*Secretary.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

CONSOLIDATIONS AND MERGERS OF DOMESTIC TELEGRAPH CARRIERS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 158)

to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of Title II the following new section:

"'CONSOLIDATIONS AND MERGERS OF TELEGRAPH CARRIERS

"'SEC. 222. (a) As used in this section—

"'(1) The term "consolidation or merger" includes the legal consolidation or merger of two or more corporations, and the acquisition by a corporation through purchase, lease, or in any other manner, of the whole or any part of the property, securities, facilities, services, or business of any other corporation or corporations, or of the control thereof, in exchange for its own securities, or otherwise.

"'(2) The term "domestic telegraph carrier" means any common carrier by wire or radio, the major portion of whose traffic and revenues is derived from domestic telegraph operations; and such term includes a corporation owning or controlling any such common carrier.

"'(3) The term "international telegraph carrier" means any common carrier by wire or radio, the major portion of whose traffic and revenues is derived from international telegraph operations; and such term includes a corporation owning or controlling any such common carrier.

"'(4) The term "consolidated or merged carrier" means any carrier by wire or radio which acquires or operates the properties and facilities unified and integrated by consolidation or merger.

"'(5) The term "domestic telegraph operations" includes acceptance, transmission, reception, and delivery of record communications by wire or radio which either originate or terminate at points within the continental United States, Alaska, Canada, Saint Pierre-Miquelon, Mexico, or Newfoundland and terminate or originate at points within the continental United States, Alaska, Canada, Saint Pierre-Miquelon, Mexico, or Newfoundland, and includes acceptance, transmission, reception, or delivery performed within the continental United States between points of origin within and points of exit from, and between points of entry into and points of destination within, the continental United States with respect to record communications by wire or radio which either originate or terminate outside the continental United States, Alaska, Canada, Saint Pierre-Miquelon, Mexico, and Newfoundland, and also includes the transmission within the continental United States of messages which both originate and terminate outside but transit through the continental United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall prevent international telegraph carriers from accepting and delivering international telegraph messages in the cities which constitute gateways approved by the Commission as points of entrance into or exit from the continental United States, under regulations prescribed by the Commission, and the incidental transmission or reception of the same over its own or leased lines or circuits within the continental United States.

"'(6) The term "international telegraph operations" includes acceptance, transmission, reception, and delivery of record communications by wire or radio which either originate or terminate at points outside the continental United States, Alaska, Canada, Saint Pierre-Miquelon, Mexico, and Newfoundland, but does not include acceptance, transmission, reception, and delivery performed within the continental United States between points of origin within and points of exit from, and between points of entry into, and points of destination within, the continental United States with respect to such communications, or the transmission within the continental United States of messages which both originate and terminate outside but transit through the continental United States.

"'(7) The terms "domestic telegraph properties" and "domestic telegraph facilities" mean properties and facilities, respectively, used or to be used in domestic telegraph operations.

"'(8) The term "employee" or "employees" (i) shall include any individual who is absent from active service because of furlough, illness, or leave of absence, except that there shall be no obligation upon the consolidated or merged carrier to reemploy any employee who is absent because of furlough, except in accordance with the terms of his furlough, and (ii) shall not include any employee of any carrier which is a party to a consolidation or merger pursuant to this section to the extent that he is employed in any business which such carrier continues to operate independently of the consolidation or merger.

"'(9) The term "representative" includes any individual or labor organization.

"'(10) The term "continental United States" means the several States and the District of Columbia.

"'(b) (1) It shall be lawful, upon application to and approval by the Commission as hereinafter provided, for any two or more domestic telegraph carriers to effect a consolidation or merger; and for any domestic telegraph carrier, as a part of any such consolidation or merger or thereafter, to acquire all or any part of the domestic telegraph properties, domestic telegraph facilities, or domestic telegraph operations of any carrier which is not primarily a telegraph carrier: *Provided*, That, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, no domestic telegraph carrier shall effect a consolidation or merger with any international telegraph carrier, and no international telegraph carrier shall effect a consolidation or merger with any domestic telegraph carrier.

"'(2) As a part of any such consolidation or merger, or thereafter upon application to and approval by the Commission as hereinafter provided, the consolidated or merged carrier may acquire all or any part of the domestic telegraph properties, domestic telegraph facilities, or domestic telegraph operations of any international telegraph carrier.

"'(c) (1) Whenever any consolidation or merger is proposed under subsection (b) of this section, the telegraph carrier or telegraph carriers seeking authority therefor shall submit an application to the Commission, and thereupon the Commission shall order a public hearing to be held with respect to such application and shall give reasonable notice thereof, in writing, and an opportunity to be heard, to the Governor of each of the States in which any of the physical property involved in such proposed consolidation or merger is situated, to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, representatives of employees where represented by bargaining representatives known to the Commission, and to such other persons as the Commission may deem advisable. If, after such public hearing, the Commission finds that the proposed consolidation or merger, or an amended proposal for consolidation or merger, (1) is authorized by subsection (a) of this section, (2) conforms to all other applicable provisions of this section, (3) is in the public interest, the Commission shall enter an order approving and authorizing such consolidation or merger, and thereupon any law or laws making consolidations and mergers unlawful shall not apply to the proposed consolidation or merger. In finding whether any proposed consolidation or merger is in the public interest, the Commission shall give due consideration, among other things, to the financial soundness of the carrier resulting from such consolidation or merger.

"'(2) Any proposed consolidation or merger of domestic telegraph carriers shall provide for the divestment of the international telegraph operations theretofore carried on by any party to the consolidation or merger, within a reasonable time to be fixed by the Commission, after the consideration for the property to be divested is found by the Commission to be commensurate with its value, and as soon as the legal obligations, if any, of the carrier to be so divested will permit. The Commission shall require at the time of the approval of such consolidation or merger that any such party exercise due diligence in bringing about such divestment as promptly as it reasonably can.

"'(d) No proposed consolidation or merger of telegraph carriers pursuant to this section shall be approved by the Commission if, as a result of such consolidation or merger, more than one-fifth of the capital stock of any carrier which is subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission will be owned or controlled, or voted, directly or indirectly, (1) by any alien or the representative of any alien, (2) by any foreign government or the representative thereof, (3) by any corporation organized under the laws of any foreign government, or (4) by any corporation of which any officer or director is an alien, or of which more than one-fifth of the capital stock is owned or controlled, or voted, directly or indirectly, by any alien or the representative of any alien, by any foreign government or the representative thereof, or by any corporation organized under the laws of a foreign government.

"'(e) (1) In the case of any consolidation or merger of telegraph carriers pursuant to this section, the consolidated or merged carrier shall, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, distribute among the international telegraph carriers, telegraph traffic by wire or radio destined to points without the continental United States, and divide the charges for such traffic, in accordance with such just, reasonable, and equitable formula in the public interest as the interested carriers shall agree upon and the Commission shall approve: *Provided, however*, That in case the interested carriers should fail to agree upon a formula which the Commission approves as above provided, the Commission, after due notice and hearing, shall prescribe in its order approving and authorizing the proposed consolidation or merger a formula which it finds will be just, reasonable, equitable, and in the public interest, will be, so far as is consistent with the public interest, in accordance with the existing contractual rights of the carriers, and will effectuate the purposes of this subsection.

"'(2) In the case of any consolidation or merger pursuant to this section of telegraph carriers which, immediately prior to such consolidation or merger, interchanged traffic with telegraph carriers in a contiguous foreign country, the consolidated or merged carrier shall distribute among such foreign telegraph carriers, telegraph traffic by wire or radio destined to points in such contiguous foreign country and shall divide the charges therefor, in accordance with such just, reasonable, and equitable formula in the public interest as the interested carriers shall agree upon and the Commission shall approve: *Provided, however*, That in case the interested carriers should fail to agree upon a formula which the Commission approves as above provided, the Commission, after due

notice and hearing, shall prescribe in its order approving and authorizing the proposed consolidation or merger a formula which it finds will be just, reasonable, equitable, and in the public interest, will be, so far as is consistent with the public interest, in accordance with the existing contractual rights of the carriers, and will effectuate the purposes of this subsection. As used in this paragraph, the term "contiguous foreign country" means Canada, Mexico, or Newfoundland.

"'(3) Whenever, upon a complaint or upon its own initiative, and after a full hearing, the Commission finds that any such distribution of telegraph traffic among telegraph carriers, or any such division of charges for such traffic, which is being made or which is proposed to be made, is or will be unjust, unreasonable, or inequitable, or not in the public interest, the Commission shall by order prescribe the distribution of such telegraph traffic, or the division of charges therefor, which will be just, reasonable, equitable, and in the public interest, and will be, so far as is consistent with the public interest, in accordance with the existing contractual rights of the carriers.

"'(4) For the purposes of this subsection, the international telegraph operations of any domestic telegraph carrier shall be considered to be the operations of an independent international telegraph carrier, and the domestic telegraph operations of any international telegraph carrier shall be considered to be the operations of an independent domestic telegraph carrier.

"'(f) (1) Each employee of any carrier which is a party to a consolidation or merger pursuant to this section who was employed by such carrier immediately preceding the approval of such consolidation or merger, and whose period of employment began on or before March 1, 1941, shall be employed by the carrier resulting from such consolidation or merger for a period of not less than four years from the date of the approval of such consolidation or merger, and during such period no such employee shall, without his consent, have his compensation reduced or be assigned to work which is inconsistent with his past training and experience in the telegraph industry.

"'(2) If any employee of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger, who was employed by such carrier immediately preceding the approval of such consolidation or merger, and whose period of employment began after March 1, 1941, is discharged as a consequence of such consolidation or merger by the carrier resulting therefrom, within four years from the date of approval of the consolidation or merger, such carrier shall pay such employee at the time he is discharged severance pay in cash equal to the amount of salary or compensation he would have received during the full four-week period immediately preceding such discharge at the rate of compensation or salary payable to him during such period, multiplied by the number of years he has been continuously employed immediately preceding such discharge by one or another of such carriers who were parties to such consolidation or merger, but in no case shall any such employee receive less severance pay than the amount of salary or compensation he would have received at such rate if he were employed during such full four-week period: *Provided, however*, That such severance pay shall not be required to be paid to any employee who is discharged after the expiration of a period, following the date of approval of the consolidation or merger, equal to the aggregate period during which such employee was in the employ, prior to such date of approval, of one or more of the carriers which are parties to the consolidation or merger.

"'(3) For a period of four years after the date of approval of any such consolidation or merger, any employee of any carrier which is a party to such consolidation or merger who was such an employee on such date of approval, and who is discharged as a result of such consolidation or merger, shall have a preferential hiring and employment status for any position for which he is qualified by training and experience over any person who has not theretofore been an employee of any such carrier.

"'(4) If any employee is transferred from one community to another, as a result of any such consolidation or merger, the carrier resulting therefrom shall pay, in addition to such employee's regular compensation as an employee of such carrier, the actual traveling expenses of such employee and his family, including the cost of packing, crating, drayage, and transportation of household goods and personal effects.

"'(5) In the case of any consolidation or merger pursuant to this section, the consolidated or merged carrier shall accord to every employee or former employee, or representative or beneficiary of an employee or former employee, of any carrier which is a party to such consolidation or merger, the same pension, health, disability, or death insurance benefits, as were provided for prior to the date of approval of the consolidation or merger, under any agreement or plan of any carrier which is a party to the consolidation or merger which covered the greatest number of the employees affected by the consolidation or merger; except that in any case in which, prior to the date of approval of the consolidation or merger, an individual has exercised his right of retirement, or any right to health, disability, or death insurance benefits has accrued, under any agreement or plan of any carrier which is a party to the consolidation or merger, pension, health, disability, or death insurance benefits, as the case may be, shall be accorded in conformity with the agreement or plan under which such individual exercised such right of retirement or under which such right to benefits accrued. For purposes of determining and according the rights and benefits specified in this paragraph, any period spent in the employ of the carrier of which such individual was an employee at the time of the consolidation or merger shall be considered to have been spent in the employ of the consolidated or merged carrier. The application for approval of any consolidation or merger under this section shall contain a guaranty by the proposed consolidated carrier that there will be no impairment of any of the rights or benefits specified in this paragraph.

"'(6) Any employee who, since August 27, 1940, has left a position, other than a temporary position, in the employ of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger, for the purpose of entering the military or naval forces of the United States, shall be considered to have been in the employ of such carrier during the time he is a member of such forces, and, upon making an application for employment with the consolidated or merged carrier within 40 days from the time he is relieved from service in any of such forces under honorable conditions, such former employee shall be employed by the consolidated or merged carrier and entitled to the benefits to which he would have been entitled if he had been employed by one of such carriers during all of such period of service with such forces; except that this paragraph shall not require the consolidated or merged carrier, in the case of any such individual, to pay compensation, or to accord health, disability, or death insurance benefits, for the period during which he was a member of such forces. If any such former employee is disabled and because of such disability is no longer qualified to perform the duties of his former position but otherwise meets the requirements for employment, he shall be given such available employment at an appropriate rate of compensation as he is able to perform and to which his service credit shall entitle him.

"'(7) No employee of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger shall, without his consent, have his compensation reduced, or (except as provided in paragraph (2) and paragraph (8) of this subsection) be discharged or furloughed during the four-year period after the date of the approval of such consolidation or merger. No such employee shall, without his consent, have his compensation reduced, or be discharged or furloughed, in contemplation of such consolidation and merger, during the six-month period immediately preceding such approval.

"'(8) Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the discharge of any employee for insubordination, incompetency, or any other similar cause.

"'(9) All employees of any carrier resulting from any such consolidation or merger, with respect to their hours of employment, shall retain the rights provided by any collective bargaining agreement in force and effect upon the date of approval of such consolidation or merger until such agreement is terminated, executed, or superseded. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any agreement not prohibited by law pertaining to the protection of employees may hereafter be entered into by such consolidated or merged carrier and the duly authorized representative or representatives of its employees selected according to existing law.

"'(10) For purposes of enforcement or protection of rights, privileges, and immunities granted or guaranteed under this subsection, the employees of any such consolidated or merged carrier shall be entitled to the same remedies as are provided by the National Labor Relations Act in the case of employees covered by that Act; and the National Labor Relations Board and the courts of the United States (including the courts of the District of Columbia) shall have jurisdiction and power to enforce and protect such rights, privileges, and immunities in the same manner as in the case of enforcement of the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

"'(11) Nothing contained in this subsection shall apply to any employee of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger whose compensation is at the rate of more than $5,000 per annum.

"'(12) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (7), the protection afforded therein for the period of four years from the date of approval of the consolidation or merger shall not, in the case of any particular employee, continue for a longer period, following such date of approval, than the aggregate period during which such employee was in the employ, prior to such date of approval, of one or more of the carriers which are parties to the consolidation or merger. As used in paragraphs (1), (2), and (7), the term "compensation" shall not include compensation attributable to overtime not guaranteed by collective bargaining agreements.'

"SEC. 2. Section 214 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 214. (a) No carrier shall undertake the construction of a new line or of an extension of any line, or shall acquire or operate any line, or extension thereof, or shall engage in transmission over or by means of such additional or extended line, unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that the present or future public convenience and necessity require or will require the construction, or operation, or construction and operation, of such additional or extended line: *Provided*, That no such certificate shall be required

under this section for the construction, acquisition, or operation of (1) a line within a single State unless such line constitutes part of an interstate line, (2) local, branch, or terminal lines not exceeding ten miles in length, or (3) any line acquired under section 221 or 222 of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Commission may, upon appropriate request being made, authorize temporary or emergency service, or the supplementing of existing facilities, without regard to the provisions of this section. No carrier shall discontinue, reduce, or impair service to a community, or part of a community, unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that neither the present nor future public convenience and necessity will be adversely affected thereby; except that the Commission may, upon appropriate request being made, authorize temporary or emergency discontinuance, reduction, or impairment of service, or partial discontinuance, reduction, or impairment of service, without regard to the provisions of this section. As used in this section the term "line" means any chanel of communication established by the use of appropriate equipment, other than a channel of communication established by the interconnection of two or more existing channels: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to require a certificate or other authorization from the Commission for any installation, replacement, or other changes in plant, operation, or equipment, other than new construction, which will not impair the adequacy or quality of service provided.'

"SEC. 3. Section 214 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Upon receipt of an application for any such certificate, the Commission shall cause notice thereof to be given to, and shall cause a copy of such application to be filed with, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Governor of each State in which such line is proposed to be constructed, extended, acquired, or operated, or in which such discontinuance, reduction, or impairment of service is proposed, with the right to those notified to be heard; and the Commission may require such published notice as it shall determine.'

"SEC. 4. Section 214 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(c) The Commission shall have power to issue such certificate as applied for, or to refuse to issue it, or to issue it for a portion or portions of a line, or extension thereof, or discontinuance, reduction, or impairment of service, described in the application, or for the partial exercise only of such right or privilege, and may attach to the issuance of the certificate such terms and conditions as in its judgment the public convenience and necessity may require. After issuance of such certificate, and not before, the carrier may, without securing approval other than such certificate, comply with the terms and conditions contained in or attached to the issuance of such certificate and proceed with the construction, extension, acquisition, operation, or discontinuance, reduction, or impairment of service covered thereby. Any construction, extension, acquisition, operation, discontinuance, reduction, or impairment of service contrary to the provisions of this section may be enjoined by any court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the United States, the Commission, the State commission, any State affected, or any party in interest.'

"SEC. 5. Section 214 (d) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(d) The Commission may, after full opportunity for hearing, in a proceeding upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, authorize or require by order any carrier, party to such proceeding, to provide itself with adequate facilities for the expeditious and efficient performance of its service as a common carrier and to extend its line or to establish a public office; but no such authorization or order shall be made unless the Commission finds, as to such provision of facilities, as to such establishment of public offices, or as to such extension, that it is reasonably required in the interest of public convenience and necessity, or as to such extension or facilities that the expense involved therein will not impair the ability of the carrier to perform its duty to the public. Any carrier which refuses or neglects to comply with any order of the Commission made in pursuance of this paragraph shall forfeit to the United States $100 for each day during which such refusal or neglect continues.'

"SEC. 6. Section 5266 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 47, sec. 3), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 5266. Telegrams between the several departments of the Government and their officers, relating exclusively to the public business, in their transmission over the lines of any telegraph company to which has been given the right-of-way, timber, or station lands from the public domain, shall have priority over all other business at such rates as the Federal Communications Commission shall annually fix. No part of any appropriation for the several departments of the Government shall be paid to any company which neglects or refuses to transmit such telegrams in accordance with the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall limit the authority of the Federal Communications Commission, under section 201 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the classification of communications and the prescribing of different charges for different classes of communications, and such authority of the Federal Communications Commission to fix rates for Government communications may be exercised with respect to any or all communications to which section 201 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and this section apply: *Provided further*, That the term "Government" as used in section 201 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and the term "departments of the Government" as used in this section, shall be held to refer only to the established departments, independent establishments, and agencies in the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government.'"

And the House agree to the same.

A. L. BULWINKLE,
LYLE H. BOREN,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
CLARENCE J. BROWN,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
LISTER HILL,
JAMES M. TUNNELL,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The differences between the House amendment and the proposed conference substitute are noted in the following statement, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached, and minor clarifying changes:

PROVISIONS OF THE PROPOSED NEW SECTION 222 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

*Definition of "domestic telegraph operations"*

In the definition of the term "domestic telegraph operations," contained in the proposed subsection 222 (a) (5) in the conference substitute, there is included a proviso as follows: *"Provided*, That nothing in this section shall prevent international telegraph carriers from accepting and delivering international telegraph messages in the cities which constitute gateways approved by the Commission as points of entrance into or exit from the continental United States and, under regulations prescribed by the Commission, the incidental transmission or reception of the same over its own or leased lines or circuits within the continental United States."

This proviso is the same as the one contained in the definition in the Senate bill, except that the words "under regulations prescribed by the commission" have been inserted. It was felt desirable to include this proviso, in order clearly to permit carriers to continue the operations referred to, because of the requirement (in subsection (c) (2)) that in case of a consolidation or merger of domestic telegraph companies the plan of consolidation or merger shall provide for the divestment of the international telegraph operations theretofore carried on by any party to the consolidation or merger.

*Commission approval of consolidation or merger*

Subsection (c) follows the House provision with respect to Commission approval in the case of a proposed consolidation or merger, except that (1) notice of the public hearing thereon is required to be given not only to those persons specified in the House substitute but also to the Attorney General of the United States and to representatives of employees where represented by bargaining representatives known to the Commission, and (2) the conference substitute does not give the Commission authority, as did the House substitute, to make its approval "subject to such terms and conditions, and such modifications, as it shall find to be just and reasonable." There is included, however, a provision from the Senate bill giving the Commission authority to approve an amended proposal for consolidation or merger.

*Divestment of international operations*

Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) is a provision taken from the Senate bill, and no similar provision was contained in the House bill. It provides that any proposed consolidation or merger of domestic telegraph carriers shall provide for the divestment of the international telegraph operations theretofore carried on by any party to the consolidation or merger, within a reasonable time to be fixed by the Commission, after the consideration for the property to be divested is found by the Commission to be commensurate with its value, and as soon as the legal obligations, if any, of the carrier to be so divested will permit. The Commission must require at the time of the approval of such consolidation or merger that any such party exercise due diligence in bring-

ing about such divestment as promptly as it reasonably can.

Consideration was given to the inclusion of such a provision while the bill was under consideration by the House committee. It was felt that such divestment would be desirable in the public interest, but in view of certain existing long-term contracts it was felt impracticable to require such action to be taken at this time. However, it is believed that the provision included in the conference substitute will provide for the divestment of such operations without working undue hardship on the companies involved.

*Distribution of traffic among international and foreign telegraph carriers*

The Senate bill and the House substitute contained substantially similar provisions which provided, in case of a consolidation or merger of domestic telegraph companies, for the working out of a formula with respect to the distribution, by the consolidated carrier, of traffic among international telegraph carriers, and a formula with respect to the distribution of traffic among foreign carriers in a contiguous foreign country. The House provisions are included in the conference substitute, in subsection (e) (1) and (2). It will be noted that in each of these provisions it is required that in case it is necessary for the Commission to prescribe a formula, by reason of failure of the carriers to work out a formula which the Commission approves, the Commission's formula is required to be one which will be, so far as is consistent with the public interest, in accordance with the existing contractual rights of the carriers. This will require the Commission, in each case, to give due regard to the contracts under which the carriers were operating, and had rights, prior to the consolidation or merger.

*Provisions for protection of employees*

For the purpose of protecting the employees who would be affected by a consolidation or merger of domestic telegraph companies, the House amendment provided that the Commission should require a fair and equitable arrangement to protect the interests of such employees, and required that the Commission include terms and conditions providing that during the period of 4 years from the date of approval such consolidation or merger should "not result in such employees being in a worse position with respect to their compensation or character of employment." It was provided, however, that in the case of any particular employee such protection need not continue for a longer period than that during which the employee was, prior to the approval date, in the employment of one or more of the carriers involved.

In lieu of this provision the conference substitute contains three paragraphs, subsection (a) (1), (2), and (7). These paragraphs are based upon provisions of the Senate bill but contain modifications.

Paragraph (1) provides that each employee who entered the employ of any of the companies involved, on or before March 1, 1941, shall continue to be employed by the consolidated or merged carrier for not less than 4 years from the approval date, and provides that during such period no such employee shall, without his consent, have his compensation reduced or be assigned to work which is inconsistent with his past training and experience in the telegraph industry.

Paragraph (2) requires that severance pay shall be paid in the case of any employee who entered employment after March 1, 1941, and who is discharged as a consequence of the consolidation or merger and within 4 years of the date of approval thereof. Such severance pay is to be equal to the amount of salary or compensation the employee would have received during the full 4-week period immediately preceding his discharge, at the rate of compensation or salary payable to him during such period, multiplied by the number of years he has been continuously employed immediately preceding such discharge by one or another of the carriers, but in no case is the employee to receive less severance pay than the amount of salary or compensation he would have received at such rate if he had been employed during such full 4-week period. This paragraph contains a proviso, however, that such severance pay shall not be required to be paid to any employee who is discharged after the expiration of a period, following the date of approval of the consolidation or merger, equal to the aggregate period during which such employee was in the employ, prior to such date of approval, of one or more of the carriers which are parties to the consolidation or merger.

The first sentence of paragraph (7) provides that no employee of any carrier which is a party to a consolidation or merger shall, without his consent, have his compensation reduced, or (except as provided in par. (2) or (8)) be discharged or furloughed during the 4-year period after the date of the approval of the consolidation or merger. Paragraph (7) also provides that no such employee shall, without his consent, have his compensation reduced, or be discharged or furloughed, in contemplation of consolidation or merger, during the 6-month period immediately preceding such approval.

A new paragraph (12), which is based on a provision which was contained in subsection (f) (1) of the House amendment, is included in subsection (f) of the conference substitute. This paragraph provides that notwithstanding the 4-year protection provided for in paragraphs (1) and (7), such protection shall be required to be afforded, in the case of any particular employee, only for a period following the approval of the consolidation or merger equal to the aggregate period during which such employee was employed by one or more of the carriers prior to the approval date. The effect of paragraphs (1), (7), and (12), taken together, is that no employee will be granted protection thereunder for more than 4 years and, in the case of employees who worked for one or more of the companies for an aggregate period of less than 4 years prior to the approval date, the protection would be afforded for such time, less than 4 years, as would correspond to his total period of employment prior to the approval date.

It will be noted that under paragraphs (1) and (7) the compensation of an employee may be reduced with his consent. It is contemplated that authorized collective bargaining agents will have the power to give such consent to reductions in compensation on behalf of employees.

The protection provided in paragraph (1) and in the first sentence of paragraph (7), against reduction of an employee's compensation without his consent, is a protection against reduction of such compensation below the compensation the employee was being paid at the time of or immediately prior to the approval of the consolidation or merger. If an employee's compensation is increased after the approval of the consolidation or merger, these provisions will not require that the employee's consent be obtained before reducing his compensation if such reduction does not result in his compensation being below what it was at the time of or immediately prior to the approval of the consolidation or merger.

Paragraph (12) also includes a definition of the term "compensation," taken from the House amendment, which will be applicable to that term as used in paragraphs (1), (2), and (7).

Paragraph (4) of the House amendment related to the duty of the consolidated or merged carrier to accord pension, health, disability, or death insurance benefits to employees, former employees, or former employees of any carrier which is a party to a consolidation or merger. In the House amendment the words "pension rights" were used. In the conference substitute (par. (5)) the word "rights" has been omitted. The words "under comparable conditions," which were in the House paragraph, have also been omitted. It is not believed that these omissions make any substantive change in the meaning of the provision. It was felt that their retention was unnecessary and would have given rise to difficulties of interpretation.

*Subsection (g) of the House amendment*

Subsection (g) of the proposed new section-222, in the House amendment, read as follows:

"(g) The authority conferred by this section shall be exclusive and plenary, and any carrier participating in or resulting from any transaction approved by the Commission under this section shall have full power to carry such transaction into effect without securing approval otherwise than as specified in this section."

This subsection has been omitted from the conference substitute. In view of its broadness and its general terms, the conference committee was not entirely clear as to its full scope and effect. It was felt that it might, for example, limit the jurisdiction of the Securities and Exchange Commission under one or more of the several acts which it administers, and that such an effect would have been undesirable.

*Amendments to section 214 of the Communications Act of 1934*

Both the Senate bill and House amendment rewrote section 214 (a), (b), and (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

In section 214 (a) as contained in the House amendment, the following provision appeared:

"No carrier shall discontinue service to a community, or part of a community, unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that neither the present nor future public convenience and necessity will be adversely affected thereby; except that the Commission may, upon appropriate request being made, authorize temporary or emergency discontinuance of service, or partial discontinuance of service, without regard to the provisions of this section."

The conference substitute retains this provision except that, after the words "No carrier shall discontinue", a comma and the words "reduce, or impair" have been inserted, and necessary amendments have been made to conform to this change.

The amended section 214 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, as included in the conference substitute, contains the proviso which was in the House amendment, eliminating the requirement of a certificate of public convenience and necessity in certain cases in order to avoid imposing on the carriers the necessity for making a burdensome number of applications. The cases in which the requirement is eliminated are those where no new construction is involved (as, for example, the providing of additional circuits by installing carrier or phantom equipment, or the making of other installations, changes, or replacements in plant or equipment), subject, however, to the restriction that a certificate will have to be obtained if the action proposed to be taken by the carrier would impair the adequacy or quality of service provided.

*Rates for Government telegrams*

Section 6 of the Senate bill amended section 5266 of the Revised Statutes, which was derived from the Post Roads Act of July 24,

1866, as amended, so as to (1) eliminate that part of such section which gives the Federal Communications Commission authority to fix rates for Government telegrams, and (2) provide that no telegraph company should, by reason of any benefit received under the Post Roads Act of July 24, 1866, be required to transmit Government telegrams at rates less than those applicable to other telegrams in the same classes.

In the House amendment, as reported to the House by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, this section of the Senate bill was not changed. The House, however, amended it by striking out the sentence which provided that no telegraph company should by reason of any benefit received under the Post Roads Act of July 24, 1866, be required to transmit such telegrams at rates less than those applicable to other telegrams in these same classes. Since the amendment made by the House did not, however, restore the language of such section 5266 giving the Communications Commission the authority to prescribe rates for Government telegrams, it is doubtful whether the amendment would have had the effect of requiring the continuance of reduced rates for Government telegrams under such section 5266, although this was clearly the purpose of the amendment.

Section 6 of the conference substitute accomplishes the purpose of the House by amending section 5266 so as to retain therein the language authorizing the Communications Commission to prescribe rates for Government telegrams and, in addition, provides that nothing in the section shall limit the authority of the Commission, under section 201 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, to classify communications and to prescribe different charges of different classes of communications, and provides that such authority of the Commission may be exercised with respect to any or all communications to which section 201 (b) applies and to which section 5266 of the Revised Statutes applies. Under such section 201 (b) the Commission may classify "Government" communications as such, and prescribe rates therefor.

The conference committee was informed that the word "agents" now contained in section 5266 has been interpreted so that cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractors, having contracts with the Government, are permitted to send telegrams at the reduced Government rate. It was felt that this practice should not continue, and section 5266 has, therefore, been amended by striking out the words "and agents" and by including a definition of "departments of the Government" and "Government," which will be applicable for purposes of section 5266 and section 201 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, in order to carry out the purpose of denying to such contractors the privilege of sending telegrams at the reduced rates applicable in the case of official Government telegrams.

A. L. BULWINKLE,
LYLE H. BOREN,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
CLARENCE J. BROWN,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the House and the conferees on the part of the Senate came to an agreement on this bill. There are only two major differences between the House bill and the bill as agreed upon by the conferees. One was the amendment placed in the bill on the floor of the House relating to Government messages. We compromised in that regard by agreeing to a new paragraph carrying the provision that Government tolls should still be under the supervision and regulation of the Federal Communications Commission, but we defined the meaning of the word "Government"—that is, that it should refer only to messages sent by the established departments and independent establishments of the executive branch and the agencies in the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government. At present contractors furnishing supplies to the Government under the cost-plus system are sending messages which are being carried as Government messages and thus charged the Government rate. The language finally agreed upon eliminates that practice. That is the one great change. There were also changes in some of the labor provisions.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I believe it was not called to the attention of the House at the time the bill was under consideration that a number of the large companies of the country, such as General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, and others, were receiving the same discount on telegrams as has been extended to the Government—to wit, 40 percent on all their telegrams—simply because they were considered to be agents of the Government under the provisions of the original act. This amendment leaves the rates for the Government itself just where they have been all the time, but it strikes out the privilege that has been extended to companies, such as those referred to, of obtaining Government rates.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In addition to the explanation the gentleman has given, do I correctly understand that the conference report restores to the bill certain language known as section 5266, so as to make a positive affirmation of the protection of the Government?

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman is correct. But I should also say that the Federal Communications Commission should review this question of Government rates to do justice.

The other provision is in regard to labor. We accepted the provisions of the Senate bill providing for severance pay for the employees who entered into employment after March 1, 1941, allowing 4 weeks for each year of service. There were also other amendments agreed to which are fully set out in the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1605) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to farm-acreage allotments, the farm marketing excess of wheat, the use of excess corn as silage for feed to livestock on the farm, to provide for the adequate supply of peanuts for oil and other uses, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1605, with Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] has 35 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

### SUBVERSIVE SUBSIDIES NO INCENTIVE TO PATRIOTS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I put into the RECORD a statement containing messages which I had received from the Honorable E. H. Jones, Commissioner of Agriculture for the State of Vermont, the Honorable Henry A. Stoddard, master of the Vermont State Grange, and the Honorable Arthur Packard, president of the Farm Bureau of Vermont, in which these gentlemen expressed their views concerning subsidy payments for farmers—see page A453 in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Subsequent to the receipt of the abovementioned letters from my own constituents, I asked the following question of Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange; of W. R. Ogg, director of research for the American Farm Bureau Federation, and of Ezra T. Benson, executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives:

> Will you briefly state to me at your earliest convenience the reasons why the organization which you represent is opposed to Mr. Wickard's request for $100,000,000 to subsidize the American farmer?

I call your attention to the replies which I have received. Master Albert S. Goss of the Grange wrote me as follows:

> THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
> *Washington, D. C., February 15, 1943.*
> Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
> *House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*
> DEAR MR. PLUMLEY: Answering your letter of February 13, we are opposed to the use of an additional $100,000,000 for incentive payments as proposed by the Department of Agriculture unless adequate safeguards can be thrown around the appropriation to prevent its use as subsidies and to assure that it would be used in the form of an incentive for production which would otherwise be uneconomic. We believe that the best and most effective incentive for increasing production is a price which will make it possible to produce in maximum volume. We are opposed to any form of subsidies which are used in lieu of a fair price. Briefly our reasons are as follows:
>
> First, in the Price Control Act of October 1942 Congress set up certain principles for stabilizing prices and expressly provided against any form of price fixing which would retard production when it adopted the fol-

lowing limitations: "*Provided*, That modification shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity * * * in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodities for war purposes." The original bill had no such proviso. It was added after I pointed out to the Banking and Currency Committee the dangers in the following language:

"Subsidies are not mentioned in the President's message. Subsidies are not mentioned in the bill, but all the powers are there for their use if the President so decides. Congress should not pass by such a vital issue without an understanding on it. We believe Congress should set forth the policy of meeting the costs of war dislocation now by assuring enough flexibility in ceilings to meet these unavoidable costs. We recommend that this principle be written into the measure itself by adding the following words after the word 'President' in the second sentence: 'Shall adjust prices where necessary to maintain adequate production goals.'"

The purpose seems entirely clear. Instead of modifying ceilings, however, the administration now proposes using "incentive payments" to increase production. We believe that when a commodity is controlled by a ceiling so that the law of supply and demand will not operate, and a payment is added in any form to increase production, that payment becomes a subsidy, and we are strongly opposed to the use of any form of subsidy in lieu of a price which will enable farmers to produce to the maximum. We are not asking a general price increase. We are merely asking that no ceilings be established at a price so low that farmers cannot produce to the maximum. We believe in letting economic law regulate the price rather than relying on subsidies in lieu of a fair price, and we are opposed to subsidies for the following reasons:

1. As proposed, they would be subsidizing the consumers and the farmers would get the blame.
2. Subsidies are inflationary.
3. Subsidies conceal costs and defeat efforts to correct leaks.
4. Subsidies promote inefficiency.
5. Subsidies make everyone pay for benefits enjoyed by a few.
6. Once used, subsidies are hard to get rid of. If we employ them now during a period of unprecedented income, and prices are thereby held at noncompensatory levels, when the war ends our price structure will be below normal. Then, when it becomes necessary to drop subsidies because of excessive debt, it will either be necessary for farmers to raise prices or go bankrupt. With unemployment a growing problem at that time, it would be impossible to raise prices so the alternative would be bankruptcy. Of all times in American history there is less excuse today for maintaining a false price level to subsidize the consumer than ever before.
7. Subsidies destroy initiative and undermine character. They are not the means of building an independent, self-reliant people.
8. Subsidies are an expedient way of dodging a hard, disagreeable issue. They are the means of evading a fundamental correction to an unbalanced economy.
9. Subsidies open the way to political abuse.
10. Subsidies are the means of building a strong centralized government and lead to dictatorship.

A recent decision of the Supreme Court illustrates our point. An Ohio farmer refused to pay his overproduction fine, arguing that the law had been passed after his crop was planted and he was denied the protection of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, which prohibits taking property without due process of law. Pointing out that wheat prices were being maintained by subsidies, the Court said, "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

Of course, it is true that the Government will always regulate that which it subsidizes.

The remedy is to recognize and adjust the uneconomic balance in income which has been artificially stimulated and maintained. Congress should do nothing further toward maintaining this unbalanced economy. It should insist on fundamental reforms rather than relying on the unsound expedient of subsidies.

I think the time has come for plain speaking. The Secretary of Agriculture is in a very difficult position. Congress has ordered that price ceilings shall be modified to secure production. The Office of Price Administration has refused to obey Congress. The President has placed the responsibility of production on the Secretary. The Office of Price Administration refuses to permit him to obey the law and the only thing he can do to assure production is to ask for subsidies.

He put Congress in a very difficult position. You have to choose between allowing the Office of Price Administration to ignore the law or calling a halt. If you call a halt and refuse to grant money for incentive payments you may be blamed for loss of production. Your problem is more difficult because it will take time to make the Office of Price Administration obey the law and the time lost may result in curtailed plantings and curtailed crops, so you hesitate to make an issue of it when vital production is at stake.

It seems to me you have a number of things to consider. First, it should not be forgotten that our chief problems are manpower, machinery, and adequate prices. Solving our manpower situation will do a great deal more toward increasing production than so-called incentive payments. In fact, the incentive payments will probably add very little if we can get the manpower situation corrected. In my judgment these payments are proposed in lieu of a program of adjusting the manpower situation and certainly if they result in any such ends they cannot be justified.

As proposed the payments are apt to prove discriminatory in effect. For example, let us take two farmers, one of whom has produced to the limit of his human and acreage capacity, while the other has made no extended effort. Let us assume a price ceiling which barely pays production costs or even falls a little below production costs. Incentive payments are granted to increase production and the payments are such that they would be very profitable upon the increased production. The man who has already done his best can make no increase and gets no incentive payments while the one who had not previously tried reaps the benefits.

It seems to us that the remedy lies in placing upon the shoulders of the Secretary the responsibility of determining what price is necessary to secure production. At the present time there is a conflict between two agencies of the Government. One is charged with the responsibility of holding down prices, and the other with the responsibility of securing adequate production. It seems apparent that adequate production is the best means of holding down prices, and that the divided responsibility should be terminated. The responsibility of securing adequate production should carry with it the power of determining prices necessary to accomplish that end.

The policy of Congress as expressed in the Price Control Act of October 1942 in requiring modification of maximum prices could be assured if there were included in an appropriation act a proviso that no money should be used to pay subsidies, bonuses, incentive payments, or other similar rewards in the case of any commodity upon which a maximum price had been fixed as long as such maximum limitation existed.

If such safeguards are adopted we believe that the situation would rapidly clear up. Then, if the Secretary were given powers to prevent destructive price ceilings, a limited amount for such incentive payments might be justified. To accomplish the last purpose, we suggest consideration of a proviso that (1) the Secretary of Agriculture should make the determination as to whether modification is necessary in maximum prices on any agricultural commodity or on any processed agricultural commodity or on any commodity made in whole or substantial part therefrom in order to secure increased production for war purposes; (2) in making such determination he should not consider as part of the farmer's income any subsidies, bonuses, incentive payments, or similar rewards received by the farmer; and (3) he should have the power and it should be his duty to set aside any maximum prices so established as to retard production.

Yours sincerely,

A. S. Goss,
*Master, the National Grange.*

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ogg, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, sent me the following reply:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
*Washington, D. C., February 16, 1943.*

Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN PLUMLEY: In reply to your letter inquiring the reasons why the American Farm Bureau Federation is opposed to the proposed appropriation of $100,000,000 for incentive payments to farmers, I wish to advise that we are opposed to this appropriation for the following reasons:

1. We are opposed to the use of subsidies to consumers in lieu of fair prices to farmers. The proposed incentive payments are in reality subsidies to the consuming public which are offered to farmers in order to avoid paying higher prices to farmers.

If there ever was a time when the American people were able to pay fair prices for farm commodities, they can do so now. The national income is now approximately $120,000,000,000 annually—the highest on record. Nonfarm families today are only paying 22 percent of their total earnings for food—the smallest percentage in 30 years. Thus, despite the increases in the prices of food, the average nonfarm family, because of increased earnings, is spending a smaller percentage of its income for food than ever before.

An economy which does not pay the cost of its food supply is bound to break down sooner or later. Why should consumers be subsidized out of the Treasury at this time, when they are well able to pay fair prices for food without subsidies and when we need to conserve our financial resources for the winning of the war and to avoid adding unduly to our debt burden. There is now pending before Congress a bill to extend the national debt limit to over $200,000,000,000 and some economists are predicting an ultimate national debt of $300,000,000,000. If the Nation embarks upon the policy of holding down inflation by subsidizing consumers out of the Treasury and with inadequate control of wages, which are the principal factor in the costs of all goods and services, there is no telling to what staggering totals such subsidies may eventually mount.

2. Farmers want fair prices in the market place instead of subsidies. The position

of the American Farm Bureau Federation on this issue is clearly set forth in Resolution No. 7 entitled "Inflation, Price Control, Subsidies," which was adopted at the last annual meeting of the federation in Chicago, December 8, 9, and 10, 1942, from which I quote the following statement:

"The use of payments to bring farm returns up to parity at a time when huge surpluses were depressing the markets, was entirely justified, but the entire farm program was based on the assumption that parity prices are fair to consumers as well as to farmers, and that as economic conditions improve, market prices would rise to parity, thus eliminating the need for parity payments. Now, with wages higher in relation to food costs than ever before, there is no sound reason why retail prices should not be permitted to rise to such levels as to assure farmers parity for their products in the market place.

"The practice of paying subsidies to avoid raising the price to the consumer cannot be fairly considered as preventing inflation, because the same total amount is paid whether the consumer pays it all, or whether he pays part of it and the taxpayer the balance. We are unalterably opposed to the use of subsidies in lieu of fair prices in the market place at times when consumers are fully able to pay fair prices. We aggressively urge that present experiments in this field be abandoned and be replaced by action based on the more realistic policy of fixing retail price ceilings at levels which will reflect fair prices to the producers of farm products."

No organization has fought harder for parity payments and conservation payments to farmers than the American Farm Bureau Federation, but we asked for these payments because it was not possible to secure parity prices in the market place. In the case of these crops, however, on which incentive payments are to be made, they are commodities on which we have or will have acute shortages. When you have a shortage of a commodity there is no difficulty therefore involved in raising the price. There is no reason why through proper adjustment of the support prices and price ceilings farmers could not obtain sufficient prices to induce them to plant these crops without subsidies.

The fact is, the best incentive for production is price. If the purpose of these payments is to obtain maximum production the best way to obtain this is through an incentive price rather than an incentive payment.

3. The proposed incentive payment program is unfair to farmers. To hold down prices to consumers through subsidizing the cost of producing food at a time when consumers are well able to afford to pay the entire cost, is unfair to the farmer. Not only will farmers be subjected to criticism of the public because of these subsidies at a time when our debt and tax burdens are mounting very rapidly, but farmers will be placed in a very disadvantageous position in the post-war period as a result of such subsidy program. For 20 years American consumers have been getting food at bargain prices. Throughout most of the 20-year period following the First World War farm prices were relatively lower than industrial prices and industrial wages. Now, when consumers are able to pay fair prices for food, if bargain prices are to be continued by means of subsidies in order to avoid requiring consumers to pay the entire cost of food, then when the period of post-war surpluses returns and consumer buying power declines, and debt burdens are much higher, farmers obviously would be placed at a much greater disadvantage.

I believe that the average consumer is willing to pay the farmer a fair price for his food without subsidy so long as there is no excessive pyramiding of margins and costs between the farmer and the consumer. The average consumer would much rather pay more and be able to get enough to eat than to have bargain prices and be short of food.

4. These incentive payments are unnecessary. Farmers are anxious to produce to capacity but that cannot be done unless they can be assured of a sufficient return to enable them to offset their rapidly rising costs. This assurance can be given by proper use of price supports and proper adjustment of price ceilings as authorized under existing law. The goal of maximum production will be achieved more effectively through a price incentive than through an incentive payment.

5. Congress placed a mandate upon the Office of Price Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust price ceilings and price supports on agricultural commodities to the extent necessary to achieve the necessary production for the war effort. If these mandates of law are fully carried out there will be no need for the proposed incentive payments. Section 3 of the act of October 2, 1942, specifically provides:

"SEC. 3. No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity under authority of this act or otherwise below a price which will reflect to producers of agricultural commodities the higher of the following prices, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture:

"(1) The parity price for such commodity (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials) or, in case a comparable price has been determined for such commodity under and in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, such comparable price (adjusted in the same manner); or

"(2) The highest price received by such producers for such commodity between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942 (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials), or, if the market for such commodity was inactive during the latter half of such period, a price for the commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in line with the prices, during such period, of other agricultural commodities produced for the same general use. * * *

"* * * That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs: *Provided further*, That in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing: *Provided further*, That in fixing price maximums for agricultural commodities and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, as provided for by this act, adequate weighting shall be given to farm labor."

Section 9 of that act likewise amends the Steagall Act of July 1, 1941, increasing the minimum price support from 85 to 90 percent of parity on any commodities for which the Secretary of Agriculture asks farmers to increase their production for the war effort. In the case of such war crops the Secretary is empowered to establish price supports at whatever levels above the minimum 90 percent of parity level that he finds necessary in order to achieve maximum production for the war.

There can be no question, therefore, either of the legal authority or the specific mandates which Congress has given to the responsible agencies of government to achieve maximum production. Congress has repeatedly rejected subsidies and has repeatedly declared as its policy that prices should be established on agricultural commodities at such levels as will obtain the maximum output needed for the war.

The time has come when Congress should see to it that the laws which it enacts are fully carried out in spirit and intent as well as the letter of the law. The persistent and continued attempts to evade, circumvent, and even ignore the mandates of Congress and policies of Congress, and to coddle the consumer at the expense of the farmer are not only wrecking the morale of farmers but seriously jeopardize an adequate food supply unless these policies and procedures are corrected speedily.

Since last September the morale of farmers in every section of the country has sunk to a low ebb because of the misleading propaganda attacking farmers, farm organizations, and Congress because of their efforts to face these problems realistically and obtain practicable, workable solutions which will enable farmers to get the maximum food produced.

Farmers do not want inflation and our organization has consistently favored an all-out program to control inflation, but thus far there has been no control of wages comparable to the control of farm prices. Those who complained the loudest against the 110 percent of parity provision and against the proposals to require the inclusion of farm wage costs in fixing price ceilings on agricultural commodities, gave their support to a 15-percent rise in industrial wages above the January 1941 level under the so-called Little Steel formula. They thought it was all right for industrial wages to go up 15 percent although they were already at peak levels in 1941, even higher than the peak of World War No. 1—yet, they thought it was all wrong to even permit farmers to include their increased wage costs in fixing farm price ceilings at a time when farmers' wage costs were spiralling rapidly upward, and they were losing hundreds of thousands of workers due to the unprecedented wage inflation.

More recently another wage boost in some cases amounting to 30-percent increase, has been approved through lengthening the workweek and requiring time and a half to be paid for all overtime above 40 hours per week, yet at the same time farmers are told that farmers must not have an increase in price to offset their rapidly rising wage costs. How will farmers be able to get the three million additional workers which they are going to need on the farms this year to produce this enormous supply of food unless price ceilings are sufficiently adjusted so that they can bid up and pay higher wages?

Again and again the provisions and policies of Congress in the price-control legislation have been flagrantly violated and ignored.

For example, ceiling prices were recently established on corn at considerably less than parity prices to farmers although section 3 of the act of October 2 specifically prohibits fixing a maximum price on any agricultural commodity or product thereof below the parity price for such commodity. Similarly price ceilings have been imposed on flour which do not reflect parity prices to producers of wheat. There is nothing in the act which authorizes the inclusion of subsidy payments in fixing farm-price ceilings. Yet the law is being interpreted to authorize the

inclusion of subsidies in fixing ceilings on agricultural commodities.

Farmers, and I believe the American people generally, regard this situation as a very crucial issue as to whether the laws of Congress are going to be carried out as intended by Congress or whether officials are going to be permitted to evade them or circumvent them from being carried out as Congress intended. The future preservation of our constitutional democracy and our democratic form of government depends upon whether Congress which under the Constitution is supposed to make the laws by which the people are to be governed is going to require the administrators of these laws to carry out the spirit and intent of the laws enacted by Congress. As indicative of this widespread conviction on the part of the American people I wish to quote at this point the following resolution adopted by voting delegates at our last annual meeting representing millions of farm people in 44 States and Puerto Rico.

"Resolution 15

"Preservation of constitutional government

"We reaffirm our faith in the constitutional, representative, democratic form of government as the best for the United States of America. Our Nation is blessed with a magnificent heritage of freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of enterprise. The American way of life has encouraged and rewarded the qualities of initiative, enterprise, resourcefulness, frugality, hard work, and self-denial, and has made America the land of opportunity in the eyes of the entire world. Under the American system we have attained average standards of living that are unmatched anywhere.

"We realize that during this period of world conflict we must have greater central direction of our war effort, but we view with grave concern the continuing efforts being made, under the guise of the war, to centralize greater authority in the executive branch of government and to permit flagrant abuse of administrative powers.

"Among these alarming trends are: The delegation of excessive and unduly sweeping legislative powers to the executive branch; usurpation of additional powers by Government officials through strained interpretations of the statutes; nullification of congressional enactments and policies by administrative orders and regulations; proposals to confer upon the Executive sweeping authority to suspend acts of Congress; propaganda by subversive groups and others, obviously intended to discredit Congress in the eyes of the people and persuade them to yield to further grants of dictatorial power; enormous blank-check appropriations without sufficient control and accounting to the legislative branch; and almost unlimited authority to transfer bureaus and funds or create entirely new bureaus and clothe them with vast powers.

"We view these efforts to weaken the legislative branch of our Government as a serious threat to democracy and freedom in this country.

"While our armed forces are fighting for democracy on the battle fronts of the world, all freedom-loving citizens must be alert and active to preserve our form of representative, constitutional government."

For these reasons, therefore, we believe the time has come when Congress must take appropriate action to correct various policies which, unless corrected, will discourage rather than encourage maximum food production and which may jeopardize our constitutional form of government with its balance of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.

Sincerely yours,

W. R. Ogg, *Director of Research.*

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Benson of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives has this to say in response to my question:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
FARMER COOPERATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., February 16, 1943.*

Congressman CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

Re farm subsidies.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PLUMLEY: Through action of the delegate body of this council, which represents cooperative associations distributed in all of the 48 States with farmer memberships in excess of 2,000,000, distributed in practically every county, we have opposed the use of subsidies in lieu of a fair price in the market place.

Farmers throughout the Nation are opposed to Government payments, particularly at a time when the Government is asking for increased production and when consumers are able and willing to pay for the cost of this food direct without calling upon the Government to further increase the national debt, which has already reached dangerous proportions.

Farmers believe that the Nation can and should pay for its current food bill. They believe that even through subsidies, consumers pay for the food they consume through the payment of taxes to provide the funds for subsidies. The only distinction is that the payment may be in different proportions. Further than this, subsidies have a demoralizing effect by tending to make the beneficiaries more subservient to Government. Subsidies invite political abuse, encourage inefficiency, conceal costs, are difficult to stop once they are started, and tend toward the development of a strongly centralized government. Farmers, who are by nature independent in character, resent any program which tends to destroy initiative and undermine the character of the recipients.

We believe that Congress is in a position to greatly strengthen the morale of farmers, which is now at the lowest ebb in recent years, by taking a firm position in opposition to subsidies in lieu of fair prices which will obtain maximum production of needed food and fiber products.

Sincerey yours,

EZRA T. BENSON,
*Executive Secretary.*

UNAUTHORIZED DIRECTIVES

Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to any open or subversive attempt to change the form or manner of our Government. I am opposed to unauthorized directives issuing out of the executive department, for which authority has not been specifically given by Congress. To suggest that the Executive can usurp the prerogatives of the legislative branch is to abort the fundamentals.

There are certain things which cannot be done and which cannot be justified at any time or in any place by anybody.

When Abraham Lincoln undertook to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that he acted in disregard of the Constitution.

Every lawyer in this body and every lawyer in the United States—and everybody ought to be a lawyer for his own protection these days—knows that the Supreme Court said in the famous case known as ex parte Milligan:

The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, in all times and under all circumstances.

No doctrine involving more pernicious consequences was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of the Constitution's provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism—the theory of necessity on which it is based is false.

What I wish to say in conclusion is that the end sought to be attained does not to any extent or in any respect justify the means which the Secretary of Agriculture seeks to employ.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, whatever objections may be made to certain sections of this bill, it is at least a recognition of the fact that there is an immediate necessity for increasing the amount of food that will be produced in this country this year. While this bill may accomplish something along that line, it seems to me the objection to it is that it does not remove the real causes of our present trouble.

I hope everyone has read the joint statement made a short time ago by Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau; Albert Goss, master of the National Grange; and Ezra T. Benson, executive secretary of the National Council of Farm Cooperatives. No one can question the authority of any declaration made by these well-known farm leaders.

Among other things, they point out "That the American farm family stands between a large part of the world and hunger." Certainly, if our armed forces, our allies, and our own population are to be fed, it must be by the effort of our own farmers. We have the resources; we have the soil; we have the skilled workers. All we need is for the Government to adopt a program which will permit the full utilization of our productive capacity.

Most of us agree that this cannot be accomplished simply by offering subsidies for crops badly needed. A fair return for the farmer in the market place is essential.

At the root of the difficulty, of course, is the lack of experienced help. The farmer's sons are being taken into the Army in ever-increasing numbers. Others upon whose help he once relied are going into defense plants, where wages are higher and hours shorter. As a result, thousands of acres of crops are still unharvested.

The matter is made worse by the lack of new farm machinery, and of materials, equipment, and help for making repairs. Farming cannot be done without machinery any more than a battle can be won without adequate fighting equipment. The allotment of certain very essential machinery in certain areas is really pitiful.

Certainly we do not intend that the war effort shall be hindered by lack of food. Let us then insist upon action at once that will insure to agriculture the

necessary manpower and the essential machinery.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in procuring food—an abundance of food—for the American soldiers, who are fighting all over the world, for the American people, and for such of our allies as may need it.

In order to get that food we must have manpower, machine power, and feed for the livestock, poultry, and other animals on the farms on which the food is produced.

According to the latest information received from the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Government will take for lend-lease and Army and Navy purposes approximately 25 percent of the beef that is produced in the United States this year, up to 40 percent of the pork, about 30 percent of the eggs, approximately 20 percent of the butter, 45 percent of the cheese, 50 percent of the condensed and evaporated milk, 30 percent of the lard, 25 percent of other edible fats and oils, approximately 60 percent of the canned fruits and 45 percent of the dried fruits, 50 percent of the canned vegetables, 15 percent of the wheat, and 20 percent of the rice.

It will be seen, therefore, that nearly 25 percent of the essential production of food in the United States will be used outside of our country, and for our armed forces in 1943. In order to produce this food, we must have feed for our livestock, for our poultry, our hogs, and other animals on the farms, and I am interested at this time in trying to extend the ability of the farmer so that he may produce additional feed for his livestock. Section 3 of the bill is a proposal which was made by me in the interest of increasing the amount of feed for dairy cattle. We are going to have a big shortage of butter in this country. In 1943, as long as the war lasts, we will have a shortage of milk. It is now predicted that within 30 or 60 days we will be rationing butter and other dairy products.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman agree with me that our real food shortage may come after the cessation of military hostilities, in the demand on us for foodstuffs to take care of people in other countries?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no doubt about it, because the demand from those countries upon us will be terrific. We will be called upon to supply foundation dairy stock for the people in other countries of the world, which will mean a shortage of supplies for the people in the United States. If I had my way I would cut out all restrictions upon every type of essential food production in the United States. There is no reason for trying to continue regimentation and control over the American farmers so that they will produce less at a time when the people of the country will go hungry, because of a lack of food within our borders.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not my colleague think it would be a wise procedure for the great Committee on Agriculture to look into that point, with the idea of bringing before the House a measure which would do just that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We have talked about that in the Committee on Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes more.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry but I cannot yield. We have talked about it in the committee, and with the exception of cotton I think we are pretty well agreed that all restrictions on production should be eliminated for the duration of the war. We have not yet agreed on cotton as to what is the best thing to do. My amendment simply provides with reference to corn that where a farmer has been given a corn-acreage allotment, he may be permitted to plant corn for silage in addition to the corn-acreage allotment, without being penalized. At the present time, if farmers plant more than they are allowed, they do not get the benefit payments, nor do they secure the loans provided in the commercial corn area. My amendment removes the restrictions and when I speak here in behalf of section 3, I am talking for millions of small dairy farmers throughout the United States who are not now able to raise sufficient feed to take care of their dairy cattle. I do not speak for that group of large commercial farmers—and there are very few of them—who seem to think that the smaller farmer should produce less so that they can have the privilege of selling more corn. We are at war, we are having a terrific shortage of food, which will become more apparent as time goes on. The farmers are willing to produce food. They do not want subsidy payments or other benefits from the United States Treasury. We should give them opportunity to produce the corn and the other things we need to take care of the demands of our country, first of all to feed our men in the armed forces. We have a chance to demonstrate here whether we are going to stand by a regimented philosophy of scarcity, as has been practiced for the past 10 years under the New Deal, or are going to let farmers go out and produce to take care of the Nation and its food demands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventeen members present, a quorum.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, 30 years ago I was out in Fargo, N. Dak., and went to hear Billy Sunday preach a sermon. I remember he said that a lot of people go to church and sing "Throw out the life line, throw out the life line," when they have not enough pep to throw out a clothesline. When I realize what is happening in the way of producing food, I think of Billy's sermon. We have seen during the last couple of years the several departments and different groups pounding the farmers of the country on the back and asking them to produce more food.

There is one point I would like to present today. During many years we have not even been able to feed ourselves, and now they expect the farmers all at once to feed the whole world. For 10 years we have been importing more agricultural products than we have exported. The American farmer is now asked to:

First. Furnish food for domestic consumption formerly supplied by imports.

Second. Furnish food for our armed forces in ever-increasing amounts.

Third. Furnish food for lease-lend.

Fourth. Furnish food for the peoples of occupied countries.

This is a serious matter. It is not all tied up in this bill that is before us today, but I think the people from the district of every Member of this House, wherever he may come from, can be hungry just as well as the people from any other district. I think we have a responsibility—not in a sectional, not in a partisan spirit, but in a spirit of working with what we have in order to produce this food.

I think that statistically speaking we are still in a position to reach the goals we have been asked to reach.

The other day I called your attention to the fact that we fell down on crop after crop as far as acreage was concerned, and showed it was only due to the fact that we had a good crop year that the farmer accomplished what he did in the year 1942.

So in the consideration of this bill today the time has come when, as representatives of the people, we must decide what course we will follow. We must decide whether we will support Mr. Brown and what he is trying to accomplish through the OPA, or whether we are going to continue to pass laws, turn them over to the OPA, and then spend hour after hour on the floor criticizing the so-called bureaucrats for doing what we asked them to do by legislation on this floor.

It is a much more serious problem than most people realize.

There is one thing I have been watching for quite a little while. The mere

fact that we appropriated money out of the United States Treasury—and I am not talking against incentive payments or anything else—but the mere fact that we "roll out the barrel" does not produce any more food for the people to eat. I am not so sure that a lot of people are not sitting down to omelets and roasts and other food products which they think they are going to eat in 1943, that has not been produced up to this time. In other words, we do not want to count our chickens before we put the eggs in the incubator.

I can prove this point easily because I have kept track of what is happening in the State of Wisconsin since the Agricultural Department put on an incentive payment of 3¾ cents per pound on cheese. I supposed that when they put this incentive payment on that product we would have an increase in the production of cheese. I follow it each week. I wish that any Member who is interested would look at this. The State of Wisconsin is holding its own pretty well. We are only down about 16 percent. But in the country as a whole we are producing from 23 to 28 percent less than we produced in the corresponding weeks a year ago. We had a subsidy, yet the subsidy did not produce the cheese. So this is an important matter. It is something we must iron out and work out together. It is something on which we cannot be sectional or partisan in our approach. Our obligation is help produce the food needed to win this war.

As far as I am concerned, I think the time has come when the O. P. A. and Mr. Prentiss Brown must either be supported or liquidated. For example, I dare say no one could dispute the fact that there is enough lard wasted in the United States at the present time, due to the fact that hogs are not going through the normal channels of trade to offset all the peanut oil we can produce in this country, even if we pass the bill that we have before us today. Thousands and thousands of hogs are not going through the normal channels of trade. Millions of pounds of lard are being wasted. We have either got to support Mr. Brown and the O. P. A.—set it up and have him follow it according to law, or else we have to go ahead in a hodge-podge manner as we are at the present time and take the risk of starving the people of the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman give us a little additional information on what he means by supporting Mr. Brown and the O. P. A.? Will the gentleman expand on that a little?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I realize that there have been some strange things happen through the O. P. A. We hear them criticized. According to the bill brought out by the Banking and Currency Committee, there are not any of these ceilings on agricultural products put on without the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. He must assume his share of the responsibility. We must, I repeat, either support the O. P. A. legislation, repeal it, or supplant it with something better.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to farm-acreage allotments, the farm marketing excess of wheat, the use of excess corn as silage for feed to livestock on the farm, to provide for the adequate supply of peanuts for oil and other uses.

The bill could be designated as a bill to win the war. I say this in all seriousness. I know that it is quite popular to tag a bill as a war measure in order to secure its passage. However, insofar as peanuts are concerned, it is absolutely necessary that this legislation be immediately adopted so that this Nation may have sufficient food in order to meet the civilian and military requirements. It has been said that food will win the war. If this be true, it certainly can be said that lack of food will lose the war.

We all know that the war in the Pacific has cut off the importation of vegetable oil and that as a nation we are faced with the responsibility of finding a replacement. This replacement, in the main, lies in cottonseed, soybeans, and peanuts. The peanut is one of the best, if not the best, sources of vegetable oil and the Department of Agriculture has, therefore, requested that the acreage allotment in normal times of 1,610,000 acres be increased to 5,500,000 acres.

Under the present law, each year there must be set up a national acreage allotment sufficient to supply only the edible trade. Ordinarily peanuts are produced for the edible trade as other competitive oils are cheaper and are, therefore, more widely used.

The Office of Price Administration has placed a ceiling on vegetable oils which will not cover the cost of production.

Heretofore, we have had a two-price system for peanuts; one price for edible peanuts and another for excess peanuts which were produced for oil. It has been difficult to explain why there should be a two-price system because all peanuts cost the same to produce. Naturally, the two-price system has been brought about by the low price of vegetable oil, only a few peanuts being necessary for this competitive business, and peanuts grown on allotted acreage being sold for edible purposes and bringing a much higher price.

However, the war has now changed the whole picture. It is of vital necessity to our war effort that we have more vegetable oil, not only for civilian and military use but for lend-lease shipments. I was recently told by a person who had returned from a visit to one of our allied countries that the people when given lard, or vegetable oil, would spread it upon bread and eat it. The human body must have fats and oils to properly function and it is up to this Congress to do everything within our power to aid the production of these fats and oils.

Regardless of the price of peanuts, I am afraid that we will fall far short of the acreage requested by the Department of Agriculture. This will be due to farm labor shortage and also shortage of farm machinery equipment.

This bill provides that for the years 1943 and 1944 all peanuts produced whether grown on excess, allotted, or unallotted acreage shall bring the same price. This act also provides that the producer shall not lose his allotment as these will be continued after 1943.

I can assure this House that the farmers of my section are going to do everything within their power to increase the peanut acreage. Many of them have lost their help by reason of the Selective Service and are being handicapped because they are not able to secure proper farm machinery equipment. In spite of these handicaps, they are going forward to victory, keeping ever alive the motto, "Food Will Win the War."

This administration has requested the increase in peanut acreage. This House must help make this increase a reality by the speedy enactment of this legislation.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 35 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, the statement was made yesterday on the floor that special study should be made of this bill. I want to thank those who made that suggestion. I intend within the time allotted to me to give you all I know about peanuts and peanut legislation, and I hope you will do me the kindness to follow me closely.

Before doing that I want to make reference to frequent remarks that were made on the floor yesterday, one this morning, and practically every day, to the effect that the time has come when the entire farm program should be repealed and the farmers of the Nation should be turned loose without any planning or any regulations. I think this complaint has become general enough, certainly among the Members of Congress, to justify a hearing by our committee on that subject, and on yesterday I asked our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, if he would not immediately undertake a complete and exhaustive hearing and let the people who are interested, the Members of Congress who feel that way, come before the committee. Personally I have some doubt that you really want to do that. There seems to be a general misunderstanding of how the programs stand.

There is a limitation today on only three commodities: One is wheat; this is limited to 55,000,000 acres, simply because when you begin to gather wheat this year you will have on hand 660,000,000 bushels, the biggest surplus ever known in the history of the world. If

you plant much more you will not have any storage facilities. The W. P. B. has already granted all the metals they can to build storage places for wheat. Canada has a 2-year supply of wheat on hand, Australia has an enormous supply of wheat, and Brazil has a 2-year supply of wheat. For these reasons the acreage of wheat is still limited.

The acreage on cotton is still limited because, to begin with, last year when we were harvesting our cotton crop we had with that crop in the field 24,000,000 bales. We cannot consume in this country over 12,000,000 bales, and in order to do that, every textile mill must run 24 hours a day every day in the year; consequently, your consumption of cotton is limited by your textile-mill capacity. There is a shortage of long staple cotton, and for this reason there is no limitation, and, as a matter of fact, an extra premium is being paid to farmers to get them to grow more long staple cotton.

The other limitation is on tobacco. The tobacco crop was increased 10 percent this year. It is felt that in these times when, as someone has said, we may have to feed the world, the day may come when it is much more important to have a piece of grease, to have a piece of bread, than it is to have a cigarette or a chew of tobacco. There are those who advocate the removal of all programs. I do not see it. Those who advocate the elimination of all planning of farm programs during this emergency are, in my judgment—hear me—doing the same thing as if they were advocating abolishing the War Production Board, abolishing the planning commissions in the Army and the Navy, that we send Mr. Nelson home, and that we tell the manufacturers of this Nation: "There are no strings on you; there is no planning; we need lots of war materials; you can build whatever you please."

What would be the result of that? No Member of the House, I say, would care to suggest it. What would be the result of that? Why, the manufacturers would build those things they are best equipped to build; would they not? Secondly, they would build those things which would pay the greatest profit; would they not? All right. Let us say that the easiest thing to make is tanks and their manufacture shows a good profit. There would be no limit and no specifications as to the tanks he manufactured. If we followed that policy generally, we might wind up by having 5,000,000 tanks and not a machine gun with which to equip them. Or, let us say it is planes; we would wind up with 5,000,000 planes and not a motor to go in them. Is there anybody on the floor who would advocate that? What is the difference between planned industry and a planned farm program? Unless we have someone somewhere planning the needs of this Nation and of our armed forces, how is the man in California going to know what the man in Pennsylvania is planting? How do we, as individual farmers, know what is needed most?

The gentleman from Minnesota has mentioned corn. There is but one restriction or requirement today with respect to the production of corn and that is that, together with their corn, they must plant a certain amount of war crops, soybeans, flaxseed, peanuts, or something else. They go to the Minnesota farmer and tell him, "You can plant all the corn you want after you put in 4 acres of soybeans, or 3 acres of flaxseed." Is that wrong?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I cannot yield now.

If we can take a General Motors Corporation plant, which has made automobiles and nothing but automobiles, and absolutely put them out of the automobile business, destroy their business, if we can take your boy and put him into the armed forces and send him to the battle line to give his life, is it such a terrible thing to tell the farmers of Minnesota or Georgia that we are planning this program so as to supply what we need to win the war, that all we ask him to do is to put in 5 acres of soybeans, or 10 acres of flax, or a few acres of peanuts, or Irish potatoes? That is the only regimentation on the farm you have today. It is a program necessary to win the war. There may be some who think that you can win this war on a hit-and-miss policy. For myself, I do not think so. I do hope, and this is all I intend to say on the subject, that the chairman of my committee will order an immediate hearing on the proposal to repeal every law on the statute books with regard to farm legislation, abolish, if you please, the Department of Agriculture and turn the farmers loose, and we will see whether you are for it when you get the full facts. I do not believe you will be. That is all I want to say on that, except I wish you would do some thinking.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. On that point?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand, it is contemplated that $400,000,000 be appropriated for payments under the Soil Conservation Act. Does the gentleman think that amount of money is necessary in view of the fact that that is almost as much as we had away back in the time when we were using those payments to cut down on the so-called soil-depleting crops?

Mr. PACE. The gentleman will have to get the detailed information from my colleague from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] who informed me that the majority of that appropriation for payments to be used as an inducement for increased production and in no instance and in no case will a dime be used for reducing production.

Mr. HALLECK. I thought the Appropriations Committee had turned down the proposal that sought to pay $100,000,000 for incentive payments.

Mr. PACE. They did, but that was an extra $100,000,000 for certain special war crops.

Now, I want to get to section 4 of the bill.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I am sorry. I hope to finish quick enough to permit questions. I am going to run right through this.

Yesterday one of the Members of the House came to me and jokingly said, "Why should I vote for a peanut bill when there is not a peanut grown in my State?" Of course, he was joking with me, but it tempts me to say that there is not a Member of this House who should not be vitally interested in section 4 of this bill, which is the peanut section.

This bill contemplates the setting up of a program where there will be produced this year 850,000,000 pounds of the finest protein meal in this Nation—get that, 850,000,000 pounds of peanut meal—which is among the best in protein value. There is not a Member of this House, I dare say, who has not been called upon in the last 3 weeks by the poultry and cattle producers and dairymen of this Nation with regard to the shortage of meal. Am I not correct about that? With the enormous increase in livestock and poultry there is today a very acute shortage of meal, very critical, for both the poultrymen for mash, for the dairyman, and for the cattle raiser. Therefore, no man who has an interest in producing sufficient cattle, poultry, and dairy products for the needs of the Nation should have any opposition to this bill.

Secondly, besides 850,000,000 pounds of protein meal, this bill will produce 600,000,000 pounds of vegetable oil. There is not any commodity hardly, not excepting airplanes, that is needed more than is vegetable oil, fats, and oils, if you please just grease. About 8 weeks ago I was in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture talking about this bill. He turned to me and he said: "Last week there was sitting in the chair which you now occupy the purchasing agent for the Russian Government crying like a baby." I said, "Mr. Secretary, what do you mean?" He said, "He sat there with tears in his eyes and said 'For God's sake, Mr. Secretary, give us some grease.'" He said, "They do not wait to cook with it. They grab it in their hands, they spread it on a piece of bread and they eat it like a starving child." Those may be the fellows who are going to be our salvation, and I feel like it is my duty and your duty to do anything possible to produce every pound of grease we can to send to Russia and to supply our own people.

That is why I think everybody in this House should be interested in this bill.

The impression was created among some of the Members that this is preferential treatment for peanuts. In the first place, not one single thing will be done for peanuts that is not also done for every oil-seed crop. There will be considerably more money spent on soybeans than will be spent on peanuts. There will be as much at least, and probably more, because the price is higher, on flaxseed than on peanuts. The fats and oil program is one whole program, and every commodity in it is to be treated just exactly alike. The only reason we are here today is to ask you, with the consent of the peanut producers of this

Nation, to put them in position to produce this oil and meal.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I cannot yield. I am going to get to that period a little later.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Tell us why it is necessary to take them out of the general bill then?

Mr. PACE. I want to tell you all I know about the peanut situation. About 6 years ago peanuts were bringing approximately $40 a ton. At that time it was costing about $80 a ton to produce them. Last fall the best estimate is that it cost about $121 a ton to produce them. This bill authorizes a price of $129, so do not be afraid anybody is going to get rich out of it. We went to the officials and showed them that we could not produce peanuts for $40 a ton. They said, "They are worth more than that for oil." They figured out what they were worth for oil—I have forgotten the exact figure—but say it was $50. The Surplus Commodities Corporation said, "We will give you $50. We will announce that we will pay $50 a ton and we will crush them into oil." That program was started. The announcement was made and it had the effect of raising the price of peanuts up to $50 a ton. The cost of production went up. The next year they raised the price to $60 and the next year to $70, speaking generally, the next year to $80 and in 1940 or 1941 to $90.

At that time cotton was around 7 or 8 cents a pound and peanuts at $70 or $80 or $90 a ton was a little better bet than cotton. There was an increase in peanut acreage because it was better than cotton. Then the Department of Agriculture called several of us in and said, "We are going to have to stop this diversion program. We cannot guarantee a price on peanuts with no limit on production, because it is beginning to cost the Department too much money."

It cost them $3,000,000 in 1939 and $699,000 in 1940. They said, "We can no longer put a price support under peanuts and let the acreage expand all over the Nation if it will cost the Government too much." We realize that that was a sensible position for them to take.

We then introduced the bill to put peanuts under marketing quotas. In practically every respect it is like the law on cotton, corn, wheat, and rice. It was just like the law in regard to all the other commodities, that all the producers had the right to vote, and they would get allotments in accordance with their past-production history.

The referendum was held. About 90 percent of the peanut farmers of this Nation voted in favor of quotas. It was for a 3-year period, for the years 1941, 1942, and 1943.

Under the law, as in the case of the other controlled crops, the producers are entitled to 90-percent-of-parity loans. So the peanut producers are entitled in 1943 to marketing quotas, acreage allotments, and a guarantee of 90 percent of parity. Ninety percent of parity would be around $140. They had a free market in peanuts last fall, and in my section the price of peanuts went up to $200 per ton. I want you to bear that in mind, and then remember that this bill fixes a price of $129. Peanuts sold in my district for $200 a ton. That was the price the old producers, as I am going to call them, received last year and what they are entitled to receive this year, 90-percent loans, 90-percent protection on price in a free market up to the ceiling.

When the Japs attacked Pearl Harbor they cut off the imports, naturally, that we had been receiving from the Philippines. That meant the loss of over 1,000,000,000 pounds of vegetable oil, cocoanut oil, copra, palm oil, and so forth.

Last February the Secretary made efforts to make up that loss. He went to the soybean producers of the Northwest and said, "We want you to increase your acreage three or four million acres." He went to the peanut producers of the South and said, "We want you to increase your peanut acreage," He went to the flaxseed producers and said, "We want you to increase your flaxseed acreage."

Mr. Henderson at that time had put a ceiling on all vegetable oils, which reduced the value of peanuts for oil purposes to only $80 to $85, so that is all Mr. Wickard would pay for the 1942 crop.

We were therefore faced with the situation of having one producer getting $80 for the peanuts he produced while another producer was getting as high as $200 for them, although merely a fence separated the fields in which these peanuts were grown and it cost as much to produce one as the other. That created a very unhappy situation, as you can easily imagine.

Last September a group of us on the committee began working on this bill. You talk about hearings, we have had farmers in from every section of the Nation. The farmers had a mass meeting in North Carolina and Virginia and sent a committee of 14 up here to study this bill, and they O. K.'d it. Farmers have been here from Texas, they have been here from Georgia, South Carolina, and Alabama. This bill is the result of 5 months of negotiations.

The bill involves a substantial loss on the part of the old producers because they are entitled to quotas. They have taken their cuts for 2 years, and they are entitled to quotas this year under every moral right. You and I have not the right to take that away from them unless we can give them something in return. Under this bill it is provided that during the war the quotas are canceled, their 90-percent loans are canceled, and they are required to accept a price of 85 percent instead of 90 percent of parity. In consideration of that sacrifice on the part of the farmers, this bill provides that after the war is over their quotas will be restored to them.

It has been intimated here that special treatment is being accorded the peanut producers. I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday afternoon, so you would have it available this morning, two letters from the Department of Agriculture. These are the support programs that have been announced so far.

Flaxseed is supported at 93 percent of parity. Bear in mind that this bill limits the price to 85 percent of parity for peanuts. Flaxseed is supported at 93 percent of parity and peanuts at 85 percent of parity; soybeans at between 105 and 115 percent of a comparable price, as no parity has ever been set up for soybeans; hogs at 90 percent of parity, not less than $13.50 a hundred; chickens at 90 percent of parity; turkeys at 90 percent of parity; eggs at 90 percent of parity; milk at 90 percent of parity; potatoes at 92 percent of parity; dried beans at 90 percent of parity; dried peas at 90 percent of parity; sugar beets at $11 a ton; naval stores at 90 percent of parity; and others in proportion.

Somebody, for a good cause or not, attempted to create the impression on the floor yesterday that this bill was giving special treatment and a special price to peanut producers. The law states—I have the law here, and everybody knows it as the Steagall amendment—that when the Secretary asks for increased production of any farm commodity he must guarantee the producers 90 percent of parity.

All in the world this bill does is this: In order to help the new producers, to whom the Secretary of Agriculture in 1942 paid only $82 for their peanuts, the old producers have come in and said, We are willing to submit to an amendment of the law to suspend quotas and allow an unlimited production of peanuts during the war; we are willing to give up the protection of 90 percent of parity so that the new producers can be brought up to us, so that everybody will get the same price for peanuts. If we are accepting the least price in the book, how can anybody charge that any special treatment is being accorded to peanuts?

Let me explain the bill now. It simply says that for 2 years, in the hope the war will be over in that time, marketing quotas on peanuts will be suspended; there will be no control and that for those 2 years the price shall be 85 percent of parity; that for those 2 years there will be no marketing quotas, but in consideration of the surrender made by the old producers that after the war is over their quotas will be restored and any excess acreage that is planted in peanuts during that period will not be the basis for an allotment. Then the bill provides that the edible trade shall continue to receive at least the quantity of peanuts they have received in the past. That was requested by all the manufacturers.

This bill does not provide 1 penny of subsidy. By voting for this bill you do not vote for a subsidy, but I do not want to mislead you. A subsidy program has been arranged for flaxseed, for soybeans, for cottonseed, for peanuts, and for every other oilseed crop.

I do not know exactly how much it will cost, but if it goes through, I can tell you what the peanut crop will cost. As I said before, this bill provides for the production of 600,000,000 pounds of oil and 850,000,000 pounds of meal. The ceiling on peanuts has now been fixed at $169,

and this bill assures the producers $129 per ton. The ceiling has been fixed at $169 per ton, and that is what the manufacturers of peanut butter will have to pay for peanuts. They are going to cost the Government $129. Therefore, on 635,000 tons, the Government will buy peanuts for $129 and sell them for $169, making a profit of $40 a ton, or $25,400,000. The program contemplates that there will be 1,000,000 tons of peanuts for oil. They are worth for oil about $83. The producers will get $129 per ton. That means that there will be a loss of $46 a ton on 1,000,000 tons of peanuts, making a loss of $46,000,000 and a profit of $25,400,000, or a net loss of $20,600,000.

The same treatment has been set up for soybeans, except that it costs more money, and the same for flaxseed, and I presume the same program will be set up for cottonseed. What difference does it make? Much of this oil will be bought for lease-lend, and in paying a subsidy of $20,000,000 to keep down the price, in order that the producers can produce it, what difference does it make between that and raising the market price by $20,000,000, and then lease-lend coming and paying the extra $20,000,000 for the oil?

This bill is not what I want, but it appears to be the best we can do under present conditions.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. Some question was brought up on the floor yesterday, and in some way those who spoke gave the impression that there was something in this particular bill which established or created a subsidy on peanuts. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is anything in this bill which establishes or creates a subsidy as far as peanuts are concerned?

Mr. PACE. There is not. This bill does only two things. It suspends quotas during the war, and it reduces the protection of the farmers from 90 percent down to 85 percent of parity, providing that after the war is over they will get back the situation as it was before.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If peanuts are not being accorded any different treatment than that given soybeans, under the Steagall Act of July 1, 1941, then why the necessity for passing this law? Why not leave the matter now just as it is, just as they were, just as soybeans and flaxseed are concerned, if peanuts are not being accorded any different or better treatment under this act?

Mr. PACE. They are not.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then it must follow that if they are not then there is no occasion for this law.

Mr. PACE. When the Secretary fixed the price of excess peanuts last year at $82, it was less than 90 percent of parity. We demanded 90 percent of parity as provided by the Steagall amendment. In order to get around that law the Secretary of Agriculture set up a new and different and so-called comparable parity on peanuts for oil. Over my protest and vigorous objections they set up a separate parity, which the gentleman from Wisconsin and most everybody else says was unfair, and put down the price to $80.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am sympathetic but there was no parity for soybeans, as I understand it, and it is fixed at 95 percent of that, is it not?

Mr. PACE. Soybeans are fixed at from 105 to 115 percent of a comparable price.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Under the Steagall amendment it is 85 percent.

Mr. PACE. But the October 2 stabilization act made it 90.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Even so, is it not true there was no parity price for soya beans?

Mr. PACE. But they have all been adjusted on an equality basis—flaxseed, soya beans, and peanuts.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Now, is it not true that there is a parity price for edible peanuts of something like $149 a ton?

Mr. PACE. And that is the only parity.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But with a comparable price for the oil peanuts around $3.60, or $3.40, or $75 or $80 a ton.

Mr. PACE. I cannot tell exactly what the difference is, but the law fixes the parity price and there is no authority to take peanuts or wheat or anything else and set up a separate parity for the different uses to which they are put. If you did, you would have a parity on wheat for feeding, you would have a parity on wheat for bread and a parity on wheat for breakfast foods.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the parity price now and what was it on July 15, 1942, on edible peanuts?

Mr. PACE. About $148.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And what was it on oil peanuts?

Mr. PACE. One hundred forty-eight dollars.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No, no. I beg your pardon. The July 15, 1941, price as fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture on oil peanuts.

Mr. PACE. I said just now, in order to overcome the Steagall amendment and pay the producers less than it costs to produce them——

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman answer the question and give us the price of oil peanuts as fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture July 15, 1942?

Mr. PACE. If I have it, I will.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What was it, approximately?

Mr. PACE. Approximately $80.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is about 4 cents as against 8 cents for edible peanuts?

Mr. PACE. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Eighty-two dollars a ton for oil peanuts as against $149 for edible peanuts?

Mr. PACE. Yes; and this bill is to correct that condition.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that under the terms of this bill peanuts will be the only basic commodity that will be permitted for 2 years to produce unlimited production?

Mr. PACE. It will not. Every other commodity except cotton, wheat, and tobacco can be produced without limit and has a 90-percent guaranty of parity prices if the Secretary asks for increased production.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman give us a little more light on this fact. The gentleman has emphasized the sacrifices which the farmer makes in dropping from 90 percent down to 85 percent.

Mr. PACE. That is the old producers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it not true that the old producer, under the old plan, received a 90-percent benefit only on that portion of the crop which was covered by the quota? In other words, any excess he had was not eligible for the 90 percent?

Mr. PACE. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Under this bill there is no such thing as an excess?

Mr. PACE. None at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD. He receives 85 percent on everything?

Mr. PACE. Across the board.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it is fair for us to say that there is no sacrifice involved in that. That is a good horse trade. I think that is a good horse trade for any grower of peanuts.

Mr. PACE. Assuming that the old producer is going to plant some excess; yes; but in Virginia and North Carolina, where they do not have the acreage, those producers will suffer a terrific loss, because they cannot expand their acreage. They cannot plant many excess peanuts, and they are taking it on the chin simply as a patriotic duty, and I think it one of the most splendid gestures I have ever seen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That part II of subtitle C of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 377. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, for any farm (or in the case of rice, for any person) which has in 1942 an acreage allotment for any commodity, except wheat, under the provisions of this title, the allotment for any subsequent year shall not be reduced on account of the failure to plant, harvest, or market, in whole or part, the commodity in any of the years beginning February 1, 1943, and ending December 31 of the year in which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated, if such failure was due solely to—

"(1) The shifting from the production of the commodity to the production of one or more needed war crops, in accordance with the request of the Secretary; or

"(2) The owner, tenant, or operator having entered the military or naval service; or

"(3) The owner, tenant, or operator being unable to secure adequate farm equipment and machinery or farm labor (including tenants); or

"(4) Any combination of the foregoing.

Any determination by a county agricultural conservation committee under this section may be reviewed only by the State agricul-

tural conservation committee. For the purpose only of determining State and county allotments under subsections (a) and (b) of section 334, in the case of wheat, the acreage which shall be considered to have been planted to wheat for harvest in each year of the period beginning January 1, 1943, and ending December 31 following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated, shall be the acreage which the Secretary determines would have been planted to wheat for harvest in such year except for one or more of the reasons set forth in (1), (2), (3), and (4) above."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York that his amendment is out of order at this place if there are any other amendments to the first section, and the Chair understands there are. If the gentleman will withdraw his amendment until the amendments to the first section are considered, the Chair will then consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I withdraw the amendment at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, we do not have time this afternoon—at least I do not within my allotted time—to discuss with the very able gentleman from Georgia and others the merits of the triple A program. I am indeed glad to know that he has called the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that there is considerable sentiment in this country for taking the restrictions off of many features of agriculture and that we may have full and complete hearings before our committee in the near future in respect of the matter.

Mr. Chairman, this bill we are now considering well illustrates the fact that when we attempt by legislation to control the natural law of supply and demand we usually get ourselves into serious difficulty. This bill and the debate thus far well illustrates that fact.

A few months ago we had an ample supply, and in many instances a surplus, of many commodities of which there is now an insufficient supply and in many cases an alarming scarcity.

It was only a few months ago that we decided to add peanuts to the so-called basic farm commodities. After this was done, it was, of course, necessary, if we were to follow through, to give peanuts the Government crutch and treat this commodity with the same consideration and respect that we were giving the other basic commodities by making Government funds available for loans and thus guaranteeing a minimum price—just as we were doing for the other so-called basic crops.

All of this required legislation by Congress and the giving to Government agencies control of the farms and farmers. We now always refer to them as bureaucrats.

We asked for it, made it possible, and we got it.

Of course, we did not authorize or expect these agencies or bureaucrats, or whatever you wish to call them, to wholly ignore not only the spirit and intent of many of these legislative acts in their administration of them.

We find, however, that they not only ignored the spirit and intention of the Congress in the interpretation that they put on many of these laws, but in many instances they violated the exact letter and provisions of the act, and it is because of the refusal of the O. P. A. and the Department of Agriculture to obey the law that this Congress passed, and to follow the directions in the price-control bill and establish ceilings for the price of vegetable oil at a place where the farmers can produce peanuts for oil without a loss to them in the production of the peanuts, that makes this bill necessary.

In other words, if the O. P. A. would follow the intent and direction of the Congress, and if the Secretary of Agriculture would do what he was directed to do in the price-control bill, and if the Department of Agriculture would devote its time to looking out for the interests of agriculture and the interests of the farmer instead of someone else, this bill would not be necessary.

Now, what are we to do about it?

We are told, and we know, that one of the most critical needs of the Nation today is an additional supply of fats and oils—particularly vegetable oils. In fact, the need has already become so urgent that a great deal of time and study is under way to determine the minimum amount on which the human body can maintain normal health.

Of course we all agree that our military and naval forces must be maintained at the maximum rather than the minimum requirements. All of our allies in this war, and particularly Russia and England, are in most urgent need of additional fats and oils.

This means that we must produce more of the oil-producing crops, such as soybeans and peanuts; and so the word has gone out to the farmers who produce the peanuts that we must have a huge increase of acreage. The only way we can do this is to undo what we and the farmers who grew the peanuts did, when in 1941 we made quotas effective for 3 years. By legislation we placed control for 3 years on the farmers and on the acreage that they could plant.

But now, we are at war; and the war has changed the picture, so far as peanuts are concerned, just as effectively as it has changed the picture in many other respects.

The same basic reasons underlie the necessity for the other provisions of this bill. Feed for livestock is becoming a serious problem. Dairy farmers not only need silage, but the beef growers must have something to take the place of cottonseed cake and cottonseed meal and soybean cake.

I have received hundreds of letters and telegrams in the past few weeks from farmers and ranchers in my district and State, telling of their inability to obtain cottonseed cake and cottonseed meal and soybean cake.

Yes, the war in a dozen ways, both directly and indirectly, has changed the feed picture overnight, so to speak, and so this legislation provided for in sections 2 and 3 of the bill is apparently necessary to augment our feed supply so that we may have dairy products and beef for our soldiers scattered throughout the seven seas and all over the world.

Yesterday my very good friend from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] rather facetiously kidded the members of the Agriculture Committee—of which I have the honor of being a member—of adhering to the old familiar doctrine of "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours." He indicated that the members of the committee interested in corn, though not interested in peanuts and wheat, were willing to go along because they were getting something for corn; that those interested in wheat, although not interested in corn or peanuts, were willing to go along because they were getting something for wheat; and that those interested in peanuts, although not interested in corn and wheat, were willing to do something for corn and wheat so that they could get what they wanted for peanuts.

Well, admitting for the sake of argument but not conceding that my friend may have more or less correctly analyzed the positions of some of us on the committee, nevertheless I am sure my friend must concede that while we may have been a little selfish in looking out for what seems to be the best interest of our own district or State, that in view of the peculiar circumstances of the times brought about by the impact of war and perhaps by too much governmental control and planning for the farmer, does make the sum total of the legislation necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I am not unaware of the very pertinent observation made yesterday by the distinguished and very able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as to the dangers which this sort of legislation forbodes. I am just as alarmed and concerned as is he about the payment of subsidies under whatever name, and I am in full accord with the action taken by his subcommittee on agricultural appropriation in rejecting the request for $100,000,000 to finance incentive payments to farmers. The farmers do not need financial incentives to be patriotic. All they ask is a decent price for what they produce. The farmers do not want subsidies. All they want and all they demand is that they have a price including labor costs, at the home market, with a ceiling low enough to protect the consumer against an unreasonable or inflationary price.

There is no use of trying to kid the farmer any longer. We know and he knows why some of those in high places prefer the payment of subsidies over a cost plus reasonable return to the farmer at the local market. Did not some of them let the cat out of the bag when they said if they discontinued the payment of subsidies they would lose control of the farms?

No, my friends, be not deceived, the program of Mr. Brown who is now the Director of O. P. A., and the program of those for whom he speaks, has not changed. It is the same program he advocated before he became a "lame duck" and while Mr. Henderson was still at the head of the O. P. A.; and that is, to keep farm prices down and soothe the farmer with subsidies, while coddling certain other groups with increased wages and giving them a free hand to fix their own formulas.

The labor formula includes living costs with no ceiling; and yet when the farmer asks for inclusion of his labor costs, he is offered a hand-out to be apportioned by the swivel-chair bureaucrats in Washington.

In view of what is taking place, I think it is a fair statement to say that some of those in high official places are more interested in soft soaping the consumers through a subsidy program, hoping for their votes, than they are for the general welfare of either the farmer or the country.

Because of the emergency, I shall reluctantly support this bill, but just as soon as possible we should by legislation assist the farmer in extricating himself from some of the mess we find him in today.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to try to boil this thing down as much as I can in 5 minutes. First of all, I think it proper for some of the Members who were not here in 1937 to know that I was the one member of the committee who opposed the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 on the Democratic side.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 had some quota provisions in it to which I took direct objection, and to which I still object. The farmers, in order to cast a vote on whether or not a quota shall be put into effect, are either told by county agents or in voting booths are confronted with the statement that unless quotas are in effect, no loans will be available to the farmers. This is not in accordance with my conception of the proper way in which Americans should exercise the franchise on any question.

We come now to a situation where we are relieving certain farmers producing certain crops from burdens which were fixed upon their shoulders as a result, first, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and, second, by the Price Control Act. There is no other reason for this bill. My distinguished, beloved, and learned friend, the gentleman from Georgia, STEVE PACE, has with every bit of genius and ability he possesses made repetitious calls on both the Department of Agriculture and on the O. P. A., making efforts properly to represent his constituents who produce various crops, and particularly with reference to this bill, peanuts, to see if some little wisdom could not be got through the strange thickness which apparently existed between their ears providing for a certain price on oil which would permit all producers of peanuts to receive at least the cost of production. Failing in that, of course, the only remedy the gentleman had was to present a bill such as this, not to relieve farmers from actual depression, not to relieve farmers from the evil of their own ways and practices, but as a matter of fact, God willing, to see if he could not do something to relieve them from the pressure of ill-devised legislation and administration of legislation which in all candor has manifested in so many ways and degrees the complete disregard for the letter of the law and the intention of Congress. My time does not permit me to go into this phase of it.

Now, we are confronted with a bill which provides for the production of an essential war material, oil. What are we going to do about it? We do not have the Agricultural Adjustment Act up here for consideration. We do not have the Price Control Act up here. We have only one act. We have this act to provide ways and means by which farmers may produce a crop which is part and parcel of the program involved in the war effort. Oil is the basis of the major argument in this bill.

I said yesterday that I regret very much finding myself in the position of being called upon to even vote upon such a question. When I do vote, I am going to offer an amendment to the bill. I am going to vote for this bill with the greatest of repugnance that has ever confronted me. I have never voted for a bill which I was quite so much opposed to as I am to this one, but I am going to vote for it for the simple reason it is the only means at hand to meet this situation.

In the future, God willing, I hope the Congress will get together and do something with reference to channelizing the laws which they pass in order to control the administration of those laws within proper channels, and will not give to the administrative branch of the Government and those charged with the administration of the laws powers in excess of powers which we, the Congress, possess. We cannot delegate powers we do not have, yet those powers are exercised down here by the administrative branch. There are many things the Congress cannot do that they do. We are on the horn of the dilemma and I have stated my position.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland: Strike out section 1 and insert the following as a substitute for the bill:

"That subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and paragraphs numbered 1 to 9, inclusive, and 12, of the Joint Resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended,' approved May 26, 1941, as amended, shall not apply with respect to any crop planted or harvested prior to the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President."

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment as not being germane.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. May I ask the gentleman from South Carolina to withhold his point of order for the time being?

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I withhold the point of order if the gentleman wants to speak on his amendment.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, first I want to apologize to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture for not having expressed my sentiments on this legislation before the committee, but being a new Member and just becoming acquainted with the procedure of the House and the various ramifications of its operations, I will have to plead guilty to ignorance on the subject until I heard the discussions yesterday.

The amendment I offer to this bill is probably not germane and the point of order which the gentleman from South Carolina has made, or will make, will probably be sustained. But I want to take this time to discuss some of my views in reference to the activities of the Department of Agriculture as they relate to crop control and farm allotments. I intend to have presented to the Committee on Agriculture a bill which will do that which my amendment is intended to do; that is, suspend for the duration of the war all the activities of the Department of Agriculture that relate to crop allotments and quotas for farm products during this emergency.

In this, my first address to the House, may I say that I have nothing but the highest interests of the farmers of this country at heart. I am a farmer myself; I have been engaged in farming all of my life, and I have never been engaged in any other business. I know the feelings of the farmers; I know what the rank and file of the practical farmers are thinking today, and I say to you in all fairness and with all due respect to the Department of Agriculture that the activities of that Department during the last few years have done more to hurt the farmers of this country than any other one thing that has been done.

The Department of Agriculture has an admirable staff of trained research experts. It was created as a research department. It was created to do the things that the people wanted done in the way of experimentation, control of crop diseases, and things of that kind, but we find it has branched out to become a bureau, the main desire of which is to regiment the farmers of this Nation. I do not want it and I know the farmers of this Nation do not want it.

The provisions of this Agricultural Adjustment Act are not so harsh today because we are at war and the demand for farm products is exceptionally great, but I submit, Mr. Chairman, if this war had not come, and if the activities of the agricultural administration had prevailed up to this time, every crop raised in this country would have had a quota. We would be licensed by the Department of Agriculture; we would be regulated in every activity that we could pursue in any form in this country.

I have heard a lot said in this House about regimentation. The farmers of this Nation constitute the largest single individual group in this Nation and when you put that many people under license and control of a Government bureau you have no longer freedom of action and free enterprise in this country. You are regimenting people in the largest single enterprise in this country who do not want to be regimented, people who are resourceful, people who have initiative and industry, the conservative people of this country, and the backbone of this country. If you ever have to come to the people who will come back and save our constitutional form of government and the right of individuals to pursue their business as they see fit, you will have to come to the farmers.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Can the gentleman give us his opinion from his long experience as a farmer with reference to why the farmers of this country generally have so long acquiesced in this program and why they have so long taken the handouts and voted for the administration that gave those handouts to them?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I will explain that, but before explaining it may I say to the gentleman that I can speak to him in good faith on this subject.

For the last few years I have been operating one of the largest truck farms in Maryland. I have been eligible to receive farm payments and subsidies because of the size of my operations, but I have never asked for nor accepted 1 cent from the Federal Government in payment for any crop, because I believe it is unsound and going to lead to chaos in agriculture as well as have an adverse effect on every other business in this country.

The farmers do not want this regimentation. It was put over by the promotion agencies of the Department of Agriculture. We have a Department of Agriculture doing a good job in carrying out the purposes for which it was created, and it is doing a worth-while service for the people of this country. However, there drifted into the Department of Agriculture a philosophy of government under which the Department thought that they could by their promotion work and activities guide the farmers of this country. Every bit of this legislation has been made effective through the various agencies of the Department of Agriculture, such as the Extension Service in every county in the State. These agents have advised a certain selected few of the farmers that this law is what they want.

In my own county we had this experience in connection with the wheat-quota program. Out of 4,000 wheat farmers, 400 voted on the subject, and approximately 60 percent of the 400 voted in favor of the program. The ones who did vote for it were men who had been receiving benefits from this Administration, who were the wards and the favorites of the agents of the Department of Agriculture. They were organized by the men who wished to perpetuate this system.

A great majority of the farmers throughout the country who are opposed to it are not organized. Naturally the farmer will take it when an agent hands him a check, but the farmer who is taking it realizes this system is unsound and wants to get rid of the shackles. He has had enough of it to see where it will lead if this program is continued. It will mean to him that he or his children and his family will be regulated and restricted in every activity and every farm operation from now on if this practice continues.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I am reluctant to interrupt the able gentleman, who is making such a splendid and sound statement, but is not the only purpose of benefit payments to maintain political control over the producers of this Nation?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I will not agree with the gentleman on that point, because this program does not have any relation to either party. It started years ago and has culminated in what we have. The roots and the seeds of it started many years ago.

Mr. SHORT. I am not blaming any particular party, but is not the purpose of it to maintain control over the producers of the Nation by these bureaucrats?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. To maintain control; I would not say for political purposes. I would say it is because they have a philosophy of government they believe is ideal, and they want to impose it on the will of every farmer in the country.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Then the gentleman would say that the method used by the Department of Agriculture in getting their program over and having it acquiesced in by the farmers is a method of debauchery of the farmers by this Bureau?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. We have the same situation among the farmers as obtains in labor. We have the professional farm organization men who are out to save the farmer. The rank and file of the farmers have just as much voice in what is done as labor generally has in the activities of radical labor representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, a number of other Members want to speak on this bill, so I shall have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina made a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist that the gentleman from South Carolina assign his reasons for the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a point of order is not pending.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I reserved a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina reserved a point of order. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the subject under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again read? Most of us did not hear it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The Clerk again read the Baldwin of Maryland amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Maryland on the point of order made by the gentleman from South Carolina as to his amendment.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, my amendment eliminates for the duration the activities of the Department of Agriculture in allotting farm acreage for any crop. This bill, H. R. 1605, as presented to the House deals with certain specific crops. While my amendment deals with other crops in addition to these, it still deals with the same subject matter, crop control and crop allotment for all agricultural purposes. The reason I submitted the amendment in this way was because of the necessity of food production at this time. I thought the more speed we could have in eliminating the restrictions by the Department of Agriculture in the production of farm crops, the better this Nation would be. I intend, as I said a moment ago, to introduce bills covering the subject matter contained in my amendment. I realize as well as all the rest of the Members that we are going to have serious problems affecting agriculture after this war is over, but I say to you in this reconstruction period, if the Government again is ever called upon to spend money to help industry, particularly the farmers, let us spend that money to correct the cause and not just as a subsidy, a continual subsidy year after year, because I submit that after the war expenses have been paid the Treasury of this country will not have any subsidies to spend on any crop.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the title of this bill is "To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to farm acreage allotments, the farm marketing excess of wheat, the use of excess corn as silage for feed for livestock on the farm, and to provide for the adequate supply of peanuts for oil and other uses, and for other purposes."

Under that title an amendment providing for the postponement of operations of any part of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is germane, and the House is entitled to consider amendments that relate to that purpose. This amendment clearly relates to that purpose, and, therefore, it is germane, and in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN] in effect strikes out subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended. The purpose of the bill before the Committee of the Whole limits itself to amending subtitle C of the Agricultural Act, and the Chair is of opinion, taking into consideration of course the statement of the gentleman from New York, that it would, in effect, repeal other sections of the act, not included in this bill. It goes away beyond the scope of the present bill and the Chair thinks it is, therefore, not germane to the bill and sustains the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, Henry Thomas Buckle, in his History of Civilization in England, said that the greatest reforms of the English-speaking race had consisted not in doing something new but in undoing something old. I am convinced now, as I was convinced years ago, that the present farm program is a detriment to the small farmer.

I said then, when the first Bankhead bill was proposed, that I feared we would live to see our small farmers gnawing the corncob of economic inequality. That prediction has come true. But I did not expect to see the man who advocated plowing up my cotton and killing the pigs of the country eating muskrats as an example to the rest of the Nation.

This farm program has enriched the big planter to the detriment of the small farmer. The present policy of regimentation is driving us toward the same disaster that the Russian program brought to the Russian farmers in the Ukraine in 1933.

If you will take these bureaucrats off of the backs of the farmers of this country, pull the leeches off, stop the special interests from skinning the farmers, and let those farmers raise what they want to raise and what they can raise, then they will produce the food and the fiber to feed and clothe this country and supply our allies.

I am not at all enthusiastic about this bill. I feel somewhat as the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] said he did. It may be the least of two evils under the circumstances, but I would much prefer to have a bill here that would take off the American farmer these restrictions that are hampering him as he has never been hampered before.

The cotton farmer makes a cent an hour for every cent a pound he receives for the cotton he produces. Today cotton is 19½ cents a pound, which means 19½ cents an hour, for his work, toiling in the hot sun, while the man in the factory is drawing on the average more than 80 cents an hour, and yet you are stripping our farms of young men for the armed services or putting them in these factories, where in many instances they have three or four times as much labor as necessary to do the work and where laborers are given special exemptions. As a result, agriculture in this country is on the downgrade at a time when we need agricultural products as we never needed them before.

Something must be done to relieve this situation. I am in favor of stripping the statute books of all of these restrictions, turning our farmers loose, and letting them go ahead and make their own crops in their own way.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. PACE. And does the gentleman advocate the same thing in industry in this Nation, turning the matter loose to the manufacturers?

Mr. RANKIN. My honest opinion is that if you would turn the manufacturers of industry loose, and take these labor racketeers off their backs, we would get more munitions manufactured for the same amount of money and in the same length of time. Yes, I say to the gentleman from Georgia, I favor that policy.

Mr. PACE. So the gentleman does not think there should be any plan so far as munitions are concerned?

Mr. RANKIN. We have a Navy Department, a War Department, and an air force. Let them state what they want and the manufacturers of America will produce it, if you just give them a chance.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Is it the gentleman's opinion that American industry, as well as the American farmer, only needs to know what is needed, to provide it?

Mr. RANKIN. American industry is just as patriotic as American bureaucracy. The American farmer is just as patriotic as any bureaucrat that ever lived, and if you will turn them loose and give them a chance they will produce everything we need.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: On page 1, after the enacting clause, strike out all of section 1 and insert a new section, to read as follows:

"To suspend laws, regulations, and orders which restrict the production of agricultural commodities. That, until the day following the date on which the President proclaims that hostilities in the present war have ceased, all provisions of law, and of regulations and orders, which restrict, authorize the restriction of, or by the payment of benefits have the effect of restricting the production of any agricultural commodity, are suspended."

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order until I discuss the amendment?

Mr. FULMER. I reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina reserves a point of order against the amendment, and the gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I regret that this type of amendment is being objected to as not germane to the bill. When I heard the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN] I knew it would be ruled out on the same ground that my amendment would be ruled out, because it extended to a great many of the other laws and acts which I feel should be done away with for the duration.

Not long ago I rose to discuss H. R. 1003 which I introduced on January 11. I submit that if this amendment, which embraces the provisions of H. R. 1003, were adopted today, or better yet, if H. R. 1003 itself were adopted, it would constitute an absolute cure-all for every bit of trouble which the farmer is having with his production problems and for all the problems he is facing for the duration of the war.

The farmers of America have been assigned a gigantic task, one that should entitle them to having all the shackles and hindrances taken away from them, so that they could proceed in an orderly manner to produce to the limit all the articles of food which our allies, which our armed forces and which our civilian population must have if we are to win this war.

The other day I accused certain officials in the Department of Agriculture of selling the American farmer down the river. I repeat that charge today. I say that the Department of Agriculture has failed to interpret the laws as Congress intended those price-regulation laws to be interpreted.

Not long ago there was testimony before the Committee on Agriculture which showed that the officials in charge of the parity-price program, which was passed last November before the Seventy-seventh Congress adjourned, were deliberately taking the law into their own hands and manipulating the prices as they saw fit. They failed to follow the instructions of the House which definitely set forth that the highest monthly average from January 1942 to the following September should be the basis on which to fix farm prices. It was admitted before our committee by one of the officials that they had disregarded

this interpretation of the law and had proceeded as they saw fit. I cannot condone them for this shortcoming. I do condemn them for another thing. Not only did the Department of Agriculture officials take the bull by the horns and interpret the law as they wanted to, but certain officials therein were additionally bold. They went out and deliberately tried to defeat certain Members of Congress for reelection. That is a matter of record before the Committee on un-American activities. It was proved that one of the head economists in the Department of Agriculture was a clearing house for the handling of immense sums of money which went toward the defeat of many Representatives in this House.

I think it is high time that the Congress took some kind of controlling measure to regulate such procedure.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I note in the report concerning section 4 it is stated that the necessity for section 4 comes about because of the refusal of the Office of Price Administration to set a decent price, a price which is equivalent to cost of production, upon vegetable oils. Is that a fact?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. What arises in my mind is this: Do we as a Congress have to become subservient to the Office of Price Administration and come here and pass legislation designed to give the peanut grower cost of production just simply because the bureaucrats down in the Office of Price Administration refused to do what is right?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. We pass these laws here in Congress, but after they are passed they are interpreted and carried out the way the bureaus want, and not according to the intent of Congress.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot yield further, I am sorry.

I do not know how other Members view the attitude of the people back home, but I say very frankly that it is getting in my hair. I do not know how much longer they are going to stand for the red tape and the deliberate malfeasance—it is nothing short of that—of some of the officials who are supposed to be running the various departments of this Government. I do not know how long the folks back home are going to countenance continual inaction on the part of Congress to liquidate these bureaus, but I do know that there is very great amount of dissatisfaction over this inaction.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Does the gentleman remember the predicament the farmers were in in 1932? Or does he have any knowledge whatsoever about it?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not know anything about that. But I want to say that a decade of the present policies put into operation by the Department of Agriculture has had the most devastating effect that could be imagined upon the American farmer, and the 10 years just past were but a prelude to the catastrophe which is now descending upon the farmer and hampering him in every way he could be hampered, making it impossible for him to proceed in a constructive way to increase production at a time when it is so badly needed.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield gladly to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. My very able but young friend did not make such close observation of matters in 1932, but does not the gentleman remember back that far to know that we were not eating horse meat at 29 cents a pound?

Mr. BONNER. If the gentleman will yield, I will remind the gentleman from Kentucky that the farmers were riding around in Hoovercrats then.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair about this, but will the gentleman tell us frankly and conscientiously whether the condition of the farmer is worse today than it was during the last days of Hoover in 1932?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have but a few seconds left, but I will answer the gentleman by saying that right now in my section the farmers cannot even get rubber boots to go out and shovel manure. The farmer has not got a chance to follow out the program our Government expects him to follow—in other words, to produce food for our Army, to produce food for our allies, to produce food for our civilian population. I submit that unless some action is taken we are going to fail in our attempt to meet these demands. In my opinion, he is in the worst condition in the history of our entire Nation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman has not answered my question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I will state, as did the gentleman from Maryland, that my amendment is far-reaching. It seeks to cure a lot of the present evils that we are now beset with, and if it were passed it would allow the farmer to go ahead with a constructive program.

I believe that if my amendment were adopted it would be germane. I feel that it is a definite remedy, a panacea, and that it will do everything and a little bit more than the amendment which was offered previously.

I hope the gentleman from South Carolina will withdraw his point of order and that the Chair will sustain this amendment, and I ask that due consideration be given to this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from South Carolina makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the present bill, because it goes beyond the scope of the present bill.

The gentleman has offered an amendment which is very far-reaching and clearly goes beyond the scope of the bill. It is not therefore germane to the bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, this bill is beset with many errors like every other Government-controlled law dealing with the business of the farmer. We have here 12 photographs which show the inefficiency in the failure of the agricultural agency to place in a warehouse the 1942 peanut crop. I know they pay their favorites in the Farm Security Agency for doing stenographic work more than we pay our county judges and sheriffs in Oklahoma, and they have a a peculiarly bureaucratic, inefficient method of selecting men to compile forms, and the very burdensome forms they compile are so complicated that not 1 percent of the Members of Congress can fill any one of these forms out to save his life without help; but notwithstanding all these complications, and in spite of all these regulations of regimentation, I am for this bill, and hope amendments will be offered that will make it work better.

I am for this bill, because we cannot help thinking of the favors which the Congress, our legislative and our executive branch of government has given to organized labor, has given to capital generally, the banking, industrial, and the mercantile world. We cannot forget that back in the dark days of the Hoover administration when this Congress lent a hand to mankind by large appropriations, and brought him up to his social and business status of today, you tried to correct a very grave evil. Let us not draw a line of demarcation between the farmer and the unorganized group of labor on the one hand and organized labor, industry, and capital groups on the

other. By the way, the unorganized group of labor is seven times greater in number than the organized group, but they do not have the power or organization to crack the whip to where they can scare those in authority.

Let us run these labor racketeers, these bureaucrats, out of the Government. Let us fix it by law. Let us give it some serious study. Let us take these matters before the proper committees and give serious thought and study and remove the power of decision that is lodged in some of these greedy, incompetent bureaucrats, and may I add, manned by Communist-minded in many respects, who are trying to get the farmers into some such communistic or communistic front organization.

I want to remove paternalism from government and go back to the sound old principles of democracy that men may freely express their views and that each and every individual in this democracy will have an equal opportunity with everybody else. The chances are that we will not all be on an even keel; in the end there will be the strong and the weak, but we will be born equal and have an equal start in life.

We talk about the Ruml plan; we talk about taxes being too high and that the contractors who made the millions in 1941 and 1942 want to forget 1942 and begin a new pay-as-you-go plan and be forgiven their 1942 income taxes. Surely we should think of the millions of dollars that the labor racketeers garnered from our farmers, businessmen, and others in charging very excessive dues and fees, all of which was free of taxation, exempt from paying income taxes. Yet we object to a semipaternalistic bill to appropriate forty or fifty or a hundred million dollars to help the farmers of this country. If we could guarantee parity to the farmers, we could do away with all of these laws of a paternalistic nature, and we can do it if we have the courage and will get down to the milk in the coconut.

You know, we have laws now that not only discriminate between certain classes in favors received from the Government in dollars and cents but we have a class that is exempt from violence or threats of violence, while if you or I should commit the same crime we would be dealt with by the laws of our land. Do you think that is right? You know it is not right, regardless of any man's affiliations with any kind of an organization, fraternal or otherwise. These people should not have any more privileges under the criminal code of our land than our farmers have, and it is up to us to straighten out these discriminations against the commission of crimes, exemption from paying income taxes of the great masses, as we go along.

I want to get back to the bill. Every amendment that I shall offer is a constructive amendment, an amendment that will give private dollars lying in banks bulging out with money a chance to be used against our Government tax-paid dollars, and I hope you will support the amendments. We would like to take the Government out of business as soon as conditions will permit, and we hope that we can reach the point that we can get the Government clear out of business before too long. Do you remember back yonder in the dark days a certain man who handled a gavel in a certain deliberative body being in the banking business? If I remember correctly, he borrowed from one of the then Government agencies in those days $90,000,000 that possibly the Government had to charge off.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. When I conclude. If that is true, why quibble over half of that much to protect all the farmers of America? May I say, without becoming personal about it, I did not mention the name of the borrower. Can you figure out who I have in mind? I am talking about one individual. This bill will not cost the Government half as much, if the statement is correct, as that one lost loan.

Let us hope that we can do something constructive for agriculture. Support every constructive amendment. I appreciate the remarks made by the farmer from Maryland. It would be wonderful if all of our farmers were farmers of his kind; then we would be represented as well as any other group in America.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, may I see if we cannot agree on a limitation of time? We want to get through with this bill tonight. I appreciate all of the speeches, but if we keep this up we will be here very late. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 15 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I intended to offer to this section.

Mr. FULMER. On this section?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, make it 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER]?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not know how many people want time to speak on this bill.

Mr. FULMER. That will take care of the Members who are standing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Maryland has an amendment he wants to offer to this section and he will probably want to be heard on it, and the gentleman from New York wants to be heard.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, make it 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I see two additional Members rising for time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise not to object to any specific part of this section 1 because I think it is highly desirable that we make these provisions to protect the farmer who is not able to carry on his farming operations during the war on account of conditions brought about by the war, which is all that section 1 does. I feel, however, that I could not allow this matter to go by without saying for the record just a few words in regard to the greatest of oil and feed-producing crops of the Nation, which crop was overlooked by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia when he so eloquently discussed the need for additional vegetable oils.

The gentleman from Georgia did mention that there was such a thing as cottonseed, but we get a wrong conception of this whole question of vegetable oils and particularly of high-protein feeds if we do not give consideration to that greatest of all oil-seed crops, the greatest of all producers of vegetable oil and protein feed, cottonseed.

There is no crop known to man that compares with the seed of the cotton plant when it comes to producing vegetable oil and the high-protein feed on which our livestock, our dairy, and our poultry interests are so dependent. Cottonseed makes up the bulk and the backbone of the vegetable-oil feeds produced in America. Cottonseed is the bulwark of our high-protein feeds. It does not make any difference how successful we may be with the programs we hope to inaugurate during the coming year; even granting that they are 200 percent successful, we would still be faced with a shortage of both vegetable oil and high-protein feed if we do nothing about cottonseed.

There is but one source from which you can meet the needs of this Nation as far as vegetable oils and high-protein feeds are concerned, and that is cottonseed. It has produced the overwhelming bulk of those supplies during the years past. Five million acres in peanuts will not change that situation. We have grown as high as 49,000,000 acres of cotton in the United States. We get 2 pounds of seed for every pound of lint, and from that seed we have fed our dairy herds, we have fattened our beef cattle, and in recent years we have supplied the poultry and the dairy people and the hog growers with a large percentage of the important protein feeds in their mixed feeds.

Today we are faced with a shortage; in fact, absolutely no high-protein feed can be had. We must recognize that this matter of high-protein feed is just as important as the production of vegetable oils. You cannot fatten all the cattle, you cannot properly carry on your dairy production, you cannot even properly carry on your poultry production, without a supply of high protein feed, and you must grow cotton in order to get it.

Do not think of the cotton crop simply as a fleecy staple, think of it as the greatest producer of high-protein feed the world has ever known. Then you will properly picture the cotton crop of this Nation and have some realization of the importance it has in American agriculture and in the question of feeding the American people in the coming years.

Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. HINSHAW rose.

Mr. POAGE. I yield first to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman from Texas, the largest cotton-producing State, to give the House his opinion as to why there is such a shortage of cottonseed cake and cottonseed meal at the present time?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is exactly the question I wanted to ask.

Mr. POAGE. The reason is that there is 27 percent more livestock in the Nation today than there has ever been before. We are feeding them heavier than we have ever fed them before. The poultry interests are relying almost entirely on the cottonseed, when in years past they relied on fish meal, meat scraps, and tankage imported from foreign lands. All the farmers over the Nation have learned after a long period of years that it is profitable for them to feed their livestock a balanced ration, including a substantial amount of cottonseed meal. And, of course, the gentlemen recognize that the acreage planted to cotton last year was less than one-half what it has been at times in the past.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland: On page 1, line 4, after the last word "amended", strike out the balance of the section and insert in lieu thereof "by amending section 376 thereof by adding thereto the following: '*Provided further*, That such jurisdiction shall in no case be exercised as to any crop now planted or planted hereafter between the date of the enactment of this act and the date of the conclusion of peace.'"

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman from South Carolina on the point of order.

Mr. FULMER. I do not care to discuss the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from South Carolina indicate to the Chair in what way the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland is not germane to the subject matter of the bill?

Mr. FULMER. I do not believe it is in line with the real purpose of the bill, and it goes much further than we intended under the bill, so it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Maryland amends the same section of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 that is covered by this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the amendment be again read? Many of us did not hear it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment.

The Clerk again read the Baldwin amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman from Maryland on his amendment, solely for the purpose of determining whether or not the amendment is germane to the section covered by the bill before the Committee.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, this bill amends section 377. To my mind another amendment that deals with section 377 is pertinent at this time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman hear me for just a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill relates to part 2 of subtitle C of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. It provides an amendment with reference to the acreage, the allotment for commodities, by adding a new section, 377, in which there is an involved provision relating to proclamations, acreages, and all that sort of thing. In the report of the committee, so that this language might be intelligible, on page 5 attention is called to section 376 of part 2 of subtitle C, to which section 377 is proposed to be added. In section 376 is a provision for the jurisdiction of the courts, that have to do with the apportionment of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. That is the only authority they have to act. This amendment that the gentleman from Maryland has offered to that provision is an amendment which is clearly and entirely germane and which is entirely germane to the operations of section 377, which is offered here by the committee. This is a substitute to the same part, the same title, the same subtitle of the bill that has brought it in. It is clearly in order under the rule. There are several parts where the Agricultural Act is amended, and on page 513 of the Manual I remind when I read:

To a bill amending a general law in several particulars, an amendment providing for the repeal of the whole law was held germane, but the bill amending the law in several particulars must vitally affect the whole law.

It is apparent that it is entirely similar to the subject matter of the bill, that it covers an item entirely within the purview of the particular section, to which the amendment is offered. There is no question in my mind that it is germane to this bill at this point.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair hear me on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the section which it is proposed to amend by the bill under consideration is section 376 of subtitle B, part 2, entitled "adjustments of quotas and enforcements," and to the subtitle "court jurisdiction." The portion of the bill immediately under consideration is an amendment to that subtitle. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland deals only with the subject of jurisdiction, which is the subject of that subtitle. It merely provides that that jurisdiction shall not be exercised in a specified period of time. The amendment offered by the bill relates to periods of time, and, in fact, goes further than that. It seems to me the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland is germane, being restricted entirely to the subject of jurisdiction, which is the subject of the subtitle of the basic law under consideration.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I call attention of the Chair to the fact that section 376, which is sought to be amended, deals with one subject, and one only—the jurisdiction of the courts in the enforcement of the penalty provisions of the act. The provision in the bill under consideration, while an amendment to part II of subtitle C, does not in any way go to the enforcement of the act, through the courts or otherwise, but simply provides for a different method of making allotments to individual farms in the case of the basic commodities except wheat, and for making allotments to the counties and States in the case of wheat. It is a new section and does not touch anything at all under this subtitle except the method and procedure of making allotments. I submit that the amendment which the gentleman offers cannot be germane, because it applies only to the subject of court jurisdiction, which is not in any way involved in the committee provision.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. Under the statement of the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Chairman, is the amendment offered by the committee bill itself germane?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not involved in this. The Chair is ready to rule and interprets the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland to involve the question of jurisdiction and enforcement of jurisdiction for the whole act. His amendment provides that such jurisdiction shall in no case be exercised as to any crop. The bill before the Committee restricts itself to certain crops. The amendment of the gentleman from Maryland would in effect suspend jurisdiction to enforcing the entire Agricultural Adjustment Act, because it would do away with the machinery for such suspension, and, therefore, the Chair is inclined to rule that the amendment is too far reaching, and goes beyond the scope of the bill and is not germane, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preferential motion offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Mr. DIRKSEN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me assure the members of the Committee of the Whole that this is in no sense a dilatory motion. This motion is tendered in the very best of faith and in the earnest hope that the Committee will approve it so that the bill can be reported back to the House after the Committee rises with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken. I believe, from the discussion that has obtained on this floor both yesterday and today, that two things are quite evident. The first is that everybody is interested in taking the snarls out of this food program and in doing something for agriculture. The second thing

that is quite evident is that there is a wide diversity of opinion on this floor right now with respect to this bill. Some object to section 4, which relates to peanuts. I object, among others, to section 3, which relates to the use of excess corn for silage feeding purposes. But the essential point I make in support of the preferential motion to strike the enacting clause is, that this bill does not solve the food problem which is before us now. One of our problems is manpower. The other problem is obtaining sufficient farm machinery for the farmers so that they may do their work. Only within the last few days we have repudiated the proposal of Secretary Wickard for $125,000,000——

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman complains that the bill does not solve the manpower or the farm machinery problems. Of course, the gentleman does not contend that the Department of Agriculture has any jurisdiction over those matters?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me continue for a moment and I will get to the gentleman's point.

There is the problem of manpower. There is the problem of farm machinery. There is the problem of prices. O. P. A. pegged the corn price under parity, and the gentleman from Kansas himself waxed quite eloquent in the Well of this House as to the illegality of that operation by the Office of Price Administration. Now we come along with a four-section bill which seeks to preserve the rights of farmers who for one reason or another cannot plant their acreage, a bill that deals with wheat penalties and affects only 3 percent of the visible supply of wheat, a bill that seeks to permanently change the act of 1938 with respect to corn silage for feeding purposes; and finally a bill which in my considered judgment provides a subsidy of $60,000,000 for the peanut crop. It does not go to the heart of the food problem. It does not touch the price structure. It does not mandate the Secretary of Agriculture as it should. I insist that the Committee on Agriculture come before us with an over-all bill that is based upon a sound perspective of the food problem that is before the country today. Until that is done we are going to have these constant recriminations and abuses over the failure of the food program and the derelictions of the Federal Government. Let us suspend this thing once and for all. Let us send it back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken and insist that this committee, which is disposed to find a solution for this problem, come back at an early date with an over-all program that will accomplish that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me say to the gentleman that if the bill were to be passed in its present form without amendment, I will support the gentleman's motion, but I believe the bill can be cured. Let me say that I agree with the gentleman that the present agricultural problem needs overhauling. I think I would say to him that a majority of the Members on this side of the aisle, as well as on the gentleman's side, will join him in overhauling it. But it has not been done and it cannot be done in a day or a week.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Oklahoma knows as well as I do how abstruse and difficult of understanding this agricultural legislation is. It is difficult to spell out the implications of any amendment on this floor at the present time. Out of familiarity of 10 years with the subject matter, I try to do it and fail more often than not. I am not willing to torpedo this whole program, so I say let us send back this piecemeal legislation now and insist that an over-all, comprehensive program be brought before us that will deal with the problem from alpha to omega.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GREEN. Is there only 5 minutes on each side of this motion?

The CHAIRMAN. There are 5 minutes on each side of the motion. Five minutes have been consumed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and 5 minutes has been allotted to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. GREEN. May I make a unanimous-consent request? I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended to 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the general attitude of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], it is that the restrictions and limitations on production should be lifted. Of course, he knows that such a program would take months in its preparation. Yet we have a bill here that says for corn all limitations on production shall be removed, and the gentleman is opposing it. We have a provision here that says on wheat, for all these millions of bushels of penalty wheat, now in storage, it may be fed by livestock producers; and the gentleman would have you send this bill back to the committee and deny them that privilege and wait for months and months until some other committee can present the matter. The Committee on Agriculture does not have jurisdiction over the manpower problem, nor has it jurisdiction over the farm-machinery problem. We have what the committee thought were four urgent and important measures or modifications of the law that should be made.

Certainly everyone is in favor of section 1 to preserve a man's allotments which he is unable to plant on account of manpower shortage, fertilizer shortage, or machinery shortage, or being drafted in the service. Certainly the House is entitled to pass on the question of whether or not the farmers should be permitted to feed their penalty wheat and not go through another 6 months or 6 years holding it in storage. Certainly the House should be given permission to say whether or not all limitations on the production of corn should be removed, which this bill does; and certainly the House should be permitted to say whether or not all limitations on the production of peanuts should be removed; and that is exactly what this bill does. The third and fourth sections of the bill are to do exactly that. If the enacting clause is stricken out, then certainly the penalty wheat cannot be fed; then, certainly, the farmers in the commercial corn area cannot plant this excess corn for silage; certainly the peanut producers will not know what to do. They cannot produce peanuts for $82 a ton like they had to last year, and you will not have your meal and you will not have your oil.

So, if you do not like a particular section, offer an amendment to strike it out and if the House strikes it out well and good, but I certainly hope the House is not going to ruin the entire work of the committee that has gone on over a period of months and months; and the committee hopes that the House will at least accord the committee and the Members of this House the privilege of passing on this bill section by section.

I know the gentleman from Illinois is very bitter against the corn section, but he should not carry his opposition quite so far as to seek to kill now, utterly and definitely, the remaining sections of the bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman that I think it would be a big mistake for the committee to vote in favor of the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois, because we should have a chance to act on it paragraph by paragraph. Being a member of the committee I excuse myself, but it would be unfortunate, after the weeks and weeks these gentlemen have worked on the measure not to have it considered. There are certainly millions and millions of farmers in this Nation from the corn area, the wheat area, and the peanut area who are interested in this legislation. I hope you will give the House a chance to pass on it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. All I know, coming from a city district, is that there is a very serious farm problem not only from the angle of manpower but from many others. We have all got to approach it temperately and intelligently. I am as anxious as anyone who has not got a farm in his district to do something constructive in the situation. I hope the leadership in this House on both sides of the aisle—constructive leadership, men representing farm districts—will try to meet this problem, having in mind not only the interests of the farmer but the interests of the Nation.

It seems to me, following the debate on this bill, that this bill is a step in the right

direction, and certainly the motion made by our distinguished friend from Illinois would, in my opinion, constitute, if adopted, a serious blow to the strides forward we have already made in this session toward a solution of the farm problem.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 93, noes 101.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. PACE.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote, and the Chair is counting his own vote, the ayes are 109 and the noes are 109.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much talk about many things that are not germane to this bill. I come from Iowa, and you know what Iowa produces. I am interested in corn. There is nothing in this bill that helps corn, although I am not disposed to defeat the bill on that account. I voted against the motion to recommit just now. I want to help all farmers wherever they may be. But may I say to the folks here that we are not getting anywhere near parity on corn. I have in my pocket a letter from my son in Iowa who sold corn last week for 79 cents a bushel; whereas they will tell you that corn parity is $1. We do not have any corn in my section of the State, the greatest corn-producing area in the world, that brings parity, and this bill is not going to help bring parity.

They tell you that if you add the benefit payments to the parity payments you will get as much as parity, but that is unfair, dishonest, illegal, unconstitutional, and wrong, because when a man gets his parity payments and his benefit payments he has already earned them. He gives up something, he gives a consideration before he gets those payments, and you have no legal or just right to say that he should pay twice for the same thing and that such payments should be added to the parity price that he gets per bushel in the market.

Suppose you have 80 acres of corn and you are only allowed to grow 50 acres. You lose the benefit of the 30 acres, thereby you are paying once for that benefit payment, and it is neither the law nor is it common sense nor justice to say that the farmer is getting parity for corn when he is only getting 79 cents for it, and to use the argument that he should add the other payments to his unit payment per bushel. He pays for his benefit allowances in addition to and outside of his parity payment.

In the present bill there is a provision that every man may feed wheat to his own cattle and to his own chickens. That does away in large measure with our corn market. There is in the present bill a statement that silage shall not be added when you figure the corn allotment. That is not fair to the corn farmer because it just simply sets the whole thing free. A man who raises silage can raise all the corn he wants to raise besides his silage corn and still get his crop or benefit payments. The bill should be amended in respect of this matter. The silage provisions should be limited to the duration of this war, exactly the same as the other provisions are limited.

I say particularly at this point that unless something is done for corn to put it on an even keel with other crops, then Iowa ought not to vote for the bill because we are entitled to just treatment and we are not getting parity payments and we will not get it under the terms of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, they bring wheat over into the corn country and sell it for 85 percent of parity—of corn parity. They do not sell that wheat for 85 percent of wheat parity, no. They bring it to my door, the corn farmer's door and there they sell it for 85 percent of corn parity, thereby breaking the market for corn. This is unjust and unfair.

A little more than a year ago the Secretary of Agriculture in a speech at Atlanta gave notice that he intended to sell commodity wheat owned by the Government at 85 percent of corn parity and the next morning the corn market in Chicago dropped 4 cents per bushel. Such things as this have put corn farmers into great quandary and they wonder why these Government agencies always aim at corn and try to bring down its price in the open market.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I voted for the recent motion to recommit this bill, and I would like to take just 3 or 4 minutes to tell you why I voted as I did. There is an ancient maxim which says that "The least governed country is the best governed country." I have been here 8 years, and as time has gone on I have become more and more convinced day by day that that maxim is true.

As I sat here this afternoon listening to debates on both sides of the House on this bill my mind drifted back to a recollection of some of the agricultural history of ancient Rome. When bills of this character were introduced then on behalf of the farmers of the Roman Empire, it did not take them long to ruin the farmer.

Time and again during the last 8 years I have sat here and I have seen the distinguished representatives of the farmers from New York City, Chicago, Pittsburgh, and other great centers of population sponsor bills of this character. When I went back home and told my farmer friends of the wonderful legislation that had been passed for their benefit, they just could not understand why anybody would want that sort of a bill any more than I could. This morning I sat in a committee and listened to a group of packers telling the members of that committee that now, at a time when America needs beef and pork as it has never needed it before in all of its history, they are running about 25 percent of their capacity. It was explained to the committee that the reason they could not run at full capacity was because of the numerous regulations placed upon them by the Government.

Now, I am talking to you gentleman on the right here, my Democratic colleagues. I want to take your minds back to the time when your fathers told you that one of the great fundamental principles of democracy was equal rights for all and special privileges for none. You were also told that ancient maxim that the best-governed country is the least-governed country. I think that giving subsidies to the farmers is wrong in principle, just the same as it is wrong to subsidize any other group of our people, as a matter of principle. There is not a farmer in your district who will not tell you, if you ask him, that in his opinion he ought to have a fair price for the commodities which he sells. The law of supply and demand was placed here by the Creator of the universe, and it will work with unerring certainty in those things if you will just unshackle the natural forces and give the natural laws a chance to operate.

It seems to me that if we will free the farmer, if we will tear the shackles from him, if we will give him a chance to produce, we will see such a surge in production as this country has never seen before.

They say the farmer is getting more already than he ought to have for his crops. I was out in Missouri the other day, and I find the farmers out there are getting from 15 to 16 cents a pound for fat beef. I can remember in the last war when they were getting 26 cents a pound for the same kind of beef. The farmer today is restricted every time he turns around. Before he can plant an acre of this or that kind of crop he must ask somebody in Washington what he has to plant, and then he must hurry up and get it planted before this person in Washington changes his mind.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Right along that line, under the peanut bill passed 2 years ago, some of the farmers could not even buy their seed to plant from the seed people from whom they chose to buy it, but had to buy it from a specified organization.

Mr. BELL. That is true. It got to the point last year where, you recall, if a farmer had a bushel of wheat he had raised on his own farm with his own labor he could not feed it to his own hogs. I know many a farmer who

sold his hogs without fattening them just because he could not feed his own grain to the hogs—grain he had raised on his own farm.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman understands, does he not, that the bill before us lifts just a little the restrictions about which the gentleman is talking? It does give the farmer the right to feed his own wheat to his livestock. He does not have the right to do it now without being penalized. This helps a little.

Mr. BELL. It does not go far enough.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman, but it helps a little.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question, but first I want to lay the basis for the question.

I have been taught that a golden maxim of the law is uniformity. Certainly, if uniformity in the law is good, uniformity in regulations and in prices ought to be equally good.

We have had a number of meetings in reference to the peanut expansion in the United States. At those meetings my colleagues from the States of Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, and other States were present. We met with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. It was my understanding, concurred in by others who were at that meeting, that there would be uniformity of price payment for the same kind and quality of product if this bill passed.

I notice on page 4 of the report of the committee in reference to the matter of the payment for peanuts produced in the different areas of the United States that the southeastern Spanish peanut is worth under this plan $130 per ton. The southwestern Spanish peanut is grown in the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and others, and that is worth $127.50 per ton. My question is, If that commodity is of the same character and quality, why is not the payment the same to the southwestern farmer as to the southeastern farmer?

Mr. PACE. The payment will be identical. Those are averages determined by the Department of Agriculture, dependent upon two conditions, the oil content of the peanut and the rating of the peanut. Most of the peanuts in the Southwest are what are called windrowed. They are left to dry on the ground. They are usually on an average graded slightly under those that are stacked and put in houses. Peanuts having the same grade and the same oil content, grown anywhere in the United States, will bring exactly the same price.

Mr. BROOKS. Then I understand this itemization on page 4 is wrong?

Mr. PACE. No. That is what the Department of Agriculture estimates on the basis of past history of grades and oil content will work out as a general average.

Mr. BROOKS. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that peanuts grown in the State of Texas of the same quality and character as those grown in Georgia will receive exactly the same amount as those grown in Georgia?

Mr. PACE. They will.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. How can it be determined before the peanuts are grown and harvested that your peanut will be better than the southwestern peanut? We are not talking about past averages but peanuts that are to be grown from now on.

Mr. PACE. This table is prepared, I am told by the Department of Agriculture, on the basis of past averages. However, they have given us the positive assurance, and they have given that assurance to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who is here, that identical peanuts will receive the same price. That table is based simply on the past history of how they have graded peanuts as to grade or oil content. I am perfectly willing to give the gentleman the positive assurance that his peanut or any other peanut will receive exactly the same price, according to the grade and oil content.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, the vote just taken indicates the exact division of the present opinion of the House on this important measure. I fear that some of my colleagues who opposed this legislation have not given careful thought to the intent of the legislation. The intent of this bill is to give the farmer a higher price for the commodity in question (peanuts). It is all essential that we enact legislation to raise the price paid to the farmer, not only for peanuts, but also for practically every food farm commodity.

We cannot escape our responsibility in this by sticking our heads in the sand as an ostrich would. It is my responsibility and your responsibility to foster in every reasonable way the production of food for the American people. There exists now a scarcity of many essential food commodities. This scarcity will be intensified as time and the war goes on.

O. P. A. and Department of Agriculture ceilings on farm commodities should, in all probability, be absolutely abolished. I shall not be surprised if time may reveal to you and to me the necessity of such action and the absolute realization of such action by the Congress. I have appeared before War Manpower Commission Chairman McNutt; the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard; the Price Administrator, Mr. Brown; and others high in responsibility, and have endeavored to indicate to them the impelling necessity for a higher price for farm commodities—I mean a higher price to the farmer—if we are to have even a reasonable portion of the now necessary farm production. It appears difficult to impress upon these officials and upon you, my colleagues, the dire necessity for immediate action if food in adequate quantities is produced on the farms and on the stock ranges.

Very recently I received a most significant communication from a distinguished friend of mine, the Hon. K. K. Knight of Bunnell, Flagler County, Fla. He is a large farm and livestock producer, an honest, upright citizen, and one who thoroughly understands the problems confronting farmers in their production now. His communication follows:

BUNNELL, FLA. *January 30, 1943.*

Congressman LEX GREEN,

*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR LEX: I thought I would bring to your attention the farm labor situation in this locality.

As you know, the largest percent of crops grown here are cabbage and Irish potatoes, with potatoes being the main crop.

Most farmers have about completed planting some 2 weeks late on account of labor, and would have been much later but there has not been a single day in January we could not work.

The harvest season will start in about 50 days, and if there isn't something done about farm labor for harvesting, I just don't know what is going to be the outcome.

Every farmer in this section, including Hastings and surrounding territory, is from one to six men short on his regular labor now and just can't get any.

They pay such high wages at these boat yards, airports, and other war work that the farmer just can't get anyone to work.

I have worked my labor 60 hours per week ever since December 1, 1942, even used all women I could get. If something isn't done about farm labor I'm going to have to reduce my operations, as well as the rest of the farmers. We cannot afford to produce the stuff when we cannot get labor to harvest it.

It is really critical around here.

It seems to me everyone should work at the very least 50 hours per week in times like this.

As long as the war industries are allowed to pay such high wages and still are guaranteed a profit the farmers will get no labor unless they are on the same basis.

I'm not in any position to try to make any suggestions to you, but I see some dark hours ahead of these farmers in harvesting season. I figure there will be many a potato not dug in this section if there isn't something done and done quick.

Crops are looking mighty fine now and if something don't happen there is going to be a bumper crop.

Just thought I would lay the circumstances before you and you might be able to help in some way.

Yours truly,

K. K. KNIGHT.

Now, my colleagues, in the Bunnell-Hastings-La Crosse, Fla., Irish-potato production areas, a ceiling price of $3.10 has been placed upon their early Irish potatoes. A large acreage is being planted. These producers have no assurance that they will be able to obtain necessary labor to gather these potatoes after they are produced. If the potatoes are not gathered and marketed, the consumers, largely city dwellers, will be the ones to suffer primarily. It is true that the producer will suffer large financial loss, but the city consumer will suffer more in the loss of his necessary food.

The same thing obtains in practically every food and livestock crop now in the process of production. Farmers have lost their employees to industrial war production and other high-salaried employment. They have lost also an un-

usually large number of their sons and other helpers to the armed forces of our country. The farm population of our country is ultra patriotic. I believe an excessively large percentage, comparatively speaking, of farm young men and women have gone to the armed forces. This is in keeping with their high principles of Americanism and patriotism.

The farmer may produce and harvest food for his own family first, which is absolutely justifiable and to be expected, but what I am trying to get to your mind is this: The one who will lack and suffer for food is ultimately the city dweller. My colleagues who represent the city dweller should be first concerned and should first vote for the bill which you are now trying to defeat. If you strike down this bill, it will set a precedent for you to strike down other bills which may be later presented to you and which have for their purpose also an incentive for increased food production. It is your responsibility, my colleagues, and you are confronted with the question of whether you desire to vote for more adequate food production or for scarcity and possible hunger of our city dwellers by defeating this legislation.

Farm wages of from probably 75 cents a day realized by the farmer himself to possibly $1.50 or $2.50 a day realized by his paid employee do not well compare with industrial wages of from 85 cents to $2 an hour. What are you who are fighting this bill going to offer as a substitute to bring about increased food production? I have not heard you on the floor this afternoon offer any substitute. You have merely spoken against the bill and against increased farm production, as provided by the bill.

I, too, try to represent city dwellers and in their interest I am supporting this bill. When food becomes scarce in the cities which I try to represent, they may hold me responsible for a short-sighted policy of limited production. If I should vote against this bill, I feel that vote would be for limiting farm production. How can you expect farmers and stockmen to produce when you do nothing to raise existing unfair ceilings placed upon their commodities? Sacrifices already made by farmers and producers of our Nation are unequaled in the history of the human race. And the dart which you are thrusting in them today, in opposition to this bill, is one which will rebound, I fear, to the hunger of city dwellers.

The responsibility is yours.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, we have had considerable debate upon this section of the bill. There are several other sections, and I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this section do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FULMER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section do now close. We wish to finish this bill tonight.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina that all debate on this section do now close.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland: Page 1, line 6, strike out all of section 1, after line 5, on page 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided,* That part 2 of substitute C of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall not apply with respect to any crop planted of corn, wheat, or peanuts, or harvested prior to date of the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 26, 1941, as amended by Public Laws 374 and 384, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 26, 1941, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(13) Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions, the farm marketing excess for any crop of wheat beginning with the crop harvested in the year 1941 and ending with the crop harvested in the year in which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated, for any farm shall be reduced by the amount of such crop of wheat produced on the farm which the producer thereof after the effective date of the act feeds to livestock or poultry belonging to him, if the producer establishes the amount of such feeding to the satisfaction of the Secretary. Where an adjustment in the amount of the farm-marketing excess is made pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph, the difference between the amount of the penalty or storage as computed upon the farm-marketing excess before such adjustment and as computed upon the adjusted farm-marketing excess shall be returned to or allowed the producer."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already recognized the gentleman from Oklahoma to offer an amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: Page 4, line 3, after the period strike out the period, insert a comma, and the following: "And of any and all penalties imposed, charged or collected on wheat produced in the year 1941 in excess of 15 cents a bushel, the penalty shall be returned to or allowed to the producer."

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that it is not germane. Does the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. But, Mr. Chairman, I had been recognized and the gentleman's point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the point of order does not come too late. The gentleman from Iowa reserves the point of order and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma for 5 minutes.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment brings back the old penalty again. Bear in mind the amendment does not endeavor to return to or allow the producers in 1941 the entire penalty. It merely returns or allows to them that portion of the penalty in excess of 15 cents. At the time this penalty was imposed upon the farmer he thought that there would be a 15-cent a bushel penalty on each excess bushel of wheat, but the penalty was considerably more. He either paid it or he made bond and stored the wheat. My amendment simply returns that portion which is in excess of the 15 cents. It does not break faith with the farmer. He pays the amount of the penalty that he ordinarily would have paid of 15 cents a bushel for that excess wheat. If a point of order should be made as to the germaneness of this amendment I would like to be heard by the Chairman.

I do feel that this amendment is fair, both to the Government and to the farmer. The farmer can take this additional money that he has paid or made bond to pay, he can buy Government bonds to help fight this war. He did not know he would have to pay 49 cents or 57 cents or 67 cents a bushel as he will have to pay now. This amendment only applies to the 1941 crop. He will still have to pay his penalty on other wheat, but it is not fair to penalize that farmer on the 1941 crop, when in fact, the penalty was invoked 2 days before his harvest started.

So I submit he is entitled to have returned that portion of the penalty in excess of 15 cents.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Facetiously I would like to ask this question: Does the gentleman think it is fair to make the farmer pay 49 cents a bushel and forgive and forget taxes that apply against the 1942 income which the industrial operators and industrial workers receive?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not think we are going to forgive any of the boys. We may "rumble along," but I doubt if we will "Ruml along."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What would the gentleman say as to the precedent that might be set if his amendment were adopted in the event any of this legislation were repealed with respect to penalties paid by other crops?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I would say that no other crop was affected like wheat. I happen to represent an area that raises

not only wheat, cotton, peanuts, alfalfa, and soya beans but we raise everything down in Oklahoma, including children.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The same precedent is involved in taxes or penalties levied under the statute. This could cause the Government to lose millions and millions of dollars if the gentleman's precedent were followed in other cases.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The Government will not lose a dollar, because they collected an amount to which the Government was not entitled. It either has collected it or it has not collected it. Some of them have not paid. They made bond.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULMER. The same thing applies to cotton and all other commodities. When we passed the 85 percent of parity wheat went from 60 cents to $1. Cotton went from 11 cents to 20 cents. Cotton is in the same position as wheat.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. But there is some difference in that the wheat farmer had actually started harvesting his crop before the 49-cent penalty was put on.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It was unfair to the wheat farmer. No wheat farmer would ever have sown his wheat if he had known the Government was going to impose such a confiscatory rate.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman think there could be any common sense or rhyme or reason for penalizing the farmer for raising a little more wheat than the Government has set out for him to raise? Because some group has said that a certain quota should be allowed, if a farmer happens to go above it, is there any common sense, in view of the fact that we have to feed all the people of the world, for penalizing him for doing it?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Instead of producing 110 percent or 90 percent we will not likely produce more than 80 percent of the food goals for 1943.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is not this the time to encourage him to raise more food rather than to limit him in the amount he shall raise, especially wheat?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think we should raise everything we possibly can, and I will say that I doubt very seriously if we will have enough labor and enough implements to raise nearly as much as we need for lend-lease and for our soldiers, much less for you and me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] has reserved a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GILCHRIST. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] provides for the return of money. It provides that all penalties that have heretofore been paid in by anybody must now be refunded. The section to which the amendment is offered provides simply that an adjustment shall be made for payments that have not yet been assessed or allowed. That is, where a farmer has not yet paid the penalty he is to be excused from the payment of it. The proposed amendment goes much further and says that wherever any money has been paid, then that money must be returned from the Treasury to the producer. It goes far afield from the terms of section 2. I submit that it is an addition to section 2 that is not germane. I ask for a ruling on the point of order.

Mr. HOPE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kansas rise?

Mr. HOPE. I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the point of order is good and should be sustained. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma goes to an entirely different subject than that contained in this section. This section provides that in determining the farm marketing excess on any crop of wheat the amount of such wheat which a farmer fed to livestock shall not be counted. That is all this paragraph does. Then it states in conclusion:

> Where an adjustment in the amount of the farm marketing excess is made pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph, the difference between the amount of the penalty or storage as computed upon the farm marketing excess before such adjustment and as computed upon the adjusted farm marketing excess shall be returned to or allowed the producer.

It will be noted that the provision for returning or allowing the penalty refers only to a case where an adjustment is made "pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph."

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma is not confined to wheat that may be fed. He wants to return the penalty which has been paid upon any wheat marketed or fed since 1941. It seems to me that this is a much broader provision than is contemplated in the present bill. The bill relates to a recomputation of the farm marketing excess where wheat is fed after the effective date of the act. The gentleman's amendment provides for a refund of penalties already paid under the provisions of existing law. There is no relationship between the two things, and it seems to me it is very clear that the amendment is far beyond the scope of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Oklahoma on the point of order.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the language of the bill, on page 3, line 22, reading as follows:

> Where an adjustment in the amount of the farm-marketing excess is made pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph, the difference between the amount of the penalty or storage as computed upon the farm-marketing excess before such adjustment and as computed upon the adjusted farm marketing excess shall be returned to or allowed the producer.

By my amendment I do not add a new section; I merely add a portion to that section of the bill which returns to the producers, those that have not fed their wheat, any penalty they might have paid. The fellow who has already paid his penalty or who has already fed his wheat or disposed of it would not benefit. So I submit to the Chair that this is merely in line with this provision of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma provides as follows:

> And any and all penalties imposed, charged, or collected on wheat produced in the year 1941 in excess of 15 cents per bushell shall be returned to or allowed the producer.

The intent of the gentleman's amendment clearly is that it shall apply to all types of wheat raised in 1941; whereas, the purpose of section 2 of this bill provides only for the return of farm marketing excesses to those who meet those provisions pursuant to this paragraph.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma goes far beyond the provisions of section 2, which deals with a specific matter. The amendment is therefore beyond the scope of the bill and not germane.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit a motion that the Committee rise and discontinue consideration of the bill and have asked for time in which to explain the motion. I offer the motion reluctantly because I have the deepest affection for those who are supporting the bill. We have served side by side in many a hard-fought battle for agriculture. But this is a bill to sabotage the legislative program so laboriously built up through the years. This bill is a proposition to dynamite the farm program—and the one farm program—on which all farm-minded Members of Congress and all national farm organizations are in complete agreement.

For 20 years we have been wandering in the wilderness in an effort to secure legislation which would put agriculture on a plan of economic equality with industry and labor—legislation similar to that already granted every other group and industry—in the land. At last we have succeeded in formulating a program which will give the farmer parity in the market place. It is the product of years of conference and research and legislative evolution. It has the approval of every national farm organization. It won the last election. It will win the next election.

It will produce the greatest amount of food in the coming crop year of any plan that has been suggested—and it is the only program that will produce suf-

ficient food to adequately supply our wartime needs.

Of the various items in that program, the fundamental principle is its opposition to subsidies. The farmer wants no handouts. He does not want alms out of the public treasury and the taxpayers do not want him or anybody else to be raking subsidy handouts from the national treasury. The farmer asks only a parity price but he wants that price in the open market along with labor and industry and every other honest and self-respecting producer.

This bill violates every principle of that program. One of its least objectionable features is its subsidy for one crop. All other crops are left out in the cold. In no respect is it a national bill. It is a bill for three groups—three crops—three sections of the country. On the contrary, the accepted farm program is a national farm program. It provides for every product, for every crop, and for every section. It is for every star in the Union and every stripe in the flag. But this hybrid bill is both sectional and provincial. It is the mongrel offspring of an unholy alliance between industries and sections conceived in their own interests and the devil take the rest of us. It is calculated to divide our forces. It drives a wedge between farm groups who should be presenting a united front to the enemy. It is in contravention of the action taken by other committees of the House against subsidies and gratuities from the public treasury. It is in defiance of the platforms adopted last fall by every national farm organization in the United States.

Not a single farm organization approves this bill. Can you imagine this House approving a labor bill opposed by all the labor organizations in the country? Not a single farm journal in the Nation approves the bill. Even the Department of Agriculture does not endorse the bill. In fact, it is impossible to find anybody any where outside the floor here who can be said to be genuinely interested in national agriculture who has been urging the passage of the bill.

To pass this bill is to abandon the one program on which we have all been in agreement—the one program which we have any practical chance of translating into law—and the one program which, when adopted, will give all farmers everywhere an equal opportunity for parity of price and income and an American standard of living. To pass such a bill as this is to turn aside into a devious bypath from the broad highway marked out by united American agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. What section of the bill contains the subsidy provisions referred to by the gentleman?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Let us not quibble about technicalities. Everybody knows there is a $60,000,000 subsidy here for peanuts.

Mr. COOLEY. I differ with the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman differs with the obvious. And he knows I am his friend and the friend of the lowly goober. I joined with him and other friends not long ago to pass a bill to include peanuts as one of the basic commodities when there was no ground for such action by any criterion. The agricultural economists who wrote the original bill refused to include it and we had to use a legislative sandbag to get it in. I am willing to do the gentleman and the peanut every possible personal favor, but when it is proposed to destroy the agricultural program on which all American farmers must rely for justice for themselves and their children, that is another matter.

Let me plead—not only with the friends of the farmer but with the friends of the taxpayers and the few remaining friends of the United States Treasury, from which this money must be drawn, and who receive nothing in return—let me plead with those who favor a farm program which will feed our armies and our allies—to defeat this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is not debatable, the Chair will inform the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. May I ask whether or not a Member can get up, take the floor, and speak for 5 minutes, and make a motion which automatically comes to a vote?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] may have 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] on a point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. A vote cannot be interrupted for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Georgia through with his point of order?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is to ask whether or not a Member can take the floor, and upon the completion of his remarks offer a motion which is not debatable, and take all other Members off the floor?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] may have 5 minutes before the vote is taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia have 5 minutes to speak on the motion that the Committee do now rise. Is there objection?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 99, noes 105.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. PACE to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 123, noes 111.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAGNUSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 1605, had come to no resolution thereon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I ask my friend from Massachusetts, the majority leader, if he can tell us the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very glad to do so.

Monday is Washington's Birthday, and there is no intention of having any legislative business on that day. It therefore follows that the bill (H. R. 1605) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act will go over until Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is definitely established then that House bill 1605, with respect to farm acreage allotments, and so forth, which has just been laid aside, will come up again on Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I think it is the only thing to do.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think that is the fair way to proceed.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Thursday and Friday the first deficiency appropriation bill will be considered. I understand the probabilities are that Thursday will be devoted to general debate and on Friday the bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule.

Subject to the fact that on Thursday and Friday that appropriation bill will be considered, other business will be considered in the following order:

First, there will be the amendment to the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, and that will follow the bill we have been considering today. Following that will be H. R. 1692, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, which I understand is an important bill. Following that will be the Columbia Basin project bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When are we going to have before us the resolution creating a standing committee on aviation, in which a good many of us are interested?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot see where that can come up next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, the gentleman realizes that after the resolution has been out 7 days any member of the committee has a right to call it up.

Mr. McCORMACK. The appropriation bill will be considered Thursday and Friday, and I cannot see where that resolution can be taken up next week. No delaying tactics are involved at all, because I have no reason for delaying it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Let us carry this a little further. Suppose the lend-lease bill should be reported out of the committee, what will happen to that?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, everyone recognizes that the lend-lease bill is of paramount interest.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Perhaps the Committee on Ways and Means has something to bring up. I see the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is here.

Mr. McCORMACK. That would have the right-of-way.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Which would have the right-of-way?

Mr. McCORMACK. The lend-lease bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How about the bill increasing the debt limit?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no official notice about the bill, except through the newspapers. The bill is before the Committee on Ways and Means. I am informed that it has been ordered reported. That bill is a very important one, too. So there is the lend-lease bill, the bill out of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the resolution from the Committee on Rules, which was reported a few days ago. The bills to which I have previously referred were announced as being on the program for this week, and inasmuch as Members are interested in these bills it is only fair that the order in which it was announced that they would come up be followed as nearly as possible. I cannot see that the resolution in connection with the creation of a new committee can be considered until the week after next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I hope the gentleman will find that there will be time for it next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure that from my angle there is no tendency to delay, but as far as the first 2 or 3 days of next week are concerned, I may say that there has been no pressure on me from the Committee on Rules to have this resolution brought up Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have tried to put a little pressure on now from this side.

Mr. McCORMACK. The interest of my friend from Massachusetts is thoroughly appreciated. I will cooperate with him just as soon as I can.

Mr. BULWINKLE. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that I should like to put on some pressure the other way.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two resolutions of the General Assembly of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the national council of the Farmers Cooperative.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCANLON] be permitted to extend his remarks by the inclusion of a speech he delivered last Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech I delivered before the food division of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Brig. Gen. Albert L. Cox at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York on October 21, 1942, and also two letters written to me by General Cox.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on H. R. 1605 be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement in respect to the battleship *Oregon*.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain excerpts and a few brief editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I obtained permission to extend my remarks. I ask unanimous consent to include with those remarks an editorial by Al Williams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] for 30 minutes.

### SELECTIVE TRAINING ACT

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Military Affairs has reported out my bill to amend the Selective Service and Training Act by providing the manner in which those with dependents would be called to the service.

I was very desirous of refuting some misleading statements which had been made by certain officials who opposed the bill.

Because of the lateness of the hour, I will not claim the time that has been allowed to me, but I now ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. D'ALESANDRO (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), indefinitely, on account of illness.

### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1446. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Monday, February 22, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

### COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a hearing of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, February 23, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., for the consideration of postal employees' salary bills.

---

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

191. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

192. A letter from the executive director, national legislative committee of the American Legion, transmitting the financial statement for the year 1942 up to October 31, 1942; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

---

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 837. A bill to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 123. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 1692. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. IZAC: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 621. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1730. A bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 1914. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 1911. A bill to provide for holiday service on rural mail routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 1912. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States as students at educational institutions and other places; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1913 (by request). A bill to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 1914. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 1923. A bill to provide for the free distribution of seeds and plants by Members of the Congress for Victory gardens; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CULKIN:

H. R. 1924. A bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages by radio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1925. A bill to provide for releasing certain persons in military service to aid in agricultural production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1926. A bill providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1927. A bill to impose an inheritance tax on the possession and enjoyment of property transferred from a decedent and not subject to estate taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 1928. A bill to improve the military and naval efficiency; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 1929. A bill to encourage the prospecting for and development of the mineral resources in the southeastern United States and to establish an assay office, testing laboratory, and experiment station at or near Knoxville, Knox County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1932. A bill to amend section 1 (e) of Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 19, 1939; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 125. Resolution authorizing expenses for the special committee provided for by House Resolution 102; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 126. Resolution relative to reporting debates as heard on the floor of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. Res. 127. Resolution increasing the compensation of the special officer in the office of the Sergeant at Arms; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

H. Res. 128. Resolution authorizing a study and investigation of proposed methods to maintain peace after the present war; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARSON of Ohio:

H. R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Carl W. Bucey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 1916. A bill for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damages, or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N. C., on March 7, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1917. A bill for the relief of Ray Funcannon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1918. A bill for the relief of Edward A. Silvia; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 1919. A bill for the relief of Vannie Butler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARD JOHNSON:

H. R. 1920. A bill for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 1921. A bill granting a pension to Wilson L. Holloway; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 1922. A bill granting a pension to Joe L. McCarty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 1930. A bill for the relief of John R. Page; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 1931. A bill to correct the record of Ralph Everett Crawshaw; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 1933. A bill for the relief of Ronald A. Cox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 1934. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Donald B. Johnston; to the Committee on Claims.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

151. By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Memorial of the Sixteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America and the Office of Price Administration to relieve dairymen and the dairy industry in New Mexico by raising the ceiling price on fluid milk or lowering the ceiling price on feed used in the dairy industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

152. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Waucoma Grange, No. 682, of Evansville, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

153. Also, petition of "Win the Peace Now" Committee, Madison, Wis.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

154. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of C. H. Sprowls, post adjutant, Wheeling Post, No. 1, the American Legion of Wheeling, W. Va., urging that our Federal Legislature forbid and prevent the attendance of Japanese in our colleges and universities and particularly those of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Education.

155. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Elsie Howe, pay-roll clerk, and 67 other employees of the J. F. Stampfer Co., of Dubuque, Iowa, endorsing the Rumi plan of pay-as-you-go income taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

156. By Mr. DELANEY: Resolutions adopted at the commemoration of the silver anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence by the people of Lithuania, held on February 14, 1943, at the Webster Hall, New York City, under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Council of Greater New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

157. By Mr. MICHENER: Petitions forwarded by D. J. Mowrer, of Parma, Mich., and signed by 167 other farmers of Jackson County, Mich., urging repeal of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

# SENATE

## MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God, Author of liberty, we come with sacramental remembrance that on this new day in the cycle of the passing year even the calendar makes obeisance at the shrine of patriotism. Out of the heroic yesterdays when founding fathers, pledging their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor, molded the Union comes an arresting voice: "Let us now praise famous men and our fathers that begat us; for the Lord manifested in them great glory, even His mighty power from the beginning."

In this city which is baptized in his revered name, where the monumental shaft lifts its glistening whiteness to the bending sky, telling to the generations following of the supremacy of unsullied character, we bow in this hallowed temple of the freedom he wrought to achieve, to give Thee thanks for the life and service of that one whom we reverently call the Father of his Country. We would clearly see that stately figure, fatherly yet stern, who having won all renounced

all. As in the deep need of our Nation's cause we lift our hearts to Thee, especially would we remember that one who in the darkness and the doubt of an hour when all the lamps had gone out gained strength and solace for himself and for his tattered, suffering troops when, alone and apart, he found an altar for bended knee on the hard and frozen ground. May we honor him by being worthy of the favor of his God and our God, who hath made and preserved us a nation. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

HIRAM W. JOHNSON, a Senator from the State of California, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MALONEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 18, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 167. An act for the relief of Charles F. Kegel;

S. 304. An act for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps;

S. 305. An act for the relief of Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps;

S. 306. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as a result of the disaster at the East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941;

S. 418. An act for the relief of Howard M. Sandus; and

S. 493. An act for the relief of Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes.

The message returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 12) to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral-development purposes in time of war.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 170. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. T. Travis;

H. R. 205. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons who have claims for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 218. An act for the relief of H. F. Mathis;

H. R. 227. An act for the relief of the Tours Apartment Hotel;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts;

H. R. 250. An act for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.;

H. R. 251. An act for the relief of Franklin E. Ludwig, Mary Taylor, and Frank A. Taylor;

H. R. 279. An act for the relief of George Kennedy;

H. R. 402. An act for the relief of Frank T. Been;

H. R. 478. An act for the relief of Edith M. Powell;

H. R. 517. An act for the relief of Irene Dial;

H. R. 533. An act for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg;

H. R. 535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Donna Pittel;

H. R. 575. An act for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Violet Cuccio;

H. R. 579. An act for the relief of Barbara Healy;

H. R. 598. An act for the relief of Thelma Cannon McGroary;

H. R. 605. An act for the relief of Shumate Investment Co.;

H. R. 637. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward;

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of Charles T. Dulin;

H. R. 769. An act for the relief of John Cardillo and Philip Cardillo;

H. R. 940. An act for the relief of Howard E. Dickison;

H. R. 976. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Sebastian Eger;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of the State of Oregon, Department of Forestry of the State of Oregon, and certain organized protection agencies in the State of Oregon for protection of unappropriated public-forest lands intermingled with Oregon and California lands from July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939;

H. R. 1094. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. Herfurth, Jr., Inc.;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of El Paso Electric Co.;

H. R. 1099. An act for the relief of Jose J. Perez;

H. R. 1100. An act for the relief of the estate of James A. Henderson, deceased;

H. R. 1128. An act for the relief of Bernice James;

H. R. 1131. An act for the relief of the estate of Ola Fowler;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Nannie May Blythe and Claudia Blythe;

H. R. 1153. An act for the relief of Cordie Underwood and Wilbur Kea;

H. R. 1162. An act for the relief of R. E. Cotton Co.;

H. R. 1270. An act for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor);

H. R. 1273. An act for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre;

H. R. 1276. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Baldwin, Mattie Baldwin, and Clement B. Baldwin;

H. R. 1279. An act for the relief of Lee Watts;

H. R. 1319. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. V. Justice;

H. R. 1423. An act for the relief of Clara E. Freeman;

H. R. 1424. An act for the relief of Ernest P. Leavitt;

H. R. 1426. An act for the relief of Mrs. F. A. N. Yeager;

H. R. 1428. An act for the relief of Paul W. Mankin;

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of Albertine Nast;

H. R. 1464. An act for the relief of J. H. Atkins;

H. R. 1468. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Azer;

H. R. 1582. An act for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased;

H. R. 1587. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of The Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States;

H. R. 1639. An act for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublein and Mrs. Ethel Bowers;

H. R. 1667. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation;

H. R. 1685. An act for the relief of Eva C. Netzley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff;

H. R. 1771. An act for the relief of August Svelund;

H. R. 1785. An act for the relief of the William Wrigley, Jr., Co.;

H. R. 1786. An act for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.; and

H. R. 1787. An act for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MALONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gurney | Reynolds |
| Austin | Hatch | Robertson |
| Bailey | Hayden | Russell |
| Ball | Hill | Scrugham |
| Bankhead | Holman | Shipstead |
| Barkley | Johnson, Calif. | Smith |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | Stewart |
| Buck | La Follette | Taft |
| Bushfield | Langer | Thomas, Idaho |
| Butler | Lodge | Thomas, Utah |
| Byrd | Lucas | Tunnell |
| Capper | McClellan | Tydings |
| Caraway | McFarland | Vandenberg |
| Chavez | McKellar | Van Nuys |
| Clark, Mo. | Maloney | Wagner |
| Connally | Maybank | Wallgren |
| Danaher | Mead | Wheeler |
| Eastland | Millikin | Wherry |
| Ferguson | Moore | White |
| George | Murray | Wiley |
| Gerry | O'Daniel | Willis |
| Gillette | O'Mahoney | Wilson |
| Green | Overton | |
| Guffey | Radcliffe | |

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are conducting hearings in Puerto Rico on behalf of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are absent conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is necessarily absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

## READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the standing order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, Washington's Farewell Address will now be read by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who has heretofore been designated to perform that duty.

Mr. MILLIKIN advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

*To the people of the United States:*

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation

derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, ar greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances; attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human insti-

tutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? and let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The

nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maximum no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and

humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors, and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
*19th September, 1796.*

## VISIT OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND MME. CHIANG KAI-SHEK TO TOMB OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, following the reading of the address of General Washington, the first President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this morning the President of the United States and Mme. Chiang Kai-shek visited Mount Vernon and laid a wreath upon the tomb of General Washington. I thought on this particular day it was of special significance and exceedingly appropriate that this ceremony should take place and that the distinguished visitor who is in our gates should pay merited tribute to the first President who was the Father of his Country, George Washington.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CHASE A. CLARK

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Chase A. Clark, of Idaho, to be United States district judge for the district of Idaho.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Tuesday, March 2, at 10:30 a. m., has been set for a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee room on this nomination. At that time and place all interested parties may make representations to the committee.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CURTIS L. WALLER

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] I wish to make the following announcement:

The Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Curtis L. Waller, of Florida, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination, and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Tuesday, March 2, at 10:30 a. m., has been set for a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee room on this nomination. At that time and place all interested parties may make representations to the committee.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JAMES V. ALLRED

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in accordance with a rule of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to make an announcement.

The Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of James V. Allred, of Texas, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Tuesday, March 2, at 10:30 a. m., has been set for a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee room on this nomination. At that time and place all interested parties may make representations to the committee.

## DEDUCTION OF BENEFIT PAYMENTS FROM PARITY PRICES—NOTICE OF ADDRESS

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I give notice that at the next session of the Senate, which I assume will be next Thursday, I shall make a motion, if given an opportunity, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 660, to prohibit the deduction of benefit payments in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities. The bill has been on the calendar for 2 or 3 weeks, and I wish to seek action on it.

## NOMINATION AND CONFIRMATION OF GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES RECEIVING COMPENSATION OF $4,500 PER ANNUM OR MORE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, February 19, 1943.*

The Honorable the VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES and PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: My attention has been called to the provisions of S. 575. I desire to express my unqualified opposition to this proposed legislation.

The proposal for Presidential nomination and Senate confirmation of all employees receiving more than $4,500 per annum presupposes congressional responsibility for the operations of executive agencies. An agency head is responsible for the success or failure of his program. This accountability is dissipated if responsibility for the appointment of employees is divided.

Under our form of government the appointment of those officers who, in a fundamental sense, determine policy has generally been subject to Senate confirmation. But determination of policy is not synonymous with the exercise of administrative discretion. Neither does it include work performed by the vast number of technical and scientific personnel who occupy positions which fall above a salary figure of $4,500 or any other arbitrary amount.

The practice of the Federal Government with respect to the selection and appointment of non-policy-determining employees has evolved over a period of 60 years. This development culminated in the passage of the Ramspeck Act of 1940 requiring the appointment of practically all such employees on the basis of merit under the Civil Service Act. To turn the clock back by reversing this decision would be folly in time of peace. In war it would be little less than tragic.

Equally important are the practical considerations which make this bill undesirable. More than 33,000 positions would be subject to Presidential nomination and Senate confirmation under the terms of the proposed legislation. I do not have the time personally to examine the qualifications of the individuals whose appointments would in such circumstances have to be approved by me. It is equally evident that the Congress does not have the time. Senate confirmation would either become a rubber-stamp process or a task of such magnitude as to leave little time for the conduct of legislative business and to delay appointments to essential war jobs.

The experience with confirmation of War Manpower Commission appointments as required by its appropriation act is significant. On January 11, 1943, 30 names were nominated to the Senate. No action was taken until February 15, when 21 names were confirmed and 1 was sent back to the committee. At the present time, almost 6 weeks after the submission of the nominations, action still remains to be taken in 8 cases. If the proposed bill is enacted into law, with the inevitable multiplication of delays of this character, the American people will not fail to realize that it is the legislative branch of the Government that is thus holding up vigorous prosecution of the war program.

This bill, if enacted into law, would also adversely affect the recruitment of persons for key positions. It would lay all of us open to the charge that we are playing politics with the war program. We cannot permit confidence in the Government to be undermined in this manner. Neither can we afford to add the obstacle of Senate confirmation to other difficulties which confront us in our efforts to secure the best talent of the Nation for the Government service.

During the past 2½ years, in the face of a steadily dwindling reserve of manpower, the Government service has expanded from less than 1,000,000 employees to approximately 3,000,000. Undoubtedly in view of the large numbers involved, the limited supply, and the speed required, mistakes have been made. Corrective steps have been taken and will continue to be taken to eliminate abuses and to strengthen the machinery for the application of the merit principle to the recruitment, advancement, and removal of employees.

In our zeal to correct mistakes, however, we should not make the error of undermining the entire administrative structure that has been erected for the conduct of the war. Confirmation of administrative, professional, and technical employees by a legislative body is the very antithesis of the merit system and would sweep away years of civil-service progress.

For these reasons I urge that this bill not be enacted into law.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that earlier in the day the Vice President placed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by the President of the United States concerning a bill recently introduced by me providing for the confirmation of certain officials.

Saturday I gave out a statement to the newspapers in answer to the letter of the President, urging the early enactment of my bill requiring Senate confirmation of all Government employees receiving $4,500 or more per annum. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed immediately following the letter placed in the RECORD by the Vice President.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator McKELLAR declared:

"In no place does the Constitution say that only policy-determining officials shall be confirmed by the Senate. The Constitution says 'all officers.'

"But let us see about policy-determining officials. My good friend Jimmie Byrnes is a policy-determining officer. So is Harry Hopkins. So is Nelson Rockefeller, Mr. Stettinius, Mr. Jeffers, James M. Landis, Elmer Davis, Donald Nelson, Paul V. McNutt as Manpower Chairman, and Vice President Wallace as head of the Board of Economic Warfare.

"These are 10 of the most important policy-determining officials of the Government, and surely they were not confirmed, as everybody admits is required by the Constitution.

"Members of the Cabinet were confirmed by the Senate, but surely no one could claim that even members of the Cabinet have greater power for determining policies than these gentlemen above named. I should think, off-hand, that these 10 gentlemen are very excellent examples of policy-determining officials, none of whom has been confirmed by the Senate, as I recall.

"This bill does not interfere with the Civil Service Act or the employees under it, except as an additional precaution it requires confirmation as provided by the Constitution.

"The next argument is the time it would take the President and Congress to appoint these officers. A complete answer to that argument is the entirely effective and successful way of appointing all of the permanent officers of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Post Office.

"These appointments take little time of the President or the Senate, and I think everyone will concede that we get the best material in this method of appointment. Who will say that our Army officers, our Navy officers, our Marine Corps officers, and our postmasters are not of the very best classes of officers in our Government.

"There have been over 100,000 officers appointed and confirmed during the present administration without any delay worth mentioning.

"There is no politics in this bill. Its purpose is simply to follow the tried, proved, and constitutional way, the American way, of appointing officials of the Government.

"Mention is made of the scarcity of manpower. If appointments were made in the constitutional way, it is exceedingly doubtful if it would be necessary to have 3,000,000 persons working for the Government. If this bill is passed, I doubt if manpower would be so scarce.

"One of the purposes of this bill is to see how many of this vast increase from 1,000,000 to 3,000,000 employees are really necessary.

"It is not a question of correcting mistakes. It is a question of standing by the Constitution that has made us great. It is a question of Americanism.

"I have the very greatest respect for the opinions of our great President, but, with that great respect, I still think that S. 575 should become the law at the earliest possible moment, and I hope the President will reconsider his letter to our distinguished Vice President and sign the bill if it should be passed."

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

DISCONTINUANCE OF APPROPRIATION FOR UNITED STATES COURT FOR CHINA

A communication from the President of the United States recommending that no funds be appropriated for the United States Court for China for the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, relating to the Exchange Stabilization Fund, including summary of the operation of the fund from its establishment to June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADDITIONAL SALES OF WHEAT FOR FEED

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit additional sales of wheat for feed (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Navy, Agriculture (2), and Commerce; Executive Office of the President (Board of Economic Warfare), and Federal Security Agency which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Moose Lake State Hospital Employees, Local No. 488, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, of Moose Lake, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called McKellar bill, relating to confirmation by the Senate of governmental employees receiving compensation of $4,500 or more per annum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Santa Monica Bay Parlor, No. 267, Native Sons of the Golden West, Santa Monica, Calif., protesting against the formation and enrollment of a Japanese unit of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"*To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Government in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, do respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the residents of the State of Idaho are anxious to assist in every possible way in winning the war and are willing to face obstacles of all types; and

"Whereas the tire-rationing program and restrictions on the use of rubber are seriously crippling the production of food and disrupting vitally needed transportation; and

"Whereas the need for prompt development of synthetic rubber is most urgent to promote the successful prosecution of the war effort and alleviate the restrictions now required on travel facilities; and

"Whereas vast supplies of raw products from farm and forest are available for producing synthetic rubber of high quality by known and proven processes: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That we respectfully request that the Congress of the United States of America give the matter of development of synthetic rubber its immediate attention and aid in every possible way the development of the manufacture of synthetic rubber. We further respectfully urge that restrictions now in effect by any and all agencies of the Government, preventing an immediate development of synthetic rubber from any and all sources, be removed by congressional action; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to immediately forward a certified copy of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring an immediate investigation by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of all the agricultural "musts," to the end that the requirements of sufficient manpower, sufficient current credit, proper price relationship between production costs, ceilings and floors, sufficient farm machinery and repair parts, gasoline, rubber, fertilizer and other necessary supplies be definitely determined on a long-time basis, etc., so that sufficient food and fiber may be forthcoming to meet increasingly expanding goals and to supply all requirements; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See memorial printed in full when presented by Mr. LANGER on the 18th instant, at p. 1083 of the RECORD.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by members of the woman's division of the Christian Service of the Oxford (Kans.) Methodist Church, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale and distribution of alcoholic liquors in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

"Senate Concurrent Resolution L

"A concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the President to take immediate steps toward production of synthetic rubber from farm products

"Whereas our supply of natural crude rubber has been cut off almost entirely by one of our enemies in this Second World War, thus very seriously interfering with the mo-

bility of our commerce and industrial and agricultural efficiency, our modern way of life, and the successful prosecution of this war; and

"Whereas scientific research has proven beyond the experimental stage that a good quality of synthetic rubber can be made from various agricultural and forest products with less of vital war materials and with greater speed than from petroleum, which is very rapidly nearing depletion; and

"Whereas the American farmer now needs rubber more than ever before, because of scarcity of help and essential time saving in order for him to meet most certainly the tremendous needs of our armed forces and those of our allies, which our Washington authorities are expecting, and which needs the American farmer is patriotically, loyally, and cheerfully ready to supply to the best of his ability; and

"Whereas the patriotic hearings by the subcommittee of the United States Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as conducted by Senators Gillette, Wheeler, Thomas of Oklahoma, McNary, and Norris on the investigation relative to the production of industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, and synthetic rubber from farm crops, proved the feasibility and practicability of using farm crops as the source of the above-named alcohols and rubber; and

"Whereas said investigation further proves that the use of $650,000,000 of Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds have been authorized by Secretary Jesse Jones to a few of the large petroleum companies for the ostensible purpose of manufacturing 700,000 tons of Buna-s synthetic rubber from the quickest, least-costly way, 200,000 from alcohol; and

"Whereas the use of farm crops for the manufacture of alcohol and synthetic rubber would furnish a cheap source of rubber and tend to stabilize the Nation's most essential industry and its buying power in our national economy, and yet it was ignored in this Nation's great war effort to defeat the world's Fascist dictators and again reassure man's freedom; and

"Whereas it is not just now that the American farmers are beginning to sacrifice, but rather they have had this experience throughout most of the past post-war period in producing this Nation's food and fiber almost always below the cost of production, thereby resulting in the loss of farm homes; and furthermore the work of the farmer has been from 12 to 16 hours, and now in the Nation's greatest emergency his best trained and skilled help—his sons—have been conscripted, thus reducing seriously his ability to meet the food requirements of our people, our men in uniform, and our allies, and when he needs rubber for his most effective work in the Nation's peril, he witnesses these same petroleum interests, that have been given the $65,000,000, dilly-dallying and stalling in meeting this Nation's extremely critical rubber needs: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota,* That we demand of the United States Congress and the President of the United States that steps be taken immediately toward the production of the all-essential rubber from farm products for war and domestic uses; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Vice President, Henry A. Wallace, and the Senators and Representatives from the States of North Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oregon, Montana, Missouri, Iowa, Oklahoma, and North Dakota, requesting them to renew the determined fight to make rubber out of farm crops."

By Mr. GILLETTE (for himself and Mr. WILSON):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution 17

"Whereas daylight working hours are a vital factor in the preparation and harvesting of crops, the feeding of farm animals, and the production of all farm commodities; and

"Whereas the new war time known as daylight-saving time since its establishment has proved to be wasteful, rather than time-saving; and

"Whereas in these days of dire need every possible hour on the farm must be used for the production of vital foods; and

"Whereas the factories engaged in war production are largely on a 24-hour-per-day basis and those not thus engaged are largely on a short-day basis of work; and

"Whereas because of these conditions this change in time has not resulted in the saving of electric power and fuel; Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the house (the senate concurring),* That we respectfully petition Congress of the United States to repeal the act known as "daylight-saving time," chapter 7, second session, Public Law 403, Seventy-seventh Congress (S. 2160) which was approved by Congress January 20, 1942, and which establishes a standard time for the United States 1 hour earlier than mean astronomical time, and by this repeal permit agriculture to operate with a greater degree of efficiency; be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to the two Iowa Senators and the eight Iowa Members of the House of Representatives, and that they be thus petitioned to use all their influence and best offices that this change in time may be made and put into effect before the heavy farm-work season begins."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 16

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has before it for consideration House bill 1012 and Senate bill 246 affecting air commerce; and

"Whereas air commerce (air lines) represents a minor part of civil aviation, and private flying and fixed base operations represent a major part of civil aviation whose operations are not interstate in character and therefore are of no concern of the Federal Government, the pending legislation would deny to the States their inherent rights to govern within their own State and would seriously jeopardize private flying and fixed base operations; and

"Whereas by applying the intent of this legislation to other forms of transportation our national economy would be seriously affected; and

"Whereas there is no immediate need for this legislation as the President of the United States is vested with full power under the Defense Act to regulate all aircraft, civilian or otherwise, if necessary; and

"Whereas those men who are serving their country in the various branches of service are unable to voice their sentiments or opinions on this proposed legislation at this time, and they are the persons who have contributed more to the development of aviation and are entitled to their place in aeronautics when and if they return from active duty; and

"Whereas there is ample time for such legislation to be considered in the future since consideration has not been given future developments and improvements which will change methods now used in the regulation of aircraft: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That the State Legislature of Iowa respectfully requests that no action be taken on the above-mentioned bills or any similar bill or bills by Congress until the present war is over and peace is established; be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the clerk of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the clerk of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of Congress, and to each of the Iowa Senators and Representatives in Congress."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.)

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 8

"Whereas stock feeders in Iowa are finding it difficult and in many cases impossible to obtain oil meal, cottonseed meal, soybean meal, tankage and similar feeds so necessary in the feeding and finishing livestock for market; and

"Whereas where available these must generally be purchased if at all at increasingly exorbitant prices in mixtures and compounds generally known as commercial stock foods; and

"Whereas the difficulty in obtaining these necessary feed substances, at reasonable prices in the usual forms, is seriously slowing down and discouraging the production of meat so necessary to the war effort; and

"Whereas it is being commonly asserted and believed that this situation does not arise from an actual shortage of these products so much as by manipulation and preferences which might be prevented and removed by national authority: Be it therefore

*"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Iowa (the house of representatives concurring),* That we call upon the Congress of the United States to institute such investigation of this subject as may be necessary to determine the fact and fix blame, if any, and pass legislation, if any is required, to correct the situation complained of; be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of Agriculture and to each member of the Iowa Delegation in Congress."

---

"House Concurrent Resolution 13

"Whereas this Nation is now engaged in a world-wide war which has brought about a tremendous demand upon our transportation facilities; and

"Whereas it is recognized that a serious problem has arisen relative to the continuation of our transportation facilities because of the shortage of rubber, and our Government has urged, as a result of investigations and conclusions reached by the Baruch committee, a development of synthetic rubber to alleviate the shortage; and

"Whereas it is a desire of this State to cooperate in every way possible with the Federal Government and its committees and to make available its surplus commodities which are essential in the manufacture of synthetic rubber; and

"Whereas in the State of Iowa raw materials are available for the manufacture of alcohol used in the production of synthetic rubber; and

"Whereas, it would be economically advantageous to erect factories for the production of synthetic rubber in the area where protein byproducts are urgently needed for animal feeds: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the house (the senate concurring),* That Rubber Administrator William

M. Jeffers and our two Senators, Hon. GEORGE A. WILSON and Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE, and our eight Congressmen be urged to use their best efforts to help unsnarl the present situation relative to the production of synthetic rubber from agricultural products; that such plants be located in the surplus-crop area, including the State of Iowa, to the end that our State, Nation, and humanity be benefited and also to the end that this war be brought to a successful and more rapid conclusion; be it further

*Resolved by the house*, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Vice President Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard, Rubber Administrator William M. Jeffers, Senator Guy M. Gillette, Senator George A. Wilson, and our eight Members of the House of Representatives and that this resolution be spread upon the House and Senate Journals of the Fiftieth General Assembly of the State of Iowa."

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the War Production Board of the United States to release sufficient supplies of metallic ammunition and shot shells to permit farmers and stockmen to keep predatory animals under control and to permit hunters to adequately harvest surplus crops of game birds and game animals for food during the period of the war emergency

*"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring therein):*

"Whereas predatory animals, such as wolves and coyotes, have increased to an alarming extent in recent years; and

"Whereas if such animals are not kept under control, tremendous damage results to flocks of sheep and poultry; and

"Whereas surplus crops of game birds and game animals constitute a tremendous potential supply of food which can be made available to the people of South Dakota only if the same can be harvested by hunting; and

"Whereas the supply of shot shells and metallic ammunition in the State of South Dakota is not sufficient at the present time to provide an adequate supply to control predatory animals and game birds; and

"Whereas ring-neck pheasants have increased to the extent that they are a nuisance and are doing considerable damage to grain and forage crops; and

"Whereas migratory waterfowl, during their fall migration period, feed in large numbers in South Dakota grain fields and can do extensive damage to such fields if not kept under control; and

"Whereas it will be an economic waste of very valuable food resources if surplus game crops cannot be adequately harvested due to a lack of sporting ammunition: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring)*, That we earnestly recommend to the War Production Board of the United States that they release a sufficient supply of metallic ammunition and shot shells to permit farmers and stockmen to keep predatory animals under control and to permit hunters to harvest the surplus game crop in South Dakota during the war emergency; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to each Member of Congress from South Dakota, including both Senators and Representatives, and to the War Production Board of the United States, with the request that this matter receive their most earnest consideration."

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 7

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture for an appropriation to combat grasshoppers and other insect plagues

"Whereas the State of New Mexico is from time to time greatly damaged by grasshoppers and other insect plagues which destroy crops and damage pasture land; and

"Whereas it is necessary for the general welfare of the State of New Mexico and the welfare of the people of the United States that such grasshopper and insect plagues be combated; and

"Whereas, if money is not appropriated in order that such grasshopper and insect plagues may be scientifically combated, there may be a large decrease in various agricultural crops in the State of New Mexico; and

"Whereas, if money is not appropriated to scientifically combat grasshoppers and other insect plagues, the pastures of this State may be seriously damaged, resulting in an impairment of the livestock products of this State; and

"Whereas, it is necessary for effectual conduct of the present great war effort that a maximum production be attained in all agricultural pursuits of this State: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved*, The Sixteenth Legislature of New Mexico does hereby request the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture, be and they are memorialized and petitioned to provide funds to the State of New Mexico in order that grasshoppers and other insect plagues will be effectively combated; be it further

*"Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in Congress."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

"Senate Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution setting forth the policy of the State of New Mexico regarding the respective rights and powers of the Federal and State Governments to control and administer the uses of the waters within the State of New Mexico, and establishing a policy to promote joint action by the States and the United States in the efficient use of water and the control of flood waters to the end that litigation be avoided and the use and control of water be continued in the manner and under the laws as heretofore exercised

*"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:*

"Whereas in the State of New Mexico there are rights of immense proportion which have been acquired in reliance upon State laws governing the use of water, and there are many enterprises awaiting development, which is possible only through the use of water; and

"Whereas differences of opinion have arisen regarding the respective rights and powers of the Federal and State Governments to control and administer the use of waters within the several States, with the result that the stability of existing property rights and the future development of the water resources of this State are threatened and doubt is cast upon the authority of this State to exercise control over such use; and

"Whereas in order to remove all causes, present and future, which might lead to litigation, the welfare of this State requires that action be taken to insure interstate comity in the use of water, and to promote joint action by the States and the United States in the efficient use of water and the control of flood waters to the end that litigation be avoided and the use and control of water be continued in the manner and under the laws as heretofore exercised: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved*, That it is the policy of the State of New Mexico to maintain its jurisdiction and control over the rights to the use of the waters in this State, and to protect such rights as have been established under the laws thereof; be it further

*"Resolved*, That it is the policy of this State to protect rights to the beneficial use of water within this State as against threatened uses outside of the State; be it further

*"Resolved*, That it is the policy of this State to promote harmonious relations with the United States and with other States in respect to the beneficial use of water, and to encourage the making of compacts with respect to such relationship; be it further

*"Resolved*, That in furtherance of these policies, the Governor shall direct the Interstate Stream Commission to perform such duties as may be necessary to carry these policies into effect; be it further

*"Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

"Senate Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relating to the potash industry, requesting Congress to take proper steps looking to its protection

"Whereas in the First World War, because of control of then existing mineral potash resources by enemy countries, notably Germany, the United States was deprived of this essential industrial and agricultural chemical, and despite the expenditure of vast sums of money in efforts to produce potash from inferior and uneconomic sources, only small amounts could be made available; and

"Whereas, determined that such scarcity of a chemical vital in peace and war should not occur again, the United States Government and private enterprise conducted wide explorations for a permanent supply of potash, which resulted in the discovery and development of the New Mexico field, where, from three mines, potassic ores are removed to refineries for concentration and thence shipped to all parts of this country and to Canada and to Cuba; and

"Whereas American potash production for the most part is from the public domain and State-owned lands, under leases supervised by Federal and State technicians, thus assuring maintenance of high conservation and safety standards; and

"Whereas all the requirements of the United States for potash are now fully met by American mines and refineries, employing in New Mexico and other Western States several thousand workers, who, with their families and business and professional enterprises serving them, comprise thriving communities of permanent importance to the West; and

"Whereas foreign supplies of potash constitute a menace to these communities and to the American potash industries, unless some effective measure of import control is established by law: Therefore be it

*"Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of New Mexico requests the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States in its present session to give consideration in appropriate

legislative measures to methods of controlling potash imports into the United States and its possessions at the close of the war, to the end that the American potash industries shall survive, thus assuring continuance of their operations and the preservation of the welfare of their workers and the communities dependent on them; be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable CARL A. HATCH, the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, and the Honorable A. M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Mineral Resources Committee, a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys of the United States Senate."

A joint memorial and a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America and the Office of Price Administration to relieve dairymen and the dairy industry in New Mexico by raising the ceiling price on fluid milk or lowering the ceiling price on feed used in the dairy industry

"Whereas the dairy industry is one of the most important industries in New Mexico both from an economic standpoint and from the standpoint of production of essential food products needed for assistance in the war effort; and

"Whereas the prevailing ceiling price set by the Office of Price Administration upon fluid milk is too low to allow dairymen to pay the expenses of production and have a reasonable margin of profit; and

"Whereas the prevailing ceiling price fixed by said agency of the Government upon livestock feeds is too high to enable dairymen to feed their herds and produce fluid milk with a reasonable margin of profit; and

"Whereas the dairy industry in New Mexico has been seriously injured and jeopardized by the prevailing ceiling prices on fluid milk and livestock feed, and grave danger exists that many dairy businesses will be forced to discontinue business as a result thereof; and

"Whereas dire food shortages in New Mexico would immediately result from enforced discontinuance of the business of dairying by any considerable number of dairies, resulting in hardship and deprivation for babies and children and other needy persons in this State; and

"Whereas the dairy industry can be encouraged to continue in business by (1) raising the ceiling price on fluid milk to an amount sufficient to enable the business to receive a reasonable profit on its products, or (2) lowering the ceiling price on livestock feeds to be used in the dairying business, sufficiently to accomplish the same purpose; and

"Whereas the government of the State of New Mexico is without power and authority to accomplish the desired result: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico,* That the Congress of the United States and the Office of Price Administration be, and they are memorialized, petitioned, and requested to take such action as may be necessary to raise the ceiling price on fluid milk, or lower the ceiling price on livestock feeds used in the dairy business, to protect and encourage continuance of the dairy business in New Mexico by allowing such business a reasonable profit for engaging in such business; be it further

*"Resolved,* That engrossed copies of this memorial be mailed forthwith by the proper officials to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from New Mexico, and to the Office of Price Administration in Washington, D. C., and the State Director of the Office of Price Administration in New Mexico."

---

"House Joint Resolution 18

"Joint resolution relating to the ceiling prices on livestock and farm products

"Whereas the stock growers and farmers are urgently requested to increase their production of livestock and farm products, to meet the demands of the military services, of the lend-lease operations of the Government and of home consumption; and

"Whereas unless this request is met, there is the possibility of there being a shortage of food supplies for home consumption; and

"Whereas the cost of labor and of necessary equipment and machinery has greatly increased, and owing to the competition of the various war industries, there is a shortage of farm labor, requiring labor for long hours on the part of the stock grower, the farmer, and the members of their families: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That the Legislature of the State of New Mexico respectfully petitions that the Congress of the United States require that in the fixing of ceiling prices of livestock and of farm products, the increased cost of labor and materials be given full consideration and that likewise, in fixing such prices, the value of the long hours of labor of the stock grower, the farmer and their families be also taken into consideration; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies of this joint resolution be sent to the Senators and Members of Congress from New Mexico."

Two joint memorials and a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial, memorializing Congress and its Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and the House Committee on Public Lands of the urgent need for grazing privileges among the small livestock men in certain counties in New Mexico

*"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:*

"Whereas the State of New Mexico has for years supplied a livelihood to many inhabitants thereof by providing grazing privileges in an unlimited way to all livestock men, within its borders; and

"Whereas the main industry of the State of New Mexico has been the raising and caring for livestock therein, profitably and gainfully, up to and including the year 1932; and

"Whereas during the last few years, grazing privileges which were available have been limited as a result of tax sales or other form of transfer of existing community land grants, particularly in the counties of Mora, Taos, Rio Arriba, and Sandoval, thus diminishing the grazing privileges necessary for maintaining the high quality and feasibility of ownership of livestock; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has seen fit and duly proper to engage in the purchase of these community land grants from private individuals for soil conservation purposes and the creation and establishment of national forests, particularly the Santa Fe National Forest embracing parts of Mora and Taos Counties, and the Carson National Forest embracing the counties of Mora, Taos, and Rio Arriba; and

"Whereas the said Government of the United States, in initiating practices of soil conservation and the establishment of national forests has limited the use of, and in some instances has entirely denied these grazing privileges so that many inhabitants have been forced to abandon the livestock industry because of those inadequate concessions and limitations thus causing these individuals in the above counties mentioned to apply for relief and confine their search for livelihood to the helping hand of their Federal Government; and

"Whereas to relieve poverty and to encourage and promote among these individuals, individual industry in a manner conducive to better living, it is deemed necessary to relax the soil conservation laws and promote more extensive grazing by small cattlemen in these federally owned community land grants: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That the committees on public lands of both Houses of Congress, the Congressional Representatives of New Mexico, the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, be informed of the condition that exists, and that they be requested to undertake official action to alleviate the depressing circumstances which exist by providing for an adequate system of conservation having in regard the above necessitous circumstances of residents formerly occupying these land grants herein above referred to, and comparing the detriments of relief with the advantages of conservation and make adjustments accordingly; be it further

*"Resolved,* That the Congress be requested to enact a law providing that these small land grants be used strictly by those individuals who carry on the livestock industry for a livelihood as distinguished from commercial enterprises and that steps be taken to harmonize present Government supervision and administration with better grazing concessions; be it further

*"Resolved,* That the United States Congress be informed of the desperate need for more federally owned grazing lands dedicated to the exclusive use of small stockmen; be it further

*"Resolved,* That an enrolled and engrossed copy of this memorial be mailed to the committees on public lands of both Houses of Congress, to the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture and to New Mexico's congressional delegation."

---

"House Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial memorializing Congress, its Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and the House Committee on Public Lands, of the urgent need for extending opportunities for the production of food for national emergency

*"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:*

"Whereas because of the War Production Board having requisitioned the steel from the Boice City-Farley branch of the Santa Fe Railroad in Union County, N. Mex., the county lost $16,512.50 annually from its tax income, and $736,795 from the valuation of the county, and suffered irreparable disruption in the livestock business; and

"Whereas, by the purchase and retirement of 75,000 acres of land in Union County as a portion of the Tri-State Land Utilization Program another $2,250 annual tax income has been lost to Union County, and also has the livestock industry disrupted to that further extent in production; and

"Whereas this land is located in the best beef- and mutton-producing area in the State of New Mexico, and it will contribute a substantial amount of food to the national larder should this land be placed under beef production, as well as add materially to the resources of the county and State; and

"Whereas to relieve the poverty caused by the above facts, for relief to individuals, and

as encouraging individual industry in a manner conducive to better living, and to promote livestock food production: Be it therefore

*"Resolved,* That the Committee on Public Lands of both Houses of Congress, the congressional representation of New Mexico, the President of the United States, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and the National Food Administrator, be informed of the condition, and that they be requested to undertake official action to alleviate the circumstances which exist by regulation, proclamation, or legislation, as may be necessary, by restoring the 75,000 acres of land in Union County, N. Mex., now under the Tri-State Land Utilization set-up by sale to individuals; be it further

*"Resolved,* That such sales be carried out in small grants so that no one person may acquire more than four sections, and to be used strictly by individuals who carry on the livestock industry for a livelihood as distinguished from commercial or speculative enterprises; be it further

*"Resolved,* That such grants or sales be made at prices commensurate with other publicly owned lands similarly situated, on the amortization plan, extending over a period of 30 years, with interest at 3 percent on deferred payments."

---

"House Joint Resolution 20

"Joint memorial petitioning the Congress of the United States to authorize and require the proper authorities to adopt a more liberal policy toward white settlers using Government lands under permits, to permit an increase of livestock on the national forests, and to open soil-conservation districts for grazing additional stock during the war emergency

*"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:*

"Whereas within the limits of the State of New Mexico there exist vast areas of grazing land, owned and controlled by the Federal Government, as national forest land, lands administered under the Taylor Grazing Act, and land embraced in soil-conservation districts, on all of which grazing of livestock by settlers of the State has been reduced to a minimum, in line with a general policy of the conservation of the range, which was adopted under peacetime conditions; and

"Whereas our Nation is now at war and the country is facing a serious meat shortage, by reason of the extraordinary demands of our armed forces, as well as of those of our allies, and of the peoples of the Allied countries, and it is our belief that we should all make every effort to increase our meat supply; and

"Whereas it is our belief that an increase in the number of stock grazing on the said Federal-owned lands can be permitted for a few years without any permanent damages to the range, and if such increase be allowed, it will result in a very considerable increase in meats produced and marketed in this State; Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico,* That it is the sense of the legislature, now in session, and representing the people of this State, that the Congress should speedily enact such appropriate legislation as to authorize and direct that the various agencies of the Federal Government having in charge the control of grazing on Federal-owned lands in New Mexico, permit a substantial increase in the number of livestock to be grazed on said lands for the duration of the war emergency, in the interest of the people of this State and of the Nation as a whole; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That a duly enrolled and engrossed copy of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, the Honorable CARL A. HATCH, the Honorable A. M. FERNANDEZ, the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, and to His Excellency, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States."

## PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAX PLAN—RESOLUTION OF CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, for my colleague the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] and myself I present herewith for appropriate reference a petition in the form of a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut entitled "Resolution Memorializing Congress Concerning the Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plan."

Mr. President, I should like to say, for myself, that I am among the many who favor the pay-as-you-go tax policy, and I wish further to say that I believe in the withholding feature in the collection of taxes.

Mr. President, if I were compelled to write a tax bill today, I would adopt the principle of the so-called Ruml plan, with the proviso that we would collect from the taxpayers of the country whichever was the higher of the 1942 or the 1943 taxes.

I realize, more particularly just after having again heard the Farewell Address of the Father of his Country, that one cannot see so far into the future as he would like, and, after hearing from the Finance Committee, when its studies are completed, I may change my views, but, as of now, I am among those who believe in the principle of the so-called Ruml plan.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague for his courtesy and cooperation in presenting, in behalf of both of us, a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut. I might remark that when the 1942 tax bill was before the Finance Committee its very able chairman, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], appointed a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and myself to investigate and report back to the full committee the merits of the Ruml plan. At that time the subcommittee filed a unanimous report favorable to the adoption of the Ruml plan, but, so far as I presently recall, the only votes for its adoption in the full committee were those which reflected the views of the subcommittee, who, apparently, at that time were the ones who knew most about it.

The joint resolution of the General Assembly of Connecticut was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE, STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
*Hartford, February 17, 1943.*

Hon. FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: The following senate joint resolution was passed by this assembly on this date:

"Resolution memorializing Congress concerning the pay-as-you-go tax plan

*"Resolved by this assembly,* That we respectfully urge our Senators and Representatives in Congress to assist in the passage of a pay-as-you-go tax plan; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the clerk of the senate and the clerk of the house of representatives be directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and Representatives for Connecticut in Congress and a copy to the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means."

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE F. BALDWIN,
*Clerk of the Senate.*
SEARLS DEARINGTON,
*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

## PRODUCTION OF ALCOHOL FROM AGRICULTURAL OR FOREST PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and myself, I present Senate concurrent resolution D of the Legislative Assembly of North Dakota memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing for the production of alcohol from agricultural or forest products, and ask that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution D

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing for the production of alcohol from agricultural or forest products

Whereas our Nation is engaged in a death struggle with the Axis powers for the preservation of our form of Government and the American institutions; and

Whereas patriotism demands that every private consideration should be set aside to the end that the prosecution of the war may be carried to a successful conclusion; and

Whereas, it is incumbent upon private citizens as well as upon corporations and associations to do everything possible to provide the materials necessary to win the war at the earliest possible date; and

Whereas rubber is one of the necessary materials of vital importance in the prosecution of the war; and

Whereas investigation has demonstrated that there will be a shortage of nearly 500,000 tons in 1943 and more than 1,000,000 tons shortage in 1944; and

Whereas it has further been demonstrated that alcohol necessary in the production of rubber can be obtained by processing agricultural and forest products, of which we have an abundance, and that the setting-up of plants and machinery of sufficient capacity for production of rubber on a large scale can be ready for operation within 6 or 8 months at an expense much less than production from oil processes; and

Whereas facts abundantly show that very little rubber can be produced from oil processes in 1943 and 1944; and

Whereas any unnecessary delay in the production of this vital war material will result in prolongation of the war, the sacrifice of thousands of our young men in the armed forces of the United States, and the destruction of countless millions of property; and

Whereas plants established during the emergency for processing such products for the manufacture of rubber would be of continued value in times of peace by utilizing surplus agricultural products and thus materially contribute to the economic stability of our Nation and aid in the rehabilitation of its citizens during the period of adjustment after the war; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives*

*concurring*), That we memorialize, petition, and urge Congress to take such steps as are necessary for the speedy enactment into law a bill providing for the manufacture of rubber and alcohol products from agricultural and forest products in order to expedite the prosecution of the war and providing an increased supply of rubber for war purposes, and we further urge that no private or selfish interest of any person, association, or corporation be permitted during our present extreme national emergency in any manner or by any means whatever to delay or hamper final and favorable consideration of such proposed measure; be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State of the State of North Dakota cause copies of this resolution to be mailed to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member of Congress from the State of North Dakota, to the Honorable Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, and to each of the secretaries of state and the Members of Congress of the States of Montana, South Dakota, and Minnesota.

C. NORMAN BRUNSDALE,
*President pro tempore of the Senate.*
W. J. TROUT,
*Secretary of the Senate.*
RALPH G. BEEDE,
*Speaker of the House.*
W. M. SMART,
*Chief Clerk of the House.*

## ASSISTANCE FROM ARMED FORCES IN PLANTING AND HARVESTING CROPS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD a very brief extract from a letter written by Lloyd Rundell, a member of the Assembly of the Wisconsin Legislature, relating to the subject of the draft of a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the granting of furloughs or release of persons in the armed forces for the planting and harvesting of crops and to limit the size of our armed forces.

This letter is from a man of large experience, a farmer who knows whereof he speaks.

With the new ration program in effect we should not hesitate a moment in seeing that production is not further curtailed by lack of labor.

We are facing a very critical food situation. The farm sections of this country are calling for men.

Mr. President, the letter I desire to read has a bearing upon this serious situation in the country. It reads:

WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE,
ASSEMBLY CHAMBER,
*Madison, February 15, 1943.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have been over much of Wisconsin and find that there are millions of bushels of corn to be gathered. An early snow stopped the machines last fall. This corn will have to be husked by hand, as the snow has beaten it down to the ground. After the corn is gathered, the ground must be plowed, and crops planted. It can't help but be late, as very little fall plowing was done. We on our own farm wonder where the help is coming from, to care for three or four hundred little pigs, 1,200 chickens, 80 Guernsey cattle, besides 270 acres to be planted in oats, barley, flax, soybeans, canning peas and corn.

At least a million men should be available by April 1 to remain until June 1, and another million June 15 to stay until October 1. Can you send me the Congressional Journal?

Maximum cordiality,

LLOYD RUNDELL,
*Assemblyman.*

Mr. President, I ask that a draft of a proposed joint resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature follow the letter in the RECORD and be appropriately referred.

The draft of the proposed joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint Resolution A

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the granting of furloughs or release of persons in the armed forces for the planting and harvesting of crops and to limit the size of our armed forces

Whereas agriculture has lost more than 3,000,000 operators, farm workers, and year-around hired workers to war industry and the armed forces; and

Whereas the reduction of the manufacture of farm machinery, coupled with the inadequate prices to the farmer for his produce has afforded him neither the tools necessary to perform his job nor adequate compensation for his work; and

Whereas it has been estimated that millions of dollars' worth of crops were lost last year because they could not be harvested and dairy herds were slaughtered because of an inadequate amount of help; and

Whereas a great supply of food has now become so important that it equals military operations in determining the outcome of the war and will furnish the only sure way to peace and the only means of avoiding anarchy and bloodshed; and

Whereas the need for increasing the production of crops and other agricultural commodities in the year of 1943 is extremely critical and many hardships will be imposed upon the people of this country, as well as to all of our fighting allies, unless there is an increased production of food made possible by an adequate farm labor supply; and

Whereas it is suggested and recommended that the best means of alleviating the farm labor shortage would be to economize on other types of labor for the benefit of the farmer, to discontinue the drafting of labor from farms into the armed forces; and among other measures, to grant furloughs to the farm boys in the armed forces for the peak periods of planting and harvesting; and

Whereas it is extremely unwise to increase the size of our armed forces to such an extent that it impairs the ability of our farms to produce an adequate supply of foodstuffs: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the assembly, the senate concurring*, That this legislature hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to authorize the granting of furloughs to suitable members of the armed forces in order that they might assist in the planting and harvesting of farm crops and caring for livestock and poultry under proper military direction; be it further

*Resolved*, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Secretary of the War Department, Secretary of the Navy Department, Secretary of Agriculture, and the War Manpower Commission, and to each House of Congress of the United States, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

## RESOLUTION OF WAR COUNCIL MEETING OF MINERS AT DENVER, COLO.—AID TO SMALL MINING OPERATIONS

Mr. SCRUGHAM presented a resolution adopted by mining men assembled from all sections of the West at the first annual war council meeting held in conjunction with the forty-sixth annual meeting of the Colorado Mining Association at Denver, Colo., on January 29 and 30, 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We endorse the Special Small Business Committee of the Senate of the United States and commend its excellent work in attempting to stimulate a rational program in aid of small mining operations which add so materially to the production of strategic and critical minerals. We ask the continued efforts of this committee to this end and urge the committee, by investigation or otherwise, to secure effective cooperation of the Government in the discovery of new sources and the expansion of existing sources of these materials.

## PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAX PLAN

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have received many communications relating to the pay-as-you-go method of paying income taxes, but I have one in my hand from Nebraska submitted by Mr. G. A. Winters, general manager of the Grand Island Daily Independent, Grand Island, Nebr., which is a plan which may be considered optional to the Ruml plan. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the communication was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX PLAN

From G. A. WINTERS,
*General Manager, Grand Island Daily Independent, Grand Island, Nebr.*

First, require everyone to file a tax return not later than March 15 and pay at least 25 percent of the tax due on 1942 income. Then give the taxpayer three optional methods of paying the 75-percent balance.

First option: If the taxpayer pays the entire 1942 tax on or before March 15, an allowance be made of 2½ percent of the total tax.

Second option: If the taxpayer pays the entire 1942 tax in four installments in 1943, allowances be made as follows: March 15 payment, no allowance; June 15 payment, 1 percent on that payment; September 15 payment, 2 percent; December payment, 3 percent. This would be a total of 1½ percent of the total tax.

Third option: Taxpayer to pay 25 percent of tax on March 15, and balance of tax, or 75 percent, be deferred over a period of 5 years. Twenty percent on this balance due would be added to 1943 tax, plus an interest charge of 2 percent; to 1944 tax a 20-percent payment, plus 4 percent; to 1945 tax a 20-percent payment, plus 6 percent; to 1946 tax a 20-percent payment, plus 8 percent; to 1947 tax a 20-percent payment, plus 10 percent. Total interest charge would figure 6 percent of the deferred tax, and the entire amount would be liquidated by the close of 1948. Any unpaid balance would be a lien on an estate, in case of death, and a first lien on assets of a corporation, if liquidated prior to 1948.

I believe millions of individuals and corporations would avail themselves of the first option, other millions on the second option, and that more than 75 percent of the total 1942 tax would be paid during 1943.

On the plan of deductions from 1943 earnings, I would suggest a 25-percent deduction, which would include the present Victory tax, from all salaries and wages after exemption, as is proposed, but also in addition give all taxpayers the following options:

An employed person could advise his employer to deduct any amount in excess of 25 percent, if such person thought his 1943 tax would be greater than the fund created by the minimum deduction. In other words, the 25-percent deduction would be the minimum, but could be increased at the option of the employee.

Corporations and individuals who are not employees could, if they desired, make application with the internal revenue department as a volunteer contributor, be given a permanent register number and make voluntary deposits monthly equal to one-twelfth of their estimated 1943 tax.

The 1943 tax returns would be made in the regular manner, and any credits that the taxpayer had accumulated during 1943 would be applied as a credit against the tax due on 1943 earnings.

Again I think millions would avail themselves of this privilege, it would bring millions of dollars into our National Treasury, and certainly would be a curb on inflation.

Yours truly,

G. A. WINTERS.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; with amendments (Rept. No. 60).

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 163. A bill to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship construction reserve funds, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 61); and

H. R. 133. A bill to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 62).

## ADDITIONAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE GASOLINE AND FUEL OIL SHORTAGES (REPT. NO. 59)

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I submit herewith an additional report from the Special Committee to Investigate Gasoline and Fuel Oil Shortages, and because it deals with a subject of tremendous importance to the great majority of the people of the country, and more particularly to the people of the northern section of the country, where there has been acute distress in the last several months, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate two statements in the conclusions of the special Senate committee. First, I read the following:

CONCLUSIONS

1. The over-all picture: Little improvement in the over-all picture can be expected during this and the following wartime winters. It is likely that increased military demands will absorb the additional petroleum products transported to the eastern seaboard as a result of increased transportation facilities now being provided. For this reason all convertible oil-heating units should be converted to coal as soon as possible. But this is not enough. To avoid a serious coal transportation problem individual coal consumers should put in their coal during the coming summer. It is also possible that a fuel oil shortage may develop next winter in the States of Oregon and Washington. Efforts should be made to stock pile as much petroleum as possible in that area.

I thought I should call particular attention to that paragraph because the situation may be extremely serious next winter.

There is one other statement in the report, containing two paragraphs, which I should like to read. It is under the heading "Centralization of administrative authority," and is as follows:

5. Centralization of administrative authority: Administration of the various programs affecting the petroleum problem has not been sufficiently integrated. Until December 2, 1942, the Petroleum Coordinator was empowered only to consult the many other agencies regulating the production, transportation, distribution, and rationing of petroleum products. On December 2, 1942, by Presidential order, the position of Petroleum Coordinator was abolished and that of Petroleum Administrator for War was created. The Petroleum Administrator for War has somewhat more authority than the Petroleum Coordinator, but lacks the vital power to make final decisions and to enforce them in the various agencies. He can only attempt to persuade.

The centralization of authority in a single head with power to issue directives to other departments is essential. These directives should be final except where a conflict results between the oil program and some other program. The War Production Board should reconcile such differences.

I request that the report be printed and printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report submitted by Mr. MALONEY is as follows:

GASOLINE AND FUEL-OIL SHORTAGES

CONCLUSIONS

1. The over-all picture: Little improvement in the over-all picture can be expected during this and the following wartime winters. It is likely that increased military demands will absorb the additional petroleum products transported to the eastern seaboard as a result of increased transportation facilities now being provided. For this reason all convertible oil heating units should be converted to coal as soon as possible. But this is not enough. To avoid a serious coal-transportation problem individual coal consumers should put in their coal during the coming summer. It is also possible that a fuel-oil shortage may develop next winter in the States of Oregon and Washington. Efforts should be made to stock-pile as much petroleum as possible in that area.

2. The Eastern States: The States hardest hit in the East are Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virginia. South of Virginia the Atlantic Seaboard States have not suffered severe hardship. These States enjoy a milder climate and use proportionately larger amounts of coal and wood as fuel. For this reason it would contribute to a more realistic view of the situation along the Atlantic seaboard if district 1, now comprising the entire seaboard, were divided into two districts. The problems of the hardship area could be then viewed separately from those of the remainder of the States. Most statistics now available are given in bulk for the entire district.

3. The Middle Western States: The Middle Western States have suffered severe hardship this winter. While there has not been an actual shortage of oil in this area, it has been necessary to withdraw stocks from it to supply the East with transportation facilities. The committee agrees, and most of the persons in the Middle West have agreed, that it is proper for the entire country to share its oil-transportation facilities rather than that any particular area should suffer.

4. The far West: A change in requirements for the Pacific fighting fronts would create a shortage in Oregon and Washington which are now supplied by tanker. Plans should be made now to handle these contingencies.

5. Centralization of administrative authority: Administration of the various programs affecting the petroleum problem has not been sufficiently integrated. Until December 2, 1942, the Petroleum Coordinator was empowered only to consult the many other agencies regulating the production, transportation, distribution, and rationing of petroleum products. On December 2, 1942, by Presidential order, the position of Petroleum Coordinator was abolished and that of Petroleum Administrator for War was created. The Petroleum Administrator for War has somewhat more authority than the Petroleum Coordinator, but lacks the vital power to make final decisions and to enforce them in the various agencies. He can only attempt to persuade.

The centralization of authority in a single head with power to issue directives to other departments is essential. These directives should be final except where a conflict results between the oil program and some other program. The War Production Board should reconcile such differences.

6. Cooperation between military and civilian authorities: Lack of coordination between the military and the civil authorities resulted in a severe crisis during the latter part of December 1942, when the military authorities found it necessary to demand large quantities of oil for use in North Africa. At the present time arrangements are being worked out whereby Army and Navy officers will work closely with the petroleum industry and the Petroleum Administration for War. Active cooperation between these authorities is essential, with the military making every effort to advise civilian authorities of its needs reasonably far in advance. Actual military needs for battle operations must come first; but, on the other hand, complete disruption of civilian transportation, or recurring periods in which households are unheated, would produce a situation at home which would impair the war effort as seriously as a military defeat. The committee believes that such crises can be avoided by careful planning and cooperation.

7. Effect of prices on supply: Much of the hardship being suffered by fuel-oil consumers results from a price structure which discouraged the production, transportation, and accumulation of fuel oil in the places where it was most seriously needed. It is more profitable to produce and to sell gasoline than fuel oil, and the industry was allowed to produce the more profitable item at the expense of the less profitable one. Selling prices of both products were fixed at levels which discouraged dealers from accumulating stocks. Prices in the areas with the greatest demand were lower than those in areas where the need was not as great, resulting in a tendency to ship less to the place where the shipment would be less profitable.

8. Gasoline consumption: The public consumed enormous quantities of gasoline during the spring and summer of 1942 before teeth were put into the rationing system. During this period transportation and refining facilities which might have been used for fuel oil were instead utilized for gasoline. To achieve a proper balance between the quantities of fuel oil and gasoline production is imperative.

9. Transportation: Although much sincere effort has been spent on the problem of transporting petroleum into the distressed areas, the committee has too often been informed that things cannot be done rather than that a way must be found to do them. As a result, suggested improvements have been put into

effect only after months of discussion, and in some cases delay nullifies the suggestion.

Substantially more petroleum products can be moved by rail. To date the railroads have done a magnificent job in increasing the movement of oil to district 1 from 5,000 barrels a day to over 800,000 barrels. However, the committee feels, and it has been assured by Mr. John J. Pelley, president, Association of American Railroads, that the railroads can do even more and are working to that end.

Consideration should be given to the pooling of oil for transportation, discontinuing the present practice of specifically earmarked individual shipments by companies to specific consumers. This would increase efficiency, as the pre-war marketing structure was not designed for present conditions. This proposal is by no means revolutionary, as oil going through pipe lines has been similarly pooled. To a certain extent this has been done by the Petroleum Administrator for War by designating terminals to receive trainload shipments. Supplies so received are allocated among all companies needing them. Much more should be done along these lines.

10. Tankers: Utilization of tankers is almost entirely in the hands of the Navy and the War Shipping Administration. While the committee has hesitated to ask for specific tanker routes, inasmuch as these might constitute secret military information, it is the committee's opinion that more oil could be brought to the east coast by tanker without impairing the war effort.

11. Barges: The use of barges also can and should be greatly increased.

12. Makeshifts: Greater ingenuity should be exercised to utilize makeshifts. In the summer of 1941 the use of box freight cars to carry steel drums of oil was urged. Now, after a year and a half, this proposal is being adopted.

13. Tank trucks: More attention should be given to utilizing existing tank trucks. Parts of the petroleum industry have complained of a shortage and asked that more be built, while dealers in the East have advised that tank trucks in that area are idle.

14. New pipe lines: The war emergency pipe line is being extended from Norris City to New York as rapidly as possible. Plans have also been completed for a second pipe line. The building of other pipe lines to the East depends on the availability of scarce materials for such pipe lines. Many of these materials are needed in the escort vessel, the aviation gasoline, and the synthetic rubber programs. Alternate methods of petroleum transportation which might consume less steel should be considered.

15. Fuel-oil rationing: Fuel-oil rationing should be simplified and much wider discretion given to local ration boards. Experience thus far shows that decentralization is the only practical solution to rationing. The committee would like to see a great decrease in the number of officeholders in Washington and an increase in the number of persons working with their own neighbors to solve individual problems in each area. The committee has received complaints from Governors and many others about long queues of persons waiting at ration boards.

Vigorous efforts should be made to get additional persons of high caliber to serve on boards. It should be recognized that rationing of all articles is going to be the most important single influence on daily civilian life in the next year or two. On this basis persons of outstanding ability can be induced to serve on ration boards. Sufficient funds should be provided for adequate and competent clerical staffs.

16. Rationing for next winter: It is too late for a substantial change in the method of rationing this winter. The disturbing effect of a major shift at this time would far outweigh the gains. On the other hand, some things should be done at once. The coupons for remaining periods should be made valid now to ease the strain on local distribution to the extent that existing stocks will permit. At the same time it should be vigorously emphasized that no more coupons are forthcoming.

For the next heating season serious consideration should be given to a straight-line percentage cut based on use during the 1941–42 heating season with provision for the local boards to grant relief in hardship cases. Some method must be established of reconciling the total number of rationing coupons outstanding with the total supply of oil available Consideration should be given to the possibility of allocating to each ration board a total number of oil ration coupons and allowing the board to decide between its own claimants. Due provision could be made for claims by any board for an additional allowance.

17. Integration of local distribution: A central authority should be charged with responsibility for integrating activities in each community. This authority should know where all supplies of fuel oil are to be found and should be authorized to fill emergency requirements without delay or red tape other than a brief spot check. This system has already been tried in some localities and found successful in easing the hardships which generally have resulted from break-downs in the rationing or distion systems.

18. Black markets and pleasure driving: Gasoline rationing along the Atlantic seaboard, where the amounts of gasoline are limited, should be tightened with the objective of eliminating black markets, and the allowances to preferred classes of motorcar drivers should also be examined in the light of the much smaller quantities of gasoline which are now available. The pleasure-driving ban should be redefined with particular care given to the needs of rural drivers.

Nation-wide gasoline rationing for the purpose of conserving rubber should be put on the basis of mileage with due weight given to the availability of rubber to the particular driver and his individual needs. To the extent that the rubber situation allows, more mileage should be permitted in sparsely populated areas where alternate forms of transportation are not available.

19. Integration of all passenger transportation: Passenger transportation in each part of the country should be integrated. The committee knows that many agencies have been talking about this for almost a year with no results. The pooling of automobiles and taxicabs has been only partly successful. Abandoned railroad lines remain abandoned. Vigorous efforts must be made to obtain maximum utilization of all vehicles.

20. Representation for smaller dealers and distributors: Attention should be given to the desirability of increasing the representation of smaller dealers and distributors on the industry committees. These dealers and distributors have played an important part in the petroleum business and their position in the business should be reflected on the committees. Moreover their lack of representation can hardly instill in them complete confidence that they will be fairly treated.

INTRODUCTION

Critical shortages of both fuel oil and gasoline, with widespread complaints of suffering, induced the committee to resume its investigation during December 1942. The efforts of a multiplicity of agencies had not been successful in averting the crisis brought on by an unusually cold December and the increased demands of the armed forces.

Information was drawn from many sources. Letters of inquiry were directed to the Governors, Senators, and Congressmen of each State, to the Government officials in charge of departments whose activities affected the oil and gasoline situation, to a great many oil companies, to the various oil industry war councils, to the railroads, and to many others.

*The witnesses*

The committee held open hearings on January 4, 11, 12, 13, and 27, 1943. Among the witnesses were Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior and Petroleum Administrator for War; Leon Henderson, formerly Price Administrator and Director of the Civilian Supply Division of the War Production Board; Joseph B. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation; William Jeffers, Rubber Director; and Admiral Emory S. Land, War Shipping Administrator. Maj. J. A. Parten, Director of Transportation, Edward B. Swanson, Director of Research, J. Howard Marshall, Counsel, and Robert L. Minckler, Director of Petroleum Supply of the Petroleum Administration for War; John R. Turney, former Director, Motor Transport Conservation Division, John L. Rogers, Director, Motor Transport Division, Fayette Dow, Director of the Division of Petroleum and Other Liquid Transportation, and Ernest R. Holzborn, Director of Division of Inland Waterways of the Office of Defense Transportation, also appeared. John J. Pelley, president, Association of American Railroads, testified on rail transport of fuel oil and gasoline. Additional witnesses from the Office of Price Administration were Joel Dean, chief, Fuel Rationing Division, Charles F. Phillips, director, Automotive Supply Rationing Division, and John R. Richards, chief, Gasoline Rationing Branch. From some of the critical areas came Hon. WILLIAM J. MILLER, United States Representative from Connecticut; F. H. LaGuardia, mayor of the city of New York; Walter P. Hedden, director of port development, the Port of New York Authority; Maurice J. Tobin, mayor of Boston, Mass.; Stanley W. Church, mayor of New Rochelle, N. Y.; and Lester Scott, director of the oil heating division of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association of Washington, D. C.

Executive hearings were held with officers of the Army and Navy, with many members of the Petroleum War Council, and with persons in the petroleum industry. The committee also held numerous conferences.

*The committee's objectives*

The committee has two major objectives. First, it desires to dissipate the confusion in the public mind as to the prospects for future supplies of fuel oil and gasoline. To date gasoline and fuel-oil rations have been changed so often in district 1 that it is impossible for consumers to know what they can expect in the future. Much of the hardship of any rationing plan can be removed by letting the public know in advance what it may expect and what it must do.

The committee's second objective is to study the specific criticisms and suggestions offered by many persons who took the time and made the effort to appear before it and to answer its communications.

In the aggregate these suggestions are extremely valuable. The committee is of the opinion that advice of this type should be sought and followed more extensively.

The committee intends to continue its investigation in order to keep in touch with the manner in which petroleum products are supplied, transported, and distributed, so long as the shortage exists.

ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

The committee believes that the shortages of fuel oil and gasoline have been intensified, and suffering increased, because of the present intolerable division of authority.

The problem of fuel oil and gasoline supply is chiefly in the hands of the Petroleum Administrator for War and the War Production Board. Through its price control the Office of Price Administration also influences the production of petroleum products.

Transportation problems are affected by the Petroleum Administrator for War, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Office of Price Administration, the War Production Board, the Army, the Navy, the War Shipping Administration, the Interstate Commerce Committee, and the Rubber Director.

Rationing is administered by the Office of Price Administration, the Office of Defense Transportation, and the Department of Agriculture. The Petroleum Administrator for War and the Rubber Director are vitally interested. The Petroleum Administrator should be in a position to tell the rationing authorities exactly how much petroleum they have to distribute. He is now doing so, but did not begin to do so until the middle of December. In areas where the rubber shortage requires that less gasoline should be distributed than is available, the further direction should come from the Rubber Director. A single authority should then handle the rationing function.

No one agency has complete authority. In the last analysis, disputes as to supply are resolvable by the War Production Board. The Petroleum Administrator for War has extensive powers to recommend, but not to direct. As a result the public has suffered delays, surprises, and inefficiencies. In the field of transportation the Office of Defense Transportation is supreme. The rationing field is divided between the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Defense Transportation. The supply situation resulting from this confusion of authority at least once was completely confounded by the fact that the Army and Navy stepped in and drained the supplies from the New York area without warning. The Army has very properly first call on petroleum stocks everywhere, but only after a severe shortage was created along the eastern seaboard, as a result of unexpected military demand, did the Army and the Navy begin to fully cooperate with the petroleum industry in an effort to avoid unnecessary emergencies.

The Executive order which established the Petroleum Administration for War was popularly supposed to have vested ultimate authority in Harold L. Ickes as Administrator. In practice, Mr. Ickes is not wielding his alleged authority. The committee, after careful perusal of the order, does not believe that he has it. He can make recommendations. He has no authority to compel their adoption.

In fact, the only effective additional power granted to Mr. Ickes by this directive was over the oil industry as such. Mr. Ickes did not even gain power to decide oil-rationing policies. This remained in the Office of Price Administration. As a result, public announcements of the Petroleum Administrator and of the Office of Price Administration are not always in accord.

The committee is convinced that the identity of the possessor of ultimate authority needs to be settled immediately and unmistakably.

### TRANSPORTATION

#### *The background*

The present oil shortage is the result of a loss of normal transportation facilities and an increase in demands for petroleum products. Of the two, the loss of transportation facilities has been the major factor, particularly in that part of petroleum district 1 which includes the North and Middle Atlantic seaboard States.

Under normal conditions nearly all of the oil supply for the eastern seaboard was delivered by tankers from the Gulf coast around the tip of Florida and from the great oil-producing areas of Venezuela. Normally a 50 to 100 days' supply has been held in storage along the eastern coast, and this was drawn upon during the winter period of heavy demand and replaced the following summer.

The Middle West, which comprises petroleum district 2, is a great oil-producing area. It is also a huge consumer, and normally its production is about equal to local consumption. The Middle West has not normally supplied oil products to the East. Transportation facilities, therefore, have been geared for a long haul from the Gulf coast. In peacetime this haul was most economical by tanker. During the summer of 1941 large numbers of tankers were placed in the British service, creating a threatened shortage in the Atlantic-seaboard States. At this time railroads carried practically none of the east-coast supply, and Government officials stated that the railroads were not prepared to greatly increase their contribution.

At this point this committee was created to investigate gasoline and fuel-oil shortages. The committee learned that the railroads could haul much more petroleum than had been hauled by the tankers loaned to the British. The railroads have now accomplished this and much more, having increased the number of barrels they carry into district 1 daily from about 5,000 in 1941 to well over 800,000 at the present time.

Since Pearl Harbor we have lost many tankers. At the same time the need for tankers to transport oil and gasoline to the fighting fronts has absorbed practically all of the tanker facilities which remain. For domestic civilian consumption we must rely on railroads, pipe lines, and inland waterways.

#### *Pipe lines*

Pipe lines are much more expensive than tankers; railroad tank-car movement is even more costly than pipe line. Temporary expedients such as the use of steel drums loaded on box cars raise the expense even higher because of the labor necessary to handle them. Nonetheless, we must have the oil. This is not a matter of comfort. Oil to heat our homes is essential to the health of the Nation's workers; gasoline to maintain our transportation system is essential to our war production.

On the other hand, pipe lines require large quantities of materials and equipment for which they are in competition with other vital war programs. Therefore it is necessary that every effort be made to transport as much oil as possible by methods which will cause the least drain on other war programs. It appears, however, that large diameter pipe lines utilize less steel and other strategic materials than other types of new overland facilities.

#### *Tankers*

Admiral Emory S. Land, War Shipping Administrator, has advised the committee that the use of tankers to supply any significant portion of the needs of district 1 is out of the question for at least 1 year. Some petroleum products do come to the east coast by tanker, but the committee believes that this quantity cannot be regarded as an addition to supplies in district 1 in view of the larger quantities of oil products withdrawn for use abroad.

On the other hand, without in any way interfering with war shipments abroad, it is possible to utilize some tankers to a certain extent for supplying the east coast. Tankers not infrequently arrive too late to leave in a convoy and have to wait, loaded, in east-cost ports for the next convoy. These tankers might better be utilized by unloading their cargo and making a round trip to the Gulf ports for a fresh cargo before the next convoy. Again, it is possible that new tankers could more wisely make a "shake-down cruise" along the coast instead of across wide stretches of water. New tankers require a great deal of adjustment during their first voyage. By running them along the coast, considerable risk of serious accident could be eliminated and petroleum products delivered to the Atlantic seaboard.

It has been difficult for the committee to study intensively the utilization of those tankers which are now available. This subject is entirely in the hands of the armed forces and the War Shipping Administration. The figures and data are considered military secrets into which the committee is extremely reluctant to probe. The committee has constantly been interested, however, in finding assurances that the tanker routes to the fighting areas are the shortest possible. It has suggested that more tankers might be sent to Africa directly from West Indies ports. It also urges that, where possible, convoys be sent abroad directly from Gulf-coast ports. The committee understands that the trip to Europe from New York is far shorter than from Texas, but it is longer than the circuitous voyage from the Gulf to New York and thence to Europe.

One reason behind the sending of tankers, and tank cars as well, to Gulf coast ports is to relieve refineries at these points of the huge quantities of gasoline and distillates which are incidental byproducts of aviation gasoline and other war products. The committee has suggested to the Office of Price Administration and the Petroleum Administrator that some other means might be found to give financial relief to these refineries so that tankers and tank cars will not be required to make the long trip to the Gulf ports to pick up supplies.

#### *Barges*

The increased use of barges also can help to relieve the situation. Congress has been recommending such increase and found the administrative agencies extremely slow in adopting this proposal. Various reasons have been suggested to the committee, such as lack of motive power and the limited capacity of the inland waterways. However, it is believed that to date no sufficiently vigorous effort has been made to locate the motive power, and that much could be done to increase the efficiency of the waterways.

#### *Railroads*

The committee has been advised that the railroads expect to increase substantially their capacity to carry oil by removing bottlenecks and inefficiencies. The railroads have worked diligently at this task and at the time of this report had achieved a considerably increased load. It is believed that still more can be done to provide switching, loading, and unloading facilities at terminals and to utilize the large storage capacities and unloading facilities of the independent distributors.

Careful study should also be given to the possibility of increasing the quantities of petroleum products which the railroads could carry by pooling all oil products at the point of origin. Mr. John J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads, testified before the committee that one reason there are so few solid trains carrying only fuel oil to the East was the large number of shipments and the diversity of points of destination. As a result, single oil cars are put into trains carrying other types of freight and considerable time is lost in handling. Mr. Pelley agreed that if oil from the various companies could all be pooled and made up into solid trains which would then proceed to the places where the oil is needed without regard to the destination determined by the shipper, there could be some improvement. He qualified this by saying that allowances would have to be made for the different types and grades of oil. If this were done, a shipper would simply deliver the oil to the railroad and the consignee would receive a document entitling him to a specific quantity of a certain type of oil, but not necessarily to any particular tank car full of oil. In this way

the tank cars could be moved with regard to the railroads' facilities and the requirements of each region.

At the committee's hearings last year it was recommended that a large quantity of petroleum products could be shipped in box cars if steel drums were utilized. In the last month, after a year and a half of delay, this proposal was adopted with a resultant increase of 20,000 barrels a day of oil brought into district 1.

The committee recently recommended to the Petroleum Administrator that pending the completion of the pipe line to Norris City, Ill., tank cars should be used to drain the Illinois area of its surplus, which could then be readily restored upon the completion of the pipe line to Norris City, Ill. This would have benefited the east coast, since the tank-car turn-around time from the Chicago area is 10 or 11 days, as compared with 19 or 20 from Texas. The committee is convinced that a great many more cars could have been used for this purpose and that at the present time this is still feasible. However, it was not until February 1943 that the Petroleum Administrator took some action in this direction by increasing shipments of fuel oil from district 2 by 30,000 barrels a day. Larger shipments were not approved for such reasons as a lack of surplus in district 2, east of the Mississippi River, and the necessity of relieving Gulf coast refineries. The first reason did not jibe with figures in the committee's possession obtained from the Petroleum Administrator. As for the second, while the committee realizes the need to relieve the Gulf coast refineries of the financial and physical burden of producing vast quantities of fuel oil and gasoline in the course of making aviation gasoline, it is not actually necessary to ship these products to the east coast if they can be obtained closer to home as stated above.

*Outlook for next winter*

This winter, even with rationing, east coast consumption of petroleum products has exceeded deliveries by 156,000 barrels a day since November 1, 1942. The balance has come out of the now depleted inventories. As a result of the proposed increase in efficiency by the railroads, and the shorter haul resulting from the completion of the Big Inch pipe line to Norris City, tank-car deliveries to district 1 should rise to about 900,000 barrels a day. Pipe lines will deliver an additional 300,000 barrels a day over their top 1942 capacity after the Big Inch has been completed. With additional usage of barges, ocean tankers, and various makeshifts, and with a continuance of strict rationing, it is conceivable that by next winter the present deficit might be transformed into an excess of 150,000 or more barrels a day.

On the other hand, further tanker losses or additional requirements for the armed forces could easily wipe out this anticipated surplus and turn it into a shortage. Should this occur, next winter will be even more difficult than the present one, inasmuch as it is not likely that inventories can be built up this summer equal to those we carried into the winter of 1942 because of military requirements.

It is therefore clear that additional transportation facilities should be provided if this is at all possible. The committee does not emphasize a particular type of facility that should be provided, since this depends on the availability of materials and labor in a market where petroleum transportation competes with such programs as the aviation gasoline, escort vessel, and synthetic rubber program.

The consumer on the eastern seaboard is in a position to make an effective contribution to the solution of this problem. It should be clear that he will not be any better off next winter than he is this winter, because the prospective 150,000 barrel surplus is based on rationed requirements. If that surplus disappears, the consumer may well be in a far worse situation next year.

Fuel oil users should therefore convert to coal, and should acquire their winter supply of fuel during the summer of 1943. Financial assistance should be given to those who need it, and plans should be made so that necessary equipment is readily available. It is urgent that coal be stored during the summer, as railroads will not be able to provide it if they must carry the fuel oil load during the fall and winter.

The far West thus far has not suffered seriously, but a change in requirements for the Pacific fighting fronts would create a shortage in Oregon and Washington, which are supplied by tanker. Increased requirements for the fighting forces in the Pacific would also draw away large quantities of the supply available to the remainder of the Pacific coast. Plans should be made at this time to handle these contingencies. Increased storage space should be provided and utilized. Conversion from oil to other fuels should be accomplished.

FUEL-OIL RATIONING

The committee has held extensive hearings with respect to the administration of fuel oil rationing. Representatives of the public, the fuel oil dealers, and the Office of Price Administration have been heard and examined. The opinions of Governors, Congressmen, and Senators throughout the Nation have been solicited and carefully analyzed. Hundreds of letters from individuals affected have been considered.

The problems of rationing nonindustrial fuel oil must be divided into two groups: First, those affecting the heavier household heating oils, and second, kerosene and range oil.

*Kerosene and range oil*

The committee believes that kerosene and range oil should not be rationed at all. They are used primarily by poor persons who are not addicted to waste and who have not the funds to insulate their homes. They are of necessity purchased in very small quantities, as most consumers of this type of fuel do not have large storage tanks. The total quantity of this fuel used is comparatively small and it should have been possible to supply all consumers without attempting any rationing.

Instead of doing this, a rationing system was attempted but it broke down and caused much hardship. Stocks were kept at a very low point, so that dealers were unable to supply their customers. On the other hand, a great many persons, who otherwise would not have used this type of fuel, were allowed to buy auxiliary kerosene heaters in order to evade the rationing restrictions.

*Integration of local distribution*

Much can be done to relieve the hardships suffered this winter by the establishment of central depots for each community to which persons completely out of oil can apply for quick relief. This expedient has been put into effect successfully in a few communities and, the committee is informed, is being tried elsewhere. It is equally applicable to the rationing problem with respect to the heavier fuel oils. The committee hopes that it will be generally adopted. Boston and New York have used it successfully.

There should be some central authority in each community which would know the quantities of fuel oil in every storage facility and what additional quantities are in transit, and the dates when the new supplies can be expected. This general agency could also be called upon in all emergencies to supply those who need oil in a hurry.

THE RATIONING FORMULA

The committee found several serious defects in the present fuel-oil rationing system. In an effort to achieve a scientific standard a complex mechanism was devised which, despite its complexity, failed to arrive at a proper result in a substantial number of cases. The method of determining the ration penalizes the consumer who uses more oil than is permitted under an allegedly scientific formula. The formula does not take into consideration such conditions as exposure, structure of the house, wind velocity, and height of ceilings. The Office of Price Administration contends that these factors are compensated by the weight given to past consumption figures, but past consumption figures are taken into consideration only when they substantially agree with the formula. Where past consumption figures are high, according to a chart which does not take into effect the above factors, past consumption is given practically no weight in determining the ration. The Office of Price Administration has justified this practice by saying that the inefficient consumer should be penalized, but obviously some houses consume more oil because of their location or structure without being inefficient. The method of computing the ration is designed to force the inefficient consumer to convert. Interoffice memoranda of the Office of Price Administration show it was the purpose of the rationing regulations to penalize most heavily the old house with an old oil-burning system. In this way, the memoranda state, persons with this type of equipment will be forced to convert.

The memoranda show that the Price Administrator was unwilling to take a forthright position to force conversion of equipment to coal, because he felt that no matter who was required to convert the rules would be attacked as unfair. Instead, a vicious regulation was devised to force conversion by those who are least able to do so and least able to protest.

Four distinct formulae were devised to calculate the oil allowable for homes, together with complex forms to furnish the information needed to apply the rules.

The first rule limits the square footage a family of given size may heat. Thus, a single person is entitled to heat 2,000 square feet. Two people may have 2,600, additional persons 300 additional feet each, up to a maximum of 3,500 feet.

Next, the Office of Price Administration obtained temperature data for the past 43 years for every county in America. Thus, they calculated how much each county was above or below normal last year. They then prepared a consumption table for each county. This adjusts last year's consumption to that of a hypothetical normal year and then applies a one-third cut.

Having obtained a figure from the consumption table, the rationer must turn to the area table. One column of this table indicates how much oil an efficient house of a given square footage in that locality should theoretically use, after applying a one-third cut to normal use. This column is known as the midrange. There are two other columns, one giving the maximum and the other the minimum ration allowable for that square footage. Each varies from the midrange by about 13 percent. If the figure given by the consumption table exceeds the maximum ration the maximum indicated is the final ration. If the figure given by the consumption table is less than the minimum ration for the square footage, the so-called special base on the consumption table is consulted. This column applies only a 15-percent cut to the previous year's use. Then the special base or the minimum ration, whichever was less, was given as the final ration.

The rules permit an additional 125 gallons irrespective of the size of the house for the presence of a child under 4. This is a clear discrimination in favor of the owner of a small house. A percentage of the ration would be far fairer.

The theory underlying all this ritual was to avoid penalizing the efficient user while forcing the inefficient to amend his ways. Joel Dean, Chief of the Fuel Rationing Division, testified before the committee that the Office of Price Administration feared that people who had kept their houses at 80° F. with all the windows open might suffer no hardship by the rationing if a straight percentage cut had been applied.

Whatever one's view of the theory underlying the system of calculating the ration, in practice it has collapsed. Volunteers, rushed to distraction and unable to grasp so quickly the elaborate and intricate system, have fallen back on rules of thumb like a gallon a square foot. Local boards have been weeks behind in processing applications, a situation accentuated by the failure to issue coupons to the boards until months after the rationing was in effect. Errors are common. Even without error, a cut as high as 75 percent or as low as 15 percent of the previous winter's consumption is perfectly possible.

The committee believes that a simple flat percentage cut, adjusted for temperature variation, with discretion in the ration boards to alleviate hardship, would have worked adequately. The red tape would have been eliminated, and the consumer would have understood the process.

Another major defect of the present plan is the division of the coupons into five heating periods, with minor overlaps. At a time when trucks, tires, and drivers are as scarce and precious as rubies, this has cut the amount of the average delivery almost in half. This, of course, multiplies deliveries. The average householder can be trusted to budget his own fuel without mechanical assistance, if he is convinced that no extra ration will be forthcoming.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Gasoline rationing on the Atlantic seaboard must be considered separately from the remainder of the country. In the Eastern States gasoline rationing is predicated on a shortage of gasoline as a result of insufficient transportation facilities. Elsewhere gasoline rationing is designed to reduce driving to an average of 5,000 miles per year per vehicle in order to conserve tires.

*Rationing in the East*

Along the Atlantic seaboard the principal difficulties have been the existence of black markets and lack of information as to the facts. The public has not known from week to week and sometimes from day to day, how much gasoline it could count on. On one occasion all gasoline sales were stopped completely; on other occasions the value of the ration card was reduced; and still again, without warning, pleasure driving was banned, although it was perfectly obvious that many of the persons receiving A cards would use them primarily for pleasure driving.

The authorities also have suffered for lack of information and this has been the reason for the last-minute changes. Lack of information has also been one of the principal reasons for the existence of black markets. Under the original rationing system put into effect early in the summer, truck operators were given all the gasoline they wanted with the result that a vastly larger number of coupons was outstanding than the amount of gasoline trucks could legitimately use. Under the present system whereby trucks are certified for a certain amount of mileage by the Office of Defense Transportation, there has been some tightening of control. Nonetheless, the difficulties remain. Charles F. Phillips, Director of the Automotive Supply Rationing Division of the Office of Price Administration, admitted to the committee that he did not know how many coupons were outstanding:

"The CHAIRMAN. But there could be twice as many coupons out as there are barrels of oil in the tanks?

"Mr. PHILLIPS. It is conceivable that is correct.

"The CHAIRMAN. Does that give you any worry about a black market?

"Mr. PHILLIPS. If they were outstanding, I would be very definitely worried about that.

"The CHAIRMAN. But they may be outstanding, so far as you know?

"Mr. PHILLIPS. The point is, we do not have records at this moment which would allow us to say one way or the other that that is correct."

There is no question that black markets do exist and that they must be eliminated. The committee feels, however, that the soundest approach to this problem must be premised upon an understanding that public opinion is the chief weapon against black markets. To mobilize public opinion people must have confidence in the information received from the administrative agencies, and must at least understand some of the reasons for the regulation. The ban on pleasure driving, for instance, while extremely effective in taking automobiles off the road, would have much greater public support if "pleasure driving" were accurately defined and if that definition made reasonable allowances for transportation conditions in various communities. In rural areas, for instance, or suburban districts where transportation is very poor, the use of the automobile cannot be restricted as it should be in cities. The city dweller can find transportation to a moving picture or to a friend's home. On the other hand the rural, and often the suburban, dweller must use his automobile or stay at home. If he stays at home he loses touch with his neighbors and his usefulness will suffer.

Regulations affecting the use of automobiles and gasoline rationing should be carefully thought out before they are issued, so that their first impact on the public will be an incentive to cooperation. Even the policemen who were asked to enforce the original pleasure ban were not officially given a definition of pleasure driving.

*Nation-wide rationing*

In areas outside of district No. 1 where the preservation of rubber is the principal consideration in gasoline rationing, greater care should be given to tailoring ration cards to the particular needs of the driver, taking into consideration the amount of rubber available to the particular driver, and if possible the gasoline consumption of the automobile, and the availability of alternative transportation to the driver.

At the present time there is no shortage of reclaimed rubber which is suitable for recapping passenger automobile tires. For this reason every consideration should be given to allowing all the mileage possible to drivers outside of district No. 1.

On the other hand, to the extent that Nation-wide gasoline rationing is dependent on the completion of synthetic rubber plants, it may be necessary to reconsider the entire subject in view of the delays in the synthetic rubber program. If the 5,000-mile average was based on the completion of full synthetic rubber capacity by the middle of 1944, it may have to be revised as a result of the decision which in effect postpones a great portion of the synthetic rubber program.

*Commercial vehicles*

To date there has been no attempt to limit the actual transportation of goods by motor vehicles. The plan for rationing has been intended to eliminate only inefficiencies and wasteful operations. To accomplish this, the Office of Defense Transportation attempted to obtain a great deal of information about truck operations. Every operator was required to fill out a very complicated 4-page form indicating by quarters for the past 2 years his use of gasoline, his mileage, his average load factor, and a considerable quantity of miscellaneous information.

By analyzing these forms, the Office of Defense Transportation expected to eliminate a number of operations which they considered wasteful and yet permit each truck operator to transport goods as in the past. Examples of the type of operations which it was desired to eliminate are call-backs—that is, making more than one call a day to particular points, loads below capacity, and special services.

To process the forms it was proposed to gather all questionnaires except those of large fleet operators at a single office in Detroit. There they were to be analyzed by a large staff. On the basis of the analysis the operator was to receive a certificate of war necessity allowing him to operate a given number of miles in each quarter of the coming year.

The plan quickly collapsed. Millions of small truck operators, and particularly farmers, either did not understand the form or did not have the requested information concerning the details of their operations. As a result, a large proportion of the forms were returned to the Office of Defense Transportation incompletely made out. To handle the complex problem of deciding how much of a truck operator's mileage was actually necessary under efficient operating conditions, a large clerical staff was recruited in Detroit. A large part of the personnel possessed only very limited education. Wages were low, and would not attract more qualified persons in an area like Detroit where a labor shortage exists. The Office of Defense Transportation admits an error of as high as 5 percent, and this seems to the committee to be conservative.

As soon as the farmers and small truckers began to receive their certificates of war necessity, a wave of protest arose which compelled the Office of Defense Transportation to permit the local war boards of the Department of Agriculture, in the case of farmers, and the local ration boards, in the case of commercial operators, to issue temporary rations until February 1. Neither the Office of Price Administration nor the Office of Defense Transportation appears to have an accurate idea of the amount of coupons which were issued, and the resultant situation is chaotic from the standpoint of attempting to calculate the demand for gasoline.

For a permanent rationing system the Office of Defense Transportation proposes to leave the farmers in the hands of the local war boards and to handle truck applications at its own district offices turning the certificates of war necessity over to the ration boards for their actual issuance of the coupons. There is no reason to believe that the system has resulted or will result in increased efficiency in operations. The regulations with respect to increasing truck efficiency could be enforced more directly without making an effort to calculate the amount of gasoline the individual saves and to cut his ration accordingly. This results in a complicated operation and could just as easily be achieved by specific order to the trucker. The system has not worked as a check on the amount of gasoline outstanding and has in fact become one of the primary sources of black-market coupons.

The committee believes that truckers should be allowed as much mileage as they can show they actually need and that specific regulations should be designed to enforce efficiency.

Serious consideration should be given to the necessity of eliminating certain types of trucking operations as a result of the tire shortage. The Office of Defense Transportation is in charge of this. To date no system

has been evolved for reducing the gasoline consumption of trucks engaged in transporting luxuries. The Office of Defense Transportation has conceded that the present system of rationing would have to be changed and new information obtained from the truckers if an attempt were made to ration on the basis of commodity carried.

On the other hand, gasoline rationing may be the wrong way to restrict transportation of luxuries. Should this become necessary as a result of the tire shortage, it could be accomplished by a direct prohibition. If the purpose is to eliminate or curtail the manufacture of luxury products, this also should be done directly. It would be absurd to cut off the flow of commerce at the transportation level. Manpower and materials should not be wasted producing goods to lie idle in storage. Similarly, trucks should not be permitted to operate on a curtailed basis to carry luxuries, or to lie idle, but should be transferred to the transportation of essential goods in the event that the rubber and replacement parts situation requires such a change.

The public passenger transportation is becoming increasingly congested as a result of restrictions on the use of passenger automobiles, increased travel in areas of war-work activities and lack of new facilities. Vigorous efforts must be made to achieve maximum utilization of all transportation facilities, including private automobiles, abandoned transportation lines, and all other equipment which could possibly be put in use. This problem has been given some thought by the Office of Defense Transportation, but is one which requires actual practical application in the field. Experts should be found who can analyze each critical area and propose a plan for handling its problems. In particular, such plan should include full utilization of private automobiles. These are a substantial portion of the Nation's wealth and of its transportation system. They should be fully exploited.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 742. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, by providing for loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in aggregate amount not to exceed $100,000,000 in each fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year 1943, by prescribing the rate of interest and maturity of loans made under said act; and by authorizing the extension of the maturities of and the reduction of interest rates on loans heretofore made; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 743. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter H. Kindon; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 744. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to standardize the amount to be contributed by the United States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 745. A bill to provide for the internment of deportable aliens for the duration of the present wars and for 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 746. A bill to extend the Silver Star award for gallantry to members of a State guard or home militia who display heroism in action against a foreign enemy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 747. A bill granting a pension to Sally Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 748. A bill to provide for the delivery of mail on rural free-delivery routes on holidays other than Sundays; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 749. A bill to prescribe the base period to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in determining and publishing parity price for oranges and comparable price for grapefruit; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 750. A bill providing for classification of clerks in third-class post offices, and for other purposes; and

S. 751. A bill to increase allowances for clerk hire in post offices of the third class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 752. A bill exempting newspapermen from testifying with respect to the sources of certain confidential information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 753. A bill to increase the rate of pensions for widows of Spanish-American War veterans from $30 a month to $45 a month; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 754. A bill for the relief of Iver M. Gesteland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 755. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. WAGNER introduced Senate bill 756 and 757, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 758. A bill to amend Sec. 3 (c), Public Law 288, 77th Congress, authorizing a uniform allowance for certain officers in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. J. Res. 34 (by request). Joint resolution to establish the first week in October of each year as "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK AND HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACTS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I introduce two bills for appropriate reference, and ask that a statement relating to the proposed amendments to the Federal Home Loan Bank Act be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bills introduced by Mr. WAGNER were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

S. 756. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended; and

S. 757. A bill to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended.

The statement presented by Mr. WAGNER in connection with the bills is as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT

Section 1 would provide that the Federal home-loan banks may make advances to their member institutions on the security of any mortgage or obligation which is insured under the National Housing Act or for which a commitment to insure has been made under that act, or as to which the member institution has insurance under that act. No such advance could exceed 90 percent of the unpaid principal of the mortgage or obligation offered as collateral for the advance.

Under existing law the Federal home-loan banks have a limited power to make advances on mortgages insured under the National Housing Act, but the member institutions cannot put up as collateral for such advances loans which they have made with the insurance protection provided in title I of the National Housing Act but for which they have not taken mortgage security. Also, they cannot use for this purpose mortgages insured under title II which have more than 20 years' unexpired maturity. It is believed that, insofar as these types of loan are deemed worthy of insurance under the National Housing Act, they should be acceptable as collateral security for advances by the Federal home-loan banks.

Section 2 deals with the base for the issuance of consolidated Federal home-loan bank debentures, which are the joint and several obligations of all the Federal home-loan banks. At present, such debentures may not be issued in excess of five times the total paid-in capital of all the Federal home-loan banks nor in excess of the notes or obligations of member institutions held by all the banks and secured under section 10 (a) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act. However, no provision is made for including in the debenture base secured advances made under other provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act or for including therein obligations of or fully guaranteed by the United States which are owned by the Federal home-loan banks. The present section would include these items, but would retain the existing provision that such debentures may not in any event be issued in excess of five times the total paid-in capital of the Federal home-loan banks.

Section 3 is the most important section of the bill. It would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase obligations of the Federal home-loan banks and of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, up to a limit of three times the capital stock, reserves, and surplus of the banks or the insurance corporation, as the case may be. The Secretary of the Treasury would have entire discretion as to such purchases, being merely authorized and not required to make them.

The Federal home-loan banks (which provide reserve-credit facilities for nearly 3,800 members, comprising savings and loan associations and similar institutions, savings banks, and insurance companies) and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (which insures, up to $5,000 for each investor in each institution, the safety of accounts in approximately 2,400 savings and loan associations and similar institutions) are designed to stabilize local savings and home-financing institutions and thus to aid in protecting the whole financial structure. Under ordinary conditions the banks and the insurance corporation will have no difficulty in obtaining necessary funds in the open market. However, the provision here proposed is essential as a bulwark in times of stress, when they might not be able to market their obligations to the public on reasonable terms. Its enactment would be in accordance with other measures for Government purchase or guaranty of obligations of Federal agencies, as in the case of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Public Housing Authority, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and other agencies which have this protection.

Section 4 deals with examinations of the Federal home-loan banks. The existing law requires that they be examined "at least twice annually." The present section would change this to read "at least annually."

Thus the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration would not be required to examine the banks oftener than once a year, but would still have authority to examine them more often if it saw fit to do so. It is believed that the section would make possible some economy in money cost and in personnel, while preserving all essential authority.

Section 5 is the usual separability provision.

AMENDMENTS TO HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933

This bill, which consists of only one section, would make two changes in Section 5 (c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, dealing with the lending and investment powers of Federal savings and loan associations.

At present, a Federal savings and loan association may make real-estate loans only on first liens of not over $20,000 on homes or combinations of homes and business property within 50 miles of its home office, except that not over 15 percent of its assets may be loaned on first liens on "other improved real estate" without regard to these limitations. The present section would change the words "other improved real estate" to "any improved real estate", so as to negative any construction that homes and combination home and business properties are excluded from the 15 percent provision.

In addition, the bill would provide that a Federal association may invest its funds in any mortgage or obligation as to which the association is protected by insurance under the National Housing Act, or for which a commitment to insure has been issued under that act. Federal associations would thus be able to make use of the provisions of Title I of the National Housing Act insuring financial institutions with respect to alteration, repair, and improvement loans made without the expense and delay incident to title searches and the taking of mortgage security. These associations would in this way be enabled to participate more fully in the war housing program, which has recognized the need for the prompt supplying of additional family units in defense areas through the conversion of existing dwellings into a greater number of family units and the restoration and rehabilitation of dwellings now unsuitable or uninhabitable.

## HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 170. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. T. Travis;

H. R. 205. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons who have claims for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 218. An act for the relief of H. F. Mathis;

H. R. 227. An act for the relief of the Tours Apartment Hotel;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts;

H. R. 250. An act for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.;

H. R. 251. An act for the relief of Franklin E. Ludwig, Mary Taylor, and Frank A. Taylor;

H. R. 279. An act for the relief of George Kennedy;

H. R. 402. An act for the relief of Frank T. Been;

H. R. 478. An act for the relief of Edith M. Powell;

H. R. 517. An act for the relief of Irene Dial;

H. R. 533. An act for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg;

H. R. 535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Donna Pittel;

H. R. 575. An act for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Violet Cuccio;

H. R. 579. An act for the relief of Barbara Healy;

H. R. 598. An act for the relief of Thelma Cannon McGroary;

H. R. 605. An act for the relief of Shumate Investment Co.;

H. R. 637. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward;

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of Charles T. Dulin;

H. R. 769. An act for the relief of John Cardillo and Philip Cardillo;

H. R. 940. An act for the relief of Howard E. Dickison;

H. R. 976. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Sebastian Eger;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of the State of Oregon, Department of Forestry of the State of Oregon, and certain organized protection agencies in the State of Oregon for protection of unappropriated public-forest lands intermingled with Oregon and California lands from July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939;

H. R. 1094. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. Herfurth, Jr., Inc.;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of El Paso Electric Co.;

H. R. 1099. An act for the relief of Jose J. Perez;

H. R. 1100. An act for the relief of the estate of James A. Henderson, deceased;

H. R. 1128. An act for the relief of Bernice James;

H. R. 1131. An act for the relief of the estate of Ola Fowler;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Nannie May Blythe and Claudia Blythe;

H. R. 1153. An act for the relief of Cordie Underwood and Wilbur Kea;

H. R. 1162. An act for the relief of R. E. Cotton Co.;

H. R. 1270. An act for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor);

H. R. 1273. An act for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre;

H. R. 1276. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Baldwin, Mattie Baldwin, and Clement B. Baldwin;

H. R. 1279. An act for the relief of Lee Watts;

H. R. 1319. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. V. Justice;

H. R. 1423. An act for the relief of Clara E. Freeman;

H. R. 1424. An act for the relief of Ernest P. Leavitt;

H. R. 1426. An act for the relief of Mrs. F. A. N. Yeager;

H. R. 1428. An act for the relief of Paul W. Mankin;

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of Albertine Nast;

H. R. 1464. An act for the relief of J. H. Atkins;

H. R. 1468. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Azer;

H. R. 1582. An act for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased;

H. R. 1587. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of The Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States;

H. R. 1639. An act for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublein and Mrs. Ethel Bowers;

H. R. 1667. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria, & Washington Railway Co., a corporation;

H. R. 1685. An act for the relief of Eva C. Netzley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff;

H. R. 1771. An act for the relief of August Svelund;

H. R. 1785. An act for the relief of the William Wrigley, Jr., Co.; and

H. R. 1786. An act for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1787. An act for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.; to the calendar.

## VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION EDUCATION, ETC., OF DISABLED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND THOSE IN WAR INDUSTRIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 180) to provide vocational rehabilitation education, training, and other services to persons disabled while members of the armed forces, or disabled in war industries or otherwise and to render such persons fit for service in war industries, agriculture, or other useful civilian industry, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. MURRAY (on behalf of the Special Senate Committee to Study and Survey the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 106), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress (providing for a study and survey of the problems of American small business enterprises), agreed to October 8, 1940, and continued by Senate Resolution 66, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby increased by $70,000.

## BETTER MOBILIZATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURRAY (for Mr. KILGORE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 107), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

*Resolved*, That the subcommittee on technological mobilization of the Military Affairs Committee is authorized and directed to study the possibilities of better mobilizing the national resources of the United States for the more efficient prosecution of the war. The subcommittee shall report to the Military Affairs Committee from time to time the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this resolution, the subcommittee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ or borrow from Government agencies and departments such clerical, special, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer

such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $10,000, in addition to the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

### INVESTIGATION BY TARIFF COMMISSION CONCERNING RUBBER, PLASTICS, TEXTILE FIBERS, COPPER, ALUMINUM, WINE, AND DEHYDRATED FOODS

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 108), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

*Resolved*, That the United States Tariff Commission is hereby requested, in accordance with section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, to conduct investigations, within the scope of such section, with respect to (1) rubber, natural and synthetic; (2) plastics; (3) textile fibers, natural and synthetic; (4) copper; (5) aluminum; (6) wine; and (7) dehydrated foods, with a view to obtaining and analyzing information which will be of assistance to the President and the Congress in the formulation of policies with respect to production, utilization, and foreign trade in such products after the present war. All other departments, independent establishments, and agencies of the Government, when requested by the United States Tariff Commission, shall cooperate fully with such Commission in accordance with section 334 of such act, for the purpose of assisting it in the performance of such functions. The Commission is requested to give precedence to such investigations in order that it may be in a position to supply current information with respect to such matters as and when requested, except that such investigations shall not be permitted to interfere with activities directly concerned with the prosecution of the war.

### SUFFRAGE FOR PERSONS LIABLE FOR MILITARY OR NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. WILEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 109), which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

*Resolved*, That the Senate hereby recommends and requests that the several States take such action as may be necessary to prevent any person who is liable for training or service in the land or naval forces of the United States from being denied the right to vote on account of his age.

### TRIBUTE TO HON. JAMES E. WATSON

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, my native State of Indiana has long been known as the home of great authors of literature, and as the birthplace of great statesmen. In this present day, when one surveys the list of men who are prominent in the directing of our war effort, it can also be said of my Hoosier State that it is the home of great executives. However, it is not often that twin attributes of author and statesman are revealed in one person.

It was my pleasure a week ago to attend a function at which the outstanding feature on the post-prandial program was the toast given by my able colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], to his predecessor, Hon. James E. Watson. This tribute contained such delightful humor, such subtle satire, and such an appreciation of the human philosophy of Mr. Watson's character as are rarely heard from one given to the serious duties of statesmanship in these trying days.

For the delectation of all his former associates, and for the pleasure of thousands of people of Indiana who hold Jim Watson in the kindliest esteem, I ask unanimous consent to have this estimate of him by a lifetime acquaintance inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JIM WATSON

(By FREDERICK VAN NUYS)

As a Hoosier, I am very glad to present a very meager thumbnail sketch of the career and characteristics of my fellow Hoosier, Jim Watson.

If I were to begin this recital in the conventional way, I should start with the date of his birth but for the life of me I can't find out what it was.

I have read all his obituaries in the old Congressional Directories and Who's Who, but the date of his birth has been carefully concealed. I, therefore, leave it to you and Leon Henderson to find that out for yourselves.

I do know this much, however. He was born in Randolph County, Ind., in the early part of the last century.

There is very little to learn about his early life or his scholastic training—if he had any.

It was only after his marriage—and his friends say largely on account of his marriage—that he got started on his successful career. Having heard a great voice and being possessed of a great vision and the bearer of a great message, just like Wendell Willkie, he moved to Rushville, Ind. The sun bathed and blossomed, scented hills and valleys of dear old Rush County appealed to both Watson and Willkie as more fertile political fields for the cultivation of their great message than Winchester, Ind., or Wall Street and the Bronx in the great city of New York where nine-tenths of its citizens still believe that the United States of America is bounded on the west by the Allegheny Mountains.

But I am digressing from my theme. I am going to stick with Jim Watson and leave Wendell Willkie to the tender ministrations of that distinguished trio of wet nurses—CHARLEY MCNARY, ARTHUR VANDENBERG, and BOB TAFT. Maybe through their tender and intimate ministrations they may be able finally to discover his political sex—whether it be Democratic or Republican or both, or none—and so end the great suspense. [Laughter.]

Now back to Watson.

What characteristics made Jim Watson successful?

First he is one of the best story-tellers in America. Again his stories usually are directed at himself and carry no stings.

I am going to give you just one as a sample.

When Jim, as a young man, was making an honest living practicing law—that was, of course, before he went into politics—he was trying a law suit. It was a jury trial.

Having lunch with his client, Jim noticed that his client seemed somewhat perturbed and asked him why.

"Well," said the client. "Don't you think that we ought to get another lawyer to help you?" "Why,", said Jim, "I thought I was doing a good job. What's the matter with me?"

"Well, it's like this," said the client. "You see the other side has two lawyers and when one of them is talking the other one is thinking. Now on our side, when you're up talking nobody's thinking."

Second. Jim Watson is a shrewd observer and keen politician.

As illustrative of this, I want to relate an incident or two.

In one of his early campaigns for the House, he knew that one of the southern counties in his district was made up almost exclusively of Germans. Jim saw his chance. He couldn't speak German but he immediately took up its study through a correspondence school. A few weeks later he went down there to attend a big rally. Jim was prepared. He bought a pair of wooden shoes and danced with all the buxom German girls and much to the surprise of his audience delivered his political speech in German. Of course, the audience, which was composed of real Germans, couldn't understand one-tenth of what he was trying to say but they all went home and pronounced it a fine speech.

I said that nine-tenths of his audience did not understand what he was trying to say.

I might add right here that the same observation might be made concerning many of Jim's later speeches made in English—2 hours long—on the tariff, our monetary system and, kindred subjects, but they all went away and said it was a fine speech.

Jim early in life gave voice to one of the guiding political philosophies of his life.

It was—"If you can't beat 'em, jine 'em."

He not only gave voice to that philosophy but he practiced it.

To my certain knowledge he at one time belonged to 28 different fraternal orders and scores of similar organizations. In "jineing" up Jim never let a little thing like consistency interfere with his activities.

For instance, at one and the same time he was affiliated with the Ancient Order of Hibernians and sub rosa, of course, the directing head of the Ku Klux Klan. For years he carried an honorary membership in the bartenders union, and during the same time was the most vociferous advocate and defender of the Women's Christian Temperence Union. During prohibition, he outrivaled Carrie Nation on the stump but knew the back door of every drug store in Indiana. [Laughter.]

It has been said that a leopard cannot change his spots nor an Ethiopian his skin. Well—I just wish all of you could have known Jim Watson in his prime.

Just one more late instance of this quality.

The election in 1938 in Indiana was too close to be comfortable. I speak advisedly. The change of a handful of votes would have changed the results.

Soon after the election, Jim was having lunch with an Indiana newspaperman and out of the clear sky he spoke up and said, "You know I could have beaten VAN NUYS this time if they had nominated me out there at Indianapolis."

"How's that?" asked the newsman.

"Well, the vote in Terre Haute decided the election. All the profiteers, gangsters, and racketeers down there voted for Van Nuys. If I had been on the ticket they would all have voted for me and I would have been elected."

Take that for what it is worth.

Now, in addition to the qualities above named, Jim, of course, possessed many substantiating qualities. He was a great campaigner.

I wish you could have seen him in his prime. He would ruffle up his long hair, slap his right thigh with that big right paw, point his long bony index finger at his audience and so dramatically and fervently describe the iniquities of the Democratic Party that cold chills ran up and down the spines of his hearers and the next day even the children in the streets shied around Democrats as something unclean and dangerous like the lepers in Ben Hur.

Yes, Jim was a great campaigner. He has kissed more babies, coddled more mothers, eaten more cold mashed potatoes and head

lettuce with Thousand Island dressing at political banquets, listened to more long-winded introductory speeches, slept in more cold spare bedrooms, promised more jobs, and slapped more people on the back than any other 10 men in the United States of America.

In fact, he slapped so many backs that a recent survey shows that 8 out of every 10 of the older men and women in Indiana today are suffering from sacroiliac trouble due to Watson's campaigning. He was a godsend to the chiropractors and osteopaths of Indiana. He made 'em rich. Now they want him to come back and start in on the coming generation. [Laughter.]

To boil it all down, Jim Watson for 50 years was cussed and discussed more than any other man in Indiana. But it worked and he managed to serve his country—and incidentally stay on the Federal pay roll—for half a century. But like everything else except taxes, Jim's public service came to an end. He was caught in the political cataclysm of 1932.

I have heard since coming down here, that, prior to that election, he was frequently asked by his colleagues what sort of opposition he had. The substance of his reply was: "Oh, not much. My opponent is a young mine-run lawyer without much experience or background. Off the record, I think he is a push-over."

I happened to be elected and when Jim was asked by these same colleagues how it came about he said, "That fellow VAN NUYS is a wonder—a second Daniel Webster—an eminent jurist and statesman—nobody could have beaten him." He said it so frequently and so vociferously that I have been embarrassed ever since I have been down here trying to live up even to even a fractional part of Jim's alibi.

Anybody can be a good winner in poker or politics but it takes a good sport to be a good loser. Along with his other qualities, Jim is a good loser.

So that's that—a very meager thumb nail sketch of Jim Watson—the Hoosier boy of humble origin who by the hard way and by his own efforts became one of the best known, best liked, and most colorful political figures in the Nation.

May he and his fine wife have many, many more years of health, happiness, and prosperity. [Prolonged applause.]

## STRIKES AND SLOW-DOWNS IN WAR PRODUCTION—SPEECH BY CAPT. EDDIE RICKENBACKER

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am proud indeed to have gained such a worthy ally as Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker in my fight to speed up the production of greatly needed war weapons for our soldiers by stopping strikes, slow-downs, and absenteeism in war factories, and removing the restrictions which keep people from working as many hours a week as they desire.

Most of these pernicious practices of the labor-leader racketeers are carried on within the law, and as a Member of our national lawmaking body I have been attempting to correct the law ever since I became a Senator, and I hope the Senate will soon enact the bills which I have introduced on the subject.

Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker has come back from the very jaws of death, almost miraculously, to bring us his message from the battle-scarred areas where many of our brave soldiers and sailors lost their lives because they did not have enough weapons of war with which to protect themselves. One of the reasons why they did not have enough high-powered air bombers and other powerful weapons of war was that a sufficient number of such weapons had not been manufactured because of strikes, slow-downs, absenteeism, and a 40-hour week in our war factories. Captain Rickenbacker brings back the true facts from the lips of those who died and from the lips of those who still live and who in far-away places are fighting for freedom. They wonder why the Congress of the United States of America has not passed legislation that would stop this labor-leader racketeering and increase the production of the weapons they need so badly. Realizing, as does all America, the perilous experiences through which Captain Rickenbacker and the other members of his brave crew passed during those death-threatening days while on their little life rafts they floated day after day on the unruly waves of the ocean, where death was expected momentarily, it seems that it is only through an act of God that Captain Rickenbacker has been spared in order that he may use his knowledge to benefit our armed forces and this Nation in this grave crisis. I, for one, sincerely believe that Captain Rickenbacker is a godsend to this Nation at this time, and I should like very much to see him honored by some suitable citation.

I ask that a copy of Captain Rickenbacker's speech of February 18 on the subject I have been discussing be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In coming to you today, I am not unmindful of the exceptional honor, and I accept it not as an individual or personal tribute but as a tribute to a symbol to which I have contributed in my humble way.

The symbol that has made America great, inspired throughout the generations by our forefathers, and which has woven its way through the history of these great United States like a golden thread, comprised of imagination, individuality, self-reliance, initiative, and, last but not least, eternal but simple faith in the Supreme Being.

As all of you have either heard or read of my Pacific mission, there is little need of my dwelling on that subject, with the exception of stating that, after visiting with General MacArthur's boys in New Guinea, Port Moresby, Buna, and Gona, I returned to Australia, and then through the Fijis to Guadalcanal, a veritable hellhole, as the rainy season had just started.

Henderson Field runway is a metal strip that has been bombed and shelled for months and is also the airplane graveyard of the Pacific, not only for enemy planes but our own as well.

Dugouts were filled with mud and water. Men were working in jumpers without shoes or socks. Marines and soldiers were in the fox holes with billions of mosquitoes. Malaria was prevalent, as was diarrhea.

Here you will find a Catholic priest, Protestant preacher, or a Jewish rabbi, all preaching the simple faith to Catholics, Protestants, and Jews alike.

Oh, men and women of America, if you could only understand what our boys—your boys and mine—are doing in these hellholes throughout the Pacific and the burning sands of Africa, that your way of life may be preserved and the character that has made this Nation great may be carried on, you would not worry about 8 hours a day overtime or double time for Sundays and holidays, for this is a life-and-death struggle for the welfare of this Nation.

Without victory, social security, old-age pensions, wage-and-hour bills will mean nothing. France had her slow-down and sit-down strikes, had her social legislation—which I am not against—but they failed in the realization that without work and without producing something of value, they could not last. Today, they are serfs and slaves of Hitler's hordes. Millions of men, women, and children are starving. That goes for Holland, Belgium, the Scandinavian countries, Bataan, Corregidor, Hong Kong, and Singapore.

Accept your responsibilities with the privileges that you are enjoying. Remember patriotism without service is a hollow word. Make this land your land, so that it will be a livable place for your children as it has been for you, and make it the right kind of a place for your boys to return to. Recognize your obligation to the heritage you enjoy by being a citizen.

And to those 5,000,000 aliens who have failed to accept the responsibilities of citizenship of this Nation, but who came here to enjoy its fruits and privileges, apply tomorrow for your first papers and the responsibilities that go with them; if not, go back to where you came from.

Do not let these boys come back from their graves in these hellholes scattered throughout the Pacific and other parts of the world and from the depths of the seven seas—do not let them come back and plague you for having failed in your obligation on the home front to give them more and more of everything that is needed to hasten a final victory.

I know you realize that I have said—and I say again—we have in the past several years spent billions of dollars to destroy self-reliance, initiative, imagination, and individuality trying to plan the lives of 130,000,000 people by a superior few. Now we are spending billions to re-create self-reliance, initiative, imagination, and individuality.

For once you place our boys in a fox hole in the jungles of the Pacific, or on the desert sands of Africa, they are on their own. Once you have ordered our boys as commando troops to attack the enemy at night, they are on their own. Once you have dropped parachute troops behind enemy lines, day or night, they are on their own. Once you place a man in the cockpit of a plane and send him into the blue above, he is on his own. Once you put our boys into the tanks against the enemy, they are on their own. Once you put an officer into the front lines, leading a group of our boys into the face of enemy fire, he is on his own.

It is imagination, individuality, self-reliance, and initiative that are going to win this war for America, not only on the field of battle but on the home front.

For bear in mind that when this war is over—pray God it will be soon—there will be more rugged individualists come back to America from the four corners of the world than we ever had at any one time in our history, and I thank God for that.

As I have said before, if necessary to make us appreciate our duties, bring back the troops from the hellholes of the world, place them in the factories, take the war workers, particularly those single men without dependents from 18 to 38 years of age, and place them in the fox holes with the filth, vermin, diarrhea, malaria, and the Japanese, and I will guarantee you that our production will be increased, and much of it doubled, within 30 days.

We would have no more feather-bedding, no more slow-downs, no more restrictions on effort.

The perpetual slow-down in war industry caused by absenteeism, particularly in the aircraft industry where it exceeds an average of 10 percent, is probably the most flagrant abuse of our obligation since Pearl Harbor. In the Boeing factory alone the day following Christmas 26 percent of the employees were absentees, and our aviators in those hellholes

are crying their eyes out for only a few more Flying Fortresses. In the Douglas plant there was an absenteeism of 11,000 employees the day after Christmas—a shocking and deplorable condition.

It is not the loss of individual man-hours that is so deadly, but the accumulated loss of thousands of hours on the production line of other employees caused by individual absenteeism which, during the past year, has run well into hundreds of millions of man-hours.

Cut this absenteeism in half and our fighting forces throughout the world will be grateful, as it will add sufficient planes and parts and other weapons for their use to hasten final victory and save the lives of untold thousands of our boys.

There is no absenteeism in the fox holes in the jungles of the Pacific or the burning sands of Africa, for if attempted there, they would get a bayonet in their bellies from their buddies.

We hear a lot nowadays about the shortage of manpower hours. It is not the shortage of manpower hours that is slowing up the badly needed production of our war weapons and supplies. No. But it is the shortage of productive manpower hours, for again none of us are producing so much that we cannot—all of us—produce a little more.

There are still millions of old men and middle-aged women, unemployed by war industries, who would gladly and conscientiously contribute, if given an opportunity.

Give us back that old-fashioned American incentive and love of country, and we will produce enough war weapons to turn heaven and hell upside down on the heads of Mussolini, Hitler, and Tojo. For experienced production men—and thank God we have many—know from actual results that those manufacturers who have retained the "incentive" plan report that their experiences under actual production conditions prove to them that they would lose 50 percent effectiveness if their employees were on the straight 40-hour week and hourly rate.

Further, these same manufacturers also report a noticeably lower absenteeism in their plants than in plants where only hourly rate men are employed.

Certainly, the experience of years of "know how" by men who have been honest with labor should be worth listening to in this country's need of productive manpower hours.

Let our labor leaders become leaders in fact as well as name and take advantage of the great opportunity that is theirs and ask Congress to repeal, for the duration only, that section covering the weekly hours of the wage-and-hour law, but use the present hourly rate as a basis for pay or wages.

For, again, experience has proven that manufacturers in many industries who are operating on the "incentive" plan are showing a conservative increase in production per manpower hour of at least 33⅓ percent over those operating under the wage-and-hour law.

This would give us an increase of 5,500,000 extra workers among the 16,500,000 now employed in manufacturing on a 48-hour week without overtime. This increase in productive manpower hours would not only take care of the estimated 2,100,000 employees that will be needed to take care of increased war production, but would leave free 3,400,000 men now on the pay rolls in manufacturing for farms or other needed essential services.

Why should not our Congress show the common sense and intestinal fortitude now and clarify our labor laws so that millions of innocent men and women will have the same protection from our Government as do the racketeers?

Let America come back to the fundamentals that made it great. Let us all be realists instead of emotionalists, sentimentalists, or selfish, greedy human beings in this hour of our country's need.

Or must we wait until hundreds of thousands of the cream of our youth—sons, brothers, husbands, and fathers—have been slaughtered and wrecked—mentally or physically—before we recognize our duty?

Yes, I am opposed to overtime pay for a 48-hour week during this life-and-death struggle. In times like these, I do not approve of overtime pay for a 48-hour week with present high wages, except for those men in the foxholes, swamps, jungles, deserts, and the frozen north of the Aleutians and Iceland, for they are the men making the supreme sacrifice. For there is little reason why those of us back home should not expend every effort and energy—if not for our boys in uniform then, at least, to save our own skins.

Give the millions of honest men and women in this country an opportunity to do their best—they ask no more.

And to the labor leaders who are so prone to criticize so feebly, I say petition your Government for the privilege of flying to the hell-holes of the Pacific and the battlefields of North Africa, and see for yourselves as I have—then and then alone will I listen to you—for I have earned my right to citizenship.

And to those few scuministic, synthetic Communists in labor, commerce, and government, who are so prone to smear, I say go back to Russia where you will find millions of men and women willing to die and starve for their country in turning Hitler's hordes from their land—there you will find how transparent you are.

Or better yet, those of military age, get into Uncle Sam's uniform and pay your share of the obligation for the privileges you are enjoying—go to the hell-holes of the Pacific or the battlefields of north Africa and learn to use bayonets on the Germans, Italians, and the Japs, where your smearing will do some good.

And while I am on the subject, I noticed a few days ago the announcement of the declaration of the War Manpower Commission to 29 occupational groups that even though they may be fathers of 5 or 6 children, they must find war important jobs by spring or face induction.

Here again I am shocked to find that our officials in Washington have omitted challenging a group known more commonly as labor racketeers of the "graft" age, and I spell it with a "G" and not a "D".

And I reiterate again, that our Congress should see fit to introduce and pass such legislation, to first—upon his release or discharge, any member of our armed forces can be employed by any employer without having to join any organized labor unions.

Second—upon his employment, he shall have equal voting rights with any other employee in any union, and any employee and management plan of the employer.

Third—his seniority in relation to other employees of draft age should date as of the day he enlisted or was inducted into this country's service.

I definitely feel that our situation here at home is most serious and that by such legislation our Congress could free honest labor from those racketeers and parasites that are right now hindering the effort of our workers to do the best they can to win this war. Such legislation will insure all the members of our services an equal opportunity right now as well as after this war is over with those who stayed at home in industry.

What better bonus could we give our service men than the elimination of their having to buy the right to work in their own country on their release or discharge from the service.

Why should they have to pay exorbitant membership fees demanded by those unions working under a closed shop agreement—and what better bonus could we give them than to eliminate their having to pay dues for the privilege of keeping their jobs?

Briefly, why shouldn't a man's honorable discharge or release from the service of his country be all he would henceforth need as a union card when he returns to work for himself and his family after having worked for all of us so willingly and risked his life in our behalf?

Why could we not use the splendid abilities of our local selective-service boards to draft those men needed by our war industry or our farmers?

Let these men be sent to Army or Navy schools and there let them be taught an agricultural or industrial skill in the same way that their younger and unmarried contemporaries are being taught a skill of war. These men could then be released to the farm or to industry and under this legislation they would not have to join any labor union.

They would be men who, I believe, would have a sobering effect on those malcontents who seem to think it their business to foment strikes and discontent. These men will have served their country through the Army or the Navy and will be able to tell their children that they did their bit, even though their job was only to make the implements at home that were shipped to those serving at the other end of the supply lines, in battle.

These men could replace those single men now in essential industry. It would be better to have a man with a family, working at home in industry with his family than to have him drafted for combat service and have our Government liable for the support of his family. He could earn the wages of industry and in this way make a fairer distribution of the costs of this war.

With the end of the war, they could be given honorable discharges the same as those who were in combat and make them feel that they had served their country to the best of their ability. For there will be millions of young men returning home who have never had a job or who have never been forced to pay tribute to men who never did an honest day's work in their lives.

We all must realize that this war we are fighting is a total war. It is a war in which all of us can get hurt—for which all of us will have to pay, and in which all of us will have to work and fight in order for all of us to win.

In many ways a man can acquire a record of his service which, although it might not be all in one place and quite informal, is nonetheless a record. It is quite different with such records when a man enters the service of his country.

The armed services take no chances in such a haphazard means of recording his deeds or misdeeds. Just as soon as he gets his uniform, he acquires what is known as his service record.

In our Army, this record of the service that a man performs for his country is inscribed in a little white book that has 24 pages. These pages provide for the detailing of his whole history while in the service of his Nation.

Thus, in these entries in his service record, one finds the story of his transfers, promotions, leaves, illnesses, wounds, his deeds of valor or indiscretion, behavior, and promotion or demotion of rank. They are all duly recorded for his country, himself, and for posterity. It is shown just what he did for his country and in the fighting for the safeguarding of those who, he had every reason to expect, were working just as hard for him as he was fighting and risking his life for them.

Since this war is a total war in which all of us have a definite responsibility in working side by side with those fighting for us—then I do think we civilians at home should be proud to have records kept of our services for

our fighting men in the same manner that records are kept of their service for us.

All of us would be proud to have such a record—whether a Cub Scout or an invalid in a wheel chair—with which we could prove that we had acquitted ourselves honorably in this fight.

Save the Nation for these boys when they return because by our acts and efforts will they judge us.

Yes, of course, buy bonds, buy to the limit, if you believe in this land. Buy a stake in its future so that when this horrible catastrophe is over you will not be the first one crying for relief.

Yes, I know I have been accused of being the representative of the National Association of Manufacturers, the automotive industry, the American First Committee, and even accused of being a Fascist. Frankly and sincerely, I represent no person or persons, group or groups, color or creed, nor have I any political ambitions—I speak for myself alone, but echo the sentiments of millions.

And again, I frankly state that I much prefer to break bread with Henry Ford, the Fisher Bros., the K. T. Kellars of Chrysler, and the Charlie Ketterings of General Motors, for here are men who have come from the soil and given the world one of the greatest gifts humanity has ever received in history—the automobile.

Yes, I would rather sit down with these men than with those who are living in the laps of luxury at the expense of the sweat and toil of millions of honest men and women.

Let us give these millions of young men inducted into the uniform of these great United States an opportunity on their return to again join the union of Americanism.

And to Congress I say again, face the facts and show the traditional American intestinal fortitude by legislating this cancerous element from our midst. Why should these racketeers be immune from reporting their incomes or paying taxes on their tributes from the millions? Why should our Congress not bring about compulsory incorporation, public accounting of their funds, and forbid political contributions from their ill-gotten gains if they are honest in their intentions?

No, I am not a labor hater. I believe in honest labor unions who are doing their darndest to turn out the weapons we need. I have been laboring for 40-odd years—since I was 12 years of age in many lines of endeavor. I come from humble parents. I know the value of honest labor. I have served labor as well as employer.

And I know just how serious the situation is from the thousands of letters I have received from men and women in many industries from all parts of the United States—both union and nonunion—who have urged and pleaded that I bring the facts before the public before it is too late.

And to those millions of honest men and women war workers goes my heartfelt thanks—but to those whom the shoe fits—I say wear it.

For there is nothing of material value that any of you or anybody has on the face of this globe that I want—with the exception of 10 more years of life with my mental and physical faculties to help preserve the freedom and standards of living dedicated to us by our forefathers for our children and our soldiers when they come back—and only God can give me that.

### AMERICA AND ITS WAR EFFORTS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "America and Its War Efforts" delivered by him in Raleigh, N. C., Friday, February 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

### NATIONAL MANPOWER—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BANKHEAD

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of national manpower delivered by him on February 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "We Must Go Forward" delivered by Senator BUTLER at a recent meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in St. Louis, Mo., which appears in the Appendix.]

### ABRAHAM LINCOLN—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM J. GROSS

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on Abraham Lincoln delivered by William J. Gross, editorial editor of the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel, February 10, 1943, at Fort Wayne, Ind., which appears in the Appendix.]

### THE LABOR FRONT—ADDRESS BY MAURICE R. FRANKS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Labor Front delivered by Maurice R. Franks before the Executives' Club of Chicago and published in the Executive Club News of February 9, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

### ANYTHING MAY HAPPEN—EDITORIAL FROM THE FORT WAYNE NEWS-SENTINEL

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel of February 18, 1943, entitled "Anything May Happen," which appears in the Appendix.]

### AVOIDANCE OF WORLD WAR NO. 3—ARTICLE FROM THE PROGRESSIVE

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How Can We Avoid World War No. 3?" written by William Henry Chamberlin and published in The Progressive of February 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

### THE NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Blow to Planning," dealing with the National Resources Planning Board and published in the Washington Star of February 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

### EDITORIAL COMMENTS ON ACQUISITION OF ISLAND BASES

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Cleveland (Ohio) Press entitled "America Needs British Bases," and an editorial from the Lynchburg (Va.) News entitled "Island Bases," which appear in the Appendix.]

### "FEATHER BED" WORKING RULES ON RAILROADS—LETTER FROM ELISHA M. FRIEDMAN

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Elisha M. Friedman, dealing with "feather bed" working rules on the railroads, published in the New York Times of Februuary 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

### TRANSFER OF JEWS FROM RUMANIA TO PALESTINE—DISPATCH FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article containing a dispatch published in the New York Times on February 13, 1943, under the title "Rumania Offers To Transfer Jews From Trans-Dniestria to the Allies," which appears in the Appendix.]

### NOMINATION OF JAMES V. ALLRED—EDITORIALS FROM SHREVEPORT TIMES AND WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Shreveport Times entitled "Louisiana Ignored," and an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Political Holiday," which appear in the Appendix.]

### GEORGE WASHINGTON—POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Washington—First President," by Horace C. Carlisle, which appears in the Appendix.]

### MERGER OF TELEGRAPH COMPANIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, at the session last Thursday I explained in some detail the conference report on Senate bill 158, the telegraph merger bill. Since that time I have been asked whether the provisions of subsections (f) (2) and (f) (7) are broad enough to permit discharge, for reasons other than those of consolidation and merger, of employees who were hired after March 1, 1941. I wish to state now that it is my opinion, and, I am sure, the opinion of the other conferees on the part of the Senate, that these provisions are interpreted by us to mean that such junior employees are protected against discharge only for the period specified in (f) (2) and then only for causes arising out of merger; they are not meant to require the employer to continue the employment of such employees when their services would no longer be required due to a change in economic conditions, resulting in a drop in business.

At this time I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 158.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will not the Senator postpone his motion until the routine morning business shall have been concluded?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am willing to do that.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE WAR EFFORT BY EAST AURORA, N. Y., STUDENTS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the patriotic endeavors of the high-school students of East Aurora, N. Y., have caused widespread and favorable comment. In fact, I have in my hand an article from the New York Times commending the school children of that village for their exemplary conduct in the sale of bonds and in the purchase of airplanes. The article proceeds to explain that the students sold $50,000 of war bonds to aid in buying a Bell Airacobra for the Army Air Forces, and that three planes flew over the village in honor of their accomplishment.

Within a few hours afterward the superintendent of schools notified the manufacturer of the aircraft that the children had raised a sufficient sum of money to buy a second plane, and the article proceeds to state that they are now preparing in a substantial way to make the third purchase.

I should like to have the article commendatory of the activities of these young people inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUPILS BOUGHT TWO PLANES—EAST AURORA YOUNGSTERS ARE NOW SELLING BONDS FOR A THIRD

BUFFALO, February 20.—It took East Aurora school students more than a year to sell $50,000 in War bonds to buy a Bell Airacobra for the Army Air Forces, but today they bought a second and the sum represented less than 2 hours of bond selling.

The first plane was turned over to Maj. Milo H. Miller at Bell Aircraft Corporation January 23. As a reward, he arranged for three planes to fly over East Aurora January 29.

Within 2 hours after the flight the superintendent of schools, Walter L. Bumgardner, called the major to tell him enough bonds had been sold to buy another Airacobra.

Today student representatives presented the check to Lawrence D. Bell, president of the aircraft firm, and informed him they had sold $19,000 in bonds toward a third plane.

The planes are marked with the East Aurora schools' "blue devil" astride a bomb.

## ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 49, Senate bill 707, to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General. For the information of the Senate I wish to say that the Committee on the Judiciary considered this measure and reported it unanimously. The bill simply provides for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General. It seems that until 1933 there were six Assistant Attorneys General, each one heading a division or a branch of the Department of Justice, and being responsible for that division, and reporting directly to the Attorney General, but on June 16, 1933, the number was reduced to five.

The Attorney General points out that a new division has been created since that time, called the War Division, having jurisdiction of all prosecutions and similar matters relating to the war, but that there is no Assistant Attorney General to head that Division because of the reduction of the number to five. He also points out that there will be no additional expense incurred, in that the Assistant Attorney General will not draw any more salary than do the classified attorneys now in the Department who are performing this work. The chief reason for wanting an additional Assistant Attorney General is that he may head a number of divisions which are now more or less without any cohesion. He will be head of all those divisions and responsible to the Attorney General, and will report directly to the Attorney General.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Am I correct in my understanding that the Senator from Texas said that the bill has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; unanimously.

Mr. WHITE. Is the bill on the calendar?

Mr. CONNALLY. The bill is on the calendar. It has the unanimous report of the Committee on the Judiciary. This morning I consulted prominent Members on the Republican side of the Chamber about the bill, and there is no objection on their part to the Senate proceeding to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the distinguished minority leader, sent word to me this morning that because of a slight indisposition he will not be here today, and he hoped that the calendar would not be called today. The bill in question is on the calendar. I do not regard consideration and passage of the bill as being contrary to the wish expressed by the Senator from Oregon with respect to calling the calendar. When the Senator from Oregon is again present, if he should have a reason for requesting reconsideration of the action of the Senate on the bill, which I doubt he will have, it will be entirely agreeable to me to have the action reconsidered.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should say to the Senator from Kentucky that I will be very glad to accede to any motion of that kind because I do not care to inconvenience the Senator from Oregon. I have the highest respect and admiration for him, and I would not do anything contrary to his views in his absence. When he returns to the Chamber, if he wants the action on the bill reconsidered, so far as I am concerned, I shall cheerfully agree to such a request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 707) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 348 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 295), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"There shall be in the Department of Justice six officers, learned in the law, called the Assistant Attorneys General, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall assist the Attorney General and Solicitor General in the performance of their duties."

## MERGER OF TELEGRAPH COMPANIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The routine morning business is concluded.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 158, which was presented and printed in the RECORD on last Thursday, February 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 158.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 158) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I am opposed to the adoption of the conference report. I have in my hand a letter dated February 13 from one of the employees of the Postal Telegraph Co., which recalls to mind what was taking place a few years ago in this country before the Postal Telegraph Co. was organized. The writer says:

It is with many misgivings that I view the impending merger of the two land telegraph companies, the Western Union and Postal Telegraph. The misgivings are as to what sort of service the American public will get once Western Union has the field to itself. Years ago Postal Telegraph had on display in all of its offices the slogan "Did you ever stop to consider what the telegraph service was before Postal entered the field?"

Mr. President, if the conference report shall be adopted it will mean that we are creating a monopoly in this country, so far as the telegraph service is concerned. It will mean that the people are going to be at the mercy of this monopoly.

I have a further objection to adoption of the report. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] said on Thursday last, as it appears on page 1094 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—

It is true that Postal preferred stock, the senior security of the present landline company, has risen from $9 a share to $19 or $20. However, I desire to point out the fact that there is no way of determining at this time what the value of this security will be in the event of a merger. We all know that securities fluctuate frequently on the market upon a mere suspicion or hope that their value will be increased. I, for one, am not guided or interested by what the people in Wall Street do in this regard.

Mr. President, a few days ago the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] submitted to the Senate a list of the preferred stockholders of the Postal Telegraph Co. That list shows that during the few weeks this matter has been

under consideration in Congress the value of the preferred stock held by a few of those whose names appear in the list has risen in the amount of $1,357,060. In other words, we find in the list a group of Wall Street operators who would benefit by this merger to that extent. I ask that the list be printed in the RECORD in this connection as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Postal Telegraph, Inc.—List of common stockholders of 2,000 shares or more and preferred stockholders of 500 shares or more, as at May 9, 1942*

| Name and address [1] | Number of shares | |
|---|---|---|
| | Common | Preferred |
| Abraham & Co., 120 Broadway | 329 | 2,160 |
| Allen & Co., 30 Broad St. | 60 | 5,100 |
| Asiel & Co.: | | |
| 11 Wall St. | 3,188 | 78 |
| 15 Exchange Pl., Jersey City, N. J. | 1,330 | ------- |
| Baar Cohen & Co., 39 Broadway | 3,600 | 50 |
| J. S. Bache & Co., 36 Wall St. | 1,262 | 1,420 |
| Mordick L. Baliozian, 10 West 33d St. | 4,000 | 200 |
| Mordick L. Baliozian, 120 Broadway, care of Bonner & Bonner, Inc. | 2,800 | ------- |
| Harrington J. Barrus & Lois Marsh Barrus, care of Bonner & Bonner, Inc., 120 Broadway | 3,500 | 100 |
| Manuel Berdu, care of Bonner & Bonner, Inc., 120 Broadway | 2,000 | ------- |
| Board of Regents of the University of Nevada, Reno, Nev. | 2,400 | 600 |
| Boody, McLellan & Co., 111 Broadway | 2,000 | ------- |
| Gertrude S. Brazier, care of Bonner & Bonner, Inc., 120 Broadway | 5,500 | 100 |
| Bucher & Co., care of Guarantee Trust Co., of New York, 524 5th Ave. | ------- | 500 |
| Leigh Caffey, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 4,000 | ------- |
| Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., trustee, V. A. dated Apr. 10, 1901, with Arabella D. Huntington, deceased, for Archer Milton Huntington, 70 Broadway | 4,500 | 1,125 |
| John B. Cline, care of Charles Hughes & Co., 32 Broadway | 3,000 | ------- |
| Clooney & Co., care of Fiduciary Trust Co. of New York, 1 Wall St. | ------- | 500 |
| Confederation Life Association, 12 Richmond St. East, Toronto, Ontario, Canada | 2,460 | 615 |
| Content Hano & Co., 39 Broadway | ------- | 600 |
| Jacob S. Carre, care of Bonner & Bonner, Inc., 120 Broadway | 2,700 | ------- |
| Cudd & Co., care of the Chase National Bank, 11 Broad St. | 40 | 510 |
| G. M. Dahl, 20 Pine St. | ------- | 1,000 |
| Delafield & Delafield, 14 Wall St. | 400 | 1,010 |
| Dominick & Dominick, 115 Broadway | 2,460 | 1,508 |
| Joseph M. Dragoni, 46 East 52d St. | 2,500 | ------- |
| Joseph M. Dragoni, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,500 | ------- |
| Mary F. Drake, Cooperstown, N. Y. | 2,100 | ------- |
| Alexander Drucker, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,100 | 50 |
| Francis I. Dupont & Co. and Chisholm & Chapman, 1 Wall St. | ------- | 1,915 |
| Francis I. Dupont & Co. and Chisholm & Chapman, a single copartnership, 1 Wall St. | 820 | ------- |
| Charles Engelhard, 30 Church St. | 2,000 | ------- |
| C. A. Englan & Co., care of Chemical Bank & Trust Co., 165 Broadway | ------- | 2,225 |
| Fahnestock & Co., 1 Wall St. | 700 | 5,225 |
| Farell Bros., 50 Broadway | ------- | 2,675 |
| Filor, Bullard & Smyth, 39 Broadway | ------- | 1,075 |
| Bridget, Flynn, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 3,200 | ------- |
| Fox, O'Hara & Co., 60 Broad St. | 1,040 | 530 |
| Charles Frederic & Co., care of Irving Trust Co., 1 Wall St. | 2,879 | 1,312 |
| French & Co., care of The Penna Co., Packard Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa. | ------- | 1,600 |
| Fuller, Rodney & Co., 44 Wall St. | 3,000 | ------- |
| William N. Gillette, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,000 | ------- |
| Globe Telegrah & Tr.p Co., Ltd., Electra House, Victoria Embankment, London, England | 2,910 | ------- |
| Goldman, Sachs & Co., 30 Pine St. | 13,448 | 587 |
| Marcus S. Goldnamer, Edinar Bldg., Washington, D. C. | 2,000 | ------- |

[1] Unless otherwise noted, addresses are in New York, N. Y.

*Postal Telegraph, Inc.—List of common stockholders of 2,000 shares or more and preferred stockholders of 500 shares or more, as at May 9, 1942*—Continued

| Name and address | Number of shares | |
|---|---|---|
| | Common | Preferred |
| Goodbody & Co., 115 Broadway | 4,664 | 1,550 |
| Anna H. Greenwald, care of Jessey & Co., 2 Rector St. | 2,100 | ------- |
| Joseph J. Haesler, 98 Overlook Rd., Upper Montclair, N. J. | 2,500 | ------- |
| Hallgarten & Co., 44 Pine St. | 706 | 1,905 |
| Harris, Upham & Co., 11 Wall St. | 4,388 | 1,313 |
| Hayden, Stone & Co., 25 Broad St. | 200 | 1,000 |
| H. Heintz & Co., 60 Beaver St. | 4,540 | 1,810 |
| Frank Herbst, 44 Wall St. | 2,027 | 701 |
| Herzfeld & Stein, 30 Broad St. | 2,000 | 600 |
| Miss Emma Hey, 39-01 Main St., Flushing, Long Island, N. Y., care of M. L. Gottleib | 2,000 | ------- |
| Mathilda Hickey, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 3,000 | ------- |
| Higson & Co., care of Continental Bank & Trust Co., 30 Broad St. | ------- | 1,000 |
| Hirsh, Lilienthal & Co., 165 Broadway | ------- | 2,310 |
| Hirsh, Lilienthal & Co., 25 Broad St. | 4,380 | ------- |
| William A. Hunt, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 3,300 | ------- |
| Hurley & Co., 55 Wall St. | 5,044 | 1,261 |
| A. M. Kidder & Co., 1 Wall St. | 4,222 | 7,218 |
| Kidder, Peabody & Co., 17 Wall St. | 3,076 | 441 |
| Spencer B. Koch & Co., 29 Broadway | 120 | 630 |
| Kordula & Co., care of City Bank Farmers Trust Co., 22 William St. | 2,200 | 730 |
| Krauss & Co., care of Manufacturers & Traders Trust Co., 284 Main St., Buffalo, N. Y. | 2,600 | 650 |
| Augusta Kubicek, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 7,700 | 250 |
| Laird, Bissell & Meeds, 120 Broadway | ------- | 700 |
| Lehman Bros., 1 William St. | 19,028 | 10,217 |
| Henry Lieferant, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,100 | ------- |
| Alfonse M. Linderfelser, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,000 | ------- |
| Alexander List, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,000 | ------- |
| Frederick Lohl, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 5,000 | ------- |
| Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., 61 Broadway | 1,100 | 16,294 |
| E. Lowitz & Co., 29 Broadway | 40 | 5,010 |
| McDonnell & Co., 120 Broadway | 2,660 | 4,082 |
| Robert B. McFalls, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,000 | 100 |
| Arthur L. MacBain, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 3,000 | ------- |
| Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., 1295 State St., Springfield, Mass. | 2,000 | 500 |
| Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, 70 Pine St. | 1,433 | 2,470 |
| Richard Meyer, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,000 | ------- |
| Newan Bros. & Worms, 25 Broad St. | 5,150 | 8,245 |
| Nutt & Co., 46 Wall St. | 100 | 625 |
| Orvis Bros. & Co., 14 Wall St. | 1,840 | 757 |
| Donald F. Othmer, 99 Livingston St., Brooklyn, N. Y. | 2,000 | ------- |
| Parrish & Co., 40 Wall St. | 200 | 1,450 |
| Pearl Assurance Co., Ltd., High Holborn, London, England | 2,182 | 540 |
| William Rosenblatt, 1125 Park Ave. | 2,000 | 500 |
| Rudolph & Co., care of Manufacturers Trust Co., 45 Beaver St. | ------- | 1,300 |
| Salkeld & Co., care of Bankers Trust Co., P. O. Box 704, Church St. Annex | 2,020 | 505 |
| Henry G. Solomon, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,000 | ------- |
| Ewald Schmitz, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,000 | ------- |
| Olga Schnepf, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 3,000 | ------- |
| Warren S. Schoenthaler, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,800 | ------- |
| J. & W. Seligman & Co., 65 Broadway | 300 | 700 |
| Shields & Co., 44 Wall St. | 2,300 | 775 |
| Sigler & Co., care of Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 70 Broadway | 8,048 | 1,887 |
| William Simon, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 4,000 | ------- |
| I. M. Simon, 315 North 4th St., St. Louis, Mo. | 2,000 | 100 |
| Smith, Barney & Co., 14 Wall St. | 3,454 | 835 |
| Stephen J. Stroock & Co., 1 Wall St. | ------- | 600 |
| Sidney Susswein, 220 Broadway | 2,000 | ------- |
| Sutro Bros. & Co., 120 Broadway | 1,760 | 700 |
| Hazel Thurnheir, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 3,600 | ------- |
| Albert Tramer, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 7,000 | 200 |
| Tucker, Anthony & Co., 120 Broadway | 4,300 | 1,543 |
| University of Rochester, Lincoln Alliance Bank & Trust Co. | 6,500 | 1,625 |
| Ward, Griever & Co., 40 Exchange Place | ------- | 4,020 |

*Postal Telegraph, Inc.—List of common stockholders of 2,000 shares or more and preferred stockholders of 500 shares or more, as at May 9, 1942*—Continued

| Name and address | Number of shares | |
|---|---|---|
| | Common | Preferred |
| Minna G. Werdermann, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 27,580 | ------- |
| Wertheim & Co., 120 Broadway | 1,000 | 3,175 |
| White Weld & Co., 40 Wall St. | 20 | 700 |
| Wiley & Co., care of Manufacturers Trust Co., 55 Broad St. | 500 | 7,625 |
| Robert Willicombe, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 24,676 | 62 |
| C. King Woodbridge, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway | 2,200 | 125 |
| Total | 326,384 | 135,706 |

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not know who the Wall Street operators are. One of those on the list is Fahnestock & Co., No. 1 Wall Street, New York, which has 5,225 shares of preferred stock. The stock has already gone up in value $10 per share, so that company has made a profit of $50,000. Another concern has over 10,000 shares of the preferred stock.

If that stock were sold today that company would have a profit of $100,000. If the Western Union takes over the Postal Telegraph Co., and the increase in the value of the preferred stock of the Postal amounts to two million dollars or three million dollars, whatever it may be, ultimately those who hold the stock will appear before the appropriate commission asking for telegraph rates based upon what this stock has cost them, and asking that the American public pay rates based upon what they had to pay for the stock of this company.

Not only that, but I believe that if the proposed merger should become effective the preferred stock would rise in value even more rapidly than it has risen up to the present time. Fundamentally, Mr. President, I cannot see why the Senate should be asked to pass upon the merger of two telegraph companies, among all the enterprises in the country. The proponents of the measure could just as well ask us to pass upon the merger of any two companies engaged in the manufacture of war materials. They could just as well ask for the merger of two telephone companies. There would be as much logic in such a request as there is in the one which has been made with reference to the merger of two telegraph companies. I think we are asked to embark upon a course which would be injurious to the country.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does not the Senator know that legislation has already been enacted permitting telephone companies to merge?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I agree that that is true. At the time such legislation was enacted I was not a Member of the Senate, and was not in a position to object. This is the first time since I became a Member of the Senate that a proposed merger of this nature has come before the Senate, and I desire to urge my emphatic protest against it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have been requested by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], to read to the Senate a statement in relation to the conference report. It will require about 5 minutes.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HAWKES

1. The provisions protecting the employees of any merged company that occurs under this act should not be any more exacting on the merged companies than the provisions contained in the amendment of 1940 to the Interstate Commerce Act authorizing the consolidation and merger of railroads. The merged company should not be compelled to keep employees, who under ordinary conditions, could be dismissed by either of the companies merging. The purpose of the act should be to protect only employees who might be discharged as the result of the merger itself. The United States needs manpower right now and, while I am definitely in favor of reasonable protection of the employees who were on the pay roll of these two companies on March 1, 1941, or prior thereto, to an extent that will allow them the opportunity of providing themselves with other employment if their services are no longer required by the merged company, I do not believe the protection should go to the point of guaranteeing employment to those who would have been released in any event regardless of the merger.

2. If we are to preserve the right of private industry to manage its own affairs, restricted only by the Government insofar as it is necessary for the protection of the rights of the people as a whole, then the company management should have the right to make extensions to its property which in its opinion are desired and required for service to the people of the United States.

3. I recognize that this act is said to be permissive and not compulsory, but the whole purpose of the act is to bring about a merger to correct a condition that exists. The question involved is whether the Government should control private industry or whether private industry should be permitted to control itself in such ways that give due consideration to the public interest. This point can all be summed up in saying that the people of the United States must decide whether they wish to preserve the fair rights of private ownership and operation or desire to have, at first, certain private institutions controlled and directed by Federal agencies, which, in my opinion, will ultimately lead to the control and direction of all private industry by the Government.

4. I believe the provision in section 2, which compels the domestic telegraph carriers to divest themselves of international telegraph operations with due diligence on a consideration basis which, in the opinion of the Federal Communications Commission, is fair, is an unsound provision to be incorporated in this bill. I might ask, who is going to buy these cable lines, except some other company that is precluded from buying them under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act? The answer to that might be that the Government, itself, will buy the cable lines. I do not believe the people wish to have private industry carved up into sections, part of which are Government-owned and controlling in their effect upon private industry.

I am unavoidably absent from the Senate today, but for the above reasons, if present, I would record my vote against the adoption of the conference report, but if these points could be cleared up, I would record my vote in favor of the conference report.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not rise under any delusion that anything I may say will prevent the acceptance of the conference report or prevent the enactment of the proposed legislation now under consideration. I merely desire to reiterate what I have said before, namely, that, in my opinion, the proposed legislation is unsound, unwise, and that it falls distinctly within the category of special-privilege legislation.

The proposed legislation would do three things: It would guarantee 4 years of employment to men who are employed by the Postal Telegraph Co. and who, for the most part, seem to be opposed to the legislation at a time when they are better able to obtain work than they will be 4 years from now.

It would recover a considerable percentage of the investment which the original investors in the Postal Telegraph & Cable Co. made years ago, and would enable approximately 30 percent of the present stockholders to reap a speculative profit.

I cannot consider the proposed legislation, Mr. President, without looking at the calendar and seeing Calendar No. 32, Senate bill 403, a bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as a result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida. A group of farmers in the State of Florida have sustained great loss through absolutely no fault of their own. Yet the Senate has blocked the passage of legislation to enable them to recover their losses, and at the same time has hurried through, as though it had to be done in a minute, the proposed legislation for the benefit of New York bankers and brokers who, with their clients, hold most of the stock of the Postal Telegraph Co.

Mr. President, I am opposed to any legislation of this nature, which takes from all the people for the benefit of a few, unless those few are needy and in distress. As I look over the list of stockholders of the Postal Telegraph Co. I seriously doubt that any of them are needy and in distress today. When legislation of this nature is proposed I desire to hit it as often and hard as I can.

Mr. President, on the question of the adoption of the conference report, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have hoped the proposed legislation would pass without further delay, but if there is to be a yea-and-nay vote, I wish to speak briefly upon the situation.

This legislation has had as long and as thoughtful study as any with which I have been familiar during my legislative service. An appropriate committee of this body, the Committee on Interstate Commerce, conducted long and laborious hearings and later gave thoughtful consideration to the information placed before it at the hearings. Legislation was finally drafted which had the approval of the committee. I believe it had the unanimous approval of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, and in due course it was passed by the Senate. It went to the other House and there the corresponding committee studied the proposed legislation and reported it to the House. The House then gave the legislation its blessing.

The House struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and wrote an amendment, so when the bill went to conference the entire subject matter of this legislation was before the conferees of the Senate and the House. Although the House committee and the House itself struck out all after the enacting clause and wrote a new bill, that bill contained chiefly changes in form and in detail rather than in the basic principles of the bill as it passed the Senate. I believe it entirely truthful to say that the House bill followed the basic purposes and concepts of the Senate bill.

Mr. President, there are groups who are interested in the legislation which is now before us. There are the telegraph companies involved. I believe we are warranted in saying that the Postal Telegraph Co. and the Western Union Telegraph Co. look with approval upon the passage of the legislation, although they may be motivated by different considerations. I apprehend that the Postal Telegraph Co. desires the passage of the legislation because it sees in it an alternative to the bankruptcy of the Postal Co. and the dissipation of the resources of that company through the procedure of a bankruptcy court.

I understand also that the Western Union is in favor of the legislation. I do not know that it has said so in specific terms, but I suspect that it sees in it an alternative to the assumption by the Government of the United States of the operations of the Postal Telegraph Co. and the Postal Company's services and facilities operated in competition with a private company. I do not blame the Western Union Co. at all for its anxiety because of this possibility.

Labor is involved, and is interested in the pending report.

Mr. President, I believe the sound thinkers in the labor organizations of the country approve the measure as it now stands; but whether they approve it or not they should approve it because it writes for labor a charter not found elsewhere in legislation enacted by Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does what the Senator said mean that the measure would establish a precedent for labor in matters like the one dealt with by it?

Mr. WHITE. There is no other situation like it. In the pending measure we guarantee that, after the merger, labor employed before March 1941 shall continue to have employment for a period at least equal in time to the period during which it was employed by the constituent companies before the merger, with a maximum of 4 years' time. In my view there is no comparable situation. Something has been said about what we have done for railroad labor, and the question is asked why we should

do more for the telegraph employees than has been done for railroad employees. I think there is a very basic difference which furnishes a convicing reason for the greater liberality on our part for the telegraph company labor. When a railroad line is abandoned or when its services are curtailed employees affected can go to a hundred other railroads in the country seeking employment. When a corresponding change occurs with reference to a telegraph company, when the Postal Telegraph Co. disappears, there is just one place where the man who has given his life's services to the telegraph industry can go for employment, and that is to the merged company which it is proposed to set up. Because of that narrow market for telegraph labor I think we are justified in what I concede is liberality.

Then, Mr. President, the Government of the United States is interested in the measure. We have in the RECORD the approval of the President of the United States of its purpose and general principles. The Signal Corps of the War Department has asked for enactment of the measure. The communications authorities of the Navy Department have asked for enactment of the measure, and so has the Federal Communications Commission, having general authority and general jurisdiction over all communications facilities of the country. Are we to deny recognition to those voices from the governmental authorities of the country?

But, over and beyond all that, I think that the people of the United States are interested in the measure. They are interested in communications service; and the overwhelming weight of authority before the committee and before the Senate is that by permitting the merger we shall preserve for the people of the United States a better telegraph service than we shall find under any of the alternatives which face us at this time.

So, Mr. President, because I think that all those groups are entitled to consideration, and because I think that their combined voices should be persuasive with the Senate, I express the hope that the conference report will be agreed to by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gerry | McClellan |
| Austin | Gillette | McFarland |
| Ball | Green | McKellar |
| Bankhead | Guffey | Maloney |
| Barkley | Gurney | Maybank |
| Bridges | Hatch | Mead |
| Buck | Hayden | Millikin |
| Bushfield | Hill | Moore |
| Butler | Holman | Murray |
| Byrd | Johnson, Calif. | O'Daniel |
| Capper | Johnson, Colo. | O'Mahoney |
| Danaher | La Follette | Radcliffe |
| Eastland | Langer | Reynolds |
| Ferguson | Lodge | Robertson |
| George | Lucas | Russell |
| Scrugham | Tunnell | Wherry |
| Shipstead | Vandenberg | White |
| Stewart | Van Nuys | Wiley |
| Taft | Wallgren | Willis |
| Thomas, Idaho | Wheeler | Wilson |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope we may have a vote on the conference report while a quorum is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. MCNARY's name was called). I have been asked to announce that if present and voting the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the minority leader, would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are detained on official business of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are conducting hearings in Puerto Rico on behalf of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are absent conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I am not advised how these Senators would vote if present.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is necessarily absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is unavoidably absent. I have been requested to announce that, if present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—42

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Austin | Hill | Radcliffe |
| Ball | Johnson, Calif. | Reynolds |
| Bankhead | Johnson, Colo. | Russell |
| Barkley | La Follette | Scrugham |
| Capper | Lodge | Stewart |
| Danaher | Lucas | Taft |
| Eastland | McClellan | Tunnell |
| George | McFarland | Vandenberg |
| Gerry | McKellar | Van Nuys |
| Green | Maloney | Wallgren |
| Guffey | Maybank | Wheeler |
| Gurney | Mead | White |
| Hatch | Millikin | Wiley |
| Hayden | O'Mahoney | Willis |

NAYS—17

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gillette | Robertson |
| Buck | Holman | Shipstead |
| Bushfield | Langer | Thomas, Idaho |
| Butler | Moore | Wherry |
| Byrd | Murray | Wilson |
| Ferguson | O'Daniel | |

NOT VOTING—37

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Clark, Mo. | Pepper |
| Bailey | Connally | Reed |
| Barbour | Davis | Revercomb |
| Bilbo | Downey | Smith |
| Bone | Ellender | Thomas, Okla. |
| Brewster | Glass | Thomas, Utah |
| Bridges | Hawkes | Tobey |
| Brooks | Kilgore | Truman |
| Burton | McCarran | Tydings |
| Caraway | McNary | Wagner |
| Chandler | Murdock | Walsh |
| Chavez | Nye | |
| Clark, Idaho | Overton | |

So the report was agreed to.

## AGRICULTURAL LABOR—DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, on the 18th of February I introduced two bills, one relating to deferment from military service, and the other relief of agricultural labor. After the bills were introduced I received letters from three Members of the Senate expressing willingness to join as cosponsors of the bills, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], whose communications came in just a little too late to have them included as cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that their names appear in the permanent RECORD as cosponsors of each of the bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## CONDITION OF SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, when the President, in effect, agreed to a truce with big business 2 years ago, we knew it was a sort of compromise that only the prospect of war could enforce upon him; and he came to it only after a year of vain appeal to the patriotism of big business leadership to throw its full

support behind the preparedness program.

Many believed that it was a bitter bargain, and saw in it even then the disturbing prospect that the history of World War No. 1 might repeat itself. But I doubt whether anyone could have foretold what the compromise would provoke.

A decade ago his leadership brought to this land a new day for the common man, for the little operator, for small business. The reforms brought about were so great that the New Deal has been called a bloodless revolution.

From what I see about me now, from evidence coming to me through the inquiries of the Small Business Committee and from various other quarters, from the recent discussions which have occurred on this floor, the conviction grows more deeply on me that we are in the grip of a reactionary change, which, if unchecked, will make any excesses of the New Deal pale into insignificance in the backward lengths to which it may go and which could conceivably bring the final extermination of traditional democracy in this country.

This change comes at a time of great stress, when the emergencies of an unprecedented war demand unprecedented experiments and entail unprecedented dislocations; when the consideration of time supersedes all cost, and that of production, all question of means. It is a beclouded scene, one in which the pain of a treasonable wound may be easily confused with the stricture of needed sacrifice, one in which the stern orders of war's necessity may ride double with bureaucratic tyranny and stupidity.

Our condition is made difficult, and many of us are wont to cry out against the symptoms, rather than the disease; yet I feel sure there is no Member of the Senate who does not realize that free enterprise in this country has been dealt a deadly blow, incident to the struggle against the enemy beyond our gates.

We have been disturbed here recently by a most alarming picture of the shift in the production ratio between big business and small business. It has been admitted that 70 percent of all war contracts is in the hands of 100 giant concerns, and the share of small business in the war program, while its size may be uncertain, is, I think, without question far out of proportion to what it should be and must be if small business is to survive this war.

We have been presented the alarming picture in silhouette, and we know that the greater portion of the production shift is the result of the direct action of our Government in placing war contracts with big business. But that does not present the full view. Though not so obvious, an agency-by-agency, bureau-by-bureau close-up of this all-pervasive bureaucracy is no less disturbing. It was this shift I had in mind when I spoke of the reactionary change in the character of our Government.

There is an old saying that more than 80 percent of any law lies in its administration. That saw may have belonged to the field of emphatic half-truths once, but today it is an understatement of literal fact. Never before in our history has government been so much the will of men, as opposed to the check and guaranty of laws; never before have our fates, our every right, so depended on the liver condition, the emotional processes, the prejudices, the bent of mind, the character of past experience, and the special interests of governors, big and little. Of such is the unholy kingdom of bureaucracy.

Bureaucracy, itself, I regard to be a fungus growth on the body politic, but it is the character of this bureaucracy about which I wish to speak.

When this bureaucratic element, which I believe to be so inimical to our traditional democracy, began to insinuate itself into the wartime executive branch 2 years ago, few of us discerned the intent or extent of the undertaking. Since the inquiries of the Small Business Committee began, I think this intent has been growing increasingly clear to us. Where we have been able to lift the camouflaging vestments of official title here and there, its extent is seen to prevail alarmingly.

Mr. President, the unwholesome intimacy of big business with our war agencies and the arrogant attitude of some agency bureaucrats toward small business was revealed in the testimony of J. Raymond Walsh, C. I. O. research director, before the Small Business Committee shortly before Christmas. Walsh testified that W. P. B. was continuing with the construction of the $38,000,000 armor-plate plant for the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co., subsidiary of United States Steel, at Gary, Ind., despite the traffic congestion and labor shortage at that place, despite the large use this would make of critical materials, despite the fact that there were a number of virtually idle small steel companies crying for armor-plate contracts, and despite the fine record of production of the Standard Steel Pool, a group of small independents, who had surpassed the big companies in production, and who would suffer vitally by the projected shift of production to the new plant under United States Steel.

Mr. Walsh, when comparing the methods in use for fabricating steel, pointed out that the independents of the pool were using a process which required no nickel and very little molybdenum, both of which are highly critical materials, while the two "big business" companies of the industry were processing in a way that required more molybdenum and a very considerable amount of nickel—some 280 pounds per tank, which would build four tank engines, eight tank transmissions, seven airplane motors. He said there was no demand from W. P. B. that Big Steel drop nickel from its formula, but instead that it be given a subsidy at the expense of the independents to continue the use of this process.

This policy seems neither in the interest of the war program, nor in any degree fair to the independents, and is a concrete example of how smaller concerns are ignored and big business preferred.

In describing this strange course of action, Mr. Walsh submitted a revealing bit of information. He said:

> There may be a direct relationship between this (the use of nickel by Big Steel) and the employment in the Tank and Combat Vehicle Section of the Ordnance Division of the War Department of the son-in-law (Mr. Reuel E. Warriner) of Mr. R. C. Stanley, president of the International Nickel Co., who is a member of the board of directors of the United States Steel Corporation.

There is a case where small business may see the whites of their eyes.

But is this a rare accident of circumstances; is it a coincidence? Let us turn to the field of tire manufacture. As chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on the use of cotton fabric in tires, I, too, have run afoul of such strangely accidental circumstances.

I am sure that many Senators know of the effort to influence the Army Ordnance Division to require the use of rayon fabric in the production of all synthetic rubber tires, and to give rayon preference in the manufacture of natural rubber tires, also to the exclusion of cotton.

Unlike cotton, rayon has to be treated with a solution of latex before rubber will adhere to it, and practically all the machinery for this treatment is in the hands of the Big Four tire companies, so that only these companies were and are able to make any substantial quantity of tires in which rayon is specified.

For months the subcommittee has been insisting on fair competitive tests for cotton fabric. Long before the conclusion of these tests, which are still in progress, and I suppose foreshadowing the inevitable end, W. P. B. authorized another increase in the high tenacity rayon capacity of 50,000,000 pounds annually. More than 8,000,000 pounds of critical materials, such as steel, copper, and aluminum, are being used in the rayon-expansion program, all at Government expense. Substantially all this program is concentrated in the hands of the two largest rayon companies. Obviously the rayon program is placing the small tire companies at a very distinct additional disadvantage.

The subcommittee has not as yet had officially submitted to it a copy of the report of the Automotive Engineers Ordnance Advisory Committee, under whose supervision the tests of rayon and cotton fabric tires have been made. However, I have been advised that the committee will recommend that all standard size and larger tires made of synthetic compounds for the Army be made of rayon and that the natural rubber tires of these sizes also be made of rayon insofar as the supply of rayon makes this possible.

This recommendation will be made despite the report we have had that, in the test made at El Centro, Calif., which is one of the testing points, the tires making the best record there were synthetic rubber and cotton cord tires manufactured by Armstrong Tire & Rubber

Co., of Natchez, Miss., a small producer, Again, from Normoyle, Tex.—the other point of reported testing—the unofficial advice we have received is that the General Tire Co.'s standard size synthetic rubber tires showed performance as between rayon and cotton cord to be about equal.

If Mr. Jeffers, the Rubber Administrator, follows the rayon recommendation of the committee every small tire manufacturer will be crippled. But that is not half the story. It will throttle a host of cotton farmers of the South, who, also, are small businessmen and the foundation of traditional democracy, for tire fabric constitutes the largest single domestic market for cotton in this country.

Most Senators are familiar with the story of economic subjugation of the South which Eastern corporate industry and big business control has effected through adverse freight rates, a subjugation which has prevented the South from developing industrially, and has forced a part of it, through undernourished years, to rely largely on the single-crop cotton culture in order to exist at all. Now this fraternity of industrial behemoths of the East proposes to do further injury to the South's chief money crop, and reduce its market.

Confronted with this apparent partiality for rayon, in the face of the inevitably serious dislocation to our existing economy, I can find only one explanation to submit.

The members of the aforementioned advisory committee are: Messrs. Elliott and Boyle, Goodrich Rubber Co.; Messrs. Lyon and Darrow, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.; Mr. Pushee, General Tire & Rubber Co.; Messrs. Shivley, McCarty, and Sohl, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.; Messrs. Soulen and Orr, Mansfield Tire & Rubber Co.; Mr. Martin, United States Rubber Co.; Capt. J. J. Robson, United States Army Ordnance, formerly of Firestone.

This list reads like the register of America's corporate rubber rajahs, even including the United States Army's representation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCRUGHAM in the chair). Does the junior Senator from Tennessee yield to his colleague?

Mr. STEWART. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Do all the gentlemen to whom the Senator makes reference work in the rubber agency?

Mr. STEWART. I do not know how much time they devote to such duties as they might have in Washington, but they are members of the advisory committee, who, as I understand, meet at stated times and receive and pass upon the progress reports of the tests.

Mr. McKELLAR. Are they dollar-a-year men?

Mr. STEWART. I am not sure whether this group consists of dollar-a-year men. My colleague will recall that when the first hearing was held there were in attendance a group of Senators from the cotton-producing States, as well as a representative of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. who was a so-called dollar-a-year man. At least, he was loaned by Firestone, probably to the Rubber Administrator, or to some department of the W. P. B. I believe he or someone else stated on that occasion that the persons comprising this committee were not dollar-a-year men but served in an advisory capacity, coming to Washington only at infrequent intervals.

Mr. McKELLAR. Do they belong to the class of employees who receive mileage, hotel expenses, and a per diem of $23 a day while they are working for the Government?

Mr. STEWART. I do not have information on that point. I am sorry I cannot advise the distinguished Senator in that regard.

Mr. McKELLAR. Were any of them appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, as required by the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. STEWART. I believe not. It is my understanding that they are merely sent here to serve in an advisory capacity. As I say, they come only at infrequent intervals. I do not believe they are considered to be employees, or even dollar-a-year men. They advise with the United States Army, with the Rubber Administrator, and with those who are charged with the responsibility of determining whether or not cotton or rayon is better for the construction of tires which the Army will later purchase.

Mr. McKELLAR. A rather interesting situation arose a few days ago in the hearings on one of the bills being considered by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

A very small organization had asked for quite a large sum of travel pay. The representative of that organization was asked by the committee how many men used the travel pay. I believe it finally developed that only one man in the whole bureau was using the fund. The witness was asked, "How could you spend $11,000 travel pay on one man?"

I see the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is a member of the committee and who, I believe, was present at the time, sitting in the Chamber. He can verify my statement or correct me if I am mistaken.

The gentleman who was testifying for this particular bureau very candidly stated that the arrangement was as follows: Whenever the bureau, or any of its members, felt that it was wise to call in experts for consultation, they were called in at Government expense, including whatever travel pay might be necessary going and coming. The Government paid the hotel expenses in Washington, and paid the experts, or consultants, $23 a day, if I correctly recall the sum, for the time they were in Washington and working. It was also stated that some of them worked for only a few days, while others worked as long as 6 months, or possibly even longer.

In other words, under the term "travel pay" a number of consultant employees of the Government were brought here at the expense of the Government. In addition to traveling expenses, the Government paid the experts a per diem and their hotel expenses.

I see the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] rising. I ask him if I am correct in my recollection.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee is absolutely correct. As I understand in some of the departments "travel pay" was used to hire so-called experts as the Senator has stated.

With reference to the amount paid, I believe the Senator is also correct. In one instance we were told that the bureau brought a number of lawyers to Washington. I asked the bureau representative how much the experts had been paid, and I understood that the amount would be furnished later, and we did not receive an answer at the time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I refer to the situaton to show the tendency on the part of the bureaus to conceal the number of employees by paying their salaries and expenses under the term "travel pay."

Last year the Government spent approximately $147,000,000 for travel pay alone. I think such a situation should make Senators pause before we continue an item which is used so promiscuously and as a cover-all for so many different purposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am thoroughly in accord with what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I thank my colleague and the junior Senator from South Carolina for their contributions. I agree with the conclusions announced by my distinguished colleague. I repeat what I have already stated, that I do not have the information as to whether the members of this advisory committee are dollar-a-year men. I know that with reference to the tire tests which are being conducted, one in California and one in Texas—remote sections of the country from Washington—it is quite conceivable that the men may have been paid considerable traveling expenses if they made trips to the scenes of the tests.

It may be said that I have not shown any connection between the rubber rajahs and rayon. Let me recall that the five largest of these companies own approximately 98 percent of the latex-treatment equipment for use in the manufacture of rayon tires, which would afford them a closed monopoly of the output of rayon-fabric tires.

It is obvious that the members of this committee have a special interest in whether rayor or cotton fabric is selected for Army tires—a selfish interest and a common interest which is opposed to the interests of the small tire manufacturer and the great cotton-growing people of the South. The supervision of the tests which mean so much to cotton farmers and little tiremen is handed over—lock, stock, and barrel—to their industrial enemies.

These intimations and disclosures are not merely confined to the experience of the Small Business Committee. Everywhere the official vestment of this bureaucracy is lifted we find the ele-

phantine foot of big business. Recently I received a letter from the officers of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, representing a million farmers of this country—a letter going further in its charges than I am prepared at the moment to go. Senators may be already familiar with it, for my watchful colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee has had the letter placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In brief, this association of farmers charges that the power branch of W. P. B. has twice "misinterpreted" the plain order of the W. P. B. and so continued to prohibit extensions to serve farm families from existing distribution lines, despite an acute need.

In placing responsibility for the obstruction, the association did not mince matters. I quote from the resolution:

> We are today confronted, through the press, with the astounding announcement that Curtis Ernest Calder, of Bronxville, N. Y., who lists his office address as No. 2 Rector Street, which is the office of the Electric Bond & Share Co., as Director General of Operations in the War Production Board, is now to determine the destiny of our country in the application of power to the production of food and to the relief of the shortage of manpower. Mr. Calder is a former secretary, vice president, and president of the Texas Power & Light Co., a subsidiary of Electric Bond & Share. He is now president of the American & Foreign Power Co., and he is a director in one of Mussolini's power companies—the Italian Super Power, Inc.

That, Mr. President, according to the record, is the background and connections of the man who, cloaked under the official title of Director General of Operations, W. P. B., is blocking the way of American farmers, who need electric current with which to operate their farms, already so acutely short of manpower, and to grow needed food for our armed forces and civilian workers.

The Rural Electrification cooperatives having cut the cost of electricity to farm families and so placed a restraint upon the economic license of these corporate giants, we know that those in control of the private corporate utilities are not interested in extending or sustaining the cooperatives.

There is the case of the independent meat packers, with which most Members of the Senate are familiar. As we know, the independent packers claim that the O. P. A. price ceilings, the custom slaughtering regulations, and the quota regulations are unfair to them.

I should like to cite specifically what Mr. Wilbur LaRoe, president of their national association, has to say about quota regulations. Speaking of the tremendous advantage they give to the big packers, he says:

> An advantage so great as to raise a question whether many of the smaller concerns, especially those having no quotas, can continue to exist. The unfairness of the quotas is due to the fact that only physical slaughtering was recognized as a basis for the quotas. Many hundreds of legitimate processors in the meat business were denied quotas merely because of the accidental fact that instead of doing the physical slaughtering themselves they hired agents to do it. Common sense was thrown to the winds by giving these agents the quotas and denying them to the principals. Such perversion of justice cannot be excused by alleged administrative difficulties. An efficient and just administration will overcome difficulties rather than resort to expedients that cause palpable injustice.
>
> The fixing of quotas on the basis of physical slaughtering played right into the hands of the big packers who have ample slaughtering facilities. So well equipped are they for slaughtering that hundreds of processors depended on them for carcasses or other supplies. Suddenly, by administrative fiat, these nonslaughtering processors found themselves without quotas and also without any source of supply because the big packers in many cases refused to supply their old customers. The latter were and now are threatened with ruin.
>
> The Office of Price Administration could have adopted a regulation requiring slaughterers to follow their old channels of supply, but the lame excuse is given that such recognition would have presented administrative difficulties. As a result of this grotesquely unfair administrative policy, the big packers are now in the position where they can use their great slaughtering facilities to their own advantage and, indeed, to take over the customers of the processors they formerly supplied.

That, in brief, is the plight of the small packer. If, Mr. President, you do not think it is producing actual grief and want among them, I will cite the situation in Cincinnati that almost exploded last week, and is still brewing. I am advised through Mr. Robert Brooks, of the Labor Division of O. P. A., that the supply of carcasses to the independents in that neighborhood has fallen so low that they have been forced to cut their work week about in half, or to let out 50 percent of their workers. That condition came to a head Friday when some 4,000 workers decided to call en masse on the United States Employment Office there and demand that, incident to the President's order extending the work week to 48 hours, they be given other jobs so as to be absorbed in an industry in which they could carry out the aim of the Presidential instruction.

By dint of the agitated efforts of local O. P. A. representatives, the employers, and the A. F. of L. leadership of the workers themselves, the public protest parade was called off, so I am told, because of an O. P. A. promise that a ceiling would be placed on live hogs to bring them within reach of the independents there. But obviously that is a stopgap measure and does not strike at the root of the difficulty, as analyzed by Mr. LaRoe. I refer to the O. P. A. quota regulations.

I cannot state now which O. P. A. bureaucrat found a policy of requiring slaughterers to follow their old channels "too difficult" to bother with; but, placing the most charitable interpretation on his motives, I should say that in his reasoning he was recklessly irresponsible toward hundreds of small packers throughout the country, whose welfare concerns the welfare of the national economy as a whole. I cannot say who the bureaucrat was, but his action—to my suspicious mind—smacks of big-business thinking and method; and I, for one, want to know who he was and why he did that destructive thing.

The cases for inquiry multiply. The Senate will recall that our able floor leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] cited on the floor of the Senate last week the case of a director of the Smaller War Plants Corporation who waited and waited to see the "big" men of W. P. B., and finally was told he was not needed, and to go home.

Recently a group of manufacturers representing the Southern work-clothes industry came to my office with a story of price regulation that will put them out of business, and has already done so in some instances. They are caught in a price squeeze that makes continued operation impossible, except at a loss, they told me.

They spoke of a member of their industry, a manufacturing wholesaler—I quote here from a brief they submitted to me—who was—

> competing with those aggrieved by the operation of this order, who has been granted relief by the Office of Price Administration from the roll-back with respect to his prices, resulting in distinct competitive disadvantages to other members of the industry.

They cited the case of the Rice-Stix Co., as reported in the December 5, 1942, Federal Register. I do not know who was responsible for the order, or all the circumstances surrounding it. Those Southern work-clothes manufacturers are soon to have a hearing before the House Small Business Committee, I am told. But I should like to know who was responsible for the order and what were the circumstances. I frankly admit that I am suspicious of the motives of the bureaucrats involved.

I had hoped to have the details of another case to present to the Senate today, but they have not as yet reached me. The case is that of a Nashville constituent of mine, who, when he learned that the whole output of antifreeze manufactured before the war was being taken by the armed forces, had the vision and enterprise to compound a new antifreeze which required no critical materials, and to build a plant—without use of critical materials, either—to supply the civilian need. I might add that he salvaged an old brewery and with great resourcefulness improvised on the use of various fixtures in order to construct the plant without using critical materials demanded for the war program.

He manufactured what he insists is an entirely harmless and efficient antifreeze, and put it on the market at a price somewhat lower than that of Prestone and Zerex, the two formerly prevalent brands made by those giant corporations, Union Carbide & Carbon Corporation and the du Pont Co., respectively. Only last fall his product went on sale. Already, without ever giving it a test, O. P. A. is banning it as harmful. O. P. A. did not forbid its sale in the hands of retailers and distributors, who hold some hundreds of thousands of gallons of it, but forbade its sale only at the source of manufacture, fixing February 15 as the date for the effect of the ban.

That was not enough, it would seem, for it has also arbitrarily cut the price from $2.40 to 75 cents a gallon, without

any rime or reason, or at least any reason it was willing to explain to the producer. It appears to me that it was not satisfied merely to close down his business, but, since he is operating in partnership without limitation of liability, it ordered a retail price which does not even meet his cost of manufacture—with the aim of crushing him financially, so that he will not again be a competitor or potential competitor of the monopolistic oligarchies.

My constituent does not know who dictated that order, nor do I, but for many reasons he is persuaded to believe that it was influenced by one of the corporate oligarchs who dodge in and out, playing hide and seek; and I admit that my suspicion is no less than his.

Perhaps many other Members of the Senate received, as I did, a copy of a letter sent to the President by the American Contractors' War Advisory Committee, who had been told that small business was essential, and who had organized to represent 24 employer associations of the building trades. They aver that they learned the procedure for obtaining war contracts, and told it to the small contractors everywhere. For 7 months they have been busy making contact with the chief awarding officers of the armed services, at whose instance they formed corporate pools of contractors, so as to enable them to handle the contracts. They advised the awarding officers of what they had done. They sought out Lou Holland, of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, who, quoting from the statement, "tried his best" to set up within the Corporation a special unit to help award war contracts to those pools; but "due to some powerful influence, directly opposed to our cause, he has been unable to do anything for us to date."

It is a pity about those little fellows, but they say their case is quite simple: Unlike big business, they just did not have the know-how.

Let me mention another case: In January 1941 the Government, as we know, filed an antitrust suit against General Electric and Westinghouse, the two behemoths of the electric-fixtures industry, and a group of subsidiary and "suffrance" companies. That was in the days when war clouds had darkened over the country, when even the man in the street feared that the rain of steel was imminent, and when the President was seeking, with poor success, to bring the big industries of the Nation into full production in preparation for the inevitable hour.

About the middle of that year—in August, to be exact—the independents of the electric-fixtures industry—the little men of fluorescent lighting, some 3,500 in number—sent their representatives to Washington to offer their services. Let me explain that the only small businessmen or operators in any wise independent in the lighting-fixtures business are, or were, the neon sign men—those who manufactured fluorescent display signs operating by means of what is called the cold cathode method, the only method for which I am told, the twin dynasties of the electric-fixtures empire do not hold the patents.

The little men of the fluorescent-lighting industry, responding to the Office of Production Management query as to what they could do to aid in war preparation, said that the sign industry was generally equipped to engage in light metal working and in some types of electrical work, but that it also had facilities for producing and installing lighting in plants engaged in war work. The O. P. M. said that was fine, and that such a conversion would be a very intelligent and practical thing for the sign industry to do. The sign men then asked for enough copper—not very much—to enable them to bring about the switch-over from making fluorescent signs to making fluorescent fixtures for indoor illumination. The O. P. M. demurred, but finally told the committee who had come to Washington that if they would go back and instruct the members of their industry to file separate applications accompanied with affidavits saying that they wanted to convert to the production of fluorescent-lighting equipment, they would be allowed the amount of copper—from 60 to 90 tons—which they sought. The little men sent in their applications and affidavits and waited.

In the meantime the executive branch of the Government had made peace with the big, bad boys of the lighting industry and postponed the suit against them.

We are told, according to the Government's averment in that suit and in another filed later, that the General Electric Co. and the Westinghouse Co., with their "suffrance" companies, have a monopoly on the incandescent-lighting field and on the indoor fluorescent-lighting field. Fluorescent lights for indoor illumination utilize what is called the hot-cathode method. It is the Government's further averment that fluorescent lights are much more efficient and use much less electricity than the old incandescent lamps use, but that because of a reputed agreement with certain electric-power utility corporations who did not want to have the fluorescent lights—using less current—come into general use, General Electric and Westinghouse had never pushed it on the market. The bill filed further avers that General Electric and Westinghouse had been willing to confine themselves to use of the hot cathode or indoor fluorescent lamp because they held the patents on it and because it was more profitable to manufacture. But they had warned—and were able to enforce their warning—the little men in the fluorescent-lighting industry that they must confine themselves to the making of signs—must stay "outdoors," to use the trade term.

As the Senate knows, after the war came, W. P. B. succeeded O. P. M., many bureaus sprang up—among them the lighting branch of the Industry Operations Division—and bureaucrats elbowed in. But not one of them was from the neon-sign industry. That little group continued to get the "brush-off."

Then in March of 1942 came a W. P. B. order requiring sign men to cut their sign production at first 50 percent and after July to cease production altogether. This prohibited them from continuing as sign men. They, of course, had been vainly seeking to convert to indoor illumination all this time. But in May there followed another order, denying materials to all fluorescent lighting manufacturers except those producing for essential uses. This order denied the sign men the means of joining in the war program or to survive at all and they were thus denied without consultation or warning and without any avenue of effectual appeal.

The point of this story is that 2,500 of these small businesses "died" waiting for the "sympathetic consideration" assured them in August 1941, 2,500 of the 3,500, employing between 65,000 and 70,000 skilled men. That is the story in the 15 pages of a brief prepared for me by Mr. Chalmers Hamill, Chief of the Small Business Section of the Department of Justice; and he specifies the orders and the acts.

Speaking of the sign men's appeals from the May order which denied them materials with which to make indoor fluorescent lamps, Mr. Hamill says:

> It is a fair statement to say that decision upon almost every appeal that was filed was unreasonably delayed, and that the eventual decision, if any was rendered, was almost invariably adverse to the appellant.

Finally, as the brief sets forth, the remnants of the sign businesses, under the leadership of the president of their association, Mr. Victor H. Todd, got to Lou Holland, of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. This was last August. He instructed the appropriate branch of W. P. B. to see to it that the necessary materials were allocated to four manufacturers of cold cathode transformers, as proposed by the sign men. These four manufacturers were to make 2,000 of these transformers to be held for the demand of cold cathode, or former sign men, for use in war orders under the terms of the May edict.

The branch heads of W. P. B. gave Mr. Holland lip service, but, according to this brief, their action continued to be delay and obstruction, with the result that only a few of the 2,000 transformers authorized in August had been delivered as of the 1st of this month.

Mr. Hamill cites as the high point of this bureaucratic obstruction an order, a copy of which he attaches to his brief. It was, he says, first issued in May as a secret and confidential order; it was not signed by any responsible person, agency, or department; it was not promulgated as an official order or distributed to a single person in the cold cathode industry, and it was never even mentioned in the meetings of the Industry Advisory Committee for the fluorescent lighting industry until in November. The effect of this order was to eliminate the fluorescent lighting industry by requiring practically all installations to be incandescent for the duration, and this in the face of the fact that incandescent lamps cost far more in critical materials and in current consumed.

So the small outdoor-lighting men have remained "outdoors" in a very ironical sense, while sinisterly within the portals of their Government sit a former president of the twice-accused corpora-

tion, General Electric, at the right hand of Donald Nelson, himself; a former vice president of that company, at the head of the Industry Operations Division of W. P. B.; also a man from the Corning Glass Co., another of the big companies named in the Government suits; another man formerly of General Electric and Central Hudson Gas and Electric Co., who is, or was, chief of the lighting fixtures division—and a host of lesser men of the big electric fixtures corporations whom I know not.

There is much outcry against the economist, the theorist in the Government, and I am certainly not here to defend him; but I am less disturbed by theorists and economists than I am by some gentlemen who know far more what they are about, and I am talking about the representatives of big business, the men of the monopolistic corporations who infest, I suspect, every emergency agency of this Government.

Yes; big business has the know-how—the know-how to throttle everybody and everything that stands in its way, and I do not exempt the national interests of this country or the success of our arms in this war.

Perhaps I am jumping to a conclusion on insufficient evidence or on mere suspicion; that is possible, and that is the reason for my appeal here today; that is why I have presumed to impose on the patience of the Senate with this long review of occurences, some of which must be familiar to every Member of the body.

I do not know who are responsible for all these destructive and obstructive acts, but I want to know and I think the Members of the Senate and the Congress and the people of this country should know. So I am urging the Small Business Committee to ask the authority of this body to require from every emergency agency of this whole bureaucracy a report of the age, education, and business or professional affiliations and background in full during the 5-year period preceding their employment by the Government of every employee drawing $4,500 annual salary, or greater, and of every dollar-a-year man connected with the Government in any way whatsoever, and all who have been so connected during this emergency.

I will propose to the committee that they designate a case-work subcommittee to probe into the reports of specific instances prejudicial and destructive to small business and its participation in the war program and the instances where such prejudice amounts to an obstruction to the war effort. I am proposing that this case-work committee determine the specific acts, edicts, and policies that cause, or reflect this destruction and obstruction, and uncover the specific bureaucrats responsible for them, either by action or influence. I will offer my services to act on such a subcommittee.

Even that, however, will not go far enough to uproot the predatory, the irresponsible, and the obstructive in the Federal bureaucracy. We who have watched know that their bigness has made them overbearing and contemptuously bold. It will take action to prove what the will and intention of the Congress and the people are. I suggest that it might be a good idea for the Senate to establish some sort of a policy of public censure.

I think it is up to us to defend that champion of small business, the President, against the wolves within his gates that gnaw at his heels while he is engaged with the enemy without.

Mr. President, returning to that alarming summary of small business' share in wartime production, let me make another proposal. I had heard that the total prime war contracts obtained for small business through the Smaller War Plants Corporation was the pitiful share of $200,000,000. Here on the floor last week the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] stated that the share was somewhat higher, namely, $846,000,000. Last December, General Somervell testified before the Small Business Committee that small business' share totaled 20 percent of all War Department contracts, or $4,000,000,000 worth. Last week a statistician at the Smaller War Plants Corporation told me that the corporation did not accept the figures given by General Somervell, but he was indefinite, indeed, by implication, he admitted that they did not know how much in war contracts had gone to small business.

I propose that the Smaller War Plants Corporation be empowered and instructed to determine, through first-hand, or documentary information, the number, amount, and distribution of prime and subcontracts that have gone to small business. We do not want statistical sleight-of-hand; we want the facts. Let us get at the bottom of this matter. Moreover, I have been unable to obtain any accurate figures as to just what war contracts have been let for this and the next fiscal years. W. P. B. and O. W. I. have advised me that over-all totals do not exist, and it would require some time to compile them. But I have drawn some deductions from over-all figures submitted by the President in his budget message and from the Budget Director's letter to the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, of the House of Representatives, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5.

Of the $170,000,000,000 yet unspent, two-thirds have been obligated or committed for expenditure during this and the next fiscal year. Of this total we may eliminate from our consideration 17.2 billion dollars for the R. F. C. and other Government corporations, and another $36,000,000,000 for military and civilian pay, subsistence and travel, although there is much in that category of contractual interest to small business. This leaves 120.3 billion dollars, of which the two-thirds obligated or committed represent 80.2 billion dollars.

Those obligations and commitments, if the budget message break-down is a yardstick, are divided between the fiscal year 1943 and the fiscal year 1944 in roughly a 7 to 10 ratio. That would mean there are approximately $32,000,000,000 contracted for 1943 deliveries and approximately $48,000,000,000 contracted for 1944 deliveries.

The Corporation's new head, the affable Colonel Johnson, has recently talked pretty stoutly for the press about the share of contracts he was going to get for small business—twenty-five to thirty billion dollars' worth, he was quoted as saying. This is as it should be. It is acutely needed. But he did not say where he was going to get any such amount.

If the commitments against existing appropriations are allowed to stand, it seems obvious to me that he has little chance of getting any such share for small business during 1943 or 1944. If we wait till after 1944 to start cutting small companies in, it will most certainly be too late to pump money into many small businesses which are being strangled, but which even now might be usefully serving the war program. The breaking point is here, and the time to aid small business has arrived. It cannot survive on promises and future hopes. We have already been told of instances of concerns which have contracts which they cannot perform.

I suggest that the Small Business Committee be authorized to bring before it the procurement heads and contract makers and commitment devisers of all the Government agencies interested in this $80,000,000,000, for a reexamination of these contracts, their amounts and dates of delivery, showing all particulars, all looking toward a renegotiation of all or part of that titanic chunk of $48,000,000,000 worth of contracts and like instruments slated for the maw of the big business behemoths for the fiscal year 1944. I suggest, incident to reexamination and possible renegotiation, that all contracts for 1944 deliveries on which work has not actually begun, be suspended as of this date except where the President, in his discretion, deems that a contract suspension would be harmful to the prosecution of the war.

If this seems drastic action, I repeat, the situation demands drastic action. It would be ironical and absurd if, engaged as we are in a mortal struggle to preserve our way of life, we should now choke to death that which we seek to save, and, apparently, too pressed by need, too entangled by fell circumstance, to perceive fully the movement of our hands.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Navy; and

Capt. Laurance N. McNair, United States Navy, retired, to be a rear admiral in the Navy on the retired list for temporary service, while serving as chief of United States Naval Mission to Peru, to rank from the 11th day of February 1943.

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

William M. Leiserson, of Ohio, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1946; and

Harry H. Schwartz, of Wyoming, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the remainder of the term expiring February 1, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Col. Clay Anderson, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Coast and Geodetic Survey nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified of all confirmations of today.

INCREASE IN SIZE OF THE ARMY—ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider a bill in which the Army is very much interested. It is a bill merely to raise the ceiling upon the number of men in the armed forces who may be sent to educational institutions, inductees who are in uniform and who have had the usual 13 weeks of basic training. The bill provides for removing the existing 2-percent limitation so that the Army may be permitted to put more men into the colleges and universities.

I am just informed that there is an agreement with the leader on the other side to the effect that we are not to take up any bills today, but it would be perfectly agreeable to me if the representative of the minority would permit this matter to be considered, and if the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] shall later indicate any objection, I shall be glad to withdraw the request.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as the Senator from North Carolina knows, the Senator from Oregon is unavoidably absent, due to illness. He asked the Senator from Kentucky, and I think he indicated his desire to others, that there should not be a call of the calendar today. I do not know whether the objection of the Senator was to the call of the calendar, and to all the bills on the calendar, or to some particular bill. I do not know whether it is this particular bill which the Senator from Oregon did not want considered today. I have a feeling that no national calamity will ensue if this bill is not acted upon this afternoon, and I think that, out of deference to the desire of the Senator from Oregon, the measure should go over.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall not insist upon my request. I think we can have the bill considered on Thursday, and the minority leader is always so accommodating about such requests that if there was even a suspicion of acting contrary to his desires I should not want to place myself in the position of suggesting action at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's attitude. The Senator from Oregon sent word to me that, because of his illness today, he would not like to have the calendar called. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was interested in a bill which was passed with the understanding that the Senator from Oregon, when the Senate meets again, could ask for reconsideration. That means, of course, that it will go over until Thursday anyway. So that no harm could come in allowing the bill in which the Senator is interested to go over originally. I appreciate the position taken by the Senator from North Carolina in the matter.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The arrangement suggested is entirely agreeable to me.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. If there is no further business, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 25, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 22, 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Frederick Foote, from the State of Minnesota, to be program control technician, at $4,600 per annum, in the Minneapolis regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

James K. Johnson, from the State of Ohio, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Cleveland regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Grafton L. Brown, from the State of Maryland, to be field supervisor at $4,600 per annum in the Washington regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

George A. Selke, from the State of Minnesota, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Minneapolis regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Calvin T. Durgin, February 7, 1943.
John D. Price, February 10, 1943.
Andrew C. McFall, February 13, 1943.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Arthur J. Barrett, a citizen of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of May 1942.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of August 1942:

Hudson E. Bridge, a citizen of Missouri.
William J. Dickinson, a citizen of Virginia.
Howard E. Wertman, a citizen of Ohio.
Joseph E. DeSoucey, a citizen of New York.

Marshall Smith, a citizen of Alabama, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1942.

The following-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of December 1942:

Platoon Sgt. William H. McDaniel
Staff Sgt. Herbert F. Breeden
Platoon Sgt. Robert M. Ervin

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of December 1942:

Thomas M. Kerr, Jr., a citizen of New Jersey.
James C. Norris, Jr., a citizen of Tennessee.
Ross T. Dwyer, Jr., a citizen of California.
Harrison B. Rue, a citizen of Tennessee.
Samuel A. Hannah, a citizen of Alabama.
Hurley E. Fuller, Jr., a citizen of Texas.
James F. McInteer, Jr., a citizen of Virginia.
Samuel Jaskilka, a citizen of Connecticut.
John A. Lindsay, a citizen of Massachusetts.
Charles G. Haskins, a citizen of Illinois.
Robert W. Powers, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Ronald W. Davis, a citizen of Washington.
Rex E. Walker, a citizen of Oklahoma.
Frank H. Haigler, Jr., a citizen of California.

The following-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of December 1942:

Platoon Sgt. George E. Kittredge, Jr.
Platoon Sgt. Josiah W. Bill

The following-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of December 1942:

Sgt. David R. Miller
Sgt. "A" "G" Savell
Sgt. John J. Aubuchon

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of December 1942:

Gordon A. Stallings, a citizen of Florida.
Tom S. Parker, a citizen of California.
Maurice E. Flynn, a citizen of Massachusetts.
Paul L. Allen, a citizen of New York.
Robert D. Metzger, a citizen of Ohio.

The following-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of December 1942:

Platoon Sgt. Ernest C. Bennett

Platoon Sgt. Eugene H. Haffey
Platoon Sgt. James H. Pope

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of January 1943:

Don W. Galbreaith, a citizen of Idaho.
Theodore A. McKay, a citizen of Washington.
William T. Westmoreland, Jr., a citizen of Texas.
Mitchell O. Sadler, a citizen of Texas.
Raymond J. Fening, a citizen of Ohio.
Charles A. Chapin, a citizen of Illinois.
Laurence L. Scott, a citizen of California.
Charles L. McNeil, a citizen of Tennessee.
William R. West, a citizen of Mississippi.
Ephraim Kirby-Smith, a citizen of Tennessee.

The following-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 13th day of January 1943:

Platoon Sgt. Lee F. Bennett
Platoon Sgt. Thomas Parran, Jr.

---

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 22, 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

James Vernon Doucet to be program control technician at $4,600 per annum, Denver regional office.

Leroy Allison West to be area director at $4,600 per annum, Denver area office.

Julius Cohen to be principal attorney at $5,600 per annum, Office of the General Counsel.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Clay Anderson to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Alvin C. Thorson
Joe C. Partington

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEER WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Glenn W. Moore

TO BE AN AIDE WITH RANK OF ENSIGN

Emerson E. Jones

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the maker of all things and the lover of all men, grant that Thine approval may be more to us than the plaudits of this world, giving our fellow citizens potent examples of honest living, faith, and virtue. In loss and in panic, Thou hast led us as a people; do Thou quiet the pulse of doubt and distempered fears. Today let us lift our thoughts to the resounding hills and be revitalized by the spirit of him who was first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.

We pray that we may be prophets of a new day, inspired by him whose very soul recognized the sacredness of human freedom so much that he dedicated his life, his wealth, his kin, and his all at the altar of the lagging Colonies. Almighty God, as these moments are grave, oh may school and church, labor and management, catch the spirit of our immortal Virginia patriot and feel the highest honor to consecrate themselves at the shrine of our democracy. Oh, may our blessed land heed the word from the Book of Life:

*Be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might. Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil; for we wrestle against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God that ye may be able to stand in the evil day and having done all, to stand.*

Through Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 19, 1943, was read and approved.

THE NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial published in the Washington Evening Star, of Friday, February 19, in relation to the elimination of the House provision to finance the work of the National Resources Planning Board.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had not intended to recognize any Member to proceed for 1 minute, today, but the Chair has had so many requests that the Chair is going to recognize Members to proceed for 1 minute. Without objection, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK] may proceed for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

[Mr. FITZPATRICK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE INTRACOASTAL CANAL SYSTEM

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a couple of very short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. GREEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief radio address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a set of resolutions commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SEPARATE COMMITTEE ON AVIATION

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House have asked me if I knew how people in the aviation industry felt about the necessity of creating a standing committee in the House to consider legislation relating to civil aviation.

On February 18, I wrote Mr. E. E. Wilson, president of United Aircraft Corporation, asking him if he would express his views regarding the setting up of this proposed committee. Mr. Wilson speaks for 4 of the most important units in the industry, employing more than 50,000 employees.

I can think of no other individual whose opinion should carry more weight with Members of the House who have not as yet made up their minds on this subject.

A telegram from Mr. Wilson follows:

EAST HARTFORD, CONN., *February 22, 1943.*
Congressman WILLIAM J. MILLER:

Replying your letter February 18 and speaking for Pratt & Whitney, Hamilton, Chance Vought, and Sikorsky, we favor establishment House Aviation Committee. We believe report of Morrow board called to investigate Mitchell charges is magna carta American aviations. Morrow board concluded a strong air force to be a necessity for national security and that private industry must be backbone of such force. Following this report and congressional action looking to steady development Army, Navy, and commercial aviation made progress. We believe each of these three services should develop freely in accordance with its own requirements with each, utilizing the work of the other to promote general progress. Air transport has now taken on such global significance, we believe separate committee of Congress essential to its proper development. In addition, it now seems probable private flying will develop rapidly after hostilities, utilizing new vehicles such as Sikorsky helicopter. With this development, aviation will come of age. We believe committee essential to progress development of aviation and very much in the public interest.

UNITED AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,
By E. E. WILSON, *President.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a brief radio address on the subject of reciprocal trade agreements.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a brief address I made recently.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Military Affairs may be permitted to file a supplemental report on the bill (H. R. 1730) to amend paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Dallas Times Herald.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the San Francisco Examiner.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting an article entitled "The Recollections of Washington—Memoir of the Mother," which was in the Encyclopedia, a weekly paper published at Yorkville, S. C., on Saturday, July 1, 1826. I felt that my colleagues would be interested in this account of the President and his mother.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from Lamborn & Co., the sugar experts of this country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a concurrent resolution introduced in the Senate of the State of Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article which I have written on Abraham Lincoln, entitled "He Grows Greater With the Ages," which appeared in the February number of the National Republic.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from Belvoir Castle, the official newspaper of Fort Belvoir, of Virginia. This article was written by Corp. Joseph Neatrour, of Johnstown, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article dealing with the elimination of bottlenecks. This article deals with labor racketeering and is entitled "Feather Beds," and is taken from a recent newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article from the Evening Star of February 19, entitled "On the Record."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Indianapolis Times and a letter from Mr. Wayne Coy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of February 21, 1943, stated that one of our colleagues on the other end of the Capitol in an address made in Philadelphia the night before made the following statement:

> The general feeling is that the military has always asked for too much. I think the record will support this feeling.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Army Appropriations for the last 6 years, I know that the Army before Pearl Harbor never did ask for enough. Of course they did not get all that they asked for of the Bureau of the Budget in those years, but I am proud to say that my committee in many war items gave them more than the Bureau of the Budget set up in the estimates.

Mr. Speaker, I am still convinced that Gen. George C. Marshall and the able corps of officers he has under him throughout the States and the world are in position to know what the Army needs and why they need it, much better than any civilian or group of civilians.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. BOLTON addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include in connection therewith the editorial Starving a War Industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I obtained permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article entitled "In Time of War Prepare for Peace." I had an estimate from the Public Printer, but because the exact amount did not show in the RECORD it has not been printed. The amount is $120, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the article included notwithstanding the estimate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I have two other unanimous-consent requests: I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include letters explaining the mining industry of the State of Idaho, in two separate instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Montana State Board of Public Welfare.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own re-

marks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial, and also to extend my own remarks and include therein an order of the Civil Service Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, 18 years ago today, I believe it was, for some mysterious reason the House, probably for the first time, omitted reading Washington's Farewell Address on the birthday of the Father of our Country. I served notice then that as long as I was in Congress it would never be omitted again, if I could prevent it. I have carried out that promise.

Today the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] has very kindly agreed to read that address to the House. In order that Members may have a chance to hear this great message to the American people from the greatest of all Americans, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 15]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Feighan | McLean |
| Arends | Fellows | McWilliams |
| Baldwin, Md. | Fenton | Maas |
| Baldwin, N. Y. | Fernandez | Magnuson |
| Barden | Fish | Marcantonio |
| Barry | Ford | Martin, Iowa |
| Beall | Furlong | Merritt |
| Bender | Gallagher | Merrow |
| Blackney | Gamble | Miller, Mo. |
| Bloom | Gavagan | Miller, Pa. |
| Boren | Gerlach | Morrison, La. |
| Bradley, Mich. | Gibson | Murphy |
| Bradley, Pa. | Gilchrist | Murray, Tenn. |
| Buckley | Gillette | Myers |
| Burchill, N. Y. | Gordon | Nichols |
| Burgin | Gorski | Norton |
| Busbey | Grant, Ind. | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Byrne | Griffiths | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Cannon, Fla. | Gwynne | O'Connor |
| Capozzoli | Hall, | O'Leary |
| Carson, Ohio | Leonard W. | O'Toole |
| Celler | Heffernan | Pfeifer |
| Clark | Hobbs | Philbin |
| Cochran | Hoch | Phillips |
| Cox | Hoeven | Ramey |
| Crawford | Hoffman | Reed, Ill. |
| Crosser | Holifield | Rowan |
| Culkin | Hope | Sadowski |
| Cullen | Jensen | Sasscer |
| Cunningham | Keefe | Satterfield |
| D'Alesandro | Kelley | Scanlon |
| Dawson | Kennedy | Schuetz |
| Delaney | Keogh | Scott |
| Dewey | Kerr | Shafer |
| Dickstein | Kilday | Sheridan |
| Dingell | King | Smith, Maine |
| Ditter | Klein | Smith, Ohio |
| Doughton | Kunkel | Smith, W. Va. |
| Drewry | LaFollette | Smith, Wis. |
| Durham | Landis | Somers, N. Y. |
| Eberharter | Lane | Stearns, N. H. |
| Ellison, Md. | Lewis, Colo. | Sumners, Tex. |
| Engel | Lynch | Sundstrom |
| Englebright | McGranery | Taber |
| Fay | McGregor | Treadway |
| Troutman | Wene | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Voorhis, Calif. | West | Woodrum, Va. |
| Ward | Wigglesworth | Wright |
| Weichel, Ohio | Winter | |
| Weiss | Wolcott | |

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and eighty-seven Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] will read Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Speaker, Washington's Farewell Address:

*To the people of the United States:*

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me

all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until

changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? and let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religion principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to

repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maximum no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect,

or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverence and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
*19th September, 1796.*

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, while it is true, as we have observed from understanding the reading of his speech, that George Washington warned us against and emphasized the danger inherent in entangling foreign alliances as such, it is not usually observed that in this same speech he said—and I desire to emphasize his statement:

> We may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

This statement has too long gone unemphasized—and he goes on to say:

> Harmony and aliberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest.

The farseeing vision and unexcelled wisdom of the Father of our Country should not be constricted nor limited by the bounds some short-sighted people these days undertake to emphasize and to impose.

The counsel and advice in this immortal address is as apropos and as applicable today as of the day and date of its delivery, if it be read and heard understandingly as a whole, as it should be.

Too many people who have ears to hear do not listen, while many of those who have eyes read with one eye shut today.

St. Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, said:

> Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning.

We should take notice and govern ourselves accordingly.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HARE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by the secretary of the South Dakota Citizens for Victory, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on wildlife conservation and to include therein a letter from the author of a poem that was quoted by the gentleman from Virginia, chairman of the Select Committee on Wildlife Conservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the president of the Farmers' Union of the State of Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very timely statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD, with comments on the address just heard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in all the years that we have celebrated Washington's Birthday and listened to the sound advice given to the American people for their guidance in the conduct of their Government—never have we stood in greater need for the good advice given us in his Farewell Address and I particularly commend for the consideration of my colleagues and the people of this country the following passages from his address, so ably presented to the Members of the House today by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]:

> As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible: Avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burthen which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your Representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To

facilitate to them the performance of their duty.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government.

Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Hon. Harry Slattery, Rural Electrification Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. O'TOOLE, for 4 days, on account of illness.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 23, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a hearing of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, February 23, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., for the consideration of postal employees' salary bills.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

193. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey of the Muskingum watershed in Ohio; to the Committee on Flood Control.

194. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting an additional report of the committee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

195. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a communication requesting that no funds be appropriated for the United States Courts for China for the fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 114); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

196. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

197. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

198. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting photostatic copies of contracts entered into between the United States Treasury and the Defense Plant Corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

199. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, of the Exchange Stabilization Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

200. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the cost ascertainment report and appendix for the fiscal year 1942; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

201. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

202. A letter from the Secretary, Territory of Hawaii, transmitting a copy of the Journal of the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, special session of 1941; to the Committee on the Territories.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of Committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Supplemental report to part II to accompany H. R. 1730. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1691. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1908) for the relief of Joseph Lee Hauser, and the same was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 1935. A bill to prescribe the base period to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in determining and publishing parity price for oranges and comparable price for grapefruit; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 1936. A bill to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 1937. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey of Alsea Bay, Oreg., with a view to constructing a harbor of refuge; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 1938. A bill to establish the grade of admiral of the fleet of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 1939. A bill establishing Pacific standard time for that part of the State of Idaho now on mountain time, for the period during which daylight saving time is in effect; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 1940. A bill prescribing the salary for the Commissioner of Public Roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 1941. A bill permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. J. Res. 83. Joint Resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

H. Res. 129. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1691, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the cost of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Crawford resolution relative to having Congress annul eight laws of the Legislature of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to House Concurrent Memorial No. 1, adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the increase of strategic metals, particularly zinc; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Gillette bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Assembly Joint Resolutions Nos. 14, 22, 23, 24, and 26 of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to stating House Committee on Aviation; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to agricultural conditions; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to relieving dairymen and dairy farming in New Mexico; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to continue the national program of providing hot lunches for school children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States

to establish a defense or other plant in or around Great Falls for the recovery and protection of sponge iron; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to delay action on House bill 1012 and Senate bill 246 until the present war is over and peace is established; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider the bill relative to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to encourage the production and proper consumption of agricultural products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1942. A bill for the relief of Henry B. Tucker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 1943. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Alascn H. and Cecile M. Franking; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 1944. A bill granting a pension to Mollie Sigmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 1945. A bill for the relief of J. P. Kerr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1946. A bill for the relief of John Adams Webster; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

158. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of the Oregon Chapter of the American Institute of Architects; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

159. By Mr. BARRETT: Memorial of the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and act upon proposed Federal legislation related to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

160. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of H. O. Wilson, secretary, No. 813 N. F. P. O. C., Creston, Iowa, and signed himself and 16 others, urging adoption of legislation to increase salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

161. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Memorial of the Nevada Legislature on the pay-as-you-go income-tax plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

162. By Mr. MOTT: Senate Joint Memorial No. 2 of the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein, memorializing and requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation equalizing the burden of the Federal income tax between citizens of the United States who are residents of States having community property systems and those having common law systems of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

163. By Mr. TALBOT: Senate joint resolution of the Assembly of the State of Connecticut, memorializing Congress concerning the pay-as-you-go tax plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

164. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of Roy Rose Post, No. 253, the American Legion, Big Lake, Tex., endorsing resolution adopted by the American Legion national convention, urging that voluntary enlistments be continued in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

165. By Mr. WHITE: Memorial of the Idaho State Legislature, urging Congress to broaden and liberalize the administration of the duties of the Federal joint dehydration committee of the Agricultural Marketing Administration so as to permit the establishment and development of dehydration plants and facilities to increase the production of dehydrated potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

166. Also, memorial of the Idaho State Legislature, urging Congress to take such action as is necessary to correct present inequities in Federal statutes pertaining to the hospitalization of war veterans so that a veteran of World War No. 2 discharged on or after December 7, 1941, be considered "a veteran of a war" and entitled to hospitalization for treatment as indicated or care of any disease or injury regardless of the nature of origin when such treatment is required; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

167. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Regular Veterans Association, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amending section 701 of title 3 of the Nationality Code; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

168. By Mr. ANGELL: Senate Joint Memorial No. 2 of the Oregon State Legislature; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

169. By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Senate Joint Memorial No. 3 of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing Congress and its Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and the House Committee on the Public Lands of the urgent need for grazing privileges among the small livestockmen in certain counties in New Mexico; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

170. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 9 of the Sixteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico, setting forth the policy of the State of New Mexico regarding the respective rights and powers of the Federal and State Governments to control and administer the uses of the waters within the State of New Mexico, and establishing a policy to promote joint action by the States and the United States in the efficient use of water and the control of flood waters to the end that litigation be avoided and the use and control of water be continued in the manner and under the laws as heretofore exercised; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

171. Also, House Joint Resolution No. 20 of the Sixteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico, petitioning the Congress of the United States to authorize and require the proper authorities to adopt a more liberal policy toward white settlers using Government lands under permits, to permit an increase of livestock on the national forests, and to open soil conservation districts for grazing additional stock during the war emergency; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

172. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 6 of the Sixteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing Congress, its Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and the House Committee on the Public Lands, of the urgent need for extending opportunities for the production of food for national emergency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

173. Also, House joint memorial of the Sixteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture for an appropriation to combat grasshoppers and other insect plagues; to the Committee on Agriculture.

174. Also, House Joint Resolution No. 18 of the Sixteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relating to the ceiling prices on livestock and farm products; to the Committee on Labor.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in a changing world we pray in the name of a changeless Christ and rejoice that faith hath still its Olivet and love its Calvary. Grant that we may be delivered from indifference, lest the spiritual chords cease to vibrate and the appeal of the soul becomes dead. Forbid that we should approach the throne of grace with our own achievements or things of personal gain. We would seek Thy presence as the pathway of eternal righteousness and truth.

We pray that we may keep in memory the tears over Jerusalem, the wounded that grieved Thee at Bethany, and realize in our breasts that sympathy which came from the rent in our Saviour's heart. As we walk through the green pastures of our fair America, let us have a deep sense of the groanings by which they were wrought. Thou hast caused in the inner darkness of suffering souls the sweetest music; as gold in the furnace, we are being tried; oh, help us to be worthy of all Thou hast done and taught. Bestow upon us the breath of the higher life, blessing us with the utmost things revealed in our sacrificial Lord. For newness of courage, of understanding, and for all the fruits of the spirit we pray now and ever, in the name of our Saviour and Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 707. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 158) entitled "An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of

domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Executive Office of the President (Board of Economic Warfare).
5. Federal Security Agency.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very able address last night by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker before the Legislature of the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION INVITING CAPT. EDDIE RICKENBACKER TO ADDRESS CONGRESS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of our greatest living Americans is Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker.

He is one of the greatest heroes of all time.

His life's story will be a thrilling inspiration to the children of coming generations.

His address to the New York Legislature last night was one of the greatest patriotic appeals ever made. I am inserting it in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

I am introducing a resolution inviting him to address the Members of Congress, the Members of both the House and the Senate.

To me it is inconceivable that one of our greatest living heroes of two wars should go through what Eddie Rickenbacker has gone through, come back alive, and be invited everywhere else to address legislative as well as civic bodies, and not be invited to address the Members of Congress.

I am sending my resolution to the Clerk's desk to be read. After that I shall ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not care to recognize the gentleman at this time for the consideration of the resolution. It would have to be referred to the Committee on Rules in any event.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I ask the other Members of the House to appeal to the Committee on Rules to bring this resolution out tomorrow, so that we may invite this dynamic hero to address the Congress of the United States.

The resolution reads as follows:

*Resolved*, That Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker be, and he is hereby, invited to address the Members of Congress, including Members of both the House and the Senate, in the Hall of the House of Representatives, at his earliest convenience; and that the Speaker appoint a committee of three Members to communicate with Captain Rickenbacker and to make such arrangements as may be necessary for his reception.

MOHANDAS GANDHI

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Mohandas Gandhi has millions of followers in India who regard him not as a human being but as a hallowed saint who can do no wrong. His well-advertised death in prison would be a powerful weapon our enemies would use unscrupulously. Neither we nor our allies can afford to waste lives and resources quelling revolts now.

I, therefore, hereby beg on bended knees that Gandhi be released before he dies. To save the dignity of those who need dignity I urge that it be done as a gracious concession to soft-hearted Americans like me, of whom, I think, there are plenty. Our shoulders are broad, and we do not mind stooping to conquer.

FARM FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CARLSON of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two letters on the subject of postal employees' wages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Retirement Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution received from Hon. Charles W. Lyon, speaker of the Assembly of the Legislature of the State of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

VOLUNTARY FARM WAR CORPS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and include as a part of my remarks a bill that I am introducing for the establishment of a voluntary farm war corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therewith the provisions of a bill for the incorporation of labor organizations, which I introduced in Congress on February 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial by Edwin Wilson, editor of the Brooklyn Eagle, which appeared in that newspaper on February 22, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FOOD RATIONING

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday virtually every Washington paper carried a rather detailed account of the so-called point-rationing system and carried a photostatic copy of the consumer declaration that every consumer must make on coffee and canned goods.

In the lower left-hand corner of this official form appeared a little box that contained this notice:

NOTICE

Section 35 (A) of the United States Criminal Code makes it a criminal offense, punishable by a maximum of 10 years' imprisonment, $10,000 fine, or both, to make a false statement or representation as to any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States.

If any Member of this House, any lawyer, any citizen, will go to the trouble to examine section 35 (A) of the Criminal Code, he will find that it is predicated upon a willful and knowing misrepresentation. I think it is something of an outrage for the Office of Price Administration, with a Budget-approved form, to hold up to the humble citizens of this country that if they make a mistake in answering the questions on that form there looms before them a fine up to $10,000 or imprisonment for 10 years, or both. It is high time for the Smith committee to get busy on that sort of thing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THREE ARMIES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer on farm production.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GROSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REECE of Tennessee addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a resolution passed by the Wayne Co-Operative Milk Producers, Inc., Fort Wayne, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on two topics, and in one to include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post, and in the other to include an address delivered by Miss Dorothy Comingore, a motion-picture star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain data. The data I seek to include exceeds the quota allowed. I have an estimate from the Government Printer, which is attached, showing that it will cost $202.50.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COFFEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

QUOTAS ON WHEAT

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I thought the Members of the House would be interested to know that the Secretary of Agriculture has this morning signed a release and order removing limitations on the production of wheat during the year 1943.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Are there any strings tied to that order?

Mr. PACE. I am not in a position at the moment to give you the details of the order. I am trying to get it, but the order was released at 10:30 this morning, removing the limitations on the production of wheat.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will say to the gentleman that there is a string tied to the order that requires the farmers to raise 90 percent of the crops dictated by the Secretary.

Mr. PACE. I do not think there is any doubt but what the order will contain a provision that these very vital and essential war crops must be produced. Personally I can find no objection to that provision, when the Nation is in critical need of certain crops, that they should necessarily be produced along with whatever acreage of wheat you desire.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the light of the gentleman's pronouncement, plus the fact there are other actions that should be taken by the Secretary of Agriculture, does the committee propose to bring up H. R. 1605 today?

Mr. PACE. The gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman FULMER, has asked the majority leader to permit the passing over of that bill for the time being, in view of those developments.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different subjects, and in one to include an article by George Q. Lynch, and in the other a broadcast by John B. Hughes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include Senate Joint Memorial No. 8 with reference to establishing facilities for the recovery and production of sponge iron and steel.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in view of the withdrawal of the farm bill I should like to inquire of the majority leader what the program will be for today and tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill amending the Civilian Pilot Training Act will be the order of business today, and thereafter a bill out of the Naval Affairs Committee, H. R. 1692, authorizing the construction of certain shore establishments, will be taken up. That will be the business for today and tomorrow. That will be followed by the Columbia Basin bill.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, for 18 long years the postal employees of this Nation have waited for some recognition by the Congress in the way of an increase of salary. I should like to call to the attention of the House the fact that this morning the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House started hearings on salary increase legislation, and I want to take this opportunity to compliment the chairman of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH] for having inaugurated those hearings. I also wish to urge the friends of postal employees here in the House to appear before our committee to submit, in person or in writing, statements in support of this legislation.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the conclusion of the legislative business for the day, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AVIATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read into the RECORD at this point a telegram I have just received from the air-line pilots in the city of New Orleans in reference to the Nichols resolution:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *February 22, 1943.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

We the undersigned air-line pilots, living in New Orleans, earnestly request that you oppose and vote against the approval and passage of JACK NICHOLS' House Resolution No. 23. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee now handles very satisfactorily and efficiently all legislative matters pertaining to all modes of transportation, including air-line transportation and commercial aviation legislation generally.

Respectfully yours,

B. S. Catlin, Charles Quinn, M. T. Benedict, H. E. Craft, T. S. Bridges, E. F. Bennett, L. D. Anderson, P. R. Johnson, B. R. Deris, R. E. Cain, W. H. Jumonville, John Dugan, J. E. Maynard, C. Devincent, W. Hortson, L. Damron, F. P. Curtis, Marvin Whitman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects and to include in one extension two letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two requests: First, to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the life and services of Joseph J. Sinnott and to include certain remarks I made formerly in the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. The second request is to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the report of the Atlantic States

Marine Fisheries Commission, and to include therein certain excerpts from that report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AVIATION

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I just took note of the telegram that was read by the gentleman from Louisiana which was sent by air-line pilots. I happen to have in my hand a whole group of telegrams from air-line pilots opposing Resolution No. 23. I have read them over. They are so similar that I have no doubt they were inspired by someone.

I am willing to bet anyone that these air-line pilots have no conception of what this bill is; that if you asked them how air-line activities are being handled now they would not know that they were being handled by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I do not mind giving consideration to spontaneous letters or telegrams, but where it is plainly evident that they are inspired I think we should take that into consideration.

HEARINGS ON H. R. 1605

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, since the peanut bill is not going to be brought up today, there is a little matter I want to get straightened out. I was the one who told the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] that we had not had any hearings on H. R. 1605. We heard a lot of talk about it, but we did not have any hearings. I made that statement on the floor. I noticed the other day that my good friend and colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] challenged that statement by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. I should like at this time to repeat my statement and to assure both the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] that I was telling them the truth.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 707) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 348 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 295), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"There shall be in the Department of Justice six officers, learned in the law, called the Assistant Attorneys General, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall assist the Attorney General and Solicitor General in the performance of their duties."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman would explain the need for this legislation.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been acted on by the Senate and is on the Speaker's desk. The House committee has unanimously reported an identical bill. The bill was requested by the Department of Justice. The request is based primarily upon the fact that there has been a substantial increase because of war activities. If the gentleman will permit, I will read a very short letter which will give the explanation. This is a letter written by the Department of Justice to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, and it is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
*Washington, D. C., February 10, 1943.*

Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: The number of Assistant Attorneys General in the Department of Justice, in addition to the Assistant Attorney General in charge of customs matters whose office is in New York City, was reduced from six to five by section 16 of the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 307). These five officials head five divisions of the Department: The Antitrust, the Claims, the Criminal, the Lands, and the Tax Divisions.

The growth of the Department of Justice is indicated by the fact that the number of employees has risen since 1939 from 9,000 to 29,000. This growth is solely attributable to the war work of the Department, the increase in personnel being almost entirely absorbed by the war activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. This growth, however, has placed a heavy burden upon the small group of persons at the top who are responsible for making policy and reporting directly to me. Despite this large growth, which has brought many responsibilities to me, there have been no additions in personnel of men who under my immediate supervision direct this vital work.

In May of 1942, after consultation with officials of the Bureau of the Budget, I created in the Department a War Division. This division includes the War Frauds Unit, the Special War Policies Unit, the Alien Enemy Control Unit, and the Alien Property Litigation Unit.

The Solicitor General, who is the second ranking officer of the Department, has been acting as head of the War Division. During the summer of 1942, when the Supreme Court was not in session, this arrangement worked admirably. Since the Supreme Court resumed its sessions, however, it has become more and more apparent that the Solicitor General cannot properly be asked to divert from the duties of his own extremely important office the time and energy which he has had to devote to the work of the War Division.

The efficient functioning of the War Division requires it to be headed by an official who will devote all his time to it. It is highly desirable, in view of the importance of the work of the Division, that its head be an Assistant Attorney General. With this status, he would rank with the heads of other divisions of the Department, and, like them, would be a member of my immediate staff.

For these reasons I recommend that legislation be enacted authorizing the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General. I send you herewith a draft of a bill.

The proposed legislation would not involve additional expense. It would, in fact, actually decrease the expenditures of the War Division. The chiefs of the various units in the War Division have already been so classified by the Civil Service Commission that the head of this Division, even if he were not an Assistant Attorney General, would undoubtedly be classified by the Civil Service Commission at $9,000. An Assistant Attorney General receives $9,000 a year. On the other hand, an Assistant Attorney General could so combine the various administrative services of each of the four operating units as to eliminate much duplication with the result that administrative expenses would be considerably decreased.

I am informed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that the legislation proposed is in accordance with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,
FRANCIS BIDDLE, *Attorney General.*

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is practically restoring an office that was previously in effect but eliminated when the administration was proclaiming the fact it was going to save 25 percent of governmental expenditures?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; under the economy arrangement.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And this is about all they did?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. This bill will probably save money and will increase the efficiency of the administration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. One more question. There is need for this legislation, in view of the fact that the Senate has unanimously approved it and also the gentleman's committee, but someone has suggested that this is possibly to take care of a "lame duck." Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; I do not know of any "crippled duck" that is around in the neighborhood of this job.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman think they have all been taken care of now?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; there are still some around that have not been taken care of yet.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the estimated cost of this provision?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The estimate given to the committee, and it seemed sound to the committee, is that this would reduce the total amount. It involves four division heads, as I recall, each of whom is getting around $9,000, which is the amount being paid to the Assistant Attorneys General. It is contemplated by doing this we may eliminate some of the heads of divisions and others of the personnel. At the present time most of the work, if not all the work, that it is expected will be directed by the contemplated Assistant Attorney General, is being taken care of by the Solicitor General. The Solicitor General at the time the Supreme Court was not in session did very well with the job, but

we are told now that the duties of the Solicitor General are such that he cannot be expected to do the work it is contemplated this Attorney General will do.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It appears to me that this Department has been doing a lot of things in the last few years that it should not concern itself about. It seems to me that if this Department would devote its efforts to performing the duties and functions with which it is really charged, it might not need this additional help. I shall not object, but I do feel that bills of this kind should be brought in under a rule and the Congress be given an opportunity to learn more about them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1903) was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2 OF THE CIVILIAN TRAINING ACT OF 1939, AS AMENDED

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1670) to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know whether there is going to be debate on this bill and an opportunity to amend it?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I may say to the gentleman that we have a rule which the gentleman from Oklahoma is ready to report. This is a small bill and we thought in order to save the time of the House we would take it up under unanimous consent, but we are entirely willing to go ahead and call up the rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand if the bill is called up by unanimous consent there will be an hour of general debate?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes, there will be an hour.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the bill be subject to amendment under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes, that would follow.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection. My only reason for mentioning the matter at all is that section 2 of the bill is believed by the Appropriations Committee to be subject to proper amendment in order to take care of the appropriation matter in the proper way. That is the only reason I offered a reservation of objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I say to the gentleman that I do not think there will be any objection to consenting to that without debate.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I call the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina to the fact that I have submitted section 2 of the bill to the Appropriations Committee, and the clerk of that committee believes that the wording of that section should be changed. Otherwise, I have no objection to the bill whatsoever.

Mr. BULWINKLE. We will agree to take that up under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is no need for debate from my standpoint at all. It is a mere matter of proper amendment to section 2.

Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks, I desire to say that I took occasion to inquire concerning the language of section 2 this morning. I inquired of the very able clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Marc Sheild. He agreed with me that this language was most peculiar and unusual. I then inquired concerning that language of the distinguished Parliamentarian, our friend, Mr. Deschler, who agreed that section 2 as written is subject to being stricken on a point of order. I then requested that expert draftsman of appropriation language, Mr. Sheild, to prepare an amendment in due and proper form. Because of short notice and the fact that this bill is being brought up by unanimous consent rather than under a rule, as had been anticipated, the amendment was not prepared in time to be inserted in the bill.

The amended section 2, as prepared by the clerk of the Appropriations Committee, is as follows:

SEC. 2. Any appropriations heretofore made and available for obligation during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for carrying out the provisions of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, shall be available for carrying out the provisions of such act as amended hereby. Any obligations entered into heretofore under such appropriations for purposes which are brought within the scope of such section 2 by this amendatory act shall be deemed to be valid if otherwise properly incurred.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this amendment will be substituted for the present section 2 in the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The bill will certainly be considered under the 5-minute rule, of course.

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to objest, Mr. Speaker, as I understand, this is a very minor piece of legislation. A rule was granted for its consideration. There is no disposition I know of to take up any time under the rule. If the gentleman is going to bring in this bill immediately and permit amendments under the 5-minute rule, I see no reason to call up the rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill (H. R. 1670), as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the first sentence of section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "civilian."

SEC. 2. Any amounts heretofore appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, and unexpended, shall be available for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of such act, as amended by the provisions of this act.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 provided for the training of civilian pilots. At that time it was contemplated to train civilians, recognizing that they might be of service to the Army, but that was not the primary purpose. After the war began, about the 1st of last July, the program was changed to provide for training men for military service. About the 1st of December an order was made preventing civilian enlistments. This meant that training of new men after that was confined to men who were in the service.

In January the War Department made an arrangement by which the civilian air training program was to include enlisted men on active service. Therefore, the new plan is to train only men who are in the service and on the active list. That is the program for the present.

In order to authorize this properly by law, it was necessary to strike out the word "civilian" so that the funds appropriated for training purposes under the Civilian Pilot Training Act would be applicable to the training that is continuing at the present time. That is the only purpose of the bill.

The section 2 referred to a moment ago is the one that would authorize the present appropriations to be available for the training under the act as here proposed to be amended.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the House should know that this bill has as its purpose as it is written the allowing of the expenditure of C. A. A. funds for the training of military pilots in our civilian pilot-training set-up. That is, it includes a fund of approximately $25,000,000 which is controlled by the C. A. A. and which would be paid for this civilian pilot-training program.

On the other hand, the Navy also has a set-up in the civilian-pilot-training program through which it reimburses the C. A. A., and the appropriations for the naval program are reflected in the appropriation for the Navy.

Under this bill the C. A. A. would expend its funds for the training of Army personnel in the civilian-training program, and I understand since this bill has been written an agreement has been reached between the Army and the C. A. A. whereby the money for the training of these Army trainees in the civilian-pilot-training program will be paid out of the appropriations for the Army.

I have no objection to this bill. I think the bill is all right now.

Mr. LEA. The gentleman has made a correct statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the chairman of the committee give us a little more technical information with reference to the language in the closing sentence of the first paragraph on page 2? This is what I should like to determine. The report states:

> The 14,000 men to be given such training each month will be in addition to the numbers now being trained so that, all told, it is contemplated that a population of more than 30,000 men will be in training under these arrangements throughout the coming months.

As I understand that language, it means they can train as many as 30,000 a month.

Mr. LEA. That is the program expected when they get into operation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is 30,000 per month, instead of a total of 30,000?

Mr. LEA. Yes. The instruction of a trainee may cover more than one of the progressive courses, each of which is short.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have just now discussed the subject of section 2 with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]. While it is admitted that in all probability this language in the bill may do what the committee intends, in order not to hold up the bill at this time, and inasmuch as the amendment I referred to is not yet prepared, I shall not delay matters but let the bill go on to the Senate without objection or point of order, the idea being that in the Senate the amendment may be submitted.

Mr. LEA. I appreciate the attitude of the gentleman. I can say that the committee is indifferent as to the particular form of the section as long as it accomplishes the purpose. We will give attention with a view to meeting anything the gentleman has in mind when it comes to agreement with the Senate.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I should like to make an observation and not ask a question, if that is agreeable to the gentleman. I do it to bring to the attention of the House an dto have the record show that perhaps no civilian agency of the Federal Government more nearly set its program for wartime need in better or more effective motion than the Civil Aeronautics Administration through its civilian pilot-training program.

We must remember that prior to the entrance of America into this war the pilot-training program under the act of Congress, which was a far-sighted legislative proposal, had resulted in the training of thousands of young people who were funneled almost immediately into flight activities of the Army and the Navy.

I wish that Members of Congress could have the entire story of this amazing job in the mass production of pilots.

Actually, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has been training pilots for the defense of this country since 1939. Of all our civilian Government agencies, the C. A. A. was the first to go to war.

Its purpose was to make more American pilots, and thus to promote civil aviation, but at the same time to strengthen the national defense. The result was that when war came, we had nearly 100,000 licensed pilots in this country. Here, gentlemen, was a war weapon ready at hand. The reservoir of pilot material, before C. A. A. training began, was only 26,144 licensed pilots.

This production of pilots is the more remarkable when you consider that between 1903, when the Wright brothers successfully flew their frail craft at Kitty Hawk, and 1939, we had registered only 26,000 Americans who could fly. One year later, in 1940, this figure had jumped to 41,006, and by 1941, to 82,277. Then came the war, and we stepped up our production of pilots. By 1942, there were 104,876 civilian pilots and today, exclusive of thousands of pilots in the military services whose names do not appear on C. A. A. rolls, there are 110,510.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Without objection, the gentleman from California may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. I yield further to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The list of heroic Army and Navy flyers who received their start in the C. A. A. program is a long one. Capt. Joe Foss, the marine ace who has already surpassed Rickenbacker's World War record by bagging 26 Jap planes, learned to fly at Graham Aviation Service, a C. A. A. contract center in South Dakota. Of the 79 flyers with Jimmy Doolittle on his Tokyo raid, 19 had received C. A. A. training. Of the 17 Navy pilots in Fighting Squadron Six, which shot down 27 Jap planes in one engagement, 6 started flying under C. A. A. auspices. One could go on almost indefinitely in this fashion, for some 15,000 C. A. A. trainees had entered the Army and Navy air services even before Pearl Harbor.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration established this important war job in a strictly nonbureaucratic manner. All training was contracted to private individuals, to flight operators for teaching flying, and to colleges and educational institutions for giving ground school instruction. As a Government agency, it bought no planes, bought no airports, hired no instructors. It simply applied its vast experience to the supervision of the program to standardizing methods, equipment, curricula and, thus, assuring the continuous production of adequately trained men ready for their special combat training by the Army and Navy.

In this process, a great training organization has been built up all over the country—a truly American product. There are now some hundreds of training centers in this country, every one adequate and capable of starting our military pilots on the way to their specialized military training. Think what a meaning these training centers have when peacetime comes again—when aviation takes its place in our daily lives.

Of all the money we are spending today to win the war, this comparatively small amount spent to train our youth to fly is most certain to prove valuable in war as well as in peace.

Mr. LEA. What the gentleman has said is true, and a good deal more could be added.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I also commend the work of the C. A. A. and at the same time take occasion to call the attention of the Chairman to a comparatively minor situation that has developed as part of this training program. It has been called to my attention that some of the schools operating under the C. A. A., due primarily, according to their claim, to a lack of C. A. A. inspectors, are checking out their own students. There have been a few complaints in Connecticut that the interests of the school seem to be in having the program prolonged, and they refuse to check out the students, and insist that they need 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 hours' longer training. I wish the chairman would take that matter up, and see whether it is general or whether it is localized in Connecticut.

Mr. LEA. I did not catch quite all the gentleman said.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Instead of having inspectors to check them out, employees of the schools are checking them out. It is said that it is to the interest of the schools to keep them there longer.

Mr. LEA. The problem is suffering from a lack of sufficient inspectors, and it is my belief that the number of inspectors will be increased. Many more are needed.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks recently made, and include therein the amendment which I was expecting to offer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this subject in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. There being no further debate, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

### CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 123, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 1692, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rule making in order H. R. 1692, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes. The bill authorizes an expenditure of $1,256,607,000 for facilities for the operation of our Navy in this wartime. This money is made available, to be used largely in the discretion of naval authority, to those entrusted with the conduct of our Navy in time of war.

Mr. Speaker, the authorization of this vast sum of approximately a billion and a quarter of dollars for the furtherance of our naval and shore establishments, and for other purposes in connection therewith, is reminiscent of the fact that this country is making some real contributions to this unfortunate global war in which the civilized world finds itself embroiled, other than in terms of casualties. While ordinarily the sacrifices of war are thought of in terms of killed, wounded, and maimed, there is also the economic cost of war to be considered. And while we justly and rightly are prone to think of war sacrifices in the cost of blood, the economic cost to the country is not an insignificant thing.

In World War No. 1 this country made substantial contributions in the matter of dollars and the sinews of war, but not nearly so much as it is going to do in this war. At the close of that war we were contributing 36 percent of the total allied cost of the war. At the rate we are stepping up our contribution to that cause in this war it is safe to predict that before the war is over we will be contributing more than the total of all of our allies. Some interesting figures about what we are now contributing have been compiled. For instance, we are today contributing 61.9 percent of our entire national income, or a total of $78,000,000,000 up to date in World War No. 2; while the total contribution of Great Britain is 69.2 percent of its national income, which amounts in dollars to only $18,000,000,000. Add to this Canada's contribution of 45.4 percent of its national income — $2,997,000,000; Australia's 40.3 percent of its national income—$1,432,000,000; New Zealand's 63.4 percent of its national income—$430,000,000—and we have a grand total of $23,137,000,000 of contributions by the entire United Kingdom and its dominions as against the $78,000,000,000 from the United States. Moreover, it is estimated that before another year will have passed the total cost to the United States of this war will have reached the stupendous and staggering sum of $213,000,000,000.

The same sources estimate that by that time the total contribution of the British Empire will have been $88,000,000,000. Thus it is seen that the United States is and will continue to contribute the lion's share of the cost of World War No. 2 while the lion itself—Great Britain—will be a poor second. Certainly no European ally will ever again have the effrontery to refer to Uncle Sam as Uncle Shylock.

There is nothing to be gained by an extensive argument on the rule. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes. As the gentleman from Mississippi has explained, this rule comes before the House with the unanimous report of the Committee on Rules, to make in order a bill from the Naval Affairs Committee authorizing the expenditure of $1,256,607,000 for public works, for the Navy, and for Navy facilities. However, it has a very unusual aspect and is one of the most extraordinary bills that has come before the Congress since I have been a Member during the last 22 years. I would not want this occasion to pass without commenting upon it. This rule makes in order a bill from the Naval Affairs Committee, introduced by the ranking minority member, the able gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS]. He was placed in charge of the hearings on the bill by the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman VINSON, and I understand the hearings were extensive and went down into the minutest details, and, further, that this bill is one of the most thoroughly considered bills ever brought before the House of Representatives. The distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], has established a precedent in the House of Representatives by turning such an important bill over to the ranking minority member of the committee, having him introduce it in his own name and placing him in charge of the hearings. I feel that this precedent that has been established in time of war is one that should be commended; that the chairman of the committee should be congratulated because of his fairness and wisdom in time of war in placing a minority member in charge of an important bill, because all of us on both sides, Republicans and Democrats, have one objective, and that is to do everything in our power to expedite final victory. We are all pulling our weight in the same boat to all-out victory, and the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, recognizing this situation, has established a precedent that can well be followed by other committees, particularly those committees that have anything to do with the war work, such as the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I would not want this to go by without some mention of the fact that the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee has voluntarily established a precedent in the House that could be very properly copied by other committees during the war. The gentleman from Georgia, Chairman VINSON, should be commended for his broad-gaged statesmanship, for his liberality, for his nonpartisanship, and intelligent leadership, because that all goes to make for national unity, unity in his committee, and unity in the House of Representatives, and I hope that other Members will appreciate it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May it not also lead to making the ranking minority Member become experienced in handling the affairs of the committee?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the gentleman raised that issue. There is no good reason why it should not be done extensively in other committees, even in the Committee on Agriculture. On the other hand, everyone knows that there is a close line-up in the House and that the Republicans, in conjunction with constitutional Democrats, have a large majority. This is not a controversial bill and, therefore, it was not done for political purposes. It was done out of a sense of fairness, purely because the chairman of the committee thought it was in the interest of national unity in wartime. For that reason I have taken this opportunity to commend and congratulate the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], for setting a fine example of cooperation in our war efforts to all Members of the House.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1692) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1692, with Mr. MERRITT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be printed at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop the following naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as he may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land, and to continue or complete the construction of any project heretofore authorized or undertaken, which projects have been specifically approved by the Secretary of the Navy, with approximate costs as indicated: Fleet facilities, $67,900,000; aviation facilities, $238,000,000; storage facilities, $5,350,000; liquid-fuel storage, $10,350,000; Marine Corps training facilities, $33,132,000; ordnance storage facilities, $50,000,000; personnel training and housing facilities, $33,700,000; hospital facilities, $66,005,000; shore radio facilities, $3,500,000; Naval Research Laboratory, $750,000; miscellaneous structures, $33,000,000; passive defense, $15,000,000; advance bases, $720,000,000; miscellaneous and unforeseen facilities, $223,313,000: *Provided*, That the approximate cost indicated for each of the classes of projects enumerated above may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward but the total cost shall not exceed $1,500,000,000.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike out the figures "238,000,000" and substitute therefor "223,000,000."

Page 2, line 4, strike out the figures "33,132,000" and substitute therefor "28,632,000."

Page 2, line 5, strike out the figures "33,700,000" and substitute therefor "33,120,000."

Page 2, lines 9 and 10, strike out the following: "; miscellaneous and unforeseen facilities, $223,313,000."

Page 2, strike out line 14, and substitute therefor the following: "$1,256,607,000: *Provided further*, That prior to the acquisition, by lease or otherwise, of any land under authority of this act, the Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Senate and House Naval Affairs Committees all such prospective acquisitions."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is an administration measure. It was sent to the Speaker of the House by the Secretary of the Navy, and by the Speaker transferred to the Naval Affairs Committee. When the bill reached the committee I requested, on behalf of the Naval Affairs Committee, that the distinguished minority member, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] should introduce the bill, which he did, and when the hearing was had I asked the gentleman from Minnesota to become acting chairman of the committee and to conduct the hearing on the bill.

I wish to take this opportunity to state that I have adopted the policy on these departmental bills of giving them to the various members of the committee, instead of the chairman introducing all of the bills. A few days ago the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY] presented to the House a bill from the Naval Affairs Committee. Today the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] will present this bill on behalf of the Naval Affairs Committee.

I want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] on the magnificent report he has filed. I invite every member of the committee to carefully consider the report and it will give you the full details about the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman, and will ask my distinguished colleague from Minnesota, who so ably conducted the hearing on this bill for 4 days, to explain the bill to the membership of the committee.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee [Mr. VINSON] for his comments, and also for the opportunity of presiding over the Naval Affairs Committee, thereby giving me a much better opportunity to more fully study every detail of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is before us as an integral part of the program of the expansion of the Navy, which is already national policy. It simply implements the expansion of the seagoing Navy by providing in an orderly manner the shore facilities that are necessary for the expansion of the fleet itself.

The committee went into every detail of the bill and eliminated a number of items or parts of items. In all, the committee reduced the amount of the authorization by $243,393,000. It is quite possible that some or all of that may have to be asked for later, but at this time the committee felt that those amounts were not justified as a part of the present program. Later, as the program does expand, if the war lasts longer than we expect, we may have to come back and authorize those items that are now eliminated. But by having eliminated them now we are assured of only the most essential construction taking place, that part which is absolutely essential to provide shore facilities necessary for the expanded fleet and to provide for them in a time schedule, so that they will be ready as the new ships of the Navy are commissioned and need shore facilities.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Are the projects authorized by this bill for the immediate construction?

Mr. MAAS. Yes; they are all authorized for immediate construction. That does not mean that every item in the bill can be built starting the day after the bill becomes law, nor the day after they get the appropriation, but it is a program designed for this coming calendar year, all of which it is necessary to start at least the plans if not the actual construction now, so that there will be orderly progression of making these facilities ready as the fleet needs them.

The committee reduced the amounts of items where there was not a concrete program for the requested authorization. Every dollar requested in this bill that now remains represents a definite program. It is part of a whole, and everything that has been left in the bill is essential for immediate consideration. It would be foolish to have provided for expansion of the fleet as we have and then not have the facilities necessary to operate that fleet.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I note on page 2, beginning in line 16, the following:

*Provided further*, That prior to the acquisition, by lease or otherwise, of any land under authority of this act, the Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Senate and House Naval Affairs Committees all such prospective acquisitions.

I am just wondering if it is necessary for the Army and Navy to report to the committees what they propose to do, and then get authority from those committees as to whether or not purchases may be made, under the language there contained, which seems to me a very good provision.

Mr. MAAS. I shall be very happy to explain that situation. There has been a growing apprehension relative to the military services going into the real-estate business. Of necessity, they have become very large holders of land. While we do not want to deny them anything that is essential to carry on the successful prosecution of the war, our committee is very hopeful, in the case of the Navy, that the Navy shall lease wherever possible instead of acquiring title to land which it will have forever after.

We do not want to remove any more land than we can possibly help from the tax rolls of the various counties and States, which is done when the Navy acquires the title. We feel that while we must allow discretion to the Navy in the selection of sites, that at least we should know what they are doing, we should be familiar with their expansion program, and particularly where land is acquired. We are not imposing any restriction on them; we are granting in this bill the authority to acquire the land, but we are saying that they shall make a report to our committee before they actually consummate the deal and give to the Congress the right of veto. If the proposal is made on something that we do not deem essential, we think before the deal is finally consummated we should have the right to act on it affirmatively.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then it does require House and Senate approval for the acquisition of property?

Mr. MAAS. It would take affirmative action on the part of the Congress if we wished to disapprove it. If we take no action whatever, then the purchase is made. This gives us an opportunity to control things a little more closely. We also felt that those charged with the responsibility of this program, particularly in the matter of the acquisition of land, would be doubly careful about any purchase they made if they knew they had to report to the Congress and that it would be subject to scrutiny. We think we have thrown sufficient safeguards around the authority so they will not run wild in the acquisition of land.

In this connection I am going to place in the RECORD a letter sent to the chair-

man of the Naval Affairs Committee, signed by the Secretary of the Navy, assuring us that no such land would be acquired without consulting the committee. In this same connection a little further in the bill there is a section on air-transport facilities. I might explain at this time that I will put a letter in the RECORD at the proper point that upon the request of the committee the Secretary of the Navy wrote us assuring us that he would not actually consummate or make any irrevocable commitments in the matter of new air-transport terminals without consulting further with the committee when the program is more completely worked out. We are not restricting his authority, but we are going to be kept informed, and, again, we have the right of veto if we feel that they should not proceed with any specific project.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that particular point?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Can the gentleman tell us what new locations are presently being considered by the Navy Department?

Mr. MAAS. I do not quite get the gentleman's full question. There was a little confusion in the Chamber.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman stated he had received a letter from the Secretary of the Navy to the effect that the Navy would not go ahead with the construction of any new naval air transport stations without express authority from the committee, and I ask the gentleman what new stations the Navy is now considering.

Mr. MAAS. I can answer the question, but I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Minnesota may answer if he cares to.

Mr. COLE of New York. I make these inquiries only for the purpose of the record so we may have an understanding of the Navy Department's intentions.

Mr. MAAS. The gentleman's question relates to the present construction of facilities for naval air transport. I may say that this is the first time in any legislation there has appeared any reference to the naval air transport service which has been established by the Navy. It does not mean that this is a new service. Heretofore they have used other existing facilities, but the service has gained in importance and size to the point where they feel they must have their own separate facilities. This is in fact an air service to deliver critical supplies throughout the world, wherever the Navy may need them. I would answer the gentleman's question by stating that the fields presently under consideration are in New York, Miami, Kansas, on the Patuxent River in Maryland, in the San Francisco Bay area, at Seattle, and at Treasure Island in California.

Mr. COLE of New York. May I ask the gentleman what is the total cost as presently estimated?

Mr. MAAS. The estimate furnished us by the Navy Department was $40,000,000.

Mr. COLE of New York. I would direct the gentleman's attention to the report, page 14, in which these items are set forth under "Aviation facilities," table 2. Under the item "Naval air transport expansion" we see an item of one new station at a cost of $10,000,000 and an expansion of six stations at a cost of $30,000,000.

It was my impression from the hearings before the committee that there were to be three new major stations, two on the Atlantic coast and one on the Pacific, which would cost $10,000,000 each; that those were the three on which no action would be taken until further approval by the committee.

Mr. MAAS. I should be pleased to read the letter from the Secretary at this point.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am simply asking as to the information which has been given to the committee. It would appear from the gentleman's statement that we are to have one new station and an expansion of six existing stations.

Mr. MAAS. The program they asked for did not include only new stations. We have a station at Treasure Island, for instance; we have a station at Seattle, and there is to be a new station at New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. And a new station at Miami.

Mr. MAAS. It was not a new station. It would be an extension of existing facilities.

Mr. COLE of New York. Oh, yes.

Mr. MAAS. It was not a new station.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is not to be in connection with or operated in connection with any present facilities.

Mr. MAAS. Yes; because the Coast Guard is contiguous and we now operate the Coast Guard.

Mr. COLE of New York. Not in naval air transport work.

Mr. MAAS. No. None of these are exclusively for naval air transport at the present time. They are an expansion of existing facilities that are other than naval air transport.

Mr. COLE of New York. The purpose of my inquiry is to have it definitely understood as to what items the Department is going to report back to the committee before any action is taken.

Mr. MAAS. They will report on the whole program before any final commitment is made.

Mr. COLE of New York. The whole naval air transport problem?

Mr. MAAS. Yes; as to facilities.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would suggest that the gentleman read the letter from the Secretary on air transport.

Mr. MAAS. Yes. I will read the letter from the Secretary of the Navy to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. It is dated February 17, 1943, and is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
*Washington, February 17, 1943.*

Hon. CARL VINSON,
*Chairman, Naval Affairs Committee,*
*House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am informed that in the course of the hearings on H. R. 1692, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," some concern was expressed by the committee with respect to the proposed construction of certain facilities for the development of the naval air transport service.

The program of facilities for this service is still in the formative stage. We have determined that certain facilities must be provided to accommodate the great expansion in this service. We also know the general locations in which the proposed facilities should be constructed. However, the specific details and the exact locations in the general areas will depend upon the results of surveys now in progress.

It is my understanding that the committee accepted these projects with the understanding that when the details have been worked out they will be discussed with the committee before final commitments are made. This arrangement is satisfactory to me.

Very truly yours,

FRANK KNOX.

The chairman to which he refers in this case is the acting chairman, myself. May I state to the House that my purpose in pursuing that line during the hearings on this bill was because I wanted, and the committee was of like mind, the committee having stated a policy to the Navy, that wherever transport facilities were to be constructed, that they should have in mind the post-war potentialities of such facilities. We did not want them to simply build during the war some temporary stations that would be thrown away when the war is over. We wanted them wherever possible to extend the existing facilities, and that any new construction that should be so located that it would be so constructed with the thought in mind of its potential use as a part of the commercial air system when the war is over.

Mr. COLE of New York. With further regard to these naval air transport commitments, the gentleman will agree that this procedure the committee is adopting today is rather unusual in technically authorizing the creation of naval facilities but holding a string on the actual operations by requiring the Navy Department to come back to the committee for further approval. Is it the gentleman's understanding and can he assure the committee and the House that when the Department reports back to the committee its plans, as authorized by this bill, so far as naval air transport service is concerned, that the committee will immediately be advised of that report and hearings will be held on the report?

Mr. MAAS. I am quite certain that the gentleman can be assured of that. Of course, the chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], will be in charge and the report will be made to him, but our understanding is that that will immediately be transmitted to the full committee and they will be given an opportunity in session to discuss the said report before any final action is taken by the Navy Department.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am very glad to know that the committee is expressing concern, and has concern, for the location of such transport airports in view of their possible ultimate use by the civil air transport services. I would like to ask the gentleman, in setting up a global air-line service or a global air transport service in the Navy, does that in any wise conflict with the Army's similar program

or are they cooperating in setting up these lines?

Mr. MAAS. They are cooperating and they are not in conflict. The Navy must have an uninterrupted service, a fast source of supply of critical material that must be flexible because the Navy stations move. Sea warfare is quite different. The Army must have its system because it has fixed bases that remain in a chain and in a system a relatively long period of time. We cannot put the dependence of one upon the other. There is no conflict between the two at all.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is there any sense in setting up duplicating lines or parallel lines to given places or will they operate only one or the other of the lines or a joint line?

Mr. MAAS. We cannot say that both can always operate by using the joint line, because at any time the Navy may have to move overnight to an entirely different system of islands. If it depended on a joint line it would not have the flexibility that is necessary. However, they do work together when they are running over parallel routes, and on that part of the joint route which is parallel, and they do cooperate, but we cannot restrict them to just one line without destroying the flexibility that is necessary.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman does not quite understand me.

Mr. MAAS. I think I understand the gentleman thoroughly.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would it not be entirely within reason that when a Navy plane is going to a joint Army-Navy destination and if it is not fully loaded, it might also carry Army material.

Mr. MAAS. I can assure the gentleman it does. They cooperate perfectly when they are on a joint part of the route, but we must still run both services over that same joint route because of the necessity of shifting one service at any time to a different route. But I can assure the gentleman that the Army planes and Navy planes carry each other's cargo whenever feasible.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice on page 13 of the report, under fleet facilities, which is one of the large items in this bill, about $67,000,000 provided. Is the gentleman at liberty to advise the committee what portion, if any, of the fleet facilities will be beyond either continental or insular United States?

Mr. MAAS. No; I cannot tell the gentleman because we do not know and nobody knows at the present time. We do not know, nor does the Navy, the exact location. We know what our operations in general terms are going to be for the next period. We know that the expansion of the Navy will require so many repair bases and so many operations bases. As the theater of war shifts, the locations will have to shift. But we know that we need the facilities that are authorized no matter where they may be. The vast bulk of them will doubtless be outside our continental limits.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think there is some confusion as to just what the Secretary of the Navy must report back to the House and Senate committees. My interpretation of this bill, aside from the letter—and I want the gentleman to correct me if I am wrong, because he thoroughly understands the case and is making a very fine explanation of the bill, for which he should be congratulated—is that the only matter upon which the Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Senate and House Committees on Naval Affairs is the purchase or lease of land for the purpose of building these bases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

That is by restriction in the legislation itself. The other matter which I have just discussed, a letter concerning which I have read, is an agreement and understanding with the Secretary that he will not make final, irrevocable commitments on the establishment of the air-transport bases without first discussing the matter with the committee. If it sees fit to object to it, the committee can pass legislation prohibiting it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What I am getting at is this. The bill itself restricts the report back to the lease or purchase of land.

Mr. MAAS. In regard to the air transport it may not involve either. It may involve only construction. But we feel that we want a voice in determining where these projects shall be located, even if they involve merely expansion of existing facilities without the acquisition of land.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think the gentleman is correct about that; the Congress should have the last say.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Has any discussion been had with the Navy Department regarding foreign bases that may be built for transport aviation?

Mr. MAAS. Yes. I may say to the gentleman that the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs has appointed a subcommittee to study that entire matter and to confer continually with the Navy and report back to our committee on it. I think we will have a very decided voice in that matter, and we will keep the House informed of the progress.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman understands what I have in mind, although I shall not pursue the question.

Mr. MAAS. Yes.

We cut out an item of $4,500,000 from the Marine Corps appropriation. This involves a very important matter. This appropriation was requested to establish facilities to train the Marine Corps' share of the illiterates in the service. This is a matter on which we may have to take some legislative action. The committee took the only action it could by striking this item from the bill.

It seemed to the committee utterly ridiculous that we should set up three duplicating systems of education for the considerable number of illiterates we get under the operation of the Selective Service System, who must be given a primary education before they can be useful to the military services.

Under the present order of the manpower director, the Army takes its share of these men and the Navy and the Marine Corps each have to take their share. Each is then required to provide extensive new educational facilities. Four million five hundred thousand dollars would be required to set up temporary schools to train the Marine Corps' share of the illiterates. That also represents a depletion of the manpower of the Marine Corps. It actually reduces the authorized strength of the Marine Corps, because a great many marines are required to help educate these illiterates, and the instructors and whatever illiterates they get are to that extent a reduction from the effective fighting strength of the Marine Corps, which is presumed to be a combatant organization, with everybody in it available for immediate front-line duty.

It seemed to us utterly ridiculous that with the Army setting up a great system of education for these illiterates we should compel the Marine Corps and the Navy to take a share of them and then set up duplicating systems of education. So our committee dealt with the matter as far as we could go by striking out the item for the Marine Corps providing for training illiterates, hoping that that would make the Manpower Commission see the light and not thrust upon the Marine Corps a share of the illiterates, as that would serve no useful purpose in that organization.

In another section dealing with the training of the women reserves of the Navy, the WAVES, we struck out $580,000 because we felt this training was being concentrated in too few educational institutions. It was our desire, and we felt it reflected the views of the rest of the Congress and the country, that this educational training of the WAVES should be dispersed as much as possible to the smaller colleges. Otherwise, many very valuable educational institutions of small size are going to be forced to collapse, which would be an irreparable loss to the Nation. Many of them may never be able to open again. There would be very little difference in the cost as between concentrating the training of the WAVES and distributing them to the smaller colleges, but even if it cost a little more we felt that the ultimate cost to the national economy would be far less than under the present system. So we struck out $580,000, with instructions to the Navy to distribute their WAVES training a little more widely and contract with more smaller colleges.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. For the RECORD, will the gentleman supply figures show-

ing the amount of land to which the Navy now has title and the amount of land to which it expects to get title under this bill?

Mr. MAAS. The gentleman's question is very pertinent. However, the list is too long to read during my time. I have here a document which has been made a public document and which I will make a part of the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include this table in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The document referred to is as follows:

REPORT OF BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS ON LAND ACQUISITION FOR THE NAVY FROM JULY 1, 1940, TO JAN. 15, 1943

*Land acquisition report*

JULY 1, 1940, TO JAN. 15, 1943

| | Tracts | Acres | Interest | Refund | Original deposit | Deficiencies |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941 | 3,406 | 125,799.17 | $35,791.99 | $4,255.25 | $17,244,247.16 | $1,822,642.99 |
| July 1, 1941, to June 30, 1942 | 6,373 | 347,599.18 | 8,383.01 | 54,529.75 | 43,357,119.44 | 2,292,043.78 |
| July 1, 1942, to Jan. 15, 1943 | 6,844 | 339,984.24 | 6,465.00 | 15.00 | 21,461,240.18 | 430,908.23 |
| Total | 16,623 | 813,382.59 | 50,640.00 | 58,800.00 | 82,062,606.78 | 4,545,595.00 |

JULY 1, 1942, TO JAN. 15, 1943

| | Tracts | Area acres | Interest and refunds | Original deposit | Deficiencies |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alaska: Kodiak, N. A. S. | 3 | 33.36 | | $1,234.00 | |
| California: | | | | | |
| Alameda: | | | | | |
| Floating drydock | 1 | 12.63 | | 159,000.00 | $10,800.00 |
| O. L. F. | 3 | 50.005 | | 4,325.00 | |
| Turning basin | | 126 | | 97,500.00 | |
| Coast Guard Station, Government Island | 15 | 17 | | 53,655.00 | |
| Addition to Livermore Field | 4 | 150.2 | | 19,800.00 | 17,044.07 |
| Humboldt: Section base | 5 | 478.24 | $50.00 | 7,152.00 | 3,400.00 |
| Los Angeles: | | | | | |
| Fuel-oil facilities | 4 | 485 | | 194,150.00 | |
| Yacht club, Coast Guard | 1 | 9.375 | | 5,000.00 | |
| Mare Island: Power transmission line | 18 | 17.207 | | 10,877.80 | |
| Monterey: Radio station | 6 | 363.605 | | 46,651.70 | |
| Imperial: M. C. A. B., El Centro | 13 | 812.25 | | 36,137.00 | |
| Kern: M. C. A. B., Mojave | 12 | 1,546.20 | | 12,435.00 | |
| National City: Amphibious forces, destroyer base | 103 | 36.96 | | 119,657.00 | |
| Port Chicago: Additional facilities, naval magazine | 250 | 90 | | 61,000.00 | |
| Riverside: Reservoir site | 1 | 2.337 | | 134.20 | |
| Santa Ana: L. T. A. station | 3 | 1,606.52 | | 722,804.00 | |
| Santa Barbara: | | | | | |
| Ammunition storage facilities | 3 | 185.18 | | 42,051.00 | |
| M. C. air station | 71 | 420 | | 258,983.00 | |
| San Bernardino: N. S. D. | 4 | 73.51 | | 1,135.00 | |
| San Diego: | | | | | |
| Paratroop training center | 12 | 75.2 | | 30,056.00 | 751.91 |
| Outlying field | 1 | 150.26 | | 8,750.00 | |
| Auxiliary landing field | 12 | 856.1 | | 43,487.00 | |
| Road to Otay bombing target | 8 | 2.34 | | 50.00 | |
| Addition to N. S. D. | 4 | .286 | | 4,000.00 | |
| Destroyer base repair shop | 66 | 54 | | 184,482.00 | 9,325.00 |
| Recreational facility | 24 | 42.136 | | 37,551.00 | 3,500.00 |
| Machine-gun range | 75 | 82.00 | | 287.00 | |
| Armed guard training school | 1 | 15 | | 19,000.00 | |
| San Diego and Orange: M. C. training area | 2 | 123,620.00 | | 4,239,062.00 | |
| Salton Sea: Seaplane op. training | 5 | 1,680.00 | | 2,140.00 | |
| San Francisco: | | | | | |
| M. C. storehouse | 6 | 1.58 | | 178,116.00 | 450.00 |
| H/W to D. D. | 6 | 1.15 | | 21,129.99 | |
| Tiburon: Naval net depot | 1 | 1.18 | | 1,600.00 | 300.00 |
| Vallejo: Southern Pacific R. R. Co. | | .23 | | 1.00 | 282.53 |
| Connecticut: | | | | | |
| New London: Exp. U. S. Coast Guard Academy | 189 | (1) | | 9,950.00 | |
| Florida: | | | | | |
| Broward: | | | | | |
| Satellite Field, N. A. S. | 113 | 1,195.5 | | 15,029.00 | |
| Operational training base | 31 | 221.3 | | 30,407.00 | 1,250.00 |
| Operational training field | 58 | 960.00 | 85.00 | 87,037.00 | 760.00 |
| Broward and Dade: Aircraft Gunnery School, Hollywood | 630 | 14,568.70 | | 114,159.70 | |
| Dade: Additional operating facilities, N. A. S. | 2 | 2,507.51 | | 1,240,200.00 | |
| Daytona Beach: | | | | | |
| Operational training base | 138 | 1,707.6 | | 82,385.00 | |
| Satellite Field | 11 | 1,145.00 | | 3,437.61 | |
| De Land: Aviation operational training station | 81 | 1,625.00 | | 83,607.20 | |
| Duval: Gunnery training field | 116 | 6,233.00 | | 28,009.00 | 17,994.00 |
| Hillsborough Receiving Station | 12 | 4.5 | | 4,337.00 | |
| Jacksonville: Addition to Aviation Gunnery School | 75 | 2,426.1 | | 5,992.00 | |
| Key West: Addition to naval operating base | 1 | 1.52 | | 30,000.00 | |
| Lake City: Operational training base field | 32 | 1,172.3 | | 21,649.44 | |
| Melbourne: | | | | | |
| Operational training field (base) | 0.285 | 2,378.5 | | 12,072.00 | |
| Operational training station | 0.73 | 375.65 | | 6,758.00 | |
| Monroe: Marine railway | 0.1 | 1.2 | | 20,000.00 | |
| New Smyrna: Operational training base | 58 | 771.79 | | 28,266.00 | |
| Panama City: Section base | 7 | 350 | | 23,168.95 | |
| Pensacola: Gunnery range | 11 | 771.65 | | 24,162.44 | |
| Pinellas: Section base | 2 | 14.10 | | 401.00 | |
| Richmond: | | | | | |
| Additional facilities, N. A. S. | 2 | 228.126 | | 5,801.00 | |
| Do | 65 | 1,820 | | 54,065.15 | |
| Sanford: Operational training base field | 133 | 1,490 | | 73,006.00 | |
| St. Augustine: Satellite gunnery field | 2 | 276 | | 1,585.00 | |
| Sterling: Outlying field | 34 | 640 | | 8,851.00 | |
| Vero Beach: | | | | | |
| Operational training base field | 152 | 2,135 | | 116,850.00 | |
| Operational training base | 27 | 1,025 | | 3,784.00 | |
| Volusia: Operational training base | 21 | 116.89 | | 3,846.00 | |
| Georgia: | | | | | |
| Brunswick: | | | | | |
| Establish N. A. S. | 100 | 2,450.35 | | 44,978.00 | |
| Operational training base, N. A. S. | 1 | 311.5 | | 1.00 | |

[1] Certain lands.

*Land acquisition report*—Continued

JULY 1 ,1942 ,TO JAN. 15, 1943

| | Tracts | Area acres | Interest and refunds | Original deposit | Deficiencies |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Idaho: | | | | | |
| Bannock: Extension naval ordnance plant | 1 | 64.94 | | $20,450.00 | |
| Kootenai: | | | | | |
| United States naval station | | 3,969.59 | | 152,471.80 | |
| Naval fuel station | | 80.66 | | 4,287.00 | |
| Illinois: | | | | | |
| Lake: Naval training station | | 685.2 | | 206,648.50 | |
| Seneca: Plant expansion | | 195,725 | | 3,250.00 | |
| Indiana: | | | | | |
| Burns City: | | | | | |
| Extension ammunition depot | | 2,323.54 | | 46,035.00 | |
| Do | | 2,185.55 | | 45,515.00 | |
| Do | | 4,229.83 | | 80,160.00 | |
| Kokomo: Certain rights in storm sewer | | | | 1.00 | |
| Peru: | | | | | |
| Addition N. R. A. B | | 75.5 | | 1,715.00 | |
| Plant expansion | | 23.63 | | 150,001.00 | |
| Iowa: | | | | | |
| Ottumwa: railroad spur track, N. R. A. B | 6 | 29.12 | | 11,970.00 | |
| Kansas: | | | | | |
| Gardner: | | | | | |
| Auxiliary field | 1 | 150 | | 9,150.00 | $4,750.00 |
| Additional N. R. A. B | 1 | 160 | | 17,140.00 | |
| Hutchinson: N. R. A. B | | 2,565.1 | | 387,115.00 | |
| Louisiana: | | | | | |
| Houma: N. A. S | 11 | 1,743.18 | | 152,954.00 | |
| New Orleans: N. R. A. B | 1 | 165.5 | | 25,600.00 | |
| Orleans Parish: | | | | | |
| Sec. base N. R. A. B | 6 | 26.01 | | 69,901.80 | |
| | | 117.84 | | 13,500.00 | 2,500.00 |
| Shell Beach: | | | | | |
| Gunnery training center | 1 | .77 | | 7,000.00 | |
| Do | | 4.91 | | 7,000.00 | |
| Plaquemines Parish: Railroad spur track | 7 | 30,341 | | 3,338.00 | |
| Maine: | | | | | |
| York: Addition to Navy Yard | 1 | 1.37 | | 18,100.00 | |
| Cumberland: | | | | | |
| Barracks facilities | 17 | 9.783 | | 4,575.00 | |
| L. I. fuel storage and replacement depot | | (1) | | 78,837.75 | |
| Maryland: | | | | | |
| Baltimore: Shipbuilding facilities | 5 | 38.56 | | 85,001.00 | 12,075.64 |
| Anne Arundel: Plant expansion | 1 | 4.544 | | 1,500.00 | |
| Cecil: | | | | | |
| Naval training station | 42 | 740 | | 255,477.00 | 54,444.00 |
| Do | 1 | 330 | | 94,820.00 | 21,674.50 |
| Prince Georges: Outlying field, N. R. A. B | 1 | 185.524 | | 3,500.00 | |
| St. Marys: B. O. Q | 1 | 1.8 | | 1,500.00 | |
| Solomons: Amphibious training and operating base | 16 | 110 | | 79,777.00 | 12,698.00 |
| Massachusetts: | | | | | |
| Boston: | | | | | |
| Storage area | 11 | 40.8 | | 156,450.00 | |
| Berthing and docking facilities | 6 | 7.51 | | 9,800.00 | |
| Hingham: Garage and shop facilities | 11 | 9.85 | | 13,600.00 | |
| Springfield: Shipbuilding facilities | 5 | 8.486 | | 98,475.00 | |
| Michigan: | | | | | |
| Grosse Ile: Outlying field | 13 | 480.72 | | 80,443.05 | |
| Minnesota: | | | | | |
| Minneapolis: | | | | | |
| Outlying field | 13 | 28.76 | | 1.00 | |
| McInnis Airport | 54 | 113.3 | | 49,500.00 | |
| Naval dispensary | 9 | 12.85 | | 24,652.00 | |
| Mississippi: | | | | | |
| Gulfport: Naval base depot | 9 | 2.4 | | 978.00 | |
| Missouri: | | | | | |
| St. Louis: | | | | | |
| Outlying field N. R. A. B | 26 | 40 | | 4,501.12 | |
| Auxiliary field No. 1 | 1 | 156.566 | | 2,191.92 | |
| Nebraska: | | | | | |
| Hastings: Naval Ammunition Depot | 405 | 48,572.77 | | 2,525,898.09 | 63,093.93 |
| Nevada: | | | | | |
| Hawthorne: Addition to N. A. B | 3 | 160 | | 2,000.00 | |
| New Jersey: | | | | | |
| Bayonne: | | | | | |
| Addition to N. S. D | 26 | 14 | | 30,985.62 | |
| Plant expansion | 1 | .612 | | 13,750.00 | |
| Gloucester: Building facilities | 2 | 12.18 | | 110,000.00 | |
| Hudson: Expansion plant facilities | 1 | .69 | | 118,000.00 | |
| Lakehurst: N. A. S | 4 | 5.746 | | 16,670.00 | |
| Hoboken: Shipbuilding facilities | | 1.205 | | 135,001.00 | |
| New York: | | | | | |
| Garden City: Plant expansion | 2 | 6.87 | | 319,911.75 | |
| Farmingdale: Plant expansion | 1 | 5 | | 3,750.00 | |
| Erie: Plant expansion | 1 | 2.9 | | 65,000.00 | |
| Port Washington: Plant expansion | 1 | 11 | | 210,000.00 | |
| Scotia: N. S. D | 24 | 270 | | 149,709.75 | |
| Seneca: N. T. S | 105 | 2,000 | $15.00 | 439,337.00 | 1,900.00 |
| St. Albans: Hospital site | 3 | 122.6 | | 562,000.00 | 1,250.00 |
| North Carolina: | | | | | |
| Cherry Point: | | | | | |
| Outlying field M. C. A. B | 16 | 1,469.323 | | 5,276.67 | |
| Do | 25 | 573.16 | | 43,384.60 | |
| Elizabeth City: Water pipe line L. T. A. B | 4 | 4 parcels | | 68.00 | |
| Oklahoma: | | | | | |
| Clinton: Naval air factory | 31 | 5,120.00 | 917.00 | 307,024.40 | 27,902.00 |
| McAlester: N. A. D | 368 | 44,959.97 | 913.00 | 613,234.00 | 48,384.06 |
| Norman: | | | | | |
| Extension Naval Service School | 1 | 5.48 | | 886.00 | 74.00 |
| Moore Field, N. R. A. B | 3 | 532.34 | | 21,637.40 | 17,881.00 |
| Goldsby Field, N. R. A. B | 5 | 391.77 | | 47,900.00 | 16,340.00 |
| Noble Field, N. R. A. B | 5 | 441.05 | | 29,950.00 | 1,900.00 |
| Gunnery School | 88 | 8,353.78 | 3,725.00 | 101,434.95 | 28,693.05 |

1 Certain lands.

*Land acquisition report*—Continued

JULY 1, 1942, TO JAN. 15, 1943

| | Tracts | Area acres | Interest and refunds | Original deposit | Deficiencies |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Oregon: | | | | | |
| Tillamook: L. T. A. Station | 50 | 1,596.07 | | $263,891.00 | |
| Tongue Point: Addition N. A. S | 6 | 7.68 | | 12,852.00 | |
| Pennsylvania: | | | | | |
| Philadelphia—Extension Aviation Supply Depot | 1 | 118.5271 | | 475,000.00 | |
| Philadelphia: | | | | | |
| Additional facilities, M. C. S. D | 11 | 2.39 | | 177,076.00 | |
| Plant expansion | 1 | 0.3085 | | 1,000.00 | |
| Pittsburgh: Receiving barracks | 28 | 11.9983 | | 149,001.00 | |
| Puerto Rico: | | | | | |
| San Juan: | | | | | |
| Airport site | 3 | 784.99 | | 338,835.00 | |
| Expansion, N. A. S | 1 | .89 | | 3,756.00 | |
| Vieques: | | | | | |
| Fleet operating facilities | 3 | 370.73 | | 132,377.39 | |
| Do | 8 | 12.77 | | 1,200.00 | |
| Do | 3 | 601.68 | | 117,789.30 | |
| Rhode Island: | | | | | |
| Davisville: Advance base depot | 130 | 1,522 | | 566,505.72 | |
| Newport: Training station | 21 | 26.3 | | 75,001.00 | |
| Quonset Point: Addition to N. A. S | 82 | 589 | | 70,000.00 | |
| South Carolina: | | | | | |
| Beaufort: | | | | | |
| Radio localizer | 13 | 21.8 | | 327.00 | |
| Addition, N. A. S | 16 | 87.588 | | 12,130.15 | |
| Charleston: | | | | | |
| Railroad spur track | 1 | .75 | | 6,501.00 | |
| Underground fuel oil storage | 6 | 20.663 | | 21,003.00 | |
| Parris Island: Water line to Marine barracks | 40 | 331.15 | | 3,921.00 | |
| Tennessee: | | | | | |
| Shelby: | | | | | |
| Extension naval training station | 3 | 140.8 | | 19,703.20 | $1,567.00 |
| United States naval hospital | 2 | 206.54 | | 24,027.15 | 4,472.85 |
| Texas: | | | | | |
| Corpus Christi: Auxiliary base field | 17 | 2,850 | | 213,632.00 | 80.00 |
| Dallas: N. R. A. B.: | | | | | |
| Expansion, N. R. A. B | 61 | 189.76 | | 14,500.00 | |
| Outlying practice field, N. R. A. B | 2 | 162.06 | | 10,442.00 | 400.00 |
| Outlying field, N. R. A. B | 1 | 204.47 | | 12,818.00 | 4,428.90 |
| Do | 2 | 139.45 | | 9,067.00 | 178.00 |
| Do | 1 | 249.74 | | 26,177.00 | |
| Addition, N. R. A. B | 2 | 76 | | 38,571.00 | |
| Grand Prairie Airport | 1 | 274.30 | | 176,200.00 | |
| Eagle Mountain Lake: Railroad spur track | 2 | 8.89 | | 1,186.40 | 1,771.84 |
| N. R. A. B | 1 | 340.26 | | 26,500.00 | |
| Do | 1 | 5.08 | $775.00 | 1,775.00 | |
| Ft. Worth: Marine Corps glider base | 20 | 2,922.044 | | 143,489.63 | |
| Kingsville: | | | | | |
| Outlying field | 4 | 200 | | 9,789.00 | |
| Do | 3 | 246.70 | | 15,999.00 | |
| Ward Island: Radar Maintenance School | 28 | (1) | | 9,460.00 | |
| Utah: | | | | | |
| Clearfield: Naval supply depot (closed) | 56 | 841.33 | | 723,615.97 | |
| Virginia: | | | | | |
| Magruder: N. C. T. C | 22 | 4,500 | | 32,205.00 | |
| Norfolk: | | | | | |
| Subassembly shop | 1 | 23.41 | | 65,000.00 | |
| Establishment of Atlantic coast line depot | 1 | 1.50 | | 90,000.00 | |
| Railroad right-of-way | 4 | 10.77 | | 3,291.00 | |
| Additional storage facilities | 1 | 44 | | 250,000.00 | |
| Emergency water supply | 1 | 11.275 | | 7,500.00 | |
| Accomas: Outlying field | 6 | 734.96 | | 42,252.52 | |
| Quantico: | | | | | |
| Naval hospital | 1 | 4.38 | | 8,000.00 | |
| Additional facilities, naval hospital | 1 | .348 | | 6,000.00 | |
| Richmond: Overpass N. T. S | 1 | 2.156 | | 2,156.00 | |
| Isle of Wight: Extension Franklin Airport | 3 | 118 | | 11,801.00 | |
| Norfolk: Storage facilities | 1 | 10.253 | | 118,000.00 | |
| Washington: | | | | | |
| Everett: Shipbuilding facilities | 7 | 41.46 | | 140,386.00 | |
| Indian Island: Ferry service | 1 | .96 | | 1,050.00 | |
| Pacific Beach: Antiaircraft training station | 10 | 3.71 | | 74,705.00 | |
| Pasco: N. R. A. B | 17 | 2,218.37 | | 3,213.31 | |
| Harbor Island: Receiving station | 5 | 17.26 | | 14,271.49 | |
| Seattle: | | | | | |
| Water-reservoir site | 1 | .829 | | 1,600.00 | |
| Naval Reserve armory | 1 | 3.67 | | 94,000.00 | |
| Spokane: N. S. D | 7 | 665.58 | | 40,204.97 | 13,971.50 |
| Whidby: Gunnery school | 18 | 732.25 | | 118,205.00 | 15,065.00 |
| Total | 6,844 | 339,984.24 | 6,465.00<br>−15.00 | 21,461,240.18 | 430,908.23 |

JULY 1, 1941, TO JUNE 30, 1942

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alaska: | | | | | |
| Dutch Harbor: N. A. S | 1 | 127.02 | | $78,937.00 | $76,027.00 |
| California: | | | | | |
| Alameda: | | | | | |
| N. A. S | 3 | | $2,218.64 | | 32,627.10 |
| O. L. F | 2 | 143.44 | | 19,801.00 | |
| O. L. F | 1 | 301.05 | −150.00 | 90,000.00 | |
| O. L. F | 8 | 252.00 | | 25,076.00 | 3,011.25 |
| O. L. F | 1 | 205.52 | | 6,700.00 | |
| O. L. F | 5 | | | | |
| N. O. B. overhead structure | 14 | 1.33 | | 23,800.00 | 2,567.87 |
| Shipbuilding facilities | 22 | 7.66 | | 42,833.60 | |
| Berkeley | 4 | | | | 9,950.00 |
| Hunters Point: Battleship drydock | 266 | 230.50 | | 755,300.86 | 7,968.20 |
| Los Alamitos: N. R. A. B. to establish | 11 | 715.20 | | 146,576.00 | 24,738.10 |
| Los Angeles: | | | | | |
| Naval hospital | 2 | 100.00 | | 150,002.00 | 16,281.00 |
| Shipbuilding facilities | 4 | 15.58 | | 87,500.00 | |
| Lynwood: Marine gear and equipment | 1 | 7.97 | | 17,943.08 | |
| Monterey: Section base | 5 | 5.07 | | 54,502.00 | 10,500.00 |
| Morro Bay: Section base | 42 | 120.00 | −125.00 | 38,831.00 | 1,700.00 |

1 Certain land.

*Land acquisition report*—Continued

JULY 1, 1941, TO JUNE 30, 1942

| | Tracts | Area acres | Interest and refunds | Original deposit | Deficiencies |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Niland, U. S. M. C.: | | | | | |
| Landing field | 7 | 1,718.40 | | $3,810.00 | |
| Artillery and antiaircraft firing range | 1,220 | 112,613.67 | | 82,336.62 | |
| Oakland, N. R. A. B.: | | | | | |
| Outlying field | 2 | 111.13 | | 12,750.00 | $5,544.00 |
| (Closed) | 1 | | | | 45,624.00 |
| Do | 1 | | | | 14,000.00 |
| Port Chicago (closed) | 5 | | | | 47,784.00 |
| Port Hueneme, advance base depot | 171 | 1,573.00 | | 1,500,000.00 | |
| Santee, U. S. M. C.: Parachute training center | 11 | 612.65 | | 56,259.00 | 5,293.00 |
| Stockton: Shipbuilding facilities | 1 | 1.1 | | 27,500.00 | |
| San Diego, N. A. S.: | | | | | |
| Auxiliary landing field | 4 | 852.20 | | 10,652.35 | 2,157.65 |
| Seaplane base | 1 | 78.20 | | 1.00 | |
| Auxiliary landing field | 1 | 160.00 | | 2,830.00 | |
| Do | 16 | 208.92 | | 15,893.00 | 4,656.59 |
| Bombing target | 1 | 40.00 | | 1,200.00 | |
| Do | 1 | 46.00 | | 1,300.00 | |
| Outlying field | 1 | 25.73 | | 700.00 | |
| San Diego: | | | | | |
| R. D. F. S | 5 | 19.00 | | 8,656.00 | 250.00 |
| Radio and sound laboratory | 8 | 60.00 | | 31,321.00 | 11,900.00 |
| M. C. T. A. training area | 54 | 9,567.32 | | 80,075.73 | 1,375.14 |
| Destroyer base | 2 | 16.68 | | 96,351.00 | |
| San Francisco: | | | | | |
| Receiving ship station | 1 | 380.00 | | 44,801.00 | |
| N. O. B. net and harbor defenses | 1 | .23 | | 2,000.00 | |
| M. C. S. D. (closed) | 3 | | | | |
| San Pedro: Ammunition depot | 6 | 9,147.55 | | 379,242.50 | |
| Terminal Island: N. O. B., expansion of | 277 | 40.00 | | 300,000.00 | |
| Tiburon (closed) | 1 | | | | |
| Connecticut: | | | | | |
| Groton: Shipbuilding facilities | 2 | 28.37 | | 222,000.00 | |
| New London Submarine Base: | | | | | |
| Operating facilities | 2 | .45 | | 13,301.00 | |
| Do | 4 | 34.06 | | 10,001.00 | |
| Ammunition storage | 1 | 10.83 | | 320.00 | |
| Extension | 2 | 202.00 | | 28,600.00 | |
| Right-of-way power connection | 6 | 10.06 | | 1,025.00 | |
| District of Columbia: | | | | | |
| Washington Navy Yard: | | | | | |
| Storage area (closed) | 179 | 7.25 | | 443,028.50 | 59,020.23 |
| School and recreational facilities | 1 | 2.68 | | 16,694.40 | |
| Florida: | | | | | |
| Jacksonville, N. A. S.: | | | | | |
| Spur track | 3 | 17.70 | | 1,901.00 | |
| Outlying field | 25 | 697.20 | | 13,561.00 | |
| Do | 31 | 373.00 | | 8,876.00 | 500.00 |
| Do | 6 | 161.00 | | 1,451.00 | |
| Do | 3 | 40.00 | $300.00 | 1,460.00 | 700.00 |
| Do | 6 | 305.92 | | 5,101.00 | |
| Outlying field (additional) | 9 | 63.00 | | 1,701.00 | |
| Outlying field | 1 | 33.20 | | 350.00 | |
| Do | 17 | 180.65 | | 2,290.00 | |
| Well site | 23 | 353.17 | | 12,640.00 | |
| Radio beacon | 1 | 11.00 | | 375.00 | |
| Do | 2 | 13.60 | | 1,701.00 | |
| Shipbuilding facilities | 1 | 3.50 | | 85,000.00 | |
| South Jacksonville: Shipbuilding facilities | 1 | 14.34 | | 90,001.00 | 599.00 |
| Key West, N. S.: | | | | | |
| Barracks and laundry facilities | 30 | 5.28 | | 46,826.00 | |
| Expansion | 43 | 8.31 | 2,275.00 | 65,513.50 | 3,091.00 |
| Key West, N. O. B.: | | | | | |
| Housing, laundry, and storage facilities | 29 | 4.18 | | 51,363.00 | |
| Water supply system | 18 | 6.96 | | 155.00 | |
| Key West: Hospital | | 9.70 | | 67,401.00 | 5,500.00 |
| Mayport: Section base | 21 | 55.03 | | 18,540.00 | 7,936.00 |
| Miami, N. A. S.: | | | | | |
| Landing field | 7 | 640 | | 14,778.00 | |
| Development field | 28 | 567.17 | | 13,706.00 | |
| Low-cost housing | 204 | 34.68 | | 31,953.12 | |
| Spur track | 1 | .36 | | 302.00 | |
| Radio station | 1 | 29.30 | | 1,025.00 | |
| Square boundaries | 3 | 20.04 | | 649.27 | |
| Pensacola, N. A. S.: | | | | | |
| Radio range facilities | 1 | 10 | | 162.50 | |
| Outlying field | 1 | 79.50 | | 2,385.00 | |
| Do | 1 | 160 | | 3,320.00 | |
| Do | 7 | 160 | | 2,375.00 | |
| Do | 7 | 207.75 | | 4,053.00 | 343.00 |
| Do | 4 | 115.62 | | 1,791.00 | |
| Do | 9 | 263 | | 18,990.00 | 1,400.00 |
| Do | 4 | 640 | | 8,611.00 | |
| Port Everglades: Section base 2 | 2 | 72.00 | | 6,382.00 | |
| Georgia: | | | | | |
| Atlanta: | | | | | |
| N. R. A. B | 7 | 20.18 | | 16,786.00 | |
| Extension | 1 | .61 | | 2,100.00 | |
| Baldwin County: Ordnance facilities | 1 | 110.00 | | 1.00 | |
| Hawaii: | | | | | |
| Pearl Harbor Navy Yard: | | | | | |
| Dredging channels | 2 | 117.60 | | 25,860.00 | |
| Do | 3 | 351.00 | 70.58 | 94,502.00 | 1,298.96 |
| Pearl Harbor, N. A. D.: Ammunition storage | 15 | 537.29 | | 135,278.00 | |
| Idaho: | | | | | |
| Pocatello: | | | | | |
| Ordnance facilities | 7 | 145.94 | | 47,200.00 | 11,585.00 |
| N. O. P | 13 | 68,666.89 | | 29,692.89 | |
| Illinois: | | | | | |
| Chicago: Ordnance facilities (closed) | 1 | 78.79 | | 130,011.75 | |
| Freeport: Shipbuilding facilities | 1 | 43.54 | | 125,000.00 | |
| East St. Louis: Shipbuilding facilities (closed) | 1 | 19.86 | | 11,472.00 | 7,528.00 |

*Land acquisition report*—Continued

JULY 1, 1941, TO JUNE 30, 1942

| | Tracts | Area acres | Interest and refunds | Original deposit | Deficiencies |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Indiana: | | | | | |
| Burns City, N. A. D.: | | | | | |
| Ammunition storage (closed) | 36 | 2,196.26 | −$544.00 | $36,530.00 | $1,224.00 |
| To establish | 127 | 5,901.26 | | 79,702.17 | 14,252.90 |
| Ammunition storage | 9 | 565.06 | | 3,625.00 | |
| Additional storage | 5 | 347.00 | | 4,815.00 | 1,138.00 |
| Evansville: Shipbuilding facilities | 12 | 44.66 | | 76,374.35 | 7,385.45 |
| Jeffersonville: Shipbuilding facilities | 16 | 15.77 | | 20,251.00 | 532.70 |
| Do | 21 | 27.02 | | 79,395.47 | 400.00 |
| Peru, N. R. A. B.: To establish | 32 | 1,986.00 | | 339,282.00 | 30,472.00 |
| Kansas: | | | | | |
| Gardner, N. R. A. B.: | | | | | |
| Outlying field | 1 | 160.00 | 360.00 | 10,401.00 | |
| Spur tract right-of-way | 3 | 20.02 | | 1,806.00 | |
| Outlying field | 1 | 131.50 | | 10,849.00 | 3,051.00 |
| Louisiana: | | | | | |
| New Orleans, N. R. A. B.: Outlying field | 2 | 89.69 | | 15,000.00 | 21,659.48 |
| New Orleans, N. A. D.: | | | | | |
| To establish | 1 | 859.00 | 800.00 | 31,783.00 | 19,326.00 |
| Do | 12 | 2,657.26 | 1,308.00<br>20.00 | 98,318.62 | 34,300.55 |
| Maine: | | | | | |
| Bath: Shipbuilding facilities | 3 | 1.97 | | 23,000.00 | |
| Do | 1 | .09 | | 15,000.00 | |
| Portland: Section base | 1 | 3.00 | | | |
| South Portland: Shipbuilding facilities | 1 | 2.31 | | 25,000.00 | 1,450.60 |
| | | | | 4,560.00 | |
| Net stowage | 2 | 2.27 | | 1,201.00 | |
| Rockland: Section base | 1 | 1.10 | | 15,105.00 | |
| Maryland: | | | | | |
| Annapolis: Extension to athletic field | 62 | 7.33 | 409.31 | 289,511.12 | 115,753.47 |
| Baltimore: | | | | | |
| Shipbuilding facilities | 1 | 5.92 | | 1.00 | 77,499.00 |
| Do | 3 | 7.02 | | 303,501.00 | 60,879.31 |
| Cedar Point: N. A. S., to establish | 113 | 5,955.11 | 236.00 | 712,282.00 | 241,380.00 |
| Piney Point, N. T. R.: | | | | | |
| Boat harbor | 1 | 18.60 | | 6,875.00 | 115.00 |
| Spotting range | 1 | 11.30 | | 2,350.00 | |
| Massachusetts: | | | | | |
| Boston: Shipbuilding facilities | 1 | 3.85 | | 93,737.14 | |
| Boston, navy yard: | | | | | |
| Garage facilities | 1 | .38 | | 68,000.00 | 7,750.00 |
| Extension repair facilities | 1 | 5.00 | | 220,000.00 | |
| Charlestown, navy yard: Pattern storehouse | 1 | .19 | | 18,000.00 | |
| East Boston: | | | | | |
| Shipbuilding facilities | 4 | 8.09 | | 181,201.00 | |
| Fuel-oil storage | 10 | 60.32 | | 300,000.00 | |
| South Boston Naval drydock | 1 | 17.29 | | 148,000.00 | |
| Hingham: | | | | | |
| Shipbuilding facilities | 14 | 123.12 | | 174,772.08 | |
| Railroad trackage | 9 | 5.66 | | 2,250.00 | |
| Shipbuilding facilities | 1 | 4.00 | | 10,600.00 | |
| Quincy: Shipbuilding facilities | 6 | 42.29 | | 62,653.00 | |
| Springfield: Shipbuilding facilities | 1 | 8.64 | | 11,300.00 | |
| Waltham: Shipbuilding facilities | 2 | 6.68 | | 38,901.00 | |
| Chelsea, navy yard: Berthing and docking | 2 | 7.58 | | 188,400.00 | 11,800.00 |
| South Boston, navy yard: | | | | | |
| Receiving ship facilities | 2 | 3.50 | | 500,001.00 | |
| Do | 1 | .94 | | 25,000.00 | |
| Hingham, N. A. D.: | | | | | |
| Extension | 250 | 3,747.63 | | 150,000.00 | |
| Do | 3 | 29.71 | | 54,026.00 | 250.00 |
| South Weymouth, N. A. S.: | | | | | |
| Safety zone | 12 | 72.56 | | | |
| Lighter-than-air facilities | 187 | 979.40 | 263.75 | 70,964.00 | 1,339.00 |
| Access road, right-of-way for water main | 25 | 204.00 | | 15,126.00 | |
| Squantum, N. R. A. B.: | | | | | |
| Outlying training field | 5 | 206.42 | 150.00 | 17,911.00 | |
| Auxiliary Field | 1 | 226.12 | | 18,145.00 | |
| Michigan: | | | | | |
| Grosse Ile, N. R. A. B.: Expansion | 2 | 42.46 | | 11,001.00 | |
| Mississippi: | | | | | |
| Gulfport: Naval base depot | 10 | 911.50 | | 27,753.00 | |
| Missouri: | | | | | |
| Robertson, N. R. A. B.: To establish | 1 | 40.37 | | 16,150.00 | |
| Nevada: | | | | | |
| Hawthorne, N. A. D.: High explosive area | 2 | 796.41 | | 917.82 | |
| New Jersey: | | | | | |
| Camden: Shipbuilding facilities | 1 | 15.18 | | 390,000.00 | |
| Cape May: Section base | 2 | 1.80 | | 3,001.00 | 500.00 |
| Hoboken: Shipbuilding facilities | 4 | 3.70 | | 450,752.00 | |
| Hoboken: Ship repair facilities | 1 | 18.51 | | 290,200.00 | |
| Newark: Shipbuilding facilities | 1 | 115.12 | | 675,000.00 | |
| New York: | | | | | |
| Amagansett, R. D. F. S.: Internal security | 7 | 41.45 | | 32,250.00 | 1,738.00 |
| Bethage: Plant expansion | 198 | 32.00 | | 35,201.00 | 580.00 |
| Brooklyn: | | | | | |
| Ship repair facilities | 1 | 5.77 | | 400,000.00 | |
| Do | 1 | 25.88 | | 700,000.00 | |
| Shipbuilding facilities | 1 | .22 | | 24,000.00 | |
| Freeport: Shipbuilding facilities | 5 | .36 | | 7,291.00 | 675.00 |
| Brooklyn: Shipbuilding facilities | 5 | 2.50 | | 70,050.00 | |
| New York, N. A. S.: | | | | | |
| To establish | 2 | 51.00 | | 286,000.00 | |
| Do | 1 | 942.42 | | 9,250,000.00 | |
| Round Island, N. A. D.: Safety area (closed) | 1 | 7.00 | | 1,500.00 | |
| Brooklyn, M. S. D.: Storage | 11 | .48 | −54.00 | 53,876.00 | 9,683.00 |
| Brooklyn: Exp. pier facilities | 1 | 25.93 | | 1,100,000.00 | |
| Brooklyn Navy Yard, Kent Ave. addition | 29 | 25.40 | | 1,478,509.00 | 73,000.00 |
| Long Island, Navy Yard: Shipbuilding facilities | 1 | 3.71 | | 250,000.00 | |
| New York: | | | | | |
| Navy yard, security | 8 | .29 | | 30,150.00 | |
| Shipbuilding facilities | 1 | .85 | | 40,000.00 | |
| Salvage facilities | 1 | 3.08 | | 2,610,000.00 | |

*Land acquisition report*—Continued

JULY 1, 1941, TO JUNE 30, 1942

| | Tracts | Area acres | Interest and refunds | Original deposit | Deficiencies |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| North Carolina: | | | | | |
| Cherry Point, M. C. T. A., aviation | 94 | 7,582.20 | | $104,869.00 | |
| Cherry Point, M. C. A. B.: Magazine storage | 6 | 832.90 | | 14,905.00 | |
| Elizabeth City, N. A. S.: | | | | | |
| Lighter-than-air base | 13 | 765.22 | | 78,211.00 | |
| Spur track | 32 | 57.00 | | 8,160.50 | |
| Morehead City: | | | | | |
| Section base | 2 | 58.00 | | 15,002.00 | |
| Do | 7 | 134.10 | | 1,950.00 | |
| Onslow County, M. C. T. A | 33 | 7,397.25 | | 78,285.00 | |
| Area H | 91 | 6,814.89 | | 12,257.00 | |
| Area I | 108 | 1,973.77 | | 153,302.00 | |
| Area J | 63 | 6,360.99 | | 168,931.00 | $51,000.00 |
| M. C. T | 81 | 7,023.77 | | 136,032.00 | |
| | 116 | 8,290.05 | | 169,946.00 | |
| | 5 | 1,538.50 | | 2,990.00 | |
| Ohio: | | | | | |
| Brooklyn village shipbuilding facilities | 1 | 76.69 | | 76,000.00 | |
| | 2 | 14.62 | | 90,000.00 | |
| Cincinnati: | | | | | |
| (Closed) | 14 | 1.73 | | | 1,056.36 |
| Do | 1 | .10 | | | 1,500.00 |
| Do | 4 | .50 | | | 3,775.00 |
| Cleveland: Ordnance facilities | 1 | .33 | | 6,000.00 | |
| Lockland: Closed | 1 | 2.57 | | | 13,347.00 |
| Toledo: Shipbuilding facilities | 40 | 5.11 | | 135,471.00 | 5,830.00 |
| Oklahoma: | | | | | |
| Norman, N. R. A. B.: | | | | | |
| (Closed) | 15 | 1,266.02 | −$553.00 | | 20,850.80 |
| Do | 12 | 1,271.78 | | | 23,486.00 |
| Oregon: | | | | | |
| Tongue Point, N. A. S | 1 | 4.20 | 99.12 | 9,500.00 | 3,000.00 |
| | 1 | 7.68 | | 1.00 | |
| Tongue Point, N. A. S | 1 | 1 | 74.34 | 3,250.00 | 22,350.00 |
| Additional facilities | 1 | 128.41 | | 1.00 | |
| Do | 1 | .16 | | 100.00 | 125.00 |
| Portland: Plant expansion (closed) | 1 | 13.04 | | 65,200.00 | 24,800.00 |
| Pennsylvania: | | | | | |
| Ambridge: Shipbuilding facilities | 2 | 63.55 | | 56,641.50 | |
| Eddystone: Ship repair facilities (closed) | 1 | 34.52 | | 600,000.00 | |
| Danville: Shipbuilding facilities | 4 | 14.47 | | 330,231.00 | |
| Greensburg: Shipbuilding facilities | 2 | 152.75 | | 10,800.00 | |
| Homestead: | | | | | |
| Plant site | 2 | .55 | | 20,550.00 | |
| Shipbuilding facilities | 6 | .58 | | 40,791.56 | |
| Philadelphia: | | | | | |
| N. R. A. B. (closed) | 19 | 576.73 | | 278,287.35 | 181,009.00 |
| N. O. R. D | 1 | 2.67 | | 170,000.00 | |
| Navy yard: | | | | | |
| Parking area (closed) | 3 | 6.37 | | 3.00 | |
| Housing (closed) | 1 | 13.11 | | 39,337.20 | |
| Bridge (closed) | 9 | 76.25 | 221.21 | 210,684.53 | 3,347.47 |
| Shipbuilding facilities | 2 | 9.25 | | 694,366.00 | |
| Do | 21 | 1.87 | | 444,854.00 | |
| Do | 2 | 1.60 | 416.47 | 104,920.50 | 15,080.50 |
| Plant expansion | 1 | 4.33 | | 145,000.00 | 5,000.00 |
| Mechanicsburg, N. S. D.: Storage | 36 | 821.81 | | 123,526.00 | |
| Puerto Rico: | | | | | |
| San Juan: | | | | | |
| Graving-dock facilities | 35 | 5.45 | | 114,695.00 | 12,145.24 |
| Do | 1 | 22.06 | | 989,387.95 | 1,620.00 |
| San Juan, N. A. S.: | | | | | |
| Storage facilities | 4 | 772.70 | | 144,875.79 | 8,225.99 |
| Do | 33 | 946.70 | | 131,306.83 | |
| Fuel-storage facilities | 2 | 180.14 | | 30,100.00 | 100.00 |
| Ammunition-storage facilities | 43 | 54.14 | | 29,691.00 | |
| Firing range | 1 | 12.59 | | 3,969.80 | |
| Ammunition depot | 27 | 178.95 | | 43,892.00 | 1,998.80 |
| Vieques: | | | | | |
| Fleet operating facilities | 6 | 10,208.85 | −24,000.00 | 403,326.00 | |
| Do | 5 | 1,284.04 | | 36,224.80 | |
| Do | 2 | 7,936.60 | | 35,460.00 | |
| Do | 19 | 97.33 | | 15,952.15 | 2,213.56 |
| Do | 34 | 686.96 | | 46,866.70 | |
| Do | 6 | 1,234.03 | | 46,739.00 | 15,860.35 |
| Do | 34 | 2,120.24 | | 76,528.00 | |
| Do | 22 | 2,217.33 | −7,903.69 | 149,151.50 | 26,746.00 |
| Do | 8 | 1,304.49 | | 142,373.10 | 11,687.00 |
| Rhode Island: | | | | | |
| Melville: Fuel and net depot | 9 | 267.89 | | 110,401.00 | |
| Newport: | | | | | |
| N. O. B. fleet supply depot | 3 | 83.94 | | 60,002.00 | |
| Ammunition storage facilities | 1 | 600.00 | | 14,000.00 | |
| N. T. S., Hostess House, gate control | 4 | 36.78 | | 19,451.00 | |
| Additional ferry slip | 3 | 205.28 | | 50,000.00 | |
| Rifle range | 1 | 165.20 | | 65,000.00 | |
| Quonset Point, N. A. S.: | | | | | |
| Small boat harbor | 1 | 9.43 | | 11,300.00 | |
| Outlying field | 1 | 683.00 | | 1.00 | |
| South Carolina: | | | | | |
| Charleston: | | | | | |
| Navy Yard, storage facilities | 2 | 81.70 | | 100,000.00 | |
| Shipbuilding facilities | 8 | .23 | | 28,226.00 | |
| Do | 9 | .96 | | 30,899.00 | |
| Do | 1 | 3.04 | | 28,285.00 | |
| Tennessee: | | | | | |
| Memphis, N. R. A. B., to establish | 33 | 2,279.48 | −250.00 | 203,601.00 | 41,265.00 |
| Texas: | | | | | |
| Corpus Christi, N. A. S.: | | | | | |
| Base Field P-3 | 4 | 63.74 | | 8,930.54 | 116.40 |
| Field No. 20 | 1 | 250.00 | | 33,500.00 | 3,620.00 |
| Field No. 21 | 3 | 250.00 | | 28,850.00 | |
| Field No. 22 | 2 | 245.70 | | 29,783.25 | 2,712.50 |
| Field No. 30 | 4 | 249.99 | | 33,279.85 | 7,594.22 |

*Land acquisition report*—Continued

JULY 1, 1941, TO JUNE 30, 1942

| | Tracts | Area acres | Interest and refunds | Original deposit | Deficiencies |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Texas—Continued. | | | | | |
| Corpus Christi N. A. S.—Continued. | | | | | |
| Field No. 34 | 1 | 250.00 | $878.00 | 26,875.00 | 14,634.70 |
| Field No. 31 | 4 | 249.76 | | 36,932.00 | 5,312.00 |
| Field No. 32-B | 5 | 250.00 | | 33,900.00 | 3,000.00 |
| Field No. 33 | 5 | 250.00 | | 32,950.00 | 708.52 |
| Field No. 35 | 1 | 250.00 | 58.72 | 25,750.00 | 8,370.00 |
| Field No. 36 | 1 | 250.00 | 2,237.93 | 27,250.00 | 8,837.50 |
| Field No. 40 | 53 | 640.00 | | 21,451.00 | |
| Field No. 52 | 1 | 277.00 | | 11,959.50 | 2,663.50 |
| Field No. 53 | 1 | 160.00 | | 12,500.00 | 1,438.35 |
| Virginia: | | | | | |
| Dahlgren, N. P. G.: | | | | | |
| Right-of-way for railroad | 1 | 10.20 | | 3,150.00 | 3,350.00 |
| Do | 2 | 10.81 | | 2,300.00 | |
| Newport News: British barracks | 1 | 5.03 | | 7,545.00 | |
| Portsmouth, Norfolk Navy Yard: | | | | | |
| Exp. shipbuilding facilities | 2 | 3.50 | | 25,119.00 | 206.00 |
| Naval storehouse | 30 | 34.32 | | 60,999.52 | 16,785.00 |
| Rec. facilities | 1 | 7.26 | | 7,000.00 | |
| Road | 1 | .99 | | 1.00 | |
| Gas-generating plant | 1 | 3.82 | | 5,290.00 | |
| Expansion | 1 | 1.49 | | 1.00 | |
| Extension to quay wall | 1 | .94 | | 1.00 | |
| Naval hospital | 1 | 25.97 | | 64,927.00 | |
| Portsmouth, fuel annex | 2 | 290.33 | | 23,501.00 | |
| Norfolk, N. A. S. | | | | | |
| Extension to | 122 | 87.47 | | 104,104.00 | 13,162.00 |
| Dredge spoil area | 111 | 50.00 | | 299,460.00 | 20,090.00 |
| Auxiliary landing field | 98 | 578.53 | | 14,017.00 | |
| Expansion of barracks | 43 | 30.20 | | 32,366.00 | 740.00 |
| Expansion of air station | 13 | 226.97 | | 85,693.00 | 64,438.00 |
| Norfolk, N. O. B.: | | | | | |
| Prison, barracks, antiaircraft, etc. | 28 | 508.38 | | 122,011.00 | 29,070.00 |
| Old Point Comfort: Officers' living quarters | 1 | | | 500,000.00 | |
| Norfolk, N. O. B.: Section base | 5 | 1,761.00 | | 276,502.00 | 9,960.00 |
| Quantico M. C. T. A.: Barracks | 1 | 3.12 | | 624.00 | |
| St. Julien's Creek, N. A. D.: Access road | 1 | 1.55 | | 1,550.00 | |
| South Richmond: Shipbuilding facilities | 5 | 200.39 | | 324,080.00 | |
| Virgin Islands: | | | | | |
| St. Thomas: | | | | | |
| Section base | 3 | 10.89 | | 13,782.50 | |
| N. A. S., rifle range (closed) | 1 | 33.54 | | 1,501.00 | |
| Washington: | | | | | |
| Seattle: | | | | | |
| Storage facilities | 21 | 76.20 | | 4,146,929.27 | 287,037.17 |
| Shipbuilding facilities | 5 | 10.91 | | 136,952.00 | 32,550.00 |
| Whidby Island, N. A. S.: Rearming base | 139 | 4,324.46 | | 678,219.50 | 54,205.75 |
| Bremerton, Puget Sound Navy Yard: | | | | | |
| Rifle range | 3 | 3,375.71 | | 6,780.28 | |
| Turret shop | 62 | 30.78 | −16,936.00 | 431,421.00 | 20,674.00 |
| Shipfitters' shop | 4 | .58 | | 115,267.70 | 38,233.30 |
| West Virginia: | | | | | |
| Point Pleasant, shipbuilding facilities | 2 | 82.14 | | 47,320.00 | 1,301.25 |
| Total | 6,373 | 347,599.18 | 8,383.01<br>−54,529.75 | 43,357,119.44 | 2,292,043.78 |

JULY 1, 1940, TO JUNE 30, 1941 (FISCAL YEAR 1941)

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alaska: | | | | | |
| Amaknak, N. A. S. | 1 | 1,930.00 | | | |
| California: | | | | | |
| Alameda: Housing (closed) | 1 | 70.0287 | $8,016.31 | $105,000.00 | $96,071.75 |
| Long Beach: N. R. A. B. | 1 | 475.16 | | 108,000.00 | 17,000.00 |
| Long Beach: Housing | 1 | 39.37 | | 39,371.00 | |
| Mare Island: Radio station | 5 | 3,303.90 | | 176,401.00 | |
| San Diego: | | | | | |
| Marine Corps training area | 112 | 19,298.25 | | 257,609.77 | 103,137.19 |
| Do | 1 | 11.78 | | 6,500.00 | |
| Do | 31 | 16.50 | | 124,967.00 | 123,951.67 |
| Middletown, Marine Corps training area extension | 1 | .23 | | 150.00 | 150.00 |
| N. A. S., Camp Kearney | 12 | 14.52 | | | |
| N. A. S., Linda Vista | 1 | 160.00 | | 4,800.00 | |
| N. A. S., Otay Mesa | 2 | 315.00 | 1,407.00 | 10,400.00 | 5,619.20 |
| N. A. S., Ocotillo | 2 | 80.00 | | 2,000.00 | |
| N. A. S., Rosedale | 1 | 160.00 | | 9,600.00 | 5,800.00 |
| Naval destroyer base | 3 | 6.75 | | 6,462.00 | |
| San Francisco: | | | | | |
| Hunters Point drydock | 52 | 48.00 | | 3,993,572.00 | |
| Risdon Iron Works (closed) | 1 | 33.00 | | 1,900,000.00 | |
| Solano County: Housing | 32 | 28.93 | | 14,468.00 | |
| Terminal Island: N. A. S. | 2 | 333.60 | | 300,000.00 | |
| Canal Zone: | | | | | |
| Coco Solo, N. A. D. | 58 | 1,250 | | | |
| District of Columbia: | | | | | |
| Bellevue: | | | | | |
| Magazine | 2 | 2.148 | | 1,750.00 | |
| Housing | 1 | 81.9316 | | 40,863.20 | |
| Florida. | | | | | |
| Jacksonville, N. A. S. | 18 | 173.5 | | | |
| Auxiliary flying field | 32 | 1,024.95 | | 10,629.00 | |
| Do | 9 | 113.9 | | 5,175.00 | |
| Do | 48 | 2,680.00 | | 16,651.00 | |
| Do | 1 | 865.60 | | 27,000.00 | |
| Do | 28 | 500.00 | | 12,440.00 | |
| Do | 51 | 5,732.00 | 600.00 | 55,505.00 | 8,032.25 |
| Right-of-way, N. A. S. | 18 | 54.00 | | 1,935.00 | |
| Key West, N. A. S. | 6 | 57.30 | | 125,000.00 | |
| Miami, N. A. S., Opa, Lock aviation training field | 60 | 1,533.35 | | 26,255.00 | |
| Pensacola, N. A. S., auxiliary flying field: | | | | | |
| 1940 C | 13 | 200.00 | | 5,756.00 | |
| 1940 A | 5 | 320.00 | 247.68 | 9,651.00 | 2,064.00 |

*Land acquisition report*—Continued

JULY 1, 1940, TO JUNE 30, 1941 (FISCAL YEAR 1941)

| | Tracts | Area acres | Interest and refunds | Original deposit | Deficiencies |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Georgia: | | | | | |
| Macon: Fuze assembly and loading shop | 1 | 266.49 | | $1.00 | |
| Hawaii: | | | | | |
| Barbers Point (Oahu) N. A. S. (closed) | 1 | 2,659.41 | | 198,298.62 | |
| Heeia, Mokapu, aviation shore facilities | 332 | 464.66 | | 481,189.88 | $390,161.14 |
| Ilio Point (Molokai), landing field | 1 | 261.00 | | 2,610.00 | |
| Oahu, radio station (closed) | 1 | 359.24 | | 36,000.00 | |
| Pearl Harbor: | | | | | |
| Housing development | 4 | 254.46 | | 123,871.94 | 99,735.61 |
| (Aiea), Naval reservation | 1 | 0.80 | | | |
| (Oahu), Ferry boat landing | 1 | .097 | | 110.00 | |
| (Ewa) Navy Yard (closed) | 6 | 37.58 | | 3,916.80 | 15,286.28 |
| Naval reservation | 3 | 368.89 | | 98,451.50 | |
| South Halawa Gulch: | | | | | |
| Fuel-oil facilities | 3 | 344.91 | $650.31 | 83,291.80 | 60,650.70 |
| Do | 2 | 27.58 | | | |
| Roadway (easement) | 1 | 11.55 | | | |
| Indiana: | | | | | |
| Burns City, N. A. D. (closed) | 13 | 754.90 | 63.90 | 13,752.45 | 6,589.55 |
| Do | 52 | 2,489.36 | 5.00 | 50,327.00 | 33,218.50 |
| Do | 90 | 5,478.00 | 1,288.23 | 85,178.35 | 29,832.63 |
| Indianapolis: Bomb sight shop (closed) | 1 | 160.00 | | 40,000.00 | 9,250.00 |
| Illinois: | | | | | |
| Glenview: Airport (closed) | 5 | 319.00 | 10,634.19 | 577,295.00 | 238,893.00 |
| Kentucky: | | | | | |
| Louisville: Gun mount assembly shop | 1 | 135.00 | | 40,501.00 | 20,249.00 |
| Addition to | 1 | 1.29 | | 501.00 | 120.00 |
| Maine: | | | | | |
| Kittery: Housing | 8 | 100.00 | | 7,000.00 | |
| Maryland: | | | | | |
| Piney Point: | | | | | |
| Small Boat Harbor | 2 | 24.16 | 12.18 | 3,000.00 | 267.50 |
| Do | | 6.79 | | 4,000.00 | |
| St. Marys Spotting range | 1 | .70 | | 150.00 | |
| Massachusetts: | | | | | |
| Squantum: Naval Reserve aviation base | 1 | 20.33 | | 42,500.00 | 6,500.00 |
| Michigan: | | | | | |
| Grosse Ile, Naval Reserve aviation base | 1 | 15.195 | | 1.00 | |
| Do | 2 | 475.00 | | 196,794.00 | |
| Do | 4 | 14.50 | | 3,521.00 | |
| Macomb County: Small size machine shop | 4 | 115.09 | | 155,896.00 | |
| Do | 6 | 23.65 | | 26,250.00 | |
| Mississippi: | | | | | |
| Pascagoula: Housing facilities | 29 | 207.51 | | 22,497.45 | |
| New Jersey: | | | | | |
| Bayonne: Naval supply depot | 3 | 153.00 | | 2,837,002.00 | |
| New York: | | | | | |
| Brooklyn: Naval medical supply depot | 10 | .31 | | 29,500.00 | 10,410.00 |
| Shipbuilding facilities | 1 | 53.25 | | 4,000,000.00 | |
| Fort Lafayette: Naval magazine | 1 | 9.70 | | | |
| New York City: Receiving barracks | 42 | 2.63 | | 239,179.00 | 37,264.00 |
| North Carolina: | | | | | |
| Onslow County: | | | | | |
| Marine Corps Area A | 63 | 2,889.22 | | 90,280.00 | 6,400.00 |
| Marine Corps Area B | 41 | 5,173.50 | | 116,852.00 | |
| Marine Corps Area C | 116 | 6,226.34 | | 148,005.00 | |
| Marine Corps Area D | 128 | 6,048.87 | | 80,800.00 | |
| Marine Corps Area E | 139 | 1,028.23 | | 70,694.00 | |
| Marine Corps Area F | 75 | 10,866.93 | | 129,500.00 | |
| Marine Corps Area G | 74 | 12,921.23 | | 114,928.00 | |
| Ohio: | | | | | |
| Canton: Machine shop | 3 | 129.00 | | 54,001.00 | 6,500.00 |
| Pacific Islands: Palmyra | | | | [1] | |
| Pennsylvania: South Coatesville: Shipbuilding | 1 | 1.00 | 444.83 | 3,200.00 | 4,275.00 |
| Puerto Rico: | | | | | |
| Isla Grande, N. A. S | 16 | 293.25 | | | |
| San Juan: | | | | | |
| N. O. B | 2 | 27.00 | | | |
| Low-cost housing | 8 | 58.098 | | 23,282.75 | |
| N. O. B | 51 | 1,630.59 | | | |
| Rhode Island: | | | | | |
| Melville: N. F. D | 3 | 51.60 | | 16,200.00 | |
| Newport: | | | | | |
| N. T. S | 1 | 127 | | 50,001.00 | |
| Section base | 4 | 16.55 | | 174,371.00 | |
| Quonset Point: | | | | | |
| N. A. S | 476 | 379 | | 926,041.60 | 231,461.20 |
| Do | 195 | 225.80 | | 335,959.00 | 18,132.25 |
| Housing | | 124 | | 30,000.00 | |
| South Carolina: | | | | | |
| Charleston, N. A. D | 32 | 6,748 | | 180,085.70 | |
| Texas: | | | | | |
| Corpus Christi: | | | | | |
| N. A. S | 162 | 2,049.85 | 2,956.54 | 229,402.94 | 22,842.85 |
| Do | 9 | 1,741.81 | 3,708.09 | 167,093.45 | 45,763.18 |
| Do | 3 | 860.90 | 1,532.75 | 59,225.00 | 38,690.50 |
| Orange County: Housing | 6 | 92.40 | | 25,182.85 | |
| Nueces County: Housing | 1 | 140.07 | | 15,407.70 | |
| Virgin Islands: N. A. S | 1 | 28 | | 2.00 | |
| St. Thomas: | | | | | |
| Marine aviation | 3 | 8.44 | [2] 657.50 | 2,346.00 | |
| Do | 3 | 91.40 | 685.26 | 5,907.00 | 7,852.00 |
| Virginia: | | | | | |
| Alexandria, N. T. S.: Housing | 1 | 32.32 | | 15,000.00 | |
| Naval torpedo shop | 1 | 1.55 | | 42,500.00 | |
| Dahlgren: | | | | | |
| N. T. R | 1 | 17.13 | | 1,284.75 | |
| N. P. G., safety zones: Owners: | | | | | |
| Branson et al | | 8.98 | | 1,800.00 | |
| Davis et al | | 5 | | 325.00 | |
| M. L. Maiden | | 26.50 | | 1,451.00 | |
| Benjamin Harris | | 1 | | 1,150.00 | |
| Wesley James | | 5.39 | | 1,000.00 | |

[1] Not determined.
[2] Refund.

*Land acquisition report*—Continued

JULY 1, 1940, TO JUNE 30, 1941 (FISCAL YEAR 1941)

| | Tracts | Area acres | Interest and refunds | Original deposit | Deficiencies |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Virginia—Continued. | | | | | |
| Dahlgren—Continued. | | | | | |
| N. P. G., safety zones: Owners—Continued. | | | | | |
| Ida Bell Johnson | ---------- | 1.25 | ---------- | $1,187.50 | ---------- |
| B. Johnson | ---------- | 5.68 | ---------- | 568.00 | ---------- |
| W. H. Johnson | ---------- | 5.50 | ---------- | 1,275.00 | ---------- |
| B. I. Johnson | ---------- | 4.15 | ---------- | 415.00 | ---------- |
| John Key | ---------- | 35.50 | ---------- | 3,880.00 | ---------- |
| Dolly A. Lewis | ---------- | 7.36 | ---------- | 2,300.00 | ---------- |
| M. L. Maiden | ---------- | 14.37 | ---------- | 5,505.00 | ---------- |
| Edgar Newton | ---------- | 12.75 | ---------- | 727.02 | ---------- |
| Little Creek: Section base | 3 | 37.94 | ---------- | 22,076.00 | $3,155.00 |
| Newport News: Housing | 1 | 42.32 | ---------- | 51,215.67 | ---------- |
| Norfolk: | | | | | |
| N. A. S. | 1 | 272.03 | ---------- | 24,966.00 | ---------- |
| Do | 1 | 175.63 | ---------- | 3,516.00 | ---------- |
| Do | 5 | 388.70 | $470.61 | 22,681.00 | 4,971.50 |
| Do | 3 | 616.41 | ---------- | 46,900.00 | ---------- |
| Do | 1 | 7.10 | ---------- | 551.00 | ---------- |
| Do | 4 | 328.95 | 139.80 | 32,895.00 | 2,105.00 |
| Do | 1 | 12.07 | [1] 50.00 | 7,504.20 | ---------- |
| Do | 15 | 441.02 | ---------- | 45,997.00 | 4,625.00 |
| Navy Yard | 1 | 16.23 | ---------- | 9,560.00 | 1,840.00 |
| North Titustown: Housing | 2 | 3.71 | ---------- | 2,771.00 | ---------- |
| Quantico: Marine Corps training area | 9 | 1,209.81 | ---------- | 58,702.00 | 5,700.00 |
| Washington: | | | | | |
| Bainbridge Island: | | | | | |
| Radio station | 17 | 160.03 | 83.45 | 25,397.65 | 1,153.45 |
| Do | 28 | 90.39 | −656.75 | 11,656.00 | ---------- |
| Clallam, Snohomish, Skagit Counties | 1 | 996.29 | ---------- | 38,707.50 | ---------- |
| Indian Island: Ammunition storage facilities | 117 | 2,715.98 | ---------- | 50,848.25 | 17,947.83 |
| Kitsap County: Marine Corps training area | 3 | 390 | 120.57 | 7,701.00 | 1,500.00 |
| Seattle, N. A. S.: | | | | | |
| Auxiliary fields | 4 | 200 | ---------- | 5,600.00 | ---------- |
| Adjacent to | 7 | 6 | ---------- | 13,481.00 | 2,970.00 |
| Radio transmitter site | 1 | 19.95 | −2,286.00 | 15,253.00 | ---------- |
| Machine-gun range | 1 | 23.57 | ---------- | 9,428.00 | ---------- |
| West Virginia: | | | | | |
| South Charleston, N. A. S. | 289 | 57.50 | 3,330.29 | 41,741.00 | 74,251.26 |
| Florida: | | | | | |
| Jacksonville: Auxiliary field | 21 | 785.45 | ---------- | 9,093.23 | ---------- |
| Pensacola, N. A. S.: Auxiliary field | 2 | 120 | ---------- | 650.00 | 50.00 |
| Total | 3,406 | 125,799.17 | { [1] 34,255.25 [2] 35,791.99 } | 17,244,247.16 | 1,822,642.99 |

[1] Refund. [2] Interest.

Mr. MAAS. That is exactly the information the gentleman desires. Also, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point a letter dated February 22, by the Secretary of the Navy, to the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
*Washington, February 22, 1943.*

The CHAIRMAN,
*Naval Affairs Committee,*
*House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My attention has been called to the amendment to the pending bill to authorize certain public works, H. R. 1692, the amendment being as follows:

*"Provided further,* That prior to the acquisition, by lease or otherwise, of any land under authority of this act, the Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Senate and House Naval Affairs Committees all such prospective acquisitions."

It is my understanding that this amendment has been proposed in order to avoid the necessity of having specific legislative authorization for each individual acquisition of land. I understand further that the committee understands from the wording of the amendment that the Department will come into the agreement with the Naval Affairs Committees of the House and Senate with respect to acquisitions before final commitments are made. This procedure is acceptable to me.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK KNOX.

Mr. MAAS. The bill also provides that the approximate cost indicated for each category may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward but that the total cost shall not exceed $1,256,607,000. The committee is of the opinion that this flexibility is necessary in order to permit the authorizations herein contained being effectively carried out, thus allowing for changes as the military situation may develop.

The first committee amendment reduces the sum authorized to be appropriated for aviation facilities by $15,000,000, from $238,000,000 to $223,000,000. This reduction was determined upon since the need for the money involved is entirely problematical. The necessity for this sum will depend upon whether the Navy Department later decides that an additional primary training base is required. If such need should arise, the committee will be available to give immediate consideration to a request for legislation to provide therefor.

I have already discussed the second and third amendments, dealing, respectively, with illiterate training in the Marine Corps, and the WAVE training.

The fourth amendment deletes entirely the item of $223,313,000 for "Miscellaneous and unforeseen facilities." The committee understands that the Navy Department has no program outlined, or in view, which would require the sum sought under this heading, but that it was intended to have this amount available to meet unforeseen contingencies. It was the consensus of the committee that, since the wording of this bill provides flexibility to permit the shifting of the funds provided therein from one category of projects to another, the Navy Department would have ample time to come before the committee and present its needs for such additional amount if the occasion therefor should arise.

The fifth amendment corrects the total sum authorized by this bill to conform to the reductions recommended by the committee. It also includes a proviso requiring the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Senate and House Naval Affairs Committees all prospective acquisitions of land under the authority conferred by this bill.

The funds requested under this heading provide for the expansion of existing operational aviation stations, expansion of existing aviation training stations, further development of a naval air transport service, and the expansion of lighter-than-air bases in the continental limits of the United States. The air program has been greatly expanded during the fiscal year 1943, and the current program calls for a continuation of the shore facilities to meet the present increased operating pilot procurement plan and plane operating plan. The committee was informed, during the exhaustive hearings conducted on the bill, that there remains unexpended under the act of August 6, 1942—Public Law 700, Seventy-seventh Congress—the sum of $70,000,000 for aviation facilities. Accordingly, upon enactment of this bill, there will be available for this purpose a total of $293,000,000.

Since complete new air stations and air facilities are included in the program,

the individual items for construction will include all of those required in such establishments. These are principally runways, grading, drainage, roads, walks, taxiways, parking areas, hangars, shops, administration buildings, control towers, storage of all kinds, officers' and men's living quarters and messing facilities, communications, fire protection, and purchase of land. The funds to be spent for each of these projects will not be in the same proportion as in previous construction since the greater part of this program contemplates the expansion of existing stations to a greater extent than heretofore. Following this plan a greater proportion of construction will be in facilities such as barracks, bachelor officers' quarters, shops, parking areas, storage, and accompanying utilities.

This general method of providing for required expansion is applicable to operating stations, training stations, and to some extent the program listed under "Aircraft transportation service." The "Lighter than air" item is a program for development outside the continental limits and in areas where no lighter-than-air facilities now exist and will therefore require complete new construction. The proportionate amount to be used for individual items will therefore conform to that usually found in a new development.

It is estimated that it will be necessary to acquire 15,000 acres of land at a cost of $1,500,000 to provide the facilities authorized under this class of projects.

In the break-down furnished the committee under this heading, there is one item not specifically provided for previously; that is, "Naval air transport service." The committee desires to emphasize, however, that this does not mean that a new service is being initiated but merely that the present one, which has proved of tremendous value to our far-flung naval forces, is being augmented to meet the greatly increased demands for such service. The committee is informed, in this connection, that the Navy Department has heretofore utilized the Pan American Airways to the maximum extent possible, and intends to continue to do so. Its facilities will still be limited even after the expansion which this bill will provide, and, in addition, there are various routes which it does not traverse. It is vital in the prosecution of the global war to be able to afford passenger and freight service by air. This service also is instrumental in maintaining the proper morale in that it provides a means of transporting the mail to the naval forces at distant points. There is no other possible way to assure such uninterrupted service than by providing the expansion contemplated by this item.

It is understood that in extending the facilities for this service, the Navy Department will give consideration to the desirability of making the expansions in a way that will enable such facilities to dovetail into our commercial needs after the war.

The program of repair, beyond the scope of maintenance forces, includes repairs, painting, and rehabilitation of buildings, appurtenances, and accessories; overhaul and repairs to ventilating devices, elevators, floors, walls, ceilings, and lighting fixtures; repair and replacement of steam and water lines; repair and replacement of power lines; repair and overhaul of power tools and maintenance machinery; and repairs to roads, walks, and grounds.

At present there are 16 hospitals of temporary construction. These temporary structures are necessarily built of the cheapest available materials; construction will require considerable repair. There are 15 permanent naval hospitals, the capacity of which has been doubled and, in some cases, tripled by the addition of temporary construction. Although the permanent structures in institutions of this group will require only the planned upkeep, the temporary structures will require considerable upkeep, due to type of structure.

To parallel the increases in naval personnel, it is necessary to continue the program of development of hospital facilities by new construction, extensions of existing facilities, or by acquisition of existing structures. A total of approximately 60,000 hospital beds will be required to serve the hospitalization needs for the planned total of personnel.

Upon completion of the current Public Works program, a total of 40,000 beds in naval hospitals will be realized. It will be necessary to provide an additional 20,000 beds during the fiscal year 1944. Since the existent hospitals are capable of limited expansion only, it will be necessary to provide these additional facilities in new developments.

It will be impracticable to state all of the specific area in which these new facilities will be required. Some locations depend entirely upon future developments.

It is estimated that it will be necessary to acquire 300 acres of land at a cost of $30,000 to provide the facilities authorized under this class of projects.

PASSIVE DEFENSE

Passive defense ..... $15,000,000

This item provides for the continuation of the program of passive defense, including camouflage, black-out, security, and other like facilities. The program being materially reduced over that originally contemplated, it is believed that the figure of $15,000,000 will carry the work forward during the fiscal year 1944.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY].

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to go into detail in respect to this bill. This report, as the chairman has stated, is a splendid report and it takes up every detail in the bill. I shall not take up the time, therefore, of the Committee by going into particulars. The committee cut down considerably the amount of money that was requested by the Navy, thus proving that the Committee on Naval Affairs is in favor of economy, as well as efficiency. This bill has been brought to your attention after a great deal of study, and a great deal of hard work upon it. I hope the bill will pass.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope very much that none of the money authorized to be appropriated by this bill will be used for painted ships on painted oceans, or for wooden guns. Saturday afternoon I took it upon myself to make a little investigation of the fortifications around the House Office Building. In broad open daylight, with civilian clothes on, I climbed to the top of the New House Office Building, and there inspected the great fortifications erected for the protection of the membership of this House. I went there because of my curiosity. I had been unable to determine the caliber or character of the guns which have been placed there. And here comes the story. We are being protected by wooden guns and decoy soldiers—believe it or not. Those guns are made of wood, and the soldiers are decoys. Under high heaven why have they been placed over our heads? I am somewhat of a duck hunter. When I put out my decoys, I expect to attract live ducks, and if I should put out wooden guns, I certainly would expect to attract live enemy planes. There is no effort made to camouflage those guns. They are sitting there under the blue sky, for every plane that comes and goes to see. Gentlemen, it was a gruesome sight.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Would the gentleman not rather have wooden guns there, and let the soldiers have the real guns? We do not need the guns.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; but I submit that this is a serious situation. It is serious to have decoys over our heads. I call attention also to the fact that we are protected by well-trained soldiers, and there I was in plain daylight, in civilian clothes, climbing to the House Office Building roof and nobody stopped me and nobody fired at me. After 5 o'clock in the afternoon we go to our offices, and when we walk in the front door a soldier says, "Halt, show me your pass." I have been going in and out that same door for almost 9 years. I show my pass at the main door, and I venture to say that there are at least a dozen other doors that are wholly unprotected. I suppose they think that all saboteurs will walk in the front door, and none will go in the back door of the House Office Building, where we must conduct our business. I call this to the attention of the House because I think it is downright serious. Just a few minutes ago I asked a member of the Military Affairs Committee if he could tell me the caliber of the guns on top of the House Office Build-

ing, and he said, "Yes; they are .50-caliber antiaircraft guns." I said, "Are you sure, John?" He said, "Yes."

Mr. Chairman, if the Military Affairs Committee does not know anything about it, I am just wondering how many wooden guns we have around here. If they are going to place decoys up there, pray tell me why did they not put a great big gun up there? They would have just utilized a little more wood.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not much concerned about how many wooden guns, but how many wooden Congressmen they have got around here.

Mr. COOLEY. Those decoys would probably indicate we have some lame ducks in Congress. I think the time has come when the Members of this House ought to know what is being done around this city of Washington. It is unfortunate that this city, the Capital of the greatest republic of the earth, is being protected by wooden guns and decoy soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested to hear this dicussion about wooden guns and wooden soldiers. The Congress is just a part of our system of government. There are three separate and independent branches of government. I wonder if anybody in the House could advise us whether they have wooden guns and wooden soldiers protecting the other two branches or departments of the government, or whether we are just selected for this particular special privilege? I wonder what protection the Supreme Court gets and the other department of the Government without even mentioning it by name.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We have heard a good deal about wooden guns and wooden soldiers, but is not the real danger from wooden heads?

Mr. FISH. I think the gentleman is right—wooden heads and bureaucratic government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to discuss an aviation project for our Navy. For 15 years I have been urging that the cadets at West Point be trained in military aviation. About a year ago the Army took over and developed the Stewart airfield in my district, a few miles outside of Newburgh. The actual flying training of the cadets began last spring and has proved a great success. I am told by General Wilby, in command at West Point, that it far exceeds his highest expectations in training the cadets to fly. Having this in mind, I introduced a bill on the first day of this session, January 6, urging that the same kind of aviation training be inaugurated at the Naval Academy at Annapolis. I asked the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], on the 29th of January for a hearing on my bill. He replied on the 30th of January, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
*Washington, D. C., January 30, 1943.*

Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. FISH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 29 enclosing House Joint Resolution 21 providing for aviation training for midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, which you introduced.

It does not require legislation for the Naval Academy to give aviation instruction to midshipmen. However, I am advocating that an airfie'd be built at Annapolis and that the midshipmen be given instruction in aerodynamics as well as being trained to qualify as aviators, as I believe that all of the students at the Naval Academy should be trained in this branch of the Navy.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

CARL VINSON,
*Member of Congress.*

I want to ask the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee if he could give the House any information as to what progress is being made to locate an air field near Annapolis in order to train midshipmen to fly, similar to the way West Point cadets are being trained at the Stewart airfield near Newburgh?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], I want to advise the House that in this very bill $10,000,000 is being made available for the construction of a new airfield at or adjacent to Annapolis for the purpose of giving complete instruction at the Naval Academy.

Mr. FISH. I thank the gentleman very much. I am sure that such aviation training of the midshipmen at Annapolis will be a great benefit and service to our Navy. My one regret is that it has not been done before, it may now be too late to perfect them in flying for this war.

According to the gentleman from Georgia, the provisions in the pending bill take care of the bill that I introduced and it will go into effect immediately?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Just as soon as this bill becomes law it is the intention of the Bureau of Yards and Docks to commence construction of a $10,000,000 airport at Annapolis.

Mr. FISH. I think the House will be very much interested to know that the training of the West Point cadets to fly at Stewart Field about 10 miles distant, has proven highly successful; so much so that the officers at West Point tell me that has been the greatest advance made at the Military Academy in the last 100 years.

I am very glad that Annapolis is about to follow suit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to just sort of emphasize and elaborate upon some remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] on the opening of the debate on this rule.

First of all, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs for causing this administration bill to be brought before the House in the manner in which it has been. It shows his broad-mindedness and shows his great Americanism, to distribute the honors on both sides of the aisle. In giving the handling of the bill to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] he showed again, as he has on many occasions, his great liberal spirit of Americanism, and as far as he is concerned, during this war there is no division between Democrats and Republicans.

I want to emphasize a remark I made upon the floor of this House the other day, going a little further along the line that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] pursued this morning, when a distinguished Member of this House, whose remarks may have been provoked by another Member's observation, was recalling the many things he had said 5 years ago, to show that he was right then and some others were wrong. I stated at that time that I did not know any good purpose to be served by rehashing, going over issues and going over controversies and going over differences of opinion that existed in this country prior to Pearl Harbor.

There were those who believed that in order to defend our country an Army, Navy, and Air Corps were necessary to have here. There were those who believed that we should have these three military factors and send them to Europe. Those were the two schools of thought. Now what good can be served by bringing those matters up? Who was wrong makes no difference. History may tell us sometime. Future generations may be the arbiter of that question but leave it alone now. This Nation today is in a fight for its existence. There is no room among us now for nagging.

It is my belief that the less we bring up those matters on which we were then divided, the better; in other words, the less we talk about matters upon which we were divided, the better, and the more loyal we shall be to our country and to our boys who are scattered on every sea and in every land on the face of the earth fighting and dying for the cause for which we entered this war. I believe that whenever we do or say anything that causes disunity in however slight a degree, we break faith with the boys who are fighting for us. So again I say, Mr. Chairman, the less we talk about controversial matters that were buried away on December 7, 1941, the greater will be our service to our country and her sons. I do not believe there is a Member of this House on either side of the aisle that has not but one purpose in his mind—to win this war as quickly as it can be won with the least possible loss

of life and treasure. This is the reason I wanted to take the time to say these few words. What difference does it make who was right and who was wrong? We are all one today and we must stay one; and the way to stay one is to forget those matters that had better be forgotten. Quit talking so much and do more acting. It is no time for talk, to make headlines—and it is no time for horseplay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. In view of the general interest on the part of the membership, I have secured now and should like to read the release with reference to wheat quotas issued by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard today suspended wheat-marketing quotas in a new move to insure adequate feed supplies for the huge livestock and poultry production programs.

The Secretary's action, taken under the authority of the emergency provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, lifts marketing quotas for the remainder of the 1942-43 marketing year and for 1943-44, and releases at once for feed on market any wheat which has been stored off the market because of the quota.

At the same time the Secretary announced that wheat farmers who in 1943 meet 90 percent of their farm war-crop goals will be eligible for Agricultural Adjustment Administration wheat payments and wheat loans, even though they exceed their wheat allotments.

I should stop there to state, because so many Members have asked about it, that this is a positive statement that farmers who have met 90 percent of their war-crop goals will be eligible not only for wheat loans but the producers will receive their payments.

This provision, it was pointed out, will enable wheat farmers, in areas where other crops are not so successfully grown, to increase their wheat production.

The Secretary urged wheat farmers, however, to maintain careful farming practices so as not to jeopardize future wheat crops. He recalled the wind and water erosion and resultant low yields that have followed excessive acreage increases in the past.

"With three good wheat years behind us, our wheat supplies at the present time are the largest in our history," Secretary Wickard said. "In view of the tremendous increase in the number of livestock, however, additional feed reserves are a safeguard for the future.

"We entered the present marketing year with a total wheat supply of 1,613,000,000 bushels. At the same time this year wheat consumption, including moderate exports, promises to be the largest since 1920. And it must be remembered that in 1920 our gross exports totaled 369,000,000 bushels.

"Livestock feeding has accounted for the bulk of the current increase in wheat consumption. With some increase expected in the quantity used for food, and substantial quantities being used for alcohol production, our total domestic consumption is expected to be the largest in history."

The 1942-43 marketing quota was made effective following a referendum of wheat growers May 2, 1942, and the 1943-44 quota was proclaimed August 6, 1942. The 1943-44 quota referendum which was to have been held this spring is canceled by today's announcement.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think the gentleman from Georgia should be congratulated for the splendid fight he has made, not only in the committee, but also on the floor of the House, for the farmers not alone of his district, but for the farmers of America generally, for the farmers in my own section particularly, the wheat growers.

What the gentleman from Georgia has just said with reference to production of wheat gives us encouragement, for in our State, while we have had a surplus of wheat, at the present time it is disappearing and disappearing fast because we are feeding it to livestock. I think the Secretary of Agriculture did a very wise thing this morning when he lifted the restrictions, because we are not only going to have a shortage of many foodstuffs but we are going to have a shortage of corn, and our wheat surplus will be used to take up the slack in the shortage of corn.

Mr. PACE. I appreciate the attitude of the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] has so thoroughly explained all phases of this bill that it would be but trespassing on the part of the committee if I endeavored to repeat what he has said, because I could do nothing more than to reiterate what the gentleman from Minnesota has already announced.

I therefore ask that the bill be read now for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop the following naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as he may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land, and to continue or complete the construction of any project heretofore authorized or undertaken, which projects have been specifically approved by the Secretary of the Navy, with approximate costs as indicated: Fleet facilities, $67,900,000; aviation facilities, $238,000,000; storage facilities, $5,350,000; liquid-fuel storage, $10,350,000; Marine Corps training facilities, $33,132,000; ordnance storage facilities, $50,000,000; personnel training and housing facilities, $33,700,000; hospital facilities, $66,005,000; shore radio facilities, $3,500,000; Naval Research Laboratory, $750,000; miscellaneous structures, $33,000,000; passive defense, $15,000,000; advance bases, $720,000,000; miscellaneous and unforeseen facilities, $223,313,000: *Provided*, That the approximate cost indicated for each of the classes of projects enumerated above may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward but the total cost shall not exceed $1,500,000,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike out the figures "238,000,000" and substitute therefor "223,000,000."

Page 2, line 4, strike out the figures "33,132,000" and substitute therefor "23,632,000."

Page 2, line 5, strike out the figures "33,700,000" and substitute therefor "33,120,000."

Page 2, lines 9 and 10, strike out the following: "; miscellaneous and unforeseen facilities $223,313,000."

Page 2, strike out line 14 and substitute therefor the following: "$1,256,607,000: *Provided further*, That prior to the acquisition, by lease or otherwise, of any land under authority of this act, the Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Senate and House Naval Affairs Committees all such prospective acquisitions."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Thereupon the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MERRITT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1692) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 123, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 373, nay 0, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—373

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Boren | Clason |
| Allen, Ill. | Boykin | Clevenger |
| Allen, La. | Bradley, Mich. | Coffee |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Bradley, Pa. | Cole, Mo. |
| Anderson, Calif. | Brehm | Cole, N. Y. |
| Anderson, N. Mex. | Brooks | Colmer |
| Andresen, August H. | Brown, Ga. | Compton |
| Andrews | Brown, Ohio | Cooley |
| Angell | Bryson | Cooper |
| Arends | Bulwinkle | Costello |
| Auchincloss | Burch, Va. | Courtney |
| Baldwin, Md. | Burchill, N. Y. | Cox |
| Barrett | Burdick | Cravens |
| Barry | Burgin | Crawford |
| Bates, Ky. | Busbey | Creal |
| Bates, Mass. | Butler | Crosser |
| Beall | Camp | Culkin |
| Beckworth | Canfield | Cunningham |
| Bell | Cannon, Fla. | Curley |
| Bender | Cannon, Mo. | Curtis |
| Bennett, Mich. | Capozzoli | Davis |
| Bishop | Carlson, Kans. | Delaney |
| Blackney | Carson, Ohio | Dewey |
| Bland | Carter | Dies |
| Bloom | Case | Dilweg |
| Bolton | Celler | Dirksen |
| Bonner | Chapman | Disney |
| | Chenoweth | Ditter |
| | Chiperfield | Domengeaux |
| | Church | Dondero |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Douglas | Johnson, Okla. | Reece, Tenn. |
| Drewry | Johnson, Ward | Reed, Ill. |
| Durham | Jones | Reed, N. Y. |
| Dworshak | Jonkman | Rees, Kans. |
| Eaton | Judd | Richards |
| Eberharter | Kean | Rivers |
| Elliott | Kearney | Rizley |
| Ellis | Kee | Robertson |
| Ellison, Md. | Keefe | Robinson, Utah |
| Elston, Ohio | Kelley | Robsion, Ky. |
| Englebright | Keogh | Rockwell |
| Fay | Kerr | Rodgers, Pa. |
| Fellows | Kilburn | Rogers, Calif. |
| Fenton | Kilday | Rogers, Mass. |
| Fernandez | King | Rohrbough |
| Fish | Kinzer | Rolph |
| Fisher | Kirwan | Rowe |
| Fitzpatrick | Kleberg | Russell |
| Flannagan | Knutson | Sabath |
| Fogarty | Kunkel | Sadowski |
| Folger | Lambertson | Satterfield |
| Forand | Lane | Sauthoff |
| Ford | Lanham | Scanlon |
| Fulbright | Larcade | Schiffler |
| Fulmer | LeCompte | Schwabe |
| Furlong | LeFevre | Sheppard |
| Gale | Lemke | Short |
| Gallagher | Lesinski | Sikes |
| Gamble | Lewis, Ohio | Simpson, Ill. |
| Gathings | Ludlow | Simpson, Pa. |
| Gavagan | McCord | Slaughter |
| Gavin | McCormack | Smith, Maine |
| Gearhart | McCowen | Smith, Ohio |
| Gerlach | McGehee | Smith, Va. |
| Gifford | McGranery | Smith, W. Va. |
| Gilchrist | McLean | Smith, Wis. |
| Gillette | McMillan | Snyder |
| Gillie | McMurray | Somers, N. Y. |
| Goodwin | McWilliams | Spence |
| Gordon | Maas | Springer |
| Gore | Madden | Stanley |
| Gossett | Magnuson | Starnes, Ala. |
| Graham | Mahon | Steagall |
| Granger | Maloney | Stearns, N. H. |
| Grant, Ala. | Manasco | Stefan |
| Grant, Ind. | Mansfield, Mont. | Stevenson |
| Green | | Stewart |
| Gregory | Mansfield, Tex. | Stockman |
| Gross | Marcantonio | Sullivan |
| Guyer | Martin, Iowa | Sumner, Ill. |
| Gwynne | Martin, Mass. | Sumners, Tex. |
| Hagen | Mason | Sundstrom |
| Hale | May | Taber |
| Hall, Edwin Arthur | Merritt | Talbot |
| | Merrow | Talle |
| Halleck | Michener | Tarver |
| Hancock | Miller, Conn. | Thomas, N. J. |
| Hare | Miller, Mo. | Thomas, Tex. |
| Harless, Ariz. | Miller, Nebr. | Thomason |
| Harness, Ind. | Miller, Pa. | Tibbott |
| Harris, Ark. | Mills | Tolan |
| Harris, Va. | Monkiewicz | Towe |
| Hart | Monroney | Troutman |
| Hartley | Mott | Van Zandt |
| Hays | Mruk | Vincent, Ky. |
| Heidinger | Mundt | Vinson, Ga. |
| Hendricks | Murdock | Voorhis, Calif. |
| Herter | Murray, Wis. | Vorys, Ohio |
| Hess | Newsome | Vursell |
| Hill | Nichols | Wadsworth |
| Hinshaw | Norman | Walter |
| Hobbs | Norrell | Ward |
| Hoch | O'Brien, Mich. | Wasielewski |
| Hoeven | O'Connor | Weaver |
| Holifield | O'Hara | Weiss |
| Holmes, Mass. | O'Konski | Welch |
| Holmes, Wash. | O'Leary | Wene |
| Hope | O'Neal | West |
| Horan | Outland | Wheat |
| Howell | Pace | Whelchel, Ga. |
| Hull | Patman | White |
| Izac | Patton | Whitten |
| Jackson | Peterson, Fla. | Whittington |
| Jarman | Peterson, Ga. | Wickersham |
| Jeffrey | Pfeifer | Willey |
| Jenkins | Philbin | Wilson |
| Jennings | Phillips | Winstead |
| Jensen | Pittenger | Winter |
| Johnson, Anton J. | Ploeser | Wolcott |
| | Plumley | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Johnson, Calvin D. | Poage | Wolverton, N. J. |
| | Poulson | Woodruff, Mich. |
| Johnson, Ind. | Powers | Worley |
| Johnson, J. Leroy | Price | Wright |
| | Priest | Zimmerman |
| Johnson, Luther A. | Rabaut | |
| | Ramspeck | |
| Johnson, Lyndon B. | Randolph | |
| | Rankin | |

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—61

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Arnold | Barden | Buckley |
| Baldwin, N. Y. | Bennett, Mo. | Buffett |
| Byrne | Hébert | Norton |
| Clark | Heffernan | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Cochran | Hoffman | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Cullen | Kefauver | O'Toole |
| D'Alesandro | Kennedy | Pracht |
| Dawson | Klein | Ramey |
| Day | LaFollette | Rowan |
| Dickstein | Landis | Sasscer |
| Dingell | Lea | Schuetz |
| Doughton | Lewis, Colo. | Scott |
| Ellsworth | Luce | Shafer |
| Elmer | Lynch | Sheridan |
| Engel | McGregor | Sparkman |
| Feighan | McKenzie | Taylor |
| Gibson | Morrison, La. | Treadway |
| Gorski | Morrison, N. C. | Weichel, Ohio |
| Griffiths | Murphy | Wigglesworth |
| Hall, Leonard W. | Murray, Tenn. | Woodrum, Va. |
| | Myers | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Bennett of Missouri.
Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Sparkman with Mr. LaFollette.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Engel.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Arnold.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Ramey.
Mr. Lewis of Colorado with Mr. Scott.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the bill just passed and to include in connection therewith two letters from the Secretary of the Navy and a table of land acquisitions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include a resolution from the city of Columbus in reference to the Ruml plan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD in support of H. R. 1605.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have hesitated to speak on this measure because so many Members have also desired to speak, and I have been afraid that we might be found guilty of an act sometimes called speaking a bill to death. But my interest in the successful prosecution of the terrible war we are engaged in, together with the welfare of those who labor in all the various phases connected with this great undertaking, compels me to say something in behalf of the bill we are now considering.

This measure, in my opinion, comes before this body for consideration at a late hour. There is a crisis to be overcome in all the channels of food production. Food is vitally essential to the successful prosecution of this war, to the maintenance of civilian efficiency; food is scarce and steadily becoming scarcer, and the crop year is well under way already. Everybody seems to agree that more food must be produced, seemingly not realizing that in order to produce more food there must be either more farmers, more land in cultivation, or more efficient production methods. We all know there are many, many farmers in the armed forces today, decreasing instead of increasing this avenue of relief for the situation. Drastic reductions in farm-equipment outputs eliminate the possibility of securing more efficient production methods, and farmers are as always working 12 and 15 hours a day, so there is no available avenue of relief here. There is only one possible way we have today to alleviate, in a small measure, the impending shortage of food, necessary, as we all agree, to the maintenance of civilian efficiency, and to the actual winning of this war; and this way is to increase the acreage planted in foods of all kinds. A very pertinent section of the bill before you today seeks to increase this acreage to some extent; to help supply in some measure, at a very late hour, more food for victory.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] made a timely speech in behalf of this bill. His remarks, logically and powerfully stressing the necessity for Government action to help avert more serious consequences resulting from this situation, should have compelled quick support of this measure. A dire need exists at this time for vegetable oils, more and more vegetable oils, which are used in the manufacture of high explosives. As those of us familiar with this particular commodity know, there will not be more of such oils produced this year. Instead, there will be less oils produced this year, unless encouragement for the production of this commodity is given the farmer. I say the farmer is entitled to produce more. The armed forces of America, the needs of our allies across the seas, and the needs of our people at home demand this.

This bill does not provide a subsidy for the peanut farmer. It only guarantees him 85 percent of parity. Is not this a meager price to pay for a definite aid to the perilous shortage of food which you know so well exists? Much greater prices are paid hourly for much less actual benefit to the war program. This action is necessary to overcome a ceiling placed on vegetable oils. If this price ceiling is not overcome, the peanut farmer will not be able to produce any peanuts for oil purposes, and he will not do so. It would be poor lack of interest in relief of the food shortage and an ungracious act on the part of the Government to ask him to do so, to produce at a loss.

Farming is the basic industry of this country, and at this late hour some are coming to realize the farmer's part in military, as well as civilian, aspects of winning the war. Let us be fair with him today. Let us grant him the opportunity which he must have to produce more food, which the military and civilian needs of today demand. The clarion cry is for food and more food—produce, produce, produce. And yet some seem to think this can be done and will be done simply because more food is needed, regardless of the production stumbling blocks facing the farmer, and regardless of the loss he faces under the present arrangement. Unless this Congress comes to the farmer's aid and gives him a partially fair treatment, I tell you more food cannot and will not be produced. This square deal is all he has ever asked for; it is all he will ever ask for. This bill is a beginning, and should be passed without a dissenting vote.

The American farmer is and has always been patriotic to the core. He has given his sons in large numbers to the Army by way of voluntary service and selective-service induction. Many of these farm boys have also gone into defense plants over the country, because of the extremely high wages being paid there until the agricultural industry is stripped to the bottom for help to produce the necessary food; and unless our Government and this Congress do something that will be a relief to this industry, I am fearful of the results 10 months from now. In this bill we have an opportunity to aid a part of the people who are engaged in farming. It may not be sufficient, and may have to be added to, but it is a beginning. It will not give the farmer cost of production and over 20 cents an hour for his labor, and it will be recalled that he works, not 8 hours a day or 48 hours a week, but from early morn until late at night, with no thought of a 40- or 48-hour week, or time and a half or double time for holidays. He is trying to feed and clothe his family and produce a little extra to help carry on the war effort.

By Executive decree a few days ago a 48-hour week was established, with time and a half for all hours over 40. This meant an inflationary increase of 30 percent on the 48-hour week basis. Do you call this a subsidy? When common labor in industry is drawing 80 cents per hour for their toil? And yet, when this Congress is asked to assist the farmer to get cost of production, and one-fourth as much as common labor is drawing in industry, you hear the cry of "subsidy to the farmer."

The farmer is confronted with the high cost of living the same as any other individual in any other American industry. He is confronted with increased prices for materials, machinery, and commodities which he has to buy. Do you not think it right to, in a small measure, pay him a small percentage and extend to him a part of that American phrase and way of life, equal rights? This bill is a beginning toward doing so.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered for today I may be granted permission to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Denis W. Delaney, State administrator of the W. P. A. in Massachusetts, which appeared in the Boston Traveler of Friday, February 19, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution of the Montana Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of the rivers and harbors bill introduced at the last session and this session, and to include a newspaper item taken from the Washington Post of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial by the president of the Missouri Farmers' Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Afro-American of February 20, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Honorable George A. Quigley, mayor of New Britain, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief radio address I delivered last Sunday night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. Theodore Granik at the commencement exercises of the St. Johns University Law School, where he received an honorary degree. The cost of this will be $90.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time that I may have an opportunity to explain to the House the provisions of my bill, H. R. 1730, to amend the Selective Service Act.

A number of officials who have seen fit to oppose this bill have issued statements with reference to its provisions which are very misleading. I feel, therefore, that I should inform the House of its exact provisions, what it will do and what it will not do.

The bill has for its purpose the formulation of categories of those persons who are registered under the Selective Service Act and have persons dependent upon them. It would formulate four categories. The first would be the single man with no dependents, the second the single man with collateral dependents, such as a mother or other dependent, the third would be the married man with no children, and the fourth the married man with children.

The bill would accomplish three purposes and none other. It would, first of all, provide that quotas be filled on a State-wide basis rather than on a local board basis as at present. Second, it would provide by law for these categories. Third, it would prevent the calling of any man placed in a category with a lower priority ahead of men in a higher priority within his State.

The provision that quotas be filled by local boards has created the greatest dissatisfaction that has arisen under the draft act. It has resulted in a situation in which various draft boards in the cities would be calling their men on entirely different bases with reference to dependents. In other words, it might be that a draft board on one side of the street would be calling married men, or maybe married men with children, while the draft board across the street would still have single men uncalled. It has resulted in the principal dissatisfaction which has existed with reference to the law.

That dependency shall be considered in all questions of deferment is the established policy of this Nation. It has been thoroughly established in the draft laws of two wars. It is the clearly expressed legislative intent that depend-

ency shall be considered in passing upon any question of deferment.

At the time we had the original bill up in 1940, as those of us who served on the Committee on Military Affairs then and have served continuously since remember full well, it was presented to us upon the proposition that dependency constituted the proper basis of determining deferment in all cases of men with dependents. That such a well-established policy of this Government and such a clearly expressed legislative intent should be violated by administrative decree is contrary to our system of government.

Those of us who have worked with this bill from the beginning were very much shocked, indeed, when Mr. Paul V. McNutt announced that as to 29 occupations which, in his opinion, are unessential to the war effort dependency would be disregarded. Such a ruling is contrary to the entire philosophy of selective service. It is wrong in principle, of course. It perverts the Selective Service Act from the high purpose for which it was adopted; that is, the production of fighting men for this Nation, into a whip in the hand of an administrative official, a bureaucrat, if you please, for the enforcement of his administrative orders. That such should ever happen was never the intention of this Congress.

In June 1942, after the declaration of war, we passed a bill—it came through the House as title II of the allotment and allowance bill—under which we provided that the President should have the power to set up categories of registrants with reference to persons dependent upon them.

Immediately after that was passed, actually before it was signed by the President, the Selective Service System issued a regulation to the local boards under which the identical categories which I now have in my bill were set up, and the boards were instructed to defer men with dependents on the basis of those categories.

When the 18- and 19-year-old draft bill was in the committee, I had an amendment attached to the bill which would have required the calling of those categories in the order of priority in which they were then set up.

It was in the bill when it went through the House. There was practically no objection to it. When it passed this House it was thoroughly discussed, and it was fairly understood by the House. However, it went out of the bill in conference, so that it was not in the bill at the time it became law. It was because of its elimination that Mr. McNutt was in a position to issue his order regarding dependency in those 29 instances. Oh, it is true that the occupation included gamblers, bartenders, night club operators, and also some other occupations. The very nature of the occupations which he provided should not be regarded as essential leads me to suspect that those were included for the purpose of opening up the policy that dependency would not constitute a ground for deferment. I fear it was the thought that no one could criticize an order with reference to gamblers, bartenders, and night-club operators, and that then the policy would be established, and it would be in Mr. McNutt's hands to determine just who in this Nation should be deprived of the right of dependency.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman will remember, of course, that at the time the categories, which are the same as in this bill, were written into the Pay and Allotment Act, that that was done at the request of the Selective Service Bureau, and a conference was called by me as chairman of the committee, and some of the ranking members, to discuss it with them before it was written into the bill.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. It was adopted at the direct request of the Selective Service. They came before the committee, and it was the one time that we adopted the procedure under which the committee went back into session and heard witnesses on the adoption of a conference report.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. The gentleman will recall that Mr. McNutt listed the 29 occupations and asserted that the 29 industries and 36 occupations—that that was only the beginning.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct, and since that time he has made a further statement to the effect that there would be others to follow in which they would determine for themselves with reference to the essential character of an occupation. The thing to remember here is that there is a matter of principle involved. That there is a matter of principle with reference to the preservation of the families of the Nation. Also that every man in this Nation shall be treated exactly the same, and the wife and child of a man shall be treated exactly the same, and that the matter of dependency shall be passed on as it relates to a particular case.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What time does the gentleman's bill fix, or does it fix the time in respect to when they marry and have children?

Mr. KILDAY. The provision of my bill is the same as the present regulation of the Selective Service. That is the marriage must have been contracted prior to the 8th of December 1941, which is the present regulation of the Selective Service System. Mr. Speaker, the opposition to this bill proceeded in a very unusual manner. The departments affected have been requested by the Military Affairs Committee to appear and express their views. Many of the things which have been brought up in opposition to the bill were not brought before your committee, and we were sitting as your committee for the purpose of hearing facts. Many of them were given out in newspaper statements or in radio talks, so that there was no opportunity for those who are familiar with the technical phases of this very technical law, the Selective Service Act, to cross-examine or determine whether or not those statements and conclusions were correct. In the first place, there was given to the public the view that should this bill be adopted, occupational deferments would be abolished. It was then said that if it came to a question between the chief of an airplane manufacturing crew, and the father of a family, that the father of the family should go first. I have no quarrel with that. That is not involved in my bill. There never has been a suggestion but that such should be the case. It was one of those things to fill the minds of people with doubt as to what should be done.

I hold in my hand H. R. 1730, and after the enacting clause, the very first paragraph is word for word, verbatim, the present law under which all occupational deferments are now granted. The first paragraph of my bill is a reenactment of the only law under which occupational deferments are now granted. So that from the beginning there has never been any opportunity for any bickering as to whether occupational deferments would be abolished under my bill. When the question was raised, I said if there was any doubt, that I would offer an amendment to make that doubly clear. Before the bill was reported by the Military Affairs Committee, it adopted an amendment to the next paragraph to make clear that registrants shall be assigned in these categories only after all occupational deferments have been granted. In other words, then, your occupational deferments are granted and if the registrant is not granted occupational deferment he is considered for assignment to categories with reference to persons dependent upon him. Only those who are left after occupational deferments are granted are assigned to the categories.

I have not taken the trouble to look it up in the dictionary, but my personal idea is that the words "classification" and "category" are practically the same; that the definitions would be almost identical; but that is not true when you come to the Selective Service Act, because by legislation we have assigned to those two words very fixed and definite legal meaning.

Your classifications are 1–A, single man with no dependents. Then you have classification 2–A, which is a necessary worker in a munitions factory. Then you have 2–B, necessary worker in a related occupation—farming and what not. Then you have 3–A, a married man or a man with dependents; 3–B, a married man or a man with dependents, who is working in a defense industry. Then you come to classification No. 4, which includes those physically, mentally, and morally disqualified for military service.

Those classifications and categories relate only to classification No. 3. They are subheads of classification No. 3.

In my bill I set out those categories. I think it would be well to get my bill and read it. As I offered it, it consisted of 77 lines of printing. Of those I wrote 16. The remainder of the bill consists of the existing provisions of the Selective Service Act and regulations adopted by the Selective Service System itself. So

I assure you there is no pride of authorship on my part here, because of the 77 lines of type, but 16 of them were written by me.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is a fact, is it not, that after the Selective Service System sent out that telegraphic advice to the draft boards they later on withdrew it?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct for all practical purposes. A telegram was sent out establishing the categories, and it was followed by a letter of confirmation. On the 20th day of June 1942 the telegram went out. On the 26th it was followed by a letter of confirmation, and on the 15th day of July they were abolished, for all practical purposes, in that the new release to local draft boards, instead of saying "You shall do this," said, "You should consider the advisability of assigning them to these categories."

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Does the gentleman's bill do anything about the practice of the United States Employment Commission in recommending the deferment of individuals who are asked for under union contracts and whom the union is unwilling to have released from their jobs?

Mr. KILDAY. May I say to the gentleman my bill does not affect deferments. The point I am trying to make clear is that it has no effect at all on deferments. That is an entirely different question and one to be treated separately. It relates only to the categories of classification No. 3.

Mr. CASE. It does relate to orders that are issued by Mr. McNutt?

Mr. KILDAY. It prevents such orders as he has already issued, effective as of April 1. It prevents them by putting in these categories of dependents, and specifically also prevents them by providing that no man shall be inducted because of his occupation or occupational group. That is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. CASE. The reason I bring up this question is because of a specific case that came to my attention where a young man was employed in a war industry. The United States Employment Service was ready to replace him and had a man to replace him, but under the union contract he could not be replaced unless he was replaced by union officials, and since they were not ready to replace him, it operated to require deferment.

Mr. KILDAY. May I say I am going to discuss matters like that a little later in detail, because I contend that before disrupting the families of this Nation, the Manpower Commission should have done something about the wastage of manpower such as you mentioned.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I wonder if the gentleman has had any information with respect to the activities of the draft boards in local communities since the statement by Mr. McNutt with regard to the continued practice of inducting married men with dependents, indiscriminately, just as they had before.

Mr. KILDAY. I may say that I am very much alarmed relative to the present mental condition of the local draft boards. We will never be able to fully repay the men who have served in the machinery of the Selective Service Act. They have served without compensation. They have served in very difficult tasks, tasks that are thankless. All they get is the satisfaction of having done a patriotic duty. I believe I have heard from more draft board members in the last few weeks than General Hershey or Mr. McNutt. I say to you I am thoroughly alarmed at the way they feel now. They are in personal contact with family men who must go into the service. That responsibility weighs heavily on them.

They have seen what happens to the family after the father has gone and they now are faced with a positive directive that no matter how many children this man may have, no matter what the situation may be with reference to dependency, that because of the character of the work that he may be doing, even though it be an honorable profession, if Mr. McNutt says that it is not essential to the war, then these draft boards are faced with the necessity of taking the head of the family out of that home; and many of them have told me they do not propose to serve under such circumstances as that.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. Does the gentleman's bill contain any provision that would tend to relieve the farm labor situation?

Mr. KILDAY. No; we do protect the Tydings amendment by providing that it shall not be altered or affected by this bill.

Mr. JENKINS. No doubt in the consideration of this bill much thought was given to that topic. What has developed? Is there anything that I could take back or send back to my farmers who are very much interested in this proposition as to whether or not there is any relief in sight for them?

Mr. KILDAY. I may say that is the next thing we are going to consider in our committee.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I have had many complaints from my district along the same line the gentleman has been discussing. Am I correct that this bill has already been reported out of committee?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct; it is now pending in the House.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. When will it be brought up?

Mr. KILDAY. I cannot tell the gentleman about that; that depends on the Rules Committee. We shall have to get a rule. We expect to appear before the Rules Committee in the very near future. I hope we may appear before them tomorrow.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Is there any way in which we can expedite it a little?

Mr. KILDAY. I am going to have to refuse to yield for awhile until I proceed further with my statement.

We come now to the question of occupational deferments and the number of available men to supply the military needs. Now, there is a thing about the administration of the Selective Service Act that has troubled many of us for quite some period of time, and that is the attempt to use it to engender fear in the men who are registered with these boards in order to force them to get into so-called necessary industry and things of that kind. I know it was never the intention of the author of the bill that it should be used for that purpose, and I am sure it was never the intention of the members of the Military Affairs Committee that that would be the office that it would serve. For over a year we have been told that the draft of family men is imminent. Constantly, constantly, constantly this has been drilled into us—if you do not get into a necessary occupation you face draft, and still the threat is the same, "You face draft in the near future." There are other things the Manpower Commission could have done before it resorted to taking the heads of families and disrupting the homes of this Nation. That is to say, they might have done some of these things: At the time that the order was issued, there had been no statement of any prospective lengthening of the 40-hour week.

Later word went out that the 40-hour week had been suspended. I say that that report was misleading—that is the most charitable word I can use—that it was misleading in all of its implications. That order did not suspend the 40-hour week; it provided in almost this language: That no employer shall be regarded as fulfilling his full effort in the war if he is maintaining a workweek of less than 48 hours. They did not go on to say that no employee shall be regarded as doing his full duty in the war effort if he maintains a workweek of less than any number of hours. If he should procure his deferment on the grounds that he was a necessary employee, he could become a chronic absentee, so far as this order is concerned; there is nothing in this order about the 40-hour week that deprives him of his exemption from the draft. He can work 30 hours a week or he can work 15 hours a week, and still there is nothing to affect his status as a necessary man in industry.

Absenteeism, as my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON] told us here the other day, constitutes our greatest drawback in war production today. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] stated that 12,700,000 man-hours of labor were lost in the month of December 1942 alone because of absenteeism. He stated further that only 170,000 man-hours of labor were lost in the entire year 1942 by strikes. Let that sink in!

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the Manpower Commission, which is charged by law with utilizing the available manpower of this Nation, but it does nothing to correct such absenteeism, but states that it is going to take these fathers of

families without doing a thing in the world to correct that situation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Before putting my question, let me say that I am in entire sympathy with the observations the gentleman has just made.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman from New York for that statement, for I know of no higher compliment that could be paid my efforts than to have them approved by the distinguished author of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman used an expression, however, the accuracy of which I rather doubt; that is, to the effect that the War Manpower Commission is charged by law to do certain things. I cannot find the law.

Mr. KILDAY. If I said that, I apologize most abjectly. Actually, the thing I am complaining about is that it does not exist by law; as a matter of fact, it exists by Executive order only. I appreciate the gentleman's correction, for I surely would not want to appear so ignorant in the permanent RECORD of the Congress.

We upset the entire educational system of this Nation in the month of November 1942, in order to provide a pool of 1,000,000 eighteen- and nineteen-year-old boys. We never expected to get more than 500,000 soldiers out of that million. The report of the Bellamy committee published on Sunday shows that the Federal Government has over 1,000,000 civilian employees on its pay roll between the ages of 18 and 38. There is a comparable pool to the one that we secured in the 18- and 19-year-old draft. Nothing has been done to see to it that only those essential to the Federal Government should be continued on that pay roll. Had we secured from that pool of a million on a ratio comparable to the 18 and 19 pool, we would save 500,000 homes under the projected program of the Manpower Commission. That is too much to expect. Let us say it is half. Then it would be a quarter of a million homes. Say that is too much. We will take just 10 percent of the million. A hundred thousand homes in this country saved from disruption which now faces them under the order of Paul V. McNutt.

Here is perhaps the most glaring fault of all. On the 5th day of December 1942, the President issued an Executive order stopping voluntary enlistments. He provided then, of course, that all men coming into the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps must come through the Selective Service System. As of December 5 the Army had physical standards which it regarded as proper for an excellent soldier. No one had compelled them to fix those standards. Those were standards that military men regarded as requisite for a soldier on general service in the field. The Navy's qualifications at that time were a good deal higher than the Army's. The Navy has always taken the position that its physical requirements must be higher. They contend that their men must have perfect vision and there were some other so-called defects which the Army overlooked but the Navy would not. So that when the Army was put to drawing its men from the same pool as the Navy, notwithstanding that its physical requirements were sufficient to itself, it saw fit to raise its physical requirements to meet those of the Navy. Very shortly before Mr. McNutt said, "We will take family men" the Army increased its physical requirements, thereby very materially increasing the percentage of those rejected for physical reasons If there is a Manpower Commission should it not have the power to see to it that the Army, if its physical requirements were sufficient, would not increase them simply because the Navy had higher requirements, or if the Navy's were too high that they would be required to reduce them to the level of the Army? On the other hand, if each was necessary that they would require them to retain them as they were and save these hundreds of thousands of men, single men, men without dependents, available for military duty, qualified physically before December 5, 1942, and now disqualified because of higher physical standards. This is a great waste of manpower.

A cruel thing was done in the opposition of this bill and I hope it was not done intentionally. A contention was made that if my bill were adopted it would mean that the venereals and other undesirables throughout the country would have to be taken into the service first.

I say that was a cruel thing sent out to the homes of prospective draftees. It was a cruel thing to have the mothers and fathers of this Nation believe that we were going to organize our Army basically with venereals, then we were going to fill it up with boys from good Christian homes in this Nation to be soldiering side by side with all the venereals in the country. Still that statement was made and it was given publicity throughout the Nation. Of course, the witness who testified to that before the committee, on cross-examination by me, admitted that that probably was not the situation, but as it is with charges of that sort, the qualification or the explanation never catches up with the charge.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague's time be extended for another 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I think the gentleman from Texas has contributed much to the war effort by the introduction of his bill and also by having it reported to the House where there can be full and fair discussion of the whole selective-service administration. May I say that on the whole the selective-service administration, and particularly the local boards, as suggested by my colleague, have done a marvelous job. However, I would like for the gentleman to comment on two things that were testified to before the committee by General Hershey, head of the Selective Service, and also by General White, Chief of Personnel in the War Department. One of these was that in their judgment this bill is impractical, if not impossible, of administration. The other one, in order that my colleague may comment on it for the information of the House, is that most of those gentlemen testified, as I recall it, that due to the seriousness of the war effort it is now apparent that by the first of next year all men under 38 years of age who are physically fit, whether married or unmarried, will be called into the service. In the event that is true, and we must rely upon that assumption, I am anxious for my colleague to comment on what his bill would then accomplish.

Mr. KILDAY. I may say to the gentleman that that is my next topic for discussion. I want to finish my statement now with reference to the contention that it would require the calling in of the undesirables first.

There are three distinct reasons why that could not happen. In the first place, these men would be assigned to categories under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe. In the second place, the definition of each category is preceded by the language:

> Registrant otherwise qualified.

Nowhere is the qualification defined in the statute, and it is still within the power of the President and the Selective Service to state what shall constitute "qualified." They can make it what they please. The third reason is this: There now appears in the law—and I rewrite it into my bill as the second paragraph beginning on page 3—this language:

> The President is authorized under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any and all categories of those men found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective.

So that situation never did exist. There was never any possibility of such results. Now I want to comment on my colleague's points in reverse order.

In the first place, I do not recall that any definite date was stated by which all men under 38 physically qualified would have to be in the Service, but I accept my colleague's statement of the first of the year. I do not care if the delay is only 30 minutes, I say that the family relationship in this Nation should be recognized and protected to the last second possible. I do not care whether it is pending for every married man in the Nation to go, and when we need them, of course, they will go and my bill does not prevent it. It provides that they shall all be taken, but they shall be taken in this order of preference, recognizing the family as being the cornerstone of our society and our Nation, recognizing it as being the institution we are seeking to preserve in this war. I say that it is worth while to preserve it, if it is

only for a few minutes or a few weeks or a few months.

I cannot get over the fact that more than a year ago the same statements were going forth that the induction of married men with children was imminent; exactly the same statements as are going forth now went forth back there at that time.

Right here let me give you some figures by comparison with the World War which show that there is some difficulty here, something is out of kilter. At the time the World War ended we had 4,800,000 men under arms in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. We had approximately that same number of men under arms at the time we considered the 18- and 19-year-old draft. At the end of the World War not more than 12 percent of the men who served were married. This included those who married while in service. These figures are secured from the allotment and allowance records of the World War.

We drafted men from 21 to 31 in the World War, except that 120,000 some odd under 21 and over 31 were inducted under the provisions of the last draft act. We had a larger age spread in this war because we were at that time drafting the age group from 21 to 45.

We have 20,000,000 more people in the country now than we had during the last war, and still when we reached the same point in the size of our Army we were told that we were faced with the imminent draft of family men, when we did not reach that point in the World War with 20,000,000 less people in the country.

You may say, too, there is so much more industry now, but that does not account for it. Less than 1,200,000 in the entire Nation were in II–A and II–B, about five-hundred-thousand-and-some-odd in munitions factories, and almost the same number in related industries, including the farm, at the time we reduced the draft age. So that is not where your situation is. There is a leakage in your manpower, that is true. I still contend, and have contended from the beginning with little success, that it comes from that provision of the law under which the quota of the local board is based not upon the number who are registered in that local board but upon the number registered in that local board and not deferred by it.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I think it should be pointed out that whereas in the last war, as the gentleman says, there were 4,800,000 men in the service, there are already approximately 7,500,000 men in the service, and we are rapidly on the way to having 10,000,000 or 11,000,000 men in the service.

Mr. KILDAY. If my colleague will recall, I said that at the time we considered the 18-and-19-year-old amendment to the Draft Act our armed forces were practically identical with those of the World War, and we were then reducing our minimum to 18-year-olds, and long before that the contention had been made that the draft of family men was imminent.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. On the question of this bill's not being susceptible of proper administration, let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that under the bill there is nothing that will prevent married men from being inducted, even married men with a number of children, when the time comes that it is necessary to do it.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. The last question General Hershey answered before the committee as he left the stand was my question:

> Now, General, isn't it a fact that under my bill no person not now deferred would be deferred by my bill?

He said:

> That is correct. It creates no new deferment.

Mr. THOMASON. In that connection, may I ask another question? Under the gentleman's bill would an unmarried young man engaged, say, in a necessary agricultural pursuit, who is necessary on a farm, be drafted before a married man with a rich wife or a wife who had an income?

Mr. KILDAY. Under no circumstances, as I told the gentleman in the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is there now or has there been any provision to defer a young man because he is engaged in the agricultural industry? If there is, I have failed to find it or hear of it.

Mr. KILDAY. When the 18–19-year-old draft bill was up, Senator TYDINGS in the Senate offered an amendment to the bill which provided for the continuance of a man in agriculture, and that he should lose his deferred status if he left without the permission of his draft board. But there has never been the possibility that my colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] raises here, of taking a single man in a necessary industry in order to grant deferment to a married man with a rich wife or who is able to take care of his children from his estate or anything of that kind. That question has never been involved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON. I am not taking issue with the gentleman by controverting his answer to my question, but what provision in the bill does the gentleman make that answer to, when you say that an unmarried young man on a farm and necessarily engaged in farming will not be taken before a married man with a rich wife?

Mr. KILDAY. I am going to read the provision of the bill to my colleague. I shall read the paragraph, for it contains only a few lines.

Mr. THOMASON. We are all interested in this, and I think it is a very important matter to be cleared up.

Mr. KILDAY. This is a very helpful discussion. After the enacting clause the bill is amended to read as follows:

> (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

Then comes the next paragraph:

> Under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, registrants not deferred under the foregoing paragraph shall be assigned to categories with respect to persons dependent upon them for support, in the following order.

The only power that now exists for deferring men in industry or agriculture exists under present law which is this first paragraph of my bill. If this language was not in the present law, they could not grant occupational deferments. I have put in the same identical language, and under an abundance of precaution have provided the categories shall be formulated of what is left after the occupational deferments have been made.

Mr. THOMASON. I take no issue with what the gentleman is saying, but there are subsequent provisions in the gentleman's bill, which he so ably expounded in the beginning, in which you say that every single man in the State, not in the area of the local board, must be exhausted before you can take a married man under any conditions.

Mr. KILDAY. Let me interpret that. The registrants will not go into the categories until after the occupational deferments have been granted. The provisions to which the gentleman refers read as follows—and this is the only section of the bill that I wrote, and the rest of it is either existing law or a regulation written by Selective Service:

> Persons assigned to such categories shall be inducted in the foregoing order of such categories. No person assigned to any of said categories shall be called for induction prior to the call for induction of all persons within the same State who have been placed in categories herein made subject to induction prior to the category in which such person has been placed.

Therefore the category with the lower priority cannot be inducted prior to the induction of all persons in the State who have been assigned to categories with a higher priority. But it relates only to those "who have been" placed in such categories and no person is placed in a category until all occupational deferments have been granted. Then those left over are assigned to the categories.

Now, let us discuss whether the bill is capable of administration. We must remember that 4 months before the time scheduled for induction the calls are made upon the States. Therefore, 4 months before the men are desired the National Selective Service sends to each of the 48 States, and to the District of Columbia, a call for a blanket number of men from that particular territory. It goes to the State director. In his office the State director allocates that call among the local boards in his State.

The State director maintains in his office at all times a current inventory of the men available in each of the local boards in his State. He knows the number of single men in each board in his State. He knows the number of single men with collateral dependents; the number of married men with no children; the number of married men with children. He is also from time to time given the number for which that State is entitled to credit for volunteers and those already in the service. The State director, in his office in the State capital, takes that blanket call and apportions it to his local boards, giving each local board credit for those who are already in the service. If my bill is adopted the only difference would be that where there was a local board that had no single men and there were local boards with single men in the State, he would make no call on the board which had exhausted its single men until he had exhausted the single men in other boards. The same would be true if he had a call for 2,000 men and he filled it with 1,000 single men, and that is all he had left in the State, then he would take the other 1,000 married men without children and apportion them out in those boards from the current inventory he keeps in his office at the State capital. There could be no difficulty at all in its administration.

Mr ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Can the gentleman conceive of anything that would add more to the difficulties of administration of the Selective Service Act than an attempt to enforce Mr. McNutt's order?

Mr. KILDAY. I cannot imagine anything as destructive of the morale of our people. There is not a business in any town or in any city in the United States that is not now completely disrupted. I wish you could come to my office and read some of the hundreds and hundreds of letters that I have, some from ministers in those communities, appealing to the Congress to do something to extricate families living in their parishes from the horrible cruelty that has been brought to bear upon them by this kind of an order. Letters come from mothers of children who are not able to work. They are to be faced with this difficulty, notwithstanding the plain mandate of the Congress that it shall not be done.

There is nothing in the world about my bill that is not workable. They all have to admit, when you pin them down to it, that it is workable. When they come before the Military Affairs Committee they know that we are informed of the technical workings of this act and that a simple, blank statement by them that it cannot work will not suffice. There has been only one reason advanced why it should not be adopted, and that is "Because I do not want it." The only reason that has been advanced by any of the departments after you take into consideration the cross-examination of the witnesses is, "I do not want it." We know that the Manpower Commission does not want to face organized opposition to a National Service Act. They would like to convert the machinery of the Selective Service Act to that purpose. It may be much easier for them to do. I say to you if we are worthy of the positions of trust which we hold, it is time for us to say the legislative intent is plain. We have spoken time and again upon what the policy of this Nation shall be, and we insist and we maintain that the families shall not be thus so easily disrupted. I am willing to maintain the 40-hour week in peacetime. I am willing to maintain it as an institution, but before we go into the maintenance of that, let us see to it that that great institution in American life, the Christian American family, be maintained.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

### INVESTIGATION OF THE JAPANESE IN AMERICA

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution, asking that a special committee of the House be set up to investigate Japanese activities in the United States and its possessions. I have requested that this committee direct an investigation into any and all activities of the Japanese in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including their infiltration into American economic, political, and social life, with the end of preserving the security of the United States during the war and looking toward the establishment of a proper policy toward the Japanese residents of the United States, its Territories and possessions after the war.

We first heard much of Japanese infiltration tactics on Bataan and in the Philippines, but the Japanese had for many years practiced a different type of infiltration—infiltration into the vitals of our economic, political, and domestic structure. The disciples of Bushido, by insidious and indirect means, inserted themselves in a great many organizations in much the same fashion as the Nazis have utilized their front organizations. In our great Pacific coast cities they controlled much of the hotel and restaurant business although always there was a white manager who would front for them with the general public. They lowered prices to their own countrymen in the fresh produce and vegetable field, forcing out their white competition, only to raise prices as soon as they had monopolized this sphere of business. Always they had prominent civic leaders as their attorneys, paying them on a retainer basis. Whenever a situation came up in which they were interested, they had only to contact these individuals with their specious reasons to have them immediately come forward in their interest. Investigation will show that Japanese consuls in our large cities lavished expensive and sumptuous gifts on a great number of prominent citizens at Christmas and other appropriate occasions.

I wish to make it clear here that I do not intend to indict the great majority of these individuals because I am positive there was no disloyalty to their country in their minds. However, because their actions were unintentional, does not alter the fact that they were of great importance and value in the subtle propagandizing efforts of the Japanese nation and enabled them to exert an unbelievable amount of influence on the economic, political, and social life of the Pacific coast region.

After my study of this question, I wish to assure the Members of this House that there is not the slightest doubt in my mind but that the Japanese consul, taking his orders directly from Tokyo, ruled the Japanese colonies in our country with an iron and dictatorial hand; thus there was a society within a society and a race within a race. Every 2 years the Japanese consul in the large Pacific coast cities was changed and a new consul came in, bearing direct orders from the "Son of Heaven" in Tokyo. He directed the establishment of Japanese language schools; he managed the complicated Japanese financial system through the Japanese banks, owned and controlled in the land of the Samurai. The consulate office was the fountainhead from which flowed all directives to Japanese residents, both alien and native to this country, and was also the center of espionage and propaganda activity to which came all the data which the Japanese were able to gather regarding our Pacific coast line and the isles and inlets of the Alaskan Peninsula.

Let me outline briefly to you a few of the examples of Japanese infiltration tactics which have recently come to light. The most striking example, in my opinion, is a fact recently brought out by Miller Freeman, captain, U. S. N. R., retired, publisher of eight trade journals, and who is undoubtedly one of the greatest experts on the Japanese problem in our country. He points out that in the China Club of Seattle, Wash., which has an executive board composed of 29 members, 11 members are listed in the 1942 roster of officers and members of the Japan Society of Seattle. How ironic it is that with China and Japan having been at war for over 5 years such a large majority of the directors of the China Club and the Japan Club should belong to both organizations.

I wonder also if you gentlemen know that immediately after Pearl Harbor, several Japanese organizations turned over to the American Red Cross a number of bandages, medical supplies, and other material fashioned by Japanese societies. They attempted to obtain wide publicity and made great fanfare about their patriotism at that time, neglecting,

however, to mention that all their supplies up to that date had been forwarded to the Japanese military machine. They neglected, also, to mention that it was necessary for them to remove the bills of lading from the material which they donated to our Government because it had been addressed previously to Tokyo.

The War Relocation Authority and the Federal Reserve Bank Board now have all the information regarding the financial assets and economic enterprises of the Japanese in this country. Now that we are at war with Japan, we need not be concerned with diplomatic niceties. Is there any reason why this information should not be made available to the American people? Do not the American people, and particularly the residents of the Pacific coast, have the right to know the extent of the economic stranglehold possessed by Japanese residents on the domestic economy of our country? I for one must insist that the American people have a right to be fully informed on this subject.

Let me point out also here that these are not recent developments in Japanese strategy. The Japanese have used these tactics for many years. Over 20 years ago, our able colleague [Mr. WOODRUFF] called to the attention of Congress some information which he has recently again brought to light before this Seventy-eighth Congress. During World War No. 1, our so-called ally, Japan, owned two airplane plants in the State of New Jersey which were employed on Government contracts. These two plants were the Standard Aircraft Corporation and the Standard Aero Co., which were in the control of Mitsui & Co., the fiscal agents of the Japanese Government at that time. Japan, therefore, had access to our most advanced secret military information regarding that vital military weapon, the airplane. Under orders from Tokyo, this company actually shipped a number of complete airplane engines to Japan for study and imitation at the height of this war. It has even been reliably reported that Jap emissaries applied at that time to Thomas Edison, head of the United States War Invention Board, to share in all the technical military information available to this country.

Despite the enlightening exposé made by the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman WOODRUFF, and despite the fact further investigation showed the Japanese had not only stolen our military secrets but while so doing had milked the United States Treasury of over $16,000,000, I can find no evidence to demonstrate that any successful effort was ever made to follow up these events and to receive an accounting from the Japanese nation.

Those who have read the White Paper of the State Department, outlining our Nation's course of diplomacy with Japan prior to Pearl Harbor, find it difficult to understand why the American people were left so much in the dark as to the actual trend of diplomatic events in that area. I venture to say that if the true facts are brought out regarding the inadequacy of our naval intelligence in the Pacific area the American public will find such a revelation even more astounding. I know conclusively that the facts regarding Japanese military preparations, the Japanese war psychosis, and Japanese plans for conquest were brought forcefully to the attention of our Naval Intelligence not once but many times in the years preceding Pearl Harbor.

Even the schoolboys in coastal cities on the Pacific coast who had observed Japanese merchant marine sailors, cameras slung over their backs, on their Sunday afternoon stroll over the waterfronts of our large cities were more aware of the crisis which might become imminent at any moment.

Certainly, the fishermen in the great Alaskan salmon industry, who had fought to expel Japanese floating canneries from our Alaskan waters, were well aware of the true facts. Certainly, too, it is no wonder that these same fishermen expressed their wonder in times past that not only did the State Department exert its influence against their efforts to expell the Japs from these regions, but even urged that their technical and student missions receive special courtesies in viewing this area. If anyone doubts the accuracy of the information which the Japanese have regarding the shores and inlets of the Alaskan Peninsula, I urge him to ask any experienced fishing skipper in those waters if he would not prefer to have the Japanese maps and sounding charts in preference to those obtained by the belated efforts of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

In my mind there is no question but that the same pro-Japanese influences which existed in this country prior to Pearl Harbor still exist, although they have temporarily gone underground. I believe the investigation of Japanese activity during these many years in our country will bring out a number of startling revelations which will materially assist us in the prosecution of the present war. Mme. Chiang Kai-shek quoted a Chinese proverb in her recent address to this House: "Know thyself; know thy enemy." I do not believe that either the American people, the Members of Congress, or even the military authorities can fully understand the Japanese conflict in all its aspects without knowing more fully what has been the history of pre-war infiltration and propagandizing in this country. If we fully study and analyze their mode of second-front activity in this country, we will better be able to conduct the present war to a successful and speedy conclusion. Armed with this information, we will realize the necessity for diverting a greater portion of our military might to the war in the Pacific before they have been able to consolidate the vast industrial and economic empire they have recently taken over.

Even a dilettante student of history knows Japan, although nominally one of our allies in World War No. 1, did practically nothing for the common cause in that conflict. They did manage, however, to take Tsingtao from the Germans, which they afterward retained along with the mandated isles, which they fortified strongly in abrogation of their solemn trust and which we must now reckon with in the war of the Pacific. By building up previous to the First World War a great stock pile of materials which they lacked, they also managed to grab a great part of world trade. In truth, the greatest factor in the modern economic development of Japan was the First World War. Japan felt no obligation to her allies in that war any more than she has given us any reason in World War No. 2 to believe she will assist Germany unless such help coincide with her own nefarious purposes. However, in the event Germany seems about to succumb to weight of combined Allied military might, may we not expect that she will attempt a diversion to save her own skin?

I submit, gentleman, in view of what has already transpired in the past and future eventualities we may anticipate, this investigation is an urgent and immediate necessity.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman for bringing this subject to the attention of the House at this time. I think it is high time that we look into the status of the Japanese in this country not only during the war but after the war. Will the gentleman give the House his attitude on the present War Department project of developing a Japanese unit within our own armed services?

Mr. JACKSON. I might say to the gentleman that I have not gone into that matter in any great detail. We all know, however, that it is one which requires the greatest precaution. From what we have been able to gather up to date I think it is pretty clear that the Japanese we trusted most are those who often proved to be the most treacherous.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Does not the gentleman believe that the utmost care must be taken in separating the wheat from the chaff, so to speak, before any Japanese in this country are permitted to join our armed forces?

Mr. JACKSON. That is right. I do not see how it is possible for the War Relocation Authority or any other branch of the Government to determine the loyalty of the individual Japanese on the basis of the information we now have on hand.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman comes from the Pacific coast and knows the reaction of the people out there just as I do.

Mr. JACKSON. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman knows that there are already a number of Japanese in the Army—several thousand who are there under operation of the Selec-

tive Service Act prior to our going into war with Japan.

Mr. JACKSON. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. They are now in the service.

Mr. JACKSON. That is right.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman, I understand, is proposing a committee to make this investigation; is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; I may say that it is for a study of the Japanese problem in all its aspects.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe the gentleman is proposing a very good line of inquiry, but I see the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] present, and I wonder if this does not come within the purview of the work of the Dies committee.

Mr. JACKSON. I may say to the gentleman from Tennessee in that connection that what I propose is a study of the whole Japanese question, not just the matter of the subversive side of it with which the gentleman from Texas is interested. The committee that I propose is of much broader scope than that of the Dies committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

DOMESTIC FOOD REQUIREMENTS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, about 10 days ago there was published a portion of a report called The Tables and Notes of Estimates of Minimum Civilian Consumer Requirements by the Office of Civilian Supply of the War Production Board. That Office is headed by a man named Joseph Weiner. The report contained a number of statements or a study or recommendation which would bring prohibition back to the United States by the back door.

The Office of Civilian Supply, in this report, stated that the country should have its distilled liquor production—its distilled liquor supply after the present supply shall have been exhausted—reduced to 1 percent. The cut was to be 99 percent—a sort of bedrock recommendation, if the war endured for several years.

I asked to see the full report. We only had the newspaper version of part of the report. I was refused the report by the Office of Civilian Supply under Mr. Weiner. I then wrote to the Stabilization Director, Mr. Byrnes, and said that, insofar as a portion of the report had been made public, the entire report should be made public; that if the press had a portion of the report the Congress was entitled to the entire report. I presume, as a result of my letter to Mr. Byrnes, the entire report has now been made public. It appeared in the New York Times of day before yesterday. It is called Tables and Notes on Estimates of Minimum Civilian Consumer Requirements, supposedly during the extremities and rigors of war. I have gone through these notes and tables and estimates, and, so far as I am concerned, they are naught but arbitrary abstractions and pure guesswork. They are so loosely devised, so conditioned, as to be valueless, but to the uninitiated, to the rank and file of the public who only read headlines, they may be mightily dangerous and frightening. They have already caused runs in various stores throughout the Nation, particularly with reference to liquors, watches, and toilet preparations, among other commodities.

These tables are based upon consumption records of 1941 and in turn based upon 1939 prices and are to be made applicable to 1943, 1944, and 1945 and beyond, depending upon the duration of the war. Any schoolboy knows that 1943 and 1944 and 1945 and on would be utterly different from 1939 and 1941. I repeat, the schedules are based on consumption in 1941, and in turn based upon prices of 1939. The years 1943, 1945, and 1946, and onward, probably are no more the same as the years 1939 and 1941 than the moon is like green cheese. There will be vast differences between those periods. There will be difference in production values and costs, difference in the quantity of materials available, wholesale changes in laws and regulations. The pre-war period will be utterly different from the war years. And because of these changes this whole business, this whole report, to my mind, is absurd, useless, and a mere hodgepodge.

These estimates, furthermore, fail to consider the extreme differences in taxes between the years 1939 and 1941 and the taxes that may have to be imposed in the years 1943, 1945, 1946, and so on, the taxes that may be written in this House for the future. They fail to consider changes in purchasing power, changes in living standards in different parts of the country. They fail to consider the black market and other important factors. I come to the inescapable conclusion that the whole business is a mumbo-jumbo of nonsense and wishful thinking.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Do I understand the gentleman to intend to convey the idea that there is a bigger demand for liquor in 1942 than 1941, and a still greater demand in 1943 and 1944?

Mr. CELLER. No; I did not say that. I will come to the liquor part of it in a moment. I did not infer what the gentleman indicated in any sense of the word.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman said the estimates for the following years were incorrect.

Mr. CELLER. They do not estimate what the consumption will be in the following years. Their theory is this: They give you a bedrock estimate of what the civilian can do with or without and they take the consumption of 1941 based on 1939 prices, and they apply that to what they consider the most rigorous period of the war, the so-called bedrock consumer-demand period. When that time will come I do not know, and they do not tell us.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is the gentleman afraid we are going to run out of liquor?

Mr. CELLER. No; that is not my point. If the gentleman will bear with me, he will get my point.

This report cuts radios, for example, down to 12 percent. Just why it is 12 percent we are not told. It is mighty serious, however, to cut down radios when the ears of the Nation are glued to radios for war news. But maybe we will be compelled to cut radios even lower than 12 percent. What I complain about is that we are not told why they must be cut to 12 percent. Books are cut to 29.3 percent at a time when books will be more necessary for the enlightenment of the public than ever before. But why 29.3 percent? On whose authority? On Mr. Weiner's? We can have no confidence in his judgment. Who aided him? What are their records? Who are they? The authors of this report are so guileless as to imagine the public will hold the manufacture of watches down to nil, while lipstick and rouge is reduced to 70 percent. Imagine watches entirely cut out but lipstick held at 70 percent. Citrus fruits are to be 76 percent, toilet soap and deodorants are, respectively, 67 and 70 percent, while tomatoes, a very valuable vegetable, are reduced to 76 percent. Golf balls are 50 percent. Why in thunder we must have golf balls manufactured and golf courses open when we come to the extremes of war is beyond my comprehension. Coal is reduced to 75 percent. Why? We are not told. It is just an arbitrary figure like all the others. It is just as though someone put a lot of numbers in a hat, and someone blindfolded pulled them out.

Over and beyond that, the report still contains the obnoxious recommendation that manufactured whisky and distilled spirits be reduced to 1 percent of the 1941 consumption, based upon 1939 prices. The authors under this man Weiner are as unrealistic as a log of wood, I would say. They offer no reasons for this cut. They do not tell us who was consulted. We must take it or leave it. Here is a ukase. Obey it. Ask no questions. Did the Office of Civilian Supply confer with Army or Navy officials? Did representatives of the Executive vouchsafe any suggestions or memoranda? Who is behind this sorry mess?

The report is encyclopedic in scope as it is revolutionary in purpose. It covers all commodities and services. Yet the Congress was not consulted, the public was not consulted, and industry was not consulted. The author or authors only consulted themselves. I would call them wiseacres and mere pretenders to knowledge. These men fail to realize, for example, that during the last war the Nation refused to accept prohibition, refused to accept a 1-percent regimen. The Nation flouted prohibition. The

bootleggers supplied the demand, and they will do so again, but in the meanwhile a billion dollars in revenue will be lost. This Nation will not again be regimented into prohibition—Weiner or no Weiner—Office of Civilian Supply or no Office of Civilian Supply.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Do I understand that this document or ruling that the gentleman is discussing has already been put into effect or is it a mere proposal?

Mr. CELLER. It is a proposal.

Mr. CURTIS. By what authority does he propose it?

Mr. CELLER. Goodness knows. I do not know. Perhaps the gentleman can give me some enlightening information on it.

Mr. CURTIS. What is his official capacity in this Government?

Mr. CELLER. He is Chairman of the Office of Civilian Supplies.

Mr. CURTIS. He is the same gentleman that cut the agricultural machinery estimates of the Department of Agriculture in half?

Mr. CELLER. I believe he is the same gentleman. I am here to criticize him most severely, and I hope the gentleman who has just propounded the questions will do the same thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. This preliminary report was bad enough, but the final report is worse. I am reminded of an old adage that the more you poke an old pile the worse it stinks, and that is the best way I can characterize this report that has emanated from the Office of Civilian Supply as presided over by this man Weiner.

Mr. KEFAUVER Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does it appear that this is a report from a committee or from this man individually?

Mr. CELLER. It is a report presumably from this so-called Office of Civilian Supply, presided over by this man Joseph P. Weiner.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I ask the gentleman further if there were any public hearings or if the public had an opportunity of presenting its viewpoint?

Mr. CELLER. I checked on that, and, as far as I could discover, there were no public hearings. The public was not taken into the confidence of these "Weinerites," these charlatans. Congress was not consulted. I do not believe a single Member of the House or the Senate was consulted. I do not know of anybody who was consulted. Industry was not consulted, and they have a very strong interest in the cutting down of their production and their wares. They are as patriotic as these "Weinerites." They ought to know something about it. We ought to know something about it. A report as cataclysmic as is this report certainly ought to be the result of some deliberation on the part of the Members of the House. No; we get it after it is all cooked up, ready to dish out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my discussion on the subject for which I asked time to address the House, may I say that I am not so deeply alarmed as the gentleman from New York who just preceded me, with reference to the shortage of liquor in this country. I believe that if the manpower, energy, and materials that are being used in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of liquor, were utilized in industry or business necessary in the prosecution of the war, our country and our people would be so much better off than by using all this material and manpower for such unnecessary purposes. I do not think we need to get so terribly alarmed because someone in a report advocates the cutting down of the use of intoxicating liquors in this critical time. How anyone can justify the use of sugar and other important food ingredients for use in intoxicating liquor is more than I can understand. There appears to be plenty of liquor on hand, but not enough food. Liquor stocks are plentiful, but not food.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman knows there is no distillation of liquor now, that those facilities are all used for the production of alcohol for smokeless powder.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am informed the liquor people claim they had a 3- or 4-year supply on hand when they went into that production. Nobody has seen fit to ration liquor in this country except in State-wide rationing in a few States. The Federal Government has not done any rationing of liquor, but it has rationed shoes, canned foods, vegetables, and other foods, besides necessary farm machinery, and other necessary things. If you want to go to a liquor store I am informed you can still buy whatever quantity you want without the necessity of coupon books or rationing regulations. At least that is the case here in the District of Columbia, where more liquor is consumed than in any city of its comparative size in this country. They may decide to change the practice, but not so now. The supply seems to be holding out, at least in Washington.

Mr. CELLER. There is considerable rationing at the source of whatever distilled spirits are left. They do not manufacture any liquor now.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years, I have been trying to secure legislation to amend the Agricultural Act so a farmer could feed his own "excess" wheat to his livestock and poultry without paying a penalty on it, also to permit a farmer to put his green corn in the silo without being included in a corn quota. I have thought the penalty of 49 cents on wheat raised in addition to a restricted quota was too strict, and have tried to secure legislation on that matter. The Department of Agriculture did not see fit to go along, but opposed it. But today, as the House was about to consider and vote on these matters, we are advised the Department by Executive order has, without legislation, agreed that farmers should not be penalized for feeding wheat to livestock and poultry, and they should not be made to pay 50 cents a bushel for extra wheat they might be fortunate to grow in addition to their allotment by the Government. They say now a farmer may raise any amount of wheat he desires, except he is expected to comply with other requirements of the farm program. Of course, I am glad to see the Department go at least as far as it did.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the Department plans to do with all the penalty money that has been collected from the farmers and now in escrow, but I do know these same farmers could and would make good use of that money. Looks kind of off color for the Government to keep that penalty money that was collected because a farmer raised a little extra wheat that is going to be so much needed in the next few months. In 1941 the sum of $5,194,822 was collected in penalties from Kansas farmers. About $2,000,000 has been refunded. Last year the Government collected $763,000 from the farmers of my State; about $40,000 of that has been returned. I do not know about the figures for the whole country, but understand they are about five times these amounts. These farmers who raised the so-called excess wheat did not receive parity payments, or 85-percent loans, or insurance benefits, or even soil-conservation payments. Then why not refund their money? I am informed that except in a few cases most of it is in small amounts, and most of it paid by men engaged in diversified farming. That extra wheat, although we did not realize it, may turn out to be mighty important as a part of our dwindling food supply.

Mr. Speaker, our own Government and the governments of countries in other parts of the world are asking for more and more food. People across the seas are in want at the present hour. As a matter of fact, our so-called surplus of wheat is dwindling right now. I am informed the estimated carry-over for July 1 is about 700,000,000 bushels. I understand, too, that about 75,000,000 bushels of this amount is to be allocated for livestock feed. Possibly a hundred million bushels will go for foreign relief. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the shortage of other foods is bound to increase the demand for wheat products, so that by July 1 we may not have more than 400,000,000 bushels of wheat. If we should happen to have a rather short crop in place of a surplus this year, we could have a shortage within the year. I think, Mr.

Speaker, that we are going to be mighty fortunate if we do have a little surplus of wheat by the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year's crop failure would not only wipe out all our surplus but would create a food crisis. The farm problem and the production of food is becoming more serious day by day. Even if we could be assured of a favorable crop year and could have the employment and equipment similar to last year, we would still be unable to meet the demands for food. Our producers are beginning the year with a shortage of labor and a shortage of farm machinery and equipment, and yet they are expected to produce even more food than last year. Unless, Mr. Speaker, the producers of our country are given a little more help, equipment, and machinery than present plans and regulations appear to permit, the food shortage in this country by the end of 1943 will be the most critical experienced in this country in its history.

Mr. Speaker, the American farmer has a tremendous responsibility. He will do his best to meet it, notwithstanding the handicaps that confront him.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a most critical problem. We must not do anything to hamper or hinder production. On the other hand, we must see to it that everything possible under the circumstances shall be done to help the farmer in his effort to meet the challenge that confronts him.

### JUDGE LESLIE R. DARR

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A656, there appears a statement of the gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., Representative of the Second District of Tennessee. In this statement Judge Leslie R. Darr is severely criticized and castigated for the sentence he imposed upon three defendants who were convicted in the district court at Chattanooga of illegally interfering with an election in McMinn County, Tenn.

Mr. Speaker, the independence, purity, and the honesty of the Federal judiciary is one of the most blessed bedrocks of our democracy. The Federal courts have deserved and won the approbation of the people throughout the history of this Republic. That confidence must be preserved. With all deference to the gentleman from Tennessee, I think it ill becomes any Member of Congress to criticize the action of a Federal judge when he was not present at the trial, did not hear the testimony, and did not see the witnesses as they appeared in court.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that our colleague from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has spent a number of months working on this case, gathering up the evidence presented to the Department of Justice, and was to a very great extent familiar with the facts in the case, whether or not the gentleman from Tennessee agrees with what he said about the sentence or not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the gentleman will give me opportunity to answer his question, I shall endeavor to do so. I have read in the newspapers that the gentleman from Tennessee has been very much interested in the case. I did not observe that he was present at the trial. I might say to the gentleman that I notified the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] that I was going to make this brief statement, so it is not being made in his absence, without his knowledge.

Furthermore, the floor of the House of Representatives is a poor and improper tribunal for the trial of a lawsuit. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House is zealous in its efforts to maintain the sanctity of the judiciary, and in doing this we have had very good success. If any Member of Congress has a substantial complaint, he should present the complaint to this committee, which would conduct a fair and full investigation. Would not this be better and fairer than publicly making a charge on the floor about a matter of which the Member cannot have full information? I do not know the details of the case against the three defendants from McMinn County to which the gentleman from Tennessee alluded. No one who was not present at the trial is in a position to pass judgment on the fairness of the sentence imposed. The newspaper accounts indicate the men proved good character, that one was in the armed forces, and the other two were working in a vital defense factory. These considerations undoubtedly were taken into account by the judge in fixing the sentence, as they should have been.

I know Judge Darr very well personally. I have practiced before him for 16 years. He has decided cases for and against my clients.

Of one thing I am absolutely sure, and that is that Judge Darr did what he thought was right and just, without fear and without regard to any outside influence. Judge Darr needs no defense from me. The high esteem in which he is held by the lawyers and people of his judicial district repudiate any implication of impropriety.

As a district judge and as a circuit judge for many years before he was elevated to the Federal bench, Judge Darr has made a remarkable record as a jurist of the best and highest type. He renders justice according to the law and the evidence, having in mind at all times the solemn obligations of his position. He is beyond approach or influence of any kind.

I regret that anyone has seen fit to disparage a man whom I consider one of the Nation's finest district judges.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] have unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### MR. AND MRS. WILLIAM DENNIS, KEENE, N. H.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I have here a resolution passed by the New Hampshire House of Representatives in honor of Mr. and Mrs. William Dennis, of Keene, who have seven sons in the service. I am happy to call to the attention of this House the magnificent record set by this New Hampshire family:

Whereas Mr. and Mrs. William Dennis, of Keene, have set what is believed to be a national record by having contributed seven sons to the American armed forces; and

Whereas this notable accomplishment is another instance proving that New Hampshire's citizenry always rises completely and in unity to the occasion in times of national stress: Be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives hereby go on record as voicing its tribute to Mr. and Mrs. Dennis and the gallant fighting members of their family; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the clerk send a copy of these resolutions to Mr. and Mrs. William Dennis, of Keene.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix by including an address made over the radio last night by Fulton Lewis, Jr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BARDEN, for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. RAMEY, for today, on account of important business.

To Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, for 3 days, on account of death in his family.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 24, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

### COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The subcommittee on pay raise legislation, Congressman JENNINGS RANDOLPH, chairman, will begin public hearings on H. R. 1860, on Wednesday morning, February 24, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 246, House Office Building.

### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

There will be an open hearing of the Committee on Agriculture at 10 a. m.,

Wednesday, February 24, 1943, for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 83 to permit additional sales of wheat for feed.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, March 4, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 134 to provide for the suspension, during the war, of operating-differential subsidy agreements, and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

The committee will also hold a public hearing on Thursday, March 18, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1361 (Mr. LANE) and H. R. 1409 (Mr. FOGARTY), conferring upon men in the merchant marine the same rights, privileges, and benefits accruing to those serving in the armed forces; and on H. R. 1858, to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine who served during the World War as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who served during such war.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, March 9, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on H. R. 1880, a bill providing for the construction of a ship canal across the State of New Jersey, connecting New York Bay with the Delaware River, and forming the last link in the Intracoastal Waterway from Boston to the Mexican border.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

203. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, Library of Congress, fiscal year 1944, involving an increase of $13,680, in form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 115), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1903. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General; without amendment (Rept. No. 149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 1947. A bill to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1948. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1940, pertaining to emergency officers' retirement benefits; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1949. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, and for other purposes," approved May 24, 1938; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1950. A bill to prescribe the base period to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in determining and publishing parity price for oranges and comparable price for grapefruit; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1951. A bill to amend to District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 1952. A bill to provide for post-war planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1953. A bill to establish a Voluntary War Farm Corps for voluntary service on the farms of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 1954. A bill to require that the Federal contribution to States for old-age assistance shall be the full amount in cases where the State matches to the extent of its ability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1955 (by request). A bill to restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and to regulate its value as provided in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States; to restore full employment and production; to prevent inflation and depression; and to provide a stable currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 1956. A bill to exempt persons in the military and naval forces of the United States from Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1957. A bill to confer the power of arrest without warrant upon officers, agents, special agents, or duly accredited representatives of the Counter-Intelligence Corps or Military Intelligence Division of the Army of the United States or of the Naval Intelligence Service of the Navy of the United States in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1958. A bill to authorize and empower officers, agents, special agents, or duly accredited representatives of the Counter-Intelligence Corps or Military Intelligence Division of the Army of the United States or of the Naval Intelligence Service of the Navy of the United States to administer oaths in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHIFFLER:

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution directing the War Relocation Authority to cease and desist from the establishment and operation, at relocation centers where enemy aliens, including persons of Japanese blood, are interned, of plants for the manufacture of pottery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 130. Resolution requesting Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker to address a joint session of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 131. Resolution making H. R. 7, a bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. Res. 132. Resolution providing for investigation of Japanese subversive activities in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GAVAGAN:

H. Res. 133. Resolution to make H. R. 51, a bill to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State due process of law and equal protection of the laws, and to prevent the crime of lynching, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to take action on the resolution introduced by Representative CRAWFORD relative to annulling of certain laws; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take steps toward production of synthetic rubber from farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass such legislation to include teachers in the social-security plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for an appropriation to combat grasshoppers and other insect plagues; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1959. A bill for the relief of Harold Paikin; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 1960. A bill for the relief of William Meyer; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 1961. A bill to amend the act of October 14, 1940, entitled "An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Nicholas G. Daras"; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 1962. A bill for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 1963. A bill for the relief of G. H. Garner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 1964. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Lott; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCOWEN:

H. R. 1965. A bill granting a pension to George E. Armacost; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1966. A bill for the relief of W. P. Richardson, as successor and assignee of W. P. Richardson & Co., of Tampa, Fla., a partnership composed of W. P. Richardson, George W. Hessler, and L. C. Park, by reason of certain claim arising within the World War period; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 1967. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth Lively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 1968. A bill granting a pension to Margaret McAllister Barron; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1969. A bill granting an increase of pension to Rosalie C. Hood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. R. 1970. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Callaway Booth; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 1971. A bill for the relief of Winston Holder; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1972. A bill for the relief of Louis and Estelle Thomas; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1973. A bill for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1974. A bill granting an increase of pension to Robert Wornice Denny; to the Committee on Pensions.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

175. By Mr. BUFFETT: Petition of the Omaha B'Nai B'Rith Auxiliary, protesting against massacres of Jews in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

176. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition forwarded by Herman Holmes, of Chariton, Iowa, and signed by himself and 10 other postal employees, urging favorable consideration of the proposed salary increase for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

177. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Painting and Decorating Contractors of California, Inc., relative to extending benefits of the Social Security Act to painting contractors and other self-employed persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

178. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the common council of the city of Hamtramck, Mich., petitioning the Congress of the United States of America to exempt persons in the armed forces of the United States from Federal income taxes by passing a bill now pending in Congress providing for said exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

179. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the clerk, house of representatives, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota No. F; to the Committee on Rules.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we come before Thy presence with thanksgiving. Thou who art the loftiest spirit of heaven and earth, we thank Thee that Thou hast endowed man, noble in feelings and in destiny. Thou hast left us doors to open, teaching us that meekness is courageous, that self-surrender is a mighty thing, and that the Golden Rule is heroic.

Dear Lord, as the joy of the sailor is in the harbor toward which he moves, likewise the force of the soul is in the propelling motives which sweep it on. Almighty God, we pray that these may be our credentials by which victory is won: Unity, directive wisdom, courage, zeal, and all above personal gain; Oh, let the tides of these virtues pour over our souls, "nor attempt the future's portal, by the past's blood-rusted key." Hold Thou the very focus of our minds to this living truth, that we are remade by the things which unmake us, renewed by that which would destroy us, and saved unto life by that which we call death. O Christ, as Thou didst fulfill Thy divine mission on the Cross and all creation was widened for man's salvation, inspire us to glory in sacrifice, distress, and restraint for the sake of liberty and union both now and forever. In the name of Him who is the hope of the world, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday today be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 134), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved,* That an additional position of official reporter of proceedings and debates of the House is hereby authorized at the rate of $7,500 per annum and the compensation thereof shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTION OF HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee for the War Department I feel impelled to speak.

The War Department has been attacked and ridiculed for methods being used to protect the House Office Building here in Washington. In my opinion, the attack is unwise and does not represent the attitude of the Members of Congress.

I do not want the War Department to withhold guns from men who are fighting and dying in the battle zones in order to protect the House Office Building or officials in Washington. Washington is threatened not with bombs from without but with bombs from within.

If anybody in Washington is fearful of his own security here when men are dying in the battle zones of the South Pacific and North Africa, may heaven pity him.

If the War Department wants guns here, real or wooden, or no guns at all, it is all right with me. We must trust somebody.

Congress needs no protection. It only needs to prosecute a more effective policy for victory and the peace to follow.

Thinking in terms of all Americans at home, I say, not from bombs but from brainstorms, bickering, backbiting, and bungling, O Lord deliver us.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech which I delivered over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter which I have received.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TEXTILE WORKERS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, a joint announcement has just been made by the War and Navy Departments through their respective Under Secretaries, Patterson and Forrestal, that "textile makers meet all demands of services."

It is generally acknowledged that textiles are as essential in war as metal and powder. Needless to say, it is very gratifying to me, representing, as I do, a district containing so large a number of spindles and looms, to know that my people have thus attained their objective.

For some time now, all through my section of the country, special ceremonies have been held for conferring the awards by the Army and Navy upon industries reaching the high requirements assigned to them. From furnace, field, and factory in the South have gone countless young men and women into the armed forces. Our boys and girls are representing us at the far-flung battle fronts across the seven seas. With the siphoning away of these younger men and younger women, additional responsibilities have fallen upon the shoulders of others. "They also serve who follow the plow or stand behind the loom." It is, therefore, with great pride as the spokesman from a textile district to publicly commend both employer and employee for having met the rigid requirements and completing the task assigned to them. The problem of absenteeism does not prevail in our section, nor is there serious controversy between capital and labor.

With the announcement by the War and Navy Departments of the splendid achievements in the past on the part of our textile industries goes the assurance that all future requirements, however rigid, shall be promptly and fully met.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 1975, Rept. No. 170) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years; to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, reported to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and to be ordered printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed to Hon. W. D. Jamison, a former Member of the House, by Mr. Wilfrid W. Parry, of Toronto.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders that may have been entered, I may be permitted to address the House today for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a poem entitled "Faith in Congress," by Ernest Osborne, of Knoxville, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution from the General Assembly of Iowa on gasoline taxation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FARM LABOR

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the farmers of Kimball County, Nebr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an interview published in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I am today sending a letter to Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau suggesting that the Treasury Department give consideration to setting up simplified facilities at the Union Station here and other centers of peak troop-transportation movement for the cashing of servicemen's pay checks 24 hours a day. Here is a service that would be of negligible cost and yet it would be of great assistance to our fighting men. Under current conditions, unless they are lucky, know someone, or can get to a bank during banking hours, about the only place they can cash their checks from Uncle Sam is in a place of low repute or some form of "clip joint." This service is a courtesy and accommodation that we owe to the men in the service of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include excerpts from a letter I received this morning from a constituent and also a letter from a former constituent dealing with agricultural problems.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from the Secretary of Labor and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by Col. Walter S. Drysdale, the commandant of Fort Benjamin Harrison, of Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes today at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include three memorials from the State Legislature of Montana.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE NATION'S MEAT SUPPLY

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. FISHER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the Order of the Day issued by Premier Stalin on February 22.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ELECTRIC-POWER RATES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and that my speech may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in support of legislation asked by the Attorney General to make possible proper prosecution for treason in the civil courts for those who aid or harbor enemies of this Nation in overt acts, and to include an article, written at my request, summarizing the recent military trial of eight saboteurs prosecuted by the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TAX COLLECTION

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include a brief editorial from the Boston Traveler.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. McLEAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE RUBBER PROGRAM

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by the late Will Rogers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEEFE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Mr. George Morris.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 109, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 839) to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall later yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], a member of the Committee on Rules, and I now yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of H. R. 839, the so-called Grand Coulee Dam bill, also known as the Columbia Basin project bill.

Demand has been made by the State of Washington and the people in that section for favorable action upon this bill because it will require action on the part of the State legislature to prevent speculation in lands involved in this irrigation project.

Most of you know that we have spent about $160,000,000 on the Grand Coulee Dam. A great deal of land in that section of the country has and is being developed and is ready for irrigation. Many large property owners already are seeking to acquire additional land, because, naturally, after the land is irrigated it will be enhanced in value four or five times as much as it is worth today. This bill aims to prevent the speculation in and undue accumulation of that land by a few, to thus deprive many persons of the opportunity to obtain a fair amount of acreage at reasonable prices. This bill as it is drafted will provide—and I think this has been agreed between the State of Washington and the property owners—that each owner will be restricted to 160 acres. I myself have always believed that 40 acres of irrigated land is enough for any farmer to take care of, but to bring about harmony and the opening of the project without delay the interested persons have agreed on a limitation of 160 acres for each owner.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that immediate action should be taken on this measure because the Legislature of the State of Washington will shortly adjourn, and it is necessary that this proposed legislation pass and authority be given to the State and the people to bring about this adjustment on which they have worked for many, many years. I am aware that the distinguished Senator from Washington, Senator WALLGREN, who has the interest of the people of his State at heart, realizing the importance of this legislation, will urge Senate action without delay. Therefore I feel that the rule should be agreed to, and I hope the bill, which will be thoroughly explained by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE], will pass without any opposition.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H. R. 839, a measure which will permit the reclamation and irrigation of the proposed Columbia Basin. This reclamation and irrigation work will be done under the policy laid down by the Congress in the reclamation law of 1902 and will permit the opening up of a considerable area of land for the use of small farmers.

This measure places a limitation of 160 acres upon the amount of land in this project that can be owned by any one individual. I am told that it will, when the water is taken to the land, include some of the richest dirt in all America.

The resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules. A number of Members of Congress appeared before the committee in support of the measure. I believe the bill should be given, not only full consideration, but the support of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 839) to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 839, with Mr. GAVAGAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, much could be said about the policy of the Government and the development of this large farming area in the State of Washington known as the Columbia Basin project. There is a lot of history connected with this development. In the study of the project and its promotion many eminent men have been called in to investigate and pass on its merits. I distinctly recall that former President Hoover, when he was Secretary of Commerce, made a special trip and went over the entire project, and gave it his stamp of approval. I distinctly recall that the great and eminent engineer, Lt. Col. George W. Goethals, who built the Panama Canal, at the request of the Columbia Basin executive committee came to the State of Washington and went over this project. He also gave it his stamp of approval as being a feasible and worthwhile project.

Shortly after the advent of the present administration, as a result of the efforts that had been made by the State of Washington—I may say that the State of Washington has made numerous appropriations in support of this program from its State treasury—it was finally decided to construct the great Grand Coulee Dam, primarily for the purpose of bringing water onto these semiarid lands in the State of Washington.

The Government has now spent, I am told, some $140,000,000 in building this greatest dam and power project in the whole United States. It is now proposed in accordance with the original plan to pump water from the Columbia River some 200 feet into a large natural reservoir to be constructed by damming up the ends of the Grand Coulee, a defile running through the fertile wheatlands of Washington. The reservoir will be constructed 30 miles long and some 2 miles wide. Everything is to be done under the plan of the Reclamation Bureau of the Government in bringing settlers to this land and providing a means whereby the land can be colonized and settled up by these people, establishing farms through this fine farming section. The object of the bill is to prevent speculation, and provide that a settler when going on the land will not be loaded unnecessarily with various commitments and debts beyond any possibility for him to pay. The bill has been carefully considered by the committee and it comes to you with a unanimous report, all members of the committee agreeing to it. I hope that the bill will pass, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, because I am one of two of the minority members still remaining on the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee, the chairman has asked that I make a brief statement concerning H. R. 839. This bill is to prevent speculation in the lands to be irrigated and settled under the Grand Coulee Dam, some of which are private lands, some State, and some Federal.

Irrigation is the lifeblood of most of the farming lands in the 10 Western States. The annual waterfall in these States varies from 6 to 15 inches. In one steady rain in Washington you often get as much moisture as we do in my State of Colorado in a year. The problem of holding back the waters in the mountains in streams at their source by means of reservoirs and other devices is of vital importance. From these reservoirs ditches are built, many miles in length, to take the stored-up water as it is needed to the thirsty lands below.

Great irrigation and reclamation projects have been built by the Reclamation Service in my State, because in the Rocky Mountains is stored the waters that irrigate and drain the lands west to California, south to Mexico, and east to the Mississippi. Tunnels have been built to take the waters through mountains to fertile lands on the other side, and storage dams have been and will be built to hold these waters until needed for the dry lands below. Our people have prospered by the building of these projects, both public and private, but they have suffered in the past because of lack of proper legislation against speculation such as is here recommended.

Time and experience have shown where the mistakes have been made and subsequent legislation should be passed to help correct it in the future. In this bill the committee has undertaken to take from it as much of the governmental regimentation as was possible and to try to prevent unnecessary speculation in the irrigation and settlement of these 1,200,000 acres of land to be watered from the Grand Coulee Dam.

All last year the committee wrestled with a bill presented to it by the Department of the Interior on this subject. There was much objection to many of the provisions of that bill because of its socialistic and rehabilitation nature, and finally the whole bill was referred to a subcommittee to take out everything but the antispeculative part. This is the result of their work. The only clause that seems too broad in its scope is found on page 12 and the bill was reported with recommendation that this be stricken.

There are two principal provisions in this bill by which it is hoped speculation will be prevented. There is first a limitation on the size of plots which can be acquired or conveyed. The Reclamation Act of 1937 provided for plots of 40 to 80 acres, but this bill, H. R. 839, allows up to 160 acres, which is generally conceded to be all one family can handle. Secondly, the consideration to be charged is restricted to the appraised value and means are provided whereby the present owners of land can dispose of their excess holdings in a satisfactory way. The reasons for these provisions are plain: Speculators are precluded from getting hold of large parcels of land and holding back settlement until an inflated price can be charged for their holdings. These speculative features expire 5 years after the land comes under irrigation, although no person may ever own more than 160 acres of land under this project.

The development of this project is not contemplated until after the war. The settlement of the public lands of the West helped to satisfy the boys returning from our other wars. These lands are pretty well gone today, but this great development for the settlement of 1,200,000 acres of newly irrigated land offers some solution for the returning soldiers and sailors who want to return to the soil.

To the best of my knowledge this legislation is fair; it is sound; it is necessary.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It is not contemplated that this development will be made during the present war?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Not at all. That is my understanding.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And the gentleman thinks it will assure homes for some of our boys when they come back from the services?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is the intention.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And no person can acquire more than 160 acres.

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How are these appraisements to be made? I see that they can only be obtained at the appraised value. Who is the appraiser?

Mr. ROCKWELL. My understanding is that the appraisal is made by a neutral group of farmers in a particular section. In other words, the lands in one particular part may be worth considerably more than the land in another part.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And this provides for capable and disinterested appraisers to make a fair appraisal of the land?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is my understanding.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. One of the prime purposes of this bill is to prevent speculation on the part of large property owners, is it not?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I understand then that this resolves itself into this, that the Federal Government fixes the sale price of this land.

Mr. ROCKWELL. It does for 5 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the major purpose of H. R. 839 is to control speculation in Columbia Basin lands, to render more secure the investment of the Federal Government in the Grand Coulee Dam project, and to provide for the orderly development thereof. Prompt passage of this legislation will make the reclamation features of the project available for construction at the end of the present World War should Congress then desire to utilize the project to cushion the shock resulting from the demobilization of wartime industry and of our armed forces.

EARLY PASSAGE OF LEGISLATION NECESSARY

The passage of this legislation before February 20, 1943, is vitally necessary if the project is to be ready for construction at the end of the present World War. It is necessary that the Legislature of the State of Washington ratify this legislation, and the legislature meets in January of 1943 and will not meet again for 2 years. After ratification by the legislature, the water contracts can then be submitted for the approval of the landowners at the district elections. After this is done the contracts must be validated by the courts and recordable contracts executed by each landowner.

PROJECT AUTHORIZED IN 1935

The Grand Coulee Dam project, including the Grand Coulee Dam, power plant, and irrigation canals, was authorized by Congress under the provisions of the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028). Approximately $160,000,000 has already been allocated or appropriated for the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam and power plant on the Columbia River in the State of Washington. This great development has already proved its value in serving many large defense industries with electric power.

ANTISPECULATION ACT OF 1937

On May 27, 1937, Congress approved an act—chapter 269, 50 Statutes 208—to prevent speculation in and to implement the orderly development of the 1,200,000 acres of irrigable land in the project. This act was intended to make the lands available to the settlers at prices established by careful Government appraisals, disregarding any incremented values resulting from project construction. These appraisals, which are of record, have been approved as fair and equitable by the landowners and by the directors of the three Columbia Basin irrigation districts which embrace substantially all of the lands to be irrigated.

DEFECTS IN 1937 ACT

After extensive studies made by Federal and State experts under the direction of the Bureau of Reclamation, and in collaboration with the landowners and their representatives, it was discovered that the 1937 Antispeculation Act required amendment if control over speculation in lands was to be made effective, and if the Federal investment in the project was to be rendered amply secure. Under the 1937 act, farm ownership was limited to 40 acres in the case of a single person, and to 80 acres in the case of a married person, instead of to a unit of a size and productivity capable of supporting a family. In the case of a sale of excess land for a price in excess of the appraised value, the purchaser was penalized instead of the seller. There was

no provision whereby holders of large wheat farms, occupying about one-third of the best project lands, could dispose of their excess acreage without selling it piecemeal. While the owners of these lands favor irrigation, many have indicated that they would exclude their lands from the project rather than assume the burden of selling the same a parcel at a time. To preserve these valuable lands within the project boundaries, it was deemed wise to provide for their acquisition, if necessary.

RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

Since the Anti-Speculation Act of 1937 was enacted, Congress has approved a general reclamation act known as the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. To bring the Grand Coulee Dam project clearly within the general provisions of the 1939 act, and thereby further safeguard the Federal investment in the project, it has also been necessary to amend the 1937 Anti-Speculation Act.

H. R. 7722

After extensive hearings the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation unanimously reported out H. R. 7722. This bill amends the Anti-Speculation Act of 1937 so as to correct the defects heretofore mentioned. Farms are to range in size from 10 acres, near towns, to 160 acres, depending upon soil, climate, and location. The Secretary of the Interior is given authority to purchase lands, both within and without the project. This authority is granted to enable the Secretary to purchase the large wheat farms, if necessary, and such portions thereof that are outside the project but adjacent thereto. It is believed by those familiar with the project that the investment involved in land purchased will be relatively small, since it is believed there will be little difficulty for the landowners to sell their excess holdings to other settlers. It is believed, however, that the granting of this authority to the Secretary will prevent the withdrawal from the project of some of its best lands.

NO EXPENDITURES UNTIL AFTER THE WAR

Except for the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam power plant and balancing reservoir, no expenditures under this legislation are contemplated until after the war. The War Production Board has already stopped all construction on the project except the installation of some generators, and work necessary to maintenance of the dam and power plant. When the war is over it will then be the duty of Congress to determine if it wants to proceed with the construction of the irrigation features of the project.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I believe this covers 1,200,000 acres?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How much of that is owned by the Federal Government?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Not to exceed 10 percent.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How much of it is owned by private individuals?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Approximately 80 or 90 percent.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman has stated that there are persons who own four or five thousand acres in this project. By what process is title taken from those private owners and made available to the Government?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Those private owners agree to sell at a price that has already been appraised and fixed, to the Federal Government, and the Federal Government then sells to the individuals.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They sell it to the Federal Government?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. They sell it to the Federal Government and the Federal Government turns it over to the farmers.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That has already been agreed upon?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman. will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I understand that it would not be possible for anyone to buy any of this land for the purpose of speculation, but it may be bought for the purpose of investment?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No one can get more than 160 acres; no family.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What I am getting at is this: How do you distinguish between investment and speculation?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. We do not distinguish. We just provide that each unit be fixed, and fix it at enough so that it will support a family. In some areas which are very rich it is only 10 acres. In others it will be 40 acres. The most it can be is 160 acres. So that no family can own in this particular section more than 160 acres of land.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Investment and speculation have had much to do with the development of all economies, here and elsewhere. What is the ultimate effect going to be on the economy where you eliminate both the possibility of investment and of speculation?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Of course, there can be no investment for 5 years. After 5 years it is released then, and it will proceed along the lines of any other activity.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Speculation or anything else?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. From what little experience I have had in the Northwest, it seems to me that speculation is what has caused a great deal of the trouble in the past.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is right.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. They get people to move on there with rose-colored glasses, and afterward they found they had it so high that they could not operate on that basis, and that is the reason you have this bill here today.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is exactly right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the effect of this bill to put the Federal Government in a position to acquire this land basically as if it were public domain by reason of these present owners selling their land to the Government at the appraised price?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So, then, having attained the status of public domain, the Government proceeds to sell this land to what we will call homesteaders?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Under some agreed plan?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I understand that the maximum amount which a given family can acquire under this procedure is 160 acres of land or 160 acres of land subject to irrigation?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It is 160 acres of irrigated land. They can own any amount of land that is not irrigated.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, if there is a piece of land that has an acreage of 160 acres subject to irrigation, and another 160 or 320 acres which may be strictly grazing and not subject to irrigation, that one family might also have that, under this general procedure?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The appraised value of the respective acreages has not yet been completed, has it?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It is not entirely completed, although on most of the areas it is well under way, and in some areas I understand it has been at least partly completed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When will they begin selling these so-called homesteads?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Just as soon as they can get authority to do it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, when this legislation becomes law and you set up the machinery, they are on the way?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. And when the State of Washington passes similar legislation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the purchasers of that land owe an obligation to the Federal Government?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So that it will be a transaction between the Federal Government and the farmers?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Through the Bureau of Reclamation; yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now suppose you or I with a family had a son or a daughter, say 20 years of age, unmarried, living with the father and mother, that family then could purchase an acreage

of land with 160 acres subject to irrigation. Could that family also proceed, before that son or daughter is married, but having in mind that they will soon be married, to purchase another 160 acres in the name of the adult child?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. This only provides for a family up until the age of 18. After they reach the age of 18, then there is a provision for this land to be acquired by people over that age.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] did not point out the danger that I see in this bill. This looks to me like a subsidy to those people who are to purchase this land, at the expense of the Grand Coulee project.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No.

Mr. RANKIN. It looks like a subsidy from the Federal Government. What are you selling this land for? What is it proposed to sell this land for to these people? To sell it at whatever it cost? As a matter of fact, the landholders who will own this land can make their own irrigation district, purchase the water power from the Grand Coulee project, and do everything the Bureau of Reclamation is trying to do except they would not get a subsidy. Now, is not that the situation?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; that is not correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me warn you gentlemen out in that country. There is not a man in this House who has struggled harder for the development of the Columbia River than I. I have not had time to read this bill carefully, but it looks to me as if you are trying to subsidize these people who own this land or put it in the hands of the Bureau of Reclamation for Government control of farming in that area.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I wish to say to the gentleman that I feel that when he reads this bill his mind will be completely changed. There is no other way by which either the State of Washington or the Federal Government, or the owners can get at this problem other than the way we are getting at it here, and this is not going to cost the Federal Government anything. Ultimately it is not going to be at the expense of the Grand Coulee Dam. On the other hand this is going to provide a market for every kilowatt of power that is produced at the Grand Coulee Dam; there will be a big reservoir market for the Grand Coulee Dam power.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, according to the gentleman's statement, it is proposed to exhaust the power of the greatest dam on earth to irrigate some extra land that you say now is not worth $10 an acre. The purpose is to bring it into production and competition with the farmers of that area and throughout the country.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. If I said that I said something I did not intend to say.

Mr. RANKIN. Grand Coulee Dam is the greatest power dam on earth.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I do not believe the gentleman from Mississippi and I are talking to the same purpose. Let us get straightened out.

Mr. RANKIN. What are you going to sell this land at?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It will be sold at various prices.

Mr. RANKIN. What?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Most of it at $85 an acre.

Mr. WHITE. The dry land at not over $10 an acre.

Mr. RANKIN. How much?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. With water on it it will be sold at $85. At the present time it is worth between $5 and $10 an acre.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is the dry land price.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but you are going to utilize the power of the dam to get water on this land and the result is that this project is going to be subsidized indirectly at the expense of the Federal Government and the power consumers along the Columbia River. If this is the program, I want to warn you people in that area that you certainly will stir up a hornet's nest in this House if that develops, when I have an opportunity to study this bill.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. O'CONNOR rose.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield first to the chairman of the committee [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. I simply want to set the gentleman from Mississippi right: The features he objects to have all been taken out of the bill. That was done when we revised it.

Mr. RANKIN. If they have been taken out, the gentleman admits that they were in the original program.

Mr. WHITE. This bill has been considerably revised. No; I do not admit they were in the original program. There were certain things that put burdens on the settlers that we took out of the bill because we did not want to get into the matter of financing the construction of buildings and things like that; we want to let the settlers work out their own salvation. We will put water on the land but let them proceed from that point forward.

Mr. RANKIN. I promised Members of the House—and I say "I" because of the great interest I took in the development of these Columbia River projects—but those of us who worked so hard for the power development promised these men from other sections of the country who were protesting against irrigating additional land at Government expense, that that would not be done, but that power would be developed, and that if this power was to be used for irrigation purposes it would be sold to these people at the same rate it was sold to anybody else.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. None of this power is going to be used for irrigation purposes. If any is sold to any of these people it will be sold at the same rates that it is sold to anyone else.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. For the benefit of the gentleman from Mississippi, is it not true that the development of this very project was part of the inducement for the building of the Grand Coulee Dam at a cost of approximately $160,000,000, and that it was at that time contemplated to develop this very irrigation district under the plan which is now being evolved by this bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. What will be the result of opening up more farm land than can possibly be used during this emergency? When the war is over these additional acres will come in competition with the acreage of this country on which we have been spending billions of dollars to curtail production because we had too many farms operating. By this bill we are creating an additional million acres, which will further complicate the farm problem during the reconstruction period after the war is over.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. None of this land will be opened up for several years. We have already learned that we do not have too many acres under cultivation. We may have thought that at one time, but we have concluded that that is not a fact. Further, the crops that are raised on these reclamation projects do not come into competition with the regular farm crops of the Eastern and Southern States.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Does not the gentleman realize that before this war crops raised in California and on projects in other States similar to this project were receiving prices so low that they were not even worth the price of harvesting because they were so abundant? So much land had been opened up that the farmers had no market for their crops, and this created a real problem. We were going to have quotas placed on those crops just before the war started, just as we had wheat and cotton quotas.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I do not agree with the gentleman as to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, we come together today and all these present days under the dark shadow of the announcements of the successful bombing of our transports, the defeat of our Army, and the loss of hundreds of our boys. With heavy hearts we turn to the business of the day. To all the thousands of our people waiting in the anguish of anticipation of further news let us extend our sympathy and understanding.

In considering the bill before us there are certain principles to be dealt with that are far more important than the bill itself. These principles should be the background of all our legislation, they should guide us at every point.

We must be certain that the basic intent and purpose of everything we do is to further the war effort, and to protect our economy. Set up against such a background, we can then strip each bill of such provisions as may confuse or retard or stultify the war effort. We can then see our own actions more objectively and so keep ourselves from being swayed by sectional differences and selfishness.

The bill before us, to justify itself on this basis, must make possible the increase of food and other agricultural materials. Only the imperative needs should influence our decisions. We should ask ourselves, Are the provisions of this bill going to give us a greater supply of these fundamentals that are the sources of energy that must be generated if we are to have strong fighting men, well equipped for battle, and a civilian army able to carry the load?

I confess I find myself trying to evaluate the bill challenged by the thought of our men overseas. They are facing the stark realities of the most brutalizing war of all history. With death on every hand they are not concerned with parities, with subsidies, with penalties. They are not interested in overtime payments—the hours they know are based upon necessity—with life or death on their pay checks. They look to us for the tools of war. They expect us to measure up to their need.

Last week there was much discussion on this floor about peanuts. Today we speak of irrigations. Peanuts are one of the sources of oils for lubrication of machines and for sustenance of human life. Water is the life of the soil. We must give all these matters careful consideration.

We may seem to spend overmuch time on these little things, for, to many, peanuts are insignificant bits that spell circuses and parades rather than oil, and irrigation is something they know nothing of. To them I would say that we are not concerned with little things because we want to be, but because we have to be.

Those who have come from the captured and enslaved countries tell us that the invaders first made very certain not of the gold which was controlled, but of taking the foods containing oil, for oil is the life, the sight, the blood, the tissue, the vitality of the adult soldier, just as it is of the infant child; without water nothing lives. So I would point out that upon these so-called unimportant matters does the future of our Army and of our children rest.

So when we give our final judgments, can we not base them at all times upon just one thing, the need of our armies and of our people for the vital products of the earth and of the machines? Can we not set aside every suggestion of sectionalism and selfish interest and think only of these fundamentals? To meet our full responsibility must we not lift ourselves out of all bickering and disorder into a place where everything we say and all we do protects our production and our economy?

I am not preaching; this is simply the picture as I see it. But I am clarifying what is in my own heart and in the hearts of all mothers; yes, of all wives and fathers, too, as we brace ourselves to meet the continuing tragedies that are upon us. I claim the right and the privilege to say these things, because I am the mother of two sons in the service. Like every other mother I am perfectly aware of the drama of defeat being enacted in north Africa. I am willing and ready to bear my share of tragedy if God so wills. Indeed, I would not have it otherwise.

But as a Member of this body, this occurs to me. The people in their pain may turn and ask, What is Congress doing? To what principles do our Representatives adhere? To my mind, we must so govern our actions that we can say to them in all sincerity:

We know there is no use of putting up a wailing wall in our hearts for our dead in an attempt to hide our inadequacy. We know that we of the Congress must be increasingly aware, increasingly responsible. We know that to meet our full responsibility we must lift ourselves into a place where we work together for the protection of our production and our economy. For whether we like to admit it or not, these are the things for which our men die, or have to live on, hideously maimed in body, mind, or soul.

The country needs to feel confidence in this Congress. The mothers of our fighting forces need to know that when we spend time on small-seeming things we do so because those very things are crucial to the life and spirit that sustains their sons. They should feel somewhat comforted and reassured as they stop to realize that even though I happen to be the only woman in the House with sons who are in the line, a very large number of you, my honored colleagues, wear service stars, as do I. To us especially is the need for awareness and the sense of responsibility a vital, throbbing reality.

It is for us to infuse the other Members of this Congress with our own burning desire to clear away confusions, to use our mistakes constructively, that we may sustain our fighting forces and build, bit by bit, the great army behind the army that will provide every fighting man of ours and of our allies as well with everything essential to his need and vital to his spirit.

To do this we must protect the smallest link in our economic structure as a Nation, that we may keep faith with the boys who have gone out from our homes.

I have tried to express what I know is your thought and feeling as it is my own, that the country may know the underlying principles of our actions and the determination of our designs.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentlewoman from Ohio has made a splendid presentation of American ideals, which has my full sympathy and support.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the gentlewoman will take into consideration the fact that after the Civil War the fertile lands of Kansas, Nebraska, and Iowa awaited the returning soldiers. We are trying to do here what they did then, so that when our soldiers return they will find fertile irrigated lands awaiting them in the State of Washington for settlement.

Mrs. BOLTON. I appreciate very much what the gentleman means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attempt to go into the details of this bill. I think the gentleman from Idaho, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and the distinguished gentleman from Utah, chairman of the Committee on Public Roads, have gone into the bill very carefully. However, there are a few matters to which I wish to call attention specifically.

One is that all expenditures under this irrigation project on the part of the Government are reimbursable, and all expenditures under irrigation projects in the past throughout the western country have been reimbursable. The percentage of repayment is very close to 94 percent, so you can see that the Federal Government is taking little or no chances whatever in the development of this great project.

Already $160,000,000 has been expended in the development of what is known as the Grand Coulee Dam. It was built as a dual project, for power and for irrigation. At the time the money was expended, the development of this great area of dry land was one of the inducements which caused the Government to build the dam.

May I also call your attention to the fact that at all times the Congress of the United States will have its hands on the purse strings. No money can be expended under the operation of this bill without first being appropriated by Congress. This bill carries an authorization only for the purchase of land, and the land can only be bought when the money is appropriated by the Congress. Consequently, there should be no opposition to this bill at all. If we were not going to go ahead with the development of this irrigation project close to the Grand Coulee Dam it would be questionable whether it was the part of wisdom for the Government to go ahead and expend that money on that project.

It may be that many gentlemen in the East, the North, and the Central States do not consider that this project might not be worth while but the project might very properly be termed an enlargement of our domestic market—that is, increased markets for all manufactured goods and machinery.

Whenever you create an irrigation district and bring into cultivation land that has been heretofore lying out in the sun

producing nothing but squirrels, prairie dogs, and some grass here and there, and bring into production such as forage crops, that in turn produce cattle and sheep, then you create a market for the manufacture of farm implements, household furniture, clothing of all kinds, and of harness, automobiles, and various other kinds of machinery in the States of Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Connecticut, and other States. Likewise you create a market for all kinds of foodstuffs not locally grown. You can go into my town, which is located in the midst of an irrigation district, and you will find on the shelves of the merchants goods from nearly every State in the Union. You will find there clothing from New York and cotton goods from the South, and manufactured goods of every kind from every State where there is manufacturing, so that nearly every State benefits from these projects.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the settlement of these projects bring about a great expansion of markets in every section of the country?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct.

Mr. GRANGER. And this legislation does not set up any precedent heretofore not in force?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, no. Congress has adopted this plan heretofore. This bill simply amends a law passed by Congress. It has been pointed out that we should not develop more land because it will bring into production competitive crops. That is not true. The crops produced on these reclamation areas as a rule are forage crops, not produced in other sections of the country, and, in addition to creating an enlargement of general markets, it creates a great beef production and sheep production. A few moments ago something was said about there being too much food produced a few years ago. I take issue with that statement. Never was there too much food produced to meet the needs of the American people. There was simply too much food produced to meet the market demand because the people had no money with which to buy the food, and when pigs were being killed and cotton was being plowed under and grain was being destroyed there were hungry people in the United States and people who had nothing on their backs. To repeat, there never was a time when there was too much produced, and at the very time they were destroying the crops and killing the pigs people were hungry and people were in need of clothing. If sufficient sheets and pillowcases were put on all of the beds in the country, and if babies and children had been supplied with the needed cotton clothing, there never would have been a surplus of cotton; and if these undernourished children had been properly fed, there would have been no surplus of either meats or grains. I do not believe in an economy of scarcity and never have.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. The bill says that this is to prevent speculation in land. Will the gentleman explain what there is in the bill that will prevent that?

Mr. O'CONNOR. No man, first of all, can own over 160 acres of land under water. He can irrigate only 160 acres of land. He cannot get any more than that. If it were not for this bill, these big corporations could go in and buy up this land and create a monopoly on it and force the Government to pay exorbitant prices. The yardstick by which the Government is going to buy this land is on a dry-land price. Dry-land price in the West is somewhere between $1.50 and $5 an acre. There is not a chance for speculation—speculation always comes first.

Mr. GROSS. And how long will this prevent speculation in the land?

Mr. O'CONNOR. For a period of 5 years.

Mr. GROSS. And what is the ceiling price on this land?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The ceiling is fixed by the cost of the water and the land. The Government is not going to make one cent, neither is the Government going to lose one cent, because all of this indebtedness is reimbursable.

Mr. GROSS. Then would $85 be the ceiling on that land?

Mr. WHITE. Eighty-five dollars will be to put water on the land. Then on top is cost of land. That same indebtedness will be assumed by the settler and paid out over a long period of time by annual payments.

Mr. GROSS. I am a member of this committee, and I am interested in this bill. You are telling me that this $85 will buy the land and the cost of the water, and that will be the ceiling price on this land for 5 years.

Mr. O'CONNOR. No; $85 will put the water on the land; then on top will be the cost of the land.

Mr. GROSS. And how long does that stand?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It stands for 5 years.

Mr. GROSS. Then I could not sell it for 5 years for more than $85, but after 5 years I could sell it for $90.

Mr. WHITE. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that a poor fellow that could not stick around would have to sell it at $85 and the other fellow that would get it second hand, at the beginning of the second year, could sell it for $90?

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is no chance under this bill for the man to be forced out of the land, because he has the Government back of him.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I was going to point out that in section 3 there is a provision which requires that the purchase contract guarantee to the vendee a right to recover from the vendor or the grantor an amount equal to the payments made in excess of the appraised value. So that there is a specific provision for recovery in case of a sale above the appraised value.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have this opportunity to speak on this bill, as it concerns my own State of Washington.

I want to point out right here that we are not trying reclamation at this time. This is not a new bill. It forms no new policies. All that we are trying to do is to set up a stronger, a fairer, and more just protection for these boys that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] spoke of, the boys who will be coming home from overseas and who want to go out upon the land and attain something of American independence. To me this is strictly a nonpartisan task that is before us today. To justify the time and attention of this Congress it should be in the direction of making greater, secure, and more productive the soil that is affected by reclamation. Our job is to create more taxpayers in America. The sense of this act that we are passing judgment on today will assure just that.

I think it is well to remind the committee also that the effect of this act must be to build confidence on the part of those who may aspire to go out on the land, confidence in the land itself and in the Government that will make it available to them.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand, some of this land is privately owned, and while the principle may be good, does not this legislation seek to establish a new principle by placing a limitation upon the price that a private individual can secure for his land?

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. That provision is already in existing law. Several of the reclamation laws provide for such a restriction—that is, they carry an antispeculation provision.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As far as privately owned lands are concerned?

Mr. CASE. Yes. I know we have it in the so-called Wheeler-Case Act for the small Great Plains projects, and I think it is in the new General Reclamation Act in principle, if not in the same form as here. The principle is to prevent private speculative benefits on Government expenditures. It only means that they cannot get water above a certain acreage. It does not say that they may not continue to own land, but before they get the benefit of water that is provided by Government expenditure they must agree that they will sell their excess lands.

Mr. HORAN. The point hinges on whether a private owner has a right to make unlimited profit out of improvements placed on the property by such a development at the expense of the Government, so we place a restriction on that for 5 years, because of the fact that speculation in land quite often raises the capital debt of anyone going on the land

to the point where he is forced out of business.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What made you select 5 years?

Mr. HORAN. That was done under pressure. You know, we have had quite a bit of discussion over this. Personally I have known nothing but reclamation projects all my life, and I do not think that 5 years is quite enough.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. As I understand the principle involved is protection against speculation. Why do you limit this protection to 5 years? Why not make it permanent? If the good, great, big Government of the United States wants to be so kind to these people, I cannot understand why you want it to give them this protection against speculation for a few years and then throw them to the dogs.

Mr. HORAN. We are assuming they will be established on their property by that time and can take care of themselves.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I recall the discussion that came up on that point in consideration of previous legislation. Some wanted to limit it to 3 years. Five years was adopted as a compromise, I think. Furthermore, there are other factors that eventually enter into the rise in prices of land, and it would deny consideration of other factors in the price of land if the limitation were to exist in perpetuity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2½ additional minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In order to set the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] straight on this, if I understand the matter correctly in my mind regarding speculation, there are two kinds of speculation that you and I know about on irrigation projects—namely, the speculation that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] speaks about is speculation after the land has been irrigated, after it is all under this fine cultivation that is second to none in the world. The other speculation is before the land is ready. That is the kind of speculation that this bill tries to eliminate. Those men go in and pick up this land before it is touched, and they hang onto it and do nothing to it whatsoever, and then the Government comes in and gets it all ready, like a garden, and then they are ready to sell their land. This bill puts a quietus on that kind of operations. The gentleman from Ohio should support the bill from that angle.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] has stated most of what I intended to say. The period of speculation in a proposition of this kind is before it gets going and when it gets into distress.

Mr. HORAN. That is right.

Mr. PHILLIPS. And one purpose of this bill is to attempt to prevent speculation at the start before the permanent settlers have time to get on it.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman for bringing out that point so very clearly. The whole point is this: In my own district in Washington at the time of the depression we had a mortgage debt against every acre in our district that averaged $750, showing that when you allow values to go hog wild it gets beyond the ability of the owners to handle.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, before my time is consumed, I must say I am not only a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, reporting the bill, but also of the subcommittee to which the earlier bill was submitted for redrafting. Accordingly, I have given double thought to this particular bill before us today and am thoroughly satisfied with it. I approve it; I think it ought to be passed unanimously today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Briefly.

Mr. GROSS. This bill gives the Secretary of the Interior the authority to establish town sites on this land. Has such authority ever been granted in similar legislation before to the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. MURDOCK. My information is that it has been done. In the carrying out of these projects we give the right to the Bureau of Reclamation to establish districts. That is what we mean by saying the Secretary is authorized to do so-and-so, meaning the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I may state for the information of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the authority to establish town sites has been in the law ever since I can remember. I personally was connected with one of these town sites in the State of Idaho for 16 years.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true, however, that a Secretary could come along and establish a town site to suit himself irrespective of the possible needs of the people already there?

Mr. MURDOCK. I will answer the gentleman's question; then, Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further, for my time is too limited. We can imagine a lot of things if we turn our fancy or prejudice free. If we are to have such great projects we must give some discretion to the Secretary or some official and that we have always done.

Mr. Chairman, there were some controversial features in the original bill, but those, I believe, have all been taken out. One or two things pertaining to what has already been said here today should be cleared up, however.

I notice the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the great advocate of public power, had a question with regard to the bill. He seemed to fear this bill might subsidize farmers at the expense of the power consumers of the area. I want to point out, coming as I do from a reclamation portion of the country, that when we build dams and reservoirs in the West, we do it these days with more than one object in view. When we build dams they may be solely for flood control or simply for power purposes, or for impounding water for irrigation. In recent years two or more of these objects have been the multiple purpose of their construction. Now, the great reclamation policy which was inaugurated under the Newlands Act in 1902 has developed to a thing of very tremendous value to the entire West. These vast reclamation projects are established and constructed on engineering data. Government engineers are careful to estimate the cost of the whole project, and there is applied to flood control, or to power, or to irrigation its proportionate cost of the whole project; and, mind you this, Mr. Chairman, every one of these projects is reimbursable, so that part which is attributable to power production is repayable to the Treasury from the sale of power and that part of the cost which is assessable against irrigation is repayable over a period of 40 years, with interest. The men who go out there pioneering and establish homes and turn these desert acres into productive farms ultimately pay back every penny into the Federal Treasury which has been paid out. That is a point which all should be careful to remember.

Having said this, let me get to the matter uppermost in my heart, after listening with solicitude, sympathy, and full accord to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] a few minutes ago. She spoke with feeling, because she is doing her duty as a Member of this House in these trying war days in the light of her being a mother of two sons in the service. I want to say to my good friend from Ohio that I can appreciate that point of view, for I, too, have two sons in active service, one on the firing line in Africa. I, too, am thinking of this and every other measure we pass here now in the light of what it contributes to this war.

What part does irrigation play in our war effort, and what part may it play for our boys after the war is ended? I want to point out to my friends two things in answer to that. Some may think of the great State of Arizona as a desert. I want to remind you that Arizona agriculture produces $100,000,000 annually and that 98 percent of all we produce there by way of food and fiber is produced under irrigation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. How much of the long-staple cotton, so vital to the airplane

industry, is produced in Arizona now or would be if Arizona did not have irrigation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Not a fiber would be produced without irrigation, and I thank the gentleman for raising that question and extending my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I have not time.

In the year 1942 the State of Arizona produced more than $100,000,000 in cash value in food and fiber; and, mind you, practically all of that was produced under irrigation. Among the fibers, the long-staple cotton, 1½ inches in length, is the one in which the War Department is so greatly interested, or SXP, the finest grade which is used in parachutes and barrage balloons. This is so vital that the President on yesterday issued an Executive order permitting the harvesting of that crop by the Army. The production of that cotton is one of the most vital aspects in our whole war effort. There could not be a boll of that cotton grown without irrigation. The same thing applies to guayule rubber, the natural rubber plant which we are growing down in Yuma County, and in other parts of the Southwest. I know of nothing more vital to war needs than this long-fiber cotton for parachutes, or than this natural rubber guayule plant, yet we must grow both under irrigation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. That cotton is so vital today that we are sending the Army, under the Army command, into the fields to harvest it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes, that is what I had reference to by the unique action of the President yesterday. I say that those now desert acres—whether they be in the Columbia Basin or elsewhere in the arid section, there being now several million acres in the Columbia Basin possible of development from Grand Coulee Dam—are the agricultural hope of the country and we ought to develop them.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I make this observation to see if the gentleman does not agree with me. One of the primary purposes of this bill is to provide homes and employment for the very boys who are in the front line today defending our country.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has expressed exactly the other thought I had in mind. A reading of the hearings on this bill will show that I pointed that out in the hearings. I, too, want to prepare some place for these boys returning from the Army at the close of the war, that they may make homes and establish themselves on the soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the passage of this bill, H. R. 839. I do so because I am familiar with the area, with the program, and with what it will mean to our country. This entire development lies in my district.

I call to your attention a very important point, that we are not establishing a precedent. This has been done before, I am advised, as early as 1926, under the Coolidge administration.

Second, may I emphasize the fact that this $160,000,000 project, now producing power for the great war effort, for the development of magnesite, steel rolling mills, and aluminum in our area was established by the Bureau of Reclamation and built and engineered by the Bureau of Reclamation, to develop along with this great power project the placing of water upon these 1,200,000 acres of land.

Third, this bill does not call for an appropriation and is not an appropriation bill. It is merely an act to keep speculation from creeping into the handling of this vast acreage of land on the part of individuals who may want to control huge acreages for speculative purposes.

Fourth, the private landowners in this area are all in favor of this procedure and are willing to comply and want to comply with this program.

Fifth, this land has been appraised and is in the process of being appraised. The prices are acceptable to the private landowners.

Last, may I emphasize that this is an enabling act to start a program for the development of land for our returning soldiers. It will take us from 2 to 3 years to enter into the individual contracts with the individuals who will want to buy land under this project, and to establish those contracts. We need to have these prices known to the individuals who wish to purchase this land.

This project will enable the settlement of approximately 20,000 new farmers.

All these points, supporting this program of reclamation in the great State of Washington, make it imperative upon me to place before you a sincere request that you give this bill your serious consideration. I urge its passage.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely glad to be here in the well of the House today to urge your favorable consideration and passage of this bill, which has been so well explained and spoken for by my colleagues from the great State of Washington.

As a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I have been in favor of this bill, especially since I personally know the conditions under which this project is to be handled. I was born and have lived all my life within 50 miles of this project. I have seen almost every acre on it. I am personally familiar with the Grand Coulee Dam.

We, as a government, have $160,000,000 invested in this great project, which has three primary considerations, flood control, power, and irrigation, and the irrigation is by no means the least consideration. We now have the feature of flood control, we have the feature of power, and we need the feature of irrigation which this bill will provide and which this committee has brought before you for your consideration.

This land is approximately 1,000,000 acres of the poorest land in the United States as it is today, without water, but the finest land in the world with water. There is plenty of water for every acre of this land. It is level enough to take it cheaply. We have people to put on this land, and, especially after this war, we will want the acreage this land will provide for homes. It will take from 2 to 5 years to make a single acre of this land available, so it is especially important at this time that we prepare the way for the use of this land at a time when we want it and must have it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon one of our colleagues called attention to the fact that some of the guns placed here on the office buildings for our protection are dummy guns. It is not my purpose to criticize my colleague for giving away what may have been military secrets, but I fear that the impression may have gone out as a result of that that the Capital City of the United States is not adequately defended against air attack. I had several officers in my office this morning who are charged with the responsibility of defending the District of Columbia against air attack. They came to see me because I happen to be a Reserve officer in antiaircraft myself. They brought with them maps showing all the defenses of the city of Washington and the District of Columbia, and pointed out to me every single emplacement, guns of every type, searchlights, observation posts, and all of those things that go into antiaircraft defense. Let me say just in a general way that there is a regular scheme for aircraft defense in any area. It involves a series of concentric, irregular circles around the area to be defended. The outermost circle is one of observation posts. These observation posts are placed approximately 25 to 30 miles out. The city of Washington and the District of Columbia is ringed with these observation posts, well out into the States of Virginia and Maryland. Then the next circle is one of searchlights, placed again in such an arrangement that planes coming in from any direction could be picked up well out of the area where the bombs may be released. The next ring is one of heavy guns, what we call antiaircraft guns. We have different types in this country. Then inside of that are circles of smaller guns. Formerly we used machine guns in that innermost circle, or for those innermost emplacements. In fact, a few years ago we used .30-caliber machine guns, and then we developed .50-caliber

machine guns for such areas. That gun was used until about a year ago, when we developed the presently used Bofors gun, which you have seen about the city of Washington and in various areas. When these Bofors guns became available, they replaced the .50-caliber machine guns which had been placed on various Government buildings, the House Office Building, and the Senate Office Building, and various other buildings downtown. They probably would have been placed on these same buildings except for two reasons: First, their range is greater, and therefore they can be placed farther away from the immediate target; second, they are very much heavier guns, and these roof supports are not sufficient for these guns. You will remember that one was placed in the House parking lot for several months. You can see them down along the Potomac River and in various places throughout the city of Washington.

I went over that map this morning. It shows these gun emplacements, and without divulging any secrets, I want to say to you that this area is adequately defended against air attack. It has all the observation posts reaching well out. It has the searchlights properly placed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It has the most modern antiaircraft guns to be found anywhere—heavy guns—on that next circle. It has these very efficient Bofors guns I have told you about properly placed. In brief a curtain of exploding shells can be thrown up so as to be virtually impenetrable.

In an open area such as the District of Columbia, the machine gun is no longer deemed proper as a primary weapon for antiaircraft uses, but is used for the purpose of defending gun emplacements and the personnel against low flying planes that might attack them with machine guns.

However, when those places were vacated it was felt that it was the proper thing to do to place dummy guns there rather than to move out altogether, and that is the explanation as to the dummy gun emplacements.

I do want to assure you that the city of Washington and the District of Columbia is adequately defended against air attacks.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Personally I am not afraid to be in the House Office Building without any protection, but the gentleman is a member of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Did you know that dummy guns were there until yesterday?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, I did not. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] asked me what size gun it was over there, and I told him at that time it was a .50-caliber gun, because originally there were that size guns up there. Until these Bofors guns became available we had .50-caliber machine guns up there.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Are the same kind of dummy guns on the Senate Office Building?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The same kind of dummy guns are on the Senate Office Building.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. And on the Department of Labor Building?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now let us not go further into that. I said to you that when the Bofors guns came in the replacements were made. Why should we give away any dummy-gun stations that we have at all? It is not a matter of good defense to be telling where we have dummy guns. I have told you that these men who are charged with the defense of the city of Washington have shown me their maps, and I say to you that we are adequately defended.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Do you not think it is far more important that we worry about what is hanging over the heads of our soldiers than what is hanging over our own heads?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I certainly do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you know whether those guns are up there to reassure Congressmen of their own safety?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; they are not there for that purpose at all. Originally we had .50-caliber machine guns, and when they were replaced by the bigger, better, and more modern guns, the dummies were simply left there for any deceptive effect that they might have.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Does the gentleman share the apprehension of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], who is an expert at duck hunting, that those guns would serve as decoys to bring bombs down on the Congressmen's heads?

Mr. SPARKMAN. None whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear the last speaker assure us that the District of Columbia is adequately prepared for defense, but I think we might well go back to the subject under discussion and consider whether the District of Columbia and the people therein are going to be fed, which is also a very important item.

Mr. Chairman, after Pearl Harbor, we found that from a military standpoint we were unprepared for war. The immediate response of our boys and of American labor and American industry astounded the world. It has been well said that production will win the war. It was self-evident that we sorely needed men, tanks, guns, planes, and ships, and now the stark truth has dawned upon us that we are in desperate need of fuel, food, and fiber. The health and vitality of our fighting men and our men behind the guns in industry are dependent upon an adequate food supply. For the first time in the history of our Nation we are faced with a critical food and fiber shortage. I am fearful, Mr. Chairman, that the shortages now apparent are insignificant with those which lie ahead. I sometimes shudder to think what would happen to America should we experience another drought similar to 1934. In this hour of peril the Nation is indeed fortunate to have available our irrigation resources of the West. The 16 Western States depend upon irrigated land for more than 70 percent of their food output. We in the West are agriculturists and irrigationists, and we are dead willing to do our part. The established agricultural production in western States must be protected and expanded. We have the plant, we can do the job if but given the necessary manpower, machinery, repairs, and equitable prices.

I am wholly in favor of this bill to control speculation in lands within Federal irrigation projects. It is a protection both to the Government and to the settler. It has long been accepted as a basic reclamation policy. The land is practically worthless without water. It is a wise provision to prevent speculation and gives the settler a chance to produce and live, and a measure of economic security.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] has expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for those of us who live in the far western part of the United States to tell Members of this House that we sometimes farm under different methods than those of the East or the North or the South, but sometimes it is necessary to remind them of that fact. Sometimes it is necessary even to remind the Department of Agriculture.

A few days ago there was distributed in my area a very interesting and informative circular, mimeographed, from the Department, telling us how to take care of silk umbrellas in wartime. The farmers of that area do not, as a rule, get their water for the land from sources which make silk umbrellas necessary. We get it by conserving the water in the run-offs in the watersheds. We get it by reclamation projects such as this one before us today.

This bill goes only to details in which every Member of the House, whatever his opinion may be upon the subject of reclamation projects, can very well agree. This is a bill which merits the support of every one of us.

As to the need of this land, I merely lay before you the fact that even in an agricultural country the program of agriculture is not yet entirely coordinated. We are spending great sums of money to bring out of the schools boys and girls trained for the basic occupation of the United States, which is agriculture, and yet we are not always providing them with well-located and adequate lands

for them to use after they are trained. We need food. We have been in the United States, recipients, inconsiderate recipients, of several years of excellent farming conditions. They cannot go on. We are expected to feed the world. We shall need every bit of land that can be put into production.

This bill deals with certain details of the development of the Columbia Basin project but concerning these details I think there can be no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one or two further questions?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does this 5-year limitation as to restrictive marketing apply on the land that is unsold as well as the land that may be sold to settlers?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is my understanding. I ask the gentleman from Washington if that is correct.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, after the first 5 years, the Government can sell this land at a much higher price.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I submit that question to the gentleman from Washington. Is my understanding of that correct?

Mr. HORAN. It is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then, after the 5 years expires, the whole thing is open.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Whether it has been sold to settlers or not.

Mr. PHILLIPS. As I understand it, that is correct. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan for his information that the speculative periods in irrigation districts are right at the start, and in times of distress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand. I have been all over the Rocky Mountains looking for suitable sites to put dams with which to concentrate water.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There are lots of places.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Another question is this: When this land is offered for sale to the settlers, are all the improvements on it—all the irrigation ditches—is everything in complete running order, or will he have to make an investment over and above the $85 or $90 per acre?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I should hazard a guess that he would have to make an investment himself. That is what usually happens in these irrigation districts. How much of an investment he would have to make, I am unable to answer.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That was not considered by the committee?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That was not considered in discussing this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I just want to submit two observations in support of this bill. The first is this: The bill is devised to see that this project is devoted to the development of the family-sized farm, which, after all, is the basic unit in American democracy.

The second observation I want to make is that if there is one thing we could do now that would be most important as a means of preparation for the men who come back from winning this war it is this sort of thing. There is nothing I know of that is more constructive than for a man to come back from the war knowing there is a place where he can take a fresh start, where he can get a piece of land properly watered somewhere in this Nation, preferably in the West, where he can settle down and really have an opportunity to begin his life with hope again.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California yields back 1 minute.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I feel that this bill is properly safeguarded and does provide those things that we desire in an irrigation project. The bill should pass.

When it was first presented to the committee, the bill on page 12, line 20, had these words, "providing for the general welfare." These words were rather offensive to several members of the committee because they cover a multitude of sins and provide for social gains and objectives that were not practical in an irrigation bill. The committee struck out the words "providing for the general welfare."

The thing I am concerned about in some of these bills is that the Federal Government may adopt entirely too much control over individuals who settle upon the land. May I say, in governmental control, that most of us should feel that regimentation and planned economy which we have been experiencing is not compatible with the freedom and justice and the liberties which we enjoy in a democracy. Our Government should be merely an umpire guaranteeing a fair play, but the race and the development of this land should be left entirely to individuals. They should reap the rewards or suffer the losses and not the Government.

This bill does not require an appropriation. The bill removes the speculation from the development in this Grand Coulee irrigation project. It will make it possible for some 20,000 farm owners to live on the soil and develop their property.

Certainly our material resources, particularly the water, should be utilized to the best advantage. It is interesting when you talk about flood control, irrigation, and power. The individual who wants flood control must have an empty reservoir so he can take care of the floods when they come. The individual who desires irrigation must have a full reservoir in order to have water to put upon the land. Along with the development of dams and irrigation is that of power. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] was worrying about the power. Surely he realizes that with 20,000 new farm homes in this area that electricity will be needed in these homes and that the surplus energy of the Coulee Dam will have an outlet.

I hope that future administrations, be they Democratic or Republican, will not adopt a program of scarcity as we have done in the past. In the past little pigs have been killed and crops plowed under. There has never been an abundance of food; there has merely been a shortage of money to buy the food.

In my State, Nebraska, we have several irrigation projects. It is possible to bring an additional 600,000 acres under irrigation in Nebraska. We have adopted the policy in our State that not a single drop of water should leave the State until it is first utilized on our land and again for the production of power, if possible. The future must see intensive farming. Irrigation is the answer. This bill, which gives the opportunity, after the war is over, for the development of more land for irrigation should have the approval of this House.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that our colleague from California [Mr. VOORHIS] talked before me because he made the point I wanted to make. Since I have been here this is the first indication I have seen that we are beginning to figure out what our agricultural objective is. It is the family-sized farm. That is one criticism we could have made of our present agricultural program. That is, we did not have the most desirable agricultural objective in this respect.

I am not going to stand here and say that any man should have only so many acres of land. I do say that from a governmental Federal policy we should have an agricultural objective. That objective should be a farm the size a man and his family can operate. If we are going to do any subsidizing, we should at least subsidize according to what we believe in, and subsidize only the man who owns and operates and lives on his own farm.

I also wish to call your attention to the fact that when you irrigate this semi-arid land you are benefiting not only the people who live on the irrigated land. I do not know of any better example than North Dakota, which is represented so well by our good friends the gentlemen from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK and Mr. LEMKE]. If they have small areas of irrigated land, it would give those people some of the greatest social and farm security they could ever have. If they had a small area of irrigated land they would be assured of a crop every year on that land, and this would enhance very materially the value of all the rest of the land adjacent to the irrigated section. They can make much better and safer use of the surrounding nonirrigated land.

Many arguments could be advanced here as to whether we should irrigate any

land. I realize that the 1,200,000 acres we are going to put into cultivation under this bill at some future time is a small part of the 341,000,000 acres of crop land in the United States. I also realize it is somewhat confusing to spend as much money on irrigation as we did in previous years and then turn around and spend millions of dollars for not producing crops. This is especially true when we have imported competitive agricultural products in value equal to 10 percent of our national farm income.

I think that as far as the future welfare of this country is concerned the people in the Midwest and all over the United States in the years to come must assume a rather realistic approach to the problem of irrigation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to oppose this measure. I have been one of the most enthusiastic supporters of the development of the Columbia River. My main object has been to give the American people electricity at what it is worth. The Almighty has "mysterious ways his wonders to perform."

In the Tennessee Valley our surplus or secondary power, which is floodwater power, comes in the wintertime when we have our heavy rains and when we need it for heating purposes. On the Columbia River it comes in the summertime, from melting snow and ice. The summertime is when they need this extra power to pump the water for irrigation purposes.

I am not opposed to giving those farmers this power at cost, but I do not want to see the Bureau of Reclamation subsidize irrigated areas east of the Cascade Mountains at the expense of the power consumers west of the Cascade Mountains. I am willing for the Government to provide those farmers with this water, or with the power to pump this water, at what it actually costs, but I do not want to burden the power consumers of the rest of the area with exorbitant rates in order to do so.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman would not oppose the people who pump this water being granted a rate of 2 mills per kilowatt-hour?

Mr. RANKIN. That power can be produced at Grand Coulee at 2 mills per kilowatt-hour or less, and, as I said, I would like to give it to them at cost.

Mr. WHITE. It is the program of the Bureau of Reclamation to furnish power to pump this water at the rate of 2 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Mr. RANKIN. That is all right, and I am for that.

Some time ago I was on the Columbia River. I visited the Bonneville Dam and was thrilled to contemplate what the distribution of that power at the proper rates would mean to the people of that great northwestern country, not only now but for centuries to come.

I have labored for years for the building of both the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams. I knew what the Tennessee Valley Authority had meant to the people of our section of the country.

If I had my way, the T. V. A. would not retail power to anybody but it would be sold through the municipalities and the cooperative power associations. In that way we would avoid the criticism, or the charge, of selling too much power to any monopoly or to any one concern. I would apply the same rule on the Columbia River.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman said that he would sell it to the municipalities and the cooperative power associations. Does he mean by that he would not sell it to private owners?

Mr. RANKIN. I would sell it to private companies provided they would sign an agreement to distribute power to all their customers at the same rates the municipality or the cooperative association were permitted to charge—the yardstick rates.

What I am after is getting electricity to every human being in America, to every home, to every business establishment, to every farm in America at the very lowest rates it can be produced and distributed without loss on legitimate necessary investments.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to express my appreciation of the work of the gentleman from Mississippi all these years in furnishing abundant and cheap electric power to the farmers of America. I regard the gentleman as a man with a vision, as coauthor of the T. V. A., and an effective supporter of similar great projects. Also I assure the gentleman that this proposition before us develops the whole program of reclamation and irrigation in the Columbia River Basin in a logical manner, so that no true subsidizing is done for power producer or farmer, for each pays his own share of the cost.

Mr. RANKIN. That is fine; that is the policy I want pursued.

I call attention to the fact that Grand Coulee is the largest power dam on earth. It will supply about eighteen or twenty billion kilowatt-hours of electricity each year. The power generated at Grand Coulee every 24 hours will exceed the combined physical strength of every man living west of the Mississippi River working 8 hours a day.

I want to see this power distributed at the lowest possible rate to ultimately return to the Government the money invested, even if it takes 50 years. And my first concern is to see that this power is distributed to the farmers at those rates.

Today every other country in the world is running ahead of us on rural electrification and the development of waterpower. Since Japan began this war against China I am told that Japan has built a dam in Manchukuo bigger than any dam in America, with the exception of Boulder Dam and Grand Coulee. I pointed out the other day that the Aluminum Co. of Canada has a contract with the United States and Great Britain and is now completing a dam in northern Quebec, as big as Boulder Dam. They are fighting today over the Dneprostroy Dam in Russia. When that dam was constructed it was the biggest one in the world. I believe it was built by Colonel Cooper, the same engineer who built the Wilson Dam, on the Tennessee River.

The people of Europe 8 years ago had 90 percent of their farms electrified, in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Italy, and France, and in Switzerland and Holland they had 100 percent of their farms electrified. Eight years ago Japan had 90 percent of her farms electrified. When I first brought those facts out several years ago, some Member arose and said that those were socialized countries, where the populations were dense. But I pointed out that even at that time New Zealand, far away, sparsely settled New Zealand, where the farms are few and far between, had 65 percent of her farms electrified, while at that time America, the richest country in all the world had only 10 percent of her farms electrified, and as a rule those were suburban farms, owned by men living just outside of a municipality. I have tried all these years not only to have these dams built, but to develop the water power of the entire Nation, and also to distribute it at rates the people could afford to pay.

Last week I put into the RECORD the rates for 1941, showing overcharges in every State in the Union in 1941, which amounted, all told, to more than $1,000,000,000 a year.

In 1941 we used 139,000,000,000 kilowatts of electricity in this country. There are 230,000,000,000 kilowatts of annual production going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries, a wealth richer than the diamond mines of Golconda; more valuable than all the oil wells, gold mines, or diamond mines that the world has ever seen; yet when we offer a bill to try to develop that power in order to benefit all the American people and to leave something for the generations to come, to light their homes, lighten their burdens, and make their living conditions more pleasant and more attractive, we run up against the opposition that seems to be inspired by certain selfish interests all over the Nation.

I wish we could develop all the water power of this country, and I have introduced a bill for that purpose.

I congratulate the people of the Columbia River area on this great development. It marks the dawning of a new day for the Pacific Northwest.

It reminds us of the immortal lines of Bishop Berkeley concerning progress in America which were written 200 years ago:

Westward the course of empire takes its way;
The four first acts already past,
A fifth shall close the drama with the day;
Time's noblest offspring is the last.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NORMAN].

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, in commenting briefly on H. R. 839 I want to emphasize that the people of the State of Washington are unanimously behind this bill. The people of the State, through their legislature and the taxpayers, put up all the money for the preliminary work leading up to the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam.

I had the privilege of being a member of the State Senate of Washington for 11 sessions, covering a period of about 16 years, during which time the Grand Coulee project was promoted, started, and completed. In 1919 the State of Washington voted $100,000 for the first survey for the Columbia Basin project. Each succeeding session they voted from $50,000 to $100,000 to carry on the work of the Columbia Basin Commission, which hired engineers, made borings and various surveys, which eventually resulted in the construction of the project by the Federal Government. The taxpayers of the State of Washington cheerfully put up this money. They do not desire, and are not attempting by this bill, to get any reimbursement for that at all, but they have brought this project, through their preliminary work and the lending of the credit of the Federal Government for the construction of the work, up to the point where they can now build up an area of about 20,000 new farms, which will be a protection to this country against another food crisis, similar to the one we are passing through now.

I respectfully urge the House to pass this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I was assigned to make sure that no part of this argument was left out.

I want to compliment the new Members of this Congress who have spoken on this bill. They not only have spoken well, but they spoke fully about the facts before us.

The time has gone by when we consider whether it is a good or a bad thing for irrigation. That was done in 1937, when this law was passed. We had an extended argument on the necessity of irrigation. That does not apply now, because all we are trying to do in this bill is to amend the act of 1937. We have found that, while in the act of 1937 we tried to prevent speculation, we did not prevent it. Here are the reasons we did not prevent it. Our law was not specific enough. There are one or two things that we have to remedy, and that is all we are here for. It is to remedy that bill of 1937.

We provide now that instead of having 40 acres of land, any owner can have 160 acres under this bill. The reason we want to increase it is that if limited to 40 acres a great number of owners would not come in at all. They did not come in. It is thought now that by increasing the number of acres they will all come in because anyone who has ever lived in the West, who has ever irrigated land there, knows that 160 acres is a lot of land.

The second fault with the old bill was that the Secretary of the Interior could forecast the value of the land after the water was on it. Instead of fixing the value of the land under existing conditions he was authorized to figure ahead on something that was not yet in existence; in other words "increment values." Now that has been changed and the values of the present existing situation are taken into consideration.

The one thing that appeals to me as the most valuable in this bill is that while we ask for no appropriation for this huge project of over a million acres, and it will not be put into operation probably for the next 20 years, it is planned economy for this country, following this Second World War. Those of us who were here in this Congress 7 or 8 years ago remember that there were 15,000,000 men out of work in this country, and it was necessary for this Government to furnish work for them. I do not think there was anybody in the Congress at that time who wanted private industry to suspend and let the Government do the work, but private industry had failed, and the Congress stepped in to furnish the jobs. Now, when this war is over we want to make sure there are jobs for those boys who are returning from the Second World War. I hope that private industry will furnish those jobs, but whether it does or whether it does not, those jobs will be furnished, and the conservative Members of this Congress may be confronted with what we were all confronted with in 1933, 1934, and 1935; that is, to furnish jobs.

It seems to me this bill is a step in the right direction. Twenty thousand families will find homes and a place to work and the money expended by the Government will be paid back. As proof of this I cite the cost of the Grand Coulee Dam to date of $160,000,000, on which the Government is now receiving an annual income of $12,000,000. When this Congress can plan an enterprise that is self-liquidating, and at the same time avoid the expenditure of millions in direct relief, there should be no valid argument against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, it is my information that all time on the other side has been consumed. We have no more speakers on this side. I ask that the bill be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with, the bill to be printed in the RECORD and considered as read. I may state that the bill sets forth a number of paragraphs that were in the previous bill. It is a technical bill and in order fully to understand it one would really have to compare this bill with the previous one.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman couple with his request a further request that any part of the bill is to be considered open to amendment?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request to meet the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, be printed in the RECORD at this point, and to be subject to amendment at any part. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill reads as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act of May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. In addition to the primary purposes for which the Grand Coulee Dam project (hereafter to be known as the Columbia Basin project and herein called the project) was authorized under the provisions of the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028), the project is hereby authorized and reauthorized as a project subject to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and the provisions of each of those two acts together with the provisions of this act shall govern the repayment of expenditures and the construction, operation, and maintenance of the works constructed as a part of the project.

"SEC. 2. (a) No part of the funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated or allotted for project construction or for the reclamation of land within the project shall be expended in the construction of any irrigation features of the project, exclusive of Grand Coulee Dam and appurtenant works now under construction and of the pumping plant and equalizing reservoir and dams, until the requirements of the following subdivisions (i) and (ii) of this subsection (a) have been met:

"(i) All lands within the project shall have been impartially appraised by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter called the Secretary) and evaluated at the date of appraisal without reference to or increment on account of the construction of the project. Reappraisals may be made at any time by the Secretary, and will be made upon the request of the landowner concerned accompanied by an advance to the United States of $15 for each quarter section or fraction thereof involved, on account of expense thereof. In such reappraisals the Secretary shall take into account, in addition to the value found in the first appraisal, improvements made after said appraisal, such irrigation construction charges on the land as have been paid, and other items of value that are proper, other than increments on account of the construction of the project. The term 'appraised value' as used in this act shall mean appraised values determined as provided in this subsection.

"(ii) Contracts shall have been made with irrigation, reclamation, or conservancy districts organized under State law embracing the lands within the project providing for payment thereby of that part of the cost of construction of the project determined by the Secretary to be the part thereof to be repaid by irrigation. Each such contract shall conform to the requirements of this act, shall require repayment within the maximum period permitted under the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto (hereinafter called the Federal reclamation laws), and provide that payments shall be enforceable by all means and remedies provided in said laws.

"(b) (i) The lands within the project shall be developed in irrigation blocks, as that term is defined in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. The Secretary shall segregate the lands in each irrigation block into farm units of sufficient acreage for the support of an average-sized family at a suitable living level, having in mind the character of soil, topography, location with respect to the irrigation system, and such other relevant factors as, in his judgment, enter into the determination of the area and boundaries thereof; and shall establish the units as hereafter provided. No farm unit shall contain more than 160 or less than 10 acres of irrigable land, except that any nominal quarter section comprising more than 160 acres of irrigable land may be included in 1 farm unit, and except that lands owned by the United States may be established into units of lesser size for part-time farming purposes.

"(ii) Prior to the initial delivery of water to an irrigation block, the Secretary shall prepare a plat of all the farm units in the irrigation block and shall publish a notice of the intention to establish such farm unit plat in six weekly issues of a newspaper of general circulation in the county or counties in which any part of the irrigation block is located. From the date of first publication, a copy of the plat shall be available in the county auditor's office of each of said counties for public inspection during the business hours of the office. Any interested landowner shall have the right to file written objections to the plat with the county auditor of the county in which his lands are situated before the close of the period of publication. After expiration of the period of publication the Secretary shall consider and determine all such objections, draw the plat in final form, and file it for record in said county auditors' offices. With the consent of the owners of all farm units affected, the Secretary may revise the plat or any part thereof from time to time, and place the revisions of record with the original plat.

"(iii) Water shall not be delivered from, through, or by means of the project works to or for lands not conforming in area and boundaries to the farm units covering the lands involved, nor to or for more than one farm unit held by any one land owner, except that as to lands held by the one having equitable or legal title on May 27, 1937, or the heir or devisee of such owner, delivery may be made to or for a total irrigable area not exceeding the maximum provided in this section. The limitations of this subdivision shall not apply to lands owned by the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof, corporate or otherwise.

"(iv) Lands within the project in excess of one farm unit held by any one landowner shall, except as otherwise provided in this act be deemed excess land: *Provided*, That if excess land is acquired by foreclosure or other process of law, by conveyance in satisfaction of mortgages, by inheritance or by devise, water therefor may be furnished temporarily for a period not exceeding 5 years from the effective date of such acquisition, delivery of water thereafter ceasing until the transfer thereof to a landowner duly qualified to secure water therefor.

"(v) As used in this act, the terms 'owner,' 'landowner,' and 'any one landowner,' denote any person, corporation, joint-stock association or family; the term 'family' denotes a group consisting of either or both husband and wife, together with their children under 18 years of age, or all of such children if both parents are dead; the term 'their children' includes the issue and lawfully adopted children of either or both husband and wife; and the term 'lands within the project' denotes those lands within the boundaries of the existing Columbia Basin irrigation districts, or revisions thereof approved by the Secretary, which the Secretary determines may be supplied water from, through, or by means of the project works and are required to be included to provide for sound development and operation of the project. Lands shall be deemed to be held by a family, if held as separate property of husband or wife, or constitute a part or all of their community property, or if they are the property of any or all of their children under 18 years of age.

"(c) As a condition precedent to receiving water from the project and in consideration thereof, each landowner shall be required to execute, within 6 months from the date of the execution of the contract between the United States and the district within which the land is located, a recordable contract covering all his lands within that district, agreeing as to such lands for and on behalf of himself, his heirs, successors, and assigns to the provisions set forth in this subsection (c): *Provided*, That any landowner, having failed to execute such a contract within this period, may be permitted to execute such contract within 1 year after the date of judicial confirmation of the validity of the contract between the United States and the district but only in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed under section 8 concerning this privilege.

"Each such recordable contract shall provide—

"(i) That the landowner will conform his lands by purchase, sale, or exchange at the appraised values to the area and boundaries of the pertinent farm unit or units shown on the plats filed under subsection 2 (b) and will dispose of excess land then or thereafter owned by him at its appraised value; that the Secretary is thereby given an irrevocable power of attorney to sell in behalf of the landowner any such excess land at said appraised value; and that the United States is thereby given, without further consideration, an option to buy any such excess land at said appraised value: *Provided*, That sales under such power or such option, unless otherwise provided in writing by said owner, shall be only for cash and only such that surrender of possession by the owner of any area of excess lands then operated as a single unit for dry farming or grazing may be effected substantially at one time.

"(ii) That in the period from the date of execution thereof and to a date 5 years from the time water becomes available for the lands covered thereby, no conveyance of or contract to convey a freehold estate in such lands, whether excess or nonexcess lands, shall be made for a consideration exceeding its appraised value, and in connection with any conveyance of, or contract to convey, such an estate within such period the grantor or vendor or the grantee or vendee or any lien holder thereof shall, within 30 days from the date of such conveyance or contract, file in the office of the county auditor in the county or counties in which the land is located an affidavit describing the conveyance or contract and the consideration therefor.

"(iii) That in the event that within such period such a conveyance of, or contract to convey, is made without filing within said 30 days the affidavit required in (ii) of this subsection, or is made for a consideration in excess of the appraised value, the Secretary, at any time within 2 years of the day on which there is filed for recording in the official county records the contract or deed involved, whichever is filed earliest in the event both the contract and deed are filed in a given transaction, may cancel the right of such estate to receive water from, through, or by means of the project works by a written notice of cancelation: *Provided*, That said power to cancel as to any given parcel of land may be waived by the Secretary at any time within said 2-year period by a written notice of waiver: *And provided further*, That after any such cancelation a project water right for the estate involved may be acquired only on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary.

"(iv) That should any freehold estate in land covered thereby be conveyed or contracted to be conveyed within the period defined in (ii) of this subsection, the transaction, and any mortgage or other lien covering any deferred consideration thereunder, shall be subject to all the provisions of subsection 3 (b) hereof.

"Any or all of the provisions of this subsection (c) required to be included in the recordable contracts may be made covenants running with the land when said recordable contracts expressly so provide.

"(d) Each contract made pursuant to subdivision 2 (a) (ii) shall provide that no water will be delivered from, through, or by means of the project works except in accordance with the provisions and limitations of section 2 hereof.

"(e) Each district contract may include provisions—

"(i) Requiring that all lands within the district not covered by recordable contracts provided for under subsection (c) or otherwise not eligible to receive water shall be subject to assessment in the same manner and to the same extent as like lands eligible to receive water, subject to such provisions as the Secretary may prescribe for postponement in payment of all or part of such assessments but not beyond the expiration of the period during which the price limit under subsection 2 (c) applies.

"(ii) That, without compliance with other provisions of State law for the exclusion of lands, lands may be withdrawn from the district by filing a written notice of withdrawal with the district board on or before such date fixed by such board between a date 10 days after the official notice of the election on the contract between the United States and the district and the date of such election. The date limiting the time of such filing shall be announced in the official notice of the proposed election, and lands for which such notice is filed shall be deemed excluded from the district for all purposes as of the time of such filing. Thereafter lands so withdrawn and excluded so long as they remain in private ownership shall not be entitled to receive water from, through, or by means of the project works.

"(f) Any instrument, action, determination, rule, or regulation of the Secretary or his duly authorized representatives under the authority of this section 2 which is or may be determinative of the title to lands or interest in lands in private ownership within the project shall be effective as to any given parcel of land, as against purchasers for value without actual notice, only from the time of the filing for record in the office of the county auditor of the county or counties in which the lands affected are located of a copy thereof authenticated in the manner authorized by law. Such filing shall impart legal notice to the public of the matters and things set out therein.

"SEC. 3. (a) Fraudulent misrepresentation as to the true consideration involved in the conveyance of, or contract to convey, any freehold estate in land covered by a recordable contract made under subsection 2 (c) hereof, in the affidavit required by that subsection shall constitute a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"(b) Should any freehold estate in lands subject to the recordable contract made under subsection 2 (c) hereof be conveyed or contracted to be conveyed after the date of execution of such recordable contract and within 5 years from the time water becomes available for such lands, at a consideration

in excess of the appraised value of said estate, the transaction, and any mortgage or other lien covering any deferred consideration thereunder, shall be invalid and unenforceable by the vendor or grantor, his successors or assigns as to that part of the consideration in excess of the appraised value of the estate involved. In the case of any such transaction involving deferred payments, said invalid portion of the consideration shall be deducted first from the deferred payments in the inverse order of their due dates.

"The vendee or grantee in any such transaction, at any time within 2 years from the date of any such conveyance or contract and on filing a correct affidavit as required in subdivision 2 (c) (ii), may recover from the vendor or grantor, or the successors or assigns thereof, an amount equal to the payments made in excess of the appraised value.

"In connection with any judgment or decree hereunder in favor of a vendee or grantee, said vendee or grantee shall have the right to recover court costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

"SEC. 4. (a) For the purposes of assisting in the permanent settlement of farm families, protecting project land, facilitating project development, preventing speculation in project lands, and providing for the general welfare, the Secretary is authorized to administer public lands of the United States in the project area and lands acquired under this section; to sell, exchange, or lease such lands; to establish town sites on such lands; to dedicate portions of such lands for public purposes in keeping with sound project development; to acquire in the name of the United States, at prices satisfactory to him, such lands or interest in lands, within or adjacent to the project area, as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of the project; to accept donations of real and personal property for the purposes of this act; and to disseminate information by appropriate means and methods. Any moneys realized on account of donations for purposes of this act shall be covered into the Treasury as trust funds.

"(b) Contracts, exchanges, and leases made under this section shall be on terms that, in the Secretary's judgment, are in keeping with sound project development. In addition, land-sale contracts shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, provides for the return in a reasonable period of years of not less than the appraised value of the land and improvements thereon.

"Qualifications of applicants for the purchase of land for irrigation farming shall be prescribed as provided in subsection C of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 702), notwithstanding any other provisions of law.

"SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary may enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes or assessments to any State or political subdivision thereof or irrigation, reclamation, or conservancy district with respect to any real property situated therein after it is acquired pursuant to the authority of this act and before execution by the United States of a contract of sale covering it, out of funds derived from the leasing of such lands. The amount so paid for any year upon any such property shall not exceed the taxes or assessments that would be paid to the State or subdivision, as the case may be, upon such property if it were not exempt from taxation thereby.

"(b) Any public lands and any lands or interests in lands acquired by the United States under the provisions of this act and included in farm unit plats filed by the Secretary under subdivision 2 (b) (ii) and offered for sale shall be subject to all provisions of the laws of the State of Washington relating to the organization, government, and regulation of irrigation, reclamation, and conservancy districts and shall be subject to liens for charges legally assessed by any such district, to the same extent and in substantially the same manner as public lands subject to entry are or may be subject to said laws and charges by the provisions of sections 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7 of the act of August 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 506), as amended by the act of May 15, 1922 (42 Stat. 541).

"(c) Upon execution by the United States of a contract of sale of any lands within the project, the lands under contract may be taxed by the State or political subdivision thereof in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands of a like character. All taxes legally so assessed may be enforced by the sale of the lands in the same manner and under the same proceeding whereby said taxes are enforced against privately owned lands: *Provided*, That the title or interest which the State or political subdivision thereof may convey in any tax proceeding shall be subject to whatever title remains in the United States and to any prior lien reserved to the United States for all unpaid installments upon the contract of sale, whether accrued or otherwise, and any other charges upon said land which have accrued or may accrue under and by virtue of said contract of sale or the contract between the United States and the district in which the land is located.

"SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such moneys as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, to be reimbursable to the extent required by this act. All revenues received in carrying out the provisions of section 4 hereof shall be covered into the General Treasury as 'miscellaneous receipts.' Amounts equal to appropriated funds requisitioned by the Secretary and made available for disbursement on the books of the Treasurer of the United States shall be debited in a special account in the Treasury, to be known as the Columbia Basin land-development account. Amounts equal to revenues covered into the General Treasury, as 'miscellaneous receipts' shall be credited in said special account. After such credits equal the amount of the debits with interest thereon at the rate of 3 percent per annum from the respective dates of the debits, additional credits in said special account shall be made by the Secretary, in the manner determined by him, the basis of corresponding credits to the construction cost obligations of the district or districts entering into contracts under section 2 hereof.

"SEC. 7. No water shall be delivered for irrigation within the project until the State of Washington, by appropriate legislation, shall have adopted, authorized, ratified, and consented to all the provisions of this act insofar as such provisions or any of them, in whole or in part, may come within the scope of State jurisdiction or authority or be applicable to State lands.

"Legislation otherwise conforming to the standards above stated in this section will meet the requirements of the section even though, by reason of limitations in the State constitution, the contracts required under subsection 2 (c) cannot be executed pursuant to such legislation as to the State's school and other public lands. As to such lands, the provisions and requirements of subsection 2 (c) shall remain effective, but if these constitutional limitations have not been removed at least 6 months prior to the expiration of the time provided for the execution of the contracts the time is hereby extended for a period ending 6 months after the removal of the limitations.

"SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized to perform such acts, to make such rules and regulations, and to include in the contracts hereinbefore provided for such provisions as he deems proper for carrying out the provisions of this act; and in connection with sales or exchanges under the act, he is authorized to effect conveyances without regard to the law governing the patenting of public lands. Wherever in this act functions, powers, or duties are conferred upon the Secretary, said functions, powers, or duties may be performed, exercised, or discharged by his duly authorized representatives.

"SEC. 9. The consent of the United States is hereby given to the sale of school lands and any other public lands of the State of Washington comprising a part of the lands within the project at prices not to exceed their appraised values, determined as provided in subsection 2 (a) hereof.

"SEC. 10. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 11. This act may be cited as 'The Columbia Basin Project Act.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: On page 12, line 19, after the word "developed", insert the word "and." On page 12, line 20, strike out the words "and providing for the general welfare."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, stripped of its trimmings, this is just one more paternalistic measure, and, as is the nature of all political paternalism, destructive of free enterprise and liberty.

Like the other paternalistic proposals that come before legislative bodies for consideration, this one comes gilded with a great humanitarian principle, concern for the welfare of honest people, those who truly earn their living by the sweat of their brows, and the promise that the supreme political authority will protect them against the wiles and cunning of speculators, bad people, who would live off the toil of others.

But this humanitarian concern and protection is to last for only 5 years.

As though speculation would cease after the initial interests that are involved in the project would be taken care of. I suppose the theory is that after living on, or owning, the land for 5 years this does something to make one immune against speculation.

Like every other paternalistic measure, this one involves further extension of political price fixing of farm commodities, for surely the supreme political authority cannot place a value on this land without concerning itself, sooner or later, not only with prices the farmers on this irrigated land receive, as well as all farm prices, but the prices of all services, for all prices are part of one process.

I understand provision is made in this bill for the Federal Government to lay out town plots on the project. This is to be a politically planned project all the way through. The National Resources Planning Board and one or more of the Federal housing agencies will be

there to plan the towns, build the houses, and regulate the living conditions of the community.

Totalitarianism marches on.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, some folks might think that with the hundreds of thousands or perhaps millions of acres of fertile land in this country going uncultivated because of lack of farm machinery and labor it was unnecessary to irrigate land to grow crops; but be that as it may—and I shall not oppose this bill—we should not forget that we are not going to grow crops, we are not going to grow anything on this additional land brought under irrigation nor other land unless you get the labor to plant, cultivate, and harvest the crops. The morning paper carries the statement that the Secretary of Agriculture has suspended the restrictive orders which prevented the marketing of wheat except under penalty. That is one step in the right direction, but there are many other restrictive orders the New Deal has put in force that are now in effect, that will have to be rescinded before we will be able to feed the civilian population or any armed force. In time of stress regimentation has been shown to be worse than a failure. It is a positive drag on production.

The papers also carry the news that the President has ordered the armed forces to pick cotton in the West. Well, now, if this administration thinks that it can grow crops, that it can produce beef, pork, butter, eggs, or milk under the administration of the Army it has another think coming. The way to produce food is to permit the experts—the farmers who have been doing the job—to continue to do it.

Until this Congress comes to the relief of the farmer and permits him to carry on his work in the old-fashioned, independent way, we are just at a standstill.

The first thing for this Congress to do, in my judgment, at least, is to get back on the land the men who know how to cultivate it and who, either because of higher wages, patriotism, or the draft, have been taken from the farm. They are exempting men all over who are in industry. Some of them are skilled mechanics and some are not, but if they happen to be in a factory, no matter what their age, no matter what their fitness for the armed forces, many of those men are exempt.

The country is now aware, as Congress is aware and as the unions themselves are aware, that absenteeism is hindering production not only here and there but all over, yet some of those who are guilty of that practice are exempt from service. On the other hand, they take the farm boy, the only man—I say that advisedly—who can grow the food the armed forces and the civilian population need. You take him off the farm and put him in the armed forces, and the land lies idle.

I speak of that because last week, being home, and living in an agricultural county, I took that question up with a member of the draft board. The only answer they could give, and it was the only answer, was, "Our folks are farmers. When the administration calls for so many men, we haven't anyone else to take except the men off the farms." So you see what is happening to us throughout our county, and I know it is the same in other counties and districts and in other States. We are stripping the farms, and we all know it. Unless we put through this Congress soon some legislation which gives the farmers some relief, it is just idle to put other land under the plow or into cultivation in irrigated districts.

The simple, effective remedy is to defer expert farm workers, to return to the farms men now in the Army who know farm production in sufficient number, to produce the food which we must have.

The President's plan of sending a company of soldiers to pick the cotton crop in the West may get that particular product harvested. But there is nothing new about it. Perhaps he got the idea from another Roosevelt—Clinton Roosevelt, who, in 1841, published a book entitled "The Science of Government." Permit me to quote from that book. That Roosevelt wrote:

> Where large numbers might congregate, they should labor together under leaders in the fields and in factories under foremen and officers, precisely as soldiers in an Army do.

The idea may be all right as a theory, but it will not work in practice. It will not produce food. Farming is a year-around job. It is a job that requires brains, knowledge, experience, as well as a strong back.

A company or a regiment from the Army might have in it some expert farmers, but where will you find a regiment where more than 50 percent are fitted to, in one instance, plant, cultivate, and harvest crops in the North; in another, carry on farming operations in the South; or take over and manage a dairy?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. If what the gentleman's local board told him is correct, it is contrary to the instructions issued by the Director of the Selective Service System to these boards. I believe the regulation is called regulation No. 19, although I am not sure I can recall the number offhand. They state the policy, which is supposed to be a new one, that persons engaged in the production of essential food shall be considered for deferment by the draft boards.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know that. They may be considered but they are not as a rule given deferment or exemption.

Mr. MOTT. If they do not do it, they are going against the instructions issued by the Director.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But you have to have so many units, some for this, that, and the other, to put the regulation in force. The farmers go to the county agent, but the units do not add up to quite enough, and the boy goes into the Army just the same and the land is not cultivated.

Mr. DONDERO. That order came too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I merely rise to add my endorsement to the pending legislation. I hope it will pass the House with due dispatch. We have come to a point now in my State, as my colleague from that section knows, where a bill of this sort is essential.

Many of you older members of the House will recall the fight we had here for many years to develop what we called our public power resources in the West. Many of you stood up at the time we were seeking appropriations for Grand Coulee Dam and other projects and asked what we were going to do with the power. It now turns out that the need for power is far beyond the ideas of any of us at that time. If we had built five Grand Coulee dams, we would still not have enough power for the war effort and for the industries in the Pacific Northwest. So this is merely building a roof on the house this Congress has built over a period of years on our public-power program.

I do hope there will be little or no opposition to this bill. It means that we can develop that section now as it should be developed and let it be an outlet for those who want to go into the great West to make their living.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet I think it is appropriate at this time to speak about something else that is happening in the West.

Three years ago one of our fellow Members, the Republican Representative from California, JACK ANDERSON, presented an idea which at that time fell on deaf ears. Today, in a factory in Salinas, Calif., the wisdom of his foresight is being proven, for there the United States is at this moment producing its first batch of natural rubber from a scrawny-looking shrub called guayule. It is only 600 tons—small in comparison to our national emergency rubber needs—but a step which might well point the way to the opening of a vast rubber producing area in our Southwest.

It was almost 2 years before the bombing of Pearl Harbor that the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] first presented his idea to Congress. He told us then that it would be good business for the United States to grow rubber, especially with the possibility of a war in the Pacific shutting off the supply from the East Indies.

In the following months he actually traveled from door to door of the Federal agencies trying to interest them in his idea. The strange looking plant he carried with him as exhibit A aroused passing interest and was then forgotten. He was given endless reasons why the United States should not produce rubber domestically — international relations, appropriations, the unproven qualities of guayule.

But so deep-rooted was his faith in his idea and in the necessity for this country to develop its own rubber resources that he was not discouraged in

his efforts. Time after time he suggested in behalf of the House the necessity of providing domestic rubber for national defense purposes and introduced a bill providing for the cultivation of guayule.

While waiting for it to be brought up for a committee hearing he started his rounds again from door to door of the Government agencies. It was not until March 5, 1942, that a bill providing for a guayule program was finally signed by the President.

This is the same plant which the Baruch committee described in its report on the rubber situation as "the principal source of crude rubber which could not be lost to us short of conquest of American territory." The report went even further and recommended a program for its production be given support. But the Baruch committee—and all of us—were more than 2 years behind our colleague from California.

And so today, I would like to give honor where honor is due—even though it is to someone from the opposite side of the aisle. I would like to pay tribute to the undaunted spirit of persistence which the gentleman from California, JACK ANDERSON, displayed in his attempt to make the Nation guayule conscious. He might well be called the father of our emergency guayule program.

That is a small amount in percent of our national needs, but, as I say, I think this House ought to give flowers to the living, and ought to pay tribute to the gentleman from California, JACK ANDERSON, a Republican Member of this House, for his foresight, and I look for the day, if we pay attention to some of these ideas like the gentleman from California, JACK ANDERSON, had, particularly on guayule rubber, when we will never again have to depend upon any part of the world for our natural sources of rubber.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GAVAGAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 839, and, pursuant to House Resolution 109, reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those who spoke on the bill may revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a list of higher educational institutions dropped from the official educational directory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to address a word or two to my Republican colleagues from New England. It is quite all right for you Members to support the construction of the Florida barge canal, when the measure providing for that job comes before the House, which I trust will be in the very near future.

The Providence Journal, the bible of Republicanism, has issued its pronunciamento. In an editorial on Sunday, February 21, it decided that it will accept the barge canal, in order that the people of New England will not have to freeze next winter in their homes, as they did during the past few months—in order that our schools, our industry, our stores, our retail and wholesale establishments will not have to close their doors, as they have been forced to do this winter.

I ask that you read this editorial carefully, and then screw your courage to the sticking point, and support the canal project, because New England needs oil, and this measure provides our best bet:

[From the Providence Sunday Journal of February 21, 1943]

OUR BEST BET

Oil-starved New England's Representatives in Congress should bend their efforts toward getting favorable action on the bill now pending in the House Ways and Means Committee appropriating $44,000,000 for the construction of the Florida barge canal as a practical way of helping assure a more adequate supply of fuel for this section next winter.

There is now complete and open to traffic an inland waterway from Corpus Christi, Tex., to the west coast of Florida. There is likewise complete an inland waterway from Jacksonville, on the east coast of Florida, north to Trenton, N. J.

All that is necessary to complete the route from the oil-field area to New Jersey is the barge canal across Florida, tying together the two existing waterways. Construction of the canal was authorized by vote of Congress last July. But beginning of work awaits the passage of the appropriation making funds available.

Responsible construction firms have given assurances that the canal can be completed and in operation within 10 months after work starts, and say there is ample equipment available to do the job. Thus, with a quick beginning, the waterway should be ready for use by next January.

With the canal in service, oil could be brought by barge from Texas to New Jersey and transshipped from there to New England and other northeastern points. Contracts have already been placed for some barges and all those needed can, it is said, be provided easily by the time the canal is ready. These vessels are of wood construction, quickly built, and capable of carrying either crude or heavy oils. They would be brought, in tows of three, over the water route by tugs.

The proposal—provided Congress will act upon it promptly—appears to offer this section its "best bet" for not having to go through next winter what is going through this winter in trying to get oil enough to keep its people from freezing and its businesses and industries from closing down.

The entire undertaking, its sponsors emphasize, would involve almost no use of critical materials, and the manpower requirements for the canal job, it is asserted, would be small, because it would be almost wholly machine excavation through level country. As for the cost—$44,000,000, according to the Army engineers—it would be only a small fraction of the $250,000,000 which the Federal Government is now paying annually to the oil companies to help them meet the extremely heavy cost of transporting oil to the East by rail.

For your edification I want to call your attention to two other timely editorials published by the Providence Journal—a member of the august assemblage known as the mighty press. These editorials were published during June of 1942—you will recall that was an election year and Democratic Members of Congress had to be defeated, even if Rhode Islanders did freeze.

The first, published June 19, 1942, the day after the House passed the Florida barge canal and pipe line bill, is as follows:

[From the Providence Journal of June 19, 1942]

BOONDOGGLE

The wartime House did not do itself proud or help the taxpayer's pocketbook or make any true provision for relief of the oil shortage in the East when it authorized construction of a barge canal across Florida.

The trans-Florida pipe-line project which was included in the authorization could be undertaken without passing any legislation, but perhaps its inclusion was thought to make the canal scheme smell sweeter.

It doesn't. The canal will take from 18 months to 3 years to build, if the Senate concurs and the President approves. The objection voiced by Representative BENDER, of Ohio, was to the point—"If the submarine menace is not ended by then," he said, "I'm afraid we'll all be gone."

The assertion of Representative MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, that "if we had this barge canal now it would be of inestimable value to the country" does not make sense, except as a cover for a pork-barrel project. It is the pork, in fact, which the country smells.

Can Mr. MCCORMACK show where he can get the barges if he had the canal? Can he demonstrate how the narrow, shallow, incomplete inland waterway north to New York could handle the traffic necessary to provide real relief, if the barges were available? Can he prove that the labor, reinforcing steel, and machinery required to build a five-lock canal across Florida could be safely diverted from the war effort?

Some of Mr. MCCORMACK's constituents ought to lay him a bet that neither Massachusetts nor any other rationed State down to and including Florida will ever get a drop of wartime oil by way of the proposed canal, even if the Senate doesn't slap the boondoggle down, which it should.

The second editorial was published on June 21, 1942, and was an attempt to ridicule the Senate majority leader, who had the temerity to express an interest in a measure which would help New

Englanders to get oil for the coming winter. It reads:

[From the Providence Sunday Journal of June 21, 1942]

THAT BARGE CANAL

Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, predicted here Thursday night that the Senate will pass the Florida barge canal bill. "We must provide gasoline and fuel oil for you people of New England," he said.

Thanks, Senator, but it is officially stated that the canal would take at least 18 months to build, or until January 1944, which seems a long way off to us.

And even then, Senator, there will be the little matter of barges. On the basis of an average round-trip distance of 2,500 miles between Gulf oil ports and delivery points in the rationed area, at an average towing speed of 5 miles per hour, the round trip would take about 21 days.

To bring in 300,000 barrels daily, 120 barges of 2,500-barrel capacity would have to be loaded every day, and 120 barges times 21 days makes 2,520 barges. Where will the steel come from, Senator? And how about the towboats, at least 500 of them?

There is still another little matter. Does the Senator imply that the Navy will not have driven off the U-boats by January 1944, permitting resumption of efficient oil transport by oceangoing tankers? If so, what has the Navy to say in reply?

Perhaps Senator BARKLEY was hasty in what he said here. Perhaps he ought to get all the facts together for presentation to the Senate when the barge canal bill comes up.

Apparently roused to fury by the prospect that the Senate would likewise pass this measure, the same editorial page carried the pronouncement that Congress was playing "peanut politics, like Lilliputians binding up Gulliver," and went on to say:

There is no sinister conspiracy to discredit Congress. Congress is discrediting itself.

The same editorial page carried a great cartoon. It depicted a fat Congressman lying in bed, with a beatific smile on his countenance, while in his head danced visions of fat pork barrels, swimming gracefully in an endless line through the Florida barge canal.

This great example of foresight and demonstration of consistency comes from the press that believes that it alone, in the words of the Federalist, "possesses the most wisdom to discern, and most virtue to pursue, the common good of society."

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative business and any other business on the Speaker's desk, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Louis Bromfield.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Connecticut General Assembly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOOD

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make some informal observations on a subject that is engrossing the attention of the country at this moment. It is the subject of food. I shall address myself to it as a member of the loyal opposition. On February 22, the Vice President of the United States, at the Washington Birthday dinner at the Mayflower Hotel, in the course of his remarks said:

It places upon the Republican minority the responsibility for really behaving as a loyal opposition and abstaining from tactics which are purely political.

So I want to abstain from tactics that are purely political and discuss a subject that is in no sense political whatsoever. There is nothing more political about the production of food than there is about an earthquake. The subject of empty bellies is going to engross the attention of the American people as no other issue has done. I believe there is no question but that we are on the threshold, if not in the midst, of a food crisis right now, and I fear that it has not been anticipated and that is the reason for these observations. I say that in my judgment there has not been an over-all food program, and the possible stringency in the country has not been anticipated, as indicated by the records of those who have been identified with the subject of food. In the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1940, Mr. Wickard said:

Our situation now from the standpoint of reserve supplies is exceptionally strong.

On the 27th of May 1941, Mr. WALLACE, the Vice President, in an article which he contributed to a pamphlet on nutrition and national defense gotten out by the Department of Agriculture, had this to say:

In this war, thanks to the ever-normal granary and the efficiency of modern farm production, we can approach the problem more constructively than in the last war.

Now, get this:

There seems little likelihood that we shall have meatless days or days without sugar. Apparently we do not have to cut down on our food needs in order to make sure that there is a surplus to send to our friends across the sea.

That is Mr. WALLACE talking, onetime Secretary of Agriculture and now the Vice President of this country.

Two days after Pearl Harbor, on the 9th of December 1941, the President went on the radio and, among other things, said this:

A review this morning leads me to the conclusion that at present we shall not have to curtail the normal use of the articles of food. There is enough food today for all of us and enough left over to send to those who are fighting on the same side with us.

That statement was made by the President 2 days after Pearl Harbor.

About 3 weeks after Pearl Harbor—to be exact, on the 27th day of December 1941—Mr. Evans, Administrator of the A. A. A., was participating in a round-table discussion in the Hotel Pennsylvania in New York City. There he made this statement, as quoted in the New York Herald Tribune of that date:

Assurance that the United States will not be confronted with food shortages and rationing was given by R. M. Evans, Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, at a round-table discussion of the emergency food problems at the Hotel Pennsylvania yesterday. When the war situation hit we were prepared to handle the food problem, due to our previous planning, said Mr. Evans. The farmers have been canvassed and know what they are expected to produce. There is no reason to believe that the people of the United States and any other country cannot expect all the food that is necessary. There is no reason why there should be any rationing here or that prices should go very far above the present level.

There you have some quotations from gentlemen who have been identified with the problem of food production, and as late as 3 weeks after Pearl Harbor were giving assurances to the country that there would be no food stringency, that rationing would be unnecessary, and that there would be food enough for us and for our allies.

On the basis of those statements I think it is eminently fair to conclude that there has been no comprehensive food program and that the Department of Agriculture and other officials charged with this responsibility have not been seeing into the future and determining the needs of this country and our allies, and cutting the cloth of the food plan accordingly.

There is no question about a food crisis. On February 20, 1943, the Institute of Food Distribution got out a digest. There they carried a long article called Serious Food Shortage Probable, in which they go on to analyze the factors and reasons that will enter into it.

As early as November—in fact, on November 2, 1942—there was a two-page spread in Time magazine on this subject. Now, that is 3 months ago, and here is the language of that article:

Statisticians talked in a babel of tongues, but it was left to the United States housewife to see through without words. The United States was in trouble with the most vital of all supplies—food. She knew it from the simple evidence that her grocer's shelves and butcher's hooks were empty.

About that time Mr. Paul Willis, who was president of the American Grocers' Association, made this statement:

A scandal far greater than the rubber situation looms in the immediate future. Unless immediate steps are taken to coordinate this country's system of food production and distribution, a major food shortage is a certainty.

Here are people who have canvassed the situation. Here are people who have realistically appraised the problem and

as early as November were all predicting that there would be a serious food shortage in the country, and it remained for the fuse of canned goods rationing to touch off the explosive and bring it home with a loud report to the people of this country.

It occurs to me that this matter of food production is elementary insofar as the facts are concerned. There is, first of all, the job of producing food. Second, there is the job of processing food. Third, there is the job of distributing food. It does not make any difference how many potatoes they grow in Maine; it does not make any difference how many potatoes they grow in Idaho or how many soya beans they grow in Illinois or how many peanuts are grown in Georgia or how much flax is grown in North Dakota or how many vegetables are produced in Colorado, California, or Louisiana. If they are not processed and distributed and made available to the consumer they have no commercial usefulness. I have heard very little in the discussion about the processing and distributing factors that enter into this whole food picture.

But let us consider for a moment item No. 1—namely, the production of food. First, you have to have the land. Certainly we have land in abundance right now. Always we have had it. Second, you need manpower. Of that I want to speak directly. Third, you need money in the way of finances and credit for farmers. The country is filled with money. The various credit agencies of the Government have sufficient legislative authority and sufficient funds to make any form of production loan available to any farmer for any kind of commodity.

Next, you need markets. The market is here. The very evidence of people who are marching on grocery stores in order to get a supply of tinned food is the best evidence of a market. You need weather, but weather is one of those unpredictable things, and if we fail to have that kind of good, consistent growing weather and moisture that we have enjoyed in the last 5 or 6 years, this whole food program is going to become even more acute.

Finally, you need the disposition to produce. When Mr. Wickard came before the subcommittee for agriculture in the Appropriations Committee that considered this $125,000,000 incentive request of his, I said: "Mr. Secretary, I am satisfied that the farmers of the country are just as patriotic in tilling the soil as our men in uniform are in fighting on the combat fronts."

I do not believe they need any incentive other than a fair price; that is all the incentive they need; and if it needs further proof, let me observe that the University of Illinois made a canvass of every farm in the State and found that No. 2 on the list of incentives for farmers was their desire to do a patriotic job and to participate in the war effort by serving on the farm front and producing war crops and other foods that are necessary. Nobody can ever persuade me that the farmers need a little special cash incentive of some kind or other as the Secretary would set up for the purpose of tilling the soil and devoting themselves to this very critical problem of food which disturbs the whole country at the present time.

So we have the land; we have the money; we have the markets; we cannot control the weather; there is a disposition to produce. This leaves three other factors: The first one is manpower, the second is machinery, and the third is the price that the farmer gets. Let us look at manpower.

After a long controversy over manpower the farm organizations finally made their representations to the Senate last year which eventuated in the adoption of the so-called Tydings amendment to the amendments that had been enacted by the House to the Selective Service Act. We had a good deal of discussion over this on the floor at the time, but it remained for the Senate to propose that amendment which in effect would defer a man who was regularly employed in an essential farm occupation and so long as he remained identified with that occupation. Once he left, once he was no longer an essential food producer, that was the end of his deferment. Insofar as I can ascertain about 364,000 have been deferred under the Tydings amendment this far. One statement I saw this morning said 364,000. The other statement I got from Mr. Tolley, of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. He said the most current figure they had was about 350,000; but do not forget that nearly 2,000,000 people have been siphoned from the farm either into the armed services or have voluntarily left the farm to go into defense plants at higher pay.

I am not disposed to lay the whole problem upon the Army and the Navy, because it may be that but a small percentage of those who have been taken from the farm have actually gone into the armed services. Certainly we know that many have gone from the farms to find a job in some defense plant.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It may be of interest to the gentleman and to Members of the House to know that Secretary Wickard in appearing before the Foreign Affairs Committee in connection with our consideration of the Lend-Lease Act and its impact upon American agriculture testified that according to the best calculations his Department could make, that of all of the men who have been drained away from agriculture since January 1, 1941, something over 60 percent have been drawn to factories and something less than the remainder, which would be less than 40 percent, to the military services.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me interpose. That simply gives point to the observation that I just made that you cannot put the whole responsibility upon the armed services, because everyone knows that a good many of them have left the farms to find these lucrative jobs. I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The reason they have left the farms and gone to the factories is that under the laws that have been passed and the regulations that have been put into force they have depressed farm prices so far below industrial wages that these people leave the farm and go to the factories in order to make a living.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would say that is probably a collateral reason and does not enter particularly into the thing I want to say, namely, that there is confusion, there is lack of perspective, there is failure to find agreement in this whole manpower situation so that there can be a distribution of manpower to those essential fronts that are indispensable in maintaining a war economy.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CREAL. In making that calculation of 60–40, charging allurement to factories with 60 percent, I am afraid the gentleman is overlooking one valuable point: One-half of the factory workers are over draft age and put off the subject of military service if they were at home. I maintain that the men who are in the Army and the men who are in the factory would not run over 50–50 that are competent military material. We are overlooking all those 45-year olds in the factories which the military service would not have touched anyway.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Kentucky that we have been overlooking that. I think the gentleman from New York said it was a sort of guesswork figure; that is, it is the best figure they had. It cannot be resolved with anything like mathematical certainty. I am sure I do not know, I am sure the Secretary of Agriculture does not know. I could not get the figures. So it has not been definitely ascertained; but the fact remains that it is common knowledge that men of all ages have gone from the farm into the defense plants; but still we do not know what the percentage is or as to whether or not they are still amenable to military service under the Draft Act. That does not, of course, change the essential point we are trying to make. It may be more, it may be less, but the point is the manpower problem is still there.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield, I may say in answer to the gentleman from Kentucky that men over military age were probably the best class of farm labor in the whole country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is entirely probable.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman believe the problem can be solved better by letting the Army men be ordered to harvest the crop or by leaving the men who are on the farms there, or sending others back? Which is the gentleman's idea?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman will relieve me for a moment from an answer, I will come to that answer, because I want to discuss it directly in proper sequence.

Look at the strange inconsistencies that have crept in. Maybe they are necessary. I do not know. But they do not look reasonable to me. The Selective Service takes farm hands. The farm hands leave the farm to go into defense plants. Then the State Department makes a treaty with Mexico to bring in Mexicans for work in California and Arizona. I suppose it is all right. But the point is, it looks like going a long way around to arrive at a solution of this problem.

Under the Selective Service, the Army takes experienced hands from the farm, and the farmers then often cannot properly take care of their dairy herds and have to sell them. Only this week the Federal security administrator of Maryland said they were ready to buy milk cows that were being thrown on the market by herd owners because they did not have labor enough to take care of them, or for any other reason. So we take men off the farm, the farmer has to throw his dairy herd on the market, and another Federal agency steps in to buy them or to negotiate some kind of a deal whereby they can be distributed to some other farmer in the locality.

The Army takes men from the farm through the instrumentality of the Selective Service, or they are permitted to go into defense plants. Then the President suggests that we ought to take increments from the Army for short periods of time and transfer them to the farm so long as it does not interfere with their training and the basic program of the Army, maybe for 1 day, maybe for 2 days.

Can you imagine that? Can you imagine the colonel in charge of a regiment suddenly bringing in his battalion commanders and company commanders and saying to them, "Gentlemen, I have here a directive"—that is the favorite term, a "directive"—"that we are to pile on a train and go out here into Cherokee County, Mont., and bring in the wheat." But any rational being knows that that is not the solution for farm manpower any more than the experience we have had in recent months of a Connecticut farmer who sent down to the United States Employment Service for some farm hands and they sent him one drunk, one epileptic, and one schoolboy.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. On that point, I noticed where they were going to send soldiers into the field to pick cotton. I know you are the finest bunch of gentlemen on that side of the aisle, but I would not feed you to pick cotton for me, because you do not know how. You have to grow up in the cotton field to know that. Cotton picking is an art. I would rather have one of those old boys from down on the creek in my district who grew up on a cotton farm pick cotton in my field than three or four men, the best, even though they worked themselves to death, who had never picked any cotton. So it is just stupid, in a way, to talk about sending men into a cotton field to pick cotton, men who have never had any experience in gathering cotton at all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And we do not want any of your cotton pickers up telling us how to make tanks.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. Does not the gentleman think that the real trouble arose because of our failure to treat the farm as a war industry and to have some coordinated and sensible policy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that states the case.

Mr. DIES. My district is half industrial and half agricultural. We have a great many big shipyards. The shipyards and the Government and everyone are making appeals to the people to leave the farms. They have placards in all the restaurants. There is no effort being made to keep the men on the farm. We have so many foolish regulations, such as the difficulty in trying to get permits of public necessity to operate a tractor to haul products, that the farmers generally are discouraged. Here is the Government itself inducing them to go to the industries. Does not the gentleman think that that is the real cause of this trouble?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think so.

The next proposal to meet this farm-labor problem appeared in the February 17 issue of the official magazine for the War Production Board, known as Victory. Here is a cartoon with the title "Pitch In—3,500,000 Volunteer Agricultural Workers Wanted Now."

We are going to start a recruitment program for girls and boys, for a high-school victory corps, for folks who live in rural areas and in urban areas, for that matter, to take them out to the farm, from one evidently nonessential pursuit or industry into one that is more nearly essential or related to the war effort. That is the thing for which Mr. Wickard has requested $60,675,000.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Would the gentleman repeat that? Did I correctly understand him to say that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for money for a corps of women farmers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Partly women and partly men, young folks and old folks.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is that for our part of the country, out in the Middle West?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I assume it is for all parts of the country. Here it is:

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 106

Communication from the President of the United States transmitting to Congress this request dated February 10, 1943:

"For expenses necessary for the formulation, development, and execution, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture and either independently or in cooperation with individuals or agencies, public or private, of a plan to assist in providing an adequate supply and distribution of labor, including sharecroppers and tenants, including aliens for the production of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, including recruiting, placement, and transportation of such labor within the continental United States and elsewhere; including transportation of their families and household effects;

"(2) Furnishing by loan, grants, or otherwise of medical services, training, subsistence, and shelter;

"(3) Construction or lease and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services;

"(4) Employment of persons, including aliens and organizations by contract or otherwise at the seat of Government and elsewhere;

"(5) Purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles;

"(6) Printing and binding;

"(7) Acceptance and utilization of voluntary, uncompensated services, $65,075,000."

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. There are not any women in that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The general phrase "recruitment of agricultural workers" simply bears out what is appearing in the official Victory magazine of the Government, that they propose to develop a farm army, including men and women.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Well, they will not work. The gentleman comes from Illinois and he knows. I do not mean the women will not work, but they know their capacity, and whether they do or not, they cannot work on our mechanized farms. We have expensive machinery. We cannot get parts. We need skilled labor, and while the women might be fine in some parts of the country where they raise truck gardening, perhaps, they will not do in the Middle West.

I speak as one who tried to be a farmerette in New England in the last war when I was in school in Northampton, Mass. They took a corps of us out there and we were asked to husk corn. We did it with a little picker. I think I was supposed to be the best husker, perhaps because I was the huskiest, but even on that New England farm where we went out in the morning at 8 or 9 o'clock and had tea at 4 in the afternoon and then quit, I do not think I husked 15 bushels in 2 weeks, and when I told the people at home about it, they said, "Thank goodness, we do not have anybody like you on our farms."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say the gentlewoman from Illinois merely anticipated what I had in mind saying, that when you buy a mechanical corn picker for $800, or you pay $1,200 for a tractor, or you pay equivalent amounts for other machinery on the farm, two elements are involved. First, a person who has no mechanical experience and who does not know anything about farm work, would have to undergo a rather extensive course of mechanical education before they can operate such machines. Secondly, with machinery at a premium today, a farmer is not so apt to trust

high-priced machinery to some inexperienced hand, only to have it jammed or get into difficulty, and then to discover through his county rationing board that it is difficult to get parts, and certainly almost impossible to get new machinery. The gentlewoman from Illinois is exactly right.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Further I happened to be talking to a farmer from Illinois this noon and we mentioned this subject. I said, "Do you know of a single man you employ who does not have to operate two or three very difficult-to-handle machines during the day, know how to interchange the parts? It is just like a factory, is that not true?" And he said, "That is true. We could not possibly pick up stenographers or clerks and try to use them on our farm." I further think if this administration contemplates such a ridiculous, silly program, this Congress should rise to a man and stop it.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the lady from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] that since she was in Massachusetts in 1920 Harvard has developed a new technique. She is turning out denatured Americans now that would surprise you. Some of them can teach the farmers how to milk ducks, show a blacksmith how to weld a wooden handle to a pewter spoon, train one to extract sunbeams from cucumbers, or to manufacture gunpowder out of ice.

Some of them can graft a dead bough to a living trunk and make it blossom as the rose, mix oil and water together placidly in the same bottle, and make boon companions of the spider and the fly—to say nothing of their superb efficiency in promoting social gains.

Indeed, they are making for us a new world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will remind the gentleman there are two other special orders.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman from Mississippi does not care to hear from Massachusetts. Massachusetts furnished the brains of the New Deal, did it not? Through Mr. Frankfurter down there you recall how the White House was almost fully staffed from Harvard.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. I want to say to the gentlewoman from Illinois if there is any question about what the gentleman has said to the House as to this being the contemplated program of the Department of Agriculture, all she needs to do is to come before our committee which is holding hearings and the Secretary will be there in the morning. He released a statement today before the committee in which he outlines the very things that the gentleman from Illinois has been suggesting to the House, $65,000,000 plus, that he contemplates using for the purpose that the gentleman from Illinois indicated they expect to use it for.

Let me say to the gentleman that it is not a matter of guesswork on the part of the program that has been suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me indicate that the situation is acute even now. The monthly labor survey by the United States Department of Agriculture for January contains this statement:

> Farmers of the country hired 185,000 additional men and women during January compared with 220,000 new employees in January 1942, and were short 154,000 hired employees at the beginning of this month.

It is here. That is the Department speaking. We cannot quarrel with those figures; and the reason for simply enumerating these various factors that I have presented to you thus far is to indicate that there is no consistent perfected program even now to solve this manpower problem.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On that same point I think the gentleman will find that in December the number of farm hired workers dropped to the lowest number since they started keeping records at the Department of Agriculture, some 25 or 30 years ago.

I wish to ask the gentleman this question: If I understand the gentleman's approach it is to this effect, that if these men in the service are sent to the farms they will work for the same wages they are paid as soldiers, but that the Government will then proceed to invoice the farmer for their time put in on the crop. I want to ask this question: Coming to the statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi—and if you will permit me I want to issue a challenge to him. I will challenge any man on that side above 50 years of age to pick cotton in any field where they produce cotton.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But, if I may interrupt the gentleman, I do not want it picked in my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I will issue another challenge. I will challenge any man on that side to go into the details with me and talk sugar beets. So I think we are even on that score.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have had experience in my section on this question of group help going out to the farms. We are still trying to untangle the question as to the pay, how much should be paid and who should receive the pay by the group which was taken out in the field last fall and where they performed the work under a supervisor.

Does the gentleman believe that that type of work can be made at all satisfactory to the farmer with reference to paying the work, supervising the work, and the farmer selling the crops and paying the wages for the work?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman will permit, I will deal with that in just a few minutes. I am going to show him who is going to get the money and how it is going to work.

Is it not strange that after the Tydings amendment intended to defer agricultural workers was approved that it should be necessary for 40 Senators to have to join together in a Senate measure in order to secure the deferment of farm workers? Is it not strange that 30 Senators had to join together in another bill to seek to procure furloughs of farm workers who had been inducted into the Army in order to permit them to go back to the farms to produce their crops? I will give you one illustration, one case of one young farmer out in my country who had 14,000 bushels of corn in the field. They sent a certificate out to the camp in a western State showing that he was one of the master junior farmers in his State. They sent large photographs taken on the farm showing him working with a tractor, plowing corn, and everything else, and still they could not get him out of the service. He was finally furloughed to pick his corn but he is still in the service. Now, there is no coordination.

I asked Mr. Wickard in effect: "Have you an arrangement with the War Manpower Commission? Have you some kind of arrangement, a definite arrangement, with the Army about this matter?"

He answered in substance: "No, there is no definite arrangement, no definite formal arrangement."

And so the farm manpower problem is one of those amorphous things in the midst of a food crisis that has not been solved, and the manpower problem is still here.

Now, getting to the observation made by the gentleman from Michigan: On the 20th of August, 1942, the Department of Agriculture issued a release which among other statements contained this language:

> The United States Department of Agriculture announced today that administrative machinery for transporting domestic farm workers into areas where serious shortage exists will be completed early in September.

That was in August when the announcement was made. Quoting further:

> Funds available for transportation of workers are limited, and certain conditions of employment must be met before the Government undertakes to pay transportation of these workers. These conditions include payment of prevailing wages with a minimum of 30 cents per hour or an equivalent piece rate.
>
> Wage boards through public hearings will determine the prevailing wage in given areas * * * adequate housing, and sanitary facilities. The Farm Security Administration will pass on such provisions locally. Employers will be expected to furnish performance bond or other acceptable guaranty fulfillment of contract agreements.

That was in August, but on the 22d of June 1942 the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, to whom Mr. McNutt and Mr. Wickard had entrusted the responsibility for this domestic and Mexican farm-labor transportation program, got out a memorandum. I expect

I was not to see it, as it was evidently a confidential memorandum, but I have it, anyway. On page 4, paragraph 8, there appears this language:

The Farm Security Administration in cooperation with appropriate Federal and State agencies shall make all necessary provisions for insuring continuous compliance by employers of domestic agricultural labor transported under this program, with wage provisions, working conditions, housing, sanitary and other living standards, transportation requirements, and all other provisions of employment contracts entered into by such employers, and shall provide the necessary machinery for satisfying grievances and dissolving disputes.

You see what Mr. Baldwin, of the Farm Security Administration, is undertaking to do? You see what Mr. McNutt is undertaking to do; you see what all those who have a finger in the pie are seeking to do? They want to extend a kind of social control to the farms of the country, and so there must be an assurance on the part of the farmer before he can get a hired hand under this program that the sanitary facilities are all right, I suppose there must be indoor plumbing instead of the kind I saw out on the farm when I was out there as a kid. There must be medical facilities, agreement about subsistence, about the amount of time that shall be worked, about prevailing wages, and that a board be appointed by the Secretary to pass on grievances.

Let us take this example. Here is a farmer with half a dozen hired hands. They get into a dispute with the farmer. They say they are not getting enough money, the conditions are not right. The farmer may want to dismiss them. He will not dismiss them under that program because Mr. Baldwin and the Farm Security Administration will step in and say, "Here, there is a grievance, and it is a bona fide grievance, so there must be a wage board to determine and dispose of this grievance, since you signed a contract with the F. S. A."

When in the name of common sense are they going to quit tying social reform to the problem of manpower when the country is faced with an emergency famine in some articles? When are they going to stop it?

They had a meeting over on the Senate side Saturday afternoon. If the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is here, he will bear me out. They called all this to the attention of the Farm Security Administration, so they are going to modify their contract with the farmers, they are going to modify this social program they are seeking to impose upon the land. But their modifications do not mean anything as long as Mr. Baldwin is administering the program, for why did he inject the Social Security into it to begin with? It is too much to believe that he will not get back to the social aspects of this proposal.

When the Arizona long-staple-cotton growers supplicated that group for help, they laid out before them four single-space typed pages that they had to sign and enter into as a contract between them and the Farm Security Administration. They could not do it. They had to leave some of the long-staple cotton in the field, notwithstanding the fact that the military authorities were fairly praying for it because it filled a very necessary and critical use. So here is this social program.

The Secretary now has requested $65,075,000 for a recruitment program. You will notice in the language which came from the Budget Bureau that it speaks about an investigation of wage rates and all that sort of thing. It is seeking to translate and to apply the Fair Labor Standards Act to the farmers of the country. Then they wonder why the food program has bogged down and why we have an acute manpower problem.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CREAL. I have been listening a long time to hear the medicine prescribed. Is the gentleman in favor of lifting farm prices in general, taking the ceiling off?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Let me get to that directly. I want to prescribe the remedy as soon as I make the case.

Mr. CREAL. The gentleman can answer "Yes" or "No."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall prescribe the remedy as I see it.

Mr. CREAL. Is the gentleman opposed to the measure of adding all labor into the farm parity price? Is the gentleman in favor of or opposed to adding all labor in fixing the parity formula?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I am not in favor of going about it in that fashion. Why do we have to go into the back door in order to reach an objective? The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has a bill that is in the Committee on Rules at the present time, dealing with farm wage rates.

Mr. CREAL. One other question: Is the gentleman in favor of or opposed to the money incentive to produce more?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The incentive request that the Secretary made?

Mr. CREAL. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Absolutely. I was one of the six who voted to kill it, and 30 minutes later I said to the Secretary as he came in, "I am one of those who oppose this incentive idea, and I voted against it."

Mr. CREAL. You expressed an opinion on all remedies, and I am listening now for your remedy for the situation that we all agree on.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman anticipates me just a little. I will get to it directly if the gentleman will not take all my time.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Do you think we are at the place where maybe the farmer faces this danger, that he has got to go to a board and say, "I want a man," and they are going to tell him how much he will pay them; that he will work 40 hours a week and receive time and a half for overtime; that they must afford him certain facilities, afford him an automobile to go back and forth to town and a lot of other preposterous things? Do you think we are about at that place now?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Here is this request for $65,075,000, in which they say although there are 95 labor camps owned by the Government that can be used for this purpose, an additional 250 camps will be necessary, which are provided for under this estimate of appropriation. In other words, 250 labor centers are proposed to be established with that money, among other things, in addition to a big amount for administrative purposes and augmentation of the present pay roll.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. The Secretary of Agriculture spoke of giving the high-school boys and girls 3 weeks' training so that they can become farmers. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois knows that a high-school boy 17 years of age can be taken out and in 3 weeks' time taught mechanics, how to run these machines; he can become a good agronomist; an animal industry man who knows about the breeding of cattle and the farrowing of hogs; he can become a chemist, a botanist, and a veterinarian all in 3 weeks? Would that not be quite a problem?

Mr. DIRKSEN. He might not produce much on the farm, but he might qualify as a Government farmer down here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You were speaking about the extension of the social-control program. May I ask you this: When these men go to work on the farms, if these things go on, is it a part of the administration's program, as you understand it, to require the farmer to sign contracts establishing, for example, the union scale and the check-off?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, I do not know how far this is going to go, but the point I make is this: Here we are confronted with a critical food problem in the country and the authorities continue to think in terms of social control, when the farmers are seeking manpower to till the soil.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Have any of them suggested, if he goes on this 40- or 48-hour week, and if men are limited only to those who belong to the union, where the farmer is going to get the money? I remember they said the farmer could pay as high as $200, but they have never told us where he is going to get the $200.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; outside of the incentive Mr. Wickard uses. Now, he is not entirely blameless. He is a fine gentleman. You would not want a finer man to come and sit down at the table with you or to testify before a committee, but the difficulty is that I do not believe he has an over-all concept of this problem. When they were considering deferring essential workers in the poultry and livestock industry, it was Mr. Wickard who sanctioned the inclusion of the provision to stabilize farm wages. Why does that have to be done now? Why did he not stand up and speak his piece? Does he have to be guided around by all the social reformers down in the Department of Agriculture? If

he is going to do the job for the farmers, he ought to stand up and fight vigorously and resolutely with the Director of the War Manpower Commission, with the Director of the Stabilization Board, and with everybody until we get somewhere on this program because it is his responsibility if there is going to be an acute famine and starvation in the country, and I propose to say it to him.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Is it a matter of over-all concept or socialized contamination?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Maybe it is both. Now, here is something that I probably ought not say, but I am going to say it. I will probably be criticized for saying it, because I cannot prove it. But I understand that when they were considering the application of the Tydings amendment to the War Manpower Commission they actually had under discussion down there behind closed doors the possibility of including in the directives to the draft boards that if there was a request for a deferment they should consider, along with everything else, whether the farmer was paying a substandard wage. I know that it was discussed. I cannot bring you the printed document, unfortunately. If true, that does not leave Mr. McNutt blameless in the matter. What I want to know is when they are going to stop injecting this note of constant social reform into a program that means full bellies and high morale and contentment of mind for the American people when we expect the most of them in the prosecution of the war effort.

Mr. RAMEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. On the small grape-growing islands of Lake Erie all the boys were taken off the islands because the ruling was that the raising of grapes was not agriculture, because some were used to make wine. The boys were taken off the islands and girls were brought from Marblehead Peninsula, and for each girl there were three or four inspectors called social engineers. In view of the fact that they rebelled against the social engineers, they fined the little boat that carried the grapes, because they said that the little boat that contained five or six men was not equipped like an ocean liner.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must go on.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman constantly uses the phrase "social reform." What he means is regimentation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, definitely.

Mr. DIES. Then why do you not use that language?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is what it is.

Mr. DIES. There is no reform to it; it is just regimentation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, they are just trying to reform the farm structure of the country and bring it to heel. Here is a quotation from the December 15 issue of Victory, the Government's official magazine. It contains the title "Crop Units To Guide Farm Deferment." It is a strange thing. You have got to make 18 points in order to get deferment. The farmer who grows artichokes, hops, cantaloups, watermelons, and that sort of thing is just out of luck. Those are pointless items. For instance, if you have 12 head of milk cattle, you get 1 point; if they are feed cattle, it takes 20 to give you 1 point. It takes 600 broiler chickens to give you 1 point, but if they are egg-laying chickens, only 75 will get you 1 point. Twenty hogs are equal to 1 point, or 40 turkeys will get you 1 point.

Mr. DIES. What about goats?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There are no goats on here so far as I can see.

Here are distinctions between corn and edible beans, rice, broomcorn, green peas, sweet corn. Of that 5 acres will give you a point as against barley, wheat, and grain sorghums where you need 15 acres to get a point; and so on. A member of the draft board has to be a combination cost accountant, lawyer, and mathematician, and be extremely versatile to work out deferment for a farmer of draft age.

Is that the way it ought to be done? Here is the author of the Selective Service Act [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I am sure I speak with his approval when I say he never had in mind any such silly program as that. Is it not against the American system and the original plan of having one's neighbors decide? Here comes a young man and says he has 120 acres, 40 in corn, 60 in wheat, 20 in pasture, that he has so many cattle, so many milk cows. Do they need this kind of nonsensical stuff to enable a draft board to determine whether such a man should be left on the land to produce the munition of food?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Selective Service System was getting along pretty well until another agency more recently created was put in general charge of the policy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That agency is the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. They were getting along pretty well, I agree, until a new social slant was developed.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I should like to ask my friend from Illinois if the list he just held up for our edification——

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman means the point system for keeping a boy on the farm?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I want to know if that was furnished our draft boards back home before they had to pass on the cases of these boys?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, definitely.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Then I think some of us begin to have an understanding of the problem of our people back home. The home folks write us; we take it up with the System in Washington, and they say: "Why, it is all in the hands of your local draft board; they are handling it." After all, somebody has hamstrung, put in a strait jacket, the local draft boards back home so that they cannot do anything about it. I think it is high time the country was told what the facts are.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With all the conflicting directives that have been issued in one direction and another it has just become a labyrinth of confusion.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I served on the State Board of Appeals for the State of Pennsylvania for a year and a half. The gentleman has not any conception what a ridiculous formula they have given the draft boards to figure out why a man should be deferred. We just laughed at it; it was impossible to interpret; we could not figure it out, so we finally discarded it and went back to the old-fashioned American way of determining whether a man was producing farm stuff in sufficient quantities to keep him on the farm. The arithmetic they presented to us, as an average American, I could not understand.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to my friend that before long a member of a draft board will have to have a good working knowledge of logarithms, differential calculus, the squaring of the circle, and the fourth dimension, if more directives are hurled at them.

Mr. KLEBERG. We shall have to send them to Harvard for a while before they take up their duties as members of draft boards.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. When we approved the taking of women into the Army, we were told they were to replace Army men doing desk work, stenographers, messengers; and so on, to release more manpower for the Army.

I just learned that we already have 18,000 WAAC's in various colleges, and perhaps are going to send 40,000 more to college, so we have not gained anything in manpower there; we are nothing ahead. Also, I understand the recent plan is to take 400,000 of these draftees and give them 13 weeks basic training and then give them a long course in the colleges of the country. I do not know where our manpower is going.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The burden of what I want to say is that there are so many inconsistencies, such a failure to have an over-all concept of this manpower problem, and such a failure to develop some kind of area of agreement between the War Manpower Commission and the Department of Agriculture on the one hand and the Department of Agriculture and the armed services on the other that there is confusion even now in the very midst of the crisis.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Why do not we as a Congress here, instead of going through all this talk, have about two or three hundred of us go over and see the Secretary of Agriculture and let him know what we are talking about and demand

that he get rid of this particular group of bureaucrats who are trying to jam this stuff down our throats?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it is better to have the Secretary of Agriculture come over here to the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. GAVIN. Then get him over here and get all the theorists who are conceiving these ideas over here to listen to what we are talking about. The American farmer today wants to be relieved from the restrictions and regulations and regimentations that have been strangling him to a point of utter exhaustion. Remove the shackles from the American farmer. He wants to go on his own, and all he asks is a fair price for his product and refuses to go on the charity list of the Federal Government.

Unless the irons are taken off him and he receives the friendly cooperation of our Government in the way of farm equipment, consideration of his labor problems and fair prices for his production, the American people face a serious food shortage. Turn the farmer loose, give him an even break and there will be no question as to his ability to produce the foodstuffs in this all-out effort of America to win the war.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. From whom do the local draft boards receive the directions to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. From the Selective Service System headquarters here in Washington.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Until recently they were received from General Hershey, I believe.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Has that been changed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. General Hershey has not been changed, but the Executive order of December 5, 1942, has made the Selective Service System a component in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. But up until recently the Army fixed these directions to the local board?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Mr. Hershey was the Director, and now he has a boss.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Now he may be influenced by this intervening influence to which the gentleman referred, but he still approves and issues the orders, does he not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right, but he has a boss, let us not forget. Mr. McNutt is the Director of the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I doubt that Mr. Hershey can be bossed, if the gentleman will excuse me for saying that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Maybe not. I do not quarrel with that. I am just giving you the organizational set-up.

Just a word or two about machinery. I said the first thing you have to have is manpower. The second thing you must have on a farm is machinery if you are going to produce. First, you have to plow the soil, and you must have plows. There must be disks. There must be harrows. After awhile the crop must be tilled and there must be cultivators. After awhile it must be harvested and there must be corn pickers, there must be tractors, there must be trucks, there must be animal power. All those things that are necessary on a farm today indicate that farming is a mechanized business.

They made a survey of the State of New York. It was a farm-by-farm survey made by the country war boards. When they got through they found that the New York farmers had requested 194,000 pieces of equipment. How many are they going to get? As far as I know, their quota will be about 18,000 farm implements.

I had reference here recently to some folks at home in business who are trying to stimulate egg production and chicken production. Maybe it is not generally known, but you can take a case of eggs and in 16 weeks you can convert it into a thousand pounds of succulent, yellow-legged broilers, but you must have brooder stoves. When they tried to get brooder stoves from the manufacturers they could not get them. The reason is that the War Production Board has not allowed any material for the manufacture of such brooder stoves.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I had a special order myself to follow the gentleman from Illinois, and I should like to get started some time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall try to conclude this very quickly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not going to object to this request.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, about 30 minutes ago the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] asked the gentleman a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I am coming to that.

Mr. KEFAUVER. He asked the gentleman what his revenue was. The gentleman has consumed 30 minutes since then and has not yet answered the question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wanted to develop the whole picture.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I should like to know what the procedure is now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has asked unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One other thing about machinery. Let me say to you that probably 10 percent of the soybeans in Illinois are still in the field. One cause is weather; the other cause is that they could not get the machinery to get them out.

Here is one other statement from the chairman of the Citizens for Victory Chapter in South Dakota who wrote the gentleman from South Dakota, FRANCIS CASE, a Member of this House, and said:

> Our farm-machinery quota is 53 percent. It should be 153 percent.

So there is this question of manpower. There is this question of machinery. Finally there is this question of prices. We have been going around in circles, talking about incentive payments, talking about removing the penalty on wheat, talking about removing the market restrictions on peanuts in H. R. 1605, that languished on this floor for several days, taking every kind of a back-door approach to the problem, when, as a matter of fact, from a price standpoint, if you will pay the farmer a proper price, without all these lures, without all these devices, that price will be enough incentive for him to go along and to address himself with vigor and resolution to the cause of producing war crops.

And now the program.

Mr. DIES. Tell us what the gentleman thinks can be done without resorting to regimentation and socialistic schemes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First of all, we can utilize all the tillable land in the country. We can take off the restrictions if there is going to be hunger and a food shortage, and say, "Here is God's own soil. It needs only rain and sunshine and the devotion of the rugged hands of the farmer to make it produce, to make it full of the promise of full bellies for the people of the country." So, No. 1 is to rearrange this program during the duration so that we utilize our land.

Mr. DIES. In the case of cotton, where there is such a great surplus, would the gentleman remove the quota and let the farmer start producing cotton as much as he may?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, the gentleman forgets that neither the Secretary of Agriculture nor anybody else has asked for an expansion of cotton, because it is not a war crop; it is not edible.

Mr. DIES. Then, on what crops should the quotas be reduced?

Mr. DIRKSEN. On wheat, rice, corn, sugar, all foods, all fibers and all feeds.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KLEBERG. My friend should know, with reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Texas, that cotton is the highest protein-producing crop in this Nation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is speaking of the seed.

Mr. KLEBERG. Certainly, and if you are going to have the beef and milk you had better remember that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Now, on the question of manpower, why do they not give effect to the Tydings amendment? Why do they not defer these agricultural workers, where a body of citizens, in the form of a draft board, says they are doing a job in an essential pursuit, and leave them there without all this folderol and nonsense?

Finally, why do we not adopt some of the European system, where, when a man is in the army and there is a crop ripened, bring him home for 3 or 4 weeks and let him harvest the crop in the field? Or send him home for a couple of weeks in the spring so that he can address himself to the job of planting and seeding? There is no program for furloughs today. As for deferments, it has not worked properly, for otherwise we would not have this controversy over manpower today. The Secretary of Agriculture himself has not been bold enough to indicate to us that he has resolved that problem anywhere on a formal basis of understanding with the other agencies of Government, such as the Army, the Navy, and the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is very good to see the gentleman following the suggestions made by the administration. I had understood that most of the quotas on food products had been lifted. Also I notice the President's plan to enable the farmers to have the services of soldier boys.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Well, the President said so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, you ought to read the President's language. He says 1 or 2 days at a time. How are they going to do planting in 1 or 2 days? You read the President's language.

Now, on machinery, why can there not be made a recheck on the inventories on machinery, a recheck of the whole steel program, in the hope that there can be an increase in the quotas on various types of machines that are necessary to till the soil? There is no evidence that an understanding has been reached with the War Production Board with respect to an increase in the quota on agricultural machinery.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Especially in repair parts. That is the most essential thing right now, and it will take less steel, and it will give them the repairs for their machinery. If you will give us repairs for the machinery, we will get along pretty good.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now let us quit a lot of this back-door approach like we have had in the form of these little bills that we have had before the House recently, and let us get these prices up to parity. It does not make any difference what the price of pork chops is if there are no pork chops. That is the problem that is before the Congress and the administration at the present time.

Finally, why not get a tough food czar? We asked Mr. Baruch to bring in a report on rubber—why not similar treatment for food? I am sorry to say I do not believe Mr. Wickard is going to get tough with Donald Nelson or with McNutt, or with the Army and the Navy. I think we need some kind of a food czar; somebody who will stand up and see his job in a crusading light and evaluate agriculture as industry that is identified with the production of a munition of war, and, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] says, then we will get somewhere. But I see no evidence disclosed in the conversations I have had with Mr. Wickard before the committee to indicate that he is going to do that job.

Finally, it is about time we are thinking a little about the food processing and distribution business. A head of cabbage in the field is just a head of cabbage until you put it on the consumer's table. That is one part of this problem that has received no attention at all. But if it does not receive any more attention than it has had in recent days, then Congress will certainly have to take the bit in its teeth. To recapitulate, let us utilize our land, let us solve this manpower problem with deferments and with furloughs in planting time and harvesting time. Let us recheck the whole machinery program and get more machinery for the farmers.

Let us fix the price somewhere close to the farmer so you do not have to hand him a lure in the form of a $125,000,000 subsidy. Parity prices will give him production cost and do the job. Then we will not need a lot of these piecemeal suggestions that have come along for the solution of this problem. The time is now. When you go back home and you find that folks are pretty short on rations you are going to hear about it. It is our responsibility after all. We created the Department of Agriculture; we supply the funds; it is our responsibility to carry through and see that the job of producing food is done.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. We provided for parity price on farm products, but how can we have a parity price if somebody in the administration insists in putting a freeze on it, for instance in the case of corn, and saying that we cannot get a price that is anywhere near parity?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a complicated and difficult problem, but I am persuaded that O. P A. has done an illegal thing, has directly violated the intent of Congress when it blocked the price of corn at 88 cents on the farm, which means $1 on the Chicago market.

Mr. ARENDS. And at the same time taking money out of the pockets of the taxpayers to make up the difference when the whole thing should be taken care of without difficulty by a free play of the law of supply and demand.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If we had a tough food czar who would say to O. P. A. Director Brown, who would say to Coordinator Byrnes, who would say to everybody who had any authority in this field of food production and distribution that we had to have manpower and a fair price, he would finally bring order out of chaos and give us a plan predicated upon the instrumentalities that we have and the quantities that we need.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. The gentleman has ridiculed with great effect, supported by able gentlemen who interrupted him to ask questions but who simply added to his argument, some of the President's suggestions of things that he thought would contribute to relieve this condition. The President in no sense claimed they would be a total remedy. He pointed, for instance, to the use of children, but the idea was ridiculed, asking how they could learn to handle intricate machinery in 2 or 3 weeks. The gentleman knows that children can do all sorts of difficult things and I am sure he will admit that there are many things that an intelligent child, raised on the farm, can do and do well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, very definitely. My friend is in error when he states that I ridiculed the idea.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. It seems to me that the gentleman from Illinois and the very able gentleman who interrupted him ridiculed the idea.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My statement was that that was not the solution.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Another suggestion the President put forward and put into effect was the use of the soldiers. The President did not say that that would solve the difficult problem but merely that it would be a help toward solution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All these makeshifts merely postpone the inevitable; that is all. Let me remind you that you cannot argue with hunger. It is our solemn responsibility as elected tribunes of the people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial and a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks, and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] for 10 minutes.

### FOOD

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I can readily see why the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is particularly disturbed about this matter of food, particularly so as the few remarks I expect to make this afternoon will indicate why he should feel more

than the average Member of Congress, with the possible exception of the Representatives from the State of Iowa, that this food problem is a real problem. Today I particularly wish to call attention to the fact that Chicago is the food capital of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of food in its relation to war is receiving more attention each day. In these days of particular interest in food production, it is well worth our attention to realize where the great bulk of the food of our country is really produced. A few States surrounding Chicago contribute a very large percentage of the food of our Nation.

Official reports of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture, which I have studied, show that in 1941 Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Michigan furnished over one-third of the milk produced in our country. Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin produced over 42 percent of the creamery butter; Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana produced over 62 percent of the American cheese of the Nation; and Wisconsin, alone, produced over 11 percent of the milk of the Nation.

Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, and Minnesota produced over 53 percent of the pork of the Nation and Iowa, alone, produced over 20 percent of this pork.

Illinois, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska produced over 36 percent of the beef and veal of the Nation and Iowa, alone, produced nearly one-tenth of the Nation's supply.

Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Ohio produced over 25 percent of the chickens and over 28 percent of the eggs of the Nation.

Illinois and Iowa, alone, sell over 55 percent of the corn that goes into manufactured corn products and produce practically one-third of the corn, in bushels, grown in the entire Nation.

Kansas and North Dakota produce over one-third the wheat of the Nation and Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and South Dakota produce an additional 15 percent of the national production. Illinois and Iowa produce nearly a third of the oats and Minnesota, North Dakota, and Nebraska produce over one-third of the barley of the United States.

Minnesota, Iowa, and North Dakota produce over 70 percent of the flax of the country and Minnesota, alone, produces over 47 percent of the flax of the Nation. Illinois, alone, produced 46 percent of the soybeans and with Iowa, Indiana, and Ohio produced over 87 percent of the soybeans of the Nation.

As to farm income, Iowa, from sales from farms, is 7.90 percent; Illinois is 6.17 percent; Minnesota is 4.54 percent; Ohio, 3.86 percent; or a total of 22.47 percent in these four States, with Iowa alone representing nearly one-twelfth of the farm income of the Nation. Iowa, though only 56,147 square miles in area in comparison with other States with over 250,000 square miles, has the largest sales from farms of any State in the Nation.

When you realize that this one State has only 20,000,000 acres of cropland out of the total 341,000,000 acres in the United States, the importance of this one State, in food production, is readily appreciated. My purpose in calling your attention to the facts are twofold.

First. If food is to be produced to feed our armed forces; to feed ourselves, which we have not done for many years; to furnish food to fulfill our lease-lend commitments, and to feed those falling behind our lines as well as occupied countries; we must get this accomplished where they have the land and the productive and fertile soil to accomplish it. If we want coal, we go to the coal-producing areas, and if we want food we must recognize the areas that can produce it.

Second. In talking of manpower, transportation, farm machinery, equipment, and other requisites for more production, we must appreciate the area that can furnish the production. We cannot let any productive acres lie idle. We must provide the priorities necessary to make these acres produce their maximum, or we will not provide the amounts of food that must be produced.

The great Midwest, with the greatest area of rich, fertile, and productive land in the world, is the food hope of this same world today. Many States do not produce enough food for their own populations. The Midwest has never, in history, had the agricultural responsibility it has today. Since Iowa alone is reputed to have 25 percent of the A No. 1 farm land in America, you can readily see that a rather large percentage of the best land in America is within confines of this area. Chicago can most assuredly be termed the food capital of the world.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I rise to compliment the gentleman for bringing in these figures, following the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. Here is your food basket, and intermingled with that food basket we are placing these defense orders and building these unbelievable defense plants, and this is pulling the men off the farms into the factories. New York City has already admitted, through its financial interests, that New York has ceased to be the financial center of the world. It is moving to the Central West, because your tens of millions of dollars in defense money is being spent by the people out there. All you need to do is to study the increase in demand deposits and savings and time deposits of the people in those areas, and so you have the conflicting forces of the building of war machines running contrary to the production of food. The gentleman is making an important contribution, showing where the principal portion of the food produced in this country must come from, because there is the soil and the fertility, and that is where they need the farm labor.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observation, because I have seen that becoming more serious each day. As every new plant comes in, the impact is just that much more, so far as manpower is concerned in respect to the farm. There is one point that we little realize, and that is the small number of farmers who actually contribute to the great production of food. We do not realize the small number that do this. I dare say there are not more than 50,000 farmers who produce the cheese of this Nation. We do not have to take very many of those men from the cheese-producing farms to have an effect upon the market.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is correct about these farmers who actually produce the food for export, the ones who are producing it on the farms, who shove the food into the market.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for his contribution following that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I ask him whether he has figures to bear out those statements that in Iowa and other States there is produced more food that any other section of the country. Notwithstanding that, Iowa has had more voluntary enlistments than from other parts of the country. In spite of that, the draft boards of each community, when they get monthly calls to supply more men, still have to go to the farms, and take more and more off the farms. And that is the cause of the farm labor shortage today. Has the gentleman any figures to bear that out?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; I would not have any knowledge of what is happening in any one of the particular States.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. My district is right in the Midwest, in Iowa, in a farming district, and I have letters from the draft boards.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Any State that is producing 10 percent of the beef or 20 percent of the pork and 7 percent of the eggs must naturally feel the effects of a shortage of farm labor. There are only 12 States like Iowa needed to produce as it does; if you are going to keep someone milking, and someone plowing, you had better be keeping them in the Midwest.

Mr. DIES. But does not the gentleman realize that he gets his cottonseed from the State of Texas?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Oh, I live in a district where we do not get any of that seed from Texas. We produce a great quantity of hay there, and use oil meal for protein feed for our livestock.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. When I was home I talked to many farmers about this labor proposition, and I asked them whether or not they could use city help, boys and men and women who had lived in the cities, and transplant them to the farms. They said, "No," that they had tried that and that they had had 6 weeks of it, and they cannot make farmers out of them. They have to have help that has been trained on the farm.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We have heard, and justly so, requests from the Democratic side for specific remedies for the farm labor problem. May I offer this suggestion. According to the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, we have approximately 3,000,000 civil service employees in the employ of the Government of the United States. If we could only have a manpower czar who could go into that problem and take one out of every six of these civil-service employees who are cluttering up today that pay roll and which pay roll exceeds the pay roll of the armed forces of the Nation, and put those five or six hundred thousand men into the Army, and take that equivalent number out of the Army who know something about farming, we would do a lot for keeping up production.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. And I would like to say further to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] that I was somewhat modest in what I said about the State of Wisconsin, so that no one would accuse me of demagoging, but I may say that the great State of Wisconsin produces more alfalfa hay than any State in that region, and that is why we do not have to buy any cottonseed meal from the State of Texas.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I was very much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] who made the critical statement about the great number of people on the public pay roll. Of course, the gentleman overlooks the fact that the great majority, or three-fourths of these, are working in the war effort.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Oh, no; the gentleman does not overlook anything. I still maintain we have far too many civil-service employees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. In any event, this question is such a broad one, of interest not only to the farmer but to the people in the cities, and also because it deals with furnishing food to people abroad who are suffering, contributions to it should be made on a broad scale rather than from a small, limited point of view. Does my friend agree with that statement?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to the majority leader that that is the only attitude I have tried to take on the matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know it; that is why I asked the gentleman that question.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If we are going into the sidelines, we will just end up out in the woods somewhere.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, this is a problem for the men and women of this country without regard to party to consider, having regard for all the factors that are necessary to win the war, so that we will do everything we can to help the farmer produce food, because that is one of the prime necessities of war, in my opinion.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If the majority leader reads these remarks I should like him to read them in the spirit that I am calling to his attention the places that we must produce that food, if we are going to have it for ourselves as well as for all other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say that I agree thoroughly with the statement of the majority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE PROBLEM OF FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Under those circumstances, I am not going to detain the House this evening except for a few minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman will yield, may I thank him for deferring. It was very gracious of him, and I am very grateful.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois. If I had had time to speak, there were some things in the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois that I wanted to comment upon and to discuss. But mainly I have here what I believe to be a constructive program for solution of our food-production problem. I agree it is probably our No. 1 problem today. But we can solve it. And we must. The remarks of the majority leader, just made, hit the nail squarely on the head. In my judgment, the problem of food production is, next to the military conduct of the war, the most important problem America has to face today. It breaks down into three or four parts. One of them is price, another is manpower, another is machinery, and another is the balance of production in order that we may secure these products which are most needed for the war and for our civilian needs.

In connection with this matter, a proper application of such statutes as the Soil Conservation Act can be used to increase the production of America rather than to decrease it. With the lifting of wheat quotas a further step in that direction has been taken. But when some Members have suggested that the whole Soil Conservation Act be repealed I believe they have not thought the matter through. I shall discuss this matter at some length in my later speech.

Now, the price to the farmer has to be as fair to him as the price to the manufacturer of airplanes or ships or guns is to him. We do not expect those manufacturers to produce at less than cost. We must not expect the farmers to do so, either.

We have a shortage of farm labor. On that problem I shall have some proposals to advance which I believe are constructive. Right now I wish to say but one thing in answer to the gentleman from Illinois: If it is necessary for the Government to take a hand in helping to furnish farm labor, then I disagree with the point of view generally expressed by the gentleman from Illinois, which, if I interpret it correctly, implies that the Government has no responsibility for seeing that the conditions of that labor are fair and just. I think it does have such a responsibility if the Government is going to move people into a particular job. As long as the contract is a free and open contract without governmental action, the situation is quite different.

Finally, I wanted to remind the House that we have had some good news from Tunisia this morning. I hope it is still good this evening. I hope that as time goes on it will be possible for us to consider all the things we do more and more under the influence of those great and tragic events that are taking place on the actual battlefields of the world. If you even go down here to the railroad station and see the girls saying good-bye to their husbands and sweethearts, it will give you an influence that we need day by day as we consider our business. These are times that ought to try men's souls and make us very, very much in earnest about all we do.

On Monday, or whenever I get a good chance, I am going to discuss this food production and farm problem, and I am going to discuss it quite freely. Some things I know need correction. Some of them need it very much, indeed. But I am going to also point out some of the constructive measures that can be taken, for the time is past for my viewing with alarm. Much more than that is required of us.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CREAL. While this record is being made concerning the farm question, may I say that while we have heard lots of complaints, most of which I agree with, and I could go further and make more, I do not find myself in agreement with every one of the complaints made by the gentleman from Illinois. I condemn this socialistic tendency, but I am going to offer a remedy. I am for the incentive payment; I am for the inclusion of all labor in the parity formula; I am for a more liberal extension of draft exemptions; I am for deferment of a man if he is big enough in agriculture, or for taking him out of the Army and sending him back home; and I am for a compulsory furnishing program for machinery parts. If that does not make enough program, if anybody else has anything to offer they have all day tomorrow to offer it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say to the gentleman that every one of the points made by him, with one excep-

tion, is in the speech I intended to make this afternoon and which I shall make at the first opportunity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

THE MANPOWER PROBLEM

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota and I engaged in a little debate a few minutes ago about what the people on the Federal pay roll are doing. He said in a very loose way, which characterizes a great deal of the criticism of bureaucracy in government, that you can take 1,000,000 or a large number of men off the Federal pay roll.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman will yield, I believe I stated one out of every six men.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman stated five or six hundred thousand. Anyway, the RECORD will show it.

I have already put in the RECORD today as an extension of remarks an analysis that has been made of just what the civilians on the Federal pay roll do. Later on I am going to get a fuller analysis, but in November 1942 there were 2,750,101 civilian employees on the Federal pay roll. Of those, according to the analysis prepared by Dr. Frank Prescott, who is head of the department of government of the University of Chattanooga, 400,000 civilians in Federal employment were engaged in the task of civilian administration of the war effort. A total of 1,612,256 are used in the operation of the navy yards scattered from Kittery, Maine, to Bremerton, Wash.; Federal arsenals at Watertown, Frankfort, and Rock Island. They build ships, make guns, and do other work that anybody else in a defense factory would do, which is, of course, necessary in the war effort.

Also if you call an employee of the Federal Government a bureaucrat, then you find yourself including letter-carriers, tax clerks, draftsmen, engineers, employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority. They are all covered on the Government pay roll, yet they are building dams, making munitions, working in arsenals, and contributing a very substantial amount to the war effort of our Nation, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] must know.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Is it not true also that a very considerable number of people are actually working in the armed services of supply? In the most essential type of work in the war effort? They are civilian employees.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is true. I understand it is close to 900,000 men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does the gentleman not agree with me that you could go into this Government of ours today—this great civil service that we have today—and take one out of every six men and remove him with benefit both to our Nation and to our armed forces and to our farm labor?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I want to say to the gentleman that I think on the whole the Government handles its employees about as well as private business does. I think that the habit we have gotten into of criticizing and castigating everybody that works for the Government is having a very bad effect, and it certainly is not justified.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Do you feel that it is right today that our civil-service employees' total pay roll should equal or approximate that of the armed services of America?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not know how the total pay roll compares to that of the armed services. I will say I know of men who are working as engineers for the Tennessee Valley Authority, whom I know have been offered four or five times the amount they are making working for the Government. You know men working for the War Production Board, for instance, Mr. Wilson, who made $140,000 a year, yet he works for the Government for $9,500. On the whole, considering the demand in private industry, the salaries paid Government employees is modest and in line.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Regarding these attacks that are made on bureaucracy, of course, we must have department bureaus in order to operate the Government anyway.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We always have had them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, there can be excessive bureaucracy and I assume that is what they have in mind, but during wartimes we must have more centralized activities than in normal times in order to win the war.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is certainly correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. The War Production Board is composed of substantial men in their community life, men who were connected with substantial businesses. They have come here for patriotic purposes to help our country out in this time of war.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Whether the dollar a year is right or wrong we will not discuss, but these attacks are made upon men of that type.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; and I may say that I think it must have had a very bad effect upon the morale of those fine men from both political parties, men who came here to give the very best efforts, to have some men get up on the floor every day and make blanket accusations against people working for the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Our last crop year up until now was adequate and very successful in feeding our own people and the world, was it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It was the peak production of the United States in the history of this country, I am advised.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. And what we are talking about is the evil prophecies of the gentleman over there about the future?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Something that has not happened as yet, yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. We are condemning largely in these talks what is in front of us, with a glorious record behind us?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is exactly right and it is interesting to see a lot of criticism when our record has been so good. We can all criticize, but very few constructive suggestions are offered.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to say that for all these difficulties there is constructive correction, and if there be anything in what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has said, we have already authorized the Civil Service Committee of the House, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], to make a scientific study of the Government departments for that need.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. They will determine whether there is any chance to prune personnel, and if there is, I am certain it will be done.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure it will be.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think there is no question about it that many agencies of the Government are working well and plenty of overtime in attempting to do a good job. Very often we find that the reason why they do not do a good job is because of an incapable administrator over them, and we find certain points of criticism. I am reminded of the experience of a good friend of mine who is also known to my colleague from California who took a job in an agency of the Army. There were 2,600 employees in this particular organization in a city other than

Washington. He very soon found that either the administration of that particular section of this agency was very badly handled or they were trying to pad the pay rolls; he was not sure which, because he found that he only had on an average of an hour and a half's work to do a day for a man of his ability, and so he resigned and left feeling that he had made a mistake in going there in trying to serve the Government in that capacity. There are cases like that; I hope there are not many of them; and I think that in Washington most of the agencies of the Federal Government are really working overtime and trying to do a good job.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I agree with the gentleman. He takes a very fair and correct viewpoint about the matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate very much the constructive suggestion the gentleman from California has made. If you take any large organization, certainly one as large as the executive branch of the Federal Government, you are going to have dozens of little aggravating incidents which may look like things not being done right. You parade those little instances before the Nation and the people might be inclined to think the incident is typical of the whole Federal executive department; whereas, as a matter of fact, I think most of us will agree with the gentleman from California that on the whole these men and women in the executive departments are working hard, putting in a lot of overtime work on Saturdays and Sundays and that they are not overly compensated.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would not condemn the whole crowd for the faults of a few.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Many Members on the gentleman's side, I will say to the gentleman, do not. I am glad he takes a very fair attitude about it. This is typical of the gentleman's sense of fairness.

Let me say further that 3 years ago the whole War Department was in the Munitions Building. Now it occupies the entire Pentagon Building, the new Munitions Building, and many others. This expansion has been necessary because of the war; they have had to grow and grow rapidly. The Army has increased 30 or 40 times in size in 3 years. There may be instances where there is poor management, but I do not think any private enterprise in the United States could have expanded to the extent the War and Navy Departments have without making similar mistakes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I respect my colleague very much and I do not want him to go on record—and I do not think he wants to go on record—as saying that the Congress of the United States, of which he is a part, does not have the responsibility of seeing that the nonessentials in government are weeded out.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course I do not; and I did not say that.

Mr. JENSEN. No; and I am sure the gentleman does not want to leave that impression, as most people would infer from his speech as they read it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not think most people would. I think if the people had all the facts there would be less grumbling about bureaucracy.

Mr. JENSEN. I believe the gentleman realizes that we do have a lot of lost motion and that we are spending quite a little money that is not necessary in this dual Government of ours where they have set up bureaus and spent money so extravagantly.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further to the gentleman. There has been, of course, a lot of lost motion and a lot of needless expenditure. This we regret, but I am sure these conditions are being ironed out and remedied.

Mr. JENSEN. And I hope the gentleman is going to help.

Mr. KEFAUVER. What I will say is that, considering the enormity of the job on hand and the success that has so far been accomplished, the Federal Government has done a splendid job.

Mr. JENSEN. And the gentleman is going to assist in every way he can to help cut down those nonwar expenditures, I am sure.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am going to assist in keeping down any expenditures I do not believe to be necessary or proper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from a local newspaper in my district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

### THE MANPOWER PROBLEM

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is there not some misunderstanding about this criticism of the bureaucracy in this respect, that the critics of bureaucracy have in mind not altogether the matter of the numbers that are employed by the Federal Government but the relative need of private industry as compared with that of the Government?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely right. I want to convey to my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], that I am sorry that he takes it as an attack upon bureaucracy simply because I stand up here and back up the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in answering the query from the majority as to some specific suggestions as to how we can help solve the manpower situation and help to secure farm labor so badly needed.

As one of the few men in the House whose profession is farming, I still believe I am right in my statement that a good man armed with the proper authority could go into this vast civil-service system of ours and separate therefrom 1 out of every 6 without harming the war effort in the least, and send those approximately 500,000 men into the armed services, thereby giving an opportunity for an equal 500,000 men skilled in the art of farming to go back and help produce the food the Nation must have to win this war. If that is an attack upon bureaucracy, I have no apologies to make whatsoever. Too much bureaucracy represents creeping paralysis unless checked in time.

Mr. Speaker, I quote herewith, in support of my statements concerning the number of civil-service employees now on the pay roll, from the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1944, on page 852, as follows, and from the statement of Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, Civil Service Commissioner:

ESTIMATES AND ACTUAL GROWTH OF PERSONNEL IN FEDERAL SERVICE

Mr. FLEMMING. On page 12 of the justifications, you will notice that we estimate the number of employees in the Federal Government by July 1, 1943, will be 2,972,000. I have a chart on that that I would also like to discuss with the committee.

If you will take this chart, you will notice that the actual number in the Federal service at the beginning of the present fiscal year was 2,206,000. The actual number in the Federal service on November 30 was 2,750,000. The actual number in the Federal service on July 1, 1943, if the rate of growth through November 30 is maintained during the remaining 7 months, will be 3,510,000.

Our estimates are based on the fact that, at the time they were prepared, we believed that the total number in the Federal service on July 1, 1943, would be 2,972,000. Obviously it is going to be larger than that. If the present rate of growth were maintained during the rest of the fiscal year, it would reach 3,500,000 by July 1. But I am not saying that it is going up to 3,500,000. It is, however, going to be somewhere in between 2,900,000 and 3,500,000. Just what the figure will be it is very difficult to predict, of course, at the present time.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. O'TOOLE (at the request of Mr. GAVAGAN), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. STEWART, for the week of March 1, on account of important business.

To Mr. DAVIS, for the week of March 1, on account of official business.

### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 158. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit

consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Charles F. Kegel;

S. 304. An act for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps;

S. 305. An act for the relief of Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps;

S. 306. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as a result of the disaster at the East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941;

S. 418. An act for the relief of Howard M. Sandus; and

S. 493. An act for the relief of Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 25, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

### COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, March 4, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 134, to provide for the suspension, during the war, of operating-differential subsidy agreements, and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

The committee will also hold a public hearing on Thursday, March 18, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1361 (Mr. LANE) and H. R. 1409 (Mr. FOGARTY), conferring upon men in the merchant marine the same rights, privileges, and benefits accruing to those serving in the armed forces; and on H. R. 1858, to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine who served during the World War as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who served during such war.

### COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, March 9, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on H. R. 1880, a bill providing for the construction of a ship canal across the State of New Jersey, connecting New York Bay with the Delaware River, and forming the last link in the Intracoastal Waterway from Boston to the Mexican border.

### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, March 16, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 149.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

204. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the payment of certain travel costs of dependents on a mileage basis in order to promote efficiency and economy in such payments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

205. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to permit the shipment tax-free of certain tobacco products to territories of the United States for the use of members of the military and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

206. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for special assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 901. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider certain claims arising after January 1, 1926, out of the Tariff Act of 1922; without amendment (Rept. No. 157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 1975. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1912. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States as students at educational institutions and other places"; without amendment (Rept. No. 171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1291. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1296. A bill to amend sections 347 (b) and 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940 by extending the periods within which petitions for naturalization filed prior to the effective date of that act may be heard, and to extend for a period of 4 years the time within which certain citizens must return to the United States as evidence of the fact that they have elected to become American citizens, respectively; without amendment (Rept. No. 173). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1573. A bill relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 338. A bill to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to purchase and improve the electric light and power system of the Anchorage Light & Power Co., Inc., an Alaska corporation, and for such purpose to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed $1,250,000 in excess of present statutory debt limits; without amendment (Rept. No. 175). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1284. A bill relating to the naturalization of persons not citizens who serve honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war; without amendment (Rept. No. 176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1941. A bill permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 332. A bill to revise the Alaska game laws; with amendment (Rept. No. 178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 171. An act for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke; without amendment (Rept. No. 150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 173. An act for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann; without amendment (Rept. No. 151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 405. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ernestine Fuselier Sigler; without amendment (Rept. No. 152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 517. An act for the relief of Vodie Jackson; without amendment (Rept. No. 153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. S. 518. An act for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom Turpin; without amendment (Rept. No. 154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 243. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Bolinross Chemical Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 553. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee; with amendment (Rept. No. 156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1081. A bill for the relief of Frank Borah; without amendment (Rept. No. 158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1238. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charles J. Bair; with amendment (Rept. No. 159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1315. A bill for the relief of George Henry Bartole; with amendment (Rept. No. 160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1413. A bill for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1522. A bill for the relief of Morton Fiedler; with amendment (Rept. No. 162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of Arthur G. Klein; without amendment (Rept. No. 163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1814. A bill for the relief of Harold Byrne; without amendment (Rept. No. 164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1838. A bill for the relief of Lucia Humble; with amendment (Rept. No. 165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1845. A bill for the relief of the estate of Ted Vaughan, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1874. A bill for the relief of Robert P. Sick; with amendment (Rept. No. 167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1875. A bill for the relief of Carl Swanson, Geraldine Cecilia Swanson, a minor, and Almer Swanson; without amendment (Rept. No. 168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1893. A bill for the relief of George H. Crow; without amendment (Rept. No. 169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 1976. A bill relating to the importation, manufacture, sale, or possession within the State of Minnesota of certain nonintoxicating beverages; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 1977. A bill for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to July 1, 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 1978. A bill providing for the issuance of appropriate insignia to rejected or deferred registrants for military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 1979 (by request). A bill to provide that members of the armed forces who served on vessels in Germany or Austria-Hungary during the period from November 12, 1918, to July 11, 1923, shall be entitled to receive an Army of Occupation of Germany Medal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1980. A bill to permit the filing of certain claims for disability benefits under Government insurance policies; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1981. A bill to amend section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 1982. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUYER:

H. Res. 135. Resolution making H. R. 351 a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation to speed up the manufacturing of synthetic rubber; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to determine the identity of dual citizenship in any other country and prohibit such citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security relative to school teachers and county, city, and State employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States enforcing and carrying out House bill 6999 of the Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Selective Service Act creating a national pool for manpower; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 1983. A bill granting a pension to Josie Fisher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 1984. A bill for the relief of Paul Barrere; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 1985. A bill granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 1986. A bill for the relief of W. E. Cary; to the Committee on Claims.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

180. By Mr. ANGELL: House Joint Memorial No. 3 of the Oregon State Legislature; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

181. By Mr. GWYNNE: Photostatic copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8 of the Iowa State Senate, asking for an investigation of the supply and distribution of oil meal, cottonseed meal, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

182. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Olympia Council No. 394, Knights of Columbus, Flushing, N. Y., recording its unanimous opposition to the registration of womanhood of our country; and to the draft, involuntary or voluntary for industry or the armed forces or for any other purpose; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

183. By Mr. MOTT: House Joint Memorial No. 3 of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, the Senate jointly concurring therein, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as will lead to the adequate reimbursement of the State of Oregon and its political subdivisions and governmental agencies for the revenue derived from the taxes upon the real property so acquired by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

184. By Mrs. NORTON: Senate joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose any legislation transferring to the Federal Government the administration of unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

185. By Mr. SUNDSTROM: Joint resolution of the Senate of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose any legislation transferring to the Federal Government the administration of unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

186. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Puerto Rico Civil Service Commission, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to its resolution to express the solidarity and endorsement of the Civil Service Commission to the declaration of rights and petition of justice; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God and Father of us all, amid the maddening maze of things that fill our toiling days with fever and fret we would tarry now in the shelter of Thy shadowing wings. At the inn of the morning we wait for Thee, O Guide and Guardian of our pilgrim way. We need Thy presence every passing hour whether the road be starred with flowers or stabbed with thorns. As we trudge along the path our feet must tread may our eyes be lifted up from the ground beneath them to the eternal hills of peace and power, whence cometh our help. Forgive us that so often we go in the poverty of spiritual rags when we could claim the golden gifts of Thy grace.

We would stay for this moment the noisy shuttle of time that we may catch a revealing glimpse of the larger pattern it is weaving. Tune our tangled lives to the harmony of Thy purpose. Make of our hurrying years a tapestry of beauty. Before evening comes and our work is done, may our glad eyes yet see some victory of liberty over tyranny, of righteousness over injustice, of brotherhood over ruthlessness, of virtue over evil, of peace over war, in our hearts, in our Nation, and in all the world. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 22, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 707) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 839. An act to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1670. An act to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended; and

H. R. 1692. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 158. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Charles F. Kegel;

S. 304. An act for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps;

S. 305. An act for the relief of Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps;

S. 306. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as a result of the disaster at the east base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941;

S. 418. An act for the relief of Howard M. Sandus; and

S. 493. An act for the relief of Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 7)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Post Office Department of $365,000 for printing and binding, fiscal year 1943 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CONTRACT FOR USE OF SILVER IN WAR PRODUCTION AS SUBSTITUTE FOR COPPER, ETC.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a contract entered into on May 6, 1942, by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Defense Plant Corporation for the purpose of permitting a quantity of silver to be used as a substitute for copper and other strategic materials in plants engaged in the war effort (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

COST ASCERTAINMENT REPORT, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Post Office Department cost ascertainment report, with an appendix, for the fiscal year 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

OIL AND GAS LEASES WHOSE INITIAL TERMS HAVE EXPIRED

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of oil and gas leases which by their terms would have expired in 1942 but by reason of their inclusion in approved unit plans are extended beyond their initial 20-year terms until the termination of such plans (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

MUSKINGUM (OHIO) FLOOD CONTROL SURVEY REPORT

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, report of a survey of the Muskingum watershed in Ohio, describing an investigation of a program of run-off and waterflow retardation and soil erosion prevention in aid of flood control (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ARCHIVES TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the chairman of the National Archives Trust Fund Board, submitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, relative to the moneys, securities, and other personal property received and held by it and its operations (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Library.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Department of the Treasury which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of Ramona Parlor No. 109, Native Sons of the Golden West, of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the formation of a Japanese unit of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Resolutions adopted by California Parlor, No. 247, of Los Angeles; Verdugo Parlor No. 240, of Glendale, and San Diego Parlor No. 208, of San Diego, all of the Native Daughters of the Golden West, in the State of California, protesting against the formation of a Japanese unit of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, favoring an appropriation to combat grasshoppers and other insect plagues; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See memorial printed in full when presented by Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ) on the 22d instant, p. 1178, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, favoring relief for dairymen and the dairy industry of New Mexico by raising the ceiling price on fluid milk or lowering the ceiling price on feed used in the dairy industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See memorial printed in full when presented by Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ) on the 22d instant, p. 1179, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the taking of immediate steps toward the production of synthetic rubber from farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GILLETTE on the 22d instant, p. 1176, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

"Senate Joint Memorial 8

"Joint memorial to the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the establishment at Great Falls or some other site in Montana of a suitable plant or other facilities for the recovery and production of sponge iron and other strategic minerals from the proven iron-ore deposits in Cascade, Judith Basin, Fergus, and Meagher Counties, Mont.

*"To the President of the United States and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"Whereas we are engaged in a war of survival, the duration of which effort is at the present time uncertain;

"Whereas public recognition has been given to the fact that the success of that effort is at present, jeopardized by the lack of sufficient iron and steel scrap to operate our steel mills at capacity;

"Whereas enormous deposits of high-grade low-prosphorus content iron ore do now, and for more than 50 years have been known to exist in Fergus, Judith Basin, Meagher, and Cascade Counties, Mont., suitable under modern metallurgical methods for the economic production of high-grade sponge iron; and

"Whereas sponge iron is a suitable and natural substitute for scrap; and

"Whereas natural gas and coal deposits in unlimited quantities are known to exist and are now being produced in areas immediately adjacent to said iron-ore deposits in ample quantities and with ample reserves to justify the erection of a necessary mill or mills for the production of not only sponge iron, but pig iron, and steel if deemed advisable; and

"Whereas the people of and industries in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Wyoming, Montana, South Dakota, North Dakota, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, and Alaska, have suffered industrial retardation directly affecting their standard of living from a lack of iron and steel products by virtue of exorbitant freight rates and the concentration of the iron and steel industry of the nation in the area tributory to the Great Lakes; and

"Whereas development contemplated hereby would provide homes, employment, and a better standard of living for hundreds of thousands of our citizens now serving and to serve in the armed forces of the United States upon their resumption of civil life; and

"Whereas the feasibility of such a plant has heretofore been recognized by the following authorities among others: N. H. Weed of United States Geological Survey, 'Fort Benton Folio' (No. 55, in 1899; 'Little Belt Mountain Folio' (No. 56) in 1899; United States Geological Bulletin by L. G. Westgate in 1920, entitled 'Iron Ore Deposits Near Stanford Mont.'; Report by Dwight R. Woodbridge, M. E., 1916, entitled 'Iron Lands in Little Belt Mountains,' and numerous other publications by geologists and mining engineers of national repute: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That an iron and steel plant or other suitable facilities be erected at Great Falls, or some other convenient point in Montana for the production of sponge iron and such other iron and steel production as the war effort and economy of the country may require for the development of the iron-ore bodies known to exist in Fergus, Judith Basin, Meagher, and Cascade Counties, Mont; be it further

*"Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives in

Congress from this State, and to any other Federal boards, bureaus, commissions, or agencies executing or exercising duties and functions consonant with the tenor of this memorial."

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and act upon proposed Federal legislation related to the Townsend plan

"Whereas there is now pending or will be pending in the current session of the Congress of the United States of America, proposed legislation embodying essential principles of the so-called Townsend plan, in which thousands of Wyoming citizens are keenly interested: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress aforesaid be, and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently and fairly consider and act upon, at said session, by its legislative branches as such and not merely in committee, the proposed legislation aforesaid; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of said United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator E. V. ROBERTSON, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative FRANK A. BARRETT."

—

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend titles I, IV, and X of the Social Security Act to provide payments in excess of maximum amounts as the act now provides

"Whereas title I, section 3 (a) now provides for a maximum payment of $40 per month; and

"Whereas title IV, section 403 (a) now provides for payment of $18 for one child and $12 for each additional child per month; and

"Whereas title X, section 1003 (a) now provides for payment of $40 per month; and

"Whereas these payments are inadequate to meet the necessary cost of living in decency and health: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring)*, That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend title I, to provide for a maximum payment of $50 per month; amend title IV to provide for a payment of $22 per month to the mother or relative with whom the child or children are domiciled; and amend title X to provide for a maximum of $50 per month; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That certified copies of the memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate and Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, EDWARD V. ROBERTSON, Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT, and to the Honorable Arthur J. Altmeyer."

A resolution adopted by the Puerto Rico Civil Service Commission, San Juan, P. R., expressing solidarity and endorsement of that commission with and to the declaration of rights and petition of justice laid before the President and the Congress of the United States by the legislature and political parties of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas the Legislature of Puerto Rico has passed certain laws tending to improve living conditions and to protect the welfare of the people of Puerto Rico; and

"Whereas among these laws are to be found the following: Land law of Puerto Rico; law creating the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority; law creating the Puerto Rico Transportation Authority; law creating the Puerto Rico Development Company; law creating the Development Bank of Puerto Rico; law creating the Puerto Rico Planning, Urbanizing, and Zoning Board; law creating the Puerto Rico Communications Authority; law regulating the sugar industry in Puerto Rico; and

"Whereas some of these laws were sanctioned by the direct vote of the people of Puerto Rico and all were passed by the Legislature of Puerto Rico in the exercise of the power delegated to it by the people of Puerto Rico; and

"Whereas Congressman FRED L. CRAWFORD of Michigan, has introduced a resolution in the Congress of the United States of America with the purpose of having the Congress annul these laws, thus despoiling the people of Puerto Rico, in the midst of the great sacrifices it is making in the military and civil fields for the defense of democracy, of all enjoyment of democracy; and

"Whereas this constitutes an unheard of assault against the liberties of the people of Puerto Rico, the doctrine of President Roosevelt and the American Nation, in America and throughout the world, and its adoption would imply a sinister loss of prestige to that doctrine; and

"Whereas if such a resolution is adopted, not only the people of Puerto Rico, but all small peoples would see democracy declared a fraud, a lie, and a farce by the Congress of the Nation which is directing the war for democracy and which will fundamentally influence the formation of world liberties following victory; and

"Whereas if the precedent is established by which the will of the people and of its legislature in Puerto Rico expressed in the eight laws mentioned has no value at all, the same procedure could be applied to all the legislation and all the democratic acts of the Puerto Rican people and of its legislature; therefore be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico:*

"1. To condemn, as it hereby condemns, in the most energetic and unequivocal terms, the assault against democracy in Puerto Rico and against the principles of democracy outside of Puerto Rico, which the Crawford resolution constitutes;

"2. To condemn, as it hereby condemns, in the most energetic and unequivocal terms, as the representatives of a people struggling for democracy, the fact that in the very Congress of the United States of America a resolution has been introduced of such nature that it brings into disrepute and stains the high motives of the Government of the United States of America in directing the present struggle in the defense and affirmation of democracy;

"3. To declare, as it hereby declares, that, although confiding in the spirit of righteousness of the Congress of the United States and believing that it will not permit the adoption of such sinister resolution, it affirms the unbreakable will of our people to oppose such violation of liberty and democracy by all legitimate means which freemen can and should employ to defend themselves against tyranny and oppression;

"4. To declare, as it hereby declares, that in the employment of the necessary means for the defense of our democracy and our liberty against such sinister assault, our people will act in such manner that our fellow citizens of the north, descendants of Washington and Jefferson, will not have to feel ashamed of us;

"5. That copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the American press, to the legislatures of the 48 States, and to all parliamentary bodies of America and of the world which function free of totalitarian tyranny."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Sumner County, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor sales and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A resolution adopted by a meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent, at Detroit, Mich., in connection with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, dedicating themselves to the winning of the war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Macomb County (Mich.) Board of Supervisors, favoring payment by the Federal Government of a service charge to units of local government where munitions and defense plants are located; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 17

"Whereas the Federal Government in the levying of a tax on gasoline and upon automotive units has invaded a field of taxation heretofore exclusively reserved to the States; and

"Whereas there has never been any direct relationship between such Federal taxes and Federal aid to the States for highway purposes; and

"Whereas it appears that normal Federal aid for highways may not be continued beyond the end of the present fiscal year, and

"Whereas gasoline rationing has drastically and seriously reduced State revenues for highway purposes; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has sources of revenue not available to the States: Therefore be it

*"Resolved*, That the Senate of the State of Iowa (the house of representatives concurring) do memorialize the Congress of the United States to take action necessary to effect the retirement of the Federal Government from the field of automotive taxation, with special reference to the tax on gasoline and the use tax on automotive units, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to each United States Senator and each Congressman from Iowa."

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

*"To the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, do respectfully represent that

"Whereas the need for the speeding up of the production of food by the farmers of this Nation calls for every aid and assistance to be given the farmers to produce the greatly increased amounts of food needed to carry on the war effort; and

"Whereas the restrictions placed on the amount of machinery to be made available for farm use in 1943 will most seriously curtail full production of food; and

"Whereas the full production of food is a most necessary need: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That the Senate of the State of Idaho, the House of Representatives of Idaho concurring, respectfully request and petition the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled to immediately take steps to have the allocation of farm machinery increased to permit the fullest use of the manpower and energy of the farmers in the production of food.

"Immediate action is necessary to make adequate machinery available for use in time to plant the 1943 crop; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward copies of this memorial to the Honorable JOHN THOMAS, the Honorable D. WORTH CLARK, the Honorable HENRY DWORSHAK, and the Honorable COMPTON I. WHITE, Members of the Idaho delegation in Congress."

---

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 4

*"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Government in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, do respectfully represent that

"Whereas the residents of the State of Idaho are anxious to assist in every possible way in winning the war and are willing to face obstacles of all types; and

"Whereas the tire rationing program and restrictions on the use of rubber is seriously crippling the production of food and disrupting vitally needed transportation; and

"Whereas the need for prompt development of synthetic rubber is most urgent to promote the successful prosecution of the war effort and alleviate the restrictions now required on travel facilities; and

"Whereas vast supplies of raw products from farm and forest are available for producing synthetic rubber of high quality by known and proven processes: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the house of representatives concurring),* That we respectfully request that the Congress of the United States of America give the matter of development of synthetic rubber its immediate attention and aid in every possible way the development of the manufacture of synthetic rubber. We further respectfully urge that restrictions now in effect by any and all agencies of the Government, preventing an immediate development of synthetic rubber from any and all sources, be removed by congressional action; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward a certified copy of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State."

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

"Senate Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President, the Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, and the War Production Board with respect to the urgency of prompt completion of all units of the Central Valley project

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore appropriated an aggregate of $149,969,000 for the construction of the Central Valley project, California, and it is estimated that the further sum of $114,031,000 will be necessary to complete said project; and

"Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior has for the past 7 years been engaged in constructing said project; and

"Whereas some units of the project are only partially completed, including Shasta Dam, Keswick Dam, the Contra Costa Canal, Madera Canal, and Friant Dam, while work has not even commenced on vital units such as the Delta Cross Channel, the Delta-Mendota Pumping System, and the Friant-Kern Canal; and

"Whereas construction of said Friant Dam on the San Joaquin River has been virtually completed by the United States Bureau of Reclamation except for installation of control gates; and said Friant Dam and Madera and Friant-Kern Canals can be completed enabling beneficial use to be made of waters now going to waste, by the use of a comparativel insignificant amount of strategic materials and expenditure of a relatively small additional appropriation by the Congress, and the necessary machinery and equipment for such construction is now idle and therefore available, the necessary labor, skilled and unskilled, can be obtained without material conflict with the manpower demands of the war program, and, with irrigation water available from said Friant Dam through said canals, said San Joaquin Valley lands will be capable of affording an enormous increase of production of foods, fibers and raw rubber vital to the progress of the war; and

"Whereas the War Production Board has recently ordered cessation of construction of all units of said project except Shasta Dam; and

"Whereas the Great Central Valley of California is now making a contribution to the current war program by the production of essential foods and fibers; and

"Whereas the completion of the Central Valley project by providing sorely needed supplementary water supplies will enable an enormous increase in the production of foods and fibers of which there are now serious shortages throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas completion of the project will make available many thousands of acres peculiarly suited to the growing of guayule, the most feasible source of natural rubber; and

"Whereas on completion the project will afford a source of electric energy which will enable a vast expansion of shipbuilding yards, factories, and other strategic war production plants in California; and

"Whereas all features of the Central Valley project are designed as mutually interrelated, and to fulfill the objectives of the project and to make a material contribution to the war program, it is imperative that the project, including all features thereof, be completed in its entirety: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes and urges the President and the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the War Production Board that all units of the Central Valley project and all features thereof and particularly those portions thereof positively necessary to aid the war effort be promptly completed, and to that end that the necessary funds, priorities, and materials be made immediately available; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the War Production Board."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 24

"Joint resolution relative to the growing shortage of motortruck transportation

"Whereas the population of the Western States of the United States is thinly spread over an area of 1,508,916 square miles with a railroad trackage of only 41,593 miles; and

"Whereas within the State of California there are 1,868 communities wholly dependent upon motortruck transportation for transportation of necessary foods and other goods to and from their communities; and

"Whereas the State of Oregon has 941 and the State of Washington has 874 such dependent communities; and

"Whereas the delivery of fluid milk to the cities of San Francisco, Los Angeles, Oakland, Sacramento, and Spokane is wholly by motortruck and trailers; and

"Whereas 89.3 percent of fruits and vegetables and 66 percent of the livestock used for food in the city of Los Angeles is transported by motortruck and trailer; and

"Whereas 75 percent of fruits and vegetables and livestock used for food in the city of San Francisco is transported by motortruck and trailer; and

"Whereas 80.6 percent of all interstate motortruck and trailer loads originating in Los Angeles consists of total or partial loads of raw or other war materials transported from or to war manufacturing plants; and

"Whereas the State of California produces annually 30,000,000 tons of farm, ranch, and orchard products which must of necessity be transported to market by motortrucks and trailers during all or some part of its journey to market; and

"Whereas railroads are overburdened in furnishing the transportation needs of the armed forces of the United States during the war emergency, and are not equipped with rolling stock, cars, or locomotives to take over any considerable portion of the transportation of foodstuffs and other supplies heretofore transported by motortrucks and trailers; and

"Whereas new or additional motortrucks or trailers are unobtainable; and

"Whereas thousands of motortrucks and trailers, busses, and farm motorized implements, indispensable for the necessary production and transportation of foods, supplies, and war materials are in disrepair and not in use because needed repair parts or tires cannot be obtained; and

"Whereas motortruck and bus transportation is rapidly becoming difficult or impossible to obtain due to the fewer motor vehicles available for the necessary needs of the people; and

"Whereas any further lessening in the number of motortrucks or trailers available for transportation will paralyze the agricultural and livestock industries of this State and jeopardize the supply of food and the operation of war manufacturing plants; and

"Whereas it is apprehended that because of the conditions aforesaid farmers, fruit and vegetable growers will be hindered in their production of food operations and there will not be a sufficient number of motortrucks and trailers to transport this year's crops of vegetables, fruits, grains, or livestock to market or to transport raw and other materials to and from war production plants: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly),* That the Congress of the United States be and the same is hereby memorialized to appoint a committee to immediately investigate conditions that prevail in the motortrucking industry in the Western States in respect to the procurement of necessary repair parts and tire replacements and to take such other and necessary action in the premises as will relieve and prevent any further disruption of the motortrucking and passenger-bus industry and enable food producers to produce and cultivate their crops and convey the same to markets; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the

House of Representatives and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from California."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 26

"Joint resolution relative to the Pharmacy Corps bill

"Whereas the Pharmacy Corps bill (S. 216; H. R. 997) is now pending in Congress, providing for the creation of a pharmacy corps in the United States Army, to be organized under graduate pharmacists skilled and learned in the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines; and

"Whereas in the treatment of disease and the care of the sick or injured the services of skilled, reliable, and experienced graduate pharmacists are essential, and such services are second only to the services of skilled physicians and surgeons; and

"Whereas it is the well-established public policy of the United States and of every State thereof to require all persons engaged in the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines to be graduate pharmacists; and

"Whereas such public policy is vital and necessary to the safety, health, and life of its people; and

"Whereas the health, safety, and preservation of life of every member of the armed forces of the United States is of primary and paramount importance for the safety of the Nation; and

"Whereas members of the armed forces of the United States, and especially those of them who are overseas at various fighting fronts, are entitled to receive, and it is the policy and desire of the people of the United States to furnish to them, the best treatment and most proficient services within the power and capacity of the people, and especially to furnish proficient and skillful graduate pharmacists to safeguard the health and lives of its fighting men; and

"Whereas the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines is essentially a professional service requiring great skill, intimate knowledge and experience with drugs and medicines: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the legislature of this State unanimously endorse the Pharmacy Corps bill (S. 216; H. R. 997) and request the Members of Congress to enact the same into law; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each Senator or Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States, and that the Senators and Representatives from California are hereby respectfully urged and requested to support the said Pharmacy Corps bill."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution relative to small business enterprises

"Whereas the great majority of manufacturing plants in California are small enterprises with 100 or less employees; and

"Whereas a great many of such small business enterprises have been adversely affected by war conditions; and

"Whereas a large number of such manufacturing plants could readily be converted and adapted to the production of materials, goods, or supplies essential to the war effort; and

"Whereas such conversion and adaptation would materially further the war effort and contribute to national defense: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to effectuate the policy of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and aid small business enterprises; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy of the United States be memorialized to distribute military and naval contracts more widely by purchasing in smaller quantities and awarding a proportionate share of such contracts to small business enterprises; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Vice President of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States, and that the Senators and Representatives of California are hereby respectfully requested to urge such action."

---

"Assembly Joint Resolution 20

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Federal Government to immediately assign a large force of O. P. A. investigators to the city of Vallejo and surrounding communities to enforce the Rent Control Act

"Whereas the city of Vallejo and the surrounding communities form an area occupied largely by defense workers and members of the armed forces stationed at Mare Island; and

"Whereas in spite of large housing projects by Federal agencies, the area is still greatly overcrowded; and

"Whereas such a situation results in difficulty in finding accommodations for families of men in the armed services; and

"Whereas some unscrupulous persons take advantage of the situation to charge unfair rental and food prices, giving unfavorable publicity to a city deep in the war effort and patriotically doing all that is possible for victory; and

"Whereas strict interpretations of the 'freezing' statutes often result in penalizing the fair landlord who has hesitated to raise his rents and is giving more in proportion than the other landlord who was first to raise his rents; and

"Whereas the staff allowed the branch of Office of Price Administration in this district is insufficient to inspect premises and prices to do justice to both landlord and tenant and seller and purchaser: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Federal Government be, and is hereby, memorialized to immediately assign a large force to the branch of the Office of Price Administration in the Vallejo area to check rental and food prices and services and to penalize unscrupulous offenders of the Office of Price Administration rules and regulations; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Federal Government be, and is hereby, memorialized to raise the Federal Housing Administration building quotas for the Vallejo and surrounding communities so that patriotic private citizens may do their part to provide further housing accommodations in the area; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the main office of the Office of Price Administration, to the main office of the Federal Housing Administration, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing and petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass the bill generally known as the Lea-Welch Bill suspending the exemption from tolls in favor of the United States Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge during the war emergency and for 6 months thereafter

"Whereas the Golden Gate Bridge, spanning the waters of San Francisco Bay, is an essential link in the highway system of the State of California and an indispensable connection between the United States Army reservations at Forts Baker, Barry, and Cronkhite, Calif., and the Presidio of San Francisco, and between many other military establishments in this State, without which connection the movement of armed forces of the United States would be interrupted and the transportation of soldiers, sailors, munitions, and the implements of war would be rendered almost impossible without the use of Government water transport; and

"Whereas the War Department permit under which the Golden Gate Bridge was erected provides for the passage of all Government traffic free of the payment of all tolls; and

"Whereas, due to the tremendous increase in the size of the armed forces of the United States and the vast increase in Government traffic due to the emergencies of war, the volume of free traffic has swelled to such proportions that it is monopolizing in large part the services of said bridge and has vastly increased the wear and tear thereon, without any return whatsoever to the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District; and

"Whereas, due to the rationing of gasoline and rubber, the civilian traffic has so decreased that the revenues of said bridge will not meet the expenses of the maintenance and operation of said bridge and the payment of interest and retirement of its bond issue; and

"Whereas said bridge was built out of funds wholly raised by the sale of bonds secured by the revenues of said bridge and the property within the district; and

"Whereas, the present and future existence of the structure depends either upon its operation within the income secured from tolls or the payment of any deficit by the property owners in the counties of San Francisco, Marin, Napa, Sonoma, Del Norte, and part of Mendocino; and

"Whereas the bridge was built through the courage, enterprise, and patriotic spirit of the people of the aforesaid district, and these same property owners are now facing a heavy penalty through the existing financially dangerous condition brought about largely through the lack of tolls from Government traffic; and

"Whereas the failure of the revenues of said Golden Gate Bridge to meet the cost of maintenance and operation thereof would disrupt the traffic situation of the State and the fiscal affairs of the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District without fault on the part of said district or its management; and

"Whereas there was introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress a bill numbered H. R. 7667 by Representatives CLARENCE F. LEA and RICHARD J. WELCH, which bill provided that all Government traffic should pay tolls for the duration of the present emergency; and

"Whereas said bill has been reintroduced in the present Seventy-eighth Congress and is of the most vital importance to the people

of the State of California and to the highway system of the State of California; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States, through its various agencies, military and civil, is obliged to and does pay tolls for the carrying of its traffic and the transportation of essential men and materials to all privately owned public utilities engaged in the transportation and carrying thereof; and

"Whereas the directors of the bridge district, in compliance with original requests from the War Department at the time the bridge was first planned, generously cooperated in the demands of the War Department for the construction of certain installations and highway improvements running into several hundred thousand dollars more than was at first suggested; and

"Whereas the intent and effect of this measure, if passed, will be a great forward step in correcting what is now recognized as an extremely unfair business relation between the War Department and the bridge district to the serious detriment of the latter; now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California urgently represents to the Congress of the United States that the passage of said bill is a matter of urgent necessity, and it hereby memorializes the Congress to enact said bill in order to prevent penalizing the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District and the State of California, of which said State the said district is a political subdivision, and to prevent the disruption of the traffic of the State of California and the fiscal system of such Golden Gate Bridge District due to the causes recited in the preamble to this resolution; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

---

"Assembly Joint Resolution 27

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress in relation to retaining the administration of California fishery production in the United States Department of Agriculture

"Whereas the general matter of the control and regulation of the production of foodstuffs in the interest of the prosecution of the war is now vested in the United States Department of Agriculture and is being ably administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, Claude Wickard; and

"Whereas an attempt is being made to transfer the jurisdiction of production of the California fisheries to another agency of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the production of food, regardless of the nature thereof, is all one subject and the administration of matters relating to food production should be and remain centralized in one agency: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the President and the Congress of the United States be and they hereby are memoralized and requested to take no steps which would result in the transfer of the administration of the production of the California fisheries to any agency other than the Department of Agriculture of the United States; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to each Member in the Congress of the United States from California, and to Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 22

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Social Security Act in respect to earnings and other income of recipients of old-age assistance

"Whereas the provisions of the Federal Social Security Act now in effect relating to grants to States for old-age assistance require the State agency, in determining need, to take into account any other income and resources of an individual claiming old-age assistance; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the Legislature of California to make adequate provision for the senior citizens of the State and to allow them to earn and receive incidental income in a reasonable amount without deduction thereof from the amount of aid allowed them, and without jeopardizing their right to receive old-age aid; and there are many legislative bills now pending before the Legislature of California to accomplish these results, consideration of which necessarily awaits action by the Congress and the President of the United States; and

"Whereas it is the consensus of the members of the Legislature of California that provision of adequate assistance to the senior citizens of the State is one of the most important subjects before the Legislature of California at this fifty-fifth regular session of the legislature: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress and President of the United States are hereby memorialized to amend the Federal Social Security Act in such manner as to permit the States to allow their senior citizens to earn and receive other income in such sum as the President and the Congress may deem proper, without deduction from the amount of old-age aid which would otherwise be allowed them, and without affecting their eligibility to receive aid; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed immediately to send copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

---

"Assembly Joint Resolution 23

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact Senate bill 450 regarding compensation to civilians

"Whereas the United States is engaged in a total war and many civilians are patriotically contributing their services in such necessary activities as civilian defense work; and

"Whereas many of these civilians, including the civilian defense workers, may be injured and become burdens on their families or society unless provision is made to protect them from financial loss caused by such injuries; and

"Whereas the members of the Legislature of the State of California believe that the Federal Government should make provision to protect these citizens rendering invaluable service to our country: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact Senate bill 450, introduced by Senator PEPPER, which provides for compensation to civilians including civilian defense workers; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and the Representatives from California."

By Mr. WHEELER:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting the amendment by that body of the Social Security Act of Congress so as to provide for the payment by the Federal Government of social security to city, county, and State officers and employees, and school teachers

*"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:*

"Whereas, the Social Security Act of Congress makes no provision for the payment to city, county or State officers or employees: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (both houses concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby respectfully urged to amend the Social Security Act in such manner as to provide for the payment by the Federal Government of adequate social security to city, county, and State officers and employees, and school teachers, and thus place them in a position of equality with industrial and other employees; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be mailed by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a memorial identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

A substitute for House Joint Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Substitute for House Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial to the President and the Senate of the United States of America, setting forth the wishes of the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of Montana, relative to the winning of the war by the total defeat of the Axis Powers, and relative to post-war settlements affecting the peace and stability of our country and of the world, and asking the President and the Senate, as the treaty-making power in our country, to fully recgnize and accept our national duty and responsibility in the reestablishment and future maintenance of world peace and order

*"To the President and the Senate of the United States:*

"Whereas young men from Montana are for a second time in a generation fighting and dying on foreign soil for the freedom and security of our Nation; and

"Whereas the people of our State, mindful of the fact that a nation as large and as powerful as the United States of America will find it impossible to maintain a policy of complete isolation in a world in which distances are being cut down every day by continually improving means of transportation and communication, and hopeful that in the peace to follow our certain victory that our country will, together with the other nations, accept its full share of responsibility in the reorganizing and rebuilding of the post-war world and the safeguarding of world peace; and

"Whereas, realizing that the new problems our Nation will face in its task of helping to establish and maintain a just and durable peace may require certain sacrifices, a high devotion to the cause of world peace, a united effort on the part of all citizens of the Nation, and a determination to insist on the maintenance of a free and stable order in the world, regardless of race or religion: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, in regular session assembled, the senate and house concurring, do respectfully and earnestly urge upon the President and the Senate of the United States, our firm conviction that our war effort should not stop short of the total military defeat of all the Axis Powers, our belief in the vital need of our country's full cooperation and responsibility, with the other United Nations, in reestablishing order after the present war; in the maintenance of peace in the many countries where civil law has been wiped out during this war, and in the necessary use of international policing or such other means as may be required to keep such peace: In the readjustment of treaties with other nations so the world trade and commercial needs and possibilities may be encouraged and developed to the mutual benefit of all nations and peoples; and in the necessity that our country accept this inevitable change in our world relations, and enter upon such new policy with the courage and determination characteristic of the United States of America, and with a full confidence in the eventual solution of the principal problems ahead, to the end that American principles may benefit the rest of the world, and strengthen and fortify here at home those same principles of economic and political democracy which we so deeply cherish; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state of Montana to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, to the Honorable Senate of the United States, to the Members of Congress from the State of Montana, and to each of the legislative assemblies of the several States of the United States of America."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a memorial identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Immigration:

"House Joint Resolution 3

"Resolution to the Congress of the United States to initiate proper action and legislation to determine the identity, and forfeit the citizenship of those holding a dual citizenship in any other country and prohibiting such citizenship

"Whereas the war in which the United States is engaged has focused attention upon certain traitorous and disloyal elements in the citizenship of this country which have used their technical citizenship as a cloak behind which to promote and carry out these disloyal designs; and

"Whereas attention has also been focused on nationals, of foreign countries, who have regarded their primary and real loyalty to the country of their origin and their American citizenship as only a necessary convenience in better securing the material and political advantages which this great Nation holds forth; and

"Whereas these elements have been weakening factors in the unified body of loyal American citizens believing in the traditions and principles of the American democracy; and

"Whereas an outstanding evidence of the existence of these elements has been the acceptance of a dual citizenship status by acknowledging allegiance to the sovereignty of their native country particularly among the Japanese, German Bundists, and Italian Fascists; and

"Whereas foreign countries have held forth such dual citizenship status for their nationals in this country for the purpose of retaining their sovereignty and jurisdiction over said nationals and for the purpose of commanding their loyalty and obedience in peace and in war; and

"Whereas this war has made us aware of the necessity of scrutinizing more carefully our citizenship in order that by infiltration of disloyal elements our democratic processes are not perverted from their original purposes and used against our own interests; and

"Whereas the safety and protection of the American democracy requires the immediate weeding out of said disloyal elements and the forfeiture of, and exclusion from, American citizenship of those nationals of other countries practicing dual citizenship or for whom dual citizenship is held out: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Montana (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States be, and the same is hereby memorialized to institute proper action and legislation: (1) to determine the identity of those persons in this country of Japanese ancestry or otherwise subscribing to citizenship, or making themselves amenable to the sovereignty of any other country; (2) to forfeit the American citizenship of such persons, and (3) to prohibit any person now or heretofore holding or exercising a dual citizenship from being or ever becoming an American citizen; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from Montana."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.)

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. NYE):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Concurrent Resolution C

"Whereas a Nation-wide rationing system has been established for the purpose of conserving and distributing various commodities vital to our war effort or made scarce by war conditions; and

"Whereas the administration of the ration program is established at one point in every county, and the application blanks and questionnaires being used are of such form that it is almost impossible for most people to complete them by mail; and

"Whereas farmers are handicapped by distance from the county rationing office, lack of time, and in many cases lack of complete information: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring)*, That we recommend to the Office of Price Administration that:

"1. A local board be established in each town for the purpose of receiving applications in connection with the rationing program, also empowered to act in emergencies;

"2. That necessary forms be simplified and made as few as possible;

"3. That farmers be given special consideration in the rationing of gasoline, tires, and other materials necessary in the production of food and raw materials so vitally needed in the war;

"That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the administrative heads of the national and State Office of Price Administration and to each of the Members of Congress of this State."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution V

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the President to authorize the Indians to elect their Commissioner of Indian Affairs and other administrative officials and that treaty rights and claims be promptly adjudicated and paid

"*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein)*:

"Whereas the Indian Americans who have loyally been serving their country and ours, both in the armed forces and elsewhere, have long been under practically complete domination of the Indian Bureau, with no voice in the administration of tribal property and affairs, and have witnessed, without power to effectively protest, the building up of a vast array of life-term employees, very few of whom are Indians, paid from tribal funds or a charge against tribal property and other resources; and

"Whereas rights, as assured by treaties and legislation, have, in too many instances, not been adjudicated and the Indians reimbursed for their property, neither financially nor by larger, more profitable allotments of lands and equipment; and

"Whereas on the Standing Rock Sioux Indian reservation, near our capital city, magnificent new brick buildings have been erected at Fort Yates for administrative offices and housing employees, with many Indians living the year around in poor tents, without coal, sufficient clothing or food, and sickness so prevalent that the agency hospital facilities are wholly inadequate: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we believe in preserving the personal and property rights of the Indians, of whom there are nearly 10,000 in our State, and commend their loyalty, and that we recommend to Congress and the President that the Indians, as citizens and voters under the act of June 2, 1924, be authorized to vote for and elect their own Commissioner of Indian Affairs and other administrative officials; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That all tribal and personal rights and claims, as evidenced by treaties otherwise, be promptly adjudicated and paid; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of State of North Dakota send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, the North Dakota Members of Congress, and to the secretaries of state of the States of Minnesota, South Dakota, Montana, Wisconsin, Kansas, Oklahoma, Wyoming, and Washington for the attention of their respective legislative assemblies."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION E

"Whereas during the past 25 years the economy of the Nation has been so fundamentally based on rubber that unless rubber is immediately forthcoming the Nation's economy is doomed to a disruptive break-down which will drastically curtail the all-out war effort, and endanger ultimate victory.

"For the past year high officials of our Government have been attempting to make synthetic rubber out of petroleum. From the best information available, 33 rubber plants have been authorized, all with the Standard Oil Co. and members of their patent pool. Grants have been made by Jesse Jones, head of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pro-

viding all necessary funds to the extent of a half a billion dollars or more.

"Since this arrangement has been made, plants have reached only the blueprint stage. One or two plants may be in operation by 1944. From the time that has elapsed since the construction of these plants was authorized, without results, it is self-evident that the making of synthetic rubber is still in the experimental stage and that the experience so far has been in the wrong direction.

"The Russian Government has successfully been making all of their rubber for the last 10 years or more, and they offered to this Government over a year ago their formula for making synthetic rubber out of agricultural products. Nothing has been done to take advantage of this.

"The Gillette committee findings of last year established the fact that plants for making rubber out of agricultural products can be built with one-third of the amount of critical materials required by the petroleum plants and one-third of the cost in about one-half of the time. That at this time we have a surplus of certain agricultural products, all of them containing carbohydrates. In fact, rubber can be made from anything that grows out of the ground, including waste products.

"Whereas it appears that no results are apparent at this time from the action that has been taken by the Government to make synthetic rubber. Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring)*, That we ask the reintroduction of the Gillette bill and its immediate passage, so that speedy arrangements may be made for the building of plants to make rubber from agricultural products as well as from petroleum products so as to assure an adequate supply of synthetic rubber to be used in winning the war, and to insure the all-out war effort and speedier victory by preventing the disruptive break-down of our national economy; now be it further

*"Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to each Member of Congress from North Dakota, including both Senators and Representatives, Mr. GILLETTE, of Iowa, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the President of the United States, Mr. Jeffers, Rubber Administrator, Jesse Jones, and to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate of the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Montana, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Illinois, Michigan, South Dakota, and Colorado."

---

"House Concurrent Resolution 1

"Whereas the farmers in this country are called upon to contribute to the war effort by an increase in production of farm products; and

"Whereas the expense for farm labor, machinery, repairs, and all other items entering into the over-all cost of the production of agricultural products has greatly increased; and

"Whereas war industries are permitted to include the cost of labor, as well as all other costs, plus profit, in determining the total cost of materials and equipment for the purposes of war; and

"Whereas food is one of the main essentials and is absolutely necessary for the winning of the war, and the farmers of this country are engaged in an all-out effort to win this war; and

"Whereas the farmers of this country cannot successfully carry on unless they receive a reasonable profit for their agricultural products; and

"Whereas they are now being discriminated against to the advantage of labor and industry; and

"Whereas there is now before the Congress of the United States a bill for the establishment of prices for agricultural products which will include the cost of labor and other costs, and will give to the farmer a return upon the basis of parity: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring)*, That we earnestly recommend that the Congress of the United States, as quickly as is possible, pass and enact into law such measure or measures as may be necessary to return to the farmer such prices for all agricultural products as will assure to him a reasonable profit over his cost of production, including all cost of labor; be it further

*"Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution, under the seal of the State of North Dakota, be transmitted by the secretary of state to each Member of Congress from North Dakota, Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, chairmen of the Committee on Agriculture in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and the president of the senate and speaker of the house of representatives in the States of Montana, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, Michigan, Texas, Missouri, Illinois, and Indiana."

## PROPOSED NAVY YARD IN NARRAGANSETT BAY—RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly, adopted by both houses and signed by the Governor, proposing, first, that a United States navy yard be created in Narragansett Bay; second, that the outer line of defense, inclusive of Gay Head, Block Island, and Montauk Point, be completely fortified.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 67

Resolution proposing (1) that a United States navy yard be created forthwith and completely equipped within Narragansett Bay and (2) that the outer line of defense, inclusive of Gay Head, Block Island, and Montauk Point be completely fortified immediately as nationally necessary

Whereas the great strategic importance of the Narragansett Bay area, together with the region contiguous thereto, constitutes a potential asset of inestimable value, both in peacetime as well as in wartime, to the whole United States, inasmuch as it can and should be completed as a powerful protector of New York City and harbor, and then would, when so completed become of vital consequence to the security of each of the 19 States within the northeastern part of the United States lying east of the Mississippi River and north of Tennessee and North Carolina, which area contains approximately 60 percent of the population and 80 percent of the industry and wealth of the United States, and that this is emphasized by the fact that at least 50 percent of the imports and exports of this northeastern area pass through the port of New York and, consequently, if New York were injured, the whole northeastern area might be seriously crippled, to the great detriment of the whole United States; and

Whereas within the Narragansett Bay area and region are already located many naval and military establishments and facilities, such as the Northeastern Naval Air Base at Quonset Point, the naval torpedo station, the naval training station, the Naval War College, the naval fuel depot at Melville, the PT boat basin, the PT officers' training school, the naval hospital, ammunition storage depots, naval supply depots, naval housing projects, the inner line of defense, and numerous interior and surrounding forts and antiaircraft gun installations and that these, in the aggregate, could constitute a valuable nucleus of a permanent United States naval operating base, and that it is necessary to the best interests of both the United States of America and the State of Rhode Island that all these establishments and facilities be kept in being and fully effective, during the war and during the peacetime to follow; and

Whereas the Narragansett Bay area does not now possess a United States navy yard, nor is the outer line of defense in existence which line would comprise a fortified Gay Head, a fortified Block Island, and fortified Montauk Point, and which outer line of defense, when in existence, would protect the outer ship lane to and from New York and would also protect Block Island Sound, Buzzards Bay, and the southern approach to Cape Cod Canal and the eastern entrance to Long Island Sound, and that, unless and until these facilitie are created, the Narragansett Bay area and region will not be fully effective either as a protector of New York and the northeastern part of the United States, aforesaid, or as a United States naval operating base, since it will lack a necessary United States navy yard capable of building, repairing, and servicing ships of all categories; and

Whereas without a navy yard it is practically certain that, when the war is over, many of the existing naval and military establishments and facilities, enumerated above, will be dismantled or placed on reduced, skeletonized operation as happened following the World War No. 1, and thus the United States would then be deprived of vitally important and valuable assets and the industries of the State of Rhode Island would then greatly suffer, but that, on the other hand, if a modern, fully equipped United States navy yard be located in the Narragansett Bay area, all of the existing wartime establishments and facilities would become adjuncts to the United States navy yard and be coordinated therewith and this coordinated whole would then become of permanent value, available for full use during peace as well as in war: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations*, That in view of the foregoing facts, unqualified support is hereby given to the proposal that a completely equipped United States navy yard, capable of building, repairing, and servicing ships of all categories, be at once created within Narragansett Bay, and unqualified support is hereby given to the additional proposal that the outer line of defense, inclusive of Gay Head, Block Island, and Montauk Point, be completely fortified and, therefore, hereby urge upon the Government of the United States that the creation of these proposals be undertaken immediately as nationally necessary; and, be it further

*Resolved*, That a printed copy of this resolution, duly certified, be sent forthwith by the secretary of state of Rhode Island to each of the following: The President of the United States of America; the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, the chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, the chairman of the United States House Committee on Naval Affairs, the chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Military Affairs, the chairman of the United States House Committee on Military Affairs, the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, the Governor of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations.

## RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I present two petitions in the form of resolutions from the General Assembly of North Carolina, with the letters transmitting them.

I ask that the resolutions and the letters be printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Raleigh, February 18, 1943.*

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: By direction of our general assembly, I take pleasure in enclosing herewith copy of House Resolution No. 492, recently passed as indicated.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Yours for victory soon,

THAD EURE,
*Secretary of State.*

"House Joint Resolution 492

"Joint resolution to petition the Office of Price Administration to adjust fairly the price of milk to be paid to the farmer

"Whereas the Office of Price Administration has temporarily frozen milk prices on the farm level at the prices prevailing during the month of January 1943; and

"Whereas the ratio between the price of milk and the cost of feed and labor was very unfavorable at that time to the producers and is now even more unfavorable; and

"Whereas the Office of Price Administration in fixing ceilings on feed manufacturers, warehousemen, handlers, and dealers has provided for reasonable margins of profits; and

"Whereas 56 herds of dairy cattle have already been sold in North Carolina and many other dairymen are seriously contemplating sale because milk prices are insufficient to cover mounting feed and labor costs; and

"Whereas North Carolina is a milk deficient State and imports more than 2,000,000 pounds of milk per month; and

"Whereas any decrease in milk production in North Carolina will necessitate increased shipment of milk into the State and further burden transportation facilities; and

"Whereas this order will result in a decrease in milk production in North Carolina far below present demands and further aggravate the growing food shortage: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):*

"SECTION 1. That the Office of Price Administration be requested to reconsider their action and either rescind the order or fix milk prices at the farm level high enough to cover all feed and labor costs and allow a reasonable margin of profit.

"SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization, the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Prentiss Brown, Director of the Office of Price Administration, and to each Senator and Representative from North Carolina in the National Congress, with the request that our Senators and Congressmen do everything possible to get the Office of Price Administration to reconsider this action and get this matter adjusted before it is too late."

To the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
SENATE CHAMBER,
*Raleigh, February 20, 1943.*

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. BAILEY: I am enclosing copy of a resolution passed by the General Assembly of North Carolina asking that the Nation be put back on standard time during the winter months and hope some action may be taken before the winter of 1943 sets in.

At the council of State governments held in Baltimore in January, a survey revealed that the new war time slows production, causes absenteeism in important war industries, disrupts the domestic, industrial, and commercial life of the Nation. It forces families to stagger meal hours where adults work and children go to school, thus adding to the problem of share-the-ride transportation. In North Carolina this new wartime has caused a decline in the school enrollment of 25,000 pupils. The wartime schedule is bad enough during the summer months, so we do petition you to make a change back to standard time during the winter, if you do not see your way clear to advocate a complete change for the year round.

Thanking you for giving your attention to this, I am,

Very truly yours,

LEE B. WEATHERS,
*Chairman, Federal Relations Committee.*

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has seen fit to enact legislation redefining standard time, and to put into effect daylight saving or wartime, as a method of saving electric power and speeding the war effort by moving the hands of the clock forward 1 hour in each of the time zones of the United States; and

"Whereas the advanced time does not seem to speed the war effort in any material degree, but on the other hand has disrupted our domestic and industrial life in North Carolina causing a loss in production in our industrial plants by workers being late in reporting for duty, especially during the winter months; and

"Whereas the new time schedule has disrupted the domestic life, causing parents who work and children who attend school to observe different hours, in their eating and working; and

"Whereas school attendance in North Carolina shows a decline of approximately 40,000 under last year, most of which decline is due to the unwillingness of rural parents to allow their children to venture on lonely roads before daylight to meet the 4,800 rural school busses, now restricted to travel on designated routes as a means of conserving tires and gasoline: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of North Carolina (the house of representatives concurring):*

"SECTION 1. That the General Assembly of North Carolina does hereby petition the Congress of the United States to enact amendatory legislation so as to redefine standard time in the manner in which it was defined before congressional legislation provided for daylight saving or wartime, and especially that wartime not be used during winter months when the disruption, discomforts, and disadvantages are greatest in our industrial, domestic, and agricultural endeavors.

"SEC. 2. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the North Carolina congressional delegation and to the President of the United States, Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification."

## RESOLUTIONS BY NATIVE SONS OF THE GOLDEN WEST, COMPTON AND SAN DIEGO, CALIF.—JAPANESE UNIT OF THE ARMY

Mr. STEWART presented resolutions adopted by Compton Parlor No. 273, of Compton, and San Diego Bay Parlor No. 267, of San Diego, both of the Native Sons of the Golden West, in the State of California, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Compton Parlor No. 273 of the Native Sons of the Golden West is grieved and shocked to learn of the proposal to enroll in the United States Army a unit composed of so-called "citizens of the United States of America of Japanese ancestry."

The members of Compton Parlor are firmly of the opinion that the Constitution of the United States of America does not confer citizenship on any person of Japanese descent born in this country; therefore, there are no "citizens of the United States of Japanese ancestry"; they also are of the belief that all Japanese, regardless of protestations otherwise, inherently are loyal only to Japan, and they are thoroughly convinced that the enrollment of a United States Army unit composed of Japanese will be inimicable to the welfare of the State of California and the Nation, and will undoubtedly create a dangerous threat to a proper and adequate defense of this country: Therefore

*Resolved,* That Compton Parlor is strenuously opposed to the formation of a Japanese unit of the United States Army, and hereby respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States of America to exercise its prerogative and nullify the declared intention of the War Department to organize and enroll such a unit; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this petition be sent the Secretary of War, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, the Chairman of the House of Representatives Military Affairs Committee and others.

A. R. TARLETON,
*President.*
F. J. SMITH,
*Secretary.*

---

The members of Santa Monica Bay Parlor, No. 267, of The Native Sons of the Golden West are grieved and shocked to learn of the proposal to enroll in the United States Army a unit composed of men of Japanese ancestry.

The members of Santa Monica Bay Parlor are firmly convinced that the enrollment of a United States Army unit composed of Japanese will be inimicable to the welfare of the State of California and of the Nation, and will create a dangerous threat to a proper and adequate defense of this country. Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That Santa Monica Bay Parlor, No. 267, of The Native Sons of the Golden West is strenuously opposed to the formation of a Japanese unit of the United States Army, and hereby respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States of America to take such steps as may be necessary to prevent the organization and enrollment of such a unit. And be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this petition be sent to the Secretary of War, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, the Chairman of the House of Representatives Military Affairs Committee, and others.

## THE RUML TAX PLAN—PETITION

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I present a petition signed by K. A. Henn and 59 other residents of Springfield, Vt., with respect to "the current income-tax situation" and in favor of the so-called Ruml plan. I should like to have the RECORD note the fact that the petition has been sent to me, and I ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

## WORKERS DRAWING UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I present a letter from Chairman Altmeyer of the Social Security Board showing that in the average week of

January 1943, there were 213,910 workers who were drawing unemployment insurance benefits. On the basis of a 48-hour week, this would represent a loss in excess of 10,000,000 manpower hours per week at a time of critically severe manpower shortage. The Social Security Board is investigating the reasons for this situation. Any judgment should be withheld pending a disclosure of the facts; but I respectfully suggest that this exhibit should be included in any manpower shortage investigations which Congress makes. Therefore, I ask that this letter be printed at this point in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD,
*Washington, D. C. February 15, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
*United States Senate, Washington D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: The War Manpower Commission has referred to us your letter of February 6 requesting information on the number of workers currently drawing unemployment-insurance benefits. The following figures indicate the number of individuals who, in the average week during January 1943, received unemployment-insurance benefits under each of the States systems:

| | |
|---|---|
| Alabama | 5,970 |
| Alaska | 20 |
| Arizona | 180 |
| Arkansas | 1,090 |
| California | 13,200 |
| Colorado | 220 |
| Connecticut | 1,170 |
| Delaware | 300 |
| District of Columbia | 700 |
| Florida | 3,170 |
| Georgia | 3,780 |
| Hawaii | 60 |
| Idaho | 120 |
| Illinois | 29,890 |
| Indiana | 6,420 |
| Iowa | 1,420 |
| Kansas | 1,220 |
| Kentucky | 2,830 |
| Louisiana | 3,560 |
| Maine | 1,920 |
| Maryland | 2,910 |
| Massachusetts | 5,760 |
| Michigan | 9,190 |
| Minnesota | 3,100 |
| Mississippi | 1,270 |
| Missouri | 7,710 |
| Montana | 240 |
| Nebraska | 520 |
| Nevada | 60 |
| New Hampshire | 640 |
| New Jersey | 12,310 |
| New Mexico | 90 |
| New York | 51,880 |
| North Carolina | 3,700 |
| North Dakota | 190 |
| Ohio | 5,530 |
| Oklahoma | 1,190 |
| Oregon | 550 |
| Pennsylvania | 11,450 |
| Rhode Island | 1,850 |
| South Carolina | 2,060 |
| South Dakota | 140 |
| Tennessee | 6,190 |
| Texas | 1,360 |
| Utah | 210 |
| Vermont | 340 |
| Virginia | 1,590 |
| Washington | 830 |
| West Virginia | 1,540 |
| Wisconsin | 2,220 |
| Wyoming | 50 |
| Total, all States | 213,910 |

We are currently making a study in collaboration with the United States Employment Service and the several State unemployment compensation agencies as to the reasons why the individuals enumerated above are receiving unemployment compensation benefits. Preliminary analyses in a few States have indicated that the group now receiving unemployment compensation benefits is made up in considerable part of older persons, and particularly older women, in addition to those workers who are receiving benefits while in the process of moving from one job to another.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. ALTMEYER,
*Chairman.*

## DISTRESS AMONG LIVESTOCK FEEDERS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram which I sent concerning the livestock feed shortage in the State of Oklahoma and the reply thereto, disclosing a very critical situation. I ask that the telegrams be referred to the appropriate committee with the hope that some relief may be afforded at an early day.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 24, 1943.

CHICKASHA COTTON OIL CO.,
*Chickasha, Okla.:*

Complaints concerning cottonseed feeds in Oklahoma indicate acute distress among stockmen, both dairy and beef cattle. Will you please wire me whether this shortage of feed is approaching exhaustion?

I would like to have your information based upon not only your immediate knowledge but from what knowledge you can acquire from other sources of supply.

E. H. MOORE.

---

CHICKASHA, OKLA., *February 24, 1943.*

E. H. MOORE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Answering your wire, to my definite knowledge there is immediate and acute distress among all classes of livestock feeders, including beef and dairy and hog and sheep, due to shortage of cottonseed products, which are not approaching but have reached vanishing point. Relief must come quickly as critical period at hand and will extend to April 15, when pasture will afford relief. However, feeding program will suffer unless stocks are also made available in smaller quantity during summer feeding period. My office importuned daily by scores feeders pleading for relief. This especially critical period as cattle usually just maintained on winter ration and not too thrifty.

L. C. HUTSON,
*President, Chickasha Cotton Oil Co.*

## PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAX PLAN—RESOLUTION FROM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri presented a resolution adopted by the National Affairs Committee and concurred in by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City, Mo., which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL INCOME TAXES FROM SALARIES, WAGES, AND DIVIDENDS SHOULD BE COLLECTED CURRENTLY

*Be it resolved*, That the Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City approves in principle the Ruml plan of collecting Federal income taxes from individuals receiving salaries and wages, and bringing the collection of such taxes to a current basis, rather than the present method of collecting in the year following that in which the income was received. If necessary, drastic action should be adopted that will bring collections to a current basis without imposing 2 years' taxes in 1 year.

With many workers employed in war plants at abnormally high wages, it is believed labor, capital, and the United States Treasury will be benefited by withholding taxes from such wages at rates of 10 percent to 12 percent above a uniform exemption. The payment of dividends to stockholders by corporations should be subjected to similar rates of withholding taxes during war time.

The exemption should be on the same level for the taxpayers regardless of the status of the taxpayer regarding salary, wages, or dividends, with the final adjustment being made when the individual files his return at the end of the calendar year. To levy withholding taxes on a base exemption that differs with the marital status, or number of dependents of the taxpayer, would work an intolerable burden on employers and corporations making distributions of dividends.

The chamber favors the adoption of a plan that will bring the imposition of Federal individual taxes on salaries, wages, and dividends to a current basis, even though Congress finds it impracticable to adopt the Ruml plan in its entirety. It is unalterably opposed to any method that will impose at the same time income taxes for both a current year and a prior year.

## RESOLUTIONS OF CHAPEL HILL (N. C.) CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION—CONSUMERS' REPRESENTATION ON ECONOMIC STABILIZATION BOARD

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the body of the RECORD resolutions unanimously adopted by the members of the Chapel Hill Consumers Association, Chapel Hill, N. C., on Friday, January 29, 1943, in the town hall. I ask that the resolutions be accompanied by a letter addressed to the President by Mr. Harvey Lebrun, a member of the board of directors of the Chapel Hill Consumers Association, under date of February 4, 1943.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPEL HILL CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION,
*Chapel Hill, N. C., February 4, 1943.*

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
*President of the United States,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At a meeting of our association last Friday, in the town hall, our members voted unanimously to join the American Association of University Women in urging you to add a consumer representative to the Economic Stabilization Board. On that Board, you will recall there are two representatives each for labor, management, and farm interests, but none for organized consumers. The Government representatives on the Board, of course, represent us all, and properly so, but they hardly fill the requirements for consumer representation as such. Most of the earlier agencies that were given control over economic processes have had consumer representatives as such, and it is our view that the considerations which led to those appointments are doubly important in the Economic Stabilization Board. For, although no other group has a greater stake in stabilization, no economic interest is more likely to be overlooked than that of unorganized, and unrepresented, consumers—a situation which can be corrected only

by having spokesmen of such consumers as are organized participate along with the representatives of producer groups in the formulation of national directives that affect their common interests.

As Dr. McHale, of the American Association of University Women stated in her letter to you on this matter, "At no time have the citizens of this country been so conscious of their problems as consumers, so well organized, so well informed and articulate, and so ready to participate responsibly in developing sound policies." This widespread concern on the part of organized consumers means that consumer representatives on the Economic Stabilization Board would have a large, informed body of consumers on whose experience they could draw in contributing the consumer viewpoint.

Enclosed is a copy of the resolutions we passed on this matter. We trust that you may yet give them favorable consideration and thus help to carry out the basic democratic principle that groups whose interests are most involved should participate in the governmental and quasi-governmental bodies that make decisions and determine policies affecting those interests. Such action would not only insure the best service to the Nation by the Board, through the resulting balanced consideration of all aspects of the problems with which it will deal, but it will strengthen national morale by giving evidence to the great mass of people who are conscious of their needs and responsibilities as consumers that they will have spokesmen on the Board through whom their voice may be heard and their wishes made known. As Donald Montgomery writes of the wartime food administration (in the current Survey), "Let us in on the job. We want to help carry the load. Some thirty million or more of us stand to go hungry if the job isn't done (properly). We want to be in there pitching when the farm bloc threatens to highjack our grocery bill, or to push the dirt farmer off the production line. We want to be on hand when any selfish interest (whether labor or capital) puts the heat on to grab something for itself out of this war at our expense."

Sincerely yours,

HARVEY LEBRUN,
*Member of the Board of Directors,*
*Chapel Hill Consumers Association.*

---

*Resolved by the members of the Chapel Hill Consumers Association in meeting assembled:*

1. That this association herewith goes on record as in favor of the maximum practicable cooperation and participation of organized consumers in the conduct of Government services that greatly affect the interests of consumers;

2. That we join the American Association of University Women in petitioning President Roosevelt to appoint a consumer representative on the Economic Stabilization Board, since no other economic interest has a greater stake in stabilization and no interest is more likely to be overlooked than that of unorganized and unrepresented consumers.

*Resolved further*, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to the chairmen of the appropriate committees of Congress, to James F. Byrnes, Director of the Economic Stabilization Board, to the director general of the American Association of University Women, and to the press.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 629. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Minnesota to such State for use for park, recreational, or wildlife-refuge purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 64).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 479. A bill relating to the sale of public lands granted to or vested in the State of Idaho by the act of July 3, 1890; without amendment (Rept. No. 65).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 134. A bill for the relief of the heirs of John J. Shields; without amendment (Rept. No. 66);

S. 258. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Lew O. Calhoun; without amendment (Rept. No. 67);

S. 376. A bill for the relief of C. Y. Webb; without amendment (Rept. No. 68);

S. 684. A bill for the relief of Lt. M. V. Daven; without amendment (Rept. No. 69); and

S. 717. A bill for the relief of Cinda J. Short; without amendment (Rept. No. 70).

## SENATOR FROM TENNESSEE—DISMISSAL OF PETITION OF JOHN RANDOLPH NEAL

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections I desire to make a report on a complaint which was made by one John Randolph Neal, of Tennessee, contesting the election of TOM STEWART to the office of United States Senator. On February 4 the complaint was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The charges made by the contestant were fully considered at a meeting of the committee, and as a result it was unanimously voted that it be recommended to the Senate that nothing was presented casting any doubt on the election of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] and that the petition should be dismissed.

I therefore submit the report of the committee (Rept. No. 63) which sets forth the complaint in full and the conclusions of the committee, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution I am now reporting, carrying out the recommendation of the committee, be immediately considered, and I ask that it be agreed to and the complaint dismissed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution reported by the Senator from Rhode Island will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 110) was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the contest of John Randolph Neal against TOM STEWART, Senator from the State of Tennessee, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is this a resolution from the Committee on Privileges and Elections?

Mr. GREEN. It is.

Mr. WHITE. Did the minority members of the committee assent to the report?

Mr. GREEN. They did, every one. The minority was well represented at the meeting which recommended dismissal of the petition. The motion was made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Every member of the committee present voted for the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

## INSPECTION OF JAPANESE RELOCATION CENTERS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, some days ago the Senate adopted a resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to make an investigation of the relocation camps where Japanese are concentrated at this time. There was an oversight on the part of those in charge of the measure in that the words "accompanied by one investigator" were omitted.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the original resolution which I report from the Committee on Military Affairs, which would merely give us the privilige of inserting the words I have just read in a previous Senate resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 111) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Senate Resolution 101, authorizing inspections of the Japanese relocation centers in the United States, agreed to on February 11, 1943, be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting after the word "committee", in line 3, a comma and the words "accompanied by one investigator", so that as amended the resolution will read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof duly appointed by the chairman of the committee, accompanied by one investigator, hereby is authorized to visit for the purposes of inspection, during the present session of Congress, the Japanese relocation centers in the United States, the expenses incurred in pursuance thereof, not to exceed $3,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

## INVESTIGATION OF COMMODITY PRICES IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably Senate Resolution 23, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 23) submitted by Mr. NYE January 7, 1943.

The resolution had previously been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, on page 2, line 15, to strike out "$3,000" and to insert "$1,000", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of commodity prices prevailing in the District of Columbia, with a particular view toward determining how prices paid by consumers for agricultural commodities, or for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from agricultural commodities, compare with the prices received by farmers for such agricultural commodities. The committee shall report to the

Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $1,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF LABOR SHORTAGE IN PACIFIC COAST AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN STATES

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 88, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 88) submitted by Mr. DOWNEY February 1, 1943.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was, on page 2, line 11, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,000", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the existing shortage of labor in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States and its effect upon the efficient and successful prosecution of the war effort, and (2) methods of relieving such shortage. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation together with its recommendations, if any, for legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $1,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CONTINUANCE OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE VIOLATION OF THE RIGHTS OF FREE SPEECH AND ASSEMBLY, ETC.

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably Senate Resolution 98, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 98), submitted by Mr. LA FOLLETTE, February 11, 1943, was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred under Senate Resolution 266, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, agreed to June 6, 1936; and under Senate Resolution 70, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, agreed to February 19, 1937; and under Senate Resolution 154, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, agreed to August 12, 1937; and under Senate Resolution 266, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, agreed to May 18, 1938; and under Senate Resolution 126, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, agreed to August 4, 1939; and under Senate Resolution 135, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, agreed to June 28, 1941, to investigate the violation of the right of free speech and assembly and interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively is hereby continued during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress for the sole purpose of concluding the printing of hearings and reports, and the limit of expenditures is hereby increased by $500.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably Senate Resolution 106. I should like to have the attention of the Senate to this resolution, because it is important; it involves a considerable amount of money. I ask that it be read, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 106), submitted by Mr. MURRAY February 22, 1943 (on behalf of the Special Committee to Study and Survey the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises), was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress (providing for a study and survey of the problems of American small business enterprises), agreed to October 8, 1940, and continued by Senate Resolution 66, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby increased by $70,000.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 759. A bill for the relief of W. I. Dooly; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 760. A bill to restore to active duty certain retired officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 761. A bill making it unlawful for any person to change his residence from one State to another for the purpose of avoiding the payment of any judgment for support of minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANAHER:

S. 762. A bill to amend section 304 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, for the purpose of affording relief in the case of certain leases made by corporations or partnerships; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. WHEELER introduced Senate bill 763, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. TYDINGS introduced Senate bill 764, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 765. A bill for the relief of Viola Dale; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 766. A bill for the relief of Margaret B. Martin; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 767. A bill to authorize the establishment of an additional coinage mint of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 768. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 769. A bill for the reimbursement of civilian personnel of the United States Antarctic service for the value of personal property lost during the expedition to Antarctica; and

S. 770. A bill for the relief of Eddie Percle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERTON:

S. 771. A bill to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay;

S. 772. A bill to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide double credit for enlisted service outside the continental limits of the United States; and

S. 773. A bill to increase the pay of retired officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 774. A bill to further extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 775. A bill for the relief of Robert Judson McGarry; and

S. 776. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 777. A bill to increase the Federal contribution for old-age assistance; and

S. 778. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for aid to permanently and totally disabled individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 779. A bill to provide for the taking into custody, during the continuation of the existing war between the United States and Japan, of any or all Japanese residing in or found in the United States; and

S. 780. A bill to provide for the incarceration of dangerous aliens, and for the detention of deportable aliens pending their deportation; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 781. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a Military Aviation Academy and a Naval Aviation Academy for

training persons for service as commissioned officers in the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 782. A bill to promote the national defense and to facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment and essential to domestic requirements through safe and adequate inland waterways, by the immediate authorization and construction of the New York Bay-Delaware River section of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, as now connected and made navigable from New England to Florida; to the Committee on Commerce;

S. 783. A bill to establish the grade of Admiral of the Fleet of the United States Navy;

S. 784. A bill to amend that part of the act of June 24, 1910 (36 Stat. 619), relating to disposition of profits from sales of ships' stores; and

S. 785. A bill to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. CLARK of Missouri):

S. 786. A bill to amend title 1 of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 787. A bill for the relief of Samuel Jacobs, Bertha Jacobs, and Harry Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BONE:

S. 788. A bill to amend the act of December 6, 1940, relating to leave of absence for postmasters who serve in the armed forces, so as to include those who serve in the merchant marine; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. NYE:

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to amend section 124 (f) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to amortization of emergency facilities; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. GILLETTE introduced Senate Joint Resolutions 36, 37, and 38, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and appear under a separate heading.)

## AMENDMENT OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT—EXEMPTION OF MARRIED MEN WITH CHILDREN

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the Selective Service Act by exempting married men with children.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD in full.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) Every registrant who was married prior to December 8, 1941, who has maintained a bona fide family relationship with his family since that date, and who has a child or children under 18 years of age, shall be exempt from training and service under this act."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I may say that in introducing this bill I am in no way seeking to interfere with the armed forces of the United States, but an Executive order has been issued deferring all single men who are over the age of 38, even though they may be physically fit.

Physically fit men between the ages of 38 and 45 years have been deferred. I appeal to the ordinary common sense of the Members of the Senate and the people of the country, and submit that a single man between 38 and 45 who is physically fit or a physically fit married man who has no children should be taken before married men with children are taken. The result of taking married men with children is to break up many homes in America, and in many instances to force the married women who are left to go to work in factories, and oblige them to have their children raised in institutions.

Mr. President, we are talking about preserving the American way of life; we are talking about preserving the American home; yet when married men with children are taken in preference to single men between the ages of 38 and 45 and married men without children—and that is being done now—it results in breaking up the home life of many families. That will result not only in destroying the morale of our people, but everyone knows that it will destroy the morals of the people. It also will deprive many children of the care and education they should have.

Mr. President, I submit that we should place in the law a provision exempting married men with children. If in the defense of the United States and our institutions, after all physically fit men have been taken, it becomes necessary to amend such a provision, then those in authority can come to Congress and ask that the law be changed, and we can change it. In the meantime no married man with children should be taken.

Mr. WHEELER subsequently said: Mr. President, a few minutes ago I made a statement on the floor with reference to deferments. I now ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my former remarks with reference to the bill a special cable to the New York Times. It states that the bill amending the National Security Act by removing all restrictions on use of the militia outside of Australian territory was defeated in the Australian House of Representatives. This is the third time that has happened.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 25, 1943]

AUSTRALIANS DEFEAT SERVICE AMENDMENT—HOUSE KILLS BILL TO FREE MILITIA TO FIGHT ANYWHERE

CANBERRA, AUSTRALIA, February 24.—The bill amending the National Security Act by removing all restrictions on use of the militia outside of Australian territory was defeated in the House of Representatives this afternoon on a motion for the first reading, 34 to 29.

In accordance with a decision reached by the opposition at a meeting earlier in the day the bill was introduced by A. W. Fadden, as requested by opposition senators.

In agreeing that Mr. Fadden should sponsor the bill the opposition decided not to withdraw Speaker W. M. Nairn and the chairman of the committee, J. H. Prowse, from their posts to give the opposition its maximum voting strength because it was known at least two opposition members would not support the bill.

Mr. Nairn offered to resign to vote for unrestricted militia service, but the offer was declined on the ground that in the absence of a solid party vote the sacrifice of the speakership would be meaningless.

A bill defeated on first reading may be revived at any time.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have received this morning and present for appropriate reference a House joint memorial from the State Legislature of Montana, which I had not seen previous to the time I drafted the bill I have just introduced. The memorial reads as follows:

House Joint Memorial 5

A joint memorial to the President and the Congress of the United States and to War Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt protesting the uncertainty of the economic status of the men now under provisions of the draft law and urging Congress of the United States to enact proper legislation to amend the present Selective Service Act and requesting War Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt to establish by executive order a uniform system for inducting married men with children into the armed forces

*To the President of the United States and to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled and to War Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt:*

Whereas there has existed no uniform policy for the drafting of men in the armed forces by the selective service; and

Whereas such policy has caused much uncertainty of the economic status of the men now under the provision of the draft law; and

Whereas married men in Montana were drafted long before married men were drafted in many other States; and

Whereas in the Associated Press report of January 19, of an interview with War Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt, the uncertain status of married men with children still exists; and

Whereas we citizens of Montana do not wish a repetition of the above conditions by having our married men with children drafted in the armed forces before all available manpower in the previous classification has been drafted in the other States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate concurring)*, That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact proper legislation to amend the present Selective Service Act by creating a national pool of manpower for the purpose of selection of men into our armed forces and that War Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt be urged by Executive order to establish in the meantime a uniform system of draft as between the various States; be it further

*Resolved*, That no State shall be required to send married men with children into the armed forces until all States shall be uniformly required to do likewise; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House

of Representatives of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorial presented by the Senator from Montana will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.)

JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY, ANALYZE, AND EVALUATE REQUESTS FOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill entitled "A bill to establish a joint committee of Congress to conduct studies, make analyses of and evaluate requests for appropriations." In introducing this bill I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that we have set up numerous committees, the most notable one being the so-called Byrd committee, which have delved into various activities of the Federal Government and have given us most illuminating and valuable information.

However, a number of committees have directly or indirectly operated along the same line. It is perfectly obvious that if any reductions in expenditures are to be made, and if efficiency in the administration and disbursement of money is to be obtained, the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate are the forum and the place where such policies will be debated and such action as is possible will be taken.

Members of the Senate and the House will rely on those two committees primarily for economy. I think it has been pretty well demonstrated that the Appropriations Committees do not have all the information they should have in passing on the appropriations for departments, bureaus, and so forth. Therefore, the bill I have introduced provides that the Appropriations Committees shall have a joint staff of trained experts who shall all through the year examine into the various ramifications of our governmental machinery, and be in a position to advise the appropriations committees where there is inefficiency, where there is extravagance, and where economy can be effected. If we do that, it will be economy in itself, because it will be a continuing operation, and it will obviate appropriation by the Senate and House of funds for numerous committees more or less operating in the same field.

It has been my experience, from being the chairman of one of these committees, that the experts in the Comptroller General's department as a whole are very efficient and able men, who can give very valuable information, and if the bill is enacted into law I should like to see the force largely recruited from the General Accounting Office.

Mr. President, when the head of a bureau or of a department employing thousands of persons, comes before the Appropriations Committee asking for money, we are not in a position to elicit from him the detailed information we should have. The only way we can get it is by having a joint committee of Congress, which even between sessions of Congress could conduct surveys at the request of the Appropriations Committees, and, when appropriation bills come before us, give us information thereon—whether or not automobiles used by various departments are too numerous, whether questionnaires are too numerous, whether office space is being wasted, whether machinery is being wasted, whether necessary functions are not being performed, and so forth, and so on.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. It may need some alterations and corrections. I had it drawn in consultation with the experts of the Comptroller General's department. I hope Senators will read it. Inasmuch as the bill deals with appropriations by the Congress I respectfully suggest that it be referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 764) to establish a joint committee of Congress to conduct studies, make analyses of and evaluate requests for appropriations, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby established a permanent joint committee of Congress to be known as the Joint Committee on Appropriations, which shall have authority (a) to make such investigations and studies as may from time to time, in its opinion, appear necessary to determine the necessity for, propriety of, and other incidents surrounding, requests made upon the Congress for appropriations of funds; (b) to undertake such investigations and studies as may be directed by either of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate or House of Representatives; (c) to make such investigations and studies, and reports thereon, as shall be ordered by either the Senate or House of Representatives, or by any committee of either which has jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations, or expenditures; (d) to require any department, establishment, or agency in any branch of the Federal Government to furnish such information regarding its powers, duties, activities, organization, financial transactions, and methods of business as it may from time to time require of them; and (e) its staff, when duly accredited by the committee (to be evidenced by credentials validated by its chairman), shall, for the purpose of securing information set forth under (d) hereinbefore, have access to and the right to examine any books, documents, papers, reports, or records of any kind of any such department, establishment, or agency of the Federal Government: *Provided*, That the reports on investigations and studies initiated by the Joint Committee on Appropriations may be made public by the chairman thereof when in his opinion such would be in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the Joint Committee on Appropriations, when directed by either the Senate or House of Representatives or any committee thereof to render reports to them on certain matters, shall maintain such reports confidential unless otherwise directed.

SEC. 2. (a) The Joint Committee on Appropriations shall consist of seven members. Three members shall be appointed from each of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives by the respective chairmen of such committees, and the chairman shall be appointed from either of the said Committees on Appropriations by mutual agreement of the chairmen of such committees: *Provided*, That should the chairmen of the said Committees on Appropriations fail to appoint a chairman of the Joint Committee on Appropriations within 30 days after the effective date of this act, or within 30 days after a vacancy occurs in such position, then the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint a chairman from the remaining membership of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(b) The members of the Joint Committee on Appropriations, including the chairman, shall continue as members thereof so long as they continue as members of their respective Committee on Appropriations or until their successors are appointed. The respective chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives shall, on the last day of a Congress, appoint members of their respective committees who have been reelected to the succeeding Congress to fill any vacancies which may then be about to occur on said Joint Committee on Appropriations, and such appointees and the members of said committee who shall have been reelected shall continue until their successors are chosen.

(c) The Joint Committee on Appropriations shall, when Congress is not in session, exercise all the powers and duties devolving upon said committee as provided by this act, the same as when the Congress is in session.

SEC. 3. The Joint Committee on Appropriations is authorized to employ a staff of investigators, analysts, attorneys, accountants, or such other professional or clerical employees as may be necessary from time to time to competently execute its undertakings. The staff (a) shall be headed by a chief of staff appointed by the committee with compensation not to exceed $9,000 per annum; (b) the chief of staff shall employ and fix the compensation of such staff members and other employees as may be authorized by the committee and, when authorized by the committee, shall purchase such office equipment, books, stationery, and other supplies as may be necessary for the proper performance of the duties of the committee and as may be appropriated for by the Congress; (c) the chief of staff, staff members, and other employees are authorized to perform such travel as may be directed by the chairman of the committee and they shall be reimbursed for necessary traveling expenses and subsistence expenses in accordance with the provisions of the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended, and regulations issued pursuant thereto governing the executive departments and establishments.

SEC. 4. The Joint Committee on Appropriations and its staff members shall have the same privilege of free transmission of official mail as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

SEC. 5. The Joint Committee on Appropriations shall make an annual report to the Congress on the first day of each regular session and such report shall be a public document.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the operation of the Joint Committee on Appropriations and such appropriations shall be disbursed by the disbursing clerk of the Senate.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I am delighted to find the Senator from Maryland sponsoring legislation of the sort proposed in the bill. I remind the Senator that at the beginning of the present session of Congress the minority members of the Senate Appropriations Committee and of the House

Appropriations Committee joined in a legislative effort very much along the line suggested by the Senator from Maryland. I simply wish to request, since the matter is being presented for study, that the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) which was submitted at the opening of the present session may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) is as follows:

[78th Cong., 1st sess.—S. Con. Res. 2—In the Senate of the United States, January 18, 1943, Mr. NYE (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. LODGE, Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. WHITE, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BURTON and Mr. REED) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations]

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee known as the Joint Committee on Budgetary Control (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee).

SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee shall be composed of 10 members, as follows: (1) 5 members who are members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 3 from the majority and two from the minority party, who shall be chosen by the majority and minority members of such committee, respectively; and (2) 5 members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, 3 from the majority and 2 from the minority party, who shall be chosen by the majority and minority members of such committee, respectively.

(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations by which he was chosen, except that the members chosen by the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations who have been reelected to the House of Representatives shall continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress.

(c) The members shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the joint committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the joint committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of a clerk and such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the Congress is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary, to authorize such expenditures as may be necessary for printing, binding, and other purposes as may be authorized by the joint committee. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the joint committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or such member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said joint committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any questions pertinent to the matter herein authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C. 1940 ed., title 2, sec. 192). The cost of stenographic services in reporting such hearings as the joint committee may hold shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 7. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to investigate the operation and effects of the present budgetary system, to ascertain the necessity for, the economy, and the correctness of amounts of appropriations made to or requested by the various governmental departments, independent agencies, and establishments, and to make such other investigations with reference to the expenditure of public funds as it may deem necessary, and in particular to investigate such questions as may be submitted to it by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, or by any member of the joint committee, and to report, from time to time, to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 8. The joint committee shall make available to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the subcommittees thereof at the request of the chairman or ranking minority member of committees or subcommittees thereof all available data together with the services of experts and assistants on the staff of the joint committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think the request made by the Senator from North Dakota is appropriate. I may state to the Senator that I believe all bills and resolutions tending to accomplish the same result should be considered by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate at an early date. The bill I introduced was prepared last November at the conclusion of the work of the so-called Tydings committee. The only reason it has not been introduced before this time is that the persons in the office of the Comptroller General who have been cooperating with me have been making a study as to how the best service can be performed for the least money.

As the Senator from North Dakota knows, the Brookings Institution also has made a survey of appropriations made by Congress. The institution has recommended for our consideration the setting up of a joint staff such as the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House have on the subject of taxation. That has proved to be a very valuable adjunct of Congress.

Mr. President, if this policy is written into the law, it will, in my humble opinion, save money in the Senate and in the House, and perhaps save countless millions of dollars throughout the Government. It will put all persons involved on notice that we are not only appropriating money, but that we, as the appropriating arm, insist that the money not be wasted, but be spent efficiently; and if it is not spent efficiently, our experts will so advise us, and we can provide for such economies as the evidence may warrant.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I am sure there will be full and free cooperation in the Appropriations Committee on the subject to which the Senator from Maryland refers, and if we can accomplish our purpose I think we can save the taxpayers of the United States endless hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

Mr. TYDINGS. I may suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that he knows, as I know, that we have had a great many committees working more or less along the same line. If such a policy as that proposed were adopted, it would not be necessary to have so many such agencies. The authority for making the appropriations begins with the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. NYE. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Appropriations Committee should make these investigations and elicit the information, so that we may make economies in the committee in line with the information obtained.

## LOANS FOR MINERAL DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES IN TIME OF WAR—WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on the last call of the calendar Senate bill 12 came before the Senate for consideration and was passed. Later the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which it was passed. Inasmuch as the bill was sponsored by the senior Senator from Nevada, I have taken up the matter with the Senator from Maryland. I now am authorized by the Senator from Maryland, who could not be on the floor this morning, to ask that the motion to reconsider be withdrawn. I so request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator again indicate the bill to which his remarks are directed?

Mr. McCARRAN. Senate bill No. 12, which had to do with the question of the lending powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in regard to mines producing strategic and war essential minerals. Let me say to the Senator from Maine that an attempt was made to amend the bill on the floor of the Senate and then to recall it. The Senator from Maryland now requests that his motion to reconsider be withdrawn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion to reconsider is withdrawn.

## THE TREATY-MAKING POWER—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, complying with the requests of scores of communications which I have received, I introduce three alternative joint resolutions on the subject matter of an amendment to the Constitution dealing with the treaty-making powers. The subject matter is, of course, within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, because of the legal aspects involved, I suggest to the

Chair that the joint resolutions be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, so that the same subcommittee may have charge of the entire investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolutions will be referred as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the making of treaties;

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the making of treaties; and

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the making of treaties.

## FUNCTIONS OF THE WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BAILEY submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 133) to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## CONFIRMATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES RECEIVING COMPENSATION OF $4,500 OR MORE PER ANNUM

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

## HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1670. An act to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 1692. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

## CONFIRMATION BY SENATE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, it is my observation that there is considerable misunderstanding in the country regarding to so-called McKellar bill, which I would not support in normal times, but which I believe to be absolutely indispensable in these abnormal times, if Congress shall be in a position to respond to the country's demand that the taxpayer shall be protected against the pay roller. I have set down my own conception of the issue in a letter to the editor of the Bay City (Mich.) Times, which I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 16, 1943.

The EDITOR,
*Bay City Times, Bay City, Mich.*

DEAR SIR: I have just read your interesting editorial of February 10th entitled "Not Very Convincing" and referring to the pending McKellar bill requiring Senate confirmation of Federal employees receiving $4,500 a year. You state that this measure "does not seem to have any more than nuisance value" and that "MCKELLAR, VANDENBERG, and the others would do well to forget about this unwise and pickayunish piece of legislation."

Without in any way intending to complain about the editorial I want to respectfully suggest that there is considerable misunderstanding about this McKellar bill; and for the sake of whatever light it may throw upon the subject, I want to make the following observations.

In normal times I have always opposed the confirmation principle involved in the McKellar bill for the very good reasons (which you point out) that the exercise of this Senate veto on personnel may easily become a mere instrument of partisan patronage and political "pie counter" tactics. But under the abnormal conditions which we now confront I want to suggest that this possible infirmity sinks into relative insignificance compared with the far larger public service to be rendered by this process of scrutiny. The war requires us to establish many new and vast bureaus. The nature of this emergency requires that these bureaus shall have large discretionary power because the subsequent nature of their swiftly changing responsibilities cannot be anticipated. Thus, lump-sum appropriations frequently become unavoidable. Yet the country rightfully wants Congress to hold these bureaucrats to "strict accountability" for their expenditures to the end that every possible needless public expense shall be avoided. I may add that I personally believe this to be a primary obligation upon every Member of Congress. Under existing abnormal circumstances there is no way that this Congressional check can be exercised except as the new positions thus created and their personnel are submitted to the Senate for confirmation. In my view this goes to the very heart of the country's right to legitimate protection against extravagant and wasteful bureaucracy.

I respectfully call your attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 15 at page 942 where the following colloquy occurred:

"Senator VANDENBERG. Then the practical effect would be that the Manpower Administrator can name whom he pleases to whatever position he wishes to create, at approximately whatever salary he desires the employee to receive, within the rather loose general framework of the civil-service law and the Classification Act?

"Senator WALSH. I believe that to be true."

With this set of facts in mind, I now respectfully call your attention to my own further comments at page 943, as follows:

"Senator VANDENBERG. I have no desire to interfere in any way with the personnel of the War Manpower Commission. I do not want to have anything to do with the selection of any nominee or employee which the Manpower Commission may have. I agree that, under the circumstances, broad discretionary powers must be allowed. I also agree that in the first instance lump-sum appropriations must be made for personnel. But since this is the war system under which we must operate there should be at least one point where these positions when created should pass in review before the Senate. I know of no possible way in which that may be done except by the enactment of the McKellar bill and that is why I am in favor of it."

I call your attention to the language thus used. I am asserting that these "positions" should pass in review. That has nothing to do with patronage. It has no relationship to senatorial interference with appointments (even though this could result as a by-product). It has solely to do with the protection of the public purse and with a practical congressional check upon this sprawling bureaucratic personnel which is rapidly becoming an intolerable burden upon the American taxpayer. I may be wrong, but I know you will welcome this statement of what I believe to be the facts regarding a matter which is bound to become increasingly controversial. I respectfully submit that any "pie counter" which might be persuasively argued against the McKellar bill in normal times is far outweighed by the indispensable need of this congressional audit in abnormal times.

Cordially and faithfully,

A. H. VANDENBERG.

## GOVERNMENT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has introduced a bill dealing with Puerto Rico. That bill is now on the Senate Calendar. The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, under whose general jurisdiction the administration of affairs of Puerto Rico naturally falls, has written me a letter commenting on the Vandenberg bill fixing the term of the Governor of Puerto Rico. I think it would be in the interest of orderly procedure if the letter of the Secretary were printed in the RECORD for the information of Senators who may care to read it.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
*Washington, January 27, 1943.*

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I should like to express my deep concern with S. 40, and to ask that you take steps to see that it is recommitted to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. The primary and immediate purpose of the bill has been made clear by its sponsor, Senator VANDENBERG. This purpose is to accomplish the removal of the present Governor of Puerto Rico. So understood, the bill raises a number of grave issues of policy and of constitutional power. These issues cannot adequately be explored within the confines of a letter. But I shall attempt here to epitomize the more outstanding objections to the bill in its present form.

1. The bill was reported favorably by the committee 14 days after its introduction. No hearings were held. Neither this Department nor the State Department was asked to give its views, although this Department has jurisdiction over Puerto Rico and although the State Department is charged with the responsibility for our international policy. The views of none of the interested departments were obtained. The people of Puerto Rico had no opportunity to make their position known to the committee. I am informed that for a long time no substantial change in any of the organic acts relating to our Territories has been proposed by a committee of the Congress except after full discussion and hearings. That normal procedure is especially necessary with a measure so controversial and so punitive as S. 40.

2. I do not think that it is necessary in this letter to discuss the details of the administration of the government of Puerto

Rico by Governor Tugwell. But this much should be said. The grave problems of Puerto Rico have challenged American statesmanship for many years. The Governorship of Puerto Rico has always been a most difficult position to fill. There has been sharp controversy with respect to the administration of Governor Tugwell's predecessors and doubtless will be with respect to that of his successors. With respect to the administration of Governor Tugwell, it is worth noting that both houses of the legislature have passed resolutions approving the Governor's administration. In addition, the insular government has received a memorial expressing similar approval signed by more than 314,000 Puerto Ricans. In view of this evidence that Governor Tugwell is supported by a majority of the Puerto Rican voters, although not by the most vocal segment of the population, S. 40 might well appear, to the people of Puerto Rico and to the majority of the insular legislature, to be an expression by the Congress of the United States of a disapproval of an administration which has the support of the majority of the people. However, the issues presented by this bill are more profound and far-reaching than the administration of any single Governor.

3. S. 40 does not seem to me to have been framed with due regard to our responsibilities in the Caribbean or to our developing relations with Latin America. These peoples would most certainly examine with critical care our professions of a "good neighbor" policy, and our announced acceptance of principles of self-determination, if the Congress were summarily to remove a Puerto Rican Governor who is supported by a majority of the island population. I need not emphasize that this is a time of war and a period of developing territorial and colonial policies among the United Nations, and that we cannot afford to sow seeds which might ripen into a suspicion of the motives which lie behind our territorial and insular policies.

4. If S. 40 were enacted, it would serve to make untenable the position of future Governors of Puerto Rico. With the precedent of a legislative removal of Governor Tugwell, the future Governors would hesitate long before they risked criticism by a highly vocal minority of the population. Yet if they avoided this danger, they unquestionably would be subjected to equally bitter criticism by the majority of the Puerto Rican population. I think that Congress should proceed with great caution before it places the Governorship of Puerto Rico in so unfortunate a dilemma.

5. Even if there were in fact grounds of policy pointing to the desirability of removing Governor Tugwell, I must state most emphatically that the Constitution vests this responsibility in the President and not in the Congress.

It needs no argument to establish that the Governor of Puerto Rico exercises purely executive functions and that his removal by any means other than impeachment is a purely Executive responsibility. Senator VANDENBERG, in introducing this bill, recognized both that his objections to Governor Tugwell did not rise to the level which would warrant impeachment and that there was precedent for a rejection of any legislative recommendation to the President for an Executive removal. S. 40 was proposed as "the answer to this dilemma" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 37). I conceive that the issue thus reduces itself to whether the device of terminating the office of an executive officer, when coupled with a change in the duration of his term, is anything different from a legislative removal.

It seems to me to be plain enough that S. 40 does undertake to remove Governor Tugwell from office. It provides categorically that "the term of office of the Governor of Puerto Rico * * * shall expire 60 days from the date of the enactment of this act." I do not see how words could be plainer, or that the expiration of a man's term of office by force of legislative enactment differs in the slightest degree from removing him from his office by command of the legislature. The effect of this removal is not, as the committee's report suggests, changed or minimized by the possibility that Governor Tugwell might be renominated by the President. This he could do in the event of any legislative removal, save only one done through the constitutional method of impeachment.

I enclose a brief which shows in detail the reasons why S. 40 violates the constitutional requirement of a separation of powers, and the constitutional prohibitions against legislative punishment of an individual.

Even had the committee proceeded with full deliberation, and even had it held full hearings at which Governor Tugwell could defend himself, S. 40 would still be a proposal for unconstitutional action by the Congress. However, I might in this connection observe that I do not see that the committee protects itself from the charge of acting without a hearing by noting that the Governor may have a hearing before the committee in the event that he should be renominated by the President. A judge would not be warranted in entering a verdict of guilty upon receipt of an indictment because the accused might later make a motion for a new trial. Whether or not Governor Tugwell should receive a hearing by the Senate through a renomination, the fact would remain that under S. 40 he would have been removed from office without a hearing.

6. The ostensible purpose of S. 40 is to provide a 4-year term of office for the Governor of Puerto Rico. This is a matter which is, of course, wholly within the power of the Congress. But, even here, I urge upon you that the committee should consider with great care some of the issues involved in this proposal.

The first provision for a Governor of Puerto Rico provided that he should serve for a term of 4 years. (Act of April 12, 1900, sec. 17, 31 Stat. 81.) In 1910, President Taft recommended that the governor hold office at the pleasure of the President. Secretary of War Dickinson, testifying in support of this amendment, explained that this was desirable in order to prevent disorganization of the insular administration as the close of the term draw near. (Hearings, House Committee on Insular Affairs, on bill to amend organic law of Porto Rico, 61st Cong., p. 24.) This recommendation was adopted by Congress and constitutes the present law. (Act of March 2, 1917, sec. 12, 39 Stat. 955; 48 U. S. C. sec. 771.)

It seems to me to be of crucial importance that, if at this time any change should be made in the form of the government for Puerto Rico, any move which is made should be a plain and unmistakable step in the direction of a democratization of the insular government. The people of Puerto Rico would inevitably believe that any change in the governorship which Congress should now provide would represent its best and its ultimate judgment on the nature of that office. This would be a bitter disappointment to a large proportion of the Puerto Ricans and could not but lead to dissolutionment, confusion, and to a loss of confidence in the United States.

I repeat that this is a time of war and a period of transition in the colonial policies of the United Nations. Puerto Rico and the world have been given reason to look to the United States for an enlightened leadership in Territorial and colonial policy. Instead of furnishing such leadership, this bill expresses the policy of the United States to be one which directs the removal of a Governor who has been endorsed by a majority of the people of Puerto Rico. This will seem, not only to the people of Puerto Rico, but to the world, that the Congress of the United States does not propose to move in the direction of further democracy and self-determination for the Territories of the United States. The effect of S. 40 upon the delicate balance of international policy would seem to me to be most serious.

I cannot express too earnestly my profound hope that S. 40 will not pass, or that you may see fit to have this bill recommitted to your committee for a more careful study of its grave questions of Territorial and insular policy and of constitutional power.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
*Secretary of the Interior.*

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
*United States Senate.*

---

MEMORANDUM ON THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SENATE 40

This bill provides that the term of office of the Governor of Puerto Rico shall expire 60 days after the enactment of this act and at the end of each 4-year period thereafter. Fourteen days after the bill was introduced it was reported favorably by the Senate Committee after an executive session. No hearings were held.

Senator VANDENBERG, when introducing S. 40, indicated that he hoped in this way to escape the ordinary limitations upon legislative removal of executive officers. He recognized that his objections did not rise to the level which would warrant an impeachment proceeding; he recognized that the President might, as did President Coolidge, reject as an invasion of Executive power a congressional recommendation for executive removal; and he recognized the unfairness of attaching a rider to an appropriation bill. S. 40 was proposed as "the answer to this dilemma." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 37.)

It is true that S. 40 understakes to oust Governor Tugwell from his position through a different method than any of the other alternatives, but this is not sufficient to save its constitutionality. S. 40 would be valid only if its purpose and effect did not include a legislative removal of the Governor. Senator VANDENBERG made its purpose wholly plain. The language of S. 40 is equally clear. It provides that "the term of office of the Governor of Puerto Rico * * * shall expire 60 days from the enactment of this act." It is indisputable that S. 40 if enacted would serve to remove the Governor from office 60 days thereafter. There is no such justification for this removal as would exist, for example, were the Governor to be chosen in a different manner, as by election by the Puerto Ricans. S. 40 is, therefore, in the boldest form a legislative removal of the Governor of Puerto Rico. As such, the bill violates fundamental principles of the Constitution.

I. S. 40 CIRCUMVENTS THE IMPEACHMENT PROVISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION [1]

The power to remove an executive officer of the Government is exclusively in the President of the United States. It is a power coincidental with the power to appoint. The power to remove is not a legislative power; [2] the only way in which the legislature can remove an executive officer of the Government is through impeachment,[3] and only for

---

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 37.

[2] *Meyers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52); *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602).

[3] Art. I, sec. 3, of the Constitution provides: "The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose they shall be on oath or affirmation. * * * And no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present."

the reasons specified in the Constitution.[4] The whole purpose of impeachment is to punish public officials for misconduct in office. The crimes for which they may be removed are well defined. Impeachment is limited to high crimes and misdemeanors.

Under impeachment proceedings the officer is given his day in court. He is informed of the charges made against him and is permitted to meet them. All impeachments must originate in the House of Representatives, and are tried by the Senate, whose Members are seated on oath or affirmation, and two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present must concur before a conviction can be obtained.

No impeachment charges have been brought against Governor Tugwell, and S. 40 is an attempt to impeach him by an indirect method which would, if successful, wholly circumvent the impeachment process. It is not to be thought that the framers of the Constitution would have taken such elaborate pains with the impeachment clause had they supposed Congress could by this device so simply remove an executive officer.

II. S. 40 VIOLATES THE FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES OF SEPARATION OF POWERS

The powers of each of the three principal departments of government are, under the Constitution, separate and apart and each is free from the control or coercive influence, direct or indirect, of each of the other two. Indeed, the Members of the First Congress for this reason eliminated a phrase from the bill creating the Department of State, which declared that the President alone could remove the principal officer of the Department. This was done, because the Congress recognized that the power to remove was inherent in the Executive, and it did not, therefore, wish to insert a provision which would imply that the executive power to remove was delegated to the Chief Executive by legislative authority.[5]

James Madison, in urging this action, said: "If there is a principle in our Constitution, indeed in any free constitution, more sacred than another, it is that which separates the legislative, executive, and judicial powers. If there is any point in which the separation of the legislative and executive powers ought to be maintained with great caution, it is that which relates to officers and offices."[6]

The President is charged with the responsibility of taking care that all of the laws of the United States are faithfully executed.[7] Therefore, the President has the power to choose those persons in whom he has the greatest confidence and those who, in his opinion, will most ably facilitate in the discharge of that responsibility. Governor Tugwell has been appointed to such a position of trust. His appointment was affirmed by the Senate and his character and fitness passed upon in accordance with law. And, so far as the adequacy of his performance is concerned, it may be noted that his administration has been commended by a resolution passed in both houses of the Puerto Rico Legislature,[8] and by a memorial signed by more than 314,000 American citizens residing in Puerto Rico.[9] Should the Governor fail in his duty, the President and the President alone has the power to remove him. Removal of an executive officer is, under elementary principles, an executive and not a legislative function.

At one time it was argued that by virtue of its power to confirm, the Senate could exercise a certain measure of control over removal. But as to this Chief Justice Taft, in *Myers* v. *United States*, decided in 1926, said: "When a nomination is made, it may be presumed that the Senate is, or may become, as well advised as to the fitness of the nominee as the President, but in the nature of things the defects in ability or intelligence or loyalty in the administration of the laws of one who has served as an officer under the President are facts as to which the President, or his trusted subordinates, must be better informed than the Senate, and the power to remove him may, therefore, be regarded as confined, for very sound and practical reasons, to the governmental authority which has administrative control. The power of removal is incident to the power of appointment, not to the power of advising and consenting to appointment, and when the grant of the executive power is enforced by the express mandate to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, it emphasizes the necessity for including within the executive power as conferred the exclusive power of removal."[10] And for the Congress "* * * to draw to itself * * * the power to remove or the right to participate in the exercise of that power * * * would be to infringe the constitutional principle of the separation of governmental powers."[11]

This basic proposition of our constitutional law is established not only by a decision of the Supreme Court but has also been recognized by Presidents Cleveland, Wilson, and Coolidge.[12] Text writers, jurists, and scholars all concur.[13] It has also the approval of Congress; for when the Organic Act[14] of Puerto Rico came before the Senate for consideration, Senator Shafroth, of Colorado, chairman of the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, in his report,[15] recommended that the provision of the bill which authorized the Governor of Puerto Rico to be selected "from the elected members of the Senate and House of Representatives" of Puerto Rico be amended to authorize the President of the United States to nominate the appointee for that post. "This amendment," he said, " is deemed necessary in order to establish in Puerto Rico the principle of separation of legislative and executive departments which has proved so successful in our country."

It seems, then, entirely plain that S. 40, in undertaking to remove Governor Tugwell from office, violates long-settled principles that only the executive branch of the Government has power to remove an executive officer.

III. S. 40 VIOLATES THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROHIBITION AGAINST LEGISLATIVE PUNISHMENT OF INDIVIDUALS

A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. It has in times past been used arbitrarily to deprive persons and even whole classes of people of their civil, political and property rights without trial or rehearing.[16] Bills of attainder have had a bloody history in England. Nor were they foreign to the several colonial assemblies here in this country during our early period.[17] Article I, section 9, was adopted to make certain that the Congress would be prohibited from passing bills of attainder. Such a prohibition secures to each the enjoyment of all civil, political and property rights without fear of punitive congressional action and prevents legislative infliction of punishment without affording the accused the safeguards of a judicial trial.

S. 40, if enacted, would be a legislative determination aimed directly at Governor Tugwell and Governor Tugwell alone. It would be a legislative act inflicting punishment without trial. The Congress would thereby exercise the function of the office of judge, and in the language of textbooks, assume "judicial magistracy."[18] It would pronounce upon the guilt of the Governor without any of the forms or safeguards of trial. This it would do without any of the judicial protections requiring proper proof and evidence—in fact without any opportunity for the Governor even to defend his position or to express his views. The prohibition against bills of attainder, together with the constitutional requirements of elementary fair play found in the due-process clause of the fifth amendment, condemns legislation such as S. 40.

It is true that S. 40 does not seek to imprison the Governor of Puerto Rico or to seize his property, but it is not to be supposed that the great guarantees of the Constitution against unfair legislative action are meaningless so long as the bill is directed only at a man's honor and his continuance in office. "The Constitution deals with substance, not shadows."[19] If a man may not constitutionally be subjected to a small fine without knowing the charge against him and without an opportunity to be heard, much less can he constitutionally be ousted from official position by legislative action based upon unknown grounds, and consummated without notice to the accused or opportunity to be heard in his own defense.

The United States Senate, at its last session, has reached the same conclusion. The Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1943, as it reached the Senate floor contained the proviso—

*"Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of Goodwin Watson."

Six Senators took the floor to demand the elimination of the proviso. They objected that the clause was unconstitutional because it amounted to a bill of attainder,[20] because it was a legislative interference with the executive function,[21] and because it deprived Mr. Watson of his office without a trial or hearing;[22] it was also opposed as, for these reasons, reflecting thoroughly bad legislative policy.[23] Even the one Senator who undertook to explain the reasons for the provision that said conditioning an appropriation bill upon the removal of an employee "is not a desirable procedure."[24] The provision was eliminated on a voice vote[25] and was never restored.

The position of the Senate would apply with redoubled force here. Watson at least knew the objections which had been raised against him; the Governor of Puerto Rico is not informed, either by S. 40 or by the accompanying report, as to the cause for the enactment.

---

[4] Art. II, sec. 4, of the Constitution provides: "* * * all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors."

[5] Act of July 27, 1789 (1 Stat. 28); 1 Annals of Congress 576, 578–579, 585, 591.

[6] 1 Annals of Congress, 581.

[7] Art. II, sec. 3, of the Constitution provides: "* * * he (the President) shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed * * *."

[8] Adopted February 10, 1942.

[9] Cablegram from Hon. Luis Munoz-Marin, president of the Puerto Rican Senate, to Hon. Harold L. Ickes, dated September 13, 1942.

[10] *Meyers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52), 121, 122.

[11] Id., p. 161.

[12] Id., pp. 168–170.

[13] Rottschaefer, Constitutional Law (1939), p. 408; Willoughby, Constitutional Law (1929), III, pp. 1510, 1512, 1524; Corwin, The President (1940), p. 95; Cushman, The Independent Regulatory Commission (1941), p. 675.

[14] 64th Cong., 1st sess., H. R. 9533.

[15] 64th Cong., 1st sess., Sen. Report 579.

[16] Macaulay's History of England, vol. V, p. 213.

[17] Belknap's History of N. H., ch. 26; see also Elliott's Debates, vol. 1, pp. 322–34.

[18] See *Cummings* v. *Missouri*, 4 Wall. 277. See also *Ex parte Garland*, 4 Wall. 333.

[19] *Cummings* v. *Missouri*, *supra*, 325.

[20] Sen. MURDOCK, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 6, 1942, p. 4000.

[21] Sen. BARKLEY, *id.*, pp. 3997, 3998.

[22] Sen. DANAHER, *id.*, p. 4001; Sen. HILL, *id.*, p. 4001; Sen. MEAD, *id.*, p. 4003.

[23] Sen. TAFT, *id.*, p. 3998; Sen. HILL, *id.*, p. 4002.

[24] Sen. MCKELLAR, *id.*, p. 4002.

[25] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 6, 1942, p. 4004.

Watson appeared before a congressional committee to defend himself; the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs has acted without hearing the Governor or any of the interested agencies here or in Puerto Rico. The penalty proposed last pring operated only against Watson; here the committee undertakes to penalize the 2,000,000 residents of Puerto Rico because it does not like their duly appointed Governor.

No principle of our law is more cherished than that which insures that no man shall be condemned without a fair trial. No principle of our form of government is more basic than that which insures that neither the legislature nor the Executive shall control the functions of the other. S. 40 in its present form viciates both principles, and is unconstitutional.

ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF MAXIMUM PRICES ON PORK AND BEEF PRODUCTS AND BREAD AND OTHER BAKERY PRODUCTS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire at this time to make reference to a telegram I received this morning from the Meyer Kornblum Packing Co., of Kansas City, Kans. The telegram reads as follows:

KANSAS CITY, KANS., *February 24, 1943.*
Senator CLYDE M. REED,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: First, may I thank you for the interest you are taking in the problems of the packer and I assure you that your efforts are appreciated by all. From the text of Senate Resolution 94, which you recently presented to the Seventy-eighth Congress, I am sure you are thoroughly familiar with the situation. On Saturday, February 20, 1943, we received what is in effect to us a mandatory order to furnish the quartermaster 250,000 pounds of carcass beef at the existing ceiling price. Under the present Office of Price Administration regulations this company will take a loss of approximately $7,000 in filling this order. Although we feel it is our patriotic duty to cooperate with the Quartermaster Department in order that our armed forces should not suffer through the Office of Price Administration's mismanagement on the home front, we are not financially able to carry on for any length of time under these conditions. We are carrying on with our domestic business at about 25 percent of capacity and at a big loss trying to hold our organization together so that if and when this unjust muddle is cleared up we will be in position to utilize our vitally essential facilities in the war effort. This situation is prevalent among the small packers who like ourselves have limited capital and under these conditions in due time will be forced to cease operations. It is a fallacy to believe that our beef and pork supply can be processed and distributed to our armed forces without the aid of the small packers. It is my opinion that under the present set-up the Office of Price Administration with its discriminatory regulations is encouraging black-market operations and forcing small packers out of business. Our record of the past 8 months wherein we processed over 40,000 head of cattle for the armed forces is proof of our patriotism and willingness to cooperate with the Government if given half a chance. An expression of your views will be appreciated.

MEYER KORNBLUM PACKING CO.,
SAMUEL KORNBLUM,
*Vice President.*

Mr. President, I wish to add that I submitted Senate Resolution 94 in order to bring the matter in question to the attention of the public and the Senate. The resolution is now on the calendar. I wish to say to the Senate that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, through a subcommittee, is preparing to hear the packers and bakers next week. That was all that I expected to accomplish by offering the resolution. Inasmuch as that end is being brought about, I am willing that the resolution remain on the calendar for consideration, if that be necessary, at some future time.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT ON WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by the President of the United States on the occasion of the George Washington Birthday Dinner in Washington, February 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY AND THE RUSSIAN ARMY CELEBRATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Washington's Birthday—and the Russian Army Celebration," delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah at the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Russian Army, held in New York City, February 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEED FOR A WORKING LIAISON BETWEEN THE SENATE AND THE EXECUTIVE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Need of a Working Liaison Between the Senate and the Executive," delivered by him at Manitowoc, Wis., on February 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TUNNELL BEFORE JEWISH WAR VETERANS

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator TUNNELL at a meeting of Jewish War Veterans in New York City, February 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

VITAMINS FOR THE HOME FRONT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a press release on the subject More Vitamins Needed for the Home Front, issued by him on February 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STABILIZATION PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization, at a meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, D. C., Saturday, February 13, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SIZE OF THE ARMY—ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT T. PATTERSON

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address relating to the size of the armed forces delivered by Hon. Robert T. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, in Pittsburgh, Pa., February 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DONALD CLAUDE DOBBINS—TRIBUTE BY H. CLIFFORD NORTHCOTT

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to the memory of former Representative Donald Claude Dobbins by H. Clifford Northcott, of the First Presbyterian Church, Champaign, Ill., February 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HOUSE OF THE FUTURE—ADDRESS BY BROR DAHLBERG

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on The House of the Future delivered by Bror Dahlberg in Washington on February 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STEEL WORKERS' UNION FINANCIAL REPORT

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement from the current issue of Steel Labor, publication of the United Steel Workers of America, summarizing a 60-page financial audit of the union's accounts, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ROBERTO LADD AT MEETING OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES ASSOCIATION

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Roberto Ladd, of Mexico, before a meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

SMALL BUSINESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS (MO.) POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Post-Dispatch of St. Louis, Mo., of January 28, 1943, entitled "In Behalf of Small Business," which appears in the Appendix.]

JUDAISM AND A JUST AND ENDURING PEACE

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement from the American Institute on the subject Judaism and a Just and Enduring Peace, which appears in the Appendix.]

MME. CHIANG KAI-SHEK—POEM BY PLINY A. WILEY

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Pliny A. Wiley entitled "Mme. Chiang Kai-shek," which appears in the Appendix.]

MUSIC IN WAR—ARTICLE BY MRS. MARGARET BANKS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Music in War," by Mrs. Margaret Banks, music director of radio station WBIG, Greensboro, N. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

BLACK MARKETS—ADDRESS BY HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN AND INTERVIEW WITH EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, one of greatest services a Senator may extend to his constituents as a representative of a State, or that a Senator may extend to the people of the United States as a United States Senator, is to warn them of impending danger.

Rationing of food is necessarily changing our diets, which we hope will be for the better. The physical system may possibly undergo a change in nutrition. To my mind one of the greatest menaces to come from the rationing system is the so-called black market. Price Adminis-

trator Prentiss M. Brown has denounced black market operations as nothing short of treason and their operators as able assistants to the Nazis and Fascists.

Administrator Brown is unquestionably 100 percent correct in his assumption. The worst menace from the black market is in meat. Aside from the sabotage practice, is the danger of disease. Surreptitious handling of meats, unsanitary containers, and exposure to bacteria, necessarily increase the percentage of contamination. No emphasis of care in the meat menace is too strong. With changed physical systems the human body will be more susceptible to epidemics.

The privations of rationing are nothing new to Pennsylvanians, but the rationing, as we know, is for protection of the American people. It is ordered so that each and everyone may get his or her share of the food available for distribution. There should not be, and I do not believe there is, any disturbance in the minds of the people over this readjustment of food distribution. We are reliably informed that the nations to which we are sending food are at the same time contributing mainly to our soldiers stationed within their borders.

The pioneers of America, especially at Valley Forge, knew privations, not only of food, but of clothing, and our conditions do not approximate the distress of those times, for we are well provided for, and hope to continue to be for the duration.

Mr. President, I ask that Price Administrator Brown's remarks and a portion of an interview with Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., by Mr. Ernest K. Lindley be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PRICE ADMINISTRATOR PRENTISS M. BROWN

The success or failure of the drive against black markets is entirely up to the American public. All of the laws in the land, enforced by a sufficiently large organization which we do not possess, would be useless if the public fails to cooperate in stamping out this national pestilence.

We already have black markets in many rationed commodities—tires, coffee, sugar, and now meats—and the illegal operations in meats are by far the most serious—serious for many reasons.

Black markets affect our national economy. Our dollar decreases in purchasing power as the avaricious demands of these racketeers send prices skyrocketing. Black markets hold the people's food for ransom. They are another road to inflation.

Black markets depress the morale of the merchants and the public and, as the prices of essental foodstuffs rise, the spirit and morale of the people sink. Black markets are a service rendered to the enemy. The firm of Hitler and Hirohito would find it hard to devise an instrumentality more detrimental to the morale of the American people than unrestricted black markets in all foods. No Nazi propaganda could be more demoralizing.

Black markets will have a disastrous effect on the health of our people. Poisoned meats are making their appearance on these black markets. Control of this phase is practically impossible, and large sections of our population may become infected. What finer service could be performed for our enemies?

The Nazis and Fascists may not be able to sabotage our war plants, or bomb our industrial centers, but their able assistants—the operators of the black markets—contribute most effectively by helping to wreck American health, morale, and economy.

Black markets can only survive if the public becomes a party to their support. The Government will do everything possible to curb and prosecute these racketeers, who are undermining our war effort, national economy, and health.

The Government needs the assistance of every American in defeating these highjackers of our democracy.

The black markets must and will be stamped out. They give aid and comfort to the enemy—they are nothing short of treason.

---

WASHINGTON REPORTS ON RATIONING—STETTINIUS BROADCAST, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1943

Mr. LINDLEY. Last week Mr. Prentiss Brown, Office of Price Administration Administrator, told us the "why" of rationing. Today we have the great privilege of hearing from Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., lend-lease administrator, who heads the Washington agency dealing with lend-lease affairs. I'm going to ask him chiefly about food shipments abroad—where and why we send foods, how much we export under lend-lease, what his future plans are. Mr. Stettinius, may I start today's interview by asking you just why we do send food abroad to our allies?

Mr. STETTINIUS. Mr. Lindley, food in its way is just as important as guns in fighting the enemy. Our food helped to sustain the British in their dark days when they stood alone. Our food is now helping the valiant Russians in their present offensives.

Mr. LINDLEY. Tell us, what's the relation between lend-lease shipments of food abroad and our shortages at home?

Mr. STETTINIUS. Mr. Lindley, I'll let you answer that question for yourself—as far as the present situation goes. Last year we lend-leased a total of 6 percent of our foodstuffs abroad. I think it's interesting to take up, one by one, the foods which we have supplied our allies.

Mr. LINDLEY. Fine. What about beef? Most Americans think anything is good to eat as long as it's beef.

Mr. STETTINIUS. Americans aren't alone in that taste. We shipped from our shores last year only 1 pound in every 500 of our supply of beef.

Mr. LINDLEY. That's, roughly, two-tenths of 1 percent of our beef. It's only a drop of gravy from a steak.

Mr. STETTINIUS. It's very small in relation to our supply, but the quantity was considerable—about 18,000,000 pounds. Under incoming or reciprocal lend-lease we received more than 25,000,000 pounds of beef from Australia and New Zealand—for our troops there, of course. We did export more pork because we had it—almost 10 percent of our pork production was lend-leased. Other meats shipped accounted for less than 1 percent of our output.

Mr. LINDLEY. What were our largest exports?

Mr. STETTINIUS. We sent 13 percent of our fats and oils to our allies. In Russia practically all of the food we provide goes to the fighting man.

Mr. LINDLEY. Do we send many eggs abroad?

Mr. STETTINIUS. Our eggs are sent in dried form to save shipping and they account for 10 percent of what our hens laid in 1942.

Mr. LINDLEY. What about dairy products?

Mr. STETTINIUS. We sent less than 1 percent of our butter to our allies, and all of that to Russian soldiers. A big slice of our cheese went abroad as a substitute for meat—about 23 percent of American production. In spite of the large amount of cheese, our total exports of milk products, including butter, cheese, dried, condensed, and evaporated milk, represented only 3½ percent of our total fluid-milk production.

Mr. LINDLEY. Do we get fish across the troubled waters?

Mr. STETTINIUS. Seven percent of our fishing catch has been canned and shipped out. Of course, some of the best European fishing grounds off the Scandinavian countries are under Nazi control. There's so little fresh fish in England now that it isn't even rationed.

Mr. LINDLEY. Since the American people are about to start on their adventures in the rationing of some of the canned and processed foods, tell us whether or not lend-lease has made this new rationing necessary.

Mr. STETTINIUS. Let me go back to the figures again, Mr. Lindley. We sent lend-lease countries last year less than 1 percent of our supply of canned vegetables. We managed to get on ships 1⅞₀ percent of our canned fruits and juices.

Mr. LINDLEY. We can all conclude quickly that lend-lease shipments had little to do with last year's shortages. Now, where does our food go? Why do we have shortages?

Mr. STETTINIUS. Civilians at home have a larger purchasing power and are eating more food than ever before. There's more money in the pockets of all the millions of war workers and farmers. They, too, need plenty of nourishing food to turn out guns and tanks and planes and food for our fighters. We are feeding our own armed forces well. A soldier or a sailor eats more than the average civilian. He should. He usually works harder and needs more food. Then we're collecting supplies of food for future offensives, for the push to final victory. Of course, lend-lease is shipping large quantities abroad, although they are small considering our total supply. And in 1943 it will be necessary to provide the other United Nations with much more food, probably double that furnished in 1942.

Mr. LINDLEY. Lend-lease isn't, as you indicated, a one-way street. We get some food from our allies, don't we?

Mr. STETTINIUS. Yes, indeed. Under lend-lease we pool all our resources—men, implements of war, food—so that we can all use them best when and where we need them. Let me give you an example. In England under reciprocal lend-lease, our fighting men receive, without payment, quarters, transportation, hospitalization, and some food. All their bread is made from British flour. Besides that, the British furnish our overseas soldiers with considerable quantities of potatoes, fruits, and vege bles, jam, and sugar.

Mr. LINDLEY. The Australians give our troops even more food, don't they?

Mr. STETTINIUS. Yes. Of course, they are a great food-producing country. For months, Australian civilians have gone without potatoes so that our men could eat them. We've taken practically all of their pork and canned meats, vegetables, and citrus fruits. In New Zealand, too, the civilians are tightening their belts to feed our men well. Australia and New Zealand have lend-leased for our troops more beef, lamb, mutton, and veal than we've lend-leased to the whole world.

Mr. LINDLEY. Now, about Russia.

Mr. STETTINIUS. Mr. Lindley, we are sharply increasing our food shipments to Russia. This year we expect to send them over half of the food supplies we lend-lease. You see, they've lost important parts of their food-producing lands—the Ukraine, the bread basket of Europe. One of my Washington

colleagues was criticized lately for saying something like this: The more Nazis put out of action by the Russians, the fewer left for our boys to finish off. I'll stand by him; and in the work of lend-lease we shall send Russia as much food as we can to keep her soldiers strong and to help them drive the Germans from their land.

Mr. LINDLEY. I want to thank you for coming today and for explaining so well the part that lend-lease plays in winning the war. I know it will help to make victory quicker and peace more lasting.

### THE FOOD-PRODUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, one of the most serious and portentous problems with which our country is now faced is that of food production. The unprecedented needs of our allies and ourselves, together with the unprecedented demands from all countries upon America's food production, require that the farmers in the United States produce the necessary foods in quantities never before anticipated.

Yet, despite these heavy demands, despite these glaring needs, and despite the imminent danger of a failure in the food-production program, no constructive step has been taken to insure the farmer the manpower, the prices, or the machinery necessary to attain his goals. The fact is that even though America is now faced with the tremendous need for increased food production, the administrative leaders of the agriculture program are still laboring under the delusion of scarcity.

Mr. Herbert Hoover and many other competent authorities have recently proclaimed to the public that this great and productive Nation stands in imminent danger of going hungry. This is an incontrovertible and shameful fact. During recent weeks, a number of revealing communications have come to my office from farmers, food dealers, and others who have made a study of this tremendous problem.

I have at hand one of the most informative letters which has yet come to my attention, with respect to the need for immediate remedial action regarding the food-production program. The letter, written by Mr. Tom Linder, Commissioner of Agriculture in the State of Georgia, under date of February 17, 1943, makes it plain that if the food-production program remains plagued with the present restrictions and present vague, obscure, and dictatorial administrative policies, America will fail in her obligations to herself and the world in this most vital of all programs, the production of food.

Mr. President, since I feel that Mr. Linder's letter evaluates in as few words as possible the grave shortcomings of our present agricultural program, and because I feel that it clearly outlines the steps necessary to alleviate these conditions and insure the success of the American food-production program, both during and after this war, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture, where it may be given further consideration and study.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
STATE CAPITOL,
*Atlanta, February 17, 1943.*

Hon. STEPHEN PACE,
*The House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PACE: In re House Resolution No. 1408, to include cost of all farm labor in parity formula for agricultural commodities.

Labor that goes into the production of farm commodities is as essentially a part of the cost of that product as labor that goes into the production of industrial products.

Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act the Secretary of Agriculture is fully authorized to include labor in determining parity.

Leaving labor cost out of parity determination is simply one of the steps of the Secretary of Agriculture to determine a fake parity instead of true parity under the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

A year ago I stated to the Subcommittees on Agriculture of the House and Senate that in my opinion no law passed by Congress would effectuate relief for farmers so long as the present Secretary of Agriculture remained in office. I am still of that opinion. An official who has no regard or respect for the acts of Congress cannot be relied upon to carry out any law passed by Congress in the spirit of its enactment.

I am sending a copy of this letter to a number of Senators and Congressmen in the hope that they will support your resolution, House Resolution 1408.

#### FOOD CANNOT WIN THE WAR, IF WE DO NOT HAVE THE FOOD

Corn quotas have been reduced and reduced and reduced until the Corn Belt is hardly self-sustaining, to say nothing of supplying sections that have depended upon buying feed.

On checking with the Department of Commerce I find that we have been importing a considerable quantity of cottonseed meal and cake from Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico. Today, without ships for importing feedstuffs from South America, we have a very acute shortage of cottonseed meal right here in the Cotton Belt.

Unless restrictions are taken off the farmers and the farmers are permitted to operate their individual farms to the best possible advantage, we cannot possibly feed our own civilian population in this country for a very great length of time, to say nothing of our armed forces and our allies overseas.

I note some newspapers are putting on a brave front in an effort to support administration policies and are saying that Georgia farmers will produce or exceed their quotas in the 1943 Victory food program. These people are simply "whistling in the graveyard," and expressing wishful thinking. The outlook for production in Georgia at this time is for a reduction of 40 percent below 1942.

#### DISSATISFACTION, UNCERTAINTIES, AND SHORTAGE OF SUPPLY AND LABOR, ALL PLAYING A PART

The best information obtainable at this time is that we have 100,000 fewer adults on Georgia farms today than we had at planting time in 1942. There is an acute shortage of farm labor, farm implements and equipment, and a shortage of fertilizer.

In addition to the above many of our best farmers are so disgusted with Government control, unceasing trips to the county seat for instructions, unfair treatment in prices, and the idea that the present administration is hostile to all agriculture, that they are not in a frame of mind to risk bankruptcy to produce cheap crops for an administration that mistreats them at every turn.

These are hard facts but they are facts, and must be faced if the administration hopes to get anything like maximum production under present conditions.

In many cases in Georgia men who have labor do not have sufficient quotas, while men who do not have labor have more quotas than they can plant. This condition neutralizes a considerable part of the labor that is now on the farms.

#### INCLUDING LABOR COST WILL HELP

The inclusion of labor cost in determining parity will certainly be of immense help provided the Secretary of Agriculture will honestly include this labor cost in determining parity. As stated above, it will make no difference for Congress to enact such a bill if the Secretary of Agriculture does not carry out the purpose of the bill.

#### FARM MORALE IS CRACKING

Let no one be deceived. Farm morale is rapidly breaking up in this section. Unless the administration gives assurance of higher prices for farm products and takes the strings off the farmer, no bill that Congress can pass will be worth the paper it is written on.

The crops in this country are produced by bona fide farmers who have struggled to pay their own way in the past. No farmers who are existing on the farm only through Government subsidies are hardly self-sustaining, let alone able to feed the balance of the country. Subsidies of $100,000,000, $200,000,000, or $500,000,000 paid out only to selected farmers will make the situation worse instead of better.

Only by a guaranty of prices to all farmers that will enable them to produce can the country expect crops that even with rationing will suffice to provide the necessary food in the coming months.

#### BY ALL MEANS PASS H. R. 1408

H. R. 1403 should be passed at once, but do not stop with the passage of H. R. 1408.

Agriculture is the No. 1 war industry at this time. It is the rock on which the entire building sits. If it is allowed to crack, the balance of our war efforts will fall of their own weight.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

TOM LINDER,
*Commissioner of Agriculture.*

### NEED FOR A WORKING LIAISON BETWEEN THE SENATE AND THE EXECUTIVE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I see that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY] is present in the Chamber. I ask him if he will not kindly give consideration to Senate Resolution 22, which I offered almost a year ago, and which was resubmitted on January 7, 1943, and give me an opportunity to be heard before the committee. I have received favorable expressions on the subject of the resolution from leading newspapers and magazines, which apparently have found much merit in the resolution. I have asked some of my Republican friends to cooperate, but for some reason or other there seems to have been a brake on the subject. The people are entitled to be heard on it.

The resolution contemplates a working liaison between the Senate and the President. It reads as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Chief Executive be invited to join with the Senate in the creation of a Foreign Relations Advisory Council to be constituted of the following: The Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State,

other technicians whom the Secretary of State might designate, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the chairman and the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and such other Senators as the President might from time to time designate.

Anyone with eyes to see and ears to hear ought to know that we are facing a tremendous challenge. Various plans have been suggested to the country as to what direction the peace should take. After the last war the President, who as the president of a great university, had preached the need of the President taking the advice of the Senate in the negotiation of a treaty, disregarded his own preachment and presented to the Senate a treaty which was practically a fait accompli, as he considered it. We know the result. There ensued one of the greatest catastrophes of the world. What might have been, no one can say; but we know that after the war with Spain President McKinley saw the need of placing a couple of Senators among the plenipotentiaries in working out a treaty.

Mr. President, I should like to know whose war this is. Is it the Executive's war or the people's war? I should like to know whose peace it will be—the Executive's peace or the people's peace.

Under the Constitution Senators are charged with advising and consenting in connection with a treaty. Most of the principal newspapers in the country—even including the reticent Washington Post—have commented favorably on this proposal. For 8 months last year the resolution to which I have made reference lay in the dusty, musty pigeonholes of the Committee on Foreign Relations without consideration, and it is there now, to be resurrected, I hope, if my remarks have any effect.

It is particularly interesting to note that recently some of the distinguished Members of the Senate have said to me that they are interested in the proposal, which the editorial leaders of the Nation believe contains merit. I believe that the resolution contains merit. I have no particular pride of parenthood in it. I believe that basically it goes to the question to which the world is seeking an answer. It involves a matter of coo,eration.

If the Senate and President will cooperate we shall probably have an answer to future wars, or at least an answer to some of the troubles associated with economic and political problems which are facing the Nation today.

The world is looking for the answers to many questions. The answers will never be found until the nations learn to cooperate. So, too, the answers will not be found to certain questions, until the Senate and the Executive learn to cooperate—especially in those spheres where the Constitution requires that they "play ball together."

The purpose of the proposed liaison committee is to create machinery for cooperative effort. I should think the Chief Executive would welcome the adoption of this resolution.



So I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to take up the resolution and allow me an opportunity to be heard before the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I desire to say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that his resolution will receive the attention of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I cannot make any commitment as to what the committee will do, because I do not carry its authority around with me. The committee is fairly representative of the membership of the Senate, and will be glad to consider the resolution.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the resolution was pending in the committee for 8 months last year, and it has been before the committee for 2 months during the present session. I am taking advantage of the opportunity now to ask that I be given an opportunity to present the matter before the committee so that the resolution may receive consideration by the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. We shall be very glad to hear the Senator at any time that is mutually convenient. However, it does not necessarily follow that merely because the resolution is in the committee it should be reported and adopted. A great many bills are before the Committee on Foreign Relations which have not been reported. We do not report bills until we study them, analyze them, digest them, put them "through the wringer," and determine what course to pursue. We do not merely make speeches in the Senate and pass bills on that basis.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I challenge the remarks of the able Senator from Texas.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I call for the regular order, because the morning business has not as yet been completed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order has been demanded.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be privileged to comment on the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall not object if the Senator does not consume more than 5 minutes.

Mr. WILEY. I assure the able leader that I shall not take more than 2 minutes.

Mr. President, my point, first, is that there has been no meditation on the resolution. Second, no study or analysis of it has been made by the committee. The resolution has been frozen in the committee; and I now believe it is time that consideration be given to it by the committee. As I have said, I have no pride of parenthood in the resolution. I am greatly concerned with the problem of what is to happen a year from now, or 2 or 3 years from now, when peace appears upon the horizon. I do not wish to see the country suffer another such mix-up as we had following the last war. I ask for consideration of the resolution, and I ask my Republican brethren to see that I get an opportunity to be heard, and that the resolution is taken out of the cobwebs and pigeonholes of the committee.

### TENTH ANNUAL BROTHERHOOD WEEK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, this is the tenth annual celebration of Brotherhood Week. In the Nazi war of nerves, the strategem of divide and conquer has played an important part. Time and time again Axis agents have sown the seeds of hate and disunity within the countries they are attacking. But here in the United States the Axis campaign to divide Americans along racial and religious lines has failed.

The tenth annual Brotherhood Week which we are now observing is proof of this—a proof of the revulsion of the American people against hate fomented by the Nazis, a proof of our united aim for the achievement of brotherhood and good will among the peoples of the world.

The slogan of this year's observance, "Victory for brotherhood," reaffirms our conviction that upon the outcome of this war depend freedom, liberty, and equality among men regardless of race, color, or creed.

Brotherhood Week, which began last Friday, is sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. It is endorsed by the President and by Governors, mayors, educators, labor leaders, editors, and civic and religious leaders throughout the country. The spirit of Brotherhood Week is illustrated by a story which most of us may remember reading in the newspapers, but which I should like to repeat here.

It is about three American boys in the Navy—a Protestant, a Catholic, and a Jew—united by their common faith in American democracy and in freedom, who met death together and were buried side by side. Their plane crashed in the harbor of San Juan, P. R., on the last day of the old year. The three young airmen—Lt. Edward Mallory Vogel, of Erwin, Tenn.; Edwin J. Sipowsky, of Waukegan, Ill.; and Issie Goldberg, of New York City—were buried together in the cemetery at Santurce. A Protestant chaplain read the service for Vogel, a Catholic priest for Sipowsky, a Jewish rabbi for Goldberg. Every member of the squadron was present. The Stars and Stripes, for which they died, was over each of them. Did their different religious faiths divide them? No, because their common faith in a common cause united them, as it unites the millions of Americans who are fighting for freedom.

Here is our answer to Hitler's hate campaign. Here is the reason why the celebration of Brotherhood Week this year takes on a deepened significance.

Now let me read the proclamation of President Roosevelt:

> The perpetuation of democracy depends upon the practice of the brotherhood of man.

The American conviction in war and in peace has been that man finds his freedom only when he shares it with others. People of every race, every creed, are able to live together as Americans on this basis. We are fighting for the right of men to live together as members of one family rather than as masters and slaves.

Let me repeat that:

We are fighting for the right of men to live together as members of one family rather than as masters and slaves.

There is another answer to Hitler.

The President's proclamation continues:

We are fighting that the spirit of brotherhood which we prize in this country may be practiced here and by freemen everywhere. It is our promise to extend such brotherhood earth wide which gives hope to all the world. The war makes the appeal of Brotherhood Week stronger than ever.

The President concluded:

I trust that the call of the National Conference of Christians and Jews to affirm anew the religious principles of understanding, justice, friendliness, and cooperation on which the realization of brotherhood lasts will be heeded across the land by those of every occupation and religious allegiance. It is the application of these principles that makes our country united and strong.

Mr. President and my colleagues, the response to the President's appeal has been widespread and spontaneous. Leaders of all religious groups—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—have formally endorsed the observance of Brotherhood Week. They include Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, of the Methodist Church; Dr. Ferdinand Q. Blanchard, moderator of the Congregational Christian Churches; Dr. Joseph C. Robbins, president of the Northern Baptist Convention; William Cardinal O'Connell, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Boston; the Most Reverend Thomas E. Molloy, Bishop of Brooklyn; Archbishop John J. Cantwell, of Los Angeles; Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio, Tex.; and Rabbi Israel Goldstein, president of the Synagogue Council of America.

Among the labor leaders who have formally announced their support of Brotherhood Week are William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and David J. McDonald, secretary-treasurer of the United Steel Workers of America.

Governors of a number of States have issued proclamations urging the cooperation of all citizens in Brotherhood Week.

I think it is only fitting, Mr. President, that we in the Senate—we who represent the American people, with their divergent races and creeds—pledge ourselves to solemn observance of American unity through Brotherhood Week. Let us pause to be grateful for our heritage of American freedom and tolerance. Let us resolve that the victory of freemen over the evil forces of fascism will establish the spirit of brotherhood throughout the world.

## TRANSPORTATION OF PETROLEUM BY PIPE LINE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 103) submitted by Mr. CLARK of Missouri (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MOORE, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. BURTON, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. CAPPER) on February 15, 1943, was read, as follows:

Whereas the production of ships, the making of high-octane gasoline, and the construction of synthetic-rubber plants have been and are being delayed because of the shortage of necessary materials; and

Whereas it is now proposed to construct a steel pipe line from points in Texas northeast to a point in Indiana for the transportation principally of petroleum products; and

Whereas the construction of such pipe line will consume materials and labor in competition with the above-mentioned projects and will cost a vast sum of money; and

Whereas the diversion and use of vast quantities of critical materials and labor would be justified only if alternative means of transportation for petroleum products, such as barges and railroad tank cars, are not and cannot be made available, and then only if the projected pipe line is so located and of such character as to provide the maximum increase in the required transportation capacity for petroleum and petroleum products; and

Whereas it has been contended that recently announced plans of the War Production Board and the Petroleum Administrator for War for projected additional pipe-line construction do not meet these requirements, and that consideration should be given to constructing other pipe lines in other locations and to alternative means of transporting petroleum products: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That a full and complete study and investigation be made for the purpose of determining (1) the necessity and desirability of constructing any additional pipe line; (2) the extent to which any projected pipe line would unduly compete for scarce materials and labor with other programs necessary to the war effort; (3) the type, location, and use of any projected pipe line and the functions to be performed by it; (4) the availability of any alternative means of transportation for petroleum products, such as barges or railroad tank cars; and (5) the possibility of increasing the efficiency of present facilities for the transportation of petroleum by rerouting or otherwise.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution go over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will go over.

## SOLDIERS' MAIL

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Army Postal Service, a branch of the Adjutant General's Department, is today providing postal service to all areas throughout the world where United States forces are stationed. Headed by Brig. Gen. Clayton S. Adams and staffed by experienced postal personnel, the Army Postal Service is affording complete postal facilities at all overseas Army post offices. Utilizing every available means of transportation, the Army Postal Service is dispatching mail at the rate of 15,000,000 pieces a week, the most tremendous mail-handling job ever undertaken by any postal system in the world.

While an integral part of the Army organization, the Army Postal Service is operated in close collaboration with the civil Postal Establishment.

From Iceland to India and from the African desert to the jungles of New Guinea and Guadalcanal, the United States Army mails are being received and distributed with regularity and dispatch, and in volume. Mails to our overseas forces at the present time are three times greater than during the peak period of World War No. 1.

The remarkable accomplishment of the Army Postal Service under the most trying circumstances of war is due in large measure to the keen appreciation had by those directing Army operations so magnificently of the value of good mail service as a vital factor of morale.

The insistence of the Secretary of War, General Marshall, General Somervell, General Ulio, and General Adams that we provide our troops with the best possible mail service under any and all circumstances is being reflected daily at mail calls among American troops at home and abroad

I wish to state further in this connection, Mr. President, that from time to time, I have heard innumerable compliments of the magnificent manner in which this mail service is being provided and handled for the benefit of our men at home and abroad. Only a few days ago I had the privilege and honor of talking to General Ulio, The Adjutant General of the United States Army, under whose direction this work is handled, and I took advantage of the opportunity to congratulate him, for I think General Ulio is doing a magnificent work, and that he deserves the praise and thanks of our several million men in the armed forces.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, in this connection, to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a very interesting and timely article from the March 1943 issue of the Reader's Digest entitled "Soldiers' Mail," by Stanley High, which article was condensed from the Rotarian.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### SOLDIERS' MAIL

(Condensed from The Rotarian)

(By Stanley High)

Thirty thousand letters to American soldiers overseas were "lost" when a plane crashed off Newfoundland last October. Two weeks later, divers recovered the 40 mail bags from 40 feet of water. At the Army Post Office in New York City Army mail clerks took over. Each of the 30,000 envelopes was separately dried. Within a month all but 20 pounds of the 1,000 pounds of letters had been readdressed, reenveloped when necessary, and dispatched again overseas.

When the United States expeditionary force set out for Africa, members of the Army Postal Service were on the transports. En route they sorted mail received just prior to sailing. Ashore, they set up mobile post offices, advanced with the troops, and were passing out mail to soldiers who had been less than 24 hours in Africa.

Last December, Christmas mail was still being posted here, too late for regular delivery to troops overseas. General Marshall and Secretary Stimson are great believers in the value of mail, so the Army Air Transport

Command turned over more than a dozen big planes and 31,000,000 belated Christmas letters, some of them posted only 10 days before December 25, reached the troops in time.

Thus, on every continent and on islands from Iceland to Guadalcanal, the postal services of the Army and Navy are delivering the mail to our fighting men, against unbelievable odds of geography, war, and acts of God. For mail from home, as boost and bolster for morale, is a military necessity.

These overseas post offices are set up in trucks, tents, boats, hotels, schools, and even churches. The Army Post Office on Guadalcanal is in a wooden building which the Japs put up. Trucks from each combat unit pick up mail there, and platoon sergeants have carried letters directly to men in the fox holes. In Greenland and Alaska some mail is dropped from planes. Many bags of mail a week go by air to the Aleutians. In Australia, chartered commercial planes give daily service over a 3,000-mile route.

When mail from home arrives overseas, the postal clerks don't stop sorting until all of it is ready for distribution. When, for example, 7,000 bags of mail arrived at New Caledonia on December 15, the post office went on a 24-hour shift until the last letter had been sorted.

An officer of the Army Postal Service reports that "in the middle of battle, with stuff dropping all around them, men will put the mail call ahead of the mess call." "If I had to choose," a navy skipper told me, "between taking aboard fresh food or mail, I'd take mail every time. The boys seem to manage when food is scarce, but being short-rationed on mail really gets them down."

Army Postal Service estimates that the average soldier writes four letters a week and receives seven. Not all of this mail comes from families or friends. To buck up Private Tommy Smith, a whole county may have been organized to write him letters. A radio program offers prizes to children who get persons to write to soldiers. Of 150 letters recently received by a unit in Iceland, 83 such mass-production messages went to one soldier, and Fort Devens, Mass., received 1,400 letters addressed to a soldier no one at Devens or in the War Department had ever heard of. Such organized letter writing is a headache—the soldiers don't care for letters from strangers, and the War Department urges that people write only to soldiers they know.

A cable can be sent to or by a soldier in the Atlantic or Pacific areas for 60 cents, if one of 136 form messages is used. These cover almost every contingency: "Love and Kisses," "Are You All Right? Worried About You," "Son Born," and so on. Last November the Army Post Office in New York sent through 40,000 such cables.

About 10 percent of Army-Navy mail is improperly addressed. Last October the New York Port of Embarkation Post Office handled 379,800 such letters and 7,280 misaddressed parcels. The full time of 100 men is required to run down and correct these mistakes. Ninety-five percent of them finally reach their intended destination—but not as promptly as if they were properly addressed. Inclusion of the Army Post Office (A. P. O.) number is especially important, for if it is omitted, the letter or parcel must be held up until the alphabetical personnel files are thumbed through and the number is found and added.

Every large port post office has a staff of men to rewrap inadequately packaged tokens of love from home—a pathetic welter of battered cakes, melted chocolates, socks, framed photographs, and scores of other things.

Under a recent regulation, no more packages may be sent to troops overseas unless you present to your post office a soldier's request for the article and his commanding officer's approval. Too many people were sending things that were either provided by the Army or could be bought more cheaply at a post exchange. For example, 20 percent of the packages to soldiers contained cigarettes, which troops overseas can buy for 5 or 6 cents a pack.

Home-town newspapers take much badly needed cargo space; and reports, particularly from combat areas, indicate that they are only sketchily read. Hence, newspapers and magazines may be sent to soldiers and sailors only by the publishers.

The safest, speediest letter service to men overseas is V-mail. It was launched last June and about 1,000,000 V-letters are delivered every week. Where V-mail facilities exist, it is now the only mail service by air to and from men overseas.

Instead of forwarding the letter itself, the A. P. O. has it photographed on 16-millimeter microfilm, one 90-foot roll of which will contain miniature reproductions of 1,700 V-letters and weighs only 5½ ounces. To transport 1,700 ordinary one-page letters would require 34 times as much cargo space.

After crossing the ocean and arriving at a V-mail station, a photographic enlargement of each letter is made and sealed in an envelope for delivery to the person addressed. If microfilms are lost in transit, the port post office sends duplicates. To use V-mail simply ask for a form at your local post office or stationer, write your message on it, address carefully, stamp it, and mail it as you would any other letter.

Last October the U. S. O. in San Francisco received a packet of several hundred letters without envelopes, written to home folks by marines on Guadalcanal. Stationery had run out, so the boys had used mud-spattered Chinese rice paper or scraps of wrapping paper. A marine chaplain on Guadalcanal had sent the bundle to the U. S. O. with the request that the letters be addressed and mailed—which they promptly were.

"The mail," said a navy postal officer, "is a valuable munition of war, and we treat it as such."

So, when you write a cheerful letter to your soldier, you're really "passing the ammunition."

## PREVENTION OF DEDUCTIONS IN DETERMINING PARITY OR COMPARABLE PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 660.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 660) to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection, and I shall not oppose taking up the bill. I may desire to make some general observations regarding the subject when the bill is under consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand it is not debatable at this hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 660) to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, which is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in determining the parity price or comparable price for any agricultural commodity, and in establishing, maintaining, or adjusting any maximum price or prices for any agricultural commodity, or for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part from any agricultural commodity, no deduction shall be made by any agency of the Government for any subsidy payment, parity payment, conservation payment, incentive payment, or other payment made with respect to any agricultural commodity. The agencies of the Government having jurisdiction with respect to such prices and payments shall make such adjustment in any such prices heretofore determined or established as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, it will be recalled that promptly after the approval of the Stabilization Act early last October an Executive order was issued providing for the stabilization of the national economy, and there was included in that order section 2 which came as a distinct surprise to most, if not all, the Members of the Senate. Section 2 reads as follows:

2. In establishing, maintaining, or adjusting maximum prices for agricultural commodities or for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part from any agricultural commodity, appropriate deductions shall be made from parity price or comparable price for payments made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, parity payments made under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and governmental subsidies.

I think it will be generally agreed, Mr. President, by the members of the Banking and Currency Committee which considered the stabilization or price-control measure, by the Members of the Senate who heard the discussion of the bill, and by the members of the conference committee, all of them, that this subject was not mentioned from the beginning to the end of the deliberations on the bill, and, it never having been mentioned, no one had any idea that the bill would be construed in such a way as to permit a reduction in maximum prices or in parity prices.

Section 3 of the act of October 2, 1942, provides:

SEC. 3. No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity under authority of this act or otherwise below a price which will reflect to producers of agricultural commodities the higher of the following prices, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture—

(1) The parity price for such commodity (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials) or, in case a comparable price has been determined for such commodity under and in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942,

such comparable price (adjusted in the same manner), or

(2) The highest price received by such producers for such commodity between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942—

And so forth.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator if I am correct in my understanding that the purpose of this bill is to reenact what was enacted in the original bill but which was misconstrued by the Department, and to make it so plain that anybody can understand it, even the Department itself?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator is entirely correct. This bill simply makes clear what the Senate thought it was doing at the time of the passage of the act.

Mr. President, I shall not indulge in a very long discussion of this matter, because I think practically every Member of the Senate is familiar with this controversy. I have a letter from the master of the National Grange, which I send to the clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
*Washington, D. C.*

Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR BANKHEAD: We have always felt that the Price Control Act of October 2 set forth a very clear policy that maximum prices should be adjusted to meet rising costs, and that subsidies should not be used either in lieu of fair prices or any calculated ceilings with reference to parity.

We are therefore glad to see your bill S. 660, and trust it will receive the favorable consideration of the Congress.

Yours very truly,

A. S. GOSS,
*Master, National Grange.*

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I now send forward a letter from Mr. Ezra T. Benson, executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
FARMER COOPERATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., February 11, 1943.*

Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD 2d,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR BANKHEAD: On behalf of the many cooperative organizations affiliated with this council, with farmer memberships totaling in excess of 2,000,000, distributed in all of the 48 States, we endorse the principles of your bill S. 660, "to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes."

Practically all farmers are firmly and unalterably opposed to subsidies in lieu of a fair price in the market place that will result in maximum production. We believe that your bill is in line with the intent of Congress when it passed the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942. It seems to us unfortunate that legislation of the character of S. 660 is necessary when Congress, as we believe, so clearly intended that the parity price referred to was the price in the market place, exclusive of Government subsidies, incentive, conservation, or other Government payments.

The farmers of this country are disappointed and discouraged because they are prevented from producing, to the maximum, the vital foods necessary to the effective winning of the war, when Congress clearly intended that modifications in ceiling prices in the market should be made "to increase the production" of farm products for war purposes.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA T. BENSON,
*Executive Secretary.*

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I now send forward a letter from Mr. Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK
PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
*Washington, D. C., February 23, 1943.*

Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR BANKHEAD: We would like to advise you that the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation wishes to go on record as supporting your bill, S. 660. We believe that this bill will correct the present violation of the intent of Congress in that parity and conservation payments should not be included in computing ceiling prices for specific commodities.

The provision that subsidy and incentive payments shall not be included in computing parity and comparable prices should do much to discourage the program of subsidies and incentive payments to which we are unalterably opposed.

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. W. HOLMAN,
*Secretary.*

Mr. BANKHEAD. I now send to the desk a letter from Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and ask that it be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
*Washington, D. C., February 11, 1943.*

Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR BANKHEAD: I want to congratulate you on your success in getting prompt approval of the Senate Committee on Agriculture of your bill, S. 660, which will prevent the inclusion of subsidy payments in fixing price ceilings on agricultural commodities. Farmers deeply appreciate this action. I hope the Senate will speedily approve this bill.

Farmers everywhere are united in opposition to the policy of paying subsidies in lieu of fair prices. Representatives of four great national farm organizations recently adopted unanimously a statement opposing the payment of subsidies in lieu of fair prices to farmers for agricultural commodities. Farmers do not want to be forced into the position of seeking subsidies when fair prices can be obtained in the market place. If there ever was a time when the consuming public is able to pay fair prices for farm commodities, they can do so now when our national income has reached the record-breaking total of approximately $120,000,000,000 annually, and certainly workers are receiving the highest wages in the history of the Nation. Despite increases in the cost of food, the average nonfarm worker is paying only 22 percent of his income for food, which is the lowest percentage in the past 30 years.

We do not believe that Congress intended the Office of Price Administration to include subsidies in fixing maximum prices on agricultural commodities. Neither the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 nor the act of October 2, 1942, authorized such action. On the contrary, the provisions relating to ceilings on agricultural commodities, which are very specific and mandatory in character, refer consistently to prices rather than to mandatory rates or payments.

Notwithstanding, the Office of Price Administration, by administrative interpretation, has adopted the policy of including subsidy payments to farmers in fixing ceilings on agricultural commodities. This maximum price recently imposed upon corn is a flagrant illustration. This ceiling, in our opinion, is a violation of the intent, if not the letter, of the law, which prohibits the placing of ceilings on any agricultural commodity below the parity price. This price ceiling on corn is based on market price and not farm price, and is based upon the inclusion of payments to farmers, with the result that the maximum price fixed on corn is considerably below the parity price to farmers, although the law specifically prohibits fixing maximum prices on any agricultural commodity at such a level as will reflect a price to farmers below the parity price of such commodity.

I hope that Congress will speedily approve your bill in order to protect farmers against this abuse of administrative power.

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
*President.*

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is necessarily absent because of illness. It is in my mind that he is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and many on this side look upon him as our authority in agricultural matters. Is the Senator from Alabama in a position to indicate the attitude of the Senator from Oregon toward the proposed legislation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am very glad the Senator propounded the inquiry. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the minority leader, was present at the meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when the bill was considered and reported. The Senator from Oregon took an active part in bringing about a favorable report on the bill; in fact, there was no opposition in the committee on the part of those in attendance, by either Democrats or Republicans. The vote to report the bill was unanimous.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the letter just read by the clerk, coming from Mr. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, I should like to ask the Senator whether the proposed legislation would affect the Executive order putting a ceiling on corn?

Mr. BANKHEAD. So far as the effect on an order in existence is concerned, I have given that subject some thought.

The bill nullifies the Executive order providing that all benefit payments must be deducted from parity prices and ceiling prices.

Mr. LUCAS. I can appreciate that, but I am wondering whether the proposed legislation will meet the question I raise with respect to the position in which the corn farmer finds himself at the present time as a result of an Executive order which says that corn cannot be sold for a price above 88 cents a bushel.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It would nullify that, because this order is prospective, and the deductions under the order are prospective. That would be my legal opinion about it.

Mr. LUCAS. Assuming the proposed legislation shall be enacted, would the President have the power, in the opinion of the Senator, to follow out by Executive order what the departments have been doing, which seems to be more or less contrary to what the Congress intended for them to do?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think he would not have the power, and that he would not assume to exercise such power. In view of the fact that there has been a controversy ever since this matter was acted on, if favorable action shall be taken specifically on the proposition, I think the President, as the Chief Executive of the United States, the chief law enforcement officer, will observe and respect the action of Congress. The President had an opinion on the subject, we have been told, and we know about the controversy, and what was put into the RECORD here, and so forth, on which the President acted; but there would be no justification of any sort for anyone disregarding the provisions of the law, if the bill should be enacted.

I will say further to the Senator that Congress, rather than the President, has the power, if it wishes to exercise it, to control the appropriations, through the agricultural appropriation bill, as it has done in the past through limitations.

Mr. LUCAS. There is no question about that. Now, let me propound a further question. Can the Senator tell me how many commodities would be affected as the result of the proposed legislation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It affects all who get benefit payments, and the incentive payments suggested are benefit payments. If the law stands as it is now, a farmer will not benefit by accepting incentive payments, because they will be deducted from his parity or ceiling prices. It will go in one pocket and out of the other.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand from the Senator that in the event a commodity is selling, for instance, at a figure above the parity price, the farmer will still get the parity payment for that product?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is up to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress. It is not required by the pending bill. The only effect of the bill on that matter would be to prohibit the deduction of those payments under the order, and leave to the Congress the matter of dealing with the commodity.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that once a basic commodity reaches the parity price, the individual who has benefited through parity payments is not entitled to parity payments thereafter.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is provided in the last appropriation bill. It is up to Congress to provide it again, and provide such limitations, if it sees fit.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator what his opinion is with respect to a commodity which reaches parity, as to whether or not the farmer is entitled to an additional parity payment above the parity the commodity has reached.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it depends entirely upon the nature and character of the payment.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will yield further, of course there are only two basic commodities at the present time to the producers of which the proposed legislation will give some aid and comfort, and I sincerely hope that the Senator is correct in his position when he says it will nullify the order whereby corn has been placed in a very unfavorable position. I hope that is true. But wheat and corn are the two basic commodities which are far under the parity price at the present time. As I understand, all other basic commodities have reached parity, or are above parity.

I agree with the suggestion in Mr. O'Neal's letter. If any basic commodity, or any byproduct thereof, has reached the parity point, I hope the Appropriations Committee will take that into consideration in the determination of the amount which should be appropriated for parity payments. If they will just take the ceiling off corn and leave the loan value where it is, corn will reach parity through the law of supply and demand.

Mr. President, I wish to say further that all through the debate and action on legislation dealing with the farmers since I have been in Congress, I have at times stood on the floor of the House and Senate and said that the farmer did not want a dole, that the farmer did not want subsidy payments, but that what he wanted was parity price for what he was producing.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Parity price in the market place.

Mr. LUCAS. Precisely; parity price in the market place. I hope that when the time comes the Appropriations Committee will consider the philosophy which has been expounded over a period of years in Congress with respect to parity payments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. There have never been any parity payments made to the farmers where the commodity was bringing parity in the market place.

Mr. LUCAS. That statement is what I wanted to hear. I thought that was the law.

Mr. RUSSELL. That cannot be done under the basic law. Even if Congress were to make an appropriation of a billion dollars for the purpose of making parity payments, not one dime of the money would be expended if the commodities were bringing parity in the market place. We made parity appropriations of approximately $212,000,000 for the fiscal year 1941, and less than half that money was spent, because of the fact that some of the commodities were already bringing parity.

Others were bringing a little less than parity. Therefore only those farmers received parity payments whose commodities could not be sold for a price equal to or greater than parity.

Mr. President, there is much confusion as between parity payments and soil conservation payments. The soil conservation payments have been deducted in determining the amount of the parity payments the farmer would receive. In other words, the average price that the commodity brought in the market place would be added to soil conservation payments on the commodity, and if the total were less than parity, then parity payments were made on such commodity. Let us assume that the parity on corn was a dollar a bushel, and it brought 85 cents in the market place. The amount of the soil conservation payment was added to the 85 cents to determine whether the corn farmer was to receive any parity payments. Insofar as parity payments themselves are concerned, they are never made where a commodity brings parity, and cannot be made under the terms of the basic agricultural adjustment act of 1938 if the market price is equal to or greater than parity.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama again yield to me?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. That was my understanding, and that is the reason I asked the question I did of the Senator from Alabama. I appreciate the explanation which has been made by the able Senator from Georgia, because it is tremendously important.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think every one understands this subject. It has been thoroughly considered and discussed since the Executive order was made. I do not care to debate the subject further. I know of no objection to the measure. I ask for a vote on it.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, how much will the total amount in benefit payments to the farmers be under the pending measure? Has the Senator made an estimate of it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No. It depends on what benefit payments are made to the farmers.

Mr. GUFFEY. I wondered if there were any figures on that point.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; there are not.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I simply wish to make one observation before the vote is taken on the bill, and that is with respect to the opinion which has been advanced by the able Senator from Alabama regarding legislation negating the authority which exists at the present time through an Executive order placing

a ceiling on corn. That is a very important matter in my section of the country, and I think it is important wherever corn is produced for the commercial market.

For instance, only yesterday I received a telegram from a farmer living near Belvidere, Ill., who has 16,000 lambs he is feeding at the present time. He states unequivocally that he cannot feed these lambs much longer, because he cannot buy the corn he needs for feed. Why is it that he cannot buy the corn? The primary reason is that at the moment the farmers in my section are tremendously disturbed at the price of this commodity. Every farmer feels that sooner or later, through the Congress of the United States, or through another Executive order, the corn farmer is going to be permitted to obtain a parity price for corn. Consequently the farmer who has the corn in the crib or in the elevator or in the terminal, or wherever it is stored, is holding onto it until the time comes when he can get a better price.

Mr. President, the sooner the Executive order dealing with the corn situation is removed from the books in the executive department, the better it will be from the standpoint of the morale of the farmer, from the standpoint of producing more, and from the standpoint of bringing about the harmonious condition which should exist for the corn farmer in the corn sections throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, in my opinion, that is tremendously important. There is not a hog farmer in Illinois or Iowa or the Midwest, and there is not a cattle farmer in the Midwest who can feed parity corn at the price he is getting at the present time for the cattle and the hogs, and still make a handsome profit. The corn-hog ratio is out of all proportion, and the cattle-corn ratio is out of all proportion, and there is no reason why the one who is raising corn should not be able to get the parity price through the law of supply and demand. That is exactly what he wants, and he does not want a subsidy, he does not want a dole, if he can get away from it.

Mr. President, while I am on the subject I wish to make what seems to me a distinction between parity and the so-called subsidy we have been giving to the farmers all these years in the way of an adjustment. The farmer has not been able to get a parity price for his basic crops, and in order to meet that situation we said to the farmer, "If you will produce less we will adjust, so far as we can, with soil conservation and parity payments and benefit payments." So we paid him money to keep the surplus crops off the market.

We are sooner or later coming to a discussion of incentive payments. Incentive payments have been discussed in the House of Representatives. I wish to make one observation in respect to that matter. We have expended millions of dollars, yes, perhaps billions of dollars over a period of 10 years, to pay the farmer for producing less. Now there seems to be a considerable disturbance among the legislators in Washington about paying incentive payments in this great emergency for producing a little more toward the war effort. There is no question about giving the mineral producers of the West some $400,000,000 to produce more copper, more zinc, and more strategic and critical materials. That is not subsidy; that is just good business for the war effort; but when it comes to producing certain critical materials from the standpoint of food, which are basic and elemental and indispensable for the war effort, in line with what the Secretary of Agriculture says the country cannot stand incentive payments, and the farmer should not have the benefit of incentive payments because of that fact.

Mr. President, no one is more opposed to the basic principle of subsidies than is the Senator from Illinois, but we are in an all-out war. We have been in an economic war since 1932—and long before that. The President of the United States along with the farm leaders, back in 1932, worked out a farm program through the triple A, which gave to the farmers the adjustment payments, the benefit payments, and the soil conservation payments. They are nothing but subsidies, and God knows the farmer was glad to get those subsidies back in 1933, when the country was in the greatest economic depression and in the most chaotic condition that we have ever experienced in all our history.

Mr. President, some time ago when a new chairman of the Republican Committee was elected he made certain statements which I shall never forget. He said that he had been after the New Deal animal since 1932, and he hoped to be in on the kill in 1944.

Mr. President, the New Deal animal in 1932 had the courage and the vision and the intestinal fortitude to go out in that crisis and save the country from the great catastrophe we were abou to experience. During that time I talked to one of the greatest bankers in this country, one of the big businessmen, if you please, and he said "If I were President of the United States in this crisis I do not know what I could do to save the country."

Another individual who is worth millions upon millions of dollars today, one of the toughest opponents of this administration, said at that time, "If I can save 10 percent of my fortune in 1933; if someone will come to the front to aid me save only 10 percent of my millions, that is all I am asking." Such an individual did come to the front in 1933 and saved not only this man's millions but the country too, which was the important thing. The person who made the statement about being after the New Deal in 1932 comes from a State where individuals, distressed and angry, and sick and sore and lame as the result of the fallacies of the old deal, went out and took from the bench a judge who dared sign a decree of eviction in a foreclosure case, and threatened to hang him from the limb of the first tree they found.

Those are the conditions which existed when this new chairman was trying to "get" the New Deal in 1932. So these adjustment payments have been with us, Mr. President, for all these years. Democrats and Republicans alike, whether they came from the city or the farm, have consistently, in a nonpartisan spirit, voted for adjustment payments. They have recognized that agriculture is the basic industry in America, and that unless agriculture succeeds all other industry fails.

We now come to the point where the administration says it wants some incentive payments in order to bring about a little greater production and the old spirit of antagonism and captious criticism arises because they are incentive payments, because they are a subsidy. Many million dollars have been obtained through the R. F. C. to be used as subsidies for other industries. The farmers have taken billions in subsidies but at the moment it is popular to condemn and criticize and take issue with practically everything which is being done in the war effort so far as the home front is concerned. However, Mr. President, the chickens may come home to roost in connection with a good many of these petty and vindictive protests.

Mr. President, that is all I care to say.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to express my agreement with the Senator from Alabama and the very helpful suggestion made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

The subject under discussion is not a new one. After we passed the so-called Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, the interpretation put upon that act by Executive order and followed by the Office of Price Administration was so contrary to the understanding of many Senators who helped pass it that 21 Members of the Senate signed a letter directed to Mr. Leon Henderson. Among the signers of the letter were the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], who is not present today, and other Senators. There were 21 signers in all. The only reason why there were not 51, 61, or 71, was that the letter was not presented to that many. It was presented for signature to only 21 Senators.

In the letter we said exactly what the bill of the Senator from Alabama proposes. At that time we challenged the construction which had been placed upon the Price Control Act. I believe the challenge was fair. Last fall I helped to pass the Price Control Act. The interpretation subsequently placed upon the act went far beyond anything that ever occurred to me as being possible.

As the Senator from Tennessee has said, all we are now proposing to do is to reaffirm the position of the Congress. As a member of the so-called farm bloc, I believe that the time has perhaps come, or will come in the future, when we should recast the laws which affect the welfare of agriculture. I have repeatedly said that I shall be happy to participate in the revision when the time comes. The only question involved in the bill is whether the revision of the farm program shall be made by enactment of laws in Congress or by Executive order. That is all the bill of the Senator

from Alabama means to me; and I will vote for it and support it because I think the place to amend, revise, and change laws is in the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a few brief observations with respect to the subject now under discussion. I am not opposing the pending bill. I shall probably vote for it. However, I should like to discuss as briefly as possible the agricultural situation with respect to the laws which we have enacted dealing with farm prices, beginning in 1933.

It is unnecessary, and it would probably be unprofitable, to go into the historic, chronological development of agricultural legislation. For many years both political parties declared themselves in favor of farm legislation which would put the farmer on an economic equality with industry. That was a legitimate objective, and I voted for all the legislation which seemed to be heading in that direction. In the effort to accomplish that purpose I may have voted for many unsound agricultural proposals. However, we have all been more or less groping in the dark about what was the wisest thing to do with regard to agriculture.

Many persons throughout the country and many Members in both Houses of Congress have regarded agriculture as a sort of stepchild of the Government. Back in the Hoover administration Congress created what was known as the Farm Board. Before that time, in the Coolidge administration, Congress passed the McNary-Haugen bill, which was vetoed. I believe Congress repassed it in the Hoover administration, and it was again vetoed. Congress then passed the bill creating the Farm Board and appropriated $500,000,000 to be used by that Board to stabilize agriculture. I voted for all those bills because I never regarded the condition of the farmer as a partisan political situation or controversy.

In spite of our efforts the farmer continued to decline in his relationship to industry. In 1933 Congress passed the so-called triple A bill, which, after being enacted into law, operated for a while and was then declared to be unconstitutional. Congress then passed soil-conservation legislation, and so on. All our efforts were directed toward the objectives which were universally regarded as proper and wise—that of putting the farmer on an economic basis equal to that of industry.

In order to accomplish that object, we had to fix some period which would be fairly representative as between industry and agriculture. It was admittedly an arbitrary period. A period had to be fixed by law, during which the purchasing power of the farmer would be fairly representative as compared to industry and other elements of our population. In its wisdom Congress fixed the period between 1909 and 1914 as the 5-year period during which the income and purchasing power of the farmer, as compared with other elements of our country, was about as fair and representative as in any other period that could be selected. I believe that period was the most representative 5-year period which could have been selected in an effort to put agriculture on an economic equality with industry.

In the legislation which was proposed we had a formula called parity which was not a fixed term. It was not a static quantity. It was flexible. It had to be flexible because of the flexibility of wages and industrial prices. We conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture power to adjust the formula of parity, depending on the cost of industrial products which the farmer was compelled to buy, so that his purchasing power would be maintained on a parity approximately equal to the purchasing power during the period of 1909 to 1914.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Domestic Allotment Act, and the Soil Conservation Act, were parts of the program. The Soil Conservation Act must be regarded in a distinct category from the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Soil conservation might proceed without regard to the triple A, because soil conservation is a problem which confronts our people without regard to the prices which may be received for agricultural products.

Soil conservation is the business of conserving our soil in order that each generation may be able to support itself on the land. We all know that as our population increases every acre of land must support more people than it did the year before. Therefore we had to bring a halt to the wastage of our soil, and we inaugurated the soil-conservation program.

As I understand, the bill of the Senator from Alabama has no effect whatever upon soil conservation or payments under the soil conservation law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Under the Executive order it has effect, because under the Executive order the soil-conservation payments have been deducted in determining the amount of the parity payments that the farmer would receive.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be true. I am taking the two agricultural problems separately. Soil conservation does not of necessity have any relationship to benefit payments under the parity provisions of the law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Many of us believe they are not benefit payments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Soil conservation payments are payments in a certain respect as a reward for the conservation of our soil.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; they are a help in conserving the soil.

Mr. BARKLEY. They are entirely separate from the benefit payments which are supposed to bridge the difference between market prices and parity, as we read it into the law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is an exactly correct statement; yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. When we wrote the parity formula, we always assumed—and I think it was a correct assumption—that the purchasing power of the farmer should at all times be kept as nearly as possible in relationship to his purchasing power during the 5-year period from 1909 to 1914. In other words, benefit payments were supposed to bridge the difference between the market prices of the products provided for in the law and the prices which would be received if the formula were reached by market prices; and the benefit payments were supposed to make up the difference between actual market prices and the parity price which would be arrived at by an adjustment on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, and which theoretically would be the price the farmer would receive if he were receiving parity at the market.

We wrote the first Price Control Act after long deliberation and many conferences. I have said here before, and I repeat now, that at the beginning of consideration of the first price-control bill those who represented agriculture insisted that in the fixing of maximum prices for farm products the maximum should not be below parity. As we went along in the consideration of the first price-control bill—and, even before the bill was introduced, in the many conferences which took place, and in which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. STEAGALL, participated—and in the consideration of what really should be done relative to the matter of agricultural products, we finally came to the conclusion that, in view of the differences which existed in respect to many agricultural commodities, we should set a price higher than parity. In fixing a minimum-maximum—which is rather a contradictory term, but that is really what it was—we went to 110 percent of parity instead of parity, and we wrote into the law originally that when we fixed a minimum price or a maximum price for agricultural products it could not go below 110 percent of parity.

In the process of writing the legislation we had, in a sense, three alternatives: The price could not go below the price represented either by parity or the price which prevailed on October 1, 1941, or on December 15, 1941, whichever was the highest—and as to which, of course, we gave agricultural products the benefit of all the doubts. We gave them the highest of the three prices determined among those three categories.

In all the first price-control act nothing was said about what should be done in regard to benefit payments. I think that was because of the theory that whenever, by any natural process, prices reached parity, benefit payments ceased anyway. The only theory upon which we ever paid benefit payments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act was that in order to put agriculture on approximately an even keel with industry the Government would make up the difference. In the first instance it was to be done by a processing tax, not by the ordinary methods of taxation. We started out to raise the money necessary to put agriculture on an economic basis equal with that of industry, by charging a processing tax. However, that method was declared to be unconstitutional. Then we adopted a different method; but the whole theory was that so long as the prices for the basic commodities were

below what we had written into the law as parity, the difference should be made up by an appropriation out of the Treasury of money which was to be put there by some method of taxation—a method which we had to change after the Supreme Court's decision. The whole theory was that whenever the prices on their own merits—each agricultural tub standing on its own bottom—reached those parity prices, the benefit payments should cease.

But, strange to say, in the first price-control act and in the second price-control act Congress said nothing whatever about what should be done in regard to benefit payments with respect to price ceilings which should be fixed by the Administrator on agricultural products or on other products processed from agricultural products.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has referred to benefit payments, and has stated that when the price for the commodity reached parity the benefit payments should cease. That is true as to parity payments; but with respect to the payment of soil conservation payments the price the farmer receives for his product has no effect whatever.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct; the Senator stated that.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator said they were entitled to the benefit payments; but under the Executive order which has been issued, soil-conservation payments which are paid for specific services performed by the farmer also are deducted before the price for the agricultural commodity has actually reached the price ceiling.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct; but I have always said that, as I understood it, benefit payments and soil-conservation payments are in entirely different categories.

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly.

Mr. BARKLEY. And even though the prices for the basic agricultural commodities set out in the Agricultural Adjustment Act should be reached, soil-conservation payments would still be made.

Mr. RUSSELL. They have no relation to parity.

Mr. BARKLEY. They should still be made to those who engage in the soil-conservation program.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. And to those who are entitled to payments under that program because they are seeking to conserve the fertility of our soil.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret that I did not understand the Senator's position on the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I tried to make that distinction.

I myself would regard it as regrettable if agriculture—and I do not believe that agriculture as a whole takes any such position—if agriculture as a whole should now, in the midst of a great world war, say, "Not only do we want to receive parity payments or parity prices on the market for the commodities we produce, but we want to receive more than parity; we want the Government still to pay the benefit payments," which in my judgment cannot be done under the law when parity prices are reached.

That is not the same situation at all as fixing maximum prices on agricultural products. We said they should not go below 110 percent of parity or two other prices, whichever was the highest. I come from a farm State, and during my 30 years of service in the two Houses of Congress I have—as I have repeatedly stated here—voted for every measure which seemed to be headed in the direction of putting agriculture on an economic basis equal with that of industry, according to the program and the promises of both political parties over a period of 30 years.

There can be no doubt that there is confusion in the law. When Congress passed the first price-control law it said nothing about what should be done as to benefit payments, or whether they should be deducted. Probably Congress proceeded on the theory that everyone understood that whenever prices reached parity, of course the benefit payments ceased, and their payment did not constitute a part of the policy at all.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In other words, they were not paid.

Mr. BARKLEY. Exactly; they were not paid.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But they did not affect the parity price.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at all. They were not paid. In other words, the Government did not have to make up the difference between the parity prices and the prices the farmer was receiving; and that matter was, again, separate from the ceiling which the Office of Price Administration put on—which added to the confusion, I readily admit. I think that confusion is not only in existence among the farmers themselves but in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. So many different laws on the subject have been passed that there is legitimate confusion; and the situation is a complicated one. As to that there can be no doubt. The situation is complicated; and I doubt whether anyone can ever get the thing down to a gnat's eye, as we say in the country, to determine fractionally what can or should be done in order to eradicate the confusion which has existed.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to read all of the first Price Control Act; but in section 3 we really provided a floor to a ceiling. That is an inconsistent term, but that is really what it amounts to. We put a floor under the ceiling. We said, "You cannot go below a certain thing as a ceiling. You may go as high above that as possible, but you cannot go below it." That was 110 percent of parity or the highest of the prices prevailing on October 1, 1941, or December 15, 1941, or the average price for such commodity during the period July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1929. There were four different categories there.

In section 3 of the last Price Control Act we provided—and there is some inconsistency between the language of the two acts; I do not think anyone realized it—

> No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity under authority of this act or otherwise below a price which will reflect to producers of agricultural commodities the higher of the following prices, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture—
>
> (1) The parity price for such commodity (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture—

And so forth. In this act we set 110 percent of parity, but in the last one we set parity, which was an inconsistency between the two acts.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This act, however, suspends section 3 of the original act so far as they are in conflict.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. Therefore the last act practically repealed the 110-percent provision of parity as carried in the first act.

> (1) The parity price for such commodity (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials)—

Still nothing is said about benefit payments—

> or, in case a comparable price has been determined for such commodity under and in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, such comparable price (adjusted in the same manner), or
>
> (2) The highest price received by such producers for such commodity between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942 (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials), or, if the market for such commodity was inactive during the latter half of such period, a price for the commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in line with the prices, during such period, of other agricultural commodities produced for the same general use.

That set a different standard, a somewhat different basis in its variations from the standard fixed in the first act, which no doubt has contributed to the confusion which exists in the minds of many able people about what really ought to be done in regard to benefit payments.

I think it ought to be said, in fairness to the President, that his attitude all along has been that in the consideration and in the fixing of minimum-maximum prices for agricultural products and other products manufactured from agricultural products benefit payments ought not to be added to the price in order that a minimum-maximum might be fixed. That has been the President's attitude all along; it has been a consistent attitude; and it can be justified on the ground that, originally, we did not intend that the Government should step in and make payments to farmers where parity was received in the process of marketing under the old rule of supply and demand.

In other words, if agricultural products reached parity the benefit payments which would otherwise have been paid ought not to be added to that parity price in fixing the minimum below which the Price Administrator could not go. The President has been consistent about that, and, therefore, in the interpretation of the last act which still did not mention benefit payments, which still charted no

course by which the Administrator could be guided in fixing minimum prices or maximum prices for agricultural products, the President, in harmony with his consistent attitude on the subject, and, I suppose, under his advice and direction, the Price Administrator, by this Executive order, deducted not only benefit payments but soil conservation payments from consideration in fixing the maximum ceiling, as we call it, for agricultural products and other commodities made of agricultural products.

I think that the Congress probably was remiss, or it may be it was negligent, or it may be it did not realize the situation when it failed to make clear what ought to be done with regard to benefit payments. I do not understand that the bill of the Senator from Alabama, in effect, will provide that benefit payments, or theoretical benefit payments, shall be added on top of the formula we have fixed in both these laws in determining what the ceiling on agricultural products shall be. Am I correct about that?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; the bill merely provides that they shall not be deducted.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand it provides that such payments shall not be deducted, and that would mean that in fixing a ceiling where any commodity had not yet reached parity, or even where it had reached parity, neither the actual payment should be deducted from that price nor the theoretical payment added to it in determining what should be the maximum ceiling.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This bill has nothing to do with what are to be considered in fixing either the minimum or the ceiling price. It prohibits such a thing as certain deductions being made.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I said awhile ago, it is a complicated, involved subject, and is not easy for anybody to understand the laws and say that all on the right belongs in one category and all on the left belongs in another.

I am not, as I have said, opposing the bill of the Senator from Alabama; I intend to vote for it; but I wish to issue a warning, and I do it as a friend of the farmer.

I own a little farm. My father died at the age of 78 years, and all his life he was a farmer. So I have had the farmer's background during my entire life. I went through the last war, and I saw what happened to the farmers at the end of the last war. When wheat was bringing $2.50 a bushel many of our enthusiastic agriculturists who saw that looked upon it as a mirage and convinced themselves that the price would never go down again, insisted that wheat be held for $3 a bushel, and some of them insisted that we pass a law providing that wheat should not bring less than $3 a bushel.

Many of them held their wheat for $3 a bushel and sold it for 50 cents a bushel when the war was over. Many of them bought large farms. They traded in their small farms, on which they had been happy and satisfied all their lives, as the first payment on large farms, because they saw this mirage and did not realize that the debacle was inevitable, as it came a few years later; and so they lost their small farms and as well their large farms. That contributed very largely, in my judgment, to the agricultural crisis which developed in this country and which made necessary all the legislation, which is more or less artificial in a sense, dealing with agricultural products. I do not want that thing to happen again. I do not want our agricultural people to become so enthusiastic over future high prices that they will bring about or force us to bring about an unsound situation. I know they do not want to do it; but farmers, as a rule, are not economists; they spend every waking hour at work; they have not enough time to study the intricacies of economics and of prices, and usually they take what they can get when they take their products to market. I do not want them to be led on by any mirage of apparently high prices to the extent they were 25 years ago and find that they have built up an artificial situation from which they must descend in the years that will follow this war. I do not want to take any action which might bring about even approximately the same disastrous situation which resulted after the last war, which many of us remember.

I shall vote for the pending bill because I think Congress has the right to fix the formula; I think it has a right to say what shall be the standard in any legislation it enacts. It has not done so; it has left it in confusion. The President has been consistent in his attitude on the subject, and where Congress left it in confusion the President had a right, in my judgment, to put his own interpretation upon it according to his own theory of agricultural fairness and justice.

There may be other forms of legislation dealing with the subject of agriculture which will come before us, but I hope that we may here utter a word of caution that may be heard and heeded throughout our country against taking advantage of a temporary inflationary period to bring about an artificial situation which may again result in untold harm to the agricultural industry of the United States. It is largely because I wish to utter such a word of warning and caution that I have taken the time of the Senate to discuss this proposed legislation.

I appreciate the sincerity of the Senator from Alabama in undertaking to clear up this situation. I shall vote for the bill with some trepidation, I will say frankly. I am not absolutely certain, and none of us could claim to be absolutely certain that we have been doing the right thing in any of our agricultural legislation. We have been, more or less, groping in the dark; but I hope that the passage of this bill will not be regarded as an indication that the Senate and the House of Representatives do not seriously consider the possibility of another run-away inflation, that we do not ignore the rights of other people in this country, but that we realize that those who work for wages and those who live in cities have some rights in the matter of legislation which will affect the prices they must pay for commodities they are compelled to buy.

I realize that there are many avenues and many phases of the agricultural situation and farm labor which I do not think have any immediate or direct relationship to the pending bill, matters in which we are all interested, about which we may have to do something, but it cannot be done in connection with the proposed legislation.

The problems of the farmer are serious, and in many cases distressing, though not so much because the Army has taken all the men from the farm. When I was at home recently I had a conference with farmers in my county, who told me that in that county for every man taken by the Army three men had been taken by industry, and they went into industry because of the higher wages paid to labor in plants producing war materials. That all raises a very difficult problem, namely, as to what we can do by law about the matter. Can we say by law that a young man on the farm, or an old man, or a middle-aged man, shall not go to a city where he can make two or three times as much in wages, in the hope that he may save something and, when he comes back to the farm, after the war, have a little nest egg, something to go on? Can we do that by law? I myself doubt that we can. Yet the great injury to agricultural labor in this country has been the result of the high wages paid in industrial plants, and not so much because of the drafting of farm labor. That question may come up later in connection with other proposals, and I do not wish to discuss it now. I merely mention it as one of the problems we must face.

I hope that the passage of the pending bill will not be regarded by any one as affording a license to get all that can be gotten out of the war, with respect to the prices of all commodities, whether produced by agriculture or industry. In the expression of that hope, and with that caution, which I feel in my own heart I should utter, I expect to vote for the bill.

Mr. GILLETTE obtained the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator enters upon a discussion of the general features of the bill, I wonder if he could be of assistance to some of us who are trying to understand the challenge before us, many of us who are not on the committee, and who are not intimately familiar with the structure of the law.

Will the Senator give us a simple, mathematical example of the way the present system works adversely to the farmer, and how under the proposed legislation the correction will be made?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator does me honor overmuch in thinking that I can contribute to lessening the confusion; but I will say to him that I shall, in 5 or 10 minutes, try to draw a brief picture of the situation as I see it, and I will do so in words of one syllable, because I am at home with words of one syllable, and with no other language.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does it take 5 or 10 minutes to present an exhibit to demonstrate what we are talking about?

Mr. GILLETTE. Perhaps I can do it in less, but I shall try to give an explanation, at least.

Let us take this picture: If there are produced on the Senator's farm 100 bushels of corn a year, and there is a market for but 60 bushels, we will say, there are 40 bushels too much raised. I shall return to the parity price in a moment, but let us assume that the price has been fixed at a parity relationship, that the price per bushel is $1. If the Senator produces 100 bushels of corn and can sell it at a dollar per bushel, he has $100. But there being a market for but 60 bushels, we are faced with a farm problem such as we have been faced with for years.

One group—the production-control group—says that the thing to do is to cut down the production to 60 bushels. That is production control. Another group says, "Produce the 100 bushels and take 40 bushels off the market by some machinery." That is surplus control. Another group says, "Produce the hundred bushels, and enlarge the market by developing new markets and new uses." That is known as expanded-utilization plan. That is the third group. We have a combination of the production-control and surplus-control groups in our present machinery.

We said in the original farm act, which was declared to be unconstitutional, "Cut down your production to 60 bushels of corn and we will compensate you. We will raise the money by a processing tax and we will compensate you." The Supreme Court said that the Federal Congress had no authority to do that in that way.

Then we enacted the Soil Conservation Act, and accomplished the same thing by going "around Robin Hood's barn" to secure reduced production. We said, "Take enough of your acreage out of production so that you will raise 60 bushels and we will pay you for putting that acreage into soybeans, or alfalfa, or other soil-building crops. We are not paying you for curtailing your acreage. We are paying you for building up the soil in the other acres, and we hope by the reduced production to raise the price so that your per unit price will be in a parity relationship. This means a parity price for the 60 bushels you have to sell."

Granted that that is accomplished, the Senator would have 60 bushels to sell, and he would get $60. From the benefit payments he would get the conservation payment for the corn he did not raise, which has nothing to do with the price per unit.

In the original act we defined what parity was.

> Parity as applied to the price of any agricultural commodity shall be that price for the commodity which will give to the commodity purchasing power with respect to articles the farmer buys equivalent to the purchasing power of that commodity.

Then we made this definition:

> Parity as applied to income shall be the per capita net income of individuals on farms from all farming operations.

In my opinion that is what confuses some of those who have chosen to interpret the matter. All we allowed such a farmer as I have been supposing was $60, if we could bring it up to the parity price. Any conservation payment had no bearing whatever on the price. It was to compensate for what the farmer did not raise, and supplement his income.

We took the further position, "Well, if we do all that, perhaps the price will not come up in the market even with that curtailment. It is a voluntary agreement, perhaps not a sufficient number of farmers will go in, and there will still be too much corn, and the price will go down." Then we said, "If and when, even after all these efforts, the market price for one of these basic commodities does not reach a parity figure, if and when that situation prevails, and if and when the Congress of the United States makes money available, we can supplement the income by a parity payment apportioned among the basic commodities in the proportion that they are below a parity price."

Now I come to the Price Control Act. Many of the farm commodities, principally the grains, were below a parity price notwithstanding these efforts. Then we adopted a price-control act, and it was amended, and the amendment to the present law read:

> No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural product—

Not income, but price for the commodity—

> under authority of this act which does not reflect to producers of the agricultural commodity from which it is processed—

A number of alternative prices, including the parity price.

After that was enacted, the President, by Executive order, said that in determining the parity price of a commodity in the market—of corn, for instance, using it as an example—a farmer shall not deduct what he received in benefit payments—that is, conservation payments—and they were included notwithstanding the suggestion which has been made here. Parity payments and conservation payments, have no relationship whatever, especially the conservation payments, to the price of the commodity in the market.

The proposal before us today merely says what was heretofore stated in the law in relation to determining the parity price per unit for the commodity. I shall refer, in that connection, to an additional provision. We said, in the parity price provision set out in the Price Control Act, that no ceiling price should be placed on flour, for instance, which did not reflect to the wheat grower a parity price, merely applies to basic commodities, corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts. So we added this provision:

> No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any commodity processed in whole or in substantial part from any agricultural commodity—

Going into the whole field of production of agricultural commodities—

> below a price which will allow the producer a comparable price.

To take the position now that in determining a comparable or parity price for a particular commodity in the market—which is the number of units produced times the price received for the commodity—there can be deducted a conservation payment, or a parity payment, or any other type of benefit payment, is to bring an element and factor into the situation that has no more relation to a parity price or a comparable price than the King of Siam has to our Government in the United States of America. All in the world the bill of the Senator from Alabama proposes to do, as every Senator knows, is to make that point clear, and to abrogate, in effect, the regulation issued by the executive department. The bill simply enunciates what ought to be apparent to everyone, that in determining the parity price—not income—no deduction shall be made for subsidy payments, and so forth.

In the first place, the Agricultural Adjustment Act reservation does not relate to anything but the basic crops, and the man who is not under the program, who does not choose to come in, does not obtain any of the conservation or benefit payments. The thousands of farmers who are outside the commercial corn areas do not get such payments. Those payments are not part of their income, and cannot be. Thousands and hundreds of thousands of those who are raising other commodities are not benefited by such payments.

The statement contained in the bill of the Senator from Alabama simply makes the matter so clear that no one in the future can misconstrue it. It makes a clear, definite, concrete, candid statement of what the Congress wants; that in determining parity price—not income—or comparable price for any agricultural commodity manufactured in whole or substantial part, no deduction shall be made for subsidy payments, conservation payments, parity payments, and so forth.

Mr. President, I realize my 9 minutes are about up, but in the half minute remaining I wish to say that I cannot for the life of me see why it should be necessary to present in the United States Congress a bill of this kind, and enact it into law, but from the interpretation which has been made, and from the confusion which has resulted therefrom, it became necessary, and I compliment the Senator from Alabama upon presenting his bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if I may I will return to my inquiry. The Senator from Iowa started me out on a farm with 100 bushels of corn, of which I was going to be able to sell 60 bushels.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. He left me there and proceeded to make the situation clear, definite, concrete, and candid. I wonder if the Senator can add to the illumination, at least to the extent of showing me, with my 100 bushels of corn, in dollars and cents what is involved on the one hand by way of penalty under the Executive order and on the other hand by way of correction under the pending legislation. Is that possible, or can it be simplified to that extent?

Mr. GILLETTE. I think it can. The Senator from Michigan admits that I

brought him up to the point he just mentioned. Then the President of the United States says, in an Executive order, "The price of your corn is not a dollar a bushel in the market, and on corn which is turned into hominy grits and into breakfast foods we can put a ceiling price, which makes it unnecessary for you to receive a dollar for your corn. Why? Because you have received parity payments or conservation payments for not raising the other 40 bushels. Consequently we do not have to give you a dollar a bushel for your 60 bushels. You have already received a conservation payment."

Is that clear?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The conservation payment is related to the 40 bushels which I did not raise rather than to the 60 bushels I am trying to sell?

Mr. GILLETTE. Absolutely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). The bill is still before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I think we should have a record vote on the bill, so I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Austin | Gillette | Radcliffe |
| Bailey | Green | Reed |
| Ball | Guffey | Revercomb |
| Bankhead | Gurney | Reynolds |
| Barkley | Hatch | Robertson |
| Bone | Hawkes | Russell |
| Brewster | Hayden | Scrugham |
| Bridges | Hill | Smith |
| Brooks | Holman | Stewart |
| Buck | Johnson, Calif. | Taft |
| Burton | Johnson, Colo. | Thomas, Idaho |
| Bushfield | Kilgore | Thomas, Utah |
| Butler | La Follette | Tobey |
| Byrd | Langer | Tunnell |
| Capper | Lucas | Tydings |
| Caraway | McCarran | Vandenberg |
| Chavez | McFarland | Van Nuys |
| Clark, Idaho | McKellar | Wagner |
| Clark, Mo. | Maloney | Waligren |
| Connally | Maybank | Walsh |
| Danaher | Mead | Wheeler |
| Davis | Millikin | Wherry |
| Eastland | Moore | White |
| Ellender | Murray | Wiley |
| Ferguson | Nye | Willis |
| George | O'Mahoney | Wilson |
| Gerry | Overton | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if it be his true intent, through the pending bill, to speak the congressional purpose and intent?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is my purpose.

Mr. DANAHER. And, of course, the Senator from Alabama would further feel that any Executive order, or purported Executive order, which would fly in the face of the congressional intent, should be corrected by legislative action in this way?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what I have stated. The bill so indicates on its face.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator may recall that on various occasions during 1942 there was discussed the matter of an Executive order which would place a limitation on salaries to be earned by any person in the amount of $25,000 per annum after the payment of taxes. Congress refused to pass any such legislation. It was generally felt throughout Congress that any such legislation should be general and apply alike to money earned and money derived from inheritance or income from investments, as distinguished from salary. Therefore, Congress having enacted a rule of general application under the tax legislation, when the so-called stabilization bill came along I am sure it was generally felt that under the language of that particular legislation there was no room for an Executive order.

So, Mr. President, as the Senator from Alabama has said, in order to execute the true intent of Congress, I should like to ask him how he would feel about an amendment which would add a new section 2 to the bill. The proposed section would read as follows:

SEC. 2. No department, bureau, instrumentality, or other agency of the executive branch of the Government shall enforce any penalty under, and no person shall suffer loss because of any attempted enforcement of, the terms of Executive Order No. — of October 2, 1942, insofar as such order purports to limit the salary of any person to be earned in any one year to $25,000 after the payment of taxes.

Does the Senator from Alabama feel that he can accept that amendment in behalf of the committee?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The two subjects are so far afield that there is no reason in the world to commingle them. Of course, I cannot accept the proposed amendment. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut that we did not intend to give the President such power. If the question should arise in the way in which the pending matter is brought up, in a separate bill to substitute a tax for the Executive order, I should support such a measure; but the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut ought not to be injected into this farm measure. I hope the Senator will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, my purpose is, as the Senator from Alabama properly concedes, to see to it that the congressional intent in this particular is executed under the proposed section 2, just as the Senator from Alabama would have it executed in accordance with section 1 of the bill. I believe that the two sections would fit together like a pair of gloves. They would properly reflect the congressional intent in both particulars. In my opinion, the Senator from Alabama would be well advised to accept the amendment on behalf of the committee, and I hope he can be prevailed upon to accept it. However, if the Senator thinks that the amendment should not be a part of the bill, and refuses to accept it, I offer the amendment and send it to the desk to be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words on the pending amendment.

There is now pending in the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a bill which would raise the debt limit. I believe that an amendment dealing with this subject has been agreed to by the committee, and will soon come up in the House when the bill is called up for consideration. If the bill comes over to the Senate with such a provision in it, the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate will have to deal with it, and act upon it.

In addition to that bill, there will be another tax bill before us in a very short time. The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is now considering such a bill. We shall have to deal with the proposal in some tax bill, where the subject is appropriate and germane. When those bills come to us and we begin to consider them on their merits, I am sure they will receive the consideration to which they are entitled. I am sure that all Senators will vote their convictions on the subject whenever it is appropriate to do so. Certainly we should not complicate the pending legislation, dealing with one particular phase of the farm situation, by undertaking summarily to repeal, without committee consideration, an Executive order on the subject issued by the President, without regard to the merits of the question, on which I make no declaration. When we reach that subject in an appropriate bill I shall vote my convictions upon it.

Regardless of how I shall vote on such a proposal in the tax bill when the time comes, I certainly hope it will not be added to the pending bill, thereby complicating the farm situation.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senator from Connecticut, in whose sincerity and ability I always have great confidence, will not insist on the proposed amendment as a part of the pending bill. Before long he will have an opportunity to vote on the same question.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as the Senator from Kentucky knows, I have great confidence in his judgment. I appreciate the expression of his anxiety and interest in connection with the matter under discussion. However, so far as his argument seems to stem from his belief that the proposed amendment has not had committee consideration, I respectfully refresh his recollection. We assuredly considered it in the Committee on Banking and Currency when the stabilization bill was before us. Not only did we consider it, but we refused to put language in the bill which would have made the Executive order possible.

I should like to have the Senator from Kentucky refresh his recollection in that particular and have it made perfectly clear that we did give the amendment consideration and refused to write it into

the bill. Not only did we refuse to put it into the bill in the committee, but we did not put it into the bill when it was before the Senate.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alabama has said to me personally, and on the floor of the Senate, that he is in favor of attainment of the objectives which I seek by the proposed amendment. I assume from the attitude and expressions of the Senator from Kentucky that he believes the proposed legislation will be in better shape and more germane to the general subject without the amendment. In the light of the representations of my distinguished colleagues I am willing to withdraw the amendment and allow the bill to come to a vote in its present form.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. My recollection does not need any refreshing on the subject of what happened in the Committee on Banking and Currency with respect to this subject. Frankly, the proposal was considered in the committee and rejected. However, in the bill as it was finally enacted, there is language which might give color to the contention that we did not fully reject it. Be that as it may, the Finance Committee also considered the subject when it had before it the last tax bill and did not include it. I recall that. But the amendment which has been offered by the able Senator from Connecticut to repeal an Executive order, was not given consideration. The committee which has been giving consideration to it in the other House has worked out a modification. How that modification will appeal to the Senate, I do not know.

It will be entitled to consideration on its merits; and I assure the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that it will receive consideration on its merits. I again thank him for withdrawing his amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to add to what has been stated by the able Senator from Connecticut and the able Senator from Alabama. I share the feelings of both of them. These two things stem from the same source. The President did not have power by Executive order either to effect parity prices on agricultural commodities or to issue the order which was issued with respect to the limitation of salaries.

I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that whenever the question comes before the Senate I shall be with him. I hope that Senators who have the feeling that the President has exceeded his powers in both instances will vote for the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when Mr. BILBO's name was called). The senior Senator from Mississippi is necessarily absent. I am privileged to announce that, if present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that he would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mrs. CARAWAY (when Mr. MCCLELLAN's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. MCNARY's name was called). The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is unavoidably absent. He is suffering from a slight cold. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BANKHEAD (when Mr. SHIPSTEAD's name was called). The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is necessarily absent. He requested, in the event a vote were taken before he returned, that I announce that if he were present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business for the Senate. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from California and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, those Senators would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is detained on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—78

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Austin | Danaher | McCarran |
| Bailey | Davis | McFarland |
| Ball | Eastland | McKellar |
| Bankhead | Ellender | Maloney |
| Barkley | Ferguson | Maybank |
| Bone | George | Mead |
| Brewster | Gillette | Millikin |
| Bridges | Guffey | Moore |
| Brooks | Gurney | Murray |
| Buck | Hatch | Nye |
| Burton | Hawkes | O'Mahoney |
| Bushfield | Hayden | Overton |
| Butler | Hill | Radcliffe |
| Byrd | Holman | Reed |
| Capper | Johnson, Calif. | Revercomb |
| Caraway | Johnson, Colo. | Reynolds |
| Chavez | Kilgore | Robertson |
| Clark, Idaho | La Follette | Russell |
| Clark, Mo. | Langer | Scrugham |
| Connally | Lucas | Smith |
| Stewart | Tydings | Wheeler |
| Taft | Vandenberg | Wherry |
| Thomas, Idaho | Van Nuys | White |
| Thomas, Utah | Wagner | Wiley. |
| Tobey | Wallgren | Willis |
| Tunnell | Walsh | Wilson |

NAYS—2

| | |
|---|---|
| Gerry | Green |

NOT VOTING—16

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Glass | Pepper |
| Andrews | Lodge | Shipstead |
| Barbour | McClellan | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bilbo | McNary | Truman |
| Chandler | Murdock | |
| Downey | O'Daniel | |

So the bill (S. 660) was passed.

PREVENTION OF SPECULATION IN LANDS OF THE COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 839) to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in land of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which has just been laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on February 15 the Senate passed Senate bill 408 proposing certain amendments to the reclamation law by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project. The bill was transmitted to the House. It has been lying there ever since the 15th of February. Yesterday the House passed a companion bill. There are differences between the two. In order that the two bills may go to conference, I move that all the language of the House bill following the enacting clause be stricken out, and that the language of the Senate bill, as passed by this body on February 15 be substituted, and that conferees be appointed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

That the act of May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. In addition to the primary purposes for which the Grand Coulee Dam project (hereafter to be known as the Columbia Basin project and herein called the 'project') was authorized under the provision of the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028), the project is hereby authorized and reauthorized as a project subject to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and the provisions of each of those two acts together with the provisions of this act shall govern the repayment of expenditures and the construction, operation, and maintenance of the works constructed as a part of the project.

"SEC. 2. (a) No part of the funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated or allotted for project construction or for the reclamation of land within the project shall be expended in the construction of any irrigation features of the project, exclusive of Grand Coulee Dam and appurtenant works now under construction and of the pumping plant and equalizing reservoir and dams, until the requirements of the following subdivisions (i) and (ii) of this subsection (a) have been met:

"(i) All lands within the project shall have been impartially appraised by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter called the 'Secretary') and evaluated at the date of appraisal without reference to or increment on account of the construction of the project. Reappraisals may be made at any time by the Secretary, and will be made upon the request of the landowner concerned accompanied by an advance to the United States of $15 for each quarter section or fraction thereof involved, on account of expense thereof. In such reappraisals the Secretary shall take into account, in addition to the value found in the first appraisal, improvements made after said appraisal, such irrigation construction charges on the land as have been paid, and other items of value that are proper, other than increments on account of the construction of the project. The term 'appraised value' as used in this act shall mean appraised values determined as provided in this subsection.

"(ii) Contracts shall have been made with irrigation, reclamation, or conservancy districts organized under State law embracing the lands within the project providing for payment thereby of that part of the cost of construction of the project determined by the Secretary to be the part thereof to be repaid by irrigation. Each such contract shall conform to the requirements of this act, shall require repayment within the maximum period permitted under the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto (hereinafter called the Federal reclamation laws), and provide that payments shall be enforceable by all means and remedies provided in said laws.

"(b) (i) The lands within the project shall be developed in irrigation blocks, as that term is defined in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. The Secretary shall segregate the lands in each irrigation block into farm units of sufficient acreage for the support of an average-sized family at a suitable living level, having in mind the character of soil, topography, location with respect to the irrigation system, and such other relevant factors as, in his judgment, enter into the determination of the area and boundaries thereof; and shall establish the units as hereafter provided. No farm unit shall contain more than 160 or less than 10 acres of irrigable land, except that any nominal quarter section comprising more than 160 acres of irrigable land may be included in one farm unit, and except that lands owned by the United States may be established into units of lesser size for part-time farming purposes.

"(ii) Prior to the initial delivery of water to an irrigation block, the Secretary shall prepare a plat of all the farm units in the irrigation block and shall publish a notice of the intention to establish such farm unit plat in six weekly issues of a newspaper of general circulation in the county or counties in which any part of the irrigation block is located. From the date of first publication, a copy of the plat shall be available in the county auditor's office of each of said counties for public inspection during the business hours of the office. Any interested landowner shall have the right to file written objections to the plat with the county auditor of the county in which his lands are situated before the close of the period of publication. After expiration of the period of publication the Secretary shall consider and determine all such objections, draw the plat in final form and file it for record in said county auditor's office. With the consent of the owners of all farm units affected, the Secretary may revise the plat or any part thereof from time to time, and place the revisions of record with the original plat.

"(iii) Water shall not be delivered from, through, or by means of the project works to or for lands not conforming in area and boundaries to the farm units covering the lands involved, nor to or for more than one farm unit held by any one landowner, except that as to lands held by the one having equitable or legal title on May 27, 1937, or the heir or devisee of such owner, delivery may be made to or for a total irrigable area not exceeding the maximum provided in this section. The limitations of this subdivision shall not apply to lands owned by the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof, corporate or otherwise.

"(iv) Lands within the project in excess of one farm unit held by any one landowner shall, except as otherwise provided in this act, be deemed excess land: *Provided*, That if excess land is acquired by foreclosure or other process of law, by conveyance in satisfaction of mortgages, by inheritance or by devise, water therefor may be furnished temporarily for a period not exceeding 5 years from the effective date of such acquisition, delivery of water thereafter ceasing until the transfer thereof to a landowner duly qualified to secure water therefor.

"(v) As used in this act, the terms 'owner,' 'landowner', and 'any one landowner' denote any person, corporation, joint-stock association, or family; the term 'family' denotes a group consisting of either or both husband and wife, together with their children under 18 years of age, or all of such children if both parents are dead; the term 'their children' includes the issue and lawfully adopted children of either or both husband and wife; and the term 'lands within the project' denotes those lands within the boundaries of the existing Columbia Basin irrigation districts, or revisions thereof approved by the Secretary, which the Secretary determines may be supplied water from, through, or by means of the project works and are required to be included to provide for sound development and operation of the project. Lands shall be deemed to be held by a family, if held as separate property of husband or wife, or constitute a part or all of their community property, or if they are the property of any or all of their children under 18 years of age.

"(c) As a condition precedent to receiving water from the project and in consideration thereof, each landowner shall be required to execute, within 6 months from the date of the execution of the contract between the United States and the district within which the land is located, a recordable contract covering all his lands within that district, agreeing as to such lands for and on behalf of himself, his heirs, successors, and assigns to the provisions set forth in this subsection (c): *Provided*, That any landowner, having failed to execute such a contract within this period, may be permitted to execute such contract within 1 year after the date of judicial confirmation of the validity of the contract between the United States and the district but only in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed under section 8 concerning this privilege.

"Each such recordable contract shall provide—

"(i) That the landowner will conform his lands by purchase, sale, or exchange at the appraised values to the area and boundaries of the pertinent farm unit or units shown on the plats filed under subsection 2 (b) and will dispose of excess land then or thereafter owned by him at its appraised value; that the Secretary is thereby given an irrevocable power of attorney to sell in behalf of the landowner any such excess land at said appraised value; and that the United States is thereby given, without further consideration, an option to buy any such excess land at said appraised value: *Provided*, That sales under such power or such option, unless otherwise provided in writing by said owner, shall be only for cash and only such that surrender of possession by the owner of any area of excess lands then operated as a single unit for dry farming or grazing may be effected substantially at one time.

"(ii) That in the period from the date of execution thereof and to a date 5 years from the time water becomes available for the lands covered thereby, no conveyance of or contract to convey a freehold estate in such lands, whether excess or nonexcess lands, shall be made for a consideration exceeding its appraised value, and in connection with any conveyance of, or contract to convey, such an estate within such period the grantor or vendor or the grantee or vendee or any lien holder thereof shall, within 30 days from the date of such conveyance or contract, file in the office of the county auditor in the county or counties in which the land is located an affidavit describing the conveyance or contract and the consideration therefor.

"(iii) That in the event that within such period such a conveyance of, or contract to convey, is made without filing within said 30 days the affidavit required in (ii) of this subsection, or is made for a consideration in excess of the appraised value, the Secretary, at any time within 2 years of the day on which there is filed for recording in the official country records the contract or deed involved, whichever is filed earliest in the event both the contract and deed are filed in a given transaction, may cancel the right of such estate to receive water from, through, or by means of the project works by a written notice of cancelation: *Provided*, That said power to cancel as to any given parcel of land may be waived by the Secretary at any time within said 2-year period by a written notice of waiver: *And provided further*, That after any such cancelation a project water right for the estate involved may be acquired only on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary.

"(iv) That should any freehold estate in land covered thereby be conveyed or contracted to be conveyed within the period defined in (ii) of this subsection, the transaction, and any mortgage or other lien covering any deferred consideration thereunder, shall be subject to all the provisions of subsection 3 (b) hereof.

"Any or all of the provisions of this subsection (c) required to be included in the recordable contracts may be made covenants running with the land when said recordable contracts expressly so provide.

"(d) Each contract made pursuant to subdivision 2 (a) (ii) shall provide that no water will be delivered from, through, or by means of the project works except in accordance with the provisions and limitations of section 2 hereof.

"(e) Each district contract may include provisions—

"(i) Requiring that all lands within the district not covered by recordable contracts provided for under subsection (c) or otherwise not eligible to receive water shall be subject to assessment in the same manner and to the same extent as like lands eligible to receive water, subject to such provisions as the Secretary may prescribe for postponement in payment of all or part of such assessments but not beyond the expiration of the period during which the price limit under subsection 2 (c) applies.

"(ii) That, without compliance with other provisions of State law for the exclusion of lands, lands may be withdrawn from the district by filing a written notice of withdrawal

with the district board on or before such date fixed by such board between a date 10 days after the official notice of the election on the contract between the United States and the district and the date of such election. The date limiting the time of such filing shall be announced in the official notice of the proposed election, and lands for which such notice is filed shall be deemed excluded from the district for all purposes as of the time of such filing. Thereafter lands so withdrawn and excluded so long as they remain in private ownership shall not be entitled to receive water from, through, or by means of the project works.

"(f) Any instrument, action, determination, rule, or regulation of the Secretary or his duly authorized representatives under the authority of this section 2 which is or may be determinative of the title to lands or interest in lands in private ownership within the project shall be effective as to any given parcel of land, as against purchasers for value without actual notice, only from the time of the filing for record in the office of the county auditor of the county or counties in which the lands affected are located of a copy thereof authenticated in the manner authorized by law. Such filing shall impart legal notice to the public of the matters and things set out therein.

"SEC. 3. (a) Fraudulent misrepresentation as to the true consideration involved in the conveyance of, or contract to convey, any freehold estate in land covered by a recordable contract made under subsection 2 (c) hereof, in the affidavit required by that subsection shall constitute a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"(b) Should any freehold estate in lands subject to the recordable contract made under subsection 2 (c) hereof be conveyed or contracted to be conveyed, after the date of execution of such recordable contract and within 5 years from the time water becomes available for such lands, at a consideration in excess of the appraised value of said estate, the transaction, and any mortgage or other lien covering any deferred consideration thereunder, shall be invalid and unenforceable by the vendor or grantor, his successors or assigns as to that part of the consideration in excess of the appraised value of the estate involved. In the case of any such transaction involving deferred payments, said invalid portion of the consideration shall be deducted first from the deferred payments in the inverse order of their due dates.

"The vendee or grantee in any such transaction, at any time within 2 years from the date of any such conveyance or contract and on filing a correct affidavit as required in subdivision 2 (c) (ii), may recover from the vendor or grantor, or the successors or assigns thereof, an amount equal to the payments made in excess of the appraised value.

"In connection with any judgment or decree hereunder in favor of a vendee or grantee, said vendee or grantee shall have the right to recover court costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

"SEC. 4. (a) For the purposes of assisting in the permanent settlement of farm families, protecting project land, facilitating project development, preventing speculation in project lands, and providing for the general welfare, the Secretary is authorized to administer public lands of the United States in the project area and lands acquired under this section; to sell, exchange, or lease such lands; to improve such lands, or other lands within the project under contract with the owners or organizations thereof as herein provided, by clearing, leveling, and preparing them for handling of irrigation water; to establish town sites on such lands; to dedicate portions of such lands for public purposes in keeping with sound project development; to acquire in the name of the United States, at prices satisfactory to him, such lands or interest in lands, within or adjacent to the project area, as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of the project; to accept donations of real and personal property for the purposes of this act; and to disseminate information by appropriate means and methods. Any moneys realized on account of donations for purposes of this act shall be covered into the Treasury as trust funds.

"(b) Contracts, exchanges, and leases made under this section, shall be on terms that, in the Secretary's judgment, are in keeping with sound project development. In addition, land-sale contracts shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, provides for the return in a reasonable period of years of not less than the appraised value of the land and improvements thereon. Contracts for repayment of costs incurred by the United States in clearing, leveling, and preparing lands for the handling of irrigation water may, in the Secretary's discretion, be made with individual water users or any form of water users' organization satisfactory to him.

"Qualifications of applicants for the purchase of land for irrigation farming shall be prescribed as provided in subsection C of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 702), notwithstanding any other provisions of law.

"SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary may enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or political subdivision thereof with respect to any real property situated therein after it is acquired pursuant to the authority of this act and before execution by the United States of a contract of sale covering it, out of funds derived from the leasing of such lands. The amount so paid for any year upon any such property shall not exceed the taxes that would be paid to the State or subdivision as the case may be upon such property if it were not exempt from taxation thereby.

"(b) Any public lands within the project and any lands or interests in lands acquired by the United States under this act, beginning at such date or dates and subject to such provisions and limitations as may be fixed or provided by regulations made under section 8, shall be (i) subject to the provisions of the laws of the State of Washington relating to the organization, government, and regulation of irrigation, reclamation, and conservancy districts, and (ii) subject to legal assessment or taxation by any such district, and to liens for such assessments and taxes and to all proceedings for the enforcement thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands of like character. The United States does not assume any obligation for amounts so assessed or taxed; and any proceedings to enforce them shall be subject to any title then remaining in the United States, to any prior lien reserved to the United States for unpaid installments under land sale contracts made under this act, and to any lien for any other charges, accrued or unaccrued, under and by virtue of such contracts or any contract between the United States and the district in which the land is located. Regulations to carry out this subsection shall be effective when filed for record in the manner provided in subsection 2 (f).

"(c) In addition to taxation or assessment under subsection 5 (b) upon execution by the United States of a contract of sale of any lands within the project, the lands under contract may be taxed by the State or political subdivision thereof in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands of a like character. All taxes legally so assessed may be enforced in the same manner and under the same proceeding whereby said taxes are enforced against privately owned lands, subject to the limitations in favor of the United States that govern the enforcement of district assessments or taxes as provided in subsection 5 (b). If lands under any such contract shall at any time revert to the United States before transfer of title under the contract by reason of default thereunder, all liens or tax titles resulting from taxes levied pursuant to the authority of this subsection upon such lands shall be thereupon extinguished; and the levying of any such tax by such State or political subdivision shall be deemed to be an agreement on its part, in the event of such reversion, to execute and record a formal release of such lien or tax title.

"SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such moneys as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, to be reimbursable to the extent required by this act. All revenues received in carrying out the provisions of section 4 hereof shall be covered into the General Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Amounts equal to appropriated funds requisitioned by the Secretary and made available for disbursement on the books of the Treasurer of the United States shall be debited in a special account in the Treasury, to be known as the Columbia Basin Land Development Account. Amounts equal to revenues covered into the General Treasury as miscellaneous receipts shall be credited in said special account. After such credits equal the amount of the debits with interest thereon at the rate of 3 percent per annum from the respective dates of the debits, additional credits in said special account shall be made by the Secretary, in the manner determined by him, the basis of corresponding credits to the construction-cost obligations of the district or districts entering into contracts under section 2 hereof.

"SEC. 7. No water shall be delivered for irrigation within the project until the State of Washington, by appropriate legislation, shall have adopted, authorized, ratified, and consented to all the provisions of this act insofar as such provisions or any of them, in whole or in part, may come within the scope of State jurisdiction or authority or be applicable to State lands.

"Legislation otherwise conforming to the standards above stated in this section will meet the requirements of the section even though, by reason of limitations in the State constitution, the contracts required under subsection 2 (c) cannot be executed pursuant to such legislation as to the State's school and other public lands. As to such lands, the provisions and requirements of subsection 2 (c) shall remain effective, but if these constitutional limitations have not been removed at least 6 months prior to the expiration of the time provided for the execution of the contracts the time is hereby extended for a period ending 6 months after the removal of the limitations.

"SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized to perform such acts, to make such rules and regulations, and to include in the contracts hereinbefore provided for such provisions as he deems proper for carrying out the provisions of this act; and in connection with sales or exchanges under the act, he is authorized to effect conveyances without regard to the law governing the patenting of public lands. Wherever in this act functions, powers, or duties are conferred upon the Secretary, said functions, powers, or duties may be performed, exercised, or discharged by his duly authorized representatives.

"SEC. 9. The consent of the United States is hereby given to the sale of school lands and any other public lands of the State of Washington comprising a part of the lands within the project at prices not to exceed their appraised values, determined as provided in subsection 2 (a) hereof.

"SEC. 10. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the

remainder of the act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 11. This act may be cited as 'The Columbia Basin Project Act'."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. Am I to understand that the language which the Senator is proposing as an amendment to the House bill is the precise language heretofore approved by the Senate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is the identical language approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 839) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senate passed House bill 839, having amended the bill. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Office appointed Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MCNARY, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

## URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 82, to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment was, on page 1, after line 7 and following the heading "Legislative," to insert the following:

SENATE

For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, including compensation to stenographers of committees, at such rate as may be fixed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, fiscal year 1943, $200,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses except in accordance with the provisions of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, approved June 3, 1926, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 24, to insert:

INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

THOMAS JEFFERSON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to enable the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two-hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans," approved July 30, 1942, fiscal year 1943, $50,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 13, to strike out "$1,000,000", and insert "$750,000."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the amendment. If there is one bureau of the Federal Government that does not of its own initiative create work for itself it is the office of the Treasurer of the United States. The evidence which was taken by the Appropriations Committee does not present a single fact upon which the proposed reduction can be justified. On the contrary, it presents ample evidence to justify the conviction, which I entertain, that the Treasurer of the United States is not asking for enough money to do the work which should be done. The Treasurer has to examine every check which is issued by every branch of the Government. He or his office has to examine every check which is issued by the War Department, every check issued by the Navy Department, every check issued by every bureau and section of the vast establishment which has been erected here. More important than that—to me, at least—is the fact that it is necessary for the Treasurer of the United States to examine the checks which are sent as allotments to the dependents of the boys in the Army and in the Navy who are bearing the burden of the war. Yet, although the evidence before the committee was that there already is a backlog of checks which have not been examined, the committee has recommended a cut of $250,000. The Treasurer of the United States examines the checks in a more detailed and more careful way than most banks examine the checks which are passed through them.

Senators will be interested to know that more than 300 stop-payment checks pass through that office every single day of the year. The personnel of the Treasurer's office has been increased by scarcely more than 20 percent in the past 2 years, whereas the work of that office has been more than doubled.

I have here a letter which I received from the Treasury Department in response to a request which I made, and before the Senate votes, without evidence, to cut the appropriation for the office which scrutinizes the payments which are being made, I think it should know what is in this letter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator made the statement that there is no evidence in the record upon which anyone can base an opinion as to why this reduction should be made. I am curious to know why it was made and how it came about, if the Senator will tell us that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reduction was made upon the motion of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], who, if I may quote him with propriety, said in the meeting of the committee that he was offering the amendment on general principles.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Oregon will wait for a moment, I will yield to him.

Mr. LUCAS. What the Senator from Wyoming suggests is a very interesting way to legislate, and I am very thankful to the Senator. I should like to find out why the appropriation was cut, if there was no evidence to show any reason for it. The Senator from Illinois is just as anxious as is any other Member of the Senate to save the taxpayers' money, but I am curious to know just why it all came about. In view of the information furnished by the Senator in the first part of his statement, I have my curiosity satisfied, and I thank him.

Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. MCKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor. Does he yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I gave also as my reason for offering the amendment which reduced by 25 percent the House emergency appropriation for the office of the Treasurer of the United States the fact that no demonstration had been made of the efficiency of the force of the Department.

In other words, although the work of the Department has increased, it is taken for granted by the proponents of this $1,000,000 deficiency appropriation that those already in the Department are efficient and industrious. I question the efficiency and industry of many persons among the hordes of payrollees in the bureaus and departments of the executive branch of our Government. All through our discussions in the Appropriations Committee, when considering the needs of the departments, we are confronted constantly with overstaffed and overmanned executive departments. The only way I know how to reduce the number of clerks and the expense incident to their employment is to cut the appropriations for them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not cut the appropriation at the expense of the dependents of the soldiers and sailors of the United States.

Mr. HOLMAN. No, and probably not at the expense of efficiency in handling the business in question. There are so many employees in that office now that they are falling all over themselves. Moreover, the farming industry and commercial enterprises are being deprived of needed workers. Why cannot the executive departments get along

with fewer employees; why cannot they tighten up their belts and get to work as the taxpayers and the producers of the country are doing and must continue to do to even greater extent than they yet have done, if we are to win this war. Fewer and fewer people must do more and more work in government as well as in private life.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, now will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to refer, first, to the evidence, and I shall read from it——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to do it myself, but shall be very glad to have the Senator save my voice.

Mr. McKELLAR. The evidence is as follows:

We estimate that we would actually need to clear all checks—

That is merely the clerical work of clearing checks, not affecting payments to soldiers or anyone else—

We estimate that we would actually really need to clear all checks, which we now have on hand—

Listen to this:

and which will be received during the remainder of the fiscal year, $1,500,000; but we foresee—

Listen to this:

we foresee that we cannot get the necessary employees to do that much of a job.

So the witness, Mr. Barnes, assistant to the Treasurer, was asking for $1,500,000 and at the same time conceding that even if he should get it or if he should get a million dollars it was doubtful whether he could hire the employees to do the job.

So, in spite of the fact that we may get this $1,000,000, we will still have a heavy background of uncleared checks at the end of this fiscal year.

We have now on our rolls enough people so that we can use an increase of $912,000, and the only addition to our present commitment will be $81,000 for employees that we contemplate we will be able to get during the balance of the year.

That is the testimony of the Department, and on that testimony the committee was exceedingly liberal in this matter. I wish, however, to be absolutely fair and just to the Department. I now read a letter which I have received today. The Department evidently recognized that the testimony which was adduced before the committee did not even justify the $750,000 we provided for them. So I have a letter today from Mr. D. W. Bell, Acting Secretary of the Treasury, which I think ought to be read. It might have changed the situation entirely if it had been received before today but it has been received in the last half hour. I read from the letter:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to House Joint Resolution 82, providing urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year 1943.

As passed by the House, House Joint Resolution 82 provided a deficiency appropriation in the amount of $1,000,000 for "Salaries, Office of the Treasurer of the United States," fiscal year 1943. In reporting the resolution, the Senate Committee on Appropriations reduced this item from $1,000,000 to $750,000, with the explanation that it was the feeling of the committee that the latter amount would be sufficient for the remainder of the fiscal year.

The Department, through its representative, testified before the committee that even if it got a million dollars it did not believe it could obtain the clerical help with which to do the work, and it would still have a tremendous backlog of these checks. What was the committee to do on the evidence before it? It takes evidence to justify appropriations. On the evidence before it the committee was extremely liberal in granting $750,000.

But Mr. Bell goes on to say:

This reduction of $250,000 will have the effect of seriously impairing the accounting operaticns of the Treasury—

That is absolutely ex parte; the committee has to have facts on which to work and not mere statements—

and of hampering the settlement of disbursing officers' accounts in the War and Navy Departments. I should like to take this opportunity, therefore, of placing the facts before you, with the earnest request that every effort be made to have this appropriation restored to $1,000,000, as approved by the House of Representatives.

The funds in question are required for the office of the Treasurer of the United States for the purpose of clearing the great volume of checks issued by all of the Government departments and agencies and drawn on the Treasurer. It is estimated that over 159,000,000 checks will be paid by the Treasurer of the United States during the current fiscal year. The funds made available to the Treasurer under the regular appropriations will provide for the clearance of only 69,800,000 checks. In other words, there will be 89,300,000 more checks to be handled this year than can be cleared with the funds available.

This great volume of check clearances is due to enormous increases in the number of checks issued on account of War and Navy disbursements.

In order to dispose of this vast volume of checks, it was originally estimated that a deficiency appropriation of at least $1,235,000 would be required for this fiscal year. This estimate was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, and the justification for that amount was not questioned. However, because of the difficulty of recruiting such a large force, it was agreed by both the Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury that a smaller estimate * * *.

It is not to remove this amount, but to lessen it, that they have agreed that they cannot get that much help. The letter continues:

In his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, the Assistant to the Treasurer clearly indicated that the estimate of $1,000,000 was considerably less than the amount actually needed. The Senate committee's reduction from $1,000,000 to $750,000 will, as previously stated, create a backlog of uncleared checks that will result in serious delay in the settlement of the War and Navy disbursing accounts—

Not payments to soldiers, but for the settlement of disbursing accounts—

and generally affect the Treasury's accounting operations.

It should also be pointed out that the major portion of the additional employees required for this work have already been placed on the rolls.

They do not wait for the Congress, they do not care anything about putting the evidence before us when we send for them and ask them to do it.

As of this date, the Treasurer advises me that his office has on hand over 40,000,000 checks awaiting assorting, classifying, and stating. Unless the full amount of $1,000,000 is provided, the accumulation of such checks will total over 60,000,000 by July 1.

The Treasury is deeply concerned over the reduction of this appropriation, and if you should desire additional information regarding the clearance of these checks, the Department will be pleased to have its representatives appear again before your subcommittee.

Mr. President, this bill has been before the Senate since last Monday. I suggested to the Senator from Wyoming a few moments ago—I do not believe I mentioned the fact that Mr. Bell had written me a letter—that on the strength of information I had received we should let this matter go to conference, and let it be worked out there on the facts.

The Department did not furnish evidence on the subject. They admit that they did not furnish it. The committee acted absolutely in accordance with the facts, and it was because of lack of evidence that this particular appropriation was reduced.

If there is one thing the Committee on Appropriations does it is to act upon facts brought before it, and in this state of the record I think they were exceedingly liberal in allowing $750,000.

I ask that the letter from Mr. Bell be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
*Washington, February 24, 1943.*

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
*Acting Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to House Joint Resolution 82, providing urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year 1943.

As passed by the House, House Joint Resolution 82 provided a deficiency appropriation in the amount of $1,000,000 for salaries, Office of the Treasurer of the United States, fiscal year 1943. In reporting the resolution, the Senate Committee on Appropriations reduced this item from $1,000,000 to $750,000, with the explanation that it was the feeling of the committee that the latter amount would be sufficient for the remainder of the fiscal year.

This reduction of $250,000 will have the effect of seriously impairing the accounting operations of the Treasury, and of hampering the settlement of disbursing officers' accounts in the War and Navy Departments. I should like to take this opportunity, therefore, of placing the facts before you, with the earnest request that every effort be made to have this appropriation restored to $1,000,000, as approved by the House of Representatives.

The funds in question are required by the Office of the Treasurer of the United States for the purpose of clearing the great volume of checks issued by all of the Government departments and agencies and drawn on the Treasurer. It is estimated that over 159,000,000 checks will be paid by the Treasurer of the United States during the current fiscal year. The funds made available in the Treasurer's regular appropriation will provide for the clearance of only 69,800,000 checks. In other words, there will be 89,300,000 more checks to be handled this year than can be cleared with the funds available. This great volume of check clearances is due

to enormous increases in the number of checks issued on account of War and Navy disbursements.

In order to dispose of this vast volume of checks, it was originally estimated that a deficiency appropriation of at least $1,235,000 would be required for this fiscal year. This estimate was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, and the justification for that amount was not questioned. However, because of the difficulty of recruiting such a large force, it was agreed by both the Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury that a smaller estimate in the amount of $1,000,000 would be submitted, although this amount would not provide the full number of employees actually required. In his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, the Assistant to the Treasurer clearly indicated that the estimate of $1,000,000 was considerably less than the amount actually needed. The Senate committee's reduction from $1,000,000 to $750,000 will, as previously stated, create a backlog of uncleared checks that will result in serious delay in the settlement of the War and Navy disbursing accounts, and generally affect the Treasury's accounting operations.

It should also be pointed out that the major portion of the additional employees required for this work have already been placed on the rolls. In fact, on the basis of the present pay-roll commitment, a deficiency appropriation of at least $919,000 would be required in order to carry the present force to the end of the fiscal year. As of this date, the Treasurer advises me that his office has on hand over 40,000,000 checks awaiting assorting, classifying, and stating. Unless the full amount of $1,000,000 is provided, the accumulation of such checks will total over 60,000,000 by July 1.

The Treasury is deeply concerned over the reduction of this appropriation, and if you should desire additional information regarding the clearance of these checks, the Department will be pleased to have its representatives appear again before your subcommittee.

In conclusion, may I express the hope that you will do everything possible to effect the restoration of this item to the amount of $1,000,000 as approved by the House of Representatives.

Verty truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
*Acting Secretary of the Treasury.*

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Tennessee for having read the letter from the Treasury Department.

I now call attention to the fact that, as I understand the testimony before the committee which the Senator has just read, and as I understand the letter, it is quite clear that the Treasurer of the United States says, "We have so much work that we should have a million and a half dollars, but since we cannot get employees in sufficient number to use that amount, we are not asking for what we should have, we are asking for a smaller amount," and the Bureau of the Budget approved the smaller amount because of a recognition of the manpower difficulty.

Now let us see exactly what transpired before the committee. I read from the report of the hearings:

Senator McKELLAR. We have a request here for an additional amount for salaries in the office of the Treasurer of the United States for the fiscal year 1943, $1,000,000.

Will you tell the committee what that is for?

Mr. Barnes, who was appearing for the Treasury, answered:

Mr. BARNES. Senator, I would like first to explain in a general way what it is for.

The Treasurer clears all of the checks issued by all of the Government departments drawn on the Treasurer of the United States. They have increased in great volume during the last year or so and our appropriation for 1943 is inadequate.

We estimate that we would actually need to clear all checks, which we now have on hand and which will be received during the remainder of the fiscal year, $1,500,000; but we foresee that we cannot get the necessary employees to do that much of a job. So, in spite of the fact that we may get this $1,000,000, we will still have a heavy backlog of uncleared checks at the end of this fiscal year.

We have now on our rolls enough people so that we can use an increase of $912,000 and the only addition to our present commitment will be $81,000 for employees that we contemplate we will be able to get during the balance of the year.

Senator McKELLAR. This is all brought about by the tremendous increase of checks drawn on the Treasury?

Mr. BARNES. The tremendous increase of checks; yes, that is the major portion of it.

Senator McKELLAR. Are there any further questions?

Senator HOLMAN. I suppose some place there is a schedule of the different kinds of employees and the number in each schedule, and what the rate of pay is for each classification; is there not? Would that be too voluminous for you to submit for the record?

Mr. BARNES. No.

Senator HOLMAN. I merely want a skeleton, an outline, just to give us an understanding of it.

Mr. BARNES. I think we have a break-down on that.

Mr. FUNK. It is in the justifications, pages 3, 4, and 5.

Senator HOLMAN. Have I been supplied with that?

Mr. FUNK. We will be glad to supply that information.

Senator McKELLAR. Will you put that into the record?

Mr. FUNK. Yes.

(The material referred to is as follows:)

I shall not read that. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Wyoming will permit, I think it would be very enlightening if the Senator would read it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to read it. I continue reading from the report of the hearing.

*Additional personnel on an average annual basis necessary to meet increased requirements of Office of Treasurer of United States, fiscal year 1943*

| | |
|---|---|
| Grade CAF–11: 1, at $3,800 | $3,800 |
| Grade CAF–10: 1, at $3,500 | 3,500 |
| Grade CAF–9: 2, at $3,200 | 6,400 |
| Grade CAF–8: 2, at $2,900 | 5,800 |
| Grade CAF–7: 3, at $2,600 | 7,800 |
| Grade CAF–6: 9, at $2,300 | 20,700 |
| Grade CAF–5: 14, at $2,000 | 28,000 |
| Grade CAF–4: 76, at $1,800 | 136,800 |
| Grade CAF–3: 176, at $1,620 | 285,120 |
| Grade CAF–2: 325, at $1,440 | 468,000 |
| Grade CPC–3: 24, at $1,320 | 31,680 |
| Grade CPC–2: 2, at $1,200 | 2,400 |
| Total (635) | 1,000,000 |

Mr. BARNES. We will put in the record a statement showing a break-down of these employees. Most of them are in the low grades. That is what we need mostly, the low-grade personnel.

Senator McKELLAR. Are there any further questions? If not, we are much obliged to you gentlemen.

(Thereupon, the subcommittee proceeded to the consideration of other business, after which it adjourned.)

That is the record, Mr. President, and the response which I received to my inquiry at the Treasury Department shows that this increase of work incident to clearing these checks has been so great that the Treasurer has been obliged to put people on the roll. They are now on the roll. They have been paid, and there will be a deficit of $7,000 as of the 1st of March. If we make the reduction of $250,000, the result will be that it will be necessary for the Treasurer to lay off some of the employees there now, and that will result in increasing the work which is now being performed.

Mr. President, from the statement of Mr. Barnes I find that the total funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1943 amounted to $1,700,000. Of this there was expended up to February 10, $1,555,000. The funds which have been committed through to the end of February amount to $152,000, making a total expended and committed of $1,707,000 by the 1st of March, or an excess of $7,000.

That was the reason, Mr. President, why the Treasury called upon the Congress for a deficiency appropriation. That call was made with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget very early in the session.

Commitment 4-month period March 1 through June 30 on present monthly base of $228,000—$912,000.

Funds requested to permit further recruitment—$81,000.

Total additional funds requested—$1,000,000.

Mr. President, I shall not labor this matter. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Treasury Department to me, setting forth the facts which I have tried to summarize, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
FISCAL SERVICE,
*Washington, February 25, 1943.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I appreciate your having called me in regard to the deficiency of $1,000,000 for the Office of the Treasurer of the United States for the fiscal year 1943, contained in House Joint Resolution No. 82, and which amount was reduced by the Senate committee to $750,000.

I will state in this connection that a letter was addressed to Hon KENNETH McKELLAR, acting chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, by Mr. D. W. Bell, Acting Secretary of the Treasury, under date of February 24, explaining the need for this full appropriation of $1,000,000 and the effect of the reduction of the $250,000 on the work of the Treasurer's Office.

When the deficiency estimate was prepared and submitted to the Budget Bureau, it was estimated that in order to accomplish the clearance of all of the checks at that time

estimated to be presented to the Treasurer for payment was indicated to be approximately $1,250,000. In discussing the estimate with the Budget Bureau, it was agreed between the Budget Bureau and the Treasurer's Office, however, that in view of the present situation regarding recruitment of new employees there was little possibility of being able to obtain enough employees to expend the $1,250,000 appropriation. Accordingly, the Budget Bureau reduced the estimate to $1,000,000. The basis of the estimate submitted was an increase of 59,460,000 checks over the number cleared in 1942, classified as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| War (on basis of 3,000,000 checks monthly for 8 months) | 24,000,000 |
| Navy (on basis of 1,250,000 checks monthly for 8 months) | 10,000,000 |
| Less 1942 clearings | 2,500,000 |
| Navy yards (on basis of 17,000,000 less 3,200,000 cleared in 1942) | 13,800,000 |
| Interest | 950,000 |
| Social Security Board | 2,150,000 |
| Public debt redemption (based on 18,000,000 bonds) | 1,060,000 |
| Other war activities and war establishments | 10,000,000 |
| Total | 59,460,000 |

This increase applied to the checks cleared in 1942, amounting to 79,124,903, would make a total of 138,584,903 checks to be cleared by the Treasurer in 1943. The regular appropriation for the Treasurer's Office for 1943 provided for the clearance of 69,800,000 checks. Assuming 138,584,903 checks for 1943, however, the estimate was short by 68,784,903 checks.

The item of 10,000,000 checks in the above tabulation, shown under "other war activities and war establishments," is now estimated, however, to amount to 42,700,000. So, it is clear that the figures used for the deficiency estimate were far below the number of checks that are now expected to be presented. The major portion of the $1,000,000 requested, $890,800, is for the clearance of checks, excluding $42,700 for rental and purchase of equipment used in connection therewith. The $109,200 was for additional work in other activities of the Treasurer's office in connection with the administrative work in regard to personnel, accounting, and the redemption of securities.

The situation, as it appears at this time, is substantially as follows:

*Salaries, office of the Treasurer, United States*

| | |
|---|---|
| Total funds appropriated for fiscal year 1943 | $1,700,000 |
| Expended through Feb. 10, 1943 | 1,555,000 |
| Funds committed through end of February 1943 | 152,000 |
| | 1,707,000 |
| Indicated deficiency as of Mar. 1, 1943 | 7,000 |
| Commitment 4-month period Mar. 1 through June 30 on present monthly base of $228,000 | 912,000 |
| Funds requested to permit further recruitment | 81,000 |
| Total additional funds requested | 1,000,000 |

It will be noted from this statement that there is an indicated deficiency of $7,000 as of March 1. The personnel commitment for employees now on the roll for the 4-month period March 1 through June 30 is $912,000. The $81,000 shown in the statement above is for personnel recruitment during the current fiscal year. It will be noted that in order to cover the deficiency as of March 1 and provide for the present employees, $919,000 would be required. The appropriation of $750,000, therefore, would be $169,000 short of the amount needed to carry our present employees until June 30 and would not permit of the further recruitment notwithstanding the great volume of work to be accomplished. It would mean in effect that curtailment of the force would have to be accomplished to offset the shortage of $169,000. It is thought that such curtailment would be decidedly inadvisable at this time in view of the fact that we have use for all of the employees on the roll and all that we can recruit for the balance of the fiscal year and that, notwithstanding any recruitments we may be able to accomplish, we will have a tremendous backlog of checks at the end of the fiscal year.

In other words there will be approximately 89,300,000 more checks presented this year than we will be able to handle without funds available. With the funds of the additional appropriation, we would still have a backlog of fifty-five to sixty million checks by June 30.

The break-down of personnel for this increase is included in my testimony before the Senate committee, and for your information I am supplying it herewith as follows:

*Additional personnel on an average annual basis necessary to meet increased requirements of Office of Treasurer of United States, fiscal year 1943*

| | |
|---|---|
| Grade CAF-11: 1, at $3,800 | $3,800 |
| Grade CAF-10; 1, at $3,500 | 3,500 |
| Grade CAF-9: 2, at $3,200 | 6,400 |
| Grade CAF-8: 2, at $2,900 | 5,800 |
| Grade CAF-7: 3, at $2,600 | 7,800 |
| Grade CAF-6: 9, at $2,300 | 20,700 |
| Grade CAF-5: 14, at $2,000 | 28,000 |
| Grade CAF-4: 76, at $1,800 | 136,800 |
| Grade CAF-3: 176, at $1,620 | 285,120 |
| Grade CAF-2: 325, at $1,440 | 468,000 |
| Grade CPC-3: 24, at $1,320 | 31,680 |
| Grade CPC-2: 2, at $1,200 | 2,400 |
| Total (635) | 1,000,000 |

Very truly yours,

G. O. BARNES,
*Assistant to the Treasurer.*

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rose for the purpose of making clear on the Senate floor, as I did in committee, why I feel the action proposed to be taken would be a great mistake; it would be legislation upon a basis, it seems to me, not to be altogether justified, and it would certainly cut down the work of a bureau of the Government which is not responsible for the increased burden placed upon it. The huge appropriations which we are making for war materials, the appropriations we are making for airplanes, for guns and tanks, the appropriations we are making for allotments, the appropriations for this tremendous increase of expenditure, all have to clear through the office in question, and the number of checks clearing through it are twice as many today as they were a year ago. The facts clearly indicate that although the work of this office has been considerably more than doubled, the personnel has been increased by only 20 percent. Mr. President, I feel that the proposed action is a striking example of false economy.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it is remarkable how these organizations grow. It will be seen from the reading of this additional personnel set-up that it is made on a yearly basis. The Department officials are figuring this million dollars on a yearly basis. They are not figuring on the basis of the next 4½ months' period. Listen to this from the justification placed in the hearings. I hope the Senate will listen to it, because our committee has been attacked. It has been suggested that we were reporting bills without having the facts before us. I deny that as strongly as it is possible to deny it, because it is not correct.

Senators, listen:

Additional personnel on an average annual basis.

This is not a 4 months' basis. This is a deficiency bill we are passing, providing for the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order that there may be no misunderstanding about the matter, the $750,000 which is in the joint resolution at the present time for the purposes outlined is a deficiency appropriation to carry out the functions of this particular agency to the 30th of next June only.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the meantime the Senate will be considering the regular appropriation bill, which will make the appropriation for the year which begins the 1st of July next and ends a year from then.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, we will.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield in a moment. I wish to say to the Senate that it is very difficult to deal with bureaucracies. I hope my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], will not be too hard on us. I hope he will not berate us too greatly. Our committee is trying to do its duty.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois was not berating the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Illinois interrupted the Senator from Wyoming and asked if this bill had been reported without testimony having been taken; if the committee made these reductions without having any testimony before it. I deny that that was done. I hope to heaven the Senate will uphold me in that denial, because I have the facts here which were put into the record after the meeting of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr LUCAS. I never want to be misunderstood by my good friend the Senator from Tennessee. I was not berating the committee, but I merely asked the Senator from Wyoming, in view of the information he furnished the Senate, upon what basis the committee reported the measure, or cut this appropriation, if what the Senator said was correct, that there was no evidence to sustain it. I asked the Senator how it came about, and he told the story. That is all the Senator from Illinois was seeking. My curiosity was satisfied.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am delighted to know that.

Mr. LUCAS. If I berated the committee, or if the Senator thought what I said

in any way implied a berating of him as chairman, I want to apologize.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not want the Senator from Illinois to apologize.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want to get into any argument at all with my friend, the Senator from Tennessee, because he is a pretty touchy fellow to handle, and I want to be just as kind to him as I can be.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sorry the Senator from Illinois thinks I am tough because I am not.

Let me go back to what the Treasury Department has put in the record:

> Additional personnel on an average annual basis.

Do Senators know what that means? That means that all these clerks will be on the list of employees when the agency comes in under the regular appropriation bill. The employees now proposed to be provided for will be there then. When they are there they are glued there. They cannot be separated from their places there.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator, I am sure, will recognize the fact that the statement which is made with respect to the payment on an annual basis does not mean that the agency is asking for an appropriation for a year.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know what they are asking for. The evidence does not disclose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is very clear.

Mr. McKELLAR. Wait a moment. I wish to say, in answer to the Senator's question, that whatever the intention may be, the Department asked for 635 clerks on an annual basis of $1,000,000, and the officials are so accurate about it they do not even divide the clerks into parts, as they do sometimes in the set-up. They have the exact number that will take the exact amount of $1,000,000. That is what they intend to do. Simply because some checks have not been sorted as they want them sorted they want the $1,000,000 in order to take on a set of employees who will be there probably as long as they live, or as long as the Government lasts.

Senators, listen to this: The Department asks for 325 clerks at $1,440, or a total amount of $468,000. That is for the year. According to their own figures, this appropriation instead of providing $1,000,000 for a deficiency should provide much less. The Department officials say they cannot get that many clerks.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Has not the Senator always found that the average departmental head, or bureau or agency head, who comes before the Committee on Appropriations, or a subcommittee thereof, never recommends a cut in an appropriation? In his long experience, has the Senator from Tennessee ever known of a department head recommending a cut in an appropriation?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator's question reminds me of a breakfast I had with President Hoover in 1931, when we were trying to effect reductions, just as we are trying to effect them now. Mr. Mills was Secretary of the Treasury. He was one of the most delightful gentlemen I have ever known, and he was also a very efficient man. He was sitting across the table from me, and when the question of economy was brought up the President asked for expressions of opinion. I said:

> Mr. President, the first thing to do, it seems to me, is to convert members of your Cabinet.

I said:

> Take my good friend, Mr. Mills, who sits right across the table from me. Yesterday he was before the committee testifying that his Department could not do the work required of it unless appropriations were increased; and every other member of the Cabinet has been before our committee asking that their appropriations be increased.

Mr. President, answering specifically the question asked by the Senator from New Mexico, I do not believe I recall when a department head requested that a cut be made in an appropriation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment. I wish to say that heaven knows we want to give the office in question whatever is necessary, and when there is evidence supporting their request I should be delighted to give them what they ask. This is a time of stress, but I want to see the work of the Government proceed in a proper way. That is why I urged upon my friend the Senator from Wyoming, awhile ago, that instead of taking the course he proposed, we take the course of letting the matter go to conference, calling the officials before us, and making them tell us exactly what they mean, and let the matter be settled. If it goes to conference we shall have these men before the conference committee, and they will be given whatever is right within the terms of the House bill and the Senate amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to thank the Senator from Tennessee for allowing me to make a further observation. Personally I believe it is time that some Senator should take the action which was taken by the Senator from Oregon. I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations for several years. I have always found that the heads of bureaus or divisions come before the committee and in a plausible way conclusively prove to the committee, to their own satisfaction, that it should give them every penny which they ask for; but we have never heard of anyone appearing on behalf of the taxpayer and telling the committee that the money should not be appropriated.

Mr. McKELLAR. In the present state of the record it seems to me that this belated proposal for an appropriation of a million dollars indicates that a large number of employees are being placed on the rolls. When we come to the regular appropriation bill it will be said, "We have all these employees, and we must have appropriations for them." I want to appropriate every dollar that is necessary to do the work. At first the Department demanded $1,500,000 and at the same time it asserted that it did not know whether it could get the employees. This is a deficiency appropriation, and not an annual appropriation. It seems to me that $750,000 should be sufficient to do all the work necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. My understanding of the phrase "on an annual basis" has always been that it relates only to the rate of compensation of the employees. Congress, of course, will determine hereafter whether $1,000,000, or any other sum, should continue to be appropriated. I understand the phrase to mean that the employees will be paid on an annual basis. Dividing $1,000,000 by 650, which is the number which I believe the Senator suggested they wanted to put on, we get approximately $1,640 per annum as the average rate of pay. If an employee were on the pay roll for only 6 months, and were paid on an annual basis, he would get as much a month for 6 months as he would receive if he were employed for the whole year. That is what I understand the words "on an annual basis" to mean.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know what the phrase means, except what it says. "Annual basis" means annual basis so far as I can understand the language. However, aside from that, why should we not have the facts? An appropriation of $1,000,000 is requested. A million dollars is more than I can draw a check for. The Department ought to justify it. I am perfectly willing to have representatives of the Department come before the conference committee and justify it. We do not want to do any person an injustice. The amendment of the committee could not possibly result in injustice to any soldier or sailor, as my distinguished friend intimated a while ago might be the case.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, as the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, will readily admit that he has usually found me in his corner when he has been trying to reduce appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Sometimes he has found me in his corner when he has tried to increase appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be true.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In this instance, I feel that the committee has acted under a misapprehension, and I have so stated.

In order that I may make clear what I have in mind, permit me to say that it must not be forgotten that this additional appropriation of a million dollars, which the Treasurer has asked for, is not to be expended alone on the employees who have been listed. It is to be expended for the payment of all salaries. The point is that already the work of the Treasurer has been so great that the appropriation heretofore made has been

altogether exhausted and there will be a deficit of $7,000 on the 1st of March next. The amount of $1,000,000 which has been requested is for the purpose of paying all the employees, including these employees, until the 30th of next June.

With respect to the remark made a moment ago by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], let me say that the record clearly shows that the Treasurer asked for $1,500,000 in the first instance. He then saw that he probably could not obtain the employees. He then discussed with the Bureau of the Budget an appropriation on the basis of $1,250,000, and finally accepted a reduction of $500,000 under what had been originally requested. I believe that we have before us an instance of an agency which has been operating efficiently and economically. I am glad to hear the Senator state that he intends to have the matter pursued in conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. I informed the Senator to that effect before the discussion arose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will recall that I was on my feet presenting another matter to go to conference, and I thought the Senator was referring to that. I wish the record to be clear that so far as I can see, the reduction should not be made. If it is made, it will seriously cripple an essential work of the Treasury Department.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, under the law the appropriations for the fiscal year ought to have been broken down into 12 parts. That seems not to have been done. The appropriation for the whole year is $1,700,000, and we are now in the month of February. Four months and a few days remain, and a deficiency appropriation of $1,000,000 is requested, after practically two-thirds of the year has expired. When we allow $750,000 more, I think we are being exceedingly liberal.

The Senator from Wyoming seems to have talked with officials in the Department and apparently is in possession of some additional facts which the committee did not have. However, on the basis of the facts furnished the committee, I think we have been exceedingly liberal, and I hope the Senate will not change the pending amendment, but will agree to it. I very much hope that the Senate will agree to the amendment and allow this matter to go to conference. We do not have the facts warranting the granting of a larger sum. I think we have been exceedingly liberal upon the facts which the Department has given us, and we have asked the Department for facts.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee if he has any knowledge as to how much of the original appropriation of $1,750,000 is now available?

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that it will be entirely exhausted by today or tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 3, line 13.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] desires to address the Senate, but he has been called momentarily from the Chamber, and I shall occupy the time until he returns.

I very much hope that the position of the Senator from Tennessee will have the support of this body.

This is the first appropriation bill which has come before the Senate during the present session of Congress.

This is the first item about which there has been a controversy concerning the amount of money to be appropriated. This is the first effort to cut the expenses of the Government in an appropriation bill presented to this session. It seems to me that the attitude which we take on this matter will be largely determinative of the attitude of Congress toward appropriations during the life of this session. I believe we shall announce to the country by the vote which we are about to take whether we, of this Congress, are savers of the public funds or spenders of the public funds. I very much hope that word will go out to the people of the Nation that this Congress proposes to save the finances of the Nation if it can be done.

Mr. President, there has been a dearth of testimony in connection with this item. I think it is safe to say that there was no affirmative showing by the Department of the need for the sum of $1,000,000, with the exception that a Department representative said he wanted and needed the money. There was an assertion of a need, but there was no proof of the necessity for the money.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Can the Senator tell us whether any more elaborate testimony was presented in the hearings before the House committee than was presented before the Senate committee?

Mr. WHITE. No, the House hearing was as devoid of information concerning the subject as was the short hearing before the Senate. However, the fact remains that in general, when representatives of the departments come before the Appropriations Committee and ask for additional employees and additional money—in this instance 635 clerks and an additional $1,000,000—those representatives are the ones who appoint the clerks and spend the money, and in a very real sense they are self-serving witnesses.

Mr. President, I believe that the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee, that this matter be gone into further before the conference committee, should have weight. This issue having been raised and presented to us, I think we ought to declare by our votes that we propose to save the money of the people of the Nation whenever and wherever it is possible for us to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, line 13.

Mr. GUFFEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Guffey | Overton |
| Austin | Gurney | Radcliffe |
| Bailey | Hawkes | Reed |
| Barkley | Hayden | Revercomb |
| Bridges | Hill | Reynolds |
| Brooks | Holman | Robertson |
| Buck | Johnson, Colo. | Scrugham |
| Burton | La Follette | Stewart |
| Bushfield | Langer | Taft |
| Butler | Lodge | Thomas, Idaho |
| Byrd | Lucas | Tobey |
| Capper | McCarran | Tunnell |
| Caraway | McFarland | Tydings |
| Chavez | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Clark, Mo. | Maloney | Van Nuys |
| Connally | Maybank | Wagner |
| Danaher | Millikin | Walsh |
| Eastland | Moore | Wherry |
| Ellender | Murray | White |
| Ferguson | Nye | Wiley |
| Gerry | O'Mahoney | Wilson |
| Green | | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, line 13.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it so happens that I am a member of the Appropriations Committee and have had an opportunity to give the matter under consideration some thought. I have a high regard for the faithfulness of the office of the Treasurer of the United States, and I am confident that the request was made in a spirit of sincerity. Also, I dislike any false economy. False economy is just as bad as false expenditure, and it is no part of my thought to favor the taking of any step which would cripple the Government; but I think it should be borne in mind that the item under consideration is a deficiency item, that other deficiency bills will be coming along, and that if the proposed reduction is too severe—and I am inclined to think that it is not—there will be ample opportunity to make a showing on that point, and for Congress to take corrective action.

Since I have been a Member of the Senate there has been an atmosphere which gives one the feeling that certain agencies are more eager in looking for reasons why a thing cannot be done than in trying to overcome the difficulties and accomplish the task. We are in a period in which the people certainly begrudge any needless appropriations, when they are called upon to make such heavy expenditures for the immediate prosecution of the war. One of the most effective ways in which the Appropriations Committee can work to achieve economy is to try in a friendly and cooperative spirit to put some of the agencies on their mettle and to let them see what they can do with smaller amounts. After all, a great many people in our armed forces and on the home front—the heads of families, mothers, and wives who are trying to get by under rationing—are having their ingenuity tested. They are being called upon to do the best they can with the means at hand, even though those means may be inadequate; and I think we should have some of that same spirit in Government.

I have an idea that if the agency affected by the pending amendment will develop the modern, wartime approach

to its duties it will be surprised when it sees how much it can do with the means at hand, even though it does not have the full amount for which it asks. As the chairman of the committee said, that agency will have an opportunity when the bill is in conference; it will have other opportunities when other urgent deficiency bills come before the Senate. So I hope the committee amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, line 13.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who is ill. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and let my vote stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senators from Washington [Mr. BONE and Mr. WALLGREN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE and Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained on business in one of the Government departments.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] has been called away on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I am advised that, if present, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 7, as follows:

YEAS—56

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Bailey | Brooks |
| Austin | Bridges | Buck |
| Burton | Hill | Revercomb |
| Bushfield | Holman | Reynolds |
| Butler | Johnson, Colo. | Robertson |
| Byrd | La Follette | Stewart |
| Capper | Langer | Taft |
| Caraway | Lodge | Thomas, Idaho |
| Chavez | McCarran | Tobey |
| Clark, Mo. | McFarland | Tunnell |
| Connally | McKellar | Tydings |
| Danaher | Maloney | Vandenberg |
| Eastland | Maybank | Wagner |
| Ellender | Millikin | Walsh |
| Ferguson | Moore | Wherry |
| Gerry | Nye | White |
| Green | Overton | Wiley |
| Gurney | Radcliffe | Wilson |
| Hawkes | Reed | |

NAYS—7

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Guffey | Murray | Van Nuys |
| Hayden | O'Mahoney | |
| Lucas | Scrugham | |

NOT VOTING—33

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Downey | O'Daniel |
| Ball | George | Pepper |
| Bankhead | Gillette | Russell |
| Barbour | Glass | Shipstead |
| Barkley | Hatch | Smith |
| Bilbo | Johnson, Calif. | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bone | Kilgore | Thomas, Utah |
| Brewster | McClellan | Truman |
| Chandler | McNary | Wallgren |
| Clark, Idaho | Mead | Wheeler |
| Davis | Murdock | Willis |

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate that a day or two ago I received a letter from Mr. James W. Murphy and Mr. John D. Rhodes, who, as we all know, are our Official Reporters here in the Senate. I will read the letter so that the Members of the Senate may understand exactly what they desire. The letter is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 22, 1943.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
*Acting Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: As explained to you this morning, owing to the fact that the employees of the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate are not on the regular Senate roll, it has not been possible to pay them the 10 percent additional compensation under the terms of the act approved December 22, 1942. We therefore beg to submit for your consideration the amendment to House Joint Resolution 82 which is enclosed, which will enable us to pay the employees entitled to it the same additional compensation as is being paid to the employees of the Official Reporters of Debates of the House of Representatives and other Government employees. The amendment has been drawn and the amount will be paid in strict accordance with the provisions of the additional compensation act (Public Law 821, 77th Cong., 2d sess.). The total amount involved to April 30, 1943, is $676.17.

Very respectfully yours,

JAMES W. MURPHY,
JOHN D. RHODES,
*Official Reporters, United States Senate.*

The reason the suggested amendment covers the period only to April 30 is that the temporary law providing 10 percent additional compensation expires on that date, and thereafter there will probably be another law passed which will take care of the situation from that time on. For that reason these gentlemen have asked for only $676.17.

It is a matter of apparent justice. I offer the amendment, Mr. President, and ask that the clerk read it. I hope the Senate will agree to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

To enable the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate to pay employees of their office engaged in work connected with reporting or transcribing of official proceedings of the Senate additional compensation amounting to 10 percent of their earned basic compensation as is not in excess of the rate of $2,900 per annum, in accordance with the terms of Public Law 821, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, approved December 22, 1942, $676.17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I ask what period of time the amount provided is proposed to cover?

Mr. McKELLAR. From the date of the approval of the act, which was December 22, 1942, until April 30, 1943, when the act goes out of existence.

Mr. LODGE. And is it to be presumed that at that time the Official Reporters will be on the same basis as the other employees?

Mr. McKELLAR. They will be on the same basis as other employees; but that legislation is yet to be passed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order to make the record complete, the purpose of this amendment is to put the Senate Official Reporters in the same status as the Official Reporters of the House of Representatives, so that there may be no preference in either body for the same work?

Mr. McKELLAR. None whatever. That is the purpose.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. In responding to the Senator from Massachusetts, I believe the Senator from Tennessee said that it would take effect from the date of the approval of the act on December 22. I understand, however, that the law, as originally passed, was retroactive to December 1, 1942, and therefore the amendment will conform to that provision.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator is correct about it. The act was approved on December 22, but, as I recall, was made retroactive to the 1st of December 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution was passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 677, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 677) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 677) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking out "$800,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,200,000,000"; and (2) striking out of the third proviso "July 1, 1943" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1944."

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, this bill is a measure to amend the law in regard to activities of the Federal Housing Administration. It does not create any new organization nor does it give the Federal Housing Administration any new authority. It merely creates two extensions; one in the matter of time, and the other in regard to the maximum amount of mortgages which can be reinsured under the act.

Under the present law the act would expire on July 1, 1943, and the maximum amount which can be reinsured under the existing law is $800,000,000. The bill provides for extending the time limit to July 1, 1944, and also for increasing the amount of mortgages which could be insured under the act to $1,200,000,000.

The operations under the Federal Housing Act are so familiar to my colleagues in the Senate that I am sure it is not necessary to give any explanation or description of them. The operations of the Federal Housing Administration have been of very great value; in fact, I can say that they have been of vital importance in helping to create housing facilities for workers in defense areas. The demand for these housing facilities has increased so materially and so fast that it is necessary there should be new legislation extending the time, and also the maximum of insurance. The good and highly constructive service rendered under the present law should be continued.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether the bill applies to defense housing only.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is the purport of it.

Mr. LODGE. No other type of housing is contemplated under it?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It contemplates only defense housing, under title VI of the Federal Housing Act.

Mr. LODGE. How much money is authorized to be appropriate for this purpose?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There is no appropriation whatever provided. I can say that the Federal Housing Administration has been operating so far at a profit, and no appropriation is called for or desired. The bill merely raises the maximum amount of mortgages which can be insured under the provisions of the act, and extends the time limit for its operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ATTENDANCE OF ARMY PERSONNEL AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, at the request of the Army, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 739, a bill relating to the attendance of Army personnel at educational institutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 739) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States as students in educational institutions and other places."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the bill; I think from what I know of it that it is a wholly meritorious measure. We have not been calling the calendar today, but Senators are reaching into it and picking out bills and asking unanimous consent for their consideration, or moving that certain measures on the calendar be made the subject of Senate consideration.

I confess I think that if the calendar is in effect to be called in the method we have been pursuing today, there should be an understanding to that effect, and Senators who are absent should know that bills are being brought from the calendar before the Senate for consideration. I repeat, I do not intend to object to the bill to which the Senator from North Carolina refers.

Mr. REYNOLDS. My only reason for bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate today is that the War Department have requested that this bill be given immediate consideration. They asked me to try to get the bill through last Monday, and a week before that the Committee on Military Affairs had considered the bill, and it had been unanimously reported.

The Army officials tell us they have made all their arrangements with colleges and universities to take an increased number of students of whom they are very badly in need in the Army, and that failure to enact such legislation is considerably hampering the war program.

The bill merely grants the privilege of raising the percentage of men in uniform who may be sent to colleges and universities. The expanded program goes into effect March 1, and they say that if this matter should be delayed any longer, it would cause much difficulty and confusion, and result in a good deal of unnecessary expenditure.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina whether or not the language in the bill which would authorize the employment of students as investigators at industrial plants is something new. Is not that outside the present law?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is outside the present law, as I understand.

Mr. DANAHER. What is the purpose of it?

Mr. REYNOLDS. As a matter of fact, at the present time, under a law passed some time ago, the Army is privileged to send 2 percent of its officers and its inducted men in uniform and in service, after they have received their basic 13 weeks' training, to colleges and to universities, for the purpose of increasing their knowledge of certain specialties in which they happen to have been trained. The Army finds that the 2 percent will not be sufficient, with the increased personnel of the Army, and they merely ask that the 2 percent be raised in order that they may procure for themselves the technicians and the specialists whom they find absolutely necessary to carry on the war program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That Public Law No. 435, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved February 6, 1942, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That during the present war and for 6 months thereafter and notwithstanding other provisions of existing law, personnel of all components of the Army of the United States may be detailed as students at technical, professional, and other educational institutions, or as students, observers, or investigators at industrial plants, hospitals, and other places, and all necessary expenses incident thereto shall be payable from any appropriations available to the Military Establishment: *Provided*, That this act shall not be construed as authorizing the acquisition of real estate by the War Department, except by lease, for use in the Army specialized training program."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several

nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Michael W. Straus, of Illinois, to be First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice Ebert K. Burlew, resigned.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

Edward L. Bartlett, of Alaska, to be Secretary of the Territory of Alaska (reappointment).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Calvin T. Durgin, February 7, 1943;

John D. Price, February 10, 1943;

Andrew C. McFall, February 13, 1943; and

Sundry citizens and meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

The following-named persons to be members of the American Mexican Claims Commission;

Edgar E. Witt, of Texas;

Samuel Marshall Gold, of New York; and

Charles F. McLaughlin, of Nebraska.

CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH MEXICO—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred Executive D, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, a consular convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Mexico City on August 12, 1942, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 3) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD—WILLIAM M. LEISERSON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William M. Leiserson to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD—HARRY H. SCHWARTZ

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry H. Schwartz to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I feel it is my duty to oppose the nomination of former Senator Schwartz to the National Mediation Board. There is nothing personal in my opposition. The action I am taking is one of principle, and in considering the nomination from this angle I have to ask myself, and I ask Senators, can we have confidence that the decisions rendered by this nominee as a member of the Mediation Board will be fair, just, and in nowise influenced by the thoughts and wishes—or, shall we say, commands—of the Chief Executive, who has sent this nomination to the Senate?

To answer this question we must look into the record of this nominee for the last 6 years, during which time he was a Member of this body. He was elected to the United States Senate in 1936 on a platform of "I will support Mr. Roosevelt in everything he does and says; I will vote for every measure he wants; and I will vote against everything he does not want. I will support him blindly." He was elected on that platform in 1936, and I think every Member of the Senate will agree with me that he lived up to the very letter of that platform during the 6 years he was a Member of this body.

In his campaign for re-election last fall his platform was exactly the same as it was in 1936—"I have been a rubber stamp for the President for 6 years and I offer myself again as a rubber stamp for the ensuing 6 years."

He was defeated because he offered a continuation of his rubber-stamp services. So the "pay off"—his nomination as a member of the National Mediation Board is sent here for confirmation.

In order that he may function efficiently, it is essential that a member of the National Mediation Board shall have the proper approach, that of an unbiased interceder or propitiator, who shall be able to mediate fairly and justly. We have no right to assume that this nominee has any such qualifications. On the contrary, we have every right to assume that his sympathy and his response will be colored by the views and wishes of some other man to whom he considers he owes allegiance.

Mr. President, the sending of such a nomination to the Senate reflects no credit on the Chief Executive. There is not a soul in this country who is not ready and anxious to get behind the President, as Commander in Chief, in every effort he takes to win this war, but when we, in the Senate, have to take time out to consider political partisan appointments which are sent us for confirmation it makes us wonder how much of the whole war set-up is politically partisan.

We hear on all sides that the public esteem for the United States Senate is at an all-time low. Regardless of whether this estimate is justified or not, it would do no harm to point out that the Congress of the United States is the one hope of true democracy in the country today, and it is no exaggeration to say that it is the only representation that true democracy has in the Capital City today.

It is within the power of this body here today to perform an act of independence, to show the people of the Nation that the Senate, the greatest deliberative body in the world, is fulfilling the purpose for which it was created by refusing to confirm this nomination, this political payment for 6 years of rubber-stamp servitude to the exploded fallacies of the distorted minds of the creators of the now completely discredited New Deal.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I had not expected to say anything concerning this nomination, because I know that all Members of the Senate who for the past 6 years have served with the nominee know that he is a man of outstanding character and ability. I know that those who served with him on the various Senate committees will give that testimony.

It is true that he was a political candidate 6 years ago, and that he made a pledge to the people of his State that if he were elected he would support the President of the United States. He carried out that pledge because he believed it was the basis upon which he was elected. He carried out his pledge to the people of his State. I did not agree with the Senator on many of his votes. I frequently disagreed with him. I did not agree with him on the sort of pledge he made. I say freely and frankly that I would make no such pledge. This man did. He lived up to it. More than that, I can say that so far as the interests of the State of Wyoming are concerned, his record for 6 years can be scanned and it will be found that never once did he vote against the interests of his State or of the people of his State, and upon matters of that kind he did not hesitate to disagree with the leadership of the President. The pledge upon which he was elected was a pledge upon the larger national issues.

Now with respect to his partisanship, Mr. President, I should like to say a word. Harry Schwartz was a member of the field service of the Department of the Interior when Secretary Ballinger was under attack. A political attack was leveled against Secretary Ballinger, the Republican Secretary of the Interior under the Republican President, William Howard Taft. Mr. Schwartz, then a Democrat, supported and defended Mr. Ballinger, and he did it so effectively that long after that administration had passed into history, and when the present administration had come into power, and Secretary Ickes was at the head of the Department of the Interior, Senator Schwartz showed him why in his judgment he believed Ballinger was right, and brought Secretary Ickes to the defense of Secretary Ballinger.

I think it should be said in behalf of this former member of this body that he is not and never has been a narrow partisan; that he is a man of ability, and a man of character. I believe he is completely qualified to discharge the duties of the position to which he has been nominated, and I shall be very happy indeed to vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, this is just another appointment of a "yes man." I gladly support the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] in his opposition to the nominee for reasons similar to those he has assigned. In my opinion, the people of Wyoming, and of the country as a whole, will find encouragement in his stand.

This nomination is another instance where the people's voice is ignored. Again we are asked to confirm another ex-officeholder with the type of mind that will be controlled by the proposition that "the king can do no wrong."

This nomination is another refutation of the assertion that in the prosecution

of a war partisanship is submerged in the interest of winning the war. Every branch of the Government is constituted with the character of mind which is actuated by political considerations. The rights of the States, which are deeply imbedded in the Constitution, are today totally ignored. Every governmental function is more and more being definitely packed—literally packed—with men to whom party, or regime, is the thing. Willing and able men are being excluded, and will continue to be excluded, from any participation in governmental activities during this time of crisis. The people are being admonished, and Congress is being admonished, to place no obstacles in the way of the Government in the prosecution of this war. The wisdom of Woodrow Wilson is being ignored. He said:

> We do not need less criticism in time of war, but more. It is hoped that criticism will be constructive, but better unfair attack than autocratic repression. Honesty and competence require no shield of secrecy.

The appointments which come to the Senate for confirmation are principally of a partisan, political character. In the pending case, it is just another instance of a back-door entrance into the Government in defiance of the will of the people of Wyoming.

The same principle obtains with reference to the judiciary. The rights and equities of the State of Louisiana are totally ignored in the appointment of an active politician to a high and responsible judicial position. That appointment, too, is a reward to the individual who, also, is a "yes man" to the political philosophy of the New Deal party.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss the particular qualifications of the appointee whose nomination is now under consideration. Those who have served with Mr. Schwartz have, I think, a high regard for his character, his ability, and his patriotism. I have no question as to his qualifications, both from the intellectual standpoint and from the standpoint of his general attitude upon the subject with which he will deal, in the position to which he has been nominated.

I wish to observe very briefly, however, concerning the belated "holier than thou" attitude assumed here in this session of Congress against the appointment of men who have held office heretofore, but who have been defeated for reelection, and have been named to executive positions. If I had the time to give a list of all the so-called lame ducks who in the history of the United States have been appointed to high station, I am sure that it would be found that it is not a partisan habit. Abraham Lincoln was a "lame duck" at one time. He was a defeated candidate. He was defeated not only once but more than once in some of his political aspirations, and yet I think we all will realize that he became and now is one of the outstanding historical figures in all American history. He was a "lame duck" though during his political career.

I recall that President William Howard Taft was overwhelmingly defeated for President of the United States in 1912. Of course he was not a senatorial "lame duck," he was not a congressional "lame duck," but he was a Presidential "lame duck." Yet that did not bar him from elevation to the highest station in our judicial system, the Chief Justiceship of the United States, and it did not bar him from making an outstanding Chief Justice of the United States.

In 1912 the distinguished former Senator from Utah, Mr. Sutherland, became a "lame duck." He was thereafter promptly appointed to the Supreme Court by a Republican President, and his nomination was promptly confirmed by the Senate with no serious objection or opposition. If serious weight is to be given to the theory now being advanced against the appointment of men merely because they have been defeated or repudiated by the people under circumstances which probably have no bearing whatever upon their qualifications, the people of our country will be denied the services of these outstanding men as well as many others who might be mentioned as having been at one time or another "lame ducks."

It so happens that at the present time the Democratic Party is in power and is the legitimate object of attack. There is an open season on it. I realize that. However, that has not always been true. When the Republicans were in power they did not disdain the appointment of men who had served here and elsewhere, and had been so unfortunate as to be defeated by the people when they came up for reelection.

I have mentioned only a few—the number has been legion—in order to express the hope that qualified men will not be denied the right to serve their country merely because they have been defeated in an election. If that had been the rule during the past, the country would have been deprived of the services of some of its ablest, most patriotic, and outstanding citizens.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I believe that an important point was ignored entirely during the discussion which has taken place. I do not know the gentleman from Wyoming whose name has been proposed, or anything about him; but the position to which he has been nominated is semijudicial in character. Therefore, his expressions of opinion relative to what he would do under certain circumstances become very vital in arriving at the decision which Senators are asked to make. We might as well say that in selecting a jury in a court of law the members of the jury should be chosen because they have promised in advance to do what the prosecuting attorney wants them to do.

The Senator from Kentucky has mentioned the name of a former President of the United States, a very distinguished statesman. I refer to William Howard Taft. If Mr. Taft had pledged the President of the United States who appointed him that as a member of the Supreme Court of the United States he would do exactly what the President asked him to do, the Senate would not have confirmed the nomination of former President Taft to that high judicial office.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the statement made by the Senator from South Dakota. However, I deny—and I defy anyone to controvert the denial—that the man whose name is under consideration promised the President what he would do in any case arising before the board to which he has been nominated as a member. In his campaign for election in the first instance, and when he ran for reelection recently, he did only what many Democrats, as well as Republicans, have done. He promised to support the President, who is a member of his own party. There is nothing reprehensible about that. I defy any Senator to point to anything that Mr. Schwartz ever said as indicating that in any decision which might come before him as a member of this board he would be governed by partisan considerations. I do not think any such evidence can be adduced.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] for a moment.

I was elected to the United States Senate in 1934, the first time a Democratic Senator was elected from Pennsylvania in 60 years. I had one plank in my platform, and that was 100-percent support of President Roosevelt and his New Deal policies. I carried the State by 125,000. I was reelected in 1940 by a majority of more than 175,000. I ran on the same platform—100 percent support of President Roosevelt and his policies. I was the first Democratic Senator reelected from Pennsylvania in 100 years. The last Democratic Senator to be reelected was Mr. Buchanan, who subsequently was elected President of the United States. I now predict that the President and the Democratic Party will carry Pennsylvania in 1944 on 100-percent support of the President's policies, and I wish to assure the Senators on the other side of the Chamber that I will have a Democratic colleague from Pennsylvania after that date.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania that he should not be too sure about his figures. He once stated that the former Senator from Nebraska would be elected by 100,000 votes, and the people of Nebraska defeated him by nearly 110,000 votes.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to correct the figures of the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield the floor when I am through.

Mr. President, I have sat silently by for nearly 2 months. I wish to say that the time has come when the philosophy of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] should apply in this great body and throughout this great land.

The people of my State elected me because I am absolutely opposed to the New Deal—not to the Jeffersonian form of democratic government, but to new dealism. A similar situation prevailed in Wyoming, where I campaigned for the junior Senator from Wyoming. The people of that State believed that they had had enough of regimentation and dictatorship. We new Senators come

here bringing with us the mandate of the people, who have said that they are fed up with the New Deal and do not want any more of it.

New Deal appointment after New Deal appointment is proposed. We have sat idly by in the case of most of them. We did attack the appointment of Edward J. Flynn—and rightly so. We attacked the appointment of Josh Lee—and rightly so. Josh Lee is not qualified to fill the office to which he has been appointed. We have had the appointment of Prentiss Brown, Mr. Herring, and others. They have been repudiated by the people of their own States because the people are against the philosophy which they represent. They have been promoted by the President to further new dealism in this country, and extend it to the four corners of the earth.

Mr. President, the people of the country expect from this young group of Senators the philosophy of government which they want represented in the Senate. When we say that from the bottom of our hearts we want cooperation with the President, we mean it. In his war policy we will go the limit. I know what war is. I had something to do with it in the First World War. However, when New Deal political appointments are brought before us and we are asked to "rubber stamp" them by way of confirmation, we will not do so because the appointees do not represent the will of the people of the Middle West. We shall be opposed to such nominations. If the President and Senators want our cooperation, let them leave politics out of the war issue and make appointments from both the Republican and Democratic sides. Let us have men who will provide leadership which will win the war, instead of the leadership which has torn us down and brought us to the condition in which we are today.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the pending nomination. I shall be against any other political appointment which brings into the Senate the philosophy of the New Deal, which has been defeated in the Middle West and will be defeated in 1944.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, it is to be regretted if partisan State politics is to be constantly injected into the consideration or approval of appointments of men whose standing cannot be questioned by intelligent persons from any section of the country. The gentleman whose nomination has been attacked will stand as well in the scale of ability as any of those attacking him. There could be nothing but cheap partisan politics in objecting to a man of Mr. Schwartz's type. It is to be regretted that Senators who say they are speaking for the country, but who are in fact speaking for their own States, object to national service on the ground that the State of Mr. Schwartz has said by a few thousand votes that he should not continue in service in the Senate. The United States is entitled to the service of this man regardless of any particular State. The pending appointment is not a State appointment, and it should not be rejected because of petty politics from State sources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to say anything with reference to the nomination of former Senator Schwartz because I believe that he is well known on both sides of the Chamber. I think he is well qualified.

I take issue with the junior Senator from Nebraska when he says that so-called "lame ducks" should not be appointed to office. I prefer "lame duck" Democrats to some of those who have been holding office heretofore. I happen to be a partisan Democrat because I believe in party politics and in the principles of the Democratic Party. I wish that some of those who are now holding office in the various departments of the Government could be supplanted by Democrats who lost in the elections last fall. I think it would be better for the Government and for all concerned.

The point I am endeavoring to make, Mr. President, is that I do not object to a Republican or a Democrat. If the people of Nebraska wish to have in the Senate the Senator who now represents that State, it is the business of the people of Nebraska and not of the people of New Mexico, or any other State in the Union. I respect what Nebraska did, even though I should have preferred that a Democratic Senator be elected. Both Republicans and Democrats have been objecting because every Tom, Dick, and Harry, and every fair-haired boy from New York, Brooklyn, and elsewhere has been getting a job in Washington. I am glad that "lame duck" Democrats are being appointed, even at this late hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Green | O'Mahoney |
| Bailey | Guffey | Overton |
| Ball | Gurney | Radcliffe |
| Bankhead | Hawkes | Revercomb |
| Barkley | Hayden | Reynolds |
| Bone | Hill | Robertson |
| Bridges | Holman | Russell |
| Brooks | Johnson, Colo. | Scrugham |
| Buck | La Follette | Stewart |
| Burton | Langer | Taft |
| Bushfield | Lodge | Thomas, Idaho |
| Butler | Lucas | Thomas, Utah |
| Capper | McCarran | Tobey |
| Caraway | McFarland | Tunnell |
| Chavez | McKellar | Tydings |
| Clark, Idaho | Maloney | Vandenberg |
| Clark, Mo. | Maybank | Van Nuys |
| Connally | Mead | Wagner |
| Danaher | Millikin | Walsh |
| Eastland | Moore | Wherry |
| Ellender | Murray | White |
| Ferguson | Nye | Wiley |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination under consideration? On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when Mr. CHANDLER'S name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. If he were present my colleague would vote "yea." I am not advised how the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when Mr. MURDOCK'S name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri (when Mr. TRUMAN'S name was called). My colleague the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent from the city on important official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on official business for the Senate. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from California, the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from West Virginia, and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. The following Senators are unavoidably detained: The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—46

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bailey | Hill | Radcliffe |
| Bankhead | Johnson, Colo. | Reynolds |
| Barkley | La Follette | Russell |
| Bone | Langer | Scrugham |
| Capper | Lodge | Stewart |
| Caraway | Lucas | Thomas, Idaho |
| Chavez | McCarran | Thomas, Utah |
| Clark, Idaho | McFarland | Tunnell |
| Clark, Mo. | McKellar | Tydings |
| Connally | Maloney | Van Nuys |
| Eastland | Maybank | Wagner |
| Ellender | Mead | Walsh |
| Green | Millikin | White |
| Guffey | Murray | Wiley |
| Gurney | O'Mahoney | |
| Hayden | Overton | |

NAYS—20

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Butler | Revercomb |
| Ball | Danaher | Robertson |
| Bridges | Ferguson | Taft |
| Brooks | Hawkes | Tobey |
| Buck | Holman | Vandenberg |
| Burton | Moore | Wherry |
| Bushfield | Nye | |

NOT VOTING—30

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Gerry | Pepper |
| Austin | Gillette | Reed |
| Barbour | Glass | Shipstead |
| Bilbo | Hatch | Smith |
| Brewster | Johnson, Calif. | Thomas, Okla. |
| Byrd | Kilgore | Truman |
| Chandler | McClellan | Wallgren |
| Davis | McNary | Wheeler |
| Downey | Murdock | Willis |
| George | O'Daniel | Wilson |

So the nomination of Harry H. Schwartz to be a member of the National Mediation Board was confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations in all these cases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

PRESENTATION OF AVIATION MEDAL TO THE PRESIDENT IN RECOGNITION OF HIS AFRICAN FLIGHT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that I may report back without amendment from the Committee on the Library Senate Concurrent Resolution 7. I wonder if I could get consent to take the concurrent resolution up now? It is merely a measure requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a suitable medal to be presented to the President as a token of esteem for his contribution to aviation by his recent flight across the Atlantic. There are no public funds involved. The expense is to be met by private subscription. Indeed, money has already been raised to strike the medal to be presented to the President for his contribution to aviation by his trip. The presentation is sponsored by the International Association of Aviation, it is in the interest of aviation, and the expenses are to be paid by the International Association.

I would not insist on having this resolution taken up now if any Senator objected. I do not believe it is a matter to which anyone would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the report and the consideration of the concurrent resolution at this time?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is requested to strike a gold medal of appropriate design with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary, for presentation to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in recognition of his contribution in inspiring confidence in aviation as a means of travel by his unprecedented flight to the "unconditional surrender" conference with Prime Minister Winston Churchill at Casablanca, North Africa.

SEC. 2. Any expenses necessary to carry out the purpose of this concurrent resolution shall be paid by the American Section of the Ligue Internationale des Aviateurs.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 1, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 25, 1943:

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE UNITED STATES MINT, DENVER, COLO.

Moses E. Smith, of Ault, Colo., to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo., in place of Mark A. Skinner, deceased.

TEMPORARY PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Ernest L. Gunther, August 11, 1942.
Spencer S. Lewis, August 15, 1942.

---

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 25, 1943:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

William M. Leiserson, to be a member, for the term expiring February 1, 1946.

Harry H. Schwartz, to be a member, for the remainder of the term expiring February 1, 1944.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Capt. Laurance N. McNair, to be a rear admiral in the Navy on the retired list, while serving as chief of United States Naval Mission to Peru.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE

The nominations of Floyd C. Camp et al. for promotion in the Navy.

(NOTE.—A full list of the names of the persons whose nominations for promotion in the Navy were confirmed today may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 15, 1943, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on p. 948, and ending on p. 949.)

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Myron Craig, Alma.
Carolyn Carter, Ashmore.
Bernard G. Finnegan, Bradford.
Lillian W. Tice, Chatham.
Fred O. Grissom, Kinmundy.
Fern Conard, La Moille.
Raymond M. Hartman, Mount Carroll.
Roger C. Morris, South Pekin.
Clark R. Morris, Xenia.

OHIO

Fred Durr, Bradford.
Farland A. Humbert, Howard.
Thomas Kyer, Jackson.
Perry L. Heintz, Jackson Center.
Ethel S. Reames, Lynchburg.
Garrett W. Bowen, Newtown.
Neile Stinebaugh, Republic.
Frankie Junkerman, Sugar Grove.

OKLAHOMA

Ida C. Courtney, Copan.

PENNSYLVANIA

Margaret B. Glomb, Wexford.
Edward C. Hardt, Wildwood.

WISCONSIN

Chris Kartman, Cassville.
Marie Gunn Dunham, Cumberland.
Will Riley, Darlington.
Frank J. Shortner, Edgar.
Tessa B. Morrissy, Elkhorn.
Reginald L. Barnes, Greenwood.
Frank M. Doyle, Ladysmith.
Edward L. Murphy, Middleton.
Celestine D. Kaltenbach, Potosi.
William Murray, Prescott.
Solon A. McCollow, River Falls.
John C. Reinke, Stone Lake.
Charles M. Dunn, Taylor.
Arnold A. Conklin, Vesper.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Unto Thee, our Father in heaven, we offer our tributes of praise for the glorious hope in our Saviour. With the friction of nations in their woeful agony, the collisions of classes and current disputations we would hear Thy assuring voice: "Great shall be the peace of Thy children." This ageless truth forever shines forth in noonday splendor.

Oh, allow not the atmosphere of brotherhood to be wrenched by murmurings, skepticisms, or despairs. Do thou condescend to human infirmity and chide it that the low-flying things may give place to high-up realities; our souls mounting to the altar of dedication. We would acknowledge Thee to be the Lord and be still and know that Thou art God. In the court of human life we pray for the power of that faith which is the necessity of the soul, made heroic by those who stand and wait. We beseech Thee that this stained and sorrow-blackened world shall feel the withering might of freedom's arm and every man hearing its clarion note, shall be challenged to follow in its train. Almighty

God, in great wisdom and peace be with our Speaker and the Congress. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

O. P. A. DIRECTOR BROWN

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, in the speech delivered by O. P. A. Director Brown, he called for the rebirth of unity, and then proceeded to willfully misstate the facts with reference to the Committee on Un-American Activities, when he stated falsely that the committee was leading the forces in this country that were fighting Russia. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, may I call attention to the fact that the British Labor Party of England was able to distinguish between the Communists in England and Russia, when it rejected membership or affiliation of the Communist Party in the British labor movement. The reason given was that the primary loyalty of the Communist Party in Great Britain, which officially describes itself as the British section of the Communist International, is to the Communist International and the British Labor Party unanimously refused to permit the Communist Party of Great Britain to affiliate with it. When O. P. A. Director Brown calls for a rebirth of unity and then proceeds to misrepresent and libel a committee of this House, then it seems to me he is setting a poor example of unity.

UNITY

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks by including an editorial from the Evening Star newspaper and an article from the newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great interest last night to Raymond Gram Swing. He was commenting upon our situation as to unity. I am sorry that I am overwhelmed with the idea that we are doing too much professing unity and too little in actually practicing it. The excerpts that I offer in the extension and the revising of my remarks relate to unity among the allies, including Russia, and Josef Stalin, for whom I have the greatest respect, and to whom you and I owe a debt of gratitude.

RATIONING AND INCREASED FOOD SUPPLY

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. ELLIOTT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

BLAIR HOUSE

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I see by the newspapers that $8,000 a guest is the cost to the United States at Blair House, and that additional funds are sought to entertain noted foreigners. If Mr. Harry Hopkins and family will move out of the White House and pay board for a time, they will make room for some of these interesting dignitaries, and Blair House will not be in need of an additional appropriation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial and a resolution that appear in the San Francisco Examiner, in connection with the Pacific war area.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

FOOD RATIONING

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I would not stand in the Well of the House and indulge in carping criticism. I believe, however, it is the duty of any Member of this body to bring to the attention of the Congress and of the country what he believes to be a wrong procedure in the Office of Price Administration, in placing its present rationing program into effect.

Mr. Speaker, a penalty is being practiced on the loyal housewife who heeded the plea of Federal authorities against food hoarding. On the other hand, it appears a premium is given to the individual who purchased, in some instances, thousands of cans of unnecessary food. It overflowed pantry shelves and was stored in basement and attic.

I now come to the specific instance. An 8-point-per-can ration deduction has been made by the O. P. A. I believe this to be an injustice, because 15 to 29 points are needed for purchase of a similar can of food. The person who has not hoarded is, therefore, at a disadvantage, and I do not believe such a policy should be countenanced. In other words, we should place a premium on patriotism and not on hoarding. The latter group are chuckling at what has happened. They know they are in a preferred position. I shall place in the Appendix of the RECORD, with the permission of the House, a statement the Office of Price Administration is making today, due to my charge that this inequity is being allowed. I do not feel fairness will be practiced if the O. P. A. continues its plan. We cannot purchase a can of food with less than approximately 15 points, yet only 8 points are deducted per can for those who have hoarded.

Our people know it is necessary to have rationing. Let us have it on common-sense lines—not on a 2-to-1 balance in favor of the persons who overstocked.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a radio address made by my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

OUT-PRODUCING THE AXIS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, according to a report made by the War Production Board to a Senate committee on day before yesterday, America at present is out-producing the Axis by 2½ to 1. If this be true, it is the greatest accomplishment from an industrial standpoint that ever has been made by any people at any time in the history of the world. On it can be built victory in this war. Our problems are by no means solved, nor should we be content or satisfied with our accomplishments, but I think it well to point this out at least as a step in progress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of Texas approving the bill of my distinguished and able colleague from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, being House Resolution 6999.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article on income tax.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two letters on the meat situation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from Mr. Bozarth, a prominent dairyman in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article on the farm-labor problem by Guy R. Erdley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a letter from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a column written by my predecessor, Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROTECTION OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a great deal about the shortage of manpower these days. In checking up I find that we have 55 privates and 2 officers guarding the House Office Buildings and the Capitol. We have a very competent police force at the Capitol and I am taking the floor for the purpose of suggesting to the War Department that they remove the superfluous guards that we have up here and put them where they are more needed, and turn the guarding of the Capitol and the office buildings over to the Capitol Police. With the shortage in manpower all useless tasks should be abolished.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am utterly amazed at my colleague from Minnesota, a man usually of splendid judgment and absolute fairness.

We have on this hill $180,000,000 worth of property. We have a few Metropolitan Police around here and we have some boys, who are on patronage, wearing police uniforms. Without these soldiers, in a time like this, that would be all the protection we would have for this $180,000,000 worth of property.

If a bomb should fall here those men on the ground will not be of any help to us. They cannot protect us. It happens to be the business of the Speaker of the House of Representatives to protect the property on this hill, and it cannot be protected by a few Metropolitan Police, who are only loaned to us, and a few patronage boys, who are fine boys, who want to come here to go to school. But some day or some night somebody may come into this building and destroy a million dollars worth of property. As long as I have the responsibility, I am going to keep somebody here to protect these buildings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 136

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 136, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 102 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the special committee appointed to conduct such investigation, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $60,000, including expenditures for the employment of legal and other experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. That the official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, it may not be out of the way, in view of certain remarks made having to do with the protection of the Capitol, the House Office Building, and what is generally known as Capitol Hill, especially in view of the statements made that the wooden guns we see on the office buildings constitute our protection, for any Member of the House before he makes any such statement to consult the War Department and inform himself of the inner and outer ring of high caliber antiaircraft guns in position for the protection of Capitol Hill and in fact all of Washington.

ELECTION CONTEST: SULLIVAN AGAINST MILLER

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 137) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the joint application for order of recount of John B. Sullivan, contestant, against Lewis E. Miller, contestee, Eleventh District of Missouri, be not granted.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the unanimous action of this committee successfully undertakes to establish the fact, the law, and a precedent for all time that jurisdiction of an alleged contested-election case cannot be conferred on the House or on one of its committees by any joint agreement of parties to an alleged election contest unofficially or otherwise submitted.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENTAL ALLOWANCES TO OFFICERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 1746, and ask unanimous consent to substitute S. 641, to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Georgia explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the distinguished gentleman from Oregon, Mr. MOTT, seek recognition, as the bill was to be presented to the House from the Naval Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Oregon to explain to the House the purpose of this proposed bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it would be better to put the question on the gentleman's request that the bill be considered, with the understanding that the gentleman from Oregon will explain it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the fourth paragraph of section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"No rental allowance shall accrue to an officer having no dependents while he is on field duty unless his commanding officer certifies that he was necessarily required to procure quarters at his own expense, or while on sea duty, except for temporary periods of sea duty not exceeding 3 months, nor shall any rental allowance accrue to an officer with or without dependents who is as-

signed quarters at his permanent station unless a competent superior authority of the service concerned certifies that such quarters are not occupied because of being inadequate for the occupancy of the officer and his dependents, if any, and such certifications shall be conclusive: *Provided*, That an officer, although furnished with quarters, shall be entitled to rental allowance as authorized in this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters."

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 so as to permit the payment of rental allowances to officers who have dependents while they are on field duty and when the commanding officer certifies that the officer has been required to rent quarters at his own expense and also to provide that naval officers without dependents may have rental allowance when they are necessarily on sea duty for a limited time, not to exceed 4 months.

Section 6 of the pay readjustment bill provided, among other things, for rental allowance for officers who have dependents to whom quarters have not been assigned. These were fixed at amounts ranging from $45 to $105 per month, but when such officers were on field duty no rental allowance was provided for them. The Comptroller General a short time ago decided that under the language of that act no officer without dependents could be entitled to rental allowance regardless of whether he was assigned to Government quarters or not, which was never the intention of the Congress. The Comptroller General is of the opinion that the ruling he made may probably contravene the will of Congress and has agreed to suspend operation of this order until March 1. In the meantime it is necessary to pass this bill before March 1 so that these officers without dependents who are necessarily required to secure quarters at their own expense, and also naval officers who are on sea duty not exceeding 4 months may receive rental allowance.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This bill applies to the Army as well as to naval and marine officers.

Mr. MOTT. That is right. The bill as originally considered applied only to the Navy, marines, and Coast Guard; but the War Department suggested that it be amended to include the Army also; so a Senate bill covering all of these services was substituted in the committee for the House bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Let us take the case of a married man on duty on shipboard; would he be granted these allowances while he is on duty and away from his base?

Mr. MOTT. On temporary duty only, not if he is assigned to permanent sea duty.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SMITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a bill which I have introduced to reach certain tax dodgers in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FURNISHING OF PROCESSED FOOD TO RANCHERS IN THE WEST

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, something has got to be done to relieve the situation in States such as my own where distances are great from source of supply with reference to the furnishing of an adequate amount of processed food to our ranchers, both sheep and cattle men. We must make sufficient processed foods available to the sheep and cattle men or they will close shop.

I received a very interesting telegram this morning from the Garfield County Sheepman's Committee reading as follows:

MILES CITY, MONT., *February 25, 1943.*
Representative JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
*United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:*

Present processed food rationing for sheepmen and ranchers is as sensible as the War Production Board's suggestion that lambing be postponed until better weather. Urge you to recommend that sheepmen be given some consideration in amount of their allotment and to be allowed to buy in quantities.

GARFIELD COUNTY
SHEEPMAN'S COMMITTEE,
E. L. ALEXANDER, *Chairman.*

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can arrange with the gentleman from New York for debate to continue for the rest of the day, to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York and myself, and to read the first paragraph of the bill before the Committee rises tonight?

Mr. TABER. But take no action on it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not beyond reading the first paragraph.

Mr. TABER. That is satisfactory.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, then I ask unanimous consent that debate continue throughout the day, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself, and that the first paragraph of the bill be read before the Committee rises this evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1975, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is an economy bill. It is true it aggregates in appropriations and contractual authority the sum of $6,298,000,000—an amount which even in bills of large denominations could not be counted by any Member of this House within his lifetime—a sum so stupendous that the finite mind of man cannot comprehend its purchasing power. But, Mr. Chairman, I dare say the committee has never reported a bill more carefully scrutinized or more closely trimmed

While more than 99 percent of the appropriations carried in this bill are directly connected with the war program, outside of one item, the item for the Maritime Commission, we have reduced the estimate submitted to us by more than 10 percent. Considering the fact that in the last session of Congress we pruned more than $1,000,000,000 from the supply bills of the previous year, this further reduction in excess of 10 percent constitutes a notable economy and more than conforms to the commitments of the committee to continue its policy of drastic retrenchment.

At the same time it should be pointed out that we have denied no funds actually necessary to the prosecution of the war and the transaction of the normal business of the country.

Mr. Chairman, the bill is in keeping with the record made by the committee and the House in the Seventy-seventh Congress. The results secured through the expenditure of funds provided for the current fiscal year border on the miraculous. Never since Aladdin touched the wonderful lamp has so much been accomplished in so short a time. Starting from scratch, on the tragic December 7, 1941, we have put more men on the firing line, better equipped, better trained, better clothed, better housed, better fed, better hospitalized, and better paid—more efficient fighting men—than have ever been sent to the front in a like period of time, by any nation in the history of the world. And if anyone doubts any single item in that inventory let him ask the men themselves—and if still incredulous let him ask the Japs and the Nazis. The Nation is being defended. Its shores are being held intact and inviolate. With little time to prepare, it is winning victories from seasoned foes. No other Allied nation has made, and is making, so valorous a stand—or is being so well served and so well defended.

And yet, believe it or not, the highways and byways, the press and the air, are filled with querulous complaints.

"Congress has bungled. Congress is playing politics. Congress is wasting money. The war program is being neglected. Congress has failed to dot the i's and cross the t's. Nothing is right and everything is wrong."

May I take advantage of the occasion to ask here and now—in this greatest forum of the Nation and the world—in the opening consideration of the first war bill of the Seventy-eighth Congress for a bill of particulars? I now invite anyone to stand and in my time say wherein this committee or this House has been negligent or remiss or culpable in any respect in the conduct of the war, to point out specific instances in which this committee and this House has failed to come up to its opportunities and its obligations and its responsibilities, to point out one dollar that should have been appropriated that was not appropriated or one dollar that was appropriated that should not have been appropriated.

It is easy enough to stand on the street corners and make general charges and demand that Congress and the high command be consigned individually and collectively to perdition for alleged sins of omission or commission. But I am asking you now to put your finger on the heinous and outrageous instance or situation or condition to which you refer in your generalities. Please do not hesitate to interrupt me. I will be glad to give you time. And do not hesitate to offer amendments to this bill. If anyone charges Congress with extravagance or waste or maladministration let them speak now. We want to know about it.

If further economies can be made in this bill we want to make them, and we will help you make them.

It is natural for people to complain. That is an American privilege. It is a privilege you would not have in Germany or Italy or Japan. It is one of the privileges we are fighting to maintain—the right to go out on the street and "cuss" any man from the President and the Governor down to the mayor and the constable. And at the time we are making our loudest "squawk" we realize that we have less to complain about than any people on the face of the globe.

Life has been easy for us here in America—easier than we appreciate. We have become so accustomed to plenty and liberty and freedom of speech that we impose on it. We do not even want to slice the bread, or wear trousers without cuffs, or be rationed.

There was bitter complaint that we were shipping butter to Russia and yet that butter helped Russian heroes to roll back the resistless tide of invasion that would have swamped not only Russia but every free nation, including our own. What would every American home be enduring today in privation and peril but for the gallant stand Russia has made when all others were driven back? And yet there were those who were unwilling to put a little butter on the black bread of the Russian boy whose bayonet was making it possible for their own boys to stay a few months longer at home.

Usual supplies of gas on the streets of your city mean American blood on the decks of the Pacific Fleet and the sands of Africa, and yet there were those who denounced Congress and the Government because they could not have the usual supply of gas to drive out and make "whoopee" on Saturday night.

Complaint about the rationing of shoes puts a patriotic citizen in the class of those who would go back to the darkest days of the Revolution when American soldiers left bloody footprints in the snow at Valley Forge.

Sugar on every table at home means insufficient explosives at the front. That last bowl of sugar may mean the last shot in some boy's gun as the Japs pour over the breastworks at Guadalcanal.

Scarcity of beef and pork at your butcher shop means a square meal over there—with enough energy to make a winning charge against heavy odds when the battle hangs in the balance.

American marines eating a sliver of mule meat in the fox holes of Bataan, trying to grind with their teeth the dry rice they could not even cook on Wake Island, and with nothing at all those bitter days of defeat in Tunisia, would have been glad to slice their own bread. But the people who are enjoying the usual home life for whom these boys are starving and dying—for whom their blood reddens the soil of an alien land 3,000 miles from everything they hold dear—beat their breasts and shriek to high heaven because they have to slice their own bread.

And while we are on that subject, it might be well to explain that the cloth saved by taking the cuffs off of trousers is this year making 600,000 complete suits of clothing. And discontinuation of sliced bread effects three economies: The slicing machinery is needed by the armed forces; the paper required to wrap sliced bread contains chemicals badly needed in the manufacture of munitions; and unsliced bread is less subject to deterioration. When the war is over and the long years of peace come once more and grandchildren ask what we did to help win the war, there will be those who can say proudly: "I complained because I had to slice the bread."

But let me get back to what Congress has done for these boys. Although the American camps of 1898 teemed with disease and vermin and death—although one camp in Ohio in 1918 was unable to supply coffins fast enough to care for the victims of the epidemic of influenza which swept every concentration of troops that year—there has not been a single epidemic or contagion in any American camp in this war. There are not even any cooties. And, remarkable as it may seem, the health rate is much higher in our cantonments than it is in civil life. In other words, there are men in our armed forces who are well and robust today who would not be alive if they had remained in civilian life.

As an example of the efficacy of our hospitalization, the percentage of wounded who recovered from the bombing at Pearl Harbor breaks all records in the history of military medicine.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Because the gentleman is discussing the relative health situation of military and civil life, may I call to the attention of the committee the fact that the Civil Service Subcommittee yesterday heard testimony that 12 percent of those persons who were separated from Government employment did so because of ill health.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is a corroborating situation. A comparison of the health of civilians with that of men in the service is decidedly in favor of service conditions, and is a tribute to the efficacy of our Medical Corps and the efficiency of the Congress in making the necessary provision for the service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman satisfied that we have an adequate number of hospitals to care for the disabled? I am troubled because I am told that some of our men coming back from overseas are being sent to insane asylums or in some cases to jails because there is no place for them in the hospitals. I am checking up on that, but I want the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There has never been, there is not today, and there never will be sufficient hospitals in a world war, but we are meeting the need more promptly and by larger percentages than ever before in the medical history of warfare.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman give us any figures as to the

number of individuals wounded, and the mortality rate of those who have been wounded in the war, how many are dying?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, we cannot as yet give exact figures for any period, and especially current figures; that is confidential information. As a matter of fact any figures we would give on current casualties, even if available, would be obsolete, as they increase daily, unfortunately. I may say however, that in proportion to the number of men involved, in proportion to disadvantages under which we are advancing on all fronts, the number at this time is gratifyingly small.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am told that the Navy has a remarkable training of first aid, when men are wounded. They are treated in a primary way, and almost immediately taken to a field hospital, which is better than anything ever done before in the care of the wounded.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And further, each man is equipped with an emergency kit, with emergency drugs for self-application, and a very large number of lives have been saved which would have been lost in former wars, because they are in a position to take primary care of their wounds. Our men have had not only improved equipment and supplies, but they have been infinitely better trained. In France, in 1918, General Pershing deplored the lack of training, "the lack of military information on certain points" displayed by American officers from colonels down, arriving in France.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Can the gentleman give us something about the comparative cost of training men in this war as compared with the other?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course the training in this war is more expensive than in the last war, first, because there is a longer period of training and it is more comprehensive. And, second, because costs entering into the courses given are heavier. Naturally the cost varies with the character and nature of the course. But we have provided everything needed to train a man to take care of himself and his men, and we have never hesitated to appropriate money for training when we thought we were getting value received.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And I may state that the taxpayers would not object to any money that is spent along that line.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that. As between spending too much and spending too little, as between having ample requirements and having inadequate funds, I do not think there is a single man in this House who would differ with the policy of the committee putting sufficient men on the front line in time and with enough to do the job.

Mr. ROWE. And in addition to the costs being greater, by reason of the time, is there not an additional element to consider in that the percentage of mechanical equipment and extensive training require increased cost?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is perhaps the most important element of cost. The planes of 1918 were hardly more than kites, while the Flying Fortresses of today are among the most intricate and expensive machines produced in this mechanical age. That same is true in the comparison of tanks and all other war equipment. And the gratifying feature of it is that all branches of warfare and character of equipment is being produced in record time and with record efficiency. A recent report from Mr. Donald Nelson was that the manufacture of munitions, the production of planes, the output of guns, and the launching of ships tops not only American records but is greater in both volume and value of the mechanical output of any modern nation—in peace or in war. We are producing every month more than was produced in any previous month in any land or in any industry. American industry and labor, fed by American agriculture, is winning the war.

But no tribute to those who are serving the Nation in this war would be complete without reference to the extraordinary contribution of President Roosevelt. Without his foresight we would not be a free people today. He came to the Presidency at the close of a decade that had been devoted to disarmament—when disarmament meant dismantling of the American Navy.

In 1922 the Washington Conference had solemnly agreed to gradual disarmament and the five contracting powers, including Japan had bound themselves to sink a percentage of their ships and retard and eventually abandon new construction. It was in keeping with the temper of the American people.

We hoped and believed that at last the millenium was about to dawn and the peoples of the world dwell together in permanent peace and amity. Apparently the world had reached a stage of civilization when war could be relegated to the limbo of the barbaric past and we could now sink our battleships and beat our swords into plowshares, and our spears into pruning hooks. We entered wholeheartedly into the agreement, and we kept our agreement.

Japan signed the protocol and prostituted it to her advantage in preparing for a war she had long had in contemplation, an advantage and a program which but for President Roosevelt, would have been fatal to the American people.

In the period between 1922, the year of the first conference, and 1934 our Government laid down only 35 combatant ships. During that period Japan, in contravention of the commitments of the conference, laid down 119 ships. When President Roosevelt came to the Presidency the temper of the American people and the temper of this Congress was adverse to spending money on armaments. We were especially adverse to building up the Navy. Men on the floor of the House said, and said very properly as it seemed at that time, "What is the use spending millions of dollars to build battleships we will take out and sink the next time we have a disarmament conference?" So when President Roosevelt recommended expansion of the naval program, we demurred. I remember very well, and other Members who were here in 1932, 1933, and 1934 will remember, that we went along with the President's naval construction program very reluctantly. But, fortunately for the Nation, we went.

Under President Roosevelt's plan we constructed 30 combatant ships, 8 dreadnoughts, 12 cruisers, 2 aircraft carriers, 65 destroyers, and 36 submarines. In the next 7 years we built 153 vital naval units. In the previous 11 years we had built only 35, as contrasted with the 7 years in which we built 153. The important thing is that at the end of that 7 years we not only had the ships but we had the manufacturing facilities for producing ships and naval equipment which we would otherwise not have had. More than that, we had the trained personnel, trained officers, whom we would not have had had we not followed the program laid down by President Roosevelt.

I make no statement of the significance of the situation. A statement is not necessary, but I ask you what would have been our position after Pearl Harbor if we had pursued the program we were pursuing in the decade following the Washington Conference? And what would have been our situation without these ships, this naval strength, these manufacturing facilities, and this naval personnel—the direct and immediate result of the policy of President Roosevelt—on December 7, 1941?

The figures speak for themselves. The significant thing is that the President did not advocate a similar program with regard to the Army. Looking at it 10 years afterward we can see unmistakably the President's policy. He advocated the construction of a navy as a protection and not with an idea of ever having to use it in war. He knew, as all American statesmen had begun to realize at that time, that Japan had designs which we must be in a position to meet. He looked upon the Navy as a shotgun behind the door. If we had it Japan would never attack us. He did not realize at that time, nor did anyone else, that Japan had long since entered upon a program of controlling the Pacific Ocean. There are very frank statements on record now in which Japanese statesmen said that the Pacific Ocean was a Japanese ocean and they expected to control it. We know now that that was and is their objective.

What would have been our position after Pearl Harbor if we had been without the ships and the men and the facilities which President Roosevelt's policy gave us?

In contrast, the President did not build up a corresponding Army. Why? Because he did not expect to go to war. At a comparatively late date we had an Army of only 136,000 men, an Army smaller than the Army of Rumania. No one can look at that record and doubt for a moment that his idea was to prevent war and not to provoke war. No one can now doubt that but for his wise, far-sighted policy we would have been

helpless in this greatest crisis in our national history.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly that the President did not think we were going into a war with Japan. If he had, I am sure America would not have furnished all the materials to build that great navy for Japan.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is right, with perhaps this reservation. Even had we known positively and officially of Japan's plan of attack, we could not have denied her materials unless we were ready to precipitate the war at a time when we were woefully unprepared and when we were striving earnestly and sincerely to avoid war. Secretary Hull worked up until the last minute in an endeavor to avoid war. Up to the last we depended on the superiority of our Navy to prevent war.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I agree with about everything the gentleman has said. The Congress in 1937 passed a law giving the President the power to place an embargo upon all war materials, that is in the rough, or in the raw, being sent to Japan. In June 1939 I made the statement on the floor of the House that Japan was our greatest menace and that I thought the President should have placed an embargo upon the shipment of what amounted to 54 percent of the materials Japan was using for the construction of the war materials and war equipment about which the gentleman is talking. Personally, I always thought the President should have used the power given him by Congress to place an embargo upon the shipment of those materials.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman and I were in complete accord; but looking back at it even now, as long as there was a chance to maintain peace, as long as there was a possibility of keeping out of war—and that was unquestionably the will of the American people—to have taken that step would have been notice to Japan that we anticipated war and were ready to meet it. We would have been the aggressor.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. In view of what the gentleman said, I wonder if he thinks that the American Congress, or this Congress, or the President of the United States in future will ever permit a thing like that to happen where we absolutely furnish the materials to some other nation to build up a great armament to be used against us by her.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman takes that position because we must not only win this war on terms of unconditional surrender but we must completely disarm these predatory nations and we must maintain airfields and bridgeheads in strategic positions over the world to prevent them from rearming. We must not only deny them supplies, but we must maintain a surveillance that will prevent them again disturbing the peace of the world.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I know that the gentleman will agree that any traffic in war preparation materials which is carried on for the sake of profit is basically wrong from a moral standpoint; we all know that; but I ask the gentleman whether in his opinion it does not appear to be true that at any time when America had taken drastic action in this matter of shipments to Japan, Japan was apparently ready to strike? Hence the taking of such action necessarily had to be when, as, and if this Nation was ready to follow through with the consequences thereof. Does not the gentleman believe that is true?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Exactly; there was only one ground upon which we could deny these materials to Japan, and that was solely, wholly, and only upon the ground that we thought she was using them to prepare armament to be used against us; and whenever we took that position, in the eyes of the chancelries of the world we invited war.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Our distinguished chairman has brought out a thought that I have wanted to explore a little in connection with this bill and the committee report, and if he will permit me I will bring it in at this point in the debate.

The gentleman from Missouri has laid down the proposition that we must maintain bridgeheads and keep these predatory nations unarmed, we will say. I wish to submit this question because to me it is perhaps one of the hottest issues of today; it ties directly into this: Are our people in this country prepared mentally and financially to put up the necessary dollars in the form of taxes to carry on such a program? That is question No. 1.

Question No. 2 is this: Coming directly to the bill here, the committee report on page 14 and the bill on page 25 shows a deficiency item of $6,150,000 to put the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the Treasury Department in position to collect $8,000,000,000 of additional taxes assessed by the revenue act we passed last year. Here is a deficiency bill, as I understand, for $6,000,000,000 and more. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This is a deficiency bill. Our budget for the fiscal year now running called for $8,000,000,000 of additional taxes as set forth on page 14 of the committee report. We are now appropriating $6,150,000 to facilitate and implement the Bureau of Internal Revenue in collecting that $8,000,000,000. At the same time we have a proposition here before us on the Hill where it is being proposed that that $8,000,000,000 of taxes be canceled or forgotten. Now, I raise that question and tie it in with the gentleman's comment to the effect that we must maintain bridgeheads, maintain standing armies, disarm and keep disarmed predatory nations; and I want to ask the gentleman to comment on this whole thing not only as to whether or not in his opinion with so many millions of our people and so many Members of this House in a frame of mind to cancel, and forget, and forgive taxes, whether or not we are prepared morally to go ahead and take on that job at this time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. My good friend for whom I have the highest regard and for whose economic opinions I have very wholesome respect is, of course, going very far afield when he wants to leave the bill and talk about a subject entirely foreign to the province of our committee. I must not encroach upon the jurisdiction of the prerogatives of my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

In answer to the gentleman's first question, Shall we maintain airfields and bridgeheads to prevent a recurrence of this world holocaust? may I say that up to this time we have tried everything else. You know, I know, and we all know beyond peradventure of a doubt that if Germany and Japan are allowed to rearm, it is only a question of time before my grandson and your grandson, if not my son and your son, will have to fight this war all over again. Is there any man on this floor who has any doubt about that? If so let him rise now and enter his objection. As often as they are permitted to rearm we will have to go through this same thing again, but it will be a little bit worse each time.

I think the gentleman rather magnifies the steps which it will be necessary to take. We will not need a large standing army. We can go back to the smallest standing army we have ever maintained in time of peace and hold these airfields and bridgeheads, because we operate now with airplanes and explosives. We do not have to occupy forts and maintain large bodies of troops. All that it is necessary is to keep sufficient explosives and airplanes and we can nip any outbreak in its incipiency.

So far as expense is concerned I believe any of you would be willing to put it up to any taxpayer in the country as to whether he wants to adopt a policy with assurances that it will prevent the robber nations of Europe from rearming and again running amuck or whether he wants to come back and spend billions, billions, and billions of dollars as we are spending them now simply because we did not take the proper steps to prevent a recurrence of this thing the last time we fought it out in a world war.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Going to the other phase of it, and coming right down to the bill, keeping out of the field of taxation as best we can, in the event the Congress within the next few weeks cancels the 1942 tax assessment as discussed on page 14 of the committee report, then what?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt? He is adopting a premise of "If such-and-such a thing is done."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But the premise does not pertain to this bill. If the gentleman insists, I shall be glad to have him make a statement, but we are getting clear away from the subject in hand.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; I do not think so, because in that event would the $6,150,000 be necessary for the Internal Revenue Bureau?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The necessity for additional money is to carry out the laws of this Congress. If you want to carry out the laws, if you want them to carry out your directions to the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the collection of these taxes as provided by statute, they will have to have this money. If you do not propose to collect these taxes you do not need it.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Before the gentleman becomes too far removed from his suggestion that we maintain strategic outposts, I want to inquire of him if he does not think that we should hold them and others in collaboration with all nations who will join with us in a determination to preserve law and order and peace in the world?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I certainly feel we would be amiss in our trust to all civilized nations if we did not collaborate in the maintenance of the peace of the world.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does not the gentleman agree there must be on the part of Americans, particularly those in the position of leadership in our Nation, a deeper consecration to America's responsibility in those regards than has ever existed before?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I was preparing to agree with the gentleman, but he takes in too much territory when he says "than has ever existed before." The President of the United States and representatives of the United States in the armed forces, the Army and Navy, for 150 years have consecrated themselves to this end. The pages of our history are full of men from Washington down who would sacrifice personal interest for common good. I ask anybody to suggest a method or course which President Roosevelt could have taken which would more completely and more adequately have carried out his oath of office, which would more adequately and more completely have maintained the integrity of our Nation and the perpetuity of our Government and our institutions than the course he did take? If you can suggest it, I will yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree completely with what the gentleman said and when I made the remark I did a moment ago the main reason I put it as I did was because I think we never before in our Nation have faced an international problem as acute as we do now. It is my earnest hope that at the conclusion of this war we will avoid some of the things which I believe were overlooked and neglected at the conclusion of the First World War.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am in complete accord with the gentleman that the world was never so small and our responsibility was never so great.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And our safety so dependent upon what happened on an international scale.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Precisely.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has been expressing much better than I can some of the thoughts that have been going through my mind. I take it, however, that the gentleman is not trying now to give us a complete program for after-war safety; but laying down, rather, the cornerstone or the basic foundation of our future international policy. It may be that international organization will be needed, I am not competent to speak on that and I do not care to do so at this time; it may be that some justice as between nations in economics will be necessary for a lasting peace, but I believe that the task, as the gentleman has said, is such that we must see to it that a police power preserves peace and does so by keeping aggressor nations disarmed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to hear the gentleman make that statement. Of course, we can adopt at this time only the broadest general directions. We cannot at this time determine the detail and the minutiae or even the framework by which this can be done. It will require the ability, the time, and the patriotism of the wisest men we have today to work it out.

On that account, I rather deplore the fact that we are omitting in this bill the provision for the National Resources Planning Board. We cannot wait until the time is upon us, until we reach the precipice; we must plan in advance. Every reasonable human being knows that there must be some forethought. Provision should be made now. Of course, Congress should itself take a direct hand in the matter, but we should at this time have appropriated to continue these activities in such a way that we could correlate them with the work of the Congress.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not believe there is a Member of the House who is not fully in accord with what the gentleman is saying, that we must lay the foundation for continued peace in this world or else civilization as we know it will be destroyed and lost.

Now, may I refer back to the colloquy we had a few moments ago with reference to placing an embargo upon the shipment of materials to Japan. May I remind the gentleman of the famous speech of the President, made in the city of Chicago in the fall of 1937, when he spoke about quarantining aggressor nations, referring to Japan, I think. It has always seemed to me that the reasonable interpretation of that speech was that trouble with Japan should be anticipated. Having that in mind, I always thought that the President should have placed that embargo following the passage of the act of Congress giving him the power to do so.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. To have done so would have amounted to a virtual declaration of war at that time. While we can look back now and see that war was inevitable, at that time we did not believe and the great majority of the American people did not believe that war was inevitable.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my good friend from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A moment ago the gentleman said that unless we disarmed Germany and Japan our grandsons if not our sons would be fighting this war over again. Did I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I believe nobody objected to that statement at the time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. I am not objecting now. I just wanted to ask the gentleman whether or not he thought we could avoid these future wars and save our sons and our grandsons if we continued to meddle in every quarrel that came up over on the other side and placed our commercial interests above the welfare and the lives of our own citizens.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman understands, of course, that we are not in this trouble because of meddling.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not understand that at all.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are in it because Japan came like a thief in the night, and plunged a dagger in our back.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am familiar with all that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But for Japan's action, we might never have been involved.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can we continue to meddle in the quarrels over there—I will leave out the "continue"—can we meddle in the quarrels over there and keep out of war?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is like the question, When did you stop beating your wife? We have not been meddling.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean to say that sending ships into belligerent waters and carrying munitions of war was not meddling?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Absurd. Germany declared war first, Italy declared war first. Japan, without excuse and without notice, in probably the most reprehensible international action ever taken by any nation, made it a matter of self-preservation.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Concerning the inquiry with reference to why an embargo was not imposed against Japan, I think it is known, or should be known, that an embargo was not leveled against Japan because it was known that if such an embargo were leveled it would precipitate war with Japan. Our Navy advised the State Department that we were not prepared to go to war with Japan. It was, therefore, to prevent war that an embargo was not imposed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has stated the situation exactly.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MAY. The only reason I asked the gentleman to yield is to clear up a misunderstanding. In addition to the fact that the administration was doing everything it could to keep us out of war, after that bill was passed by the Congress—and it came out of the House Committee on Military Affairs after weeks of hearings—it was known that all of the strategic war materials in the Far East, such as rubber and tin, were being made available to this Government, and if we had shut down on Japan promptly we would not have gotten millions and millions of pounds of critical materials that we did get. That was a good reason for delaying the embargo.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There can be no question about our position at the time. We took the only course open.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I was interested in the question of the gentleman from Michigan. To me it was a rather shocking question. It reveals that the gentleman is still laboring under the illusion that this great Nation, the most powerful nation in the world, can hold itself aloof, that by keeping our ships out of belligerent waters, by staying out of quarrels, and all of the other old isolationist phrases, we can remain at peace. Surely the gentleman should realize by this time that this Government must shoulder its responsibility, that we must take a part in preventing these quarrels from developing into wars of aggression, which inevitably engulf the whole world.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The United States in neither the First World War nor in the present World War has had any ulterior motive. At the close of the last World War we were in a position to take the lion's share of the spoils, but we did not take a foot of land, we did not take a dollar of indemnity. We did not take a single trade advantage. We did not ask for a single commercial concession. We came home empty handed, bringing our dead with us, and an imperishable record for unselfish service to Christian civilization that has never been equaled in the annals of mankind. That is our position today. We do not want to meddle with the affairs of any nation. We do not want a foot of territory. We do not want any commercial advantages, we do not want any trade treaties or material advantages of any kind. We want to maintain only our right to live our own way and maintain the freedom of all nations.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Misouri. Yes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I do not understand the gentleman's two statements. I do not see how they coincide—that we are in war because Japan attacked us and that war was inevitable. The gentleman made both statements.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It was inevitable because Japan had planned it for 25 years. Japan announced after she opened this war that she was going to make the terms of peace in the White House. Her leaders said that their allies might have the territory east of the Rocky Mountains, but they wanted the Pacific coast because the Pacific Ocean was a Japan pond and they proposed to control it. Their first start was in Alaska, and they are in Alaska this afternoon—the first stop on their way to take our coast west of the Rockies. It was inevitable. Japan made it inevitable; and her attack was the first step in furtherance of the determination to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With pleasure.

Mr. CASE. I am interested in the gentleman's remarks in regard to not getting any advantage after the war is over. I think of it in connection with the statement of the Secretary of the Navy, that we should have some bases in the Pacific at the close of the war.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I did not see the statement made by the Secretary of the Navy. What was it?

Mr. CASE. My understanding is that the Secretary of the Navy stated that at the conclusion of this war we ought to secure our position in the Pacific, by some outlying naval bases.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. My position is the position of the average man on the street. I do not attach any particular significance to it beyond a personal opinion that I have gained from listening with the rest of the members of the Committee on Appropriations to the evidence that we have had before us. It is that we must take some means to prevent the rearmament of Japan. I think all of us agree on that. If we do not, we will have to fight the war again in 20 years. It is merely a matter of how we shall prevent rearmament. I am willing now to listen to any suggestion the gentleman makes along that line, and I am satisfied that we have a common purpose, a common motive, a common opinion to the extent that Japan and Germany must be prevented from rearming.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. In respect to the suggestion that during the 18 months previous to Pearl Harbor we did not do anything to lay an embargo on the shipment of goods to Japan. During that time when we refused to lay an embargo on the shipment of goods to Japan we accumulated the largest amount of rubber ever accumulated by anybody, and had we not possessed that enormous rubber reserve, then our military would have been out long before now. Because of our failure to declare that embargo, it enabled us to build up a huge reserve of rubber.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Which fully justified our position in refusing to invite the embargo.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. In order to take our proper place in a post-war world, does the gentleman think it is necessary that we should surrender our national sovereignty, our form of Government, or our way of life under it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under no circumstances. That is what we are fighting to maintain, and that is what we propose to defend at all cost.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. I am sure that the gentleman is expressing the desire of a great mass of the American people in the stand that he is taking and the statement that he has already made. After the last war we came out asking nothing, and is it not a fact now that all of the nations of the world except the belligerents are looking to the United States to take the leadership and lay the foundation for a peaceful future?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In every part of Europe today, men in chains, in concentration camps, in empty houses, watching their children starve, are stretching out their hands to America, their only remaining hope, the hope of the world.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman speaks of a plan and a program for disarmament after the war, that is, disarmament of the belligerents. Does not the gentleman think that any feasible, practical plan will envision a League of Nations, a disarmament of the countries, and a policing power that will enforce peace throughout the world?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All of these plans and suggestions will be welcomed and will be considered.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman has correctly stated, and I thoroughly agree with him, that Japan attacked us. But I would like to ask the gentleman, Which does he think is our greatest enemy, Japan or Germany?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unquestionably, our most dangerous enemy is Japan.

Mr. FISH. Can the gentleman answer me, Why are we not concentrating more of our efforts against the Japanese at this time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have the best qualified Army and Navy lead-

ership in the world, and I am willing to leave it to them.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I understood the gentleman to say a moment ago that Japan has been preparing for a war for 25 years. Does the gentleman think that our State Department knew those plans were being made or that that was the intention of Japan?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Oh, no. We had no positive knowledge. There was evidence which put us on guard. That is why we repeatedly tried to enter into an agreement with Japan to disarm.

Three different times we said to Japan, in 1922, 1930, and 1931, and to the other nations of the world, "Now, let us quit this absurd thing of competitive armament. Why should we spend millions of dollars and burden our people and the people of every country of the world in this race to build the most battleships and the biggest guns? Let us agree together that we will have no more wars and live in peace and amity." We made every effort to maintain peace with Japan—even up until the last minute. Their representatives were in the State Department ostensibly trying to reach an agreement between Japan and America at the time they struck.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. The white book issued by the State Department would indicate that they had a pretty thorough knowledge as to what was existing.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They had no positive information. Gradually through the years there grew up a volume of evidence which pointed to the fact that we had better keep our eye on Japan; but we did not propose to declare war. Our purpose was to maintain peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most interesting items submitted to us was a Budget estimate for $200,000 to continue the National Resources Planning Board for the rest of this fiscal year. In view of the fact that the independent offices subcommittee had already rejected the continuation of the organization beyond July 1, it was generally felt in the committee that it would be better to stop it now.

The National Resources Planning Board throughout its entire life has been made up of people without a practical viewpoint on life. It has been made up of those whose theory of life is that it is absolutely impossible for the economic system of America to take care of our people after this war is over, and that we must have some kind of fake employment or employment on public works, that we cannot afford, in order to provide the daily bread of our people.

America became great because of hard work and because of an economic system based upon the private employment of her people, based upon thrift, based upon industry, based upon the idea that we should keep our country at peace whenever it was possible and raise the standard of living of the American people.

In 150 years America has become the greatest and richest nation in the world. Her standard of living for her people is higher than anywhere else in the world. We have not educated our people to believe that they must be at somebody else's throat all the time with a saber or a gun. On the other hand, the American people are not yellow. They will fight when it is necessary to do so and there is no other recourse, for their liberty, for their country, and for the right to live. We are engaged in that kind of a struggle now.

The implication of the continuance of the National Resources Planning Board is that America is dead. It represents an attitude of defeatism. It represents an attitude that there is no future for America.

If the planners in this outfit were any good they would be working at the war effort. They would not be getting up plans based on a defeatist theory for the after-the-war period.

It is about time that the Congress began to take cognizance of the situation and began to plan for an after-the-war period in which there will be a free America. A free America with a free economic system where a man can, as he has been able to do throughout the history of America, work up to a position of real importance and real power in our country as a result of his own ability. The only way that the standards of living of America can be maintained and increased is by the increase in the capacity of our country to produce consumable goods. That has been our history. As a result of that type of free economy we have progressed. The reactionary theories of the Roosevelt administration that America is defeated make no appeal to me and I cannot support the continuation of any organization such as this one which is based entirely on a defeatist attitude toward the future of America.

Now, there has been some discussion here about the preparation for war, and I want to say a few words about that.

In 1922 the disarmament treaty was agreed to, which leveled off the navies of the world. That treaty and its extensions were lived up to, and as a result of that treaty America had just as good a Navy as any of the rest at the end of that period.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman remembers, does he not, that one signatory power present at that conference in Washington and who signed the treaty that finally came from the conference failed to observe the stipulations of the treaty? I refer to Japan.

Mr. TABER. Well, she did later on, perhaps, but not in the early part of the picture—not in the period down to the time that she renounced and refused to go along.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman is mistaken about that, because Japan never repudiated that treaty, notwithstanding the fact that she was continuously violating the provisions of it.

Mr. TABER. Japan refused to go along with it in about 1931. From that date on she began to build up a Navy that was away beyond the treaty Navy. Very soon after that Hitler came on the scene. When Hitler began to come into power all these treaties were scrapped and our race was not as rapid as the race of Japan, but what did we do while that was going on? In spite of the fact that the white book that the administration has put out from the State Department indicates that for many years the Secretary of State believed that Japan was ready to spring at us whenever she got a chance, what happened? In 1937 from this country 2,081,037 tons of steel and scrap iron went to Japan—enough to build 20 battleships, 200 submarines, 10 aircraft carriers, 26 cruisers.

In 1938 1,365,721 tons went to Japan. Again, in 1939, 2,035,000 tons of scrap, and 144,000 tons of steel ingots and blooms. In 1940 after the war had started with China, which started in 1940, 936,000 tons of scrap and 285,000 tons of steel ingots and blooms went to Japan.

In addition to that scrap and steel, in 1937, $2,483,000 worth of aircraft went to Japan; in 1938, $11,062,000 worth of aircraft; in 1939, $3,306,000 worth of aircraft; in 1940, $932,000 worth of aircraft. During that period $219,000,000 worth of petroleum products went to Japan, and this included, in 1939, 555,000 barrels of aviation gas and, in 1940, 776,000 barrels of aviation gas. Oh, I do wish this administration had been alert and upon its toes to protect the interests of America.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman know of any greater record of appeasement in the history of that word about which so much has been said in the last few days, applied to a certain noble American, accused of being a potential appeaser? I say that this record is probably the world's greatest in appeasing.

Mr. TABER. It certainly is a record of failure in appeasement.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Is the gentleman implying by his statement that that is the price we paid for tin and rubber?

Mr. TABER. The tin and rubber would not have been nearly so useful to us as these things Japan got from us were to her. That oil was the thing with which she was able to start the war and to maintain her war in China. The same is likewise true of steel and aircraft.

Mr. SHAFER. How about the gold we purchased?

Mr. TABER. I presume that has something to do with it.

Mr. SHAFER. It paid the expenses, did it not?

Mr. TABER. It did.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I think if the gentleman had traveled on the Pacific during the last 15 years he would have observed, as I and others did observe, that the Pacific was simply always filled with Japanese tankers traveling from our west coast to Japan. It was during those years, may I say to my friend from New York, that Japan prepared for the things that have happened since December 7, 1941.

Mr. TABER. That was the way she put herself in shape to make the trouble for us which she has made. I want now to come directly to the bill. There are a few items in the bill to which I wish to call attention. I have spoken about only one so far.

One item that does not appear in the bill is the item to look after farm labor. There are no printed hearings on that part of the estimate that was sent to us. Our committee decided after 2 days' hearings and a lot of work on the part of all us—and the decision was unanimous—that we would not be able to bring the parts of this bill that absolutely need to have attention in here to the House in time to meet the demands if we attempted to reach an agreement upon a program to handle agricultural labor. We felt that we must have a very considerable number of days to look the thing over, to hear the different people and the different programs, and try to work one out.

There has been no attempt on the part of the committee to dodge the program; it is just that we did not have put up to us what we believed was a satisfactory program, and we did not have the time before this bill had to be brought up to take care of that situation. We are going to have to ask the indulgence of the House to permit us to go into the whole picture, make a thorough study of it next week, and then come back here with another bill that relates to this particular program. The rest of the cuts that have been made I believe were made without any sacrifice of any real interest of any organization having to do with the war effort or the economic system of America.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Would the gentleman explain what was done with the Office for Emergency Management, and just what is the function of this agency?

Mr. TABER. The functions of that agency are rather involved. Estimates for several items were submitted to us. Let me take, first, the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Service. An item was presented involving a total program of $2,800,000 for the care of children of employed mothers, and payments to States amounting to a total of about $3,000,000,000. It was a part of a program which it was suggested to us would cost $30,000,000 a year.

There seemed to be no intelligent method of setting it up; there seemed to be no intelligent method of handling it, and we did not feel that we were in any position to bring that in here. It may be that something will have to be done along this line, but the program presented to us was so crude and incompetent, in our opinion, that we did not feel that we could consider it.

There are several small items in the bill dealing with travel expenses and items with reference to the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and to the Office of Defense Transportation.

A program was suggested for the National War Labor Board. The regular portion of the program amounting to $3,250,000 we allowed. A lot of items with reference to the Bureau of Labor Statistics we did not allow because we did not feel that they made a good case for them.

With reference to the Manpower Commission, we refused to appropriate $2,454,000 which had previously been denied by the Labor and Social Security Subcommittee, denied by the full committee, and denied by this House last year. They claimed they could not keep the people, but this was the history of the thing: They have a set-up calling for 21,900. They claim they had a turnover of 14,000 in a year, a large portion of whom were boys who were taken into the service.

At the end of the period they had over 19,000 on their roll, indicating that they were not very seriously embarrassed by the salaries they had to pay or that they would have any more than 2,000 vacancies out of the 21,000 employees. That is what was in here under Office for Emergency Management very largely.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with this bill there has been an absolute agreement on the part of the minority and the majority of the subcommittee. There is nothing in here that I intend to offer an amendment to. The bill has been very carefully considered in the committee, it has been considered entirely on its merits and nothing has been put in here that I feel should be subject to criticism even in the slightest degree. I hope that when the bill is read the membership of the House will stand against the addition of any unnecessary sums to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask one question, not for the purpose of getting involved in taxation. The committee recommends $6,150,000 to further implement the Internal Revenue Bureau in the way of putting on additional help and personnel in handling the returns necessary under the Victory tax and for the thirty-five to forty million additional new taxpayers that came in as a result of the 1942 Revenue Act, and who will file returns. It seems to me this is a sensible question. If the law is repealed that assessed those taxes for which the additional personnel is now called for and no additional law enacted bringing in a similar number, the $6,150,000 would not be expended, would it?

Mr. TABER. Well, I presume that is true, but it is an assumption that I would not expect to result.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Neither do I expect it to result, but I bring up that question to show that when you bring thirty-five or forty million additional taxpayers into the family to contribute directly to the tax box there are involved from seventy to eighty million additional tax calculations that have to be made and audited by somebody.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. The $6,000,000 that has been added to the bill is a small fraction of what would be required upon an annual basis for this operation. There will be very little of this $6,000,000 spent before the first of April, and it will not implement their force to any great extent until close to the 1st of July.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. It is absolutely necessary to have the force in the Bureau of Internal Revenue if we are going to collect the revenue.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think so too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK].

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, today I introduced a bill to place second-, third-, and fourth-class mail on a paying basis. For a number of years the Government has been giving a subsidy to the users of second-, third-, and fourth-class mail which is costing the taxpayers of this country close to $130,000,000 per annum.

The following tables will show the losses for the past 5 years:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1938: | |
| Second-class mail | $89,608,278.20 |
| Third-class mail | 23,352,987.75 |
| Fourth-class mail | 16,969,837.46 |
| Total | 129,931,103.41 |
| 1939: | |
| Second-class mail | 87,264,126.47 |
| Third-class mail | 23,682,071.15 |
| Fourth-class mail | 17,488,641.33 |
| Total | 128,634,838.95 |
| 1940: | |
| Second-class mail | 85,381,026.63 |
| Third-class mail | 26,291,985.68 |
| Fourth-class mail | 21,809,869.92 |
| Total | 133,482,832.23 |
| 1941: | |
| Second-class mail | 83,519,746.30 |
| Third-class mail | 22,325,181.15 |
| Fourth-class mail | 19,092,069.41 |
| Total | 124,936,996.86 |
| 1942: | |
| Second-class mail | 86,345,597.65 |
| Third-class mail | 23,954,159.98 |
| Fourth-class mail | 17,909,587.20 |
| Total | 128,209,344.83 |

The total loss for the past 5 years amounts to $645,195,166.28. This is over a half-a-billion-dollar subsidy given by

the Government during the 5 years mentioned above.

There have been rumors around Capitol Hill that the postal authorities are going to recommend an increase in the postage on first-class mail. That is something which is hard to understand, because first-class mail is used by nearly every family in the United States. It does not seem possible that they would increase the postage on this mail where men making $20 to $30 per week would be affected and at the same time give a subsidy to a small minority group using the second-, third-, and fourth-class mail.

In 1938 the net income from first-class mail was $123,535,504.94, in 1939 the net income was $128,291,223.29, in 1940 it was $136,680,313.10, and in 1941 it was $146,815,578.73. In 1942 the net income was $162,976,883.65.

I feel that the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle who are today making speeches on economy and advocating the cutting down of appropriations for all departments except those engaged in war activities should support my bill. It will save the taxpayers of this country millions and millions of dollars. Part of this saving could be used to increase the pay of postal employees, who have not received an increase in salary for many years; the balance could go into the Treasury of the United States.

To continue the practice of permitting second-, third-, and fourth-class mail to go through the post office at a loss is something I cannot understand. Of course, I am not advocating that a profit be made, but at least the users should pay for the cost of handling second,-third-, and fourth-class mail.

You will note in the Postmaster's annual report that the newspapers, magazines, and different publications receive an annual subsidy from between eighty-five to ninety million dollars. In other words the taxpayers of this country are making a contribution to the very papers that are advocating economy throughout the various departments, but they do not complain about the subsidy they are receiving, which in the past 5 years amounted to close to a half billion dollars.

Very often the newspapers refer to the franking privileges accorded to Members of Congress. Yet if you will take the amount it costs the Government for the congressional franking privilege, you will see that it is about one-half of 1 percent of the total amount lost on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail.

I, therefore, appeal to the Members of Congress to ask the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to report this bill out favorably, because if it is enacted into law, it will save the taxpayers, not only millions, but billions of dollars that are now going to the owners of the newspapers, magazines, and other publications throughout the country.

I assure you I will do everything in my power to get favorable action on this legislation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have noticed within the past 6 months that several magazines with Nation-wide circulation have doubled their subscription rates, from 5 to 10 cents, and that a good many others have increased their rates to protect themselves and get the benefit of the inflation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein the bill to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, the bill which I have introduced today is as follows:

A bill to provide for increasing postal rates on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail matter so that such rates will yield revenues adequate to cover expenditures

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to prescribe, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this act, regulations providing for such increases in the rates of postage applicable to mail matter of the second, third, and fourth classes as may be necessary in order that the revenues in the case of such several classes of mail matter will fairly approximate the costs and expenditures attributable thereto, and to amend such regulations, from time to time, to the extent necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The rates of postage provided for in such regulations shall become effective, in lieu of the rates now provided by law, within such reasonable time after the promulgation of such regulations as the Postmaster General may provide therein. The regulations prescribed pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be published in the Federal Register.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes. If I heard the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee correctly, I am amazed that he should indicate in his remarks that there has been any lack of support insofar as the minority is concerned in building up our great ship-construction program which is so vital in the war effort.

My mind goes back less than 3 years to a day in June when this House was informed, 10 months after the war had started, that the Chief Executive of this country had indicated that unless Members of Congress desired to stay here and make speeches they could go home, that there was nothing else for them to do. We all recall, of course, that Congress did not go home. The Congress remained in Washington and as a result the war effort got under way at increased speed shortly thereafter. I think, generally speaking, that every ship-construction bill that has come along has had the overwhelming support of Members on both sides of this aisle.

Only 2 days ago a ship-facility bill was before the House, and on a roll call there was a unanimous vote in favor of the passage of the legislation.

This bill is the first deficiency bill. As in the case of other deficiency bills, the hearings reflect certain tendencies on the part of the executive agencies. They reflect a tendency to override the work of the regular subcommittees. They reflect a tendency to build up in the remaining portion of the fiscal year an organization to be carried on in the next fiscal year. They reflect a tendency to come in before the Deficiency Subcommittee with a lot of personnel that was never authorized by the regular subcommittee, placing the Deficiency Subcommittee in the position of either approving the increase or compelling a lot of personnel to be severed from the rolls of the Agency.

I think this particular bill has dealt with these tendencies in pretty satisfactory shape.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There are more than 100 Republicans on the floor and only 15 Democrats. This being a move toward economy, does not the gentleman believe we ought to have more Members here?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I believe we ought to have a large representation here on any bill that carries in the neighborhood of $6,000,000,000, as this one does.

As I say, I think this bill deals with the tendencies to which I have referred in a pretty satisfactory manner, but they must be watched and guarded against, in every deficiency bill.

It may be that the Congress should take drastic action, such, for instance, as limiting specifically by the terms of the bill the number of departmental personnel and the number of field personnal that may be carried on the rolls of this or that agency. It is a perfectly ridiculous spectacle, to my mind, to see 100,000 additional Federal personnel going on the Federal rolls every month, with the Committee on Appropriations often confronted by the fact that personnel has been added before the committee has passed upon the merits of the addition. This is a matter that should be given further and careful consideration.

This bill carries a total in contract authorizations of $5,250,000,000, reduced to a net obligation of about $2,174,000,000 by reason of the fact that about three-quarters of the actual appropriation for the Maritime Commission in the bill is to be applied against this contract authorization.

The bill also carries appropriations aggregating about $4,125,000,000, or an aggregate in the net as indicated in the report of about $6,299,000,000.

The principal item, of course, is for the Maritime Commission, which takes all the contract authorization to which I have just referred and $4,000,000,000 out of the $4,125,000,000 of appropriations.

Outside of the Maritime Commission, there is only about $125,000,000 of appropriations, which reflects a decrease of $13,900,000, or 10 percent, as compared with the Budget estimates.

The principal items outside of the Maritime Commission are $40,000,000 for the Public Roads Administration for access roads; $10,000,000 for the Office of Education for training programs; $31,-000,000 for the Treasury Department,

largely for expenses of loans and the Bureau of Internal Revenue; $7,500,000 for the Department of Justice, largely for the Immigration and Naturalization Service; $6,800,000 for judgments and claims; $5,500,000 for the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics; $4,700,000 for the Department of Agriculture largely for forest fires and insect control; and $3,250,000 for the War Labor Board, with particular reference to wage stabilization.

Certain important requests have been omitted, at least for the time being, including that for a farm labor program, $65,000,000; that of the National Resources Planning Board, $200,000; that of the Office of Education, $3,068,000; that of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Service, $2,884,000; that of the Children's Bureau, $1,200,000; and that of the United States Employment Service, $2,454,000.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The amount stated for the Children's Bureau is quite a cut from the amount asked.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The item requested by the Children's Bureau has been deferred at least for the time being. It amounted to $1,200,000 for the balance of the fiscal year or $4,800,000 on an annual basis.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If a little more information could be secured and an amendment worked out, would that be considered?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the committee felt that this is a matter in which the States and localities should be primarily responsible, and that further study is essential before approving the program submitted.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe the Committee would feel, would it not, that it is very essential at this time that we should keep up the health of the children. I think it is the least that we can do for those who serve in the armed service.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The program proposed had to do with the taking care of mothers at the time of childbirth.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That has to do with the life of the child.

Mr. JENSEN. In respect to the appropriation for the Justice Department, is that made necessary because of the increase of the F. B. I. force?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The increase for the Justice Department is very largely for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. There is nothing here I think for the F. B. I., as such.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Supplementing what the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] has spoken about, with respect to the requested additional appropriation of $1,200,000 in a supplemental estimate for the Children's Bureau, that provides grants to the States in providing medical nursing, hospital, and maternal care for the lives of children of enlisted men in the armed forces. As I understand the gentleman, and I have read the statement on this subject in the report, it is the attitude of the deficiency committee that this item was passed over or eliminated from the estimates because it was thought that the States themselves are in a financial condition to stand this additional expenditure, rather than for the Federal Government to pay it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that if he will consult the table appearing in the RECORD he will see that a number of States are in fact taking care of these things 100 percent, and are therefore making no request for this purpose. The committee felt, I think I am correct in saying, that before embarking on a $4,800,000 annual program, which has no enabling legislation to support it, further study should be given the question.

Mr. KEEFE. But it is merely supplemental to the program now being carried out.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There is a program that applies to prenatal care and to postnatal care also, but it does not apply, as I understand it, to the particular matter contemplated here, namely, expenses at the time of childbirth.

Mr. KEEFE. The hearings indicate that the Children's Bureau had in fact made allotments out of appropriated funds, in this fiscal year, to inaugurate this program in some 27 States that had approved programs. As I understand it, the deficiency item was to enable the carrying on of that program that had already been inaugurated, and it was in operation in some 27 States, that had programs already approved, and that there were some 17 other States that had programs subject to approval. Personally I am interested in seeing that that particular program is carried on, and unless there is some good reason that can be advanced other than the mere fact that the States themselves are in a financial condition to carry this program on, and I find according to the list I have before me that only 7 States have not requested funds for this purpose, including Alaska, I think I would be compelled to offer an amendment. It seems to me that this is a very vital question, and one that should be given the attention of the Congress. As I say, I personally would be inclined to offer an amendment to the bill in the absence of a very specific showing of a lack of necessity to restore this item, because I believe it is a very vital and necessary work that this Bureau is doing.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think I can say to the gentleman that all the members of the committee have sympathy with the objectives sought by several of the items eliminated, including the one in respect to which the gentleman has just expressed his own personal interest.

However, as I have already stated, I think it was felt that these programs should have further study, involving as they do the question of the division between Federal activity on the one hand and local activity on the other; involving as they do the fact that no one of them has been supported by enabling legislation; involving further as they do the fact that each of them calls for a very substantial outlay if estimated on an annual basis.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] was talking about a program for mothers whose husbands were in the service; maternity care.

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I was interested in the program which apparently has been started, to take care of mothers who are employed in war industries, which is also in this bill or was presented by the Budget in this bill, I believe?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It was.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The same action was taken on that. It was deferred?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It was.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The next question as I read this—I cannot tell—have they already started these nurseries for taking care of these children of employed mothers?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There has been a certain amount of work done under W. P. A. There is also being carried on a certain amount under the Lanham Act funds, the funds being used, as I understand it, in those communities where there has been a great increase of workers from outside communities so that local communities are not in a position to take care of them, and as a matter of experience, resulting in actual payment for that care largely, if not wholly, by the mothers whose children are taken care of.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The next question arises, if you cut this off right here, does that not mean that some women will have to leave defense industries who are now working in essential industries?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This is a proposal to take over the work by the Office of Defense Housing and Welfare Service, and to administer it through grants to States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

A large share of the expenditure will be borne by Uncle Sam instead of locally—the proposal calls for about $30,000,000 on an annual basis.

The committee, as I said in the other instance, felt that before embarking on a quasi permanent program calling for a large expenditure of funds, and in direct conflict with work now being carried on under Lanham Act funds, further study should be given the matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem proper that you should help those communities where there is

a tremendous influx of workers? As the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] said, I do not see how those women can carry on their work if the children are not cared for. It seems to me it should be done at once and then change it over to another department later if advisable.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think everybody in the committee and everybody in the House is fundamentally in sympathy with the objectives sought. The question is one of ways and means and not of objectives.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. Is the Lanham Act fund for emergencies only in those fields?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. As I understand it the Lanham Act activities are confined to those communities, where there has been a great influx of workers from outside, on the theory that the influx has led to a situation that the locality might properly not be asked to take care of.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly. There are many matters I wish to cover.

Mr. KEEFE. Did the committee go into the activities of Mrs. Kerr in connection with this program in the use and handling of funds under the Lanham Act?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. We had a representative of that agency before the committee. Mrs. Kerr herself did not appear.

Mr. KEEFE. Was the committee motivated in its action in striking out the funds for the Children's Bureau by reason of the fact that Mrs. Kerr was alleged to be doing some activities along similar lines with funds provided under the Lanham Act?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No. I think you are confusing the items. There are two items. One is for the Children's Bureau and deals with the care of mothers at the time of childbirth. The other is an item for the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Service, which proposes to carry on day care for children while the mothers are in employment. Mrs. Kerr comes in the latter picture.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman mentioned W. P. A. nursing projects. Of course, the gentleman is aware that those projects will be closed down by April 1?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. A large part of them will close on April 30, as I understand——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. So that all the more, that makes the need for increased appropriations?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is a factor in the picture.

MARITIME COMMISSION

Now, as has been stated, Mr. Chairman, the principal item in the bill is for the Maritime Commission.

Just to give an over-all picture, from July 1, 1940, to date, if this bill is passed, the Congress will have authorized about $11,226,000,000 for the construction of the so-called long-range program.

Appropriations aggregate $3,685,000 of which $2,091,000 are reported as unexpended. The independent offices bill just passed by the House carries further appropriations amounting to $1,289,000. In this bill there is a total of $4,000,000,000. This gives an over-all total of $7,300,000,000 for expenditure in the next 18 months.

Large as this seems, it appears to be justified by the fact that we have already reached a monthly expenditure of $400,000,000 and expect to go to $500,000,000 before the end of the calendar year. It also appears that the $4,000,000,000 under consideration before us now reflects a reduction of about $900,000,000 at the hands of the Budget.

The $4,000,000,000 now under consideration if allowed will be applied about one-quarter in respect to 2,242 ships under contract before October 31 last; and about three-quarters in respect to 2,161 ships to be placed under contract after that date. In other words, the long-range program contemplates 4,303 ships in addition to 843 ships in the other 3 programs of the agency, an over-all total of 5,146 ships.

The goal of 8,000,000 dead-weight tons in construction was reached in the calendar year 1942. It is hoped to go to 16,000,000 dead-weight tons in 1943 and to 18,800,000 dead-weight tons in 1944.

The importance of the work of the Commission cannot be exaggerated. It is apparent to us all.

There are a number of other items in the bill but I do not wish to take too much time.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY—PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION

Public Roads Administration is asking for $40,000,000 for the construction of access roads. There has been a total authorization for access roads of $260,000,000 and appropriations to the amount of $74,600,000. You will find a summary of the projects by States on page 583 of the hearings. By June, 767 projects are reported for the Army, 349 for the Navy, and 226 for the War Production Board.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY—OFFICE OF EDUCATION

The Office of Education asks for $10,000,000 for additional payments through the States for vocational courses in less than college grades. Original estimates were based on 1,040,000 students for preemployment classes and 1,325,000 for supplemental instruction, a total of 2,365,000 students. Revised estimates call for 1,350,000 students for preemployment classes and 1,240,000 for supplementary instruction, a total of 2,590,000 students.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The N. A. C. A. asks for $5,494,000, for the most part to bring its staff up toward that which is authorized in the independent offices bill for 1944. The total provides also for some construction work at Langley Field and for the completion of the engine laboratory at Cleveland.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT—BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The Bureau of Internal Revenue, asks for $6,150,000 by reason of the new provisions of the tax law, particularly the Victory tax, for a large expansion of personnel and of field offices.

I call attention particularly to the proposed salary stabilization unit with about 300 people and 13 regional offices costing almost $700,000 annually. This unit had been set up by reason of the act of Congress of October 2, 1942, and the Executive order of the President of October 3, 1942, to deal with the matter of increases in salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Up to January 28, 1943, the Bureau had received 7,544 requests for its consideration—a statement covering this work will be found on page 473 of the hearings.

WAR LABOR BOARD

For the War Labor Board the committee recommends $3,250,000 bringing this agency on an annual basis up to $11,800,000 or thereabouts. It, too, contemplates a large increase in force, 2,280 to be exact with 12 regional offices, this again resulting from the act of Congress and the Executive order just referred to. While the Bureau of Internal Revenue has to pass upon salary increases, it is up to the War Labor Board to pass on wage increases.

The general policy of the Board is said to be to maintain the wage level of September 15, 1942, except where a change is necessary to correct so-called maladjustments, to eliminate substandards of living, to eliminate gross inequities, or to assure the effective prosecution of the war.

The agency has already had something over 20,000 applications for wage increases. They are coming in at the rate of about 8,000 cases a month. A statement as to its jurisdiction may be found at page 661 of the hearings.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

The matter of the increase for the Department of Justice $7,600,000 or thereabouts has already been referred to by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. It is caused, in large measure, by the increase in work of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in dealing with the alien enemy detention program. The Service is charged with responsibility for the temporary detention of alien enemies, for the handling of any that may be placed on parole, and in large measure for those who may be interned.

There are half a dozen items that have been omitted, at least for the time being. I do not think further detail is necessary considering what has already been said. They include the farm labor

program item calling for over $65,000,000 in the calendar year 1943; the National Resources Planning Board item of $200,000, referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]; the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Service item of $2,884,000 for the balance of the fiscal year, and $30,000,000 on an annual basis; the Office of Education item of $3,068,000 for the balance of the fiscal year, and $8,500,000 on an annual basis, the Children's Bureau item of $1,200,000 for the fiscal year and $4,800,000 on an annual basis; and finally the United States Employment Service item of $2,540,000 which has already been turned down on two previous occasions by the subcommittee in charge of this agency.

I do not think I will take further time, Mr. Chairman, unless there are some questions. Other matters, I think, can be properly dealt with under the 5-minute rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House is a very important piece of legislation, but I hope to speak to you briefly about something which may be even more important than the pending legislation, and that is the synthetic rubber program of the Nation. It would be a waste of time to elaborate upon the importance of the rubber program because everybody knows it is of the utmost importance.

The War Production Board is bungling the rubber program. Instead of seeking to brush aside the obstacles in the way, it often appears that some of those in authority in the War Production Board are even seeking to throw obstacles in the way in order to prevent progress. I trust that this could not be so.

My portion of Texas, rather the district which I represent in Texas, not only produces considerable wheat, it is the greatest grain sorghum-producing area in America. We produce vast quantities of grain sorghum, many millions of bushels. We produce in Texas more than one-half of the grain sorghum which is produced in the Nation. As early as last March I called on the War Production Board to give consideration to the use of grain sorghum in the manufacture of grain alcohol, and on March 2, by letter, Mr. A. I. Henderson, Deputy Director of the Materials Division, assured me that consideration would be given to the use of surplus grain in Texas. Then at a later date, on September 22, Mr. Jeffers—and let me say that Mr. Jeffers, in my opinion, is doing the best he can to make a good Rubber Director—assured me that consideration would be given to the use of Texas grain in the production of grain alcohol.

At a later date Mr. John W. Boyer, Chief of the Alcohols and Solvents Section, Chemicals Division, War Production Board, led me to believe that some consideration was being given to grain sorghum in west Texas. I talked with him on January 5, 1943; then on January 28 I wrote him a letter stating in substance that west Texas was the greatest grain sorghum-producing area in the United States and asking for an investigation of the area. On February 6 in a letter of reply, Mr. Boyer stated that an engineer was then in Abilene, Tex., and that the area would be given full consideration during the next few days.

Mind you, Mr. Boyer did not say in his letter that grain sorghum would not be considered as a grain for the production of alcohol. No one else in the War Production Board had made any such statement, insofar as I know. I do not mean, however, that any promises were made to the people of Texas, or that great encouragement was given.

Then last week to my amazement another development came—a development which made me wonder about the forthrightness of some officials in the War Production Board.

I called Mr. Boyer to learn what progress was being made toward the use of grain sorghum in the alcohol program. Mr. Boyer stated that grain sorghum was not being given any consideration, and there was no thought in the War Production Board of giving any consideration to grain sorghum. He stated that the Department of Agriculture had charge of grains and starches and that the Department had selected wheat for the alcohol program and that grain sorghum was out of the picture. I promptly asked a member of the staff of Secretary Wickard for an explanation. Officials of the Department of Agriculture denied ever having made any such requirement, but did admit having written a letter to Mr. Donald Nelson which might have been misunderstood. The department wanted all surplus grains to have due consideration in the alcohol program. It seemed, therefore, that the War Production Board had willfully misled Texans into believing that grain sorghum was being considered, when actually the Board did not have the remotest idea of giving it a moment's consideration. I trust there was no real intent by the War Production Board to mislead anyone, at any rate, it was very unfortunate.

In order to inform and enlighten the War Production Board, the Department of Agriculture wrote a very significant letter yesterday, which I will insert later, and which certainly leaves the Board free to use wheat, corn, and grain sorghum in the grain-alcohol program. This is as it should be.

Let me quote the following from the letter:

> In view of these facts the Department recommends that consideration be given to the location of alcohol plants in the heaviest surplus grain-producing areas and to the utilization of various feed grains, such as corn in the Corn Belt, grain sorghums in the Southwest, and wheat in the Pacific Northwest.

Many months have passed since the War Production Board began to wrestle with the rubber program, and it is discouraging to learn that only yesterday did it learn that in making grain alcohol all types of grain could be considered.

I do not want to be unfair—I know that much grain alcohol has already been produced, that much progress has been made. I know that it is easy to criticize and hard to deliver the goods. But I think the American people have had a right to expect more goods than the War Production Board has delivered. This is war and "too little and too late" must give way to delivery on schedule.

Let me make it clear that if rubber can best be made by processes which do not require grain, then no grain should be used. The war effort comes first. There is no dispute on that point.

Texas is a great oil State, and we are glad to have our oil used in the rubber program. What we need is rubber, and plenty of it, and the material out of which it is made is of relatively no importance. However, experts have chosen both oil and grain.

Mr. WORLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. I would like to commend the gentleman for presenting the case in such excellent fashion. I know he has spent several months, exactly as I have and several other Members from the southwest portions of the country, in trying to secure proper attention from the rubber production branch of the Government to our resources in Texas. There is one question I would like for the gentleman to explain. One reason that was advanced by Mr. Boyer and other gentlemen of the War Production Board, as to why we were not given consideration in the grain alcohol program, was that our proposed sites were not on navigable streams. Can the gentleman favor us with any information as to why that should be the case? We have down there plenty of raw materials to manufacture all the alcohol they will need in the synthetic rubber program.

Mr. MAHON. I may say to the gentleman that Mr. Boyer and others in this branch of the War Production Board seem to consider the Baruch report as a chart and guide. But my observation has been that when the report serves their purpose they use it. When necessary they seem to be able to interpret it rather liberally. The Baruch report did recommend that grain alcohol plants be put on navigable streams.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman is making a very important statement, and one with which I agree wholeheartedly. I notice, however, that the gentleman seems to be of the opinion that the Department of Agriculture coupled with the War Production Board has been somewhat derelict in view of negotiations the gentleman has carried on with them in waiting until perhaps yesterday to say that now grain sorghum may be considered in the alcohol program. But does not the gentleman believe that probably one reason for their dereliction is that the President vetoed the bill this Congress passed in which we tried to get synthetic rubber made from grain alcohol? Does the gentleman perhaps think

that the Cabinet members were discouraged by the Chief's own action in vetoing that bill, and does he not believe that is probably one of the reasons for the delay that has come about?

Mr. MAHON. I may say to the gentleman that I voted for the bill to which he refers, but I do not believe the Department of Agriculture has had the responsibility of the rubber production program. I am blaming the War Production Board with short-sightedness and delay.

I am not saying that all alcohol should be made out of grain sorghums or out of wheat or out of corn. I say make it out of anything, and make rubber out of any available material. I say put the plants anywhere in any State of the Union that it is necessary and proper they should be put. Fair consideration and more action is what I am pleading for.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. It is very apparent that the gentleman has made quite an extensive study of this subject. Does the gentleman feel from his studies that the War Production Board is justified in demanding that these plants be built on navigable streams?

Mr. MAHON. I do not claim to be any expert on this subject. I will say that I believe that recommendations of the Baruch report should be given consideration just as all facts should be given consideration in any matter. I think the plants ought to be placed in the grain-producing areas and that the question of navigable streams should be wholly optional. I believe there are plenty of places in the United States where the plants might be properly located that are not on navigable streams.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. That is my opinion.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Now, I should like to add for the record some general observations about grain sorghum. During the 1930's the average production for the entire United States was in excess of 52,000,000 bushels annually. The average Texas production was 27,000,000 bushels annually. The 1941 national production was about 111,700,000 bushels. The 1942 national production was about 107,000,000. In 1941 Texas produced 57,900,000 bushels and in 1942 Texas produced in excess of 59,000,000 bushels.

But the production of grain sorghum could be increased almost unbelievably. Large areas of Texas, especially west Texas, and parts of Oklahoma, and the Southwest generally, could increase grain sorghum production in 1943 by many millions of bushels with anything like fair weather conditions. Here is an almost unlimited source of grain for the production of alcohol and feed. The farmer can produce it if an adequate price is offered and if he is given a little encouragement by way of manpower and farm machinery. It is not an experimental crop.

Since it has been officially determined that the production of alcohol from grain is essential to the success of the rubber program, at least a minimum of one plant should be constructed for the use of each of the three principal grain sources—grain sorghum, wheat, and corn. As I understand it, a combination of these grains can be used in the same plant.

There has been for years a demand for the industrial use of surplus farm crops. Since such a program fits into the war effort, now is the time to begin that program. If the plants are placed in these grain areas referred to, then after the war, they will be near the sources of supply and can utilize surplus crops and help solve the problems of peacetime.

It may be to the selfish interest of some business enterprises to scrap these plants after the war. The War Production Board should have no part in furthering such a scheme.

I want to insert at this point the letter which was sent yesterday by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Grover B. Hill, to Mr. Jeffers:

FEBRUARY 24, 1943.

Mr. W. M. JEFFERS,
*Rubber Director,*
*New Municipal Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. JEFFERS: This is to inform you concerning the availability of grain for use in the manufacture of alcohol, particularly in connection with the projected 100,000,000-gallon expansion in the alcohol production facilities.

The total supply of corn available at the beginning of the present marketing year starting October 1, 1942, was 3.7 billion bushels, the largest supply on record. In spite of the high level of utilization this year, it is estimated that there will be a carry-over of 500,000,000 bushels of corn on October 1, 1943. Approximately one-half of this carry-over will be located in the State of Iowa.

The current year's supplies of wheat are likewise the largest in the Nation's history and the carry-over at the end of the marketing year on July 1, 1943, will probably be 700,000,000 bushels or more than an average year's domestic requirements.

The Department's 1943 food-production program calls for increased production of corn, of wheat, of barley, and of grain sorghums.

In view of these facts, the Department recommends that consideration be given to the location of alcohol plants in the heaviest surplus grain-producing areas and to the utilization of various feed grains, such as corn in the Corn Belt, grain sorghums in the Southwest, and wheat in the Pacific Northwest.

The Department definitely recommends that the new alcohol facilities be equipped to retain all the protein byproducts possible because of the urgent need for additional protein feeds in our food-production program. It is also recommended that serious consideration be given to the applications of producer-cooperatives in the allocation of alcohol plants because of their interest in the production, handling, and processing of grain, and their interest in the use of protein feed byproducts.

Attached are tables and maps showing the amount and location of grain supplies.

Sincerely yours,

GROVER B. HILL,
*Assistant Secretary.*

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Under all the circumstances, does not my colleague think that it is only fair to say that, regardless of the merits of whether synthetic rubber should be made from alcohol produced from grains or from butadiene produced from oil, that these factors have not been the real cause of the delay in the production of synthetic rubber? I ask that because only recently the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs held a rather extensive investigation as a result of the charges made by Mr. Jeffers, and certainly it cannot be said that he has not been on the job.

Mr. MAHON. He has been very energetic.

Mr. THOMASON. He ought to be commended for his efforts, regardless of whether some of his criticisms were just or unjust.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. However, it should be borne in mind, I believe, that the real cause of the delay in the production of synthetic rubber is this thing about which Mr. Jeffers has complained, that he could not get priorities with which to get materials—pumps, compressors, and things of that sort—to build the plants. It has not been a question of the merits as between alcohol produced from grain or butadiene produced from oil, as I see it. The trouble has been that because of Hitler's terrible submarine warfare, escort vessels, airplanes, and bombers and what not must of necessity be built. The War and Navy Departments have insisted, as I think they have a right to insist, that the escort vessels and the materials that are necessary to make them are entitled to have the highest priorities.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct in asserting that escort vessels must come first. I am not complaining at Mr. Jeffers for not getting priorities.

Mr. THOMASON. The trouble is that there has not been material available out of which to make the plants, the compressors, the pumps, and the steel. There have not been available the high priorities on the most critical building materials.

Mr. MAHON. I would not differ with my friend on that point. Of course, there is a scarcity of material, and available material should be put to the best use, but it does seem to me that it would not have taken until yesterday for the War Production Board to learn that they were free to make grain alcohol from wheat, grain sorghum, or corn. I am complaining of the bungling and the failure to use to the best advantage the scarce materials.

And I trust that my keen interest in this matter has not led me to overstate the case or to indulge in improper criticism.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman does not maintain that all rubber should be made from grain alcohol?

Mr. MAHON. I do not care how it is made. I am sure the gentleman and I share the same views with respect to that. The first consideration is getting

the rubber. Let it come from both oil and grain and from any other available source.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the majority leader took issue with the statement made by a highly respected, an outstanding American, our former President, Mr. Herbert Hoover, that "time runs in our favor in this war." Only a limited opportunity of debate was afforded at that time. The issue raised by the distinguished majority leader deserves more than passing attention. In fact, every utterance of the majority leader merits extended consideration. His comments are never commonplace. But his address on that occasion took on an added significance because of the acknowledged qualities of leadership of the man against whom he leveled his criticism.

I shall not dwell at any length on the motives which prompted the majority leader to take the course which he did. It can hardly be supposed that the effort took on the characteristics of earlier days when a notorious smear campaign demonstrated the depths to which prejudice could drag public utterances. Nevertheless, it can hardly be disputed that he speaks with the authority of an administration spokesman, that his utterances reflect its attitude. Nor shall I make any extended observation on the wisdom of the majority leader in raising the issue at a time when unity means so much. Suffice it to say, that many of us who are mindful of the dangers of disunity are extremely doubtful of the wisdom of drawing the inferences which the majority leader did from Mr. Hoover's statement.

The war in which we are engaged is a titanic struggle. It is a struggle which, because of its magnitude, entails the most far-reaching obligations ever assumed by any nation. It is a struggle which, because of its scope, tests the supremacy of our strength and of our willingness to sacrifice. It is a struggle which, because of its consequences, commands the unrelenting, the unyielding, the uncompromising will of our people to contend for a final and complete victory. To this conflict America has committed herself. There can be no turning back—no compromise. There is no middle ground. There must be either the humiliation of defeat or the exultation of victory. The former we refuse to contemplate. The latter we intend to enjoy.

What factors are involved in this struggle? Are we to dismiss from our minds entirely the preparations made by the enemy long before the fateful days of September 1939, which resulted in the accumulation of vast stores of every conceivable device of destruction? Are we to ignore completely the handicap which the enemy enjoyed and which it hoped we could not overcome? Waging war is a wearing down process—an attrition of the enemy's resources. The greater the day-by-day attrition, the closer the approach to victory. But the wearing down—the whittling away process—does take time. And it will continue to take time, a shorter time perforce now than at the beginning, and certainly a shorter time the harder we apply ourselves; but every day will count until the texture of an intolerant tyranny is completely destroyed.

The majority leader disputes the statement that the element of time—an indispensable part of a wearing-down process, of a constant weakening of the enemy's resistive strength—is a factor in our favor. If my convictions on this question were of my own contriving, if I stood here and made assertions of my own evolving, I might be charged with presumption in opposing one who is responsible for the direction of legislative policies in the prosecution of the war. But I offer in support of my contention nothing of my own, unless it be the claim of common sense. I make no profession of my tactical ability as a strategist or of my crystal gazing skill as a prophet. Nor do I urge upon you the acceptance of an abstract theorem simply as an academic proposition. In opposing the position taken by the majority leader, I depend upon the authoritative sources which I, as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House, am privileged to examine and which I would be at liberty to quote but for the limitations imposed by war. These limitations, however, do not prevent me from drawing the conclusions of a reasonable man. These limitations do not prevent me from insisting here and now that every day that sees disintegration and dissolution taking place on a wider scale and on a broader base in the ranks of the enemy—whether on the home front or on the battlefield—means in Berlin, Tokyo, and Rome a weakened resistance and a waning resolution. These limitations do not prevent me from insisting that every day that sees the bombing of industrial establishments, of submarine bases, of shipbuilding centers, in Germany and in the countries that are its vassals today, contributes to whittling down the strength of the enemy. These limitations do not prevent me from insisting that every day that sees the continuance of this uninterrupted attrition makes our offensive the more effective as well as the less costly, and hastens the day of the enemy's collapse. Is the prospect of this dissolution and disintegration, this weakened resistance and waning resolution, an unpleasant one? Is the anticipation of the whittling down of the enemy's strength an undesirable one? Is the hope of hastening the day of the enemy's collapse an unwelcome one?

If we are not to regard the element of time as a favorable factor, are we to assume that the majority leader advocates a policy of headlong haste? As I see it, that is the alternative which he offers and espouses. Otherwise, there is no point to his criticism of Mr. Hoover's statement. Is the war to be prosecuted with reckless abandon—in a slap-dash, helter-skelter fashion—regardless of the price always exacted by impatience and impetuosity? Have we not had enough of boisterous bustle? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the time taken for painstaking planning is time well spent and that it in no way weakens the effectiveness of an offensive.

Reflect for a moment on the success which attended our African invasion—the move that contributed more to Hitler's realization of the certainty of his defeat than any move thus far made in the war. The success of that adventure was due primarily to the careful planning which preceded it, to the days and weeks spent in fitting together the pieces of the plan into a perfect and composite whole, all of it timed with a clock-like precision, that would have been impossible without punctilious care in preparation. Those preparations took time. Days upon days were spent on every detail. Items were checked and rechecked—all of it taking time—the element which the disciples of headlong haste no doubt grudgingly gave. If time was a valuable factor then, and it was, what new element has suddenly intruded? What has converted a valuable asset into a worthless liability? The large-scale offensive operations to be launched against the Axis partners will require a steady flow of expeditionary forces. Are we to assume that future expeditions will be less carefully planned than the one which led to Casablanca? Are we to accept the hazards of hit-or-miss policies? Can successful offensives be expected if the element of time in preparation is tossed aside? The suggestion that such a course should be adopted is repellent to me as I envision the cost of these expeditions and these offensives—the flower of American manhood. And I certainly cannot reconcile the majority leader's idea of precipitous haste with the solemn warning just sounded by the President that the Nation still faces "reverses and misfortunes."

Many of us remember the old-fashioned copy books of our boyhood. They were part of the "horse and buggy" days. There comes to my mind one of the maxims of that day that I copied and recopied over and over again—"time is worth while, if the task is worth while."

That maxim does not suggest procrastination or slothfulness or unnecessary delay. It does not suggest the wisdom of failing to strike when the iron is hot. But it does suggest taking time to do a given task well and thoroughly, and it implies that dangers lurk where finishing a job is looked upon as more important than the thoroughness with which it is done. That maxim suggests orderly procedure rather than hit-or-miss methods—completeness rather than incompleteness in preparation—competency rather than incompetency in execution—a clarity of perspective rather than a fog of confusion in the approach to any undertaking. In the instant case it suggests that the effective driving force of well-planned, skillfully organized, and competently directed campaigns will expedite the prosecution of the war and save the interminable delays which always can be counted on as the cost of plunging without planning.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that no greater encouragement could come to our enemy than the impression that we

despaired of our ability to take the necessary time to defeat him and that we have become as desperate as a gouged gambler. Does he play his cards with the calm confidence of assured and certain winning? If time is not in our favor, Mr. Chairman, then desperation can be substituted for deliberate decisions and the urge of despair can take the place of confident assurance. This is the alternative offered by the majority leader. But let it be remembered that a price must be paid for the gambler's chance, which in this case will be paid for in men—in the needless wastage of our most cherished possession.

I doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the majority leader will deny the assertion that the element of time is a factor in any undertaking. It is either a favorable or an unfavorable factor which must be taken into account. It is an advantage or a disadvantage. As we review the record from Pearl Harbor down to today, are we to draw the conclusion that our growing strength is to our disadvantage? And will tomorrow's additional strength add to such disadvantage? Are we to conclude that the potency and power of the arsenal of democracy are destined to decrease as the day-by-day drive on Berlin develops? If the tomorrows offer nothing in our favor, shall we abate the efforts of the millions of American men and women who are straining every fiber of their being to reach a peak of production in the weapons of war? Are their efforts in vain? How shall we account to our people for the shortages rigorously exacted by a rationing process which reaches into their very means of subsistence, if time does not work in our favor? Why the giving up? Why the sacrifice? Why the doing without? Are these exactions a part of a subtle scheme to revolutionize our social structure or are they the price which we must pay to take advantage of the element of time in the expeditious prosecution of the war?

If time is not in our favor, what have we to depend upon for the complete victory which al of us crave and for which we fervently pray? How are we to meet the reverses and overcome the misfortunes of which the President warned unless time is afforded us, leaders and people alike, to work harder and longer and more conscientiously and unselfishly than we have up to this time?

The majority leader's position is made the more untenable, not only by the warning sounded by the President, but by the declaration of Mr. Stalin as he directs the most successful continued offensive thus far carried on against Hitler. "Time is working against Fascist Germany," Stalin declared a day or two ago. Russia is waging an offensive operation, yet Stalin believes that time is a factor in his favor today. By making that statement he is not suggesting a slowing down of his offensive, a slackening of his effort, which would permit a recovery by Hitler. Quite to the contrary. Stalin is encouraging his countrymen, challenging them to even greater efforts as he warns them that Germany is "not yet conquered."

I have tried, Mr. Chairman, to find some reasonable basis for the charge leveled against our former President by the majority leader. I have sought to interpret his opinion in the most favorable light—in light that would appeal to reason, to common sense, and to patriotic impulses. I confess, Mr. Chairman, that I have failed in this effort. The majority leader claims that Mr. Hoover is lacking in vision, "unable to grasp and meet the problems of our country at war," and that if we follow "his advice the result will be a stalemate of the war, a wave of appeasement sentiment, and a negotiated peace." I see in this attack, Mr. Chairman, something which smacks of the style to which resort was had during the last campaign, and which we had reason to believe was buried effectively by the ballots which were cast. You will remember that repeated efforts were made to cast aspersions on the patriotic purposes of many men and that ridicule was heaped upon them for lacking in vision. I shall not detain the House at this time to discuss this phase of the question. If these men erred, they erred out of too much confidence in the assurances which had been given to the American people—in a too-literal acceptance of the promises made by men in high places.

Upon what ground does the majority leader base the charge against Mr. Hoover? He is disturbed over the publicity which followed our former President's appearance before the Senate committee. He has quoted from the releases which were given to the press. I know that the majority leader would not want the impression to prevail that he was not fully informed of the contents of that release, or that he would lift from the context a sentence upon which to pin an assertion. Let me direct the majority leader's attention to other phrases in that release and to other recent public utterances of Mr. Hoover, so that his mind may be set at rest and be free of the fear which haunts him. From that release I quote:

> The United Nations now have a ring around the European Axis and the Japanese. From these rings we are doing an effective job of aggressive attrition to their home fronts. Germany and Italy have passed their zenith, and are steadily degenerating on both the military front and the home front. They will be weaker in 1943, and still weaker in 1944. Japan cannot grow stronger; she is losing more tonnage and planes than she can construct.

In that same release we find this further positive statement:

> Total war is inevitably a race of exhaustion between nations. And we must make a strong finish.

I ask you, do those statements smack of appeasement, of a negotiated peace?

Reflect for a moment on other recent statements made by our former President:

> Our country is now engaged in the greatest struggle of its existence. All Americans, regardless of their past views, are now united in a single purpose. That purpose is to achieve victory and thereafter build a world where we can hope to live in peace and security.

Again:

> We are in this war, and the only road out of it is victory. There will be no liberty anywhere if we lose the war.

Or:

> Today, again, we have a victory to win in war, in making peace and in restoration of freedom. And again as before it must be won by our united effort, by the heroism of our men in the field, and by the eternal vigilance of a free people.

Can you find a suspicion of appeasement in these declarations?

Or again:

> Industry is doing the magnificent job which only an industry born of free enterprise and directed by men who have risen by merit could do. The Army and the Navy are proving to have the full courage and skill of our race—and will prove that by victory in this war.

Or again:

> If we would attain lasting peace now, we must win this war with undoubted victory.

Mark you, these are the utterances of one whom the majority leader is fearful of as an inducer of appeasement. I urge you to examine these declarations with a most critical eye—I plead for no charity in your interpretation—and then, in a dispassionate, honest, fair, unprejudiced spirit, with a mind open to reason rather than beclouded by intolerant convictions, make your own appraisal of them.

A stalemate of the war, a wave of appeasement sentiment, an urge for a negotiated peace could develop in one way. It could come from one source—from a fear of defeat, from a sense of futility, from a conviction of the worthlessness of waging war to a decisive victory. Can you find the slightest suspicion of such suggestions in what Mr. Hoover has said? His statements are the very antithesis of such suggestions.

Why, I ask you, are there rumors of peace feelers by Hitler today? Is he seeking to negotiate because of his confidence or because of his despair? Are we to assume that a fear of defeat, a sense of futility, a conviction of the worthlessness of waging war to a decisive victory will be the result of the certain assurance which is ours of our growing strength and of our enemies' increasing weakness? Stalemate, appeasement, negotiated peace are the fruits of a disheartened spirit and a discouraged soul.

Are we likely to be disheartened in spirit or discouraged of soul as we see the tangible evidence of the ever-growing success of a free people to thwart the designs of tyranny? Are we to believe that the American people will be stalemated in their purpose or inclined to appease or to negotiate as the mounting might of America makes itself felt on every battlefront? Men negotiate for settlement when they are fearful of the outcome of an undertaking, not when they are assured of success.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that our spirit to carry on to a decisive and complete victory will be helped rather than hampered as time affords us ever-increasing opportunities to mass greater and greater striking force. Time will give us more ships and still more ships, more planes

and still more planes, more guns and still more guns and more and more determination to carry the war to a glorious and triumphant conclusion.

No, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hoover did not speak in terms of appeasement. Mr. Hoover spoke in terms of victory.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

FARM LABOR SITUATION

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, the rationing of processed foods which began this week has raised an important issue in the minds of the American people. Could the present food shortage have been avoided, or is it the inevitable result of endless bungling among incompetent bureaucratic officials and Government politicos?

Everyone knows that one of the underlying reasons for the serious food situation now facing us is the shortage of labor on American farms. Proper foresight among Government leaders could have prevented much of this difficulty—but foresight among Government leaders certainly has left much to be desired, particularly in the War Manpower Commission. Now that the horses are out of the barn, of course, these same officials are frantically rushing around trying to lock the various doors through which the horses escaped.

Soldiers are being sent into the fields to save the crops. The President stated only a few days ago his belief that young people of high-school age could do a lot to relieve the shortage. Perhaps they can—but these are patchwork methods. What of the skilled farm hands that are needed to raise the stock? It takes a lifetime of experience to run a livestock farm properly. Can freshman farmers furloughed from high school step into the places of farm managers drafted into the Army? Will crops and animals adjust their schedules to week-end attention only, from willing but handicapped novices? There are some officials who do not seem to appreciate the intricate demands on a farmer's experienced knowledge. The New York City markets commissioner only the other day reminded these officials of the facts.

I hope the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration will remember—

He said—

that it takes longer to bring a calf into the world than it does to create a destroyer. Nature cannot and will not be hurried.

There have been many reasons for the shortage of farm labor. At a time when heavier and heavier responsibilities are daily being placed on American farmers to assume the obligation of feeding the world, close to 2,000,000 workers have been drained from the farms into the armed services and war factories. Hundreds of farms have been sold out for lack of present and anticipated help. Thousands of heads of cattle have been prematurely killed off for market for lack of farmhands to care for them. While the labor shortage pulls tighter and tighter its stranglehold on American farms, the production of farm machinery has been reduced to a crippling degree—40 percent of the 1940 total—and even this goal cannot be accomplished on time, according to the Secretary of Agriculture. Wages in industry have soared, and the overtime clause has encouraged them, but farmers still must work regularly up to 70 and 80 hours a week, with no such compensation to show for it.

Those 6,420,000 pigs and mother sows that were slaughtered on the New Deal altar back in 1933 would have produced some mighty welcome meat during this ever-increasing crisis. The skeletons in the closet of the New Deal cannot, unfortunately, be picked for meat now that we need it.

I read in the paper the other day that Russian soldiers, who would rather have food from us than guns, are spreading—not butter—but lard on their black bread, eating tallow, and linseed oil.

Let us hope that we do not force this condition on our own sons—our own soldiers—because of the failure of those of us on the home front to demand intelligent handling of our labor supply.

America, the arsenal of democracy, must produce the food that will win the war. While praying for military successes abroad, we cannot tolerate political bungling at home.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said in the last few weeks about the creation of a permanent committee on aviation in the House of Representatives. Members of the House have expressed themselves pro and con on the subject. It has now reached a point that this matter of internal organization within the House of Representatives has attracted the interest and the fancy of some of those outside the House of Representatives. Yesterday practically every Member of the House received a telegram from some air-line pilot in the United States expressing his objection to the creation of this committee. Those telegrams, my friends, were sent out at the instance and demand of a man named Behncke, Dave Behncke, being the head of the Airline Pilots Association. What his interest is in the matter is more than I can understand. Those telegrams reached the House yesterday en masse. It was a movement well directed and well timed. I am perfectly willing that the membership of the House make up their own minds as to whether or not this body should in this internal problem be guided and directed in its activities by Mr. Behncke or his organization.

Of course the pilots who are sending in these telegrams do not realize the import of the thing they are doing. Nor do they comprehend what is sought to be done for them, or they would not be sending the telegrams. Only this morning there comes to my desk a copy of a letter directed to Mr. LEA, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, from a great American, Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Green objects to the House of Representatives creating a standing committee on aviation. Mr. Green in part says:

It has come to my attention that an attempt is being made to take from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which you are chairman, jurisdiction over legislative matters relating to civil and commercial aviation, including air-line transportation.

He further says—and I shall put the whole letter in the RECORD:

Certainly what is not in the best interest of the industry cannot be in the best interest of the laboring people of the industry.

Mr. Green's letter, in full, is as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEA: It has come to my attention that an attempt is being made to take from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which you are chairman, the jurisdiction over legislative matters relating to civil and commercial aviation, including air-line transportation.

In view of the splendid way in which your committee has been handling civil aviation problems, resulting in our country's civil and commercial flying assuming a place second to none in world aviation, I see no reason for any such changes as are being proposed. There appears to be little or no good reason to take the jurisdiction over civil aviation legislative matters from your committee and place it in the hands of a new legislative committee, the members of which may be well-meaning and sincere, but certainly they will not have the broad and complete grasp of the commercial aviation picture as do the veteran legislators of your committee. Could it be that this move is primarily to create another committee so someone may have what they deem better committee assignments, or to enhance some other form of political expediency? Civil flying has in the past suffered considerably from the intervention of politics, and it seems likely that this move may be similarly tinged.

The air-line pilots are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor as are other groups of laboring people in civil aviation. Certainly what is not in the best interest of the industry cannot be in the best interest of the laboring people of the industry. The pilots and other air workers see no good reason for taking the jurisdiction over legislative matters affecting civil aeronautics from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and, I might add, I have always respected the advice of the pilots on matters of this character, because I have through the years found it to be sound.

The American Federation of Labor, therefore, is strongly opposed to the passage of House Resolution 23, which takes jurisdiction over commercial aviation legislative matters from your well-experienced and thoroughly seasoned committee, where it is being handled most satisfactorily, and turns it over to a new committee which can only be regarded as inexperienced in such matters and whose actions would certainly be extremely unpredictable. In other words, this seems to be another one of those cases where it would be far better to leave well enough alone and not take a chance, especially with a matter that is as important to the country as civil and commercial aviation at the present time, with particular reference to air transportation.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,
*President, American Federation of Labor.*

Mr. Green, you are entirely correct. The best interest of this industry and the best interest of the people of the United States is the only thing that those who sponsor this legislation are interested in, and Mr. Green the sponsors of this legislation are interested as well in the well-being and the best interest of those people who labor for the industry. So, Mr. Green, you and I start with the same premise.

I want to create a permanent committee on aviation only so it can direct 100 percent of its attention to the best interests of the public, the industry and those who labor for the industry. You, Mr. Green, are a busy man and have no doubt been so occupied with other things that you have not had time to give the proper amount of study to this all-important problem.

Likewise Mr. Behncke has probably been so busy with other things that he is not quite as conversant with the organization of the House of Representatives as are we who are a part of the House of Representatives and who, incidentally, will not yield to Mr. Behncke or to you in our interest in that, things best for commercial aviation, the country, and those who work for commercial aviation.

Nothing affecting aviation should be adopted unless it is in the public interest, and unless it is in the interest of this industry, and so far as I am concerned—and my actions in this fight will bear this out—I want the question of whether or not there is to be a standing committee of this House on civil aviation determined purely upon its merits and upon nothing else. I am not interested in any collateral matter. I am not interested in the propaganda that is going around that probably I am active in this matter only because I want to be chairman of the proposed new committee. This thing is too important to be determined on the basis of personalities. I think I would make a good chairman of the committee, but I am not particularly interested in that. I think I know the subject, but who is the chairman of the committee makes no difference to me. All I want is that he shall be a man who knows the subject matter, whether it is myself or somebody else. I am not concerned. No; let us keep this squarely on the basis of merit.

Now, I come to another matter, and I hope Mr. Green that you, Mr. Behncke, and the air-line pilots of the country will follow closely in the RECORD what I am about to say. Only a few days ago there was reported from the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce——

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I interrupt the gentleman before he goes into that bill reported from another committee, because I should like to say that many Members of Congress, including myself, have received communications by telegram and letter from air-transport pilots.

One in particular came from a young man in my district that I had first interested in flying. Now he is a pilot for a transport concern. He wrote me a letter in opposition to H. R. 23. I later talked with him by telephone and asked him if he understood the subject matter. He told me frankly that he did not. He told me that he had been requested in a rather demanding fashion that he send the telegram. He said he knew nothing whatsoever about the subject matter.

Mr. NICHOLS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I am sorry. I only have a short time. I am going to discuss a part of this bill that is very involved, and then I will yield if my time permits.

I hope the Members of the House will interest themselves in this. This is H. R. 1012, reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes. I would direct your attention to page 94 of the bill. I would direct your attention to section 29, found on page 94 of the bill, and I read:

Subsection (a) of section 412 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 is hereby amended by striking out the words "every air carrier shall"—

Now, just keep that in your minds. Let me tell you what the present situation is. This section deals with contracts made between the air lines, air carriers and others. The existing law provides that every such contract must be filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board and that before that contract shall have legal force, it must be approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board. That is a "shall." That is a "must."

Now, under existing law the air lines of this country entered into a contract with the Railway Express Co. which incidentally is 100 percent owned, by the railroads. The air lines entered into a contract with Railway Express, wherein they agreed that Railway Express should have a monopoly upon the gathering of air express, and the contract further provides—and this cannot be successfully refuted—that Railway Express shall fix the rates that the air lines will charge for the transportation of air express subject only to the approval of the Board. That contract has been before the Civil Aeronautics Board for a great many months. It has not been approved. Until it is approved it is subject to the Sherman antitrust law. It is an illegal contract. It is not in the public interest, because if the railroads of this country are to be able to say to the air lines what the air lines may charge for the transportation of air express, then the public will suffer as they do today, when air express is from 10 to 12 times as high as rail express, and certainly much higher than it should be.

Now, if section 29 of this bill is adopted—I challenge you to read it and I challenge anyone to successfully refute the statement that I am about to make—if section 29 of this bill is adopted the contract between the American Railway Express Agency and the air lines of the United States will become legal, unless it is positively disapproved by the C. A. B. And it will place this contract and all akin to it beyond the authority of the Department of Justice to prosecute for violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Not only that, if section 29 of this bill is adopted, this is what it provides: In the first place it says "strike out the word 'shall' and insert the word 'may'" That would make it read:

Every air carrier may file with the Board its contracts.

Then what can the Board do? This bill points it out specifically and definitely. Any contract entered into by an air line with any other person or any other individual or corporation does not, under this bill, even have to be filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. LEA. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Board would have control over the rates paid by the express company.

Mr. NICHOLS. The contract is already in existence.

Mr. LEA. The idea of this provision is that at the present time the law requires all contracts to be filed.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is right.

Mr. LEA. There are a great many contracts of minor character, and the volume of business is becoming so great——

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, I do not yield further. I yielded to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. LEA. It is left in control of the Board. It says "to the extent required by the regulations."

Mr. NICHOLS. No, no. I will read it to you:

The Board may, by order, disapprove any such contract, whether or not previously approved by it, that it finds to be adverse to the public interest, and may approve any contract that it finds to be not adverse to the public interest—

But listen—

or may advise the parties that it proposes to take no action with regard to such contracts or agreements.

Until the Board disapproves a contract the contract is legal and binding and is outside the pale of the law governing violations under the Sherman Antitrust Act. If they simply advise that they are not going to take any action, then and only then can one party to the contract compel the Board to act. I read it to you:

*Provided*, That in any case in which the Board proposes to take no action with respect to a contract or agreement and so advises the parties thereto, any such party may petition the Board to take action.

That is the only instance in the bill where a party to that contract can petition the Board to take action on the matter. What does it mean? This means that contracts could be entered into indiscriminately and never have to be filed with the Board, and would be

legal and beyond the antitrust laws until the Board could find them and compel their filing, and finally disapprove them.

I would rather have control over the rate structure of a going transportation than to own its stock, if I was its competitor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. NICHOLS. I thank the gentleman.

I am bringing this up now so there will be plenty of time for free and open discussion before this bill comes to the floor for consideration. Here is the test of whether or not there should be a standing committee on aviation. Is the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce so busily engaged with other important matters that it cannot give proper attention to the consideration of aviation legislation? It is a great committee, membered by smart men. Yet, they have just reported H. R. 1012 containing section 29, and if H. R. 1012 is passed with section 29 in it you can wrap the air lines of this country up in a package, tie a red ribbon around it, and deliver it to the railroads; and I challenge successful refutation of that statement. Now, I am sure that this was not done deliberately by the committee, but the bill will speak for itself. Thus, the committee did not have sufficient knowledge of the subject matter to detect this dangerous provision in the bill, or they were too busy to give sufficient attention to the study of the bill before some urge compelled them to report it out.

Following is section 412, subsection (a) and (b) which is existing law:

POOLING AND OTHER AGREEMENTS

FILING OF AGREEMENTS REQUIRED

SEC. 412. (a) Every air carrier shall file with the Authority a true copy, or, if oral, a true and complete memorandum, of every contract or agreement (whether enforceable by provisions for liquidated damages, penalties, bonds, or otherwise) affecting air transportation and in force on the effective date of this section or hereafter entered into, or any modification or cancelation thereof, between such air carrier and any other air carrier, foreign air carrier, or other carrier, for pooling or apportioning earnings, losses, traffic, service, or equipment, or relating to the establishment of transportation rates, fares, charges, or classifications, or for preserving and improving, safety, economy, and efficiency of operation, or for controlling, regulating, preventing, or otherwise eliminating destructive, oppressive, or wasteful competition, or for regulating stops, schedules, and character of service, or for other cooperative working arrangements.

APPROVAL BY AUTHORITY

(b) The Authority shall by order disapprove any such contract or agreement, whether or not previously approved by it, that it finds to be adverse to the public interest, or in violation of this act, and shall by order approve any such contract or agreement, or any modification or cancelation thereof, that it does not find to be adverse to the public interest, or in violation of this act; except that the Authority may not approve any contract or agreement between an air carrier not directly engaged in the operation of aircraft in air transportation and a common carrier subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, governing the compensation to be received by such common carrier for transportation services performed by it.

Following is section 29 of H. R. 1012, which proposes to amend the above existing law:

SEC. 29. Subsection (a) of section 412 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the words "Every air carrier shall" at the beginning of such section, and by inserting in lieu thereof "Every air carrier may, and, to the extent required by regulations or order of the Authority, shall"; and by striking out subsection (b) and inserting the following subsections:

"APPROVAL BY AUTHORITY

"(b) The Board may by order disapprove any such contract or agreement, whether or not previously approved by it, that it finds to be adverse to the public interest or in violation of this Act and may approve any such contract or agreement or any modification thereof that it finds not to be adverse to the public interest or in violation of this Act or may advise the parties that it proposes to take no action with respect to such contract or agreement: *Provided*, That in any case in which the Board proposes to take no action with respect to a contract or agreement and so advises the parties thereto, any such party may petition the Board to take action with respect to the contract or agreement in which event the Board shall approve or disapprove the contract or agreement in accordance with this section. No order of disapproval shall be entered except after reasonable notice and hearing.

"AGREEMENTS BETWEEN DIRECT AND INDIRECT AIR CARRIERS

"(c) In the case of a contract or agreement between an air carrier indirectly engaged in air transportation and an air carrier directly engaged therein, affecting the terms and conditions pursuant to which the former utilizes the facilities or services of the latter, an order of disapproval under subsection (b) of this section shall, effective upon such date as may be fixed in such order, make unlawful the carrying out of such contract or agreement in the respects specified in such order."

Mr. Chairman, finally, if section 29 of this bill is adopted the public will suffer. Forget about individuals, forget about the individual desire of members of any committee of this House. We are charged with the duty of guarding the public interest, and the public interest here is being flouted and disregarded, not that any member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would deliberately do it; no, no; but they were either too busy or for some reason did not catch this thing, because if they had it would not be here now.

I bring this up this early so it can have free and open debate. I do not want to do anything in this fight under cover; I do not want to take any left-handed jabs at anybody; and I do not want to put the rush act on anybody. So there is plenty of time. This bill for the creation of the Committee on Civil Aviation will not be on the floor probably for a week, and if my statements that I have made today are wrong somebody will prove they are wrong. And then if they do, well, maybe you had better not pay any attention to me any more. But if I can prove they are correct—and I shall have more to say on the subject; I cannot cover it in 20 minutes; I shall have more to say on the subject in the days to follow—if I can convince this House that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has permitted to come out of it a bill which would, if enacted into law, permit the railroads of this country to throttle and stifle the expansion of the air lines and would throw to the four winds the public interest, then, I suppose I shall have no trouble whatsoever in getting agreement from a majority of the membership of the House for the creation of a committee which can devote 100 percent of its time to protecting aviation and guarding the public interest therein.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, if those Americans who have been privileged to live for some years in the Far East have any particular contribution to make to our country's thinking in a time like this, it is, I believe, primarily because of the simple fact that they have had the opportunity to come to know something of the psychology of the peoples who live there and with whom we must, whether we like it or not, be dealing in this war and after the war.

It is apparent that in the last 20 years of diplomatic dealings with certain oriental nations, and in our military relations thus far in the war, we have, with the best of intentions, made some grievous errors. I believe that the chief reason for such errors has been because we have tended to project our own ideas and our own reactions over into the minds of people who have not had our background and who, therefore, naturally do not have many of our ideas and our reactions.

After the last war our country went through a great period of disillusionment and debunking and cynicism. We denounced communism by name. Nevertheless, I think it can be maintained that, without quite realizing it, a great many Americans took over in their thinking one of its fundamental theses, economic determinism—the doctrine that no man or nation ever does anything except on the basis of what he or it expects to get in immediate material gain.

It became popular to try to explain all of human behavior and motivation by the simple device of dividing all human beings into two groups—"haves" and "have nots." Now, I think it was right to divide nations into "haves" and "have nots"; I suspect the error was in assuming that the only things which a nation can "have" or "have not" are those things which can be counted or measured or weighed. Japan went to war against terrific odds to try to get some things she did not have; Indians are on the brink of plunging their people into physical disaster in the attempt to get some things they do not have—but the chief things they are after are not among those which one can weigh or measure or count. They are certain intangible

things, certain things of the spirit, if you will—what the orientals call "face."

On the whole we have tried as well as any nation in history to live by the Golden Rule. And it is a good rule, if only we understand it. We did to Japan in the pre-war years what we would like to have had Japan do to us. It did not work, because the Golden Rule in its ordinary interpretation is not effective when dealing with people who have different backgrounds from ours and who do not necessarily want to have done unto them just the things which we want to have done unto us. We have to read it this way, when we are dealing with people of different cultures: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you, if you were they. And that is quite a different thing.

Let us give an illustration or two. You remember a year ago, before the President made one of his Nation-wide broadcasts, he suggested that we have at hand a map or a globe or an atlas so we could follow his discussion of America's great strategic problems.

He said that to understand this war we must study geography. Surely that is true, but it is only part of the truth. More important than the geography itself is to know what the other fellow thinks when he studies the geography. It is at this point that we have not yet got down to bedrock, I believe.

Another illustration is taken from the Roberts report on Pearl Harbor. You remember it describes in considerable detail how General Short and his staff and Admiral Kimmel and his staff had met on several occasions, as was their duty, to discuss all possible methods by which an enemy might attack the Hawaiian Islands, and to make plans to repel such possible attacks. And then in two places it says that "without exception" they believed that there would be no attack by air against Hawaii. They were reasoning, in effect: "Now, if we were in Japan's place we would not attack by air. We are pretty sure that the British General Staff if planning an attack would not do it by air. Therefore, the Japanese will not attack by air." But you remember the attack came by air. Here were our greatest experts; some of them had spent their lives studying the Pacific and its geography. They knew everything about the Pacific—except the Japanese.

We find the same sort of thing in our diplomatic dealings. In the summer and fall of 1941 the State Department spent many months working out a comprehensive plan to try to resolve our differences with Japan without having to go to war. Americans did not want to go to war. We could not see any problem either Japan or we faced which would require or be usefully served by our going to war. The plan was eminently fair and magnanimous—from any western point of view. You remember some of the provisions of it. It showed Japan in ways she could not possibly refute, even if she had been interested in refuting them, how it was enormously to her own economic advantage to pull away from the Axis and to go along with us; indicated how her economy did not fit in with those of Germany and Italy, and did fit in with those of China, the Philippines, Australia, America, and the other nations around the Pacific basin.

It offered to let Japan's great export silk come into our country permanently on a duty-free basis; offered to loan, perhaps, billions of American dollars to Japan, without much thought of ever getting it back, to help Japan shift from a war to a peace economy, because, if she had been willing to do it, it would have been a cheap price to pay. You see, we marshaled all the arguments that appealed most to us and naively supposed that those were the arguments that would appeal most to Japan.

Well, the dollar may have become God Almighty to many Americans, unfortunately; but there still are some peoples in the world to whom the dollar is not God Almighty. There still are some peoples who operate primarily on a basis of spirit. And you will find the Japanese are among them and the Chinese are among them and the Indians are among them. They are carrying on a policy right today that from any western standpoint is sheer suicide, but they do it in order to try to get that thing which they do not have and which they want most of all to have—standing, equality, recognition, "face."

It does not make any difference what we think the Orientals ought to think, or what we wish they thought, or what we thought they thought. If we are going to win this war and try to work out a decent peace afterward we must deal with them utterly realistically, on the basis of what it is they really want, what they think, what they feel, what they are after. Unfortunately, we cannot find that out from the Department of Commerce reports or even from the World Almanac. We can find that out, as a rule, only from those peoples themselves, or from persons who have been privileged to live there long and intimately, and have dealt with them and discussed these things with them over a period of years.

It is only because of such a background that I presume to stand before you for a little while this afternoon to try to discuss our situation in the Pacific exactly as a doctor studies the body of a patient at the autopsy table.

Somebody may say, "Well, that is water gone over the dam; forget about yesterday; get on with tomorrow." But every experienced physician knows that practically all the progress we ever made in medicine came from this humble studying at the autopsy table, trying to see why and where we went astray; not to condemn, not to recriminate—I am not interested in that—but only to discover how in the world we could have failed to see or could have so misinterpreted the findings that were there as plain as day. This patient is dead. That is true. We cannot bring him back. We cannot bring back pre-Pearl Harbor days; but we can learn something from ruthless examination of our mistakes so that when, please God, we have another chance, we will not make those same mistakes again.

The autopsy is almost always very unflattering to doctors. We may have been perfectly convinced on the basis of the most careful study and conscientious examination that the trouble was, for example, in the stomach. We may have called in expert consultants and most of them agreed that the trouble was in the stomach. We may even have had a propaganda agency to try to convince all the relatives that the trouble was in the stomach. But if when the man is opened up the trouble turns out to have been in the liver, then, you know, it was in the liver; and it does not make any difference whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, it was in the liver.

We are facing the kind of situation in the Pacific, it seems to me, where such an autopsy study, or at least an exploratory operation, can be of great value. The first thing that is necessary is to disabuse our minds of any preconceived notions and deal with facts and people as they are, as events are proving them to be.

To begin with, if we are to understand our enemy, Japan, there are three simple observations to make. First, is this: The Japanese are a people of small stature, and like many people of small stature, or with physical disabilities, have had a terrific inferiority complex. My, what the world has suffered from men like Napoleon and Caesar with epilepsy; or the Kaiser with his withered arm; or Mussolini with his 5 feet 5 inches; or Mr. Hitler with his inability to make good at any ordinary activity.

If he had been a little more successful as an artist or a musician, if he had been a little more successful in his love affairs and had had a good home with children, a normal ordinary living, if he had even been a better corporal, the world might have been spared a lot that we are going through today. The chances are he would have been a law-abiding, respectable, honest, hard-working citizen, just as most other Germans have been. But everything he touched was a flat failure.

And so he did the thing that any man would do who is worth his salt, he resolved to surpass in something. The whole trouble was that the way in which he determined to surpass was vicious and destructive.

On the other hand, look what the world has profited from people whose reaction to their disability or sense of inferiority took a constructive, socially useful trend. Steinmetz, with his deformity; persons who were blind but yet created exquisitely beautiful things; or went deaf and still composed symphonies. Robert Louis Stevenson or Elizabeth Barret Browning, and many others afflicted with tuberculosis, unable to go out and do ordinary work like other people, yet in their sick beds writing things surpassingly beautiful, and without which the world would be infinitely poorer. St. Paul, with his "thorn in the flesh" driving him on to the ends of the earth.

Unfortunately the Japanese urge, like Hitler's, took the form of trying to conquer the world, not so much to show the

world as to reassure themselves that they were not inferior men just because of their smallness of stature.

The Japanese lived for centuries alongside the Chinese, who were much more impressive physically. For almost a hundred years the Japanese have been in close contact with the western nations of America and Europe, whose people are even more impressive physically. So you see the Japanese officer, riding the tallest horse possible, or carrying a sword so long it clanks on the ground, trying to bolster up his own ego, to inflate himself into something more important than subconsciously he knows he is. We may not like this, we may think it is infantile, but it is a dominant factor in Japanese psychology nevertheless.

The second observation is this: The Japanese are a singularly unimaginative, uncreative people. They are efficient, determined, disciplined, capable, and as resolute as any people in the world, but, strangely enough, they never yet produced a single major basic invention. For centuries they lived alongside the Chinese, who are one of the most imaginative peoples in the world. Look at the basic inventions which came from China, the compass, gunpowder, silk, paper and, as a result, printing, long before it was dreamed of in Europe, porcelain—on and on you could go. Never to this day has one such come from the Japanese. They are one of the few peoples that never succeeded even in inventing a way to write down that which they spoke; had to take over the Chinese written language.

Then in recent decades the Japanese have been in contact with western peoples who are by all odds the most inventive the world has ever known. Of course, Japan smarted because of the contrast.

This lack of creativeness is not a congenital thing. It is the result of centuries of regimentation. You put Japanese in our environment with similar rewards and stimuli, and I think you will find that they will become as original as the Chinese or we are.

But in Japan everything was settled, ordained by heaven, which they believe has given them the way for all the world. A premium is placed upon blind obedience and conforming. A penalty is put upon varying from the prescribed way. The Japanese until we forced them open wanted stability, not change.

The great crime still is to have dangerous thoughts. Because if men have new thoughts in science or invention, then the first thing you know they will be having new thoughts in politics or religion. They may even begin to develop concepts like liberty, or that man can be self-governing, instead of being wholly directed by the son of heaven.

In short, the uncreativeness of the people of Japan was the inevitable result of complete control of all life and thinking by the government, if you want to put it that way. Sometimes I wish some Americans would take note from Japan of the result of complete control of life by the government and not try to impose the system on us.

So it was perfectly natural that the Japanese, suffering because of the contrast between themselves and other peoples, would seek to compensate by trying to out-invent, out-fight, out-guess the Chinese and us; that they would invent a two-man submarine, or a Zero fighter which could at least outclimb and outmaneuver anything we had been able to produce. Surely we can understand that reaction.

Then there is a third thing: Even nature has always been against Japan. She has been subject to typhoons, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, almost every year. All these factors have operated upon the Japanese psychology until as a nation they have developed a true persecution psychosis. They have brooded over their troubles, real and imaginary, until they have become the most moody, self-pitying, and morbidly introspective people in the world. Their suicide rate in times of peace is several times higher than that of any other country that keeps vital statistics.

I have seen Japanese officers in China, the conquerors, sit at my desk and say, "Why doesn't the world think more of us," and put their heads down on their arms and weep—because nobody loved them. But that does not mean they will not go doggedly on. They never had what we would call a break. They never expect to get a break. Everything they have they got the hard way, wrested it from an unfriendly nature by sheer determination and unrelenting struggle. They have believed that the very hardness of their existence had prepared them to conquer us who grew rich in a land which had incredible wealth and resources, and they believed that therefore we had become soft and too pleasure-loving to be able to "take it."

A Japanese general, after Pearl Harbor, announced: "We can defeat America because Americans have a spoiled-baby complex." They are finding out, the hard way as usual, how wrong they were when they assumed our love of comforts and conveniences meant that we cared more about things than about great principles. Perhaps we are just finding it out ourselves.

Now, when you take a nation with such a psychological background and suddenly liberate it from its inferiority complex, you have a situation that is loaded with dynamite. About 1858 Japan took over from the West universal military service. Up until that time a man could not be a soldier in Japan unless he were born a Samurai or did some great deed for which he was rewarded by being elevated to the Samurai class. The most coveted honor was to have a chance to bear arms for the Emperor, and the Emperor was also God. Their patriotism and their religion coincided; the Emperor has a double hold on every Japanese heart. That is, everything in Japan centralized, unified, pulled together around the Emperor.

In contrast, the basic religion in China was ancestor reverence; one's own family was the unit. That is, most everything in China decentralized, disunified, pulled apart.

So when Japan took over conscription she had the urge and was able to build herself up rapidly in military strength, whereas China with her tradition of regarding the military as not the highest but the lowest level of society had no psychological urge to become a great military nation.

In 1894 Japan picked a quarrel with China over Korea, and defeated China. Little Japan had overcome the great colossus of Asia.

Ten years later she treacherously assaulted Russia, and defeated her. I was studying in the Imperial University in Tokyo in the summer of 1931, and one morning a Japanese professor said to us:

> Future historians will attach more importance to the Russo-Japanese War than they do at the present time. A hundred years from now they too, will see what we Japanese already know, that the Russo-Japanese War was one of the greatest turning points in all human history, if not the greatest. It was the first time that white men went out against a colored people—and were turned back.

And if you will notice, the Japanese are still turning the white man back in many places.

Little, despised Japan, he believed, had reversed the whole current of human history. She had sounded the death knell of the white man's dominance. That is heady wine.

Then in 1914–15 the Japanese defeated the German garrison in Shantung—another white nation. Then there was the Anglo-Japanese alliance. In 20 years Japan moved from an insignificant group of volcanic islands to an alliance with the greatest empire of all times. For centuries she had been at the bottom; now she was at the top, suddenly released from her inferiority complex. Of course, it went to her head. Of course, the pendulum swung too far. Of course, she was a little arrogant, browbeating, self-conscious, and strutting, lest people not notice how important she suddenly had become.

And then at the time of Japan's greatest psychological overcompensation, two terrible things happened to her. One was at the peace conference after the war. The one thing the Japanese asked for more than anything else was that there be included in the League of Nations covenant recognition of the principle of equality of races. And England committed, with our acquiescence, if not support, one of the three incredible blunders from which her Empire crumbles today—not the commonwealth but the Empire. An Anglo-Japanese alliance—yes; but not a 16-word clause in the covenant recognizing the principle of racial equality. Japan in her new pride was slapped down. The Japanese gritted their teeth and waited, waited and worked for the day when in Tientsin they could strip Englishmen publicly before the "inferior races." What could be more humiliating? Perhaps we can begin to understand what satisfaction the Japanese derived from witnessing Sir Mark Young, representative of the proud white men who had swaggered through the Orient for so long, come down from the heights of Hong Kong,

cross on the ferry, and walk up as a humble suppliant before his Japanese conquerors. Where? In the grand ballroom of the Peninsular Hotel into which previously no oriental had been permitted to set foot.

The second blow to Japan came from this Congress in 1924. America was having labor troubles on the Pacific coast. Oriental immigrants had lower wage levels, and they were able to undercut our wage and living standards. There was a real problem. Nobody denies that. If we had given as the reason for our excluding orientals the economic reason, which in most cases was the real reason, there would not have been a murmur of protest from any oriental people. They know we are a sovereign country and have a perfect right to regulate our own immigration. But we do not have a right to insult friendly peoples because of their race or color, at least not if we expect to avoid war with them. Unfortunately, the basis on which we excluded them was one of race, that non-Caucasians are ineligible for American citizenship. No matter what a man's or a woman's ability may be, or education, or culture, or charm, or professional skill, if the pigment in his or her skin is different from ours, he or she is because of that fact automatically and inescapably branded as inferior, forever condemned to a level below us—officially stigmatized. Gentlemen, that day we made war between ourselves and Japan inevitable—if and when Japan could manage to get sufficient military strength to attack us.

Americans spent many months gravely and at times heatedly debating whether the repeal of the Neutrality Act or the passage of the Lend-Lease Act or the Selective Service Act, and so forth, might lead us into war with Japan. I suspect the autopsy demonstrates that they were all shadow boxing. They were not causes; they were consequences. They were the inevitable sequelae of our own act in excluding orientals on a basis of race. Other peoples were hurt as badly as Japan. But the Chinese were too proud and too correct to snipe back and thereby lower themselves to our level. Japan in her new-found power resolved to avenge, to make us eat our words. We are reaping today in bloodshed what we sowed then in arrogance and in the belief that somehow we were above the laws of human community. Did we get enough from it to be worth all the American boys now being killed or tortured?

Perhaps a good case could be made out for passing the Exclusion Act. On the other hand, perhaps a good case could be made out for selling war supplies to Japan to help her conquer China and build up her own military strength. But surely no mind that can add up two and two and get four can ever make out a case for doing those two things at the same time. If you are going to insult Japan and make her hate you, then you had better not arm her. If you are going to arm her, then you had better not insult her.

If a man walks up and slaps you in the face and calls you a vile name, he does not hand you a revolver at the same time, or if he does, you know what is wrong with him—he is crazy. Yet this was for years the deliberate policy of a nation of 130,000,000 free Americans in the land with the finest press and radio service, greatest universities, greatest number of organizations for discussing public problems, to help us make wise decisions. It would be incredible if not so tragically true.

I do not like to say such things. Yet those are the autopsy findings. I never yet liked to tell a man that he had tuberculosis or cancer. Yet it is no kindness to him to pretend that he does not have it if he does. It was no kindness to our country all those years, and it is no kindness now for any man to close his eyes to the situation which exists. I wish it did not exist, but wishing does no good. We must deal with it as it is.

What I have already said, it seems to me, gives us some clues as to how to deal with Japan as an enemy. I can illustrate by a little story. After the Japanese seized the Chinese city in which our hospital was located, I negotiated on repeated occasions with Japanese officers trying to get permission to reopen in temporary quarters our schools which they had shelled out of existence. One day in the midst of discussion with the chief of staff of the Yamaoka Division which had its headquarters in our city, I chanced to say to him something about having served in the United States Army in the World War. He looked at me for a moment hesitantly and then his face beamed. Up until that time I was his potential enemy, but when he discovered I had once been a soldier, I was almost his buddy. Apparently he believed that anybody who had ever served in any army would, of course, think exactly as the Japanese did. He said, "You had a hard time licking the Germans, but your task was nothing compared to ours in trying to lick the Chinese." I said, "I do not understand that. The Germans are supposed to have one of the best, if not the best military machine in the world."

He said, "That is right. That is why it is easier to fight them. It is harder to fight the Chinese because they don't know how to fight." I was still puzzled.

He said, "Well, military science is the same all around the world. But the Chinese don't understand it." As I pondered that I began to see his meaning. The law of gravity works just the same in Asia and in America. The laws of chemical affinity work at the North Pole the same as at the South Pole, or the Equator. The drill regulations of the French Army, the Germany Army, the Japanese Army, and the American Army, et cetera, are almost exactly the same. Yes; military science has been essentially the same all around the world. Therefore, people who understand it would presumably fight alike. He went on, "When you fought the Germans, you could look at a map and tell from the terrain where they would put their artillery. You could tell where their infantry would come. Therefore, you could make plans to repel them. But the Chinese, they do not understand military science. They never put their infantry or their artillery in the right place."

I suppose that is what the Japanese mean when they accuse the Chinese of being insincere.

He said, "We have defeated them and defeated them and defeated them. When did they ever win a real victory? But they still won't sue for peace." Yes; that was not the way western nations carried out wars. When the French were defeated in 1871 they sued for peace. When the Germans were defeated in 1918 they sued for peace. When the French were defeated in 1940 they sued for peace. But these confounded Chinese have been licked for 5 years and still they will not sue for peace. He said, "You have no idea how hard it is to fight the Chinese." Surely, that gives us insight into how to fight Japan, or at least how not to fight her. Do not fight according to the book.

Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt a year ago last Christmas decided the basic strategy by which we were to carry on this war. It was to hold defensively in the Pacific while attacking in Europe. It was based on two assumptions. If the assumptions are sound, it is good strategy. If they are unsound it is poor strategy. Nobody knows yet for sure. The assumptions were first that we could hold defensively in the Pacific. Second, that we could dispose of Hitler and Mussolini with sufficient rapidity that Japan could not get her gains consolidated and organized and exploited to the point where she would be practically impregnable, or where it would cost us a million men and hundreds of billions of dollars and years of time to defeat her. Japan gambled we would not pay that price, that we would say, "What are we in this trouble for? We have no obligation to the Philippines which justifies such a sacrifice. Let us get our boys back home and have peace." Japan would give anything to get us to accept a Munich-type of peace now—so that she can build up to the place where she can surely defeat us and enslave us militarily and economically. Let him who thinks that fantastic be prepared to accept responsibility for the destruction of our Nation.

Now, I do not know much about the European end of the task, except that our success there depends on our ability to hold in the Pacific just as much as ultimate victory over Japan depends on our ability to knock out the Axis in Europe fairly speedily. But I do want to apply to the Pacific end of the task some of the things I have said.

There is no evidence thus far that we can hold defensively in the Pacific. Every time we have tried to hold defensively we have been licked; whenever we let Japan plan and initiate moves at her own choice and time we are playing her game, and she will strike here in force and then there in force and with every detail worked out with the most meticulous care. If we just resist her offensives, they will be as efficient and precise and disastrous as at Pearl Harbor and

Manila. But if we will meet her offensives, not with defense but by taking the offensive ourselves, her military machine can be thrown out of stride relatively easily. China has proved that repeatedly. Centuries of regimentation have left Japan's men, especially her officers, no match for China's or our own men, once a plan goes awry. The white man's record in the Pacific has been one of repeated defeats, except for the three times we have taken the offensive. Each time we have won when we have upset Japan's strategy; she was not able to adjust herself, could not make the necessary changes quickly. The Chinese discovered that long ago, and so they ceased to adhere to old methods. They hit and run, developed the night attack, infiltration. Practically all the unorthodox tricks the Japs have used against us they learned from the Chinese. The Chinese did not have guns, so they had to use their wits. They have been holding Japan off all these years, largely by wits and will. Now they have got to have some guns in addition to their wits; and we have got to have more wits in addition to our guns.

We are making real progress but, unfortunately, like Japan we seem to prefer getting it the hard way. May I illustrate by the story of a young American marine officer, who was our Assistant Military Attaché in Peking. When the Japanese invaded in 1937 things looked utterly hopeless for the Chinese. They had almost nothing with which to fight except their bare hands, and their wills. And yet they were holding the Japanese juggernaut unbelievably. This young officer said: "Those Chinese have got something. We may have to fight Japan some day. We had better find out how to do it." And so he asked for and was given an assignment to the Chinese armies, and for 2 years he lived with the Chinese guerrillas, marching on foot here and there through much of north and northwest China. He retreated with them through our city only a few hours before the Japanese began to shell us. He knows more about how to fight the Japanese than any other man in our armies. Then he came home to this country, but his suggestions were not received very much better than DeGaulle's were received by the French generals. He resigned his commission, gave up his income, his seniority rights, and all the rest. Many friends and fellow officers called him a fool. He went up and down this country for months and months writing, speaking, and trying to waken us to the danger that threatened us and to get us to prepare to meet it. It was largely in vain.

Then the war broke out and he went back into the marines. He is now Col. Evans Carlson. He was the commander of the group, of which Jimmy Roosevelt was second in command, that carried out the raid on Makin Island. He and his personally trained marines using the tactics learned in China, recently returned from an excursion into the jungles of Guadalcanal, having killed 400 Japanese, with the loss of only 17 of our men. I understand that at long last he is being brought back to this country, I hope to help us understand our enemy, and to plan our campaigns accordingly.

We have been pretty much like Braddock and his redcoats. They marched out to fight the Indians in proper dress-parade order, the way they fought wars in Europe. They would die rather than degrade themselves by shooting from behind a tree or a bush. They had codes in war almost like those for duels. The main thing was not whether one killed or got killed, but whether one did it in proper form. The rules of the game were more important than victory. That is commendable and good cricket—provided the enemy fights under the same code. It is disastrous otherwise. Fortunately, for the red coats and for America, Washington and his scouts were like Carlson and his men. They knew their enemy, they were not wedded to yesterday's methods, they were not too particular about form and finesse, they resisted by attacking, and they saved the day.

The autopsy reveals that we went into this war without much real knowledge either of our enemy or of ourselves. We were a good deal like Goliath. You recall he, too, was a master of defensive warfare—he had every kind of the best and tested weapons for defending one's self that had been devised up to that time. The story is a most illuminating classic, thoroughly up to date. It describes in detail all the weapons Goliath had. His helmet was made of this, and his shin guards of that; his mail weighed so much, the staff of his spear was so thick, and its head weighed so much. He had so much armor he had to have an assistant carry his shield before him—like destroyers before a battleship. The recital of all he had and what he could do with it reads almost like one of Secretary Knox's speeches or official reports before Pearl Harbor. He, too, like Goliath, talked as if we could win over any combination of enemies in both oceans simultaneously and singlehandedly.

Then out came David. The king and his friends feared David could not fight; he had no such weapons as Goliath's. They tried to put a lot of armor on him. David refused because he knew if he fought Goliath on terms where Goliath was superior he would be defeated. I heard an admiral say last fall, "But if the Japs would just come out and fight us, we could lick them easily." Of course, we could. That is why they do not come out and fight us according to our book. That is just the point.

The mighty Goliath was insulted when David came out. What could that little stripling do to him? Or what could that funny-looking Austrian paperhanger and ex-corporal do to us? Or that puny collection of volcanoes called Japan? It was an insult to Goliath's—and our—dignity. David did not have the orthodox weapons, so he used his wits and he took the offensive. He invented the first torpedo bomber. He had five ready but needed only one. When Goliath lumbered out, the record says David "hastened and ran to meet him," sent over his torpedo bomber and down went Goliath—or the *Repulse* or the *Prince of Wales*.

Why do I recite all this? Because America has plenty of the best kind of wits, the intelligence, the ability, the initiative, the inventive genius, the resourcefulness, the courage, the will; America has everything if she will just get rid of her Goliath state of mind and deal with the situation realistically as it is. We cannot survive by defending yesterday and by its methods. We must boldly move ahead, true to our country's noblest traditions.

In addition to understanding our enemy and understanding ourselves, there is a third thing we must do if we are going to win, if we are going to be able to hold in the Pacific until we can dispose of Hitler in Europe. That is, we must understand our allies far better than we have thus far. We cannot alone hold defensively in the Pacific—and we should recognize it frankly. We were able to take the offensive temporarily a few times—at Midway, north from Port Moresby, and at Guadalcanal, especially in Admiral Halsey's audacious and unorthodox naval attack of last November. Three times we concentrated our power and took the offensive, three times we won. But we cannot hope to mount more of even these limited offensives in the Pacific now, to say nothing of a large-scale offensive, unless our allies hold.

That means that we must keep Russia in the war. The materials we are shipping to Russia are, from the standpoint of our own security, just as necessary for helping Russia keep strong forces in Siberia as they are for helping her pound Hitler on her western front. Those Siberian forces have been tying up between 400,000 and 600,000 of Japan's best troops, plus the shipping and the factories in Japan necessary to supply those men. If Russia went down, it would be a disaster for us in Europe and equally a disaster for us in the Far East. The released Japanese armies would immediately be turned against China and ourselves.

We must also keep China in the war. China is tying up, it is estimated, between 800,000 and 1,200,000 of Japan's troops. Most of them are not Japan's best troops. Japan uses her shock troops to drive into a new area, then she replaces them, usually with men between 35 and 45 years of age, who cannot get out and do much heavy campaigning. They have to garrison every railroad station and cut every bridge, every tunnel, every large village, and highway in occupied China. Tens of thousands are killed every year.

China also neutralizes an enormous amount of Japanese manpower and the shipping and the factories in Japan necsary to supply those men. We have to keep China in the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. I am sorry, but no more time is available.

Mr. JUDD. That is quite all right, Mr. Chairman. The thing I wanted to discuss today was a little of the background

of our job in the Pacific, especially certain psychological considerations.

If at some future time there is opportunity I should like to go on to the conclusions which it seems to me follow inexorably from the background I have tried to present. I am grateful for your patience in listening to the report of one who has lived out there, and feels under obligation to try to share his experiences and some lessons to be gained therefrom. I do not pretend to be any smarter, or any wiser, than others—of course not. It is merely that I had the chance to see what most of you have not had opportunity to observe first hand. Surely, I would be derelict in my duty to my country if I did not report what I have seen in the hope it will help us to come to a fuller realization of the character of our enemy, and the magnitude of our task.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, we have just listened to what to my mind was perhaps the greatest and most informative speech I have ever heard delivered on the floor of this House with reference to the background situation in the South Pacific as it relates to this country and one of the countries with which we are now at war, namely, Japan. I have always maintained that Japan was our greatest menace—and I so maintain today.

The Russians are taking pretty good care of the Germans.

The reason I am taking this time is this, not that anything we are going to say on the floor of this House will create disunity among the Members of the House, nor will it create any disunity in the country, but try as hard as we can, and I have been saying it repeatedly on the floor of this House, that I think we should all keep away from past issues that were buried at Pearl Harbor in 1941. But like Banquo's Ghost, they will not stay down. Regardless, the American people are as one person today. They are 100 percent back of the President, our Commander in Chief, in the winning of this war, and so is Congress 100 percent back of our Commander in Chief.

The specific reason I am taking this time is caused by a colloquy that occurred between the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and myself with reference to what action should have been taken prior to Pearl Harbor with reference to this very country, Japan. I know the distinguished gentleman from Missouri did not intend to say anything that would cause a rehashing of those matters, but we rather got off on it and had sort of a field day on the mistakes or omissions that occurred before Pearl Harbor.

I believe every Member of the House agrees with the distinguished gentleman when he laid down the plan for peace after the war. I also believe mistakes were made before Pearl Harbor, and they will no doubt be made in the future. I think mistakes were made by all of us from the President down. Of course, our hindsight is always better than our foresight. I thought at the time the President made his famous quarantine speech in Chicago in the fall of 1937, when he spoke about quarantining aggressor nations, that it was premature. I did not believe, as was suggested here by the gentleman who spoke a few moments ago, that the people should say much until they were ready and prepared to follow through, and confessedly we were not ready or prepared to follow through at that time.

Congress in 1937 passed an act authorizing the President to place an embargo upon the exportation particularly to Japan of war materials. At that very time and from that time on we were shipping to Japan 54.4 percent of the materials they were using to kill Chinamen with and to prepare for us. What were those materials? Trucks, copper, pig iron, machinery, and engines, and also high-test gasoline for the squadrons of Japanese airplanes. We have an acute shortage of every one of those materials today.

I thought the President should have put an embargo on then and said so June 27, 1939, on this floor, because I felt these very materials were going to be used, not only used against China, but also used against this country, because I have felt, for years past, knowing the Japanese as I did, having spent time on the coast, that they had designs on the Pacific coast.

The point was made this morning by two distinguished gentlemen from Texas that, if the embargo had been used, Japan would have cut off from us the rubber supply which we received from them until the embargo was actually placed. Let us suppose that the embargo had been placed and we had been cut off from the supplies of rubber, Japan would not have received the materials with which she has made guns, produced arms and ammunition with which she is fighting us today. Perhaps we would have been better off if we had put the cards on the table, taken the bull by the horns, and had started the production of rubber in this country, as we might have rubber today.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Has it been called to the attention of the gentleman the well-laid plans to defeat the United States, published back in January 1942?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Has the gentleman had that matter called to his attention?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes, I know about it.

I made my statement on the floor of this House in June 1939, and urged at that time that that embargo be placed upon the exportation of these materials. But, Japan was in no condition at that time to declare war on the United States. She had to get these materials from us before she was sufficiently armed to declare war upon us. Now, my friends, I realize it is perhaps not good policy even to bring these things out, and I have tried to keep them down, but, as I said awhile ago, sometimes it cannot be helped, sometimes you have got to follow through on what you have said before.

As idealists, if we are going to lead the world in morals and ideals we must not travel around with the dove of peace and Bible in one hand and with the other one reach out and grab the profits and gold made from the sales of death-dealing agencies, or we will have to suffer the consequences.

In support of that statement I want to call the attention of the House to an article that appeared in Labor, on the 15th day of September 1940, entitled "Patriotic Oil Moguls," which reads:

A Norwegian freighter has just left Houston, Tex., with 770,000 gallons of aviation gasoline for Japan—

Get that; on the 15th day of September 1940—

and 1,000,000 barrels more are expected to follow.

This, in spite of an embargo placed on such shipments by our Government on July 27. Now, what happened?

That articles goes on to say:

Why has the embargo been raised?—

Get this—

Because, after Washington closed the American market to Japan, British producers rushed in and offered the little, yellow men all the "gas" they needed to wipe out the Chinese, and possibly the American and British Navies.

To the ordinary citizen, that looks like a nasty "kettle of fish." But you must remember these oil magnates must have their profits, even if in grabbing for the gold they jeopardize the safety of their own countries.

It has been said that we are known the world over as the grabbers of money, and if we are going to lead the world in morals, idealism, and good government let us abandon that policy, and carry the dove of peace in one hand and the Bible in the other, instead of reaching out with one hand for the gold that we will make out of the profits of the sale of materials to kill human beings.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman think it is about time that we began to think about America and the future of America and the future of the American people, rather than concerning ourselves about putting a bottle of milk upon everybody's doorstep?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, of course I think that "bottle of milk" speech was the most silly and asinine thing that I ever heard of coming from a responsible person.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, the question of farm credit and rural finance has received so much comment due to the bringing to life of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation that I include the following table from the 1942 Agricultural Statistics from page 702, published by the United States Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 776.—*Agricultural loans not secured by farm real estate: Loans outstanding January 1 and loans made each year, by selected lender groups, 1923–42*

OUTSTANDING JAN. 1

| Year | Insured commercial banks | Agencies now supervised by Farm Credit Administration | | | | | | Farm Security Administration | Rural Electrification Administration | Commodity Credit Corporation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Other than PCA, RACC and banks for cooperatives loans and discounts | Production credit associations | Regional agricultural credit corporation | Banks for cooperatives | Agricultural Marketing Act revolving fund | Emergency crop and feed loan offices | | | |
| | *1,000 dollars* | *1,000 dollars* | *1,000 dollars* | *1,000 dollars* | *1,000 dollars* | *1,000 dollars* | *1,000 dollars* | *1,000 dollars* | *1,000 dollars* | *1,000 dollars* |
| 1923 | (1) | | | | | | 2,359 | | | |
| 1924 | [2] 2,943,818 | 42,732 | | | | | 2,513 | | | |
| 1925 | (1) | 62,267 | | | | | 2,207 | | | |
| 1926 | (1) | 79,660 | | | | | 2,101 | | | |
| 1927 | (1) | 91,677 | | | | | 2,292 | | | |
| 1928 | (1) | 74,325 | | | | | 2,246 | | | |
| 1929 | (1) | 80,058 | | | | | 7,976 | | | |
| 1930 | (1) | 73,356 | | | | 14,510 | 8,946 | | | |
| 1931 | [2] 1,936,360 | 126,839 | | | | 136,698 | 61,442 | | | |
| 1932 | (1) | 117,137 | | | | 156,230 | 49,769 | | | |
| 1933 | (1) | 89,276 | | 24,373 | | 158,835 | 90,353 | | | |
| 1934 | (1) | 75,387 | 27 | 144,615 | 18,697 | 157,702 | 90,863 | | | 64,577 |
| 1935 | 807,613 | 89,052 | 60,459 | 87,088 | 27,831 | 54,863 | 111,238 | 5,600 | | 32,591 |
| 1936 | 661,606 | 49,249 | 93,400 | 43,394 | 49,962 | 44,433 | 172,468 | 64,415 | 10 | 271,219 |
| 1937 | 593,614 | 42,149 | 104,481 | 25,282 | 69,534 | 53,754 | 164,762 | 134,203 | 3,338 | 212,032 |
| 1938 | 788,351 | 41,787 | 136,918 | 15,588 | 87,504 | 30,982 | 171,983 | 166,534 | 34,315 | 182,810 |
| 1939 | 1,064,667 | 33,531 | 146,825 | 11,081 | 87,193 | 23,723 | 170,952 | 218,030 | 88,129 | 358,449 |
| 1940 | 1,094,392 | 34,151 | 153,425 | 8,005 | 75,843 | 20,547 | 167,795 | 287,688 | 183,243 | 199,839 |
| 1941 | 1,281,275 | 34,607 | 170,686 | 5,855 | 74,405 | 16,461 | 167,863 | 327,731 | 249,229 | 280,218 |
| 1942 | 1,449,937 | 40,091 | 185,611 | 5,531 | 112,692 | 16,914 | 163,792 | 364,612 | 322,509 | 146,984 |

[1] Not available.
[2] Estimated for all open State and National banks.

Total amount of federally financed non-real-estate loans, on Jan. 1, 1942, $1,358,125,000.
Total amount of insured commercial bank loans on Jan. 1, 1942, $1,449,937,000.

From the above table you will note that Federal rural non-real-estate financing was begun in 1923 as emergency crops and feed loans of $2,359,000. This was followed in 1924 by loans through the Federal intermediate credit banks of $42,732,000. By 1930 we find the Agricultural Marketing Act revolving fund. In 1932 we had the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation put in operation as a part of the R. F. C., though the loans were not made until 1933. This type of loan was replaced by the P. C. A., and the R. A. C. C. has been allowed to liquidate. Its recent entering in the loan field is with the funds paid back by the borrowers of this agency. You can also note that though as high as $144,000,000 of these personal property loans were made in 1 year by the R. A. C. C., there are only $5,531,000 of these loans still to be collected.

These R. A. C. C. loans were made generously. In many cases the loans were made on a semirelief basis and not directly on the basis of the cash amounts the property would bring on the market at that time. In other words, the loans were made as character loans, and also on the basis of the normal agricultural value of the personal property. Their repayment shows how short-sighted anyone is that has not faith in the rural people of America.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that the commercial banks have increased their loans from eight hundred and seven million in 1935 to one billion four hundred and forty-nine million on January 1, 1943. You will also note the gradual expansion of some of these other agencies. You will also note that during the past 7 years no new agencies have been organized.

An analysis of the place of these Federal-financed programs would take much more time than I have today. The basis of their origin, the reasons for their development, the contributions to the welfare of the Nation they have rendered, and the future place of these institutions in the financial structure of our economy, would require many hours to fully discuss. It cannot be approached on a partisan basis, as both parties have been supporting legislation that brought these institutions into existence. The abundant credit available today has changed the picture. Many non-Federal-financial institutions are eager to render the service performed by these agencies.

Many of these same banks were compelled to dispose of their chattel mortgages. But that is a long story.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BALANCED MANPOWER: THE KEY TO VICTORY

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the talk of the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD. There was one statement in that talk, however, with which I wish to take issue. He made the point that when the immigration law of 1924 was passed, when we laid down the principle that no oriental could become an American citizen by migrating here, that laid the seed for this war. We have a great many racial problems in America, and in my opinion they cannot be solved by adding more brown men and black men to the population. I am not putting this upon the basis that we are superior to them, but we are different from them, and we can get along well if we keep apart. I concur heartily with him on the proposition that we ought to lay emphasis on the Pacific war and that we ought to take the offensive against Japan.

I want to address myself for a few moments today to the matter of manpower, to try to point out, if I can, that there are some very fatal defects in our manpower set-up. In the first place, I am interested in this matter because I spent several years in a selective-service organization as chairman of an appeal board in California.

That experience gave me an insight into the pulling and tugging for the manpower of the Nation by the military, the farmers, and the industrialists.

My experience in the World War as a flier made me realize that any future war would be total war. What is meant by total war? It is a war in which all of the resources of the Nation—the human resources, the physical resources, and even the spiritual and intellectual resources of the Nation are bound together into a mighty force to strike the enemy a deadly blow. The American Legion 20 years ago realized that our next war would be a total war and prepared a universal-service law whereby they advocated the drafting of all of the resources of the Nation in the event of war—men, money, property, credits, and everything that would be needed in this total war, including Government control of prices, and so forth.

In a total war balanced manpower is the key to certain and quick victory. Also, if the home front is disorganized and does not work, the war front will be disorganized and ineffective. The success or failure of the war front will vary directly with the success or failure of the home front.

Manpower is our most fundamental and basic resource. From it come those that must do the fighting that alone can win the war; from it come those that will make possible the production for our armed forces and for those at home. The productive forces of the Nation in a total war are so interwoven with the military forces that for all practical purposes they are really one. Therefore, we must, by planning and an over-all point of view, so weld these forces together as to produce the greatest efficiency in each.

As far as I can determine from what has been done and what has been said, we have not really tackled this problem in a broad, fundamental, and comprehensive manner. In 1940 when we began to withdraw men from civil life for our armed forces we had in these forces 500,000 men. It soon became obvious that the war demands would take many of our producers from the ranks. This has continued until by the end of this

year there will have been withdrawn 10,500,000 from productive ranks. Naturally this would create great dislocations in our productive force. To aggravate the problem the productive forces have been called upon to continue to increase their production. To further complicate the matter, there has been a great migration of people from parts of the country and from certain occupations to other parts of the country and to other occupations.

Someone in the great national effort must take a view of the whole picture and must divide up this Nation's manpower in the right proportions to keep our great war machine in balance and going at top speed. Otherwise, each group interest would pull and tug and pillage other groups for its share of the manpower. The result might be utter chaos, part of which is now here. The armed force, which is the spearhead of the mighty war effort, stretches its tentacles down into every farm and every factory in the land to get what it needs to wage the war successfully. The armed forces being so dependent upon the productive forces, we can see that the productive forces cannot be robbed too much or the armed forces will lack the very things they need to exist and to fight the war. And at the same time the productive forces, while being depleted, are called upon to increase their production.

We have less men than we normally needed to do more work than they did before. In other words, we must have some kind of rationing of our national manpower. These matters were clearly understood by the President. On April 18, 1942, he issued an order creating the Manpower Commission. The Chairman was Mr. McNutt, who is also Federal Security Administrator. Here is what that Chairman was ordered to do:

Formulate plans and programs and establish basic national policies to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the prosecution of the war; and issue such policy and operating directives as may be necessary thereto.

Estimate the requirements of manpower for industry; review all other estimates of needs for military, agricultural, and civilian manpower; and direct the several departments and agencies of the Government as to the proper allocation of available manpower.

And among other things—

Formulate legislative programs designed to facilitate the most effective mobilization and utilizing of the manpower of the country; and, with the approval of the President, recommend such legislation as may be necessary for this purpose.

Ten months have now elapsed since the order was issued. What has been accomplished? Has there been a formulation of plans and programs to establish basic national policies to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower?

I have been trying to find out if broad basic matters have been considered. As far as I can learn the problem has only been considered piecemeal. One group considers the agricultural problem; another group considers the industrial problem, whether there shall be a 40-hour week or a 48-hour week and similar problems.

In total war there is no well-defined line between the armed forces and the civilians. They are closely knit together. The war machine is like a delicate organism. A disruption in one part disrupts all parts of it. The productive effort or lack of effort manifests itself directly at the front. If our productive effort is good it means quicker victory. That means less loss of life and less wounded men. To show you what that might mean I need but cite you what happened in the great Argonne drive. In that battle, lasting 46 days, we lost about 21,500 men. That was an average of 600 a day. Had the war terminated 1 week earlier we would have saved 4,200 men who are now lying in the national cemetery.

Let us look at the arithmetic of this problem, reduced to its simplest form.

The number of employed persons over 10 years of age, according to the 1940 census, was 52,000,000.

This was divided as follows:

In agriculture, 9,100,000.

In nonagricultural pursuits, 42,900,000.

In other words, at the time selective service began to take our men for the Army, 52,000,000 persons carried on the work of these United States.

By the end of 1943 the armed forces will consist of 11,000,000 men, of which 10,500,000 were brought in after 1940.

This leaves a total of 41,500,000 who must do the work formerly performed by 52,000,000 people. It is a little more aggravated than that because our demands for production have stepped up because of commitments under lend-lease and our stupendous war program.

We can assume that the proportionate decrease in manpower in the various groups is equal, although that is not exactly true.

Think of it—one-fifth of our 1940 manpower has been taken from us.

How are we going to handle this situation?

How are we going to keep up our agricultural production with a drop of about one worker out of every five?

Is our workweek the right length to take care of the situation? The 40-hour week was put into effect to spread labor. With a surplus of labor it was proper to make the work hours per week shorter.

But now we must do much more with less workers. Will an increase in hours per week solve the situation? If the 48-hour week is placed in effect in so-called nonessential employments, are the employers able to survive if time and one-half is insisted upon? How can absenteeism be cured so that the workers will work every day? Have any studies been made to determine if in war plants the unit of work per man is what it should be? I do not mean sweating, but we should require each man to give us his best effort. Many of these men are out of the war because they are in war plants and their war occupation is not their regular one. Their friends and neighbors have sons and husbands engaged in warfare with their very lives at stake. We have a right to expect them to give us their very best effort, and if they are not doing so to insist upon it.

Has an inventory been taken to determine how many more women can be used in the war effort?

In other words, has a budget of our national need for manpower been made so that whatever allocations are determined upon will produce the maximum results in our war effort?

In short, has the Manpower Chairman given serious consideration to the formulation of plans and programs to establish basic national policies "to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the prosecution of the war"? That was his order on April 18, 1942. Ten months have elapsed. He has several other big jobs, but none of them compare with this job and none are as vital to the Nation and to its people. His efficiency in this job may mean the saving of thousands of lives. If this man is too busy we should get a man who can give it his full time. There are men available who could do this job and do it quickly. With the basic picture worked out we could then fill in the annoying and complicated details.

Let me say here the Army and Navy are doing a good job. They, of course, had the advantage of an organization and much earlier planning. But they had a plan, they are working it out and their part of the job will click. They have said they believe that we can have an armed force of 11,000,000 and that in their computations they had considered the industrial and agricultural productive forces of the country. Their determination that our productive forces could sustain that large a force was naturally based upon the assumption that the productive force would be efficiently organized and guided. That is the job of the Manpower Chairman. He must furnish the leadership and get together the basic plan. And it would not hurt if he told the country what it was. We cannot wait. Twelve thousand of our men are going out every day to fight our battles. They and their loved ones are entitled to know that those in charge of the manpower problem are handling it expeditiously and efficiently. If they are not, we should get someone that can. When our very existence is at stake and the lives of these young men are thrown into the furnace to save us, the least we at home can do is to see that the home front is properly led.

There are ominous signs that this job is not being carried out in the manner or in the time that the President's order contemplated. Confusion and indecision are rampant.

In agriculture, for instance, there are already dangerous warning signals. The people are confused. They want to cooperate, they are willing to work hard, but they do not know what is wanted. Rules are put into effect that hamper and obstruct and confuse them instead of helping them toward better production goals. I shall place in the RECORD at the end of this discussion certain data

on agricultural production in California, which is indicative of conditions throughout the land. Think of it. In the county in which I live there was a loss of 125,000 tons of tomatoes because of lack of manpower, and similar losses in over a dozen other crops. What does that mean for the Nation and for the future? Already serious shortages are being felt throughout the land and the future may see more serious shortages.

There are likewise many weak spots in industry. I need not point them out here. Suffice it to say that one of the main cogs in our war leadership is not functioning as well as we have a right to expect. It is not pleasant to stand up here and say these things. But when the lives of our sons are at stake someone must say them.

Perhaps these matters should be corrected by Congress passing laws laying down the broad principles which should govern our administrative leaders in the productive effort. There are two bills pending in Congress now, the Kilgore bill in the Senate and the Wadsworth bill in the House. It is significant that both of these bills state as their purpose the thing which is set forth in the President's order and which has been so imperfectly carried out to date.

For your information I read from the Kilgore bill:

That it is the purpose of this act to (1) inventory and mobilize all the economic resources of the United States, including manpower, facilities, materials, technical and scientific knowledge, and natural resources for maximum use in the provision of military and essential civilian needs; and (2) adjust and stabilize the economy in accordance with the needs of full mobilization and other conditions created by war.

And from the Wadsworth bill:

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress hereby declares that in view of the critical nature of the present war and in justice to those in the armed forces of the United States, it is necessary to provide further for the comprehensive, orderly, and effective mobilization of the manpower and womanpower of the Nation in support of the war effort.

I hope what I have said has caused you to think further about this problem and to insist that something be done. The mighty cable of national effort to win the war comprises thousands of strands of civilian and military effort. The military strands are interwoven with the civilian strands. The military strands are sound and tough and are and will carry their part of the load. Some of the civilian strands are weak and rusty. They are the ones which reduce the effectiveness of the strong strands. Let us hope and pray that the direction and administration of our civilian effort will improve. It can release a veritable geyser of human effort if it will furnish leadership and take the shackles off our productive effort. I earnestly hope that this may be done.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I take this occasion to again thank my constituents for designating me to represent them. The Third California district is one of the most varied and also one of the most productive in the entire United States.

We produce in quantity a greater variety of agricultural crops than any other district in the United States. We have a great many thriving industries. We have such great permanent Navy and Army projects as the Mare Island Navy Yard and McClellan Field, as well as dozens of other Army and Navy projects placed during the present war. Some of these will undoubtedly be permanent. No other district has a greater interest in the proper utilization of our manpower than this district, so that we may maintain our high degree of production. Thousands of our sons have entered the Army and Navy. Some are now among our far-flung forces and many more will soon be fighting our battle for freedom in all parts of the world. Let us organize our productive effort so as to speed the day of victory and the return of our boys.

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY CROP LOSSES; 1942 SEASON

(A. E. Mahoney, agricultural commissioner, San Joaquin County, Calif.)

The following report is a résumé of the crop losses incurred in San Joaquin County for the 1942 season with special reference to labor shortages:

| | |
|---|---|
| Asparagus: | |
| Producing acres | 34,000 |
| Number of acres unharvested as a result of labor shortage | 7,000 |
| Approximate tonnage | 5,250 |
| Approximate farm value | $525,000 |
| Strawberries: | |
| Producing acres | 175 |
| Percentage of crop unharvested | 65 |
| Approximate number of crates unharvested | 47,250 |
| Approximate farm value | $47,250 |
| Sugar beets: | |
| Acreage | 18,000 |
| Number of acres disked under in the spring as a result of labor shortage to thin and weed | 1,000 |
| Approximate farm value | $100,000 |

Harvest of the crop at the present time is far behind normal and beets are continually losing sugar as a result of not being harvested on schedule.

| | |
|---|---|
| Cherries: | |
| Producing acres | 4,100 |
| Percentage of crop unharvested | 30 |
| Number of tons unharvested | 5,000 |
| Approximate farm value | $500,000 |

Reasons for losses:

1. Serious labor shortage.
2. Small sized fruit in some varieties.
3. Low prices which in many cases were a result of not getting the fruit harvested soon enough to carry properly. Delay in harvest also brings the fruit in competition with later cherry districts.

Plums, apricots, and peaches: The loss in these fruit crops was silght due entirely to prolonged cool weather during harvest thus allowing growers a much longer harvest period than normally occurs.

| | |
|---|---|
| Tomatoes: | |
| Pear tomatoes | 12,629 |
| Round tomatoes | 10,176 |
| Total acreage canning tomatoes in county | 22,805 |
| Harvested tonnage | 172,854 |
| Unharvested tonnage | 124,580 |
| Average number of tons per acre unharvested | 5.20 |
| Tomatoes—Continued. | |
| Average number of tons per acre harvested | 7.58 |
| Percent harvested | 60 |
| Percent unharvested | 40 |
| Acreage of canning tomatoes in 1941 | 17,209 |
| Tonnage harvested in 1941 | 141,113 |
| Average yield per acre 1941 tons | 8.2 |
| Percentage of increase in tonnage over 1941 | 28 |
| Percentage of increase in acreage over 1942 | 32 |
| Approximate farm value of unharvested tonnage | $2,000,000 |

Grapes: Growers were able to pay excessively high wages for harvesting their crop. Tokay grapes which sold for fresh consumption and wine grapes for shipment were not subject to ceiling prices and therefore grape growers could afford to pay more than other farmers who were limited by ceiling prices on their commodity. None of the crop remained unharvested.

FACTS CONCERNING 1942 CANNING-TOMATO SEASON, SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

1. Shortage of labor required to harvest crop reported by almost all growers.
2. Large percentage of crop unharvested due principally to a shortage of labor.
3. Killing frosts on mornings of November 5, 6, and 7 ended harvest.
4. Crop on vines at frost time mostly mature fruit which would have been picked prior to frost had sufficient labor been available.
5. Start of harvest season later than normal. One cannery reported processing as many tomatoes in August of 1941 as in September 1942.
6. Killing frosts also shortened season for delivery. One cannery reported completion of processing on November 18, 1941.
7. Tie-up at canneries due to a shortage of labor. Many growers reported 24 hours or longer in making deliveries.
8. Shortage of boxes occurred at canneries. Growers not only were required to wait for unloading but also for empty boxes. In some instances growers were sent home without boxes, necessitating laying off of crews.
9. Canneries in most cases were running short-handed and some canneries were unable to obtain sufficient labor for night shift. Employees worked many hours overtime and those canneries which operated the night shift had mostly volunteer labor on this shift.
10. Sufficient trucks were available with few exceptions. However, the long period of waiting at the canneries to make deliveries accounted for those exceptions.
11. Many growers express an unwillingness to grow tomatoes next year primarily as a result of seeing so much tonnage lost in the field as a result of labor conditions. Type of labor employed in harvesting tomatoes very undependable. Growers never knew from day to day whether or not they would have a crew.
12. Tomato pickers averaged from $1 to $1.50 per hour on a piece-work basis.
13. High wages did not stimulate workers to work longer hours or to remain on the same job, or to do satisfactory work.
14. School children assisted some in harvesting tomatoes, but require supervision, instruction, and experience.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 18, 1943]

MUDDLING IS OUT WHEN A SON GOES

(By E. A. Evans)

This is written by a man whose only son, aged 18 years 1 month and 12 days, went away this morning to join the Army.

I went with him as far as I could in the chilly dawn. We waited together, not talking much, in the bare assembly room of the draft board in the basement of a dingy old school, until a brisk corporal came in and read a list of 70 names, 1 of them my boy's.

I saw him square his shoulders and walk out to a big waiting bus, and I looked after that bus until it vanished far down the street on its way to the induction camp in Virginia. And it wasn't all pride—though it was that, too—that swelled up in me and hurt my throat.

Then I walked to the office, trying to think about a subject that has claimed much of my attention as a newspaper writer—the squabbles and confusions and muddles of the war effort on the home front.

But somehow my thoughts were not quite the same as they had ever been before.

HE'S HEARD IT ALL

I have heard it said that these things are inevitable in an undertaking so vast, under a President whose genius is for great leadership, not for the details of efficient organization; that somehow the weapons and the food will get produced, in spite of muddling; that it's useless to worry about a War Production Board row, or a failure to solve the manpower puzzle, or a fumbling attack on the problem of food production.

I have heard all that, and have resented it rather mildly, believing that these things would cost me higher taxes, delay for a while the day of victory, and prolong the little inconveniences of wartime.

Today I know that whether Mr. Roosevelt provides or fails to provide a better home-front war organization may mean a whole world's difference to my boy's mother and to me.

Mr. Nelson, Mr. Wickard, Mr. McNutt, and the other so-called czars are not doing as good a job as needs to be done. I don't so much blame them, for they are victims of a system, or a lack of system, that is not their fault. They have no means of going to the President regularly and frequently with the conflicts and differences bound to rise among them; no way of getting his prompt, firm decisions—and no man except the President can make many of the decisions that are imperative.

JOB FOR EXPERTS

The size of the Army and Navy, for instance. I have little right to an opinion about that, for I don't and shouldn't know the grand strategy. Congress shouldn't attempt to settle it, for most Congressmen can't know much more about it than I do. It shouldn't be left to the generals and admirals, for they think first, and properly, only about getting as many men as they can possibly need.

Only the President, the civilian Commander in Chief, whose duty it is to know all about both the military and the home-front requirements, can determine the size of the armed forces to my satisfaction.

If he says 11,000,000 men this year, with my boy as one unit among them, all right with me. But then I want him to make some more definite decisions. This country can put 11,000,000 men into uniform, and equip them and supply them, and grow the food to keep the war won after they win it—but not unless many things are done that haven't yet been done.

I don't want Mr. Nelson wasting his time on rows with the Army and Navy. I don't want Mr. McNutt and Mr. Wickard fiddling away precious days on phony manpower and food-production schemes. I don't want confusion in Washington. I want the quarterback to run the war-organization team, and keep it working as a team, and see that every member understands and obeys the signals.

HE'S ONE OF US

Yes, that's asking much of the busy President. But I know now how much I have to lose. If Washington muddling prolongs the war 1 minute, and that minute means my boy doesn't come back, victory, and all the fine things Mr. Roosevelt promises for this country and the world after victory, won't mean much to me.

There must be many millions of people in America—parents, wives, brothers, sisters—who feel as I learned to feel this morning when my son went away. With the induction rate rising to 12,000 a day, their number must be growing.

We can be the most powerful bloc in America—a pressure group of people who are willing to go hungry and cold and ragged, if necessary, and who ask nothing for ourselves except that the Government be organized to win the war quickly and bring our boys home safely.

I hope we can make the President understand what we want. And surely we can, for after all he's one of us.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, in the appropriation bill now before us we find an appropriation for three and one-quarter million dollars for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, as well as an appropriation of a little over a million dollars to complete the experimental laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio.

I am glad to find this item in the bill. I think many times we have overlooked the importance of the work done by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Our Army and Navy and the units of our aviation industry have cooperated extensively with this committee. The enviable position in which we find ourselves in the aviation world, I believe, is due largely to the work of the Advisory Committee.

I wanted to take 3 or 4 minutes this afternoon to discuss a subject that will soon be before this House. Reference has been made to it this afternoon. That is, the formation of a standing committee to deal with civil aeronautics. The day before yesterday my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] made a very interesting address in opposition to the creation of such a committee, but in that address he indicates that he feels a charge has been made that the committee presently handling aviation legislation, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has a prejudice against civil aviation. I can only speak for myself. I am only one of nine Members of this House who introduced a resolution in this session asking for the creation of such a committee, but I assure my good friend from Tennessee and the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that it was the furthest thing from my mind to charge this great committee or any member of it with having any prejudice against civil aviation.

I want to repeat in part what I said the other day, that I appreciate, as I know everybody now knows who has followed that legislation, the contribution that the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has made to the advancement of aviation in this country, going way back to 1920 and continuously thereafter. It was not in my mind that there was any incompetence on the part of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but it sifted itself down simply to this: Are the problems of sufficient size and magnitude that we need a standing committee, a group of men who will devote their every possible energy to solving the problems of the present and the future? I sincerely believe that the work the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has before it this year and every other year makes it a physical impossibility for them to keep up with these problems. This is manifest in the report filed with the bill H. R. 1012. The first major amendments to the act of 1938 are proposed in the bill, and still it was only possible to have 9 days of hearings consisting of about 2 hours a day. No representative of the 27,000 licensed pleasure pilots in this country were heard; no representatives of the various State regulatory bodies were heard, and no member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will deny that there is a very grave constitutional question raised in certain sections of this bill. I cite these facts simply to indicate that time being as pressing as it is, members of that committee could not give it the time to which I feel the industry is entitled. As a matter of fact, does it not sift itself down to this when we come to make a decision: Whether we are going to listen to the testimony and the desires of men who represent important units of the aviation industry, or whether we are going to listen to men like Mr. Green whose interest in the subject concerns only one phase of it? Whether we are going to listen to men like Captain Rickenbacker who heads one of the great air lines of the country or listen to people who perhaps for purely personal reasons feel things were not being well handled?

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read down to and including line 4 on page 2.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the floor today

and to include in those remarks at that point certain excerpts from existing law and a portion of the bill H. R. 1012, and also a letter received from Mr. William Green.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the floor today and to include certain excerpts from letters and other material, which will not be very long.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] that he may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial as part of his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein an editorial from the Washington News and a table showing the loss of agricultural crops in San Joaquin County, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] may extend his own remarks and include therein an address made by him at the Commodore Hotel, New York, on Sunday, February 21, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] may extend his own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the bill today may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I may address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE WOMEN WHO TAKE CARE OF AMERICA'S HOMES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein a very fine editorial from the Washington Post relative to the WINS, the women who will carry on the work without any uniform or without any glamor or without any ultimate appreciation of what they are doing, the women, many of whom, with a smile, are sending the men to the front—their husbands, their fathers—carrying on perhaps the prosaic work of washing dishes, taking care of homes and children, and keeping up the strength and health of the family; the women who in many instances must take the place of both father and mother to their children; the women who must manage on a very much lowered budget; the women who must bravely keep on smiling when they know they must bear the loss of the men in their families for the sake of others; the little-sung heroines of war.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The editorial is as follows:

WINS TAKE OVER

She is not on a 48-hour week. Her's is a 7-day round-the-clock job. She works alone without the stimulus of companionship. She wears no uniform, no insignia. She gets no citations, no medals, no pay check. But at last she has been given a name. She is a WIN. By bestowing this title on the American housewife and making her an official part of the mobilization for war, the Office of Civilian Defense has given homemaking a recognition that may affect its status permanently.

Many women leaders have long contended that active homemakers should be classed as producers just as if they were in offices or factories, and rewarded on the same definite basis. Now, thanks to the efforts of a national magazine, the Government has officially recognized homemakers as producers in the war effort. And the WINS have come to join the WAACS, the WAVES, and the WAFS. And who knows but what more definite hours and more definite rewards for the sun-to-sun vocation of housewifery may eventually grow out of such action?

No group is more vital to the winning of the war just now than the 20,000,000 prospective WINS. They are the ones who must cushion the impact of food rationing, who must see that Americans are kept fit and healthy and gastronomically satisfied despite the decrease in food supplies. They must be the chief conservators of war materials, as fats and tin cans, and also of home goods, as clothes, house furnishings, electric equipment. They must function as doctors, nurses, plumbers, electricians, dry cleaners, launderers, delivery boys to save manpower, rubber and gasoline. In addition, they must be the chief morale builders of the Nation, sustaining their menfolk by their cheer and hope, adjusting their children to a world of war, and training them for a world of tomorrow, and keeping, as far as possible, life functioning as usual so that the "home" which absent men dream of will be awaiting them on their return.

This is a large order. But American housewives are meeting it valiantly. It is something that their efforts are being recognized officially and that they have been given a name and program, even without benefit of pay check.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 707. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 26, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Invalid Pensions at 11 o'clock a. m., Monday, March 1, 1943.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a hearing of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on Wednesday, March 3, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 1607.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, March 4, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 134 to provide for the suspension, during the war, of operating-differential subsidy agreements, and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

The committee will also hold a public hearing on Thursday, March 18, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1361 (Mr. LANE) and H. R. 1409 (Mr. FOGARTY), conferring upon men in the merchant marine the same rights, privileges, and benefits accruing to those serving in the armed forces; and on H. R. 1858, to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine who served during the World War as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who served during such war.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, March 9, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on H. R. 1880, a bill providing for the construction of a ship canal across the State of New Jersey, connecting New York Bay with the Delaware River, and forming the last link in the Intracoastal Waterway from Boston to the Mexican border.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, March 16, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 149.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

207. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 6, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of report on the Cheyenne River, S. Dak., and Wyo., with a

view to improvement of Rapid Creek, S. Dak., for the control of floods, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on June 13, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

208. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 8, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Saginaw River, Mich., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

209. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

210. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend that part of the act of June 24, 1910 (36 Stat. 619), relating to disposition of profits from sales of ships' stores; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

211. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level-premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

212. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a list of oil and gas leases which by their terms would have expired in 1942 but have been extended beyond their initial 20-year terms until the termination of such plans; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 136. Resolution authorizing expenses for the special committee provided for by House Resolution 102; without amendment (Rept. No. 179). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Committee on Elections No. 3. House Resolution 137. Resolution authorizing the joint application for order of recount, Eleventh Congressional District of Missouri; without amendment (Rept. No. 180). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DISNEY: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1780. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1037. A bill preserving the nationality of a person born in Puerto Rico who resides for 5 years in a foreign state; without amendment (Rept. No. 182). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1289. A bill to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien; without amendment (Rept. No. 183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1295. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the residence for naturalization purposes of certain aliens who serve in the military or naval forces of one of the Allied countries during the Second World War, or otherwise assist in the Allied war effort, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1680. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge; without amendment (Rept. No. 185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 1987. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 which provides for marketing quotas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 1988. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. R. 1989. A bill to provide for increasing postal rates on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail matter so that such rates will yield revenues adequate to cover expenditures; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOCH:

H. R. 1990. A bill to establish a Chiropody (Podiatry) Corps in the Medical Corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARD JOHNSON:

H. R. 1991. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 1992. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for air and war-risk insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1993. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct experiments in the revegetation and reforestation of the public domain and authorizing an appropriation for said purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 1994. A bill authorizing the Shoshone-Goship Bands of the Shoshone Nation of Indians to sue in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 1995. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1996. A bill to amend section 2, paragraph 3, of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 1997. A bill to repeal section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 1998. A bill providing for the issuance of appropriate insignia to rejected or deferred registrants for military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 1999. A bill to provide for payment of certain travel costs of dependents on a mileage basis in order to promote efficiency and economy in such payments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2000. A bill to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURCH of Virginia:

H. R. 2001. A bill requiring departments, agencies, and independent establishments in the executive branch of the Government to pay postage of official mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 2002. A bill to require that parity reflect increased farm labor costs for the purposes of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and the act of October 2, 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1943, Gen. Casimir Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Res. 138. Resolution to create a Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 2003. A bill for the compensation of Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2004. A bill for the relief of Morris Spitz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 2005. A bill for the relief of Christine Mangrum, Luster Mangrum, and Nathan Mangrum; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 2006. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hagar Simpson and Mrs. Nat Price, Jr., and Giffin Bros. Clinic; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 2007. A bill to provide for the relief of Georgia V. C. Chapman and Julie I. Chapman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEAN:

H. R. 2008. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mae Scheidel, Mr. Fred Scheidel, Mr. Charles Totten, and Miss Jean Scheidel; to the Committee on Claims.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

187. By Mr. ANGELL: Memorial of the Forty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, asking that legislation be enacted to include teachers under the provisions of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

188. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of Mrs. John D. Weir and 64 other residents of the cities of Schenectady and Scotia, Schenectady County, N. Y., opposing double taxation and

plans advanced by the Treasury's general counsel, Randolph Paul, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury, which would put an unsupportable burden on the American taxpayer, and favoring the pay-as-you-go plan proposed by Mr. Ruml; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

189. By Mr. LAFOLLETTE: Concurrent resolution of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana, urging the Congress of the United States to encourage and support the establishment of a permanent memorial commemorating the life work and achievement of the late George Washington Carver; to the Committee on the Library.

190. By Mr. MOTT: Senate Joint Memorial No. 4 of the Forty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States forthwith to cause to be enacted into Federal law such provisions as will include and make suitable provisions for teachers in the social-security plan, or make it permissible for teachers to be included, and thus render it possible and proper for the members of that profession to retire in reasonable competency when their time has arrived for ceasing active duties in the schoolroom; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

191 Also, Senate Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Forty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President of the United States and the United States Navy to make the necessary arrangements to have a new battleship named and christened the *Oregon;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and everlasting Father, we pray that the world's great crisis may bind us to something beyond the clouds which overshadow us; we praise Thee that Thy love and light are without limit. We rejoice that as the potter knows infinitely more than the clay, so we trust to Thy overguiding will, Thy chart of faith and sight. Blessed Lord, do Thou increase the power of that faith in us which deepens, broadens, and dignifies the enduring worth of human life.

Almighty God, we thank Thee with bounding gratitude for our own dear America, beautiful for pilgrim feet and for patriots' dreams which see beyond the years. Wherever its reaching hand extends do Thou widen the paths of freedom and brotherhood. Ease the stress and the strain of our vital energies which are so often consumed by the fever of just living. Oh, lead our people to give themselves pause, to meditate upon the deep things of the soul, on time and its meaning, on life and its mysteries, and on the privileges we thrust aside; when thus alone jealousy and suspicion are purged away. At this altar the splendor of youth is revealed, the pride and health of life are magnified, and we draw the future near and claim it for our own. Heavenly Father, give to our President blessings of good cheer, rest, and growing strength. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 12. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral-development purposes in time of war;

S. 660. An act to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes;

S. 677. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended;

S. 739. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States as students at educational institutions and other places"; and

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution requesting that an appropriate medal be designed for presentation to the President in connection with his recent trip to Africa.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 839. An act to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MCNARY, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res 82. Joint resolution to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following department:

Department of the Treasury.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including a copy of a bill that I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial appearing on February 19 in the Asheville Daily Citizen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEAVER]?

There was no objection.

### STRIKES AND SLOW-DOWNS IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the country and the American war effort has again been insulted by a strike and a slow-down in an aircraft factory in this country. The International Association of Machinists yesterday closed for 3 hours two large Boeing Aircraft plants making Flying Fortresses. A further shut-down or slow-down is threatened.

On numerous occasions since I came here I have voted for and I have spoken for the outlawing of all strikes and slowdowns in war industries. It is too bad that Congress has been unable to enact such legislation. Anyone who willfully stops or slows down war production in this country is an enemy of this Republic. Any kind of proteering out of war is criminal.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in regard to proposed aviation legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the reading of the Journal and at the conclusion of the legislative business in order for the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes in opposition to a proposed standing committee on aviation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H. R. 1691

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 1691.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF DEFENSE HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 121, Rept. No. 186), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct an investigation of the progress of the defense housing program, with a view to determining whether such program is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously, and economically, and with a view to determining whether the authorization of additional appropriations for defense housing purposes is necessary.

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation, or otherwise, as the committee deems desirable.

TRANSPORTATION OF CIVIL EMPLOYEES OF THE NAVY

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 129, Rept. No. 187), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 1691, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'HARA addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a petition of the Ottawa County Farm Growers Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY].

There was no objection.

FARM LABOR

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the subject of drafting the boys on the farms who are producing the necessary food to win this war is becoming very critical. Because of the inroads made upon these food producers by the local draft boards, many of the farmers are compelled to either quit farming or to cut their production materially. This is especially true in all Central and Midwestern States. I know this is true in Indiana, as I have received untold numbers of letters and notices of farm sales which tell the story.

Much confusion has resulted from the conflicting statements which have been made on this subject by the Manpower Commissioner and the head of the Selective Service System. We read the statement that the farm boys are to be deferred in order that they may produce the necessary food for victory. Then when we read the list of the boys who have been inducted into the armed service of our country we find many farm boys' names included. The farm boys are being inducted regardless of the publicity that is given out by those department heads to the contrary.

The people know of these inconsistencies, and they re greatly alarmed over these drastic inroads which are being made. When the farm manpower is lessened, that limits production of food. With the present rationing orders forced upon us, which we assume are essential, it is time that those in power awaken and lend a hand to aid in the production of the food which is so highly essential to our victory in this war.

All realize the shortage of food now, and by the end of 1943 this shortage will be much greater. If the war continues, and the end is not yet in sight, this food shortage in 1944 will be one of our greatest problems.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LEMKE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CROSSER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

AN OUTSTANDING EDITORIAL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include therein editorials on the subject of the antiracketeering bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

WE NEED "HOME RULE" ON PUBLIC POWER

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. NORMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, after line 7, insert:

"SENATE"

Page 1, after line 7, insert:

"For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, including compensation to stenographers of committees, at

such rate as may be fixed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, fiscal year 1943, $200,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses except in accordance with the provisions of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926 approved June 3, 1926, as amended."

Page 1, after line 7, insert:

"To enable the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate to pay employees of their office engaged in work connected with reporting or transcribing of official proceedings of the Senate additional compensation amounting to 10 percent of their earned basic compensation as is not in excess of the rate of $2,900 per annum, in accordance with the terms of Public Law 821, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, approved December 22, 1942, $676.17."

Page 2, after line 14, insert:

"INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

"THOMAS JEFFERSON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to enable the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two-hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans', approved July 30, 1942, fiscal year 1943, $50,000, to remain available until expended."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$750,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri explain the amendments?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Senate has returned the bill with two major amendments. One provides $50,000 for the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission to be expended in the celebration of the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson. The other makes a reduction of $250,000 in the amount provided for the Office of the Treasurer of the United States.

The House rejected the appropriation for the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission amendment, and the committee disapproves of the amendment reducing provision for the Office of the Treasurer of the United States. However, we are confronted with an unusual situation. Funds for the Selective Service System are completely exhausted. They are without money to meet their pay roll next Monday. Immediate action is imperative. On that account, the House committee is willing to agree to the amendments in order to secure funds for the Selective Service System.

The other amendment of the Senate, representing a reduction of $250,000, we are in position to take care of in another way.

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not like the $50,000 item, but the trouble seems to be that the Selective Service System is all out of money and does not have money to meet current pay rolls for their clerical help all over the country. These pay rolls must be met on March 1. There is no opportunity for a conference at which we might be able to get rid of that item. Therefore, I can see nothing to do but swallow the $50,000 item, even though we do not like it and it is not needed at this time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say that the House passed this resolution a week ago yesterday. There has been ample time for the consideration of the joint resolution in detail, and it is a matter for regret that it reaches us at so late a date that we must either agree to the amendment or leave the Selective Service System without funds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker be authorized to sign the enrolled joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 82) to approve urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ABSENTEEISM

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, during the month of December this Nation announced the loss of 31 Liberty ships at sea. If the man-days lost as a result of absenteeism during the month of December had been applied to the production of Liberty ships, they would have produced 42 ships. So, more Liberty ships were sunk on the ways in this country due to absenteeism in December than the Axis could sink on the water.

The House Naval Affairs Committee has approved a bill to correct this situation. This morning the House Rules Committee granted us a rule on that bill, H. R. 1691, and the majority leader has assured the committee that it will be considered on the floor on Monday next.

Absenteeism—America's absenteeism—has now become Axis weapon No. 1. It is the cheapest weapon, and the deadliest, that has ever been placed at our enemies' disposal against us. Into the very heart of this huge effort of ours, the life-and-death struggle which we call our war effort, it is cutting deeper, deeper, as the race for military supremacy goes on. Our citizens have become disturbed. They sense a process of corrosion at work, undermining our war effort, eating into it like damp rot. If those who are entrusted with the command of our fighting forces seem to become desperate and helpless as they review the figures showing more and more lag in our war plants, it is because they are fighting men, with business to do on the battlefields and on the high seas, and this new weapon is stabbing them in the back.

In time of peace absenteeism is simply the failure of the worker to show up on the job when he is due. Today absenteeism is the collaboration of that missing worker with the enemies of the United States. Whether he is forced into that collaboration by circumstances beyond his own control, or whether he does so as a matter of his choice, the effect is the same. I can see no other way to define it.

[Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON further addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday next, March 2, after the address by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], a special order, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a letter on the farm problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including therein an address by my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF USE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES AND MOTORBOATS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two letters from constituents and an excerpt from an O. P. A. publication.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING IN SMALL COUNTRY NEWSPAPERS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important institutions in this country is the newspaper that serves the small city or town, or the rural area. Those newspapers will have a tough time during this war. I rise now to make an appeal that in any Government advertising program, whether it be for the sale of bonds or the recruiting of personnel for the armed forces, some of that advertising should be granted to the small papers of the Nation. Those papers are more thoroughly read by the average person who

takes them than are the large newspapers in the cities. Advertising space with them would produce more per dollar expended than almost any other kind. I urge this upon the Treasury and any other Government department or agency doing advertising of that sort.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a telegram I received this morning regarding price ceiling placed on potatoes in Kern County, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ALL-OUT EFFORT FOR WAR IN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REES of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object and do this in order that I may inquire about the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday the bill just referred to by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON], H. R. 1691, will be taken up. This is a bill authorizing the bringing of personnel injured in Hawaii home at Government expense, as I understand. It also relates to absenteeism in naval establishments. I understand 2 hours' debate have been provided under the rule.

Then there is a House resolution, if it can be brought up on Monday, the Lanham resolution, authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to continue investigation of the defense housing proposition, which has been reported out of the Rules Committee today. If we cannot get that up on Monday it will have to wait until some later date.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that does not require any additional money?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding also.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. On Monday will we have the Consent Calendar?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will say that we may dispense with the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday. That would be my intention. We had a call of that calendar recently. However, I have no fixed views on that matter personally.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I simply want to get the program; that is all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose we withhold that until a little later, and I will advise my friend and the House.

Then on Tuesday the Nichols resolution will be taken up, which relates to the establishment of an additional standing committee of the House on aviation.

I am hopeful that the lend-lease bill will be in order for Wednesday. If not Wednesday, then Thursday. In other words, I want to bring that bill up as soon as possible when it is formally reported out of committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I suppose the debate will be fairly liberal on that legislation?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have informed the members that whatever they agree upon in committee will certainly be agreeable to me. Whatever agreement any committee makes on debate on any bill is satisfactory to me, particularly at this time in the session. So I assume they will arrive at an agreement that will be satisfactory to all the membership of the committee. Whatever agreement they arrive at will be satisfactory to me. However, if something develops which precludes the lend-lease bill coming up next week, then the Navy Department appropriation bill will be taken up either Wednesday or Thursday. If the lend-lease bill is taken up, the probabilities are that the legislative situation will be such that the Navy Department appropriation bill will have to go over until the following week.

That is the general program for next week. If there are any changes, I will advise my friend and the House; but on Monday and Tuesday we will know definitely just what will be taken up then.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I gladly yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I would like to find out how much time will be allowed for debate on the Nichols resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, in the ordinary course, in the absence of a unanimous-consent request, the debate would be limited to 1 hour. As far as I am concerned, I am putting no other legislation on for Tuesday, because I assume there is such interest in that resolution that both the proponents and the opponents of the resolution would want considerably more than 1 hour.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The facts are, the rule requires 1 hour; and if any single Member wishes to object, it cannot be longer than that?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct. But I have set aside Tuesday for the consideration of that bill because I assume that both the proponents and the opponents would want considerably more debate than 1 hour.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They both might want it and not get it, because one Member can object.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct; but I have set aside Tuesday for the consideration of that resolution alone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON AVIATION

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next there be 4 hours of debate on the Nichols resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I will object at this time.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1975, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE JUDICIARY

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES, UNITED STATES COURTS

Fees of commissioners: For an additional amount for fees of commissioners, fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified under this head in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1942, $15,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, asked me a moment ago about the Consent Calendar, and I was unable to advise him and the House at that time. I have made inquiry, and I find there are 15 bills on the calendar, and the Consent Calendar will be called on Monday.

So I make that announcement for the benefit of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the Members of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses, military bases (national defense): For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, military bases, Employees' Compensation Commission, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the Employees' Compensation Commission Appropriation Act for 1943, $75,000, which total appropriation shall be available also for the administration of the act of December 2, 1942 (Public Law 784), and for the procurement outside the United States of supplies or equipment or special

services without regard to the civil service and classification laws and section 3709, Revised Statutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 5 minutes, and ask also that my time may be extended to 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order and that his time may be extended to 8 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE ENEMY WITHIN OUR GATES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the Communist Party, which has been branded by the Department of Justice as being subversive, un-American, and dedicated to the destruction of this Government, flooded the country with full-page advertisements in the daily newspapers maligning Congress and spreading their poisonous propaganda through the channels of the public press.

It must have been heartsickening to our brave boys in uniform to read that treasonous filth, published by this subversive group, led by that ex-convict, Earl Browder, in what were supposed to be respectable newspapers, for the purpose of undermining and destroying this Government and everything else that our people stand for, including the Christian religion.

These people are just as dangerous to the welfare of this Nation as if they shouldered guns and made war upon the people of this country, or openly attempted to stab our soldiers in the back.

More than a hundred years ago Sergeant S. Prentiss, perhaps the most eloquent man who ever occupied a seat in this House or any other legislative body, defined the principles of self-defense in terms that apply most forcefully to our situation today, in which he said:

> The principles of self-defense, which pervade all animated nature and act toward life the same part that is performed by the external mechanism of the eye toward the delicate sense of vision, affording it, on the approach of danger, at the same time, warning and protection, do not require that action shall be withheld till it can be of no avail.
>
> When the rattlesnake gives warning of his fatal purpose, the wary traveler waits not for the poisonous blow but plants upon his head his armed heel, and crushes out at once his venom and his strength.
>
> When the hunter hears the rustling in the jungle and beholds the large green eyes of the spotted tiger glaring upon him, he waits not for the deadly spring but sends at once through the brain of his crouching enemy the swift and leaden death.
>
> If war was declared against your country by an insulting foe, would you wait till your sleeping cities were wakened by the terrible music of the bursting bomb; till your green fields were trampled by the hoofs of the invader and made red with the blood of your brethren? No. You would send forth fleets and armies; you would unloose upon the broad ocean your keen falcons; and the thunder of your guns would arouse stern echoes along the hostile coast. Yet this would be but national defense, and authorized by the same great principle of self-protection which applies no less to individuals than to nations.

Yet today when our boys are baring their breasts to the enemy's bayonet in North Africa, in Guadalcanal, and on every other battle front in the world to protect our Government and our homes, we see this enemy, as poisonous as the rattlesnake, as treacherous as the stalking tiger, and as dangerous as an invading foe, using the daily press to further its perfidious plans of planting the dynamite of destruction under the Government of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

> During the existing war and for 6 months thereafter, reserve officers of the Public Health Service may be distributed within the several grades without regard to the proportion which obtains among the commissioned medical officers of such service.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BULWINKLE: Strike out lines 14 to 18, page 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "During the existing war, and for 6 months thereafter, any commissioned officer of the regular corps of the Public Health Service may be appointed to higher temporary grade with the pay and allowances thereof without vacating his permanent appointment, and hereafter reserve officers of the Public Health Service may be distributed in the several grades without regard to the proportion which at any time obtains or has obtained among the commissioned officers of such service."

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, there was a bill introduced to amend the public health law to take care of a situation affecting the Public Health Service. A bill is now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and before the Subcommittee on Public Health, of which I am chairman, but, due to the fact that we are having to redraft the original bill and there is an emergency in this situation which this amendment will cure.

These officers in the Public Health Service are sent to all parts of the world today. They are in Africa, in India, they are in Alaska, in Iceland, in England, and any country that the Army or Navy is in these men are there at this time. The additional language in the amendment authorizes the temporary grades to officers of the regular corps of the Public Health Service during the existing emergency. It is not permanent legislation.

Similar authority exists for temporary promotions in the Navy, Army, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. My understanding is that this is designed to take care of a temporary situation that exists during the present disturbance.

Mr. BULWINKLE. It is.

Mr. TABER. It is not anything in the nature of permanent legislation, but is to meet a situation that confronts Dr. Parran, Chief of the United States Public Health Service, and it is an item which the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has not yet had opportunity to bring in here and have passed?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. I can see no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DURHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I think the gentleman should point out that many of these men have been in the service 14 and 15 years with no promotion, is that correct?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it has no effect upon the legislation which is now pending before the gentleman's subcommittee?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No.

Mr. HINSHAW. And that legislation may in due course be passed. This particular amendment has nothing to do with the type of person that may be employed by the Public Health Service?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, by agreement on the part of the members of the committee, I am authorized to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: Page 8, line 18, after the period insert a new paragraph as follows:
>
> "CHILDREN'S BUREAU
>
> "Grants to States for emergency maternity and infant care: For grants to States, including Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, to provide, in addition to similar services otherwise available, medical, nursing, and hospital maternity for infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men in the armed forces of the United States of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades, under allotments of the Secretary of Labor and plans developed and administered by State health agencies and approved by the Chief of the Children's Bureau, $1,200,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will have to make a point of order that the amendment is not germane at this point in the bill. It comes under the Department of Labor.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I would be perfectly willing to withhold the offering of the amendment and offer it at the Department of Labor item in the bill if the gentleman will indicate to me just where that point is.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It would come to the section of the bill devoted to the Department of Labor, page 18.

Mr. KEEFE. I have no objection then to redrafting it so that it may be inserted

on page 18 or on page 19 at the end of the provision having to do with the Department of Labor.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I take it for granted that the gentleman will offer it at the place in the bill to which it is germane.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. I have no objection to doing that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] withdraws the amendment for the time being.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct an inquiry to the chairman of the committee.

On page 7, line 20 of this bill, under the heading "Public Health Service" we find this language:

Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth.

May I ask the chairman of the committee if that phrase "and so forth" is used extensively in appropriation bills? It is not clear to me just what it does mean.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The phrase is standardized and is frequently used in appropriation bills. It refers to the various allowances which go with the maintenance of such an office. It is used in order to save time and space in the bill. It is a familiar term and its significance is understood by the officials of the department and by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. CANFIELD. My only additional comment is that it seems to me we should be a little more explicit; $135,000 is a sizable sum and should be fairly described.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time in order to make certain comments about the bill, which have to do, I am sure, with the section under consideration.

I have here a newspaper clipping from last night's Washington News, from which I should like to read a couple of paragraphs. This article has to do with juvenile delinquency, one of the most important problems we face today. The first paragraph I shall read is as follows:

Major part of the delinquency increase since the war is not due to war tension and disrupted home. It is due, Dr. Winsor charged, to the way pressure groups and taxpayers' associations have used, or abused, the idea of war economy to cut public funds for services to meet delinquency problems held over from before Pearl Harbor as well as those arising since then.

The second portion I should like to read is this:

When fathers go off to war and mothers go into war industry and family incomes are reduced, we should see a strengthening, not a weakening, of school and recreational facilities, welfare and probation departments, to fill the gaps in caring for growing children. The delinquent child who gets only perfunctory, inadequate treatment from juvenile aid and probation services, who is referred to an institution but cannot be admitted because there is no room, not only fails to get adequate treatment but is confirmed in his delinquent ways by learning that nothing will happen if he continues to play truant from school or engage in harmful gang activities, it was said.

As a person who has spent a good deal of his life as a school teacher, this is a problem in which I am profoundly interested. The committee in this bill saw fit not to include any funds for the care of the children of mothers who are at work in defense industries or elsewhere. I agree with the committee's opinion as expressed in their report, that this is primarily a matter where local responsibility should be exercised to the greatest possible extent. Certainly, I do not think the Federal Government ought to run such programs. I do think there are instances where the local people, having developed an adequate program for taking care of this problem, may need Federal financial assistance. And where the local people show a need of such financial aid to carry on their program, I think we should give it to them, for this matter of giving children the best possible chance of a healthy adjustment in their formative years is one that just will not wait and which must not be neglected.

I do not believe it is desirable, if it can possibly be avoided, for mothers of children to leave their homes to go to work anywhere. I realize there are a great many mothers who must work for financial reasons and cannot help it, but surely the most important contribution any woman can make is the training of her own family and the rearing of American children.

This problem of care of children, then, is one that should be met first by doing everything possible to encourage and to make possible their mothers staying with their first and biggest job. But the fact is that today many children are not getting the care they require because their mothers are for one reason or another at work. I heartily agree that the localities should take primary responsibility. The method of providing care, recreation, and constructive activities must be then worked out in the communities by the local people. But on the purely financial side, it is my opinion that there will be a number of instances where Federal aid will be desirable and necessary to enable the local people to carry out their own programs.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. What does the gentleman think of the situation in which the mother of the family, when the father has not gone to war, is employed in a war industry, when that mother also goes into the war industry, probably in part for the lure of the money that can be made?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think she is taking a step down from the best and most important contribution she can make.

Mr. HINSHAW. I agree entirely with the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman feel that before we bring a program in here providing funds for any such purpose the agency asking the funds should come before us with a proper explanation of what they intend to use the money for so that we can know something about what we are doing?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I agree with the gentleman about that. I would say further that I think the committee would act properly in being very careful to see that the control of such programs is in the hands of local people who have really developed them and built them up. All I want is that there be available the possibility of Federal financial aid where it is necessary.

May I say a word about another phase of this problem, another item for which the committee did not allow funds, and that is the item upon which the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin has bearing, for here, in the case of the necessity for maternity care of servicemen's wives and their babies when they come into the world, there is a Federal responsibility very definite and clear. Here again I understand the committee rejected the appropriation for the reason that they felt it was not authorized in law and wanted further consideration of it, but it is clear to me that where the father of this baby has gone to war and where his wife who bears a child in his absence, while he is fighting for this country, needs maternity care, it certainly is a responsibility of the Federal Government to see that she gets this medical care and attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to point out that under the Selective Service Act as it has been drawn and under the regulations which have been promulgated under it we have a situation where in the case of persons who have been married following certain dates and now have children, the men of those families if they are of draft age are not exempt from service. It is not unnatural that such couples should have children. In many instances they have had not only one but two children since the date set out in the regulations. In any event we have that situation. It is our job to think about it and to do something about it. I do not know how you can expect a young mother with her husband drafted and gone to war to live on the allotment that is allowed and take adequate care of one or two children, unless she goes to work. We do not desire her to go to work and leave those children for some day nursery or other institutional care. We want her to take care of her children as they should be taken care of by their mother. I offer that as something to think about, as a question that has arisen under the law, and one that is highly important to the future not only of our country, but of its citizens of 20 years from now.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Construction fund, United States Maritime Commission: To increase the construction fund established by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, $4,000,000,000: *Provided*, That the amount of contract authorizations contained in prior acts for ship construction and

facilities incident thereto is hereby increased by $5,250,000,000 (toward which $3,076,280,455 is included in the amount appropriated herein): *Provided further*, That without regard to the limitations imposed thereon in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, the Commission is hereby authorized to incur obligations for administrative expenses, including the objects specified in such Appropriation Act, during the fiscal year 1943, of not to exceed $16,625,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Page 11, at the end of line 10, insert "*Provided*, That no ship owned by the United States shall be disposed of under act of March 11, 1941 (Public Law 11), as amended, except by lease."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is self-explanatory. It merely provides that upon the cessation of war activities title to these ships shall remain in the United States, and that includes naval as well as merchant vessels. It is offered here in conformity with the policy already adopted and as set forth in the provisions of the amended act.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. As I heard the amendment read, there was no restriction as to the length of the term of the lease. On other legislation we have a limit of 6 months after the conclusion of the war for the termination of the lease.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Lend-Lease Act itself takes care of that. It provides a period of termination, and any limitation here should coincide with the period provided by the Lend-Lease Act.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that perhaps there is something in what the gentleman from Minnesota calls attention to, and that perhaps the language of the Cannon amendment might be amended by adding that the lease under the Lend-Lease Act must expire 6 months after the termination of the war.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have no objection to such a provision and would accept an amendment to that effect.

Mr. MAAS. I think something should be provided in law that the lease shall terminate with the termination of the war. We should not be providing ships to foreign nations with which they could compete with ours even for 6 months after the war. I would like to see the amendment provide for the termination of the lease with the termination of the war.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Strike out the period in the amendment and insert "which must end 6 months after the conclusion of peace."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 11, line 4, insert "*Provided, further*, That no funds appropriated under this act or heretofore or hereafter appropriated under this heading, shall be available for the construction or acquisition and conversion of any vessels for use as a naval auxiliary, except on a reimbursable basis from funds appropriated to the Navy Department, pursuant to an act authorizing the construction or acquisition and conversion of auxiliary vessels for the Navy Department."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is subject to a point of order, and I make the point of order, or, if the gentleman desires to debate the amendment I shall be glad to reserve the point of order.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I join in the making of the point of order and its reservation.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter, and I shall state to the Committee how it happened, how it arose. In January the Navy Department submitted to the Budget in the usual method required by the Department for clearance, a bill to authorize the construction of a million tons of auxiliary. Bear in mind that from the beginning of time down to date the Navy has always controlled what is known in the Navy as the auxiliary shipping bills. For instance, in 1941 and 1942 we authorized 2,500,000 tons of auxiliaries. In the past that authorization has been brought before the House in a separate bill from the Naval Affairs Committee, and when it becomes law, then we go to the Committee on Appropriations to get the money to carry out the authorization. When the Navy Department in January desired to build a million tons of auxiliary, what happened? The naval budget officer from the Navy, on January 13 went before the general Budget officials and they said this:

They state that they were already giving to the Maritime Commission, Admiral Land, sufficient money to finance the building of the merchant ships which can be built according to the types which we call naval auxiliary tonnage. In addition to that, they have given and propose to continue to give the War Shipping Administration, also Admiral Land, plenty of money to convert many of the ships for Army or Navy use. The paper today states a request for $4,000,000,000 before Congress for the Maritime Commission.

Here it is in the bill. Now, what does that mean? It means that if the construction of the auxiliaries for the Navy, which are composed of tankers, supply ships, repair ships, and other ships that are armed but do not carry armament, they propose by the set-up that is now being worked out with the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, to give to the Navy its auxiliaries. Now, I am opposed to the War Shipping Administration or the Maritime Commission taking the place of Congress. In other words, what is under way now is to circumvent Congress in making the authorization, the Naval Affairs Committee in presenting it to the House, and the Naval Appropriations Committee from making the appropiration. We have no objection to the Maritime Commission acting as the agent of the Navy to construct any of its auxiliaries, but we do propose to enter a vigorous protest against the Navy Department becoming the pensioner of the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration.

Now, what is going to happen? The Navy says, "We need a million tons of auxiliaries." The Maritime Commission comes in here and gets $4,000,000,000 to build ships. It will say to the Navy, "There are certain other demands that must be met out of this pool and therefore you may not be able to get what you want." Now, who is going to run the Navy, the War Shipping Administration, the Maritime Commission, or will the Navy run itself? Congress should have a voice in the matter. You are sitting here today and permitting to happen that which we are all opposed to, that is, losing control over what goes into the Navy and what dispositions are made of the ships that are being built by the Navy. I say it is a very important matter. It is a serious matter. The Naval Affairs Committee the other day authorized a billion tons of ships.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, I am frank to admit that the amendment is legislation, but I want to say it comes with poor grace on the part of the Appropriations Committee to make a point of order against this amendment, because the very genesis of this was legislation in the last appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman would feel that the Navy should take charge of building every cargo ship that goes along in a convoy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all; but I do say that the Navy should control its auxiliaries and not turn it over to the War Shipping Administration or to the Maritime Commission. By what you are doing here, see what happens now. The Budget is refusing to clear a bill for a million tons of auxiliaries, but you tell them to get it out of the pool of the Maritime Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS]. Of course, the Chairman understands we reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Chair so understands. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I am hoping that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will withdraw the point of order against this amendment. The Naval Affairs Committee has gone into this matter very carefully and has unanimously voted to offer this amendment to this appropriation bill.

We find ourselves in a very peculiar situation, where the Naval Affairs Committee, charged by the House with the responsibility of bringing before it legislation for the composition of the Navy, is losing control, losing even the right to get information about the size of the Navy. We will not know what the composition of the Navy will be. We will not know what we ought to authorize, because we will not know what they are going to get through the Maritime Commission. They are going to build ships for the Navy. Thereafter ships will be built for the Navy that will never have been approved by the Naval Affairs Committee, nor authorized by the Congress. We are not going to know what we ought to authorize hereafter, because we will not know what they will have or what they may or may not need.

Further, I point out to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that in the category of auxiliaries they are now including escort carriers which, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, cannot be interpreted as auxiliaries. An escort carrier is a combatant vessel. We fly airplanes from it. Naval personnel—not contract labor, but naval aviators have to operate off of those carriers. The only possible interpretation of it being an auxiliary is that it escorts convoys, but it is a naval combatant vessel.

The Navy Department no longer has control over the design or the construction; it cannot even inspect these vessels, and I want to point out that after they are built it requires considerable alteration by the Navy after the Maritime Commission has built them. We do not object to the Maritime Commission's building them; we are merely asking that they act as the contract agents for the Navy, and this amendment merely provides that the Navy shall design, or shall have the final say at least on the design and on the construction and shall have some supervisory inspection service over these ships so that they shall be built for the purpose to which they are to be put in operation by the Navy.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Does not this amendment, in effect, allow the Maritime Commission to interfere in what may be a matter of naval strategy?

Mr. MAAS. The proposed situation without our amendment certainly does. Heretofore the policy has always been that military people must decide military strategy. Now you are setting up a civilian agency that sets itself over and above the military, because military strategy is dependent upon the equipment and the ships and the transports that we need to carry that strategy out. Thus, you are giving to a civilian agency the power of vetoing military strategy.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. HESS. Under this set-up, would it not be possible for the Maritime Commission, which is constructing these carriers, to turn them over to foreign nations under lend-lease?

Mr. MASS. It would. The gentleman from Missouri has offered an amendment permitting them to lease but not to transfer to our other allies; but here the Navy is told that it cannot go before the Naval Affairs Committee and ask for tonnage because it must get them from the Maritime Commission, and the Maritime Commission may say, "We are sorry; we have decided to give this to one of the United Nations under lease-lend." The Navy finds itself unable to carry out its strategy because it does not control the shipping program.

I hope the gentleman will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would completely disorganize our ship construction program; it would stop the building of ships already on the ways; it would cancel contracts requiring months to negotiate; it would throw a destructive monkey wrench into smooth-running machinery; it would delay immeasurably our war construction program.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, permission to include in the RECORD a statement submitted to the Committee on Appropriations by Admiral Land at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The memorandum is particularly pertinent and should have the careful consideration of all who are interested in expediting an efficient construction program. Under the leave granted it is included as follows:

RE: PROPOSAL TO PLACE MARITIME CONSTRUCTION OF VESSELS FOR USE AS AUXILIARIES ON A REIMBURSABLE BASIS

The present construction program of the Maritime Commission including some military and naval auxiliary construction has been carefully worked out under Presidential direction, on a maximum basis to make the most effective use of steel and other materials, ship-construction facilities, and manpower in the yards, the offices and in governmental agencies.

This is primarily true with the idea of utilizing the best shipbuilding brains in the country, always considering the brains available and the ability to produce.

The agreements and arrangements between the Maritime Commission and the other agencies worked out in the line with the program of the President cannot be disarranged without slowing down the war construction program and without a needless slowing down of the use of war manpower.

The attitude of all the agencies in the past has been to avoid any activity of an unnecessary nature in the coordination of the construction program both of strictly merchant vessels and vessels capable of use as naval or military auxiliaries, or expressly designed as such.

The proposed amendment would upset the whole accounting arrangement worked out under the President's program not only as to future construction, but as to construction heretofore constructed, acquired, or converted for naval or military use. It would throw out of pattern the appropriations made and to be made for merchant vessel construction, including certain vessels for naval or military use.

Any modification will seriously disarrange the close working cooperation now existing between the Navy Department and the United States Maritime Commission with particular reference to new construction, as it affects the all-out war effort.

The amendment would require a specific additional authorization for such construction by the Maritime Commission and involve, even if such construction should be continued by the Maritime Commission in line with the present over-all ship-construction program, a tremendous duplication of supervisory manpower as well as much dislocation of arrangements for allocation of vessels, not only shipways but shipyard labor supervision, both by the contractors and by the Government.

The job is to build the ships to help win the war. The ultimate control or permanent provision of vessels specifically designed for auxiliary use will be worked out in line with the President's program. For the present the ship-construction program and the utilization program must be kept on a coordinated, unified basis in order to make the most effective use of the available construction facilities and available tonnage in meeting necessities of the war effort.

The proposed amendment is legislation in that it retroactively amends the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. The Commission's construction fund is created by that act. That act expressly provides that vessels constructed under it must be of such design that the vessel may be suitable for economical and speedy conversion into a naval or military auxiliary, or otherwise suitable for the use of the United States Government in time of war or national emergency (see sec. 501 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936). The proposed amendment would amend and, in fact, render ineffective the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, by requiring an appropriation and a specific authorization before any vessel suitable for use as a naval auxiliary could be constructed with funds in the construction fund of the Maritime Commission. It would render illegal action lawfully taken under existing law. Construction under existing contracts would have to be stopped.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Is it not true that the construction program which the Maritime Commission has now

entered upon and which this bill implements by giving them funds to carry out the construction program upon which they are engaged and which is under the direction of the President of the United States after conference with the Navy Department? It certainly is a ridiculous and violent assumption to say that the Maritime Commission, whose one object is to build ships, cargo ships, or any other kind of ships to help win the war, would not turn over to the Navy whatever ought to be turned over to the Navy. I think we are exaggerating far beyond its importance something that would not possibly occur.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does the gentleman think the Navy should be required to get its tonnage for auxiliaries from the War Shipping Administration? Or should it get it from Congress?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the Navy should get it from Congress.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. All right; but it is not getting it from Congress.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Let me say this to my friend, my distinguished friend, my able friend, who is chairman of the great committee that gets anything it wants to have because they are usually reasonable when they ask for something in this House, that if there is any division about this, the way to do it is for my friend to bring something here from his great committee and let the Congress, after recommendations for or against by the President, act upon it. What we are doing here is exactly what the Navy has asked to be done.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. All that we are asking in this matter of auxiliary shipping, all that the Secretary of the Navy and the Navy Department is asking be done, is that the Congress control their affairs, and not the Maritime Commission.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Then does not my friend think the Secretary of the Navy and the President ought to get together?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, I think they are together.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They are not, because this is the recommendation of the Maritime Commission carrying out a program agreed upon under the direction of the President of the United States.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, in this program the Kaiser ships have been agreed upon.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the proper remedy is for the gentleman and his great committee to bring in a bill to authorize the procedur he recommends, rather than attempt it by way of amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to insist on the point of order.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I shall concede the point of order.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman concedes the point of order, I wish to emphasize the fact that the relations between the gentleman and myself in the conduct of our committees have been very cordial, and I do not want my appearance in objecting to this amendment or raising a point of order against it to be taken as an objection to the essential principles that are involved in the gentleman's amendment. I am in sympathy with the objections sought by the amendment, but I make the point of order, because I do not think that this deficiency bill is the proper place to secure those objections, for it would possibly tie up construction under existing legislation for the Maritime Commission. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's objectives.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to both the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Missouri that this does not interfere at all with any construction program of the Maritime Commission. It merely gives back to the Congress control of the auxiliary of the Navy. What is happening? It goes from the Congress under blanket authorization to the War Shipping Administration and to the Maritime Commission. If you want to control these things, let it go as it has been in the past. We want the Maritime Commission to construct the ships. They are building the ships for us today involving a hundred million dollars. We have no quarrel there, but we do say that Congress should say what constitutes a navy. The Constitution put the responsibility upon the Congress to provide and maintain a navy, not the Maritime Commission and not the Shipping Administration.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] or the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] desire to be heard further?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 11, line 4, before the word "*Provided*", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no funds appropriated under this act shall be available for the construction or acquisition and conversion of any vessel for use as a naval auxiliary which is not constructed or acquired and converted on a reimbursable basis from funds appropriated to the Navy Department pursuant to an act authorizing the construction or acquisition and conversion of auxiliary vessels for the Navy Department, and."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this amendment is not legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time of debate has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is on the point of order. I submit this is not legislation on an appropriation bill. It is a limitation on the money to be used in the construction of certain types of ships.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I speak very briefly on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation bill provides money for the construction of ships by the Maritime Commission. As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia, it simply limits those funds as to the type of ships for which the funds might be used and is, therefore, very definitely a limitation on the appropriation itself and not legislation.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard briefly?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, the beginning of the section is that the appropriation is made to increase the construction fund established by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and any amendment such as proposed by the gentleman effects an amendment to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. If legislation is brought in to accomplish the purpose which the gentleman desires, I have no objection, but I am unable and he is unable to say what effect it will have upon the fund that is provided for the work now in progress. But whether that is true or not, it would be an amendment to the construction fund provided by the Merchant Marine Act.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, here is an authorization for the Maritime Commission to build ships, any kind of ships. We put a limitation on it and say they cannot build a certain type of ship. That certainly is not legislation. It is a limitation. That is the whole point.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All debate has been closed.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The debate had not closed on the section and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first dispose of the point of order.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] raises a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have withdrawn the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] insist on the point of order?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] provides for a limitation upon the appropriation contained in this

bill. Therein it differs from the last amendment offered.

The gentleman from Missouri raises the point of order that the amendment is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

The Chair thinks that clearly this is merely a limitation upon an appropriation, therefore overrules the point of order.

Under the unanimous agreement, all debate on this paragraph of the bill was confined to 10 minutes, which time has expired; therefore no further debate is permissible on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 81, noes 40.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 10, line 24, strike out "$4,000,000,000" and insert "$3,772,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to take out the money that would be required for the 36 aircraft carriers that would have to be built some other way and not out of this appropriation, under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 46, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of and for expenditures authorized by the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148-148e), including surveys and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian citizens, fiscal year 1943, $3,500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1944.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, realizing the sentiment of the House with reference to increasing any appropriations provided in the bill by the committee, I am not going to offer an amendment to increase this appropriation from $3,500,000 to the amount requested by the President through the Bureau of the Budget. The Budget asks for $3,944,000. This was cut to $3,500,000 by the committee.

On the 1st of January a meeting was held in Denver of the State officials having to do with insect and grasshopper control. At that meeting it was decided that it was necessary in view of the conditions that at least the sum of $4,250,000 should be provided. Later the Budget submitted a request for $3,944,000. These funds are used for the control of several insects but the one in which we are the most interested is the grasshopper. Approximately 12,900 tons of bait are estimated as necessary for the Western States infested with this pest. Montana needs the greatest amount of bait material, 2,075 tons; Nebraska comes second with an estimate of 1,280; Texas third, with 1,250; and the others fall in line below that mark.

The States that are interested in this item are Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, and Washington.

I want to make this record, Mr. Chairman, so when the matter comes before the Senate Committee on Appropriations they will be apprised of the necessity for an increase of this amount.

Last year there was appropriated the full amount asked by the Budget, $3,950,000. That was cut this year; yet last year was a good year for production, and with a very successful campaign of control, still 5 percent of the crops in these Western States was destroyed by the insects, principally by grasshoppers.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not hear the gentleman mention the State of Arizona as being one also afflicted by grasshoppers.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right.

Mr. MURDOCK. I assure the gentleman it is one of the Western States that is so afflicted.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is one of the vital States that is so affected. I am sorry I omitted the gentleman's State and hurry to assure the gentleman it was not intentional. I do not want to criticize the committee for I know they are trying to cut down on every nonessential item, as they term it, but the production of food is just as essential today as any other factor vital to our military effort. I am not going to offer an amendment, because I feel confident the committee would have to oppose it and defend the bill, and I feel that the House consequently would probably vote down the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I hope the gentleman has recognized that in the language of this bill there is a provision that allows the Federal Government to work on range lands this year. This is the first time it has been done. I think this is of great benefit to the gentleman's State.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is very true. This is what happens. As a rule the grasshoppers infest the range land and then later when the grass becomes not so good they get over into the crops and destroy the crops. The importance of protecting essential food and fiber crops from the threatening populations of grasshoppers and the scarcity of labor for the coming crop season no doubt prompted the Department to request funds to extend its part of the cooperative effort to combat grasshopper control somewhat beyond the practice followed in preceding years. The estimate submitted contemplated the procurement and transportation of bait materials to distribution centers where they will be available to farmers for use in protecting cultivated crops. Approximately 12,900 tons of bait will be needed to apply control on somewhat more than 2,000,000 acres of croplands. In addition to this the estimate contemplated the purchase and application of approximately 14,800 tons of bait to an additional 3,900,000 acres through the use of trained assistants working under supervision and using equipment furnished by the Government.

The heavy infestations that may occur on range lands will also destroy large quantities of valuable forage needed for food of livestock. The control of grasshoppers on range and idle lands is, therefore, of special importance in connection with the production of food needed because of the war effort.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for payment of interest on moneys held in trust for the several Indian tribes, as authorized by various acts of Congress, fiscal year 1942, $35,000.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us a deficiency bill. I am not rising to make any effort to have reintroduced into it any of the funds that have been taken out, but I do rise to bring to your attention something of vital moment to the Nation and to the future of our country, which is larger than the Nation.

We are finding on every hand that our homes are being endangered. Our men are with the forces and intensively on the production lines. Our women are being called upon to take an increasingly active part in the war program. The cross purposes at which we are working in so many of our war efforts mean that one group pulls people out and the other group tries to put them in. I assert very, very feelingly today the hope that this Congress will take into consideration a fundamental principle of the future, which is the children, and their homes. Without adequate maternity care, without proper environment, without the protection of the home itself, we are going to lose our virility, we are going to lose everything for which this entire holocaust is taking place.

Those of us who work in the field of social hygiene know that the increase of venereal diseases among children down to the age of 5 years is shocking beyond measure. Why? Because in so many instances the mothers and the fathers are out of the home and no one is responsible. England has found that it is uneconomic to have the children below certain ages brought into nurseries; perhaps we will find the same thing. But let us find ways to protect our mothers and through them the children now. Let us find ways to make it possible for the mothers of children, say under 12 years of age, to be constrained to stay at home. On one hand many people are trying to do this, but on the other hand our terrible need for production is drawing these women out. The young women of the world are the future of the world, and their children must be protected in every possible way. So I would urge you,

even as I charge myself, to be exceedingly watchful in the Committee on Appropriations, and in every committee on which we sit. Let us be careful lest in our endeavor to be more careful of money, we be less careful of life, less careful of health, less careful of the right of the children to be physically well born, with adequate mental capacity to be constructive citizens, with such opportunity as can be given only through an adequate home whose influences are those of emotional security.

Have you any conception of what it is to a child to find home insecure, mother not there, daddy not there? The child wonders what has happened, and fears that perhaps they do not care so much as they used to care, and feels lost—responsible to no one, often with serious consequence.

We must not permit the war, terrible as its needs are, to make us forget that the peace needs are going to be even greater. Can you imagine a time in which it could be more important to have people of good physical strength and vitality, clear minds, trained emotions, and God-fearing spirits than in that time which is coming after this war—the time we call peace, the time for building the new world? What are we building a new world for? Are we building a new world for social and moral cripples, physical cripples, or are we going to protect it from those admissions of our failure to be true to the great laws of life?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Statistics (national defense): For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Statistics (national defense), fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1943, $12,300.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 19, line 3, after the period, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"CHILDREN'S BUREAU

"Grants to States for emergency maternity and infant care: For grants to States, including Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, to provide, in addition to similar services otherwise available, medical, nursing, and hospital maternity and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men in the armed forces of the United States of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades, under allotments by the Secretary of Labor and plans developed and administered by State health agencies and approved by the Chief of the Children's Bureau, $1,200,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I make the point of order that the amendment is not authorized by law.

Mr. KEEFE. I ask the gentleman to withhold the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I should be very glad to withhold the point of order. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri reserves the point of order.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the first necessity of childhood is provision for safe arrival into the world. A year ago it became apparent that many young women, wives of men in the armed services, often living away from home and expecting their first babies, would not be able to obtain good maternity care throughout the prenatal period and at the time of childbirth, unless public maternal and child-health services could be provided when good care was not otherwise available. Many of the wives living near army posts are nonresidents and, therefore, not eligible for certain community services. Private funds have been made available for emergency care for a number of these women, or more often for the cost of sending them back from the camps to their home towns, but often it is not feasible for the wife to go elsewhere. As the number of cases increase, private funds have proved to be insufficient to meet the need of medical and hospital care. The Army has been forced to discontinue in many areas the provision of medical or hospital care for wives and children of service men which it usually provides during peacetime. American Red Cross officials have indicated the inability of their chapters to meet the need. Neither the Red Cross, the Army Emergency Relief, nor the Navy Relief Society have the organization to carry out a program of maternity care of the size indicated. The State health departments already have the administrative organization to undertake such a program in their maternal and child-health divisions and local public health services.

Red Cross representatives at 240 Army posts reported that in the one month from July 15 to August 15, 1942, 3,262 soldiers requested help in securing maternity care for their wives; 39 percent of these requests were for assistance in obtaining care for wives living near the army posts, and 61 percent were requests for assistance in obtaining care of wives living in another State.

The problem of maternity care exists not only near the camps but also in many home communities where wives and children of service men are living and where public provision for maternity care or medical care of children is not available or is inadequate. The American Red Cross reports that 2,601 requests from soldiers' and sailors' wives for help in obtaining maternity care or care for their sick children were received in the month of August 1942 in a 10-percent cross-section of chapters in 46 States.

Dependents' allowances for privates and the lower grades of noncommissioned officers are not sufficient unless the families have other income to provide for the costs of maternity care and care of sick children, which amount to at least $70 and $80 per case for maternity care and at least $20 or $30 for medical care of the baby during the first year of life.

At the request of the State health officers, the Children's Bureau has made special allotments during the current year from maternal and child health funds available under the Social Security Act for grants to State health agencies. Altogether $390,177 has been made available to meet the need for medical, nursing, and hospital maternity and infant care. At the beginning of the program 38 State health departments indicated that a total of $544,900 would be needed. Twenty-eight States are now carrying on these programs under plans approved by the Children's Bureau, most of them not getting under way until the second quarter of this fiscal year. Physicians attending women eligible for care may state in the application for care whether hospital care is needed, and if so, authorization may be given by the State health agency. Proof of financial need is not required, but it must be shown that similar care is not otherwise available. The State plans set up rates of payment to physicians and hospitals and to agencies providing visiting-nurse care.

Experience during the past 5 months shows that the demand for this service is very great; the sums available have not been sufficient to enable some States to accept all the cases for which application has been made. One State, for example, in December 1942 had a waiting list of 300, and another a waiting list of 400.

On February 3, 1943, the President transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Children's Bureau for the fiscal year 1943 in the amount of $1,200,000 for grants to States for the payment of maternity care and infant care for the wives and infants of the men in the armed forces of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades—grades carrying monthly base pay of $78 or under. The grants are to be made in accordance with plans developed and administered by State health agencies and approved by the Chief of the Children's Bureau. The pending amendment would restore this amount to the present bill. I fully realize that the amendment offered is subject to the point of order that the amount requested is in excess of the amount authorized by the maternal and child-welfare sections of the Social Security Act. We were in hopes that the point of order would not be raised. The problem is here. It is critical and should prompt the proper legislative committee to act at once in bringing in legislation that will give proper legislative authority for this appropriation.

The following questions and answers and the following letters answer many questions in relation to this amendment:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CONCERNING PROPOSAL FOR AN APPROPRIATION FOR GRANTS TO STATES FOR EMERGENCY MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE

(For more detailed information see hearings, pp. 317-329)

1. Is there legislative authority for the appropriation?

There is certainly a basis for work of this kind in title V, part 1, of the Social Security

Act—in fact there is full authority as to everything except the amount of appropriation authorized. This title, section 501, authorizes appropriations "for the purpose of enabling each State to extend and improve, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, services for promoting the health of mothers and children." The methods of administration which would be followed with respect to the new funds would be in accordance with procedures, policies, and regulations relating to maternal and child-health programs under the Social Security Act. Limited programs of the kind proposed are already in operation under these provisions, and the new money would merely provide for an extension of these programs.

2. Why is the proposal intended to benefit only the enlisted men of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh pay ratings of the armed services?

Because these are the men whose pay rates are so low that they are unable to provide these services for their wives and children. These are also the grades covered by legislation providing allotments and allowances to dependents of men in the armed forces. Enlisted men in the first, second, and third grade are entitled to quarters or monthly allowances for quarters for dependents. (At present approximately $38.)

3. What is the basis of eligibility for care?

Eligibility is determined by the State health agency on the basis of an application from the physician to whom the woman applies for care, stating that maternity care or medical care for infants and health supervision for such infants is needed. No test of financial need is required but care will not be approved if similar services are otherwise available (through facilities provided by the Army, Navy, State, and local health agencies or other local authorities).

4. How are funds to be allotted?

Allotments to States will be made by the Secretary of Labor on the basis of the financial need of each State for carrying out its plan, taking into consideration the number of children born in the State whose fathers are in the armed forces of the United States, the extent to which there are unusually large concentration of troops in the State, and the experience of the State as to applications for care. (See information on numbers of births whose fathers are in the military service, attached.)

5. What requirements will the Children's Bureau require to be incorporated in the plan submitted by the State health agency before such plan can be approved?

a. That costs of State and local administration will be provided from existing funds or new funds provided by States or localities, without recourse to the funds provided by the new appropriation.

b. That care will be available only when the father is an enlisted man of the specified grades in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

c. That the requirements of section 503 (a), subsections 2 to 4 and 6, are met. (These requirements provide for administration of the plan or supervision of the administration of the plan by the State health agency; such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan; such reports as may be required by the Secretary of Labor; and provision for cooperation with medical, nursing, welfare groups and organizations.)

6. What provision will be made with reference to costs per case?

The State plan will provide for maximum rates for care of certain types and for agreements with hospitals made by the State health agency in accordance with procedures outlined in the regulations. Costs of hospital care will be calculated on basis of per diem ward costs.

7. What will be the annual cost?

The amount of $1,200,000 will provide for about 15,000 cases in 1 quarter, or about two-fifths of the births expected to men in the armed forces during that quarter. The total annual cost would range from $5,000,000 to $6,000,000 and would cover from a third to a half of the cases. Costs are estimated as averaging $75 for maternity cases and $20 for health supervision and medical care of infants during 1 year. There will, of course, be considerable variation in cost per case depending on whether hospital care is required and other factors.

8. How many States are now cooperating in a program of this kind?

Money was set aside under maternal and child-health funds for 29 States. Plans for 27 States had been approved at the time of the hearing. (See p. 328.) An additional plan has since been approved. The list of States as given in table 1, page 328, is correct as of today as to States with approved plans, with the exception of Virginia, which has withdrawn its affiliation for the time being. Funds have been exhausted in a number of States (9 States as of the date of the hearing).

9. What is the extent of the need?

The extent of the need is shown on page 325 of the hearings. It is important to note that the Army and Navy formerly provided medical and hospital care for dependents of service men without regard to financial need. The Army has been forced to discontinue in many areas the provision of such care which it usually provides during peacetime. American Red Cross officials have indicated the inability of their chapters to meet the need. Colonel Myer, of the Army Emergency Relief, wrote the Children's Bureau in August that "none except emergency cases are included in which we give assistance." On December 8 a letter from the Army Air Forces Branch, District of Columbia Division of the Army Emergency Relief, signed by Lavinia H. Van Nostrand for the first vice president, stated: "I am so interested in this program because in our Army Emergency Relief, Air Forces Branch, we have many calls for assistance fron prospective mothers. There just isn't any provision made for them in our relief program."

As stated in the hearings, Red Cross representatives at 240 Army posts reported that in the 1 month from July 15 to August 15, 1942, 3,262 soldiers requested help in securing maternity care for their wives; 39 percent of these requests were for assistance in obtaining care for wives living near the Army post, and 61 percent were requests for assistance in obtaining care of wives living in another State.

The problem of maternity care exists not only near the camps but also in many home communities where wives and children of service men are living and where public provision for maternity care or medical care of children is not available or is inadequate. The American Red Cross reports that 2,601 requests from soldiers' and sailors' wives for help in obtaining maternity care or care for their sick children were received in the month of August 1942 in a 10-percent cross-section of chapters in 46 States.

In a letter dated August 25, 1942, from the Salinas Valley Chapter, Salinas, Calif., of the American Red Cross, the following statement is made:

"It so happens that within the past 2 weeks the situation has grown out of bounds, due to the increase of Army population and also to the fact that this is the time when we might rightfully expect an increase of babies.

"The Army hospital at the Presidio of Monterey has taken these women for prenatal care and for delivery until 2 weeks ago, when this service had to be discontinued. This left the Salinas Valley Chapter with about 50 expectant mothers with no arrangement for prenatal or maternity care.

"We, of course, are trying to work this out with the county health officers. For the time being, the presidio is continuing its prenatal clinic. At the last clinic session our women left home at 7:45 in the morning and returned to Salinas, a distance of 20 miles, about 2:30 in the afternoon, having had no lunch. Only one physician was available."

The following case has been reported by the State Health Department of Wisconsin:

"Corporal X, extremely worried and concerned, appeared at the health department, sent by the Sisters at St. —— Hospital, where his wife had been confined 2 days before. The Sisters had asked him about meeting the hospital charges and he had had to tell them that he had absolutely no funds. The couple had come from the Dakotas and this was their first baby. Shortly before confinement, Mrs. X had a short hospitalization and Corporal X was paying on these charges. They lived in an old apartment house in a poor part of town and shared both kitchen and bathroom with neighbors. The income was $94 monthly, of which $35 went for rent, $7 for military insurance, $2.50 for bonds (deducted), $2.50 camp laundry (deducted), $25 for food, and a few dollars a week on the old hospital bill. The couple had been unable to provide anything for the baby, and all that was in readiness were some things the landlady and neighbors had sewed for it. The physician at the Army camp had given prenatal care, but was unwilling to sign an application for hospital care at health department expense, as he thought free services should be only for the destitute; therefore, the health department felt it could do nothing further."

---

[From The Child of November 1942]

SAFEGUARDING THE HEALTH OF MOTHERS AND CHILDREN

MATERNITY CARE FOR WIVES OF MEN IN MILITARY SERVICE

*State plans approved*

By October 1942 State and territorial health departments had requested from the Children's Bureau funds amounting to more than $1,500,000 to provide obstetric and pediatric medical care and hospital care for the families of men in military service. Plans had been received from 25 States and Hawaii and most of these had been approved and were in operation: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washingto Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Funds totaling $308,000 have been allotted to these States to meet immediate needs. No further funds can be allotted to these States from current Fund B appropriations. Appropriation of additional funds depends on the passage of bills now in Congress.

In several of the States the services are made available on a State-wide basis; in others they are limited to the most critical areas surrounding military posts. Some of the plans provide only maternity care; others include care for sick children under 1 year of age.

*Percentage of newborn babies whose fathers are in military service*

The percentage of all babies born whose fathers are in military service is already substantial and is on the increase. Preliminary figures based on birth certificates filed during May, June, and July 1942 are available for 28 States and the District of Columbia. The following tabulation shows the percentage of

these babies whose fathers were stated to be soldiers or sailors:

| State | Total births | Children of men in military service | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number | Percent of total |
| Total, 28 States and District of Columbia | 309,357 | 9,176 | 3.0 |
| District of Columbia | 5,089 | 401 | 7.9 |
| Wyoming | 1,419 | 85 | 6.0 |
| Kansas [1] | 8,416 | 460 | 5.5 |
| Rhode Island | 3,428 | 166 | 4.8 |
| Georgia | 13,618 | 642 | 4.7 |
| Maryland | 4,092 | 188 | 4.6 |
| Louisiana | 9,354 | 408 | 4.4 |
| Nebraska | 5,655 | 240 | 4.2 |
| Utah | 3,933 | 166 | 4.2 |
| Oregon | 5,697 | 234 | 4.1 |
| New Mexico | 3,475 | 135 | 3.9 |
| Arizona | 3,076 | 114 | 3.7 |
| Maine | 4,480 | 160 | 3.6 |
| North Carolina | 21,118 | 765 | 3.6 |
| Idaho | 2,981 | 104 | 3.5 |
| Delaware | 1,397 | 43 | 3.1 |
| West Virginia | 9,469 | 282 | 3.0 |
| Illinois | 35,004 | 958 | 2.7 |
| Missouri | 15,681 | 425 | 2.7 |
| Tennessee | 15,750 | 388 | 2.5 |
| Mississippi | 11,870 | 285 | 2.4 |
| Ohio | 33,971 | 812 | 2.4 |
| Indiana | 16,303 | 367 | 2.3 |
| North Dakota [2] | 2,950 | 68 | 2.3 |
| Michigan | 29,987 | 675 | 2.3 |
| Iowa | 11,999 | 265 | 2.2 |
| South Dakota | 3,105 | 66 | 2.1 |
| Vermont | 1,810 | 38 | 2.1 |
| Wisconsin [3] | 23,330 | 236 | 1.0 |

[1] Data for June, July, and August.
[2] July data incomplete.
[3] Figures for 5 months, January–May 1942.

Thus 3 percent of all the babies whose births were registered in these States in May, June, and July 1942 were born to wives of men in military service. In nine States and the District of Columbia the percentage was more than 4. But in the fall of 1941 not only was the total strength of the military force much less than it is now, but the proportion of married men in the services was much smaller.

In 22 States, where it was possible to analyze the figures by months, the percentage rose from an average of 2.7 in May to 3.1 in June and 3.7 in July.

The Children's Bureau has information which indicates that the proportion of married men in the armed forces more than doubled in the short period from December 1941 to April 1942. Indications are that the increase is continuing. On the basis of this information and the figures presented in the table, it may be conservatively estimated that 5 percent of the births in the United States in the year beginning July 1942 will be to wives of men in the armed forces. Since the information available as to the strength of the armed forces in the fall of 1941 and the proportion of married men in them agrees well with the results of the information tabulated from birth certificates, State health officers may find it useful to study birth certificates registered in planning programs for maternity care for soldiers' and sailors' wives.

For children born of unmarried parents whose fathers are in military service the percentage is probably much higher than for all babies. In one State, Michigan, for which information is available, from birth certificates filed during May, June, and July 1942, it appears that 2.3 percent of all babies were stated to have fathers in military service, compared with nearly 10 percent of the children born out of wedlock. This figure, of course, is based on a small sample, but at least it can be taken to indicate that this problem is especially acute.

---

### MATERNITY CARE FOR WIVES OF MEN IN MILITARY SERVICE

Letters and reports have come to the Children's Bureau from 21 States, written by physicians and nurses, as well as health officers, who are administering the programs. The States represented are Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin.

#### EXCERPTS FROM THESE LETTERS AND REPORTS

From a physician in Olympia, Wash., writing to the State health department:

"In reply to your letter of January 30, 1943, concerning the possibility of having to discontinue the care of maternity cases who are dependents of soldiers.

"I think it rather important that every effort be made to continue this program.

"Last June I made a survey and found the wives of 2,500 enlisted men living in Olympia. Since then two eastern divisions have arrived at Fort Lewis, and this number has increased. This is a potential problem.

"Thurston County has no hospital, and these people are living in furnished rooms, so that hospitalization is necessary either here or as an emergency at Fort Lewis.

"I find that room and board in Olympia at present is about $60 per month, with room alone at $28 per month as a minimum. From this you can readily see that these people have no funds themselves. In fact, the aftercare of these people is becoming a problem where they are living in rooms.

"These wives are a long way from their relatives, in case of one division, the New York and New Jersey, so transporting them home is not practical.

"It might be worth while to contact the Governor and see if the legislature would send a memorial to Congress urging an appropriation.

"If I can be of any assistance, let me know."

And two others from Minnesota—women needing help for themselves:

"DEAR SIR: Am writing you in regards of my confinement that is to be in April. My husband is in Army, a private in Hawaii, and I was told that there is a help in paying for cases of Army wives' confinements. So would like to hear from you in regards to this matter.

"I am staying home, but I have to pay for board and room, and after buying fuel for heating my room, there isn't much left from my checks from War Department. So, please write and let me know all details about this.

"Mrs. M. ———,
*"115 W. ——— St., Winona, Minn.*
"My doctor is: Dr. ———."

"DEAR SIRS: Through my doctor, I have received information that you help soldiers' wives with hospital expenses.

"I am expecting a baby in less than a month. My husband is a private in the Army and as yet I haven't received my allotment. Being without anything whatsoever for 4 months has made my past expenses quite high. I am staying at home or otherwise I don't know what I would have done.

"My doctor told me that you helped others—soldiers and their wives—in similar cases, who have needed help. If I could but hear further about this I would appreciate it very much.

"It would be such a comfort if I could possibly get aid with this expense.

"Sincerely yours,
"Mrs. H. ———,
*"Route 2, Wayzata, Minn."*

From a public-health nurse in Boise, Idaho, reporting three cases of wives of servicemen under her care:

"Mrs. H., a young mother of three children, lives with her parents. The husband is stationed in Australia. The husband has not seen the youngest child, who is now 5 months old. The child is suffering from malnutrition. Immediate hospitalization of infant was recommended by the pediatrician and finances were taken care of."

From the chief of social service, Duke University Hospital, Durham, N. C.:

"As you know, quite a number of women have been given maternity care in Duke Hospital under maternal and child health services. Previous to this plan for enlisted men's wives and infants we had an increasing number of nonresident women and infants needing medical care and without sufficient funds to pay for it.

* * * * *

"One girl came from California to Durham because her husband had relatives here and he is stationed at a camp about 100 miles from here. She was quite relieved to be accepted here under the plan because she has a possible heart disease.

* * * * *

"Yesterday, Mrs. X, an 18-year-old white woman, wife of a private at Camp Butner, was admitted as an emergency to Duke Hospital. She is 7 months pregnant and has had some bleeding throughout most of the pregnancy. She and her husband, previous to his induction 4 months ago, were tenant farmers in Alabama. He was drafted before he was able to sell his crop so that they not only did not have any money except for the Army pay and allowance, but also had several debts. When their other baby was born 18 months ago he had 'Doc W., a wonderful doctor—knew him all his life,' deliver her at home and she had come through it all right although she almost had a miscarriage several times. In Durham they had lived in a home where there are several other Army families. She had been to a local physician twice. Private X meant for her to come to the hospital, but didn't know how he was going to pay for her delivery. He felt he should have watched his wife closer, but she never complained. A neighbor and landlord brought her to the clinic. * * * Her husband was surprised when told of this plan for paying for hospitalization and with an obviously relieved expression said 'sure takes a load of worry off my shoulders.' No one had told him about it before and several men in his company are in his same fix. * * *

"A number of infants have also been hospitalized under this plan and much the same relief and appreciation is shown by the parents. Again the living conditions, strain, and tension mothers are under in a new environment will undoubtedly affect the health of babies. This past week a mother and 6-month-old baby arrived at the local bus station after a 3-day bus trip from Missouri. They came to be with the soldier stationed at Camp Butner who had never seen the baby and wanted to before he was sent out. They had no place to live, of course knew nothing about local medical facilities, nor had the money to pay for medical care. The baby was critically ill with pneumonia, was referred to the hospital by the Travelers Aid Service upon arrival at the bus station and immediately admitted to this hospital under the plan."

A nurse in New Jersey reports the following case:

"Mrs. T is a young woman, under 20, married to a private who is stationed elsewhere; living with her mother-in-law. Mrs. T expects a baby in April. She has been receiving prenatal care from a local physician. She has been worried about how she could pay for medical and hospital care at time of delivery since neither she nor her mother-in-law have any independent means. When she learned, through her physician, that the State MCH program would pay for this care, she was overjoyed, since this seemed the solution of her previously insoluble problem. The young woman was frightened about having a baby. Her mother-in-law seemed as much frightened as the girl herself. The public-health nurse understood the girl's anxieties and told her about the type of care she would get, summing it up by saying, 'we will take care of you as though you were our daughter.' This reassurance

evidently meant much to the girl and she appeared much calmer and happier."

From South Dakota comes the report of two mothers who had had maternity care under the State health department plan. Both had Caesarian operations:

"Mrs. X's husband is a private in the Army. A normal 7½-pound baby boy was delivered by Caesarian section on December 28. This program made it possible for Mrs. X to have good antepartum, intrapartum, and postpartum service.

"Her parents are of the very low-income group and financial aid was necessary."

"Mrs. S is a primipara, 24 years old and the wife of a private first-class. She lives in a small home with her parents, brother and his family. This home has only two bedrooms and, as a result, the expectant mother had to sleep on a davenport.

"Prenatal care was given by a physician and public-health nurse. The medical and hospital obstetric care program made it possible for Mrs. S to be brought to the hospital 2 weeks prior to delivery. A normal 7-pound male was delivered by Caesarian section."

From Phoenix, Ariz., a nurse reports that previous maternity care in Army hospitals is no longer available. This case illustrates the need for a planned service:

"This case was that of a private's wife who received her prenatal care at Luke Field, expecting to be delivered there until within a week's time of delivery. She was then advised that they were no longer able to care for obstetrical cases. Captain ——— was notified of this and arrangements made by him at St. ——— Hospital, which has accommodations for five cases. This mission is primarily for the colored population but due to the emergency consented to care for the needs of this type of case. Due to their limited accommodations, they were only able to keep this woman 3 days from time of delivery. She was then returned to her home where she is taking care of the baby by herself with the help of her husband. Captain ——— requested the assistance of the city health nurse and both the nurse and doctor have been making frequent calls at the home."

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of the House can subscribe to the tender and human sentiments expressed by the lovely and gracious gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and those expressed so forcibly and so well by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. However, there are definite limits within which the Congress may act when you have a particular measure before you for consideration. This committee is an appropriation committee and not a legislative nor a policy committee. Every committee of this House, policy-making committee, and rightfully so, is extremely jealous of its prerogatives. The Appropriations Committee would be criticized severely if it attempted to legislate on this matter. Speaking as a member of the Appropriations Committee I would be among the first to criticize the action of my own committee if we should attempt to enter into the broad field of legislation and policy making in this House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Please allow me to finish my remarks and then I will gladly yield.

Under the Children's Bureau we have an authorization for $5,280,000 per year, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] informed you. This sum has already been appropriated for the fiscal year 1943 and the Budget estimate for a like amount is now pending for 1944. But all that is authorized by that act has been appropriated and there is no further authority to appropriate under the act. As a matter of fact, it is not broad enough to do what is here contemplated. It provides for prenatal and postnatal care, but not for obstetrical services or hospitalization in confinement. In other words, there is no legislative authority for the appropriation which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] seeks. Furthermore, there is no policy delineated by the House or the Senate or by the National Assembly with reference to this particular matter. Thus far it has been administered solely by the whims or caprice or by orders or directives of an adminisrative agency of the Federal Government, without the approval of the Congress.

Another weakness of this proposal is that it is not universal in its application to children to be born to the men of the armed services. It selects only the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh pay grades of enlisted men. It does not base the provisions of the aid upon any lack of financial ability. It does not base the appropriation upon any lack of facilities existing in any particular community. I took occasion to call the War Department this morning with reference to this item to find what their interest was in it. There has been no request by the War Department for an appropriation or for action of this sort. I was informed that to the extent of their ability, to the limit of their hospital capacity, at every Army post the facilities of the hospital for maternity cases for wives of officers and enlisted men of all ranks and grades were made available.

In view of these facts, even though the point of order should be overruled, I think the House would be quite unwise in taking this step until there has been careful and deliberate consideration of the whole subject matter and the Congress of the United States has established a policy under which the War Department should operate—I am doubtful as to the wisdom of placing this subject matter under the Department of Labor. I think we are not to be criticized in raising a point of order or justly criticized in voting down this amendment on its merits in this particular case, when you consider all the facts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman help us secure legislation along lines that will be beneficial?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] has expired.

Does the gentleman from Missouri insist upon the point of order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order. I conceded it in my statement to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin concedes the point of order.

The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Domestic Air Mail Service: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1942, for the inland transportation of mail by aircraft, $343,299.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that I served for 4 years on the welfare committee in the Ohio Legislature and during that time have studied rather extensively a long-range program for underprivileged children. I would like briefly to give to the Members of this House a code of ethics which is in keeping with the remarks made a few moments ago by the Honorable Mrs. BOLTON of the Twenty-second Ohio District.

Every child has the inalienable right to be born free from disease, free from deformity, and of pure blood. Every child has the inalienable right to be loved, to have individuality respected, to be trained wisely in body, mind, and soul. In a word, to be brought up in the fear and admiration of the Lord. I trust that any committees or subcommittees dealing with appropriation measures will bear this thought in mind when they allocate moneys affecting a child-welfare program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1943, to be available also for the protection and repair of the Rio Grande rectification and canalization project, $300,000, to remain available until June 30, 1944.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise particularly to ask a few questions with reference to certain items in this particular section of the bill. I notice on page 21, in line 18, an item of $35,000 for representation allowance of the Foreign Service. As I understand it, there is about $125,000 that was formerly allowed, and that amount was increased last year to $150,000. Now, here is an extra item of $35,000 to be added to the $150,000 for additional expense for the use of foreign representatives. When you use the term as it is used here, "for representation," I wonder what the item of representation really means? Allowances are made for living costs. If this is in addition to living-cost allowances, we should know something as to how it is spent. Does it apply to items necessary for the living of these representatives? I think the item of $35,000 ought to be explained, if there is anyone who can explain it and can tell us the purpose for which the funds are to be expended.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Or is the gentleman specifically asking the chairman of the committee to explain?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The representation allowance has nothing to do with the living allowance. The Foreign Service is given living allowances, and even light allowances, rent allowances, to cover differences in the exchange of money and other things. This has to do with the so-called entertainment fund.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What kind of entertainment? Does the gentleman mean that it is to provide liquor and other luxuries, or something like that?

Mr. STEFAN. It is for food and beverages; I think this particular item has to do with some emergency in Europe.

Mr. REES of Kansas. All right, now, let me call your attention to the item on page 23 where there is a much larger amount requested that is an additional item for representation. We have not been told how much the representation is going to cost, but it seems to include a lot of items for emergency auxiliary people. Who are they? This appears to be a rather new group. These representatives already have their necessary expenses paid. Is it not fair to know what the representation cost will amount to and the purpose for which it is to be used?

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman that this probably would be subject to a point of order, but, as I understand it, this is for representation allowances in South America for an auxiliary force that we are going to send to South America. I would call the gentleman's attention, however, to the fact that the subcommittee which is making the regular appropriation for the Department of State is now holding hearings on quite a gigantic sum to be paid for an auxiliary force going into South America. This item is to furnish that auxiliary force with a representation allowance, or, rather, entertainment allowance. I think this might run to around $90,000, and that the whole amount of the representation allowances for all phases would run to around $290,000 when it is wound up. I think there should be some debate on this item.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Two hundred thousand dollars or two hundred and ninety thousand dollars sounds like quite a considerable item for representation. I think somebody should tell us what this money is going to be spent for. If we are going to spend money for parties or some kind of entertainment, it appears like a lot of money for that purpose, and if we are going to spend a part of it for refreshments they should tell us about it. If this is an item of expenditure that should not be explained, we ought to be told. If it takes most of it for entertainment, and it is the thing we are expected to do, then let us know that, too. If none of these funds from the Public Treasury are for beverages, tell us about it. If the chairman of the committee thinks it is to be used for beverages, all right; if that is what they want it for, tell us, and why.

Mr. STEFAN. It is for food and beverages.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I call the gentleman's attention to the language of the bill. Nothing in this bill appropriates money for any purpose such as suggested by the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What does "representation" mean?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The testimony before the committee on this item, Mr. Chairman, was largely and necessarily off the record; but I may say to the gentleman that the provision is for extra services in neutral countries, especially in Portugal and Sweden, where it is important for us to increase our diplomatic and consular representation, because in these two countries we are taking care of our interests throughout the world in those enemy countries in which we are now without representation. This amount is the smallest commensurate with reasonable disposition of our diplomatic business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But I am directing the Chairman's attention to the item on page 23. This is a different part of the bill. Those items have nothing to do with the European situation. It looks to me like a brand-new set-up from the appearance of it, and it is costing $290,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. My understanding was that the gentleman referred to representation allowances on page 21, line 18.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I did that, but I refer now especially to an item that appears to amount to $200,000 or $290,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. When the gentleman began his remarks he specifically referred to the item of $35,000 for representation allowance for foreign service. I answered him on that. If he has another item to bring up I shall be pleased to answer him on that also.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The item to which I referred now particularly is on page 23, line 11. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] suggested that the item would probably cost as much as $90,000 for representation.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield to me I think possibly I can make it a little clearer to him. The representation allowance, $35,000, was presented to us on this basis. It is required because of higher prices of food and taxes on diplomatic missions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Spain, Sweden, and Turkey were particularly mentioned as places where we had so many other things to handle. The item for the Foreign Service Auxiliary includes 232 additional employees who are required in connection with the State Department set-up in South America. It covers Foreign Service officers and this is for their salaries and the salaries of the technical people who are required to go down there. That is what the hearings demonstrated. I have the number here who are obliged to go down there. There are 166 clerks; there are attachés, 12; and agricultural advisers and commercial advisers, 5; economic analysts, 15. I have the names of those people. I was quite particular to see that they were real people who had had business experience. I cannot see anything to criticize in connection with that. There is nothing in this particular item for living allowances. Our hearings are specific on that. It covers salaries.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. This has absolutely nothing to do with salaries.

Mr. TABER. Then the State Department has misrepresented this to us.

Mr. STEFAN. No; the State Department did not misrepresent it. Representation allowance has absolutely nothing to do with salaries or taxes or living allowances.

Mr. TABER. That item is for Foreign Service Auxiliary emergency, $491,000, and that has just that situation in it. I am sorry if the gentleman is not familiar with the hearings on it, but that is the picture.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have the hearings before me. I do not find that the item includes salaries. My understanding is that it was for some outside expense, as near as I can gather, and that is what I am trying to find out. It is in addition to salaries and other necessary expenses allowed our representatives, and is described as "representation."

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think this matter might be cleared up by reference to page 365 of the hearings.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have that before me.

Mr. LUDLOW. There the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Shaw, defined these representation allowances, and said:

> We are asking this appropriation in order to make increases in representation allowances, particularly in quarters where there is a great deal of important diplomatic activity such, for instance, as Madrid and Stockholm. Those two capitals, from my point of view, are exceedingly important at the present time.

I would like to emphasize there is nothing in the nature of recreation or quasi-recreation involved in this representation; it is hard official business that is comprised under that term, and important official business at the present time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That covers the item of $35,000 for the European countries, but does not cover the countries in South America. It seemed to me this is a big item. It is said to amount to $200,000 or $290,000. Surely, an item as large as that ought to have some detailed information on it. The term "representation" might cover a multitude of things and I do not see anything in the hearings or in the bill to explain it. That is the reason I raised the question.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am not familiar with the hearings at all, but I do know that the war has greatly multiplied the duties of our diplomatic representatives in all of the countries, and that is especially true in South America and the European countries.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman, and, like him, I want to see everything done to assist our diplomatic representatives in these, as well as in other countries, but these items are for so-called auxiliaries in South America.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this is a deficiency bill. The bill includes $200,000 to be added to the sum of $2,280,000, for increased rentals and other expenses. There are a number of other items of additional expenses. But, Mr. Chairman, here appears to be a new addition to our Foreign Service. It does not appear to be authorized by law; but whether it is or not, this expenditure, I feel, should be explained. Line 10 on page 23 states, and I quote:

*Provided*, That the cost of living and representation allowances, as authorized.

And so forth. It is the "representation" item, that amounts evidently to $200,000 or $290,000, and being in addition to living expenses, and travel expenses for the auxiliary service, that ought to be explained. Surely that ought to be fair.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Foreign Service, auxiliary (emergency): For an additional amount for Foreign Service, auxiliary (emergency), Department of State, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1943, $491,000: *Provided*, That cost of living and representation allowances, as authorized by the act approved February 23, 1931, as amended, may be paid from this appropriation to American citizens employed hereunder.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the words "and representation," in line 11 on page 23, on the ground that they are legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the item is authorized by law. Paragraph 12 of title XXII, found on page 1877 of the United States Code, provides specific authorization for the item.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand, this appropriation is for a new auxiliary service, not the regular service.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Missouri advise the Chair whether the auxiliary service referred to in the paragraph is authorized by law?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This comes within the provisions of the statute, which reads:

Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, and within the limitations of such appropriations as may be made therefor, which appropriations are authorized, ambassadors, ministers, Diplomatic, Consular, and Foreign Service officers may be granted allowances for representation; and also post allowances wherever the cost of living may be proportionately so high that, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, such allowances are necessary to enable such Diplomatic, Consular, and Foreign Service officers to carry on their work efficiently.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has advised itself on the language referred to by the gentleman from Missouri, but the point on which the Chair would like to be enlightened is the language in the last sentence of the paragraph referring to the fact that moneys may be paid from this appropriation to American citizens employed thereunder.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there is no specific legislation authorizing the Foreign Service Auxiliary, but it is in existence and is in operation at this time for this fiscal year. No point of order was made by the gentleman on that score. The point of order was directed at the provision for representation allowances, which are authorized by law, as I have indicated.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not for this kind of organization, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Missouri kindly answer one more question the Chair has in mind? Is there legislative authorization for representation allowances to be made to American citizens employed in accordance with this paragraph?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, language could not be more explicit than that just cited from paragraph 12 of title XXII, which specifically covers authorization of appropriations for cost of living and representation allowances under such circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. What the Chair is concerned about is, Does the term "American citizens" as used in this paragraph refer to ambassadors, ministers, diplomatic, consular, and Foreign Service officers. Is that what the committee has in mind?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unless they were American citizens they could not be serving as representatives of this Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they employees under the terms of this law?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly; there can be no question about it.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the explanation made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations as to the existing law, the Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order made by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order against the language in lines 6 to 13 on page 23 that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, not authorized by law.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the point of order comes too late. There has been debate since the paragraph was read. It is now too late to interpose a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the gentleman from Missouri that we have not gone beyond the point at which a point of order can be made. The paragraph is still under consideration.

Does the gentleman desire to point out to the Chair anything further the Chair may consider in view of the second point of order made against the language in the paragraph?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have passed the proposition, Mr. Chairman; we are now on the proviso. The point of order made by the gentleman did not apply to the first portion, which is a separate entity as against the proviso. Inasmuch as the point of order was not interposed at the time, it now comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises the gentleman from Missouri that he will hold that the point of order does not come too late, in view of the fact that the proviso is a part of the paragraph. Does the gentleman desire to advise the Chair any further on the paragraph?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The point has been covered.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Missouri point out to the Chair the legislative authority for the Foreign Service Auxiliary? The section referred to by the gentleman from Missouri, which has been analyzed by the Chair, refers to the language "representation" on line 11, page 23. Is there legislation to which the gentleman can refer the Chair authorizing the Foreign Service Auxiliary?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no specific legislation on that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Missouri, the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Kansas.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses for collecting the internal revenue, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1943, $6,150,000: *Provided*, That the limitations on the amounts which may be expended for printing and binding, stationery, and personal services in the District of

Columbia, are hereby increased from $1,606,850 to $1,839,850, from $565,400 to $616,290, and from $11,006,542 to $11,373,785, respectively.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Page 25, after line 11, insert a new paragraph:

"Office of Treasurer of the United States, salaries: For an additional allowance for salaries, Office of the Treasurer of the United States, fiscal year, 1943, $250,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is offered to supply a deficiency created by the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) agreed to by the House and returned to the Senate this morning. If this amount is not provided, it will be necessary for the Treasurer of the United States to immediately discontinue essential and indispensable activities. We ask that it be included in the pending bill at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to bring to the attention of the House again the provision for mother and child care, referred to in the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and to remind the House that the Appropriations Committee in its report left the door open for an appropriation after enabling legislation has been passed. I am very glad to receive assurance from the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] that he would help us secure enabling legislation which would provide care for the mothers and children. I understand that either the Naval Affairs Committee or the Committee on Military Affairs has some such idea in mind, that is, care for the wives of the soldiers. I would like very much to show the House two children here in Washington who are mentally deficient and deformed because of improper care at birth. I know every Member is interested in protecting both the mothers and the children of the Nation, and it is only a question of working out some plan that is acceptable.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In connection with that, I think the House should bear in mind that on April 30, with the closing down of the W. P. A., there will be eliminated all these nursing projects, where thousands and thousands of children are being cared for, under which a number of children attending these nurseries have care, because of the fact that the mothers have taken jobs in defense industries.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is true. I believe that the place of the mothers is in the home, bringing up the children. Some sort of care must be given to children if their mothers cannot be at home and they are obliged to work in industry in order to win the war. An undernourished child and a lonely, unhappy child are the most pathetic things in the world. Mothers and children must be properly nourished. The future strength of America is dependent on the health of both the mothers and the children of today.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read to the bottom of page 28.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 42, insert the following new section:

"SECTION 301. No part of any appropriation or authorization in this act shall be used to pay any part of the salary or expenses of any person whose salary or expenses are prohibited from being paid either in appropriation or authorization in any other act, but this prohibition shall be effective only during the term that such prohibition in such other act is effective."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] offered to the other bills that have been paseed, and I am offering it at his request. Let me add this. So far as the charges of subversive activities are concerned, a special committee has been appointed by the Committee on Appropriations, to hear those charges, and I am in hopes that they will start hearings immediately on them.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This is a provision, Mr. Chairman, that is already carried in other bills that have been passed and we have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

ABSENTEEISM AND MANPOWER PROBLEMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, since the pending deficiency appropriation bill was reported to the House, members of the committee have been called by friends of some of the governmental departments and agencies and others, demanding to know why some of the agencies did not receive all the funds they requested of them. It is a lot of arrogance, but it has been done; just as if the Appropriations Committee had to make any excuses or explanations to some of the agencies why they did not get all the money they requested.

We have been told that the work of some of these agencies would be seriously hampered unless the funds were allowed and made immediately available. Many telegrams and letters have also been received from various sections of the country, saying some rather uncomplimentary things about Members whose responsibility it is, after hearing all the evidence, to report the bill to this House. Even threats of political retaliation have come to some members of the committee. A few radical and irresponsible labor agitators have taken very serious exceptions to some of the things Members of Congress have said to some witnesses, including one Cabinet member who appeared before our committee.

I have personally been taken to task with reference to only three items that were slashed or eliminated by the committee. Perhaps a majority of the inquiries or threats have been made with reference to the request to the committee that was not granted for the Department of Labor for the alleged purpose of curing absenteeism in the industries of the country having war contracts. The committee heard the evidence as presented by the Secretary of Labor, in which she went into some detail to explain what she thought were the main causes of absenteeism. She spoke of illness, unfavorable working conditions, and advocated more and better drinking fountains for the workers, all of which should, of course, be corrected. Evidently, however, those things were not the main causes of the trouble.

The charming and clever Madam Secretary, after making what I am certain our committee felt were trivial suggestions for improvement, then wound up by urging the committee to give her more funds so she might send some of her people into the local labor unions to educate them and ask them to educate these absentees that form about 10 percent of those who work in industries, and that would cure the absenteeism. The committee thought otherwise.

The testimony of Madam Secretary, who proved to be not only a very clever, but evasive witness, brought out that the major part of the absenteeism came at week ends. That is to say, either Saturdays or Mondays. She did not mention hang-overs by name, but admitted that the situation with reference to absenteeism is getting gradually but considerably worse as time goes on.

I have asked the indulgence of Members at this time in order to show some concrete evidence that there are considerable hang-overs at the end of each week. The fact that nine-tenths of the absenteeism in factories having vitally essential war contracts come on week ends is pretty good evidence, but I have much better evidence than that. I have received a rather large number of telegrams from these absentees themselves, complaining because Members of Congress have had the temerity to ask about it.

I shall not put all of these silly, arrogant, and threatening telegrams into the RECORD, but let me read a part of one. This is a night letter sent to me from Vallejo, Calif.:

Your speech on absenteeism and strikes stinks. Come out here and help build warships and eat worms like we do.

I shall not place his name in the RECORD, although he claims to be the past

president of a Washington County political organization of some importance. He evidently felt important when he sent that message. I have other similar messages and letters, some of which boldly threaten me politically. Many of them are so worded as to strongly point to week-end hang-overs.

Many of you heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON] this afternoon state as a matter of fact that the number of man-days lost in the shipping industries of the country during the past year would have constructed 42 merchant ships, ships that are vitally needed at this time. And yet, while our brave men on the high seas are battling enemy U-boats and giving their lives for liberty, bear in mind that 10 percent of the industrial workers are absenting themselves from work for one reason or another or without any reason at all, many of whom insist on week-end hang-overs, as is shown by this and other insolent and threatening telegrams received by members of the committee who dare criticize a practice that has shocked decent citizens everywhere.

Now please bear in mind that the one main suggestion of Madam Secretary, the one cure-all for this outrageous and shocking practice of absenteeism, was a plea for more and more money to add to her present overcrowded pay roll in order to educate the local labor unions so that they might in turn educate these thoughtless and, I am sorry to say, in some instances, irresponsible workers, who, despite the fact that they are receiving the highest wages they ever got, persist in absenting themselves practically every week end. The committee evidently felt from her testimony that if Madam Secretary does not actually condone this outrageous and shocking practice of workers deliberately absenting themselves from work, especially on week ends, that she is certainly not too deeply disturbed about it. Read her exact words in the hearings, as shown in part on page 554, which testimony speaks for itself:

LABOR LOST THROUGH ABSENTEEISM OF EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would like to ask some questions, Madam Secretary. I was very much interested in your statement. I am sure the committee appreciates the information given. I am especially interested in your statement concerning absenteeism on the part of workers in industry. Will you please give the committee the exact figures on the loss of man-hours or man-days, or both, on account of absenteeism?

Secretary PERKINS. I think it has been estimated at about 350,000,000 man-days lost from illness and about 251,000,000 man-days lost by industrial accidents. Absenteeism is impossible to estimate, but those two we can estimate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have noticed repeated statements in newspapers quoting Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker as stating, I believe, that 10 percent of the workers in industries with war contracts are absenting themselves from work. That seems like an unreasonably high percentage, and I want exact figures, not an estimate.

Secretary PERKINS. We do not have any figures on that, nor do we know how to get any figures that are exact on that point. But taking 350,000,000 man-days lost through illness and 251,000,000 man-days lost through industrial accidents, that represents in itself a considerable number of man-days, as you can see. When they are absent on account of illness or when they are absent on account of accidents, there is nothing blameworthy on them. But they are preventable, although the individual is not blameworthy if he has an accident.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Then, you say that you and your Department are doing everything within your power to correct that unfortunate and unhappy situation?

Secretary PERKINS. That is one of the reasons why we are asking for this appropriation. We feel that we are not doing everything possible. We are doing everything we can today, lacking real facilities. But there is a limit to what you can do by advice which you print in the public press. That does not catch on as does the laying on of hands.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The fact is, Madam Secretary, there are thousands of good citizens, many of whom have boys in active service in the armed forces, who are deeply disturbed about this shocking situation of absenteeism in the various industries. There is also a deep-seated feeling that you, Madam Secretary, are not very much disturbed or even concerned about it. That's the point I am trying to drive home.

Secretary PERKINS. We have done the very best we could do. We have pointed out these things as often as possible. We are very hopeful that with a little more money and a few more people in the field possibly we can make the local unions in the locality conscious of the particular absenteeism problem of their particular members in their particular plants.

STRIKES IN WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Madam Secretary, let me say to you frankly that in my judgment, it is going to take a whale of a lot more than giving you a little more money in order to make the local labor unions or this 10 percent of the workers, who are letting America down in this crisis, absentee conscious. Unless this absentee and strike racket stops in these war industries, Congress is going to do something about it whether you can or not. Whether you know it or not, the country is fighting mad about it. And that reminds me what a great many citizens and taxpayers in Oklahoma, and the rest of the Nation, who have given their money, their time, and their sons to this war effort, feel that you, as Secretary of Labor, are much more concerned about social gains than in winning the war or stopping these strikes that are sabotaging the war program. And I think it would be well to discuss informally, either on or off the record, your attitude with reference to these strikes in defense industries.

Secretary PERKINS. I should be very glad to do so. I am sorry if anybody imagines that I have encouraged strikes at any time, either in wartime or at any other time, but particularly in a wartime like this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. How many men are out on strikes at this moment? And how many strikes and how many man-days have we lost since Pearl Harbor on account of strikes and walk-outs?

Secretary PERKINS. That is a question that I could not possibly answer because I do not have the figures for today; but I can give them to you for the month past.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would like to have it for the record.

Secretary PERKINS. It is a small number in comparison to days lost for the other causes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Of course, working conditions and what you call other causes should be improved wherever possible to do so, but let me remind you that our gallant men in the armed forces are not complaining about the bad condition of their fox holes nor are they absenting themselves or striking for higher wages.

Again the committee has been criticized for its failure to give the Manpower Commission additional funds on which to operate. As one Member of Congress who has a profound respect for and much confidence in the ability and integrity of the genial gentleman who is Director of the Manpower Commission, Governor McNutt, I am by no means in sympathy with his apparent failure to recognize the vital importance of maintaining the American home. Both the Governor and General Hershey appeared before the committee at the same time and it was unfortunate for the General to appear before the committee with the Governor, who is a very brilliant, fair, and versatile witness. Let me add that I have a very high regard for Governor McNutt. I consider him one of the ablest executives in all the Government. It is significant, however, that both the General and the Governor, were free with the use of the expression "I issued a directive." The fact is the General has issued so many directives to draft boards that some Boards have written me that he has made the intent of the law even more confusing. These so-called directives will be a powerful factor in helping make certain the passage of the Kilday bill that will set forth in no unmistakable terms the formula for the Manpower Commission and Director Hershey to follow. Again I must quote from the record of the hearings. Let the witnesses speak for themselves:

CONSIDERATION GIVEN TO FARM LABOR PROBLEM

Mr. JOHNSON. I noticed, Governor, that you appeared recently before another committee over at the other end of the Capitol, in your capacity as Director of the Manpower Commission. Newspapers throughout the country quoted you as saying that during this year 10 out of 14 able-bodied men, irrespective of their family status, between 18 and 38, will be called for some part in the war effort. I refer, of course, to your statement about your so-called work or fight order.

Mr. MCNUTT. Ten out of fourteen between the ages of 18 and 38.

Mr. JOHNSON. And that applies to men only in the category between the ages of 18 and 38?

Mr. MCNUTT. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON. Just what did you mean by that statement?

Mr. MCNUTT. Just that.

Mr. JOHNSON. I was in hopes, Governor, that you might wish to amplify your so-called work or fight order. I realize that you have a tremendous job, a Herculean task, a task that would try the patience of any man. I know that you are conscientiously doing the job assigned you and putting everything you have into it, as you have done in every job you have ever undertaken. And yet, I must say to you frankly, Governor, that your statement that you meant "just that" does not answer the question that I was driving at. I assume, and I think the country assumes from your various statements, that you as Director of the Manpower Commission are concerned primarily if not solely with what happens to be one's occupation for the moment. That, of course, is important but not everything to be considered. There are many of us who believe that the matter of keeping the home ties intact during this emergency is of vital importance, and I must confess I

am surprised and disappointed that apparently little if any consideration is being given by you in this important factor. I am further of the opinion that unless the manpower problem is approached from a more lenient and realistic angle toward the heads of families, especially fathers with small children, that Congress will take the proverbial bull by the horns and do something about it, like the passage of the Kilday bill.

There is another problem, a most serious problem, facing the farmers, who must feed, not only our own Army but those of our allies, and that is the threatened food shortage. As I am sure you know, thousands of young farmers, many of whom are the only dependents on the farm, have volunteered or have been drafted into the armed forces or else have gone to work in essential war industries. This situation is more serious than you might possibly know. The Secretary of Agriculture has said to the farmers that they must raise at least 10 percent more farm products, and especially foodstuffs, in 1943 than they did in 1942. Farmers will strive and work overtime to continue to feed the world, but it is obvious that this cannot possibly be done at the rate farm hands, farm tenants, and farm owners and their sons are leaving the farms, not only for the armed forces but for higher wages in airplane factories and other war industries.

Another serious problem soon in the making is to get some of those farmers back to producing the things that our men and boys in the armed forces must have if they are to eat during the next several months. There are literally hundreds of farms that will go untilled this year unless something is done to correct the unfortunate situation, and very quickly. There are many dairy herds in my State that are being slaughtered because there is nobody to do the work, with a milk and butter shortage threatening the country. The present farm problem, Governor, is serious, and I am wondering if you are giving it the special consideration it deserves.

Mr. MCNUTT. It was one of the first to receive consideration. The directive covering the protection of dairy farmers came first. The last directive which has gone down having to do with the implementation of the Tydings amendment was the result of conferences with the Senate Agriculture Committee and a subcommittee of which Senator TYDINGS was a member, and long conferences with various farm organizations and the Department of Agriculture. We finally arrived at a meeting of minds, and that directive represents such a meeting of minds.

Mr. JOHNSON. Frankly, I must confess that I don't like that word "directive." It is being overused and much overemphasized by too many bureau heads these days. After all, the plain intent of Congress should be carried out rather than what the head of some outside organization might agree on. If the Tydings amendment means anything, it would defer essential farm work. But up to date the directives I have seen that have gone out from General Hershey's office have been about as clear as mud on the subject of deferring farm labor. As a result many farm communities have almost exhausted their farm labor. I personally know of several instances where the only son of a farmer has either volunteered or been drafted into the service, or else has gone to work in some industry.

I am sure you will agree that one of the most serious situations facing the Nation at this time is the problem of producing more food. It just can't be done unless there is a decided change in the present policy. Our farms are being drained of manpower. This is a matter that our people are becoming very much disturbed and alarmed about.

Mr. MCNUTT. I do not know of any problem that has received or will receive more careful attention.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 1975, the first deficiency appropriation bill, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers and designation of paragraphs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the deficiency appropriation bill may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein, in connection with the remarks I made in the Committee this afternoon, statements and examinations made in the Appropriations Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next, after completion of business on the Speaker's table and the conclusion of any other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 839) to amend the act approved May 27, 1937, by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation of lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. WHITE, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ROCKWELL.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the disposition of the business of the House and other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS—LEND-LEASE ACT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 1501) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION TO THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 5.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas there have always existed close ties of friendship between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama; and

Whereas these friendly relations, based on the mutual respect and admiration of two free and independent nations, happily grow stronger day by day; and

Whereas the Government and the people of the Republic of Panama have cooperated wholeheartedly with the United States of America in the present world conflict; and

Whereas on January 6, 1943, the National Assembly of Panama graciously adopted a resolution expressing solidarity and extending felicitations to the Congress of the United States: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States express its deep appreciation to the National Assembly of the Re-

public of Panama, and to the people which it represents, for this message of friendship and solidarity, which had as it inspiration the determination of achieving complete victory over our common enemies and restoring the principles of liberty and democracy throughout the world.

*Resolved further*, That a copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the National Assembly of the Republic of Panama.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include in those remarks certain letters and a statement from the magazine entitled "Child."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 12. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 660. An act to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, March 1, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Invalid Pensions at 11 a. m., Monday, March 1, 1943.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a hearing of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on Wednesday, March 3, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 1607.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, March 4, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 134, to provide for the suspension, during the war, of operating-differential subsidy agreements, and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

The committee will also hold a public hearing on Thursday, March 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1361 (Mr. LANE) and H. R. 1409 (Mr. FOGARTY), conferring upon men in the merchant marine the same rights, privileges, and benefits accruing to those serving in the armed forces; and on H. R. 1858, to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine who served during the World War as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who served during such war.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, March 9, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on H. R. 1880, a bill providing for the construction of a ship canal across the State of New Jersey, connecting New York Bay with the Delaware River, and forming the last link in the Intracoastal Waterway from Boston to the Mexican border.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 16, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 149.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

213. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on a list of papers, recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 121. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to investigate the progress of the defense housing program; without amendment (Rept. No. 186). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 129. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 1691, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 187). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 1501. A bill to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2009. A bill to prohibit the fixing of maximum prices below cost on agricultural commodities or commodities processed or manufactured from any agricultural commodity; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2010. A bill to repeal section 3540 of chapter 33A of Public Law No. 250, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2011. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2012. A bill to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos who are permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to provide for the cancelation of outstanding feed and seed loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose legislation transferring to the Federal Government the administration of unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to reimburse the State of Oregon for the revenue derived from the taxes upon the real property so acquired by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 2013. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Grand View Hospital; W. J. Pinkerton, medical doctor and surgeon; Ina Antilla, registered nurse; and Leone Gresiak, nurse, for service rendered and medical attention for Edwin Beckman, deceased, a former Civilian Conservation Corps enrollee of Camp Gogebie, Merenisco, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOLGER:

H. R. 2014. A bill for the relief of the Winston-Salem Southbound Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2015. A bill for the relief of the estate of John Gellatly, deceased, and/or Charlayne Whiteley Gellatly, as administratrix of the estate of John Gellatly, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 2016. A bill for the relief of William H. Linhart; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. Res. 139. Resolution referring H. R. 2015 and accompanying papers to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

192. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of Victory Consumer Information Center, 1606 Westchester Avenue, Bronx, N. Y., favoring the appropriation of adequate funds for Office of Price Administration enforcement of price-control regulations; subsidizing the production of basic commodities, whose costs are increased by the war, so that the price ceilings will remain stable; also favoring the restoration and extension of the food stamp

plan for needy families, so that a well-nourished America may produce for victory at peak strength; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

193. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Senate joint resolution No. 7 of the California State Legislature; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

194. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of Locale Italiana dei Sarti da Uomo, No. 63, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, concerning the Hobbs bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

195. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of sundry citizens representing organization and dairymen who have direct interest in the welfare of dairying, especially as it affects Somerset County; to the Committee on Agriculture.

196. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Assembly joint resolution No. 10 of the California State Legislature; to the Committee on Agriculture.

197. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 10 of the California State Legislature; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

198. By Mr. RAMEY: Petition of A. F. Peirson and 30 other members of the Ottawa County National Farm Loan Association, of Ottawa County, Ohio, urging that Congress permanently reduce the rate of interest on Federal land bank and/or Land Bank Commissioner loans to 3½ percent; to the Committee on Agriculture.

199. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary of the Convention of the Diocese of Ohio, Cleveland, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to representation of the religious conscience at the peace table; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

200. Also, petition of the executive secretary, Middletown Post, No. 218, the American Legion, Middletown, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to correction of the hindrances to the war effort; to the Committee on Labor.

---

# SENATE

## MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee that Thou hast formed our minds to seek Thee, our hearts to love Thee, and hast made our spirits restless for the rest that is alone in Thee. Since Thou hast set our feet or a path so full of chance and change that we know not what a day may bring forth, and hast curtained every day with darkness and rounded our little life with sleep, grant that we may use with diligence the fleeting span of time vouchsafed to us, filling sunny hours with labor, working while it is called day, knowing that the night cometh when man's work is done.

Bowing now at this noonday shrine, may Thy name be hallowed, may our hearts be cleansed, and may our daily duties shine with the halo of a new glory.

"O healing peace of this withdrawing place!
O central calm that soothes storm-shaken men!
Refresh our fainting souls, but better still
Go with us to our tasks of life again."

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 25, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 641) to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5) expressing to the national assembly and people of the Republic of Panama appreciation of their friendship for the United States.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 839) to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WHITE, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ROCKWELL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 707. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General; and

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

### REPRESENTATION OF SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ON BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. McKELLAR (for Mr. GLASS) presented a letter, which was read, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
*Washington, D. C., March 1, 1943.*

*To the Senate:*

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the act approved May 17, 1928, I hereby appoint Senators ELMER THOMAS and CARL HAYDEN to represent the Senate Appropriations Committee on the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy during the remainder of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

CARTER GLASS,
*Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations.*

### JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR AUSTIN AND REPRESENTATIVE WADSWORTH ON PROPOSED NATIONAL WAR SERVICE ACT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, tomorrow at 10:30 a. m. the Committee on Military Affairs will commence public hearings on Senate bill 666. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, a joint statement by Representative WADSWORTH, who introduced the corresponding bill in the House of Representatives, and myself relating to what would be done if the proposed National War Service Act of 1943 were passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE AUSTIN-WADSWORTH BILL WOULD DO

It would provide for over-all organization and total mobilization of all our skills, and of our man and woman power.

It would make known the equal liability of all in the war effort.

It would enable Government to cure the evils of unbalance, hoarding, piracy, absenteeism, inadequate training for management and supervision, labor turn-over, and such shortages as those in agriculture.

It would remove the confusion now prevailing under coercion through orders and indirect sanctions.

It would substitute due process of law for Executive acts, thereby implementing the will of the people that, in this war, if any "mobile" person should refuse to perform his assigned duty, punishment could be applied only after conviction of an offense in our courts of justice.

It would stimulate moral power by voluntary methods to be employed when and so long as they are effective.

It would provide for selection and assignment of every man between the ages of 18 and 65 and every woman between the ages of 18 and 50, subject to reasonable exemptions and deferments.

It would erect safeguards for family life, for wage and hour laws, overtime pay, collective bargaining, mediation and arbitration, and other procedures for the settlement of labor controversies and questions.

It would preserve the right to join or not to join any union, where the person concerned is assigned to a job. It would not affect the status of a person entering employment without being assigned.

It would provide compensation to trainees during such training, and offer the opportunity of education for stepping up skills.

It would preserve reemployment, seniority rights, and rates of pay to the same extent as men in the armed services have such rights preserved.

It would keep, as the operating agency in making selections, the democratic Selective Service System. Such selection would be made under the designed direction of the War Manpower Commission.

It would provide for the mobilization and designed direction of willing workers who, left to themselves, would be unable to know where and how best to serve the Nation at war.

WHAT THE BILL DOES NOT DO

1. It does not put civilian enterprise or labor under military law or military control.
2. It does not break up families.
3. It does not form labor battalions.
4. It does not break up or abridge the freedom of anyone assigned to join or not to join a labor union.
5. It does not destroy reemployment and seniority rights.
6. It does not change the rate of compensation or the hours of service in any occupation to which anyone is assigned.
7. It does not discriminate between groups, such as agricultural workers and industrial workers.
8. It does not require service of a kind beyond one's abilities.
9. It does not make liable any woman who has living with her and under her care either a child or children under 18 years of age, or one or more other persons, who, on account of age or illness, needs her personal care, nor any pregnant woman.
10. It does not assign anyone to a location where reasonable housing accommodations for such person or his or her immediate family are not available.
11. It does not move people from place to place unless necessary to the war effort.
12. It does not establish a new principle or practice for democratic countries.
13. It does not abridge the sovereignty of the several States.
14. It does not destroy the democratic process.
15. It does not bring into question the patriotism or courage of the citizen.
16. It does not make any permanent change in our way of life.
17. It does not extend beyond May 1, 1945, and may be terminated before then by concurrent resolution of Congress.

Public hearings will begin March 2, 1943.

WARREN R. AUSTIN.
JAMES W. WADSWORTH.

## ENDORSEMENT BY SECRETARY OF WAR OF PROPOSED NATIONAL SERVICE ACT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, on February 26, the Secretary of War, Hon. Henry L. Stimson, made a report to Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, on Senate bill 666, containing, among other statements, the following:

The War Department strongly endorses S. 666, Seventy-eighth Congress, a bill to provide further for the successful prosecution of the war through a system of selective war service with the aid of the Selective Service System and urges its prompt passage by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the report submitted by the Secretary of War may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
*February 26, 1943.*

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
*Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: The War Department strongly endorses S. 666, Seventy-eighth Congress, a bill to provide further for the successful prosecution of the war through a system of civilian selective war service with the aid of the Selective Service System and urges its prompt passage by the Congress. Comments on specific provisions of the bill will not be given at this time.

S. 666 would make every man who has registered or is required to register under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and every woman between the ages of 18 and 50, with certain exceptions, who are required to register under this bill, liable to contribute by personal service to the war effort in a noncombatant capacity in industry, agriculture, or any other occupation, activity, or employment which the President shall from time to time determine to be essential to the effective prosecution of the war. The power to determine that such workers are needed is vested in the President. He may call for volunteers for service and, if the response is inadequate or if he deems it impracticable to call for volunteers, may, either directly or through the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, direct the Selective Service System to supply the required number of persons. The Selective Service System would be maintained intact, and would be utilized as the agency to classify and select those persons to be assigned to service.

A total mobilization of our man and woman power is essential to win the war. Only through comprehensive legislation, such as S. 666, to place on everyone the equal obligation to serve in the war effort can a total mobilization be achieved.

Britain and Russia have national war service laws, under which men and women may be assigned to nonmilitary as well as military duties. Both Germany and Japan likewise have such laws. These countries are more fully mobilized than we are. We cannot wage war to the greatest advantage and with minimum losses, or contribute our full part to the united war effort, without mobilizing our human resources with a thoroughness at least approaching that of our enemies and our principal allies. Furthermore we owe an obligation to our fighting men to effect an extension of the Selective Service System to the home front to assure a steady, full supply of munitions and supplies necessary to win the war.

At this crucial stage of the war, we can no longer depend solely on voluntary methods backed by indirect sanctions to cure the growing critical labor shortages which threaten the war effort. There are labor shortages, present or imminent, in agriculture, mining, and industry. There is increasing evidence of the inadequacy of the present controls to achieve a full utilization of our manpower and to solve the labor shortage problem. As a result, in several instances where labor shortage emergencies existed, it has been necessary to take men from the Army to supply labor. This is a practice that is wasteful and disruptive to the Army's training program. As a further result, proposals have been made to give blanket deferments to groups of workers, thus limiting greatly the manpower pool on which the Army depends for its soldiers. We must direct additional labor into essential occupations rather than keep the men out of the Army who are needed for the job of winning the war.

S. 666 recognizes that if possible the problem of labor supply should be solved by voluntary methods. It provides for compulsion only when voluntary methods fail or are for other reasons inadequate.

Inasmuch as the committee has requested that this report be expedited, the Bureau of the Budget has authorized its submission without a determination by the Bureau as to whether it conforms to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
*Secretary of War.*

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 8)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department, fiscal year 1943, amounting to $4,000,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF WORLD WAR VETERANS' ACT

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (2) and Agriculture (2), Federal Works Agency, The National Archives, and Executive Office of the President (Office of War Information) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated.

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of Local No. 358 (C. I. O.), of the United Grocery Store Employees Union, Detroit, Mich., favoring restoration by the Senate of an appropriation of $1,400,000 for continuance of operations of the National Resources Planning Board eliminated by the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution of the Fraternal Congress of Maryland and the District of Columbia and also the forty-third annual session of the New York Fraternal Congress, favoring the adoption of an improved and revised calendar dividing the year into 12 months composed of 4 equal quarters to start with the year 1945; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution of the one hundred and twenty-sixth convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Ohio, held in Cleveland, Ohio, requesting that the religious conscience of America be adequately represented on the United States delegation

at the peace conference following the war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions of Compton Parlor, No. 273, Native Sons of the Golden West, of Compton; Topanga Parlor, No. 269, of Canoga Park, and Los Angeles Parlor, No. 124, of Los Angeles, both of the Native Daughters of the Golden West, all in the State of California, protesting against the formation of a Japanese unit of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance.

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose any legislation transferring to the Federal Government the administration of unemployment compensation

"Whereas the Federal Social Security Board, and other Federal agencies and Federal officials, propose to recommend to the Congress plans that will involve the nationalization of unemployment insurance in the 51 States and jurisdictions of the United States; and

"Whereas transfer of these proper State functions to the Federal Government would eliminate all consideration of local conditions of living and employment; and

"Whereas New Jersey will have collected from employers and workers within its own borders and have available for distribution to jobless workers approximately $285,000,000 at the close of 1943; and

"Whereas the proposal to federalize unemployment insurance systems of the various States seriously threatens the availability of this fund for use in the State of New Jersey alone, since the unified national system might involve pooling of all State funds; and

"Whereas the New Jersey Legislature by the enactment of chapter 386, pamphlet laws of 1941, directed that the employment service division of the New Jersey Unemployment Compensation Commission, now loaned to the Federal Government for the war emergency, be returned to State service: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:*

"1. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey considers that post-war problems may be properly administered only under a State employment security system including both unemployment compensation and employment service and, therefore, respectfully urges and petitions the Congress of the United States to oppose the enactment of any proposal involving the transfer of the administration of unemployment compensation from the States to the Federal Government.

"2. The secretary of state be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in the Congress, the Federal Security Administrator, and the Federal Social Security Board.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the States of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress and the Veterans' Bureau of the United States of America to locate a veterans' hospital at Thermopolis in Hot Springs County, Wyo.

"Whereas one of the inevitable results of the present war will be an increase in the number of members and veterans of the armed services who require hospitalization and medical treatment; and

"Whereas there are located at Thermopolis, in Hot Springs County, Wyo., some of the finest medicinal hot mineral springs in the world, and such city is otherwise ideally suited by reason of climate and other conditions as a location for such a hospital: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring)*, That we hereby memorialize the Congress and the Veterans' Bureau of the United States to consider and take appropriate action for the location of a military and veterans' hospital at the city of Thermopolis, Hot Springs County, Wyo.; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies of this memorial be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and E. V. ROBERTSON, to Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT, and to the Director of the Veterans' Bureau of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the general court of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to create a pharmacy corps in the United States Army

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill to create a pharmacy corps in the United States Army; and

"Whereas there is a definite need in this war emergency for the capable handling of drugs, medicines and pharmaceutical supplies which are used in the treatment of diseases of our boys and girls in the armed forces: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened,* That the general court of the State of New Hampshire goes on record as urgently requesting the Congress of the United States to pass legislation without delay to create a pharmacy corps in the United States Army, and be it further resolved that the secretary of state be directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of War, the Surgeon General of the United States Army and to the Senators and Representatives of this State in Congress."

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A resolution adopted by a meeting held in Carnegie Hall, New York City, favoring the setting up of a systematic and definite relief program for the children of the stricken and hungry countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted in commemoration of the silver anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania, held on February 14, 1943, at Webster Hall, New York City, under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Council of Greater New York, reaffirming adherence to, and faith in the enforcement of, the Atlantic Charter and the Declaration of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Bison, Kans., and vicinity, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor sales and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Commitee on Military Affairs:

"House resolution requesting Congress to enact legislation to establish a Pharmacy Corps within the United States Army

"Whereas the experience of every civilized country in the world, as exemplified by the laws on their statute books governing the practice of pharmacy, including those on the statute books of all of the States of our own country, requires that a pharmacist shall have at least 4 years of professional training in a college of pharmacy to make him a safe person to be entrusted with the responsibility of handling the many dangerous drugs and medicines prescribed by physicians, such as strychnine, morphine, sulfanilamide, bichloride of mercury, serums and vaccines, etc.; and

"Whereas correspondingly competent pharmaceutical service is not afforded the men serving in the Army and is not comparable to that received by our civilian population, such services being performed in the Army in many cases by men with only 90 days of emergency training and in other cases by those who have had no pharmaceutical training whatsoever, thus jeopardizing the health and welfare of our soldiers; and

"Whereas the men in the Army should be afforded pharmaceutical service of at least the same competency and efficiency as that afforded the civilian population; and

"Whereas this can only be accomplished by creating a Pharmacy Corps in the Army, which will have the authority required and the personnel of which will be adequately educated and trained for the purchase, selection, manufacture standardization, storage, and dispensing of medicines and for such other pharmaceutical and administrative duties as their education and training qualifies them to perform: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland,* That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to enact, without delay, legislation to establish a Pharmacy Corps within the United States Army; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the house be and he is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of War, to the Surgeon General of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the United States Congress from the State of Maryland."

By Mr. WHERRY (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Legislative Resolution 9 opposing war time

"Whereas daylight working hours are a vital factor in the preparation and harvesting of crops, the feeding of farm animals, and the production of farm commodities; and

"Whereas laborers and office workers are, under the new war time, compelled to go to work, and children are compelled to go to school, during the winter months while it is still dark, with a consequent increase in the use of electricity;

"Whereas the new war time, since its establishment, has proved to be wasteful, rather than time saving: therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Legislature of Nebraska in fifty-sixth session assembled:*

"1. That the Congress of the United States is urged to repeal the act establishing war time, commonly known as daylight-saving time.

"2. That a copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed by the clerk, be sent to each Senator and Representative from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to pass at the present session of Congress a social-security law which will allow benefits to every citizen who desires the same, including members of the military forces of our country

"Whereas the present social-security law omits some groups from participating in the benefits of social security; and

"Whereas we feel adequate social-security legislation will solve the social welfare problems which are of most vital concern to our Nation, and will be a foundation for a more secure future of all citizens of our Nation; and

"Whereas some of our citizens in the military personnel of our Nation, due to their former employment, are allowed the advantages of social security and others are not, and each one is working for the same objective and each should have the same opportunity to enjoy the benefits of a secure future; and

"Whereas, in the past groups of people with the same interests have set up, or through legislation have enacted retirement funds, pensions, or security for their future plans, some having been successful and some having failed; and

"Whereas to insure the future of these organizations they should be allowed to come under the National Security Act: Be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah,* That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, a Social Security Act which will retain the Federal-State relationship now provided for in the Social Security Act, but which will include every citizen who wishes to participate, including the military forces of our country; be it further

"*Resolved,* That a certified copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and to each Senator and Representative of the United States Congress from this State; be it further

"*Resolved,* That provision be made for farmer, business, and professional men and other self-employed persons to buy into the social-security program on terms comparable to those now in effect for employed people."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a memorial identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 643. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 71).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 555. A bill for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow; with an amendment (Rept. No. 72);

H. R. 1639. A bill for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublein and Mrs. Ethel Bowers; without amendment (Rept. No. 74); and

H. R. 1786. A bill for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 75).

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 675. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act to conscientious objectors; without amendment (Rept. No. 73).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

S. 360. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service; with an amendment (Rept. No. 76).

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 789. A bill to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax exempt properties in the District of Columbia;

S. 790. A bill to prohibit the issuance of alcoholic beverage licenses in certain localities in the District of Columbia, to prohibit advertising the price of such beverages, and for other purposes; and

S. 791. A bill to effectuate the intent of the Congress as expressed in section 1, paragraph (k) of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 24, 1942, by adding to the list of institutions named in said paragraph the name of the American Tree Association, an institution similar to the institutions so named; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 792. A bill to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 793. A bill to establish a reserve of Government-owned agricultural commodities; and

S. 794. A bill to provide for a new base period, and for considering increases in the cost of farm labor, in determining parity prices for certain agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 795. A bill relating to certain restrictions applicable to agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 796. A bill relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 797, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 798, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LANGER also (for himself and Mr. GURNEY) introduced Senate bill 799, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 800. A bill to authorize certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to act as notaries public during the existence of war or a national emergency and 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 801. A bill for the relief of Clara A. Andresen; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. BYRD introduced Senate bill 802, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 803. A bill for the relief of Marie A. Atanasio; and

S. 804. A bill for the relief of Ralph B. Coleman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 805. A bill for the relief of William D. Warren; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 806. A bill for the relief of the estate of E. H. Zimmerman; and

S. 807. A bill for the relief of Mary Frances Hutson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution to extend certain provisions of law relating to overtime compensation to employees in the Library of Congress; to the Committee on Civil Service.

## INCREASE OF SOLDIERS' BASE PAY

Mr. LANGER. I introduce a bill to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to increase the monthly base pay of enlisted men.

In this connection I wish to say that several months ago, when the matter was before the Senate, I made a motion to raise the base pay to $100, and the bill I am now introducing proposes to carry out that suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 797) to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to increase the monthly base pay of enlisted men, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## FORECLOSURE OF MORTGAGES BY H. O. L. C.

Mr. LANGER. I introduce a bill relating to foreclosure of mortgages held by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

In this connection I wish to say that hundreds of folks are losing their homes in the Northwest, among them many university professors, because the cost of living has gone up without a corresponding increase in salaries, with the result that they cannot meet payments to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 798) relating to foreclosure of mortgages held by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## LANDS IN TRUST FOR INDIAN USE

Mr. LANGER. On behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and myself, I introduce a bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Indian use, and for other purposes. It relates to South Dakota and North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 799) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for Indian use, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

## CONFIRMATION BY SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION EDUCATION, AND SO FORTH, OF DISABLED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND THOSE IN WAR INDUSTRIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAFT submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 180) to provide vocational rehabilitation education, training, and other services to persons disabled while members of the armed forces, or disabled in war industries or otherwise and to render such persons fit for service in war industries, agriculture, or other useful civilian industry, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I submit a resolution with regard to an investigation of the housing situation.

Some days ago I submitted a similar resolution providing for such an investigation by a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. Because of the fact that the Committee on Banking and Currency also has had to deal with F. H. A. and the housing under its charge, it has seemed desirable to have this special committee, made up of three members of the Committee on Education and Labor and three members of the Committee on Banking and Currency. That is the only change in the resolution which I heretofore submitted.

The resolution (S. Res. 112) was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

Whereas the United States Government is now the owner of numerous projects to provide residence quarters for war workers and lower-income groups which were constructed by the United States Housing Authority, the Federal Works Administrator, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Farm Security Administration, the Defense Homes Corporation, and other agencies; and

Whereas the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal home-loan banks, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Loan Administrator, the Federal Works Administrator, and other agencies have financed or assisted the financing of various other housing activities; and

Whereas on February 24, 1942, the President of the United States, acting under the authority vested in him by title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, provided for the consolidation of functions of Federal agencies relating to housing in a National Housing Agency, and said National Housing Agency has continued to exercise the functions consolidated in it; and

Whereas the effect of said Executive order expires with the expiration of the First War Powers Act, 1941, and great confusion will result from the expiration of said Executive order if permanent legislative provision is not made to deal with the subject of housing; and

Whereas numerous projects have been constructed under emergency legislation to provide housing for war workers, the disposition of which housing after the war has been left for future legislative determination; and

Whereas the figures now obtainable appear to show that there is now a serious shortage of housing, and the construction of housing in the period which follows the war should be an effective means of preventing industrial depression; and there is need for a constructive and over-all plan for the provision of such housing through private and public agencies; and for the permanent coordination of all Government activities related to such housing: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That there is hereby established a special committee to be known as the Special Committee on Housing, to be composed of three members of the Committee on Education and Labor to be appointed by the chairman of such committee, and three members of the Committee on Banking and Currency to be appointed by the chairman of such committee, which special committee is hereby authorized—

(1) To study the work of all branches of the National Housing Agency, including the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Federal Public Housing Authority, the Defense Homes Corporation, the Alley Dwelling Authority of the District of Columbia, and all other Federal agencies exercising functions in connection with housing activities, and prepare a report showing the work of such agencies and the present status of all projects undertaken, financed, or managed by them;

(2) To recommend a plan for the disposition of emergency housing at the termination of the war emergency;

(3) To prepare a comprehensive plan for the construction of housing after the war, including that to be provided or financed by private capital or private agencies, and that to be provided or financed by Government funds or Government agencies, and all other housing, with special reference to the possibility of encouraging home ownership and of eliminating slums and other deteriorated areas, and with special reference to the extent of the necessity of the Federal Government's subsidizing housing for lower income groups.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to make reports on pending nominations, bills, and resolutions during any adjournment or recess of the Senate following today's session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs be permitted to file reports during the interim between now and Thursday in the event the Senate shall adjourn or recess from today to Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE NAVY COLLEGE TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there has been much comment in the press and elsewhere concerning the operation of the naval college training program.

The Navy Department has completed its regulations with respect to this program, and will shortly have ready for distribution in pamphlet form the details of this plan, which includes information as to the purpose of the program, the selection of colleges under the program, arrangements made by the Navy Department with colleges, together with the details which will be of special interest to the Members of Congress, namely, the qualifications and procurement of students who may be enrolled in the program.

In view of the fact that Members of the Congress will have requests from their constituents as to the qualifications and procedure for students to enroll in this program, I ask unanimous consent that the plan as prepared by the Navy Department be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the plan was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAN FOR OPERATION OF THE NAVY COLLEGE TRAINING PROGRAM V–12

I. PURPOSE OF PROGRAM

A new Navy college-training program to be known as V–12 will eventually supersede the present V–1 and V–7 programs. Its purpose is to produce naval officers chosen from young high-school seniors, high-school graduates, and college students who appear to have the potentialities for ultimate selection as officers after carefully prescribed college training. The plan contemplates that this college training will be carried on while the men are on active duty, in uniform, receiving pay and under general military discipline.

II. SELECTION OF COLLEGES

The selection of the educational institutions which will participate in this program will be made by a joint committee consisting of representatives of the armed forces and the War Manpower Commission. In the event of failure on the part of the members of the committee to agree, the final decision will be made by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. All correspondence on this subject will be answered only by this committee and should be addressed to the Joint Committee for the Selection of Non-Federal Educational Institutions, room 3732, Navy Department, Arlington Annex, Washington, D. C.

III. PROCUREMENT OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN PROGRAM

*1. Qualifications*

A. Civilians

(1) For admission to the screening test described in paragraph 3 (b) on page 3, the following will be considered for the test to be given April 1943:

(a) High-school and preparatory-school graduates who will have attained their 17th and not their 20th birthdays by July 1, 1943, regardless of whether they are presently attending college.

(b) High-school and preparatory-school seniors who will be graduated by July 1, 1943, provided they will have attained their 17th and not their 20th birthdays by that date.

(c) Students who do not hold certificates of graduation from a secondary school but who are continuing their education in an accredited college or university

(2) For admission to the screening test to be given late in 1943, all applicants for V-12, except those who were in college in the spring of 1943 and those to graduate from high school or prep school midyear winter 1943–44, must produce certificates of graduation from high or prep school.

(3) To be considered, each applicant shall;

(a) Be a male citizen of the United States.

(b) Be morally and physically qualified for this program, including a minimum visual acuity of 18/20.

(c) Be unmarried, and agree to remain unmarried until commissioned, unless sooner released by the Navy Department.

(d) Evidence potential officer qualifications, including appearance and scholarship records.

Candidates who cannot meet the above requirements are advised not to apply.

B. Enlisted men in Regular Navy or Naval Reserve

(1) In order to be considered, each applicant shall:

(a) Be on active duty.

(b) Be a male citizen of the United States.

(c) Be morally and physically qualified for this program, including a minimum visual acuity of 18/20.

(d) Have a minimum education of graduation from high school with a creditable scholarship rating and a maximum education of not more than 3 years of college (men having more than 2 years of college are eligible for the Reserve midshipmen program). The candidate's signed statement in this regard may be accepted.

(e) Be between his 17th and 23d birthday on the day application is submitted.

(f) Be unmarried, and agree to remain unmarried until commissioned, unless sooner released by the Navy Department.

(g) Be recommended by their commanding officers (the commanding officers through whom individual requests for this training are submitted should bear in mind that their recommendations will be the most important single factor in the selection of such men and should assure themselves that candidates whom they recommend are within the prescribed age limit, have the educational requirements and are physically qualified). The commanding officer's responsibility is clear to nominate only desirable applicants for this training which leads to commissioned officer status in the United States Naval Reserve.

(h) Must have passed the general classification test with a mark of 85 (if the individual meets all other requirements and has not taken a classification test, or the mark is not available, paragraph (g) shall be stressed).

(i) Each applicant must sign a statement that he is willing to accept reduction in rating to apprentice seamen (the rating held by other students).

*2. Preference for colleges, courses of study, and branch of service*

a. Successful candidates will be permitted to indicate their preferences as to colleges on the Navy list to which they wish to be assigned, and those preferences will be respected insofar as possible, within geographical limits and student availability within the area. No guaranties, however, can be made that a student's request for a given institution will be granted.

b. Students will be permitted to express preliminary choice of the branch of service, i. e., Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, at the time of assignment to the V-12 program, but this choice will not be binding. Final assignment will be based upon demonstrated ability and counseling during the first two semesters and the needs of the service.

c. Students will be permitted to express preliminary choice of the course of study; i. e., medicine, engineering, etc. Assignment and continuance in these courses will be based upon available quotas and demonstrated competence in the particular fields of subject matter required.

*3. Procedures for civilian selection*

a. A quota for the year 1943 of high-school seniors who will be graduated by July 1, 1943, high-school graduates, and college students not in an armed force program will be assigned to each State. One-half of this quota will be placed on active duty about July 1, 1943, and one-half about November 1, 1943.

b. A screening test will be administered at local or nearby schools or colleges for all volunteers. The screening test will be given on the same day throughout the country, and all candidates within the continental limits of the United States must take this test on the same day in order to qualify. This test will be given at a date to be announced, approximately April 2, 1943. A similar test will be given late in 1943 for the then eligible students who, after fully qualifying and being accepted, will be placed on active duty about March 1, 1944.

c. Preliminary application forms for the V-12 program will be distributed through local high schools and colleges. Each applicant must submit this form, properly filled out and certified by a high-school principal or college administrator before admission to the screening test. The certifying authority is directed to eliminate, by refusal to certify, applications of candidates who obviously fall below the physical standards or who show evidence of inadequate educational preparation.

d. Tests will be scored by various regional offices which administer the screening tests indicated in paragraph (b) above. These offices will be designated by the Training Division, Bureau of Naval Personnel.

e. During a given period of a month or six weeks, successful applicants will be requested to report at their own expense to the nearest Office of Naval Officer Procurement.

f. In the few States wherein there is no Office of Naval Officer Procurement, a temporary branch office will be set up for this purpose.

g. On reporting to the Office of Naval Officer Procurement, the candidate will be interviewed to determine potential officerlike qualities, and given a physical examination.

h. Selection will be made by a committee from candidates who are qualified up to this point. The decision of these committees will be final in choosing the proper number of candidates to fill the quota.

i. The selection committee will be composed as follows:

(1) An educator who will be selected on the basis of his competence in appraising qualifications of prospective college students.

(2) A representative civilian who will be selected from a panel nominated by the present civilian committees, which are now set up near practically every Office of Naval Officer Procurement.

(3) A naval officer who should be a senior officer of the Office of Naval Officer Procurement.

There shall be at least one such committee in each State, and in States wherein there is more than one Office of Naval Officer Procurement, there shall be at least one such committee for each office. The civilians on these committees may be on a contract basis in order that the Navy shall have some directive power over their time.

j. Accepted candidates under 18 years of age shall be enlisted in class V-12, United States Naval Reserve by the Office of Naval Officer Procurement and placed on inactive duty until they are ordered to college. Candidates over 18 years of age shall be inducted under selective-service procedures and then enlisted into the Naval Reserve, class V-12, by the Office of Naval Officer Procurement and placed on inactive duty or furlough without pay until ordered to college. Students will enter colleges in three groups in July, November of 1943 and March 1944.

k. Service and health records on each accepted candidate shall be retained in the Office of Naval Officer Procurement until transferred with the candidate when ordered to active duty. Enlistment, or proper portions of induction papers will be forwarded to the Bureau of Naval Personnel for retention in the Procurement Division.

*4. Procedures for selection of enlisted reserves and probationary commissioned students*

A. V-5 Students

The naval aviation cadet selection boards shall continue to obtain through induction (or enlistment) V-5 candidates up to the total yearly quota. These candidates will be obtained by present methods of selection. From this quota the number authorized to enter the college program will be sent to the Office of Naval Officer Procurement for approval by the selection committees stationed there during the selection period. The papers of those selected will be transferred to the Office of Naval Officer Procurement concerned, and the candidate transferred to class V-12, United States Naval Reserve, in the rating of apprentice seaman, and assigned to colleges at the same time as other V-12 students.

B. V-1 Students

Enrollment of college students in the V-1 program will not be accepted after March 15, 1943, and enrollment may be terminated earlier if quotas are filled. Those students enrolled in this program who are in or have completed the final term of their sophomore year in March 1943, will be given qualifying examinations about April 1, 1943. Other V-1 students will continue their college training until the last half of their sophomore year, at which time they will be given the qualifying examination. The Training Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel will be responsible for the construction, administration, and scoring of these tests. Based on reports of these tests furnished by the Training Division, the Procurement Division wil assign men to further college training as desired. Those candidates who fail the test will be ordered to general enlisted service on active duty in the Navy. Those who are accepted will be placed on active duty as apprentice seamen, or class V-5, with pay, subsistence, and uniforms, and on July 1, 1943, will be assigned to colleges designated by the Bureau of Naval Personnel, to spend full time in completing their college training. For schedule on continuance of education for V-1 students, see subparagraph d below.

C. V-7 Students Now Enrolled

The present V-7 students who have more than one term to complete for a degree will be placed on active duty and ordered to the various colleges on the same date as the V-12 students. Those V-7 students who have one term or less to complete for a degree may remain on inactive duty in the college which they have been attending. Those V-7 students who have one term or less to complete for a degree and who desire to be placed on active duty, will be placed on active duty but not necessarily in the college which they have been attending.

D. Schedule for V-1 and V-7 Students

(1) V-1 and V-7 students will continue their education on the following schedule:

(a) Students who are selected to complete college training for the purpose of qualifying them for appointment in professional classes

of the Naval Reserve will be permitted to complete additional equivalent semesters, so that upon graduation they will have completed a total number of semesters as follows:

| | *Total semesters* |
|---|---|
| Chaplains | 12 |
| Medical and dental | 12 |
| Engineer specialists | 8 |

(b) Students who are selected for training to qualify them for engineers for general duty, deck, supply, or Marine Corps general duty will be permitted to complete additional equivalent semesters as follows:

Those who had on July 1 completed 7 semesters will receive 1 additional semester.

Those who had on July 1 completed 6 semesters will receive 1 additional semester.

Those who had on July 1 completed 5 semesters will receive 2 additional semesters.

Those who had on July 1 completed 4 semesters will receive 2 additional semesters.

Those who had on July 1 completed 3 semesters will receive 3 additional semesters.

Those who had on July 1 completed 2 semesters will receive 3 additional semesters.

Those who had on July 1 completed 1 semester will receive 4 additional semesters.

(2) Engineer reservists following the specialist program, regardless of the number of equivalent semesters completed on July 1, 1943, will be allowed to continue their college training at institutions designated by the Navy until they have completed a total of eight equivalent semesters since matriculation.

(3) Course requirements in the V–1 and V–7 programs were stated in the Navy announcement of March 1, 1942, in general terms only. It is impossible, therefore, for the Bureau of Naval Personnel to specify the completion programs in detail. The Bureau will, however, require that V–1 and V–7 reservists complete the following minimum programs for the several classifications by the end of their college training:

*Minimum requirements to be completed in college*

[V–1, accredited college program; V–7, college juniors and seniors]

| Type of service | Candidates for eventual commission in classification | Subject | Required minimum length of course [1] |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Deck (general service) and preaviation. | D–V (S) | English | 1 year. |
| | D–V (G) | Mathematics | 1 year, including completion of trigonometry. |
| | C–V (S) and A–V (N), SC–V (G) except engineering drawing not required. | Physics | 1 year, including laboratory. |
| | | Engineering drawing | ½ year. |
| | | Navigation | Desirable. |
| b. Engineering (general service). | E–V (G) | English | 1 year. |
| | | Mathematics | Through trigonometry. |
| | | Physics | 1 year. |
| | | Chemistry | Do. |
| | | Engineering drawing | Do. |
| | | Elementary heat-power engineering. | Desirable. |
| | | Navigation | Do. |
| c. Engineering specialists (mechanical engineering). | E–V (S), O–V (S), and A–V (S), CC–V (S). | English | 1 year. |
| | | Mathematics | Through integral calculus. |
| | | Physics | 1 year, including laboratory. |
| | | Chemistry | Do. |
| | | Analytic mechanics and strength of materials. | 1 year. |
| | | Hydraulics | ½ year. |
| | | Kinematics and machine design | 1 year. |
| | | Thermodynamics | ½ year. |
| | | Heat-power engineering (steam) | ½ year, including laboratory. |
| | | Internal combustion | Do. |
| | | Electrical engineering [1] | 1 year. |
| d. Engineering specialists (electrical engineering power). | E–V (S), O–V (S) | English | 1 year. |
| | | Mathematics | Through integral calculus. |
| | | Physics | 1 year, including laboratory. |
| | | Analytic mechanics and strength of materials. | 1 year. |
| | | Heat power | ½ year, |
| | | Direct and alternating currents | 1 year. |
| | | Electrical machinery, D. C. and A. C. | Do. |
| e. Engineering specialists (electrical engineering, communications, and ultrahigh frequency). | E–V (S), O–V (S), A–V (S). | English | Do. |
| | | Mathematics | Through linear differential equations. |
| | | Physics | 1 year, including laboratory. |
| | | Direct and alternating currents | 1 year. |
| | | Electronics and high-frequency circuits. | Do. |
| f. Engineering specialists (Civil Engineering Corps). | CEC–V (S) | English | Do. |
| | | Mathematics | Through integral calculus. |
| | | Physics | One year including laboratory. |
| | | Analytic mechanics and strength of materials. | 1 year. |
| | | Structures | Do. |
| | | Hydraulics | ½ year. |
| | | Surveying | 1 year. |
| | | Heat-power | ½ year. |
| | | Electrical engineering | Do. |
| | | Highways | Do. |
| | | Sanitary engineering | Do. |
| g. Medical and Dental Corps. | MC–V (S) and DC–V (S). | English | 1 year. |
| | | Chemistry, including inorganic, qualitative, and organic. | 2 years. |
| | | Physics | 1 year, including laboratory. |
| | | Biology (½ year to be zoology) | Do. |
| | | French or German | 2 years (school) or college. |

[1] A minimum year course is considered to be the equivalent of a course meeting 3 class-hours per week for at least 30 weeks.

E. Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps Students

(1) All members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps who are enlisted in class V–1 will be ordered to active duty about July 1, 1943, concurrently with those students who are enlisted in the V–12 program. Although on active duty, they will continue their Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps training as at present until they have completed their advanced course. While on active duty, they will receive the pay and allowances of an apprentice seaman.

(2) Members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps who are not enlisted in class V–1 may make application for appointment as reserve midshipmen prior to April 1, 1943. If accepted, they will be ordered to inactive duty and will continue their Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps training at their own expense until about July 1, or when the V–12 program becomes effective.

(3) All members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduating before July 1, 1943, will be commissioned as ensigns in the United States Naval Reserve. Those who sever their connection with their college before July 1, 1943, will be discharged from the Naval Reserve, or at their own request, be ordered to active duty in an enlisted status. Those who maintain their connection, in good standing, but do not graduate before July 1, 1943, will be transferred to class V–12 as apprentice seamen, and will be ordered to active duty as outlined in subparagraph (1) above.

(4) The V–12 program is expected to be placed in effect approximately July 1, 1943. As presently planned, this program contemplates the continued existence of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps in substantially the same manner as at present. It is believed that present staffs and facilities are adequate to administer and handle any changes which may be brought about through the operation of the V–12 program.

(5) Commencing on approximately March 1, 1944, candidates for the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps will be obtained from apprentice seamen, class V–12, who have previously completed the first 2 4-month semesters of instruction in the V–12 program. Those candidates who are enrolled in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps are then expected to continue their training as members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps for 4 additional 4-month semesters. This training will require a total of 2 calendar years.

(6) Although those members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps will be on active duty as apprentice seamen, class V–12, they will continue to be uniformed as hitherto.

(7) At present the curriculum is divided into a basic and an advanced course. Commencing as above, inasmuch as all enrollees will have previously received two basic semesters of general instruction under the V–12 program, they will immediately enter into their Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps training. Beginning as above, the instruction will no longer be referred to as "basic course" and "advanced course," but will be combined and designated as Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps course. The curriculum for this course will be revised to include the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps instruction not previously covered during the first 2 semesters of the V–12 program. Additional subject matter will be included if considered necessary by this bureau. A copy of the finished curriculum for the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps course will be forwarded to the Professor of Naval Science and Tactics prior to November 1, 1943.

(8) For purposes of administration, the members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps who have been secured through the V–12 program will be divided into two classes:

(a) Those who are receiving instruction for the first two semesters will be designated second classmen, and

(b) Those receiving instruction for the last two semesters will be designated first classmen.

(9) Members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps will receive the same pay and allowances, medical services, etc., as all other apprentice seamen, class V–12, on active duty.

(10) Present members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps will receive the same instruction as originally planned on the accelerated schedule.

F. Enlisted Reserve Corps Students (Students Who Were Enrolled in the Basic Course, Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps, Because of Required Military Training at Institution)

When other members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps are called to active service, those in the above category who have requested assignment to the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard will, if qualified and accepted by the Navy, be enlisted in the V–1 program and handled in accordance with paragraph b above.

G. Present Probationary Commissioned Students

When the V–12 program goes into effect, students now holding probationary commissions in the United States Naval Reserve, on inactive duty in a deferred status, will be permitted to resign and accept assignment to the V–12 program as apprentice seamen on active duty without meeting the age requirements specified for civilians entering this program. At the satisfactory completion of their prescribed professional education, they will be again commissioned in the United States Naval Reserve, if physically qualified.

*5. Procedures for Selection of Enlisted Men Now on Duty*

A. General Considerations

(1) A quota (total 10,000) will be assigned to the enlisted personnel of the Navy. Increments of this quota will be assigned to the main distribution commands listed below.

(2) The assignment of these quotas will be on a percentage basis of the total 10,000 based on the number of personnel shown to be on hand by the latest composite reports of the large distribution commands. The quotas assigned to shore activities will be reduced by 20 percent to equalize the effect of personnel on shore who are not physically qualified for sea duty, and to favor men serving at sea.

(3) Enlisted men will be ordered to report in three groups so as to permit an even flow into the schools which will be beginning semesters in July, November of 1943, and March of 1944.

(4) Individual enlisted men meeting the qualifications listed below may apply for this college program on an application blank which shall be comparable to the one used by enlisted men in applying for a commissioned rank. Approved applications will be forwarded by the commanding officer directly to the large distribution commands. Commanding officers will indicate the priority in which men under their command are recommended. These commands will select the proper number of men to fill the increment of the quota assigned to them by the Bureau. The applications of these successful candidates will be forwarded to the Bureau of Naval Personnel (Procurement Division).

(5) At the proper time the men will be ordered to report to the various colleges as directed by the Bureau of Naval Personnel. Those men who have not taken the general classification test will be ordered via the nearest district command where they will be given the general classification test or a comparable screening test designated by the Bureau of Naval Personnel. Those passing this test will be ordered to the several colleges. Those not passing the test will be returned to general detail.

(6) Enlisted personnel selected for this training will be retained in their existing branch of service whether United States Navy or United States Naval Reserve, and those who fail to successfully complete the program and receive commissions in the Naval Reserve will be restored to general service in their former ratings.

B. Assignment of Quotas

Quotas will be assigned to the following commands who will choose the proper number of personnel from the applications forwarded directly to them by the commanding officers to fill the necessary increment of the total quotas.

(1) Commander Service Force, Pacific Fleet, Subordinate Command.

(a) For all activities for whom he distributes personnel in accordance with reference (a), Bu. Pers. Cir. Ltr. No. 154–42.

(2) Commander Service Force, Atlantic Fleet, Subordinate Command.

(a) For all activities for whom he distributes personnel in accordance with reference (a), Bu. Pers. Cir. Ltr. No. 154–42.

(3) Commander Southeast Pacific Force.

(a) For all ships and outlying stations under his command.

(4) Commandant, Fifteenth Naval District.

(a) For all Districts and Panama Sea Frontier Force activities.

(5) Commandants of all Naval Districts in the continental limits of the United States, and the Commandant of the Potomac and Severn River Naval Commands.

(a) For all activities within the boundaries of their respective commands not included in (1) and (2) above, whether or not they distribute personnel to them in accordance with Bu. Pers. Cir. Ltr. No. 154–42.

NOTE.—Special instructions will be issued to the Commandants concerning prorating quotas to recruits at naval training stations, men on general detail, armed guard personnel under instruction in service schools, United States Navy construction training centers, etc., to afford availability of this plan to the maximum number of personnel in a transitory status.

(b) Assignment of quotas will be on a percentage basis, 10,000 total, based on the number of personnel shown by latest composite reports of activities listed above, except that numbers reported in shore activities will be reduced by 20 percent to equalize the effects of personnel on shore who are not physically qualified for sea duty. Men selected will be sent to school in 3 increments of one-third of the total quota, each 4 months. The first increment will be supplied by July 1, 1943, and each additional increment 4 months thereafter.

C. Coast Guard and Marine Corps

(1) The quota for the Coast Guard will be filled by taking 450 enlisted men to be selected by them and the remaining 270 to be taken from civilian sources.

(2) The quota for the Marine Corps will be 1,000 from enlisted sources and 2,500 from civilian sources.

(3) These quotas will be included in the total Navy quotas.

IV. ARRANGEMENTS WITH COLLEGES

Contracts with the institutions will provide for training, housing, feeding, and medical service.

The contract with the institution will insure a definite minimum number of men. Students may or may not be housed in groups, depending upon local conditions. It is the responsibility of the institution to see that satisfactory feeding and housing is maintained. Contracts with the institutions will cover the cost of same.

A cooperating institution will be required to accept men ordered to it for training. At the same time, each institution will be expected to maintain high standards of selectivity in examinations, instructions, etc., and to recommend transfer to other duty of students who fail to meet those standards.

V. ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM AT THE COLLEGES

All administration of the program at the colleges will be under the cognizance of the Training Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel.

*1. Administration*

All units of the program will be under the command of commanding officers. Such commanding officers will be under the jurisdiction of the district commandants with respect to purely military matters only. They will report to the Chief of Naval Personnel. The size of the administrative staffs assigned to the colleges will depend upon the number of enlisted men attached. Where the number so warrants, this staff will include a commanding officer and the necessary executive staff plus a disbursing officer and medical officer (or pharmacist mate). The latter two will be necessary in order to provide for issue of uniforms, monthly pay, allotments, insurance, etc., and vaccinations, inoculations, hospitalization, with suitable entries on health records. Chief specialists will be provided for physical training and indoctrination.

*2. Curricula*

The Training Division will prescribe the curricula which are necessary to insure production of officer material for the various branches of naval service, including aviation cadets, engineer and deck officers, engineer specialists, medical and dental officers, Supply Corps officers, and chaplains. Curricula will vary in length, depending on training requirements. The length of course for chaplains, medical and dental officers will be twelve 16-week terms, engineering specialists eight 16-week terms, engineering for general duty six 16-week terms, deck and marine line officers four 16-week terms, and aviators two 16-week terms.

There will be three 16-week terms in each calendar year. Courses for the first two 16-week terms, or the equivalent, will be similar for all students except premedical and predental (for these students, chemistry and foreign languages are substituted for English and history) and will emphasize fundamental college work in mathematics, science, English, history, engineering drawing, and physical training. All students inducted in the V–12 program will receive instruction in naval organization and general naval orientation. The amount of time devoted to this work will not exceed three classes per week during the first two semesters.

Outlines of all curricula will be prepared by the Training Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, with such assistance as may be required from representative educators or educational societies.

If the college is satisfied that the student has adequately covered any of the subjects included in the curricula, proper substitutes will be permitted.

*3. Discipline*

Discipline and separation from the training program will be handled as follows:

(1) Minor matters of internal discipline (such as demerits, etc.) will be administered locally by the commanding officer of the school.

(2) Separation from the program (not from the service) for disciplinary reasons

will be accomplished only by the Bureau of Naval Personnel (Officer Discipline Section) and all such cases will be referred to the Bureau by the commanding officer of the school. They will then be referred to the Officer Discipline Section via the Training Division.

(3) The extent of the disciplinary action in subparagraph (2) above is to drop a man from the officer candidate program. When this is done, the man automatically reverts to ordinary enlisted status, and is available for assignment to general service or further disciplinary action. Such further disciplinary action, such as mast punishments, courts martial, or separation from the service, is solely the responsibility of the established Enlisted Discipline Section of the Bureau of Naval Personnel.

(4) Cases warranting separation from the officer candidate program for scholastic reasons, as reported by the faculty of the college or as reported by naval personnel as the result of screening tests, will be referred to the Training Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel by the commanding officer of the school for action, and that division will decide the disposition of the cases.

*4. Physical training*

A. Compulsory

Will be given to all enlisted students in the form of physical drills, swimming, and setting-up exercises to be limited to several hours per week.

B. Voluntary

Enlisted students under the V–12 Program will be permitted to take part in all college athletics and other activities of the campus on the same basis as civilian students insofar as it does not interfere with their prescribed hours or courses of study.

*5. Extracurricular activities (other than physical, covered above)*

Students will be permitted to participate in college extracurricular activities the same as civilian students insofar as it does not interfere with their prescribed hours or courses of study.

*6. Liberty*

Insofar as possible, enlisted students will be required to maintain the Navy's standard of discipline. Military activities will be kept to a minimum and will be subordinated, consistent with necessary military supervision, to academic training.

*7. Pay and allowances*

As mentioned under Administration above, a disbursing officer will be provided to one or a group of colleges, depending on the number of enlisted students and location. All students will be encouraged to make substantial allotments for insurance and Government bonds as it is considered desirable for them to inaugurate systematic financial habits at an early phase in their naval career, and will further limit their spending money to an amount not detrimental to their training.

*8. Fraternities*

Enlisted students will be allowed to join all previously established organizations or fraternities on the campus already in existence and available to all students on the same terms. They will not be permitted to establish or join any activity or organization not available to membership to all students either civilian or enlisted on the campus or which might be inimical to naval interests.

VI. ASSIGNMENT AT COMPLETION OF TRAINING

1. Upon satisfactory completion of college training, all students may be assigned to appropriate specialized training in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

2. If found qualified upon completion of this specialized training, students will be commissioned in the appropriate Reserve.

VII. DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PROGRAM

1. The Training Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel will have cognizance of:

a. Provision of schools and facilities.

b. Selection of teaching staffs.

c. Curricula and methods of instruction.

d. Examination of achievement.

The Training Division will give achievement examinations at the end of the first two terms. The result of these examinations will be used in determining further assignments.

e. Reporting to Procurement Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel all necessary information concerning the progress and status of individuals, and recommending to the procurement division action such as advancement, appointment, etc.

2. The Procurement Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel is responsible for decisions as to:

a. Enrollment.

b. Call to active duty and subsequent orders.

c. Appointment and commissioning as recommended by the Training Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel.

## SUFFRAGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—ADDRESS BY JAMES R. KIRKLAND

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an address delivered by James R. Kirkland, a prominent attorney of the District of Columbia, and chairman of the District of Columbia Bar Association, before the Central Business Association on February 11. In his remarks Mr. Kirkland discusses intelligently and concisely some of the problems of District residents—I should like to say "District citizens," but that is almost satirical, considering the treatment accorded the good Americans who make their homes in the National Capital.

I endorse fully Mr. Kirkland's statement that—

In this day when America is bringing liberty to all the people of the world, it is shameful that she neglects the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Without in any way seeming critical of the efforts of many Americans who are insisting that Britain give the people of India the right to run their own government, I am suggesting that before we take on the Indian problem of the British Empire, these good people should first free the people who reside in the District of Columbia.

These Americans are taxed without representation. They are drafted into the armed services without representation. Thousands of Washingtonians are fighting today on scattered fronts all over the globe, to carry the four freedoms to the people of all the world—except to their own relatives and themselves in the District of Columbia.

I believe thoroughly in our representative form of government. I also believe it should be representative for all American citizens in the United States. I hold that the resident citizens of the District of Columbia should be represented in Congress, should have the right to choose their representatives in Congress, and should also be allowed to participate in the election of President and Vice President.

I again direct the attention of the Senate to Senate Joint Resolution 33, introduced by me, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia. It is a companion resolution to that introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS of Texas, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

I ask that a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 33 be printed at this point as a part of my remarks, to be followed by a copy of the remarks delivered by Mr. Kirkland.

There being no objection, the joint resolution and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 33

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be proposed for ratification by the legislatures of the several States which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years of the date of its passage, shall be valid as a part of said Constitution, namely:

"The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

---

SPEECH BY JAMES R. KIRKLAND BEFORE CENTRAL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION FEBRUARY 11, 1943

I come to you today as the chairman of the District of Columbia Bar Association Committee on Americanization. I also come to you as a citizen and a property holder in the District of Columbia. In this day when America is bringing liberty to all the peoples of the world, it is shameful that she neglects the citizens of the District of Columbia. The four freedoms have transcended the seven seas, but the Atlantic Charter has not yet come to the shores of the Potomac.

It is high time that we Washingtonians should do something about this condition. No greater affront has ever been offered us than the refusal of new Congressmen to serve on the congressional Committee on the District of Columbia. I say that that was an affront. I say also that we have been harping on this matter of suffrage for such a long time that perhaps like Tara's harp it will finally resound through the monumental marble halls of the Federal Government. Let us hope that our parental Federal Government will condescend to give us some means of expressing ourselves and to have some congressional representation in our own affairs.

I am particularly interested in another matter by virtue of an association. My father-in-law, the late Dr. Stephen E. Kramer, former assistant superintendent of the Washington public schools, was probably known to many of you. He did a splendid job, but a

neglectful Congress has given us an understaffed and poorly housed educational system. Our children should be educated in a model public-school system which should be a standard for the world.

Our fire and police departments need help. We need more modern fire-fighting equipment and the police department needs more permanent personnel. As a former assistant United States Attorney, I have marveled that the Nation's Capital of approximately 750,000 people is policed by a force of approximately 1,500 patrolmen whose job is to safeguard its citizens and their property and maintain law and order day and night. Undoubtedly the efforts of the auxiliary police have contributed in our present conditions, but we need a much larger and better equipped police department.

We have talked a great deal about local suffrage. We have had many arguments pro and con. We have heard the argument that certain minority classes might control and that politics might be harmful to the administration of the Nation's Capital. However, out of my experience as a public prosecutor and private attorney, I do not think there is a better behaved city in the world and I feel that our efficient citizen associations have shown that we are capable of self-government.

Many suggestions have been made for the approach to complete statehood. Personally, I do not care what approach is made. My idea is to get something started—do something at the present time. I have suggested to friends and I have made public speeches along the same lines, that if Congress feels we are still incapable of self-government, we should at least be entitled to the same badge of honor and dignity in the Halls of Congress as Alaska, Hawaii, and the other territories. We should at least have a congressional Delegate. I urge this because in the constant turn-over of Congress, a Delegate from the District of Columbia could at least be the means of keeping Congress advised of local problems. The Committee on the District of Columbia is constantly in a state of flux. With new Congressmen coming in, fresh ideas being constantly suggested, many congressional policies of great value are cast aside in the biennial turn-over. If we had a Delegate, we would have a clearinghouse for our ideas; we could maintain files of information and data available on all local problems; he could rise and defend our policies on the floor of Congress; he could appear before committees and he could answer interrogatories from the floor of other Members seeking information. In his presence we would have at least a spokesman and consultant for our problems.

My experience in the District of Columbia Bar Association has been that Congress has been slow to make full concessions. I have watched that process carefully in connection with our local courts. I think you can be justly proud of your municipal courts as they are now constituted. They have jurisdiction today in all civil suits up to $3,000. I predict that before long domestic relations will also form a part of their jurisdiction and then the courts will be truly municipal in character and will administer the affairs of our community.

I repeat, let us petition Congress to have at least a congressional delegate. If that idea succeeds, let us petition them further for an elected delegate in both bodies of Congress. A spokesman in each branch would be alert to our opportunities and further our hopes. If their election disputes the contemplated abuses, then I think it would be in order to petition for full suffrage.

I want to compliment your organization; you have been a very progressive body. You have had the best interests of the District of Columbia at heart and you have always done a very good job. I say that you should now put your shoulders to the wheel and push ahead for local suffrage. I am looking forward confidently to the day in the very near future, when we will all be able to say, with the residents of every other State, that we, too, are 100 percent Americans.

## MILITARY PREPAREDNESS—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, those who served in this body before our entry into the war will, I am sure, recall that there was never effective and decisive resistance to serious requests for military preparedness. In fact, Congress was more eager to prepare the country for war than was the executive branch.

The real cleavage of opinion came largely between two groups: First, those who, although realizing the unpreparedness of the United States, thought that the security of our country could be promoted by talk; and second, those who felt that as long as we were unprepared we should indulge in as little threatening talk as possible.

In a recent article in the New York Times the distinguished journalist, Mr. Arthur Krock, makes a definitive contribution to the history of our pre-war period. With facts and figures which are incontestable he shows the desire of Congress to prepare the United States. Let us hope that some day someone will explain equally clearly the fact that many of those who saw with clarity the imminence of war delayed so long in preparing for it.

The best policy for any legislator to follow is that of personal conviction. Whether it puts him into some subtle classification as an interventionist or noninterventionist is entirely immaterial. Honesty of purpose is the important standard involved.

I ask unanimous consent that the article of Mr. Krock be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE DEFENSE AND WAR FISCAL RECORD OF CONGRESS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 25.—In the skirmishes and battles that are being and will be fought between the President and Congress, one of the causes of which is the forming fourth-term drive, several small and large obstructions to the war program can develop. But the record of Congress for the past 10 years in dealing with Presidential requests for War and Navy Department appropriations offers strong assurance that the sinew of war, which is money, will not be denied any element of growing strength that Congress can provide.

It takes much more than money, of course, to fight and win a war. But money is an indispensable supply. If the United States and Great Britain had diverted much of it into an armament race in the last decade, when the Axis Nations were making ready for the present conflict, the war—as Mr. Dooley could have said—might have been over as soon as it began, if not before. Therefore, the congressional attitude toward defense and war appropriations is comforting to a people about to be afflicted again, and this time in the midst of desperate battle, with the wasting germs of a legislative-executive political conflict that are being incubated by the fourth-term drive.

In the 1933–42 period the record shows that Congress appropriated almost $10,000,000,000 more for the Military Establishment than was asked in the original Presidential budgets during those years, and considerably more than the totals of the first and supplemental Budget estimates. During the same period Congress supplied almost $1,000,000,000 more for the Naval Establishment than the President's original estimates.

#### THE DEFENSE POLICY SPLIT

There were numerous instances, which there is no space here to recount, when Members of the House and Senate sought to add to the total appropriations. These Members included A and B isolationists and noninterventionists. A isolationists were willing to spend for arms if the arms were to be used in North America; B isolationists and noninterventionists extended their concept of the defense zone of the United States to the Western Hemisphere, and after the collapse of France some of the latter accepted lend-lease as a wise necessity, clinging only to their demand that we keep out of the war.

The attack of the Japanese on Pearl Harbor, followed by the declaration of war against this Nation by the other two Axis Powers, ended the argument and merged the disputants. But it is worth remembering that the argument was not over money to arm the forces of the United States. And there is no reason to think that, except to achieve obvious economies to promote efficiency, Congress will engage in any such argument for the duration.

The subjoined comparison is between the President's original Budget estimates for the last decade and the sums granted by Congress. A considerable part of the difference is accounted for by supplemental Budget requests from the Executive. But it is accurate to say that, as a general rule, and particularly in the last 3 years, Congress has given more to the Military and Naval Establishments than the President sought.

In the following table the first figure is the amount of the original Budget estimates and the second is the amount appropriated, all in millions of dollars:

War Department (1933), $301, $304½; (1934), $280¾, $378; (1935) $289, $292¾; (1936) $320½, $368½; (1937) $391, $420; (1938) $428¾; $514; (1939) $618½, $648; 1940) $869, $879½; (1941) $11,202, $13,469; (1942) $71,723, $75,610. For the current fiscal year the President's first budget was for 39,532 and the House reported favorably on $42,820.

Navy Department (1933), $354½, $334½; (1934) $323½, $572¾; (1935) $295¼, $371½; (1936) $488, 498½; (1937) $561½, 559; (1938) $577½, 588¼; (1939) $579½, $656¾; (1940) $1,028, $1,050; (1941) $4,460, $4,506; (1942) $23,810, $24,085. And for the current fiscal year the congressional bills have already provided for almost a billion more for the Navy than the original estimates.

#### THE GRAND TOTALS

The grand totals for the period, as affecting the War Department, including the amount reported by the House for 1943, are: $125,962 estimated, $135,642 voted. For the Navy Department the totals are: $46,427 estimated, $47,948 voted.

To further point out the fact that the issue over intervention was not an issue over

armament for national defense, it should be noted that Senator LODGE, a noninterventionist, urged compulsory military training some months before the President endorsed it, and is now an ardent supporter of the plan to raise the Army to 8,200,000 officers and men in 1943. Some of his other activities are typical. He voted in 1941 to confine our forces to the Western Hemisphere. But he voted "yes" for 21 percent naval expansion in 1938, for 6,000 versus 5,500 Army planes in 1939, for lend-lease and its $7,000,000,000 appropriation in 1941, for the 18-month extension of military service in 1941, and against the provision to compel 1 year's training of the 18- and 19-year-olds before they could be assigned to combat areas.

ALIENS IN LABOR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Aliens In Labor, delivered by him, Friday, February 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SIZE OF OUR ARMY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject The Size of Our Army, delivered by Senator Green, on February 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HOUSING STUDY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Housing Study," delivered by him to the National Association of Housing Officials at Richmond, Va., on February 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT QUEZON TO HIS COUNTRYMEN

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by President Manuel Quezon to his countrymen on the anniversary of his departure from Corregidor, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR AT DINNER OF PRODUCE FOR VICTORY COMMITTEE

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, before a dinner meeting of the produce-for-victory committee of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce of February 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

GEORGE WASHINGTON DINNER ADDRESS BY EUGENE S. CASEY

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Washington Day address delivered by Hon. Eugene B. Casey at Albuquerque, N. Mex., on February 26, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED WAR AIMS AND STRATEGY—ADDRESS BY LOTHROP STODDARD

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject United War Aims and Strategy, delivered by Lothrop Stoddard, February 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PUBLIC RELATIONS BUREAU—EDITORIAL FROM NORRISTOWN (PA.) TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress Needs Public Relations Bureau," from the Norristown (Pa.) Times-Herald of February 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

RICKENBACKER CHALLENGED BY FELLOW HERO OF WAR—ARTICLE FROM PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing under a New York date line of February 28 entitled "Rickenbacker Challenged by Fellow Hero of War," which appears in the Appendix.]

JOINT COMMITTEE ON WAR PROBLEMS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of February 21, 1943, entitled "Congress' Two Glass Houses" and S. Con. Res. 2, which appear in the Appendix.]

MONOPOLY AND DESECRATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE DAILY OKLAHOMAN

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Monopoly and Desecration," published in the Daily Oklahoman, which appears in the Appendix.]

IN SOILED ERMINE—EDITORIAL FROM THE DAILY OKLAHOMAN

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "In Soiled Ermine," published in the Daily Oklahoman, which appears in the Appendix.]

BILLIONAIRE BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Gilbert E. Busch, United Press staff correspondent, containing figures regarding the size of certain business organizations in the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRANSPORTATION OF PETROLEUM BY PIPE LINE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 103) submitted by Mr. CLARK of Missouri (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MOORE, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. BURTON, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. CAPPER) on February 15, 1943, was read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. This resolution is to go over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be passed over.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded, and the calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE IN PAY OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 17.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 17) to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, whose rate of compensation is governed by the act of July 1, 1930 (Public Law No. 489 of the 71st Cong.), shall be paid additional compensation at a rate of $350 per annum: *Provided*, That each such employee shall be paid only such additional compensation or portion thereof as will not cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of $5,000 per annum.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall take effect as of December 1, 1942, and shall remain in effect for the duration of the present war and for 6 months thereafter.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, during the month of December last, Congress passed a bill providing for an increase of $300 for each fireman and policeman in service in the District of Columbia. The bill was vetoed by the President, on two specific grounds. One ground was that the bill did not take care of another group in the District, namely, the school teachers. The other ground was that it contained a retroactive feature, that it extended back 1 year. In other words, in the bill passed in December last it was provided that the increases in pay should be retroactive to December 1941. It will be noted that the bill now under consideration provides that the increases shall be retroactive to December 1942 only.

Following the President's veto, the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia introduced a bill providing for an increase of pay for the members of the police force and the members of the fire department amounting to $480 a year. As a result of the hearings on the bill, the chairman of the committee changed the amount from $480 a year as the increase for a year to $350 a year for each member of the respective services for the duration of the war. In other words, we reduced the amount provided by the initial bill which was introduced, and set up what we thought was a fair amount of additional pay for the police and fire services for the duration of the war.

We worked the matter out in various ways, but came to the conclusion that a flat sum of $350 for each member would be fair, because by making such provision we would increase the wages in the lower brackets, so that policemen who were receiving only $1,900 a year would receive an increase sufficient to warrant them remaining in the service.

For the enlightenment of the Senate, I wish to present some figures on the subject which I think very much worth while.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he states the figures?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. OVERTON. What was the basis for the increase? Was it recommended because of the increased cost of living?

Mr. McCARRAN. The principal basis is the increased cost of living.

Mr. OVERTON. That is why there is suggested a flat increase of $350 a year for the members of each service?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is a fact, and it is also because of the increased service demanded of the police and fire departments at this time.

Mr. OVERTON. That is equally distributed?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is equally distributed.

Mr. OVERTON. That is why the increases are the same?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. In other words, we believe that those who receive the smaller salaries, namely, $1,900 a year, which is the entrance salary in the police service and the fire service, should be taken care of, because it has been from that element that we have been losing a greater number of policemen and firemen. One thousand nine hundred dollars a year is not sufficient to sustain a family of four people in the District of Columbia, according to the facts and figures presented by the Department of Labor.

In order that Senators may know exactly what will happen if the bill shall become law, let me say that six employees in the police service will receive $4,850. They are now receiving $4,500. Mind you, there are only six in that category. They will receive an increase of 7.5 percent.

Eighteen of the employees now receiving $3,600 will receive $3,950, or an increase of 9.7 percent.

Forty-five of the police force now receiving $3,050 per annum will receive $3,400, or an increase of 11.4 percent.

Sixty-three of the police force now receiving $2,750 will receive $3,100, or an increase of 12.7 percent.

Seven hundred and eighty-eight of the police force now receiving $2,400 will, if the bill shall become law, receive $2,750, or an increase of 14.5 percent.

Sixty-one members of the police force now receiving $2,300 will receive under the proposed law $2,650, or an increase of 15.2 percent.

Fifty-four members of the police force now receiving $2,200 will receive $2,550, or an increase of 15.9 percent.

Eighty-six members of the police force now receiving $2,100 will receive $2,450, or an increase of 16.6 percent.

One hundred and seventy-eight members of the police force receiving $2,000 will, under the proposed law, receive $2,350, or an increase of 17.5 percent.

Three hundred and sixty-three members of the police force of the District of Columbia now receiving $1,900 per annum will receive $2,250, or an increase of 18.4 percent.

The total number of policemen authorized by act of Congress for the District of Columbia is 1,711. According to the figures, there is now a shortage of about 41 privates. There is now a greater shortage in the lower grade, the vacancies in the list of privates being 77. In other words, the quota which is allowed by law cannot be filled, notwithstanding the fact that there is a greater need for police service than ever in the history of Washington. The reason for inability to fill the quota in the lower grade is the entrance salary of $1,900, which extends over the whole year. Therefore, we thought best and we think best that this bill should carry a flat $350 raise for all those receiving as high as $4,500 a year, but in no case would anyone receive in excess of $5,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the bill approved by the District Commissioners?

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill was not approved by the District Commissioners. No bill increasing salaries, with which I have had anything to do, has been approved by the District Commissioners. In answer to the Senator's question I wish to read from the testimony of the Chairman of the District Commissioners before the committee. Mr. Young, Chairman of the District Commissioners, testified in a hearing on this bill, when the bill contained a provision for $480 per annum increase in place of $350 per annum. I read from his testimony:

> The CHAIRMAN. While you are on your feet, Mr. Mayor, will you tell us what you think about this bill?
>
> Commissioner YOUNG. Well, Senator, it puts me in a very peculiar position, not a very happy one.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. You testified voluntarily. Now, I can cross-examine you, because you submitted yourself.
>
> Commissioner YOUNG. Well, I think you easily guess, and every man in the room can guess it doesn't put me in a very pleasant position, because I am very proud of the force. I think I, personally, since I have been on the job, have appointed about 700 of them. That is a pretty large part of the force, and without trying to flatter the major too much—

Referring to Major Kelly—

> I think the force shows a great improvement, to such an extent I think the citizens now are praising it, where, not so many years ago they were critical. The police force has done a great job, and nobody will dispute the fact that they deserve a raise. I wish I could sit right here at this table and sign my name to the money this bill calls for.

That statement was made when the bill carried a provision for an increase of $480 per annum. Commissioner Young then said he wished he could sit at the committee table and sign his name to the increase the bill calls for.

Later on, after the hearings had been held, and upon further consideration, we thought it best to reduce the amount to $350 per annum, a flat allowance to all members of the force then receiving under $4,500 a year.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand from the Senator that the Commissioners as a body are opposed to the measure which the Senator is submitting, but are they opposed to any increase in the pay scales?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know that I would be justified in saying they are opposed to any increase, but they have opposed every increase which has been submitted. They opposed the proposal for a $300 increase which was contained in the bill passed by the Senate last December. Senators will find from the RECORD that I stated to the Senate at that time that the Commissioners were opposed to the increase. They oppose the present proposed increase. As between two bills, that is a substitute measure which will be proposed in the Senate, and the one which is offered by the committee, I am advised that the Commissioners favor the substitute. The substitute would raise the salaries of those in the lower brackets $100 per annum, and raise the salaries in the higher brackets $300 per annum. In other words, the substitute bill would give a greater increase to those in the higher brackets, and a lesser increase to those in the lower brackets. Yet it is in the very low brackets where we are losing the men, because they cannot live on the present salaries.

For the further enlightenment of the able Senator from Michigan I wish to read a letter.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Do the Commissioners approve or disapprove the substitute bill or have they made a report in respect to it?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am advised that the Commissioners approve the substitute bill which has been mentioned and which I think the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] will present. I have just referred to the substitute, which proposes to give an increase in salary of $100 a year to those in the $1,900-a-year bracket and $300 a year increase to those who are in higher pay brackets.

Mr. OVERTON. May I ask the Senator why the Commissioners approve the substitute bill rather than the original bill? Is it because the substitute bill carries less increase in the aggregate?

Mr. McCARRAN. That would be my conjecture, because the substitute bill carries a maximum of $300 increase in place of $350.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me before the letter to which he referred is read?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am merely seeking information. I do not know what the facts are about the proposed increase, except what the Senator has just said. In the Post Office Department, however, we have a tentative understanding that the employees shall receive an increase of $300 each. I think it is quite generally agreed or understood that that is what the increase will be, and that is acceptable to the employees. I wonder whether it would not be well to make the increase given to employees generally about the same? I am merely suggesting that thought to the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall discuss that matter, I will say to the Senator from Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read a letter which addresses itself largely to the question

propounded by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK read as follows:

FALLS CHURCH, VA., *January 25, 1943.*
Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: I am a private in the Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D. C. I noticed in the Sunday Star paper where Senator BURTON, of Ohio, is to file another police and fire pay bill in the Senate with the one you have introduced but at a lower scale.

I suppose we all have our ups and downs, so I will give you a few of mine. We have five children and did live in Washington, but cost of living growing so high I thought it best to move out, so moved to Falls Church, Va., which did not reduce our cost of living at all. We live very simple, depriving ourselves and children of many a want. The children spend very little for shows and such things children want, and my wife and myself spend nothing only for necessities. We can't clothe ourselves or children as they should be, but we do have enough to eat even if it is simple food and have to leave off other things. I have tried to save the best I could for war bonds and stamps, but the best we have done is one $25 bond and the children have six or seven dollars each in stamps. We know our country needs all each one can do, so we will do the best we can, but we do have to live. I don't want this letter considered as a complaint but merely a statement of existing conditions.

I'm planning on a garden this spring which will help a lot, but with the high cost of shoes, clothing, foods, and other living experses, it's impossible to live and pay my bills at my present salary.

If we were allowed to do extra work at other places, it would give us a little extra money to pay our bills with. We work many hours overtime, but do not get any pay for it.

I think the bill you introduced is small enough, and will help the whole department a lot even if it does not meet each of our needs, but anything less will just make it that much harder for us to live. There are lots of other men in the Police Department who have as large a family as I, and some larger. So what you can do for the department will be greatly appreciated by my family and myself and lots of other families.

JUST A POLICEMAN.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] propounded a question to me and then was called from the Chamber. He has asked me to defer making answer to his question until he returns, which I will gladly do.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] a moment ago raised the question of the cost of living in the District of Columbia. The cost of living is somewhat connected with the question propounded by the Senator from Tennessee. In other words, it will not do to compare the cost of living in the District of Columbia with the cost of living elsewhere, because it is higher in the District of Columbia than it is in any other comparable city in the United States.

I beg leave to read an article from the local press which carries confirmation of my last statement. The article is headed:

District cost of living rises 7½ percent in a year.

The article continues—

District living costs advanced 0.3 percent between December 15 and January 15, as compared with an average rise of 0.2 percent in other large cities during the same period and now are 7.5 percent higher than a year ago and 19.8 percent above the level of December 15, 1940—

I draw that especially to the attention of those who are interested in this subject, and I repeat what the article states, that District living costs now are 19.8 percent above the level of December 15, 1940—

the Labor Department reported today—

This was just a few days ago—

Food costs in the District increased 0.8 percent during the month, and fuel, electricity, and ice 1.9 percent. Prices of clothing and housefurnishings dropped fractionally, while costs of miscellaneous items remained unchanged. As an economy measure, the Labor Department made no survey of rents in January.

The January advance brought the District cost of living index to 119.4 percent of the 1935–39 average.

That is a matter which takes the consideration of the pay which should be given to the policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia out of the category of comparison with any other city in the country. The reason for that is obvious. There has been an influx of hundreds of thousands of people into the District. In Washington we have the greatest pay roll of any city in all the world, and the cost of living is constantly increasing. The cost of living is so high that it will absorb any increase in pay. That appears to me to be one of the reasons for the continuation of the high cost of living in the District.

I do not like to touch upon a phase of the subject which would be in answer to the question of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] until he has returned to the Chamber. However, I will say that we cannot compare the pay of policemen or members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia with that of members of the Postal Service because the pay received by those engaged in the Postal Service is governed by the Nation-wide cost of living, whereas the pay of men who work in the Police and Fire Departments of the District of Columbia is governed by a cost of living which is entirely localized and belongs entirely to the city of Washington.

Let me say further, in answer to the statement of the Senator from Louisiana, that I have in my hand a report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States which dwells upon the increased cost of living in the various cities. Leaving out the fractions, I read from the table, as follows:

Atlanta, total, $1,556; food, $609; clothing, $197; housing, $291; fuel and light, $96; furniture, furnishings, and household equipment, $36.

Going through a long list, we come to the city of Washington.

We find the cost of living in Washington to be the highest in the United States for a four-person manual worker's family at maintenance level as defined by the Work Projects Administration.

The total is $1,731; food, $622; clothing, $220; housing, $352; fuel and light, $119; furniture, furnishings, household equipment, $44; miscellaneous, $372.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the entire table, because it deals with the subject under discussion.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Estimated*[1] *cost of living for a 4-person manual worker's family at maintenance level as defined by the Work Projects Administration,*[2] *in 33 large cities as of Sept. 15, 1942*

| City | Total | Food | Clothing | Housing | Fuel and light | Furniture, furnishings, household equipment | Miscellaneous |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Atlanta | $1,556.93 | $609.95 | $197.56 | $291.25 | $96.35 | $36.62 | $325.20 |
| Baltimore | 1,566.34 | 616.90 | 206.41 | 254.94 | 107.21 | 44.58 | 336.30 |
| Birmingham | 1,518.13 | 608.11 | 212.58 | 243.58 | 74.27 | 38.15 | 341.44 |
| Boston | 1,657.86 | 606.51 | 206.40 | 272.33 | 151.57 | 39.21 | 381.84 |
| Buffalo | 1,558.10 | 595.30 | 212.77 | 259.74 | 113.61 | 40.17 | 336.51 |
| Chicago | 1,691.04 | 614.36 | 194.36 | 306.52 | 133.15 | 38.32 | 404.33 |
| Cincinnati | 1,587.74 | 608.60 | 222.24 | 276.02 | 98.17 | 43.47 | 339.24 |
| Cleveland | 1,645.12 | 595.21 | 222.78 | 303.97 | 115.82 | 40.52 | 366.82 |
| Denver | 1,521.98 | 586.81 | 201.87 | 243.27 | 114.18 | 39.16 | 336.69 |
| Detroit | 1,686.50 | 602.14 | 207.43 | 325.24 | 123.49 | 38.01 | 390.19 |
| Houston | 1,511.88 | 578.33 | 197.62 | 249.56 | 85.39 | 40.72 | 360.26 |
| Indianapolis | 1,528.86 | 584.45 | 195.28 | 253.91 | 99.74 | 40.45 | 355.03 |
| Jacksonville | 1,564.29 | 634.28 | 183.90 | 237.46 | 113.63 | 39.49 | 355.53 |
| Kansas City | 1,467.25 | 576.63 | 208.72 | 220.61 | 111.69 | 38.84 | 310.76 |
| Los Angeles | 1,574.91 | 600.77 | 209.67 | 250.56 | 71.07 | 41.14 | 401.70 |
| Manchester | 1,594.06 | 631.68 | 194.59 | 200.57 | 178.40 | 39.05 | 349.77 |
| Memphis | 1,567.03 | 594.49 | 226.68 | 287.64 | 89.71 | 42.65 | 325.86 |
| Milwaukee | 1,614.07 | 578.72 | 175.00 | 304.42 | 128.10 | 38.11 | 389.72 |
| Minneapolis | 1,622.46 | 588.42 | 202.75 | 311.54 | 140.53 | 38.81 | 340.41 |
| Mobile | 1,433.72 | 618.60 | 196.27 | 193.48 | 83.17 | 40.16 | 302.04 |
| New Orleans | 1,520.33 | 630.88 | 205.63 | 215.06 | 70.88 | 45.02 | 352.86 |
| New York | 1,722.72 | 650.48 | 206.30 | 311.04 | 128.12 | 41.05 | 385.73 |
| Norfolk | 1,624.41 | 637.43 | 216.26 | 261.94 | 111.96 | 41.85 | 354.97 |
| Philadelphia | 1,570.44 | 613.19 | 210.76 | 265.09 | 106.22 | 39.83 | 335.35 |
| Pittsburgh | 1,606.76 | 612.26 | 209.77 | 291.58 | 94.85 | 40.62 | 357.68 |
| Portland, Maine | 1,600.26 | 622.50 | 201.18 | 212.19 | 167.47 | 39.97 | 356.95 |
| Portland, Oregon | 1,616.41 | 642.81 | 196.47 | 206.58 | 161.44 | 41.13 | 367.98 |
| Richmond | 1,562.58 | 586.87 | 212.02 | 257.86 | 108.73 | 42.29 | 354.81 |
| St. Louis | 1,617.94 | 616.26 | 201.07 | 296.65 | 114.13 | 43.06 | 346.77 |

[1] See explanation of method given on pp. 1 and 2.

[2] See the Works Progress Administration publication, Intercity Differences in Costs of Living in March 1935 59 cities, Research Monograph XII, for the items included in the maintenance budget.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated cost of living for a 4-person manual worker's family at maintenance level as defined by the Work Projects Administration, in 33 large cities as of Sept. 15, 1942*—Continued

| City | Total | Food | Clothing | Housing | Fuel and light | Furniture, furnishings, household equipment | Miscellaneous |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| San Francisco | $1,717.18 | $642.51 | $210.03 | $291.78 | $87.18 | $43.55 | $442.13 |
| Scranton | 1,576.36 | 612.49 | 199.95 | 265.24 | 98.26 | 39.75 | 360.67 |
| Seattle | 1,643.09 | 649.28 | 213.92 | 201.42 | 127.98 | 42.61 | 407.88 |
| Washington, D. C. | 1,731.88 | 622.06 | 220.69 | 352.10 | 119.82 | 44.29 | 372.92 |

TABLE 2.—*Estimated*[1] *indexes of cost of living for a 4-person manual worker's family at maintenance level*[2] *in 33 large cities as of Sept. 15, 1942, on a base of the cost in Washington, D. C., as of that date as 100*

| City | Total | Food | Clothing | Housing | Fuel and light | Furniture, furnishings, household equipment | Miscellaneous |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Atlanta | 89.9 | 98.1 | 89.5 | 82.7 | 80.4 | 82.7 | 87.2 |
| Baltimore | 90.4 | 99.2 | 93.5 | 72.4 | 89.5 | 100.7 | 90.2 |
| Birmingham | 87.7 | 97.8 | 96.3 | 69.2 | 62.0 | 86.1 | 91.6 |
| Boston | 95.7 | 97.5 | 93.5 | 77.3 | 126.5 | 88.5 | 102.4 |
| Buffalo | 90.0 | 95.7 | 96.4 | 73.8 | 94.8 | 90.7 | 90.2 |
| Chicago | 97.6 | 98.8 | 88.1 | 87.1 | 111.1 | 86.5 | 108.4 |
| Cincinnati | 91.7 | 97.8 | 100.7 | 78.4 | 81.9 | 98.1 | 91.0 |
| Cleveland | 95.0 | 95.7 | 100.9 | 86.3 | 96.7 | 91.5 | 98.4 |
| Denver | 87.9 | 94.3 | 91.5 | 69.1 | 95.3 | 88.4 | 90.3 |
| Detroit | 97.4 | 96.8 | 94.0 | 92.4 | 103.1 | 85.8 | 104.6 |
| Houston | 87.3 | 93.0 | 89.5 | 70.9 | 71.3 | 91.9 | 96.6 |
| Indianapolis | 88.3 | 94.0 | 88.5 | 72.1 | 83.2 | 91.3 | 95.2 |
| Jacksonville | 90.3 | 102.0 | 83.3 | 67.4 | 94.8 | 89.2 | 95.3 |
| Kansas City | 84.7 | 92.7 | 94.6 | 62.7 | 93.2 | 87.7 | 83.3 |
| Los Angeles | 90.9 | 96.6 | 95.0 | 71.2 | 59.3 | 92.9 | 107.7 |
| Manchester | 92.0 | 101.5 | 88.2 | 57.0 | 148.9 | 88.2 | 93.8 |
| Memphis | 90.5 | 95.6 | 102.7 | 81.7 | 74.9 | 96.3 | 87.4 |
| Milwaukee | 93.2 | 93.0 | 79.3 | 86.5 | 106.9 | 86.0 | 104.5 |
| Minneapolis | 93.7 | 94.6 | 91.9 | 88.5 | 117.3 | 87.6 | 91.3 |
| Mobile | 82.8 | 99.4 | 88.9 | 55.0 | 69.4 | 90.7 | 81. |
| New Orleans | 87.8 | 101.4 | 93.2 | 61.1 | 59.2 | 101.6 | 94.6 |
| New York | 99.5 | 104.6 | 93.5 | 88.3 | 106.9 | 92.7 | 103.4 |
| Norfolk | 93.8 | 102.5 | 98.0 | 74.4 | 93.4 | 94.5 | 95.2 |
| Philadelphia | 90.7 | 98.6 | 95.5 | 75.3 | 88.6 | 89.9 | 89.9 |
| Pittsburgh | 92.8 | 98.4 | 95.1 | 82.8 | 79.2 | 91.7 | 95.9 |
| Portland, Maine | 92.4 | 100.1 | 91.2 | 60.3 | 139.8 | 90.2 | 95.7 |
| Portland, Oreg. | 93.3 | 103.3 | 89.0 | 58.7 | 134.7 | 92.9 | 98.7 |
| Richmond | 90.2 | 94.3 | 96.1 | 73.2 | 90.7 | 95.5 | 95.1 |
| St. Louis | 93.4 | 99.1 | 91.1 | 84.3 | 95.3 | 97.2 | 93.0 |
| San Francisco | 99.2 | 103.3 | 95.2 | 82.9 | 72.8 | 98.3 | 118.6 |
| Scranton | 91.0 | 98.5 | 90.6 | 75.3 | 82.0 | 89.7 | 96.7 |
| Seattle | 94.9 | 104.4 | 96.9 | 57.2 | 106.8 | 96.2 | 109.4 |
| Washington, D. C. | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[1] See explanation of method on pp. 1 and 2.
[2] See the Works Progress Administration publication, Intercity Differences in Cost of Living in March 1935, 59 Cities, Research Monograph XII, for the items included in the maintenance budget.

Mr. McCARRAN. I return again to the reason for the proposed increase to employees of the fire department and the police department, which question was raised by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

On February 23, 1942, the Secretary of Labor reported on continuing studies made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. I read some of the high lights of the Secretary's report.

In the 8 months from May 12, 1942, to January 12, 1943, the national average cost of all foods rose 9.4 percent.

On January 12 the national index of food costs stood 33 percent above the 1935–39 averages, and 14 percent above the figures for 1942. Prices of clothing and household furnishings of the type purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers in large cities of the United States have skyrocketed amazingly.

In the field of men's clothing the Secretary of Labor reports that between September 15, 1939, and January 15, 1943, the price of work trousers increased over 37 percent.

The price of cotton overalls increased over 47 percent. The price of cotton work shirts increased over 51 percent. Other price increases for specific articles of men's clothing were:

Business shirts, 30 percent; street shoes, 28 percent; work shoes, 32 percent; topcoats, 32 percent; overcoats, 20 percent; wool suits, 30 percent.

In the field of home furnishings the following increases were reported: Inexpensive living-room suites, 40 percent; medium bedroom suites, 24 percent; sheets, 52 percent; wool blankets, 23 percent.

These figures are averages for 21 large cities of the United States, but they are probably to be considered an index of average price changes in Washington as indicated by the fact that the average change in the cost of all goods purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers in the 21 cities between September 1939 and January 1943 was 19.8 percent, which is exactly the same percentage rise reported for goods of the same grades during the same period in Washington, D. C.

I do not desire to detain the Senate. I was hoping that the Senator from Tennessee would return to the Chamber. I must now dwell upon the question which he propounded, namely, In view of the fact there is a proposal to increase the pay of postal workers by a flat $300 per annum, would it not be well to have a uniform increase of $300? A portion of my last statement was in answer to that very proposal.

The increased cost of living in the District of Columbia is far in excess of what it is in other cities of the country. Pay raises for postal employees, if granted by Congress, will be covered in legislation concerned only with that subject.

Why should the provisions of Senate bill 17 affect the provisions of Senate bill 360? If one bill affects the other, it must be clear that the two bills interact.

As presently drawn, Senate bill 360 grants a flat increase of $300 to postal employees throughout the Nation. The cost-of-living index for the Nation is lower than for the District of Columbia. It is not the contention of the proponents of the committee amendment to Senate bill 17 that action taken in behalf of postal employees should even be considered by the Senate in connection with its deliberations on Senate bill 17; but if this claim is made by the proponents of the minority substitute for Senate bill 17, then they must accept the logical conclusion that if postal employees are entitled to a flat increase of $300 on the basis of the Nation-wide cost-of-living index, then the higher cost-of-living index in the District of Columbia justifies a flat increase greater than $300 for policemen and firemen in the District. It should be stressed that whereas Senate bill 360 provides an increase of $300 for postal employees in the lower salary grades, Senate bill 17 would give the policemen and firemen of the District in the lowest salary grades an increase of $350. The proposed minority substitute for Senate bill 17 would limit police and fire department employees in the District in the lower salary grades to an increase of only $100 a year, which is barely 5 percent above their present rates of pay.

As I understand, the difference between the substitute which will be offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the bill which has been reported by the committee is a difference of $50. The substitute would give an increase of $100 a year to the lowest paid in the service.

Mr. President, the lowest paid are the ones who suffer the most. The person who wrote the letter to the chairman of the District Committee is a man with a family of four, including himself. He can scarcely get along on $1,900. Many are refusing to take service in the District of Columbia police force because $1,900 per annum is not a living wage under the existing cost of living in the District.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I apologize to the Senator from Tennessee. I delayed the answer to his question as long as I thought I could. I will state it again if the Senator cares to hear it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be glad to have the Senator from Nevada do so. I should like, however, to make a further statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to have the Senator from Tennessee make his statement now.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to do so.

The Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads came to the conclusion that a flat increase of $300 for postal employees was probably the best way to solve the problem. The increased cost of living is given as the reason for the increase, is it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Nevada to that extent.

What I rose to say is that I believe it would be better if our action on all these matters were as nearly uniform as possible, making the increases about the same. I submit that suggestion for the Senator's consideration.

I do not know the situation in the District, and I cannot speak with regard to it. However, I think we should give the employees of the Government whose living expenses have risen a reasonable increase. We did so during the last war, and we might well do so in the present war. We are doing so now, and should continue to do so after the 1st of April.

Mr. McCARRAN. At the hazard of repetition, because of my very high regard for the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee, and because he is chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, which has in hand the matter of an increase in pay for employees of the Postal Service, I desire to read an article published quite recently in the local press, and which is correct:

District living costs advanced 0.3 percent between December 15 and January 15, as compared with an average rise of 0.2 percent in other large cities during the same period, and now are 7.5 percent higher than a year ago and 19.8 percent above the level of December 15, 1940, the Labor Department reported today.

Food costs in the District increased 0.8 percent during the month, and fuel, electricity, and ice 1.9 percent. Prices of clothing and house furnishings dropped fractionally, while costs of miscellaneous items remained unchanged. As an economy measure, the Labor Department made no survey of rents in January.

The January advance brought the District cost-of-living index to 119.4 percent of the 1935–39 average.

During the single month between December 15, 1942, and January 15, 1943, the cost of food in Washington rose eight-tenths of 1 percent, or at the rate of approximately 10 percent a year. Only 6 of the 21 major cities showed greater percentage increase in the cost of food. During the same month, the cost of fuel, electricity and ice in Washington increased 1.9 percent (at the rate of approximately 23 percent per year). This was the second largest increase reported among the 21 major cities of the country.

On January 15, 1943, the cost of food in Washington stood approximately 34 percent above the 1935–39 average. The cost of clothing in Washington was approximately 32 percent above the 1935–39 average. The cost of house furnishings stood exactly 29 percent above the 1935–39 average.

I dwell on that in answer to the Senator's observation that it is not fair to judge what should be a proper pay increase for the employees of the District of Columbia on the basis of what the Senator may find to be a proper increase for a group which extends around the United States; because the cost of living in the District of Columbia, as shown by the figures quoted—figures taken from reports by the Department of Labor—is far out of line with the cost of living in any other comparable city in the United States. I dwell on the matter for another reason, as well: I think comparisons are not fair; but if we were to make comparisons at all, there is no comparison between the groups with which we are dealing and the postal employees group. The police force in the District of Columbia—especially in the District of Columbia, where the police force has been cut down yearly—is now some 77 men short because of inability to get a sufficient number of men to serve at the salary we are paying them, and in the District the police force is called upon for greater activity and greater service than it ever before has been called upon, or for which the police force in any other city is called upon at the present time. Generally speaking, it is not fair to compare a policeman's salary with that of any other Federal employee, because a policeman on duty has no fixed hours of labor. He must remain on duty; he is subject to call at all times. The same statement applies to a fireman. Even though a policeman or a fireman may have a day off, he is subject to call at all times, and must stand by and hold himself in readiness. That situation does not prevail with reference to any Federal services other than the Police Department and the Fire Department; and of course I am dealing now entirely with the District of Columbia.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not propose to disagree with the Senator as to much that he says. I do not know that I shall disagree with him at all. There is a great deal to be said in favor of the position he takes. I desire to ask the Senator if he has any figures showing how much more the cost of living has increased in Washington than it has elsewhere in the entire country generally. If he has figures of that kind, it seems to me they would be helpful to us in this matter.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope that the information I have at hand, and which I have prepared along the very line of the Senator's request, may help enlighten the Senator in that respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be very glad to have the information. I should think that it might be very helpful to have a comparison between the general average throughout the country, outside the metropolitan district of Washington, and the situation in Washington.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me state something which may assist in that connection: In the city of Baltimore, the starting salary for a policeman is $1,825. The top salary is $2,086. The increase between 1938 and 1942 was $255. The increase for the top salary was $296. That is the increase between those years.

So at present the initial salary is $2,080, and the top salary is $2,382. The living cost differential between Washington and Baltimore is $151; that is to say, the cost in Washington is $151 higher than in Baltimore.

In Boston, another comparable city, the starting salary is $1,600. The top salary is $2,100. There, as in the city of Washington, the police force has had no increase for many years. The differential between the cost of living in Boston and the cost of living in Washington is $60, the lesser cost being in Boston.

In Buffalo the differential in the cost of living is $173.

In Cincinnati the differential is $130.

In Cleveland the differential is $86.

In Detroit the differential is $45.

In Los Angeles the differential is $157.

In Milwaukee the differential is $117.

In Minneapolis the differential is $109.

In Newark the differential—closest to that of Washington—is $9.

In New Orleans the differential is $211.

In Philadelphia the differential is $161.

In Pittsburgh the differential is $125.

In St. Louis the differential is $100.

In San Francisco the differential is $14.

In Kansas City the differential is $264.

In most of the cities I have named an increase has been given within the past few years to the members of the police force; whereas, as a matter of fact, since 1930 no increase has been accorded to those serving in the police service in the District of Columbia.

I shall not detain the Senate longer on this matter, because I take it that the Senator from Ohio, in opposition to a $50 item in the increase, will present his proposal in line with the minority views.

Let me say to the Senate that approximately a year ago hearings were held in the House on the matter of an increase of $300 for the members of the police and fire departments of the District of Columbia. The bill came to the Senate, was referred to the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, and was held in that committee until late in the year. Then it was reported to the Senate, and finally was passed by the Senate and passed by the other body, but was vetoed by the President. The reasons for his veto were, not that he did not favor an increase in pay for the members of the police force and fire department but rather that the bill left out a great group of employees in the District of Columbia—namely, the teachers—and, rather, because it carried a provision that the increase should be retroactive for 1 full year—namely, from December 1942 to December 1941.

In other words, if the bill had been signed by the President and had become law, instead of having received the President's veto, those who would have received the increase would have received it from December 1941.

The present bill is retroactive only to December 1942.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the whole thought on the subject must center on the practical application. There is authorization whereby the District of Columbia can have seventeen-hundred-odd policemen. However, it is impossible

to obtain 1,700; and today there are only approximately 1,600 policemen in the District of Columbia. The turn-over during a year is about 500. The reason for that is that the men are lured away to cities where they receive better wages, where there are better living conditions, where the cost of living is lower, and where the wages are higher. So they will not stay here even for 1 full year or for 2 years. They even give up the security incident to their jobs here in order to go to places where wages are higher.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the Senator's position is that, assuming, let us say, that a general increase of $300 for post office employees, for instance, is a fair and just increase, and that an additional $50, or an increase of $350, for the police force of the District of Columbia would be in substantial line with the $300 increase for postal employees throughout the country, the difference between the cost of living in Washington and in other places throughout the remainder of the country would about take care of the difference of $50 in favor of the policemen, according to the Senator's bill. Is that an approximately correct statement of the Senator's argument?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is one way of stating it. I think it could be stated in another way, and yet carry the same thought. The cost of living in the District of Columbia is much higher than it is in other places. I do not stand on the position that $300 is sufficient for Postal Service employees; I am inclined to believe—and I am very emphatic in my belief—that they should receive much more than $300. I do not say that $350 is a fair increase for the District police and the District firemen. I do not think it is fair; I think it should be more. I introduced a bill to provide an increase of $480 a year, but I was convinced from the hearings and from the conditions precedent that I could not get that bill through, however just the $480 increase was, however right it was, however fair it was. So, in order to get through what I thought was merely partially fair and partially reasonable, I changed the bill so as to provide an increase of $350.

If $300 is fair for the Postal Service employees, then, indeed, the members of the police department and of the fire department of the District of Columbia should have far more than $350, and $50 is little enough as a differential between the two classes of services, in view of the cost of living within the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I desire to insert in the RECORD at this point, amplifying the statement I have made, a chart showing the amount of salary increase, 1938–42, to police departments and fire departments in various cities of the country.

I also ask that there be inserted in the RECORD a chart from which I read showing the differential in the cost of living in the various cities.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Amount salary increases, 1938–42*

| City | Police department | | Fire department | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Start | Top | Start | Top |
| Philadelphia | $400 | $400 | $225 | $200 |
| Detroit | None | 264 | 220 | None |
| Los Angeles | 240 | 300 | 240 | 300 |
| Cleveland | None | 525 | None | 525 |
| Baltimore | 255 | 296 | None | 100 |
| St. Louis | None | None | 240 | 240 |
| Boston | None | None | None | None |
| Pittsburgh | None | 115 | 82 | 115 |
| Washington, D. C. | None | None | None | None |
| San Francisco | 240 | 300 | 240 | 400 |
| Milwaukee | 180 | 180 | 60 | 60 |
| Buffalo | 50 | 50 | None | None |
| New Orleans | 115 | 115 | 146 | 146 |
| Minneapolis | None | 120 | None | None |
| Cincinnati | 144 | 264 | None | 120 |
| Newark | (1) | (1) | None | 500 |
| Kansas City | (1) | 180 | 140 | 120 |

[1] No figures.

*Police salaries*

| City | Population gain or loss, percent | Salaries 1938 | | Increases, 1938–42 | | Present salaries | | Living cost differential[1] | Present salaries plus living cost differential | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Start | Top | Start | Top | Start | Top | | Start | Top |
| Baltimore | 4.5 | $1,825 | $2,086 | $255.00 | $296 | $2,080.00 | $2,382 | $151 | $2,231.00 | $2,533 |
| Boston | −.8 | 1,600 | 2,100 | | | 1,600.00 | 2,100 | 60 | 1,660.00 | 2,160 |
| Buffalo | .8 | 1,900 | 2,200 | 50.00 | 50 | 1,950.00 | 2,250 | 173 | 2,123.00 | 2,423 |
| Cincinnati | 6.1 | 1,500 | 1,860 | 144.00 | 264 | 1,644.00 | 2,124 | 130 | 1,774.00 | 2,254 |
| Cleveland | .8 | 1,800 | 2,420 | | 525 | 1,800.00 | 2,945 | 86 | 1,886.00 | 3,031 |
| Detroit | 13.7 | | 2,640 | | 264 | 2,310.00 | 2,904 | 45 | 2,355.00 | 2,949 |
| Los Angeles | 4.5 | 2,040 | 2,400 | 240.00 | | 2,280.00 | | 157 | 2,437.00 | |
| Milwaukee | 11.3 | 1,800 | 2,160 | 180.00 | 180 | 1,980.00 | 2,340 | 117 | 2,097.00 | 2,457 |
| Minneapolis | −1.5 | 1,680 | 2,160 | | 120 | 1,680.00 | 2,280 | 109 | 1,789.00 | 2,389 |
| Newark | −3.5 | | | | | 2,100.00 | 3,000 | 9 | 2,109.00 | 3,009 |
| New Orleans | 5.0 | 1,524 | 2,004 | 227.38 | | 1,751.38 | | 211 | 1,962.38 | |
| Philadelphia | 2.1 | 1,825 | 2,190 | 400.00 | 400 | 2,225.00 | 2,590 | 161 | 2,386.00 | 2,751 |
| Pittsburgh | −3.2 | | 2,310 | | 115 | 1,732.00 | 2,425 | 125 | 1,857.00 | 2,550 |
| St. Louis | 6.4 | | 2,160 | | | 2,160.00 | 2,160 | 100 | 2,260.00 | 2,260 |
| San Francisco | 6.3 | | 2,400 | | 300 | 2,400.00 | 2,700 | 14 | 2,414.00 | 2,714 |
| Kansas City | .8 | 1,500 | 1,680 | | 180 | | 1,860 | 264 | | 2,124 |
| Average | | | | | | | | | 2,088.00 | 2,543 |
| Average without Boston | | | | | | | | | 2,120.00 | 2,572 |
| Without Boston and St. Louis | | | | | | | | | 2,109.00 | 2,598 |

[1] Living cost differential is the amount by which the basic minimum annual cost of living for an average manual worker's family, on a subsistence level, in the District of Columbia, as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, exceeds the corresponding figure for the city in question.

On basis sugar ration, metropolitan areas. Washington population gain, 25 percent.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit the matter to the Senate on the presentation I have made.

## VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION, ETC., OF DISABLED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THOSE DISABLED IN WAR INDUSTRIES—NOTICE

Mr. BURTON obtained the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement for the information of Senators.

It had been my intention, after conferring with the majority leader, to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 180 when the pending business had been disposed of. I am now informed that there is a second bill which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] desires to have taken up, and also that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a measure which he wishes to bring before the Senate. After having conferred with the senior Senator from Kentucky and others I have decided to defer making a motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 180 until Thursday next, at which time, as soon as I am able to secure recognition following the conclusion of the routine morning business, I shall make the motion which I had intended to make today.

## INCREASE IN PAY OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 17) to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk——

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair. Does the Senator from Ohio yield for that purpose?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gerry | Overton |
| Austin | Gillette | Radcliffe |
| Bailey | Green | Reed |
| Ball | Guffey | Revercomb |
| Bankhead | Gurney | Reynolds |
| Barbour | Hatch | Russell |
| Barkley | Hawkes | Scrugham |
| Bone | Hayden | Shipstead |
| Brewster | Hill | Smith |
| Brooks | Holman | Stewart |
| Buck | Johnson, Calif. | Taft |
| Burton | Johnson, Colo. | Thomas, Idaho |
| Bushfield | La Follette | Thomas, Okla. |
| Butler | Langer | Thomas, Utah |
| Byrd | Lodge | Truman |
| Capper | Lucas | Tunnell |
| Caraway | McCarran | Tydings |
| Chavez | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Clark, Idaho | Maloney | Van Nuys |
| Clark, Mo. | Maybank | Wagner |
| Connally | Mead | Wallgren |
| Danaher | Millikin | Walsh |
| Davis | Moore | Wheeler |
| Eastland | Murray | Wherry |
| Ellender | Nye | White |
| Ferguson | O'Daniel | Wiley |
| George | O'Mahoney | Wilson |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is necessarily absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the amendment proposed by the committee, it is proposed to insert the following:

That Public Law No. 489 of the Seventy-first Congress (S. 1370), approved July 1, 1930, is hereby amended for and during the period in which this act shall be in effect by suspending sections 1, 2, and 3 thereof, and inserting in place thereof the following new sections:

"SECTION 1. That the annual basic salaries of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police, the United State Park Police, and the White House Police shall be as follows: Major and superintendent, $8,000; assistant superintendents, $5,000 each; inspectors, $4,500 each; captains, $3,900 each; lieutenants, $3,350 each; sergeants, $3,050 each; privates, a basic salary of $2,000 per year with an annual increase of $140 in salary for 5 years, or until a maximum salary of $2,700 is reached. All original appointments of privates shall be made at the basic salary of $2,000 per year, and the first year of service shall be probationary.

"SEC. 2. That the annual basic salaries of the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be as follows: Chief engineer, $8,000; deputy chief engineers, $5,000 each; battalion chief engineers, $4,500 each; fire marshal, $5,000; deputy fire marshal, $3,300; inspectors, $2,760 each; captains, $3,300 each; lieutenants, $3,140 each; sergeants, $2,900 each; superintendent of machinery, $5,000; assistant superintendent of machinery, $3,300; pilots, $2,900 each; marine engineers, $2,900 each; assistant marine engineers, $2,760 each; marine firemen, $2,400 each; privates, a basic salary of $2,000 per year with an annual increase of $140 in salary for 5 years or until a maximum salary of $2,700 is reached. All original appointments of privates shall be made at the basic salary of $2,000 per year, and the first year of service shall be probationary.

"SEC. 3. That privates of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, and the White House Police, and privates of the Fire Department shall be entitled to the following salaries: Privates who have served less than 1 year, at the rate of $2,000 per annum; privates who have served more than 1 year and less than 2 years, at the rate of $2,140 per annum; privates who have served more than 2 years and less than 3 years, at the rate of $2,280 per annum; privates who have served more than 3 years and less than 4 years, at the rate of $2,420 per annum; privates who have served more than 4 years and less than 5 years, at the rate of $2,560 per annum; privates who have served more than 5 years, at the rate of $2,700 per annum."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect as of December 1, 1942, and terminate June 30, 1944, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe, at which time sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act approved July 1, 1930, shall again become effective.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield in order that I may make an explanation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. MCCARRAN. In the President's veto of the firemen's and policemen's bill which was passed at the last session, he made special mention of the fact that we had not taken care of a great group of employees in the District, namely, the school teachers. The teachers are under different regulation from the firemen and policemen, so that it was necessary, and we deemed it proper, to introduce two bills instead of one. Therefore, Senate bill 17 deals with firemen and policemen, and Senate bill 18 deals with teachers. It is our desire to have the two bills go along together. Therefore, as soon as Senate bill 17 shall have been disposed of, I shall move the immediate consideration of Senate bill 18, so that the two bills may thus proceed through this body together.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, in proceeding to the consideration of the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I have presented I wish first of all to express my appreciation of the service which the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] has been rendering to the Senate as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. It has been my privilege to serve for 2 years on that committee, and I wish to pay tribute to the diligence, the intelligence, and the activity which he has displayed in leading that rather difficult committee, which deals with many matters which are considered only in committee, and which never reach the floor of the Senate.

My only reason for presenting minority views in this instance is that I feel that the action recommended by the majority is out of line with the policy of the Senate as a whole, and the rates of pay as a whole for the Nation as a whole, and I believe that in order that we may not leave the District behind, in order to treat the District fairly, and not put the District ahead of where it belongs, it is necessary for us to have in mind what is being done with respect to other Federal pay rolls, including other District pay rolls aside from those affecting policemen, firemen, and teachers.

The first obligation we have in the Senate is to make sure that the District of Columbia is not overlooked and left behind when we take measures affecting the rest of the United States. It became clear in the last session that it would be appropriate to increase somewhat the rates of pay of the employees of the Federal and District governments. We therefore passed in the last days of the session Senate Joint Resolution 170, which provided for overtime pay for employees both of the Federal Government and the District, with the exception of the District policemen, firemen, and teachers. That included, in cases where overtime pay could not be readily computed, payment on the basis of a 10-percent bonus. Of course, in the case of policemen, firemen, and teachers, overtime pay cannot be readily computed, and therefore an analogous raise would be a 10-percent bonus to bring them in line with the other employees of the Federal Government and to bring them in line with the other District employees.

It so happened, however, that there had been under study in the District committees of the House and the Senate a proposal to raise the pay of the policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia. I refer to the Metropolitan Police, numbering about 1,661 men; the metropolitan firemen, numbering about 902; the Park Police, numbering 78; and the White House Police, numbering about 126; a total of about 2,767 men, which is by no means a force in excess of what is needed in the District of Columbia.

The rates of pay have not been increased for a long time in the District. Therefore a study was made of that subject, and as a result of the study there was passed in the House a bill which provided on a well-considered basis an increase in the pay of policemen and firemen. The bill came before the District of Columbia Committee of the Senate. It was considered at length. It had the agreement of the members of the Police and Fire Departments, and the District Committee, and it was placed on the calendar with the recommendation that it pass, but it was not acted on in February or March, whenever it reached the calendar, because it was recognized that

at that time the Federal Government had not yet acted on pending bills for the increase of pay of employees of other branches of the District and Federal governments. Therefore the bill was held on the calendar until after action was taken in these other fields, and I believe it was appropriately held there. It was finally passed on the same day we passed the bill providing for the other employees and in the light of that bill having passed.

I wish to emphasize first of all that in taking that action we brought the District employees in line with the employees of the Federal Government, and brought the policemen and firemen in line with the other District employees.

The bill contained these provisions: It was to be a permanent increase in pay. It had been discussed on that basis; it had been agreed to on that basis by the representatives of the departments themselves who appeared before the committee. It was a permanent, justified basis of increase in pay, and well deserved. I will yield to no one in the recognition of the necessity for an able, diligent, and loyal police and fire department in a community of some 800,000 people, such as the city of Washington.

The increase provided was on this basis: Beginning with the full patrolman, a man who has had 5 years service, running through the captain, there was provided an increase of $300 per year. That was the uniform basis. Then applying the increase also to the younger men below the 5-year patrolman, it made not so large an increase in their case, but I am convinced the reason for that was that their rate of pay already was above the rate of pay for similar service in many comparable cities in the United States. In any event it was agreed upon by representatives of the department as a permanent basis of pay.

The increase in their case was as follows: Instead of $300 per man, the beginner was raised from $1,900 a year to $2,000 a year. The second year man was raised from $2,000 a year to $2,140 a year, that is an increase of $140 in his case. The third year man was raised from $2,100 a year to $2,280. The fourth year man was raised from $2,200 a year to $2,420. The fifth year man was raised from $2,300 a year to $2,560 a year. And finally the $2,400-a-year man was raised to $2,700, making a $300 increase.

I emphasize that such an increase was probably long over-due. It was necessary. It should have been voted. It was voted by the Senate and by the House in December of last year.

But when the measure reached the President it was vetoed, not because of the increase being too large or too small, but because it was on a permanent basis, whereas the increase to the other Federal employees and District employees was on temporary basis to April 30, 1943; secondly, on the ground that it did not include the teachers, for the teachers had not been put in that bill, and their bill had not come up for action; and, thirdly, on the ground that instead of being retroactive to December 1942, as in the case of the other employees of the Federal Government and the District, it was retroactive to February 1, 1942, because it was an old bill that had been on the calendar for a long time, and had started with that date. It was vetoed on those grounds in a message in which the President suggested that a comparable bill, with those exceptions, would meet with approval.

What I am seeking to do at this time is to move a substitute which will reenact precisely the rate of pay which was agreed upon by the members of the District Committee as a permanent rate of pay, passed in December last on that basis, and now, only 2½ months later, I believe still to be recognized by us as an appropriate rate of pay at this time.

In order that there may be no delay in the men getting their increased pay and getting it from December 1, 1942, it is obvious that we should pass a measure similar to the one which previously passed both Houses of Congress, and was vetoed for certain reasons, and that we should omit the provisions on which the veto was based. If passed in that form, I believe there will be no objection to it in the House, which passed the other bill. It would take effect immediately. It would be generally in line with all other increases of pay in the Federal Government and, in general, would represent an increase of about 10 percent in the cost of the District departments. The cost of these departments to the District is about $6,000,000. The proposed increase in pay would make the cost $6,600,000. Mr. President, it will be remembered that the increase Congress voted Federal employees was 10 percent on the first $2,900. An increase of $290 was provided for many employees drawing more than $2,900. The increase proposed by the amendment being a flat $300 in most cases, and being somewhat less in the lower brackets, is generally in line with that program, and therefore I believe is a fair step to take, particularly in view of the long hearings and the full discussion of the subject with members of the departments.

Therefore, I think it is important, if we are not to leave the District behind, that we pass the bill which will most quickly go through both Houses and bring the employees in question into line with the other employees and let them get their increase as of December 1, 1942.

We made a special examination into these matters to make sure that it is a fair and just measure for the District in line with the proper principles of municipal government at this time. I wish to say first that we have this base to stand on: The measure of increase was approved in the hearings as a permanent basis of pay. Therefore it certainly would be as good now as a basis of pay as it was when a similar bill was passed two and a half months ago.

Next, the increase is substantially the same as was allowed other Federal employees and other employees of the District.

Third, it is generally in line with the pay for comparable work in comparable cities.

Mr. President, I recognize that it is not fair and proper to bind any one city by the example of another. Even the statistics are not comparable in detail. To a certain extent they must be adjusted to meet the cost of living, and I have done that. But I believe that in general I can recognize that the proposed rates, as agreed upon by the departments, and as contained in the bill passed by us last December, are in line with the comparable rates of pay for similar departments elsewhere.

Let us begin with the regular rate of pay for the patrolman—that is the man who will be getting $2,700 under the proposed rate of pay—and let us compare that pay with the pay in the 11 large comparable cities of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Los Angeles, Cleveland, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, Boston, Baltimore, and Cincinnati. Those are cities which are comparable roughly with Washington in the matter of cost of living. The cost of living in those cities does not vary more than 10 percent from that in Washington. The cost of living in most of them is closer to that of Washington than 10 percent.

If the rate of pay in the District of Columbia for the regular patrolman is fixed at $2,700, there are only five cities in that group where the rate of pay is higher, and there are six where the rate is lower. Washington will be approximately in the average place among cities of similar size. The cities in which the pay is above that in Washington are New York with $3,000; Chicago, $2,802; Detroit, $2,904; Cleveland with a shifting figure of $2,675 to $2,945 in the discretion of the safety department; and San Francisco with $2,700.

Those in which the pay is below that in Washington are Philadelphia with $2,590, Los Angeles with $2,580, Pittsburgh with $2,425, Boston with $2,200, Baltimore with $2,080 for the police department and $2,000 for the fire department, and Cincinnati with $2,124.

Those figures are taken from communications sent to me by the mayors of those cities within the past month.

Turning to the comparable pay of the beginner, as to which a special provision is made in the bill presented by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], there again we find that the increase from the old pay of $1,900 to the new pay of $2,000 is squarely in line with the average of the comparable cities of the United States. The reason why a larger increase would not be called for is that the pay already is higher than in many comparable cities. In the same comparable cities to which I have referred only five pay more than $2,000 and six pay less than $2,000. The five paying more than $2,000 are Chicago with $2,400, Philadelphia with $2,225, Detroit with $2,310, Los Angeles with $2,280, and San Francisco with $2,400.

Those paying less than $2,000 to beginners are New York, with $1,660; Cleveland, with $1,800; Pittsburgh, with $1,732; Boston, with $1,700; Baltimore, with $1,820 for the policemen and $1,700 for the firemen; and Cincinnati, with $1,320.

Again Washington, on this adjusted basis, is within the average of the comparable cities.

I may say a word also in answer to the argument as to the cost of living. According to the Department of Labor, the cost of living in these 11 cities does not in any case vary more than 10 percent from that in Washington. The lowest figure for cost of living in any of these cities is 90.4 compared with 100 in Washington.

The cities which are paying less to their beginner firemen than the city of Washington under this new plan are New York, with $1,600 as against $2,000. Cost of living is almost exactly the same, because it stands at 99.5 in New York compared to 100 in Washington.

In Cleveland, with $1,800 as the starting figure, the cost of living stands at 95 compared with Washington at 100.

Pittsburgh, with $1,732, 92.8 percent.

Boston, with $1,700, 95.7 percent.

Baltimore, with $1,700 for firemen and $1,820 for policemen, 90.4 percent.

Cincinnati, with $1,320 as a starting point, 91.7 percent.

If each of those amounts were adjusted upward by the necessary 5 or 10 percent increase to meet the cost of living, it would still come under the $2,000 figure provided in the substitute amendment for the beginner.

In dealing with the morale of the city administration and the city police department, I believe that those in the best position to judge what the pay should be and what effect it would have on the morale are those in charge of the executive branch of the Government. I have before me a letter which was sent to the able Senator from Nevada, as chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, under date of February 6, 1943, signed by the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The Board of Commissioners disagreed with the Senator from Nevada and in the following words expressly approved the recommendation which I am now making. The last sentence of the letter reads as follows:

> The Commissioners recommend, therefore, that the substitute bill proposed by Senator BURTON be adopted.

That is a definite recommendation by the men responsible for the morale of the employees of both the Police Department and the Fire Department. I am not contending that the rate of pay should not be further studied if later a further increase should be granted to other Federal employees and other employees of the District of Columbia. However, I believe that under the present circumstances the rate of pay proposed by the amendment is justified by the pay for comparable positions and by the action we have already taken with regard to other District employees. If we do not adopt the program which I have proposed, we shall discriminate against other employees of the District of Columbia, who are receiving a 10-percent bonus instead of an increase of $350, as provided in the proposal of the senior Senator from Nevada.

I wish also to emphasize the fact that we are now in the midst of considering general changes in rates of pay for employees of the Federal Government and employees of the District. We are also considering means of economizing in handling the finances of the Federal Government as well as those of the District.

The increase proposed by the majority proposal is not merely an increase of $300 or $350. The cost to the District of Columbia would be increased by one-half. Instead of being increased from $6,000,000 to $6,600,000, the cost would be increased from $6,000,000 to $6,900,000. The increase is such, and the field it covers is such, that it would add 50 percent to the cost of the services.

I do not believe that we should override the recommendations of those in charge of the administration of the District of Columbia, and, over their objection, increase by 50 percent the cost of administration of the District Government for which they are primarily responsible as executive officers of the District.

The factor which really moves me most in bringing this subject to the attention of the Senate is the relation between the pay situation in the District of Columbia and the general pay situation in the Federal Government. It so happens that I have been serving on the Committee on Civil Service. We have been considering a number of bills. We now have before us a bill dealing with rates of pay of Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia after April 30, 1943. It therefore seems to me that we should await action upon a bill of broad scope before going ahead with one for the District of Columbia on a different basis from anything Congress has adopted in the past.

I wish to emphasize that the bill before us, to which I am objecting, introduces a novel basis for increasing the pay of Federal employees. Instead of being on a 10 percent basis, or on the basis of a $300 flat increase, as proposed in the Postal Service bill—which is not quite comparable—it is on the basis of a $350 flat increase to every employee. That basis is carried over into the teachers' bill, which will follow the bill now before us.

If we are to adopt the basis of a flat increase of $350 for teachers in the District of Columbia and $350 for the Metropolitan Police force, the White House Police, and the Park Police, we shall have difficulty in avoiding the discrimination which will result if we do not do the same thing for other District of Columbia employees, and for that matter, all Federal employees. No greater harm can be done in any kind of governmental practice than to discriminate between employees in comparable positions. Low pay is not so bad as discrimination. Discrimination disorganizes efficient operation of any government. Therefore, I believe we should bring about an increase as promptly as possible, consistent with what we did last December, dealing uniformly with both Federal and District pay rolls. After the general policy has been adopted, if necessary we can reconsider this increase in the light of other adjustments. Let us not place rates of pay for policemen and firemen on a different basis from rates of pay for Federal employees or for other employees of the District of Columbia. I believe it to be in the interest of orderly government to proceed on that basis. Therefore I agree with the District Commissioners that we should pass the substitute measure which I have offered which would keep increases in pay in the District government in line with other increases, rather than put them on an independent basis.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I understand that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are opposed to the so-called McCarran bill and are in favor of the substitute measure offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. I will put into the RECORD the letter of February 6, 1943, which discusses both bills and concludes with the following sentence:

> The Commissioners recommend, therefore, that the substitute bill proposed by Senator BURTON be adopted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator vouch for the letter having been dictated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia?

Mr. BURTON. I do not know by whom the letter was dictated.

Mr. BYRD. By whom was it signed?

Mr. BURTON. The letter was handed to me by the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia as a copy of a letter bearing the signature of the President of the Board of Commissioners. My copy does not have the signature on it, but it was handed to me by the corporation counsel as being a copy of the original letter, which I assumed was signed.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from Ohio have any information indicating that the copy was not authentic?

Mr. BURTON. No; and I ask the Senator from Nevada if there is any doubt about the authenticity of the letter.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator has had previous experience along this line, I noticed that he smiled when I propounded the question.

Mr. BYRD. If there is any charge that the copy of the letter to which reference has been made by the able Senator from Ohio is not authentic, it seems to me that the charge should be proved or withdrawn.

Mr. BURTON. I will be glad to withdraw the copy if there is any question about it. I have only the word of the corporation counsel that it is an authentic copy.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not disputing the authenticity of the copy. I have the same letter. I also have the statement which I read a little while before the Senator took the floor, which was made by the same member of the Board of District Commissioners who purportedly signed the letter from which the Senator read to the Senate, a copy of which I have. We have been through this same thing before. We know that certain letters were sent to us which purported to be signed by the President of the Board of Commissioners, but which were not dictated by the President of the Board. I believe the Senator from Ohio will not dispute that statement.

Mr. BURTON. I have no knowledge as to who dictated it. I understand that

the letter is authentic. It is signed in the name of, and presumably by, the President of the Board of Commissioners. I assume there is no question about it being an official statement of the President of the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. BYRD. As the Senator knows, many letters are sent, even by the President of the United States, which are not dictated by the President. However, there is no question that the letter referred to by the Senator from Ohio represents the attitude of the District Commissioners, is there?

Mr. BURTON. I believe there is no question about it; and I think the Senator from Nevada recognizes it as the last official statement from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to propound another question to the Senator from Ohio. What percentage of increase would be represented by the proposed increase of $350?

Mr. BURTON. Of course, that would vary. As the Senator from Nevada has pointed out, in the case of the man with a lower rate of pay, it would be more than 17 percent. In the case of a $4,500 man it would be less than 10 percent. The net result would be about 15 percent on the median rate of pay. It can be tested most simply by pointing out that under my proposal the cost would be increased by $600,000, while under the majority proposal the cost would be increased by $900,000, or 50 percent, representing an average increase of from 10 to 15 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Do I correctly understand from the Senator from Ohio that the proposed increase of $350 would represent discrepancies and discrimination between employees of the same branch of the service?

Mr. BURTON. The same increase would be granted to each employee, but the percentages would vary. District employees who are not in the police or fire department, and not in the teaching force, would still receive the 10-percent bonus.

Mr. BYRD. There would be further discrimination between District employees and civil service employees of the Federal Government, for whom legislation has already been enacted.

Mr. BURTON. That is correct. Let me add that if there is to be a readjustment of pay on a higher basis than the 10-percent bonus, it will be from April 30, 1943, on, whereas the bill would make the increase effective, even on the highest rate, retroactively from December 1, 1942, for these employees, and these employees alone.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator not agree with me that an increase in pay of District employees in greater proportion than the increase in the pay of civil-service employees would create a discrimination between District employees and Federal employees, which would operate as an influence on Congress to increase the pay of Federal employees to the same extent that the pay of District employees is increased?



Mr. BURTON. Let me say, as the Senator from Nevada has said, that an argument can always be made that the cost of living in the District of Columbia is a little higher than it is elsewhere; but it is so little higher that I do not believe it justifies any such discrepancy as would exist under the committee bill. As compared with the cost of living in most comparable cities, the cost of living in the District of Columbia is less than 10 percent higher. Therefore, that situation would justify at the most an increase of 10 percent in the 10-percent bonus, or an additional 1 percent. There is no justification for a 50-percent increase in cost to the District of Columbia, such as would be brought about by the committee bill.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say that in making such a distinction we should have to make a difference between the pay to civil-service employees in Washington and that to civil-service employees serving elsewhere in the country, which would be an impossible thing to do.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. In specific answer to the Senator from Virginia, let me say that the greatest increase under the bill would be 19.4 percent. The increase under House bill 6386, which passed in December, was 26 percent. So if we talk about discrepancies we must take that matter into consideration.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should state at this point, for the Senator from Nevada, that when the increase is more than 10 percent it is because there is an increase in the time worked. The increase is one of overtime pay in recognition of the time worked, rather than a flat bonus for the same time worked.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator state the hours of work of a policeman or fireman?

Mr. BURTON. A policeman or fireman works full time, 24 hours a day. I respect him for it, and he is paid on that basis.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gerry | Overton |
| Austin | Gillette | Radcliffe |
| Bailey | Green | Reed |
| Ball | Guffey | Revercomb |
| Bankhead | Gurney | Reynolds |
| Barbour | Hatch | Russell |
| Barkley | Hawkes | Scrugham |
| Bone | Hayden | Shipstead |
| Brewster | Hill | Smith |
| Brooks | Holman | Stewart |
| Buck | Johnson, Calif. | Taft |
| Burton | Johnson, Colo. | Thomas, Idaho |
| Bushfield | La Follette | Thomas, Okla. |
| Butler | Langer | Thomas, Utah |
| Byrd | Lodge | Truman |
| Capper | Lucas | Tunnell |
| Caraway | McCarran | Tydings |
| Chavez | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Clark, Idaho | Maloney | Van Nuys |
| Clark, Mo. | Maybank | Wagner |
| Connally | Mead | Wallgren |
| Danaher | Millikin | Walsh |
| Davis | Moore | Wheeler |
| Eastland | Murray | Wherry |
| Ellender | Nye | White |
| Ferguson | O'Daniel | Wiley |
| George | O'Mahoney | Wilson |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, much ado has been made about the attitude of the District Commissioners. Who knows best the police force of the District of Columbia? Who is best qualified to speak for the District of Columbia so far as its police force is concerned? The District Commissioners have opposed every increase of salary that has been offered. Are they the best qualified? The able Senator from Ohio makes much of a letter he has received, and which he has offered for the RECORD, in which the District Commissioners favor his substitute; but his substitute is almost identical to the bill which Congress passed last December. The District Commissioners opposed it then with all the power they had; they were opposed to the Senator's bill in December last; but they are in favor of it now, notwithstanding the fact that the cost of living in the District of Columbia has gone up since December last as reported by the Labor Department. They were opposed to a $300 increase in December; they were opposed to a $300 increase throughout the year 1942; but they are in favor of it now in place of a $350 increase which is only slightly in keeping, if you please, with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia. But who knows the Police Department of the District of Columbia best—the Commissioners or the Chief of Police? Let us see what the Chief of Police says about this. He is not in the category that would be affected; he would not be touched by this bill at all; he is entirely removed from it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Am I correct in understanding the Senator to say that the proposed substitute is practically the same as House bill 6386 which was vetoed by the President?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Ohio in his proposal does not provide retroactive payment to February 1, 1942, as did the bill passed at the last session; he does not provide that the increase shall be permanent as did the bill which was vetoed.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. So the proposed substitute of the Senator from Ohio is not the same as the legislation the Commissioners opposed when a similar bill was under consideration at the last session.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Commissioners opposed it in the early part of 1942, when the retroactive feature would have been operative only for 30 or 60 days. The retroactive feature, of course, became augmented when the bill passed the Senate because such a long delay had been permitted to ensue; but the District Commissioners were opposed to it when it was first initiated, and they will be opposed to every proposal for an increase in the compensation of men who toil which may be presented, but they will

not oppose a raise in their own set-up, and mark my words as to that. They will oppose those in the police department who pound the sidewalks and those in the fire department who respond to alarms, but they will not oppose anything that augments their own power. Power is a funny thing, and it is just as funny in the District of Columbia as it is elsewhere. Let us see what the Chief of Police of the District says. I read from the record.

Major KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the men of the police department get an increase commensurate with the scale of living—

"An increase commensurate with the scale of living." What is that? It is 114.9 as compared with other cities. That is the scale of living in the District of Columbia.

We know that the cost of living has gone up, and I would like to see the men in our department who are performing hazardous duties at all times get a sufficient raise so that their families would be able to enjoy, as comparably as they possibly can, an increase of salary to meet conditions due to the national emergency.

I would say that since the national emergency started policemen have been called upon to render many extra duties. In the beginning we were required to cancel leaves, days off, due to the many details we were required to perform. As time went on, we restored the day off, and we restored the leave as best we could, granting 3 days' leave to about 4 or 5 percent of each precinct. We have increased that a little now. We have gone up now to 5 or 6 days, probably a little more, in each precinct and each unit to 10 percent of the command. The Manual requires us to grant leave to no more than 10 percent of the command at any one time.

The men have put in many extra hours of work. In many cases we have tried to restore the hours that they have lost, but there has been such an accumulation of extra work that up to this time we have not been able to give it all back to the men.

I would like to say on behalf of the members of the police department that have performed fine police work during the past year.

Who has performed that work? I draw the attention of the Senator from Virginia because he has given so much attention to this matter that I think it is well for him to dwell upon it. Who has performed so much extra work? The police force of the District of Columbia in which the Senator from Virginia is so much interested.

Let me say here, to digress for a moment, that there is a very highly critical tone in the views of the minority. I do not think there is anyone more interested in the District of Columbia than is the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what was it the Senator said about a "highly critical tone"?

Mr. McCARRAN. I said there is a highly critical tone in the views of the minority on the bill. That does not apply to the Senator from Virginia of course, and if he will wait a moment——

Mr. BYRD. I thought the Senator from Nevada referred to "the Senator from Virginia."

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator from Virginia will give me his attention, he will not then be mistaken.

Mr. BYRD. I was trying to give the Senator my attention, but I was diverted for a moment and probably missed that part of his remarks.

Mr. McCARRAN. I always try to give the Senator from Virginia my attention. Perhaps there are other more interesting matters at this time, but the statement in the views of the minority to which I refer is that which criticizes the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia because the committee reported to the Senate a bill when, the minority views say, there was not a quorum of the committee present at the time. Mr. President, if the Committee on the District of Columbia should wait for a quorum, it would wait a long time.

Mr. President, I have had in my possession for many months—indeed, ever since I have been chairman of the committee—the proxy of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I think it is a great honor for me to hold it, and never once has he questioned it. The senior Senator from Virginia has always been willing to go along with my judgment on these matters, and I am surprised that the junior Senator from Virginia does not go along with the senior Senator from Virginia in this all-important matter.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Virginia usually makes up his own mind and votes his own convictions; and while he has great regard for the senior Senator from Virginia, the senior Senator from Virginia has not been here. So, why should I follow the senior Senator from Virginia when he has been unable to attend the hearings of the District of Columbia Committee?

I wish to say further that I have great admiration and respect for the distinguished chairman of the committee, and I am entirely willing to vote to give to the policemen of the District of Columbia, as I said before, a reasonable increase in salary, and I think that the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio gives a reasonable and proper increase to the policemen of the District of Columbia, and I speak as one who is very deeply interested in the District of Columbia. I want to see justice done to the policemen of the District, and I think the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio will do justice to them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator think that his constituents would be overpaid if they received $4.16 more a month than they would get under the substitute?

Mr. BYRD. I think that the proposal made by the Senator from Ohio to give a $300 increase on the average, as I understand it, would provide an adequate increase and would be in proportion to what has been done in the case of employees of the Federal Government. For that reason I intend to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then $4.16 to men who receive less than a living wage in the District of Columbia, some of whom——

Mr. BYRD. I do not admit that they receive less than a living wage.

Mr. McCARRAN. Just a moment. I have the floor, and I refuse to yield to that kind of argument.

Mr. BYRD. I do not admit the Senator's premise——

Mr. McCARRAN. The figures constitute the premise.

Mr. BYRD. I do not admit that the premise of the Senator from Nevada that they are not receiving a living wage and that the proposal of the Senator from Ohio would give them less than a living wage is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. The substitute of the Senator from Ohio would give those in the lower brackets $4.16 a month less than the bill reported by the committee. If the Senator wants to take from his constituents $4.16 a month—another bottle of milk, perhaps, or another pair of shoes for the policemen—then, I have no further argument to make to the able Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia would take nothing from the salaries of the police; it is a question of increasing their salaries, as the Senator from Nevada well knows, and when he say I want to take from any of my constituents who may be on the police force $4.16 a month, which has not been given to them, he is making a statement that is not borne out by the facts.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is borne out by the figures, and figures do not lie.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator contend that the policemen have this increase now.

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator contend that the policemen have the increase now?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Nevada said the Senator from Virginia was taking it away from them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly the Senator will attempt to, if he votes for the substitute.

Mr. BYRD. Take away something they do not have?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; take away from them something they should have.

Mr. BYRD. There is a disagreement with the Senator about that, and I think the Senator should be reasonable enough to know that we can differ about these matters. The Senator has a fine mind, and I respect it. He is an able, brilliant Senator, but I have at least some mental capacity, and I try to operate my mind as best I can.

Mr. McCARRAN. That does not answer the argument at all. That is just a plaudit, which does not answer anything.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is assuming that his judgment is infallible and always correct——

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all.

Mr. BYRD. I say that there are others in the Senate who have some judgment, and all we can do in these matters is to vote in accordance with the dictates of our conscience.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I am willing to vote as I have suggested, and I am doing it with the knowledge, which the Senator must have, that I am deeply interested in the maintenance of law and order in the District of Columbia. I am voting as indicated because I think the provision pro-

posed is fair and just. The Senator may disagree with me, but when he talks about my taking away $4.16 from the policemen, which he says is a bottle of milk a day, then he is stating something that is not correct, because they have not gotten the $4.16.

Mr. McCARRAN. With the same degree of cogency the Senator could say they have not the $300, either.

Mr. BYRD. Why should I not vote, by the same reasoning, to make the figure $400 or $500?

Mr. McCARRAN. Vote to give them a bottle of milk.

Mr. BYRD. Not only a bottle of milk but a bottle of something else, too, perhaps. With all due respect to the Senator from Nevada, who usually makes a clear and logical argument, I do not think in this instance he is doing so.

Mr. McCARRAN. The trouble is that the Senator from Virginia, in making his argument here, in propounding a question to the Senator from Ohio, seems to be wedded to the substitute bill because there is a differential of $50.

Mr. BYRD. I did not say I was wedded to it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I say there is a differential of $4.16 a month.

Mr. BYRD. I do not think the Senator from Nevada should put words in my mouth. I never said I was wedded to it for that reason. I merely asked a question.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator said so himself.

Mr. BYRD. I did not say I was wedded to it. I said I approved the proposal of the Senator from Ohio, and I approved that particular provision. That is not the only reason why I shall vote for the proposal of the Senator from Ohio. I think all of us are entitled to our judgment, that we are all entitled to vote as we see fit to vote. I may make many errors—as I do—but at least I can say I vote in accordance with my sincere judgment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry to see the Senator from Virginia, whom I have followed very closely in his effort to effect economies, and whom I hope to continue to support very closely, go into a line which does not reflect economy at all. In other words, I dislike to see him led astray by something based on a false premise.

Mr. BYRD. I appreciate very much the kindness of the Senator in acting as my guardian. I shall be very careful to observe and give full consideration to all the suggestions he may make.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator. I continue now with the statement of Major Kelly:

I would like to say on behalf of the members of the police department that they have performed fine police work during the past year. They have been very faithful, very loyal, and their devotion to duty is commendable.

The CHAIRMAN. What has been your turnover, Major?

Major KELLY. We have appointed approximately, in the past year, about 560 men.

Mr. President, I wish to draw the attention of the Senate to that. He says:

We have appointed approximately, in the past year, about 560 men.

Why was there such a turn-over when, under the classified civil service, these men were assured of a tenure in office? Why was there a turn-over? It was simply because $1,900 would not sustain the average family in the District of Columbia, and therefore it was not alluring to men to enter the service and serve for a year, or perhaps longer, at $1,900 a year. Secondly, it was because a position paying $1,900 a year, while it might have been worth while a year ago, is not worth while now. There are 77 vacancies in the police department of the District of Columbia at this time because it is not possible to fill the places. Yet the Chief of Police is asking for more men because of the District's increase in population, extending into the hundreds of thousands.

I read further from the testimony:

The CHAIRMAN. You have lost that number and more?

Major KELLY. We have not lost exactly that many, but Congress last year was generous enough to give to the police department 195 additional men, which made that many vacancies. Then we have been required also to fill vacancies that occurred at the White House. The bill passed also allowed them 60 additional men. Then, with the many enlistments, with some men inducted into the service, many men belonging to the Officers' Reserve, and men enlisting voluntarily, and separations for various reasons caused the remainder of the vacancies.

The CHAIRMAN. In your judgment, and from your observation, Major, did the high salaries paid in other lines of work draw from your force to any great extent?

Major KELLY. We have had some few men who have resigned from the service due to the fact that they have obtained better positions. We feel also that many other men would leave the service if it were not for the security of the positions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Budget for the coming year does not promise you any considerable amount for increases. In other words, you asked for 200 and the Budget contemplates about 100?

Major KELLY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And that struck me—and I hope you will correct me if I am wrong—when I saw that item, it struck me that with the increased population of the District of Columbia, and the increased duties that have devolved upon and will devolve upon the police force, when in your judgment the 200 was absolutely essential that the 100 will not meet the essential phases, hence you are going to impress on the police force for the next year at least just as we have in the past, a greater number of overtime hours, a greater vigilance and a greater service in every respect. Am I correct in that assumption?

Major KELLY. In asking for 200 men, to be honest and candid about it, that is not a drop in the bucket. With the increased population, with the many new streets throughout the District of Columbia, the many new houses that have gone up, apartments all throughout the city—and some of the settlements are practically cities in themselves. I was talking one time with Mayor LaGuardia, in comparing our police department with theirs. They have between 18,000 and 19,000 policemen for a population of 7,000,000 people. I am convinced that our population, the people living in the District of Columbia, together with people who come into the District of Columbia from nearby Maryland and Virginia for their employment, runs us over a million people. Mayor LaGuardia said at that time, considering our growing population and a comparison with his police department, that it looked like we should have about 3,000 policemen.

I dwell on that for a moment, because it is imposing on some 1,600 policemen now in the District of Columbia duties which should be performed by 3,000 policemen. That grows out of the fact that the Capital of the Nation is a place of attraction. Thousands of people are coming into the District daily. Not only that but hundreds of thousands who were not employed here before are now being employed here. People who have come from every section of the country, people who have come from every section of the world, are being employed here, and there is not a city in all the extent of this country that is better governed, from the standpoint of the police regulations and the police records, than is the District of Columbia at the present time. I say governed from the police standpoint, mind you. I limit my expression to that.

Mr. President, some misleading statements have been made here by my able colleague the Senator from Ohio, and I wish to dwell on them, and I think what I have before me, prepared on the basis of the figures, is sufficient to sustain what I am contending.

In several of its passages the minority views seem likely to mislead a casual reader. They have evidently misled one Member of the Senate. For instance, the first paragraph on page 4 of the minority views gives the impression, intentionally or otherwise, that the committee bill will boost the increase or proposed raise $290,000 above the raise proposed by the minority proposal, through granting increases to high-salaried employees. That is not the fact.

In the case of policemen, the five grades of privates now receiving under $2,400 per year would get $260,050 of the total raises proposed by the committee bill. The minority substitute would give these same men raises totaling only $104,540. Thus $155,510 of the total by which the cost of the committee bill exceeds that of the minority substitute would go to these privates in the Metropolitan Police force, the men who most deserve and need increases.

Let me dwell on that point for a moment. One thousand nine hundred dollars is the pay for police service during the first year of service. There is great attraction to those in that service to go abroad and work for higher salaries, for the cost of living in the District of Columbia is going up by leaps and bounds. It was testified by the writer of the letter which was read earlier today at the desk that $1,900 is no salary at all. What would the substitute bill give to the newly appointed policeman? It would give him an increase of $100 a year. He might just as well receive no increase. He may go out and get a job paying him $14 a day, or $100 a week, or $500 a month, a job which he knows he can get on the outside in war activity. However, due to his loyalty, due to his desire to serve, due to an adherence to service, due to the fact that if he remains constant in his present position he will have something in the future, the man remains on the job at a salary of $1,900 a year, and he would remain

on the job at $1,900 a year, plus $100 increase if the substitute bill were enacted. It seems to me those things should be considered by us.

What will we do with 360 men who now receive only $1,900 a year, and who would receive an increase in salary of only $100 under the substitute measure? What will we do with 337 men who under the substitute will receive only an approximate 14 percent raise in salary, whereas the rise in the cost of living is 19.5 percent? It seems to me it is a question of being practical rather than of being theoretical.

Mr. President, there are those who are opposed to any increase in salaries at this time. Perhaps that is proper. There are those who are so economically minded that they can see nothing but cutting down salaries and wages. But the economy of the country does not run that way. The economy of the country is increasing the cost of living to the average citizen. If we cut down the salaries of those in the public service we will force public servants out of office. They will not serve us any longer. They will go where they can receive better pay, and they can always come back to their old jobs in time of stress. It seems to me it would be much better to take a practical view of this whole situation than to take of it a theoretical, economic view.

Mr. President, under the committee bill or the proposed substitute, who will get the extra money represented by the increased pay?

In the case of policemen, the five grades of privates now receiving under $2,400 per year would get $260,000 of the total raises proposed by the committee bill. The minority substitute would give these same men raises totaling only $104,540. Thus $155,510 of the total by which the cost of the committee bill exceeds that of the minority substitute would go to these privates in the Metropolitan Police force, the men who most deserve and need increases. Raises proposed by the committee bill for police officials now receiving over $3,600 per year would total only $2,100.

In the case of firemen, 295 men now receiving less than $2,400 per year would get $103,250 of the total raises proposed by the committee bill. The minority substitute would give these same men raises totaling $39,340. Thus $63,910 of the difference in cost between the committee bill and the proposed minority substitute would go to these men who need the raises most. Raises proposed by the committee bill for officials of the fire department now receiving more than $3,000 would total only $5,250.

Mr. President, something was said by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] bearing on the subject of the increased cost of living. Let me say that the increased cost of living in some of the cities mentioned by him must be considered from the standpoint of an increase that was in existence when the tabulations used by the Senator were formulated, and long before. Let us take, for instance, Philadelphia. The subsistence level in Philadelphia for a family of four is $1,570. In Detroit it is $1,686. In Los Angeles it is $1,574. In Cleveland it is $1,645. In Baltimore it is $1,566. In St. Louis it is $1,670. In Boston it is $1,657. In Pittsburgh it is $1,606. Whereas in Washington it is $1,731—the highest of all.

Following the cities I have mentioned come San Francisco, and others, including Kansas City.

Mr. President, laying aside all technicalities, does anyone deny, and will the able Senator from Ohio deny that the cost of living has increased in the District of Columbia far out of line compared with the cost of living in any other city in the country? Will anyone deny that the cost of living in the District of Columbia is higher than in any other comparable city of the country? If it be true that the cost of living in the District of Columbia is higher than in any other comparable city of the country, let us not forget the public servants who serve not in hours, but in days and years, who have no limit of time of service, but are subject to call at all times, and let us say to them, "You shall have at least an increase of compensation commensurate with the cost of living as it has gone up in the District of Columbia." If we do that we will not give an increase of $100 to the $1,900-a-year men, and approximately $150 a year increase to the $2,400-a-year men. We will give the higher range of increase to the one who needs it, to the one who has, for example, two children and a wife, and who has been obliged to move out of the District of Columbia in order to live at all, and who denies himself everything, and who can provide his children only a minimum of amusement. We will give a raise to such an employee commensurate with the raises given in the higher brackets. We will give such an employee a raise of $350 a year.

Mr. President, let me now speak of the danger of a veto in this case. Let us study the veto message of the President with respect to the bill passed last year. The President dwelt specifically upon the fact that we had not taken in the teachers of the District of Columbia, and then he dwelt upon the fact that we allowed the bill to rest so long in the Senate that it was retroactive to the extent of 1 year. When we put the bill through the Senate in December we were standing between the devil and the deep blue sea. In other words, if we sent it back to the House, at that time there was not a quorum of the membership of the House in the city, so that one objection would kill the bill. If we passed it and sent it to the President, he might veto it. We took a chance with the latter course, and got "left." We would have been "left" in either event. Now we have before us a bill which has been worked out based on the facts in the case, and we ask that the substitute bill be not adopted.

## STRIKES IN WAR INDUSTRIES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I introduce a bill entitled "Relating to strikes in war industries during the war, and for other purposes" and ask unanimous consent that the bill be read at the desk for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read.

The bill (S. 802) relating to strikes in war industries during the war, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to marshal and utilize the full manpower of the country in the present emergency, in all war industries as well as in the combat services; and

Whereas the critical need of the armed services for supplies, munitions, and shipping makes it imperative that no stoppages of work in war industries be tolerated for any cause, or for any length of time. Strikes, slow-downs, and voluntary absences from work are definite aids to the enemy; and

Whereas recalcitrant employers have been effectively dealt with by seizure of their plants under authority of war powers legislation; and

Whereas the adjustment of wages has been taken out of the control of management by order of the Administrator of Economic Stabilization; and

Whereas management, having been deprived by governmental edict of jurisdiction to bargain collectively under the National Labor Relations Act with reference to adjustment of wages, is powerless to adjust those differences that cause industrial strife.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) Until the cessation of hostilities in the present war every registrant under this act (1) who is employed by any person engaged under contract or otherwise in the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials for the United States or any agency thereof, or of any articles or materials required by the United States or any agency thereof for use in connection with the war effort, and (2) who strikes or acts in concert with other employees in such manner that their absence from work will seriously impede or delay the manufacture, production, or mining of such articles or materials, shall immediately notify his selective service local board to that effect, and the employers affected shall make public the names and addresses of the employees concerned. Thereupon, such local board shall proceed immediately to determine, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) whether it will be in the best interests of the war effort for such registrant to be inducted into the land or naval forces under this act, to continue to be employed in the work in which he was engaged immediately prior to his notification to the local board as herein provided, or to be employed in some other work essential to the war effort. The local board shall notify the registrant of its determination and shall attach to such notification an appropriate order directing the registrant to report for induction into the land or naval forces or to return to work. Each such registrant who fails to notify his local board as herein provided, or who fails to comply with any such order issued by his local board, shall be subject to the same penalties that are applicable in the case of failure to comply with any other requirement of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the bill just introduced is for the purpose of preventing strikes, or "employees acting in concert with each other in such manner as their absence from work will seriously impede or delay the production of materials of war."

It may be called work-or-fight legislation.

I fully realize that the problem is a most difficult one. I have no desire whatever to be unfair to labor or deprive it of any rights. However, after all, Mr. President, in time of war all considerations must yield to the paramount question of national defense.

It is true—and I have said it time and time again—that only a small minority of the laboring people of America are not cooperating in proper measure with the war effort; but a minority can seriously interfere with the production of the essential equipment which will gain for America a victory based on an unconditional surrender at the earliest possible time.

In this day of our peril we can no longer tolerate any interference from any source whatsoever with a 100-percent utilization of all the manpower and resources of America.

Existing law provides that if an employer does not cooperate with the Government, the President has the power to seize his plant; but there is no law which prohibits strikes or controls the new and insidious methods of certain labor leaders who induce the members of their unions to absent themselves en masse, such as the vote taken yesterday by the workers at the Lockheed and Vega aircraft plants at Los Angeles to hold a 24-hour mass meeting beginning at 12:30 a. m. Wednesday in protest against the War Labor Board's delay in handing down a decision on wage demands, or to control such instances as that which occurred in the Boeing plant at Seattle last week, when 10,000 workmen, as reported by the Associated Press, left their tools and machines to demonstrate by means of a parade their intention to strike if their demand for higher wages was not approved by the War Labor Board.

It is true that this strike threat was camouflaged under what the leaders called the holding of a 24-hour general labor meeting, and will proceed to unfinished business and from then on will wait for the War Labor Board to give its decision, but the effect is the same. There was a cessation of work in these plants producing Flying Fortresses, the most needed and effective of all our implements of war.

The bill proposed may not be perfect but it certainly offers a basis for a method of control which will prevent those impediments and delays which are now occurring in the production of munitions of war using the existing machinery established by the Selective Service and Training Act.

It amends the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940, under which every male citizen from 18 to 65 years of age—from 18 to 45 for military service—has already registered. This registration was required so that those within these age limits could be utilized in the most effective manner in the prosecution of the war.

The bill provides that any man between the ages of 18 and 65 who strikes or acts in concert with other employees in such manner that their absence from work will seriously impede or delay the production of war materials, shall immediately notify his local selective-service board to that effect, and if he fails to do so he shall be subject to the penalties imposed under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

It further provides that the employers affected shall make public the names and addresses of the employees who strike, or who act in concert with other employees in such manner that their absence from work will seriously impede or delay the production of war equipment.

The bill then would provide that the local board, subject to the same appeals which now exist in the Selective Training and Service Act, may decide which is for the best interest of the country, whether such registrant shall be inducted into the armed forces, or whether he shall continue in the work in which he was engaged at the time of his act, or whether he shall be employed in some other work essential to the war effort.

The regulations of the Selective Training and Service Act already provide that any registrant who changes his place of living or his occupation shall notify his local board. Therefore the notification required in this law is entirely consistent with the underlying principle of the selective-service registration.

It is, of course, true that at the present time the armed forces are inducting into service only those between the ages of 18 and 38, so under present regulations, those over 38 who commit the acts set forth in this proposed bill would not be inducted into the armed forces, but the local boards, with the new authority provided under the proposed legislation, could compel such registrants to work either in the plant where the impediment to production occurred, or in some other essential war activity, so that the services of such registrants could be utilized to the best advantage in the war effort.

The proposed legislation would be operative only until the cessation of hostilities.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe that one thing which the recent strike in the Boeing plant has made evident is that the War Labor Board has been rather slow in passing on disputes. Of course, if the Labor Board does not in the future act with more speed than it acted in the case to which reference has been made, it will tend to increase industrial unrest considerably. It would be unfortunate, therefore, if we were to have strikes in the future because the War Labor Board has not been quick in acting upon the disputes which have come before it.

I do not make that observation in a spirit of antagonism to anything the distinguished Senator from Virginia has said. However, some agencies which are beyond the scope of Congress should be put on notice to do what they can to prevent strikes and not give opportunity for workmen to complain that long delays cause them to suffer injustices, which may or may not be the case. I read a very interesting article on the subject by Mr. Arthur Krock. The article was published in last Sunday's New York Times. The situation seems to be that the motivation of the strike referred to was not so much due to the issue involved as to the failure of the agency set up by the Government actually to pass upon the matter and adjudicate it in accordance with the facts. So far as we can we should serve notice on the War Labor Board that we expect it to see that strikes are not caused by delays—which have occurred in too many cases—in adjudicating matters coming before it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from Maryland a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How long did the War Labor Board have the matter under consideration—for 2 weeks or for 2 months?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know the time; but my recollection is that it was several months. They were about to decide it once, and then a petition for reexamination was filed by one member of the Board. Then the Board looked into the matter a second time. If my recollection is correct, I think the strike occurred approximately 6 weeks or 2 months after the Board looked into the matter the second time. In the meantime, no decision had been handed down.

The matter of wages is at the Board's disposal. They know how much the workers are receiving; they have the formula and the procedure. It seems to me they could very quickly ascertain whether there was merit in the complaint, and could arrive at a decision. I can think of nothing more unfortunate in the trial of a lawsuit than long delay during which a man does not know where he stands. Perhaps the workmen in this case were basically all wrong, or perhaps they were all right. I am not purporting to pass on that. But at least there should be quick action by the War Labor Board so as not to create unnecessary dissension in the ranks of the workers.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Maryland that there should be no undue delay in the settlement of the question of increased wages for workers. However, I point out that the present situation is only one instance of strikes occurring throughout the country.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am simply saying that the occasion is one which will supplement the occurrence of strikes throughout the country. In the Boeing case, I think the War Labor Board contributed no small factor to the loss of 6 hours' work by each of 10,000 workmen; whereas if the decision had been promptly rendered the strike might have been prevented. The Government should be as careful as anyone else in making sure that it is not responsible for the loss of man-hours of work during the war.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, under Government regulations now existing, no employer can increase wages and salaries without the approval of the War Labor Board. A strike today in a war-industry plant for higher wages is not a strike against the employer, but is a strike

against the War Labor Board, representing the Government. It is, in fact, a strike directly against the Government itself.

I agree that an agency of the Government, such as the War Labor Board, should have authority over increases in wages. Such authority is now effective, and it is, therefore, more imperatively necessary than previously that the Congress itself, by a strong declaration of policy, decree that strikes affecting war production shall not be permitted during the war emergency. I say this because what little influence the employer once had to prevent a strike has been taken away, first, due to the fact that the employer has been deprived of the right of discharging striking employees for striking, and second, because the employer is no longer able to adjust the wages of his own employees.

The granting of wage increases involves the vital question of the control of inflation. It seems to me obvious, therefore, that if wages are to be controlled to avoid inflation, strikes must be controlled as well. There is ample governmental machinery already established to correct any injustices or inequalities in wages that now exist.

It appears to be evident that we are faced again with strikes and threats of strikes. The instance of 10,000 workers leaving their tools and machines in the manufacture of Flying Fortresses at the Boeing plant in Seattle and parading through the streets as a demonstration to secure an increase in wages under threat of strike, and the statements made by their labor leaders, give an ominous warning that unless their demand is granted, a general strike in all airplane plants on the west coast will be called.

In the East the demands of John L. Lewis for large wage increases in the coal field will come up for consideration on March 10. Recalling the victory John L. Lewis won over the Government when he was appointed an arbiter by the President to sit on his own case, the country can anticipate a determined and bitter fight by this labor leader to win the increases in wages, and other concessions he is now asking. Interruption of the Nation's coal supply, even for a short period, will strike at the very lifeblood of the war effort.

Heretofore the administration has opposed antistrike legislation, and it has been mainly due to the influence of the administration that no such protective legislation has yet been adopted by both branches of Congress.

On June 13, 1941, the Senate adopted a resolution stating that it was "the sense of Congress that strikes in industries that affect the national defense effort are contrary to sound public policy and they are hereby condemned," but due to the influence of the administration this resolution was defeated in the House.

The House, by large majorities, passed two Smith bills, which, if enacted, would have done much to curb strikes and speed the war effort, but both those bills were smothered in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. Therefore, up to this date, there has not been a law enacted by Congress to control strikes in war industries, which have done so much to sabotage a 100-percent war effort.

While lately effort has been made to minimize strikes, the fact is that strikes in vital war industries have been constantly occurring. In the year before Pearl Harbor, when this country was preparing for its own defense, the Labor Department reports that 23,047,000 man-days were lost in all strikes. In the year after Pearl Harbor, with the country at war, as reported by the War Labor Board, 4,565,000 man-days were lost in all industries. Of these, 2,095,294 man-days were classified as being in war industries; but the fact is that practically every strike since Pearl Harbor, and most of the strikes since the emergency began, have affected adversely the war effort, even though occurring in a plant not classified as a war-production plant. For example, today, with the impending shortage of food, a food industry is not classified as a war industry, yet a strike in any food processing plant is just as much a strike against the war effort as a strike in a war-production plant.

In the 4 weeks ending January 23, 1943, in war industries alone 258,498 man-days were lost, as reported by the War Labor Board. If this ratio continued throughout the year 1943, there would be an increase of approximately 50 percent of the man-days lost in war industries as compared to 1942.

It is true that the man-days lost since Pearl Harbor involve only a small percentage of those who work in war-production plants, which proves what I have said many times before, that a vast majority of the workingmen of this country are completely loyal and are doing their utmost to promote the war effort, but this does not excuse even a minority, headed by unprincipled leaders, who are willing to sabotage the war effort if such action succeeds in advancing their own selfish interests.

In this desperate war in which we are engaged we must mobilize every resource of America, both at home and on the battlefield, to win the earliest possible victory.

Not only do we have strikes today, but it has been definitely shown that absenteeism is doing even more to retard the full war effort, and I believe this bill will do much to prevent unwarranted absenteeism.

The No. 1 job before the country is to win this war, and every day that we can shorten the war means saving perhaps thousands of American lives.

I feel the time has come when the question of strikes or unwarranted absenteeism in plants must be dealt with firmly and effectively. We must hit at the heart of the matter, and Congress should declare, by effective legislation, that we will not tolerate unwarranted absenteeism or any other stoppage of work which denies to our soldiers the equipment and material necessary to achieve the task we have given them—to defeat by unconditional surrender the most brutal yet the most efficient enemies this country has ever faced.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement from the War Production Board showing the man-days of strike idleness in all industries, as well as in war industries, again emphasizing that since Pearl Harbor a strike in any industry in practically every instance has had an adverse effect on the full war effort.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II—*Man-days of strike idleness*

| | 5-year average, 1937-41, all industries | 1942, all industries | 1942, war industries |
|---|---|---|---|
| January | 923,378 | 390,000 | 46,197 |
| February | 796,608 | 425,000 | 118,700 |
| March | 1,324,084 | 450,000 | 166,680 |
| April | 3,334,445 | 375,000 | 173,513 |
| May | 2,108,529 | 325,000 | 137,330 |
| June | 1,763,120 | 550,000 | 254,653 |
| July | 1,372,769 | 450,000 | 233,614 |
| August | 1,346,916 | 450,000 | 266,353 |
| September | 1,213,114 | 450,000 | 318,892 |
| October | 1,274,516 | 325,000 | 167,865 |
| November | 1,068,113 | 175,000 | 91,925 |
| December | 501,162 | 200,000 | 119,572 |
| Total | 85,133,777 | 4,565,000 | 2,095,294 |
| Monthly average | 1,418,896 | 380,417 | 174,608 |

Mr. BYRD. I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a very able article by Arthur Krock, appearing in the New York Times of February 28.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIE-UP AT BOEING POSES NEW CRISIS IN WAR LABOR—MEMBERS OF CONGRESS GROW RESTIVE, SOLDIER BACK FROM AFRICA TALKS OF PLANES THAT DID NOT COME—WAGE RULING DELAYED BY WAR LABOR BOARD

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—Thousands of workers in the Boeing plants on the Pacific coast laid down the tools and left the machines by which the great Flying Fortresses are made in protest this week against the length of time it has taken the War Labor Board to pass on higher wage demands.

Before wiser counsels prevailed, some of the workers' spokesmen said that, until the Board acts and acts satisfactorily, the walkouts will continue and will be made general in the aircraft industry. This would, of course, have steadily reduced the production of airplanes on which the safety and victory of the American armed forces depend.

Congress was quick to respond to this latest breach by union members of the pledge of their leaders to abandon the strike as an economic weapon for the duration of the war. Senator CONNALLY reintroduced a bill which the administration had influenced him to withdraw some time ago in consideration of the establishment of War Labor Board and the no-strike pledge. This bill would outlaw strikes and provide for Army seizure and operation of struck war plants, with heavy penalties for the strikers. In the House related moves were made to maintain vital war production.

SOLDIER'S CONDEMNATION

Out at Walter Reed Hospital in Washington 14 United States soldiers, who were wounded in the north African fighting, lay in a ward and read the news from the Pacific coast. One of their number, Corp. H. V. La Rochelle, who said he was the spokesman of them all, was quoted in the local press as follows:

"We who have lain in shell holes watching the skies for bomber and fighter plane help which failed to appear feel pretty bitter about the whole thing. In the Army, acts less treasonable than this are punishable with death before a firing squad."

These things were said and done in the United States this week.

It is fair to relate that the aircraft workers on the west coast have a grievance. Since last July they have been asking the War Labor Board to pass on an application for higher pay. A conference on the subject broke down in Los Angeles during that month, presided over by Paul Porter. Contracts had generally expired between April and July for 9 plants with 250,000 employees. There followed a period of uncertainty as to the wage policy of the administration until October 2, when the Stabilization Act was passed and the War Labor Board was directed to stand by the Little Steel formula.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD

The Board then instructed Mr. Porter to pursue a further inquiry. He finished it in December and made recommendations for increases which have been before the War Labor Board ever since. But the case is hot, and the Board has been busy with the administrative work of setting up regional groups to carry out its wage policies.

The result was the delay against which the Boeing workers demonstrated. Probably they heard whispers that good unions do not get the attention from the War Labor Board that hell-raising unions do.

But also the Boeing worker leadership has been troublesome to the industry and to the country. Before Hitler attacked Russia, when, according to the Communist Party line in the United States, the anti-Axis nations which we were aiding were engaged merely in a capitalist war, there was much Communist leadership at Boeing. When Russia was bombarded into an allied position, and especially after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, this leadership was supplanted by an experienced, mature spokesman named Garry Cotton, who had the support of the International Association of Machinists, the parent American Federation of Labor organization. But he was not extreme enough to suit the hotheads in the local, and they replaced Cotton with H. J. Gibson, younger and lacking experience.

UNION'S DEMANDS

The international union, if this grave matter is not quickly settled and for keeps, can suspend the local. But then in all likelihood it will go over to the Congress of Industrial Organizations and there will be a loss of dues and no improvement in the situation. For the workers are plainly out to bully the War Labor Board in giving them more than Mr. Porter recommended. They are asking for a beginning wage of 95 cents an hour instead of the present 62.5 cents, at Boeing, and the present 60 cents in southern California. Mr. Porter has proposed: A beginning wage of 65 cents at Boeing, rising to 85 cents at the end of 16 weeks; the maintenance of the beginning wage of 60 cents in southern California, rising to 80 cents at the end of 16 weeks.

These are the general facts in the controversy which produced the things said and done in the United States this week that have been enumerated above. The President was suffering from a slight illness during the course of events, and the White House explained that, had he not been ordered by his doctors to refrain from action in any but the greatest emergencies, he would have intervened by telephone.

The President's health is more than ever of vital importance to the United Nations and the cause for which they are at war. But when it is completely safe for him to assert himself, and if at that time there remains even the vestige of a threat that workers will close down any of the aircraft plants, however briefly, it is plain that Congress and the country will expect him to act sternly. And, from what the wounded corporal said, it seems certain that the armed forces of the United States would applaud the most vigorous action necessary.

DRAMA OF IMAGINATION

What will that action be, assuming that the threat of further work stoppages continues and the President has directed the War Labor Board to stand by his wage stabilization, anti-inflation policy against all strong-arm pressures? No prediction may be ventured. But imagination may be indulged, and the following dramatic act envisaged which this generation will probably never witness, chiefly because, one hopes, it will never be necessary.

All broadcast facilities are ordered to be mobilized to carry throughout the United Nations words issuing from a microphone in the White House. American Army commanders in India, China, the islands of the Pacific, South America, the Caribbean, Iceland, Alaska, Africa, and the United States are instructed to assemble as an audience all troops not engaged in battle or activities germane to battle. The Navy has directed its men to stand by to listen, wherever possible.

THE PRESIDENT SPEAKS

On the ground, on and under the sea, and in the air the armed forces of the United States—men and women—hear these words from the Commander in Chief:

"Henceforth there will be no work stoppages in the production of the supplies you must have to fight the war. I have directed the Army and the Navy to take over at once any war plant where there is even the semblance of a strike, a slow-down, or abnormal absenteeism.

"I have directed Selective Service to draft any able-bodied male citizen responsible for any of these shocking delinquencies, and I shall find means to deal effectively with those unfit for Army service. I shall make no further effort to restrain Congress from legislating strong correctives. I have been patient, too patient perhaps. From now on you may count on me to enforce a true equality of sacrifice and effort, as comparable to your own as I can make it."

But—it must be repeated—this is only a flight of fancy.

## COTTON A VITAL FACTOR IN WAR

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a round-table discussion entitled "The Farmer and Victory," by Chris Christensen, T. W. Schultz, and William Spencer. The discussion took place at Chicago.

Mr. Christensen is the dean of the college of agriculture and director of the agricultural experimental station and extension service of the University of Wisconsin. Mr. Schultz is professor and head of the department of economics at Iowa State College. Mr. Spencer is the dean of business at the University of Chicago. At present he is on leave from the university, to act as director of the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. President, the discussion of the farmer and victory by these three professors absolutely amazes me. I quote first from Mr. Schultz, page 2:

Mr. SCHULTZ. We just throw those figures at ourselves all the time. There has been a very credible—

He says "credible," but I know he means "creditable"—

record, I grant, in some parts of agriculture, but look at the fact that virtually half of agriculture, in terms of people, is in the South, and cotton is not needed for the war.

A college professor, a professor at an agricultural college, is making the statement that cotton is not needed for the war.

Again Mr. Schultz, on page 12 of the pamphlet, says:

Mr. SCHULTZ. You would in the case of wheat. You would in the case of several of th products that I mentioned. Let's take cotton for just a second in that connection.

A second must have been all the time they ever devoted to cotton in their entire lives.

Here we have an economy which involves almost half of the farm people of the United States. We've got so large a stock of cotton carry-over that if we didn't produce any short-staple cotton next year we'd still have plenty. You could take all the 1943 crop and dump it in the Gulf of Mexico, and you wouldn't hurt the war effort one iota.

Think of a professor of agriculture in a college making a statement of that kind, and sending it over the radio, if you please, apparently with the approval of a member of the War Manpower Commission set up in Washington.

Furthermore, we're going to use a lot of ships to bring in fertilizer from Chile to grow more cotton. That simply doesn't make sense.

Again on page 20 Mr. Spencer gives voice to this remarkable statement:

Mr. SPENCER. Gentlemen, we are agreed that the consumer has a heavy responsibility in helping the farmer do his job of producing more food as a war weapon. Certainly agriculture as a whole, notably the Cotton Belt, is not now on a wartime basis.

We are agreed that we must produce more fighting foods.

Listen to this:

We must produce more fighting foods, such as meat, dairy products, eggs, peas, peanuts, and soya beans.

We are agreed that in some regions and in some agricultural activities farm workers are not now being fully utilized.

We're not agreed fully as to how far the increased prices for farmers will solve this problem. We do believe that removing some of the loans on cotton production, and perhaps even in wheat, may help out, but we still will have left, after that is done, a problem of recruiting and allocating and training farmers with farm experience in order to get the food that we need.

After reading these statements of these three agricultural professors, so-called, I am wondering if some of our colleges are putting a premium on ignorance.

Of all the ignorant discussions I have ever read or heard of concerning a great agricultural product, none excels in ignorance this discussion by the three professors about cotton. It is remarkable that a man claiming to be a professor of agriculture could be such an ignoramus about one of the greatest food crops in the world. All three seem to be agreed, from the foregoing excerpts in the pamphlet that cotton is

of no food value. I suppose these professors must imagine that lint cotton only is grown. I do not suppose they ever heard of cottonseed or its value as food.

Ordinarily 1,600 pounds of short-staple cotton produce about 500 pounds of lint or, as we used to say in the far South, 1,600 pounds of seed cotton to the bale. Mind you, Mr. President, two-thirds of this cotton is composed of cottonseed. The oils and fats from cottonseed are infinitely more extensive, infinitely better as a fighting food than some of the products suggested by the three learned professors of agriculture.

The kernels of cottonseed contain the richest oil fats. The oil is used in the Army as well as in civiliar life. From the fat of these seeds are made lard, butter, and all the modern shortenings which are in common use, not in one State alone, not in one section alone, but all over the country. They are used in New England, they are used in the West, they are used in the Middle West, they are used right there in Chicago, and, while these gentlemen may not know it, every day of their lives, in one form or another, they eat cottonseed which they say has no food value of any kind. Furthermore, the hulls of the cottonseeds are ground and produce cattle feed which in turn produces all kinds of dairy commodities.

Mr. President, if I were inclined to be critical I would say that the ignorance of these three agricultural college professors is monumental. Probably, that, however, would be saying too much for them. They talk as if lint cotton grew by itself on the cotton plant and that such lint cotton was valueless to the world. I shall discuss that later.

I want to say first, without fear of successful contradiction, that no food products are more necessary in this war than oils and fats and that our principal oils and fats come from cotton, the three radio agricultural professors at Chicago to the contrary notwithstanding. Of course, substantially, we now get no vegetable oils from abroad at all. The supply of vegetable oil from the Far East, principally copra, was very great, but since the war these supplies of vegetable oils have ceased, so that we are now dependent upon our own vegetable oils. Until last year the quantity of vegetable oils from cottonseed was substantially as large as from all other sources combined. This year soya-bean oil is slightly ahead of cottonseed oil. In terms of pounds of meal the proportions are soya bean, 1,350,000,000 pounds; cottonseed, 1,250,000,000 pounds; flaxseed, 1,500,000 pounds; peanuts, 1,250,000 pounds. In any event, it can be safely said that more than one-third of all our vegetable oils and fats come from cottonseed. I imagine that the three agricultural professors at Chicago did not know that cotton came from seed and that two-thirds of cotton in the seed is composed of the seed. Perhaps they had never heard of cottonseed oil mills and refineries. They probably thought that lard, oleomargarine, and all other shortenings were hog lard. Of course, they did not understand that they themselves ate this product in their everyday lives and that it would have been bad for them individually for all the cotton crop of 1943 to be dumped in the Gulf of Mexico. It would not only hurt the war effort tremendously, but it would hurt as well the three radio farmers of Chicago.

COTTON NOT NEEDED IN THE WAR

Mr. President, I take up first the statements of these three radio farmers that "cotton is not needed for the war."

I wonder what sort of clothes the three radio farmers of Chicago wear. I wonder what sort of clothes they think the boys in the Army wear. Substantially, every shirt the soldier wears is made of cotton. Every undershirt, every pair of socks, the bag in which he carries his clothes, every piece of under apparel he wears or he uses is made mostly of cotton. The khaki uniform he wears is made of cotton. It is remarkable that any person who went to school for as much as a year does not know these facts, and yet the three radio agricultural experts at Chicago seem not to know it.

Perhaps they think that all the clothes of the soldiers are made of silk obtained from our enemy, Japan. I do not know how else they could think that our soldiers would be clothed, unless they were under the delusion that, like Mr. Jiggs, all of them wore red flannel underclothes.

Of course, they wear woolen clothes, too, but without cotton they could not go very far in the way of dress, and if the cotton crop were placed in the Gulf of Mexico, our soldiers at home and abroad, as well as our civilians, would be in a sad plight, the three radio experts at Chicago to the contrary notwithstanding.

FOOD USES OF COTTON

Cottonseed oil is used in butter making, the making of oleomargarine, and in the making of a great variety of compounds containing animal fat, as well as in the making of hydrogenated vegetable cooking fats. It is used for the manufacture of soaps, for lotions, creams, artificial leather, linoleum, explosives, paint, and medicine. Not only that, Mr. President, the meal and hulls are used for stock feed to greatly increase our supply of cattle, poultry, sheep, and hogs. They are used as fertilizers, and for all kinds of feed products. The oil is used for dyestuffs, but its greatest value is in foodstuffs.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was waiting for the Senator to address himself to the use of cottonseed in the preparation of cottonseed meal and cake for the cattle industry, and hence in the production of beef. I wanted to tell the Senator that I have received several telegrams from New Mexico, which is a cattle-producing State, demanding to know why the cattle raisers there cannot buy cottonseed meal and cake to feed cattle, stating that there apparently is a shortage. Will the Senator please explain that?

Mr. McKELLAR. Explain the shortage?

Mr. HATCH. Yes. I understood the Senator to say that the college professors were proposing that the cotton be dumped into the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. McKELLAR. They say it could be dumped into the Gulf of Mexico without hurting the war effort. I am merely enumerating the hundreds of uses of cotton, among them the feeding of cattle, the feeding of sheep, even the feeding of hogs, for hogs, too, eat cottonseed meal. It is good food for man and beast.

Mr. HATCH. The point I was making was that apparently, from the messages I have received from my State, there is now a shortage of that product.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; yet these three farmer professors in Chicago, who broadcast over the radio, and who are connected with the War Manpower Commission, say that if all this year's crop, the 1943 crop, were dumped into the Gulf of Mexico, the war effort would not be hurt a bit. I wonder where the Senator's constituents would get the cottonseed meal and hulls with which to feed cattle in his State, if all that crop were dumped into the Gulf of Mexico. There would be difficulty in getting feed for stock.

Mr. HATCH. Of course, the Senator has been speaking facetiously, but he is discussing a very serious matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am discussing one of the most serious food situations in this country. The cottonseed crop is one of the most important of all the food crops at this time, not only in itself, but for the oils and fats which come from it, as well as because of its use in the production of meat for the whole country.

Mr. President, linters are the fiber of cotton immediately around the seed, a very short, fuzzy fiber, not over one-sixteenth or at most an eighth of an inch long, which is used for the making of gunpowder. I wonder where these three agricultural radio professors at Chicago, who are advising the American people about this matter, would get the material out of which to make gunpowder if it were not for the vast amount of linters that are taken from the cottonseed meal after the lint cotton is ginned.

If the cotton crop of 1943 were dumped into the Gulf of Mexico, I wonder what the gunpowder industry in our country would do.

These professors say cotton is not helpful to the war effort. What ridiculous nonsense. Linters not only are used exclusively at the present time in making gunpowder, but they are commandeered already by the Government. All the linters of last year's crop, and, as I understand, of this year's crop, have already been commandeered by the Government for the making of gunpowder. Yet these three professors are talking about cotton not being of value to the war effort.

In ordinary times linters are used for the upholstery of furniture and automobiles, yarns, mops, cordage, wicks, and for the manufacture of cellulose, rayon, lacquers, cellophane, and plastics. The three agricultural college professors and radio experts would not be able to function with the movies if all the cotton were dumped into the Gulf of Mexico.

There are hundreds of different uses to which both the cotton and the cottonseed products are put, notwithstanding

the statements of our three radio professors.

Mr. President, in conclusion I may say that no one knows where these statements come from, and we do not know anything about them, and I would not have said anything about them but for these three men broadcasting over the radio, one of them connected with the War Manpower Commission, talking about throwing the entire cotton crop into the Gulf of Mexico, and saying that it would not hurt the war effort at all. I thought someone should call attention to this matter.

BUREAUCRATIC CONTROL OF FARMS

Mr. President, I wish now to draw attention to another matter and to put into the RECORD two or three letters which I have here, one of which I read:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
LOCAL BOARD NO. 1,
*Lauderdale County, February 18, 1943.*

Mr. M. L. PIPER,
*Ripley, Tenn.*

DEAR MR. PIPER: The Lauderdale County Local Board No. 1 would like to notify you that your farm labor does not meet the requirements necessary to classify your farm as an essential farm. If you will check this at the local board office, we will be glad to help you adjust this situation, so that your essential farm help will not be drafted from your farm.

Very truly yours,
J. N. WYATT, *Chairman.*

I shall read an extract from a letter written by the owner of the 2,400-acre farm referred to in this letter, stating what it contains—though it is said it does not come within the war effort:

The farm that this letter is directed to is only about 112 to 115 years old—

He is very much mistaken about that; the land is older than that—

The farm that this letter is directed to is only about 112 to 115 years old, situated 4 or 5 miles out of Ripley, Tenn., and has only been owned by three different people—the first owner being a man by the name of Oldham, then the J. T. Fargasons, of Memphis, owned it, and now myself. This farm consists of about 2,400 acres and has been a stock farm for the last 60 years. On January 1, in making up our inventory, we had 309 head of cattle and 200 head of hogs. We grew the following crops in 1942: About 250 bales of cotton, 12,000 to 14,000 bushels of corn, about 100 acres of soybeans, 5,000 bushels of oats, a small acreage of wheat, and pasture of various kinds for the stock mentioned. During December and January we marketed from 25,000 to 30,000 pounds of meat, we furnished in the neighborhood of 100 tons of cottonseed for oils and other purposes, and yet this board says that this farm is not classified as an essential farm. If it is not, I would like to know what it would take to make it essential.

I ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOODS LUMBER CO.,
*Memphis, Tenn., February 22, 1943.*

Hon. KENNETH D. MCKELLAR,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a letter from the Selective Service System, the same being with reference to a farm near Ripley, Tenn., in Lauderdale County. My reason for writing this letter is to give you an idea of what the public is having to put up with with the different agencies governing farms and other works.

The farm that this letter is directed to is only about 112 to 115 years old, situated four or five miles out of Ripley, Tenn., and has only been owned by three different people—the first owner being a man by the name of Oldham, then the J. T. Fargasons, of Memphis, owned it, and now myself. This farm consists of about 2,400 acres and has been a stock farm for the last 60 years. On January 1, in making up our inventory, we had 309 head of cattle and 200 head of hogs. We grew the following crops in 1942: About 250 bales of cotton, 12,000 to 14,000 bushels of corn, about 100 acres of soybeans, 5,000 bushels of oats, a small acreage of wheat, and pasture of various kinds for the stock mentioned. During December and January we marketed from 25,000 to 30,000 pounds of meat, we furnished in the neighborhood of 100 tons of cottonseed for oils and other purposes, and yet this board says that this farm is not classified as an essential farm. If it is not, I would like to know what it would take to make it essential.

This is one of many such things that we are up against in the way of committees, boards, regulators, and dictators, which are doing more harm than the public can do good. There are millions of working hours lost in trying to do business with the many agencies that have been set up in the past few years. I am one who would quit trying to do anything if we were not at war until such things were corrected.

We bought the farm referred to about a year ago, and during the year we have marketed over 200 head of hogs and in the neighborhood of 120 to 125 head of cattle in addition to the crops above referred to. We also operate two sawmills and furnish the majority of our output for Government purposes. We have some additional farm interests in Arkansas, with which it very nearly keeps a man busy going to the county agencies and different regulating boards to try to do business. Much of this was set up before we were at war.

I am one who is ready and willing to, and am doing everything in my power to promote war against our enemies, but we find many things done by Government agencies that are detrimental and retard instead of being a benefit, in the way of causing time lost, circulars to be filled out, reports to be made that do not amount to as much as the paper they are written on, for a majority of the agencies that are set up never had 5 cents' worth of business in their lives, would not know what a pay roll was if they were to see one, and there are thousands sitting back in a big, easy chair in front of a desk that do not do anything but put in time and draw the Government pay. Our armed forces could be increased by several hundred thousand if they were put in the Army instead of put behind a desk, and maybe could do something to promote our war effort.

I am writing this letter in the kindest of spirit, but giving facts as we see them, and we think something should be done in this way to encourage the public to produce instead of taking up their time with inexperienced people making reports.

I hope you will pardon my writing you this long letter.

Yours very truly,
EUGENE WOODS.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this is what comes from legislation by bureaus. This shows the action of a bureau chief, small, it is true, but a bureau chief. The information used comes from Washington. He says that a 2,400-acre farm, producing all those foodstuffs, including cotton, is not essential to the war effort! When I think of it, I feel that perhaps we should abolish all the bureaus, without exception. We would hardly make a mistake.

MANPOWER AND THE FARM-LABOR PROBLEM

Now, Mr. President, I wish to refer to something else, and it will take me but a moment.

I have obtained from the Washington News an article about bureaucratic farming which I wish to read. On page 26 I find the headline "McNutt's job safe, says man whose orders turned on heat." The article reads:

Picking on War Manpower Chairman Paul V. McNutt has taken on the proportions of a national pastime during the last fortnight—yet the man who initiated most of these "directives" which fanned up this fury so far has escaped the heat.

He is Fowler Harper, deputy War Manpower Commission chairman and former professor at Indiana University law school, where Mr. McNutt was one-time dean.

Mr. Harper was the first of a long line of Hoosier schoolmen Mr. McNutt brought to Washington. Professor Harper's first assignment was as general counsel for the Federal Security Agency. He took that position shortly after Mr. McNutt was made administrator. Later he returned to Indiana University, but made weekly trips here as one of the expert professional "consultants."

Let me state what I understand these consultants to be. Senators will recall that we had much to say last year about travel pay. We could not conceive how the travel pay had grown. I am told it grew up in this way: The bureaucrats here, when they did not know what they wanted to do, would call for an expert consultant to come. The consultant would come here and put up at a hotel, his entire expenses would be paid at the hotel, his mileage would be paid, then he would get $23 a day, as I remember the amount, for the time he remained here. Sometimes he would stay a week, sometimes a month, sometimes 6 months. It was wholly indefinite, merely another way of putting on employees. But that was not what I desired to discuss.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am very much interested in what the Senator is saying about the pay of consultants. He says they were paid $23 a day.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was the testimony before our committee, as I remember it.

Mr. HATCH. They had no fixed salary whatever?

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand a sort of consensus of opinion has grown up in the bureaucracies that reputable consultants should be paid $23 a day.

Mr. HATCH. Yes, but they were not on a regular annual salary basis?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. HATCH. They were on a per diem basis?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, and it is placed under the head of "Travel pay." That is why the travel-pay item looks so large. I give this as a prelude to what follows, and I wish Senators would listen to what Mr. Harper said about the way they manage picking the cotton crop:

We can send thousands of sharecroppers and others from Arkansas and Tennessee to do this work.

I ask the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] to think about that. We all

remember the provision of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution. I think I can quote it fairly accurately:

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude * * * shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

I continue to read what Mr. Harper said:

We can send thousands of sharecroppers and others from Arkansas and Tennessee to do this work—

Mr. Harper explained—

But the cotton planters do not want them, although they seem willing to take Mexicans.

I do not know what the situation is in Arizona.

Mr. HATCH. All I can say about my own State of New Mexico is that the only problem of labor we have is getting sufficient labor. There is no preference anywhere.

Mr. McKELLAR. I continue to read:

But the cotton planters do not want them, although they seem willing to take Mexicans. All we ask is that they pay them 30 cents an hour, which is what the Mexicans got last year. Surely Americans should be as adequately paid as this imported labor and the price is not so high compared with wartime cost of living.

Mr. Harper feels that absenteeism is the latest overworked word of the wartime critics.

Mr. President, I am not criticizing the war. I think the war is progressing well. I am delighted at the way the war is proceeding. I am a thousand percent for it. The main business in this country is to defeat Hitler and the Japanese and the—well, the poor Italians need hardly to be mentioned, because they are already defeated. The great thing is to win the war. But I am opposed to involuntary servitude anywhere in the United States.

I was not old enough to take part in the enactment of the thirteenth amendment, but I am for it. I am for the whole Constitution. I think it is just as effective in war as it is in time of peace. I am for the Constitution a thousand percent. I want the Government conducted under the protection of the Constitution, and under the protection of all of it, and I say that the War Manpower Commission, and no other commission, has a right to take people from Tennessee and Arkansas—I refer to those States simply because they are mentioned in the article from which I am reading—and send them someplace else where the War Manpower Commission may think it is better for the people generally to take them.

I am opposed to involuntary servitude, and I regret that the War Manpower Commission gives out such a report as this.

In order that there may be no mistake about the matter, I ask unanimous consent that the article in question be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

HE'S NOT TOO MUCH CONCERNED—MCNUTT'S JOB SAFE, SAYS MAN WHOSE ORDERS TURNED ON HEAT

(By Daniel M. Kidney)

Picking on War Manpower Chairman Paul V. McNutt has taken on the proportions of a national pastime during the last fortnight—yet the man who initiated most of the "directives" which fanned up this fury so far has escaped the heat.

He is Fowler Harper, deputy War Manpower Commission Chairman and former professor at Indiana University law school, where Mr. McNutt was one-time dean.

Mr. Harper was the first of a long list of Hoosier schoolmen Mr. McNutt brought to Washington. Professor Harper's first assignment was as general counsel for the Federal Security Agency. He took that position shortly after Mr. McNutt was made administrator. Later he returned to Indiana University, but made weekly trips here as one of the expert professional "consultants."

Like other New Deal and pro-labor professors, he was named as a public representative on one of the War Labor Board panels.

Finally he returned here for his present full-time job as War Manpower Commission deputy chieftain, a $9,000 post.

KNOWS LABOR LEADERS

In these various roles he has become well acquainted with industrial labor leaders from coast to coast and often confers with them, as well as with management, regarding manpower problems.

These contacts in the field have served to develop the present War Manpower Commission program which is causing much controversy in Congress and throughout the country. Mr. Harper isn't especially perturbed by the criticism, and says he feels there is not much substance to the various reports that Mr. McNutt is to be replaced.

"The last Congress kept nagging Mr. McNutt for not doing anything," Mr. Harper said. "Now they are nagging him about his doing too much. The 48-hour week and the work-or-fight plan are things which inherently develop pressures. So this heat is not unexpected and might even be called legitimate.

COMPLEX JOB

"Ours is an incredibly complex job and whatever we do will be tough on various groups affected. Classifying certain jobs as not necessary in wartime is bound to make persons employed in such fields resentful. But if this is an all-out war, we have to go all-out to win it and that means using every bit of manpower for its best wartime purposes."

An example of the power now wielded by War Manpower Commission is the fact that the Army rescinded its order to send several thousand troops into Arizona to pick cotton when Mr. Harper protested to both the War Department and Agriculture.

"We can send thousands of sharecroppers and others from Arkansas and Tennessee to do this work," Mr. Harper explained. But the cotton planters do not want them, although they seem willing to take Mexicans. All we ask is that they pay them 30 cents an hour, which is what the Mexicans got last year. Surely Americans should be as adequately paid as this imported labor and the price is not so high compared with wartime cost of living."

Mr. Harper feels that absenteeism is the latest overworked word of the wartime critics.

NOT LIKED BY POLITICOS

"We have been working on that problem for many months," he said. "Through the cooperation of union labor and management I established a program in the lumber industry at Seattle which has worked out extremely well. These are things which we are doing all the time."

Professor Harper isn't the kind of person who ever will do much to make the former Governor of Indiana a President of the United States. He almost automatically arouses the prejudice of the type of democratic politicians who control conventions.

Frank M. McHale, Indianapolis attorney and the 1940 manager of the McNutt-for-President campaign, probably wouldn't call on Paul if he thought Professor Harper was in the same building.

Having spent all his life in school or teaching, until he took up new dealing on the McNutt staff, he has none of the "don't take life too seriously" of the politico who came up from the post of precinct committeeman.

Mr. Harper is married and has a daughter in high school here.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before I take my seat I wish to say that my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], one of the best legislators we have, has come into the Chamber, and I should like to ask him whether he is in favor of the War Manpower Commission taking laborers in Arkansas and Tennessee and bringing them out to his State, with or without their consent, and putting them to work picking cotton in his State? I do not believe the Senator is.

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course not. What actually happened was that there was a shortage of labor to gather the Arizona cotton crop. The Farm Security Administration recruited some, but not enough, cotton pickers in various parts of the United States; some in Arkansas, some in Missouri, some in Tennessee, and more from Texas. They came out to Arizona after the cotton was ready to be picked, and as everyone who has had any experience in cotton picking knows, when most of the cotton bolls are fully open a man can pick more pounds of cotton per day, because there is more available cotton on each cotton plant. Particularly is that true of the long-staple cotton, which sometimes grows nearly 6 feet high.

The cotton does not all ripen at the same time. So pickers have to go back at a later date and make a second picking.

In the second picking the picker cannot make as much money per day, because he has to go to more plants to get the cotton. In the third picking, the last of the crop, he cannot make nearly as much each day as he could in the first picking.

The persons who were imported from other States came out and picked the first part of the Arizona cotton crop, but when it came down to the third picking they were not there, because they could not make the big money that they had earlier in the season. That is the truth about it.

It was officially reported to me that on the 11th day of February, there were 7,500 bales of extra long-staple American-Egyptian cotton, planted at the request of the Army, which is needed to make blimps, which is needed to make parachute cloth, which had not been picked. There also was 13,000 bales of Acala cotton, the staple of which is about an inch long, that had not been picked on that date. All of both varieties of Arizona cotton that should have been at the gins under normal conditions around Christmastime, certainly by the 15th of January. It was not picked by the middle of February, and some of it will not be picked at all, but will be lost.

Mr. McKELLAR. There will not be a great deal of it, will there? As I

understand there were 7,000 bales of the long-staple cotton not picked?

Mr. HAYDEN. About 7,500 bales had not been picked two and a half weeks ago, and the time for planting this years crop is practically at hand.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Arizona recalls seeing in the newspapers that it was first thought to send the Army out there to pick the cotton, but it was found that there was not enough cotton to justify such an attempt.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me explain the Army feature of the situation to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will.

Mr. HAYDEN. About 3 weeks ago General McNarney, the Assistant Chief of Staff, made the statement that the Army would not agree to furlough individual soldiers to engage in the harvesting of crops but that the Army would make military organizations available to assist in the harvests; that is, send them out to the farms by companies or battalions. A statement to the same effect was made, I think, on the following day by General Marshall. Realizing that this idea of harvesting crops by organized bodies of troops was something new and untried, I made the suggestion to General McNarney that as an experiment, in order to find out how to do it, some of the extra long staple cotton planted in Arizona at the request of the War Department be picked. I did not argue that it was necessarily an emergency matter, because perhaps a considerable part of it could be picked in the course of time, and what was lost in any event would not be an enormous quantity. But I did insist that any new scheme has to be tried out, just like any newly invented machine, for, as the mechanical engineers say, there are always "bugs" in it that have to be worked out.

If soldiers go out to help farmers harvest their crop, the first question is, Shall the grower pay as much for the service rendered as he would pay to anyone else who gathered it, whether it be corn, wheat, soybeans, or cotton? Everyone who stops to think about the matter would not hesitate to say that the farmer should not gain by having soldiers perform the work at a cheaper rate than if it were done by civilians.

The second question is this. When the farmer has paid for the harvesting work, who gets the money? Does the soldier who personally picks the cotton get the money? Or does it go into the Treasury of the United States? My suggestion was that it go into the company funds, so that the soldiers could buy more boxing gloves, or baseball bats, or perhaps have better Christmas dinners, or for any other purpose for which company funds are maintained. It was distinctly understood that no military organization was to be engaged in harvesting crops for any very long period of time so that the sums paid into the various company funds would not be excessive.

The next proposition is: How are the soldiers to be transported from where they are to the place where they do the work? The place where the fields to be harvested are located may be nearby some Army camp to which the soldiers can return at the end of each day. In the case of the wheat harvest it may be that they may have to be taken many hundreds of miles. There is the problem of transportation, the problem of what shall be taken along in the way of tentage and equipment and how the soldiers are to be fed. It is obvious that there are many details to be worked out in a practical way.

My suggestion to the War Department was not wait until next summer or fall when some great emergency arises, but that the services of soldiers be utilized in an experimental way by gathering the remainder of a crop of cotton, every bale of which the Army very greatly needs for blimps, for parachutes, and for other types of equipment where great tensile strength is required. That was the essence of my proposal. It was agreed to by the Army, and was agreed to by the officials of the Department of Agriculture directly in charge of the procurement of farm labor. The objection came from Mr. Harper of the War Manpower Commission. He knew nothing of the facts upon which the proposal was based. But he had not been consulted, and he therefore objected to anything being done. As a result of his personal intervention the order authorizing the use of troops to assist in the picking of long staple American-Egyptian cotton in Arizona was canceled.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is another case of bureaucracy. Let me say to the able Senator from Arizona that if he, as a boy, had experience in the picking of cotton, as I did, he will recall that the first crop is very nearly the best; the middle crop is the second best, and the last crop, which is known in cotton parlance as the "top crop," looks very much better than it is. I should not be surprised if the Senator's estimate concerning the top crop of cotton in Arizona is much less than 7,000 bales. I am also sure that if the Senator has had experience with cotton, as I have had, he knows that the statement which I have made is true. The so-called top crop looks better than it really is.

Mr. HAYDEN. My information came directly from the chairman of the Department of Agriculture war board in Arizona. I asked him to make a check and give me an accurate report. I have confidence in his figures. Whether the unpicked crop is 2,000 bales, 5,000, or 7,000, it offers an excellent opportunity to try out an experiment and ascertain whether soldiers in organizations can successfully harvest crops. There is grave doubt in my mind about that. I do not believe that the use of a company of soldiers, only a few of whom may have at any time picked cotton, would be very efficient. That is particularly true with regard to the harvesting of wheat, when it is necessary to use binders and combines, the handling of which requires skill and experience with agricultural machinery. The only way to find out is actually to make the experiment. My idea is that by a process of trial and error the Army can find out whether the use of companies of soldiers to harvest crops is a worth-while way of proceeding. If it proves not to be satisfactory, we will all know that some other method will have to be adopted when a real harvesting crisis arises next summer or next fall. That is the whole idea I had in mind.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as a part of my remarks on this very interesting subject I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article appearing on page 8 of today's Washington Daily News, written by Mr. Arthur F. DeGreve, quoting Mr. Bernard Baruch. He expresses the same view I hold regarding involuntary servitude and commandeered labor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUT HE BELIEVES IN WORK OR FIGHT—BARUCH STILL BRANDS LABOR DRAFT SLAVERY

(By Arthur F. DeGreve)

Bernard M. Baruch, adviser to Presidents and one-time international financier, clings to his belief of nearly a quarter of a century—that it would be impossible and dangerous to attempt to draft labor for war work. But he also is still convinced that labor can be compelled to work or fight.

The white-haired Baruch received this correspondent in the hotel suite he uses as an office when the weather precludes conferences in a nearby park. The interview came as a Senate committee prepared to begin hearings on the Austin-Wadsworth bill which would draft, with some exceptions, all men between 18 and 65 and women between 18 and 50 for war work if they did not volunteer.

CLEARLY * * * SLAVERY

Baruch said his views are the same as those he expressed to Congress in World War No. 1, when he headed the War Industries Board, and in a memorandum to a joint congressional and Cabinet commission on organization for war in 1931.

"We have heard a good deal of a slogan: Draft every dollar, everything and every man," he said 12 years ago. "The attempt to draft labor is * * * impossible and dangerous * * * a soldier serves the Nation directly. There is but one master in the case and that master is America. He serves to profit no one but the country as a whole. There is no distinction between him and his comrades. He enters an immemorial status. His destiny is not contractual. He is clothed, fed, housed, and attended."

Baruch contended that industry is in the hands of millions of private employers and its employees, therefore, serve in private industry operating for gain.

"Enforced and voluntary services for a private master is and has been clearly and repeatedly defined by our Supreme Court as slavery," he pointed out.

BEATS CHAIN GANG

While the Government cannot say to an employee, "work here, work there," Baruch emphasized that it can say "work or fight." He noted that this principle was barely invoked in the First World War and is capable of immense expansion.

"The work or fight method," he declared, "is compatible with our present institutions and far more effective than any chain-gang impression that could be invented."

He feels that strict application of a work or fight policy would go far toward solving absenteeism and unauthorized strikes.

Baruch has no official status but is credited with considerable influence on home-front war policies. He is a close friend of Stabilizer Byrnes and Chairman Harry Hopkins of the Munitions Assignment Board—two of President's Roosevelt's closest advisers.

HINTED FOR WAR PRODUCTION BOARD HELM

Recently, when Production Chief Nelson struggled with the services over control of arms scheduling, it was reported that the President would remove Nelson and appoint Baruch as his successor. Subsequently it was reported that Baruch would be named to a new superboard to handle broad policies affecting the civilian economy.

Friends said today that Baruch is seeking no wartime Government job, but they added that he feels he could not refuse to serve in any capacity if called upon by the President.

## INCREASE IN PAY OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 17) to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Chair state the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I believe I should clear the record on at least two points which were mentioned by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. He made reference to what he thought might be a critical paragraph in the minority views. I wish to assure him that it was not a criticism of his conduct of the committee business, or his leadership of the committee. As I have already stated, I applaud his leadership. I appreciate the way in which he has devoted his time and attention to the work of the committee. I found it necessary merely to make mention of the situation outlined in the report for the reason that I was submitting the report of a minority, and I thought that unless I made some reference in the report to the attendance at the meeting at which the issue was raised, my report as a minority of one might be misunderstood.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the question is appropriate. It is agreed, is it not, that the Senator did not submit his substitute at the time the bill was under consideration by the committee?

Mr. BURTON. No, Mr. President. At the committee meeting I asked that a vote be taken upon the very question which I am presenting here. I did not have the proposal in writing, but I asked that the same provisions that were in House bill 6386 be reported. My request was voted down by a vote of 3 to 1. I was emphasizing the smallness of the attendance, in a committee of 15, to justify the minority report of one.

Turning to another point, the Senator referred to the action of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. I do not wish to spend much time on that question except to say that in their letter of February 6, 1943, which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD, the Commissioners stated that they are not opposing raises in pay. They are recommending the passage of my substitute, and they quote in their letter the statement which they made in January 1942 when a similar situation was before them. They based their objection on the discrimination which would have resulted from the passage of House bill 6386 at that time, which discrimination would not exist if my proposal should be adopted. I quote the following paragraph from their letter of January 22, 1942, which is quoted in their letter of February 6, 1943:

> The Commissioners take the position that if the rise in the cost of living in the District of Columbia justifies increases in basic salaries, such increases should be only for the duration of the national emergency, or so long as the high cost of living prevails, should be on a percentage basis and should apply to all affected by the cost of living in the District.

Since that time the increased cost of living has been met for other employees of the District of Columbia by the 10-percent bonus provision. Therefore, I believe that my substitute is directly in line with the steps previously taken by the Congress. The reason the President vetoed the previous bill was because he differed with the general policy of the Congress at that time to make the increase permanent and to date it back to an earlier date.

The gist of my argument is that the police and fire departments need an increase. We voted an increase last December on a permanent basis. It was recommended by the department on a permanent basis. I urge the renewal of that vote. I have shown that the proposed rates of pay, even when adjusted to the cost of living, are consistent with the rates of pay in cities comparable to the District of Columbia. As we approach the question at the present time, if we adopt the committee bill the rates of pay will be out of line with those of District employees who are receiving the 10-percent bonus; they will be out of line with the pay of employees of the United States Government who are receiving the 10-percent bonus. Representing the Committee on Civil Service, which is discussing these matters, I think I should urge the point that we should not go out of line in our discussions, based on what is good for the whole United States, and for the other employees of the District of Columbia at the present time. But if different consideration is to be given the District of Columbia, it should be done only after the whole question has been considered by the Congress. Therefore, I urge that the Senate repeat the step previously taken. In doing so we will justify the District of Columbia Commissioners in declining to increase the cost by 50 percent, as would be the case if the proposal of the majority of the committee were adopted.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the proposed substitute amendment because it is in line with what we have done for other Federal employees as well as for other employees of the District of Columbia. To do otherwise would be out of line with what has already been done.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia dated February 6, 1943, to which reference has already been made.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1943.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
*Chairman, Senate District Committee,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have given consideration to S. 17, a bill "Providing for a temporary adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia."

At the time of the preliminary meeting of your committee, the Commissioners suggested as a substitute for S. 17 a bill which would grant to members of the Police and Fire Departments an increase in pay conforming strictly with the standards established by Joint Resolution 170, namely, 10 percent of the pay of any member of either organization up to and including $2,900, with a proviso that in no event should any member receive additional compensation which would make his pay exceed $5,000. The Commissioners recognized the equity of an increase in pay for the members of the Police and Fire Departments, but felt that any increase granted them should conform to Joint Resolution 170. The substitute proposal of the Commissioners would give to the Police and Fire Departments an increase commensurate with that accorded the classified employees of the District, and would do away with the discrimination which would result from the passage of S. 17. In addition, the proposal of the Commissioners would satisfy the principal objections of the President to H. R. 6386 in that the substitute bill would make the increase effective as of December 1, 1942 (instead as of February 1, 1942), and would provide that the increase should continue for a temporary period.

Since the meeting of your committee at which S. 17 and the proposal of the Commissioners were discussed, two additional substitutes have been suggested, one of which would increase the pay of each policeman and fireman by $350, up to and including Inspectors in the Police Department and Battalion Chiefs in the Fire Department (resulting in an over-all increase of approximately 15 percent), and the other a substitute bill by Senator BURTON which is substantially the same as H. R. 6386, which passed the Congress but was vetoed by the President with the suggestion that with the elimination of certain objectionable features the President would be favorable to the legislation therein proposed.

The objections of the President have been met by the substitute proposed by Senator BURTON, in that the substitute would provide for a temporary, instead of a permanent, increase, and make such increase effective as of December 1, 1942 (instead of February 1, 1942). Furthermore, bills are now pending before the Congress which would provide for an increase in pay for school teachers, which would remove the final objection of the President. The substitute likewise conforms substantially to Joint Resolution 170 by providing for an over-all increase of approximately 10 percent, and on a temporary basis.

The Commissioners, in their report to the chairman of the House District Committee on January 22, 1942, objecting to the passage of H. R. 6386, stated in part as follows:

"As stated in our report on the former bill, if it is fairly established that living costs in the District of Columbia have risen sufficiently to justify increases in the pay of firemen and policemen, such facts would also justify increases in the salaries of other District employees, as well as employees of the Federal Government. The proposed legislation aids a select few without regard to the level of compensation of other employees.

"The Commissioners take the position that if the rise in the cost of living in the District of Columbia justifies increases in basic salaries, such increases should be only for the duration of the national emergency, or so long as the higher cost of living prevails, should be on a percentage basis, and should apply to all affected by the cost of living in the District."

These objections have been removed by the passage of Joint Resolution 170, which provides for a temporary increase in pay for a substantial number of District employees, and the amendments made to H. R. 6386 in the proposed substitute of Senator BURTON.

The Commissioners recommend, therefore, that the substitute bill proposed by Senator BURTON be adopted.

Respectfully,

———, *President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gerry | O'Mahoney |
| Austin | Gillette | Overton |
| Ball | Green | Radcliffe |
| Bankhead | Guffey | Reed |
| Barbour | Gurney | Revercomb |
| Barkley | Hatch | Reynolds |
| Bone | Hawkes | Russell |
| Brewster | Hill | Stewart |
| Brooks | Holman | Taft |
| Buck | Johnson, Colo. | Thomas, Idaho |
| Burton | La Follette | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bushfield | Langer | Thomas, Utah |
| Butler | Lodge | Truman |
| Byrd | Lucas | Tunnell |
| Capper | McCarran | Tydings |
| Caraway | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Chavez | Maloney | Wagner |
| Clark, Idaho | Maybank | Wallgren |
| Danaher | Mead | Walsh |
| Davis | Millikin | Wheeler |
| Eastland | Moore | Wherry |
| Ellender | Murray | White |
| Ferguson | Nye | Wiley |
| George | O'Daniel | Wilson |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment proposed by the committee.

On this question the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has demanded the yeas and nays. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senators from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. McFARLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS].

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent on account of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is absent because of illness. If present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—40

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gerry | Revercomb |
| Austin | Green | Russell |
| Ball | Guffey | Taft |
| Bankhead | Gurney | Thomas, Idaho |
| Barbour | Hawkes | Thomas, Okla. |
| Brewster | Johnson, Colo. | Truman |
| Brooks | Lodge | Tydings |
| Buck | Maloney | Vandenberg |
| Burton | Maybank | Wherry |
| Bushfield | Millikin | White |
| Butler | Moore | Wiley |
| Byrd | Nye | Wilson |
| Danaher | O'Daniel | |
| Ferguson | Reed | |

NAYS—31

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Barkley | Hill | Radcliffe |
| Bone | Holman | Reynolds |
| Capper | La Follette | Stewart |
| Caraway | Langer | Thomas, Utah |
| Chavez | Lucas | Tunnell |
| Clark, Idaho | McCarran | Wagner |
| Eastland | McKellar | Wallgren |
| Ellender | Mead | Walsh |
| George | Murray | Wheeler |
| Gillette | O'Mahoney | |
| Hatch | Overton | |

NOT VOTING—25

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Bilbo | Chandler |
| Bailey | Bridges | Clark, Mo. |
| Connally | McClellan | Shipstead |
| Davis | McFarland | Smith |
| Downey | McNary | Tobey |
| Glass | Murdock | Van Nuys |
| Hayden | Pepper | Willis |
| Johnson, Calif. | Robertson | |
| Kilgore | Scrugham | |

So Mr. BURTON'S amendment, in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the committee, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill S. 17 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## TEMPORARY ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES FOR TEACHERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 18, providing for temporary adjustment of salaries of teachers in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 18) to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries for teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries for teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That any employee of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rate of compensation is covered by the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, as amended, and as further amended by Public Law No. 188 of the Sixty-eighth Congress, approved June 4, 1924, as amended, shall be paid additional compensation at a rate of $350 per annum: *Provided*, That each such employee shall be paid only such additional compensation or portion thereof as will not cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of $5,000 per annum.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall take effect as of December 1, 1942, and remain in effect for the duration of the present war and for 6 months thereafter.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all except the enacting clause, and insert the following:

That teachers and all other educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia whose salaries are fixed in the Teachers Salary Act, approved June 4, 1924, as amended, shall be paid additional compensation amounting to 10 percent of so much of their earned basic compensation as is not in excess of a rate of $2,900 per annum, and each such employee shall be paid only such additional compensation or portion thereof as will not cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of $5,000 per annum.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect as of December 1, 1942, and shall terminate on April 30, 1943, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I desire to discuss the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Senator does so, if the Senator from Nevada desires to make a statement regarding the bill, he should proceed to do so at this time.

Mr. BURTON. I am very glad to have the Senator from Nevada discuss the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this matter may be disposed of quite promptly. The same argument which was indulged in with reference to the bill relating to the police and fire departments applies with equal force to the bill relating to pay for teachers.

The lowest pay for teachers in the District of Columbia is $1,400. Because of that low salary, it is impossible to fill the quota for teachers in the District. The increase proposed by the substitute will effect about the same result in the lowest salary brackets for teachers as was effected by the bill adopted by the Senate in regard to policemen. In other words, what the Senate is doing is adding more starvation to those who are already starving. The Senate has just voted a $100 increase to men who are getting only $1,900 and a much larger increase to men who are getting from $2,400 up to $3,600. The same thing applies to the teachers' bill. If the Senate is to be consistent, it might just as well adopt the substitute, and have it over with.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I shall take but a moment to express this thought: At the last session of Congress the teachers of the District of Columbia were the one group that were not granted a temporary increase of pay. The substitute provides for them precisely the same increase of pay as was voted for the other Federal employees and the other employees of the District of Columbia. It will last until April 30, 1943, at which time there will have to be a reconsideration of the issue as to them and as to all other Federal employees. I, therefore, urge the adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senators from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS].

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—38

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Ferguson | Reed |
| Austin | Gerry | Revercomb |
| Ball | Green | Russell |
| Bankhead | Gurney | Taft |
| Barbour | Hawkes | Thomas, Idaho |
| Brooks | Hayden | Thomas, Okla. |
| Buck | Johnson, Colo. | Truman |
| Burton | Lodge | Tydings |
| Bushfield | Maloney | Vandenberg |
| Butler | Maybank | Wherry |
| Byrd | Millikin | White |
| Clark, Mo. | Nye | Wiley |
| Danaher | O'Daniel | |

NAYS—34

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Barkley | Hatch | Radcliffe |
| Bone | Hill | Reynolds |
| Capper | Holman | Scrugham |
| Caraway | La Follette | Stewart |
| Chavez | Langer | Tunnell |
| Clark, Idaho | Lucas | Van Nuys |
| Connally | McCarran | Wagner |
| Davis | McKellar | Wallgren |
| Eastland | Mead | Walsh |
| Ellender | Murray | Wheeler |
| George | O'Mahoney | |
| Gillette | Overton | |

NOT VOTING—24

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Guffey | Pepper |
| Bailey | Johnson, Calif. | Robertson |
| Bilbo | Kilgore | Shipstead |
| Brewster | McClellan | Smith |
| Bridges | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Chandler | McNary | Tobey |
| Downey | Moore | Willis |
| Glass | Murdock | Wilson |

So Mr. BURTON's amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide additional compensation for teachers and all other educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia whose salaries are fixed in the 'Teachers Salary Act.'"

## WAR LOAN DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS—SUSPENSION OF ASSESSMENT AND RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 700, proposing to amend the Federal Reserve Act.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 700) to amend section 12B and section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act during the continuance of the war and for 6 months after its termination, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. WAGNER obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope Senators will remain in the Chamber. I think the bill sponsored by the Senator from New York need not involve much controversy, but following that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] desires to have a bill considered. Whether we finish these bills this afternoon may determine whether the Senate will have to meet tomorrow or may go over until Thursday. I hope Senators will remain in the Chamber.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I suppose it might be said that the bill now before the Senate is rather technical in its nature, so I propose to make a brief statement, and after completing my statement, of course, I shall be willing to answer any questions which may be propounded, if I am able to answer them.

The measure now before us, Senate bill 700, provides that for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter so-called war-loan deposit accounts shall be relieved from Federal Deposit Insurance assessments and also from reserve requirements. It was introduced by me at the request of the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Mr. Crowley, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Eccles. Its enactment is intended to improve the machinery for the Government's war financing. It has also the approval of the Treasury, of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and of the System's open-market committee.

War-loan accounts were originally authorized by the Second Liberty Bond Act of September 24, 1917. The law provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may deposit in such incorporated banks and trust companies as he may designate any proceeds arising from the sale of bonds and certificates of indebtedness, Treasury bills and War Savings certificates authorized by the Liberty Bond Acts. Most of the Government bonds purchased by banks, insurance compa-

nies, and other large investors, as well as the Defense and War Savings bonds sold to the public, have been issued under authority of the Second Liberty Bond Act and the various amendments thereto.

Incorporated banks and trust companies may qualify for war-loan accounts by applying to the Treasury through the Federal Reserve banks, and such accounts are secured by a pledge of bonds. The Treasury determines the maximum which may be on deposit in any account at any one time. When banks which have qualified for war-loan accounts subscribe to Government securities for their customers or for themselves, they enter the amount of their allotted subscriptions in the war-loan accounts on the payment dates. The balances in these accounts are subject to call by the Treasury. Subsequently, as the Treasury has need for funds, calls are issued. The calls consist of giving notice to the banks to transfer to their respective Federal Reserve banks whatever percentage of the funds in the war-loan accounts is required by the Treasury to meet its current expenditures. Thus the war-loan accounts are drawn down gradually as Treasury needs arise. The money is then checked out of the Reserve banks by the Treasury in payment of the Government's expenses. As the money is spent by the Government, checks are received by contractors, businessmen, and others who deposit them in the various banks throughout the country. Thus the money previously withdrawn from the banks flows back into the banking system as privately owned deposits.

The Federal Reserve banks act as the Government's fiscal agents, and all payments made by the Treasury are charged against its accounts in the Federal Reserve banks. As a matter of Treasury policy, the balances in these accounts are kept down as much as possible. They just keep feeding those accounts into the Federal Reserve banks as the Treasury needs the money, so that the maximum amount of funds is kept within the private banking system.

If there were no such mechanism—that is, if all banks upon subscribing to Government securities for their customers or themselves were required to transfer the funds in payment of their subscriptions immediately to the Federal Reserve banks—there would be periodic, heavy drains on the deposit totals and reserves of the banking system, with serious disruptive effects on the Government bond market. The larger the financing operation, the greater and more disruptive the drain would be. In peacetime, when the Government was not compelled to raise and expend such huge sums as are demanded by war and when the banks had superabundant reserves, the situation, of course, was very different. But today when the Treasury must go to the public and to the money market for large sums of money every few months, and when reserve requirements are repeatedly increased as bank deposits increase, it is very important to extend the war loan deposit mechanism as wisely as possible throughout the banking system.

If there were no such mechanism, it would be necessary to pump billions of reserves into the banking system to offset the heavy drains at financing periods, and as the funds were spent by the Government and flowed back into the banks as deposits, the reserves which had been pumped in would become excessive in relation to the current need.

Any such scarcity and redundancy of reserve funds would create difficult problems for the Treasury and the Reserve System. To the extent that the war-loan account mechanism exists throughout the banking system such difficulties can be avoided, and the flow of deposit reserves into the war-loan accounts, then to the Federal Reserve banks as the Treasury needs and calls for the money, then back into the banking system as the Treasury expends the money, is accomplished smoothly and without disruptive effects. There is a close adjustment and a minimum time lag between the drawing down of the money and its flow back into the deposit structure.

Because of this consideration, the Reserve System has made a special effort and a concerted drive, through all of the Reserve banks, to induce as many banks as possible to apply and qualify for war-loan deposit accounts. The results so far have been gratifying, and a large number of banks, fifty-six hundred, have applied and qualified for these accounts, even though they may have felt that the war-loan accounts should not be subject to deposit-insurance assessments or to reserve requirements. There are still many thousands of banks which have not as yet used war-loan accounts, and it is clear that the requirements of existing law, which the pending bill would suspend for the duration, are a deterrent in many instances. Not only is a more widespread setting up of this convenient and necessary mechanism thus impeded, but banks that have war-loan accounts are discouraged from utilizing them as fully as would be the case if these statutory requirements were suspended. Neither requirement existed when war-loan accounts were originally authorized by Congress in the last war. We had no deposit insurance at that time, and war-loan accounts were not subject to reserves before the year 1935. If this measure is enacted I feel sure that the mechanism will be widely set up and generally utilized to facilitate the large financing operations which are ahead of us as long as the heavy requirements of the war situation continues.

The time element of the enactment is important. If we have large financing operations in April, which is now in contemplation, the problem of financing will be greatly increased unless this bill is enacted in the meantime and we are successful in increasing and expanding war-loan accounts. Prompt passage of this measure is urged in order that the Treasury and the banks may have time to complete the necessary arrangements for the banks to act as war-loan account depositories before the next financing takes place.

At present the War Loan Deposit Account is a demand deposit and the Federal Reserve member banks must carry reserves against these deposits. Central reserve city and reserve city banks must carry a reserve of 20 percent and country banks a reserve of 14 percent. All member banks carry a reserve of 6 percent against time deposits. The statutory requirements were 3 percent on time deposits and 13 percent on demand deposits of central reserve city banks, 10 percent on demand deposits of reserve city banks and 7 percent on demand deposits of country banks. The Federal Reserve Board had power to double all reserve requirements and it did so, so that country banks now carry 14 percent and reserve city banks 20 percent against demand deposits. Last fall, because of war financing, requirements for central reserve city banks were reduced from 26 to 20 percent, which is the same percentage required for reserve city banks on demand deposits.

Mr. President, that concludes my statement. Unless Senators desire to ask questions about the bill, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Apparently the enactment of the bill will, to some degree, reduce the premium income of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator tell me to what extent that will happen?

Mr. WAGNER. I do not have the figures before me. Mr. Crowley, however, was not disturbed about it. He appeared before our committee. I think Mr. Crowley stated at the time that the elimination of the assessment requirement would perhaps affect the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the extent of about two and one-half million dollars.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So I understand that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation approves the measure?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Has the Senator explained section 2 of the bill?

Mr. WAGNER. With reference to the reserve?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WAGNER. I think I did. I hope I did.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the effect, in a word, of section 2? Is it to suspend reserves on war bond deposits?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes, only on war bond deposits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 8, after the word "That", it is proposed to strike out "during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after its termination," and insert in lieu thereof, "until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from New York a question. The bill addresses itself to the insurance of bank deposits?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would the Senator kindly state what his conception is as to the spirit and the intent of the law passed

by the Congress for the insurance of bank deposits? Was it for the benefit of insuring banking corporations, or was it for the benefit of the people?

Mr. WAGNER. For the benefit of the people, of course.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. That leads me to another question which comes to my mind due to a condition which has arisen under my own observation in my own State. Mr. Crowley has arbitrarily said that the people of a particular community in my State cannot have the benefit of the bank deposit-insurance law because—and what is to follow is my own interpretation—because, I take it, that Mr. Crowley does not like the Bank of America. I do not know whether or not my conclusion is correct, but I believe it be well founded based on the acts of Mr. Crowley. The people of my State, and the people of the State of New York, and the people of every other State are entitled to have their deposits insured, and when they set up a banking institution under the laws of their State they should know that they can have the benefits of the law enacted by the Congress. Mr. Crowley, who by the way, as I understand, is not even under salary from the Government, but is highly salaried by a private institution, says the people of my State cannot have the benefits or the rights under that law. Does that conform with the ideas of the able Senator from New York?

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know enough about the facts to decide that particular question, but when we had hearings upon the measure which is now before the Senate the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], a member of the committee, made inquiry of Mr. Crowley with reference to this very situation, and Mr. Crowley said that he had ample justification for what the Corporation did with relation to the one bank, one branch of which, I think, is located in Boulder City and another somewhere else in the State of Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. One at Las Vegas and the other at Boulder City.

Mr. WAGNER. He said he was quite willing at any time to discuss the matter with the committee or with anyone who was interested. I read from the hearings:

Mr. CROWLEY. Well, I presume you are talking about Las Vegas and Boulder City.

Senator SCRUGHAM. Yes; and the branch at Boulder City.

Mr. CROWLEY. Well, from my understanding, our record shows in connection with that bank that all except qualifying shares are not owned locally, and that the qualifying shares that the directors have are under option by a holding company, to be purchased from them at their option at a fixed purchase price.

Senator SCRUGHAM. I understand the outstanding shares are optioned.

Mr. CROWLEY. That is a subject, gentlemen, that would take a long, long time to explore, and we do not like to have that brought up in connection with this bill.

I am sure that our Corporation, our associates, in the Federal supervisory and the regulatory fields would welcome an opportunity, if the Senate Banking and Currency Committee so wished, to be given a reasonable length of time to submit our reasons for the stand we have all taken on the expansion of holding-company banks throughout the west coast.

I think, Senator, as far as your situation is concerned, that if those people will buy the controlling interest in that bank, which they have indicated a willingness to do, that we would be very happy to insure it. I hate to have that tied onto this bill, but I want you to know, Senator, that we would be very happy to sit down and discuss this matter with you.

I think that has to do with the matter which the Senator from Nevada has in mind.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I go back again to the first principle, and my question about it which the able Senator from New York answered correctly. Did we enact the law for the insurance of deposits for the welfare of Mr. Crowley, or to suit his whims or his caprices, or did we enact that law for the welfare of the people?

Mr. WAGNER. For the welfare of the people. Of course Mr. Crowley must follow and obey the law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. But he is not following it. He is not following the spirit of the law. Here is a group of people who are supporting a bank in their community. It is the only bank in the community of Boulder City. Boulder City has been created by the Federal Government. It is a Federal city. It is supported entirely by Federal employees. It is located at Boulder Dam. The people there want to support their bank. They want to deposit their money in that bank. But Mr. Crowley says, "No, we will not give you any guarantee insurance whatsoever. You can deposit your money there at your own risk if you want to." He made the same statement with reference to the bank at Las Vegas, which is one of the largest cities in the State of Nevada. The people of Las Vegas want to deposit their money in the Las Vegas bank, that is the Nevada State Bank. Mr. Crowley says, "Yes; you can deposit your money there if you want to, but you cannot have any insurance. We will not guarantee you."

I ask the question: Was the law enacted to suit the caprice of Mr. Crowley, who is not even retained by the Federal Government, but is retained by a private concern?

Mr. WAGNER. Of course, that statement does not relate to this particular proposed legislation.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not sure that it does not. It seems to me it does. The status of Mr. Crowley in this whole setup is very important. Is he serving the Federal Government or is he serving a private concern? Is he serving the Federal Government in the spirit of the law, or is he serving some private concern in the letter of the law? It seems to me that is very important, and it certainly will control my vote on the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the subject about which the Senator from Nevada is inquiring has no direct relationship to the proposed legislation, although it does affect the insurance of deposits.

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. This is not simply a matter of Mr. Crowley's whim.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; but what I refer to is apparently a matter of Mr. Crowley's whim.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, what I started to say was that the position taken by Mr. Crowley as the head of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is a position which is adhered to and endorsed by all those who are connected with the Federal Deposit Insurance setup, including the supervisory agencies, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, which has no direct connection with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, but which, of course, does have an interest in the regulation of matters of this sort.

While it is true, as we all recognize, that this law was passed for the benefit of depositors, nevertheless there are certain regulations and qualifications which must be met by banks in order that they may come under the system. There are regulations of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which have barred some banks from being insured, merely because they failed to comply with those regulations.

I do not know all the details relating to the two banks referred to, but I understand that they are not locally owned. As I understand, some of the shares of those banks which are held by the directors are optioned to be sold to someone else.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator tell me what difference that would make to the depositors?

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps it would not make any difference, but that is one of the regulations of the F. D. I. C.

Mr. McCARRAN. That brings us back to the same question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not possess all the facts. All I know is what Mr. Crowley said in answer to the question of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] at the time the bill was before the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. I make the assertion, without fear of successful contradiction, that Mr. Crowley exercises his authority in conformity with his likes and dislikes. He has formed a dislike for a certain banking institution which has many branches located in the West. He does not propose to allow that institution to give to the people of my State the rights which the law gives them, and which the spirit of the law intended to give them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator refer to the institution controlled by Mr. Giannini? That is the Bank of America, is it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is the Bank of America.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is known everywhere as the Giannini Bank.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know whether it is or not.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator say that no bank in that group has been

insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation?

Mr. McCARRAN. If any banks are to be insured, why not the banks of Nevada?

Mr. BARKLEY. Each bank, of course, must stand on its own bottom.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well, but that objection has not been raised with respect to the banks in Nevada. They are simply told, "You cannot have insurance."

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, this matter was before the committee when the committee considered the proposed legislation. Strictly speaking, it has nothing to do with the pending legislation. However, at the suggestion of the junior Senator from Nevada, our committee agreed that at another time we would hear Mr. Crowley with regard to the situation mentioned, and that satisfied the junior Senator from Nevada at the time.

Mr. McCARRAN. It does not satisfy the senior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know what more we can do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the instance of the Nevada banks, Mr. Crowley may be guilty of everything which the able senior Senator from Nevada has said, but I do not wish to allow the Senator's indictment to stand as a generality, because I have had a great deal to do with Mr. Crowley in connection with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. If I ever saw an intelligent administration of a public trust, if I ever saw an earnest, enlightened effort to deal with the subject to the best possible advantage to the Nation, I have seen it in connection with what has been done under Mr. Crowley in every instance which has come to my attention.

Frequently there have been violent disputes as a result of the application of decisions of the F. D. I. C. to some given state of facts. However, so far as the general attitude is concerned, as reflected in the public service of Mr. Crowley, in this particular assignment—again declining to apply what I have said to the Nevada situation, because I know nothing about it—I assert from a very close connection with Mr. Crowley's public service that I think he is one of the ablest, fairest, and best administrators I have seen in my 15 years of public service.

Mr. WAGNER. I agree with everything which the distinguished Senator from Michigan has said.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I wish to endorse everything the senior Senator from Michigan has just stated in regard to Mr. Crowley.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that when the pending bill was under consideration by the Committee on Banking and Currency Mr. Crowley appeared before the committee and testified. Mr. Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, also appeared and testified. The matter was gone into very carefully, and no opposition developed to the bill at the time. The committee acted favorably upon it by unanimous vote.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in view of what has been said about the F. D. I. C., I should like to quote some figures relating to what has occurred since the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation came into existence. Incidentally, the permanent plan of insurance became effective August 23, 1935. The Senator from Kentucky knows something about its history.

The total income of the F. D. I. C. from 1934 to 1942 was $406,000,000.

The assessments paid in by banks were $319,000,000.

The income from investments was $87,000,000.

The total expenses paid and losses charged off by the F. D. I. C. were $80,000,000.

The total insurance loss and expense was $50,000,000.

The total administrative expense was $30,000,000.

The surplus of the F. D. I. C. on December 31, 1942, was $326,000,000.

The capital of the F. D. I. C. on December 31, 1942, was $289,000,000.

The capital paid in by the Treasury on December 31, 1942, was $150,000,000.

The capital paid in by the Federal Reserve banks, equal to one-half of the Federal Reserve banks' surplus, on January 1, 1933, was $139,000,000.

I know of no institution with a record which equals or surpasses the record made by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this question is of vital importance to the State of Nevada. I do not propose to let it pass unnoticed, because it has been the subject of correspondence with Mr. Crowley, who has passed it off lightly with a wave of his hand, saying that he would take care of it. However, he never did take care of it. I know that Mr. Crowley is intent upon not giving to the people of my State what the spirit of the law intends they shall have. I do not believe that the bill should pass at this late hour in the afternoon without a thorough understanding of it. In my files, but not available at this hour, I have correspondence bearing upon the subject which I think the Senate should know about.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over until tomorrow so that we may discuss the whole matter at length and in the spirit of the law. I hope the Senator from New York will be agreeable to that suggestion, so that we may discuss the matter more thoroughly. I will say frankly to the Senator from New York that I did not know until a moment ago what the purport of the bill was. I did not know how intimately it affected my State. I did not know that it was a matter so closely touching the banks of my State.

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know what the Senator means by affecting the banks of his State. We now have 14,307 commercial banks and trust companies. The number of insured commercial banks and trust companies is 13,347. I assure the able Senator from Nevada that the banking situation in his State will be gone into thoroughly by the Committee on Banking and Currency. The committee so decided at its last meeting, and the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] who is not now present in the Chamber, seemed perfectly satisfied.

The pending bill is rather important from the standpoint of War bonds which the Government is attempting to sell. We hope to expand the opportunities of sale. We want to bring in banks which, because of the assessment involved, did not feel willing to participate in the purchase of War bonds. Every day lost is a serious thing for the country.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is it so serious that the interest of the people of a sovereign State should be set aside and forgotten?

Mr. WAGNER. That question does not relate to the pending bill at all.

Mr. McCARRAN. Oh, indeed it does.

Mr. WAGNER. No; it has no relation whatever to it. The bill deals with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and relieves certain banks from assessments because of War-bond deposits. That affects the bank at Boulder City to which reference has been made. There is nothing in the bill which would affect that bank specifically.

Mr. McCARRAN. The whole spirit of the application of the law is involved in the pending bill. When I bring to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency a situation which is being ignored by Mr. Crowley in order to satisfy his own dislike for some particular banking institution, I think it is time for the Senate to wake up to the question involved.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. All the pending bill would do would be to relieve certain deposits in insured banks from the tax which goes into the fund to pay off losses. We cannot provide by law that certain banks in Nevada shall be insured. They are not paying any taxes into the fund, and until they are insured they will not pay any taxes. So the pending bill could not possibly affect them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Why are they not paying into the fund, and why are they not insured?

Mr. BARKLEY. I presume the reason is that the banks have not met the requirements of the regulations. I have no reason to assume otherwise. I agree with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in what he has said about Mr. Crowley. The Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation does not consist merely of Mr. Crowley. Mr. Crowley is the head of the board. I think the F. D. I. C. has done a magnificent job in insuring banks and in inspiring confidence on the part of the people in the safety of deposits in our banks, both National and State. If several

banks which may be branch banks or subsidiary banks of a bank located in another State have not come within the regulations of the Board, and therefore are not insured, and are paying no taxes into the fund, I say frankly that I do not see what that has to do with the pending bill. All the bill seeks to do is to remove the necessity of payment of taxes on some of the deposits which are insured. The bill would not affect at all the deposits which are not insured. I hope the Senator will not insist that the bill go over in order that he may discuss that subject.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall insist that the bill go over, because I think I would be doing an injustice to the people of my State were I not so to insist. Something must be done so that the people of any State, regardless of its size—it may be a State of small population—shall have the benefit of the rights granted by law. If Mr. Crowley is going to set himself up as a czar in this matter and is going to deny the people of my State the rights the law intends them to have, I intend to find out about it. I did not know about the hearings. If I had known about them I should have appeared before the committee.

Mr. WAGNER. I am sure that the Senator has an erroneous impression about the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no erroneous impression about Mr. Crowley, nor do I have an erroneous impression regarding the fact that he is not a Federal employee, but is being retained and employed by private concerns. I am not in error on that point.

Mr. WAGNER. The Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board are equally greatly interested in the bill because of what would be done under its terms. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is now receiving less money than it would receive if the measure became law.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. WAGNER. If the bill were enacted into law, all banks whose deposits are insured would be eliminated from the necessity of paying the assessment tax. All banks, including the banks in the Senator's State, would be relieved from that necessity.

Mr. McCARRAN. But I want deposits in the banks of my State insured.

Mr. WAGNER. The pending bill does not relate at all to the question of insuring bank deposits.

Mr. McCARRAN. But I want them brought under its terms so they will be insured.

Mr. WAGNER. The bill has nothing to do with that question. All the pending bill would do would be to provide that, so far as war-loan deposits were concerned, the insured banks would not be required to pay into the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation the one-twelfth of 1 percent assessment. The bill has no relation at all to the subject matter about which the Senator is disturbed. The junior Senator from Nevada himself immediately realized that to be so, and said: "It is true that it has nothing to do with that situation; so we shall defer until another time."

I agreed, and the committee agreed, that we would hear Mr. Crowley on the very situation to which the Senator refers. The committee could not be fairer than that; because there is nothing in the pending bill which would in any way affect the situation about which the Senator has been speaking.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know that the Senator believes he is correct in that statement.

Mr. WAGNER. In what respect does the Senator believe I am mistaken?

Mr. McCARRAN. But I should like to have an opportunity to know what the hearings were, at least. Let me say that the Senator is not to blame for the fact that I am bringing up the matter, because I did not know until just now that the bill was to be considered today.

Mr. WAGNER. The bill does not in any way or in any respect refer to the situation about which the Senator is complaining. That is why I appeal to him not to cause delay in acting on this measure, which is very important, because we shall soon have another war-loan drive.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will it be between now and Thursday?

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator that if we do not dispose of the bill today, I shall move that the Senate meet tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. That will be all right.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was hoping that the Senate might dispose of the pending bill and of one or two other bills today, and not meet tomorrow. But if the measure must go over to a subsequent day, I shall ask for a session tomorrow.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to point out two things which may have a bearing on the points raised by the Senator from Nevada. Regardless of whether they do have pertinency at this moment, they should be considered in connection with any further discussion of the matter.

In the first place, Mr. Crowley said—and I read from page 16 of the hearings:

This—

Meaning the Nevada bank situation—

has been kind of a thorn in our sides for a long, long time, and we feel quite definite about it, since all of the supervisory forces and the Securities and Exchange Commission are in accord, and if this committee has any requests, we would be glad to prepare our testimony and our charts and show you why we have taken the stand we have taken on that matter.

Then I turn to one further factor, which is subsection "g" of the Federal Reserve Act compilation. I read from page 54:

The factors to be enumerated in the certificate required under subsection (e)—

Which deals with the requisites to be considered in insuring banks—

and to be considered by the Board of Directors under subsection (f) shall be the following: The financial history and condition of the bank, the adequacy of its capital structure, its future earning prospects, the general character of its management, the convenience and needs of the community to be served by the bank, and whether or not its corporate powers are consistent with the purposes of this section.

Let me also remark that any bank seeking to be insured must elect and file notice of election and willingness to be bound by the regulations of the F. D. I. C., which of course are issued pursuant to the warrant of the law.

Therefore, I respectfully suggest that in one or more particulars Mr. Crowley intimates that the banks mentioned by the Senator from Nevada have failed to qualify. One of the points he certainly stressed was that the stock ownership of the Nevada banks was optioned, that only a few qualifying shares were owned locally, that all the remaining capital structure—insofar as the corporate shares represented evidence of ownership—were apparently outside the control of the banking system of the State of Nevada.

Please understand that I am deducting much of the foregoing from the testimony submitted by Mr. Crowley. I do not know that it controls; but I do say that there are factors between the F. D. I. C., created by law, and the applying banks which very properly may militate against their being eligible for insurance at all.

But regardless of whether there are any such factors, I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Nevada that the matter very properly should be gone into by the Committee on Banking and Currency. Mr. Crowley has said he is willing to have the committee do so. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], has said he is willing to have the committee take such action, and speaking as a minority member of the committee, I am quite willing that it be done.

So I respectfully add that in any case, regardless of whether the banks are insured, the matter certainly does not bear on the question of whether we take out of an assessment base the balances created by the United States Government for its convenience in serving as a possible attraction to banks all over the country to participate in our war financing efforts. After everything is said and done, that is all the bill is intended to accomplish.

Therefore, to the extent that the bill will aid in the war effort, it is an essential and necessary measure, and in no way relates to whether banks in Las Vegas or Boulder City are eligible for insurance.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I was about to make a suggestion. If possible, I desire to satisfy the Senator from Nevada; because he is entitled to a hearing on the matter. If the Senator will select any time satisfactory to him, I will call a meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee, so that the whole matter may be threshed out. I shall be glad to have the Senator select any time he prefers.

As has been so ably stated, the bill in no way relates to the grievance which the Senator from Nevada has in mind; and even if we were to postpone passage of the bill, the Senator would find in the end that there is nothing in the measure which would affect the situation he has in mind. I am quite willing now, if the Senator from Nevada will agree, to arrange to have the committee meet on next Tuesday, a week from tomorrow. If that time is satisfactory to the Senator, the Committee on Banking and Currency will meet then, and we shall have Mr. Crowley before us, and the Senator from Nevada and his colleague will be there, and the matter will be discussed before the full committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Of course, I am not sufficiently in touch with the situation to be able to select a particular date.

Mr. WAGNER. I want to extend every courtesy of the committee—

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is always courteous.

Mr. WAGNER. But I realize the danger of delaying the passage of the pending bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would there be any gross danger in delaying the matter until the next session of the Senate?

Mr. WAGNER. In the conduct of the war, every day counts. We are anxious to have a very large subscription, and we want to add to the number of banks which we are sure will utilize these facilities if we eliminate the assessment provision.

Mr. McCARRAN. I respectfully suggest that no great harm can result from having the matter go over to the next legislative day. Whether that be tomorrow or Thursday, I have no right to designate.

Mr. WAGNER. I respectfully suggest that every day counts.

Mr. McCARRAN. Every day counts to my people, too.

Mr. WAGNER. It is not particularly Mr. Crowley who is concerned about the situation.

Mr. McCARRAN. But it is Mr. Crowley who is dominating the situation, and Mr. Crowley's likes and dislikes are entering into the situation.

Mr. WAGNER. Oh, no.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am afraid the Senator has not been sufficiently advised.

Mr. WAGNER. I am advised with reference to the pending bill. The request has come from the Treasury, which is concerned with obtaining a large subscription.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall respectfully ask that the bill go over until the next legislative day. Whether that be tomorrow or Thursday, I have no right of designation. But I should like to go into the subject. I say frankly to the Senator from New York that until this moment I had no idea that a bill of this nature was coming before the Senate. Had I known it was before the Senator's committee, I should have been there.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's colleague is a member of the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And he took particular pains to inquire of Mr. Crowley about the particular situation to which reference has been made. Let me ask the Senator from Nevada whether, if the bill shall go over to the next legislative session, which will be tomorrow if we cannot dispose of it today, he will be satisfied with disposing of it tomorrow. He could discuss the matter he wants taken care of, I suppose. There is no amendment which could be offered, and no legislation which could be enacted, which would affect the situation in which he is interested.

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill is susceptible of amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. We cannot decide in the Senate whether the banks to which the Senator has refered should be insured.

Mr. McCARRAN. No, indeed; not at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. I myself have no objection to the bill going over until tomorrow, but I should not want to have it go over until Thursday.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well; I shall be satisfied with anything that will give us time enough to look into the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is about 5 o'clock, and I suppose the bill might as well go over until tomorrow.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I wish to move to have a bill on the calendar considered.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator may ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside so that he can ask that another bill be considered, if the Senator thinks the bill can be disposed of this afternoon, so that it would not interfere with the pending bill tomorrow.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that there are two bills which I wish to have considered, which, so far as I am informed, are not controversial, though there are a number interested in them. I have no way of knowing how long consideration of the bills will take, but I do not suppose it will take long. They were reported from the committee unanimously. One or two amendments have been offered to one of the bills since it was reported.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is rather doubtful whether at this hour a new bill should be taken up if it involves controversial questions. I do not know whether the Senator's bills are controversial. The Senate will meet tomorrow, and I wonder whether the Senator would be discommoded in any way if the bills went over until tomorrow.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That would be entirely agreeable.

## TRANSFERS AND REDUCTIONS OF PERSONNEL IN THE CLASSIFIED SERVICE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider Senate Resolution 84. It merely makes a request for information from the Civil Service Commission. I cannot imagine there will be any objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and the pending bill is temporarily laid aside. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 84) submitted by Mr. BYRD on January 21, 1943, was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the Civil Service Commission is requested to prepare and submit to the Secretary of the Senate detailed monthly reports for the month of January 1943 and each month thereafter up to and including April 1943 with respect to (1) the number of employees of the various executive departments and agencies released or transferred to other departments and agencies pursuant to section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "A joint resolution extending until April 30, 1943, the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), and for other purposes," approved December 24, 1942; (2) the number of vacancies which have been allowed to remain unfilled subsequent to the date of enactment of such joint resolution; (3) the savings in salaries resulting from such reductions in personnel; and (4) the instances in which such reductions were made possible by the adoption of a 48-hour workweek.

## SIZE OF THE ARMY

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, Thursday last I introduced Senate bill 763, to amend the Selective Service Act by exempting married men with children. Some criticism has been made of the proposal, on the ground that it would tend to limit the size of the Army, and also that no civilian should have anything to say about the size of the Army.

I call attention to an editorial in the New York Times of February 26. Certainly the New York Times could not be called an isolationist newspaper, because it consistently supported the administrations' foreign policy, both before and after Pearl Harbor.

The editorial from the New York Times reads as follows:

### SIZE OF THE ARMY

It is the administration's decision that we need an army of 8,200,000 by the end of this year. The Navy, the marines, and the Coast Guard are planning for 2,600,000. This would make a total just short of 11,000,000 men planned for our armed forces by the end of 1943.

Spokesmen for the Army imply that this decision is irrevocable. Many of them cannot understand why the decision should be even questioned. They seem to assume that those who do question it want to fight a soft war and not a hard one. They imply also that the decision made by the Army is an expert decision, and that any questioning of it must necessarily be inexpert.

But the questions nonetheless continue. They increase rather than diminish. The fact that the War Department itself has just been forced to consider the question of assigning troops to help pick cotton is simply one more indication that the questioning has not been baseless.

It is not for laymen to decide what the size of the armed forces should be. But the country must be satisfied—and it has not yet been satisfied—that the question has been decided on the right principles and by the right method. Advocates of an 8,000,000-man army have put forward, as if they were conclusive, arguments which are not in fact

conclusive. We are told, for example, that the Axis commands an estimated land strength of 510 to 605 divisions; that the United Nations can muster only an estimated 395 to 505 divisions against them; and that therefore we must have so-and-so many divisions to turn the balance. We are told that 13½ percent of the German population is in the armed forces, and that we must therefore put a similar percentage into our armed forces.

These figures involve a considerable element of guesswork. We do not, in fact, know precisely how many fully trained and equipped divisions the Axis today can muster. We do not even know how many fully trained and equipped divisions our Russian ally now commands. But regardless of the accuracy of these figures, they are being put forward with an implication that must be questioned. This is the implication that a nation's total effectiveness in war is measured primarily if not wholly by the number of men it can put into uniform. This is clearly not true. The number of a nation's army divisions symbolizes its total effectiveness in war only on the assumption that its war effort is a balanced one. If we have less than the largest possible number of men in the armed forces under a balanced war effort, then we are falling below the standard demanded by total war. But if we have more than this number in the armed forces, they are there only at the cost of other aspects of an essential war program.

It does not follow, for example, that an American Army of 10,000,000 would necessarily be twice as effective in winning the war as an army of 5,000,000. It could, in fact, be considerably less effective. The real question is one of a proper internal balance. Raw materials and manpower are limited; whatever is used in one direction cannot be used in another. The steel and man-hours that go into tanks mean just that much less for merchant ships, and vice versa. The men that go into the Army mean just that many men fewer for the production of food, clothing, mechanized equipment for the Army, or the production of transport ships and escort vessels to carry the Army. Every man added to the armed forces, in short, not only means one man more to supply; it also means one man less to supply him.

It is from this point of view that the problem must be considered. When we so consider it, it is clearly fallacious to assume that our effort can be compared with the German effort simply by comparing the number of men each nation puts into a standing army. If we are to land troops on or near the European Continent and to keep them properly supplied, our war effort becomes necessarily different from the German war effort. A far greater percentage of our strength must necessarily go not merely into manning and building a Navy, but into manning and building troop transports, freighters, and tankers. These become our lifeline. Upon the maintenance of that lifeline the whole effectiveness of our Army depends.

But to create and maintain this lifeline requires thousands of merchant seamen, who at present are not counted as members of our armed forces, though they play a role no less vital. It requires thousands of shipbuilders to turn out this merchant fleet. It requires, behind these, the workers in the steel mills, in the iron mines, the workers on a hundred accessories of all sorts that go into ships. Behind these, in turn, are the farmers. And as Louis Bromfield remarked in a recent letter to this newspaper, "Without food, all the ships and planes and tanks and soldiers are worthless." None of the workers on ships, in factories, on the farm, is in uniform; but all are as vital in our total war effort as the men who are in uniform.

When we take this over-all view, we can see why it is that the Army leaders alone are not qualified to be the sole and final judges of the size of the armed forces. It is not enough for the generals to say that we need so many men, or for the admirals to say that we need so many ships. Obviously, other things in proportion, an army of 16,000,000 men would be twice as effective as an army of 8,000,000. Other things equal, 400 new destroyers would be twice as effective as 200 new destroyers. And so on. But other things never can be equal. If we make our Army larger, we must make some other part of our war effort smaller. This applies to any part of our war effort whatever.

That is why in total war the problem of the size of the armed forces is one that can be worked out only by the joint study and consultation of military, economic, agricultural, and industrial experts. The question involved is not at all what the total size of our war effort ought to be. This ought obviously to be as great as we can possibly make it. The real question concerns the internal balance of our war effort. Even before we have begun to realize the ultimate goal of induction set by the armed forces, there is already admitted to be on all sides a serious labor shortage. What intelligent and responsible questioners of the plans for ultimate armed forces of 11,000,000 are asking is whether the proper food authorities, farm authorities and specialists in many other lines were consulted, and whether proper weight was given to their opinion, before the Army figures were arrived at.

Total war is a military problem. But it is much more. It is a problem of a nation's total economy. And experts on that economy must be consulted on every major decision no less than purely military experts.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that statements have been made before the Committee on Military Affairs to the effect that if we are to have an army of 11,000,000 men we will take four-fifths of the able-bodied men of this country between the ages of 18 and 38. That would mean that we would take four-fifths of the married men of the country between 18 and 38 with children.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to remind the Senator that replacements, normal replacements and replacements made necessary by battle casualties, would probably take the other fifth in a little over a year, which would mean that the present plan is to take all the able-bodied men between 18 and 38.

Mr. WHEELER. I think that was substantially the testimony which came out before the committee. So that it would mean that practically all the physically fit men between 18 and 38 would be taken into the armed forces.

Mr. President, when certain officers appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I questioned them on the point of why they exempted physically fit single men between the ages of 38 and 45. The answer was that the greater percentage of the men between those ages could not stand up as well under war conditions as the younger men. It should be remembered, however, that when they are considering men between the ages of 38 and 45 they are considering them from the standpoint of combat service. It is well known that there will be perhaps more than a million and a half men, probably many more than that, who will not be used in actual combat service but who will be used in other than combat service. I cannot understand why Army officials wish to exempt physically fit single men between the ages of 38 and 45, and take all the physically fit married men between the ages of 18 and 38, who have children. If that is done it will result in breaking down completely American home life. The wife in such a family will, in order to make a living—unless she can live with her folks or has money of her own—place her children in an institution, at least during the daytime, while she goes to work to support them. The very rock upon which the Government is founded is the American home. The very foundation of democracy in this country is the American home. While the men are fighting for democracy in some other country it is proposed to destroy the American home by taking from it the head of the family, the father whom the children need for advice and counsel just as much as they need their mother.

Mr. President, I shall never be able to subscribe to any policy of that kind. Let me say that if such a policy is to be followed, then, much as I am opposed to the measure proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and by Representative WADSWORTH, I feel that we shall have to do what they propose in their bill. It will be necessary to turn over to the Federal bureaucrats in Washington the right to say where every farmer, where every merchant, where every laboring man, and where everyone else shall work, in what particular place, and as Mr. Baruch is quoted as saying in this afternoon's newspaper, that means slavery.

Mr. President, last summer I was talking with a group of farmers in my State. One farmer said to me "Why do you not conscript labor?" I said to him "You are a farmer, are you not?" He answered "Yes." I said to him, "How would you like to have some bureaucrat in Washington to say to you, 'You are on a piece of land which is not very fertile. You are living upon what is less than an economic unit from an agricultural standpoint, and we are going to take you from it, remove you from your home, and make you work for someone who has a much better and larger farm'? How would you like to have some bureaucrat say to the corner groceryman 'We are going to take you by the scruff of the neck, remove you from your store, and make you work for the A. & P., because your store does not comprise an economic unit'?"

Mr. President, what would such action mean? It would mean that in this country we would have the very thing against which we are fighting—there would be a dictatorship, a Fascist government.

Before the Congress of the United States decides upon a program such as has been outlined, I believe we had better stop and think not only of its immediate effect but we had better ascertain where we in the United States are drifting. We had better be sure where this course is going to take us. We want to be sure whether it is necessary to go to the extent of destroying the American home in order to carry on a successful war.

Mr. President, someone has said, "Of course, the American people are willing

to make any sacrifice which is necessary in order to preserve democracy." I agree with that statement. In order to save democracy in the United States, every man, woman, and child, regardless of age, marital relations, or economic conditions, would be perfectly willing to make any sacrifice necessary. But we are not simply called upon to support an American Army. We are called upon to send Russia a tremendous amount of food and ammunition. It has been testified that 1,500,000 tires were sent to Russia alone last year. We are sending food to north Africa to civilians and to the Army alike. We have to send food to England. We have to send equipment to South America. We have to send equipment to India, to Australia, to China, and practically all over the world. To begin with, we said we were going to be the arsenal of the democracies of the world. Is it possible for us, without destroying democratic institutions in the United States of America, to be the arsenal of the world, to be suppliers of food for the rest of the world, and at the same time furnish the men to fight in the four corners of the world? That is the problem as I see it.

Mr. President, while I am as anxious to win the war as is any other Member on the floor of the Senate, or anyone in the Government, whether he is a bureaucrat or in any other position, first of all I want to see constitutional government and democracy preserved in the United States; I do not want to lose it while we are fighting for a utopia and for a quart of milk for every child throughout the world.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Kildroy P. Aldrich, of Illinois, to be First Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, vice Ambrose O'Connell; and sundry postmasters.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Ernest L. Gunther, August 11, 1942; and

Spencer S. Lewis, August 15, 1942.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army, under the provisions of section 23 and section 24e of the National Defense Act, as amended:

*To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps, with rank from date of appointment*

First Lt. Albert Junior Bauer, Medical Corps Reserve;

First Lt. John Barry Brady, Medical Corps Reserve;

First Lt. Arthur Abbitt Kirk, Medical Corps Reserve; and

Sundry officers for promotion and/or appointment, by transfer, all in the Regular Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

### AMERICAN-MEXICAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edgar E. Witt, of Texas, to be a member of the American-Mexican Claims Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Samuel Marshall Gold, of New York, to be a member of the American-Mexican Claims Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles F. McLaughlin, of Nebraska, to be a member of the American-Mexican Claims Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael W. Straus, of Illinois, to be First Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

### ALASKA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward L. Bartlett to be Secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

### FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, with nearly all the members present, unanimously voted to report favorably the nomination of Kildroy P. Aldrich, of Illinois, to be First Assistant Postmaster General. It is very desirable to have the nomination confirmed as soon as possible. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination may be confirmed now, though it is not on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kildroy P. Aldrich, of Illinois, to be First Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, vice Ambrose O'Connell.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, has the nomination been reported from the committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. It was approved by all the members present. I think nearly all the members of the committee were present. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] moved that the nomination be favorably reported, and it was unanimously reported by the members present.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

### THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

### THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for appointment and promotion in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Marine Corps nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 2, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 1, 1943:

#### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the position indicated:

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEER WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Leonard C. Johnson, from the 1st day of March 1943.

John Bowie, Jr., from the 1st day of March 1943.

Ector B. Latham, from the 1st day of March 1943.

George R. Shelton, from the 16th day of March 1943.

Ira T. Sanders, from the 24th day of March 1943.

Edward R. McCarthy, from the 24th day of March 1943.

Francis B. Quinn, from the 24th day of March 1943.

Emil H. Kirsch, from the 26th day of March 1943.

#### WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Dr. Frank H. Sparks, from the State of Indiana, to be Director, Bureau of Manpower Utilization, at $8,000 per annum, in

the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission.

Lawrence B. Fenneman, from the State of Maryland, to be area director, at $6,500 per annum, in the Maryland area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Farrell Daniel Coyle, from the State of Rhode Island, to be area director at $6,500 per annum, in the Providence area office of the War Manpower Commission.

James P. Blaisdell, from the State of California, to be area director at $6,500 per annum, in the San Francisco area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Frederick R. Whitney, from the State of Massachusetts, to be head manpower utilization consultant at $6,500 per annum, in the Boston regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Frank M. Bristow, from the State of Missouri, to be field supervisor at $5,600 per annum, in the Kansas City regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Samuel M. Derrick, from the State of South Carolina, to be field supervisor at $5,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Ramy B. Deschner, from the State of Missouri, to be area director at $5,600 per annum, in the District of Columbia area office of the War Manpower Commission.

William J. Fitzgerald, from the State of Connecticut, to be area director at $4,600 per annum, in the New London area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Stanley N. Bailey, from the State of California, to be assistant area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Walter L. Sundstrom, from the State of Washington, to be senior training specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Seattle area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Elmer K. Delp, from the State of New York, to be senior training specialist at $4,600 per annum in the New York regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

A. Frederick Smith, from the State of Florida, to be senior economist at $4,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

James J. Carney, Jr., from the State of Florida, to be program control technician at $4,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Orland V. Steele, from the State of Washington, to be senior administrative officer, at $4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Percival Stanley Brown, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1937.

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. Leroy Hugh Watson, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 11, 1941.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

MEDICAL CORPS

*To be colonels*

Lt. Col. Edward Augustus Coates, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 1, 1943.

Lt. Col. James Albertus Bethea, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Asa Margrave Lehman, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 5, 1943.

Lt. Col. Oramel Henry Stanley, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. Sewell Munson Corbett, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 9, 1943.

Lt. Col. Samuel Reily Norris, Medical Corps, with rank from March 11, 1943.

Lt. Col. Benjamin Norris, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 12, 1943.

*To be captains*

First Lt. David Paul Ward, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 5, 1943.

First Lt. Edwin Emmons Corcoran, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 8, 1943.

VETERINARY CORPS

*To be colonels*

Lt. Col. Allen Chamberlain Wight, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 24, 1943.

Lt. Col. Elwood Luke Nye, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 24, 1943.

CHAPLAINS

*To be captains*

Chaplain (First Lt.) Roger Dace Russell, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from March 30, 1943.

Chaplain (First Lt.) John Frederick Gaertner, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from March 30, 1943.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Platoon Sgt. John F. Coffey, United States Marine Corps, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of December 1942.

Andrew M. Zimmer, a citizen of Indiana, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of December 1942.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of February 1943:

William F. Mazlack, a citizen of Indiana.

Richard A. Kelly, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Preston S. Marchant, a citizen of South Carolina.

Jackson C. Turnacliff, a citizen of Minnesota.

---

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 1, 1943:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Kildroy P. Aldrich to be First Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department.

AMERICAN-MEXICAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

TO BE MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN-MEXICAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Edgar E. Witt
Samuel Marshall Gold
Charles F. McLaughlin

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Michael W. Straus to be First Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

ALASKA

Edward L. Bartlett to be secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

*To be rear admirals*

Calvin T. Durgin
John D. Price
Andrew C. McFall

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

*To be second lieutenants*

Arthur J. Barrett
Hudson E. Bridge
William J. Dickinson
Howard E. Wertman
Joseph E. DeSoucey
William H. McDaniel
Herbert F. Breeden
Robert M. Ervin
Thomas M. Kerr, Jr.
James C. Norris, Jr.
Ross T. Dwyer, Jr.
Harrison B. Rue
Samuel A. Hannah
Hurley E. Fuller, Jr.
James F. McInteer, Jr.
Samuel Jaskilka
John A. Lindsay
Charles G. Haskins
Robert W. Powers
Ronald W. Davis
Rex E. Walker
Frank H. Haigler, Jr.
George E. Kittredge, Jr.
Josiah W. Bill
David R. Miller
"A" "G" Savell
John J. Aubuchon
Gordon A. Stallings
Tom S. Parker
Maurice E. Flynn
Paul L. Allen
Robert D. Metzger
Ernest C. Bennett
Eugene H. Haffey
James H. Pope
Don W. Galbreaith
Theodore A. McKay
William T. Westmoreland, Jr.
Mitchell O. Sadler
Raymond J. Fening
Charles A. Chapin
Laurence L. Scott
Charles L. McNeil
William R. West
Ephraim Kirby-Smith
Lee F. Bennett
Thomas Parran, Jr.

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Timothy J. Sullivan, New London.
Edward A. Bowes, Saybrook.
Thomas P. Horan, South Norwalk.
Arthur J. Caisse, South Willington.
Emanuel Kurtz, Trumbull.

DELAWARE

Zora B. Tatman, Frederica.

GEORGIA

Joseph T. Bohannon, Grantville.
Sarah Short Barnett, Leary.
Farris K. Mize, West Point.

IDAHO

Donald E. Springer, Headquarters.

INDIANA

Heber A. Loyce, Lowell.
Dale E. Hughes, Perrysville.
Nelson H. Minthorn, Royal Center.
Iver C. Bain, Russellville.
Hugo J. Thalmann, Union Mills.

KANSAS

Beulah H. Stewart, Baldwin City.

KENTUCKY

Wilcie Brandenburg, Booneville.
Rebecca B. Forsythe, Greenup.
Ezra C. Williams, Russell.
Emma K. Riley, Sparta.
Leta W. Hobbs, Woodburn.

LOUISIANA

James L. Treadway, Alexandria.
Mildred M. Gleason, Belcher.
William S. Montgomery, Saline.

MINNESOTA

Esther E. Flynn, Westbrook.

MONTANA

Harry H. Howard, Bozeman.
Glen Mace Cox, Shelby.

NEW MEXICO

Ray S Soladay, Carlsbad.
James A. Walsh, Central.

VERMONT

Clarence J. Coon, Bomoseen.
Anson S. Hawkins, South Shaftsbury.
Bernis H. Snyder, Townshend.

VIRGINIA

Otho H. Brewbaker, Buchanan.
Albin O. Haley, Front Royal.

WEST VIRGINIA

Edwin Caperton, Alloy.
Lois E. Henderson, Osage.
Myrtle Blackman, Parsons.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art not far away, we pray for the emancipation of everything which

holds us down as our ageless petition rises: "What shall I do to be saved?" When things are working adversely, give us the capacity to discern the essential meaning of life. Oh, for the upward gaze of faith and the onward glance of hope.

When parents of the broken circle come to the brow of the hill and stand on the verge of their great sorrow sighing for those who are tossing in the storm of battle, oh, be with them a blessed ministry. When the crisis comes, may they be as cloistered saints finding the path of a heavenly peace. With souls undisturbed by the memories of other days when young hearts knew the joy and prospect of home and that love which carried them from sun to sun, dear Lord, let them find Thee waiting beyond the horizon of their grief. Oh, lead them over deserts dread and gird their armor with fresh courage; soothe and touch their wounded hearts as they suffer through the strain. Before their longing eyes unveil the cross of Him on whose brow there never rested the cloud of an unpromising day. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 26, 1943, was read and approved.

PRACTICE AIR RAID

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to have a statement read by the Clerk which he thinks will be of interest to every Member of the House. We have not had a practice air-raid evacuation of this end of the Capitol yet. The Chair, after consultation with both the majority and minority leaders, feels that this should be done at an early date, and will ask the Clerk to read the statement.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Chair desires to announce that there will be a practice air raid tomorrow between 2 and 4 o'clock, and the House and all persons on the House side of the Capitol will participate.

The guests in the galleries will leave the Chamber by way of the steps on the east and west side of the galleries and proceed to the first floor, where they will leave by the south or east doors as directed by the air-raid assistants.

All Members will leave by the east door or through the hall leading to the Chamber. Those leaving by the east door will proceed straight through to the east front of the Capitol and thence to their respective shelters in the House Office Buildings. Those leaving by the hall leading to the Chamber will proceed down the steps and thence out the south door on the first floor.

Members having offices in the New House Office Building should go to that building, entering by the main entrance on B Street, where they will be directed to shelter spaces located in the corridors. Members having offices in the Old House Office Building or in the Capitol only and others in the House side of the Capitol should go to the Old House Office Building, entering by the entrance alongside the terrace on New Jersey Avenue nearest B Street, where they will be directed to shelter spaces located in the corridors. All persons should proceed to their respective shelters by way of the Capitol Grounds.

Elevators will not be operated during practice air-raid tests or actual enemy raids.

Air-raid warning signals for the legislative group of buildings will be by the legislative bells and buzzers.

The signals are as follows:

Washington blue, one continuous ring (20 seconds).

Washington white, two short rings.

When the white signal is sounded, the air-raid test has been completed, and all legislative business will be resumed where it left off when the blue signal sounded.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests, first that my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] may be allowed to speak for 30 minutes today at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered, his subject being the Ruml plan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Colorado [Mr. HILL] may be permitted to speak for 15 minutes today, following the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

ABSENTEEISM

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on February 22 the Committee on Naval Affairs unanimously approved H. R. 1691, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON], dealing with the transportation of civilian employees and absenteeism in navy yards and stations. On last Friday the House Rules Committee granted a rule making this bill in order and it was scheduled to be brought up today.

Since the introduction of the original bill 1691 the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON] has introduced another measure, H. R. 1876, dealing with absenteeism on a much broader scale. Because of the widespread attention which the country has given the important subject of absenteeism, it is believed that we can save time, and save the time of the Congress, by combining the Johnson bills. Therefore, the draftsmen are in the process of completing preparation of a measure dealing with the whole subject, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON] will introduce the revised measure shortly. The Committee on Naval Affairs plans to begin hearings on the subject this week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. NEWSOME asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Milwaukee Journal of February 5, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ALLEN of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial on the food shortage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, March 3, after reading of the Journal and at the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's desk, and all other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, also to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech I made in New York on Friday, and also a third time to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Daily Bond Buyer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from J. H. ROSS, president of the Watercarriers' Association for Petroleum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter written by a constituent on the question of the peace after World War No. 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration may sit on Wednesday next during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

WORK OR FIGHT

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much about drafting workers and absenteeism. The El Paso Herald-Post quotes Mr. Barney Baruch as saying in 1931:

> The attempt to draft labor is * * * impossible and dangerous. A soldier serves the Nation directly. He serves to profit no one but the country as a whole.
>
> Industry is in the hands of millions of private employers. It is operated for profit to them. Enforced and involuntary service for a private master is, and repeatedly has been, defined by our Supreme Court as slavery.
>
> All this does not say, however, that men not under military discipline are free agents in war. The Government cannot say, "Work here, work there" or "work for Mr. A." But it can say—as it did say in 1918—"Work or fight." The Government can * * * specify whole classes of employment which are not considered essential at all. It can say that if a man be found unfit for military service but fit for other work in the essential lists, he must so employ himself or be cut off from rations, transportation, fuel, and supplies.
>
> The work-or-fight method is compatible with our institutions and far more effective than any chain gang or impressment that could be invented.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs a question. I understood him to say a moment ago that our committee would begin hearings on the combined Johnson absentee bills this week.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct. The combined bill will be presented to the House this morning. May I say that the bill on the calendar dealing with absenteeism will not be called up today due to the fact we want to consolidate it with another bill dealing with the same subject and in that way save time. We propose to commence hearings on Wednesday morning.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. How long does the chairman think these hearings will continue?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I hope we can get the bill back to the House during the latter part of this week or next Monday morning.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanmous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

POINT RATIONING

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the recent order by the O. P. A. for rationing canned goods places a penalty on persons who abstained from hoarding, and a premium for those who engaged in hoarding. This is evident from the fact that only 8 points are deducted from a ration book for each excess can declared at the time of registration, while the same can of goods purchased after the system becomes effective will take from 13 to 29 points.

An instance was cited of one Washington woman who admitted that she had on hand more than 1,200 cans of goods. Under the point rationing system she had enough property on hand to consume her entire ration points far beyond the expected period of this war. Under the regulations she could not be denied a book, and not more than 50 percent of the coupons could be deducted. And, although regulations provide further that excess declarations can be deferred for deductions from subsequent ration books, that would not necessarily worry a person who had on hand sufficient canned goods for the duration. The policy is unfair to every other citizen.

The O. P. A. point rationing system, as the same will be operated under current regulations, will be unfair to every family that patriotically and unselfishly heeded the Government's appeal not to hoard. At the same time it will extend a great benefit to those who did hoard canned goods as the regulation covering deductions is applied. The housewife and family who did not hoard canned goods will be from 50 to 75 percent worse off than those who engaged in hoarding. In fairness to all the regulations should be revised.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short statement by C. T. Revere, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short speech made by Mr. Leahy, of Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution by the unicameral Legislature of Nebraska opposing war time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Chicago Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial from Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own re-

marks in the RECORD and include therein a prepared statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative business and following any special orders heretofore entered the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON] may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a summary of statements by various Government officials, prepared by the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FUEL RATIONING

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

[Mr. AUCHINCLOSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

STATE DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HORAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein resolutions adopted by the Mississippi Press Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MERRITT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three occasions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONTRACT BETWEEN AIR LINES AND EXPRESS AGENCIES

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday I made some remarks on the floor pertaining to a certain contract existing between the air lines of the United States and railway express agencies. I also directed those remarks to section 29 of H. R. 1012. On Friday the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, placed a statement in the RECORD in which he very nicely said in effect that I did not know what I was talking about. This afternoon, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, I shall discuss that contract. I have a copy of it. I think I shall be able to convince the House that it may be that I do know what I am talking about. If you are interested in that subject matter, I would very much appreciate your listening to my remarks this afternoon.

CAPT. EDDIE RICKENBACKER

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks, and include certain excerpts from newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the other special orders are concluded, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, also, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I have three requests. First, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend my own remarks and include a statement I made over the Mutual Broadcasting System last Sunday night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Also, Mr. Speaker, that I be permitted to extend my own remarks and include a brief radio statement made by Dr. John Lee Coulter, over the radio a week ago Sunday night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Third, Mr. Speaker, that I be permitted to extend my own remarks and include a letter which I received from James Truslow Adams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SEPARATE COMMITTEE ON AVIATION

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on the important question of creating a separate committee on aviation, every Member of Congress received today a letter from the president of the Air Line Pilots Association. Because of the importance of this letter in respect to this important subject, I have asked to include it as a part of my remarks today, and commend that every single Member of this House read the letter before he comes to the floor tomorrow at the time that we take up the subject of the creation of a separate committee.

I ask unanimous consent to so extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Roger W. Babson on industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Mr. Owen Scott, which is really illuminating, and which I think will be beneficial to every Member to read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include brief excerpts from statements by agricultural colleges and universities of the various

States. I have submitted the matter to the Public Printer, and find that it will cost $337.50. Notwithstanding this I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the passing of an illustrious citizen of Chattanooga, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a letter by Louis Bromfield on the farm situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders of today I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, upon the conclusion of the legislative business and other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PREPAYMENT PURCHASE PRICE OF CERTAIN HOUSING SOLD BY FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 702, to permit the prepayment of the purchase price of certain housing sold to individuals by the Farm Security Administration, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the case of any contract or agreement for the sale of any real estate to any individual—

(1) by the Department of Agriculture or any agency of the Department of Agriculture; or

(2) by any homestead association or corporation established by the Department of Agriculture or any agency of the Department of Agriculture; or

(3) by the National Housing Agency or any agency of the National Housing Agency, in case such contract or agreement was, prior to February 24, 1942, made by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency of the Department of Agriculture, or any homestead association or corporation established by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency of the Department of Agriculture; or

(4) by the National Housing Agency or any agency of the National Housing Agency, or any homestead association established by the National Housing Agency, or any agency of the National Housing Agency, in case such contract or agreement would, except for Executive Order No. 9070 of February 24, 1942, as amended and supplemented, have been made by the Department of Agriculture or an agency of the Department of Agriculture, or a homestead association or corporation established by the Department of Agriculture or an agency of the Department of Agriculture;

if such contract of agreement provides for the payment of the purchase price in installments over a period of years, no provision of such contract or agreement shall be deemed to prevent the prepayment of any portion of the purchase price, and upon the payment of such purchase price, together with interest (on the amount thereof previously unpaid) to the date of such payment, there shall be delivered to the purchaser a warranty deed to such real estate.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAINING OF NONFARM YOUTH FOR FARM LABOR

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 75, to provide for the training of nonfarm youth for farm labor, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this measure authorizes the appropriation of funds for the training of rural personnel for work on the farms, to be administered largely through the 4–H Clubs. I understand the Committee on Appropriations is now considering this whole subject matter, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REHABILITATION OF VETERANS DISABLED IN THE PRESENT WAR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 801, to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the fact that this whole rehabilitation program is now under consideration by another committee, I feel that the entire problem should be studied and the House be enabled to pass upon the whole question at one time. I, therefore, object to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Three objections are required.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. I think that is all the Members of the House who will object, if they understand the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Three objections are heard, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE TO SERVE IN THE MERCHANT MARINE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 131, to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MAKING TEMPORARY DISABILITY RATINGS OF WORLD WAR VETERANS PERMANENT AFTER 10 YEARS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 799, to make temporary disability ratings of World War veterans permanent after 10 years.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill changes very substantially the regulations affecting veterans. There is no estimate of the cost involved in it. The Veterans' Administration is opposed to it. It has been the policy of those of us who are looking after these bills that if any bill is presented which is opposed by any department of the Government, it should not be passed by unanimous consent, although in making the request that it go over without prejudice, it is not our intention to indicate any opposition to the bill itself.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, let me say to the gentleman from New York that if he really wants economy in the bureaus of this Nation here is one place he can get it.

I pointed out a few days ago that leaving these veterans' cases open indefinitely to be "boll weeviled" through by employees from time to time not only keeps unnecessary people on the pay roll at great expense, but keeps the serviceman on pins. Let me show you what it means. I pointed out several years ago that when the Pension Bureau was in operation and the Veterans' Administration was in operation, the salaries in the Veterans' Bureau amounted to $43,000,000 a year and in the Pension Bureau about $3,500,000 a year. Taking from that all the personnel we had for hospitals, which would amount to $20,000,000 or $21,000,000 and would still leave $22,000,000 difference.

This bill does not have any effect on the pay a man gets for disability under certain rating, but it does provide that if he has had that rating for 10 years, that unless there is a mistake made or a fraud committed, then his rating is made permanent so far as his rating is concerned, and you do not have this great horde of bureau employees going through the records from time to time and keeping him on pins. I hope the gentleman from New York will withdraw his objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. As I indicated, while we may have no objection to the bill, yet the Veterans' Administration does, and there is no reason why it should not go over for further consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, the Bureau objects; a bureau grows by what it feeds on. Does the gentleman expect to get any bureau to recommend that it be cut? With all deference to the head of the Veterans' Administration, I have been chairman of this committee for 13 years and have been on it ever since it was created. I was asked to go on it by the minority leader, Mr. Garrett, when it was first created. I have gone all through this legislation, and I will say to the gentleman from New York that this bill will not only bring peace of mind to thousands and thousands of veterans, but it will reduce the cost of the Veterans' Administration.

I hope the gentleman from New York will not ask that it go over without prejudice, but that he will permit us to take it up and pass it now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to that request.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

PROVIDING GOVERNMENT PROTECTION TO WIDOWS AND CHILDREN OF DECEASED WORLD WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1744, to provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War veterans.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have a letter here from the Veterans' Administration in which it is stated that the cost of this bill for the first year will be $60,000,000, for the second year $61,000,000, for the third year $62,000,000, for the fourth year $62,000,000, and for the fifth year $62,000,000. It is evident that this is not proper legislation to be on the Consent Calendar.

I therefore object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

AMENDING VETERANS REGULATION NO. 10, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1749, to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting therefor a colon and the following: "Any officer, enlisted man or woman, member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) or Navy Nurse Corps (female) employed in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of the present war."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND SECTION 23 OF THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF FEBRUARY 5, 1917

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1671, to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I see the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] here. Will he explain the bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, this bill gives an increase in pay to the Director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Some time ago there was a consolidation of two bureaus. During and since that time the duties of the office have been very greatly increased. The number of employees involved in this Bureau now is very much larger than it was.

This simply puts the head of this Bureau on a basis comparable with the heads of other bureaus who get $10,000 a year. The present salary is $9,000. I think it is justified by the conditions under which the Bureau operates, by the importance of the Bureau. It simply brings him on a level with a great many other bureau heads who do work of comparable importance.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understand, at the time this consolidation was made the head of this Bureau was receiving $9,000, and by reason of the fact that the consolidation did not fix his salary at $10,000 he is not receiving the amount that is received by heads of other similar departments.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS TO UINTAH AND OURAY RESERVATION, UTAH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 837, to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is another measure which has been approved by the Committee on the Public Lands but has not cleared the Budget Bureau. We feel this bill should not be passed by unanimous consent. The Budget Bureau having the tremendous burdens it has at this time, we feel it should be aided in its efforts; therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1730, to amend paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

GRANT OF PARCEL OF LAND TO CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 21, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and is hereby, authorized to grant and convey, under such conditions as may be approved by the Secretary of the Navy, to the city of San Diego, State of California, for use as a public street, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a strip of land containing 5,950 square feet contiguous to Lytton Street between Barnett Avenue and Rosecrans Street at the United States Naval Training Station, San Diego, Calif.

SEC. 2. That if any part of the above-described lands hereby granted to the city of San Diego shall be used for any other purpose or purposes, or shall cease to be maintained by the city of San Diego for the purpose for which granted, such part shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out lines 8 and 9.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COST OF TRANSPORTATION OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF NAVY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1691, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be withdrawn from consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to pay the costs of transportation of civilian employees to places of duty in the Naval Establishment outside the continental United States, or in Alaska, and return, upon relief therefrom, to the places at which they were engaged or from

which they were transferred for such duty: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to transfer such employees from one station to another without their consent.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall remain in force during the present war and until 6 months thereafter, or until such earlier time as the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 129 was laid on the table.

ATTENDANCE OF PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1912, to authorize the attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States as students at educational institutions and other places.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of what this bill is?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to answer the gentleman's question. May I say that the provisions of this bill are necessary for the Army's specialized training program in the small and large colleges. Without the removal of certain restrictions in the basic act of last year it would not be possible to accomplish the large technical training program in the colleges and scientific schools throughout the country, which most Members of Congress desire to be carried out.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understand this bill, it will use the college establishments—large and small—for this training. Has this been unanimously reported by the committee?

Mr. ANDREWS. It has been unanimously reported; yes.

Mr. RANKIN. What are some of the restrictions?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, Public, 435 of the last Congress placed a limitation for training of 2 percent of the total personnel of enlisted men and officers who might be sent to technical training schools. That was passed chiefly because of the necessity for Signal Corps and Air Corps training: for example, radio engineers and electrical engineers.

The present bill raises the old limitation. It takes away the limitation, it being the Army's intention to train about 6 percent, and this is necessary, because of their desire to train 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old men in colleges in specialist subjects. It is essential for the entire project which has been set up in the last few months.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from New York state how many will be trained under this program?

Mr. ANDREWS. I am not able at the moment to give the exact number. It will probably be nearly 200,000, I would think as an offhand guess. The original list of colleges included 400 to 450 and this is being increased from week to week down to the smaller colleges, it being the desire of the War and Navy Departments to sprinkle the program over as many colleges as possible.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Has the gentleman any information as to how many colleges or universities will be included?

Mr. ANDREWS. I could not tell the gentleman exactly. There are about 1,500 in all in the country, and they hope to include just as many as possible.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What will be the cost?

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not recollect the total cost, although the figures are available.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Or the cost per student?

Mr. ANDREWS. The cost per student will be considerably less than it would be for the same student attending the same institution in a regular course at his own expense.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how many of the so-called smaller colleges, if the gentleman can tell us, have thus far been selected?

Mr. ANDREWS. I am unable to give that definitely, but the gentleman may call the War Department—office of G–1, Colonel Beukema—and they will give him the up-to-the-minute information. They started out not long ago with over 400 in the first selection just for the Army alone. The colleges are selected by a 9-man board—3 from the Army, 3 from the Navy, and 3 civilians representing the Manpower Commission.

Mr. CELLER. Is there a disposition to avoid a so-called educational black-out by keeping in operation most of our small colleges?

Mr. ANDREWS. That is exactly what is in mind.

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, have they included the world-famous colleges, Harvard and Princeton?

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman should know better than to ask that question.

Mr. FISH. That is not an answer. I want information.

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes; they have.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. A similar bill has been passed by the Senate. Without objection, the Senate bill will be considered in lieu of the House bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That Public Law No. 435, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved February 6, 1942, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That during the present war and for 6 months thereafter and notwithstanding other provisions of existing law, personnel of all components of the Army of the United States may be detailed as students at technical, professional, and other educational institutions or as students, observers, or investigators at industrial plants, hospitals, and other places, and all necessary expenses incident thereto shall be payable from any appropriations available to the Military Establishment: *Provided*, That this act shall not be construed as authorizing the acquisition of real estate by the War Department, except by lease, for use in the Army specialized training program."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1912) was laid on the table.

CITY OF ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 338, to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to purchase and improve the electric light and power system of the Anchorage Light & Power Co., Inc., an Alaska corporation, and for such purpose to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed $1,250,000 in excess of present statutory debt limits.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, is hereby authorized and empowered to purchase and acquire from Anchorage Light & Power Co., Inc.,a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Territory of Alaska, any or all of the electric light and power properties owned by said corporation, including electric current, light and power plants and systems, and all or any part of the property, both real and personal, rights, claims, easements, interests, and equities connected therewith, and to reconstruct, extend, and improve the same, and for such purposes to issue bonds in an amount not exceeding $1,250,000, the same to be in excess of the present statutory debt limit of said city as provided by the act entitled "An act to authorize municipal corporations in the Territory of Alaska to incur bonded indebtedness, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1936 (49 Stat. 1388): *Provided*, That no more than $1,000,000 of the proceeds of the sale of said bonds may be used for purposes of purchasing and acquiring such properties. Nothing herein shall be so construed as to prevent or preclude the said city from incurring other indebtedness up to, but not beyond the limits prescribed by said act of May 28, 1936, without regard to the bonded indebtedness herein authorized.

SEC. 2. Before said bonds shall be issued, a special election shall be ordered by the common council of the said city of Anchorage, Alaska, at which election the question of whether such indebtedness should be incurred and such bonds shall be issued in any amount not exceeding $1,250,000 for the purposes hereinbefore set forth, shall be submitted to the qualified electors of said city whose names appear on the last assessment roll of record of said city for purposes of municipal taxation. The form of the ballot shall be such that such electors may vote for or against the issuance of bonds in any amount not exceeding $1,250,000 for the purposes herein specified. Not less than 20 days' notice of such election shall be given by posting notices of the same in three conspicuous places within the corporate limits of the city of Anchorage, Alaska, one of which shall be at the front door of the United States post office in said city. The election notice shall state the date of said election, shall describe the polling place or places, and the times the same will be open, and shall state that bonds of said city in any amount not exceeding $1,250,000 are proposed to be issued for the purposes herein specified. The registration for such election, the manner of conducting the same, and the canvass of the returns of said election shall be, as nearly as practicable, in accordance with the requirements of law for general or special elections

in said city. Such bonds shall be issued to raise money for the purposes herein authorized only upon condition that not less than 55 percent of the votes cast at such election in said city shall be in favor of the issuance of said bonds for such purpose.

SEC. 3. The bonds herein authorized shall be coupon bonds, shall be negotiable instruments for all purposes, and shall bear such date or dates, be in such denomination or denominations, mature in such amounts and at such time or times, not exceeding 30 years from the date thereof, be payable at such place or places, and be sold at either public or private sale, be redeemable or nonredeemable before maturity either with or without premium, and carry registration privileges as to either principal and interest, or principal only, as may be prescribed by the Common Council of the City of Anchorage, Alaska. The bonds shall bear the signatures of the mayor and the clerk of said city and shall have impressed thereon the official seal of said city. The coupons to be annexed to such bonds shall bear the facsimile signatures of the mayor and of the clerk of said city. In case any of the officers whose signatures or countersignatures appear on the bonds shall cease to be such officers before delivery of such bonds, said signatures or countersignatures, whether manual or facsimile, shall nevertheless be valid and sufficient for all purposes, the same as if said officers had remained in office until such delivery. Said bonds shall bear interest at a rate to be fixed by the Common Council of the City of Anchorage not to exceed 5 percent per annum, payable semiannually, and said bonds shall be sold at not less than par plus accrued interest.

SEC. 4. The bonds herein authorized to be issued shall be general obligations of said city of Anchorage, payable as to both principal and interest from ad valorem taxes which shall be levied upon all the taxable property within the corporate limits of such municipality in an amount sufficient to pay the interest and principal of such bonds as the same shall become due and payable. The city of Anchorage is hereby granted the further right to pay said bonds out of the net revenues of the utility to be purchased with the proceeds of the bond issue, and any additions thereto, and to pledge the revenues from such utility, after all necessary expenses of maintenance and operation shall have been paid, in an amount sufficient to pay the principal and interest of such bonds as the same shall become due and payable.

SEC. 5. Any ordinance of the city of Anchorage, Alaska, authorizing the issuance of these bonds, or fixing the terms and covenants thereof, or both, may contain covenants by the city in order to protect and safeguard the security and the rights of the holders of these bonds, including covenants as to, among other things—

(a) The use and disposition of the revenues of said utility and any additions or betterments thereto the cost of which is to be defrayed with such proceeds, including the creation and maintenance of funds to be used for operation and maintenance, for renewals and replacements to said utility, and for disposition of any surplus from said revenues.

(b) The establishing and maintaining of adequate rates and charges for electric energy and other services, facilities, and commodities sold, furnished, or supplied by said utility sufficient to pay all cost of maintenance and operation, bond service, and other charges upon the gross revenues as provided by ordinance.

(c) The operation, maintenance, management, accounting, and auditing of said utility.

(d) Limitations upon the right of the city of Anchorage to dispose of all or any part of such utility without making provision for payment of all outstanding bonds.

(e) That the Common Council of the City of Anchorage is authorized to create a board of three members to be known as the board of public utility commissioners, which board shall manage and control the operation of said utility.

SEC. 6. If the Common Council of the City of Anchorage shall deem it advisable, said city may issue all or any part of the bonds authorized by this act not used for the purchase of such utility for the purpose of making any necessary extensions, additions, or improvements to said utility. Bonds for these purposes may be a part of the same issue of bonds issued for the purpose of purchasing said utility, and shall be payable from the same fund, or they may be issued in different series and may mature at any time subsequent to the last maturity of the original issue, but in any event may not mature more than 30 years from date thereof, or may mature concurrently with bonds of said original issue maturing on or subsequent to January 1, 1955. Regardless of whether or not said bonds are issued in series, any bonds issued to pay for any such extensions, additions, or improvements shall rank pari passu with the original bonds issued for the purchase of such utility.

SEC. 7. No part of the funds arising from the sale of any or all of the bonds authorized by this act shall be used for any purpose or purposes other than those specified in this act and authorized at the election authorizing the issuance of the same. Said bonds shall be sold only when and in such amounts as the Common Council of the City of Anchorage shall direct, and the proceeds thereof shall be used only for the purposes or any of them hereinbefore mentioned, and under the orders and direction of said common council from time to time as such proceeds may be required for said purposes.

SEC. 8. If the Common Council of the City of Anchorage shall deem it advisable, any or all of the bonds, the issuance of which is authorized by this act, may be refunded. Said refunding bonds may be exchanged for said outstanding bonds or may be sold at not less than par at public or private sale, and the proceeds of such sale shall be used only for the payment of the bonds being refunded: *Provided*, That such refunding bonds shall bear an interest rate not greater than the bonds being refunded. Said refunding bonds may mature not later than 30 years from date and shall be payable in such amounts and at such times and places as the Common Council of the City of Anchorage shall prescribe.

SEC. 9. The said city of Anchorage is hereby authorized to enter into contracts with the United States of America, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, under any act or acts of the Congress of the United States to encourage public works, for the relief of unemployment or for any other public purpose, for the sale of bonds issued in accordance with the provisions of this act, or for the acceptance of a grant of money to aid said municipality in financing any public works; or to enter into contracts with any persons or corporations, public or private, for the sale of such bonds; and such contracts may contain such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by and between the Common Council of said City of Anchorage and the United States of America, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, or any such purchaser.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### REVISION OF THE ALASKA GAME LAW

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 332, to revise the Alaska game law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the gentleman from Alaska explain in what particular the game laws of Alaska will be changed, modified, or revised.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, the principal proposed change in the Alaska game laws is designed to take care of the people in the military service who have gone to Alaska within the last 2 years. Under the present law it is impossible for men in the military service who have been sent to Alaska from the States to acquire the right of residence for the purpose of taking game in the Territory. The distinction is that a nonresident license for large game costs $50 and a nonresident license for small game costs $10, while a resident license for both small and large game costs $2. The principal purpose of the bill is to treat the soldier and the sailor just the same as other people who come to Alaska and give them the right of residence when they have been in Alaska for the statutory period of 1 year.

There is another purpose of the bill, a minor one, and that is to clarify the status of Filipinos. There has always been some measure of doubt as to whether they ought to be classed as aliens or citizens. This bill would classify them as citizens for the purpose of this law only, so that they could get licenses as residents of Alaska.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, if those Filipinos were soldiers, it seems to me it would be in order to give them the same right you give American soldiers, but I cannot understand why you would want to give a Filipino civilian the right to come to Alaska and get a special privilege to kill the game that is rapidly diminishing there now.

Mr. DIMOND. I suggest to the gentleman that they are not going to get any special privileges. They are simply to be treated as residents of Alaska after they have been there for a year, which is the period of residence required of everybody. May I point out to the gentleman a matter which he knows even better than I, that the Filipinos are not aliens, neither are they citizens, they are "nationals." The only distinction that can be made in the law is to treat them as residents. Since their heroic defense of their cause and our cause in the Philippines, I think we may well treat them as residents. The number involved is very small, and this provision of the bill has no opposition in Alaska.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman that I am not going to object to the consideration of this bill as far as these Filipinos are concerned, but if any other bill is brought in here to spread this privilege further, I shall object.

There are three things in Alaska that, to my mind, are worthy of preservation. Our greatest asset in Alaska is the fish. The fisheries of Alaska bring in at least $60,000,000 a year. The next greatest asset we have in Alaska is the fur-bearing animals. Every time you send someone out into the woods with a gun to kill those animals you decrease the supply and drive toward the ultimate extinction of the fur-bearing animals in that area. The next greatest asset is the timber, which we are now trying to conserve.

I am not willing to throw Alaska open to everybody who wants to go there for a short time to shoot a gun and destroy what fur-bearing animals we have now, because the time will come if it has not already arrived when many of the people of Alaska are going to want to make their living from these fur-bearing animals. So any other spread of this privilege will be objected to if I am on the floor when the bill comes up.

Mr. DIMOND. I am grateful to the gentleman from Mississippi for his vision and his intelligent and sympathetic and active interest in Alaska and Alaskans, and I can assure him that the people of Alaska are just as solicitous as anybody can be to preserve the fur-bearing and the game animals of Alaska. There is nothing in this bill which will tend to break down the protection of the law as to either the fur-bearing animals or the game animals.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not questioning the desire of the people of Alaska to preserve the fur-bearing animals. I have been to Alaska. I was on the Committee on the Territories for 15 years or more. I am familiar with the situation in Alaska. But I want Alaska saved for the Alaskan people. I was delighted that the privilege was given to the city of Anchorage a few moments ago to increase its power facilities. We have enough water power going to waste in Alaska to supply the United States if it could be used. I want what is in Alaska saved for the people of Alaska, and not have it made a preying ground for people who want to go there from every section of the globe.

Mr. DIMOND. That is completely admirable. All Alaskans agree with that doctrine.

Mr. SABATH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from Mississippi call attention to the great value that is being obtained for the people of Alaska and the United States from the fisheries and the fur-bearing animals and the other valuable properties there. The gentleman representing Alaska is familiar with the situation. If I am not mistaken, there are a great many valuable minerals there and many other things of great value.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois has asked a vital question. Alaska has billions and billions and billions of tons of coal. It has enormous timber resources. It has already produced about $600,000,000 worth of gold and has at least that much left in the ground for future mining. It has valuable deposits of copper, platinum, antimony, tungsten, tin, and other minerals, for which the world is clamoring now. In addition, it has some 40,000,000 acres of just as good agricultural and grazing land as can be found anywhere in the United States.

Mr. SABATH. Is that the same Alaska that we obtained from Russia in 1867 for $7,200,000?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes, it is.

Mr. SABATH. That is the same Alaska?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. That was not such a bad deal, was it?

Mr. DIMOND. No.

Mr. RANKIN. And that is the same Alaska that the Japs are trying to take away from us now.

Mr. DIMOND. Yes. Now to continue my answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION], the bill before us further seeks to amend the existing law in such manner as to give the Alaska Game Commission control over game or fresh water fishes, making it possible to restock depleted streams and lakes and to stock waters that are at present barren, and to control fishing of game fish so as to prevent depletion; to permit integration of the Fishery Service and the Wildlife Service in Alaska in the interest of more efficient administration; to give the Alaska Game Commission authority to more completely control the hunting of big game animals in any area where there is danger of depletion by putting a limit on the total number of such animals that can be taken out of any area; and to give the Secretary of the Interior discretionary authority to revise downward the license fees prescribed in section 10 of the bill so that in all possible cases additional provisions may be made for those in military service where that can be done without risk of depletion.

The bill does not cover the licensing or regulation of commercial fishing operations. All commercial fishing in Alaska is regulated and controlled under an entirely separate law. The power of the Secretary of the Interior, outlined in section 9, to regulate the manner in which "game fishes may be taken, possessed, transported, bought or sold" does not embrace the power to regulate commercial fishing but only the power to regulate game fishing or fishing for sport. A license for fishing under this bill is required only when the fishing is not commercial in nature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That an act entitled "An act to establish an Alaska Game Commission, to protect game animals, land fur-bearing animals, and birds in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved January 13, 1925, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Definitions: That for the purposes of this act the following shall be construed, respectively, to mean:

"Commission: The Alaska Game Commission.

"Secretary: The Secretary of the Interior.

"Director: Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.

"Executive officer: Executive officer, Alaska Game Commission.

"Territory: Territory of Alaska.

"Person: The plural or the singular, as the case demands, including individuals, associations, partnerships, and corporations, unless the context otherwise requires.

"Indians: Natives of one-half or more Indian blood.

"Eskimo: Natives of one-half or more Eskimo blood.

"Take: Taking, pursuing, disturbing, hunting, capturing, trapping, or killing game animals, fur animals, game or nongame birds, or game fishes; attempting to take, pursue, disturb, hunt, capture, trap, or kill such animals, birds, or game fishes, or setting or using a net, trap, or other device for taking them, or collecting the nests or eggs of such birds, unless the context otherwise requires. Whenever the taking of animals, birds, or nests or eggs of birds, or game fishes is permitted, reference is had to taking by lawful means and in lawful manner.

"Open season: The time during which animals, birds, or game fishes may lawfully be taken. Each period of time prescribed as an open season shall be construed to include the first and last days thereof.

"Closed season: The time during which animals, birds, or game fishes may not be taken.

"Transport: Shipping, transporting, carrying, importing, exporting, or receiving or delivering for shipment, transportation, carriage, or export, unless the context otherwise requires.

"Game animals: Deer, moose, caribou, elk, mountain sheep, mountain goat, bison, muskox, and the large brown, grizzly, and black bears, which shall be known also as big game, and such other animals as the Secretary has or shall declare, as hereinafter provided, to be game animals, to be known also as big game if so designated in the declaration, including those that have been or may hereafter be transplanted, introduced, or reintroduced into the Territory, or any part thereof.

"Fur animals: Beaver, muskrat, marmot, raccoon, pika, hare or rabbit, squirrel, fisher, fox, lynx, marten or sable, mink, weasel or ermine, sea otter, land otter, wolverine, coyote, wolf, and polar bear, and such other animals as have been or may hereafter be transplanted, introduced, or reintroduced into the Territory, or any part thereof, and found and declared by the Secretary to be fur animals: *Provided*, That whenever the Secretary shall find that in any section of Alaska any animal is predominantly taken as a game rather than as a fur animal, or is predominantly taken as a fur animal rather than as a game animal, he shall so declare and then and thereafter, so long as such declaration remains in effect, such animal in the specified section of Alaska shall be considered to be a game animal or fur animal as the case may be, to the same extent as if it had been expressly included in the foregoing definitions of game and fur animals.

"Game birds: Anatidae, commonly known as waterfowl, including ducks, geese, brant, and swans; Haematopodidae, Charadriidae, Scolopacidae, and Phalaropodidae, commonly known as shorebirds, including oyster-catchers, plover, sandpipers, snipe, curlew, and phalaropes; Gruidae, commonly known as crane; and the several species of grouse and ptarmigan, and such other birds as have been or may hereafter be transplanted, introduced, or reintroduced into the Territory, or any part thereof, and found and declared by the Secretary to be game birds.

"Nongame birds: All wild birds except game birds.

"Hunting: The taking, as herein defined, of game animals, game birds, and nongame birds.

"Trapping: The taking, as herein defined, of fur animals.

"Game fishes: Rainbow, steelhead, cutthroat, eastern brook, and Dolly Varden trout, and grayling, and such other fishes as the Secretary may declare, from time to time, to be game fishes.

"SEC. 3. Residence and citizenship: That for the purposes of this act a citizen or a national of the United States who has resided in the Territory for a continuous period of 12 months immediately preceding his claim for resident hunting, trapping, fishing, or other privileges under this act, or a person not a citizen or a national of the United States who has in good faith declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States, whose declaration of intention is in good standing, and who has resided in the

Territory for a like period, shall be considered a resident: *Provided, however,* That whenever the Secretary shall determine the fur resources of Alaska are threatened by hunting or trapping, or from other causes, he may, in his discretion and for such periods as he shall determine, extend the required residence period in the Territory from 12 months to 3 years as a prerequisite to obtaining a resident trapping license; a citizen or a national of the United States who has not resided in the Territory for a continuous period of 12 months, or for the extended period of 3 years, as the case may be, immediately preceding his claim for resident privileges shall be considered a nonresident; and a person not a citizen or a national of the United States who is not a resident of the Territory, as defined in this section, shall be considered an alien.

"SEC. 4. Alaska Game Commission created: That a Commission to be known as the Alaska Game Commission is hereby created. The Commission shall consist of an executive officer and four other members. The executive officer of the Commission shall be the representative of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, designated by the Director to occupy that position, and he shall provide for the due administration of the functions of the Commission under this act. The other four members of the Commission shall be appointed by the Secretary to serve for 4 years unless sooner removed: *Provided,* That the present members of the Alaska Game Commission appointed pursuant to section 4 of the act of January 13, 1925 (43 Stat. 739), are hereby made the appointed members of the Alaska Game Commission as reorganized and continued hereunder, each to serve a term of office equal to the unexpired term of his office as a member of the Alaska Game Commission under the provisions of the act of January 13, 1925. Each member of the Commission appointed by the Secretary shall be a resident citizen of the judicial division from which he is appointed and shall have been a resident of Alaska for at least 5 years before his appointment, but not more than one resident of a judicial division shall serve on the Commission at one time, and no Federal or Territorial employee shall be appointed as a member of the Commission. The Secretary may remove a commissioner for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or misconduct in office, giving him a copy of the charges against him and opportunity to be publicly heard in person or by counsel in his own defense; pending the investigation of the charges, the Secretary may suspend such commissioner. The Secretary shall fill vacancies on the Commission by appointment for the unexpired term, and a vacancy shall be filled by appointment from the same judicial division in which it occurs. The office of any commissioner shall be vacant upon his removing his residence from the judicial division from which he was appointed.

"Members of the Commission, other than the executive officer, shall receive no compensation for their services as members thereof, except a per diem of $10 for each member for each day going to and from and in actual attendance at meetings of the Commission, but the total salary or per diem compensation of the member from the second judicial division shall not exceed the sum of $1,500, and that of any of the other members, except the executive officer, the sum of $900 in any one fiscal year, and each such member in addition shall have reimbursed to him actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred or made in the discharge of his official duties, in accordance with the fiscal regulations of the Department of the Interior, which shall be paid on proper vouchers from the appropriation for the enforcement of the Alaska game law. The executive officer shall be paid his salary and shall have reimbursed to him all actual and necessary traveling and other expenses and disbursements in accordance with the fiscal regulations of the Department of the Interior from the appropriation for the enforcement of the Alaska game law and from such other appropriations for the work of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Territory as the Director may designate.

"The Commission shall maintain and have its principal office in the capital of the Territory.

"A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. All investigations, inquiries, hearings, and decisions of a commissioner shall be deemed to be the investigations, inquiries, hearings, and decisions of the Commission, when approved by it and entered by it in its minutes, and every order made by a commissioner, when approved and confirmed by the Commission and ordered filed in its office, shall be, and be deemed to be the order of the Commission. The Commission shall have an official seal.

"SEC. 5. Duties and powers of the Commission, wildlife agents, and other persons: That each member of the Commission, any employee of the Department of the Interior authorized by the Secretary to enforce this act, any marshal, deputy marshal, collector or deputy collector of customs, shall have power, in or out of the Territory, and it shall be his duty to arrest without warrant any person committing a violation of this act in his presence or view, and to take such person immediately for examination or trial before a officer or court of competent jurisdiction; he shall have power to execute any warrant or other process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction for the enforcement of the provisions of this act; and he shall have authority, with a search warrant, to search any place at any time. Any officer or other person empowered to enforce this act shall have authority without warrant to search any camp, camp outfit, fish creel, pack or pack animals, automobile, aircraft, wagon, or other vehicle, sled, or any boat, vessel, or other craft in the territorial waters of the United States, or any boat, vessel, or other craft of the United States on the high seas when such officer or employee has reasonable cause to believe that such camp, camp outfit, fish creel, pack or pack animals, automobile, aircraft, wagon, or other vehicle, sled, boat, vessel, or other craft has therein or thereon any of the animals, birds, or fishes, or parts thereof, or nests or eggs of birds, protected by this act taken, possessed, sold, intended for sale, or transported contrary to law. The several judges of the courts established under the laws of the United States and United States commissioners may, within their respective jurisdictions, upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause, issue warrants in all such cases. All guns, traps, nets, fishing tackle, boats, aircraft, wagons or other vehicles, dogs, sleds, and other paraphernalia used in or in aid of a violation of this act may be seized, and all animals, birds, game fishes, or parts thereof, or nests or eggs of birds, taken, transported, or possessed contrary to the provisions of this act shall be seized within or outside the Territory by any officer or person authorized to enforce this act, and upon conviction of the offender or upon judgment of a court of the United States that the same were being used or were taken, transported, or possessed in violation of this act, shall be forfeited to the United States and disposed of as directed by the court having jurisdiction, and if sold the proceeds of sale shall be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the executive officer to be disposed of as provided in subdivision K of section 10 of this act. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General, upon request of the Secretary of the Interior, to aid in carrying out the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 6. Bond of employees: That before entering upon the duties of his office, the executive officer shall execute and file with the Secretary a bond to the people of the United States in the sum of $1,000, with sufficient sureties, and each wildlife agent or other person authorized by the executive officer to sell licenses shall so file such a bond in the sum of $500, conditioned for the faithful performance of their respective duties, and for the proper accounting and paying over, pursuant to law, of all moneys or property received by them, respectively. Each person so bonded shall have reimbursed to him on proper voucher the premium paid by him on his bond.

"SEC. 7 Taking of animals, birds, and game fishes restricted: That, unless and except as permitted by this act or by regulations made pursuant to this act, it shall be unlawful for any person to take, possess, transport, sell, offer to sell, purchase, or offer to purchase any game animal, fur animal, game fish, game bird, nongame bird, or any part thereof, or any nest or egg of any such bird, or to molest, damage, or destroy beaver or muskrat houses: *Provided,* That nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the collection or exportation of such animals, game fishes, birds, parts thereof, or nests or eggs of birds, for scientific or educational purposes, or of live animals, game fishes, birds, or eggs of birds for propagation or exhibition purposes, under a permit issued by the Director, pursuant to regulations hereinafter authorized to be adopted by the Secretary. Fur or game animals and game birds which escape from captivity, unless recaptured by their owners in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, and all fur and game animals and game birds which have been or may hereafter be transplanted, introduced, or reintroduced into the Territory, or any part thereof, are declared to be wild fur or game animals or game birds, as the case may be, and shall be subject to the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 8. Poison, use prohibited: That no person shall at any time use any poison to kill any animal or bird protected by this act or put out poison or a poisoned bait where any such animal or bird may come in contact with it; but a wildlife agent or predatory animal hunter may use poison to kill wolves, coyotes, or wolverines, under such regulations as the Commission may adopt; and no person shall sell or give any strychnine or other poison designated by the Commission to any hunter or trapper. No hunter or trapper shall have any strychnine or other poison designated by the Commission in his possession, and any such poison found in the possession of any such person shall be seized and disposed of in such manner as the Commission may determine. Any person selling or otherwise disposing of any strychnine or any other poison designated by the Commission shall keep a record in a special book showing the name and address of each person purchasing or otherwise procuring it and the kind and amount thereof, which record shall at all times be open to inspection by any wildlife agent or other officer authorized to enforce this act, and he shall transmit such information monthly to the Commission.

"SEC. 9. Regulations: That the Secretary, upon consultation with or recommendation from the Commission, is hereby authorized and directed from time to time to determine when, to what extent, if at all, and by what means game animals, fur animals, game birds, nongame birds, and nests or eggs of birds, and game fishes may be taken, possessed, transported, bought, or sold, and to adopt suitable regulations permitting and governing the same in accordance with such determinations, which regulations shall become effective on the date specified therein; but no such regulations shall permit any person to take any female yearling or calf

moose, any fawn deer, or any female or lamb mountain sheep except under permit for scientific, propagation, exhibition, or educational purposes; or to use any dog in taking game animals; or to sell the heads, hides, or horns of any game animals, except the hides of moose, caribou, deer, and mountain goat, or skins of black bear, which the regulations may permit to be sold under such restrictions as said Secretary may deem to be appropriate; or to use any shotgun larger than a number 10 gage; or to use any aircraft, or steam or power launch, or any boat other than one propelled by paddle, oars, or pole, in taking game animals or game birds; or to sell any game animals, game birds, or parts thereof to the owner, master, or employee of any coastal or river steamer or commercial power or sailboat, or to procure for serving or to serve any such game animals, game birds, or parts thereof in any cannery or to the employees on any such steamer or boat; nor, except as herein provided, shall prohibit any Indian or Eskimo, prospector, or traveler to take animals, birds, or game fishes during the closed season when he is in need of food and other sufficient food is not available, but the shipment or sale of any animals, birds, or game fishes, or parts thereof so taken shall not be permitted, except that the hides of animals so taken may be sold within the Territory, but said Secretary by regulation may prohibit such native Indians or Eskimos, prospectors, or travelers from taking any species of animals, birds, or game fishes for food during the closed season in any section of the Territory within which he shall determine that the supply of such species of animals, birds, or game fishes is in danger of extermination; nor shall any such regulation contravene any of the provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and regulations: *Provided*, That no person shall knowingly disturb, injure, or destroy any notice, signboard, seal, tag, aircraft, boat, vessel, automobile, sled, dog, dog team, paraphernalia, equipment, building, or other improvement or property of the United States used in the administration or enforcement of the provisions of this act, or any poster or notice to the public concerning the provisions of this act or any regulation adopted pursuant hereto, or any marker indicating the boundary of any area closed to hunting, trapping, fishing, or other special use under the provisions of this act, or shall knowingly destroy, remove, tamper with, or imitate any seal or tag issued or used by the Commission or attached under its authority to any skin, portion, or specimen of a wild animal, bird, game fish, or other article for purposes of identification or authentication in accordance with the provisions of this act or any regulations adopted hereunder.

"SEC. 10. Licenses: Subdivision A—Nonresident, hunting, trapping, and fishing licenses. That except as otherwise permitted by this act, or by any regulation or order made pursuant hereto, no nonresident as defined by section 3 of this act shall take or possess any of the animals, birds, or game fishes protected by this act, or by any regulation or order authorized hereunder, without first having procured a nonresident hunting, trapping, or fishing license as herein provided.

"Subdivision B—Resident export licenses and permits: No resident of the Territory shall transport therefrom any game animal, bird, game fish, or part thereof, unless he has (a) a resident export and return license, which will entitle him to transport out of the Territory for mounting and return to him in the Territory within 1 year such game animal, bird, game fish, or part thereof, as shall have been legally acquired by him and which shall be specifically identified in the license, or (b) a resident export permit, which may be issued in such circumstances and upon such conditions as the Commission may prescribe, and which will entitle him to export from the Territory for other than return, but not for sale, such game animal, bird, game fish, or part thereof, as shall have been legally acquired by him and which shall be specifically identified in the permit.

"Subdivision C—Resident hunting, trapping, and fishing licenses: The Commission, whenever it shall deem expedient, may by regulation require residents of the Territory to procure resident hunting, trapping, and fishing licenses authorizing them to take animals, birds, and game fishes protected by this act, and after the effective date of such regulation, no resident shall take any animal, bird, or game fish protected by this act without having first procured resident hunting, trapping, and fishing licenses as herein provided. The fee for such licenses shall be as follows: For each fishing license the sum of $1; for each hunting license, which shall include the privilege of fishing, the sum of $2; and for each trapping license, which shall include the privilege of hunting and fishing, the sum of $3; but no such license sha be required of native Indians and Eskimos, or of residents under the age of 16.

"Subdivision D—Registered guide license: Only a person who is a resident of the Territory, as defined in section 3 of this act, may act as guide for a nonresident in any section of the Territory where the Commission by regulation, and the Commission is hereby authorized to issue such regulations, requires nonresidents to employ guides prior to engaging in authorized big-game hunting privileges, and he shall first register with the Commission on a form which it shall provide for this purpose and procure a registered guide license as herein provided, and the Commission shall determine by regulation the qualifications required of such guides. No person other than a registered guide shall act as guide for a nonresident in any section of the Territory where guides are required by regulation of the Commission to be registered.

"Subdivision E—Alien special licenses: No alien shall take any of the animals, birds, or game fishes protected by this act, or own or be possessed of a shotgun, rifle, or other firearm, without first having procured an alien special license, except that an alien may take game fishes protected by this act upon first having procured an alien fishing license, as herein provided.

"Subdivision F—Records, reports: Each person to whom a license is issued to take animals or birds, or to deal in furs, shall keep records which shall show the kind and number of each species of animals or birds so taken, purchased, or otherwise procured under such license, the persons from whom they were purchased and to whom they were sold, date of purchase or sale, name of the trapper, and the number of the trapper's license, and shall, on or before 30 days after the expiration of his license, make a written report to the Commission on a form prepared and furnished by it setting forth in full the data herein required to be recorded. Such records shall at all reasonable times be subject to inspection and examination by any officer or other person empowered to enforce this act. Any licensee who shall fail correctly to keep such records or who shall fail to submit such report or who shall in any such report knowingly falsely state any such data or who shall refuse to exhibit his records for inspection and examination as herein required shall be punished as prescribed in section 15 of this act.

"Subdivision G—Fur-farm license: No person shall engage in the business of farming fur animals or possess them for purposes of propagation without first having procured a fur-farm license as herein provided.

"Subdivision H—Fur dealers, licenses, fees: No person shall buy or sell the skins of fur animals, or engage in, carry on, or be concerned in the business of buying, selling, or trading in the skins of fur animals protected by this act without first having procured a license as herein provided, but no license shall be required of a hunter or trapper selling the skins of such animals which he has lawfully taken, or of a person not engaged or employed in the business of trading in such skins to purchase them for his own use but not for sale, or of native Indians or Eskimos, or of cooperative stores operated exclusively by and for native Indians or Eskimos, or of stores operated by missions, exclusively for native Indians or Eskimos: *Provided*, That the stores exempted from procuring licenses as herein provided shall, on or before 30 days after the expiration of each license year as specified in this act, make a written statement to the Commission, on a form prepared and furnished by it, setting forth such material facts concerning the management and operation of such store as the Commission may by such form require and in addition thereto shall keep the records, make the reports, incur the penalties, and in all other respects be subject to the requirements of subdivision F of section 10 to the same extent as licensed fur dealers.

"The applicant for such a license shall accompany his application by the required fee as follows:

"(a) If the applicant is a resident of the Territory, $10, or is an association or copartnership composed exclusively of residents of the Territory, organized under the laws of the Territory, for each member, $10.

"(b) If the applicant is a nonresident of the Territory but is a citizen or national of the United States, or is a corporation composed exclusively of citizens or nationals of the United States, organized under the laws of the Territory or of a State of the United States, or is an association or copartnership composed exclusively of citizens or nationals of the United States, organized under the laws of the Territory or of a State of the United States, any member of which is a nonresident of the Territory, $100.

"(c) If the applicant is an alien, or is a corporation, association, or copartnership, not organized under the laws of the Territory or of a State of the United States, or is a corporation, association, or copartnership, any stockholder or member of which is an alien, $500.

"(d) If the applicant is a resident of the Territory and an agent in charge of a station of a fur dealer of either of the classes (a), (b), or (c), or a resident itinerant agent of such dealer, $10.

"(e) If the applicant is a nonresident of the Territory but a citizen or national of the United States and an agent in charge of a station of a fur dealer of either of the classes (a), (b), or (c), or a nonresident citizen or national itinerant agent of such dealer, $100.

"(f) If the applicant is an alien and an agent in charge of a station of a fur dealer of either of the classes (a), (b), or (c), or an alien itinerant agent of such dealer, $500: *Provided*, That no license shall be issued to any agent whose principal has not procured a license in accordance with (a), (b), or (c).

"Subdivision I. Fees and application for, and issuance of, licenses and permits: Licenses and resident export permits shall be issued by the executive officer through wildlife agents and other persons authorized by him in writing to sell licenses. Resident export licenses and permits may also be issued by customs officers. Application blanks for licenses and permits shall be furnished by the Commission and shall be in such form as the Commission may by regulation determine. Each application shall be subscribed and sworn to by the applicant before an officer authorized to administer oaths in the Territory. Members of the Commission, wildlife agents, and other persons authorized in writing by the executive officer to issue licenses, and postmasters and customs officers, are he eby authorized to administer such oaths. The applicant for a license or resident export permit shall accompany his application with a license or permit fee as follows: Nonresident general hunting, trap-

ping, and fishing license, $50; nonresident hunting and fishing license, but not including the privilege of hunting big game, $10; nonresident fishing license, $2.50; resident export and return license, $1 for each animal or bird trophy; resident export permit, if shipper is removing residence, $1 for each animal, $1 for each bird, or if shipper is not removing residence, $5 for each animal, $1 for each bird; registered guide license, $10; alien special hunting, trapping, and fishng license, $100; alien fishing license, $2.50; and fur-farm license, $2. Whenever the Secretary determines that the circumstances justify the charging of lesser fees for any class of licenses or permits than the fees specified in this section, he may by regulation prescribe reduced schedules of fees to be paid for the issuance of licenses or permits of that class, and during the period any such regulation is in effect no greater fee shall be charged for any license or permit of the class involved than the fee so prescribed by the Secretary.

"Subdivision J. False statements in application for and alteration and expiration of licenses and permits: Any false statement in an application for a license or permit as to citizenship, place of residence, or other material facts shall render null and void the licenses or permits issued upon it. Any person who shall make any false statements in an application for a license or permit shall be guilty of a violation of this act and upon conviction of any such violation shall be punished as provided in section 15 hereof. No person shall alter, change, loan, or transfer to another any license or permit issued to him in pursuance of this act, nor shall any person other than the one to whom it is issued use such license or permit, and each of such licenses shall expire on the 30th day of June next succeeding its issuance.

"Subdivision K—Proceeds of licenses and permits: The Commission is hereby authorized to prescribe regulations permitting each officer or person selling licenses or permits, other than officers or employees of the United States, to retain for his own use and benefit such portion of the proceeds of each sale made by him, not exceeding 10 percent thereof, as the Commission may from time to time allot for the purpose of compensating such officer or person for his services in connection with the issuance of licenses or permits, but the sums so retained shall be reported to the executive officer in accordance with the regulations of the Commission. Subject to the withholding of any compensation so authorized, each officer or person selling licenses or permits shall, as soon as practicable after the first day of each month, transmit the proceeds from such sales, together with a report thereof, to the executive officer who shall keep accurate records of such proceeds and promptly deposit 50 percent thereof in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, and transmit 50 percent thereof to the treasurer of the Territory to be covered into the Territorial school fund. Receipts from all other sources shall be accounted for and disposed of in like manner.

"Subdivision L—Tags and seals: The Commission is hereby authorized and directed to adopt tags or seals of an approved type or design to be used for marking seized articles, and beaver and marten skins, or the skins of other fur or game animals when required by the regulations of the Secretary to be tagged or sealed, for purposes of identification and authentication.

"Subdivision M—Special regulations, permits, and licenses: In addition to the hunting, trapping, and fishing licenses or permits required by any other provision of this act, or by regulations authorized to be issued thereunder, the Commission may from time to time prescribe regulations requiring residents, nonresidents, and aliens to obtain special licenses, upon the payment of fees fixed by such regulations, prior to the taking of specified game animals in specified areas, and may by such regulations limit further the number, kind, and sex of such animals that may be taken in such areas, and also may restrict the number of persons who may hunt in each such area. Whenever such additional restrictions are imposed by regulation, the executive officer shall issue to qualified applicants, upon receipt of the proper application and fee, the special licenses repersons who may hunt in each such area. Whenever such additional restrictions are imposed by regulation, the executive officer shall issue to qualified applicants, upon receipt of the proper application and fee, the special licenses required by such regulations, in the number designated by the regulations and in the order of the receipt of applications.

"SEC. 11. Collectors of customs, duties of: That it shall be the duty of collectors of customs at ports of entry in the United States to keep accurate accounts of all consignments of game birds, game animals, skins of fur animals, game fishes, or parts thereof, and nests or eggs of game birds, received from or returned to the Territory, except when shipped for scientific, propagation, exhibition, or educational purposes under a permit issued by the Director pursuant to regulations of the Secretary; and it shall be the duty of all collectors of customs to enforce the provisions of regulations adopted pursuant to this act with respect to shipments of game birds, game animals, skins of fur animals, game fishes, or parts thereof, and nests or eggs of game birds.

"SEC. 12. Burden of proof: That the possession of any wild animal, game fish, wild bird, or part thereof, or any nest or egg of such bird, during the time when the taking of it is prohibited, shall, in any action in rem, constitute prima facie evidence that it was taken, possessed, bought, sold, or transported in violation of the provisions of this act, and the burden of proof shall be upon the possessor or claimant of it to overcome the presumption of illegal possession and to establish the fact that it was obtained and is possessed lawfully.

"SEC. 13. United States attorneys, duties of: That it shall be the duty of the United States attorney for the division in which any wild animal, game fish, wild bird, or part thereof, or any nest or egg of such bird, has been seized because taken, transported, bought, sold, or possessed contrary to the provisions of this act, or in which any gun, trap, net, fishing tackle, boat, dog, sled, aircraft, wagon, or other vehicle, or other paraphernalia has been seized because used in the unlawful taking of any wild animal, game fish, wild bird, or part thereof, or any nest or egg of such bird, or in which any sled, boat, aircraft, wagon, or other vehicle has been seized because used in the transportation of any wild animal, game fish, wild bird, or part thereof, or any nest or egg of such bird, illegally bought, sold, or possessed contrary to the provisions of this act, to institute an action in rem against it for the forfeiture thereof to the United States in any case in which the disposition of such article is not involved in a criminal prosecution. In case of judgment being rendered in favor of the United States, the wild birds, game fishes, wild animals, or other articles forfeited shall be disposed of as directed by the court having jurisdiction, and if sold, the proceeds of sale shall be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the executive officer to be disposed of as provided in subdivision K of section 10 of this act: *Provided*, That no action in rem shall be required with respect to any wild animal, game fish, wild bird, or part thereof, or any nest or egg of such bird, or any gun, net, fishing tackle, trap, or other device possessed or used in or in aid of a violation of this act and legally seized when the claimant thereof releases such article or articles to the United States by a voluntary release in writing witnessed by two disinterested parties, in which case such articles shall be disposed of by the executive officer and if sold the proceeds shall be disposed of as provided in this section.

"SEC. 14. Continuance of funds: That the unexpended balances of any sums appropriated by the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for enforcing the provisions of the act of January 13, 1925, as amended, for the protection of game animals, fur animals, and birds in the Territory, are hereby made available for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this act and regulations made pursuant hereto, and all contractual obligations heretofore incurred under the amended, shall remain in full force and effect.

"SEC. 15. Penalties: That unless a different or other penalty or punishment is hereby specifically prescribed, a person who violates any provision of this act or of any order or regulation adopted pursuant to this act, or who fails to perform any duty imposed by this act or by any order or regulation adopted pursuant to this act, is guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than $25 nor more than $500, or be imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both; and, in addition thereto, any person convicted of a violation of any provision of this act who is the holder of any form of license issued hereunder shall thereupon forfeit said license and shall surrender it upon demand of any person authorized by the Commission to receive it, and upon a second conviction he shall not be entitled to, nor shall he be granted a license of such form for a period of 1 year from the date of such forfeiture, and upon a third or successive conviction for a period of 5 years from the date of such forfeiture; and any cooperative store operated exclusively by and for native Indians or Eskimos, or any store operated by missions exclusively for native Indians or Eskimos, without a license as provided in this act, upon a second or third conviction for violation of this act, shall not be entitled to engage in the business of dealing in furs for such time as the court before whom such conviction is had may decide: *Provided*, That such prohibition shall not be imposed for the first conviction, nor for a period in excess of 1 year from date of the second conviction, nor for a period in excess of 5 years from date of the third or any subsequent conviction; and all moneys from fines shall be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the executive officer to be disposed of as provided in subdivision K of section 10 of this act.

"Any licensed guide who shall fail or refuse to report promptly to the Commission any violation of this act of which he may have knowledge, shall be guilty of a violation of this act, and, in addition thereto, shall have his license revoked and shall be ineligible to act as a licensed guide for a period of 5 years from the time of his conviction therefor or of the establishment to the satisfaction of the Commission of definite proof of such offense.

"SEC. 16. Administration of oaths for purposes of prosecution: That such officers, agents, or employees of the Department of the Interior as may be designated in writing by the Secretary or executive officer for the purpose are hereby authorized and empowered to administer to or take from any person, an oath, affirmation, or affidavit whenever such oath, affirmation, or affidavit is for use in any prosecution or proceeding under or in the enforcement of this act.

"SEC. 17. Authorization of appropriations: That there is authorized to be appropriated,

from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and to accomplish the purposes of this act and regulations made pursuant hereto, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized out of such moneys to employ in Alaska and elsewhere such persons and means as he may deem necessary for such purposes, including printing; purchase, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; construction of aircraft hangars and other structures; restocking depleted areas; emergency feeding of wildlife; investigation of wildlife and game-fish resources and conditions; and protection and rehabilitation of Territorial wildlife and game-fish resources.

"SEC. 18. Separability of provisions: That if any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act shall for any reason be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder thereof, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or parts thereof directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

"SEC. 19. Application to Mount McKinley National Park: That nothing in this act contained shall be construed as repealing or modifying in any manner section 6 of the act of Congress approved February 26, 1917 (39 Stat. 938), entitled 'An act to establish the Mount McKinley National Park in the Territory of Alaska.'

"SEC. 20. Date effective: That this act shall become effective immediately upon its passage and approval, and shall be known by the short title of the 'Alaska Game Law.'"

With the following committee amendment:

Page 25, strike out lines 1, 2, 3, and 4.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

### AMENDING IMMIGRATION ACT OF FEBRUARY 5, 1917

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to No. 12 on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 1761, to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917. I do so because we passed this over without prejudice at the request of the gentleman from Ohio, who wanted more facts in connection with the bill. He has received those facts, and is willing to withdraw any possible objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I want an explanation of it from the gentleman from Illinois. However, Mr. Speaker, there is no use going any further, because I am going to object to raising the salary of this Commissioner of Immigration at this time. What we want is to have the immigration laws enforced.

Mr. MASON. I wish the gentleman would reserve his objection until he has had the explanation that he has asked.

Mr. RANKIN. Very well. I will reserve it for the explanation, but I am going to object.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the explanation of this bill is merely this: When there was a Commissioner of Naturalization and also a Commissioner of Immigration, each man received a definite salary. That salary in total amounted to $15,000 a year. At the time these two offices were combined and placed in charge of one man, the salary was fixed at $9,000, which is below the level of other heads of bureaus. Now, we have had difficulty in getting the type of man in charge of the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, who would do the very thing that the gentleman from Mississippi wants—namely, a better enforcement of the laws of both naturalization and immigration. We now have one such man in prospect. That gentleman in order to accept the position gave up an income of twice as much as $10,000, and we think it is only proper and right, in order to get that caliber of man that we have been wanting for some time, to place him on a par with the other heads of bureaus and grant him $10,000. That is the explanation of the bill, and I will guarantee it.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman give me this gentleman's name and address so that I may check up on him? I am a little skeptical about loading up these bureaus and making them any more topheavy than they are now.

Mr. MASON. We are not loading them up. This position is vacant at the present time, and this man was selected because of his outstanding qualifications.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman that I have figured it out exactly. We have a great many disabled veterans who are coming back from abroad, who have been injured in this war, and I think we can get plenty of them to take this job at the present salary; and if you will let it stand as it is for a short time, we will get some of these men who have been on Guadalcanal, or in north Africa, or in Europe, fighting the battles of our country, and I am sure that we can get a real, outstanding American among them to take this position at the salary now provided.

Mr. MASON. But the question, of course, is whether the fact that they have fought in Guadalcanal, or other places on the globe, qualifies them for a highly technical position.

Mr. RANKIN. And I will say to the gentleman that there are some who have disqualifications that we have not been able to get rid of.

Mr. MASON. We have gotten rid of some of these who have disqualifications.

Mr. RANKIN. Not all of them. I have in mind now a man that I understand the gentleman's committee was unable to get off the pay roll, though they proved that he had been connected with 21 subversive organizations. I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The status of the bill at the present time is that it has already gone over with prejudice. The gentleman from Mississippi has given evidence of what his action will be today. I have looked into this bill, and I join with my friend from Illinois in hoping that the bill will pass. What I suggest is that the unanimous consent request be not pressed, and I am going to ask my friend from Mississippi to personally look into the matter between now and next consent day, and I am satisfied that upon examination of the merits, he will not object, and I hope he will not.

Mr. MASON. I wish to thank the gentleman for that suggestion, and with the understanding that the gentleman will look into this matter thoroughly before the next call of the Consent Calendar, I will withdraw the request at this time.

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Illinois is withdrawn.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### SUPPLIES FOR MARTINIQUE

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention a matter which I think is of vital importance to the people, not only of America, but all the people of the United Nations. It is high time for America to stop any and all appeasement of the Laval-Vichy government in any manner, shape, or form, by direct or indirect aid.

It so happens that this very moment there is a boat by the name of *Guadaloupe* loaded with food and supplies at New Orleans, which was supposed to sail 1 week ago to Martinique. However, the seamen on this boat have struck and have declared themselves pro-Americans and refused to take any more food or supplies to Martinique as long as Admiral Robert, Chief of Martinique, maintains his pro-Vichy attitude. As a matter of fact, the United States is shipping to Martinique each month from $800,000 to $1,000,000 worth of food and supplies.

This chief ruler of Martinique has refused to cooperate in any manner with America and the United Nations. As a matter of fact, the people of Martinique are pro-American and the only reason they are not revolting is that food and supplies are being shipped from the United States. It so happens that at Martinique at this very minute, under the control of Admiral Robert there is a French airplane carrier *Berne*, two cruisers, six oil tankers, which we need desperately at this time, two big merchant ships, and many small vessels. The United Nations could use these to a great advantage if they were turned over to them, but Robert has point-blank refused. Not only that, it has come to my knowledge that over 30,000,000,000 gold francs, which is approximately $650,000,000, that should have been turned over to the United States long ago, are being held by Admiral Robert, and many suspicion that part of that gold is being sent to Vichy, France, direct

to Laval. Not only that, but General Giraud's private envoy has been cooling his heels in Puerto Rico because Admiral Robert would not let him come to Martinique as requested by General Giraud himself. It is my understanding that it was decided at the Casablanca conference that General Giraud's special envoy would be sent to Martinique to see if certain matters could be ironed out and settled with Admiral Robert.

We all realize that the true French people of France and the other French people in other parts of the world are pro-American—those gallant patriotic Free French souls still manifest that same burning patriotism that Lafayette brought to America—but under the leadership of men like Robert and Laval they are seriously being prevented from helping the cause of the United Nations.

The irony of the whole thing is that we are protecting Admiral Robert from a revolution and keeping him in charge of Martinique by giving him this food monthly, which the American people themselves need at this moment.

Two months prior to Pearl Harbor the Navy decided to take over Martinique. The Navy, so I am informed, went so far as to place the Marines on the ships for the specific purpose of occupying Martinique and it is my understanding that the Navy would have occupied Martinique if it had not been for the State Department, who turned thumbs down. This is a serious matter and I wish to call this matter to the attention of the State Department, the Navy Department, the War Department, and the Commander in Chief of our armed forces.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS TO INVESTIGATE PROGRESS OF DEFENSE-HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 121.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct an investigation of the progress of the defense-housing program, with a view to determining whether such program is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously, and economically, and with a view to determining whether the authorization of additional appropriations for defense housing purposes is necessary.

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation, or otherwise, as the committee deems desirable.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution gives the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds authorization to make further investigation as to conditions surrounding housing projects for which we have appropriated millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, unlike other committees, has expended only a small amount of money, approximately $4,000. I feel it will make such investigations as will show or bring to light whether any unnecessary housing has been erected, or whether favoritism has been shown to any States or districts.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen, we have already passed 10 or 11 resolutions authorizing investigations by 5 or 6 standing committees of the House and have also created 3 or 4 special committees, but I think of all we have authorized, the present one asked for is not only fully justified but is by far the most urgently needed.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Ramspeck resolution and the Cannon resolutions giving the Committee on Appropriations subpena power, which I supported, will render valuable service. While the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs have been given the same power as accorded them last year, I hope they will now penetrate matters further than they have heretofore. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been given special investigating authority and it should dig deep into certain contracts that were awarded.

I did not oppose the Cox resolution to investigate the Federal Communications Commission, but opposed the creation of the committee provided in the Smith resolution and also what I deemed the unnecessary continuation of the Dies committee. I am not going to call attention to certain minor investigating resolutions which I have favored, but in supporting the resolution before us I express the hope that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will obtain facts and information that will be beneficial from every point of view. Only this morning a large delegation headed by our amiable and hard-working former colleague, Hon. Edward A. Kelly, acting in behalf of the Mayor of the city of Chicago, appealed to me to assist them in having an assignment of housing allocations sanctioned to take care of approximately 20,000 families. The committee claims that other States and cities have received priorities which are being withheld from Chicago.

The shortage of housing became acute in Chicago when the War Department recognized the advantages which would inure in placing war orders in the city of greatest diversified manufacture in the United States, due, principally, to its central location and transportation advantages. Besides the plants that have been constructed within the city of Chicago, several have been built and are in the course of construction outside the city limits of Chicago. The people employed in the latter prefer to live in Chicago, having as it does, many conveniences and recreational facilities, which could only be provided in a limited way on a new project or in a mushroom community. They have found a splendid city administration under Mayor Edward J. Kelly, who just last Tuesday was again renominated for mayor, receiving 114,000 more votes than the other two Democratic and three Republican candidates combined, and a 350,000-vote majority above the highest Republican candidate.

In view of that, I feel that the Republicans can save themselves unnecessary work if they will join in making the election of our splendid mayor unanimous. I think it will be much in the interest of their own party as well as in the interest of the city of Chicago.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I am very glad the gentleman made the correction. The election is not over yet. That was just the primary.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, it is nearly over, because when people vote 4 to 1 for a man they approve, in this instance, not only his splendid administration but they also plainly and overwhelmingly recognize his stanch support of our President in our great war effort the past 4 years. I know that the good people of Chicago, when it comes to the election, will vote to continue him in office by even a still greater majority than he received in the primaries.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I wish to say at this time, but I ask unanimous consent to have the privilege of inserting in the RECORD the names of some of the Republicans holding important positions in some of the executive agencies, who, unfortunately, the Republicans characterize as crackpots.

I am inserting the names of just a few who come to mind, namely, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, and his assistants, Mr. Forrestal and Mr. Bard; the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson; the Under Secretary, Judge Patterson, and several assistants under him; Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board and, I believe his assistants, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Batt; Mr. E. R. Stettinius, Administrator of the Lend-Lease Administration; Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, and others.

I think the Republican gentlemen would desist from assailing these men holding leading positions in the Government as crackpots, because, as I understand, 90 percent of them, unfortunately for this administration, are Republicans; some of them high in the Republican Party. Naturally, the President appointed them to these high positions in the hope that they would be of great service to the country and bring about economy and efficiency in their respective branches, and also stimulate the production of materials to meet our war needs.

As I stated to the President, and say to you gentlemen now, this matter of appointments is one on which I have differed with the President. I think if he had put in some good, aggressive, economically minded Democrats, there would not have been so much criticism of the so-called crackpots and bureaucrats which we hear about so much today from the Republicans, and even from a few misguided Democrats on our side.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, after yielding 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PACE). The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to include in his remarks certain extraneous matter. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rather unique occasion in the history of the House of Representatives as the heavens are about to fall, because for the first time in the 35 years the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee has admitted in the House that a Republican had done something good.

Mr. SABATH. No; the gentleman misunderstood me; I did not admit that.

Mr. FISH. He had to go back of course quite a way, at least 75 years, but he said that Secretary Seward did the right thing in buying Alaska. That is at least a partial concession.

Mr. SABATH. There is no question about that.

Mr. FISH. I was very much interested in listening to his swan song over the Kelly-Nash regime in Chicago. I understand that finally all elements have got together in Chicago and have determined to oust Mayor Kelly on April 6. The representative of that great machine here in the House must of course deliver a swan song in advance and present all the alibis.

So far as the rule is concerned, I believe there is no opposition to it; it merely makes in order a bill extending the time of the committee to investigate national defense housing areas and find out if anything should be done in those defense areas. I was also very interested to learn about the conditions in Chicago. I thought Chicago had grabbed almost everything under the New Deal and had all the housing and national defense housing which was needed for Chicago and probably for five or six other cities as well. The gentleman from Illinois has been very jealous of Chicago; we find that the chairman of the Rules Committee through his great power and influence has seen to it that the national defense housing of Chicago was just 100-percent-plus.

If the Speaker will permit me, coming from a small district up the Hudson River, to say a few words about my own district, I would appreciate it. I thought I had accomplished a great deal last summer just before the primary election—and we had a primary election up our way last year. Some of the people in the city of Newburgh wanted to get priorities in order to repair certain houses and build two-family houses and increase the available space for the manpower that had moved in to Stewart Airfield, and two or three shipyards. So finally we got action and the National Housing Agency gave us priorities, but whether it was because I was elected or not I find that within the last few days these priorities have been taken away and all this effort has gone for naught. Naturally I am taking the floor today to urge the continuation of the powers of the permanent Committee to Investigate National Housing Conditions not only in Chicago but also in the city of Newburgh. I am calling the attention of the chairman of that committee, my very good friend with whom I have served so many years and for whom I have such great admiration, to ask him if he will do something to see that the city of Newburgh gets a little help. I would remind him that Newburgh was Washington's headquarters during the Revolutionary War for 2 years and was the cradle of liberty long before the Nash-Kelly regime was ever known in Chicago. I would like him, if he would, to kindly look into the housing situation in Newburgh, and see if something cannot be done to restore the priorities there so that we can build at least a few two-party houses and rehabilitate the old houses to take care of the personnel of Stewart Airfield and the men in the shipyards.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Everybody knows of the prominent part Newburgh played in the early history of our country which led into our constitutional government, but I noticed with a great deal of interest the gentleman's statement that Newburgh was the Cradle of Liberty. There is no question but it played an important part in the development, but I always had the impression that Faneuil Hall was the Cradle of Liberty.

Mr. FISH. That is the trouble with you people from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; just because you were fortunate enough to have some eminent historians you have assumed a monopoly of the entire history of the United States. It is true that some patriots shot their guns at the British at Lexington and Concord and those shots resounded around the world at that time. Yet there is no reason why these shots should keep on reverberating to the historical discrimination of the other 12 Colonies or States which were also in the Revolutionary War as was the great State of New York for 7 long weary years.

Mr. McCORMACK. I paid tribute to Newburgh. I just want to save my friend from himself. Sometimes a friend is a real friend when he saves another friend from himself. Unless the gentleman from New York wants to have another revolutionary war engaged in through the press he had better revise his remarks when he said there were a few guns fired off at Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill.

Mr. FISH. I hope to see the day when American history is rewritten so that all the other 12 Colonies so-called at that time are brought into the revolutionary picture and are not completely dominated and monopolized by Massachusetts. Of course, we know about the Boston Tea Party and Lexington. We have heard about Paul Revere's ride. We want to tell you, though, that the Battle of Saratoga, the most decisive battle in the whole war, was fought in the State of New York. We want you to know that Washington had his headquarters at Newburgh for over 2 years. He did not have his headquarters in Massachusetts for more than 6 months during the Revolutionary War. Even Pennsylvania was in the war. They want to be heard too.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Has the gentleman ever heard of Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell?

Mr. FISH. I think that they were overlooked by the historians from Massachusetts.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield tc the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. May I add that the only reason why Ohio did not win the Revolutionary War was because there was no Ohio at that time, or it would have won the war.

Mr. FISH. I yield now to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. If California had been in the Union as one of the Colonies, I am sure California would have taken the lead.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, unconsciously and unintentionally by reverse action the gentleman is paying the greatest tribute to Massachusetts that I have ever heard. However, I want to join with my friend from New York in his insistence that the contributions of New York during the Revolutionary War be properly recognized. There is one thing about Massachusetts, we are always willing to entertain a condescending state of mind toward New York.

Mr. FISH. I agree with that. I am going to speak in the gentleman's district in Boston on the 17th of March on Evacuation Day. I realize when I go up there to the Hub of Culture and Higher Learning that we from New York are handicapped. Nevertheless, my complaint is, and has been for a long time, that most of the fighting was done in New York and most of the talking and history writing was done in Massachusetts.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I think Illinois ought to have something to say about its contribution to the Revolutionary War.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman stated that General Washington's headquarters were in New York.

Mr. FISH. No. I said in Newburgh, N. Y., in my congressional district and where I now reside.

Mr. SABATH. For 2 years. Does not the gentleman think that if the people at that time had supported Washington and not opposed him, the same as they

are opposing Roosevelt now, he could have secured liberty and freedom for this country long before and it would not have been necessary for him to suffer these 2 long years?

Mr. FISH. I do not know whether that is a personal remark or not, but may I say to the gentleman that my great-grandfather, Nicholas Fish, was a colonel of infantry in Washington's army at Newburgh at that time.

Mr. SABATH. Congratulations.

Mr. FISH. Giving his full support to our armed forces and victory, as all of us on the minority side are doing at the present time. I would also remind the gentleman from Illinois that George Washington turned down an offer of a crown at Newburgh and later refused a third term, which example might well have been copied by the occupant of the White House.

Having won or lost the historical fight for New York—I do not know which—I want to go back to the resolution before us and ask the chairman if he will not use his influence so that the people of Newburgh may get priorities for building these two-party houses so badly needed for defense purposes.

Mr. LANHAM. Insofar as I personally am concerned, I am quite willing to follow anywhere where George Washington has lived.

Mr. FISH. That is all I am asking for and feel confident that the results will be constructive.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], chairman of the committee.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, after this splendid, patriotic verbal detour into the mysteries of history, when Paul Revere has ridden again, when once more the embattled farmers at Concord have fired the shot heard around the world, and Washington has revisited Newburgh, N. Y., may I take just a moment or two of your time to explain the pending resolution.

In the last Congress a resolution identical with this one in its terms and provision was passed and under it an appropriation through the Committee on Accounts was made of $10,000. The committee spent a little less than $4,000 of that amount in making this investigation. It was much more economical to make it in the last Congress than it will be in this Congress, by reason of certain advantages that we had formerly in the matter of transportation.

I think as much was accomplished for the good of the country in the small sum that was expended under that resolution as by any comparable amount spent in the history of this Congress. It is contemplated that under the funds which we hope to have allocated to the committee for this purpose under the pending resolution similar good results can be obtained.

May I say that all the committee will ask after the adoption of this resolution will be that it be permitted to expend in a similar investigation the amount remaining of the $10,000 allotted to the committee in the last Congress. In other words, we are not asking for 1 penny in addition to that which has heretofore been authorized; but, in view of the fact that this is a new Congress, a new resolution is required and new action by the Committee on Accounts of the House of Representatives to authorize the expenditure of the unused portion of that former allotment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I wonder if the gentleman can tell the House what percentage of the contracts now let under this defense-housing program are let to the lowest responsible bidder.

Mr. LANHAM. Unfortunately, I do not have that detailed information at hand at the present moment. Of course, that information could be given by the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, Mr. John B. Blandford, Jr., who has supervision of all public houses in the United States.

May I say concerning this particular measure that it has no reference to the F. H. A., but simply to the emergency housing for defense purposes in congested areas for the industrial workers who are moved into these areas and where housing is not available and where private capital cannot run the risk of doing this temporary construction. If this law is properly administered, it is the purpose that this money, insofar as possible, shall be recouped and returned to the Treasury when the emergency is over. It has nothing to do with slum clearance or subsidized housing for low-income groups but is purely a defense measure for the emergency to take care of the industrial workers and those officers of the Army and Navy assigned to the various plants, shipbuilding, munitions, and plane plants, where housing is not available and cannot otherwise be provided.

Mr. JENSEN. The reason I asked the question is that when the last appropriation for defense housing was before the House I offered an amendment which required that all contracts should be let to the lowest responsible bidder. The gentleman from Texas saw fit to oppose that amendment, if he recalls.

Mr. LANHAM. I do. Of course, I recall also the reasons.

Mr. JENSEN. I am thinking that if that amendment had gone through it might not be necessary to have this investigation.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to my friend that I think this investigation would be quite necessary even under those circumstances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. There has been a great deal of speed necessary in much of this housing in order to have the essential materials and munitions of war for our fighting forces. There would have been in some cases unfortunate delay incident to advertising for bids. I know that several of these contracts were negotiated, others awarded under competitive bidding. However, I may say that if this law is administered in accordance with the terms and provisions of the act, it will accomplish a wonderful purpose. No man on the committee or in this House will have cause to be ashamed of it. Our object is to follow up as closely as we can, with the multiplicity of our duties, the administration of this law, to effect the necessary economy, and to prevent the diversion of any of the funds to purposes for which it has never been intended.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. May I say in connection with the contracts that I have watched the Federal Register very closely for months, and universally in that Register the little Housing Administration is advertising for bids to be received on a certain date.

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. LANHAM. I know that has happened in many instances; but I cannot give the gentleman the percentage.

Mr. JENSEN. The reason I say I am happy to hear the gentleman make that statement is that our able chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] promised and assured us when this appropriation was before the Congress that that would be insisted upon.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; to the greatest possible extent; and we have done that.

Mr. JENSEN. I hope the committee continues to insist that these contracts be let to the lowest responsible bidder.

Mr. LANHAM. We insist upon that in every case where it is possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my 1-minute speech on Captain Rickenbacker be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

### AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS TO INVESTIGATE PROGRESS OF THE DEFENSE-HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to compliment the gentleman from Illinois and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules on reporting out the rule providing for the consideration of this bill. May I ask the chairman and the members of that committee if they will not set a hearing on my bill for rent control, which is along the same lines as this housing bill? I have received communications from all over the country expressing great interest in the investigation of rent control, and I sincerely hope the distinguished gentleman from Illinois will grant me a hearing on my bill so that the Committee on Banking and Currency, where the price-control and

rent-control bills originated, may be authorized to investigate this very vexatious problem of rent control.

Mr. SABATH. Answering the gentleman, may I state that so far we have already reported out and acted upon 11 resolutions providing for investigations. I have pending before me now about 42 or 43 other resolutions to investigate and to create committees and, in addition, have many requests for rules on important bills, so with the best of intentions I cannot take up all these things immediately. However, as soon as conditions will permit, the gentleman will be given a hearing.

Mr. ROLPH. I recognize very definitely the great burdens under which the Committee on Rules labors, but the Committee on Banking and Currency really has nothing to do at the present time except wait for this rule to come out. We have no legislation pending before our committee. The question of rent control is of paramount importance. I believe that if the committee will give me a hearing on that resolution, it will report it out.

Mr. SABATH. The Committee on Banking and Currency has a bill pending and has asked for a rule on it. Unfortunately, I have not been able to give the committee a hearing on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Nebraska to ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by a prominent banker of my district before the special Senate committee to study the problem of small business enterprises.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. It is my purpose to ask one or two questions in respect to the resolution. I note that the resolution states that its purpose is to make possible an investigation with a view to determining whether the authorization of additional appropriations for defense housing is necessary. As the gentleman perhaps knows, we went into that somewhat in the recent hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill. There was a conviction on the part of some members of the subcommittee that there is some uncertainty in respect to the merits of additional appropriations. So I hope the resolution is adopted, but I should like to ask the distinguished chairman a question. In his remarks he said it was an attempt to determine whether or not the appropriations were being expended according to the purposes of the basic law. What is the opinion of the gentleman's committee with respect to the purpose of the basic law? Is it to encourage privately financed housing or publicly financed housing? In other words, does the committee favor private construction through the F. H. A., or public-defense housing?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that my friend has asked that question. Of course, this particular law has nothing to do with the F. H. A. It has to do with emergency housing of industrial workers who are brought into localities where these various plants are established.

Mr. CASE. It has to do with F. H. A. in this respect, that both forms of housing are administered under the National Housing Agency and that if private financing with F. H. A. insurance does the job, it is not necessary to appropriate money from the Treasury for defense housing projects.

Mr. LANHAM. I was coming to the other part of the gentleman's question. We have tried to the extent of our ability and power to encourage and give preference to building by private industry. We have insisted on that in the hearings and we have had assurance from the War Production Board witnesses who have appeared before us that they would give the same priorities to private concerns that wish to put up this housing that they would give to public agencies. Our principal interest, of course, is in private housing, and we have so hedged this law with such restrictions. The act is purely an emergency measure and no public housing is supposed to be built under it in these localities where the plants are stationed except such housing as is not available otherwise through private construction or buildings already in those localities. After the emergency it is all to be sold or salvaged, and the money returned to the Treasury. In other words, it is purely legislation with reference to the war emergency to meet a condition that exists by reason of the congested areas where these workers have been assigned. We do not want them to become a financial burden on the communities where they have been taken and consequently we make provision that part of the rents shall be used in paying taxes to those communities, and when the emergency is over, then we are to recoup for the Treasury all we can by sale and salvage.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. CASE. I am very glad that the gentleman has made that statement and that the chairman has made clear his position and the intent of the committee with regard to the financing of housing projects. These things are joined in the National Housing Agency in the person of the Commissioner and in the administration of the Agency.

The question arose in our hearings as to whether the intent is to encourage privately financed F. H. A.-insured housing or public housing with Treasury funds. I am glad to say the statement by the Commissioner was the same as that given by the gentleman from Texas. Some Members, however, have been told that private builders find difficulty in getting priorities while the public housing projects sail right along.

Mr. LANHAM. I know they have, and we have insisted on private building wherever possible, and the committee has had assurance from the War Production Board representatives that they would give exactly the same priority.

Some persons have expressed another fear with reference to this legislation in the nature of a suspicion that in some of the agencies there are those who wish to divert some of these funds from such emergency construction into socialized housing after the war is over. They do not make such accusation against the administrators in charge, and I do not think such an accusation against them could justly be made, but they are suspicious of the purposes of some of the personnel. Naturally, we should like to know about that and do our best to keep the administration of this act true to the legislative intent.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, of course, we know from experience that this matter of public housing and the lack of transportation facilities has had a great deal to do with the troublesome problem of absenteeism in war industries. I would like to cite an example. We have a large ordnance plant in my district. Federal housing agencies built several hundred houses in that general area. Some of them are dormitories, some 15 miles from the plant. The problem of transportation has since entered the picture and today those houses are occupied to a small extent only. They have never been fully occupied. Many of them were never occupied. Is it the intention of the committee that its inquiry may go so far as to look into the kindred question of transportation, to inquire why many units already built have never been occupied?

Mr. LANHAM. I will say that the committee has looked into that general subject. We have the assurance of the administrative authorities that the housing will now be built within a radius of 2 miles from the plant—not more than 2 miles—which is walking distance for the workers. Not being the administrator, of course I cannot give the gentleman any definite and detailed information about any particular project, except upon inquiry of the administrative authorities.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Of course, these units of which I speak are already built. They have been standing idle for months.

Mr. LANHAM. I understand. Of, course, transportation facilities were much more available at that time. I do not know to what particular project the gentleman is referring, and would not have all the detailed information with reference to it. That would have to be secured through the Administrator.

But the purpose of this resolution is to enable us to look into those features, in order that we may not be wasting money, in order that we may not have undue vacancies, and to see that this law may be administered in accordance with its intent and provisions as economically as possible.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I will be glad to give the gentleman the data and the names and places, if the committee would look into this particular problem.

Mr. LANHAM. I would appreciate that. I would also suggest to the gentleman that he inquire of the administrator who has charge of all this housing, just why certain conditions exist of which he has complained.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON.]

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said on this floor concerning the food problem, and the shortage of manpower on the farm, and heretofore practically all the speakers have been from agricultural districts. I am speaking as one who represents a metropolitan district, or what might be termed strictly the consumers.

I am interested in this simply because it is my people who will have to suffer because of this inevitable shortage of food.

The Secretary of Agriculture and other administrative officials have recognized the present shortage by introducing what we call the rationing system, but I sincerely question whether they realize the extent of the shortage, which we are bound to have in the future. A letter was sent out by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, dated January 29, 1943, in which is stated:

> Reports reaching me from the field indicate that morale is high, and weather permitting, western farmers and ranchers will hang up some new production records in 1943.

I challenge these statements, because I have also with me a letter, which I am going to insert into the RECORD, from one of the large farmers of California.

The loss or the reduction in production for this one farm in tomatoes alone between 1942 and 1943, calculated on the point system established by the O. P. A., will equal the total amount of points allowed every man, woman, and child in my district for 2 months.

Now, these figures may sound startling, but those are some of the facts that we must face, and it is high time we are getting off our high horse, quit talking in generalities, and get down to brass tacks. These are the figures:

In 1942 this farmer raised 225 acres of tomatoes. He sold from that acreage 2,300 tons of No. 1 tomatoes. In addition to that 2,300 tons, he lost between 700 and 1,000 tons of No. 1 tomatoes in the field because of the lack of help to market them. This acreage averages approximately 15 tons per acre. Now, this year he is only going to plant 40 acres in tomatoes, or a reduction of 185 acres. Not even taking into consideration the 850 tons which he lost, but only calculating the 2,300 tons which he sold, and subtracting from it the 600 tons which he should produce this year, leaves a difference of 1,700 tons between the amount to be sold this year and the amount sold last year.

The Department of Agriculture figures show that these tomatoes will conservatively net 786 No. 2 cans per ton. One thousand seven hundred tons will equal 1,336,200 No. 2 cans, which is the reduction in tomatoes by 1 farmer alone. On the basis established by O. P. A. of 16 points per can of No. 2 tomatoes, this would show that this amount of cans would consume the total rationing points of 445,400 people for 1 month. I have an excess of 229,000 people in my district, so I say it would consume practically the 2-month quota of my constituents.

The reason that this farmer did not receive sufficient help in 1942 certainly was not because of poor wages. He hired men, women, and children, and the average season wage amounted to $8.60 per day. Bear in mind that a great many of these were Mexicans and could not earn that much money in any other line of endeavor.

This same farmer operates a 90-acre orchard of apricots, and the Government claims more apricots are needed than tomatoes. Last year he estimated that 150 tons of this fruit were lost because of insufficient help, and his average cost to the pickers was $10 per day, including men, women, and children. I have with me pictures of this apricot orchard showing the fruit which has fallen to the ground when overripe and not picked in time. These apricots sold for $67.50 per ton, showing a loss to the producers of $10,000. We, the consumers, are paying for this loss through our food shortage.

This farmer is not asking for higher prices, he is asking for help, manpower, and he has offered in his letter several practical suggestions. I know that the farmers in California have been offered verbal assistance on the importation of farm help, but to date there has been no visible means of substantiating the Government's promise, because the first thing the Government does is, not to get the help to take care of the crop and save this food for a nation, but as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] stated in his speech last week, it sends out its theorists with all of their socialized ideas attempting to put in a social system first, and then after that has been established, it attempts to bring in the needed help. We are at war. We need this food both for our soldiers, our allies, and our civilians. To these men, who are more interested in the social system than the results, I want to say, let us produce the food, win the war, and then argue over the social system after the war is won. Remember the law of supply and demand will necessitate the farmers paying sufficient wages.

Along with this point, I again ask the Department of Agriculture to be specific and show me who are the farmers, who are going to overcome the shortage, which I have substantiated.

While I realize that this is just one farmer, and these figures are very small compared with those of the entire United States, yet, it is an example of what is happening throughout America today.

I am inserting here the letter from Mr. Thorpe, who is one of the large farmers in California, and who has covered this subject in a most comprehensive fashion. He has offered some very constructive remedies:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *February 17, 1943.*

DEAR MR. POULSON: This replies to your February 12 inquiry concerning certain of my last season's farming operations.

Among other properties, I own and operated a 225-acre patch of tomatoes in the Salinas Valley, Monterey County, Calif., also a 160-acre walnut orchard, and a 90-acre apricot orchard in the same county.

On my tomato deal I used a crew of about 50 Mexicans for planting. At the end of each week during the planting season this gang struck for an additional pay raise of 5 cents an hour. In each case it had to be granted as no other planting labor was available. The job took 7 weeks, so the boys got 30 cents an hour more at the finish than at the start, for an average of 15-cents-an-hour increase from the start to the finish, so that my average planting cost was $67.50 a day more than anticipated.

These tomatoes were twice fertilized and were dusted by airplane; were several times irrigated and several times hoed for weeds, with all such operations running at much higher costs than ever before, but I produced a bounteous crop of 15 tons per acre of fine-quality tomatoes. Indeed, not a load was rejected by the canner and in all cases my percentage of culls was far below the tolerance as shown by State inspector reports.

I obtained a crew averaging about 50 tomato pickers, mostly Mexican women and children, about 25-percent Mexican men. This crew was not adequate to handle the harvest and they soon got behind. But try as I would, and did, by scouring the country from all sources, including the working of every man, woman, and child living on my farm, even my superintendent's wife and children, it was impossible to secure sufficient pickers to harvest the crop as it ripened, with the result that some of the fields could only be picked over once, many of them twice, although tomatoes should be picked over four or five times during the canning season for only thoroughly red-ripened, firm tomatoes are acceptable to the cannery and they do not all ripen at once.

The pickers worked on a contract basis of 16 cents per box. This was later raised to 18 cents. On this basis the men, women, and children engaged in this work from the start to the finish of the season averaged $8.60 per day. Hence, it will be realized that the pay was plenty high but sufficient available labor was just unobtainable.

As a result I delivered 2,300 tons to the cannery and actually lost, due entirely to unavailability of pickers, between 700 and 1,000 tons of beautiful, sound, first-class tomatoes. This loss was occasioned over approximately a 30-day period when the maturity was at its height. The tomatoes simply became overripe and then rotted on the vines.

The net result was that my tomato operations, not figuring interest on the investment, depreciation on farming equipment, including a very heavy depreciation on the trucks I used to haul the tomatoes from the field to the roadside, netted me $3,000. The depreciation on my equipment, irrigation system, etc., plus taxes on the land, are considerably more than $3,000. Hence, I took a substantial loss on the operation whereas a nice profit would have been obtainable had there been available sufficient harvesting labor.

A further result of this experience is that my tomato acreage for this season is reduced to 40 acres because it seems apparent that harvesting labor will be much scarcer this year than it was last and I cannot afford to

take the chance of losing my shirt by producing a large, expensive crop which cannot be harvested.

Our Government claims they need apricots even more than they need tomatoes. I had a similar experience on my apricot deal last year. Fully 25 percent of my crop dropped to the ground and rotted there simply because it was impossible to obtain the necessary harvesting labor though the pickers were averaging $10 a day and they were mostly men, women, and children, about 60 percent Mexicans. This fruit was sold for $67.50 a ton to the canner, which is a comparatively high and reasonably profitable price, so naturally every possible effort was made to obtain pickers, still an insufficient number were available hence the fruit rotted on the ground and at least 150 tons of first-class fruit were lost on this 90 acres. A couple of photographs of this apricot loss are attached. For your information I may advise that apricots must be picked from the trees before they become overripe. When they drop to the ground they are worthless.

In my walnut operations a similiar situation occurred. Fully 15 percent of that crop was lost due to a shortage of harvesting labor. Walnuts carry perhaps the highest nonconcentrated food value of any natural product—3,280 calories per pound of kernels, and 3,200 calories is about an average daily food ration for an adult.

As a result of last season's experiences I personally know of dozens of farmers who are greatly contracting or completely eliminating their operations in crops which they have ordinarily grown and which entail a substantial amount of labor per acre or per ton These are usually the crops that are most urgently needed by our Government for Army, lend-lease, as well as for civilian requirements.

The principal reason behind these curtailments is that our farmers are convinced that the harvesting labor situation will be very much worse this summer and fall than it was last year. They cannot afford to plant and care for these crops which are expensive to grow if they cannot get them harvested.

Most of these crops which entail considerable labor per acre or per ton are what we term heavy-tonnage crops—that is, they will produce from 10 to 25 tons per acre, whereas the crops the farmers are diverting to, which require little labor per ton or per acre, are comparatively light-tonnage crops such as grain, hay, beans, and peas, some of which are already in serious oversupply and others are in and will continue to be in ample supply regardless. However, such crops produce only from a ton to 2 tons to the acre, hence when diversion of this kind occurs the loss in tonnage of food produced is about 90 percent.

Of course, California farmers growing orchard crops simply cannot divert their orchard crops to other crops requiring less labor for the reason that in most cases these farmers have more money invested in their trees and orchard development and equipment than they have in their land. It has taken them from 5 to 12 years from planting to get their orchards into production, so they must stay with these crops. Such items as apricots, peaches, prunes, raisins, apples, nuts, and pears are what the country needs most and what they are the shortest of. While these orchardists cannot switch to other production, still, due to the current labor shortage, they cannot perform the work that is necessary to produce normal quantity and quality.

For instance, trees must be pruned, sprayed, fertilized, and several times irrigated and cultivated, the fruit on most of them thinned each year.

At present, fertilizer is practically unobtainable; experienced pruners are generally unobtainable, so many farmers are not pruning this year. Those who are find it necessary to break in inexperienced, inefficient help at very high wages if such are at all obtainable. The result is that what pruning is being done is not being efficiently done and the cost per acre is at least four times normal. The fruit thinning in the spring, which usually costs $15 an acre, will cost at least $50 where help can be obtained for it, but probably half the orchards or more will not be thinned. Many will not be sprayed and few will be fertilized. The result is certain to be a substantial shortage in the quantity of fruit and nuts produced, but unless a very material increase in harvesting labor supply is available this summer and fall, much of such fruit and nuts as are produced will rot on the ground for lack of harvesting labor.

I realize it's almost impossible for the layman to believe that a farmer will spend a year producing a crop and then let it go to waste. Certainly the farmer does not intend that this shall happen, so when the harvest season is at hand he spends most of his time rustling around scouring the country for harvesting hands, but as every other farmer is doing the same thing and the harvesting hands are not available, he has no alternative but to let a good portion of his crop go to waste.

Again, most laymen think that a man operating a so-called family-size farm can perform practically all the labor with himself and family. But what is a family-size farm? Certainly a man can hardly be expected to make a living on an apricot orchard, say, of less than 20 acres. Well, it takes 80 workers to harvest and dry a 7½-ton-per-acre crop of apricots from a 20-acre orchard. I have produced 12 tons per acre on my farm and expect 10 tons per acre this year. But this 20-acre grower can't expect to have a family of 80, so he must have extra help during the harvesting period, else his crop goes to waste. The same situation prevails in most of our other orchard crops

Now, Mr. POULSON, there is only one solution to the problem. If the Government wants these vegetable, fruit, and nut crops salvaged, they will have to import a minimum of 60,000 Mexicans and get them coming promptly so that the full 60,000 will be available not later than the 1st of July. Then, in addition, they will have to grant 60- to 90-day furloughs to men in the armed forces who have had previous agricultural experience and who are stationed in the continental United States. The Mexicans could be used on the smaller farms and the soldiers stationed in larger units on the larger farms.

For instance, one farm which I manage employs about 1,000 people in the harvesting campaign from July 1 to November 1. Here in California there are many farms which use from 100 to 5,000 people during the harvesting season. I understand that practically all European belligerents follow this system of releasing men from the armed forces for necessary agricultural harvests.

Certainly we must avail ourselves of the maximum available Mexican labor and the services of experienced Army men, else we will surely starve in this land of plenty. And, believe me, the public is going to blame nobody but the administration if such a situation is permitted to occur.

I am writing my canner for figures as to the number of cans and cases of various products which are packed per ton and will give you this in a separate letter in a few days.

And now, Mister, anything you can do toward insuring a reasonable supply of Mexican labor and obtaining temporary furloughs for the military trainees will certainly be deeply appreciated by all California farmers and surely should be by the consuming public who are the ones who will suffer most from the very severe food shortages that are certain to occur if these two steps are not promptly taken.

Sincerely,

C. THORPE,
*California Walnut Growers' Association.*

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this resolution.

About 2 weeks ago I was in Indiana and I visited one of our defense industries. I believe it is the largest naval depot in the world, known as the Burns City naval depot. The commandant of that defense project took me out to see some defense housing. He also gave me some pictures of the houses being built near that particular place. I have some of those pictures and would like the members of the committee to look them over.

These houses were started a year ago in June and they have not all been completed, but two of those that were completed have already blown down, and before occupancy. I have pictures of those houses that were destroyed and by just an ordinary windstorm.

The captain further informed me that he was not sure he would permit his employees to move into that project, consisting of 600 houses, because he did not know that it would be safe for them to live there.

I think it is the job of this committee to go there and investigate this project, look it over, and try to save some of the money that we seem to be throwing away. I have inspected those houses myself rather closely. They are flat top, prefabricated, demountable, multiple units. I found I could run my hands underneath the walls separating the various units. The different parts of the units had been prefabricated from green lumber. The lumber had warped and had left them in a terrible condition. Also, you can run your fingers between the partitions of the units and the walls.

I am not so sure but what we will have $1,500,000 largely wasted at Burns City, Ind., because of somebody's bungling.

We are also building 400 units at Seymour, Ind., in my district. Three hundred and fifty of those are prefabricated houses. There also was allocated 50 F. H. A. houses. I have a blueprint of the whole project. Thirty-five of the 50 F. H. A. houses are being built on lots that were developed some years ago by a private concern in that city. He laid the water mains, the gas mains and put up the electric light lines for 35 of those houses. The sewers and water mains are laid for all 50. So they lack only two items for the other 15, that is, the power lines and the gas mains. The power company has said that they will take down some line that they have adjoining that area which is not in use, and extend it to these other 15 houses. So the only other things needed are a small amount of critical materials to extend the gas mains. Now the War Production Board will not grant them that critical material for extending only the gas main, where the electric light and the water main and the sewer system is already installed or the material available for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I suggest the gentleman consult the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from

Illinois [Mr. SABATH], because out in my county, in a township there where they are repairing these summer homes they get all of the material for the city folks to repair their summer homes so they can come out there in the country and enjoy themselves in the summer. I am sure the gentleman can tell him, because the gentleman who is having this work done is named Sabath.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is a member of this committee, is he not?

Mr. WILSON. I am a member of the committee; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. It seems to me while you are investigating the housing that has been built by the United States Government, and paid for by the taxpayers, that you should at the same time investigate those Federal agencies which are destroying privately owned housing and are discouraging private enterprise from providing housing. I have the facts in reference to a case in a defense center in my district where a gentleman had 18 houses which were renting for $5 a month. When he died the administrator, to make these houses available for defense workers, went into court and secured an order permitting him to improve these houses, to repair them, and put them in good condition. The administrator spent considerable money and placed these houses in good modern condition, but the Office of Price Administration compels him to rent all those houses for $5 a month, the amount they were being rented for on March 1. The tenants were satisfied with the raise in rent, but the O. P. A. said "No." In another town in the same defense area a fine modern house must be rented for $6 because the O. P. A. so decrees. These properties are being rented by defense workers receiving as much as $400 per month. The Office of Price Administration, with its apparent utter contempt for private enterprise, is discouraging private enterprise from building or repairing property for defense workers; then another agency comes along and does it at the taxpayers' expense. I think that should be looked into. Is it the intent of the Government that eventually there will be only one landlord left and that would be Uncle Sam?

Mr. WILSON. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his splendid contribution.

I have this blueprint here which shows the location of those 50 F. H. A. houses; shows the water mains and everything there except the transfer of the light line for 15 houses and new gas mains. It would mean a tremendous saving to the Government if we would use a small portion of the critical material used in building temporary houses to extend this gas main and finance them privately.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman realize the number of pay rolls that will be stopped just as soon as that project is settled? Does the gentleman want that? Does he not think the pay rolls play an important part?

Mr. WILSON. They should not play such a part in these critical times. I do not think they should be hoarders of manpower today when it is so badly needed in industries.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree with the gentleman's point of view, but I still think he will find they play a part.

Mr. WILSON. I feel that many of them are probably parasites which could and should be done away with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] and ask unanimous consent that he may proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, before the Japs attacked us at Pearl Harbor I introduced in this House a bill to eliminate strikes in war industries. Shortly thereafter the President, by Executive order, adopted one provision of that bill, namely, the creation of a board to settle disputes between management and labor, and provided that the findings of this board should be final.

Today, while labor disputes shamefully threaten to stop the west-coast production of the bombing planes we must have, I reintroduce that bill and provide that if the findings of the National War Labor Board are not adhered to by either management or labor and that if such lack of adherence might cause a stoppage or interruption in production, then the Government of the United States shall be empowered to take over the operation of such plant. My bill would guarantee the continuous production of any war weapons regardless of how long labor and management might be involved in dangerous and delaying disputes.

All of the people of this country have fervently hoped that both management and labor had quit scrapping and had turned their fighting energies to answering the challenge of production. We had all hoped that everything would be forgotten except the struggle of bringing this war to a quick and victorious end.

For 8 months I had the high honor and privilege of being on active duty with the United States Navy. In many of the widely scattered areas of the southwest Pacific I saw with my own eyes how badly planes were needed. I know that planes or the lack of them will mean the difference between life and death for multiplied thousands of our men.

It makes my blood boil to see a petty, trivial dispute stop or even slow down the production of these planes and it makes no difference whether such a dispute is the fault of management or labor.

One day's production of bombing planes could have saved Java. A week's production at our present rate might well have saved our raw rubber resources. Lack of air power contributed largely to our first set-back in Africa. This very day we need more planes to smash Germany's submarine bases and to blast Hitler's arms factories. We need more planes to push Rommel and his hordes into the Mediterranean. We need more planes all over the world and it is impossible to hope for victory without superiority in the air.

It is clear that the fault in these disputes lies somewhere between management and labor. Now it seems strange to me, that if a buck private or an officer fell down on the job he would be court-martialed; how then can the guilty parties who knowingly contrive to slow down or stop production be permitted to go scot free? Do they not realize that the boys on the battle fronts are fighting for our lives and for the very lives of those who by their actions retard or deny badly needed weapons of war?

Is this justice? Is this part of our victory drive? Is this the way we answer the pleas of our boys all over the world? Is this the way we hope to win the war?

It seems that there are still many who spend more time thinking of fat profits than they do about Hitler and Hirohito. There are still some in this country who believe that they have a God-given right to cash in on the tragedy of war. There are still those who believe, even when they know the true strength of our enemies, that we can still cling to the peacetime belief that this war can be won on a part-time, spare-time basis.

The philosophy of what can we get out of this war will prove fatal. It must be supplanted by the patriotic theme of what can we give and what can we do to bring this war to a speedy and successful end.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentleman from Michigan stated that I could bring about the elimination of special priorities to some people in his State for summer homes. I never had either the opportunity or the pleasure of visiting that section, nor have I ever aided or assisted anyone there. If I had been so inclined—and I never was—I do not think my influence would be any greater than that of the chairman of this committee. We are reporting this resolution, the gentleman understands, to give this splendid committee the right and opportunity to make their investigations wherever there are reasons to believe or circumstances indicating that something may be wrong. They will report it to the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to correct a misunderstanding?

Mr. SABATH. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not mean to intimate that the gentleman from Illinois who is talking had anything to do with that. The remotest connection was that the man who was having the work done was named "Sabath." I did not think for a minute that the chairman of the Committee on Rules was having it done. I was just trying to show how even the name carried great influence. I wish the chairman of the committee would come over and see us some time; it would improve his health and he would enjoy himself.

Mr. SABATH. I have never been able to use a summer home; I have been too busy working both summer and winter. I do not know of any Sabath who has a home there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He is a fine young fellow.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak somewhat out of order, but also on a subject that has a direct bearing, I may say to the chairman of the committee, on this bill. First of all, I listened with great interest to the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas regarding the question of work stoppages in plane plants. Like the gentleman, I have had a little first-hand knowledge on how important the plane is in the Pacific and other areas.

May I say to the House today that I deplore the fact it happened as much as anyone else that there was some dispute which arose in my home city of Seattle regarding the Boeing Aircraft workers. I can report to the House that the matter has all been cleared up. There never was any intention on the part of the workers to have a strike or a work stoppage. I have the figures from the management and it so happens that they lost approximately 2 hours and 15 minutes on 1 day. Management and labor worked hand in hand in the Boeing plant. Those workers had a mass meeting in protest not of the management but of a Government bureau that has been sitting for 8½ long months on a decision it should have made a long time ago. They have agreed to work 6, 8, or 10 hours on any Sunday or any other day they are off to make up for the 2½ hours that were lost. It is all straightened out now and the bureau, I understand, is going to make a decision on the matter this week. They should have done that a long time ago.

While we are on the subject of strikes, I want to read to the House part of a report made by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself. We spent about 30 days investigating Pacific coast shipyards and labor conditions and production in that area. This has a direct bearing on housing. I do not think, of course, that we should tackle all of our problems, but we ought to get to the major problems first. I may say to the Members of the House that in the shipbuilding industry of the Pacific coast, and I think this is typical of all over the country, strikes and shutdowns are no problem at all. Your committee had this to say—

Absenteeism: Another problem was the tragic loss of man-hours due to absenteeism. As a part of this report there is submitted a chart from the California Shipbuilding Co. in Los Angeles on the subject of absenteeism, which is typical of the situation on the coast. Although it is a broad subject, and one dealing with human nature, someone must take hold of the problem of instilling into workers' minds a realization of the critical necessity of staying on the job. There is far too great a tendency, as may be seen from this chart, toward unnecessary absenteeism. For instance, since your committee has returned to Washington, reports have reached it that during the past holiday period there was more absenteeism than ever before. The labor organizations to which the employees belong should thoroughly cooperate in the solution of this problem. The committee found in many instances that union leadership has already been very active in this respect. It is suggested that the Navy Department should collaborate with the unions and management in a program designed to impress upon workers the absolute necessity of remaining on the job.

Your committee made no detailed study of the question of strikes and shut-downs in the shipyards. There have been few of any consequence on the Pacific coast since the master agreement was entered into. However, it must be noted that the Bureau of Ships has reported that during 1942 there was a total of 16 strikes and shut-downs in shipyards engaged on naval work, resulting in the loss of approximately 170,000 man-hours. According to the bureau, this loss on naval work, covering the entire United States, is negligible compared to the losses resulting from absenteeism. The Bureau report seems to coincide exactly with your committee's conclusion as to the west coast yards. Throughout the Nation, in the month of December alone, a total of over 12,700,000 man-hours is estimated to have been lost through absenteeism in shipyards engaged in the construction and repair of naval vessels. A comparison between this and the loss through shut-downs adequately explains why the Bureau considers the shut-down problem negligible as compared to absenteeism. "It will be noted," says the Bureau, "that for only 1 month this is roughly 75 times the number of man-hours lost through strikes an ' shut-downs over the course of the whole year." Loss through absenteeism represents nearly 10 percent of the total man-hours worked during December. The Bureau further states that the most serious aspect of this situation is the fact that the tendency toward absenteeism is steadily increasing. In the Pacific coast area there was an increase of from 5.7 percent to 7.7 percent during the year.

All studies indicate the peak of absenteeism is reached over the week ends, with absences on Saturday and Monday accounting for almost 40 percent of the total man-hours lost. As pointed out in this report, causes include lack of adequate housing and transportation, quitting without notice (which results in workers being carried on the books as absentees), high earnings, long hours (resulting in time being taken off for shopping), weather, and the nature of the work. The deplorable thing about this absenteeism is that none of the reports from the Department of Labor or the Bureau of Ships show that either sickness or accidents played an important part in it. The Bureau reports that one company, with an absenteeism rate of 11.8 percent, showed thorough detailed analysis that industrial injuries accounted for only 1.8 percent and sickness for only 0.3 percent. Absenteeism is the most serious manpower difficulty in the shipbuilding industry. A vigorous publicity campaign is being conducted against it by both employer groups and labor unions.

I may say to the gentleman from Texas that one of the causes of absenteeism in the shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast in particular is due to lack of housing or the placement of houses in proper places. It is one of the reasons why men are absent. They cannot find a place to live. Many of these yards are overmanned and overstaffed, transportation is bad, and many times they have found, in studying this matter, that it is because the housing has not been adequately taken care of or placed in the right places.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman from Washington realizes that from the standpoint of the committee we do not decide upon the location of the housing. That is an administrative matter. I may say further that thus far all the money has been supplied both through the committee and by appropriation that has been asked for to meet the urgent demand for housing in these areas.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is why this particular legislation is very important. It is one of the causes, although not the predominant cause.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include excerpts from General Hines' statement made to a subcommittee on appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss this afternoon, not as an expert but as one profoundly interested in the matter and who has done his share of thinking about it, the food-production problem which we face in America. First, I want to make a general observation.

America is in the greatest war in its history. She has to depend generally on three motives to carry her through successfully. One of those motives is the motive of patriotism. It is the highest and best of all and must be drawn upon by every group and every person. Beyond that there are two possibilities: One is a general draft—of manpower, industrial facilities, and wealth—with governmental direction of the actions of our people. The other is the motive of reasonable incentive of holding forth a fair and reasonable inducement to secure the action which is needed from a national standpoint.

As a general proposition, most of us will probably agree that to the extent we can retain this last motive we will be better off. In other words, to the extent that we can have not only the motive of patriotic devotion to our country to get the things done we need to have done, but also an incentive on the people's part to get them done, we will be that much stronger.

I want to put a few things on all-fours with each other when I start. The proposition of permitting profit to be made in the manufacture of war equipment and the proposition of allowing overtime pay for work beyond a certain number of hours per week, and the proposition of fair prices to our farm producers, and

the proposition of a fair wage to farm labor, are on all-fours with one another in this consideration. Any one is exactly the same kind of thing and has the same general sort of effect as the others. If you are going to do away with any of them and go to some other system, then you face a basic decision which is fraught with serious consequences. So, in my speech I am assuming that we are going to try to secure the war production we need and solve our problems by the use of reasonable incentive to our people to accomplish the things our country must have accomplished and that we will attempt to avoid compulsion as long, at least, as we can.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I recall the gentleman introduced a bill in October 1939, to take the excess profits out of our war efforts.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; along with the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct. I introduced a similar bill at the same time, having the same purpose. I assume there is no inconsistency in what the gentleman is now saying and his proposal at that time. I feel that I am perfectly consistent in allowing reasonable profits as an incentive while demanding that unusual, war profits be taxed.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman and I introduced like bills. They were tax bills. Now, I say to the gentleman that the tax rates we proposed in our bills at that time were probably not as high as the tax rates that are presently in effect. All we were trying to do was to prevent the making of millionaires out of the war. There was ample incentive left under our bills, because they applied only to profits in excess of normal earnings and even then the rates were graduated.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is exactly true.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think there can be no doubt in anyone's mind at present but that next to the military fighting on the fronts of this world the most important and serious problem America faces is the problem of food production. In consideration of the whole matter of farm prices, farm manpower, the availability of machinery, and everything else, it is not, in my judgment, either accurate or fair to talk about those things as though it were simply a drive on the part of some so-called farm bloc to get something for a special group. The major and fundamental proposition is to try to have a situation where we can be certain to secure the maximum food production, which the Nation must have.

I discount completely talk about farmers being unwilling to go ahead, or stopping their work. I do not think that will happen under any circumstances where it can possibly be financially avoided by a farm operator in America. But I do think we have a duty to be sure they can go on as they desire to do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman believe we are ever going to get sufficient men to work the farms as long as the factories pay wages two or three times what a man can make on the farm?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am coming to that in my speech in the normal course, and I would rather not speak on it now, if the gentleman does not mind.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Very well; that is all right.

WHY RATIONING?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to put myself on record as believing this, because I know it is not going to be very popular in the next few months. I think wherever we have a scarcity of any type of commodity, particularly if it is an important one, we must in fairness have a rationing program to see that such supplies of that commodity as we do have are fairly distributed among the people. I know the operation of those rationing programs is not going to be very popular, but I do not know any other way to do it properly and to make sure that these scarce commodities reach all sections of the country and all sections of the population on a fair distribution basis.

It seems to me that the factors in this food-production problem fall into four general categories: First, the matter of price; second, the matter of manpower; third, the matter of machinery; and, fourth, the matter of a balance of production, by which I mean the securing of those crops in sufficient quantity which are particularly needed in view of the present situation. I shall discuss as many of these as I have time for this afternoon. I shall try to supply some constructive answers.

NEED FOR SIMPLIFICATION

May I make one over-all observation? If there is one thing that is needed more than anything else it is a need for the maximum possible amount of simplification of the farmers' present problems, the removal of as much red tape, conflicts of responsibility, and confusion as possible. May I illustrate with three or four examples.

I have not been able to see why in connection with the meat problem, which has been a serious thing in our section of the country, we could not avoid all the difficulties connected with the application of the 70-percent quotas on deliveries to the civilian trade by simply saying to the Army and Navy and other governmental purchasers, "You have first priority. You have first right to buy meat. You can purchase as much as you need for our armed forces and for other war purposes, but as far as the limitations on delivery for civilian trade are concerned, we are not going to have a system like that. All we are going to say is that the first right is to the armed forces and to other governmental purchasers, and the civilians will in the normal course receive on the basis of fair distribution whatever is left over." It seems to me that would avoid a whole lot of red tape and difficulty, which now surrounds the meat problem.

Another example of the same sort of thing occurs with regard to machinery. It seems to me there ought to be a definite centralization of this whole farm-machinery program in one farm-machinery administrator, and everybody ought to know who he is. The War Production Board ought to make one over-all allocation of as much steel and as much equipment as is possible to be given to agriculture, and thereafter allocations of that machinery and repair parts should be made to the various counties of the country on the basis of what the local county war boards say is needed in their areas, rather than what someone in Washington decides may be needed. All this should be in the hands of the Agriculture Department and nowhere else.

I think there needs to be definitely one agency responsible for farm manpower. At present there are three or four, and nobody seems to know exactly which one really has the responsibility in certain areas. That situation ought to be ended at once and there should be one agency, that everyone in the country would know was responsible for all phases of that problem.

As far as the farmer is concerned, I should like to see him able to go to just one place in each county in this country, insofar as possible, where all these various things that he has to contact the Government on could be centralized—gasoline, machinery, labor, and all the rest. For example, I should like to see one simple application for all the gasoline and oil the farmer is going to need for any purpose, approved by the county war board, and to have this complete his contact with the whole gasoline rationing program. That is what Mr. Jeffers has been contending for, and I think he is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In his proposal, does the gentleman appreciate the fact that, while this simplification is undoubtedly economically feasible, a lot of the so-called specialists would be let out of their positions, and that would be a rather uncomfortable position for them to be found in.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the other consideration is more important, I may say to the gentleman. I believe simplification of this thing is very necessary.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am in accord with the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understood that, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Now, I want to make it plain that I am in support of the efforts of our Government to prevent inflationary increases in living costs. The only fundamental way to do that is by monetary controls, taxation, and compulsory savings, so as to keep total buying power in line with the total supply of goods. But to do it effectively by this method we would, as a Congress, have to go much further than we have along all three of these

lines. So we fall back on price control. I do not think we can expect to completely prevent any increases. Some adjustments, in fairness and equity, will need to be made. Some Government workers, like postal workers, need and deserve an increase. People dependent on old-age payments need, very much, enough more dollars a month to at least make up for increased living costs. Price ceilings for some businesses will need adjustment as a result of the recent 48-hour week order. And some farm prices will, in my opinion, have to be allowed to increase, as I will in a moment show.

To guard our children's health, I hope, meanwhile, we will, as a war measure and one that we could well continue into peacetime, extend our school lunch and penny milk programs. I shall speak more of this at some future time.

WHAT PRICES SHALL THE FARMER RECEIVE?

I come now to a discussion of farm prices. First it seems to me perfectly plain that if we are to get sufficient production, that no price upon any commodity in any portion of the country ought ever to be fixed where the ceiling on that commodity is below the cost of production. That seems to me to be self-evident. One of the members of the California delegation, [Mr. ELLIOTT], has introduced a bill, H. R. 2009, which would provide that under the so-called Anti-Inflation Act no ceiling price could be fixed below a reasonable cost of production for a farm commodity. That bill is the result of discussion and action by the California delegation in the House. I have an example of what happened in one case in my own country, the county of Los Angeles. There the price of milk was raised late in the month of January from 97 cents per pound of butterfat to $1.08 per pound of butterfat. This action was taken under the State law of the State of California by the California Milk Control Board after exhaustive hearings in which representatives of both producers and consumers were heard. On February 13, an over-all freeze order on milk prices was issued by the Office of Economic Stabilization, providing that prices of milk should be no higher in any portion of the country than the highest price received in January. Since the milk price fixed by the California Milk Control Board did not go into effect until February 1, this action on the part of the Government had the effect of lowering the price back to its previous level.

Figures on the cost of production for dairymen in the Los Angeles area indicate beyond reasonable doubt that this price represents a return to dairymen below their cost of production. That cost includes among other things the payment of wages of some $200 per months to their milkers. This wage, moreover, must compare with wages in shipyards and aircraft factories and it is no more than just that agricultural workers receive something like the same compensation as industrial workers do for equally important work.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentleman from California is not quite right. It was the October price that was referred to. That 97 cents would have been all right in October, but by January it had risen to $1.08.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I had considerable consultation with dairymen from our country out there, and they told me they were perfectly willing to pay these wages, but that they should have a price which would enable them to do so. The price of alfalfa hay increased from $23 in October to $40 before the price was stabilized at about $31.50 delivered to these dairymen, an increase of about 25 percent over October. From all the evidence at my command I am convinced that the price fixed by the California Milk Control Board was not too much and was a reasonable price. I believe that if the price ceiling in that area or in any other area is fixed below the cost of production, that it ought to be adjusted at once so as to at least cover such costs.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I notice that it says in today's paper—and my people are fed this sort of literature—that the meat prices were fixed on March 15, and that because Boston observes Lent, they allowed you in Los Angeles a higher ceiling, and it seems to me that if they had the same ceiling in Boston, we would be all right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Los Angeles is a long way off, and the freight charges are considerable. We have been extremely short of meat out there for a long, long time; probably more so than any other part of the country.

Mr. GIFFORD. The point I am making is this, Does the gentleman think we should be punished in Boston for observing Lent?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Oh, no; certainly not. I may say that we observe Lent, too, in California. I would like now to read to the House a portion of a letter that I recently received. It is from Mr. Benjamin, the secretary of the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau Cooperative Association.

It reads in part as follows:

> If we are no longer able to purchase wheat on the basis that we have heretofore been purchasing, it will mean an immediate increase on poultry feeds of some $10 to $14 per ton according to the amount of wheat used, and in dairy and other feeds in proportionate amounts.
>
> Poultrymen are at this time purchasing the baby chicks that will lay the eggs and furnish the meat for the consumers in the latter part of 1943 and the fore part of 1944. A poultryman cannot be expected to make the necessary investment in poultry flocks if there is no possibility that he can operate these flocks on a basis where he can have a reasonable expectancy of getting a return of the money invested, plus enough money to provide a livelihood for himself and his family. The same thing holds true with the dairyman.
>
> Coming almost identically with the wheat situation is the announcement of the ceiling price on eggs, a ceiling, by the way, which apparently is aimed to discourage not only an increased production of eggs but to decrease the already inadequate supply. One of two things must be done immediately if we are to have dairy and poultry products that will come anywhere near to supplying the demand. Either make available immediately ample supplies of wheat now being held with the Commodity Credit Corporation for feeding purposes at prices no higher than they have been, or else take the other and perhaps preferable course—immediately remove all price restrictions or ceilings affecting both dairy and poultry products and let the price range be governed by the demand which I am sure will adequately take care of the increased cost of production.

I believe that is a very significant letter, and I quote it, as will be seen, not because it comes from my own district but because of its Nation-wide importance.

In the first place, Mr. Benjamin urges support of the bill now before the Agriculture Committee to free 100,000,000 bushels of Commodity Credit Corporation wheat, because he says it is absolutely necessary for poultrymen and dairymen to provide them with feed, and, in the second place, he points out that at the present time dairymen and poultrymen are finding it very difficult to plan for the future and are even threatened with being forced to go out of business, in view of the ceiling prices set and in view, on the other hand, of the rising cost of feed and other costs of production. He urges the removal of the ceiling prices. I do not know whether you could completely remove price ceilings, but I do say that they should be adjusted upward to cover the cost of production. And I know that ceiling prices on poultry products in the Los Angeles area, as well as milk prices there, are having the same effect as Mr. Benjamin describes for Pennsylvania. So, though I would be the last to want to increase living costs unnecessarily, I say these ceilings must be lifted if we are to get the production we simply must have.

Low-priced food is good if it can be fairly had. But it is more important that we have sufficient food.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield briefly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I received a letter from Nat Dysart, of Phoenix, Ariz., speaking for the dairy industry in that part of the State, and his picture of their situation is about the same as the gentleman has presented. Perhaps the problem is uniform throughout the country.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

In all considerations, whether by Congress or the O. P. A. or the Department of Agriculture or anybody else, maximum production must be the first consideration and low prices have to be second. The rule must be that no action should be taken which will reduce production.

In this connection, there is a difference between the problem with regard to the so-called basic crops on the one hand and some of the specialty crops that are

raised in a State like California, on the other. I happen to be in sympathy with the fundamental principle of the Bankhead bill that the Senate recently passed, because I think it is fair and just. But that is not going to solve much of the problem for the dairymen and the poultrymen, the citrus grower, or a lot of the people who grow specialty crops. Indeed, the raising of prices of the so-called basic crops sometimes works to the disadvantage of these other farmers since it may increase the cost of their feed. This must be borne in mind.

Now, there has been legislation before the House providing for the inclusion of farm labor costs in the computation of the parity formula. I have done a lot of thinking about this proposal. It has seemed to me, as I have thought about it and as this problem has developed, that there was a great deal of merit in that proposal, because probably the fundamental reason for the shortage of agricultural manpower has been the fact that farm incomes generally have been less than other people's incomes through the years. That has been true both on the farmer's side and on the hired help side of the picture.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In just a moment.

I am more and more of the belief that if there were inclusion of farm labor costs in the parity formula and a provision for increases in labor costs in the ceiling prices in every case, that might help tremendously toward solving the basic problem that has existed wherein farm wages have been laid down because farm income has not been large enough to allow for payment to farm labor of wages more nearly in line with other wages. I realize this is a very big question. But I am also convinced there is a fundamental principle of justice involved.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understood the gentleman to say that in his judgment farm labor should be included in the parity price.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it true that in your country, help, milking cows, gets $200 and $250 a month?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes. In some instances they do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And that cost is added on to the price that is charged the consumer, is it?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes. I said I believed the price that has been fixed was not enough to enable the dairyman to make both ends meet, and I think the ceiling must be raised.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The trouble is that the hired help instead of the owner of the cow was getting the raise.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The wages were as I said. I also said the dairymen talked to me about the matter and the dairymen said that they had to pay wages like that in order to compete with the wages in the airplane and shipyard industries, just as the gentleman said. They had no complaint about that phase of it, but all they asked was that their price enable them to cover it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you not think that our farmers——

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say to the gentleman that I do not care to yield further. I have a speech here that I would like to make.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But you just glossed over that part which affects us in the East.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have not glossed it over.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you think that our hired men on the farm should get $200 and $250 also? Why should they not?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It depends on what they are doing, of course. These milkers are very highly skilled workers, and I frankly doubt that farmers generally could possibly pay wages anything like that. That is the very thing we must, in my opinion, face up to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They are trying to produce beef for you people in California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would rather not yield further at this point. I will simply say that I hope we can work toward a fair and just relationship between farm incomes all along the line and other incomes.

THE SMALL FARMS

The problem of farm production affects not only the 1,000,000 farmers in this country who produce the bulk of our farm production and receive about one-half of the farm income and who ordinarily hire considerable labor, but it also has to do with a considerably larger number of what I might call small-farm operators. Those operators of small farms by and large do their own work. There are about 5,000,000 of them. They are people who do not hire very much labor, and their production can in many cases, in my judgment, be increased considerably if they can have reasonable assistance, particularly if they can be assisted with really cheap credit in purchasing a little livestock and improving some of their farm practices. These small farmers are a most important factor in helping their country at this time.

Some of these farmers' own production on their farms has not got up to this "16 units of production" standard that was set up for exemption from the draft. I believe that that standard is going to have to be liberalized. It would certainly be wrong in the present situation for a farm operator to be drafted. Rather than that, I would want to see him able to increase his farm production. And I am convinced that is not only possible but is happening. I would like to point out that in the case of 80 percent of the people who have received so-called rehabilitation loans from the Farm Security Administration, those loans have been repaid currently. That, in my opinion, is proof of the character of these people.

Figures which I want to insert at this point in my speech on the increases in production for which these small farms have been responsible in the last year, are to me very inspiring figures. Here is an element in the possibility of increased food production which sometimes is not discussed as much as it should be and which must be taken fully into account. For it may offer us more hope than we can have from any other direction.

For example, I will give you one figure on the increased production of dried beans.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics figures indicate that 27 percent of the increase came from people who were borrowers from the Farm Security Administration and that 10 percent of the increase in the production of eggs came from the same group.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put that table in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

*Increases in production of essential crop and livestock products between 1941 and 1942 by all farmers and by Farm Security Administration borrowers*

| Product | All farmers | | F. S. A. borrowers | | Percent of net increase by all farmers contributed by F. S. A. borrowers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Amount increase, 1941–42 | Percent increase | Amount increase, 1941–42 | Percent increase | |
| Milk (pounds) | 3,914,000,000 | 3 | 1,419,000,000 | 20 | 36 |
| Pork (pounds live weight) | 2,252,000,000 | 13 | 192,400,000 | 36 | 9 |
| Eggs (dozen) | 516,000,000 | 15 | 49,800,000 | 31 | 10 |
| Beef (pounds live weight) | 1,767,000,000 | 11 | 124,300,000 | 38 | 7 |
| Chickens (pounds live weight) | 366,365,000 | 14 | 37,100,000 | 36 | 10 |
| Peanuts (pounds) | 1,028,000,000 | 70 | 101,700,000 | 88 | 10 |
| Soybeans (bushel) | 104,000,000 | 98 | 3,360,000 | 106 | 3 |
| Dry beans (pounds) | 110,500,000 | 6 | 30,100,000 | 34 | 27 |
| Sugar beets (ton) | 1,616,000 | 16 | 113,000 | 24 | 7 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Total number of all farmers | 6,097,000 |
| Number of actively supervised Farm Security Administration borrowers producing in 1942 | 463,941 |
| Proportion of all farmers who were actively supervised Farm Security Administration borrowers, percent | 7.6 |

Mr. VOORHIS of California. So I think in the first place that we have a problem of price, where that price has got to be a price that is fair and just to the farmer. I am in sympathy with my colleagues who believe that it should not be below parity in any case. I think they are right. I believe the price of citrus fruits should not have been fixed below parity, as was done with the result that orange growers in my section are at present having a most difficult time. I believe their prices should be at parity, not below it. I am also certain that no price ever ought to be below the cost of production in any case; and I

should like to see the cost of farm labor included in the formula. And in the case of these small farmers who comprise about five-sixths of the whole farm population of this land there should be pressed vigorously every means of enabling those people to raise some livestock and improve their farm practices as they are unable to do with the Farm Security rehabilitation loan program, so that they can continue to account for increases in our food supplies.

MANPOWER FOR FOOD PRODUCTION

In the matter of greater food production we come face to face with the problem of manpower. There are two different problems in connection with this; one is the problem of the regularly employed year-around skilled farm hand; the other is the problem of seasonal labor for the harvesting of crops. These two problems are entirely different and distinct, it seems to me. In connection with the first one, the securing of competent year-round labor, I am ready to go to the extent of making it possible for a farmer to make an appeal to the local draft board, or perhaps to let him take it to his county War Board, so that where an irreplaceable man has been drafted into the Army off the farm, he could get that man furloughed out of the Army to do this all-important farm work. And certainly we should not draft any more such essential farm workers at all. The next problem, that of seasonal labor, has got to be solved too, but it will involve different measures.

America is in the midst of total war and part of the cost of total war has been shortage of manpower on our farms, partly because the income of the farm people is below the income of the other people, partly due to other causes. We need labor every place; we need it in industry; we need it on the farms; we need it in a hundred and one different places. And we need men for the fighting forces. So I say with regard to the furnishing of this seasonal labor that we have got to do everything we can think of to draw upon all kinds of groups. So far as possible, they should be people with at least some familiarity with agricultural work. Some of this labor probably will come from high-school boys and girls, supervised wherever possible by some of their teachers. Some of it will come from people who may go out of other occupations and be able to do this sort of work. Some can be recruited in those few portions of the country where there are still people not fully employed. Some of this work may be done by people who could be spared temporarily even from other jobs in order to help with it. Some of this labor we are trying to bring from our neighboring Republic of Mexico. I should not object at all to seeing us take a recess in Congress and some of us helping out on it. From all groups possible this farm labor will have to be recruited in an orderly way. In any case, the point I am making is that there is not any easy solution of this problem of seasonal farm labor except that the responsibility for its recruitment has got to be put in one place, with one agency; and that agency should be responsible for the recruitment, mobilization, transportation, housing, and placement of those workers. It must also be recognized that if a Government agency is to recruit labor—especially if the workers come from a foreign country—there must be some responsibility for housing, wage standards, and similar conditions, as well as for seeing that the workers do effective work for the farmer. And now I am not going to get into an argument about what agency ought to do it; I know it ought to be one agency and I know that the time has passed when there should be any argument. Personally, it is my opinion that the Farm Security Administration can do the job, and that on the whole, in spite of some complaints, that they are better qualified perhaps than anybody else to go all the way through with it; but I am not going to talk about that; one agency should have charge, whether it be the Farm Security, the Extension Service, or some other. A long time ago California farmers urged that a special and separate farm-labor section be established in connection with the United States Employment Service. Had that been done, it might have answered the problem. The essential thing now is to definitely centralize this responsibility at once.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Briefly.

Mr. CURTIS. In reference to using young people, students, on farm work, assuming that they are physically able to do it, what are you going to do to stop them from going into industry and getting the higher wages that have drawn away a great deal of farm labor?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know what you are going to do to stop people from going into industry unless you want to freeze labor.

Mr. CURTIS. Is not that the difficulty with farm labor?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Unless you freeze labor all of the way along the line, I do not see how you can stop people from going into certain jobs. But in California at least we do not have any great number of high-school boys and girls going into industry on account of the child-labor laws.

Mr. CURTIS. Is that not where most of the farm labor comes from?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. A good deal of it; yes, sir.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think the answer to the gentleman from Nebraska would be that these youths would have to have a permit to work in those factories.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; they would.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If this food problem is serious enough, it would surely never be required to have any permit for these younger people to work.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right, so far as agriculture is concerned. I thank the gentleman very much.

SOIL CONSERVATION CAN BE A POSITIVE, NOT A RESTRICTIVE, PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, in the course of conversation on the floor about this farm problem, two or three gentlemen have gotten up and said that they thought we ought to repeal completely the Soil Conservation Act. I want to address myself to that for a few moments because the fact of the matter is—and I am not going into a whole lot of detail about it—that 3 percent of our good farm land in this country, or 57,000,000 acres, has been completely destroyed by erosion, another 12 percent of it, or 225,000,000 acres, has lost about three-quarters of its good top soil, and three-fourths of our croplands today are in need of some type of erosion control. And now, with more extensive use of our soil required than ever before, there is correspondingly greater need to guard and protect it. I have some figures here—and I ask unanimous consent to insert them with my speech in the RECORD—on the yield per acre of wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, soybeans, and flaxseed for the 5-year period from 1928 to 1932 and the 5-year period from 1938 to 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I hope you will notice the difference between these figures and the increased yield per acre in the later period, which certainly is in large part the result of the operation of the Soil Conservation Act.

*Average yield per acre, 1928–32, 5 years before Soil Conservation Act*

| Crop: | | |
|---|---|---|
| Wheat | bushels | 14.14 |
| Corn | do | 24.66 |
| Cotton | pounds | 173.92 |
| Peanuts | do | 683.44 |
| Soybeans | bushels | 14.16 |
| Flax seed | do | 5.76 |

*Average yield per acre, 1938–42, 5 years after Soil Conservation Act*

| Crop: | | |
|---|---|---|
| Wheat | bushels | 15.88 |
| Corn | do | 30.4 |
| Cotton | pounds | 248.62 |
| Peanuts | do | 739.02 |
| Soybeans | bushels | 18.94 |
| Flax seed | do | 9.26 |

I think that payments to farmers for engaging in these soil building practices are justified for the reason that he, the farmer, usually makes some sacrifice, financially, to carry them on. I do not think they are subsidies. They are simply payments to enable farmers to preserve the greatest heritage we have to give to future generations of America, namely, the heritage of a fertile soil.

At the moment it is absolutely necessary that we secure certain types of crops for this war which have not in the past been extensively grown. I am not in favor of having any program in effect which will reduce the production of anything we need. I think lifting of all restrictions on wheat was absolutely right. I do think that the Soil Conservation Act can be used positively instead of as a means of restriction and I think it is necessary that it be used positively now, so as to offer an inducement and an incentive to farmers to produce those types of crops which they have not been normally producing and which are sometimes difficult to produce but which America today needs very much for this war.

Mr. Speaker, there are several phases of this food production problem which I have not time to discuss now. One of them is the necessity of an adequate supply and sensible distribution of machinery. I will conclude with these thoughts.

America today is at war. American soldiers are dying on the fields of Tunisia and in the south Pacific. It is useless for Members to get up on the floor and say that we should by some magic waving of the congressional hand bring back the good old days. We are not in the good old days. We are in the most terrible crisis in all the history of America, and every resource of this Nation must be bent toward winning of this war and supplying the sinews thereof. Our economy is twisted all out of shape by this war and we cannot help that fact. Every group is going to suffer to some extent. But the one principle of all-out maximum production must be paramount to all others. Your Agricultural Committee is taking up a complete consideration of this whole problem of food production. I hope the committee will do this with a completely open mind and with only one objective in view, namely, the securing of the maximum possible balanced production of agricultural commodities, both for the war period and for the future of our country and the world.

Next to actual military operations on the fighting front there is no problem so crucial for America at the present time as that of food production. No action, whether it be in the passage of legislation by the Congress, or in the fixing of price ceilings, or in the determination of manpower policies, which has the effect of reducing agricultural production can be justified in the present situation. It is the duty of Congress to insist by legislation, if necessary, that in the consideration of the fixing of prices not only the restraining of inflationary rises in the cost of living be considered but also the effect of such action upon the production of an adequate supply of food.

The time has passed when a negative attitude toward the problem of food production on the part of any governmental official, any Member of Congress, farmers, consumers, or anybody else will answer the problem. There has got to be a vigorous advocacy of the necessity of abundant food production in America and it is no good merely complaining about the things that are wrong. Constructive action must be taken at once with regard to each of these matters. And above all there must be simplification and streamlining of all the contracts our farmers have with governmental agencies. I believe this can be accomplished, I believe it must be.

No over-all panacea will answer the problem, nor will the repeal of all existing agricultural legislation answer it. The problem is far deeper than that and must be considered in the light of the fact that America is in the midst of the greatest and most terrible war in all the history of the world, wherein her need for food and for fiber is greater than ever before in history. The production record of our farmers for 1942 broke all records in spite of difficulties. In 1943 we must do everything needful to make it possible for our farmers to do at least as well again.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes at this time, notwithstanding other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL]?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Is that in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request is in order and if the House unanimously agrees the Chair may recognize the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, there are other special orders, of which I have one.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are 2 hours and 15 minutes of special orders.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have notified others that I would yield 5 minutes extra time if they asked me, but I will yield for no further extra time. I would not request more than 5 minutes extra time. We have done it in some cases of outstanding speeches of the kind I cannot make.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, there are one or two things that have come to my attention through the public press in the last few days that after listening to the most interesting speech of the distinguished gentleman from California I want to call to the attention of the House. I am very much interested in this matter of farm production. I have borne in mind so many times, as all of you have, the words of Napoleon when he said that an army fights upon its belly.

We have before us today a very critical situation in the matter of the production of the necessary food to fight this war with. If I had a half hour instead of 5 minutes I could say a lot of things that have been in my mind. I am going to take this time to say to you gentlemen here today, because I know you are very earnest about this whole matter of food production, that I picked up the paper the other day and I read an article which doubtless many of you saw, in which it was stated that out here in Maryland dairymen were selling their herds, disposing of them, because they could not go ahead with production under the present price ceilings on milk. I happen to know that out in Missouri, where I live, the same situation has obtained for 6 months or longer and many, many hundreds of herds have been sold and disposed of at junk prices at a time when we need milk, butter, and cheese more than we have ever needed it before, just because of the thoughtless orders issued by certain bureaucrats regarding price ceilings on milk as well as other farm products.

In this article I saw in the paper the other day it quoted the Secretary of Agriculture as saying that the farmers need not worry, the United States Government is going to buy their dairy cows wherever they cannot stay in business by reason of price ceilings or because they cannot get help or for any other reason. The Government is going to buy up their herds. I will confess my observation has been that the bureaucrats have had considerable experience in milking the public, but I do not think that experience fits them to milk these thousands of cows that they seek to take over.

While that remark may be somewhat facetious, I do think we are faced with a very critical and serious situation if the United States Government by reason of the unwise regulations with which it has hedged about the dairy industry starts in to buy up all the dairy herds of this country. I do not believe the dairy industry is going to function with bureaucrats milking the cows. I think we ought to make sensible regulations and let the farmers go on milking these cows.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I read the same thing the gentleman from Missouri did. I think it was one of the most dangerous invitations I have ever seen. It provided that where farmers were going to kill their herds the Government would buy them, so all a farmer has to do to unload his cows on the Government is to threaten to kill them. The first thing you know the Government will get all the dairy cows in this country and we will be without milk and butter entirely.

Mr. BELL. That is a very serious thing from the standpoint of the production of milk, butter, and cheese. It is also a serious thing, as I see it, from the standpoint of the future of this country. More than once I have quoted the statement of Thomas Jefferson that whenever we get to the point that more than 50 percent of the people of the country have abandoned their farms and moved into the cities we are going to be faced with serious difficulties.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I have listened with great interest to the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. Day after day on the floor of this House I have listened to other statements which point out a situation of which we all are quite well aware and which causes us deep concern. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, What do you propose to do about it?

Mr. BELL. It would take me 30 minutes to tell the gentleman that. I propose to take the floor sometime soon and give my ideas on that point. I cannot do it in the short time that is left.

Mr. KEEFE. I hope somebody from the Democratic side will tell us what they propose to do about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and

include therein two short bills introduced today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROTECTION FOR EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, ever since the sit-down strikes, which began on the last day of December 1936, the God-given, the constitutional right of a man to work to earn a livelihood has been successfully challenged by certain labor leaders and organizations.

That challenge has been successful because, and only because, it had back of it the support of this administration, which, in return, has received the political support of those who have levied tribute upon the exercise of the right of the American worker to support his family by his daily toil.

For 6 years, this administration and the New Deal organization has connived with certain labor leaders, racketeers, and politicians to deprive American workers of their freedom from want, their freedom from fear. During all that time, with two exceptions, the Congress has failed to come to the rescue of the American worker, whose loyalty, patriotism, and willingness to work in defense of his country, to carry on the war, no sensible individual has ever questioned.

Today with war production seriously curtailed by absenteeism, by slow-downs and by strikes; with an impending threat to tie up coal production when the miners' agreements expire in March, and with the papers carrying many news stories of threatened strikes in the aircraft industry, the administration still lacks the inclination or the courage to solve the problem.

In my judgment, we do not need anti-strike legislation. That conclusion is based upon the assumption that the American worker, with his sons and his brothers in the armed forces, will willingly do his utmost in support of the fighting men, if permitted to do so without restriction.

To break up the corrupt political alliance which has existed, and which today exists, between the administration and labor politicians and racketeers, I have today introduced a bill prohibiting political contributions by labor organizations, this in the form of an amendment to the so-called Corrupt Practices Act.

To unshackle the American worker, to free him from the tyranny of the administration-backed labor organizations, I have introduced a bill which will prevent those who would keep him from employment, levy tribute upon him, from continuing their unlawful activities.

If the Seventy-eighth Congress has the courage which those who sent it here thought it would have, they will pass this or similar legislation without undue delay and insist that the other body do likewise; and if the President vetoes it, the Congress will pass it over his head.

The time for mealymouthed pussyfooting ended long, long ago. The time for plain speaking is here. Action is long overdue.

Today I have introduced two bills the passage of one of which will tend to break the connection between political contributions and war production and the other of which will free workers from the rule of labor politicians while at the same time not interfering with the right to strike:

A bill to protect employees engaged in war production

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That it shall be unlawful for any person, alone or acting with another or others, directly or indirectly, by force, coercion, intimidation, or by show or threat of force, or attempt to use force, to force or attempt to force any person to become, be, or remain a member of any labor organization; or, by force, coercion, intimidation, or threat of force, or attempt to use force, to force or attempt to force any person to refrain from engaging in or remaining in employment; or by force, coercion, intimidation, or by show or threat of force, or attempt to use force, to interfere or attempt to interfere with any employee or other person on his or her way to or from employment, or while seeking employment, which in any way contributes to the production of anything which is to be used directly or indirectly for national defense or the prosecution of the war, or which may become an article of interstate or foreign commerce.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any labor organization or the officers thereof, or for any other organization or the officers thereof, to commit any of the acts herein made unlawful when committed by a person or a group of persons.

SEC. 3. Interference in the manner prescribed in section 1, with each employee or other person is hereby made a separate and distinct offense.

SEC. 4. In addition to any other penalty imposed by this act, every person or organization violating the terms hereof shall be liable to every employee or person deprived of employment by violation of section 1 for double the amount of damage suffered by such employee or other person, which said damages shall be not less than the sum of $50, together with the costs of such suit, including an attorney fee of $25, which said damages shall be recoverable in any court of record of any State or any Federal court sitting in the State where such violation may occur, and jurisdiction of such actions and of the persons and organizations involved therein is hereby conferred upon such courts.

SEC. 5. Any person violating any provision of this act shall, for each act, be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 and imprisonment of not more than 1 year.

SEC. 6. If any provision of this act, or the application of any provision, to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, or the application of such provision, to any person or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

---

A bill to amend section 251 of title 2 of the United States Code (February 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, section 313, 43 Stat. 1074)

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 251 of title 2 of the United States Code (February 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, section 313, 43 Stat. 1074), be amended by adding after the comma, which follows the word "Congress" in the first sentence, the following: "or any other corporation, or any labor union, organization, association, or group charging initiation fees or collecting dues from employees" so that said section when amended shall read as follows:

"It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, or any other corporation, or any labor union, organization, association, or group charging initiation fees or collecting dues from employees, to make a contribution in connection with any election to any political office, or for any corporation whatever to make a contribution in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section. Every corporation which makes any contribution in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation who consents to any contribution by the corporation in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time this afternoon because by this time tomorrow the House will be engaged in the consideration of a very important and far-reaching resolution, and because time for debate may be somewhat limited at that time, I wanted to bring to the attention of the House this afternoon just a very few basic considerations in connection with the so-called Nichols resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it has required 100 years for the world in reality to catch up with the vision of Tennyson 100 years ago. In case you have not read Locksley Hall for some time, I want to read you just a few lines that were penned by Tennyson in 1840:

I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;
Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue.

After 100 years the world has in reality caught up with the vision of the poet of 100 years ago. We have universal interest today in the question of aviation and have a universal recognition of the great importance aviation will play in that period when the world returns once more to its peaceful pursuits after the war has ended and the battle flags have been furled.

Growing out of that universal interest and the recognition of the importance of commercial and civil aviation is a proposal before the House of Representatives that there be set up in this House a special committee to deal with legislation affecting civil and commercial aviation. That is the origin and purpose of the resolution, the widespread interest in commercial and civil aviation. But I am impelled to ask further what reason brings this proposal before us at this time.

If you will just strip this proposal of all the superfluous arguments that have been made pro and con and reduce it to its very simple thesis, I believe you will agree with me that this resolution con-

fronts us now because there is a presumption, at least, that there is a legislative job to be done by the House of Representatives, and that there does not now exist in the House of Representatives adequate legislative machinery to do that job. To me, that is the only justification that could bring this proposal before the House at this time.

Let us admit that if there is a legislative job to be done, and the House of Representatives does not have adequate legislative machinery to do it, if it does not have legislative machinery that is willing or able to function, then we need to set up another committee to do that job. But if we admit, on the other hand, that the House of Representatives today does have sufficient legislative machinery to do an adequate job on whatever legislation now is necessary, or whatever legislation may be necessary when we also "dip into the future far as human eyes can see," then we do not need to establish another standing committee of this House to deal with the class of legislation. To me, that is the argument in the whole matter. We may discuss today every phase of legislation, past and present, we may dip into the future, we may visualize, as well we might, the great progress that certainly will come in this field when the war is over, but we come back finally to that one question.

Mr. Speaker, for several years I coached football. I have never yet in an emergency, in a tight game, when the going was rough, deemed it wise to take out my regulars, my veterans, who knew what they were doing, who had had long experience on that job, and substitute for them men who had not been under fire, men who were not veterans with experience.

Let us for a moment examine that. Suppose a new committee is established in the House of Representatives to deal with the question of commercial and civil aviation. Let us examine into what would be the functions of that particular committee and what some of the results might be. Suppose that we do set up this committee. Suppose that by this time tomorrow we have decided that such a step should be taken—and I say with all reverence, Heaven forbid that we should take such action—but suppose that should be the action of the House, what then? The great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a committee that has for a score of years studied this whole problem of aviation and has reported very far-sighted legislation, will be stripped of its legislative functions insofar as its program of aviation is concerned. The new committee, at the very start of its legislative program, will have to work out all of the difficulties, all of the interrelated problems of an integrated transportation system in this Nation.

That would be the first step, Mr. Speaker, toward tearing down what has been built up along that line. Then what would happen? The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce still would have legislative supervision over our transportation by railroads, transportation by busses, by trucks, and other methods, and you would have, so to speak, competing committees of this House dealing with legislation for competitive systems of transportation.

Mr. Speaker, during the considerations that were recently had before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on another piece of legislation we had witness after witness appear before that committee. I am not going into a discussion of H. R. 1012, the House bill which has been mentioned on this floor a number of times in connection with the resolution that is coming before the House tomorrow, because H. R. 1012 can stand on its own merits, and will at the proper time. But witness after witness came before the committee in its considerations and my distinguished friend from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], never let a witness leave the stand without asking him this question:

Has there been any time in the past when there was not adequate legislation for the maximum development of aviation in this country? Is there at this time needed, other than that now proposed any legislation that is vitally necessary for the present or future development of aviation?

And, without exception, these witnesses told the committee, in answer to questions of the gentleman from New Jersey, that they did not know of a single instance in which the committee had been derelict in performing its duties for the sake of the aviation program of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it not true that a little while ago when legislation was under consideration with regard to the lake shippers and truckers that the railroads lobbied against that legislation?

Mr. PRIEST. I cannot agree that that is true, but I would like to yield to my friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] to answer that question.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The answer is "No."

Mr. PRIEST. I have only been on the committee a few months and insofar as I am informed that has never occurred.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it not also true that Members of Congress receive arguments—let us put it that way—from the railroads against the enactment of that legislation?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No; I do not think so. I was on the subcommittee that drafted the Motor Transportation Act. The railroads did not lobby against that legislation. I think the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] will bear me out on that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know I received many protests from lake shippers and also from truckers commenting on the bill when it was under consideration.

Mr. BULWINKLE. You may have had protests from lake shippers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. From lake shippers concerning the railroad's interest against the legislation; from lake shippers and truck operators.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I have been on every transportation bill since 1930 or 1931.

Mr. PRIEST. I yield now to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I recall in the hearings a question was asked each time whether the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had passed the necessary legislation and the answer was invariably yes, but when Resolution 23 was before the Committee on Rules no witness was ever asked whether he felt a separate committee would be desirable. I wonder why that was not asked. The matter was before the House and before the Committee on Rules all of that week, and not a word was asked of any of these witnesses as to whether they thought it would be desirable.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure that the witnesses and the industry, or any one that might desire to give information in that respect, had every opportunity to do it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Not unless the question was first asked as the other question was.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Answering first the question just asked by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, I would say that the subject matter of hearings was the bill we had before us and was not the Nichols resolution, and therefore it was not appropriate to question on that. The only opportunity they could have to express their opinion of that was in the hearings conducted by the Committee on Rules, and I understand it is not the practice of the Rules Committee to hear from those on the outside. But I wish there could have been an opportunity for that question to have been a part of the hearings.

In reference to the question that was propounded by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], I happened to be not only a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the time that legislation was considered, but I was also a member of the subcommittee. The situation which then existed was no different from that which exists when any important legislation is being proposed and considered. A question was raised by the lake shippers as to some features of the bill as it was originally introduced, but in the final analysis the bill as reported by the committee provided adequately for the questions that had been raised by the lake shippers. I wish to go further and say that the provision that appeared in the bill had their approval, and I feel that if the gentleman from Michigan will look at the RECORD he will find that he voted in favor of the bill.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just one final word: I am glad, also, that the gentleman from New Jersey brought up the fact that the hearing before the committee recently was not Resolution No. 23 but was on H. R. 1012, because, as I said in the beginning, I do not believe that H. R. 1012

should be the basis for any argument in connection with Resolution 23 to come before the House tomorrow. To sum up in this last 1 minute, let us strip this question, as I stated a few moments ago, of all of those extraneous matters and look at it squarely as it is. Does there exist a committee in this House composed of trained, experienced, loyal, faithful, conscientious men to do this job of handling aviation legislation?

The only way that we can judge whether they can do it in the future is to look at the past, and when we consider that record in the past, and use it as a yardstick, there cannot be a doubt anywhere that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is capable of doing whatever job may come to it. We have not yet come to a situation where we must throw up our hands and say that the problem now is too big for the men who have been for a score of years performing such valuable service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] for 15 minutes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I agree at the outset with my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]. I want the question of whether or not there shall be a permanent standing committee on aviation set up in this House, to be determined without extraneous matters being considered. I certainly agree with that. I want it to be set up without considering whether or not it is pleasing to one or two men in the American Federation of Labor, who should, by all the rules of the game, have their mouths closed as to the internal organization of the House of Representatives. Yes; I agree with him.

On last Thursday I made some remarks on the floor of the House directed to section 29 of House Resolution 1012, which is the section of that bill proposing amendments to existing law known as section 412 of the Civil Aeronautics Act. In effect, I said that if section 29 of 1012 was adopted into law that it would be contrary to the public interest and contrary to the best interests of the commercial air lines in the United States. In these remarks I also mentioned the existence of a certain contract between 16 of the major air lines and the Railway Express Agency, pointing out that, although this contract had been in existence for a number of years, it had never been approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and stating further that the contract was an illegal contract and in violation of the Sherman antitrust law. I stated that this contract virtually gave the Railway Express Agency a monopoly on air express and that under the contract Railway Express Agency could fix the rates charged by the air lines for air express.

These statements have been challenged since that time. My purpose today is to offer you proof of the authenticity of my original statement, and proof which will refute the challenge made to them.

At the outset I want to say that when I stated that under the contract Railway Express could fix the rates charged by the air lines for air express that the word "fix" was probably a poor choice of words. Had I said that under the contract Railway Express Agency had control over the rates charged by air lines for air express I would have been absolutely correct, proof of which I shall give you further on in this statement.

I first said that Railway Express Agency, under the existing contract, had a monopoly on the air express business. Let us look now to the contract itself to ascertain whether or not this statement is correct. Although there are 16 separate contracts with 16 of the principal air lines and Railway Express Agency, the following clause is in each contract:

> The air company agrees that during the time in which operations are carried on under this contract it will not accept express business as described above or otherwise from any party other than the express company.

In other words, under the provisions of this contract not even the air lines themselves nor any other person or company can handle air express except the Railway Express Agency. One of the first provisions in each of said contracts is:

> The express company shall, subject and in accordance with the terms thereof, furnish adequate personnel and suitable equipment for the promotion, solicitation, collection, acceptance, and delivery of parcels, packages, or other air-express matter for transportation by airplane and shall use its motor vehicles, property, offices, and other facilities, and its agents and employees, in operating an air-express business as an independent contractor and not as an agent of the air company.

To strengthen Railway Express Agency's position as an independent agency, dealing in air-express transportation business, Railway Express Agency now holds a certificate of convenience and necessity from the Civil Aeronautics Board as an indirect air carrier. And incidentally Railway Express Agency is the only company in the United States so designated.

Now, let us see whether or not this monopolistic contract has in any way hampered the expansion and growth of the air lines and thus the air-express business in the United States.

I now quote a paragraph which is in every air-line Railway Express Agency contract in the United States:

> The express company agrees that in the event any other air line desires to enter into a contract with the express company to handle air express, which competes with the air company, the express company will not so contract with such competing air line unless the air company shall first give its written consent thereto or upon compliance with the following conditions.

In this connection, Grover Loaning, technical consultant, Air Cargo Plane Committee, Production Division, War Production Board, had the following to say:

> This monopolistic contract exerted a very great influence in retarding the development of air cargo carrying in the United States, so that we find ourselves today in this war emergency having to make literally frantic efforts to catch up to a position that we could have well had many years ago had this branch of the air transport industry been free and open to competitive development.

Figures from the industry for the year 1937, a normal pre-war year, show that Canadian air lines carried 26,279,156 pounds; that the T. A. C. A. operations—Central America—for the same period carried 11,346,504 pounds; whereas, the air lines of the United States carried but 4,293,456 pounds; while those in Alaska, alone, carried 2,940,757 pounds. This means that Canada, with a population of but 11,000,000 people, compared to ours of 132,000,000 people, making our population 12 times greater than that of Canada, still Canada carried 6 times as much air cargo as did the United States. Further, Central America, with a population of but 2,500,000 people, on the operation of but one air line, carried two and one-half times as much air cargo as did the United States, although our population is 60 times that of Central America. This incredibly small showing for the United States can be explained only in terms of restriction and suppression.

As might be expected, the operating costs in the various countries reflect the volume of business, and in spite of most difficult operating conditions, Canadian air lines had an average cost of 20 cents per ton-mile. T. A. C. A.—Central America—18.2 cents per ton-mile, and our domestic air lines an average of 80 cents per ton-mile.

The lesson is clear. Air lines should not be controlled by their competitors.

I also state that Railway Express Agency under existing contracts can control rates charged for air express by the air lines.

Let us once more look to the contract itself for proof of this statement. The following clause will be found in each of the contracts between Railway Express Agency and the sitxeen principal air lines of the United States:

> *Provided, however,* That the express company shall not be required without its consent to establish air express rates less than twice the existing first class rail express rates between the same points unless required by law.

Whether or not this is control over the rates to be charged by air lines for air express was probably more clearly expressed than I can express it in a recent public statement by: once more, Grover Loaning, technical consultant, Air Cargo Planes Committee, Production Division, War Production Board.

> Actual air express rates at the present average 80 cents a ton-mile, which is 5 to 7 times higher than railway express rates. Cargo planes can be run at about 8 to 10 cents per ton-mile. Actually railway express rates—not air express rates, but ordinary rail rates—run from 10 to 15 cents per ton-mile. Today we have proof that aircraft can carry express for less than the rate charged for express carried by the railroads if done in enough volume.

Following is another paragraph contained in each of these contracts under subdivision 8, entitled "Rates":

> The air company agrees to confer with the express company upon matters pertaining to the express rates to be charged and when any change is made in such rates, 15 days previous notice thereof shall be given by the air company to the express company, unless notice is waived in writing by the express company.

Those people who will argue and who have been arguing that this is not, first, a monopolistic contract, and, second, that proposed amendments to section 412 of the Civil Aeronautics Act will not legalize such contracts will point out to you that with reference to the last-quoted paragraph, if agreement is not reached, the matter will be referred to a traffic committee composed of representatives of the air lines, but herein lies one of the cutest little monopolistic jokers in the whole contract.

First. Under the contract, air express may route express traffic over whatever air line it chooses and in this connection I quote the following clause from the contract:

The express company agrees to use its best efforts to divide the traffic on a fair and equitable basis between the carriers, giving due consideration to reliability and frequency of schedules.

Second. Each air line does not have an equal vote on the traffic committee, but the value to be given to each air-line representative vote will be determined by the following formula which I quote from the contract:

Beginning with the effective date of this agreement, and of July 1, 1936, the voting power of the representative of the air company on the traffic committee shall be determined as follows:

The percentage of pound-miles of air express carried by the air company during the period from January 1, 1935, to June 30, 1935, inclusive, with respect to the total pound-miles of air express carried during such period by all companies having similar agreements with the express company shall be added to the percentage of the route-miles of the air company on the last day of such period, with respect to the total route-miles of such air companies on that day, and the total thereof shall be divided by two. The result thereof shall represent the percentage of total voting power which the representative of the air company shall have on the traffic committee for such period.

On January 1 and July 1 of each year thereafter, beginning July 1, 1936, the voting power of each member of the traffic committee shall be revised in accordance with the above formula, but determined on the basis of pound-miles of air express carried for the corresponding 6 months' period of the preceding year, and the route miles on the last day of such period.

The net result of the above is that first, Railway Express Agency gives whatever company it chooses the bulk of the air-express business, and then that the company which has the most air-express business has the largest vote on the traffic committee.

Now let us see what it is necessary for the traffic committee to do before it can reach a binding agreement. A majority of the voting power of the committee is not sufficient as the contract requires that three-fourths of the voting power must be had before final action by the committee can be arrived at. As per the following provision in the contracts:

*And provided further*, That the action taken at any meeting by the members having three-fourths of the voting power, as hereinafter determined, of the traffic committee, shall constitute the action of the committee and be binding upon the air company.

This now brings us to that portion of my statement wherein I say that if section 29 of H. R. 1012 were to be enacted into law, it would legalize these otherwise illegal and monopolistic contracts. Remember that these contracts have been pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board for approval for years, but have never been approved; and also remember that until they are approved they are subject to prosecution under the Sherman antitrust laws. However, if subsection (C) of section 29 of H. R. 1012 was enacted into law it is my contention that these contracts would be legalized and thus lifted from the pale of the Sherman antitrust laws.

Now let us look at the subsection (C). First, you must remember that there is but one "air carrier indirectly engaged in air transportation" and that that indirect air carrier is the Railway Express Agency, therefore subsection (C) is directed specifically at the contracts between Railway Express Agency and the 16 major air lines of the United States. I now read subsection (C):

(C) In the case of a contract or agreement between an air carrier indirectly engaged in air transportation, and an air carrier engaged directly therein affecting the terms and conditions pursuant to which the former utilizes the facilities or services of the latter, an order of disapproval under subsection (B) of this section shall, effective upon such date as may be fixed in such order, make unlawful the carrying out of such contract or agreement in the respects specified in such order.

Thus, where under existing law, the contracts are illegal or subject to the Sherman Antitrust Act until approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board, if the above subsection (C) of section 29 were adopted as law, these contracts would be legal until they had been declared to be illegal by an order of disapproval issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

If any person in the House questions my interpretation of first, the provisions of the original air line Railway Express Agency contracts, or second, my interpretation of proposed section 29 in H. R. 1012, I suggest that you call Thurman Arnold, Assistant United States Attorney General, in charge of the antitrust division. And further, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to call this bill back to that Committee and before it is finally offered to the House for consideration, call Thurman Arnold and the members of his staff before their committee and question them as to their interpretation of the provisions contained in section 29.

The above was exactly the situation when I made my speech on the floor last Thursday and actually is still the situation today, except that since that time some of the airlines have reached agreement with the Railway Express Agency to delete from these contracts all that portion of the contracts with monopolistic tendencies and particularly rate fixing control. And this will continue to be the situation until these contracts with the agreed portion of them deleted has been approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board, leaving in the contracts however those provisions which permit Railway Express to route air express over air lines of their own choosing, and leaves the voting power of the traffic committee in exactly the same condition as above described.

I do not mean to say that my speech had anything to do with the agreements to delete the monopolistic portions of the contracts, but the fact remains that after years of quibbling over these very provisions, only last week agreement was reached. Whether or not positive threat of prosecution under the Sherman antitrust law had anything to do with these agreements being reached, I do not know. Of this, however, I am sure: any committee of the Congress who was either so busy, or who had so little knowledge of the subject matter before it that it would report out a bill containing provisions similar to those contained in Section 29 of H. R. 1012 which are so clearly adverse to the public interest cannot do as good a job in handling legislation pertaining to civil aviation as can a committee created 100 percent for that purpose and directing its entire attention to the subject.

Mr. LEA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. LEA. Do you contend that this contract is legal or illegal at the present time?

Mr. NICHOLS. The contract before last Friday, which was the day on which the air lines and the Railway Express agreed to delete the monopolistic tendencies, was illegal. Now they have taken the monopoly out of it and I think it is legal and will be approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. LEA. But it does not assume any binding authority until it is approved by the board.

Mr. NICHOLS. Oh, yes; it does.

Mr. LEA. There are two things that cannot be escaped.

Mr. NICHOLS. Just a moment. In your statement you talked about section 414. Your argument would be good if it were not for the fact that subsection C of section 29 applies specifically to one contract, and nothing else. Therefore, under all the decisions I can find, an act of Congress which is specific and special supersedes general legislation.

Mr. LEA. Now, if I can trespass upon the gentleman for just a moment, there are two questions. One is about the contract and the other is about the law. In the first place, no agreement that can be made by the air lines with the express company can oust the Civil Aeronautics Board from its jurisdiction. It has a right to make rates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 more minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. There are two fundamentals about the law. One is that no power can deprive the Civil Aeronautics Board of its right to control these rates. No agreement between the air-line carriers and the express company can deprive the

Board of that right. They cannot make any contract that is controlling. Another thing that is very apparent is that the air line alone can make the rates. The express company cannot make the rates. The further fact is that the express company made a request to lower these rates. If anybody is responsible for them not being lowered it is the air lines and not the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. NICHOLS. All right. I am not any more willing for the air lines to have a monopoly and be able to keep rates up than I am for the Railway Express Co. to have it.

Mr. LEA. But they do not have a monopoly. They cannot take jurisdiction from the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. NICHOLS. The fact remains that this contract has been in existence for 6 years, and it has never been approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. LEA. It has been unlawful all the time, and the Attorney General had a right to prosecute at any time during that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, may I have the right to extend my remarks, and I will answer the gentleman tomorrow? I think the gentleman has been finding a mare's nest; and if the Attorney General helped him to find it, it is that much more important.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DURHAM was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] is recognized for 15 minutes.

### CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the debate has been quite interesting this afternoon with reference to whether or not the Congress should even undertake to establish a standing committee on aviation.

Mr. Speaker, in ages remote, far antedating the time which memory of man can recall and since the presence of man was first noted on earth, man has been at war. On February 6, 1941, I addressed this, the greatest of deliberative assemblies, on the subject of the lend-lease bill. On this occasion I called your attention to the tragic fact that from 1496 B. C. down to that date during only 227 years of that period had the world been at peace. I stated too and I quote:

> My countrymen and my colleagues, I take the floor on this occasion to lay before you and abler minds than my own some thoughts for your patriotic, earnest, and honest consideration. Some thoughts upon which, after consideration, action must be taken. Action upon which more, in my opinion, depends concerning our future and the future of the world than in any like period in the world's history. The hand of fate has inexorably laid upon our shoulders and minds responsibilities unparalleled in the annals of history.
>
> Our common God has willed this test and God willing we will discharge our obligations.

And so today as we approach consideration of the Rules Committee's resolution to create a standing committee on aviation I recall the words just quoted as deeply significant and entirely applicable to the matter of forming a standing committee to consider commercial and civil aviation and its problems.

On December 17, 1903, at Kitty Hawk, N. C., Orville Wright flew an airplane powered by an engine in a straight course for 12 seconds; then Wilbur Wright took it up for a flight that lasted 30 seconds. This weird contraption of human genius was at that time but the germ of the planes of today, even as the planes of today constitute but a larval stage of the planes of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the effective beginning of aviation and man's conquest of the air is comparatively so recent as still to be fresh in our minds, while the wars between the Medes and the Persians are so remote that we must refer to history for information thereon. The periods in which the Romans, the Goths, the Vandals, the Huns, and the Saxons roamed the world are part of the dim, distant, and remote periods in man's history. So, my colleagues, as we look ahead as through a fog it is essential that we let history shed its piercing light through the miasmic, kaleidoscopic, and whirling events which fill the world and block our vision into the future. History was young and by comparison puerile in its guiding influence during the period of the Huns, the Saxons, and the Romans. The minds of these early men were not equipped with the lessons of the ages. Yes it is true that the world was small insofar as man's then knowledge of it was concerned. These early men believed the earth to be flat, and even though in later years scientific research in many fields has proven it conclusively to be round only today is that aspect a stern reality and a part of our necessary planning for the future.

All of our essential concepts have been changed. Yes; again, even though in 1472 Leonardo Da Vinci thought and wrote about airplanes, and though in the works of Francis Bacon there was reference to the subject, and in 1617 lectures on flying were conducted by Fleyder of Tuebingen; in Italy, Borrelli, a scientist, in 1680 discussed the question on a basis of man's muscular power and reached the conclusion that this was impossible. In 1706 Sir George Cayley constructed a tiny helicopter made of gull feathers, and in 1870 Alfonse Penaud constructed two models with propellers driven by twisted rubber bands. Most of the pioneers in this research directed their attention to developing models capable of vertical flight. One hundred and fifty years ago the first voyage by air in America took place in the presence of George Washington on January 9, 1793, when Gene Pierre Blanchard ascended in a hydrogen-filled balloon. He took off from a yard at the old Walnut Street Prison in Philadelphia. He carried a passport of introduction from George Washington. This was the first airborne letter in this country. The aeronaut in his balloon reached the height of 5,812 feet. He traveled 15 miles in the elapsed time of 46 minutes and landed near Woodbury, N. J. So much for the early history.

Today the scenes are vastly changed; the world has changed; men's minds have changed; all about is change. The United States is no longer a land separated from the rest of the world by broad oceans or even miles. Today distance is figured in hours and not miles. Today we are producing in quantity standard transport airplanes that fly away with 6-ton loads and traverse 200 miles in 1 hour. Tomorrow planes will carry 100 tons at speeds of from three to four hundred miles an hour and with ranges double that of the planes of today. Such planes are already planned, and engineering is nearly complete. Post-war commercial craft will probably maintain 300 miles an hour on long runs. The distance from here to my home town will be measured by 6 hours and some minutes instead of 2,100 miles as it is measured on the ground today. Directions to remote places as of yesterday are completely destroyed. Among the truths of yesterday there is one which still stands: The shortest line between two points still is a straight line. And the nearest approach to that accomplishment on the face of the globe is the arc of the circle which begins at a given point and maintains an even elevation vertically over the earth and over a straight line from the starting point to the objective to be reached. Thinking out loud, let us compare distances and directions as between Mercator or flat maps and so-called top-of-the-world maps, those which depict the North Pole and the Arctic circle in the center. Let us for this purpose plan a flight from Frisco to Berlin. Those who think in terms of a flat map would expect to cross Missouri and continue on across the eastern coast of the United States near New York on a course a bit north of east, but the true course instead of even being close to New York would pass 1,000 miles north of Montreal and would save at least 1,000 miles in distance. This true course from Frisco to Berlin would be east of north, it would take you across Oregon, one corner of Washington, over Alberta, Canada, on north of Hudson Bay, across Baffin Island and Greenland, touching northeast Iceland, the southwest corner of Norway, and would come into Berlin from a bit west of north.

Time does not permit a full discussion and development of the new geography and the transition which has occurred in direction and distance, but I think it is safe to say that if the war ends in 2 years international air transport will in the main move at a speed of a little over 200 miles an hour and on jumps or hops

of 1,000 miles or less, but there will continue to be a demand for faster and more direct service and the fast trans-Atlantic sleeper will become to the air what the Twentieth Century and Broadway Limiteds are to the rails. The comparison tomorrow will be between air transport from New York to London, as is the case today between New York and Chicago. The same kind of fast service can be provided between Chicago and Moscow. Transportation rates will drop from the current 90 cents per ton-mile to possibly 30 cents.

Under lend-lease and war operation the United States Army's Air Transport Command is operating about 70,000 miles of route, and this will increase. The A. T. C. is about to become bigger than all of the pre-war international air lines of the world combined, and we had better be thinking of the herculean expense and effort of converting the A. T. C. operations into a peacetime commercial asset. All of this must start from the center as from the hub of a wheel. This must start with a determined, intelligent, continuing, and applied effort for the development of our domestic, commercial, and civil air operations within the United States. At the end of this war the United States may easily have more transport planes, more experienced transport pilots, more trained navigators, more seasoned and trained ground crews, and a more productive and highly developed aircraft manufacturing industry than all of the other nations on earth combined, certainly much more than the United Nations combined. Much labor and much thought intelligently combined and applied are essential before the question as to where these pilots will be permitted to fly their equipment can be determined. This field leads into diplomatic, political, legislative, legal, and military problems. For the purpose of this discussion we need no concept of the manner in which we, the United Nations, and Russia may undertake to police the world after the war. There may be some overlapping involvement in results, schools of thought which adhere to each country's determination to hold to its own sphere of interest and security, and the school of international and global thinkers will, of course, give expression to the results of their cogitation. But in any and all events military aviation as an immediate aftermath will form an essential part, and the location of strategically situated bases will play a prominent part. The question of the standing committee will only by indirection be affected by these considerations. Aviation in these phases, manufacturing, transport, and private flying will furnish us the hub, the backlog, for these continued and successful operations.

I am not one of those who believe that aviation should hold up its hands as a supplicant to government and plead that as a master magician the Government will guarantee success in the post-war world to come. Under our system, a free system, we can expect, however, the guaranty by Government to the people and to private enterprise of the fruition of opportunity to achieve success by competitive effort and ingenuity, and further, to individuals and to groups, to reap the fairly earned and merited award of patriotic and successful enterprise. Today's aircraft are at the same time the most destructive product of human genius and at once the most vital to world reconstruction and to the accomplishment of that Christian and vital goal, a lasting peace. Today the production, the operation, and the utilization of battlecraft of the air will decide the outcome of the war in a major degree. From today on, the winning of the peace together with the carrying on of the war will depend in a major degree upon how well we work and think. There should be no abridgment in any degree of the efforts of the Congress to do its share with respect to this major segment of the world's problems and the part our problems play as an integer thereof. There must be no conflict between other matters of importance in the efforts which the Congress must make to plan the future of and to solve the problems which confront commercial and civil aviation.

We must not be influenced by appeals for a meticulous adherence to procedures and organization which served well in the past but we must accept the challenge and react thereto in kind and in the spirit and tempo of the times. Commercial and civil aviation of today are merging rapidly with tomorrow's age, and the problems of yesterday are as pygmies compared to giants when juxtaposed with those of tomorrow.

Operations, air-traffic control, minimum requirements for airports, insurance, contact flight rules, flight plan rules, transcontinental operations, pilot rules, control of the air over continental United States, policies connected therewith, aids to navigation including weather forecasts, and so forth, together with objects projecting up into the air space, zoning requirements, authority of control-tower operators, equipment in such towers, and so forth, make up but a small part of the development of domestic and civil aviation and their problems. Upon how well we work and upon the results of our labor depends much more than is indicated on the surface. The day is not far distant when uniformity of air rules of all kinds, together with operations will become vital to international intercourse by air.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. If that is agreeable to the other Members who have special orders, without objection it is so ordered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEBERG. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that our rights and privileges in the bases that have been constructed under Lend Lease in foreign countries should be maintained?

Mr. KLEBERG. I should think so, and there is nothing I have said that would indicate to the contrary.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And the protection should be legislative if necessary.

Mr. KLEBERG. I imagine so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is not being done at the present time.

Mr. KLEBERG. This Congress and this body by omnipotent decree are charged with a responsibility which beggars measurement and description. The United States of America has been and is the hope of the world leading to the realization of final, lasting, and constructive peace, if possible. Young Americans fighting in far-flung lands are fighting to maintain the guaranties which we are pledged to preserve. The United States is more than the arsenal of democracy today; it is the only hope of a war-torn world to maintain such freedom as may exist in small spots thereof and to gain back for those who have lost it that priceless adjunct of life, and to provide it for uncounted millions who have never experienced it before.

When the proposal to form a standing committee as part of the organization of the House of Representatives reaches this floor, we who are the voice of the people will decide upon a question so momentous that upon our decision may well depend the answer to the question, Did they die in vain? The rapid development of air transportation in the immediate past and the vital part it plays in the decision in this, the greatest of all struggles, and the yes or no to whether this mass malignity will again beset the world will depend upon our action; yes, and more too. The place our country will occupy and its position among the nations of the world hinges upon our vote on this question. To those young Americans who have pledged their lives and sacred honor in the defense of their country our action means much. It means so much more than much that I hesitate to think we might not in the discharge of our obligations successfully meet and overcome the opposition of those who oppose the creation of a standing committee. I cannot believe this will happen. This citadel of representative democracy and freemen cannot long survive our failure to lay the foundation upon which our future place in the world is to be builded. This future place and its permanency will depend upon the basic arrangements made by the victor governments. Air transport has become an agent or instrument of State policy in every important nation except the United States. Before the war all the other nations were represented in international air transport by either partly or wholly owned monopolies created by their respective governments. Our only partial monopoly, Pan American, did extremely well despite its nongovernmental status. The development of our prestige at home when the vexatious questions of international air policies will be discussed between our State Department and diplomats and those of other lands may well depend upon what we have to offer when that time comes. Within the executive branch the President's interdepartmental committee has been established to discuss and study this whole question. If I know

the people of the United States they will expect their Representatives and their voice in the halls of state to speak with full information and knowledge of what goes on. If we do not have practical plans and pursue them with typical American genius and determination we shall have failed in our trust. It has been shown that the American people and we as the Representatives in the Congress have a vital and enormous stake in the success of the American aviation industry after the war. This success will depend in a large measure upon the assurance by the Government of the continuation of a free system of society and economy and therefore a strong, free, privately owned and operated industry. All phases of this industry, international air transport, domestic air transport, private flying, and aircraft manufacturing are interdependent for success and the security of our country. You must remember that the aircraft industry is different from other older industries with regard to its need in preparing for the post-war period. The people of the United States through this body and the Congress and by our action can assure them that the aviation industry shall have the opportunity to succeed in the post-war period. Congress is now charged with the setting up of a committee to study, make research and, when necessary, pass legislation on the specific problems which are peculiar to the American aviation industry and penultimately vital to the well-being of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I have not in my heart or mind the desire to criticize the committee now charged with this responsibility but I must and do state with deep conviction that this committee with the multitude of important matters over which it has jurisdiction does not have the time to give to this vital question. This is the crux of the whole matter. A statement which has been couched in various forms has been made ad lib on numerous occasions that the House or the Congress has too many committees. This may be true in some conceptions of the matter but it can have no possible weight or bearing upon this specific question. Upon how we handle the development of commercial and civil aviation here at home depends in no small part the future of all branches of aviation. This is the nucleus, this is the backlog, and upon this depends many things, among them our position with reference to the trade routes of the world and their effect upon the direction of civilization. By indirection, but intimately and indivisibly connected therewith, is involved also our prestige and place at the peace table, and last but not least, the final multiplied impact of what might be our failure to grasp vital opportunity by the forelock for the welfare of the United States of America and the consequent well-being of the rest of the world. Surely, there cannot be such a degree of pride in committee prestige, or fealty to long established custom in the minds of a majority of the House as to blight our efforts to make secure our future.

Mr. Speaker, it is true, I confess with reluctance, that feeling in this matter has reached such a high pitch. I regret to note the evidences of unusual activity in the mustering of support for the maintenance of a status quo which comes from the outside. This pressure had, of course, to originate from within. But be that as it may, and without malice or ill will toward any person, but purely because of my devotion to my country and its well-being, and with all of the emphasis which I can muster and put forth, I urge the creation of a standing Committee on Commercial and Civil Aviation set forth in the resolution from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and give the reasons why, in my opinion, a special committee on aviation should not be established.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a telegram from the Airline Pilots' Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE RUML PLAN

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor this afternoon to relieve my own mind. I have had so many letters relating to the Ruml plan that I have given it a good deal of study and think I have reached a decision. I hope this decision will reach my constituents so it may possibly serve to assure them that I do not need so many letters.

I trust I shall not have to change my mind as time goes along. I came across a little bit of advice lately, and I want to give it to you in the hope it may be helpful to you also. It runs something like this: "Never shift your mouth into high gear until you are sure your brain is turning over." I really feel now that I have followed this injunction as far as this Ruml plan is concerned. I recently received a letter telling me that I was sitting on the fence. My reply was that I might possibly be sitting on the fence, but I was not keeping my ear to the ground, because that posture would be so difficult. But I am extremely anxious that my people know how I stand relating to this matter. I will be glad to give half my time to the House. I hope I bait you to ask questions. However, let me roam a little while at random, because this plan of taxation is tied up somewhat with other matters, particularly inflation. We are largely relying now on price control to prevent inflation, but price control is blowing up rather badly, I am sorry to say. We are not paying much attention to monetary control, and this taxation matter is perhaps the most important phase of the inflation problem.

The Ruml plan is hailed with delight by many of my people. They may not fully understand it, but they think they do, and they inform me that it is very simple and that we are just trying to put obstructions in the way and purposely finding imaginary difficulties in its transition process. I have perused the long addresses made before the committee and tried to weigh the evidence. I have read a long statement from the Secretary of the Treasury, as represented by Mr. Paul. After several days of thinking over the problem I have come to this conclusion: I voted for prohibition some time ago; my people wanted me to. Afterward they wanted to repeal it; I voted to repeal it. They now want me to vote for the Ruml plan, and they seem tc be unanimous about it. My suggestions as to its disabilities fall upon deaf ears. Even large organizations like the New England Council and some Rotary Clubs have carefully scanned my suggestions, and call them worthless. Therefore, I have about decided to vote for the Ruml plan. Let it not be said that I am not responsive to the wishes of a large majority of my people on a matter they clair fully to understand. I would fail them, however, if I did not warn them of some dangers. They tell me it is simply like setting the clock ahead, as in daylight saving. That, indeed, would be simple if that was the only effect of it.

Mr. Ruml tried to tell the committee that, but the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] would not be convinced. I read and reread Mr. CRAWFORD'S statement. He seemed to stagger the Committee on Ways and Means so that they themselves did not know how to pursue the subject further at the moment.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] took the floor and interested and somewhat convinced most of us. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] did likewise. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN] also made comments. But those speeches have been too few compared with the national interest in this matter.

Taxation affects all of us and increasingly so. We should give this new plan careful thought. It is certainly revolutionary. The gentleman from Michigan told us that we have forty-seven billion of demand deposits; twenty-six billion of time deposits, and that we have cashable United States bonds amounting to about seventeen billions, and therefore, must be able to pay the taxes now due.

He did not wish to cancel this accrued indebtedness. He called that "economic blasphemy." Some time in the future he will have many followers, no doubt. I

sit next to him day in and day out on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I have a high regard for him, knowing that he knows far more than I about financial matters.

But I must ask myself if I properly represent my people if I follow him in his viewpoint. But he fully supports some "pay-as-you-go plan." So do I. We agree on that. But the gentleman from Michigan says we should collect the 1942 taxes from all those who have the ability to pay. I think he will agree that we should not be harsh with those who do not now have the ability to pay. He argues that we should collect what we could without hardship to those who find themselves unable to pay.

Mr. Ruml claims that the majority of people do not save to pay taxes. That is an indictment against our people which I do not want to make. It may be true, but it is not flattering to my constituents if they are included in that class. Perhaps the people did not know until last October exactly how much their taxes would be increased this year, but they certainly knew they were to be greatly increased. I know a great many people like myself "put their money in a pocket which is often full of holes." Mr. Ruml ridicules the administrative claims that the administering of the plan would be difficult. The Treasury Department sent me a long statement that I have here outlining very many serious difficulties. I, for one, would like to live in America a little while longer, although I seem to have been living outside of it for the last few years. Honestly, I hate to think that somebody is going to forcibly take away my salary before I get it. I would like to have it and make a voluntary payment of taxes. This forcible taking may be necessary in wartime, but if we begin we will have to keep it up until the judgment day, because if we at some time attempted to go back to the old way, we would find it probably impossible. If we should try to go back, the Treasury would have no money that year. Let us not forget that. There may come a month when my neighbor has misfortune. He would not like his employer to deduct for that month; he would need it. Some other neighbor the next month may have the same experience. Gradually all my neighbors may suffer this experience, and they might want me to repeal this law. It will be too late to retrace our steps.

This taking away violently before you get it, is hardly the American way. It would not be quite a free country. Many of you argue that this method is necessary because the great majority of people do not know how to take care of their money and we must grab it off to be sure we will get it. You may tell my people that if you want to. I might have the feeling that you are perhaps right in believing this, but I am not ready to indict my constituents as a shiftless people and unfit to receive their pay because they are not to be trusted to pay their taxes voluntarily.

I read the statement made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and I rather agreed with him as most of you seemingly did. Finally he found difficulties in the so-called windfall problem and he decided to suggest that we should take the 1942 or 1943 income, whichever was the higher, and pay the 1943 tax on that basis. That seemed to solve one of the problems and for a time I was comforted. Suddenly and provokingly it came over me that that was not the real solution to prevent the so-called windfall. The man who had a salary of a hundred thousand dollars last year and saved up to pay his taxes, could say, "It does not matter to me. You can take either year and I can be satisfied." So I was a little unhappy because I had thought the gentleman's suggestion had solved that phase of the vexatious question.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], said it would not make any difference to 75 percent of the taxpayers, as they would notice no difference. That is true, and this plan only applies to salaries and wages, it is said. The Treasury warns:

> We will have to make arbitrary rules for all employers to follow in taking away part of the salary from each and every one of their employees.

Some have two children, some are married, some unmarried, and some have other exemptions. You must take away each month, the Treasury says, what may be proper to take, having fully in mind each taxpayer separately according to his exemptions. The employer is to be the collection agency. The employer of 2,000 people or more will have a large bookkeeping establishment added to his office force. The Treasury Department should like this, because the employer will be forced to be the collection agency.

But does the Ruml plan apply only to salaries and wages? What about the farmer who has one crop a year; when is he going to pay? The Treasury says that he must make and file returns, and at least quarterly. You cannot take any money away from the farmer each month or even quarterly when he needs it all to raise his crop. He gets paid only at the end of the year, at which time he may figure out exactly what he may have to pay. Do not turn this problem away as being unimportant. It is very important. There is the real-estate operator, the insurance man, the men who are not salaried people, who make commission or profit at only fortunate times, but must estimate the year before how much they might possibly have to pay. They would be totally unable to do this and payments might become due at their most inconvenient moment. Take it away from him monthly when he has not received it. Cannot we wait until he has come into possession? We must do so if "pay as you go" means anything.

But after all "it is so simple."

The Treasury thinks it very complicated. They ought to know. Am I so dumb with all the training I have had in legislation, that I am so ignorant that I cannot understand, "a la Harry Hopkins"? Anyway I have read these objections, I have thought about them. I can see complications in plenty, unhappiness when payments are forcibly taken in months greatly needed and I am wondering if it is not a very un-American thing to do. But Ruml says, "If you forgive one you ought to forgive all," that that is the American thing to do. Perhaps I ought to agree to that. He also agrees that we should have some provision in the bill to prevent windfalls and has suggested such provision. Do his followers know that he desires to prevent windfalls? From my letters I doubt that he has stressed that.

I may have some friends who have money in their pockets to pay large taxes that they were supposed to pay this year. If you pass this plan they can now spend it, because the Government will forcibly take the 1943 tax payments away from that year's salary. They need not use the money they have saved for that purpose. Is that an inflation check? No, and that is what the gentleman from Michigan may be worrying about. It is another inflation impetus. Taxation must be the principal check on inflation. As I have read somewhere, "taxation must take the steam out of the boiler," so that we may proceed safely. We will have $15,000,000,000 of money on rampage after all taxes are paid this year, even after you have forced savings for taxes, lest our people spend it and add to the inflation hazard. We are bidding up and up for the goods that are now available.

We have heard about the black market this afternoon If someone will tell me as a legislator what I can do to stop the bootlegger, please tell me. We graduated a large school of bootleggers during prohibition days. They are well versed in the business and they can teach an army of others how to do it. Rum itself was even outlawed in those days. Meat is not outlawed. How can you reach the individual who kills and sells to his neighbors without going through the wholesale and retail trade store? If you did catch them, the jails would not be large enough. The fines would be unpopular. Our people will have meat if it is to be had.

We are a people that can be led if we understand the need, but we cannot be driven, even by bureaucrats. We are a democracy. A democracy can succeed only where our people are educated. I have to claim we are at least partially educated. Therefore, we do not believe everything the bureaucrats tell us. We are able to weigh matters. We recognize too much bungling in our bureaucratic Government. Yes, it may be easy to say we can lick inflation if we want to. Canada, it is said, has overcome it, with her 11,000,000 people. Great Britain has largely overcome it, with 41,000,000 people. But it is not so easy for us with 130,000,000 people.

As I questioned earlier in the day, why, because we observed Lent in March in Boston, and therefore the meat price was low, should the O. P. A. have not recognized this condition and fixed price ceilings fairly? We might be led to think they did not pay much attention to Lent in Los Angeles, because they gave them a

higher ceiling price. I read that one wholesaler in Boston lost $800 on one carload of meat last week. Why should he try to get beef for his customers? Must our people be forced to actually rely on bootleggers?

We cannot make too arbitrary rules. We must have broad rules that allow relief in almost each particular case. Similarly, under the Ruml plan, that month when the man should not have his money taken from his salary, the rule should provide relief. I often claim that the exception proves the value of the rule. It is no good unless it can stand exceptions. If the exceptions get too many, change the rule. But these bureaucrats here in the O. P. A. must make rules and blindly follow them. Many of them know little of their problems. Our delegation had to meet the other day and unanimously demand that the food administrator in New England be removed from office. It seems he has no qualifications for such a job so vital to our people.

How can a public have faith and be willing to obey the law under these conditions? They cannot. I worry about the psychology of our people. Unless this psychology is carefully studied and weighed these laws and regulations will certainly fail in their purpose. Contrast the demands of labor. You have an administration seemingly absolutely throttled and controlled by labor and a Congress absolutely controlled by the farmer vote.

Here we have an executive and a legislative branch separated. In England you have a Parliament with the Cabinet as part of it, working absolutely together on every question. The psychology of the people of Great Britain, where 40 percent of the people are working on war contracts, where they have had such terrible bombings and suffering, and every day expecting more dreadful ones to come, is not like ours. We do not believe, apparently, that we are to have any bombings. We cannot feel the immediate need. We have to resort to high wages and overtime pay in order to get the work done.

No, the psychology is nothing like Great Britain's. Do not let us compare it too favorably. But the psychology of a democracy like ours is highly important.

In Great Britain the men work 65 hours a week, the women 55. After 48 hours they get one-fourth overtime for the next 2 hours and after that one-half. Here we get time and a half after 40, and the average week here is not 55 or 65 hours, it is 45.

Conditions over there are indeed different; the psychology is very different. True, over there they have a $24,000 limitation on salaries. Our President has suggested we ought to have a $25,000 limitation. Well, we got away from their viewpoint a long time ago. Of course, it is now reaching similarity. But they are still, I hope, a democracy.

I am opposed to the $25,000 limitation because I come from a part of the country—not like Los Angeles—but a district where we entertain summer people who come with money. About all my people work for people who must generally have to have a salary of more than $25,000. Limit those people and we would be out of a job. So, if I properly represent my people, I would never think of limiting a man's salary to $25,000. Then, again, I do not greatly worry about who may have more than $25,000 that we can take from them so easily.

Personally, "I only ask the slightest break—a few more cents than taxes take." I am then satisfied. Have not I said anything yet tart enough to provoke somebody to ask me a question? Are you all in full agreement with me? Is the Ruml plan simple or is it not?

Mrs. LUCE. Has the gentleman any formula to prevent a fool from losing his money?

Mr. GIFFORD. To prevent a fool from losing his money? Oh, a fool and his money are invited places. I do not know how anybody could prevent him from accepting the invitations. I know I would not refuse if the gentlewoman invited me to go places. I could perhaps not be regarded as a fool, however, in that instance. No wise man could resist it. The fool when he travels and has money, is then called a tourist.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I understand the Ruml approach, it is to the effect that we file a tentative return, and then a final return, and then join that with the statistics of the Treasury Department, and we now have 44,000,000 taxpayers.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That means to me, to say the least, that there must be filed some 88,000,000 individual tax calculations, which somebody must audit.

Mr. GIFFORD. It would seem so. But does the gentleman remember that it was said in one of the hearings that both returns could be made on the one sheet, or the one return blank?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the reason that I say there must be 88,000,000 individual tax calculations, because on that final return, which is the original return for the next year, there must be two sets of calculations.

Mr. GIFFORD. The Treasury has to take the burden of that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In addition to that, if we have our industrial concerns withholding the taxes on some 39,000,000 nonagricultural pay roll payees, and they are now on the pay roll, it means that those industrial concerns, as the gentleman said, must maintain expanded bookkeeping departments and a statistical personnel to prepare those withholding returns and send those into the Treasury. That means another thirty-five or forty million more returns which somebody must audit. So, as we explore all these possibilities. we should have in mind at least, it appears to me, that the Internal Revenue Bureau will perhaps prove to be the largest bureau we have in the Government service. I think that is probably the way we are headed. One other question bothers me very much and it has developed within the last 10 days. That is to the effect that big industry, prime contract holders, Government contracts, are now proposing some new service, that if a withholding tax is assessed, that industry and organized labor will band together in asking for an increase in wages sufficient to cover the withholding tax.

Mr. GIFFORD. Of course they will—why not you and I do the same thing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman any carefully thought-out plan as to how we can raise taxes?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, yes; there are a number of ways.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the other Members would like to have the gentleman state them.

Mr. GIFFORD. I pay about $32 per thousand on real estate that has no returns. People with bonds and stocks do not pay a cent. Why not explore that?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Why not tell us what they are? Perhaps we might like it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, I would suggest many things.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman state them in the revision of his remarks?

Mr. GIFFORD. And make those suggestions then?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I should include a sales tax, stamp taxes, and many unpopular devices. We must find the money somehow.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Just one moment. Before I forget it—my time is now short—I wish to repeat: Price control is not enough. We must have money control; we must have labor control. We cannot sit on a one-legged or two-legged stool; three legs are necessary.

Until you have those controls I am willing to go along with the farmer and see that he gets a fair price. Until control is extended elsewhere also I have reluctantly made up my mind that the farmer should have a reasonable price, in spite of the danger that impends. Certainly labor has been coddled. I hate to come to that decision. But I cannot listen to the threats of labor that "If we pay any more for food we will demand a still higher wage." They got there first and now do not welcome others. It is no use putting up an umbrella any longer that is full of holes. This country has been going on the last 7 or 8 years in this fashion. "The rain is supposed to fall equally upon the just and the unjust, but it falls more on the just, because the unjust have stolen the just's umbrella." That is what has been happening.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. After the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, we can understand now why we need 241,000 desks that the purchasing agent told the gentleman from Massachusetts about the other day.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes. It is indeed now understandable.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The gentleman has made an excellent statement on this question. It is a difficult problem. I think everyone who studies it runs into the difficulties the gentleman mentions.

Mr. GIFFORD. Right there I want to ask you, Should my people at home, after baring my breast upon this subject, think that I am too dumb to understand it?

Mr. CARLSON. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. GIFFORD. I will tell them you said that.

Mr. CARLSON. You just led into some avenues that need further explanation. When we come to the administrative difficulties let us not forget that we have millions of social-security accounts that are kept in this Nation. They report weekly and monthly. I, for one, agree with the gentleman from Michigan. I did not think we could keep them; but they seem to be doing very well with it. Now, there is just one issue. Is this Nation concerned enough about getting people out of tax debt and the Nation in a place where it is not threatened with insolvency when we shift 30,000,000 people, 20,000,000 in industry and 10,000,000 in the Army, from wartime to peacetime? Those people who will be in tax debt, on higher wages, will be liable for income taxes out of unemployment compensation checks. That is what concerns me. The gentleman is correct. He has presented some good problems.

Mr. GIFFORD. I would like to take the time, but I do not have it, to tell you the good things about the Ruml plan. There are many. It will relieve the distress of those people who are called upon to pay this year and have not the cash, and they will not have a tax debt hovering over them. They will have to pay this year, and if the plan is adopted they will notice little difference except they will have lost control of their own earnings to perhaps 20 percent. But those who have saved in these Army camps near me; those who have held money back to pay taxes can now be relieved and can spend it. It might make them happy. In a way it would be a windfall.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield to permit me to correct the RECORD?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not want the RECORD to stand as showing the statement made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] attributed to me, if I understood him, that I feel these records cannot be kept. I have had a great deal of experience in keeping records. I love to keep records, and I enjoy records that are beautifully kept. I think we can keep the records, but it requires manpower to do it, both in the offices of industry and in the offices of Government. So I simply do not want the RECORD to show that I do not believe those records cannot be kept. They can be kept, but I question the advisability of some of these records, and I would suggest this remedy, that if we are to withhold the tax at the source, then make it unnecessary for all those who received $2,500 or less of income to file a return, and let the fellow who scales them make a return to the Government and get rid of about fifty or seventy-five million returns.

Mr. GIFFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Now, I want to read you something before I finish, this from a very experienced and able economist whom my people trust:

> All of this talk by Treasury spokesmen and Congressmen about revenue to the Government being lost if the Ruml plan is adopted is just so much buncombe and they must know it. One cannot conceive that Treasury tax experts and members of the Ways and Means Committee are as stupid as they are trying to appear.
>
> Each person has to pay a certain percentage of his income to the Federal Government in the form of taxes. What possible difference can it make to the financial receipts of the Government whether the payments made in 1943 be considered as payments of taxes on 1942 incomes or on 1943 incomes. Subject to minor adjustments the Government gets the same amount of money.

There is some basis for his saying that. The Treasury made a mistake in saying we would lose $10,000,000,000 in the first instance.

> It is just exactly as sensible as arguing that daylight saving shortens the length of a day.
>
> What the Treasury is obviously trying to do is to work up some scheme by which the low-income groups which comprise the bulk of the voters in the country are put on a current year income tax basis while people with larger incomes are soaked for 2 years taxes in 1 year. This is on a par with the political ethics of the New Deal.

There is a feeling on the part of the Treasury that they should select those whom they think are able to pay and forgive or forget the rest. Is that equality of treatment and good American policy?

The atmosphere presses equally on all of us. Taxes, they used to say, should be placed on us in the same manner—equally and proportionately, but we have gone far away from the words "proportionately" and "reasonably." Taxes are no longer imposed in that manner.

I perhaps feel better now that I have talked about this matter. There have been seemingly so many in full agreement. I simply got to the point where I could not keep an open mind any longer. Fellows who keep an open mind too long had better beware lest only a draft blow through it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include a report from the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURDOCK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE PRODUCTION OF FOOD AND FIBER

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, let it be understood clearly that I do not pretend to have prophetic vision, neither do I think it serves any useful purpose for us to be constantly saying "I told you so."

At the outset, however, what I shall have to say is for the purpose of the record, and in view of the fact that those of us in and out of Congress who are especially charged with the responsibility of the program for agriculture and in our endeavor to see that the American farmer is given all the assistance, help, and every encouragement possible in his gigantic task to produce the necessary food and fiber to feed and clothe our armies and our civilian population; I want to briefly refer to some remarks I made in April 1941, almost 2 years ago. The remarks at that time were provoked by a statement of Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, which he made in connections with a Budget recommendation and referred to the items having to do with agriculture as nondefense items. On that occasion, among other things, I said, and I quote:

> Today neither the press, the public, nor anyone else seems to be concerned about the farmer's place in the national defense program. We are building battleships, tanks, airplanes, and bombers, and all the instruments of modern warfare to the tune of billions for the defense program, and yet, as I say, no one seems to be concerned about the place the farmer is to have in the program. I am afraid it is due to the fact that because of the huge, so-called surpluses of wheat, cotton, and a few other farm commodities that everyone thinks America has an abundance of foodstuffs sufficient to feed the world indefinitely.
>
> We must remember that the condition of the American farmer is much different than it was in 1917 and 1918, and I am afraid too many of us do not realize just what may be ahead.
>
> Yes, we are hearing a great deal about munitions, airplanes, and battleships, and I yield to no one in my desire for the strengthening of our defense program in every particular. But, after all, there will be no mass production unless there is plenty to eat. An army always "marches on its stomach," and our soldiers must be fed even though citizens are in want.

I predict that if agriculture is not reckoned with in this huge defense program (and remember, it was presumably only a defense program at that time) more quickly than many of us now realize, there will be concern about the food program and there will be a rude awakening for those who think agriculture is not important in this program.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Morgenthau was not the only one in high officialdom who apparently did not consider agriculture as an essential defense industry, and even after Pearl Harbor as an essential war industry. It was months after Pearl Harbor before agriculture was considered as an essential matter in the selection of an army. Agriculture workers were classified by selective service as nonessentials long after Pearl Harbor, and it was only a few months ago—to be exact, about November 1, 1942—before agriculture was given a classification as an essential war industry.

More than a year ago the Agriculture Committee of the House—of which committee I have the honor to be a member—called General Hershey and others before the committee and told them of the plight of the American farmer, particularly with reference to his inability to obtain adequate machinery and repairs and skilled or even ordinary farm labor; that this labor shortage was not only imminent but real. General Hershey was apparently sympathetic, but could not or at least did not do much about it.

With the progressive difficulties which the producers of the country found themselves in and were having in getting farm machinery and equipment as well as labor, the House Agriculture Committee last summer again held hearings for several weeks, endeavoring to get something done. We again called Secretary Wickard; General Hershey; Mr. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Board; and Mr. Donald Nelson, at the head of W. P. B. We spent several days urging that some concrete program be worked out, that something definite be done, and done quickly, to get more equipment to the farmers, and that something be done, and done quickly, that would stop the exodus of skilled manpower from the farms.

Mr. Speaker, on October 12, 1942, while these hearings were still in progress, I made certain suggestions to General Hershey which I put in the record as of that date. I call your attention to them:

I therefore suggest and urge that General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, in conjunction with the manpower board and the Department of Agriculture, take immediate steps to assist in stopping this exodus from the farms, and that the following directive be made effective at once:

That all persons affected by the Selective Service Act not already inducted into the armed forces, whose chief occupation for the past 3 years has been that of a farm operator or farm laborer, as disclosed by their respective questionnaires, be temporarily deferred and positive instructions be given to the local boards to make such temporary deferment. Pending such temporary deferment said local boards refrain from inducting any of such persons pending a reclassification of those farm operators and farm laborers engaged in the production of essential food and fiber for our war effort.

That the further following steps be taken just as speedily as possible:

(a) An immediate survey be made by the Selective Service in conjunction with the Manpower Board and the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of determining the amount of experienced and skilled farm operators and farm laborers available in the continental United States.

(b) That a survey be made by the Selective Service in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture as to the necessary amount of farm manpower essential to carry on the food and fiber victory program.

(c) That all persons found to be engaged in agricultural pursuits deemed essential to the war effort, and whose chief occupation has been that of farm operators or farm laborers for the past 3 years, be permanently deferred from induction in the armed forces so long as they engage themselves in essential agricultural pursuits.

(d) That farm organizations or representative farmers be given equal representation on all of the agencies dealing with manpower or priorities, heretofore or hereafter created for the purpose of prosecuting the war.

(e) That adequate publicity be given to the part the farmer has had and is having in the war program, and that such publicity be especially emphasized in the rural communities through the weekly newspapers and otherwise, to the effect that food and fiber is just as essential to the war effort as the worker in a defense plant, and that producing necessary food and fiber is just as patriotic as serving in the armed forces.

(f) That the Selective Service Administrator be explicit and firm in his instructions to the local boards, in emphasizing the necessity for keeping the experienced farmer and farm laborer on the farms and ranches necessary to the program to produce food and fiber essential to the prosecution of the war.

Immediately that the hearings before our committee were completed, a subcommittee of the full Committee on Agriculture, comprised of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE], and myself, together with Mr. Coffee of Nebraska, who was then a member of our committee, drafted a report and recommendations which were approved by the whole committee and copies were sent to Secretary Wickard, General Hershey, and Mr. Nelson, and which report appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A3704.

I shall quote briefly a few paragraphs from this report:

1. We recommend that directives be issued immediately to local draft boards to place in deferred classifications men essentially engaged in the production of vital food and fiber supplies.

2. Our investigation discloses that the greatest exodus of workers from the farm has been caused by the inducement of high industrial wages. No one can expect a worker to stay on the farm at a wage of $30 to $60 per month when he can receive as much as $100 per week or more in an industrial plant or on a defense project. Ceilings on farm commodity prices prohibit any substantial increase in farm wage rates. The Government pays the bill for industrial production and we observe that the War Labor Board is daily adjusting industrial wages upward. Either farm prices must be raised so that the farmers can compete in this labor market or else industrial wages must be brought to the same comparative level of farm wages.

3. We are convinced that the various agencies connected with the war effort have not shown proper appreciation of the importance of agriculture in winning the war. When requests have been made for materials for the manufacture of farm machinery, the reply has always been that such materials were needed for war production. The time has come when these agencies should recognize that necessary food and fiber is war production, and now that the shortage of labor has become so acute, immediate provision should be made for supplying the farmers of the Nation with necessary farm equipment, machinery, and repair parts.

4. Our committee was astonished to learn that, up to date, there has been no comprehensive survey of the manpower of this Nation and of the requirements to successfully carry on the war. We strongly recommend:

(1) That a definite determination be made as to (a) the total number of armed forces which the manpower and industry of this Nation can support and sustain, (b) the able-bodied manpower needed to support such armed forces and civilian population, and (c) the manpower available for such purposes;

(2) That all needs be rated according to their respective importance for the winning of the war;

(3) That an appropriate priority system be established for the allocation of the available supply of manpower.

5. The farmers in every part of the Nation do not know how to plan for 1943 crops. Contracts must be made, material must be secured, fertilizers must be bought, seed must be ordered, months in advance. Utter confusion exists today on every farm, every ranch, every dairy. We appeal to the President and the several administrative agencies to act and act now, so the farmers may know whether to plan and how to plan.

6. Price ceilings can protect the consumer only so long as there is something to price. They may easily and quickly bring about such shortages that supply will be many times more important than price. We, therefore, recommend that minimum prices be fixed and ceilings be adjusted so as to encourage abundant production. Very little rationing of farm commodities will be necessary if the producers are encouraged, and they should not be required to produce at a loss.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the record shows your Committee on Agriculture in the House has been on the alert. But even so, that will not satisfy bare backs and hungry bellies.

The fact that Mr. WALLACE and Mr. Wickard, and many others in high places said there was plenty of food for all and that rationing of any appreciable amount of foodstuffs would not be necessary; as was pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] the other day, is of no consolation now. Rationing is here, and no one should complain about that, if that is what it takes to feed our boys over there and everywhere, and our workers who are turning out the arms and munitions for them to do the job.

What we need to be alarmed about is not the rationing particularly, but that there may be something to ration. Let us look at this picture—I am afraid some of us do not realize just how big

an assignment we have given the American farmer in this job of furnishing food and fiber. Let us see what we are demanding of him.

We have a population in this country, in round numbers, of 130,000,000 people. The farm population, that is, people who actually reside on the farms, is now estimated to be 29,048,000. The Department of Agriculture has subdivided into three categories, into numbers, those who must do the job of producing the food. In making these calculations, they say there are 2,035,000 full-time hired workers on the farms of this Nation. At certain seasons of the year considerable in excess of that number were necessarily employed on the farms; but in reducing that number to year-round full-time employment the 2,035,000 was estimated as the full-time hired workers in producing the crops of 1942.

Second, we have the farm operators. This term is intended to cover the man who lives on the farm, manages the farm, works on the farm, and in most cases works in the fields planting, cultivating, and harvesting the crops. Upon him rests the responsibility of producing the crops to feed the Nation without regard to seasons, weather, or hours. The Department of Agriculture estimates this number to be 5,140,000 full-time operators engaged in farm production.

Third, this category contained in the classification is known as the family worker. For the crop year 1942 these family workers were estimated at 1,250,000. This, mind you, covers the number of family workers reduced to a year-round, all-time basis, who devote their time and their brawn to producing.

To recapitulate, we have:

| | |
|---|---|
| Hired workers | 2,035,000 |
| Operators | 5,140,000 |
| Family workers | 1,250,000 |
| Total | 8,425,000 |

Now what does this mean? It means that this comparative handful of people of 8,425,000 must not only produce the food and fiber to sustain themselves and the remaining 20,623,000 members of their own families, but also an army and a navy totaling over 10,000,000 at the present time; also the 17,500,000 engaged in war production, and the 21,300,000 who labor in the mines and factories of the Nation, and in addition some 200,000 who are engaged in disseminating news by press and radio. Likewise the remaining 57,000,000 (including several million Government employees) of our civilian population.

Then in addition to all of this, they are expected to supply the food for millions and untold millions of those allied with us in the war, and millions in the conquered countries which we must feed immediately following their liberation.

Think of it—just 8,425,000 to do this job. And yet, day after day, we hear news commentators in the press and over the radio, referring to this group of men and women as a group of greedy hogs, solely responsible for high prices, entirely chargeable with inflation.

Well, what are we to do about it?

I fully realize and appreciate that much of the damage has already been done, as far as securing labor is concerned. The draft, and industry with its attractive high wages, has already tremendously crippled the skilled farm labor supply. We can and must, however, save from the wreck what is left, and do so now. We must see to it—

First. That no more bona fide farmers or farm laborers are inducted into military service so long as they engage in agriculture.

Second. I think we should immediately release and discharge where it can be done without serious disruption to the armed forces, every skilled agricultural worker who can be of more service in winning the war on the farm than in the Army.

Third. We must encourage the States through every available facility, such as the agriculture colleges and other schools and through local citizens' committees and through the chambers of commerce and civic clubs in the smaller communities, to recruit every available worker, whether he be a schoolboy or senior citizen, bank clerk, lawyer, merchant, or preacher; either for full time or part time for seasonable planting and for seasonable harvesting. All of this, of course, to be without compulsion and strictly on a voluntary basis.

I know that this system was of great aid and assistance to many farmers in World War No. 1, and it can be again.

Fourth. That the O. P. A. and the W. P. B. see to it that priorities are so adjusted that a greater amount of necessary equipment and machinery gets to the farmers without further delay. Let the local dealers and merchants have this machinery on the ground at the places where it is needed and the local war boards pass upon the priorities and necessity for the machinery. In every community they know the farmers, what they need, and who will do the job if furnished the tools and equipment.

In the name of high heaven, let us get away from so much of this Washington and regional stuff. If these congressional lame ducks must have high-salaried jobs in the O. P. A. and in other places, please let us not saddle agriculture with them in this emergency.

Fifth. During the emergency at least let us take all restrictions off of production. I am not adverse, of course, to the program of providing for a minimum of the so-called war crops; provided a common-sense course is pursued in the allocation of the same, taking into consideration and as a primary consideration, the adaptability of the crop to be grown and the particular community where it is requested that it be grown.

In other words, let us not try to raise rice on the high plains of North Dakota, or try to raise pinto beans in the rice swamps of Arkansas.

And, finally, let us give to the farmer a fair parity price at the market place for what he produces.

The world will never forget how the American farmer came to its rescue during the closing years of the last World War. Food was the crying demand, and the farmer produced it. With less help and equipment he increased his production and answered every call of a hungry world. He did not strike and refuse to plant or harvest. He did not hoard his products and say, you must pay me unreasonable prices or I refuse to sell. He answered the appeal of patriotism and he will do so again; but he is entitled to fair treatment.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Clarence B. Kelland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### AMERICA'S POSITION IN POST-WAR AVIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, there is before this House a resolution looking toward the creation of a permanent standing committee on civil and commercial aviation, domestic and overseas. To my surprise there has been expressed opposition to this resolution, both on the floor and in committees and in private conferences.

There has been expressed the fear that the formation of the proposed committee on aviation problems would take something away from the present Committee on Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, or Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This is true to a certain extent, but it would be to a very limited extent, since the problems which the proposed new committee would consider are, and would continue to be, largely new problems. Indeed, the necessities of modern warfare are pushing air transport along so fast that merely to keep up with aviation today is a full-time job. Most of that province which would be covered by the proposed committee would be in territory which existing committees have never yet explored or even contemplated. And it is my observation that each of the existing committees concerned already has plenty to do.

Certainly the proposed permanent standing committee on civil and commercial aviation would not find itself in conflict with existing committees. The spheres of influence of many committees of this House touch and overlap of necessity, but each has as its basic concern the well-being of the people of these United States. This aim does not dictate that all matters should be placed in the hands of a single committee. It

rather suggests committees which can specialize on certain lines, and a logical synchronization of all of their efforts. And in all the fields of human endeavor which require specialization today, aviation is the most exacting.

The proposed new committee would have to consider and formulate new policies for controlling the new situations which are developing in this transition period. Beyond a few generalizations on post-war policy we should not go in this period of flux. This House needs a committee of air-wise Members who can keep their legislative feet on the ground, no matter how much they or others fly in the stratosphere—men who shall be prepared to advise this body in this highly technical field when this global war has been won, and in the light of conditions as they shall then exist.

Certainly the principle of the freedom of the air must be a basic general premise for the post-war world. The gentlewoman from Connecticut in her most eloquent maiden speech before this House recently seemed to advocate a sort of an American freedom of the world's air, which would be comparable to the old British freedom of the seas when Britannia ruled the waves. In that same speech she spoke confidently of American defeat in the next war if this nation espoused the wrong air policy.

Now, I insist that there is a probability we might prevent future wars from ever plaguing the world, by a proper American air policy. The executive branch of our Government now has an interdepartmental Post War International Air Policy Committee, headed by Assistant Secretaries of State, War, Navy, Commerce, and others. Certainly this House should have a committee capable by authority and membership to study continuously and report when needed on this all-important subject.

We abhor glib phrases in this generation. Our young men are not inspired to fight to "Make the world safe for democracy," and so on. But I really believe that the basic reason why this country is involved in this war is the belief that this can be made the war to end all wars on this earth. And this great desire can be brought to pass through two factors; first, that all other nations and peoples shall see and recognize our capacity to throw an overwhelming air might to any part of the globe at any time; and, second, that our nation, which destiny has elevated to the greatest position of power ever held by any nation on earth, shall make all other nations and peoples know and realize that we covet nothing which is theirs—and will even help them to hold that which is theirs against any aggressor.

The achievement of our war aim to bring permanent peace to the world requires the will to have that peace, and the power effectively to demand it—both depending upon the universal realization that the will and the power are genuine.

American aviators, military and civilian, are now known pretty much all over the world. They are a very high type of our young manhood. We are fortunate to have them so widely dispersed as unofficial but very effective ambassadors of good will all along our far-flung air lines. On my flight to Europe I saw their work at first hand at Belem and Natal in our sister Republic of Brazil, in Trinidad, in Lisbon, Bermuda, and the Azores. These are only a few of their locations, of course, but I noted the confidence and fellowship with which the officials and natives of these places approached our flying men and ground crews and other personnel. It was evident that here was being engendered that confidence and friendship which are the guaranties of peace to come. Here was the fruit of the blending of good will with the evidence of power.

All along these constantly expanding aerial routes American boys are fraternizing with the people of the great cities and with the natives of jungles and desert. Our men have no background motive of imperialism—no secret belief in themselves as a superior race—and their friendly approach is recognized as sincere. Our airmen, ground crews, sanitation corps, are working and playing with the people they meet from the sophisticated night clubs of Rio to the landing fields hewn from the jungle or the steel apron laid down beside an isolated desert oasis. Our contractors actually pay the natives for their work; they can buy standard goods and are not cheated at our stores; our doctors treat their ailing and their injured; our men are teaching them to play our outdoor games and the principles of fair play and American sportsmanship. This is a new kind of conquest—the conquest of peace and fellowship, and the people are at first skeptical, and then responsive.

The peoples of a large part of the world are becoming aware of the power which is America. They see or they hear about the B–17E Boeing Flying Fortresses, the B–24 Consolidated Liberators, the B–25 North American Mitchells, the B–26 Martin Marauders which roar along the lanes toward what will obviously be highly destructive conduct. They also note the split tail P–38 Lockheed Lightnings, the flying cannon platform P–39 Bell Airacobras, the rejuvenated P–40 Curtiss Warhawks, and many other types of bombers, fighters, interceptors, reconnaissance, cargo, transport, and passenger planes as they hurry along toward the fronts in a steady stream. And the word that all that power has not come for exploitation but instead is come to enforce the policy of live and let live, is working a new spirit into the peoples of this earth. The word of hope is spreading outward from each of the American airports like the ripples on the surface of a lake when an unaccustomed impulse breaks its surface. This is the new diplomacy. Our airmen are preparing the way for permanent peace on this earth.

Many bases for our aviation forces have been developed outside of our continental limits. Steps should be taken at once to make all bases which figure in our hemispheric influence permanent acquisitions. As for the other great air bases which we have developed, or shall have developed in Europe, Africa, Asia, or on the islands of the seas, the treaties which solidify the world peace after this war will have to deal. They will be available to all nations for legitimate commercial purposes. We will approach the peace conferences with an attitude of fairness to all concerned, but with the determination to end future wars.

These conferences will have to consider and determine just what freedom of the air is to include. The principle of the freedom of the sea, with which we have had some experience, will give some hints as to how not to proceed. But there is a vast difference between the low-value quantitative transport of iron ore, cement, raw wool, and such cargo in surface ships which travel 200 miles in a day, and the carrying of refined cargo at 200 miles an hour. Rules worked out for visits of slow-moving transports to points on the periphery of a country are not applicable to an air transport which could hop from New York to Detroit and return while a surface ship was coming into dock from Sandy Hook.

Few nations will desire to seal the air over their territory from all other peoples. But, just as surely, the so-called right of innocent passage cannot be construed to permit the possibility of reconnaissance or aerial photography over strategic areas. No; there will have to be air lanes from which foreign planes shall not deviate, and stated airports which they may utilize. The extent of their passenger and cargo carrying activity will likely have to be settled by reciprocal agreements. The many legislative angles of such questions require the existence of the permanent standing committee proposed by the resolution before this House. These matters are too important and too specialized to be dumped into the lap of just any committee.

I am often impelled to think of the development of the great West by the coming of transport facilities into that region, as comparable to the world transformation which the new cargo carrying airplanes will bring upon the conclusion of this war. And a new development is coming to the West through the expanded civilian uses of aviation, as soon as we can return to peaceful pursuits. This is of particular interest to my great State because of the distances and elevations with which we are blessed. We have at Lowry Field and at Buckley Field a very large number of aviators of all categories who are training at one of the most modern airports in the world, and favored by almost continuous flying weather. I am told that Denver offers the greatest number of sunshine hours

per year of any airport in this country, and, moreover, that pilots who receive their training in that clear, pure, mile-high air, are acknowledged to be superior flyers.

Fort Logan is a center of training for our airmen, and our State institutions are turning out finished pilots, observers, gunners, bombardiers, navigators, and ground crew men in great numbers. As an indication of Colorado's leadership in this field—at the recent preflight institute held under the auspices of the Aviation Committee of the Denver Chamber of Commerce and the C. A. A., leading speakers were Prof. Ben Wood, nationally known pioneer in aviation education, of Colorado University, and Dr. George Frazer, president of Colorado State College of Education.

This country has taken the lead throughout the development of aviation. Our industry is now geared to a fast-moving program of airplane production which will have tremendous momentum on the day that the unconditional surrender of our enemies is signed. Some part of that industry will revert immediately and naturally to the production of automobiles, and other items and machinery of peaceful pursuits, but another large part will continue to serve the new demand for airplanes—cargo in many specialized fields and passenger planes of all categories.

All along these new air lanes, and in all of the restored countries, there will be a critical need for transport. The United States Air Transport Command or some logical successor will continue to deliver along all of these long air lanes, carrying vitally needed foods and medicines, farm machinery, and seed instead of aviation gasoline, bombs, guns, and tanks. I do not see that the coming of peace will bring any diminution of the usefulness of these planes, air lanes, or bases. Quite the contrary will surely be the case.

As always before, when we have sent occupational troops into any country, a certain number will return when their service is terminated. All along these war-born routes, American boys who have soldiered out there will return, bringing wives and friends, and establish themselves as residents. They will branch out in all directions from the established air lanes and go into various vocations. And these peaceful settlers will be, just as they were in the service, unofficial American ambassadors of good will and trade and development, continuing their great work for our country and for the peace of the world.

One of the most important lanes, and perhaps the longest being currently flown by the United States Air Transport Command, is the one out to Chungking. It replaced the Burma Road when that supposedly indispensable trade route was cut off. Without the vital war necessities flown to China's armies, the Japanese could not have been held in China. The air transport alone kept Japan from complete ownership of the sky over China. A blessing on that air route and on all of the pilots and crews who flew and are still flying its hazardous mountain course. And they were inspired to their continued effort by the legendary accomplishments of Claire Chennault's Flying Tigers, and their successors in the American Air Corps out there.

It is my hope that our country can double and redouble that transport to China, and bring that heroic people increased and more direct assistance. We have trained a few Chinese pilots in this country. This program should be speeded up, and also the training of all categories of airmen in China itself should be encouraged and aided by American instructors and equipment. For with a China strong in the air, and continuing our traditional friendship and mutual aid, there would be no further Japanese menace. We should do everything possible to attain this goal. In a peacetime assured by this alliance in mutual friendliness and advantage we would continue to supply China with her aviation materials and many other goods. China is a natural and an immense market and a good friend and neighbor for the nation which does not seek to exploit her.

In our own hemisphere there are other friendly nations whose air future we should be working assiduously to assure. With Mexico we are already in partnership. Brazil is our natural ally in all pursuits in that we complement each other's products. The vast expanses and great difficulties of surface transport in that great country invoke of necessity the airplane. The Brazilians have demonstrated that they make good pilots. It is our role to supply them with airplanes and with precision mechanical articles which are properly transported by airplanes both during and following the conflict. The efficiency of the Brazilian air arm and bases is of vital interest to North America as well as South America. The transport of raw rubber and chicle from the Amazon jungles is now an established business of air transport. It results that many of the interior natives are familiar with large transport airplanes, but have never seen an automobile or a streetcar.

Something in the way of a statement from the legislative body of this Government concerning the principle of freedom of the air is needed today in order to dissipate the uneasiness which exists in other nations, Britain for example, as evidenced in recent House of Commons debate and some newspaper comments concerning the great advances along the new air lanes made by the United States Air Transport Command. The London Times of December 29, last, closed an article on this subject by stating that it is reported that American assurance has been given that America would not attempt to exploit her advantage by nailing down concessions over the world air routes.

Now, I do not know any agency of our Government which is competent to give any such post-war assurance. If such assurances have been given to any nation, certainly this House has not been consulted, and legislation concerning post-war air transport is definitely the concern of this body.

This is just one more reason why I rise to advocate favorable consideration upon the resolution before the House to create a permanent standing committee on civil and commercial aviation, domestic and overseas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

## PROMOTING HEMISPHERICAL SOLIDARITY THROUGH EDUCATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to direct the attention of the House for a few minutes to the post-war world. We have heard considerable discussion this afternoon about the post-war world from the standpoint of aviation, from the standpoint of military problems, and from other standpoints, but I want to say just a few words about the post-war world from the standpoint of improved international relations and that fundamental goal which we all have in this war of developing a program which will lead to permanent peace throughout the world.

I hesitate naturally to suggest anything now about an appropriation at a time when we are operating with a hundred billion dollar budget, and I would make no such suggestions, but I feel that perhaps this small appropriation which I am about to propose may serve as insurance to protect the dividends we hope to secure from the expenditure of these hundreds of billions of dollars which we are forced to spend in the prosecution of this war.

I do not begrudge and I am sure no Member of the House begrudges the expenditure of anything and everything that it takes to bring victory to our side in this terrible conflict, and I hope by the same token that no right-minded man or woman objects to the expenditure of reasonable sums of money to protect the dividends which will come to the world as a result of this war if out of it comes a permanent peace for all mankind.

I have introduced a bill in the House today known as H. R. 2034, which has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The purpose of this bill is to promote further the friendly relations of the peoples of the Pan-American republics by providing for Pan-American student-teacher scholarships of $1,000 each throughout the country; scholarships which our student teachers can use in studying in teachers' colleges in our South American republics, and to provide 1,000 scholarships of $1,000 each for students in the other American republics to use in studying in teachers' colleges of the United States. Inasmuch as the bill is very short I ask

permission, Mr. Speaker, to incorporate at this point the text of H. R. 2034 as a part of these remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The resolution referred to follows:

H. R. 2034

A bill to promote further the friendly relations of the peoples of the Pan American Republics by providing for Pan American student teacher scholarships

Whereas the good neighbor policy of the United States was adopted to promote solidarity among the Republics represented in the Pan American Union; and

Whereas familiarity with peoples of other republics and their customs tends to promote the understanding which is necessary to the success of the good neighbor policy; and

Whereas well-trained and carefully selected instructors in the elementary and high schools who understand the peoples and customs of other Republics furnish the best means by which to transmit knowledge and understanding to the greatest number of people: Therefore

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for each of the four following fiscal years, the sum of $2,000,000. Such sum shall be used each year for the payment of the expenses of 1,000 students from the United States in attending teachers' colleges in the other Republics which are represented in the Pan American Union and the expenses of 1,000 students from such Republics in attending teachers' colleges in the United States.

SEC. 2. The Pan American Union acting with the advice and counsel of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs is authorized to provide for the selection each year of 1,000 students from the United States for attendance at colleges in the other republics which are represented in the Pan American Union, subject to the following conditions:

(a) Candidates for scholarships shall be selected from students who are finishing their freshman year and are enrolled in State-supported teachers colleges which are members of the American Association of Teachers Colleges.

(b) Scholarships shall be awarded to two students residing in each congressional district. All other scholarships shall be scholarships-at-large.

(c) The awarding of scholarships-at-large shall be on such a basis as will insure Nation-wide distribution of such scholarships.

(d) The selection of candidates for scholarships from congressional districts shall be supervised by the State office of education of the State in which the district is located. Insofar as practicable such candidates shall be selected from teachers' colleges in each State in proportion to the enrollment in each college.

(e) The selection of candidates-at-large for scholarships shall be supervised by the United States Office of Education.

(f) Candidates for scholarships shall be required to take physical and aptitude examinations.

(g) Each scholarship shall be for the payment of the expenses of attendance in the junior year of college, or the equivalent thereof, at a college selected by the Pan American Union to participate in the exchange of students under this act.

Sec. 3. The Pan American Union is authorized to provide for the selection each year of 1,000 students from republics which are represented in the Pan American Union for attendance at colleges in the United States, subject to the following conditions—

(a) The selection of candidates for scholarships from each republic shall be supervised by the Minister of Education of such republic.

(b) The number of candidates to be selected from each republic shall be determined on the basis of population.

(c) Candidates for scholarships shall be selected from colleges which have as their primary function the training of teachers for elementary and secondary schools.

(d) Candidates for scholarships shall be required to take physical and aptitude examinations.

(e) Each scholarship shall be for the payment of the expenses of attendance in the junior year at a State-supported teachers college which is a member of the American Association of Teachers Colleges. Insofar as possible, the distribution of visiting students to the teachers colleges of the United States shall be made on the same basis as the selection of students from the United States to attend the teachers colleges of the other republics in the Pan American Union.

SEC. 4. No college shall participate in the exchange of any students under this act unless it—

(a) provided that credits earned by any of its students for instruction received at another college under a scholarship awarded under this act shall be counted toward graduation at full face value;

(b) provides for the making of periodic reports to the Pan American Union, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and to the Institute of International Education; and

(c) assumes responsibility for the welfare and progress of students assigned to it under this act.

SEC. 5. The scholarship of any student may be revoked by the Pan American Union after notice upon determination by it that the student has failed to maintain a satisfactory scholarship record.

---

BILL PROVIDES EDUCATIONAL PLAN FOR HEMISPHERIC SOLIDARITY

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 1.—Calling upon his colleagues "to spend at least a tiny fraction of a penny for the promotion of peace every time we spend a dollar or more for the prosecution of war," Congressman KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, South Dakota, today introduced legislation authorizing the appropriation of $2,000,000 annually to provide scholarships for exchange students between State teachers' colleges of the United States and those of other American republics. MUNDT'S bill provides for a thousand student teachers to be transferred each way each school year, with $1,000 allotted to each student. Every congressional district in America would participate in the program.

Mr. MUNDT advised the House that in the preparation of this legislation he had conferred with Nelson Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and with a committee of faculty members from Indiana State Teachers College at Terre Haute, Ind., who had been making a special study of inter-American relations in the field of education. MUNDT said that Mr. Rockefeller was enthusiastic in his response to the suggestion and expressed the belief that the proposed program would be welcomed in all the American republics.

In limiting these scholarships to students in the teachers' colleges of the republics cooperating in the Pan American Union, MUNDT declared, "The ideal manner in which to improve and preserve friendly relations among neighbor nations is to promote an understanding and appreciation of the cultural background, the political systems, and the economic problems of sovereign states. By giving student teachers of the United States an opportunity to live and study for a year in other American republics we train missionaries of good will in the educational field who will in turn transmit this enlightened understanding to the students with whom they come in contact in the classroom. The same dividends will accrue for the student teachers of the other American republics who spend a year in study and association with students and educators scattered throughout the teachers' colleges of the United States. It is nothing more than prudent peace insurance for the post-war world to begin, now, devising methods for a better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world. Here in the Americas, from Alaska to Argentina, let us demonstrate the process now of promoting peaceful cooperation through learning to respect one another by coming to know one another more understandingly."

Mr. MUNDT. A reading of this bill will indicate I am sure some of the benefits to accrue and will clearly point out the method of operation incorporated in the bill. The purpose of the legislation is to make these scholarships available only to students in teachers' colleges for this reason, that after they graduate and become teachers and go into communities their influence can be radiated out much more widely and rapidly than students in any other branch of learning. Students from South America will live in this country and our students will live in the countries of South America for a year, many times in private homes. When they come back to this country to assume their profession of teaching they will come in contact with both parents and students and be in a very intimate position to spread a better understanding and appreciation of the customs and cultural background and political systems and economic problems of our sister republics in this hemisphere. The same is true for the visiting students who will come to the United States from the other American republics.

I hope that this legislation which I have suggested may receive early consideration by the House Foreign Affairs Committee for the reason that very soon there will be called on this hemisphere an inter-American meeting of the ministers of education of all the 21 republics. These ministers of education are meeting in an effort to implement through the device of education a better understanding among the various peoples of these republics. I feel that some such system of exchange of teachers as I propose would be something which will win the hearty approval of the meeting of these ministers of education. I hope those who approve of this program will let my colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee know of your support.

Mr. Speaker, I have consulted at some length with Nelson Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and his staff on this problem. He has gone over this legislation with me and it has his hearty support and approval.

I have been in conference with a faculty committee of the Indiana State Teachers College at Terre Haute, Ind., some of the members of which I have known for some time in a professional capacity, and I presume that is the reason they have contacted me on the problem. The Indiana State Teachers College has a faculty committee called the war emergency planning committee, which has worked in conjunction with Nelson Rockefeller and myself in proposing various details of H. R. 2034, and I may add that the gentleman from Terre Haute, Mr. NOBLE JOHNSON, has also been of inestimable value in his contributions and suggestions in trying to establish this type of legislation for encouraging good will through these scholarships.

The members of this faculty committee at the Indiana State Teachers College are as follows: J. F. Mackell, chairman; V. E. Breidenbaugh, D. W. Morris, M. O. Peters, F. M. Curtis, S. A. Yager, R. F. McDaid, and J. F. Sembower.

These Indiana educators have done a splendid job in thinking through some of the problems involved in this legislation. We have a number of commercial scholarships available to Americans to study in South American schools and available to South American students to study in the schools of the United States, but my proposal is the only type of scholarship which is specifically set up for students who are going to become teachers in the American republics and who consequently will carry the missionary work of public understanding, good feeling and good friendship out to the youth who are developing ideals of citizenship as they come up through the school systems of all these republics.

It is well known that such magazines as Time magazine and the Reader's Digest are now publishing issues in Spanish or Portuguese, so that the South Americans may learn from a reading of American magazines in their native language a little more about our attitudes, our ideals, and customs in this country. This is a splendid service. The more we can do to understand each other in this hemisphere, it seems to me, the better we are prepared to cement and to further the good friendship and good feeling existing among the various American republics.

The orientals have an old saying to the effect that, "the man you do not like is the man you do not know." I think there is a great element of human experience and truth in that axiom, and the better we can come to know the people of this hemisphere and the people throughout the world, the better we are going to like and understand them and the better we come to knowing them the more probable it is that the program which will develop after the war, whatever it is, for the preservation of peace, will have an opportunity to succeed.

The ideal manner in which to improve and preserve friendly relations among neighbor nations is to promote an understanding and appreciation of the cultural background, the political systems, and the economic problems of sovereign states. By giving student teachers of the United States an opportunity to live and study for a year in other American republics we train missionaries of good will in the educational field who will in turn transmit this enlightened understanding to the students with whom they come in contact in the classroom. The same dividends will accrue for the student teachers of the other American republics who spend a year in study and association with students and educators scattered throughout the teachers' colleges of the United States. It is nothing more than prudent peace insurance for the post-war world to begin, now, devising methods for a better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world. Here in the Americas, from Alaska to Argentina, let us demonstrate the process now of promoting peaceful cooperation through learning to respect one another by coming to know one another more understandingly.

Now, as to the cost of this program. My bill calls for the appropriation or the authorization of an appropriation of $2,000,000 a year to provide these 2,000 scholarships in the amount of $1,000 each, one-half of which will be for students of the United States and one-half of which will be for students in the other American republics, working through the Pan American Union.

This will amount to an expenditure of about $1 for the promotion of peace and for the preservation of better human relationship for every $50,000 we are now spending for the prosecution of this war. That $50,000, of course, and hundreds of billions more must be spent, but it seems to me it is equally important that we spend this little $1 in order to make sure that out of the war will come something of genuine benefit to all mankind.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come when this Congress should give some attention to developing programs and processes whereby perhaps we can spend at least a tiny fraction of a penny for the promotion of peace and good will every time we spend a dollar or more for the prosecution of the war. To that end, as you know, I have also introduced House Joint Resolution 28 to establish a Post-War Planning Commission. We must spend what it takes to win the war and I think good judgment indicates we must also spend what we can to protect and develop benefits from the war which will prevent some future historian from writing of this conflict that once again a tremendous burden of human sacrifice shall have been made in vain.

## SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, "we're over the hill to the poorhouse."

I take the floor not to bring to your attention a new fact, a new circumstance for your consideration, but to remind you and remind you again that the farm-labor shortage is serious and must be solved now. Crops that are not planted cannot be harvested. You reap what you sow—sow nothing, reap nothing.

If something is not done now, we shall be so far gone over the cliff of food shortage in a few days that we can never recover the ground lost. I do not believe that with millions of men without factories and men without farms in foreign countries that we should overexpand our military forces at the expense of the bread baskets of all our allies. Food will win the war. Do we want soldiers—even hungry ones and half-equipped, half-clothed ones? The rest of the world boasts about their manpower and about how many men they can put under arms. All right; if they have men, we have the machinery and the skilled labor to feed and equip all the armies our allies can marshal, provided we use our heads.

If the bureaucratic parasites who have fed so long on the people are not smart enough to keep their hosts alive, we must take the bull by the horns lest we all go down to defeat. If the paper planners at mahogany desks cannot understand the dirt and weather problems of the farmer, and we do not inform them, we may all go hungry; and while most of the farmers I know cannot afford to lose many pounds, there are thousands of bay windows in Washington that will look better for a little controlled diet, and, believe you me, they will get it.

I have a letter this morning from one of the biggest packers in the country, who tells me that he has been asked by the Government to pack 33 percent more food this year to help win the war. But when he went out to contract the acreage for raising this food he met a frightening situation. He has been unable to match his contracts of last year by almost 50 percent. He is offering from 25 percent to 75 percent more to the farmers if they will produce the fruit and vegetables for him to can, but they are forced to refuse his offers because in most cases there is only Ma and Pa and maybe Uncle John, who was injured in the last war, to do the work. Last year there was Ma, Pa, Uncle John, and three strapping farm boys to do it. If the youngsters have not been drafted, they are in the city working in a defense plant for a lot more than a farmer ever made and on a 48-hour week, too. Which leaves Ma and Pa and Uncle John, who have always worked 70 to 80 hours per week, and therefore are unable to absorb the extra load. Farm-machinery shortages cannot solve the problem, either, but only complicate it.

Gentlemen, I have never held myself up as a universal authority and I know that there are a lot of the tactical problems of the War Department that I do not understand, as well as a lot of the political ambitions which prompt some of our highest leaders, but I am a farmer and I have been eating three square meals a day for years, and so long as two and two make four we have to raise food before we can eat it.

It is a matter of statistics that most of our cities have grown enormously in the last 6 months and where can new city dwellers come from but from the country. We are drafting about 10 percent of our manpower, which should reduce the city populations 10 percent and the rural population about 10 percent; but such has not been the case. While the farms are literally robbed of men, the cities have absorbed their 10-percent loss to the armed services and have grown by thousands. From where can such increases come except from back of a plow, or out of a hay mow? If you are not worried and if you have not some suggestions to offer, you are not fulfilling your responsibilities to America. America needs food and food will not just grow. It has to be planted in earth that is prepared for it and at the right time. It has to be plowed and cared for and watched until God and Nature have done their work. It has to be harvested and stored against the time of need. This is hard work and it cannot be done by a pencil-pushing political appointee. We can push pencils and keep records after Hirohito has joined his none too honorable ancestors and after Schickelgruber is papering the walls of Hell. We will need the work then, but why cannot we pare our bureaus to the last drawer now and get in crops in order that we may eat.

There are still the blind ones among us who are yapping about social gains and esthetic progress and the spreading of some kind or another of glad tidings over the world. They will look mighty queer next winter when their ration books are just memories or are being used in the bottoms of their old shoes to keep out the snow. How can a bunch of men who claim to be smart be so dumb? Did no one read the story of the ant and the grasshopper in his second-grade reader? Has everyone forgotten the old hymn Work for the Night Is Coming? Has not anyone told Washington that we are at war and men are dying?

Take the case of the packer in Indiana who is getting less than 50 percent of the food planted on the farms this year that he got planted last year. How is he going to pack 33 percent more, as the Government asks? How far will a 50 percent crop stretch? Also, what will happen if we should have a bad season? Gentlemen, we need to overplant and do not kid yourselves one bit. That is not taking food off your table this minute, or the next meal, but come Christmas 1943 and we will know what effect half of last year's crop of pumpkins will mean. It will mean that the boys in service will get all there is, and will need more than there is; not to mention our Allies and their needs, which will leave you, and John Q. Public and Mr. Taxpayer absolutely a round zero, and you cannot live long on that.

They took our nylon, but stockings can be made of rayon or cotton. They stopped us driving our cars, but we can get there on the streetcars, or stay home with a good book. If they need the shirts off our backs to win the war we will just button our coats a little tighter, but so far as I know people have had to have food since long before Nero, and yet we sit here fiddling while time burns.

There is an old motto often used on Victorian sundials which should remind us of the dangers of delay. It goes like this, "It is later than you think." Gentlemen, you will be emptier than you think and so will I and so will those boys in north Africa and Iceland and the Solomons if we do not get busy.

The Lord will do more than his share; he will grow it if we will plant the seed and harvest the crop, but He will never plant the seed or harvest and store the crop for us. Who will do it this year? The Lord only knows.

## CONTESTED ELECTION, SEVENTH DISTRICT, ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

FEBRUARY 27, 1943.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: That there is now in progress, under the provisions of the Federal Statutes, a contest for the seat in the House of Representatives from the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois is indicated by a petition which has this day been filed with the Clerk signed by James C. Moreland, contestant, wherein he prays that the time allowed for taking testimony in the beforementioned case be extended beyond the time permitted by law and setting forth the ground upon which the request is made.

Since this authority can only be granted by action of the House itself, the petition and accompanying exhibits are transmitted herewith for consideration by the appropriate committee.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

The SPEAKER. Referred to the Committee on Elections No. 3 and ordered to be printed.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TOWE (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), on account of illness.

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution requesting that an appropriate medal be designed for presentation to the President in connection with his recent trip to Africa; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

## ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

## BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 2, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a hearing of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on Wednesday, March 3, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 1607.

### COMMITTEE ON ROADS

There will be a hearing of the Committee on Roads on Thursday, March 4, 1943, at 10:30 a. m.

### COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, March 9, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on H. R. 1880, a bill providing for the construction of a ship canal across the State of New Jersey, connecting New York Bay with the Delaware River, and forming the last link in the Intracoastal Waterway from Boston to the Mexican border.

### COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

You are hereby advised that the hearing on H. R. 134, to provide for the suspension, during the war, of operating-differential subsidy agreements, and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes, which was previously scheduled for Thursday, March 4, 1943, has been postponed until Thursday, March 11, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m.

The committee will also hold a public hearing on Thursday, March 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1361 (Mr. LANE) and H. R. 1409 (Mr. FOGARTY), conferring upon men in the merchant marine the same rights, privileges, and benefits accruing to those serving in the armed forces, and on H. R. 1858, to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine who served during the World War as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who served during such war.

### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 16, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 149.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

214. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, fiscal year 1944, involving an increase of $254,200 in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 119); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

215. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting the petition and accompanying exhibits in the case of a contested seat in the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 120); to the Committee on Elections No. 3 and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAGNUSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1563. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes: with amendment (Rept. No. 189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers House Report No. 190. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers House Report No. 191. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DREWRY: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 303. An act to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No 192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1936. A bill to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 1976. A bill relating to the importation, manufacture, sale, or possession within the State of Minnesota of certain nonintoxicating beverages; without amendment (Rept. No. 194). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 2002. A bill to require that parity reflect increased farm labor costs for the purposes of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and the act of October 2, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 772. A bill for the relief of M. L. Leopold Rosenberg and his wife, Lisa; without amendment (Rept. No. 196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1225. A bill for the relief of Joseph Nathaniel Growder; without amendment (Rept. No. 197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1467. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal; without amendment (Rept. No. 198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2017. A bill to provide for the payment of annuities to blind persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLACKNEY:

H. R. 2018 A bill to authorize certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to act as notaries public during the existence of war or a national emergency and 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 2019. A bill to suspend the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission under section 14 (a) and section 14 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act to issue rules relating to the solicitation of proxies, consents, and authorizations during the period of war emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 2020. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 2021. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 2022. A bill relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2023. A bill to amend section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2024. A bill to provide compensation for widows and children of certain deceased members of the Civil Air Patrol; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2025. A bill to amend that part of the act of June 24, 1910 (36 Stat. 619), relating to disposition of profits from sales of ships' stores; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHELCHEL of Georgia:

H. R. 2026. A bill to proclaim as treason, during the present war, all strikes impeding the progress of national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 2027. A bill relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2028. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, to provide for a 10-percent increase in annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 2029. A bill to provide for the insurance of war crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 2030. A bill to permit the shipment tax-free of certain tobacco products to Territories of the United States for the use of members of the military and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 2031. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the eastern section of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2032. A bill to protect employees engaged in war production; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2033. A bill to amend section 251 of title II of the United States Code (Feb. 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, sec. 313, 43 Stat. 1074); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 2034. A bill to promote further the friendly relations of the peoples of the Pan American Republics by providing for Pan American student teacher scholarships; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 2035. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2036. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution to extend the time for filing return and paying the tax on 1942 individual income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to provide for a national farm moratorium; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. Res. 140. Resolution for the continuation of the select committee conducting the investigation and study of the interstate migration of destitute citizens; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. Res. 141. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1563, a bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to locate a veterans' hospital at Thermopolis, in Hot Springs County, Wyo.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to create a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

201. By Mr. BARRETT: Memorial of the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the State of Wyoming memorializing the Congress of the United States of America relative to an appropriation of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service to be used in feeding the elk in Teton County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

202. Also, memorial of the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the State of Wyoming memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation relating to reviews by United States district courts of decisions of Federal boards, commissions, and other agencies of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

203. Also, memorial of the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the State of Wyoming memorializing the Congress of the United States of America (and the Veterans' Bureau of the United States) to locate a veterans' hospital at Thermopolis, in Hot Springs County, Wyo.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

204. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of Painting and Decorating Contractors of America urging favorable action by Congress on the extension of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

205. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations proposing that a United States Navy Yard be created forthwith and completely equipped within Narragansett Bay, and that the outer line of defense, inclusive of Gay Head, Block Island, and Montauk Point, be completely fortified immediately as nationally necessary; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

206. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Bryan Daily Eagle, Bryan, Tex., favoring House bill 123; to the Committee on Labor.

207. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of the conference committee of National Jewish Women's Organizations protesting the Nazi persecutions of Jewish men, women, and children, and expressing wholehearted support of the stand of the President to achieve the rescue of the Jews who have survived the Nazi fury; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

208. By Mr. STEFAN: Memorial of the Nebraska State Legislature, urging the Congress of the United States to repeal the act establishing wartime, commonly known as daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

209. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly, relative to the construction of a navy yard in Narragansett Bay, and the fortification of the outer line of defense of Narragansett Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

210. By Mr. HOCH: Petition of Painting and Decorating Contractors of America, Philadelphia, Pa., advocating an extension of benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.